

DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY

2024–2025 First Term Thu 2:30pm–5:15pm CCT G01

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:

Online Lecture		Class Discussion		Student Presentation		Reading and Research		Written Assignments	
In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class
2 hrs		0.25 hr		0.25 hr	0.25 hr		3 hrs		2.5 hrs
M		M		M		M/O		M	

M: Mandatory activity in the course O: Optional activity

Assessment Scheme:

Task nature	Purpose	Learning Outcomes
Student Presentation (20%) <i>Scheduled on the weeks marked with an asterisk.</i>	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 <i>no more than 20</i> 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 PowerPoint presentation of no more than 12 pages by 6pm on the presentation day.

<p>Book Report (20%)</p> <p><i>Due on</i> <i>Oct 31 (Thu)</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stone 1996 2. Person 2002 3. Kim 2005 4. Janzen 2012 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write a book report of no more than 1600 words in English (or 2000 characters in Chinese) of one of the four books listed and engage the course reading materials in the review. 2. Summarize the author's approach, interpretive framework, thesis, and main arguments. 3. Unpack the author's presuppositions. 4. Analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the approach and his/her main arguments.
<p>Term Paper (50%)</p> <p><i>Term paper proposal and tentative bibliography due on</i> <i>Nov 21 (Thu)</i></p> <p><i>Paper due on</i> <i>Dec 5 (Thu)</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>For the term paper proposal, submit an abstract of no more than 400 words in English (or 500 words in Chinese) and a tentative bibliography.</p> <p>Write a term paper of 4000–5000 words in English (or 5000–6250 characters in Chinese) on one of the following topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A critique of Martin Noth's theory of the DH or one of its modified models 2. A comparison of two different compositional 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, literary, historical or psychological perspective
<p>Class Participation (10%)</p>	<p>To encourage learning collaboration and flow of ideas among the students in class and on Blackboard Discussion Forum.</p> <p><i>* Attendance is mandatory.</i> In case of foreseeable, excused absence, you are required to notify the instructor by email in advance. Absence might result in the deduction of class participation mark.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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:

<p>Books:</p> <p>Cross, Frank Moore. 1973. <i>Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel</i>. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. [BS1171.2.C76]</p> <p>Crüsemann, Frank. 1996. <i>The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament</i>. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. [BS1225.6.L3 C7813 1996]</p> <p>Janzen, David. 2012. <i>The Violent Gift: Trauma's Subversion of The Deuteronomistic History's Narrative</i>. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 561. London: T&T Clark. ProQuest Ebook Central.</p>
--

- Kim, Uriah Y. 2005. *Decolonizing Josiah: Toward a Postcolonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic History*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix. [BS1286.5 .K523 2005]
- McConville, Gordon J. 2000. *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000. De Gruyter Ebook. [BS1286.5 .R43 2000]
- Nielsen, Flemming A. J. 1997. *The Tragedy in History: Herodotus and the Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 251. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic. [BS1197 .N43 1997]
- Noth, Martin. 1981. *The Deuteronomistic History*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. [BS1275.N6513]
- Person, Raymond F. 2002. *The Deuteronomistic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature*. Studies in Biblical Literature. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. [BS1275.52 .P47 2002]
- Pury, Albert de, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds. 2000. *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. JSOTSup 306. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Stone, Ken. 1996. *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 234. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic. ProQuest Ebook Central. [BS1171.2 .T5 1999]
- Trimm, C. 2022. *The Destruction of the Canaanites: God, Genocide, & Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. EBSCOhost.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. 1972. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. [BS1275.2.W37]

Supplemental Bibliography:

