

Psychological redaction around novelty seeking behavior in the Former Prophets

Jordan K. Pommerenck ^{*}

Abstract

This work proposes a novel theoretical redaction source(s) (denoted by the siglum DtrΨ) based on a psychological analysis of Old Testament literature. In particular, this work argues that literary coherence in the *Former Prophets* can be examined around the psychobiological dimension of temperament known as *novelty seeking*. This work suggests that Israel's migration from Egypt, followed by the conquest of Canaan, and a subsequent bloody, violent era, contributed to societal conditions that favorably biased population genetic drift towards *novelty seeking* behavior. Further, a redaction source(s) (DtrΨ) intentionally redacted Old Testament narratives throughout the *Former Prophets*, without regards for event resolution, which connect with the observable behavior of *novelty seeking*. Finally, the expression 'a man after God's own heart' (1 Samuel 13:14 RSV) reflects both a projection of the redaction source(s)' (DtrΨ) view of psychobiological temperament onto other *novelty seekers* and a recapitulation with *Imago Dei* (Genesis 1:27 RSV), that is, God seeking after humanity.

Keywords: Psychology, Genetics, Novelty Seeking, Psychobiology, Redaction, Former Prophets, Old Testament, David, Jeremiah, DtrΨ.

License: This work is licensed under a "CC BY-NC-ND 4.0" license. 

***Corresponding author:** pommerenck.theology@gmail.com

I. Introduction

Due to the considerable difficulty in identifying the 'optimal' literary structure in the *Former Prophets* (*Nevi'im Rishonim*), Old Testament scholars have

been unable to reach a consensus regarding the degree and scope of textual redac- 13
 tion (Römer 2020). Martin Noth originally conceived the theory of a single his- 14
 torical Deuteronomist (DtrH) to explain the consistent theological style shared be- 15
 tween the book of *Deuteronomy* and the *Former Prophets* (Noth 1943). Frank Cross 16
 sought to modify this single redaction source hypothesis by theorizing that both an 17
 exilic and Josianic redaction source (a dual redaction hypothesis) may have been re- 18
 sponsible for the various textual passages involving the temple cult described in the 19
Kings narratives (Cross 1973; Radjawane 1974). Rudolf Smend proposed that, dur- 20
 ing the Babylonian period, a plurality of nomistic redactors (DtrN) were responsible 21
 for the coherence of much of the Old Testament (Smend 1971), while Walter Diet- 22
 rich theorized yet another layer of redaction at the prophetic level (DtrP) for the 23
Samuel and *Kings* narratives (Dietrich 1972). Timo Veijola advanced this ‘threefold 24
 layer of redaction’ (DtrH + DtrN + DtrP), known as the ‘Göttingen hypothesis’, by 25
 attempting to reconcile the seemingly conflicting monarchical viewpoints found in 26
 the *Former Prophets* (Veijola 1975; Veijola 1977). He also argued for a covenant the- 27
 ologian redaction source ‘*bundestheologischer Deuteronomist*’ (DtrB) during the Per- 28
 sian period (Veijola 1996). Norbert Lohfink postulated that a redaction source may 29
 have contributed to the development of the conquest narratives ‘*Deuteronomistis-* 30
che Landeroberungserzählung’ (DtrL) found in *Joshua* and *Deuteronomy* (Lohfink 31
 1981; Lohfink 1991). He also introduced a later Deuteronomist than DtrH which he 32
 denoted as ‘*Überarbeiter*’ (DtrÜ), which shared similarities to the theory of redac- 33
 tion (DtrS) proposed by Kaiser (Kaiser 1992). While numerous redaction theories 34
 have been advanced, an increasing number of scholars have voiced objections due to 35
 the perceived differences in literary structure and composition between *Deuteron-* 36
omy and the *Former Prophets* (Eissfeldt 1965; Westermann 1994; Knauf 2000; Noll 37
 2007). Other scholars remain unconvinced that there is any correlation between the 38
 Davidic kingship in the *Samuel* and *Kings* narratives and *Deuteronomy* (Würthwein 39
 1994; Auld 1999; Aurelius 2012). While Noth’s single redaction theory continues to 40
 find some adherents (Van Seters 1983; Blum 1990; McKenzie 2014; Krause 2015), the 41
 theories of Smend and Cross tend to enjoy the majority of support amongst scholars 42
 (Pury, Römer, and Macchi 2000; Römer 2020). However, objections to the vari- 43
 ous redaction theories, as well as, the associated difficulties in attempting to deduce 44
 the ‘exact’ literary coherence of Old Testament texts have motivated a pressing need 45

to discover the most ‘*optimal*’ criteria (criterion) upon which to base future Old Testament studies. As a result, various metrics have been suggested for determining the coherence and extent of redaction for Old Testament texts (Avioz 2017). An increasing amount of recent scholarship has sought to probe the various ‘*artistic*’ and ‘*rhetorical*’ aspects of various Old Testament pericopes for literary coherence (Crenshaw 1974; Fishbane 1975; Fokkelman 1975; Magonet 1976; Bar-Efrat 2010). For this reason, Shimon Bar-Efrat sought to clarify how such studies should optimally be approached by introducing several criteria for examining textual coherence, which include a structural analysis at the (1) the verbal level, (2) the level of narrative technique, (3) the level of the narrative world, (4) and the level of the conceptual content (Bar-Efrat 1980). This present work connects with the fourth point outlined by Bar-Efrat, that is, the level of conceptual content.

