

STEPHEN C. RUSSELL

THE KING AND THE LAND



A GEOGRAPHY OF ROYAL POWER
IN THE BIBLICAL WORLD

N. The Holy Place.

O. The most Holy Place.

P.P.P.P. Thirty Treasurers

Chambers, in two rows opening into a gallery, door against door, and comprising three sides of the Holy & most Holy Places.

Q. The Stairs leading to the Middle Chamber.

R.R.R.R. 133. The Hallings for the King and his Courtes of Fraught upon Pavement.

S. The side of the Separation, three Stairs high, without Cloysters, but the upper Stories narrower than

lower, to make room for a Hall as before. There were 24 Chambers in each Story, and they extend into a walk or alley, S. between the Buildings.

T.T. Two Courts in which were Kitchens for the Priests of the twenty-four Courses.

PLATE I. P. 346

A. Description of the Inner Court Buildings for the Priests in Solomon's Temple.

ABCD. Separate Place.
ADEF. Inner Court, composed of the Priests' Pavement on the Separate Pavement on both three sides, by a curb rail.

G. The Stairs leading East.

H. The Cloysters covering the Building of the Priests.

K. The Courts in which were the Coffers and Kitchens for the Priests.

L. Ten ways to the Porch of the Temple.

M. The Arch of the Temple.

The King and the Land

The King and the Land

*A Geography of Royal Power
in the Biblical World*



STEPHEN C. RUSSELL

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America.

© Oxford University Press 2017

Some rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, for commercial purposes, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics rights organization.

This is an open access publication, available online and distributed under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), a copy of which is available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Subject to this license, all rights are reserved.



Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Russell, Stephen C., author.

Title: The king and the land : a geography of royal power in the biblical world / Stephen C. Russell.

Description: New York, NY : Oxford University Press, 2016. | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Description based on print version record and CIP data provided by publisher; resource not viewed.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016018204 (print) | LCCN 2016005295 (ebook) |

ISBN 9780199361892 (updf) | ISBN 9780190630027 (epub) |

ISBN 9780199361885 (hardback : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Kings and rulers—Biblical teaching. | Kings and rulers, Ancient. | Bible. Samuel—History of Biblical evetns. | Bible. Kings—History of Biblical events.

Classification: LCC BS1199.K5 (print) | LCC BS1199.K5 R86 2016 (ebook) | DDC 221.9/5—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016018204>

Printed by Sheridan Books, Inc., United States of America

For Julie and Olivia

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ix
1. Solomon's Temple: On Space, Power, and Ancient Evidence	1
2. David's Threshing Floor: On Royal Dedication of Land to the Gods	16
3. Jehu's Dung Heap: On Royal Decommissioning of Religious Space	40
4. Absalom's Gate: On Royal Navigation of Collective Urban Politics	68
5. Hezekiah's Tunnel: On Royal Shaping of the Water Supply System	84
6. Summary	107
<i>Notes</i>	111
<i>Bibliography</i>	205
<i>Index of Ancient Sources</i>	259
<i>Index of Subjects</i>	275

Acknowledgments

I BEGAN THINKING about the themes I take up in this book during my time as a postdoctoral scholar in the Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. At Cal, I joined an informal group of doctoral students who were preparing for their comprehensive examinations in the Geography Department. Over the course of a semester, we read and discussed the work of scholars whose influence on geography as it is taught and practiced at Cal continues to be felt—Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, Andy Merrifield, Stuart Elden, and Doreen Massey, among others. This body of work helped me connect my undergraduate training in architecture and my doctoral training in Biblical and ancient Near Eastern studies to scholarly conversations taking place across the humanities and social sciences. During this time, I also had the privilege of presenting precursors to chapters of this book to the Memory and Identity Working Group in the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Cal and to the Jewish Studies Working Group at the Graduate Theological Union. I am thankful for engaging comments and questions on my work from these intellectual communities, and in particular from Deena Aranoff, Amos Bitzan, Daniela Blei, Aaron Brody, Robert Coote, Sarah Cramsey, Jay Crisostomo, Steed Davidson, Daniel Fisher, Ashwin Jacobs, Garrett Galvin, Kathleen Grady, Rhiannon Graybill, Udi Greenberg, Corinna Guerrero, Shaina Hammerman, Ronald Hendel, Dale Loepf, Dieudonne Mair, Greta Marchesi, Benjamin Porter, Yosefa Raz, Terry Renaud, Eli Rosenblatt, Annette Schellenberg, Annie Sheaffer, Ilan Tojerow, and Niek Veldhuis.

On the East Coast, I had the pleasure of presenting ideas on land rights that I take up in Chapter 2 to the Hebrew Bible Seminar at Columbia University and to the Old Testament Research Colloquium at Princeton Theological Seminary. I read a draft of Chapter 4 to the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Cornell University. And I presented a draft of

Chapter 5 to a doctoral seminar on Isaiah taught by Mark S. Smith at New York University. I also benefited from engaging conversations in less formal contexts with a number of colleagues in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. I am very grateful for helpful comments and questions about the ideas I pursue here from Brendon Benz, David Carr, Daniel Fleming, Christopher Hooker, Elaine James, Ki-Eun Jang, Dylan Johnson, Nyahsa Junior, Daniela Lehmann, Mark Leuchter, David Marcus, Zachary Margulies, Naphtali Meshel, Sara Milstein, Lauren Monroe, Dustin Nash, Daniel Oden, Dennis Olson, Cory Peacock, Daniel Pioske, Leong Seow, Ira Spar, Michael Stahl, and Bruce Wells.

Almost every page of this book was either written or revised at various New York and Philadelphia cafes in the company of Jeremy Schipper or Esther Hamori. As I wrote this book, Esther was completing *Women's Divination in Biblical Literature: Prophecy, Necromancy, and Other Arts of Knowledge* (Yale, 2015), and Jeremy was finishing up *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Yale, 2016). Their camaraderie, critical insight, and good humor were just what the doctor ordered. Several discussions with Jeremy about the social and legal background of Ruth had a particular influence on the arguments I make in Chapters 2 and 5.

I presented early versions of material from this book at the Annual Meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature. I read material from Chapter 1 to the Hebrew Bible, History, and Archaeology Section in 2013; a draft of Chapter 4 to the Space, Place, and Lived Experience in Antiquity Section in 2012; and theses I take up in a different form in Chapter 2 to the Social Sciences and the Interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures Section in 2011. For their comments and questions coming out of these SBL meetings, I am thankful to Mark George, Baruch Halpern, Christl Maier, Victor Matthews, Jeremy Smoak, and Matthew Suriano.

I owe special thanks to three colleagues who read and commented extensively on written drafts of several chapters of this book. I first met Robert S. Kawashima during his time as a Postdoctoral Faculty Fellow in the Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at New York University. Participating in intellectual conversations beyond the disciplinary boundaries of biblical studies, Robert's work bears the particular influence of a French intellectual tradition that culminated in the work of Michel Foucault and that has included important contributions from Alexandre Koyré, Alexandre Kojève, and Jean-Claude Milner. In line with this tradition, Robert has pushed me at several junctures to consider what was distinctive about Israelite and Judahite

spatial politics, even as Israel and Judah formed part of a larger cultural continuum spanning the ancient Near East. During my time as his doctoral student, Mark S. Smith quoted to me Ludwig Mies van der Rohe's aphorism, "God is in the details." The genius of Mark's work has been his effortless movement between large themes in Levantine history and religion and myriad textual and archaeological evidence requiring detailed evaluation and analysis. He helped me think through several pieces of evidence I explore here as well as the larger arguments I develop in this book. Glasses of whiskey, fried turkeys, and conversations about the ancient Near Eastern context of biblical literature with Chip Dobbs-Allsopp are among my happiest memories of my time as a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Biblical Studies Department at Princeton Theological Seminary. Chip helped me situate my analysis of spatial power within a larger understanding of the legal, social, and political structure of Iron Age Israel and Judah. Robert, Mark, and Chip deserve special thanks for the many hours they spent reading drafts of chapters of this book and for the grace with which they delivered penetrating critiques of them.

I enjoyed completing this book in the vibrant intellectual atmospheres of the Religion Department at Augustana College and the History Department at John Jay College, CUNY. For their warm welcome to Augustana, conversations about space, and help accessing library resources, I am thankful to Stefanie Blumley, Margaret Farrar, Laura Hartman, Samantha Keehn, Pareena Lawrence, Dan Lee, Jason Mahn, Daniel Morris, Kelly Murphy, Jennifer Poppo, Richard Priggie, Nirmala Salgado, Eric Stewart, and Cyrus Zargar. For their warm welcome to John Jay College and helpful conversations about historical and pedagogical method, I am thankful to Jama Adams, Simon Baatz, Andrea Balis, Jane Bowers, Blanche Wiesen Cooke, Mary Gibson, Anissa Hélie, Allison Kavey, James De Lorenzi, Gerald Markowitz, Sara McDougall, David Munns, Kevin Nesbitt, Hyunhee Park, Edward Paulino, Allison Pease, Matthew Perry, Michael Pfeifer, Itai Sneh, and Gregory Umbach. Funding for this work was provided by a Faculty Scholarship grant from the Office for the Advancement of Research at John Jay College, CUNY. Support for this project was provided by a PSC-CUNY Award, jointly funded by The Professional Staff Congress and The City University of New York.

It has been a pleasure to work with the editorial team at Oxford University Press, especially with Cynthia Read, who was exceptionally helpful at every stage of the publication process. Johanna Baboukis, Gina

Chung, and Stuart Roberts offered invaluable assistance. Kate Mertes produced the indices. I am grateful to anonymous readers from the press for their helpful comments.

With great affection I dedicate this book to my wife Julie and my daughter Olivia, with whom life is so beautiful.

The King and the Land

I

Solomon's Temple

ON SPACE, POWER, AND ANCIENT EVIDENCE

THIS BOOK MAPS unexplored dimensions of royal spatial power in Iron Age Israel and Judah. Whereas a rich tradition of scholarship focuses on the social basis of monarchic power in the biblical period, I show how a spatial perspective allows a richer understanding of the heterogeneous, hidden, and at times contradictory forces that shaped the legitimacy of the monarchies in the biblical period.¹ By focusing on the social production of space, I interrogate textual and archeological evidence from the ancient Levant in fresh ways. How did ancient Near Eastern kings transform existing spaces—privately held lands, shrines, town gates, and urban water supply systems—and discourse about them in order to bolster their power? How did biblical scribes conceive of the relationship between centralized monarchic power and traditional forms of collective power based on assumed kinship? To what extent are biblical descriptions of royal spatial power critical of kingship or supportive of it? In exploring these and other questions, this book traces the spatial foundations of monarchic legitimacy in the Hebrew Bible and offers insight into the nature of socially produced space and political power.

As a brief example of the complexity and subtlety of spatial power in the biblical world, and as an introduction to the themes I explore in the coming chapters, consider the biblical description of Solomon's building projects, particularly the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem (1 Kgs 5:14–8:50).² Solomon's temple is perhaps the most well-known, and well-studied, spatial expression of royal power in the Hebrew Bible. Scholars have noted that awe-inspiring architecture in the highest elevation of Jerusalem's royal complex and a narrative about that architecture as commissioned by

Yahweh would have served to legitimize the Judahite monarchy in the eyes of Jerusalem's inhabitants.³ Indeed, the motif of the king as builder is well attested in ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions.⁴ But an analysis of spatial power in this biblical narrative can be pressed further. Curiously, the architecture of the Jerusalem temple is described as being imported from up the Levantine coast.⁵ According to the account in Kings, it was constructed not in a local vernacular, but in Phoenician style, with assistance from Tyrian builders. The timber required for the project was imported from Tyre (1 Kgs 5:21–28), Tyrian masons quarried and dressed the stone (1 Kgs 5:32), and a Tyrian metalsmith fabricated the building's bronze furnishings (1 Kgs 7:13–45). Although Phoenician temples have not been preserved, the biblical description of the architecture of the temple resembles northern temple design in Syria as it is known from the archaeological record.⁶ Iron Age temples at Tell Tayinat and 'Ain Dara contain floor plans similar to the temple described in 1 Kgs 6–7.⁷ Furthermore, the temple at 'Ain Dara includes a wrap-around structure like that described in Kings.⁸ This temple style is considered to have older Syrian antecedents, for example temple D at Ebla and the Alalakh VII temple.⁹ The use of cherubs to decorate the Jerusalem temple may also have reflected Syrian influence, though the motif is rather widespread.¹⁰

Although the biblical description of Solomon's palace is not sufficiently detailed to allow a definitive analysis of its form, at least one structure in the palace complex also has archaeological parallels in the north.¹¹ "The House of the Forest of Lebanon," mentioned in 1 Kgs 7:2, was apparently a structure separate from the palace and adjoining it. It was characterized by several rows of cedar columns in its central hallway. Ronny Reich observes that such rows of columns are unattested in the archaeological record of Israel and Syria and argues that the building's closest archaeological parallels are Phoenician.¹² The ninth-century Phoenician temple at Kition in Cyprus contained four rows of seven stone bases with small indentations that would have supported wooden columns.¹³ David Ussishkin also notes parallels between Solomon's "The House of the Forest of Lebanon" and the eighth-seventh century palace at Altintepe in Urartu, which contained three rows of six columns each.¹⁴ Thus, close archaeological parallels to Solomon's temple and one structure in his palace complex come from the north. All this is well known to historians and archaeologists of the region. But we can trace spatial politics in the biblical narrative one step further.

