Course Code: THEO5217  
Title in English: Deuteronomistic History  
Title in Chinese: 申命記式歷史

Course Description:
This course covers the major scholarship pertaining to the so-called Deuteronomistic History (DH), a perceived coherent literary unit that encompasses the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings, and Samuel. It provides an overview of the major models on the literary production of the DH as put forth by the historical-critical scholars throughout the 19th to 21st century and examines the literary structure, central themes, and textual issues of these books by positing them within the literary culture of the ancient times. It traces the development of the current debates on the DH that both challenge various suppositions in the original formulation of the theory and yet continue to assert the validity of the overall thesis.

Learning Outcomes:
After completing this course, students should be able to:
- Describe and compare the original and various modified theories of the DH
- Appreciate the contributions that the historical critics have made to elucidate the relations between Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets.
- Deepen their awareness of the intellectual milieu in which this scholarly construct has originated and problematize the anachronistic elements of the original thesis
- Demonstrate a familiarity of the current approaches to the reading of the DH

Learning Activities:
The course consists mainly of online lectures, interwoven with class discussion, independent reading, class presentation, and research activities. The time allocation (per week) of the learning activities is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online Lecture</th>
<th>Class Discussion</th>
<th>Student Presentation</th>
<th>Reading and Research</th>
<th>Written Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In class</td>
<td>Out of Class</td>
<td>In class</td>
<td>Out of Class</td>
<td>In class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>0.25 hr</td>
<td>0.25 hr</td>
<td>0.25 hr</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/O</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M: Mandatory activity in the course  
O: Optional activity

Assessment Scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task nature</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Student Presentation**  
(20%)  
*Scheduled on the weeks marked with an asterisk.* | To facilitate the students’ critical review of the reading materials and the exchanges of ideas among them. | Students are to work independently or in pairs. Each student/pair will have 15 minutes in class to present one of the assigned topics marked with an asterisk in the course schedule. Each student/pair is required to give a summary of the week’s reading materials, highlight the issues at stake, and conclude with their position(s) to the debate. Each student/pair is to upload their presentation by 6pm on the presentation day. |
| **Book Report**  
| (20%)  
| **Due on**  
| **Nov 3 (Tue)**  
| To facilitate the students to critically synthesize and analyze the course reading materials and to engage the content dialogically with one of the following books:  
| 1. Write a book report of no less than 2000 words of one of the three books listed and engage the course reading materials in the review.  
3. Analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the approach and his/her main arguments.  

| **Term Paper**  
| (50%)  
| **Term paper proposal and tentative bibliography due on**  
| **Nov 10 (Tue)**  
| **Paper due on**  
| **Dec 8 (Tue)**  
| To evaluate the students’ ability to critically engage current scholarship in the criticism of the Deuteronomy–Kings and to analyze and critique different theories’ strengths and weaknesses and to incorporate the learned ideas from various models of the DH in an exegesis of a text from Deuteronomy–Kings.  
| For the term paper proposal, submit an abstract of no more than 400 words and a tentative bibliography. Write a term paper of 5000–6000 words (graduate requirement) on one of the following topics:  
1. A critique of Martin Noth’s theory of the DH or one of its modified models  
2. A comparison of two different models of the DH  
3. An (re)assessment of a textual issue in Deuteronomy–Kings  
4. A critical exegesis of a text, a theme or a motif from Deuteronomy–Kings from a contextual, theological, or literary perspective  

| **Class Participation**  
| (10%)  
| To encourage learning collaboration and flow of ideas among the students in class.  
| 1. Consolidate the students’ understanding of the reading materials.  
2. Develop critical attitude toward the reading materials.  
3. Deepen students’ awareness of how an interpreter’s social locations, including their own, and presuppositions affect the process of reading.  

