

**The Coup of Jehoiada and the Fall of Athaliah: The Discourses and  
Textual Production of 2 Kings 11**

**By  
Clayton Hale Bench**

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**Department of Religious Studies  
University of Alberta**

## **Abstract**

The general purpose of this study is to explore the discourses that guided and constrained the textual production and reproduction of 2 Kings 11, the report of Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution. The specific aim of this study is to determine how and why Athaliah's execution was not incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History the same way that other Ahabite death reports were incorporated into it. In 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10, there is a fairly consistent literary framework composed of prophetic oracles against Israelite kings, conspiracy/coup reports, and oracle fulfillment reports. However, in 2 Kings 11, Athaliah's execution is not reported along with an oracle fulfillment report as was the case with other Ahabite death reports. Approaching 2 Kings 11 from a discourse critical perspective shows that the Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution were not initially a part of the Deuteronomistic History; rather, 2 Kings 11 was initially produced as a basic coup report. As can be seen from an analysis of the interdiscursivity and intertextuality of 2 Kings 11, once this text was finally incorporated into the deuteronomist's historical framework, 2 Kings 11 was successively redacted and reproduced in Late Monarchic Judah and Persian Period Yehud. The discourses that guided and constrained this process of production and reproduction were concerned with Joash's dynastic legitimacy and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem-centered Yahweh cult. As a result, Athaliah's Israelite heritage and her short period of rule in Jerusalem had to be delegitimized. Those producing and reproducing the text within this discursive framework attempted to mystify Athaliah's genealogy. They also reported her reign outside of the normal formulaic regnal structure so as to skip and delegitimize her reign. In doing so, the connection between Ahaziah and his son, Joash, was strengthened creating a sense of continuity between the two, an important element of Davidic royal ideology. This study shows that the discourses that influenced the production and reproduction of 2 Kings 11

were Judahite-centered discourses concerned with retelling Judah's history within an oracular framework. Nathan's oracle to David (2 Samuel 7) and the prophetic oracles against Israelite kings in 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10 played a central role in determining how Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution would be reported as compared to other coups and death reports in 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10.

## **Dedication**

*For my Mother, Martha Mary Hale  
For my Father, Leslie Edwin Bench*

## **Acknowledgments**

Writing a Ph.D. dissertation is an incredibly time consuming task. While devoting myself to research, writing, and teaching, I have received guidance, instruction, and support from many different people. I am extremely grateful and indebted to my supervisor, Dr Felice Lifshitz, who graciously offered her support throughout the writing of this dissertation. I am also indebted to Dr. Ehud Ben Zvi, Janey Kennedy, and Barb Heagle who arranged for me to spend the first year of my Ph.D. studying at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich Germany. I am also grateful to the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies/Religious studies at the University of Alberta for providing assistantships and teaching opportunities throughout my stay in Alberta, these provisions were an essential element of my studies and growth. The departmental administrators were exceptionally helpful and offered their support through several challenging situations. For this I am extremely grateful. I would also like to thank the other members of my supervisory committee, Dr David R. Seely and Dr Willi Braun. I would like to thank David Seely for agreeing to guide the dissertation's specialization in the study of the Hebrew Bible. I would like to thank Will Braun for his guidance in matters of theory and method. Many of the theorists that Willi introduced to me have had a profound impact on the direction of my research. I would also like to thank Dr. Andrew Gow for his support and guidance during my time at the University of Alberta. Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Nolene, and my children, Amelia, Emmett, and Keene, for patiently supporting and encouraging me throughout my studies. You are precious to me.

# Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgments.....	v
Contents.....	vi
List of Figures and Illustrations.....	ix
Abbreviations.....	x
Chapter 1: The Challenges of 2 Kings 11 and Some Answers through Critical Discourse Analysis.....	1
Introduction: 2 Kings 11 – An Enigma and a Crux.....	1
Discourse Analysis.....	3
Doing Discourse Analysis.....	7
Discourse Practice: Intertextuality.....	8
Discourse Practice: Interdiscursivity.....	9
Textual Analysis.....	9
Social Practice.....	10
Challenges/Conclusions.....	11
Discourse Analysis and 2 Kings 11.....	12
Chapter 2: Review of Literature.....	14
Introduction.....	14
The Two Source Theory.....	15
Wellhausen on 2 Kings 11:6 – Treballe-Barrera on 2 Kings 11:9-10.....	19
Form Critical Issues.....	30
Genre Critical Issues: 2 Kings 11 as Saga, Historical Narrative or Historiography.....	35
2 Kings 11 as Propaganda.....	36
Redaction Critical Issues.....	41
Recent Redaction Critical Analyses.....	44
Gender Critical Issues.....	47
Historical Issues.....	51
Hypotheses about Royal Inscriptions and the Coup of Jehoiada/Enthronement of Joash.....	53
External Sources that Have Implications for Understanding the Oracle Traditions Associated with Ahabites.....	56

The Kurkh Monolith: An Inscription of Shalmaneser III, 853-845 BCE .....	56
The Tel Dan Inscription/Stele of Hazael.....	60
Conclusion: The Relationship Between Historical Analyses and the Consensus View in Literary Analyses .....	66
Source Critical Conclusions .....	67
Discursive Tension: Palace and Temple .....	68
Discursive Tension: Verbal Disagreement .....	69
Discursive Tension: The Necessity for Explicitly Davidic Symbols .....	70
Chapter 3: The Interdiscursive Nature of 2 Kings 11 and its Effect on Perceptions about Athaliah .....	78
The Genre of 2 Kings 11 .....	80
Other Genres Significant for Understanding 2 Kings 11 .....	83
Activity Types, Styles, and Rhetoric in 2 Kings 11 .....	84
The Innovations of 2 Kings 11 in Comparison with other Military Palace Coup Reports .....	88
Interdiscursivity, Intertextuality, Textual Production, and 2 Kings 11.....	94
Technique, Perspective and Coup Reports .....	95
Coup d’Etat in the Hebrew Bible.....	101
Chapter 4: Textual Analysis, Constitution of Identity and Worldview in 2 Kings 11 .....	108
The Control of Communicative Events in 2 Kings 11 .....	110
Textual Cohesion and 2 Kings 11 – Elaboration, Extension, and Enhancement.....	111
Cohesive Clausal Functions (Elaboration, Extension, and Enhancement), Explicit Cohesive Markers (reference, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion), and the Rhetorical Modes of 2 Kings 11 (Fairclough, 176) .....	113
Bourdieu, the Rules of Politeness, and 2 Kings 11 .....	113
Ethos, Social Identity, and 2 Kings 11 .....	115
Dimensions of Clausal Grammar: Transitivity, Theme, and Modality .....	116
2 Kings 11 and Modality: Auxiliary Constructions, Verbal Tense, and Adverbial Constructions .....	118
Key Words and their Meaning in 2 Kings 11 .....	119
Wording, Interpretation, and Ideological Bias in 2 Kings 11 .....	120
Conclusion.....	124
Chapter 5: Manifest Intertextuality and 2 Kings 11.....	126
Introduction .....	126
Summary of Manifest Intertextuality in 2 Kings 11 .....	128

Authoritative objects in 2 Kings 11 and Manifest Intertextuality: The Spears and Shields belonging to David .....	129
On Genealogy.....	140
Genealogical Statements about Athaliah: Marginalizing, Splitting, or Pruning?.....	141
Genealogical Statements about Joash .....	151
Oracle and Promise: The Oracle of Nathan and its Discursive Role in the Genealogies of Joash and Athaliah .....	159
Oracle and Conspiracy: The Oracle Traditions of Ahijah, Jehu son of Hanani, Elijah, Micaiah, and Elisha .....	164
Conspiracy and Covenant .....	173
Conclusion.....	175
Chapter 6: Conclusion .....	181
Bibliography .....	186
Appendices.....	196
Appendix A: Kaige, Lucian, r/700, 2 Chr 22:10-23:21 .....	196
Appendix B: MSS borc2e2/Rahlfs no. 19, 82, 700, 127, 93.....	202



## List of Figures and Illustrations

<i>Table 1 - The Lucianic Recension of 2 Kgs 11:5-12</i> .....	27
<i>Table 2 - Transcription and Translation of the Tel Dan Inscription</i> .....	61
<i>Table 3 - Explicit Genealogical Statements about Athaliah</i> .....	145
<i>Table 4 - Implicit Genealogical Statements about Athaliah</i> .....	146
<i>Table 5 - The Tearing Motif in the Oracles against Saul and Solomon</i> .....	160
<i>Table 6 - Ancestral Inheritance versus Vineyard in 1 Kgs 21:3, 4, and 6</i> .....	168

## Abbreviations

- AASF Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae*  
*AASOR Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*  
*AB Anchor Bible*  
*ABD Anchor Bible Dictionary. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992*  
*AfO Archiv für Orientforschung*  
*AfOB Archiv für Orientforschung: Beiheft*  
*AHw Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. W. von Soden. 3 vols. Wiesbaden, 1965–1981*  
*ANESTP The Ancient Near East: Supplementary Texts and Pictures Relating to the Old Testament. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. Princeton, 1969.*  
*ANET Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. 3d ed. Princeton, 1969*  
*ARI Assyrian Royal Inscriptions. A. K. Grayson. 2 vols. RANE. Wiesbaden, 1972–1976*  
*ASOR American Schools of Oriental Research*  
*ATANT Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments (AThANT?)*  
*BASOR Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*  
*BASORSup Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research: Supplement Series*  
*BDB Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford, 1907*  
*BETL Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium*  
*BHS Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1983*  
*BibS(F) Biblische Studien (Freiburg, 1895–)*  
*BibS(N) Biblische Studien (Neukirchen, 1951–)*  
*BIES Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society (= Yediot)*  
*BN Biblische Notizen*  
*BZAW Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*  
*CAD The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago, 1956–*  
*CahRB Cahiers de la Revue biblique*  
*CAL Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of religion. Cincinnati.*  
*CANE Civilizations of the Ancient Near East. Edited by J. Sasson. 4 vols. New York, 1995*  
*CBC Cambridge Bible Commentary*  
*CBQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly*  
*CBQMS Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series*  
*CC Continental Commentaries*  
*COS The Context of Scripture. Edited by W. W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden, 1997–*  
*DJD Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*  
*EstBib Estudios bíblicos*  
*FAT Forschungen zum Alten Testament*  
*FOTL Forms of the Old Testament Literature*  
*FRLANT Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*  
*GBS Guides to Biblical Scholarship*  
*HAL Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Fascicles 1–5, 1967–1995 (KBL3). ET: HALOT*

*HALOT* Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994–1999  
*HKAT* Handkommentar zum Alten Testament  
*HRCS* Hatch, E. and H. A. Redpath. *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1897. Suppl., 1906. Reprint, 3 vols. in 2, Grand Rapids, 1983  
*HSM* Harvard Semitic Monographs  
*ICC* International Critical Commentary  
*IDB* *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, 1962  
*IDBSup* *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville, 1976  
*IEJ* *Israel Exploration Journal*  
*Int* *Interpretation*  
*JBL* *Journal of Biblical Literature*  
*JBQ* *Jewish Bible Quarterly*  
*JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*  
*JNSL* *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*  
*Joüon* Joüon, P. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. *Subsidia biblica* 14/1 2. Rome, 1991  
*JQRMS* *Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series*  
*JSOT* *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*  
*JSOTSup* *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series*  
*LexSyr* *Lexicon syriacum*. C. Brockelmann. 2d ed. Halle, 1928  
*LSJ* Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996  
*Mandl* Mandelkern, S. *Veteris Testamenti concordantiae hebraicae atque chaldaicae, etc.* Reprint, 1925. 2d ed. Jerusalem, 1967  
*NAWG* *Nachrichten (von) der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*  
*NCB* *New Century Bible*  
*NIBCOT* *New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*  
*NICOT* *New International Commentary on the Old Testament*  
*OBC* *Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by J. Barton and Muddiman  
*OTG* *Old Testament Guides*  
*OTL* *Old Testament Library*  
*P AM PHILOS SOC* *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*  
*RIM* *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project*. Toronto  
*RIMA* *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods*  
*RIMB* *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Babylonian Periods*  
*RIME* *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods*  
*RIMS* *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Supplements*  
*SBL* *Society of Biblical Literature*  
*SBLRBS* *Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study*  
*SBS* *Stuttgarter Bibelstudien*  
*ScrHier* *Scripta hierosolymitana*  
*SJOT* *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*

*TA* Tel Aviv

*TDOT* *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 8 vols. Grand Rapids, 1974–

*THAT* *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Edited by E. Jenni, with assistance from C. Westermann. 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1971–1976

*ThWAT* *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart, 1970–

*TUAT* *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments*. Edited by Otto Kaiser. Gütersloh, 1984–

*VIATOR-MEDIEV RENAISS* *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*

*VL* *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. Edited by E. Beuron, 1949–

*VT* *Vetus Testamentum*

*VTSup* *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*

*VTSup* *Vetus Testamentum Supplements*

*ZAW* *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

*ZDPV* *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*

## **Chapter 1: The Challenges of 2 Kings 11 and Some Answers through Critical Discourse Analysis**

### *Introduction: 2 Kings 11 – An Enigma and a Crux*

Ever since I began to familiarize myself with the peculiarities of 2 Kings 11, I have been constantly perplexed concerning its function in the narrative of the Books of Kings. 2 Kings 11 is both an enigma and a crux in the narrative. On a purely contextual level, 2 Kings 11 is a transitional point in the history of the divided monarchy. Though the narrative of Jehu's coup in 2 Kings 9-10 describes the fall of the house of Ahab in the kingdom of Israel, 2 Kings 11 describes the execution of the last Ahabite, Athaliah, Ahab's daughter who had been married to Jehoram, king of Judah, in what appears to be a diplomatic marriage meant to solidify political relations between Israel and Judah in the mid 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE. 2 Kings 11 is a crux because, at least in its final form, Athaliah's attempt to annihilate the house of David almost succeeded. Though many scholars (including myself) question the historicity of Athaliah's attempt to murder all Davidide heirs to the throne, the narratological aim of 2 Kings 11 is clear. In the face of near annihilation, Yahweh's promise to David and his posterity (2 Sam 7) had not been forgotten and through the actions of both royal and cultic personnel, Joash, the only living Davidide, was saved from the massacre and eventually enthroned and guided by the priest Jehoiada.

Though it appears to be an important part of the deuteronomistic (dtr) theological and political framework that links Josiah to several important Judahite kings and ultimately to David himself, 2 Kings 11 is also different from its literary context in several important ways. For example, 2 Kings 11 breaks from the standard way of reporting Judahite royal succession in that it lacks standard regnal formulae for the reign of Athaliah. Furthermore, 2 Kings 11 also breaks from the standard dtr technique of reporting oracles and their fulfillment in conjunction with

royal succession (especially in connection with the Ahabites).<sup>1</sup> This is significant because 2 Kings 11, though it breaks with common literary devices used elsewhere in the 1-2 Kings, is a parallel account of the report of Jehu's coup (2 Kgs 9-10), the event that was also a catalyst in the Athaliah narrative (the report of Ahaziah's death at the hand of Jehu was to be understood as contemporary with the rise of Athaliah).<sup>2</sup> In light of the many similarities between 2 Kings 11 and 2 Kings 9-10, one wonders why the central themes of oracle and oracle fulfillment report do not find their way into the narrative of Athaliah's fall; after all, she is an Ahabite and her death comes at the tail end of 2 Kings 9-10 the report(s) of the fulfillment of Elijah's oracle against the house of Ahab. Exploring this central question will be the pervasive theme of this dissertation.

To come to some conclusions about the above question, this analysis will take into consideration the interdiscursive nature of 2 Kings 11 with other coup reports generally as well as other coup reports in the Hebrew Bible (particularly, the coup of Jehu in 2 Kings 9-10) and also the intertextual nature of 2 Kings 11 that shows strong links to both the oracle of promise delivered from Nathan to David in 2 Samuel 7 as well as a sequence of curse oracles delivered to Israelite kings beginning with Jeroboam and climaxing with the oracles of Elijah against Ahab (1 Kgs 21; 2 Kgs 9-10). These analyses will clearly show why the coup of Jehoiada and the accession of Joash are not explicitly legitimated by a prophetic oracle and the fall of Athaliah is not explicitly associated with the oracle of Elijah (or its explicit fulfillment). In their most basic forms, the reasons for the not associating 2 Kings 11 with the Elijah oracle tradition are due to a

---

<sup>1</sup> During the period of the Divided Monarchy, the regnal reports of the kings of Judah included the following: 1) regnal introduction stating the name of the contemporary Israelite king and the year of his reign followed by the name of the Judahite king and, most often, the name of his father; 2) the age of the Judahite king, the length of his reign, and the name of his mother along with her father's name or her origin; 3) a report or citation of the source from which the information was supposedly taken given as a rhetorical question, e.g., "All the acts of <PN>, are they not given in <source>?"; 4) finally, a death that most often (see Manasseh) states that the king was buried with his ancestors followed by the name of the son (usually the eldest) that had been chosen to succeed him.

<sup>2</sup> L. Barré, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion. The Narrative Artistry and Political Intentions of 2 Kings 9-11*, (CBQMS 17, 1988); Barré argued that the two accounts are literarily parallel.

particular Judahite perspective about the role of prophets in Judahite versus Israelite societies and the need to construct a legitimate genealogical link between Joash and a legitimate Davidic ruler (Ahaziah) without any interrupting illegitimate rulers (e.g., Athaliah). As regards the first reason, in Judah, prophets were most often understood as delegitimizing figures that appear to warn kings and people during times of wickedness. In Judah, the presence of a righteous priest somehow trumped the need for prophets. A good example of this is found in the story of Jehoiada's son Zechariah in 2 Chr 24:15-20 wherein Zechariah the priest, due to growing wickedness in Judah, becomes a prophet of warning to the king and the elites when they no longer follow the priests. In other words, in Judah righteousness was present when the elites followed the counsel of a legitimate priest. When they did not, Yahweh sent prophets to correct the corruption. As regards the second reason (above), Judahite historiographical practices followed certain rules of text production. Genres like regnal formulae were produced or reproduced in modified form to indicate whether a king or queen was a legitimate ruler. As will be shown throughout this dissertation, the discursive frameworks of the communities that produced and consumed 2 Kings 11 guided and constrained its production in ways that intentionally distanced the execution of Athaliah from the fulfillment of Elijah's oracle as carried out during Jehu's revolt. The modification of standard regnal formulae was meant to argue that she was not a true Judahite ruler so as to give the impression that there was no interruption between the rule of Ahaziah and Joash (see 2 Sam 7).<sup>3</sup>

### *Discourse Analysis*

As with the terms religion, ideology or culture, the meaning of the term discourse is often ambiguous. To compound the problem, no two scholars define the term in the same way. As stated above, discourses are the sets of rules (social norms) that guide and constrain

---

<sup>3</sup> N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, (Cambridge: Polity, 2006), 62-100.

communication (verbal or textual).<sup>4</sup> Though this definition of discourse is useful for this project, it certainly glosses over the complexity of discourse as well as the role some key theorists like A. Gramsci, L. Althusser, M. Foucault, M. Bakhtin and more recently N. Fairclough have had in shaping my understanding of how discourse, language, and social practices are intertwined.

Though the term *discourse* had been used prior to M. Foucault's contributions, mainly in linguistics and rhetoric, Foucault was the main disseminator of current social scientific perspectives on discourse and Discourse Analysis.<sup>5</sup> Foucault was influenced by structuralist thinkers (though he later distanced himself from structuralism), Marxist revisionists such as L. Althusser, and the existentialist/nihilist Nietzsche (Foucault, after having read Nietzsche, declared the experience a revelation).<sup>6</sup> Foucault's theories about the relationships between discourse and knowledge, knowledge and power, and discursive formations and social practices are often the basis of, or are at least used in serious conversation with, all that is currently being done in discourse studies.

For Foucault, discourse is "the group of statements that belong to a single system of formation [of knowledge]."<sup>7</sup> By analyzing the field of statements (Fr. *énoncés*) as verbal performances or by means of "a logical analysis of propositions, a grammatical analysis of sentences, a psychological or contextual analysis of formulations" Foucault aimed to delineate

---

<sup>4</sup> M. Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed; London: Routledge, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> "Discourse' itself was originally a technical term in linguistics and rhetoric, meaning a reasoned argument, but in some usages it has now come to mean something equivalent to 'world view'. Foucault readily admits in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* that his own use of the term was somewhat equivocal and that he had used and abused it in a multitude of ways (AK: 107). In the most general sense, he uses it to mean 'a certain "way of speaking"' (AK: 193). He also uses it to define 'the group of statements that belong to a single system of formation [of knowledge]', for example 'clinical discourse, economic discourse, the discourse of natural history, psychiatric discourse'" (AK: 107– 8). (C. O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault*, [London, GBR: Sage Publications, 2005], 78; M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, [New York: Pantheon, 1972], 107-108, 193; see also N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 37; *Language and Power*, [New York: Longman], viii-x, 24-27).

<sup>6</sup> H. Sluqa, "Foucault's Encounter with Heidegger and Nietzsche," in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, (ed. Gary Gutting, Cambridge: Cambridge, 2006), 210-239.

<sup>7</sup> M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 107-110; see also C. O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault*, 78.



“rules of [discursive] formation.”<sup>8</sup> Foucault argued that discursive formations (how objects, enunciative modalities, subject positions, concepts, and strategies are constituted) reflect the discursive practices within institutions and social groups. Furthermore, Foucault developed the term *orders of discourse* as a way of analyzing the ways that discursive formations (and as a result, discursive practices) are organized in relation to one another.

Within the field of statements that belong to a given system of knowledge, Foucault argues that “there can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others.”<sup>9</sup> Fairclough notes that Foucault’s position here “is reminiscent of writings on genre and dialogism by Bakhtin (1981, 1986), which Kristeva introduced to western audiences with the concept of intertextuality.”<sup>10</sup> Foucault argued that intertextual relationships (i.e., formation of concepts) like forms of *succession* (ordering of enunciative series, types of dependence), forms of *coexistence*, and *procedures of intervention* are important tools for understanding discursive formation.<sup>11</sup> Though there is not space here to address each of these as they relate to discourse, it is sufficient to note that they highlight the importance of intertextuality within Foucault’s *Discourse Analysis*.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 31-39, 107-108; see also Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 40.

<sup>9</sup> M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 98.

<sup>10</sup> M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, (ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981); *ibid.*, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, (ed. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, trans V.W. McGee, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986); J. Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” in *The Kristeva Reader*, (ed. T. Moi, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 34-61.

<sup>11</sup> M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 56-59.

<sup>12</sup> The following concepts and vocabulary are common in current discourse studies: discourse, discourse analysis, discursive, discursive formation, discursive practice, statements or enonces, enunciation, system of knowledge, framework of knowledge, coexistence/intertextuality, interdiscursivity, ideology, archaeology (of discursive formation), genealogy (of discursive formation), series/succession (of concepts and statements). Furthermore, Foucault was influenced by a number of preceding and contemporary social theorists whose work can be seen, some less than others, in Foucault’s now famous theoretical treatise, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. The influence of L. Althusser (and as a result, Gramsci and Marx), M. Bakhtin and J. Kristeva can be seen in certain positions taken by Foucault. Earlier theorists, such as Gramsci and Althusser, had already identified important social tendencies that would later play central roles in social theory and Discourse Analysis. For example, Gramsci’s insights on hegemony and Althusser’s conceptions about ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses/Repressive State Apparatuses are now important topics of research within discourse studies generally. Such terms, though not strictly

According to Norman Fairclough discourse is indicative of social change. In his approach to discourse, Fairclough focused in on Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in ways that highlighted the fractures in texts, concepts, ideologies, and complex (in the Gramscian sense) ideological interactions. Fractures are the places where contradiction, overlap, and manipulations of texts, concepts, and ideologies accumulate. Fractures reflect the ways that normalizations and institutionalizations are challenged both in time and through time. As a result, (for Fairclough) discourse analysis is also historically oriented since such fractures are indications that discourses and ideologies change. Discourse analysis examines the effects of discourse and how it interacts, constitutes, competes and reproduces discourse. At the same time, this analysis acknowledges that discourse changes over time, providing a tool for the analyst that is useful for the analysis of discursive change and social change.

For Fairclough, discourse analysis must necessarily take into account ideological complexity. As a result, Fairclough relied on Gramsci's argument that various ideologies conflict, overlap, and intersect in the process of subjectification (Althusser's *interpellation*).<sup>13</sup> As a result, discourse analysis tends to avoid focusing on singular, isolated instances of discourse, but rather aims to consider the whole spectrum of interdiscursive interactions (related to Gramsci's *ideological complex*) and how these interactions generate power relations, marginalization, and especially social change.<sup>14</sup> This is significant for an analysis of 2 Kings 11 because it is clear that conceptions about who Athaliah was were constantly shifting as the text was produced and reproduced successively over time. For example, Athaliah was not initially

---

associated with Discourse Analysis since they predate its emergence, are nevertheless core components of any study of discourse.

<sup>13</sup> L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, (trans. B. Brewster, New York: Monthly Review, 1971), 170-182.

<sup>14</sup> Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 92; A. Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, (New York: International, 1971), 195.

understood as cultically deviant. The material about the cult of Baal and the need for cultic renewal is laden with Deuteronomistic [Dtr] and post-Dtr language indicating that it was added to the text during and after the time of Josiah in the late 7<sup>th</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE.

Because discourse analysis assumes that discourses are both historical and complex (in the Gramscian sense; i.e. the *ideological complex*), discourse analysis tends to use a *complex* of (interdisciplinary) approaches. Doing discourse analysis requires scholarly self-reflection and a conscious effort to think critically about what types of interdisciplinary methodological combinations best serve the particular subject matter under analysis. Each communicative event requires a different set of interdisciplinary considerations.

Finally, discourse theorists constantly reinforce the argument that “language is social practice” and that, as a result, the context of language is central in evaluating the formation of discourses.<sup>15</sup>

### *Doing Discourse Analysis*

There is no set way of doing discourse analysis. What is agreed upon by most is that discourse analysis interdisciplinary and is focused on analyzing the ways that language is used to dominate in society (i.e., pointing out the ways that language functions an aspect of social practice).

The main aim of discourse analysis in my research is to analyze discursive practices by means of three elements: intertextuality/interdiscursivity (macro analysis of discourse practices); textual analysis (micro analysis of discourse practices); and social practice (matrix of discursive relations; Fairclough’s reinterpretation of Foucault’s *orders of discourse*; ideational and political uses of discourse and their effects).<sup>16</sup> Interdiscursivity, intertextuality (intertextual chains),

---

<sup>15</sup> R. Wodak and M. Meyer, *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, (London: Sage, 2009), 5-6.

<sup>16</sup> N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 232-238.

manifest intertextuality, and coherence are indicative of text production, distribution, and consumption. The purpose of approaching these elements of a communicative event is to highlight the “three-dimensional conception of discourse” as described by Fairclough:<sup>17</sup>

This three-dimensional conception of discourse...is an attempt to bring together three analytical traditions, each of which is indispensable for discourse analysis. These are the tradition of close textual and linguistic analysis within linguistics, the macrosociological tradition of analyzing social practice in relation to social structures, and the interpretivist or microsociological tradition of seeing social practice as something which people actively produce and make sense of on the basis of shared common sense procedures.<sup>18</sup>

These three aspects are essential for understanding discourse practice, text consumption and distribution, and, as a result, highlight social practices behind textual production.<sup>19</sup>

### *Discourse Practice: Intertextuality*

Fairclough, working under the influence of Bakhtin and Kristeva, saw *intertextuality* as an example of the use and reuse of texts. As noted by Fairclough, Kristeva argued that intertextuality implies “the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history”.<sup>20</sup> In other words, intertextuality implies that a text has reworked or reused a text from the past. This is important because each instance of text production, whether it is production, reuse, or reworking, is an instance of interpretation that changes the meaning and form of the text from its previous state to the next. In this way, intertextuality identifies the reasons for text production and indicates the ways that societies change through observing the fractures, contradictions, and textual difficulties produced through the process of communal textual production and reproduction.

My definition of intertextuality is certainly simplistic. Intertextuality is far more nuanced than what I present here. For example, intertextuality can be observed in the conscious or unconscious interactions between communicative objects. These interactions may be extensive

---

<sup>17</sup> *idem*, 73.

<sup>18</sup> *idem*, 72.

<sup>19</sup> *idem*, 232-238.

<sup>20</sup> J. Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” 39.

or quite minimal resulting in a major intertextual reproduction of an earlier text or a basic statement that has a major impact on how an older text is to be understood. However, for the purposes of this dissertation, only a basic (perhaps materialistic) understanding is sufficient.

Thus, as Fairclough noted,

The relationship between intertextuality and hegemony is important. The concept of intertextuality points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions (genres, discourses) to generate new ones...The combination of hegemony theory with intertextuality is particularly fruitful. Not only can one chart the possibilities and limitations for intertextual processes within particular hegemonies and states of hegemonic struggle, one can also conceptualize intertextual processes and processes of contesting and restructuring orders of discourse as processes of hegemonic struggle in the sphere of discourse, which have effects upon, as well as being affected by, hegemonic struggle in the wider sense.<sup>21</sup>

### *Discourse Practice: Interdiscursivity*

Fairclough differentiated between intertextuality and interdiscursivity arguing that intertextuality is overt or *manifest* while interdiscursivity is *constitutive* and that it extends the bounds of intertextuality. Fairclough explained further, “On the one hand, we have the heterogeneous constitution of texts of specific other texts (manifest intertextuality); on the other hand, the heterogeneous constitution of texts out of elements (types of convention) of orders of discourse (interdiscursivity).”<sup>22</sup> Thus, the difference between the two types of intertextuality is mainly found in the intentionality or lack thereof of the text under analysis. Texts that make explicit references to other texts are exhibiting *manifest intertextuality* while texts that exhibit *interdiscursivity* are implicitly (whether knowingly or otherwise) guided and constrained by discursive rules associated with both genres and social norms.

### *Textual Analysis*

*Textual analysis* is used in discourse analysis to explore the “ways in which social relations are exercised and social identities are manifested in discourse, but also...with how

---

<sup>21</sup> N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 102-103.

<sup>22</sup> *idem*, 84-85.

social relations and identities are constructed (reproduced, contested, restructured) in discourse.”<sup>23</sup> Text analysis (as utilized in discourse analysis) analyzes words and their meanings, grammar, interactional structure, textual favoriting, ethos, themes, modes, and metaphor so as to engage the bias of the text on a micro level.<sup>24</sup>

### *Social Practice*

The analysis of *social practice* aims “to specify the social and hegemonic relations and structures which constitute the matrix” of the social and discursive practices that are evidenced in the given text under analysis. Furthermore, it also aims “to specify the relationship of the instance of social and discursive practice to the orders of discourse it draws upon, and the effects of reproducing or transforming orders of discourse to which it contributes.”<sup>25</sup>

Methodologically, discourse analysis sits comfortably within the field of Sociology. In the same vein as the work of Foucault and others, Fairclough (and others) employed discourse analysis for the purpose of exposing the manipulation and maintenance of power in society.

CDA [critical discourse analysis] sees discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of ‘social practice’. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s), which frame it: The discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> idem, 137.

<sup>24</sup> idem, 234-236. Textual analysis of the Hebrew Bible does have a lot to offer this kind of analysis, but to be useful or more useful for a social scientific approach to the text, the focus of the analysis must no longer be on textual history alone, but must also include conclusions about the textual history within a broader sociological analysis of the text sample/communicative event under analysis. It is, I think, a great strength of this type of approach that textual analysis of the Hebrew Bible has a long and fruitful history to which a social scientific analysis can turn to enhance the interdisciplinary nature of such an analysis.

<sup>25</sup> idem, 237-238.

<sup>26</sup> N. Fairclough and R. Wodak, “Critical Discourse Analysis,” in *Discourse as Social Interaction*, (ed. T. A. van Dijk, London:Sage, 1997), 258-284.

Furthermore, Fairclough aimed to analyze discourse by discerning the relationships between discursive events, significant objects, and any other objects that are constituted by discourse in social groups to help sustain and reproduce the current social structure and power.

In agreement with recent social theorists who deal specifically with social institutions and the objects that are significant to the institution, it is my contention that the various significant objects belonging to (or are claimed to belong to) institutions and the interrelations between those objects are not only repositories of historical data concerning the institutions under analysis, but also reflect institutional use of significant objects to marginalize other institutions and their members. As regards 2 Kings 11, this is an important observation. 2 Kings 11 clearly calls on significant institutional objects (2 Kgs 11:9-11; Davidic objects) and discourses (covenant versus coup/conspiracy) to claim that one past is more authoritative than another.

### *Challenges/Conclusions*

As previously stated, there are some challenges that one must be aware of when doing discourse analysis. First, the term discourse is often ambiguously defined. Each scholar uses the term differently. Thus, it is extremely important to explicitly define what one means when using the term. Second, doing discourse analysis is an ambiguous process. There is no set guide to doing discourse analysis and each scholar employing what they may call discourse analysis will perform their tasks differently from each other. There are, however, some general features upon which most or many would agree are defining elements of discourse analysis.

Discourse analysis seeks to define the relationship between language use and social practice. Discourse analysis is often employed to highlight social imbalance indicated by the ways that a particular discursive practice is used to marginalize and dominate in society (i.e., how discourse practice institutes social practice). Discourse analysis is interdisciplinary as it

appropriates and utilizes various other approaches to accomplish its goals. Indeed, this interdisciplinary nature is one of the main reasons that discourse analysis is so diverse; because each scholar brings to his/her analysis his/her various skills in combination with what he/she sees as *discourse analysis*, the result is that no two scholars will ever do their analysis the same way, even though they may agree on certain principles and aims.

### *Discourse Analysis and 2 Kings 11*

Though many analyses of 2 Kings 11 use approaches very similar to discourse analysis, they are also different in that they are mainly concerned with reconstructing its textual history. This is most often done by arguing that certain features of a textual stratum could only belong to one particular social context. This is not the focus of discourse analysis, though it is true that the two approaches (historical criticism and discourse analysis) may be complementary and that historical critical approaches such as redaction criticism play an important role in my conclusions. However, this project is mainly focused on conceptual fractures in and surrounding 2 Kings 11 by means of discourse analysis.<sup>27</sup>

To support my thesis, I will argue that the discursive frameworks that guided and constrained the production of 2 Kings 11 are behind the perplexing conceptual fractures that make 2 Kings 11 such an enigma within its literary context. The coup of Jehoiada and the execution of Athaliah could not be reported the same way as, for example, the coup of Jehu. This is because the prophetically legitimated coup sequence in 1 Kings 11-2 Kings 10 (coups and succession of Israelite kings) was understood as a long negative report of repeated failure. Associating this tradition with a Judahite king (especially Joash who was understood as the last living Davidide) and supporting Yahwistic priest would have undermined the legitimacy of the

---

<sup>27</sup> Source critical observations may often be indicators of conceptual fractures, but again, the aim of source criticism is to define textual development while discourse analysis focuses on the formation of discourses that guide and constrain knowledge and its dissemination (including text production).



actions reported in 2 Kings 11, actions that were remembered and produced in light of Davidic, Deuteronomistic, and Yehudite priestly discourses. Analysing the discourses (intertextuality, and interdiscursivity) of 2 Kings 11 will show that the coup of Jehoiada and the fall of Athaliah, though literarily similar to other coup reports, especially the coup of Jehu, could not be reported as the other reports had been. This was due to the ways that several central discourses guided and constrained the production of 2 Kings 11 as it was incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) and subsequently edited, reedited, and transmitted in the Persian Period.

## Chapter 2: Review of Literature

### *Introduction*

Much has been said about the source and redaction critical issues in 2 Kings 11. However, the question as to why Athaliah was not included in the oracle fulfillment tradition of Elijah (against the house of Ahab) has not been sufficiently explored. The reasons for disassociating Athaliah from the oracle tradition are an important indication of how the community reading 2 Kings 11 understood the role of prophets, priests, and kings. Disassociating Athaliah from the oracle tradition also indicates that there are both ideological and geographic constraints on how much authority the negative prophetic oracles of Elijah could have had in Judah versus Israel. The oracle tradition of Elijah was initially aimed only at Ahab and his sons. It was only much later (as different editions of what is referred to as the Deuteronomistic History emerged) that the boundary of the curse was extended to include Jezebel and, in turn, began to be understood as applicable to both males and females.

As stated above, the analyses of 2 Kings 11 have been driven by source, form, and redaction criticism. As regards source criticism, it is generally held (see below) that 2 Kings 11 is composed of two sources, though this common assumption was recently challenged by J. Trebolle-Barrera. In the area of form criticism, the most salient work has shown that 2 Kings 11 does not use the normative Judahite regnal formulae to report the reign of Athaliah. This observation is an important piece of evidence that is useful for unraveling the peculiarities of 2 Kings 11. It is especially relevant for showing that the report of Athaliah's reign was manipulated for various reasons, all of which were meant to deligitimate her reign.

These approaches to 2 Kings 11 are relevant for my research because they are a starting point for several important observations that I make in my attempt to answer questions about the

relationship between the oracle tradition of Elijah and 2 King 11. I assume that my approach to 2 Kings 11 is somewhat novel because it is focused on discourse and not on textual reconstruction. However, I openly admit that I see source and redaction critical studies as foundational works and that assumptions about textual history are implied or even explicitly stated in the subsequent analysis. Though my focus is not on source or redaction reconstructions of 2 Kings 11, I still utilize the arguments of others to support my own hypothesis about the text. Discourse analysis is different from traditional source, form, and redaction criticism in that its main aim is not to reconstruct texts, but rather, to reconstruct the discursive rules that control the production of texts.

As a result, reviewing the two source theory, form critical, and redaction critical observations about 2 Kings 11 triangulates my hypothesis and allows me to consider how the detailed analyses of previous scholars were much like what is now called discourse analysis while at the same time showing how their approach differs from my own (text reconstruction versus discursive formations). However, the ultimate purpose of reviewing their work is to explore others views about the relationship between Elijah's oracle and 2 Kings 11 and its effect on how Athaliah is perceived in the text.

### *The Two Source Theory*

Many scholars have either fully accepted or accepted in a modified form a two source theory to explain the textual features of 2 Kings 11. Those who maintain this theory argue that there are two sources that have been joined together in the composition of 2 Kings 11: a priestly or temple oriented source and a secular or politically-centered source.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, (trans. J. S. Black; New York: Meridian, 1957), 154; B. Stade, *ZAW* 5 (1885):279-288; see also M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *II Kings*, (AB 11; New York:Doubleday, 1988),

Wellhausen argued that, based on their common focus, language, and style, parts of 2 Kings 11, 12, 16:10-20, and 22 all belong to a priestly source. It is important to note, however, that in Wellhausen's famous *Prolegomena*, he maintained that some of the elements of 2 Kings 12 (the types of payments mentioned there) are older than those mentioned elsewhere in P.<sup>29</sup> The point being that, even though Wellhausen deduced a priestly source type associated with 2 Kings 11 and 12, this should not be strictly equated with the theological perspectives of the pentateuchal Priestly source (P).<sup>30</sup> Focusing in on 2 Kgs 11 and following Wellhausen's proposal that priestly material could be detected in 2 Kings 11, a majority of subsequent scholars argued that, based on the text's perspective and vocabulary, 2 Kgs 11:1-12 and 18b-20 belong to a priestly tradition.<sup>31</sup> Though I do not fully agree with the two-source theory, I do think that there is strong support for arguing that some parts of 2 Kings 11 were modified according to scribal ideologies during periods after its initial production. These later modifications were heavily influenced by priestly ideology and aim to present Jehoiada, the priest, as the central actor in 2 Kings 11.

Some scholars also argued that the Elohist source (E) could be detected in the book of Kings. Benzinger, for example, argued that E could be found in texts like 2 Kings 22-23. Benzinger, for the same reasons, also argued that 2 Kings 11 belonged to this strand of tradition. Holscher argued that J (the Jahwist/Yahwist) could be detected up to the history of the divided kingdom in 1 Kings 11 (contra Smend).<sup>32</sup> Smend argued that there was a pre-Deuteronomistic version of the book of Kings that was a combination of three pentateuchal/octateuchal sources,

---

131; N. Na'aman, "Royal Inscriptions and the Histories of Joash and Ahaz, Kings of Judah," *VT XLVIII* (1998):339-341; O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament an Introduction*, (trans. P. R. Ackroyd; New York: Harper and Row), 295; J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, (Edinburgh:T&T Clark, 1951), 419.

<sup>29</sup> J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 198-199.

<sup>30</sup> *idem*, 154.

<sup>31</sup> Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament An Introduction*, 298-299.

<sup>32</sup> *ibid.*

J1, J2 (JE). Smend argued that there are traces of J1 in the old Elisha narratives (2 Kgs 4.8-37) and those of J2 (a combination of J and E) could be detected in 2 Kings 5 and 6 (E) as well as in 2 Kings 9-10 (J). Smend also claimed that this work utilized other historical sources (the History of Solomon; the History of the Kings of Israel and Judah) and that from this material, other elements that were particularly relevant to the Temple in Jerusalem were also inserted (2 Kgs 11; 12.5-7; 22-23).<sup>33</sup>

Montgomery also argued that there are two sources present in 2 Kings 11. He claimed that v.13-18a were a later insertion that contained religious undertones and a second report of the execution of Athaliah (the older of the execution reports is found in v.20, i.e., Stade's secular source).

Gray states "The fact that two sources are involved is indicated by the double mention of the death of Athaliah." Various scholars have pointed out this feature in the text, noting that Athaliah, according to one tradition, was executed prior to the enthronement of Joash (v.13) while in the other tradition she is executed after his enthronement. Another indication that this text may be composed of two distinct sources is the way the text oscillates in its spelling of the name Athaliah (v.1-12) versus Athaliahu (v.4-12; 18b-20).

In contrast to those who argued that 2 Kings 11 contained two reports of Athaliah's execution, Rudolph argued that the function of v.20 (the second mention of the death of Athaliah) was a literary device or refrain that recalled the previous execution. Most others argued

---

<sup>33</sup> R. Smend, *Die Entstehung Des Alten Testaments*, (Theologische Wissenschaft Bd 1. 1. Aufl. ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978), 129-134; Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament An Introduction*, 298-290.

that v.20 indicates the presence of another source that was reporting a different version of the execution of Athaliah.<sup>34</sup>

J. Robinson also argued that v.13-18a were originally a separate account of the death of Athaliah that emphasized "...that the whole people approved of Athaliah's death, rededicated themselves to the service of Yahweh and destroyed the alien temple of Baal. Thus the whole narrative presents Athaliah's death as a part of a religious reform that foreshadowed the even greater reform of Josiah that was to come later."<sup>35</sup> The focus on erradicating Baalism in 2 Kings 9-11 should certainly be seen as a Judahite discourse that existed during or shortly after the Josianic reforms (2 Kgs 22-23). As a result, at least in part, 2 Kings 11:13-18a should be dated to the late monarchic or early exilic period due to their concern with dtr ideology evident in, for example, the reestablishment of a covenant relationship with Yahweh and the destruction of Baalism. This is also supported by the similarity between the anointing scene of Joash and 2 Kgs 23:1-2 and Josiah's presentation of the newly discovered book of law.

In an attempt to explain the similarities between the immediate context of 2 Kings 11 (2 Kings 9-10 and 12), O. Eissfeldt argued that,

The narrative of xi [2 Kgs 11] possibly contains two strands. From its content it is clearly of Judaeen origin and thus differs from ix-x [Israelite]. It is now linked with ix-x by the cross reference in xi, I, to the death of Ahaziah narrated in ix, 27-8, and could originally belong – or at any rate one strand of it – to the same narrative context as ix-x, in that the events in Judah are in fact the direct sequel of Jehu's revolution which concerned primarily the northern kingdom.<sup>36</sup>

However, Eissfeldt's argument is problematic since he implies that the Jehu story is of Israelite origin. It is true that that Jehu was an Israelite king (extra-biblical sources confirm this), but the narrative of his coup is certainly a Judahite retelling of the events and, as a result, a highly

---

<sup>34</sup> W. Rudolph, "Die Einheitlichkeit der Erzählung vom Sturz der Atalja" (Festschrift Bertholet, 1950), 473-78; M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *II Kings*, 131-132; see also Treballe Barrera, Julio C., "La coronación de Joás (2 Re 11): Texto, narración e historia," *EstBib* 41 (1983): 5-16.

<sup>35</sup> J. Robinson, *The Second Book of Kings*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary, (New English Bible, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 109.

<sup>36</sup> O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament An Introduction*, 295.

propagandistic one at that.<sup>37</sup> Beyond this point (to be discussed later) there are several important links that tie the two narratives together thematically as well. I cannot overstate that one of the central claims of this dissertation will be that the differences between the Jehu and Jehoiada narratives are predominantly not a result of their different provenances (Israelite vs. Judahite), rather, they are based on the ideological geographic understanding of the region from the perspective of Judahite scribes in much later periods (Late Monarchic Judah and Persian Period Yehud).

### *Wellhausen on 2 Kings 11:6 – Trebolla-Barrera on 2 Kings 11:9-10*

Wellhausen also argued that v.6 was a later addition to v.1-12 (the secular source). His conclusions have been widely accepted by many scholars. Trebolla-Barrera, however, argued that one must take a closer look at the textual recension history to be certain. Trebolla-Barrera proposed that the difficulties with v.6 are resolved if one sees v.11 as a *Wiederaufnahme* (Ger. *resumption*) resuming the narrative from v.8. If this is so, and it seems that the Lucianic recension clearly supports his claims here, then it is v.9-10 that are secondary (i.e., the addition of descriptions about David's spear and shields stored in the temple).<sup>38</sup> Trebolla-Barrera's conclusions are significant because they convincingly call into question Wellhausen's source critical understanding of 2 Kings 11 which in turn calls into question most subsequent analyses because of their reliance on Wellhausen's proposals. For the purposes of this dissertation, Trebolla-Barrera's conclusions, with some modifications (seeing v.18 as secondary) will become a foundation starting point for a discursive analysis of 2 Kings 11.

---

<sup>37</sup> P. Dutcher-Walls, *Narrative Art, Political Rhetoric: The Case of Athalia and Joash* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996); see also L. Barre, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 1988.

<sup>38</sup> Trebolla-Barrera, *Jehu y Joas: Texto y Composición Literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11*, (Tesis y Monográficas, Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1984), 177.

In his monograph *Jehu y Joas*, J. Treballe-Barrera presents a very thorough reading of the text of 2 Kings 9-11. Treballe-Barrera convincingly argued that any literary historical examination of this text must consider the details of the textual critical issues that scholars have often omitted. From Treballe-Barrera's perspective, this must necessarily include a close reading of the miniscule manuscripts  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  (Rahlfs, mss. 19, 82, 93, 108, 127), the Vetus Latina (Cod. Vindobonensis palimpsest, Luciferi Caligiari, etc.), the Chronicler, and parts of the Old Armenian tradition. Treballe-Barrera argued that these textual witnesses have preserved many elements of the Old Greek translation whose Hebrew Vorlage is different in many ways from the proto-Masoretic text and the Masoretic Text (MT) of the Ben Asher/Ben Naphtali traditions.<sup>39</sup> These texts, especially those represented in the manuscripts  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  (Rahlfs, mss. 19, 82, 93, 108, 127) are known to have preserved what is known as the *Lucianic* recension of the Old Greek translations.<sup>40</sup>

Treballe-Barrera argued that the current consensus about the source divisions in 2 Kings 11 is misleading because Wellhausen's conclusions (the foundation from which most subsequent analyses derive) were not based on a proper understanding of the textual critical issues underlying 2 Kings 11. To remedy the problem, Treballe-Barrera first laid out a clear critique of Wellhausen's analysis of 2 Kings 11:6.

According to Robinson and Treballe-Barrera, Wellhausen made two flawed arguments about 2 Kings 11:6. Wellhausen argued that v.6 was a gloss because it gives the same information that is given in v.7, but used different words (evidence that it is trying to clarify the information in v.7 and as a result, is a gloss by a later scribe). Wellhausen also assumed that two ambiguous terms in the text, שלשית and הידות, were synonymous. Connected to these two flawed

---

<sup>39</sup> idem.; A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, (Septuaginta Studien III; Göttingen, 1911).

<sup>40</sup> "Offizielles Verzeichnis der Rahlfs-Sigeln: Herausgegeben vom Septuaginta-Unternehmen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen" <http://septuaginta-unternehmen.adw-goe.de>.



arguments, Wellhausen also claimed that those leaving and entering the Sabbath service were leaving and entering through a nearby set of military barracks or quarters (v.5-7). This assumption has some serious consequences for understanding the apparent strategy being taken by Jehoiada in organizing the coup d'état and, most importantly, it has consequences for how later scholars would argue for a two source theory of 2 Kings 11.<sup>41</sup>

Stade (and many others after him), building on Wellhausen's hypothesis, also argued that 2 Kgs 11.6 was a gloss from a later scribe and that the chapter can generally be divided into two major sources: a primary source in v.1-12; 18b-20; and a secondary source in v.13-18a. Although Gray noted the complementary relationship between the two sources, in the end he also followed Wellhausen's and Stade's arguments and concluded that 2 Kings 11 is composite. The evidence often cited to justify this source division is as follows: 1) the double mention of the death of Athaliah (v.16 and 20); 2) the observation that the role of the people of the land in the secondary source is lacking in the primary source (v.14, 18, [19-20\*]); 3) the centrality of the temple in the secondary source versus the secular nature of the primary source (v.13-18a); 4) the anti-Baalist theme that appears suddenly at the end of the chapter (v.18a).

Šanda takes a different perspective, though in the end, he also agrees with the two source division. For Šanda, a clear unity is evident in the text. He argued that the themes and vocabulary were complementary. However, there are also clear elements of discontinuity. To explain this, Šanda argues that there were indeed two sources in the text, but they are contemporaneous. However, there are several indicators that the shift in vocabulary is not due to contemporaneous usage, but rather, is the result of communal reinterpretation over a long period of time. For example, the tension as regards the temple and the palace, king and priest, Baal and Yahweh, and

---

<sup>41</sup> N. Na'aman, "Royal Inscriptions", 346-347.

so forth, all indicate that the text was produced and reproduced over time rather than at a single moment in Judahite history as implied by Šanda.

G. Robinson argued that Wellhausen's assumption about the synonymy between the terms שלשית and הידות is based on false premises and must be revisited since there is no evidence that the two should be understood as synonyms. As a result, Robinson's argument also calls into question some of Wellhausen's other arguments concerning this chapter and its apparent source division. Calling into question Wellhausen's assumptions naturally calls into question the assumptions and analyses of those who have continued to use his work as a starting point for their own analyses of 2 Kings 11.

Following Robinson's lead, Treballe-Barrera has raised the most serious challenge to the source critical assumptions about this chapter. Treballe-Barrera argued that all previous analyses have failed to understand that the Masoretic and Kaige-Theodotion (Kaige-Theod.) texts are misleading because they do not present an accurate picture of the earliest Hebrew textual witness of this chapter.

Treballe-Barrera argued further that certain Greek manuscripts as well as the Vetus Latina preserved readings from a Hebrew textual Vorlage (Ger. *original* or *model*) whose Hebrew text differs from both the MT and the Kaige-Theod. of the Septuagint (LXX). Treballe-Barrera points out that at various points in the history of the LXX, attempts were made to correct older Greek translations so as to bring it into conformity with the MT.<sup>42</sup> These new Greek recensions were made at various points over several hundred years between the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE and the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE. As early Christian movement(s) adopted the earlier Greek-Jewish translations, Judaism began to distance itself from those Greek translations because of their growing prominence and use in Christian circles for Christian purposes. The Jewish recensions

---

<sup>42</sup> Treballe-Barrera, *Jehu y Joas*, 17-87.

were meant to provide new Greek translations that conformed to the contemporary Hebrew authoritative tradition which most agree was a *proto-MT*. The result was that some older Hebrew traditions were preserved in the translations adopted by early Christians. The *kaige* tradition that closely follows the standard MT is an example of the corrective movement in Judaism. As such, the *kaige* recension is an excellent source for understanding the early stages of the Masoretic textual tradition. Readings preserved in older Greek translations that were not corrected into conformity with the MT have preserved many variant readings that appear to be evidence for a Hebrew Vorlage that differs substantially from the MT.

Trebolle-Barrera argued that to understand the deep textual critical points of 2 Kings 11 one must approach the MT in conjunction with the manuscripts that preserve this other Hebrew textual tradition so as to understand the full textual-critical picture. These other readings are preserved in the miniscule Greek manuscripts  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , the *Vetus Latina* (the pre-Vulgata Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible), certain parts of the Old Armenian translation, parts of Chronicles and elements found in Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews* (*Ant.*).<sup>43</sup> As a result of this approach, Trebolle-Barrera raised two major challenges against the two-source theory that currently continues as the consensus source critical view of 2 Kings 11.