Why does the literary account of Solomon's construction of the palace and temple emphasize the use of foreign architecture? The ancient Near

Eastern literary motif of the king as builder does not depend on a particular design aesthetic.¹⁵ While some commentators treat this architectural style as incidental, I suggest that it represents the spatial expression of a particular power strategy consistently exercised by Solomon in the book of Kings. According to the dual-processual model of political action, developed by anthropologists and discussed further below, strategies of power employed by political actors in any society are profitably understood as falling along a continuum that lies between two poles. An exclusionary strategy tends toward the centralization of power, while a corporate strategy tends toward its distribution. In large part, the prominence of those employing an exclusionary strategy depends on their ability to become central to a network of extragroup exchange partnerships. Their skill at handling extragroup relationships translates into prestige and power within the group. Solomon is consistently portrayed in First Kings as employing an exclusionary strategy of power. According to the narrative, he strengthened diplomatic ties with prestigious neighbors through marriage (3:1; 11:1–8); he commanded tribute from Israel's neighbors (5:1, 4; 10:10, 15, 25); he hosted international envoys after gaining an international reputation for wisdom (5:14; 10:1–13, 24); and he organized and controlled international trade (5:15–28; 9:26–28; 10:15, 22, 28).¹⁶ Whether or not these depictions are in any sense historical, the narrative is consistent in depicting Solomon as employing an exclusionary strategy of power. Seen in this light, the foreign architecture of Solomon's temple and palace is not incidental to his politics, a mere narrative quirk. Rather, the Phoenician-style temple was a clear spatial expression of a broader pattern of monarchic power that depended on the management of extragroup networks.¹⁷ In four case studies focusing on royal power to dedicate and decommission cultic space, royal attempts to assert authority over the segmentary political unit of the town, and royal construction and care of water supply systems, this book uncovers and maps such unexplored patterns of royal spatial power in the Hebrew Bible and sets them in their archaeological and ancient Near Eastern literary contexts.

Thinking about Space

Some of my readers will wish to proceed directly to my analysis of ancient evidence in the chapters to follow. Others may be interested in how my work here relates to other scholarly conversations taking place across

the humanities and social sciences. The questions I ask of ancient evidence in the case studies to follow reflect developments in critical spatiality. Especially influential on my work here is the contribution of Henri Lefebvre.¹⁸ My dialogue with Lefebvre supplements two current approaches to studying ancient space—let us call them the sacred and the geometric. Work on ancient space sometimes draws on Mircea Eliade's delineation of the sacred. Eliade's work is best appreciated in light of several approaches to religion that had analyzed it in terms of other phenomena.¹⁹ In contrast, drawing on the work of Rudolf Otto, Eliade asserted the irreducible nature of the sacred and analyzed it in its own terms.²⁰ For Eliade, sacred space is a site of hierophany, an irruption of the sacred into this world.²¹ Its sacred structure contrasts sharply with the chaos of profane space. It functions as an *axis mundi*, linking earth with both heaven and the underworld, and is also an *imago mundi*, a representation of the cosmos. Eliade treats the structure and furniture of Solomon's temple, discussed above, as a microcosm of the created order described in Gen 1–3.²² Eliade's analysis of the sacred has proven enormously influential, and Jonathan Z. Smith's revision and extension of Eliade's program has been extremely robust.²³ Within biblical studies, his paradigm of sacred space is seen, for example, in helpful works from Yehoshua Gitay, Frank H. Gorman, Seong Il Kang, Robert S. Kawashima, and Jon D. Levenson.²⁴ But Eliade's paradigm is not entirely appropriate for the questions I take up in this book. In particular, Eliade does not sufficiently account for the political dimension of religious space, nor for the complex interpenetrations and reflections between the religious and the secular. Moving beyond Eliade's paradigm, this book is concerned with how spaces, including religious ones, performed political functions, intentionally or otherwise.

A second approach to ancient space has been more narrowly concerned with the material realm. I am referring here to the kind of geometric cataloging and measurement sometimes associated with the discipline of archaeology, but evidenced also in biblical studies.²⁵ This approach lies very much within the legacy of Galileo Galilei, Isaac Newton, René Descartes, and Gottfried Leibniz.²⁶ For these thinkers, space has absolute, mathematized, and measurable dimensions, independent of the material objects of which it is constituted.²⁷ Newton investigated the geometry of Solomon's temple, discussed above, as recorded in the Hebrew Bible.²⁸ Valuable studies of ancient Levantine urban architecture with attention to politics and with an empirical focus include those from Kathleen M. Kenyon, Volkmar Fritz, Zeev Herzog, and C.H.J. De Geus.²⁹ A great strength of these studies

is their anchoring of the discussion of ancient urban space in quantifiable data. The questions I ask in this book are not compellingly answerable from a purely quantitative analysis of available evidence. Rather, I attend to the cultural, social, and political significance of ancient Levantine landscape and architecture.³⁰

It is precisely here that Lefebvre's work is so helpful. He argues that "(Social) space is a (social) product."³¹ Real spaces in the physical world are not geometrical ideals but are produced by particular societies at particular times. They result from historically situated economic and political configurations and perform functions that have culturally imbued meanings. Lefebvre's work lies very much within the materialist tradition of Karl Marx, and his analysis of space is rooted in political economy.³² He advocates moving beyond simple measurement of Cartesian space or cataloguing of the objects that fill it to analyzing how particular spaces are related to the economic and political life of the societies that produce them.³³ Lefebvre delineates a triad for thinking about space—spatial practice, representations of space, and spaces of representation—that allows him, and this study, to expand the definition of space beyond Cartesian dimensions without becoming lost in ephemeral realms.³⁴ The precise nature of this triad has been the subject of much discussion, especially by geographers.³⁵ The theses I develop in the coming chapters do not depend on one particular interpretative tradition of Lefebvre's work—indeed, they are developed from ancient evidence rather than contemporary theoretical reflections or anthropological analogues. But Lefebvre's influence on this book is still felt in so far as, in line with a broad consensus among geographers about the meaning of Lefebvre's writings, I ask certain kinds of questions of the ancient data I analyze here. Indeed, this book furthers a critical trajectory within biblical studies that reads the Hebrew Bible in light of the approach to space taken by Henri Lefebvre, a trajectory that includes the work of Jon L. Berquist, Roland Boer, Mark K. George, Christl M. Maier, Mary E. Mills, and Jaime L. Waters, among others.³⁶

Thinking about Power

I trace here the relevance of spatial analysis to a richer understanding of monarchic legitimacy. In the background to my analysis are conversations taking place beyond biblical studies about the nature of political power and legitimacy. The observations of Max Weber and Antonio Gramsci on

the need of authority to reproduce its own legitimacy continue to be relevant to any analysis of political life.³⁷ However, this book leaves behind Weber's delineation of ideal types of authority, which has occupied biblical scholars, and Gramsci's work on civil society and hegemony in favor of approaches that observe the complex and contradictory interactions between dominant and subordinate actors.³⁸ For example, James Scott sketches the hidden and public transcripts of domination and resistance.³⁹ Scott points to the discrepancies between the public performance of power and the private actions, ideas, and words which constitute resistance. His case is summarized in an Ethiopian proverb that he cites, "When the great lord passes, the wise peasant bows deeply and silently farts." Scott's work pushes me here to pay attention to the ambiguity of the biblical text, in which some perspectives are more muted than others. Ambiguity is particularly evident in sections of the David Story that I discuss in Chapters 2 and 4. Scott and other scholars offer insight into the nature of power. However, none of their overarching theories of power is entirely appropriate for my work. Contemporary theories of power have all been influenced, to a greater or lesser extent, by the experience of European colonialism and its accompanying intellectual developments.⁴⁰ To my mind, there are qualitative differences between the political and economic structure of colonial Europe and the political and economic structure of the ancient Near Eastern societies I examine here. I therefore draw on aspects of contemporary thinking about power while emphasizing in several case studies the spatial dimension of monarchic legitimacy. Space will emerge in this book as one arena for the intersection of what Michael Mann has identified as the four sources of social power—control over economic, ideological, military, and political resources.⁴¹ Indeed, a major contribution of this book is the way in which it supplements the theory of power with spatial insights, a contribution that has implications beyond the disciplinary boundaries of biblical studies.⁴²

Particularly discernible in my thinking here are the approaches to power taken by Anthony Giddens and by Richard Blanton and his colleagues. Recently, the implications of their work for the study of the ancient Near East have been taken up by Daniel E. Fleming, Anne Porter, Adam Miglio, and Brendon Benz.⁴³ Giddens and Blanton et al. are not merely interested in emphasizing power structures at the center of society, but in examining the complex interactions between a variety of social actors. Giddens has developed a general theory of the social sciences, which have as their domain "neither the experience of the individual actor, nor the existence of

any form of societal totality, but social practices ordered across space and time.”⁴⁴ He traces the background to his structuration theory in three broad trends in the academy: an increased emphasis on the active, reflexive character of human conduct, the recognition of the fundamental role played by language in social life, and the declining importance of empiricist philosophies of natural science.⁴⁵ He re-conceives the traditional conceptual divide between subjective agents and objective social structures as a duality, namely “the duality of structure.”⁴⁶ Structure is both a medium and an outcome of reproduction of practices.⁴⁷ Structuration theory has become very influential in sociology, despite important critiques.⁴⁸ Though the arguments I develop here do not depend on Giddens’ theoretical model, his legacy in the academy can be felt in this book in at least three ways. I pay attention to language—particularly spatial language—as a window through which to view society. I observe the complex interactions between agents—at times historically identifiable individuals—who play differing roles in establishing and reproducing social structures. And I ask how social structures are related to physical ones in space and time. However, unlike Giddens, whose focus is abstract and ontological, I ground my arguments here in empirical observation. The Hebrew Bible, other ancient Near Eastern texts, and a wide variety of archaeological evidence are the primary materials from which I develop my theses in the chapters that follow.

Also influencing the questions I ask of ancient evidence is the model of political power put forward by anthropologists Richard Blanton, Gary M. Feinman, Stephen A. Kowalewski, and Peter N. Peregrine, mentioned briefly above.⁴⁹ In critiquing neoevolutionary explanations of social change in pre-Hispanic Mesoamerica, they develop a dual-processual model of political action. According to this dual-processual approach, political actors engage in two primary processes as they exercise power. An exclusionary or network strategy depends on control over relationships between the group and external networks. Political leaders exercising this strategy have special access to outside polities, the divine world, luxury imported goods, or specialized knowledge and they limit access of others to these potential sources of prestige and legitimacy. A corporate strategy of power, on the other hand, depends on managing relationships within the group. This strategy emphasizes the distribution of power within the group and the egalitarian ethos of bonds of kinship even while individual political actors lead the group. Blanton et al. outline sources of power in broad terms and draw on the work of several anthropologists and political economists to

chart the differences between these two strategies of power. The two strategies, however, are not viewed as mutually exclusive, but as both operating within a single political system. In the chapters that follow, I pay attention to competing strategies for power that operated in various configurations in ancient Israel and Judah. The arguments I develop do not depend on distinguishing a premonarchic, egalitarian, tribal past from the experience of centralized rule in the monarchic period. Rather, I treat centralized monarchic power and distributed power based on the traditional language of kinship as functioning together in the Iron Age II.⁵⁰

Working with Ancient Evidence

This book draws principally on the Hebrew Bible, especially material in the books of Samuel and Kings, as it seeks to reconstruct the history of Israelite and Judahite monarchic power. Scholars generally treat these biblical books as part of the so-called Deuteronomistic History, a collection of books spanning Joshua through Kings that belong as a collection to the post-monarchic period, after the fall of the Israelite monarchy to the Assyrians in the eighth century BCE and the fall of the Judahite monarchy to the Babylonians in the sixth century BCE. I situate myself within a scholarly tradition that seeks to recover monarchic-era content in this post-monarchic collection. In my view, much of the material in these books was not merely invented by scribes in the late sixth or fifth centuries but was composed in the eighth through early sixth centuries, while kings still reigned over Judah. It is from this earlier biblical material that I recover and map spatial aspects of royal power in these Iron Age kingdoms.

