

The Formation of Biblical Texts

Chronicling the Legacy of Gary N. Knoppers

Edited by
DEIRDRE N. FULTON,
KENNETH A. RISTAU,
JONATHAN S. GREER,
and MARGARET E. COHEN

*Forschungen
zum Alten Testament
176*

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Edited by

Corinna Körting (Hamburg) · Konrad Schmid (Zürich)

Mark S. Smith (Princeton) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

176



The Formation of Biblical Texts

Chronicling the Legacy of Gary N. Knoppers

Edited by

Deirdre N. Fulton, Kenneth A. Ristau,
Jonathan S. Greer, and Margaret E. Cohen

Mohr Siebeck

Deirdre N. Fulton, born 1976; 2011 PhD; Associate Professor in the Department of Religion at Baylor University.
orcid.org/0000-0002-5922-5461

Kenneth A. Ristau, born 1977; 2013 PhD; professional resource faculty at MacEwan University and lecturer at the University of Alberta.

Jonathan S. Greer, born 1973; 2011 PhD; Visiting Professor of Archaeology at Grand Valley State University; Associate Director of excavations at Tel Dan, Israel.
orcid.org/0000-0002-3054-9622

Margaret E. Cohen, born 1975; 2013 PhD; scholar of Hebrew Bible and the archaeology of Ancient Israel; teaches Judaic Studies at the University of Arizona.

ISBN 978-3-16-160741-7 / eISBN 978-3-16-162756-9
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-162756-9

ISSN 0940-4155 / eISSN 2568-8359 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <https://dnb.de>.

© 2024 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by SatzWeise in Bad Wünnenberg using Minion typeface, printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

Gary was a leading scholar in many of the subfields of biblical studies and made significant contributions in discussions concerning the so-called Primary and Deuteronomistic Histories, the Book of Chronicles, the Book of Ezra-Neemiah, and Samaritan Studies. Gary was highly-regarded among his peers, a much-sought-after speaker in national and international contexts, and a devoted mentor to many students. We seek to celebrate his important career with a volume of collected essays by expert scholars that builds upon and interacts with trajectories in scholarship that he influenced.

Along with his family and personal friends, our scholarly community was greatly saddened to learn of Gary's passing. So many expressed their appreciation for his academic contributions, his friendship, and his service to the guild. Losing such a vibrant and beloved colleague, teacher, and friend too soon was a terrible thing. One expression of this appreciation came in the form of a special session at the annual meeting of the SBL in 2019 at which a number of scholars offered papers in honor and memory of Gary. As was true of Gary's scholarship, this session also was a mixture of retrospection, new questions, intellectual curiosity, and warm hospitality. At the time we could not have known that shortly thereafter we would all be forced into a different crisis, as we all faced an unprecedented global pandemic. The difficult and unexpected burdens brought on by these events have lengthened the time it has taken to see this project to fruition. Even so, as we continue to remember Gary, and look back over these years since his death, we editors, all former students of Gary's, are pleased to offer this volume, which stems from that SBL session, as a lasting memorial to him.

June 16, 2023

Deirdre N. Fulton, Kenneth A. Ristau,
Jonathan S. Greer, and Margaret Cohen

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the many contributors to this volume who were eager to honor Gary's memory with their work. Our work on this project was also greatly assisted by a number of people over the course of several years. We are especially appreciative of assistance received during the COVID-19 pandemic when personal and professional challenges were numerous for so many.

For assistance with formatting and editing, we would like to thank Brent Nessler from Baylor University for all of his hard work. We would also like to thank Christina Olson, Cara Forney, and Abigail Bodeau, from Baylor University as well as Viviana Moscovich, from The Center for the Mediterranean World. We are grateful to our editor at Mohr Siebeck, Elena Müller, as well as Betina Burkhart, for their kind help and patience during this project.

Table of Contents

Preface	V
Acknowledgments	VII
Introduction	1

Part I

“Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History”:

The Formation of the Primary and Deuteronomistic Histories

Steven L. McKenzie

Gary Knoppers on the Deuteronomistic History	17
--	----

Bernard M. Levinson

Contributions to the Study of Kingship in the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History	33
---	----

Jonathan S. Greer

Recasting the Sin of the Calf: The Deference of Jeroboam in 1 Kings 12 and the Formation of the Earliest History of Israel and Judah	41
---	----

Jeff Rop

Elisha’s Secret Demons: Philanderer, Fraud, Traitor, Murderer	57
---	----

Mark Lackowski

Samson among the Deuteronomists	75
---	----

Konrad Schmid

Was There Ever a Primary History?	97
---	----

Baruch Halpern

Who Lost the Book of the Torah?	121
---	-----

Part II

“Great Among His Colleagues”:
Gary Knoppers’s Contributions to the Study of the
Book of Chronicles

Thomas Römer

What is a Discovered Book Good For? Josiah’s Reforms and the Finding
of the Book in 2 Kings 22–23 and 2 Chronicles 34–35 153

Ehud Ben Zvi

Chronicles and the Concept of the “Twelve Tribes of Israel” 169

James VanderKam

The Priestly List in 1 Chronicles 5:27–41 (English 6:1–15) 187

Christine Mitchell

Commonalities without Equivalence 203

Melody Knowles

The Treatment of Psalm 132 in 11QPs^a (11Q5) and Chronicles:
Politics and Religious Practices in the Second Temple Period 223

Kenneth A. Ristau

One Nation Under David: An Ideological Innovation in Chronicles . . . 243

Part III

“Negotiating Identity in an International Context”:
The Text of Ezra-Nehemiah and the Twelve

Tamara Cohn Eskenazi

Conflict and Marriage and the Holy in Ezra 9–10 261

Louis C. Jonker

Achaemenid Language Politics in Ezra-Nehemiah 279

Deirdre N. Fulton

“The Enemy Without or Within?” Revisiting Identity in Ezra-Nehemiah 297

Manfred Oeming

In the Beginning of the Age of Coins: The Power and Money and the Possibilities of "The Fear of God" According to Nehemiah 5	315
--	-----

John Kessler

The Silence of Exile: The Meaning, Function, and Significance of the "Calls of Silence" in the Book of the Twelve: Zephaniah 1:7, Habakkuk 2:20, and Zechariah 2:17[13]	343
---	-----

*Part IV**"Two Nations under God":*

*The Influence of Northern Israel and Samaritan Studies
on the Formation of Biblical Texts*

Sidnie White Crawford

The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Masoretic Pentateuch: More Evidence for a Common Ancestor from their Scribal Practices . . .	367
--	-----

Magnar Kartveit

What the Pre-Samaritan Texts Can Tell Us About the History of the Pentateuch in the Hellenistic Period	385
--	-----

Reinhard Pummer

Cultural Exchange Between Samaritans and Jews in Late Antiquity: Selected Case Studies	403
---	-----

H. G. M. Williamson

Did Isaiah Refer to the Samaritans?	427
---	-----

Contributor affiliations	441
------------------------------------	-----

List of Publications by Gary Knoppers	443
---	-----

Index of Sources	453
----------------------------	-----

Index of Modern Authors	479
-----------------------------------	-----

Subject Index	489
-------------------------	-----

Introduction

Questions concerning the composition and formation of specific biblical texts and how these texts interact with one another have dominated many of the current discussions in biblical studies. Such questions include explorations of the literary relationship between the Pentateuch and the (so-called) Deuteronomistic History, how these texts may have functioned as a corpus (or related corpora), as well as inquiries into the potential interconnections among these texts and those of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Further, as appreciation has grown for the significance of the history of Judah and Samaria in the Persian and Hellenistic periods as it pertains to text production, the discussion has expanded to incorporate explorations of the way that textual criticism – particularly as it relates to the relationships among the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, Qumran corpus, and the Masoretic Text – and literary criticism intersect. In this volume, a wide array of leading voices in this discussion come together to tackle questions about the composition and formation of the Hebrew Bible and the future directions of such studies.

In the past three decades, few contemporary scholars have contributed as meaningfully to such a wide range of topics in biblical studies as Gary Knoppers. His scholarship is respected and valued by scholars in North America and across the globe. Spanning the gulf between higher and lower criticism, Gary made important contributions in the areas of historical, textual, and redactional criticisms of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament across various corpora.

Gary's dissertation from Harvard University, *What Share Have We in David? The Division of the Kingdom in Kings and Chronicles*, was later substantially revised and became his two-volume work, *Two Nations Under God*.¹ While he was trained in what is known as the "Harvard School" of biblical criticism – and was greatly influenced by his *Doktorvater*, Frank Moore Cross, Jr. – Gary also thoroughly engaged the "Göttingen School" of thought and adopted aspects of this approach in his work.

Gary was a very careful reader of the biblical texts, and many of his articles and works reflect this care. He often tackled what one may classify as "discrete questions," particularly related to textual and historical issues, thoroughly reviewing the previous scholarly work on the topic as well as considering the multiple textual traditions, and ancient Near Eastern, and classical sources.

¹ G. N. Knoppers, *Two Nations Under God*, vol. 1–2, HSM 52–53 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993–94).

Any article of Gary's provides a thorough literature review of the previous scholarship on the topic.

His most well-known scholarship is in the books of Chronicles, on which he published a number of very important articles as well as his two-volume commentary on 1 Chronicles for the prestigious Anchor Bible series.² In more recent years, he also published on Ezra and Nehemiah, as well as the broader questions about the history and thought of the Samaritans. His most recent (single-authored) book, *The Jews and the Samaritans*, is a synthesis of Samaritan studies from biblical and classical sources.³ Drawing on his work in biblical studies as well as his broader interest in ancient Near Eastern sources and archaeology, Gary's study on the Samaritans exhibits his expertise in areas beyond the biblical texts.

Gary was also adept at bringing scholars' work together in edited volumes. He edited a number of books on topics including the Pentateuch, the Deuteronomistic History, identity and identity formation in biblical texts, covenant in the Persian Period, and Second Temple period studies, to name a few. These volumes are well-regarded by biblical scholars and also reflect Gary's unique ability to work with many scholars from different universities and perspectives.

This collection is reflective of Gary's endeavors in this regard and also brings together scholars from a number of different research areas. Specifically, this volume examines the formation of biblical texts, and the historical questions related to these processes, within these crucial subfields. This project was undertaken as a memorial for Gary, but it also now contributes to the larger scholarly discourse on the composition and formation of the Hebrew Bible. Many of the contributions identify significant, original insights and methods within Gary's work. The essays in this volume are both retrospective in some sense, reviewing and assessing Gary's scholarship, but also prospective in providing innovative and insightful directions for future research on the formation of biblical texts. Especially important in Gary's work on this subject, and so too in the essays here, are issues of community, identity, and ethnicity. He saw such issues, especially the relationship between Judeans and Samaritans, as providing vital context for understanding the composition and formation of the texts, helping guide scholars in illuminating literary and textual history.

We have arranged this work in four units modeled after several of Gary's own edited volumes and other works:⁴ the Primary and Deuteronomistic Histories, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah and the Prophets, and Samaritan/Samaritan Stud-

² G. N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, AB 12 (New York: Doubleday; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004); idem, *1 Chronicles 10–29*, AB 12A (New York: Doubleday; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).

