

Introduction

1. Content and Structure

The book of Kings falls into three sections: the reign of Solomon (1 Kgs 1–11), the divided monarchy (1 Kgs 12–2 Kgs 17), and the kingdom of Judah alone (2 Kgs 18–25). The contents of the second section, the bulk of which is the subject of this present volume, are represented in the following table.

	Texts	Kings of Israel	Kings of Judah	Prophets
The contents of 1 Kings 12 – 2 Kings 17 in the Masoretic Text	1 Kgs 12–14		Rehoboam	Shemaiah, unnamed older and younger prophets
	12:16–14:20	Jeroboam		
	15:1–8		Abijam	
	15:9–24		Asa	
House of Jeroboam	15:25–32	Nadab		
	15:33–16:7	Baasha		Jehu ben Hanani
	16:8–14	Elah		
	16:15–20	Zimri		
House of Baasha	16:21–22	Tibni (interregnum)		
	16:23–28	Omri		
	16:29–22:39	Ahab		Elijah (17–19; 21) nameless (ch. 20) Micaiah (ch. 22)
	22:40, 51–2 Kgs 1:18	Ahaziah		
House of Omri	1 Kgs 22:41–50		Jehoshaphat	
	2 Kgs 2			Elijah and Elisha
	3:1–8:26	Jehoram		Elisha (3:1–8:15)
	8:16–24		Joram	
House of Jehu	8:25–9:29		Ahaziah	Elisha and a disciple
	10	Jehu		
	11		Athaliah	
	12		Joash	
House of Jehu	13:1–9	Jehoahaz		
	13:10–14:16	Jehoash		
	13:14–25			Elisha

Texts	Kings of Israel	Kings of Judah	Prophets
14:1-22		Amaziah	
14:23-29	Jeroboam II		
15:1-7		Azariah/Uzziah	
15:8-12	Zechariah		
15:13-16	Shallum		
15:17-22	Menahem		
15:23-26	Pekahiah		
15:27-31	Pekah		
15:32-38		Jotham	
16		Ahaz	

The stories of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah are recounted simultaneously. They are interwoven in dentate fashion, with the kings of each kingdom being dated over against those of the other. This system of cross-dating forms the backbone of this section of Kings. Driver aptly described the overall pattern:¹

In the arrangement of the reigns of the two series of kings a definite principle is followed by the compiler. When the narrative of a reign (in either series) has once begun, it is continued to its close—even the contemporary incidents of a prophet's career, which stand in no immediate relation to public events, being included in it; when it is ended, the reign or reigns of the other series, which are synchronized with it, are dealt with; the reign overlapping it at the end having been completed, the compiler resumes his narrative of the first series with the reign next following, and so on.

The discrete account of a king's reign typically consists of three parts: opening formulae, materials set during the reign, and closing formulae.

The elements of the opening formulae are:²

1. synchronism of the accession year with the regnal year of the king from the other country;
2. king's age at accession (lacking for kings of Israel);
3. length of reign;
4. name of Queen Mother (lacking for kings of Israel);
5. theological evaluation.

The elements of the closing formulae, all of which rarely occur together, include:

1. source notice;
2. brief supplemental details about the reign, if any;
3. death and burial notices;
4. succession notice.

Regnal
formulae

Opening
formulae

Closing
formulae

1 S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1972), 189.

2 The list is adapted from Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development*, 24–25.

The observation of this pattern is significant for reconstructing the composition of the books of Kings. When a king's account or his formulae vary from these patterns, an explanation is required. For instance, when an anecdote is not incorporated within the regnal formulae for any king, it may be an indication that the anecdote has come into that location secondarily either as a displacement or as an addition. Synchronically, such a situation directs the reader's attention to some particular feature or connection in the narrative.

Like a backbone, the frame formed by the interlocking regnal accounts is flexible enough to allow for other structural features.³ There are opportunities to draw comparisons and analogies between kings, especially with the earlier, more idealized figures of David and Solomon. The repeated evaluation of the kings along religious lines gives rise to patterns of apostasy and reform.⁴ The foregoing table shows that the central section of Kings is dominated by prophetic stories, especially those of Elijah and Elisha, in 1 Kings 17–2 Kings 13. Hence prophecy and fulfillment comprise another very important component to the book that is at once structural and thematic.

