

FORMULAS FROM  
ROYAL RECORDS OF ISRAEL AND OF JUDAH

BY

SHOSHANA R. BIN-NUN  
Haifa, Israël

There is an almost unanimous agreement among scholars regarding the supposition that the Book of Kings was composed during the Babylonian exile because the latest event mentioned is Evil Merodach's pardon to Jehoiachin. The framework of the book has been attributed by most scholars to the author or the redactor who is supposed to have taken his material from one or more older sources. It has been taken for granted that the redactor had not used the official annals of the kings of Israel and of Judah but some later composition which ultimately dated back from the official records.

With the help of a close analysis of the framework of the book an attempt has been made in this article towards the demarcation of the first-hand sources that have been included in the Book of Kings. As a result of our investigation a much earlier time of composition of the main part of the book may be suggested.

WELLHAUSEN<sup>1)</sup> considered both form and contents and the whole systematic chronology of the scheme as the redactor's work who had arrived at his numbers by calculation on the ground of numerous exact dates like 1 K vi 37, 38; xiv 25; 2 K xii 7; xviii 13; xxii 3 which he had found in his source<sup>2)</sup>. Only these annalistic notes, that appear outside the scheme of the book, and the lines of the kings of both states were original. The redactor's source may have been the regularly quoted books of the chronicles of the kings, though WELLHAUSEN believed that there had been only one composition and not three as mentioned by the redactor. The chronology of the kings of Israel depended upon that of the kings of Judah. These books of the chronicles could not have been the chronicles themselves but a secondary source. WELLHAUSEN's statement that the official annals

<sup>1)</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, Berlin 1905, pp. 270-285.  
<sup>2)</sup> *ibid.*, p. 284, note 2.

of the kings would have been called 'chronicles' and not 'books of the chronicles'<sup>3)</sup> is based upon the false assumption that the Hebrew *dibrēy bayyāmim* is the equivalent of 'chronicles', whereas it means only 'the affairs of the days'. The official document in which these were written down, may well have been called *šepher dibrēy bayyāmim*<sup>4)</sup>.

WELLHAUSEN's supposition was developed and modified by later scholars. HOELSCHER<sup>5)</sup> attributed only the scheme to the redactor who had taken the facts from his sources. He stressed the similarity in form and contents of the many stereotype notes regarding both Israel and Judah from the time of Solomon until the end of the book. He argued that these similar notes provided sufficient evidence that they had all been derived from a single source, whose author was the biblical narrator E. E had written his historical composition during the exile using as sources traditional legends and chronicles. The latter were based upon the official annals of Jerusalem and Samaria. Both the author E and the redactor of 'Kings' wrote their works in Babylon. HOELSCHER did not explain how the official annals from Jerusalem and from Samaria, which had been destroyed 136 years before the fall of the former, could have been available to the author of the source in Babylon. And if they were available to E why should not the redactor himself have used the first-hand sources as well, if both are supposed to have written during the same period? The assumption of an intermediate source dating from about the same time as the redactor of the book makes little sense.

All those scholars who have assumed that the redactor took his material from a single source have based their arguments upon similarities in style and contents but have not paid attention to the differences. Individuality, however, is never defined by what is common to many but by what one differs from others. Therefore an analysis of the formulas and their differences is essential before one comes to any conclusion regarding the authorship of the framework of the book.

The hypothesis of an intermediate source has been extended by Martin NORT<sup>6)</sup>. He attributes the scheme of the Book of Kings to

<sup>1)</sup> *ibid.*, p. 285.

<sup>2)</sup> Compare *Est.* ii 23, x 2.

<sup>3)</sup> G. HOELSCHER, "Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion", *Einheitskriterien, Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag, I. Teil, pp. 151-203.

<sup>4)</sup> M. NORT, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, Halle 1913, pp. 66-87.

Sp. 13. 1. 10. 1. 1. 7350

the Deuteronomistic redactor, whereas the information had been derived from the diaries of the kings of Israel and of Judah. According to NORTON these diaries were not the official annals, though based upon them, but unofficial adaptations of the history of the kings. They were not arranged according to years but had summarized the material which belonged together and which usually embraced a number of years as is obvious from 1 Kings vi 37, 38 and vii 1<sup>1)</sup>, whereas the annals had to be conducted continuously. He admits, however, that the redactor may have made changes in the order of the details of his source. M. NORTON's latter admission calls his previous conclusion in doubt, because the arrangement of the material within the Book of Kings may be due to the redactor and not to an intermediate source, which must naturally always remain in the dark. NORTON does not explain when and where those generally known diaries of all kings of Israel and of Judah may have been composed. Covering a period of about four hundred years, they were supposed to have been based upon the official records of Jerusalem and Samaria. The assumption that both in Judah and in Israel similar summaries, which remind us of modern statistics, had been written down independently, and that these were available to the author of our book, seems anachronistic and highly improbable, even if he is supposed to have written the Book of Kings in Mizpa while staying with Gedalia, as NORTON believes most probable.