³ G. N. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁴ See, for example: G. N. Knoppers and J. McConville, eds., *Reconsidering Israel and Judah:*

ies. In the same spirit represented in Gary's collaborative efforts, our aim was to bring together different scholars in the study of one area or topic to provide a comprehensive, yet polyvocal, discussion.

The first section, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Formation of the Primary and Deuteronomistic Histories," takes its title from a 2001 article of Gary's, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings."⁵ This article compares attitudes towards and depictions of kingship in Deuteronomy itself and the accounts of the monarchs, particularly Solomon, in the book of Kings. In addition to laying out diverging attitudes toward the monarchy in these different bodies of work, he also points out competing attitudes toward the polity more broadly, its functionaries, structure, economic concerns, and cult needs. This careful dissection serves to complicate some of the more superficial views of indebtedness among texts and Gary ends this article by posing provocative questions about the number of times the texts of Deuteronomy and the history may have been edited. As well, he concludes with the insightful reminder that though there may be clear influence between a source and an editor, the magnitude and faithfulness of that influence is not something to be assumed.

Like its namesake, this section, too, explores the relationship between interconnected bodies of text and considers the reach of source material in shaping coherent, edited narratives. In this section, we also find the contributors searching to extrapolate sources out of the emended final products, both from the biblical texts and also as they remember and review Gary's own finished works. As Gary pointed out in "Rethinking," the relationship between authors and

The Deuteronomistic History in Recent Thought, SBTS 8 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000); G. N. Knoppers and A. Hirsch, eds., *Egypt, Israel, and the Ancient Mediterranean World: Studies in Honor of Donald B. Redford*, PÄ 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2004); G. N. Knoppers and B. M. Levinson, eds., *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007); O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz, eds., *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011); G. N. Knoppers, L. L. Grabbe, and D. N. Fulton, eds., *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*, LSTS 73 (London: T&T Clark; New York: Continuum, 2009); G. N. Knoppers and K. A. Ristau, eds., *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009); O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and M. Oeming, eds., *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011); R. J. Bautch and G. N. Knoppers, eds., *Covenant in the Persian Period: From Genesis to Chronicles* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015); M. L. Miller, E. Ben Zvi, and G. N. Knoppers, eds., *The Economy of Ancient Judah in Its Historical Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015); M. Kartveit and G. N. Knoppers, eds., *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*, SJ104/StSam10 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018).

⁵ G. N. Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings," *CBQ* 63 (2001): 393–415.

their source material is not necessarily straightforward, and, even drawing on those sources, later authors use and adapt them according to their own wishes. In this way, explaining the development of what we call the Deuteronomistic History cannot be done with a singular, linear progression. Rather, “Rethinking” reminds us to consider multiple editions of both earlier and subsequent texts, redactions that represent the realities and concerns of differing and perhaps competing groups. The essays brought together here address both discrete and schematic questions concerning the literary and developmental relationship within and between texts.

This section begins with Steven McKenzie’s piece which offers an appreciation of Gary’s many works and wide array of interests, but which reviews specifically those works whose titles indicate a focus on the Deuteronomist or Deuteronomistic History. In this way, McKenzie provides a kind of scaffold on which to hang the other contributions by surveying Gary’s approach to the literary development of a coherent Deuteronomistic narrative through the use of, paradoxically, both imitation and consistency with sources, but also at times subversion and divergence from them. McKenzie carefully directs attention to the critical, but often subtle, changes or realignments in Gary’s understanding of the Deuteronomistic History. Especially relevant is the review of “Rethinking” in which McKenzie highlights a shift in Gary’s view of the complexity and multiplicity of Deuteronomistic redactions. Steadfast in Gary’s work, however, is the view that, despite multiple authors and editors, and despite varying genres and content, Deuteronomistic work is coherent and exhibits unity more than not. This tension – between acknowledging the consistencies and patterns as well as the divergences of ideology and differences of hands – continually drove Gary’s scholarship forward, as McKenzie’s discussion demonstrates.

Similarly, Bernard Levinson discusses a group of Gary’s lesser-recognized contributions focusing particularly on the issue of kingship, a topic which pervaded much of Gary’s oeuvre in large and small ways. Here he reviews, for example, an article on the Ugaritic legend of Kirta in which we find not only an example of Gary’s control over and incorporation of material from the wider ancient world, but also another case in which royal ideology is examined and indeed complicated by the creativity and design of the author. Levinson has also chosen “Rethinking” as a case which shows an important moment in the evolution of Gary’s perspective on the Deuteronomistic history and its ideology and development. He targets Gary’s complication of the traditional view of what is Deuteronomic and what is Deuteronomistic, highlights the disconnects on which Gary focuses regarding the authority and constraints of kingship and praises Gary’s restoration of independence to the Deuteronomistic historian.

Jonathan Greer’s investigation of the sin of Jeroboam proposes a nuanced view of the monarch that is theologically neutral in its earliest form. Bringing to bear evidence from a variety of sources including textual criticism, extrabibl-

ical text traditions, archaeological data, and more, Greer probes accounts concerning Jeroboam I to show a trajectory through the texts which reflect the growth of the tradition about him. Focusing in particular on a discreet passage in 1 Kgs 12, Greer is interested in teasing apart strata that reveal evolving portraits of the monarch. In a context of close interaction between historians from the southern and northern kingdoms, an originally ambiguous account of the Jeroboam's temple building activities, as well as his commissioning of cultic icons and other religious reforms, was reworked to convey a southern, orthodox Yahwism more clearly, and to condemn cult activities outside of those parameters. The familiar condemnation of the sin of Jeroboam develops over the course of multiple reworkings of a core story, as well as influencing and being influenced by texts outside of Kings, and at each stage there is perhaps more compromise between competing traditions than is typically assumed. In offering this proposal, Greer, like Knoppers, has shown not only the growth of Jeroboam's infamy regarding his golden calves, but also demonstrates an example of the non-linear progression of history making in the biblical text, relying on multiple reworkings by changing groups, each with their own prerogatives.

The editors of this volume were all students of Gary's and we were pleased to be joined by one of our own cohort, Jeff Rop, whose contribution here concerns the Elisha cycle. Rop, reacting to a conversation with Gary concerning some oddities about the prophetic account in 2 Kgs 3, addresses the seemingly questionable behavior of Elisha in a number of passages and suggests that these reports are part of a contemporary reaction to negative press concerning the prophet. Several points harken back to Gary's questions concerning the depiction of the monarchy, as well as other functionaries within the state, in disparate texts. The Elisha cycle and Rop's investigation of numerous apologies within it provide another example of how the history's content – whatever its origin – is incorporated and reshaped. Gary's approach affirms both that the Deuteronomistic school was not a monolith and that there is not an obligation to assume every editorial moment represents a single, homogeneous guild. So too, in the example of the Elisha cycle, Rop posits a series of literary events which reflect needs and motivations of different groups of authors and editors.

The essay on Samson comes from Mark Lackowski, one of the last group of students to take courses with Gary, and this piece, like "Rethinking," addresses the shifting landscape as Deuteronomistic scribes make sense of disparate realities and traditions in order to create a coherent narrative. Lackowski demonstrates a number of parallels between the narrative of Samson and that of Zedekiah, suggesting that the two accounts emerged together to shape a larger Deuteronomistic vision of downfall and exile. As Samson's character and storyline evolve through the addition of supplements to his cycle, Lackowski argues, the story of this judge is developed by Deuteronomistic writers in order to encapsulate both Israel's deliverance at its demise. As Gary discussed in "Re-

thinking,” the Deuteronomistic writings and redactions deal heavily with the role of the king and with the nature of royal authority and must even navigate conflicting views on the matter. Here as well, the position of king, or indeed the lack of a monarch, offers additional perspectives on leadership in Israel and Judah, and Samson’s fully supplemented account serves as both a cautionary tale and a postexilic beacon of hope.

In Konrad Schmid’s essay, he addresses the question of an “Enneateuch,” and reviews three specific problems with the theory of an overarching history extending from Genesis to Kings. For the first of these concerns, whether there is redactional unity, Schmid points out the chronological coherence evidenced in the entirety of Genesis through Kings and brings attention to the “hinge” of Josh 24, joining together Genesis through Joshua with Judges through 2 Kings. Regarding the critique of the material feasibility of an “Enneateuch,” he looks to both rabbinic discussions as well as references concerning ancient libraries to demonstrate that very lengthy scrolls were a possibility, and regardless of the technical concerns, such a serial work is possible on one or more scrolls. Finally, he asks if the content of Genesis through 2 Kings, while a coherent complex, is a self-sufficient one, and he concludes that the “Enneateuch” was never a “self-contained entity.” Rather, it relies on the prophetic corpus to provide the view of the future. Having considered these questions, Schmid reaches the conclusion that both combination and separation are powerful forces which shape the biblical text. It is not possible to use simple yesses and nos to discuss the existence of various forms, but instead, Schmid sees a progression from the connecting of Genesis and the following books to the combination of Genesis–2 Kings with the prophetic corpus to the separation of the Torah from the books which follow it.

We close this section with Baruch Halpern’s piece in which he rather mysteriously asks, “Who lost the Book of the Torah?” In unravelling this mystery, Halpern touches on several of our repeated themes: those of the relationship between disparate source material and their coherent presentation by the Deuteronomistic historian as well as the function of the monarch, particularly as regards his responsibility to the law. Halpern parses the text of Josiah’s Reform Report in order to demonstrate how the Deuteronomist reaches for known themes in Deuteronomy and the histories in order to make Josiah’s actions Deuteronomic. Ultimately, the discussion must wrestle with the account of Solomon. Gary posits in “Rethinking” that the details of Solomon’s reign are related against a known, prestigious Deuteronomic source but that the Deuteronomistic author is not obliged to affirm everything about this source – in fact, the author is free to contest it! Here, Halpern also reckons with the complex of both an inherited regnal account as well as the Deuteronomist’s own original contributions, and it is from this worked narrative, along with the Reform Report, that he recovers the evidence to charge Solomon.

In section two, “‘Great Among His Colleagues’: Gary Knoppers’s Contributions to the Study of the Book of the Chronicles,” six scholars have explored issues that intersect with his highly influential work in this area. Although Gary’s contributions to biblical studies are wide-ranging and impact many discrete corpora within the Hebrew Bible, he is perhaps most commonly known for his extensive scholarship on the book of Chronicles. Gary would, of course, readily acknowledge that his work built upon the work of his colleagues, Hugh Williamson and Sara Japhet, both of whom must be recognized as particularly influential in reviving critical study of this once neglected text. Nevertheless, Gary’s contributions significantly advanced and expanded their work. In addition to the introduction and notes on 1 and 2 Chronicles for *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (3rd through 5th editions), five dictionary articles, and his peerless two-volume commentary on 1 Chronicles in the Anchor Bible series, he wrote forty-one articles that predominantly engaged with the books (nearly half his total output).⁶ A posthumous collection of essays entitled *Prophets, Priests, and Promises* adds seven new and revised articles about Chronicles to complete Gary’s oeuvre.⁷ His articles cover the reigns of important kings in the book as well as central themes and issues, and, taken as a whole, his works demonstrate the ingenuity of the Chronicler (Chr) in composing a history of Judah in light of Samuel-Kings.