Pattern in the
arrangement
of Israelite
kings

A pattern that has often been overlooked but may be highly significant for the book is perceptible in the list of the kings of Israel.⁵ The sixth king following Jeroboam I is Ahab (Nadab, Baasha, Elah, Zimri, Omri, Ahab), who is portrayed as Israel's worst king. The sixth king after Ahab is Jeroboam II (Ahaziah, Jehoram, Jehu, Jehoahaz, Jehoash, Jeroboam II). The sixth after Jeroboam II is Hoshea (Zachariah, Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah, Pekah, Hoshea), in whose reign the kingdom comes to an end. The story of the kingdom of Israel, all of whose kings are evaluated as having done what YHWH considered evil, thus forms a pattern of six-six-six in its narrative recounting and assessment. As one short of seven, six is the quintessential number of imperfection.

2. Text

Dead Sea
Scrolls

A distinctive feature of this commentary is its focus on textual criticism. The reason is the importance of textual criticism in the history of critical scholarship on the book of Kings on the one hand and, on the other, the tendency of commentaries on Kings to ignore the topic for the most part. The discovery, beginning in 1947, of the "Dead Sea Scrolls" has revolutionized our understanding of the text of the HB and its development. Not that the Qumran caves yielded significant quantities of materials related directly to Kings. On the contrary, there were only fragments, most quite small, of three manuscripts, each from a different cave, and of these only a handful contain passages covered in this volume.⁶ But the Qumran

3 The following examples are drawn from the observations of Nelson, *Kings*, 98–100.

4 Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen*.

5 Leithart, *Kings*, 245.

6 The full list is 1 Kgs 1:1, 16–17, 27–37 from 5QKgs; 1 Kgs 7:20–21, 25–27, 29–42, 51 from 4QKgs; and 1 Kgs 3:12–14; 12:28–31; 22:28–31; 2 Kgs 5:26; 6:32; 7:8–10, 20; 8:1–5; 9:1–2; 10:19–21 from 6QpapKgs. Cf. Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*.

finds demonstrate the value of the Greek texts, particularly Codex Vaticanus (G^B) and the Lucianic manuscripts (G^L), as independent witnesses to an early Greek translation (“Old Greek” = OG) of a pre-Masoretic Hebrew text. It has long been recognized that these Greek texts betray stages of recension toward the developing Masoretic Text (MT).⁷ In Kings, the OG is preserved in G^B only in 1 Kgs 2:12–21:29. Otherwise G^B reflects an early recension known as *kaige* after its idiosyncratic translation of the Hebrew כגג. In the rest of Kings, G^L is the closest witness to the OG.⁸ In addition, the “Old Latin” (OL), the collective of extant Latin manuscripts translated from Greek before the Vulgate in the fourth century CE, frequently safeguards OG readings.

Old Greek

The value of the OG through its various attestations as a witness to both the content of the text of Kings and the process by which it was composed has been richly explored by Julio Trebolle in a series of publications beginning in the 1980s. While Trebolle’s insights have achieved high regard among his peers in biblical studies and textual criticism, much of his earlier work has been overlooked and underutilized because it was written in Spanish. It is hoped that the obvious influence of his ideas on this commentary will lead to greater appreciation and consideration of them in the interpretation of Kings. Nevertheless, there are two important types of textual differences between the MT and OG where I differ with Trebolle’s prioritization of the OG. These relate to chronology and to extended “supplements” in the Greek witnesses.

Julio Trebolle

2.1 The MT and OG Chronologies

Since the regnal formulae with their interlocking chronological references are the backbone for the book of Kings, the frequent differences in chronological data are disconcerting.

In his 1968 monograph Shenkel sought to counter previous explanations for these chronological differences that resorted rather arbitrarily to postulations of coregencies and separate and alternating systems of reckoning; instead, Shenkel offered a text-critical explanation.⁹ He pointed out that the MT and OG operate under two different chronological systems, and he argued that the OG’s chronology was more primitive and the MT’s a secondary development.¹⁰ Though not without its critics,¹¹ Shenkel’s explanation has been very influential over the past five decades.

Shenkel’s argument for the priority of the Greek chronology

-
- 7 For a more thorough discussion see Shenkel, *Chronology*, 5–21.
- 8 The history of the Lucianic text is complex and debated. It is generally recognized as consisting of two strata, the older of which (“proto-Lucianic”) was very similar to the OG and has even been considered OG by some scholars, notably Barthélemy. Shenkel, *Chronology*, 5–21.
- 9 Shenkel, *Chronology*. Much of Shenkel’s work was aimed at Thiele’s explanations in *Mysterious Numbers*.
- 10 J. M. Miller’s unpublished 1964 Emory dissertation (“The Omride Dynasty in the Light of Recent Literary and Archaeological Research”) anticipated Shenkel’s results in arguing for the primacy of the OG chronology. See his “Elisha Cycle” and “Another Look.”
- 11 See the early review of Shenkel’s book by D. W. Gooding in *JTS* 21 (1970): 118–31. Also Galil, *Chronology*, 138–43.