2. Novelty Seeking Behavior

This work presents a novel means of approaching biblical texts in terms of the psychobiological temperament of a theoretical redaction source(s) (denoted by the siglum DtrY). In this work, literary coherence is examined around the locus of *novelty seeking* behavior (Boden 2004; Sowden, Pringle, and Gabora 2015; Ivancovsky, Baror, and Bar 2024). This dimension of temperament is a psychobiological classification of observable hereditary behavior which manifests early in life and contributes towards long term habit formation (C. R. Cloninger 1987; C. R. Cloninger, Svrakic, and Przybeck 1993). Associated hereditary personality traits often manifest in impulsive (often poor or impaired) decision-making, novel stimulation, impaired fear-processing, extravagance, and an uncontrollable temper (Roussos, Giakoumaki, and Bitsios 2009; Swartenbeck et al. 2013; Gottlieb et al. 2013). While the exact genetic mechanisms which predominantly control *novelty seeking* remain theoretical due to the complex nature of human behavior (Berlyne and Mauderli 1974; Kidd and Hayden 2015), such behavior can nonetheless be correlated with human receptor encoding (DeYoung 2013; Jauk 2019) and is hypothesized to primarily be *modulated* by the principal monoamine neuromodulator *dopamine* (Costa et al. 2014; Ivancovsky, Baror, and Bar 2024), although other alternative mediation pathways, such as the zona incerta (ZI), have been experimentally found to regulate *novelty seeking* in

primate behavior (Ogasawara et al. 2022). The psychobiological stimuli impacting *novelty seeking* behavior are novelty, potential reward, and potential relief from boredom or punishment (Krebs et al. 2009). Each of these stimuli correlate with *predictable* behavioral responses: (1) Novelty or curiosity correlates with an insatiable desire to explore or pursue resolution strategies (Kashdan et al. 2018), (2) Potential reward is associated with appetitive strategies designed to mitigate desire (Schultz 1998), (3) potential relief from boredom or punishment correlates with avoidance or escape strategies (Bench and Lench 2019). A person with a genetic predisposition to *novelty seeking* would display observable behavior that could be characterized as impulsive, exploratory, fickle, excitable, quick-tempered, and extravagant (Zwir et al. 2020). Such individuals tend to neglect important details, become quickly distracted or bored, and may easily be provoked to prepare for fight or flight (Gu et al. 2018).

There are a number of societal and biological factors that may favor the genetic propagation of *novelty seeking*. Human psychological theory suggests that men give sexual preference to women that display the behavior of *novelty seeking* due to perceived fertility considerations (Miller 2000). Further, men who exhibit the behavior of *novelty seeking* theoretically maximize their own fertility *opportunities* (Zaromatidis, Carlo, and Racanello 2004), and mutual *novelty seeking* may contribute to the greatest increase in mating success in both sexes (Vall et al. 2015). There are also societal considerations that advantage the behavior of *novelty seeking* such as ‘*female farming systems*’ which can encourage the avoidance of domestic duties in favor of violent raiding and conquest (Harpending and Cochran 2002). Migration, such as recorded in the book of *Exodus*, would also serve to selectively benefit *novelty seeking* behavior (Chang et al. 1996; Chen et al. 1999). Finally, *novelty seeking* has been theorized in the warrior-worrier model to be advantageous when confronted with threatening environments where maximal performance is required despite the potential for pain or death (Goldman, Oroszi, and Ducci 2005). This work suggests that (1) Israel’s migration from Egypt, followed by the conquest of Canaan, and a subsequent bloody, violent era, contributed to societal conditions that favorably biased population genetic drift towards *novelty seeking* behavior, and (2) a redaction source(s) (DtrY) consistently and intentionally constructed biblical narratives, without regards for event resolution, which connect with the observable behavior of *novelty seeking*.

3. Novelty-Seeking Redaction Source(s)

110

There are a number of Old Testament pericopes that potentially deal with *nov-* 111
elty seeking behavior. Gideon's *risk taking* behavior is emphasized in his raid 112
upon the Midianites, while accompanied by only three hundred men (Judges 7:7 113
RSV). Further, his *uncontrollable temper* is twice recorded during his pursuit of the 114
Midianite kings. He scourged the elders of Succoth and murdered the men of Penuel 115
for refusing to assist him and his soldiers (Judges 8:16–17 RSV). Finally, Gideon's 116
imbalanced sexual *appetite*, conditioned by *potential reward* ('*he had many wives*') 117
(Judges 8:30 RSV), is alluded to as precipitating the destruction of his own genetic 118
line. Jephthah the Gileadite was a '*man of valor*' but the author amends that he '*was* 119
the son of a harlot' (Judges 11:1 RSV). The elders of Gilead eagerly made Jephthah their 120
leader, but the tragedy of Jephthah is highlighted in his poor decision-making. His 121
rash vow to God led to him offering his only daughter as a '*burnt offering*' (Judges 122
11:35 RSV). Samson is another example of an Old Testament judge whom the '*Lord* 123
blessed' (Judges 13:24 RSV), yet consistently demonstrated *novelty seeking* behavior. 124
The expression '*the Spirit of the Lord began to stir him*' (Judges 13:25 RSV) may be 125
a key phrase in deducing that this *novelty seeking* behavior had become evident. As 126
with Ruth, Samson did not confine his sexual interests to his own ethnic people, and 127
instead engaged in at least one high-risk one-night stand with a '*harlot*' from Gaza 128
(Judges 16:1 RSV). His own imbalanced sexual *appetite*, conditioned by *potential re-* 129
ward, led to his seduction by Delilah, his eyes being gouged out, his protracted re- 130
venge against the Philistines, and ultimately his death (Judges 16:4–30 RSV). *Novelty* 131
seeking behavior was also displayed by the prophets. Elijah was a forceful and dy- 132
namic prophet who opposed the monarchy of Ahab. After calling down fire from 133
heaven and brutally executing the prophets of Baal, Elijah was threatened with death 134
by Jezebel. Only a few paragraphs removed from performing this spectacular mira- 135
cle, the emotionally exhausted prophet underwent what is often colloquially called 136
an '*Elijah complex*' though, this work is the first to connect this nervous breakdown 137
with the psychobiological dimension of temperament of *novelty seeking*. 138