First, Trebolle-Barrera called on G. Robinson's argument that Wellhausen was unjustified in assuming the synonymous relationship between the terms *הידות* and *שלשית*. He also noted that Wellhausen's arguments about v.6 are assumed in most subsequent analyses. For example, in Montgomery's notes v.6 is argued to be secondary from v.7 and that it is also problematic because it adds "an unintelligible word" *מִקֶּטֶר*.<sup>44</sup> The assumption is that v.6 is basically pre-telling the information about to be presented in v.7. It is true that there are many

---

<sup>43</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> Montgomery, *Commentary on the Books of Kings*, 419.

examples of secondary expansions in the Hebrew Bible that attempt to clarify enigmatic readings. Some of these readings made their way into the MT as explanatory notes meant to aid reading and interpretation of especially difficult passages. The problem with this particular example is the difficulty that arises when trying to ascertain whether v.6 is actually recasting the information given in v.7. Wellhausen's arguments were based on his assumption that v.6, in an effort to interpret *הידות* in v.7, inserted a synonymous term *שלישית*.

Robinson took issue with Wellhausen's assumptions about the synonymy between the terms *שלישית* and *הידות*, noting that he

...does not explain why the writer did not use the same word *שלישית* in v.7 too, if he meant the same division. In the parallel account in 2 Ch xxiii 4f., we note, the Chronicler has dropped the word *ידות* and the accompanying sentence, probably because he could not understand this word *ידות* in the sense of *שלישית* referring to the remaining fractions of the unit whose one third is mentioned in v.5. Moreover, we note that the numeral noun *שתיים* is used in the Old Testament generally in the sense of "both", referring to pairs, to two similar things; it is nowhere used in the sense of two fractions of one unit. As such, the two parts mentioned in v.7 could not have been parts of the unit whose one third is mentioned in v.5.<sup>45</sup>

Here, Robinson may be incorrect since successive reuse of the biblical text necessitated the use of different vocabulary so as to help a new community of readers understand older terms that may have become redundant. Even if Robinson's argument here was weak, there are still plenty of reasons to suspect Wellhausen's conclusions about the synonymy between *שלישית* and *הידות*.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> idem, 59.

<sup>46</sup> Related to this problem, Wellhausen further assumed that the terms used in this verse *בא* and *יצא* respectively have the meaning *heimgehen* (to go home or off duty) and *aufziehen* (to go on duty, take charge of guard duty). G. Robinson points out that in light of almost all instances of these verbs Wellhausen's assumptions are incorrect and in fact opposite to their intended and regular usage. Wellhausen's intention was to get at what he thought Jehoiada's strategy was trying to accomplish. According to Robinson, "Wellhausen's arrangement of the guards is unclear. According to his hypothesis, the companies which did duty in the palace during the week came and served in the temple and the company which kept watch in the temple during the week 'am Sabbat *heimgehen* und den Dienst im Konigshaus *versehen*". For Robinson, this doesn't make sense because it implies that these groups are never allowed to leave but remain on a continual cycle of entering and leaving service at either the temple or the palace. According to Robinson, the evidence elsewhere in the HB contradicts Wellhausen's argument. Robinson noted that other examples of those going to and leaving from service do so on a monthly basis and not on a weekly basis (see 1 Kgs 5.28; E. 14; 1 Kgs iv.7; 1 Chr 27.1).

Trebolle-Barrera built on Robinson’s conclusions further arguing that v.6 is indeed not a gloss, but is in agreement with its surroundings in v.5-7. Further, Trebolle-Barrera argued that Robinson’s conclusions lead to other questions about Wellhausen’s arguments concerning v.9-10 noting that these verses only agree with their context if Wellhausen’s conclusions about v.6 are accepted. Combining Robinson’s conclusions with a close reading of the MT and the *Lucianic* readings that are witnesses to the Hebrew Vorlage of the Old Greek translation of this chapter (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>, the Vetus Latina, etc.), Trebolle-Barrera noted that

El análisis conjunto de crítica textual y literaria viene a dar la solución al complicado problema sobre las posibles interpolaciones del relato. Una repetición de engarce (‘Wiederaufnahme’) delimita aquí una vez más el texto de la glosa interpolada; esta abarca, no solo el ya sospechoso v.10, sino también el anterior v.9, que, según Wellhausen, estaba en contradicción con el v.6. Es necesario disponer de una visión de conjunto del texto, en sus distintas tradiciones, masorética, *kaige* y antioquena.

The unified analysis of both textual and literary criticism provides the solution for the complicated problem concerning the possible insertions in the story. A connecting repetition [‘Wiederaufnahme’] delimits, yet again, the text of the inserted gloss; this not only accounts for v.10, but also the previous v.9, that, according to Wellhausen, was in contradiction with v.6. It is necessary to have a complete understanding of the text in its various traditions, masoretic, *kaige* and Antiochene.<sup>47</sup>

I agree with Trebolle-Barrera that source critical analyses must not be attempted until, as far as is possible, the full textual critical history is understood. Joining a complete textual reading of all textual witnesses with literary critical approaches is essential according to Trebolle-Barrera. His proposed solutions to the source critical issues are illustrated in the following table:

	NRSV	MT	Kaige (LXX <sup>B</sup> ) of Kings (Rahlfs Ed.)	Vorlage of Old Greek (OG) Translation (LXX <sup>L</sup> in bold type with mss name in parentheses)
v.5	He commanded them,  “This is what you are to do:  one-third of you, those who go off duty on the Sabbath	וַיִּצְוֶנָם לְאֹמֶר  זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּן  הַשְּׁלִישִׁת מִכֶּם כְּאִי הַשַּׁבָּת  וַיִּשְׁמְרֵי מִשְׁמֶרֶת	καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς λέγων  Οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὃν ποιήσετε,  τὸ τρίτον ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰσελθέτω τὸ σάββατον  καὶ φυλάξετε φυλακὴν οἴκου	καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς λέγων  [Οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὃν/τοῦτο το/[ <del>τθ</del> (b’)] <b>ρημα ο (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ] ποιήσετε/εποιήσετε <b>(e<sub>2</sub>)/ποιησεται (o)</b> ,  τὸ τρίτον ἐξ/εν <b>(o)</b> ὑμῶν [εἰσελθέτω τὸ σάββατον καὶ/οι εἰσπορευομενοι το <b>σαββατον (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ]  φυλάξετε <b>την (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> φυλακὴν οἴκου

<sup>47</sup> Trebolle-Barrera, *Jehu y Joas*, 177.

	and guard the king's house	בית המלך:	τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι	τοῦ βασιλέως [ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι/ <b>ἐν-τῷ πυλῶνι (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ]
v.6	(another third being at the gate Sur  and a third at the gate behind the guards),  shall guard the palace;	וְהַשְׁלִישִׁית בְּשַׁעַר סוּר  וְהַשְׁלִישִׁית בְּשַׁעַר אַחֲרֵי הַרְצָאִים  וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ אֹתָהּ מִשְׁמַרְתֵּי הַבַּיִת מִמֶּנּוּ:	καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐν τῇ πύλῃ τῶν ὁδῶν  καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς πύλης ὀπίσω τῶν παρατρεχόντων,  καὶ φυλάξετε τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ οἴκου,	καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐν τῇ πύλῃ ( <b>bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub></b> ) τῶν ὁδῶν  καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς πύλης ὀπίσω τῶν παρατρεχόντων,  καὶ <b>φυλάξετε (e<sub>2</sub>)</b> τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ οἴκου <b>μεσσαι (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/αμεσσαι (b')</b> ,
v.7	and your two divisions  [all] that come on duty in force on the sabbath  and guard the house of the LORD	וּשְׁנֵי הַדְּוִיּוֹת בְּכָבֶד  כָּל יֹצְאֵי הַשַּׁבָּת  וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ אֹתָהּ מִשְׁמַרְתֵּי בֵּית-יְהוָה אֶל-הַמִּלְאָךְ:	καὶ δύο χεῖρες ἐν ὑμῖν,  πᾶς ὁ ἐκπορευόμενος τὸ σάββατον,  καὶ φυλάξουσιν τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου κυρίου πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα,	καὶ δύο χεῖρες [ἐν ὑμῖν/ <b>εισπορευμενος (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ],  πᾶς ὁ ἐκπορευόμενος τὸ σάββατον,  καὶ/ <b>καὶ (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> φυλάξουσιν τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου κυρίου πρὸς/ <b>ἐπι (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> τὸν βασιλέα,
v.8	shall surround the king,  each with weapons in hand;  and whoever approaches the ranks is to be killed.  Be with the king in his comings and goings.	וְהִקְפְּתֶם עֲלֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוֹיָכִי  אִישׁ וּכְלָיו בְּיָדוֹ  וְהַקָּבֵא אֶל-הַשָּׂרֵרִים יוּמָת  וְהָיוּ אִתּוֹ הַמִּלְאָךְ בְּבָאָתוֹ וּבְיָצְאוֹ:	καὶ κυκλώσατε ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύκλω,  ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ,  καὶ ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος εἰς τὰ σαδηρωθ ἀποθανεῖται.  καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν.	καὶ κυκλώσατε/ <b>καταστησατε αυτους (br)/καταστησατε εαυτους (ore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα <b>και καταστησατε αυτους περι τον βασιλεα (b')</b> κύκλω,  ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν <b>τη (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> χειρὶ αὐτοῦ,  καὶ/ <b>καὶ (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος/ <b>εισερχομενος (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> εἰς <b>τὰ σαδηρωθ (e<sub>2</sub>)/τα σιδηρωθ (b)</b> <b>και (ore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ἀποθανεῖται.  καὶ ἐγένετο/ <b>γινεσθε (brc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/γινεσθαι (o)</b> μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν καὶ [ἐν τῷ/ <b>ἐν-τῷ (rc<sub>2</sub>)</b> ] εἰσπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν/ <b>αὐτόν (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> .
v.9	The captains did  according to all that the priest Jehoiada commanded;  each brought his men who were to go off duty on the sabbath,  with those who	וַיַּעֲשׂוּ עֲרֵי הַמְּאִוִּת  כְּכָל אֲשֶׁר-צִוָּה יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן  וַיָּבִיאוּ אִישׁ אֶת-אֲנָשָׁיו אֲשֶׁר חָזְרוּ אִתּוֹ בְּיָמֵי הַשַּׁבָּת  עִם יֹצְאֵי הַשַּׁבָּת	καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι πάντα,  ὅσα ἐνετείλατο Ἰωδαε ὁ συνετός,  καὶ ἔλαβεν ἄνθρωπος τοὺς ἄνδρας αὐτοῦ τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους τὸ σάββατον  μετὰ τῶν ἐκπορευομένων τὸ	καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι <b>κατα (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> πάντα,  ὅσα ἐνετείλατο <b>αυτοις (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> Ἰωδαε ὁ συνετός <b>ιερευς και εγενοντο μετα του βασιλεως εν τω [εκπορευεσθαι αυτον και εν τω/εκπορευεσθαι αυτον και εν τω (bre<sub>2</sub>)] εισπορευεσθαι αυτον (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ,  καὶ ἔλαβεν/ <b>ελαβον (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ἄνθρωπος/ <b>εκαστος (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> τοὺς ἄνδρας αὐτοῦ <b>και (bore<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους τὸ σάββατον  [μετὰ τῶν ἐκπορευομένων τὸ

	were to come on duty on the Sabbath,  and came to the priest Jehoiada.		σάββατον  καὶ εἰσηλθεν πρὸς Ἰωδαε τὸν ἱερέα.	σάββατον/ <b>μετα τῶν εἰσπορευομένων καὶ εκπορευομένων το σαββατον (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ]  καὶ εἰσηλθεν/ <b>εἰσηλθον (c<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> πρὸς Ἰωδαε τὸν ἱερέα.
v.10	The priest delivered to the captains  the spears and shields  that had been King David's, which were in the house of the LORD;	וַיִּבְאוּ אֶל־יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן:  וַיִּתֵּן הַכֹּהֵן לְשָׂרֵי הַמַּאֲיָוֹת  אֶת־הַחֲנִיטִים וְאֶת־הַשְּׁלֵטִים  אֲשֶׁר לְמֶלֶךְ דָּוִד אֲשֶׁר בְּבַיִת יְהוָה:	καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις  τοὺς σειρομάστας καὶ τοὺς τρισσοὺς  τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυὶδ τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου.	καὶ ἔδωκεν <b>αὐτοῖς (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις  [τοὺς σειρομάστας/ <b>τας φαρετρας (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ] καὶ τοὺς τρισσοὺς/ <b>τα δορατα (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ]  τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυὶδ/ <b>δαυειδ (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> τοὺς/ <b>α ην (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου <b>χορευθ και ησαν εν ταις χερσιν αυτων και εποιησαν οι εκατονταρχοι και οι παρατρεχοντες [κατα παντα α ενετειλατο αυτοις ιωδαε ο ιερευς (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)]</b> .
v.11	the guards stood,  every man with his weapons in his hand,  from the south side of the house to the north side of the house,  around the altar and the house, to guard the king on every side.	וַיַּעֲמֵדוּ הַרְצִים  אִישׁוֹ וְכַלְיוֹ בְּיָדוֹ  מִמֶּזְרַח הַבַּיִת הַיְמָנִית עַד־מַגְרֵב הַבַּיִת הַשְּׂמָאלִית  לְמִזְבֵּחַ לַבַּיִת עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְעַל־בָּיְתוֹ:	καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ παρατρέχοντες,  ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ,  ἀπὸ τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς δεξιᾶς ἕως τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς εὐωνύμου  τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύκλῳ.	[καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ παρατρέχοντες/ <b>καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ παρατρέχοντες (r)</b> ],  ἀνὴρ/ <b>εκαστος (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> καὶ [τὸ σκεῦος/ <b>τα σκευη (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ] αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ/ <b>αὐτοῦ (c<sub>2</sub>)</b> ],  ἀπὸ τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς [δεξιᾶς ἕως τῆς ( <b>o</b> )] ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου [ <b>post - τῆς ὠμίας (e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ] τῆς/ <b>του (e<sub>2</sub>)</b> εὐωνύμου/ <b>αριστερας (borc<sub>2</sub>)</b> / <b>αριστερου (e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ]  τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ/ <b>καὶ (o)</b> τοῦ οἴκου ἐπὶ/ <b>περι (borc<sub>2</sub>)</b> /τὸν βασιλέα κύκλῳ.
v.12	Then he brought out the king's son,  put the crown on him, and gave him the covenant;  they proclaimed him king, and anointed him;  they clapped their hands and shouted, "Long live the king!"	וַיֹּצֵא אֶת־בְּנוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ  וַיָּתֵן עָלָיו אֶת־הַכִּוֶּנֶת וְאֶת־הַבְּרִית  וַיִּמְלְכוּ אֹתוֹ וַיִּמְשְׁחוּהוּ  וַיִּכְפְּרוּ יָדָם וַיִּשְׁאוּ קוֹלָם לֵאמֹר: יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ:	καὶ ἐξᾠπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως  καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ νεζερ καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον  καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔχρισεν αὐτόν,  καὶ ἐκρότησαν τῇ χειρὶ καὶ εἶπαν Ζήτω ὁ βασιλεύς.	<b>καὶ ἐξεκκλησιασεν ἰωδαε ο ἱερευς παντα τον λαον της γης εις οικον κυριον (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> καὶ ἐξᾠπέστειλεν/ <b>ἐξηγαγε (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως  καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ νεζερ/ <b>το αγιασμα (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον  καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν/ <b>ἐχρισεν (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> αὐτόν καὶ ἔχρισεν/ <b>ἐβασίλευσεν (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> αὐτόν,  καὶ ἐκρότησαν <b>ο λαος (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> [τῇ χειρὶ/ <b>ταις χερσιν αυτων (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> ] καὶ εἶπαν/ <b>ειπον (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)</b> Ζήτω ὁ βασιλεύς.

Table 1 - The Lucianic Recension of 2 Kgs 11:5-12

Trebolle-Barrera proposed that, based on the OG translation of the Hebrew Vorlage, there is a “Wiederaufnahme” (Ger.) or “engarce” (Sp.) (resumption) present in the OG text that is missing in the MT. A “Wiederaufnahme” or resumption is a textual device used by scribes to mark an insertion or interruption of material between two textual points. These textual points are easily identified by noting the repetitions in the text that are meant to call the reader’s attention to the resumption of the narrative after the inserted or interrupting material. For example, consider the following structure: Sentence A, Insertion A, Insertion B, Insertion C, Sentence A (Wiederaufnahme/engarce/resumption), Sentence B, Sentence C, etc.. The repetition of “Sentence A” is a device that demarcates interruptions while at the same time calling attention to the first instance of “Sentence A” so the reader can know that the story is moving in relation to these two points (given in red type below).

<sup>8</sup> καὶ καταστησατε αὐτοὺς (br)/καταστησατε εαυτοὺς (oc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)<sup>48</sup> ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα καὶ καταστησατε αὐτοὺς περὶ τὸν βασιλέα (b’) κύκλω, ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ὁ εἰσερχόμενος (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) εἰς τὰ σαδηρωθ (c<sub>2</sub>)/τα σιδηρωθ (b) καὶ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ἀποθανεῖται. καὶ γινεσθε (brc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/γινεσθαι (o) μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορευέσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ [ἐν τῷ/ ἐν-τῷ (rc<sub>2</sub>)] εἰσπορευέσθαι αὐτόν (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>). <sup>9</sup> καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι κατὰ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) πάντα, ὅσα ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) Ἰωδαε ὁ συνेतὸς ἱερεὺς καὶ ἐγενοντο μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορευέσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι αὐτὸν (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>), καὶ ἔλαβον (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ἕκαστος (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοὺς ἄνδρας αὐτοῦ καὶ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους τὸ σάββατον μετὰ τῶν εἰσπορευομένων καὶ ἐκπορευομένων τὸ σάββατον (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) καὶ εἰσηλθὼν (c<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) πρὸς Ἰωδαε τὸν ἱερέα. <sup>10</sup> καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχοις τὰς φαρετρας (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) καὶ τὰ δοράτα (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοῦ βασιλέως δαυιδ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) α ἡν (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου χορεθ καὶ ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι καὶ οἱ παρατρέχοντες κατὰ πάντα α ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>). <sup>11</sup> καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ παρατρέχοντες, ἕκαστος (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) καὶ τὰ σκευὴ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς δεξιᾶς ἕως τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου [post - τῆς ὠμίας (e<sub>2</sub>)] τοῦ (e<sub>2</sub>) ἀριστερας (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/ἀριστερου (e<sub>2</sub>) τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ (o) τοῦ οἴκου τὸν (e<sub>2</sub>) περὶ (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τὸν βασιλέα κύκλω.

<sup>8</sup> And they set themselves over the king and they set themselves round about the king, each man with his weapon in his hand, those coming in to the Saderoth and he will be killed. And you will be with the king in his goings and comings. <sup>9</sup> And the centurions did according to all that Jehoiada, the wise priest, had commanded them and they were with the king in his goings and his comings. And they each took their men

<sup>48</sup> See Jos. 10:18 for another example of καθιστημι used in conjunction with the preposition επι+acc.; also, Dt 17:14-17; 28:36; 1 Sam 22:9; 2 Sam 6:21; 1 Kgs 2:35h\*; 4:7; 11:28; 2 Kgs 7:17; 10:3; 1 Chr 6:16; 9:29; 11:25; 2 Chr 12:10; 21:5; Judith 6:14; Ps 2:6; 8:7; 9:21; 44:17; 108:6; Sir 46:13; Jer 1:10; 6:17; 47:11; Dan 1:11 (compare Theod. and Old Greek); 2:49 (compare Theod. and Old Greek versions, OG prefers επι+gen.); 3:12 (same note as previous);



coming in for the Sabbath with those coming in and going out for the Sabbath and they went in to Jehoiada the priest.<sup>10</sup> Then the priest gave the centurions the quivers and the spears of King David that were in the house of the Lord xoreth and the were in their hands **and the centurions did**, and the runners, **according to all that Jehoiada the priest had commanded them**.<sup>11</sup> And the runners took their stand, and each one with his weapon in his hand, from the south side of the house to the north side of the house, of the altar of the house, encircling the king about.

Trebolle-Barrera's observation calls into question all previous conclusions about the source analyses of this chapter. Instead of viewing v.6 as a gloss, Trebolle-Barrera (following G. Robinson) argued that Wellhausen was incorrect to see שלישית and הידות as synonyms. Rather, they are two *different* technical terms in the narrative. Trebolle-Barrera also shows quite convincingly that there is an interruption in the Old Greek (OG) text that is demarcated by a "Wiederaufnahme." The OG material in v.9-10 that appears between these two textual markers is a later gloss or an interruption, contra most other scholars who have followed Wellhausen's lead and argued that these verses are part of the primary source in v.1-12; 18b-20, excluding v.6 as a gloss.<sup>49</sup>

Though I do not completely agree with Trebolle-Barrera that v.9-10 are the only interruption in this otherwise unified text, I believe his analysis is one of the most significant, if not the most significant, approaches to this chapter since Wellhausen's analysis and as such, must be considered in all further analyses including my own.<sup>50</sup> One of the main consequences of

---

<sup>49</sup> J. Trebolle-Barrera, *Jehu y Joas*, "Entre estas correspondencias, los v.9-10 constituyen una interrupción fuera de lugar. No se ha tomar pues el v.9 como criterio para juzgar sobre los vv.5-7, como hace Wellhausen. Muy al contrario, el v.9 resulta ser una glosa, junto con el sospechoso v.10. El v.6 forma parte del relato y resulta necesario para completar los datos del v.5. Efectivamente se alude aquí a tres tercios de la guardia, que 'entre' de servicio en el sábado y que se ha de apostar en tres puntos del palacio y de los anejos del palacio, sin entrar en el Templo. Por otra parte, otras dos divisiones que 'salen' del servicio ordinario del Templo, correspondiente a los días de semana, han de seguir apostados en el mismo Templo y rodear al rey cuando salga." 177-178.

<sup>50</sup> For a short review of Trebolle-Barrera's published dissertation, see I. Mihalik, "Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11 by Julio C. Trebolle-Barrera" *JBL* 105.3 (1986):521-523; Another byproduct of Trebolle-Barrera's analysis is that it calls into question parts of the Wiederaufnahme itself. One interesting byproduct of Trebolle-Barrera's observation is that it in fact calls attention to two other source critical points of interest. It is one thing to point out the similarities between the two textual points in this Wiederaufnahme. However, there are also two major differences between the two pieces of text that must be assessed. First, the initial part of the *wiederaufnahme* includes the appellative ὁ συνετός, which is not included in the final part of the *wiederaufnahme*. Second, the the final part of the *Wiederaufnahme* includes the military group και οι παρατρεχοντες (OG tradition) that was not included in the first. From a source critical perspective, this raises questions about their presence in

Trebolle-Barrera's observations for this dissertation results from his argument that 2 Kgs 11:9-10 are secondary. This conclusion, which is well founded in my opinion, is very significant because of the contents of those two verses (i.e., the use of Davidic/Cultic emblems in the report of Jehoiada's coup). The significance is that without these two verses, there is little evidence of Davidic/Cultic involvement (i.e., legitimacy and support) in Jehoiada's coup. Though the details of the events are far from clear, the insertion of these Davidic/Cultic items into the narrative is an extremely important detail for understanding how this narrative was produced and reproduced over time in various communities.

### *Form Critical Issues*

The main form critical issue in this chapter is its break with the standard regnal formulae common elsewhere in the books of Kings. V. Fritz attempted to explain this irregularity as the work of the DtrH concerning Athaliah's reign. He stated that even though "Her reign is acknowledged in the introductory formula of Joash of Judah and his chronology (12:1-4); in ignoring the usual pattern, however, the Deuteronomistic Historian does not include her years of reign in the official succession of the Davidic dynasty."<sup>51</sup>

Gray explained that the unusual treatment of the Athaliah material that is "...not rounded off with the usual editorial notes and comments" implies that her period of rule was seen as an

---

these traditions and inclines one to accept only the material that is witnessed in both text samples while questioning the two terms that are only found in one or the other. As a result, other examples of these terms must also be reexamined so as to determine their purpose in the text (v.6, 11, 19).

<sup>51</sup> V. Fritz, *1 & 2 Kings*, (Continental Commentary Series; trans. A. Hagedorn; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003); for a list of formulaic death reports in the Hebrew Bible, especially the appendix entries for the Books of Kings see B. Cribb and D. Block, *Speaking on the Brink of Sheol*, (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009).

“usurpation.”<sup>52</sup> This is not due to Athaliah’s Israelite heritage since the report of her reign is also different from the formulaic way the reigns of Israelite kings are reported in the book of Kings.

From a slightly different perspective, Long saw the story of Athaliah as a “flashback” after the report of Jehu’s revolt against the Omrides. Long states

Formulaic regnal summaries define the outer limits of this section, which covers a six-year span of time presumably during the early years of Jehu’s reign. In effect, Athaliah abruptly enters the Dtr story line as a flashback after the close of Jehu’s reign (10.34-36), and leaves it before one encounters the typical introduction to the reign of Jehu’s successor....Her story in important ways presupposes the final form of the Jehu traditions in chs. 9-10.<sup>53</sup>

Nelson, though downplaying the historical critical conclusions others have made about the text, still found value in noting the formulaic divergence of this chapter. He argued that the narrative concern of 2 Kings 11 is to de-legitimize Athaliah. According to Nelson, the narrator treated the reign of Athaliah as an interregnum because the report of her reign is narrated outside the usual system.<sup>54</sup> Nelson is clearly referring to the formulaic system of reporting the initiation and conclusion of the reigns of kings in the books of Kings.

Similar to Nelson, Sweeney saw the report of Athaliah’s reign as the concluding unit of the regnal report of the reign of her son Ahaziah (2 Kgs 8:25-11.20). “It is an appendix, insofar as it stands outside the formal structure of the introductory regnal account for Ahaziah in 2 Kgs 8.25-29 and the concluding regnal account of the reign of Jehu in 2 Kgs 10.31-36.” Here, Sweeney followed most other observations about the formulaic deviance of the report of Athaliah’s reign. However, he did make the important observation that the text treats Athaliah’s reign similar to that of the report of Israel’s revolt against the house of David (Rehoboam) in 1

---

<sup>52</sup> J. Gray, *I & II Kings*, (OTL; Westminster, 1963), 514; see also G. H. Jones, *I and 2 Kings*, (2 vols. NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 477; notes the missing “...editorial formulae for introducing Athaliah’s reign and for recording its conclusion...”; see also P. Dutcher-Walls, *Narrative Art*, 69.

<sup>53</sup> B. O. Long, *2 Kings*, (FOTL X; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 146; H. D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen: Untersuchungen zu einen Grundthema der deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung* (AThANT 66; Zurich, 1980), 104-113.

<sup>54</sup> R. D. Nelson, *First and Second Kings*, (IBC; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1987), 207.

Kings 12 which also lacks introductory formula introducing the beginning of Jeroboam's reign. However, Sweeney concludes that the account of Athaliah's reign is also different from 1 Kings 12 because it "lacks a concluding regnal formula, which is supplied for both Jeroboam ben Nebat (1 Kgs 14.19-20) and Jehu (2 Kgs 10.31-36)."<sup>55</sup> Even though there are similarities between the regnal report of Jeroboam and Athaliah, there is no substantial evidence for literary dependence between the two. One must look elsewhere for answers about the formulaic peculiarities of 2 Kings 11 (e.g., how do the redactors report events associated with other Queen Mothers like Jezebel, etc.).

The form critical observations about the reign of Athaliah indicate that those who worked the report of her reign into the DtrH did not see her as a legitimate ruler. Another possibility is that, in comparison with the story of the execution of Jezebel, the death of the queen mother was understood as the ultimate end of her son's reign (i.e., part of Ahaziah's regnal report). Both Joram and Ahaziah were killed by Jehu. Following these reports, both Jezebel and Athaliah were executed without any use of standard regnal formulae for reporting their deaths. One difficulty with this perspective is that Athaliah is reported to have reigned for six years while we have no indication of how long Jezebel ruled before she was executed, though the text implies it was not for long since Jehu's revolt is reported very swiftly.

Perhaps the most significant form critical observation is that there is a connection between the successive regnal formulae, the oracles of Ahijah-Elijah, and the coups of Jehu and Jehoiada. Especially in the cases of Israelite kings from Jeroboam to Jehu, the succession reports have been modified to include reports about the fulfillment of oracles due to the sins of Jeroboam. It seems significant that in the very text where the term קשר is used for the first time in connection with Judahite succession, there is no oracle fulfillment report associated with

---

<sup>55</sup> M. A. Sweeney, *I & II Kings*, (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 342.

Athaliah's execution. This further supports the claim that these narratives were interconnected thematically by the deuteronomist, but had to be reported differently due to geographic and ideological concerns. It may also indicate that a later voice, one that understood the term קשר differently from the way it was used to describe Israelite kings, was responsible for incorporating the already extant narratives about Israelite corruption into a reevaluation of corrupt Judahite kings from a post-monarchic perspective. This later understanding did not see קשר and the outcome of coups in Judah as the result of contemporary prophetic oracles, but rather as a thematic link to show that some Judahite kings followed the practices of Israelite kings (Jeroboam and Ahab//Judahites in general [2 Kgs 17; later interpretations include Judah in this Israelite curse], Ahaz of Judah [2 Kgs 16:2-3], Manasseh and Amon of Judah [2 Kgs 21]). It was only with Manasseh that the discourse about the practices of Israelite kings was partially balanced with an evil Judahite king. Even then, Manasseh still did "as King Ahab of Israel had done" (2 Kgs 21:1) and Jerusalem and the house of David are redefined metaphorically as Samaria and the house of Ahab (2 Kgs 21:13-15). In this instance, a Judahite king does receive a negative oracle similar to those in the narratives from Ahijah to Elijah/Elisha (1 Kings 11-2 Kings 10). All other oracles to Judahite kings (2 Kgs 20:16-18; 22:16-20) contain themes that are focused on the salvation of Jerusalem as a city and also tend to delay predicted catastrophes until after the death of the king receiving the oracle (Hezekiah and Josiah). Intriguingly, this theme of oracular delay is also found in late reinterpretations of the Ahab narrative (1 Kgs 21:28-29) and also with Jehu (2 Kgs 10:30).<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Though the example here associated with Jehu does extend his dynasty, it is important to note that this oracle in v.30 is the positive result of Jehu's obedience to Yahweh, not, as with the other cases, the result of repentance or Yahweh's love for David. The theological perspective is most closely related to Ahijah's initial positive oracle to Jeroboam promising him a lasting dynasty based on his obedience to Yahweh. All other oracle 'delays' are negative, i.e., disaster is coming and there is nothing that can be done about it, but, it won't happen until the days of the king's sons.

The form critical issues also serve to clarify why the Athaliah/Joash narrative is so different from the other regnal reports and why Athaliah was not associated with the oracle fulfillment tradition prevalent throughout the preceding reports of oracle, conspiracy, and succession in Israel.

The additional material in 2 Kings 11 about Baalism should be understood as a counter-cultic discourse. The earlier discourse did not have this counter-cultic element, but was focused on the legitimation of Davidic rule. This again supports the claim that Athaliah was not originally understood as associated with Baalism, at least explicitly in 2 Kings 11. Rather, the formulaic deviance of 2 Kings 11 indicates that the narrative was incorporated into the successive conspiracies and coups that preceded it.

The lack of standard regnal formulae for the reign of Athaliah, as has been argued, may be the result of a discursive framework that constrained and guided views about who could be a legitimate ruler in Judah. Athaliah did not fit the standard description of a Judahite king because she was Israelite (i.e., non-Davidide), female, a usurper, and according to later additions to the text, a participant in and matron of foreign cultic practices. There is also a possibility that the narrative was worked into its current literary position at a late point in the textual history. If this were the case, the lack of regnal formulae could also be due to the redactor's or author's lack of conformity or understanding about the chronistic mode of reporting with standard regnal formulae. This is possible, but not probable since 2 Kings 11 was worked into the DtrH in order to link Josiah to David via Joash. The Dtr was responsible for framing much of the chronistic nature of the book of Kings and was certainly aware of the importance of regnal formulae in reporting the reigns of Israelite and Judahite kings. As a result, it seems most probable that the lack of regnal formulae for the reign of Athaliah is the result of the above mentioned discourse

about proper Davidic succession and its ideological guides and constraints for constructing concepts about who can and cannot be a valid ruler in Judah.

*Genre Critical Issues: 2 Kings 11 as Saga, Historical Narrative or Historiography*

For the most part, exegetes from the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries considered 2 Kings 11 to be either an historical narrative or a saga.<sup>57</sup> Historical Narrative was thought to be objective, focused on the most recent past, and concerned with actual events while the saga had a particular structure that created suspense, focused on the distant past, and reported atypical events often marvelous or miraculous along with the typical. As such, saga was understood to be less objective than historical narrative.<sup>58</sup> Because of the complexity of 2 Kings 11, many scholars have had difficulty determining its genre because it contains elements that appear to be miraculous and objective – even curt historical narrative.<sup>59</sup>

It could be argued that the account contains miraculous elements because it is a link in the chain of statements that report the fulfillment of the Davidic covenant/promise beginning in 2 Samuel 7, though this connection is only implied. Furthermore, the clear connections between 2 Kings 11 and 2 Kings 8-10 are a strong indication that the events of 2 Kings 11 should be understood as somehow connected to the Yahwistic reform of Jehu initiated by the prophet Elisha or that a later scribe framed them as such. This connection may be another example of the miraculous (i.e., implied miraculous) elements of 2 Kings 11.

---

<sup>57</sup> A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1961), 243-244.

<sup>58</sup> Barre, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 47-48.

<sup>59</sup> For a recent discussion about ‘historiography’ and the inclusion of the “miraculous” in pre-Modern historical texts, see F. Lifshitz, “Beyond Positivism and Genre: ‘Hagiographical’ Texts as Historical Narrative,” *Viator* 25 (1994):95-113; Concerning these texts, esp. 2 Kgs 9-11, Rendtorff argues that these texts show “that the preservation of the continuity of the Davidic dynasty was their decisive contribution to history.” (R. Rendtorff, *The Old Testament*, [London: SCM, 1985], 46; see also 107-108, 179; Wurthwein, Nicholson, Soggin, Talmon).

On the other hand, 2 Kings 11 employs a curt, fast paced report of the events of Jehoiada's coup d'état. This stylistic attribute has clear indications of historical writing that, for obvious reasons, has led some to classify it as historical narrative.

### *2 Kings 11 as Propaganda*

Several important monographs have been written concerning the genre of 2 Kings 11. Dutcher-Walls explored the literary and rhetorical aspects of this chapter with a follow-up focused on the sociological and ideological underpinnings. Citing Barre, Dutcher-Walls argued that the story resembles apologetic rhetoric.<sup>60</sup> Its purpose is to support the "...thesis that the Davidic dynasty has been authoritatively and legitimately restored after an interruption explicable only as the death throes of the powerfully evil Omride line."<sup>61</sup> In light of my own synthesis of Treballe-Barrera's work, it may be the case that Davidic symbols were added to the narrative later to solidify the connection between Josiah, Joash, and David.

In his monograph, L. Barré presents the report of Athaliah's downfall in contrast with that of the fall of Omrides in the north during the revolt of Jehu. For Barre, the genre is apologetic propaganda meant to justify the actions of Jehoiada in initiating the revolt in the first place. "Its earnest apologetic purpose suggests that it sought to convince the elders of Judah that Jehoiada's coup, *unlike Jehu's*, was a heroic and righteous act of loyalty to the Davidic dynasty."<sup>62</sup> Thus, Barre sees 2 Kings 9-11 as a single piece of propaganda with two parts. The first is the report of the revolt of Jehu against the Omrides. Barre argues that this first part of the piece of propaganda paints Jehu in a negative light.<sup>63</sup> However, the terms used to describe Jehu,

---

<sup>60</sup> Dutcher-Walls, *Narrative Art*, 85; Barre, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 56.

<sup>61</sup> *Idem*, 86.

<sup>62</sup> Barre, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 54

<sup>63</sup> *Idem*, 55



like ‘zealous,’ are ambiguous because they can be used both negatively and positively (see Elijah’s statements of zeal in 1 Kgs 19:10, 13). Furthermore, the parallel coup reports (2 Kings 9-10//2 Kings 11) are not different ideologically, but geographically. What this means is that the ideological assumptions of a Judahite scribe would prefer that two similar stories, such as these, would have different outcomes based on geographic (spacial) observations.

The second part of the propaganda is apologetic (2 Kings 11) and was written with the Elders of Judah in mind as the intended audience. “The narrative solicits their political support by ardently rejecting the damaging charge that Jehoiada was motivated by the same self-serving goals that seven years earlier had driven Jehu when he seized the throne of Israel through deception and violence.”<sup>64</sup> Though I agree that there is clearly an apologetic feel to 2 Kings 9-11, I do not fully agree with Barre’s analysis because he failed to mention the role of prophets in the account of Jehu (and in previous accounts of coup and succession) as authoritative instigators of change (this also supports the idea that Jehu’s revolt was seen in a positive light from a Judahite perspective).

The earlier form of the text of 2 Kings 11 was void of Baalistic and explicitly Davidic symbols. As a work of propaganda or even historical narrative without these elements, the discursive voice is much different. The addition of anti-Baalist reports indicate that there was a need to associate Athaliah with Baalism since the anti-Baalism theme was not the initial evil that Athaliah had done. The initial breach was that Athaliah had attempted to nullify a different oracle, the oracle of promise to the house of David. In its earliest development, the execution of Athaliah was not justified because of her deviant cultic practices; rather, it was because she had stepped between Yahweh and his chosen dynasty, the Davidides. As a result, the oracle tradition that appears to climax in the culmination of Jehu’s coup was initially the end of the fulfillment

---

<sup>64</sup> idem.

reports of the Elijah oracle tradition. The report of Athaliah's execution was secondarily added to the sequence of events and, for various reasons both ideological and socio-contextual, when the anti-Baalistic material was added it created a strong link between 2 Kings 9-10 and 2 Kings 11.

These later additions concerning the destruction of Baalism and Jezebel extended the boundaries of the earlier oracle tradition of Elijah. The earlier field of statements associated with the oracle tradition and its fulfillment reports was concerned mainly with predicting the destruction of successive royal houses and was directed only at male offspring. Later, a prophetic and anti-Baalistic discourse appropriated the oracle tradition and extended the oracles boundaries to everyone associated with Ahab and especially, Jezebel. It is only this late discursive voice that drives us to ask why Athaliah's rise and execution, after having been inserted immediately after the all-consuming revolt of Jehu against her father's house, were not associated with Elijah's oracle against the Ahabites and its associated oracle fulfillment reports.

As has been shown, the answer is complicated, but every perspective, source critical, form critical, genre critical, etc., seems to support the probability that the execution report of Athaliah was only secondarily understood as connected to the Jehu revolt narrative and the oracle tradition associated with it. Thus, the earlier discursive formations that were behind the production and reproduction of 2 Kings 11 were not concerned with cultic reform, but rather, were more concerned with the continuation of the Davidic dynasty. As a result, Athaliah's execution was a result of her attempt to nullify Yahweh's promise to David through Nathan.

However, this does not fully answer the questions I have raised about Athaliah and Jehioada's coup. Once the explicit link between Baalism in 2 Kings 9-10 and 2 Kings 11 was established, it was certainly understood that Athaliah was indeed an Ahabite, a full-fledged Baal worshipping daughter of Jezebel. All of Athaliah's kin and even some Judahites (Ahaziah and

his relatives), were consumed in the oracle fulfillment. This anti-Baalistic discourse must certainly be understood as a counter-cultic voice emanating from the Jerusalem cultic institution, but it also has clear ties to a prophetic discourse.

In this late reappropriation of this oracle tradition, Jezebel and Ahab are to be punished because they killed the prophets and introduced Baal worship into Israel (themes that often appear in conjunction with one another). Initially, the oracle of Naboth was specifically associated with ethical and inheritance laws. Ahab according to the earliest voice in this tradition had killed Naboth and his sons and taken their property. Elijah's oracle was a response to this breach of ethics between a king and his subjects. It was only later that Jezebel was included in the oracle curse because she had killed the prophets and arranged Naboth's execution.

Finally, an anti-foreign cult discourse reappropriated and reproduced the oracle tradition that resulted in the association of Ahab and Jezebel with Baalism, whoredoms, and sorceries (non-Yahwistic worship; 2 Kgs 9:22). These discursive shifts have a direct impact on how 2 Kings 11 should be understood. Athaliah's execution was only secondarily associated with her practice of Baalism. However, it is still unclear why, at the time 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the sequence; Athaliah's execution was not associated with the cultic annihilation of Baalism as was Jezebel's execution. Joram's death by the arrow of Jehu was associated with the earlier oracular discursive framework that constrained the oracle's fulfillment only to punishment of the sons of Ahab (a direct mirror of the earliest form of the oracle that was apparently given as a symbolic curse associated with the death of Naboth and his sons; i.e., Just as you killed Naboth and his sons, You and your sons will be killed; Naboth//Ahab, Naboth's sons//Ahab's sons). If the discourse that produced and reproduced the oracle tradition in its later form (as part of an anti-Baalistic discourse) is responsible for expanding the oracle's boundaries

from restricted to only male offspring to ultimately including everyone belonging to Ahab, that same discourse must be responsible for disassociating Athaliah from the oracle fulfillment reports that it inserted for Jezebel and all the worshippers of Baal.

A disassociation was made between Athaliah and the other instances of the eradication of Baalism because this late discourse was a mix of both priestly temple-centered and Davidic ideologies. Prophets had instigated the coups in the north because there was no obedience to authoritative Yahwistic worship from a Judahite perspective. In Judah, there was an authoritative Yahwistic institution; it was the only proper Yahwistic place of worship. Its structure was authoritative, it had a priest, and functionaries; it was the place of coronation that was officiated by the priest. The later discursive formations behind the production of 2 Kings 11 were predominantly Yahwistic, Jerusalem-centered discourses. As a result, in this authoritative space controlled by an authoritative Yahwistic priest, allowing the expansion of the Elijah oracles to control even part of that domain would indicate that Judahite and Israelite kings were the same and that the authority of the Jerusalem temple cultic institution was subject to the oracles of Israelite prophets.

This is both an ideological and a geographical discursive formation (i.e., the text's production was both guided and constrained for ideological/geographic reasons). This later discourse extended the curse of the oracle tradition to all associated with Ahab *within the kingdom of Israel*. There is never a fulfillment report associated with any Ahabites executed in Judah. In contrast, even Judahites (Ahaziah and his relatives from Judah) are subject to the oracle's fulfillment *within the territory of the kingdom of Israel*.

## *Redaction Critical Issues*

Redaction criticism, as Steck put it, aims “...to trace the course of a writing’s developmental history in the viewpoints changing within the text.”<sup>65</sup> The redaction critical analyses of 2 Kings 11 have tended to focus on the location of this chapter in relation to two or three possible social locations that are implied in its text and thus indicate certain ideological tendencies that best fit in their respective socio-historical settings. Prior to the Deuteronomistic Hypothesis of M. Noth, biblical scholars often focused their analyses of the text of the historiographical books of Kings on source critical approaches that were based on the assumptions of the Graf-Wellhausen *Documentary Hypothesis*.<sup>66</sup> This hypothesis argued that the Pentateuch was composed of various textual strata each with its own theological-ideological worldview. Though source theories about the Pentateuch are complex, the basic assumption is that there are three or four literary strata that can be identified through a close reading of the text of the Pentateuch: the J source (Yahwist/Jahwist), the E source (Elohist), the D source (the Deuteronomist), and the P source (Priestly).<sup>67</sup>

Based on these assumptions and noting the similarities in language and form between the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, scholars expanded the source theories into their analyses of the books subsequent to the Torah/Pentateuch leading to theories and discussions about different groupings of the books contra the term Pentateuch; for example, using terms such as Tetrateuch (four books, Gen-Num), Hexateuch (six books, Gen-Josh), Octateuch (eight books, Gen-Ruth),

---

<sup>65</sup> O. H. Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis*, 75.

<sup>66</sup> Wellhausen, J. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 1983; K.H. Graf, *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 1866; and “Die s.g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs,” in *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, (hg.v. Adalbert Merx, Bd. 1, 1869), 466-477; see also G. Davies, “Introduction to the Pentateuch,” in *The Pentateuch*, OBC, (J. Barton and J. Muddiman, eds., Oxford:Oxford University Press, 2001), 16-53; J. Conrad, *Karl Heinrich Grafs Arbeit am alten Testament: Studien zu einer wissenschaftlichen Biographie*, BZAW 425, (Berlin:Walter de Gruyter, 2011).

<sup>67</sup> Much more complex proposals certainly exist, but this basic framework is the standard starting point for source analyses of the Pentateuch.

and Enneateuch (nine books, Gen-Kgs) began to emerge in biblical scholarship dealing with source critical approaches to the Hebrew Bible (though these terms had been used by much earlier exegetes). Though source theories continue to play a role in the analysis of the books of the “Former Prophets” (Josh-2 Kings), the focus has predominantly shifted to the analysis of the redaction activity of those who collected and edited older traditions into what we now know as Deuteronomy-2 Kings. Each successive redaction of this work had a clear ideological perspective that is often identified as *Deuteronomistic*.

This shift in focus was due to the now famous (and still relevant) work of the German scholar M. Noth who wrote part of a major research project on Tradition History during World War II. A part of this work focused on what Noth referred to as the Deuteronomistic History (*Deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk*, [DtrH]).<sup>68</sup> Noth argued that a *single* author or redactor was responsible for collating various literary traditions about Israel’s past into a coherent whole using a specific structure that guided his new literary product. The structure of the DtrH, according to Noth, was apparent in the deuteronomist’s use of significant speeches at particular times, made by prominent figures from the past (Josh 1; 23-24; Judg 2; 1 Sam 12; 1 Kgs 2.1-9\*; 1 Kgs 8; 2 Kgs 17; etc.) in the DtrH.<sup>69</sup> These speeches have subsequently come to be known as “Farewell Speeches” (though this term doesn’t fully do justice to the genre and its purpose).<sup>70</sup> Noth argued that this literary work was completed by a scribe in the Exilic Period (Late Neo-Babylonian Period) around the middle of the sixth century BCE.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 15, (Trans. E. W. Nicholson Sheffield:Sheffield, 1981).

<sup>69</sup> *idem*, 4-11.

<sup>70</sup> *idem*, “Introduction:; T. Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History*, 115-123.

<sup>71</sup> M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 12; *idem* „Schriften der Königsbucher Gelehrten Gesellschaft“. *Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse*, 18 (1943):43-266; *idem*, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, (Tübingen:Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957).

As a result of Noth's important conclusions, scholarship focused on the books of Joshua-2 Kings completely shifted away from source critical analyses in the Former Prophets (Josh-2 Kgs); all analyses of these texts must grapple with (and if necessary modify) Noth's conclusions in one way or another.

Beginning with Noth, 2 Kings 11 was understood to be one of various elements copied by the Deuteronomist from the supposed source *The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah* that was concerned with, among other things, literary material about the temple in Jerusalem and the succession of rulers.<sup>72</sup> Thus, for Noth, 2 Kings 11 was a monarchic period source that was collated into the framework of the DtrH around the year 562 BCE.<sup>73</sup>

Later scholars, predominantly from North America and Europe, followed Noth's proposals about a Dtr edition of certain books, especially in the books of Joshua to Kings. F. M. Cross proposed a double redaction theory that argued, contra Noth, that there was not a single editor responsible for a single edition of the DtrH, but rather, there were two major revisions from two different historical periods: one from the monarchic period and another from the exilic period.<sup>74</sup>

In Europe, a different consensus emerged associated with R. Smend who proposed a triple redaction model for the DtrH.<sup>75</sup> In contrast to Cross's model that saw the composition of the DtrH in two major redactional blocks, Smend's triple redaction theory was more nuanced in

---

<sup>72</sup> idem, 65-67

<sup>73</sup> idem, 65-69; It is also important to point out that Noth did not see 2 Kgs 9-10 as connected to 2 Kgs 11. Noth argues that 2 Kgs 9-10 were likely not originally linked to the Elijah-Elisha prophetic stories, but more likely associated with an earlier set of prophetic stories like those of 1 Kgs 11, 12, 14, 20, and 22.

<sup>74</sup> F. M. Cross *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274-289; R. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, JSOT 18 (Sheffield:Sheffield University Press, 1981).

<sup>75</sup> R. Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme Biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. W. Wolff, Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971), 494-509; T. Romer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 2005; G. Knoppers, "Theories and Redactions of Kings," in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography, and Reception*, (Lemaire and Halpern, eds. Leiden:Brill, 2010), 69-88.

that it accounted for the evidence of textual stratigraphy or layers of editing that began to be collated during the exilic period. Dietrich and Veijola, two of Smend's more well-known students, continued to modify Smend's triple redaction approach to the DtrH.<sup>76</sup> Though Dietrich argues that all three redactions likely took place between the beginning of the exilic period and 560 BCE (a very short period of time), Smend argues that the process took much longer. This perspective was presented in a recent major monograph by T. Römer (below) in a modified form that synthesizes arguments for a pre-exilic redaction with those arguing for exilic and post-exilic redactions that occurred over an extended period of time.

### *Recent Redaction Critical Analyses*

Most recently T. Römer has followed suit with a triple redaction analysis that argued that at least three different redactions can be detected; these redactions derive from the Assyrian Period, Babylonian Period, and Persian Period. In this redaction model, Römer argues that the prophetic stories about Ahijah, the anonymous prophet in 1 Kings 13, Jehu (the prophet), Elijah, Micaiah, Elisha, Jonah, Isaiah, and Hulda all conform to the DtrH's ideas about the role of prophets from their ideological perspective of the Exilic Period or Neo-Babylonian Period (i.e., the 6<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE; Dt 18.18-22).<sup>77</sup> Römer also includes 2 Kings 11 in this redaction period noting that the report of events in 2 Kings 11 foreshadows the events of Josiah's reforms in 2 Kings

---

<sup>76</sup> W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte* (FRLANT 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); W. Dietrich, "Prophetie im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk," in Thomas Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (BETL 147; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 47–65; R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989); T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, serie B, Tom 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1975); T. Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, serie B, Tom 198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1977); G. Knoppers, "Theories and Redactions of Kings," 69-88.

<sup>77</sup> T. Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History*, 153; E. Ben Zvi, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Compositional and Redactional Notes in I – II Kings" *ZAW* 105/3 (1993):331-351.



23.<sup>78</sup> Though I think that Römer is correct that 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the DtrH in the Exilic period, I think that the discursive shift between palace and temple, royal guard and temple guard indicate that 2 Kings 11 was produced as part of an earlier discourse concerned with the continuation of the Davidic dynasty that had little to do with the eradication of Baalism. The cultic reforms of 2 Kings 9-10 and 2 Kings 11 must be understood as traditions that have been produced and reproduced by different discursive constraints and guides over a long period of time.

Redaction critical observations are useful because they help to paint a broad picture of the communal and social discourses that constrain and guide the production of knowledge. The redaction critical analyses above support the argument that the cultic reforms of Jehu and Jehoiada were not initially concerned with erradicating Baalism. The earliest instance of the Elijah oracle was associated with ethical laws about land ownership, murder, and retribution. As regards the element of retribution, the earliest instance of this oracle presented punishment against Ahab that mirrored his murder of Naboth and his sons. In 2 Kings 11, the earliest discursive formations were guided and constrained by concerns for preserving the Davidic dynasty. Much later, these two narratives were joined with two major themes, the eradication of Baalism, conspiracy, and succession. It is more difficult to say what the provenance of the theme of conspiracy and succession may be, but it is very clear that the themes included in the discourse against Baalism are quite late in the redaction of the DtrH. As a result, the redaction critical analyses have some importance for answering my central questions about Athaliah's execution report, the coups of Jehu and Jehoiada, and the oracle tradition of Elijah against Ahab, Ahabites, and Jezebel. The claim that the anti-Baal material is secondary to the earlier redactions

---

<sup>78</sup> Idem, 103-106; see also R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, 125, 134; also, C. Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja, Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte Judas im 9. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, SBS 105 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1982).

of the DtrH offers some insight as to why Athaliah was not part of the oracle fulfillment report sequence that culminated in 2 Kings 9-10. The pre-cultic reform material in 2 Kings 11 may not have even been incorporated into the DtrH until it was inserted and joined to its surroundings via the anti-Baalistic theme that it now includes. However, other Dtr discourses are present in 2 Kings 11 indicating that it may have been incorporated into an earlier Dtr work. For example, there is a theme that contrasts covenant and conspiracy in 2 Kings 11 that is not specifically associated with the eradication of Baalism. The theme of covenant and covenant renewal is closely associated with late monarchic period discourses that constrained and guided the production of Dtr ideology about the covenant relationship (similar to Neo-Assyrian treaties) between Yahweh, his people, and kings.