- Ben Zvi, Ehud. 2009. "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," edited by Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau, 59–86. Winona Lake: Pennsylvania State University Press. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- De Moor, Johannes C. and Harry F. van Rooy, eds. 2000. *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill. [BS1286.5 .P39 2000]
- Dutcher-Walls, Patricia. 1991. "The Social Location of the Deuteronomists: A Sociological Study of Factional Politics in Late Pre-Exilic Judah." *Journal for the Study of Old Testament* 52: 77–94.
- Edelman, Diana V. 2014. *Deuteronomy-Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation*. SBLANEM 6. Atlanta: SBL.
- Eynikel, Erik. 1996. *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Oudtestamentische Studiën, D. 33. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill. [BS1335.2 .E97 1996]
- Grabbe, Lester L., ed. 2001. *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period*. JSOTSup 317. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Grabbe, Lester L., ed. 2005. *Good Kings and Bad Kings*. New York: T&T Clark. [BS580.J75 E97 2005]
- Hagedorn, Anselm. C. 2004. *Between Moses and Plato: Individual and Society in Deuteronomy and Ancient Greek Law*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. [BS1275.52. H34 2004]
- Halpern, Baruch. 1988. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Janzen, David. 2013. *The Necessary King: A Postcolonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic portrait of the Monarchy*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press.
- Kelle, Brad E., and Brent A. Strawn, eds. 2020. *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Oxford Academic.
- Mendels, Doron. 1998. *Identity, Religion and Historiography: Studies in Hellenistic History*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement 24. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Nelson, Richard D. 1981. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSupp.18. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

- O'Brien, Mark A. 1989. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag.
- Person, Raymond F. Jr. 2010. *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Pury, Albert de, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds. 2000. *Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. JSOTSup 306. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Römer, Thomas C. 2005. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. New York: T & T Clark. [BS1286.5 .R66 2007]
- Römer, Thomas, ed. 2000. *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CXL VII. Peeters: Leuven University Press. [BS1286.5 .F87 2000]
- Scheeringa, Linda S., and Steven L. McKenzie, eds. 1999. *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. JSOT Supplement Series 268. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press. [BS1171.2 .T5 1999]
- Thompson, Thomas L. 1999. *The Bible in History: How Writers Create a Past*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Van Seters, John. 1983. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven: Yale University Press. ACLS Humanities E-Book. [UL DS62.2 .V35]
- Wesselius, Jan Wim. 2002. *The Origin of the History of Israel: Herodotus's Histories as Blueprint for the First Books of the Bible*. London: Sheffield Academic Press. [BS1205.52 .W477 2002]

Essays and Articles:

- Auld, Graeme A. 1999. "The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic?" Pages 116–26 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. 1999. "Deuteronomistic Contribution to the Narrative in Genesis–Numbers: A Test Case." Pages 84–115 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*.
- Campbell, Antony F. 1994. "Martin Noth and the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 31–63 in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham. JSOTSup 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. [BS1197 .H47 1994]
- Coggins, Richard J. 1999. "What Does "Deuteronomistic" Mean?" Pages 22–35 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*.
- Davies, Philip R. 2005. "Josiah and the Law Book." Pages 65–77 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings*.
- Davies, Philip R. 2014. "The Authority of Deuteronomy." Pages 27–47 in *Deuteronomy-Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation*. Edited by Diana V. Edelman. SBLANEM 6. Atlanta: SBL.
- Dietrich, Walter. 2000. "History and Law: Deuteronomistic Historiography and Deuteronomic Law Exemplified in the Passage from the Period of the Judges to the Monarchical Period." Pages 315–42 in *Israel Constructs Its History*.
- Exum, J. Cheryl. 2000. "The Centre Cannot Hold: Thematic and Textual Instabilities in Judges." Pages 578–600 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah*.
- Freeman, Michael. 1994. "Religion, Nationalism and Genocide: Ancient Judaism Revisited." *European Journal of Sociology* 35: 259–82.
- Frisch, Amos. 2011. "Comparison with David as a Means of Evaluating Characters in the Book of Kings." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11: 2–20. [www.jhsonline.org]
- Glassner, Jean-Jacques. 2000. "Historical Times in Mesopotamia." Pages 189–211 in *Israel Constructs Its History*.
- Halpern, Baruch. 2000. "The State of Israelite History." Pages 540–65 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah*.
- Janzen, David. 2019. *Trauma and the Failure of History*. Atlanta: SBL Press. EBSCO eBook.