With such a large oeuvre, there are many themes and contributions on which one could ruminate. We would suggest that Gary’s influence is well illustrated by the articles in this volume. The first article in the section, “What is a Discovered Book Good For? Josiah’s Reforms and the Finding of the Book in 2 Kings 22–23 and 2 Chronicles 34–35” by Thomas Römer, examines some perplexing features of the Josiah tradition in Chronicles and Kings. With recourse to archaeological finds and excavations, Römer argues that the Chr had either additional sources or a different version of Samuel-Kings than attested in the Masoretic text (MT). Römer evaluates the traditions in MT Kings and MT Chronicles of cultic reform in the seventh century BCE and finds that these traditions probably reflect historical circumstances. Römer argues, however, that the Chr recognizes that the discovery of the book of the law did not, as Kings suggests, trigger the reform. Römer also suggests that the ark only came to the Jerusalem

⁶ G. N. Knoppers, “Introduction” and “Notes on 1 and 2 Chronicles,” in *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*, ed. M. D. Coogan et al. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 575–665. Idem, “Chronicles,” “The Chronicler’s History,” “The Deuteronomistic History,” and “Solomon,” in *New Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. D. N. Freedman and A. C. Myers (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 241–44, 341–42, 1236–38. Idem, “First and Second Books of Chronicles,” in *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, 1 (A–C), ed. K. D. Sakenfeld et al. (Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 2006), 622–31. Idem, *I Chronicles*.

⁷ G. N. Knoppers, *Prophets, Priests, and Promises: Essays on the Deuteronomistic History, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah*, ed. C. M. Maier and H. G. M. Williamson, VTSup 186 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2021).

temple in the reign of Josiah when, as only the Chr reports, Josiah instructed the Levites to put it there (2 Chr 35:3). Römer argues that a monumental platform at Kiriath-Jearim may have been the sanctuary of the ark and under northern influence. Römer's weaving together of text-critical, literary, historical, and archaeological evidence would most certainly have intrigued Gary and reflects Gary's own interest in using such diverse evidence to investigate texts.

In "Chronicles and the Concept of 'The Twelve Tribes of Israel,'" Ehud Ben Zvi explores a topic that interested Gary a lot, namely conceptions of collective or community identity. In a variety of articles on Chronicles, as well as articles on other books, Gary frequently considered how the politics of Samaria and Judah related to one another as well as how biblical literature reflected and informed constructions of identity. Ben Zvi's study examines a particular construction of that relationship, the idea of the twelve tribes of Israel. Ben Zvi observes that the construction is especially informed by the Pentateuch and that the Chr seeks to counterbalance and temper this construction in favor of a Jerusalem and Judah/Yehudite-centered ideology.

For the Chr, questions of identity were addressed, at least, in part, through lists and genealogies. In many investigations, Gary demonstrated the importance of the genealogies in Chronicles, not as a mere prologue, but as an integral part of the overall ideological perspective of the book. James VanderKam's article, "The Priestly List in 1 Chronicles 5:27–41 (English 6:1–15)," builds on Gary's thoughtful interpretation of 1 Chr 5:27–41 as a list not of high priests but of a prominent priestly family. VanderKam shows that the list almost certainly exists to validate the credentials of Joshua in the Persian period and, therefore, legitimate the priesthood of the Second Temple. Gary very often read texts with a view to their insights on the history of the period in which they were written, especially as a reflection of the ideological debates and intellectual currents of that age.

Christine Mitchell, in "Commonalities without Equivalence," employs another of Gary's strategies for understanding difficult texts, namely the analysis of extrabiblical literature and cross-cultural comparisons. Starting with a rich discussion of scholarly developments in Comparative Literature and Comparative Religion, Mitchell argues for a nuanced approach to comparisons, an approach with "emphasis on the local, specific, attuned to difference, non-equivalent." She applies her method in two specific examples, one of which is particularly relevant to the study of Chronicles. Mitchell examines "the title or position of *lahhin* at Elephantine and the title or position of Levite in Chronicles," arguing that the former may tell us more about what a fourth-century Levite in Jerusalem looked like than the utopian/idealized presentation of Levites in Chronicles. Especially instructive in this conclusion is the challenge it presents to the common approach to the study of Chronicles, namely, the tendency to interpret its presentation of history as a reflection of its own time. Mitchell's

essay points to a need to distinguish carefully between what might be intellectual currents, utopian or dystopian fantasies, or historical echoes and reflexes when reading texts.

In “The Treatment of Psalm 132 in 11QPs^a (11Q5) and Chronicles: Politics and Religious Practices in the Second Temple Period,” Melody Knowles examines the Chr’s use of Ps 132 especially in light of the Qumran scrolls. In doing so, she reflects Gary’s interest in textual criticism and the Qumran material. Although Gary did not often study the Psalms from an academic perspective, it is perhaps because they meant so much to him at a personal and spiritual level. He, therefore, would have enjoyed reading about the diverse expressions of Yahwism that Knowles finds reflected in the Chr’s and Qumranic use of Ps 132, as well as the attention Knowles brings to the importance of Psalms in Chronicles. Knowles deftly illustrates how the differences point to diverse theological priorities. The Chr promotes Jerusalem and the temple in contrast to the emphasis of the Qumran community on the law, while both adopt a reserved and nuanced interpretation of the Davidic monarchy.

The last article in the section, “One Nation Under David: An Ideological Innovation in Chronicles,” revisits one of Gary’s earliest articles, “Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?”⁸ The characterization of the kings of Judah was a recurrent topic in Gary’s articles, where he repeatedly showed how the Chr read and adapted royal traditions in Samuel-Kings to new ideological purposes. In the case of Rehoboam, Gary argued that subtle changes in the narrative support the Chr’s ideologically negative stance towards the secession of the northern kingdom. Gary’s perspective inspired several scholarly investigations, which further developed and elucidated the Chr’s purposes. In this article, Ristau provides a review of this scholarship and turns to Gary’s more recent scholarship to reinforce some key ideas about how the promotion of the Davidic kingdom functioned both to promote Jerusalem and as a cipher for the interpretation of Torah in the Persian period.

These six articles in this tribute to Gary’s work highlight important topics and methods of his work and reveal his enduring legacy and influence on students and colleagues in the study of Chronicles. For those of us who call ourselves “Chroniclers,” Gary’s academic work will continue to influence and shape our insights. We lament the inability to see his finished work on 2 Chronicles in the Anchor Bible series and, much more significantly, to continue our conversations with him in person. He was a mentor for our scholarship on this book, as well as a beloved colleague and friend. We return now and in the future to study of the book of Chronicles with many memories and with gratitude that we have so many of his thoughts available to us to imagine what some of those conversations with him might have been like.

⁸ G. N. Knoppers, “Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?” *JBL* 109 (1990): 423–40.

The third section, “Negotiating Identity in An International Context’: The Text of Ezra-Nehemiah and the Twelve,” examines the exilic and postexilic text of Ezra-Nehemiah and the Twelve. The title of this section is an homage to the Lipschits, Knoppers, and Oeming edited volume, *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*.⁹ Gary edited and contributed to a number of edited volumes over his career. Just as the 2011 edited volume explores questions related to community boundaries in Judah, while others examined long-term compositional questions of how identity was negotiated and renegotiated, Gary’s numerous articles on Ezra-Nehemiah explore similar questions. In honor of Gary’s scholarly contributions, Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, Manfred Oeming, Louis Jonker, Deirdre Fulton, and John Kessler explore compositional and thematic questions related to Ezra-Nehemiah and the Book of the Twelve. Much of Gary’s work focused on the exilic and postexilic periods and issues related to identity and autonomy. Eskenazi, Jonker, and Fulton broadly examine themes related to identity in the postexilic period while Oeming and Kessler explore specific themes related to the texts but with historical considerations in mind.

Tamara Cohn Eskenazi’s contribution, “Conflict and Marriage and the Holy in Ezra 9–10,” explores the message and meaning of Ezra’s so-called “marriage crisis.” As Eskenazi observes, the exact contours of this crisis, the meaning of *zera’ haqqōdeš*, and the exact identity of the “peoples of the land(s)” have troubled interpreters. Eskenazi provides an analysis of Ezra 9–10, using a lens of “social memory” to understand what the narrative conveys. In her analysis, Eskenazi concludes that marriage was the “litmus test” in Ezra 9–10 and serves to move the connection between the “communal and so-called personal.” She compares this dynamic to activities in Athens which addressed tensions between the *polis* and *oikos*. Rather than focus on the historical reliability of the events, Eskenazi focuses on the rationale for why the text was composed.

In “Achaemenid Language Politics in Ezra-Nehemiah,” Louis Jonker examines the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah from the perspective of language identity. Jonker focuses on the Aramaic portions found in Ezra 4:6–6:18 and 7:12–26, as well as in Neh 8 and 13, in order to understand the synchronic and diachronic development of the text of Ezra-Nehemiah. Jonker examines the different interpretive reasons that scholars use to explain the use of Aramaic but broadens this discussion to consider the appearance of Hebrew in Ezra-Nehemiah. Jonker offers a number of explanations but views the use of Aramaic as well as Hebrew as a bilingual means of negotiating “power relationships with the imperial center” and also with the diaspora to the east. The use of Aramaic was a way to offer a “subtle polemic” against Samaria to the north and strengthen the place of Jerusalem. It strengthened ties with the Babylonian community

⁹ Lipschits, Knoppers, and Oeming, *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period*.

and provided a reminder to them of Jerusalem's spiritual importance. It was also a tool of "colonial mimicry," that used the tool of the empire against it. Jonker's analysis offers a careful diachronic consideration of the use of Aramaic, as well as Hebrew, in negotiating identity in Yehud.

In "The Enemy Without or Within," Deirdre Fulton also considers questions of identity in Ezra-Nehemiah. The title of Fulton's chapter is a nod to Knoppers's 2007 article, "Nehemiah and Sanballat: The Enemy Without or Within?" and Fulton examines the relationship of Nehemiah and Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem. Exploring the passages in which the conflicts between Nehemiah and the neighboring groups appear (namely, Neh 2:9–4:17, 6:1–19, 13:4–9 and 28), she compares them to the genealogical references to these two groups and concludes that the neighboring enemies are integrated into the community through their family ties. This integration is intriguing in light of Nehemiah's lack of family ties to the larger Judean community. In the end, Fulton concludes that participation in the Jerusalem community, according to Nehemiah's presentation, is not grounded in marriage alliances to the Jerusalem elite but rather on Judean identity and Jerusalem-centered worship of Yahweh.

Manfred Oeming examines the fifth-century Judean economy and ethics in his article, "In the Beginning of the Age of Coins." Specifically, he examines the text of Neh 5 and discusses the history of coinage and taxation in Judah and then moves to a discussion of theological ethics in the text. Oeming points out that Nehemiah's act of appealing to the Judean elites to release slaves bound in debt-slavery is unique. The Chr school, which he credits with the final editing of Ezra-Nehemiah, exaggerated Nehemiah's deeds and presented him as an "ethical hero" who is worthy of emulation. The core text of Nehemiah, for Oeming, is written by Nehemiah himself, and thus he offers what he calls a "mediating position" between scholars of Oeming's minimalist and maximalist schools.