This earlier discourse did not include material about the eradication of Baalism. Rather, in 2 Kings 11 two different ideas about conspiracy are present. 2 Kings 11 marks a middle point in the usage of the term קשר or “conspiracy” in contrast to ברית, which means “covenant.” The Jehoiada narrative makes a clear break with the previous conspiracy narratives that use the term קשר. In all previous examples and in all subsequent examples in the book of Kings, קשר is used negatively (with the exception of the coup of Jehu). In 2 Kings 11, the coup of Jehoiada does not begin with a conspiracy (קשר), but rather, Jehoiada secretly calls together elite military men and makes a covenant with them (ברית). Athaliah cries out קשר קשר (“Conspiracy! Conspiracy!) against those participating in the scene she sees before her. Yet, in the middle of a clear sequence of conspiracies beginning in 1 Kings 15:27 (the fall of Nadab, son of Jeroboam after the conspiracy of Baasha), 2 King 11 also reports a conspiracy, but uses different terms to describe it. 2 Kings 11 legitimizes Jehoiada’s coup by using authoritative and evocative language like וַיִּשְׁבַּע אֹתָם בְּבֵית יְהוָה “and he made them

swear in the house of Yahweh” (2 Kgs 11:4). This discursive shift is likely not due to successive reinterpretation of the term קשר over time as 2 Kings 11 was produced and reproduced by successive communities. Rather, the use of the term ברית in contrast to קשר was meant to highlight the legitimacy of Joash, Jehoiada, deuteronomistic theology, and the relationship between all of these and Josiah’s cultic reforms that may not have initially included specific injunctions against Baalism, but were more generally focused on centralizing Yahwistic worship in Jerusalem. Any warnings against foreign practices were given generally and did not single out Baalism specifically.

### *Gender Critical Issues*

In her 1993 article “Queen Mother” Ackerman explores the role of the Gebirah/Queen Mother in the Judahite royal house.<sup>79</sup> Summarizing recent works, Ackerman argued that many have tried unsuccessfully to elucidate this enigmatic topic. Ackerman noted various contrasting opinions, like those of Ben-Barak and Anderson who argued that (unlike the Hittite Queen Mother, Tawananna) the Judahite Gebirah had no cultic role in Judahite society. In contrast, G. Ahlstrom argued that the cultic role of the Gebirah in Judah was to participate in a Judahite ‘Hieros Gamos.’<sup>80</sup>

Ackerman found no evidence for these proposals and her goal is to revisit the material afresh. Ackerman sought to understand the Gebirah’s role by analyzing it as a mirror image of the role of the Judahite king. She argued that the Gebirah devoted herself to the mother goddess Asherah just as the king was to devote himself to Yahweh. In conjunction with the latter, the Gebirah, as the devotee and temporal representative of the mother goddess (and the king as the

---

<sup>79</sup> S. Ackerman, “The Queen Mother and the Cult in Ancient Israel,” *JBL* 112/3 (1993):385-401.

<sup>80</sup> *Idem*, 387.

representative of Yahweh), had an important role in her son's succession to the throne. Ackerman based her conclusions on a comparison with the Judahite theology that the king was the adopted son of Yahweh and in turn, the Gebirah was the adopted daughter of Asherah. One of her main roles was to legitimate her son's chosen-ness as an adopted son of Yahweh (she herself being the adopted daughter of Yahweh's consort, Asherah).<sup>81</sup> As regards 2 Kings 11, Ackerman argues that it is likely that queen mothers, like Jezebel and Athaliah, participated in the Asherah cult.<sup>82</sup>

Another recent work that explores the role of the queen mother, by E. A. Knauf, argued that the Queen Mother may have had a profound impact on the writing of history.<sup>83</sup> Though Knauf pointed out that his analysis was only a hypothetical exercise meant to explore whether or not Queen Mothers had an important role in deciding what was remembered and forgotten in the royal court, his analysis is fascinating because of its novel approach in attempting to break the role of queen mother free from both misogynistic ancient historiography as well as modern misogynistic analyses that are blind to the important roles that women played in the biblical text, in preserving memories about the past, and in ancient society generally. Knauf is doubtful that the Queen Mother held an official office in the court; rather, she had a role or function in the royal house as head of the female household/harem.<sup>84</sup>

Exploring further, Knauf claimed that it is possible that, for example, Athaliah could have held an influential role in the historiographic practices of the court in Judah. He posited that

---

<sup>81</sup> *Idem*, 388, 399, 400-401.

<sup>82</sup> *Idem*, 388-399; There are several problems with Ackerman's approach. First, it employs an uncritical comparative analysis. By uncritical, I refer to the common practice of pointing out positive parallels without engaging in the analysis of difference. Second, the proposal can only remain a weak hypothesis because Ackerman has little-to-no evidence to back up her claims.

<sup>83</sup> The proposals that Knauf argues in his essay are clearly hypothetical and exploratory. He clearly indicates as much. The questions he raises, however, are useful ones.

<sup>84</sup> E. A. Knauf, "The Queens' Story. Bathsheba, Maacah, Athaliah and the 'Historia of Early Kings'" *Lectio Difficilior* 2 (2002): 10. Cited 26 May 2014. Online: [http://www.lectio.unibe.ch/02\\_2/axel.htm](http://www.lectio.unibe.ch/02_2/axel.htm).

Athaliah was responsible for various historiographic elements that presented Israelite rule in a more favorable light. For example, he argued that Athaliah was responsible for the insertion of the Saul narrative that showed that the northern kingdom took precedence over Judah; it was meant to show that the first Israelite king was a northerner. According to Knauf, Athaliah was also responsible for certain elements of the David narrative that presented him as a hero, though an unsuccessful one (a vassal of Philistines, etc.).<sup>85</sup> Knauf argued further that Athaliah was responsible for the history of the divided/united kingdom. Knauf argues that this narrative could have been used by Athaliah to show that Davidic rule under Solomon and Rehoboam tried but failed to retain a unified kingdom of Israel and Judah while, in contrast, the Omride/Ahabite dynasty succeeded in controlling “Dan to Beersheba.”<sup>86</sup> Athaliah further tainted memories about David by involving him in questionable acts such as the deaths of Saul and Eshbaal.

According to Knauf, Athaliah’s historiographical influence balanced the memory of the Davidic dynasty with memories about the successes of the kingdom of Israel. The message was one that encouraged Judahites under her rule to be proud of David and Solomon, but be faithful to the house of Omri just as David should have been faithful to Saul.<sup>87</sup>

One of the main weaknesses in Knauf’s analysis is that he doesn’t explore other periods that could have influenced a similar ideological shift. For example, the period of Israelite hegemony over Judah during the period of the Omrides seems a much more plausible social backdrop for the emergence of pro-Israelite propaganda. Furthermore, this argument is supported by several different texts that appear to present, from Jehoshaphat on, a period of powerful Israelite influence in Judah.

---

<sup>85</sup> Idem, 23-24.

<sup>86</sup> idem, 24-26.

<sup>87</sup> idem, 26.

Another weakness is that the oracle tradition that functions as a thematic backbone of the narrative between 1 Kings 12 and 2 Kings 10 (or, better, 2 Kings 11) has a negative impact on the image of Israelite kings. This oracle tradition was intricately bound up with the positive oracle tradition of promise to David (see the oracle of Ahijah to Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 14:6-16). Thus, it seems unlikely, as Knauf proposes, that Athaliah would have backed the production of a history about David that is so intricately connected with negative oracles about her father, Ahab.

N. Tan in her analysis of Jezebel, Athaliah, and other Queen Mothers in the Hebrew Bible, noted that many of the most infamous figures of the text are often connected to foreign women. In Tan's opinion, the DtrH is "keen...to find links of 'foreignness'" for those women he deemed as the bad influence and who were involved in foreign worship. For example, strictly speaking, both Maacah and Athaliah were children of earlier intermarriages between an Israelite and a "foreign woman."<sup>88</sup> From a gender critical perspective, Tan's analysis highlighted the historiographical bias of the deuteronomist who established a marginalizing connection between evil, foreignness, and women.

In the Hebrew Bible, women (including Athaliah) are constructed as the link between evil actions and ensuing destruction. This is not employed simply in describing the effects of associating with foreign women, but in the very deep metaphors of the Bible that use women as cyphers for understanding obedience//disobedience, blessing//cursing, and prosperity//destruction. In this construct, the negative parallel is often associated with foreign women while the positive side dealing with obedience, blessing and prosperity includes mention of faithful women; the centerpiece of such stories is clearly patriarchal.

---

<sup>88</sup> N. N. Tan, *The 'Foreignness' of the Foreign Woman in Proverbs 1-9 : A Study of the Origin and Development of a Biblical Motif*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008),65-80.

There are some exceptions to this construct (Ruth and Tamar), but these do not apply to the text at hand (both Ruth and Gen 38 are not Dtr). Athaliah, by means of not only literary framing, but also by association with Jezebel her mother, is clearly the foreign woman who stands as a link between the people and destruction. As such, she is doomed to die ignominiously in the narrative or the people themselves are doomed to destruction for allowing her to live. This historiographical technique is common in the DtrH and is supported by its warnings about foreignness (including foreign women) and how, if not completely wiped out, foreign practices will cause Yahweh to destroy and scatter the Israelites just like Yahweh had done with the nations who lived in the land before them.<sup>89</sup>

The main point of challenging these marginalizing constructions is to call attention to the ways that they are propagated and to address their implications. As deep metaphors, almost hidden or assumed, they are often used and reused without noting the social prejudices they harbor against women. Such is the case with Athaliah since the narrative flow of 2 Kings 11 contradicts the historical realities of the events it reports. The chapter's clear propagandistic purpose calls attention to the necessity to read carefully and critically with an understanding of the historiographical techniques common in both the Hebrew Bible and the wider Ancient Near East.<sup>90</sup>

### *Historical Issues*

Matters of a historical nature dealing with 2 Kings 11 can be categorized into three or four main groups. First, there are matters dealing with the roles of the various social groups

---

<sup>89</sup> See Exod 23:31; Lev 18:26-30; Num 21:1-3; 33:51-56; Dt 2:12, 21-23 (concerning Esau and Ammon and dispossessed people); 2:34; 3:6; 4:26-31; 8:17-9:3; 2 Kgs 22:19; 2 Chr 33:9; 34:24-27.

<sup>90</sup> Dt 17:15 and Athaliah – is she rejected because she is foreign, female, or both? Birds of the air and animals eating corpses, Dt 28:26.

mentioned in the 2 Kings 11 and how scholars identify and analyze them. Some examples of social institutions and groups are discoverable in statements about the role of the temple and its personnel (male and female), the role of the royal court, the role of the *people of the land*, and the role of Israel in Judah and vice versa.

Second, there are archaeological matters. One must define how Israelite, Judahite, and Yehudite material culture can serve to clarify the economic, cultic, and sociological aspects of this text. Third, there are matters of epigraphy. Fourth, there are matters of dating the text or at least addressing hypotheses about its date and its use and reuse in various subsequent communities.

Addressing the role of various social groups in the text must be done in conjunction with, at least in part, the source theories mentioned above. To begin with, it must be noted that one of the major elements of the two source theories about 2 Kings 11 was its sudden mention of *the people of the land* and their role in the accession of Joash. Since the primary source (v.1-12; 18b-20) fails to mention the people of the land, source critics have tried to explain the social context of the two sources.

For example, to explain the differences between the two sources, Montgomery argues that the primary source was the work of an official scribe.<sup>91</sup> Montgomery's analysis of the second source (v.13-18a) is that it appears to be parallel to the reforms of Josiah. Both deal with reestablishing a covenant and eradicating foreign practices and personnel.<sup>92</sup> It is in the second source that *the people of the land* are introduced. Montgomery argues that this is an example of the people's role in the body politic of Judah. This indicates that at times of emergency, the

---

<sup>91</sup> Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), 418.

<sup>92</sup> *idem*, 422.



Judahites played an important role in succession/accession. Montgomery cites various examples from the ancient Near East supporting this role of the people in such matters.<sup>93</sup>

Concerning the role of the Temple in the text of 2 Kings 11, it must be noted that Noth and others conjecture that the contents of 2 Kings 11, at least in part, was taken from sources containing material about the temple in Judah. Noth proposed that the Judahite source mentioned in the books of Kings, “The Chronicles of the Kings of Judah” contained various literary materials that the Dtr used including material about the temple.<sup>94</sup> Gray states that “we may safely infer the use of temple records” in parts of both 2 Kings 11 and 12.<sup>95</sup>

### *Hypotheses about Royal Inscriptions and the Coup of Jehoiada/Enthronement of Joash*

N. Na’aman has explored the possibility of whether Judahite inscriptions were utilized as sources in the compilation of certain parts of the books of Kings. He has specifically dealt with 2 Kings 11 and 12. Noting that previous analyses, such as Montgomery’s who noted that certain elements of the stories about Joash appear to be lapidary and Van Seters who noted that some material may have been borrowed from memorial inscriptions, Na’aman aimed to explore the possibility that some of the material in 2 Kings 11-12 was based on a Judahite royal inscription.

Na’aman’s criteria for exploring this possibility were as follows. First, material that may have been based on a royal inscription would likely use singular terms not found in the DtrH. Second, there would likely be an element about building (common motif in many ancient Near

---

<sup>93</sup> Yeho-Milik Inscription, 400 BCE; E. Glaser, *Altjemenische Nachrichten*, (Princeton: Straub, 1906), 162; N. Rhodokanakis, *Enactment of Fundamental Constitutional Law in Old South Arabia*, Proc. Am. Philos. Soc. 67 (1928): 207.

<sup>94</sup> M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 1981.

<sup>95</sup> J. Gray, *I and II Kings*, 85; see also S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), 175.

Eastern [ANE] royal inscriptions). Third, central themes running throughout the Hebrew Bible or the DtrH would be less likely to appear in a royal inscription.<sup>96</sup>

With these criteria in mind, Na'aman pointed out that the temple repairs of Joash and Josiah are the only two examples that give specific dates for their renovations. Furthermore, 2 Kings 11 uses terms like כְּרִי (*Karite*) and שְׁדָרוֹת (*ranks* or *pillars*) that are unique to this chapter. He also noted, however, that there are many Dtr elements found throughout 2 Kings 11-12. In conclusion, Na'aman argued that elements from these chapters were originally taken from a dedicatory inscription that was unearthed during the renovations of the temple in the time of Josiah (as implied in 2 Kings 22-23). Na'man noted that the discovery of the inscription may have given rise to the stories about Hilkiah's book-find. According to Na'aman, the Dtr writing shortly thereafter used the inscription as a source for his reconstruction of the reign of Joash. To explain the similarities between 2 Kings 11 and the 2 Kings 9-10, Na'aman proposed that the Dtr used an already known source about the reform of Jehu to guide the structure of his report about Joash while the similarities between the reforms of Jehoiada/Joash and the time of Josiah (the scribes own time or shortly thereafter) are the result of the scribe inserting elements about the Dtr covenant theology from his own time into the report of Jehoiada's reforms and reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty.<sup>97</sup> Answering the question about which elements may be original, Na'aman proposed that the report of Athaliah's rise to power, Jehoiada's revolt, Joash's enthronement, and the execution of Athaliah may be original to 2 Kings 11.<sup>98</sup>

Na'aman's proposal here highlights an important difference in opinion about the sources of the books of Kings. On the one hand, there are those following Wellhausen, Noth, Gray, and

---

<sup>96</sup> N. Na'aman, "Royal Inscriptions and the Histories of Joash and Ahaz, Kings of Judah," *VT* 48/3 (1998):333-349.

<sup>97</sup> *idem*, 343.

<sup>98</sup> *idem*, 344

Driver who propose that there is at the core of this chapter an underlying source (perhaps taken from the enigmatic “Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah”) that contained important stories and events about the temple and royal succession.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, Na’aman argued that at least part of the source material for the Books of Kings must have come to the deuteronomist in the form of royal inscriptions. Van Seters and Na’aman are in agreement that it is unlikely that ancient authors utilized royal or temple archives to write their literary products.

Contra Na’aman, G. Rendsburg rightly notes the conspicuous lack of evidence for any Judahite royal inscription at all.<sup>100</sup> Rendburg argued that Judahite rulers, based on theological reasons, didn’t produce royal inscriptions.<sup>101</sup> Rendsburg’s argument, supported by evidence *ex silentio*, pointed out the glaring lack of supporting evidence for theories arguing that the author of Kings used royal inscriptions to compose parts of 2 Kings 11-12. Pre-empting possible counter arguments, Rendsburg noted that there were indeed inscriptions in Judah (Siloam inscription, etc.) but that these did not mention the names of the kings who produced the inscription as is common in other ANE royal inscriptions. Rendsburg argues that the lack of evidence for royal inscriptions in Judah is due to social, political, and theological controls that prevented Judahite kings from doing things that one would expect a king to do in the ANE, like erect dedicatory inscriptions.<sup>102</sup>

Perhaps the most significant weakness of Rendsburg’s critique is that he claimed that normative priestly theological assumptions were consistent in various periods of Israelite history.

---

<sup>99</sup> n(n). 94 and 95.

<sup>100</sup> The authenticity of the Jehoash inscription is hotly debated. Many scholars believe it to be a modern forgery while others, based on the patina evidence, argue that it is authentic. Due to the controversy surrounding the inscription, I will not utilize it in my discussions about the social, political, and discursive agendas behind the production of 2 Kings 11.

<sup>101</sup> G. Rendsburg, “No Stelae, No Queens: Two Issues Concerning the Kings of Israel and Judah,” in *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the “Other” in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers* (eds. D. R. Edwards and C. T. McCullough, Boston: ASOR), 95-107.

<sup>102</sup> *idem*, 97-98.

The material culture (ostraca, art, figurines, etc.) shows that one cannot assume Israelites/Judahites were unwilling to produce images of gods, their symbols, and titles. It seems best to recognize the paucity of evidence in the form of royal inscriptions without positing unfounded claims about why this is so. It seems dubious, based on the above examples, to argue that the lack of inscription evidence is due to theological concerns within the royal ideology of Israel and Judah.

### *External Sources that Have Implications for Understanding the Oracle Traditions Associated with Ahabites*

Another important historical-critical issue that must be mentioned is the discovery and incorporation of Mesopotamian and Syrian inscriptions that mention Israelite or Judahite kings and how one should go about incorporating these external sources into historical reconstructions of the material at hand. Though 2 Kings 11 deals with Joash specifically, ANE inscriptions that mention royal figures from the houses of Omri (Jehoram) and David (Ahaziah) will be discussed because of their relevance for the climactic events in 2 Kings 11.

### *The Kurkh Monolith: An Inscription of Shalmaneser III, 853-845 BCE*

Any external information about Israelite or Judahite kings from the period of Omri-Jehu are relevant because they highlight the major tensions between biblical historiography and the historiography of other text producers reporting or remembering the same events or periods mentioned in the biblical text. The Kurkh Monolith, erected after the famous battle of Qarqar (853-852), is the most important and extensive description of the battle of Qarqar. During the period of Assyrian reconquest (911-823 BCE), a succession of Assyrian rulers began to reclaim regions and trade routes that had been lost during the Aramean invasions and expansion of the previous two centuries. As the Assyrian expansion grew (instigating the period now known as

the Neo-Assyrian period), a coalition of kings emerged to counter the resurgence of the Assyrians. This conflict came to a head in the famous battle of Qarqar. Concerning the battle, Charpin stated “...in the face of the Assyrian threat twelve kingdoms of the area set aside their rivalries and united under the leadership of Damascus, Hamath, and Israel. Shalmaneser [III] claimed to have emerged victorious, but the situation was apparently far from settled, for the Assyrian armies campaigned in the region at least five more times.”<sup>103</sup>

Ahab, the father of Athaliah and the object of Elijah’s oracles, was a major force in this twelve-kingdom coalition. The relevant text from the Kurkh Monolith, written in first person from the perspective of Shalmaneser III, states:

I approached the city of Qarqar. I razed, destroyed and burned the city of Qarqar, his royal city. 1,200 chariots, 1,200 cavalry, 10,000 troops of Irhuleni, the Hamathite; 2,000 chariots, 10,000 troops of Ahab, the Israelite; 500 troops of Byblos; 1,000 troops of Egypt; 10 chariots and 10,000 troops of the land of Irganatu; 200 troops of Matinu-ba’al of the city of Arvad; 200 troops of the land of Usanatu; 30 chariots and [ ]000 troops of Adon-ba’al of the land of Šianu; 1,000 camels of Gindibu’ of Arabia; [ ] hundred troops of Ba’asa of Bit-Ruhubi, the Ammonite – these 12 kings he took as his allies.<sup>104</sup>

As has been noted previously, this coalition list is startling for several reasons, the most significant being that Ahab, the whiny and wicked arch nemesis of Yahwism according to the biblical text, was in reality a powerful king with enough resources to raise the largest military force among the twelve-kingdom coalition facing off against the Neo-Assyrian expansion. Naturally, as is common in Mesopotamian historiography, the numbers presented in the inscription were likely aggrandized to heighten Shalmaneser III’s claim of victory over the coalition. Even in light of this, Ahab is clearly one of the major players in the coalition.

This information is significant when viewed in contrast to the biblical account of Ahab’s lack of accomplishment and weak personality. Significantly, all of the military conflicts mentioned in the book of Kings are between Israel and the Aramean coalition of 32 kings led by

---

<sup>103</sup> D. Charpin, “The History of Ancient Mesopotamia,” in *CANE*, vol. I, (eds. Baines, Beckman, and Rubinson, New York: Scribner, 1995), 807-829.

<sup>104</sup> K. L. Younger, “The Kurkh Monolith (2.113A),” in *COS*, vol. 2, (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 261-264.

Ben-Hadad. In all battle reports involving Ahab, his small military might is highlighted to contrast the small Israelite army with the sea of soldiers led by the king of Aram. These reports are good examples of other theologically charged military accounts in the DtrH that aim to show that Yahweh's military prowess is more important than having a innumerable host of military personnel. This theological recasting refuses to recognize that Ahab controlled a major military force in the region and is meant to convince the readership of Yahweh's great power.

The Kurkh Monolith of Shalmaneser III also has an effect on how the oracle tradition of Elijah is to be understood. The earliest version of the oracle tradition of Elijah against Ahab presents Ahab in a much different light than the later additions. A later discourse that has appropriated the Ahab narrative (e.g., 1 Kgs 20:43; 21:4-7) presents Ahab as a sulky man-child who pouts and refuses to eat when he doesn't get his way.

In addition, this later tradition puts most of the blame for Naboth's death on Jezebel, who, in order to please her whiny husband, took matters into her own hands to secure Naboth's beautiful and convenient vineyard for him. However, the earlier tradition referenced partially in 1 Kgs 21:19-22 and certainly in 2 Kgs 9:25 placed the blame squarely on Ahab's shoulders. These earlier voices knew nothing about the *faux* trial that Jezebel arranged to bring about the murder Naboth. Instead, especially in 2 Kgs 9:25, these earlier texts appear to argue that Ahab himself had been directly involved not only in Naboth's death, but also in the death of anyone who could possibly claim inheritance rights to Naboth's coveted vineyard – that is, Naboth's sons. This tradition completely contradicts the later tradition as regards geography (Naboth was stoned to death in his city, not at the vineyard itself) and detail (Jezebel was not responsible or even mentioned in the older tradition about Naboth's death and Naboth was not the only person murdered; his children were also victims of Ahab's land-lust). The point is that the earliest

instance of oracular curse against Ahab occurred not because of divergent cultic practices (Baalism), but because he unethically and illegally breached inheritance law in Israel. Like many of the earlier prophetic oracles in the Hebrew Bible, Elijah's initial oracle was a warning against unethical behavior.

This depiction, is a more accurate presentation of Ahab, the powerful Israelite king whose sin was not cultic deviance, but the predicted sin of kings in 1 Sam. 8:10-18

<sup>10</sup> So Samuel reported all the words of the Lord to the people who were asking him for a king. <sup>11</sup> He said, "These will be the ways of the king who will reign over you: he will take your sons and appoint them to his chariots and to be his horsemen, and to run before his chariots; <sup>12</sup> and he will appoint for himself commanders of thousands and commanders of fifties, and some to plow his ground and to reap his harvest, and to make his implements of war and the equipment of his chariots. <sup>13</sup> He will take your daughters to be perfumers and cooks and bakers. <sup>14</sup> *He will take the best of your fields and vineyards and olive orchards and give them to his courtiers.* <sup>15</sup> He will take one-tenth of your grain and of your vineyards and give it to his officers and his courtiers. <sup>16</sup> He will take your male and female slaves, and the best of your cattle and donkeys, and put them to his work. <sup>17</sup> He will take one-tenth of your flocks, and you shall be his slaves. <sup>18</sup> And in that day you will cry out because of your king, whom you have chosen for yourselves; but the Lord will not answer you in that day. (Emphasis added)

The observation that the earliest iterations of 2 Kings 11 and 2 Kings 9-10 were guided and constrained by different discourses is further evidence that 2 Kings 11 was not originally part of the oracle tradition sequence, but was only tied in later by the themes of anti-Baalism and conspiracy. The discourses that guided and constrained the initial production of 2 Kings 11 were not concerned with ethics as were the earliest instances of the Elijah oracle against Ahab, but rather, they were concerned with preserving the Davidic dynasty by wresting power from the hands of the usurper Athaliah.<sup>105</sup> Furthermore, the powerful connections and coalitions of the Ahabites are implied in details about marriages due to political alliances (Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal of Sidon and Athaliah's marriage into the Judahite dynasty). The Kurkh Monolith, evidence of political marriages, and the earliest discourses against Ahab's unethical behavior as a powerful land-grabbing king paint a picture of Ahab and Ahabites that is concerned with Ahab's

---

<sup>105</sup> For an excellent proposal as to the socio-political reasons for ousting Athaliah; see O. Sergi, "Judah's Expansion in Historical Context," *Tel Aviv* 40 (2013): 226-246.

quest for power, land, and expansion. This portrayal of Ahab contradicts the biblical narrative's view that he was a sulky king with an ambitious wife (highlighting that the latest expansions of the text appropriated memories about Jezebel in order to transfer blame to her, i.e., Jezebel was an example *par excellence* of the evils of foreign women and foreign cultic practices according to the Dtr). The discursive framework of 2 Kings 11 was initially quite different. This partially explains why Athaliah was not associated with the Elijah oracle fulfillment report.

### *The Tel Dan Inscription/Stele of Hazael*

Perhaps the most significant inscription for understanding the oracle tradition, fulfillment reports, and 2 Kings 11 is the fragmentary Tel Dan Stele. This inscription likely contains reference to the deaths of both Joram and Ahaziah, whose deaths were specifically related to the rise of Athaliah in 2 Kings 11. This inscription contains a very different account of how these two kings were killed. According to 2 Kgs 9:21-28, Jehu was responsible for the deaths of Joram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah. 2 Kgs 9:14 does mention that King Joram had been on guard at Ramoth-gilead during a conflict with Hazael, but v.15 states “but King Joram had returned to be healed in Jezreel of the wounds that the Arameans had inflicted on him, when he fought against Hazael of Aram.” Those producing the oracle tradition(s) of Elijah (1 Kgs 19:16 and 1 Kgs 21:19-22) and the theme of conspiracy appear to have transferred responsibility for the deaths of Joram and Ahaziah from Hazael (as stated in the inscription below) to Jehu.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> N. Na'aman, “The Story of Jehu's Rebellion – Hazael's Inscription and the Biblical Narrative,” *IEJ* 56 (2006):160-166.



Ln.	Transliteration	Translation <sup>107</sup>
1	[ מרע ] [גזר ] [ ]	[... ] and cut [... ]
2	[ ] [אבי יס ] [עלוהיבהת ] [לחמהבא ] [ ]	[...] my father went up [against him when] he fought at [... ]
3	[ ] [אבהוה ] [הויעלמלכיש ] [ ]	And my father lay down, he went to his [ancestors] and the king of Is- ]
4	[ ] [המלךהדד ] [אחי ] [ ]	rael entered previously in my father's land. [And] Hadad made me king.
5	[ ] [אפקמנשב ] [עתי ] [ ]	And Hadad went before me, and I departed from [the] seven [...-]
6	[ ] [לפיר ] [ ] [מלכישב ] [עאסריא ] [ ]	s of my kingdom, and I slew [seve]nty kin[gs], who harnessed thou[sands of char-]
7	[ ] [אחאב ] [ ] [רמבר ] [ ] [קתלתאיתיהו ] [ ] [ ]	riots and thousands of horsemen. [I killed Jeho]ram son of [Ahab]
8	[ ] [מל ] [ ] [יהובר ] [ ] [איתאחז ] [ ] [ ]	King of Israel, and [I] killed [Ahaz]iah son of [Jehoram, kin-]
9	[ ] [ש ] [ ] [איתקריהםהרבתואהפך ] [א ] [ ]	g of the house of David. And I set [their towns into ruins and turned]
10	[ ] [ישמן ] [ ] [ ]	their land into [desolation...]
11	[ ] [אחרןולה ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	other [... ] and Jehu ru-]
12	[ ] [ראל ] [ ] [ואשמ ] [ ] [ ]	led over Is[rael... ] and I laid]
13	[ ] [מצרעל ] [ ] [ ]	siege upon [... ]

Table 2 - Transcription and Translation of the Tel Dan Inscription

Another possibility for explaining the apparent contradiction between the biblical text and the Tel Dan inscription is that Jehu may have allied himself with Hazael and that Jehu's actions could then be claimed as having been Hazael's actions since Hazael would have certainly been the senior partner in the alliance.<sup>108</sup> However, the inscription also claims that after subjugating Israel and Judah, Hazael desolated their (pl.) land. Naveh's reconstruction of the previous line argues that Hazael may have also demolished some Israelite and Judahite towns. It seems unlikely that Jehu was allied with Hazael; as soon as Assyrian domination waned in the region Hazael conquered Israel and made it his vassal during Jehu's reign.<sup>109</sup> Na'aman argued that "The assumed early military cooperation between Hazael and Jehu, in the course of which the latter operated as an agent of the former, is not supported by the available sources."<sup>110</sup>

<sup>107</sup> My translation is based on J. Naveh, "The Tel Dan Inscription," in *Studies in West-Semitic Epigraphy*, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2009), 256-273.

<sup>108</sup> idem, 160; Schniedewind and Halpern's argument that Hazael took credit for killing Joram and Ahaziah even though Jehu was the one who killed them by calling on a similar example in the execution of Giammu in the annals of Shalmaneser III (W. M. Schniedewind, "Tel Dan Stele: New Light on Aramaic and Jehu's Revolt," *BASOR* 302 [1996]: 75-90; B. Halpern, "The Stele from Dan: Epigraphic and Historical Considerations," *BASOR* 296 [1994]: 63-80).

<sup>109</sup> N. Na'aman, "The Story of Jehu's Rebellion" 160-166; idem, "Three Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan," *IEJ* 50 (2000): 100-104.

<sup>110</sup> idem, 162

Concerning the discrepancy between the biblical narrative and the Tel Dan inscription, Na'aman argued that, based on the disagreement between 2 Kgs 8:28-29 and 9:15-16, there must have been an earlier Judahite chronicle that agreed with the Hazael/Tel Dan inscription that Hazael was indeed responsible for the deaths of Joram and Ahaziah.

However, parts of Na'aman's arguments are strained. For example, his translation of a key line of inscription is problematic. He translated lines 3-4 as "the king of Israel invaded, *advancing* in my father's land." (emphasis added)<sup>111</sup> Na'aman translates םקד in this way so as to argue that 2 Kgs 9:27bβ-28a, which he claims derives from an original Judahite chronicle, is in agreement with the Tel Dan inscription (i.e., that both claim that Israelites had waged a campaign into Aramean territory). Naveh, in contrast, translates lines 3-4 as "and the king of Israel entered *previously* in my father's land." (emphasis added)<sup>112</sup> The difference is in the translation of the word םקד. Na'aman, erroneously translated it as a participle *advancing*, while Naveh sticks with the more common prepositional/adverbial translation, *before* or *previously*. This seems more appropriate in light of the fact that the phrase already has a verb that indicates that םקד was to be understood in an adverbial sense, *previously*. In light of this, it seems that Na'aman's conclusions may be forced as a result of trying to work the translation of the inscription into conformity with 2 Kgs 9:27-28 so that both agree that Joram and Ahaziah went, or advanced, into Aramean territory and confronted Hazael at Ramoth-gilead. Rather, following Naveh's translation, the inscription likely refers to the long history of conflict that had occurred *previously* between Aram and Israel during the reigns of earlier Aramean kings and is supported

---

<sup>111</sup> idem, 160-166.

<sup>112</sup> J. Naveh, "The Tel Dan Inscription," in *Studies in West-Semitic Epigraphy*, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2009), 256-273.

by the economic and political realities during this period.<sup>113</sup> Israelite expansion into Aram had always been a point of conflict between the two regions and it is fitting that the Tel Dan inscription mentions the reality that Israelite kings had *previously* attempted to expand their interests into Aramean territory.

Na'aman's argument about the contradictions between 2 Kgs 8:28-29 and 9:27-28, as he noted, had previously been recognized by S. Otto. Otto argued that the discrepancy over whether Israel controlled Ramoth-gilead or was attempting to take it back after it had been seized by the Arameans is a result of the conflation of two different sources: a short Judahite chronicle and a longer propagandistic narrative meant to legitimate Jehu.<sup>114</sup> Na'aman, calling on Otto's argument, argued that the material indicating that Ramoth-gilead was under Aramean control is more accurate, while the anachronistic additions were included later, during a period when Ramoth-gilead was actually under Israelite control. Though Na'aman's arguments about the translation of lines 3-4 of the Tel Dan inscription are problematic, his point that during this period Aram likely controlled Ramoth-gilead (in conjunction with Otto's observations) seems probable. It also seems likely that 2 Kgs 8:28, which presents both Joram and Ahaziah going against Hazael together, is in agreement with the Tel Dan inscription. The additional material

---

<sup>113</sup> "The fate of Aramean Damascus during the first half of the ninth century is obscure; but at the end of this period, it emerged as a regional superpower, and King Hadadezer (Adad-idri) presided over an anti-Assyrian league of twelve middle and southern Syrian states. Shalmaneser III conquered Bit-Adini and secured a bridgehead across the Euphrates. Aramean, Israelite, Neo-Hittite, Phoenician, and even Arab powers of all sizes rallied around Hadadezer's leadership to save Hamath and block the Assyrian advance. The decisive battle took place in 853 at Qarqar on the Orontes, a 'royal city' of Hamath. The biased Assyrian version is all we have, but, significantly, Shalmaneser's alleged victory was not followed by the usual benefits of conquest. Similar clashes between Assyria and the unflinching 'twelve kings' in 849, 848, and 845 prove the resilience of their coalition. The anti-Assyrian league did not fall apart until Hazael seized power in Damascus about 842. Shalmaneser calls Hazael a usurper ('son of a nobody'), and the second book of kings tells how he murdered his predecessor. Abandoned by the former allies of Hadadezer, Hazael managed to survive Shalmaneser's savage attacks of 841 and 838 single-handedly, and the Assyrians had to suspend their efforts toward the conquest of middle and southern Syria until the end of the century; even northern Syria was left alone after 831" (P. Dion, "Aramean Tribes and Nations of First-Millennium Western Asia," in *CANE*, vol. 1, [New York: Schribner, 1995], 1281-1294).

<sup>114</sup> S. Otto, *Jehu, Elia und Elisa. Die Erzählung von der Jehu-Revolution und die Komposition der Elia-Elisa-Erzählungen*, (Stuttgart, 2001).

that appears to argue that Ahaziah came to visit Joram after he had been wounded (not killed) appears to contradict the Tel Dan inscription.

This observation leads to another difficulty in that this tradition is related to yet another oracle tradition associated with Elijah's discussion with Yahweh at Horeb. The driving sins behind the instructions and oracle in 1 Kgs 19:15-17 is Israel's abandonment of Yahweh's covenant and the killing his prophets. Elijah tells Yahweh "I have been very zealous for Yahweh, the God of Hosts; for the Israelites have forsaken your covenant, thrown down your altars, and killed your prophets with the sword. I alone am left, and they are seeking my life, to take it away." These actions seem to parallel the coming actions of Yahwistic revivalists who will tear down the altars of Baal and kill his priests; 2 Kgs 10:26-28 and 11:18. Yahweh responds with instructions and a prediction:

Go, return on your way to the wilderness of Damascus; when you arrive, you shall anoint Hazael as king over Aram. Also, you shall anoint Jehu son of Nimshi as king over Israel; and you shall anoint Elisha son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah as prophet in your place. Whoever escapes from the sword of Hazael, Jehu shall kill; and whoever escapes from the sword of Jehu, Elisha shall kill.

It appears that there are at least two oracle traditions. One is concerned with the fall of Israelite kings (eventually, culminating in the fall of the Ahabites) that argues that all male offspring of cursed kings will be killed. The other is concerned with Yahweh's covenant and Israel's sin of killing Yahweh's prophets. Yahweh's response to Elijah alludes to Jehu's murder of Joram and Ahaziah who had "escaped from the sword of Hazael." (1 Kgs 19:17). The other oracle associated with the death of Naboth and his sons was delivered and fulfilled twice, once in the death of Ahab (1 Kgs 21:19b//22:38) and again at the death of Joram (2 Kgs 9:25-26). Thus, both oracles appear to be converging and climaxing at the death of Joram. On the one hand, Joram, according to 2 Kgs 8:29 and 9:15, had "escaped" Hazael's sword and was, as a result, to be killed by Jehu (1 Kgs 19:17). On the other hand, Joram was Ahab's son, and thus cursed with

his father to die as Naboth and his children had died: murdered with blood spilled on Naboth's plot of ground. Both oracles are attributed to Elijah, but their impetus and aims are different. One is concerned with punishing an unethical king who had breached inheritance law through murder, and the other is a response to Israel's (as a people) rejection of Yahweh's covenant and the murder of Yahweh's prophets. Both were reworked from a Judahite perspective that argued that Jeroboam's sins were the main reason for Israel's destruction. This oracle's perspective understood Jerusalem as the only legitimate place to worship Yahweh and as a result was likely produced under the influence of much later discourses.<sup>115</sup>

The consequences of these observations for the interpretation of 2 Kings 11 are clear. The report of Ahaziah's death in 2 Kings 11:1 makes no mention as to how he died or who killed him. It is possible that the report of Ahaziah's death may have been associated not with Jehu's murder of Joram and Ahaziah, but rather with Hazael (though as it now stands, it is clearly in an intertextual relationship with regnal formulae associated with Ahaziah including the report of his death in 2 Kings 9-10). In light of these observations, the actions of Athaliah were not the result of the northern cultic reform of Jehu, but more likely Athaliah took action after learning that her son, Ahaziah, had been killed in battle against Hazael King of Aram. The Tel Dan inscription forces us to reappraise how 2 Kings 11 is to be understood. If 2 Kings 11 stands alone and the later anti-Baalistic and Dtr material is momentarily set aside, the earliest voice of 2 Kings 11 is a base political and curt historical report. Ahaziah was dead and Athaliah ruled in his place as Queen Mother. Later discourses associated with Davidic ideology, centralized cultic practice, covenant, and anti-Baalism reappropriated the report of Ahaziah's death and Athaliah's reign,

---

<sup>115</sup> Both traditions contradict the information in the Tel Dan inscription. Why would two different oracle traditions claim responsibility for the deaths of Joram and Ahaziah, a claim that was clearly unrealistic? In the end, the relevance of this information for 2 Kings 11 is that it appears that the oracle of Elijah itself is a counter voice against Aramean dominance. Yahweh, not Hazael, was responsible for dictating history. Yahweh, not Hazael, had ordered the death of Joram and Ahaziah.

coloring them with culturally exclusive and misogynistic strokes. However, even then, Athaliah was never associated with the expansions of the Elijah oracle tradition, at least not explicitly. The reality of the events as presented in the Tel Dan inscription liberate Athaliah, at least momentarily, from the grasp of the ideologues responsible for the Elijah oracle traditions, both those concerned with covenant and the murder of prophets as well as those concerned with ethical behavior and centralized Yahwistic worship in Jerusalem.

*Conclusion: The Relationship Between Historical Analyses and the Consensus View in Literary Analyses*

Most, if not all, of the historical reconstructions of 2 Kings 11 are dependent in some way on previous literary/source critical analyses. Those source critical analyses have neglected an important textual tradition (the OG/Proto-Lucianic tradition) which differs in many ways from the MT and the Proto-MT textual tradition. According to Cross, Tov, and others, this Palestinian text type (the Vorlage of the OG/Proto-Lucian) developed independently from the Babylonian text type (Proto-MT and MT); if this is the case, then we have two important text types that reflect on the past and imagine the future from different perspectives; their textual development (textual criticism) developed separately and thus their use for filling in lacunae in the text of the other must be questioned. These two text types likely developed from a single tradition that broke into two at the point of the Babylonian Exile. Naturally, these two textual traditions preserve different memories of the monarchy. The Palestinian text type and the Alexandrian text type (Egyptian) are likely closely related.

The result is that the literary analyses of 2 Kings 11 (both textual and literary analysis) have been based primarily on the MT textual tradition (with the exception of a few, Treballe-

Barrera, etc.) and in turn these analyses were often utilized in broader historical reconstructions with obvious implications about their veracity.

### *Source Critical Conclusions*

Though I see some glaring problems with the two-source theory, those who adhere to this hypothesis have done a great service in pointing out the tensions in 2 Kings 11. These approaches, in conjunction with a close reading of the textual critical peculiarities of 2 Kings 11, show that there appears to be a divide between memories of the events in 2 Kings 11 as a political event versus memories of the events as cultic reform laden with Dtr significance. Furthermore, the near-certainty that 2 Kgs 11:9-11 is a later addition provides additional information about how 2 Kings 11 was produced, distributed, and consumed in Judah. In conjunction with these observations, it is significant that the people of the land appear so suddenly in the narrative and that the destruction of Baalism in 2 Kings 11 may be completely secondary due to the fact that Jehoiada, who maintained control through the whole narrative, did not instruct the people to take action against Baalism in v.18; they rush into action uninstructed and spontaneously. The narrative then picks up again as if the eradication of Baalism from Jerusalem never happened. From that point, the narrative quickly returns to the previous theme and flow wherein Joash is being elevated as king and Jehoiada is directing all aspects of the procession.

Source critical analyses of 2 Kings 11 are significant for discourse analysis because they help identify possible ideological fractures in texts. Source criticism is similar to discourse analysis in that it seeks to highlight the textual inconsistencies. The difference is that source criticism uses these inconsistencies to reconstruct the text as well as explore the ideology of

different strata within the text. In contrast, discourse analysis is aimed directly at the ideological formations and, though the two approaches can be used in conjunction, discourse analysis is focused on highlighting the structures of power that were in place when the text was produced and consumed. The difference is one of focus. Discourse analysis doesn't need to adhere to a particular proposal about source division in a text, though it may be useful.

Due to the significant contribution that Treballe-Barrera has provided for furthering the discussion about 2 Kings 11, this project will assume that his proposals for v.9-11 are correct. However, I will also modify and synthesize his work with previous scholarship. It seems nearly certain that the tensions in the text are the result of different authors writing to diachronically different communities. Rather than give a detailed explanation of my hypotheses about the source divisions of the text, I will instead briefly describe the tensions that I sense in the text. I do this because I do not think that it is possible to come to any concrete conclusions about the exact source divisions of 2 Kings 11. The tensions in the text are indication enough that it is diachronic. This can be done without making overconfident claims about where one source ends and the other begins.

### *Discursive Tension: Palace and Temple*

The first tension is between palace and temple. From beginning to end, 2 Kings 11 is at odds with itself over who is doing what and where. For example, Jehosheba hid Joash in an empty chamber (or bedroom) in v.2 while in v. 3 the text relates instead that he was hidden in the house of Yahweh. In v.2, the palace is the implied hiding place while in v.3 (perhaps a later addition to the text) the location is not a bedchamber, but the temple. Another example of this tension/inconsistency is found in the instructions of Jehoiada to the centurions. When seen in



conjunction with 1 Kings 14:25-28, the description in 2 Kings 11 appears to relocate important dynastic objects from the palace to the temple. In 1 Kings 14:25-28, the shields used by the guard belonged to the guard and the guardroom, not the temple. In 2 Kings 11:10, Jehoiada takes the spear and the shield from the temple and gives them to the guard. Further, in 1 Kings 14:24-28, the use of the weapons is palace-centered, a description that would fit nicely with the narrative of 2 Kings 11 if much of the material about the house of Yahweh were removed.

Yet another tension is found between the palace and the temple in the descriptions of the coronation of Joash. In v.11-12, the coronation takes place in the temple while in v. 19, the coronation takes place in the palace. It may be that the procession described in these verses represents two parts of a single event: the *coronation* of Joash in the temple followed by the *enthronement* of Joash in the palace. This makes sense and fits quite nicely with the protocol description in 1 Kings 14:24-28. However, given the tension between palace and temple elsewhere in 2 Kings 11, the presence of two different coronation events still raises suspicion and must at least be acknowledged as a possible point of tension between palace and temple.

### *Discursive Tension: Verbal Disagreement*

Another tension closely related to the previous point is indicated by the different types of enthronement in 2 Kings 11. In v.12, two descriptions are at odds. The first act was to bring out the king's son, put the diadem on him and give him the royal protocol. All of the verbs used for these acts are in the third person singular, implying that a single person, Jehoiada, was doing the action. The second part of v.12 changes to third person plural, "they made him king and anointed him, they clapped their hands and said, 'Long live the king!'" The point is that the first part of v.12 could stand alone. When Athaliah's perspective of the coronation scene is presented, we get

another account of the scene. “When she looked, there was the king standing by the pillar, according to custom, with the captains and the trumpeters beside the king, and all the people of the land rejoicing and blowing trumpets.” This description introduces two new types of actors into the narrative: the people of the land and the trumpeters.

The tension caused by the shift in tense may be resolved when one considers additional material in the Lucianic version that introduces the people of the land immediately before v.12. This partially clears up the problematic shift in tense in the verse. It seems probable that the tension in these verses is the result of an ideological argument about who must take part in the coronation of a Judahite king. The first (and earlier) discourse argues that priests can take charge and anoint kings without including other authoritative actors. The second discourse argues that the elites and landowners (*the people of the land*) played an important role in the coronation of kings (DtrH; 2 Kgs 22-23). Though the text in its final form mixes the two discourses, the sudden appearance of the people of the land and the tension as regards who must be present to legitimately enthrone a new king (multiple institutions, not just the cultic institution) indicate that this was an important concern that had to be addressed by those producing and reproducing the text of 2 Kings 11.

### *Discursive Tension: The Necessity for Explicitly Davidic Symbols*

There is yet another, somewhat different, tension between the perspective of what I understand to be the earliest discursive formation, the royal Judahite monarchic discourse, and a secondary voice in v.9-11. The tension lies in the lack of Davidic symbolism in the older source in contrast to the secondary addition in v.9-11 (as Treballe-Barrera has pointed out). In the older narrative, the centurions and their men are simply holding weapons. The secondary material in

v.9-11 attempts to clarify that these weapons are not simply ordinary weapons, but symbolic spears and shields associated with the Davidic monarchy and even David himself. This indicates that in the older discourse, a strong Davidic symbolic framework did not yet exist or was not yet fully developed. It is therefore likely that before this narrative was reworked as part of the DtrH, it lacked much of the ideological and propagandistic material that it now contains. The first shift in discourse in the text was to associate the coup of Jehoiada with the Davidic line of kings by adding material about symbolic objects that were likely associated with royal Davidic protocol (the spear and the shields; see also 1 Kgs 14:24-28 and the exploits of David in 2 Samuel) and may have been part of a discourse meant to justify the intervention of Jehoiada in establishing Joash as king and executing Athaliah (justification because Athaliah had threatened Yahweh's promise to David and his sons). This tension is not the result of a discursive conflict between palace and temple, but rather is the result of necessary ideological additions to the narrative when it was reworked into its present form by the first Dtr redaction during or shortly after the reign of Josiah and successive redactions in the Persian period. The relationship between Josiah's reform and 2 Kings 9-11 has been pointed out before. The scenes (pillars, covenants) and the outcomes (destruction of foreign cultic practices, especially Baalism) of the Josianic reform were likely the inspiration for the themes used to rework older dynastic traditions into the DtrH.

Identifying these tensions is significant for this project because they highlight the discursive voices present in 2 Kings 11. This relates to my thesis, that 2 Kings 11 should be seen as part of a larger Judahite retelling of other coup reports in 1 Kings 11-2 Kings 16. It also helps to answer some of the questions about why 2 Kings 11 is so different from other coup reports. It appears that initially 2 Kings 11 lacked fully developed Davidic and priestly/temple-centered discourses. This point will help to answer questions about why Athaliah's execution was not

described as resulting from the fulfillment of the oracle tradition that began with Ahijah. As will be explained in detail, the basic reason was that the Josianic redaction and its associated discursive rules for producing ideology and distributing it could not allow Joash, a key figure and link between Josiah and David (Joash and Josiah are the only two Judahite kings whose building activities are recounted with specific dates), to be associated with the fall of the Ahabites, foreign cultic practices, and Baalism. In turn, Athaliah was too close, both genealogically and geographically, to Joash to be associated with the fulfillment of the oracles against the Ahabites. However, this is certainly not the complete picture.

There are still questions about how the Elijah oracle tradition shifted from predicting only the annihilation of males to its later expansion that included both males and females (Jezebel and perhaps some other implied females in descriptions of complete annihilation; at some point, perhaps in conjunction with Jezebel, this oracle tradition and the discourse that guided and constrained its production, also included anti-Baalist themes). At the same time, the earliest account of the coronation of Joash was not sufficiently Davidic. As a result, a later hand, likely from the Josianic period, added explicitly Davidic objects into the narrative in v.9-11.

There is a further link between the fall of Athaliah and other similar narratives in 1-2 Kings: the theme of conspiracy or קשר. Athaliah cries קשר (*conspiracy/treason*) as soon as she realizes that the coup's aims had been accomplished (v.13-14). This term is nearly ubiquitous throughout the DtrH's coup report sequence (1 Sam 22:8, 13; 2 Sam 15: 12, 31; 1 Kgs 15:27; 16:9, 16, 20; 2 Kgs 9:14;10:9; 11:14; 12:21; 14:19; 15:10, 15, 25, 30; 21:23, 24; 17:4 and in prophetic texts, Is 8:12, 14; Jer 11:9; Am. 7:10; also in 2 Chr 23:13; 24:21, 15; 33:24; 25:27; Neh 4:2). In the books of Kings, the term is predominantly used to describe successive conspiracies in the kingdom of Israel. Its use beginning with the fall of Athaliah narrative marks

the first time the term is used to refer to Judahite royal succession narratives. From 2 Kings 11 on, it is used to describe both Israelite and Judahite succession practices (2 Kings 11:14; 12:21; 14:19; 15:10, 15, 25, 30; 21:23, 24). This reappropriation of the term קשר was likely the result of an exilic or Persian period discourse that appropriated earlier discourses about the conspiracies and oracles against Israelite kings. These stories were reworked to fit into the Persian period reevaluations of Judahite kings after the fall of the monarchy or perhaps after the failure of the Josianic reforms in the very late monarchic period. The theme may have been retroactively applied to Judahite kings as a reevaluative adjustment of the monarchic ideology that Judahite kings were different from Israelite kings. This discourse argued that, in the end, both Israelite *and* Judahite kings fell from Yahweh's favor and were destroyed (even in light of Yahweh's promise of love for David and his house). However, there are still problems with this observation, the foremost being that the coups of Jehu and Jehoiada use the term קשר positively while its use in most other instances in the DtrH is clearly negative. In this way, the use of the term קשר is yet another example of tension/inconsistency in 2 Kings 11 since the term is used differently in the Jehu-Jehoiada coups in contrast to its uses elsewhere in the book of Kings.

Furthermore, the term קשר is most often associated with prophetic oracles when describing the conspiracies and violence often present in texts about Israelite royal succession. In the reports about Israelite kings, the conspiracy (קשר) is led by the person who will become the king once the coup has been successful. When describing the coups of Judahite kings, the conspiracies do not result in the elevation of the coup leader as king. Instead, the people of the land (2 Kings 14:19-21; 21:23-24) intervene and choose a new king (sometimes even executing those responsible for the קשר, 2 Kgs 14:5-6; 19:23-24).