Since I hope that this book will find an audience beyond biblical studies, let me briefly frame the lines of evidence that allow me to use a post-monarchic collection of biblical texts as a window into monarchic-era spatial politics. A decisive turn in scholarly approaches to Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings was inaugurated by the work of Martin Noth.⁵¹ Biblicists had long noticed thematic and linguistic connections between this collection of books.⁵² Going beyond their analyses, Noth observed the particularly close connections between summarizing passages in an editorial voice in Josh 12, Judg 2, and 2 Kgs 17 and speeches in the mouths of characters in Josh 24, 1 Sam 12, and 1 Kgs 8. These texts use a distinctive linguistic style as they look back at Israel's history and frame its future in terms of obedience to Yahweh. Noth argued that these key texts were the product of a single author who worked during the

period of Israel's exile, in the sixth century BCE. The author composed material to frame several hundred years of Israel's history in the light of the theology of the book of Deuteronomy. The main theme to which the author returned again and again was Israel's obedience or disobedience to Yahweh. Thus Noth was not only interested in identifying the redactional layers in these books, but attempted to discern the literary plan governing the whole. He saw the Deuteronomistic Historian both as an editor who arranged and shaped large blocks of existing material and as an author responsible for important texts that framed the collection. In his study of the Pentateuch, Noth asked new questions about the oral traditions behind the biblical text. While acknowledging oral tradition, his treatment of the Deuteronomistic History lay very much in the tradition of the literary focus of nineteenth-century German biblical scholarship, more compellingly executed than his predecessors.

Several major revisions to Noth's thesis, in different directions in Germany and the United States, have been proffered in the almost seventy years since its original publication.⁵³ Most important for the arguments I develop here is a particular scholarly tradition in the United States that has emphasized the existence of monarchic-era documents, now lost to us, that were revised in the post-monarchic period. Frank Moore Cross demonstrated that the two major themes of the book of Kings—the sin of Jeroboam ben Nebat and the promise to the House of David—find their fulfillment in the portrayal of the reign of Josiah, king of Judah.⁵⁴ According to 2 Kgs 22–23, this descendant of David destroyed cult sites reputedly established by Jeroboam because they violated “The Scroll of Instruction” (סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה) discovered in the temple in Jerusalem during his reign.⁵⁵ Cross thus posited a first edition of the Deuteronomistic History that was composed in the time of Josiah, with the work later revised following the exile to Babylon. The book of Kings is composed, in the main, of alternating vignettes of Israelite and Judahite kings. A very tight editorial framework sandwiches the actual descriptions of particular kings between formulaic introductory and concluding comments. Richard D. Nelson observed closely the shifts in the editorial formulae used to evaluate the reigns of kings in the book of Kings.⁵⁶ He argued that there were clear distinctions between the formulae used to evaluate kings who reigned before Josiah and those used to evaluate kings who reigned afterward. Nelson thus regarded a single editor working in the time of Josiah as responsible for assembling the first edition of the book with its standardized editorial formulae, and a second editor in the exilic period for extending

and revising the work using slightly different formulae. Several scholars have engaged in a debate about even earlier possible editions of Kings or the Deuteronomistic History or source documents for these in the time of Hezekiah, Jehu, or even earlier. Important contributions on different sides of the debate have come from Helga Weippert, Iain Provan, Baruch Halpern and David Vanderhooft, Erik Eynikel, Steven L. McKenzie, André Lemaire, Anthony F. Campbell and Mark A. O'Brien, Marsha C. White, Bernard Lehnart, Thomas Römer, and Jeremy M. Hutton, among others.⁵⁷ Despite tremendous differences of opinion between these scholars about the possibility of pre-Josianic source material in the Deuteronomistic History, there remains a consensus among them about the existence of writings from the time of Josiah himself and further editing of the collection in the exilic period and they have relied on the types of evidence taken up by Cross and Nelson: thematic climaxes and shifts in editorial formulae. Where relevant, I discuss their work further in the individual chapters that follow. The arguments I develop here, however, are not dependent on one scholarly theory of the Deuteronomistic History or another. Rather, I build my case studies around particular texts in Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles and, where relevant, I discuss internal and external evidence for the dates of their composition and editing.

Three lines of evidence for dating biblical texts help me relate the narrative world of the texts I discuss to the social world that produced them. These independent lines of evidence converge to suggest that the principal texts I take up in the chapters that follow are not merely the literary invention of Jewish scribes writing in the sixth century BCE or later. They were composed in the main in the eighth through sixth centuries and reflect that social world. The first important category of evidence is changes to the Hebrew language over time. The discovery and decipherment of Late Bronze Age texts from Ugarit have provided biblical scholars with a wealth of data for another Northwest Semitic language with which to compare biblical Hebrew.⁵⁸ William Foxwell Albright observed stylistic similarities between a handful of biblical poems and the Ugaritic texts.⁵⁹ He argued that these poems were composed at an earlier date than the rest of the Bible. Albright's students Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman systematically laid out the orthographic, morphological, and syntactic features that they regarded as diagnostic of this older stratum of Hebrew now preserved in a few biblical poems.⁶⁰ David A. Robertson attempted to quantify these features and suggested that a critical density of archaic linguistic elements pointed to the antiquity of a particular biblical poem.⁶¹

The approach has not always been well received for three main reasons. First, although the biblical texts that are arguably archaic are all poems, arguments for their antiquity are often based on grammatical comparisons to prose material. In fact, the grammar of biblical Hebrew poetry has been far less studied than that of biblical Hebrew prose. As a result, it is hard to say conclusively whether a particular grammatical feature is a chronological marker or whether it belongs instead to a distinction between poetry and prose. Second, and quite closely related, even if it is acknowledged that certain linguistic features belong to an older stratum of Hebrew, it is still difficult to say whether a particular poem is genuinely archaic or whether its author used obscure forms in order to achieve an archaizing effect. Finally, the corpus of archaic poetry is quite small, perhaps some one to six chapters of the Bible. There is thus very little linguistic data from which to build a case, making any conclusions subject to a substantial margin of error. Despite these cautions, the tradition of using linguistic criteria in dating biblical texts is well established in biblical studies, especially in the United States.

Linguistic evidence is useful not only for distinguishing Archaic Biblical Hebrew from Standard Biblical Hebrew, but also Late Biblical Hebrew from Standard Biblical Hebrew. The most prominent proponent of this approach has been Avi Hurvitz.⁶² Beginning with a body of biblical literature that is widely considered postexilic on other grounds—principally, Isa 56–66, Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, Esther, and Qohelet—and considering also non-biblical texts from the postexilic period, Hurvitz's method has been to identify linguistic items that occur exclusively or mainly in this late corpus that have alternative linguistic equivalents with the same meaning in similar or identical contexts in other biblical books. Through such comparisons, Hurvitz has built up a database of features characteristic of Late Biblical Hebrew as compared to Standard Biblical Hebrew. He argues that a biblical text of uncertain date belongs to the postexilic period if it contains a density of these characteristic forms. Gary A. Rendsburg has refined the approach by recognizing the possibility of regional variation in Hebrew.⁶³ The nuances of their arguments do not concern me here, though I will occasionally discuss particular features of Biblical Hebrew in the chapters that follow. Rather, in framing the themes of this book for the reader unfamiliar with biblical studies, I would like to note the broad implications of this approach. Hurvitz's work confirms the existence of a layer of Hebrew now preserved in the Hebrew Bible that dates from the monarchic period. In the main,

the biblical texts on which I base my reconstruction of spatial power in ancient Israel and Judah are written in this Standard Biblical Hebrew. They date from the monarchic period. Though subject to the ideological and poetic impulses of all writing, they have first-hand knowledge of monarchic spatial power and are not merely the literary inventions of a later age.

A second line of evidence for the production of ancient texts is inscriptional material that has survived from ancient Israel. Seth L. Sanders has recently pointed out the implications of these inscriptions for understanding the form and intent of biblical prose writing.⁶⁴ Daniel Pioske, drawing on Sanders, has likewise noted the implications of these inscriptions for dating the material now contained in Samuel and Kings.⁶⁵ Although the epigraphic evidence is fragmentary, it suggests that Iron Age II Israel witnessed the birth of Hebrew as a vernacular, alphabetic writing system. In the Late Bronze Age, as evidenced in the Amarna archive, the international language of diplomacy in the Levant was Akkadian. But Ugarit in the Late Bronze Age, and Israel in the Iron Age, both developed something new in the ancient world, a written vernacular that connected local languages with local political organization. Sanders summarizes the evidence nicely. There is no inscriptional evidence for extended prose writing in Hebrew like that found in Samuel or Kings in the tenth century BCE. About two hundred wordless seals and seal impressions from the tenth through late ninth centuries BCE from Tel Rehov and the City of David have been unearthed.⁶⁶ The Gezer calendar and the Tel Zayit abecedary from this early period are perhaps better described as pre-Hebrew and they do not reflect the verbal trappings of typical ancient Near Eastern bureaucracy—references to taxation, standing armies, official hierarchies, and so on.⁶⁷ These data suggest that written Hebrew did not yet form part of official political organization in ancient Israel and Judah in this early period. In the late ninth century BCE Moabite, Ammonite, and Aramaic royal monumental inscriptions attest the start of the use of local vernaculars by kings in the Levant.⁶⁸ Beginning around 800 BCE, Hebrew writing appears on seals from Judah.⁶⁹ A much wider variety of inscriptional material from the eighth through sixth centuries BCE witnesses the use of standardized Hebrew as a vernacular written language for royal and non-royal genres by the late Iron Age II.⁷⁰ This evidence suggest that it was during the eighth through sixth centuries BCE that it became possible to write extended narratives in vernacular Hebrew like those I discuss in the chapters that follow. This is the period of Hezekiah and Josiah and

inscriptional material thus lends credence to the arguments outlined above for an edition or editions of Kings from the late Iron Age II. At the same time, this inscriptional material also serves as a warning against positing extended written narratives in Hebrew from before the eighth century BCE.

Thirdly, and finally, the very portrayal of political life in the Hebrew Bible suggests that these narratives were not merely invented by scribes in the post-monarchic period. The editorial framework of Kings understands Israel and Judah as mirror images of one another. In this perspective, following a united monarchy, some tribes broke away to form a northern kingdom, while other tribes, and Judah in particular, formed a southern kingdom. Political life in both kingdoms is imagined in this framework as similar, centered on the royal court. But close observation of the narratives themselves, as argued especially by Daniel E. Fleming, betrays the opposite reality.⁷¹ Israel and Judah did not share identical political organization. In Blanton's terms, the Judahite and Israelite political systems had opposing strategies of political action in different proportions. Israel was a tribal collective, in which traditional structures of collective governance continued to function powerfully, while Judah was much more strongly controlled by its monarchy, the House of David. Differences between political organization in Israel and Judah were preserved by Judahite scribes despite their bias for understanding Israel and Judah as mirror images of one another. This fact suggests that some information about the social world of Israel preserved in the Bible comes from Israel itself and is not merely invented by scribes working in a later period.

Each chapter of this book also relies heavily on non-biblical evidence. Israel and Judah were situated within a wider cultural continuum spanning the entire Fertile Crescent. I draw on texts as diverse as Old Babylonian Mari letters mentioning census, Neo-Assyrian legal texts depicting royal dedication of land to the gods, and Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions boasting of the king's shaping of the urban water supply system. With the help of these and other texts, I set Judahite and Israelite monarchic legitimacy within wider patterns of ancient Near Eastern spatial power. I also take advantage of the enormous advances in Levantine archaeology made in the last thirty years. For example, the discovery of built-in benches in Levantine city gates before the monarchic period helps shape my argument in Chapter 4 that city gates were associated with the distributed power of the town as a collective political unit. By utilizing the full range of archaeological and textual material from the ancient Near East, I offer a

more nuanced portrait of spatial power than would be possible from biblical evidence alone.

The Structure of This Book

In the chapters that follow I trace some unexplored dimensions of royal spatial power in the biblical world. Chapters 2 through 5 explore three themes related to the example with which I began this chapter, Solomon's construction in Jerusalem of a temple in a foreign style, and the relationship of this monumental architecture to the pattern of centralized power attributed to him in the book of Kings. Chapters 2 and 3 further examine royal shaping of cultic space. In Chapter 2, I set the description of David's purchase of Araunah's threshing floor in 2 Sam 24 within the context of ancient Near Eastern land transfer texts, especially legal documents and royal inscriptions depicting royal dedication of land to the gods. The chapter provides a general framework for understanding royal administrative rights in land. I show how the narrative's third scene presents David as a pious ancient Near Eastern king, even as the chapter's other scenes offer an ambiguous portrait of David as reckless. Chapter 3 considers how ancient Near Eastern kings could enhance their image of power by decommissioning cultic spaces dedicated to the gods. I focus on one biblical example of temple decommissioning, Jehu's destruction of Baal's temple in 2 Kgs 10:18–28. Rituals of violence are not simply invented out of whole cloth and I trace the background of the several violent decommissioning rituals described in the narrative. These help me uncover behind the present form of the narrative an older and somewhat more circumscribed description of Jehu's decommissioning of a temple of Baal and the transformation of that older narrative into an account of national religious and political significance.

