The Portrait of the Kings and the Historiographical Poetics of the Deuteronomistic Historian

By

Alison Lori Joseph

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Near Eastern Studies

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Ronald Hendel, Chair
Professor Robert Alter
Professor Erich Gruen
Professor Steven Weitzman

Spring 2012

Copyright © 2012 Alison Lori Joseph, All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

The Portrait of the Kings and the Historiographical Poetics of the Deuteronomistic Historian

By Alison Lori Joseph

Doctor of Philosophy in Near Eastern Studies

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Ronald Hendel, Chair

This dissertation explores the historiographical style and method of the Deuteronomist (Dtr) in the book of Kings, with particular attention to what I call the prototype strategy in the portrayal of the Israelite kings. It lays out a systematic analysis of Dtr's historiographical composition and the ways he includes and reshapes his inherited sources to suit his purposes. This work offers a framework for the selectional and compositional method that Dtr employs in the construction of his history, and especially in crafting the portrait of the kings. This analysis suggests that Dtr has a specific set of historiographical priorities to which he adheres in order to interpret the history of the monarchy in light of deuteronomistic theology. This is done through crafting a comprehensive narrative that functions didactically, instructing the kings and the people of Judah how to behave through illustrating the consequences of disobedience.

A key element to Dtr's historiographical process is the use of a prototype strategy. Dtr focuses on the royal portrait as a literary tool to convey his theological message. This prototype is based on a literary picture of David as the exemplum of covenant fidelity. Dtr uses David as the royal comparative to construct the portrait of both good and bad kings. He is the model of the deuteronomistically adherent king, the one whom all subsequent kings are required to emulate. Only those kings who contribute to Dtr's meta-narrative are constructed using this prototype.

The analysis of the portraits of David, Solomon, Jeroboam, Manasseh, and Josiah highlights the historiographical poetics at play in the construction of the accounts and the expression of Dtr's theological concerns. Each example demonstrates how the selectional and compositional strategies are used by Dtr to create an effective account of the king's reign and to promote deuteronomistic theology. This work contributes important perspectives to the study of Kings and the Deuteronomistic History as a whole. Greater understanding of Dtr's historiographical method results in a greater understanding of the book of Kings. Also, by indentifying Dtr's literary and historiographical style, it is possible to see the differences between the method of the pre-exilic and exilic Dtr, contributing to redactional decisions, on grounds beyond thematic justifications.

FOR CALEB

וְשִׁנַּנְתָּם לְבָנֶיךָ

"And the endeavor to ascertain these facts was a laborious task, because those who were eyewitness of the several events did not give the same reports about the same things, but reports varying according to their championship of one side or the other, or according to their recollection."

– Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, I, XXII.4-XXIII.3

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements *iv*
Abbreviations *vi*

CHAPTER 1
THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL POETICS OF THE PRE-EXILIC DEUTERONOMIST 1
The Axis of Selection 9
The Axis of Composition 14
1 Kings 11: A Case Study 18

CHAPTER 2
HISTORIOGRAPHICAL POETICS IN LIGHT OF REDACTION CRITICISM 31
Is there a Deuteronomistic History? 31
What is the State of Current Scholarship? 47
How Does Redactional Theory Affect the Historiographical Poetics? 50

CHAPTER 3
WHO IS LIKE DAVID? WAS DAVID LIKE DAVID? 54
Was David like David? 65
The Davidic Prototype 68

CHAPTER 4
JEROBOAM, "WHO CAUSED ISRAEL TO SIN" 72
The Axis of Selection 73
The Axis of Composition 79

EXCURSUS 1: THE REGNAL FORMULAE IN ISRAEL 96

CHAPTER 5
JOSIAH, WHO "THERE WAS NONE LIKE HIM" 99
The Axis of Selection 100
The Axis of Composition 106

CHAPTER 6
MANASSEH, "WHO DID MORE EVIL THAN ALL…WHO WERE BEFORE HIM": 127
A COUNTER-EXAMPLE
The Axis of Composition 130

EXCURSUS 2: DEUTERONOMISTIC VERSUS CHRONISTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY 147

CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION 150

BIBLIOGRAPHY 157

Acknowledgements

The road to the PhD has been long and there have been many stops on the way: New York, Atlanta, Berkeley, Palo Alto, Philadelphia. At each stage I have learned so much and met so many people without whom none of this would be possible. These words could never do them justice, but they will have to suffice.

I first need to thank my teachers at Solomon Schechter Day School (now Golda Och Academy) for introducing me to the multivocality of the biblical text, and especially the unique perspectives of Deuteronomy.

I would like to thank my MA advisor William Gilders, out of whose class the first inklings of this dissertation emerged. My committee members at UC Berkeley have been essential in helping these ideas develop. As an undergraduate when I first learned about biblical type scenes and read *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, I knew that this was what I wanted to do. It was something of a dream to come to Berkeley and study with Robert Alter whose attention to the literary aspects of my work have set it apart in the field and make my and my colleagues' training unique in the world of biblical studies. Erich Gruen offered thoughtful, specific, and encouraging advice at every stage, always delivered with a smile and a hug. Steven Weitzman has encouraged my work since I was applying to doctoral programs, and I am grateful that he came to Stanford University and was willing to join my committee. I am so appreciative of all his feedback and advice, both theoretical and practical. My dissertation chair and advisor Ron Hendel was a great advocate, tracking down funding even when there was seemingly none to be had in order to make this dissertation possible. I am thankful that he was so willing to accommodate me in my cross-country research and writing. Our NES graduate student services advisor Shorena Kurtsikidze made living across the country possible. She always had answers to all my administrative questions and arranged for and delivered all paperwork necessary, even the final signature pages. Thank you.

There have also been many friends and family along the way who have acted as teachers, mentors, sounding boards, cheerleaders, and babysitters. Ariel Simon, my friend and perennially brokenhearted fellow Mets fan, we did not know when we spent the spring of 2001 sitting next to each other in Butler Library writing our undergraduate senior theses that we would still be in school 10+ years later. Thanks for all things second Temple. I know you'll do it. My friend, stylist, and best maid Elena Aronson started this journey with me and even though we've made different choices since then, she has always been supportive of my professional and personal endeavors. I am so glad she came to Berkeley, because where would we be otherwise? My friend Dr. Rebecca Rubin Damari was always available for offering a word I couldn't think of, linguistic advice, venting about our respective programs, and pep talks via phone, email or text. While we were in different fields at different universities on the two coasts, it feels like we did this together. Thank you for always being there.

I could not have done this without the constant love and support of my family. My parents Susan and Charles Joseph early on instilled in me a love of learning and a love of Torah. They had the courage to send me to school where even from a young age I was learning things

they didn’t know. More recently, they were always available for help, babysitting, and filling up the fridge. Thank you to my husband Matt Kirschen for his constant love and support. He is the only person I know who is willing to attend more school and years of training than me. In comparison it makes my road feel short. And to my beautiful boy Caleb, who despite his best efforts, I finally got this finished. I hope that you will always love learning and love Torah. This work is dedicated to you.

Abbreviations

ABN	Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CMHE	Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973.
DBF	Death and burial formula
Dtr	The Deuteronomist
Dtr^1	The pre-exilic Deuteronomist
Dtr^2	The exilic Deuteronomist
DtrG	Deuteronomistic *Geschichtsschreiber* (the historiographer), the exilic, Deuteronomistic Historian
DtrH	The Deuteronomistic History
DtrN	The exilic or early post-exilic, nomistic redactor(s) of the Deuteronomistic History
DtrP	The exilic, prophetic redactor of the Deuteronomistic History
GKC	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. 2d ed. Oxford, 1910.
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JHS	*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
MT	Masoretic Text
RF	Regnal formula
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Chapter 1

The Historiographical Poetics of the Pre-exilic Deuteronomist

Regardless of the context, the presentation of events in the past conveys the intentions and imagination of an author. The process of historiography is complex, even when the goal of a text is not strictly to portray an historical account. The power of the continued life of an historical document after its composition can be seen within American historical memory. A pertinent example is Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's mythic poem, "Paul Revere's Ride," first published in 1861. This poem, which presents an account of the beginning of the Revolutionary War, takes on the role of an historical document even though it was intended as a literary one. Writing in 1860 on the eve of the Civil War, Longfellow attempts to evoke a shared sense of cultural and moral values among Americans. Longfellow's now famous poem has come to replace the historical account of that important night in the common American memory and is a prime example of how the author's intentions in a literary text can reshape the common conception of history. It also testifies to the blurry line between the genres of literature and historiography.

Historians have long criticized Longfellow's loose portrayal of historical detail. The historical record is as follows: On April 18, 1775 as the British prepared to march on Boston, Paul Revere and William Dawes rode from Boston (Charlestown) towards Lexington to warn John Hancock and Samuel Adams that the Royal troops were coming, knocking on doors and sending previously planned lines of communication into alert. Longfellow narrates that Revere continued the ride onto Concord, even though the truth is quite the opposite. After fulfilling their initial mission in Lexington, Dawes and Revere set out for Concord, and Samuel Prescott joined them on the way, until all three were stopped by British troops. Prescott and Dawes managed to escape, but the British officers detained, questioned, and escorted Revere at gunpoint back to Lexington. Of the three riders, only Prescott arrived at Concord in time to warn its militia of the British approach.[1]

Revere rode a total of 13 miles that night from Boston to Lexington, and an additional two miles from Lexington before he was stopped by the British patrol.[2] Revere's ride pales in comparison to that of the unknown Israel Bissell, who rode from Watertown, MA to Philadelphia, 345 miles for four and a half days.[3] Yet, if Paul Revere were not the one to carry the message, "One, if by land, and two, if by sea," why have most Americans only heard of Revere, while Prescott and Bissell are all but forgotten? The answer lies in Longfellow's portrayal of the unassisted role of Revere. The well-planned chain of warnings was very much a team effort, yet Longfellow focused solely on the role of his hero, Paul Revere.[4] His poem created a national Revolutionary legend of Revere who had been little known previously.

---

[1] Paul Revere, "A Letter from Col. Paul Revere to the Corresponding Secretary [Jeremy Belknap]", 1798, Manuscript Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society, http://www.masshist.org/cabinet/april2002/reveretranscription.htm.
[2] David Hackett Fischer, *Paul Revere's Ride* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 130.
[3] "Israel Bissell - Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia", n.d., http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Israel_Bissel.
[4] Fischer, *Paul Revere's Ride*, 332.

As consumers of history, we should consider how a poetic hero can replace an historical one within the historical record. How can an event and one of its actors be completely rewritten and be absorbed as history? Until recently, historians of the American Revolution as well as textbook writers relied almost entirely on Longfellow's poem as historical evidence.[5] This is likely a result of the popularity of the poem, as Longfellow was one of the most prominent American poets of the 19th century. Despite Longfellow's disregard for historical fact, the poem has become part of the historical record. It is only in recent years that historians (with limited success) have attempted to dissuade Americans from relying on Longfellow's version of the story.

The success of the poem likely lies in both the quality of the poetry as well as the meaningful connection Longfellow made with his contemporary audience, an engagement that continues throughout American history. Longfellow's Paul Revere (as opposed to the historical Paul Revere) became a national symbol of the fight for freedom. The powerful images of the event and the hero have become our national memory. They have overshadowed and eclipsed the original event and have formed a new collective American memory. According to American historian David Hackett Fischer, Longfellow "appealed to the evidence of history as a source of patriotic inspiration, but was utterly without scruple in his manipulation of historical fact."[6]

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's "Paul Revere's Ride" offers a powerful example of the process of historiography and its reception history. A beautifully written poem that sets itself up as the transmission of an historical memory creates a character who appeals to the poet/historian's contemporary audience. The people hold fast to the inflated minor player because Longfellow's depiction speaks to them. The hero becomes a meaningful symbol, representative of the memory of historical experience, even if he does not necessarily reflect the historical experience itself. This is the process of historiography—the historian interprets the past in a way that is meaningful to him and his audience.

Longfellow's poem and its questionable role in the received tradition of American collective memory pose a worthwhile example for the study of biblical historiography. Longfellow's commitment to ideological concepts influences the way his narrative is constructed. He is interested in patriotism and creating a mythic hero. He interprets the historical facts in order to support his ideological goals. While he may (or may not) have intended for his poem to be taken as a replacement for a more accurate historical account, it has claimed that place in American collective memory. This occurrence requires us to consider the modes of historiography. Does a narrative need to be intended as history to be history? Where do we draw the boundaries between fiction and history? How do we deal with the differences between history and collective memory? Can history be presented without an ideological perspective?

§

[5] "Paul Revere - Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia", n.d., http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Revere.
[6] Fischer, *Paul Revere's Ride*, 331.

These questions will be explored in this dissertation, which will examine the historiographical style and method of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist (Dtr)[7] in Kings. This historian was a collector, author, and redactor. He inherited several self-contained and comprehensive documents that he adopted and reshaped to suit his purposes. This inquiry, looking at the process of historiography, will integrate the work of biblical scholars who started to consider issues of styles of redaction and composition, moving beyond those scholars who had previously only dealt with biblical history in order to discover and prove its historicity/ahistoricity and to designate its sources. This also takes into account the methods developed through the revolution in literary study of the Bible that began in the 1970s. This project will consider the process of historiography and the choices that the Deuteronomist as editor and author had to make in order to craft his history.[8] The process of historiography is plagued by many problems, including the use of sources—their reliability, objectivity and provenance. We need to take questions of methodology seriously when examining "historical" works in the Hebrew Bible like the Deuteronomistic History (or Chronicles, for that matter). These works have either been mined for historical data (the old "Bible as history" approach) or reduced to tendentious constructions of a "usable past," but rarely, if ever, studied as the product of an author sifting between sources, deciding what to include in his history and how to structure what is included on the basis not only of the theological or ideological, but also literary considerations.

Since the work of Martin Noth (1943), the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) – the books of Deuteronomy through Kings – have largely been considered a unified literary work.[9] While opinions on the compositional and redactional history of these books are hotly contested, since Noth their unity is widely accepted. In more recent years, scholars have debated both the dating of that work and the evidentiary elements that have contributed to the belief in a unified narrative. These positions will be discussed in detail in chapter 2. Scholars have further divided and allocated the units of the History to various redactors and historical contexts. Also, the growing interest in literary approaches has led to literary considerations being applied to the historical narratives. Literary critics have approached these narratives as historical fiction and have challenged the various tactics scholars have in assessing the historicity of the historical or "history-like" narratives of DtrH. Increasingly, with the discovery of extra-biblical evidence that both undermines and verifies the historicity of the biblical narrative, scholars have taken sides on

[7] I will adopt a modified version of Cross's double redaction theory, with a primary Josianic redaction and an exilic secondary updating. This will be discussed more thoroughly in chapter 2. See Frank Moore Cross, "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomic History," in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274–289.

[8] Throughout I will use the following sigla: Dtr for the Deuteronomist, the deuteronomistic redactor, Dtr^1 for the pre-exilic Dtr, as in Cross's redactional theory, Dtr^2 as the exilic Deuteronomist (unless otherwise indicated, Dtr will stand for the pre-exilic Deuteronomist), and DtrH for the Deuteronomistic History in its received form of the books of Deuteronomy through Kings.

[9] Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschischtswerke im Alten Testement*, 1943; *The Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1981). Noth is preceded by Ewald (1869) in identifying a unity of composition, but with two Deuteronomistic Historians and a pre-exilic date (Heinrich Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (6 vols.; Göttingen: Dieterichs Buchhandlung, 1843); *The History of Israel* (trans. R. Martineau; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1869), 1:156–168.) Noth's work sets a new standard for scholarship. For a survey of the history of the Deuteronomistic History, see Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues," in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 24–141.

the veracity and acuity of the biblical historian and the reliability and competency of its redactor. My inquiry moves beyond this discussion. Despite questions of historicity, how do we understand the final redacted text and the method(s) of the historian(s) who created it? The main scholarly concerns, in respect to the process of historiography, that I will deal with in this dissertation are intention of the author, the use of sources, the relationship of the historiography to historical events, and the theological and literary shaping. My analysis will focus on devising a methodological schema that reflects the historiographical poetics in Kings.

In his book on *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*,[10] Meir Sternberg focuses on a definition of "poetics" as what "the biblical narrator want[s] to accomplish, and under what conditions…he operate[s]."[11] He begins his discussion by posing the following questions: "What goals does the biblical narrator set himself? What is it that he wants to communicate in this or that story, cycle, book?" Sternberg suggests that the reader approach biblical narrative as "oriented to an addressee and regulated by a purpose or a set of purposes involving the addressee. Hence our primary business as readers is to make purposive sense of it, so as to explain the *what's* and the *how's* in terms of the *why's*-of communication."[12] In dealing with the historiographical poetics of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist in Kings, this dissertation will do just what Sternberg asserts is necessary for reading biblical texts. This work will explore the ways in which Dtr writes his history, how he selects his sources, how he re-crafts and integrates them into a comprehensive story that reflects the general history of the monarchy, and where he makes original compositions. A comprehensive analysis of this process is lacking in the prolific scholarship dealing with Kings specifically and DtrH generally. Greater understanding of the historiographical poetics of Dtr and his purposes in redaction and composition will greatly supplement the bevy of scholarship largely focused on redactional criticism. This work will advance the field so that once source and redactional lines have been drawn, it will be possible to understand Dtr's goals, explaining the what's, how's and why's of his historiography.

Scholarly discussion largely focuses on the intention of the author and the relationship he maintains to the history of the story he creates. According to Robert Alter, "The biblical historian's drive to understand the political, moral, and psychological predicaments of the historical personages leads him to shape the events, amplifying what is known through shrewd literary elaboration, [but] there remain bothersome instances of invention plain and simple."[13] He also contends that "the writer could manipulate his inherited materials with sufficient freedom and sufficient firmness of authorial purpose to define motives, relations, and unfolding themes, even in a primeval history, with the kind of subtle cogency we associate with the conscious artistry of the narrative mode designated prose fiction."[14] While the generic distinction between fiction and history can be endlessly debated, Hayden White, noted theorist of historical writing who has written influentially about historiography and historiographical theory, posits that generally "what distinguishes 'historical' from 'fictional' stories is first and foremost

[10] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press, 1985).
[11] Ibid., 2.
[12] Ibid., 1.
[13] Robert Alter, "Imagining History in the Bible," in *History and--: Histories Within the Human Sciences* (ed. Ralph Cohen and Michael S. Roth; Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), 67.
[14] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 32.

their content, rather than their form."[15] As such, historical and fictional narratives will appear similarly, only distinguished by their subjects. The historical method requires the evaluation of documents in order to determine what is historical, followed by constructing the most plausible story from the evidence, not so much a product of the historian's poetic talents.[16] White's definition of history and the use of the historical method require us to consider both the author's intention and the way in which he used his sources. Biblical historiography takes quite seriously the task of presenting an understandable past, yet the history of scholarship has not included serious considerations of how the historian works. More recently, three scholars who have dealt with these issues in an attempt to understand how the biblical historian worked are Baruch Halpern, Marc Brettler, and Gary Knoppers.

Halpern in his book *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* bases his arguments on Noth's premise of narrative unity, but does not directly address the question of the unity of the history. Instead he reacts to the work of scholars who debate the historicity/ahistoricity of the work, the generic identification of literature or historiography, and provenance of composition and redaction. In response, Halpern attempts to qualify and quantify the historiographic process of ancient Israel. He addresses the question of the general nature of biblical history and the role of the historian. He believes that the history writer's intention is to "lead the reader to believe that the work is a valid representation of the past." The narrative does not necessarily have to be historically accurate, but the author must intend to present it as true and the reader believes that it is valid.[17] The author's historical intention is one of the major characteristics of biblical history that Halpern highlights; this view comes under attack by other scholars.

Historical intention, both of the author and redactor, is an important issue for discussion; many historical-critical scholars, in reconstructing the prehistory of the text as we have it, deal with the identification of multiple sources or editorships, asserting that perhaps the ancient editors were not able to see the contradictions in the text that moderns can see.[18] This is a simplistic perspective. Instead, we should argue that the editors were competent and that the biblical historian was aware of the contradictions inherent in the texts.[19] This is a perspective supported by both Noth and Halpern.

Halpern also addresses the general question of historiography. What is the relationship between the writing of history and historical events? He contends that "history is not what happened....History is our way of organizing particle configurations into perceptible fictional blocks, such as individuals, groups, and the environment….historians deal with people, and with societies, as though these were the atoms of causation. The historian's job is to expound human causes to the reader…"[20] Halpern identifies the process of history writing as metaphoric. History "is a form of human perception about the subatomic past. It is not accurate; like all memory, it is

[15] Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 27.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Baruch Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), xxii.
[18] Ibid., xxv.
[19] Ibid., xxv–xxvi.
[20] Ibid., xxxiii.

a useful form of organizing knowledge."[21] In this way, historiography inherently lacks scientific objectivity, yet, need not be fictional. Halpern's work, especially his conception of Dtr as maintaining "antiquarian" interests (to be discussed below) is important to my arguments here. His understanding of the selectional work of Dtr contributes greatly to my approach to Dtr's historiographical method.

In contrast, Marc Brettler looks more to the form-critical elements of the biblical historian. In *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* he seeks to highlight the central factors that are responsible for the production of the biblical texts of ancient Israel. Brettler finds Halpern's approach to history, relying on the intention of the author to deem it historical, problematic. Brettler counters, "How do we know if an elaboration goes beyond the evidence the author had, especially when that evidence is no longer available to us?" How can we know the intentions of the author? How can we know if the narrator believed what he wrote?[22] Brettler contends that "it is difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether a biblical author was working from sources."[23] Also, he argues that "Halpern's model is especially problematic because it places intentionality in such a central role."[24] Brettler clearly defines history as "a narrative that presents a past," and not merely a narrative whose author intends it to be historical, as he accuses Halpern of doing.[25] These two perspectives are not mutually exclusive. An author who intends to write history would indeed by its nature be creating a "narrative that presents a past."

Brettler's arguments against Halpern fly in the face of the history of scholarship on the Deuteronomistic History beginning with Noth. Noth believed strongly in the competence of the Israelite historian, while Brettler questions his motives, first suggesting that historical intention does not make a text historiographical, and second that we cannot know the intentions of the Deuteronomist. More recently, some scholars, especially those deemed literary critics of the Bible, have given up on historical-critical biblical study and only use synchronic approaches, deeming the text unhistorical.[26] These approaches were likely influenced by the intellectual development in the world of critical theory of the mid-20th Century, beginning with the doctrine of intentional fallacy in the 1940s, which denied that the interpreter has access to the author's intentions. This prohibited scholars from considering the intentions of the biblical authors. Literary criticism is important in the interpretation of the aesthetic quality of the biblical text, but it should not inhibit historical interpretation. Halpern asserts, "Scholars who maintain that our inability to achieve certainty – whether because of the nature of language or for any other reason – precludes 'knowing' history at all mistakenly apply the natural defect of the universal human condition to indict the epistemology of human science."[27] Such an approach is nihilistic, leaving us to wonder, can we know anything about the history? This suggests that we ought to consider the possibilities of intention while maintaining that any assessment is not fool-proof. We will always be left at a point of indeterminacy.

[21] Ibid.
[22] Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), 11.
[23] Ibid., 12.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Halpern, *The First Historians*, xix.
[27] Ibid., xxi.

In his review of Brettler's book, H.G.M. Williamson argues that biblical historiography cannot "be reduced to the…factors which [Brettler] isolates. They have their place, of course, and his understanding of the ideological shaping of the material is of particular value. But with literature of such extent and diversity, other factors too clamour for admission, not least Halpern's 'antiquarian interest'."[28] Both Halpern and Brettler's work comes down to the same question: how did the biblical historian see his sources? They approach this question in different ways – both of which are necessary to understanding the process of deuteronomistic historiography. I aim to take into account the approaches of both these scholars, following Williamson's charge that both the compositional and selectional processes must be considered.

A third scholar who begins to bridge the gap between Halpern's work on antiquarian interest and Brettler's focus on theological and literary shaping is Gary Knoppers. In his two volume work, *Two Nations under God*, Knoppers focuses on the thematic elements present in DtrH, namely the role of the unified monarchy in the entirety of the History.[29] Focused on this theme and Jeroboam's literary role in the production of the History, Knoppers combines some of the main issues Halpern, Brettler, and others have begun to explore, as well as puts them into application focusing on the figures of Solomon and Jeroboam. My work is a direct extension of these three scholars and of work in historiographical theory in general.

While acknowledging the limits of our knowledge, we can still claim some knowledge of the past, the historians' intentions, and the ways in which they used their sources.[30] This view reflects developments in New Historicism, which considers "reality" in literary texts. This approach requires, as defined by Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt in their manual for *Practicing New Historicism*, when thinking about textuality you have to give "attention to genre and rhetorical mode, to the text's implicit or explicit reality claims, to the implied link (or distance) between the word and whatever it is – the real, the material, the realm of practice, pain, bodily pleasure, silence, or death – to which the text gestures as that which lies beyond the written word, outside its textual mode of being."[31] In this way, Greenblatt states, "New historicist critics have tried to understand the intersecting circumstances not as a stable, prefabricated background against which the literary texts can be placed, but as a dense network of evolving and often contradictory social forces."[32] This suggests that all texts should be considered in the context of their historical context and in respect to the social, political, and religious factors that contributed to the text's development. Just as the New Historicists who see literature as a product of place and time focusing on texts themselves, with the right tools, we can derive some information about the history of ancient Israel from the text. This is not to say that all of the text corresponds to fact nor that we must completely deny the veracity of all those texts. Instead, we must occupy a moderate middle ground between those who say that we can

[28] H. G. M. Williamson, "Review of The Creation of History in Ancient Israel, by Marc Z. Brettler," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 47, no. 2 (1996): 355.
[29] Gary N. Knoppers, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, V 1: The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam* (vol. 1, 2 vols.; Harvard Semitic monographs; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993); *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, V 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah* (vol. 2, 2 vols.; Harvard Semitic monographs; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994).
[30] Halpern, *The First Historians*, xxi.
[31] Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 23.
[32] Stephen Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 170.

never get to the intention of the authors (or that we would even want to) and those who assert that the history is wholly historical or ahistorical. We must identify what intent we can draw out of the text. Similarly, Hayden White challenges modern historians that we need to rethink the "basic issues of intellectual historiography, to reexamine governing concepts and strategies of interpretation…in response to new methodologies that have arisen in philosophy, literary criticism, and linguistics and that offer new ways of conceiving the tasks of historical hermeneutic."[33] It is with this in mind that I will look seriously at Dtr's method as author and redactor.

This dissertation will systematically layout the historiographical method the pre-exilic Deuteronomist uses in Kings. I would like to suggest that his work operates on two different axes. The first is the axis of selection, which includes the methodological priorities that guide Dtr in his selection and redaction of sources. These priorities are three-fold; Dtr attempts to find balance among (1) reporting the historical events that occurred and staying true to the sources that he possesses describing those events, likely those from the royal archives (Halpern's antiquarian interest; a commitment to a source tradition), (2) loyalty to the prophetic tradition, and (3) the organizational strategies used for incorporating these sources, through the ordering of episodes.

The second axis is one of composition, rhetoric, and formation. The following compositional strategies are used: (a) promoting the deuteronomistic programmatic agenda, (b) attribution of historico-political events to theological causes, and (c) the use of a prototype strategy. The subsequent chapters will consider the narrative accounts of a few specific kings and these priorities will be explored in each narrative. Those texts will be mined for understanding how Dtr as author and redactor worked in constructing these narratives.

While textual criticism plays an important role in biblical interpretation as well as contributes to greater objectivity in redactional decisions, this dissertation will focus on the earliest achievable edition of Kings, which is the Masoretic Text (MT).[34] Accepting the primacy of the MT over the Septuagint (LXX) as the original edition does not preclude me from adopting retroversions in the text based on LXX evidence. While the MT preserves the earlier version, many individual readings and details are best preserved in other witnesses. While the complete narrative version may be secondary, it is possible for me to use the LXX as a better witness to the proto-MT *Vorlage* that may have been corrupted in the process of transmission. The LXX often preserves the best reading. The texts explored in the subsequent chapters, especially the Jeroboam narrative, have some significant variations between MT and LXX, but my analysis will focus on the poetics of the historiography of the MT edition.

The majority of Septuagint scholars fall into two camps, one which believes that the LXX version is a midrash of sorts on the MT and the other, that the LXX is based on an earlier stage in the literary development of the text.[35] I am convinced by the first group of scholars. There is also

[33] White, *The Content of the Form*, 185.
[34] Sidnie White Crawford, Jan Joosten, and Eugene Charles Ulrich, "Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1-9, 1 Kings 11:1-8, and Jeremiah 27:1-10 (34 G)," *VT* 58, no. 3 (2008): 359.
[35] For more on this discussion, see: P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship Between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum v. 104; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 4; Zipora Talshir, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z*

significant debate about the deuteronomistic influence on the LXX and its *Vorlage*. This is especially true when a passage parallel to one in the MT Kings lacks deuteronomistic elements found in MT. Is this a sign of a proto-Dtr text or does it reflect a text that has been emptied of its deuteronomistic rhetoric? This debate is outside the scope of this project. I am exclusively focused on the historiographical poetics of Dtr as depicted in the MT, since I view it as the original edition and the LXX as secondary.

Also, while this dissertation is primarily focused on literary concerns and deriving the historiographical poetics, redaction criticism will play an essential role in determining which parts of texts are indeed a product of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist and therefore contribute to my analysis.

The Deuteronomist's Historiographical Methodology

THE AXIS OF SELECTION

1. Scholarly Commitment to his Sources

Dtr has a "scholarly" approach to his sources, or, as Halpern describes it, an "antiquarian" interest.[36] Similarly, Noth calls Dtr an "honest broker," one who "had no intention of fabricating the history of the Israelite people. He wished to…base it upon the material to which he had access."[37] Dtr consults his sources and reports what he finds in them, even adopting them wholesale and integrating them into his larger account. He will include accounts and events even when they are in conflict. Hermann Gunkel said the following of J and E, but it is equally true for Dtr: "These collectors...are not masters but servants of their material. We may imagine them, filled with reverence for the beautiful, old accounts, striving to render them to the best of their ability."[38]

Halpern also discusses the ways in which Dtr uses his sources. He maintains that while they were likely influenced by ideological, theological, and political views, the ancient authors

---

(Jerusalem: Simor, 1993); Julio C. Trebolle, "Samuel/Kings and Chronicles: Book Divisions and Textual Composition," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Eugene Charles Ulrich et al.; Boston: Brill, 2006), 96–108; "Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Traditions," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006), 483–501; "The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in the Books of Kings," *7th Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (1991): 285–299; "Redaction, Recension and Midrash in the Books of Kings," *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 15 (1982): 12–35; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981); Marvin A. Sweeney, "A Reassessment of the Masoretic and Septuagint Versions of the Jeroboam Narratives in 1 Kings/3 Kingdoms 11-14," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 38, no. 2 (2007): 165–195; Crawford, Joosten, and Ulrich, "Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible," 58:352–366.

[36] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 3.

[37] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 128.

[38] Hermann Gunkel, "Introduction. The Legends of Genesis," in *Genesis* (trans. Mark E. Biddle; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), lxxiii..

had "authentic intentions. They meant to furnish fair and accurate representations of Israelite antiquity."[39] It was with this in mind that the historians attempted to give an account of a coherent sequence of past events. Halpern offers the example of the relationship between Judges 4 and 5 to demonstrate this "antiquarian interest" and how Dtr uses his sources[40] (similar to Gunkel's characterization of the redactor being enslaved by his sources). Halpern masterfully illustrates that in his attempt to be as precise and accurate as possible in his interpretation of his source, Dtr misreads the poetic parallelism in Judges 5 and instead of seeing two parallel images, he interprets them as two disparate objects (e.g. Judges 5:26, "She put her hand to the tent peg and her right hand to the workmen's mallet" is mis-interpreted in the prose version in 4:21 as two separate items).[41] This mis-interpretation of biblical figurative language is representative of the great pains to which the Deuteronomistic Historian (the author/redactor of the Judges 4 and 5 pericope) went in order to accurately render the information in his sources.

Dtr attempts to compose a history based on sources, whether those be the ones that he cites, e.g. the annals of the kings, or others. Halpern describes this process as "imagination based on evidence."[42] I agree with Halpern, who contends that the history writer's intention is to "lead the reader to believe that the work is a valid representation of the past."[43] This does not necessarily mean that the past represented in any given account is an accurate historical portrayal, but that the author intends to present the information as true and that the reader believes that it is legitimate. This strategy is essential to the success of the History and towards its goal of religious inculcation; the historian must make his reader believe the accuracy of the historical account.

In Kings, the imperative to represent the history of Israel accurately is often at odds with the other priorities of Dtr's historiographical goals, but he does not omit events or characters that complicate those aims.[44] For example, had Dtr not possessed texts depicting a positive picture of Jeroboam would he have included an initially positive view? It is particularly interesting to consider this historiographical priority in contrast to those of the Chronicler. For example, in Chronicles, the David account is wholly positive and the northern kingdom is never acknowledged as legitimate. The Chronicler is not beholden to his historical sources to the same degree as the Deuteronomist is and omits narratives or pieces of information that are not helpful or even detrimental to his overall goals in writing his narrative. (See excursus 2 for more on this comparison.)

Despite this commitment to his sources, reflecting the thoroughness of an historian, there are countervailing forces at work in the process of selection. It seems that in some instances as if

---

[39] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 3.
[40] Baruch Halpern, "Doctrine by Misadventure: Between the Israelite Source and the Biblical Historian," in *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism* (ed. Richard E. Friedman; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 41–73. Baruch Halpern, "The Resourceful Israelite Historian: The Song of Deborah and Israelite Historiography," *HTR* 76, no. 4 (1983): 379–401. *The First Historians*, 76–99.
[41] This type of parallelism is typical of biblical poetry, in which the second part of the verse expands on the first, often using a less common word of a higher register. Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 3–26.
[42] Baruch Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001), 101.
[43] Halpern, *The First Historians*, xxiii.
[44] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 128.

Dtr does not quite have a choice in selection – everything must be included, therefore this is not really a process of selection at all. On the other hand, we do know that Dtr does not include in his narrative everything within the historical record. A common refrain is the deuteronomistic formulaic closing to the reigns of the kings, "And the remainder of the deeds of King X…, is it not in the writings of the books of the deeds of King X/kings of Israel/Judah?"[45] This formula, in its essential nature, testifies to that fact that there are events in the reign of each king that were part of the archival record, but Dtr chooses not to include them. Dtr seems to include those things that are of interest to him and to promote his agendas.

The kings who are not useful to him in the construction of his story get slight mention and exist as not much more than temporal place markers. One has to assume that a king who reigned for say 52 years, like King Azariah (2 Kgs 15:1-7), had some significant events occur during his reign that deserve to be included in an historical narrative, but Dtr reports Azariah's reign in seven verses: he ascends the throne, does what was right in Yahweh's eyes, but does not take down the high places, contracts leprosy, and dies. Another historiographical impulse exists here, when, as in the cases of kings with almost no space allotted them, Dtr allows himself to leave things out. He banishes the remainder of the acts to the annals, omitting what he considers not important to him as an historian, yet a chronicler would have reported them more explicitly. The political and religious agenda of the court of Josiah is the strongest factor in determining who gets space, leading to the question of, does such-and-such a king contribute to the overall goals of the narrative. The kings who get the more extensive stories, Solomon, Jeroboam, Ahab, Hezekiah, Josiah, et cetera are all crucially linked to the deuteronomistic theological program, positively and negatively. While they too have the rest of their acts documented in the annals of the kings, their accounts seem to be semi-complete, and even include elements that undermine the religious program. The process of selection, as a historiographical methodology, is quite complex in that Dtr seems to play some role in selection, but is limited in how selective he may be. This impulse also adds to another literary strategy to be discussed below – the use of prototypes. Dtr develops the reigns of certain kings because of the way they contribute to his prototype construction and the ways in which that prototype augments to the overall goals of the history.

2. Loyalty to the Prophetic Tradition

The second redactional priority is the use of prophetic tradition. This is done in two specific ways. The first is content based. Dtr uses a somewhat comprehensive prophetic source or record and disperses it into the larger narrative of his history. The second is structural; the use of prophetic sources creates a prophecy-fulfillment framework prominent throughout the History. This schema contributes to the greater theological messages of the History; prophets speak and warn and the kings and people must heed their messages or they will be punished.

[45] See Solomon, 1 Kgs 11:41; Jeroboam, 1 Kgs 14:19; Rehoboam, 1 Kgs 14:29; Abijam, 1 Kgs 15:7; Asa, 1 Kgs 15:23; Nadab, 1 Kgs 15:23; Baasha, 1 Kgs 16:5; Elah, 1 Kgs 16:14; Zimri, 1 Kgs 16:20; Omri, 1 Kgs 16:27; Ahab, 1 Kgs 22:39; Jehoshaphat, 1 Kgs 22:45; Ahaziah, 2 Kgs 1:18; Joram, 2 Kgs 8:23; Jehu, 2 Kgs 10:34; Joash, 2 Kgs 12:19; Jehoahaz, 2 Kgs 13:8; Joash, 2 Kgs 13:12; Jehoash, 2 Kgs 14:15; Jeroboam II, 2 Kgs 14:28; Azariah, 2 Kgs 15:6; Pekah, 2 Kgs 15:31; Jotham, 2 Kgs 15:36; Ahaz, 2 Kgs 16:19, Manasseh, 2 Kgs 21:17, Amon, 2 Kgs 21:25; Josiah, 2 Kgs 23:28.

The use of prophetic material has been widely acknowledged.[46] Even within his one author theory, Noth prominently mentions the use of the prophetical stories in the History: "Dtr. has made extensive use of stories about the prophets… [who] appear chiefly as opponents to the kings." These stories "stress the intervention of a prophet in domestic or foreign affairs."[47] Also, Anthony Campbell outlines the existence of a "prophetic record," an early, northern, prophetic document circulating at the end of the 9th century.[48] He looks to the books of Samuel and Kings as evidence of this source,[49] highlighting the prophetic record present in 1 Kings 3-2 Kings 10.[50]

This prophetic source has a northern provenance. From the beginning of Kings until 2 Kings 18 all the prophets (except man of God from Judah, 1 Kgs 13) are Israelite. The use of this source accounts for the presence of northern editing in an otherwise southern history.[51] P. Kyle McCarter in his commentaries on 1 and 2 Samuel also speaks of a prophetic source used by Dtr in Samuel, a middle stage of pre-deuteronomistic redaction in which the stories were already in some basic order.[52] He suggests that "the first Book of Samuel derives its basic shape from a prophetic history of the origin of the monarchy that was intended to present the advent of kingship in Israel as a concession to a wanton demand of the people." In this way, the king would be the head of the government, but he was subject to the instruction and admonition of the prophet. McCarter also pinpoints 1 Kings 11:29-39; 14:1-16; 16:1-4; 2 Kings 9:1-10 as deriving from this source.[53] While I am unsure whether the prophetic tradition used in Kings is as complete and comprehensive as Campbell lays out, it is clear that pre-Dtr prophetic texts are certainly integrated into the History.

The second way in which the prophetic tradition influences the History is in its structure. The effect of the use of the prophetic texts is, as von Rad describes, that prophecy and its fulfillment becomes an objective "framework schema" of the History.[54] Prophecy-fulfillment is "the theological structure of the Deuteronomistic historical work within the Books of Kings."[55] The prophet speaks and Yahweh's word is fulfilled in the course of history, defining deuteronomistic theology.[56] In this way, as Campbell similarly describes, "The Prophetic Record has imposed an ordered conceptual structure, with a unified picture of God's guidance in these events, and a clear sense of causation in the understanding of the role played by sin in the

---

[46] Antony F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1 - 2 Kings 10)* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986); Alexander Rofé, *The Prophetical Stories: The Narratives about the Prophets in the Hebrew Bible, Their Literary Types and History* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 97; Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible Commentary; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 92–94.
[47] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 107.
[48] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 1.
[49] Ibid., 2.
[50] Ibid., 14.
[51] Ibid., 113.
[52] P. Kyle McCarter, "Introduction," in *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary* (Anchor Bible 8; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 18.
[53] Ibid., 21.
[54] Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947); "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings," in *Studies in Deuteronomy* (trans. David Stalker; London: SCM Press, 1953), 78.
[55] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 81.
[56] Ibid., 83.

downfall of kings."[57] Also, the major verdicts handed down to kings and people are frequently presented by the prophets, demonstrating the integration of the prophetic tradition and deuteronomistic theology.

The value of the prophetic evaluation in this way and the influence of the prophetic text, even beyond Campbell's defined Prophetic Record, are pervasive throughout the entirety of the History. This prophetic text is not only the source for many prophetic passages, but also a redactional influence for Dtr. Even when this particular source document is complete, Dtr finds other prophetic texts, many similar to those of the prophetic record, to weave into his History. This includes southern prophetic texts as well. The figure of the early prophets is influenced by the role of the prophetic in the Prophetic Record. These prophets "are portrayed as central figures, exercising authority of king-maker and king-breaker in Israel."[58]

3. The Ordering of Episodes

Once selectional choices have been made, there are two organizational principles used in the arrangement of multiple scenes in a given narrative. The first is the anachronistic re-narrativization of sources and "historical" events, while the second is a juxtaposition of scenes that manifests itself in the piling up of episodes. Frequently, a narrative may reflect a chronological reorganization in order to highlight an ideological or artistic purpose over a historical one. David Glatt describes this as "chronological displacement," which is "a situation in which an author or editor intentionally transfers an episode from its original chronological context (of which he knew through general historical awareness or from another written source) into a different setting."[59]

Dtr also juxtaposes various scenes, collecting stories that have similarities and presenting them together. This is something akin to the rabbinic principle of סמיכות פרשיות, the juxtaposition of topics or proximity of issues. According to Yair Zakovitch, "the rabbis assumed that the textual proximity of different ideas may create an additional stratum of meaning."[60] סמיכות פרשיות is usually used as a hermeneutical tool that the rabbis employ to explain why two narratives, which superficially seem disparate, may be connected on a deeper level. An example of this is how the story of Judah and Tamar in Genesis 38 interrupts the Joseph story. Readers have wondered why this story interpolates the larger Joseph narrative and has been explained by the use of סמיכות פרשיות, that the appearance of the words הכר נא and the theme of recognition are the impetus for bringing the two stories together. While this concept has largely been developed

[57] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 111.
[58] Ibid., 114.
[59] David A. Glatt, *Chronological Displacement in Biblical and Related Literatures* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 1. In his book, Glatt develops a methodology for when we can see and evaluate chronological displacement, but he concentrates on episodes that have external comparisons (e.g. multiple accounts of Mesopotamian chronicles and biblical narratives with more than one account, namely Samuel-Kings and Chronicles), calling this "empirical" evidence. He is less confident in his discussion of "chronological displacements inferred from internal evidence." Yet, while these narratives may not have the same external evidence, internal clues may exist that can give us a reasonable level of certainty. This topic comprises chapter four of his book, pp. 149-187.
[60] Yair Zakovitch, "Juxtaposition in the Abraham Cycle," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz; Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 510.

as a hermeneutical tool, it can also be viewed as a compositional and redactional strategy. Separate stories or sources may attract others based on similar words, themes, et cetera, the same way that they are evaluated from a hermeneutical perspective. Zakovitch considers the juxtaposition of two units as a mode of "inner-biblical interpretation" in which "one story is intended to influence our reading of another."[61] In this way, we need to ask, what were the redactor's intentions in bringing these stories together? Zakovitch contends that "in a cycle of stories in which every story, by being placed next to its neighbor, creates a juxtaposition pregnant with meaning. Through these juxtapositions we are taught a lesson in the ideas and beliefs of the biblical editor, as well as in the Bible's own evaluation of some characters."[62]

Both of these principles greatly influence the formation of the final text. They are a way for Dtr to integrate the various sources and pieces of his record into a larger narrative, focused towards achieving his historiographical goals and creating meaning within his narrative of the past.

THE AXIS OF COMPOSITION

Once Dtr makes his choices in selection, he manipulates the sources to fit his ideological needs through three main compositional strategies.

a. Promoting the Deuteronomistic Program

The single most important goal of DtrH is promoting the program of deuteronomistic theology. This theology is focused on centralization of the cult in Jerusalem, covenant theology, the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, and Jerusalem as the chosen city. Dtr uses the History as a didactic tool to teach proper worship and the necessity of compliance to the covenant. Similarly, the Book of Kings is concentrated on establishing the proper (and improper) location and modes of worship of the Yahwistic cult. The correct forms of worship are often outlined through the evaluation of various kings and the fates of their kingdoms. It is through this theological lens that Dtr presents the events that take place in the history of Israel and the actors in this history. Those kings who keep the covenant are good and are rewarded with peaceful and prosperous reigns and those who do not are punished. This is also true for the collectivity of the people. The northern kingdom of Israel sinned by following the cult of Jeroboam so they were destroyed and exiled. Dtr is particularly focused on his brand of the proper worship. Worship is only permitted in the temple in Jerusalem; previously accepted cult sites and iconography, such as Jeroboam's calves, *ašērîm*, and *maṣṣēbôt*, were prohibited. In order to clearly identify these practices as forbidden, Dtr adopts a rhetoric of idolatry in which these previously acceptable Yahwistic and traditional practices are presented as foreign and idolatrous. Idolatry can be catalogued into three categories, in ascending order of impiety: wrong place, wrong symbols, and wrong deities.[63] The pre-exilic Dtr is primarily focused on the first two: place and symbol. These elements are often described as "syncretistic." While he does not condone worship of other deities, this concern does not appear as a primary focus of Dtr's theology and his rhetoric.

[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid., 511.
[63] Thanks to Mark Smith for these categories (in conversation, December 12, 2011).

By evaluating what happens to the players of history through the lens of deuteronomistic theology, Dtr attempts to make sense of history, particularly the bad things that have befallen Israel and Judah, and to inspire his audience to fidelity to that same theology. Dtr wants us to believe that if only the historical characters had been faithful to the deuteronomistic covenant, their fates would have turned out differently. Likewise, the people of Judah should now get on board in the hopes that their future will conclude better. What is particularly interesting about Dtr's commitment to his religious theology as compared to other biblical writers is that he is driven by offering a view of the past that reflects his sources and the prophetic tradition. As such, he includes episodes that may undermine his overall programmatic goals.

This unique brand of deuteronomistic theology emerges from the 7th century Jerusalem court of Josiah.[64] Many scholars locate the composition of DtrH to this moment in time. This contention is made largely because of accordance between the theology and the measures of Josiah's reform as outlined in 2 Kings 23, which specifically targets other cult sites and objects. (Also, the focus on the found book of the law in 2 Kings 22 during the reign of Josiah and its connection to the book of Deuteronomy, further contributes to this belief.) Centralization of worship in Jerusalem and the removal of "traditional" and syncretistic cult symbols were a major break in Israelite religion and required the positive promotion of the Deuteronomistic Historian and his evaluation of history to disseminate and indoctrinate the people of Judah.

b. The Attribution of Historico-Political Events to Theological Causes

Throughout the History, Dtr attributes historical and political occurrences to religious, ideological and theological causes. Yairah Amit summarizing others, namely von Rad, Kaufmann and Seeligmann, describes this as the "dual causality principle," which attributes both historical and divine causality to events and occurrences. Von Rad believes that during the period of the united monarchy a new kind of history emerged that showed a transition from the writing of miraculous episodes to that of a comprehensive historical work. These two different methods represent the activity of God differently. This change in the perspective of Yahweh's role in history led to a new form of narrativity, in which Yahweh functions in the background of history while human action is in the foreground (as opposed to the prominent role of God in the use of miracles).[65] Kaufmann indentifies this new narrativity as demonstrating the indirect governing of history by Yahweh. This is the dual aspect – causes are the result of both historical forces and divine providence. Amit sees a different manifestation of dual causality. It is the "shaping of plots, the portrayal of characters, the treatment of time and space, and finally the prominence of the place of God."[66] Amit offers two examples, that of Joseph's brothers (Gen 37-45) and the story of Ehud (Jgs 3). She explains that Joseph's brothers' jealousy develops as human action, but the characters and the reader learn later that it was all part of Yahweh's plan. The brothers' emotions and subsequent actions were guided by their own human psychology as well as providence. With the example of Ehud, Amit suggests that many coincidences had to occur in order for multiple points in the story to work out, without these coincidences Ehud would not have been successful. For example, what if he had not been admitted to the privy

[64] Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 1, 7, 9.
[65] Yairah Amit, "The Dual Causality Principle and its Effects on Biblical Literature," *VT* 37, no. 4 (1987): 387.
[66] Ibid., 37:392.

chamber? If one of the guards had stopped him on the way out? If the guards had not waited as long to go up after Ehud left? All of these coincidences were necessary in order to make Ehud successful. Amit describes this as "the elements of chance or surprise [that] may be joined together in a system of human reasoning; on the other hand, the manner of using them – in the very plots which apply the dual causality principle – is destined at one and the same time to signify the existence of a system of divine reasoning."[67]

While the attribution of double causes (divine and human) are at play in deuteronomistic composition (generally), the dual causality principle does not function in the same way in the more "history-like" narratives (as opposed to the more mythic accounts like Judges).[68] I am offering a more precise conception of how dual causality functions in the historical narratives. In Dtr's original compositions there are often two causes for events. As in the example to be discussed below, the kingdom is divided because of Solomon's apostasy as described in 1 Kings 11 and Rehoboam's stubbornness against lessening the corvée obligations as described in 1 Kings 12. Although the split of the kingdom can be attributed to dual causes, this is different from what Amit discusses. In those stories, the dual causality principle is more integrated into the narrative. Without Yahweh's guidance things might not have worked out (e.g. Ehud), or there would not be a good reason that events happen (we must remember, especially in the more "mythic" stories that they are stories, told for specific purposes within the religious "corpus" of a nation). Tales do not exist in isolation. The stories told and recorded have some national purpose. When we move to the more "historical" stories of DtrH, especially of Samuel and Kings, the divine causality is less integrated into the overall story because the narrative is based more-or-less on historical occurrences or remembrances of historical occurrences. Divine causality is more constructed and less organic, more like a template of divine causality imposed on historico-political causality, but the historico-political explanations often still (co-)exist separately from the divine explanation. The divine reason does not seem to be the driving force, rather part of the organizing structure. In this way, it is possible to see that when Dtr applies the dual causality principle in the historical books, perhaps a narrative strategy that was learned from the mythic oral and written stories, he does so in order to ascribe divine cause onto purely historico-political occurrences. The two causalities are not mutually dependent as they are in the Joseph and Ehud stories, it is possible to pry them apart. And while they were inseparable to Dtr's world view, it is possible for us to see the divine causality in Dtr as an ideological and theological attempt at understanding the historical events and ascribing divine meaning. This is an important element of the rhetorical method of Dtr. At almost every important stage in Israelite history, a political description (probably from a source document) is accompanied by a theological one, illustrating how all the major events in that history are the result of Yahweh working in history.

[67] Ibid., 37:394.

[68] Note that the difference lies in passages of deuteronomistic composition. While Judges is part of DtrH, the voice of Dtr is not very prominent. He is merely the framer of earlier traditions, unlike in Kings where he is an author of significant textual material.

c. The Use of a Prototype Strategy in Constructing the Portrait of the Kings

A third strategy that is closely related to the use of juxtaposition is the smoothing of the narrative pieces through the use of what I will call a prototype strategy. This process complies with the practice Hayden White calls "emplotment." He describes this as "to 'emplot' a sequence of events and thereby transform what would otherwise be only a chronicle of events into a story is to effect a mediation between events and certain universally human 'experiences of temporality'….The meaning of stories is given in their 'emplotment'."[69] White discusses historiography as a process that requires interpretation. The historian has to interpret his material to construct some pattern. Sometimes he has more facts than he can include and has to exclude things, but at other times, he does not have enough information and has to fill in the gaps to offer plausible explanations.[70] White contends that historical facts are "selected" by the historian.[71] In this way, the historian chooses what he wants to include and reconstitutes it through a narrative story-line. White highlights "two levels of interpretation in every historical work: one in which the historian constitutes a story out of the chronicle of events and another in which…he progressively identifies the *kind of story* he is telling."[72] In this way, "A given historian is forced to emplot the whole set of stories making up his narrative in one comprehensive or *archetypal* story form."[73]

According to White, this process, of choosing the plot, occurs before telling the story. It is part of the interpretation of sources: "It can be argued that interpretation in history consists of the provisions of a plot-structure for a sequence of events so that their nature as a comprehensible process is revealed by their figuration as a *story of a particular kind*."[74] White supports his argument with historian R.G. Collingwood who simultaneously "insisted that the constructive imagination was both *a priori* (which meant that it did not act capriciously) and *structural* (which meant that it was governed by notions of formal coherency in its constitution of possible objects of thought)."[75]

Brettler also contends that the biblical historian puts events into patterns: "Events themselves do not typically occur in patterns. It is the historian who sees patterns in events or in traditions concerning events, and writes a historical account that reflects these perceived patterns."[76] I think many would agree that this is one of the major tasks of an historian. In general, Brettler views the use of typology as a reenactment, a prefiguration of events that is used to convey meaning. He offers the example of the wife-sister episode in Genesis 12 functioning as a pre-enactment of the Exodus.[77] For him, the most accurate way to view typology is through the use of vocabulary of another text. [78] While themes and events in the content may be apparent, the use of a common vocabulary is a more certain indicator. This feature and the way in which

[69] White, *The Content of the Form*, 172–3.
[70] Hayden White, "Interpretation in History," *New Literary History* 4, no. 2 (1973): 281.
[71] Ibid., 4:287–8.
[72] Ibid., 4:292.
[73] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 8.
[74] White, "Interpretation in History," 4:291.
[75] Ibid., 4:293.
[76] Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*, 34.
[77] Ibid., 52.
[78] Ibid., 55.

Brettler describes the use of typology require that one text be the original and against which the secondary text is reconstructed into a similar type. This is similar to the discussions in New Testament scholarship about the use of typology in the New Testament.

I am suggesting a different kind of patterning. While Brettler offers the use of typology as a macrocosmic contribution to the meta-narrative, I am advocating a more specified use of patterning. Dtr uses a specific form of typology: a royal prototype strategy that he employs to construct the portrait of his kings. The prototype of the king is steeped in deuteronomistic language and concerns. Instead of being portrayed as a "real" person, each king is evaluated through the lens of the prototype to assess his fidelity to the covenant and his love of Yahweh. In Kings, Dtr uses a Davidic prototype (positively and negatively) to construct the portrait of his kings. Early on, von Rad, followed by Richard Nelson, made this observation, that the David of history (i.e. in the book of Samuel) is free of deuteronomistic additions. Instead, David is used "as the prototype of a king who was well-pleasing to Jahweh."[79] In this way, David "is the king after the heart of the Deuteronomist. He is the prototype of the perfectly obedient anointed, and therefore the model for all succeeding kings in Jerusalem."[80] Similarly, Richard Nelson highlights "heroes and villains" as one of the themes in DtrH. The heroes include David as the prototype for the perfect king, as described by von Rad.

While my argument for the use of a prototype strategy builds on these ideas, it takes into account further literary considerations. It is first necessary to consider what a literary prototype is and how it functions in our historical narratives. Renowned linguist George Lakoff defines prototypes as "cognitive reference points of various sorts [that] form the basis for inferences." [81] These inferences are part of the conceptual structure, in which prototypes have a "special cognitive status" of being a "best example."[82] In Kings, prototypes of individual kings (David as the model for the good king and an anti-David for the bad king) are laid out, allowing the reader to consider each king and his individual acts on micro and macro levels: What did this king do and how does his character and reign fit into the larger history of Israel and Judah and reflect the way Yahweh works in history? Furthermore, the use of a prototype allows the reader to infer information about each king without the narrator supplying it because he is cast in a certain mold that the audience already recognizes.

Throughout this work, the portraits of the individual kings will be considered specifically for their role in this prototype strategy and the ways in which the use of the prototype strategy is a primary compositional tool of the Deuteronomist's method.

1 Kings 11: A Case Study

In the quest for describing the process of historiography of the Deuteronomistic Historian, it is fruitful to begin laying out his method with a clear example. 1 Kings 11 describes the fall of King Solomon followed by (or caused by) the rise of Jeroboam. The majority of

[79] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 86.
[80] Ibid., 88.
[81] George Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 45.
[82] Ibid., 41.

scholars have long agreed that this chapter is made up of several discrete narratives that are re-organized into a more-or-less coherent plot.[83] The value of using this chapter as a paradigm also lies in the delineation between the voice of the Deuteronomist (quite clear) in his composition and the earlier sources.[84] This chapter consists of three main episodes: (1) the sin of Solomon with the foreign women and his punishment for covenantal disobedience (vv. 1-13); (2) the rise of two (or three) adversaries (vv. 14-27(28); and, (3) the election of Jeroboam by Ahijah the prophet and the warning of fidelity to the covenant (vv. 29-39). The smooth integration of these three somewhat separate episodes comes together in a complete narrative account. The organization and melding together of each episode develops into a narrative context that combines the different storylines into one continuous plot. The goal of Dtr in writing together and organizing these stories is clear; it is an attempt to present Solomon at the end of his reign led astray by his foreign wives and the necessary punishment for this infidelity, while still maintaining the eternal dynastic Davidic promise. Deuteronomistic ideology is clearly the motivating factor in the weaving together of the stories. The macro-story is smooth, but there are clear markers within the chapter that show the seams of reorganization. It is through these gaps that it is possible to ascertain some of the guiding principles of Dtr's historiographical methodology.

1 Kings 11[85]

> (1) Now the King Solomon loved many foreign women along with[86] the daughter of Pharaoh, Moabite and Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian, and Hittite women.
> (2) **From the nations which Yahweh told the children of Israel "Do not come among them and they will not come among you, they will surely turn your heart after their gods," Solomon clung to these**[87] **[gods] out of love.** (3) And he had 700 hundred royal wives and 300 concubines. **And his wives turned away his heart.** **(4) And it happened in Solomon's old age [that] his wives turned**

[83] Nadav Na'aman, "Sources and Composition in the History of Solomon," in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium* (ed. Lowell K. Handy; Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997), 57–80. Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:135–9. Gary N. Knoppers, "Dynastic Oracle and Secession in 1 Kings 11," *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, vol 7, 1987* (1987): 160.

[84] Dtr especially in vv. 1-13, 32-39.

[85] Deuteronomistic composition is designated by the **bold** font.

[86] This resolves difficult syntax.

[87] The referent of בהם is ambiguous. Does Solomon cling to the women? Although the preposition is a 3mp form, it would be grammatically justifiable to read this as women, especially since this is a response to Solomon's love, which has been established in verse 1 as for the women. Cogan translates in this way, making the referent explicit with the use of parentheses: "To such (women) Solomon held fast out of love" (Cogan, *1 Kings*, 325). בהם is also used twice in the first half of the verse, referring to the nations forbidden to Israel, so it could refer to the nations. "Solomon clung to the nations." Gray maintains the ambiguous "to them" and does not make his intention explicit (John Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (2nd ed.; Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), 272). Fritz implicitly seems to intend the gods, in using the proximal deictic pronoun "these" to refer to the most immediately preceding object (Volkmar Fritz, *1 & 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary* (trans. Anselm Hagedorn; Continental Commentaries; Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress Press, 2003), 128). I make explicit "their gods" as the referent for two reasons. The first is that אלהיהם is the closest object in the syntax, immediately preceding בהם. The second is based on the general concern of the passage. This section of the chapter is focused on Solomon's apostasy of idolatry caused by his marriage to foreign women. The deuteronomistic theological perspective is pervasive throughout the whole account, and it is for this crime that Solomon is punished.

away his heart after other gods, and his heart was not fully with Yahweh his God, as was the heart of David his father. (5) And Solomon went after Ashtaroth the god of the Sidonians, and after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites. (6) And Solomon did evil in the eyes of Yahweh and he was not fully behind Yahweh like David his father.

(7) **Then Solomon built a high place to Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, on the mountain which is next to Jerusalem and for Molech the abomination of the Ammonites.** (8) And thus he did for all his foreign wives who burned incense and sacrificed to their gods. (9) **And Yahweh was angry**[88] **with Solomon because he had turned his heart from Yahweh, God of Israel, the one who had appeared to him twice. (10) And he commanded him about this matter, to not go after other gods, but he did not keep that which Yahweh commanded.**

(11) **And Yahweh said to Solomon, "Because it was this way with you and you did not keep my covenant and my laws which I commanded you, I will surely rend the kingdom from you and give it to your servant. (12) But in your days I will not do it, for the sake of David your father, [but] I will rend it from the hand of your son. (13) But I will not tear [away] the whole kingdom, but one tribe I will give to your son for the sake of David my servant and for the sake of Jerusalem which I have chosen."**

(14) **And Yahweh raised an adversary against Solomon,** Hadad the Edomite, from the line of the king of Edom. (15) And it was when David fought[89] Edom that Joab general of the army went up to bury the slain, having killed all the men of Edom. (16) For six months Joab and all of Israel dwelt there until they killed all the men of Edom. (17) Hadad and some of the Edomite men, servants of his father fled with him to Egypt and Hadad was a small child. (18) And they set out from Midian and came to Paran. They took with them men from Paran, then they came to Egypt to Pharaoh King of Egypt who gave him shelter and arranged for his sustenance, and gave him land.[90] (19) And Hadad found great favor in the eyes of Pharaoh, and he gave him as a wife the sister of his wife, the sister of Tahpenes the queen mother. (20) And the sister of Tahpenes bore him Genuvat his son and Tahpenes weaned him in the house of Pharaoh and Genuvat was in the house of Pharaoh among the children of Pharaoh. (21) But when Hadad heard from Egypt that David slept with his fathers and that Joab the general of the army died, and Hadad said to Pharaoh, "Send me away and I will go to my land." (22) And Pharaoh said to him, "But what are you lacking with me that you ask to go to your land?" and he said, "Nothing, but do let me leave."