John Kessler's contribution, "The Silence of Exile," focuses on the Book of the Twelve. Building on scholarly observation that – unlike 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and some of the Psalms – the Twelve does not contain descriptions of conquest, forced migration, or the period of Babylonian rule, Kessler explores this silence in the Twelve. He specifically examines the "Calls of Silence" in Zeph 1:7, Hab 2:20, and Zech 2:17[13] which demarcate the era of Babylonian control over Judah. Kessler examines the function of the "Calls of Silence" in the Twelve, the exact meaning for the phrase "be silent before [the Lord] Yahweh," offering a different translation and meaning to this phrase, and the composition of Hab 2:20, Zech 2:17[13] and Zeph 1:7. His conclusions for all three issues have important implications for understanding this "exilic gap" in historical periods in the Twelve.

The final section "Two Nations under God" takes its name from the published form of Gary's dissertation concerning the formation of the Deutero-

nomistic History and its historical and theological settings.¹⁰ Situated very much at that point in his career within the so-called Harvard school, much of this work presented evidence for a Josianic edition of a history of the Hebrew kingdoms in line with the ideas of his mentor Frank Moore Cross. Already in this work, however, Gary's close reading strategy that integrated higher and lower criticism illuminated new theological contours of the text and anticipated fresh directions in research.

Most significantly for the collection of essays in this section, he identified a more pronounced focus on the North in the histories, albeit shaped by the perspective of seventh-century Jerusalemite scribes, piquing his own interest in the relationship between Israelites and Judahites in the late Iron Age II. While never abandoning this interest throughout his career, he turned special attention to North-South relations in the last phase of his scholarship culminating in his 2013 work, *Jews and Samaritans*, and continuing in the 2018 co-edited work with Magnar Kartveit, *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*, and the 2019 posthumous collection of his own essays in *Judah and Samaria in Postmonarchic Times*.¹¹ In these later works, Gary's focus shifted to the later periods of Samaritan – or, as Gary preferred, Samaritan – and Judean relations, with a special focus on the Persian period, offering a well-argued corrective to simplistic notions of the relationship between these two communities of Yahwists. Instead, Gary offered a view that acknowledged not only times of conflict between the communities, but also embraced and emphasized periods of cooperation and collaboration, suggesting ways this cooperation may have influenced the formation of the Pentateuch and ushering in a host of new perspectives and inviting new questions. The essays included here represent a continuation of that trajectory and a renewed interest in Samaria and the Samaritans, as well as the later Samaritan inheritors of these traditions.

Sidnie White Crawford leads off with a close look at scribal practices current in the formation of the Samaritan Pentateuch and its relationship to the Masoretic Pentateuch. More specifically, she examines the paragraph markings of Pentateuch manuscripts from Qumran and compares them with the *qiṣṣim* in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the *parashot* in the Masoretic Text. Her study emphasizes the importance of the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran for highlighting the value of the Samaritan Pentateuch in understanding the various textual traditions of the Second Temple period. Through a technical collation and comparison of the systems of paragraph markings, Crawford bolsters arguments put forth by Gary and others that the Samaritan and Masoretic Penta-

¹⁰ Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*.

¹¹ Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans*. Knoppers and Kartveit, *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*. G. N. Knoppers, *Judah and Samaria in Postmonarchic Times*, FAT 129 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

teuchs share a common textual history prior to the turn of the eras reflective of their shared cultural and religious heritage.

Magnar Kartveit continues the discussion of pre-Samaritan texts and their relationship to the history of the Pentateuch in the Hellenistic period. He reviews Gary's contributions to the growing notion that the Pentateuch as we have it represents the collaborative, or compromising, efforts of Judean and Samaritan scribal communities and traces the impact of Gary's scholarship in ongoing discussions. Kartveit then turns his attention to similarities and differences among the pre-Samaritan texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch with an eye toward important thematic elements of Samaritan theology focused on developing views of Moses and the prophets. He concludes that the priority placed on Moses (and the diminished view of the prophets) evident in the Second Temple period has its roots in a shared tradition represented in the pre-Samaritan texts and early texts of the MT tradition.

Reinhard Pummer explores the enduring contact and similarities between Samaritans and Jews in late antiquity, prioritizing the perspective of the Samaritans with some comparison to rabbinic Judaism. He includes a discussion of textual and archaeological evidence for Samaritan synagogues, *miqva'ot*, *mezu-zot*, dietary laws concerning meat and dairy, and Targumim. While conceding the tension at various points and instances of polemic, Pummer traces out ongoing interaction and exchange of ideas between Samaritans and Jews that only dwindled in the Middle Ages, primarily due to demographics. He concludes that a common tradition explains the similarities in religious culture between Samaritans and Jews in late antiquity and beyond that was enriched through ongoing interaction between the groups.

Hugh Williamson concludes the section with his exploration of Isa 65–66 and the question of anti-Samaritan polemic. He revisits the conclusions of earlier scholars who assumed the anti-Samaritan nature of these texts – a position that recent scholarship has disregarded due to new understandings of the Samaritans and their texts – through a close study of the vocabulary and intertextual references within Isaiah and beyond (especially in the books of Chronicles) with special attention to the identity of “those who abandon the Lord.” Williamson concludes that even if the specificity that the earlier interpreters implied cannot be sustained, an early Gerizim-centered community who would later become known as the Samaritans may indeed have been included among the targets of Trito-Isaiah's polemic.

The community of scholars who have contributed to this volume and the ideas presented herein attest to the range of Gary's expertise, as well as to the abundance of his colleagues and friends. Yet these essays are only a small indication of the breadth and depth of the impact of Gary's scholarship in biblical studies. Rare is a work on Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, or the Samaritans – or many other topics in bib-

lical studies, for that matter – that does not cite and engage Gary’s ideas. His careful scholarship helped us rethink older paradigms and invited us to create new syntheses. His generous spirit modeled new collaborative relationships across various disciplines, encouraging cooperation between archaeologists and biblical scholars, and also across various methodological divides, bringing together scholars from across the globe. While we continue to grieve the loss of our mentor, colleague, and friend, we hope that this work will serve as a tribute that celebrates the legacy of his many contributions and encourages important works to come.

Part I

“Rethinking the Relationship between
Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History”:
The Formation of the
Primary and Deuteronomistic Histories

Gary Knoppers on the Deuteronomistic History¹

Steven L. McKenzie

Gary Knoppers was that rare scholar whose every interest soon became an area of expertise. That is clear on his most recent *curriculum vitae*, which lists the following areas of interest:

Ancient Historiography

Ancient Israelite and Near Eastern History

Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Law

Biblical Theology

Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah

Comparative Ancient Near Eastern Religions

Early Judaism

Inner Scriptural Exegesis

The Samaritans and Early Jewish-Samaritan Relations

Syro-Palestinian Archaeology

Textual Criticism

It is curious that the Deuteronomistic History does not occur on this list. I think that this is because the Deuteronomistic History was the root from which the other interests grew, so that it is, in fact, implicit in all of the items that are on the list.

Only three of Gary's sixteen books contain the words "Deuteronomist" or "Deuteronomistic" in their titles. Two of the three are the published volumes of his dissertation, and the third is a co-edited collection of essays. But again,

¹ I am grateful to the editors for the invitation to contribute to this volume in Gary's memory and for the opportunity to articulate the significance of his work to me and to our field. Our careers have had a lot in common. We first met during the 1982–83 academic year as doctoral students at Harvard. We shared an interest in the Deuteronomistic History and each wrote dissertations on the topic under Frank Cross within a few years of one another. Those dissertations were our first books respectively. We became friends a decade later as participants in an NEH-sponsored summer seminar led by John Van Seters at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. The topic was ancient historiography. I have fond memories of a cook-out at Gary and Laura's apartment in the UNC married student housing and of numerous animated conversations with Gary and the other participants in the seminar. Those conversations multiplied over the years as our friendship grew and we collaborated in various projects related especially to the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles. We planned at one point to co-author a commentary on 1–2 Kings; sadly, that plan never came to fruition.

this bare statistic belies the significance of the Deuteronomistic History in Gary's work. For one thing, Gary had a predilection for the article form. His *c.v.* lists an impressive 110 published scholarly articles.² Of them, only ten percent, exactly eleven, contain the terms "Deuteronomist" or "Deuteronomistic" in their titles. One of these is an annotated bibliography,³ and another is a dictionary article. But again, I would propose that Gary's scholarship was "Pan-Deuteronomistic" in terms of the influence that the Deuteronomistic History had in sparking his interests. In what follows I will examine these eleven articles, minus the annotated bibliography, in chronological order focusing on what they have in common and where they differ in order to determine whether there was a common thread in Gary's work on the Deuteronomistic History and how his mind may have changed over his career.

1. "Sex, Religion, and Politics:
The Deuteronomist on Intermarriage."
HAR 14 (1994): 121–41.

The first of Gary's eleven "Deuteronomistic" articles appeared the same year as the second volume of his dissertation. In the article, Gary dealt with the notice about Solomon's marriages in 1 Kgs 11:1–4. He took issue with the interpretation by Fishbane that the notice was a postexilic expansion intended to address the issue of mixed marriage from the same vantage point as Ezra 9:1–2.⁴ Gary argued that, in fact, the prohibition of intermarriage with all Gentiles was more complex than previously recognized. First Kings 11:1–4, he contended, was a Deuteronomistic composition and crucial to the periodization of Solomon's reign in the presentation of the Deuteronomistic History. In it, the Deuteronomist (Dtr¹) made use of the *topos* of mixed marriage, which he adapted from the ideology of Deuteronomy 7. The topic was not an overriding concern of his, but it was important enough for him to employ it as an indication of decadence and regression. An example is Judg 3:5–6, where intermarriage marked the decline of the period of the judges from the golden age of conquest. Similarly, in 1 Kgs 11:1–4, Dtr¹ signaled the downfall of the united monarchy drawing exegetically on Deut 7:4 and even more directly on Josh 23:11–13. Rather than being the

² His work was actually once declined for publication on the grounds of over-productivity: In the 1990s when he was hard at work on 1 Chronicles for the Anchor Bible. Gail O'Day, who was the editor of *JBL* at the time and who was also gone much too soon, asked Gary to hold off submitting articles because his accepted pieces had created a backlog in the publication queue.

³ G. N. Knoppers and J. Greer, "The Deuteronomistic History," in *Oxford University Press Bibliography Online* (www.oxfordbibliographiesonline.com).

⁴ M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 125–6.

catalyst of 1 Kgs 11:1–4, Ezra–Nehemiah instead had extended and expanded the Deuteronomistic *topos* of mixed marriages of which 1 Kgs 11:1–4 was a part.

2. “Prayer and Propaganda:
The Dedication of Solomon’s Temple and the Deuteronomist’s
Program.” *CBQ* 57 (1995): 229–54.