Chapter 4 treats a second theme from our opening example, the style of centralized power wielded by some Levantine kings. The chapter examines the portrayal of Absalom's political strategy in 2 Sam 15:1–6, which depicts his interactions with legal claimants seeking judgment in Jerusalem's gates. The narrative, I argue, depends not only on the well-known civic function of Iron Age Levantine city gates but also on the less-recognized tension between centralized power and the distributed, collective power of towns as independent segmentary political units. In Chapter 5, I pursue further a third theme from our opening example, royal construction in Jerusalem. The chapter examines the biblical claims that

Hezekiah reshaped Jerusalem's water supply system in 2 Kgs 20:20; 2 Chr 32:2-4, 30. I trace the literary contours of the ancient Near Eastern motif of the king's shaping of the water supply system, showing how it was deployed in two contexts: amid general claims of the king's abundant provision for his people, and, far less frequently, amid specific claims of military success. I evaluate the biblical claims about Hezekiah's shaping of the water supply system in the light of these literary contours and recent archaeological discoveries in Jerusalem. Chapter 6 offers a brief summary of the book's arguments.

David's Threshing Floor

ON ROYAL DEDICATION OF LAND TO THE GODS

IN CHAPTER 1, I CONSIDERED as an example of royal spatial power the architectural style in which a Levantine king built a temple. Levantine temples were often constructed, or rebuilt, on land traditionally considered to hold cultic significance.¹ Ancient Near Eastern kings also founded new sanctuaries on land previously used for other purposes.² In this chapter, I take up the broader question of administrative control of the land that ancient Near Eastern kings dedicated to their gods and I consider especially the description of David's purchase of Araunah's threshing floor in 2 Sam 24. According to the narrative, David took a census of the fighting men of Israel and Judah, resulting in pestilence against the people.³ As the scourge approached Jerusalem he averted it by offering sacrifices on an altar built on the threshing floor he purchased from Araunah the Jebusite. The chapter is rich with spatial themes—it depicts the census takers traversing the territory of Israel and Judah, the king making a private purchase of land, and David constructing an altar at the site of a hierophany.⁴ The narrative also serves political ends—it portrays David as a pious king who designates land for cultic use by constructing an altar on it. Second Sam 24 thus offers us another opportunity to trace the spatial politics of the Iron Age Levant. In particular, one question will guide my analysis of the narrative here: Why does David purchase Araunah's land and cattle? In other words: Why doesn't David simply offer a sacrifice at the location commanded by the prophet with cattle provided by Araunah?

Biblical scholars have generally answered the question in one of three ways.⁵ Some read David's purchase of Araunah's threshing floor in light of the tradition preserved in 1 Chr 21 that Solomon subsequently

built Yahweh's temple at the same site. According to this view, 2 Sam 24 "contains the *hieros logos* of the sanctuary at Jerusalem. . . . The site of the sanctuary . . . cannot be owed to pagan generosity, but it is formally purchased."⁶ Second Sam 24, however, makes no mention of the future temple, nor is any connection drawn between the threshing floor and the temple anywhere in Samuel–Kings. The tradition about the temple's location preserved in 1 Chr 21 is a late reinterpretation of the story in Samuel. In this chapter, I seek an answer to our central question within the plot of 2 Sam 24 and the thematic arcs of the book of Samuel, without recourse to the later reception of the story. For other scholars, David's refusal to offer sacrifice gratis "expresses an essential point about worship and service to God, whether Jewish or Christian (see Mal. 1:6–10; 2 Cor. 8:1–5)."⁷ Some Jews and Christians no doubt have held such a view of worship, but it is not clear that 2 Sam 24's ancient audience would have shared their conviction. No less a biblical hero than Abraham was content to offer a ram for which he paid nothing, on a site he did not own (Gen 22:13). And in the book of Samuel itself, Israelites sacrifice without censure cattle provided by Philistines (1 Sam 6:13–16). We are still left with the question, then, of why, within the narrative logic of 2 Sam 24, David purchases Araunah's land.

Census, Pestilence, and Expiation

Scholars have offered a third explanation that deserves fuller consideration here, one that revolves around the logic of cause and effect that connects census, pestilence, and expiation in 2 Sam 24.⁸ I find this third explanation quite helpful and I will lay out the argument in some detail before noting its shortcomings and offering a supplementary explanation that focuses on patterns of royal administrative control of land in the ancient Near East. Our first clue within this third scholarly approach comes from the realization that the narrative of David's purchase of Araunah's threshing floor in vv. 18–25 is not an isolated account but is integrally related to the plot of 2 Sam 24 as a whole. To be sure, the chapter contains points of tension and outright contradiction that suggest a complicated editorial history.⁹ It begins with the assertion that "Yahweh's anger again flared up against Israel" (וַיִּסַּף אֱלֹהֵי-יְהוָה לְחַרוֹת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל), but there is no indication of what incited him to anger nor any mention of other incidents of divine rage in the immediately preceding chapters.¹⁰ The reader might better expect the pestilence to follow immediately on the declaration of Yahweh's anger in v. 1, but an entire narrative about a nine-month-long census intervenes

(vv. 2–9). David's contrition in v. 10 reads better as a response to divine punishment rather than a precursor to it. The narrative presents David's choice of Araunah's threshing floor as being motivated by the prophet Gad's command in vv. 18–19, but the reader wonders if David's vision of Yahweh's envoy near Araunah's threshing floor in v. 17 was the real determining factor in the altar's location.¹¹ Yahweh stops his envoy in v. 16, but according to vv. 21, 25 David's sacrifice, offered subsequently, checks the pestilence. These points of narrative tension point to the chapter's complicated editorial history.

A large number of discrepancies between the Hebrew manuscripts and ancient translations of 2 Sam 24 hinder the recovery of that editorial prehistory.¹² Consider, for example, v. 16, which records Yahweh's command to his envoy to relax his destructive hand. The traditional Hebrew text, preserved in medieval manuscripts, notes that at the time of Yahweh's command, "Yahweh's messenger was beside the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite." The parallel version of the story in 2 Chr 21:16 and an ancient copy of Samuel discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls contain additional material: "David lifted his eyes and saw the messenger of Yahweh standing between earth and heaven with an unsheathed sword in his hand stretched out over Jerusalem. David and the elders, covered in sackcloth, fell on their faces." Evidently, at some stage in the transmission of the traditional Hebrew text, a scribe's eye accidentally skipped from וַיִּשָׂא דָוִד to וַיֵּאמֶר דָּוִד at the start of v. 17. P. Kyle McCarter has undertaken the Herculean task of evaluating the many ancient witnesses to the original text of 2 Sam 24 and I find his assessment of these compelling.¹³ Even so, I develop my arguments about 2 Sam 24 primarily in relation to the core narrative logic of the chapter's three main scenes, rather than in relation to particular points of discrepancy between the textual witnesses.

Scholars have reconstructed the chapter's editorial history in several ways. McCarter distinguishes between two main approaches to the editorial history of the story.¹⁴ Some scholars argue that the narrative originally consisted of two or three independent tales that were later combined into the current narrative.¹⁵ Others regard the chapter as an originally unified account with later interpolations of various kinds.¹⁶ In my view, the sections mentioning the prophet Gad are particularly suspect of being late in so far as they reframe elements of the story to emphasize prophetic interests. I thus place little weight on vv. 10–14, 16a, and 17–19 in the argument I develop further below.¹⁷ I will not recount and critique the various approaches to the chapter's editorial history here. Rather, I will lay out

the evidence for the unifying logic that guides the current form of the story—its assumptions about census, pestilence and affliction, and expiatory sacrifice.

In the current form of the book of Samuel, the literary presentation of David's purchase of the threshing floor cannot be excised from the surrounding account of pestilence. None of the three scenes in 2 Sam 24—census, pestilence, and land purchase—stands coherently on its own. Rather, the plot of each depends on the plot of the others. The land purchase is necessitated by the pestilence, which in turn results from the census. And the census and pestilence receive no resolution without the land purchase. The chapter is constructed around a shared conception of cause and effect as it relates to census, pestilence, and expiatory sacrifice. To be sure, the narrative has undergone editorial development. But the driving logic of each narrative section makes most sense in the context of the other sections.

What logic connects census and pestilence in the Hebrew Bible? Biblical Hebrew דָּבַר, “pestilence” (2 Sam 24:13, 15), refers to a lethal outbreak of disease among humans or domesticated animals that originates from the divine world.¹⁸ Some identify it with bubonic plague, but in my judgment such identification is too specific.¹⁹ To be sure, biblical pestilence shares features in common with infectious diseases like bubonic plague—for example, Lev 26:25 implies that the cramped conditions of siege might make the population susceptible to pestilence.²⁰ But in our text, 70,000 die from pestilence within a few hours (2 Sam 24:15), which would require a transmission rate that does not match the epidemiology of bubonic plague.²¹ Biblical pestilence refers to destruction inflicted directly from the divine world (Exod 5:3; 9:3, 15; Lev 26:25; Num 14:12; Deut 28:21; 2 Sam 24:13, 15; Jer 21:6; Ezek 5:17; 14:19; 28:23; 38:22; Amos 4:10; Ps 78:50). As such, pestilence is imagined as a forerunner or scout going before Yahweh as he marches out to battle in Hab 3:5. Biblical pestilence thus has some semantic overlap with other biblical terms indicating lethal outbreaks from the divine world—רָשָׁף (used in poetic parallelism with דָּבַר in Hab 3:5) and כָּטָב (used in poetic parallelism with דָּבַר in Hos 13:14; Ps 91:6).

Importantly for my thesis here, biblical pestilence also shares much in common with biblical Hebrew נָגַף “blow, affliction” (2 Sam 24:21, 25), which similarly refers to a rapidly spreading, lethal outbreak from the divine world (Exod 12:13; 30:12; Num 8:19; 17:11f; Jos 22:17). The roots of both nouns are not found together in parallel lines of biblical poetry, but the roots appear together in a paraphrase of the opening chapters of Exodus

found at Qumran (4Q422 3:8). Furthermore, within the biblical corpus itself, pestilence and affliction are used with several key terms in related literary contexts. They both result from Yahweh's anger (compare *קצף in Num 17:11 and *אנף in Ps 78:50). Yahweh strikes with both of them (*נכה; compare Exod 12:13 and Exod 9:15; Num 14:12; Jer 21:6). They both cause death on a massive scale (*מות; compare Num 17:13–14 and 2 Sam 24:15; Jer 21:6; Ps 78:50). And both can be “restrained” (*עצר; compare Num 17:13, 15 and 2 Sam 24:21). This overlap in usage suggests that pestilence and affliction were related concepts and were conceived of in similar terms.

Given the conceptual overlap between pestilence and affliction in the Hebrew Bible, biblical clues to the cause and cure of affliction prove relevant to answering the question of our narrative's unifying logic. Ephraim A. Speiser, drawing especially on the work of Jean-Robert Kupper on census in the texts from ancient Mari, has observed that census taking was an inherently dangerous activity in ancient Israel and Judah.²² He notes that according to Exod 30:11–16, when a census was taken of the Israelites, each one who was numbered was required to pay a ransom (כֶּפֶר) in order to avoid affliction (נִגַּף). This expiatory silver was fixed at half a shekel for every man of fighting age, regardless of economic status. The grammar of Exod 30:11 is sufficiently ambiguous as to suggest that affliction might come upon the people as a whole even if one individual failed to make an expiatory payment. Indeed, other biblical references to affliction suggest that it would strike the people, somewhat indiscriminately (Exod 12:13; Num 8:19; 17:11; Josh 22:17). For Speiser, Exod 30:11–16 proves the existence in ancient Israel of a basic conceptual link between census and ritual expiation.

The connection between census and ritual is also evidenced, Speiser argues, in the texts from ancient Mari.²³ For example, in discussing conscription at Mari, Jack M. Sasson points to a letter from Shamsi-Adad to Yasmaḥ-Adad that includes the following lines detailing military census:

Yarīm-Addu wrote to me the following: “I have inspected the Ḫaneens of the encampment and I have fixed (at) 2000 men (those) who are to go on a campaign with Yasmaḥ-Adad. All these men are (now) inscribed, by name, on a tablet.” This is what he wrote to me. Determine for yourself the 2000 Ḫaneens of the encampment who will march with you, plus 3000 men (previously). Have Lā'ūm and those servants who stand before you hear this tablet and decide upon this matter. The men of your district have not been tallied

[lit. purified, CAD 'cleared'] for a long time, and the day of tallying is long overdue. But since at this moment you cannot tally the people, you must certainly tally the people on your return. Until then, replace only the deserters [missing (?)] and the dead.²⁴

In this and other Mari texts, what is quite patently a census, a recording of names for military conscription, is denoted with the Akkadian verb *ebēbum* and its derivatives. Since the verb's basic meaning in other contexts is "ritual purification," Speiser has argued that military census at Mari included ritual purification.²⁵

Why did census require expiation? Speiser argues that census in ancient Israel and at Mari was an inherently dangerous activity.²⁶ It exposed the population to the possibility of divine wrath, not merely to the burden of royal taxation or conscription.²⁷ He finds the background to the census taboo in mythological texts describing gods writing on or reading from tablets as they discern or determine the fate of individuals. He cites Gilgamesh VII iv 49–52; X vi 36–39; Exod 32:32–33; and the Mishnah *Rosh ha-shana* I 3, which depict divine reading and writing, as evidence for an ancient fear of divine lists of names. Speiser concludes, "Military conscription was an ominous process because it might place the life of the enrolled in jeopardy. The connection with the cosmic 'books' of life and death must have been much too close for one's peace of mind. It would be natural in these circumstances to propitiate the unknown powers, or seek expiation as a general precaution. In due time, such a process would be normalized as a *tēbibtum* in Mesopotamia, and as a form of *kippūrīm* among the Israelites."²⁸ In my judgment, Speiser's proposal is not entirely convincing for two reasons. He reads into some of these texts a more specific concept—cosmic books of life and death—than the texts themselves seem to merit. And he connects these mythological texts to those mentioning census when the ancient texts themselves give no philological indication of such a connection.