(23) **And God**[91] **raised up an adversary against him.** Rezon son of Eliada who fled from Hadadezer king of Soba his lord. (24) And he gathered around him

---

[88] ∗'*np* appears in the *hiphil* only in Deuteronomy and Dtr (2 Kgs 17:18). Elsewhere it appears in the *Qal* (Cogan, *1 Kings*. 328**).** It is a marker of deuteronomistic language.

[89] This is corrected on the basis of LXX, בהכות for בהיות, as in 2 Sam 8:16, the original report of this incident. This also makes sense within the syntax of the phrase. It is followed by את-אדום. The correction is a transitive verb and takes Edom as its direct object. היה is stative and therefore would not take an object.

[90] This is absent in LXX and is likely a gloss.

[91] It is interesting to note that while the sentiments seem to be the same, the subject of the verb ויקם in verses 14 and 23 is different. In verse 14, the text says that "Yahweh raised an adversary against Solomon, Hadad the Edomite,"

men and he was the leader of a band and David killed them, and they went to Damascus and dwelled there and ruled from Damascus. (25) And he was an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon and [together][92] with the evil which Hadad [did], he despised Israel and ruled over Aram.[93]

(26) Now Jeroboam son of Nebat the Ephramite, from the Zeredah and the name of his widowed mother was Zeruah, was a servant of Solomon and he raised his hand against the king. (27) And this is the account of raising his hand against the king. Solomon built the Millo, closed the breach in the city of David, his father. (28) Now the man Jeroboam was a capable man and Solomon saw how the young man did his work, so he put him in charge of all the corvée of the house of Joseph.

(29) And it happened at that time that Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem and the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite found him on the way. He covered himself with a new robe, and the two of them were alone in the field. (30) And Ahijah took hold of the new robe which was upon him and he tore it into twelve pieces. (31) And he said to Jeroboam, **"Take ten pieces for yourself, for thus says Yahweh, the God of Israel. I am about to tear the kingdom from the hand of Solomon and I will give you ten of the tribes.**[94] **(32) But the one tribe will be for him, for the sake of my servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, the city which I chose from all the tribes of Israel. (33) Because [he] left me and [he] bowed to Astarte, god of the Sidonians, to Chemosh, god of Moab, and to Milcom, god of the Ammonites and [he] did not walk in my way, to do right in my eyes, and [to keep] my laws and ordinances as David his father. (34) But I will not take the entire kingdom from his hand for I will position him as *nāsîʾ* all the days of his life, for the sake of David my servant, whom I chose, who kept my commandments and my laws. (35) And I will take the kingdom for his son and give it to you, the 10 tribes. (36) But to his son I will give one tribe in order to be a lamp for David my servant all the days before me in Jerusalem the city which I chose for myself to establish my name there. (37) But it is you I will**

---

while verse 23 says, "God raised up an adversary against him, Rezon son of Eliada." This may indicate that the Rezon account was added later and the redactor paraphrased verse 14, switching *Elohim* for Yahweh.

[92] Something is missing here. The return to Hadad as the subject is quite sudden. "Together" represents the *wāw*-copulative and an attempt to somehow reconnect the story of Hadad, which is interrupted by the Rezon story. There is also no verb here, yet one is needed.

[93] It is not clear to whom this refers. It would make sense if this referred to Rezon, who from Damascus rules over Aram. But this whole verse is an awkward recap of the short verse and a half about Rezon. Or, this could be an attempt at a smoother transition to the Hadad account, but there is no conclusion to the Hadad narrative. We do not know what happens after Hadad requests permission to return home from Egypt. Perhaps the end of verse 25 is the original conclusion to the Hadad story and therefore we should read Edom for Aram, as in some Greek and Syriac manuscripts. This would be an easy scribal error of graphic confusion of ד and ר. In this way, verses 23 and 24 are an interpolation into the Hadad story, and the beginning of verse 25, returning to the adversary of Solomon, functions as a *Wiederaufnahme*. There are too many things missing in verse 25 for us to decide definitively, and therefore I leave the MT Aram uncorrected and suggest that Hadad is added to the Rezon conclusion to wrap up the narratives of the adversaries of Solomon.

[94] The beginning part of this narrative stems from a pre-Dtr northern prophetic source, akin to the sources of the Elijah and Elisha stories (Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 107.)

take and you will be king over all you desire and you will be king over Israel.[95]

(38) **Thus it will be if you heed all that I will command you and you will walk in my way and do what is right in my eyes, to keep my law and commandments which David my servant did, then I will be with you and I will build for you a lasting dynasty as I built for David, and I will give to you Israel. (39) And I will humble the seed of David, but not forever."**

(40) And Solomon attempted the murder of Jeroboam. Then Jeroboam got up and fled to Egypt to Shishak, king of Egypt, and he was in Egypt until the death of Solomon.

(41) **And the remainder of the deeds of Solomon and all he did and his wisdom, is it not in the writings of the book of the deeds of Solomon? (42) And the days that Solomon was king in Jerusalem and over all Israel were forty years. (43) And Solomon slept with his fathers and he was buried in the city of David his father, and Rehoboam his son became king in his place.**[96]

THE AXIS OF SELECTION

1. Scholarly Commitment to his Sources

In 1 Kings 11, the most remarkable sources that have been included and are unnecessary and perhaps even undermine Dtr's construction of his meta-narrative are the stories of Hadad and Rezon. These stories must have been part of the collection of sources that Dtr inherited. The stories of these enemies do not quite fit into the overall story, as well as within their chronological sequence. Instead of leaving these stories out of the historical record, Dtr attaches them onto the end of the story of Solomon. The way in which Dtr uses these "tacked-on" sources will be discussed further below as part of Dtr's organizational strategies, but it is important to recognize that Dtr's methodological commitment to his sources does not allow him to omit the stories challenging Solomon's long and peaceful reign entirely.

This is also seen in the inclusion of the split of the kingdom. In his attempt to present what he deemed an accurate historical portrait, Dtr must include the split of the kingdom, even though the destruction of the unified Davidic kingdom is extremely dangerous for Dtr's theological program. This is unlike the Chronicler who does not have the same historiographical commitment and does not report the split of the kingdom and the two century existence of the divided kingdoms). Dtr must include these historical occurrences. He deals with his allotted history by recasting it.

---

[95] Many scholars consider varying parts of verses 36-39 as part of the northern original source, including Noth (vv. 36abα-37); Weippert (vv. 37, 38bαβ); Campbell (vv. 37-38b); Vanoni (vv. 36abα, 37) in Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:191–196. The thematic content and phraseology is too deuteronomistic to attribute it to an earlier source.

[96] This is a common formulaic ending to the reigns of Israelite and Judean kings used by pre-exilic Dtr. For more see Baruch Halpern and David S. Vanderhooft, "The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries BCE," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62 (1991): 179–244. Especially page 193 pertains to Solomon.

The rejection of Solomon calls into question the deuteronomistic program mandating the unconditional eternity of the Davidic dynasty, yet the first king to succeed David, his son Solomon, loses control over the entire country. Dtr transforms the fact of the split of the kingdom into an "educational moment" to teach kings (and the audience of the History) the importance of fidelity to the deuteronomistic covenant. Solomon was not faithful to Yahweh, and therefore he is punished, but Yahweh's promise to David will still stand because one tribe will remain in the hands of the Davidic king. Here, both programmatic issues are addressed: the cult must be practiced in the deuteronomistic way (i.e. no syncretism and worship of other gods and foreign symbols), and the Davidic promise is maintained.

2. Loyalty to the Prophetic Tradition

In 1 Kings 11 we have the inclusion of the narrative of Ahijah the prophet. This was likely a northern, pre-Dtr prophetic tradition that Dtr includes in his narrative and adapts to his evaluation of Solomon and the appointing of Jeroboam. While the passage is highly rewritten by Dtr, particularly verses 32-39, the beginning part of the story reflects an earlier kernel of a northern tradition.[97]

Dtr takes the core elements of the story, the prophet Ahijah putting aside King Solomon and designating Jeroboam king in his place and inserts more deuteronomistic elements, namely verses 32-38. The original source likely contained the use of the robe as Ahijah's prop. Still, Dtr maintains the general narrative integrity of the original prophetic story. The story of Ahijah fits well with the idea of prophets as "king makers" and may be an indicator of its origin from a northern prophetic record.[98] This is an earlier tradition that Dtr incorporates into his narrative.

3. The Ordering of Episodes

Once Dtr has made his selections of sources, here the stories of the foreign adversaries and Ahijah's prophecy, he uses his organizational methods to craft them into a coherent narrative. Several time markers within 1 Kings 11 show a reorganization of events. In the first section of the chapter about Solomon's sin, verse 4 begins with ויהי לעת זקנת שלמה "and it happened in Solomon's old age."[99] This definitively sets the scene at the end of his life, and

[97] Anthony Campbell attributes verses 30, 31, 37 and 38b to an earlier prophetic source from the end of the 9th century B.C.E. He highlights the texts associated with the anointing of Saul, David, and Jehu and those designating and rejecting Jeroboam, Ahab, and Jehu as belonging to this source. He describes narratives from this source with several characteristic elements, which the story of Jeroboam and Ahijah share. In this second group of texts, Campbell describes the characteristic elements as (1) the tearing away of the kingdom from the present king; (2) designation of another king; (3) evil prophecy against the present king or his house; (4) the destruction of the royal house; (5) the cutting off of every male; (6) reference to the fate of the house of Jeroboam; (7) the fate of those who die in the city or the country. Ahijah's speech in the designation of Jeroboam includes the first two elements, the tearing away of the kingdom and designation of another as king, and the rest occur in the oracle to Jeroboam's wife (1 Kgs 14:7-16) (Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 24, 25.)

[98] Ibid., 114.

[99] It is interesting to note that LXX makes it further explicit that the idolatry was isolated to late in Solomon's reign. In the reorganization of MT verses 1-3, LXX attaches 3b (that the women turned Solomon's heart) at the end of

presumably at the end of his reign; it is an unambiguous time marker that attempts to cast the infidelity late into his reign, demonstrating a break from his faithfulness as a young man, evident in his wisdom and the general success and prosperity of the greater part of his reign. This break is made clear in the disjunctive syntax of the first verse. 1 Kings 11 begins with the fronting of the subject, והמלך שלמה אהב נשים נכריות רבות creating a disjunctive sequence and a complete break with the narrative that precedes it. While scholars may disagree as to when the negative critique of Solomon begins,[100] the general treatment of Solomon and what happens to him, takes a stark turn at this juncture; even the grammar suggests it.

The punishment for Solomon's sin described in verses 11-13 manifests itself in the raising up of adversaries, first Hadad and Rezon, and then, we are led by the organization of the chapter to believe, Jeroboam. It is through Dtr's reconstruction of these narratives that the adversaries are set up as the vehicles of punishment and are banished to the periphery of the Solomon account, the last acts at the end of his life and reign. Yet it is possible to see through several temporal clues that the stories of Hadad and Rezon were removed from their original chronological place in the events of the reign of Solomon (and David) and re-set at the end of his story.[101] Verse 14 begins with the raising up of Hadad the Edomite as an adversary of Solomon. The verse begins with a *wāw*-consecutive verb, ויקם continuing the sequence of actions from verse 11. There Yahweh speaks (ויאמר) to Solomon declaring the king's infidelity and pronouncing the verdict that the kingdom will be torn away from him. The next action begins with ויקם in verse 14, presumably that after Yahweh spoke to Solomon he raised the adversary against Solomon. The consecutive action shown by the syntax demonstrates the relationship between the two acts, the pronouncing and raising up of the enemy. Presumably, the temporal context of verse 4 wants us to read this act as the continuation of the previous section, leading us to understand that the ויקם of verse 14 occurs similarly during the period of the old age of Solomon. Yet as the narrative continues, it is made clear that Hadad is an adversary of Solomon's early reign.

Hadad is an enemy acquired from the time of David. Immediately following the announcement of the arrival of an adversary to Solomon, verse 15 continues with another temporal marker, ויהי בהכות דוד את אדום "and it was when David fought Edom." Young Hadad flees to Egypt from David and Joab's annihilation of Edom. Hadad remains in Egypt, living in the court of Pharaoh, even marrying Pharaoh's sister-in-law, until the death of David when he requests to return to his land. In verse 21 we are given the indication of the passage of time that links us to the new historical context. Verse 21 begins with disjunctive syntax, fronting the subject, emphasizing Hadad: והדד שמע במצרים שכב דוד עם אבתיו וכי מת יואב "But when Hadad heard from Egypt that David slept with his fathers and that Joab had died…" It is at that time that Hadad petitions Pharaoh to return to Edom. While we do not have any account of what happens to Hadad after that request, we may presume that he did return to the land, rid of the tyrant who decimated his people, and takes the offensive against Solomon. This would set the temporal

---

verse 4. Verse 4 says that Solomon's heart was not completely with Yahweh in his old age and in the LXX continues that "the foreign women turned his heart back after their gods" (Sweeney, "A Reassessment," 38:180.)

[100] J. Daniel Hays, "Has the Narrator Come to Praise Solomon or to Bury Him? Narrative Subtlety in 1 Kings 1-11," *JSOT* 28, no. 2 (2003): 149–174. Marc Zvi Brettler, "The Structure of 1 Kings 1-11," *JSOT*, no. 49 (1991): 89. Kim Ian Parker, "Repetition as a Structuring Device in 1 Kings 1-11," *JSOT*, no. 42 (1988): 19–27.

[101] Glatt, *Chronological Displacement*, 163; James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ed. Henry Snyder Gehman; International Critical Commentary; New York: Scribner's, 1951), 241.

context for having become an adversary to Solomon at the beginning of his reign (more precisely at the death of David). The temporal markers in the specific narrative of Hadad the Edomite demonstrate a different chronology from that of the larger frame of the chapter, setting Hadad as a divinely raised adversary at the end of Solomon's reign rather than the beginning.

The anachronistic re-narrativizing of the episodes in the chapter continues with the raising up of a further adversary, Rezon son of Eliada. While the account of Rezon lacks many of the details of that of Hadad, Rezon is presented similarly as a second adversary whose group was also killed by David and fled his land. Verse 25 says ויהי שטן לישראל כל ימי שלמה "And he was an adversary to Israel during all the days of Solomon." Like Hadad, Rezon does not appear to be an adversary who emerges in Solomon's old age, towards the end of his reign, as verse 4 would like to establish. Instead, Rezon was an adversary throughout the life (and reign) of Solomon. The explicit temporal markers in the two accounts of the adversaries demonstrate that these textual snippets and the "historical" events they describe were re-chronologized to fit into the greater goals of the frame story of the chapter. The two enemies from the beginning and throughout the duration of Solomon's reign are re-narrativized by Dtr to appear when summoned. They are adversaries raised up by Yahweh in Solomon's old age to punish him for his sins of infidelity to Yahweh and the covenant. They appear only at the end of Solomon's story to further highlight the break in Solomon's behavior at this time from earlier in his reign. Glatt agrees that "the editor of Kings has chosen to intentionally focus Solomon's woes on his later years, even as references or chronological data pointing to much earlier settings are left intact."[102] In this way, the enemies of Solomon are portrayed as participating in a causal relationship of the sin and its subsequent punishment, supporting the deuteronomistic program of covenant obedience. As Diana Edelman describes, these "chronological displacements…can be seen as the result of the Deuteronomist intentionally concentrating all of Solomon's faults and woes at the end of his reign."[103]

Similarly, these events come together in a juxtaposition of episodes; there is a piling up of "adversary" stories. Diana Edelman sees them as a trio of "bad guys," functioning in a folkloric pattern of repetition of threes.[104] First presented is the story of Hadad. As discussed above, Hadad's people is destroyed by David and Joab, and he flees to Egypt, only returning after David's death. Hadad then becomes an enemy to Solomon. This story is followed by a second adversary, Rezon. Almost the same words are used to introduce the appearance of these two adversaries. The Hadad story may have been the original because of its level of detail and the Rezon story is later added to it. We are given information about the life of Hadad in Egypt that is superfluous to the context of Hadad being an enemy of Solomon and the means of exacting punishment. It is unclear whether these stories were collected and juxtaposed by Dtr or whether they had previously circulated together in Dtr's *Vorlage*.[105]

---

[102] Glatt, *Chronological Displacement*, 164.
[103] Ibid., 165.
[104] Diana Edelman, "Solomon's Adversaries Hadad, Rezon and Jeroboam: A Trio of 'Bad Guy' Characters Illustrating the Theology of Immediate Retribution," in *The Pitcher is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström* (ed. Steven W. Holloway and Lowell K. Handy; Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 190; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 168.
[105] The way that LXX rewrites and further combines these independent stories demonstrates that they were already connected in the LXX *Vorlage*. In the MT, the separate originals can be detected, but in LXX the rewriting erases

The narrative continues to a possible third enemy. Because of the connection of the first two adversaries, when Jeroboam is introduced, although not as an "adversary" per se, rather as one who raises his hand against the king (v. 26), he automatically falls into the category of the third "adversary." This is the effect of the juxtaposition; the separate stories are juxtaposed and their meaning is enhanced by the juxtaposition. Solomon's punishment is two-fold. It is not only the tearing away of the kingdom from Solomon's son, as pronounced in verses 11-13, but also the raising up of two (three) adversaries who will torment Solomon in his old age (or throughout his reign). Dtr brings these three stories together because of their commonalities. This is also a testament to Dtr's attempt to represent his sources (both written and oral). Traditions existed that included stories of (at least) two foreign adversaries. Dtr re-chronologizes those traditions to benefit his overall narrative plot, displacing them to the end of the account of Solomon's reign (both in narrative and historical time). The presence of long-term enemies during the prosperous reign of Solomon does not correspond with Dtr's general portrayal of the greater part of Solomon's rule. It is only in the later part of Solomon's life that Dtr wishes to introduce these foreign enemies into the narrative. Regardless of his faithfulness to historical chronology (which seems loose), Dtr is committed to maintaining the stories and finding a way to work them into his overall narrative.

The effect of the juxtaposition is also heightened when the pattern of juxtaposition is broken. Dtr sets up a sequence of adversaries raised by Yahweh in the case of Hadad and Rezon, and while the juxtaposition clearly allies Jeroboam with them as a third adversary, the difference in his introduction (lacking the announcement of an adversary) highlights his importance and uniqueness, directing the reader to take him more seriously than the others. The breaking of the pattern signals a new phase in the history.[106] This contrast is also made in the use of the verbs introducing each adversary. Hadad and Rezon are both introduced that "Yahweh/*Elohim* raised up an adversary against Solomon," וַיָּקֶם the C-stem of √קום. In contrast, Jeroboam "raised his hand against the king," וַיָּרֶם. The C-stem of √רום. It is significant to note the verb used for Jeroboam's rebellion is also a verb of ascension, parallel to ויקם. This (1 Kgs 11:26, 27) is the only context in which √רום + יד means rebel. There are many other verbs for rebellion (including מרד, מרה, פשע that are used by Dtr), but this is the only instance where this expression is used. The use of parallel verbs further connects Jeroboam to the others yet the contrast of the verbs, representing Hadad and Rezon as passive objects and Jeroboam as an active agent, further highlights the importance of Jeroboam among the adversaries.[107] Also, we need to ask what Jeroboam does to "raise his hand against the king." Is the act of וירם יד developed from finding a parallel verb? There is no report of rebellious behavior. Also, this comment is closely followed by the report that Solomon saw Jeroboam as capable and set him over the house of Joseph (v. 28). This also precedes the secret meeting with Ahijah. Is accepting the interaction with Ahijah

---

the existence of separate origins. LXX reflects the deuteronomistic addition of ויקם in the introduction of the adversaries, but combines the introduction of Hadad and Rezon with a *wāw*-conjunction and only one ויקם: Καὶ ἤγειρεν κύριος σαταν τῷ Σαλωμων τὸν Αδερ τὸν Ιδουμαῖον καὶ τὸν Εσρωμ υιον Ελιαδαε, (v. 14) equivalent to the Hebrew, ויקם יהוה שטן לשלמה את הדד האדמי ואת רזון בן אלידע.

[106] Robert L. Cohn, "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative," *ZAW* 97 (1985): 26.

[107] Ibid.

considered rebellion?[108] The juxtaposition to the previous adversaries colors our reading of verse 26, creating a rebellious figure who sets out against Solomon, as do Hadad and Rezon.

THE AXIS OF COMPOSITION

a. Promoting the Deuteronomistic Program

The theological stance of Dtr is demonstrated most in the first part of 1 Kings 11. Verses 1-13 are a deuteronomistic composition. As discussed above, it may reflect an earlier tradition (written or oral) in which Solomon had one thousand wives (certainly an exaggerated number), many (if not all) of whom were foreign, and for whom he built various things, including religious sites. The passage is so reworked by Dtr, illustrating deuteronomistic themes, ideology, and phraseology that it is no longer possible to peel back the deuteronomistic layer. Dtr highlights that through Solomon's acquisition of the foreign women, he was tempted by them and led away from Yahweh into worship of the gods of the foreign women. He is unlike his father David, the paradigm of deuteronomistic theology, and his heart is not completely dedicated to Yahweh. It is interesting to note the concept of אהבה previously committed to the dedication of Yahweh (Deut 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, et cetera) is now directed to the women and their gods (v. 2). The verb אהב is covenantal, deuteronomic language. While אהב in relation to Solomon's women is employed in the secular sense of the word, it is still significant that it is used, echoing the theological sense of the word, so important to Dtr, alluding to a turning away of religious love and loyalty and transferring it to the foreign women and by extension, their gods.

The covenant theology is clearly seen in the punishment. Because Solomon was not faithful to the covenant, Yahweh will remove the kingdom from him, but for the sake of David to whom Yahweh made an eternal promise (also a key element to the theology), Yahweh will not do it in Solomon's lifetime, but in that of his son. It is also for the sake of David and Jerusalem that Yahweh will only take 10 of the tribes from Solomon's dynasty. While the final form of the narrative corresponds to deuteronomistic theology, it also reflects Dtr's struggle with the actual historical occurrences. The separation of the kingdom did not take place during Solomon's reign and Dtr must account for that. A complete break with the Davidic dynasty would undermine the Davidic promise, therefore some of the kingdom must remain in Davidic hands, with a promise for a future return. All of these elements are theologically essential to Dtr reworking the original story.

The phraseology is clearly deuteronomistic.[109] Dtr talks about Jerusalem as the chosen city, David as the ultimate servant, and Solomon's apostasy as a turning of his heart away from

[108] Thanks for Jeffrey Tigay (in conversation) for this question. Similarly, Halpern presupposes the resistance of a rebellion, naming "Jeroboam's putative revolt" as "boast[ing] prophetic support as its religious motive force" (Baruch Halpern, "Levitic Participation in the Reform Cult of Jeroboam I," *JBL* 95 (1976): 526). Robert Cohn suggests that the interruption of the Jeroboam and Solomon narrative by Ahijah's prophecy, placing it before the notice that Solomon wants to kill Jeroboam, "the author supplies a reason for Solomon's anger. He implies that Solomon acts before the prophecy and compounds his sin by attempting to defy the divine will" (Cohn, "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative," 97:27).

Yahweh, again connected with the language of love. It is here, with David's successor, that Dtr sets the standard for the measure of a good king – one whose heart is fully with Yahweh and who is like David. (This will be explored further in chapter 3.) The comparison with David (either like him or not like him, more common) continues in the evaluation of the subsequent kings. The concern of being fully with Yahweh makes clear that syncretistic worship is not acceptable. Likely this is the charge against Solomon, not that he gave up all Yahwistic worship, but that he was also worshipping, sacrificing and offering incense, to the gods of the foreign women. This is also common to Dtr's strategy of pursuing his theological goals – placing all worship that he does not deem appropriate into a category of idolatry. Here syncretism is utterly forbidden and should be treated as a complete forsaking of Yahweh and Yahwistic worship.

b. The Attribution of Historico-Political Events to Theological Causes

1 Kings 11 is based on the description of several historical events. First and foremost is the split of the northern and southern kingdoms that occurs after the death of Solomon. The second is the uprising of Hadad and Rezon as foreign enemies. And the third is the rise of Jeroboam to the position of king over the North. As discussed previously, foreign adversaries Hadad and Rezon are a means of punishment for Solomon's sin. This connection is made explicit through the consecutive syntax of the verses. Both episodes begin with ויקם (vv. 14, 23), the *wāw*-consecutive, highlighting the connection of these events with what precedes them, namely the sin and doom pronouncement on Solomon. Yet within the text there is an implicit indication of a more political cause. Joab, general of the army under David, slaughtered all the men of Edom (v. 15) forcing Hadad to flee. Similarly, Rezon son of Eliada fled David's massacre of his band and lived in exile in Damascus (v. 24). Both Hadad and Rezon wait until the death of David to return, presumably plotting their revenge.

Furthermore, the split of the kingdom, which occurs in 1 Kings 12 when Rehoboam travels to Shechem, presumably for his coronation or something of the sort, is attributed to political reasons. The men of the North request relief from their heavy corvée, but instead of lessening the burden, Rehoboam increases it. In response, the people separate from the Judean king, declaring Jeroboam their king. Instead of a political reason for the separation, Dtr constructs a theological one as is described in the beginning section of chapter 11. Yahweh's direct speech in verses 11-13 makes clear that the kingdom will be torn away from Solomon because he did not keep Yahweh's covenant and laws. While this split is the consequence of Solomon's behavior, the historical "reality" demands that this occurs during the reign of Rehoboam and not that of Solomon. Dtr must contend with this fact and covering his bases addresses this issue with theological reasons. In the doom proclamation, Yahweh continues that the split will not take place during the days of Solomon for the sake of Solomon's father David. Instead the kingdom will be torn from the hand of Solomon's son (v. 12). This further qualification is crucial to the original theological attribution of Solomon's sin for the reason of the split because the immediate impact of this causation is not felt since the "punishment" is not exacted during the life of Solomon. Diana Edelman suggests that Hadad and Rezon are included for theological reasons, to show the impact of Solomon's sin and correct the postponed

[109] For deuteronomistic phraseology see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Especially Appendix A, pp. 320-365.

punishment with immediate retribution.[110] Citing Würthwein and Jones, she contends that this was a late, post-deuteronomistic addition.[111] It is not necessary that this must be post-Dtr. It is possible for this same motivation, theologically triggered inclusion of immediate retribution, could be the work of Dtr in his redaction. Furthermore, Dtr must contend with the fact that the entire kingdom is not torn from Rehoboam's hand (only ten tribes) as well as his own ideological commitment to the eternity of the Davidic dynasty. In this way, further qualification is made in verse 13 reminding the reader lest he believe that Yahweh has forsaken his promise to David and his commitment to Jerusalem as the divine city; Yahweh will not tear away one tribe because of David.

The third historical occurrence is the rise of Jeroboam to the position of king of Israel. The people of the North choose Jeroboam and pronounce him king in 1 Kings 12:20. It is essential to Dtr's overall narrative plot that the split of the kingdom is a result of Solomon's sin. To demonstrate this cause, it is necessary for the new king be chosen by Yahweh. For this reason, Dtr utilizes the episode of Jeroboam and Ahijah. Likely, as discussed above, this was an existing tradition that Dtr uses for his own means. It also follows a trope of prophetically elected kings (cf. Samuel and David).[112] Jeroboam is introduced by his father and mother's names (v. 26) similar to the regnal formula. He is chosen by the prophet Ahijah who lays out the reasons for the split of the kingdom (again, Solomon's sin) and warns him to be faithful to the covenant. Once more, this is the attribution of a theological cause for a historico-political occurrence.

c. The Use of a Prototype Strategy

In 1 Kings 11, the prototype strategy is used prominently in the construction of Jeroboam. He is set up to be a second David. This is a strategy that continues in the portrait of the kings most important to Dtr. He uses a Davidic prototype to portray his kings. The ways in which the Davidic prototype is created and applied will be address in chapter 3. Additionally, the role of Ahijah's prophecy (1 Kgs 11:29-39) in establishing Jeroboam in the Davidic prototype will also be explored in detail in chapter 4.

§

The ensuing chapters will follow a similar organizational structure as this analysis of 1 Kings 11, but they will be focused on the complete narratives of various kings, rather than a single chapter as appears here. In this way, it will be possible to see Dtr's selectional and compositional choices at work to construct the entire portrait of these kings. Following the next chapter, which summarizes some of the major scholarly positions on redactional theories in Kings and the way in which they contribute to and affect the historiographical poetics, chapter 3 will lay out the use of the Davidic prototype, what is included in it and how it functions. This model will serve as the prototype for the treatment of subsequent kings. Chapters 4 and 5 will deal with Jeroboam and Josiah respectively. As with the case study of 1 Kings 11 presented in

[110] Edelman, "Solomon's Adversaries," 166.
[111] Ibid., 170.
[112] Mark Leuchter, "Jeroboam the Ephratite," *JBL* 125, no. 1 (2006): 51–72. Cohn, "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative," 97:26.

this chapter, I will address the accounts of those kings in light of the six-part schema of the historiographical poetics that I have described in this chapter. Finally, chapter 6 will function as a counter-example, offering an analysis of the Manasseh narrative in 2 Kings 21 as demonstrating how these historiographical priorities are unique to the pre-exilic Deuteronomist, and the exilic Deuteronomist uses a variation of the poetics, highlighting different theological concerns. This illustration will also further clarify the pre-exilic Deuteronomist's historiographical method.

Chapter 2

Historiographical Poetics in Light of Redaction Criticism

An essential issue in the endeavor of clarifying the historiographical poetics of Dtr is understanding Dtr's role as author and redactor. The previous chapter outlines the various methodological commitments that guide Dtr in his process of selection and composition. This chapter will explore further the nature of Dtr's work in compiling the Deuteronomistic History as well as some of the prevailing scholarly theories about the redactional history of DtrH.

Is there a Deuteronomistic History?

Since the work of Benedict Spinoza in the late 17th century, biblical critics have discussed the connection between the book of Deuteronomy and the historical books of the Former Prophets. For almost four centuries, scholars have considered the issues relating to the Deuteronomistic History along the lines of three topics: the identity and dating of the author(s), the process and date of the formation of the books, and the coherence of the books to each other and their connection with Deuteronomy.[1] Depending where scholars fall on the first two sets of issues usually determines how they view the coherence of the books. More recently, there have been scholars who view an ultimate lack of coherence among the books and have disavowed the idea of an existence of a Deuteronomistic History. These issues come together in understanding the role of Dtr in the compilation of the History.

W.M.L. de Wette, at the turn of the 19th century, is the first to use the term "deuteronomic" to describe the historical books.[2] It is this concept, one which suggests that some early form of Deuteronomy, influenced by the reform of Josiah, reflects an ideology present in the historical books.[3] The books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings reflect, more-or-less, an ideology that values and alludes to (explicitly and implicitly) the law of Deuteronomy. De Wette argues that there is no evidence for the existence of a Mosaic law before the time of Josiah in the seventh century B.C.E.[4] He suggests that Deuteronomy is separate from the Tetrateuch and that each source has its own stylistic and thematic "peculiarities."[5] Also, de Wette may have been the first to identify Deuteronomy with the found book in 2 Kings 22, highlighting that the unity of worship described in the book only appears historically for the first time during

[1] De Pury and Römer highlight these as the issues that 18th century scholars addressed. Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 32.
[2] Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Halle, 1806).
[3] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 33–35.
[4] John W. Rogerson, *W.M.L. De Wette, Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography* (JSOTSup 126; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 58.
[5] Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Reimer, 1817); *A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament* (trans. Theodore Parker; Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1850), 2:134.

the reign of Josiah.[6] He points out that the religious practice in parts of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, does not match the picture of the Israelite cult in Exodus and Numbers, where sacrifices were offered at many local shrines, as well as wherever Israel gathered. Also, non-priests sometimes played priestly roles (i.e. David when he brings the Ark to Jerusalem). He therefore concludes that before the time of David and Solomon, Yahweh was worshipped at many holy places and even after the building of the temple, worship continued at these places. It was only with the reign of Josiah that the freedom of religious worship comes under attack.[7] De Wette also suggests that there is a unity apparent in the book of Kings, in which no "marks of the insertion of different narratives, or of a compilation from them" is seen.[8] He dates the conclusion of Kings toward the end of the Babylonian exile.[9]

Since de Wette, scholars have debated the origins of the Deuteronomistic History and even if such a history exists. There is no longer a unified consensus on the existence of DtrH.[10] While there are detractors from this theory (including Auld,[11] Knauf,[12] Westermann,[13] and Kaiser[14]) who contend that a Deuteronomistic History does not exist, they do not deny that, at some level, there is a connection between the books as well as some commonality of themes and ideas. The focus on finding these deuteronomistic connections has manifested in debates about the origins and number of redactors. This has occurred to such an extent that those who deny the existence of DtrH do so because they argue that the redactional layers get so separated, amplified and multiplied that it is difficult to maintain that the work of so many hands and varying times can possibly be unified. It reaches a point that there are so many levels of redaction that a scholar such as John Van Seters, in an essay in a volume on the future of the Deuteronomistic History,[15] wonders, "can DtrH avoid death by redaction?"[16] Instead, with encouragement he argues:

> The first task of redaction criticism of the DtrH is not to continue to split it up into small fragments on the basis of rather dubious principles, but to identify the large amount of later additions and to retrieve the core work. It is only in this way that

[6] Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi Libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctioris opus esse monstratur* (Jena, 1805); Wette, *A Critical and Historical Introduction*, 2:150.
[7] Rogerson, *W.M.L. De Wette*, 59–60.
[8] Wette, *A Critical and Historical Introduction*, 2:239–40.
[9] Ibid., 2:248.
[10] Gary N. Knoppers, "Is there a Future for the Deuteronomistic History," in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Thomas Römer; Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000), 120.
[11] A. Graeme Auld, "The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic.," in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. Steven McKenzie and Linda Schearing; JSOT 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 116–126.
[12] Ernst Axel Knauf, "Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' (DtrH) Exist?," in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. Albert de Pury, Jean-Daniel Macchi, and Thomas Römer; Journal for the Study of the Old Testament; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 388–397.
[13] Claus Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (Theologische Bücherei 87; Gutersloh, Germany: Chr Kaiser, 1994).
[14] Otto Kaiser, "Das Verhältnis der Erzählung vom König David zum sogenannten deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: am Beispiel von 1 Kön 1-2 untersucht," in *Sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids* (ed. Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer; Freiburg, Schweiz: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 94–122.
[15] Thomas Römer, ed., *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000).
[16] John Van Seters, "The Deuteronomistic History: Can it Avoid Death by Redaction?," in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Thomas Römer; Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000), 213–222.

its unity and consistency of perspective will become apparent. Redaction criticism need not be the death of the DtrH as Noth understood it. On the contrary, it can be the means by which to revive this important thesis to new life and vitality.[17]

The questions of coherence and consistency of the books making up the History as well as whether a Deuteronomistic History exists are closely linked to the consideration of the role of the Deuteronomist(s), his(their) historiographical interests, and historical context. Scholars since the 19th century have grappled with constructing theories of historians who had specific historical and compositional motivations that guided the process of historiography.

§

The Legacy of Heinrich Ewald

An early advocate for a specific redactional theory was Heinrich Ewald who published the six volumes of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* between 1843 and 1859.[18] Ewald followed up on de Wette's contentions that the references in Deuteronomy to the temple and Jerusalem preclude dating to Moses' time, as its setting maintains, but rather these references seem more appropriate to the period of unity of worship established during the reign of Josiah.[19] Based on de Wette, Ewald also suggests a Josianic date for Deuteronomy. He takes this further, assessing that Deuteronomy and the reform of Josiah influenced the historian in the composition and redaction of Judges and Kings.[20] Yet, for Ewald, the role of the Deuteronomist in the redactional process is incomplete. He sees the hand of the Deuteronomist in the editing, but contends that deuteronomic ideas are "as yet very far from entirely penetrating and remodeling that early work."[21] This attests to a use of older sources.

Ewald theorizes on the major concerns guiding the work of his scholarly successors: the dating and extent of redactional levels and Dtr's historiographical process. Despite this, surprisingly few of the scholars of the 20th century cite Ewald as influencing their similar theories, despite Ewald's renown as a scholar. Anticipating Martin Noth, Ewald highlights the speeches that the Deuteronomist includes as part of "a consistent plan."[22] Similar to the hypothesis that Frank Moore Cross published in the 1970s,[23] Ewald posits a theory of double redaction. The first is an editor who "remodeled" "an old historical work…according to Deuteronomic ideas." He dates this author as "close to the prosperous reign of Josiah."[24] Ewald locates this version to the reign of Josiah because the History belies a nation weakened by Assyrian power, but still maintains a kingdom of David and a temple and the hope that these

[17] Ibid., 222.
[18] Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*.
[19] Wette, *A Critical and Historical Introduction*, 2:150.
[20] Ewald, *The History of Israel*, 1:156.
[21] Ibid., 1:157.
[22] Ibid., 1:119.
[23] Cross, "CMHE," 274–289.
[24] Ewald, *The History of Israel*, 1:157.

institutions will continue. This is most appropriate to the context of the Josianic reform when the declining kingdom seemed to have a resurgence.[25]

Ewald's second redactor is the last editor of Kings. He is the final author and collector who edited Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings, including them together as a whole. He wrote the introduction to Judges in exile, creating a book that functions as an introduction to the history of the monarchy.[26] This second editor also added content to the biography of David, including 2 Samuel 21-24. The original portrait of David was idealized.

Ewald also begins to describe the method of a deuteronomistic author/redactor and the relationship between the History and Deuteronomy. The Deuteronomist "attempted most rigorously and emphatically to recommend the old law, altered and renovated in such a manner as to suit his times, and to employ all the force of prophetic discourse in representing it as the sole salvation of the kingdom."[27] Ewald's description is of a writer who wanted to update the law to his contemporary situation. Anticipating Baruch Halpern's idea of a Deuteronomist with "antiquarian interests," Ewald describes the relationship that the writer creates between Deuteronomy and the historical books in incorporating what he calls "historical lore" with his own agenda:

> All this expenditure of antiquarian learning, however, is incurred, assuredly not in order to help in the history or narrative itself, but simply to aid the legislative and prophetical aim of the writer, and accordingly the historical observations, lavishly poured forth in some places, are generally broken off suddenly so as not to encroach upon that which interests the author more than the history itself.[28]

Ewald makes clear that the author is more concerned with his ideological perspective than the history itself.

This assessment continues in Ewald's description of the way in which the Deuteronomist functioned in writing the rest of his History and the way he used his sources and incorporated them together in his process of redaction. The Deuteronomist tried

> to fuse [material] into one narrative by proper selection and abridgement, the rich but not always self-consistent materials which this diffuse literature had produced. And more completely the Deuteronomic ideas took possession of the extensive field of the history of the Judges and the Kings, and strove to illuminate and recast its more important features, the easier did it become to omit from the fuller earlier works much which under this new light seemed to have lost its importance.[29]

Dtr treats the history as "a medium for his own views."[30]

---

[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., 1:159, 161.
[27] Ibid., 1:118.
[28] Ibid., 1:126.
[29] Ibid., 1:156.
[30] Ibid., 1:165.

Additionally, Ewald suggests a difference in the way that the Deuteronomist used his sources in Samuel and 1 Kings 1-2 from the rest of Kings. In Samuel, it is clear to see the older material is collected and blended, but in the rest of Kings it is harder to trace the origins. He takes the work of a "Prophetical Narrator" and blends "into one narrative with it all the materials he wished to take from other works, as well as additions of his own…[He] used his own judgment in the selection of his materials, and often placed them near together, with but little attempt at amalgamation."[31] As the content of the History got close to his contemporary period, the Deuteronomist included more details and more original composition.[32] Ewald's construction of the historiographical process of Dtr is very similar to that developed by scholars of the 20th century (as reflected in the work of Martin Noth, Frank Cross, and Baruch Halpern to be discussed below), although it is generally unacknowledged. Dtr adopts and adapts his sources, making choices in selection and composing original material to flesh out the overall narrative told by the book. It is also possible to see how even in the mid-19th century the concerns dealt with in this dissertation (Dtr's use of sources, the historian's intentions, and his historical context) were already part of the scholarly discussion.

Is Composition Unified? The Legacy of Martin Noth

While scholars certainly dealt with these issues during the intervening century, the contemporary history of the scholarship on the Deuteronomistic History primarily takes as its starting point the work of Martin Noth. Although scholars may agree, disagree, or tweak Noth's theses, they all contend with him. What is unique about Noth's approach and may have been the catalyst for the scholarly response is what de Pury and Römer describe as "a matter not so much of indentifying or of distinguishing the redactional layers but of raising a question about the *literary plan* that controlled the redaction."[33] This is a question of historiography and the historiographical method. Building on the established work of de Wette, Ewald, Kuenen,[34] Wellhausen, and others, Noth looks beyond the layers of redaction and attempts to derive a description of the historiography of the Deuteronomistic History. He attempts to answer the questions about the coherence and consistency of the History, laying out an organizational literary plan for the work of Dtr. Noth adds authorial artistry and narrative intentions to the concept of deuteronomism, the influence of Deuteronomy on the Former Prophets, and the use of vocabulary and phrases uncommon to the Tetrateuch, which had long been established to a greater or lesser degree. Noth sees Dtr as an author, encouraged by his singular perspective and characteristic linguistic usages.

Noth begins by offering the question of consistency and coherence: "Do we in fact have here a comprehensive framework indicating a larger literary unit which has adopted much traditional material?"[35] In response, he sets out to prove that the work is a self-contained whole. He points to the work of this author as using language and ideology similar to that found in

[31] Ibid., 1:158.
[32] Ibid., 1:159.
[33] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 47.
[34] Abraham Kuenen, *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzmeling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (3 vols.; Leiden, 1861); *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua)* (trans. Philip H. Wicksteed; London: Macmillan, 1886).
[35] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 15.

deuteronomic law.[36] On a linguistic basis, it is possible to see the work of a single deuteronomistic editor or different editors with a similar style. It is the linguistic uniformity – the use of a characteristic vocabulary, diction, repetition of phrases and sentence structure – that suggests that the work is self-contained.[37]

Noth derives a structure that focuses on the literary unity of the History. This is the framework that Dtr used in order to organize and bring together the disparate traditions. Noth's foundational evidence centered around: (1) structural organization – at the important points in the course of history bringing in speeches of the important people;[38] (2) smooth transitions between books;[39] (3) diversity between the old traditional material and the coherent uniformity of the deuteronomistic parts;[40] (4) a date of 480 years from the exodus to the dedication of the temple based on calculations found in DtrH.[41]

According to Noth, Dtr constructs his history by bringing "forward the leading personages with a speech, long or short, which looks forward and backward in an attempt to interpret the course of events, and draws the relevant practical conclusions about what people should do." This technique is not used outside DtrH.[42] Breaking with earlier scholars, Noth asserts a Dtr who is involved with compilation and composition, creating an intentional unity within the History. In no uncertain terms, Noth declares that "Dtr. was not merely an editor but the author of a history which brought together material from highly varied traditions and arranged it according to a carefully conceived plan."[43] This also leads to the integration of the ideology of Deuteronomy and the question of the consistency of the books. In this way, Noth's Dtr incorporated deuteronomic law and then added other sources, organizing and shaping them and adding his own evaluations (often through speeches by major characters) at important points in the History. Noth appeals to a Dtr as author and redactor, asserting a unity of composition. Yet he acknowledges that inconsistencies in perspective exist within the History, which he attributes to the redactional sources. Yet he also contends that unity exists for Dtr as author in shaping and composing the History according to his own design.[44]

According to Noth, Dtr's main goal was theological. Dtr wanted "to teach the true meaning of the history of Israel," which was the moral decline of Israel and the futile warnings and punishments that ended with total annihilation. Divine retribution is a unifying factor in the course of events. Dtr approached the history from a theological perspective that viewed the goal of deuteronomic law as "intend[ing] to keep them [Israel] from forsaking God."[45] Israel has a special relationship with God, based in a "covenant." "Dtr. saw divine intervention in history."[46] Dtr was not interested in the cult and presupposes that "sacrifice was inevitably a customary

[36] Ibid., 17.
[37] Ibid., 18.
[38] Ibid., 18, 24.
[39] Ibid., 24.
[40] Ibid., 25.
[41] Ibid., 43–4.
[42] Ibid., 18.
[43] Ibid., 26.
[44] Gary N. Knoppers, "Introduction," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 2.
[45] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 134.
[46] Ibid., 135.

form of worship."[47] He was not interested in the temple: "For him the temple is little more than a place toward which one turns in prayer, the location of the invisible divine presence."[48] Key to Noth's interpretation is an exilic perspective, writers who are living without a temple. In this way, Dtr's "concern with the temple as the place of sacrifice is purely negative."[49] Dtr does not answer the questions of whether the people were hopeful for a new order to emerge from the catastrophes of their history. Instead, Dtr "saw the divine judgment which was acted out in his account of the external collapse of Israel as a nation as something final and definitive, and he expressed no hope for the future, not even in the very modest and simple form of an expectation that the deported and dispersed people would be gathered together."[50] Dtr "thought that the order of things as put forward in the deuteronomic law had reached a final end, an end which his whole history is intent upon explaining as a divine judgment."[51]

It is with this concept of the unity of composition that Noth rejects the popular idea of two stages of Deuteronomistic composition (similar to Ewald's theory). In viewing the books from Joshua to Kings as a unity because of the use of the same style, dating becomes clear; the earlier dates given by scholars are too early for the entirety of the composition.[52] The negative themes, treatment of the monarchy, and punishment of Judah do not make sense in a pre-exilic setting. Instead, Noth begins with an exilic date for the entire history. The History ends in 2 Kings 25:27-30 with the release of Jehoiachin by the Babylonian king, which can be dated to 562 B.C.E. This gives a definitive *terminus a quo* for the History.[53] Noth does not entertain the possibility that these verses could have been a later addition to the History, allowing for an earlier start date.

Most of Noth's dating argument is based on the perspective of various themes and their most appropriate context. Noth highlights that Dtr focuses on the importance of the monarchy. Even the narratives that precede the establishment of the monarchy function in the discussion of monarchy. As such, for example, Judges functions as a time filler between the occupation and the monarchy, demonstrating how the people's fidelity to Yahweh deteriorated during the Judges period.[54] Writing from an exilic perspective, Dtr depicts a view of the monarchy from hindsight, after its destruction, creating an inevitable situation in which "the monarchy led the Israelite nations to destruction."[55] In his collection of the history of the monarchy, "Dtr. abandoned his normal practice of basically letting the old accounts speak for themselves and setting forth his own theological interpretation of history only in the introductions and conclusions. Here, instead he composes the narrative himself and develops it at length."[56]

[47] Ibid., 138.
[48] Ibid., 139.
[49] Ibid., 140.
[50] Ibid., 143.
[51] Ibid., 144.
[52] Ibid., 20.
[53] Ibid., 27.
[54] Ibid., 76.
[55] Ibid., 77.
[56] Ibid.

Noth's exilic dating of the History is contingent on the fact that he viewed DtrH as having been written on the decline; divine judgment of 587 left no hope for the future.[57] In this way, Noth saw DtrH as "a type of *theodicy*, an attempt to comprehend and justify divine judgment." The History functioned "as an extended lament over the repeated failure of the people of God and the resulting loss of the good gifts of God."[58] In this way, Noth reads the text as anti-monarchic. The kings of Israel led the people down this road. Noth accounts for any pro-monarchic attitudes as reflective of older traditions that were incorporated by Dtr. What is original about Noth's theory is first the claim that there is continuity among the books and second that he rejects the theories that the Pentateuchal sources continue into the historical books.[59] This is the lasting influence that Noth has on current scholarship; most scholars accept that DtrH is a coherent collection of texts crafted intentionally by Dtr.

While Noth maintains unity and accounts for diversity through attribution to the source texts Dtr uses, inconsistencies in themes often demonstrate consistency through multiple narratives. As such, Noth's theory of the unity of composition and redaction is too simplistic to explain the complexity of perspectives illustrated throughout the history. The main criticism against Noth is whether a one author explanation can adequately account for the diversity of the material and perspectives within DtrH. The prevailing opinion is no – you cannot attribute DtrH to only one author.[60]

The major arguments against Noth emerge as responses to two of his main assertions – that DtrH is the product of an exilic setting and the unitary work of one individual. The prevailing opposition primarily falls into two camps; Frank Moore Cross and his students ("the Harvard School") take up the issue of refuting an exilic context for the primary composition and redaction of the History, while Rudolf Smend and his students ("the Göttingen School") challenge the issue of the unity of composition, but maintain an exilic date. While these scholars posit the bases of their theories almost forty years ago, their disciples who have revised and enlarged the ideas are still primarily divided along these lines, spanning the oceanic divide, figuratively and literally.

How to Date Dtr after Noth?

Cross builds on Noth's deuteronomistic theory of viewing the books of Joshua to Kings as a single historical work of diverse sources that expresses the theological and historical slant of the editor, using a framework marked by speeches, patterned after Deuteronomy, characterized by a unique literary style. Cross opposes Noth's dating of the work to the exilic period, primarily based on the appropriateness of major themes to the historical context. While Noth saw the major theme of the History as doom, manifesting in a history of Israel that is a story of apostasy and idolatry, Cross sees a current of positive perspective running through the narrative. To Noth, this

[57] Martin Dietrich, "Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History," in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (ed. Steven McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 171.
[58] Ibid., 173.
[59] Iain Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter, 1988), 5.
[60] Knoppers, "Introduction," 5.

negative theme was most suitable to an exilic audience.[61] In contrast, Cross identifies a positive outlook that he views as more fitting to a pre-exilic context and attributes the more negative themes to a second, exilic editor. Similar to the theory of Ewald (although he does not cite him), Cross contends for a theory of double redaction, naming these two editors, Dtr^1 and Dtr^2.

Cross identifies two contrasting themes in Dtr^1, Jeroboam's sin and David's faithfulness. Jeroboam's sin is the northern theme of this editor, while the central event in Judah is David and his establishment of the sanctuary in Jerusalem; this contrasts Jeroboam's establishment of the rival shrine at Bethel.[62] The climax of these themes comes in the person of Josiah in "extirpating the counter-cultus."[63] According to Cross, these two foci have older roots: "One stemming from the old Deuteronomic covenant theology which regarded destruction of dynasty and people as tied necessarily to apostasy, and a second, drawn from the royal ideology in Judah: the eternal promises to David."[64] This manifests in two versions of the Deuteronomistic History, the primary one written in the age of Josiah and whose goal was programmatic reform and a secondary revision that functioned as a sermon to the exiles. In this way, the theme of hope in the original work is overwritten and contradicted. Dtr^2 attempts to update the history in the post-exilic world. He adds Manasseh's sin as the reason for the demise of Judah. This was an incident not found in the earlier Deuteronomistic History. This exilic edition preserves the work of the Josianic Dtr and adds events and causalities without completing a stylistic revision. There is no peroration (the addition of speeches at the end and beginning of significant episodes is a signature of Dtr's style) at Jerusalem's fall and the climactic existence of Josiah becomes anti-climatic after the fate of Judah is sealed by Manasseh.[65] In this way, Cross contends for two redactors but maintains Noth's theory of the unity of composition because the primary edition was the pre-exilic one, and the exilic version only consists of supplemental additions, not a total rewriting. This is not unlike the similar arguments that Noth made for the incorporation of inconsistencies; inconsistencies reflect the perspectives of source documents or are later additions.[66]

Cross's theory offers a useful approach to the positive perspectives prevalent throughout the History. It is a convincing revision of Noth's theory of doom and his attribution of any positive elements to the perspectives of Dtr's sources. The optimistic, monarchical ideology that Cross highlights fits better in a pre-exilic context than an exilic one. Yet, according to de Pury and Römer, Cross's construction of the composition of DtrH in two main steps shows "an improper simplification of the diachronic and thematic complexity still perceptible within this great historiographical corpus."[67] My schema of historiographical priorities contributes a more nuanced understanding of the work of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist. This offers both a synchronic look at the process of historiography and takes into account literary methods of selection and composition.

---

[61] Cross, "CMHE," 275.
[62] Ibid., 282.
[63] Ibid., 283.
[64] Ibid., 284.
[65] Ibid., 287–9.
[66] Noth contests the idea of "two independent and self-contained literary units in Judg. 2.11-3.6" and instead suggests that the passage "shows a 'Deuteronomistic' foundation which is augmented in various ways by secondary sources." Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 21.
[67] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 67.

Also, one has to wonder whether the identification of themes and the designation to the most plausible and appropriate historical context is methodologically sound on its own merit. Does the attribution of context require more evidence? Richard Nelson offers more supporting arguments as well as addresses some of the criticisms cast against Cross. In the area of thematic attribution, contrary to Cross, Nelson suggests that mention of an exile or disaster is not an automatic sign of exilic composition. This potential outcome is mentioned early on by prophets. The eighth century conquest and deportation of Israel would have been a clue that this was a possibility.[68] Nelson describes the contention that the mention of exile means an exilic context as an argument having "little value," implying that themes can have multiple plausible and appropriate contexts. He also argues against the idea that historical information preserved into exile, does not necessarily have to be pre-exilic, as well as an assertion that literary style not be exclusively late.[69] Halpern also addresses the issue of the concept of exile in the pre-exilic period as being a date indicator. Similar to Nelson, Halpern does not accept Cross's theory that conditional monarchy must be a product of exilic reality. Exile had been a reality for Israel from the mid-8th century. The pre-exilic history could incorporate differing opinions on the (un)conditional promise.[70]

In contrast, Nelson suggests that the arguments that are "valuable" to support a double redaction theory are based on structure, literary criticism, themes, and theological perspectives. He argues that there is a change in structure within the history. This is seen in 2 Kings 21:10-15 and 24:2 (the prediction of inevitable punishment for Manasseh's sins). He asserts that this "is of a different, more generalized nature than the prophecy-fulfillment structure of the earlier parts of the history."[71] He also proposes that literary critical irregularities and stylistic variations are evidence of multiple redactions.[72] Like Cross, he indentifies the existence of an ambivalent attitude toward the Davidic dynasty, which contains both unconditional and conditional promises. He asserts that a pro-David attitude is more appropriate to a pre-exilic writer, writing during the reign of Josiah, the "new David" (2 Kgs 23:25).[73] This argument is one that is used successfully against exilic dating and the proponents of a primarily exilic DtrH. How to deal with the conflicting conditional and unconditional promises is a major sticking point for accepting the exilic perspective. Contrary to those who insist that both perspectives are exilic (à la Noth), Erik Eynikel suggests that "a solution such as presented by Cross seems much more obvious: unconditional texts are pre-exilic, conditional are exilic."[74] Continuing to follow Cross, Nelson also sees the themes of the promise to David and sin of Jeroboam climaxing in the reign Josiah, but he also recognizes the "contradictory sub-theme of an inevitable punishment for Manasseh's sins, [as] a theological motif out of tune with the rest of the history,"[75] suggesting its exilic (and secondary) origin. Against Eynikel, I see both the unconditional and conditional as part of the pre-exilic edition.

---

[68] Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 25.
[69] Ibid., 26.
[70] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 114.
[71] Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 27.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid., 28.
[74] Erik Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 29.
[75] Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 28.

The major issue addressed by scholars in considering redaction is the contradictory attitude towards the Davidic dynasty and the commitment to conditional and unconditional promises.[76] This is one problem many scholars have with Noth's constructions – how does one contend with the conflicting attitudes towards the monarchy? Noth suggested contradictions were the early perspectives of Dtr's source documents. Instead, Nelson argues that conditional promises are not evidence for an exilic writer, but unconditional ones are evidence of a pre-exilic writer, suggesting that scholars should not confuse "the promises of an eternal possession of the throne of the North by Davidides contingent upon Solomon's obedience" with "the unconditional dynastic oracles concerning the dominion over Judah and Jerusalem which are dependent only upon the faithfulness of Yahweh."[77] For Nelson, the theme of the unconditional promise, especially as expressed in 2 Samuel 7, is a structural element that was not "merely passively cop[ied]" but Dtr "recalled it in later chapters, and even added his own insertion so that it might better serve his purpose. Yet he let stand unaltered the strongly unconditional dynastic promise (11b-16), making no attempt to conditionalize it." For Nelson, Dtr agrees that Yahweh's promise to David was unconditional.[78]

Like Cross, for Nelson the optimistic outlook and positive attitude towards the monarchy suggest that the greater part of the History makes more sense as a product of the Josianic period, an era, according to Nelson, that was "marked by nationalism, reunification, centralization, a flourishing of prophets (Jeremiah, Zephaniah), dynastic pride, and a desire to return to the sources of the national life."[79] In this way, the History is used as royal propaganda to support Josiah's policies, to meet the opposition that called the program revolutionary, appealing to the antiquity and authority of deuteronomic law, demonstrating that centralization was a feature of early worship and that Jerusalem was the place chosen for centralization. For Nelson, "the historian's prevailing mood is optimism. In the past Yahweh consistently saved his people when they repented of their sins, and now the divine promises are being fulfilled in Josiah's person and policies."[80]

Nelson's conclusion, reflective of the theory of the Cross School, is that

> the Deuteronomistic history was an optimistic and nationalistic defense of the Davidic dynasty and the policies of Josiah. This was effected by a review of Israel's past, of Yahweh's history of grace to a sinful people, and of his promises to the house of David. The exilic editor, on the other hand, wished to justify Yahweh's punishment of the people by a portrayal of how disobedience and deafness to the warnings of his messengers, culminating in Manasseh's apostasy, enraged Yahweh to the point of destroying Judah as he had first destroyed Israel. However, acceptance of the justice of the punishment by the people and proper repentance may motivate him to forgive and permit the captives to reach a *modus vivendi* with their conquerors.[81]

[76] Ibid., 99.
[77] Ibid., 104–5.
[78] Ibid., 107.
[79] Ibid., 121.
[80] Ibid., 122.
[81] Ibid., 126–7.

Gary Knoppers, who falls into the Harvard camp, arguing for a double redaction theory with the primary location of activity in the pre-exilic period, focuses on an additional theme pertaining to the monarchy as justification for a pre-exilic date. He highlights that Dtr is focused on the united monarchy, using it as the theme that informs the entire history. He supports this by considering the amount of space given to the united monarchy in contrast to the number of years that it actually existed. Dtr's investment in the united monarchy is connected to his interest in the divided monarchy. For Knoppers, "the themes and structure which the Deuteronomist established in 1 Kings 1-14 set the stage for his entire coverage of the divided monarchy."[82] The narratives about Solomon's early reign establish the Davidic monarchy and temple and Solomon's apostasy results in the creation of two states. This concern appears within my construction of the prototype strategy in which David, king of a united kingdom, is the paradigm and Josiah who reunites the kingdom is the only one to live up to the Davidic prototype.

The alternative to Cross and the Harvard School's view of a double redaction history, taken up by German scholars, advocates for an exclusively exilic date. In 1971, Rudolf Smend presented an analysis of Joshua 1; 13; 23-24 and Judges 1-2:5, passages that had been previously recognized by Noth as Dtr. Smend suggested that in these passages there is a contradiction in the conception of the conquest, suggesting that many verses within these chapters were later additions.[83] He views the narrative, which describes Joshua conquering the entire country and exterminating the ancient inhabitants, as the first edition of Dtr, but secondary passages illustrate a cohesive but contrary alternative conquest narrative that was not considered complete and left many of the former inhabitants still living in the land. Smend suggests that this Dtr redaction be divided into two different layers, yet both exilic.[84] He identifies these two layers as DtrH (or DtrG, for the Deuteronomistic *Geschichtsschreiber*), the Deuteronomistic Historian who created the first edition largely focused on presenting a historical account, and DtrN, a nomistic redactor who re-edits DtrH, correcting it and adding other material according to the law. While Smend's theory disregards the idea of a unitary composition, it is similar to Noth's theory that sees the theological intention of Dtr as explaining the catastrophe to the people in the exile, maintaining the same negative outlook as Noth.[85] One of the main problems with Smend's essay is that he argues from a very small number of texts.