- Hendel on 1 Kings 16:21 Hendel has recently criticized Shenkel for basing his conclusions on redactional and historical considerations and proffered his own argument on text-critical grounds.¹² He shows how the MT and OG construe the starting point of Omri's reign differently. The difference becomes clear in 1 Kgs 16:29, where MT dates Ahab's accession to the 38th year of Asa of Judah, while the OG dates it to the second year of Asa's son, Jehoshaphat, a difference of five years. The reason for this difference is that the MT construes the beginning of Omri's twelve-year reign from the point in v. 21 when half of the people followed Omri and half Tibni or, more accurately, from v. 16 when *all Israel* made Omri king. This was, according to v. 15, the 27th year of Asa of Judah. The OG, on the other hand, dates Omri's reign from the 31st year of Asa, after Tibni had died. Its phrase *after Tibni* at the end of v. 22 makes its dating clear. Hendel argues that from a text-critical standpoint the MT's construal of v. 23, which is idiosyncratic and therefore a kind of *lectio difficilior*, is more likely to have been altered by the OG's more "literal" construal than the other way around.¹³ That "literal" interpretation in turn led to (hyper)correction of the chronology in the OG in a manner typical of Second-Temple hermeneutics. Contrary to Shenkel's assessment, therefore, the MT chronology is primitive and the OG revisionist.
- 2 Kings 8:16 Additional text-critical evidence for the primacy of the MT chronology is found in 2 Kgs 8:16.¹⁴ The OG is not extant here, but based on its previous numbers it had Jehoram of Judah taking the throne in the second year of Ahaziah of Israel and reigning eleven years.¹⁵ Since Ahaziah's reign spans the end of Jehoshaphat's and the beginning of Jehoram's in the OG, the proper place for the account of Jehoram's reign according to the OG chronology would have been immediately before the beginning of Joram of Israel's reign, i.e., between 2 Kgs 1:17 and 1:18. Not coincidentally, this is where the single instance of OG chronology in the MT is found, what Shenkel calls "a precious witness to the OG chronology in a Hebrew text"¹⁶ However, there is no evidence in the Greek tradition for the account of Jehoram ever having been present here.¹⁷ The OG account of Jehoram was always in 2 Kings 8, where the MT has it, as shown by the occurrence of two historical presents—distinguishing features of the OG—in 8:22, 24, as Shenkel points out. This means that the OG placement and the OG numbers are at odds. The OG account of the reign of Jehoram is in the wrong place according to the "rules" of the composition of Kings. The only way this could have happened is if the MT chronology was in fact the older one. The OG introduced its revised figures into the MT's placement.

12 Hendel, "Two Editions."

13 The use of וַיִּשְׁׁ + imperfect indicates that the events of vv. 21-22 are set at an earlier time, i.e., with those of v. 16 (Rabinowitz, "'AZ Followed by Imperfect"). The OG's construal of the verse, therefore, is actually a misunderstanding of this feature and another indication of MT's primacy. See the commentary on this passage.

14 See S. L. McKenzie, "The Priority of the MT Chronology in Kings," in *Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of P. Kyle McCarter, Jr.* (ed. C. Rollston et al., forthcoming).

15 As per Shenkel's reconstruction in *Chronology*, 37-38, 68-82.

16 Shenkel, *Chronology*, 74.

17 The notice in G^L at 1:17b in agreement with MT is hexaplaric and therefore the result of secondary adjustment.

Yet another indication of the MT’s primacy comes from the story in 2 Kings 3, though the evidence here is mainly literary rather than text-critical. Shenkel argued that the king of Judah in the story was originally anonymous. The reason for Elisha’s response to the kings’ appeal for help (v. 14) was part of DtrH’s polemic against Israel: YHWH had regard for Judah because of the promise to David but was opposed to Israel because of the sin of Jeroboam. MT’s identification of the king of Judah as Jehoshaphat was based on similarities with 1 Kings 22 and led to a shift in the entire chronology of the period, while the OG’s identification with Ahaziah preserved the older chronology and may have retained the tradition about the identity of the king of Judah in the original story.¹⁸ If, however, this story is a post-DtrH addition that drew from the start on 1 Kings 22, as I contend, then it was righteous Jehoshaphat for whom YHWH had regard (v. 14), and the identification of Ahaziah undermines the point of the story and must be secondary—part of the OG’s programmatic revision of the chronology.