Gary began this article by noting the different scholarly views on the unity, composition, and date of 1 Kings 8, especially as such views reflected the broader theories of Cross and Smend regarding the composition of the Deuteronomistic History as a whole.⁵ He highlighted the position of Noth that Solomon’s promotion of the temple as a place of prayer rather than of sacrifice indicates an exilic date.⁶ By contrast, Gary argued for the literary unity of 1 Kings 8, positing a chiasmic structure to the chapter that integrates Solomon’s prayer more tightly than generally appreciated. He observed verbal parallels between the invocations in vv. 27–30 and vv. 52–53 and balance and resonance within the petitions. He argued that the attention given to the ark in 1 Kings 8 was not due to source material but to the Deuteronomist’s stress on the temple superseding the ark as Israel’s central, unifying cultic institution. He argued, moreover, that the invocations in Solomon’s prayer worked to integrate the temple into Israelite tradition as the fulfillment of promises made to Moses and David, the two dominant figures in the Deuteronomistic History. With this background, the various situations posed in Solomon’s prayer depict the temple as the site of security and prosperity for the nation. The most likely setting for such a prayer, Gary contended, was the late preexilic era, specifically the reign of Josiah when Dtr¹ wrote. The main point of the chapter was to reassert the significance of the temple to fill the religious vacuum left by Josiah’s proscription of competing shrines in his program of cultic centralization.

⁵ The fundamental pieces are F.M. Cross, Jr., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274–89; and R. Smend, “Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte,” in *Probleme Biblischer Theologie. Festschrift für Gerhard von Rad* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968), 111–34. The subsequent elaborations of their basic theses are well known and can be found in a host of works on the Deuteronomistic History, including the two volumes of Gary’s dissertation, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*, HSM 52, 53 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993–94). In the present article, Gary also cited the mediating view of M. A. O’Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*, OBO 92 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) and his mentor Antony F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1 – 2 Kings 2)*, CBQMS 17 (Washington, DC: CBA, 1986).

⁶ M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 93–5.

3. "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King:
A Reexamination of a Relationship."
ZAW 108 (1996): 329–46.

In this third article, Gary observed the contrast between the restrictive law of the king in Deut 17:14–20 and the far-reaching power and authority accorded to kings in the ancient Near East in general and in the Deuteronomistic History. The article began by summarizing the two major explanations: (1) that the Deuteronomic law is a cipher by which the Deuteronomist critiques kingship in general and specific Israelite kings, notably Solomon; and (2) that the Deuteronomist was influenced by royal Judean theology to adopt a more positive stance on monarchy than Deuteronomy despite the negative example of individual kings. Gary sought to elaborate the second explanation, arguing that it understated the contrast between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History with regard to kingship. In addition to using the later presentation of Solomon to explain the earlier Deuteronomic law, this explanation overlooked the contrast between Deuteronomy's distribution of powers and those approvingly adopted by kings in the Deuteronomistic History. In addition, Deuteronomy's prohibitions of the accumulation of women, wealth, and horses were not the criteria used by the Deuteronomist to evaluate kings. Solomon's trade in horses and his enormous wealth were signs of his great success and reward according to divine promise. It was also not polygamy for which Solomon is condemned but exogamy and the apostasy in which it resulted. The Deuteronomist did not use Deut 17:16 in the reprimand but instead cited the prohibition and warning, respectively, against intermarriage in Deut 7:3 and Josh 23:11–13. For the Deuteronomist, in short, the institution of monarchy was not an inherent threat as it was in Deuteronomy. Gary concluded that the idea that the law of the king in Deuteronomy expressed the Deuteronomistic view of kingship should be abandoned. Rather, the Deuteronomist (Dtr¹) was an independent author who, to be sure, used the Ur-Deuteronomic code as a foundation for his History, but at the same time subverted its law circumscribing kingship in Deut 17:14–20 by means of his royalist ideology.

4. "Deuteronomistic History."

Pages 341–42 in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*.

Edited by David Noel Freedman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

As a dictionary entry, this article was essentially synthetic. Gary summarized Noth's initial theory, eloquently pointing out its attractiveness in the face of earlier scholarship that either focused on individual books in the Former

Prophets without recognizing their relationship to one another or tried to identify strands in these books in continuity or analogy with the Pentateuch. After outlining the influential revisions of Noth by Cross and Smend, the article noted the recent spate of contributions arguing for an earlier monarchical edition on the basis of the regnal formulae. Gary identified himself as an adherent of Cross's double-redaction theory and characterized his own work to that point as focused on Dtr¹, arguing "that the attention given to the history of the northern monarchy, the fall of Israel, and the reign of Josiah can only be understood in the context of Dtr's treatment of the United Monarchy and the causes he imputes to the creation of the Divided Monarchy."

5. "Is There a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?"

Pages 119–34 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*.

Edited by Thomas Römer. BETL 147. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

In a second article on the Deuteronomistic History from the year 2000, Gary began by noting the breakdown of the long-standing consensus about Noth's theory of the Deuteronomistic History that had occurred in just the few years since the appearance of the two volumes of his dissertation in the Harvard Semitic Monographs. The challenges were important, he averred, for their revival of pre-Noth proposals and for the questions they raised about ancient historiography. Gary grouped the challenges into three rough categories: a book model, which advocated the view that the individual books within the Former Prophets were discrete units only loosely joined together editorially;⁷ a more radical version of the book model that saw the Former Prophets as products of independent and unrelated redactional efforts that had nothing to do with history writing;⁸ and a block model that conceived of the Former Prophets as the combination of a series of independent blocks.⁹ In addition to these three options, Gary took note of reconstructions that posited so many Deuteronomistic complexes and editions as to undermine any realistic notion of unity in the work.

⁷ J. G. McConville, "Narrative and Meaning in the Books of Kings," *Bib* 70 (1989): 31–49; idem, *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomistic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993); C. Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* TBAT, 87 (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1994).

⁸ E. A. Knauf, "L' 'historiographie deuteronomiste' (DtrG) exist-t-elle?" in *Israël construit son histoire: L'historiographie deuteronomiste à la lumière des recherches récentes*, ed. A. de Pury, T. Römer and J.-D. Macchi, MoBi(G) 34 (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1996), 409–18.

⁹ See note 22 in Gary's article for bibliography, which is too large to cite here. The example he examined was E. Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, OTS 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

Gary acknowledged that these competing models rightly pointed out the simplistic nature of Noth's view of the purpose of the Deuteronomistic History and reminded scholars of its compositional and textual complexity. They also raised or resurrected many important questions about the work's beginning, unity, and genre. Their answers to those questions, though, came with their own sets of questions and shortcomings. Gary sought, therefore, to mount what he called "a moderate defense" of the theory of the Deuteronomistic History as a unified product of ancient Israelite history writing. He posed and addressed three sets of questions: (1) whether the Deuteronomistic History is historically reliable, (2) whether it is plausible that the Deuteronomistic History incorporated diverse pre-existing sources without reworking them, and (3) whether the elements of the Deuteronomistic History form a continuous narrative. Gary took issue with the assumptions of the first question about historical reliability and access for ancient writers to the past. The question, he argued, should be whether the Deuteronomistic History represents a meaningful, sequential narrative of the past according to the limitations and understandings of the day, and he contended that a positive response was defensible based on ancient Greek analogues. He problematized the second question as well, asserting that engagement with heterogeneous sources was endemic to the task of history writing. The almost inevitable narrative tensions created by diverse sources were tolerated in the Deuteronomistic History. Here Gary appealed to Chronicles as an analogue of a work that attests the inclusion of diverse materials, many of which we possess elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, but that at the same time evinces a clear compositional technique and literary integrity. As to the third question, Gary took the position that some of the alleged major discrepancies within the Deuteronomistic History were more imagined than real and that there were multiple unifying factors throughout the work, including sequential periods, prophecy and fulfillment, links between Deuteronomy and subsequent books, pericopes written in Deuteronomistic style and language, and specific formulae and collocations. Gary concluded by reaffirming Noth's view that the Deuteronomist was both an editor and an author – "someone who selected and reworked sources, but also someone who created his own material and arranged the whole into a broadly sequential and connected work."

6. "Rethinking the Relationship
between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History:
The Case of Kings." *CBQ* 63 (2001): 393–415.

This article is a remarkable read and a key to Gary's insights as well as changes in his thought.¹⁰ It begins by noting the contrast between the panegyrics one typically finds in ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions and the wariness expressed toward monarchy in the book of Deuteronomy. The contrast raises the question about the attitude toward monarchy in the following books of the Deuteronomistic History and the way in which they interpret Deuteronomy. The article focuses on the comparison of Deuteronomy and Kings in regard to the issue of royal authority. Deuteronomy's perspective on monarchy is that it is an institution distinct from the courts, the military, the priesthood, and prophecy and that one may "take it or leave it." Thus, Deuteronomy mandates a distribution of powers among the other offices that is not dependent on royal authority. What is more, Deuteronomy's legislation places limitations on the king (Deut 17:14–20): He may not be a foreigner, and depending on the meaning of the proscriptions against multiplying horses and leading the people back to Egypt to multiply horses, his authority to conduct war and engage in trade may be restricted. Nor is he to have a large harem or to accrue great wealth. The single positive stipulation is perhaps the most significant: The king is subordinated to the Deuteronomic Torah, which is not a royal promulgation. The king is to copy the torah and adhere to it "all the days of his life."

Gary stressed the strikingly different royal ideology in the books of Samuel-Kings, where authority is concentrated in the king and even enhanced. The evaluations of the kings of Israel and Judah hold them responsible for maintaining the relationship between Yhwh and the people. "In one work the royal role is that of a figurehead, bereft of traditional kingly authority, while it is assumed in the other that the king leads the nation and exercises substantial authority in implementing specific Deuteronomic legislation."¹¹ Gary thus contended against Noth that Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History did not stem from the same social circle. While Deuteronomy reflects the perspective of the Jerusalem temple, the Deuteronomistic History betrays the interests of the royal court. The point is illustrated by the case of Solomon, who is not condemned in Kings for his horse trading or his wealth. Rather, these are

¹⁰ For further reflection on the importance of this article see B. M. Levinson, "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah," *VT* 51 (2001): 511–34, who made some of the same observations about Deuteronomy's relationship to the Deuteronomistic History, as well as the article by Levinson ("Contributions to the Study of Kingship in the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic History") in this volume.

¹¹ Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship," 408.

viewed as accomplishments and even rewards from Yhwh. Nor is he condemned for his harem *per se* but for the foreignness of his wives and the religious apostasy into which they led him. Gary pointed to Chronicles as an analog for how an author (Dtr¹) could build on but reconfigure source material (UrDeuteronomy). Gary closed the article with something of a surprise. He raised the possibility that the contrasts he had noted might be explained as the work of multiple Deuteronomistic editors, working in either Deuteronomy or the Deuteronomistic History. He thus approached, at least theoretically, the so-called “Smend” or “Göttingen” model of layers.

7. “Yhwh’s Rejection of the House Built for his Name:
On the Significance of Anti-Temple Rhetoric
in the Deuteronomistic History.”

Pages 221–38 in *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context:
A Tribute to Nadav Na’aman*.