Smend's student Walter Dietrich continues this line of thought looking to the book of Kings and expanding the number of texts involved in these redactions.[86] Dietrich identifies a third layer of redaction that contains prophetic judgments, designating it DtrP. Dietrich's DtrP is an author and redactor who integrates the Deuteronomistic History with pre-Dtr material. History according to DtrP is the fulfillment of prophetic predictions. All three of these redactors are exilic; he specifically dates DtrH ending with 2 Kings 25:21 to around 580 B.C.E., DtrN ending

[82] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:9.
[83] Rudolf Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker: ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1971), 494–509.
[84] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 67.
[85] Ibid., 68.
[86] Walter Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

with the rehabilitation of Jehoiachin around 560 B.C.E., and DtrP as somewhere in between, but located in Palestine, likely Jerusalem.[87]

Timo Veijola, another student of Smend, focuses on DtrN in Samuel and Kings.[88] He evaluates the books from their theological perspectives, considering the attitude each redactor has of the institution of monarchy. Again, here we see another instance of dividing the conflicting attitudes towards the monarchy as indicators of independent redactors. Veijola attributes those texts that are favorable towards the monarchy and attempt to legitimate the Davidic dynasty to DtrH. DtrP, on the other hand, has a negative view of the monarchy while DtrN criticizes the monarchy and tries to "clean up" the narratives of David and Solomon.[89] This combined theory concentrates on theological intention, attempting to explain the catastrophe of the exile.[90] Dietrich further explains that the first redactor was pro-monarchic; the later redactor, late exilic or perhaps early post-exilic is anti-monarchic. This produces a counterpoint in which the redactor reflects a pro-monarchic stance after the fall of the kingdom and an anti-monarchic one once restitution becomes a real possibility.[91] Like the Cross School, much of the source designation is based on the perceived attitude towards the monarchy, yet Veijola dates both positive and negative attitudes to the exile.

While many scholars have adopted the Smend-Dietrich-Veijola theory, it has the potential danger of infinitely multiplying the number of redactions. Also problematic is that the theory never considers the possibility of a pre-exilic date for any of the texts. Like Noth, who sees the end of 2 Kings 25 (the release of Jehoiachin) as the *terminus a quo* for the history, since it is the last piece of historical information included, the Göttingen School maintains this same perspective, rather than viewing the report of the end of the monarchy as a later addition. As such, the continued discussion of the dating of DtrH revolves around this pre-exilic/exilic alternative. According to de Pury and Römer, "The question of future prospects presented in an exilic edition of DH remains very much under discussion. Can we really actually imagine that such a historiography would have been composed in order to explain Judah's national catastrophe? Many scholars consider this Nothian hypothesis improbable."[92]

I have two main concerns with the Smend-Dietrich hypothesis. The first is methodological. The Göttingen School divides its redactional layers by the subject matter addressed in the text. Could not (and likely so) the different subjects (law, prophecy, kingship) be of interest to a single theological thinker? Instead, these scholars assign each subject to a different redactional level. It is more methodologically sound to approach the different perspectives thematically, as the Harvard School does. Nelson suggests looking at the "genuinely contradictory themes or tendencies and try[ing] to relate them to the historical situation of a pre-exilic or exilic author" rather than assuming that an author is only interested in one topic.[93] The other problem with the Smend theory is that it gives up on the idea of an author-redactor. By

[87] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 69.
[88] Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975).
[89] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 70.
[90] Ibid., 68.
[91] Dietrich, "Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History," 156.
[92] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 135.
[93] Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 22.

dividing the text up into so many strands, as Thomas Römer says, it "theoretically contradict[s] the idea of a unified, coherent Deuteronomistic History."[94] Additionally, the theory of the nomistic editor as the last set of hands to work on the history is extremely problematic. How could the first two strata (before the nomistic) be Deuteronomistic? DtrH cannot exist without Deuteronomy! Furthermore, some passages do not fit into the categories laid out by Smend and students.[95] Similarly, Provan is concerned with the intricacy of the web of explanation: "The very complexity of the Göttingen thesis at this point, even in its milder forms, prompts one to ask whether there is not something seriously wrong with the basic assumptions which lie behind it. The evidence can be much more simply explained if it is supposed that only the later DtrN material is to be associated with the DtrN who has edited DtrG [DtrH], and that the primary DtrN material is from the hand of DtrG himself."[96]

A positive side of Smend's theory of multiple redactors, which Provan points out, allows Smend "to resolve within a Dtr framework a tension which had long been discussed in OT scholarship, between the two contradictory pictures of the conquest, as well as resolving a major problem created by Noth himself, in his attribution of so much material to secondary Dtr editing without allowing for a second Dtr editor."[97] Consistent additional material can be grouped as a consciously developed redactional layer, rather than isolated additions, which when given this designation usually reflect some aberration (thematic or otherwise) that has been tacked on somewhat haphazardly to the primary text. Smend's theory allows for this material, later additions to an exilic text, to be considered intentional revisions, rather than just additions.

An alternative to fully disregarding exilic dating in favor of a Josianic date is suggested by Thomas Römer. He proposes that if DtrH were the work of a Josianic Dtr then it functions as nationalist propaganda but "one should not think of a *unified* literary work under Josiah, but rather a collection of different documents (scrolls) expressing the preoccupations of the nationalistic party, which may have been assembled in a library of a sort."[98] The Josianic scribes must have had royal chronicles from the northern and southern kingdoms, to which they refer.[99]

A major difference between the two schools is their approach to the unity of the History. Is it on the level of composition or redaction? There are too many theological tensions and too much literary-critical evidence to say that the History was authored by one person. The existence of theological tensions in the text is an issue for the unity of composition. Similarly, the proponents of the different scholarly schools designate similar perspectives to either levels of redaction or sources. The difference comes down to this question. For example, the concept of redactional level DtrP is not so different from the idea of a prophetic record, advocated for by Campbell and others, and what I consider in the second of my selectional priorities, loyalty to the prophetic tradition.[100] Highlighting a prophetic text, whether it is a redaction or source, acknowledges a significant number of texts with a prophetic perspective. I agree with Provan

---

[94] Thomas Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction* (New York: T. & T. Clark Publishers, 2007), 30.
[95] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:39.
[96] Provan, *Hezekiah*, 26.
[97] Ibid., 17.
[98] Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History*, 71.
[99] Ibid., 103.
[100] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*.

who contends that it makes more sense to explain unity in the editing process rather than in the sources: "Theological tensions and Dtr additions taken together, then, encourage one to believe that the redactional theories about the way in which the DH came into existence are closer to the mark than the theory of unified authorship."[101] Noth highlights that Dtr imposed literary, thematic, and chronological unity on his work, through selection, addition, and composition. This is in essence the perspective promoted by my schema of historiographical poetics. Because of these efforts, the History is not a compilation of loosely connected texts, but a unified work with deliberate intention and design.[102] The Cross hypothesis approaches the text in a similar way, advocating for a redactor with deliberate intentions, in style, perspective, and content. In contrast, the Smend hypothesis, with its multiple levels of redaction does not subscribe to Noth's theory of unity and an overall, intentional narrative framework. Instead, each stratum has its own perspective and is integrated together, but the independent styles, themes, and interests are still seen.

Is Consensus Possible?

For much of the last forty years, the possibility of compromise between the supporters of a Josianic date and those of an exilic one has seemed unlikely. This debate has even been described as something of a "holy war," but more recently, there has been movement by both sides towards more common ground. [103] Also, there have been assessors of the debate who have highlighted that the two camps are not as entirely oppositional as previously believed. Such scholars include Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Enzo Cortese.

Cortese considers the possibility of a rapprochement between the two schools, suggesting that part of the problem in coming to agreement is the legacy of Martin Noth and his influence over all subsequent scholarship of the Deuteronomistic History. While Noth's theories have been widely accepted for seventy years, scholars challenge several elements of his arguments. Despite this, because of his acclaim and influence, scholars have been hesitant to depart from his ideas entirely. While Ernst Knauf rightly contends that "Noth's Dtr has been abandoned by everyone,"[104] few scholars are willing to admit it. Noth is often considered (while the history of scholarship from the 19th century does not confirm this) the "father" of the study of the Deuteronomistic History. Regardless of Noth's prestige, both the Harvard and Göttingen Schools argue for multiple levels of redaction that contradict Noth's theory of a unitary composition. The influence of Noth and the idea of a unitary composition are especially problematic for any kind of pre-exilic dating, as an exilic redaction is readily apparent and accepted by all scholars at some level.[105] Yet, while almost all scholars see multiple redactions in DtrH, contrary to Noth, many are unwilling to give up the anti-Nothian "prejudice" against a pre-exilic date for a first redaction. This is especially pertinent since there is consensus that pre-exilic parts of Deuteronomy exist. Cortese wonders why if such is true for Deuteronomy, the possibility of a

[101] Provan, *Hezekiah*, 24.
[102] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:18.
[103] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 95.
[104] Knauf, "Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' (DtrH) Exist?," 390.
[105] Enzo Cortese, "Theories Concerning Dtr: A Possible Rapprochement," in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989* (ed. C. Brekelmans and J. Lust; BETL 94; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 181.

Josianic redaction to other books of DtrH is denied?[106] Increasingly, there seems to be a movement within the German school to support a first redaction of DtrH in the Josianic era.[107] This becomes something of a slippery slope; once it is accepted that there is some pre-exilic redaction, it becomes hard to deny that parts of the David story are not pre-exilic.[108] Cortese suggests that this direction, of acknowledging some pre-exilic composition and redaction, is the road to compromise. He states that "by situating the beginnings of the literary activity of the Dtr milieu in the time of Josiah…it is possible to imagine the establishment of a small library of texts containing propaganda in favour of the ('Dtr') policy of Josiah. That library would comprise Deuteronomy, perhaps a version of the conquest account exactly copying the Assyrian model (Joshua), and an edition of Kings (+Samuel*?) showing that Josiah is a worthy successor of David."[109] Even admitting to this small amount of pre-exilic activity, this possible position also returns to questions of indentifying activity on a level of redaction or of sources and deuteronomistic composition.

This issue, allowing for even minimal pre-exilic attribution, opens a Pandora's Box for many, as suddenly when accepting the possibility of the existence of pre-exilic redaction, many texts seem undeniably pre-exilic. This is also closely related to the identification of positive versus negative attitudes towards the monarchy and the overall optimistic versus pessimistic views of the majority of the history and its primary redaction. The designated historical context, exilic versus pre-exilic, contributes to the overall understanding of the redactor's outlook on the world; is this a triumphalist history of the Josianic court or a theodicy making sense of the fall of Judah and the exile?[110] This thinking returns to the arguments of which themes are most "appropriate" to which context. As discussed above, while of heuristic value, this method is extremely speculative.

Another major problem that impedes the compromise of these perspectives is the way in which the opposition deals with the others' key texts. There is a certain amount of an "us and them" attitude in the designation of redactions. Even for Noth and his hypothesis of the unity of composition, texts that do not fit into a certain compositional and redactional theory are designated as "other" or later additions. Halpern describes the original concept of the Redactor (R) "as a source for incongruities." He is a construction to which scholars attribute anything that seems inconsistent and was previously considered contradictory.[111] Anthony Campbell suggests that "arguments like these are vulnerable to the tactic we might jestingly call 'secondary pingpong' or 'redactional roulette', in which Rule One requires that the opposition's key texts be relegated to the status of secondary addition and Rule Two requires that Rule One always be applied."[112] In other words, in order to resolve any kind of conflict or inconsistency, scholars just date before and/or after their primary redaction to account for conflicting themes and perspectives. Designating "otherness" in redactional identification will not gain any ground

[106] Ibid., 182.
[107] Ibid., 180.
[108] Ibid., 183.
[109] Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 96.
[110] Ibid., 134.
[111] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 110.
[112] Antony F. Campbell, "Martin Noth and the Deuteronomistic History," in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (ed. Steven McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 47.

methodologically or in the attempt at consensus. Another issue in viewing the similarities in the seemingly oppositional theories is the explosion of sigla designations. According to Halpern, there is not much difference among the various theories, yet the different sigla give the appearance of major rifts.[113] Halpern equates the different theories, suggesting that Cross's double redaction theory is not that different from the others. Cross's Dtr^1 is virtually the same as Noth's Dtr and Smend's DtrH. Each designates the original and primary historical composition. The difference is in their dating. Cross's primary version was written during the reign of Josiah and the others' in the early exile. Cross's Dtr^1 reflects the unconditional eternal Davidic monarchy, which conflicts with the condition of ongoing fidelity to Yahweh. As for the conditional promises, Cross attributes them to Dtr^2 while Dietrich and Veijola designate them DtrN. All three agree that conditional promises exist in a separate redactional level from the unconditional promises and belong to an exilic context.[114]

What is the State of Current Scholarship?

While Cross and Smend published their theories forty years ago, their perspectives have continued to influence the direction of the current scholarship. For the most part, scholars still fall into the divisions of the Harvard and Göttingen schools. Recently, within the Harvard School there has been some discussion of additional pre-exilic redactions based on variations in regnal formulae. The book of Kings is organized by accounts of the chronological presentation of the kings of Israel and Judah. Each account is preceded by an introductory formula that usually includes an evaluation of the king's actions during his reign, especially with respect to religious issues, and concludes with a death and burial formula.

Since Cross, many scholars have focused on the regnal formulae as important evidence for unity or multiplicity of authorship. According to Nelson, "The historian's formulas, especially the verdicts upon the Judean kings, reflect a fascinating diversity, always made up of the same basic material of Deuteronomistic clichés and always with the same overall pattern, but never exactly alike. But the formulae of the exilic editor are carbon copies of each other with only the slightest differences, and even those were forced upon him by circumstances."[115] The advocates of a two-edition theory assert that the second editor must have copied the usage of the first. These formulae become less varied and more stereotyped.[116] Some scholars who have dealt with the issue of the regnal formulae are Helga Weippert,[117] Iain Provan,[118] Baruch Halpern and David Vanderhooft.[119] The consideration of these formulae will form the basis for discussion in chapter 3 and establishing the Davidic prototype.

Weippert suggests that the differences in the formulae designate a Hezekian date for the original version of the pre-exilic history, and two subsequent redactions. The main points of her

[113] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 116.
[114] Ibid., 112–3.
[115] Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 42.
[116] Ibid., 31.
[117] Helga Weippert, "Die deuteronomistischen Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Biblica* 53 (1972): 301–339.
[118] Provan, *Hezekiah*, 33–56.
[119] Halpern and Vanderhooft, "Editions of Kings," 62:179–244.

argument focus on three primary versions of the regnal formulae: one that focuses on the kings who purge or continue worship at *bāmôt*, written during the reign of Hezekiah, one that evaluates kings on the basis of the religious reform of Josiah, and a final one that is seen in the final four kings following Josiah, which is exilic.[120] Her theory reflects three periods (Hezekian, Josianic, and exilic) of redaction in both northern and southern contexts.

Similarly, Iain Provan in his book *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* focuses on the *bāmôt* theme found in the formulae. Provan sides with Cross's sentiments, that one should look to the process of redaction (rather than on the level of authorship) for the consistency and unity of the entire history for which Noth argues. But he contends that Cross's theory of the two main thematic concerns of pre-exilic Dtr (Jeroboam's sin for Israel and David's faithfulness for Judah) is misleading. These are not parallel concepts and that obedience (and disobedience) to the law in Judah is also important.[121]

Instead, Provan highlights the use of the theme of *bāmôt* in the regnal judgment formulae as a dividing factor of redactional layers. He asserts that in 1 Kings 22 to 2 Kings 15 that the author does not see the worship at the *bāmôt* as the same as Jeroboam's worship or the worship of Baal.[122] Instead, the worship at *bāmôt* is a lighter offence and not a sufficient enough reason to condemn a king. According to Provan, "This author did not hold the Judaean kings who tolerated the במות to be as responsible for what took place there as he did the condemned kings for the sins associated with them….the author must have perceived a difference either in the nature of the offences described, or in the degree of responsibility for them on the part of the kings."[123] He argues that this is a different view of *bāmôt* from what is seen in the Judean judgment in 2 Kings 17:9-11, which may reflect "a later editor, reviewing the history of Israel and Judah from an exilic perspective, [who] understood the two kingdoms to be equally guilty of idolatry, and saw

---

[120] Weippert's major arguments are also described in André Lemaire, "Toward a Redactional History of the Book of Kings," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville; trans. Samuel W. Heldenbrand; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 446–461. She suggests a three part redaction. The first is the history of the kings of Judah from Jehoshaphat to Hezekiah. These accounts demonstrate a redactional unity that is seen in the evaluation of the kings. These judgments reference *bāmôt* and use *sûr*. Also, in the evaluations of kings of Israel, beginning with Joram, *sûr* is preceded by a term of negation and followed by *min*. These concerns are those of the religious reforms of Hezekiah (Lemaire, "Toward a Redactional History," 452.)

A second redaction includes the kings before Jehoshaphat (until about 850 B.C.E.) plus Hezekiah, Amon, and Josiah. This redaction is similar to the scholars who call for a pre-exilic deuteronomistic redaction during the reign of Josiah. The evaluations of the kings in this redaction focus on the features of the Josianic reform (as compared to the Hezekian), in the evaluations of the Kings of Judah, especially the elimination of the "hosts of heaven." The evaluations of the kings of Israel include the accusation of walking in the ways of Jeroboam, a judgment rendered in the reign of Jeroboam I. Cf. Baasha (1 Kgs 15:34), Zimri (1 Kgs 16:19), Omri (1 Kgs 16:26), Ahaziah (1 Kgs 22:52), and implicitly in Nadab and Ahab. The evaluation of the early kings of Judah in this redaction deal with the expulsion (or lack thereof of) the *qĕdēšîm*. Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14:24) and Abijam allow them, while Asa (1 Kgs 15:12) and Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:47) expel them. (This transgression is implicit. 1 Kings 15:3 reports that Abijam continued all the sins of his father, presumably including allowing the existence of *qĕdēšîm*, which his son Asa attempts to eliminate.) The third redaction is an exilic presentation of the last four kings.

[121] Provan, *Hezekiah*, 28.

[122] Ibid., 65.

[123] Ibid., 62.

the worship at the במות in Judah as indicative of Judah's participation in this."[124] Provan's conclusion is that the first edition of DtrH derives from the time of Hezekiah.

Additionally, Baruch Halpern and David Vanderhooft attempt to harmonize the positions of Cross and Weippert. They pose the methodological question of "when is variation a signal of changed authorship, and when the result of a single author's exploration of a fixed form?"[125] This challenges the assumptions of Weippert and scholars influenced by her that "variations in the regnal formulae in Kings reflect the activity of diverse authors."[126] Halpern and Vanderhooft deal specifically with the concluding formulae, which they call the death and burial formula (DBF). They focus on the phrase וישכב עם אבותיו "and he lay with his fathers," highlighting that, stereotypically, every Judahite king before Hezekiah is reported to be buried with his fathers in the city of David (two of the components of the DBF) and after Hezekiah the death and burial formulae are all different.[127] They state that "the disappearance after Ahaz of every trace of the pre-Hezekian burial formulary in Kings is no accident of transmission."[128] Instead it is indicative of a two stage redaction: "There is a change in authorship at Hezekiah."[129]

Similar to Weippert, they also deal with the accession formulae, likewise noting that Josiah's regnal evaluation does not deal with *bāmôt*.[130] Maintaining a commitment to the Cross hypothesis and a Josianic edition of DtrH, Halpern and Vanderhooft suggest that "the Josianic historian worked vital changes" on the early Hezekian edition.[131] In this way, "Josiah's courtiers injected a Hezekian policy of centralization, imbued with new and more pointed monotheistic fanaticism."[132] They further point to the unfulfilled (and false) prophecy of Huldah as justification for a pre-Josianic redaction. The oracle that announces the destruction of Judah and that Josiah would die a peaceful death seems to have derived from two different dates. Rhetorically they question, "Would an exilic editor, aware of Josiah's violent death, have endorsed this oracle – or, stated differently, would an exilic editor have inserted the oracle in its present form, rather than reinterpreting any difficulties it presented; and, did the oracle originally promise Josiah a peaceful death, or only death at peacetimes?"[133] Instead, they suggest that the oracle remains within the text because "E(Dtr)x [Halpern's siglum for Dtr_2] manages to fashion the ironic fulfillment of Huldah's oracle only by twisting fact into an alien appearance indicates how far the seeming intention of the oracle both bound and buffaloed him; E(Dtr)x would have selected against such a text had it not already lain enshrined in an inherited history – that of H(Dtr)jos [Halpern's Josianic historian]."[134]

[124] Ibid., 73.
[125] Halpern and Vanderhooft, "Editions of Kings," 62:183.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid., 62:194.
[128] Ibid., 62:195.
[129] Ibid., 62:196.
[130] Ibid., 62:207.
[131] Ibid., 62:242.
[132] Ibid., 62:243.
[133] Ibid., 62:222.
[134] Ibid., 62:229.

More recently (2011), Lauren Monroe has suggested a radical alternative to these theories.[135] Like Provan, she suggests a first redaction ending with the reign of Hezekiah (using the lack of a report of his death as evidence), written late in the reign of Manasseh or early in the reign of Josiah. She contends that this history, focused on the removal of *bāmôt* is non-deuteronomistic, arguing that the *bāmôt* theme is not necessarily tied to the ideology of centralization.[136] She further suggests that the pre-exilic account of Josiah's reform was written separately from this first edition of the history and by holiness priests, rather than the deuteronomistic historians. She argues that "in the holiness account of Josiah's reform Josiah is portrayed as targeting specific *bāmôt* whose operation interfered with the consolidation of his relgiopolitical control, with no evidence of a Deuteronomic agenda."[137] Instead she suggests that the literary connections between 2 Kings 22-23 and Deuteronomy were added in a secondary stage of the history, by a deuteronomist.[138] While Monroe's recommendation that her perspective requires biblical scholars to reconsider the "conventional boundaries" between Priestly, Holiness, and Deuteronomistic writing is a worthwhile one, which can remind us that we impose modernly constructed categories on the ancient contexts that produced our biblical texts, it is not possible to suggest that the pre-exilic history is non-deuteronomistic and that the account of the reform of Josiah is also originally non-deuteronomistic. As will be discussed in chapter 5, the literary design of the account of Josiah's reform is intrinsically connected through intertextual links with the entire course of the history of the monarchy. The various elements of my schema of Dtr's historiographical poetics also support this. In the account of Josiah, the focus on the deuteronomistic elements of the reform, the intertextual correspondences with all other parts of the history as well as links with specific deuteronomic laws, and the use of the prototype strategy all disprove Monroe's theory.

How Does Redactional Theory Affect the Historiographical Poetics?

More recently, the discussion about the origins of DtrH in general, and the book of Kings specifically, has focused on deriving a historiographical approach of Dtr. Once the historical context of each Dtr's composition and redaction has been identified, scholars deal with the issues of style, thematic interests (content), and theology represented within the redactional level. While important to our understanding of the history of composition and the interpretation of these texts, it is necessary to be aware that many of these conceptions are based on circular arguments; redactional levels, as discussed above, are often designated on stylistic, thematic, and theological grounds. Then, representative stylistic, thematic, and theological interests of a certain redactor are derived when evaluating the texts previously assigned to those redactional levels.

A major methodological problem arises out of these conflicts – how does one differentiate between the different voices that reflect various layers of redactions and the voices of the component sources? How do we differentiate between the perspectives of a redactor and the perspectives represented in older traditions and later activity?[139] Also, how can we

[135] Lauren A. S. Monroe, *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[136] Ibid., chap. 4.
[137] Ibid., 130.
[138] Ibid., 133.
[139] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 112.

characterize the extent of the work of an author/redactor? Should an extensive composition be considered the same act of creation as the insertion of a scribal gloss?[140]

Despite this methodological concern, these historiographical evaluations are worthwhile and are among the major concerns with which this dissertation will deal. The descriptions of the historiography of Dtr as author and redactor began with Noth. Noth acclaims an historian who "was not merely an editor but the author of a history which brought together material from highly varied traditions and arranged it according to a carefully conceived plan."[141] He insists that "we must say that Dtr. was the author of a comprehensive historical work, scrupulously taking over and quoting the existing tradition but at the same time arranging and articulating all the material independently, and making it clear and systematic by composing summaries which anticipate and recapitulate."[142] While some scholars have relegated the inconsistencies within Dtr's text to the ineptitude of the scribe, Noth's theory allows that inconsistency comes from the historian's use of sources, which vindicates the redactor from incompetency. According to Halpern, "it implies that Dtr was built on *blocks* of narrative sources."[143] As such, Halpern argues that "the reviser transmitted the text largely intact suggests that he or his community regarded it with reverence…the scribe's insertions must have been consonant with his reading of the text: they reconcile difficulties in the text or difficulties arising from the application of the text to changed realities."[144] Noth's view of the role of Dtr continues, McKenzie describes Dtr's work as follows: "Dtr obviously had sources which he edited to form his narratives….On occasion he also composed narratives out of whole cloth….By both processes he created a new work of history. He shaped all of his narratives with his own theological perspective. His purpose in the book of Kings was to offer a comprehensive theological explanation of the history of Israel and Judah in the divided monarchy."[145]

It seems that scholars will continue their battle over asserting their opinions contrary to Noth's theory while still maintaining its validity. In this dissertation, the argument of Noth that will prove the most important is the role of Dtr as both author and redactor. He is one who inherited and adopted traditional sources, which he respected, and includes in his scheme for creating a complete, cohesive, and chronological historical document. He is theologically motivated and interprets his sources in light of his theology.[146] In this way, the activities of Dtr as redactor were threefold. In integrating the pre-deuteronomistic sources he inherits, Dtr (1) freely composes when he is missing sources or wants to contradict the sources he has, (2) rephrases or inserts sources into new historiographic frameworks, and/or (3) loyally recopies his sources.[147] These actions work well with the historiographical poetics I described in the previous chapter. Dtr uses his sources, the prophetic tradition, and a system for organizing scenes while recrafting his work to promote the deuteronomistic program, attribute theological significance to historico-political events, and develop the portrait of his kings using a prototype strategy.

---

[140] Ibid., 116.
[141] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 26.
[142] Ibid., 120.
[143] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 114.
[144] Ibid., 117.
[145] Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 42; Leiden; New York: Brill, 1991), 80.
[146] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 118.
[147] Ibid., 116.

In this dissertation, I will adopt a modified version of the Cross theory. I find this model and the arguments that support it to best fit with the evidence, although there remains considerable uncertainty about many details. The primary thematic and ideological concerns reflected in DtrH are most appropriate for the pre-exilic period. The hopefulness of the reign of Josiah and the unconditional Davidic promises, both as organizing frameworks and as historical events, lose their import and purpose if attributed to an exilic context. I agree with Gary Knoppers who contends for a pre-exilic DtrH, wondering "why would a Deuteronomist living during the Babylonian exile, write such an ambitious and laborious history, if his only message was a guarded expectation of divine compassion, predicated upon abject repentance?"[148] Also, it is possible to see within stylistic elements, changes in the thematic concerns in exilic passages. This will be explored in chapter 6, with the counter-example of 2 Kings 21.

The value of this history of redaction criticism and the redactional assessments made in the following chapters are crucial to understanding the historiographical poetics of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist. In order to properly assess the ways in which the Deuteronomist (or Deuteronomists) work, it is essential to make clear which texts are indeed a part of a specific level of redaction and composition. Only then can they be evaluated for style. By first dividing the texts into their historical contexts, it is possible to use the thematic concerns to derive stylistic choices. As such, each example given in the subsequent chapters will also include a redactional assessment of the pericope. The historiographical poetics can also offer more solid "principles" upon which to make redactional decisions that are better than the ones Van Seters challenges as "dubious," as cited in the beginning of this chapter.[149]

Also, recognition of stylistic differences in the competing thematic perspectives highlights the differences in the origins of composition. This will be particularly important in discovering the underlying historiographical concerns in these texts. The historiographical method will also be a location in which the seams of redaction can be uncovered. While the modified double redaction theory suggested by Weippert and Provan, in particular the argument about the attitude towards the *bāmôt* theme, is compelling, the texts on which the following chapters focus are all part of a Josianic redaction according to both Weippert and Provan's constructions. Accepting the Cross theory of a primarily pre-exilic Josianic redaction has a great impact on historiographical concerns. The theological function of the History, an attempt to promote the deuteronomistic program and the Josianic reform, at the time of Josiah, is an essential guide to the construction of history. The persona of Josiah himself contributes to the portrait of the kings, good and bad, through the creation of a specific literary prototype focused on David and based on Josiah, first established in the account of the reign of Solomon. This prototype is used to evaluate the kings and convey a didactic message to the people Judah of the proper form of Yahwistic worship. This prototype, along with other stylistic elements on both selectional and compositional levels, illustrates a systematic, stylistic narrative framework imposed by Dtr on the majority of the History. Unlike the Smend-Dietrich theory, the unity of the narrative constructed is of utmost importance to the understanding and function of the History.

[148] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:25.
[149] Van Seters, "The Deuteronomistic History," 222.

This dissertation takes the scholarly perspectives presented over the past two hundred years and builds on them. The idea of conceiving of historiographical poetics relies on the work of Noth and the idea of a competent redactor who used sources to craft his history as well as inserted his own material at crucial junctures. And while I do not hold to Noth's redactional theories, the concepts of unity in DtrH and Dtr's role in reshaping his sources into a theologically meaningful narrative are crucial components to the poetics I lay out. While Noth and others assert that Dtr does indeed use sources, integrating and recrafting them, there is no comprehensive assessment of how methodologically Dtr accomplishes that. This is the value of my historiographical poetics.

This dissertation does three things to advance the scholarship of the field. First, it takes issues of literary style seriously. Bringing into play the example and method of the so-called literary critics of the Bible, this work considers the process of historiography, not just for its presentation of the past, but also for the ways in which the historian crafts his history in order to present the past, evaluating and cataloguing the literary style and techniques that he uses to make his history successful. Second, this work builds on the redaction scholarship, as outlined in this chapter, demonstrating the various selectional techniques that Dtr uses to make choices of what and how to include the record of the past in his historical narrative. The scholarship has not frequently considered the ways in which earlier traditions are integrated into the text as well as why a specific Deuteronomist makes the choices he does. These two impulses make up the historiographical poetics that I have outlined in chapter 1 and will apply in the following chapters. Such a comprehensive and systematic presentation of the many historiographical priorities has not been offered previously. And third, this work highlights the importance and role of the prototype strategy in the intentional crafting the portrait of the kings, and how that strategy functions in both evaluating the kings of Israel and Judah similarly through deuteronomistic standards and how the literary portraits of the kings can be compared and contrasted.

Chapter 3

Who is like David? Was David like David?

In the book of Kings, the Deuteronomist uses a prototype strategy to evaluate each king in the history of the monarchy. The bad kings, those who do what is "evil in the eyes of Yahweh," are compared to Jeroboam and Ahab, and often to each king's father if his father acted similarly. The good kings, those who do what is "right in the eyes of Yahweh," are compared to their own fathers, if they were also good. Only three kings, Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah, are compared to David, who is set up as the prototype of the good king. One of the kings who does what is pleasing to Yahweh, but does not remove the high places is compared negatively to David – he is explicitly said to be not like him. This raises the question to define, what does it mean to be like David? Is there some set of criteria that can be derived from the narrative of Kings that would qualify a certain king to be like or unlike David? Furthermore, would David, as represented in Samuel, be "like David" as constructed in Kings or is David, as the standard for good kings, exclusively a deuteronomistic construct and typological tool?

This chapter will explore the development of the David prototype. Through the analysis of the individual regnal formulae of the good kings, it is possible to derive some answers to these questions. Once the model has been established, it will then be reflected back on the character of David, exploring whether David is actually like his literary alter-ego. In establishing the range of this prototype and its antithesis, this chapter will supply necessary approaches for subsequent chapters in which individual kings, namely Jeroboam, Josiah, and Manasseh, will be considered as having been constructed by Dtr according to the model of this prototype.

I return to the literary definition laid out in chapter 1 by linguist George Lakoff. Prototypes are "cognitive reference points of various sorts [that] form the basis for inferences."[1] These inferences are part of the conceptual structure, in which prototypes have a "special cognitive status" of being a "best example."[2] Dtr employs his prototype strategy to fill out the literary portraits of his kings. He uses David as the model for the good king and the anti-David as the model for the bad king. In this way, it is possible for the reader to take stock of the various kings, compare them to each other, and consider how the prototypical portrait of that king contributes to the overall theological goals of the History. The prototype of the king is steeped in deuteronomistic language and concerns. Instead of being portrayed as a "real" person, each king is evaluated through the lens of the prototype to consider his fidelity to the covenant and his love of Yahweh.

Von Rad was one of the first to notice the use of a Davidic prototype and the differences between that prototype and the figure of David. He wrote, "The actual history of David is noticeably free from Deuteronomistic additions. This is astonishing in view of the constant mention of David in the course of the history that follows as the prototype of a king who was

[1] Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, 45.
[2] Ibid., 41.

well-pleasing to Jahweh."[3] In this way, the use of the prototype strategy is a compositional technique used by Dtr, unique to the book of Kings. It is through the construction of the royal prototype that Dtr expresses his theological evaluation of each king. In this way, von Rad describes David as "the king after the heart of the Deuteronomist. He is the prototype of the perfectly obedient anointed, and therefore the model for all succeeding kings in Jerusalem."[4] I argue that the concept of the prototype in cognitive linguistics adds precision to von Rad's analysis. Also, the following chapters will explore the literary life of the prototype beyond the presentation of David, taking von Rad's assertions and putting the concept of the Davidic prototype into application in the portrait of subsequent kings.

The regnal formula has long been seen by scholars as an unequivocal site of deuteronomistic evaluation. At the start of the account of each king, Dtr includes a formulaic introduction that gives details about the king's background and reign as well as contains an evaluation measuring the king by deuteronomistic standards.[5] The regnal formulae are the fingerprints of the redactor, left behind for the reader to hear his voice. The book of Kings, states Robert L. Cohn in his discussion of the structure of the book, "more than any other biblical book…bears explicitly the marks of its author. While the omniscient narrator of much biblical prose stays in the background, the narrator in Kings…wields a heavy hand."[6] The regnal formula is a narrative tool used by Dtr to synchronize the narratives about the kings of Israel and Judah, to make the chronology of events and reigns clear, to create segues and uniformity in the presentation of the information about each king, and most importantly, to put into application the major concepts of the deuteronomistic theology through the judgment formulae.[7] Dtr uses these formulae to interpret the narratives. Dtr would have had his sources about the reigns of each king and would have been familiar with their acts as described in those sources. In compiling his sources, Dtr adds the regnal formulae to interpret those acts. The formulae are intrinsically linked to the process of historiography as Dtr uses them to frame and mold the story of each king. They are also the place where the application of the Davidic prototype begins. While scholarship on these formulae has largely been focused on synchronizing chronology between the two kingdoms and as signs of different levels of redaction,[8] the accession formulae deserve inquiry on their own merit, in addition to the teasing out of redactional layers.

---

[3] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 86.
[4] Ibid., 88.
[5] In the introduction to his commentary, Cogan says that Dtr shows the "adoption of Deuteronomic thought and its application in conceptualizing the history of Israel. Among the key Deuteronomic tenets addressed in Kings are the call for steadfast loyalty to YHWH by observing the Teaching of Moses, and the centralization of the cult at the chosen place. Thus, in the pragmatic framework created by Dtr, which ties the entire work together, the following particulars are recorded for each monarch: name, age at accession (for the kings of Judah), length of reign, mother's name (for the kings of Judah), evaluation, references to source, death and burial, name of success. The judgment formulations, 'doing what was pleasing to YHWH' and 'doing what was displeasing to YHWH,' find their explication in the standard set by David in his exemplary behavior: he 'walked with integrity and with uprightness, doing all that I commanded…keeping my statutes and my rules' (1 Kgs 9:4)" (Cogan, *1 Kings*, 96.)
[6] Robert L. Cohn, "The Literary Structure of Kings," in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 108.
[7] Cogan, *1 Kings*, 96.
[8] As discussed in the previous chapter and also: Richard D. Nelson, "The Regnal Formulae in Kings," in *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 29–42. Halpern and Vanderhooft, "Editions of Kings," 62:179–244. Iain Provan, "The Judgment Formulae of the Books of Kings," in *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (Berlin;

The redactional conversations attempt to divide the individual formulae into patterns. Helga Weippert contends that there are as many as six different formula patterns, reflecting three levels of redaction (and a northern and southern version at each level). Recently, many scholars (including W.B. Barrick, E. Cortese, I. Provan, and A. Campbell) have argued with and against Weippert. While the patterns that she isolates are important to recognize, for my purpose in understanding what makes a good king and what makes one like David, the distinctions are not necessary. In this discussion I will consider the regnal formulae of eight kings as part of the same pattern, a product of the Josianic redactor. These kings are: Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Amaziah, Azariah, Jotham, Hezekiah, and Josiah. All of these kings are said to do הישר בעיני יהוה, "what is right in the eyes of Yahweh."[9] While some scholars exclude a few of the kings I have mentioned from this pattern, even if they were the product of subsequent redactors, it does not affect the case for trying to understand what the Josianic author/redactor constructed in the figure of David.[10] These scholars also isolate a second pattern, a subset of those who do what is right with those also compared with David (Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah). Despite these arguments, I will include the two patterns together on the grounds that either the Josianic redactor is responsible for both patterns or he inherited the earlier "like David" tradition, and then exploits it in his composition. Yet, while the regnal formulae simultaneously display diversity and unity, they seem to be constructed on the same model and from the same hand. In the evaluations of the "good" kings, there are three elements included in the designation of "good." These are the assertion that the king does הישר בעיני יהוה, a paternal comparison (to David the ancestral father or to the literal father), and whether his לבב is with Yahweh.[11] By tracking these designations, we attempt to discover what it means to be a "good" king, even the best of kings, and whether David in Samuel can stack up to these standards.

New York: W. de Gruyter, 1988), 33–55. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*. Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah*. Weippert, "Beurteilungen der Könige," 53:301–339. W. Boyd Barrick, "On the Removal of the High-Places in 1-2 Kings," *Biblica* 55, no. 2 (1974): 257–259.

[9] While there is disagreement on the provenance of various redactors, it is worthwhile to note that there is some consensus among scholars that most of the kings' formulae I am concerned with are identified as deriving from the same hand and part of the same pattern (Weippert's RIS1; Campbell's B pattern; Provan's Hezekian Redaction). Weippert includes Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Amaziah, Azariah, Jotham, and Josiah in her RIS1 pattern (1st Redaction, Southern Kings, 1 for הישר, the negative assessments are 2). She identifies Asa, Hezekiah and Josiah as part of RIIS (2nd southern redaction) (Weippert, "Beurteilungen der Könige," 53:308, 325, 335.) Barrick wants to extend Weippert's designation of RI (Jehoshaphat to Ahaz) to include Asa and Hezekiah (Barrick, "On the Removal of the High-Places in 1-2 Kings," 55:258.) Provan argues for their inclusion as well, asserting that it is impossible to attribute the David and *bāmôt* elements of the formulae to different authors. Rather, "the use of David as a comparative figure, while it does not occur for most of the intervening kings, is found at both ends of this block (1 Kgs 15:11; 2 Kgs 16:2; 18:3). There is absolutely no indication that this element was introduced secondarily to a text containing the במות element, nor that the במות element was introduced secondarily to a text containing the David element" (Provan, *Hezekiah*, 53.) Provan and Campbell both exclude Josiah's formula from this pattern, Campbell because he sees Hezekiah as the last of his pre-Dtr "B" pattern, and Provan because he identifies a Hezekian provenance for the primary pre-exilic DtrH.)

[10] Halpern and Vanderhooft argue that the variations in the regnal evaluations are not reliable proof for the distinguishing of edition (Halpern and Vanderhooft, "Editions of Kings," 62:179–244.)

[11] It is interesting to note that those scholars who deal with parsing the various patterns of the regnal formulae do not identify לבב as a constituent element. Instead they focus on the judgment, the comparison, and the במות theme. This may reflect scholarship that does not recognize the majority of these accession formulae as Dtr and לבב is unequivocally a Dtr concept (Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 144–51. Provan, *Hezekiah*, 33–55. Weippert, "Beurteilungen der Könige," 53:301–339.) Only von Rad seems to acknowledge the use of לבב in constructing the prototype (Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 87–88.)

הישר בעיני יהוה

Of the more than 40 monarchs who reign over Israel and Judah only eight[12] are reported to have done what is right in Yahweh's eyes, הישר בעיני יהוה. All of these are kings of Judah. The command to do what is right in the eyes of Yahweh is a deuteronomistic injunction, intrinsically linked with observing the commandments. This phrase is first used in Deuteronomy 6:18, where the connection to the deuteronomistic covenant is made clear and defines how one does what is right: שמור תשמרון את מצות יהוה אלהיכם ועדתיו וחקיו אשר צוך. ועשית הישר והטוב בעיני יהוה... "Surely you shall keep the commandments of Yahweh your God, his testimonies and his statutes which he commanded you. And you shall do what is right and good in the eyes of Yahweh" (vv. 17-18).[13] The kings who do what is right in Yahweh's eyes are those who are faithful to the deuteronomistic covenant. Throughout DtrH, obedience to these commandments and statutes is repeated. One who does what is right adheres to deuteronomistic theology.

כדוד אביו

The designation of doing what is right is connected with being like David only four times in the evaluations of the good kings (Asa, Amaziah, Hezekiah, and Josiah), yet one of these connections is negative.[14] (Amaziah is explicitly not like David, but like his father Joash, 2 Kgs 14:3.[15]) Due to the infrequency of the connection to David, it is difficult to understand what is deemed right or not right in Yahweh's eyes and what it means to be like or unlike David. If we take the formulaic assessments and the collection of information about the acts of each king in the subsequent narrative and use his deeds as evidence for designation, the evidence is contradictory. Also, while one may wonder why a comparison made so infrequently should be considered of utmost importance, the instructions given to Solomon as he becomes king make clear that being like David is essential for the proper behavior of kings.

It has long been agreed that Josiah is the hero of DtrH, and many also include Hezekiah as well. Both Hezekiah and Josiah execute major religious reforms, carrying out the religious ideals of deuteronomistic theology, Hezekiah tears down the high places, removing an asherah and *maṣṣēbôt*, and takes down the bronze serpent, Nehustan, which Moses erected, because people are worshipping it. Josiah, upon finding a law scroll in the temple, reaffirms the covenant, purges Israel and Judah of idolatrous practices, – tearing down cult sites, removing objects from the temple, deposing idolatrous priests – and celebrates the Passover. The praise for these kings is unparalleled. They are both set up as kings of incomparability.[16] We are told about both

[12] Asa (1 Kgs 15:11); Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:43); Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:3); Amaziah (2 Kgs 14:3); Azariah (2 Kgs 15:3); Jotham (2 Kgs 15:34); Hezekiah (18:3); Josiah (2 Kgs 22:2).

[13] Cf. Deut 13:19.

[14] Twice a bad king is said to not be like David (Abijam, 1 Kgs 15:3 and Ahaz, 2 Kgs 16:2). For this reason, Weippert includes them in her RI (Weippert, "Beurteilungen der Könige," 53:335.)

[15] Many scholars see this negative comparison to David as a secondary addition (Provan, *Hezekiah*, 93.)

[16] Hezekiah: ביהוה אלהי ישראל בטח ואחריו לא היה כמהו בכל מלכי יהודה ואשר היו לפניו. וידבק ביהוה לא סר מאחריו וישמר מצותיו אשר צוה יהוה את משה "In Yahweh God of Israel he trusted and following him there was none like him among all the kings of Judah and [those] who were before him. And he cleaved to Yahweh and did not turn from him and he observed his commandments, which Yahweh commanded Moses" (2 Kgs 18:5-6). Josiah: וכמהו לא היה לפניו מלך אשר שב אל יהוה בכל לבבו ובכל נפשו ובכל מאדו. ככל תורת משה ואחריו לא קם כמהו "And like him there was no king before him

Hezekiah and Josiah that there was never before or following someone like him (which of course cannot be true as it is said of both of them). Gary Knoppers makes a convincing argument that Josiah and Hezekiah (as well as Solomon) are incomparable for different virtues and therefore are not in conflict. Solomon is incomparable for his wisdom, Hezekiah for his trust, and Josiah for his reform.[17] Hezekiah is not merely like David (as reported in the Asa account), but he does "all that David did," ככל אשר עשה דוד אביו (2 Kgs 18:3). Even more impressive is Josiah's emulation of David: וילך בכל דרך דוד אביו ולא סר ימין ושמאול "And he walked in all the ways of David his father and did not stray to the right or left" (2 Kgs 22:2).[18]

Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:3)	ככל אשר עשה דוד אביו	ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה
Josiah (2 Kgs 22:2)	וילך בכל דרך דוד אביו ולא סר ימין ושמאול	ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה

It is not surprising that Hezekiah and Josiah are both compared to David, but the designation of King Asa is less expected. The account begins, King Asa "did what was right in the eyes of Yahweh, like his father David" (1 Kgs 15:11). He expelled the *qĕdēšîm*[19] and removed the idols his ancestors made; he deposed his mother Maacah as queen mother because she made an asherah. He brought votive gifts to the temple, but later took gold and silver from the temple to make a treaty (rather more like a bribe) with Ben-Hadad against Baasha of Israel. Even though he did many things towards cultic reform, Asa did not remove the high places. Cogan describes these inconsistent actions as "deviations from cultic rigorism"[20] The quality of "rightness" of Asa's deeds is mixed – he got rid of idolatrous practices, but did not remove the high places; he brought offerings to the temple, but also took from it to promote his foreign policy. While not explicitly stated, Asa's taking objects from the temple likely would have been viewed negatively by Dtr.[21] Deuteronomistic notice of construction in the temple adds to the positive assessment in the routine formula, but taking the treasure to enlist foreigners against the Northern Kingdom is not positive.[22] Regardless of the mixed deeds, Asa's acts earn him a triple praise designation; he does what is right; he is like David; his heart was completely with Yahweh (לבב היה שלם, 1 Kgs 15:14) all his days. Given the focus on the deuteronomistic cleaning up the cult of Yahweh from all "foreign" elements even if they had been traditional features of Israelite worship in the past, the inclusion of Asa who does not remove the high places is baffling.

---

who turned back to Yahweh with all his heart and all his soul and all his might, as all the instruction of Moses. And after him, no one arose like him" (2 Kgs 23:25).

[17] Gary N. Knoppers, "'There was None Like Him': Incomparability in the Books of Kings," *CBQ* 54, no. 3 (1992): 411–431.

[18] The comment about Josiah is made in the concluding formula of his reign, while the others are in the accession formula. This may be significant in chronologizing the composition and the construction of this contention.

[19] I am convinced by the suggestion of Phyllis Bird that the use of the term *qĕdēšîm* usually translated as "male cult prostitutes" illustrates ambiguous gender, as the 3mp can be used for both male or male and female. Also, there is no real evidence of the existence of sacred or cultic male prostitutes in the Hebrew lexeme, instead it is perhaps a female position that has been erroneously analogized into a male profession. As such, I maintain the term *qĕdēšîm*, a gender inclusive category, rather than translating it (Phyllis A. Bird, "The End of the Male Cult Prostitute: A Literary-Historical and Sociological Analysis of Hebrew qādēš-qĕdēšîm," in *Congress Volume* (ed. International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament; Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 66; Leiden: E J Brill, 1997), 37–80.

[20] Cogan, *1 Kings*, 398, n. 14.

[21] Ibid., 402.

[22] Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings: A New Translation* (1st ed.; Anchor Bible Commentary 11; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988), 141.

While the inclusion of Asa with Hezekiah and Josiah is unclear, the designation is even more confusing when compared to the evaluation and deeds of Asa's son Jehoshaphat. Jehoshaphat is portrayed very similarly. But it is even possible to view his actions as more praiseworthy than Asa's, yet he does not receive the same acclaim. Jehoshaphat "walked in all the ways of his father Asa, he did not stray from them, doing what was right in the eyes of Yahweh" (1 Kgs 22:43). Like Asa, he did not remove the high places, but he made peace with Israel (v. 44), rather than taking from the temple to secure allies against Israel (it is unclear whether peace or war with Israel is judged positively or negatively by Dtr, but likely Dtr did not approve of taking gold and silver from the temple).[23] Jehoshaphat removed the remnant of the *qĕdēšîm* who were left from the days of Asa (v. 46). This statement belies the fact that the act for which Asa receives the highest praise was incomplete, and Jehoshaphat has to rectify the situation.[24] Provan reasons why Asa receives this acclaim, "while it is true that only Asa, Hezekiah and Josiah are compared positively to David, it is equally true that only these three kings attempted reformation."[25] Does this mean that Jehoshaphat's purge of the *qĕdēšîm* is not a reform?

For these deeds, Jehoshaphat receives only one element of praise, that he did right in Yahweh's eyes. Instead of being compared to David, the ancestral father, Jehoshaphat is compared to his actual father, Asa, and nothing is said about his heart. One difference is that Jehoshaphat's act of removing the *qĕdēšîm* is only included in the closing formula, rather than in the introductory formula, as in Asa's case. Cogan says that "only with reference to Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah, are specific reform acts reported."[26] But the reforms of Josiah are also not included in the introductory formula. After Josiah's introduction, the narrative continues with the finding of the scroll in the temple. So this difference may be inconsequential in determining why Asa is so praised.

Perhaps the account of Jehoshaphat is not the best test case because his evaluation is constructed differently from the other seven kings who do what is right. Except for Jehoshaphat, the evaluation begins with ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה. In all but one case (Jehoash[27]), the verse then continues with a comparison: Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah to David, and Amaziah (additionally, not like David), Azariah, and Jotham to their fathers. In the case of Jehoshaphat the judgment begins with the comparison and is followed by the הישר בעיני יהוה phrase. In the chart below the difference in the anomaly of the construction of Jehoshaphat's evaluation is quite clear.

[23] Cogan, *1 Kings*, 402.
[24] This act is also seemingly incomplete as Josiah also removes the houses of the *qĕdēšîm* (2 Kgs 23:7). Their existence perhaps is a persistent trope. See the discussion in chapter 5.
[25] Provan, *Hezekiah*, 40.
[26] Cogan, *1 Kings*, 402.
[27] Jehoash does not follow in the footsteps of his father Ahaziah, the son of Athaliah, the daughter of Omri, who walked in the ways of the house of Ahab (2 Kgs 8:27). Instead, after being hidden away from his grandmother Athaliah by the priest Jehoiada, he follows the teaching of Jehoiada (2 Kgs 12:3).

Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:3)		ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה	ככל אשר עשה דוד אביו
Josiah (2 Kgs 22:2)		ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה	וילך בכל דרך דוד אביו ולא סר ימין ושמאול
Asa (1 Kgs 15:11)		ויעש אסא הישר בעיני יהוה	כדוד אביו
Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:43)	וילך בכל דרך אסא אביו	לא סר ממנו לעשות הישר בעיני יהוה	
Amaziah (2 Kgs 14:3)		ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה	רק לא כדוד אביו ככל אשר עשה יואש אביו עשה
Azariah (2 Kgs 15:3)		ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה	ככל אשר עשה אמציהו אביו
Jotham (2 Kgs 15:34)		ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה	ככל אשר עשה עזיהו אביו עשה
Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:3)		ויעש יהואש הישר בעיני יהוה כל ימיו	אשר הורהו יהוידע הכהן

The comparison of this father and son, two of the few "good" kings, does not fully illustrate the defining criteria for praise. They both fail to carry out one of the key elements of deuteronomistic theology: removing the high places. Yet, Asa receives the triple praise like Josiah and Hezekiah who enact a more thorough reform, but Jehoshaphat does not. This is further confounded in considering the assessment of Amaziah. Amaziah did what was right in Yahweh's eyes, but "not like his ancestor David" (explicitly not like David, as opposed to Jehoshaphat for whom all reference to David is omitted). Amaziah does all that his father Joash does (2 Kgs 14:3); Jehoash (Joash) is also said to do what was right in Yahweh's eyes but does not remove the high places (2 Kgs 10:31, to be discussed below). Amaziah's political acts include killing the servants who murdered his father, but not killing their children. Dtr seems to approve of this action giving it divine sanction, connecting it to a proscription in the Law of Moses (2 Kgs 14:6). Amaziah also instigates a battle, in which he is defeated, with King Jehoash of Israel. He seems no worse than the other good kings. One difference in the indictment against Amaziah for not removing the high places, as compared to Asa, is that the narrator adds that the people continue to sacrifice at the high places, yet this is also true for Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Azariah, and Jotham, who are all said to do what is right like their fathers. All references, positive or negative, to David are omitted in the judgment of these three kings.

Asa (1 Kgs 15:14)	רק לבב אסא היה שלם עם יהוה כל ימיו	והבמות לא סרו
Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:44)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	אך הבמות לא סרו
Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:4)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו
Amaziah (2 Kgs 14:4)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו
Azariah (2 Kgs 15:4)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו
Jotham (2 Kgs 15:35)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו

Deuteronomistic praise for Jehoash is couched in the description of the king as follower of Jehoiada the Priest. Jehoiada made a covenant with Yahweh and the king and the people to be Yahweh's people. He institutes some cultic reform, tearing down the temple of Baal and getting rid of the priests of Baal (2 Kgs 11:17-18). In his regnal evaluation it says, ויעש יהואש הישר בעיני יהוה כל ימיו אשר הורהו יהוידע הכהן "And Jehoash did what was right in Yahweh's eyes all of his days, as the Priest Jehoiada instructed him" (2 Kgs 12:3). Jehoash does not follow his father Ahaziah the Omride but instead follows Jehoiada. It is interesting that while Jehoiada reaffirms the covenant and roots out Baal worship, Dtr does not seem interested in his deeds. They are described matter-of-factly, but Dtr offers no narrative comment or evaluation as he does for kings. Like Asa, Joash takes temple votives to pay for international protection. He gives tribute to King Hazael of Aram who subsequently withdraws from Jerusalem (2 Kgs 11:18).

Given the overwhelming praise of Josiah and Hezekiah, it seems that the designation of Asa as like David is anomalous. Separating Hezekiah and Josiah from the other good kings, the main differences in Asa's religious behavior, which according to Dtr is usually what warrants evaluative judgment, is that there is no explicit report of the people continuing to sacrifice at the high places.[28] Since Asa does not remove the high places (which would receive unqualified praise from Dtr, as Hezekiah, who does remove the high places (2 Kgs 18:4) receives), the verse continues with a restrictive clause: והבמות לא סרו רק לבב אסא היה שלם עם יהוה כל ימיו "But the high places he did not remove, yet the heart of Asa was full with Yahweh all his days" (1 Kgs 15:14). The verse begins with a disjunctive fronting of the object, emphasizing the high places themselves, as well as grammatically separating it from the preceding verses of Asa's praiseworthy behavior and of the things that he did indeed remove; he removed (√סור): the idols (v. 12) and Maacah (v. 13). The second clause begins with רק, which introduces a "restrictive clause," limiting the thrust of the first clause, and allowing the second clause to take on more importance, significance, and meaning, creating a contrast with the first phrase.[29] Even though he did not remove the high places, Asa's heart was fully with Yahweh. This is a grammatical difference from the other reports of the non-removal of high places. Instead of the disjunctive fronting of the object, those clauses begin with the restrictive particle, רק. It is unclear whether this is significant in measuring the "rightness" of acts or whether the author just wanted to vary his construction, not beginning both clauses in 1 Kings 15:11 with רק.[30]

רק, or in one instance אך (also a restrictive particle), is used to qualify some element of the regnal judgment. In the case of Asa, it is to restrict the degradation of his praiseworthiness and cultic commitments, although he did not remove the high places, his heart is fully with Yahweh (1 Kgs 15:14). This same particle רק is used to introduce a restrictive clause in the evaluation formula of Amaziah, ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה רק לא כדוד אביו "He did what was right in Yahweh's eyes, yet he was not like David his father" (2 Kgs 14:3). Furthermore, the rightness of the other five good kings is restricted by רק or אך (in the case of Jehoshaphat) that they did not remove the high places.

It seems that to be like David means to enact some kind of cultic reform, which Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah all do. But Jehoshaphat reforms and is not said to be like David.

---

[28] Helga Weippert argues that the differences are the result of two different layers of redaction. That her RI does not directly blame the individual kings, rather the people, for their sins. This is true for the southern and northern reports of this redactor. For the northern kings who did not turn away from Jeroboam's sin, the blame is on Jeroboam, not the individual king. As such, Weippert designates the Asa report as a product of her second redactor, RII. She also includes 2 Kings 18-23 (the reports of the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah) as originating from the same hand, while the other formulae derive from her RI (Provan, *Hezekiah*, 35–38.) While her redactional schema is not well supported, it is interesting to note that her divisions deal with similar contradictory elements in the pattern as my argument: focusing on why Asa is singled out as like David and the difference in the culpability of Asa in not removing the high places.

[29] Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (ed. Arthur Ernest Cowley and Emil Friedrich Kautzsch; 2nd English ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 153.

[30] W.B. Barrick argues that the differences in the words proceeding the high places, ו (1 Kgs 15:14, אך (2 Kgs 22:44), and רק (2 Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35), demonstrate a conscious attempt by the redactor to show a worsening situation. For this reason, he contends that Asa should be included with the work of RI (Barrick, "On the Removal of the High-Places in 1-2 Kings," 55:258.) While this may reflect a decline in the behavior of the kings, the grammar does not support this. אך and רע as restrictive particles seem to have the same semantic ranger and restrictive force (Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 39.3.5.

Furthermore, it also seems that the praise only few receive to do what is right is qualified in the cases of those who do not remove the high places. There are five kings who did what was right in Yahweh's eyes and are not compared to David. They did not remove the high places and the people continued to worship there. Their acts lack cultic rigorism and their virtue is somewhat diminished by this qualifier. This is not surprising. But what is surprising is that Asa, who like those five, also does not remove the high places, is said to be like David. What makes Asa's judgment, as seen through both the grammatical construction and the triple praise, different from and more praiseworthy than the other five kings whose evaluations seem similar? If we can make any conclusion from the examples, those who are like David do some kind of reform, but not all reformers are like David. Also, to be like David does not require the removal of the high places. Evaluation of the third element of praise heaped on David לבב שלם may help clarify these designations.

לבב

The third component of praise for the good kings is the directing of one's לבב, heart. The use of לבב in the book of Kings, as an evaluation of the kings, is related to cultic loyalty, a prominent deuteronomistic theme. The concept of "the love of God" in the book of Deuteronomy reflects political loyalty as seen in Suzerain treaties of the ancient Near East. Weinfeld describes it as, "The suzerain demands the vassal's love of heart and soul or whole hearted love."[31] In deuteronomistic terms, loyalty is expressed through fidelity to the covenant. In this way, Weinfeld maintains that "terms and expressions that were once part of the political vocabulary were stripped of their political content and passed into religious usage and came to have only a theological significance."[32]

The use of לבב, alone and in construct is an expression of loyalty. The directing of one's heart is often in construct with other terms: (ובכל נפש) בכל לב, בתם לבב, לב שלם.[33] In the case of David especially, loyalty is expressed through the use of לבב. Weinfeld says, "To 'walk before Yahweh' means to 'serve Yahweh', and the expressions צדקה ,ישרת לבב ,אמת signify loyalty and wholeheartedness constantly stressed in deuteronomic literature and ascribed particularly to David, the loyal king."[34]

The phrase בכל לב ובכל נפש has a direct Akkadian equivalent in the expression of covenantal loyalty: *ina kul libbi, ina gummurti libbi*. A prevalent injunction in Deuteronomy, it is usually connected to a statement of observing the commandments or walking with Yahweh. The application of one's לבב, demonstrating loyalty, is an indicator of covenant fidelity. Used eight times in Deuteronomy,[35] this phrase is connected with specific behaviors, as in Deuteronomy 10:12-13. The rhetorical question of "what does Yahweh require of you" defines this important behavior: ועתה ישראל מה יהוה אלהיך שאל מעמך כי אם ליראה את יהוה אלהיך ללכת בכל דרכיו ולאהבה אתו ולעבד את יהוה אלהיך בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך. לשמר את מצות יהוה ואת חקתיו אשר אנכי מצוך היום לטוב לך "And now, Israel, what does Yahweh your God ask of you? That you fear Yahweh your God, walk in

[31] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 81.
[32] Ibid., 85.
[33] Weinfeld sees the terms בתם-לבב (as in 1 Kgs 9:4) and לב שלם as "equivalent." Ibid., 335.
[34] Ibid., 253.
[35] Deut 4:29; 6:5; 10:12; 11:13; 13:4; 26:16; 30:2, 6, 10.

all his ways and love him and serve Yahweh your God with all your heart and all your soul. Observe Yahweh's commandments and his laws, which I commanded you, for your wellbeing." The connection between loving Yahweh בכל לבב and observing the commandments is made clear.

