

According to Which “Law of Moses”? Cult Centralization in Samuel and Chronicles

Benjamin D. Giffone
LCC International University, Stellenbosch University
benjamingiffone@gmail.com

Evangelical Theological Society
2015 Annual Meeting*

I. INTRODUCTION

The general question that motivates this study is literary and theological: To what legal standards are the characters in the narratives of the Former Prophets and Chronicles held accountable by the storymakers? To ask the question more plainly: What was “Law” for the Deuteronomistic Historian, the Chronicler, and the authors of the sources that they apparently used?

For example, Jephthah’s horrible conundrum over his vow would have been solved, the Targumist observes, if he had only consulted the high priest, who would have told him about Leviticus 5:4-6, and he would have offered the proper sacrifice before the priest at the sanctuary to release himself from his rash vow!¹ It is easy for us to chuckle over this proposal of an obvious, easy way out based on Leviticus—but it points to this deeper question of the inner logic of the narratives: What is presumed as “Law” from the standpoint of the narrator, and how are we as readers expected to evaluate the characters’ actions?

The question is also complicated by the uncertainties surrounding the compositional history of these texts. It is perfectly plausible that a certain character’s actions would have been considered acceptable in a source text, but then evaluated negatively (explicitly or implicitly) by the editor who incorporated that narrative into a later work (or vice-versa).

The particularly tricky question that I propose to tackle in this paper is the problem of cultic centralization in Samuel, the Deuteronomistic History, and Chronicles. Some scholars have questioned the extent of “Deuteronomistic” influence on the book of Samuel.² One of the ways that Samuel supposedly differs from [especially] Kings is the lack of explicit “Deuteronomistic” disapproval of the plurality of religious sanctuaries.

I argue in this paper that the Chronicler, as an early interpreter of Samuel and Kings, alerts us to the diverse understandings of (or emphases in) cult centralization that are represented in these texts and in the Pentateuch. In light of recent studies that demonstrate the Chronicler’s apparent desire to bring his source narratives into compliance with *both* Deuteronomistic *and* Priestly understandings of Law, I suggest that we *read backward* from the Chronicler’s perspective on centralization in order to evaluate the model of centralization represented in the

* Atlanta, November 17-19, 2015.

¹ Targum Jonathan for Judges 11:39 reads: “And at the end of two months she returned unto her father, and he did to her his vow that he vowed. And she did not know man. And it was made a rule in Israel *in order that a man not offer up his son and his daughter for a holocaust as Jephthah the Gileadite did. And he was not inquiring of Phinehas the priest; and if he inquired of Phinehas the priest, he would have redeemed her with blood.*”

² For a recent discussion of this question, see Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala, eds., *Is Samuel Among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History* (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), especially the editors’ introductory essay (1-15).

final form of Samuel and Kings. I believe that doing so will demonstrate that Samuel is in fact a “Deuteronomistic” book, exhibiting the precise view of cult centralization that we would expect from a book that advances the Deuteronomistic narrative in the way that it does—that is, the “discovery” of “the place which YHWH will choose to set his name to dwell there” (Deut 12:11).

II. DIFFERENT KINDS OF CULT CENTRALIZATION

One of the things we must acknowledge first is that “cultic centralization” comes in at least two varieties: “Deuteronomic,” and “Levitical.” Both patterns emphasize the importance of priests in religious sacrifice, as well as a central location for sacrifice. There are two key differences: the sacral nature of domestic slaughter for food, and the particular central location that is emphasized.

Reading Leviticus 1-7 and 17 together, one pattern of centralization emerges. Leviticus 17 sweeps *all* slaughter of domestic animals into a category of ritual: the *זֶבַח*. These animals must be slaughtered at the door of the tent of meeting, and the blood of the animal dashed upon the altar of YHWH (17:3-6).³ For a *זֶבַח*, the fat is burned before YHWH (7:31), and the right thigh (שׁוֹרֵק הֶזְמִין) and breast (חֶזֶק) belong to the priest (7:31-36). The centralization of slaughter at the sanctuary was intended to prevent idolatry (17:7).

