not necessarily in their *present* form or order.@@1 Budde’s further conclusion that 1 Kings i. ii. 1-9, 13 sqq. were likewise wanting *(Sam.* p. xi.) is also valuable, since (*a*) 2 Sam. v.-viii. (with xxi.-xxiv.) finds its natural continuation, on the analogy of the Deuteronomic compiler’s framework in Kings, in 1 Kings ii. 10-12, iii. 2, and (*b*) 1 Kings v. 3 seq. (also Deuteronomic) explicitly points back to the summary of the wars in 2 Sam. viii. It is commonly recognized that the compiler of 2 Sam. v.-viii. has wrongly placed *after* the capture of Jerusalem (v. 6 sqq.) the conflict with the Philistines (v. 17 sqq.), where the “hold” is not Zion but some place of retreat, perhaps Adullam (cf. xxiii. 14). This being so, the conflicts in xxi. 15 sqq., xxiii. 8 sqq., which are located around Gath, Lehi (so read xxiii. 11), Pasdammim (so *v.* 9; see 1 Chron. xi. 13), Bethlehem, and the valley of Rephaim, should also precede the occupation of Jerusalem and the subsequent partition of territory among David’s sons and others *(e.g.* xiii. 23, near Bethel). These passages combine to furnish a representation of the events leading to the capture of the capital which is distinct from and now superseded by the detailed narratives in ii. 12-iv. Here, Ishbaal is east of the Jordan, David’s men are engaged in fighting Benjamin and Israel—even at Gibeon (about 6 m. N.W. of Jerusalem), the interest of the history is in David’s former relations with Israel at Saul’s court, and he is regarded as the future deliverer of the oppressed people. These stories are, in fact, of a stamp with the detailed narratives already noticed (§ 3), and they conflict with the fragmentary traditions of David’s steps to Jerusalem as seriously as the popular narratives of Saul conflicted with older evidence. But already Josh. ix. 17, xv. 63; Judg. i. 21, 29, 35, xix. 10-12; 2 Sam. v. 6 (cf. xxi. 2), indicate the presence of a line of alien cities including Jerusalem itself, and would point to an important alien district, the existence of which obviously bears upon the trustworthiness of the group of narratives encircling Bethlehem of Judah and Gibeah of Benjamin, the traditional homes of David and Saul.@@2 On the other hand, this would ignore the representation of (north) Israelite extension over Judah by Joshua and Saul,@@3 and it may be inferred that we have to allow for absolutely different and conflicting standpoints in regard to the history of the district, and that the Judaean traditions of David once had their own independent account of the occupation of Jeru­salem and its neighbourhood. The fragments preserved in 2 Sam. v.-viii., xxi.-xxiv. are quite distinct from ii. 12-iv.; they throw another light upon David’s relations to Saul’s family (xxi. 1-14); and the stories of heroic conflicts with giant-like figures of Gath, &c. (xxiii. 9 seq., 18, cf. 1 Chron. xi. 11, 20) find no place by the side of the more detailed records of David’s sojourn under the protection of a king of Gath, one of a confeder­ation of Philistine cities (1 Sam. xxvii., xxix.). It is probable that popular stories of the conquest of the earlier inhabitants have been applied to the Philistines; their general character associates them with the legends of the “ sons of Anak ’’ who enter into Judaean (perhaps originally Calebite) tradition elsewhere (Num. xiii. 22; Josh. xi. 21 seq., xv. 14; see Budde, *Sam.,* p. 310 seq.).@@4 Several intricate literary problems however at

@@@l Cornill, Nowack, Stenning and Kennedy (see *Literature,* below) accept Budde’s suggestion that ix.-xx. were inserted by a hand later than the first Deuteronomic editor of viii. ; but the further assumption that this editor had deliberately omitted ix.-xx. from his edition cannot be proved, and deals with a literary stage too early for any confident opinion or even for any critical investigation of value.

@@@2 “ Jerusalem ” in 1 Sam. xvii. 54 is usually treated as an ana­chronism, because of its occupation by the Jebusîtes, and Kirjathjearim (vii. 1, 2, perhaps *Kiryat el-Enab,* 9 m. W. of Jerusalem) is commonly admitted to be in alien hands. But it is clear that Nob (1 Sam. xxi. seq.), about 2 m. N. of the capital, on this view, was scarcely an Israelite city, yet the presence of the priests of Shiloh there is essential to the present structure of the book.

@@@3 For Joshua, see the older portions of Josh. x., and for Saul, I Sam. xiv. 47-51 (his wars), xv. 4 (his Judaean army), xvii. 54 (Jerusalem), xxvii. 7-12 (south Judaean clans under Israelite suzerainty) and 2 Sam. i. 12 (Septuagint).

@@@4 For this cf. the “ Anakim ” of Gaza, Gath and Λshdod, &c., in Josh. xi. 21 seq., with the “ Philistine ” lords, *ib.* xiii. 3, and see Philistines.

once arise in connexion with the two series v.-viii., xxi.-xxiv., and ix.-xx., since, apart from their earlier literary growth as distinct units, they have undergone some revision and alteration when compilers brought them into their present form.