139

While migration, protracted warfare, and a fragmented society ('*every man did what* 140
was right in his own eyes') (Judges 17:6 RSV) '*could*' explain why the vast number 141

of Old Testament pericopes, particularly within the Succession Narrative (Court History) (Rost 2015; Knapp 2021), feature *novelty seeking* behavior (due to favorable genetic bias), the events themselves do not explain why a redaction source(s) (DtrY) would focus on this behavior in particular rather than some other unified literary theme. Even before the events recorded in the *Former Prophets*, much of Old Testament literature is dedicated to characters who display *novelty seeking* behavior. Abram abandoned his homeland, culture, and people because he believed that God would give him and his descendants the land of Canaan as an inheritance (Genesis 12:1 RSV). Abram's *risk taking* behavior is further emphasized in his daring raid, while accompanied by approximately three hundred men, upon the hosts of Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him (Genesis 14:14–17 RSV). Rebekah was willing to leave her homeland and culture to travel to Canaan and marry Isaac (Genesis 24:58 RSV). Jacob travelled to Paddan-aram, married multiple women, and returned to Canaan with his wives and children. The theory that one (or more) of the prophets may have unified the Old Testament around this literary theme of *novelty seeking* (DtrY) is one possible compelling explanation for literary coherence, although this is not to suggest that the entirety of the Old Testament did not undergo further or prior redaction. The prophet Jeremiah makes an interesting theoretical redactionist due to his exhibited *novelty seeking* behavior. Jeremiah frequently described himself as *weeping* due to the impending captivity of his people (Jeremiah 9:1 RSV, Jeremiah 13:17 RSV, Jeremiah 22:10 RSV). Further, he was apparently so distraught that God had to command him to refrain from crying aloud and weeping (Jeremiah 31:15–16 RSV). Such emotional behavior is consistent with *novelty seeking* behavior when confronted with dysphoric conditions. Those with this genetic predisposition are more prone to *crying* and other erratic *emotional* behavior, perhaps due to associated irregularities with the μ -opioid receptors' (MOR) modulation of dopaminergic activity (Kreek et al. 2005; DeYoung 2013). A redaction source, such as the prophet Jeremiah, would no doubt choose to focus on characters and events that reflected the behavior that he himself exhibited, whether subconsciously as a means of self-reflection or perhaps more likely as a means of catharsis in response to the emotional events of his own day. By contributing to the literary evolution of Old Testament literature, a *novelty seeking* redaction source (DtrY) would gain new insight into his own behavior by focusing on those who expressed similar be-

havior (not unlike a form of confession) (Kelly 2002). Psychoanalysts have theorized that catharsis allows a person ‘to get free from the hysterical symptoms by reproducing the pathogenic impressions that caused it and by giving utterances to them with an expression of affect’ (Breuer and Freud 1895; Scheff 1979). If a *novelty seeking* redaction source (DtrΨ) were responsible for contributing to much of Old Testament literature, one would quite reasonably *expect novelty seeking* behavior to be a prominent literary feature.

4. Davidic Genetics and Novelty Seeking

Old Testament literature appears to focus on characters and events that highlight *novelty seeking* behavior, particularly when the Davidic line is involved. The harlot Rahab is mentioned in the tradition of the Matthean genealogy as the mother of Boaz and the progenitor of Christ (Matthew 1:5 RSV), although this is perhaps due to exegetical conflation of Rechab (Ρηχαβ) with Rahab (Ρααβ) (1 Chronicles 2:55 RSV) (Bauckham 1995; Bauckham 2002). Rahab rejected her own people, culture, and religion in favor of the God of Israel (Joshua 2:11–12 RSV). Her *fear* of destruction (Joshua 2:9 RSV) and her religiosity were no doubt influenced by her own *novelty seeking* behavior. Similarly, Ruth rejected her own people, culture, and religion in favor of the God of Israel (Ruth 1:15–17 RSV). While women are more religious than men due to societal advantages and genetic risk-reward predispositions (Walter and Davie 1998), only women with a genetic predisposition for *novelty seeking* behavior (Li et al. 2020) would risk their own life by abandoning their own people, culture, and religion in favor of novelty. Ruth is introduced apparently for the sole purpose of connecting this *novelty seeking* behavior with her descendant David (Ruth 4:22 RSV), as she is not mentioned again in Old Testament literature. The theoretical redaction source(s) (DtrΨ) may have specifically emphasized the rejection of both priest ‘for those who honor me I will honor’ (1 Samuel 2:30 RSV) and king ‘the Lord shall seek for himself a man after his own heart’ (1 Samuel 13:14 RSV) in favor of a genetic line predisposed to *novelty seeking* behavior. David was the eighth son of Jesse and was anointed by the prophet Samuel because he had a ‘heart after God’ (1 Samuel 16:6–13 RSV). The narrative immediately shifts to conflict with the Philistines. The Masoretic tradition (Tov 1999) records that David’s oldest brother, Eliab, was aware