Deuteronomy 12 presents a different pattern of sacral domestic slaughter in Israelite practice. When Israel will enter the Promised Land, they may slaughter and eat domestic animals whenever they please (12:20-21), but “ritual” slaughter would be centralized in “the place in which YHWH your God will choose for His name to dwell” (12:15-18).

The stated rationale for this pattern is the same as that of the centralization of all slaughter in Leviticus 17: the avoidance of idolatry and animism (12:2-8, 23-25, 29-31). Tigay writes:

[Leviticus 17] was practical when all Israelites lived near a sanctuary, as when they lived in the wilderness. Even after they settled in Canaan and scattered across the land, it would remain practical as long as it was legitimate to have sanctuaries throughout the land. But once a single sanctuary was chosen the requirement would become impractical, since those who lived far from it would be able to eat meat only on the infrequent occasions when they visited there. To avoid this hardship, secular slaughter of domestic cattle, too, will be permitted, and the people may eat meat whenever they want and can afford to.⁴

One command (Leviticus) confirms the prevailing ANE assumption that all slaughter is a spiritual/religious act, and centralizes that religious activity under the authority of the priests. The other command (Deuteronomy), for pragmatic reasons (Deut 12:21), retains the centralization of religious activity under priestly authority, but desacralizes the act of slaughter for food. Sacrifices are still eaten (12:17-19), but no longer is all eating of meat a ritual act. In

³ “Any man from the house of Israel who slaughters an ox or a lamb or a goat in the camp or who slaughters outside the camp, but has not brought it to the door of the tent of meeting to present it as a *qorban* to YHWH before the sanctuary of YHWH, blood[guiltiness] will be reckoned to that man; he has shed blood, and that man will be cut off from among his people—in order that the sons of Israel may bring their sacrifices (זִבְחֵיהֶם), which they are [currently] sacrificing on the edge of the field, that they may bring them to YHWH, to the door of the tent of meeting, to the priest, and might sacrifice the sacrifices of the *shelamim* to YHWH. The priest must dash the blood upon the altar of YHWH at the doorway of the tent of meeting and turn-to-smoke the fat as a soothing aroma to YHWH.” (Lev 17:3-6)

⁴ Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 124.

fact, religious pilgrims to the prospective central sanctuary may even sell their own animals and their produce, travel with the proceeds to the sanctuary, and purchase sacrificial offering/feast animals and produce at the central sanctuary (Deut 14:22-27). In Deuteronomy 18:3, the priest's portion (of either an ox or a sheep) is to be the shoulder (זָרוֹעַ), the two cheeks (לִפְתָּיִם), and the stomach (קֶבֶד).

The other difference in emphasis between these two variants of cultic centralization is the location of centralization. Both systems presume priestly involvement, but the Levitical system is closely tied to the tabernacle, and is therefore portable. Deuteronomy, on the other hand, never mentions the tabernacle/tent of meeting in cultic instructions, but looks intently “forward” to the discovery and establishment of “the place which YHWH your God shall choose.” This difference becomes important in reading the narratives, because there is a period between the full conquest of Jerusalem (2 Sam 5; 1 Chr 11) and the consolidation of the tabernacle into the Jerusalem temple (1 Kgs 8:4; 2 Chr 5:5) in which *Jerusalem is available* as a cultic center but *the tabernacle is elsewhere*. The Deuteronomist and the Chronicler approach this period of “conflicted centralization” somewhat differently.