This reveals another conceptual fracture as regards the meaning of קשר as it is used to describe Israelite succession versus Judahite succession. In Judah, קשר is associated with the acts of servants who have no claim to the throne. The coup or conspiracy never results in the elevation of the coup leaders to the throne of Judah (Jehoiada and also 2 Kings 14:19-21; 21:23-24). In Israel, קשר always results in the elevation of the coup leader to the throne. This is further evidence that there is much tension in 2 Kings 11 since the chapter includes a mix of both uses of the term (not to mention the similarities to the coup of Jehu in 2 Kings 9-10). It may be that the legends about the fall of the Ahabites were incorporated into the DtrH by means of the theme קשר. Indeed, the two instances of treason found in 2 Kings 9-10 do not use the term קשר, but rather in 2 Kings 9:32, Joram cries מרמה, (*treachery*; the only time this term appears in the Dt-2 Kings) and Jezebel, in 2 Kgs 9:32, does not use a specific term to describe Jehu's coup, but rather asks him "Is it peace, Zimri, murderer of your master?". This is a clear intertextual reference to 1 Kgs 16:9-13. Jezebel's comparison of Jehu to Zimri was not only a clever way of calling him treasonous, but was also meant to remind Jehu of the consequences of participating in a coup. Ironically, Jezebel, the most infamous woman in the Hebrew Bible, is credited with delivering a warning to Jehu meant to call his attention to the proper observance of servant/master relations (1 Sam 25:10). Her response critiques the aftermath of the coup of Zimri while the prophetic oracle tradition sees the result of successive coups in Israel as the will of Yahweh. These observations may imply that an older narrative that used different terms for "conspiracy" was later reworked and standardized using קשר (*conspiracy*) as a thematic backbone for describing the inadequacy and wickedness of Israelite kings. Indeed, perhaps these variant uses of the idea of conspiracy were the inspiration for incorporating various texts by means of the term קשר.

These observations imply that 2 Kings 11 was reworked successively for different reasons. The initial discursive voices indicate that the Joash/Jehoiada narrative was reworked in order to link Josiah to Joash and ultimately to David. An older succession account was modified by adding material about David (his prestigious weapons) as well as including a coronation scene that recalled the reestablishment of the covenant in the time of Josiah (2 Kings 23:1-3). Determining the direction of dependence is difficult since *the people of the land* are not mentioned in 2 Kgs 23:1-3, but rather *all the people of Judah* and a host of others. This indicates that 2 Kings 23:1-3 may be dependent on 2 Kings 11 since it appears to misunderstand that *the people of the land* are the elites, not the general population of Judah. Furthermore, the elaboration of what happens as the king stands by the pillar seems to be an explanation of the ambiguous term עֲדוּת (perhaps “testimony” or “decrees” see 2 Kgs 23:3) in 2 Kings 11. Additionally, in 2 Kings 9-10, one expects to hear about the role of the people of the land in the cultic reform of Jehu, but they are not mentioned. Rather, specific titles of the elites are provided. Officers, priests, leaders, servants and the generic term people are used, but *the people of the land*, an idiomatic phrase referring to elites, is never used. This suggests that the phrase should probably be understood as a Judahite title for elite classes in Judah.<sup>116</sup>

All of these observations are significant for clarifying why the oracle traditions of 1 Kings 11-2 Kings 10 are not referenced in the accession of Joash and the fall of Athaliah. As stated previously, the strong links between 2 Kings 11 and the fall of the Ahabites indicates that it would be completely reasonable to associate Athaliah with the oracle tradition of Elijah and that at her execution, it would have been appropriate for the author to insert an oracle fulfillment report showing that all of Yahweh’s words had been fulfilled and the Ahabites were no more.

---

<sup>116</sup> B. Halpern, *The Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel*, HSM 25 (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1981).

From a discourse critical perspective however, the discursive tension in 2 Kings 11 both internally and externally indicates that conceptual shifts had to be made in order to incorporate 2 Kings 11 into its current location in the DtrH. The reasons for cultic reform in Israel were different than in Judah, though the narrative draws strong parallels between 2 Kings 9-10 and 2 Kings 11 in an effort to lead the reader to think otherwise (i.e., that there was a contemporaneous outburst of anti-Baalistic zeal in both Israel, led by Jehu, and in Judah, led by Jehoiada).

As a result, it is likely that Athaliah's execution was not originally understood as connected to the fall of the Ahabites, the killing of prophets, or Baalism. Her sin, in the view of the earlier reading, was to usurp the throne of David, temporarily nullifying important dynastic ideology about Yahweh's enduring love for Davidides (because of David). Once it is realized that v.18 is very much secondary to the text, there is no indication that Athaliah was worshipping Baal other than her connection to Ahab and Jezebel as noted in 2 Kings 8:16-27.

The point is that it is possible Athaliah was not originally associated with the Elijah oracle tradition because initially her execution report did not mention Baalism. Her sin was attempting to take the throne by murdering all remaining Davidide males. Furthermore, in an earlier discourse it is possible that prior to the anti-Baalistic additions to both 2 Kings 9-10 and 2 Kings 11, the oracle tradition of Elijah was directed at only the male offspring of Ahab. It was only later that a prophetic and anti-Baalistic discourse necessitated that the oracle tradition apply to Jezebel due to her association with Baalism and traditions arguing that she had murdered many Yahwistic prophets.

In light of this, it is important to note that the oracle tradition was specifically modified to include Jezebel in the fall of the Ahabites because she murdered Yahweh's prophets and introduced Baalism in Israel. Furthermore, it was only later that *all* associated with Ahab were



drawn into the annihilation in the wake of Jehu's revolt and that this extension of the oracle's boundaries specifically targeted the worshippers of Baal.

All of the later material, the material that is secondary to the earliest discourse behind the oracle tradition of Elijah, is associated with removing Baal worship from Israel. 2 Kings 11 may have been worked into this narrative sequence prior to the extension of the oracles' boundaries. That is, Athaliah was only later accused of practicing Baalism when those producing and reproducing the text inserted v.18 into 2 Kings 11. The earlier oracle tradition was not aimed at destroying the female offspring of Ahab, but rather, only the male offspring which, naturally, excluded Athaliah from the tradition of the oracle and fulfillment reports. However, this conceptual shift only partially explains why Athaliah was not associated with the oracle fulfillment reports related to the Elijah oracle traditions.

### **Chapter 3: The Interdiscursive Nature of 2 Kings 11 and its Effect on Perceptions about Athaliah**

The objective of exploring a text's interdiscursivity is to identify what discourse types are called upon to guide and constrain text production, dissemination, and consumption. As a starting point, it is helpful to address four basic questions. What is the obvious genre of the text? Does the text call on multiple genres? What activity types, styles (tenor, mode and rhetoric), and discourses guide and constrain the perspective of the text? Is the text innovative or conventional in comparison to texts that are guided and constrained by similar discourses both within and without the society producing, disseminating, and consuming the text? <sup>117</sup>

For the purposes of this project, the answers to the above questions help to clarify why the coup report of Jehoiada and the execution of Athaliah were not associated with the long framework of oracles and oracle fulfillment reports that precede 2 Kings 11. <sup>118</sup> The incorporation of 2 Kings 11 into its current literary context by means of secondary thematic insertions created a tangible tension between the oracle(s) of Elijah and Elisha against Ahab, their authority, and their ideological reach within their literary context in texts including, for example, 2 Kings 11. The thematic links between 2 Kings 11 and the preceding sequence of oracles and coups causes pause, since one must conceptually deal with two authoritative claims: 1) Yahweh's words never fail and a true prophet's words never fail (Dt 18:9-22); and 2) the Davidic dynasty, in conjunction with the cult at Jerusalem, would never fail according to Yahweh's promise to David (2 Sam 7; as well as Dtr statements that Yahweh would place his name in Jerusalem [implied] to

---

<sup>117</sup> N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 232.

<sup>118</sup> See von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, (trans. D. Stalker, Chicago: Regnery, 1953), 78; Von Rad argued that, along with the Dtr framework for organizing history around farewell speeches or covenant renewal speeches, that the Dtr also structure parts of his history by a framework of oracles and oracle fulfillment reports.

dwell there and that that location would be the only proper place to worship Yahweh; this location would also be the center of the Davidic dynasty).<sup>119</sup>

On the one hand, the oracle and oracle fulfillment report sequence in 1 Kgs 11-2 Kgs 10 served as a guide for composing parts of the DtrH. Elijah's oracles against the Ahabites, at least in their final forms, were no more than reiterations of previous oracles beginning with Ahijah against Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11; 14). In accordance with Dt 18:9-22, any prophet that was viewed by the readership as authoritative must pass the prophetic test so as to verify that his/her words were indeed from Yahweh. The test was that "If a prophet speaks in the name of the LORD but the thing does not take place or prove true, it is a word that the LORD has not spoken. The prophet has spoken it presumptuously; do not be frightened by it." (Dt 18:22) This prophetic test plays out again and again through much of the DtrH as important prophetic oracles were remembered and reported as fulfilled as a way of showing their validity in light of the instructions given in Dt 18:9-22 about how to test prophetic utterances.<sup>120</sup>

Furthermore, and this is significant for much of the Elijah materials, in Dt 18:18-19 Yahweh promises "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet, who shall speak to them everything that I command. Anyone who does not heed the words that the prophet shall speak in my name, I myself will hold accountable." This is significant because it argues that prophets in Israel will be like Moses. The Elijah legends and oracles place a great amount of authority on Elijah by constantly reaffirming that his oracles, the words of Yahweh, had not failed. Additionally, Elijah's visit to Horeb in 1 Kings 19 has close parallels to the story of Moses in Exodus. Elijah flees from those trying to kill him, receives instruction at Horeb, and puts in motion a series of

---

<sup>119</sup> O. Sergi, "Judah's Expansion," 2013.

<sup>120</sup> G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 1953.

events that will result in a new order and a revival of Yahwism. Thus, Elijah is endowed literarily with Moses' prophetic mantle and, as a result of the Dtr prophetic test in Dt 18 along with clear references to Elijah as a Moses-like figure; his words must not be allowed "to fall to the ground."<sup>121</sup>

### *The Genre of 2 Kings 11*

Based on its structure and themes the genre of 2 Kings 11, as we now have, is best described as cultic revolution in its latest form and a coup report in its earliest form. However, 2 Kings 11 cannot be defined or described using a single genre. This is due to the diachronic nature of the text as well as the common use of chronistic reports in the ancient Near East for various generic purposes. Genres are often part of a genre complex, especially diachronic texts that have been produced and reproduced over time. For example, 2 Kings 11 is a cultic revolution, but it is also a coup report, a covenant report, a succession report, an execution report, and so on. Because 2 Kings 11, in its final form, is found within a long succession of coups or palace conspiracies from 1 Kings 11-2 Kings 22, it seems clear that the text as we now have it must be predominantly understood as a popular cultic revolution, but this may not have always been the case. There is evidence that shows that 2 Kings 11 was initially understood as a military palace coup d'etat and was only popularized and legitimated as it was reproduced in later periods.

The difference between a revolution and a coup is an important element for understanding the production of 2 Kings 11. Coups often carry negative baggage. As a result, when 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the DtrH, all questions about the legitimacy of Jehoiada's coup had to be pre-empted and legitimated. One of the most common ways that coups are legalized is by appealing to a more broad support base. To do this, those who incorporated 2 Kings 11 into the DtrH reproduced the coup of Jehoiada not as a coup d'Etat, but as a revolution

---

<sup>121</sup> See Dt 18:15-22; 1 Sam 3:19; 2 Kgs 10:10, Isa 44:26.

and a coup de culte. Revolutions are more popular and imply a large support base. In contrast, coups, often carried out by small groups of disaffected elites, have a very narrow support base and are most often viewed negatively.

How was the coup of Jehoiada reconfigured as a revolution? The coup of Jehoiada was recast as a popular revolution by adding material that argued for a more broad support base so as to include institutions outside the palace in the coronation of Joash (i.e., the inclusion of the cult and the landowners *the people of the land*). The reason for seizing the throne from Athaliah was originally not based on her alleged cultic deviance; rather, the coup of Jehoiada was carried out by disaffected Judahite elites in response to Athaliah's policies and ideology. In fact, when the deuteronomistic and post-deuteronomistic editing is removed from 2 Kings 11, a very different picture of Athaliah emerges that does not mention deviant cultic practices or thematic links to the coup of Jehu. The similarities between the two, once this material is removed, are not a result of being produced under the guidance and constraints of a single contemporaneous discourse, but rather, the similarities exist because they were produced using a similar genre (interdiscursivity): they are both coup reports and coup reports were common occurrences in the ancient world. Later, when the 2 Kings 11 was incorporated by the Dtr into the sequence of Israelite oracles, conspiracies and oracle fulfillments ending with Jehu (2 Kings 9-10), the coup was recast as a religious revolution and tied thematically by the Dtr's overarching agenda that argued that the history of the divided monarchy (1 Kgs 11-2 Kgs 17) must be understood in light of Dtr ideology (cultic centralization in Jerusalem mixed with Davidic ideology in contrast to Israelite cultic deviance and Israelite monarchic failure).<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> See again, von Rad's argument (n.118 and 120) that along with Noth's proposals about the framework of prophetic covenant renewal speeches, there was also a framework of prophetic oracles and their fulfillment that served as structure for at least part of the DtrH.

The term קשר (*conspiracy*), common to all previous oracle-conspiracy reports between 1 Kgs 14-2 Kgs 10, was contrasted with Jehoiada's ברית (*covenant*), a legitimizing term. The discourses guiding and constraining the reproduction of Athaliah's execution report reconceptualized her execution as similar to the deaths of Ahab, Jezebel, Jehoram, and Ahaziah. Thus, the coup of Jehoiada was recast as a cultic revolution and, as a result, Athaliah was eventually associated with Baalism because she was the daughter of two of the most famous Baalists in the Hebrew Bible: Ahab and Jezebel.

Interdiscursivity can be detected when common genres or types are used and reused. Noting the ways that these genre types are innovative as compared to other instances of the type shows how discourses are being practiced in society in that discourse practices can be seen in the ways that discourses guide and constrain the production of knowledge in a social group (including textual production). Thus, establishing a clear theory of coups d'état and how 2 Kings 11 is innovative in light of coup interdiscursivity will show that 2 Kings 11 has gone through a series of innovative redactions that have reconceptualized what was originally a military palace coup into a coup de culte/restoration and a revolution, the former (coup) being more negative and the latter (coup de culte/restoration and revolution), as with most revolutions, more positive.<sup>123</sup> As a result of having a clearer theoretical typology of coups d'état, it will be possible to make sound observations about how Athaliah was conceived at various points in the production of 2 Kings 11 from the perspectives of different communities reproducing, disseminating, and consuming the text over time. Doing this partially alleviates the tension and sense of expectation created when 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the DtrH at the end of the Jehu narrative, the climax of the fall of the Ahabites.

---

<sup>123</sup> M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat: A Critical Theoretical Synthesis*, Prager Schriften zur Zeitgeschichte und zum Zeitgeschehen, (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 18-19, 25.

### *Other Genres Significant for Understanding 2 Kings 11*

Interdiscursively, 2 Kings 11 is influenced by many different types of text production, especially those that I refer to as succession and inheritance texts (SIT). This broad body of genres includes text types from several different social institutions: the state (treaties, succession treaties, land grants, instructions, edicts and speeches), the cult (covenant, contracts, accounts of property transfer and distribution, mythology), and the family (accounts of inner-familial power transfer in the form of goods, money, genealogies, and most commonly, property/inheritance at times of death or marriage).

For example, the genres that serve as a structural framework of the DtrH according to Noth (farewell speeches/covenant renewal speeches) have a lot in common with 2 Kings 11. An analysis of this relationship shows that, as with all of these summarizing speeches inserted by the Dtr as a literary framework, 2 Kings 11 is concerned with Israel's obedience to Dtr laws of monotheistic Yahwism via a covenant between Yahweh and the people, that they will be "his people."<sup>124</sup> However, the other speeches are not necessarily coup reports, though one could argue that they are similar in that Israel, through rebellion, constantly sought to replace Yahweh's kingship by choosing other gods as their divine kings and queens. Though this would certainly be an interesting avenue of inquiry, the Dtr speeches themselves are not explicitly concerned with coup, but rather, with summarizing Israel's cultic state in the memory of the Dtr and his interpretation of his available sources.

Both Athaliah's accusation of conspiracy in 2 Kings 11:14 and the clear contrasting argument by the Dtr that Jehoiada's coup was not a קשר, but rather, a ברית, shows that the Dtr understood 2 Kings 11 as similar to the other Dtr speeches and a significant moment of covenant renewal very much in line with those in the other Dtr speeches and with Dtr ideology generally.

---

<sup>124</sup> M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 1981.

In this way, though textual analysis clearly shows that the vocabulary, themes, and literary context indicate that 2 Kings 11 is generically a coup report (though in modified form), it is also complex of genres, since it is also closely related to the Dtr genre of farewell speeches and covenant renewals.

### *Activity Types, Styles, and Rhetoric in 2 Kings 11*

The activity types in 2 Kings 11 also indicate that it is a genre complex, though I focus here on 2 Kings 11 as a type of coup report. For example, the sense of secrecy in Jehoiada's actions, the types of social groups he organizes (military personnel), and the careful planning for executing the coup, and the eventual replacement of the existing state apparatus (under Athaliah) with a new or restored form of government are all classic activity types associated with coups.<sup>125</sup> However, other activity types in 2 Kings 11, likely added later when the narrative was incorporated into the DtrH and specifically associated with a succession of negative coups in Israel, indicate that Jehoiada's coup is no ordinary coup. The common term for conspiracy, קשר, is never used to describe Jehoiada's coup except Athaliah's final and only direct speech wherein she cries קשר קשר, "Conspiracy! Conspiracy!" From the perspective of those working 2 Kings 11 into the DtrH, Athaliah's accusation is a false one. Instead, the Dtr saw Jehoiada's coup in stark contrast to the previous succession of coups in Israel that all used the term קשר as a leitwort; Jehoiada's coup was understood as having been founded on a ברית, (*covenant*). The Dtr contrasted between these two terms so as to highlight the difference between Israelite kingship and Judahite kingship (during Josiah's reign). On the one hand, Israelite kingship is often cursed through oracles that predict successive conspiracies using, almost exclusively (with the exception of Jehoram and Jezebel), the term קשר. On the other hand, Jehoiada's actions are described with

---

<sup>125</sup> See M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat*, 15-16, 19, 25 and for Marx's four aspects of coup, see Bankowicz, 23-24; for types of coups and their outcomes, see S. P. Huntington, "Patterns of Violence in World Politics," in *Changing Patterns of Military Politics*, (ed. S. P. Huntington, New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962), 75-93.



authoritative language evocative of covenant, loyalty to Yahweh, and loyalty to authoritative cultic personnel. Jehoiada does not establish a conspiracy, קשר, with his counterparts, rather, he calls them to the house of Yahweh and makes a covenant, ברית, with them and causes them to take an oath concerning what he is about to tell them as well as the plans for the coup he was about to execute.

Other activity types not specifically associated with coup reports are concerned with the observance of rules for sacred space and storing devoted and nostalgic objects, such as the spear and shields that belonged to David that were stored in the house of Yahweh. It is true that symbolic objects play a part in legitimizing actions, but as has been shown previously, the presence of these objects in v.9-11 is likely a secondary addition to the text and as a result the objects are probably a part of post-coup attempts to legalize the coup's outcome by calling on authoritative discourses associated with the house of Yahweh and the Davidic dynasty.

Other activities concerned with sacred space are found in v.15 when Jehoiada, concerned about performing executions in the temple, orders the guard to remove Athaliah and execute her elsewhere. This concern for protecting the house of Yahweh from bloodguilt is part of what many scholars argue is a later temple-centered source that was added to the earlier source of 2 Kings 11:1-12, 18b-20. Though I do not strictly hold to these source divisions, it is helpful to recognize that there is general agreement that a temple-centered redaction or source was secondarily added to 2 Kings 11. The actions of Jehoiada in protecting the sanctity of the house of Yahweh are an example of how a later discourse about sacred space had to grapple with difficult including שדרות (does it mean temple *pillars*? Or, military *ranks* of soldiers?) and difficult concepts such as how non-priestly personnel were allowed to enter and guard the temple. The report of Athaliah's execution was guided and constrained by this budding discourse

about the rules and regulations of the Yahwistic temple cult (rules that were more developed in the Chronicler's account of 2 Kings 11//2 Chr 22:10-23:21).

Furthermore, perhaps the latest discourse in 2 Kings 11 presents another activity type that is anti-Baalist that was not initially present in the narrative about the fall of Athaliah. This activity type is focused on a completely different type of overthrow, a coup de culte. The tension between this activity type and those associated with the military palace coup of Jehoiada indicates that much later, 2 Kings 11 was recast as both a widely popular revolution (not a coup) that aimed to eradicate Baalism and enthrone Joash by a more broad elite base (as compared to the support of only the military). As has been pointed out by most theorists of coups d'état, there is an often ignored difference between revolution and coup. Revolution, on the one hand, is broadly supported among a social group. Coup, on the other hand, is almost always (especially as regards military palace coups) narrowly supported by powerful elites who were already in positions of power within the existing system and have the support of the military apparatus. In this way, it seems probable that Jehoiada's coup was popularized by later redactors causing a shift in perception about the coup by using different vocabulary to describe it and claiming that the support for the coup was broad (that it included the people of the land and that it aimed at reviving Yahwism in Judah).

Furthermore, it is significant that Jehoiada is not involved in the destruction of Baalism in Jerusalem. He does not order the people to action, a significant deviation from the amount of control he wielded in the narrative thus far. Rather, the people, after making a covenant with Yahweh, spontaneously rush upon the house of Baal, tear down its images and altars, and murder the priest of Baal, Mattan. The people, not Jehoiada, do this. To be sure, Jehoiada's covenant renewal demands that the people annihilate all foreign cults from Judah, thus Jehoiada is

indirectly a participant. However, up to this point in the narrative Jehoiada has given explicit instructions concerning all activities of the coup. It is therefore surprising that in this instance, Jehoiada does not command that the people destroy Baalism. This tension is the result of the secondary nature of the anti-Baalist material in 2 Kings 11. The material in v.18 is a clear interruption in the coronation account of Joash. Once it is removed, there is a more smooth flow of coronation activities and a return to the previous state of narrative report that places all activities under Jehoiada's control.

Thus, the activity types in 2 Kings 11 must be understood diachronically so as to make visible the shifts in perceptions (that were guided and constrained by discourses) that argued that Jehoiada's actions were not part of a coup similar to the chaotic northern coups (associated with oracles of destruction uttered in the face of cultic deviance), but rather, they were a revolution with a broad base, popular, and aimed at legitimating Jehoiada, Joash, and centralized Yahwism as the state cult. As a result, these observations are further support for the claim that the reason that Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution were not understood as fully part of the oracles and oracle fulfillments of Elijah is that 2 Kings 11 was not initially a part of the sequence of oracles against Israelite kings. Furthermore, once 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the DtrH, Dtr themes were used to weave a thematic bond between it and its literary context creating a tense link between Athaliah and the fall of the Ahabites. Yes, Athaliah was an Ahabite, but she was an Ahabite in Judahite territory. The previous narrative context in 2 Kings 9-10 makes very clear that everyone found in Israelite territory associated with Ahab, even Judahites, was to be completely annihilated. It is significant that Jehu's all-consuming coup does not spread into Judahite territory. It is evidence of a discursive framework that includes territorial conceptions about cult, oracles, and their boundaries. This discourse provides some reasons for why

Athaliah's execution was not reported in connection with an oracle fulfillment report, as were the executions of the rest of her family, including some Judahites that had ventured into the territory of Israel (though their execution is noted as having spared no one, it is not reported with an oracle fulfillment report).

### *The Innovations of 2 Kings 11 in Comparison with other Military Palace Coup Reports*

In its final form, 2 Kings 11 is innovative in comparison with other coup reports based on the following observations. 2 Kings 11 in its current form and literary context, unlike the coup reports associated with Israelite kings, and coup reports generally (both contemporary and ancient), is innovative because it mixes religious reform, monarchic revolt, and military palace coup within one text. To be sure, coups result in reforms, but they are more narrow and swift than the reforms resulting from revolutions and reforms. As Bankowicz noted, there are "...similarities and differences existing between coup d'état and other phenomena, such as revolution, rebellion, civil war and guerilla warfare, which result in the destruction of an existing political order or its substantial transformation."<sup>126</sup> However, "Coup d'état is the illegal overthrow of the existing political power by a small group of conspirators, who use the strategy of a sudden seizure of neuralgic state institutions and facilities, and is accompanied by violence or by the threat of its use. *It is the work of conspirators, and thus is not the political change enforced by mass social forces.*"<sup>127</sup> (Emphasis added)

The point is that many theorists recognize that coups are often narrow and, more often than not, are viewed negatively by those not involved in the coup. In contrast, a revolution or even a reform is the result of political change enforced by mass social forces because, by

---

<sup>126</sup> M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat: A Critical Theoretical Synthesis*, (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 10.

<sup>127</sup> *idem*, 19.

definition, revolutions are supported by a broad social base. Coups are most often top-down affairs where disaffected elites make a surprise and violent bid for power while revolutions are always bottom-up affairs where large disaffected social groups make a bid for power with broad social support.<sup>128</sup>

2 Kings 11 was not initially portrayed as a revolution or a reform. Rather, later communities, guided and constrained by communal discourses, appropriated the narrative and recast Jehoiada's military palace coup as a more popular event, like a revolution, for propagandistic reasons aimed to legalize and popularize the coup. Soon after Jehoiada's successful coup, which was illegal according to the previous institution (under Athaliah), the participants set out to legalize and legitimate their actions.<sup>129</sup> To do this, material that was explicitly linked to David and the house of Yahweh was added in v.9-11 along with other elements that argued that the coup was more broadly supported than it actually was (e.g., the involvement of the people of the land).<sup>130</sup> The people of the land and the violent cultic overthrow of Baalism in Jerusalem were added later to argue that the coup was not a coup, but rather, a revolution with support from institutions outside the palace and temple of Yahweh. The people of the land, a term likely referring to elite landowners, were introduced in association with the DtrH's democratization of royal ideology. It argued that decisions about kingship had to be controlled and balanced by including various social institutions in the decision-making process.

This material was meant to argue that the coup was legitimate since it successfully refused to allow Yahweh's promise to David to fail. Thus, the dynastic and cultic links between

---

<sup>128</sup> idem, 18, 20; See also C. Barbe, "Colpo di stato," in *Politica e Societa*, vol I. (La Nuova Italia, Firenze, 1979).

<sup>129</sup> See M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat*, 25, "A result of a successful coup d'etat is the establishment of a new state power, which is illegal from the perspective of the present juridicial system. The new power, however, has a strong ambition to be legalized and thus quickly proceeds to form a new political system with a whole new legal and institutional infrastructure."

<sup>130</sup> See J. Treballe-Barrera, *Jehu y Joas*, 177-178.

Jehoiada, Joash, Rehoboam, Solomon and David were strengthened in order to highlight the legitimacy of the coup. This may have been done during or shortly after the reign of Josiah, the generally accepted locus of Dtr ideology, who saw himself as part of a lineage of prestigious kings favored by Yahweh (David, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, and Hezekiah).

It is worth noting, as pointed out by Na'aman, that only Joash and Josiah are credited with major temple restorations recorded with a specific date.<sup>131</sup> Furthermore, there are close parallels between the covenant renewal scenes in 2 Kings 11 and 2 Kings 23. Based on these observations, it seems probable that the deuteronomists felt a special need to link Josiah to Joash for legitimating purposes. This could be due to 2 Kings 11's role as a point of crux in the DtrH, a point of tension that highlights the near destruction of the Davidides. It could also be the result of traditions about Joash as a temple builder/restorer, a central theme in the DtrH (Jerusalem was the center of the Davidic empire and the center of authoritative Yahwism).

#### *Prophetic Oracles and Coups in the Hebrew Bible*

Another innovation in 2 Kings 11 is the way that it constrains the dominant themes from 1 Kgs 11-2 Kgs 10. Themes such as negative conspiracies (קשר), oracles that promise complete annihilation of the cursed king's family, and the perception that there was a binary relationship between prophets and kings are all constrained in 2 Kings 11. In light of the role of prophecy in the ANE and the Dtr's understanding of prophets and prophecy from a legitimate Jerusalem-centered cult, it is not surprising that 2 Kings 11 is distanced from the oracles of Elijah. A short description of the role of prophets in the ANE is helpful to highlight the point being made here about the innovative way that 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into its current literary context while at the same time being constrained from full incorporation into it.

---

<sup>131</sup> N. Na'aman, "Royal Inscriptions," 333-349.

There are several ways to understand the role of prophets in ancient Israel, especially in light of the broader ANE context of Israelite prophecy. Prophets functioned as legitimators of the actions and agendas of those in power; prophets also functioned as messengers of destruction. Based on their persona and expertise and likely their prophetic record (i.e., perceptions about their successful activities) certain prophets likely wielded substantial social influence in ancient societies. The memories of prophets like Elijah and Elisha were certainly venerated and constantly supported by the Dtr's ideal of prophecy in Dt 18:9-22. At the same time, the oracles of Elijah and Elisha also had to be carefully controlled, as was the case generally in the ancient world when dealing with negative oracles.

As Couey recently pointed out, prophecy in the ANE did not exist as a binary between an oppositional prophet and the king.<sup>132</sup> Rather, the transference of oracles by royal officials to the king suggests that there is a close relationship between prophets (and their oracles), royal officials (including priests), and the king. As evidenced in the Mari Letters, the Assyrian prophetic texts (and texts that reference oracles, i.e., the Treaty of Esarhaddon), and Lachish 3, the duty of royal officials was to report any oracular activity under their jurisdiction by passing the reports of prophetic utterances up the chain of command until they reached the king. This indicates that there was a particular royal attitude about prophetic oracles that seems to be glossed by the Dtr. According to the evidence from Lachish 3 and other ANE examples, kings did not receive only negative oracles, but both positive and negative oracles from various centers of prophetic activity. Kings were interested in being made aware of both negative and positive oracles. The positive oracles were helpful and legitimizing while the negative oracles were viewed as warnings, signs of political unrest, and had to be censored and controlled.

---

<sup>132</sup> J. B. Couey, "Amos vii 10-17 and Royal Attitudes toward Prophecy in the Ancient Near East." *VT* 58/3 (2008): 300-314.

Furthermore, kings in the ancient world had specific protocol in place for transferring prophetic oracles up the chain of command until they ultimately reached the king.

From the perspective of the Dtr, in contrast to the epigraphic evidence, prophets face off with evil Israelite kings directly, not through a chain of command. Furthermore, prophets rarely appear to give negative oracles when there are righteous Yahwistic priests functioning in Jerusalem. These observations give the impression that prophecy was viewed as a sort of peripheral priesthood that functioned when a perceived illegitimate priesthood was present. Prophets show up with oracles of warning in the Hebrew Bible whenever ethical or cultic norms have been breached. Only rarely are there cases of positive prophetic oracles to kings, and even these are suspect given they were produced as if associated with Israelite kings (Jeroboam and Jehu) when in reality, they are propagandistic retellings of Israelite history based on the Davidic oracle of promise in 2 Samuel 7. It would be surprising if Israelite ideology actually allowed positive oracles to describe Israelite royal authority as partially founded on Yahweh's love for David, the Judahite king par excellence.

Within this royal discourse about prophetic oracles, especially from the perspective of ANE texts from Mari and, much later, the Neo-Assyrian period, there were clear attempts to control and record oracles. There are several reasons for this. First, oracles legitimating the king were a powerful form of propaganda. Oracles delivered in public space could have a powerful effect on the hearer, but this reality is a double-edged sword since oracles could also call into question the legitimacy of the king.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> Questions naturally arise as regards the difference between oracles delivered in public versus private space. It seems best to note that many examples of prophecy from the ANE (Mari, Neo-Assyrian, etc.) are delivered from ecstasies to elites via intermediaries. Only rarely do prophets/prophetesses deliver oracles directly (see Huffmon, "Prophecy in the Mari Letters," *BA* 31.4 (1968):101-124). This implies that prophecy for the most part was a private affair between an ecstatic/groups of ecstasies and elite recipients of their oracles via intermediary officials that were charged with keeping the recipients of oracles informed concerning oracular activity.



For this reason, ANE oracles and texts that make reference to them have some indications that negative prophetic oracles, if possible, should be tightly controlled (if delivered in public, this created serious problems for the king and also indicated that prophets, sensing public dissatisfaction, could play an important part in revolution, revolt, and coups d'état) or even kept secret so as to contain rumors of weakness indicated by these portents of doom.

As administrators of temples and also royal officials, priests were in a unique position as mediators between ecstatic prophets and royal administrations in the ancient world because temples, administered by priests, were often the locus of oracular and ecstatic activity. It was a priest's duty to report both negative and positive oracles to the king. This likely resulted in great tension between the cultic state apparatus and prophets. Couey interpreted Amos 7:10-17 in light of this tense dichotomy between king, cult and prophets.<sup>134</sup> Amos 7:10-17 is also relevant to 2 Kings 11 for many of the same reasons that Couey raised in his analysis of royal attitudes toward prophecy, but in the case of 2 Kings 11, it is indicated mainly by the absence of expected links between the execution of Athaliah and the oracles of Elijah.

This was due to the Dtr's unique view of prophecy. The Dtr had inherited or collected many traditions about prophetic oracles that related to the fall of Israel and, in particular, the Ahabites. Using the term קשר with its common negative sense, the Dtr argued that קשר and oracle were linked and thus, oracles, by association, were also negative and their presence a sign of dynastic weakness. This is a different understanding of the role of prophets in earlier periods; prophetic oracles had been used in the region for some time to legitimate, warn, and even challenge kings. The Dtr did not have such a positive view of oracles. Prophets, especially in light of the fall of Samaria, were direct opponents to the king, even personally confronting the king about unethical behavior. In Israel, at least from a Judahite perspective, there could be no

---

<sup>134</sup> idem.

priestly royal intermediary because an authoritative Yahwistic cult didn't exist according to this discourse. Because of these two perceptions (both erroneous), that prophets were symbols of coming disaster and that prophets bypassed the official structure of passing on oracles through official means (through priests and others), the links between the Elijah oracles and Athaliah had to be downplayed because they delegitimized the role of priests in the royal apparatus and could have called into question the legitimacy of the Jehoiada coup since prophets, especially in the oracle sequence from 1 Kgs 11-2 Kgs 10, were mainly present during times of apostasy.

As a result, the reports of Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution were indeed thematically linked to the Ahabites by late redactions of 2 Kings 11 (these redactions added material about covenant, anti-Baalism, and royal symbols), but could not be fully consumed by the Elijah/Elisha oracle tradition because Judahite discourse constrained that link to avoid any perception that Yahweh had sent messengers of doom to Judah at that time. People would question why Yahweh had done such a thing, bypassing what they thought was a legitimate cult and its personnel, not to mention that it would have raised questions about why Joash was spared after many of his relatives had been killed in the coup of Jehu.

### *Interdiscursivity, Intertextuality, Textual Production, and 2 Kings 11*

Generally speaking, reports of military coups have some basic structural features. The actors usually include a military leader, military commanders and their respective military organizations. Themes include secrecy, planning and foresight, timing, retribution, and concluding statements about the efficacy or inefficacy of the coup depending on the perspective of the report.<sup>135</sup>

There are many examples of extra-biblical coup reports in Herodotus and Thucydides (Coup of the Magi, 3.77-79; 7.35; Coup of Cylon, 5.71.1//Thuc. 1.26; The Theban Surprise,

---

<sup>135</sup> M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat*, 9.

*Thuc.* 2.2-6; The Attic Coup, *Thuc.* 6.95.3), Assyrian and Babylonian sources (Inscription of Naram-Sin, Iddin-Sin, Samsu-Iluna, Iahdun-Lim, ), and Hittite sources (the Edict of Telipinu; The Apology of Hattushili III; The Edict of Hattushili, etc.). The widespread examples of coup reports and texts that imply the reality, danger, and threat of coups indicates that various administrative institutions were in place in the ancient world that aimed to avert the rise of insurrection and its potential explosion into outright coup.

Even ancient hymns and other seemingly unrelated texts like instructions to priests and court officials can be read as strong prophylactic measures designed to prevent insurrection and conspiracy against the current regime. For example, in the Hittite instruction to the royal guard (The Mešedi Protocol), there is a constant concern about which troops were allowed to have what weapons, where troops were allowed to stand in relation to the king, how they are allowed to exit and enter the king's presence and what the consequences were for breaching protocol.<sup>136</sup> Though the Mešedi Protocol is not a report of a coup, its purpose is, at least in part, to institutionalize an established protocol meant to protect the person of the king from his own guard (i.e., from a coup). The strictures of the Mešedi Protocol are such that any sign of breaching it was to be immediately addressed and investigated (and punished) so as to protect the king from harm from within his own guard.

### *Technique, Perspective and Coup Reports*

According to Luttwak, "A coup consists of the infiltration of a small but critical segment of the state apparatus, which is then used to displace the government from its control of the remainder."<sup>137</sup> The most prominent theorists of Coups d'Etat, Naudé (17<sup>th</sup> century), K. Marx, L. Trotsky, E. Luttwak, S. P. Huntington, D. C. Rapoport, and J. A. Goldstone, tried to provide a

---

<sup>136</sup> G. McMahon, "Instructions to the Royal Guard (Mešedi Protocol)" in *COS* vol. 1 (eds. Hallo and Younger, New York: Brill, 2000), 225-230.

<sup>137</sup> E. Luttwak, *Coup d'Etat: A Practical Handbook*, (London: Penguin Press, 1968), 24.

typology for analyzing different types of coups.<sup>138</sup> Marx theorized that there are four aspects of coup d'état. First, the coup must be organized secretly and carefully timed for maximum efficacy, utilizing the element of surprise. Along with this, society must be properly prepared for the coup, explaining why coups occur at times of political and social tension. Second, the current state administration must be seen as degenerate and generally accepted as a failure. Third, assassins control the state military forces or are confident that the military will in fact support the coup, i.e., they are in on the conspiracy. Fourth, the coup is executed and the process begins afresh.<sup>139</sup>

Much later, Huntington argued that there are three types of coups: governmental, revolutionary, and reform.<sup>140</sup> According to Bankowicz's recent synthesis of theories concerning Coups d'Etat,

The contemporary understanding of coup d'état derives from the idea that coup d'état is a planned, organized and sudden overthrow of the existing power, accompanied by the violation of legal and constitutional principles and by the use of force or the threat of its use. Thus, the authors of coup d'état can be people present in a broadly understood power sphere or people who directly administer state power. A result of a successful coup d'état is the establishment of a new state power, which is illegal from the perspective of the present juridical system. *The power, however, has a strong ambition to be legalized and thus quickly proceeds to form a new political system with a whole new legal and institutional infrastructure.*(Emphasis added)<sup>141</sup>

It is this process of legalization that is quite significant for understanding the discourses guiding and constraining the production and reproduction of 2 Kings 11.

Taking into consideration these theoretical proposals concerning a theory of coup d'état offers significant guidance for analyzing coup reports from the ancient world. However,

---

<sup>138</sup> G. Naudé, *Considérations politiques sur le Coup d'État*, 1639; K. Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, (trans. Daniel de Leon, Chicago: Charles H Kerr and Co., 1907 [originally published in Ger. 1869]); C. Malaparte, *Technique du Coup d'État*, 1931; L. Trotsky, *The Permanent Revolution & Results and Prospects*, (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1969); E. Luttwak, *Coup d'Etat: A Practical Handbook*, 1969; S. P. Huntington, "Patterns of Violence in World Politics," 75-93 in *Changing Patterns of Military Politics*, (ed. S. P. Huntington, New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962); J. A. Goldstone, "Revolution," Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Science at Stanford University, Jan. 1997, see also Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat*, 39.

<sup>139</sup> See M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat*, 23-24 and K. Marx *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, 1907.

<sup>140</sup> S. P. Huntington, "Patterns of Violence in World Politics," 75-93; M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat: A Critical Theoretical Synthesis*, 33-34.

<sup>141</sup> M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat*, 25.

contemporary theories must be modified for use in analyses of coup reports in the ancient world. For example, contemporary theories of coup use terms including democracy, parliament, and the state, terms that, for the most part, were not used in the ancient world or are only partly synonymous with ancient terms associated with government and elite classes in society. Thus, the following typology is based on previous theories, but I have modified it accordingly so as to take in to consideration the differences between contemporary discourses and ancient ones as well as focusing on the perspectives of coup reports as a foundational element for establishing a typology of these reports.

Coup reports, for the most part, tend to have a particular perspective that can fall into four basic categories. One of the most common perspectives is that of those organizing the coup. Since, especially in the ancient world (based on elite control of resources of production), text production and power went hand in hand, the reports that we have from this perspective are usually reports of successful coups. This makes sense because if the coup had failed, we would likely hear nothing about it from the perspective of those who had attempted the coup, since failure likely cost them their lives and those in power would control any narrative about the coup should such a narrative emerge. This highlights the important relationship between language and power as well as text production and power.

Another common perspective is that of the group in power that was the object of the attempted coup and successfully thwarted the insurrection. This perspective is common in Hittite edicts and other ANE texts from Assyria and Babylon. For example, the edict of Hattushili reports a coup attempt and its outcome from the perspective of Hattushili who was the object of

the coup, survived it, and was subsequently reporting the outcome of the effects of the coup (especially as regards succession changes due to the coup attempt).<sup>142</sup>

Another coup perspective is that of the historical narrative of successive coups. These reports tend to be somewhat like a chronicle, listing the names of those involved in the coup and the outcomes of successful coups. The main differences between these reports and the two previous types are that, first, these reports are often meant to be didactic or propagandistic. Second, their perspective was critical of the successful coup sequence and saw the history of successive successful coups as one of the main causes of social decay in Hittite society. These texts, like those in 1 Kgs 16?, 2 Kings 15-16, and especially the Proclamation/Edict of Telipinu (Hittite), were used by those who were in power (i.e., those who produced the texts) to argue that coups cause social decay and had led to the current (sorry) state of things. These reports usually end with propositions about how to correct the current state of chaos if possible.

A less common coup perspective is found in the cursory reports of succession in ANE chronicles. As with the previous examples, this coup perspective may or may not be negative. The cursory nature of these reports and their lack of extenuating details gives them a sense of neutrality as regards its opinion about the outcome of the coup. For example, the Assyrian King List uses the phrase *ušatbi* <PN> *GISH.GU.ZA iṣbati* (*ushatbi kussum iṣbati* “he ousted <PN> and seized the throne”) when referring to kings who usurped the throne (presumably through a coup) forcefully.<sup>143</sup> The third person singular verb *iṣbat* (from *ṣabatum*) is neutral since its use can refer to both taking the throne as a legitimate successor or through violence. The verb *ušatbi*

---

<sup>142</sup> G. Beckman, “The Bilingual Edict of Ḫattušili” in *COS*, vol. 2, (eds. Hallo and Younger, New York: Brill, 2000), 79-81; also, on the dangers and outcomes of coups d’état, see Bankowicz, *Coup d’Etat*, 28 “Coups d’état obviously attract men willing to gamble to change their personal circumstances in a single act. But unlike the gamester who wagers a fixed amount for a given sum, the player in this more dangerous sport may lose everything, including his life, through miscalculation.”

<sup>143</sup> A. Millard, “The Assyrian King List” in *COS*, vol. 1, (eds. Hallo and Younger, New York: Brill, 1997), 463-465 (sec. 1.136).

(from *tebum*) on the other hand is closely associated with rebellion and removal. As a result, there is both a cursory sense of neutrality mixed perhaps with a slightly negative portrayal of the usurper. The reason I make this claim is that the Assyrian King List does give short negative accounts of other kings that it does not see as legitimate kings. The mention of several usurpers without such negative descriptions indicates that whoever wrote the text believed that usurping the throne through coup did not affect the legitimacy of the usurper. It seems, based on the evaluation of Assur-Dugal (and others, e.g., Hazael) as “a son of a nobody” who was not legitimately on the throne, that legitimacy had to do with lineage rather than perceived negative actions (like instigating a coup; often using the term *ušatbi* “he ousted”).<sup>144</sup>

The next perspective is different from all of the previous examples and is found in several different genres such as prayers, prophecies, instructions, and psalms. These texts could be further categorized into two groups: 1) *divine prophylactic* texts against harm to the king; and, 2) *functional prophylactic* texts against harm to the king. The first group includes prayers and psalms that describe conversations between the king and his god, appeals to the god for help, and oracles or prophecies promising aid and guidance. Though these texts deal with various issues and concerns including expansion of territory, protection against foreign enemies, and promises of victory, they also deal with pleas and promises concerning insurrection from within the palace and court (i.e., military palace coups). Such examples highlight the importance of maintaining control over the palace, the royal family and the royal court and imply that protocols were in place to protect the king from revolt. This group of texts expresses these concerns in religious

---

<sup>144</sup> Gelb, I. J. “Two Assyrian Kings Lists,” *JNES* XIII, No. 4 (1954):209-230; Borger, R. *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien. AfO Beiheft 9*. (Graz: Ernst Weidner, 1956); J. B. Pritchard, Editor. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3d ed. with supplement, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 564-566; Glassner 1993:146–151; Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114-859 BC)*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 6–8; A. Millard, “Assyrian King Lists” in *COS* vol. 1 (ed. Hallo and Younger, New York: Brill, 1997): 463-465 (sec. 1.135).

texts (*religious* in this context meaning literature that describes the interactions between the mundane and the extra-mundane realms, though they were human products).<sup>145</sup>

The second group of texts is more functional. These texts are instructions to the royal family and instructions to court personnel, including the royal guard. The prime example of this type of text is the Meshedi Protocol from Hattusha.<sup>146</sup> This text, as was briefly mentioned before, is primarily concerned with establishing a strict protocol meant to be carefully observed by those who function as guards and courtiers. High officials and the king himself could watch these protocols for signs of breach. Those who stepped out of line, breaching the normal protocol, were to be immediately interrogated and reprimanded for making the breach. As a result, the protocols granted protection of the king's body through strict order and organization and provided a visual way for officials and the king himself to observe protocols as they took place. If the protocols were breached there were provisions for the king and officials to take action, since a breach was an indication of possible revolt from within the guard. These protocols were specifically meant to avert internal insurrection.

In summary, when categorizing the types of coup reports from the ancient Near East, we are left with five basic perspective types when dealing with texts that report and deal with the coup d'état (even if only through implication): the perspective of the *successful coup*; the perspective of the *unsuccessful coup*; the propagandistic *negative perspective of past coups*; the somewhat *neutral perspective of the chronicle*; and texts that take a *prophylactic* approach to coups (both religious and functional texts).

---

<sup>145</sup> “‘Religion’ is not a native term; it is a term created by scholars for their intellectual purposes and therefore is theirs to define. It is a second-order, generic concept that plays the same role in establishing a disciplinary horizon that a concept such as ‘language’ plays in linguistics or ‘culture’ plays in anthropology. There can be no disciplined study of religion without such a horizon.” (J. Z. Smith, “Religion, Religions, Religious,” in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies* [ed. M. Taylor, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988], 281-282).

<sup>146</sup> McMahon, G. “Instructions to the Royal Guard (Meshedi Protocol),” *COS* 1.85, ed. Hallo and Younger (1997): 225-230)



As stated above, working from such a typology is helpful because it provides a theoretical basis for attempting to show how 2 Kings 11 is innovative as compared to other coup reports. These innovations are indicative of the interdiscursivity of the text and, as a result, show how discourse and social practices guided and constrained the production and reproduction of 2 Kings 11 for different communities. In turn, this is an essential step for answering the core question of this project: how and why were Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution distanced from the theme of oracle, oracle fulfillment reports, and coups that both precede and follow 2 Kings 11?

### *Coup d'Etat in the Hebrew Bible*

There are many examples of coup in the Hebrew Bible. Because of the nature of the text, it tends to mix various perspectives into one narrative. For example, the perspective discussed above relating to the propagandistic negative perspective of successful past coups can be found in texts including 1 Kings 15:25-16:22 and 2 Kings 15:8-31. Yet, there is a difference between these texts and, for example, The Proclamation of Telipinu. For example, especially in 1 Kings 15:25-16:22, there is a close connection between prophetic oracle and its fulfillment associated with these successive coups. This element of prophecy is not found in the Telipinu text, but it does have a correlative ideology of divine justice. The main difference between the two ideologies is that in the text of 1 Kings 15:25-16:22 (and in connection with Ahijah's oracle in 1 Kgs 14) the discursive field of statements makes it clear that the successive coups are due to the Israelite kings doing "evil" in the sight of Yahweh. It is generally agreed that the *evil* being referred to here had to do with cultic practices contrary to the monotheistic views of the Deuteronomic school. The Telipinu text, on the other hand, argues that the gods were seeking retribution against those who spilled blood through successive coups. The two examples both

have ideologies of divine retribution and punishment, but the sources of the punishment are different because the ideological formations about why coups happen are different. In the DtrH, the field of statements indicates that coups happen because Yahweh is punishing Israelite kings for doing *evil* in his sight, while in the Telipinu text, the gods seek to punish those who participated in a coup because they had shed blood that had to be avenged.

In the Hebrew Bible, there are at least fourteen examples of coup reports. They can be categorized as follows: coup reports from the perspective of those remaining in power after successfully putting down a coup attempt (the coup of Israel and Aaron against Yahweh and Moses, Ex. 32; the coup of Korah and Dathan against Moses and Aaron, Num 16-17); coup reports from the negative perspective of propagandistic views of past successful coups (the coup of Abimelech against the 70 sons of Jerubaal, Judg. 9; the coup of Baasha against Nadab, 1 Kgs 15:27-30; the coup of Zimri against Elah, 1 Kgs 16:9-13; the coup of Omri and “all Israel” against Zimri, 1 Kgs 16:16-19; the coup of Shallum against Zechariah 2 Kgs 15:10; the coup of Menahem against Shallum 2 Kgs 15:14; the coup of Pekah against Pekahiah, 2 Kgs 15:25; the coup of Hosea against Pekah, 2 Kgs 15.30); and finally, coup reports that are sanctioned by prophets or priests (the coup of Samuel/David against Saul, 1 Samuel 16; the coup of Ahijah/Jeroboam against Solomon/Rehoboam, 1 Kgs 11; the coup of Elisha/Jehu against the house of Ahab/Jotham, 2 Kgs 9-10; the coup of Jehoiada/Joash against Athaliah, 2 Kgs 11).

This general grouping, especially as regards 2 Kgs 11, raises some interesting questions about text production. It seems to verify the claims that 2 Kgs 11 is closely related to the coup report of Jehu that appears immediately before it in 2 Kgs 9-10. To take this a step further, it also indicates that, even though there is little about prophets, oracles and their fulfillment in 2 Kgs 11,

a careful analysis shows that what is *not* said in 2 Kgs 11 is just as important as what is said. It begs the question why are there no prophets and oracle reports associated with 2 Kgs 11?

Another point that needs to be raised is connected to the ideological formation dealing with prophets, legitimacy, and violence versus priests, legitimacy and violence and the significance of prophetic vs. priestly leadership in the Israelite coup of Jeroboam and Jehu (prophetic) and the Judahite coup of Jehoida/Joash (priestly).

Because this discourse sample (the coup report of 2 Kgs 11) is so innovative in relation to other examples of coups in the Hebrew Bible, it is prime territory for discovering the ideological strategies for establishing and reproducing discourses and discourse products like texts, objects, and ways of thinking. This discourse sample is innovative in several ways that emphasize the unique nature of the discourses it contains and their social importance.

First, this discourse sample/coup report in 2 Kgs 11 is innovative because it breaks from the other examples of coup reports that are prophetically legitimated, successful coup reports. The major innovation is that it is a priest, not a prophet, who instigates the coup. Next, unlike the other prophetically legitimated coups, the object of the coup is to install a child on the throne; in the other examples, the object is that the newly anointed and prophetically legitimated king is to violently overthrow the existing ruler. This was not the case with the Joash coup. Since Joash was a child, other actants take over fulfilling the object of the coup. This innovation highlights the importance of the Davidic promise in 2 Kings 11 (any offspring of David will be preserved and enthroned, even if the offspring is still a child), further differentiating it from the prophetically legitimated coups to the north. In Judah, bloodline was an essential element of the ideological construction (at least of those reporting the coup). In the north, there was no focus on

bloodline and dynasty except in short instances also related to prophetic pronouncements (i.e., the four generations of Jehu's dynasty).