of David's *novelty seeking* behavior and insisted that this was the reason David had visited the Israelite camp. The expression '*I know your presumption, and the evil of your heart; for you have come down to see the battle*' has been connected with the *novelty seeking* behavior that David would consistently display throughout his life (Bodner 2003). David's impaired fear-processing is recorded in the Goliath pericope. David related how, even as a youth, he was unafraid to pursue and kill both a lion and she-bear with his own hands '*I caught him by his beard, and smote him and killed him*' (1 Samuel 17:34–37 RSV). Impressed by David's fearlessness, Saul allowed the youth to serve as the champion of Israel. David preceded to slay Goliath by rendering the later unconscious using only his sling as a weapon before slaying Goliath with the Philistine's own sword (1 Samuel 17:49–51 RSV). The literary narrative immediately pivots to Saul's attempt to destroy David by exploiting the latter's *novelty seeking* behavior. By setting an outlandish bride price of one hundred Philistine foreskins for the right to marry his own daughter, Saul anticipated that David's own impaired fear-processing would cause David to accept the challenge and be slain by the Philistines, who would be eager to avenge the death of their champion (1 Samuel 18:20–25 RSV). David impossibly survived this snare, despite his own genetic weakness, which in turn led Saul to conclude that the '*Lord must be with David*' (1 Samuel 18:28 RSV). After the death of Samuel the prophet, David guarded the livestock of Nabal, yet the later returned David, '*evil for good*' (1 Samuel 25:21 RSV). David's genetic predisposition for both an uncontrollable temper and poor decision-making led him to angrily respond that he would murder both Nabal and all the men in his house (1 Samuel 25:22 RSV). Abigail, through her wisdom, prevented David from shedding innocent blood (1 Samuel 25:31 RSV). After the sudden death of Nabal, David *immediately* and impulsively decided to add Abigail as another wife (1 Samuel 25:42 RSV). After becoming king of all Israel, David added more wives and concubines (2 Samuel 5:13 RSV), perhaps due to the societal expectations placed upon ancient monarchs, but more likely due to his *novelty seeking* behavior. During the siege of Rabbah (2 Samuel 11:1 RSV), David committed adultery with Bathsheba and murdered her husband, Uriah. David likely experienced boredom due to not being present at the siege, whether intentionally or due to constraint from army leadership (2 Samuel 18:2–4 RSV). Further, his genetic predisposition for *novelty seeking* made him particularly vulnerable to sexual boredom (Oliveira, Carvalho, and Nobre 2021). The

pericope places Bathsheba in her early teens, perhaps no more than thirteen years
 old, with phrasing such as ‘*little ewe lamb*’ (2 Samuel 12:1–4 RSV). Further, her first
 menarche (2 Samuel 11:4 RSV) may have occurred during the siege of Rabbah, which
 would also explain her subsequent elevated fecundity (2 Samuel 11:5 RSV) and the ab-
 sence of any mention of prior children by Uriah. The *Samuel* narrative masterfully
 connects David’s *novelty seeking* behavior with a sexual preference for increasingly
 younger women (Lalumière et al. 1996; Toates, Smid, and Berg 2017). The discov-
 ery of Bathsheba’s unplanned conception alarmed David, who then due to impaired
 decision-making, devised a means to murder Uriah during the siege of Rabbah. Af-
 ter the birth of Bathsheba’s firstborn, Nathan the prophet presented David with a
 parable regarding a seemingly unrelated incident. When confronted with this situa-
 tion that required judgment, David was *greatly* moved with anger, declared that the
 offender was the son of death (Schipper 2007; Pyper 1996), and that the offender
 should repay sevenfold (2 Samuel 12:5 LXX). Such a judicial rendering was entirely
 incompatible with Old Testament law which required only fourfold restitution for
 a stolen sheep (Exodus 22:1 RSV), although ironically, it mirrored the penalty pre-
 scribed for an adulterer (Proverbs 6:23–35 RSV). The Masoretic tradition indicates
 ‘*fourfold*’ rather than sevenfold, most likely due to an attempt by a subsequent well-
 intentioned revisionist to bring the text into alignment with the Pentateuch, perhaps
 several hundred years after the completion of the *Septuagint*, as the passage is alto-
 gether absent from the *Dead Sea Scrolls* (Feldman 2015). Not only does the redaction
 of the *Samuel* narratives showcase David’s *novelty seeking* behavior, the genetic pre-
 disposition of his descendants is also recorded. David’s firstborn son, Amnon, ‘*was*
so tormented that he made himself ill’ in his attempt to seduce his virgin half-sister,
 Tamar (2 Samuel 13:1 RSV). With the help of David’s ‘*cunning*’ nephew, Jonadab,
 Amnon was able to forcibly enact his rape-fantasy with Tamar, but was unable to
 satisfy his imbalanced sexual *appetite* (2 Samuel 13:15 RSV). Such behavior is strongly
 correlated with the genetic predisposition for *novelty seeking* behavior (Toates, Smid,
 and Berg 2017), which Amnon inherited from his father (Gray 1998). Absalom’s un-
 controllable temper led him to scheme protracted revenge against Amnon for raping
 his sister. The *Samuel* narrative records his premeditated murder of Amnon, his lust
 for the crown, and his incestuous adultery with David’s concubines (2 Samuel 16:22
 RSV). The *novelty seeking* exploits of Solomon are recorded in *Ecclesiastes*, where the

king sought out all knowledge, wisdom, and pleasure (Ecclesiastes 1:13 RSV, Ecclesiastes 2:1 RSV). Solomon increased his riches beyond all contemporary rulers (1 Kings 10:23 RSV). Further, he multiplied wives until his harem numbered one thousand women (1 Kings 11:1–4 RSV). Despite all his appetitive strategies, he was unable to satisfy his desire for more and declared that ‘*all [was] vanity*’ (Ecclesiastes 1:2 RSV).