J. LEWY<sup>2)</sup> and J. BEGRICH<sup>3)</sup> do not ascribe the framework of the Book of Kings to the redactor but to the author of a synchronistic history which included the formulas with the numbers for the kings of Israel and of Judah. The hypothesis was extended and developed by A. JEPSEN<sup>4)</sup>. BEGRICH denied the unity of the framework and distinguished four different systems, while JEPSEN attributed the whole system to the composer of the synchronistic chronicle, who had included all the historical information contained in the Book

<sup>1)</sup> NORTON's argument that the divided arrangement of the details in the Book of Kings cannot be due to the Deuteronomistic redactor but must have been taken from his source because the Deuteronomist would have joined together all the information regarding a certain theme, is not in keeping with the evidence of the Book of Kings, in which we do not find the systematic order which NORTON ascribes to the redactor of the book, not even in his topical summary in 2 Kings xvii 7-41.

<sup>2)</sup> *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda*, Gießen 1927.

<sup>3)</sup> *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda*, 1927, pp. 172 ff.

<sup>4)</sup> *Die Quellen des Königbuches*, Halle 1956, pp. 30-40.

of Kings in his work. Being still near the actual happenings this author, who had used reliable sources, had given a true and complete picture of the history of the two kingdoms. JEPSEN supposes that this chronicle had been composed during the reign of Hezekiah, after the destruction of Samaria, and it was this synchronistic history which served as the main source of the exilic redactor who copied the information together with the scheme. JEPSEN does not explain why the otherwise so reliable redactor should regularly have mentioned two books if he had used only one composition as a source for the details of both states. Though rather tendentious in the selection<sup>1)</sup> the hypothesis is very important because it declares a considerable part of the Book of Kings even verbally to have been composed as early as at the time of Hezekiah. But whatever problems may arise from our book will have to be asked again with regard to JEPSEN's ingenious synchronistic history. Of what type were the original records, from which the historical information had been derived? All suggestions of intermediate sources do not advance our inquiry after the first-hand sources.

Only B. MAISLER<sup>2)</sup> does not assume any intermediate source. He regards the Book of Kings as a collection containing a small number of excerpts from official records of the kings, cycles of stories and extracts from the words of the prophets and great men. Though originally written at the time of the happenings, or shortly afterwards, the material had undergone a literary adaptation at a later period after the destruction of the First Temple. The chronicles of the kings of Israel and of Judah were well known at the time of the compilation of the book during the Babylonian exile. MAISLER takes it for granted that the annals of the kings were similar in every respect to the annals of other kings of the Ancient East<sup>3)</sup>. The compiler of the Book of Kings was clearly influenced by the literary style and the methods of Babylonian historiography, as in the recording

<sup>1)</sup> JEPSEN consequently eliminates all religious material from the synchronistic history and thus achieves a modernized, completely secular historical account. But we must ask whether such a secularization is in keeping with the historical truth. L. W. KING wrote in his *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, London 1907, vol. I, p. 194, that the inclusion of religious information along with records which are purely historical is characteristic of all the Babylonian chronicles that have come down to us. There can be found no reason why a different standard should be applied to ancient Israelite and Judaeic records.

<sup>2)</sup> "Ancient Israelite Historiography", *IEJ* vol. 2, 1952, pp. 82-88.

<sup>3)</sup> JEPSEN asserts the contrary, his a.m. book.

of dates and in the use of customary formulas. This means that MAISLER attributes the framework and its formulas to the compiler although small sections of the book were taken from official records. We have been missing an explanation how the chronicles of Judah and of Israel could have been generally known during the exile in Babylon. The probability must at least be questioned.

In the following we are trying to illustrate that the analysis of the formulas of the Book of Kings leads to different conclusions than those which we have quoted above. Its fixed framework lends the book the appearance of unity and it is this unity that suggests single authorship. But a comparison of the formulas with each other discloses a lack of consistency. Not all the information of the same type is given in the same form. The formulas differ with various kings, parts of them are frequently missing or their order is exchanged.

If the framework had been composed by the author, we should ask, why did he not fit all his material into it and why did he alter the formulas so often? The changes do not seem to have been intended merely to avoid stiffness and pedantry. The author's stress on religious and moral aspects hardly allows for an assumption of such purely literary appreciation. Nor can the frequent omissions of the same details like the name of the king's father or mother and the changes in the sequence of parts of formulas be due to later recensions or to scribal errors. The deviations from the scheme are too many and often of the same type to be regarded as accidental. On the contrary, the formulas make the impression of having been derived for the greater part from first-hand sources. It makes little sense to assume that the author created a system in order not to use it for all his material. Especially some records<sup>1)</sup> which differ in style from parallel information always brought in formulas, make it probable that part of the material was taken verbally from the sources.

The framework of the book consists of:

- A) Introductory formulas with length of the king's reign,
- B) formulas for the religious estimation of the king,
- C) formulas for the close of his reign.

There are two types of introductory formulas for the kings of

<sup>1)</sup> Compare 1 Kings xvii 37 with the usual concluding formula in v. 40, 2 Kings i 17, xii 1, 2, xiv 21 with the usual formulas.

Israel. One contains only the sum of the king's regnal years with the Judaean synchronism added:

In the year . . . of C king of Judah  
reigned<sup>1)</sup> A (the son of B) over Israel (in . . .)  
. . . years<sup>2)</sup>,

the other group has two parts like the Judaean formula, one for the accession of the king and one for the length of his reign:

A the son of B began to reign (over Israel)  
in the year . . . of C king of Judah and he reigned (over Israel)  
in . . . . . years<sup>3)</sup>.