McCarter explains the relationship between census and purification in another way.²⁹ In 2 Sam 24, we are dealing with a military count of adult males who could be mustered in time of war rather than a general administrative count for taxation or some other purpose. As much is indicated by the report Joab brought back to David, "Israel was eight hundred thousand warriors who drew the sword and the men of Judah were five hundred thousand men" (2 Sam 24:9). Indeed, war was already hinted at by David's use of the verbal root *פקד in his instructions to Joab. This

verb indicates military muster in other texts in Deuteronomy–Kings, for example, “Early in the morning, Joshua mustered the troops (וַיִּפְקֹד אֶת־הַיְעָמָה), then he and the elders of Israel marched upon Ai at the head of the troops” (Josh 8:10; cf. Judg 20:15, 17; 1 Sam 11:8; 15:4; 1 Kgs 20:15, 27; 2 Kgs 3:6).³⁰ McCarter observes that in the Hebrew Bible, soldiers were subject to special rules of purity—soldiers were consecrated before battle in Josh 3:5 and special precautions for keeping the military camp ritually pure are noted in Deut 23:10–15.³¹ In Samuel itself, the notion of purity regulations for soldiers may lie in the background to the stories about David obtaining sacred bread for his men from the priest of Nob (1 Sam 21:4–5) and Uriah refusing to go home to his wife while his fellow soldiers still fought (2 Sam 11:10–11). McCarter concludes, “Once enrolled in a census, therefore, an Israelite was subject to military rules of purity. Any infraction could lead to disastrous results. This is the reason that David’s census order put Israel in jeopardy.”³² I find McCarter’s explanation more compelling than Speiser’s, but it makes little difference to my argument here. In either case, it is clear that the plot of 2 Sam 24 is driven by the notion that census involved divine, rather than merely royal, threat.

This broader picture of military census and military purity clarifies the nature of David’s sacrifice in 2 Sam 24. What purpose does David’s sacrifice serve? To begin with, it is a burnt offering (עֹלָה), i.e., an animal that was completely burnt to smoke on an altar, excepting, at least in Priestly tradition, its skin (Lev 7:8). The burnt offering was not unique to Iron Age Israel and Judah. Jacob Milgrom has traced its genealogy along the entire eastern Mediterranean littoral.³³ Particularly telling, in his view, are certain second-millennium examples from Kizzuwatna in southern Anatolia that point to the purpose of the burnt offering: “They burn one bird (for the absolution) of wrath and one bird (for the absolution) of guilt” (AOAT 3 IV.50’f.);³⁴ “They burn two birds for offense and sin, and they burn a lamb for [. . .]” (KBo V 1.2–3).³⁵ Milgrom observes, “The function of the burnt offering as exemplified by the Hittite sources, cited above, is clearly propitiatory and expiatory (for ‘wrath,’ ‘guilt,’ ‘offense,’ ‘sin’).”³⁶ The burnt offering is also understood in expiatory terms by the Qumran sectarians (11QT 27:4) and the Rabbis (t. Menah 10:2; Sipra, Nedaba 4:8; Midr. Tanḥ B 3:9a; Midr. Lev. Rab. 7:3, 11). Several biblical texts mentioning burnt offerings share this underlying logic of expiation (e.g., Judg 13:23; 20:26; 2 Kgs 3:27; 5:17).

David aims at an efficacious burnt offering, one that will make expiation and avert the pestilence. In the Holiness Code, the rules governing an animal to be sacrificed differ according to the nature of the sacrifice.

Lev 22:17–25 prohibits blemished animals of various kinds from being offered as votive, free-will, and thanksgiving offerings. Verse 23 permits an ox or sheep with one limb longer or shorter than the others to be presented as a free-will offering but not as a votive offering.³⁷ The distinction is striking since the code has just used asymmetry of limbs to disqualify temple personnel from involvement in any kind of sacrifice (Lev 21:16–23). Why does the Holiness Code permit animals with asymmetrical limbs to be used for one kind of sacrifice but not another? Jacob Milgrom, following Isaac Abravanel, suggests that a concession is made for free-will offerings because they are spontaneous and as such demand the use of the animal most readily available.³⁸ To be sure, the authors of 2 Sam 24 betray no knowledge of the complex rules governing sacrifice in the Holiness Code. But 2 Sam 24 evidently shares with the Holiness Code a belief that certain conditions must be met in order for a sacrifice to be efficacious. David must be particularly scrupulous in order to ensure the effectiveness of his sacrifice.

The narrative logic of 2 Sam 24 is thus driven by the conceptual connections between census, pestilence, and expiation. David's count of military men of fighting age triggers an outbreak from the divine world. He offers an expiatory sacrifice, a burnt offering. The sacrifice is accepted by Yahweh and the pestilence is checked. To effectively safeguard his own life, which is in peril as the pestilence approaches Jerusalem, David's expiatory sacrifice would best come from him. He cannot offer sacrifice gratis and be sure that Yahweh would accept the payment as covering him. Personal responsibility for expiatory payment associated with census is quite clear in Exod 30:12: "When you take a census of the Israelite people according to their enrollment, each shall pay Yahweh a ransom for himself on being enrolled, that no plague may come upon them through their being enrolled." In an earlier episode in 1 Sam 6, the logic of payment is also made explicit as the Philistines seek relief from the pestilence inflicted upon them by Yahweh: "If you are going to send the Ark of the God of Israel away, do not send it away empty; but you must return a guilt offering to him. Then you will be healed, and he will make himself known to you; otherwise his hand will not turn away from you" (1 Sam 6:3). If the Philistines are to be spared, they must pay. Within the narrative world of 2 Sam 24 also, David pays for the expiatory burnt offering himself to ensure that Yahweh's pestilence-filled hand will turn away from him.

But this underlying logic of expiation only explains David's purchase of Araunah's oxen. The logic of expiatory payment to avoid pestilence in

Exod 30:11–16 and 1 Sam 6:1–16 does not depend on land purchase. Indeed, within the larger narrative arc of Samuel, Yahweh’s ark is already housed in Jerusalem and would have provided a suitable location for an expiatory sacrifice to Yahweh (2 Sam 6). Why, then, does the narrative require David to purchase Araunah’s land and build an altar on it? To arrive at an answer to this central question, we must look at the nature of royal power over land in the biblical world.

Limited Royal Power over Land in the Biblical World

Several texts treating royal power over land in the ancient Near East set David’s purchase of Araunah’s land in context.³⁹ The legal concepts underpinning these land transfer texts are in turn best understood within the larger conceptual framework for land rights proposed by Max Gluckman.⁴⁰ Gluckman explicated the multi-referential concept “ownership” in terms of rights and responsibilities. Within the framework he developed, property ownership is understood as the right of an individual or group to use land in specific ways. Such rights might exclude others from using that land in similar or different ways. Or, depending on context, others might have the right to use the same land in similar or different ways. In other words, “several groups of persons may hold different kinds of rights in the same piece of land.”⁴¹ Gluckman developed a taxonomy for such rights that distinguished between rights of administration and rights of production and he showed how they are nested in a hierarchy. He termed these “estates of administration” and “estates of production” since they relate to social and political status. Gluckman developed this generalized framework for understanding land rights on the basis of a broad evidentiary base, including his own fieldwork among the Lozi of Zambia.⁴² His observations on land rights among the Lozi are not directly analogous to the systems of land tenure in the ancient Near East.⁴³ But his method of explicating ownership in terms of rights and responsibilities, his observation that different parties might enjoy different kinds of rights in the same piece of land, and his realization that such rights are nested in a hierarchy, provides a productive framework for examining land rights in biblical and other ancient Near Eastern settings.⁴⁴

Three biblical narratives in particular shed light on the nature of royal administration of land in Iron Age Israel and Judah. According to 1 Kgs

21, Naboth, a native, free Israelite from Jezreel (v. 1), owned a vineyard that was adjacent to the home of King Ahab of Israel in Jezreel.⁴⁵ Ahab sought to purchase the vineyard for use as a vegetable garden and offered better agricultural land in exchange, or cash if Naboth should prefer it. Naboth refused. By invoking Yahweh's name in his refusal he pronounced what amounted to a conditional self curse, "Yahweh forbid that I (תִּלְיָה לִי מִיְהוָה) sell you my ancestral inheritance!" (v. 3).⁴⁶ This imprecation indicates the finality of his decision—there is no possibility of changing his mind once Yahweh has been invoked. For Naboth, the land was not a mere commodity to be traded; it held special significance as his family inheritance. The narrator deftly describes Ahab's response to the imprecation by noting that he returned home sullen and vexed, lay down on his couch, and refused to eat. Within the narrative logic of the story, Ahab's sulking suggests that although he was king he had no power to seize Naboth's land at will. But Ahab's wife Jezebel understood how land could be taken. She arranged for Naboth's execution on the trumped-up charge of treason and blasphemy.⁴⁷ Having been convicted of crimes against God and king, Naboth forfeited his rights in land and his ancestral property reverted to the administrative control of the crown. Ahab was then free to take private possession of the vineyard. The narrative thus indicates both the legal limitations of royal administrative control of land and how monarchs might circumvent the law through abuse of power.

The biblical portrayal of the hereditary lands of Saul share similar assumptions about the limitations of royal administrative power over land in Iron Age Israel and Judah. Based on 2 Sam 4:4; 9; 16:1-4; 19:24-30, I reconstruct the history of rights in Saul's hereditary lands as follows.⁴⁸ Following the death of Saul and his son Jonathan, no heir was found for Saul's household and his lands reverted up the administrative hierarchy to David in his role as king. Although this reversion is not recorded, it is implied by the promise of David in 2 Sam 9:7 to "return" (*שוב, Hiphil) the lands of Saul; David will return what had previously reverted to his administrative control. When David later discovered that Jonathan's son Meribaal was indeed alive and had become a member of Machir's household (2 Sam 9:4), he restored Saul's lands to Meribaal, their rightful heir (2 Sam 9:9). Sometime afterward, while David was fleeing from a revolt against him, Ziba, an old servant of Saul's household, reported to David that Meribaal had committed treason against him. Believing the charge of treason, David exerted his administrative rights in Saul's hereditary lands and assigned them to Ziba as a reward for his loyalty (2 Sam 16:4). Finally,

David discovered that Meribaal had in fact been loyal to him—his unkempt hair and nails indicating an extended state of mourning in David’s absence (2 Sam 19:25). This new evidence placed David in a difficult legal situation. It was now clear that he had hastily reached a verdict. In ancient Near Eastern law, judges who reversed their decisions were liable to be removed from office on suspicion of corruption or incompetence (e.g., LH §5). While judicial ousting is unlikely for the king himself, this incident would have brought David’s image as a just king into question. Furthermore, within the narrative world of the text, David sought to make allies on his return to Jerusalem rather than to create new enemies out of disgruntled legal claimants—compare my discussion of royal power and judicial administration in Chapter 4. He offered a decision designed to appease both parties while keeping his impartiality as judge intact—Saul’s hereditary lands should be split between Meribaal and Ziba (2 Sam 19:30). Meribaal, however, was uninterested in the deal and renounced his rights to the land (2 Sam 19:31). Meribaal, it seems, had more use for David’s loyalty than land adjacent to his denouncer. The land then remained in Ziba’s possession.

A third biblical narrative also portrays royal administrative control of land. According to 2 Kgs 8:1–6, Elisha warned the woman whose son he had previously revived of a seven-year famine to come upon Israel. She escaped with her household to Philistine territory and returned home after seven years. On her return, she took a legal claim (lit. “cried out,” *צעק*) to the king concerning her house and field. He appointed a royal official to restore (Hiphil of *שוב*) these, and the produce yielded by the field during her absence. The text does not provide sufficient detail to reconstruct with certainty the full legal scenario here: in her absence, had her field been claimed by some other private party? Was it being cultivated by the royal household? Or was it in disuse? At a minimum, however, her approach to the king suggests that the crown had ultimate administrative control of abandoned lands.