The story of David and Bathsheba, an incident placed in the account of the Ammonite campaign, upon which it now depends (x.-xii.; with x. 15-19 cf. viii. 3-8), connects itself through the pro- phecy in xii. 10-12 with the subsequent family feuds, in particular with Absalom's rebellion (cf. xvi. 21 seq.), and again with 1 Kings i., where Adonijah's revolt rouses Bathsheba to persuade David to fulfil some promise of his to recognize her young son Solomon as his heir (i. 13, 17, 21, 29 seq.). The section is an admirable specimen of historiography. The whole is closely linked together for an ostensible purpose, a chronological scheme runs throughout (xiii. 23, 38, xiv. 28 and xv. 7),@@5 and the section concludes with an account both of David’s death and of Solomon’s accession (see further Solomon). But 2 Sam. xii. 10-12 is an insertion (Wellhausen, Cornill, Kittel, &c.), even if xii. 1-15*a* itself be not of secondary origin (Winckler, Schwally, H. P. Smith, Nowack, Budde, Dhorme) ; and of the related passages,

xv. 16 is a gloss (Budde), on xx. 3 see below, and the authenticity of

xvi. 21-23 in its present context is not beyond doubt (see also Ahithophel). Although xxi. 1-14 and ix. are of entirely distinct standpoints,@@6 both are presupposed in xvi. 5-14, xix. 16-23, and in xvi. 1-4, xix. 24-30 respectively; the gloss xxi. 7 evidently dates *after* the insertion of ix., while the opening words of ix. 1 point back, not to xxi. which is ignored, but rather to iv., from which it is now severed by the miscellaneous group of passages in v.-viii.@@7 In view of a few recognized signs of diverse origin (contrast xiv. 27 with xviii. 18, and see Budde on xv. 24 sqq., xvii. 17), it is possible that xvi. 1-14, xix. 16-30 are also secondary. In any case the new revolt of Sheba (xx. 1-22), can hardly be the original sequel to Absalom’s rebellion (Winckler, H. P. Smith, B. Luther, E. Meyer); there is no historical prelude to 1 Kings i. (note the opening verse, David’s old age, and cf. 2 Sam. xxiii. 1), and the literary introduction to the story of Sheba is to be found in the closing scene of xix., apparently at the point where David returns to the Jordan on his way to Gilgal (*v*. 40).@@8 It is to be noticed that the murder of Amasa (xx. 8 sqq.) is parallel to that of Asahel (ii. 12 sqq.), and the two (now preceding the separate groups v.-viii. and xxi.-xxiv.) are closely associated in 1 Kings ii. 5.

The miscellaneous groups, v.-viii., xxi.-xxiv., are also certainly not in their original form. The introduction in v. 1-3 is twofold *(υ.* 3 and the incomplete *v.* 1 seq.), and the list in iii. 2-5 (note the resuming link *v.* 6 after v. 1) is similar in character to that in v. 13-16, and has probably been removed from the context of the latter (cf. I Chron. iii.1-8). The presence of a late hand is also proved by the psalm in xxii. (Ps. xviii.) and by David’s “ last words," which sever xxi. 15-22 and xxiii. 8 sqq. These in turn part two related narratives in xxi. 1-14 and xxiv., and the latter (with which note the divergent features in 1 Chron. xxi.) shows several signs of later origin or re- visïon. Chap. vii. is to be read in the light of 1 Kings v. 3-5, viii. 14 sqq., all Deuteronomic passages, though not of one stamp. Con- tinuous warfare prevented the building of the temple (1 Kings v. 3-5, cf. 2 Sam. viii.), and David’s proposal to erect a house to Yahweh seems unnecessary after vi. 17 seq.; but vii. 1, 9, in fact, presuppose ch. viii., and the main object of the narrative is to emphasize Yahweh’s promise to build David’s house, *i.e.* his dynasty. vii. is connected with 1 Kings viii. but an important variation *(υ.* 16 contrast 2 Sam. vii. 6-8) illustrates the complexity of the Deuteronomic sources. It is important to notice that, as in the account of the temple in the history of Solomon, the introduction to it in these chapters (2 Sam. vi. seq.) divides miscellaneous though closely- related material (see Kings). On their prelude in **1** Sam. vi. see below, § 6.

Thus, the account of David’s conflicts with giant heroes and the conquest of Jerusalem and its district seems to belong to a cycle of Judaean tradition (cf. Num. xiii. 22, 28;

Josh. xi. 21, xv. 14), which has been almost superseded by other traditions of the rise of the Hebrew monarchy and by the more popular narratives of early relations between the Judaean David and the (north) Israelite king and

@@@5 In xv. 7 we must read *four* for *forty* (the vow in this verse refers to Absalom’s exile some years previously).

@@@6 On this and on the character of the detailed narratives in general, see B. Luther in E. Meyer, *Israeliten u. ihre Nachbar stamme,* pp. 184-199. See, generally, the studies by W. Caspari, *Aufkommen u. Krise d. israel. Königtums unter David* (1909) and *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* (1909), pp. 317 sqq., 619 sqq.; and also H. Gressmann *(Literature,* below).

@@@7 Chap. ix. belongs to the joint traditions of David and Saul (cf. ii. 5-iv.); *v.* 13, which presupposes chap. v., appears to be an addition (see H. P. Smith, Dhorme).

@@@8 xix. 40 (all Judah and *half* Israel) resumes *v*. 15 (where Israel is not mentioned). For the view that Absalom's revolt originally concerned Judah alone, see the related section in David. Dhorme, it may be observed, finds in ix.-xx. another source for x. 1-14,xii.1-15*a*, xv. 1-6, 10, 24-26, 29, xvi. 5-14, xvii. 27-29, xix. 16-23 and xx. 1-22..