The parallel scheme of the introductory formula for the kings of Judah differs from this one not only by additional details.

In the year . . . of C (the son of D) (king of Israel)  
began to reign A (the son of B) over Judah.  
. . . years was A old at his accession and . . . years reigned he  
in Jerusalem and his mother's name E the daughter of F from . . .<sup>4)</sup>.

Only Rehoboam's and Jehoshaphat's formulas begin with their names. Rehoboam, the first king of Judah after the division of the kingdom, has, of course, no synchronism.

Now, it is highly improbable that nearly the same scheme of recording events should have been developed separately by Israel and by Judah after their separation. An exact analysis of the formulas shows, indeed, a consequent difference between the two systems, which demands both attention and explanation. We intend to discuss here only the main points.

Leaving aside the synchronisms, most of which were, in our opinion, added later to the original text, we get the following formula for the length of the reign of the kings of Israel:

And there reigned A (the son of B) over Israel  
in . . . . . years,

<sup>1)</sup> For the sake of comparison we are keeping up the Hebrew order of words, although it offends against the English language.

<sup>2)</sup> 1 Kings xv 33; xvi 8; xv 23; 2 Kings xiii 1, 10; xiv 23; xv 8, 17, 23, 27; xvii 1.

<sup>3)</sup> 1 Kings xv 25; xvi 29; the LXX version of this verse brings the usual formula starting with a Judaean synchronism "ἐν ἔτει δευτέρῳ τοῦ Ἰσασαρ"; 1 Kings xxii 52; 2 Kings iii 1; xv 13.

<sup>4)</sup> 1 Kings xv 1, 9; 2 Kings viii 16, 25; ix 29; xiv 1; xv 1, 32; xvi 1; xviii 1.

or, whenever the king's name has been mentioned before in the formula for his accession:

And he reigned over Israel . . . years in . . .

The same formula with another verb *māyīšpōt*—and he judged or *māyīšār*—and he ruled instead of *māyīmlōk*—and he reigned occurs many times in the Book of Judges for rulers from the northern tribes of Israel.

"And there ruled Abimelech over Israel three years",  
 "And he judged Israel twenty and three years", Tola the son of Puah,  
 "And he judged Israel twenty and two years", Jair the Gileadite,  
 "And (so) judged Jephthah Israel six years",  
 "... and he judged Israel ten years", Eilon the Zebulunite,  
 "... and he judged Israel eight years", Abdon the son of Hillel the Pirathonite. <sup>1)</sup>

In the Book of Kings this same formula is used exclusively for the regnal years of the kings of Israel:

"And the days which reigned Jeroboam twenty and two years",  
 "And he reigned over Israel two years" (Nadab),  
 "And there reigned Ahab the son of Omri over Israel in Samaria twenty and two years",  
 "... there reigned Jehoash the son of Jehoahaz over Israel in Samaria sixteen years",  
 "... there reigned Pekah the son of Ramaliah over Israel in Samaria twenty years". <sup>2)</sup>

In all these verses the length of the reign appears at the end of the formula, no matter whether the synchronism precedes it or is inserted. The formulas for the kings of Judah, on the contrary, always bring the number of years at their beginning. There is not a single ruler among the kings of Judah, whose regnal years are recorded at the end of the formula as with the kings of Israel. Nor is there any king of Israel whose formula begins with the length of his reign. The scheme for the length of the reigns of the Judaeans kings showing the number of years at the beginning of the formula—and in all cases before the verb—is as follows:

And . . . years reigned he in Jerusalem.

This formula is likewise not the creation of the author of the Book

<sup>1)</sup> Jud. ix 22; x 2, 3; xii 7, 11, 14.

<sup>2)</sup> 1 Kings xiv 20; xv 25; xvi 29; 2 Kings xiii 10; xv 27.

of Kings. It is known from the Book of Samuel, where the king's age is mentioned in addition:

"... years was Saul old when he began to reign and . . . years reigned he over Israel", <sup>1)</sup>  
 "Forty years old was Ish-bosheth the son of Saul when he began to reign over Israel and two years reigned he",  
 "Thirty years was David old when he began to reign, forty years reigned he". <sup>2)</sup>

Leaving aside the synchronism, we have exactly the same introductory formula for the kings of Judah in our book:

"Seven years old was Jehoash when he began to reign . . . and forty years reigned he in Jerusalem",  
 "Twelve years old was Manasseh when he began to reign and fifty and five years reigned he in Jerusalem",  
 "Eight years old was Josiah when he began to reign and thirty and one years reigned he in Jerusalem". <sup>3)</sup>

A formula is characterized by the fixed order of its components. Now, it might be argued that the different sequence of the items in the formula for the kings of Judah was caused by the preceding age of the king, which is missing for the kings of Israel. But the argument is refuted by the fact that even in the two formulas for Abijam and Asa <sup>4)</sup>, in which no age is recorded, the characteristic sequence has remained unchanged, with the length of the reign before the verb as for all Judaeans kings. Apart from this fact, the order of the words might as well have been inverted even after the king's age from the point of view of Hebrew syntax.