In so far as the legal concepts contained in 2 Sam 4:4; 9; 16:1–4; 19:24–30; 1 Kgs 21; 2 Kgs 8:1–6 are not explained to the reader, these texts, scattered across several chapters in the books of Samuel and Kings, assume that their ancient audience shared the view of the legal world envisioned by the text. In particular, Samuel–Kings assumes three legal situations that would permit privately held land to revert to the crown’s administrative control. First, land reverted to the king following the death of a landowner with no heir (2 Sam 9). Second, land reverted to the king following treason

by a landowner (1 Kgs 21; 2 Sam 16:1–4). Third, land reverted to the king following abandonment by a landowner (2 Kgs 8:1–6). The king's administrative powers over land did not give him the right to seize land at will for direct use (1 Kgs 21:4). Rather, land only reverted to his control in clearly defined situations.

One further biblical narrative, Gen 23, does not feature royal administration of land but is analogous to the biblical texts just discussed in so far as it depicts administrative rights held communally by the town, which was a collective segmentary political unit as I show in Chapter 4.⁴⁹ Following the death of Sarah, her husband Abraham, living as a foreigner among the Hittites, sought to purchase the cave of Machpelah to bury her there (Gen 23). Abraham knew whose land he wished to purchase but did not initially approach the landowner, Ephron. Instead he spoke directly to the Bnei Het and asked them to speak to Ephron, who was already present in the scene (Gen 23:3–10). Abraham desired permanent access to the land for himself and his heirs. Evidently, only the collective political body known as the Bnei Het held sufficient administrative rights in land to securely transfer it to an outsider. This political body is defined as “all those entering the gate of his town” (Gen 23:10, 18) but in so far as the whole town is unlikely to have been present at the negotiations, the Bnei Het were likely some subset of the town who represented the entirety of the town as a political unit. They function in the narrative with administrative power over land like that wielded by David and Ahab in the biblical narratives discussed above. Relevant to my thesis here is the observation that although the Bnei Het are keen to satisfy Abraham's desire for land (Gen 23:6), they do not seize Ephron's land and hand it over to him. Rather, Ephron as holder of productive rights in the land must agree to the sale of the property. This principle is implicit in their declaration, “none of us will withhold his burial place from you” (Gen 23:6). To judge by this statement, the individual landowner's consent was required for the land's sale. The administrative body acts with diplomacy so as to protect the rights of individual landowners while also acceding to the request of their powerful guest, Abraham. The narrative thus comports with the broader picture outlined above of the limited administrative power over land held by society's leadership.

Such clearly defined, limited administrative rights in land are traceable in legal and administrative texts from other ancient Near Eastern societies, with whom Israel and Judah shared a common legal heritage.⁵⁰ Daniel Oden has recently examined several cases of purported administrative

confiscation of land in the ancient Near East.⁵¹ In each case he finds clear justification for the confiscation, such as an offense committed against king or god. I cite here but two examples to illustrate the limitations of royal administrative control of land in other ancient Near Eastern settings. Consider a legal claim brought against a confiscated estate in fifteenth-century Alalakh in the Northern Levant. The case and its judgment are tersely described in AT 17:

Legal decision by King Niqmepa: (1) Seal of Niqmepa. (Impression of seal inscribed with name of his father Idrimi follows) (2) Šatuwa son of Suwa of Luba (3–4) has made a payment to Apra for his daughter (5) and according to the decree of Aleppo (6) has brought a gift. (7–8) Apra has turned into an evildoer (9) and for his crime has been executed. (10). Therefore his property has been confiscated by (lit. “entered into”) (11) the palace. Šatuwa has come and received what is his (13), namely, 6 talents of copper (14) and 2 bronze daggers. (15) Therefore from this day (16) Niqmepa has satisfied Šatuwa. (17) In future . . . (18) Šatuwa will (bring no further claims). 7 witnesses.⁵²

In the background to the text is the concept of betrothal, which formed one stage in the ancient Near Eastern marriage process.⁵³ Betrothal was a contract established between a man and his future wife’s father. It involved payment of a bride price by the groom to his future father-in-law and it obligated the father to give his daughter in marriage to the groom in due course. The contract was legally binding but was not the marriage proper, which would be completed at a later time. At some time prior to the writing of our text, AT 17, Šatuwa had paid a bride price to Apra, establishing a betrothal contract between the men. For unspecified reasons, Šatuwa decided not to complete his marriage to Apra’s daughter. Šatuwa now wished to recover the bride price previously paid. In the interim, Apra had become a criminal (*bêl ma-ši-ik-ti*) and as such had his entire estate confiscated by the crown. Šatuwa thus brought the legal claim against Apra’s estate to the king, who paid him six talents of copper and two bronze daggers out of the confiscated estate. The case presumes that private estates could be confiscated by the crown. But this dense legal document mentions only the most essential details. Apra’s status as a criminal is invoked in order to make clear the legal means through which his estate was seized. The implication is that the crown could not simply confiscate land at will.⁵⁴ If that were

the case, there would be no need to explain the legal basis of the seizure. The tablet thus conforms to the ancient Near Eastern legal pattern I have been outlining, in which land could only revert back up the administrative hierarchy with good cause.

As a second example of limited ancient Near Eastern administrative control of land, consider the history of ownership of the threshing floor of 'Ili-milku son of 'Ili-ba'lu, from late Bronze Age Ugarit. The sale of the threshing floor is recorded in a tablet written in Akkadian, RS 16.145=PRU III 169:

Dynastic seal.

From this day on

Yaqaru, king of Ugarit,

has given a threshing floor/empty lot : *tamgi* belonging to 'Ili-milku son of 'Ili-ba'lu, the criminal, to 'Ili-mhr son of Talmiyānu forever.

No one shall take it (from him).

And 'Ili-mhr has “lifted” and given it to 'Abdiršappa son of Sasiyānu for two hundred (shekels of) refined silver.

No one shall take it from 'Abdiršappa and from his sons.

No one shall file a claim against him.

Witness: 'Upsānu the *sākinu*, who produced the royal seal.⁵⁵

The text describes two land transfers, which evidently took place on the same day. The contract proper—the transaction with clearly stated, and in this case already completed, legally binding obligations on both parties—was made between 'Abdiršappa and 'Ili-mhr. The former paid two hundred shekels of silver, while the latter transferred ownership of a threshing floor (*maškanu*). To remove any doubt of fraud surrounding the contract itself, the text records how 'Ili-mhr came into possession of land that had originally belonged to 'Ili-milku. Yaqaru, king of Ugarit, confiscated the threshing floor of 'Ili-milku because of his status as a “criminal” (*ibē-el arni*) and reassigned it straightway to 'Ili-mhr. As with AT 17 discussed above, RS 16.145 assumes that the king could confiscate land, but only with good cause.

The limitations of administrative rights in land are traceable in several other ancient Near East contexts. Reversion of land up the administrative hierarchy with good cause is depicted in texts from Emar (RE 16,⁵⁶ RE 34,⁵⁷ Emar 144,⁵⁸ Emar 197⁵⁹), Ekalte (Ekalte 2⁶⁰), Alalakh (AT 17⁶¹), Ugarit (RS

16.249⁶²), Assur (*Middle Assyrian Laws* B ii 22–26⁶³), and Babylon (contract from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II⁶⁴).⁶⁵ The Law Code of Hammurabi makes provisions for administrative disposal of land abandoned by a soldier (§30–31).⁶⁶ To judge by these texts, only three situations provided legal cause for reversion of lands up the administrative hierarchy: the death of a landowner with no heir; a serious crime committed by the landowner, namely a crime against king or god; or abandonment.

This larger picture of administrative control of land in the ancient Near East provides a further answer to our question: Why does David purchase Araunah's land? David buys the threshing floor because he has no legal basis for seizing it despite the dire situation he faces. The narrative makes clear that Araunah is the threshing floor's legal owner. Gad—in a verse that, as noted above, is likely a later interpolation—refers to the land in question with a construct noun phrase that expresses ownership, “the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite” (v. 18). David acknowledges Araunah's rights in land with his very first words to him, “To purchase from you the threshing floor.” Araunah has not died leaving no heir. There is no indication that he has committed any crime against king nor god. In fact, the narrative presents Araunah as loyally acknowledging David's position as king. Araunah goes out to meet David (v. 20), he puts his face to the ground before him (v. 20), and he addresses him with deferential language “my lord, the king,” (v. 21, 22; cf. v. 23) and “your servant” (v. 21). And Araunah has not abandoned his land. In what may have been the original form of Hebrew text, he was actively threshing wheat at the site when David arrived (4QSam^a; cf. 1 Chr 21:20–21).⁶⁷ Regardless, the entire scene is premised on his presence at the land in question. In light of all of this, even though Araunah is a foreigner, David has no legal right to seize his property. David seeks to purchase the land through legal means.

But once more this answer is not entirely satisfying. Scholars compare the oral transaction between David and Araunah to Abraham's negotiations with the Bnei Het and Ephron in Gen 23, discussed above.⁶⁸ In that narrative, the seller, Ephron, also initially offers the land for free and then accepts its full purchase price in silver at the insistence of the purchaser, Abraham. There, however, Abraham's motive in purchasing the land is clear within the narrative world itself—he and his heirs require access to Sarah's burial site in perpetuity.⁶⁹ But in our text, David's motive is unclear. Why should he need to own the land in order to perform rituals on it? Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses all readily build altars following revelations from Yahweh on lands they do not own (Gen 12:7; 26:25; 35:1–3; Exod 17:15).

And in the book of Samuel itself, as I have already noted, a sacrifice of cattle on hand, using their gear for wood, is offered in the field of Joshua near Beth-Shemesh without any need to transfer property (1 Sam 6:14–15). So why does David purchase land in order to make a sacrifice? Ultimately, to find a compelling answer to our guiding question, I think we must step outside the world depicted within the story and consider the world of the text's authors and audience. Expiatory sacrifice does not require David's ownership of land, but the book of Samuel's portrait of him as a good king does.⁷⁰ David's purchase of Araunah's land and his establishment of an altar to Yahweh fit a broader pattern of ancient Near Eastern royal dedication of land to the gods. The account in 2 Sam 24 draws on this aspect of ancient Near Eastern royal ideology as it offers its audience a picture of David as a pious king.

Royal Dedication of Land to the Gods

Several texts from the ancient Near East depict royal dedication of land to the gods.⁷¹ These note the king's efforts to protect dedicated land against legal claims and they emphasize the king's personal devotion to the gods, who in turn preserve his life. Setting aside the formal classification of these sources according to genre, date, and language, they describe two types of land dedication, which are at times found together.⁷² First, ancient Near Eastern kings sometimes granted administrative control over arable land to particular temples. Such land dedication involved the transfer of administrative rights in land from the king to the god, i.e., to the god's temple and its governing structure. As a result, those actually working the land—those with productive rights in the land—owed regular offerings to the temple in lieu of taxes formerly paid to the king. Second, ancient Near Eastern kings sometimes donated land for direct use, for example for the construction of temples or open-air cultic monuments. I classify this second type as a transfer of productive rights in land from the king to the god. The rhetorical force of texts describing both types of land dedication bring aspects of 2 Sam 24 into focus. They clarify what the narrative aims at when it insists that David purchased Araunah's land and built an altar on it.

As an example of the first type of land dedication, which involved the transfer of administrative control of land from the king to the god, consider a land grant by Adad-nirari III, c. 811–783, to Assur (SAA 12 1).⁷³

According to lines 3–4 of the tablet, “The towns, fields, buildings, orchards and people of [Šamaš-naš]ir, eunuch of Adad-nerari (III), king of Assyria, treasurer of Aššur, belonging to his eunuchship—Adad-nerari (III), king of Assyria, for the pres[ervation of] his [life] has exempted them and gi[ven] them to Aššur, his lord.”⁷⁴ This legal transfer can be analyzed in terms of a hierarchy of rights in land. In so far as towns generally had residents working the surrounding land, Šamaš-našir’s rights in land here are best regarded as administrative control, with the towns’ residents enjoying productive use of the same land and providing some form of tax or rent to Šamaš-našir, who in turn provided some form of tax to the crown. To judge by the language of the text, the transferred lands were already under the administrative control of Šamaš-našir by virtue of his office and he retained control of them.⁷⁵ The legal transfer depicted here occurred higher up the administrative hierarchy. By exempting these lands from royal taxation and giving them to Assur, Adad-nirari in effect transferred administrative control of this property from himself to Assur.⁷⁶ Though badly preserved, lines 5–22, r. 1–r. 5 describe the transfer of other administrative rights in land held by several royal functionaries to Assur. Here also, productive rights in the same land appear to have remained with town residents who actually farmed the town’s lands. The land transfer took place higher up the administrative hierarchy, with taxes to the king being replaced by taxes to the god.