Edited by Yairah Amit, Ehud Ben Zvi, Israel Finkelstein, and
Oded Lipschits. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

This article reviewed some of the Deuteronomistic statements against the temple in Jerusalem, specifically those in Solomon’s prayer in 1 Kgs 8:46–51 and the theophany to him in 1 Kgs 9:2–9, as well as the passages blaming Manasseh for Judah’s end in 2 Kgs 21:10–16; 23:26–27. Its objective was to understand from these texts how the Deuteronomists in a Neo-Babylonian context interpreted the temple’s demise. Gary expressed the assumption that the book of Kings was edited at least once during the late monarchy and was supplemented and edited during the exile with further additions made in the Achaemenid and Hellenistic eras. In Solomon’s prayer, Gary recognized the muted hope noticed by Wolff that repentance would lead to return.¹² But he also pointed out the promise of restoration inherent in the temple builder’s anticipation of exile and the prayer’s assertion of the continued centrality for Yhwh’s people even in exile and diaspora. In the theophany, the vision that Yhwh would make Israel the object of ridicule among the nations is harsher than that of exile alone in the prayer. Far from being anticultic, though, as Noth claimed, this passage is profoundly cultic in attributing the cause of disaster to popular neglect of Deuteronomistic tenets concerning cultic observation, such as centralization. The texts that blame Manasseh for Judah’s fall implicitly contrast with those about the fall of the North, despite their initial resemblance. Judah fell not because Jerusalem’s sanctuary was illegitimate, as was the case with those in Israel, but because of abuse

¹² H. W. Wolff, “Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” ZAW 73 (1961): 171–86.

of the one legitimate sanctuary on the part of the king and people of Judah. Thus, the article advocated a consistent ideology in Kings, such that material that assumes the destruction of 586 BCE does not deny or denounce the divine choice of the temple and Jerusalem. Rather, it sees their demise as confirmation of their special status and as a judgment against the failure to maintain centralized orthopraxis in the temple. Without offering any guarantees for the future, the Neo-Babylonian Deuteronomists made clear that if restoration ever were to occur, the location of its epicenter was beyond doubt.

8. "The Relationship of the Deuteronomistic History to Chronicles:
Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist?"

Pages 307–41 in *Congress Volume, Helsinki 2010*.

Edited by Martti Nissinen. VTSup 148. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

This piece was delivered by Gary as one of the main papers at the IOSOT meeting in Helsinki in 2010. The invitation to present a main lecture at IOSOT is a once-in-a-career recognition, so that Gary's choice of this topic was indicative of what he saw as a major contribution of his work to scholarship. Observing the long-range influence of Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic language, style, and themes on biblical literature through the Second Temple period and even into the NT, he asked exactly how such influence had been exerted. He sought to answer the question by considering Chronicles, which was strongly influenced by Deuteronomistic tradition in its use of Samuel-Kings, as a principal source. Gary first examined the case for Chronicles as a Deuteronomistic work by detailing three Deuteronomistic doctrines that are also advanced in Chronicles. The first of the three, centralization, is exhibited in Chronicles' reference to Jerusalem as the place chosen by Yhwh, just as in Kings. Moreover, by neglecting to mention all other sanctuaries with the single exception of Gibeon (1 Chr 16:39; 2 Chr 1:3), Chronicles underlines the exclusiveness of the Jerusalem temple. A second major Deuteronomistic theme also occurring in Chronicles is that of the Deuteronomic *torah*. Here, the argument might be made that Chronicles is more Deuteronomic than the Deuteronomistic History, because it refers to the *torah* much more frequently than Samuel-Kings and with stereotypical Deuteronomic phraseology. More than that, in Chronicles, kings, priests, Levites, and people are all equally responsible for *torah* observance, again more than is the case in Samuel-Kings. Third, Chronicles' enthusiastic emphasis on the Levites is well aligned with Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic tradition. A particular case in point is David's command in 1 Chr 15:2 that the Levites and the Levites alone were divinely chosen to carry the ark forever, as it comports with Deuteronomy's views concerning not just the Levites but also the places of the king and the *torah* in the Israelite theocracy.

Gary balanced this inquiry by then considering the differences in Chronicles and Deuteronomistic/Deuteronomistic tradition regarding the same three themes of centralization, *torah*, and Levites. He showed how, in all three cases, the Chronicler went beyond the Deuteronomistic tenet by combining it with other traditions, especially of Priestly origin. A notable example is the blending of regulations about the preparation of the lamb in Josiah's Passover (2 Chr 35:13). At times, the Chronicler also incorporated practices of his own day, such as the Levitical singers. While he did occasionally refer to the Levitical priests as in Deuteronomy (הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם, "the Levitical priests") he typically maintained a distinction between them as the descendants of Aaron, who officiated over sacrifices and the descendants of Levi (but not of Aaron) who effectively served as support staff for the priests (הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם, "the priests and the Levites"). By way of accounting for the Chronicler's combination of imitation and revision of Deuteronomistic literature, Gary proposed the analogue of the ancient practice of mimesis or literary imitation, "the Chronicler as an individual author, who self-consciously imitates and revises Deuteronomistic texts."¹³ Citing parallels from a variety of ancient Near Eastern, Egyptian, and Classical corpora, including the Covenant Code's dependence on Hammurapi, Gary contended for the appropriateness of the model. Mimetic works typically made use of different writings, as does Chronicles, but with focus on one particular work, style, or genre, as Chronicles does with the Deuteronomistic History. Though conversant with its main source, a mimetic piece rarely cites it directly, and such is also the case of Chronicles vis-à-vis the Deuteronomistic History. Above all, the point of a work of mimesis, as with Chronicles, was to employ the processes of reworking, recontextualizing, and expanding in order to create a new piece of literature. The model indicates that the Chronicler was not actually a Deuteronomist himself but rather an author in his own right who held his Deuteronomistic predecessor in high regard but also created his own literary product.

¹³ G.N. Knoppers, "The Relationship of the Deuteronomistic History to Chronicles: Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist?" in *Congress Volume, Helsinki 2010*, ed. M. Nissinen, VTSup 148 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 332.

9. With Eric L. Welch, "Friends or Foes?
Elijah and Other Prophets in the Deuteronomistic History."
Pages 219–56 in *Enemies and Friends of the State:
Ancient Prophecy in Context*. Edited by Christopher Rollston.
University Park: Penn State Press/Eisenbrauns, 2018.

Published during Gary's last year, this article differs from the others in this survey in that its focus is not on Deuteronomism *per se* but on the representation of prophecy in the Deuteronomistic History. The authors begin by pointing out the diversity of mantic activities described in the Deuteronomistic History and the uneven distribution of prophetic stories – largely in Samuel-Kings and in stories about the Northern Kingdom. Elijah is a case in point, as he is a miracle worker (1 Kings 17), exercises a priestly role on Mount Carmel (1 Kings 18), and appears as a Moses-figure on Mount Horeb (1 Kings 19). The figure of Elijah stands out in the Bible and the ancient Near East in its portrayal of him as superior to kings. The critique that this portrait entails of fellow mantics in its effort to distance Elijah from them, ironically, provides insights into the way prophecy normally functioned in monarchic Israel. Thus, prophecy in the Deuteronomistic History is hard to categorize. Through careful comparison with ancient Near Eastern, especially Assyrian parallels, Knoppers and Welch note the unusual if not unique nature of several aspects of prophecy in the Former Prophets, including the direct communication of prophets with kings, the role of prophecy not just in discrete episodes but in shaping Israel's history over generations, the abundance of miracles in prophetic stories, and especially the functional subordination of kings to prophets. Elijah and Elisha, in particular, are presented as independent of both the royal court and the official temple cult. They become, moreover, the focus of the narratives in Kings rather than the kings themselves, and they replace the kings as mediators between divine and human spheres. The writers of Kings admit that Elijah, as well as Elisha and Micaiah, were aberrations, and indeed, from the standpoint of Assyrian parallels, they, especially Elijah, would have been considered false prophets because of their independence from and opposition to the state, in the person of the king. Although the article did not deal directly with Deuteronomism as such but with prophecy, its interest in "the effect that the integration of such prophetic material has on redirecting and reframing readers' understandings of the past"¹⁴ displays Gary's focus on the overall coherence and unity of the Deuteronomistic History, even with the recognition that portions of it could be post-Deuteronomistic additions.

¹⁴ Knoppers and Welch, "Friends or Foes?" 237.

10. "History as Confession?"

The Fall of Jerusalem and Judah in Deuteronomistic Perspective."
 Pages 287–307 in *Writing, Rewriting and Overwriting in the Books of
 Deuteronomy and of the Former Prophets*.

Edited by Ido Koch, Thomas Römer, and Omer Sergi. BETL 304.
 Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 2019.

Gary's final article dealing with the Deuteronomistic History concerned the fall of Jerusalem and Judah at the end of Kings and thus rounded out a career that had begun with a dissertation whose first volume focused on Solomon and the beginning of Kings. The article analyzed the depiction of the empty land at the end of the book of Kings (2 Kgs 23:26–25:30). While he recognized the likelihood of several different hands in the composition of this material, Gary contended that it had been "deliberately shaped to form a coherent argument about Judah's demise."¹⁵ He sought to pinpoint and examine typological patterns used in that process. The first such pattern that he noted was an accumulation of formulae expressing divine anger that began with the account of the reign of Josiah. These formulae repeatedly affirm that Manasseh's violations of the religious orthopraxy prescribed in Deuteronomy provoked Yhwh to unquenchable wrath that was visited on Jerusalem and Judah. The second pattern was the emptying of the land of its human occupants; this pattern occurs no less than three times (2 Kgs 24:14; 24:15–16; 25:26). The texts are hyperbolic, and there are differences between them, but together they paint a picture of spiraling decline issuing from divine anger. Chronicles, by contrast, presents a single, mass exile under King Zedekiah.

Drawing from the observations of Dalley¹⁶ and Edelman¹⁷ that accounts of destruction like those in Kings were exaggerations based on ritual laments intended to evoke mercy and restoration from the gods, Gary contended that the typological presentations of Judah's demise were a literary device accentuating the reversal of Israel's entry into the land in Deuteronomy and the conditionality of its occupancy precisely as portended there. The ending of Kings, in effect, proves the trustworthiness of Deuteronomy's ideals and principles. The article, therefore, again argued for the consistency of the account of Judah's demise in Kings with the ideology of the Deuteronomistic History as a whole. Kings' account of the exile brings full circle the history of Israel in the Deutero-

¹⁵ Knoppers, "History as Confession?" 288 n. 6.

¹⁶ S. Dalley, "The Language of Destruction and its Interpretation," *BaM* 36 (1995): 275–85.

¹⁷ D. V. Edelman, "The 'Empty Land' as a Motif in City Laments," in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography*, eds. G. J. Brooke and T. Römer, BETL 207 (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2007), 127–49.

nomistic History and thus showcases its thematic coherence, however it may have been composed.

11. Conclusion

Gary's work on the Deuteronomistic History as surveyed in these ten articles that dealt overtly with the topic exhibits a fairly straightforward and consistent agenda. This agenda was also the main thesis of his dissertation, namely, the ideological coherence of the Deuteronomistic History, particularly in the book of Kings. This does not mean that Gary's work on the Deuteronomistic History was at all simplistic or monotone. He was fully cognizant of discordant notes and even outright contradictions in the Deuteronomistic History. This is especially clear in the articles that deal with the different royal ideologies exhibited in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History (#3, 6). Here, as elsewhere, Gary embraced the likelihood of the presence of multiple authors and editors in shaping the Deuteronomistic History. However, he sought to account for these discordant notes as part of a complete symphony – the end product of a creative and resourceful composer or circle putting their own interpretation on extant pieces. His emphasis on unity of purpose and theme was never simplistic. A constant refrain in his publications is the complexity of the Deuteronomistic History, which becomes all the more evident the deeper and wider one explores it. This ability to perceive consistency of theme through the diverse content of such an enormous work as the Deuteronomistic History attests a brilliant mind aware of the possibilities of interpretation and always open to the observations of other critics.