The consistent distinction between the two systems can neither be explained away as accidental nor can it be attributed to the author. Assuming that he deliberately chose the formula from Judges for the kings of Israel and the one from Samuel for those of Judah hardly makes any sense. It must therefore be admitted that he took the different formulas from different sources, the one type from Judaeans records, the other one from records of Israelite origin. On the basis

<sup>1)</sup> Two numbers seem to have been omitted in this verse, which is of no consequence for the formula. In the LXX version the whole verse is missing, in the text of Origen and in that of Lucian Saul is said to have been thirty years old at his accession.

<sup>2)</sup> 1 Sam. xiii 1, 2 Sam. ii 10; v 5.

<sup>3)</sup> 2 Kings xii 1, 2; xxi 1; xxii 1.

<sup>4)</sup> 1 Kings xv 2, 1 Kings xv 10.

of old, well known formulas the two states seem to have developed two different systems of chronistic records. In the south the scheme for Saul and David was continued by Judaeans scribes, while in Israel the older tradition from the time of the judges, most of whom had been from northern tribes, was taken up. Northern traditions had, obviously, not fallen into oblivion during the reigns of David and Solomon. The author of the Book of Kings copied both systems faithfully without changing them.

If our hypothesis is correct, we have to consider that, whenever parts of formulas are missing or details are changed, it is due to their absence or change in the sources and not to the author's decision nor to later omissions. It is obvious, for instance, that the annals of Israel never mentioned the king's mother, sometimes the father's name or the king's burial place were not recorded. Our supposition that the author derived part of his scheme and of the historical accounts from different sources from Israel and from Judah is corroborated by another unusual line of formulas for the length of the reigns of David, Solomon, Jeroboam and of Jehu. These four kings have no introductory formulas as all other kings, but instead there are long stories about their struggles for kingship. The sum of their regnal years is recorded in a different formula at the end of their reigns:

- "And the days that David reigned over Israel forty years",  
 "And the days that Solomon reigned in Jerusalem over all Israel<sup>1)</sup> forty years",  
 "And the days that Jeroboam reigned twenty and two years",  
 "And the days that Jehu reigned over Israel twenty and eight years in Samaria".<sup>2)</sup>

This formula is never used for any Judaeans king. The author, apparently, found it only in the records of Israel. The attempt to represent the Northern Kingdom as the legitimate continuation of the kingdom of all Israel under David and Solomon may have induced Jeroboam's chronicler to begin his record with the three formulas for David, Solomon and Jeroboam. The usual formula for the regnal years of the kings of Israel omits, in fact, only the words *wehayingim 'asher*. After omitting the Judaeans synchronism we have the same wording for all kings of Israel.

<sup>1)</sup> In the LXX the words "over all Israel" are missing.  
<sup>2)</sup> 1 Kings ii 11; xi 42; xiv 20; 2 Kings x 36.

... קלך א (בן ב) על ישראל ... שנה

or

וימלך א (בן ב) (על ישראל) ... שנה<sup>1)</sup>

For David, Solomon, Jeroboam and Jehu the formula reads:

והימים אשר קלך א (על ישראל) ... שנה

The extension "and the days that" at the end of their careers calls special attention to Jeroboam and Jehu, who had played outstanding parts in the history of Israel. Considering the author's views it is impossible to assume that he invented a special formula for these four kings, thus attributing similar importance to Jeroboam and to Jehu as to David and Solomon. David was the ideal king, whereas Jeroboam was considered the misleader of the people and the author's attitude towards Jehu is, at least, a critical one<sup>2)</sup>. These formulas can likewise not have been composed by the author.

A summary of the information contained in the Book of Kings gives but a vague picture of the history of Israel and of Judah from the division of the kingdom until their destruction. Many important political events are not even mentioned. On the other hand, the unbroken lines of the kings of both states form a surprising contrast with the author's fragmentary reports. Not a single king is left out, neither usurpers nor even Atalia, although, not being regarded a legitimate ruler, she has no formulas.

The enumeration of kings with the length of their reigns is, indeed, a characteristic of king-lists but not of chronicles. Keeping records of genealogies and of lines of kings was an ancient custom reaching far back until the dawn of history as is reflected by the mythological traditions which are included in the Sumerian King List. There are in the formulas of the Book of Kings some peculiar qualities of king-lists. The combination of the accession to the throne with the length of the king's reign before relating further details and even before the notice of his death is illogic and unusual in a chronicle. After all, the king's regnal years could not have been summed up before his death. In the Book of Kings details about the king's reign are always reported after the formula for the sum of his regnal years. No such illogic sequence has been discovered in other ancient

<sup>1)</sup> For Nadab 1 Kings xv 25b, for Ahab repeating his name 1 Kings xvi 29, for Ahaziah 1 Kings xxii 52, for Jehoram 2 Kings iii 1b and for Shallum xv 31.  
<sup>2)</sup> Compare 2 Kings x 31.

annals or chronicles, as far as we have been able to check up on <sup>1)</sup>.

The idea of king-lists having been kept continuously both in Judah and in Israel suggests itself by the unbroken lines of the kings and by the introductory formulas, which state the name of the king and the length of his reign in one sentence. With the summing up of his years his rule had, in fact, come to an end and he was supposed to be dead. But in the Book of Kings the report always makes a new start after closing the king's reign. The subsequent details bear a different character and seem to have been derived from another type of source, something like a chronicle or annals, written in the king's behalf, whereas the initial formulas with the length of the king's reign seem to have been copied from king-lists. If we assume a single source, from which the author took his dates, then, for no good reason, he must have anticipated the length of the king's reign, which cannot have been recorded before his death, going back afterwards to the details of his reign. Such a complicated and illogic procedure is an absurd assumption.