In deuteronomistic terms, love and loyalty are expressed by fidelity to the deuteronomistic covenant. While the concept of covenantal love and observance of the law is present in the book of Samuel (e.g. 1 Sam 12:20, 24), it is never applied to David in that narrative. Instead, it is only applied to David in Kings, and first in the instructions to Solomon. In the passage in 1 Kings 2, it is apparent that a good king, who is able to maintain the Davidic and deuteronomistic covenants, is one who directs his לבב to Yahweh and keeps the commandments. In Kings, the concept of covenantal love and לבב is intrinsically connected with Dtr's evaluation of the religious behavior of the good kings. It is one of the three praise statements given to some kings in the regnal formulae.

It is possible to understand the concept of applying his heart through the deuteronomistic speeches in the beginning of Kings. The emphasis that Dtr places on לבב and covenantal love can be seen through its role in several orations. These are good representative examples because, as discussed previously and as Noth demonstrated, speeches integrated at crucial transitional moments are essential to conveying Dtr's deuteronomistic messages.[36] There are two such speeches that may assist us in laying out the terms of expressing covenantal love through the direction of one's לבב and in turn, help in defining the expected behavior of a good king and what it means to be like David. These two speeches are David's deathbed charge to Solomon in 1 Kings 2 and Solomon's speech at the dedication of the temple in 1 Kings 8.

In 1 Kings 2:3-4, before instructing Solomon to do away with all of his enemies, David orders Solomon to keep the covenant in order to insure that the promise Yahweh made to David of an eternal dynasty will be fulfilled. This is also the location in which we see the beginning of the construction of the portrait of David in Kings as a king obedient to the deuteronomistic covenant:

> ושמרת את משמרת יהוה אלהיך ללכת בדרכיו לשמר חקתיו מצותיו ומשפטיו ועדותיו ככתוב בתורת משה למען תשכיל את כל אשר תעשה ואת כל אשר תפנה שם. למען יקים יהוה את דברו אשר דבר עלי לאמר אם ישמרו בניך את דרכם ללכת לפני באמת בכל לבבכם ובכל נפשם לאמר לא יכרת לך איש מעל כסא ישראל Keep the mandates of Yahweh your God, following his ways, keeping his statutes and commandments, laws and warnings, as is written in the instruction of Moses, so that you will be successful in whatever you do and to whatever you turn. In order that Yahweh will fulfill his word which he spoke to me, saying, if your sons are careful in their way to walk before me faithfully with all their heart and with all their soul, no one will be cut off from the throne of Israel.

These verses express many of the most crucial concepts of deuteronomistic covenant theology.[37] Verse 3 describes the condition for success as linked to careful observance of Yahweh's laws,

[36] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 18.
[37] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 334.

stipulated in the multiple terms of the עדות ,משפטים ,מצות ,חקים, as repeated often throughout the Deuteronomistic History. Verse 4 highlights the conditions for an eternal Davidic kingship as dependent on the faithfulness of David's sons, in the directing of בכל לבב ובכל נפש, which requires the application of the heart and soul as the way to observe the commandments and demonstrate loyalty, as in the suzerain treaties. While he does not explicitly say, "Just as I did," we assume that the David portrayed in this passage behaved in this way. These verses precede David giving Solomon instructions to do away with his enemies. The tone and content of these verses is very different from what follows in the rest of the chapter. It is clear that these initial theological instructions are added to the preexisting narrative by Dtr to begin the process of establishing the Davidic prototype. This David is, as von Rad suggests, "unquestionably...not the David of the succession stories, that essentially contradictory personality, tenacious, persevering and vigorous in public life, but dangerously weak in his own household…"[38] The portrait of David that begins to be depicted here is entirely different from that of the book of Samuel.

A second speech in which a different construct form of לבב is used is found in 1 Kings 8. Solomon gives a long speech and offers a prayer at the dedication of the temple. Much of this speech seems to justify the establishment of the central shrine, including the installation of the ark within the Holy of Holies and Solomon as its builder. Solomon, at the close of the dedication, offers a prayer to Yahweh, blessing Yahweh who has fulfilled his promises to Moses, calling on Yahweh to be with Israel as he had been with their ancestors. In verse 61, Solomon directs Israel to set its heart to be fully with Yahweh, והיה לבבכם שלם עם יהוה אלהינו. This clause ends with the disjunctive *ʾaṯnāḥ*, setting it apart from the next clause. The second half of the verse begins with an infinitive construct with a ל-prefix preposition: ללכת בחקיו ולשמר מצותיו כיום הזה. This construction most commonly expresses purpose,[39] but can also suggest the idea of an obligation.[40] The infinitive with ל, can also be used to define something more precisely.[41] All of these grammatical usages are called up here; in this way, it is possible to see that the second clause may further explain how one can have a full heart with Yahweh. This is done "[by] following his statutes and keeping his commandments as on this day." Through Solomon, Dtr defines the way in which one's heart is fully with Yahweh – by keeping the covenant. The entire prayer can, in some ways, be seen as a definition of maintaining a full heart with Yahweh and its connection to fidelity to the deuteronomistic covenant theology. This is particularly true in verse 58, Solomon prays that Yahweh: להטות לבבנו אליו ללכת בכל דרכיו ולשמר מצותיו וחקיו ומשפטיו אשר צוה את אבתינו "Turn our hearts towards him, following in all his ways and keeping his commandments and statutes and laws which he commanded our ancestors." It is significant that the designation of someone having or not having a לב שלם appears only five times in Kings, and never in Samuel.[42] Furthermore, its positive application is only achieved twice (Asa, 1 Kgs 15:14 and Hezekiah, 2 Kgs 20:3).

Another example in which we can see how one expresses covenantal love is Yahweh instructing Solomon to be like his father David who walked בתם לבב. Yahweh further clarifies how one does this, as לעשות ככל אשר צותיך חקי ומשפטי תשמר "Doing all that I commanded you, my laws and statutes you shall keep" (1 Kgs 9:4). This instruction goes a long way in establishing

[38] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 88.
[39] Gesenius, *GKC*, 114g.
[40] Ibid., 114l.
[41] Ibid., 114o.
[42] 1 Kgs 8:61; 11:4; 15:3, 14; and 2 Kgs 20:3.

the Davidic prototype, the measure of good kings. Even though Solomon is explicitly instructed how to be a good king and how to express covenantal love, he is not able to achieve it. This disappointment is made explicit in a similar use of לבב in the censure of Solomon. He did not do what Yahweh commanded. Instead, he had foreign wives and set his heart after other gods. Specifically, לא היה לבבו שלם עם יהוה אלהיו כלבב דויד אביו "His heart was not fully with Yahweh, his God, as was the heart of David his father" (1 Kgs 11:4). Here the lack of a full heart is the consequence of following other gods. This context is helpful in our understanding of what it means to do what is right, to be like David and to have a full heart with Yahweh. Yahweh (and Dtr) very directly instruct Solomon how to do these things.

As our topic at hand is the evaluation of the kings, we may focus our understanding of the definition of directing one's לבב as one of the elements of praise in the regnal formulae. As discussed previously, the few good kings among the many monarchs of Israel and Judah are praised for their uprightness and sometimes compared to David and a comment is made about their לבב. Only the three kings who are likened to David – Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah – have a positive comment made about their לבב. Asa's comment appears in the introductory regnal formula. Even though he did not remove the high places, Asa was wholeheartedly with Yahweh (1 Kgs 15:14). Josiah's comment appears in his closing formula and his statement of incomparability: "There was no king before him who turned with all his heart and all his soul and all his might to all the Teaching of Moses, and none like him arose after him" (2 Kgs 23:25). Hezekiah's comment is in his own prayer (2 Kgs 20:3). More commonly, it appears as a negative statement, of a king not directing his heart (e.g. Jeroboam, 1 Kgs 14:8; Abijam, 1 Kgs 15:3; Jehu, 2 Kgs 10:31).

The application of the לבב is intrinsically connected with David, usually in the cases of kings who are not like him, or do not direct their hearts like him. Yahweh tells Solomon, as discussed above, to follow his father David with a תם לבב (1 Kgs 9:4). But Solomon does not do this. His heart was not whole with Yahweh, לא היה לבבו שלם like the heart of David, כלבב דוד אביו (1 Kgs 11:4). Similarly, the sentiment is repeated (although the mention of לבב is omitted) in the instructions to Jeroboam. Solomon was not מלא "fully" with Yahweh like David his father. Similarly, the way in which Jeroboam is not like David is בכל לבבו "with all his heart" (1 Kgs 14:8). Additionally, Abijam[43] does not have a לבב שלם like the heart of David his father, כלבב דוד אביו (1 Kgs 15:3). In this way, in Kings the standard of applying the heart is a way one can be like David.

Was David like David?

Thus far, the discussion has been focused on the following questions: What does it mean to be a good king? What does it mean to have a full heart and be whole heartedly with Yahweh? And what does it mean to be like David? This final question requires further thought – was David like David? The answer, it seems, is that David as royal comparative is a typological

[43] In Chronicles his name appears as Abijah (2 Chr 11:22ff) with a clear Yahwistic theophoric element. LXX similarly has Αβιου. Gray suggests that Abijam could be explained by including Yam as the divine element of the theophoric, a deity known in the Ras Shamra mythology, yet it is not likely that this would have been part of the name of an Israelite king. Instead מ may replace ו in a scribal error. It is more likely that his name was originally Abijah as in Chronicles (Gray, *I & II Kings*, 315, n. b.)

construct that functions to evaluate the kings, but does not reflect the presentation of David in Samuel, even within its deuteronomistically composed passages. Provan even divides the portrait of David into two different themes, the "comparative" and the "promissory." And while he suggests that both of these Davids are present in Kings,[44] I'd like to suggest that the David of Kings, in a typological sense, is the "comparative," while the David of Samuel is the "promissory," the one to whom the promise of eternal dynasty is made. Also, rather than focusing on specific individual verses, as Provan does to identify the two themes, the portrayal of the two Davids is pervasive throughout and a primary literary tool for the construction of the narrative. It is clear as von Rad says, the picture of David "had a completely independent cycle of conceptions superimposed upon it, namely, that of the ideal, theocratic David, exemplary in obedience."[45] In Kings, Dtr superimposes his theology onto the existing portrait of David in Samuel. The implications of this distinction between the David of Samuel and the David of Kings are two-fold. The first is that it is another support for the theories of composition of Samuel (mentioned below) that the primary narrative and coherence of Samuel is pre-deuteronomistic. The second is more crucial for our purposes in considering the portrait of the kings in Kings. The David depicted in Kings is constructed by the same hand who crafts the portraits of the other kings. When creating this deuteronomistic view of David, Dtr has the other kings, especially Josiah, in mind, and in this way, creates what appears as a literary model to base the portraits of the other kings, but at the same time it is being formed at the same time as those portraits. In this way, Dtr takes the well-known figure of the great King David and constructs the David of Kings to function as a literary tool to further promote his deuteronomistic theology with a constructed paradigm of obedience.

The disparity in the two Davidic portraits is seen in several ways. A first difference in the presentation of the kings from that of David is that the characteristic evaluations of the kings are missing from the David story. The phrase עשה הישר בעיני יהוה does not appear in Samuel.[46] This can be credited to the sparse deuteronomistic composition in the book. Even in 2 Samuel 5:4-5, where a somewhat typical regnal formula interrupts the David narrative, this common evaluation is missing: בן שלשים שנה דוד במלכו ארבעים שנה מלך. בחברון מלך על יהודה שבע שנים וששה חדשים ובירושלים מלך שלשים ושלש שנה על כל ישראל "David was 30 years old when he became king, he ruled 40 years. In Hebron he was king over Judah seven years and six months, and in Jerusalem he reigned 33 years over all Israel." Also significant, even in Weinfeld's discussion about the covenant at the plains of Moab, he begins a paragraph, "David's loyalty to God is couched in phrases that are even closer to the grant terminology…" (i.e. meaning love and loyalty expressed through לבב phrase) but Weinfeld follows this comment with four textual examples, all of which are from Kings.[47] David's covenant love and loyalty are not expressed in Samuel. This is a deuteronomistic addition in Kings.

There is some scholarly consensus that the narratives in the book of Samuel are the product of earlier sources that Dtr lightly redacted together, adding few editorial comments. Since the work of Rost (1926), the book has been seen as the amalgamation of several complete

[44] Provan, *Hezekiah*, chapter 6, 91–131.
[45] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 88.
[46] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 335.
[47] Ibid., 77.

independent narratives.[48] Moshe Garsiel points out that it is even strange that Samuel ignores many of the major concerns of Dtr such as the fight against idolatry and centralization of the cult. "Since almost the whole of Deuteronomistic literature is engaged in a relentless campaign against the Canaanites and their idols, it is astonishing to find that the late editors of the book of Samuel hardly interfered with its contents on this issue. This is again a significant concession on the part of the Deuteronomistic editors to the received text of the book."[49] The work of Dtr is, as Garsiel describes it, "inconsistent."[50] In some books he is very active while in others he is quiet, making few additions to his received materials. Samuel is one of the places where his contribution is minimal and in Kings it is particularly strong.

Because of Dtr's minimal composition in Samuel, deuteronomistic concerns are limited. While much of the book is focused on transgression and punishment, especially in the David narratives, it is not the straight sin and punishment theology of Deuteronomy. David is not evaluated for transgressions against the covenant, instead he is criticized for his actions in the Bathsheba affair, etcetera. David is praised for his zeal for Yahweh, but not his cultic activity. Despite the critique of David and the disputed effect it has on the overall focus of the book, the central ideology expressed in Samuel is the unconditional validity of the eternal Davidic promise. This promise is expressed in Nathan's oracle in 2 Samuel 7, which many scholars have identified as deuteronomistic and a later addition to the independent narratives.[51] Dennis McCarthy highlights 2 Samuel 7 as one of the deuteronomistic passages that should be included among those singled out by Noth as functioning to tie the DtrH together. It sets up a "carefully worked out over-all structure" in DtrH, which seems unified in form and content, demonstrating a deuteronomistic hand.[52] And while contemporary scholars debate the composite nature of this passage, demonstrating pre-Dtr, Dtr, and post-Dtr strands, the present form, in P. Kyle McCarter's words, "admits to a unified interpretation."[53] 2 Samuel 7 emphasizes two major themes of DtrH: the Davidic promise and the temple. McCarter emphasizes that in Nathan's oracle, as in Deuteronomy, "security is linked, finally, to the proper worship of Yahweh."[54] While the passage may be deuteronomistic and focused on proper worship of Yahweh, a place in Samuel where we might expect to see the same view of the good king as Kings, it is very different. Even here, the establishment of the temple in Jerusalem with Solomon as its builder, as expressed in 2 Samuel 7, lacks the emphasis on removing idolatry and fidelity to the covenant ever-present in Kings and linked to the evaluations of the good kings. And while the addition of this chapter to the pre-Dtr narratives of Samuel does direct the overall reading of the book, it does not transform its royal portrait into the theological perspective in Kings.

According to Weinfeld, in 2 Samuel 7, Dtr "attaches the promise of the perpetuation of the dynasty to the Davidic dynasty in particular…provided that the Davidic house observe the

[48] Leonhard Rost, *Die Überlieferung Von Der Thronnachfolge Davids* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926). Leonhard Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David* (trans. Michael D. Rutter and David M. Gunn; Sheffield, England: Almond Press, 1982).
[49] Moshe Garsiel, "The Book of Samuel: Its Composition, Structure and Significance as a Historiographical Source," *JHS* 10 (2010): 21.
[50] Ibid., 10:23.
[51] P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel* (Anchor Bible Commentary 9; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 210.
[52] Dennis J. McCarthy, "2 Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomic History," *JBL* 84, no. 2 (1965): 131.
[53] McCarter, *II Samuel*, 212.
[54] Ibid., 217.

law."[55] Contra Weinfeld, the Davidic connection to the eternity of the dynasty is made in 2 Samuel 7, but as many scholars have argued, the covenant in Nathan's oracle is mostly unconditional, emphasizing the relationship between father and son. Obedience to the law, as articulated in Kings, is not expressed here. According to Cross, Nathan's oracle reflects "the Canaanite formula of divine sonship of the king…In 2 Samuel 7:14a this formula appears to stand in place of the covenant formula."[56] Furthermore, "in 2 Samuel 7:14b-16, immediately following the sonship formula, there is the specific assertion that no wrongdoing on the king's part can bring an end to David's perdurable dynasty."[57] This is completely different from the perspective of Kings where the fate of the people and the king relies on the king's covenant fidelity. It is only in Kings that the conditions compelling the Davidic house observe the law are made. Furthermore, Knoppers asserts that the sonship promise in 2 Samuel 7 is not reflective of a vassal treaty or grant (à la Weinfeld) in Deuteronomy and Kings, but instead focuses on "the high theology of the Jerusalem court," associating the Davidic promise with the "ritual procession of the ark (vv. 6-8) and the election of Zion (vv. 13-16)."[58] Yet, while 2 Samuel 7 establishes the Davidic house, the characteristic language of obedience is missing. In a work where the language of covenant, *bĕrīt*, is so prevalent (Dtr and the DtrH uses *bĕrīt* more than any other author[59]), the promise in 2 Samuel 7 is not constructed as a *bĕrīt,* which would entail reciprocal commitments by both parties, on the part of the king (and Israel), namely fidelity to the law. Dtr does not use *bĕrīt* except to talk about the covenant of the patriarchs and the Mosaic covenant, not in relation to the promise to David.[60]

2 Samuel 7 is one of the prophetic orations that helps structure DtrH and reflects the deuteronomistic concept of Yahweh working in history.[61] It is significant that 2 Samuel 7, with its central role in Dtr theology (establishing the eternity of the Davidic dynasty) and given the consensus that this is indeed a deuteronomistic passage (as early as Wellhausen, scholars have associated the composition of 2 Samuel 7 with Josiah's court[62]), that the typical deuteronomistic phraseology is absent. There is no mention of the מצות, of the חקים ומשפטים, as usually found with deuteronomistic reward. Even though scholars like McCarter assert that the passage reflects the "themes from the larger history,"[63] this chapter stands in stark contrast to the portraits of the kings in Kings and especially to the depiction of David as the paradigm of deuteronomistic covenant behavior.

The Davidic Prototype

The best picture we have of David's commitment to the covenant is retrospective in the Solomon story. The portrait of David as the prototype for the good king is first developed in the

[55] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 5.
[56] Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973), 257.
[57] Ibid., 258.
[58] Gary N. Knoppers, "Ancient Near Eastern Grants and the Davidic Royal Covenant," *JAOS*, no. 116 (1996): 685.
[59] Ibid., 675.
[60] Cross, *CMHE*, 260.
[61] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 16.
[62] Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David*, 35.
[63] McCarter, *II Samuel*, 215.

Solomon story in two ways: first as the exemplar for Solomon and then as the standard up to which Solomon does not measure. Solomon, given specific instructions of how to be a good king, helps us define what that role means. Solomon, the king who has the longest narrative of all the kings (ten and a half chapters), functions proleptically for all the kings, good and bad. Through the portrait of Solomon, the prototype of the comparative David is constructed, against which Solomon, the first good and bad king, and all subsequent kings can be measured. As previously discussed, the concept of the good king, one who is faithful to the covenant, is first established in 1 Kings 2:3-4, David's charge to Solomon. Prosperity and dynastic continuity rely on the king following the laws and commandments, statutes and testimonies of the Law of Moses. In his initial actions, Solomon follows the statutes of his father David (ויאהב שלמה את יהוה ללכת בחקות דוד אביו, 1 Kgs 3:3). Also, at Gibeon, Solomon appeals to the image of David as Yahweh's servant: ויאמר שלמה אתה עשית עם עבדך דוד אבי חסד גדול כאשר הלך לפניך באמת ובצדקה ובישרת לבב עמך "And Solomon said [to Yahweh], 'You showed great favor for your servant David, my father, because he walked before you in faithfulness and righteousness and the integrity (rightness) of his heart was with you'" (1 Kgs 3:6). In Yahweh's response to Solomon's prayer at Gibeon, the connections between the David of the book of Samuel (the lover of Yahweh and recipient of Yahweh's favor) and the prototypical David constructed in Kings (the deuteronomistically adherent) are made. In granting Solomon's request for wisdom, Yahweh affirms that observance of the laws and commandments ensures long life and being like David: ואם תלך בדרכו לשמר חקי כאשר הלך דויד אביך והארכתי את ימיך "And if you walk in my way, observing my laws and commandments, as David your father walked, I will lengthen your days" (1 Kgs 3:14).

Similar to the events at Gibeon, the development of the David concept continues with another prayer-response sequence. The image of David is doubly affirmed through Solomon's prayer and Yahweh's response after the building and dedication of the temple. In 1 Kings 6:12, Yahweh says: הבית הזה אשר אתה בנה אם תלך בחקתו ואת משפטי תעשה ושמרת את כל מצותי ללכת בהם והקמתי את דברי אתך אשר דברתי אל דוד אביך "This House which you have built, if you follow my laws and statutes, you shall do and observe all my commandments following them and I will establish this word with you as I spoke to David your father." It is unclear exactly what Yahweh is promising David. What is the "word"? Presumably it is the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, as seen in 2 Samuel 7, but the language of covenant loyalty as connected to observing the law is missing from the promise in 2 Samuel 7 (as discussed above). In fact, the conditional covenant established here with Solomon is wholly different from the one established with David. This sets the tone for the relationship between Yahweh and subsequent kings.

Solomon offers his prayer to Yahweh in 1 Kings 8, as discussed above, suggesting what it means of be whole-heartedly with Yahweh (1 Kgs 8:61). In response, Yahweh reaffirms and elaborates on the promise of 6:12, further articulating how David behaved and what Solomon will receive if he emulates David:

> ואתה אם תלך לפני כאשר הלך דוד אביך בתם לבב ובישר לעשות ככל אשר צויתיך חקי ומשפטי תשמר. והקמתי את כסא ממלכתך על ישראל לעלם כאשר דברתי על דוד אביך לאמר לא יכרת לך איש מעל כסא ישראל. And if you walk before me as David your father walked with a blameless heart and righteousness, doing all that I commanded you, my laws and statutes you will observe. And I will establish the throne of your kingship over

> Israel forever as I spoke to David your father, saying there will not be a man of yours cut off from the throne of Israel. (1 Kgs 9:4-5)

These verses establish the conditional nature of the Davidic promise as expressed in Kings.

The rise of Solomon and the development of the Davidic prototype heighten the impact of the fall of Solomon. These early chapters of Kings create a constructed character that is used to evaluate all the kings, but few have the ability to live up to the standard. In 1 Kings 11, Solomon is portrayed as a bad king; he was not like David. In his old age Solomon has a change of heart (for more, see chapter 1): ולא היה לבבו שלם עם יהוה אלהיו כלבב דויד אביו "And his heart was not fully with Yahweh his God, as was the heart of David his father" (v. 4). Also, in an evaluation similar to the regnal formulae, Solomon's deeds are evaluated negatively in 1 Kings 11:6: ויעש שלמה הרע בעיני יהוה ולא מלא אחרי יהוה כדוד אביו "And Solomon did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh and he was not fully behind Yahweh like David his father."

The creation of the prototype construction begins with the establishment of the kings who succeed David. Solomon is set up with conditions of how to be like David. He is to keep the laws and the statutes, walking in the way of Yahweh as David did (1 Kgs 3:14; 6:12; 9:4-5). Both the potential build up of how Solomon should be and the rebuke for the reality of the character of Solomon highlight what it means to be like David.

Knoppers suggests that the Davidic standard, "the archetype of royal fidelity" as applied to Solomon (and other kings), demonstrates Dtr's negotiation between two motifs: "An emphasis upon the need for total obedience characteristic of the deuteronomic movement and an emphasis upon the unconditionality of YHWH's promises to David characteristic of royal Judahite ideology."[64] The deuteronomistic version of the Davidic promise and its role in the History portrays royal figures "within Israelite history [who] could have attained similar assurances from the deity. David need not have been unique."[65] Is this not the essential nature of a prototype – a model which can be replicated? In contrast to Provan, Knoppers argues that "the Deuteronomist integrates both themes – the comparative David and the promissory David – within his history by presenting the unconditional divine assurance of fidelity to David and to his seed as a reward for Davidic fidelity."[66] In my mind, this integration occurs by Dtr re-writing the unconditional promise of 2 Samuel 7 into the Davidic comparative typology, with its conditional success, as depicted in Kings. Dtr re-imagines the promise of a Davidic dynasty, taking on the themes of 2 Samuel 7 in which David is established as an essential character in the history of the monarchy and exploits the importance of the role of David in founding the dynasty. This role sets him up as fitting for the role of the prototype of the good king. It is then in Solomon's succession of David that Dtr makes his covenantal requirements for the continuity of the dynasty apparent.

In this way, the Deuteronomist creates a prototype of the good king, and the best of the good kings; one who is faithful to Yahweh and the covenant and initiates religious reform. Dtr retrospectively projects this image onto the known figure of King David, the eponymous ancestor of the Davidic dynasty. This convention is used only in Kings, even though Samuel chronicles the reign of David, the construct and cultically adherent king is missing. Given the

[64] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:152.
[65] Ibid., 1:153.
[66] Ibid., 1:154.

establishment of the Davidic prototype of the measure of the good king, it is not surprising that only those kings of the Davidic dynasty, as opposed to the kings of Israel, might achieve praiseworthy status. While this literary application occurs, it is clear that the model of the good king is not based on the portrait of David in Samuel. It seems that it would be much more likely that the archetype David constructed in Kings is modeled on the figure of Josiah, the great reformer, the hero of the book of Kings, and out of whose court the history comes. [67] The next two chapters, on Jeroboam and Josiah respectively, will illustrate the ways in the ways in which this prototype is applied to the portrait of those kings, good and bad.

[67] Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 125.

Chapter 4

Jeroboam "who caused Israel to sin"

The Jeroboam narrative is made up of several discrete episodes. In these four chapters (1 Kgs 11-14), the portrait of Jeroboam is initially positive, but it is Jeroboam's negative legacy that has long term staying power. The narrative is made up of several pre-existing passages that Dtr adopts and adapts for his greater purpose. In these chapters, the hand of Dtr is clearly seen. In some places, quite obviously Dtr inserts his signature language and concerns for the proper worship – centralization of the cult and fidelity to the covenant. Elsewhere, the mark of Dtr is more subtle and is seen in the ways in which he crafts the overall story, ordering his sources and tying them together. The result is quite effective. In Jeroboam, Dtr continues to construct the prototype of David as well as its opposite, the anti-type. First Solomon and then Jeroboam provide the example for future kings of how they must and must not behave. While the actual kings rarely take notice of these exempla, the literary model is much more effective. The building of the Davidic potential only further emphasizes the depth to which Jeroboam will fall, establishing him as the prototype of the evil king, the one against whom all bad kings will be measured. This occurs through the deftly sculpted complete narrative as well as the individual episodes. In this case, the historiographical poetics of Dtr are at work in both the parts and the sum of the whole. The use of Jeroboam as the prototype of the evil king (as opposed to Ahab, the most evil king) highlights that the pre-exilic Dtr is primarily focused on a program that decries decentralized worship.

The Jeroboam story begins by introducing Jeroboam following the other adversaries of Solomon (1 Kgs 11:26-18), as discussed in chapter 1. Ahijah stops Jeroboam on the road, tears his robe, giving ten pieces to Jeroboam, and tells him of Yahweh's plans to punish Solomon and make Jeroboam king of ten tribes (1 Kgs 11:29-39). This interaction is followed by the assembly of Israel requesting that Rehoboam, Solomon's son, lighten their corvée. When Rehoboam refuses, Israel separates from the Davidic monarch and makes Jeroboam king over them (1 Kgs 12:1-19). In order to sure up his political control of his kingdom, Jeroboam establishes counter-cult shrines to keep his subjects from returning to the temple in Jerusalem (1 Kgs 12:25-33). At the dedication of the shrine at Bethel, the man of God from Judah proclaims the impending doom of Jeroboam's kingdom (1 Kgs 13:1-10). This is followed by the man of God's journey and his interactions with the Old Prophet of Bethel (1 Kgs 13:11-32). The Jeroboam narrative concludes with the second Ahijah oracle, pronouncing doom on the House of Jeroboam and the entire kingdom of Israel (1 Kgs 14).

Through the full account of Jeroboam, the different historiographical priorities can be seen working in tandem, and while it is possible to tease out how each individual element is employed, they are so well integrated that their effect on the construction of the narrative is quite overlapping. For example, the use of prophetic texts, prominent in the story that features no fewer than four prophetic interactions, are rewritten to be an integral part of defining the prototype strategy and developing Jeroboam as the next David with the first Ahijah oracle and as the anti-David with the second. These oracles also contribute theological meaning to the rise of

Jeroboam, seemingly a political and historical event. The prophecies, especially the condemnation of Jeroboam in Ahijah's second oracle and the man of God from Judah, are essential in the promotion of the deuteronomistic program denigrating the religious cult of Jeroboam, which is a theme prominent throughout the history of the kingdom of Israel and DtrH as a whole.

Historiographical Method in the Jeroboam Narrative

In the Jeroboam narrative, the work of Dtr is seen through the application of his six historiographical priorities. These priorities are both selectional (a scholarly commitment to his sources, loyalty to the prophetic tradition, and the piling up of episodes) and compositional (promoting the deuteronomistic program, the attribution of historico-political events to theological causes, and the use of a prototype strategy). The entirety of the Jeroboam narrative in these four chapters is purposeful and displays comprehensiveness and completeness. While Dtr uses many sources, including earlier prophetic legends, he orders them and smoothes them into a full narrative. McKenzie suggests, "Dtr's creative hand has been involved in every aspect of the development of the narrative analyzed. He has restructured the narratives, revised the oracles, and composed new imitative oracles in order to present a theology of history. This illustrates how Dtr was both an author and an editor."[1] The narrative is framed by the two Ahijah oracles and the other events of Jeroboam's reign are emploted in a crescendo highlighting Jeroboam's great rise and his deep fall. The movement of Dtr's plot is an integrated literary whole that sets the narrative of the entire History into motion. Through Ahijah's oracles we see Jeroboam's rise and fall and at the height of the narrative the prophecy of the man of God from Judah pronounces the ultimate destruction of Jeroboam's cult, setting it up as a cult of idolatry, and looking forward to the coming of Josiah.[2] It is in this way that the literary intentions and power of Dtr's historiographical process can be seen.

THE AXIS OF SELECTION

1. Scholarly Commitment to his Sources

Dtr's scholarly commitment to his sources is pervasive throughout the narrative. Dtr is faithful to his sources and historical tradition even when they seem to undermine his overall deuteronomistic program. The first instance is the general acceptance of the split of the kingdoms. Because of the historical reality, Dtr must contemplate this split and deal with it, unlike the Chronicler, who ignores it. Dtr uses the split as a didactic theological message and warning to the people of Judah. Despite the fact that the split of the kingdom and the ascension of a non-Davidic king are an affront to some of the major tenets of deuteronomistic theology: the eternity of the Davidic dynasty with Jerusalem and the temple as Yahweh's chosen place. Yet, Dtr allows for and accommodates the split and the non-Davidic king.

Similarly, Dtr must contend with an earlier tradition and/or sources in which Jeroboam is initially presented in a positive light. Because he is portrayed so badly later, we question why Dtr

[1] McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 80.
[2] Cohn, "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative," 97:35.

even presents Jeroboam in a positive manner.[3] (This is also different from the LXX addition in which Jeroboam is not portrayed as positively in his ascension, to be discussed more below.) To accommodate this perspective, Dtr transforms the positive Jeroboam into the vehicle for the punishment of Solomon. If he will be faithful to the covenant, he will be rewarded with a dynasty like David. At the same time, we have to ask, does Jeroboam really have a chance? Does the positive Jeroboam reflect an originally well-known positive view of Jeroboam that Dtr has to accept and only later presents a bad Jeroboam, or is the presentation of the positive Jeroboam a deuteronomistic literary invention, making Jeroboam's downfall and inability to live up to the Davidic model seem even worse? It is possible that the answer is both. Dtr takes the original tradition and uses it to his literary advantage. It would be uncharacteristic of Dtr to invent such a positive view of a king that he holds in such contempt. Instead, he exploits the tradition he has inherited to further vilify Jeroboam later in the narrative. He also needs this positive portrait to theologically explain why Yahweh takes the greater part of the kingdom from the house of David.[4]

The Septuagint includes two versions of the story of Jeroboam's rise. The first account is roughly parallel to the MT account. The second account, often called the addition, supplement, alternative story, or LXX B story, contains a narrative significantly different from that found in Kings. The long addition found in the Septuagint follows 3 Kings 12:24.[5] Perhaps a comparison with the LXX addition can help to determine the reasons for the picture of the positive Jeroboam. The narrative, as it stands in MT, raises, as Sweeney suggests, a serious theological problem: Who was wrong in choosing Jeroboam? Was it Yahweh or Ahijah? And did Yahweh deliberately set up the north for failure by making Jeroboam king?[6] The MT, with Ahijah's first oracle raising Jeroboam as king and giving him the ten tribes as a punishment for Solomon, creates a theologically problematic situation. Since Jeroboam turns out to be an evil king who leads Israel to sin and ultimately to its destruction, it is theologically problematic to consider that Yahweh either did not know that Jeroboam would turn out so bad or that Yahweh had doomed the North even before its inception. Sweeney suggests that the LXX addition attempts to address this problem of Yahweh/Ahijah's righteousness and good judgment by taking away the agency from Yahweh/Ahijah and instead presents Jeroboam as a self-promoter who raises himself up.[7] In this way, according to Sweeney, the LXX addition is an interpretation or correction of the

[3] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:185–6.
[4] Cohn, "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative," 97:25.
[5] For scholarship on the Septuagint addition see: Cogan, *1 Kings*, 355–56; David Willoughby Gooding, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *JBL* 91, no. 4 (1972): 529–533; Robert P. Gordon, "Second Septuagint Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash?," *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 368–393; Gray, *I & II Kings*, 286–88; Montgomery, *The Books of Kings*, 251–54; Adrian Schenker, "Jeroboam and the Division of the Kingdom in the Ancient Septuagint: LXX 3 Kingdoms 12.24 a-z, MT 1 Kings 11-12; 14 and the Deuteronomistic History," in *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. Albert de Pury, Jean-Daniel Macchi, and Thomas Römer; Journal for the Study of the Old Testament; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 214–257; Sweeney, "A Reassessment," 38:165–195; Zipora Talshir, "Is the Alternate Tradition of the Division of the Kingdom (3 Kgdms 12:24a-z) Non-Deuteronomistic," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 599–621; *The Alternative Story*; "Literary Design--A Criterion for Originality? A Case Study: 3 Kgdms 12:24a-z; 1 K 11-14," in *Double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. Adrian Schenker, Yohanan Goldman, and Christoph Uehlinger; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2001), 41–57.
[6] Sweeney, "A Reassessment," 38:176, 177.
[7] Ibid., 38:190.

MT. The parallel text of the MT's first Ahijah oracle is attributed to Shemaiah. In doing this, the prophecy has a sense of illegitimacy to it. Shemaiah is anachronistically added to this narrative. He is a false prophet known from the time of Jeremiah (Jer 29:24-32).[8] This leaves the reputation of Ahijah untainted – he is a true prophet, proclaiming the destruction of Jeroboam and does not deliver the message of dynastic promises for this evil king. (Shemaiah also makes an appearance in the MT narrative. Yahweh tells him to instruct Rehoboam to not fight against Jeroboam in Israel (12:22-24). These verses are often considered a late addition.[9]) The LXX's attempt to fix this issue highlights its existence in the MT version. Including the initially positive portrait creates problems for the overall narrative. It seems that if it had not been necessary for Dtr to include this positive portrait perhaps he would have left it out.

Similarly, it is hard to believe that if there had not been an originally positive portrait of Jeroboam in existence that Dtr would have gone through such lengths to construct it. Giving out accolades, especially to the great villain of the History, is certainly not characteristic of Dtr's style.

2. Loyalty to the Prophetic Tradition

The inclusion of the prophetic tradition is quite clear in this narrative and very much structures the plot of the Jeroboam narrative as well as the major plot lines in the entire DtrH. Dtr includes four independent prophetic accounts in the story of Jeroboam (Ahijah and the accession, the man of God and the altar, the old prophet from Bethel, and Ahijah and Jeroboam's wife). Except for the man of God from Judah, these prophets are northern. This is both significant in the history of the prophetic sources as well as for the literary construction. As discussed in chapter 1, Dtr integrates a pre-deuteronomistic, likely northern, prophetic source into his narratives. The presence of northern prophets is literarily significant. Condemnation by a northern prophet (1 Kgs 14), especially the one who originally raises Jeroboam as king, is particularly pregnant with meaning. Even a blind northern prophet can see the error of the establishment of the northern kingdom, its founding monarch, and its national cult. It is not surprising that when the narrative comes to the prophecy of the man of God from Judah that a southern prophet denounces the king and his shrines. This prophecy derives from a different source from the other oracles. Not only does it reflect a southern perspective, but it has a definitively later provenance with its reference to the coming of Josiah and the condemnation of Jeroboam's uncentralized cult.

The use of the various prophecies in this narrative account has several effects. It both authenticates the prophecies about Jeroboam – his rise and fall – and the prophecy against his altar, as well as sets the stage for the climax of the History with the coming of Josiah. As discussed previously, the incorporation of prophetic texts is a strategy Dtr uses to pass judgment on the kings and to demonstrate the prophet's and Yahweh's intervention in domestic and foreign affairs.[10] The fulfillment of prophetic oracles is one of the ways in which Yahweh's role in history is clearly articulated and Dtr's and Yahweh's judgments expressed and enacted. Also,

[8] Ibid., 38:170.
[9] Cogan, *1 Kings*, 354.
[10] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 107. Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 78.

it is through prophecy, especially the inclusion of the oracle of the man of God, that Dtr connects the story of Jeroboam with that of Josiah. Dtr makes use of these earlier narratives in order to support his programmatic agenda. While these prophetic narratives have been well integrated and employed by Dtr, there are still some tell-tale signs that identify these passages as originally non-deuteronomistic. These include the northern focus and perspectives expressed within. Also, these sources describe miracles occurring in Israel, yet during the "golden age" of Josiah's reign, there are no miracles. The miracles derive from inherited sources and are not part of Dtr's compositional strategies.[11] These prophetic texts are so well integrated that I will discuss the use of the two Ahijah prophecies and the oracle of the man of God from Judah below and the ways in which Dtr rewrites them to contribute to his compositional strategies. Dtr's use of the Ahijah prophecies will be explored in more depth when considering their contribution to constructing the prototype strategy. Also, the prophecy of the man of God from Judah will be considered for its contribution to the promotion of the deuteronomistic program.

The narrative of the old prophet of Bethel, while included among these other prophetic stories, is less clear in its function within the narrative. It is widely held that this story is an insertion, particularly because it does not have an Old Greek counterpart.[12] This prophetic story highlights the illegitimacy of the north – its religious practices and its prophets. Ahijah and the old prophet are both northern. The underlying attitude toward both is somewhat negative. Ahijah's folly is initially accepting Jeroboam as rightful king, but that is rectified later in the story. Conversely, the old prophet of Bethel does not evince the character we usually associate with prophets. He is a liar, tricking the man of God to violate Yahweh's commands (it seems to be for his own gain[13]), in order to prove whether the man of God is a true prophet. There appears to be nothing prophetic about this old prophet; he does not speak with Yahweh, initially deliver an oracle, or lead the people. Instead he exists to demonstrate the corruption of the northern kingdom and to legitimate the man of God from Judah, as prophet and the truth of his prophecy. At the end of the story the old prophet commissions his sons: "When I die, bury me in the grave where the man of God is buried, next to his bones lay my bones. For the word he announced by the word of Yahweh against the altar in Bethel and against all the shrines of the high places in the cities of Samaria, shall surely come to pass" (1 Kgs 13:31-32). Ironically, the old prophet, whose first proclamation is a lie, confirms the truth of the prophecy of the man of God. He serves as a witness against his own people.[14]

The political and prophetic disunity expressed in the Jeroboam narrative through the prophecies of both northern (Ahijah and old prophet of Bethel) and southern (the man of God from Judah) prophets also hints at the potential threat that the southern writers felt in their attempt to push their religious program over the established northern cult. Walsh suggests that the story of the man of God demonstrates that "even southern prophecy is weakened, tempted in

[11] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 246–8, 254.
[12] McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 51.
[13] Eynikel suggests that "the only reason for the trap is that the old prophet has learned from his sons (v. 11) that Josiah will remove bones from the graves in order to desecrate the altar…From their report he realizes that his grave will be desecrated too, unless he finds some way to prevent it" (Erik Eynikel, "Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Deuteronomistic History (1 Kgs 13; 2 Kgs 23, 16-18)," in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989* (ed. C. Brekelmans and J. Lust; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1990), 234).
[14] Jerome T. Walsh, "The Contexts of 1 Kings XIII," *VT* 39 (1989): 360.

its diffidence to abandon its own word before the self-assurance of its Israelite counterpart. Thus the political disruption willed by Yahweh has begun to spread to the religious structures of the people. Beth-El is set against Jerusalem, cult against cult, feast against feast, prophet against man of God."[15] Even though he meets a tragic fate, the truth of the words of the man of God is affirmed by the northern prophet.

The story of the old prophet of Bethel also creates an analogy between Jeroboam and the man of God from Judah. Both Jeroboam and the man of God violate Yahweh's commandments (Jeroboam in his sin and the man of God in eating and drinking). Even a man of God, presumably faithful and an unwitting transgressor, will be severely punished for violating Yahweh's commands. This highlights obedience and the law. If Israel thought Jeroboam's cult were permissible, they are reminded that it constitutes disobedience. Also, the message is sent clearly to Judah – like the man of God, if they violate Yahweh's command, they too will be punished.[16]

3. The Ordering of Episodes

The piling up of episodes can be seen in the individual scenes compiled in these four chapters. The story of Jeroboam is a collection of individual narratives that are woven together using Dtr's unique historiographical method. We have four prophetic stories and other assorted texts and traditions that are taken up by Dtr to form the story of Jeroboam's reign. Using each of these stories, and the strategic choices about where to include them, Dtr creates a powerful narrative arc that begins and ends with the two Ahijah stories. As prophet, Ahijah raises Jeroboam to the position of king and sets him up to be faithful to the covenant, but ultimately he is not, and in the end Ahijah delivers the doom proclamation against him. The use of Ahijah in both of these contexts highlights that Jeroboam had the potential to be the next David but that he cannot accomplish it. These two oracles function as an inclusio of the overall Jeroboam story. The report of the assembly at Shechem and Rehoboam and his advisors gives a more "historical" account of the split of the kingdom. In between, the condemnation of the man of God from Judah pronounces harsh judgment against Jeroboam's shrines, focusing the story on the sin of Jeroboam, defining it as de-centralized worship akin to idolatry, making clear the reasons for Jeroboam's and the kingdom's downfall as pronounced in Ahijah's second oracle in 1 Kings 14.

In the collection of these individual scenes and sources we also see a rechronologizing of the events. Dtr strategically orders the separate episodes to promote his theological and literary goals. A first example of this strategic ordering is the placement of the first Ahijah oracle. It appears following Yahweh's condemnation of Solomon for his apostasy and precedes the election of Jeroboam by the assembly of Israel. This makes clear that Jeroboam's rise was divinely, rather than humanly, devised. Jeroboam is raised up by Yahweh as the punishment for Solomon's apostasy, not primarily because the people of the north are fed up with the service demands of the Davidic monarch. The order makes the divine reason primary. This is similar to Saul's anointing by Samuel and later being chosen by lot (1 Sam 10:1; 10:21), also a divine

[15] Ibid., 39:364–5.
[16] D. W. Van Winkle, "1 Kings XII 25-XIII 34: Jeroboam's Cultic Innovations and the Man of God from Judah," *VT* 46 (1996): 113.

indicator and not exactly "political." David also has multiple versions of his accession (1 Sam 16:13; 2 Sam 2:4; 5:3).

This ordering contributes to the initially positive view of Jeroboam and his divinely sanctioned rise. The effect is seen clearly when compared with the Septuagint's version of Jeroboam's rise. Through the two different orders of constituent elements it is possible to tell multiple stories with these literary building blocks. The LXX addition features a different organization of the various episodes of the story – Jeroboam's wife inquires about the fate of her child from Ahijah before prophetic dynastic promises are made or the establishment of Jeroboam's cult. Some of the material is parallel to the MT account, including Rehoboam and his advisors and a robe-tearing oracle, although it is pronounced by the prophet Shemaiah and not Ahijah, following the assembly at Shechem in the LXX addition. Since the LXX account virtually begins with Jeroboam's doom, the initially positive portrait in MT does not exist. Jeroboam and his kingship are always construed as illegitimate. For Zipora Talshir, by putting Ahijah's doom oracle earlier, the narrative is not about the history of Israel. Ahijah does not know Jeroboam and his wife from their previous interaction (the robe tearing prophecy found in MT 1 Kings 11 appears later). Therefore, Jeroboam has no dynasty. Also, the deuteronomistic reason for the split of the kingdom, Solomon's apostasy, is missing. Instead the kingdom splits because of Rehoboam and is not connected to Solomon. The reason for condemnation in LXX appears to be treason rather than the cult (Jeroboam's raising of hands against Solomon).

Clear narrative organization, reorganization, and rechronologizing are seen through comparison with the LXX addition. In the MT, Ahijah's two prophecies highlight the "conversion" of Ahijah. Also, true to deuteronomistic theology, the MT emphasizes Yahweh's role in history: the split of the kingdom is the punishment of Solomon. Similarly, Jeroboam is initially conceived of as a second David that when unrealized makes the evil Jeroboam as the Davidic anti-type even more powerful. Also, the doom oracle against Jeroboam is extended to the people of Israel and Jeroboam's dynasty (parallel and in contrast to the promise of the Davidic dynasty, which even when punished will persist). This is later linked to their destruction in 2 Kings 17 (the close connection between the prophecy and fulfillment is clearly seen through the language and images of the prophecy/destruction report). Extending the doom to the entire kingdom also sends a clear message to Judah that the same fate could happen to them.

Similarly, there is some confusion (and room for rechronologizing) of the events surrounding the assembly at Shechem. Where is Jeroboam and when does he return from Egypt? 1 Kings 12:2 says that Jeroboam upon hearing of the plans to "coronate" Rehoboam at Shechem returns from his refuge in Egypt. The following verse states that the assembly of Israel called for Jeroboam. The third report in 1 Kings 12:20 says that following the break with Rehoboam that Israel summoned Jeroboam to the assembly and made him king. These conflicting reports are significant. Does Jeroboam return, as does Hadad (1 Kgs 11:21) when he hears of his enemy's death? The death of Solomon is implied in verse 1, which states that Rehoboam goes to Shechem to be made king. Is this what Jeroboam hears? But in the Hadad example, it is made explicit that upon hearing of the death of David, Hadad returns. This is not stated here. Instead, does Jeroboam have more nefarious, planning to block the "coronation," or even divine motivations for returning? We recall that in Dtr's ordering of events that the assembly at Shechem follows Ahijah's first oracle. Does Jeroboam return because of his insider knowledge that the kingdom will be torn from the hand of Solomon's son and given to him? Also, sending for Jeroboam (as in

verse 3), before the assembly has an effect on the narrative. D.W. Gooding suggests that the MT chronology (calling for Jeroboam before the assembly) makes the negotiation of the elders of Israel seem insincere. Yet there is no reason to believe that Israel had intended to reject the Davidic king and always planned to raise Jeroboam as king from the beginning. LXX corrects this sense, rechronologizing so that Jeroboam joins the assembly on his own accord.[17]

For my analysis, which focuses on the MT version of Kings as the best exemplar of the deuteronomistic edition, taking into account the existence of the two versions illustrates the use of rechronologizing as a historiographical technique. In putting together the discrete building blocks of the Jeroboam narrative in each way (MT and LXX), the author/editor had the ability to craft a different narrative, telling a different story. The evidence of rechronologizing in these two witnesses demonstrates that Dtr had some flexibility in the placement of the literary building blocks (and that there was a potentially different organizational structure). Furthermore, the existence of the differences in LXX shows that their order was not fixed. The editor of the LXX addition feels comfortable enough to reconstruct the narrative in such a way to tell a different story, creating a situation in which Jeroboam is more responsible for his own rise.

THE AXIS OF COMPOSITION

a. Promoting the Deuteronomistic Program

The promotion of the deuteronomistic program is clear in this story. The beginning of the narrative – raising Jeroboam as king – is focused on the necessary punishment for Solomon's apostasy. Solomon has violated the covenant so he must be punished for his infidelity. Jeroboam, by no merit of his own, is the vehicle for that punishment. He is explicitly set up as king because Solomon did not follow Yahweh's commands and statutes. The constant repetition of *Leitworter* (הלך בדרך, עשה הישר, חקות, מצות, משפטים, עדות) dealing with fidelity to Yahweh (both the Solomon and Jeroboam narratives emphasize the deuteronomistic covenant theology). Also, the narrative is focused on denouncing the cult of Jeroboam and the northern kingdom. The proclamation of the man of God from Judah (1 Kgs 13) makes a strong statement against the cult. The prophecy of Ahijah to the wife of Jeroboam illustrates what will happen to the house of Jeroboam and the kingdom of Israel. Through Dtr's composition and adaptation of the oracle, the downfall of Israel is intrinsically connected to the cult of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:16). The way in which Dtr deals with Jeroboam's cult highlights the rhetoric of idolatry that Dtr uses for portraying non-centralized shrines and iconography. Dtr renders the cult shrines idolatrous even though they were likely Yahwistic. While the concept of non-centralized Yahwistic shrines would have been acceptable (even standard) religious practice in Jeroboam's 10th century Israel, the 7th century Jerusalemite Deuteronomist is adamant about rendering it unacceptable and transgressive. Von Rad speaks to this historiographical impulse, "The Deuteronomist makes absolutely no claim to appraise the kings at a given moment in relation to the particular historical situation confronting them."[18]

[17] Gooding, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power," 91:181.
[18] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 75.

What was contemporaneously permissible has no bearing on the judgment of the king. Dtr's standard of centralization was likely unknown during most of the monarchical period.[19]

Reading the fierce reaction of the Deuteronomist, it is possible to see that Dtr is not only laboring to promote his program, but is focused on discrediting another tradition. By highlighting Jeroboam's establishment of the shrines at Bethel and Dan, Dtr recognizes a rivalry between the national cults of Israel and Judah.[20] It is clear that the Deuteronomist is threatened by Jeroboam's religious "innovations" and writes scathingly against them. Dtr does not seem concerned with the rebuilding of Shechem and establishing Penuel as the royal residence, acceptable within political strategic measures for fortifying kingship; and he does not seem overly concerned with the split of the kingdom, but Dtr is deeply disturbed by changes in cultic affairs.[21] As local worship had previously been the cultic mode for centuries before the deuteronomistic "reform," Dtr fears a return to this standard Israelite tradition, continued support of the status quo, and non-compliance with the deuteronomistic program's innovations. In response, Dtr vilifies Jeroboam and his shrines. As such, the Deuteronomist attempts to make a previously acceptable mode of worship appear unacceptable – by casting local worship as entirely foreign, tantamount to idolatry; the Deuteronomist works hard rhetorically to discourage and prohibit local shrines. Through his history (and his historiographical method), Dtr intends to demonstrate that the cultic innovations of the deuteronomistic program should replace older forms of worship.

The account of Jeroboam's shrines is presented in two parts. The first is Dtr's narrative account of Jeroboam's decision to build the shrines and the establishment of his own cult in 1 Kings 12:25-33. The second is the prophecy by the man of God from Judah in 1 Kings 13:1-5. The sin of Jeroboam is his undoing and determines the fate of the kingdom of Israel. Most northern kings are accused of following the sin of Jeroboam (see excursus 1). Therefore, it is important to consider what exactly the sin of Jeroboam is. The first way in which the Deuteronomist indicts Jeroboam is through his violation of the conditions of the promise given to him by Yahweh. Jeroboam does not trust that Yahweh will be with him, even though Ahijah assures him in the oracle that Yahweh will (1 Kgs 11:38). After ascending the throne, Jeroboam initiates several building projects: fortifying Shechem and Penuel (1 Kgs 12:25). It was common behavior in the ancient Near East, for the new king to embark on major building programs of both religious and political, strategic buildings.[22] In this way, Jeroboam is able to fortify his kingdom politically, but the central shrine of Yahweh remains in Jerusalem, part of the kingdom of Judah. Jeroboam is concerned that it will challenge the political loyalty of pious Israelites who are faithful to Yahweh:

> And Jeroboam said to himself, "Now the kingdom will return to the house of David. If this people continues to go up to offer sacrifices in the house of Yahweh in Jerusalem then the heart (לב) of this people will return to their lord, to Rehoboam, king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam, king of Judah." (1 Kgs 12:26-27)

[19] Ibid., 76.
[20] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:7.
[21] Ibid., 2:36.
[22] Ibid., 2:35.

Jeroboam sets up these cultic shrines because he is afraid that the people will return to Judah since Jerusalem is still necessary to their cultic practice. Here, typical of deuteronomistic language, לב (v. 27) designates loyalty. Instead of being concerned that the people direct their לב to Yahweh, Jeroboam is anxious that their לב will return to Rehoboam and their loyalty to the Davidic king. Jeroboam's concern also emphasizes the deuteronomistic position: that the temple in Jerusalem is the only proper site of worship. He knows this and therefore schemes to counteract its political effect on his kingdom.

Through Jeroboam's words in 1 Kings 12:26-27, we are given a rare instance in which the reader is privy to the interior monologue of one of the characters. Jeroboam takes agency in securing the kingdom rather than relying on Yahweh's promise. This is the first part of the condemnation of Jeroboam by the Deuteronomist. Jeroboam does not trust Yahweh.[23] For theological reasons, the effect of ordering the first Ahijah oracle before the establishment of the cult is clear; Ahijah's prophecy in 1 Kings 11 should have been sufficient reassurance for Jeroboam. Not only does Ahijah promise Jeroboam he will be king of ten tribes, but he also assures him that he will have a בית נאמן, a lasting house (1 Kgs 11:38). Despite this, Jeroboam works proactively to insure the sustainability of the split kingdom.[24]

In addition, Jeroboam's act also shows that he does not have faith in his followers. According to Stuart Lasine, "Jeroboam's quoted thoughts in verses 26-27 imply that he views his followers as so fickle and violent that they might kill him and return their allegiance to Rehoboam, in spite of the fact that they had so recently killed Rehoboam's *corvée* officer Joram, an act which prompted Rehoboam to rush back to Jerusalem in his chariot to avoid the same fate (12:18)."[25] Through the revelation of his thoughts, in a short one verse, Dtr convicts Jeroboam as a paranoid leader – afraid that both Yahweh and Israel will leave him. Dtr forces the reader to wonder, if Jeroboam does not fully believe in the legitimacy of his kingship, should others? Also, Dtr portrays Israel as politically unfaithful (again, the לב) and will later convict them of being religiously unfaithful; they have recently deserted one king (Rehoboam), and because of their nature, as Jeroboam fears, may just as quickly leave their new king. The evaluation of Jeroboam and Israel in this short statement is thoroughly negative

While he is vilified for this act, Jeroboam is politically and not religiously motivated to erect the counter-cults at Bethel and Dan (1 Kgs 12:26-33). He views it as a necessary act in order to secure his rule and secession from the south. Jeroboam attempts to solidify his control of the northern kingdom by establishing a northern shrine so that the people would not return to a southern (or united) kingdom since it included Jerusalem and Solomon's temple. By erecting new shrines in the north, he works to guarantee the maintenance of divided kingdoms.[26] J.A. Montgomery says that "Jeroboam's enterprise was purely political indeed cleverly founded on

[23] It is interesting to contrast this transgression with the praise of Hezekiah, one of the few exceptional kings of DtrH. Hezekiah is praised for his incomparable trust in Yahweh (2 Kgs 18:5).

[24] Saul is also condemned for an act of agency; he does not obey Yahweh's command concerning the destruction of Amalek. Yahweh commanded Saul to "go and smite Amalek, and destroy all that belongs to them. And do not spare them. Kill [every] man and woman, from child to infant, from the camel to the donkey" (1 Sam 15:3). Instead, Saul spares the Amalekite King Agag and the best of the flocks (1 Sam 15:8-9). It is for this reason, and the agency that Saul takes on in carrying out the will of Yahweh, that the kingdom is torn from him (1 Sam 15:16-29).

[25] Stuart Lasine, "Reading Jeroboam's Intentions: Intertextuality, Rhetoric, and History in 1 Kings 12," in *Reading between Texts* (ed. Danna Nolan Fewell; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 143.

[26] Cross, *CMHE*, 279.

the opposition to Solomon's autocracy and centralization of religion. But he had no religious interest beyond the restoration of the local cults."[27] It is Dtr's evaluation of these sites that gives them their negative thrust.

While Jeroboam's reasons for instituting the new cult sites seem somewhat justified on a political level, he is fiercely condemned for it. The temerity of Jeroboam's cultic activity is only shocking according to deuteronomistic proscriptions. His is an act of de-centralization, rather than idolatry. Jeroboam's cult corresponds to standards of pre-deuteronomistic worship. According to Knoppers, "Jeroboam's goal was undoubtedly to reorganize and preserve a cult, not to create a new one *ex nihilo*. Whether the issue is iconography, location, priesthood, or festival, there is good reason to believe that Jeroboam's cultus was essentially conservative, especially when contrasted with the religious innovations of David and Solomon in Jerusalem."[28] Jeroboam's cult may have been a return or a continuation of previously established cults, which never ceased to have functioned, yet according to the Deuteronomist, Jeroboam's act is as grave as one of idolatry.

To a non-deuteronomistic audience, the acts of Jeroboam are not problematic and in fact correspond with general ancient Near Eastern norms. As our sources come from the hand of the southern Dtr, we have no true record of the northern attitude towards the cult.[29] It may be possible to consider the prophecies of Elijah as evidence of the absence of northern censure for Jeroboam's cult. Elijah, a northern prophet, who fights vigorously for the eradication of foreign cults (1 Kgs 18:22), does not respond negatively to the Bethel cult. He is even told to go there to meet a group of prophets in Bethel immediately before he dies (2 Kgs 2:2-4).[30] Similarly, Knoppers contends that "indulging Jeroboam with this attention, the Deuteronomist concedes the antiquity and appeal of the sanctuaries at Bethel and Dan." If they were not popular and well established, Dtr would not have to deal with them.[31] This demonstrates the prominence of these locations, in particular, Bethel.

The narrator's report of Jeroboam's cultic actions, while delivered matter-of-factly, reads like a list of all things prohibited by deuteronomistic theology:

> So the king took counsel and he made two golden calves and said to them, "Enough going up to Jerusalem. Behold, your gods, Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." (29) And he installed one at Bethel and the other at Dan. (30) This thing became a sin and the people went before the one as far as Dan.[32]

---

[27] Montgomery, *The Books of Kings*, 256.

[28] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:35.

[29] The story of Aaron's golden calf in Exodus 32 may express a northern polemic against Jeroboam's shrines. For more on this, see Richard E. Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed: A New View into the Five Books of Moses* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2003), 173. Gary N. Knoppers, "Aaron's Calf and Jeroboam's Calves," in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. Astrid B. Beck et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 92–104. William Henry Propp, *Exodus 19-40* (Anchor Bible Commentary; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 547–583.

[30] Eva Danelius, "Sins of Jeroboam ben-Nabat, Part I," *JQR* 58 (1967): 95–114. "Sins of Jeroboam ben-Nabat, Part II," *JQR* 58 (1968): 96.

[31] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:40.

[32] As it stands, the MT does not make sense. LXX (Lucianic) includes וילכו העם לפני האחד עד דן ולפני האחד בית-אל. It is difficult to adjudicate which one is primary. The MT should be considered better on the basis of *lectio difficilior*

> (31) And he made a shrine at the high place and appointed priests from the whole population who were not from the Levites. (32) And Jeroboam established a festival in the eighth month on the 15th day of the month, like the festival in Judah. And he ascended the altar, which he made in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves, which he made, and he stationed in Bethel the priests of the high place that he appointed. (33) And he went up to the altar which he made in Bethel on the 15th day of the 8th month which he devised himself. And he made a festival for the Israelites and he ascended the altar to make an offering. (1 Kgs 12:28-33)

In the simple installation of this cult, Jeroboam violates many tenets of deuteronomistic theology. He institutes non-centralized worship and (in Dtr's interpretation) image worship, installs non-Levitical priests, changes the holiday, and creates a system of possible polytheism. While the institution of non-centralized Yahwistic cult sites would have been permissible and common in Jeroboam's time, Dtr makes clear that in his reading of history, Jeroboam's religion is akin to idolatry. Literarily, Dtr tries (and succeeds) to delegitimize the cult. One way Dtr does this, as Halpern argues, is the inclusion of non-Levitical priests. Halpern views these alleged non-Levitical priests as an invention of Dtr in "an attempt…to denigrate the northern cult." He suggests the priests at Jeroboam's shrines likely would have been in reality still Levites (perhaps Mushites over Aaronides, but Levites nonetheless).[33] If Halpern's contention is correct, this would just be one more example of Dtr's rhetorical rewrite of history in order to delegitimize Jeroboam's cult and further the deuteronomistic program.