There are three features of this body of work that I would highlight as especially worthy of emulation. The first of these is Gary's control of ancient Near Eastern and Classical sources. It was not just that he knew individual inscriptions or reliefs or monuments or texts with biblical parallels, but that he knew them well enough to consider them in detail, to speak about genres, formulae, and principles across various works. He knew them, and he insisted on bringing them to bear on the interpretation of biblical texts. It was not just that he wanted to interpret the Hebrew Bible in its larger, ancient environment but that he understood the Bible as integrated within that environment. The analysis of a biblical text or theme was not a two-step process for him – Bible then ancient parallels. Rather, the two "steps" were always part and parcel of the same project of research from start to finish. Gary was largely responsible for building the program in Classical and Mediterranean Studies at Penn State University before he moved to Notre Dame. He attracted a world class group of scholars for the Penn State program – in Archaeology, Classics, Egyptology, Jewish Studies, and

other fields.¹⁸ He worked closely with his colleagues in teaching and administration but also in research, and he fully integrated that collaboration into his research.

A second quality that Gary's scholarship modeled was his independence. He formed opinions and adopted positions based on his training, of course, as we all do. But he reached the conclusions that did on the basis on his own analyses. As regards the Deuteronomistic History, this pertained especially to the analysis of texts. Gary was always willing to listen to positions that differed from his and to make adjustments that he deemed warranted. He read widely and engaged scholars from a variety of disciplines in scholarly dialogue. But he never felt compelled to accept an idea or an interpretation because it was the majority opinion or because it was advocated by a particular scholar or "school." He always returned to the texts to draw his own conclusions and to articulate his own reasons for those conclusions. And it was always the text in its literary, historical, and cultural context that he considered.

Finally, and perhaps most important, Gary was open to what other people had to say because he was a *Mensch*. He might disagree with someone's position on a matter, but I never heard him attack anyone personally for their work.¹⁹ He was a gracious gentleman in his scholarship as in person. The field of biblical studies is richer for his contributions to it, both professional and personal, and poorer for his untimely departure. We will miss him, but we are the better for what he taught us and what we continue to learn from him.

Bibliography

- Campbell, Antony F. *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1 – 2 Kings 2)*. CBQMS 17. Washington, DC: CBA, 1986.
- Cross, Jr., Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Dalley, Stephanie. "The Language of Destruction and its Interpretation." *BaM* 36 (1995): 275–85.

¹⁸ One of the best ancient city tours I ever experienced was arranged by Gary with his colleague, Paul Harvey, who was working in Rome when the SBL International Meeting was held there in 2009.

¹⁹ The principle is well illustrated by an anecdote about William Moran, a teacher Gary and I had in common. In mid-career Moran published a rather dismissive review of G. W. Ahlström's book on Psalm 89. He did not know Ahlström at the time that he wrote the review. However, at a later conference Ahlström introduced himself. Moran had forgotten about the review by then, and he did not recognize Ahlström's name, though he could tell by Ahlström's look and manner that he should have. When he learned who Ahlström was and recalled the review he had written, Moran was embarrassed. But Ahlström never seemed to hold it against him, and over time the two men became friends. Moran said that the lesson he drew from the experience and tried to bear in mind for the rest of his career was that there was always a human being behind the publication.

- Edelman, Diana V. "The 'Empty Land' as a Motif in City Laments." Pages 127–49 in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Thomas Römer. BETL 207. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2007.
- Eynikel, Erik. *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. OTS 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Knauf, Ernst Axel. "L' 'historiographie deuteronomiste' (DtrG) exist-t-elle?" Pages 409–18 in *Israël construit son histoire: L'historiographie deuteronomiste à la lumière des recherches récentes*. Edited by Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi. MoBi(G) 34. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1996.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*. HSM 52, 53. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993–4.
- . "Sex, Religion, and Politics: The Deuteronomist on Intermarriage." *HAR* 14 (1994): 121–41.
- . "Prayer and Propaganda: The Dedication of Solomon's Temple and the Deuteronomist's Program." *CBQ* 57 (1995): 229–54.
- . "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomical Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship." *ZAW* 108 (1996): 329–46.
- . "Deuteronomistic History." Pages 341–42 in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by David Noel Freedman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . "Is There a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?" Pages 119–34 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Thomas Römer. BETL 147. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- . "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings." *CBQ* 63 (2001): 393–415.
- . "Yhwh's Rejection of the House Built for his Name: On the Significance of Anti-Temple Rhetoric in the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 221–38 in *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na'aman*. Edited by Yairah Amit, Ehud Ben Zvi, Israel Finkelstein, and Oded Lipschits. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . "The Relationship of the Deuteronomistic History to Chronicles: Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist?" Pages 307–41 in *Congress Volume, Helsinki 2010*. Edited by Martti Nissinen. VTSup 148. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "History as Confession? The Fall of Jerusalem and Judah in Deuteronomistic Perspective." Pages 287–307 in *Writing, Rewriting and Overwriting in the Books of Deuteronomy and of the Former Prophets*. Edited by Ido Koch, Thomas Römer, and Omer Sergi. BETL 304. Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 2019.
- Knoppers, Gary N. and Jonathan Greer. "The Deuteronomistic History." Oxford University Press Bibliography Online (www.oxfordbibliographiesonline.com).
- Knoppers, Gary N. and Eric L. Welch. "Friends or Foes? Elijah and Other Prophets in the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 219–56 in *Enemies and Friends of the State: Ancient Prophecy in Context*. Edited by Christopher Rollston. University Park: Penn State Press/Eisenbrauns, 2018.
- Levinson, Bernard M. "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah." *VT* 51 (2001): 511–34.
- McConville, Gordon. "Narrative and Meaning in the Books of Kings." *Bib* 70 (1989): 31–49.
- . *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993.

- Noth, Martin. *The Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.
- O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. OBO 92. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Smend, Rudolf. "Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte." Pages 111–34 in *Probleme Biblischer Theologie. Festschrift Gerhard von Rad*. Edited by Hans Walter Wolff. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968.
- Westermann, Claus. *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* TB AT, 87. Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1994.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk." ZAW 73 (1961): 171–86.

Contributions to the Study of Kingship in the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History

Bernard M. Levinson

קנה לך חבר (ʿAbot 1:6)

1. Introduction

I have always looked up to Gary N. Knoppers, as scholar, colleague, and friend.¹ The power of his work was that it changed the way I read the texts that he investigated. As a tribute to his scholarship, I will draw attention to a selection of his articles that have enduring significance for our understanding of the biblical text. These studies demonstrate his ability to push beyond simply isolating various redactional layers in the texts, which is such a temptation for work on the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History. Knoppers read the texts as *texts* – looking for the significance of the text as it stands, recognizing the creativity of the author or editor, and identifying the statement that is being made. It is that quality of interpretation that enabled him to make more powerful contributions in all of the areas that he worked on: whether the Pentateuch, or the Deuteronomistic History, or the complex of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, or Samaritan studies – all the areas represented in the present volume. In the three articles discussed here, it is also clear that Knoppers was a wordsmith, who could turn a phrase elegantly.

The common thread that joins this selection of articles is the examination of kingship, one of the motifs that Knoppers engaged consistently over the years, in his work on Near Eastern literature, in his work on the Deuteronomistic History, and in his work on the Chronicler. This leitmotiv also speaks to Knoppers capacity for intellectual growth: his ability to create dialogue across the contrasting methodologies of our field, while himself continuing to grow and learn and publish throughout his career. The fact that he could complete a new book on *Judah and Samaria in Postmonarchic Times* while battling pancreatic

¹ Consistent with the original context for this chapter as a memorial presentation, the more personal, first-person style has been maintained as appropriate.

cancer, five months and one week before his sudden death, testifies to his commitment to the discipline.²

2. Royal Ideology or Rejection of Kingship?

The first of the articles that I will address is “Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta,” which investigates kingship in Ugaritic epic and gets at the larger question of royal ideology in the ancient Near East. While making comparisons with biblical literature, the striking thing is that Knoppers reads the Kirta epic not simply for comparative significance or parallels, not simply as background, and not simply to reconstruct the syllabification: but as an independent work of world literature. Kirta acquires the depth of a tragic hero, not unlike a King Lear, betrayed by his own instincts, consumed by a family drama that he cannot master.

The basic narrative arc of the three tablets of the Kirta story places its protagonist, King Kirta, in dire straits. His wives and children have all died, leaving his royal line in danger of perishing. Kirta seeks the aid of the god El, who advises him to acquire a wife by conquering a neighboring nation. As he sets out on his campaign, Kirta makes a vow to offer tribute to the goddess Athirat should his mission succeed. Once he has achieved his goal of a new wife and children, however, Kirta reneges on his vow, thereby angering Athirat. We are missing the end of the second tablet, but the third tablet opens with Kirta suffering ill health as a result of his broken promise. He petitions El again for aid, but after he is healed, a new problem arises. His now-grown son, Yašsub, attempts to force Kirta to abdicate his throne for failing to uphold justice during his illness. Unfortunately, the third tablet breaks off at this point, so we do not know how the story ends.

Knoppers’s reading of the Kirta story as an antihero narrative insightfully identifies the core interpretive challenge posed by the epic: that the text functions neither as a defense nor as an indictment of sacral kingship, but rather contains elements of both. He notes that “traditional royal ideology” focuses on an idealized image of the king as healthy, wealthy, and wise, with these elements yielding societal benefits through the king’s role in defending the state, establishing justice, and ensuring proper observance of the cult. He also highlights the role of longevity, both in individual kings and in royal dynasties, in providing “continuity and stability” for a society (Knoppers 1994a, 574). Knoppers argues that the Kirta legend focuses on two specific aspects of this royal ideology: cultic observance and dynastic succession:

² G. N. Knoppers, *Judah and Samaria in Postmonarchic Times: Essays on Their Histories and Literatures*, FAT 129 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

[T]he author both complicates and affirms the mythology of kingship... [T]he very tensions the author discerns in the contrast between [royal] ideology and experience ultimately reaffirm the pivotal role of the king in divine-human relations. The crises caused by the loss of the king's kin, the appearance of a grave illness, and the insurrection of the heir apparent collectively underscore the importance of the king to human society.³

Separate from the main text of the article, the fun really begins in the footnotes, where Knoppers highlights passages in which the biblical authors employ plot points and literary techniques that are similar to those found in Kirta. For example, the place-names in the Kirta narrative are not Ugaritic, suggesting that Kirta is a foreign king. Selecting a non-Ugaritic king as his protagonist, someone who is both physically and chronologically distant from his Ugaritic audience, "enables the author to treat sensitive issues with a degree of freedom and independence not possible otherwise" in a text that challenges royal ideology.⁴ Knoppers then discusses how the author of Job employs a similar technique to soften the book's pungent critique of conventional theology. He creates geographical distance between the audience and the real subject by describing Job as "a man in the land of Uz" (Job 1:1) and chronological distance by placing Job in the patriarchal past.⁵ In addressing the connection in royal ideology between the king's sins and the well-being of the land, Knoppers also highlights the biblical stories of Ahab and David, whose own misdeeds lead to disasters for their people. Kirta displeases the goddess Athirat, and as a result, Kirta's health declines and a drought occurs in his land.⁶ Similarly, the Israelite king Ahab's misdeeds result in a drought in Israel (1 Kgs 17:1–18:45), and King David's illicit census results in Yahweh punishing the Israelites via a plague (2 Sam 24:10–17).