There is another remarkable fact, which supports our supposition, that the author of Kings drew the main part of his chronological framework from king-lists, especially the details from Israel. Most of the formulas for the reigns of the kings of Israel contain one part only <sup>2)</sup> both in the Massoretic Text and in the Septuagint Version, e.g. *In the third year of Asa king of Judah reigned Baasha the son of Abia over all Israel in Tirzah twenty and four years* (1 Kings xv 33). With the Judaean synchronisms at their beginning these formulas are illogic. The king acceded to the throne in a certain year of the neighbouring king, but he did not reign all his years during that one year, which is stated in the synchronism in the same verse <sup>3)</sup>. This lack of logic

<sup>1)</sup> In the *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings*, published by D. J. WISEMAN, London 1956, p. 68, lines 9, 10 (BM 21946) the years of Nabopolassar's reign are reported before his death, but the two lines form one context with Nabopolassar as subject in line 9: *XXI MU AN NA MEŠ Nabu-apal (eg)ur sarruut habili (KI) ešul ina (arab) abj unu VIII KAM šimate (MEŠ) = For 21 years Nabopolassar had been king of Babylon, on the 8th day of the month of Ab he died.* This is, in any case, the final entry for Nabopolassar and not the beginning.

<sup>2)</sup> 1 Kings xv 33, xvi 8, 15, 23; 2 Kings xiii 1, 10; xiv 23; xv 8, 17, 23, 27; xvii 1. In these verses, except for Zimri and Zacharia, who reigned less than one year, the Revised English Version adds a second *reigned* to the text, thus imitating the Judaean formulas in order to keep up the logic of the phrase.

<sup>3)</sup> The LXX brings no synchronism at all for Ela (1 Kings xvi 8) and for Zimri (xvi 15): *Καὶ ἦλθεν οὐδὲ Βασσακ ἐβραῖος ἐπιστὰς ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ δέξας τὴν ἐκτὴν ἐν θοροσά: καὶ ζῆσεν*

alone is sufficient to reveal the synchronisms as later additions <sup>1)</sup>. These formulas are quite unlike those for the kings of Judah and for five Israelite kings <sup>2)</sup>, in which the synchronism always belongs to the formula for the king's accession, whereas the length of his reign is stated in the second part with the verb *he reigned* repeated. Leaving aside the Judaean synchronism we have for most kings of Israel only a formula for the length of their reigns. The sum of his regnal years at the beginning of a king's record without any mention of his accession is impossible in a chronicle, and it makes a confused impression even in the Book of Kings, but it is in agreement with the nature of king-lists.

Supposing that the list of Israel's kings had started with David, Solomon and Jeroboam in that special formula *webayyāmim 'ašer malak A . . . šānāb*, which may have been used before by Solomon's scribes, we can imagine Nadab the son of Jeroboam securing his place in the king-list by stating his accession in the short phrase *we Nadab ben Jeroboam malak 'al Jisra'el* (1 Kings xv 25) <sup>3)</sup>. This entry was completed after his assassination by the brief formula for the length of his reign *wayyimlok 'al Jisra'el šenātāyim*. Besides Nadab there are four kings of Israel whose formulas begin with their names adding the Judaean synchronism afterwards, three of them are Ahab and his sons Ahaziah and Jehoram. Only these five kings of Israel have two parts of the initial formula, one for their accession and one for the length of their reigns. No reason whatsoever can be conceived why the author of our book should have made up special formulas for these five kings who were not regarded better than the rest, but worse as far as the House of Ahab is concerned.

<sup>1)</sup> Even those scholars who have argued that the synchronisms are original, do certainly not assume that the entries in the chronicles or other official records began with the name and the year of a foreign king. In contemporary records this is most unlikely, and even in later records no example of such a custom has been known so far. On this point see W. F. ALBRITTON, "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel", *BALYOR* No. 101, Dec. 1945, p. 18, 19.

<sup>2)</sup> Nadab (1 Kings xv 25), Ahab (xvi 29), Ahaziah the son of Ahab (1 Kings xxii 52), Jehoram the son of Ahab (2 Kings iii 1) and Shallum the son of Jabesh (2 Kings xv 13).

<sup>3)</sup> Classical Hebrew has no exact terms. The verb *malak* can have several different meanings. It can mean *he became king* or *he began to reign*, which is certainly intended in all formulas for the king's accession. But it can also signify *he was king, he ruled* or *he had reigned*. Its exact import can be understood only by the context. Therefore, its meaning of *he became king* in the phrase *malak 'al Jisra'el* can easily be changed into *he reigned* by the addition of the expression *wayyimlok*.