III. CULT CENTRALIZATION IN THE DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY AND CHRONICLES: EXAMPLES

Now, let us compare the treatments of cultic centralization in Samuel-Kings and in Chronicles. I previously remarked that I consider the Chronicler to be an early interpreter of Samuel-Kings; my view is that the so-called Deuteronomistic History reached its received form in the late Babylonian or early Persian period, and that Chronicles is the product of a single author or circle in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period.⁵ I also take the view that the Chronicler possesses the Pentateuch in something close to its final form,⁶ and therefore regards both Deuteronomy and Priestly material as scripture—“Law.”

Cult Centralization from Eli to Solomon in Samuel and Kings

A cursory examination of the early chapters of 1 Samuel reveals that sacrifice is not centralized during this period—nor are sacrifices conducted according to Priestly requirements. Several observations are relevant to our study.

First, numerous non-Levites administer sacrifices as priests. Interestingly, the book begins with Levites (Eli and his sons) serving as priests, and includes a Deuteronomistic apology for the Zadokite priesthood (1 Sam 2:27-36)⁷—and yet Samuel, an Ephraimite,⁸ serves as judge

⁵ My view is that the Deuteronomistic History developed in several stages between the late monarchy and the early Persian period, and that Chronicles is the product of a single author or school in the middle to late fourth century B.C.E. The present thesis is not dependent to any significant degree on the precise dating of either the Deuteronomistic History or Chronicles, but rather on the consensus position that the Chronicles is later than Samuel and Kings and uses those books as its source. For an alternative position that considers Chronicles and The Deuteronomistic History as “contemporary, competing historiographies,” see Raymond F. Person, Jr., *The Deuteronomistic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010).

⁶ David A. Glatt-Gilad, “Chronicles as Consensus Literature,” in *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 73-74.

⁷ Richard D. Nelson, “The Deuteronomistic Historian in Samuel: ‘The Man behind the Green Curtain,’” in *Is Samuel Among the Deuteronomists*, 24-26.

⁸ Lest it be thought that Elkanah, Samuel’s father, is a Levite residing in Ephraim, the text explicitly calls his ancestor an Ephraimite (אֶפְרַיִם; 1:1). Leuchter observes that during this period non-Levites could function as Levites in judicial and priestly capacities, and calls Samuel “an archetypical Levite”; see Mark Leuchter, “‘The Levite in Your Gates’: The Deuteronomic Redefinition of Levitical Authority,” *JBL* 126 (2007): 423, 426.

Locations of Cultic Activity: From The Era of the Judges Until Solomon's Temple	
Jdg 20:26-28	Phinehas, grandson of Aaron, administers various sacrifices at Bethel; ark is also present.
Jdg 21:19	Yearly festival to YHWH at Shiloh
1 Sam 1:3-5, 9, 24	Eli and his sons minister at the היכל יהוה at Shiloh.
1 Sam 4:1-7:2	The ark is taken from Shiloh, lost to the Philistines, and returns, ending up at Kiriath-jearim.
1 Sam 7:10, 15-17	Samuel (an Ephraimite!) offers sacrifices at Mizpah, judges on a circuit at Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah, and also sacrifices at an altar at his home in Ramah.
1 Sam 9:13, 23-24	Samuel leads a sacrifice at Zuph.
1 Sam 13:8-15	Saul improperly leads the sacrifices of burnt offering (עלה) and well-being (שלם) at Gilgal without Samuel. Note that his error is the failure to wait for Samuel, not the location itself.
1 Sam 21:1-6	Ahimelech the priest, ministering at Nob (Benjamin), offers David the “bread of the presence” from “before YHWH.”
2 Sam 5:6-9; 6:1-19	David conquers Jerusalem and brings the ark there. He offers sacrifices, and the people receive cakes to eat (6:19).
2 Sam 8:18	David's sons are priests along with Zadok and Ahimelech, but no location is mentioned.
2 Sam 12:20	David worships “in the house of YHWH” after Bathsheba's son dies.
2 Sam 15:8, 12	Ahithophel the Gilonite, a conspirator with Absalom, offers sacrifices at Hebron with Absalom.
2 Sam 15:24-29	When David flees from Absalom, Zadok and the Levites try to bring the ark with them, but David insists that it stay in Jerusalem.
2 Sam 24:16-25	David sacrifices at Araunah's threshing floor in Jerusalem.
1 Kings 3:3-4, 15	Gibeon is “the great high place”; Solomon sacrifices there and has a vision that night in a dream. Afterward, he sacrifices only before the ark in Jerusalem.
1 Kings 8:4	Solomon consolidates the ark and “the tent of meeting” into the newly-built temple.