In light of the above observations, the following points concerning coups in Israel and Judah emerge. First, in light of the various types of coups and their respective/unique perspectives, the coup of Jehoiada/Joash understands two northern coups to be legitimate (at least initially): the coup of Jeroboam and the coup of Jehu. All other coups that are associated with oracle fulfillment reports are not legitimated by a prophet, but simply report the fulfillment of the negative aspects of an oracle tradition first pronounced due to Israelite kings doing "evil in Yahweh's sight." Though it will be explored in more detail later, it is clear that, based on the fact that the positive oracles for Jeroboam and Jehu are reinterpretation of the Davidic oracle of Nathan to David (2 Samuel 7), the whole history of Israel found in the Hebrew Bible is either a complete fabrication of Israel's history from a Judahite perspective post 721 BCE or the history of Israelite kings found between 1 Kgs 11 and 2 Kgs 17 is a dramatic and theological reinterpretation of Israelite history based on actual sources (inscriptions, annals) infused with Deuteronomistic ideology as well as successive theological perspectives in even later periods. The latter option is obviously tempting to argue, but very dangerous in its assumptions since there is very little evidence so far that Judahite and Israelite kings invested much effort in erecting monumental inscriptions. The epigraphic material available (the Jehoash inscription and the Tel Dan inscription) is hotly debated and it is almost certain that the Jehoash inscription is a modern forgery.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> I. Eph'al, "The 'Jehoash Inscription': A Forgery," *IEJ* 53/1 (2003):123-128; F. M. Cross, "Notes on the Forged Plaque Recording Repairs to the Temple," *IEJ* 53/1 (2003): 119-122; Y. Goren, "An Alternative Interpretation of the Stone Tablet with Ancient Hebrew Inscription Attributed to Jehoash King of Judah," *The Bible and Interpretation*, (Feb, 2003). Online: [http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/alternative\\_interpretation.shtml](http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/alternative_interpretation.shtml).

In conclusion to this section on interdiscursivity both between extra-biblical and biblical examples of coups, it is important to recap several points. First, even though the overall discourse sample could simply be referred to as a coup report, it is imperative to further categorize coup types to explore the different perspectives of coups and their outcomes.

Second, in the end, since this genre (coup report) is not the only way that 2 Kings 11 can be categorized, the conclusion to this project must consider how this genre functions in the overall genre complex, creating a sort of analytic synthesis of the various genre types that 2 Kgs 11 calls upon (succession report, coup report, death report, report of cultic reform, etc.).

Third, the relationship between the order of operations commanded by Jehoiada to the guards must be further analyzed in relation to military protocols and their purposes. If, for example, prior to the coup the guard was primarily under the control of the palace and was so easily appropriated and used in conspiratory planning against Athaliah, how did Athaliah and her officials miss the signs of breached protocol? Were there no protocols in place? Does this support the claim that this text is primarily a priestly text and that those involved were closely associated with the temple and its protection/guarding rather than a mixture of both temple and palace guards? Why is it that it is only in the observance of older “customs” (i.e., the keeping of older protocols) that Athaliah finally comes to and realizes that protocol, from her perspective, had been breached? This discrepancy seems to reorganize society to some extent in that it centralizes all legitimate activities primarily around the house of Yahweh making the priest (Jehoiada) the head of a puppet monarchy (Joash) controlled by the priestly class. This is especially relevant considering the young age of Joash and statements about his success found in 2 Kings 12 (he was successful as long as he had Jehoiada, the priest, as his counsel). As a result, it appears that from the perspective of interdiscursivity, 2 Kings 11 was clearly produced for a

community that placed a lot of emphasis on the Davidic bloodline and the powerful role of the Yahwistic priest.

Furthermore, 2 Kings 11 distances itself from the standard or normative perspective of legitimate coup led by a prophet by insisting that Athaliah's execution and the restoration of a Davidide on the Judahite throne were the result of the acts of a Yahwistic priest. The overthrow of the Baal cult in Judah was not the result of prophetic oracles and their fulfillment as it was with the Elijah/Elisha/Jehu narratives, but rather, it was carried out successfully by the Yahwistic priest. Furthermore, the priest gives no indication that he is acting or speaking in the name of Yahweh as is the case with the prophetic oracles in the north, rather, Jehoiada the priest is acting in accordance with an already established oracular promise to the Davidides. He does not need to speak Yahweh's words, they were already spoken by Nathan. The text does not need to explicitly state that Jehoiada is acting with legitimate Yahwistic cult authority; this is implied by his station, location, and actions (priest, Jerusalem, house of Yahweh, covenant, coronation, enthronement, etc.). The Davidic oracle of Nathan was clearly presupposed at least by those who added v.9-11, but it was likely presupposed even before that (though, again, 2 Kings 11 does not explicitly or *manifestly* refer to it).<sup>148</sup>

Thus, because of its innovations in contrast to its most closely associated counterparts (the coups of Jeroboam and Jehu), it is clear that this little piece of propaganda was written to reaffirm the acts of Jehoiada as divinely inspired (through the oracle of Nathan in 2 Sam 7) and as in line with Deuteronomistic theology (abolition of idolatry, especially Baalism) but also to reaffirm that the chaotic nature of succession and coup in the north that necessitated prophetic intervention was not spreading into Judah. There was no need for a prophet, Judah had a priest. Even the effects of the coup of Elisha/Jehu that were extremely explicit both in word and deed in

---

<sup>148</sup> See N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 101-136.

carrying out the complete annihilation of the house of Ahab had no efficacy in Judahite territory. Even though literary intertextual links clearly show a connection between these narratives (chain of oracles, cries of treason, execution, the destruction of Baalism and the act of coup itself), when the narrative shifts to a description of Judahite activity, it is immune to reports of prophetic oracle fulfillment. Of course, this can be conveniently explained by the fact that the whole sequence of Israelite coups, both the positive and negative reports, were written from a Judahite perspective (at least in the literary complex as it now stands).<sup>149</sup> Thus, it is necessary to recognize that this is all an elaborate example of some the techniques of Judahite historiography.

---

<sup>149</sup> See 1 Kgs 14:6-26 (oracle against Jeroboam); 15:25-30 (fulfillment of oracle against Jeroboam through his son Nadab); 16:7-13 (Baasha); 16:15-19 (Zimri); 2 Kgs 9-10//11 (fall of Omrides/Ahabites).

## **Chapter 4: Textual Analysis, Constitution of Identity and Worldview in 2 Kings 11**

According to N. Fairclough, “Text analysis can be organized under four main headings: ‘vocabulary’, ‘grammar’, ‘cohesion’, and ‘text structure’. These can be thought of as ascending in scale: vocabulary deals mainly with individual words, grammar deals with words combined into clauses and sentences, cohesion deals with how clauses and sentences are linked together, and text structure deals with large-scale organizational properties of texts.”<sup>150</sup> The aim of textual analysis is to pinpoint the ways that the text constitutes the world and objects in the world through definition and redefinition. The relationship between text analysis and discourse is that text analysis provides evidence for how discourses guide and constrain the production of knowledge.

As regards 2 Kings 11, its structure, system of turn-taking, definitions, and so forth offer insights about how systems of knowledge, identity formation, assumed relationships, and beliefs are built into the text. Identifying these techniques for making meaning in the world within the text is essential for supporting my claims about the genre of 2 Kings 11 as well as my claims about social change that is evident in a close analysis of the discourses that guided its production.

As regards the central question of this project, text analysis helps to support the claim that there are both ideological and diachronic reasons for distancing Jehoiada’s coup and Athaliah’s execution from the sequence of coup reports that precedes 2 Kings 11. As will be shown in the following textual analysis, there is much evidence supporting the claim that 2 Kings 11 was initially a simple coup report and was only later incorporated into the DtrH and imbued with Dtr theological thematic links to its literary surroundings. As a result, the central question of this project is partially addressed by noting that Athaliah’s execution was not initially a part of the

---

<sup>150</sup> N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 75.



oracle report tradition that climaxed with Jehu's coup against her father, Ahab, and, as a result, there was no reason to question whether Athaliah should have been executed in association with the fulfillment of that oracle tradition. However, once Jehoiada's coup and the report of Athaliah's execution were incorporated into the DtrH, Judahite discourses did guide and constrain how that incorporation was to be accomplished.

Textual analysis of 2 Kings 11 (below) shows that the Dtr redactor put a lot of effort into contrasting Jehoiada's authority and actions with the actions of those initiating coups in the literary framework of 1 Kgs 11-2 Kgs 10. Jehoiada controls most of the events in 2 Kings 11. Elaborations of ambiguous or problematic statements in the narrative, for example, how the events were carried out and by whom, show that those producing and reproducing 2 Kings 11 had different views about the palace and the temple in Jerusalem. As a result, there is strong tension between the palace and the temple in 2 Kings 11.

Such observations support the claim that 2 Kings 11 was initially produced as a coup report (see Chapter 3) that was then incorporated into a larger literary corpus and modified in ways that legitimated Jehoiada's actions, legalized the coup, and argued that it was a more popular movement than it initially may have been. Thus, the current form of 2 Kings 11 has been linked to its surroundings by means of Dtr themes and ideology that are secondary. It is these secondary literary links that raise the question why Athaliah was not included in the climax of the fall of the Ahabites. This claim is supported by the observation that without the secondary additions that essentially claim that Athaliah had breached cultic norms by her (implied) practice of Baalism and the possibility that she entered sacred space unauthorized. In its un-incorporated state, i.e., without these additions, the coup against Athaliah was only supported by a minority of elites and was likely brought about more due to materialistic grievances such dissatisfaction with

policy or, simply because a group of elites within her administration wanted to overthrow her rule to increase their own power.<sup>151</sup> Much of the textual analysis that follows indicates that the process of legitimizing the coup may have taken place quickly, as is the case with most coups. However, the Dtr additions to the text (covenant renewal and destruction of Baalism) were added much later and serve as a testament to the earlier process of legitimating Jehoiada's coup since the Dtr felt comfortable linking Josiah genealogically and thematically to Joash who was enthroned as a result of Jehoiada's actions.

### *The Control of Communicative Events in 2 Kings 11*

There is very little indication of turn-taking in 2 Kings 11, which suggests an asymmetrical power relationship between Jehoiada and all other actors in the text. This observation supports the claim that whoever Jehoiada may be to different communities at different times he is clearly the protagonist of 2 Kings 11.

The mode of interaction and exchange of power and action is very simple in 2 Kings 11. Jehoiada is understood to be the authoritative figure; his main sources of authority which he exchanges or barter for the support of others are his possession of the king's son Joash, his supposed status as priest of the Yahweh cult (I avoid the use of the title "high priest" here first because it is not used in the text and second because it may be anachronistic to use it in connection with Jehoiada), and his access and control over symbols belonging to the Davidic dynasty.

Furthermore, all of the main themes of 2 Kings 11 are introduced and controlled by Jehoiada. The only exceptions to this are the acts of Jehosheba, who, even though she is not given any direct speech time, provides Jehoiada with one of his central bartering chips, the only remaining Davidide, Joash. The second exception is with Athaliah. It is only Athaliah that is

---

<sup>151</sup> See O. Sergi, "Judah's Expansion," 2013.

given any evaluative voice in this whole narrative when she denounces as treasonous the events initiated by Jehoiada. Jehoiada and Athaliah are the only two individuals allowed to speak directly in 2 Kings 11. All other communication is either implied consent followed by action (the military forces directed by Jehoiada) or collective pronouncements such as “long live the king!”

The agendas of 2 Kings 11 are also introduced and controlled by Jehoiada. First, Jehoiada hatched the plan to initiate a coup against Athaliah. Second, Jehoiada led the initiative to crown Joash and enthrone him. Third, Jehoiada officiated in the covenant renewal report of 2 Kgs 11:17. The one instance where Jehoiada does not direct the actions of those participating in the coup is found in 2 Kgs 11:18 where the people spontaneously and violently attack the house of Baal, tear down his images and altars, and murder his priest, Mattan. These actions were not instigated, at least directly, by Jehoiada. The most plausible way to account for this innovation is to note the secondary nature of v.18. The spontaneous and violent acts against Baalism interrupt the flow of Joash’s coronation. The fact that Jehoiada takes no part in annihilating Baalism along with narrative picking up right where it left off before v.18, explains, at least in part, why Jehoiada was not involved; either the secondary material did not see fit to attribute these actions to him (there could be several reasons for this) or did not attribute them to him by mistake.

### *Textual Cohesion and 2 Kings 11 – Elaboration, Extension, and Enhancement* <sup>152</sup>

The function of several clauses in 2 Kings 11 is to elaborate titles, space, actions, and customs.<sup>153</sup> Examples of elaborations of titles are found primarily in association with the central

---

<sup>152</sup> “In elaboration, one clause (sentence) elaborates on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing it’, that is, by rewording it, exemplifying it, or clarifying it...In extension, one clause (sentence) ‘extends the meaning of another by adding something new to it’. This may be a matter of straight addition (marked with ‘and’, ‘moreover’, etc.), an adversative relation (marked with ‘but’, ‘yet’, ‘however’, etc.), or variation (marked with ‘or’, ‘alternatively’, ‘instead’ etc.). In enhancement, one clause (sentence) ‘enhances the meaning of another by qualifying it in a number of possible ways: by reference to time, place, manner, cause or condition’”. (M. K. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, (London: Edward Arnold, 1985), 202-227; M. K. Halliday, *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in Social-Semiotic Perspective*, [Victoria: Deakin University Press, 1985]; idem, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. [London: Arnold, 2004]; Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 175).

figures of the text. First, Jehosheba's titles are successively elaborated, especially as regards her role as described in 2 Chr 22:10-23:21. In one text, she is described as King Joram's daughter and Ahaziah's sister (with no indication of who her mother was). Second, the titles of Joash consistently emphasize his royalty in both 2 Kings 11 and 2 Chronicles 22:10-23:21. Joash is described as the son of Ahaziah (v.2), the king's son (v.4, 12), and the king (v.8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19). Third, Jehoiada's titles are also inconsistent. Jehoiada is referred to as simply Jehoiada (v.4, 17), the priest Jehoiada (v.9, 15), or the priest (v.10, 15, 18). Fourth, the titles of Athaliah are elaborated less than other titles in 2 Kings 11. She is referred to as Athaliah (v.2, 3, 13, 14, 20), Ahaziah's mother (v.1). This indicates that there was little need or concern for elaborating her role in 2 Kings 11.<sup>154</sup>

The elaboration of space plays an important role in 2 Kings 11. The first example is that of the temple which is described and elaborated in several ways. The first example is found in v.2 which states that Jehosheba had taken Joash and hidden him in a bedroom. The next verse expands or elaborates on this by explaining that "he [Joash] remained with her [Jehosheba] for six years, hidden in the house of Yahweh." This is a clear elaboration on the simplistic statement that precedes it. This elaboration also created other issues that had to be clarified by later interpreters to explain how it was possible for Jehosheba to be in the temple given the strict male-centered laws surrounding the sanctuary. For the chronicler this was easily resolved by arguing that Jehosheba was in fact Jehoida's wife and, as a result, she had a right to live with her husband, the priest, in the temple princinct.

---

<sup>153</sup> Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 202-227.

<sup>154</sup> This could also be the result of "clipping" by simply refusing to state titles that could be damning or contradictory to the ideological perspectives of the author(s) (E. Zerubavel, *Ancestors and Relatives*, [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012]).

*Cohesive Clausal Functions (Elaboration, Extension, and Enhancement), Explicit Cohesive Markers (reference, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion), and the Rhetorical Modes of 2 Kings 11 (Fairclough, 176)*<sup>155</sup>

When communities read and reread, produce and reproduce texts, the process results in textual cohesion. Cohesion is indicative of the ideological work that has been done on a given text.<sup>156</sup> For 2 Kings 11, the main aims of establishing cohesion are to clarify the central discursive objects being described. In 2 Kings 11, attempts at cohesion are visible primarily in relation to the role of Jehoiada, the centrality of the temple for all aspects of Judahite life (who can and cannot enter the temple, how the temple administration is directed, etc.), the necessary actions against cultic deviation. The cohesive markers of 2 Kings 11 revolve around describing and elaborating upon these central Judahite/Yehudite discursive objects.

*Bourdieu, the Rules of Politeness, and 2 Kings 11*<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup> Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 176, “Halliday (1985: 288-9) distinguishes four main types of surface cohesive marking: 'reference', 'ellipsis', 'conjunction', and 'lexical cohesion'. Again, I can give only a broad sketch of these here. Reference is a matter of referring back to an earlier part of a text, forward to a part of the text that is coming, or outwards to the situation or wider cultural context of the text, using items such as personal pronouns, demonstratives, and the definite article. Ellipsis leaves out material that is recoverable from another part of the text, or replaces it with a substitute word, and so makes a cohesive link between the two parts of the text (for example, the ellipsis of 'spades' in the second part of this exchange: 'Why didn't you lead a spade?' - 'I hadn't got any'). Conjunction has already been quite extensively referred to: it is cohesion with conjunctive words and expressions, including what are traditionally called 'conjunctions' ('since', 'if', 'and' etc.) as well 'conjunctive adjuncts' (Halliday 1985: 303) or 'conjuncts' (Quirk et al. 1972: 520-32) such as 'therefore', 'in addition', 'in other words'. Lexical cohesion is cohesion through the repetition of words, the linking of words and expressions in meaning relations (see Leech 1981) such as synonymy (sameness of meaning) or hyponymy (where the meaning of one 'includes' the meaning of the other), or the linking of words and expressions which 'collocate' (Halliday 1966), that is, belong to the same semantic domain and tend to co-occur (for example, 'pipe', 'smoke', 'tobacco').”

<sup>156</sup> Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 177.

<sup>157</sup> “Bourdieu (1977: 95, 218) suggests a view of politeness which is very different from that of Brown and Levinson, claiming that 'the concessions of politeness are always political concessions.' He elaborates as follows: 'practical mastery of what are called the rules of politeness, and in particular the art of adjusting each of the available formulae ... to the different classes of possible addressees, presupposes the implicit mastery, hence the recognition, of a set of oppositions constituting the implicit axiomatics of a determinate political order.' In other words, particular politeness conventions embody, and their use implicitly acknowledges, particular social and power relations (see Kress and Hodge 1979), and in so far as they are drawn upon they must contribute to reproducing those relations. A corollary is that investigating the politeness conventions of a given genre or discourse type is one way of gaining insight into social relations within the practices and institutional domains with which it is associated.” (Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 163; P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, [trans. R. Nice, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977], 95, 218).

The rules of politeness in 2 Kings 11 reflect the structure of power within the community in which it was produced, distributed, and consumed. The use of politeness (positive and negative)<sup>158</sup> indicates that those making requests are at risk of offending superiors for asking a favor, giving a command, or even simply communicating with them. In 2 Kings 11, there is very little concern for politeness in way that Jehoiada communicates with those he addresses. This indicates the authoritative status of his character and actions. In contrast, when reporting the actions of those fulfilling Jehoiada's commands, words that evoke exactness and obedience are used. According to Bourdieu's rules of politeness, the politeness structure in 2 Kings 11 is clearly indicative of the power structures imagined therein. In contrast to Jehoiada, whose voice is heard and obeyed with exactness, there are also those who are nearly or completely voiceless in 2 Kings 11 (Joash, the captains, the Carites, the people of the land, etc.). The voiceless are completely obedient (perhaps obedience is a form of politeness) to Jehoiada's commands. In this imagined world, all social institutions listen unwaveringly to Jehoiada. The only act that seems to take place without his approval is the destruction of the sanctuary of Baal and the murder of its priest, Mattan. Jehoiada does not command this act (nor does he condemn it); the people spontaneously attack without being told to do so. This could be reported this way due to a desire to distance Jehoiada from the violent act since it could stain his image much the way, as others have argued, that Jehu's zeal for Yahweh stained his royal image when he annihilated Baalism from Israel. A more probable solution is that v.18 is a secondary addition to the text and that it interrupts the flow of the narrative. Thus, Jehoiada's lack of involvement is a result of the

---

<sup>158</sup>see N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 162-164; Brown and Levinson, *Politeness: some universals in language usage*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); G. N. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*, (London: Longman, 1983); G. N. Leech and J. Thomas, "Language, meaning and context: Pragmatics," in *An Encyclopaedia of Language*, (ed. N. E. Collinge, London: Routledge, 1989).

secondary interruption itself (i.e., those inserting v.18 failed to bring it into agreement with the dialogue structure found in the rest of the chapter).

### *Ethos, Social Identity, and 2 Kings 11*<sup>159</sup>

The body of genres and discourse types in 2 Kings 11 clearly indicates that the identity of the communities reading this text is to be located at various historical periods in Judah/Yehud. This may be stating the obvious, but it is important to spell out exactly how this is accomplished so as to define the differences between typical Judahite/Yehudite uses of genre as well as common discursive formations in comparison to other discursive formations. To be more precise, initially the ethos associated with coup reports indicates that those participating were likely Judahite elites within Athaliah's administration. Theorists of coups d'état generally point out that coups are often top-down events, planned and executed by those already in the administration that will be abolished through the coup.

When 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the larger DtrH, the thematic links used to bind it to its literary context (the secondary Dtr material dealing with covenant renewal and anti-Baalism) naturally caused the ethos of the text to shift. The participants, the vocabulary, the actions all claim that the event was communal, legitimate, and necessary for true Yahwistic reform to come about. In this way, as argued before, the coup of Jehoiada was recast as a revolution and covenant renewal by the Dtr.

---

<sup>159</sup> “The question of ethos is an intertextual one: what models from other genres and discourse types are deployed to constitute the subjectivity (social identity, ‘self’) of participants in interactions?...Ethos can, however, be seen as part of a wider process of ‘modelling’ wherein the place and time of an interaction and its set of participants, as well as participants ethos, are constituted by the projection of linkages in certain intertextual directions rather than others. Maingueneau (1987: 31-5) gives the example of the discourse (political speeches, for instance) of the French Revolution, which was modelled on the republican discourse of ancient Rome in terms of place, time, and ‘scene’ (in the sense of overall circumstances of discourse), as well as participants and participant ethos.” Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 166; Maingueneau, *Nouvelles Tendances en Analyse de Discours*, (Paris: Hachette, 1987), 31-35.

## *Dimensions of Clausal Grammar: Transitivity, Theme, and Modality*<sup>160</sup>

The actions, events, relational and mental process types in 2 Kings 11 are indicative of the socio-political power structures in place within the communities that produced, distributed, and consumed the text. The most common process types found in 2 Kings 11 are actional (Jehoiada directing the coup, coronation, and enthronement), relational (loyalty to the king, covenant making, and coup participation), and mental (expressions of sensing or evaluating).<sup>161</sup>

Actional process types in 2 Kings 11 are associated with preserving the Davidic dynasty, covenant making, coup, the coronation and enthronement of Joash, and, in certain literary strata, the preservation of the sanctity of sacred space and the reestablishment of Yahwism. These actional processes are salient social indicators of the order of the social world of the communities who consumed this text and other texts like it.

There are three passive clauses in 2 Kings 11. The first is a participial form of *polal*, while the other two use the passive hofal form of the root *מָוַת*, *to be killed*.<sup>162</sup> The function of passives in 2 Kings 11 may serve to brush aside questions about who was killing whom. It is, for example, unthinkable to argue that Athaliah was herself responsible for entering the harem to slaughter royal infants or that she personally tracked down older heirs to the throne so as to dispatch them. Rather, Athaliah had at her disposal what every Judahite ruler had before her, military personnel, royal guards, and a royal administration. It was from within these ranks that

---

<sup>160</sup> M. K. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 1985 (chapter 5); Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 177-179;

<sup>161</sup> Directed action means the participant is acting toward a given goal; non-directed action means the participant is left implicit or un-named perhaps in an effort to mystify their action.

<sup>162</sup> “Active is the ‘unmarked’ choice, the form selected when there are no specific reasons for choosing the passive. And motivations for choosing the passive are various. One is that it allows for the omission of the agent, though this may itself be variously motivated by the fact that the agent is self-evident, irrelevant or unknown. Another political or ideological reason for an agentless passive may be to obfuscate agency, and hence causality and responsibility...Passives are also motivated by considerations relating to the textual function of the clause. A passive shifts the goal into initial ‘theme’ position which usually means presenting it as ‘given’ or already known information; it also shifts the agent, if it is not omitted, into the prominent position at the end of a clause where we usually find new information.” (N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 182).



Athaliah would have commanded the slaughter of the remaining royal offspring. The use of passive verbs allows anonymity for those who may have participated in the gruesome event. The narrative places Athaliah in an active role while placing her subjects doing her bidding in a passive one (i.e., anonymous).<sup>163</sup> The result of the use of the passives in v.2 (whether one views this text as history or legend) is that its anonymity allows those who participated in the events that Athaliah directed to assimilate into the new political system. Participants, included those who passively allowed Athaliah to rise to the throne (Jehoiada!). This technique avoids asking questions about “who” was killing since passive verbs can function with or without an actant (e.g., “they were killed” versus “they were killed by...”).

According to some, the thematic structure of a text is indicative of the assumed knowledge that underlies the text producer’s (and the community’s) world view.<sup>164</sup> There are several aspects of 2 Kings 11 that are foregrounded as thematically relevant to the text. First, the statement of elapsed time in v.3 sets up the foregrounding of important actions about to take place “...but in the seventh year...” is a distinct and effective foregrounding device that contrasts what is about to take place (a coup led by Jehoiada) with what has already happened in vv.1-3 (Athaliah’s rise to power). Another example of thematic foregrounding is the sequence of Jehoiada’s actions, in preparation for the coup, that appear to build up to another central theme: the importance of the royal seed. “...Jehoiada summoned the captains of the Carites and the guards and had them come to him in the house of the Lord. He made a covenant with them and put them under oath in the house of the Lord; *then he showed them the king’s son*” (NRSV,

---

<sup>163</sup> A. Gramsci, “The Intellectuals,” in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, (ed. and trans. Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith, New York: International Publishers, 1971), 3-23 (Chapter 1).

<sup>164</sup> “The theme is the text producer’s point of departure in a clause, and generally corresponds to what is taken to be (which does not mean it actually is) ‘given’ information, that is, information already known or established for text producers and interpreters.” Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 183; see also Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 37-67 (Chapter 3, “Clause as Message”).

emphasis added). The series of acts culminates and reveals the central reason for coup preparations: Jehoida possesses the king's son.

Another example of thematic foregrounding can be seen in Athaliah's accusation against those participating in the coup when she cries קשר קשר, "Conspiracy! Conspiracy!" This accusation was false according to the Dtr who, in response to the negative sequence of conspiracies as well as Athaliah's accusation, pre-empts the accusation by using vocabulary that was clearly authoritative in Dtr circles. The Dtr describes the secret plans of Jehoiada as a ברית. The Dtr made this contrast to show the difference between kingship in Israel and Judah. According to this argument, Jehoiada's coup was a legitimate deuteronomistic event while all other conspiracies (except for the initial conspiracies of Jeroboam and Jehu) were seen in as negative since they were Yahweh's response to Israel's abandonment of deuteronomistic ideology (centralization of worship in Jerusalem, Davidic chosenness, central role of covenant, etc.).

### *2 Kings 11 and Modality: Auxiliary Constructions, Verbal Tense, and Adverbial Constructions*

The term modality is used to describe how interactions between subjects are given quality through auxiliary verbal constructions (may, should, must, etc.), verbal tense (is, was, will be, etc.), and adverbial construction (describing the quality of the verb; i.e., *do it quickly* or *he is well*, etc.), are indicative of the social relationships (whether real or symbolic) within the world of a text.

In 2 Kings 11, there is only one auxiliary type verbal phrase that is found in v.15 אֶל־תּוּמַת (let her not be killed). This particular phrase is important because its modality indicates that Jehoiada was firmly in control. This phrase is also closely related to the sacrosanct status of the temple precinct. Not only is Jehoiada in control of who lives or dies, but he is also constrained by

the priestly discourse to make certain that execution took place outside of the temple for fear of desecrating the temple through human bloodshed.

Verbal tense in any language can be used to constitute subjects (A is/was B or A is/was not B, etc.) as well as to exert control of both body and time (A will <verb>).<sup>165</sup> Jehoiada's authority is expressed in many ways in 2 Kings 11. One of those ways is demonstrated in Jehoiada's control over present and future action. Jehoiada presides over activities in the present by summoning forces, but he also exerts authority to control these forces actions in the near and distant futures. This modality is expressed through the use of verbal tenses that extend the verbal action over institutions and their personnel as well as over time and space.

### *Key Words and their Meaning in 2 Kings 11*<sup>166</sup>

The words and word-clusters in 2 Kings 11 are indicative of the hegemonic struggle in the social world of the author(s) of this text. These word-clusters are centered on the discourses of priesthood and its sacred space (the temple), religious law (deuteronomism), and both royal and cultic administration. The contested nature of words and their meanings in 2 Kings 11 indicates that at some point ambiguous language about these three aspects in 2 Kings 11 had to be modified (see elaboration, extension, and enhancement above) to be compliant with later ideological needs in the community.

---

<sup>165</sup> In Biblical Hebrew, the term tense may not fully express the scope of possible meaning conveyed by verb usage. Some recent Biblical Hebrew grammars argue that the grammatical term "aspect" may help to understand the different potential meanings of a Hebrew verb. (Arnold and Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge, 2003:53-54.

<sup>166</sup> "The relationship of words to meanings is many-to-one rather than one-to-one, in both directions: words typically have various meanings, and meanings are typically 'worded' in various ways ... This means that as producers we are always faced with choices about how to use a word and how to word a meaning, and as interpreters we are always faced with decisions about how to interpret the choices producers have made (what values to place upon them). These choices and decisions are not of a purely individual nature: the meanings of words and the wording of meanings are matters which are socially variable and socially contested, and facets of wider social and cultural processes." (N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 185-190; R. Williams, *Key Words: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976], 19).

### *Wording, Interpretation, and Ideological Bias in 2 Kings 11*

2 Kings 11 contains several examples of words and wording that are culturally and ideologically significant because they expect that the readership has the assumed knowledge to understand their meaning. 2 Kings 11 contains several words that are either new or, more likely, *hapax legomena* (Lat. *single occurrences*). The first unique word is part of the name of one of the gates mentioned in v.6, שַׁעַר סוּר, (*the Sur gate*). It is likely, as has been discussed, that this unique word is the result of a scribal error due to the graphical similarity between ס and ש. This is supported by the witness of the Chronicler's spelling (though also problematic) הַיְסוּד. In the critical apparatus of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS), Jepsen questions whether or not this word should originally have been read as סוּס (i.e., *the horse gate*). As a result, the uniqueness of the wording associated with the enigmatic *Sur gate* is likely due to a scribal error and must be seen as indicative of the relationship between texts and interpreters at a much later time (when the text was difficult to read because of the state of available sources or when certain aspects of the classical Hebrew idiom and earlier Hebrew scripts had gone out of use).

The next example, the enigmatic *house of Massah*, is a clear example of how ambiguity or loss of meaning over time leads to an increase of interpretive measures as the reading community attempted to make sense of enigmatic words and word-clusters. If this phrase is to be seen as a scribal error, then, as with *the Sur gate* above, it must be understood in relation to the community and scribal school from a much later period than the one in which the mistake was made. However, if this phrase is to be understood as part of the earliest tradition of this story but whose meaning is now unknown, then it is necessary to attempt to locate the word in an earlier social complex and discursive framework. It must be noted that the chronicler omits this enigmatic phrase altogether.

The next example of a unique and contested word or word-clusters is found in v.8 and 15, השדרות. Unlike the previous examples, there are three other instances of this term in the Hebrew Bible (1 Kgs 6:9, 2 Kgs 11:8, 15, and 2 Chr 23:14). In 2 Kings 11, the term has several meaning potentials. For example, it could refer to a columned hall or even “ranks” as in “ranks of foot-soldiers” (metaphorically *pillars* of foot-soldiers).<sup>167</sup> In v.8//2 Chr 23:7, the Chronicler replaces השדרות with הבית but then reverts back to using השדרות in v.14. This interpretive shift is indicative of the Chronicler’s association of השדרות with the temple, a shift that also indicates that the chronicler does not see השדרות as a metaphorical term for *foot-soldiers* but rather an architectural term referring to either the pillared temple or its pillared environs. The shift is also indicative of the discursive framework of the Chronicler as compared to that of the author(s) of 2 Kings 11. In 2 Kings 11, those who approach השדרות are to be killed for approaching the king and his guard while in 2 Chr 23:7 the meaning is shifted away from concern for the king to concern for protecting sacred space. The term is likely implied in 2 Kgs 11:15, a later addition to the text. Those who enter השדרות unauthorized are to be killed. As a result, the death of Athaliah is a result of her entrance into the temple complex unauthorized (and as a woman!) while in 2 Kings 11 she is to be executed for approaching השדרות (the royal guard of the king; i.e., she broke protocol). It is certainly the case that a later priestly voice can be discerned in 2 Kings 11, a voice that appears to be moving the interpretation from protection of the king to protection of the sanctuary as indicated by the statement of elaboration “...for the priest said ‘let her not be killed in the house of Yahweh’” (2 Kgs 11:15; i.e., Sederot=temple or architectural features of the temple). This observation is clearly relevant for the study of social change in Judah/Yehud.

---

<sup>167</sup> J. Gray, *I & II Kings*, 162, 166; *The Hebrew Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (HALOT) notes that Rupprecht (ZDPV 88 [1972]:44) sees it as an “unexplained architectural term” while Görg (BN 10 [1979]:12-15) argues that השדרות “made its way into Egyptian as a Semitic loanword, and then it was re-adopted back into Hebrew” (HALOT, 1310).

The earlier strata of 2 Kings 11 (especially in its earliest strata) is concerned with retelling the legend in accordance with royal protocol that was common in the ANE (see especially the Mešedi protocol) while in the later redactions/strata of 2 Kings 11 one can sense the shift of concern away from royal protocol (protection of the king) to cultic protocol (protection and service in the temple). This movement is certainly socially relevant to the exilic period and later Persian period where the temple and the priestly class were at the center of Yehudite textual production, consumption, and distribution. This is especially so for the examples mentioned above regarding the ideological shifts sensed in the chronicler's work during the Persian period. As for the later redactions/strata of 2 Kings 11, it is more difficult to determine which community in Judah/Yehud is reflected in the shift from royal protocol to cultic protocol. It is *possible* (though perhaps not probable) that a *priestly* voice could be present in monarchic Judah, especially if the coup report in 2 Kings 11 is understood as a historical source, that during a co-regency of a priest/administrator and a young king to be, a priestly voice would/could emerge as equally dominant in association with Judah's royal ideology. It may be that the chronicler makes the association between השדרות and the temple based on the elaboration given in 2 Kgs 11:15 where Jehoiada commands the guard to remove Athaliah from the ranks because the priest (Jehoiada) had previously (though we were not informed about it) stated "...let her not be killed *in the house of Yahweh*" (2 Kgs 11:15). This elaboration clearly associates השדרות with "the house of Yahweh" and it also assumes that the reader should understand the legal and cultic implications of shedding human blood in the temple precinct (usually understood as a place of sanctuary/refuge in a legal sense).

Another example of words and word-clusters that are unique is found in the term הרצין. Once again, as with other examples, in 2 Kings 11 the term refers to an actual body of military

men, *the runners* or *couriers* perhaps those who go ahead of the king to warn those observing that royal protocol must be observed by all parties. This term, however, is contested or misunderstood in the work of the Chronicler who interprets it as a participle and removes the “and” from the subsequent collective plural “the people” resulting in the form “the running of the people” or even “the running people.”<sup>168</sup> Whether or not this was an intentional change made by the chronicler, the effect is that the social world of 2 Kings 11 is misunderstood by the chronicler who must not have associated the military title “the runners” with the text either by accident or sheer lack of knowledge about military and royal protocol practices in monarchic Judah. As a result, the chronicler assumed that there was an error in his source and he/she made the necessary changes to remedy the problem.<sup>169</sup>

Another example of central wording and word-clusters in 2 Kings 11 is associated with the coronation regalia and practices in v.12 and 19. The terms נֹר (crown/diadem), עֵדוּת (testimony), and עֲמֹד (pillar) as well as the verbal formations and the proclamations of the people “long live the king!” were all part of a traditional way of understanding kingship, coronation, and succession. Not only is the variant reading of 2 Chr 23:11 and 19 extremely important for understanding social change in Judah/Yehud, but so is 2 Kgs 23:3. Though 2 Kgs 23:3 certainly recounts the covenant renewal of Josiah using central deuteronomistic vocabulary and themes, 2 Kgs 23:3 appears to understand these terms and themes quite differently from 2 Kings 11. This is an indication that two strands of tradition, the chronicler (2 Chr 23:11) and the deuteronomist (2 Kgs 23:3), appear to understand coronation practices and regalia differently than 2 Kings 11.

---

<sup>168</sup> The chronicler also accomplishes this by reversing the word order from that found in 2 Kings 11.

<sup>169</sup> The MT also removes the *vav* “and” between “the runners” and “the people”; however, as Jepsen notes in the apparatus of BHS, some mss retain the “and.” Furthermore, the construction actually requires that the *vav* be present since the רִצִּין is not in construct with “the people” הָעָם; even if the *vav* is not supplied, still implies a simple “pause” similar to the English comma (the comma itself is a derivative of the conjunction ‘and’, each a form of pause in a sentence or clause).

Naturally, these differences are socially relevant for understanding social change but also for understanding the discursive formations of each as they relate to the communities that produced, read and distributed these texts.

Those who incorporated 2 Kings 11 into the DtrH did so with a clear aim to contrast Jehoiada's coup with the coups reported in the surrounding literary context. One of the main techniques used to do this was to contrast קשר, "conspiracy," (which almost always has a negative connotation) with ברית, "covenant" (a central term in dtr ideology). Jehoiada's coup was not a conspiracy like the coups in Israel, rather, Jehoiada's coup was a covenant renewal and had broad support (at least in the final form of the text).

### *Conclusion*

Textual analysis of the vocabulary, cohesion, grammar and text structure of 2 Kings 11 clearly shows that, in its final form, 2 Kings 11 was to be understood as a popular movement with a broad support base. Furthermore, its vocabulary and themes indicate that, in its final form, 2 Kings 11 was also a cultic reform, not just a political one. However, source critical analyses in conjunction with observable tensions in the text indicate that much of the material that argues that the coronation of Joash and the execution of Athaliah were the result primarily of cultic reforms centered around the house of Yahweh are secondary additions to the text. As a result, Athaliah's execution and Jehoiada's coup may not have been strictly associated with cultic reform, but rather, the events in 2 Kings 11 were initially more basic. Certain elites within Athaliah's administration conspired against her and installed Joash as king in her place. Soon after, these questionable and illegal acts had to be justified and popularized as is the case with all coups. Textual analysis of 2 Kings 11 (the analysis of vocabulary, cohesion, grammar, and text structure) supports this claim by showing that 2 Kings 11 was produced and reproduced over



time. As this process occurred, Jehoiada's coup grew more and more popular and authoritative and was eventually incorporated into the DtrH.

These observations also show that the report of Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution was not initially part of the oracle sequence as it is now. Athaliah was not associated with that oracle tradition because 2 Kings 11 was not a part of that sequence when it was first produced. 2 Kings 11 was incorporated later by means of themes meant to contrast Jehoiada's coup with the coups (of translated as "conspiracy" in the NRSV) in the north. When this incorporation took place, those who incorporated 2 Kings 11 into the DtrH could not or did not see fit that the Elijah oracle tradition should or could be associated with Athaliah's execution, even if many of the other themes in that oracle/conspiracy sequence were used to incorporate 2 Kings 11 to its surrounding context (annihilation of Baalism, covenant renewal, conspiracy). This may have been due to a discourse about prophets in Israel versus prophets in Judah. This discourse is indicated in 2 Kings 9-10 in the way that Jehu annihilates both Israelites and Judahites associated with Ahab *if they were captured while in Israelite territory*. Any indication that Jehu's coup had spread into Judahite territory would have undermined Judahite Yahwism, including Jehoiada and the king to be, Joash.

## Chapter 5: Manifest Intertextuality and 2 Kings 11

### *Introduction*

The purpose of exploring the manifest or explicit intertextual links in 2 Kings 11 is to further highlight the ideological work exerted in its production as indicated by the ways that 2 Kings 11 overtly references other texts. The end goal of exploring the interdiscursivity, constitution techniques (text analysis), and manifest intertextuality is to create a foundation for discussing “discourse in relation to ideology and to power, and to place discourse within a view of power as hegemony, and a view of the evolution of power relations as hegemonic struggle.”<sup>170</sup> Manifest intertextuality, the explicit ways that a text calls on and modifies other texts, “sees texts historically as transforming the past – existing conventions and prior texts – into the present...”.<sup>171</sup> Exploring the manifest intertextual relationships in 2 Kings 11 is an essential step for understanding the processes of producing, reproducing, disseminating, and consuming the text. Furthermore, and in agreement with Fairclough, intertextuality must be understood as an essential element in any study of the relationship between text production and power. According to Fairclough, textual production “...is socially limited and constrained, and conditional upon relations of power. The theory of intertextuality cannot itself account for these social limitations, so it needs to be combined with a theory of power relations and how they shape (and are shaped by) social structures and practices.”<sup>172</sup>

Not only does this approach promise to highlight the power relations that constrained and guided the production of 2 Kings 11 and elements of its literary context, it also highlights important information for answering the central question of this project: why were Athaliah’s execution and Jehoiada’s coup distanced from the preceding oracle tradition that climaxed in

---

<sup>170</sup> N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 86.

<sup>171</sup> *idem*, 85.

<sup>172</sup> *idem*, 103.

Jehu's coup against Ahab? Because critical discourse analysis (CDA), especially following the approach of Fairclough, is focused on the role of discourse and social change, it is useful for locating and exploring the fractures that accumulate in texts as they are produced and reproduced over time. As a result, in conjunction with the previous chapters on interdiscursivity and textual analysis of 2 Kings 11, it is apparent that it contains several important tensions that have different perspectives about Jehoiada's coup and the reasons for ousting and executing Athaliah. These different perceptions are a result of social change. As different communities (especially in late-monarchic and exilic Judah) inherited, produced and reproduced 2 Kings 11, the text was subject to reinterpretation, especially in connection with the community's loss of the Judahite monarchy (exemplified by the disputed role of the palace and dynastic symbols in 2 Kings 11) and the emergence of a Jerusalem-centered priesthood in the Persian period.

As a result, what was initially a basic, even chronistic, account of a military palace coup aimed at removing Athaliah from power was successively legitimated and popularized by successive interpreting communities. Initial manipulations of the text were meant to legalize Jehoiada's coup. Coup theorists have often pointed out the legal challenges faced by those involved in successful coups. It is generally accepted that, due to questions of legality, those who instigate and carry out military palace coups very quickly generate discourses that guide and constrain how the coup is to be discussed publically. These discourses are quickly established and generated so as to legalize the coup and broaden support for legitimizing reasons.<sup>173</sup>

The central question of this project, as a result, is partially answered in recognizing that initially Athaliah was not associated with the themes so prevalent in the preceding material in Kings. She was certainly an Ahabite, but the connection between the oracles against Ahab and Jezebel (Baalism and dtr ideology) were an afterthought in the production of 2 Kings 11. The

---

<sup>173</sup> M. Bankowicz, *Coup d'Etat*, 2012.

deuteronomist used these themes to incorporate 2 Kings 11 into its literary context, making it fit more nicely into the thematic structure of coup, oracle, destruction, and covenant. As a result, the partial answer to the question about Athaliah's relationship with the destruction of the Ahabites is that she was not initially associated with that narrative sequence and therefore, initially, there was little reason to question why she was not included in the climax of that narrative: 2 Kings 11 was not initially a part of that sequence. To offer support for this claim, what follows will explore the tensions that emerge in 2 Kings 11 once the intertextuality of 2 Kings 11 is better understood.

### *Summary of Manifest Intertextuality in 2 Kings 11*

I will divide the types of intertextuality in 2 Kings 11 into four basic groups. First, there are explicit references to symbolic objects in 2 Kings 11. For example, the spear and the shields belonging to David, located in the house of Yahweh (v.10), the נזר and the עדות (v.12), the pillar (v.14), trumpets (v.14), altars (v.11, 18), images (v.18), and the throne of the kings (v.19). Second, 2 Kings 11 contains explicit references to authoritative space, its mythology and rules, and personnel associated with the space or its past. For example, the house of the king (v.2, 5, 16, 19), the house of Yahweh (v.3-4, 7, 10- 11, 13, 15, 18-19), and gates (v.6, 16, 19). Third, 2 Kings 11 describes symbolic actions that are clearly intertextual. For example, the secret actions of Jehoida (v.4-11), Jehoiada's control over symbolic paraphernalia (v. 10, 12, 19), anointing the new king (v.12), clapping of hands (v.12), blowing trumpets (v.12), shouting (v.12), the establishment of covenant (v.17), and an enthronement procession (v.19). Fourth, 2 Kings 11 contains vocabulary that explicitly calls attention to its broad literary context. Examples include Athaliah's accusation of conspiracy (v.14) and the use of the authoritative term ברית to describe both the conspiracy of Jehoiada and the covenant renewal (v.4, 17).

## *Authoritative objects in 2 Kings 11 and Manifest Intertextuality: The Spears and Shields belonging to David*

2 Kings 11:10 makes an explicit reference to significant objects associated with David and the house of Yahweh: the spear and the shields. This reference has direct links to 2 Sam. 8:7-12, 1 Kgs 7:51, and 14:25-28, all of which make reference to symbolic shields of gold associated with the reigns of David and Solomon. Though the reference in 2 Kgs 11:10 clearly calls on these other traditions for ideological reasons, the reference is quite limited in its detail and appears to reject some of the claims made by 1 Kgs 14:25-28 and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, LXX<sup>L</sup>, and LXX<sup>B</sup> of 2 Sam 8:7-12 that David and Solomon's golden shields had been plundered during the invasion of Shishak of Egypt.

Furthermore, 2 Kgs 11:10 is also in tension with the other traditions about these weapons in that it argues that the weapons were stored in the house of Yahweh. This view is contested by 1 Kgs 10:16-17 and 1 Kgs 14:25-28 which argue that the gold shields (no mention of a spear or spears) made by Solomon were associated with the royal palace, not the house of Yahweh. 1 Kgs 10:16-17 states:

King Solomon made two hundred large shields of beaten gold; six hundred shekels of gold went into each large shield. He made three hundred shields of beaten gold; three minas of gold went into each shield; and the king put them in the House of the Forest of Lebanon.

And, following this tradition, 1 Kgs 14:25-28 states:

In the fifth year of King Rehoboam, King Shishak of Egypt came up against Jerusalem; he took away the treasures of the house of the LORD and the treasures of the king's house; he took everything. *He also took away all the shields of gold that Solomon had made; so King Rehoboam made shields of bronze instead, and committed them to the hands of the officers of the guard, who kept the door of the king's house. 28 As often as the king went into the house of the LORD, the guard carried them and brought them back to the guardroom (emphasis added).*

The tension, as has been noted in previous chapters, is between the palace and the temple; the argument hinges on claims about where these significant objects were stored.

The LXX<sup>L</sup> presents a significantly different picture of these traditions. For example, in 2 Sam 8:7-12, the Lucianic text reads,

και ελαβε Δαυιδ τους χλιδωνας τους χρυσους οι ησαν επι των παιδων Αδρααζαρ του βασιλεως Σουβα, και παντα τα οπλα τα χρυσα και τα δορατα, και ηνεγκεν αυτα εις Ιερουσαλημ, και ελαβεν αυτα Σουσακειμ βασιλευς Αιγυπτου εν τω αναβηναι αυτον εις Ιερουσαλημ εν ημεραις Ροβοαμ, υιου Σολομωντος

Then David took the gold shields that were on the servants of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, *and all the gold instruments and the spear(s)*, and brought them to Jerusalem, *then Shishak, king of Egypt, took them when he came up against Jerusalem in the days of Rehoboam, son of Solomon (emphasis added).*

The Lucianic recension makes two significant arguments about this tradition. First, it argues that there were other gold items besides the shields that David took from the servants of Hadadezer: the gold instruments (οπλον is very difficult to translate since it was used to translate a variety of Hebrew terms) and the spear/spears (the Gk. term δορυ/δορατα is only used to translate three Hebrew terms for spear or lance: רמה צנה רמה). Second, and in agreement with LXX<sup>B</sup>, the Lucianic text pre-tells the invasion of Shishak during the reign of Rehoboam, leading the reader to believe that there is a close relationship between Solomon's gold lances (מאתים צנח, "two-hundred gold lances") and gold shields (שלוש מאות מגנים זרחה, "three-hundred gold shields") in 1 Kgs 10:16-17 and the gold shields (כל־מגני הזרחה אשר עשה שלמה) "all the gold shields that Solomon made") that Shishak of Egypt took during his campaign in Judah during the reign of Rehoboam.

The additional material at the end of 2 Sam 8:12, "then Shishak, king of Egypt, took them when he came up against Jerusalem in the days of Rehoboam, son of Solomon", is attested in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, LXX<sup>B</sup>, LXX<sup>L</sup>, and the Vetus Latina. However, the phrase indicating that David brought the gold shields and "all the gold instruments and the spears" is only found in the LXX<sup>L</sup> and Josephus (*Ant.* 8.3-4). It appears that several traditions about significant items associated with David and Solomon have been conflated. The traditions are defined as follows. First, the MT preserves a tradition about שלטי הזרה (*the gold shields/quivers*) that David took from the servants

of Hadadezer and subsequently brought to Jerusalem (this first mention of Jerusalem makes no mention of David devoting these gold shields, that comes later in v.11). Second, in 2 Sam 8:11, the MT argues that it is assumed that all of the precious items that David had acquired through his military exploits were dedicated (using the hifil of קדש, *to make holy*) to Yahweh (it is assumed that the gold shields taken from Hadadezer's servants were included). There is obvious tension between the first statement that David simply brought his booty to Jerusalem and the latter that argues that by bringing the booty to Jerusalem David had dedicated all his spoils to the Yahweh cult at Jerusalem. Third, 1 Kgs 7:51, in agreement with the second tradition mentioned above, argues that Solomon took all of the devoted things, the silver, the gold and the instruments, and placed them in the house of Yahweh that he had just finished building. In this tradition, it is assumed that the gold shields were included among these devoted items. Fourth, 1 Kgs 10:16-17 contains a tradition about a different set of shields and even describes them using different vocabulary.

ויעש המלך שלמה מאתים צנה ונהב שקוים שש-מאות ונהב יעלה על-הצנה האחת: ושלוש-מאות מגנים ונהב שקוים שלישת מנים ונהב יעלה על-המגן האחת ויתגם המלך בית-ישראל הקבוקב:

King Solomon made two hundred large shields of beaten gold; six hundred shekels of gold went into each large shield. He made three hundred shields of beaten gold; three minas of gold went into each shield; and the king put them in the House of the Forest of Lebanon.

Fifth, yet another tradition, though related to the latter, is found in 1 Kgs 14:25-28.

ויהי בשנה החמישית למלך רחבעם עלה שושק מלך-מצרים על-ירושלם: וילח את-אצרות בית-יהוה ואת-אוצרות בית המלך ואת-הכל לקח וילח את-כל-מגני הזהב אשר עשה שלמה: ויעש המלך רחבעם תחמתם מגני נחשת והפקיד על-ידי שרי הרצים השומרים שומרי בית המלך: ויהי מדי-בא המלך בית יהוה ישאום הרצים והשיבום אל-תא הרצים:

In the fifth year of King Rehoboam, King Shishak of Egypt came up against Jerusalem; he took away the treasures of the house of the LORD and the treasures of the king's house; he took everything. He also took away all the shields of gold that Solomon had made; so King Rehoboam made shields of bronze instead, and committed them to the hands of the officers of the guard, who kept the door of the king's house. As often as the king went into the house of the LORD, the guard carried them and brought them back to the guardroom.

This tradition is certainly related to that found in 1 Kgs 10:16-17, but it also contains different information. For example, only the מגני הזהב (*gold shields*) Solomon made are mentioned. There

is no indication that this tradition knew of the **צנה זהב** (*gold lances*). Furthermore, once Shishak had plundered the treasury of the house of Yahweh (assumed to include the **שלטי הזהב** *the gold shields/quivers* along with all of the other devoted items) and the treasury of the king's house (including the house of the forest of Lebanon), from which he took the **מגני הזהב** (*gold shields*) made by Solomon's craftsmen, Rehoboam crafted *shields of bronze* to replace them (**מגני נחשת**).

As if the above traditions could not be more confusing, the LXX<sup>B</sup>, LXX<sup>L</sup>, and Josephus (*Ant.* 8.10.3) contain another piece of information that challenges the above assumption that when Shishak had plundered the treasury of the house of Yahweh, he apparently took the **שלטי הזהב** ("gold shields") that David had taken from the servants of Hadadezer and brought to Jerusalem (and according to 2 Sam 8:11, were dedicated to Yahweh along with all of the spoils of David's wars). Instead, the LXX<sup>B</sup> and LXX<sup>L</sup> (and partially Josephus, *Ant.* 8.10.3) argue that when Shishak plundered the treasuries of the house of Yahweh and the house of the king, he also "took all of the gold *spears* that David had taken from the hand of the servants of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, that he had brought into Jerusalem." There are several challenges presented by this tradition. First, it argues that items deposited by David in Jerusalem were taken when Shishak plundered the treasuries of the house of Yahweh and the house of the king during Rehoboam's reign. All of the other traditions only assume this was the case, but none of them explicitly state the information as do LXX<sup>B</sup> and LXX<sup>L</sup>. Second, according to this tradition, Solomon's **מגני הזהב** (*gold shields*) were taken along with David's items. Third, and most significantly, when describing the items that David had taken from the servants of Hadadezer, the LXX<sup>B</sup> and LXX<sup>L</sup> both use the term **τα δορατα τα χρυσα** (*the gold spears*). In all Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible, **δορυ** (pl. **δορατα**) is only used to translate three Hebrew words for spear or lance: **הנית**, **צנה**, and **רמה**. It is never used to translate the term **שלט**, the term used to



describe the items that David took from the servants of Hadadezer in 2 Sam 8:7-12; there the Hebrew phrase שלטי הזהב is translated as τους γλιδωνας τους χρυσους.<sup>174</sup> This shift, as will be shown, is extremely significant for understanding the role of the symbolic objects, the spear and the shields, that are mentioned in 2 Kings 11:10.