### Recommended Learning Resource:

**Books:**


**Essays and Articles:**


Supplemental Bibliography:


---

**Class Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 1 | Sept 8 (Tue) | 1. Syllabus 2. Introduction to the Deuteronomistic History | Coggins 1999: 22–35  
Knight 1995: 61–79 |
Text: Josh 23; 1 Sam 12; 1 Kgs 8:14–21; 2 Kgs 25:27–30  
Optional:  
Campbell 1994: 31–63  
Auld 1999: 116–26 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lecture Topics</th>
<th>Reading Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 3 | Sept 22 (Tue) | 1. The Critiques of Noth’s Original Thesis  
de Puray & Römer 2000: 63–67  
Optional:  
de Puray & Römer 2000: 24–63  
Knoppers 2000: 119–34 |
| Week 4 | Sept 29 (Tue) | 1. A Critique of the Two-Redaction Theory  
2. The so-called Law Book and Josianic Reform  
3. Modified Theory: Göttingen School  
4. A Critique of the Three-Redaction Theory  
Davies 2005: 65–77  
de Puray & Römer 2000: 67–74  
Smend 2000: 95–110  
Optional:  
Lipschits 2006: 239–54 |
| Week 5 | Oct 6 (Tue) | 1. Pan-Deuteronomism  
2. What qualifies as “Deuteronomistic”?  
*Presentation 2: Is the DH a coherent work? | de Puray & Römer 2000: 74–106  
Blenkinsopp 1999: 84–115  
Optional:  
Römer 2000b: 399–421  
Rösel 2000: 195–211 |
| Week 6 | Oct 13 (Tue) | Who was/were the Deuteronomist(s)?  
* Presentation 3: Was there a Deuteronomistic Movement/Group? | Lohfink 1999: 36–66  
Optional:  
Wilson 1999: 67–82  
McKenzie 2012: 401–08 |
| Week 7 | Oct 20 (Tue) | DH, Ancient Near Eastern Historiography, and Greek Historiography  
* Presentation 4: Can the DH be qualified as history or historiography? | Glassner 2000: 189–211  
Nielson 1997: 77–117  
Janzen 2019: 11–39  
Optional:  
Halpern 2000: 540–65  
Lemche 1993: 163–93  
Person 2002: 57–63  
Van Seters 2006: 359–76 |
| Week 8 | Oct 27 (Tue) | Other Theories:  
1. Wolff’s Kerygma of the DH  
2. Von Rad’s Davidic Promise and Hope  
3. History and Collective Trauma | Wolff 1975: 83–100  
Von Rad 1966: 205–21  
Weippert 2000: 47–61  
Optional:  
Janzen 2019: 1–9, 41–88 |
| Week 9 | Nov 3 (Tue) | The Book of Deuteronomy  
1. Deuteronomism  
Millard 2013: 3–15  
Weinfeld 1972: 51–115  
Text: Deut 12–26  
Optional:  
Römer 2000a: 112–38  
Römer 2004: 168–80  
Rose 2000: 424–55  
Knight 2000: 97–112 |
| Week 10 * | Nov 10 (Tue) | The Book of Deuteronomy: Deuteronomy as Constitution | Lohfink 1982: 55–75
McBride 1987: 229–44
Nicholson 2009: 46–61
Optional:
Crüsemann 1996: 234–49
Levinson 2005: 1853–88 |
| Week 11 * | Nov 17 (Tue) | The Book of Joshua
1. Inheriting the Promised Land
2. Conquest and Violence |
| | | * Presentation 6: Is the Holy War tantamount to Genocide? |
| Week 12 | Nov 24 (Tue) | The Book of Judges: Judges Cycle |
| Week 13 | Dec 1 (Tue) | The Books of Samuels and Kings: Deuteronomist’s View of Monarchy |
Contact Details for Teacher:
WONG Kwok Sonia (王珏)
Office: KKB324
Tel: 39435150
Email: sonia.wong@cuhk.edu.hk
Office Hour: By Appointment
Academic Honesty and Plagiarism:
Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations. Details may be found at http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/.