and priest until his death. Even after the ark is brought to Jerusalem, David's sons serve as priests (2 Sam 8:18). The fact that this was acceptable is evidence that the book of Samuel does indeed have pre-Deuteronomistic content.⁹

The second is the separation of the cultic symbols from one another. Samuel begins with the ark and the tabernacle (i.e., tent of meeting) in the same location (Shiloh). Eli's sons take the ark into battle against the Philistines at the request of the elders (1 Sam 4:3-4), and the ark is captured. From this point on until 1 Kings 8:4, the ark and the tabernacle are separated, though each appears in several locations.

The third observation is that as soon as Jerusalem is conquered (2 Sam 5) and *one* of these cultic symbols (the ark) is brought there (2 Sam 6), Jerusalem is treated as the proper location for sacrifice. When David recovers after the death of his son by Bathsheba, he worships at “the house of YHWH,” (2 Sam 12:20) which seems to be the “tent” in which the ark rested in

⁹ Though, the question remains as to why the Deuteronomist retains this material. It is worth noting that although “Levitical priests” are mentioned in Deuteronomy, there is not much in the way of specific cultic instructions for them or references to the exclusivity of the Levitical priesthood.

Jerusalem (cf. 2 Sam 7:2). Later in the book (though this story might not be chronologically subsequent), David sacrifices at the threshing floor of Araunah in Jerusalem (2 Sam 24:16-25). When he flees before Absalom, he insists that the ark stay in Jerusalem (2 Sam 15:24-29). The references to cultic activity outside Jerusalem between 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Kings 8 are portrayed negatively. Absalom offers sacrifices at Hebron as a prelude to his usurpation (2 Sam 15:8, 12). Solomon's sacrifice at Gibeon (1 Kgs 3:3-4) seems to be something of an embarrassment for the author, who hastens to note that henceforth Solomon offered sacrifices *only* in Jerusalem (1 Kgs 3:15).¹⁰

The fact that there is little concern for centralization in the book of Samuel before the ark is brought to Jerusalem should not necessarily be interpreted as lack of Deuteronomistic ideology or editorial input. The period covered by the book of Samuel is exceptional with respect to "Deuteronomistic" centralization, because of this very fact. It would be unreasonable for the Deuteronomistic historian to have the same centralizing expectations for pre- and post-2 Samuel 6 characters.¹¹ The unique aspect of the Deuteronomistic presentation of the story—which is highlighted by a comparison with Chronicles, as we shall see momentarily—is the *eagerness* to centralize in Jerusalem, before the tabernacle—which would seem to be the more important cultic symbol for sacrifice—arrives in 1 Kings 8.

Cult Centralization in Chronicles

The Chronicler, having inherited such a peculiar mix of traditions in Samuel-Kings, undertook a daunting (but apparently necessary!) task: shaping the traditions according to the standard of "Law" that prevailed in his community. The Chronicler's attention to the Levites and priests, and his affinity for the Law as found in Leviticus, are well-known. However, recent studies have attempted to show that the Chronicler also *embraces* the Deuteronomistic perspective found in his main source, the books of Samuel and Kings.¹² Ben Zvi, Knoppers, and Jonker argue that the Chronicler in various ways exhibits a reverence for existing Torah tradition.