2.2 OG “Supplements”

Overlapping with the matter of the OG’s different chronology is that of its “supplements” or “miscellanies.” These are multi-verse pluses attached at the following locations in the OG: 1 Kgs 2:35; 2:46; 5:14; 6:1; 8:53; 10:22; 12:24; 16:28; 2 Kgs 1:18; 10:36. Some of them are doublets of material in the MT. Thus 1 Kgs 16:28+ contains the account of the reign of Jehoshaphat found in the MT at 1 Kgs 22:41-51. Like the minor plus *after Tibni* at the end of 1 Kgs 16:22, 1 Kgs 16:28+ reflects a chronological variance. The OG dates Jehoshaphat’s accession to Omri’s eleventh year (1 Kgs 16:28a G^L) in contrast to the MT’s date of his accession to Ahab’s fourth year (22:41). Similarly, 2 Kgs 1:18+ effectively duplicates 2 Kgs 3:1-3 MT. Another kind of plus is represented by 2 Kgs 10:36+ (a more extensive example is 1 Kgs 12:24+). It consists of materials mostly found in the MT but dispersed there rather than gathered as in the OG plus.

The debate that has raged among critical scholars concerns the origin of these “supplements” in relation to the MT and their value for textual criticism.¹⁹ There is general recognition that these passages are not Greek inventions but are derived

18 Shenkel, *Chronology*, 104–108.

19 See the following items and the bibliographies cited in them. On 1 Kgs 2:35+ and 2:46+: R. P. Pennoyer, “Solomonic Apologetic: Text and Redaction in the Succession Narrative with Special Attention to the So-called ‘Miscellanies’ in 3 Reigns 2,” PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1992; Z. Talshir, “The Miscellanies in 2 Reigns 2:35a-o, 46a-l and the Composition of the Book of Kings/Reigns,” in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Helsinki 2010* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 59; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 155–74; and E. Tov, “The Septuagint Additions (‘Miscellanies’) in 1 Kings 2 (3 Reigns 2),” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 549–70. On 1 Kgs 12:24a-z: P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11* (VTSup 104; Leiden: Brill, 2004); McKenzie, *Trouble with Kings*, 21–40; Trebolle, *Salomón y Jeroboán*; Z. Talshir, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1993). On 2 Kgs 10:31+ see Trebolle, *Jehú y Jodás*.

from Hebrew *Vorlagen*. Each of the pluses within the scope of this commentary is treated at the appropriate location. It is already clear, though, that the pluses are part of the same process of Second-Temple scribal revision as the OG chronology. In 1 Kgs 16:28+ there is a causal relationship. The chronological adjustment in the OG placed Jehoshaphat's accession in the reign of Omri, leading in turn to the transfer of the account of Jehoshaphat's reign to an earlier point in the narrative. The movement of Joram of Israel's opening formulae to 2 Kgs 1:18+ accommodated the stories in ch. 2, enclosing them within the reign of Joram of Israel rather than between the reigns of Ahaziah and Joram, where they had been interpolated into the text represented by the MT. As for 2 Kgs 10:36+, close reading shows that the material collected in it cannot stand on its own but can only be understood in light of the MT account in 2 Kings 8–9.

2.3 Textual Reconstruction

These indications of revision in the OG do not necessarily compromise its value for textual criticism where individual readings are concerned. Each case must be considered on its own merits, and it often comes down to a judgment call, particularly where the MT is difficult. Is the easier or more fitting reading in such a case the OG's retention of the more primitive text that has suffered corruption in the MT? Or is the OG reading due to second-hand smoothing of the troublesome MT? There are no hard and fast rules. General principles are only rough guidelines that are not applicable in every instance. Preference for the shorter reading should be invoked when no other explanation for the variants is evident. One must weigh the dictum *lectio difficilior praeferenda est* ("the more difficult reading is to be preferred") against making sense of the text. One must also consider such matters as the degree of certainty in the Hebrew reconstruction from the Greek text. My judgment that there are many instances where the Greek reading is superior is based on the premise that there is usually (though not always!) less at stake than for an issue like chronology and therefore less motive to make detailed alterations.²⁰