Furthermore, Dtr's version of Jeroboam's words of dedication in verse 28 suggests polytheism. While it is possible to read אלהים both as a singular and plural, the plural form of the verb indicates that Dtr intends it to be read as plural (and I have translated it as such). Dtr heaps on the accusations, including one of polytheism. Had Jeroboam actually uttered these words (not likely), he could have meant אלהים in the singular, suggesting that the calves were representatives of the one God, Yahweh, who had taken them out of Egypt, and Jeroboam was participating in permissible monotheistic Yahwistic worship. This ambiguity, and the potential innocence of אלהים, may be intentional. Montgomery suggests that the introduction of two calves (rather than one, although the narrative focuses only on the installation of one at Bethel) is to make certain

---

(Martin Noth, *Könige* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1968), 266; Cogan, *1 Kings*, 359.) Those scholars who consider the LXX to be the original, the MT omission could be explained by haplography, *homoioteleuton* (Fritz, *1 & 2 Kings*, 146; Gray, *I & II Kings*, 289.), but it is difficult to sufficiently explain how this error may have occurred. The suggestion of *homoioteleuton* is attractive, especially because of the similarity in the words, and the scribe may have jumped from one לפני האחד עד to לפני האחד עד, but that would mean that the original would have had Bethel in the middle, lost by haplography, and Dan at the end of the verse, וילכו העם לפני האחד בית אל ולפני האחד עד דן. As the Lucianic is usually a reliable witness, Knoppers is inclined to order according to that manuscript (Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:27.), but how can we explain that the Bethel clause falls off the end? Haplography could have occurred, but then Bethel would have been lost from the middle of the verse. It is not possible to posit haplography and hold to the Lucianic LXX reading. An alternative is that the MT is the original and the Greek added Bethel as a gloss. This seems to be the best explanation. In order to make sense of the MT verse, the LXX translator added the second, לפני האחד בית אל in order to make sense of the Dan clause or because the shrines at Dan and Bethel were a fixed pair and almost always appear together. Both of these scenarios could be true. Noth also suggests that Dan is mentioned alone since the narrative focuses on the dedication of the calf at Bethel, here is a comment and judgment that in their enthusiasm the people of Israel journeyed as far as Dan in order to install the other calf (Noth, *Könige*, 285.; Cogan, *1 Kings*, 359.)

[33] Instead, he suggests that the priests were Mushites, rejected from service at Solomon's temple in Jerusalem (Halpern, "Levitic Participation in the Reform Cult of Jeroboam I," 95:32.)

that the calves are seen as polytheistic. "With only one calf there was danger of confusion of the image with YHWH."[34] Similarly, the report leaves the direction of the offerings ambiguous. In verse 33 when Jeroboam ascends the altar to make an offering, does he offer it to Yahweh or to the calves? While Dtr may not go as far as to accuse Jeroboam of worshipping the calves themselves (perhaps this is a reflection of the collective memory that the shrines were permissible, the tradition against which Dtr writes), the ambiguity (there is no indirect object following להקטיר) and the mere suggestion is enough to color the episode and add suspicion to Jeroboam's intentions.

While this passage looks like a strict "factual" report, each step that Jeroboam takes in establishing his new cult violates another tenet of deuteronomistic religion. This censure is extremely subtle, casting the cult as idolatry. If any reader still thought Jeroboam's actions were acceptable, the prophecy of the man of God from Judah makes the condemnation against Jeroboam overt. Dtr uses the man of God's speech to articulate his opinion and establish sequences of prophecy and fulfillment.

> And behold a man of God came from Judah to Bethel by the word of Yahweh. And Jeroboam was standing on the altar to make an offering. (2) And he [man of God] called out against the altar by the word of Yahweh. And he said: "O Altar, Altar, thus says Yahweh, 'Behold, a son will be born to the house of David, Josiah by name, and he will sacrifice upon you the priests of the high places, the ones offering sacrifices upon you, and human bones will be burned upon you'." (3) And on that day he gave a portent,[35] saying, "This is the portent that Yahweh has spoken, 'Behold, the altar will break apart and the ashes upon it will be spilled'." (4) When the king heard the word of the man of God that he called out against the altar at Bethel, Jeroboam stretched out his hand from the altar, saying: "Seize him!" But the hand that he stretched out withered, and he was not able to draw it back to himself. (5) And the altar broke apart and the fatty ashes spilled from the altar, in accordance with the sign that the man of God gave by the word of Yahweh. (1 Kgs 13:1-5)

In this passage, a southern prophet corrects the word of the northern prophet, Ahijah. This story is strategically included after the first Ahijah oracle raising Jeroboam as king and charging him with deuteronomistic fidelity, but before Ahijah's condemnation of Jeroboam. Reaching far into the future (although contemporaneous with the deuteronomistic composition), the man of God looks to Josiah as the future king to truly be cast in the mold of the Davidic prototype, setting aside the potential David in Jeroboam.

---

[34] Montgomery, *The Books of Kings*, 255.

[35] Uriel Simon makes a distinction between an אות (sign) and מופת (portent, in his translation), which frequently appear together. Simon differentiates "portent" as a miraculous act "which lends credibility to the prophet and truth to his utterance." He defines "sign" as a symbolic act (or word) "which serves to concretize and further strengthen the word of the Lord through an actual deed or powerful symbolism," like the tearing of Ahijah's robe. Here the withering and restoring of the hand serves as a "portent." The man of God's prohibitions and their violation in the second half of the chapter are "signs." Simon's distinction is justified (Uriel Simon, "I Kings 13: A Prophetic Sign--Denial and Persistence," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 47 (1976): 86).

Even though Jeroboam is convinced of the legitimacy of the man of God as prophet, as seen by his request to be healed by the man (1 Kgs 13:6), Jeroboam does not denounce and close his shrines.[36] Instead, he consecrates "any people who wanted to be priests," and all of Israel continue to worship at the site (1 Kgs 13:33-34). It seems illogical that Jeroboam would embrace the power of the prophet yet blatantly deny the message of his prophecy, especially a king who seems to attempt to be faithful to Yahweh. This is another clue that the acts and oracle of the man of God are the product of Dtr's reimagining of the older prophetic story. The oracle is a literary tactic constructed by the Deuteronomist in order to convict Jeroboam.

The man of God's appearance has a compounded effect: he denounces the cult of Jeroboam and its priesthood, predicting a day on which it will be destroyed and its priests burned; he introduces and predicts the coming of the deuteronomistic savior, Josiah, who will rescue Israel from its illegitimate and non-deuteronomistic modes of worship. Josiah, unlike Jeroboam, will be the true second David. The man's ability to perform the "magic act" of paralyzing the king's arm legitimizes his status as divine messenger, reminiscent of Moses' demonstrations of power in the court of Pharaoh. The announcement of Josiah prefigures the Josianic reform, in deed and word. Josiah will do these things, and they will happen exactly as they have been enumerated here. The language of the report in 2 Kings 23 makes clear the connection and the prophecy fulfillment.[37] Josiah's centralization of the cult will overthrow the cult of Jeroboam. Jeroboam is the foil for Josiah; each is mentioned in the other's narrative. "What Jeroboam does, Josiah undoes."[38]

While the sin of Jeroboam is treated as the utmost form of transgression, it is not a sin of idolatry, but one of de-centralization. Yet Jeroboam is primarily convicted of not being like David. Dtr constructs a narrative in which Jeroboam sets himself against Davidic and religious tradition. While Dtr attempts to represent worship at Jeroboam's cult site as akin to idolatry, he still maintains them in two disparate categories. This is apparent when enumerating the sins of Ahab; the Deuteronomist distinguishes the sins of Jeroboam, which Ahab continues to do, from those that Ahab adds (1 Kgs 16:30-31): Baal worship to Jeroboam's de-centralized worship. This goes back to the way in which Dtr conceives of idolatry: wrong place, wrong symbols, and wrong deities. Jeroboam is only guilty of the first two while Ahab adds the worship of another deity. Still, for Dtr, the effect of connecting the act of de-centralized worship with blatant idolatry puts them in the same category – local worship is wrong. For the most part, Dtr appeals to a pious audience and tries to undermine the acceptance of local worship. These people already considered idolatry to be sinful and Dtr tells them that de-centralized worship is just as bad. The message is clear – if someone might have thought that worship at any Yahwistic shrine was permissible, through his literary and historiographical technique, Dtr lets his audience know that de-centralized worship is just as bad as idolatry, or actually becomes idolatry, yet Dtr separates these two modes of illegitimate worship and runs independent campaigns against them since the deuteronomistic policy of centralization was not yet widespread.

---

[36] "After this, Jeroboam did not turn from his evil path…" (1 Kgs 13:33).

[37] "And also, the altar at Bethel, the high place that Jeroboam son of Nabat made, who caused Israel to sin – he pulled down that altar along with the high place. He burned the high place, crushing it to dust; he also burned the Asherah. And Josiah turned, he saw the tombs there on the hill; and he sent and took the bones out of the tombs, and burned them on the altar, and defiled it, according to the word of Yahweh which the man of God proclaimed these things" (2 Kgs 23:15-16).

[38] Van Winkle, "1 Kings XII 25-XIII 34," 46:111.

b. The Attribution of Historico-Political Events to Theological Causes

The attribution of historical and political events to a theological cause is clearly seen in this narrative. The division of the kingdom is one example. 1 Kings 12:1-24 describes the historical account, outlining the division of the kingdom, Rehoboam's unwillingness to lighten the corvée of the north, and the northern desire to secede from his rule. 1 Kings 12:1-19 likely preserves an historical report, bearing what Carl Evans calls "the clear stamp of reliability."[39] While the conversations between Rehoboam and his two sets of advisors are imagined, the political and economic situations they reflect could likely be historical and may reflect an earlier royal source reporting the reasons and/or justification for the split of the kingdom.

Dtr takes this arguably historical account and puts his own deuteronomistic spin on it, attributing the cause of the split to Solomon's apostasy (1 Kgs 11) and including the story of the prophet Ahijah as king maker to execute Yahweh's desire for a split in the kingdom with Jeroboam as the king. While it may have been difficult for Dtr to contemplate the breach in the united monarchy, the rise of a non-Davidic king over Israel, and what appeared to be an abandonment of the Davidic promise (key elements of deuteronomistic ideology), he cannot deny the split of the kingdoms. His historiographical commitments do not allow him to erase history, but he can rewrite and interpret it.

Similarly, the vilification of Jeroboam, the Israelite kings, and the people of Israel, is a drawn out attempt to ascribe theological meaning to the destruction of the northern kingdom by Assyria. The negative treatment of the north is frequently part of the agenda to promote the deuteronomistic program.

According to Dtr, Jeroboam rises to power in an act of divine providence. The split of the kingdom is a result of theological reasons; the kingdom is divided because of Solomon's apostasy rather than the socio-economic conflict between the north and south over Rehoboam's corvée. By blaming Solomon, and not Rehoboam or the northern representatives, for the downfall of the united kingdom, Dtr makes the split about centralization and apostasy, not economic oppression. Consequently, according to Knoppers, "Solomon's construction of high places and his worship of other gods is more foundational than the division between Judah and Israel. And if infidelity lies at the root of disunion, then requiting such infidelity can mend the rift between northern and southern tribes" – as such, Josiah can reunite all of Yahweh's people theologically, even though the northern people no longer exists.[40] In this way, the infidelity of Israel is correctable by Dtr's hero, Josiah. Even in the report of the split of the kingdom so early in the history of the monarchy, Dtr is cognizant of the larger picture. The History is written from the perspective of the Josianic court and the coming of Josiah and his reform are the high point of the history of the monarchy. Similarly, Solomon's apostasy legitimates the division of the kingdom. In Chronicles Solomon never sins; it is not literarily necessary as the Chronicler views the northern kingdom as illegitimate. He does not need to justify its formation, instead he ignores it. In Kings, Solomon builds a high place that Dtr and Josiah cast as foreign, giving Dtr the opportunity to further the deuteronomistic program and elevate Josiah as hero. Solomon's act

[39] Carl D. Evans, "Naram-Sin and Jeroboam: The Archetypal Unheilsherrscher in Mesopotamian and Biblical Historiography," in *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method* (ed. William W. Hallo, James C. Moyer, and Leo G. Perdue; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 115.
[40] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:158–9.

sets up Josiah's reform as a way to reunite the kingdom.[41] In this way, the rise of Jeroboam, the rejection of the Davidic king (theologically Solomon and politically Rehoboam), the split of its kingdom and its eventual reunion by Josiah are clearly set up by Dtr's casting these events with theological causation.

c. The Use of a Prototype Strategy

The final compositional priority, the use of the prototype strategy, is clear in the Jeroboam account and is a crucial compositional strategy of Dtr. Jeroboam is initially set up as being cast in the mold of David in the first Ahijah oracle in 1 Kings 11:29-40, but he then is turned into the anti-David and the prototype of the evil king, the standard against which the kings of Israel are measured. Just as the David prototype was developed through the regnal formulae of the good kings of Judah, so too is the anti-type constructed through the regnal formulae of kings of Israel (see excursus 1). Furthermore, the potential for both sides of the prototype strategy, being like or unlike David, is fleshed out in the account of Solomon and then clarified in the regnal formulae (both good and bad).[42] In this way, the portraits of the kings – good and bad, northern and southern – are literarily consistent throughout the History, demonstrating a unified style characteristic of Dtr. They are judged by the same theological standards and compared to the same literary prototype. The construction of Jeroboam in the Davidic prototype is most clearly seen in the two Ahijah oracles.

Jeroboam as the Second David: Ahijah's First Oracle

After Jeroboam's introduction as an adversary to Solomon (see chapter 1), Jeroboam is met by the prophet Ahijah who, in the symbolic act of taking his robe, tearing it into twelve pieces and giving ten to Jeroboam, raises Jeroboam to the position of king. This presentation is accompanied by conveying the desires of Yahweh in splitting the kingdom and appointing Jeroboam as king of the North. Jeroboam is presented as a potential David, in both word and symbol:[43]

> And it happened at that time that Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem and the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite found him on the way. He covered himself with a new robe, and the two of them were alone in the field. (30) And Ahijah took hold of the new robe which was upon him and he tore it into twelve pieces. (31) **And he said to Jeroboam, "Take ten pieces for yourself, for thus says Yahweh the God of Israel, I am about to tear the kingdom from the hand of Solomon and I will give you ten of the tribes. (32) But the one tribe will be for him, for the sake of my servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, the city which I chose from all the tribes of Israel.**
>
> **(33) Because [he] left me and [he] bowed[44] to Astarte, god of the Sidonians, to Chemosh, god of Moab, and to Milcom, god of the Ammonites and [he] did**

[41] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 154, 155.
[42] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:120.
[43] The **bold** text marks deuteronomistic composition.
[44] The MT has these two verbs as plural, but a plural subject does not make sense in this context. I read along with the LXX, Syriac and manuscripts of the Vulgate, which have singular verbs; Solomon is their subject.

not walk in my way, to do right in my eyes, and [to keep] my laws and ordinances as David his father. (34) But I will not take the entire kingdom from his hand for I will position him as *nāsîʾ* all the days of his life, for the sake of David my servant, whom I chose, who kept my commandments and my laws. (35) And I will take the kingdom for his son and give it to you, the 10 tribes. (36) But to his son I will give one tribe in order to be a lamp for David my servant all the days before me in Jerusalem the city which I chose for myself to establish my name there. (37) But it is you I will take and you will be king over all you desire and you will be king over Israel.

(38) Thus it will be if you heed all that I will command you and you will walk in my way and do what is right in my eyes, to keep my law and commandments which David my servant did, then I will be with you and I will build for you a lasting dynasty as I built for David, and I will give to you Israel. (39) And I will humble the seed of David but not forever."

(40) And Solomon attempted the murder of Jeroboam. Then Jeroboam got up and fled to Egypt to Shishak, king of Egypt, and he was in Egypt until the death of Solomon. (1 Kgs 11:29-40)

While the investiture may have been an originally northern story (still apparent in verses 29 and 30), that praised Jeroboam, the text comes to us through a deuteronomistic hand. Dtr's version presents Jeroboam in the model of David, Yahweh's (and the Deuteronomist's) beloved king. The denunciation of Jeroboam becomes even more formidable when he is rejected for not being David-like.

In the last chapter, the Davidic prototype was established, using the regnal formula. The explicit Davidic comparison coupled with the portrait of Solomon in 1 Kings 1-10 highlight several criteria for being like David. The best of kings are those who did הישר בעיני יהוה, whose לבב was with Yahweh, and were like David. When applied to Solomon, these criteria are fleshed out, demonstrating that doing הישר meant fidelity to the deuteronomic covenant. Solomon is unable to achieve the Davidic ideal.[45] The charges against Solomon associate him with the worst kings, initiating the model for how to evaluate bad kings – those who are not like David.[46]

The connection between Jeroboam and Solomon in the construction of the prototype strategy is deeply rooted in many literary elements of the chapter. The first and most obvious is Jeroboam as the replacement of Solomon, both literally as king of ten tribes and typologically as the next David and then the model of the bad king. Similarly, Jeroboam is chosen and installed as king by Ahijah with the same words offered to Solomon in his installation:

והיה אם תשמע את כל אשר אצוך והלכת בדרכי ועשית הישר בעיני לשמור חקותי ומצותי כאשר עשה דוד עבדי והייתה עמך ובניתי לך בית נאמן כאשר בניתי לדוד ונתתי לך את ישראל If only he will heed all that I will command you and you will walk in my way and do what is right in my eyes, to keep my law and commandments which David my servant did, then I will be with you and I will build for you a lasting dynasty as I built for David, and I will give to you Israel. (1 Kgs 11:38)

[45] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:145.
[46] Ibid., 1:146.

This condemnation echoes the words spoken to Solomon by David in 1 Kings 2:3-4, as discussed in the previous chapter:

> ושמרת את משמרת יהוה אלהיך ללכת בדרכיו לשמר חקתיו מצותיו ומשפטיו ועדותיו ככתוב בתורת משה למען תשכיל את כל אשר תעשה ואת כל אשר תפנה שם. למען יקים יהוה את דברו אשר דבר עלי לאמר אם ישמרו בניך את דרכם ללכת לפני באמת בכל לבבכם ובכל נפשם לאמר לא יכרת לך איש מעל כסא ישראל Keep the mandates of Yahweh your God, following his ways, keeping his statutes and commandments, laws and warnings, as is written in the instruction of Moses, so that you will be successful in whatever you do and to whatever you turn. In order that Yahweh will fulfill his word which he spoke to me, saying, if your sons are careful in their way to walk before me faithfully with all their heart and with all their soul, no one will be cut off from the throne of Israel.

While not quite as verbose as David's words to Solomon, Ahijah's injunction to Jeroboam demonstrates similar sentiments. Ahijah charges him to do הישר בעיני יהוה, one of the characteristic elements of the regnal formula, by following Yahweh's way, obeying his commandments and law. These terms function as *Leitworter* in Kings. The comparison to David is made explicit – do these things, just as David "my servant" did. Being like David will merit Jeroboam David's reward; Yahweh will be with him and will build him a lasting dynasty. It is significant to note that the royal concept of בית נאמן is only mentioned in relation to David (1 Sam 25:28) and Jeroboam. (A third instance of בית נאמן also appears in 1 Samuel 2:35 in respect to a priestly house that will replace the Elides.) While the examples in 1 Samuel may be pre-deuteronomistic,[47] the concept is revised by Dtr and applied to the Jeroboam story. Ahijah's words clearly set Jeroboam up to be the next David. If he keeps the covenant, like David, he will be like David, the father of a בית נאמן.

The focus on the covenant in the installation of Jeroboam as well as in the reason for setting him up as king (Solomon's punishment) convey the importance of fidelity to deuteronomistic theology. Despite building the temple and the promise to David, Solomon is unable to hold onto the entire kingdom because of his gross violation of the covenant. Solomon, in worshipping Astarte, Chemosh, and Milcom (1 Kgs 11:33), does the opposite of fulfilling the criteria of the Davidic prototype.

Ahijah informs Jeroboam that the destruction of the Davidic kingdom will not be complete, instead one tribe will maintain Davidic kingship for the sake of David. Yahweh's words of punishment to Solomon in verses 11-13 are echoed in Ahijah's words of investiture to Jeroboam. In deuteronomistic style, Dtr repeats almost verbatim the conditions of the division of the kingdom, just as Yahweh speaks to Solomon:

> Because it was this way with you and you did not keep my covenant and my laws which I commanded you, I will surely rend the kingdom from you and give it to your servant. (12) But in your days I will not do it, for the sake of David your father, [but] I will rend it from the hand of your son. (13) But I will not tear [away]

[47] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 29.

> the whole kingdom, but one tribe I will give to your son for the sake of David my servant and for the sake of Jerusalem which I have chosen. (1 Kgs 11:11-13)

Ahijah speaks the following words to Jeroboam: "But the one tribe will be for him, for the sake of my servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, the city which I chose from all the tribes of Israel" (1 Kgs 11:32). The similar language used in these two speeches intrinsically connects Jeroboam's "reward" with Solomon's punishment. The words of Solomon's injunction repeated to Jeroboam are used contrastively to condemn Solomon: ולא הלכו בדרכי לעשות הישר בעיני וחקתי ומשפטי כדוד אביו Solomon "did not walk in my way, to do right in my eyes and, [to keep] my laws as David his father" (1 Kgs 11:33).

There are also many implicit allusions made comparing Jeroboam to David. One such similarity is the circumstance in which they both become king. David and Jeroboam are raised up as king as a form of punishment for the current king. After Saul's disobedience in his failure to kill Agag and the best of the sheep and cattle, David is selected to replace him (1 Sam 15). Similarly, Jeroboam is put into office to punish Solomon. Another allusion, and even foreshadowing of Jeroboam not being like David, is Jeroboam's "rebellion." Jeroboam "raises his hands" against Solomon (although we do not really know what Jeroboam actually does to rebel, see chapter 1), while David refuses to "put forth his hand against Saul" (1 Sam 24:7; 26:9, 11, 23). Although the parallel is not exact as Jeroboam הרים יד while David does not לשלח יד (in all examples), but the sense is similar.

The installation of Jeroboam in this way is particularly poignant. He is one of only four kings specifically appointed by Yahweh; the others are Saul, David, and Jehu – all are initiators of dynasties and the first of their kind.[48] Like David, Jeroboam has been singled out by divine providence. Jeroboam is promised a secure kingdom if he observes Yahweh's covenant like David. Also, they are both designated by a Shilonite (Ahijah and Samuel). Weippert calls this genre *Legitimationslegende*, which supports usurper kings who do not have a hereditary claim to the throne.[49] As both David and Jeroboam can be considered something of usurper kings (although neither seeks out the kingship), this leads to a tense relationship between the new king and the old king. Saul seeks to kill David (1 Sam 19:2, also 18:21), as Solomon does Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11:40).

The circumstances of Jeroboam's appointment also further the David connection. Both David and Jeroboam are chosen and elevated by prophets in a common prophetic motif of "prophets as king makers."[50] Samuel in 1 Samuel 16 approaches Jesse and his sons and according to the word of Yahweh picks out David from among his brothers. This story uses two standard *topoi* of prophetic tales, described by Robert Cohn as: "The secluded meeting between the prophet and the future king at which the king secretly announces his kingship (cf. I Sam 9, 27-10, 1; II Reg 9, 1-10); and second, the tearing of the prophet's robe to symbolize the loss of the kingdom (cf. I Sam 15, 27-28)."[51] Like David, Jeroboam is in the king's service, has to flee, and is chosen by Yahweh, in the deuteronomistic style, without seeking out and initiating

[48] Danelius, "Sins of Jeroboam ben-Nabat, Part I," 58:95–114. "Sins of Jeroboam ben-Nabat, Part II," 58:100.
[49] Weippert in McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 45, n. 15.
[50] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 114.
[51] Cohn, "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative," 97:26.

anointing. Unlike any other king, in Israel or Judah, Jeroboam begins his career as *David Redivivus*.[52] With these parallels in place, the reader has high hopes for Jeroboam and the success of the Northern Kingdom.

From Hero to Villain: Ahijah's Second Oracle

While Ahijah's first oracle sets Jeroboam up as a second David, the second oracle pronounces his doom. This is the final episode in the Jeroboam saga, following the initiation of his cult. Ahijah's second oracle in 1 Kings 14:7-16 is spoken at Yahweh's behest to Jeroboam's wife. In a twist on the motif of consultation oracles, frequently this is a sick king seeking an oracle, Jeroboam sends his disguised wife to inquire about Jeroboam's sick son.[53] Yahweh alerts Ahijah that she is coming and he "recognizes" her based on Yahweh's tip-off, despite that his eyes "had grown dim with old age" (1 Kgs 14:4). Although he is blind, he has the ability "to see" what Jeroboam and Israel cannot – the sinful nature of Jeroboam's cult. The following is Ahijah's second oracle:[54]

> When Ahijah heard the sound of her footsteps as she came in the doorway, he said, "Come, wife of Jeroboam. Why do you make yourself unrecognizable? I have been sent with a hard message for you. (7) **Go, say to Jeroboam, 'Thus says Yahweh, God of Israel, 'because I raised you up from among the people and I made you a *nāgîd* over my nation Israel. (8) And I tore the kingdom from the house of David and I gave it to you, but you have not been like my servant David, who observed my commandments and who followed me with all his heart, doing only what was right in my eyes. (9) You have done worse than all who came before you. You have gone and made for yourself other gods and molten images to anger me, and me you cast off behind your back.'** (10) *Therefore, I am ready to bring evil onto the house of Jeroboam and I will cut off every male*[55] *belonging to Jeroboam, even the restricted and abandoned of Israel. And I will sweep away the house of Jeroboam, as one burns dung completely. (11) Those of Jeroboam who die in the city, the dogs will eat, and those who die in the field, the birds of the sky will eat' for Yahweh has spoken. (12) As for you, get up and go to your house, when your foot comes to city, the child will die.*[56] *(13) And all Israel will lament him and bury him, for he alone of Jeroboam[' s kin] will come to the grave, for in him among the house of Jeroboam some good has been found by Yahweh, God of Israel. (14) Then Yahweh will raise up for himself a king over Israel, who will destroy the house of Jeroboam, this day and even right now.* (15) **Yahweh will strike Israel like a reed that sways in the water and drive out Israel from upon this good land, which he gave to their ancestors. He will scatter them across the river because they made *ašērîm* angering Yahweh. (16) And he will give over Israel because of the sins of**

[52] Paul S. Ash, "Jeroboam I and the Deuteronomistic Historian's Ideology of the Founder," *CBQ* 60 (1998): 18.
[53] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:77–78. Also, McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 62.
[54] *Italics* indicates the earlier doom prophecy while **bold** designates deuteronomistic composition.
[55] Literally, "the one urinating against the wall."
[56] This verse is likely part of the original Ahijah narrative, along with vv. 1-6 and 17 (Gray, *I & II Kings*, 304).

Jeroboam which he committed and because he caused Israel to sin. (1 Kgs 14:6-16)

Ahijah's oracle is primarily deuteronomistic. It incorporates earlier sources, a prophetic account that uses the sick king motif as well as a doom prophecy on the house of Jeroboam. While much of the language (especially vv. 8-9, 15-16) is characteristically deuteronomistic, the content of the oracle is more graphic than is typical for Dtr. Carl Evans suggests that the oracle was originally a doom prophecy on the house of Jeroboam alone, with language uncharacteristic of Dtr (although this language is repeated in the report of the fall of the northern kingdom in 2 Kings 17 and in the oracles against the houses of Baasha and Ahab, demonstrating how completely it has been adopted and adapted by Dtr).[57] Similarly, McKenzie suggests that Dtr may have "used an older treaty curse as the basis for the judgment oracle. But he completely changes the *Sitz im Leben* of the curse to refer to the demise of the Northern royal house. Dtr may have had a prophetic legend about the consultation of Ahijah for Jeroboam's sick son which he used as the setting for his oracle."[58] While the original oracle from a pre-existing Ahijah tradition referred to the house Jeroboam alone, Dtr re-envisions this to apply to the northern kingdom as a whole. The blame for the destruction of Israel is on its first king, Jeroboam.[59] This is the beginning of the use of the anti-David prototype that continues in the rest of the book of Kings.

The initial charge against Jeroboam is a reprise of the injunction to Jeroboam and Solomon, recalling the elements of the regnal formulae: "You have not been like my servant David, who observed my commandments and who followed me with all his heart, doing only what was right in my eyes" (1 Kgs 14:8). Jeroboam does not do הישר, his לבב is not with Yahweh, and he is not like David. Because of this, he will be punished. The creation of Jeroboam in the anti-David prototype begins with this verse. The primary charge against Jeroboam is that he is not like David (the sins of his cult are how he is not like David). He is set up with the opportunity and constructed according to the literary prototype, but he does not live up to the expectations. Instead of being like the paradigm of the good king, he becomes the prototype of the bad king. He has "done worse than all who came before [him]" (1 Kgs 14:9). This contention cannot possibly be true as Jeroboam is the first king of the North. This reflects the standard Dtr comparative formula used in relation to the other kings, but there is no one to whom Jeroboam can be compared. He is the first, yet this statement belies his status as a comparative figure. Knoppers argues against scholars who claim this comparative is "anachronistic." Instead he suggests that since the "negative incomparability formula" is only applied to a few kings – Jeroboam, Omri, Ahab, and Manasseh – in making the statement of incomparability "the Deuteronomist decries each of these three northern kings for their unparalleled apostasy."[60]

Dtr further qualifies what Jeroboam has done: "You have gone and made for yourself other gods and molten images to anger me (√כעס), and me you cast off behind your back" (1 Kgs 14:9b). Jeroboam has not been faithful to the deuteronomistic covenant. The house of Jeroboam will be destroyed and Israel will be exiled. Yahweh "will scatter them across the river because

[57] Evans, "Naram-Sin and Jeroboam," 118.
[58] McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 63.
[59] Evans, "Naram-Sin and Jeroboam," 120.
[60] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:106.

they made *ašērîm* angering Yahweh. And he will give over Israel because of the sins of Jeroboam which he committed and because he caused Israel to sin" (1 Kgs 14:15-16). This final line of Ahijah's oracle becomes the common refrain for the fate of Israel. Jeroboam inhabits the prototype of the evil king, or the *Unheilsherrscher*, the "ill-fated, hapless" ruler,[61] a typology used in other ancient Near Eastern historiographical texts, in which, according to Evans, "The king's religious offenses bring condemnation on himself and ruin to his family and nation."[62] Jeroboam becomes the standard of the evil king, against which the remainder of the kings of Israel will be measured. And he is the cause of the sins of the entire kingdom of Israel. These two elements: being like Jeroboam and having caused Israel to sin, become the constituent elements of the regnal formulae of the kings of Israel.

The role of Dtr's perspective in shaping the Jeroboam story – its episodes and Jeroboam's actions and character – is apparent when considering the historical plausibility (even the commonsensical motivations) of the narrative. The idea that Jeroboam would disobey the covenantal charge articulated by Ahijah seems illogical, given that he "inherits" the throne in the wake of Solomon's apostasy. The consequences of disobedience should have made an impact on Jeroboam, effectively inspiring, or more accurately scaring, him into submission.[63]

The absurdity of this occurrence can be interpreted in two different ways: first, from an historical perspective, Jeroboam does not commit what at his time was considered apostasy, and he believed he is faithful to the covenant, yet the Deuteronomist casts his behavior as apostasy. The second perspective is a deuteronomistic one; perhaps Dtr preserves this story for the sake of making Jeroboam look ridiculous. What kind of person would benefit from another's mistake and repeat the same mistake? Only one who is ineligible to attain such benefit. Dtr may have retained the prophetic investiture of Jeroboam along with its charge of covenantal fidelity to illustrate that Jeroboam should have known better and his inability to attain David-like status is his own fault. It is most likely that Jeroboam's disobedience is a deuteronomistic invention, created to further highlight deuteronomistic theology, demonstrating the punishment for those, especially kings, who violate the covenant.

Jeroboam's sin is a literary construction rather than an actual cultic violation. In his important and influential essay, Frank Cross contends that the major theme of the northern kingdom in DtrH is the "sin of Jeroboam" and it is this theme that guides the narrative, I would like to suggest that the sin of setting up the competing cult sites is secondary to the narrative and that the major transgression is a literary one, reflecting the construction of the Davidic prototype. First and foremost, Jeroboam was primed to be "like David," but he is not. The cultic violations are the "how" he was not like David. While Cross also highlights two themes that pit Jeroboam and David against each other (their religious behavior – Jeroboam's establishment of the counter-cult and David's fidelity), the typology of opposition is primary.[64] The contrast of David and Jeroboam is a literary construction; their behavior is part of that construction. Cross argues that the pre-exilic Dtr presents two theologies: "One stemming from the old Deuteronomic covenant theology which regarded destruction of dynasty and people as tied necessarily to apostasy, and a second, drawn from the royal ideology in Judah: the eternal promises to

[61] Evans, "Naram-Sin and Jeroboam," 99.
[62] Ibid., 118.
[63] Van Winkle, "1 Kings XII 25-XIII 34," 46:110.
[64] Cross, *CMHE*, 282–4.

David."[65] While the role of the kings underlies this theory and I do not intend to reject his assessment, Cross does not sufficiently recognize the literary design of the portrait of the kings and instead focuses on the themes as identifying levels of redaction and the theological concerns of the author/editor through cultic violations rather than literary construction. Framing the use of the prototype in terms of David versus Jeroboam lends greater precision and literary consciousness to our understanding of the Jeroboam narrative.

The importance of the oppositional prototype (over the physical cults) is further supported by the absence of mention of the calves and counter-cult at Dan and Bethel in Ahijah's doom prophecy. How can the cult violation be primary if it is not even mentioned in Jeroboam's judgment and renunciation? It is only the ordering of the narrative, putting the condemnation of the man of God before Ahijah's second prophecy that directs us to read the sin of the cult in that verdict. Furthermore, if it were all about cultic (in)fidelity we would expect Ahab, who adds to the sins of Jeroboam by introducing Baal worship in Israel, to be excoriated as the evil king (see chapter 6). But he is not.

This is also apparent in the use of Jeroboam rather than Ahab as the prototype of the evil king. Given that the Omrides, and in particular Ahab, are seen as the worst of all the kings of Israel, it is surprising that they are not used as the standard for measuring evil kings. The Ahab comparative only exists among those of the house of Omri (including two Judean kings), and the exilic version of the Manasseh account. The regnal formula for Ahab cements his place as building on the sins of Jeroboam:

> ויעש אחאב בן עמרי הרע בעיני יהוה מכל אשר לפניו. ויהי הנקל לכתו בחטאות ירבעם בן נבט ויקח אשה את איזבל בת אתבעל מלך צידנים וילך ויעבד את הבעל וישתחו לו. ויקם מזבח לבעל בית הבעל אשר בנה בשמרון. ויעש אחאב את האשרה ויוסף אחאב לעשות להכעיס את יהוה אלהי ישראל מכל מלכי ישראל אשר היו לפניו And Ahab son of Omri did more evil in the eyes of Yahweh than all who preceded him. It was a light thing to him to add to the sins of Jeroboam son of Nabat. He took Jezebel daughter of Eth-Baal, king of the Sidonians, as a wife and he went and served Baal and worshipped him. And he erected an altar to Baal in the house of Baal which he built in Samaria. And Ahab made an Asherah and Ahab continued to do and angered Yahweh, God of Israel, more than all the kings of Israel before him. (1 Kgs 16:30-33)

Dtr's assessment that it was not a small thing to increase the sins of Jeroboam is quite right. Since Jeroboam is established as the *Unheilsherrscher* in 1 Kings 13 and 14, to be worse than the prototype of evil (this comparative is articulated twice in the regnal formula, 1 Kings 16:30 and 33) sets Ahab up in a position of surpassing Jeroboam in claiming this title. But Ahab is not taken up as the literary model for the evil king. Instead, the first, founding kings are adopted as the prototypes and point of reference – David for good and Jeroboam for evil. The kings who succeed Ahab (more than half of the total number of kings of Israel) are still compared to Jeroboam, using the prototype of the evil king, the anti-David, established in 1 Kings 13 and 14. It may be possible to attribute this to Jehoram's act of removing the standing stones of Baal and not being like his mother and father (2 Kgs 3:2-3) so that the major innovation of Ahab (bringing Baal worship to Israel) only lasts two generations. But it is more likely that the Jeroboam

[65] Ibid., 284.

prototype is an intentional literary tool used by Dtr to construct the entire existence – rise and fall – of the northern kingdom. Jeroboam (and not Ahab) is the prototype of the bad king, constructed in contrast to the Davidic prototype, the exemplum of the good king. In so doing, Dtr creates two models that are polar opposites, the prototype and its anti-type.

This highlights the use of the prototype strategy. According to Paul Ash, "The Deuteronomist condemns Jeroboam for one primary reason: failure to be like David (1 Kgs 14:8). Jeroboam's construction of the calves is secondary, a specific act of being unlike David."[66] Jeroboam is the comparative, the prototype and exemplum of the evil king, but he is hardly the worst of Israel's kings. The focus on Jeroboam as the evil king demonstrates that the pre-exilic Dtr is most concerned with centralization of the cult in his religious program rather than fighting against Baal worship.

[66] Ash, "Ideology of the Founder," 60:19.

Excursus 1: The Regnal Formulae in Israel

As with the comparative David, Jeroboam as the prototype of the evil king is established and propagated through the regnal formulae. Similar to the Judean kings, as discussed in chapter 3, the kings of Israel are also evaluated through stereotyped judgment formulae that introduce and conclude the reigns of each king. The use of these formulae not only evaluates each king, but also structures the entire history, juxtaposing and synchronizing the kings of both kingdoms. In contrasting the accounts of the kings of Israel and Judah, according to E. Theodore Mullen, "The literary and theological patterns established for one kingdom can…be applied to the other." In this way, "by applying similar judgment formulae to each, the DtrH interweaves the narrative accounts of the two kingdoms and, while separating the two politically and dynastically, places both under the judgment of a particular understanding of the Book of Deuteronomy."[1] It is through these judgment formulae that the two prototypes of good and bad kings are thoroughly established. Jeroboam becomes the prototype of northern sin, and through this juxtaposition, it is interesting to see that despite this he is the only northern king compared to David.[2] Like the regnal formulae of the Judean kings, the regnal formulae of the Israelite kings are crucial components in evaluating the kings and advancing the Davidic anti-type. The comparative Jeroboam typology is pervasive throughout the reported reigns of all the kings of Israel. The first constituent element of the northern regnal formulae is the evaluation that they did הרע בעיני יהוה. Not one northern king receives a thoroughly positive assessment. Only Jehu has a chance, but he still continues in the sin of Jeroboam.

Fifteen of the nineteen kings of Israel who succeed Jeroboam are said to do הרע בעיני יהוה. Three others, Elah, Tibni, and Shallum, have no regnal formula.[3] Only Jehu (2 Kgs 9:1-10:36) is said to do הישר because of how he followed Yahweh's instructions to wipe out the house of Ahab (10:31), yet the praise for Jehu is tempered because he does not abandon the sins of Jeroboam (2 Kgs 10:29). This is a sign that he did not follow Yahweh with all his heart. In almost every instance, the report of having done evil in Yahweh's eyes is followed by a qualifying statement that the king followed the ways of Jeroboam, which he caused Israel to sin. In the regnal formulae, doing הרע is equated with continuing the sins of Jeroboam.

The second part of the formula refers to the sins of Jeroboam and the king's continued association with the cult of Jeroboam. This Jeroboam comparative element takes three different forms, although each expresses the same sentiment. The first pattern says וילך בדרך ירבעם בן נבט ובחטאתו אשר החטיא את ישראל "And he followed the way of Jeroboam and his sin, which he caused Israel to sin." In each case there is a slight variation based on the circumstances of the characters. Nadab son of Jeroboam follows the way of his father (unnamed), because he is the actual son of Jeroboam. Omri follows בכל דרך, "in all the ways of Jeroboam," and Ahaziah, son of Ahab and Jezebel, follows the "way of his father and mother," in addition to the way of Jeroboam. The following chart clearly demonstrates the similarities in evaluation:

[1] E. Theodore Mullen, "The Sins of Jeroboam: A Redactional Assessment," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 215.
[2] Leuchter, "Jeroboam the Ephratite," 125:59.
[3] Although Elah (1 Kgs 16:8-14) does not get an evaluation, Zimri wipes him out because of "the sins of Baasha and Elah" (1 Kgs 16:13).

Nadab (1 Kgs 15:26)	וילך בדרך אביו ובחטאתו אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה
Baasha (1 Kgs 15:34)	וילך בדרך ירבעם ובחטאתו אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה
Omri (1 Kgs 16:25-26)		ויעשה עמרי הרע בעיני יהוה
	וילך בכל דרך ירבעם בן נבט ובחטאתו	וירע מכל אשר לפניו
Ahaziah (1 Kgs 22:53)	וילך בדרך אביו ובדרך אמו ובדרך ירבעם בן נבט אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה

The second pattern is more stereotyped and occurs in the regnal formulae of six of the eight later kings of Israel, Jehoash to Pekah. Instead of "following the way" of Jeroboam, these kings "do not stray" לא סר מ[כל\על] חטאות ירבעם בן נבט אשר החטיא את ישראל from the sins of Jeroboam son of Nabat, which he caused Israel to sin. Most of these kings have very short reigns and the narrative accounts of their acts do not encompass more than a few verses, not much beyond the regnal formulae.

Jehoash (2 Kgs 13:11)	בה הלך	לא סר מכל חטאות יב"נ* אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעשה הרע בעיני יהוה
Jeroboam II (2 Kgs 14:24)		לא סר מכל חטאות יב"נ אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה
Zechariah (2 Kgs 15:9)			ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה
		לא סר מחטאות יב"נ אשר החטיא את ישראל	כאשר עשו אבתיו
Menahem (2 K 15:18)	כל ימיו	לא סר מעל חטאות יב"נ אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה
Pekahiah (2 Kgs 15:24)		לא סר מחטאות יב"נ אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה
Pekah (2 Kgs 15:28)		לא סר מן חטאות יב"נ אשר החטיא את ישראל	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה

יב"נ=ירבעם בן נבט*

Jehoahaz, the king immediately preceding Jehoash, fills a transitional compositional position bridging the two forms of the assessment. Jehoahaz both follows the sin of Jeroboam (although not the דרך) and does not stray from it:

Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 13:2)

ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה	וילך אחר חטאת ירבעם בן נבט אשר החטיא את ישראל	לא סר ממנה

It is clear in both of these patterns that the focus on doing what is evil is intrinsically connected to being like Jeroboam.

The third pattern is reserved for those kings of the house of Omri – Omri, Ahab and Ahaziah. There is an added element to their regnal formulae. Each of these kings causes Yahweh to anger (C-stem כעס) because of their added apostasy. The root כעס is also used in several other places when discussing the pending destruction of a dynasty for the sins a king did angering Yahweh (House of Jeroboam, 1 Kgs 15:30; House of Baasha, 1 Kgs 16:2, 13; House of Ahab, 1 Kgs 16:33). In Ahijah's second oracle, Jeroboam is said to "have done worse than all who came before you. You have gone and made for yourself other gods and molten images (מסכות) to anger me (לְהַכְעִיסֵנִי), and me you cast off behind your back." This charge is also made against Baasha and Elah in the report that Zimri has destroyed them: אל כל חטאות בעשא וחטאות אלה בנו אשר חטאו ואשר החטיאו את ישראל לְהַכְעִיס את יהוה אלהי ישראל בהבליהם "Because of all the sins of Baasha and the sins of Elah his son which they did and caused Israel to sin, angering Yahweh God of Israel with their idols (1 Kgs 16:13). Yet, unlike the accusations against the Omrides, this does not appear in the regnal formula, but instead in the narrator's comments about the oracle of Jehu calling for the destruction of the house of Baasha. Perhaps these statements are reserved for those dynasties that will be destroyed because of their apostasy. כעס is also used in the verdict on

the southern kingdom, in the Manasseh narrative referring to Judah's sin: יען אשר עשו את הרע בעיני ויהיו מכעסים אתי (2 Kgs 21:15). Also, it is interesting to note that כעס in the C-stem is thoroughly deuteronomistic. Throughout DtrH it appears in redactional passages.[4]

Returning to the third pattern of regnal formulae, the Omrides add to Jeroboam's apostasy.[5] Omri's sin is that of Jeroboam, with an added comment that he caused Israel to sin against the God of Israel with their idols (בהבליהם). Ahab introduced Baal worship into Israel (1 Kgs 16:31-33), which Ahaziah continues. Only Jehoram, the last of the Omrides, in 2 Kings 3:2 removes Baal worship from Israel and although he continues the sins of Jeroboam; he does not cause Yahweh to anger. It is interesting to note that despite the presumably praiseworthy act of removing Baal worship, Jehoram, in continuing to do the sins of Jeroboam, still does הרע בעיני יהוה, unlike Jehu who also continues the sins of Jeroboam but is seen as doing הישר because he carries out the annihilation of the house of Ahab. While it may seem illogical, von Rad suggests that "the judgment passed on the kings is not arrived at on the basis of a balanced reckoning of the number of *pros* and *cons*, by means of an average, as it were, of their achievements and their sins of omission….the Deuteronomist is not concerned with the various good and evil actions, but with the one fundamental decision on which he was convinced judgment and salvation finally depended."[6]

Despite their qualification as being worse than all the kings and also introducing Baal worship into Israel (in addition to the de-centralized worship of Jeroboam's cult), the Omrides are not used as the comparative prototype for the bad kings of Israel. In fact, the only places in which they are a comparative are in the evaluation of two Judean kings: Jehoram of Judah, Ahab's son-in-law, and his son Ahaziah of Judah (Ahab's grandson). Even though they are southern kings, they are associated with the sins of Jeroboam, Ahab, and the kings of Israel. Jehoram followed the ways of the kings of Israel (presumably the cult of Jeroboam, but Jeroboam is not mentioned explicitly) and was like Ahab (2 Kgs 8:18). Similarly, Ahaziah follows the ways of the house of Ahab, and does what is displeasing (ויעש הרע), like the house of Ahab (2 Kgs 8:27-29). In the case of both of these Judean kings, the narrator makes clear that their likeness to Ahab is a consequence of their blood relationship. The comparison to Jeroboam, and the typology of the evil king, is reserved for the kings of Israel.

Jehoram of Judah (2 Kgs 8:18)

וילך בדרך מלכי ישראל	כאשר עשו בית אחאב	כי בת אחאב היתה לו לאשה	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה

Ahaziah of Judah (2 Kgs 8:27-29)

וילך בדרך בית אחאב	כבית אחאב	כי חתן בית אחאב הוא	ויעש הרע בעיני יהוה

[4] Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah*, 69.
[5] Omri (1 Kgs 16:25-26); Ahab (1 Kgs 16:30-33); Ahaziah (1 Kgs 22:53-54).
[6] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 75–6.

Chapter 5

Josiah, who "there was none like him"

"Josiah appears to be the climactic figure of the DtrH who sees the realization of YHWH's promise to the house of David."

– Marvin Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel*[1]

Statements such as this have long confused the readers of the account of Josiah's reign. Much ink has been spilt on acclaiming Josiah as the great hero of the Deuteronomistic History, but it is somewhat surprising that the two chapter account of Josiah's reign (2 Kgs 22-23) pays little attention to the person of Josiah, and has more to do with the book finding and the reform report.

The narrative of King Josiah begins with the finding of the lost scroll of the law during the 18th year of Josiah's reign. Upon hearing the book read, Josiah tears his clothes and sends emissaries to inquire of the prophetess of Huldah about the meaning of the scroll. Huldah predicts Josiah's peaceful death and the complete destruction of Judah. Following this, Josiah embarks on a large-scale reform to purge Israel and Judah of all foreign cults. The reform culminates with the celebration of the Passover. The account ends with the death of Josiah on the battlefield of Megiddo at the hands of Pharaoh Necho, falsifying Huldah's prophecy.

The account of King Josiah, the incredible book finding and the illustrious reform, are set in the larger history following the disastrous reign of King Manasseh and preceding the ordinary and terse accounts of the final four bad kings of Judah. There is disagreement among scholars as to how to date the Josiah narrative and the reform. While some suggest that the final version of the narrative is almost entirely exilic,[2] Josiah's reform only makes sense in a context in which there was an opportunity to overturn Yahweh's anger. In the wake of the extreme judgment pronounced on Manasseh, as reflected in the current version of text, the reform of Josiah appears futile and ridiculous. If the fate of Judah were already sealed, why would Josiah put into effect such a thorough reform? As such, composition of the majority of the reform account only makes sense in a pre-exilic context. For that reason, I consider almost the entirety of the Josiah narrative a product of Dtr[1], with the exception of 2 Kings 22:15-17, 19b, 20b; 23:10-11, 12b, 24, 26-27. These verses are primarily those that deal with the Babylonian exile and the sins of Manasseh. There will be further discussion of dating the Manasseh account and the corresponding verses in the Josianic reform in the following chapter.

The book of Kings chronicles the reigns of each king and the history of the monarchy. The fate of Israel and Judah rises and falls with the cultic behavior of the kings. Throughout, the

[1] Marvin A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: the Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 26.

[2] Philip R. Davies, "Josiah and the Law Book," in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 75–6.

History builds up to the reign of Josiah. A prediction of his future appearance is even articulated in 1 Kings 13:2. Despite this, the character of Josiah seems quite minor. The narrative is not about him, but about what he does, the book finding and the reform. This shift of gaze from the king to his actions highlights what is important in this story: the "found" law book and its application. This scroll has long been associated with an early version of Deuteronomy.[3] Since de Wette's identification of the book (1805), scholars have made the connection between the content of the law of Deuteronomy and the concerns of Josiah's reform. This focus underscores the importance of the book for the deuteronomistic covenant and the deuteronomistic project. The lack of focus on the king and increased interest in the book of the law are all part of Dtr's complete narrative plan.

Historiographical Method in the Josiah Account

In keeping with his overall method, Dtr is guided by his selectional and compositional priorities. On the axis of selection, he makes decisions based on his commitment to his sources, loyalty to the prophetic tradition, and then orders his sources with the piling up of episodes. On the axis of composition, Dtr promotes the deuteronomistic program and uses a prototype strategy. Uncharacteristically, Dtr does not attribute theological meaning to historico-political events. In the account of the reign of Josiah, Dtr's method is very organic, integrating the individual priorities. Dtr's historiographical poetics is played out through complex webs of intertextuality, illustrating how the Josiah narrative is compositionally crucial to the History. The reign of Josiah, his person and his actions, is intrinsically connected with other parts of the History. Josiah and the reform are compared with other kings, explicitly and implicitly. At each juncture, Josiah and his deeds supersede all others. His reform is more thorough than any other. His covenant is more expansive, includes more people, and is based in law. He restores the divided monarchy, undoing the sins of Solomon and Jeroboam and all the kings of Israel and Judah. His Passover is unlike any ever celebrated during the monarchy. And while the focus of the account is not on the king, Dtr's poetics sets up Josiah and his reign as the climax and the eclipse of all deuteronomistic measures and history.

THE AXIS OF SELECTION:

1. Scholarly Commitment to his Sources

The Josiah account is composite. Many scholars have designated two major sources used in these chapters as the *Auffdungsbericht* and *Reformbericht*.[4] The style of reporting is not like other parts of Dtr[1]. The language is more terse. It is lacking in characteristic deuteronomistic

[3] Wette, *Dissertatio critico-exegetica*. Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 294.

[4] Oestreicher, Theodor., *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1923), 12–55; Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:126; Gray, *I & II Kings*, 650–651; Provan, *Hezekiah*, 147–51; Lester L. Grabbe, "Introduction," in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 15; Christof Hardmeier, "King Josiah in the Climax of the Deuteronomic History (2 Kings 22-23) and the Pre-Deuteronomic Document of a Cult Reform at the Place of Residence (23.4-15*): Criticism of Sources, Reconstruction of Literary Pre-stages and the Theology of History in 2 Kings 22-23*," in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 133–34.

phraseology, while it still reflects deuteronomistic concerns (cleaning up the cult of Yahweh, removing idolatrous cults and fidelity to the law). Even the syntax is uncharacteristic of Dtr's prose narrative; many perfect forms, rather than converted perfects, are used. Some scholars point to the use of these perfects as confirmation the Dtr used an archival source.[5] These factors make it unlikely that Dtr worked from his own memory or what was reported to him. More plausibly, he had a pre-existent document that he freely adapted.[6] Despite the clues of compositeness, unlike other accounts where it is possible to see the lines of redaction, the sources are so highly rewritten, rhetoricized, and redacted that it is impossible to reconstruct the original source documents. It is clear in the first half of 2 Kings 22 that Dtr borrows from 2 Kings 12 and Jehoash's construction narrative, even to the extent of leaving in details superfluous and irrelevant to the Josiah narrative.[7] The reform report, while rewritten to mirror the sins of the kings of Israel and Judah and to correspond with the previous reforms of the good kings of Judah, maintains its list-like character, a vestigial characteristic of the original document. One of the ways in which we see the deuteronomistic adaptation is the point-by-point correspondence between each stage of the reform with other parts of the History. Dtr may have reworked a pre-existing royal report of the reforms but makes it thoroughly his own. The correspondence with deuteronomistic concerns and direct and indirect connections to acts of other kings makes it clear that the final version of this report thoroughly reflects a deuteronomistic hand.

In the use and rewriting of Dtr's sources, there are still elements that he is unable to reconcile with his overall goals. Because of his commitment to his sources Dtr's historiographical method does not allow him to excise these from his history. This is most clear with the inclusion of the death of Josiah. Josiah's death on the battlefield of Megiddo undermines deuteronomistic concepts of reward: fidelity to the law and to Yahweh guarantee prosperity. The death of Josiah also denies the truth of the oracle of Huldah. Josiah is not "gathered to [his] fathers…to [his] grave in peace" as she promises (2 Kgs 22:20). With his death, Judah loses its strong monarch and the reform loses its champion. Josiah's early death was catastrophic politically and religiously. Uncharacteristic of Dtr, no theological rationalization is offered to explain the manner of Josiah's death. This will be discussed more below. Despite the theological problem created by the historical reality of Josiah's death, Dtr includes it in his account because of his scholarly commitment to his sources and his intention of writing history.

2. Loyalty to the Prophetic Tradition

Many scholars who advocate for a prophetic source or prophetic record that Dtr incorporates into his History argue that that record/source was complete by the time of Hezekiah. Dtr includes an oracle from another prophetic source in the Josiah narrative. Huldah's oracle likely derives from a southern source. The need for an oracle here lends divine authority and support to the value of the found book and the reform. It is also an element of Dtr's

[5] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:127.
[6] Norbert Lohfink, "The Cult Reform of Josiah of Judah: 2 Kings 22-23 as a Source for the History of Israelite Religion," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. Patrick D. Miller Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 465.
[7] 22:7 alludes to some kind of discrepancy in payment and dishonesty on the part of the priests. There is no such conflict in our passage. Also see note 24 below.

historiographical method – prophecy-fulfillment is a hallmark framing strategy of the History. Kings, at least good kings, do not make important moves without prophetic support (even the bad kings rely on the prophetic word, consider the Ahab and Micaiah incident (1 Kgs 22). This is true for kings in other ancient Near Eastern literature as well.[8]

The text of the oracle is as follows:[9]

> And she said to them, "Thus said Yahweh, God of Israel, 'Say to the man who sent you to me. (16) Thus said Yahweh, <u>"I am ready to bring evil upon this place and upon its inhabitants, all the words of the scroll which the king of Judah has read.</u> (17) <u>Because they have abandoned Me and made offerings to other gods, so as to cause Me to anger with all the deeds of their hands, my wrath is kindled against this place and it will not be extinguished.</u>" (18) But for the king of Judah, who sent you to inquire of Yahweh, thus you will say to him, "Thus said Yahweh, God of Israel these things which you heard. (19) **Since you were afraid and humbled yourself before Yahweh,** when you heard what I spoke about this place and its inhabitants to be a desolation and curse and **you rent your clothes and wept before me. And I too heard the utterance of Yahweh. (20) Therefore I will gather you to your fathers and you will be gathered to your grave in peace.** <u>Your eyes will not see all the evil which I am bringing to this place'.</u>" And they brought the word back to the king. (2 Kgs 22:15-20)

In this narrative, Huldah's oracle has been so thoroughly rewritten in the exilic context that it is impossible to tease out the original document. (Sweeney suggests excising it completely from the original narrative.[10]) While it seems that the prophetic oracle is not well connected to the rest of the story, as the prophet's message barely mentions the found scroll (the alleged premise for the inquiry) and does not allude to the reform, its existence and place in the overall Josiah narrative is necessary to Dtr's historiographical sensibilities. (The disconnectedness of the oracle may be the result of the exilic reworking, which leaves the original, pre-exilic content inaccessible.)[11]

In order to give the found scroll authority and to validate the book's authenticity, Josiah sends emissaries to request an oracle from the prophetess Huldah (2 Kgs 22:13). This strategy follows a motif of divine oracles that a monarch uses as an endorsement for his plan.[12] Common in the ancient Near East, if a king was not sure about something or wanted further reassurances, he consulted an oracle.[13] This is necessary since Josiah's reform is very much an innovation. It was uncommon for the king to intrude into the religious affairs of the people. And Josiah's program of centralization is an enormous break from standard Israelite religion.[14]

---

[8] Lowell Handy, "The Role of Huldah in Josiah's Cult Reform," *ZAW* 106, no. 1 (1994): 40.
[9] The **bold** font indicates Dtr[1]. The <u>underline</u> indicates exilic Dtr[2].
[10] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 45.
[11] In contrast, in its exilic context, the doom oracle pronounced against Judah is extremely important to the exilic version of the History.
[12] Jonathan Ben-Dov, "Writing as Oracle and as Law: New Contexts for the Book-Find of King Josiah," *JBL* 127, no. 2 (2008): 225.
[13] Handy, "The Role of Huldah," 106:40.
[14] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:139.

According to Nadav Na'aman, in the ancient Near East "legitimation was obtained first and foremost by receiving divine approval from god(s) by way of an oracle. Second it was attained through production of literary compositions in which the innovative element is presented as the restoration of a long-forgotten custom."[15] Here Dtr uses both – Huldah's oracle and the book finding. Furthermore, as discussed below, if the finding of the scroll were fabricated, the oracle contributes to its acceptance. While Josiah seems to use Huldah's oracle as a justification for his reform, the oracle does not say anything about the reform, and hardly even mentions the found scroll.

Huldah's prophecy appears in two parts, each introduced separately by כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל "Thus says Yahweh, God of Israel." The first part of the oracle clearly has an exilic provenance (indicated by the underline). It speaks about the impending doom of the destruction of Jerusalem, Judah, and the temple. The second part of the oracle reflects a pre-exilic kernel that has been reworked by Dtr^2. Huldah expresses the reward Josiah will receive for his fidelity; he will die peacefully. Since the oracle has been so completely rewritten, it is difficult to tease out the original pre-exilic strand, but it is clear that the prophecy about Josiah's peaceful death (v. 20a) must pre-date 609 B.C.E. when Josiah was killed in Megiddo on the battlefield. An exilic editor likely inherited the text because he would not have included the promise of a peaceful death, knowing it proves untrue.[16]

We also need to consider the context of the other verses. Had Huldah told Josiah (in his 7th century historical context) that Judah was thoroughly doomed, as in verses 16 and 17, it seems unlikely that he would have been motivated to take on the reform. If the fate of Judah had already been sealed, would Josiah have worked so hard to overturn it? Knoppers suggests "the existence of an original oracle that offered Josiah an alternative to destruction."[17] Similarly, Halpern and Vanderhooft argue that in a pre-exilic context, Huldah's oracle functions as didactic rhetoric, telling kings that if they do reform, they can forestall doom. Her words have the power to "galvanize Josiah into action."[18] Conversely, the current arrangement of Huldah's oracle seems to speak against Josiah's reforms. He was promised a peaceful death for his obedience, but he does not receive it.[19] In the final version of the oracle, Josiah is explicitly rewarded for being afraid and humbling himself before Yahweh, a reference to Josiah's response to the reading of the scroll in verse 11 ("And it happened when the king heard the words of the scroll of the law that he rent his clothes").[20] But his reward cannot avert destruction. Following this promise, Huldah's words close with "your eyes will not see all the evil which I am bringing to this place" (בכל הרעה אשר אני מביא על המקום הזה), functioning as an inclusio with verse 16 and Yahweh's words, "I am ready to bring evil upon this place" (הנני מביא רעה אל המקום הזה).[21] This

[15] Nadav Na'aman, "The 'Discovered Book' and the Legitimation of Josiah's Reform," *JBL* 130, no. 1 (2011): 58–9.
[16] Halpern and Vanderhooft, "Editions of Kings," 62:230. Cross, *CMHE*, 286, n. 46.
[17] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:149.
[18] Halpern and Vanderhooft, "Editions of Kings," 62:229.
[19] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:151.
[20] Another argument for pre-exilic origin, which Na'aman makes, highlights a datable geographic reference in the account that would place Huldah in the pre-exilic period. It is said that the royal entourage visits Huldah, who lives in Jerusalem in the *Mishneh* (2 Kgs 22:14). Na'aman identifies this as an area on the western hill of Jerusalem. It was deserted after the exile and not resettled until the 2nd century C.E. He suggests that if this text had been written in the exile or post-exile, Huldah would likely have been located in the city of David, which was populated at that time (Na'aman, "The 'Discovered Book'," 130:57.)
[21] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:142.

also conjures the phraseology of the condemnation against Jeroboam and Ahab, הנני מביא רעה "Behold I am bringing evil unto this place" (Jeroboam, 1 Kgs 14:10, Ahab, 1 Kgs 21:21). Similarly, Manasseh is presented in analogy to Ahab and the same words are declared (2 Kgs 21:12).[22]

The use of prophetic oracles is such an essential part of Dtr's historiographical poetics that he includes this oracle, in its position validating the book finding, even though it does not mention it. For the same reason, Dtr^2 rewrites the oracle to conform to the reality of Josiah's death, but still includes it.