It stands to reason that the records of a king, whether annals or entries in a king-list, began with the king's name or with his regnal year, but not with the name and year of a neighbouring king, not even if they were on friendly terms. The parallel phrasing of all synchronisms for the kings of Judah and nearly all the kings of Israel and their place at the head of the formulas disclose a later hand, that attempted to bring all the kings of both states under a common frame. The basis for the synchronistic system were, in our opinion, a number of synchronisms *at the beginning* of formulas in Judaeon records—after which pattern the author formulated the rest—and a few synchronisms in the records of Israel from the time of the alliance between the House of Ahab and that of Jehoshaphat. The latter appear exclusively *at the end* of the formula for the king's accession. It may well be that these few Judaeon synchronisms were original entries in Israelite records. Our supposition is confirmed by the fact that the only Judaeon formula which brings the Israelite synchronism at the end is that for Jehoshaphat. It must be stressed again that the choice of an exceptional order in the formulas for Jehoshaphat, the praised king of Judah, and for the evil kings of the House of Ahab cannot be attributed to the author or the redactor. After the division of the kingdom, while the war was going on between the rival states in the attempt at a reunion, it is conceivable that the regnal years of the neighbouring king were recorded as synchronism of the king's accession<sup>1)</sup>. This is even more probable during the alliance between the Houses of Ahab and of Jehoshaphat. There may even have been some interchange of records or mutual agreement at this period, which may account for the acquaintance of Judaeon scribes with the early chronicles of Israel and for some parallels in their

<sup>1)</sup> The fact that the numbers contained in the framework, are based upon two opposite systems of reckoning, as explained by JENSEN, his a.m. book, p. 42, points to different sources. The regnal years, which are always counted from the actual beginning of the king's rule or even from his claim to power, seem to have been taken from sources written in the king's behalf. The synchronisms, which do not include years of coregency (perhaps with the one exception of 2 Kings i 17), may, on the other hand, have originated with the scribes of the neighbouring kingdom, who acknowledged only the official years of the other king. This would mean, that the Judaeon synchronisms were composed in Israel and the Israelite ones in Judah, as far as they were original. Some contradictory numbers may find their natural explanation, if they are understood as originating with the different royal courts. JENSEN's suggestion to attribute both principles of reckoning to the author of the synchronistic chronicle arouses the question

concluding formulas. In any case, the similarity of Jehoshaphat's formula alone of all Judaeon kings to those of Ahab and his sons can hardly be explained otherwise. Comparing the two groups of formulas for Israel's kings, it is important to notice, that those which bring the Judaeon synchronism at the head of the formula, contain the illogic statement, as if the king had ruled so many years during the one year of the neighbouring king, while the second group for the five kings only, which seems to be more authentic, adds the synchronism at the end of the formula for the king's accession and records the length of his reign in another short phrase.

The custom of registering the king's name in the king-list of Israel during his life-time may have been continued after Nadab. Since Baasha, the name of the capital, Tirzah or Samaria, was added to the formula, and after the king's death his entry was completed by the addition of his regnal years. It may be due to this custom that all regnal years appear at the end of the Israelite formula. By the addition of the number of years the entry for his accession was turned into a formula for the length of his reign owing to the various meanings of the verb *mālak*. This could not be done to the formulas for Nadab, for Ahab<sup>1)</sup> and his sons and for Shallum, which had the Judaeon synchronisms added. Therefore a short formula for the length of their reigns was added after their death. Jehu may not have cared to record his accession in the usual way after the rejected kings of the House of Ahab. His story (2 Kings ix 1-x 28, 30), presenting him as the chosen king who fulfilled the word of God, was obviously intended to justify his bloody rise to power. It may well have been a part of his annals<sup>2)</sup>. Having made no entry in the king-list he was given the same formula as David, Solomo and Jeroboam by his son and successor. This seems, in any case, a plausible explanation for the different formulas of the kings of Israel.

We have stressed the identical wording of all synchronisms at

<sup>1)</sup> In 1 Kings xvi 29 the LXX reads ἐν ἔτει δευτέρῳ τοῦ Ἰωσαφάτ at the beginning of the formula, which corresponds to the usual synchronism. This seems to be a later correction to solve the difficulty in chronology. Twelve years were counted from Omri's accession.

<sup>2)</sup> Jehu's story is generally understood as a prophetic tale. But it is, in fact, governed by the cruel and cynic figure of Jehu alone. In its boasting tone it shows some affinities with the annals of the Assyrian kings, although there are essential differences. Cf. S. MOWISEL, "Die vord-rasitischen Königs- und Fürstenschriften", *Einheitslexikon, Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten*

the beginning of the formulas for both the kings of Israel and of Judah: מלך... מלך... ל-ג בן ד מלך... בשנת. Until this point all synchronisms are alike. But the continuation shows a constant difference between the kings of Israel and those of Judah. After the name of the king the Israelite formula goes on *over Israel ... years*, while the Judean formula adds nothing but *king of Judah*. The different endings of the synchronistic formulas may provide a key to the original entries in the king-lists. Taking these endings alone the list of Judah's kings seems to have begun with the king's name and title for his accession, stating his age and then the length of his reign, whereas the list of Israel's kings probably contained only one statement for the length of the king's reign, with the exception of the five kings whom we mentioned above. The king-list of Judah may then have read:

*A ben B meleḳ Yehudah. Ben ... šānāh A bemolkō  
we ... šānāh mālak bi-yrušālāim.*

and that of Israel:

*A ben B mālak 'al yisrā'el (be ...) ... šānāh.*

The double formula with the Judean synchronism may have read:

*A ben B mālak 'al yisrā'el (be ...) ... šānāh  
bišnat ... (šānāh) le C meleḳ Yehudah  
wayyirrok ... šānāh.*

From the many variations in the scheme of the first kings, both of Israel and of Judah, it may be concluded that no fixed system had been arrived at until after several generations. All formulas need time to be developed. Had the whole scheme been invented by the redactor, he would have started his fixed formulas with the first kings. The deviations may serve as indications that the formulas reflect the actual development of the recording methods at the royal courts of Israel and of Judah.