To sum up the convoluted history of these terms, from the above observations the following picture seems to emerge. First, it must be recognized that there are various conflicting traditions about symbolic items associated with David and Solomon. Those associated with David use the term שלט (*shield*) translated variously as γλιδωνας (LXX<sup>B</sup>, LXX<sup>L</sup>), κλοιους (Chr.), or φαετρας (Josephus, Antiq. 8.3-4) as well as the term *spear(s)* δορατα (used to translate the collective plural Hebrew singular nouns הניה *spear[s]* and צנה *spear[s]*). Those associated with Solomon use the terms מגן (*shield*) and צנה (*spears*). Second, according to the Greek traditions, both David's spears (δορατα) and Solomon's shields (οπλα τα χρυσα α εποιησε Σολομων "the gold shields that Solomon made" [LXX<sup>B</sup>]) were taken when Shishak plundered the treasury of the house of Yahweh (which presumably contained the items associated with David) and the treasury of the house of the king (which presumably contained Solomon's gold shields).

With the above observations in mind, it is puzzling on a variety of levels how 2 Kings 11:10 was able to claim that Jehoiada had access to the spear and shields of David that were stored in the house of Yahweh and how it is that they came to be used as symbols of protocol by the guards. First, the witnesses of this intertextual chain all seem to agree that Shishak took all of the gold items, both those acquired by David in his military exploits as well as those crafted by Solomon. Second, the two items mentioned in 2 Kgs 11:10, the spear and the shields, according to the above observations, are clearly associated with David. The traditions about these objects in 2 Sam 8:7-12 and in the LXX<sup>B/L</sup> of 1 Kgs 14:25-28 make no mention of their use as part of the

---

<sup>174</sup> T. Muraoka, *A Greek ≈Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2010).

royal protocol of the palace; these items were explicitly associated with the Yahweh cult at Jerusalem (though it could be argued that LXX<sup>L</sup> of 1 Kgs 14:25-28 may indicate otherwise). Rather, the spears and shields of Solomon along with the bronze shields that Rehoboam made to replace them after Shishak had plundered them, were explicitly associated with the palace and especially with royal protocol when the guard accompanied the king when leaving the palace.

Thus, it seems most probable that 2 Kings 11:10 conflated two different traditions about two different groups of symbolic objects. First, according to the intertextual materials associated with these traditions, 2 Kings 11 either rejected the idea that Shishak had plundered the temple or does not know that event in Judah's history (the latter would be surprising). Second, 2 Kings 11 uses the terms שלטים (shields) and חנית (spears) and correctly attributes these items to Davidic booty traditions as indicated by 2 Sam 8:7-12 and the LXX<sup>B/L</sup> additions to 1 Kgs 14:25-28. However, 2 Kings 11 also associated the function of these items with the other group of shields that had been initially made by Solomon (and plundered by Shishak) and then replaced with bronze shields by Rehoboam. This is supported by the observation that it is only the shields of Solomon and Rehoboam that are associated with the palace and specifically used for royal protocol when the king was to leave the palace. The confusion in 2 Kings 11 may have resulted from the description of the function of the shields in 1 Kgs 14:25-28. "So King Rehoboam made shields of bronze instead, and committed them to the hands of the officers of the guard, who kept the door of the king's house. As often as the king went into the house of the LORD, the guard carried them and brought them back to the guardroom." If those who inserted 2 Kgs 11:9-11 had indeed conflated the two traditions about the items associated with David (associated with the Yahweh cult in Jerusalem) and Solomon (items associated with the palace and royal protocol), then it would not be a stretch to interpret 1 Kgs 14:27-28 as referring to the house of Yahweh

instead of the house of the king. In other words, 2 Kgs 11:9-11 appears to argue that the protocol guarding the king was not associated with royal protocol, but rather, with cultic protocol. The items, the shields and the spears of David, like the shields of Solomon, were used for cultic purposes and had always been stored in the house of Yahweh in disagreement with 1 Kgs 10:16-17 and 14:25-28 that argue that these items were strictly for guarding the king when he left the palace.

The effects of the confusion are mitigated to some extent by Trebolle's observations, as mentioned previously, that 2 Kgs 11:9-11 is clearly a secondary addition to the text. As a result, it is clear that at the time v.9-11 were incorporated into 2 Kgs 11, those inserting the material about the Davidic objects being used as if they were items of protocol, knew about the other traditions and conflated them. Intertextually, it is also important to note that the conflation includes texts that had previously been produced by two different discursive formations: one associated with the temple and devoted items, the other associated with the palace and dynastic protocol items. As a result, it must be noted that before v.9-11 were added, those involved in the coup already had weapons in their hands. Their duties were primarily associated with guarding the palace and the king (most of the material about the house of Yahweh is secondary to 2 Kings 11). This supports the claim that initially 2 Kings 11 reported a basic coup that had not yet been fully legitimated by secondary material. Those who added v.9-11 were elaborating on the earlier coup story. Their elaborations were guided and constrained by a combination of Dtr and Davidic discourses. Those involved in the coup were not holding just ordinary weapons, they were holding weapons like those that David had taken from Hazael and devoted to Yahweh, the weapons were like those that had been crafted during Solomon's reign that had been used to guard the king when entering the temple (as Joash was about to do). Both traditions, now

conflated, were useful objects for legitimating the coup of Jehoiada and bringing it into conformity with both Jerusalem-centered Yahwistic and Davidic ideology. Inserting these objects into the narrative showed that as Joash was elevated as king, he was surrounded by Davidic, Solomonic, and Yahwistic symbolism, a clear sign of his legitimacy.

Initially, the discourse behind the production of the material in 2 Kings 11 was primarily a dynastic discourse. It reported a significant shift in power that was the result of a standard coup aimed at reorganizing the power structure in Judah. Thus, Athaliah was not initially overthrown based on cultic deviance, but rather, the coup was driven for more political reasons as is the case with coups generally. Thus, there was no reason for those producing the text in its initial stages to associate Athaliah with the Elijah oracle sequence since 2 Kings 11 was not incorporated into that sequence until the Dtr joined 2 Kings 11 thematically with its current context by means of common Dtr themes. It was only then that the coup against Athaliah was justified based on claims that she was a Baalist like her father and mother, Ahab and Jezebel.

#### *Genealogy and Regnal Reports Related to Joash and Athaliah*

The current consensus about 2 Kings 11 has generally glossed over or failed in general to address a very significant question raised by reading 2 Kings 11 in conjunction with 2 Kings 9-10: that is, why is it that Athaliah's execution is not incorporated into the sequence of oracles, conspiracies, and oracle fulfillments that begin with Jeroboam and the prophet Ahijah in 1 Kings 14 and climax with the Jehu narrative of 2 Kings 9-10? The question is completely justified by the text of Kings itself which explicitly states that Athaliah was a princess in the house of Omri and that her marriage into the Judahite royal house was a problematic link between Israelite practices and their influence in Judah. Furthermore, the Dtr prophetic ideal applied to the

succession of oracles from Ahijah to Elisha, as von Rad pointed out, offer a strong literary framework focused on oracles and their fulfillment.

This framework extends throughout much of the book of Kings, but its structure and style changes abruptly after 2 Kgs 10. From 2 Kgs 11 on, the previous themes of conspiracy, oracle, and oracle fulfillment change dramatically. Oracles of doom become rarer, conspiracy never results in elevating the conspirators to positions of power, all negative evaluations of kings are more stereotypical and most evaluations, with the exception of Manasseh, are unassociated with specific oracles.

Indeed, it is only with Manasseh that the theme of cultic deviance, oracle, and oracle fulfillment appear in the history of Judah. It is significant that when these themes do reappear, they are explicitly associated with Samaria and Ahab (2 Kgs 21:11-15; 23:26-27; 24:2-4; 24:13). Other Dtr fulfillment reports do exist, but they are based on a stereotypical curse formula, וישלח יהוה ב “then Yahweh sent <form of punishment> against....” This form is not associated with any specific oracle, but is based on the Dtr curse formula in Dt 28:20, 48 and is found elsewhere in the DtrH to verify that when the people are overcome by enemies, lions, snakes, or diseases, it is in accordance with deuteronomistic predictions of a curse (or curses) should Israel fail to keep Yahweh’s covenant. However, these statements were never associated with a specific prophetic oracle tradition; rather, they were evaluative statements based on various curses in Deuteronomy.

Because of these shifts, it appears that 2 Kings 11 was meant to function literarily as a point of transition in the history of Israel and Judah. The conceptual shifts regarding prophets, oracles, conspiracy, and oracle fulfillment reports that appear as part of 2 Kings 11 and in the subsequent history support the claim that 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the DtrH as a distinct unit and was not originally associated with the Jehu narrative of 2 Kings 9-10.

This observation provides a partial answer to the question of why Athaliah's execution was not reported in association with an oracle fulfillment report as was the case with all other Ahabites who were murdered in Jehu's coup. The answer, at least partially, is that it is because the report of Athaliah's execution was not part of the report of Jehu's coup. These texts were initially produced separately. Their production was guided and constrained by different discourses. Those who produced the report of Jehu's coup against Joram in its earliest iteration were guided and constrained by discourses associated with the prophetic oracle tradition of Elijah and its fulfillment, while those who produced the report of Jehoiada's coup were guided and constrained by discourses associated with the production of monarchic Judahite chronology. It was only later that the deuteronomist incorporated these texts by means of deuteronomistic themes like centralization, Yahwistic revival, and covenant renewal. Due to the incorporation of both 2 Kings 11 and 2 Kings 9-10 into the sequence of oracles and conspiracies from Jeroboam by means of these deuteronomistic themes, the similarities between the coups of Jehu and Jehoiada came to look quite similar, giving the impression that they had been composed as a single narrative. However, the similarities, pointed out again and again by most scholars dealing with 2 Kings 11, are exaggerated because of the deuteronomistic editing. For example, once the deuteronomistic material is recognized and accounted for, what is left are two coup reports no longer bound by common Dtr themes; they are similar because they are reported using the same genre: coup report. This is supported by the fact that once this later material is removed, the motivation for Jehu's and Jehoiada's coups are no longer predominantly cultic. Jehu's coup was a response to unethical behavior. Jehoiada's coup was politically motivated, like most coups. Thus, are these two coups similar because they were written by the same author? Or are they

similar because the genre coup report is quite narrow in structure and thus, all coup reports look similar? The answer is likely the latter.

Once the Dtrs did link these narratives together, why didn't they explicitly associate Athaliah's execution with a specific oracle report now that it was clearly a part of the DtrH's schematic framework? The context almost begs for her execution to be explicitly associated with the fall of the Ahabites, yet this connection is never explicitly stated by inserting an oracle fulfillment report.

Exploring the genealogies of Athaliah and Joash, as well as the development of two important oracle traditions, the oracle of Nathan to David in 2 Samuel 7 and the oracle sequence beginning with Ahijah and ending with Elisha in 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10 in conjunction with E. Zerubavel's recent book *Ancestors and Relatives* will help to show that at least two discursive formations were at work in the production of 2 Kings 11. One was concerned with distancing Joash from Ahab to avoid contamination from the oracles against Ahab and his sons. The other discourse that perhaps exerted the most effort on the text was concerned with skipping of Athaliah's reign by delegitimizing her so as to give the impression that there was linear Davidic continuity between Ahaziah and Joash. As regards the development of the oracle in 2 Samuel 7 as well as the oracle tradition in 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10, I will argue that Judahite and Yehudite Dtr discourses guided and constrained the production of 2 Kings 11 as it was incorporated into the DtrH and associated with the narrative of Jehu's coup against the house of Ahab. The theme of oracle, conspiracy, and oracle fulfillment associated with prophets such as Ahijah, Jehu son of Hanani, Elijah, and Elisha was used to create a thematic link between these prophetic stories, but 2 Kings 11 was not incorporated into the DtrH the same way as other conspiracy reports.

## *On Genealogy*

Genealogies are not innocent constructions about the past. They are not simply chronistic records or histories. As Eviatar Zerubavel puts it, “Rather than simply documenting who our ancestors were,” genealogies “are the narratives we construct to actually make them our ancestors.”<sup>175</sup> Genealogies are at least partially a result of society’s choices about which ancestors to remember.<sup>176</sup>

Genealogies exist on a spectrum of reliability, but no genealogy is free from distortion resulting from the biases of the people and societies that construct them. Fictive genealogies, like those of British Israelists who claim genealogical ties to the scattered ten tribes of Israel, attempt to anchor part of their identity to prestigious figures or social groups from the distant past. Yet according to Zerubavel, “even when...[genealogies]...do not include any fictive elements, the very process of constructing genealogies inevitably distorts the actual historical realities they supposedly reflect. By selectively highlighting certain ancestors (and therefore also ties to certain relatives) while downplaying or even actively suppressing awareness of others, we tactically manipulate genealogies to accommodate both personal and collective agendas.”<sup>177</sup>

Zerubavel describes eight basic techniques commonly used in society to construct genealogies: *stretching* is the technique that social groups use “[i]n order to enhance...” their “...stature and legitimacy...”; *cutting and pasting* is used to “deal with various inconsistencies”; *clipping* (similar to cutting) is used when there is a need to create a complete “rupture with the past”, *braiding* embraces “...the inherently multilinear nature of our genealogical condition” and creates a sense of social cohesion; *lumping* is used to link social groups to singularly important ancestors from the past and creates a confined sense of social cohesion among two or more but

---

<sup>175</sup> Zerubavel, *Ancestors and Relatives*, 77.

<sup>176</sup> *idem*, 77.

<sup>177</sup> *idem*, 78.



not all social groups; *marginalizing* is used to acknowledge a shared genealogy with an other undesirable or questionable social group while at the same time claiming that their genealogical claims are more valid; *pruning* aims to remove less desirable genealogical lines while at the same time highlighting genealogical ties that are more prestigious; *splitting* is used to purify genealogical narratives. Zerubavel noted “In order to marginalize others, we often push the ancestors we share with them as far back as we can, since greater distance from a common ancestor implies weaker genealogical ties among his or her co-descendants.”

### *Genealogical Statements about Athaliah: Marginalizing, Splitting, or Pruning?*

Along with Zerubavel and others, I understand genealogy to be socially constructed. From my perspective, genealogy is communicative, communication is language, and language is indicative of social practice. In light of this, I think that all instances of language, including what may seem like innocuous genealogies, are produced under the guidance and constraints of communal discourses. I also think that having a framework or typology of genealogical techniques and their uses aids the identification of those discourses and in turn provides some answers about the social practices that guided and constrained the texts being produced.

Genealogical statements about Athaliah are found in 2 Kings 8:18, 26-27 and 2 Kings 11:1, the regnal reports of Joram and his son Ahaziah, kings of Judah. The first of these, 2 Kings 8:18, is part of the Dtr evaluation of Joram. “He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as the house of Ahab had done, *for the daughter of Ahab was his wife*. He did what was evil in the sight of the LORD.” The only major textual variant in this verse is the general consensus among Syriac manuscripts that “daughter of Ahab” ought to be read “sister of Ahab.” All other witnesses are in general agreement with the MT. Furthermore, the Syriac variant is likely a gloss meant to bring

v.18 into agreement with v.26 which argues that Athaliah was the daughter of Omri, making her also the sister of Ahab.

The second genealogical statement about Athaliah comes from the introductory regnal formula of Ahaziah in 2 Kgs 8:26: “Ahaziah was twenty-two years old when he began to reign; he reigned one year in Jerusalem. His mother’s name was Athaliah, daughter of King Omri of Israel.” As is standard for Judahite regnal formulae, the regnal year of the contemporary Israelite king is given, the name of the new king (which sometimes includes the name of his father), his age and/or the length of his reign, the name of his mother (which sometimes includes the name of her father), a reference to the source of the information being given and, finally, a death report including the name of the new king. Unlike v.18 which contains few textual variants, v.26 has many. Codex Vaticanus (LXX<sup>B</sup>), for example, argues that Ahaziah reigned over Israel, not Jerusalem, but generally agrees with the MT from that point onward. Though the Lucianic tradition agrees with the MT that Ahaziah reigned in Jerusalem and not over Israel (as LXX<sup>B</sup> argues), the Lucianic manuscripts *boc*<sub>2e2</sub> disagree with the MT in several important ways.

First, the Lucianic manuscripts expand Ahaziah’s title from “Ahaziah” to “Ahaziah, son of Joram” in the second part of the regnal formulae (the part naming the mother). This must be understood as a later gloss, since all other instances in the MT, when reporting the age, duration of reign, and name of the new king’s mother, never include the name of his father. Doing so would be redundant since, for the most part (with the exception of Abijam [1 Kgs 15:1], Asa [1 Kgs 15:9], Joash [2 Kgs 12:1]), the father’s name had already been given in the introduction of the regnal report. Second, the Lucianic manuscripts are all in agreement that Athaliah’s title should be read “Athaliah, daughter of King Ahab” against the MT, LXX<sup>B</sup>, and most other witnesses that read “Athaliah, daughter of king Omri”. The disagreement results from secondary

harmonization of the Lucianic textual tradition meant to clarify the identity of Athaliah. This manuscript tradition contains a response to the difficulty of the MT.

The third genealogical statement about Athaliah is found in the next verse (2 Kgs 8:27) as a part of the Dtr evaluation of Ahaziah. “He also walked in the way of the house of Ahab, doing what was evil in the sight of the LORD, as the house of Ahab had done, *for he was son-in-law to the house of Ahab.*” This verse has one significant variant in all *Kaige* Greek translations. In all *Kaige* translations, the final phrase, the genealogical statement under analysis here, “*for he was son-in-law to the house of Ahab*” is completely omitted. However, all other translations, including the Lucianic recension, retain the phrase. Gray states that this is a “bold harmonization” on the part of the Lucianic translation.<sup>178</sup> On the difficulty of the term הַתָּן, Gray argued that “The noun *hatan* means son-in-law, and it has been suggested that Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah was a daughter not of Ahab (cf. v.18), but of Omri (v.26). This is to press the literal meaning of *bat* and *hatan* too much. We suggest that, in accordance with Arabic usage, *hatan* refers generally to relationship by marriage.”<sup>179</sup>

The genealogical statement about Athaliah in v.27 is incongruent with the standard form of regnal reports in Judah. According to Long, the insertion of this information has a far reaching purpose. “The mention of Jehoram’s marriage to a woman of Ahab’s (Omri’s) family is the first symptom that the debilitating poison associated with the house of Omri, Ahab/Jezebel, has now seeped into Judah’s bloodstream.”<sup>180</sup> Generally, any information about the mother of the new king is given very briefly, stating only her name and perhaps her father’s name and occasionally, where she comes from (as in v.26).

---

<sup>178</sup> Gray, *I & II Kings*, 481-483; also M. Noth and, later, B. Long argued that the cognate term in Akkadian was used to mean “female descendant of...” and is not strictly used to mean only “daughter.” See also Von Soden, *AHW*

<sup>179</sup> *idem*, 483.

<sup>180</sup> B. Long, *2 Kings*, 110.

As a result, the difficult and often modified v.26 is very much in agreement with the standard Judahite regnal formulae. Here, in line with other regnal reports, Ahaziah's age is given along with the length of his reign, followed by the name of his mother, Athaliah, and her lineage. It is quite certain that, as pointed out by Weinfeld and implied by Long, the standard chronistic material is then taken up in v.27 and colored with Dtr ideology.<sup>181</sup> The same can be said of v.18. What is unique about all three genealogical statements is that they refuse to directly state the obvious: Athaliah was the daughter of Ahab.

In light of this, it seems that most of the variants that restate the relationship between Athaliah and Omri/Ahab are the result of secondary interpretations meant to smooth out the genealogical difficulty found in v.26, that Athaliah was the daughter of Omri, not Ahab. Because of the ambiguity of all three of these statements, virtually all extant witnesses at one point or another attempt to say what is so difficult for the Dtr to say. The Lucianic recension doesn't hold back, and blatantly changes the name Omri to Ahab. The Syriac translation of v.18 moves in another direction, arguing that Athaliah was indeed Omri's daughter, and thus, the *sister* of Ahab. LXX<sup>B</sup> completely omits the last phrase of v.27, "for he was son-in-law to the house of Ahab." This omission may indicate the secondary nature of this phrase as well as the phrase in v.18 "for the daughter of Ahab was his wife." The standard Dtr evaluative formulae do not include material about how intermarriage resulted in "walking in" Jeroboam's or Ahab's ways or "doing evil in Yahweh's sight." Rather, the standard formulae of Dtr evaluation in the Dtr additions to the regnal formulae most often provide a very strict comparison between the king (i.e., the one being evaluated) and David, Jeroboam, Ahab, or perceived wicked ancestors (as with some later Judahite kings). These Dtr formulae never blame the outcome on the mothers or wives of the kings except in the case of Ahab/Jezebel and Ahaziah (of Israel)/Joram (of Israel)/

---

<sup>181</sup> B. O. Long, *2 Kings*, FOTL, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Jehoram (of Judah)/Ahaziah (of Judah)/Athaliah. As Sweeney and others have pointed out, the problem of marriage to foreign women was certainly part of the Dtr agenda, since intermarriage with the people that Yahweh had driven out of Canaan would lead Israel to follow the same practices of those they had just displaced. However, it is still important to show that, in comparison to all other Dtr evaluations, those evaluations associated with Ahab tend to highlight the role of intermarriage in the social decay of Israel and Judah from the deuteronomist's perspective.

Why is it that genealogical statements about Athaliah are ambiguous? As stated in the introduction, I am convinced that language is always indicative of social practices, even and perhaps especially in genealogies. Analysing the interdiscursivity, the ways that genres are used to guide, constrain, and change the production of texts along with the analysis of intertextuality, the ways that texts produce and reproduce texts according to their own social context, are essential for understanding the reasons why the statements about Athaliah's genealogy are so vague.

For example, if we were to take a very contemporary approach to Athaliah's genealogy, we could create genealogical bracket for Athaliah that would show us what we already know according to the MT: Athaliah is the daughter of Ahab. Yet, how do we know this? We only know by implication since it is never explicitly stated (reference printout and table below).

<b>Possible Explicit Genealogical Statements</b>	<b>Explicit Genealogical Statements Actually Made</b>
Athaliah, (grand)daughter of Omri	Athaliah, (grand)daughter of Omri
Athaliah, (grand)daughter of Ethbaal (Sidon)	Athaliah, mother of Ahaziah
Athaliah, daughter of Ahab	
Athaliah, sister of Ahaziah of Israel	
Athaliah, sister of Joram of Israel	
Athaliah, mother of Ahaziah	

*Table 3 - Explicit Genealogical Statements about Athaliah*

Those producing these statements had various options for making genealogical statements about Athaliah. Explicitly referring to Athaliah as the granddaughter of Ethbaal was clearly avoided for obvious reasons. The others, such as “sister of Ahaziah of Israel” or “Joram of Israel” are possible, but such instances are rare, as in the case of Jehosheba, “King Joram’s daughter, Ahaziah’s sister.” The statements in 2 Kgs 8:26 and 2 Kgs 11:1, that Athaliah was Ahaziah’s mother are to be expected as part of regnal reports (even though 2 Kgs 11 is not a proper regnal report). The expected, but lacking, statement “Athaliah, daughter of Ahab” is replaced with “daughter of Omri.”

Of all the various possibilities for making explicit statements about Athaliah’s genealogy, the most simple and expected statement, “Athaliah, daughter of Ahab” was not chosen to describe her lineage. Furthermore, the two implicit statements about Athaliah’s genealogy in 2 Kgs 8:18 and 27 do not state her name.<sup>182</sup> To determine the meaning of the phrases “for the daughter of Ahab was his wife” and “for he was related by marriage to the house of Ahab” the reader must return to the explicit genealogical statement for clarity. As stated above, 2 Kgs 8:26 does not state that Athaliah was the daughter of Ahab; rather, it states that she was the daughter of Omri.

<b>Possible Implicit Genealogical Statements about Athaliah</b>	<b>Implicit Genealogical Statements Actually Made about Athaliah</b>
for the daughter of Omri was his wife	for the daughter of Ahab was his wife
for he was related by marriage to the house of Omri	for he was related by marriage to the house of Ahab
for the (grand)daughter of Ethbaal was his wife	
for he was related by marriage to the house of Ethbaal	
for the sister of Ahaziah (of Israel) was his wife	
for the sister of Joram (of Israel) was his wife	

*Table 4 - Implicit Genealogical Statements about Athaliah*

<sup>182</sup> This is similar to Ahaziah of Israel’s regnal report in 1 Kgs 22:52, which was clearly referring to Jezebel without naming her; all Greek Translations of 1 Kgs 22:52 explicitly state the names Ahab and Jezebel.

Various proposals have been raised to deal with the problematic nature of Athaliah's genealogy; all are quite complex and cannot be explained in full detail here. Barrick synthesized various contemporary proposals to argue the following.<sup>183</sup> Athaliah was the natural daughter of Omri. She was initially married to Jehoshaphat's first-born, the unnamed and textually unattested older brother of Jehoram who died before both Jehoram and Athaliah. Athaliah had a son through this marriage, the heir to be, Ahaziah (i.e., Ahaziah was not the son of Jehoram of Judah, but rather, the son of the anonymous dead brother). Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, was married to an unnamed daughter of Ahab and was not initially meant to take the throne of Judah. When Ahaziah, son of Ahab of Israel, predeceased Ahab or died childless, Jehoram of Judah, through his marriage to the unnamed daughter of Ahab, succeeded Ahab (his father-in-law) to the throne of Israel. In sum, Barrick argues that the difficulties in the genealogical data are due to the assumption that Jehoram of Judah and Joram of Israel were two different people.<sup>184</sup> In conjunction with the above table, the implicit statements about Athaliah, according to Barrick, do not actually refer to her, but to another unnamed daughter of Ahab.

The reconstructions that hypothesize extensive genealogical manipulation from Jehoshaphat to Joash are based on too little evidence to be fully accepted. Besides this weakness, other approaches offer more plausible reasons for the difficulties associated with Athaliah's genealogy that are supported by observable textual manipulation. For example, as has been shown, all witnesses of the verses containing explicit or implicit genealogical statements about Athaliah are either part of the Dtr framework taken from a chronistic source or are Dtr evaluations written by the Dtr. As a result, especially as regards the statements about the so-

---

<sup>183</sup> D. V. Etz, "The Genealogical Relationships of Jehoram and Ahaziah, and of Ahaz and Hezekiah, Kings of Judah," *JSOT* 71 (1996): 39-53; J. H. Hayes and P. K. Hooker, *A New Chronology for the Kings of Israel and Judah*, (Atlanta: Knox, 1988).

<sup>184</sup> Barrick, "Another Shaking of Jehoshaphat's Family Tree," *VT* 51/1 (2001): 9-25.

called “anonymous” daughter of Ahab, these genealogical statements should not be seen as a part of a reliable chronistic source being quoted by the Dtr, rather, they are later Dtr evaluations meant to send an ideological message central to deuteronomistic ideology: don’t marry foreign wives like Ahab did and don’t worship Baal like Ahab did or you will suffer the same fate as Ahab and his house.

The fact that all witnesses of these texts attempt to harmonize these statements or delete them altogether should indicate to us that there is a long history of trying to come to terms with the injection of Israelite/Sidonian blood into Judah via Athaliah. Long rightly notes that in Judah, the text immediately balances the genealogical poison with a Judahite antidote at various points throughout the book of Kings. “Yet the LORD would not destroy Judah, for the sake of his servant David, since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever.” Yet, this antidote is only partially effective. Other measures, including genealogical play, can also be observed serving a similar purpose which is to delay and distance Judah from Israelite blood connections as well as conceptual connections like continuity between Israelite and Judahite kings or connections to oracles resulting from the sins of the Israelite kings, Jeroboam and Ahab.

Zerubavel’s typology of genealogical techniques is helpful for observing some of the techniques used when making statements about Judah’s relationship to Israel via Athaliah. However, one of the challenges I have faced is that none of Zerubavel’s proposed techniques fully exemplifies the techniques used in 2 Kings 8, which likely contains both chronistic material and ideologically charged deuteronomistic evaluations. For example, is the genealogical statement that Athaliah was the daughter of Omri an instance of stretching, where those constructing the genealogy chose to link Athaliah to a prestigious ancestor? Or, is it an example



of clipping, used to make a rupture with the immediate past in place of a more distant but more prestigious one? Or, is it an example of splitting, used to marginalize unwanted relatives? According to Zerubavel, marginalizing and splitting result from "...an effort to distance themselves from undesirable co-descendants, they therefore try to establish protective temporal buffers that would help dilute the contaminative effect of their common origins. Pushing the historical point at which their ancestral lines split as far back as possible is designed to help make those contaminative origins less relevant."<sup>185</sup> I have come to the realization that these techniques are most often used simultaneously, indicating the discursive complexity of discourses behind the production of 2 Kings 11 and its associated texts.

Whether 2 Kings 8:18, 26-27 contain heavily manipulated genealogies is very difficult, perhaps even impossible to determine. But what can be determined is that these verses, all part of the Dtr schema of history and evaluative comments, do attempt to create a temporal buffer between Joash and Ahab and this is primarily done by mystifying genealogical statements about Athaliah. Every attempt to identify her concretely exhibits weaknesses and uncertainty, this fact alone is evidence that her past is being mystified by the Dtr. The mystification is accomplished by inserting implicit statements about her that lead the reader on a never-ending circular chase to identify her explicitly. Athaliah is the daughter of Omri and the mother of Ahaziah. According to the text as we have it, she is implicitly the daughter of Ahab, the wife of Jehoram, father of Ahaziah. As readers, we react by asking who is the daughter of Ahab? It must be Athaliah, we return to the explicit genealogies only to be reminded that Athaliah is the daughter of Omri and, voila, the connection is mystified even though we know the connection through implicit reference and we, naturally, would prefer explicit genealogies.

---

<sup>185</sup> E. Zerubavel, *Ancestors and Relatives*, 98.

How was it any better for her to be explicitly referred to as “Athaliah, the daughter of Omri”? According to the Dtr, “Omri did what was evil in the sight of the LORD; he did more evil than all who were before him. 26 For he walked in all the way of Jeroboam son of Nebat, and in the sins that he caused Israel to commit, provoking the LORD, the God of Israel, to anger by their idols.”

The answer is two-fold. First, the technique of splitting according to Zerubavel pushes genealogical connections into the past to dilute the strength of the closer but unwanted relative being marginalized. The point here is that it is not the relationship between Athaliah and Ahab that is being buffered, but rather the relationship between Joash and Ahab. The Dtr certainly thought that Athaliah was Ahab’s daughter, but pushed the connection as far away from Joash as possible.

Second, Omri did not “up the oracular ante” the same way that Ahab did. Ahab’s marriage to Jezebel, especially if we are to assume that Jezebel was indeed Athaliah’s mother, so threatened Israel and Judah from the Dtr’s perspective that special treatment and narrative time were given to the Elijah, Ahab, and Jezebel narratives. Pushing the connection between Joash and Ahab to the boundaries of these narratives was an effective way for the Deuteronomist to marginalize the discussion to keep it from becoming a part of the central discourse. The central topic, the eradication of the effects of Ahab’s marriage to Jezebel and the reestablishment of monotheistic Yahwism in Israel and Judah, would have been distracted had the connection between Joash and Ahab been allowed much narrative time. Again, it seems clear that what we are dealing with is not a wholesale denial of connections between Ahab and Joash, but a necessary avoidance of discussing that genealogical connection.

### *Genealogical Statements about Joash*

The main technique used to distance Joash from Ahab, as stated above, was also splitting and marginalization of discussions about connections between them. I will examine two statements here: 2 Kgs 11:2 “But Jehosheba, King Joram’s daughter, Ahaziah’s sister, took Joash son of Ahaziah, and stole him away from among the king’s children who were about to be killed”; and 2 Kgs 12:1-2 “In the seventh year of Jehu, Jehoash began to reign; he reigned forty years in Jerusalem. His mother’s name was Zibiah of Beer-sheba. 2 Jehoash did what was right in the sight of the LORD all his days, because the priest Jehoiada instructed him.”

There are very few relevant textual issues with 2 Kgs 11:2. However, there is a significant textual variant in 2 Kgs 12:1. Though almost all major witnesses of this verse are in agreement with the reading “In the seventh year of Jehu, Jehoash began to reign”, the Lucianic recension makes a significant addition “In the seventh year of Jehu, Jehoash, son of Ahaziah, began to reign.” At first glance, one is tempted to write the addition off as a gloss on grounds that the Lucianic recension is simply trying to harmonize the regnal report of Joash, making it conform to other regnal reports. However, this may not be the case. It is true that there are other Judahite regnal introductions that do not mention the name of the succeeding king’s father. For example, the regnal reports of Abijam (1 Kgs 15:1) and Asa (1 Kgs 15:9) do not include the names of their fathers in their the regnal report introductory statements. However, these two examples are exceptional. As soon as it is realized that, beginning with Jehoshaphat and ending with Hezekiah, all introductory regnal formulae include the name of the new kings father, the significance of this omission in the MT’s regnal report of Joash in 2 Kgs 12:1 becomes quite clear.<sup>186</sup>

---

<sup>186</sup> The reigns of Manasseh to Josiah do not include this introductory element because after the fall of Samaria, the regnal reports of Judahite kings naturally stopped reporting their reigns by citing the regnal year of the contemporary

Given the standard and consistent use of these introductory statements from Jehoshaphat all the way to Hezekiah, it seems that the Lucianic recension may not have been attempting to harmonize the text by adding the phrase “son of Ahaziah.” Rather, the recension preserves a different reading of 2 Kings 12:1 that agrees with the long and consistent sequence of these introductory statements from Jehoshaphat to Hezekiah (who was contemporary with Hoshea of Israel).

Why such an omission would be significant is a puzzle. Unlike Athaliah, who received no explicit genealogical statement claiming that she was the daughter of Ahab, Joash is explicitly called “Joash, son of Ahaziah” in 2 Kgs 11:2 leaving no doubt as to the connection between the two.<sup>187</sup>

It is tempting to attribute the omission to a similar discourse responsible for the vague genealogical statements about Athaliah, but this is not necessary. Athaliah’s genealogy is mystified sufficiently to make it unnecessary to also distance Joash from Ahaziah in order to buffer the link between Joash and Ahab. That had already been accomplished by manipulating Athaliah’s genealogy. However, the reason for omitting Ahaziah’s name in Joash’s regnal introduction is likely based on a significant deviation from the standard regnal report genre in 2 Kings 12:2. Unlike most other regnal reports, 2 Kings 12 is preceded by the lengthy narrative of

---

Israelite king. This part of the regnal formula had also included the name of the Judahite king and his father’s name in the Dtr’s history of the divided monarchy. As a result, those whose reigns were reported after the fall of Samaria no longer included any of this material.

<sup>187</sup> However, if it is assumed that 2 Kgs 11 was not initially part of the chronistic schema used by the Dtr, but only added later as a “flashback” in light of the coup of Jehu, the omission is more significant. First, it is significant because at the death of Ahaziah there is no mention of his successor as is usually the case in concluding regnal formulae. Even in the additional Lucianic and Old Latin material inserted at the end of 2 Kgs 10:36+, there is no mention of Ahaziah’s posterity and in 2 Kgs 11:1, we learn why: Athaliah had interfered with the normal succession process in Judah and had attempted to kill all remaining Judahite heirs to the throne. Second, it is significant because it breaks from the standard and consistent introductory formulae of almost all other Judahite regnal reports and is likely preserved in the Lucianic reading of 2 Kgs 12:1. As a result, there are questions as to why the MT would break with other regnal report introductions so consistently reported elsewhere and omit the name Ahaziah in the regnal introduction of Joash.

the fall of the Ahabites. The death of Ahaziah and Joram of Israel form the introductory scene of these narratives and Ahaziah's death and burial are reported without the name of a successor, implying presuppositions about the events soon to occur in 2 Kings 11. In other words, within the narrative sequence, reporting Ahaziah's death without naming his successor (as was usually the case) indicated that there was more to that story. We learn why in 2 Kings 11 — Athaliah attempted to murder all possible heirs to the throne of Judah. Her plan was thwarted by Joash's wet-nurse, Jehosheba and Jehoiada in the events reported in 2 Kings 11. Still, the tension was palpable enough when no heir apparent was named in Ahaziah's death report that the Lucianic recension as well as the Vetus Latina inserted a large summary of the events in 2 Kgs 8-10 to bring the reader up to date. These summaries, clearly based on the same source material, mainly contain regnal information and a short summary of the wars with Hazael and Jehu. These summaries should not be read as a unit, but rather, as summarizing statements.

VL – and it was the first year of Athaliah when Jehu son of Namesi began to reign, when Ahaziah was 22, that is to say after Joram, he reigned one year in Jerusalem and his mothers' name was Athaliah daughter of Omri, king of Israel who held the throne 8 years when her son died. And he walked in the ways of the house of Ahab and did evil before the Lord as Ahab for he was of the son-in-law of the house of Ahab, for when they went together with (pain?) the king of Israel in the battle against Hazael, king of Syria, and according to the word of the Lord. Jehu, son of Namesi, seized Joram, king of Israel, son of Ahab, and killed him ?factum/completely? Is and in the same war he shot Ahaziah, king of Judah, with an arrow in [his] chariot, when his servants reported his death in Jerusalem and they buried him with his fathers.

Borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> – and the days that Jehu ruled over Israel, 28 years in Samaria. In the second year of Athaliah, (the Lord?) Ruled Jehu the son of Namesi and Ahaziah was 22 years old when he reigned and he reigned one year in Jerusalem and his mother's name was Athaliah, daughter of Ahab, king of Israel and he walked in the way of the house of Ahab and did evil before the Lord just as the house of Ahab, for he was son-in-law of the house of Ahab. Then Ahaziah went up against Hazael, king of Syria in battle, at that time, Jehu son of Namesi had engaged in conflict with Joram son of Ahab, king of Israel. And he struck him in Jezreel and he died and Jehu also struck Ahaziah, king of Judah on his chariot and he died. Then his servants carried him up to Jerusalem and buried him with his fathers in the city of David.

Even here, the summarizing insertion that repeats and rearranges information already given, the Lucianic recension doesn't name Ahaziah's successor nor does it mention his other sons about to be murdered.

2 Kings 11, though it is by no means a standard regnal report, does provide the information missing in the previous examples both in the MT and Greek recensions. Those verses raised questions when they deviated from the standard form: why doesn't 2 Kings 9 include the name of Ahaziah's successor. The answer is that it was because it was to be given in 2 Kgs 11:1, "When Athaliah, mother of Ahaziah, saw that her son was dead, she attempted to kill all the royal heirs to the throne." Then, in v.2, we are informed that "Jehosheba, King Joram's daughter, Ahaziah's sister, took Joash son of Ahaziah, and stole him away from among the king's children who were about to be killed."

These two verses serve to fill in the gap left when Ahaziah's death report did not include the name of his successor. They also partially explain why 2 Kgs 12:1 breaks with the standard regnal introduction formulae. Unlike other examples of regnal introductions, 2 Kings 12 is preceded by a long narrative that interrupts and creates literary distance between the death report of Ahaziah and the regnal introduction of Joash. Normally, the regnal reports oscillate between Judahite and Israelite kings in a sequence. This pattern is interrupted by the insertion of prophetic legends or other theologically significant stories in several places. In the sequence of the divided history, the regnal report of Ahab marks the beginning of a series of interruptions or insertions of material between his regnal introduction in 1 Kgs 16:30 and the report of his death and the name of his successor, Ahaziah of Israel, in 1 Kgs 22:40. Between the death report of Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:50) and the introductory regnal formula of Jehoram of Judah (2 Kgs 8:16), there are insertions of prophetic legends, prophetic succession, and reports of wars with Aram and the succession of Hazael. The regnal reports of Jehoram and Ahaziah in 2 Kings 8 are followed by the prophetic legend associated with the rise of Jehu.

In each case the insertions of prophetic and other materials are marked by a return to or citation of regnal formulae. In the case of Ahaziah's regnal report, this occurs differently than it does elsewhere. Once the report of Ahaziah's death at the hand of Jehu is given and his burial reported, Ahaziah's introductory regnal formula that had already been given in 2 Kgs 8:25 — "In the twelfth year of King Joram son of Ahab of Israel, Ahaziah son of King Jehoram of Judah began to reign" — is repeated with a few slight changes in 2 Kgs 9:29: "In the eleventh year of Joram son of Ahab, Ahaziah began to reign over Judah." This functions as a sort of *Wiederaufnahme*, or marker of resumption, showing that the inserted material had now come to a close.<sup>188</sup> What is surprising is that the narrative immediately turns to the encounter between Jezebel and Jehu followed by the report of Jehu's complete annihilation of Ahab's house and Baalism in 2 Kings 10. It would make more sense if the text had stated some sort of introduction to the reign of Jehu, but such an introduction is actually lacking in the MT. The only comparable material appears in the Lucianic insertion after 2 Kgs 10:36 — "it was the second year of Athaliah when Jehu began to reign" (VL — "it was the first year of the reign of Athaliah") — followed by a recap of the deaths of Jehoram and Ahaziah in the wars against Hazael and Jehu.

This insertion of this expected material in the Lucianic recension and the VL implies that when those producing this recension began summarizing the previous material by recopying significant points almost verbatim from 2 Kings 8-10, the text being recapped included Jehu's introductory regnal formula "In the second year of Athaliah, Jehu son of Nemesi began to reign." It seems possible that the irregular *Wiederaufnahme* in 2 Kgs 9:29 was used either to replace or initially be read in conjunction with this now-missing regnal report of Jehu as the contemporary Israelite king with Athaliah Queen or Queen Mother of Judah. Or, as with the repeated introductory formula of the reign of Ahaziah, the regnal introduction of Jehu was inserted at the

---

<sup>188</sup> This is a significant point for delineating the Jehu narrative from later additions.

end of his coup report. This latter scenario seems more likely since the report of the length of his reign, an element that is usually given at the beginning of the regnal report, is also found at the end of 2 Kings 10, the end of the Jehu coup narrative and immediately after Jehu's death report, the same technique used to sum up the end of the reign of Ahaziah of Judah in 2 Kgs 9:28-29. Either way, this missing material offers some insight as to why the introductory formula of Joash does not include the name of the king or queen he succeeded.

The removal of parts of the regnal report of Jehu (which, in the Lucianic text, included the name and year of the contemporary Judahite ruler: Athaliah) along with the delegitimization of the reign of Athaliah by reporting her period of rule outside of the normal regnal formulaic structure, the Dtr was able to *skip* Athaliah's reign and link Joash directly to Ahaziah. In all other cases of coups in Kings, the name of the usurping king is viewed as a valid part of the succession narrative. This is also the case in ANE kings lists and chronicles that view usurpation as a somewhat normal part of royal succession. The only time usurpers were evaluated badly in these texts is when an usurper to the throne had no connection to a royal bloodline. In these cases, they were referred to as "a son of a nobody" but, in the end, their reigns were still reported as part of the standard structure. For Athaliah, this was not the case. The succession sequence was modified in ways that argued that her reign was invalid and that the succession sequence legitimately passed from Ahaziah to his son Joash and that the intermediary rule of Athaliah was illegitimate. All references to its legitimacy had to be removed, even the structure of her period of power had to be reported outside of the genre of regnal report because that genre carried with it legitimation.

Thus, the introductory formula of Joash's reign in 2 Kings 12:1-2 marks the restart of this legitimizing genre that ended with the report of Ahaziah's death and the second report of his



introductory regnal formula in 2 Kgs 9:28-29. All of the regnal material that is found between these two points is carefully controlled so as to not report the reign of Jehu as contemporary with Athaliah, since such an addition to the regnal material of Jehu would in turn legitimize the reign of Athaliah. As stated above, there are several indications that the text of 2 Kings 8-12 was produced or reproduced in ways meant to skip over Athaliah's reign in order to make the link between Joash and Ahaziah as explicitly authoritative as possible.

Furthermore, the regnal introduction of Joash, though it does mark a return to authoritative regnal reports in contrast to Athaliah, also highlights another important shift in Dtr evaluative statements in the regnal report structure. Unlike all other righteous, partially-righteous, or evil Judahite kings who were evaluated for doing evil as their "fathers" had done or doing what was right in Yahweh's eyes as their father "David" had done, "Jehoash did what was right in the sight of the LORD all his days, *because the priest Jehoiada instructed him*" (emphasis added).

The shift contrasts the reign of Joash with the previous two reigns of Jehoram and Ahaziah of Judah, Joash's father and grandfather. According to the Dtr, they had done evil in Yahweh's eyes because they were related by marriage to the Ahabites. The chronicler significantly adds that Ahaziah did evil because his mother was his counselor. Thus, the introductory regnal formula of Joash is meant to contrast the chaotic rule of Judahites kings who had intermarried with Israel with Judahite kings who were guided by Yahweh's priests. This observation may partially explain why the introductory regnal report of Joash breaks with standard practice and omits the name of Joash's father, King Ahaziah of Judah. Even though 2 Kings 11:1-2 explicitly states that Joash was Ahaziah's son, 2 Kgs 12:1-2 may be aiming to drive home the point that, from the Dtr's perspective, genealogical statements are malleable and

secondary in contrast to the Dtr evaluations of Judahite and Israelite kings. The main thrust of 2 Kings 12:1-2 contrasts so starkly with the Dtr evaluations of Jehoram of Israel, Jehoram of Judah, and his son Ahaziah because those producing it did not want to weaken the ideological thrust of their message by inserting the name of one of the Judahite kings it was criticizing: Ahaziah of Judah, who walked in the ways of Ahab because of his mother. The message was that kings who intermarry with foreigners (Ahab, Jehoram of Judah) or follow in the ways of foreign mothers or relatives (Ahaziah of Judah, Joram of Israel) incite the fulfillment of Yahweh's oracles of doom while kings who follow the instruction of Yahweh's authorized cultic personnel incite Yahweh's favor (even if they are the product of foreign intermarriages).

Thus, Joash's genealogy was not manipulated to erase or distance an unwanted genealogical connection. Rather, as was the case with Athaliah, a single piece of his genealogy was momentarily suppressed for ideological reasons. This technique effectively sums up the drive of 2 Kings 11-12. Unlike Israelite kings and Judahite kings who had close relations with Israelite kings and foreign women, Joash and the monarchic institution were in a close relationship with Jehoiada and the Jerusalem-centered cultic institution. One relationship was genealogical, the other covenantal. For a moment, the Dtr evaluative formula shifts from genealogical comparison between the king and his actions as compared to his ancestors to an evaluation of King Joash in his non-genealogical relationship to the Yahweh cult and its priest, Jehoiada. For a moment, the standard evaluation of righteous kings in comparison to David is modified and Jehoiada takes David's place. The cult trumps the caste.<sup>189</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> This shows the difference between discourse practice and social practice – on the one hand the Dtr laws clearly forbid intermarriage with those being driven out of the land; in actual social practice, this may not have been the case. Thus, there may have been a certain flexibility applied to Joash who was not included in the fall of the Ahabites. The narrative presents him as devoted because he abandoned those connections (as if he had a choice!)

*Oracle and Promise: The Oracle of Nathan and its Discursive Role in the Genealogies of Joash and Athaliah*

That the genealogies of Joash and Athaliah are implicitly affected by the oracle traditions of Nathan and Elijah (first instigated by Ahijah) is abundantly clear. The effects of the oracle tradition of Nathan to David have spilled over into Israel and the effects of the oracle traditions of Ahijah through to the prophets Elijah and Elisha have come full circle and spilled in to Judah. The discourse guiding and constraining the production of these oracles, at least in its final form, is patently Judahite/Yehudite deuteronomism with a few significant post-Dtr additions.

The oracle of Nathan to David in 2 Sam 7.12-13 was initially strictly dynastic, though in its current form it has been modified to contain both dynastic and cultic promises and stipulations. “When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and *I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever*” (emphasis added). As pointed out by McCarter, “The original form of Nathan’s oracle in its highly parallelistic, almost poetic, prose, this statement stood parallel to that in v.12b ‘I shall establish his kingship, and keep his throne forever stable.’ With the interpolation of v.13a, however, a new parallelism was achieved: ‘He will build a house for my name, and I shall keep his throne forever stable.’”<sup>190</sup> As has been pointed out by many scholars, this interpolation is a significant shift in the dynastic oracle to David. Initially, the oracle of promise to the house of David was dynastic and fully unconditional; Yahweh promised David that he would establish his heir’s kingship and give him an eternally stable throne.<sup>191</sup> The addition of the phrase, “He will build a house for my name” indicates that, as McCarter points out, “The security of the throne is

---

<sup>190</sup> K. P. McCarter, *II Samuel*, AB 9 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984), 206.

<sup>191</sup> For another perspective, see O. Sergi, “The Composition of Nathan’s Oracle to David (2 Samuel 7:1-17) as a Reflection of Royal Judahite Ideology,” *JBL* 129/2 (2010): 261-279.

linked to the temple.”<sup>192</sup> Furthermore, the addition of the adoption metaphor in 2 Sam 7:14-16 further couches the unconditionality of the oracle with partial amendments associated with obedience. “14 I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings. 15 But I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. 16 Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever.” But even then, the oracle was understood as permanent, even if some of David’s heirs commit iniquity Yahweh would not take away his love as was the case with Saul. Even in sin, Yahweh would ensure that David’s house and kingdom would be made sure forever.

Those who produced the negative evaluation of Solomon in 1 Kgs 11:11-13 did not know about this oracle tradition (i.e., it was likely produced under a different complex of discourses). There, the negative evaluation of Solomon is parallel to the negative evaluation of Saul in 1 Sam 15:27-29.

1 Sam 15:27-29	1 Kgs 11:11
27 As Samuel turned to go away, Saul caught hold of the hem of his robe, and it tore. 28 And Samuel said to him, “The LORD has torn the kingdom of Israel from you this very day, and has given it to a neighbor of yours, who is better than you. 29 Moreover the Glory of Israel will not recant or change his mind; for he is not a mortal, that he should change his mind.”	11 Therefore the LORD said to Solomon, “Since this has been your mind and you have not kept my covenant and my statutes that I have commanded you, I will surely tear the kingdom from you and give it to your servant.

*Table 5 - The Tearing Motif in the Oracles against Saul and Solomon*

As Davidic royal discourse in conjunction with Dtr discourse guided and constrained the reproduction of these texts in light of the dynastic promise in 2 Sam 7:12-13, they also necessarily responded to the texts with amended conceptions about Yahweh’s promise to David and his house. All of these amendments were cultic in nature, endowed with temple-centered and

<sup>192</sup> idem.

Jerusalem-centered garb as in the counter-voice to the oracle against Solomon that immediately follows it in 1 Kgs 11:12-13: “Yet for the sake of your father David I will not do it in your lifetime; I will tear it out of the hand of your son. I will not, however, tear away the entire kingdom; I will give one tribe to your son, for the sake of my servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, which I have chosen.”

Similar statements are made several more times throughout the DtrH, but with some further modifications. These statements are all in response, in one way or another, to the tearing motif in 1 Kgs 11:11 (//1 Sam 15:27-29). These oracles against Saul and Solomon were understood as permanent as indicated in 1 Sam. 15:29 “Moreover, the glory of Israel will not recant or change his mind; for he is not a mortal, that he should change his mind.” The oracles were also considered to be complete rejections of Saul and Solomon, as indicated in the statements of both 1 Sam 14:28 — “The Lord has torn the kingdom of Israel from you this very day, and has given it to a neighbor of yours” — and 1 Kgs 11:11 — “I will surely tear the kingdom from you and give it to your servant.”

From the motif of tearing found in both the rejection narratives of Saul and Solomon and in light of the dynastic promise to David, these traditions could not remain without modification because a persistent Judahite discourse required that David remain central to Judahite royal identity and Solomon was a link in that genealogical chain. As a result, the oracle of Ahijah was composed or at least modified by reusing and reinterpreting the tearing motif (Ahijah tears Jeroboam’s cloak into twelve pieces) in order to counter the negative evaluation of Solomon and the apparent contradiction that Yahweh could even consider breaking his covenant with the house of David by completely tearing away the whole kingdom from Solomon. In the Ahijah oracles of promise and then doom, the motif of tearing was expanded from its initial meaning in

the Saul and Solomon oracles. When a piece of cloth is torn, it becomes two, three, four, or even twelve separate cloths. Thus, the negative evaluation of Solomon that so threatened the Davidic promise to David was reinterpreted; the cloak, symbolizing Israel as a whole, was not completely torn from Solomon, but rather, it was torn into pieces, and pieces or tribes can be divided.