3. The Piling up of Episodes

The two chapters of the Josiah account are constructed with several independent episodes, which are: the book finding (22:3-11), including the repairs on the temple; the inquiring of Huldah and her oracle (22:12-14, 15-20); the covenant (23:1-3); the reform (23:4-20); the celebration of Passover (23:21-23); the closing and death and burial formula (23:25, 28); and the death report (23:29-31). Each of these episodes is somewhat independent, but the individual strands are developed into the total narrative, strung together by thematic markers of promoting the deuteronomic law and the preeminence of King Josiah. These episodes are attracted to each other through authenticating and carrying out the laws of Deuteronomy.

The first way in which the ordering of individual elements of the story into a specific sequence is particularly effective is prefacing the account of Josiah's reform with the book finding narrative. While the found book is not mentioned in the reform report, the chronologizing of these two narratives makes it clear that the reform is a natural progression following the book finding. This implicit connection gives authority to the reform. Na'aman describes the book finding story as "the force that moved forward all other elements of the plot."[23] This event is necessary to the initiation of the reform and the composition of the story.

The narrative of the book finding has two parts to it – the context: the story of the repairs on the temple and the content: the actual finding of the book. Both of these components appear to be constructed compositions that contribute to the goals of the overall narrative. The effectiveness of this introduction to the reform report relies on the use of two borrowed elements: the pretense for finding the book, namely the repairs on the temple, a passage assimilated from the repairs of Jehoash in 2 Kings 12, and the use of a common ancient Near Eastern motif of book finding narratives. The use of these compositional elements contributes to the sense that the event happened, creating a realistic situation for the finding of the book, even if the story were fabricated. In turn, the finding of the scroll, rather than the presentation of a newly composed document, presents the law of Deuteronomy as archaic, authentic, and authoritative.

Immediately following Josiah's introductory regnal formula, the narrative launches into the events of the 18th year of Josiah's reign. According to Dtr, we do not know what went on in the first eighteen years of his reign. (Chronicles addresses this problem by inaugurating some of

[22] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 50.
[23] Na'aman, "The 'Discovered Book'," 130:54. Also, Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:125.

Josiah's reforms before the finding of the law book.) At this time, Josiah begins renovations on the temple. During this construction the scroll is allegedly found. The story of the temple repairs is as follows:

> And it happened in the 18th year of King Josiah that the king sent Shaphan, son of Azaliah, son of Meshullam, the scribe to the House of Yahweh, saying: (4) "Go up to Hilkiah the high priest and have him count the silver that has been brought to the House of Yahweh, which the doorkeepers have collected from the people. (5) Let them give it to the workers commissioned in the House of Yahweh, and they will give it to the workers who are in the house of Yahweh, to repair the breach in the temple, (6) to the carpenters, builders, masons, and to buy timber, and quarry stone, to repair the House. (7) But the silver to be given over to them is not to be audited, for they deal honestly. (2 Kgs 22:3-7)

This passage is somewhat abbreviated but clearly relies on the report of Jehoash's temple repairs in 2 Kings 12.[24]

Another pertinent issue of the book finding narrative is the use of a literary motif. The story of finding the scroll plays an important role in this narrative, in the reform, and in DtrH as a whole. Dtr's goal in establishing the book as an important player in the narrative is assisted by using a literary convention of the book finding motif.[25] Dtr uses this ancient Near Eastern literary convention to give authority to the "found" scroll, namely Ur-Deuteronomy. Here the book is found in the temple and the king has an immediate and serious reaction, demonstrating his acknowledgment that the instructions found in the book are not being followed. This change

---

[24] The dependence on the Jehoash account is clear in the details about the money for the workers and their honesty (2 Kgs 12:4-7). In the Josiah account, this element seems out of place, since the goal of reporting the construction is not for its own sake, but for the express purpose of finding the book. In 2 Kings 12 Jehoash wants the repairs to be done and the money collected, but the priests do not do it. There seems to be some kind of financial misappropriation, perhaps because of the influence and involvement of the business assessors (מכרים). There, payment for the repairs is a true concern. The reliance on 2 Kings 12 is almost verbatim, including importing the conflict of the delayed start of the repairs. In the Jehoash account, once the work finally gets underway, Jehoash says there is to be no accounting of the money collected and paid because the workers are honest. The context of this conflict is not included in the account of Josiah's repairs, but the report of payment and dealing honestly is included. The story of Jehoash's temple construction is used by the Josianic writers as the pretense for the book finding. 2 Kings 22 borrows directly from 2 Kings 12:5a, 10b, 11b, 12-13, and 15-16 (verbatim correspondences are shown in small caps):

> And Jehoash said to the priests, "all of the silver offerings, which are brought to the house of Yahweh…
> (10) …**THE PRIESTS, THE DOORKEEPERS**, would put all **THE SILVER THAT WAS BROUGHT TO THE HOUSE OF YAHWEH**. (11) …the king's scribe and the high priest would come and tie it up and **COUNT THE SILVER** found in the house of Yahweh. (12) **AND THEY GAVE THE SILVER THAT HAD BEEN WEIGHED INTO THE HAND OF THE WORKERS COMMISSIONED IN THE HOUSE OF YAHWEH, AND THEY DISTRIBUTED IT TO THE CARPENTERS AND BUILDERS WORKING IN THE HOUSE OF YAHWEH. (13) AND TO THE MASONS AND THE STONES CUTTERS, TO BUY TIMBER AND TO QUARRY STONE TO REPAIR THE BREACH IN THE TEMPLE AND EVERYTHING WHICH NEED REPAIR IN THE TEMPLE… (15) BUT THEY PAID THE WORKERS WHO REPAIRED IN THE HOUSE OF YAHWEH. (16) AND, THEY DID NOT AUDIT THE MEN TO WHOM THE SILVER WAS GIVEN TO PAY THE WORKERS BECAUSE THEY DEALT HONESTLY.**

The recapitulation of the story of Jehoash's repairs in 2 Kings 22 sets the stage for the opportunity of "book finding" during construction.

[25] Thomas Römer, "Transformations in Deuteronomistic Biblical Historiography: On 'Book-Finding' and other Literary Strategies," *ZAW* 109, no. 1 (1997): 7. Na'aman, "The 'Discovered Book'," 130:49–53.

of focus (from king to book) raises the book of the law to the position of the main character of the narrative, and of the History as a whole. Yet, even though this motif is presumably a well known convention, it does not stand alone in giving the scroll important status. Dtr is not satisfied to leave the authorization of the book merely to the use of the literary convention of the book finding motif, but it is further authenticated by prophetic oracle. By inquiring of Yahweh through the prophetess Huldah, the scroll is given a prophetic imprimatur. This demonstrates another episode (Huldah's oracle) that is piled up with the others, contributing to the overall narrative constructed.

The second significant way in which the episodes are rechronologized is the order of the closing regnal formula (DBF) and Josiah's death report. Unlike any other king, Josiah's DBF (vv. 25 and 28) appears before the report of Josiah's death.

> And like him there was no king before him who turned back to Yahweh with all his heart and all his soul and all his might, as all the instruction of Moses. And after him, no one arose like him… [(28)] And the remainder of the deeds of Josiah and all that he did, are they not written in the book of the annals of the kings of Judah? (2 Kgs 23:25, 28)

In creating this unconventional ordering, Dtr attempts to focus on the greatness of Josiah and his reign. For a brief moment, Dtr tries to ignore the historical fate of Josiah, which denies the truth of much of deuteronomistic theology and the expected rewards for fidelity to the law. By setting the death report after the DBF, Dtr wants to end the account with his statement of incomparability. It is also possible that the DBF was written before Josiah's death. So sure of Josiah's fate to live long and die peacefully, Dtr completed his history with Josiah's DBF even before he dies and the death report is only added at the end of the account following the DBF.

The rechronologizing of the events and juxtaposition of individual episodes come together to create a continuous narrative in which the book of the law, which presents a different brand of Israelite religion, is found and authenticated. This law is then put into effect through covenant renewal and reform. The intentional ordering and juxtaposition of these individual scenes come together to proclaim the value of the deuteronomic law.

THE AXIS OF COMPOSITION:

More than any of the other accounts, it is possible to see how the compositional and selectional priorities are working together. In this case, Dtr's compositional method is singularly focused on the promotion of the deuteronomistic program. The plot created by the stringing together of episodes focuses on deuteronomic law. The application of Josiah as the Davidic prototype further contributes to a unified whole in which the law and the king are deemed the heroes of DtrH.

a. Promoting the Deuteronomistic Program

Throughout the two chapter account of Josiah's reign, the priority of promoting the deuteronomistic program is the strongest impulse expressed in the account. Dtr uses his many literary tools to achieve this goal. The narrative is focused on obedience to the law of Deuteronomy; it is possible to connect the individual elements of the reform and the construction of the character of Josiah with specific laws within the deuteronomic law code. The found scroll in 2 Kings 22 is identified with an early form of that law code. The scroll plays a central role in the narrative and the History as a whole. It almost becomes another character within the story, whose presence, even when not mentioned, is pervasive throughout. The importance of the scroll is immediately recognized when the true good king, Josiah, who is faithful to the covenant, has a dramatic response at the finding and reading of the law. He is distraught because they have not been fulfilling the stipulations of the law as prescribed by this scroll. The focus on the scroll – the written law – is an implicit nod to the importance of DtrH as a whole. The History, which uncompromisingly evaluates the kings of Israel and Judah through standards of cultic rigorism, is written, based on this law code. The story of the found scroll lends authority to the law. The legitimation of the book finding and the oracle validate the whole of DtrH. Once the authenticity of the book has been established, the remainder of the narrative is focused on enacting a reform that puts the laws of Deuteronomy into practice, even though the reform report does not mention the scroll.[26] The account gives no explicit reason or impetus for commencing reform.

Josiah's reform is unparalleled in its extent and correspondence with deuteronomic law. It focuses on deuteronomistic principles – fidelity to the law, disavowing other gods, and first and foremost, centralization of the cult to the temple in Jerusalem. Josiah ensures that other sites, both Yahwistic and idolatrous, will be permanently out of commission. He sets about cleaning up not only Judah, but also the defunct kingdom of Israel, removing all aspects of idolatry and all non-centralized shrines. He hits the cult of Jeroboam hard, fulfilling the prophecy of the man of God from Judah, destroying the altar at Bethel and burning human bones on it. While Josiah's political power only extends over the southern kingdom of Judah, many scholars think that by 621 Assyrian control over the northern kingdom had seriously weakened and that Josiah was able to assert authority there. Josiah's cultic reach stretches into the kingdom of Israel, cleaning up the religious practices and preempting any resurrections of idolatrous and/or non-centralized cults; Josiah defiles and completely destroys the locations and accoutrements of these cults.[27]

The episodes of the book finding and Huldah's oracle in 2 Kings 22 are quickly followed by a detailed account of Josiah's efforts at reform. Josiah's reform in 2 Kings 23 is broken into several parts. The first part includes the public reading of the law and reaffirming the covenant between Yahweh and the people (vv. 1-3). Then Josiah cleans up Judah, removing idolatrous practices from the temple and outside Jerusalem (vv. 4-14). He then purges Israel, fulfilling the prophecy of the man of God from Judah (vv. 15-20). Finally, Josiah institutes the celebration of

[26] Ben-Dov, "Writing as Oracle and as Law," 127:231.

[27] This cultic reach, while politically plausible, is likely an artifact of Dtr. The archaeological evidence does not support the historicity of Josiah's reform. For more, see Lisbeth Fried, "The High Places (Bāmôt) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation," *JAOS* 122, no. 3 (2002): 437–465; Christoph Uehlinger, "Was There a Cult Reform Under King Josiah? The Case for a Well-grounded Minimum," in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 279–316.

the Passover (vv. 21-23). In each element of Josiah's reform, Dtr both connects with individual laws of the deuteronomic code as well as sets up Josiah as a foil to the bad kings, systematically undoing the specific sins of the kings of Israel and Judah, and superseding the good kings. Josiah improves on all previous efforts of reform, outdoing the other kings.

Unlike any previous king, Josiah is the first to follow the mandate of the law of the king (Deut 17:18-19). It requires the king to read the Torah every day. While we do not know whether he did it every day, Josiah is the first and only king we are told read the Torah at all. Dtr is focused on demonstrating how a king, like Josiah, should follow the law of Yahweh. The example presented here extends to the entirety of the book of Kings. In relaying the history of the monarchy, Dtr evaluates the kings of Israel and Judah primarily on their fidelity to the law and the covenant. While the other kings are never given a specific outline of how to behave (like the presentation and reading of a book of the law), they are still held to Dtr's standards. In reading the law, Josiah acclaims the importance of the written law code, promoting its dispersion and weight in Israel. The book finding account has a similar function.

Josiah's reform is motivated by deuteronomistic concerns. In order to centralize of the cult of Yahweh, Deuteronomy 12:2-6 requires the destruction of local shrines, the burning of *ašērîm* and *maṣṣēbôt.* Deuteronomy 6:4-5 and elsewhere demand complete loyalty and worship of Yahweh alone. Josiah eliminates the worship of Baal and Asherah. The importance of the law, obedience to Yahweh and the law, and the covenant based on law are enumerated in Deuteronomy 26:16-19. These important tenets of the deuteronomistic program, especially centralization of the cult, represent a break with previous Israelite religion. Even the commandment that there is only one God is something of an innovation. While throughout Israelite history only the worship of one God was permitted, Yahweh was the God of gods, essentially admitting the existence of other, albeit lesser, gods (e.g. Exod 15:11; 18:11; 22:19; 23:13, 24).

Josiah mounts a comprehensive reform that reestablishes the covenant between Yahweh and the people. This raises the observance of the law – Yahweh's commandments, testimonies and laws (2 Kgs 23:3) – to the highest priority. In making this covenant, the people take an oath of loyalty, committing themselves with their heart and soul to keep the covenant as prescribed by the scroll. The language of the covenant account is thoroughly deuteronomistic.

Josiah gathers the people, reads the scroll, and facilitates the covenant with Yahweh:

> And the king sent and all the elders[28] of Judah and Jerusalem assembled before him. (2) And the king went up to the House of Yahweh and all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him and the priests and the prophets and all the people, from the young to the old, and he read to their ears all the words of the scroll of the covenant (ספר הברית) found in the house of Yahweh. (3) And the king stood by the pillar[29] and cut the covenant before Yahweh, to follow Yahweh and to observe his commandments and his testimonies and his laws with all [their]

[28] Elders are important in Deuteronomy. This is an indicator that it belongs to Dtr. Cf. 1 Sam 8:4, elders ask Samuel to appoint a king. Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah*, 162–3.
[29] Cf. 2 Kgs 11:14

> heart and all [their] soul, to establish the words of this covenant prescribed in this scroll. And all the people stood in the covenant. (2 Kgs 23:1-3)

The deuteronomistic expression of covenant loyalty is articulated: the people should follow the laws, et cetera with all their heart and all their soul. This love is deuteronomistic, corresponding to Deuteronomy 6 and elsewhere. The narrator explicitly states that this covenant is a direct response to the finding of the scroll. The people make a covenant with Yahweh "to establish the words of this covenant prescribed in this scroll" (v. 3). The terms and language of the covenant contribute to the identification of the scroll with Deuteronomy.

There is one other place in Kings where we see a similar covenant. Following Jehoiada's successful coup and overthrowing the queen Athaliah in 2 Kings 11, the priest Jehoiada renews the covenant with Yahweh and starts a small reform against Baal:

> Then Jehoiada made a covenant between Yahweh and the King and the people to be a nation to Yahweh and between the king and the people. Then all the people of the land came to the house of Baal and they tore down its altars and its statues they broke into pieces. And they killed Matan, the priest of Baal, before the altars and the priest set guards over the house of Yahweh. (2 Kgs 11:17-18)

Jehoiada's covenant is the first covenant of this sort in the history of the monarchy.[30] While Josiah's covenant is established in a similar way, there is a difference in the content of the covenants. Jehoiada's covenant is not specific while Josiah's corresponds to the law in the scroll. While Jehoiada's covenant and reforms precede Josiah's, they appear as inferior. The covenant is not specific and the reform is limited to removing the temple of Baal in Jerusalem and killing the priest of Baal. It does not deal with centralization. While praiseworthy, the purge of Baal is either incomplete or short-lived. Josiah also attacks the cult of Baal in Judah. Jehoiada, a priest and not a king, puts these measures into effect, but he is neither praised nor evaluated by the historian. Instead, Josiah takes on similar but greater measures and is given the highest praise. In this way, the narrative is set up to present the acts of Josiah as eclipsing and surpassing even the positive acts of earlier figures in the history. This also highlights the importance of the scroll of the law. Josiah's covenant is based on the written word. Throughout the history of the monarchy, when a figure mounts a reform, like this one or others' (see more below), Dtr makes sure that Josiah's measures supersede those of the others.

Following the covenant, Josiah's first acts of reform are to remove the idolatrous cults of Baal and Asherah from Judah. His acts closely correspond with the injunction in Deuteronomy 12:3. The worship of Baal, *ašērîm*, and the setting up of *maṣṣēbôt* is widespread in Israel and Judah. The cult of Asherah is brought into Israel by Ahab (1 Kgs 16:33) and is mentioned again as persisting in the reign of Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 13:6). Even though in Israel, Jehoram (2 Kgs 3:2) and Jehu (2 Kgs 10:18-28) both try to wipe out the worship of Baal, it is reestablished by Ahab. In Judah there was also a tradition of reform against the *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm*. Asa removed the idols, cut down Asherah and burned them in the Kidron Valley (1 Kgs 15:12). Similarly, Jehoiada kills the priest of Baal and destroys the altar and images and the temple of Baal (2 Kgs 11:17ff). Hezekiah also destroys the *maṣṣēbôt* and cuts down the Asherah (although we do not

[30] Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 132.

have a report that they were rebuilt after Asa's and Jehoiada's reforms, 2 Kgs 19:4). But, Manasseh made an Asherah like Ahab and rebuilt the altar for Baal and the host of heaven (2 Kgs 21:3). Josiah then removed the Asherah from the temple, and like Asa burned it in the Kidron Valley (2 Kgs 23:6). He also destroyed the *maṣṣēbôt* and cut down the *ašērîm* (2 Kgs 23:14). Josiah completely eliminates Baal worship from Judah. He destroys Manasseh's altars (2 Kgs 23:12). He removes all the implements of Baal, Asherah, and the host of heaven (2 Kgs 23:4). He does away with the idolatrous priests who sacrificed to Baal and the host of heaven (2 Kgs 23:5).

Josiah seeks not only to remove the idolatrous cults, but also to undo the acts of the kings of Judah (v. 5). His position of reversing and surpassing all kings is cemented with these actions. The destruction of the cults is complete. He burns the vessels, carrying the ashes far away. He removes the priests, ensuring that worship could not resume, even in secret.[31] He removes the

[31] It is unclear what Josiah does with the priests and how Dtr regards them. In the reform report it says: "He brought all the priests from the cities of Judah (כל הכהנים מערי יהודה), and defiled the high places where the priests offered sacrifices, from Geba to Beer Sheva… But the priests of the high places did not go up to the altar (לא יעלו...אל מזבח) of Yahweh in Jerusalem, although they ate unleavened bread with their brothers" (2 Kgs 23:8-9). In these verses, Dtr makes a distinction between the priests of the high places and those of the temple in Jerusalem, but the differentiation is not as black and white as one would expect. While the priests of the local high places are separate from those in the temple, offering sacrifices only at the local shrines spread throughout the kingdom of Judah, Dtr still seems to consider them legitimate priests. We would have expected them to be deemed completely illegitimate, likely appointed by the kings of Judah throughout the monarchy and during their development of the high places, but instead, these priests are called "brothers" of the priests of the temple. These local priests do not serve in the temple, but they may enjoy the unleavened bread with the priests of Yahweh in Jerusalem. Is this a comment of their legitimacy as true priests? Is this an unwitting admission/acceptance that the high places may have also been Yahwistic, rather than idolatrous? The treatment of these priests is wholly different from that of the clearly illegitimate priests of Jeroboam, those whom he "appointed priests from the whole population who were not from the Levites" (1 Kgs 12:31). There seems to be no question of the pedigree of the priests Josiah targets. They are accepted as legitimate by Dtr as well as by the Jerusalem priests. Also, the rural priests are accepted as legitimate by deuteronomic law as well. Excluding the priests from the cities of Judah from the rights of the temple priests violates the arrangement of Deuteronomy 18:6-8 in which, in response to centralization, it is made explicit that the rural priests are able to enjoy the same rights as the Jerusalem priests (Ernest W. Nicholson, "Josiah and the Priests of the High Places (II Reg 23,8a.9)," *ZAW* 119, no. 4 (2007): 499.)

What was Josiah's intention in bringing all the priests from the cities of Judah? Did he want to remove them from their posts so that he could defile and tear down the high places? Was he worried that the priests would block him from his goals, refusing to allow him to tear down the high places? Where does he bring them? He does not seem to do anything to these priests in the form of punishment. The fate of any of these priests is unclear. Many scholars presume that Josiah brings them to Jerusalem where they eat the unleavened bread with their brethren. Nicholson suggests that the priests removed from their high places do not travel to Jerusalem. He argues that the collocation expressed in verse 9, that לא יעלו כהני הבמות <u>אֶל</u> מזבח יהוה בירושלים "The priests of the high places did not go up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem," אל and not על indicates going up to visit somewhere, while usually the preposition על is used to express an official cultic action meaning to go up and make offerings (Nicholson, "Josiah and the Priests of the High Places," 119:505.) This proposition suggests that these priests were not in Jerusalem. It was not just that they did not go up to the altar serving in the temple as guaranteed them in Deuteronomy 18, but that they did not even visit Jerusalem. These priests did not try to claim their rights according to Deuteronomy. (Is this a comment by Dtr that they are unworthy or that they chose to boycott the central shrine, not seeing any issue with their non-centralized sites?) While Nicholson's argument seems cogent, accepting it does not give us further understanding of what happens to this group. In fact, disavowing the suggestion that Josiah brings them to Jerusalem leaves us with no alternative assumption of where they end up. We are no closer (in fact farther away) to understanding their fate.

The only place in which Dtr reports that Josiah did anything physically to any of the priests is in verse 20. After destroying the altar at Bethel and burning the bones from the graves on the altar at Bethel, Josiah "sacrificed all the

Asherah that Manasseh erected in the temple (v. 7). He also thoroughly eliminates any remnant of Asherah, burning it, crushing it to dust, and dispersing the dust (v. 6).

Josiah's attacks on the foreign cults of Judah are as follows:

> Then the king commanded Hilkiah the high priest, the deputy priests and the doorkeepers to remove from the palace of Yahweh all the vessels[32] made for Baal,[33] Asherah, and all the host of heaven. And he burned them outside Jerusalem, on the terraces of the Kidron, and carried their ashes to Bethel. (5) Then he removed the idolatrous priests who the kings of Judah had set up to offer[34] sacrifices at the high places in the cities of Judah and around Jerusalem, the ones offering to Baal, to the sun, the moon, and the constellations and all the host of heaven. (6) He removed the Asherah from the house of Yahweh, from [to] outside Jerusalem, to the Wadi Kidron, and he burned it in Wadi Kidron and crushed [it] to dust, and threw the dust on the grave of the *bnei ha'am*. (2 Kgs 23:4-6)

The language of destruction is repeated throughout this chapter and in other places in the History – the burning (שרף), crushing (דקק), and throwing (שלך). Josiah does this to Asherah and to the altar at Bethel (v.15). Deuteronomy 12:3 calls for the destruction of the *ašērîm* and the *maṣṣēbôt*. The same language of that injunction is used here, creating an intrinsic intertextual relationship between the law and Josiah's fulfillment of it. These acts follow the prescription of Deuteronomy 12:3:

> ונתצתם את מזבחתם ושברתם את מצבתם ואשריהם תשרפון באש ופסלי אלהיהם תגדעון ואבדתם את שמם מן המקום ההוא And you shall tear down your altars and break apart their *maṣṣēbôt* and their *ašērîm* you shall burn with fire and hew down the statues of their gods and you will remove their name from this place.

Similarly, Moses does the same thing to the golden calf in Deuteronomy 9:21: את העגל לקחתי ואשרף אתו באש ואכת אתו טחון היטב עד אשר דק לעפר ואשלך את עפרו "I took the calf and I burned it with

---

priests of the high places (כל כהני הבמות), who were there on the altars, and he burned the human bones on them." Does this include the priests of the high places of Judah, those brought by Josiah in verse 8 (to where does he bring them?), or only those of Bethel and the high places of Israel/Samaria? Because both these verses (8 and 20) speak of the כהנים, does this exclude the כמרים of verse 5? What is their fate? It would seem incommensurate for the priests of the high places of Judah, who are considered brothers of the legitimate Yahwistic priests of Jerusalem, to meet such an ignoble fate while the idolatrous priests who made offerings to Baal, the sun, the moon, the constellations, and the host of heaven (v. 5) are saved. Yet, is there a difference between these two groups? The כמרים set up by the kings of Judah to offer sacrifices בבמות בערי יהודה "At the high places in the cities of Judah" while כל הכהנים מערי יהודה "All the priests from the cities of Judah" are accorded a different status. Are these priests one in the same? This group, the priests of the cities of Judah, is referred to as כהני הבמות "the priests of the high places" in verse 9.

[32] The term כלים in the temple is used only in Kings to refer to cultic objects, Dtr (Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah*, 195.)

[33] Baal worship in the south begins with Manasseh. Solomon does not do Baal worship. There is no mention of כלים of Baal elsewhere in DtrH. Eynikel suggests this indicates that this chapter has its own redactor, but identifies it as Dtr[1] (Ibid., 198, 199.)

[34] Reading plural with LXX, ויקטרו for ויקטר in MT.

fire and I crushed it, grinding it thoroughly until it was crushed into dust and I threw the dust [into the wadi]." These actions are thoroughly deuteronomistic. [35]

After attacking the idolatrous sites of Judah, Josiah destroys the altars of Solomon in Jerusalem and the altar of Jeroboam in Bethel. This will be discussed more below because of its importance to constructing the portrait of Josiah as the Davidic prototype, but the attack on the local cult sites of Israel and Judah, especially the golden calf of Jeroboam in Bethel, demonstrates the importance of centralization. While the reforms begin as an assault on idolatrous practices and practitioners, Josiah turns to previously accepted Yahwistic cults in order to promote the doctrine of centralization.

The focus on centralization continues with the final act of reform: the celebration of the Passover festival. Having destroyed all of the cult sites of Israel and Judah, Josiah mandates the celebration of Passover, presumably in accordance with Deuteronomy 16:2, 5-6, which requires centralization to the temple in Jerusalem. The report of the Passover is as follows:

> And the king commanded all the people, saying: "Celebrate a Passover to Yahweh your God, as prescribed in this scroll of the covenant (ספר הברית)." For a Passover like this has not been celebrated since the days of the judges who judged in Israel and all the days of the kings of Israel and the kings of Judah. Only in the 18th year of the reign of Josiah, was such a Passover of Yahweh celebrated in Jerusalem. (2 Kgs. 23:21-23)

There are two important elements that are seen in these verses. The first is that this is the only act of reform that is explicitly linked to the finding of the scroll and the second highlights the singular quality of Josiah's reform. The connection with the scroll may indicate that the celebration of Passover, which is separated from the book finding account by the twenty verses describing the covenant and the reform, may have been part of the original book finding account. Also, in this way, it serves as something of a conclusion for the reform, bringing the narrative back to focus on the scroll of the law. This envelope structure, with the book finding narrative as its opening and the Passover as its conclusion, implicitly contributes to the sense that the entirety of the reform (as expressed in the intervening verses) is enacted because of the book of the law. Invoking this belief is intentional; Dtr wants to make sure that the law code is seen as primary and as the impetus and justification for the reform. The scroll is called ספר הברית similar to 23:2 (the only other instance in the two chapters where the scroll is referred to in this way) describing

[35] A further indication of the uniquely deuteronomistic character of the vocabulary is clear in a comparison of the golden calf episodes in Deuteronomy 9 and Exodus 32. In Exodus 32, when destroying the golden calf, the text expresses similar actions but utilizes a somewhat different vocabulary and syntax: ויקח את העגל אשר עשו וישרף באש ויטחן עד אשר דק ויזר על פני המים וישק את בני ישראל "And he took the calf which they made and he burned it with fire and he ground it to powder and he scattered it in water and made the children of Israel drink [it]" (Exod 32:20). Instead of שלך, Exodus uses זרה. Instead of a verb of דקק, Exodus uses טחן with a nominal form of דק. In deuteronomistic terms, by destroying the altars of Baal and Asherah, Josiah acts like none other than the great Moses.

As a side note, in verse 12 Josiah destroys the altars on the roof, of the upper chamber of Ahaz and the altars of Manasseh in the courtyard of the temple. Here Josiah "tore down and threw their dust into the Wadi Kidron," נתץ המלך וירצם משם והשליך את עפרם אל נחל קדרון. There is no crushing into dust, but the dust is thrown. There is no burning, just tearing. The sequence and vocabulary is different here and may be an indicator that this verse derives from a later hand who imprecisely attempted to imitate the expressions of Dtr[1].

the reading of the scroll followed by the affirmation of the covenant. The Passover continues this narrative.

The second element is the uniqueness of this celebration to the 18th year of Josiah. During all the days of the kings of Israel and Judah, about 400 years, no king has instituted a festival like the one that Josiah proclaims. Without expressing it explicitly, Josiah is set up as an incomparable king (see discussion below). The last Passover celebrated in this way hearkens back to the time of the judges, that mythical time before there was a king in Israel. The statement that there had been no Passover like this since the time of the judges telescopes the history beyond the period of David and Solomon. While throughout the History, the portrait of the divided monarchies is primarily negative, the united monarchy was seen as a golden age; the comment about the quality of the celebration of the festival raises Josiah above David and Solomon, the kings of the united kingdom. Josiah is featured as a Moses-like leader, extending back to the Passover celebrated in the days of Joshua (Josh 5:10–12).[36] Dtr builds up to the celebration of this Passover in that throughout DtrH no Passover is mentioned since Joshua 5. (This is in contrast to the Chronicler who mentions a Passover during the reform of Hezekiah, 2 Chr 30.)[37]

What does it literally mean that there had been no Passover celebrated like this since the period of the judges? We have no record of any Passover celebrations during the entirety of the monarchy. Was it truly not celebrated or just not recorded? How was the Passover of Josiah celebrated differently for any other Passover (presumably, although not reported, they did occur)? Is this a nod to centralization? That this is the first time that the Passover sacrifices are only offered in Jerusalem? Is this a reflection of Deuteronomy 16 where the two separate festivals of Passover and Unleavened bread, as expressed in the Tetrateuch (Exod 23, Lev 23, Num 28), are conflated into one holiday for the first time? None of the answers to these questions are made explicit.

Finally, the last verse brings up some important questions; it was only in the 18th year of Josiah's reign that the Passover was celebrated in this way. Josiah reigned for a total of 31 years. While many scholars have questioned what happens in the first 18 years of Josiah's reign, I ask, what happens in the final 13 years of his reign? We do not know anything about them. Perhaps they were not noteworthy. It is not uncommon for Dtr to regularly focus on the events of specific years in the reigns of his kings, but why was the Passover not celebrated after the 18th year? Is this an indication that Josiah's reform never caught on? Was the Passover celebrated after this year, but not in this way: as elaborately? Centralized? These unanswered questions highlight the literary, rather than historical, value of the report of the Passover celebration. The account lacks the details of reality. Instead, we are left with a picture of a festival that is only described as being unique in the history of the monarchy, another nod to setting up Josiah as the incomparable king. This is further supported by the report in Chronicles of Hezekiah's great Passover celebration. Likely Passover had been celebrated during the monarchy, but Josiah is depicted as an irreplaceable reformer and champion of deuteronomic law.

[36] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 105.
[37] Richard D. Nelson, "Josiah in the Book of Joshua," *JBL* 100, no. 4 (1981): 536.

The Josiah account in 2 Kings 22-23 demonstrates the importance of the deuteronomistic program in action. Deuteronomic law is of the utmost importance. It is archaic, the law of Moses, and authentic as reinforced by the book finding and oracle. Josiah is the only king to follow the deuteronomic prescription of reading the Torah. And the measures of the reforms are founded in specific deuteronomic charges. In this way, through the intertextual connections to the laws of Deuteronomy, the narrative serves to promote the deuteronomistic program.

b. The Attribution of Historico-Political Events to Theological Causes

Uncharacteristically, there is a lack of attribution of the historico-political events to theological causes in this account. The only event that we can be relatively confident is historical is the death of Josiah. We have no historical evidence of the book finding or of the reform, but only of Josiah's death at the hands of the Egyptian pharaoh. Unlike other historical events that are given theological meaning and demonstrate Yahweh's role in history, Josiah's death is not attributed any theological significance. In fact, Josiah's death complicates the deuteronomistic perspective of theological reward and punishment. The effect of Josiah's death and the historical reality of the fall of Jerusalem effectively "destroy the premise on which all Hebrew historiography had been built."[38]

Trying to make sense of this uncharacteristic omission, Frost suggests that the lack of theological reassurance in the report represents an embarrassed silence. He argues that the historians at the time were too close to the disaster of his death to rewrite it and offer "theological rationalization." [39] The Chronicler, on the other hand, has more distance and crafts an explanation. Instead, we are left with silence because no one can account for Josiah's death theologically. Similarly, according to H.G.M. Williamson, Josiah's premature death is shocking. The report of his death "has the appearance of a somewhat embarrassed appendix."[40] The lack of theological (or any) explanation is a problem that does not correspond with Dtr's historiographical process.

Alternative explanations for why these terse, fact-filled verses lack theological rationalizations may suggest that the Josianic DtrH originally ends with verse 28, and these verses were appended by a secondary redactor.[41] In contrast, Michael Avioz suggests that 2 Kings 23 does offer a theological explanation for the punishment that has been ignored by scholars; Josiah is punished for going to war without consulting a prophet.[42] Another option is that perhaps the silence of Dtr as expressed by Frost is not a loss for words, but a refusal to invent a reason to convict Josiah. It is possible that Dtr is so committed to the merit of his hero Josiah that he is unwilling (like the Chronicler) to offer any explanation. While anachronistic, consider the perspective of Job who (like Dtr here) is unwilling to admit to any sin because he knows that he did nothing wrong. His friends, like the Chronicler, adhering to a strict theological

---

[38] Stanley Brice Frost, "The Death of Josiah: a Conspiracy of Silence," *JBL* 87, no. 4 (1968): 382.
[39] Ibid., 87:371, 372.
[40] H. G. M. Williamson, "The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History," *VT* 32, no. 2 (1982): 243.
[41] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 170. Cross, *CMHE*, 283–86; Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 84.
[42] Michael Avioz, "Josiah's Death in the Book of Kings: A New Solution to an Old Theological Conundrum," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 83, no. 4 (2007): 362–66.

outlook of sin and punishment, know that he must have done something wrong to warrant punishment; Yahweh does not punish indiscriminately. This explanation, while plausible, does not solve the problem of complicating Dtr's theological perspective. Punishment without sin would undermine the entirety of deuteronomistic theology (one of the agendas espoused by the book of Job).

It is also possible that Dtr is unable to make theological sense of this occurrence. He does not want to attribute the death of the ultimate good king to Yahweh. The fact of the death of this king in this way undermines a major tenet of deuteronomistic theology. The great king with all his fidelity and reforming is unable to influence his own fate.

c. The Use of a Prototype Strategy

Josiah is certainly viewed through the Davidic prototype, yet it is surprising, given that the History seems to have been leading up to his arrival (especially 1 Kings 13:2), that the character of Josiah is literarily flat in comparison with the character development of other kings. Reticence in the presentation of Josiah as a character may be explained by the nature of typology in general. The goal of the use of a type is to establish a pattern that can be repeated. Similar to Robert Alter's discussion of the use of type-scene motifs in biblical narrative, the use of character typology carries with it all the information that an audience knows about a pattern or motif. In this way, the author does not always need to lay out all of the information because it is implicit by using such a type. Alter suggests that an awareness of conventions helps us read. We recognize patterns of repetition, symmetry, and contrast.[43] In his definition, the "type-scene" demonstrates "certain prominent elements of repetitive compositional pattern[s]…that are conscious convention[s]."[44] Alter states that "the biblical authors, counting on their audience's familiarity with the features and function of the type-scene, could merely allude to the type-scene or present a transfigured version of it."[45] Similarly, with the typology of characters, when the author activates any given character type, the audience is already clued into the convention. When a character is plugged into the prototypes discussed above, the Davidic and anti-Davidic, the reader already knows a lot about a figure. One like David is faithful to Yahweh and one like Jeroboam is not and worships at and supports non-centralized cult sites. Typology can be a helpful tool and result in concision of language on the part of the biblical author.

Similar to the type-scenes as Alter states, "What is really interesting is not the schema of convention but what is done in each individual application of the schema to give it a sudden tilt of innovation or even to refashion it radically for the imaginative purposes at hand."[46] It is with this in mind that the audience begins to read the character development of King Josiah. He is very squarely set within the Davidic typology, but the narrative does not focus on him as a character. The use of a typological convention allows the reader to know about Josiah, to recognize him as the inheritor of the Davidic literary tradition, and to view him as an adherent of Yahweh's law, while simultaneously shifting the focus away from the character of the king and reflecting it on the book of the law and the reform.

---

[43] Alter, *ABN*, 47.
[44] Ibid., 50.
[45] Ibid., 58.
[46] Ibid., 52.

The way in which the typology is applied to Josiah is unlike any other instance in the History. Dtr's insistence that Josiah is the paradigm of the good king is overly emphatic. Like the other good kings he does what is right in Yahweh's eyes. As are two others, he is like David. But he is the only king to comply with the law of the king. As a type he is pitted against and triumphs over Solomon and Jeroboam; he undoes both of their sins with his reform. He does better than any of the previous reforming kings, Asa, Jehoshaphat, and even Hezekiah. And he celebrates the Passover in a way in which it has never been celebrated by any king. This portrayal justifies the earlier assertion that the Davidic prototype is modeled on the character of Josiah rather than the David we know from Samuel. There is no other king who can compare with the paradigm of Josiah.

The development of the typology, as previously discussed, begins with the introductory regnal formula. The reign of Josiah begins characteristically with this formula. Josiah is the best of the best kings. He did הישר בעיני יהוה "what was right in the eyes of Yahweh," and he was like David. Josiah's comparison to David is more robust than the two others who are also compared positively to him (Asa and Hezekiah). Josiah וילך בכל דרך דוד אביו ולא סר ימין ושמאול "walked in all the way[s] of David his father. And he did not stray to the right or left" (2 Kgs 22:2). The resemblance with David, while similar to the other kings compared, is constructed in a unique way. Asa merely does what was right כדוד אביו "like David" while Hezekiah does what is right, ככל אשר עשה דוד אביו "like all that David did." Josiah is the only one to walk in the ways of David. Similarly, Jehoshaphat walks in the ways of his father Asa, וילך בכל דרך אסא אביו. This construction ("walking in the way of X") mirrors that of the bad kings of Israel, those who walk in the ways of Jeroboam. Nadab, Baasha, Omri, Ahaziah, and Jehoahaz all walk in (all) the ways of Jeroboam (see chapter 4). This is a highly rhetorical collocation, functioning as one of the first indicators that Josiah and his reform are set up to oppose Jeroboam and undo his sin.

Furthermore, the concept of following in David's path establishes a strong connection with the laws of Deuteronomy. Josiah is explicitly set up as an adherent to the deuteronomic law. The phrase "to walk in the way(s) of Yahweh" is used throughout Deuteronomy. It is an expression of covenantal loyalty.[47] As previously discussed, this instruction first appears in Kings in David's deathbed instructions to Solomon; David lays out the criteria for being a good king. He tells Solomon: "Keep the mandates of Yahweh your God, following his ways, keeping his statutes and commandments, laws and testimonies, as is written in the instruction of Moses (בתורת משה), so that you will be successful in whatever you do and to whatever you turn" (1 Kgs 2:3). Being like David and following David's way is following the way of Yahweh. By connecting Josiah with David using these words (as opposed to the other Davidic comparisons), Dtr intrinsically links Josiah and his actions with the stipulations of deuteronomic law and following the ways of Yahweh, while simultaneously contrasting Josiah with Jeroboam and those kings who continue Jeroboam's sin. The connection with this verse in 1 Kings 2 is made further by the reference to following תורת משה. In another evaluative comment towards the end of 2 Kings 23, Dtr remarks that there was no king before Josiah "who turned back to Yahweh with all his heart and all his soul and all his might, as all the instruction of Moses (תורת משה)" (2 Kgs 23:25). This is the only instance in the account that the found scroll is referred to as תורת משה (elsewhere ספר התורה, ספר הברית). Josiah's fidelity to the law connects him with Moses and Mosaic law.

[47] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 333–34.

At the onset of the account, Josiah is set up as a righteous king. In the introductory regnal formula, he is the only king said to walk in the ways of David, parallel to and contrasting those bad kings of Israel who walk in the ways of Jeroboam. Josiah is like David, and not like the anti-David, Jeroboam. Furthermore, it is said of Josiah that he did not "stray to the right or left." Josiah is the only king to whom this deuteronomic phrase is applied. This expression also appears in the law of the king in Deuteronomy 17:20 and Deuteronomy 5:29, 17:11, and 28:14.

In Deuteronomy 17 this term appears in two contexts. The first is in a charge to the people that they should act according to the law (תורה) of a judicial ruling (v. 11). The second is in the law of the king.[48] The king is charged with reading the law (תורה) everyday, following the laws and statutes, and not straying to the right or left. The introduction to Josiah is a companion to this law in Deuteronomy. Josiah, the paradigm of the good king, fulfills the injunctions made to kings. By using the language of the law of the king, Dtr announces in this regnal introduction that Josiah perfectly exhibits kingly behavior. In the regnal evaluation, Josiah is set up as one of

[48] While many scholars attribute the deuteronomic law code to the court of Josiah, there is some question about whether Josiah and his court would really have composed this law that widely limits his power and breaks with ancient Near Eastern and Israelite standard attributions of royal power. The law of the king represents a departure from standard Israelite and ancient Near Eastern norms about monarchy and is not always reflected in DtrH. The law of the king seems to convict the king more than permit authority. It contains five prohibitions about what the king should not do, but includes only one positive duty, to read the Torah every day. It is that same Torah that limits his power. The law of the king denies the king's role in the cult. The scholarly view that suggests that Deuteronomy is promulgated by King Josiah is somewhat problematic given that the role of the king is so limited by the law of the king. DtrH's view of kingship conflicts with Deuteronomy's law of the king. Would Josiah be responsible for a law that limits his power? Sweeney suggests that the conflict between Dtr and the law of king is not as problematic and the law does not limit the king's power as much as these scholars contend. "The 'Torah of the King' does not restrict royal authority; it merely defines the conditions by which it may be exercised. It does not compromise the judicial role of the king; rather, it testifies to it by requiring the monarch to write and observe a copy of 'this Torah' – that is, the lawcode that defines the legal system administered of the land" (Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 162.)

The relationship between Josiah and the law of the king brings up another pertinent issue in the study of Deuteronomy and DtrH: what is the relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History? This is particularly pressing in the book of Kings where the kings and the people are presumably held to a deuteronomic standard, although the law presented in Kings is often very different from Deuteronomy. This also goes back to the original question of "Is there a Deuteronomistic History?" The entire concept of a DtrH relies on an assumption that the History is crafted in relation to the themes and laws expressed in Deuteronomy.

There are some problems when considering the relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History. While DtrH seems to be influenced by Deuteronomy, Dtr is still willing to reinterpret and reject some of deuteronomic law. Dtr seems to implement deuteronomic law, but also seems to change it. Knoppers suggests that "the Deuteronomist's recourse to the Deuteronomic law in judging the monarchy is selective. The Deuteronomist does not always define what the 'statutes' (חקים), 'testimonies' (עדות), 'judgments' (משפטים), and 'commandments' (מצות) are, but as most commentators have stressed, their primary reference is cultic. By comparison, the Deuteronomic code contains a wide range of legislation affecting social, economic, cultic, and political aspects of Israelite society" (Gary N. Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings," *CBQ* 63, no. 3 (2001): 406.) Also, Knoppers describes the relationship between DtrH and the deuteronomic code in this way: "If the Deuteronomist is indebted to and informed by the deuteronomic program, he also undermines it. While the deuteronomic writers engage problems in Israelite history by carefully dispersing powers among a variety of institutions, the Deuteronomist champions the exercise of monarchical power as a resolution to Israel's ills" (Gary N. Knoppers, "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship," *ZAW* 108, no. 3 (1996): 334.) Bernard Levinson suggests that Dtr "actually abrogates Deuteronomy, the very normative standard that he purports to implement" (Bernard M. Levinson, "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah," *VT* 51, no. 4 (2001): 526.) In this way, DtrH is connected to the law in Deuteronomy, but not necessarily constrained by it. He makes choices to use, change, and reject individual elements of the law.

the few good kings, one who is like David, surpassing those who are also compared to David. He is clearly set in the Davidic prototype, even contrasted with the anti-type Jeroboam. He exceeds all other kings in his strict adherence to the law of the king. It is not just that Josiah is the idealized king of kings since David and the "cult reformer *par excellence*" who puts others to shame, but since Moses and Joshua, Josiah is the first leader to understand deuteronomic law and put it into application.[49] Josiah's adherence to Deuteronomy 17:19 is a nod to this literary position.

The portrayal of Josiah in the Davidic prototype relies heavily on the connection to Solomon. One way this link is made is by reference to the law of the king. Many scholars have suggested that this law was written specifically against Solomon, citing his accumulation of horses and wives;[50] Solomon was well known to have many of both. But it is not likely that this law was composed during the time or shortly following Solomon's reign, as some scholars contend. If the law were written in response to Solomon's reign, it would suggest that 1 Kings 1-11 predates the deuteronomistic school.[51] Also, in Dtr's Solomon narrative (1 Kgs 3-10), Solomon's wealth and prosperity are viewed as rewards from Yahweh (1 Kgs 3:4-15), not as means for criticism.[52] This is further evidenced by the fact that even within the censure of Solomon in 1 Kings 11, he is not condemned for having many wives, but for having foreign wives who corrupt his religious practices. Despite this, even though the law is not necessarily a comment against Solomon, it certainly calls him to mind, further highlighting the disparity between Solomon, who violates the prohibitions of the law of the king, and Josiah who is the only king to fulfill them.

Furthermore, the contrast between Josiah and Solomon is also apparent in Josiah's exploits in purging the cults of Judah. In a final act of reform in the southern kingdom, Josiah sets his sights on the altars of Solomon. The narrative previously described the general action Josiah took against the non-centralized and idolatrous cults of Judah, but Dtr also specifically focuses on Josiah's actions against the cult of Solomon. Rather than just being another undertaking in the list of the reform measures, this act has strong literary ramifications. It is not coincidental that it is included as the final feat in Judah. Undoing the sins of Solomon is another important element of correspondence with other parts of the History, contributing to setting Josiah up as the Davidic prototype. As previously discussed, the portrait of Solomon helps contribute to the development of the Davidic prototype (especially 1 Kings 2-3) and its anti-type (1 Kings 11). By countering Solomon's sins of 1 Kings 11, Dtr constructs Josiah in the Davidic type, opposing Solomon's portrayal of the anti-type. In this way, according to Sweeney, "The narrative concerning the reign of Solomon is especially important in the Josianic DtrH because it points to Solomon as the cause of most of the problems that Josiah must resolve."[53] In destroying Solomon's altars, Josiah removes the sin that split the kingdom and essentially restores the Davidic promise of 2 Samuel 7. The correspondence between these two acts (erecting and demolishing the altars) is made clear in the word choice. Josiah removes the altars of Solomon, using the same words as the report of their installation. The reform report:

[49] Hardmeier, "King Josiah," 130.
[50] Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship," 63:409; "The Deuteronomist and the Law of the King," 108:331; Brettler, "The Structure of 1 Kings 1-11," 91–93.
[51] Knoppers, "The Deuteronomist and the Law of the King," 108:334.
[52] Ibid., 108:338.
[53] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 174.

> As for the altars that were on the face of Jerusalem from the right of the mount of destruction upon which Solomon king of Israel built to Ashtaroth abomination of the Sidonians, and to Chemosh abomination of Moab, and to Milcom abomination of the Ammonites, the king defiled [them]. (2 Kgs 23:13)

It is Solomon's apostasy that causes the rift in the kingdom according to Dtr. The announcement of overturning Solomon's sin is almost identical to the words of condemnation of its institution:

> And Solomon went after Ashtaroth the god of the Sidonians, and after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites… (7) Then Solomon built a high place to Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, on the mountain which is next to Jerusalem and for Molech the abomination of the Ammonites. (1 Kgs 11:5, 7)

By destroying Solomon's high places, Josiah removes the cause of the split of the kingdom, theoretically reuniting Israel and Judah.[54] In this way, Josiah restores the kingdom to that promised to David. Because Solomon's apostasy was the cause of the split, he bears the responsibility for the cultic sins of the North as well. The split affords the opportunity for Jeroboam to set up the competing shrines at Dan and Bethel. The sites and Jeroboam himself lead Israel to sin. Upon its demise, Israel is primarily convicted for following the sins of Jeroboam. In this way, Solomon sets the stage for the Israelite kings' transgressions. Solomon's high places initiate censure of Judean kings. Solomon's actions, resulting in the split of the kingdom, influence the future apostasy of both the northern and southern kings.[55] Only Josiah is able to overturn Solomon's sins. The contrast with Solomon is essential to the portrait of Josiah.

The disparity between Solomon and Josiah in their fulfillment (or lack thereof) of the law of the king continues in a second judgment formula at the end of Josiah's reign. (This is not the standard regnal formula – the introduction or DBF). This also begins to contribute to the contrast between Josiah and Hezekiah. Josiah is praised for his incomparability, וכמהו לא היה לפניו מלך אשר שב אל יהוה בכל לבבו ובכל נפשו ובכל מאדו ככל תורת משה ואחריו לא קם כמהו "And like him there was no king before him who turned back to Yahweh with all his heart and all his soul and all his might, as all the instruction of Moses. And after him, no one arose like him" (2 Kgs 23:25). There is a short list of characters who receive praise for their incomparability. They are Moses (Deut 34:10), Solomon (1 Kgs 10:23), and Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:5). While some scholars, including Gary Knoppers,[56] identify this verse as produced by exilic Dtr^2, I identify it as pre-exilic Dtr^1.[57]

---

[54] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:245.
[55] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 94.
[56] Knoppers, "There was None Like Him," 54:411–431; *Two Nations under God*, 2:218.
[57] Part of the cause for debate about the provenance of verse 25 may be the interruption of verses 26 and 27 inserted into the closing formula. These verses, which announce that Josiah's attempts to quell Yahweh's wrath are unsuccessful and that Yahweh will reject the temple, Jerusalem, and Judah, are undeniably exilic. Verses 26 and 27 are surrounded by the closing statements of Josiah's reign and were inserted here in an exilic context, by a later redactor (Dtr^2, represented by the underlined font): "**And like him there was no king before him who turned back to Yahweh with all his heart and all his soul and all his might, as all the instruction of Moses. And after him, no one arose like him.** (26) But Yahweh did not turn from his great wrath which burned against Judah, against all the things by which Manasseh caused him to anger. (27) And Yahweh said, 'Also Judah I will remove from my sight as I removed Israel. And I will reject this city, which I have chosen, Jerusalem and the house where I said, "My name will be there".' **(28) And the remainder of the deeds of Josiah and all that he did, are they not written in the book of the annals of the kings of Judah?"** The exilic insertion of verses 26 and 27 into the praise for Josiah, with

Knoppers suggests that these "incomparability formulae are one means by which an exilic Deuteronomist highlights the exceptional accomplishments of major figures within his history."[58] He argues that only an author who knew the kings following Josiah would be able to make a comparison to them.[59] This is not necessary. It is possible for the author to make a hyperbolic statement proclaiming Josiah's unmatched greatness and not intend it literally, while also not having a crystal ball's view into the future. An author could make this claim at the time of Josiah without knowing the fate of the subsequent kings. Similarly, existence of other statements of incomparability, specifically the one about Hezekiah, can be explained, as Provan suggests, by dating. The incomparability statement about Hezekiah predates the Josianic edition, and was the end of an earlier redaction.[60] The Josianic Dtr could be imitating this earlier author's style and replacing Hezekiah with Josiah as the greatest of kings.

Just as the contrast with Solomon contributes to the portrait of Josiah's reform, so too does a comparison between the reforms of Josiah and Hezekiah promote Josiah over Hezekiah. Dtr downplays Hezekiah's reform in order to elevate Josiah's above it. Dtr could not let Hezekiah's comment of incomparability stand without adding a comment about Josiah. While Knoppers argues that the two comments are not competing (that Hezekiah is incomparable in his trust in Yahweh and Josiah in his unparalleled reforms),[61] there is no question that the similarity of expression and vocabulary demands comparison and that the two statements be read together.

Dtr's statement of incomparability in 2 Kings 23:25 positions Josiah as the most loyal of all kings: "And like him there was no king before him who turned back to Yahweh with all his heart and all his soul and all his might, as all the instruction of Moses. And after him, no one arose like him." This verse corresponds with Deuteronomy 6:5: "Love Yahweh your God with all your heart, all your soul, and all your might." This injunction is thoroughly deuteronomistic. It is repeated verbatim in the praise for Josiah. Josiah is the only person about whom this is said.

As previously discussed, the directing of one's לב is a profession of covenant loyalty. Not only was all of Josiah's heart with Yahweh, but also all his soul and all his might. (See chapter 3 for more on this covenant loyalty.) Loyalty of heart and soul is required for the success of the Davidic dynasty, as seen in David's charge to Solomon: למען יקים יהוה את דברו אשר דבר עלי לאמר אם ישמרו בניך את דרכם ללכת לפני באמת בכל לבבכם ובכל נפשם לאמר לא יכרת לך איש מעל כסא ישראל "If your sons are careful in their way to walk before me faithfully with all their heart and with all their soul, no one will be cut off from the throne of Israel" (1 Kgs 2:3). Here, David mentions only heart and soul, but not might. Josiah complies but goes further in his fidelity. Only Josiah completely fulfills the injunction of Deuteronomy 6:5. Through these few verses it is clear to see how Dtr activates the Davidic prototype. The use of key phrases and terms is enough to set up Josiah in the model of David and to elevate him beyond all kings, past, present, and future. This verse is made as an addition to the closing DBF of the regnal formula, which concludes in verse

---

other exilic insertions transforms the narrative. Even this great king is unable to overturn Yahweh's wrath. The king presented in the Davidic prototype is unable to restore the Davidic promise. Hardmeier suggests that the pre-exilic typology is reused in an exilic context. Josiah "becomes the prototype of that future king who is quietly alluded to in the open ending of DtrH in 2 Kgs 25.27-30" (Hardmeier, "King Josiah," 141, 133.)

[58] Knoppers, "There was None Like Him," 54:411.

[59] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:219.

[60] Provan, *Hezekiah*, 121, 153.

[61] Knoppers, "There was None Like Him," 54:411–431.

28. This further suggests that Josiah is idealized in these chapters as the greatest of all Davidic kings, one who walks in the ways of David. Josiah is also set up in the model of Moses (2 Kgs 22:2; 23:25). Josiah's actions highlight the shortcomings of other kings, namely Ahaz, Manasseh, Jeroboam, Solomon – and Hezekiah.[62]

The contrast with other kings (and royal prototypes) continues with Josiah's systematic removal of the cult of Jeroboam, further eliminating the cultic separation between north and south, completing the reunification of the Davidic kingdom: "And also the altar which is in Bethel, the high place which Jeroboam son of Nabat who caused Israel to sin made, even that altar and the high place, he tore down and he burned the high place, he crushed it to dust and he burned Asherah" (2 Kgs 23:15).

Parallel to the dedication of Jeroboam's calves in 1 Kings 12, Josiah's reform focuses on Bethel (rather than also on Dan). With the destruction of the northern cult, the entire kingdom (north and south) comes under the religious auspices of the Jerusalem temple. This is a curious act. The northern kingdom had been destroyed one hundred years previously and falls under foreign dominion, but Josiah takes it upon himself to cultically clean up Israel in addition to Judah (2 Kgs 23:4-14). Was he really concerned with those who remained in Israel continuing the sins of Jeroboam? Is he anxious about the foreign people installed in Samaria who even after being taught how to properly worship Yahweh, continue to also worship at the high places and their own gods (2 Kgs 17:26-41)? Would the king of Judah really have jurisdiction to go into a foreign kingdom and clean up its religious sites?[63] The prospect of this may be possible politically because of the breakdown of power of the Assyrian Empire, yet, this is besides the point. When considering the actual likelihood and lack of pragmatic necessity in this act, it highlights its literary value. Similar to destroying Solomon's high places, in demolishing the shrine at Bethel and the high places throughout the north, Josiah reunites Israel and Judah, restoring the Davidic promise.[64] Taken in connection with the complex construction of the Davidic prototype, Josiah's act is even more significant – Dtr's portrait of Josiah is the embodiment of David and the anti-Jeroboam.

The climax of the History in the coming of Josiah is further emphasized in the overturning of the sins of Jeroboam as the fulfillment of the prophecies made against him, highlighting the importance of the prophecy-fulfillment schema as an essential element of Dtr's historiographical poetics. After tearing down the altar at Bethel, Josiah fulfills the word of the man of God from Judah spoken at the dedication of the same altar. He also legitimates the proclamation of the old prophet of Bethel as well.

> When Josiah turned and saw the graves that were on the hill, he sent and took the bones from the graves and he burned [them] on the altar and he defiled it according to the word of Yahweh foretold by the man of God, who has foretold these things. (17) And he said, "What is that grave marker that I see?" And the men of the city said to him, "The grave of a man of God who came from Judah. He foretold these things which you did upon the altar [at] Bethel." (18) And he said,

[62] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 105.
[63] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:213.
[64] Frost, "Death of Josiah," 87:370.

> "Leave him, let no man disturb his bones." And they left his bones and the bones of the prophet, who came from Samaria.[65] (19) And also (וגם) all the shrines of the high places which are in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made to anger [Yahweh], Josiah tore down and he did to them just as he had done in Bethel. (20) And he sacrificed all the priests of the high places, who were there on the altars, and he burned the human bones on them. Then he returned to Jerusalem. (2 Kgs 23:16-20)

In addition to destroying the altar at Bethel, Josiah sets out to clean up the north. The report beginning in verse 15 is presented in two parts; both begin with וגם (vv. 15, 19). The particle גם usually functions as an intensifier, connecting two clauses, adding the second to the first. In verse 15, the גם introduces the beginning of the reforms in the north, adding them to the reforms in Judah. The second וגם in verse 19 extends the reform at Bethel to all of Israel.[66] The use of וגם here and the disjunctive syntax that follows it highlight the significance of the altars destroyed. Usually verses begin with *wāw*-consecutive verbs, which narrate a continual sequence of action.[67] Instead, here וגם is followed, in both verses, by the direct object, in order to highlight the altar at Bethel and the shrines of the high places.[68] The syntax focuses the sentence on "the altar which is in Bethel, the high place which Jeroboam son of Nabat who caused Israel to sin made, even that altar and the high place, he tore down…" By putting the direct object in the first position, Dtr is sure to connect this altar, the one at Bethel, with the sin of Jeroboam. The same is true for verse 19. The direct object follows וגם: "And also all the shrines of the high places which are in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made to anger [Yahweh], Josiah tore down…" Here, Dtr makes certain that the high places Josiah targets are clearly associated with the sins of the kings of Israel.