- Janzen, David. 2020. Pages 421–33 in “The Deuteronomistic History as Literature of Trauma.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*.
- Jobling, David. 2000. “What, If Anything, Is 1 Samuel?” Pages 601–14 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah*.
- Knight, Douglas A. 1995. “Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomists.” Pages 61–79 in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, and Future: Essays in Honour of Gene M. Tucker*. Edited by James Luther Mays, David L. Petersen, and Kent Harold Richards. Nashville: Abingdon. [BS1171.2 .O43 1995]
- Knight, Douglas A. 2000. “‘Whose Agony? Whose Ecstasy?’: The Politics of Deuteronomistic Law.” Pages 97–112 in *Shall Not the Judge of All the Earth Do What Is Right?: Studies on the Nature of God in Tribute to James L. Crenshaw*. Edited by David Penchansky and Paul L. Redditt. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns. [BS544 .S53 2000]
- Knoppers, Gary N. 2000. “Is There a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?” Pages 119–34 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*.
- Lemche, Niels Peter. 1993. “The Old Testament—A Hellenistic Book?” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 7: 163–93.
- Levinson, Bernard M. 2005. “First Constitution: Rethinking the Origins of Rule of Law and Separation of Powers in Light of Deuteronomy.” *Cardozo L. Rev.* 27: 1853–88.
- Lipschits, Oded. 2006. “On Cash-Boxes and Finding or Not Finding Books: Jehoash’s and Josiah’s Decisions to Repair the Temple.” Pages 239–54 in *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Naaman*. Edited by Yaira Amit and Nadav Naaman. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Lohfink, Norbert. 1982. “Distribution of the Functions of Power.” Pages 55–75 in *Great Themes from the Old Testament*, trans. Ronald Walls. Chicago: Franciscan Herald. [BS1174.2 .L6313 1982]
- Lohfink, Norbert. 1999. “Was There a Deuteronomistic Movement?” Pages 36–66 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*.
- Mayes, A. D. H. 2000. “Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament.” Pages 456–80 in *Israel Constructs Its History*.
- McBride, Samuel Dean. 1987. “Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy.” *Interpretation* 41: 229–44. EBSCOhost.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. 1965. “II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84: 131–38.
- McKenzie, Steven L. 2000a. “The Divided Kingdom in the Deuteronomistic History and in Scholarship on It,” Pages 135–45 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*.
- McKenzie, Steven L. 2000b. “The Trouble with Kingship.” Pages 286–314 in *Israel Constructs Its History*.
- McKenzie, Steven L. 2012. “The Still Elusive Deuteronomists.” Pages 401–08 in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. Edited by Martti Nissinen. Leiden and Boston: Brill. [BS410 .V452 v.148]
- Millard, Alan. 2013. “Deuteronomy and Ancient Hebrew History Writing in Light of Ancient Chronicles and Treaties.” Pages 3–15 in *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*. Edited by Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns. [Online]
- Nelson, Richard D. 2005. “The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History: The Case Is Still Compelling.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29, no. 3: 319–37.
- Nicholson, Ernest. 2009. “Traditum and Traditio: The Case of Deuteronomy 17:14–20.” Pages 46–61 in *Scriptural Exegesis: The Shapes of Culture and the Religious Imagination: Essays in Honour of Michael Fishbane*. Edited by Deborah A. Green and Laura S. Lieber. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Oxford Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199206575.003.0004>.