His argument concludes with these observations:

The Kirta legend demonstrates that even for those who, with the best of intentions, strive to achieve the goals of royal ideology – vitality, continuity, stability, health, and justice – the reality can be the antithesis of the ideal... [Yet] for all the problems, gaps, and contradictions the Kirta legend discloses within the mythology of human kingship, it ultimately reaffirms the institution it complicates.⁷

Knoppers's focus on vitality, continuity, stability, health, and justice looms large, especially for those of us who mourn his loss.

³ G. N. Knoppers, "Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta," *JAOS* 114 (1994): 572–82 (at 574).

⁴ Knoppers, "Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta," 574.

⁵ Knoppers, "Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta," 574 n. 15.

⁶ Knoppers, "Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta," 577–79.

⁷ Knoppers, "Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta," 582.

3. History or Reception History?

The second article that I would like to share is “Jehoshaphat’s Judiciary and ‘the Scroll of YHWH’S Torah.’” Here, Knoppers turns to the narrative of the judicial reform initiated by King Jehoshaphat in 2 Chronicles 19, an episode nowhere preserved in the Deuteronomistic History:

4b וַיֵּצֵא כָעֵם מִבְּאֵר שֶׁבַע עַד-הָר אֶפְרַיִם וַיְשִׁיבֵם אֶל-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם:
 5 וַיַּעֲמֵד שֹׁפְטִים בְּאֶרֶץ בְּכָל-עִיר יְהוּדָה הַבְּצֻרוֹת לְעִיר וָעִיר: 6 וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-הַשֹּׁפְטִים רְאוּ מַה-אַתֶּם עֹשִׂים כִּי לֹא לָאָדָם תִּשְׁפֹּטוּ כִּי לַיהוָה וְעַמְּכֶם בְּדָבָר מִשְׁפָּט: 7 וְעַתָּה יְהִי פַחַד-יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם שִׁמְרוּ וַעֲשׂוּ כִּי-אֵין עִם-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ עֹלָה וּמִשָּׂא פָנִים וּמִקַּח-שֹׁחַד: 8 וְגַם בִּירוּשָׁלַם הָעִמּוּד יְהוֹשָׁפָט מִן-הַלְוִיִּם וְהַכֹּהֲנִים וּמֵרָאשֵׁי הָעָבֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְמִשְׁפַּט יְהוָה וְלָרִיב וַיִּשְׁבּוּ יְרוּשָׁלַם: 9 וַיֵּצֵאוּ עֲלֵיהֶם לֵאמֹר כֹּה תַעֲשׂוּן בִּירְאֵת יְהוָה בְּאַמּוֹנָה וּבְלִבָּב שָׁלֵם: 10 וְכָל-רִיב אֲשֶׁר-יָבוֹא עֲלֵיכֶם מֵאַחֵיכֶם הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּעָרֵיהֶם בֵּין-דָּם לָדָם בֵּין-תּוֹרָה לְמִצְוָה לְחֻקִּים וּלְמִשְׁפָּטִים וְהִזְהַרְתֶּם אֹתָם וְלֹא יֵאָשְׁמוּ לַיהוָה וְהָיָה-קֶצֶף עֲלֵיכֶם וְעַל-אַחֵיכֶם כֹּה תַעֲשׂוּן וְלֹא תֵאָשְׁמוּ: 11 וְהָיָה אֲמָרְיָהוּ בֶן-חֲנָנִי חֹרֵשׁ עֲלֵיכֶם לְכָל דְּבַר-יְהוָה וְזִבְדִּיָּהוּ בֶן-יִשְׁמָעֵאל הַגִּנִּיד לְבֵית-יְהוּדָה לְכָל דְּבַר-הַמֶּלֶךְ וְשֹׁטְרֵים הַלְוִיִּם לַפְּנִיכָם חֲזָקוּ וַעֲשׂוּ יְהִי יְהוָה עִם-הַטּוֹב:

4b [Jehoshaphat] went out among the people from Beer-sheba to the hill country of Ephraim; he brought them back to the LORD God of their fathers. 5 He appointed judges in the land in all the fortified towns of Judah, in each and every town. 6 He charged the judges: “Consider what you are doing, for you judge not on behalf of man, but on behalf of the LORD, and He is with you when you pass judgment. 7 Now let the dread of the LORD be upon you; act with care, for there is no injustice or favoritism or bribe-taking with the LORD our God.” 8 Jehoshaphat also appointed in Jerusalem some Levites and priests and heads of the clans of Israelites for rendering judgment in matters of the LORD, and for disputes. Then they returned to Jerusalem. 9 He charged them, “This is how you shall act: in fear of the LORD, with fidelity, and with whole heart. 10 When a dispute comes before you from your brothers living in their towns, whether about homicide, or about ritual, or laws or rules, you must instruct them so that they do not incur guilt before the LORD and wrath be upon you and your brothers. Act so and you will not incur guilt. 11 See, Amariah the chief priest is over you in all cases concerning the LORD, and Zebadiah son of Ishmael is the commander of the house of Judah in all cases concerning the king; the Levitical officials are at your disposal; act with resolve and the LORD be with the good” (JPS).

Knoppers’s analysis of the historiographic value of this passage stands the entire Albrightian model on its head, showing how a text that had been used for the reconstruction of a missing piece of history should instead be read as providing a sophisticated example of reception history. The Chronicler, rather than providing an original source, more accurately represents a literary synthesis of a range of earlier sources.⁸

⁸ On this subject, Louis Jonker takes Knoppers’s work into account and builds upon it. See L. Jonker, “Was the Chronicler More Deuteronomistic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations

The text, despite the influential article by Albright, is not historical.⁹ Knoppers demonstrates, for example, that late and Chronistic terminology scattered throughout the passage refutes the notion that it can be separated into an original historical core with secondary Chronistic editing. In the Hebrew text and English translation included above, the words and passages shown in bold text match the partial list of Chronistic terms and phrases that Knoppers includes in the article.¹⁰ He also addresses how the account follows Exodus 18 in delegating the king's judicial authority to certain officials, but it follows Deuteronomy's laws of the judicial administration in constructing a system in which power is divided between local courts and a centralized court in Jerusalem. However, the narrative deviates from both of these accounts in its presentation of the king's role in the judicial system. Moses retains a role as chief justice in Exodus 18, while Jehoshaphat holds no such position in 2 Chronicles 19. On the other hand, Deuteronomy's laws of the judicial administration provide no role for the king in appointing judges, while Jehoshaphat himself appoints the judges in Chronicles.¹¹ On the basis of this and other evidence, Knoppers concludes:

In its structure, titles for officials, function, and paraenesis, the description of Jehoshaphat's judicial renovation evinces two consistent features: indebtedness to other biblical accounts of judicial reforms and Chronistic composition.¹²

He further argues that the Chronicler has borrowed the authority of Exodus and Deuteronomy in order to assert a vision of royal judicial authority that is inconsistent both with the biblical sources and with Achaemenid models from the Chronicler's day. 2 Chronicles 19 is a deliberate compilation of other texts and only provides reliable information about the Chronicler's vision for a reconstructed monarchy in the Persian Age.¹³ As the last line of his article puts it:

into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomistic Legal Traditions," *SJOT* 27 (2013): 185–97.

⁹ Cf. W. F. Albright, "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat," in *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, ed. S. Lieberman (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 61–82.

¹⁰ G. N. Knoppers, "Jehoshaphat's Judiciary and 'the Scroll of YHWH'S Torah,'" *JBL* 113 (1994): 59–80, 68–71.

¹¹ Knoppers, "Jehoshaphat's Judiciary and 'the Scroll of YHWH'S Torah,'" 72–73.

¹² Knoppers, "Jehoshaphat's Judiciary and 'the Scroll of YHWH'S Torah,'" 79.

¹³ Knoppers, "Jehoshaphat's Judiciary and 'the Scroll of YHWH'S Torah,'" 79–80. Rofé reaches a similar insight about Jehoshaphat's reforms, though his article has been widely overlooked; see A. Rofé, "The Law about the Organization of Justice in Deuteronomy (16:18–20; 17:8–13)," *Beth Mikra* 65 (1976): 199–210 (Hebrew; English abstract); and idem, "The Organization of the Judiciary in Deuteronomy," in *The World of the Aramaeans: Festschrift P. E. Dion*, vol. 1, ed. P. M. Michèle Daviau, J. W. Wevers, and M. Weigl, *JSOTSup* 324–26 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 92–112. Concerning the non-historicity of 2 Chr 19, see also R. R. Wilson, "Israel's Judicial System in the Preexilic Period," *JQR* 74 (1983): 229–48; and U. Rüterworden, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde: Studien zu Dt 16, 18–18, 22, BBB* 65 (Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1987), 15–19.

"The Chronicler's depiction of Jehoshaphat's reforms ultimately reflects what he believes justice should be."¹⁴

4. Dependence or Independence?

Knoppers's work on the Jehoshaphat narrative highlights his focus on reading and rethinking established scholarly paradigms, and on demonstrating the creativity of the texts that he investigates. For me, these efforts reached a climax in his article, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History."¹⁵ He restores the independence and the autonomy of the Deuteronomistic Historian – as a reader, writer, and thinker – from the prescriptions of Deuteronomy, challenging any notion of the Deuteronomistic History as a passive or slavish implementation of the legal corpus of Deuteronomy.

Knoppers's analysis in this article breaks through to an important new insight as he cogently challenges the dominant paradigm that regards the Deuteronomistic Historian as directly implementing the legal norms of Deuteronomy. His analysis demonstrates the disconnects that exist between the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic conceptions of kingship. Deuteronomy defines the king's role in very narrow terms: it generally denies the king the normal privileges of kingship, such as the accumulation of wealth and power; it restricts the king's role in foreign policy, including the prosecution of war; and it relegates him to the role of reader, but not promulgator, of the law. Moreover, Deuteronomy's Law of the King provides no role for the monarch in either the cultus or the administration of justice. By contrast, the Deuteronomistic History preserves the king's role in the cult and the justice system and affords to the king most of the privileges normally associated with kingship in the ancient Near East.¹⁶ Moreover, although Deuteronomic law envisions no specific role for the king in the centralization of worship at the Jerusalem temple, in the Deuteronomistic History, cultic centralization becomes one of the primary metrics by which the reign of a king is judged. Knoppers summarizes the evidence as follows:

In the one literature royal powers are strigently [*sic* stringently] delimited, while in the other formidable royal powers are mandated. In one work the royal role is that of a figurehead, bereft of traditional kingly authority, while it is assumed in the other that the king leads the nation and exercises substantial authority in implementing specific

¹⁴ Knoppers, "Jehoshaphat's Judiciary and 'the Scroll of YHWH's Torah,'" 80.

¹⁵ G. N. Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History," *CBQ* 63 (2001): 393–415.

¹⁶ Bernard M. Levinson takes Knoppers's work into account in his discussion of kingship in Deuteronomy and in the ancient Near East. See B. M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). See also the contribution in this volume, S. L. McKenzie, "Gary Knoppers on the Deuteronomistic History."