5. The Paradox of Novelty Seeking

The psychobiological temperament of *novelty seeking* has been suggested as a potentially unifying theme of much of Old Testament literature. The paradoxical question remains: since the genetic predisposition for *novelty seeking* behavior contributed to many of the unsavory pericopes involving incest, rape, murder, and adultery in the *Former Prophets*, how could David possibly be considered ‘*a man after God’s own heart*’ (1 Samuel 13:14 RSV)? David’s willful rebellion against the law of God by committing adultery and murder could hardly be considered less serious than Saul’s impious sacrifice or his willful refusal to completely genocide the nation of Amalek (1 Samuel 15:9 RSV). If humility were instead used as a criterion, David would hardly serve as a worthy candidate as he intended to murder Nabal simply for the latter’s uncourteous rebuttal. David’s poor decision-making, uncontrollable temper, and sexual appetite should quite reasonably disqualify him from consideration as the ‘*choice of God*’ by any reasonable moral metric, yet the *Former Prophets* paradoxically identify David as ‘*a man after God’s own heart*’. Such an observation suggests that, according to the theoretical redaction source(s) (DtrY), God values the genetic predisposition for *novelty seeking* behavior. If Jeremiah were identified as the redactionist (DtrY), it is possible that he may have viewed his own consecration and calling by God (Jeremiah 1:4–5 RSV) as confirmation that *novelty seeking* behavior was indeed favored by God. This theory of a psychobiological redaction source(s) (DtrY) could help to explain why biblical pericopes might be presented without regards to event outcomes, because these outcomes, whether they portray characters in a positive or negative fashion, would be of only secondary interest to such a redaction source(s). Instead, the redaction source(s) (DtrY) would likely connect his own heightened curiosity and information seeking drive (Berlyne 1966; Ivancovsky, Baror, and Bar 2024) with that of other Old Testament *novelty seekers*. Because

this redaction source(s) (DtrY) believed that he sought after and was sought after 303
 by God, it is not unreasonable that he would expect others who were like himself 304
 to seek after and be sought after by God. Thus, the expression ‘*a man after God’s* 305
own heart’ may reflect both a projection of the redaction source(s)’ (DtrY) view of 306
 psychobiological temperament onto other *novelty seekers* and a recapitulation with 307
Imago Dei (Genesis 1:27 RSV), that is, humanity and the *Divine* mutually seeking 308
 after one another. 309



















6. Conclusion 310





















This work has argued that a theoretical redaction source(s) (DtrY) structured 311
 the *Former Prophets* around the psychobiological dimension of temperament 312
 known as *novelty seeking*. Further, the literary focus around *novelty seeking* behavior 313
 can provide a compelling explanation for the paradoxical fulfillment of David as ‘*a* 314
man after God’s own heart’, as this expression may reflect the redaction source(s)’ 315
 (DtrY) positive view of this psychobiological dimension of temperament. A psycho- 316
 logical approach to biblical redaction may provide an additional means of under- 317
 standing both the motivation of theoretical redaction source(s) and the literary co- 318
 herence of biblical texts. Future research would ideally examine the extent of literary 319
 coherence around the locus of *novelty seeking* (or even other dimensions of temper- 320
 ament) beyond the scope of the *Samuel* narratives. While this work has briefly sug- 321
 gested that Old Testament judges and prophets such as Gideon, Jephthah, Sampson, 322
 Elijah, and Jeremiah displayed *novelty seeking* behavior, further work should be fo- 323
 cused on analyzing the extent of this behavior in associated pericopes. Finally, future 324
 research should also examine the psychobiological viewpoint of New Testament au- 325
 thors, particularly in the synoptic Gospels and *Hebrews*. The former books identify 326
 Christ with John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets (Matthew 16:14 327
 RSV, Mark 8:28 RSV, Luke 9:19 RSV), while the latter emphasizes that *novelty seekers* 328
 are examples of ‘*greatness*’ on account of their faith (Hebrews 11:31–32 RSV). 329










References













- Auld, Alan (1999). “The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic?” In: *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*. Ed. by Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie. Vol. 268. Journal for the study of the Old Testament. OCLC Number [276868634](#).   Sheffield Academic Press, pp. 116–126.
- Aurelius, Erik (2012). *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch*. Vol. 319. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. OCLC Number [979785210](#).   De Gruyter. DOI: [10.1515/9783110903201](#).
- Avioz, Michael (2017). “The Literary Structure of the Books of Samuel: Setting the Stage for a Coherent Reading”. In:   *Currents in Biblical Research* 16.1. OCLC Number [7173926215](#), pp. 8–33. DOI: [10.1177/1476993X17694757](#).
- Bar-Efrat, Shimon (1980). “Some observations on the analysis of structure in biblical narrative”. In:   *Vetus Testamentum* 30.Fasc. 2. OCLC Number [5547932772](#), pp. 154–173. DOI: [10.2307/1517521](#).
- (2010). “Narrative art in the Bible”. In: *Understanding the Bible and its world*. OCLC Number [1255871003](#).
- Bauckham, Richard (1995). “Tamar’s ancestry and Rahab’s marriage: two problems in the Matthean genealogy”. In:   *Novum Testamentum* 37.Fasc. 4. OCLC Number [9978847180](#), pp. 313–329. DOI: [10.1163/1568536952663168](#).
- (2002). *Gospel women: Studies of the named women in the gospels*. OCLC Number [48661162](#).   Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Bench, Shane W. and Heather C. Lench (2019). “Boredom as a seeking state: Boredom prompts the pursuit of novel (even negative) experiences”. In:   *Emotion* 19.2. OCLC Number [7401717014](#), pp. 242–254. DOI: [10.1037/emo0000433](#).
- Berlyne, Daniel E. (1966). “Curiosity and Exploration: Animals spend much of their time seeking stimuli whose significance raises problems for psychology”. In:   *Science* 153.3731. OCLC Number [4632827121](#), pp. 25–33. DOI: [10.1126/science.153.3731.25](#).