Two features of the text are particularly relevant to my argument here. First, in legally transferring land to the gods the king takes concrete steps to protect that land against future legal claims. The seals at the top of the document, the careful delineation of the properties involved, the recording of the history of their administrative management, the use of legal language throughout, and the notice of the date on which the tablet was written all serve as proof of the legal validity of the transfer. The closing section of the tablet emphasizes the permanent nature of this legal transfer (ln. r.6–11). Adad-nirari pronounces a conditional curse upon anyone who might try to remove these lands from Assur’s administrative control and a conditional blessing on anyone who adds to Assur’s lands (ln. r.6–8). He makes clear that Assur’s administrative rights in these lands could never be revoked: “[He shall not give these] towns, fields, houses and orchards [to any other governor], he shall give them (only) [to] the governor of the temple of Aššur” (ln. r.9–10).⁷⁷ And the king promises to personally enforce the temple’s legal rights to land by punishing anyone who violates them and returning the lands to Assur’s temple (ln. r.10–13).

Second, the document depicts the relationship between the king and the god in terms that echo the mutual obligations of a legal contract. The text emphasizes the king's personal role in the transaction. Although third-person grammatical forms typically designate the legal parties involved in ancient Near Eastern transaction records, and in land transfer texts in particular, this tablet deploys striking first-person forms in lines 5–22, r.1–4. “I have taken” provides a structuring refrain in ln. 5, 10, 12—presumably with other occurrences in the broken sections of the tablet—that highlights the king's personal piety in dedicating land to the gods. There is no room for doubt about his motivation in being so personally involved. The king devotes land to the god for “the preservation of his life.” The text itself is a legal contract, a land transfer. The document opens with the seal of Aššur and Ninurta, rather than the customary seals of mortals, suggesting that the gods themselves were somehow regarded as legal parties to the transactions described. Typically, land sale contracts involved payment of silver in exchange for land. The god does not pay the king in silver for the land transferred here, but the logic of mutual obligations inherent in a legal contract still structures the relationship between the legal parties involved in this transaction. The king dedicated land to Assur, Assur in turn will preserve his life. In presenting to the public this special relationship of mutual obligation between god and king, the tablet served to enhance the king's legitimacy in the eyes of his subjects. This display of the king's piety assures the populace that the god will preserve the king's life.

As a second example of royal dedication of land to the gods, consider a land transfer by Assurbanipal described in SAA 12 90. According to the text, the official Il-yabi had previously dedicated “a village in its entirety” to “Sin residing in Elumu,” i.e., to the temple of the god Sin in Elumu (ln. 6–8). Il-yabi, the text claims, recorded the dedication on a stele (ln. 9, cf. ln. 14). In SAA 12 90, Assurbanipal accuses Il-yabi of changing his mind, removing the stele, and taking the village back for himself (ln. 10–11). The king boasts of intervening in this legal fraud so as to restore the village to Sin and his temple. I take SAA 12 90 as clear evidence of administrative control of land being transferred to Sin's temple in Elumu. Precisely how the lands came to be transferred, however, remains less clear. By Assurbanipal's own admission, he fashioned a new stele recording the dedication (ln. 16). The text's claim that Il-yabi had originally donated the lands for the preservation of the life of the king (ln. 9) raise doubts in my mind about the purported original dedication. Nowhere in SAA 12 90 is Il-yabi's voice heard. Rather, the account is biased in presenting Assurbanipal as just and pious.

Events may have proceeded as summarized by the king; but the charges here may be trumped up—as they were in 1 Kgs 21, discussed above. In either case, however, the text demonstrates how the literary motif of royal dedication of land to the gods circulated in connection with other themes central to royal ideology—the king establishes justice in the land; the king is pious; the king is chosen by the gods. Once more, the king takes steps to preserve the transferred land from future legal claims. The invocation of documentary evidence of the land’s prior dedication, the mention of Sin as a divine witness to the treachery, a tidy narrative about the history of the land’s administrative control, and the new legal tablet itself, all serve to establish the legality of Assurbanipal’s dedication of land to Sin. Once more, although the god does not pay for the land in silver, the notion of mutual obligations in a contractual relationship between god and king lies in the background to the text. Assurbanipal thus asks, “O Sin, exalted lord of the gods, [. . .], [accept] this village, fields and orchards joyfully [. . . and] give me a life of long days, . . . [. . .]; establish for me we[llbeing, joy, . . .] by the command of your pure mouth. May [my] dynasty renew itself forever [. . .]. May Nikkal, your beloved spouse, [look upon my] deeds [with favour]” (ln. 20–21, r. 1–r. 4).⁷⁸

A second attested type of land dedication involved the king’s transfer of land to the god for direct cultic use, as for example when a temple, altar, or cultic monument was built by the king.⁷⁹ Although the structure of such transfers differs from the first type of land dedication discussed above, descriptions of this second type of land transfer likewise emphasize the steps taken by the king to protect the land from legal claims and the implied contractual relationship between god and king. As an example of this second type of land dedication, consider Sargon II’s construction of temples in his newly founded capital, Dur-Sharrukin.⁸⁰ As I note in Chapter 1, the literary pattern governing the depiction of Mesopotamian royal construction projects is well known and the texts describing Sargon’s new capital draw on standard elements of that pattern.⁸¹ They also emphasize Sargon’s scrupulous discharge of his obligations to the gods with the result that they will preserve his life.⁸² His Display Inscription on the walls of the palace at Dur-Sharrukin boasts that he built brilliant temples and artistic shrines for Ea, Sin, Shamash, Nabu, Adad, Urta, and their consorts. According to the Display Inscription, these temples and shrines and the sacrifices and prayers offered to the gods in them were undertaken for “preservation of life, length of days, and stability of rule.”⁸³ Sargon asks, “At [Aššur’s] command, may the prince, their builder, reach and attain to old age (and abundant)

prosperity.”⁸⁴ The legal concept of contract provides the text’s guiding logic here. Sargon dedicated land to the gods and they, in turn, could be expected to preserve his life. Elsewhere, he acknowledged divine faithfulness in this relationship of mutual obligation, “The gods who dwell in heaven and earth, and in that city, listened with favor to my word, and granted me the eternal boon of building that city and growing old in its midst.”⁸⁵

The descriptions of the project are careful to note the legality of the land dedication. The land on which Sargon wished to found his new capital was not unclaimed and wild. Rather, a small agricultural settlement named Maganuba was already located there. Sargon makes clear that he purchased the land from the town’s residents:

In accordance with the name which the great gods have given me,—to maintain justice and right, to give guidance to those who are not strong, not to injure the weak,—the price of the fields of that town I paid back to their owners according to the record of the purchase documents, in silver and copper, and to avoid wrong, I gave to those who did not want to (take) silver for their fields, field for field, in locations over against the old.⁸⁶

As we might expect from our discussion above, although as king Sargon might have enjoyed rights akin to territoriality in all lands, land available to him for direct control was rather more limited. If he seized land from the residents of Maganuba without good cause, he would tarnish his image as a just king. The “tablets of purchase” are invoked as proof of the legal basis of Sargon’s rights to these lands. The land on which he builds shrines and temples for the gods are free of all legal claims.

As a final example of royal dedication of land to the gods, consider the *Apology of Hattusili III*, king of Hatti c. 1267–1240 BCE.⁸⁷ Scholars have compared the text, likely composed toward the end of Hattusili’s reign, to the story of David in the book of Samuel in so far as both justify the rise to power of an outsider to the throne.⁸⁸ Here I wish to note Hattusili’s dedication of land to Ishtar, which may be the main subject of the document.⁸⁹ According to the text, Armatarḫunta, a blood relative of Hattusili, had opposed Hattusili (*Apology* §4), including bringing a legal case against him (*Apology* §10a).⁹⁰ Hattusili’s brother, who was then on the throne, decided in favor of Hattusili and handed Armatarḫunta’s lands over to Hattusili (*Apology* §10a). The *Apology* emphasizes Hattusili’s benevolence toward his legal opponent by noting that he returned half of Armatarḫunta’s estate

(*Apology* §10a)—compare David’s proposal to split the land between Ziba and Meribaal (2 Sam 19:30), discussed above. After his accession to the throne, Hattusili dedicated this previously confiscated property to Ishtar:

How often had Ištar, the Lady, taken me! She had installed me on “the high place,” into kingship over Ḫatti Land! I, then, gave Ištar, My Lady, the property of Armatarḫunta: I withdrew it and handed it over. What had been (there) formerly, that I handed over to her, and what I had had, that too I handed over. I withdrew it (all) and handed it over to the goddess. The property of Armatarḫunta which I gave to her and whatever settlements were Armatarḫunta’s, behind every single cult monument they will erect her (statue) and they will pour a vessel. (For) Ištar (is) my goddess and they will worship her as Ištar the High. The mausoleum which I made myself, I handed it over to the goddess, (and) I handed over to you in subservience my son Tuthaliya as well. Let Tuthaliya, my son, administer the house of Ištar! I (am) the servant of the goddess, let him be servant of the goddess as well! The property which I gave the goddess, let everyone strive and strain(?) for the goddess.⁹¹

To judge by the mention of cult monuments, statues of Ishtar erected behind them, and the pouring of vessels to her, at least some of the land dedicated to Ishtar was used directly for cultic functions.⁹² Hattusili also gave Ishtar settlements that had been under the administrative control of Armatarḫunta. It appears that individual households continued to dwell there and to make their living off the surrounding land even after Ishtar’s temple assumed administrative control of their land. Hattusili’s grant of land to Ishtar thus involved both types of land dedication discussed above: a transfer of land for direct use and a transfer of land for administrative control. As with the land dedication texts discussed above, the *Apology* is careful to recount the legal history of the property so as to safeguard the god’s legal rights in the dedicated land.⁹³ Once more, the text is rooted in the mutual obligations of a contractual relationship: Ishtar safeguarded Hattusili and Hattusili dedicated land to her.

David’s Dedication of Land to Yahweh

David’s purchase of Araunah’s land and his construction of an altar on it are profitably understood against the background of these ancient Near

Eastern depictions of royal dedication of land to the gods. Although a shared conception of census, pestilence, and expiatory sacrifice unifies 2 Sam 24, its third section emphasizes land and not merely expiatory sacrifice. When the scene opens in v. 20, Araunah notices David's approach, goes out to meet him, and with deferential gestures and language inquires about the purpose of his visit. David responds—his first words to Araunah—by mentioning Araunah's land and the altar to be constructed on it, but he says nothing about the expiatory sacrifice itself: "To buy from you the threshing floor in order to build an altar to Yahweh that the plague may be checked" (v. 21b). David's emphasis on land and altar echoes the command of Gad to him in v. 18, "Go erect to Yahweh an altar on the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite"—even the ancient prophetic reworking of the story in v. 18 understood the narrative in terms of land and altar rather than a single expiatory sacrifice. Araunah's reply to this news from David is ambiguous. In continuing to use deferential language he appears to accede to David's request. But the object of the verb Araunah uses is left unspecified: "Let him take and let my lord the king offer up what is good in his eyes (וַיִּקַּח וַיַּעֲלֶה אֲדָנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינָיו)" (v. 22).⁹⁴ Is Araunah giving David permission to take the land previously requested, or is he suggesting that David instead take and sacrifice particular animals on hand? Indeed, Araunah draws David's attention to the cattle and firewood immediately available: "See the cattle for the burnt offering and the threshing boards and the cattle gear for wood" (v. 22). David declines Araunah's offer and instead purchases both land and cattle for fifty shekels of silver (v. 24). The chapter's third scene, then, focuses on land transfer and not on an individual expiatory sacrifice. This focus on land in the narrative's third scene is best understood against the background of royal dedication of land to the gods discussed above.

By erecting an altar on the land he purchases from Araunah, David puts the land to direct cultic use—our second type of land dedication discussed above.⁹⁵ Although several biblical characters build (בנה*) altars to Yahweh, David is the only biblical character to erect (קום*, Hiphil) one to him.⁹⁶ Only two other characters erect altars to any deity—Ahab erected one to Baal (1 Kgs 16:32) and Manasseh erected more than one to Baal (2 Kgs 21:3//2 Chr 33:3). Biblical historiography also presents Solomon (1 Kgs 9:25) and Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:10–16) as building altars to Yahweh—with the use of בנה*. In erecting an altar on Araunah's land, David puts the land to direct cultic use and conforms to this biblical pattern of monarchs who construct altars to their gods.

The biblical description of David's purchase of Araunah's land shares two key features with the ancient Near Eastern land dedication texts described above. First, the narrative recounts the legal history of the land so as to protect it from future legal claims.⁹⁷ The tablets of purchase invoked by Sargon, the legal verdict recounted by Hattusili III, and the oral contract between David and Araunah described in 2 Sam 24 serve the same rhetorical purpose in their respective settings. The texts depicting the first type of land transfer discussed above are themselves legal contracts and could serve as documentary evidence should a legal claim ever be brought. Despite the differences in genre between these several texts, they share an emphasis on the king's efforts to protect land dedicated to the gods from legal claims. By invoking oral land transfers or their written records, these texts present the king as meticulously just in his relations with his subjects. They also establish the legal validity of the king's transfer of land to the gods. The altars, shrines, and temples of the gods on dedicated land are protected from legal encroachment in perpetuity. As such, these texts also present the king as scrupulously pious in his dealings with the gods. By describing David's purchase of Araunah's land, 2 Sam 24 presents David as scrupulously just in his dealings with Araunah and Yahweh.