The framework of the Book of Kings with its obvious offence against the chronological order of events finds its natural explanation, if we suppose that king-lists were the first sources of the author, from which he copied the name of the king and the length of his rule, adding afterwards details from chronicles or other sources.

We find a simple pattern of a king-list in Genesis xxxvi 31-43, which is now regarded by nearly all scholars as an ancient document<sup>1)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> See on this subject TH. G. VERZSEN, "Exodusstudien", 17, XVII, Jahrgang 1873, 3, 60; and E. R. BARCLAY, "The Edomite Kinglist" of Gen.

It proves in any case that king-lists were known in Israel since early times, and it seems natural that both Israel and Judah kept such lists after their separation.

The list of the kings of Edom in Gen. xxxvi gives the name of the ruling king, his city and the name of his successor without stating the length of the king's reign. Its formula is simple:

And there reigned in ... A the son of B  
and the name of his city ....  
Then died <sup>1)</sup> A and there reigned in his stead  
C the son of D from ....

The end of this formula *and there reigned C in his stead* forms the conclusion for all kings of Israel and of Judah in the Book of Kings. Whenever the successor was a usurper the addition *his son* is, of course, omitted and replaced by *and he killed him and reigned in his stead*. The complete second part of the formula *and he died and there reigned C (his son) in his stead* is used five times in the Book of Kings<sup>2)</sup> within chronistic reports or prophetic tales but never within the framework of the book. Twice it appears with foreign rulers, with Ben-Hadad and Hazael of Syria (2 Kings viii 15, xiii 24). Two of the kings were murdered, Ben-Hadad and Jehoash king of Judah (2 Kings xii 22). Tibni (1 Kings xvi 22) was not regarded a legitimate ruler of Israel and Ahazia the son of Ahab died of an accident (2 Kings i 17). We can trace the development of this scheme in Israel because it is used in variations in the Book of Judges (xii 7-15) with the addition of the length of the judge's rule, and once in 2 Sam. x 1 for Nabash the king of Ammon.

The exclusive use of this formula in the Book of Kings for foreign rulers and for those who did not die peacefully cannot be accidental. It is as if its foreign origin had still clung to it. In any case, it does not seem to have been used in the king-lists nor in the chronicles of Israel or of Judah for the regular close of a king's reign. The concluding formula in our book uses *wayyirrok 'im 'alōtām* instead of *wayyamot*. This phrase appears for the first time as a fixed formula with David (1 Kings ii 9) and with Solomon (1 Kings xi 43). It is used in

<sup>1)</sup> In the Babylonian Chronicle published by E. DELATZSCH in *Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Leipzig 1907, the verb *mātu* = *to die*, which parallels the Hebrew *mut*, is used several times in the concluding formulas.

<sup>2)</sup> 1 Kings xvi 22, 2 Kings i 17, viii 15, xii 22, xiii 24.



our book for all kings of Israel and of Judah who were not murdered or did not die of another unnatural cause.

Only a few remarks shall be made here about the concluding formula *wayyiskab A'im 'abôtāw wayyiqqābēr be . . . wayyimloq B benō tabtāw*, which has some extensions for the Judæan kings. The almost identical wording for all kings of both states again arouses the impression as if the formula had been composed by the author. But again we find surprising deviations after comparing the formulas for the different kings. Some of the worst kings like Omri, Ahab, Jehoram of Judah, who walked in the ways of the House of Ahab, and Ahaz have the complete formula for the close of their reigns, which seems to stress their royal dignity, whereas Hezekiah<sup>1)</sup> and Josiah for instance, who were highly esteemed by the author, have only short concluding notices. These differences stand in surprising contrast to the author's estimation of the kings. It is evident that the final entry in the chronicle for the deceased king, which reported his death and burial, was made by his successor. This fact may explain the missing report of any burial of those kings who were murdered by usurpers, whereas the burial of murdered Judæan kings, who were never succeeded by usurpers, is always recorded, even of Ahaziah, who was killed by Jehu together with Joram of Israel, although Ataliah was ruling at the time. Jehu does not seem to have had Joram's burial recorded nor any conclusion of his reign, which suits his attitude very well. The closing formula of a king's reign is, obviously, not based on the author's appreciation but on the inclination of the king's successor. Thus the brief note of Hezekiah's death without mentioning his burial may be due to those who reigned for Manasseh, still a boy then of twelve years. Those who exercised power until Manasseh was grown up and influenced him against the political and religious trend of his father, may have been ministers of Ahaz' time, who had been removed by Hezekiah owing to their inclination towards Assyria, and after his death had regained influence.