- Berlyne, Daniel E. and Christiane Mauderli (1974). *Konflikt, Erregung, Neugier: Zur Psychologie der kognitiven Motivation*. Konzepte der Humanwissenschaften. OCLC Number [715637086](#).   Ernst Klett Verlag. DOI: [10.1037/11164-000](#).
- Blum, Erhard (1990). *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. Vol. 189. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. OCLC Number [29704605](#).   De Gruyter.
- Boden, Margaret A. (2004). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms*. 2nd ed. OCLC Number [51898672](#).   Routledge.
- Bodner, Keith (2003). "Eliab and the Deuteronomist". In:   *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28.1. OCLC Number [5724559096](#), pp. 55–71. DOI: [10.1177/030908920302800103](#).
- Breuer, Josef and Sigmund Freud (1895). *Studies on hysteria (Studien über Hysterie)*. OCLC Number [2137996](#).   Franz Deuticke.
- Chang, Fong-Ming et al. (1996). "The world-wide distribution of allele frequencies at the human dopamine D₄ receptor locus". In:   *Human genetics* 98. OCLC Number [118146670](#), pp. 91–101. DOI: [10.1007/s004390050166](#).
- Chen, Chuansheng et al. (1999). "Population migration and the variation of dopamine D₄ receptor (DRD₄) allele frequencies around the globe". In:     *Evolution and Human Behavior* 20.5. OCLC Number [1034724159](#), pp. 309–324. DOI: [10.1016/S1090-5138\(99\)00015-X](#).
- Cloninger, C. Robert (1987). "A systematic method for clinical description and classification of personality variants: A proposal". In:   *Archives of general psychiatry* 44.6. OCLC Number [10059199754](#), pp. 573–588. DOI: [10.1001/archpsyc.1987.01800180093014](#).
- Cloninger, C. Robert, Dragan M. Svrakic, and Thomas R. Przybeck (1993). "A psychobiological model of temperament and character". In:   *Archives of general psychiatry* 50.12. OCLC Number [121793518](#), pp. 975–990. DOI: [10.1001/archpsyc.1993.01820240059008](#).
- Costa, Vincent D. et al. (2014). "Dopamine modulates novelty seeking behavior during decision making". In:   *Behavioral neuroscience* 128.5. OCLC Number [5630695967](#), pp. 556–566. DOI: [10.1037/a0037128](#).


















- Crenshaw, James L. (1974). "The Samson Saga: Filial Devotion or Erotic Attachment?" In:   *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86.4. OCLC Number [4632159462](#), pp. 470–504. DOI: [10.1515/zatw.1974.86.4.470](#).
- Cross, Frank M. (1973). "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History". In: *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. OCLC Number [671934](#).   Harvard University Press, pp. 274–89. DOI: [10.4159/9780674030084](#).
- DeYoung, Colin G. (2013). "The neuromodulator of exploration: A unifying theory of the role of dopamine in personality". In:   *Frontiers in human neuroscience* 7.762. OCLC Number [8539129069](#). DOI: [10.3389/fnhum.2013.00762](#).
- Dietrich, Walter (1972). *Prophezie und Geschichte: eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*. Vol. 108. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. OCLC Number [903969144](#).   Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Eissfeldt, Otto (1965). *The Old Testament: an introduction including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and also the works of similar type from Qumran. The history of the formation of the Old Testament*. Trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd. OCLC Number [977657594](#).   Blackwell.
- Feldman, Ariel (2015). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Rewriting Samuel and Kings: Texts and Commentary*. Vol. 469. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. OCLC Number [914339390](#).   De Gruyter. DOI: [10.1515/9783110339291](#).
- Fishbane, Michael (1975). "Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle (Gen. 25:19–35:22)". In:   *Journal of Jewish studies* 26.1–2. OCLC Number [6022184481](#), pp. 15–38. DOI: [10.18647/734/JJS-1975](#).
- Fokkelman, Jan P. (1975). *Narrative art in Genesis: Specimens of stylistic and structural analysis*. Vol. 17. Studia Semitica Neerlandica. OCLC Number [2074589](#).   Van Gorcum.
- Goldman, David, Gabor Oroszi, and Francesca Ducci (2005). "The genetics of addictions: Uncovering the genes". In:   *Nature Reviews: Genetics* 6.7. OCLC Number [110686770](#), pp. 521–532. DOI: [10.1038/nrg1635](#).