It was this reinterpretation that marked the beginning of a new set of amendments to the oracle of the Nathan tradition. The discourse behind this reinterpretation was responsible for the insertion of 1 Kgs 11:12-13 and the Ahijah oracle of promise to Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 11:29-33, but especially v.32 “One tribe will remain his, for the sake of my servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, the city that I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel” and v.34-36,

Nevertheless I will not take the whole kingdom away from him but will make him ruler all the days of his life, for the sake of my servant David whom I chose and who did keep my commandments and my statutes; but I will take the kingdom away from his son and give it to you—that is, the ten tribes. Yet to his son I will give one tribe, so that my servant David may always have a lamp before me in Jerusalem, the city where I have chosen to put my name.

The thrust of this reinterpretation is referenced two more times in the book of Kings. For example, 1 Kgs 15:4 — “Nevertheless for David’s sake the LORD his God gave him a lamp in Jerusalem, setting up his son after him, and establishing Jerusalem” — and 2 Kings 8:19//2 Chr 21:7 — “Yet the LORD would not destroy Judah, for the sake of his servant David, since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever.” As McCarter points out, this reinterpretation is intricately bound to Dtr ideology since in 1 Kgs 15:5, “the Deuteronomistic narrator goes on to say explicitly that David was given...[a lamp] “because [he] did what Yahweh thought right, not departing from his instructions all the days of his life...”<sup>193</sup> <sup>194</sup>

Expanding on the late construction of the oracle of Ahijah to Jeroboam, Knoppers argued,

---

<sup>193</sup> K. P. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 207

<sup>194</sup> Also, favor for David vs favor for his heir in 2 Sam 7; the focus of Yahweh’s favor shifts in the later interpretations to focus only on David, not on his heirs.

The idea that Yahweh offered a stable dynasty also to Jeroboam (11:38) is certainly an exilic invention, which relativizes in a certain way the promise of an eternal Davidic dynasty...the Deuteronomists under Babylonian and Persian rule modified the triumphalist perspective of the Josianic edition of Kings. In the exilic edition, kingship is in crisis since the time of Solomon, and this crisis probably also reflects the identity crisis of the exiled generation of the high royal officers.<sup>195</sup>

Though the exact date of this construction is debated, it is clear that the construction itself is an elaboration of the oracle of promise to David and his posterity. As a result, it is very unlikely that Israelite kings would construct traditions about their dynastic longevity as a reflection of a more chosen and original dynasty, the Davidides. The implications are clear; the oracle tradition beginning with Ahijah and its derivatives is predominantly (if not fully) constructed from a Judahite perspective.

This later interpretation has a direct impact on how one is to understand 2 Kings 11. In agreement with most interpretations of 2 Kings 11, I believe that initially this narrative was independent from the DtrH and was perhaps a basic coup report. The fact that the narrative itself puts the oracle of David in danger of being unfulfilled highlights its relationship to Davidic ideology that Yahweh would maintain David's sons' throne forever. This theme could potentially fit very nicely with the earliest versions of the oracle of Nathan to David. However, the later Dtr themes used to incorporate 2 Kings 11 into its literary context are clearly associated with a more Jerusalem/temple-centered discourse. The deuteronomist, when producing and reproducing older source material by incorporating it into his new historical framework, was guided and constrained by a discourse that contrasted the term ברית (covenant) in Jehoiada's coup with קשר (conspiracy) used in all other coup reports. The establishment of a covenant between Yahweh and the king and Yahweh and the people, that they would be "his people," also contributes to the contrast between Israelite and Judahite kings; Israelite kings had been disobedient, broken Yahweh's covenant, and, as a result, was plagued by political chaos.

---

<sup>195</sup> G. Knoppers, *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*. HSM 52, 2 vols. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 152.

Jehoiada, however, was obedient, established Yahweh's covenant, and, as a result, Yahweh upheld his promise to the Davidic dynasty. This discourse was also partially responsible for the ways that the genealogies of Joash and Athaliah are dealt with in the Dtr's historical framework.

According to the Dtr reconstruction of these events, Athaliah was marginalized based on the genealogical details the Dtr used to describe her while at the same time delegitimizing her as a ruler in Judah based on his choice to present her reign outside of the standard regnal formulaic structure. The oracle of Nathan to David and its later reinterpretations had an effect on these choices. The Dtr was guided by this discourse to make the connection between Ahaziah and Joash explicit while removing any material that would argue that Athaliah's name had at one point been used in legitimate regnal formulae like that preserved in the Lucianic text of 2 Kgs 10:36+, which would have made her reign a valid interregnum between Ahaziah and Joash. Any recollection of Athaliah that appeared in any way to be a part of a standard regnal report with her as ruler threatened the David and Dtr sense of Davidic continuity between Joash and Ahaziah.

*Oracle and Conspiracy: The Oracle Traditions of Ahijah, Jehu son of Hanani, Elijah, Micaiah, and Elisha*

Concerning the oracle of Elijah based on the Naboth incident in 1 Kgs 21, Alexander Rofé argued

...in order to understand better any ancient writing one must endeavour to reconstruct the circumstances in which that literary opus came into being...In the present case, dealing with a story contained in the books of Kings, this means that the origin of the story must be established not on the basis of the current theories about the date of the Deuteronomistic redaction of the Historical Books (Deuteronomy-2 Kings), but rather as a result of an internal study of the story of Naboth itself. Only after completing this internal analysis may one step further and try to determine what can be said about the composition of larger units or even entire books.<sup>196</sup>

Moving forward with a keen mixture of folklore analysis followed by redaction criticism, Rofé makes the following observations. The core of the Naboth story appears to make a contrast

---

<sup>196</sup> A. Rofé, "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story." *VT* 38/1 (1998): 89-104.



between “bare necessity and luxury.” Naboth’s vineyard was part of his basic right as an Israelite, to have an inheritance. Ahab, on the other hand, had a palace. Naboth valued his inheritance; Ahab saw Naboth’s inheritance as another pretty piece of property that he would like to acquire.

Because of the disparate nature of 1 Kgs 21, Rofe began the second, more historical critical, stage of his analysis of 2 Kgs 9:21-26, one of the fulfillment reports of the Elijah oracle tradition cited by Jehu after he murdered Joram of Israel, son of Ahab. Rofe noted that “2 Kings ix 21-6 hints at a very different version of the Naboth incident. As against the vineyard, mentioned ten times in 1 Kings xxi, here we read (four times) about a field (*helqa/helqat sadeh*). The vineyard stood by the palace (1 Kings xxi 1), the field – further down in the valley, at a riding distance (2 Kings ix 25), on the way to Beth-Shean.” Rofe and others argue that all of the inconsistencies of 1 Kings 21 appear to be the result of secondary reworking while the report of the oracle fulfillment associated with the Naboth story in 2 Kgs 9:21-26, in conjunction with the earliest version of the oracle in 1 Kings 21 are older and paint a very different picture of the Naboth incident.

The earlier oracle tradition was based on Ahab’s unethical behavior toward Naboth, while the later editing blames the oracle on Ahab’s cultic deviance. The earlier oracle tradition appears to have a clear geographical schema focused at Jezreel, while the later tradition is full of contradictions regarding how Jezebel went about securing Naboth’s execution. These inconsistencies show that there is clearly an older oracle tradition that undergirds those references in 1 Kgs 21 and 2 Kgs 9. Rofe noted “It is generally agreed, rightly so in my opinion,

that the story of Jehu's coup, at least the first portion of it in 2 Kings ix, is fairly ancient, nearly contemporary with the events."<sup>197</sup>

Following Rofe who argued that 2 Kgs 9:21-27 is essential for understanding the redaction history of 1 Kgs 21, I will analyze the two in conjunction with one another by defining the motivation and aim of the oracles, defining the themes in the oracles, and defining the oracular structures. Finally, I will try to come full circle and point out why these oracles are significant for the study of 2 Kings 11.

The motivation for the oracle as we have it in 2 Kgs 9:21-26 appears to contain two central elements: unethical behavior as regards inheritance and concern for repayment of bloodguilt. The fact that the version of the oracle found in the Jehu narrative changes the focus from the vineyard to "plot" of ground (חלקה) is telling. The focus on inheritance terminology is classic Dtr language that uses the two term חלק and נחלה. Examples of these terms are found in Dt 10:6; 12:12; 14:27, 29; 18:1; Jos 18:7; Jos 19:19; 2 Sam 20:1; 1 Kgs 12:16. The word חלקה also figures as an important play on words in the Jehu narrative in v.10, 21, 25, 36, and 37.<sup>198</sup>

The aim of the oracle, unlike its later derivatives, was to challenge Ahab for his unethical behavior. The later versions of the oracle shift the blame from Ahab to Jezebel and also change his character from powerful and land-lusting to weak and sulky. According to 2 Kgs 9:21-26 Ahab had been with others, including Jehu and Bidkar, when the oracle was delivered. In the later versions of this oracle, Elijah receives instructions from Yahweh that he is to confront Ahab and the confrontation appears to be just between the two of them.

---

<sup>197</sup> A. Rofe, "The Vineyard of Naboth," 96.

<sup>198</sup> Though the term חלק is used in Dtr texts dealing with the allotment of land, this does not mean that its use in the earliest version of this oracle is strictly Dtr. It would be a gross error to assume that all Dtr ideology or any of it is sui generis since all ideologies reify previous ideologies. Furthermore, the use of the term חלק by itself may indicate that this version of the oracle tradition is pre-Dtr since it is not part of the common Dtr doublet חלק and נחלה. With this in mind, it seems that Rofe is justified in claiming that the oracle as it is reported in 2 Kgs 9:21-26 is earlier than the Dtr redactions.

The structure of the oracle is also significantly different in 2 Kgs 9:21-26. The oracle is a symbolic binary between an act and its consequence. “For the blood of Naboth and for the blood of his children that I saw yesterday, says the LORD, I swear I will repay you on this very plot of ground.”<sup>199</sup> The structure is based on Ahab’s actions which were restated against him in the form of an oracle. In other words, the characters are parallel: Naboth//Ahab, Naboth’s Sons//Ahab’s sons. The punishment is also parallel, blood for blood to be paid in full in the same location: Naboth’s field.<sup>199</sup>

Returning now to the issues of 1 Kgs 21, Rofe and McKenzie argue that certain elements in the oracle against Ahab in this chapter agree with the motivations behind its earlier iteration in 2 Kgs 9:21-26. For example, McKenzie noted “The Naboth narrative proper in 21:1-16 is markedly different in some respects from the report of Elijah’s oracle in vv 17-29. Jezebel is primarily responsible for Naboth’s death in vv 1-16, but Ahab is the one condemned in vv 17-29. This and other tensions have led scholars to see in vv 1-16 a distinct and usually later level of composition or redaction from the original word of Elijah beginning in v 17.”<sup>200</sup> McKenzie argued that only v.17, 18, 19a and (perhaps) 20ab $\alpha$  are a part of an earlier stratum of the oracle

---

<sup>199</sup> Similar oracle structures are found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. For example, the oracle of Nathan against David in response to the matter of Uriah the Hittite in 2 Sam 12:1-12. The parable, presented as if it were an actual legal case, serves to structure the oracle itself. Nathan presents the case, David responded and made judgment, Nathan declared that the case was actually about David’s murder of Uriah and affair with Uriah’s wife, Bathsheba. The prophetic legends incorporated into the book of Kings contain similar oracles. For example, the account of Ahab’s wars with Ben-Hadad contains an example similar to that of the oracle of Nathan against David. In 1 Kgs 20:35-42, Ahab had repeatedly defeated the Aramean armies of Ben-Hadad. In the final defeat of the Arameans, Ben-Hadad was captured and Ahab spared his life because Ben-Hadad was politically his “brother.” The oracle, in this instance, is neither structured after a parable nor simply directly stated in as a binary response to an action; instead, the anonymous prophet puts on a didactic play, engages the king with a faux complaint about ethical wrongs committed against him, wrongs that the king presumes actually happened to the man. Like David, Ahab responds to the complaint and offers his legal backing for justice to be served. Then the prophet comes out of character and pronounces the king as the guilty party in the case. Ahab, like David, had secured a verdict against himself. With the similarities, there are naturally differences as well. The oracle to Ahab was presumably based on his murder of Naboth and his sons. The oracle response to this was not given as a parable, but directly. Furthermore, unlike the previous examples, Ahab does not unknowingly declare his own guilty verdict, but is straightforwardly told that just as he shed the blood of Naboth and his children at Naboth’s field, so too would Yahweh repay the blood of Ahab and his sons on the very same field.

<sup>200</sup> McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 67; A. Rofe, “The Vineyard of Naboth,” 97.

tradition since they “introduce an individual condemnation of Ahab.”<sup>201</sup> He then noted that this material may be related to the version of the oracle found in 2 Kgs 9:25-26. As noted by McKenzie, v.20b and v.22 are clearly Dtr additions.

In sum, the earliest form of the oracle tradition against Ahab had very specific motivations and themes that were quite different from its later reiterations. However, certain elements in this earlier iteration of the oracle tradition had a profound impact on the oracle tradition in its later forms, as well as the oracle tradition of conspiracy and oracle fulfillment from the reigns of Jeroboam to Jehu.

A basic description of the development of this oracle tradition is as follows. The material that is concerned with ethical matters and inheritance is part of an earlier Elijah/Naboth tradition. In it, Ahab is either blamed directly for the blood of Naboth (1 Kgs 21:\*19) or for the blood of Naboth and his children (2 Kgs 9:26). The earlier material also has a proper understanding of the geography inherent in the story: that it took place in Jezreel. The material that associates the story with Samaria is late (1 Kgs 21:4-15a and \*18 *who is in Samaria*) and must be understood as a harmonization with the death of Ahab in 1 Kgs 22:38 since there the oracle against Ahab is fulfilled in Samaria, not Jezreel. The material claiming that Ahab violently took the inheritance of Naboth from him is also earlier (1 Kgs 21:\*15-19; 2 Kgs 9:26). The later material is less concerned with identifying the piece of ground with legal terms associated with inheritance (1 Kgs 21:3, \*4; 2 Kgs 9:25-26). A good example of this is how 1 Kgs 21:6 restates the information already given in v.3.

1 Kgs 21:3, 4	1 Kgs 21:6
The Lord forbid that I should give you my <i>ancestral inheritance</i>	I will not give you my <i>vineyard</i>
I will not give you my <i>ancestral inheritance</i>	

Table 6 - *Ancestral Inheritance versus Vineyard in 1 Kgs 21:3, 4, and 6*

<sup>201</sup> idem.

The observation that the earliest iteration of this oracle tradition is concerned with ethical behavior connected with inheritance calls into question previous arguments that all of the Jezebel material is part of the latest version of the Naboth story. This is only partially correct. Consider the version of the oracle against Jezebel in 2 Kgs 9:36-37 “In the territory of Jezreel the dogs shall eat the flesh of Jezebel; the corpse of Jezebel shall be like dung on the field in the territory of Jezreel, so that no one can say, ‘This is Jezebel.’” This version of the Jezebel oracle envisions punishment in Jezreel. Its geographic understanding agrees with the earlier material that sees retribution for the Naboth incident as taking place in Jezreel. When the oracle tradition is removed from its strong anti-Baalist and anti-foreign women context, it could be argued that the oracle’s aim is to repay Jezebel for her unethical role in the Naboth incident. In my reconstruction of the text this is limited to Jezebel’s prodding Ahab to just go and dispossess Naboth (and his sons) of the vineyard and does not include 1 Kgs 21:4-15, \*17. None of this material indicates that the oracle is directly associated with Jezebel’s cultic deviance as is the case with much of the later interpretations of Jezebel’s role in the downfall of the house of Ahab (v.25-26). This connection is made by the Dtr and later reinterpretation of the oracle of Elijah against Ahab in 1 Kgs 21:25-26, which explicitly blames Jezebel for causing Ahab’s cultic deviance.

Intriguingly, 1 Kgs 21:25-26 makes reference to the theme of dispossession common in the DtrH. Just as Jezebel had instructed Ahab to dispossess Naboth of his vineyard (יָרַשׁ, qal stem), Yahweh had dispossessed (יָרַשׁ, hifil stem) the Amorites. The use of these two different stems appears to weaken my argument that Jezebel’s instructions ought to be taken as her prodding Ahab to simply go and knock off Naboth and anyone who could lay claim to his property. However, the use of the root יָרַשׁ in Deuteronomy is more fluid than that. Both the hifil

and the qal stem of ירש are used in Deuteronomy with the meaning “to dispossess” (Dt 1:8, 21, 39; 2:12, 21, 24, 31; 3:12; 4:22; 5:31, 33; 9:1; 11:23; 12:2, 29; 17:14; 18:14; 19:1-3 [+נחלה], 14; 23:20; 25:19 [Amalek]; 26:1[+נחלה]; 28:21, 63; 30:4-5, 16, 18; 31:3, 13; 32:47; 33:23; Jer 49:1-2). Thus, the use of the hifil of ירש in 1 Kgs 21:26 is a result of its use within the Dtr additions to this chapter in v.20-22 and 24-26. Those inserting this material used stereotypical Dtr forms of speech and in this instance chose to use the hifil stem of ירש. The motivations for this choice may derive from a much later and more priestly discourse. In fact, the hifil of ירש is only used twice in Deuteronomy (Dt 7:17 and 9:3-5; see also Josh 17:10; Judg 1:19 [failure to dispossess]; Zech 9:4). Both instances, as is common with both the hifil and qal of ירש, are used in reference to the people generally being dispossessed or about to be dispossessed in accordance with Yahweh’s promise to drive them out. Dt 7:17 argues that this process will be done little by little and that the people of Israel will play a part in the eventual complete dispossession of previous inhabitants. Dt 9:3-4 has a different perspective, the dispossession of the people will be completely accomplished by Yahweh alone and is closely associated with the promise Yahweh made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Gen 15, dispossession of Amorites; 28:4; Lev 20:22-24; ).<sup>202</sup>

The language, especially that of Dt 9:3-4, has been most often associated with the Late Exilic and Early Persian periods.<sup>203</sup> Further support of the late date for the usage of ירש in the hifil is found in Num 32:39; 33:51-53, verses specifically associated with the destruction of idols/images as well as the dispossession of the Amorites living in Gilead/Havvoth-Jair and

---

<sup>202</sup> Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 63; Römer argued that Dt 12:2-7 associated with cultic centralization and the rejection of illegitimate cults in the Persian period has a “comparable” ideology to that of Dt 7:1-6, 22-26 ; 9:1-6. He noted “[a]depts of the ‘Gottingen School’...often attribute these texts to DtrN, which is to be dated around the end of the exile, or, more likely, at the beginning of the Persian period. Indeed, vocabulary and content corroborate this dating, as for instance the idiom ‘to seek Yahweh’ (v. 5), typical of the book of Chronicles.” See also J. Pakkala, *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History*. FES 76. (Helsinki:FES and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 94-99.

<sup>203</sup> Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 63.

Kenath/Nobah (Num 32:39-42), lands appointed to/taken by the descendants of Machir son of Manasseh.<sup>204</sup>

These observations are significant in light of 1 Kgs 21:25-26 since Noth and others have generally assigned both to a Dtr redaction. Based on the above observations, the use of  $\text{שׂר}$  in the hifil, alongside mention of Amorites, points directly to the same usage found in Num 32:39 and perhaps also 33:51-53. Furthermore, the use of the term  $\text{גלולים}$  (v.26) for *idols* is ubiquitous in priestly texts and late post-Dtr priestly glosses in the DtrH. Therefore, in keeping with McKenzie, it seems best to assign 1 Kgs 21:26 to a post-Dtr hand in the mid-to-late Persian Period. However, McKenzie also saw v.25 as a late addition to the text similar to v.26. Here, I disagree on account of the Dtr language and the mention of Jezebel. In my reconstruction of the 1 Kgs 21, Jezebel is Ahab's counsel. Even when the late Samaria-centered material is removed, she still says to Ahab, "Go, take possession of the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite, which he refused to give you for money." Thus, I see v.25 as a late Dtr restatement of the Naboth episode that included an indictment against Jezebel as complicit in the unethical treatment of Naboth and his family.<sup>205</sup>

It is generally accepted that the oracles against Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 14:7-11//15:27-30 and Baasha in 1 Kgs 16:1-4, 7//16:11-13 are explicitly Dtr. Thus, it appears that the Dtr, by means of the oracle tradition that included oracles from Ahijah to Jeroboam and Jehu son of Hanani to Baasha, inserted and modified the oracle of Elijah by inserting these oracles into 1 Kgs 21:20b-24, harmonizing it with these previous two dynastic oracles. The fact that the previous two oracles were spoken against heads of dynasties while the Dtr material in 1 Kgs 21:20b-22 is

---

<sup>204</sup> There are other instances of  $\text{שׂר}$  in Num 14:24:21:24, 32, 35 associated with the dispossession of the Amorites, but they are found in the qal stem. These stories are part of the military legends concerning the kings of the Amorites.

<sup>205</sup> There is also a conceptual shift in the restatement that shifts the focus from unethical behavior to cultic deviance and perhaps as the beginning of the tradition associating Jezebel with 'doing evil' in Yahweh's eyes.

aimed at Ahab, the son of Omri, the head of the dynasty, supports the claim that the Elijah oracle tradition was incorporated into the oracle tradition against Jeroboam and Baasha by means of these inserted Dtr oracular phrases: “<sup>19b</sup> Because you have sold yourself to do what is evil in the sight of the LORD, <sup>21</sup> I will bring disaster on you; I will consume you, and will cut off from Ahab every male, bond or free, in Israel; <sup>22</sup> and I will make your house like the house of Jeroboam son of Nebat, and like the house of Baasha son of Ahijah, because you have provoked me to anger and have caused Israel to sin.” Unlike the aim of the earlier oracle tradition, the Dtr oracles slightly modified the narrow application of the curse to include not only male heirs to the throne, by all males, bond and free, in Israel.

This is a good time to highlight that the Dtr addition to the Elijah oracle, much like the addition of the Jezebel material to the oracle, expands its earlier aim. The earliest forms of the oracle associated with the Elijah/Naboth story directly mirror Ahab’s actions. Naboth and his sons were murdered. As a result, Ahab and his sons will repay the blood on the very spot that it was shed. The Dtr addition to the Elijah oracle expands this limited aim to include “any male, bond or free” associated with king under the Dtr oracular curse.

The expansion of this oracle to include “anyone” (male or female, e.g., Jezebel and, implicitly, Athaliah) also deserves attention. This later expansion of the oracle’s aim occurred when 1 Kgs 21:23, the oracle against Jezebel, was inserted in the middle of the Dtr curse formula. The problem is resolved once v.23 is understood as an interruption. Restoring the oracle to a state similar to the other examples against Jeroboam and Baasha shows that v.20b-22 and 24 were initially meant to be read as part of the same oracle. Inserting v.23 interrupts this reading resulting in ambiguity as regards the meaning of תִּמָּוֶת. Usually תִּמָּוֶת is translated as “anyone who dies.” However, when read in conjunction with the Jeroboam and Baasha oracles, it is clear that



תָּמָה does not refer to just *anyone* (a very broad term), but rather it refers directly to the first part of the oracle, “all males, bond or free.” The insertion of v.23 against Jezebel interrupts this meaning and as a result, allows the curse to be extended to *anyone* associated with Ahab. This expansion of the oracle of Elijah to include *anyone* associated with Ahab is played-out almost completely in the report of Jehu’s coup in 2 Kgs 9-10. The complete annihilation of the whole house of Ahab was never the aim of the earliest versions of both the pre-Dtr and Dtr oracles against Ahab and his sons. As a result, all of the material in 2 Kgs 9-10 that argues that the oracle aimed to completely wipe out every single Ahabite is a result of this late expansion of the oracle’s initial aims, and must be seen as a late, post-Dtr addition to story of the fall of the Ahabites. Significantly for 2 Kings 11, this late material contains a strong anti-Baalist ideology along with its aim to include Jezebel and *anyone* associated with Ahab in the oracular fulfillment.

### *Conspiracy and Covenant*

Furthermore, and significantly for 2 Kings 11, this Dtr oracle tradition is clearly linked with another theme often unnoticed: the practice of coup or conspiracy using the term קָשַׁר. Throughout the history of the divided monarchy, the Dtr used term קָשַׁר alongside his Dtr oracles and their fulfillment reports as an important thematic structure in his conception of Israelite and Judahite history.<sup>206</sup> Its use in post-Joash Judah is slightly different than its use when referring to northern kings. The oracle tradition beginning with Ahijah’s oracle against Jeroboam marks the beginning of a succession of oracles and coups reported in conjunction with one another. That the term קָשַׁר is viewed negatively in these instances is supported by what I understand to be a late Dtr summary of the oracle fulfillment report against Baasha. The Dtr oracle fulfillment report against Baasha is found in 1 Kgs 16:11-13. The later summarizing statement is found in

---

<sup>206</sup> G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 1953.

v.7: “Moreover the word of the LORD came by the prophet Jehu son of Hanani against Baasha and his house, both because of all the evil that he did in the sight of the LORD, provoking him to anger with the work of his hands, in being like the house of Jeroboam, *and also because he destroyed it*” (emphasis added). In other words, Baasha’s conspiracy, at least in the latest Dtr perspective, was viewed negatively.

This perspective also clearly connects the themes of oracle and קשר (conspiracy/coup) in the source it was evaluating. Indeed, the oracle and oracle fulfillment reports concerning Israelite kings all incorporate the theme of קשר (conspiracy) and oracle in the structure of the history of the divided monarchy. In this scheme, the oracle’s fulfillment is a result of predicted *conspiracy*. The conspiracies were indications that the oracle was being fulfilled and the house under the curse was about to fall.

Significantly, this is not the case for Elijah’s oracle against Ahab. The fulfillment of the Elijah oracle against Ahab in 1 Kgs 22:37-38, the Micaiah story and the death of Ahab, is a late modification of the Elijah oracle tradition that inserted material about the interactions between the prophet Micaiah, Jehoshaphat and Ahab. Though it appears there may have been an independent oracle tradition associated with Micaiah, the fact that this tradition was added late is generally accepted since it is clear that the oracle of Micaiah and its fulfillment are modified and harmonized with the late material added to the Naboth narrative in 1 Kgs 21:\*17. These two traditions argue that Ahab killed Naboth in Samaria and as a result, Ahab’s blood must be repaid and lapped up by dogs in Samaria.

The next instance of the theme of oracle and conspiracy, קשר, is found in the Jehu narrative. After having been anointed king by the servant of Elisha, 2 Kgs 9:14 reports, “Thus Jehu son of Jehoshaphat son of Nimshi conspired [קשר] against Joram.” From this point, the

narrative moves into action and Ahab's son, Joram is murdered by Jehu and his dead body is dumped on the plot of Naboth in Jezreel in fulfillment of the Elijah oracle tradition in its earlier form. This iteration of the oracle argues that the retribution against Ahab's house was a result of an unethical breach of inheritance laws, not cultic deviance. It was also aimed only at Ahab's son, Joram, in agreement with the earlier versions of the oracle and also the Dtr framework cursing the male offspring of evil kings. This is supported by the fact that once Ahaziah was also killed, an oracle fulfillment report was not cited in association with his death. This is also the case for all Judahites caught and murdered by Jehu in Israelite territory. Only the deaths of Ahab's sons are specifically associated with oracle fulfillment reports.

### *Conclusion*

The above observations are significant for understanding the role of 2 Kings 11 in this sequence of oracles, conspiracies, and oracle fulfillments. First, as has been shown, the material in this tradition that expands the earlier material to include *anyone* associated with Ahab is behind the production of the 2 Kgs 11:18. The destruction of the house of Baal, his images and his altars, and the murder of Baal's priest, Mattan, has parallels in the late expansive materials in 2 Kgs 9-10. These expansions are the product of a Persian period discourse, a period when the Yehudite community was more cultically exclusive and strictly monotheistic. In these later exclusivist texts, Baalism is singled out as the main foreign practice to be eradicated, while in earlier Dtr ideology, all foreign practices were prohibited, at least in theory. Though this oracle tradition is not specifically cited when the Baal cult in Jerusalem is destroyed, the literary context of 2 Kings 11 makes clear the connection between the two coups of Jehu and Jehoiada. Significantly, when Jehu murdered the Baalists 2 Kgs 10:20-28, there was no accompanying

report of oracle fulfillment. This is also the case for the report of the annihilation of Baalism from Jerusalem in 2 Kgs 11:18.

Second, as stated above in the discussion about the difference between conspiracy and covenant, the Dtr material in 2 Kgs 11 is meant to contrast the sequence of oracles, conspiracies, and oracle fulfillments with the coup of Jehoiada. For example, when Athaliah is finally given a chance to speak and defend herself, she cries out קשר, קשר “Conspiracy! Conspiracy!” a clear intertextual link to the Dtr oracle, conspiracy, and oracle fulfillment. The Dtr responds to Athaliah’s accusation by describing Jehoiada’s actions with the term ברית (“covenant”). In contrast to previous conspiracies, Jehoiada gathered his forces and “he made a covenant with them and put them under oath in the house of the LORD; then he showed them the king’s son” (v.4). Unlike the Israelite coups that were instigated and led solely by Israelite elites, the Dtr argues that “the people of the land” actively participated in the coronation of Joash, an important legitimizing feature added by the Dtr. Finally, the establishment of the covenant officiated by Jehoiada between Yahweh and the new king and the people, that they would be “Yahweh’s people,” contrasts nicely with the chaotic coups of the north where Yahweh plays little to no legitimizing role (the only possible exception to this is the coup of Jehu).

Even the coup of Jehu, which most agree at least partially lauds Jehu for his bloody actions in eradicating Baalism, is not concluded with the establishment of a covenant in the north. This highlights the fact that late Judahite and Yehudite discourses are mainly responsible for the way that the story of Jehu was guided and constrained as it was re-produced and distributed in later periods. Jehu could not establish a covenant between Yahweh and the people in Israel because there was no authorized Yahwistic cult in the north. This is supported by the Dtr evaluations of Jehu in 2 Kgs 10:29 and 31. Jehu, like those before him, followed the ways of

Jeroboam. In other words, even though Jehu was recognized as being obedient to Yahweh by eradicating foreign practices from Israel, he still did not recognize Jerusalem as the only authorized place to worship Yahweh. In contrast, the coup of Jehoiada revolves around the temple in the Dtr additions to the text of 2 Kgs 11.

Furthermore, the acts of Jehoiada as an authorized priest in Jerusalem highlight the Dtr ideal as regards Davidic kingship: Davidic kings are to build and maintain a house for Yahweh's name; in return, Yahweh will stabilize their reigns. Furthermore, the late Dtr promise that Yahweh will always maintain a "lamp" for David in Jerusalem for the sake of both David and Jerusalem is exemplified in the story of Joash's rise. The Davidic dynasty was at risk of being completely annihilated; in fact, according to the story, most thought that all Judahite heirs to the throne of David were dead. In contrast to the northern conspiracies and oracles that were the result of wickedness, and the need for Yahweh to send correcting prophets to warn them, Jehoiada, an authorized priest of Yahweh in Jerusalem, developed a plan to preserve the Davidic line of kings and make sure that Yahweh's promises to David would be fulfilled.

In this way, as shown through an analysis of the genealogies of Joash, Athaliah along with an analysis of the central oracle traditions associated with the prophet Nathan and a sequence of prophets in the north (Ahijah, Jehu son of Hanani, Elijah, and Elisha), 2 Kings 11 was produced initially as a basic politically motivated coup report. Only later was 2 Kings 11 heavily reworked by Dtr editors who incorporated it into their schematic view of history in light of the sequence of oracles, conspiracies, and oracle fulfillment in the north. The Dtr contrasted the coup of Jehoiada with all previous conspiracies. The themes of oracle tradition and conspiracy that the Dtr used to incorporate 2 Kings 11 into his work contrasted the coup of Jehoiada with the northern coups that were aimed only at annihilating the male offspring of

cursed kings. This also contrasts nicely with Yahweh's promise of continuous rule to the Davidides and is exemplified and upheld by the story of Joash's rise to power.

It was only later that the expansive elements of the late additions to the Naboth material associated with Jezebel spilled into 2 Kgs 11. Once this expansive material was inserted, the perception that *anyone* associated with Ahab was at risk of annihilation was realized: male or female (Jezebel, worshippers of Baal, Judahites caught in Israelite territory) were included in this expansion. This material in turn called into question the legitimacy of Joash (a grandson of Ahab) and also raised the question as to why Athaliah's execution was not reported in association with an oracle fulfillment report.

Thus, the reason that Athaliah and Joash were not consumed in the wake of Jehu's coup is partially because the earlier oracle traditions had no claim on them because those oracles laid claim primarily on Ahab's direct male offspring, his sons. Technically, this expansive Dtr material could have laid claim to Joash since it expanded the curse to all males, bond or free "in Israel." However, the phrase "in Israel" is not to be understood as the "theological Israel" that included all tribes descended from Jacob/Israel. Instead, "in Israel" literally means "in Israel" the kingdom. As a result, even the Dtr expansion of this oracle could not lay claim on Joash because he was in Judah. This point is highlighted by the fact that Judahites were killed in the wake of the Jehu coup, but they were only valid targets if they had been caught "in Israel." It is clear, then, that the Dtr expansion is also guided and constrained by geographic ideology. The oracle tradition of Elijah, even in its expanded Dtr form, was only to be fulfilled in the territory of the kingdom of Israel.

If the above observations are correct, then why were the genealogical statements about Athaliah mystified? If the oracle tradition was already understood as limited geographically and

ideologically, then Athaliah's presence in Judah disqualified her from association with the oracle. However, in the latest expansions of the oracle, the post-Dtr material, *anyone* even Jezebel was to be consumed in the oracle's fulfillment. In conjunction with this late expansion, it may also be that genealogical statements about Athaliah were mystified in accordance with Davidic royal theology in conjunction with the necessity to make sure that Ahab's sins could not be associated with Joash due to the late expansion of the oracle's boundaries.

The Dtr framework presents Athaliah as illegitimate by reporting her period of rule outside the normal structure of reporting the reigns of Israelite and Judahite kings. Furthermore, if it is accepted that the Lucianic text contains a remnant of a previous regnal report that did report Athaliah in the normal structure of reporting reigns of kings, it is possible that the Dtr modified his source by removing and recasting Athaliah's reign to make the continuity between Ahaziah and Joash explicit since both are reported in fairly standard ways in contrast to Athaliah. There certainly may have been a need to distance Joash from Ahab by mystifying Athaliah's genealogy, but given the lateness of the oracle's expansion to include *anyone* associated with Ahab, it seems that the genealogical manipulations were likely a result of Davidic and Dtr discourses concerned with dynastic legitimacy. Ahab was the worst of the worst Israelite kings and having a genealogy that linked Joash to Omri in order to bypass Ahab would have been an effective technique to choose a bad lineage over the worst lineage possible. However, the ideological work exerted to accomplish this seems minimal in comparison to the efforts of the Dtr to report Athaliah's reign as illegitimate. Though the production of 2 Kings 11 is likely guided and constrained by both Davidic genealogical concerns and Dtr and later discourses about how far significant oracles can reach ideologically and geographically, it seems that the main

reasons for the genealogical peculiarities associated with Athaliah and Joash are primarily guided by Davidic discourse about legitimacy and always having a Davidide on the throne in Jerusalem.



## Chapter 6: Conclusion

This study has shown how different discursive frameworks from different periods in Judahite/Yehudite history have influenced the production and reproduction of 2 Kings 11. Though in their current context the Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution are thematically and contextually bound to 2 King 9-10 (as well as previous coup reports in 1-2 Kings), these reports were not initially a part of the narratives surrounding it. As 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History, Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution were reinterpreted and thematically joined by the insertion of deuteronomistic themes such as conspiracy versus covenant, the destruction of Baalism, and the importance of Jerusalem-centered Yahwism. The central aim of this study was to determine why Athaliah's execution was treated differently from other Ahabite death reports, all of which, with the exception of Athaliah, were accompanied by oracle fulfillment reports. The hypothesis of this study was that approaching the text from a discourse critical perspective, focusing on interdiscursivity, textual analysis, and intertextuality, would show that the textual production and reproduction of 2 Kings 11 was guided and constrained by discourses that aimed to distance and contrast Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution from the sequence of oracles, conspiracies, death reports, and oracle fulfillment reports in 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10. Part of this discursive framework was composed of particular Judahite/Yehudite perspectives about the prophetic oracles of Nathan (2 Samuel 7) and the sequence of prophetic oracles against Israelite kings and their fulfillment reports in 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10.

As a result, there are several ways to determine why Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution were both incorporated, though in a restricted sense, into the deuteronomist's work in such a unique way. First, Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution, in their earliest iteration,

were not produced in conjunction with the oracles against the house of Ahab in their earliest iterations. The earliest form of Elijah's oracle against Ahab (1 Kgs 21:18-19\*; 2 Kgs 9:25-26) was concerned with ethical and legal matters centered on Ahab's actions against Naboth and his sons.<sup>207</sup> As a result, the themes used by the deuteronomist to incorporate this oracle tradition as well as 2 Kings 11 into his work resulted in a reinterpretation of their contents. For the Elijah's oracle against Ahab, the deuteronomistic insertions shifted the concern from Ahab's unethical behavior to Ahab and Jezebel's cultic deviance. These insertions (2 Kgs 21:21-24\*) also created a strong thematic link with previous texts concerned with prophetic oracles, resulting in conspiracies, and oracle fulfillments. For 2 Kings 11, which was initially a basic coup report, similar deuteronomistic terms and themes were used to incorporate Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution into the broad deuteronomistic historical work. The difference is that 2 Kings 11 utilizes these themes to distance Jehoiada's coup and Athaliah's execution from Israelite coup reports and Ahabite death reports. This was done by contrasting the conspiracy theme with covenant and covenant renewal in 2 Kings 11. The significance of these observations partially answers the central question of this study: Athaliah's execution report was not associated with the fall of the house of Ahab because initially, these two reports were produced separately under the guidance and constraints of two different discourses. One (Elijah's oracle against Ahab; 2 Kgs 21:18-19\*) was concerned with ethical and legal behavior; the other (2 Kings 11) was concerned mainly with common political reasons for carrying coups: power, politics, and economy. It was only later that the Nathan's oracle and the deuteronomistic oracles in 1 Kings 14-2 Kings 10 endowed these traditions with unifying cultic themes: the centrality of Jerusalem, the special status of the Davidic dynasty, the importance of covenant making, and the supremacy of Yahweh over all other gods.

---

<sup>207</sup> See S. L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 1991; A. Rofe, "The Vineyard of Naboth," 19-104.

Once 2 Kings 11 had been incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History, the deuteronomist's discursive framework constrained the full incorporation of 2 Kings 11 into the sequence of oracles, conspiracies, and oracle fulfillment reports associated with Israelite kings. In addition, 2 Kings 11 reports Athaliah's short reign differently from other Judahite regnal reports. The regnal report genre itself carries with it a legitimizing structure; this structure was denied Athaliah so as to argue that her reign was illegitimate.

The analysis of the interdiscursivity of 2 Kings 11 supports these conclusions. For example, the above analysis determined that 2 Kings 11 appropriated commonly used genres and forms but used them in uncommon ways. These conceptual shifts are indicative of social change and successive editorial activity on the text. It is especially significant for ancient texts that text production was most often associated with power and administration. Naturally, the use and reuse of common genres are indicative of social concerns, especially from the perspective of elites who controlled the production of knowledge (texts, art, architecture, etc.). The interdiscursivity of 2 Kings 11 indicates that it was initially a basic coup report. Using contemporary coup theory, this study also determined that the report of Jehoiada's coup was first popularized to argue that it was not a coup, but a popular revolution with broad support from various Judahite institutions. The textual analysis of 2 Kings 11 also supports these claims. The vocabulary, cohesion, grammar, and text structure of 2 Kings 11 show that those who incorporated the text into the Deuteronomistic History had popularized Jehoida's coup. They accomplished this by recasting it as revolution with both popular political and cultic motivations.

The analysis of the intertextuality of 2 Kings 11 clearly showed that those who produced it and reproduced it called on various important traditions. Important dynastic objects (the spears and shields of David), important themes (conspiracy versus covenant), important oracle

traditions (Nathan's oracle versus oracles against Israelite kings), cultic centrality (the house of Yahweh versus the house of Baal), all show the intricate intertextual nature of 2 Kings 11. From a theoretical perspective, intertextuality (along with interdiscursivity and textual analysis) are indicative of social practices. This leads to the central concern of this study: determining why Athaliah's execution was not associated with the fall of the house of Ahab. There is no single answer to this question. Rather, there is a succession of answers. As stated above, initially there was no reason to associate Athaliah with the oracles against the house of Ahab because the two traditions were produced separately. As argued previously, once 2 Kings 11 was incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History, the oracle tradition was still fairly narrow in its scope (it only applied to Ahab's male offspring). Furthermore, as argued above, the oracle was also bound geographically; it was only effective "in Israel." This is supported by the fact that the only Judahites killed in the wake of Jehu's coup were those who were caught "in Israel." The result is that the Judahite discursive framework that guided and constrained the incorporation of 2 Kings 11 into the Deuteronomistic History restricted the geographic reach of the Elijah oracle tradition. Instead, the text creatively appropriated terms and themes common in narratives about the north to contrast Davidic chosenness and succession with Israelite kings and their chaotic succession history. In the end, Athaliah's execution was not reported with a deuteronomistic oracle fulfillment report because she was not a male Ahabite and she was not "in Israel." The mystification of Athaliah's genealogy and the manipulation of her regnal report (as evidenced by the parts preserved in the Lucianic recension) were solely meant to distance Joash from his Ahabite heritage through Athaliah; rather, these manipulations were meant to "skip" her reign to create an uninterrupted sense of dynastic continuity between Joash and Ahaziah. Any indication that Athaliah had been seen as a legitimate Judahite ruler would have called into question

Yahweh's promise to David that he would always have a male heir on the throne in Jerusalem. Any such material was removed in an effort to purify Davidic genealogical mythology from perceived dross. Thus, the memory of Athaliah, much like the memory of Jezebel, was successively (and negatively) modified in the production and reproduction of the Books of Kings.

## Bibliography

- “Offizielles Verzeichnis der Rahlfs-Sigeln: Herausgegeben vom Septuaginta-Unternehmen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen” <http://septuaginta-unternehmen.adw-goe.de>.
- Ackerman, S. “The Queen Mother and the Cult in Ancient Israel.” *JBL* 112/3 (1993):385-401.
- Adams, M. J., B. Halpern, and A. Lemaire. *The Books of Kings Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Althusser, L. *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.
- Auld, A. G. *I & II Kings*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Bakhtin, M. M., and M. Holquist. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. University of Texas Press Slavic Series. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994.
- Bakhtin, M. M., Michael H, and C. Emerson. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. University of Texas Press Slavic Series. 1st ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Bankowicz, Marek. *Coup D'Etat a Critical Theoretical Synthesis*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012.
- Barbe, C. “Colpo di stato.” in *Politica e Societa*, vol I. (La Nuova Italia, Firenze, 1979).
- Barré, L. M. *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion: The Narrative Artistry and Political Intentions of 2 Kings 9-11*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Monograph Series. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988.
- Barrick, B. “Another Shaking of Jehoshaphat’s Family Tree.” *VT* 51/1 (2001): 9-25.
- Barthelemy, D. *Les devanciers d' Aquila*. VTSup 10; Leiden, 1963.
- . *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*. Textual Criticism and the Translator. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Barton, J., and J. Muddiman. *The Pentateuch*. Oxford Bible Commentary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Beckman, G. “The Bilingual Edict of Ḫattušili.” Pages 79-81 in *COS*, vol. 2. Edited by W. Hallo and L. Younger, New York: Brill, 2000.
- Begrich, J. “Berit. Ein Beitrag zur Erfassung einer alttestamentlichen Denkform.” *ZAW* 60 (1944): 1-11.
- Bentzen, A. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 6th ed. 2 vols Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1961.

- Ben Zvi, E. "Prophets and Prophecy in the Compositional and Redactional Notes in I – II Kings." *ZAW* 105/3 (1993):331-351.
- Borger, R. *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs Von Assyrien*. Archiv Für Orientforschung. Graz: E. Weidner, 1956.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Brooke, A. E, N. McLean, and H. St J. Thackeray. *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Vol. 2, The Later Historical Books*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- Brown, P., and S. C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Burney, C. F. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Busto-Saiz, J. R., and N. F. Marcos. *El Texto Antioqueno De La Biblia Griega. II, 1-2 Reyes*. Madrid: Instituto de Filologia, C.S.I.C, 1992.
- Charpin, D. "The History of Ancient Mesopotamia." Pages 807-829 in *CANE*, vol. I, Edited by J. Sasson, et al. New York: Schribner, 1995.
- Cogan, M., and H. Tadmor. *II Kings : A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible,. 1st ed. Garden City: Doubleday, 1988.
- Conrad, J. *Karl Heinrich Grafts Arbeit am alten Testament:Studien zu einer wissenschaftlichen Biographie, BZAW 425*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Couey, J. B. "Amos vii 10-17 and Royal Attitudes toward Prophecy in the Ancient Near East." *VT* 58/3 (2008): 300-314.
- Cribb, B. H. *Speaking on the Brink of Sheol Form and Message of Old Testament Death Stories*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- Cross, F. M. "Notes on the Forged Plaque Recording Repairs to the Temple." *IEJ* 53/1 (2003): 119-122.
- . *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic; Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Dietrich, W. "Prophetie im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk." Pages 47-65 in Thomas Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. BETL 147. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

- . *Prophetie Und Geschichte: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* [in German and Hebrew text]. Forschungen Zur Religion Und Literatur Des Alten Und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Dion, P. "Aramean Tribes and Nations of First-Millennium Western Asia." Pages 1281-1294 in *CANE*. vol. 1. New York: Schribner, 1995.
- Dirksen, P. B. "The OT Peshitta." Pages 255-297 in *Mikra, Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. J. Mulder. Philadelphia, 1988.
- . *An Annotated Bibliography of the Peshitta of the OT*. Monographs of the Peshitta Institute 5. Leiden, 1989.
- Dirksen, P. B. and M. J. Mulder, *The Peshitta—Its Early Text and History*. Leiden, 1988.
- Douglas, M. *Natural Symbols Explorations in Cosmology*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. The International Theological Library. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1891.
- Dutcher-Walls, Patricia. *Narrative Art, Political Rhetoric : The Case of Athaliah and Joash*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Eissfeldt, O., and P. R. Ackroyd. *The Old Testament, an Introduction Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and Also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran; the History of the Formation of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Eph'al, I. "The 'Jehoash Inscription': A Forgery." *IEJ* 53/1 (2003):123-128.
- Etz, D. V. "The Genealogical Relationships of Jehoram and Ahaziah, and of Ahaz and Hezekiah, Kings of Judah," *JSOT* 71 (1996): 39-53.
- Fairclough, N. and R. Wodak, "Critical Discourse Analysis." Pages 258-284 in *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Edited by T. A. van Dijk. London: Sage, 1997.
- Fairclough, N.. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.
- . *Language and Power*. Language in Social Life Series. London: Longman, 1989.
- Field, F. *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt; Sive, Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragments. Post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, Et Monte-Falconium, Adhibita Etiam Versione Syrohexaplari*. 2 vols. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1964.
- Foucault, M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.



- Fritz, V. *1 & 2 Kings*. Continental Commentaries. 1st English language ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Gelb, I. J. "Two Assyrian Kings Lists." *JNES* XIII, No. 4 (1954):209-230.
- Gelston, A. *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Glaser, E. *Altjemenische Nachrichten*. Princeton: Straub, 1906.
- Goldstone, J. A. "Revolution." Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Science at Stanford University, Jan. 1997.
- Goren, Y. "An Alternative Interpretation of the Stone Tablet with Ancient Hebrew Inscription Attributed to Jehoash King of Judah." *The Bible and Interpretation*, (Feb, 2003). Online: [http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/alternative\\_interpretation.shtml](http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/alternative_interpretation.shtml).
- Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta." *ScrHier* 8 (1961): 26-67.
- . "trgwym swryym," *EncBib* 8 (1982): 847-854.
- Gottlieb, H. and E. Hammershaimb, *The Books of Kings. The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version*. Part II, fasc. 4. Leiden:Brill, 1976.
- Graf, K. H. "Die s.g. Grudschrift des Pentateuchs." Pages 466-477 in *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments* hg.v. Adalbert Merx. Bd. 1, 1869.
- . *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher Des Alten Testaments: Zwei Historisch-Kritische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1866.
- Gramsci, A. "The Intellectuals," Pages 3-23 in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and Translated by Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- , Quintin Hoare, and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Gray, J. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. 2nd, fully rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
- Grayson, A. Kirk. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BCI (1114-859 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Gutting, G. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. Cambridge Companions to Philosophy. 2nd ed. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Halliday, M. A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: E. Arnold, 1985.

- Halliday, M. A. K., Ruqaiya Hasan, and Deakin University. School of Education. Open Campus Program. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. [Deakin, Vic., Australia]: Deakin University Press, 1985.
- Hallo, W. W., and K. L. Younger. *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Halpern, B. "The Stele from Dan: Epigraphic and Historical Considerations." *BASOR* 296 (1994): 63-80.
- . *The Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel*. Harvard Semitic Monographs. Chico: Scholars, 1981.
- Hayes, J. H. and P. K. Hooker, *A New Chronology for the Kings of Israel and Judah*. Atlanta: Knox, 1988.
- Heltzer, M. *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit : (Royal Service-System, Taxes, Royal Economy, Army, and Administration)*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 1982.
- Hoffmann, H-D. *Reform Und Reformen: Untersuchungen Zu Einem Grundthema Der Deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Abhandlungen Zur Theologie Des Alten Und Neuen Testaments. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980.
- Huntington, S. P. "Patterns of Violence in World Politics." Pages 75-93 in *Changing Patterns of Military Politics*. Edited by S. P. Huntington. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
- Jones, G. H. *1 and 2 Kings*. New Century Bible Commentary. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1984.
- Kaufman, S. A. *Targum Chronicles*. CAL. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College 2005.
- . *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*. CAL. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 2005.
- Kittel, R., P. Kahle, O. Eissfeldt, H. Bardtke, H. P. Rüger, K. Elliger, W. Rudolph, and G. E. Weil. *Torah, Neviim U-Khetuvim = Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* [in Text in Hebrew; editorial matter in Latin.]. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969.
- Knauf, E. A. "The Queens' Story. Bathsheba, Maacah, Athaliah and the 'Historia of Early Kings'" *Lectio Difficilior* 2 (2002): 10. Cited 26 May 2014. Online: [http://www.lectio.unibe.ch/02\\_2/axel.htm](http://www.lectio.unibe.ch/02_2/axel.htm).
- Knoppers, G. "Theories and Redactions of Kings." Pages 69-88 in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography, and Reception*. Edited by A. Lemaire and B. Halpern, Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*. Harvard Semitic Monographs. 2 vols. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

- Koehler, L. H., and W. Baumgartner. *The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Kraft, R. A. "Septuagint, Earliest Greek Versions." *IDBSup*, 811-815
- Kristeva, J., and T. Moi. *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Lagarde, P. de. *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canoniorum Pars Prior Graece*. Gottingae: Prostat in aedibus Dieterichianis Arnoldi Hoyer, 1883.
- Leech, G. N. and J. Thomas, "Language, meaning and context:pragmatics." in *An Encyclopaedia of Language*. Edited by N. E. Collinge. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Leech, G. N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Linguistics Library. London: Longman, 1983.
- Levin, C. *Der Sturz Der Königin Atalja : Ein Kapitel Zur Geschichte Judas Im 9. Jahrhundert V. Chr.* Stuttgarter Bibelstudien. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1982.
- Lifshitz, F. "Beyond Positivism and Genre: 'Hagiographical' Texts as Historical Narrative," *Viator* 25 (1994):95-113.
- Long, B. O. *2 Kings*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Luttwak, E. *Coup D'etat: A Practical Handbook*. New York: A. Knopf, 1969.
- Mangueneau, *Nouvelles Tendances en Analyse de Discours*. Paris: Hachette, 1987.
- Malaparte, Curzio. *Technique Du Coup D'Etat*. Paris: B. Grasset, 1931.
- Maori, Y. *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis*. Jerusalem, 1995.
- Marx, K. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Translated by Daniel de Leon, Chicago: Charles H Kerr and Co., 1907.
- McCarter, K. P. *Textual Criticism Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. GBS. Edited by G. Tucker. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- . *II Samuel : A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. 1st ed. Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.
- McKenzie, S. L. *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.
- McMahon, G. "Instructions to the Royal Guard (Mešedi Protocol)." Pages 225-230 in *COS* vol 1. Edited by W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, New York: Brill, 2000.
- Mihalik, I. "Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11 by Julio C. Trebolle-Barrera." *JBL* 105.3 (1986):521-523.