We shall see that the Chronicler remains fundamentally respectful of Deuteronomistic elements in the narratives relating to centralization, even as he attempts to incorporate Priestly requirements as well. If, in fact, the Chronicler reworked his *Vorlage* to bring it more in line with P, this need not represent a *deviation* from "Deuteronomism" as an ideology but rather a

¹⁰ See Ralph W. Klein, *2 Chronicles: A Commentary* (*Hermeneia* series; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 22; Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10-29* (Anchor Bible Commentary; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 652; Knoppers, "1 & 2 Chronicles," in *The New Oxford Annotated Bible (NOAB)*, Michael D. Coogan, ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 620.

¹¹ Note the presence of both positive and negative references to other cultic locations (such as Gilgal, Bethel and Gibeon) in Joshua and Judges. In some texts, later rejection of these locations is clearly present anachronistically—whereas other texts portray these sites positively (Josh 4-5; 10:12-15; Jdg 4:5; 20:18).

¹² Ehud Ben Zvi, "Are There Any Bridges Out There? How Wide Was the Conceptual Gap Between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles?" in *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives* (ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 59-86; Knoppers, "Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist," 307-341; Louis C. Jonker, "Was the Chronicler More Deuteronomic Than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomic Legal Traditions," *SJOT* 27 (2013): 191-203. I am especially grateful to Louis Jonker for allowing me to read a pre-publication version of his article.

consistent “Deuteronomistic” application of scripture—which, for the Chronicler, may have been a text very close to our received Pentateuch.¹³

First, with respect to the tribal identity of those serving as priests, the Chronicler “grafts” Samuel into the genealogy of Levi.¹⁴ Even though he belongs to a period that precedes the point at which the Chronicler picks up the narrative, Samuel’s importance to Israel’s story and the tacit approval in the book of Samuel of the prophet Samuel’s priestly service necessitate his inclusion in the priestly line (1 Chr 6:28ff). Furthermore, the Chronicler alters 2 Samuel 8:18 to “clarify” that David’s sons were not כִּהֲנִים but רֹאשֵׁי (1 Chr 18:17).

Second, the Chronicler, by coincidence or by design, bypasses the pre-David portions of the Deuteronomistic story during which multiple cultic centers are used. After the death of Saul (1 Chr 10), David’s first act as king of All-Israel is to take Jerusalem from the Jebusites (1 Chr 11:4-8). The story of David’s transport of the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6) is split into two narratives (1 Chr 13, and 15-16). Of interest to our study is one of the Chronicler’s additions: David’s continued provision for the tabernacle at Gibeon, even after the ark is enshrined in Jerusalem (1 Chr 16:39-42). Herein lies the contrast: for the Deuteronomist, Jerusalem is the proper cultic center (“the place where YHWH will set His Name to dwell”) once David has conquered it (2 Sam 5) and brought the ark there (2 Sam 6). The Chronicler *embraces* this perspective but also *adds* an element consistent with Leviticus: sacrifice should still be offered at the “tent of meeting” until it is consolidated into the temple (2 Chr 5:5). The Chronicler stresses that David’s provision for the Zadokite priesthood at Gibeon was done “according to all that is written in the Torah of YHWH” (1 Chr 16:40).¹⁵

This blending of Deuteronomy- and Leviticus-flavored perspectives on centralization accounts for the Chronicler’s lack of apprehension in reporting that Solomon sacrificed at Gibeon (2 Chr 1). Whereas the Deuteronomist feels slightly embarrassed about Solomon’s private actions (1 Kgs 3:3-4), the Chronicler turns the private pilgrimage into a national assembly (2 Chr 1:3)! From that point on, Gibeon is not mentioned in Chronicles—nor is any cultic center other than Jerusalem mentioned by name. The Chronicler has transformed the story of the census, the plague, and David’s altar on the threshing floor of Araunah/Ornan the Jebusite from an appended narrative (2 Sam 24) into a catalyst for the discovery of the temple site (1 Chr 21:1-22:1);¹⁶ thus, the key moment of “Deuteronomistic” centralization is not the conquest of Jerusalem but the consecration of the temple (2 Chr 5-6).