The text that is reconstructed for each pericope treated in this commentary is an eclectic one, the "earliest inferable text," based on my assessment of the MT and the witnesses to the OG just described. The approach and its theoretical underpinning are well articulated by Troxel in describing his work with Isaiah 1–39:

My sole affirmation is that the eclectic text of Isaiah 1–39 I propose will comprise those readings with the best claim to priority, based on my evaluation of evidence from the witnesses and the literary contexts in which they stand. There is no escaping the subjectivity of these judgments, for there is no Archimedean point from which to

²⁰ Chronicles provides additional evidence for textual reconstruction where it is extant. The Chronicler's text of Kings was the same type as that of the MT. See S. L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 119–58. Agreements of Chr with Kgs OG against Kgs MT are rare and usually due to corruption in the latter. Chronicles also seems to preserve some primitive readings on its own.

assay them. And yet, the evident genetic relationship between many variants compels such an assessment.²¹

While it may not always come across in the course of an argument, all text-critical decisions in this commentary are made with humility and trepidation. Many have been changed more than once. It is a matter of considerable comfort to find a text-critical judgment by Trebolle or by one of the eminent figures of the past, such as Burney, Klostermann, or Stade, with which I agree or to whom I can appeal. There is certainly room for disagreement. My main hope is that the spotlight on the text in this volume influences future commentators to incorporate textual criticism more fully into the interpretive process.

Because this is a commentary and not a critical edition of the text, the space devoted to textual notes is limited.²² The focus is on textual differences that have significance for content or meaning, recognizing that even small differences can fall into this category. The Textual Notes will generally ignore the following variants unless there is some other reason for comment: stylistic differences, such as G's supplying of personal names for clarity, where MT has pronouns; the absence or presence of the conjunction except when it alters meaning; minor pluses, such as titles (e.g., "king of Israel," the repetition of patronymics, the presence/absence of the definite object, and the word "all"); the absence/presence of the indirect object ("to him/them") after verbs like "said," "spoke"; the different order of words/phrases where order seems unimportant; different prepositions where there is little difference in meaning (e.g., εν/επι vs. ב/על). The copy-text that breaks the tie, so to speak, between equivalent variants in the MT and OG and which is followed in most matters of spelling and other "accidentals," is the MT represented in Codex Leningradensis.²³

Ignored
variants

MT as copy
text

3. Composition

On more than one occasion in considering the process of composition behind 1 Kings 16–2 Kings 16 I thought of Festus's words to Paul in Acts 26:24: "You are out of your mind, Paul! Too much learning is driving you insane!" (NRSV). It is

-
- 21 The quotation is from the first draft of R. L. Troxel, "What is a Text?" *VT* 66 (2016): 603–26. Unfortunately, this quotation did not survive the editing process to the final form of the article. It is used here by permission of the author. See also R. Hendel, "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Prologue to a New Critical Edition," *VT* 58 (2008): 324–51. The phrase "earliest inferable text" is adapted from p. 329 of this article, where Hendel cites E. J. Kenney, "Textual Criticism," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 17, 192. The term "original (text)," as Hendel explains on pp. 333–34, is understood as an ideal goal that is indeterminable. See also R. Hendel, "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Its Aims and a Response to Criticisms," *HBAI* 2 (2013): 63–99.
- 22 The reader will find more detailed notes in *The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition*—1 Kings edited by J. Joosten, 2 Kings by A. Piquer Otero and P. Torrijano Morales. Fuller textual notes will be available in the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* and the Hebrew University Bible Project, both currently in preparation.
- 23 On the idea and function of a copy-text see Hendel, "Prologue," 343–46 and "Response," 70–75.

Compositional
model

not the great learning portion of these words that struck a chord in me but being driven to the edge of madness by the complicated and sometimes contradictory indications regarding how the material in Kings came about. Walter Dietrich, the editor of this series and a man of great learning, writes about 1 Kgs 16:7 that it *hat viel Kopferbrechung gemacht*.²⁴ The same could be said about the book of Kings as a whole, or at least of 1 Kings 16–2 Kings 16.²⁵ What makes my obsession with this issue bearable, aside from knowing I am in good company, is the hope that the model I propose goes some distance toward solving the most bedeviling compositional problems in this section of Kings. This model finds two principal levels of composition in Kings: a primary Deuteronomistic one and a secondary prophetic one. Each was the work of a distinct author/editor who each made use of different kinds of sources. Each also received later glosses and additions. These different levels of composition are signaled in the translation by the use of different fonts:

DtrH' s sources, including regnal formulae

DtrH

Glosses and additions (other than PN) to DtrH

Glosses and additions to secondary material

Prophetic and battle stories used by PN. (For different sources within the same lemma, normal, *italic* and **bold** text is used.)

Prophetic Narrative/Narrator (PN)

Glosses and additions to PN

Glosses and additions to secondary material

3.1 Pre-DtrH Sources

3.1.1 Regnal Formulae

A constant refrain in the closing regnal formulae is the statement that more information about the individual king is available in the book or scroll of the chronicles of the kings of Israel or Judah. There are reasons for taking this “source notice” seriously as pointing to a real document. These include the existence of annals and similar official records from other ancient Near Eastern countries, the presence of historically accurate information (e.g., names, approximate time frame, and the like) within the biblical accounts in Kings, and differences in the information proffered for the kings of Israel and those of Judah, i.e., the king’s age at accession and the name of the Queen Mother in the formulae for kings of Judah but not for those of Israel.²⁶ The exact nature of the “chronicles” remains elusive. The usual assumption that they were annals is based mainly on Assyrian and Babylonian parallels and is far from certain. They are probably more accu-

24 Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 10n.

25 P. Welten (“Naboths Weinberg,” *EvTh* 33 [1973] 20) notes that the variety of material and genres within 1 Kgs 17 – 2 Kgs 13 makes their analysis extraordinarily difficult.

26 L. Grabbe, *1 & 2 Kings: History and Story in Ancient Israel* (London: T & T Clark, 2017), 21–22.

rately designated king lists.²⁷ The differences in the information they contain indicate that there were separate lists for Israel and Judah. Indeed, since Israel and Judah were separate countries, there was no reason for the kings in one to date themselves over against those in the other.²⁸ The synchronistic or integrated list reflected in Kings, therefore, was a compilation rather than a primary source.²⁹ Noth built his theory in Kings around his view that the compiler was DtrH himself. However, there are reasons to think it more likely that the compilation was done before DtrH and served as a source for him.³⁰ One such reason is the distinction between the data about accession and succession, which would have belonged to the integrated king list, and the religious evaluations of the kings, which come from DtrH.³¹ Another reason relates to Israel and Judah as separate kingdoms. Very recent scholarship has stressed their distinctiveness historically, socially, and politically and the artificiality as a whole of their treatment as a single, albeit divided, entity in Samuel–Kings.³² One must then ask why DtrH, clearly writing from a Southern perspective and advocating YHWH’s choice of David and Judah, bothers to treat Israel at all—especially since his treatment is entirely negative. The two monarchies must already have been linked, and the integrated king list provided the closest such link.

An integrated
king list

By way of delineating more precisely the content of the information found in the integrated king list, we should say that it probably did not include most of the items in the closing formulae (see the list provided above).³³ That is, it would not have included the source notice referring to itself. It may have contained supplemental details, but these are not always supplied as a distinct element in the formulae. The death and burial notices are likely DtrH’s invention, since they are used to express approval/disapproval of the kings. The succession notice reiterates information in the opening formulae. Hence the integrated king list probably contained only the material in the opening formulae, absent the theological evaluation, and occasional supplemental details. For kings of Israel this means

27 J. Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale, 1983), 291–301.

28 An observation made long ago by F. Rühl, “Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda,” *DZGW* 12 (1895), 44.

29 What C. Levin (“The Synchronistic Excerpt from the Annals of the Kings of Israel and Judah,” in *Re-reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament* [FAT 87; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013] calls an “excerpt.”

30 Levin, “Excerpt,” 186–89. Also Grabbe, *1 & 2 Kings*, 22–23 and idem, “Mighty Oaks from (Genetically Manipulated?) Acorns Grow: *The Chronicles of the Kings of Judah* as a Source of the Deuteronomistic History,” in R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker (eds.), *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (Leiden: Brill, 2007): 155–73. K. Weingart (“2Ki 15–18”) reaches a similar conclusion.

31 Levin, “Excerpt,” 191–92. The former may reflect a political agenda—probably from the reign of Josiah—in the form of a claim of Judah to be the heir to Israel by virtue of their joint history.

32 See especially D. E. Fleming, *The Legacy of Israel in Judah’s Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), esp. 91–113.

33 Grabbe, *1 & 2 Kings*, 26.