With each assignment, students will be required to submit a signed declaration that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures. In the case of group projects, all students of the same group should be asked to sign the declaration, each of whom is responsible should there be any plagiarized contents in the group project, irrespective of whether he/she has signed the declaration and whether he/she has contributed directly or indirectly to the plagiarized contents.

For assignments in the form of a computer-generated document that is principally text-based and submitted via VeriGuide, the statement, in the form of a receipt, will be issued by the system upon students’ uploading of the soft copy of the assignment. Assignments without the properly signed declaration will not be graded by teachers. Only the final version of the assignment should be submitted via VeriGuide.
The submission of a piece of work, or a part of a piece of work, for more than one purpose (e.g. to satisfy the requirements in two different courses) without declaration to this effect shall be regarded as having committed undeclared multiple submission. It is common and acceptable to reuse a turn of phrase or a sentence or two from one’s own work; but wholesale reuse is problematic. In any case, agreement from the course teacher(s) concerned should be obtained prior to the submission of the piece of work.

### Term Paper Grading Rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor/Inadequate (D/F)</th>
<th>Fair (C)</th>
<th>Good (B)</th>
<th>Excellent (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction/Thesis Weight 15.00%</td>
<td>0.00 to 30.00%</td>
<td>31.00 to 60.00%</td>
<td>61.00 to 80.00%</td>
<td>81.00 to 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*weak or no introduction of topic. **paper’s purpose is unclear/thesis is weak or missing.</td>
<td>*basic introduction that states topic but lacks interest. **thesis is somewhat clear and arguable.</td>
<td>*proficient introduction that is interesting and states topic. **thesis is clear and arguable statement of position.</td>
<td>*exceptional introduction that grabs interest of reader and states topic. **thesis is exceptionally clear, arguable, well developed, and a definitive statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Information/Evidence Weight 20.00%</td>
<td>0.00 to 30.00%</td>
<td>31.00 to 60.00%</td>
<td>61.00 to 80.00%</td>
<td>81.00 to 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*information has little or nothing to do with the thesis. **information has weak or no connection to the thesis.</td>
<td>*information relates to the main topic, few details and/or examples are given. **shows a limited variety of sources.</td>
<td>*information relates to the main topic. **paper is well researched in detail and from a variety of sources.</td>
<td>*paper is exceptionally researched, extremely detailed, and historically accurate. **information clearly relates to the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Thesis/Analysis Weight 35.00%</td>
<td>0.00 to 30.00%</td>
<td>31.00 to 60.00%</td>
<td>61.00 to 80.00%</td>
<td>81.00 to 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion Weight 15.00%</td>
<td>0.00 to 30.00%</td>
<td>31.00 to 60.00%</td>
<td>61.00 to 80.00%</td>
<td>81.00 to 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*lack of summary of topic.</td>
<td>*basic summary of topic with some final concluding ideas. **introduces no new information.</td>
<td>*good summary of topic with clear concluding ideas. **introduces no new information.</td>
<td>*excellent summary of topic with concluding ideas that impact reader. **introduces no new information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Development of Thesis Weight 10.00%</td>
<td>0.00 to 30.00%</td>
<td>31.00 to 60.00%</td>
<td>61.00 to 80.00%</td>
<td>81.00 to 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*lacks development of ideas with weak or no transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
<td>*somewhat clear and logical development with basic transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
<td>*clear and logical order that supports thesis with good transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
<td>*exceptionally clear, logical, mature, and thorough development of thesis with excellent transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation/Bibliography Format Weight 5.00%</td>
<td>0.00 to 30.00%</td>
<td>31.00 to 60.00%</td>
<td>61.00 to 80.00%</td>
<td>81.00 to 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*lack of academic format/numerous errors.</td>
<td>*frequent errors in academic format.</td>
<td>*conforms to academic rules for formatting and citation of sources with minor exceptions.</td>
<td>*conforms to academic rules for formatting and citation of sources are perfect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>