This view of the Chronicler’s approach to centralization slightly nuances that of Knoppers, who writes:

Chronicles completely endorses the Deuteronomic mandate for the centralization of the Yahwistic cultus and follows the lead of the Deuteronomistic work in applying this mandate to Jerusalem.

¹³ David A. Glatt-Gilad, “Chronicles as Consensus Literature,” in *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 73-74.

¹⁴ Rendsburg accepts the connection with Ahitub, a “legitimate priest” according to 1 Chr 6, as further evidence that Eli, Hophni and Phinehas are Levites—but argues that Samuel and Zadok are non-Levites grafted into the genealogies of 1 Chr 6; see Gary A. Rendsburg, “The Internal Consistency and Historical Reliability of the Biblical Genealogies,” *VT* 40 (1990): 197n25.

¹⁵ Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10-29*, 652.

¹⁶ See Yairah Amit, “Araunah’s Threshing Floor: A Lesson in Shaping Historical Memory,” in *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles*, 133-144; Louis C. Jonker, “Of Jebus, Jerusalem and Benjamin: The Chronicler’s *Sondergut* in 1 Chronicles 21 Against the Background of the Late Persian Era in Yehud,” in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography* (ed. Tyler F. Williams and Paul S. Evans; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 81-102.

But more than that, it buttresses the exclusive status of the temple both by refusing to mention other major temples by name and by averring that the central sanctuary was elect of God and was resorted to with much success on various occasions in Judahite history. In this manner, Chronicles creatively accentuates and extends motifs found in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic work.¹⁷

Knoppers is certainly correct that the Chronicler is concerned with centralization, and hesitates to mention other sanctuaries. I argue that the Chronicler's "flavor" of centralization focuses on both the tent of meeting (stemming from his regard for P) *and* Jerusalem (an emphasis in The Deuteronomistic History). So, in one sense the Chronicler is more "Deuteronomistic" than the Deuteronomist because of the heightened focus on centralization generally. But the Chronicler's "Deuteronomism" shares a regard for written Torah tradition, which, for him, now includes P—hence, the continuing interest in the tent of meeting.

For the Deuteronomist, the objectionable parts of Israel's pre-temple cultic history are the failure to conquer Jerusalem sooner—David remedies the conquest failures of Judah (Josh 15:63) and Benjamin (Jdg 1:21)—and any failures to acknowledge Jerusalem as the exclusive cultic center once it is in Israel's possession. The Chronicler balances regard for Jerusalem with Priestly regard for the tabernacle and its successor, Solomon's temple. The Chronicler remedies David's apparent lack of regard for the tabernacle in Samuel by "clarifying" that David *most certainly did* hold *both* the ark *and* the tabernacle at Gibeon in high esteem.

IV. CONCLUSION

I would like to conclude this study with three points for further consideration. In an essay entitled, "The Distinctiveness of the Samuel Narrative Tradition," Jürg Hutzli contends:

[The] plurality of Yahwistic cult places in the book of Samuel stands in noticeable tension to the doctrine of cult centralization, which is of central significance in the books of Deuteronomy and Kings. Although one might argue that the mention of a variety of cult sites in the book of Samuel would not necessarily irritate a Deuteronomistic author since the Temple had not yet been built, I think that we should expect the Deuteronomist(s) to add explanatory-apologetic remarks like those found in 1 Kgs 3:2-3 if the ideology of cult centralization was indeed inherent to a Deuteronomistic narrative in Samuel. However, no such apologies are to be found.¹⁸