- Gottlieb, Jacqueline et al. (2013). "Information-seeking, curiosity, and attention: computational and neural mechanisms". In:   *Trends in cognitive sciences* 17.11. OCLC Number [5534358274](#), pp. 585–593. DOI: [10.1016/j.tics.2013.09.001](#).
- Gray, Mark (1998). "Amnon: A chip off the old block? rhetorical strategy in 2 Samuel 13.7-15 the rape of tamar and the humiliation of the poor". In:   *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 23.77. OCLC Number [5724655041](#), pp. 39–54. DOI: [10.1177/030908929802307704](#).
- Gu, Simeng et al. (2018). "The neural mechanism underlying cognitive and emotional processes in creativity". In:     *Frontiers in Psychology* 9.1924. OCLC Number [7918965042](#). DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01924](#).
- Harpending, Henry and Gregory Cochran (2002). "In our genes". In:   *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99.1. OCLC Number [9985165582](#), pp. 10–12. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.012612799](#).
- Ivancovsky, Tal, Shira Baror, and Moshe Bar (2024). "A shared novelty-seeking basis for creativity and curiosity". In:   *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 47.e89. OCLC Number [10244989613](#), pp. 1–76. DOI: [10.1017/S0140525X23002807](#).
- Jauk, Emanuel (2019). "A bio-psycho-behavioral model of creativity". In:   *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 27. OCLC Number [7827510788](#), pp. 1–6. DOI: [10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.08.012](#).
- Kaiser, Otto (1992). *Grundriß der Einleitung in die kanonischen und deuterokanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments. Band 1: Die erzählenden Werke*. OCLC Number [28143444](#).   Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Kashdan, Todd B. et al. (2018). "The five-dimensional curiosity scale: Capturing the bandwidth of curiosity and identifying four unique subgroups of curious people". In:   *Journal of Research in Personality* 73. OCLC Number [7247752103](#), pp. 130–149. DOI: [10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.011](#).
- Kelly, Anita E. (2002). "What is it about revealing secrets that is beneficial?" In: *The Psychology of Secrets*. Ed. by C. R. Snyder. The Springer Series in Social Clinical Psychology. OCLC Number [958526060](#).   Springer, pp. 81–99. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4615-0683-6_5](#).

- Kidd, Celeste and Benjamin Y. Hayden (2015). “The psychology and neuroscience of curiosity”. In:  *Neuron* 88.3. OCLC Number [5911937546](#), pp. 449–460. DOI: [10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.010](#).
- Knapp, Andrew (2021). “The succession narrative in twenty-first-century research”. In:  *Currents in Biblical Research* 19.3. OCLC Number [9782248386](#), pp. 211–234. DOI: [10.1177/1476993X20954841](#).
- Knauf, Ernst A. (2000). “Does “Deuteronomistic Historiography” (DtrH) exist?” In: *Israel constructs its history*. OCLC Number [1430462121](#).  Sheffield Academic Press, pp. 388–398.
- Krause, Joachim J. (2015). “The Book of the Torah in Joshua 1 and 23 and in the Deuteronomistic History”. In:  *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 127.3. OCLC Number [10334283375](#), pp. 412–428. DOI: [10.1515/zaw-2015-0022](#).
- Krebs, Ruth M et al. (2009). “The novelty exploration bonus and its attentional modulation”. In:  *Neuropsychologia* 47.11. OCLC Number [5901046588](#), pp. 2272–2281. DOI: [10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.01.015](#).
- Kreek, Mary J. et al. (2005). “Genetic influences on impulsivity, risk taking, stress responsivity and vulnerability to drug abuse and addiction”. In:  *Nature Neuroscience* 8.11. OCLC Number [106275464](#), pp. 1450–1457. DOI: [10.1038/nn1583](#).
- Lalumière, Martin L. et al. (1996). “A test of the mate deprivation hypothesis of sexual coercion”. In:  *Ethology and Sociobiology* 17.5. OCLC Number [4929105410](#), pp. 299–318. DOI: [10.1016/S0162-3095\(96\)00076-3](#).
- Li, Yi et al. (2020). “Why are women more religious than men? Do risk preferences and genetic risk predispositions explain the gender gap?” In:  *Journal for the scientific study of religion* 59.2. OCLC Number [8681417562](#), pp. 289–310. DOI: [10.1111/jssr.12657](#).
- Lohfink, Norbert (1981). “Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks”. In: *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70 Geburtstag*. Ed. by Hans W. Wolff, Jörg Jeremias, and Lothar Perlitt. OCLC Number [8689099](#).  Neukirchener Verlag, pp. 87–100.
- (1991). *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium: Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer*. Vol. III. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. OCLC Number

1416165901.   Universitätsverlag und Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. DOI: 492
10.5167/uzh-152104. 493
- Magonet, Jonathan (1976). *Form and meaning: studies in literary techniques in the book of Jonah*. Vol. 2. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie. OCLC 494
Number 780456539.   Lang. 496
- McKenzie, Stephen (2014). *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*. Vol. 42. Vetus Testamentum, 498
Supplements. OCLC Number 23179991.   Brill. DOI: 499
10.1163/9789004275652. 500
- Miller, Geoffrey (2000). *The mating mind: How sexual choice shaped the evolution of human nature*. OCLC Number 43418666.   Heinemann. 502
- Noll, Kurt L. (2007). “Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate? (A Thought Experiment)”. In:   *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 504
31.3. OCLC Number 5724559856, pp. 311–345. DOI: 505
10.1177/0309089207076357. 506
- Noth, Martin (1943). *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Vol. 2. Königsberger Gelehrte Gesellschaft. OCLC Number 2849214.   Max Niemeyer. 508
- Ogasawara, Takaya et al. (2022). “A primate temporal cortex–zona incerta pathway for novelty seeking”. In:   *Nature neuroscience* 25.1. OCLC Number 510
9379500781, pp. 50–60. DOI: 10.1038/s41593-021-00950-1. 511
- Oliveira, Leonor de, Joana Carvalho, and Pedro Nobre (2021). “A systematic review on sexual boredom”. In:   *The Journal of Sexual Medicine* 18.3. OCLC 513
Number 8928643686, pp. 565–581. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsexm.2020.12.019. 514
- Pury, Albert de, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds. (2000). *Israel constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. 515
Vol. 306. Journal for the study of the Old Testament. OCLC Number 516
276368345.   Sheffield Academic Press. 518
- Pyper, Hugh S. (1996). *David as reader: 2 Samuel 12:1-15 and the poetics of fatherhood*. Vol. 23. Biblical interpretation series. OCLC Number 34618120. 519
  Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004497771. 521
- Radjawane, Arnold N. (1974). “Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk: Ein Forschungsbericht”. In:   *Theologische Rundschau* 38.3. OCLC Number 523
9977936626, pp. 177–216. 524