- Noort, Ed. 2000. "Joshua: The History of Reception and Hermeneutics." Pages 199–215 in *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Edited by Johannes C de Moor and Harry F. van Rooy. Leiden and Boston: Brill. [BS1286.5 .P39 2000]
- Pury, Albert de, and Thomas Römer. 2000. "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues." Pages 24–141 in *Israel Constructs Its History*.
- Rad, Gerhard von. 1966. "The Deuteronomic Theology of History in I and II Kings." Pages 205–21 in *The Problem of Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill. [BS1188.R313]
- Rainer, Albertz. 2005. "Why a Reform Like Josiah's Must Have Happened." Pages 28–46 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings*.
- Römer, Thomas. 2000a. "Deuteronomy Search of Origins." Pages 112–38 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah*.
- Römer, Thomas. 2000b. "Is There a Deuteronomistic Redaction in the Book of Jeremiah?" Pages 399–421 in *Israel Constructs Its History*.
- Römer, Thomas. 2004. "Cult Centralization in Deuteronomy 12: Between Deuteronomistic History and Pentateuch." Pages 168–80 in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. Edited by Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004. [BC1275.52 .D48 2004]
- Römer, Thomas. 2014. "The Case of the Book of Kings." Pages 187–202 in *Deuteronomy–Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books*. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Rose, Martin. 2000. "Deuteronomistic Ideology and Theology of the Old Testament." Pages 424–55 in *Israel Constructs Its History*. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Rösel, Hartmut N. 2000. "Does a Comprehensive 'Leitmotiv' Exist in the Deuteronomistic History?" Pages 195–211 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*.
- Smend, Rudolf. 2000. "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History." Pages 95–110 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah*.
- Stone, Lawson G. 1991. "Ethical and Apologetic Tendencies in the Redaction of the Book of Joshua." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53: 25–36.
- Van Seters, John. 2000. "The Deuteronomistic History: Can It Avoid Death by Redaction?" Pages in 213–22 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*.
- Van Seters, John. 2006. "The Deuteronomist—Historian or Redactor? From Simon to the Present." Pages 359–76 in *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Naaman*.
- Walzer, Michael. 1992. "The Idea of Holy War in Ancient Israel." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 20: 215–228.
- Weippert, Helga. 2000. "'Histories' and 'History': Promise and Fulfillment in the Deuteronomistic Historical Work." Pages 47–61 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah*.
- Wilson, Robert R. 1999. "Who Was the Deuteronomist? (Who Was Not the Deuteronomist?): Reflections on Pan-Deuteronomism." Pages 67–82 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. 1975. "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historical Work." Pages 83–100 in *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*. Edited by Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff. Atlanta: Knox. [BS1225.2.B74 1982]
- Wong, Sonia Kwok. 2022. "Signifying the Empire against the Empire: Doing Historical Criticism with Postcolonial Theories." Pages 125–42 in *Heilige Schriften in der Kritik: XVII. Europäischer Kongress für Theologie (5.–8. September 2021 in Zürich)*. Edited by Konrad Schmid. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie (VWGTh), Band 68. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Wong, Sonia Kwok. Forthcoming. "Violence at Its Extreme and Moral Disengagement in Deuteronomy." In *The Bible and Violence*, edited by Johanna Stiebert, Johnathan Jodamus, Chris Greenough, and Mmapula Kebaneilwe. Bloomsbury T&T Clark. [Blackboard]

Class Schedule:

Class	Date	Topic	Reading Requirements
Week 1	Sept 5 (Thu)	1. Syllabus 2. Introduction to the Deuteronomistic History	Coggins 1999: 22–35 Knight 1995: 61–79
Week 2	Sept 12 (Thu)	Noth’s Original Thesis: The Deuteronomistic History	Noth 1981: 1–25, 75–99 Text: Josh 23; 1 Sam 12; 1 Kgs 8:14-21; 2 Kgs 25:27-30 <i>Optional:</i> Campbell 1994: 31–63 Auld 1999: 116–26
Week 3	Sept 19 (Thu)	1. The Critiques of Noth’s Original Thesis 2. Modified Theory: Crossian School	Cross 1973: 274–90 de Pury & Römer 2000: 63–67 Nelson 2005: 319–37 Text: 2 Sam 7:1-17; 1 Kgs 12:20–13:34; 2 Kgs 17:18-23; 21:1-18; 22:3-23:20 <i>Optional:</i> de Pury & Römer 2000: 24–63 Knoppers 2000: 119–34
Week 4 *	Sept 26 (Thu)	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 * Presentation 1: Was Deut 12–26 the law book discovered in Josiah’s reform?	Rainer 2005: 28–46 Davies 2005: 65–77 de Pury & Römer 2000: 67–74 Smend 2000: 95–110 <i>Optional:</i> Lipschits 2006: 239–54
Week 5 *	Oct 3 (Thu)	1. Pan-Deuteronomism 2. What qualifies as “Deuteronomistic”? *Presentation 2: Is the DH a coherent work?	de Pury & Römer 2000: 74–106 Blenkinsopp 1999: 84–115 <i>Optional:</i> Römer 2000b: 399–421 Rösel 2000: 195–211
Week 6 *	Oct 10 (Thu)	Who was/were the Deuteronomist(s)? * Presentation 3: Was there a Deuteronomistic Movement/Group?	Lohfink 1999: 36–66 <i>Optional:</i> Wilson 1999: 67–82 McKenzie 2012: 401–08
Week 7 *	Oct 17 (Thu)	DH, Ancient Near Eastern Historiography, and Greek Historiography * Presentation 4: Can the DH be qualified as history or historiography?	Glassner 2000: 189–211 Nielsen 1997: 77–117 Janzen 2020 <i>Optional:</i> Halpern 2000: 540–65 Lemche 1993: 163–93 Person 2002: 57–63 Van Seters 2006: 359–76