The content of these verses is also broken up by the two גמs. The first section is the fulfillment of the prophecy of the man of God. As he prophesied in 1 Kings 13, Josiah does indeed burn human bones on the altar at Bethel, permanently defiling it. Josiah's actions in verse 15 and 16 directly correspond to the words of the man of God, creating a clear example of the prophecy-fulfillment schema that structures DtrH. Just as the man of God predicts in 1 Kings 13:2, such is done: "And he called out against the altar by the word of Yahweh. And he said: 'O Altar, Altar, thus says Yahweh, "Behold, a son will be born to the house of David, Josiah by name, and he will sacrifice upon you the priests of the high places, the ones making offerings upon you, and human bones will be burned upon you"'." In case the connection was lost on the reader, the direct discourse between King Josiah and the townspeople makes the association even more clear. Josiah asks for identification of the graves on the hill. In response, the men tell Josiah

---

[65] In 1 Kings 14, the old prophet came from Bethel, not Samaria.

[66] The use of גם in these two verses may also illustrate the seams of redaction, highlighting the use of a source and the verses composed surrounding it to integrate it into the narrative. Confirmation of the use of a source may also be seen in the chronological contradiction in verses 15 and 16. In verse 15 Josiah tears down and burns the altar at Bethel, but in verse 16 he burns the bones from the graveyard on that same altar. How is this possible if the altar were destroyed in verse 15? This may reflect the use of a source (vv. 16-18*) surrounded by deuteronomistic composition (vv. 15, 19-20). Verse 15 may function as an introduction to the source, contextualizing Josiah's destruction of the altar as fulfilling the ancient prophecy of the man of God As an introduction, it appears to present something that has not yet happened (Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:204.)

[67] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 41–42.

[68] In verse 15 there is a long clause, qualifying the object before even reaching a verb, and a perfect verb at that, indicating simultaneous action, rather than furthering the narrative.

that it is the grave of the man of God "who foretold these things which you did upon the altar at Bethel."

As the old prophet from Bethel (here, Samaria) predicted, Josiah does not disturb the bones of the man of God. The old prophet was shrewd to throw his lot in with the man of God. In sparing the bones of the man of God, the bones of the old prophet are left in peace. The fulfillment of the old prophet's prediction further confirms the value of the prophecy of the man of God. It is clear that these verses were composed in conjunction with the events and composition of 1 Kings 13.

Further correspondence with the prophecy of the man of God continues in verses 19 and 20. The prophecy of the man of God is extended to apply to the whole of Israel. Josiah tears down the high places of the north and sacrifices the priests of those high places, burning their bones upon the altars. He not only counteracts the sins of Jeroboam (v. 15), but he also overturns the continued sins of those kings of Israel who follow the sins of Jeroboam (v. 19). In his role as the Davidic type and the opposition to the anti-type, Josiah undoes the sins of the bad kings, renewing the Davidic promise, eliminating the non-centralized shrines, and removing the illegitimate priests.

Contrasting Josiah with the evil acts of Solomon and Jeroboam is not the only way in which Dtr uses Josiah's acts of reform to further elevate him over the other kings as well as successfully setting Josiah up as the Davidic prototype. In addition to the statement of incomparability that sets Josiah against Hezekiah, they are further compared in their acts of reform. In the reform report, between the very specific descriptions of the destruction of the altars of Solomon (v. 13) and those of Jeroboam (v. 15), appears a general and vague verse: "And he broke the *maṣṣēbôt* and cut down the *ašērîm* and filled their places with human bones" (v. 14). The verse is not specific whether this act against the *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm* refers to North or South or both. Josiah has already removed the Asherah from the temple (v. 6) and tore down the houses of the *qĕdēšîm*, which (only in this context) have some connection to the cult of Asherah (v. 7). In both Israel and Judah worship of Baal and Asherah is prevalent.

The lack of specific location in this act of removing the *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm* may be intended to indicate that it was included to call to mind (and denigrate) the reform of King Hezekiah, the only other reformer who receives unqualified praise. Hezekiah, like Josiah, is said to do what is right in Yahweh's eyes and to be like David, ככל אשר עשה דוד אביו, "like all that David his father did" (2 Kgs 18:3). While Hezekiah's reform is significant, it is only recounted by Dtr in one verse in the regnal formula at the beginning of his reign: "It was he (הוא) who removed the high places and he broke the *maṣṣēbôt* and cut down the Asherah and smashed the bronze serpent that Moses made, for until those days Israel was sacrificing to it (all verbs perfects) and it was called[69] Nehustan" (2 Kgs 18:4). Through the syntax, it is clear that the report of reform is part of the judgment formula, rather than an account of Hezekiah's actions in narrative time, similar to that of Josiah's reform report. All of the verbs, until the end of the verse, are perfect forms. This demonstrates simultaneous action, even an aside, rather than the normal narrative syntax of *wāw*-conversive verbs, which actively move along the plot. Rather

[69] Literally, "he called it." This is the only *wāw*-conversive form in the verse.

than an account that includes "real time" action, reporting Hezekiah's deeds, the reform is part of the judgment evaluation.

The verse focuses on Hezekiah, illustrated by the fronting of the subject and the inclusion of the unnecessary 3ms pronoun. This terse account detracts from the significance and importance of Hezekiah's acts. Hezekiah attacks the high places, reinforcing the doctrine of centralization. He removes the cultic objects of syncretism, the Asherah and *maṣṣēbôt,* and he removes the icon erected by the great Moses. Presumably, it stood for half a millennium before anyone deigned to remove it. Most certainly the worship of the Nehustan did not begin at the time of Hezekiah. We have no reason to assume that Hezekiah's efforts toward reform were not genuine and attempted to be effective, but the outcome is short-lived and literarily overshadowed. Within one generation, Hezekiah's own son Manasseh rebuilds the high places and the Asherah (2 Kgs 21:3). Manasseh undermines Hezekiah's cult reform. Minimizing Hezekiah's reform report is an intentional strategy by Dtr to lessen Hezekiah's reform. (This short report is in stark contrast with the extensive account of Hezekiah's reform in Chronicles, 2 Chr 29-31.)

The necessity for Josiah to repeat the same actions undercuts the effect of Hezekiah's reform and demonstrates that Josiah was an even greater reformer and king than Hezekiah, who must have been well-known as a reformer.[70] Josiah's act of removing (again) the Asherah and the *maṣṣēbôt* in 2 Kings 23:14 is expressed by using the same verbs as the Hezekiah account: וישבר את המצבות ויכרת את האשרים וימלא את מקומם עצמות אדם "And he broke the *maṣṣēbôt* and cut down the *ašērîm* and filled their places with human bones." This compares with the Hezekiah account in 2 Kings 18:4: וישבר את המצבות וכרת את האשרה "And he broke the *maṣṣēbôt* and cut down the Asherah (sg)." The word choice makes clear that Josiah is literally repeating the same actions.[71] The necessity of this deems Hezekiah's reform unsuccessful.

Another literary indication that Dtr found Hezekiah's reform insufficient is the focus on Ahaz's altars in 2 Kings 23:12: "As for the altars which were on the roof, the upper chamber of Ahaz, which the kings of Judah had made, and the altars which Manasseh made in the two courtyards of the House of Yahweh, the king tore down. And he hastily[72] tore down and threw their dust into the Wadi Kidron." While the comment about Manasseh's altars may have been added by Dtr^2, the beginning of the verse may be pre-exilic. It is somewhat surprising that Dtr specifically mentions Ahaz and his sins here. The only other kings named in the reform report

[70] Reading between the lines, it is clear that Dtr has a problem with giving Hezekiah's reform its due. Yet, if, as it seems in Dtr's mind, reporting on a significant reform like Hezekiah's detracts from the greatness and uniqueness of Josiah's reform, why does the Josianic Dtr even include it? Hezekiah's reign is filled with many other events that the reform could have been left out. But this is not Dtr's *modus operandi*; this does not reflect his historiographical poetics. Dtr includes the reform of Hezekiah because it must have been well known and could have been included in his source material. Some scholars, including Provan, view the reign of Hezekiah, his reform, and the statement of his incomparability (2 Kgs 18:5), as the climax of a pre-deuteronomistic edition of the History written during or shortly after the reign of Hezekiah (Provan, *Hezekiah*.) Provan views the במות theme as a pervasive and framing theme throughout the book, which culminates in the reign of Hezekiah and his destruction of the high places. Hezekiah removes the sin of Jeroboam, namely the high places, but not explicitly Dan and Bethel. Literarily, Josiah must both do and out-do the righteous acts of Hezekiah and his reform. Hezekiah removes the high places; Josiah needs to burn Bethel, fulfilling the prophecy of the man of God.

[71] This is also similar vocabulary to the injunction in Deut 12:3.

[72] וירצם משם for וירץ משם. Loss of מ from haplography (Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 289.)

are Solomon, Jeroboam, and Manasseh, the prototypical kings whose cultic transgressions have long-term effects on the history of Israel and Judah. Ahaz is never previously included in this category. (Ahaz seems worse than most of the bad kings, but literarily is never afforded prototype status.) Instead, Ahaz's altars are mentioned as a backhanded jab at Hezekiah's reform. Ahaz's reign immediately precedes Hezekiah's; the altars stood at the time of Hezekiah's reform, but he leaves them standing. The message conveyed from this is, "Good thing Josiah arrived to clean up the wrong doing of the kings of Judah, even the reformers." The destruction of the Bethel altar further cements Josiah's position. Only Josiah, the greatest of all the kings, has the ability to return Israel to the "son of Jesse." All other reforms, literarily, pale in comparison.

A final intertextual association that illustrates how Josiah's reform and Josiah himself supersede all other kings is the removal of the *qĕdēšîm* (cult prostitutes). The *qĕdēšîm* have been the target of reforms by earlier Judean kings, even ones praised for their rightness. The *qĕdēšîm* are mentioned four times in DtrH. *Qĕdēšîm* and cult prostitution seems to be a southern problem and is not listed among the sins of the north. Josiah's destruction of the houses of the *qĕdēšîm* demonstrates as Eynikel suggests, a "continuity and tension with the previous texts."[73] The first reference to the *qĕdēšîm* is in the reign of Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14:24). Judah is said to do evil in the eyes of Yahweh building high places throughout the land. At that time there were also "*qĕdēšîm* in the land." The prohibition against *qĕdēšîm* appears in Deuteronomy 23:18: לא תהיה קדשה מבנות ישראל ולא יהיה קדש מבני ישראל "None of the daughters of Israel shall be a *qĕdēšâh*; none of the sons of Israel shall be a *qādēš*."

Asa is the first of three kings who attempts to remove the *qĕdēšîm*. He appears to be the first cult reformer of the southern kingdom and is the first of the kings to be given a positive evaluation (see chapter 3). He gets rid of the *qĕdēšîm*, removes the idols, and deposes his mother from the position of queen mother because she worships Asherah (1 Kgs 15:12). Even though Asa removed the *qĕdēšîm* from the land, they persist and Asa's son Jehoshaphat also strikes against them, as it says in 1 Kings 22:47, "The remnant of the *qĕdēšîm* who remained from the days of Asa his father, he exterminated from the land." Clearly, Asa's reform was incomplete and not successful in eradicating the existence of the *qĕdēšîm* from the land.[74] There seem to be *qĕdēšîm* in existence long past the time of Asa. And while Jehoshaphat is credited with removing the remnant, something continues against which Josiah strikes.

Josiah's reform destroys the houses of the *qĕdēšîm*: "He tore down the houses of the *qĕdēšîm* who were in the house of Yahweh, where women weave coverings for Asherah" (2 Kgs 23:7). Dtr is unwilling to let stand a reform by other kings (even those who receive praise) that Josiah does not also undertake. At every stage of his reign, Josiah must supersede and eclipse the other kings. Does Josiah really attack the practice of *qĕdēšîm* or just destroy the location? It is unclear what it means that Josiah tore down the houses of the *qĕdēšîm*. There is no specific mention that he removed the *qĕdēšîm* themselves, as do Asa and Jehoshaphat. Perhaps this belies the fact that there were not actually any *qĕdēšîm* left in the land at the time of Josiah. Instead of fabricating that Josiah removes them, Dtr includes the comment about removing the houses rather than the *qĕdēšîm* themselves. An alternative explanation that may give Josiah more credit

[73] Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah*, 331.
[74] Bird, "The End of the Male Cult Prostitute," 61.

is that he attacks the site of the *qĕdēšîm* so they cannot return to this practice under a future king. Unlike Asa and Jehoshaphat who presumably leave the buildings still standing, Josiah does not merely strike against those in the position of *qĕdēšîm*. This concept, attacking the "institutional foundation" of the sins of the kings of Israel and Judah, is a strategy used throughout the reform report, demonstrating the unforgiving, thorough, and definitive nature of Josiah's reform.[75] Josiah outdoes any previous attempt at reform, making his bigger, stronger, longer lasting, and farther reaching. This is another indication of how thoroughly Dtr is involved in rewriting the list of the reform report. Each element of the reform corresponds to something else in the History, presenting Josiah as either repairing and/or surpassing the actions of earlier kings.[76]

The use of the Davidic prototype through intertextual comparisons with other kings and their cultic actions sets up Josiah as the ultimate king. This technique is effective even though the account of Josiah's reign spends little time on the king himself. By using the typological conventions, the development of the character is implicit. Dtr is able to focus on the individual reforms while setting up Josiah as surpassing the best of kings based on the Davidic prototype. The use of the prototype illustrates how the entirety of the History is focused on the coming of Josiah and his reform. Dtr presents Josiah as the greatest of kings. He eliminates the sins of both the north and south, ultimately reuniting them, "returning" worship to the temple in Jerusalem. By fulfilling deuteronomic law, doing הישר בעיני יהוה, and walking in the ways of David, according to the Torah of Moses, Josiah is a figure compared to Moses and Joshua, surpassing even David, the model of the prototype of the good king.[77] In Dtr's unparalleled acclaim, Josiah out Davids even David. The figure of Josiah bears a heavy literary burden; he is the second David and the anti-Jeroboam and anti-Solomon, the antithesis of the Davidic anti-type.

The reform report and its introduction by the book finding is focused on demonstrating that the innovations of the reform are antique and that Josiah is a great reformer, clearly topping any reform previously attempted in Israel and Judah. All previous reforms were unsuccessful or insufficient and only Josiah has the ability to create real and lasting reform. In this way, Josiah's reform unites the entirety of the History, rectifying all the wrongs of the monarchy. Josiah's reform removes the cultic sites of Ahaz, Manasseh, Solomon, Jeroboam and the people of Israel, almost all the players primarily responsible for the majority of problems in the cultic lives of Israel and Judah.[78] The focus on the law and reform and lack of focus on Josiah himself function as something of a justification of the History as a whole. DtrH chronicles the history of the monarchy through the lens of cultic fidelity, primarily derived from the deuteronomic code. The book finding and Josiah's reading of the law declare the value of the written law. We know of no other king who acclaims the law in this way, using it as the basis for the covenant with Yahweh. The book finding legitimates the entire deuteronomistic project – the writing down of history, application of the law, and the value of the written law.

[75] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 2:183.
[76] This thoroughly undermines the arguments by Lauren Monroe (as mentioned in chapter 2) that Josiah's reform report derived from the hand of the holiness priests (Monroe, *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement*.)
[77] Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 173.
[78] Ibid., 44.

Chapter 6

Manasseh, "who did more evil than all…who were before him": A Counter-Example

The account of Manasseh, found in 2 Kings 21:1-18, has long been a topic of discussion and disagreement for scholars. This passage, with its explicit declaration of the impending fall of Jerusalem and Judah and naming Manasseh as the responsible cause, has been seen as an integral part in the shaping of the Deuteronomistic History, as well as a major key to identifying redactional theories. The Manasseh account, with its irreversible doom proclamation, transforms the meaning and function of the History, disavowing the eternity of the Davidic promise and calling into question the conditional or unconditional character of that promise. This passage, among others, led Martin Noth to describe the History as a pessimistic one, in which exile and punishment were inevitable.[1] Because the perspective of certain doom seems to contradict much of the History, with its unconditional, eternal promise, many have seen the oracle against Judah as a later addition to the original Josianic History.[2]

Throughout, I have primarily held to the double redaction theory expounded by Cross, positing that the majority of the History was composed during the time of Josiah and later updated by an exilic editor. These exilic additions are usually comprised of short comments, often just a verse or two, sprinkled throughout the History. In contrast, the account of King Manasseh in 2 Kings 21 includes a significant insertion of exilic material that changes the meaning and function of the account of Manasseh's reign, as well as influences the way in which we read the entirety of the History. Is the History primarily positive or negative? The Cross theory accounts for both these perspectives; the exilic version of the History is largely pessimistic, while the pre-exilic version is hopeful. Because of this passage, the final version has a very different focus and thrust from its pre-exilic precursor. Placing the blame on Manasseh marks a significant shift in theological perspective, allowing for the destruction of Judah and the end of the Davidic dynasty. As such, Cross makes an unequivocal statement that "the attribution of Judah's demise to the unforgivable sins of Manasseh is tacked on and not integral to the original structure of the history."[3]

The effect of the new perspective created in this updated account also has ramifications for the way in which we view the function and intentions of the reform of Josiah in 2 Kings 23. In the context of the present text, Josiah's reform (following the ill fated reign of Manasseh) appears futile and even ridiculous. Judah's fate has already been sealed in 2 Kings 21:10-15 because of the deeds of Manasseh, and even the great King Josiah is unable to overturn this outcome. If it were the case that the fate of Judah had already been decided before Josiah's reign, why would Dtr even include his portrait of Josiah as the hero of the History? This is similar to my discussion about the exilic perspective proffered in Huldah's oracle (see chapter 5 for more.) The irreversible verdict pronounced on Manasseh undermines the greatness of Josiah and his ability to change the fate of Judah.

---

[1] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 101, 123–27.
[2] Especially Cross, *CMHE*, 278–285.
[3] Ibid., 286.

Historiographical Method in the Manasseh Account

This detail affects the ways in which we consider the historiographical process. The pre-exilic History builds up to the coming of Josiah and his reform. Previously, I have assessed Dtr^1's historiographical poetics and focused on the portrait of a few select kings who Dtr highlights for their role in influencing the history of the monarchy: namely, David, Solomon, Jeroboam, and Josiah. These kings fill unique roles in the History, embodying the Davidic prototype and its anti-type. Dtr^1 affords these select kings fuller portraits than other kings. Given that Manasseh is blamed for the destruction of Judah and the Babylonian exile, the reader expects an extraordinary literary presentation of the king who plays such an extraordinary role, but does not find it. This is the first clue that the process of composition in this account is different from that of other kings. Instead, Manasseh is initially presented as an ordinary bad king. We do not know much more about him than many of the inconsequential kings, He does not speak or act directly. Stuart Lasine describes him as a "faceless portrait...set against a blank background." He has no emotions or a back story like other essential kings.[4] The inconsistency of the literary style makes the reader question the unity of the narrative and whether it is a product of the same author as the other accounts. The lack of literary intention displayed in the style of the blaming of Manasseh highlights its late addition to the narrative. It was not part of the greater literary plan of Dtr^1. Instead, Dtr^2 creates a composite figure who performs the most sinful actions of the bad kings. The account of Manasseh's reign operates as a "textual magnet," attracting every sin that a king ever committed into the list of Manasseh's sins.[5] Those sins are so severe that they create something of a caricature of a villain, not real, but a fictional scapegoat.[6]

This chapter, in its treatment of the portrait of King Manasseh, will deal primarily with the exilic perspectives addressed in the text, contrasting them with the pre-exilic historiographical style.[7] Through this analysis, it will be possible to see that the historiographical process in the Manasseh account is somewhat different from what we have seen in the portraits of the other kings constructed by Dtr^1. At the same time, the analysis will show that the historiographical poetics of Dtr^2 are not entirely disparate from what we have seen of Dtr^1. The specific thematic concerns may be different, but much of the methodological process is the same.

---

[4] Stuart Lasine, "Manasseh as Villain and Scapegoat," in *New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 164.

[5] Many thanks to Mark Smith for this phrase (in conversation, December 12, 2011). Also, Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*, 133.

[6] Lasine, "Manasseh as Villain and Scapegoat," 163.

[7] In places, the redactional layers in 2 Kings 21 are easily discernible, while in others it is more difficult and perhaps even impossible to separate the redactions. And while we will never definitively know which verses are from the original Dtr^1 and which from the exilic Dtr^2, my consideration of their literary and historiographical function can help us to identify the layers. I would first like to offer what I feel confident identifying as Dtr^1. Verses 1, 2a, and 3a and 17-18 are all pre-exilic. These verses roughly correspond to our typical Dtr^1 regnal formula. I also feel confident in identifying 3b, 6c, and 7b-15 as Dtr^2. Verse 5 is also probably exilic. The host of heaven is mentioned five times in DtrH (Deut 4:19; 2 Kgs 17:16; 21:3, 5; 23:4, 5; also in Jer 8:2, 19:13; Zeph 1:5). Nelson identifies all of these as secondary (Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 65.) Beyond the oracle in verses 10-15, much of the rest of the account is probably exilic. The blame on Manasseh extends beyond these verses. We see it also in verses 3, 6, and 9. Therefore, if blame of Manasseh is exilic, these verses need to be reconsidered (Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 54.) I will discuss these choices further below.

In this way, it is possible to see that both Dtr^1 and Dtr^2 were part of the same scribal school with a similar method and poetics, but the historical circumstances of the exile require that the method and content be recalibrated.[8] I will look at the portrait of Manasseh as something of a counter-example to the portraits of the other kings. It is for this reason that I address the Manasseh narrative out of its chronological order, following the treatment of Josiah, who chronologically and narratively follows Manasseh.

As with the previous chapters, this analysis will take the form of considering the different historiographical strategies that are part of Dtr's poetics. Previously, unless otherwise indicated, Dtr referred to the pre-exilic Dtr^1. In this chapter, unless specified, Dtr will still refer to the pre-exilic redactor or both the exilic and pre-exilic Deuteronomistic Historians. In the other accounts I have dealt with Dtr's historiographical poetics on both the selectional and compositional axes. I will deal with the Manasseh account in terms of its composition only. We cannot see the selectional choices in this account.

2 Kings 21 is clearly composite, but it is difficult to know whether there is a use of sources. Scholars, including those who posit single, double or triple redaction theories, identify multiple redactional layers in this narrative. Even those scholars, primarily those of the Cross School, who see a comprehensive, primary, pre-exilic history, do not suggest that the entirety of the narrative is pre-exilic. Still, the extent to which the exilic editor was at work is contested.[9] There is some consensus that at the least 2 Kings 21:11-15 are exilic. Unlike other passages where Dtr^2's additions are minimal and appear as comments or corrections pinned to Dr^1's text, Dtr^2 completely rewrites and expands the Manasseh account.

---

[8] On the deuteronomistic scribal school, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*; "The Emergence of the Deuteronomic Movement: The Historical Antecedents," in *Das Deuteronomium: Enstehung, gestalt, und Botschaft* (ed. Norbert Lohfink; Leuven: University Press, 1985), 76–98; Raymond Person, *The Deuteronomic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2002); Knauf, "Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' (DtrH) Exist?"; Norbert Lohfink, "Was there a Deuteronomistic Movement?," in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: the Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. Linda Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie; Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 36–66; Richard E. Friedman, "The Deuteronomistic School," in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. Astrid B. Beck et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 70–80.

[9] Early on Driver, Kuenen, and Wellhausen all identified verses 10-15 as intrusive (Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 270.) There is a lack of agreement on the extent of that intrusion and further additions. Some of the major positions include the following: Frank Cross points to verses 7-9 and 10-15 in the exilic redaction (Cross, *CMHE*, 285–6.) In their commentary, Cogan and Tadmor agree with 10-15, but they attribute verses 7-9 as Dtr^1 (Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 270.) John Gray attributes verses 8 -15 to a late deuteronomistic addition (Gray, *I & II Kings*, 644–45.) Similarly, Richard Friedman also identifies 8-15 as exilic (Richard E. Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 11.) Erik Eynikel indentifies verses 4, 6, 7b-16 as part of the exilic redaction (Erik Eynikel, "The Portrait of Manasseh and the Deuteronomistic History," in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature* (Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 241.) Richard Nelson includes verses 3-7 in addition to 8-15, but suggests that these verses also incorporate several pre-deuteronomistic annalistic notices (4a, 6a, and perhaps 7a) "floating somewhere in between" the exilic composition (Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 43, 65–67.) It is interesting to note that even those who do not subscribe to the double redaction model see multiple hands at work in these verses. For example, Ehud Ben Zvi similarly breaks up the sections and identifies verses 4, 7b, 8-9 (DtrN) and 10-14 (DtrP) as secondary additions to DtrH(G) (Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in II Reg 21:1-18 and the Redactional History of the Book of Kings," *ZAW* 103, no. 3 (1991): 365, 370, 373.). A major difference is that the Göttingen School views all of these three redactions as exilic.

Also, 2 Kings 21 is very sparse. Manasseh becomes king after the death of his father Hezekiah. He reinstitutes the cultic sites and symbols that Hezekiah destroyed and then inaugurates and/or restores a host of other cultic practices, including the worship of Baal, Asherah, and the host of heaven, and a variety of divination practices. He also embarks on building projects to support those practices. The list of Manasseh's transgressions is followed by a pronouncement of the impending doom of Judah. Manasseh's reign ends with the stereotypical notice that he slept with his fathers and that his son succeeded him. Nothing actually happens during the account of Manasseh's reign, even with the extensive exilic updating. There are no events to be rechronologized or juxtaposed. The account basically consists of the regnal formula, the list of sins, the doom oracle against Judah, and the closing death and burial formula (DBF). The lack of events is one of the things that makes the original portrait of Manasseh's reign like that of the other ordinary bad kings. (It may have only included 5-6 verses.) In those accounts, the ordinary bad kings ascend the throne, they are evaluated as having done what is evil in Yahweh's eyes, they commit some sins, and then they die and are buried. The remainder of the things that presumably must have happened during their reigns is relegated to the annals of the kings (cf. Joash of Israel, 2 Kgs 13:10-13; Jotham 2 Kgs 15:32-38). Yet, the parallels are not perfect because unlike these kings, Manasseh reigns for an unprecedented length of time. The account of Manasseh began as one of an ordinary bad king with the regnal formula that he did evil in the eyes of Yahweh, like other bad kings. Only the additions of Dtr^2 make Manasseh extraordinary as a bad king.

THE AXIS OF COMPOSITION

It is on the axis of composition that we more clearly see the differences and similarities in the work of Dtr^1 and Dtr^2. In this account, there is an attempt to use some of Dtr^1's historiographical methods, but they are either misapplied or Dtr^2's agenda is different so that he uses the same method as means to a different end. (This is similar to the Chronicler who in writing history has a different agenda from Dtr and therefore a different story that he wants to tell.)

A first example is the use of prophetic or prophetic-like texts. In the other accounts, I have addressed the use of a prophetic tradition as part of Dtr's process of selection, but here the prophetic is part of Dtr^2's composition. In 2 Kings 21, there is a doom oracle delivered against Judah, but it does not have the same prophetic thrust as other oracles. The oracle begins with the introduction that "Yahweh spoke by the hand of his servants the prophets." Unlike the prophetic texts of Dtr^1, these are generic, nameless, collective prophets. Also, the message of the prophets lacks warning. The first message to Judah is a proclamation of doom. The difference in this oracle leads us to believe that it is in the style of Dtr^1, but derives from Dtr^2 for several reasons. First, the term עבדי הנביאים is usually exilic.[10] Second, unlike Dtr^1, there is no prophet here. There is a nod to the use of prophecies, but it is somewhat weak.[11] The oracle is announced as Yahweh's words, which he said through his prophets. These generic, plural prophets do not seem to exist. Was there actually a warning? The oracle is cast in the prophetic pattern of Dtr^1, but it is

[10] William M. Schniedewind, "History and Interpretation: The Religion of Ahab and Manasseh in the Book of Kings," *CBQ* 55, no. 4 (1993): 350. It appears in 2 Kgs 17:13, 23; 21:10; 24:2; Jer 7:25; 44:4; Amos 3:7; Zech 1:6.
[11] Cross, *CMHE*, 286.

not quite the same. Jonathan Rosenbaum describes this as a "quasi-prophetic" statement.[12] Similarly, Cross emphasizes that "no prophecies concerning Manasseh's great sin, and the inevitable rejection it entailed, are to [be] found in the earlier part of the Deuteronomistic history. Not one."[13]

This is also in contrast to the oracle against Israel in 2 Kings 17 where we have the mention of similar generic prophets and seers, but there is a real prophetic warning. We are given an indication of the content of the warning against Israel: "And Yahweh warned Israel and Judah by the hand of all prophets[14] and every seer, saying: 'Turn back from your evil ways and observe my commandments and statutes, in accord with all the Torah which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by the hand of my servants the prophets'" (v. 13). In contrast, there is no warning in 2 Kings 21:10.

This is one example of how Dtr^2 mirrors the historiographical poetics of Dtr^1, but changes the content. Dtr^2 knows that a doom proclamation such as this would usually be announced through a prophetic oracle and while he does not possess such a prophetic source, he makes light allusion to such a revelation.

a. Promoting the Deuteronomistic Program

In the Manasseh passage we see a clear concentration on the tenets of deuteronomistic theology, but the focus is on different elements of the theology from that found in the pre-exilic History. Dtr^2 is concerned with idol worship, not just un-centralized and syncretistic worship, meting out punishment (even for a king with a long and peaceful reign) regardless of whether it violates the eternal Davidic promise and the eternal covenant between Israel and Yahweh, plus while the focus is still on transgressions against Yahweh, it is not couched in terms of violations of the law.

Manasseh is initially evaluated like all the other kings. The regnal evaluation begins as usual that he did הרע בעיני יהוה. This judgment evaluation sets the tone for the rest of the narrative. Manasseh is thoroughly established as an evil king. Beginning with this instance, רע as both noun and verb functions as a *Leitwort* in this passage.[15]

> **Manasseh was 12 years old when he became king. And he reigned 55 years in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Hephzibah. He did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh,** <u>like the transgressions of the nations whom Yahweh dispossessed before the children of Israel.</u> **He rebuilt**[16] **the high places that Hezekiah his father had destroyed…** (2 Kgs 21:1-3a)

Here, Dtr^2 makes a slight addition to the pre-exilic judgment formula. Manasseh "did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh, like the transgressions (תועבות) of the nations whom

[12] Jonathan Rosenbaum, "Hezekiah's Reform and the Deuteronomistic Tradition," *HTR* 72 (1979): 25.
[13] Cross, *CMHE*, 286.
[14] Corrected on the basis of Qumran, נביאי for נביאו.
[15] Dtr^1 is represented by the **bold** text while Dtr^2 is designated by <u>underline</u>.
[16] Literally, "returned and built."

Yahweh dispossessed (הוריש) before the children of Israel." Usually, at this point of the regnal formula, the king is compared with his father or the ancestral prototype. Instead, Manasseh is compared with the dispossessed nations. This accusation directly connects Manasseh's sin with that of Israel in the oracle against the North in 2 Kings 17:8. There Israel is punished because they "followed the statutes (חקות) of the nations, whom Yahweh dispossessed (הוריש) before the children of Israel and the kings of Israel, which they practiced." In the context of Israel, the sin of the nations was primarily non-centralized worship at the high places and following the sin of Jeroboam, as well as the building and worshipping of *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm* (2 Kgs 17:9-11). As previously discussed, these practices in the pre-exilic context were primarily syncretistic rather than idolatrous and were considered "traditional" in standard Israelite religion.[17] Throughout DtrH, Dtr^1 uses a rhetoric of othering, relegating non-centralized and syncretistic Yahwistic practice to idolatry. While Dtr^1 is concerned with and fiercely condemns the worship of other gods, his primary focus on cultic infractions is non-centralized worship. The *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm* were worshipped at these high places with or alongside Yahweh, but not necessarily as a deity. In general, cultic malpractice is evaluated in three distinct ways: wrong place, wrong symbols, and wrong deity. For the most part, the pre-exilic redactor is concerned with place and symbols. The specific language of comparison to the sins of the nations, identifying them as those whom Yahweh dispossessed (הוריש), lends itself to link Manasseh's sin with that of Israel – uncentralized and syncretistic worship. This is an expansion on the explicit comment that Manasseh rebuilds the high places destroyed by his father (v. 3). Similarly, this connection with the blame placed on Manasseh is made in verse 11, which clearly collocates the vague "what Manasseh king of Judah did" with "these transgressions," again, תעבות. The תעבות הגוים are practices prohibited in Deuteronomy 18:9, where Yahweh warns that upon entering the land, the people should not learn to do the תעבות הגוים, which include passing children through fire and a list of divination practices, similar to those in 2 Kings 21:6. Manasseh does these things. This insertion into the standard regnal formula sets the stage for Dtr^2's portrait of Manasseh. He is like the nations, and he is like the destroyed kingdom of Israel; because of this Judah will be punished.

Dtr^2 in choosing Manasseh for his arch-villain is not bothered by defying a general theological perspective: Manasseh has the longest reign of any king of Israel or Judah. He rules for fifty-five years in peace. For Dtr, length of reign and prosperity are a reward for fidelity (cf. 1 Kgs 3:14).[18] Historically, Manasseh may have been one of Judah's most successful monarchs. Beginning his reign in the late 7th century B.C.E., he recovered from the Assyrian siege in 701 B.C.E. During his long reign, the kingdom flourished.[19] This inconsistency, among others, prompts the debates about the dating of the narrative. This is a clue that Dtr^2's portrait of Manasseh is a secondary retelling of his account. The accusation that the destruction of Judah, Jerusalem, and the temple is blamed on Manasseh highlights him as the worst of all the kings, but his reign is long and non-violent. A single author would not have allowed both these details to stand.

[17] Schniedewind, "History and Interpretation," 55:650.

[18] The Chronicler offers an exegetical solution to the problem of the long reign by including a picture of a repentant Manasseh.

[19] Francesca Stavrakopoulou, "The Blackballing of Manasseh," in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe; London: T & T Clark International, 2005), 248.

Manasseh's first evil act belongs to the original, pre-exilic account. Manasseh "rebuilt the high places that Hezekiah his father had destroyed" (2 Kgs 21:3). As discussed in the last chapter, Hezekiah's reform, and the praise he receives for his righteousness, is focused on removing these non-centralized and syncretistic sites, with their foreign symbols, *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm*. Hezekiah does not fight a battle against the worship of other gods. In verses 2-3a, Manasseh is established as similar to the Israelite kings who build and worship at the high places and follow the sins of Jeroboam. He not only continues these practices, but returns to them (וישב), rebuilding the sites that Hezekiah destroys, restoring the practices of the kingdom of Israel in Judah. Manasseh is likened to the arch-villain of Israel and of the pre-exilic History, Jeroboam. It is interesting to note that even Manasseh's name contributes to this connection. He is the only biblical king to share his name with a northern tribal territory. Francesca Stavrakopoulou suggests that Manasseh's northern name makes him a Judean version of an evil northern king, contending that this may be one of the things that attracts Dtr^2 to blaming Manasseh. He is the southern version of the evil northern king and therefore a fitting candidate to shoulder the responsibility of the fall of Judah.[20] Blaming a quasi-northerner also removes some of the responsibility from Judah, because the punishment is for the king's, rather than Judah's, sins. Stavrakopoulou suggests that Manasseh's northern name, rather than an historical reputation of extreme evil as others claim, could be the reason he is vilified.

Manasseh's transgressions continue and are intertextually connected with the whole of Israel's past, from the exodus to Hezekiah's reign. The list of Manasseh's sins contains the sins of all the kings of Israel and Judah. These sins mark a distinct change in the theological focus, dealing with the worship of Baal, the host of heaven and other idolatrous practices. But they are something of a return to the תעבות הגוים enumerated in Deuteronomy 18:9. The list of Manasseh's transgressions includes:

> And he erected altars to Baal and he made an Asherah like those which Ahab, king of Israel, made. He worshipped all the host of heaven and served them.
> (4) **And he built altars in the House of Yahweh of which Yahweh said, "In Jerusalem I will set my name."**[21] (5) And he built altars to all the host of heaven in the two courtyards of the house of Yahweh. (6) And he passed his son through the fire and conjured and sought omens and made a ghost and a spirit and greatly increased doing what is evil in the eyes of Yahweh to cause [him] to anger.
> (7) Then he put the statue of Asherah that he made in the House about which Yahweh said to David and Solomon his son "In this House and in Jerusalem which I have chosen from all the tribes of Israel, I will set my name forever. (2 Kgs 21:3b-7)

These verses are primarily the addition of exilic Dtr^2. They illustrate an exilic concern with Baal worship.[22] In attributing Baal worship to Manasseh, we see a shift in the focus of the

[20] Ibid., 253.
[21] This verse seem to be repetitious or a doublet with verse 7. It is unlikely that both derive from the same hand. More likely, verse 4 was part of Dtr^1's account and Dtr^2 expands on it in verse 7, connecting it with the oracle against Judah.
[22] The pre-exilic concerns about cultic purity are focused on centralization and worship of Yahweh alone. And while Dtr^1 scorns all of idol worship, as in Deuteronomy 4:15-19, for the most part, he is not focused on fighting Baal worship, but more concerned with cultic rigorism. Even though in Jerusalem the priest Jehoiada acts against Baal

deuteronomistic program, from the battle against non-centralized and syncretistic worship (wrong place and symbols), including *ašērîm* and *maṣṣēbôt*, to full out idolatry in the worship of Baal and the host of heaven (wrong deities). The description of Asherah in verse 7 is also somewhat different from what we have seen from the pre-exilic writer; Manasseh makes a פסל of Asherah. This is the only instance of a פסל האשרה. Because this expression is unique, Mark Smith suggests that we do not necessarily know that this is a statue of the goddess Asherah, as many have argued. It is possible that it "may have been a more elaborate form of the asherah in the royal cult of Jerusalem." Smith makes clear, that what we do know, is that there is "no question" that the author considered this object to be idolatrous.[23] The coupling of Asherah worship with Baal and the host of heaven is a change from the *ašērîm* that likely were part of standard Israelite worship during the monarchy that Dtr[1] casts as idolatrous. The verses that I attribute to Dtr[2] show a new deuteronomistic focus on the sin of Baal worship and other modes of idolatry, namely the worship of the host of heaven, demonstrating a shift from concern about place and symbols to that of the wrong deity.

Following the construction of the altars to Baal and making an Asherah like Ahab, Manasseh "worshipped (וישתחו) all the host of heaven and served (ויעבד) them." These sins are similar to those found in Deuteronomy 17:2-3. Deuteronomy 17:2 presents something of a definition of what it means to do הרע בעיני יהוה and violate the covenant. One who does evil in Yahweh's eyes "follows and serves (ויעבד) other gods and worships (וישתחו) them, whether the sun or the moon or all the host of heaven, which I have forbidden."[24] Similarly, in Deuteronomy 4:19, these heavenly bodies are established as modes of worship that are particularly foreign. Yahweh reminds the people, "And when you lift your eyes heavenward and you see the sun and moon and stars, all the host of heaven, do not be led astray and worship (והשתחוית) them and serve them (ועבדתם), which Yahweh your God allotted them to all the nations (העמים) under heaven." The host of heaven is not part of Israelite worship and the use of the same verbs in these two prohibitions as 2 Kings 21:3 highlights the foreignness and forbiddenness of Manasseh's sin. Despite these prohibitions present in the deuteronomic law code, these transgressions were not a focal point of Dtr[1]'s theological program.

These verses, particularly verses 6 and 7, create a long list of Manasseh's sins. The sins of passing sons through fire and divination practices are somewhat limited in Kings. Both of these acts are linked in several parallel texts, including the oracle against Israel and Josiah's reform. While verses 6 and 7b find parallels in 2 Kings 17:17; 23:6, 24, it is unclear in which direction these correspondences go. Many have discussed the parallels between the Manasseh and Josiah accounts and that the evil Manasseh in the pre-exilic account has been constructed as a foil for the hero Josiah. This leads us to question, are the sins of verses 6 and 7 included by Dtr[1] in the Manasseh account in order for Josiah to remove, or are they added to the Manasseh account by Dtr[2] and then, for symmetry's sake, also added by necessity (in an exilic update) to 2

---

worship, killing one of Baal's priests (2 Kgs 11:18), before the reign of Manasseh, Baal worship is primarily a northern problem, introduced by Ahab and his wife Jezebel.

[23] Mark Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002), 128.

[24] It is interesting to note that the objects of worship in 2 Kgs 21:3 only include the host of heaven, while the parallel verse in Josiah's reform includes the sun, moon, host of heaven, plus the constellations (2 Kgs 23:5). The list in 2 Kgs 23:4, that the priests removed the vessels used for Baal, Asherah, and host of heaven is more similar to what we see in 2 Kgs 21:3.

Kings 23 for Josiah to counter? Similarly, while the sins of passing his son through fire and divination practices have other correspondences within Kings, it is difficult to reason why they are included here. Are they part of the original list of ordinary bad king Manasseh's sins or are they included here by Dtr^2, gleaned from the accounts of other bad kings to highlight Manasseh as an extraordinarily evil king, attributing to him every sin that was ever committed by a king?

Evaluating the literary function of these verses and their contribution in shaping the Manasseh account, they are most likely exilic. Dtr^2 collects the sins of all the kings of Israel and Judah and in constructing Manasseh as the most evil king attributes all of them to Manasseh himself. Ahaz is the only other king to pass his son through fire (√עבר C-stem). It is interesting to notice, that even though Ahaz also commits this unique transgression, he does not play an important role in the overall history. He is not referenced in 2 Kings 21 directly. Also, in his own account, Ahaz plays something of a minor role. (This is in contrast to the portrayal of Ahaz in Chronicles where he is depicted as the worst king of Judah, taking the place of Manasseh in that history.) Ahaz did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh, and although he was a southern king, he followed the ways of the kings of Israel. He "passed his son through fire" and made sacrifices at all the shrines and to things in nature (2 Kgs 16:1-4). This is the only specific mention of his sins. The rest are reasonably generic. Generic accusations of sins are not characteristic of the kings whom Dtr^1 highlights as the paradigmatic good and evil kings. Also, one of the strategies that Dtr^2 uses to vilify Manasseh is to cast him as like a northern king. Just as the northern kings and the kingdom of Israel were evil, so too is Manasseh. Ahaz, while he does not come to play an important role, is also characterized as something of a northern king, said to follow those kings. Ahaz builds an altar in the temple, styled after the one he sees in the court of Tiglath Pileser III. Ahaz's actions are not necessarily indicative of participating in foreign worship, but they follow the comment that Ahaz did what was evil. Without this, we might have read his building of the altar neutrally and as cult reform, but we do not. Also, connecting him with the kings of Israel reminds us of another northern king who built his own altar and was severely condemned: Jeroboam.[25] And while it is not fully understood what is meant, Ahaz is also mentioned in Josiah's tearing down of altars (2 Kgs 23:12). Dtr^2 seems to incorporate some elements from the reign of Ahaz to further vilify Manasseh and connect him with the bad kings of Israel.

In addition to the cultic concerns, we also see that on a theological basis, 2 Kings 21:8-15 is discordant with the pre-exilic deuteronomistic program found in the majority of the History:

> "And I will not continue to cause the collective of Israel to wander from the land that I gave to their fathers, if they will carefully observe all that I commanded them and all the Torah that my servant Moses commanded them." (9) But they did not listen and Manasseh caused them to err doing the evil of the nations whom Yahweh destroyed from before the children of Israel.
>
> (10) And Yahweh spoke by the hand of his servants the prophets, saying:
>
> (11) "Because of what Manasseh king of Judah did, these transgressions, he did [more] evil than all that the Amorites who were before him did and also caused Judah to sin with his idols. (12) Therefore, thus said Yahweh God of Israel:

[25] Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Biblical Interpretation of the Reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah," in *In the Shelter of Elyon* (ed. David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies; Sheffield: JSOT Pr, 1984), 254–5.

> ‘Behold I am bringing evil on Jerusalem and Judah, all who hear [of] it, his two ears will ring. (13) I will stretch the measuring line of Samaria over Jerusalem and the plummet of the house of Ahab; and I will wipe [out] Jerusalem as one wipes clean the bowl, wiped out and turned over on its face. (14) I will abandon the remnant of my inheritance and hand them over to their enemies and they will be as plunder and booty to all their enemies. (15) Because of that which they did that was evil in my eyes and they angered me from the day which their fathers went out from Egypt until this day.”

The exilic Deuteronomist deals with the historical reality of the exile and destruction of Jerusalem. In response, he attempts to alter his theology to fit with some of the other important concerns of Deuteronomy. Dtr^2 attributes the exile to the sins of Manasseh. The significance of this will be discussed more below.

The doom proclamation in 2 Kings 21:12-14, although consistent with the deuteronomistic idea of reward and punishment, especially for the sin of idolatry and violation of the divine covenant, does not reflect the concept of an eternal covenant. God will destroy and forsake even the remnant of Israel, namely Judah. There is no sense of pending restoration once punishment is meted out. There is no promise for a return or the continuity of the people after the destruction and exile in this oracle. In fact, the only reference to a remnant, found in verse 14, is one in which the remnant will be forsaken: ונטשתי את שארית נחלתי ונתתים ביד איביהם והיו לבז ולמשסה לכל איביהם “And I have forsaken the remnant of my inheritance and I will give them into the hand of their enemies. And they will be as plunder and booty to all their enemies.” Here שארית is linked to its earlier connotation of Judah as the only remaining tribe after the destruction of Israel. At the same time, “the remnant” is used differently – even the remnant will be destroyed. This is unlike 2 Kings 19 when Hezekiah asks what to do in the face of the approaching Assyrian army. He is reassured that “the survivors (פליטת) of the House of Judah who remain (הנשארה) will take root downward and bear fruit upward. For a remnant (שארית) will go out of Jerusalem, and survivors (ופליטה) from Mount Zion…” (2 Kgs 19:30-31). In this context, the remnant is those who survive the onslaught, consistent with the deuteronomistic theology of an eternal covenant. Similarly, in the oracle against Israel in 2 Kings 17:18: ויתאנף יהוה מאד בישראל ויסרם מעל פניו לא נשאר רק שבט יהודה לבדו “Yahweh was very angry with Israel and removed them from his presence. Only the tribe of Judah remained alone.” Even in the face of extreme punishment and impending destruction, in the pre-exilic text Judah will always be a remnant, a survivor. In 2 Kings 21:14, Dtr^2 uses the language of the remnant to continue to refer to Judah, as in the pre-exilic edition, but the remnant will no longer remain.

Another major theological difference we see in the punishment of Manasseh is a lack of focus on the violation of the law. Throughout Dtr^1, obedience to Yahweh’s laws and commandments, statutes and testimonies is primary, but in the oracle against Judah it is almost entirely absent. The only mention of the law is in a retrospective comment. In verse 8, the narrator reiterates Yahweh’s statement that he will establish Israel in the land promised their ancestors, “If they will carefully observe all that I commanded (צויתי) them and all the Torah that my servant Moses commanded them.” First, we see an abbreviated reference to the law. כל צויתי stands in for the more characteristic enumeration of laws, commandments, statutes, and testimonies common to Dtr^1. Second, the rejection of Judah in 2 Kings 21, despite this verse, is not explicitly connected to the violation of the law. Just that they did not listen. There is no

explicit indication of to what or how they did not listen. This was the perfect set up for admonition for not following the law. We would expect that they are told to follow the law, but they did not listen.

A contrast can be seen in the similar set up of accusation in the oracle against Israel. The differences highlight that the exilic oracle in 2 Kings 21 is less concerned with the violation of the covenant per se, and more with the actual practice of idolatry. 2 Kings 21:9 and 17:14 begin similarly, but the way they continue is significant. 2 Kings 21:9 says, ולא שמעו ויתעם מנשה לעשות את הרע מן הגוים אשר השמיד יהוה מפני בני ישראל "But they did not listen and Manasseh caused them to err doing the evil of the nations who Yahweh destroyed from before the children of Israel." Conversely, 2 Kings 17:14-15 demonstrate to what and how they did not listen, employing the characteristic covenant language of Dtr[1]: ולא שמעו ויקשו את ערפם כערף אבותם אשר לא האמינו ביהוה אלהיהם. וימאסו את חקיו ואת בריתו אשר כרת את אבותם ואת עדותיו אשר העיד בם... "But they did not listen and were stiff-necked like their fathers who did not trust in Yahweh their God. And they rejected his statutes and his covenant, which he made with their fathers, and his warnings, which he gave them…" The two verses begin with לא שמעו, but 2 Kings 21 does not make explicit to what they do not listen, while 2 Kings 17 makes it clear that it is the warning to keep the covenant. In turn, they rejected it. The slight variation in these two accusations against Israel and Judah is another illustration of the difference in the theological foci of Dtr[1] and Dtr[2].

It is interesting that Dtr[2] does not re-use of the oracle against Israel in 2 Kings 17:7-23, but makes reference to the fall of Israel with metaphoric connections to the measuring line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab. Allusion to the oracle against Israel is also present in the link between Manasseh's sin and the transgressions of the dispossessed nations, as discussed above. A third reference to the oracle is present in verse 15. Yahweh says that Judah "did what was evil in my eyes and they angered me from the day which their fathers went out from Egypt until this day." The mention of Egypt connects this statement with the beginning of the oracle in 2 Kings 17:7: "And it was because the children of Israel sinned against Yahweh their God, who brought them up from the land of Egypt from under the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and they feared other gods." While Dtr[2] does not re-use 2 Kings 17, his allusions make clear connections between the fates of Israel and Judah.

Throughout the Manasseh account, we see a shift in the theological focus of the exilic version. The blame of Manasseh is built on several ideological premises. First, the theological denigration of the north throughout the book of Kings has been adopted from the work of Dtr[1]. Almost every northern king is portrayed negatively. Also, the fall of the northern kingdom is used for polemical reasons – the northern kings and people behave like foreign nations and despise Yahweh's laws and prophetic warnings. The northern kingdom is like foreigners. Judah has become like Israel.[26] Manasseh is like an Israelite king. Dtr[2] absorbs this into his narrative. Second, Dtr[2] transforms the behavior of foreign nations to correspond to Manasseh's cultic malpractice regarding foreign gods (not just foreign places and symbols). This is in contrast to the oracle against Israel. Manasseh does more evil than the nations. He is not the first to participate in foreign cult practices, but the text emphasizes specifically that Manasseh's idolatry leads to exile.[27] Third, a theological premise, or more of a theological omission, is the lack of

[26] Stavrakopoulou, "The Blackballing of Manasseh," 251.
[27] Ibid., 250.

focus on fidelity to the law. Manasseh's sins are not articulated as his violation of the law (although the underlying assumption is that they are) but that he sins in his cultic practice. The mention of the commandments and the Torah of Moses in verse 8 are phrases included to stand in for the whole of the law, but we do not see the more explicit language of covenant fidelity common to Dtr[1] articulated.

b. The Attribution of Historico-Political Events to Theological Causes

In this account, the strongest impulse that we see is the attribution of theological meaning to historico-political events. It is the reason for the vilification of Manasseh. The destruction of Jerusalem and Judah and the Babylonian exile are the historical reality of Dtr[2]. While the idea of exile and destruction are a major blow to pre-exilic deuteronomistic theology, which promotes the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, the temple and Jerusalem as Yahweh's chosen place, and a connection to the land, in an exilic context, the deuteronomistic theologians look for reasons to explain the calamity of the destruction. Maintaining the strict system of sin and punishment of deuteronomistic theology, Dtr[2] finds a reasonable outlet for this explanation. Judah has sinned, and they will therefore be punished. Also, throughout Kings the fate of the nation has depended on the acts of the kings. Israel is punished for committing the sin of Jeroboam, while in this account Judah is punished for the sin of Manasseh.

Dtr[2] explains that the destruction is the direct result of Manasseh's acts:

> Because of what Manasseh king of Judah did, these transgressions, he did [more] evil than all that the Amorites who were before him did and also caused Judah to sin with his idols. (12) Therefore, thus said Yahweh God of Israel: "Behold I am bringing evil[28] on Jerusalem and Judah, all who hear [of] it, his two ears will ring. (13) I will stretch the measuring line of Samaria over Jerusalem and with the plummet of the house of Ahab and I will wipe [out] Jerusalem as one will wipe clean the bowl, wiped out and turned over on its face. (14) I will abandon the remnant of my inheritance and hand them over to their enemies and they will be as plunder and booty to all their enemies.[29] (15) Because of that which they did that was evil in my eyes and they angered me from the day which their fathers went out from Egypt until this day." (2 Kgs 21:11-15)

There is no question in this passage what the cause of the destruction and exile is. This is made explicit by beginning the oracle with יען, denoting cause.[30] Here, Manasseh is specifically blamed for doing "more evil than the Amorites." The Amorites are the standard of evil against which Ahab is also measured. Manasseh does even more evil than the Amorites (and Ahab, 1 Kgs

[28] This is the same as the oracles against Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:10) and Ahab (1 Kgs 2:21), and Huldah's prophecy (2 Kgs 23:20).

[29] This is a similar threat, but a different collocation from 2 Kgs 17:20.

[30] In the oracle against Jeroboam in 1 Kings 14:7, this same יען אשר begins a chain of causal clauses, recalling the sins of Jeroboam. It is the basis to the declaration of הנני מביא רעה in v. 10, followed by the curse on Jeroboam's house. This phrase also appears in the oracle against the house of Baasha, (1 Kgs 16:2). Howard N. Wallace, "Oracles against the Israelite dynasties in 1 and 2 Kings," *Biblica* 67, no. 1 (1986): 24.

21:26).[31] It is interesting to note here that while it is frequent that the fate of the nation depends on the behavior of the king, this is the only instance in which the king does evil, bringing punishment on the people, but he is not punished himself. This may also be another indicator that the blame is a secondary addition. In the pre-exilic version there was no individual punishment of Manasseh to which this national punishment can be attached. The pre-exilic Manasseh was not so bad as to warrant a remarkable punishment, or any punishment at all.

The attribution of theological causes to this historico-political event is quite clear. Yahweh's speech explains how the Babylonians will come to rule over Judah and deport them. It is all a consequence of Manasseh's sin and Yahweh's role working in history (v. 14). The Davidic monarchy has come to an end. Yahweh has turned the king, the land, and the people over to their enemies.

c. The Use of a Prototype Strategy

Most notably in the exilic version of this passage, we see a shift in the prototype strategy used. In the pre-exilic edition, the prototype has been based on that of David. The evil king is constructed as an anti-David. Jeroboam is established as the anti-David and has been used as the comparative prototype for the evil king throughout, especially in the evaluations of the northern kings. In the Manasseh narrative, we see a change in the prototype strategy. Exilic Manasseh is constructed in the model of Ahab as prototype. (The pre-exilic version of the narrative reveals traces of the Jeroboam comparison.) We can attribute this modification to the different concerns of the exilic writer. And while the model for the prototype is different, Dtr^2 still utilizes the historiographical poetics of Dtr^1 and employs a prototype strategy. The use of Ahab as prototype is apparent in several places, both explicitly and implicitly. Affinity between the Ahab and Manasseh accounts exists on stylistic, lexical, and theological levels.[32]

First, in the initial list of Manasseh's sins, after rebuilding the altars that Hezekiah destroyed, Dtr^2 adds that Manasseh "erected altars (מזבחת) to Baal and he made an Asherah like those which Ahab, king of Israel, made. He worshipped all the host of heaven and served them" (2 Kgs 21:3). Here the worship of Asherah is connected to the worship of Baal. Similarly, Ahab also erected an altar to Baal and made an Asherah (1 Kgs 16:32-33). The narrator explicitly likens Manasseh and his sin to Ahab. In fact, the clause הקים מזבח is rare. It only appears in these two instances. Both Manasseh and Ahab erect altars to Baal. The infrequent use of this clause links the two verses.[33] But this connection is one which Manasseh exceeds. Ahab made an altar (מזבח) while Manasseh constructs more than one (מזבחת). Similarly, Ahab is the only other person who עשה an asherah. There are other instances of constructing *ašērîm*, e.g. 1 Kgs 15:13 (Maacah עשתה) and 14:23 (Judah בנה). While the *ašērîm* were a real problem in Judah and not unique to Manasseh's sin, here the building of *ašērîm* generates a comparison with an Israelite king. The connection to Ahab is intentional. This act is also one in which Manasseh proves more

[31] Stavrakopoulou, "The Blackballing of Manasseh," 252.
[32] Schniedewind, "History and Interpretation," 55:649.
[33] P. S. F. van Keulen, *Manasseh through the Eyes of the Deuteronomists: The Manasseh Account (2 Kings 21:1-18) and the Final Chapters of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 95.

evil than Ahab; while Ahab builds an altar to Baal, Manasseh builds plural altars; while Ahab makes an Asherah, Manasseh makes one and installs it in the temple (v. 7).[34]

Manasseh is said to have done "what is evil in the eyes of Yahweh to cause [Him] to anger" (2 Kgs 21:6). This transgression, to cause Yahweh to anger, the *hiphil* of כעס, is a variation on some of the standard Israelite regnal formula. Before Manasseh, this collocation is primarily used for the Omrides (see excursus 1). In the regnal formulae, only Omri (1 Kgs 16:26), Ahab (1 Kgs 16:33), and Ahaziah (1 Kgs 22:54) are said to cause Yahweh to anger. This accusation is missing from the rest of the bad kings. The use here in the Manasseh narrative contributes to the analogy between Manasseh and Ahab. He is evil like Ahab. In Dtr^2's reconstruction of the Manasseh narrative, this comment, that Manasseh caused Yahweh to anger, serves as the close to the introductory regnal formula. Following the accusation that Manasseh did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh and the list of his sins, Dtr^2 repeats that Manasseh "greatly increased" doing what was evil in Yahweh's eyes, to cause him to anger, emulating the regnal formulae of the Omrides.

Also, in addition to the use of *hiphil* כעס in the regnal formulae, it is also used in several other places when discussing the destruction of the dynasties of kings who angered Yahweh (House of Jeroboam, 1 Kgs 15:30; House of Baasha, 1 Kgs 16:2, 13; House of Ahab, 1 Kgs 16:33). The use of this verb does three things. First, it sets up Manasseh as like Ahab and the Omrides. Second, Dtr uses it to describe the acts of those kings whose punishment is the destruction of their dynasty. Here, because of Manasseh's sins and his causing Yahweh to anger, the House of David will be removed from the throne and not only his personal house, but the entire house of Judah will be punished. Third, Manasseh is the only Judean king accused of provoking Yahweh to anger (הכעס). All the others are northern. In this way, Manasseh is further set up as the Judean counterpart of the bad Israelite kings.[35]

The verb הכעס when used by Dtr^1 (in the above mentioned places) always has Yahweh or a suffix referring to Yahweh as its object. The exilic editor uses this same expression, but the object (namely Yahweh) is implicit. Nelson astutely suggests that "only the exilic editor also uses a kind of shorthand phrase which leaves the object of the verb understood….It seems that the cliché has become so familiar that only half of it communicated the whole."[36] Alternatively, this could be an example of Dtr^2 trying to replicate (somewhat inexactly) the prose of Dtr^1.

The connection between Manasseh and Ahab's sins is made further in verse 9: "Manasseh caused them to err doing the evil[37] of the nations whom Yahweh destroyed from before the children of Israel." Here, Manasseh's act of causing Judah to err is expressed differently from the sin of Jeroboam, which he caused Israel to sin. In 2 Kings 21:19, the *hiphil* of תעה is used. This is the only use of the form of this verb in DtrH. It also appears in Jeremiah

[34] Stavrakopoulou, "The Blackballing of Manasseh," 251.
[35] Keulen, *Manasseh*, 102.
[36] Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 68.
[37] This is the only place in Kings where הרע is used in this way. Everywhere else it is the evil in Yahweh's eyes. The phrase of practicing like the nations more frequently uses תועבות, as in verse 2, cf. 1 Kgs 14:24; 2 Kgs 16:3, or less commonly חקות הגוים, cf. 2 Kgs 17:8. This is a similar sentiment to the evaluation made in verse 2 that Manasseh "did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh like the transgressions of the nations…" Yet, in that verse it remains the common הרע בעיני יהוה.

23:13, 32. This is possibly an indicator of its exilic usage. It is interesting to note that the *hiphil* of חטא, which is one of the primary sins of Jeroboam, is not used in this verse as it is in 2 Kings 21:11 and 16. This may be an unintentional slip-up of Dtr^2 in copying the style of Dtr^1; Dtr^2 attempts to use a *hiphil* form of a sinning verb, but uses the wrong one. Verse 11 may contain the more common החטא because it is more closely related to verse 16 (Dtr^1) and the sins of Jeroboam. Verse 16 continues the list of sins of Manasseh, which were initially like Jeroboam. Verse 11 reads: "Because of what Manasseh king of Judah did, these transgressions, he did [more] evil than all that the Amorites who were before him did and also caused Judah to sin (החטא) with his idols." And while this verse addresses new ideas, it is clearly modeled after Dtr^1's closing regnal formulae and therefore the same verb is used here while verse 9 reflects Dtr^2's original composition.