Hutzli is certainly correct that we find no apology in Samuel for the plurality of cultic sites. My first contention is that the book of Samuel *is* in fact "Deuteronomistic," despite its lack of overt condemnation of non-centralization, because it portrays David as *eagerly embracing* Jerusalem once it is available for sacrifice. Solomon's sacrifice at Gibeon *does* require "an apology" within the grand narrative (and Absalom's sacrifice at Hebron is understood as being sinful), but Samuel's sacrifices at Bethel, Gilgal and Mizpah require no apology because they are pre-Jerusalem-conquest. I think we *can* say that at least this one aspect of "Deuteronomism"—centralization at Jerusalem—*is* present in Samuel. In this respect, as in a great many others, Samuel is more subtle and nuanced because it draws significantly on earlier traditions which contain their own perspectives.¹⁹

¹⁷ Knoppers, "Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist," 312.

¹⁸ Jürg Hutzli, "The Distinctiveness of the Samuel Narrative Tradition," in *Is Samuel Among the Deuteronomists*, 181.

¹⁹ Nelson writes, "[Noth] conceived of the Deuteronomistic Historian as an author who was willing to let his sources speak for themselves, even if they did not mirror Deuteronomistic orthodoxy" ("The Man Behind the Green Curtain," 18).

The second point is that the Chronicler's "Deuteronomism" manifests itself in two respects: A high regard for scriptural tradition (which, for him, now includes P as well as D), and in the balancing of both P and D brands of centralization in the narrative. This is a distinction that is not always made in comparisons of the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles: both are interested in "centralization," but the emphases are different because P and D diverge in the details of centralized sacrifice and the ritual significance of domestic slaughter.

Third, I have suggested that it is the Chronicler's editorial activity pulling the narrative in a P direction that brings the Deuteronomistic aspects of Samuel and Kings into greater contrast. Without the Chronicler's slant on the attitudes of David and Solomon toward pre-temple-era Gibeon as a cultic site, we would not see the single-focus Jerusalem centralization in the book of Samuel as clearly.

This brief study has not by any means given a comprehensive answer to the question of the "Laws" to which the storymakers of The Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles hold their characters. A great deal remains to be said concerning the Deuteronomist's attitude toward cultic sites in Joshua and Judges. But my suggestion is that when the Chronicler "corrects" the Law observance (or non-observance) of his source narratives, we should carefully consider what this might mean for close readings of Samuel and Kings.

- I. Introduction
 - a. Question: To what legal standards are the characters in the narratives of the Former Prophets and Chronicles held?
 - b. Thesis: Chronicler's treatment of the theme of centralization points to the slightly different way that centralization works as a theme in Samuel.
- II. Different Kinds Of Cult Centralization
 - a. Leviticus 1-7; 17: Centralization at the tabernacle
 - b. Deuteronomy 12; 14: Centralization in Jerusalem
- III. Cult Centralization in DtrH and Chronicles: Examples
 - a. Cult Centralization from Eli to Solomon in Samuel and Kings
 - i. Non-Levites administer sacrifices
 - ii. Separation of ark from tabernacle
 - iii. Recognition of Jerusalem as soon as the ark arrives
 - b. Cult Centralization in Chronicles
 - i. Fixes the "problem" of non-Levites leading sacrifices
 - ii. While ark is in Jerusalem but tabernacle is at Gibeon: Both locations are OK until the temple is built. No embarrassment over Solomon at Gibeon.
 - iii. Tries to be "Deuteronomistic" in two ways:
 - 1. Holds centralization principle in high regard
 - 2. Holds scripture—which now includes P—in high regard
 - 3. Therefore, balances regard for Jerusalem with regard for tabernacle
- IV. Conclusion
 - a. Samuel *is* a Deuteronomistic book because of its reverence for Jerusalem, though more subtly than the other books of the Former Prophets
 - b. The Chronicler's "Deuteronomism" manifests itself in two respects: A high regard for scriptural tradition (which, for him, now includes P as well as D), and in the balancing of both P and D brands of centralization
 - c. It is the Chronicler's editorial activity pulling the narrative in a P direction that brings the Deuteronomistic aspects of Samuel and Kings into greater contrast