Week 8	Oct 24 (Thu)	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 <u>Optional:</u> Janzen 2019: 1–88
Week 9	Oct 31 (Thu)	The Book of Deuteronomy 1. Deuteronomism 2. Deuteronomy and Ancient Vassal Treaties Book Report Due.	Mayes 2000: 456–80 Millard 2013: 3–15 Weinfeld 1972: 51–115 Text: Deut 12–26 <u>Optional:</u> Römer 2000a: 112–38 Römer 2004: 168–80 Rose 2000: 424–55 Knight 2000: 97–112
Week 10 *	Nov 7 (Thu)	The Book of Deuteronomy: Deuteronomy as Constitution * Presentation 5: Can Deuteronomy be Viewed as Constitution?	Lohfink 1982 : 55–75 McBride 1987: 229–44 Nicholson 2009 : 46–61 Wong forthcoming <u>Optional :</u> Crüsemann 1996: 234–49 Levinson 2005 : 1853–88
	Nov 14	<i>94th Congregation. No Class.</i>	
	Nov 21	<i>Academic Leave. No Class.</i>	
Week 11 *	Nov 28 (Thu)	The Book of Joshua 1. Inheriting the Promised Land 2. Conquest and Violence The Book of Judges: Judges Cycle * Presentation 6: Is the 'Holy War' tantamount to Genocide?	de Pury & Römer 2000: 106–16 Noort 2000: 199–215 Stone 1991: 25–36 Exum 2000: 578–600 de Pury & Römer 2000: 117–28 Jobling 2000: 601–14 Text: Josh 6, 8 <u>Optional:</u> Walzer 1992: 215–28 Freeman 1994: 259–82 Trimm 2022
Week 12 (Makeup Class)	TBA	The Books of Samuels and Kings: Deuteronomist's View of Monarchy <i>(Time and venue of the makeup class to be discussed in class.)</i>	McKenzie 2000a: 135–45 McCarthy 1965: 131–38 Römer 2014: 187–201 Frisch 2011: 2–20 Wong 2022 Text: Deut 17:14-20; 1 Sam 8–12; 15:1–16:13 <u>Optional:</u> McKenzie 2000b: 286–314 Dietrich and Naumann 2000: 276–318 de Pury & Römer 2000: 128–41 Dietrich 2000: 315–342

Contact Details for Teacher:

WONG Kwok Sonia (王珺)
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.

Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment:

Approach 3 – Use Only with Explicit Acknowledgement

Students may use AI tools in certain class activities and assignments, provided they explicitly acknowledge and properly cite the input from AI tools.

Acknowledging Support from AI Tools

Students are required to acknowledge all functional uses of a generative AI tool and cite it when they paraphrase, quote, or incorporate any content (whether text, image, data, or other formats) that was created by the tool.

- **Example of Acknowledgement:**
"I acknowledge the use of [name of AI tool—e.g., ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com>)] to [specify the support, e.g., plan my essay, generate ideas for content, ask for examples of data collection instruments, get dates of historical events, etc.]."
- **Example of Citation:**
OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT (Mar 20 version). <https://chat.openai.com/chat>.
- **Example of Including Texts Generated by an AI Tool in Your Work:**
"The following text was generated by an AI tool/language model (e.g., ChatGPT):

[Insert the text generated by ChatGPT here.]"
- **Example of Including Texts Generated by an AI Tool and the Prompts Used:**
"[The prompt], as generated by an AI language model (e.g., ChatGPT):

[Insert the text generated by ChatGPT in response to the prompt.]"

Students are reminded to use AI tools responsibly and ethically and to be aware of their limitations. It is recommended that students clarify with the course teacher and obtain permission if necessary, when in doubt.

Term Paper Grading Rubric:

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