On the other hand, and perhaps more likely, the difference in the verb used in verse 9 may be intentional, rather than inexact modeling. The use of √תעה, meaning "to lead astray," recalls the image of the king pasturing his people. Manasseh's leadership is the opposite of how the shepherd is supposed to act.[38] The conjuring of this image makes the sin of Manasseh even more poignant. The king, who is the shepherd of his people, is supposed to care and look out for them, steering them away from danger. Instead, Manasseh guides them toward evil.

The reversion to the verb החטא and the use of הכעס connect Manasseh with the worst of Israelite kings, rendering a harsh evaluation. הכעס aligns him with Jeroboam, Baasha, Omri, Ahab and Azariah, while החטא connects him to Jeroboam, Baasha and Ahab. Manasseh is linked with both Jeroboam and Ahab, but the Ahab parallel is more prominent.[39] He is also contrasted with the best of kings: Hezekiah who tears down the high places in verse 3, David and Solomon, the founders of the centralized temple in verse 7,[40] and in the exilic account of his reign, Josiah. Throughout the Manasseh account, there are many intertextual references in which Manasseh is compared and contrasted with earlier kings. No other king has been portrayed as wicked as Manasseh, even though many of his sins were committed by other Judean kings. None did as many.[41]

The Ahab connection continues implicitly in verse 11. Manasseh "did [more] evil than all that the Amorites who were before him did." Ahab is said to have been like the Amorites: "And he acted very abominably going after the idols (גלולים) like all (ככל) that the Amorites did, whom Yahweh dispossessed (הוריש) before the children of Israel" (1 Kgs 21:26). There, the Amorites are set up as the evil standard against which Ahab is measured. Ahab sinned like the Amorites. Manasseh, on the other hand, does more evil than the Amorites (הֵרַע מכל אשר עשו האמרי).[42] It is also interesting to recognize that Manasseh is not explicitly compared with his royal predecessors, like the other kings, instead with an ethnic group, namely the Amorites.[43] This is even true in verse 2. There, after the statement that Manasseh עשה הרע בעיני יהוה when we would expect a comparison, like his father or in the cases of the Israelite kings, like Jeroboam, Manasseh is said to do הרע "like the transgressions of the nations whom Yahweh dispossessed"

[38] Keulen, *Manasseh*, 117.
[39] Ibid., 147.
[40] Ibid., 145.
[41] Ibid., 144.
[42] Stavrakopoulou, "The Blackballing of Manasseh," 252.
[43] Keulen, *Manasseh*, 125.

(2 Kgs 21:2). Like Ahab, the sin that Manasseh causes Judah to do is the worship of idols (גלולים). The term for foreign idols, גלולים, appears six times in Kings, five of which concern the sins of Ahab and Manasseh.[44] (The sixth is in the oracle against Israel, 2 Kings 17:12.) The use of this specific word further connects Manasseh and Ahab.

The most explicit connection to Ahab, his sin and fate, is made in verses 12 and 13. This is the true doom oracle:

> Therefore, thus said Yahweh God of Israel: "Behold I am bringing evil on Jerusalem and Judah, all who hear [of] it, his two ears will ring. I will stretch the measuring line of Samaria over Jerusalem and with the plummet of the house of Ahab and I will wipe [out] Jerusalem as one wipes clean the bowl, wiped out and turned over on its face."

We see here, in Yahweh's doom proclamation against Manasseh and Judah, continuity with other similar announcements. Yahweh will "bring evil on Jerusalem and Judah" (הנני מביא רעה). This phrase is also used in the oracles against the house of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:10) and the House of Ahab (1 Kgs 2:21). Additionally, it appears in the exilic version of Huldah's oracle (2 Kgs 22:20). Here Dtr^2 uses the same phraseology of the oracles against northern kings Jeroboam and Ahab and their houses to announce the fate of Judah and Jerusalem. Unlike those oracles, this re-used phrase was previously applied to kings and their punishments; in contrast, Manasseh does not receive any individual penalty. This punishment is reserved for Jerusalem and Judah alone.

In this way, Dtr^2 begins to connect the collective fate of Judah with that of Israel. This continues with the reference to the "measuring line of Samaria," explicitly linking the sin with the subsequent punishment of the northern kingdom. In 2 Kings 17, Dtr^1 makes clear that the sin of Israel is one of decentralization and syncretism. (Verses 12 and 16 mention sins of idolatry, but these verses are likely exilic.) They are also convicted for having rejected the Davidic king and separating from Judah in the first place and for not keeping the covenant (vv. 15, 21-22). The initial charge against Israel is as follows:

> And they followed the statutes of the nations, whom Yahweh dispossessed before the children of Israel, and of the kings of Israel which they practiced. (9) And the children of Israel ascribed things that were not so upon Yahweh, their God, and they built for themselves high places in all their cities from the watchtower to the fortified city. (10) And they installed *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm* on every high hill and under every leafy tree. (11) And they made offerings there, at all the high places like the nations, which Yahweh exiled before them; and they did evil things, causing Yahweh to anger. (2 Kgs 17:8-11)

The primary charge against Israel is their worship at the high places, which includes the worship of *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm*. With his short reference to the "measuring line of Samaria" in 2 Kings 21:13, Dtr^2 conjures the entirety of the oracle (and fate) against Israel. They were censured for these many sins and exiled as punishment.

[44] 1 Kgs 15:12; 21; 26; 2 Kgs 17:12; 21:11, 21; 23:24 (Schniedewind, "History and Interpretation," 55:352.)

The reference to the fate of the north is to the kingdom as a whole and not to the house of Jeroboam, which was thoroughly destroyed (1 Kgs 15:27-30), even though in much of DtrH the great sin of Israel is following the sin of Jeroboam. In contrast, the plummet of the house of Ahab refers specifically to the fate of the Omrides, rather than the collective of Israel. This further contributes to the use of Ahab, rather than Jeroboam, as the comparative prototype. Van Keulen declares that verse 13 "renders Ahab the perfect counterpart to Manasseh." Ahab bears partial responsibility for the fall of Samaria, while Manasseh bears complete responsibility for Jerusalem.[45] Until Manasseh, Ahab is the most evil king and his house is cut off from Israel.[46] Yet, even Ahab, who is an evil king *sans pareil*, is able to repent. He mourns after the oracle and is able to postpone the destruction. Yahweh says: "Because he has humbled himself before Me, I will not bring the disaster in his lifetime; I will bring the disaster upon his house in his son's time" (1 Kgs. 21:29). Manasseh, in Dtr^2's narrative, is not given this opportunity (in contrast, in Chronicles Manasseh repents like Ahab in Kings, postponing the impending doom.)

The choice of Ahab as the model for Manasseh is an easy one for Dtr^2 as Ahab is presented as an evil king who goes beyond the sins of Jeroboam. Most of the evil kings are satisfied to continue Jeroboam's sin, but Ahab adds to it. The text makes this clear:

> And as if it had been a light thing to follow the sins of Jeroboam son of Nabat, he took as wife Jezebel daughter of King Ethbaal of the Phoenicians, and he went and served Baal and worshiped him. He erected an altar to Baal in the temple of Baal which he built in Samaria. Ahab also made an Asherah. Ahab did more to anger Yahweh, God of Israel, than all the kings of Israel who preceded him. (1 Kgs 16:31-32)

Ahab not only participates in the uncentralized worship supported by Jeroboam, but he also goes further to introduce foreign women and foreign cults into the kingdom. It is not surprising that Ahab's reign is filled with fighting between Israel and Judah and with foreign kings, and that he dies on the battlefield. His death is a particularly poignant censure by the Deuteronomist. Although he tried to protect himself in battle, both by having Jehoshaphat of Judah disguise himself as the King of Israel and wearing protective armor, "a man drew his bow at random and he hit the king of Israel between the plates of the armor" (1 Kgs 22:34). According to the Deuteronomist's theological and literary sensibilities, this is anything but random. Ahab's death is an act of divine retribution. Given the way that Ahab as exemplar of the evil king is treated literarily, it is somewhat surprising that Manasseh does not share a similar fate. (The Chronicler offers an exegetical solution for this problem attesting to Manasseh's repentance and his ability to overturn potential punishment.) The lack of personal punishment is another justification that the original narrative does not contain the blame of Manasseh or the portrait of the most evil

[45] Keulen, *Manasseh*, 131.

[46] Elijah pronounces an oracle on Ahab: "Because you have committed yourself to doing what is evil in the sight of Yahweh, I am ready to bring evil upon you. I will make a clean sweep of you, I will cut off from Israel every male belonging to Ahab, bond and free. And I will make your house like the House of Jeroboam son of Nebat and like the House of Baasha son of Ahijah, because of the provocation you have caused by leading Israel to sin (אל הכעס אשר הכעסת ותחטא את ישראל)" (1 Kgs 21:20-22). The reason for this annihilation is given explicitly: "Indeed, there never was anyone like Ahab, who committed himself to doing what was evil in Yahweh's eyes, at the instigation of his wife Jezebel. And he acted very abominably going after the idols like all that the Amorites, who Yahweh dispossessed before the children of Israel, did" (1 Kgs 21:25-26).

king. In the original pre-exilic narrative Manasseh is spared and dies a natural death after a long and peaceful reign.

A specific place in which we can see the shift from the pre-exilic use of Jeroboam as the prototype of the evil king to the exilic Ahab is verse 16: "And furthermore, the innocent blood Manasseh spilled was very great until it filled Jerusalem from end to end, apart from his sin which he caused Judah to sin (החטא), doing evil in the eyes of Yahweh (לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה)." In the pre-exilic version this verse functions as the close of the regnal formula[47] and connects Manasseh's sins with those of Jeroboam. Just as Jeroboam caused Israel to sin (החטא), an important element of the prototype strategy of Dtr[1], so too does Manasseh. In the close of this verse, Manasseh is like Jeroboam (not Ahab). Causing Judah to sin has as its consequence the destruction of Judah, but the causation is not made here as in verse 11. This is because verse 16 was composed by Dtr[1], who, while viewing Manasseh as an evil king, does not blame him for the exile. In turn, Dtr[2] picks up on this phrase in verse 16 and reuses it in verse 11, expanding and qualifying how Manasseh caused Judah to sin (i.e. with his idols).

Although this motif, as connected with Manasseh, is continued in later chapters, it seems misplaced in 2 Kings 21. Manasseh is evaluated as doing what is evil in Yahweh's eyes. His sins are enumerated in the first verses (vv. 2-7) of the account; they are then followed by the oracle against Judah. The sin of spilling innocent blood is not mentioned until after the verdict of Judah and just before the concluding formula of the regnal account. The strange placement of this accusation points to the verse being separated from its original context in the list of sins in the pre-exilic account. Verse 16 seems to continue the list of the sins from the beginning of the chapter and the oracle is inserted in the middle of the list. Following Manasseh's reign, this sin becomes part of the repertoire of Judah's transgressions. The term דם נקי is often used in prophetic lists of Judah's sins.[48] It is related to a prohibition in Deuteronomy 19:10: לא ישפך דם נקי מקרב ארצך "Don't spill innocent blood within your land." The term is also used twice more during the reign of Jehoiakim in the report of the exile, referring to Manasseh and the reminder that he is to blame for the destruction of Judah,: וגם דם הנקי אשר שפך וימלא את ירושלם דם נקי ולא אבה יהוה לסלח "And also because of the innocent blood that he shed. For he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, and Yahweh would not forgive" (2 Kgs 24:4).

While it is possible since this is a sin that we have never seen before that it may be the invention of Dtr[2], attempting to further vilify Manasseh as the most evil king. It is more likely that the sin of spilling innocent blood in verse 16 belongs to the pre-exilic account, since it does not play an important role in the narrative, even though it is unique to Manasseh.[49] It is possible

[47] This is in contrast with the exilic account, which breaks the regnal formula in order to expand the narrative. The RF of the exilic account closes in the end of verse 6 with the inclusion of הרבה לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה להכעיס, Manasseh "greatly increased doing what is evil in the eyes of Yahweh to cause [him] to anger."

[48] Cf. Is 59:7; Jer 7:6, 19:4, 22:3, 22:17, 26:15.

[49] This crime is not one that is mentioned elsewhere in Kings, which Dtr assimilates from elsewhere. This verse resumes the list of sins of Manasseh that started the chapter, possibly continuing verse 3a or 4. If this verse were taken from the annals (because of the perfect), we can also see how Dtr[1] integrates it into his text. This is not done smoothly. The verse begins with וגם, which functions as a redactional juncture, connecting two redactional levels of the text (Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 83.) The verse continues: לבד מחטאתו אשר החטא את יהודה לעשות הרע כעיני יהוה "Apart from his sin which he caused Judah to sin doing evil in the eyes of Yahweh." The use of לבד here shows a somewhat clumsy redaction. Sweeney describes this as interrupting the verse. In DtrH לבד frequently appears in

to see Manasseh's spilling of innocent blood as a "transgression-innovation." No other king is accused of this. One would expect that if the author who included this transgression were the same one who vilified Manasseh, that it would play a more prominent role in the narrative. If the pre-exilic Deuteronomist had initially planned to posit Manasseh as the figure to "out-do" both Jeroboam and Ahab, surely he would have highlighted this sin as one that makes Manasseh unique among the evil kings and "worthy" of the blame of the destruction of Judah, instead of leaving it to follow the verdict of Judah. At the same time, in this way, one would also expect that if this sin in a pre-exilic version had been the cause of exile, it would have been highlighted with the sins of Jeroboam, de-centralization and causing the people to sin, and that of Ahab, idolatry, which have already been punished, with the destruction of the northern kingdom and Ahab's house, respectively.

Similarly, the presence of this innovation may be one of the reasons that Dtr^2 is attracted to the ordinary portrait of Manasseh and chooses him as arch-villain. In keeping with Dtr's style, the evil kings Dtr^1 highlights, namely Jeroboam and Ahab, each have their own "transgression-innovations." Jeroboam establishes his counter-cult at Dan and Bethel, while Ahab, "thinking it light" to merely follow the sins of Jeroboam, adds Baal worship to Israelite practice. In contrast, the ordinary bad kings do not commit "original" sins. They follow the sins of (primarily) Jeroboam and (some) Ahab. But Manasseh contributes a new sin: the spilling of innocent blood. Dtr^2 may have picked up on this sin and expanded the narrative because of it.

The use of Ahab as the prototype for the portrait of Manasseh is readily apparent in the narrative, but it is not a straight casting of Manasseh in the model of Ahab. As with the portrait of Josiah, the hero of the pre-exilic History, Josiah supersedes all prototypical models. He is better than all of the kings who preceded him, including the illustrious David. At each stage of his reform, his actions supersede those of the other good kings. Likewise, Manasseh supersedes Ahab in the extent of his evil. While Ahab builds one altar to Baal, Manasseh builds more than one (v. 3). While Ahab is evil like the Amorites, Manasseh is more evil than the Amorites (v. 11). Even Ahab has the potential to repent and push off the destruction of his house, but Manasseh has no opportunity to repent. He is not even given prophetic warning. Manasseh commits many sins, all the sins that have been committed by the kings of Israel and Judah, undoing reform, decentralized and syncretistic worship at the high places and of Asherah, worshipping Baal and the host of heaven, passing his sons through fire, a host of divination practices, in addition to a completely unique sin of spilling innocent blood. In this way, Dtr^2 creates the portrait of a king who is "worthy" of shouldering the blame of the fall of Judah, the destruction of the temple, the exile of the people, and an overhaul of deuteronomistic theology, reconsidering the eternal promises to the people and the Davidic line. In this way, analysis of the Manasseh account illustrates a difference in the foci of the historiographical poetics of the exilic Deuteronomist. It is through the exilic account of Manasseh's reign that we see a shift in the Deuteronomist's historiographical poetics. We are unable to view Dtr^2's role in selection, but his compositional poetics are clear. He creates a prophetic-like oracle to pronounce doom on Judah, imitating Dtr^1's use of the prophetic tradition. More significantly, Dtr^2's narrative demonstrates a theological shift, which moves away from the pre-exilic focus on decentralization and obedience to the law and centers on fighting Baal worship and other forms of idolatry and foreign worship.

---

lists or categorizations and is used to introduce distinct items. Here לבד interrupts the "normal presentation of activities on the part of the kings in DtrH" (Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 59.)

This change is most clearly seen in the replacement of Jeroboam as the prototype of the evil king.

Excursus 2: Deuteronomistic versus Chronistic Historiography

A second counter-example in which Dtr's unique method can be seen clearly is a comparison with the historiography of the Chronicler. While further research and attention must be given to this subject, a brief consideration of some specific instances in which the Chronicler's history varies remarkably from DtrH is worthwhile. While this treatment is descriptive rather than prescriptive, merely acknowledging differences rather than analyzing them for the motivations that prompt these differences, the goal in including them here is to demonstrate that the historiographical poetics analyzed in this work is unique to the pre-exilic Deuteronomist and the deuteronomistic school, rather than characteristic of ancient Israelite historiography in general. Three specific places in which these differences are quite clear are Solomon's sin, the role of Jeroboam, and the death of Josiah. Each of these examples illustrates, in their differences from the account in Kings, the absence of some of the key historiographical elements of the deuteronomistic poetics.

Solomon

In Kings, Solomon plays two remarkable, and oppositional, roles. In the first, he is the inheritor of the Davidic promise and the builder of the temple. He is praised and rewarded with wisdom and prosperity. In the second role, he is blamed for the division of the united kingdom of Israel. His sin of patronizing the foreign cults of his foreign wives is the downfall of one kingdom under a Davidic king. While the schism of the kingdom is an historical remembrance as described in 1 Kings 12, Dtr attributes clear theological causality to the division, pointing straight at Solomon. The responsibility of the split demonstrates both the compositional strategies of attributing theological causality to historico-political events and the promotion of the deuteronomistic program, requiring strict fidelity to the covenant.

In Chronicles, the depiction of Solomon is quite different. Solomon is portrayed only positively, and even idealistically. There Solomon is specifically chosen by Yahweh (1 Chr 22), differing from the battle for succession seen in Samuel-Kings that results in Nathan, Bath-Sheba, and David electing Solomon. Solomon is presented as a flawless king. In Chronicles, Solomon is not used, as in Kings, to offer theological explanation of the split of the kingdom. He does not receive a deuteronomistically motivated punishment. As such, he is depicted only positively. In contrast, the development of the evil Solomon as in 1 Kings 11 is part of the larger narrative of DtrH and necessary for Dtr's theological explanation of the split of the kingdoms. It is Solomon's religious sin that causes the split. Since this causal connection is not made by the Chronicler, the bad reputation of Solomon is never developed. The split is described only in political and economic terms (2 Chr 10 as similar 1 Kgs 12). In this way, the punishment of Solomon does not function as a key feature in promoting the deuteronomistic theology of covenant fidelity.

Jeroboam

A second and related example is seen in the differences in the depiction of Jeroboam and his rise to power. Like the punishment of Solomon, this event also features a similar situation in which the theological explanation for a historico-political situation is missing, transforming the depiction of Jeroboam. Throughout the Chronicles narratives, Jeroboam (2 Chr 10-13) is seen as a rebel. He is not elected by Yahweh as the legitimate head of the newly established northern kingdom. While the text refers to the Ahijah prophecy (2 Chr 10:15), Jeroboam is not set up as a second David as he is in 1 Kings 11. Instead, Jeroboam is a rebel who threatens the Davidic dynasty. Any rift of the kingdom does not originate with Solomon, but Jeroboam. Also, Jeroboam does not establish a dynasty. Instead of a northern kingdom that lasts almost two centuries, Jeroboam's rebellion is put down by Rehoboam's son Abijah (Abijam in 1 Kings). Abijah speaks to the followers of Jeroboam, acclaiming the legitimacy of the Davidic monarchy and Solomon's Temple with its Aaronide priests (2 Chr 13:4-12). The northern kingdom of Israel lasts for one generation. Abijah and his troops defeat Jeroboam. The entirety of Israel comes back under the Davidic throne. The Chronicler makes clear that Judah and the Davidic king have the support of Yahweh while Jeroboam and the tribes who denounce Rehoboam are condemned. Fighting against Judah is akin to fighting Yahweh (2 Chr 13:12). This is a stark contrast from what is found in Kings where Jeroboam is divinely chosen as king and the kingdom splits because of Yahweh's will. Instead, the rest of the Chronicler's history primarily follows the reigns of the Davidic kings, mostly ignoring the events of the kingdom of Israel as described in Kings. There is no synchronizing of the kings at the opening of each reign. Furthermore, the initially positive portrait of Jeroboam in which he is set up as a second David is absent from Chronicles because the split of the kingdom is never condoned by the Chronicler and the punishment of Solomon is not necessary. In this way, Jeroboam is not compared to David, constructed in the Davidic prototype, but neither is he used as the anti-David, the prototype of the evil king. We see that the key elements of Dtr's historiographical poetics, the attribution to theological causes and the use of the prototype strategy are missing from the portrait of Jeroboam in Chronicles.

Josiah

A third contrast is the difference in the depiction of the reign of Josiah. In DtrH, Josiah and his reign are the climax to which the History has been building. Josiah's reform is unparalleled among the few small reforms undertaken by other kings. The reforms of others are diminished in comparison to Josiah's reform. Conversely, in Chronicles, Hezekiah's reform is quite extensive. Additionally, he also celebrates the Passover, one of the unique elements of the Deuteronomist's Josianic reform. In promoting the deuteronomistic program, Dtr focuses on the role of the book of the law in his account of Josiah's reign. It is the book that catalyzes the reform. As discussed previously, the book plays the role of a character in the story, highlighting its importance.

In contrast, in Chronicles, the order of events in the narrative reflects another exegetical resolution, resolving the issue of what happened in the first eighteen years of the reign of the great Josiah. In Chronicles, Josiah begins parts of his reform before the finding of the book of the law. This shifts the focus of the account from the law to the character of Josiah. In this way,

Josiah is praiseworthy on his own merit, reforming at the onset of his reign. In Chronicles, Josiah is acclaimed because he takes on reform, even before being scared by the finding of the book of the law, while in Kings the law and obedience to it, which drives Josiah to start reform, are the focus. The deuteronomistic account is about the reform and law and Josiah is only the vehicle for this concentration, while Chronicles is centered on Josiah himself. Also, Josiah's reforms do not take on the same import to the larger meta-narrative of the Chronicler's history, as in DtrH. The Chronicles report lacks the correspondences to the undoing of the sins of Solomon and Jeroboam and the reuniting of the kingdom. This reflects that the Chronicler does not use the same prototype strategy as Dtr. Also, since the sins of Solomon, which were constructed in Kings as the theological justification for the split of the kingdom (as above), are not present in Chronicles, when the account reaches the reign of Josiah, he does not need to right this wrong since it never existed. This is the same for the sin of Jeroboam. The northern kingdom and its sin are not a focus for the Chronicler as they are for Dtr. Most notably, the Chronicler's Josiah does not inhabit the position of being a second David. We see a difference in the historiographical process in that Dtr is singularly focused on promoting his theological program, which is done especially through the use of the prototype strategy. This is absent in the Chronicler's portrait of Josiah.

We also see another difference in the report of the death of Josiah. While in DtrH, Josiah's death is an abrupt, factual report, in Chronicles it is expanded. The Chronicler offers theological justification for the death in battle for the great Josiah, which falsifies the peaceful death prophecy of Huldah. Also, Chronicles reports on the funeral and mourning for the king. There are several possible explanations for the differences. One possibility is the reason given by Frost[1] and others that the short report in 2 Kings 23, which uncharacteristically does not include a theological rationalization, is that the historian is too close to the events to make theological sense of Josiah's death. The several hundred years between the death of Josiah and the composition of Chronicles offers the Chronicler sufficient time to digest the death and to come to some theological conclusion about it. Another possibility may be that Josiah does not play the singular, unique role in the eyes of the Chronicler as he does for the Deuteronomist. While the Chronicler's Josiah is still one of the few good kings and initiates a major reform, the praise for Hezekiah is also extended to the Chronicler's account. Hezekiah is a second, or even primary hero, to the Chronicler. His reign and reform are expanded rather than diminished as by the Deuteronomist. In this way, the Chronicler has less at stake in including the seemingly denigrating, non-peaceful death of Josiah as well as the violation of the prophecy of Huldah.

These examples illustrate that the historiographical poetics, on both the axes of selection and composition, are distinct to the Deuteronomist. Dtr creates a unique narrative in which he promotes a specific brand of theology focused on fidelity to the law and the covenant, centralized worship, and the Davidic promise. Dtr tells a specific historical story, holding up the ideal king as a tool to promote that theology. In contrast, the Chronicler does not participate in the same historiographical process. His poetics are different from those of Dtr and therefore the thrust of his history portrays a different narrative with its own set of goals. The Chronicler's history functions in a different historical context in which his goals are different from those of the pre-exilic and even exilic Deuteronomists; this manifests in a different version of the history of the monarchy and a different set of historiographical poetics.

[1] Frost, "Death of Josiah," 87:369–382.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This dissertation explores the historiographical style and method of the Deuteronomist in the book of Kings. He was a collector, author, and redactor. In order to truly understand the history, we must also consider the process of historiography in which the biblical historian participates and how he includes and reshapes his inherited sources to suit his purposes. This dissertation lays out a systematic analysis of the historiographical process of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist, answering the questions of: what were the methodological priorities that guided his choices of selection, composition, and redaction? And, how does understanding these priorities influence how we consider the way in which Dtr composed his history?

Many scholars have discussed the role of Dtr as a collector, author, and redactor, but few have offered a systematic description of his method. While some scholars have previously identified some of the individual methodological priorities I include in the historiographical poetics, they have never been developed by bringing multiple observations together in this systematic and prescriptive way. This work does just that, offering a framework for the selectional and compositional priorities that Dtr privileges in the construction of his history, and especially in crafting the portrait of the kings. The most prominent of these priorities is the use of a prototype strategy, based on the portrait of David constructed in Kings.

This historiographical poetics functions on two axes, one of selection and one of composition. On the axis of selection, Dtr collects his sources, chooses what to include and omit, and how to present the sources and the events of history. He has a specific set of priorities that guide his process of selection and his method for adopting and adapting his sources, using each to conform to his overall narrative goals. In choosing his texts, Dtr maintains a scholarly commitment to his sources, including source documents even when they may contradict and undermine his narrative goals rather than excising them from the historical record. He also demonstrates loyalty to the prophetic tradition, both substantially, by including pre-deuteronomistic prophetic texts in his narrative, and structurally, by using prophecy and its fulfillment as a primary framing strategy to illustrate how Yahweh works in history. After these selectional choices have been made, Dtr orders the various texts and the episodes contained therein by rechronologizing them and juxtaposing scenes in order to craft the narrative to most effectively convey his goals.

On the axis of composition, Dtr is focused on promoting the deuteronomistic program, which is centered on centralization of the cult, covenant theology, and the Davidic promise. His primary goal in writing Kings is to interpret the history of the monarchy in light of deuteronomistic theology, using that perspective to explain the events of history, and to craft a comprehensive narrative that functions didactically, instructing the kings and the people of Judah how to behave through illustrating the consequences of disobedience. At each point, Dtr's narrative is focused on presenting the history of Israel and Judah in an attempt to promote deuteronomistic theology as well as provide an example for pre-exilic Judah – how they can

change their religious behavior and what are the consequences for those who do not. The bad kings and the entire kingdom of Israel serve as examples for Judah and the Judean kings to demonstrate the potential fate that awaits them if they do not follow the deuteronomistic covenant. This covenant is primarily focused on centralization of the cult to the temple in Jerusalem and the elimination of syncretistic cult symbols from the worship of Yahweh. Deuteronomistic theology represents a major break in traditional Yahwistic worship in which local sanctuaries were prevalent since its inception and continue throughout the period of the monarchy, well beyond the building of Solomon's temple in the 10th century B.C.E. Even the archaeological record attests to the presence of *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm*, and even calf iconography, at Yahwistic Israelite cult shrines.[1] The deuteronomistic program seeks to eliminate these elements from standard Israelite practice. Throughout the History this is done through a rhetoric of othering in which the previously accepted sites and symbols are categorized as idolatrous. In this way, Dtr convicts those who perform these practices. This didactic function is particularly focused on cultic rigorism and eliminating any "foreign" elements from cultic practice, including the construction of *maṣṣēbôt* and *ašērîm*, and demonstrating the example of the king and the effect that his cultic behavior has on his people.

A second compositional strategy used explains historical and political events with theological causation, so that everything that happens is a result of Yahweh working in history and is reflective of human behavior in fidelity to the deuteronomistic covenant. Individuals, kingdoms, and nations are punished when they violate the tenets of deuteronomistic theology. These transgressions and the resulting consequences are made clear. As I illustrate, this strategy further refines the dual causality principle discussed by Amit[2] and others demonstrating that it functions uniquely in Kings and the other more "historical" or historically based narratives. These accounts also incorporate annalistic records of historical events, and the theological causation is not primary to the sequence of events. Instead, the theological causation is an interpretation of the events (although frequently presented in narrative chronology first, e.g. Jeroboam's accession in 1 Kings 11 and the rejection of Rehoboam in 1 Kings 12), which appears obviously secondary to the plot. In this way, Dtr rewrites the historico-political accounts in order to confirm and promote his theological perspectives.

Similarly, a third compositional strategy is the use of a prototype strategy that Dtr uses to construct the portrait of the kings. The prototype strategy is a key element to Dtr's historiographical process. It is one of the major organizing structures used throughout Kings. Dtr focuses on the royal portrait as a literary vehicle to convey his theological program. It is a way in which he can categorize the kings into two groups: those who do what is right and those who do what is evil in the eyes of Yahweh. Among those kings, Dtr highlights a few specific kings to make clear what behavior is to be tolerated and praised in his kings.

---

[1] Amihai Mazar, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000-586 BCE* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 1990), 348–352; "Bronze Bull Found in Israelite 'High Place' from the Time of the Judges," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 9, no. 5 (1983): 34–40; Othmar Keel and Christoph Uehlinger, "Baal, El, Yahweh, and 'His Asherah' in the Context of Egyptian Solar and Royal Imagery: Iron Age IIB," in *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel* (trans. Thomas H. Trapp; Minneapolis; Edinburgh: Fortress Pr; T & T Clark, 1998), 177–282.

[2] Amit, "The Dual Causality Principle and its Effects on Biblical Literature," 37:385–400.

This prototype is one that is based on a literary picture of David in which David is the exemplum of covenant fidelity. He is the model of the deuteronomistically adherent king, the one whom all subsequent kings are required to emulate. Dtr uses David as the royal comparative to construct the portrait of both good and bad kings. The good kings are those who are like David while the bad kings are those who are not. While the history of the monarchy spans half a millennium, only those kings who contribute to Dtr's meta-narrative are constructed using this prototype. It is in the portrait of the kings who Dtr highlights that we can most clearly see his poetics and the expression of his theological concerns.

The development of the prototype strategy is one of the major scholarly contributions of this dissertation. It builds on the ideas of Gerhard von Rad who first acknowledges the use of David in Kings as a prototype for kings and briefly indentifies the David of Kings as very different from the David seen in Samuel.[3] My analysis of the prototype strategy takes von Rad's argument and further develops it, putting the concept of the Davidic prototype into application and considering its literary value to the entirety of Kings. In this way, it is possible to see the ways in which the Davidic prototype is used to construct the portrait of the kings. From the original portrait of David in Kings, the prototype is used to evaluate all subsequent kings, those who are like or unlike David. The kings, in whom Dtr is particularly interested and receive longer and fuller attention, are fleshed out through the use of the prototype in order to establish their significant role in the history of Israel and Judah and to act as didactic figures to convey the importance of fidelity to the tenets of the deuteronomistic covenant theology. These kings are either like David or are like the anti-David, Jeroboam.

The use of the prototype strategy also further refines the themes outlined by Frank Moore Cross in his double redaction theory. Cross highlights two contrasting themes present in the pre-exilic history: the faithfulness of David and the sin of Jeroboam.[4] Cross argues that the northern theme of Dtr[1] is Jeroboam's sin while the central event in Judah is David's faithfulness. According to Cross, the climax of these themes is Josiah's "extirpating the counter-cultus of Jeroboam at Bethel."[5] The use of the prototype strategy makes the discussion of the contrast of these themes more precise. This is not just a matter of the acts of the kings and the effects they have on the course of the history of the monarchy as Cross presents them, but the contrast between David and Jeroboam, as the anti-David, is intrinsic to the literary construction of the portrait of these, and the other, kings. These kings are inherently connected to each other through their relationship to the prototype strategy and not just in the contrasting of themes. This is further developed in the portrait of Josiah who not only is fashioned in the Davidic prototype, perhaps even surpassing his model, but also as the antidote to the anti-David. Only Josiah, in his role as the next David, has the ability to overturn the sins of Jeroboam. No other king, not even Hezekiah, has this potential because of the absence of the Davidic model. In this way, the Davidic prototype becomes the primary literary convention in crafting the portrait of the kings, highlighting the major themes and promoting deuteronomistic theology.

Chapter 1 systematically lays out the historiographical poetics of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist, as described above. It is here that it is possible to see various elements of style

[3] Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 86–88.
[4] Cross, *CMHE*, 274–289.
[5] Ibid., 283.

and method of Dtr. In this way, the discussion takes issues of methodology seriously, considering the process of historiography and the choices that the Deuteronomist as editor and author had to make in order to craft his history. The exploration of this historiographical poetics is followed by the application of these priorities in a test case of 1 Kings 11 in order to further illustrate the ways in which this method functions.

The discussion of Dtr's historiographical poetics takes into account and builds on the work of many scholars. On the axis of selection, the concept of the scholarly commitment to his sources builds on Halpern's theory of antiquarian interests.[6] While I agree with Halpern that Dtr is indeed constrained by his commitment to his sources, my discussion complicates the role of Dtr in the process of selection. Given this commitment, does Dtr have a say in the process of selection if everything must be included? We have seen many examples, not the least of which is the formulaic closing to each king's reign, that there are additional records about the reigns of the kings omitted from Dtr's account and included in the royal annals. In this way, Dtr both has a choice and has no choice in what he includes. He must include especially well-known traditions, such as the positive depiction of Jeroboam and Hezekiah as a great reformer, but he uses his compositional strategies to transform these somewhat "unfortunate" legacies to his best advantage, including them in his narrative, but recrafting them so that they will only contribute, rather than undermine, his historiographical goals.

Similarly, Dtr's loyalty to the prophetic tradition builds on theories by Campbell[7] and others of the existence of a pre-deuteronomistic prophetic history. While I accept this suggestion for the most part, the way I conceive of this method views the use of prophetic texts both in the inclusion of inherited material and in the hermeneutical process of Dtr in trying to understand history. Not only does Dtr use the semi-comprehensive northern document completed by the time of Hezekiah, but he searches out, includes and/or composes prophetic texts that extend in time and space beyond this early document. Dtr further includes prophetic oracles from southern prophets regarding the kingdom of Judah as well as until the reign of Josiah, demonstrating the role of prophetic messages and prophecy-fulfillment as selectional, organizational, and interpretative tools.

More generally, this historiographical poetics contributes to the attention given to both historical and literary concerns in biblical historiography. Building on the work of scholars such as Brettler[8] and Knoppers[9], this work also looks at the literary and form-critical elements that make up Dtr's historiographical poetics. While Brettler focuses solely on the work of the Chronicler in order to derive the intentions of the author and ancient Israelite historiographical methods, contending that this is possible because we have access to the Chronicler's major source, namely DtrH, my work analyzes the book of Kings, which Brettler somewhat discredits as a reliable source for understanding the historiographical method because we do not have access to Dtr's sources. Also, while Brettler recognizes a typology present in the work of the biblical author/redactor, it is a different kind of patterning from the prototype strategy I emphasize as crucial to the composition and redaction of Kings. His patterning is something of a reenactment of events, repeated and foreshadowed in the narrative of the history of Israel. My

[6] Halpern, *The First Historians*.
[7] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*.
[8] Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*.
[9] Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, 1:; *Two Nations under God*, 2:.

work more closely follows and extends the work of Knoppers who focuses on Solomon and Jeroboam and their roles in the shaping of Kings. My prototype strategy expands the view of the role of the portrait of the kings, looking at the specific kings (David, Solomon, Jeroboam and Josiah) at the high and low points of the history of the monarchy and considering these kings as constructed together through the same patterning.

Chapter 2 offers a brief survey of the history of scholarship on the redaction of Kings. This review provides an important premise to the consideration of the historiographical poetics, locating the compilation and composition of the primary version of DtrH, in my opinion, to the Josianic court. Through this identification, the goals of the History are made clear – it functions as a didactic example to the kings and people of Judah, instructing them to forsake the high places and the syncretistic symbols and embrace deuteronomistic theology. Aligning the History with the Josianic court in this way also illustrates the context in which these themes were most necessary. This chapter also considers the nature of a deuteronomistic history as a whole. The concepts of unity in DtrH and Dtr's role in reshaping his sources into a theologically meaningful narrative are crucial components to the historiographical poetics.

Chapters 3-6 each have as their subject a different king. Chapter 3 begins with considering the criteria for being a good king, one who does הישר בעיני יהוה. These few kings receive some praise from Dtr, but even fewer are compared to David. The rest of the chapter continues to analyze the portrait of David in Kings and how this portrait is constructed as the model for other kings. In this chapter, the prototype strategy is laid out demonstrating the ways in which David is used as the royal prototype. This portrait of David is very different from the one we see in the book of Samuel. The David of Kings, both in his own words to his son Solomon and in a retrospective appeal to the constructed figure of David, is faithful to the deuteronomistic covenant, a servant of Yahweh who was careful to always follow the ways of Yahweh, observing his laws and commandments, statutes and testimonies.

The subsequent chapters put the historiographical poetics into application in their role in crafting the portrait of the kings, while also taking into account the characteristics of the Davidic prototype explored in chapter 3 and how each king fits into the prototype. Chapter 4 considers the portrait of Jeroboam depicted in 1 Kings 11-14. While the use of prophetic sources is prominent in this pericope, the Jeroboam narrative reveals a cohesive completeness of a single narrative, following the rise and fall of Jeroboam and his kingdom. The use of the Davidic prototype is strongly applied in crafting the portrait of Jeroboam. He is first presented as a second David, one who was set up with the opportunity to be heir to the Davidic promise. He is promised a secure dynasty and the majority of the kingdom if only he would be like David, remaining faithful to the covenant. Inevitably, Jeroboam is unable to live up to the model set by David. Instead of embodying the Davidic prototype, Jeroboam becomes its antithesis. He is the anti-David, one who not only does not keep Yahweh's laws and commandments, but who also inaugurates an uncentralized counter-cult that drags the entire people of Israel down with him. By opposing the Davidic prototype, Jeroboam becomes the prototype of the evil king. Jeroboam's sin is the sin of Israel and the primary theological justification for their downfall and exile by Assyria. Jeroboam's sin is primarily one against deuteronomistic theology, rather than against Yahweh specifically. Jeroboam's cult is uncentralized and therefore deemed entirely unacceptable by Dtr. As such, Dtr rhetoricizes the cult and its founder as idolatrous. The pre-exilic Dtr focuses on cultic purity, which includes worship in the correct place and of the correct

symbols. Jeroboam's cult is neither. It functions outside the Jerusalem temple and is represented by the golden calves. While Jeroboam may have intended these sites to be Yahwistic, Dtr thoroughly marks them as idolatrous and in conflict with the covenant. The prototype strategy is an integral tool in making this connection.

Chapter 5 focuses on the portrait of Josiah, which similarly uses the Davidic prototype as its measure. In contrast to Jeroboam who is developed as the anti-David, Josiah is constructed as a true second David, one who even surpasses the model of David. Josiah is the paradigm of covenant fidelity. Not only does he keep the laws and commandments, but he institutes a major reform getting the people of Judah and the national cult in line with the scroll of the law found in the temple. The account of Josiah's reign (2 Kgs 22-23) is intertextually linked with all of the important events and figures in the history of the monarchy. Josiah is seen as the only one who can reverse the sins of the bad kings, restoring Israel to the unified Davidic kingdom, and as surpassing all of the good kings, outdoing the reform measures of even the reformers. These connections solidify the importance of these chapters to the entirety of the History and the literary intentions of Dtr in crafting the whole narrative. In this way, Josiah is the greatest of all kings, both those who precede and succeed him. In this way, the entire History has been building to prepare for the coming of Josiah. The account of his reign demonstrates a last attempt for Judah to escape the fate of Israel.

In contrast, chapter 6 centers on a counter-example of the account of King Manasseh in 2 Kings 21, in which the royal portrait depicted is the product of an exilic redactor. In this account it is possible to see the ways in which Dtr's historiographical priorities are recalibrated in an exilic setting. There are two major but interrelated differences in this example of exilic historiography. Rather than a concern with syncretistic and decentralized worship, the exilic Dtr is focused on eliminating the worship of foreign gods from Israelite practice. This concern manifests itself in a shift in the prototype strategy. Instead of casting Manasseh in the mold of the anti-David, Jeroboam, Manasseh is modeled after Ahab. This change conveys the different concerns of an exilic redactor: namely, the worship of Baal and other foreign gods. Despite this difference, the Manasseh narrative and the use of the prototype strategy are clear examples of how essential the historiographical method of Dtr^1 was to the deuteronomistic school and to Dtr^2. The impulse for the use of the prototype strategy is so strong that in Dtr^2's exilic rewrite of the Manasseh account, Dtr^2 attempts to use this method, taking the account of ordinary bad king Manasseh found in the pre-exilic History and reshaping the reign of Manasseh to appear as the worst of all kings, creating a suitable scapegoat to blame the destruction of Judah and the Babylonian exile.

The analysis of the accounts of the reigns of these specific kings highlights the historiographical poetics at play in the construction of the accounts. Each example demonstrates how the selectional and compositional strategies are being used by Dtr to create an effective account of the king's reign and the portrait of that king in order to contribute to Dtr's goals in promoting deuteronomistic theology. This view contributes to greater understanding of Dtr's historiographical method, leading to a greater understanding of the book of Kings. Also, by indentifying Dtr's literary and historiographical style, it helps us to make redactional decisions, on grounds beyond thematic justifications. In this way, the historiographical poetics becomes another device in our arsenal of tools of textual analysis.

Further Considerations

This discussion of the historiographical poetics of the pre-exilic Deuteronomist in Kings recommends areas for further consideration. One area for further research would be an in depth comparison with the Chronicler's historiographical poetics (see excursus 2 for a brief overview), which would extend to offering explanations as to why the Chronicler's historiography is so different from the Deuteronomist's. Another such area is the role of the author/redactor. Throughout I have regarded Dtr as an author, editor, and redactor. The schema of historiographical priorities, on both the selectional and compositional axes, takes this into account. The significance of these roles and Dtr's task in fulfilling these positions would be further enhanced by consideration of the nature of authorship in the ancient Near East. In its native context, are the distinctions between author and redactor artificial, imposed by modern readers, and how does this affect the ways in which we consider Dtr's role? This is an area in which many scholars have been working recently.[10] My conception of Dtr's historiographical poetics can contribute to this discussion, and the work of these scholars can offer greater understanding of Dtr's work, not only in evaluating whether it was unique methodologically, but also whether contemporary understanding of the role of the ancient redactor corresponds with the ways I have conceived of Dtr working.

Also, the historiographical poetics I have outlined and applied in this dissertation focus exclusively on Kings. As the contemporary theory, and one with which I concur, suggests that Kings is only one part of the entire Deuteronomistic History, these poetics should be considered in relation to the entirety of the History and whether they are functioning in the deuteronomistically composed passages of other deuteronomistic books, and if they are not, why. Another related question is whether the prototype strategy, which is so prominent in Kings and has been a major focus throughout this work, is used in the construction of the portrait of other deuteronomistic figures, in particular, Moses and Joshua, or is this exclusively a royal prototype only applied to the portrait of the monarchy. This would allow us to further understand Dtr's method in the entirety of DtrH, not only in Kings.

[10] Including Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2007); William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004); David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006).

Bibliography

Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Biblical Interpretation of the Reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah." Pages 247–259 in *In the Shelter of Elyon*. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies. Sheffield: JSOT Pr, 1984.

Alter, Robert. "Imagining History in the Bible." Pages 53–72 in *History and--: Histories Within the Human Sciences*. Edited by Ralph Cohen and Michael S. Roth. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.

---. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

---. *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Amit, Yairah. "The Dual Causality Principle and its Effects on Biblical Literature." *Vetus Testamentum* 37, no. 4 (1987): 385–400.

Ash, Paul S. "Jeroboam I and the Deuteronomistic Historian's Ideology of the Founder." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998): 16–24.

Auld, A. Graeme. "The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic." Pages 116–126 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by Steven McKenzie and Linda Schearing. JSOT 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Avioz, Michael. "Josiah's Death in the Book of Kings: A New Solution to an Old Theological Conundrum." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 83, no. 4 (2007): 359–366.

Barrick, W. Boyd. "On the Removal of the High-Places in 1-2 Kings." *Biblica* 55, no. 2 (1974): 257–259.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in II Reg 21:1-18 and the Redactional History of the Book of Kings." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 103, no. 3 (1991): 355–374.

Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "Writing as Oracle and as Law: New Contexts for the Book-Find of King Josiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 2 (2008): 223–239.

Bird, Phyllis A. "The End of the Male Cult Prostitute: A Literary-Historical and Sociological Analysis of Hebrew qādēš-qĕdēšîm." Pages 37–80 in *Congress Volume*. Edited by International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 66. Leiden: E J Brill, 1997.

Brettler, Marc Zvi. *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.

---. “The Structure of 1 Kings 1-11.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, no. 49 (1991): 87–97.

Campbell, Antony F. “Martin Noth and the Deuteronomistic History.” Pages 31–62 in *The History of Israel’s Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*. Edited by Steven McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

---. *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1 - 2 Kings 10)*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986.

Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Cogan, Mordechai. *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Cogan, Mordechai, and Hayim Tadmor. *II Kings: A New Translation*. 1st ed. Anchor Bible Commentary 11. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988.

Cohn, Robert L. “Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 97 (1985): 23–35.

---. “The Literary Structure of Kings.” Pages 107–122 in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*. Edited by André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.

Cortese, Enzo. “Theories Concerning Dtr: A Possible Rapprochement.” Pages 179–190 in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989*. Edited by C. Brekelmans and J. Lust. BETL 94. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

Crawford, Sidnie White, Jan Joosten, and Eugene Charles Ulrich. “Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1-9, 1 Kings 11:1-8, and Jeremiah 27:1-10 (34 G).” *Vetus Testamentum* 58, no. 3 (2008): 352–366.

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Danelius, Eva. “Sins of Jeroboam ben-Nabat, Part I.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58 (1967): 95–114.

---. “Sins of Jeroboam ben-Nabat, Part II.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58 (1968): 204–223.

Davies, Philip R. “Josiah and the Law Book.” Pages 65–77 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Dietrich, Martin. “Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History.” Pages 153–175 in *The History of Israel’s Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*. Edited by Steven McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Dietrich, Walter. *Prophetie und Geschichte eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*. FRLANT 108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Edelman, Diana. “Solomon’s Adversaries Hadad, Rezon and Jeroboam: A Trio of ‘Bad Guy’ Characters Illustrating the Theology of Immediate Retribution.” Pages 166–191 in *The Pitcher is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström*. Edited by Steven W. Holloway and Lowell K. Handy. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 190. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Evans, Carl D. “Naram-Sin and Jeroboam: The Archetypal Unheilsherrscher in Mesopotamian and Biblical Historiography.” Pages 97–125 in *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method*. Edited by William W. Hallo, James C. Moyer, and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

Ewald, Heinrich. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 6 vols. Göttingen: Dieterichs Buchhandlung, 1843.

---. *The History of Israel*. Translated by R. Martineau. Vol. 1. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1869.

Eynikel, Erik. “Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Deuteronomistic History (1 Kgs 13; 2 Kgs 23, 16-18).” Pages 227–237 in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989*. Edited by C. Brekelmans and J. Lust. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1990.

---. “The Portrait of Manasseh and the Deuteronomistic History.” Pages 233–261 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature*. Louvain: Peeters, 1997.

---. *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Paul Revere’s Ride*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Fried, Lisbeth. “The High Places (Bāmôt) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122, no. 3 (2002): 437–465.

Friedman, Richard E. *The Bible with Sources Revealed: A New View into the Five Books of Moses*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2003.

---. “The Deuteronomistic School.” Pages 70–80 in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Astrid B.

Beck, Andrew H. Bartelt, Paul R. Raabe, and Chris Franke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

---. *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.

Fritz, Volkmar. *1 & 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Anselm Hagedorn. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress Press, 2003.

Frost, Stanley Brice. "The Death of Josiah: a Conspiracy of Silence." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87, no. 4 (1968): 369–382.

Gallagher, Catherine, and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Garsiel, Moshe. "The Book of Samuel: Its Composition, Structure and Significance as a Historiographical Source." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 10 (2010): 2–42.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by Arthur Ernest Cowley and Emil Friedrich Kautzsch. 2nd English ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Glatt, David A. *Chronological Displacement in Biblical and Related Literatures*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Gooding, David Willoughby. "Jeroboam's Rise to Power." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91, no. 4 (1972): 529–533.

Gordon, Robert P. "Second Septuagint Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash?" *Vetus Testamentum* 25. VT (1975): 368–393.

Grabbe, Lester L. "Introduction." Pages 3–24 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Gray, John. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. 2nd ed. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Gunkel, Hermann. "Introduction. The Legends of Genesis." Page vii–lxxxvi in *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Halpern, Baruch. *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001.

---. "Doctrine by Misadventure: Between the Israelite Source and the Biblical Historian." Pages 41–73 in *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Richard E. Friedman. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

---. “Levitic Participation in the Reform Cult of Jeroboam I.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976): 31–42.

---. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

---. “The Resourceful Israelite Historian: The Song of Deborah and Israelite Historiography.” *Harvard Theological Review* 76, no. 4 (1983): 379–401.

Halpern, Baruch, and David S. Vanderhooft. “The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries BCE.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62 (1991): 179–244.

Handy, Lowell. “The Role of Huldah in Josiah’s Cult Reform.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 106, no. 1 (1994): 40–53.

Hardmeier, Christof. “King Josiah in the Climax of the Deuteronomic History (2 Kings 22-23) and the Pre-Deuteronomic Document of a Cult Reform at the Place of Residence (23.4-15*): Criticism of Sources, Reconstruction of Literary Pre-stages and the Theology of History in 2 Kings 22-23*.” Pages 123–163 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Hays, J. Daniel. “Has the Narrator Come to Praise Solomon or to Bury Him? Narrative Subtlety in 1 Kings 1-11.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28, no. 2 (2003): 149–174.

“Israel Bissell - Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia”, n.d. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Israel_Bissel.

Kaiser, Otto. “Das Verhältnis der Erzählung vom König David zum sogenannten deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: am Beispiel von 1 Kön 1-2 untersucht.” Pages 94–122 in *Sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids*. Edited by Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer. Freiburg, Schweiz: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Keel, Othmar, and Christoph Uehlinger. “Baal, El, Yahweh, and ‘His Asherah’ in the Context of Egyptian Solar and Royal Imagery: Iron Age IIB.” Pages 177–282 in *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis; Edinburgh: Fortress Pr; T & T Clark, 1998.

Keulen, P. S. F. van. *Manasseh through the Eyes of the Deuteronomists: The Manasseh Account (2 Kings 21:1-18) and the Final Chapters of the Deuteronomistic History*. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.

---. *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship Between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum v. 104. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Knauf, Ernst Axel. “Does ‘Deuteronomistic Historiography’ (DtrH) Exist?” Pages 388–397 in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*.

Edited by Albert de Pury, Jean-Daniel Macchi, and Thomas Römer. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Aaron's Calf and Jeroboam's Calves." Pages 92–104 in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck, John R Bartlett, Paul R. Raabe, and Chris Franke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

---. "Ancient Near Eastern Grants and the Davidic Royal Covenant." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, no. 116 (1996): 670–97.

---. "Dynastic Oracle and Secession in 1 Kings 11." *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, vol 7, 1987* (1987): 159–172.

---. "Introduction." Pages 1–18 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

---. "Is there a Future for the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 119–134 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Thomas Römer. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000.

---. "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (2001): 393–415.

---. "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108, no. 3 (1996): 329–346.

---. "'There was None Like Him': Incomparability in the Books of Kings." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (1992): 411–431.

---. *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, V 1: The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Harvard Semitic monographs. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

---. *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, V 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Harvard Semitic monographs. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Kuenen, Abraham. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua)*. Translated by Philip H. Wicksteed. London: Macmillan, 1886.

---. *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzmeling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. 3 vols. Leiden, 1861.

Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Lasine, Stuart. "Manasseh as Villain and Scapegoat." Pages 163–183 in *New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

---. "Reading Jeroboam's Intentions: Intertextuality, Rhetoric, and History in 1 Kings 12." Pages 133–152 in *Reading between Texts*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Lemaire, André. "Toward a Redactional History of the Book of Kings." Pages 446–461 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville, Translated by Samuel W. Heldenbrand. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Leuchter, Mark. "Jeroboam the Ephratite." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125, no. 1 (2006): 51–72.

Levinson, Bernard M. "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah." *Vetus Testamentum* 51, no. 4 (2001): 511–534.

Lohfink, Norbert. "The Cult Reform of Josiah of Judah: 2 Kings 22-23 as a Source for the History of Israelite Religion." Pages 459–475 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

---. "Was there a Deuteronomistic Movement?" Pages 36–66 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: the Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by Linda Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Mazar, Amihai. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000-586 BCE*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

---. "Bronze Bull Found in Israelite 'High Place' from the Time of the Judges." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 9, no. 5 (1983): 34–40.

McCarter, P. Kyle. *II Samuel*. Anchor Bible Commentary 9. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

---. "Introduction." Pages 3–44 in *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary*. Anchor Bible 8. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.

McCarthy, Dennis J. "2 Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomic History." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84, no. 2 (1965): 131–138.

McKenzie, Steven L. *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 42. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1991.

Monroe, Lauren A. S. *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*. Edited by Henry Snyder Gehman. International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner's, 1951.

Mullen, E. Theodore. "The Sins of Jeroboam: A Redactional Assessment." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 212–232.

Na'aman, Nadav. "Sources and Composition in the History of Solomon." Pages 57–80 in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*. Edited by Lowell K. Handy. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997.

---. "The 'Discovered Book' and the Legitimation of Josiah's Reform." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130, no. 1 (2011): 47–62.

Nelson, Richard D. "Josiah in the Book of Joshua." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, no. 4 (1981): 531–540.

---. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

Nicholson, Ernest W. "Josiah and the Priests of the High Places (II Reg 23,8a.9)." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 119, no. 4 (2007): 499–513.

Noth, Martin. *Könige*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1968.

---. *The Deuteronomistic History*. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1981.

---. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschischtswerke im Alten Testement*, 1943.

Oestreicher, Theodor. *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1923.

Parker, Kim Ian. "Repetition as a Structuring Device in 1 Kings 1-11." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, no. 42 (1988): 19–27.

"Paul Revere - Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia", n.d. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Revere.

Person, Raymond. *The Deuteronomic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2002.

Propp, William Henry. *Exodus 19-40*. Anchor Bible Commentary. New York: Doubleday, 2006.

Provan, Iain. *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter, 1988.

Pury, Albert de, and Thomas Römer. "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues." Pages 24–141 in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomium-Studien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947.

---. "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings." Pages 74–91 in *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1953.

Revere, Paul. "A Letter from Col. Paul Revere to the Corresponding Secretary [Jeremy Belknap]", 1798. Manuscript Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society. http://www.masshist.org/cabinet/april2002/reveretranscription.htm.

Rofé, Alexander. *The Prophetical Stories: The Narratives about the Prophets in the Hebrew Bible, Their Literary Types and History*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.

Rogerson, John W. *W.M.L. De Wette, Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography*. JSOTSup 126. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Rosenbaum, Jonathan. "Hezekiah's Reform and the Deuteronomistic Tradition." *Harvard Theological Review* 72 (1979): 23–43.

Rost, Leonhard. *Die Überlieferung Von Der Thronnachfolge Davids*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926.

---. *The Succession to the Throne of David*. Translated by Michael D. Rutter and David M. Gunn. Sheffield, England: Almond Press, 1982.

Römer, Thomas. *The So-called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*. New York: T. & T. Clark Publishers, 2007.

---. "Transformations in Deuteronomistic Biblical Historiography: On 'Book-Finding' and other Literary Strategies." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 109, no. 1 (1997): 1–11.

Römer, Thomas, ed. *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000.

Schenker, Adrian. "Jeroboam and the Division of the Kingdom in the Ancient Septuagint: LXX 3 Kingdoms 12.24 a-z, MT 1 Kings 11-12; 14 and the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 214–257 in *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Edited by Albert de Pury, Jean-Daniel Macchi, and Thomas Römer. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Schniedewind, William M. “History and Interpretation: The Religion of Ahab and Manasseh in the Book of Kings.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (1993): 649–661.

---. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Van Seters, John. “The Deuteronomistic History: Can it Avoid Death by Redaction?” Pages 213–222 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Thomas Römer. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000.

---. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the “Editor” in Biblical Criticism*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Simon, Uriel. “I Kings 13: A Prophetic Sign--Denial and Persistence.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 47 (1976): 81–117.

Smend, Rudolf. “Das Gesetz und die Völker: ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte.” Pages 494–509 in *Probleme biblischer Theologie*. Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1971.

Smith, Mark. *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002.

Stavrakopoulou, Francesca. “The Blackballing of Manasseh.” Pages 248–263 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. London: T & T Clark International, 2005.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Sweeney, Marvin A. “A Reassessment of the Masoretic and Septuagint Versions of the Jeroboam Narratives in 1 Kings/3 Kingdoms 11-14.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 38, no. 2 (2007): 165–195.

---. *King Josiah of Judah: the Lost Messiah of Israel*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Talshir, Zipora. “Is the Alternate Tradition of the Division of the Kingdom (3 Kgdms 12:24a-z) Non-Deuteronomistic.” Pages 599–621 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

---. “Literary Design--A Criterion for Originality? A Case Study: 3 Kgdms 12:24a-z; 1 K 11-14.” Pages 41–57 in *Double transmission du texte biblique: Études d’histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*. Edited by Adrian Schenker, Yohanan Goldman, and Christoph Uehlinger. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2001.

---. *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z*. Jerusalem: Simor, 1993.

Toorn, Karel van der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem: Simor, 1981.

Trebolle, Julio C. "Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Traditions." Pages 483–501 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006.

---. "Redaction, Recension and Midrash in the Books of Kings." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 15 (1982): 12–35.

---. "Samuel/Kings and Chronicles: Book Divisions and Textual Composition." Pages 96–108 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Eugene Charles Ulrich, Peter W. Flint, James C. VanderKam, and Emanuel Tov. Boston: Brill, 2006.

---. "The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in the Books of Kings." *7th Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (1991): 285–299.

Uehlinger, Christoph. "Was There a Cult Reform Under King Josiah? The Case for a Well-grounded Minimum." Pages 279–316 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Veijola, Timo. *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.

Wallace, Howard N. "Oracles against the Israelite dynasties in 1 and 2 Kings." *Biblica* 67, no. 1 (1986): 21–40.

Walsh, Jerome T. "The Contexts of 1 Kings XIII." *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 355–370.

Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael Patrick O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

---. "The Emergence of the Deuteronomic Movement: The Historical Antecedents." Pages 76–98 in *Das Deuteronomium: Enstehung, gestalt, und Botschaft*. Edited by Norbert Lohfink. Leuven: University Press, 1985.

Weippert, Helga. "Die deuteronomistischen Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher." *Biblica* 53 (1972): 301–339.

Westermann, Claus. *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* Theologische Bücherei 87. Gutersloh, Germany: Chr Kaiser, 1994.

Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de. *A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*. Translated by Theodore Parker. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1850.

---. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Halle, 1806.

---. *Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi Libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctioris opus esse monstratur*. Jena, 1805.

---. *Lehrbuch der historisch kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Berlin: Reimer, 1817.

White, Hayden. "Interpretation in History." *New Literary History* 4, no. 2 (1973): 281–314.

---. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

---. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Williamson, H. G. M. "Review of The Creation of History in Ancient Israel, by Marc Z. Brettler." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 47, no. 2 (1996): 352–355.

---. "The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History." *Vetus Testamentum* 32, no. 2 (1982): 242–248.

Van Winkle, D. W. "1 Kings XII 25-XIII 34: Jeroboam's Cultic Innovations and the Man of God from Judah." *Vetus Testamentum* 46 (1996): 101–114.

Zakovitch, Yair. "Juxtaposition in the Abraham Cycle." Pages 509–524 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1995.