- Römer, Thomas (2020). “The so-called deuteronomistic history and Its theories of composition”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*. Ed. by Brad E. Kelle and Brent A. Strawn. OCLC Number 1159624548.   Oxford University Press New York, pp. 302–322. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190261160.013.30.
- Rost, Leonhard (2015). *The Succession to the Throne of David (Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge)*. Trans. by Michael D. Rutter and David M. Gunn. Bloomsbury Academic Collections: Biblical Studies. OCLC Number 898213779.   Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Roussos, Panos, Stella G. Giakoumaki, and Panos Bitsios (2009). “Cognitive and emotional processing in high novelty seeking associated with the L-DRD4 genotype”. In:   *Neuropsychologia* 47.7. OCLC Number 319636347, pp. 1654–1659. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.02.005.
- Scheff, Thomas J. (1979). *Catharsis in healing, ritual, and drama*. OCLC Number 5977757.   Univ of California Press.
- Schipper, Jeremy (2007). “Did David overinterpret Nathan’s parable in 2 Samuel 12:1-6?” In:   *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126.2. OCLC Number 5792014048, pp. 383–391. DOI: 10.2307/27638440.
- Schultz, Wolfram (1998). “Predictive reward signal of dopamine neurons”. In:   *Journal of neurophysiology* 80.1. OCLC Number 119071546, pp. 1–27. DOI: 10.1152/jn.1998.80.1.1.
- Schwartenbeck, Philipp et al. (2013). “Exploration, novelty, surprise, and free energy minimization”. In:   *Frontiers in psychology* 4.710. OCLC Number 5164398422. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00710.
- Smend, Rudolf (1971). “Das Gesetz und die Völker: ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte”. In: *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70 Geburtstag*. Ed. by Gerhard von Rad and Hans W. Wolff. OCLC Number 344862.   Kaiser Verlag, pp. 494–509.
- Sowden, Paul T., Andrew Pringle, and Liane Gabora (2015). “The shifting sands of creative thinking: Connections to dual-process theory”. In:   *Thinking & Reasoning* 21.1. OCLC Number 5543174627, pp. 40–60. DOI: 10.1080/13546783.2014.885464.

- Toates, Frederick, Wineke Smid, and Jan W. van den Berg (2017). “A framework for understanding sexual violence: Incentive-motivation and hierarchical control”. In:   *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 34. OCLC Number [7072644904](#), pp. 238–253. DOI: [10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.001](#).
- Tov, Emanuel (1999). “The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in Light of The Septuagint”. In:   *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*. Vol. 72. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. OCLC Number [894493956](#). Brill, pp. 333–362. DOI: [10.1163/9789004275973_024](#).
- Vall, Gemma et al. (2015). “Seven basic dimensions of personality pathology and their clinical consequences: Are all personalities equally harmful?” In:   *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 54.4. OCLC Number [5892325447](#), pp. 450–468. DOI: [10.1111/bjc.12091](#).
- Van Seters, John (1983). *In search of history: historiography in the ancient world and the origins of biblical history*. OCLC Number [8930041](#).   Yale University Press.
- Veijola, Timo (1975). *Die ewige Dynastie: David u. die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Vol. 193. Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian toimituksia. OCLC Number [2006305](#).   Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- (1977). *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Vol. 198. Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian toimituksia. OCLC Number [3676985](#).   Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- (1996). “Bundestheologische Redaktion im Deuteronomium”. In: *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen*. Vol. 62. Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran julkaisuja. OCLC Number [36709570](#).   Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft und Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 242–276.
- Walter, Tony and Grace Davie (1998). “The religiosity of women in the modern West”. In:   *British Journal of Sociology*. OCLC Number [5548781536](#), pp. 640–660. DOI: [10.2307/591293](#).
- Westermann, Claus (1994). *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* Vol. 87. Theologische Bücherei. OCLC Number [1407710478](#).   Kaiser Verlag.

- Würthwein, Ernst (1994). “Erwägungen zum sog. deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. Eine Skizze”. In: *Studien zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*. Vol. 227. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. OCLC Number [7351892327](#).   De Gruyter, pp. I–II. DOI: [10.1515/9783110880984.1](#). 590
591
592
593
594
- Zaromatidis, Katherine, Regina Carlo, and Dennis Racanello (2004). “Sex, perceptions of attractiveness, and sensation seeking and ratings of the likelihood of having sexually transmitted diseases”. In:   *Psychological reports* 94.2. OCLC Number [6034881143](#), pp. 633–636. DOI: [10.2466/pr0.94.2.633-636](#). 595
596
597
598
599
- Zwir, Igor et al. (2020). “Uncovering the complex genetics of human temperament”. In:   *Molecular psychiatry* 25.10. OCLC Number [8671690475](#), pp. 2275–2294. DOI: [10.1038/s41380-018-0264-5](#). 600
601
602