It is a curious fact that after Hezekiah's death no Judæan king is said to have been *buried with his fathers*. The last Judæan king, reported to have been buried with his fathers, is Ahaz, one of the worst kings of Judah, who went in the ways of the kings of Israel. His concluding

<sup>1)</sup> Two manuscripts of the LXX have the addition *καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν πόλει Δαυὶδ*, Kings xv 21, which seems to be a supplement according to the regular of the formula. The words are missing in A and in B.

formula is certainly not due to the author's preference of Ahaz, but to Hezekiah honouring his father. All the later kings<sup>1)</sup>, even the pious Josiah, are said to have been buried *in their burial place*, not *with their fathers*. Manasseh and Ammon (2 Kings xxi 18, 26) were buried in the garden of their palace, the garden of Uzzah. Manasseh seems to have introduced a change in the traditional custom of the royal burial place. If, therefore, it is evident that the formulas reflect concrete changes in the kingdoms of Israel and of Judah, then they must be contemporary creations and not later constructions.

The assumption of some scholars that the author of the Book of Kings had no written records from Israel before him, but reconstructed the details about Israel on the ground of Judæan reports, is refuted by the different systems of formulas and by the individual divergencies, which are neither in keeping with the Judæan point of view nor with the author's opinion. To conclude our argument we are summing up the following points:

Comparing the reports in the Book of Kings concerning Israel and Judah several peculiar qualities draw a line of division between the records of the two kingdoms.

The introductory and concluding formulas, which are the main part of the framework of the Book of Kings, were not composed by its author or redactor but were taken from Israelite and Judæan records. The consequent difference between the two systems provides a decisive proof of their having been derived from different sources from the two kingdoms.

The combination of the king's accession with the sum of his regnal years in one formula is a characteristic of king-lists but not of chronicles or annals. The unbroken lines of the kings of both states enumerating the names of the kings and the length of their reigns in a different formula for each state allows the conclusion that complete king-lists from Israel and from Judah were at the disposal of the author of the book.

In Israel annalistic formulas from the time of the judges were taken up and used in the official records, while Judæan scribes continued the scheme that had been used for Saul and David.

The concluding formulas for the kings' reigns with their striking

<sup>1)</sup> Of Jehoiaquin no burial is recorded. Only LUCIAN brings a parallel to xxi 18, 26 *καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν κήποι Οὐζᾶ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ*. Cf. B. ALFRINK, "L'Expression אבותיו עם אבותיו", O.T.S. II, 1943, pp. 106-118 and "L'Expression אבותיו עם אבותיו", O.T.S. V, 1948, pp. 118-131.

preference of evil kings and their changes in details seem likewise to have been taken from the sources.

A close analysis of the formulas and a comparison of the schemes permit the attribution of greater parts of the Book of Kings to its sources than has been considered so far.

## THE ANIMAL SERIES IN THE PRIMEVAL HISTORY

BY

W. M. CLARK

Princeton

### I

In the enumeration of the creatures over which man is to rule in Gen. i 28, the MT is sometimes emended by the addition of *ibabbe-bēmā*<sup>1)</sup>. This emendation is based on the LXX and Syriac as well as on the occurrence of "cattle" in v. 26 MT. The assumption is that the phrase has fallen out through scribal error. This plausible suggestion is not to be accepted uncritically. The MT is supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch (VON GALL) and by the Targum (SPERBER). v. 26 is itself assumed to be corrupt and "beast" is added to it so as to read "over all the beasts of the earth"<sup>2)</sup>. However, a close look at the LXX shows that: 1) the LXX does not add *hayyā* in v. 26; 2) as the LXX in v. 28 adds "all the cattle and all the earth", it is questionable procedure to accept only part of the LXX reading; 3) the LXX "translates" *hayyā* of v. 28 by ἐπιτετόν instead of the normal θηρίων<sup>3)</sup>, making the animal series of v. 26 and v. 28 almost identical to one another. The procedure of the LXX in these two verses is clear. v. 26 LXX = v. 26 MT. v. 28 LXX adds two prepositional phrases from v. 26 and "translates" *hayyā* by "creeping thing" so as to harmonize the verses with one another<sup>4)</sup>. The LXX instead of supporting the proposed emendation is based on the current MT.

<sup>1)</sup> E.g., PROCKSCH; *Biblia Hebraica*<sup>3</sup> (KITTEL). Standard Genesis commentaries are cited by author's name. Many reject the emendation but I know of no thorough study of the matter. *b hēmā* is normally translated in this paper as "cattle", *hayyā* as "beast", and *remē* and *šere* are both translated as "reptiles". On the meaning of *šer* and *remē*, cf. W. H. SCHMIDT, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift* (Neukirchen, 1964), hereafter referred to as SCHMIDT, pp. 123, 125 f.; and K. ELLIGER, *Leviticus* (Tübingen, 1966), pp. 151, 154.

<sup>2)</sup> So most commentators, e.g., DRIVER, SPEISER, DELITZSCH, SKINNER, DILLMANN, PROCKSCH, SCHMIDT (p. 127, fn. 2).

<sup>3)</sup> ἐπιτετόν translates *hayyā* only here in the LXX according to HATCH and REBRATCH, *Concordance to the Septuagint*. ἐπιτετόν and its verbal equivalent normally translates forms of *remē* and *šer*.

<sup>4)</sup> v. 26 LXX: "fish of the sea and birds of heaven and cattle and all the earth and all the creeping things (ἐπιτετόν) which creep upon the earth" v. 28 LXX: