The word of the lord?: re-reading the story of the man of god from Judah

Richards, James Johnston

The Word of the Lord? Re-reading the Story of the Man of God from Judah

James Johnston Richards

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts

at the

University of Durham

Department of Theology

30th September 1996

The Word of the Lord?
Re-reading the Story of the Man of God from Judah

James Johnston Richards

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Durham

30th September 1996

Abstract

This work centres on the close reading of a biblical text. The underlying proposal is that there is value for such a reading in combining both a standard historical approach, and a narrative or 'literary' critical approach (as propounded by Robert Alter and others).

After an introductory consideration of the nature of the reading task, the work begins in Chapter One with a survey of critical approaches to the Deuteronomistic History, as a necessary preliminary to (in Chapter Two) the application of those approaches to the story of Jeroboam's cultic 'innovations' and the intervention of the man of God from Judah recounted in 1 Kings 12 and 13. A critical assessment is essayed for this approach to the text, and some preliminary conclusions are drawn as to the role of the story in the Deuteronomistic History.

The narrative reading of the text is undertaken in Chapters Three and Four. Chapter Three briefly explains the method, and it is then applied to the opening of the story. This reading is continued in Chapter Four, and concludes with a focus on specific areas of interest (e.g., the word שוב and the phrase בדבר יהוה).

In Chapter Five the results of the two readings are compared, and their implications for each other explored. Various interpretations of the text are considered, and a summary offered of the main themes and direction of the text.

ABBREVIATIONS

AASF	Annales Academiae Scientarium Fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
ATANT	Abhandlung zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AV	Authorized Version
BBB	Bonner Biblischer Beiträge
BDB	Brown Driver and Briggs Hebrew Lexicon
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
FRLANT	Forschungem zur Religion undLiteratur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JSOT	Journal For the Study of the Old Testament
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JSOT	Journal For the Study of the Old Testament
JSOTS	Journal For the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
KHAT	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NCB	The New Century Bible Commentary
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OTL	Old Testament Library
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SBLDS	Society for Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTS	Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

The Word of the Lord? Re-reading the Story of the Man of God from Judah

J.J. Richards

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts

at the

University of Durham

30th September 1996

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been a long time in the making. Whilst I alone am responsible for its deficiencies, there are many without whose help or example its merits would be fewer.

I am grateful to many friends and colleagues who have endured with patience the enthusiastic bubble of ideas on its subject matter, alternating with complaints about the difficulties of making time to complete it. Among them, I must pay special tribute to those who enabled me to be freed from parish responsibilities at various crucial points in the writing. I also wish to acknowledge the part played by my first teacher in Old Testament studies, Dr Deryck Sheriffs of London Bible College, who taught me to love the Old Testament, and not to be afraid to face its hard questions.

I am most grateful to my supervisor the Revd. Dr. Walter Moberly of the University of Durham whose tactful guidance has been of more worth than I can easily say. His gentle persistence in the face of frequent long periods of silence, and his very prompt responses, when work or queries were forthcoming from me, have been significant factors, not least in actually seeing the work through to completion.

In the final stages of writing up, Dr Stuart Weekes of Durham University was instrumental in enabling me to clarify my thinking and actually to make a single and completed piece of work out of the writing I had done up to that point.

I wish also to thank my examiners, Dr Pauline Hodgetts of West Hill College, Selly Oak, and Dr. Robert Hayward of the University of Durham who were very gracious in the extent to which they acted as involuntary proof-readers.

Finally, I must pay tribute to my wife, the Revd. Jane Maycock. This work would not have been completed without her constant support and encouragement over the years in which it has been in the making; her part in taking on greater responsibilities, both domestic and professional; and her intelligent interest in its progress— all this in the midst of her own travails as a research student.

טוֹבִים הַשְּׁנַיִם מִן־הָאֶחָד אֲשֶׁר
יֵשׁ־לָהֶם שָׂכָר טוֹב בַּעֲמָלָם: כִּי
אִם־יִפְּלוּ הָאֶחָד יָקִים אֶת־חֲבֵרוֹ
וְאֲיָלוּ הָאֶחָד שֶׁיִּפּוֹל וְאֵין שֵׁנִי לְהָקִימוֹ:
גַּם
אִם־יִשְׁכְּבוּ שְׁנַיִם וְחֹם לָהֶם וּלְאֶחָד אֵיךְ יֵחָם:
וְאִם־יִתְקְפוֹ הָאֶחָד הַשְּׁנַיִם יַעַמְדוּ נֶגְדּוֹ

Introduction

In this work I undertake two quite different readings of the story in 1 Kings of Jeroboam, the man of God from Judah, and the prophet from Bethel. These readings are undertaken in order to demonstrate, by the practical reading of a particular text, the way in which their respective approaches are thoroughly interdependent.

I have attempted to engage with each approach quite separately according to its own rules and self-understanding. The purpose of this is to try and avoid prejudging the outcome, and to avoid confusing the question of the relation of the two approaches by blending them from the start. Inevitably this has led to a certain amount of repetition, though I have tried to keep that to a minimum. I am aware also that notwithstanding my intentions there has at some points been a certain amount of blending of the two approaches, this I think is an inevitable result of a single reader attempting the task. On the whole, however, I have tried to keep conclusions about the interdependence of the two approaches to the final chapter.

It is especially with difficult texts that such reading and re-reading is essential if we are going to approach an understanding of the text which stands a chance of wider acceptance, and in that respect this story from the book of Kings is a good example which has given rise to many interpretations.

I am conscious that the areas which I address comprise only part of the reading task, and I consider below their place in the wider whole.

The Three Tasks of Reading

Broadly speaking, one can define three tasks in relation to reading the Hebrew scriptures: they can helpfully be described as operating at three different levels, but in so doing it is important not to imagine that each task is wholly discrete, or indeed that the influence of decisions made at one 'level' is solely upon the next 'higher' stage: it is clear that certain decisions at a 'higher' stage may prompt a renewed look at decisions at a 'lower' level. The whole remains provisional and somewhat fluid until reading is complete. Thus, any reading which hopes to be satisfactory, must in the words of the title be a re-reading as well within itself, even before it has regard to other readings of the text that have been made. Even when a reading is complete, as the world of biblical scholarship continues to demonstrate, the matrix of decisions at different levels which establishes a particular text and reading is rarely incontrovertible, and even the same 'reader' may re-read a text and revise previous decisions. This caveat, then, should be borne in mind in the following outline of the issues arising at the different stages of reading.

The First-Level Task: What shall we read?

At a foundational level, there is the question What is it that we ought to be reading? That is the work of textual criticism which seeks to address "the serious points of difficulty which the reader encounters, and where he might pause and wonder whether the text is in order"[1]. The exercise involves examining the evidence for variant texts, in Hebrew or in ancient translations; although James Barr notes that for the vast majority of such cases "the Hebrew manuscripts provide [the reader] with no series of substantial alternatives from which to select"[2]. This absence of evidence of alternatives tends to lead to weight being

1 Barr, J. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* London: SCM Press, 1968 p. 1

put on the ancient translations to find alternative readings to eliminate the difficulty which has been encountered.

'Difficulty' in a text may take various forms, and Barr suggests some simple examples:

> "it 'does not make sense'. The grammar is 'wrong', i.e. does not fit with usual patterns of usage. The use of words is anomalous. Or perhaps the text contradicts what is said elsewhere in the same literary work, so that it seems to 'spoil the effect' of the whole; or it may contradict something well known altogether from other sources."[3]

There are then two ways in which such a difficulty may be responded to: it can be treated as a corruption in the transmission of the text, in which case a variant text may be proposed, or the present 'difficult' form of the text may be accepted, and an explanation offered on some alternative basis[4].

In some cases, the Hebrew text presents no 'difficulty' for the reader, and questions in relation to the Hebrew text only arise because the ancient translations bear witness to material which is substantially different from the Hebrew text, or which is absent from it.[5] In some parts of the Hebrew Bible, certain similar issues arise through differing

---

2 *op. cit.* p. 2

3 *op. cit.* p. 3

4 The essence of Barr's work in *Comparative Philology* is, of course, to attempt a systematic evaluation of philological explanations, and to attempt to weigh their value as against (usually) textual emendation.

5 A case in point relevant to the present work, is the very substantial additional material by way of biographical detail about Jeroboam which is found in the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint after 1 Kings 12.24.

treatments of substantially the same events in different places as happens in, for example, Kings and Chronicles.

I have described this as the foundational level because at this stage we are still, as it were, looking at the bookshelf and deciding which book to pick up.

The Second-Level Task: Making sense of what we read

The second level may be so described because to some degree it must work with a text in which questions raised at the previous level are required to have been dealt with before it can proceed. This second level can also be seen, at least in part, as a response to 'difficulties' in the reading process. The second level comes into operation at a point where the reader has accepted that it is either wholly inappropriate, or at least unsatisfactory to resort to strategies of e.g., emendation or philological explanation. Essentially, the question can be put in the form: Given a particular text, how can I make sense of the form and content of what I am presented with? There are two mainstream[6] answers to this question: historical criticism, and what is sometimes called the 'new criticism'[7].

---

6 I do not here include structuralism in any of its more theoretical forms. An awareness of structures within a text clearly forms part of a literary reading, but structuralism *per se* is a different approach altogether. John Barton's contrast between a *theory of reading* and a *theory about writing* is illuminating in this respect, and so too his assessment that structuralism in its fully developed form is not so much "a *method* for extracting meaning from texts as an explanatory *theory* about how meaning occurs". I am sure he is correct in arguing, as I understand him to, that there is a semi-structuralist approach in which either a historical-critical, or a 'new critical' reading uses structuralism's awareness of structures in a text as a tool for reading, rather than as part of a structural analysis. *cf.* Barton J. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1984 pp. 104-139, esp. pp. 126 f, 129 f

7 A term which carries in it the seeds of its own mortality. I am aware that in the world of Literary Criticism, this term has another meaning.

1. The Historical Critical Approach

I here use the term historical criticism in a wide sense to incorporate what are often regarded as a variety of distinct methods. Specifically, for the sake of clarity within this work, I use it to include both what has usually been known as literary criticism and what was known as historical criticism. Thus it includes source criticism, form criticism, redaction criticism etc. I use the term literary criticism to refer specifically to the examination of the poetics of biblical texts, leading exponents of which include Robert Alter, Shimon Bar-Efrat and Meir Sternberg.

Historical criticism has gone through several stages of development, and can itself have a variety of focuses. It can attend to the events to which the text ostensibly refers, with the interests of an ancient historian, it can attend to the developments in the religious thinking of the society from which the texts arose, and which are seen as shaping the perspective of the text, and it can attend to the history of the text itself, the means by which it was produced, and the different materials and motivations underlying it. Typically all three concerns are closely intertwined in any historical-critical reading of a text, but what all have in common is that the results they produce are all within the proper concern of the historian. Thus there may be conclusions drawn about different source materials woven together to produce the text that we now have; or about different life situations which produced the different textual forms that we find; or about the perspectives of those who drew together the different materials. Laid alongside the biblical text is that material which might be said to constitute the tools of the historian of the Ancient Near East, and a process of mutual interaction goes on where the historical understanding may be revised in the light of the biblical text, or the understanding of the text may be revised in the light of the historical

data. This remains the dominant model for the reading of the biblical text, and it cannot be neglected by those who propose other ways of approaching the text.

Two kinds of dissatisfaction have been expressed with the historical-critical approach to reading the text. The first criticism is that a reading of a text which provides purely historical data (whether history of Israel, history of religions, or history of the text itself), is an inadequate way of reading a text which has the status of a 'classic text'[8], with all that is thereby implied for its impact upon society historically, and in its present way of thinking, and is an inadequate way of reading a text which usually does not attempt a strictly historical evaluation of the events which it describes, but a theological one (the nearest the historical-critical approach gets to dealing with this aspect of the text is in terms of the history of religious ideas). A second aspect of this relates, in the case of the Bible, to the text's role as a normative document in relation to a community of faith, whether Judaism in the case of the Hebrew Bible, or the church in the case of the Hebrew and Greek Testaments. These communities hold the text to be, in some way, the 'word of the Lord' to them in their contemporary context, and the broadly historical-critical approach has had little to say directly to this issue. All this is to say that a growing desire has been expressed to address questions to the text other than the historical. These questions belong to the third level which is dealt with below.

The second criticism of the historical-critical approach has been that it is so interested in the pre-history of the text, and in attempting to read texts which are hypothetical, however

8 Like reading Shakespeare's "Henry V", and doing no more thereby than to draw a few conclusions about the progress of the battle of Agincourt.

well-established the hypothesis, that it has neglected to read the text that we are actually presented with. This has led to the rise of a second critical discipline which properly belongs to this level of approach.

2. The 'New' literary Approach

The alternative programme for a 'literary' approach to the Bible has had more than one cause. One has been the perception that historical-critical reading has not offered any way of reading narratives for their narrative value, even where it has recognized their existence. It is not that the existence of such narratives is denied (although the 'new' literary critics might argue that the amount of text which can be read as 'whole cloth' has been underestimated)[9], rather that once they have been recognized, historical criticism becomes methodologically uninterested in them. That is, that the reading and making sense of such narratives has been treated as a trivial (in the technical sense of the word) and largely uncontroversial exercise.

Closely related to this, is the perception that the historical-critical process has divided texts into constituent parts from different sources. At the earliest level, these are seen as having been generated for particular purposes, and subsequently joined together by a redactor or redactors whose outlook differed from the outlook of the composers of the various parts or from the outlook of earlier redactors. This discovery of multiple layers, and the process of dissection of the text is seen as having failed ultimately to grapple with what we are actually presented with - a whole text that in some respects at least constitutes a finished whole, a single literary work of art in its own right.

---

9 see *e.g.*, Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical Narrative* New York: Basic Books, 1981 p. 20 ff

The best known of the exponents of this approach, are Robert Alter, Shimon Bar-Efrat, and Meir Sternberg, though many others have followed what has been seen as a fruitful approach to reading the biblical text[10]. In the opening chapter of *The Art of Biblical Narrative*[11], Robert Alter offers a literary reading of the story of Judah and Tamar in Genesis 38, and makes a strong case for the necessity of reading it as part of the larger story of Joseph[12]. His approach throughout is that of a literary critic (rather than one who is strictly a biblical scholar) handling a literary text with literary tools. He notes that such literary analysis has been applied to other ancient texts with illuminating results, and describes it as "a little astonishing that at this late date literary analysis of the Bible of the sort that I have tried to illustrate here [i.e., in his reading of Genesis 38 in the first chapter of his book] in this preliminary fashion is only in its infancy."[13]

Similarly, Shimon Bar-Efrat in the introduction to his *Narrative Art in the Bible*[14] writes that "the literary study of biblical narratives has been only of marginal concern" and that the "investigation of the narratives' artistic qualities has been pushed aside", and even where mainstream scholarship began to address literary issues, they remained in the background of research[15].

Alter is not afraid to use strong language speaking of "the endless welter of hypotheses and

---

10 There is no more natural way to describe the discipline than as literary criticism, and its exponents as literary critics, and I shall do so here, referring to the discipline formerly so known as source criticism.

11 New York: Basic Books, 1981

12 *op. cit.* p. 12

13 *op. cit. loc. cit.*

14 Tel Aviv:Sifriat Poalim, 1979, 1984[2] All references here are to *ET* Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1989, 1992

15 Bar-Efrat *op. cit.* p. 9

counter-hypotheses generated in everything from textual criticism to issues of historical chronology" and of scholars having been "wrong-headed or extravagantly perverse"[16]. Bar-Efrat's more moderate tone perhaps reflects his stance as one within the academy of biblical studies who wishes to advocate a fresh approach, whereas Alter brings an established approach from within the literary academy, and expresses surprise that it has not been applied to biblical literature. Thus Bar-Efrat argues:

> "the being of biblical narrative is equally as interesting as its becoming. Anyone who wishes to study its being must use the avenue of literary analysis for it is impossible to appreciate the nature of biblical narrative fully, understand the network of its component elements or penetrate into its inner world without having recourse to the methods and tools of literary scholarship."[17]

Both writers speak positively of the historical approaches having "enormously advanced our understanding of the Bible"[18] and having "contributed greatly to our knowledge of the world and literature of the Bible"[19]. But the essential criticism of both is that the historical-critical approach (which Alter calls 'excavative') while revealing much of interest about what lies behind the text in terms of the historical world it reflects and the processes by which it has come into being, has failed to give proper recognition to the text that we actually have, and has failed to attend to what the text itself says in its present form.

A further criticism has arisen in relation to what is perceived amongst literary critics to be

16 Alter *op. cit.* p. 13

17 Bar-Efrat *op. cit.* p. 10

18 Alter *op. cit.* p. 13

19 Bar-Efrat *op. cit.* p. 10

an inability on the part of biblical critics in handling literary categories. Alter, speaking of Otto Eissfeldt's *The Old Testament: An Introduction*[20], comments that:

> "when the nature of the biblical materials confronts him with literary categories, his apparent authoritativeness begins to look shaky. Thus, he divides biblical narratives into myths, fairy tales, sagas, legends, anecdotes and tales, using these problematic terms with a casualness and a seeming indifference to their treatment in other disciplines that are quite dismaying."[21]

And while Alter cites this as part of the motivation for his work on applying the techniques of the discipline of literary criticism to biblical narratives, he is not the only literary critic with an interest in the Bible to have made criticism of the literary-critical competence of biblical scholars in such forthright terms[22].

It is especially important in the light of the way this 'new' literary criticism in biblical studies has arisen almost in protest against the historical-critical approaches to realize that fundamentally it is addressing the same kind of textual issues that the historical-critical method does. It is still functioning at what I have described as the second level of reading, working with a text in which text critical questions are required to have been dealt with, responding to 'difficulties' in the reading process. The same question (How can I make sense of the form and content of what I am presented with?) is being asked, but in the

---

20 ET Oxford: Blackwell, 1965

21 Alter, *op. cit.* p. 14

22 Lewis C.S. "Modern Theology and Biblical Criticism" a paper given in 1959 and originally published in *Christian Reflections* (1967) now as "Fern-seed and Elephants" in *Fern Seed and Elephants* Glasgow: Fount, 1977 p. 106 f.

literary-critical approach, these questions are being answered in terms of intentional artistic textual effects, and an understanding of the methods and techniques of biblical narrative. Furthermore, while the literary-critical approach gives priority to a literary interpretation of the present text, it is not afraid to adopt historical-critical solutions where reading difficulty is not open to literary resolution.

The Third-Level Task: Engaging with the text

The third level or task varies according to the status one accords to the text, and concerns the reader's engagement with the text being read. At the simplest level, where the text is accorded the status of being a document of simply historical interest, this third level barely operates. Its questions are no more acute than those posed by the unearthing of any other piece of historical information. However, where the text is accorded 'classic' status, or is religiously normative in some way the significance of this third reading task becomes increasingly important for a reading of the text to be regarded as satisfactory.

This third reading task has two intersecting axes, one axis influences the kind of issues which are addressed to the text, and the other affects the weight given to the 'responses' which the text is seen to give to those issues.

Thus (put crudely), two readers may both read the creation story in the first two chapters of Genesis for an account of how the universe came into being. Both may find it to be an account purporting to be a scientific and historical narrative of a six-day creation. The one may accept that as an an exact account of what happened, and the other respond by saying 'We don't believe that any more these days'. This reflects difference in weight given to the

text's perceived 'responses' to the questions put. Alternatively, readers may approach this same text with contrasting questions e.g., 'By what agency did the universe come into being?' and 'What are the respective roles of women and men in the world?', and obtain (obviously) quite different answers. In this case there may be disagreement amongst readers about the relative propriety of putting one question or another to the text, or about its ability to respond to particular kinds of question.

Unless both axes are congruent for each of any given set of readers, dialogue cannot truly be established without willing suspension by one reader or another of their reading axes, or some attempt at rapprochement or compromise.

I have chosen to try and set out in this way some sort of framework for the task of reading the Hebrew Scriptures because, in essence, the mainstream approaches to reading the biblical text - historical criticism and the 'new' literary criticism[23] - while critical of the text, are often not, in themselves, critical of the reading process. This has been the concern of the burgeoning discipline of hermeneutics which it is beyond the scope of this work to address.

Brevard S. Childs and The Canonical Approach

There is, however, an approach which makes a serious attempt to integrate these various levels into a single reading task. Brevard S. Childs has explicitly rejected the term canonical criticism for his canonical approach arguing that it is not:

> "another analytical tool - [...] called canonical criticism - which merely

[23] I exclude text criticism as being not so much a matter of reading as of establishing what is to be read.

supplements the traditional disciplines of historical criticism. In my opinion, this understanding has failed to grasp the nature of the hermeneutical issues at stake."[24]

Childs's dissatisfaction seems to have been twofold, that is, both with the failure adequately to address the actual text with which we are now presented[25], and with the inability of the historical-critical approaches to handle anything other than historical questions. Because his canonical approach operates at all the different reading levels I have outlined, because it involves redefinition and rethinking of 'canon' and 'the canonical process', and because it challenges the hermeneutical priority of solely historical-critical readings of the text, it has not, I think, been fully assimilated and fully accepted as an appropriate approach to the reading of the biblical texts.

Childs's argument is that the canonizing process has hitherto been conceived as a relatively late process of selection by which decisions were made as to which texts would thereafter be accorded authority and which would not; that is, as a process of closure. Thus from a pool of available texts only a very limited few were accorded canonical status, and this by the application of criteria extrinsic, and, in some cases at least, almost wholly foreign to the texts themselves. By contrast he defines canon to mean the "particular way in which these

---

24 Childs B.S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* London: SCM Press Ltd, 1979[2] p. 16

25 In this he is like the 'new' literary critics, and it is interesting that his exploration of the canonical approach begins at about the same time. It is interesting too to observe how some of Childs's lines of argument are congruent with those of readers such as Alter and Sternberg. Compare for example the willingness of both Childs and Alter to ascribe a kind of authorial intention to a composite literary process (see e.g., Childs *op. cit.* p. 71 ff and Alter *op. cit.* p. 131 ff). Observe also the similarity of the arguments of both Childs and Sternberg for the deliberate self-effacement of the biblical writers (Childs *op. cit.* p. 59 and elsewhere and Sternberg *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 1985) p. 65 ff)

writings were received, shaped, and transmitted by a community of faith" and he argues that:

> "a religious reading of Israel's traditions arose early in its history and extended in different ways through oral, literary, and redactional stages of the growth of the material until it reached a fixed form of relative stability. This religious interpretation – I would prefer to call it confessional – involved a peculiar construal which sought to give the material a shape which could be appropriated by successive generations within Israel. The process did not happen all at once; there was no overarching hermeneutic to realize the goals; some attempts were more successful than others. I use the term canon to describe this entire religious construal."[26]

He criticizes what he sees as the failure of the historical-critical approach to engage with the religious dynamic which shaped the canon, and which Childs clearly sees as essentially distinguishable from social, political or economic factors[27]. Thus, his argument is that the concerns which shaped the final form of the biblical text we now have, were not simply a late dogmatic arrival on the scene by which certain decisions about inclusion and exclusion were made; but rather were consistently present in the formative stages of the text as well[28]. These religious and confessional issues have, in Childs's view, been insufficiently recognized and cannot simply be subsumed under historical- or social-critical labels and questions[29]. Childs denies that his approach is homiletic or confessional, and argues that

---

26 *op. cit.* p. 16 f

27 *op. cit.* p. 41

28 Indeed, he argues for an acceptance of S.Z. Leiman's view that the Hebrew Bible gives evidence for some material having been canonized as early as Moses's lifetime. (Leiman S.Z. *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence* Hamden, Connecticut: Archon, 1976 p.20 per Childs)

29 *op. cit.* p. 58

"it seeks to describe as objectively as possible the canonical literature of ancient Israel which is the heritage of both Jew and Christian. If at times the description becomes theological in its terminology, it is because the literature itself requires it."[30]

Responses to the Canonical Approach

Childs's approach has evoked a range of responses from enthusiasm through cautious welcome to substantial hostility. There has also been a general recognition, by Childs as well as others, of the need to clarify and refine Childs's approach. To some extent the world of biblical studies has waited upon the fruit of Childs's approach in order to assess its merits, and has had difficulty in doing so on the basis of the works of introduction and theology that he has produced[31].

If one is to be fair to the canonical approach it is important to avoid seeing it simply as another tool in the critical armoury, because it is intended to be integral to the reading of the biblical text at every level of the enterprise. Thus, Childs argues, the approach influences not only the questions we put to the text, or the responses we see it giving, but also the ways in which we seek to resolve difficulties with which the text presents us (my second level of reading), and even the approach to and solution of what are simply text critical questions.

Some of the controversy surrounding the canonical approach relates to the status accorded to the final form of the text. These issues are most easily presented in terms of the extent to

30 *op. cit.* p. 14

31 The range of reactions can be seen in the reviews of Childs's work, and his response published in *JSOT* 16 (1980) 2-60

which one 'privileges' a text, or a particular reconstruction of a text. James Barr has argued that the canonical principle is essentially one of form, and that the criticisms levelled at the historical-critical approach as supposedly claiming to be inductive, objective and scientific are made by extending the claims of W.F. Albright to the whole historical-critical enterprise[32]. He argues that the canonical approach simply privileges the final stages in the history of a text as against any earlier stages[33]. This, I think, misreads Childs's concept of the canonical process[34] and confines it to the point at which the body of canonical literature was exclusively fixed or closed[35]. Childs acknowledges that there was such a final closure, but argues that the concerns that brought it about were simply a continuation or projection of the processes which had shaped the text up to that point. Further, he argues that it has been a tendency of historical-critical approaches to the text to privilege earlier (often hypothetical) texts at the cost of totally ignoring the final form. For Childs the process of dogmatic decision is only one feature, and not the whole process of canon - it is meaningful to speak of an 'open canon'. Thus the canonical process is about more than questions of closure, and to understand canon or the canonical process as a dogmatic decision about the scope of the canonical literature obscures important features by limiting the term only to the final stages of a long and complex process. There is a need, he argues, to be aware of continuing interactive relationship between growing body of authoritative literature and the community which produced it and which itself is formed by the literature.

---

32 Barr, J. *Holy Scripture. Canon Authority Criticism* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983 p. 136f

33 see the discussion at p. 21ff in Barr, J. "Childs' Introduction to the Old testament as Scripture" *JSOT 16* (1980) pp. 12-23

34 Barr does not like Childs's use of the term canon declaring that "the new broad use of the term has a very simple value: its meaning is identical with the proposition 'Childs is right'" *Holy Scripture* p. 147

35 Barr's sees Childs using the term 'canon' in three quite distinct ways: in its hitherto usual meaning; for the final form of a canonical book, and for a particular holistic way of looking at texts. He is critical of Childs's application of a single term to these separate things. *Holy Scripture* p. 75ff

The earlier canonizing decisions are not qualitatively different from later ones surrounding the question of closure[36]. It is only by taking the final form, Childs argues, that weight can be given to all the processes by which the literature has been shaped.

It is important also to remember, that for Childs the canonical approach is explicitly a way of reading the text from a primarily theological perspective. This arises from a frustration with the theological barrenness of historical-critical readings, not from a feeling that such readings are historically unfruitful. Whatever historical conclusions one might arrive at, however, the final canonical form of the text is theologically normative. This is one of the areas where the canonical approach seems to me to require further clarification. Two issues arise: the question of contrasting or apparently inconsistent theological assessments of the same people or events within the canonical form of the literature; and the question of the validity of a particular theological assessment of events which appears to depend on a historical reading of the events which is no longer felt to be supportable. Here it is clear that Childs would want a canonical approach to reflect back onto historical questions. In this, I think he is in part merely arguing that the canonical final form must be considered as part of the evidence for any historical reconstruction, and allowed as such to function critically in relation to any historical reconstruction which is inconsistent with the internal evidence of the text[37].

Sadly, to some extent, the exchange between Barr and Childs is bedevilled by serious problems of terminology. Childs's choice of 'canon' to describe his informing principle

---

36 *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* p. 58f

37 Childs B.S. "Response to Reviewers of *Introduction to The OT as Scripture*" *JSOT 16* (1980) p. 56

can be seen in retrospect to have clouded the issue, though it is not easy to see another more suitable term. The debate reads at times like a dialogue of the deaf[38], and at the very least it is clear that Childs does not accept Barr's description of Childs's approach. Equally at times, it seems that the two are closer to each other than they might appear to be: thus Barr's evaluation that:

> "it is certainly not sufficient to think of scripture as a mere aimless or undirected output of church tradition: it was directed *to* the community, aimed at its needs, and had a *normative* relationship to other tradition".[39]

The need for an integrated approach to reading the biblical text encompassing historical and theological issues, and its role in believing communities today has been recognized by many, and is pursued in some detail and with more explicit attention to hermeneutical issues by Sandra M. Schneiders[40]. We shall give further consideration to questions relating to the theological reading of an ostensibly historically referential work below.

A second area of interest has been the hermeneutical nature of the canonical approach, and in particular the suggestion that the canonical approach is best understood as a kind of structuralism. John Barton has suggested of the canonical approach that:

> "It will be clear that it is a proposal as to how biblical texts ought to be read, as opposed to being interested in what their authors meant by them."[41]

---

38 Or one of those courtroom exchanges one sometimes hears where endless confusion and acrimony is caused by a witness not answering the question put, but trying to counter the point he or she thinks the lawyer is trying to make.

39 *Holy Scripture* p. 43

40 Schneiders, Sandra M. *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991

41 Barton J. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* London: Darton Longman & Todd,

In this he is, I think, only partially correct, and he sets up these two alternatives in unnecessarily strong dichotomy. Childs very explicitly argues that his approach is not merely one set of reading rules amongst many by which a fruitful reading of the text can be made, but rather a way of reading the text which is congruent with the concerns and manner of the formation of the text in the first place.

Suffice to say, in conclusion, that though the canonical approach has been pronounced dead by some of its critics, the issues it raises and the suggestions for reading the biblical text continue to be matters of serious discussion and concern, and even in Childs's much attacked formulation it continues to be highly influential.

Conclusions

In the two readings of the text which follow, we shall engage in the second level task which I have described above. The readings will attempt to do justice to what I have suggested are the two mainstream approaches, and some preliminary conclusions will be drawn.

The readings will be based on the Masoretic Text, though I shall refer to questions raised by the differing witness of the Greek text. It will become apparent, however, that though the Greek text testifies to substantial additional material surrounding the text to be read, it has small influence on the reading of this text itself.

The order of the two readings does not reflect logical, but rather chronological precedence;

1984 p. 81

and it has been convenient to treat them in this way given that the formulation of the latter has often arisen out of criticism of the former. Some of the issues addressed in the course of these two readings will reflect on questions which the canonical approach seeks to address, which has been the reason for introducing it at the outset.

It will become apparent that these readings of the text suggest or give rise to questions which they do not attempt to answer, and this points to the need for readers who are part of believing communities for which the texts are sacred scripture to go on to the third level task. The fact that I do not do so here is purely a matter of practicality in relation to the nature and scope of this present work, and not through any lack of awareness that such issues need to be addressed.

CHAPTER ONE

A Survey of Historical-Critical Approaches to the Deuteronomistic History

Martin Noth

Any survey of the critical study of the Deuteronomistic History must indisputably begin with the work of Martin Noth[42]. In relation to any particular text Noth's ideas were not necessarily new (there are, for example, clear parallels between his and C.F. Burney's[43] understanding of the redactional history of the books of Kings). In modern critical scholarship, however, it is Martin Noth who first argued for an essential unity in the corpus of historical materials running from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings, a unity which, he argues, arises from the work of a single deuteronomistic historian.

The basic unity of the historical writing in these biblical books is the fundamental thesis of Noth's work on the Deuteronomistic History. He argues that the activity of the deuteronomistic author is evident throughout Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings in passages both large and very small.

The material which the deuteronomistic historian used consisted of a number of pre-deuteronomistic narratives of varying length which had limited horizons, and which focused on significant periods in Israel's history. These sources represented a variety of stages in the development of Israel's traditions about its life in the land. The

---

[42] German publication in 1943: ET *The Deuteronomistic History* Sheffield: JSOT Press 1981

[43] Burney, C. F. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix* Oxford: Clarendon, 1903

deuteronomistic historian took these sources and linked them together according to a carefully conceived chronological scheme, interpolating speeches and narrative commentary of his own to round out the material, and to expound his understanding of the theological lessons to be learned from the history of his people and from their final catastrophic end.

The deuteronomistic author is characterised by the use of straightforward language and the repetition of distinctive phrases and constructions. It is, however, in the construction of the work as a whole that we find clearest evidence of the historian's work. Typically, at important points, he brings forward leading characters to make speeches looking backward or forward and interpret events, and elsewhere he introduces his own summarising reflections (perhaps because the material is not appropriate for a speech, or because there is no character appropriate to make the speech). There is also a simple and unified theological interpretation of the history, characterised by an emphasis on the need for obedience to the voice of God; a lack of any positive interest in cultic practices; and a concern to depict and interpret the historical process to show God's judgment working out against the whole people.

Originally, smooth transitions were made by the deuteronomistic historian between what are now separate books. Subsequent redactional activity, however, has accommodated these later divisions, and added beginning and ending material in some cases.

Noth argued that the deuteronomistic historian was not merely an editor but also an author; one who used traditional material and provided connecting passages, but also one who

made deliberate selection. Material is sometimes ordered according to the tradition inherited by the deuteronomistic historian, and sometimes according to his own scheme. The closest parallels are the Roman and Hellenistic historians of times long before their own.

Noth does concede later redactional activity, but in his view this is the augmentation, with secondary material, of an original deuteronomistic foundation. He does not see such later redaction as altering the fundamental character of the work. Martin Noth's own analysis of the message of the Deuteronomistic History is that it is a message of a God who "honoured the Israelite people with a special role and thus placed them under a special obligation"; who was "continuously meeting the accelerating moral decline [of Israel] with warnings and punishments and, finally, when these proved fruitless, with total annihilation"; and of, "a just divine retribution in the history of the people."[44]

Early critics of Noth: von Rad, Wolff

This essentially unifying approach was criticized by Gerhard von Rad on two bases[45]. In the first place he argued that it was unlikely that such a comprehensive work existed merely to buttress a theological judgment that the calamity in 587 BCE was a just punishment divinely inflicted, especially when the message of the work would, by definition, "have been directed to a generation which YHWH had written off."[46] He argues for a pattern in which the period of the Judges ends in disaster but with a clear indication that YHWH has not finally abandoned his people. This then suggests a literary parallel with the verdict on

---

44 *op. cit.* p. 89

45 See the discussions in "The Deuteronomic Theology of History in I and II Kings"(1947) in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and other essays* London:SCM Press 1966 pp. 205-21 and *Old Testament Theology* Vol. 1 German publication in 1957: ET London:SCM Press 1965/75 pp. 334-47

46 *Old Testament Theology* Vol 1. p. 346

the disaster of 587, and that the message of the work is a call to repentance. The message of the history as discerned by von Rad is strikingly similar to that often ascribed to the writing prophets, namely that the turning, or repentance, which is required is not a cultic turning but a turning of the heart.

An important text for von Rad's critique is the promise to David in 2 Samuel 7:16 of an enduring dynasty. To be sure, von Rad and Noth are agreed that the text is part of the source that the deuteronomistic historian inherited, but von Rad notes the way the theme of an enduring dynasty is picked up in a number of other places in the history[47], and fused with an area of known deuteronomistic interest, namely the location of the cultic centre. Noth ascribes these other texts to the deuteronomistic historian, and draws attention to their interest in Jerusalem as the place which YHWH has chosen as a dwelling for his name. He pays no attention, however, to the promise of an enduring dynasty.

Further, von Rad lists four other texts[48] which are part of the deuteronomistic historian's theological framework, and which must therefore be seen as significant for our understanding of the work as a whole. These texts "represent an aspect of the traditions which is wholly undeuteronomic, and show a pronounced messianic interest."[49] The promise of an enduring dynasty for David is to be allied with nearly a score of deuteronomistic texts which present a very clear picture of David as a king after God's own heart. The end result is not very easily married to the picture of David the man which

[47] 1 Kings 11:13,32,36; 15:4; 2 Kings 8:19

[48] 1 Kings 2:4; 8:20,25; and 9:5

[49] *The Problem of the Hexateuch* p. 216

emerges from the succession narrative.

Von Rad considers that this "deuteronomic conception exemplifies pre-eminently a messianic view of David"[50], and that, in adopting this tradition, the deuteronomistic historian is moving away from the theological viewpoint of Deuteronomy. In part he sees the deuteronomistic historian's action as faithfulness to the traditions which he is handling, and in particular to the persistence of the promises of the Davidic covenant. The fact that this is continually referred to throughout the history suggests that this theme continues notwithstanding the catastrophes which overwhelm Judah. However, the deuteronomistic historian's action is not merely to be interpreted as the faithful adoption of traditional material. Von Rad considers that the historian has also adopted for himself the outlook of this material and is integrating it into his understanding of Israel's history. This is seen as part and parcel of the deuteronomistic historian's adoption of patterns of prophecy and fulfilment, and of his emphasis on the certainty and abiding power of the word of God: YHWH's promise cannot fail. For von Rad, the mention of Jehoiachin's release in 2 Kings 25.27 ff, and the honour with which he is then treated constitutes a significant comment from the historian, indicating that the power of the promise to David has not been exhausted or overcome. This ultimately represents a more optimistic picture (even if only tentatively so) of the message of the Deuteronomistic History than that put forward by Noth. It was a conclusion perhaps more easily reached, for a German theologian, by one writing in 1947, than by one whose work was first published in 1943.

Secondly, in literary terms, von Rad finds it hard to accept that the deuteronomistic

50 *The Problem of the Hexateuch* p. 218

historian who is "usually so ready to talk and so glad to interpret"[51] should remain silent through the whole complex of traditions about David. Further, and more importantly, he contrasts the treatment of the historical material in two books: Judges with its cycle of apostasy, oppression, repentance, and deliverance; and Kings where the judgment goes on building up and up until the final calamity. "It is", he says, "difficult to think that the editing of the book of Judges and that of the book of Kings could have taken place as a single piece of work."[52]. This opens up possibilities of more than one stage of redaction, or, alternatively of the existence of larger pre-redactional elements with wider historical and theological horizons than Noth is prepared to admit.

Others too have felt that Noth's reading of the Deuteronomistic History was too negative. The themes of Israel's return and YHWH's mercy appear in a number of texts which Noth considers to be deuteronomistic, and this is hard to reconcile with his essentially pessimistic assessment of the deuteronomistic historian's message. H.W. Wolff[53], who is one of these, also argues that the material in Deuteronomy 30:1-10 is not deuteronomistic (contra Noth), but the product of a later redactor who composed that text and Deuteronomy 4:29-31, using the theme of return which is to be found in the Deuteronomistic History, in order to provide a positive framework for the discourse of Moses. Wolff, on the other hand finds that von Rad puts too much weight on 2 Kings 25:27-30, and challenges the more positive theological assessment of von Rad[54].

---

51 *Old Testament Theology* Vol 1 p 346

52 *Old Testament Theology* Vol 1 p 347

53 Wolff, H.W. "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes" *ZAW 73*, 1961 171-86 (all page references are to the ET: "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomic Historical Work" in Brueggemann W. & Wolff H.W. (Ed.s.) *The Vitality of the Old Testament Traditions* Atlanta: J Knox, 1982 pp. 83-100)

54 *op. cit.* p. 86, a criticism echoed by F.M. Cross (*Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the*

Wolff argues that a work of the size and complexity of the Deuteronomistic History is seeking to do more than proclaim the rather blunt messages suggested by Noth or von Rad[55]. He argues that the great speeches which mark turning points in the work show a concern for the concept of repentance and returning to YHWH, particularly focused on the usage of a favourite deuteronomistic keyword שוב:

> "...the theme 'return' appears at important highpoints of the Deuteronomic presentation of history, and it thereby demonstrates through different examples what Israel should hear and do under judgment in the exile.
>
> But could it be that this idea of return is still subordinate to DtrH's emphasis on judgment for the time of apostasy?"[56]

Wolff concludes on the basis of an analysis of the language and themes of Deuteronomy 30.1-10 that the hand of a second Deuteronomistic historian can be discerned, who "carried the theme of the history work specifically back into Moses' time in order to insure that the entire work would be read and taken to heart in his own day"[57]. He admits that his conclusions are hypothetical and tentative, and acknowledges the requirement for further study on the textual and literary relations between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History on the basis of Deuteronomy 28-30 and Deuteronomy 4.

History and Religion of Israel London: Harvard University Press, 1973 p. 277)

55 "The very size of the work requires us to ask whether DtrH did not have a rather complex intention in mind." *op. cit.* p. 86

56 Wolff *op. cit.* p. 91

57 *op. cit.* p. 96

Both von Rad's and Wolff's criticisms have challenged the nature of the conceptual framework postulated by Noth for the Deuteronomistic History. Von Rad, while accepting much of the literary basis of the thesis, challenges Noth's assessment of the theological outlook of the deuteronomistic writer. Wolff challenges both the basic analysis of the outlook of the historian, and Noth's assessment that later redactional activity did not substantially alter the theological outlook of the work.

Later Critiques of Noth's Redaction History of the Deuteronomistic History

Much of the subsequent work on the Deuteronomistic History has been addressed to an examination of pre- and post-deuteronomistic layers of redaction. In particular, it is suggested that a number of the different themes present in the history are attributable to the interests of the authors or redactors of these redactional layers. Underlying this is a generally unspoken critique: either of Noth's hypothesis that the deuteronomistic historian used material which had very limited horizons both as to time frame, and as to theological evaluation; or of his hypothesis that later redaction has had very little effect on the general message of the history.

A number of writers in recent years have surveyed the history of critical study of the Deuteronomistic history. M.A. O'Brien in his work on the Deuteronomistic History[58] divides the various studies of post-deuteronomistic redaction into two schools, the one deriving from the work of Rudolf Smend, and the other from that of Frank Moore Cross. I have found it convenient to follow the arrangement of his survey. The distinction between

58 *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (Orbis biblicus et orientalis 92) Freiburg,Schweiz: Univ.-Verlag.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1989

the two schools begins to break down in the way some writers approach the text, but it remains a useful framework for a survey of the scene.

Post-deuteronomistic redactions

The Smend School

Rudolf Smend (including Walter Dietrich and Timo Veijola) and those following him[59] propose that the work as a whole is exilic with further exilic redactions. The basis of the argument for the identification of the different redactional layers lies in Jepsen's distinction between different concerns - which do not fit comfortably with Noth's thesis of a single historian - identifiable on various grounds in the Deuteronomistic History: the cultic history, prophetic materials, and legal materials.[60]

First came the work of a historian during the early exile. This history was subsequently reworked by a prophetic redactor, and later still by a nomistic redactor (DtrH -originally referred to as DtrG, DtrP and DtrN respectively). Thus Walter Dietrich suggests that the prophetic redactor is responsible not only for the addition to the history of speeches or commentary of a prophetic nature, but also for the insertion of a number of the traditional prophetic narratives. He identifies, in particular, four prophetic speeches which show substantial similarities, and then identifies on formal and thematic grounds other texts linked with these. In a similar way, the nomistic redactor then added a number of passages

---

59 First proposed by Smend in "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Betrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte" in H. W. Wolff (Ed.). *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* Munich: C. Kaiser, 1971 pp. 494-509. Smend himself acknowledges a debt to Alfred Jepsen

60 *Die Quellen des Königbücher* Halle: Niemeyer, 1953, 1956^2

which exhibit a marked interest in the law. Veijola[61] argues that the original historian has a positive view of the monarchy, and that the greatest hostility comes from the prophetic redactor, with the nomistic redactor effecting some sort of compromise. Veijola extends his work to the book of Samuel, previously regarded as having been incorporated all as a piece by the deuteronomistic historian. Thus, for the Smend school, the competing strains present in the final form of the history are seen as the result of the different viewpoints of the redactors who each significantly affect the outlook of the work as a whole, at least in relation to its assessment of the monarchy.

There have been a number of criticisms of this school's approach, particularly in relation to problems over the criteria for identifying different strata.

S.L. McKenzie criticizes the simple acceptance of Noth's exilic dating of the primary redaction, and the failure to allow for substantial pre-exilic material with wider horizons than the very limited horizons allowed by Noth[62]. He shares the criticism of the criteria for distinguishing between DtrH/G and DtrN which I.W. Provan also makes, namely that, in Dietrich's book, "what begins as as a distinction between materials on the basis of form [and Provan notes that even this is not established beyond criticism] ends up becoming a distinction between the redactors who introduced the materials, without sufficient justification being given for this development." Provan goes on to conclude

> "The fact is that there are very few indications indeed, either from the study of the language, or from the study of the theology, or from literary

61 Veijola, T. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Annales Academiae Scientarium Fennicae 198)*, 1977

62 McKenzie S.L. *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* SVT 42 Leiden: Brill, 1991 p. 9

> [*sc.* source] critical analysis, that Red P [*sc.* DtrP?] is a separate redactor from DtrG [DtrH]. The few indications that do exist ... are certainly not sufficient to support a thoroughgoing distinction between an historian and a prophetic redactor. History and prophecy, after all, are subjects in which a single author could have been interested. All that such evidence suggests is that some prophetic material has been added to [the Deuteronomistic History] by a later redactor."[63]

O'Brien criticizes the work of the Smend school primarily because there is no reassessment of the hypothetically resultant text of the primary redaction of the Deuteronomistic History[64]. Without such an assessment, he argues, there will always be uncertainty about the nature and extent of the later redaction.

O'Brien is particularly critical of Dietrich's work for failing to take account of the text of 2 Samuel 7 in his assessment of the work of the prophetic redactor. This text with its two key elements of an everlasting dynasty and the promise of a temple seems to be obviously prophetic material. O'Brien suggests, though, that it is difficult to exclude these themes from the suggested primary version of the history, in this he reflects the criticisms of McKenzie and Provan. Further, Dietrich fails to comment on the significance of this text and its themes for the prophecy/fulfillment pattern which Dietrich sees as being of great importance for the prophetic redactor - indeed he assigns the report of their fulfillment to the nomistic redactor. The Smend school in general shows some variation in its ascription

---

63 Provan, I.W., *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings. A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History (BZAW 172)*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988 p. 24 f

64 Something which is the major feature of O'Brien's own proposals

of various parts of the text of 2 Samuel 7.

Gary Knoppers in his assessment of this school notes the serious difficulty with some passages of coming to a clear-cut decision about which redactor they should be assigned to; and he also notes particularly the problem of 2 Samuel 7. In addition to his methodological criticism on this count, Knoppers also suggests that the *Sitz im Leben* posited for the various redactors is less than convincing.[65]

O'Brien further suggests that the existence of a later independent prophetic redaction cannot really be established without a "careful examination of the judgment formulae [in Kings] and their relationship to the prophecies."[66] Finally, Dietrich notes a number of deuteronomistic additions to the prophetic speeches beyond those ascribed to the prophetic redactor, and concludes that their interest in the law suggests that they are the work of the nomistic redactor. O'Brien observes that Dietrich's nomistic hypothesis produces a substantial list of such texts, many of which are not adequately evaluated, and exhibit little or no discernible nomistic interest[67]. These texts, however, are then used by Dietrich as an aid in identifying the work of the prophetic redactor.

Veijola's work is an extension to the books of Samuel and Judges of Dietrich's work on the books of Kings. It is thus built on somewhat shaky foundations. Veijola does

---

65 Knoppers, Gary N. *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies* (Vol 1: *The Reign of Solomon, the Rise of Jeroboam*; Vol 2: *The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah*) Harvard Semitic Monographs No 52 Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993 Vol 1 p. 39 f

66 *op. cit.* p.9

67 A full list of the relevant texts is given in O'Brien *op. cit.* p.9 n.26

undertake an analysis of the nature and extent of the initial Deuteronomistic History, but confines his work to Samuel and selected material from Judges. He does not carry that analysis into the book of Kings and therefore does nothing to test those areas of Dietrich's work which are subject to the criticisms outlined above.

Additionally, O'Brien is critical of Veijola's evaluation of the Deuteronomistic History. The theme of divine legitimation of the Davidic dynasty is ascribed to the primary historian on the basis of 1 Kings 2:2, 4aαb:

> "I am about to go the way of all the earth. Be strong and show yourself a man,... that the LORD may establish his word which he spoke concerning me saying, '...there shall not fail you a man on the throne of Israel.'"

which is seen as the historian's work. O'Brien argues, however, that this text is not about divine legitimation of the dynasty at all, and that the other texts where the theme of legitimation actually does occur (2 Samuel 7:11b, 16) are not the work of the deuteronomistic historian, but rather, on the analysis of O'Brien (and Noth), part of the inherited tradition.

A weakness of Veijola's study arises from his challenge to Noth's hypothesis that there is very little deuteronomistic redactional activity in Samuel and 1 Kings 1-2. Veijola is sometimes led to identify deuteronomistic work upon slender evidence, other material is identified on the basis of its relation to the first item and so on. The resulting structure, however, is rather weak. Thus, the deuteronomistic phrase כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה in 1 Kings 3:6 — where Solomon's succession is referred to — is used as a basis for identifying David's

words:

בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר נָתַן הַיּוֹם יֹשֵׁב עַל־כִּסְאִי וְעֵינַי רֹאוֹת

"Blessed be the LORD, the God of Israel who has granted me one of my offspring to sit on my throne this day, my own eyes seeing it."

in 1 Kings 1:48 as deuteronomistic. The phrase וְעֵינַי רֹאוֹת is also seen as deuteronomistic on the basis of similar phrases about seeing in Deuteronomy 28:32, 2 Samuel 24:3 and Jeremiah 20:4. O'Brien considers this word study approach inadequate to establish the usage as characteristically deuteronomistic when a similar occurrence in Genesis 45:12 is clearly not[68]. However, the usage is more extensive in the early chapters of Deuteronomy, and it is not clear whether it is a general usage which is frequent at the beginning of Deuteronomy (perhaps because of forensic overtones), or whether it is in fact a peculiarly deuteronomistic usage. If O'Brien is right in his assessment, then Veijola's subsequent use of 1 Kings 1:48b to establish deuteronomistic provenance of 2 Samuel 24:3 may be criticized. A.G. Auld in his illuminating work on the shared text of Kings and Chronicles, is also wary of the word study approach. He notes:

> "that most of the language of the extensive pluses [*sc.* redactional additions to the basic common text] in Kings and Chronicles is already to be found in the Shared Text. Whether fashioned there, or already present in its sources, its expressions were available to be repeated, and more often re-combined and re-used in the successor texts. This means that we cannot use words and phrases... in any simplistic way as diagnostic of individual literary phases."[69]

---

68 O'Brien *op. cit.* p. 10 n. 29

69 Auld, A.G. *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* T & T Clark Edinburgh 1994 p. 149

Provan suggests that the "complexity of the [Smend school] even in its milder forms, prompts one to ask whether there is not something seriously wrong with the basic assumptions which lie behind it." He concludes that the approach of this school fails to tackle two major issues arising from Noth's view of Kings: the evidence of substantial pre-exilic material, and the tension between conditional and unconditional understandings of the promises to David.[70] O'Brien considers that the work of the Smend school is unsatisfactory, and its hypotheses 'not proven' until adequate attention is addressed to the nature and extent of the primary Deuteronomistic History.

The Cross School

The basic view of the Cross school is that the first compilation of the history took place during the reign of Josiah (by a writer corresponding to Noth's deuteronomistic historian). A pre-exilic date for a substantial part of the history had already been proposed by W.F. Albright[71], and this had found support amongst various writers[72]. Cross suggested that certain themes could clearly be connected with the Josianic work, and others with the exilic period. The Josianic composition, Cross suggested, was subsequently expanded and revised to accommodate the disaster of the exile. This accounts for the continuing theme of the dynastic promise to David throughout much of the history. In Cross's view the reshaping of the history was intended, with the minimum of reworking, to make it relevant

---

70 *op. cit.* p. 26

71 "The Biblical Period" in Finkelstein, L. *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949

72 e.g., Bright, Wright, de Vaux

to the exiles, to whom Josiah was now a broken reed[73].

Cross provides a coherent theological hypothesis which, he argues, can serve to differentiate the two redactional layers. The history is not then a call for a return to YHWH and a reuniting of the divided kingdoms, based on the powerful motifs of judgment and hope in the history, and intended to validate the Josianic reforms, but is transformed into a sermon upon history in which the "original theme of hope is overwritten and contradicted"[74]. For Cross, the contrasting themes of grace and hope are still present in a work that now has a more pessimistic message because of the exilic author's "fidelity in preserving intact the work of the Josianic Deuteronomist", and the absence of any theological comment on the fall of Jerusalem is because the record of this is the work of "a less articulate Exilic editor."[75] The Josianic theme of God's coming restoration is seen as having failed. It is because the deuteronomistic historian was writing in the exile that the theme of hope of restoration present in the Josianic writing is abandoned. (Yet it is precisely themes of hope which Cross asserts are characteristic of the exile and are clearly present in the Priestly work, Second Isaiah and Ezekiel.)

Some support for Cross's hypothesis is found in the work of Richard D. Nelson[76] who examines the dynastic promises for the Davidic dynasty, and the judgment formulae for the last four kings of Judah. Most of his work is devoted to an analysis and identification of the secondary exilic redaction, both on the basis of the judgment formulae, and on the basis

---

73 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press,1973. pp 285-7

74 *op. cit.* p 288

75 *op. cit.* p 288

76 *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTS 18) Sheffield: JSOT, 1981

of literary features of the last four chapters of Kings. He argues a very coherent case for Cross's proposed double redaction. He notes a marked change in the structure of the history in the last chapters of Kings. Features include a shift in the prophecy fulfilment pattern evident in earlier parts of the history (he notes the rather vague reference to 'his [YHWH's] servants the prophets' in the judgment on Manasseh in 2 Kings 21); and the absence of theological comment on important events - particularly the fall of Judah (cp. the comment on the fall of Israel in 2 Kings 17). While rejecting much of Helga Weippert's hypothesis about the redactional significance of the differences between the various judgment formulae on the kings of Israel and Judah[77], Nelson accepts her separation of the last four kings of Judah from the others on the basis of the short and bare formulae by which they are assessed. Two passages in Judges (2:1-5 and 6:7-10), often regarded as later than the main deuteronomistic redaction, and using the phrase 'they did not listen' are analysed.The use of this phrase, and other structural similarities identify further material in Kings which is exilic. Nelson's work adds a strong source critical underpinning to Cross's more programmatic work, and has added much to its acceptance.

Other writers following Cross (Richard Friedman[78] and Jon Levenson[79]) have tended, like Nelson, to accept Cross's basic hypothesis, and to focus on the impact of the second redaction on particular aspects of the history. Levenson, for example, argues for the insertion of the old deuteronomic law code by the second redactor.

A.D.H. Mayes[80] has produced a comprehensive attempt to examine the Deuteronomistic

---

77 Weippert, H., "Die 'deuteronomistichen' Berteilung der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher" *Biblica* 53 (1972)

78 Friedman, R.E. 'From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr1 and Dtr2' in B. Halpern and J.D. Levenson (eds) *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1981

79 Levenson, J.D. 'Who inserted the Book of the Torah?' *HTR* 68 (1975) 203-233

80 *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History*

History from Cross's perspective. His work essays a detailed synthesis of the fruit of more recent studies of the books comprising the Deuteronomistic History with Cross's basic double redaction formulation. In relation to Kings, however, he argues for three versions of that part of the history on the basis of the work of H. Weippert (for which see below).

A fundamental difference results between Cross and Noth in their assessment of the basic message of the Deuteronomistic History. Noth sees a document of final judgment and condemnation, whereas Cross sees one of a call to conversion, and the hope of a new era. Cross's different attitude, however, can simply be accounted for: he excludes from the Deuteronomistic History (and counts as later exilic redaction) all the material which Noth saw as weighing the final balance of competing themes in favour of judgment. In their reading of the work as a whole, Noth and Cross are very much in agreement.

The Cross school gives a much more satisfactory account of the attention paid to Josiah's reform, and is also well able to accommodate the promise to David in 2 Samuel 7. An important element in the structure of the history is the relationship between the promise to David and the sin of Jeroboam. The redaction history proposed by the Cross school accounts for the prominent place given in the text to the role of prophecy, and to the continuing theme of "the survival of the Davidic dynasty and Judah in contrast to the disastrous end of the northern kingdom."[81]

Again, however, O'Brien criticizes the school for its failure to make a thorough analysis of

---

London:SCM, 1983

81 O'Brien *op. cit.* p.12

the unity and conceptual framework of the Deuteronomistic History. This would be unfair to Cross himself whose approach is clearly thematic and programmatic, or to Nelson whose focus is on the secondary work. Though of course it is the proof of his theory to examine how it works in detailed application, in relation not only to a convincing body of exilic material, but also to a convincing resultant primary work. In O'Brien's view, however, the absence of a detailed proposal as to the shape of the primary Deuteronomistic History leads to a number of problems in the identification of subsequent redactional activity.

In addition I consider that Cross's fundamental hypothesis has a major weakness. He assigns the themes of grace and hope and of "the expectation of the restoration of the state under a righteous Davidid to the remembered greatness of the golden age of David" to the Josianic period, and those of "lively hope of restoration; of the eternal covenant and return..., of a new Exodus and Conquest..., and of a new allotment of the land, a new Temple, and a new Davidid..." to the "great works of the exile"[82]. There is no acknowledgement, in this part of his work at least, of the way in which what he sees as exilic themes overlap with, and could easily have been derived from, a reading of the original Deuteronomistic History - disaster and all. A discernment of these positive theological themes of promise within the history, allied with a strong deuteronomistic faith in the power of the word of God to achieve what it promised (such as is clearly exhibited in the prophecy fulfilment scheme in the history), and with the exilic context then leads to the further developments and new readings which are found in the exilic works. Such readings are however fundamentally in accord with the deuteronomistic tradition.

---

82 Cross *op. cit.* pp. 288-9

Cross finds the twin foci of the history of the northern and southern kingdoms to be the sin of Jeroboam culminating in 2 Kings 17 and the faithfulness of David which comes to a conclusion with the reforms of Josiah. Provan, who proposes a Deuteronomistic edition of kings with Hezekiah's reign as its climax, composed early in the Josianic period[83], argues that there is a separate focus on the conduct of the people who are protected from destruction in Judah because of YHWH's promises to the faithful David, and judged in Israel because they followed the ways of Jeroboam. Thus, he suggests, the work cannot function as straightforwardly as Cross would have it, to recall the people to obedience to the law, since there is a suggestion that judgment happens only to those outside the protection of the promises to David.

There is some question too whether a fairly simple double redaction approach can really do justice to the complexity of the Deuteronomistic History.

Pre-deuteronomistic redactions

In contrast to both the Smend and Cross schools are those whose attention is focused on the material available to the deuteronomistic historian, rather than what subsequent redactors did to his work. For convenience O'Brien's categorization divides these into two groups: those who argue for an extensive layer of redaction throughout the history, and those who argue for smaller blocks of material within particular (canonical) books.

83 Provan *op. cit.* p. 172

A Josianic redaction (Noth: exilic) of Judges has been proposed by Walter Richter[84], and Bruce C. Birch has suggested a late eighth century edition of 1 Samuel 7-15 including a number of texts assigned by Noth to the deuteronomistic historian[85]. An expanded version of the latter has been proposed by Kyle P. McCarter, including the rest of 1 Samuel and the whole of 2 Samuel excluding only chapters 6, 8, and 21 to the end[86].

The range of alternative proposals for Kings is more extensive. Alfred Jepsen[87] (who as we have noted is significant for Smend and others) proposed a pre-deuteronomistic priestly redactor who combined material from three sources: an account of Solomon's reign; a synchronistic chronicle of the kings of Israel and Judah; and an annalistic record of the history of the Jerusalem temple and cult (1 Kings 1 to 2 Kings 20 - Solomon to Hezekiah).

In an article based on a study of the judgment formulae relating to the kings of Israel and Judah, Helga Weippert proposes three layers of redaction[88]. The first was pre-deuteronomistic and composed at about the time of the northern exile it covered 1 Kings 22:43 - 2 Kings 17. The second is deuteronomistic and composed during the reign of Josiah. It formed a frame round the initial redaction, bringing in material from as early as 1 Kings 14, and carrying the history through to Josiah. The final redaction was carried out during the exile and provided the judgment formulae for the last four kings.

---

84 Richter W., *Die Bearbeitung des "Retterbuches" in der deuteronomischen Epoche* (BBB 21) Bonn: Hanstein, 1964

85 Birch Bruce C., *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15* (SBLDS 27) Missoula: Scholars, 1976

86 McCarter, P. Kyle, *I Samuel* (AB 8) Garden City: Doubleday; 1980 pp. 18-23; and *II Samuel* (AB 9) Garden City: Doubleday, 1984 pp. 7-8

87 *op. cit.*

88 Weippert, H. *op. cit.* pp. 301-9

Once again O'Brien notes as a weakness of this work its failure to identify the text belonging to each redactional layer. He does not perhaps intend this as a criticism in any negative sense since Weippert's article runs to less than forty pages.

A number of proposals have been made for larger pre-deuteronomistic redactional layers, Joshua 24 to Hezekiah (Joachim Schüpphaus)[89], Judges 9 to 2 Kings 10 (Giovanni Garbini)[90], and 1 Samuel 1 to 2 Kings 13 (Steven L. Mackenzie building on McCarter)[91].

In a more comprehensive treatment Antony Campbell[92] proposes a late ninth century Prophetic Record from 1 Samuel 1:1 to 2 Kings 10:28. In addition he proposes a northern expansion to that record continuing the story of the northern kings to the exile of 721, and a parallel Southern Document telling the story of Judah from the schism to the deliverance from Assyria under Hezekiah (1 Kings 12 to 2 Kings 19) - probably composed in circles hostile to Manasseh and Amon. The expanded Prophetic Record and the Southern Document then became sources for the Deuteronomistic History. O'Brien finds this study convincing, and makes much use of it in his own attempt to explore the Deuteronomistic History.

---

89 Schüpphaus, J., *Richter- und Prophetengeschichten als Glieder der Geschichtsdarstellung der Richter- und Königszeit* Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1967

90 Garbini, G., "'Narrativa della successione' o 'storia dei re'?" *Henoch* 1 (1979) 19-41

91 McKenzie, S.L., "The Prophetic History and the Redaction of Kings", *Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of S.D. Goitein*. Hebrew Annual Review 9 (1985) pp. 203-220 McKenzie, however, reviews and substantially alters his position. His arguments for so doing are set out in his *The Trouble with Kings*.

92 Campbell, A.F., *Of Prophets and Kings. A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1 - 2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS 17), Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986

An interesting and attractive proposal which probably belongs in this part of the classification is that of A Graeme Auld who proposes an underlying common text shared between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles[93]. This text, he suggests is 'at peace with itself' about the monarchy[94] and idealizes Solomon. Both Chronicles and Samuel-Kings began with this shared text and expanded on it. Any text common to both Chronicles and Samuel-Kings should be regarded as early and not Deuteronomistic. He concludes:

> "Most of the consensus view about Chronicles remains unchallenged: that these books were extensively expanded and thoroughly rewritten from a base consisting of material familiar to us from Samuel and Kings. What we have challenged of the consensus view is that the Chronicler also omitted large tracts of material from his source. For we have claimed that Samuel and Kings too have been extensively expanded and thoroughly rewritten from a base of material familiar to us in Chronicles! And of course the neater way of making the same double suggestion is to say that each of the biblical books has been produced by expanding and rewriting a common source."[95]

Auld proposes a full version of the shared text, and argues for its historical and theological coherence. He suggests that it is relatively lightly edited for Chronicles, but more extensively worked over to produce, for example the highly nuanced view of Solomon found in the Deuteronomistic history.

---

93 *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* T & T Clark Edinburgh 1994

94 In this suggestion he parallels the conclusions of Veijola.

95 *op. cit.* p. 147

Auld's work is programmatic, although persuasively and clearly argued on various points of detail, and it is not directed primarily at a consideration of the history of the Deuteronomistic History. However, the fact that is argued by reference to textual material outside the text of the Deuteronomistic History sets it apart from much of the foregoing discussion; and it presents a persuasive case for seeing the deuteronomistic redactor(s) as being as creative as the writer of Chronicles. Auld argues that by privileging the text of Kings and assuming that the Chronicler has both added to and subtracted from it, we have overlooked the creativity of the Samuel-Kings material.

New Evaluations of the Deuteronomistic History

All the foregoing alternative redaction histories for the Deuteronomistic History cut across Noth's work in some way or other, either challenging the nature of the conceptual framework he proposes or the theological outlook of its author, or assigning to pre- or post- deuteronomistic redactors material which Noth attributes to the deuteronomistic historian.

A number of attempts have been made to reformulate the hypothesis, or to formulate alternatives.

Hans Detlef Hoffmann is one of the more recent defenders of a predominantly unitary authorship of the Deuteronomistic History as proposed by Noth. Hoffman proposes[96] a sophisticated author of the Deuteronomistic History in the early post-exilic period, focusing his work on cultic reform, in order to promote cultic reform in the post exilic period.

96 Hoffmann, H-D, *Reform und Reformen* (ATANT 66) Zürich: Theologidscher Verlag, 1980

Hoffmann is more radical than Noth, arguing that it is not possible to separate out pre-deuteronomistic sources. The historian drew on Israel's tradition and supplied information appropriate to his purpose to fill any gaps.

Cultic reform, however, is not an adequate theme for explaining the relation of parts of the history to the whole, nor does it explain the deuteronomistic assessment of the last four kings of Judah whom Hoffmann does not consider in any detail. No cultic interest at all is exhibited in the judgment formulae on them.

Further, it is hard to see such a theme in Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges and Samuel. Even Hoffmann's new and radical unifying approach does not account fully for the complexity of the literary evidence, and he concedes the work of a later redactor. Finally he frequently resorts to the structure of a text alone to defend unity of authorship but other analytical methods need to be employed for corroboration.

John Van Seters[97] analyzes ancient historiographical practice and compares the deuteronomistic historian to Herodotus. He finds a simple source-redaction approach an inadequate model for the composition of the Deuteronomistic History. This is comparable with recent work on Herodotus. He argues that although in some areas the deuteronomistic historian has evidently used older material, it has been thoroughly incorporated, and no redaction history can be reconstructed. He disputes the suggestion of larger collections of stories or material. "It was Dtr himself who collected his material and put it into the

97 Van Seters, J., *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical Historiography*, New Haven: Yale University, 1983

sequence and chronological scheme in which it now appears from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings."[98] Van Seters dates the primary Deuteronomistic History in the exile, noting that when "the Dtr history is divested of all its later additions, it has a remarkably uniform style and outlook."[99] If van Seters has any criticism of Noth it is that he did not go far enough in crediting the creative capacity of the deuteronomistic historian, and ascribed too much to putative sources. Discussions of the historian's purpose are always problematic, and van Seters's suggestion that "Dtr's purpose *above all* [my italics] is to communicate through this story of the people's past a sense of their identity" treats rather cavalierly the evident *theological* purpose of the work. O'Brien considers that Van Seters's description fails to do justice to the parts of the text and their relation to the whole, and suggests that a comparative approach based on shared literary characteristics of historiographic writing is methodologically dubious. In part this must be ultimately a question of what John Barton calls "literary competence"[100], and I do not share O'Brien's doubts about the value of comparative literary study, at least as practised by van Seters. There are areas, however, where van Seters's reading of the text does not seem to me to be as sensitive to textual nuance and possible ways of reading as it might be[101]. Support for van Seters's approach is offered by S.L. McKenzie in *The Trouble with Kings*, who returns to Noth's basic view of the history, denying the existence of any kind of earlier running history, and arguing for post deuteronomistic additions by a number of hands[102].

---

98 Van Seters, *op. cit.* p. 356

99 *op. cit.* p. 359

100 *Reading the Old Testament:* see his first chapter "'Literary Competence' and Genre Recognition" p. 8ff

101 For example his reading of 1 Kings 12-14 seems to me to owe more to a proposed historical framework than to a careful reading of the text. See van Seters *op. cit.* p. 312 ff, and esp. p. 314

102 *The Trouble with Kings* p. 147 ff

Brian Peckham[103] also dislikes the source redaction approach. He moves away from an analysis of deuteronomistic language to stylistic and structural criteria for determining the nature and extent of the Deuteronomistic History. Peckham proposes two Deuteronomistic Histories: Dtr^1 which is pre-exilic and extends from Deuteronomy to Hezekiah; and Dtr^2 which uses this as a basis for a larger work from Genesis to 2 Kings 25. This author used complete literary works for Genesis to Numbers (J, E, P and Dtr^1) which were "combined with each other by a system of cross-reference and harmonization and were distributed in the new version of the Pentateuch and history composed and written by Dtr^2"[104]

O'Brien is critical of Peckham's work on a number of counts. First, the proposed narrative structure is unsatisfactory. He argues that an unbroken narrative running, without intervening material, from Joshua 11:23 to 1 Samuel 1:1 is not credible. In order to establish his narrative sequence Peckham has to explain the sudden appearance of the cultic centre at Shiloh and the annual pilgrimage which Elkanah observes. Reference to an important cultic centre at Shiloh is made in Joshua 18:1 and in numerous further places before 1 Samuel 1, especially Judges 21:19, and these serve to set the scene for the birth narrative of Samuel. O'Brien considers to be unconvincing Peckham's arguments that the pilgrimage to Shiloh is accounted for by an assumption that the deuteronomic law of centralization is in place; and that the feast at Shiloh is what is referred to in the ritual calendar set out in Exodus 34. Certainly the proposal seems to demand a quantity of convincing argument to overcome the clear *prima facie* link between the beginning of Samuel and the end of Judges.

---

[103] Peckham, B. *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* Atlanta:Scholars, 1985

[104] Peckham *op. cit.* p.1 (per O'Brien op. cit. p.18)

Secondly O'Brien criticizes the proposed conclusion of the earlier version of the history in 2 Kings 18-19, arguing that that text uses language not used elsewhere in the Dtr^1 material, and that it provides an unconvincing ending for a text which was supposed to validate and affirm the deuteronomic law of centralization. The failure of the case for the proposed Dtr^1 is of course damaging for any subsequent construction of Dtr^2.

McKenzie notes a tension at the heart of Peckham's work which lies in the proposal of a redactor so effective that all trace of earlier traditions is eliminated. Peckham's discussion, however, is focused on the way such traditions were formed and reformed in the genesis of the Deuteronomistic History. If he is right, and no trace remains, then any discussion of sources must be very highly speculative. Moreover he must maintain his case against the vast majority who are able to find evidence for redactional layers.

Iain W. Provan[105] whose study is based on analysis of the judgment formulae concludes that two editions of the Deuteronomistic History existed. He finds in the judgment formulae differing concerns about the 'high places' - in some the focus is on centralization of worship, and in others on the problem of idolatry. The first began with 1 Samuel 1 or possibly Judges 17-21 and ran through to the end of the reign of Hezekiah, seeking to portray Hezekiah as a second David. O'Brien thinks his arguments for deuteronomistic authorship of the formulae is unconvincing, and that his ascription of the whole of 2 Kings 21-25 to an exilic redaction fails to take real account of the complexity of the

[105] *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings* (*op. cit.*)

material, or of the importance of the reform of Josiah.

O'Brien himself, in keeping with his criticisms of earlier theories and hypotheses, attempts a detailed re-examination of the whole material involving source critical, linguistic and contextual analysis of the text, combined with structural analysis. His study is full and detailed. He proposes a Deuteronomistic History from Deuteronomy to to the end of the reign of Josiah in 2 Kings 23. In his assessment of the deuteronomistic redaction he employs, principally, the criterion of deuteronomistic language and thought. To this he adds material linked with such identifiably deuteronomistic material, either because it is part of a larger passage which is clearly a deuteronomistic composition, or because the theology resembles deuteronomistic theology, but the context "does not lend itself to the use of characteristic [deuteronomistic] language."[106] His particular concern is to establish the shape of the 'original' Deuteronomistic History. He identifies subsequent deuteronomistic redaction on source critical grounds, or on the basis of significantly different language and theological outlook. Thirdly he warns against too easily assigning material to a number of redactors, and stresses the importance of suspending judgment on the nature and extent of any subsequent redactional work until the shape of the primary Deuteronomistic History has been established.

O'Brien concludes that the original Deuteronomistic History "was composed principally as a story of Israel's leaders"[107] organized into three distinct periods of leadership: Moses and Joshua, Judges to monarchy, and prophets and kings. For each period use was made of extensive sources (rather than those materials of limited horizon proposed by Noth). In the

[106] O'Brien *op. cit.* p. 48

[107] *op. cit.* p.288

first period the deuteronomic code and a pre-deuteronomistic account of the conquest of the Cisjordan were used. In the second period the historian used a document about the troubled pre-monarchical period portraying a cycle of apostasy and deliverance - itself the product of multiple deuteronomistic redaction; and a late ninth century prophetic record (emphasising the prophets' authority to anoint and reject kings). In the third period the same prophetic record was used, covering Saul, David, and Solomon, and the northern dynasties from Jeroboam to Jehu. It was supplemented by a northern expansion composed shortly after the fall of the north, and a parallel southern document covering the period from David to Hezekiah (with a focus on cultic centralization). The account of the reign of Josiah is newly composed by the deuteronomistic historian, and the events depicted show that for him the reign of Josiah was the inauguration of a new era for Israel.

After the disaster of the Judaean exile an initial redaction simply covered the remaining four kings with a brief theological assessment in language borrowed from the Deuteronomistic History. A second later stage applied elements of the deuteronomistic historian's critique of the northern kings to the Davidic dynasty, portraying Manasseh as a southern Jeroboam, and thus justifying the Judaean exile. A third nomistic redaction extensively reviewed the whole history with a new focus upon the people, rather than simply upon the leaders. The Deuteronomistic History led to the growth of a deuteronomistic school which "was able to retrieve the history for posterity, despite the problems created by the violent death of Josiah and the disaster of the exile."[108]

[108] O'Brien *op. cit.* p.292

O'Brien clearly seeks to do that which he criticizes others for failing to do, and establishes a layer of original Deuteronomistic History. The conceptual framework on which it is built finds its roots in three key elements in the deuteronomic code: complete fidelity to YHWH, centralised worship at a place to be chosen by YHWH, and fidelity to the word of YHWH delivered by his messengers. This last element is derived from the theological outlook of the prophetic record.

The main criticism of O'Brien's work perhaps lies in his primary assumption which is that it is possible somehow to recover the primary deuteronomistic redaction of the history which lies between the pre-deuteronomistic redactions, and the later exilic redactions. Without wishing to suggest he is proposing individual redactors for each of the later stages, he is clearly very far towards that end of the spectrum in his proposals. His basic assumption depends upon a view of subsequent development of the text involving a redactor or redactors who insert comments and provide additional material for incorporation into the text, but who make no deletions from the basic text either altogether, or by the substitution of a fuller account of various incidents. This seems an intuitively odd redactorial approach.

Secondly one wonders if his examination of the text is not sometimes too narrow in failing to allow for any pool of understanding between the original writer and his readers. For example in his comments on 2 Kings 23 (which he excludes from his primary Deuteronomistic History) he argues that the present text of 2 Kings 23:15 as well as verses 16-20 is a later addition to the Deuteronomistic History. A main plank of the argument for

this is that

> "The report that Jeroboam built a high place at Bethel is not confirmed by the corresponding report of his cultic initiatives in 1 Kings 12:28-33. Given the careful construction of the history it is unlikely that [the deuteronomistic historian] would have made the claim in 2 Kings 23:15 if there were not some basis for it in 1 Kings 12."[109]

1 Kings 12:28, however, could be read as saying that Jeroboam made high places at Bethel, or at least as suggesting that there would have been a high place at Bethel. Like O'Brien's following comment about the absence of an Asherah pole, this may be asking the writer to be specific about things which he and his readers would have known, understood, or taken for granted.

It may be that such a narrow reading is also responsible for a certain weakness in the conceptual framework O'Brien proposes for the history. A clear theological purpose is suggested for dtrH, and for the later redactions, but not for the work as a whole. For O'Brien the theological purpose of the primary history was to validate Josiah's reforms in the light of Israel's history. Subsequent redactions then: (i) bring the history up to date (exile); (ii) accommodate the death of Josiah and fall of Judah to the deuteronomistic historian's theology; (iii) refocus the history on the people and the deuteronomic code.

O'Brien's conclusions represent in themselves a radical re-evaluation of Martin Noth's original hypothesis. Many of the sources from which the history is seen as being drawn are far from limited in horizon theologically or historically, and the later layers of redaction

[109] O'Brien *op. cit.* p.262

make substantial changes to the overall impact of the work. Where Martin Noth came to a firm conclusion about the theological outlook of the work as a whole (although not an indisputable one), O'Brien presents us with a far less clear picture overall, and consequently with a Deuteronomistic History which is a work of much smaller theological scope. He also produces a picture of a Deuteronomistic History with "an implausibly high number of redactions."[110]

Conclusions

This survey of the history of historical critical approaches to the Deuteronomistic History is by no means complete, and further studies advancing new proposals or modifying former ones continue to be produced. Inevitably, given the scale of the enterprise it is difficult for anyone to both retain an overview of the shape of the material under discussion as well as arguing all the points of detail that arise verse by verse.

The Deuteronomistic History is probably inherently resistent to the application of an exhaustive theoretical analysis even if one could be produced. Given the extent and the weight of arguments for the different positions, it would be rash to be overly certain about any particular one of the proposals examined.

However, it is possible to draw from this survey one or two tentative and general conclusions about the Deuteronomistic History itself. Firstly, there are considerable grounds for accepting that there are substantial earlier materials underlying the present form of the history with coherence and interests of their own. Secondly, the theory of a double

[110]Knoppers *op. cit.* Vol. 1, p. 45

redaction does seem to provide a good account of issues that clearly arise from the text. For both of these propositions, however, it is important to be modest about our ability to tie any given theory to the present form of the text without any loose ends remaining. Whatever our view about the literary competence of any redactor or compiler, we should allow for the possibility that, immersed as he must have been in the language and style of any earlier sources he may have used, he would at times reflect their language and style so as to now be indistinguishable from them[111].

Our inability to be certain about the putative circumstances in which the works we now have were produced should also produce a considerable caution in assigning material to particular stages because of its fit with those circumstances. In particular, many of the studies give the impression that there is an accepted and established history having an existence independent of the texts, on the basis of which textual analysis can proceed. This is not so. However much any historical reconstruction may wish to distance itself from the outlook of the texts, they remain our prime historical datum. We cannot easily assess from inner textual evidence alone the historical value of any particular text. Even if for various reasons we conclude that the present form of a particular text shows clear signs of being shaped to later concerns, we need to beware of assuming too much about the absence or presence of source material and its possible outlook.

Finally we need to recognize the interdependence of the source critical and historical enterprises, and, indeed, that the source critical enterprise is in fact part of the wider

[111] cf Auld, A.G. *op. cit.* p. 149

historical enterprise. Thus for example Auld's proposals which are very attractively argued do put the cat among the source critical pigeons. They invite not only textual reconsideration, but also perhaps a reconsideration of the history of the world from which the text originates. This emphasizes a central issue in the whole process. A number of studies proceed from an acceptance of a historical situation underlying the coming into being of the text, and which is used, in part at least, as the basis of a critical reading of the text. These two are however closely interdependent, and the way and the extent to which this is the case seems sometimes to be insufficiently recognized; or at least it is rare to find work which both pays close attention to textual issues, and to the way in which different possibilities of resolution influences our understanding of the history of Israel.

At one extreme, a writer who chose to assert that the whole of the Deuteronomistic History was a late elaborate fiction, bearing little or no relation to the realities of ancient Israel would have little or no basis for any arguments about the historical circumstances that brought the text into being (not to mention the difficulty such an approach would encounter from the implicit claims of the text itself). We could not argue about the nature of the Book of the Law, or the significance of Josiah's reforms for the current form of the text, since *ex hypothesi* either they never took place, or at least the text gives no reliable access to them. At the other extreme, a writer who claimed that the Deuteronomistic History is a plain and straightforward account of what happened faces equally formidable difficulties in the face of divergent material within the canon (Samuel-Kings compared with Chronicles), and the clear way in which the text can be seen to be oriented towards shaping the reader's thinking in a particular direction. Clearly the truth must lie between these two extremes, but

there will always be room for debate about where in the middle ground it lies.

Problems with the current approach

At a different level, however, there is perhaps a more important criticism to be levelled at this whole enterprise.

In the main, the process of identifying layers of redaction - pre- or post-deuteronomistic stems from attempts to deal with unevennesses in the material being studied. A straightforward reading of the text reveals the presence of conflicting themes and ideas. Thus, to take an obvious example, it is difficult to make sense theologically of the criticism of the people for seeking a monarchy on the one hand, and of YHWH's anointing of David and the general portrayal of David throughout the work as the ideal king on the other.

One way to resolve the problem is to postulate a source (Prophetic) or a redactor (Prophetic, exilic) for whom disapproval of the monarchy is a motif. One then abstracts from the text as it stands all the material which reflects that outlook and a respectable corpus of material with this particular outlook can be built up. At the same time, an awkwardness can be removed from the basic text. Broadly speaking again, if one finds this dissonant motif associated with clearly deuteronomistic language, one assigns it to a later redactor, and if not one assigns it to an earlier source.

While the initial hypothesis may be thoroughly respectable, it has an unfortunate effect. In New Testament studies, the criterion of dissimilarity can result in a picture of Jesus who owes nothing to his Jewish roots, and who has no influence on the church which he

founds. Similarly, in the present context, the process of identifying sources and redactional layers can produce materials that are free from any kind of internal contradictions, but also whose existence is not easily related to what preceded or what follows. It also produces a text which is free from the subtlety of outlook that occurs when competing or opposing concepts are related in a single literary work; indeed, it tends to neglect the fact that a single literary work is what we are actually presented with.

Further, this particular analytical approach tends, in the hands of different practitioners, to yield a variety of different ways of dividing the text, so as ultimately to cast doubt on the very detailed application of the process, although perhaps not on its broader appreciations.

The method also has a tendency towards fragmentation. As different themes are sought in the text, and different strands drawn out like strands from woven fabric the whole begins to collapse. And often we are left with authors or redactors who have a simplistic outlook or agenda, neglecting the witness of the present form of the text that tension and complexity may have been perfectly satisfactory or even intentional in such works. The present form tends to be neglected and is seen primarily as a rich source of matter for historical and critical investigation. It is rather as if St. Paul's Cathedral were seen primarily as the site at which one could discover the ground plan of the pre-fire cathedral - or even an 'original' Romano-British basilica.

In illustration of some of these issues it will be helpful to pay attention to a particular text in its context and to look at some of the critical issues which arise. This is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

An examination of 1 Kings 12.25-13.34

The account of Jeroboam's cultic activities, and the intervention of a mysterious man of God from Judah (1 Kings 12:25-13:34) appears at a key point in the history of Israel. The decline of the northern kingdom begins at its very inception, and the sins of Jeroboam son of Nebat are a byword in the judgment formulae on many of the kings who succeed him.

The story has been a focus of intense interest, not only because of its significant place in the Deuteronomistic History, but also because of the questions that naturally arise concerning the fate of the man of God from Judah (especially compared with that of the lying prophet from Bethel); the exact nature of Jeroboam's activities; the circumstances of man of God's oracle with its explicit prediction of Josiah; and, finally, the conception of God which may or may not lie behind this story.

There is widespread agreement among the commentators that the story of the man of God from Judah is a small piece of 'whole cloth' drawn from some pre-existing tradition (usually considered to be Bethelite) which has been inserted into the general run of the story of the kings of Judah and Israel. There is some question whether there were originally one or two man of God stories; and there are questions surrounding the nature and extent of the redactorial activity by which this material is stitched into the Deuteronomistic History, and the extent to which the story itself has been the subject of deuteronomistic or later amendment.

Analyses of the Text of 1 Kings 12.25-13.34

The work of six commentators is offered as a basis for comparison, Martin Noth[112], James Montgomery and Henry Gehman[113], John Gray[114], Gwilym Jones[115], Simon DeVries[116], and Mark O'Brien[117]. All are in agreement that the text has taken its final form in the hands of one writing from the perspective of Jerusalem rather than from that of Bethel. Noth's analysis of the text will serve as the primary key, and the others will be noted as comments upon it. The effects of each commentator's conclusions on the text can be seen in the various versions set out in Appendix 1 ("Various Analyses of 1 Kings 12.25-13.34").

Noth

For Noth the material is derived from five sources (including the deuteronomistic historian himself), the main elements being material from the story of the prophet Ahijah, and a local Bethelite prophetic tradition. First the deuteronomistic historian uses annalistic material from the royal chronicles for the opening framework of this section (v.25). He then takes up the Ahijah material (vv.26-31: the story begins in 1 Kings 11:29 or thereabouts, and runs through to 1 Kings 14:18). Into this he inserts the Bethelite material (13:1-32) which

---

[112] *The Deuteronomistic History op. cit.*

[113] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Kings* (ICC) Edinburgh T. & T. Clark, 1951 This work was complete in its primary form in February 1941, and as publication was delayed by the war was revised by Montgomery, and ready to print in October 1944, there was further delay, and Gehman undertook to "make the final preparations of the manuscript and see it through the press." (p. ix) While the updated bibliography includes reference to Noth's work, there is no evidence of any interplay between Noth's work and this commentary.

[114] *I & II Kings* (OTL) London:SCM Press, 1964

[115] *1 and 2 Kings* (NCB) Basingstoke, England: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1984

[116] *1 Kings* (WBC) Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1985

[117] *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis op. cit.*

he expands by describing Jeroboam's offering of sacrifices 12:32b-33a. He also expands 13:32b with Josiah's reforms in mind, and writes a transitional passage (13:33-4) to key the material into the remainder of the Ahijah story. A later redactional hand is evident in the Bethel references in verses 32b and 33a concerned to locate the king's actions clearly at Bethel where the prophetic story comes from.

Montgomery & Gehman

Like Noth, Montgomery and Gehman see the opening verse as coming from archival material. The next section, however, has been heavily written up to incorporate a late perspective hostile to what were then seen as cultic innovations by Jeroboam. Verses 26 and 27 are part of this later tradition. This is followed by an 'original' tradition concerning Jeroboam's cultic actions at Bethel as follows:

> So the king took counsel, and made a calf of gold. And he said to the people, "Behold your God O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah, and he went up to the altar to burn incense.

This original tradition has been modified by pluralizing the reference to a single god, and by adding the reference to Dan and Bethel in verse 29, and also by the insertion for emphasis of repetitions of the date of the feast, although it is conceded that the deuteronomistic redactor may have inherited the material in this modified form.

The whole of 1 Kings 13 is considered to be a single piece of prophetic midrash[118], with

[118] "The remaining Prophetical Stories of the North are midrash in the current sense of the word, of dubious historical value." *op. cit.* p. 41

the exception of verses 33-4 which are the redactor's own conclusion bringing us back to the point he made at the end of chapter 12.

Gray

Gray does not attempt such a close analysis of the text in terms of its redaction history. He considers that we have a "somewhat sketchy summary of events in Northern Israel by a Judaean editor or redactor"[119]. Deuteronomistic comment is evident in 12:30,31,33. The prophetic midrash[120] which follows consists of two originally separate stories (13:1-10 and 13:11-32) which take their present form in the hands of the deuteronomistic compiler (by contrast with Noth and Montgomery and Gehman). The lateness of the present form of the passages is evident in the explicit references to Josiah, and in the references to "the houses of the high places which are in the cities of Samaria" (13:32). Gray's work exhibits two primary concerns: to relate the text to the history of Israel; and to explore the history of Israel's religion revealed in the cultic practices etc. depicted.

Jones

Jones like Noth and Montgomery sees 12:25 as annalistic. Verses 26-32 are then written from a later Jerusalemite perspective (compare Gray). Verse 33 is a deuteronomistic link into an older local prophetic story. Jones sees the story as having arisen from two originally independent traditions about the man of God from Judah (he cites the disappearance of Jeroboam in the second half of the story in support). He considers,

---

[119] Gray, *op. cit.* p. 288 "The fact that there is no mention of Sheshonk's expedition to Northern Israel indicates how selectively the archival matter for Jeroboam's reign has been used" It is not clear how far we can rely on the supposed contents of the putative archive. Jeroboam would not be the first Ancient Near Eastern monarch to fail to record unfavourable information. Other explanations are also possible.

[120] "not based on historical events of the same significance" *op. cit.* p. 293

however, that a straight separation of the two parts does not satisfactorily account for the literary history of this story. This story has undergone a number of deuteronomistic or later alterations: the insertion of name of Jeroboam in 13:1 and the addition of 13:1b to link back to 12:33; the replacement of the original oracle by a deuteronomistic alternative in 13:2-3,5 (with an even later annotation naming Josiah) - וְנָתַן in 13:2 is to be translated as "he will give" treating the ו as a ו 'consecutive' (with Noth[121], Würthwein[122], DeVries: against e.g., Burney (who sees the weak ו as a decadent later usage) and Gray). This is consistent with the similar treatment of הַדֶּשֶׁן at the end of v. 3. The difficulty of this interpretation is that in making Josiah the subject of the prophecy in v. 3 Jones then ascribes the verse to "the secondary material added by the deuteronomistic redactor"[123]. This, however, puts the material into the very period for which the weak ו usage is attested, and indeed the use of a weak ו [124]here (וְנָתַן to be translated "he gave") is the one of the very things which causes Burney to regard the text as late. Further, Jones regards v. 5 as a continuation of the prophecy in v. 3 and to be attributed to the same redactor. It is very odd, however, to read that redactor as first putting into the mouth of the man of God a prophecy which refers to Josiah, and then only two verses later to have the man of God himself supposedly fulfilling the prophecy. Jones, citing Würthwein, treats the whole of vv. 7-10, 16-18, and 20-22 as a later deuteronomistic addition to explain why the man of God from Judah came to be buried with the prophet of Bethel. Jones's treatment contrasts with Noth and with Montgomery and Gehman who see the material as unaltered by the deuteronomic historian; and with Gray who seems to suggest that no layers of text, as such, are recoverable from

---

[121] Noth, M. *Könige* (Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament IX/1) Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1968

[122] Würthwein, E. *Das erste Buch der Könige, Kap 1-16* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch 1/11) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977

[123] Jones *op. cit.* Vol. 1 p. 264 - citing Würthwein, pp. 166f. and Noth (comm.) p. 297

[124] This question is considered further in Chapter 4 in terms of the effect the meanings of the different readings have on the coherence of the narrative.

this story.

DeVries

After an opening annalistic extract from "The book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel", DeVries sees the bulk of the introductory material at the end of chapter 12 as being taken from a report from (Levitical) agents in the northern kingdom to the priesthood in Jerusalem, with a later literary expansion (possibly deuteronomistic) to make it clear that both calves did not remain in Bethel (thus accepting the text's assertion of two calves). Virtually the whole of chapter thirteen is seen as being a Bethelite prophetic narrative with the incorporation of some deuteronomistic material in 12:33 and 13:1b, 2-3, 5, 18b, 32b-34. DeVries adopts the same reading of v. 3 as Jones, but accounts for v. 5 as a parenthetical note that the prophecy given by Josiah was indeed fulfilled. This makes better sense than Jones's proposal, but leaves unexplained the reason for interpolating Jeroboam's attempt to arrest the prophet between the prophecy and the report of its fulfillment. It still makes better sense overall to treat the ו in וַיִּתֵּן as weak, and to translate it "he gave" with the man of God as the subject. This makes literary sense as well when Jeroboam's attempt to thwart the prophecy is seen as failing completely with the withering of his arm, and the immediate desecration of the altar. DeVries argues strongly that the whole chapter is a single narrative with Deuteronomistic additions. In this he is with Noth and Montgomery and Gehman, and against Gray and Jones.

O'Brien

O'Brien hypothesizes much larger elements of pre-deuteronomistic redaction. Essentially 12:25 and 13:33b-34 are from a prophetic record which seeks to show the authority of the

prophets in relation to the kings. This is supplemented by a southern document from a Jerusalemite perspective, and deuteronomistic redaction which may also be presumed to embody that perspective. At a second stage of redaction, virtually the whole of chapter thirteen was inserted, with whatever was its original oracle against Jeroboam replaced by later material to reflect Josiah's reforms. This second stage of subsequent deuteronomistic redaction was concerned to "retrieve the history by accounting for the exile and the death of Josiah in a way which could be accommodated to the deuteronomistic historian's theology."[125] The story in 1 Kings 13 was one of "a number of additions to [the Deuteronomistic History] which focus on the monarchy and employ the prophecy-fulfillment schema"[126]

Summary of Findings

In summary, then, for all the commentators except O'Brien (who sees vv. 25, 28a, 29 and 13:33b-34 as part of a prophetic record), v. 25 is seen as annalistic (even Gray sees the material as "drawn from an archival source"[127]), DeVries assigns the material clearly to Israelite records, but Gray sees it as a Judaean record. None of the other commentators make it clear what source they suggest, though the implication in Montgomery is that it is Israelite, and it certainly seems more likely to be drawn from annals of the northern kingdom.

Verses 26-32 are then seen as material taking its flavour from either the deuteronomistic

[125] O'Brien *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis op. cit.* p.273

[126] *op. cit.* p.275

[127] Gray, *op. cit.* p. 288

historian (Gray, Jones,), or a Jerusalemite perspective (Montgomery - "late popular tradition"[128], DeVries - note his suggestion of Levitical spies[129], O'Brien - Southern Document), or at least from a group hostile to the monarchy (Noth - a prophet story, O'Brien - Prophetic record).

Verse 33 is seen as taking its 'flavour' from the deuteronomistic historian (all commentators including Gray who notes the redactor's "animadversion on the cult at Bethel... apparent in... v. 33"[130], though Noth attributes part of the text to the Bethelite story).

With chapter 13 a new tale begins which is widely seen as a local Bethelite tradition (Noth sees the story having begun in 12:32, Gray states that it is "not based on historical events of the same significance"[131]).

Various parts of this story are seen as later deuteronomistic additions to it:

v. 1b Jones, DeVries

vv. 2aβ-3 Jones, DeVries (2aβ - Josiah - Gray)(whole of 2 only - O'Brien)

v. 5 Jones, DeVries

vv. 7-10 Jones

vv. 16-18 Jones (18bβ - the lie - Montgomery, DeVries)

vv. 20-22 Jones

---

[128] Montgomery and Gehman *op. cit.* p. 254

[129] DeVries *op. cit.* pp. 161-2

[130] Gray *op. cit.* p. 288

[131] Gray *op. cit.* p. 293

v. 23b Jones

v. 26b Jones

vv. 31b-32 Jones (32bα - cities of Samaria - Noth, Gray, DeVries)

As can be seen some ascriptions to the deuteronomistic author obtain a wide measure of agreement, but otherwise there is a diversity of views with Jones and DeVries suggesting high levels of redactional activity, and the remainder opting for relatively little redaction.

Verses 33 and 34 are almost universally agreed to be deuteronomistic (except by O'Brien who sees v. 34 as part of the Prophetic record).

The analyses of the text are as interesting in their similarities as they are in their differences. Montgomery for example reconstructs one original tradition from vv. 28-33 which contrasts markedly with O'Brien who offers two different documents providing overlapping material but with the difference that the reference to Jeroboam going up to the altar to offer sacrifice (12:33b) is seen by O'Brien as deuteronomistic. Reconstructions of these texts based on the RSV can be seen in Appendix 2 ("'Recovered' texts of 1 Kings 12.25-33")

Conclusions

Having completed our survey of a variety of analyses of the text, we must ask how useful or satisfactory the exercise has been as a reading of the text as a whole. To be fair, O'Brien is simply concerned to identify redactional layers, and the limits within which he has chosen to operate include an acknowledgement that his task is preliminary to a reading of

the text. Others, however, building upon such work come to a variety of conclusions. Thus Montgomery notes:

> "The fact stands forth that the cult at Jerusalem contained positive elements of good, in its imagelessness and freedom from depraved practices, and for (sic) its position in the capital, where excesses were checked by a restrained culture and a political control. The part played by princes in religious advance and reformation is often overlooked... Religion is of a generally higher character in the cities than in country communities... The story [of the man of God from Judah] has its moral in the theme of the disobedient prophet..."[132]

Gray simply notes that the prophetic story's

> "mechanical and a-moral conception of the operation of the word of God... [is] a measure of the spiritual level of the dervish guild of Bethel",

(reflecting his history-of-religions interest) and that the inclusion of the second half of the story about the prophet of Bethel is

> "suggested [*sc.* to the redactor] by the the reference to the ban to the prophet on eating and drinking in the discharge of his commission."[133]

addressing a redaction criticism issue.

The sum of Jones's comments on the theological motivation of the text is that it is a condemnation of Jeroboam for idolatry, a condemnation which is misplaced, and based on a misunderstanding of what Jeroboam was doing. Jones, probably rightly, suggests that

---

[132] Montgomery and Gehman *op. cit.* pp. 256,261

[133] Gray *op. cit.* pp. 294, 298

Jeroboam is not saying that the golden calves are Israel's gods, but he neglects the possibility that this was apparent to Jeroboam's southern neighbours.

The relation between image and deity is usually subtle and complex, and this was almost certainly apparent at the time. Texts which portray the relationship simplistically may do so for polemical reasons. Even if Jeroboam's actions are viewed by the deuteronomist in the more sophisticated way which Jones suggests (and surely what is obvious to a late 20th century commentator would have been apparent to a nearer contemporary) Jeroboam might still attract the deuteronomistic historian's condemnation on the basis of Deuteronomy 12:4, especially in view of the clear continuities between Jeroboam's cultic practices and those of Baal worship.

DeVries sees the narrative as expressing "the driving hostility of [the deuteronomistic historian] against rival shrines...." and suggests that the theme of the prophetic narrative is that the test of a true prophet is radical obedience, yet, for DeVries, the disobedience of the man of God from Judah apparently does not mean that he is not a true prophet, and the truth of God's word spoken by the prophet in this story is confirmed in the consequences following the prophet's failure in obedience. There is also no real grappling with the problem of the deception of the man of God.

Methodological Critique

Thus each of the commentators surveyed draws only certain limited conclusions about the outlook of the particular source from which it is hypothesized that the text is drawn, or of the redactor who is supposed to have been responsible for its conclusion. Transparently

these are, none of them, what the present form of the text is intended to communicate - with the possible exception of DeVries's suggestion about the test of a true prophet.

As our earlier consideration of the history of critical study of the deuteronomic history demonstrates, it has generally only been those who postulate or accept a broadly single authorship for the work who are then ready to engage in the theological task which the text of the Deuteronomistic History in its final form presents. We need to ask, then, whether it is adequate to postulate 'layers' of redactors each adapting the work to reflect their viewpoint, particularly when it seems so easy to see that the work that existed after their efforts discloses a range of viewpoints. The process of analysis of sources and layers of redaction can certainly illuminate our reading of a text, but too often it stops at an assessment of the theological outlook of the source or redaction layer which has been identified, and often it is the presupposition of that very theological outlook which has been the means of identification.

Even where a particular piece of text within the Deuteronomistic History is identified as a late arrival with virtual unanimity amongst the commentators it is not enough to say how it reflects the outlook of the redactor, source, or group which produced it. Such 'late' texts need to be read with careful attention to the way in which they interact with the earlier texts, and to the way in which the outlook of one is modified and nuanced by the presence of a different perspective from other sources or layers of redaction. Someone after all must have left the text in the form in which we now have it, and felt that it reflected *their* intention; and it is in this form that the text has been transmitted to us. When such careful attention is

given to the interplay between the various layers, the varying texts in interrelation have a more significant part to play than is first apparent, not only in modifying the theological outlook of the narrative, but in shaping the way in which its very structure is perceived.

All the foregoing represent in my view a very important, but ultimately limited reading of the text. While there is a profound awareness of the historical context of the events depicted in the narrative, there is little evidence of attention to the place of the text in its larger literary context.

The Wider Literary Context

Whichever view one takes of the composition and extent of the Deuteronomistic History, it is clear that the period of separation of the two kingdoms is presented as one of great importance for the history as a whole, and the text, therefore, may well repay a close reading in the context of the whole work. This represents the partial application of aspects of the canonical approach in its attention to the relation between different texts in the canon as a whole. It is, however, a partial application only since the canonical approach, at least as conceived by Brevard Childs, involves giving explicit attention to the way in which the text is shaped by religious and theological motivation, and we shall not attempt to do that at this stage.

The Link with Exodus 32

Jeroboam's cultic activities are clearly intended to be seen in the context of the nation's salvation history. The parallel with Exodus 32 is inescapable, and is only emphasized (not

created) by being couched in the same terms (12:28, cf. Ex 32:4):

הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלוּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

(contrast Ex 32:4 ...אֵלֶּה)

The question remains whether Exodus 32:4 has been shaped to reflect Jeroboam's action, and so retrospectively to provide authoritative condemnation from salvation history. R. W. L. Moberly argues[134] that the sacral cry is entirely appropriate to the context of Exodus 32 without requiring further explanation in terms of the activities of Jeroboam. Further, Jeroboam's choice of a symbol associated with an ancient tradition of apostasy can be understood in terms of an attempt to present Yahwism in terms of religious symbols already familiar to the people of his kingdom.

1 Kings 12:30 "And this thing became a sin for the people...", can easily be read as simply a reference to the cultic practice, but a comparison with the treatment in Deuteronomy of the golden calf at Sinai is suggestive. Moses addresses the people saying "Then I took the sinful thing which you had made, and burned it with fire..." (Deuteronomy 9:21 RSV). The phrase "sinful thing" translates the single Hebrew word חַטַּאתְכֶם ("your sin"), although the clear reference is to the calf. This is further suggestive evidence of a literary connection between these two passages. Here is some theological validation for the later desecrating actions of Josiah.

Further, our perception of what Jeroboam is doing is surely intended to be coloured by

---

[134] Moberly, R.W.L. *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983 p.161ff

Deuteronomy 12, especially vv 4, 5. In Deuteronomy 12:4 is the commandment that "You shall not do so to the LORD your God" here the RSV reflects but does not preserve the ambiguity of the Hebrew, which in the context is probably best translated to prohibit the worship of YHWH in the manner of the 'nations'. This agrees with R. W. L. Moberly's assessment that "...for the redactor of 1 Kings 12:28... *there is no essential difference between syncretism and apostasy*"[135]. This allows the Deuteronomistic Historian to have a more subtle and nuanced understanding (though not approval) of the use of images in worship than commentators such as Jones seem prepared to allow.

The epithet 'Man of God'

Now we are ready for the introduction of the nameless and enigmatic man of God from Judah. Montgomery and Gehman note that he is not described as a prophet, but by the use of the "...evidently popular [i.e., folklorist] term"[136] 'man of God'. In David Petersen's discussion in *The Roles of Israel's Prophets*[137] he considers that the terms are not so simply interchangeable. Petersen utilizes role theory from the disciplines of sociology and anthropology to consider questions of the historical reality of the prophets in the Hebrew Bible. In many respects this analysis is illuminating, and in particular he goes beyond the common assessment that 'prophet' and 'man of God' are interchangeable terms - a distinction without a difference. In his discussion on the title 'man of God', however, I consider that he is over persuaded by the closeness of the apparent 'fit' between I. Lewis's description of the 'peripheral prophet' and the Elisha stories in particular (and to a lesser extent the Elijah stories). I think he does not give sufficient attention to the presentation of

---

[135] *At The Mountain of God* p.166 Author's emphasis

[136] *op. cit.* p.261.

[137] (JSOTS 17) Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981

other 'men of God' and frequently of Elijah as not only peripheral, but also as lone figures[138].

When attention is paid to the literary or rhetorical usage of this term and the way in which it is used in narrative strategy in the Deuteronomistic History, a particular connotation emerges quite clearly. 'Man of God' is invariably used, in the literature, of those who truly proclaim the words of YHWH[139], and may be seen as referring back to Moses and to Samuel.

This man's position as an emissary of YHWH is further marked by the fact that he comes בִּדְבַר יְהוָה - a phrase occurring seven times in total (with three further references to דְּבַר יְהוָה)

The Naming of Josiah and the Focus of the Prophecy

This leads us on to the interesting question of the attachment of Josiah's name to the prediction in 13:3 when it had already been fulfilled by him, by the time at which it is suggested that this text found its place in the overall narrative (all the commentators examined above).

Gray simply notes that the sign desecrates the altar.

---

[138]Petersen's discussion of this term can be found in *op. cit.* pp. 43-50. He makes extensive citation of I. Lewis's *Ecstatic Possession: An Anthropological Study of Spirit Possession and Shamanism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971)

[139]The term is used of Moses (Dt 33:1, Josh 14:6, 1 Chr 23:14, 2 Chr 30:16, Ezra 3:2, Ps 90:1); Samuel (Judges 9:6-10); and of prophets (1 Sa 2:27, 1 Kings 17:18-24, 20:28, 2 Kings 1:9-13, 4:7-42, 5:8-20, 6:6-15, 7:2-9, 8:2-11, 13:19, 23:16-17, 2 Chr 25:7-9, Jer 35:4)

Jones notes that "it is extremely difficult to decide how much of the curse belonged to the original prophetical narrative." He sees vv. 2 and 3 as containing a "present deuteronomistic version". He argues for Josiah as the subject of ונתן which is to be translated as a ו consecutive, and therefore in the future tense. Jones notes that v. 5 interrupts the sequence of the narrative concerning Jeroboam's hand, but apart from that merely states that it "...it interrupts the natural sequence of vv. 4 and 6". On wider grounds, his approach is unconvincing and in my view his case is not proven.

DeVries sees the prophecy that Josiah will *sacrifice* priests etc. as a misreading of 2 Kings 23 where all that is said (according to DeVries) is that Josiah *slaughters* the priests. He thus assumes that the reference to Josiah slaughtering the priests in 2 Kings 23 precedes the reference in 1 Kings 13, and that the reference in 1 Kings 13 is included *for the purpose* of reflecting 2 Kings 23:20 - and in any event, he seems not to address the question that the same verb זבח is used in both cases. Gray argues that 2 Kings 23:20 is an afterthought to pick up the reference in 1 Kings 13:2 which suggests that the two are both later insertions made at the same time.

DeVries argues that 1 Kings 13:2 is included because of a misinterpretation of 2 Kings 23:20 (cf also Thenius[140] - followed by Montgomery and Gehman). To DeVries it is not clear whether the statement of fulfilment is intended to be seen as having occurred in Josiah's time. The inclusion of this part of the prophecy is not, in my view, explicable in terms of a need to reflect the recorded events of Josiah's purge. Gray notes that the

[140]Thenius, O. *Die Bücher der Könige erklärt* Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament Leipzig: S Hirzl, 1873

inclusion of v. 5 is an interruption in the flow of the narrative ("...this seems irrelevant to the narrative..."), and suggests that it appears because of a "blind fury on [the deuteronomistic historian's] part". DeVries draws no theological conclusions from the inclusion of vv. 3 and 5 in the narrative.

Given that so little attention has been paid to these verses by commentators and exegetes, what grounds, if any, might there be for assigning sufficient importance to them to attract theological attention? Arguably the verses are more theologically interesting if they are in fact part of the work of a later redactor (say, O'Brien's second stage post deuteronomistic redaction), and not part of the original material.

It is perhaps as well to clear one part of the ground at an early stage. A number of the commentators (e.g., DeVries, Gray, Jones, Montgomery & Gehman, Nelson[141]) note that the introduction of Josiah's name at this point in the story is a late insertion into the prophetic legend. It is interesting to consider how our perception of this passage would be affected if what is often considered to be a gloss or insertion into the prophetic oracle, "Josiah by name", were placed in parenthesis with quotation marks closed before it, and re-opened for the continuation of the speech of the man of God from Judah.

If a generalized prophecy of the nature suggested in 1 Kings 13 was part of the material already available to the deuteronomistic historian, then he might well wish to bring this connection which he had discerned to his audience's attention. The Hebrew text does not

[141] All as previously cited except: Nelson, R.D. *First and Second Kings (Interpretation)* Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1987

allow a firm conclusion about whether the historian is saying: here is a prophecy about the desecration of the altar by Josiah which was fulfilled; or here is a prophecy about the desecration of the altar which was fulfilled by Josiah. It is likely that our modern questions about whether the prophet could at that time have prophesied Josiah's name are essentially alien to the way of thinking of the deuteronomistic historian (and more particularly alien to the way in which he has chosen to present his case). His focus is much more on the word of God and its fulfilment in relation to the altar at Bethel, and perhaps to the actions of Josiah as a fulfilment of the prior word of the Lord.

In view of the perception that verses 3 and 5 in 1 Kings 13 detract from rather than add to the quality of the narrative *qua* narrative, they can not be seen as some kind of rhetorical decoration. Indeed, the fact that the verses are included, even though they interrupt the flow of the narrative suggests that they may be of some importance. Further, the rhetorical force of the detailed repetition of the oracle in the description of its fulfilment within such a short textual space should not be missed.

One possibility is that the report of the sign and its fulfilment is included to confirm that the word spoken by the Judahite is indeed the word of YHWH, and thus to confirm or enhance the credit of the Judahite in the eyes/ears of the readers/hearers of the Deuteronomistic History. This would be consistent with the doubt about his status which is supposed by some commentators (e.g., DeVries[142], Gray[143]). Most fail to note, however, the very extensive usage of the phrase 'man of God' to describe messengers of impeccable

[142] *op. cit.* p. 170

[143] *op. cit.* pp. 295, 299

credentials as discussed above, which suggests that, in terms of the narrator's communication with the reader, further accreditation is not necessary.

This is especially the case when the task of the man of God, within the structure of the narrative, is to pronounce judgment on a cult which is clearly intended to be identified with the sin of Israel in the wilderness. A variation on this would be to say that the sign is included to add to the weight of Jeroboam's guilt in ignoring the word of YHWH. These verses may then have an internal function within the story in 1 Kings 13.

A second possible reading (and the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive) is to view the sign as a prolepsis of the eventual judgment to be meted out by Josiah: the beginning of the fulfilment of the more general judgment upon the Bethel cult.

The sign can thus function in relation to Josiah to validate his subsequent actions in desecrating the altar, and possibly to defend him from suggestions that it was his destruction of those altars that led to Judah's downfall (a reading consistent with Cross's reflection that Josiah was perceived by the exiles as a broken reed, and with the general view that this text has come lately into the narrative).

Thus what Jeroboam has done is presented as being the ancient sin of Israel. The condemnation of it is presented as being announced by a 'man of God', by the 'word of God' emphasising the validity of that condemnation. Further the altar is then defiled by God himself, proleptically enacting what Josiah will do in due course.

The Prophecy and Sign as a Vindication of Josiah's Actions

It is important for the deuteronomistic redactor to establish the reforms of king Josiah as a return to YHWH which carried the stamp of the authority of YHWH. This purpose is achieved in a number of different ways, both within the account of the reforms of Josiah in 2 Kings 23, and by the way in which it relates to other elements of the history, including in particular this passage[144].

Josiah's actions may well have come in for some criticism bolstered by Josiah's death and the final exile only a few decades later. "Josiah's opportunities and constitutional power as king were limited and did not allow him to put all the parts of the Deuteronomic law, which was not constituted as state law, into practice everywhere and without restriction, ... [And in n. 5] "It is hard to tell how far Josiah was constitutionally justified in interfering with the local shrines throughout the land... he certainly treated the land of Judaea (v. 8) in the same way as the conquered land (vv. 15,19). Did he think that the law justified him in interfering with the old religious institutions and traditions in such a novel manner?"[145]

This text can be read as validating Josiah's profanation of the altar at Bethel in a variety of ways:

a) Jeroboam's sin was was the ancient sin of Israel (1 Kings 12:28)

b) Moses had responded similarly (Exodus 32:20, and especially the parallels between Deuteronomy 9:21, and 2 Kings 23:25 which invite us to draw a general

---

[144] Knoppers also makes a proposal along very similar lines that "1 Kings 13 functions as an *apologia* for the Josianic reform..." *op. cit.* Vol. 2 p. 70f

[145] M. Noth *The Deuteronomistic History* p. 81 and n. 5

parallel between his actions and those of Moses, extending also to Josiah's action at Bethel))

c) The altar had been condemned by God (1 King 13:2 ff)

d) Josiah fulfilled to the letter what 1 Kings 13 predicts (even preserving the grave of the man of God)

e) In the sign given at the time (1 Kings 13:5) God himself proleptically defiles the altar - so Josiah is not presented as profaning something sacred to YHWH.

(f) Note also the 'disfiguring' of the king making him 'unclean' for cultic purposes, again expressing what is implicit in a reading of his actions in the light of the tradition by which the Deuteronomist measures him.

Some Preliminary Conclusions

What I suggest we may have in this text is an alternative mode of deuteronomistic comment to the speeches by prominent people, or the summarising narratives which Noth mentions.

The narrative is so constructed and placed as to give us an interpretive framework with which to view the following history of the divided kingdoms[146]. At the same time by careful use of language and ideas, we are subtly invited to see the actions of Jeroboam, not against political or cultural criteria, but against the criteria of Israel's ancient religious tradition.

If we are right in seeing this text as standing in such a close interpretive relationship to

[146]Knoppers's proposals are similar. *op. cit.* pp. 63ff

Josiah, it may have still more to say. We may perhaps look for other reasons than the wrath of God for Josiah's untimely death. Against all sense of justice the man of God is killed by the lion. If we carry that idea through to Josiah, we are perhaps being presented with a subtle argument against assigning his death to the destruction of the ancient cultic site at Bethel.

H. G. M. Williamson's discussion of the account of Josiah's death in Chronicles is suggestive. Certainly there is evidence of a strand of tradition which relates the death of Josiah to a disobedience to the word of God which is not directly related to his cultic reforms and which does not impugn them.[147]

Clearly much of this speculation depends on what a rather closer reading of the text of 1 Kings 12.24-13.33 reveals. Such a reading may throw light on how this text relates to the various hypotheses for the history of its construction, or more widely in relation to the Deuteronomistic History. It may also give us some insight into the method and abilities of authors or redactors at various stages. There is also the possibility that a closer reading of the text may throw up questions and issues which are not patent to a largely historical-critical reading.

[147] Williamson, H.G.M. *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCB) London:Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1982 p. 408 ff

CHAPTER THREE

Towards a Literary reading of 1 Kings 12.24-13.33

A. Methodology, The Opening Framework of the Narrative

The Literary Approach

Literary approaches to biblical texts have gained in favour as literary readings have increasingly been seen to begin to answer some of the kinds of questions about the text that historical critical scholars had already been addressing, but in new and creative ways. They also have the merit of being able to give a good account of the shape of the textual wood which we can see, and not merely details of the individual source and redactional trees which may make it up.

As we have already noted in the Introduction, this approach to the biblical text has arisen in explicit opposition to the historical-critical approach which we have examined in the preceding two chapters. Amongst the proponents of this approach there various attitudes towards the historical referentiality of the text. That is to say, there are some, who in using this approach to the biblical materials, are uninterested in the extent to which the text accurately depicts historical events and circumstances, or even seeks to do so. Thus, for example Robert Alter concludes that "prose fiction is the best general rubric for describing biblical narrative"[148] For Alter, it seems sufficient to read the text simply as an artistic and literary artefact.

David Gunn and Danna Fewell adopt a reader-oriented approach to the text arguing that

[148] Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical Narrative op. cit.* pp. 23, 24

"texts are multi-valent and their meanings radically contextual, inescapably bound up with their interpreters."[149] They suggest that historical-critical work on the Bible needs: "a major reconstruction of its programme in terms of social world studies, with its positivistic ('objective') notion of 'history' radically reconceived"; and they suggest that history should be seen as "existing on a continuum with notions such as 'myth' and 'fiction'."[150] They assert that they are not denying that the Bible stands in some relation to history, but that "by and large, [they] are not addressing historical questions directly."[151]

Meir Sternberg, by contrast, is highly critical of this approach to a text's relation to history. He sets out five supposed tenets of the literary-critical approach to the Bible, only to say that with the possible exception of a presumption of unity in the text, he does not share any of the tenets[152]. He is convinced of the need for historical as well as literary tools to be brought into play, and points out that knowledge of the grammar and forms of ancient Hebrew is in fact a strictly historical matter, as is, for example, the resolution of the question whether biblical narrative in the form that we have it was an innovation in the Hebrew Bible or something derived from the Ancient Near Eastern context. He argues, in my view persuasively, that source-oriented enquiry addressed to the world behind the text, and discourse-oriented analysis addressed to the world of the text are two enquiries, but there is "the need for a community or overlap rather than a division of labour."[153]

---

[149] Gunn, David M. and Fewell, Danna Nolan *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993 p. 9

[150] *op. cit.* p. 11

[151] *op. cit.* p. 12

[152] Sternberg, M. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985 pp. 6, 7

[153] *op. cit.* p. 15

In an echo of Brevard Childs's thesis of a self-effacing canonical process, Sternberg also argues for "a text whose *poesis* covers the tracks of its *genesis*".[154] Sternberg argues that

> "given their interdependence, accordingly, the two orientations [historical-critical and literary-critical] must join forces within each and every enquiry. For the literary critic, success or failure in the reconstruction of the world (above all the culture) behind the Bible is success or failure as a professional reader, not as an amateur historian. For the historian, success or failure in the interpretation of the biblical text is success or failure as a reconstructor of the past, not as a criticaster or a dabbler in hermeneutics. The actual competence shown by either in the other's branch of learning does not at all affect the principle, and the consequences of its breach only dramatize its validity."[155]

He goes on to argue that "nothing on the surface... infallibly marks off the two genres [i.e., history and fiction]. As modes of discourse, history and fiction make *functional* categories but remain constant under the most assorted *formal* variations and are distinguishable only by their overall sense of purpose."[156] By way of specific example he cites Nathan's parable of the poor man's ewe-lamb in 2 Samuel 12 where what at first appears to be a recital to King David of a series of events amounting to an injustice requiring redress turns out, with the utterance of the words "You are the man!", to have been a parable. As Sternberg notes, "nothing in the discourse has changed in reversal — not a word, let alone a structure — except the informing principle."[157]

---

[154] *op. cit.* p. 16

[155] *op. cit.* p. 17

[156] *op. cit.* p. 31

[157] *ibid.*

With these thoughts in mind, we shall go on to a literary consideration of the text in question without, at this stage, venturing any conclusions on its historiographical purport. We shall attempt to refrain at this stage from treating the text as either 'fiction' or 'history' *a priori*.

Certain fundamental methodological assumptions underlie this approach. Perhaps the most obvious one in terms of biblical criticism is a basic assumption of the unity of the text. In different hands this takes different forms. For some it is little more than a recognition that the final form of the text is a literary reality, and that one possible reading strategy is to treat it as a literary unity. More positively, the text is seen as a transmissive medium by which the author or authors wish to convey something to the reader. This does not preclude the recognition that the genesis of a text may be complex. This aspect is encompassed in the understanding that a text may be the fruit of composite artistry, and that its communicative strategies may depend upon the interaction between various layers.

The method of this approach is simply to read the text with several different fields of enquiry in mind. Within the discipline, these fields of enquiry are fairly well established and one can hardly do better in describing them than to refer to the contents pages of one of the standard works on the subject. Thus, for example, Shimon Bar-Efrat outlines the following areas of enquiry: The narrator (his stance and his manifestation); the characters (their direct and indirect shaping); the plot, whether of a single narrative or of a collection; the treatment of time and space; and matters of style. His inclusion of repetition in the last named area of enquiry is perhaps to underrate the importance of this feature of biblical

narrative, and here Alter perhaps provides a corrective.

We should recognize that what might loosely be called 'repetition' could include the practice of analogy, the use of what Alter calls 'type-scenes', as well as verbatim repetition, or almost verbatim repetition. In each case, both the similarities and the differences between an event and its repetition (or a speech and its repetition) may be highly significant.

Reading the Story: Opening Remarks

We shall attempt to apply the insights of this approach to the text of 1 Kings 12.24-13.33. In so doing we shall endeavour not to neglect the insights of historical-critical and text-critical study, but we shall seek to discover whether a literary approach may begin to provide some better answers. For convenience I shall refer to the 'author' of the text. It is quite clear, however, that the text we have in front of us may derive from a variety of source materials, though it is equally clear that some guiding mind must have been responsible for the production of the final form of the text we now have - a process which is likely to have included both authorial as well as more strictly redactorial activity.

The prime insight of Martin Noth that the text of Deuteronomy to 2 Kings must be seen as a single literary work will remain our starting point. This means that we cannot treat this text in isolation from its immediate surroundings, nor as if the first book of Kings is its only context. Indeed to do that would, in two very specific respects, be to neglect what the text itself is trying to say. In 1 Kings 12.29 we are invited to look into the past by the reference to the Exodus and by Jeroboam's use of almost the identical words assigned to Aaron at the

mountain of God; and in 1 Kings 13.2 our gaze is drawn towards the future and to the historically still distant reforms of Josiah. The clear connection with Exodus also indicates that we cannot limit our possible context for reading to the Deuteronomistic History. We need to be open to a range of contextual possibility, both in the circumstances from which the text was generated, and brought into its present form; and in the circumstances in which it is now presented to us for reading.

In a more limited context, Robert Cohn has drawn attention to the place which this text has in the context of the Jeroboam narrative as a whole[158]. He identifies a chiastic structure surrounding the rise and fall of Jeroboam, at the centre of which he puts the present text analysing it as :

C Jeroboam's sin (12.25-33)

D Man of God interlude (13.1-32) and

C' Jeroboam's sin (13.33-34)

> "At the height of Jeroboam's career, and the centre of the chiasmus the oracle of the man of God from Judah ominously prophesies the end of his cult at the hands of Josiah. Then, in an unexpected sequel, the man of God himself becomes the victim of an old prophet of Bethel who, after the man-of-God's death, confirms his prophecy against Bethel (13,1-31). Following this prophetic story the narrator resumes his description of Jeroboam's sin but now declares that Jeroboam's house will be destroyed as a result of it (13,33-34)"[159]

[158] Cohn, Robert L. "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative" *ZAW* 97 (1985) pp. 23-35

For Cohn, a significant feature of this part of the narrative is the way in which the reader is moved from a relatively sympathetic stance towards Jeroboam to one in which the reader is able more or less happily to assent to the judgment passed on Jeroboam and his house[160].

The framing of the story - opening

At this point in Kings we have now passed what we are encouraged to see as the time of greatest glory of the united kingdom of Israel. Solomon in all his glory has passed away, and we are about to see the larger part of the kingdom torn from him (in the person of his son Rehoboam) in fulfilment of the prophecy in 1 Kings 11.11-13. We have seen David and Solomon and we are now presented with two kings quite different from them. It may be that there is a purposeful symmetry in the portrayal first of Rehoboam who is conspicuously lacking Solomon's wisdom, and then Jeroboam who, in chapters 13 and 14 when faced by crises, does the very opposite of 'inquiring of YHWH'.

Robert Alter notes that:

> "The paradigmatic biblical story...starts with a few brief statements that name the principal character or characters, locate them geographically, identify significant family relationships, and in some instances provide a succinct moral, social, or physical characterization of the protagonist. ... The opening exposition, then, is pretemporal, statically enumerating data

[159] *op. cit.* p. 25

[160] *op. cit.* p. 30 - he notes how the king's reign is described now exclusively in terms of the cultic reforms which lead inevitably to judgment.

that are not bound to a specific moment in time: they are facts that stand before the time of the story proper.

> In many versions, these pretemporal verses are followed by a transitional segment in which true verbs are introduced; but, according to the indication of the adverbial phrases accompanying them ..., these verbs must be construed as either iterative or habitual. This means that after an actionless beginning, events begin to happen, but only repeatedly, as a background of customarily patterned behavior to the real plot. Finally, the narration moves into the report of actions in sequence at specific points in time ... and from that point, of course, it generally moves on to dialogue."[161]

We have reached the point, however, in the tale of the kings of Israel and Judah where the beginning and the end of the reign of each king will be marked by particular narrative formulae which, it has been conjectured, are drawn from annalistic or archival material forming part of some kind of court or cultic chronicle.[162] Typically the material may include a chronological cross reference to the current reign in the other kingdom, the age of the king upon ascending the throne, a note of his mother's name (for kings of Judah), a comment upon his cultic and religious observances, and a note of other events in his reign. In some cases this may be followed by some fuller account constituting (in Alter's terminology) a 'narrative event'. Then there is a similarly formulaic conclusion. While such an opening summary is not as pre-temporal, or atemporal, as the kind of introduction

---

[161] Alter *op. cit.* p. 80

[162] This is proposed by Noth, Montgomery and Gehman, Gray, Jones and DeVries

which begins "A certain man...", it is here employed to perform the same function of setting the scene for the tale which follows.

The boundaries of the narrative event, and particularly the opening of the new narrative event reveal that we are looking at something which is part of a larger whole. Thus the 'ætiological' comment in 1 Kings 12.19 clearly serves not only to summarize and conclude what precedes it, but also to provide a foreshadowing framework to the abortive expedition by Rehoboam against Jeroboam. The end of the previous scene is further underlined by the comment in 12.20 which picks upon 12.2, 3 and reiterates and builds upon what is stated there. Similarly, while the account of the expedition underscores the realization of the judgment against Solomon[163] it is also an important part of the framing of the following story of Jeroboam, and shows signs in terms of subject matter and vocabulary of having been selected and/or shaped to cast light on what follows.

The account of Rehoboam's abortive expedition against Jeroboam is notably laconic and devoid of dialogue. The only speech recorded is the word of YHWH to Shemaiah, and it is noteworthy that there is not even an intervening report of Shemaiah's actions. The text, instead, immediately records that those to whom the word was addressed "heard the word of YHWH and turned to go according to the word of YHWH."

The very sparsity of the account suggests that it should not be seen as an independent narrative event in its own right but rather as a transition to what follows, and part of the

[163] It is significant, for example that both in connection with the restoration of the kingdom, and when Shemaiah is instructed to speak God's word to the king, he is referred to as Rehoboam *son of Solomon*

framing of the subsequent tale. This is underscored by the presence of what will become the motifs and key words of particular significance in the account which follows of Jeroboam and the man of God from Judah. These include:

the use of the verb שוב (v. 21 and v. 24 - twice)

the use of the phrase דבר יהוה (v. 24 - twice, and closely related phrases in verses 22 and 24 - again)

the description of Shemaiah as אישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים

So many connections made in so few verses in such an economically told story, clearly indicate careful and deliberate shaping of this information by the author.

The accounts of the actions of Rehoboam and of Jeroboam show signs of being , in the present form of the text, parts of a carefully and skilfully worked whole, of which more below. The transitional section in 1 Kings 12.21-24 is a striking example of the way in which materials which might perhaps have reflected very varying concerns are brought together and set in a context which enables them to address the interests of the deuteronomistic historian. In 12.21 Rehoboam is named twice. On the first occasion he is depicted in his own right as the still great king who can muster a mighty army from Judah and Benjamin to assert his territorial claims. By the end of the same verse we are reminded that he is not simply Rehoboam king in Jerusalem, but Rehoboam son of Solomon. This aspect of Rehoboam's status is emphasized when he is thus addressed by Shemaiah in 12.23, and the purpose of his being spoken to is to confirm that "this thing [viz. the dividing of the kingdom] is from YHWH". Thus each element of the prophecy of division, that to Solomon and that to Jeroboam is tidily fulfilled satisfying the classic

Deuteronomistic motif of prophecy and fulfilment.

It is principally such thematic links in the transitional section which look *back* to the material *from* which it bridges. It is principally the use of specific key words which achieve significant thematic importance in the ensuing narrative which looks *forward* to the material *to* which this transitional section bridges. The use of דבר יהוה and איש־האלהים are key in establishing that what has happened is God's fulfilment of his prophecy to Solomon, and all this has happened by his authority. The use of the verb שוב is perhaps less central to the concerns of this section or the preceding one, and, indeed it is given no great prominence beyond what is required by the events narrated. It is however a word and a concept which as we shall see is central to the concerns of the ensuing narrative, and arguably to the concerns of the Deuteronomistic historian at this stage in his account of the history of God's people. It is perhaps, therefore, no coincidence that in his final half dozen or so words, a concatenation is engineered, of words and concepts which are central themes in the scene which is about to open.

Thus the substance of the threat to Jeroboam's kingdom forms part of the explicatory plot background for Jeroboam's actions in the following section, yet it is also significant that the threat is averted not by military precautions in Israel, or by some temporary weakness in the southern kingdom, but rather by the emphatically underlined word of YHWH. Presented in this way, the characteristic deuteronomistic motif of prophecy and fulfilment is presented in terms which will be found to be key in the ensuing narrative.

The opening scene

The dispersal of the *dramatis personae* each to his own home in 12.24 marks the conclusion of the prologue, and the annalistic information in 12.25 marks the beginning of a new event. It seems highly probable that there was some written source for this information, and certainly it is possible that we have a verbatim reproduction here of that material. We are presented with a picture of Jeroboam as an enterprising and active ruler of the northern kingdom as he 'builds' or 'fortifies' Shechem and Penuel. This account perhaps plays the part of Alter's pre-temporal or transitional material. The temporal link to the real action of this story is very tenuous. Rather it establishes the setting for the action that begins in the following verse.

We are, perhaps, moved to modify our interpretation of the king's constructional activity as the narrator allows us to eavesdrop on the king's thoughts in 12. 26. Jeroboam seems to be secure and active in his kingdom, yet this outward show is undermined as the narrator opens up Jeroboam's inward doubts. This revised view might even lead us to suspect that all Jeroboam's activity is in fact an outcome of his concerns about the loyalty of his subjects, and the possibility that his rule may be threatened internally or externally. What we see in 1 Kings 12.25 may be a move from Shechem, conveniently central (but hard to defend and on a main route for any marauding army) to Penuel— more remote and/but easier to defend[164]. Notwithstanding the fact that the people of Israel were eager to make Jeroboam king (v. 20), that he has been promised the kingdom by YHWH

[164] Smith, G.A. *The Historical Geography of The Holy Land* London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd 1931[25] p. 343 (where the author suggests the subsequent appearance of the court at Tirzah is indicative of this weakness), and 608*n*

(1 Kings 11.29-39), and that he has been protected in it by the actions of YHWH (1 Kings 12.24), we find him considering the possibility that the kingdom will revert to the house of David.

The Shaping of Jeroboam's Character: Knowing the King's Mind

Jeroboam begins with עַתָּה a word which is simply a marker of emphasis, often used in speech which is concerned with internal consideration and resolution. Significantly, after that, his first word is תָּשׁוּב. While in Jeroboam's thinking this word is related to the possibility of the people returning to the house of David, it will be used throughout the story to generate a complex web of meaning and reflection. The kingdom will not be (re)turn(ed) to Rehoboam nor will the heart of the people (re)turn to their lord (אֲדֹנֵיהֶם)[165], to Rehoboam. Jeroboam will be the king who does not turn from his 'wicked ways' but rather turns towards them, in spite of a confrontation with a man of God who himself is commanded not to (re)turn by, or turn back in the way he goes. The man of God will be turned back by a prophet from Bethel and thereby come under judgment for disobeying God. Subsequently it will be recorded of most of Jeroboam's successors that 'they did not turn from the ways of Jeroboam son of Nebat'.

Of the three actors in this tale Jeroboam is the only one into whose motives we get much insight. Robert Alter identifies a scale of means "in ascending order of explicitness and certainty, for conveying information about the motives, attitudes, the moral nature of characters". He notes that, "with the report of inward speech, we enter the realm of relative

[165]The implication is of a return to Rehoboam, almost certainly not a return to YHWH, since no turn from YHWH is envisaged. *cf* Gray's note on the Greek of this verse *op. cit.* p. 289 note *a*.

certainty: there is certainty ... about the character's conscious intentions, though we may feel free to question the motive behind the intention."[166] In the case of the man of God from Judah and the prophet from Bethel we must infer intentions, motivation etc. from their public utterances and actions. They thus remain altogether more obscure and ambiguous figures - though possibly more rather than less important than Jeroboam for that reason.

The line between intention and motivation cannot always be clearly drawn. Clearly Jeroboam's intention is to retain the loyalty of the people of Israel, though it could be said that retaining their loyalty is his motive, and that his specific intentions for achieving that are not made clear. What emerges, however, is the picture of a man who, perhaps with some justice, fears for his position and for his life.

Rehoboam has earlier been revealed as a fool in contrast with the wisdom of Solomon, and one who specifically rejects the counsel of those whom Solomon considered wise. Jeroboam is now revealed to be no wiser, but there is a marked contrast between the groups of counsellors whom Rehoboam is able to consult and the bare verb וַיִּוָּעֵץ without direct object in which Jeroboam's action is described. Although the fact that he took counsel might imply that he had advisers[167], he is depicted almost as an isolated figure and we are encouraged to see him as solely responsible for his actions. This is reinforced by the fact that Jeroboam's consultations are described with exactly the same verbal form as those of Rehoboam, but instead of a reference to the counsellors, which the

[166] Alter *op. cit.* p. 116f

[167] Though BDB offers 'consider', and notes the effect of different constructions dependent on the verb. In each case with Rehoboam (12.6, 8) the verb takes a direct object with אֵת. BDB p. 419b

account of Rehoboam might lead us to expect, the verb is used absolutely and we are left hanging. Jeroboam, indeed, by contrast with Rehoboam, moves very rapidly from his opening considerations to action: the calves are made and the fateful words spoken.

It is possible that Jeroboam's "taking counsel" is intended to show him as an anti-type to David and his practice of 'inquiring of YHWH'[168], as Rehoboam is drawn as an anti-type to Solomon. Alter notes:

> "The Bible does not employ symmetrical double plots but it constantly insists on parallels of situation and reiterations of motif that provide moral and psychological commentary on each other."[169]

Are there, however, textual clues that we should make this connection between Jeroboam and David?

The first hint that we ought to see Jeroboam in the light of David comes beyond the scope of this present study in the words of the prophet Ahijah in 1 Kings 11.38:

> "if you will hearken to all that I command you, and will walk in my ways, and do what is right in my eyes by keeping my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant did, I will be with you, and will build you a sure house, as I built for David, and I will give Israel to you."
>
> (1 Kings 11.38)

Then the comparison is reiterated in Ahijah's judgment given in 1 Kings 14.7-9. Further

---

[168] Though there is a question about the status of the text at this point. The Greek suggests another possibility: the omission of ויועצ altogether, and the substitution of וילך. Though this might be due to an accidental elision and contraction in the underlying Hebrew text: ויועץ המ]לך.

[169] Alter *op. cit.* p. 91

parallels are observable in the trusted place which Jeroboam has in Solomon's court, the enmity between Solomon and Jeroboam following Ahijah's oracle, and Jeroboam's flight to Israel's enemies to escape the king's wrath. All of these occurrences echo the story of David and Saul.[170] Thus, it is clear that when we consider Jeroboam and his actions, we are to have David in mind.

Whatever conclusions we may draw about Jeroboam's 'taking counsel' we are then told without any intervening narrative that he makes the two golden calves, and announces to the people that it is too much for them to go up to Jerusalem, uttering the words, "Behold your gods, O Israel". The significance of the placing of these words has been much debated, and we shall return to them below. It will however be helpful for that discussion to consider first the remaining verses of chapter 12.

The first thing to observe is the immediate note of criticism which follows in verse 30. The tone of condemnation of Jeroboam's cultic activities continues in verses 31-33. Whatever general view may have existed at the time, the consistent viewpoint of the author is that building shrines on the high places deserved condemnation. Similar criticism is implicit in the note that priests were appointed from among those who were not Levites.

A typical approach to the text of 1 Kings 12.32-13 1 is shown by J.A. Montgomery who argues that the introductory material in 12:32f contains duplicate material. The new narrative does, however begin in v. 32 whose "theme is independent of the notes of the cults of the high places [in vv. 31 and 32b]". He proposes an original introduction "And

[170]The David-Jeroboam parallel is noted by Cross *op. cit.* p. 279 f, and by Gary Knoppers (*Two Nations Under God* Vol 1 p. 199 f)

Jeroboam made a pilgrimage-feast [...] in the eighth month like the feast that is in Judah ... and he went up upon the altar to burn incense." The redactorial rounding out includes: condemnation of Jeroboam's acting as priest; sacrificing to the calves (noting that here they are both at Bethel - seen as as conflict with 12:29); instituting priests of high places; and "gratuitous condemnation of the assumed innovation of a new date for the Haj, of which condemnation there is no breath in v. 32 – it was 'like the feast that is in Judah'"[171] Here, however, I think Montgomery has missed the affective force of the repetition of the verb עשׂה with its continual focus on Jeroboam

He argues that it was the later Judaean calendar which was the innovation, and threw the festivals at long established cult sites out of synchronization. arguing that "on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had devised of his own heart" (v. 33) is a late gloss clumsily introduced. Similarly, according to Montgomery, the criticism of Jeroboam's going up upon the altar to offer sacrifice is "late criticism of the ancient prerogative of monarchy". It is perhaps a consequence of the isolation of this section from the surrounding narrative in 1 Kings that means that Montgomery does not consider the possibility that the description of Jeroboam going up to make sacrifices is intended not for the purposes of condemnation (this is discussed further below) but to draw a dramatic parallel between Jeroboam and Solomon and/or David. He concludes that these late criticisms serve to introduce "the first extensive case of midrash in the historical books".

[171] p. 259

Martin Noth divides the text as follows:

Original intro to prophetic story	12:32a^{a}
Dtr.'s expansion	12:32a^{b}-33ab^{a}
Original intro to prophetic story	12:33b^{b}ff

Presumably he is influenced in part, by perceived duplications/repetitions in the text.

In his commentary on this passage, John Gray proposes the following omissions ([...]) or additions (*italics*) which I have applied Gray's textual emendations to my own translation, which is intended to show the repeated verbs, the choice of translation where more than one meaning is possible, and to reflect the Hebrew word order. Gray's emendations can be compared with the approach of ,say, the RSV shown in the right hand column.

Gray	RSV
31 and he (עשׂה) made the house of the high places and he (עשׂה) made priests from the whole of the people who were not Levites 32 and he (עשׂה) made, Jeroboam, a feast in the eighth month on the fifteenth day of the month like the feast in Judah	31 and he (עשׂה) made the house of the high places and he (עשׂה) made priests from the whole of the people who were not Levites 32 and he (עשׂה) made; Jeroboam, a feast in the eighth month on the fifteenth day of the month like the feast in Judah and he (עלה) offered up *sacrifices* upon the altar
which he (עשׂה) made in Bethel to (זבח) sacrifice to the calves which he had (עשׂה) made and he (עמד) appointed in Bethel priests of the high places which he had (עשׂה) made 33 and he (עלה) offered up	so he (עשׂה) did in Bethel to (זבח) sacrifice to the calves which he had (עשׂה) made and he (עמד) appointed in Bethel priests of the high places which he had (עשׂה) made 33 and he (עלה) went up

whole burnt offerings upon the altar which he had (עשׂה) made in Bethel in the fifteenth day of the eighth month *at the feast* which he devised (בדא) from his heart and he (עשׂה) made a feast for the children of Israel and he (עלה) went up upon the altar to (קטר) sacrifice.

unto the altar which he had (עשׂה) made in Bethel in the fifteenth day of the eighth month *in the month* which he devised (בדא) from his heart and he (עשׂה) made a feast for the children of Israel and he (עלה) went up unto the altar to (קטר) sacrifice.

Gray considers that "and he offered up upon the altar" in verse 32 "was obviously erroneously transposed here from v. 33a," and he notes that "G reads the relative particle אשׁר."[172] Gray's emendations tend to strengthen the impression of a Bethel/Judah conflict with the direct apposition of those two places in the context of the appointing of a feast by Jeroboam. The MT, however, tends to suggest a more deuteronomistic perspective in relating the reference to Bethel to Jeroboam's act of sacrifice. This further reference to Deuteronomy 12 is consistent with what we have already noted above. Gray's suggested reading is consistent with what we might expect of Jeroboam's motives[173], though it perhaps tends to overlook the import of the MT and its consistency with the outlook of the deuteronomistic history as a whole.

While the various commentators' remarks may be interesting from a purely historical point of view they show no interest in the place the text that they are commenting on might play in the wider narrative. Indeed they appear to assume that the text does not really belong to the wider narrative, and perhaps even that there is no identifiable and complete wider narrative to which the text might belong. The text is an archæological potsherd, and we

[172] Gray *op. cit.* p. 289, note i

[173] *cf* Gray *op. cit.* p. 293

must look further away for other fragments of the same piece, without necessarily having much hope that a whole pot can be reconstructed.

In the context of a literary reading of the biblical text Robert Alter notes that:

"various commentators have attributed the repetitive features of biblical narrative to its oral origins, to the background of folklore from which it draws, and to the composite nature of the text that has been transmitted to us. The last of these explanations is the least interesting and finally accounts for the smallest number of cases ... under scrutiny most instances of repetition prove to be quite purposeful..."[174]

Consideration of the text reveals that we have more than an instance of a rather repetitious piece of text. On investigation a pattern becomes apparent, and with it perhaps some indication that the repetition in this text does not put it among Alter's 'smallest number of cases'. The text is laid out below, using essentially the same translation as above, with the Hebrew opposite so that pattern and word usage may be easily observed.

and he made the house of the high places	וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־בֵּית בָּמוֹת
and he made priests	
from the whole of the people who were not Levites	וַיַּעַשׂ כֹּהֲנִים
	מִקְצוֹת הָעָם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיוּ מִבְּנֵי לֵוִי:
and he made, Jeroboam,	
a feast in the eighth month on the fifteenth day of the month	וַיַּעַשׂ יָרָבְעָם
like the feast in Judah	חָג בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַּחֲמִשָּׁה־עָשָׂר יוֹם ׀ לַחֹדֶשׁ
	כֶּחָג ׀ אֲשֶׁר בִּיהוּדָה

[174] Alter *op. cit.* p. 89

and he offered up upon the altar — וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

so he did in Bethel to sacrifice — כֵּן עָשָׂה בְּבֵית־אֵל לְזַבֵּחַ

to the calves — לָעֲגָלִים

which he had made — אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה

and he appointed in Bethel — וְהֶעֱמִיד בְּבֵית אֵל

priests of the high places — אֶת־כֹּהֲנֵי הַבָּמוֹת

which he had made — אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה׃

and he offered up upon the altar — וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

which he had made in Bethel — אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה בְּבֵית־אֵל

in the fifteenth day of the eighth month

בַּחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר יוֹם בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַּחֹדֶשׁ

which he *devised* from his heart — אֲשֶׁר־בָּדָא מִלִּבּוֹ[175]

and he made a feast for the children of Israel — וַיַּעַשׂ חַג לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

and he went up upon the altar — וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

to sacrifice (burn incense) — לְהַקְטִיר׃

And behold a man of God came from Judah by the word of YHWH

to Bethel — וְהִנֵּה | אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים בָּא מִיהוּדָה בִּדְבַר יְהוָה

אֶל־בֵּית־אֵל

and Jeroboam stood upon the altar — וְיָרָבְעָם עֹמֵד עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

to sacrifice — לְהַקְטִיר׃

---

[175] *Qere. Ketib*= מִלִּבּוֹ

The first thing to note about the passage thus laid out is that of the sixteen verb forms which occur in this passage, half are forms of עשה, attention is drawn to the device by the double use of עשה in verse 31 (the only other verb in that verse being the stative היה). Thereafter until the last word of the chapter there is strict alternation between עשה and the other verbs.

Thus we get (reading right to left)

עשה	עשה	עשה	עשה	עשה	עשה
עלה	ברא	עלה	עמד	זבח	עלה
קטר					

Ignoring, once again the last word of the last verse which breaks the pattern (possibly to form a closure), and is picked up later to link this account to the story which follows, it is also noteworthy that half the remaining verbs are forms of עלה. Indeed, including ocurrences of עלה, all but two of these other eight verbs carry or can carry connotations of sacrifice.

It is not easy to believe such a strongly marked pattern is simply an accident of redaction. It makes better sense to understand this as a deliberate narrative device. Alter comments that:

> "the unrolling scroll ... was in one respect like the unrolling spool of a film projector, for time and the sequence of events presented in it could not

ordinarily be halted or altered, and the only convenient way of fixing a particular action or statement for special inspection was by repeating it."[176]

The device of repetition as used here achieves two distinct effects for the author. What we are being presented with is the narrative equivalent of a cinematic slow motion or freeze frame shot where some significant action is played on the screen several times. Narrative time moves on, but narrated time has momentarily stopped. At the same time the isolation of Jeroboam on centre stage is completed - all the verbs of action have him as the subject![177] Throughout these verses we are repeatedly told Jeroboam did, Jeroboam made, Jeroboam made. We are particularly caused to notice that Jeroboam *devised all this in his own heart* because aurally what we are expecting is אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה and what we get is אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא. Similarly the flow is brought to a sharp halt when at the end, instead of getting, as we might be expecting:

וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ ... עָשָׂה

we tumble home suddenly with...

וְיָרָבְעָם עָמַד עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְהַקְטִיר׃

[176] Alter *op. cit.* p. 90

[177] "Hammering out the verb עשה ('he made') nine times... the narrator depicts Jeroboam's acts as self-willed and self-serving" Cohn *op. cit.* p. 31

Further there is a chiastic structure which uses this pattern of the repetition of Jeroboam's actions at the altar to focus our attention on that which really is the subject of condemnation: Jeroboam's cultic innovations:

וַיַּעַשׂ יָרָבְעָם | חָג
בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַּחֲמִשָּׁה־עָשָׂר יוֹם | לַחֹדֶשׁ כֶּחָג | אֲשֶׁר בִּיהוּדָה
וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ כֵּן עָשָׂה בְּבֵית־אֵל
לִזְבֹּחַ לָעֲגָלִים אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה
וְהֶעֱמִיד בְּבֵית אֵל
אֶת־כֹּהֲנֵי הַבָּמוֹת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה:
וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ | אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה בְּבֵית־אֵל
בַּחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר יוֹם בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַּחֹדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־בָּדָא מִלִּבּוֹ
וַיַּעַשׂ חָג לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְהַקְטִיר: פ[178]

The final clause is not part of the structure, but rather serves as a transition between the formal recitation of Jeroboam's cultic works and the story about to be recounted in chapter 13. The structure reveals a focus around the introduction of the calves and the appointment of priests in Bethel. In its present form, the text reveals that there are three issues at the centre of concern: calves, priests, Bethel. As we have already commented above, the fact that Jeroboam himself went up on the altar is not in itself a focus for criticism. After the opening line in which his name is given, there is no repetition to emphasize the fact that it was Jeroboam rather than a priest who went up to sacrifice. In each of the parallel statements the emphasis is on the אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה which is firmly held within a thrice repeated בְּבֵית אֵל, this is where the focus of condemnation lies in these verses.

[178] My attention was drawn to this structure by Jerome Walsh's study "The Contexts of 1 Kings XIII" *Vetus Testamentum XXXIX, 3* (1989) pp. 355-370 (see p. 362 f), though my proposed structure differs somewhat from his.

Verses 32-33 then, as we have seen by a deliberate strategy of pattern and repetition both continue the note of condemnation sounded in verses 30 and 31, and increase our sense of Jeroboam's isolation. Not only is he isolated, but he is also in the wrong place as is demonstrated by the repeated בְּבֵית־אֵל which first appears at the end of v. 32, and is repeated three times more (including עַל־בֵּית־אֵל in 13.1). This is far more than any mere narrative plot needs require. There may also be a note of implicit criticism in the details given about the feast which Jeroboam establishes in Bethel, in which the deuteronomistic author assumes a shared deuteronomistic outlook on the part of his audience. Perhaps we are being invited to see the contrast between "Jeroboam appointed..." and an understanding that "YHWH appointed..." the similar feast in Jerusalem; and a contrast between this king who obeys the counsel of his own heart rather than 'doing all that the Lord commanded[179]. In any event this criticism is made explicit in the ensuing succession of verbs which are so focused upon Jeroboam as almost to give the impression that he was alone when he went up to sacrifice on the altar at Bethel.

"Behold your gods, O Israel..."

This particular text (v. 28) and other thematic similarities have given rise to extensive speculation and the development of numerous hypotheses in attempt to explain the relationship between the account of Jeroboam's cultic practices and the story of Aaron and the calf at Sinai. A full survey of all the issues, however, would be out of place and be disproportionate to the enterprise of a literary reading. Some consideration of the possibilities is, however, necessary if we are to make literary sense of the text we are

[179] See e.g., Gen 6.22, Ex 40.16

reading, though,conversely, it may be that a literary reading of the present text may throw some light on the issue.

J.I. Durham, in his commentary on the related text in Exodus sets out the possibilities simplified into three basic positions:

> "the entire golden calf episode [in Exodus 32] was (1) created by the deuteronomists to discredit the northern cultus of Jeroboam, which place one calf of gold at Bethel in the south and another at Dan in the north …; (2) an ancient story of idolatry in the wilderness in Moses' time recalled and used to condemn Jeroboam …; and (3) an ancient story of an entirely acceptable cultic practice begun by Aaron and utilizing a bull image in the worship of Yahweh, taken by Jeroboam as an entirely legitimate precedent for the cultus which he claimed, after all, to be Yahweh's, then later reworked by the Zadokite priesthood to attack both Jeroboam *and* Aaron …."[180]

R.W.L. Moberly notes that the view that Exodus 32 is shaped as polemic against Jeroboam, and particularly "that the substance of Ex. 32 is dependent upon Jeroboam tradition but that both reflect some early calf tradition, now lost, … is [the] most widely held today."[181] He devotes ten closely argued pages, however, to the alternative possibility that the form and substance of the Exodus text predate Jeroboam, and take their shape from concerns within Exodus 32-34. He concludes that there should at least be "an openness to

---

[180] Durham, J.I. *Exodus* (Word Biblical Commentary) Waco, Texas: Word Books 1987 p. 420

[181] Moberly, R.W.L. *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983 p. 162-3

an alternative way of understanding the tradition."[182]

While the words

הִנֵּה (אֵלֶה) אֱלֹהֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלוּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם:

form the most obvious link between the two texts, it is important in the consideration of either text that the place of these words in the larger whole should not be overlooked.

We have already observed how, by contrast with the treatment of Rehoboam in a similar situation, there is no interest shown in those whom Jeroboam consults, and that one effect of this is to isolate him on centre stage. Leaving aside for the time being the issue of his words concerning the calf images, the immediate comment on his actions in v. 29 is that "this thing became a sin". This metonymic usage of the word חַטָּאת resonates with the account of the Sinai incident in Moses' speech in Deuteronomy. Moses addresses the people saying "Then I took the sinful thing which you had made, and burned it with fire..." (9:21 RSV). The phrase "sinful thing" translates the single Hebrew word חַטַּאתְכֶם ("your sin"), although the clear reference is to the calf. Without at this stage arguing any question of priority which might be posed, there is the suggestion of a literary connection between these two passages, as well as between 1 Kings 12 and Exodus 32.

Further, irrespective of the issue of any connection with the Exodus narrative, our perception of what Jeroboam is doing is, as we have already noted, intended to be negatively influenced by the links with Deuteronomy 12: 4, 5. Similarly, as Moberly notes in respect of Aaron's words in Exodus 32.4, the use of the plural verb form after אֱלֹהֶיךָ

[182] *op. cit.* p. 171

is a customary means of suggesting a pagan understanding of deity, and its usage in this passage in 1 Kings is unlikely to be related to the number of calf images[183] - Jeroboam probably intending only to establish an alternative form and alternative locations for the worship of YHWH[184]. There is, therefore a clear inference to be drawn that for the writer of 1 Kings 12 as for the writer of the Exodus text there is, in Moberly's words, "no essential difference between syncretism and apostasy"[185]. And this is the case irrespective of any literary dependence between Exodus 32 and 1 Kings 12. Whatever answer we produce to the question of textual priority, the effect of reading Exodus and the Deuteronomistic History as works of equal status is that the logic of chronology requires us to read Jeroboam's sin in the light of what is presented as Israel's paradigmatic sin in Exodus 32. Indeed, even if we postulate an occasion at which, as it were, Exodus is 'produced' for the first time, an initial reading which recognizes Aaron's acts as sinful because they match those of Jeroboam already known to be sinful, would be likely soon to shift to a reflection of the light of the Exodus account onto the actions of Jeroboam.

We have noted in the previous discussion both that the author of our text is engaging here in a passage of extended polemic against Jeroboam, and that while at times that becomes quite explicit, at other points he assumes a shared world of deuteronomistic understanding with his audience. It is in the light of these factors that, from a literary point of view, we need to consider the words of Jeroboam. It could be argued that it simply happened this way, that Jeroboam simply used those words as reported, and that in the common practice

---

[183] *cf* also Gray p. 289 note e

[184] Moberly *op. cit.* pp. 47, 163

[185] *op. cit.* p. 166

of biblical writers, the author of this text uses speech to move the plot forward. Alternatively, these words could have been part of an inescapable givenness of the tradition with which the author had to work. Against either proposal, however, must be set the willingness certainly in this part of the narrative to use summary narration. In addition, Robert Alter notes that "there are virtually no 'free motifs' in biblical narrative."[186] That is to say there are virtually no details that cannot be deleted (or indeed altered) without thereby introducing some essential alteration to the plot.

Jeroboam's words in themselves, and the fact that they are given as *his* words are significant parts of the development of this narrative event. This suggests that these words in Jeroboam's mouth ought to be read as part of the crescendo of condemnation which, as we have already observed, these verses heap upon Jeroboam. The necessary corollary, therefore, is that they advert to something in the shared world of understanding between author and audience which implies condemnation of Jeroboam. This could be the case if the substance of the calf tradition at Sinai including the words assigned to Aaron in Exodus 32 are already known to both author and audience. So although the first possibility in Durham's list above is that Exodus 32 "was created by the deuteronomists to discredit the northern cultus of Jeroboam", it is not possible that these words in 1 Kings 12 can serve the function, in their present context, that our literary reading suggests, unless something like the events of Exodus 32 is already a given. That is to say, the present text of 1 Kings 12.28-34 implies a knowledge of the tradition of Exodus 32 in the form in which we have it[187].

---

[186] Alter *op. cit.* p. 79

[187] cf Moberly *op. cit.* p. 171

CHAPTER FOUR

Towards a Literary reading of 1 Kings 12.24-13.33

B. The Tale of the Man of God from Judah

Act One

Enter the man of God

By the end of 1 Kings 12 Jeroboam has reached a high point analogous to that of Solomon about to sacrifice in the Temple. It is a moment of high drama and spectacle; and the narrative artistry of the text has focused our attention on Jeroboam. Then there is a break, a hiatus, and at the beginning of chapter thirteen the הנה makes a break in the flow. In cinematic terms the screen darkens for a moment and as it brightens, we find that we are staring at the same scene unchanged from a moment before, "but look", now a new actor walks on:

וְהִנֵּה | אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים בָּא מִיהוּדָה בִּדְבַר יְהוָה

As we enter into the story proper, a new narrative immediacy is achieved (as Cohn notes) by a sudden switch into the present with the connective והנה and the participial verbs.[188] Now our focus will switch between Jeroboam and the man of God, but the flow is held up when for a moment longer there is continued narration (i.e., narrative movement) without any actual movement being narrated:

וְיָרָבְעָם עֹמֵד עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְהַקְטִיר׃[189]

At the entry of the man of God, then, I believe we can say with some confidence that what

---

[188] Cohn *op. cit.* p. 31f

[189] The *waw* + subject + participle is standard idiom for giving detail without advancing the story (see Joüon, P and Muraoka, T. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991 §§ 155 nc, and 159 pp. 581, 600 ff

we are being presented with is not an accident of slightly haphazard editing together of material from different sources. Rather we have a carefully constructed narrative device which brings to a *crescendo* the process of condemning Jeroboam's actions, and which, at the same time, engineers a most dramatic introduction for the man of God from Judah. We have been subtly drawn in to the narrator's deuteronomistic perspective and we await the next development with bated breath.

The Man of God: The Shaping of his Character

We are told three things about the man of God, each of which should shape the expectations of the careful listener or reader about the nature of what will follow.

The first point of significance is that he is a 'man of God'. Montgomery and Gehman's note that he is not described as a prophet, but by the use of the "...evidently popular term"[190] 'man of God' overlooks the theological and narrative significance of the term. The nameless man of God comes onto the scene as clearly marked for us as the cowboy wearing a white hat in a western. 'Man of God' is invariably used of those who truly proclaim the words of YHWH. The term is used of Moses[191], Samuel[192], and of prophets[193]. It has just been used in the preceding tale of Rehoboam where Shemaiah is described as a man of God. The archetypal man of God is Moses, and in the use of the term here we see, perhaps, a further reference to the episode of the Golden Calf in Exodus

---

[190] *op. cit.* p. 261.

[191] Dt 33:1, Josh 14:6, 1 Chr 23:14, 2 Chr 30:16, Ezra 3:2, Ps 90:1

[192] Judges 9:6-10

[193] 1 Sa 2:27, 1 Kings 17:18-24, 20:28, 2 Kings 1:9-13, 4:7-42, 5:8-20, 6:6-15, 7:2-9, 8:2-11, 13:19, 23:16-17, 2 Chr 25:7-9, Jer 35:4

32-34 - we almost expect to be told that the man of God 'came down' from Judah. Thus this man comes into the scene clearly labelled as a true messenger of God.

The significance of the second thing which we are told is less easy to assess. We are told that the man comes from Judah. Plainly this element of narrative description is not included for Jeroboam's benefit. Indeed, we may surmise that the origins of the man would have been obvious to Jeroboam and those around him - perhaps because of what he wore, almost certainly because of his way of speaking. In all probability the obvious 'foreignness' of the man of God would be something else that would be part of the tacit understanding between the author of this text and his audience, and it is made an issue in the plot by the explicit description of the man of God as coming from Judah. The fact that we are told that the man of God comes from Judah alerts us to possible issues of hostility between north and south, between Judah and Samaria, and recalls for us Jeroboam's own musings with which the tale begins, and his fears for the loyalty of his subjects. All this is likely to have certain implications for the way in which the man of God will be received by Jeroboam - is he an enemy spy, an emissary of Rehoboam, the first evidence to Jeroboam that his fears about his southern neighbour will be realized? Will the fact that he is from Judah lead to his word not being accepted in Bethel? We know this man is an alien in the context in which he is now to act, but we are not so well able to assess the implications of this for the story which follows. We cannot simply dismiss the fact as unimportant, since, in a generally laconic narrative, we are told four times in all that this man of God was from Judah.

Finally the man-of-God's status as an emissary of YHWH is further marked by the fact that he comes בִּדְבַר יְהוָה. This phrase is very prominent throughout the story occurring seven times in total (with three further references to דבר יהוה). The implications of this deserve further consideration as we see how it plays its part throughout the story.

The Oracle of the Man of God

Immediately and with hardly any intervening description the man of God cries out, and the narrator assures us that we may trust those words by slipping in the phrase בִּדְבַר יְהוָה the second time it is used in the space of two verses.

Curiously, however, it is not against the errant king that the oracle of judgment is given, but against the inanimate altar. In formal, heightened, and semi-poetic diction the man of God cries out:

2 And he cried against the altar by the word of YHWH and said

וַיִּקְרָא עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בִּדְבַר יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר

Altar, O altar — מִזְבֵּחַ מִזְבֵּחַ

thus says YHWH — כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה

Lo a son will be born to the house of David, — הִנֵּה־בֵן נוֹלַד לְבֵית־דָּוִד

Josiah by name — יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ שְׁמוֹ

[Josiah by name — [יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ שְׁמוֹ][194]

and he will slaughter upon you the priests of the high places,

וְזָבַח עָלֶיךָ אֶת־כֹּהֲנֵי הַבָּמוֹת

[194]The choice of positioning for this phrase depends on whether it is better considered part of the prophet's words, or a comment by the narrator.

the sacrificers upon you הַמַּקְטִרִים עָלֶיךָ

and the bones of man they shall burn upon you וְעַצְמוֹת אָדָם יִשְׂרְפוּ עָלֶיךָ׃

3 And he gave [will give] that day an omen saying וְנָתַן בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא מוֹפֵת לֵאמֹר

this is the sign זֶה הַמּוֹפֵת

which YHWH has spoken אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה

Lo the altar shall be split הִנֵּה הַמִּזְבֵּחַ נִקְרָע

and poured out will be the fat which is upon it וְנִשְׁפַּךְ הַדֶּשֶׁן אֲשֶׁר־עָלָיו׃

These being the first words spoken by the man of God are worthy of our particular attention. Their prophetic character is marked not only by the heightened language used, but also by the verbal forms used. The matter of verbal forms, a tricky area at the best of times, is further complicated by the fact that we are presented with a narrator who reports the speech of one who is reporting the speech of another, and the question arises as to who is actually speaking at any given point.

The general narrative past tense is established in the first verse of chapter 13:

וְהִנֵּה אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים בָּא ...

And this is continued in verse two with the *waw* consecutive imperfect as the man of God is described as having cried out [וַיִּקְרָא]. The man-of-God's first words after his vocative address to the altar are usually translated as "Thus says YHWH...", though the sense of the perfect would perhaps better be conveyed by "Thus has spoken YHWH..." or more idiomatically "This is what YHWH has said..." conveying the understanding of a judgment that has been given with some measure of irrevocability.

We now move from the man-of-God's own speech into the speech of YHWH. Here the events which the discourse describes are clearly future, yet the Niphal (passive) participle [נוֹלָד] which conveys them would normally be construed as having past reference. But whether active or passive the participle can also, when used

> "with reference to situations which are in fact *future*,... [denote] certainty... the ... *futurum instans* participle. הִנֵּה often occurs with [this construction] because that particle calls attention to a situation ... for vividness."[195]

The prophetic speech then continues this future reference with a *waw* consecutive perfect [וְזָבַח] and imperfect [יִשְׂרְפוּ].

The next verb, however, is problematic: should the וְנָתַן be read as spoken by YHWH, by the man of God, or by the narrator; and should it be interpreted as a *waw* consecutive, or a perfect with a weak *waw*?[196] In the present form of the text, the words in 1 Kings 13.3 "And he gave a sign that day saying, 'The altar shall be split and the fat upon it will be poured out.'" are fulfilled in 1 Kings 13.5 almost immediately after they are spoken. This requires us to read the וְנָתַן as a perfect with a weak *waw*, noted as a late or 'decadent' development in the language by a number of commentators[197]. Where the alternative

---

[195] Waltke B.K. & O'Connor M. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990 p. 627

[196] See Chapter 2 where this has previously been discussed in relation to its implications for the textual history. See also the discussion in Joüon, P and Muraoka, T. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991, §119z p. 404. The 'weak' waw usage has already appeared in 12.32, and is extensively present in 2 Kings 23 with which the present text has clear connections. This usage may be the blurred fingerprint the hand of a post-exilic 'author'. It does not help us to resolve the present question, however, since, although this usage is not in the 'pure' classical Hebrew grammar, we can still postulate either that it should be read as part of the narration, or as the emendation by a later editor of the original tradition of what the prophet said.

reading "And he will give a sign that day saying, 'This is the sign which YHWH has spoken: Behold the altar shall be split and the fat upon it will be poured out" is adopted, and its non-sense is explained as (clumsy) redactorial activity or a result of late interpolations[198]. However, the verb ונתן followed by the participle לאמר without any indication of change of subject requires us to understand the giving of the sign and the speaking as being performed by the same actor. That is, we are not being presented with someone predicting a sign to be given by another. The tense of the verbs in the ensuing statement, a perfect followed by a *waw* perfect in the temporal/causal apodosis[199], is consistent with the others in the speech of the man of God where the prophetic perfect is used.

It may be grammatically inconsistent for the narration to begin in 1 Kings 13:2 with a *waw* consecutive imperfect [ויקרא], and to continue in the next verse with a *waw* + perfect [ונתן]. This could, however, be because the whole text is late and less grammatically strict, or because of the influence of the tenses used in the speech surrounding this very small and isolated narrative segment (five words only), or it may be simply that there is no syntactical or grammatical inconsistency, but that the *waw* and perfect in ונתן (v. 3) introduces a further aspect of the situation governed by ויקרא (v. 2)[200].

---

[197] Burney *op. cit.* p. 179; DeVries *op. cit.* pp. 169, 170; Gray *op. cit.* p. 296, Jones *op. cit.* p. 264 (though he prefers a different reading); see also Davidson, A.B. *Hebrew Syntax* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1896[2] p. 84f. See also the discussion in Joüon/Muraoka *op cit. loc. cit.* which notes that the usage is not according to the strict Classical rules, but is not confined to late texts.

[198] Jones *op. cit. loc. cit.* (citing Noth and Würtheim); DeVries p. 170 see also Dozeman, T.P. "The Way of the Man of God from Judah: True and False Prophecy in the Pre-Deuteronomic Legend of 1 Kings 13' *CBQ 44* (1982) pp. 379-393. He deals with this verse on p. 383.

[199] see Davidson *op. cit.* p. 82 § 56

[200] Waltke & O'Connor *op. cit.* p. 530

The utterance of the man of God, then, falls into two parts, each characterized by language which expresses prophetic certainty about the fulfilment of the words by its use of the past tense, and in each case using הִנֵּה to introduce the words of YHWH, a usage which also conveys a lively present apprehension of events which lie in the future.

The Response of Jeroboam and its Outcome

The focus now swings back to Jeroboam still in the state of suspended animation in which we left him at the end of chapter 12. Our attention is turned on him again in a way which perhaps suggests an aghast and open-mouthed delay ensuing upon the oracle of the man of God. If the narrator had wanted to convey an instant lightning response we might have expected an immediate וַיִּשְׁלַח יָרָבְעָם אֶת־יָד לֵאמֹר. Instead we get a purely introductory verb, a clause which emphasizes that the king has heard the word that is spoken but does not advance the action, and a whole phrase which contains narrative information which is redundant in terms of *informing* the reader, but which does serve to *emphasize* the context in which the king is about to act. Ten words hold back the action before the narrator allows the king to move.

It is not entirely clear whether we are to see the king as being upon the altar (the term being interpreted to include not merely the surface upon which sacrifice is made but also the associated structure), or whether we are simply to see him as at the altar[201]. Equally when the action of the king is described there is some ambiguity about whether he, upon or at the

[201] In part this difficulty stems from the possible interpretations of the preceding verses at the end of chapter 12. Whether Jeroboam goes up onto the altar or offers up upon the altar depends on the interpretation of יעל which may be read as Qal or as Hiphil depending on the context. The English translations vary, some going consistently for one interpretation, some for the other, and others varying from one occurrence to the next.

altar, raises his hand, or whether he raises his hand which has been upon the altar (*sc.* in the act of making sacrifice).

Whichever way the text is read, we are presented with the situation where at the most holy moment, in the very act of sacrificing to YHWH (as Jeroboam would claim) he raises his hand against one who speaks (as the narrator permits us to know) by the very word of YHWH. Retribution is immediate, the arm withers, or is paralysed; and the king whose arm was stretched out in exercise of royal power is left there foolishly unable to draw it back. And the sign declared in the word of YHWH by the man of God is immediately fulfilled, emphasizing Jeroboam's powerlessness. Just as there has been a suggestion of a parallel between Jeroboam and Solomon at Jeroboam's moment of crowning glory, so now the judgment on Jeroboam resonates with that pronounced on Solomon. As the kingdom was torn from Solomon's hand in 1 Kings 11.31, so the altar under Jeroboam's hand is now torn apart[202].

There may be some argument for seeing the encounter so far as a 'type-scene'[203] in which man of God encounters rebellious king, delivers oracle (and validates it with a sign). If that is so, then there may be certain expectations set up about the outcome of the scene, which carry narrative tension if the expected resolution is delayed, and which are capable of being used or subverted by the author.

---

[202] Cohn *op. cit.* p. 32

[203] see *e.g.*, Alter *op. cit.* pp. 47ff

A Second Sign and Jeroboam's Response

Now Jeroboam speaks again. Previously he had spoken curtly and with royal authority, snapping out the one word command to seize the man of God. Now he becomes a humble suppliant, and more wordy to boot. Immediately, without replying to the king the man of God accedes to his request. His action is described in narration which as far as possible imitates the spoken words of the king's request.

The wording of the king's next utterance does not seem *per se* to carry any particular nuance, and its juxtaposition with the restoration of his hand could equally be seen as an expression of gratitude or an attempt to follow up a possible advantage. The narrator chooses at this point to leave open the question of the king's motivation and provides no narrative or dialogue clue. The king's offer, however, draws an exaggeratedly emphatic refusal from the man of God:

אִם־תִּתֶּן־לִי אֶת־חֲצִי בֵיתֶךָ לֹא ... וְלֹא ... וְלֹא

The refusal of hospitality is unusual and serious, in a cultural context where the responsibility for providing for travellers and those in need seems very widely to be taken for granted. The use of בִּדְבַר יְהוָה conveys that the refusal is part and parcel of the mission of the man of God. The express reference to bread and water, though possibly simply a metonymic usage for food and drink may be a more particular reference to the very minimum standard of hospitality[204]. Not even in the slightest way is the man of God to accept favour or protection from the king. The refusal has resonances with Samuel's refusal of Saul in 1 Samuel 15.26. While there is no indication that any parallel is intended,

[204] cf Elijah's requests in 1 Kings 17.10f

this would be consistent with the deuteronomistic love of analogy.

The Refusal of Hospitality

We should dwell on the words of the man of God a little longer. As a character, he is surprisingly taciturn speaking on only three occasions throughout this story. On the first occasion he says no more than is strictly required to deliver the oracle against the altar. The other two occasions are both emphatic refusals of hospitality, coupled with a report of YHWH's command to him. The story suggests that the fate of the man of God is bound up with his conduct in relation to this command (the testimony of the Bethelite prophet will be considered below). The almost verbatim repetition of the refusal in the next part of the story suggests more than a mere juxtaposition (accidental or deliberate) of two related texts. If 1 Kings 13.1-10 is indeed from a source other than 1 Kings 13.11-31/32 then they have clearly been deliberately joined in a way which requires us to read the two parts of the story in the light of each other.

This time the man of God says:	but in verse 17 he says:
כִּי־כֵן צִוָּה אֹתִי בִּדְבַר יְהוָה לֵאמֹר	כִּי־דָבָר אֵלַי בִּדְבַר יְהוָה
לֹא־תֹאכַל לֶחֶם וְלֹא תִשְׁתֶּה־מָיִם	לֹא־תֹאכַל לֶחֶם וְלֹא־תִשְׁתֶּה שָׁם מָיִם
וְלֹא תָשׁוּב בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר הָלַכְתָּ:	לֹא־תָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־הָלַכְתָּ בָּהּ:

The very substantial similarity between the two statements serves, in fact, to highlight slight but important differences between them. The elements which they have in common, however, are no less important than those that differ. We must note the appearance of בדבר יהוה in both utterances emphasizing the seriousness of the compulsion under

which the man of God refuses hospitality. Secondly the very explicit refusal of hospitality repeated with only minute variation in both utterances:

לא־תאכל לחם ולא תשתה [שם] מים.

Finally, there is the occurrence of the very significant verb שוב. Of two hundred and twenty-six verbal forms in the text we are considering, שוב accounts for twenty-one, nearly one in ten ocurrences. This is only exceeded by אמר (twenty-three ocurrences) whose frequency is unsurprising in a narrative full of speech[205]. Most occurrences are in single figures with most verbs (forty-seven out of fifty-eight) occurring no more than half a dozen times each, indeed thirty-five of the fifty eight forms occur no more than twice in the story. Considered even in the wider context of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History as a whole, 1 Kings 12 and 13 - especially 13 - have a very high incidence of occurrences of this verb[206].

Most of the differences between the speech of the man of God in 1 Kings 13.8-9 and in 1 Kings 13.16-17 are expansions of the former utterance in the latter. In one significant respect, however, there is a contraction. We shall consider this further below.

In response to the king the man of God says in emphatic and formal language:

כי־כֵן צִוָּה אֹתִי בִדְבַר יְהוָה לֵאמֹר

for so it was commanded (translating the Piel) *to me* (translating the definite object marker + pronominal suffix) *by the word of YHWH saying...*

or perhaps:

---

[205]The next most frequently occurring verbs are: היה - 14 occurrences; ברא - 12 occurrences; הלך - 12 occurrences; עשה - 12 occurrences; אכל - 11 occurrences.

[206]For full analysis see Appendix 3.

for thus he strictly commanded me by the word of YHWH saying...

whereas in verses 16-17 in response to the prophet of Bethel he simply says:

כִּי־דָבָר אֵלַי בִּדְבַר יְהוָה

for it was said to me by the word of YHWH...

or perhaps

for the word to me by the word of YHWH [was]...

in neither case is a passive verb (*cf* RSV) necessarily the most illuminating translation of the Hebrew text, though it does have fluency in its favour. The intensive force of the Piel form of צָוָה in the first utterance, combined with the force of the verb צוה itself, and the implication of there being someone who has given the command, contrasts with the absence of any but an implied verb 'to be' in the second utterance, and demonstrates the forcefulness of the man-of-God's response. We shall consider this in more detail when the man of God repeats the prohibition to the prophet of Bethel.

An Examination of the Prohibition

The instruction to the man of God about his journey is open to some nuanced reading in terms of the variation between the two accounts the man of God gives of it (this issue we shall consider in the context of verse 17); the way in which the context shapes the interpretation of the instruction; the possible ambiguities in it; and the part played by the word שוב (a fuller study of which we shall reserve until we have considered the whole narrative).

For the phrase:

וְלֹא תָשׁוּב בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר הָלָכְתָּ

the RSV (*cf* also most other English translations) offers the perfectly natural:

nor return by the way that you came

it draws no distinction in English between this Hebrew phrase, and the rather different:

לֹא־תָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־הָלַכְתָּ בָּהּ

for which the same translation is also natural, but where these two utterances stand together it is perhaps less correct to translate them identically. The Revised Version marks the difference between the two utterances and offers:

'neither return by the way that thou camest' for the first utterance, and

'nor turn again to go by the way that thou camest' for the second.

Our perception of the meaning of the initial utterance is shaped by the words immediately following:

וַיֵּלֶךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ אַחֵר וְלֹא־שָׁב בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר בָּא בָהּ אֶל־בֵּית־אֵל

we are explicitly told that "he went by another way and did not return by the way that he had come in to Bethel". English translations through native preferences of linguistic and narrative style tend to substitute a hypotactic conjunction for the original paratactic וְ in the Hebrew. Although this can be a perfectly proper translation, it does tend to close off an area of ambiguity which the narrator may camouflage by the words he uses in verse 10, but which he does not eliminate.

The injunction to the man of God as stated in his first utterance could equally well be translated 'you shall not turn back in (or on) the way in which you go'[207], thus the

injunction about not turning becomes not an instruction about the route by which the man of God enters and leaves the northern kingdom, but rather a command about the unflinching and undeviating way in which he is to pursue his mission[208]. This reading is consistent too with the injunction that he should neither eat nor drink in Bethel. YHWH's emissary is to have no fellowship with the false worshippers, nor is he to show any sign of repentance towards them in respect of the judgment which he delivers. It should be noted that repentance is a meaning well within the semantic range of שוב, and, in this context, a meaning which is clearly connoted. Thus the oracle and the manner of delivering it stand together: the altar is condemned as false, and fellowship is broken between YHWH and the northern kingdom which has incurred his unrelenting judgment.

While this meaning is perfectly possible, it is not unambiguously *the* meaning, and initially no suspicions are likely to be aroused by the narrative description which follows:

וַיֵּלֶךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ אַחֵר וְלֹא־שָׁב בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר בָּא בָּהּ אֶל־בֵּית־אֵל׃

On the contrary, the very unambiguous description of the man-of-God's actions serves not only to demonstrate the way in which he understood the instructions he had been given, but also to shape the reader's or hearer's perceptions about the meaning of those instructions.

Act Two: The Prophet of Bethel

The departure of a principal character often serves as the marker of the end of a narrative segment, and such is the case with the departure of the man of God. The new act opens with the introduction of a new character, the prophet of Bethel. It is noteworthy, that the

---

[207] *cf* e.g. 2 Kings 19.28c where the RSV offers 'and I will turn you back on the way by which you came' though it could equally well be 'and I will make you return by the way that you came'.

[208] *cf* Gray's comment on 1 Kings 13.17, *op. cit.* p. 300

change from Act One to Act Two takes place with the minimum of formal narrative marking. The RSV's "Now..." at the beginning of 1 Kings 13.11 perhaps makes more of the transition than the Hebrew ו really warrants. There is no והנה or ויהי as a formal mark of transition, see for example 1 Kings 13.1. Thus, whatever the commentators' views about the relation between the first and second parts of 1 Kings 13[209], the present form of the text marks a distinction between the two parts only by content and not by textual form.

The new character who will be one of the principal protagonists in the new turn the story takes is introduced at the outset. "And a certain old prophet dwelt at Bethel...", thus the narrator keeps our attention on this prophet as he recounts the return of his son(s) who give full account of the days events to their father. The narrator makes a point of telling us that it was not only the deeds of the man of God which were reported but also his words. This is significant in terms of the developing narrative tension when the prophet from Bethel meets the man of God.

The old prophet's response is characterized by decisive action. He rapidly establishes the road by which the man of God has departed, and the verbs crowding together in 1 Kings 13.13-14 convey an impression of a hasty departure.

We are kept in the dark as to the motivation of the old prophet at this stage. Clearly he was not present at the royal dedication of the new altar. No information is given as to why.

[209] *cf* e.g., Gray "This is another prophetic tradition known at Bethel... its inclusion at this particular point being suggested by the reference to the ban to the prophet on eating and drinking" *op cit* p. 298

Perhaps his age excused him - yet he seems active enough as his rapid departure on the ass reveals. Perhaps what we have is an indication in the text that Jeroboam's activities described at the end of chapter twelve did not evoke universal approval at Bethel. Yet the prophet's activities might be seen as an attempt to reverse the effects of the judgment upon the altar. The term prophet is of course loaded with ambiguity, and describes a particular cultic function without clear indication of approval or disapproval. The term is used with a theologically negative connotation for those who are prophets of Baal or of Ashtoreth, and for those in Jerusalem who are ostensibly prophets of YHWH. Yet it is also used much more neutrally or even positively in the context of Elisha's ministry, or the account of the choosing and anointing of Saul. The scope of the term 'prophet' is discussed more fully by D.L. Petersen. He concludes that it was originally applied to northern kingdom prophets, but that after the collapse of the northern kingdom, the title became the generic term for prophet.[210] This generic usage means that it is no surprise to find one who is described as 'man of God' also described as a prophet. Nor, indeed, as Petersen's discussion reveals, is it surprising to encounter a lying prophet (a lying man of God, however, would seriously jar the reader's expectations[211]).

The ambiguity latent in the term prophet is reinforced by the way in which the narrator declines to suggest any motive for the prophet's actions, and though at one point we are told that the prophet lies, at another he is found delivering the true word of YHWH.

---

[210] *The Roles of Israel's Prophets* p. 58-63

[211] This actually appears to happen in 1 Kings 22 in the case of Micaiah ben Imlah. There are two possible explanations for this which are consistent with the general significance of 'man of God' which I have proposed. The first is that he speaks in a way which is intended to demonstrate insincerity, and hence the king's immediate rejoinder to him. The second (not mutually exclusive) explanation is that what he says is in obedience to his vision of YHWH's purpose.

The Prophet's Invitation and the Man-of-God's Response

When he finds the man of God, the prophet's action is equally direct and to the point. He establishes the identity of the stranger, and having done so immediately invites him to return and eat bread. We know that what he is inviting the man of God to do is to act in direct contravention of the word he has received from YHWH. Moreover we know that the prophet of Bethel knows this too for his son(s) had "told him all that the man of God had done that day at Bethel; *the words also which he had spoken to the king they told to their father*" (1 Kings 13.11 RSV). What is not clear is whether the man of God knows that the prophet of Bethel knows about the prohibition. Clearly, however, the prophet's question "Are you the man of God who came from Judah?" implies some prior knowledge of the man of God and of the events at the altar.

The initial response of the man of God to the invitation is (without so much emphatic rhetoric as before) to refuse the invitation to eat and to repeat the terms of the divine prohibition. His response is phrased so as to use the verb which is key to this story "I am not able to return (לשוב) with you…". In his repetition of the divine word itself, however, there are some variations. Hebrew narrative is not afraid of verbatim repetition when prophecy is followed by fulfilment, or where spoken words are recounted more than once. There is cause, therefore, to examine closely the differences between the two reports that the man of God gives of the word of YHWH.

1 Kings 13.9	1 Kings 13.17
כִּי־כֵן	צִוָּה אֹתִי בִּדְבַר	כִּי־דְבַר אֵלַי בִּדְבַר
For thus he commanded me by the word of	For he said unto me by the word of
יְהוָה לֵאמֹר לֹא־תֹאכַל לֶחֶם וְלֹא	יְהוָה לֹא־תֹאכַל לֶחֶם וְלֹא־
YHWH saying you shall not eat bread and you shall not	YHWH you shall not eat bread and you shall not
תִשְׁתֶּה־מַיִם וְלֹא תָשׁוּב בַּדֶּרֶךְ	תִשְׁתֶּה שָׁם מַיִם לֹא־תָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת בַּדֶּרֶךְ
drink water and you shall not return by the way	drink water there you shall not return to go by the way
אֲשֶׁר הָלַכְתָּ:	אֲשֶׁר־הָלַכְתָּ בָּהּ:
(on) which you went	(on) which you went on it.

The man of God is reporting again what he has previously reported as divine speech, indeed in his words to king Jeroboam it is clear that the force of the word of YHWH to him is greater than 'mere' speech; he specifically states that he has been *commanded* by the word of YHWH. Further the phraseology and the use of לאמר clearly indicate that the man of God reports what follows to Jeroboam as the very words spoken by YHWH. This message comes with the same force and authority as the oracle against the altar with its כה אמר יהוה. Thus when the man of God responds to the prophet we expect a similarly strong refusal parallelling the 'not even if you give me half your kingdom…' of his refusal of the king's hospitality.

Instead we get a fairly plainly phrased, almost muted refusal - לא אוכל - 'I am unable…' - with as unemphatic a restatement of the prohibitions as can be imagined with the forceful "commanded me saying…" in the man-of-God's first account of the

prohibitions being reduced to the more neutral "said to me...".

A State of Uncertainty

It is not entirely clear what significance is to be attached to the insertion of שם after the prohibition on eating and drinking. It indicates some kind of spatial limitation to the prohibition, and can perhaps be seen as making it less wide ranging than in the first statement, though it may simply reflect the man-of-God's departure from the place to which it applied. It is possible that its function is more as a marker that the man of God has departed from his previous text. It makes the alert listener sit up and take notice. This is not exactly what he said last time. Thus we are alerted to the departure from his script that immediately follows.

Instead of: וְלֹא תָשׁוּב בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר הָלַכְתָּ׃

we get: לֹא־תָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־הָלַכְתָּ בָּהּ׃

The difference may seem slight, but it is one of the insights of Robert Alter that such slight differences, particularly in reports of speech are often significant in understanding the developing plot of a narrative.

We have already considered the difference between the two utterances of the man of God above, but we must now try to establish the significance of the difference. It is apparent that in a number of the instances where the construction (תשוב ללכת בדרך) is used the whole of the return 'journey' is in view. That is to say, a return to the starting point is implied[212]. BDB notes the usage of שוב to denote the repetition of an action[213], and

specifically the use of the construction שוב ללכת for 'return again'[214]. Whichever way we take it, it is clear that the reference is specifically to the return journey, and this is further reinforced by the final phrase of his account of God's command:

בדרך אשר־הלכת בה

which in (more or less) idiomatic English might best be rendered 'by the way by [*or* on] which you came'. Thus the words which the man of God attributes to YHWH now reflect the way in which the man of God has chosen to interpret them. Further, it may be significant that while the prophet from Bethel phrases his request to the man of God in what may be no more than a logical order (return, eat, drink), the man of God phrases his reply in a way which at first sight simply mirrors the prophet's request, but which also, in relation to the word of YHWH to him, gives the effect of putting the issue of eating and drinking at the head, and relegating the returning to a side-issue. It is hard to be completely certain about this since the two parts of the reply obviously take their form from what has preceded, nonetheless, their juxtaposition in this way has an effect.

The narrative strategy here raises a doubt in the hearer's mind. The initial report by the man of God of the *command* which he received from God (1 Kings 13.9) is on the face of it perfectly consistent with his subsequent actions. However, the *word* (even this difference is significant) of God which he reports to the prophet of Bethel is not identical, and this,

---

212 *cf* 1 Kings 12.24, 13.17 and Ecclesiastes 1.7, 5.14

213 p. 998 b

214 p. 233 b This seems to me a particularly confusing way of translating the phrase since 'return' lies at the semantic heart of שוב, but it is the 'again' which represents the שוב, and 'return' represents ללכת. A more literal, and in the context of this discussion, clearer rendering would be 'go again' or 'walk again' rather than to use two English words which would both be most naturally translated by the Hebrew שוב. Unfortunately it fails to produce meaningful English in, e.g., 1 Kings 12.24.

together, perhaps, with the apparently arbitrary nature of the command as interpreted by him signals to the audience a need to re-assess our understanding of God's command. Further, the alert reader/listener ought to be aware of the rather different way in which שוב ללכת is being used here when compared with its usage in 1 Kings 12.24 where the understanding, clearly demanded by the context there, is of going back on and undoing the mission on which the man of Judah had set out. A dissonance has been established and we ought to be aware that all is not well. A similar example has been noted in Genesis 3.2f where the command of God (Genesis 2.16) is altered in its re-statement by Eve. The parallel is maintained even to the tendency of ancient versions to assimilate the later statement to the earlier[215].

A modern cinematic analogy to this narrative technique which is intended to unsettle the audience can perhaps be found in the trick of filming the vulnerable back view of a character as they enter a location which sets up in the viewers an expectation that the character is being watched by another, and, typically, is about to be attacked from behind.

The Prophet Deceives the Man of God

The prophet's response to this second refusal is very subtle. As we have already noted, the author of this tale has given us a fairly clear hint that the prophet knows everything about the man-of-God's encounter with Jeroboam:

> "And his sons came and told him all that the man of God had done that day in Bethel; the words also which he had spoken to the king, they told to their father." 1 Kings 13.11 (RSV)

[215] *cf* Moberly R.W.L. "Did the Serpent get it right?" *The Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988) p. 6f

The prophet thus begins with an assertion of an essential kinship between himself and the man of God:

"I also am a prophet as you are..."

and he then moves on to the kernel of his message:

> "...an angel spoke to me by the word of YHWH, saying, 'Bring him back with you into your house that he may eat bread and drink water.'"

At each stage in the narrative process we are moved further and further away from the starting point of YHWH's emphatic command. Thus in 1 Kings 13.9 we get, "...he commanded me by the word of YHWH"; in 13.17 we get, "he spoke to me by the word of YHWH"; and now in 13.18 we get "an angel spoke to me by the word of YHWH". So we move from statement to mis-statement to downright lie.

The man of God falls victim to the prophet's deception and returns with him to Bethel and eats and drinks.

The Word of YHWH...again

Two circumstantial clauses beginning with וַיְהִי mark the beginning of a new phase in the action. First a graphic image of the two men sitting at table concludes the previous section, then in a new paragraph the tranquil after-dinner scene is rudely interrupted.

This introductory clause is as essential as it is surprising. By its use the narrator affirms the trustworthiness of the words which follow[216], which he needs to do because of the

[216] Contrary to Van Winkle's assertion, the narrator's authority immediately verifies the prophet's words

prophet's previous record. By the same token this is a surprising twist in the tale, for the prophet who has lied so unhesitatingly now, equally without hesitation, pronounces YHWH's condemnation on the one he himself has deceived.

After the initial prophetic formula the judgment falls into three parts:

1a you have disobeyed the word of YHWH

1b and have not kept the commandment which YHWH your God commanded you

2 but have come back

3 and have eaten bread and drunk water in the place of which he said to you, "Do not eat bread, and do not drink water"

and is followed by the passing of sentence:

your body shall not come to the tomb of your fathers

The first element of the judgment states in two parallel statements, one positive and one negative, the nub of the accusation against the man of God: the problem is disobedience. The English phrase "word of YHWH" rather conceals the implication of the Hebrew פי יהוה which refers to God's active speech with someone, and not merely his word communicated to them. Indeed, as D.W. Van Winkle notes, paying tribute to G.I. Davies, the phrase מרה פי יהוה is used typically to refer to disobedience to the commandments of YHWH (compare e.g., 1 Samuel 12.15)[217]. This sense of disobedience to a very

for us. See Van Winkle, D.W. "1 Kings XIII: True and False Prophecy" *Vetus Testamentum* XXIX, 1 (1989) pp. 31-43 at p. 39

[217] Van Winkle, *op. cit.* p. 41

immanent God is reinforced by the use of the quotation of direct speech from YHWH in the third element of the judgment (13.22) where instead of

וְלֹא־אֹכַל לֶחֶם וְלֹא אֶשְׁתֶּה־מָיִם

we are given

אַל־תֹּאכַל לֶחֶם וְאַל־תֶּשְׁתְּ מָיִם.

The difference can perhaps best understood by seeing the former usage as saying "He said to me that I should not eat bread or drink water..." and the latter being rather "He said to me, 'Do not eat bread and do not drink water...'" which conveys with an effect of immediacy the imperative force of YHWH's direct speech. There is no difference in meaning between these two statements in the sense that one could be described as a correct and the other as an incorrect description of what was said. There is, however, difference between them in their affective power, and in the sense of closeness to the giving of the prohibition which they suggest. The parallel statement brings us back to the first statement of the prohibition by the man of God where he refers to the divine injunction he has received not merely as דבר but as צוה.

It is equally significant that the second element of the judgment is focused on the fact that the man of God has returned or turned back. The placing of this element before the breach of the prohibitions on eating and drinking draws our attention to its significance. In the two previous statements of the prohibitions (1 Kings 13.9, 17) it has been placed second after the prohibition on eating and drinking.

At this point in the tale the nature and time scale of this judgment is unclear. The silence of

the narrative as to any reaction by the man of God in the face of the judgment also makes it difficult for us to assess the gravity of the judgment. By contrast with Jeroboam, he makes no plea for judgment to be rescinded. Indeed with stark narrative economy we move from the judgment to the next scene in the story.

The Death of the Man of God from Judah

Interestingly, in 1 Kings 13.23, the man of God is described as נביא, the only use of this term for him in the entire narrative. This reading of the text is followed by the Revised Version and the RSV, other translations prefer to deal with it in different ways; for example, treating לנביא as a description of the ownership of the ass. Montgomery and Gehman simply advocate rejecting the whole phrase as a gloss on an erroneous gloss[218], as also does Jones, at the expense of introducing into the story an ass not previously mentioned[219]. It is more likely, in my view, that a purposeful parallel is being drawn between three occasions on which a prophet departs from Bethel on an ass (1 Kings 13.13, 23 and 27 - the phraseology is similar in every case). Certainly, given the significance of the term 'man of God' (see the discussion above) and the carefulness with which the distinction has been maintained hitherto between the prophet of Bethel, and the man of God from Judah, it seems probable that the change is either a clumsy mistake whether by original author, or later editor, or it is a deliberate narrative device. Certainly a prophet is of ambiguous status in the Deuteronomistic History generally; and if we read the text following the RSV, it is interesting that, it is at the point when the word of YHWH comes to the prophet of Bethel instead of to the man of God, and at the point when the man of God is condemned for disobeying פי יהוה, he loses his special status. There is a

[218] *op. cit.* p. 264 f

[219] *op. cit.* p. 267

further ironic comment by which the status of the man of God is gradually diminished. As איש האלהים he outfaces kings and delivers the oracles of YHWH. In being deceived, he becomes נביא like his deceiver, and from being נביא it is but a short step to becoming נבלה. It is thus that he is referred to by the narrator throughout the remainder of the text until the three terms come together in 1 Kings 13.29:

הנבא את־נבלת איש־האלהים

Apart from this occurrence it is only in the mouth of the prophet of Bethel that he is honoured with the title 'man of God'. Such a reading is not crucial to the developing plot but is consistent with it. It has the merit of accounting well for the change in usage without having to postulate a clumsy redactorial or glossing process.

The plainness of the narrative at this point reflects the shifted viewpoint of the narrator from being close to the events at the Bethelite prophet's dining table to a wider view in which we see the actions of the characters through a more distant lens again. With striking narrative economy, the man of God finishes his meal and the ass is saddled for him[220]. He goes, and a lion finds him 'in the way' [בדרך]and kills him.

Then a remarkable circumstance is depicted (והחמור should probably be translated adversatively, "but the ass..."), the lion and the donkey both stand there together. Some passers by observing this phenomenon then report the wonder that they have seen upon arriving at Bethel.

---

[220] Simon, U. "1 Kings 13: A Prophetic Sign— Denial and Persistence" *Hebrew Union College Annual XLVII* 1976 p. 93ff

The prophet, hearing their tale, realizes that it is the man of God from Judah that they speak of (though no indication is given of the grounds he has for so believing). The prophecy-fulfilment pattern so beloved of the deuteronomistic historian makes its appearance here, and the author of the fulfilment is marked with a threefold repetition of the name of YHWH in the words of the prophet.

This scene structurally resembles the scene at Bethel depicted in 1 Kings 13.11-16, and the parallel is emphasized by verbal similarities as the prophet commands his sons once again to saddle the ass for him, and he sets off a second time to bring back the man of God from Judah. The circumstances of the finding of the body are repeated twice in detail so that we cannot fail to grasp the wonder that the ass and the lion both remain by the body, and that the lion neither attacks the ass nor begins to eat the body. Then with a shift again to more economical narrative, the prophet returns to Bethel, laments and buries the body.

We now enter the final scene of the narrative which brings us full circle in a reflection of the events narrated at the beginning of the chapter. The pithy לספד ולקברו of 1 Kings 13.29 is expanded in the following verses. The location of the burial is specified: in the prophet's own tomb - a mark of honour and respect. The terms of the lament are specified: 'Woe, my brother!' - certainly intended also as a mark of respect, but perhaps also as a desire to express affinity. The reader or hearer of the tale may feel that the connotations of this lament are rather ambiguous, given that it comes form the mouth of a lying prophet of a discredited cult. This is double-edged if the descent of the man of God from emissary of YHWH to prophet to corpse is maintained, for the prophet here is

contemplating his own eventual descent in the same direction.

This fraternal identification, however, works in two directions, for not only does the prophet of Bethel convey respect towards the man of God from Judah, but also he takes on his mantle in reiterating the word of YHWH against the altar, and extending it to apply to all the high places. This makes express what might be seen as an implication of the man-of-God's prophecy against the altar, that the whole cult is under YHWH's condemnation[221].

The framing of the story - closing

As the concluding words of the Bethelite prophet parallel the man-of-God's oracle against the altar, so the concluding remarks about Jeroboam reflect the opening remarks in 1 Kings 12.25 ff. They share the same essentially atemporal flavour (at least in relation to the events narrated) as the opening verses. These concluding verses contain a judgment which could have been given at the outset of the story, in immediate response to the description of Jeroboam's cultic reforms. But as the repetition differs slightly from the original statement, we may be looking at something rather more than a device by which the main thrust of the history is resumed[222].

These last two verses focus, perhaps surprisingly only on the effect Jeroboam had on the priesthood, in particular, his appointment of priests who were not Levites; and not upon

[221] The reference to Samaria by name is an anachronism in the context of the narrated time frame, though that does not affect the narrative implications of the expansion; nor is it clear from that fact in itself that the original tradition did not include some such wider denunciation now clothed in an anachronistic name.

[222] Cohn *op. cit.* p. 31

either the new feast, the calves, or the actual establishment of the high places.

No particular structure is evident in these concluding verses in themselves, but their relation to the judgment in 1 Kings 12.31 ff is important.

We have already observed the chiastic pattern in 1 Kings 12.32,33[223] which is then broken by the final clause of chapter twelve in order to introduce the story in chapter 13. If we take 12.31 into consideration as well and 13.33,34, we find an expanded pattern emerging in which the closing verses of the episode reflect the concerns of the opening verses of the condemnation of Jeroboam[224].

The danger of such patterns is that they are like figures in the clouds or pictures in the embers, differing with each beholder; but if this pattern is deemed convincing it may perhaps constitute evidence for a secondary post-deuteronomistic redaction by which the prophetic story in 1 Kings 13 has been very carefully stitched into an existing deuteronomistic judgment on Jeroboam.

If we relate this to Provan's discussion on these verses[225], some interesting factors come to light. In the first place, Lemke's proposal discussed there[226] that 1 Kings 12.31-13.33 constitutes a redactional unit is not wholly dismissed, but the scope of the unit is reduced.

---

[223] See Chapter 3 above, p.105f

[224] See Appendix 4

[225] Provan *op. cit.* pp. 78 ff

[226] Lemke, W.E. "The Way of Obedience: 1 Kings 13 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History" in F.M. Cross et al. (ed.) *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays on the Bible and Archeology in memory of G.E. Wright* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976. Unfortunately I have not been able to gain access to Lemke's essay.

The proposal here is in tune with Lemke's observations of parallels between 12. 31 and 13.33, but leads to different conclusions. The centre of our proposed chiasmus has a strong focus on Bethel, and I do not consider it possible to decide whether it is that which dictates insertion immediately afterwards of a narrative which relates to Bethel, or whether the emphasis in those verses was introduced to provide an introduction to that narrative.

We have already noted Cohn's criticism of the proposal that 13.34 is simply an example of repetitive resumption from 12.30, and even if he is wrong, it might simply be a way of framing the chiastic judgment. The mention of Dan in 12.30 without a corresponding mention of Bethel might simply arise from the need to indicate that the calf at Dan was a focus of worship in a context which otherwise focuses wholly on Bethel. The reference to Dan is cast in such a way that it echoes the very end of the judgment on Jeroboam in 13.34, and this becomes apparent if these are read as two parallel statements in a chiastic judgment.

A further feature apparent in the structure I have suggested is the way statements about Jeroboam are balanced by statements about the people. Thus, in Appendix 4, *a* and *a1* (12.30) where the focus is on the people balances *a'* and *a1'* (13.34) where the focus is on Jeroboam[227]. A similar balance can be observed between *d* and *d'* (12.32/12.33) (and, plausibly, between *c,c1* and *c',c1'* (12.31a/13.33)). Arguably this brings 1 Kings 12.30 into the proposed judgment into which we propose 1 Kings 12.33bβ-1 Kings 13.34aα has been inserted[228]. Thus, 1 Kings 13.33a assumes knowledge of the prophetic material because it was put there for the purpose of incorporating it[229]. The final

[227] Notice too the thematic link between the implication that the whole of the Northern Kingdom was involved העם לפני האחד עד־דן, and the disappearance of the house of Jeroboam from the whole earth מעל פני האדמה with the play of alliteration and assonance between the two statements.

[228] *contra* Provan *op. cit.* p. 79

clause of 1 Kings 12 resumes from the central focus of the reduced chiasmus which is created by the insertion of 1 Kings 13.1-32.We shall consider this question further below.

שוב

We have had cause at various points in the preceding discussion to consider various ocurrences of this Hebrew word, and at the outset we remarked that it was one of the key words and a motif of this narrative. Its key role has also been noted by W.E. Lemke who comments that "Quite conceivably the author of [1 Kings 13] vs. 26 intended to play on the various nuances of שוב in conjunction with דרך, leaving it purposely ambiguous in order to facilitate the transition from the literal sense (as in vss 9. 10, 17) to the metaphorical one (as in vs. 33)"[230]. T.B. Dozeman also notes the same thing[231]. What neither writer appears to draw attention to is the possibility that in this story the metaphorical meaning of the word is primary. Thus, while we may deduce the man-of-God's intention to obey the word from his action of returning by a different way, our perception is gradually shifted to see that in grasping what we might loosely call the formal meaning of the command, he has lost sight of its much more radical metaphorical significance.

שוב is used in connection with various different players in the story to different effect.

Jeroboam is the first to use the word in his consideration of the security of his kingdom. Here the context is of the people of the northern kingdom: the kingdom will *return* to the

---

[229] *cp.* Provan's whole discussion pp. 78 ff

[230] Lemke, W.E. *op. cit.* as quoted in Van Winkle *op. cit.* p. 41 Unfortunately I have not been able to gain access to Lemke's essay.

[231] Dozeman *op. cit. p. 386*

house of David; the heart of the people will *return* to Rehoboam; the people will *return* to Rehoboam king of Judah (12.26, 27).

Secondly it is applied to Jeroboam's outstretched hand which he is unable to '*return*' to himself (13.4), and which he asks the man of God to ask God to '*return*' to him, and God does '*return*' it to him (13.6). This little section in the story has the effect of suggesting that the judgment on the altar and any judgment on Jeroboam are two distinct things. The altar and the cult at Bethel as established are clearly absolutely anathema. Towards Jeroboam, however, there is a difference of approach and the possibility of change and reciprocation. At this point we should note that if we are to see Jeroboam against the light of our picture of David, Jeroboam's response to the man of God is eloquent in its silence as to any reflection on Jeroboam's own actions - by contrast, for example, with David's shocked and aghast "I have sinned against the Lord." (2 Samuel 12.13, *cf* also 2 Samuel 24.10).

Thirdly שוב occurs in the man-of-God's reports of the word of YHWH to him, and in the narrator's account of what the man of God does. On the first occasion he is unable to come to the king's house because he has been commanded not to eat, or drink, nor *turn back/ return* on/by the way on/by which he came. So he sets out by a different way - in apposition with not *returning* by the way by which he came (13.9, 10). On the second occasion the prophet from Bethel asks him to *return* and accept hospitality, but he is not able to *return* with the prophet from Bethel and accept his hospitality, because he has been told not to accept hospitality or to *return* (13.16, 17). But the prophet from Bethel tells the

man of God that the word is that the prophet from Bethel is to bring him back (lit: *return* him) to eat and drink; so he *returns* and eats and drinks (13.18, 19). Then the word of YHWH comes to the prophet who had brought him back (*returned* him)(13.20) accusing him of *returning* and eating and drinking (13.22).

The prophet from Bethel acquires a second epithet in the story and is twice described as "the prophet who had brought him back" (who had *returned* him) (13.20, 24 (possibly), and 26). And a second time he goes out; and the man of God now being dead does not *return* with him (13.19), but is brought back (*returned*) by him (13.29).

Finally Jeroboam is described as not *turning* from his wicked ways and as again making (*turning* and making) priests for the high places etc. (13.33).

The theme of turning and returning is key to this narrative, not only to the structure of its plot, but also to the questions it raises and the questions it addresses.

Thus as Robert Cohn notes, "the author uses the confrontation to mark the beginning of the reversal of the king's destiny":

> "Repeating the key word *fûb* ("return") eleven times in the tale, the author drives home the idea that the man of God's physical reversal of direction was the cause of his downfall. Climactically, the word *fûb* ("return") appears for the final time predicated of Jeroboam at the conclusion of the tale... Whereas the sin of the man of God lay in his physical return by the

way, the sin of Jeroboam was his refusal to turn back, metaphorically, from his way."[232]

We have observed how the word שוב has a vital and prominent role to play in the narrative of the man of God from Judah. It is not surprising to find this in the Deuteronomistic History, for it has been noted for some time to be a key theme for the deuteronomistic historian. We have already noted in Chapter One Wolff's identification of this as a kerygmatic key word for the Deuteronomistic History. "A return will reverse the judgment, though it might already have been decreed."[233] (A possibility we have already adverted to in connection with the withering and healing of Jeroboam's hand.) Wolff considers the role of שוב at some length in his study, but has omitted to consider its appearance here, even though 1 Kings 13 shows an outstandingly large usage of the word when compared with its other appearances in the Deuteronomistic History[234].

If this emphasis is original to the 'prophetic legend' said to underlie this tale, then it is not at all surprising that the deuteronomistic historian has chosen to include it since it includes themes so vital in the historian's view.

There are, however, certain implications from this for our understanding of the history of the text. While it is possible to conceive of this story as having existed originally in two

---

[232] Cohn *op. cit.* p. 31, 33 Though I think Cohn too has missed the possibility that the man of God ought from the outset to have been alive to the metaphorical significance of YHWH's command to him.

[233] Wolff, *op. cit.* p. 91

[234] As we have previously noted. See Appendix 3

separate tales, the common concerns and language of the two parts, their weaving together, and their weaving into the deuteronomistic history have been accomplished in a way which makes it almost impossible to recover anything but the bare bones of an earlier stage. Further, it must at least be conceded as possible that the story always was a unity, and that it was simply the narrative devices for changing scene or act which led those who were looking for sources to find them[235].

Secondly, if the story in this form is essentially as written by the deuteronomistic historian making literary, but not textual, use of an earlier tradition, then identification of later elements in this text on the basis of deuteronomistic language is a highly dubious enterprise since *ex hypothesi* the whole text is late, though derived from an earlier kernel. Contrariwise, if the שוב and דבר יהוה themes are native to an earlier text, then it sounds a note of caution about the use of such linguistic features and usages to identify deuteronomistic material[236].

דבר יהוה

In a plot full of reversal, whether of direction, expectation, or fortune, two elements remain constant and unmoved in their direction, the first is the word of YHWH, to which attention is paid throughout the narrative. The man of God comes by the word of YHWH and

---

[235] *cf.* Mr Charles Parker's remark on the subject of biblical commentators: "I found they were all so busy looking for a burglar whom nobody had ever seen, that they couldn't recognise the footprints of the household, so to speak" Sayers, D.L. *Whose Body?* London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1923 (quotation from the New English Library edition of 1977 p. 121)

[236] This is consistent with Auld's argument that "most of the language of the extensive pluses in Kings and Chronicles is already to be found in the Shared Text. Whether fashioned there, or already present in its sources, its expressions were available to be repeated, and more often re-combined and re-used in the successor texts. This means that we cannot use words and phrases... in any simplistic way as diagnostic of individual literary phases." (*op. cit.* p.149) and with his proposal that the writer of Kings should be seen as being as creative in his own way as the writer of Chronicles.

pronounces judgment by the word of YHWH. When the king attempts a rapprochement of some kind, the man of God reveals that he is under a ban by the word of YHWH.

When the man of God, albeit unwittingly, breaches the ban which he has received by the word of YHWH, then in a way slightly reminiscent of a fairy power YHWH's word seems to desert him for the apparently undeserving prophet of Bethel. The Bethelite's separate word is duly fulfilled against the man of God, and the original word of YHWH by the man of God is re-affirmed by the prophet of Bethel.

Thus, the word of YHWH becomes almost a character in the story, or at least an actor in the plot. Thus conceived, the word of YHWH is an irresistible power advancing through subtlety or brute force as the need arises. This conception of the word of YHWH echoes that suggested by Isaiah 55.10 f[237].

It is the word of YHWH which brings the man of God from Judah in the first place, and which has placed him under the ban. It is the word of YHWH which leads him to pronounce judgment on the altar, and in partial and proleptic fulfilment of which the altar collapses. It is by the word of YHWH that the prophet from Bethel pronounces judgment on the man of God, and it is in fulfilment of the word of YHWH that he is killed by the lion. Finally, the persistence of the word of YHWH is affirmed at the end of the tale by the prophet of Bethel.

---

[237] Where, indeed, the word שוב appears in describing the irreversibility of the word of YHWH. This conclusion for the narrative in 1 Kings 13 parallels that of U. Simon *op. cit.*

Interestingly the only positive event which does not occur 'by the word of YHWH' is the withering and healing of the king's hand. The very reversibility of that event stands in contrast to the narrative supposition about the irreversibility of the word of YHWH which is gradually created by a series of events which happen 'by the word of YHWH'. The contrast created by this reversible event serves to highlight the irreversibility of all the events which do come about 'by the word of YHWH'.

The second irreversible element is Jeroboam himself. It is important to keep in mind the fact that this story is set in the middle of and as part of the story of Jeroboam. Thus, although, as a number of the commentators remark, Jeroboam does not actually appear in the second half of the tale, his role and fate are issues which are present to the reader's/listener's mind throughout the second part of the narrative.

Anonymity

As the commentators all note, the man of God from Judah and the prophet from Bethel are both anonymous, and there is some suspicion that in 'the original prophetic source' the king was anonymous also.

Some support for the last point may be seen in the fact that all the shaping of Jeroboam's character takes place in the framing of the story, rather than in its substance.

Sternberg comments that "anonymity is the lot (and mark) of supernumeraries, type characters, institutional figures, embodied plot devices... By analogy to the biblical world, where the absence or the blotting out of a name implies nonexistence, the abstention from

naming in biblical discourse thus implies the individual abeyance of the nameless within the otherwise particularized action."[238]

It is part and parcel of this anonymity that we are given little or no insight into the thoughts and feelings of the characters, in relation to whom, the narrator stands at some distance throughout the tale. Our desire to read this tale with an empathy of some sort for the characters as human persons with motivations and inner lives like our own means that we find many gaps to be filled. It is not that such questions are irrelevant in relation to the text, it is just that the text gives us very little or, in most case, no help in understanding the inwardness of these characters. This narrative stands in contrast in that respect to many others which have yielded such fruitful results to careful literary readings. To recognize the existence of the gaps is to begin to understand the number and variety of the interpretations of those who have sought to interpret it.

Conclusions

We have observed at the start of the narrative the focusing of criticism on Jeroboam and his cultic 'innovations' with particular reference to the account of the golden calf in Exodus 32, and argued that there is some reason to believe that this depends on an existing tradition of Israel's sin in the wilderness.

We have noted the way in which parallels are drawn between the northern and southern kingdoms, and particularly between Jeroboam and David, and Jeroboam and Solomon. In

[238] Sternberg, *op. cit.* p. 330

this one king of the northern kingdom are enacted the promise to the dynasty and its failure.

We have observed too how the crucial themes of the narrative are the word of YHWH and its fulfilment, and the theme of repentance. The subtle interplay of metaphorical and literal usages of the word שוב brings this theme to the fore in a masterpiece of self-effacing artistry as the narrator directs us to this issue without actually explicitly making a theological or moral point.

While the possibility of some softening towards Jeroboam himself is held out (1 Kings 13.6), from a deuteronomistic perspective the institution at Bethel stands clearly condemned. Its altar is defiled with yet further defilement promised, its royal patron is powerless to defend it, its priests made up of all the rabble[239] of the kingdom, and the prophets who serve it making up 'words from YHWH' out of their own heads.

At the same time, the man of God from Judah is portrayed as one who has a limited grasp of what is required of him, and who is thus easily led astray to his own destruction. The narrative, however, is carefully cast so that his death does not undermine his oracle against the altar, but rather it is affirmed as the Bethelite prophet takes up and affirms that the word of YHWH pronounced by the man of God will indeed come to pass.

As human persons ourselves, we may find ourselves in different states of empathy with or distance from the characters portrayed. As alert readers, however, we must recognize that

[239] This is the clear implication of the text, notwithstanding Montgomery and Gehman's strictures on the AV translation (*op. cit.* p. 255)

the text gives us very little direction in our interpretation of the characters, and we must be aware therefore that whatever psychological light we may shed on them is likely to come more from ourselves than from the text[240].

In our reading we have also demonstrated that whatever its history, the text in its present form does function as a coherent literary whole.

[240] A point which Jones also makes *op. cit.* p. 266

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions

Synthesis

This work has sought to explore two different approaches, the historical-critical and the literary-critical, to reading the biblical text, and to examine in detail the results of their application to the story of the man of God from Judah. It has been suggested by some that there is an essential incompatibility between these two approaches; and we have noted how this suggestion arose from the circumstances in which the literary-critical approach was introduced into biblical studies. We also noted, however, how both approaches are engaged in reading the text at the same reading level.

We have now concluded our two primary readings of the text outlined in the Introduction, and their interdependence has to some extent already become apparent. In conclusion, I shall try to draw together the threads of these two rather different enterprises, giving further attention to their dependence on each other.

Points in Common: History, Theology, The Text as Object

One point that the two approaches have in common is their interest in history. They differ in that the literary approach is not essentially interested in the relation of the world of the text to its referent, or even strictly whether there is a referent; but they have in common the necessity of foundational historical enquiry.

While the historical-critical approach tends to be interested in the genesis of the text: the circumstances that gave rise to it, the world to which it refers and so on, the literary critical approach tends to be interested in the literary milieu of the text and in understanding the literary techniques and methods of that milieu. Both approaches are interested in grammar and language (the enquiry into which is essentially historical).

Secondly, both methods are in essence and in themselves a-theological. That is to say neither method in or of itself necessarily requires theological questions to be addressed. Neither approach of itself requires an answer to the question: In what sense is the text we have read 'Word of the Lord' for a contemporary community of faith?

A very important area that both approaches have very much in common is their treatment of the text as an *object* of investigation, and in this they stand in contrast to reader response approaches. In the case of the historical critical approach, this 'objective' treatment of the text is essential, since the information sought is information about the genesis of the text, and about the historical circumstances it reflects, both in the substance of the events it purports to relate, and in its attitude towards those events.

In the case of the literary critical approach which is concerned with textual effects, there is a wider range of possibility. Textual effects to some extent lie in the eye of the individual reader, or the ear of the individual hearer. Those that work for any particular reader tend to be accepted by the reader, and those which are felt not to produce an effect tend to be rejected. To put it another way, a body of evidence for a particular formal or structural

device may demonstrate that that device exists: the purpose or effect of that device is much more a matter of aesthetic judgment dependent on the readers of the text. Thus while some of the foremost names in this approach (Alter, Bar Efrat, Sternberg) take a firmly objective approach to the text, others are more inclined to the view that meaning is created by readers, and the same text and textual devices speak differently to different readers.[241]

The difference between the two approaches is that those who take the text-as-object approach are committed *in principle* to the idea that the text has a meaning or meanings about which ultimately everyone can agree (and beyond which further questions might be asked about what may be called the 'significance' of the text). The possibility of alternative readings of the text does not automatically invalidate this approach to the text, it may simply call for a re-examination within the same basic methodological outlook. On the other hand those who take a reader oriented approach are committed *in principle* to the idea that the text does not have a meaning or meanings as such, but rather it has readers who produce readings of the text; and that to some extent each reading is a valid reading[242].

In the literary treatment of the text in chapters 3 and 4, it will have been observed that I have tended towards the objective approach. In part this may be a matter of my personal predilection. In part, however, I would argue that it is a matter of matching reading methods to the genre of the text being read. Thus the fact that other quite different texts may

---

[241] Thus, e.g. Gunn and Fewell *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible op. cit.* pp. 7ff, or Long B.O. "The 'New' Biblical Poetics of Alter and Sternberg" *JSOT 51* (1991) 71-84

[242] The practical difficulty of arriving at an agreed interpretation in the one camp, and the unwillingness to accept conflicting readings in the other is nicely illustrated by the debate on the portrayal of Naomi in the book of Ruth between Peter Coxon and David Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell. See Fewell, Danna Nolan and Gunn D.M. "'A Son is born to Naomi': Literary Allusions and Interpretation in the Book of Ruth" *JSOT* 40 (1988) 99-108 with response by Coxon and rejoinder by Fewell and Nolan in *JSOT* 45 (1989) 25-37 and 39-43

be capable of bearing a great variety of meanings[243] does not mean that this one is also. One cannot apply the same criteria of polysemy and multivalency to the Highway Code as to a poem by T.S. Eliot. In the case of texts which are such clear cases, reading strategy depends on, and rarely departs from an *a priori* decision about the nature of the text in question.

In the case of an essentially alien text, and this is true, for modern readers, of most if not all of the Hebrew Bible, any *a priori* decision about the nature of the text being read needs to be much more loosely adhered to, and much more open to revision in the light of the results of any given reading. A proper estimation of the difficulty of making appropriate genre decisions about a text (and here Sternberg's warning about Nathan's parable to David is salutary)[244] will lead to a proper humility and caution about any judgments which are made. In the case of certain kinds of text this may ultimately not be a very important decision. In the case of transmissive texts, however, which function primarily to transmit or communicate meanings, there is an argument that, other things being equal, priority in assessing the results of any particular reading should be given to those readings where the 'writing-code' matches the 'reading-code'[245]. Very many texts involve a switching of reading codes during the course of a reading, or invite a variety of different approaches using different reading codes. Thus, to return to Sternberg's example of Nathan's parable, the change which occurs is not in the text itself but the reading code which David is invited to apply by Nathan's "You are the man!".

---

[243] *cf* Gunn and Fewell's discussion of the story of Cain and Abel *op. cit.* pp. 12ff

[244] *op. cit.* p. 31

[245] See the discussion in Thiselton, A.C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading* London, HarperCollins, 1992 pp. 501 and 524 ff. See also Sternberg *op. cit.* p. 1ff in which he tackles the same issues.

This question is part of the wider question of genre and genre competence and lies at the root of much of the discussion about the nature of the Deuteronomistic History. In some quarters, at least, there has been a tendency to suggest that the literary approaches of Alter *et al.* are only appropriately applied to narrative prose fiction. The general nature of the argument has been that since the Deuteronomistic History purports, for example, to offer us insights into the mind of David, or in this case Jeroboam, of a kind which cannot have been available to the author, then the work is not historiography. Here Sternberg is helpful again:

> "The shift of meaning [between *history* and *fiction* when applied to the world the writing represents or to the work by which the world is represented] leads to a symbiosis of meaning whereby history-writing is wedded to and fiction-writing opposed to factual truth. Now this double identification forms a category-mistake of the first order. For history writing is not a record of fact — of what "really happened" — but a discourse that claims to be a record of fact. Nor is fiction-writing a tissue of free invention but a discourse that claims the freedom of invention. The antithesis lies not in the presence or absence of truth value but of the commitment to truth value. ... [and later] ... Both historiography and fiction are genres of writing, not bundles of fact or nonfact in verbal shape."[246]

Sternberg goes on to argue that the Bible is historiographic, and that such a conclusion does not illegitimize the kind of criticism of the poesis of the Bible that he and others propose. Equally, the application of a literary critical approach does not lead inevitably to a

[246] Sternberg *op. cit.* p. 25

decision that the text is, or is being treated as, fiction.

My own conclusion is that this text ought to be read as historiography. A full argument in support, however, would demand a work of entirely different scope than this - or more probably an entirely different work altogether.

Drawing Together the Threads

I want here to try and draw together some of the main conclusions and suggestions arising from the two different approaches to reading the text adopted in this work. For convenience I shall try and summarize them in two broad categories: those that relate primarily to the world behind the text and questions about the genesis of the text; and those that relate primarily to the world of the text and questions about the poesis of the text.

1. The World Behind the Text

The Coherence of the Text

Perhaps the first point to note is the way in which the unit of text which we have been reading constitutes a single coherent narrative whole, and one which crosses many boundaries of critical dissection of the text. This is particularly the case with the opening verses in 1 Kings 12.25-33 where we noted a sustained pattern of condemnation, and increasing isolation of Jeroboam, and parallels made between both Jeroboam and Solomon and Jeroboam and David. Depending on which of the commentators surveyed one considers, this text is seen as the product of three or four different hands, whether redactors or sources. If our proposal for a narrative strategy focusing condemnation on

Jeroboam's cultic activities is deemed convincing then one of two conclusions follows.

The first possibility is that the features of the text are part of a purposeful narrative strategy. That is, either some redactor was both very fortunate in terms of the textual resources that chanced to be available, and consummately skilled in weaving them together; or we are looking at the work of a skilful writer who may have relied on sources for information, but who produced his own text.

The second, and in my view less likely, possibility is that in a number of cases material is in the text because it was in the sources and is retained notwithstanding repetition. This material is now, in fact, performing a key function in shaping our understanding of this part of the narrative, as if it had been placed there with deliberate artistic intent.

If either of these conclusions is accepted, then we can no longer distinguish between the artistic and the accidental. Thus, the grounds of literary unsatisfactoriness by which these source texts were identified vanish away, and with them the identifications themselves. Some of the identifications of sources, in any event, amounted to little more than wholly hypothetical answers to questions about how this or that element in the text might have come to be preserved, or what brought it into being in the first place.

At the very least, if our reading of the whole of 1 Kings 12.25-13.34 be judged successful, it calls for a reconsideration of judgments about the how and why of the juxtaposition of texts; especially where purely formal or accidental links are proposed, or the juxtaposition is said to be through inept redaction. This is not to deny the possibility of the existence of

any number of sources, but it does lead to very serious questions about our ability to identify them by intra-textual means.

Two Prophetic Legends

The suggestion that the story in 1 Kings 13 was originally two identifiable shorter prophetic legends is contradicted by our proposed reading. We have argued for a rhetorically purposeful alteration in the terminology for the Judahite from 'man of God' to 'prophet' to 'corpse'. Jones's suggestion of two legends[247] removes the overall text within which such purpose is arguable, but retains the textual features which led us to identify it. In the end, this is a competition between conflicting hypotheses about which each reader must make his or her own decision. The proposal that both stories were originally one, however, makes sense of the present text, where they are two inseparable parts of the same purposeful narrative; and avoids us having to suggest a surprisingly happy accident arising from the placing together of two originally separate texts. It does not contradict the possibility of the extensive rewriting of two stories into one, but this does not seem to be what Jones proposes. This is not a conclusive argument, but it is one more piece of evidence in favour of the unity of the text.

Two Deuteronomistic Redactions

I proposed somewhat cautiously at the end of chapter four that 1 Kings 12.33bβ-13.33aα might be an insertion into a carefully crafted judgment on Jeroboam. If this suggestion is convincing, then it constitutes an item of evidence in support of two broadly deuteronomistic redactions of the Deuteronomistic History. The postulated form of

[247] See Appendix 2

judgment against Jeroboam is markedly deuteronomistic in its content as is noted by most of the commentators[248]; and the story, which I suggest has been inserted, is also strongly deuteronomistic in its concerns as well, in particular in its focus on the fulfilment of the word of YHWH and its emphasis on שוב.

The Story as Deuteronomistic Commentary

At the end of Chapter Two, I suggested that the narrative in 1 Kings 13 might be intended to function as a substitute for other forms of deuteronomistic comment (by summarising narrative or the speech of a major character). It is surprising that there is otherwise apparently no such comment at this point in the Deuteronomistic History. It would be helpful at this stage to be able to point to another text in which this strategy has been identified: I have not been able to identify another text in which this is clearly the case, though it is possible that one might argue for a similar function for the cycle of apostasy, oppression, and rescue which one finds in Judges. The literary reading in Chapters Three and Four does, however, I believe, offer some possible support for this proposal.

We noted the anonymity of the man of God from Judah and the prophet from Bethel, which tends to distance the reader from the personality and particularity of the characters. Instead of being portrayed as individual human persons the possibility is opened up that they are to be seen as representative types. Anonymity raises into greater prominence their roles as prophet and man of God, and as Bethelite and Judahite. This would at least be consistent with the proposal that part of the purpose of the narrative is to function as

[248] Indeed most suggest that much of the material which constitutes this section is later deuteronomistic redaction.

deuteronomistic commentary reflecting on the place and fate of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms.

A second feature which I believe supports this proposal is the prominence of deuteronomistic themes in this narrative (again the anonymity of most of the characters emphasizes the importance of the themes). In particular ideas of repentance, of walking (or not walking) in the way (*sc.* of YHWH), of turning from the way, of the working of the word of YHWH, and of prophecy and fulfilment.

We have also noted the review and preview functions of the references to Exodus 32 and to 2 Kings 23. This reflects the same kind of concerns present in the speeches and summarising narratives which are identified as being deuteronomistic survey and comment. The literary function of the prophecy and fulfilment schema in the text serves to connect together elements which are chronologically and/or geographically distant, but thematically close (*viz* the reforms of Josiah with the cultic 'doings' of Jeroboam) and thus brings in the prospective/retrospective element typical of such deuteronomistic overviews.

In the end, the literary reading has neither depended on, nor in many respects had much to say directly about the questions of the genesis of the text which are addressed in Chapters One and Two. In certain respects it has offered evidence in support of some suggestions and against others; and the proposal of a chiastic structure has arisen out of the close reading the literary approach has demanded. While it offers support for the widely accepted thesis that 1 Kings 13 is a late insertion, it does not, on that account, suggest the text be

bypassed or dismissed. On the contrary, there seem to be good reasons why in the context of the Deuteronomistic History this text must be taken very seriously.

2. The World of the Text

Jeroboam

Arguably a literary reading of this text has not been as fruitful as it has been in the case of other texts. In this short and in some respects self-contained narrative there is less opportunity for character development and the kind of inter-textual reference one finds within and between different episodes in the Succession Narrative. Thus some of the most illuminating insights of the literary-critical approach are not present here. We have been given some insight into Jeroboam's character, and followed (in the earlier chapters in 1 Kings) his transformation from being a rising star in Solomon's court, through his role as anointed but non-dynastic successor (in parallel with David), to his active reign in the kingdom and his downfall (albeit predicted and not yet realized). In terms of literary presentation he never becomes as complex and multi-layered a character as David, but we do begin to get a glimpse of the internal life of Jeroboam the human person. This continues beyond the text we have considered into the story of the prophet Ahijah, and the death of Jeroboam's son. Jeroboam remains, however, a character who is subordinated to his role in the plot of the overall work.

The Man of God

If this is true of Jeroboam (in the context of the text we have been considering), it is even more true of the other chief protagonists, the man of God from Judah and the prophet of Bethel, neither of whom move much beyond the epithets assigned to them. The man of

God arrives impelled by the word of the Lord, and if we are correct in identifying a type scene, our expectations are shaped in a way which presupposes the triumph of him and of his mission. The denouement is delayed by the royal offer of hospitality, and we are left wondering what will happen next. We are lulled into a false sense of security until stirred by the lying words of the prophet from Bethel, but it is perhaps only when judgment is pronounced that we are caused to reflect more closely on the nature of the prohibition on the man of God, and his adherence to it. The remarkable silence as to his response to the judgment leaves a gap which we are impelled to try and fill. The possibility that the man of God repented is closed off in narrative terms by the author's silence on the subject; this leads, however, to engagement by the audience in a process of reflection on the man of God, his mission, and the word of YHWH.

The text offers only very limited clues as to how the gap should be filled. We have observed the changes in the way the man of God describes the terms of his mission, and the contrast between that and the way in which his disobedience is recounted in the judgment that is pronounced against him. We have noted how the shift in the man-of-God's own presentation alerts the reader to the fact that something is going on. It may also offer a basis for seeing some fault on the man-of-God's part which is there from early in the story, and leads to his ultimate downfall.

The Prophet of Bethel

It is not only the man of God who is enigmatic, however, both the word of YHWH, and the prophet from Bethel are equally so. In narrative terms, it is a reasonable supposition

that one who has been told all that the man of God has done and the words that he said, and who thereafter immediately goes and attempts to persuade him to breach the prohibition, intends in some way to subvert his mission. However unclear we might be as to how the validity of the oracle is damaged by breach of the prohibition on the man of God, we can be in little doubt that it is presented as so doing. The question why it should subvert the mission is left open by this narrative, it is another gap to be filled for which again the text provides very little help.

The Word of YHWH

Finally the word of YHWH is also enigmatic. It does, of course, stand for YHWH himself, but we should beware of collapsing the distance between the actors and YHWH which the narrator has created by his choice of presentation. YHWH's word is mysterious in its content, as far as the prohibitions are concerned, and it is mysterious in its action in deserting one failed messenger for another who, by any criterion, seems even less worthy. There is no indication that the prophet of Bethel repents of his own part in the downfall of the man of God (and it is important to remember in this context that repentance is an important and frequently used term in this narrative), and the moral doubts cast on the prophet by his lying and deception of the man of God make him a most surprising channel of the word. Again, the text gives very little help in solving these conundrums.

Artful Loose Ends

The text thus presents us with a world in which there are a number of loose ends, not only for the actors but for the readers/hearers as well as they become participants in that world. Though the conclusions we have come to as a result of our close reading and careful

consideration of the text have been to some extent a matter of indicating areas in which information or guidance is not provided by the text, this is in itself a helpful exercise. It indicates that a variety of possible conclusions can be drawn, and that the drawing of such conclusions will depend on other things that the reader brings to the text in the form of the reader's own context for reading. The acceptance of conclusions drawn by any given reader will then depend on the extent to which this context for reading is accepted by others.

In terms of our earlier consideration of texts as transmissive or productive, it seems that this text is very much a hybrid. Thus there are elements that are clearly transmissive: the verdict on Jeroboam; the validation of Josiah's reforms; the persistence of the word of YHWH; and, perhaps, (as suggested in Chapter Two) a reflection on the eventual fate of Josiah. Yet there are also elements which are not transmissive. It is not that the text does not raise issues in relation to those elements, but rather it leaves open the question of how they are to be resolved. It is no bad thing perhaps to conclude that we cannot make definite conclusions. Indeed the fact that firm conclusions cannot be drawn is transmissive in its own right.

Considering Other Readings

If we consider some interpretations of the 'meaning' or 'message' of the text we can perhaps point to some of the ways in which reading issues have been resolved and 'gap filling' has been done in one or two sample readings.

One thing that has become clear from our reading of the text is the centrality of שוב to the concerns of this text. This coheres very well with Wolff's assessment[249] of the message of the Deuteronomistic History. The story focuses on two critical moments of judgment, for Jeroboam and for the man of God from Judah, and the absence of repentance on their part is underscored by the way in which the word most likely to be used to describe it consistently appears elsewhere. I have suggested in Chapter Four that the withering and restoring of Jeroboam's hand can be read as an indication that there is not an absolute and inflexible hostility towards him on the part of YHWH. A still open attitude to Jeroboam personally might be why the narrative is inserted within, and not after the chiasmus which we have suggested exists in 1 Kings 12.25-33, 13.33-34, the final statements of which close the judgment on Jeroboam beyond narrative redemption. This is consistent with Wolff's historical framework and proposals about the genesis of the Deuteronomistic History, and with his conclusion that it is framed largely as a call to repentance and a warning of the dangers of not repenting.

DeVries's proposals[250] focus on the question of authentic revelation. He suggests that the Bethelite prophet's motive was to test the Judahite's claim to authentic revelation. The man of God fails the test and YHWH reveals his judgment on the man of God to the prophet. The death of the man of God is the necessary validation of the revelation of the word of YHWH to the prophet of Bethel, and when it takes place it reflects back on the truth of the original oracle of the man of God. The Bethelite prophet, satisfied that the judgment was true word of YHWH, is now happy to reiterate it himself. DeVries thus resolves a number

[249] In Brueggemann and Wolff *op. cit.*

[250] DeVries *op. cit.* p. 172 ff

of questions by proposing a motive for the actions of the prophet of Bethel (and indeed he considers the thinking of the man of God as well). This interpretation is related to DeVries's assessment of the secondary status of 1 Kings 13.18 ("He lied to him."). In my view, it is only by underreading, or not reading that clear narrative statement, and by ignoring its implications that we can accept the proposed integrity of the Bethelite prophet. This then amounts to the reading of *a* text, but it is not the present text of 1 Kings 13.

Nelson is much more alive to the way in which, as he puts it, "the narrative relentlessly refuses to deal in motivations"[251], and his conclusions about the irresistible word of YHWH are in tune with the approach of this narrative. His reading is also consistent with the anonymity of the characters in suggesting that in the man of God from Judah we are to see the fate of the whole Southern Kingdom. But it is hard to accept his conclusion that there is no moral enigma in this story. He fails to deal with the question why the prophet from Bethel is not punished for his lie[252], or the fact that the failure for which the man of God is punished appears to be a failure not to be deceived. Provan[253] improves on this by arguing for the significance of the distinction between the command received by the man of God from the mouth of YHWH, and the second hand (or rather third hand) oracle he receives from the Bethelite prophet. This reading does suggest a more satisfactory explanation for the judgment on the man of God.[254] Provan does not address the issue of the gradual shift of the way in which the prohibitions placed on the man of God are

---

[251] Nelson, R.D. *First and Second Kings op. cit.* p. 89 I would dissent from him in respect of Jeroboam for whom, as discussed, I believe the narrative does make some suggestions towards motivation.

[252] This he dismisses as "only a matter of narrative necessity". *op. cit.* p. 89

[253] Provan, I.W. *1 and 2 Kings (New International Biblical Commentary)* Peabody, Mass/Carlisle: Hendrickson/Paternoster, 1995

[254] My own theological prejudice at this point is that I am unwilling to accept that the text portrays an unfair or amoral deity. This can, I think, be justified in terms of the overall picture of God which the deuteronomistic historian builds up.

described, although this might reinforce his conclusions.

These examples must suffice to illustrate the way in which a close reading of the text can inform our assessment of suggestions which are made about its meaning.

Conclusion

In relation to the particular text we have examined, I find it convincing to propose that it is a post Josianic insertion into the Deuteronomistic History which is made with a number ends in view. It functions as a lens through which readers are to view the remainder of the Deuteronomistic History: the Northern Kingdom will fall; Judahites cannot rely on the fact that YHWH has 'chosen' the Southern Kingdom; cultic loyalty, and specifically loyalty to the 'commandments' of YHWH is fundamental to the identity of the people and to their relationship with YHWH (the significance of the link with Exodus 32); the word of YHWH will prevail in its purposes; the only appropriate response to the word of YHWH is repentance, to ignore it will lead to destruction.

Enough has now been said to demonstrate the fruitfulness of relating historical-critical and literary-critical readings. This is apparent from the conclusions about the world behind the text and about the world of the text which I have drawn above. In practice it is not a case of giving one approach automatic priority over the other, though it is heuristically helpful to begin with a presumption in favour of a final text which does form a coherent whole (whatever its genesis). The reading process should properly involve a process of continuing re-reading and revision. Thus it should not be a matter of simply applying one

method and then another, and then concluding. A good reading depends on making the best use of all the tools available, and in being prepared to revise earlier judgments.

In the Introduction I indicated that the reading process involved three levels, and argued for the interdependence of those levels. We have not really begun to address the third stage which is vital to the interests of any community of faith which seeks to read the text as scripture. I hope we have, however, established a firmly founded platform from which to begin that third level of reading

Postscript

Lying in the background of this study, deliberately not referred to or consulted, has been Karl Barth's reading of this text[255]. His reading has clearly provided the impetus for a number of the studies to which we have referred in the course of discussion. On re-reading Barth's study at the conclusion of this enterprise, it is my conviction that even those who have reservations of many kinds about his theological system and constructs, and his hermeneutic, must admit the highly sensitive and nuanced way in which he has accomplished the second level of reading. It is not that his conclusions at this level are beyond criticism, but they do show a very close, careful and subtle attention to what is going on within this text.

[255] Barth, K. *Church Dogmatics II.2 The Doctrine of God* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1957 pp. 393ff

Appendix 1

Various Analyses of 1 Kings 12:25-13:34
(see following pages)

The analyses that follow illustrate the conclusions about the history of the genesis of the text under consideration which are arrived at by the different commentators discussed in Chapter 2.

[**Books of the Chronicles:** 25 Then Jeroboam built Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and dwelt there; and he went out from there and built Penuel.]

[**Story of the prophet Ahijah:** 26 And Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; 27 if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah." 28 So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. And he said to the people, "You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Behold your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." 29 And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan. 30 And this became a sin, for the people went to the one at Bethel and to the other as far as Dan. 31 He also made houses on high places, and appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of the Levites.

[**Local prophetic story (later giving rise to 2 Kings 23:16):** 32 And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the fifteenth day of the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah,

[**Dtr.'s expansion to introduction of local prophetic story:** and he offered sacrifices upon the altar;

[**Even later expansion:** so he did in Bethel,]

sacrificing to the calves he had made. And he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places that he had made. 33 He went up to the altar which he had made

[**Even later expansion:** in Bethel]

on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and he ordained a feast for the people of Israel,]

and went up to the altar to burn incense.

13:1 ..... 13:32 For the saying which he cried by the word of the LORD against the altar at Bethel,

[**Dtr.'s expansion:** and against all the houses of the high places which are in the cities of Samaria,]

shall surely come to pass.

[**Dtr.'s transition:** 13:33 After this thing Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but made priests for the high places again from among all the people; any who would, he consecrated to be priests of the high places. 13:34 And this thing became a sin to the house of Jeroboam, so as to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.]

[**Archival:** 25 Then Jeroboam built Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and dwelt there; and he went out from there and built Penuel.

[**Critics differ widely. Late?:** 26 And Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; 27 if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah."]

[**Original tradition:** 28 So the king took counsel, and made [a calf]

[**Later development:** two calves]

of gold. And he said to the people,

[**Later development:** "You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough.]

Behold your [god]

[**Later development:** gods],

O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt."

[**Later development:** 29 And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan.]

[**Interpolation from 13:34:** 30 And this became a sin, for the people went to the one at Bethel and to the other as far as Dan. 31 He also made houses on high places, and appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of the Levites.]

32 And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the

[**Interpolation by redactor:** fifteenth day of the]

eighth month like the feast that was in Judah,

[**Interpolation by redactor:** and he offered sacrifices upon the altar; so he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made. And he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places that he had made. 33 He went up to the altar which he had made in Bethel on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and he ordained a feast for the people of Israel,]

and went up to the altar to burn incense.

[**Redactorial introduction of "first extensive case of midrash in the historical books" responsible for later addition of 2 Kings 23:16ff:** 13:1 ... ...13:18 And he said to him, "I also am a prophet as you are, and an angel spoke to me by the word of the LORD, saying, 'Bring him back with you into your house that he may eat bread and drink water.'"

[**Later interpolation:** But he lied to him.]

13:19...13:32]

[**Interpolation by redactor:** 13:33 After this thing Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but made priests for the high places again from among all the people; any who would, he consecrated to be priests of the high places. 13:34 And this thing became a sin to the house of Jeroboam, so as to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.]

[Sketchy summary of events by a Judaean redactor or editor - especially evident in emphasized passages: 25 Then Jeroboam built Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and dwelt there; and he went out from there and built Penuel. 26 And Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; 27 if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah." 28 So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. And he said to the people, "You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Behold your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." 29 And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan. 30 *And this became a sin, for the people went to the one at Bethel and to the other as far as Dan.* 31 *He also made houses on high places, and appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of the Levites.* 32 And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the fifteenth day of the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah, and he offered sacrifices upon the altar; so he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made. And he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places that he had made. 33 *He went up to the altar which he had made in Bethel on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and he ordained a feast for the people of Israel, and went up to the altar to burn incense.*]

[Prophetic midrash in saga style transmitted by Deuteronomic compiler: 13:1 ...13:10]

[Separate prophetic tradition known at the time of Josiah elaborated in light of 2 Kings 23:16-18 - see especially the emphasized text in v. 32: 13:11 ... ...13:32 For the saying which he cried by the word of the LORD against the altar in Bethel, *and against all the houses of the high places which are in the cities of Samaria, shall surely come to pass.*"]

[Deuteronomic comment: 13:33 After this thing Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but made priests for the high places again from among all the people; any who would, he consecrated to be priests of the high places. 13:34 And this thing became a sin to the house of Jeroboam, so as to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.]

[**Annalistic:** 25 Then Jeroboam built Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and dwelt there; and he went out from there and built Penuel.]

[**Written from later Jerusalemite perspective:** 26 And Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; 27 if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah." 28 So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. And he said to the people, "You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Behold your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." 29 And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan. 30 And this became a sin, for the people went to the one at Bethel and to the other as far as Dan. 31 He also made houses on high places, and appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of the Levites. 32 And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the fifteenth day of the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah, and he offered sacrifices upon the altar; so he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made. And he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places that he had made.]

[**Deuteronomistic transition:** 33 He went up to the altar which he had made in Bethel on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and he ordained a feast for the people of Israel, and went up to the altar to burn incense.]

[**Local (Bethel) narrative - aetiological?:** 13:1 And behold, a man of God came out of Judah by the word of the LORD to Bethel.

[**Possible addition to link back to 12:33b:** The king]

[**Later replaced by:** Jeroboam]

was standing by the altar to burn incense.]

13:2 And the man cried against the altar by the word of the LORD, and said,

[**Deuteronomistic replacement for original oracle:** "O altar, altar, thus says the LORD: 'Behold,a son shall be born to the house of David,

[**later annotation:** Josiah by name;]

and he shall sacrifice upon you the priests of the high places who burn incense upon you, and men's bones shall be burned upon you.'" 13:3 And he gave *[Read "he will give"]* a sign the same day, saying, "This the sign that the LORD has spoken: 'Behold, the altar shall be torn down, and the ashes that are upon it shall be poured out.'"]

13:4 And when the king heard the saying of the man of God, which he cried against the altar at Bethel, [the king]

[**Later replaced by:** Jeroboam]

stretched out his hand from the altar, saying, "Lay hold of him." And his hand, which he stretched out against him, dried up, so that he could not draw it back to himself.

[**continuation of deuteronomistic version of oracle:** 13:5 The altar also was torn down, and the ashes poured out from the altar, according to the sign which the man of God had given by the word of the LORD.]

13:6 And the king said to the man of God, "Entreat now the favour of the LORD your God, and pray for me, that my hand may be restored to me." And the man of God entreated the LORD; and the king's hand was restored to him, and became as it was before.

[**Later accretion (per Würthwein)?:** 13:7 And the king said to the man of God, "Come home with me, and refresh yourself, and I will give you a reward." 13:8 And the man of God said to the king, "If you give me half your house, I will not go in with you. And I will not eat bread or drink water in this place; 13:9 for so it was commanded me by the word of the LORD, saying, 'You shall neither eat bread, nor drink water, nor return by the way that you came.'" 13:10 So he went another way, and did not return by the way that he came to Bethel.]

13:11 Now there dwelt an old prophet in Bethel. And his sons came and told him all that the man of God had done that day in Bethel; the words also which he had spoken to the king, they told to their father. 13:12 And their father said to them' "Which way did he go?" And his sons showed him the way which the man of God who had come from Judah had gone. 13:13 And he said to his sons, "Saddle the ass for me." So they saddled the ass for him and he mounted it. 13:14 And he went after the man of God, and found him sitting under an oak; and he said to him, "Are you the man of God who came from Judah?" And he said, "I am." 13:15 Then he said to him, "Come home with me and eat bread."

[**Later accretion (per Würthwein)?:** 13:16 And he said, "I may not return with you, or go in with you; neither will I eat bread nor drink water with you in this place; 13:17 for it was said to me by the word of the LORD, 'You shall neither eat bread nor drink water there, nor return by the way that you came.'" 13:18 And he said to him, "I also am a prophet as you are, and an angel spoke to me by the word of the LORD, saying, 'Bring him back with you into your house that he may eat bread and drink water.'" But he lied to him.]

13:19 So he went back with him, and ate bread in his house, and drank water.

[**Later accretion (per Würthwein)?:** 13:20 And as they sat at the table, the word of the LORD came to the prophet who had brought him back; 13:21 and he cried to the man of God who came from Judah, "Thus says the LORD,

[**Addition by DtrN?:** Because you have disobeyed the word of the LORD, and have not kept the commandment which the LORD your God commanded you,]

13:22 but have come back, and have eaten bread and drunk water in the place of which he said to you, "Eat no bread, and drink no water"; your body shall not come to the tomb of your fathers.'"]

13:23 And after he had eaten bread and drunk, he saddled the ass

[**Later gloss:** for the prophet whom he had brought back.]

13:24 And as he went away a lion met him on the road and killed him. And his body was thrown in the road, and the ass stood beside it; the lion also stood beside the body. 13:25 And behold, men passed by, and saw the body thrown in the road, and the lion standing beside the body. And they came and told it in the city where the old prophet dwelt.

13:26 And when the prophet who had brought him back from the way heard of it,

[**Addition by DtrN and/or DtrP?:** he said, "It is the man of God, who disobeyed the word of the LORD; therefore the LORD has given him to the lion, which has torn him and slain him, according to the word which the LORD spoke to him.]

13:27 And he said to his sons, "Saddle the ass for me." And they saddled it. 13:28 And he went and found his body thrown in the road, and the ass and the lion standing beside the body. The lion had not eaten the body or torn the ass. 13:29 And the prophet took up the body of the man of God and laid it upon the ass, and brought it back to the city, to mourn and to bury him. 13:30 And he laid the body in his own grave; and they mourned over him, saying, "Alas, my brother!" 13:31 And after he had buried him, he said to his sons, "When I die, bury me in the grave in which the man of God is buried;

[**Secondary (deuteronomistic) addition written in light of 2 Kings 23:18,19:** lay my bones beside his bones. 13:32 For the saying which he cried by the word of the LORD against the altar in Bethel, and against all the houses of the high places which are in the cities of Samaria, shall surely come to pass."

13:33 After this thing Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but made priests for the high places again from among all the people; any who would, he consecrated to be priests of the high places. 13:34 And this thing became a sin to the house of Jeroboam, so as to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.]

[Extract from the Book of the Chronicles of the Israelite Kings: 25 Then Jeroboam built Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and dwelt there; and he went out from there and built Penuel.]

[Report reflecting strong Judahistic bias: 26 And Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; 27 if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah." 28 So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. And he said to the people, "You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Behold your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt."

[Literary expansion: 29 And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan.]

30 And this became a sin,]

[Material reflecting outlook of Judahite Levites: for the people went to the one at Bethel and to the other as far as Dan. 31 He also made houses on high places, and appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of the Levites. 32 And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the fifteenth day of the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah, and he offered sacrifices upon the altar; so he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made. And he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places that he had made.]

[Dtr transition: 33 He went up to the altar which he had made in Bethel on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and he ordained a feast for the people of Israel, and went up to the altar to burn incense.]

[Bethelite prophet narrative: 13:1 And behold, a man of God came out of Judah by the word of the LORD to Bethel.

[Editorial expansion: Jeroboam was standing by the altar to burn incense.]

13:2 And the man cried against the altar by the word of the LORD,

[Dtr expansion: and said, "O altar, altar, thus says the LORD: 'Behold,a son shall be born to the house of David, Josiah by name; and he shall sacrifice upon you the priests of the high places who burn incense upon you, and men's bones shall be burned upon you.'"]

13:3 And he gave a sign the same day, saying, "This the sign that the LORD has spoken: 'Behold, the altar shall be torn down, and the ashes that are upon it shall be poured out.'" 13:4 And when the king heard the saying of the man of God, which he cried against the altar at Bethel, Jeroboam stretched out his hand from the altar, saying, "Lay hold of him." And his hand, which he stretched out against him, dried up, so that he could not draw it back to himself.

[Dtr expansion: 13:5 The altar also was torn down, and the ashes poured out from the altar, according to the sign which the man of God had given by the word of the LORD.]

13:6 And the king said to the man of God, ... 13:18 ...an angel spoke to me by the word of the LORD, saying, 'Bring him back with you into your house that he may eat bread and drink water.'"

[Gloss: But he lied to him.]

13:19 So he went back with him, and ate bread in his house, and drank water. ... 13:32 For the saying which he cried by the word of the LORD against the altar in Bethel,

[Dtr expansion: and against all the houses of the high places which are in the cities of Samaria,]

shall surely come to pass."

[Dtr further complaints: 13:33 After this thing Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but made priests for the high places again from among all the people; any who would, he consecrated to be priests of the high places. 13:34 And this thing became a sin to the house of Jeroboam, so as to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.]

Prophetic Record: [25] Then Jeroboam built Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and dwelt there; and he went out from there and built Penuel.

[Southern Document: [26] And Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; [27] if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah."]

Prophetic Record [&Southern Document]: [28] So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold.

[Southern Document: And he said to the people, "You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Behold your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt."]

Prophetic record [& Southern Document] [29] And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan.

[Deuteronomistic redaction: [30] And this became a sin, for]

[Southern Document: the people went to the one at Bethel and to the other as far as Dan. [31] He also made houses on high places, and appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of the Levites. [32] And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the fifteenth day of the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah, and he offered sacrifices upon the altar; so he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made. And he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places that he had made.]

[Deuteronomistic redaction: [33] He went up to the altar which he had made in Bethel on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and he ordained a feast for the people of Israel, and went up to the altar to burn incense.

[Later insertion into DtrH - second stage redaction(with 2 Kings 23:16-20): [13:1] And behold, a man of God came out of Judah by the word of the LORD to Bethel. Jeroboam was standing by the altar to burn incense.

[Later insertion into text replacing original oracle against Jeroboam [13:2] And the man cried against the altar by the word of the LORD, and said, "O altar, altar, thus says the LORD: 'Behold,a son shall be born to the house of David, Josiah by name; and he shall sacrifice upon you the priests of the high places who burn incense upon you, and men's bones shall be burned upon you.'"]

[13:3 ... 13:32]

[Deuteronomistic redaction: [13:33] After this thing Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but]

[Prophetic Record: made priests for the high places again from among all the people; any who would, he consecrated to be priests of the high places. [13:34] And this thing became a sin to the house of Jeroboam, so as to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.]

Appendix 2

'Recovered' texts of 1 Kings 12.25-33

The texts below reproduce (on the basis of the RSV) underlying source texts proposed by some of the commentators discussed in Chapter 2

Montgomery's 'original tradition':

> "So the king took counsel, and made a calf of gold. And he said to the people, 'Behold your god O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt.' And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah, and he went up to the altar to burn incense."

O'Brien's Southern Document:

> And Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now the kingdom will turn back to the house of David; if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah." So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. And he said to the people, "You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Behold your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan. The people went to the one at Bethel and to the other as far as Dan. He also made houses on high places, and appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of the Levites. And Jeroboam appointed a feast on the fifteenth day of the eighth month like the feast that was in Judah, and he offered sacrifices upon the altar; so he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made. And he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places that he had made.

O'Brien's Prophetic Record:

> Then Jeroboam built Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and dwelt there; and he went out from there and built Penuel. [So] the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan [and he] made priests for the high places again from among all the people; any who would, he consecrated to be priests of the high places. And this thing became a sin to the house of Jeroboam, so as to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.

I

13:1 And behold, a man of God came out of Judah by the word of the LORD to Bethel. 13:2 And the man cried against the altar by the word of the LORD, and said, [original words of oracle now lost] 13:4 And when the king heard the saying of the man of God, which he cried against the altar at Bethel, [the king] stretched out his hand from the altar, saying, "Lay hold of him." And his hand, which he stretched out against him, dried up, so that he could not draw it back to himself. 13:6 And the king said to the man of God, "Entreat now the favour of the LORD your God, and pray for me, that my hand may be restored to me." And the man of God entreated the LORD; and the king's hand was restored to him, and became as it was before.

II

13:11 Now there dwelt an old prophet in Bethel. And his sons came and told him all that the man of God had done that day in Bethel; the words also which he had spoken to the king, they told to their father. 13:12 And their father said to them' "Which way did he go?" And his sons showed him the way which the man of God who had come from Judah had gone. 13:13 And he said to his sons, "Saddle the ass for me." So they saddled the ass for him and he mounted it. 13:14 And he went after the man of God, and found him sitting under an oak; and he said to him, "Are you the man of God who came from Judah?" And he said, "I am." 13:15 Then he said to him, "Come home with me and eat bread." 13:19 So he went back with him, and ate bread in his house, and drank water. 13:23 And after he had eaten bread and drunk, he saddled the ass [for him] 13:24 And as he went away a lion met him on the road and killed him. And his body was thrown in the road, and the ass stood beside it; the lion also stood beside the body. 13:25 And behold, men passed by, and saw the body thrown in the road, and the lion standing beside the body. And they came and told it in the city where the old prophet dwelt.

13:26 And when the prophet who had brought him back from the way heard of it, 13:27 [ ] he said to his sons, "Saddle the ass for me." And they saddled it. 13:28 And he went and found his body thrown in the road, and the ass and the lion standing beside the body. The lion had not eaten the body or torn the ass. 13:29 And the prophet took up the body of the man of God and laid it upon the ass, and brought it back to the city, to mourn and to bury him. 13:30 And he laid the body in his own grave; and they mourned over him, saying, "Alas, my brother!" 13:31 And after he had buried him, he said to his sons, "When I die, bury me in the grave in which the man of God is buried."

Appendix 3

Analyses of frequency of occurrence of verbs in 1 Kings 12.24-13.end

This is a listing of the roots of all the verbal forms occurring in the above text, and a listing of all occurrences of שוב in Deuteronomy or the Deuteronomistic History. This relates to the discussion in Chapter 4 about the frequency of occurrence of the verb שוב in this text.

226 verbal forms

Two listings:

I. In order of first appearance

II. In descending order of frequency

I. In order of first appearance

Root	Occurrences	Running Total
אמר	23	23
עלה	7	30
לחם	1	31
שוב	21	52
היה	14	66
שמע	3	69
הלך	12	81
בנה	2	83
ישב	5	88
יצא	1	89
עשה	12	101
הרג	1	102
יעצ	1	103
שים	1	104
נתן	6	110
זבח	2	112
עמד	6	118
ברא	1	119
קטר	3	122
בוא	12	134
קרא	3	137
ילד	1	138
שרף	1	139
דבר	9	148
קרע	2	150
שפך	2	152
שלח	2	154
תפש	1	155
יבש	1	156
יכל	2	158
ענה	1	159
חלה	2	161
פלל	1	162
סעד	1	163
אכל	11	174
שתה	9	183
צוה	2	185
ספר	2	187
ראה	2	189
חבש	5	196
רכב	1	197
מצא	3	200
כחש	1	201
מרה	2	203
שמר	1	204
מות	2	206
שלכ	3	209
עבר	1	210
שבר	2	212
נשא	1	213
נוח	3	216
ספד	2	218
קבר	4	222
חפצ	1	223
מלא	1	224
כחד	1	225
שמד	1	226

II. In descending order of frequency

Root	Occurrences	Running Total
אמר	23	23
שוב	21	44
היה	14	58
בוא	12	70
הלך	12	82
עשה	12	94
אכל	11	105
דבר	9	114
שתה	9	123
עלה	7	130
נתן	6	136
עמד	6	142
ישב	5	147
חבש	5	152
קרא	4	156
קבר	4	160
מות	3	163
נוח	3	166
קטר	3	169
שלכ	3	172
מצא	3	175
שמע	3	178
שלח	2	180
זבח	2	182
ספר	2	184
שבר	2	186
יכל	2	188
שפך	2	190
צוה	2	192
מרה	2	194
בנה	2	196
חלה	2	198
ראה	2	200
ספד	2	202
קרע	2	204
שמר	1	205
עבר	1	206
שרף	1	207
שים	1	208
לחמ	1	209
פלל	1	210
ענה	1	211
הרג	1	212
כחד	1	213
שמד	1	214
ילד	1	215
סעד	1	216
חפצ	1	217
יעצ	1	218
רכב	1	219
מלא	1	220
ברא	1	221
יצא	1	222
נשא	1	223
תפש	1	224
כחש	1	225
יבש	1	226

Occurrences of שוב in Deuteronomy or the Deuteronomistic History

Deuteronomy
1.22, 25, 45
3.20
4.30, 39
5.27
13.18
17.16(x2)
20.5, 6, 7, 8
22.1(x2), 2
23.14, 15
24.13(x2), 19, 24
28.31, 60, 68
30.1, 2, 3(x2), 8, 9, 10
32.41, 43

Joshua
1.15
2.16, 22, 23
4.18
5.2
6.14
7.3, 26
8.21, 24, 26
10.15, 21, 38, 43
11.10
14.7
19.12, 27, 29(x2), 34
20.6
22.8, 9, 16, 18, 23, 29, 32(x2)
23.12(x2)
24.20

Judges
2.19
3.19
5.29
6.18
7.3(x2), 15
8.9, 13, 33
9.56, 57
11.8, 9, 13, 31, 35
14.8
17.3(x2), 4
18.26
19.3, 7
21.14, 23
20.48

1 Samuel
1.19
3.5, 6
5.3, 11
6.3(x2), 4, 7, 8, 16, 17, 21
7.3, 14, 17
9.5
12.3
14.27
15.11, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31
17.15, 53, 57
18.2, 6
23.23, 28
24.2
25.12, 21, 39
26.21, 23, 25
27.9

1 Samuel (cont'd)
29.4(x2), 7, 11
30.12, 19

2 Samuel
1.1, 22
2.26, 30
3.11, 16(x2), 26, 27
6.20
8.3
9.7
10.5, 14
11.1, 4, 15
12.23(x2), 31
14.13, 21
15.8(x3?), 19, 20(x2), 25(x2), 29, 34
16.3, 8, 12
17.3(x2), 20
18.16
19.11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 38, 40, 44
20.22
22.21, 25, 38
23.10
24.13

1 Kings
2.16, 17, 20(x2), 30, 32, 33, 41, 44
8.33, 34, 35, 47(x2), 48(x2)
9.6(x2)
12.5, 6, 9, 12, 16, 20, 21, 24(x2), 26, 27(x2)
13.4, 6(x2), 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 29, 33(x2)
14.28
17.21, 22
18.43
19.6, 7, 15, 20, 21
20.5, 9, 22, 26, 34
22.17, 20, 26, 28(x2), 33

2 Kings
1.5(x2), 6, 11, 13
2.13, 18, 25
3.4, 27
4.22, 31, 35, 38
5.10, 14, 15
7.8, 15
8.3, 6, 29
9.15, 18, 20, 36
13.25(x2)
14.14, 22, 25, 28
15.20
16.6
17.3, 13
18.14, 24
19.7, 8, 9, 28, 33, 36
20.5, 9, 10, 11
21.3
22.9, 20
23.20, 25, 26
24.1

Appendix 4

Suggested Chiastic Structure in 1 Kings 12.25-33bα/13.33aβ-34

This is a graphical presentation of the proposal advanced in Chapter 4 for a continuous chiastic structure within the above verses into which 1 Kings 12.33.bβ-13.33aα has been inserted. There are quite marked parallels (either semantic or verbal) between most of the sections, the weakest connections being between c1 and c1' which might be better regarded simply as continuations of the parallel c and c' phrases.

a וַיְהִי הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה לְחַטָּאת
a1 וַיֵּלְכוּ הָעָם לִפְנֵי הָאֶחָד עַד־דָּן׃
b וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־בֵּית בָּמוֹת
c וַיַּעַשׂ כֹּהֲנִים מִקְצוֹת הָעָם
c1 אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיוּ מִבְּנֵי לֵוִי׃
d וַיַּעַשׂ יָרָבְעָם | חָג
e בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַּחֲמִשָּׁה־עָשָׂר יוֹם | לַחֹדֶשׁ כֶּחָג | אֲשֶׁר בִּיהוּדָה
f וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ כֵּן עָשָׂה בְּבֵית־אֵל
g לִזְבֹּחַ לָעֲגָלִים אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה
h וְהֶעֱמִיד בְּבֵית אֵל
g' אֶת־כֹּהֲנֵי הַבָּמוֹת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה׃
f' וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ | אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה בְּבֵית־אֵל
e' בַּחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר יוֹם בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַּחֹדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־בָּדָא מִלִּבּוֹ
d' וַיַּעַשׂ חָג לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל [וַיַּעַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְהַקְטִיר׃ פ

אַחַר הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה לֹא־שָׁב יָרָבְעָם מִדַּרְכּוֹ הָרָעָה וַיָּשָׁב]

c' וַיַּעַשׂ מִקְצוֹת הָעָם כֹּהֲנֵי בָמוֹת
c1' הֶחָפֵץ יְמַלֵּא אֶת־יָדוֹ
b' וְיִהְיֶה כֹּהֲנֵי בָמוֹת׃
a' וְהָיָה בַדָּבָר הַזֶּה לְחַטַּאת בֵּית יָרָבְעָם
a1' וּלְהַכְחִיד וּלְהַשְׁמִיד מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה׃ פ

a And it this thing became a sin
a1 and the people went before the one (even) unto Dan
b And he made the house of the high places
c and he made priests from the whole of the people
c1 who were not from the sons of Levi
d And Jeroboam made a feast
e in the eighth month in the fifteenth day like the feast in Judah
f and he offered up upon the altar, thus he did in Bethel
g to sacrifice to the calves he had made
h and he appointed in Bethel
g' priests of the high places which he had made
f' and he offered up upon the altar which he had made in Bethel
e' in the fifteenth day in the eighth month which he devised from his heart
d' and he made a feast for the children of Israel [and he went up on the altar to make sacrifices

After this Jeroboam did not turn from his wicked ways but he turned]

c' and he made from the whole of the people priests of the high places
c1' whoever wished it he filled his hand
b' and let him become priest of the high places
a' And it came to pass this thing [was] a sin of the house of Jeroboam
a1' to blot out and to exterminate from upon the face of the earth

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Only works actually consulted are cited in the main bibliography. The discussion on the Deuteronomistic History which forms the first part of the thesis inevitably makes mention of a number of scholars who have contributed to the debate, but whose works I have not consulted directly. For the sake of completeness a list of these works appears in the Supplementary Bibliography on page 189.

Where English translations of foreign works are cited, the reader is referred to the translation for publication details of the original work. Where it is relevant to the discussion, original publication dates are noted in the text of the thesis.

Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical Narrative* New York: Basic Books/
London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981

Auld, A.G. *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*
Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994

Bar-Efrat, S. *Narrative Art in the Bible* (ET) Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1989

Barr, J. "Childs' Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture" *JSOT* 16 (1980) 12-23

Barr, J. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*
London: SCM Press, 1968

Barr, J. *Holy Scripture. Canon Authority Criticism* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983

Barth, K. *Church Dogmatics II.2 The Doctrine of God*
(ET) Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1957

Barton, J. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*
London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1984

Brown, F., Driver, S.R., Briggs, C.A. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952[2]

Brueggemann, W. & Wolff, H.W. (Ed.s.) *The Vitality of the Old Testament Traditions*
Atlanta: J Knox, 1982

Burney, C.F. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings*
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903

Childs B.S. "Response to Reviewers of Introduction to The OT as Scripture"
JSOT 16 (1980) 52-60

Childs B.S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*
London: SCM Press Ltd, 1979[2]

Cohn, Robert L. "Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative" *ZAW* 97 (1985) 23-35

Cross, F.M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973

Davidson, A.B. *Hebrew Syntax* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896[2]

De Vries, S.J. *1 Kings (WBC)* Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1985

Dozeman, T.P. "The Way of the Man of God from Judah: True and False Prophecy in the Pre-Deuteronomic Legend of 1 Kings 13" *CBQ* 44 (1982) 379-393

Durham, J.I. *Exodus (WBC)* Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987

Fewell, Danna Nolan and Gunn D.M. "'A Son is born to Naomi': Literary Allusions and Interpretation in the Book of Ruth" *JSOT* 40 (1988) 99-108 (And see response by P. Coxon *JSOT* 45 (1989) 25-27, and the rejoinder by Fewell and Gunn *ibid.* 39-43)

Gray, J. *I & II Kings (OTL)* London: SCM Press, 1964

Gunn, D.M. and Fewell, D.N. *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993

Jones, G.H. *1 and 2 Kings (NCB)* (2 Vols) London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984

Joüon, P and Muraoka, T. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*
Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991

Knoppers, G.N. *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies (Vol 1: The Reign of Solomon, the Rise of Jeroboam; Vol 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah)(Harvard Semitic Monographs)* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993

Lewis C.S. "Fern-seed and Elephants" in *Fern Seed and Elephants* Glasgow: Fount, 1977
(Originally entitled "Modern Theology and Biblical Criticism" *Christian Reflections* (1967))

Long B.O. "The 'New' Biblical Poetics of Alter and Sternberg" *JSOT 51* (1991) 71-84

Mayes, A.D.H. *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* London: SCM Press, 1983

McKenzie S.L. *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History (VTS 42)* Leiden: Brill, 1991

Moberly, R.W.L. "Did the Serpent get it right?" *JTS* 39 (1988) 6-27

Moberly, R.W.L. *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34 (JSOTS 22)* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983

Montgomery, J.A. and Gehman, H.S. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Kings (ICC)* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951

Nelson, R.D. *First and Second Kings (Interpretation)* Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1987

Nelson, R.D. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History (JSOTS 18)* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981

Noth, M. *The Deuteronomistic History (JSOTS 15)* (ET) Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981

O'Brien, M.A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment (Orbis biblicus et orientalis 92)* Freiburg,Schweiz: Univ.-Verlag.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1989

Petersen, D.L. *The Roles of Israel's Prophets (JSOTS 17)* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981

Provan, I.W. *1 and 2 Kings (NIBC)* Peabody, Mass/Carlisle: Hendrickson/Paternoster, 1995

Provan, I.W. *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History (BZAW 172)* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988

von Rad, G. *Old Testament Theology* Volume One (ET) London:SCM Press, 1965/75

von Rad, G. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and other essays* (ET) London:SCM Press 1966

Sayers, D.L. *Whose Body?* London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1923 (Edition used: London: New English Library 1977)

Schneiders, Sandra M. *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991

Simon, U. "1 Kings 13: A Prophetic Sign— Denial and Persistence"
HUCA XLVII 1976

Smith, G.A. *The Historical Geography of The Holy Land*
London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd 1931[25]

Sternberg, M. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985

Thiselton, A.C. *NewHorizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading* London: HarperCollins, 1992

Van Seters, J. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical Historiography* New Haven: Yale University, 1983

Van Winkle, D.W. "1 Kings XIII: True and False Prophecy"
VT XXIX, 1 (1989) 31-43

Walsh, J. "The Contexts of 1 Kings XIII" *VT* XXXIX, 3 (1989) 355-370

Waltke B.K. & O'Connor M. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*
Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990

Williamson, H.G.M. *1 and 2 Chronicles (NCB)*
London:Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1982

Zevit, Z. "Deuteronomistic Historiography in 1 Kings 12-2 Kings 17 and the Reinvestiture of the Israelian Cult" *JSOT* 32 (1985) 57-73

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Works and authors cited in the thesis, but not actually consulted)

Albright, W.F. "The Biblical Period" in Finkelstein, L. *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949

Birch Bruce C., *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15* (SBLDS 27) Missoula: Scholars, 1976

Campbell, A.F., *Of Prophets and Kings. A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1 - 2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS 17), Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986

Dietrich, W. *Prophetie und Geschichte, Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtewerk* (*FRLANT 108*), 1972

Eissfeldt, O. *The Old Testament: An Introduction* ET Oxford: Blackwell, 1965

Friedman, R.E. 'From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr^1 and Dtr^2' in B. Halpern and J.D. Levenson (eds) *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1981

Garbini, G., "'Narrativa della successione' o 'storia dei re'?" *Henoch* 1 (1979) 19-41

Hoffmann, H-D, *Reform und Reformen* (ATANT 66) Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980

Jepsen, A. *Die Quellen des Königbücher* Halle: Niemeyer, 1953, 1956^2

Leiman S.Z. *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence* Hamden, Connecticut: Archon, 1976

Lemke, W.E. "The Way of Obedience: 1 Kings 13 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History" in F.M. Cross et al. (ed.) *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays on the Bible and Archeology in memory of G.E. Wright* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976

Levenson, J.D. 'Who inserted the Book of the Torah?' *HTR* 68 (1975) 203-233

Lewis, I. *Ecstatic Possession: An Anthropological Study of Spirit Possession and Shamanism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971)

McCarter, P. Kyle, *I Samuel* (AB 8) Garden City: Doubleday, 1980 pp. 18-23; and *II Samuel* (AB 9) Garden City: Doubleday, 1984 pp. 7-8

McKenzie, S.L., "The Prophetic History and the Redaction of Kings", *Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of S.D. Goitein.*
Hebrew Annual Review 9 (1985)

Noth, M. *Könige* (BKAT IX/1) Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1968

Peckham, B. *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* Atlanta:Scholars, 1985

Richter W., *Die Bearbeitung des "Retterbuches" in der deuteronomischen Epoche* (BBB 21) Bonn: Hanstein, 1964

Schüpphaus, J., *Richter- und Prophetengeschichten als Glieder der Geschichtsdarstellung der Richter-und Königszeit*
Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1967

Smend in "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Betrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte" in H. W. Wolff (Ed.). *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag*
Munich: C. Kaiser, 1971

Thenius, O. *Die Bücher der Könige eklärt* KHAT Leipzig: S Hirzl, 1873

Veijola, T. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (*AASF 198*), 1977

Weippert, H., "Die 'deuteronomistichen' Berteilung der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher" *Biblica* 53 (1972)

Würthwein, E. *Das erste Buch der Könige, Kap 1-16* (*ATD 1/11*)
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977