- Millard, A. "Assyrian King Lists." Pages 463-465 in *COS* vol 1. Edited by W. Hallo and K. L. Younger. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Montgomery, J. A., and H. S. Gehman. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings*. International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951.
- Mulder, M. J. "The Use of the Peshitta in Textual Criticism." Pages 37-53 in *La Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea*. Edited by N. F. Marcos. Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid 1985.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek ≈Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters, 2010.
- . *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint : Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*. Louvain: Peeters, 2002.
- Na'aman, N. "Royal Inscriptions and the Histories of Joash and Ahaz, Kings of Judah." *VT* 48 (1998):339-341
- . "The Story of Jehu's Rebellion – Hazael's Inscription and the Biblical Narrative." *IEJ* 56 (2006):160-166.
- . "Three Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan." *IEJ* 50 (2000): 100-104.
- Naudé, G. *Considérations politiques sur le Coup d'État*. 1639
- Naveh, J. "The Tel Dan Inscription." Pages 256-273 in *Studies in West-Semitic Epigraphy*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2009.
- Nelson, R. D. *First and Second Kings*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1987.
- . *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.
- Noth, M. "Schriften der Königsbucher Gelehrten Gesellschaft." *Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse*, 18 (1943):43-266.
- . *The Deuteronomistic History* [in A translation of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, pp. 1-110 in the 2nd ed. published by Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 1957 (3rd unaltered ed., 1967).]. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. 2nd ed. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- . *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Vol. 1*. Schriften: Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse / Königsberger Gelehrte Gesellschaft. Halle, Saale, 1943.
- O'Farrell, Clare. *Michel Foucault*. London: SAGE Publications, 2005.

- Otto, S. *Jehu, Elia und Elisa. Die Erzählung von der Jehu-Revolution und die Komposition der Elia-Elisa-Erzählungen*. Stuttgart, 2001.
- Pakkala, J. *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History*. FES 76. Helsinki:FES and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Pritchard, James Bennett. *The Ancient Near East; Supplementary Texts and Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Rad, G. von, and D. Stalker. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Chicago, IL: Henry Regnery, 1953.
- Rahlfs, A. *Lucians Rezension Der Königsbücher*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.
- Rendsburg, G. "No Stelae, No Queens: Two Issues Concerning the Kings of Israel and Judah," Pages 95-107 in *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the "Other" in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*. Edited by D. R. Edwards and C. T. McCullough. Boston:ASOR, 2007.
- Rendtorff, R. *The Old Testament : An Introduction*. London: SCM, 1985.
- Rhodokanakis, N. *Enactment of Fundamental Constitutional Law in Old South Arabia*, *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.* 67 (1928): 207.
- Robinson, J. *The Second Book of Kings*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary, New English Bible. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Rofé, A. "The Historical Significance of Secondary Readings." Pages 393-402 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning, Studies in Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by C. A. Evans and S. Talmon. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story." *VT* 38/1 (1998): 89-104.
- Römer, T. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Rudolph, W. "Die Einheitlichkeit der Erzählung vom Sturz der Atalja." Pages 473-478 in *Festschrift Bertholet*, 1950.
- Schmitt, A. *Stammt der sogenannte "6"-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* NAWG I, Phil.-hist. Kl.; Göttingen, 1966.
- Schniedewind, W. M. "Tel Dan Stele: New Light on Aramaic and Jehu's Revolt." *BASOR* 302 (1996): 75-90.
- Schulte, H. "Die Rettung des Prinzen Joas." *ZAW* 109 (1997): 549-556.

- Sergi, O. "Judah's Expansion in Historical Context." *Tel Aviv* 40 (2013): 226-246.
- . "The Composition of Nathan's Oracle to David (2 Samuel 7:1-17) as a Reflection of Royal Judahite Ideology." *JBL* 129/2 (2010): 261-279.
- Smend, R. "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte." Pages 494-509 in *Probleme Biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. W. Wolff. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971.
- . *Die Entstehung Des Alten Testaments*. Theologische Wissenschaft. 3., durchgesehene Aufl. ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984.
- Smith, J. Z. "Religion, Religions, Religious," Pages 269-284 in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. Edited by M. Taylor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Stade, B. *ZAW* 5 (1885):279-288.
- Steck, O. H. *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology*. Resources for Biblical Study. 2nd ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Sweeney, M. A. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. 1st ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
- Tan, N. N. H.. *The "Foreignness" of the Foreign Woman in Proverbs 1-9 : A Study of the Origin and Development of a Biblical Motif*. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2008.
- Tov, E. "Lucian and Proto-Lucian." Pages 477-488 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible – Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Trebolle-Barrera, J. C., "La coronación de Joás (2 Re 11): Texto, narración e historia," *EstBib* 41 (1983): 5-16.
- . *Jehú Y Joás : Texto Y Composición Literaria De 2 Reyes 9-11*. Institución San Jerónimo. Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1984.
- Trotsky, Leon. *The Permanent Revolution; Results and Prospects*. London: New Park, 1962.
- Veijola, T. *Das Königtum in Der Beurteilung Der Deuteronomistischen Historiographie : Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia Sarja B, Nide 198. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977.
- . *Die Ewige Dynastie : David Und Die Entstehung Seiner Dynastie Nach Der Deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Toimituksia - Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae : Sarja-Ser B, Nide-Tom 193. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.

- Voobus, A. "Syriac Versions," *IDBSup*, 848-854.
- Walter, D. M. "The Use of Sources in the Peshitta of Kings" Pages 187-204 in *The Peshitta as a Translation. Papers Read at the II Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden 19-21 Aug 1993*. Edited by P. B. Dirksen and A. van der Kooij. New York: Brill, 1995.
- Weitzman, M. P. "From Judaism to Christianity—The Syriac Version of the Hebrew Bible." in *The Jews among Pagans in the Roman Empire*. Edited by J. M. Lieu et al. London: Routledge, 1994.
- . "The Peshitta Psalter and Its Hebrew *Vorlage*." *VT* 35 (1985): 341-354.
- . *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Der Text Der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1871.
- . *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel : With a Reprint of the Article, Israel, from the Encyclopedia Britannica*. Meridian Library. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Whiston, W.. *The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus, the Learned and Authentic Jewish Historian and Celebrated Warrior, to Which Are Added Seven Dissertations Concerning Jesus Christ, John the Baptist, James the Just, God's Command to Abraham, Etc.* Philadelphia: J. C. Winston Co., 1957.
- Williams, R. *Key Words: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Wodak, R, and M. Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Introducing Qualitative Methods. 2nd ed. London: SAGE, 2009.
- Würthwein, E., and P. R. Ackroyd. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to Kittel-Kahle's Biblia Hebraica*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.
- Younger, K. L. "The Kurkh Monolith (2.113A)." Pages 261-264 in *COS*, vol 2. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Zerubavel, E. *Ancestors and Relatives Genealogy, Identity, and Community*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Kaige, Lucian, r/700, 2 Chr 22:10-23:21

Verse	2 Kings 11 – Kaige	2 Kings 11 – Lucianic Text (boc <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> )	2 Kings 11 – Preferring (r or 700)	2 Chronicles 22.10
1	Καὶ Γοθολια ἡ μήτηρ Οχοζίου εἶδεν ὅτι ἀπέθανον οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀπώλεσεν πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῆς βασιλείας	καὶ Γοθολια ἡ μητηρ Οχοζίας εἶδεν ὅτι ἀπεθανεν Οχοζίας ὁ υἱος αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνεστη καὶ ἀπώλεσε πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῆς βασιλείας	καὶ Γοθολια ἡ μητηρ <u>Ϟ</u> Οχοζίας εἶδεν ὅτι ἀπεθανεν Οχοζίας ὁ υἱος αὐτῆς, <u>καὶ ἀνεστη</u> καὶ ἀπώλεσε <u>πᾶν</u> τὸ σπέρμα τῆς βασιλείας	22.10 Καὶ Γοθολια ἡ μήτηρ Οχοζία/Οχοζίου ( <b>bfgrze<sub>2</sub></b> ) εἶδεν ὅτι/ἦλθε καὶ ( <b>a</b> ) τέθνηκεν [ <b>ο υἱος (bdm-ze<sub>2</sub>)</b> ] αὐτῆς/αὐτῆ ( <b>a</b> ) ὁ υἱός, καὶ ἠγέρθη/ἀνεστη ( <b>bc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub></b> ) ἠγέρθη ( <b>dm-z<sup>mth</sup></b> ) καὶ ἀπώλεσεν πᾶν/πᾶν ( <b>dn-z</b> ) [τὸ σπέρμα τῆς βασιλείας[[αυτου (A)]] /τῆς βασιλείας τὸ σπέρμα (ny)] ἐν τῷ ( <b>be<sub>2</sub></b> ) οἴκῳ/ οἴκῳ ( <b>g</b> )/οἴκου ( <b>a</b> ) Ἰουδα.
2	καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἰωσαβεε θυγάτηρ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰωραμ ἀδελφῆ Οχοζίου τὸν Ἰωας υἱὸν ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς καὶ ἔκλειψεν αὐτὸν ἐκ μέσου τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν θανατουμένων, αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν τροφὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ ταμείῳ τῶν κλινῶν καὶ ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ προσώπου Γοθολίας, καὶ οὐκ ἐθανατώθη.	καὶ ελαβεν Ἰωσαβαι ἡ θυγατηρ του βασιλεως Ἰωραμ ἀδελφῆ δε Οχοζίου τον Ἰωας υιον Οχοζίου του ἀδελφου αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκλειψεν αὐτον εκ μεσου των υιων του βασιλεως των θανατουμενων, αὐτον καὶ τὴν τροφον αὐτου καὶ ἐκρυψεν αὐτον εν τῷ ταμείῳ των κλινων εκ προσώπου Γοθολίας, καὶ οὐκ ἐθανατώθη	καὶ ελαβεν <u>Ἰωσαβεε ἡ</u> θυγατηρ του βασιλεως Ἰωραμ ἀδελφῆ Οχοζίου <u>δε</u> τον Ἰωας υιον <u>Οχοζίου/Οχιζίου του</u> ἀδελφου αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκλειψεν αὐτον εκ μεσου των υιων του βασιλεως των θανατουμενων, <u>αὐτων</u> καὶ τὴν <u>τροφην</u> αὐτου <u>καὶ ἐκρυψεν αὐτον</u> εν τῷ ταμείῳ των κλινων <u>ἐκ</u> προσώπου Γοθολίας, καὶ οὐκ ἐθανατώθη	22.11 καὶ/καὶ ἠγερέθη ( <b>dm-z<sup>mth</sup></b> ) ἔλαβεν [[Ἰωσαβεθ/[[Ἰωσαβετ ( <b>h</b> )/Ἰωσαβεε ( <b>b'y</b> )/Ἰωσαβαι ( <b>be<sub>2</sub></b> )] η/[[ἡ ( <b>dgn-z</b> )] θυγατηρ του/[[του ( <b>n</b> )] βασιλέως / ἡ θυγάτηρ τοῦ βασιλέως ( <b>B</b> )] τὸν/τον ( <b>g</b> ) Ἰωας/Ἰωας ( <b>N</b> )/Ἰας ( <b>g:abrev</b> )/Ἰωσίας ( <b>c<sub>2</sub></b> ) τον ( <b>g</b> ) υἱὸν Οχοζία/Οχοζίου ( <b>bfgnp<sup>a</sup>q-ze<sub>2</sub></b> )/Χοζίου ( <b>dp*</b> ) καὶ ἔκλειψεν αὐτὸν ἐκ μέσου των ( <b>AN abce-je<sub>2</sub></b> ) υἱῶν τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν θανατουμένων/τεθανατουμένων ( <b>n<sup>a</sup></b> ) καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν/αὐτῷ ( <b>74</b> ) καὶ τὴν τροφὸν/τροφήν ( <b>efginc<sub>2</sub></b> ) αὐτοῦ [εἰς [[το ( <b>Nace</b> )] ταμείον/[[ταμειον ( <b>mnt</b> )/το ταμειον( <b>Af-j</b> )]]/εν τῷ ταμείῳ( <b>be<sub>2</sub></b> )] τῶν/τῶν ( <b>B</b> ) κλινῶν, καὶ ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἀπο προσώπου Γοθολία ( <b>p</b> ) Ἰωσαβεθ/Ἰωσαβεε ( <b>Byc<sub>2</sub></b> )/Ἰωσαβεθ ( <b>e</b> )/Ἰωσαβεθ ( <b>n</b> )/ Ἰωσαβεθ ( <b>be<sub>2</sub></b> ) ἡ ( <b>bdmz-e<sub>2</sub></b> ) θυγάτηρ τοῦ/τοῦ ( <b>m</b> ) βασιλέως Ἰωραμ/Ἰωας ( <b>B*c<sub>2</sub></b> ) τον Ἰωας ( <b>be<sub>2</sub></b> ) Ἰωσαβαι [[-βεε ( <b>b'</b> )] η ( <b>be<sub>2</sub></b> ) ἀδελφῆ Οχοζίου [[[η ( <b>be<sub>2</sub></b> )] γυνή/[[γυνή ( <b>m</b> )] Ἰωδαε/[[Ἰωδα ( <b>g</b> )/Ἰωαδα



				(ANahm)/Ιωιαδαε (j)/ Ioidae (Arm.)]]/Ιωδαε αδελφοι(B*)/Ιωραμ αδελφοι (c <sub>2</sub> ) του ιερεως [και/[[ <b>καί</b> (B <sup>ab</sup> AN tell and Arm.)]] ἐκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ προσώπου Γοθολιας, και οὐκ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν/ <b>και των</b> <b>θανατουμενων και εδωκεν</b> <b>αυτον και την τροφον αυτου</b> <b>εις ταμειον των κλινων (d)].</b>
3	αὶ ἦν μετ' αὐτῆς ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου κρυβόμενος ἐξ ἔτη, καὶ Γοθολια βασιλεύουσα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	και ην μετ' αυτης εν οικω κυριου κεκρυμμενος εξ ετη, και Γοθαλια εβασιλευσεν επι της γης	και ην μετ' αυτης εν οικω κυριου <b>κεκρυμμενος</b> εξ ετη, και Γοθαλια <b>εβασιλευσεν</b> επι της γης	22.12 και <b>Ιωας (be<sub>2</sub>)</b> ἦν [μετ' αὐτῆς/[[ <b>αυτου</b> (Bhmc <sub>2</sub> )]]] ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ/[[ <b>τοῦ (c)</b> ]] θεοῦ/[[ <b>τοῦ-θεοῦ</b> (d)]]/[[ <b>ἐν-οἴκῳ-τοῦ-θεοῦ (t</b> <b>and Arm.<sup>mth</sup>)</b> ]] [ <sup>2</sup> κατακεκρυμμένος [[ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ (Arm. <sup>mth</sup> )]]]/κεκρῆμμενος μετα Ιωδαε εν τω οικω του θῦ (be <sub>2</sub> )/μετα της τυγατρος του βασιλεως και της τροφου αυτου (44) ἐξ ἔτη/[[ <b>ἐξ-ἔτη</b> (a <sup>mth</sup> )]]]/κατακεκρυμμένος <b>ἐξ-ἔτη (h)</b> ] <sup>2</sup> , και ἐξ ἔτη (a <sup>mth</sup> ) Γοθολια/Γοθολιας (me <sub>2</sub> )/Γοθονιας (c <sub>2</sub> )/Γοθολια (a <sup>mth</sup> ) ἐβασιλευσεν Γοθολια (a <sup>mth</sup> ) ἐπὶ/ἐπὶ (h) τῆς γῆς
4	καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἐβδόμῳ ἀπέστειλεν Ιωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἐκατοντάρχους, τὸν Χορρι καὶ τὸν Ρασειμ, καὶ ἀπήγαγεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον κυρίου καὶ διέθετο αὐτοῖς διαθήκην κυρίου καὶ ὥρκισεν αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον κυρίου, καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς Ιωδαε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως	και εν τω ετει τω εβδομω απεστειλεν Ιωδαε ο ιερευς και ελαβε τους εκατονταρχους των παρατρεχοντων και τον Χορρει και τον Ρασειμ, και εισηγαγεν αυτους προς εαυτον εις τον οικον κυριου και διεθετο αυτοις διαθηκην και ωρκισεν αυτους ενωπιον κυριου και εδειξεν αυτοις τον υιον του βασιλεως	και εν τω ετει τω εβδομω απεστειλεν Ιωδαε ο ιερευς και ελαβε τους εκατονταρχους <b>των</b> <b>παρατρεχοντων και</b> τον Χορρει και τον Ρασειμ, και <b>εισηγαγεν</b> αυτους <b>προς</b> <b>εαυτον</b> εις τον οικον κυριου και διεθετο αυτοις διαθηκην και <b>ωρκισεν</b> αυτους <b>εν</b> <b>οικῳ κυριου</b> και εδειξεν αυτοις <b>Ιωδαε</b> τον υιον του βασιλεως	23.1 [Καὶ [[ <b>εγενετο (m)</b> ]] ἐν [[ <b>ἐν (g)</b> ]]/En δε (be <sub>2</sub> )] τῷ [ἔτει τῷ ἐβδόμῳ/ετει τω ογδῳ (Bc <sub>2</sub> )]/εβδομω ετει (44) ἐκραταίωσεν/εκραταιωθη (a)/ενισχυσεν (be <sub>2</sub> ) Ιωδαε καὶ ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἐκατοντάρχους/εκατονταρχα ς (AN acfhjn), [τὸν Αζαριαν [[ <b>Ζαχαριαν (c<sub>2</sub>)</b> ]] [[υἱὸν Ιωραμ και/υἱὸν-Ιωραμ και (m)/και τον υἱὸν Ιωραμ και (qtz)]]] τὸν/[[ <b>τὸν (qtz)</b> ]] Ισμαηλ/[[ <b>Ισμαηλ</b> (n <sup>mth</sup> )]/ησμαηλ (g)] [[υἱὸν Ιωαναν/[[ <b>Ιωαναν</b> (g)/Ιωαναν (Nbec <sub>2</sub> & Arm.)/Ιαναν (f)/Ιωνα (nq- z)]]]/υἱὸν-Ιωαναν (m)] [[ <b>Ισμαηλ (n<sup>mth</sup>)</b> ]]/τὸν <b>Αζαριαν υἱὸν-Ιωραμ και τὸν</b> <b>Ισμαηλ υἱὸν-Ιωαναν (dp)</b> καὶ τὸν/τὸν (m) Αζαριαν υἱὸν Ωβηδ τὸν (fjnq-z <sup>mth</sup> ) καὶ τὸν/τὸν (fjnq-z <sup>mth</sup> ) Μαασαϊαν υἱὸν Αδαϊα και

				τὸν Ελισαφάν υἱὸν Ζαχαρία, μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον. 22.2-3 καὶ ἐκύκλωσαν τὸν Ιουδαν καὶ συνήγαγον τοὺς Λευίτας ἐκ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων Ιουδα καὶ ἄρχοντας πατριῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. <sup>3</sup> καὶ διέθεντο πᾶσα ἐκκλησία Ιουδα διαθήκην ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰδοὺ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ βασιλέως βασιλευσάτω, καθὼς ἐλάλησεν κύριος ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Δαυὶδ.
5	καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς λέγων Οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὃν ποιήσετε, τὸ τρίτον ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰσελθέτω τὸ σάββατον καὶ φυλάξτε φυλακὴν οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι	καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτο τὸ ρῆμα ὁ ποιήσετε, τὸ τρίτον ἐξ ὑμῶν οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ σάββατον φυλάσσετε τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως	καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς λέγων <u>τοῦτο τὸ ρῆμα ὁ</u> ποιήσετε, τὸ τρίτον ἐξ ὑμῶν <u>οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ σάββατον</u> φυλάσσετε τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως <u>ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι</u>	22.4 νῦν ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὃν ποιήσετε, τὸ τρίτον ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰσπορευέσθωσαν τὸ σάββατον, τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν Λευιτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰς πύλας τῶν εἰσόδων,
6	καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐν τῇ πύλῃ τῶν ὁδῶν καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς πύλης ὀπίσω τῶν παρατρεχόντων, καὶ φυλάξτε τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ οἴκου	καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐν τῇ πύλῃ τῶν ὁδῶν καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐν τῇ πύλῃ ὀπίσω τῶν παρατρεχόντων καὶ φυλάξατε τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ οἴκου Μεσσαε	καὶ τὸ τρίτον <u>ἐν τῇ πύλῃ</u> τῶν ὁδῶν καὶ τὸ τρίτον <u>ἐν τῇ πύλῃ</u> ὀπίσω τῶν παρατρεχόντων καὶ φυλάξατε τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ οἴκου <u>Μεσσαε</u>	
7	καὶ δύο χεῖρες ἐν ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὁ ἐκπορευόμενος τὸ σάββατον, καὶ φυλάξουσιν τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου κυρίου πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα	καὶ δύο χεῖρες ἐν ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος τὸ σάββατον, φυλάξουσι τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα	καὶ δύο χεῖρες ἐν ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὁ <u>εἰσπορευόμενος</u> τὸ σάββατον, φυλάξουσι τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου κυρίου <u>ἐπὶ</u> τὸν βασιλέα	
8	καὶ κυκλώσατε ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύκλῳ, ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος εἰς τὰ σαδηρωθ ἀποθάνεται. καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορευέσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι αὐτόν.	καὶ καταστήσατε εαυτοὺς περὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύκλῳ ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος εἰς τὰ σαδηρωθ καὶ ἀποθάνεται. Καὶ γίνεσθε μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορευέσθαι αὐτόν καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι αὐτόν.	καὶ <u>καταστήσατε ΑΥΤΟΙΣ</u> περὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύκλῳ ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν <u>τῇ</u> χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, <u>καὶ</u> ὁ <u>εἰσπορευόμενος</u> εἰς τὰ σαδηρωθ <u>ΚΑΙ</u> ἀποθάνεται. Καὶ <u>γίνεσθε</u> μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορευέσθαι αὐτόν καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι <u>αὐτόν</u> .	
9	καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι πάντα, ὅσα ἐνετείλατο Ἰωδαε ὁ συνετός, καὶ ἔλαβον ἀνὴρ τοὺς ἀνδρας αὐτοῦ τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους τὸ σάββατον μετὰ τῶν ἐκπορευομένων τὸ σάββατον καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς Ἰωδαε τὸν ἱερέα.	καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς Ἰωδαε ὁ συνετός ἱερεὺς καὶ ἐγένοντο μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι αὐτόν, καὶ ἔλαβον ἕκαστος τοὺς ἀνδρας αὐτοῦ τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους τὸ σάββατον μετὰ τῶν	καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι <u>κατὰ</u> πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο <u>αὐτοῖς</u> Ἰωδαε ὁ συνετός <u>ἱερεὺς</u> καὶ ἐγένοντο μετὰ τοῦ <u>βασιλέως ἐν τῷ</u> <u>ἐκπορευέσθαι αὐτόν</u> <u>καὶ ἐν τῷ</u> εἰσπορευέσθαι <u>αὐτόν</u> , καὶ <u>ἔλαβον</u> <sup>208</sup> <u>ἕκαστος</u> τοὺς ἀνδρας αὐτοῦ	23.8 καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ Λευῖται καὶ πᾶς Ιουδα κατὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἐνετείλατο Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ ἔλαβον ἕκαστος τοὺς ἀνδρας αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τοῦ σαββάτου ἕως ἐξόδου τοῦ σαββάτου, ὅτι οὐ κατέλυσε Ιωδαε τὰς ἐφημερίας.

<sup>208</sup> In agreement with all others

		εισπορευομενων και εκπορευομενων το σαββατον και εισηλθον προς Ιωδαε τον ιερα	<del>και</del> τους εισπορευομενους το σαββατον <u>μετα των εισπορευομενων και εκπορευομενων το σαββατον</u> και <u>εισηλθεν</u> προς <u>Ιουδαε</u> τον ιερα	
10	και ἔδωκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις τοὺς σειρομάστας καὶ τοὺς τρισσοὺς τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυιδ τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου.	και εδωκεν αυτοις ο ιερευς τοις εκατονταρχοις τας φαρετρας και τα δορατα Δαυιδ του βασιλεως α ην εν οικω κυριου και ησαν εν ταις χερσιν αυτων. Και εποησαν οι εκατονταρχοι και παρατρεχοντες κατα παντα α ενετειλατο αυτοις Ιωδαε ο ιερευς.	και εδωκεν <u>αυτοις</u> ο ιερευς τοις εκατονταρχοις <u>τας φαρετρας</u> και <u>τα δορατα Δαυιδ</u> του βασιλεως <u>α ην εν οικω κυριου</u> και <u>ησαν εν ταις χερσιν αυτων</u> . <u>Και εποησαν οι εκατονταρχοι και παρατρεχοντες κατα παντα α ενετειλατο αυτοις Ιωδαε ο ιερευς</u> .	23.9 και ἔδωκεν τὰς μαχαίρας καὶ τοὺς θυρεοὺς καὶ τὰ ὄπλα, ἃ ἦν τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυιδ, ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ.
11	καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ παρατρέχοντες, ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς δεξιᾶς ἕως τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς εὐωνύμου τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύκλῳ	και εστησαν οι παρατρεχοντες εκαστος και τα σκευη αυτου εν τη χειρι αυτου απο της ωμιας του οικου της δεξιας εως της ομιας της του οικου της αριστερας του θυσιαστηριου και του οικου περι τον βασιλεα κυκλω. και εξεκκλησιασεν Ιωδαε ο ιερευς παντα τον λαον της γης εις οικον κυριου.	<del>και εστησαν οι παρατρεχοντες εκαστος</del> και <u>τα σκευη</u> αυτου εν τη χειρι αυτου απο της ωμιας του οικου της δεξιας εως της ομιας της του οικου της <u>αριστερας</u> του θυσιαστηριου και του οικου <u>περι</u> τον βασιλεα κυκλω. (12) <u>και εξεκκλησιασεν Ιωδαε ο ιερευς παντα τον λαον της γης εις οικον κυριου</u> .	23.10 καὶ ἔστησεν πάντα τὸν λαόν, ἕκαστον ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς δεξιᾶς ἕως τῆς ὠμίας τῆς ἀριστερᾶς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύκλῳ.
12	καὶ ἐξάπεστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ νεζερ καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔχρισεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκρότησαν τῇ χειρὶ καὶ εἶπαν Ζήτω ὁ βασιλεὺς.	και εξηγαγε τον υιον του βασιλεως και εδωκεν επ' αυτον το αγιασμα και το μαρτυριον και εχρισεν αυτον και εβασιλευσεν αυτον και εκροτησαν ο λαος ταις χερσιν αυτων και ειπον Ζητω ο βασιλευς.	και <u>εξηγαγε</u> τον υιον του βασιλεως και εδωκεν επ' αυτον <u>το αγιασμα</u> και το μαρτυριον και <u>εχρισεν</u> αυτον και <u>εβασιλευσεν</u> αυτον και <u>εκροτησαν</u> ο λαος <u>ταις χερσιν αυτων</u> και <u>ειπον</u> Ζητω ο βασιλευς.	23.11 καὶ ἐξήγαγεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ βασιλεῖον καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια, καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν καὶ ἔχρισαν αὐτὸν Ιωδαε καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπαν Ζήτω ὁ βασιλεὺς.
13	καὶ ἤκουσεν Γοθολία τὴν φωνὴν τῶν τρεχόντων τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν λαὸν εἰς οἶκον κυρίου	και ηκουσε Γοθολια την φωνην των παρατρεχοντων και του λαου και ηλθε προς τον λαον εις οικον κυριου.	και ηκουσε Γοθολια την φωνην των <u>παρατρεχοντων</u> και του λαου και <u>ηλθε</u> προς τον λαον εις οικον κυριου.	23.12 καὶ ἤκουσεν Γοθολία τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν τρεχόντων καὶ ἐξομολογουμένων καὶ αἰνούντων τὸν βασιλέα καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα εἰς οἶκον κυρίου.
14	καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰσθῆκει ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου κατὰ τὸ κρίμα, καὶ οἱ ὦδοι κατὰ αἰ σάλπιγγες πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς χαίρων καὶ σαλπίζων ἐν σάλπιγγιν, καὶ διέρρηξεν Γοθολία τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐβόησεν Σύνδεσμος σύνδεσμος.	και ειδεν, και ιδου ο βασιλευς ειστηκει επι του στυλου κατα το κριμα, και οι ωδοι και αι σαλπιδες και οι στρατηγοι περι τον βασιλεα και πας ο λαος χαιρων και σαλπιδων εν σαλπιδιν, και διερρηξεν τον ιματισμον αυτης Γοθολια και εβοησε Συνδεσμος συνδεσμος.	και ειδεν, και ιδου ο βασιλευς ειστηκει επι του στυλου κατα το κριμα, και οι ωδοι και αι σαλπιδες <u>και οι στρατηγοι περι</u> τον βασιλεα και πας ο λαος <u>της γης</u> χαιρων και <u>εσαλπιδων</u> εν σαλπιδιν, και διερρηξεν <u>Γοθολια τα ιματια εαυτης τον ιματισμον αυτης Γοθολια</u> και εβοησε <u>Συνδεσμον</u> συνδεσμος.	και εἶδεν καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς στάσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς εἰσόδου οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ αἱ σάλπιγγες περὶ τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἠψφράθη καὶ ἐσάλπισαν ἐν ταῖς σάλπιγγιν καὶ οἱ ἄδοντες ἐν τοῖς ὄργανοις ὦδοι καὶ ὑμνοῦντες αἶνον, καὶ διέρρηξεν Γοθολία τὴν στολὴν αὐτῆς καὶ ἐβόησεν καὶ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιθέμενοι ἐπιτίθεσθε.

15	καὶ ἐνετείλατο Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις τοῖς ἐπισκόποις τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Ἐξαγάγετε αὐτὴν ἔσωθεν τῶν σαδηρωθ, καὶ ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος ὀπίσω αὐτῆς θανάτῳ θανατωθήσεται ῥομφαία, ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ ἱερεὺς Καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου.	καὶ ἐνετείλατο Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις τοῖς ἐπι τῆς δυνάμεως οὖς κατέστησε καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐξαγάγετε αὐτὴν ἔσωθεν τῶν σαδηρωθ καὶ εἰσαγάγετε αὐτὴν ὀπισθεν οἴκου τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ θανατώσατε αὐτὴν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ μὴ θανατώσατε αὐτὴν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου καὶ ἐστὶ πας ὁ εἰσπρευόμενος ὀπίσω αὐτῆς ἀποθάνεται.	καὶ ἐνετείλατο Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις καὶ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπι τῆς δυνάμεως οὖς κατέστησε <sup>209</sup> καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐξαγάγετε αὐτὴν ἔσωθεν τῶν σαδηρωθ καὶ ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος ὀπίσω αὐτῆς θανάτῳ θανατωθήσεται ῥομφαία, ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ ἱερεὺς. Καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου <sup>210</sup> εἰσαγάγετε αὐτὴν ὀπισθεν οἴκου τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ θανατώσατε αὐτὴν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ μὴ θανατώσατε αὐτὴν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου καὶ ἐστὶ πας ὁ εἰσπρευόμενος ὀπίσω αὐτῆς ἀποθάνεται.	23.14 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ ἐνετείλατο Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις καὶ τοῖς ἀρχηγοῖς τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἐκβάλετε αὐτὴν ἐκτὸς τοῦ οἴκου καὶ εἰσέλθατε ὀπίσω αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀποθανέτω μαχαίρᾳ, ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ ἱερεὺς Μὴ ἀποθανέτω ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου.
16	καὶ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῇ χεῖρας, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ὁδὸν εἰσόδου τῶν ἵππων οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀπέθανεν ἐκεῖ	καὶ ἐπέβαλον αὐτῇ χεῖρας καὶ εἰσηγάγον αὐτὴν ὁδὸν εἰσόδου τῶν ἵππων οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἐθανάτωσαν αὐτὴν ἐκεῖ.	καὶ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῇ χεῖρας καὶ εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν εἰσόδου τῶν ἵππων οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀπέθανεν αὐτὴν ἐκεῖ.	23.15 καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῇ ἄνεσιν, καὶ διήλθεν διὰ τῆς πύλης τῶν ἵππῶν τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐθανάτωσαν αὐτὴν ἐκεῖ
17	καὶ διέθετο Ἰωδαε διαθήκην ἀνὰ μέσον κυρίου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ εἶναι εἰς λαὸν τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ λαοῦ	καὶ διέθετο Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς διαθήκην ἀνα μέσον κυρίου καὶ ἀνα μέσον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀνα μέσον τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ εἶναι εἰς λαὸν τῷ κυρίῳ.	καὶ διέθετο Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς <sup>211</sup> διαθήκην ἀνα μέσον κυρίου καὶ ἀνα μέσον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀνα μέσον τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ εἶναι εἰς λαὸν τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἀνα μέσον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀνα μέσον τοῦ λαοῦ	23.16 καὶ διέθετο Ἰωδαε διαθήκην ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως εἶναι λαὸν τῷ κυρίῳ.
18	καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς εἰς οἶκον τοῦ Βααλ καὶ κατέσπασαν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ συνέτριψαν ἀγαθῶς καὶ τὸν Ματθαν τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Βααλ ἀπέκτειναν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν θυσιαστηρίων, καὶ ἔθηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπισκόπους εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου.	καὶ εἰσηλθε πας ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Βααλ καὶ κατέσπασαν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ συνέτριψαν ἐπιμελῶς καὶ τὸν Ματθαν τὸν ἱερέα τῶν βααλεῖμ ἀπέκτειναν πρὸ προσώπου τῶν θυσιαστηρίων, καὶ κατέστησεν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου.	καὶ εἰσηλθε πας ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Βααλ καὶ κατέσπασαν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ συνέτριψαν ἐπιμελῶς <sup>212</sup> καὶ τὸν Ματθαν τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Βααλ/τῶν βααλεῖμ ἀπέκτειναν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν θυσιαστηρίων, καὶ ἔθηκεν/ κατέστησεν ὁ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον/ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου.	23.17 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς εἰς οἶκον Βααλ καὶ κατέσπασαν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια καὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα αὐτοῦ ἐλέπτυναν καὶ τὸν Ματθαν ἱερέα τῆς Βααλ ἐθανάτωσαν ἐναντίον τῶν θυσιαστηρίων αὐτοῦ. 23.18 καὶ ἐνεχείρησεν Ἰωδαε ὁ ἱερεὺς τὰ ἔργα οἴκου κυρίου διὰ χειρὸς ἱερέων καὶ Λευιτῶν καὶ ἀνέστησεν τὰς ἐφημερίας τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν Λευιτῶν, ἃς διέστειλεν Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον κυρίου καὶ ἀνεγένχαι ὀλοκαυτώματα κυρίῳ, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσῆ, ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἐν ὠδαῖς

<sup>209</sup> Found in boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> but not in r

<sup>210</sup> In agreement with all others except boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>; it seems that from this point forward, the agreement between r and boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> ceases.

<sup>211</sup> See note 3

<sup>212</sup> See note 2

<sup>213</sup> See note 2

				διὰ χειρὸς Δαυιδ. 23.19 καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ πυλωροὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πύλας οἴκου κυρίου, καὶ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται ἀκάθαρτος εἰς πᾶν πρᾶγμα.
19	καὶ ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑκατοντάρχους καὶ τὸν Χορρι καὶ τὸν Ρασιμ καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς, καὶ κατήγαγον τὸν βασιλέα ἐξ οἴκου κυρίου, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ὁδὸν πύλης τῶν παρατρεχόντων οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐκάθισαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου τῶν βασιλέων	καὶ ελαβεν Ιωδαε ο ιερευς τους ακατονταρχους, τον Χορρει και τον Ρασειμ και παντα τον λαον της γης, και κατηγαγον τον βασιλεα εξ οικου κυριου, και εισηγαγον αυτον οδον πυλης των παρατρεχοντων οικου του βασιλεως, και εκαθισαν αυτον επι του θρονου των βασιλεων.	καὶ ελαβεν <del>Ιωδαε ο ιερευς</del> τους εκατονταρχους <del>και/και</del> τον Χορρι και τον Ρασιμ και παντα τον λαον της γης, και κατηγαγεν τον βασιλεα εξ οικου κυριου, και <u>εισηλθεν/εισηγαγον αυτον</u> οδον πυλης των παρατρεχοντων οικου του βασιλεως, και εκαθισαν αυτον επι <del>του</del> θρονου των βασιλεων.	23.20 καὶ ἔλαβεν τοὺς πατριάρχας καὶ τοὺς δυνατοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς καὶ ἀνεβίβασαν τὸν βασιλέα εἰς οἶκον κυρίου, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν διὰ τῆς πύλης τῆς ἐσωτέρας εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐκάθισαν τὸν βασιλέα ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τῆς βασιλείας.
20	καὶ ἐχάρη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἡ πόλις ἠσύχασεν, καὶ τὴν Γοθολιαν ἐθανάτωσαν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ βασιλέως	καὶ εχαρη πας ο λαος της γης, και η πολις ησυχασεν, και την Γοθολιαν επαταξαν εν ρομφαια εν οικω των βασιλεων	καὶ εχαρη πας ο λαος της γης, και η πολις ησυχασεν, και την Γοθολιαν <del>εθανατωσαν/επαταξαν</del> εν ρομφαια εν οικω <del>του βασιλεως/των βασιλεων</del> .	καὶ ἠψφράνθη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἡ πόλις ἠσύχασεν, καὶ τὴν Γοθολιαν ἐθανάτωσαν μαχαίρᾳ.

Appendix B: MSS borc2e2/Rahlfs no. 19, 82, 700, 127, 93

2 Kings 10:36\*-11 – VL and Greek text according to borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>

**10.36** Old Latin – anni XXVII et erat annus Gothaliae cum regnare coepisset Hieu filius Namesse cum esset annorum XXII Hocoziyas enim post Ioram regnavit anno uno in Hyerusalem et nomen erat matris eius Gothalia filia Ambri regis Hysrael quae defuncto filio tenuit regnum annis VIII et abiit in uiam domus Ahab et fecit malignum in conspectus Domini sicut Ahab quoniam de genere erat domus Ahab cum enim abiisset Ocoziyas conuietus dolore regis Israel in pugna aduersus Azahel regem Syriae et in uerbo Domini comprehendisset Ieu filium Namessi Hyoram regem Israel filium Ahab et interfecisset eum factum est ut in eodem bello sagittaret Ochoziam regem Iuda in curru quem cum retulissent mortuum pueri eius in Hyerusalem et sepelissent eum cum patribus eius.

**10:36+** borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> - και αι ημεραι, ας εβασιλευσεν Ιου επι Ισραηλ, εικοσι οκτω ετη [εν Σαμαρεια εν ετει δευτερω/πρωτω (c<sub>2</sub>) της γοθαλιας βασιλευει/βασιλευσει (c<sub>2</sub>) κς τον ιου υιον [ναμεσσει/ναμεσει (b'o)]/εν Σαμαρεια εν ετει δευτερω της γοθαλιας βασιλευει κς τον ιου υιον ναμεσσει (Sub ÷ c<sub>2</sub>)] και οχοζιας κς ην ετων (e<sub>2</sub>) εικοσι και δυο ετων εν τω βασιλευειν αυτον και ενιαυτον ενα εβασιλευσεν εν/επι (b) ιλημ και ονομα της μρς αυτου γοθαλια/γοθαλιας (o) θυγατηρ/υιος (e<sub>2</sub>) αχαραβ/αμβρει (r) βασιλεως ιηλ και επορευτη εν οδω οικου/οικω (r) αχαραβ οτι γαμβρος ην τον οικου αχαραβ (r) και εποιησε το πονηρον ενωπιον κς ως ο (b) οικος αχαραβ οτι γαμβρος ην του οικου αχαραβ και επορευθη οχαζιας επι αζαηλ βασιλεα/βασιλεως (oe<sub>2</sub>) συριας εις πολεμον τοτε συνηψεν ιου υιος ναμεσσει/ναμεσσαι (o)/ναμεσι (b') επι ιωραμ υιον αχαραβ βασιλεα ιηλ και επαταξεν αυτον εν ιεζραηλ/ιηλ (or) και απεθανεν και εταξευσεν ιου και τον οχοζιαν/οχοζια (r) βασιλεα ιουδα επι αρμα και απεθανεν και ανεβιβασαν αυτον οι παιδες αυτου εν και θαπτουσιν αυτον μετα των πατερων αυτου εν πολει δαδ

**11** Και Γοθολια η μητηρ Οχοζιου/ο (rc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) Οχοζιας (bo) ειδεν οτι απεθανον οι υιοι αυτης, και ανεστη (bo<sup>a</sup>rc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και απωλεσεν παν/παντα (r) το σπερμα της βασιλειας. <sup>2</sup> και ελαβεν Ιωσαβεε/ιωσαβει (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) η (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) θυγατηρ δε (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) του βασιλεως Ιωραμ αδελφη Οχοζιου τον Ιωας υιον Οχοζιου/[[οχιζιου (r)]] του (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) αδελφου αυτης και εκλειψεν αυτον εκ μεσου των υιων/τον υιον (e<sub>2</sub>) του βασιλεως των θανατουμενων, αυτον/αυτων (or) τροφην (r) και την τροφον αυτου, [εν τω ταμειω των κλινων και εκρυψεν αυτον/[και εκρυψεν αυτον/και εκρυψεν αυτον (r)] εν τω ταμειω/[[ταμειων (o)]] των κλινων/[[κενων (b)]] (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)] απο/εκ (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) προσωπου Γοθολιας/γοθαλια (b')/γολιαθ (o<sup>3</sup>), και ουκ εθανατωθη. <sup>3</sup> και ην μετ αυτης εν οικω κυριου (c<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/κυριω (o) κρυβόμενος/κεκρυμμενος (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) εξ ετη, [και Γοθολια βασιλευουσα/εβασιλευσεν (bo<sup>a</sup>rc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) επι της γης ετη εξ (c<sub>2</sub>) / και Γοθολια βασιλευουσα επι της γης (o\*)] <sup>4</sup> και εν τω ετει/ενιαυτω (c<sub>2</sub>) τω εβδομω απεστειλεν Ιωδαε ο ιερευσ και ελαβεν τους εκατονταρχους, των παρατρchonτων και (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τον Χορρι και τον Ρασιμ/ρασειν (c<sub>2</sub>), και απηγαγεν/εισηγαγεν (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) αυτους/αυτον (b') προς αυτον/προς εαυτον (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) εις τον (b'e<sub>2</sub>) οικον κυριου/κυριου (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και διεθετο αυτοις διαθηκην κυριου και [ωρκισεν αυτους ενωπιον κυριου/ωρκισεν αυτους εν οικω κυριου

(r)], και ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς Ἰωδαε/**Ἰωδαε** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως <sup>5</sup> και ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς λέγων [Οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὄν/τουτο το/[[**τθ** (b')]]] **ρημα ο** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ποιήσετε/**εποιήσετε** (e<sub>2</sub>)/**ποιησεται** (o) , τὸ τρίτον ἐξ/εν (o) ὑμῶν [εἰσελθέτω τὸ σάββατον και/οι **εισπορευομενοι το σαββατον** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)] φυλάξτε **την** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) φυλακὴν οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως [ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι/**ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)] <sup>6</sup> και τὸ τρίτον **ἐν τῇ πύλῃ** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τῶν ὁδῶν και τὸ τρίτον τῆς πύλης ὀπίσω τῶν παρατρεχόντων, και **φυλάξτε** (e<sub>2</sub>) τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ οἴκου **μεσσαε** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/**αμεσσαε** (b'), <sup>7</sup> και δύο χεῖρες ἐν ὑμῖν/**εισπορευμενος** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>), πᾶς ὁ ἐκπορευόμενος τὸ σάββατον, και/**και** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) φυλάξουσιν τὴν φυλακὴν οἴκου κυρίου πρὸς/**επι** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τὸν βασιλέα, <sup>8</sup> και κυκλώσατε/**καταστησατε αυτους** (br)/**καταστησατε εαυτους** (oc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα **και καταστησατε αυτους περι τον βασιλεα** (b') κύκλω, ἀνὴρ και τὸ σκεῦος αὐτοῦ ἐν **τη** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, και/**και** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος/**εισερχομενος** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) εἰς τὰ **σαδηρωθ** (c<sub>2</sub>)/**τα σιδηρωθ** (b) και (oc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ἀποθανεῖται. και ἐγένετο/**γινεσθε** (brc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/**γινεσθαι** (o) μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν και [ἐν τῷ/ **ἐν τῷ** (rc<sub>2</sub>)] εἰσπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν/**αὐτόν** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>). <sup>9</sup> και ἐποίησαν οἱ ἑκατόνταρχοι **κατα** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) πάντα, ὅσα ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) Ἰωδαε (r) ὁ συνετός/**ιερευς και εγενοντο**[[**εγενετο** (b)]] **μετα του βασιλεως εν τω** [εκπορευεσθαι **αυτον** {και εν τω/εκπορευεσθαι **αυτον και εν τω** (bre<sub>2</sub>)] εἰσπορευεσθαι αὐτόν/**και εν τω εισπορευεσθαι αυτον** (o)} (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>), και ἔλαβεν/**ελαβον** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ἀνὴρ/**εκαστος** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοὺς ἀνδρας αὐτοῦ **και** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους τὸ σάββατον [μετὰ τῶν ἐκπορευομένων τὸ σάββατον/**μετα των εισπορευομενων και εκπορευομενων το σαββατον** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)] και εἰσῆλθεν/**εισηλθον** (c<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) πρὸς Ἰωδαε/**ιουδαε** (r) τὸν ἱερέα. <sup>10</sup> και ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις τοὺς σειρομάστας/**τας φαρετρας** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και τοὺς τρισσοὺς/**τα δορατα** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυιδ/**δαυειδ** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοὺς/**α ην** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου **χορευθ και ησαν εν ταις χερσιν αυτων και εποιησαν οι εκατονταρχοι και οι παρατρεχοντες** [**κατα παντα α ενετειλατο αυτοις ιωδαε ο ιερευς/κατα παντα α ενετειλατο αυτοις ιωδαε ο ιερευς** (r)] (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>). <sup>11</sup> [και ἔστησαν οἱ παρατρέχοντες/**και ἔστησαν οἱ παρατρέχοντες** (r)], ἀνὴρ/**εκαστος** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και [τὸ σκεῦος/**τα σκευη** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)] αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ/**αὐτοῦ** (c<sub>2</sub>), ἀπὸ τῆς ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς [δεξιᾶς ἕως τῆς/**δεξιᾶς ἕως τῆς** (o)] ὠμίας τοῦ οἴκου [post - **τῆς ὠμίας** (e<sub>2</sub>)] τῆς/**του** (e<sub>2</sub>) εὐωνύμου/**αριστερας** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/**αριστερου** (e<sub>2</sub>) τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου και/**και** (o) τοῦ οἴκου ἐπὶ/**περι** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)/τὸν βασιλέα κύκλω. <sup>12</sup> και **εξεκκλησιασεν ιωδαε ο ιερευς παντα τον λαον της γης εις οικον κυριον** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και ἐξάπέστειλεν/**εξηγαγε** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως και ἔδωκεν ἐπ' αὐτόν τὸ νεζερ/**το αγιασμα** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και τὸ μαρτύριον και ἐβασίλευσεν/**εχρισεν** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) αὐτόν και ἔχρισεν/**ἐβασίλευσεν** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) αὐτόν, και **ἐκρότησαν ο λαος** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) [τῇ χειρὶ/**ταις χερσιν αυτων** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)] και εἶπαν/**ειπον** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) Ζήτω ὁ βασιλεύς. <sup>13</sup> και ἤκουσεν Γοθολια τὴν φωνὴν τῶν τρεχόντων/**παρατρεχοντων** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τοῦ λαοῦ και εἰσῆλθεν/**ηλθε** (borc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) πρὸς τὸν λαὸν εἰς οἶκον κυρίου.

<sup>14</sup> και εἶδεν και ἰδοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰστήκει ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου [κατὰ τὸ κρίμα/ ~~κατὰ τὸ κρίμα~~ (ο)], και οἱ ὠδοὶ και αἱ σάλπιγγες **και οι στρατηγοι (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** πρὸς/περι (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) τὸν βασιλέα, και πᾶς ὁ λαὸς [τῆς γῆς/~~τῆς γῆς~~ (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)] χαίρων και σαλπίζων/εσαλπίζον (r) ἐν σάλπιγγιν, και διέρρηξεν [Γοθολια τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτῆς/τον **ιματισμον αυτης γοθολια (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)**] και ἐβόησεν Σύνδεσμος σύνδεσμος/**συνδεσμον (r)/σύνδεσμος (c<sub>2</sub>)**. <sup>15</sup> και ἐνετείλατο **Ιωδαε/ιουδαε (r)** ὁ ἱερεὺς και (e<sub>2</sub>) τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχαις τοῖς [ἐπισκόποις τῆς δυνάμεως/επι της δυναμεως οὺς **κατεστησε (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)**] και εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Ἐξαγάγετε αὐτὴν ἔσωθεν τῶν σαδηρωθ, και [ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος ὀπίσω αὐτῆς θανάτῳ θανατωθήσεται ῥομφαία, ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ ἱερεὺς Καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου/**εισαγαγετε αυτην οπισωθεν/[[οπισθεν (b)]] οικου των στρατηγων/[[σατραπων (ο)]] και θανατωσατε αυτην εν ρομφαια και μη θανατωσετε αυτην εν οικω κυ και εσται πας ο εισπορευομενος οπισω αυτης αποθανειται (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)**]. <sup>16</sup> και ἐπέθηκαν/**επεβαλον (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** επ (ο) αὐτῇ χειρᾶς, και εἰσῆλθεν/**εισηγαγον αυτην (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** εις (c<sub>2</sub>) ὁδὸν εἰσόδου/οδου (e<sub>2</sub>) τῶν ἵππων οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως και ἀπέθανεν/**εθανατωσαν αυτην/[[αυτον (ο)]] (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** ἐκεῖ. — <sup>17</sup> και διέθετο **Ιωδαε ο ιερευς (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** διαθήκην ἀνὰ μέσον κυρίου και ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ [βασιλέως και ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ/**βασιλέως και ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ (c<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)**] λαοῦ τοῦ εἶναι εἰς λαὸν τῷ κυρίῳ, και ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ βασιλέως και ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ λαοῦ. <sup>18</sup> και εἰσῆλθεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς εἰς **τον (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** οἶκον τοῦ Βααλ και κατέσπασαν αὐτὸν και τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτοῦ και τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ συνέτριψαν ἀγαθῶς/**απιμελωσ (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** και τὸν Ματθαν τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Βααλ/**των βααλειμ [[βαλειμ (ο)]] (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) και (ο)** ἀπέκτειναν [κατὰ πρόσωπον/**προ προσωπου (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)**] τῶν θυσιαστηρίων, και ἔθηκεν/**κατεστησεν [[αυτους (b')]] (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπισκόπους [εἰς τὸν οἶκον/**εν οικω (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)**] κυρίου. <sup>19</sup> και ἔλαβεν **ιωδαε ο ιερευς (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** τοὺς ἑκατοντάρχους και/**και (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** τὸν Χορρι/**χορει (ο)** και τὸν Ρασιμ και πάντα τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς, και κατήγαγον τὸν βασιλέα ἐξ οἴκου κυρίου, και εἰσῆλθεν/**εισηγαγον αυτον (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)** ὁδὸν πύλης τῶν παρατρεχόντων οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως, και ἐκάθισαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου τῶν βασιλέων. <sup>20</sup> και ἐχάρη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς, και ἡ πόλις ἡσύχασεν, και τὴν Γοθολιαν ἐθανάτωσαν/**επαταξαν[[επαταξεν (c<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)]]( bo)** ἐν [ῥομφαία/**στοματι ρομφας (b')**] [ἐν οἴκῳ/**εις τον οικον (ο)**] [τοῦ βασιλέως/**των βασιλεων (βοc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>)**].