Second Sam 24 shares with the ancient Near Eastern land dedication texts described above a second key feature: the notion of mutual obligation between king and god. The texts have as their background the notion of legal contract. David purchases land, builds an altar on it, and offers sacrifice. Yahweh, in turn, will preserve the life of the people, and David's life in particular.⁹⁸ To be sure, the expiatory sacrifices themselves play a decisive role in averting the plague (v. 25). But they are enabled and made permanent here by David's establishment of an altar on land he has been careful to protect against legal claims. Without mentioning the expiatory sacrifice, David tells Araunah that he has come to build an altar to Yahweh, "So that the plague against the people will be checked (וְתִשְׁעַר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ מֵעַל הָעָם)" (v. 21).⁹⁹ The narrative understands the land and altar to play a role in Yahweh's preservation of Israel and his preservation of David's life in particular.

To sum up, then: Why does David purchase Araunah's land? The logic of census, pestilence, and expiatory sacrifice guiding the chapter does not require David to purchase Araunah's land, but the chapter's portrayal of David as an ideal ancient Near Eastern king does. The depiction of David in the third scene of 2 Sam 24 conforms to a broader pattern of spatial power found also within the ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions discussed

above. The chapter presents David as a good king who personally secures land, protects it from legal claims, and sets it aside for direct cultic use. Because David scrupulously fulfills his obligations to Yahweh, Yahweh will in turn preserve his life.

Compared to the ancient Near Eastern land dedication texts described above, which are overwhelmingly positive in their presentation of the king, 2 Sam 24 offers a more ambiguous portrait of David. In its current form, the text presents David as being misled or incited (*סוֹת, v. 1) to take the census, suggesting that the census was a mistake and foreshadowing the destruction to come. Joab's objection to the census (v. 3) leaves the reader with an impression of David as a reckless ruler. David himself accepts culpability (vv. 10, 17). The chapter in its current form thus blames David for the pestilence that caused the deaths of 70,000 of his people. And yet, by drawing on aspects of ancient Near Eastern royal ideology, the chapter's third scene offers a more positive portrait of David. He emerges as scrupulous in his dealings with Araunah and with Yahweh.

The chapter thus conforms to a broader literary pattern in the book of Samuel in which David is presented both as flawed and as having a special relationship with Yahweh.¹⁰⁰ Although forming part of an appendix to the book of Samuel, the chapter thus relates to the book's larger claim about David's legitimate kingship.¹⁰¹ Proofs of his legitimacy include his prophetic anointing, his military successes, his royal marriage, his scrupulous dealings with Saul's family, and, in this final act attributed to him in Samuel, his purchase of land and construction of an altar to Yahweh.¹⁰² In claiming that David secured this land for cultic use the narrative portrays him as fulfilling an important duty of an ideal ancient Near Eastern king. In the next chapter, I consider the opposite possibility, how an ideal ancient Near Eastern king might also decommission space devoted to cultic use.

Jehu's Dung Heap

ON ROYAL DECOMMISSIONING OF RELIGIOUS SPACE

IN CHAPTER 2, I READ the story of David's purchase of Araunah's land in 2 Sam 24 in light of ancient Near Eastern royal administrative control of land in general, and royal dedication of land to the gods in particular. Second Sam 24 offers a positive assessment of David in keeping with one aspect of ancient Near Eastern royal ideology: good kings in the ancient Near East produced religious spaces dedicated to their gods. Religious spaces were a locus for both creative and destructive royal power. In this chapter, I turn to the latter. Second Kgs 10:18–28 presents Jehu, usurper of King Ahab of Israel, as deploying a spatial strategy as part of his rise to power. In a series of calculated acts, he decommissioned a religious space with particular political associations—the temple of Baal in Samaria—and made it a dung heap (מְחֻרְאָה). Scholars treat 2 Kgs 10:18–28 as part of a unified narrative portraying Jehu's coup, 2 Kgs 9–10.¹ This larger narrative's portrayal of key events in the days and weeks surrounding Ahab's death is in turn generally understood to come from a scribe close to the events themselves, perhaps even from an eyewitness. Taking the lead from Lauren Monroe's examination of Josiah's religious purge in 2 Kgs 23, I chart in this chapter the language of desecration in 2 Kgs 10:18–28.² The several acts of destruction described in the narrative were intended to render this religious space permanently defiled. They are better understood as decommissioning rituals rather than random violence. Furthermore, the decommissioning rituals described in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 were not invented out of whole cloth by Jehu nor by scribes who wrote the account. Rather, these rituals have specific resonances in biblical tradition. The scribes responsible for 2 Kgs

10:18–28 composed their account by drawing on ritual concepts known to us from several other biblical texts.

In this chapter, I observe a number of textual seams and repetitions in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 and I argue that the decommissioning rituals in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 divide neatly between those that bear resemblance to rituals found in Priestly biblical literature and those that bear resemblance to rituals found in Deuteronomistic biblical literature. The distinction between Priestly and Deuteronomistic material in the Hebrew Bible will be familiar to readers who are professional biblical scholars. For other readers, let me briefly explain this scholarly distinction. The biblical text was composed and edited over a millennium, with only the end result of that process being directly accessible to us. Scholars have offered hypothetical reconstructions of the Bible's editing that have varied widely. But two hypotheses have proved enormously robust. First, scholars have observed that several biblical texts with a distinct repetitive style share a concern for the special role played by priests, the rules governing ritual purity and sacrificial worship, and the genealogical and chronological ordering of cosmic and Israelite history. This material, interspersed throughout Genesis–Numbers and perhaps beyond, is widely regarded as being composed by a scribe or group of scribes called by biblical scholars the Priestly writer or Priestly school.³ Second, as I noted in Chapter 1, scholars have observed that several biblical texts share distinct language and a theological outlook similar to that of the book of Deuteronomy. These texts frame Israel's past and future in terms of obedience to Yahweh. They are widely regarded by scholars as coming from a Deuteronomistic editor, who both composed new material and arranged existing material around his themes, or else from several editors working in a Deuteronomistic style.⁴ These two hypotheses, of a Priestly writer or school and of a Deuteronomistic editor or school, have proven very robust within biblical studies, even as the several details of these hypotheses have been debated. I align my analysis of 2 Kgs 10:18–28 with the broad consensus among biblical scholars that these two streams of biblical tradition are distinguishable and have distinct conceptual outlooks.

In light of the evidence I present here—seams, repetitions, and linguistic and conceptual affinity to Priestly or Deuteronomistic tradition—I propose a new reconstruction of the editorial history of 2 Kgs 10:18–28. I uncover an earlier independent account of Jehu's destruction of a single temple of Baal, which has been revised by another scribe into a story about the national religious purge of Baalism.⁵ I refrain here from attributing these two editorial layers in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 to a Priestly writer or

Deuteronomistic editor—indeed, the terms may not be appropriate for the period in which the scribes worked. Nevertheless, these two layers are clearly distinguishable in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 and reflect different streams of biblical tradition. Attention to space and politically motivated attempts to shape its meaning thus allows a fresh appraisal of some of the earliest biblical historiography and of the history of ninth-century Israel.

The Literary History of 2 Kings 9:1–10:28

Second Kgs 10:18–28 forms a distinct episode within a larger narrative that exhibits a recognizable unity. This larger narrative, 2 Kgs 9:1–10:28, tells the sustained story of Jehu's overthrow of the house of Ahab in a series of vividly depicted scenes that catapult the reader into the midst of the action.⁶ The scenes are tightly woven together so that one follows directly on the other. The story thus unfolds in simple chronological sequence with flashbacks recalling prophetic judgment against Ahab and his household. Although no timeline is given, events are portrayed as though transpiring within mere days or weeks. In quick succession, Elisha's deputy anoints Jehu as king; Jehu kills Ahab's son Joram and Ahaziah, king of Judah; Jehu arranges for the murders of Jezebel, Ahab's entire family, and Ahaziah's kinsmen; and Jehu slaughters the servants of Baal and decommissions his temple. The breathless sequence leaves the reader with a palpable impression of Jehu's ferocity as he sweeps to power.⁷ The themes of violence and prophetic fulfillment unite the episodes into a narrative whole that opposes Yahweh and Jehu to Baal and the house of Ahab. Several keywords repeat and also contribute to the sense of narrative unity—for example, *קרא*, *שלם*, *שגע*, *שלח*, *נבה*, and *דם*. ⁸ Some have even argued that the narrative possesses a symmetrical structure, which also gives the impression of unity.⁹ In turn, this unity has led some to regard 2 Kgs 9:1–10:28 as the product of a single scribe writing close to the events themselves.¹⁰

Yet, as several commentators have recognized, the narrative also shows evidence of editorial development. Although it returns frequently to the theme of violence, this theme receives uneven treatment. On the one hand, the carnage is framed as being divinely sanctioned: "You shall strike down the house of Ahab your master and I will avenge the blood of my servants the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of Yahweh, from the hand of Jezebel" (9:7).¹¹ On the other, Jehu's violence spills over in unauthorized ways against the house of David (9:27–28; 10:12–14) and

against priests (10:11)—neither were mentioned in Yahweh's command to Jehu in 9:7. Yet Jehu is never rebuked for this.¹² The reader is left with the impression that the prophetic fiat that frames the whole was secondarily applied to an existing narrative. Indeed, the prophecy in 2 Kgs 9:7–10a begins with an awkward *weqatal* verb form that has no clear syntactical connection to its context and it contains language that bears a striking resemblance to other prophecies of dynastic judgment in Kings (1 Kgs 14:10–11; 16:4; 21:23–24).¹³

The theme of prophetic fulfillment likewise receives uneven treatment in the narrative. A prophecy is given by a prophet in 9:7–10a and its fulfillment is clearly described in the narrative that follows. Two further prophecies, otherwise unknown to the reader and containing details not mentioned in 9:7–10a, are referenced in flashbacks placed in the mouth of Jehu (9:25–26; 9:36–37). The structure of prophecy and fulfillment thus differs between the first oracle on the one hand, and the second and third on the other. There is also some tension between the content of these oracles of judgment. According to 9:7–10a, Yahweh acted to avenge the blood of his prophets whom Jezebel had killed, while according to 9:25–26, it was the blood of Naboth and his sons that required vengeance. Additionally, although 9:7–10a and 9:36–37 both take up the fate of Jezebel's corpse, they do so with different language and attribute pronouncement of judgment against her corpse to different prophets. Thus, the theme of prophecy and fulfillment also receives uneven treatment in the narrative of Jehu's coup.

The narrative coherence of 2 Kgs 9:1–10:28 is strained in further ways. Consider the question of Joram's health. Purportedly, Joram returned from the battle camp at Ramoth-Gilead to Jezreel because he had been injured in the battle with Aram (9:14–15; cf. 8:29). Insofar as Jehu and the other army commanders were still at Ramoth-Gilead when Jehu was acclaimed king (9:4), the narrative assumes that Jehu's coup follows quickly on Joram's departure. As such, Joram should not have had time to recover from any injury that was severe enough to warrant him leaving Ramoth-Gilead. In fact, a battle wound (מכה, 9:15) might be expected to lead to death (cf. 1 Kgs 22:35) and the text depicts Joram as lying prostrate because of the wound (שכב, 9:16). Yet, on being informed of Jehu's approach to Jezreel, and suspecting something to be amiss, Joram prepared his chariot and rode out of the safety of Jezreel's wall to meet Jehu on the open plain (9:21). These do not seem like the actions of a king too wounded to fight. Indeed, the historian would be justified in asking—if some slim thread connects the narrative to the history of ninth-century Israel—whether the narrative has

transferred credit for Joram's death from Hazael to Jehu in order to bolster the image of Jehu as Yahweh's agent of vengeance against the house of Ahab and Baal.¹⁴

Scholars generally account for this combination of unity and tension in 2 Kgs 9:1–10:28 by positing a substantial and unified pre-Deuteronomistic layer, editorial shaping by a Deuteronomistic hand—or at least by a hand concerned with assembling a much larger, perhaps Israelite, narrative—and small post-Deuteronomistic additions. As one might expect, scholarly reconstructions of these layers vary substantially. A complete appraisal of the several approaches to the editorial history of the larger narrative lies well beyond my aims here.¹⁵ Nevertheless, I mention a few examples to illustrate that scholarly reconstructions generally share one feature in common—the view that 10:18–28 is largely from a single scribal hand, with perhaps relatively minor additions, and that it forms part of a unified base layer spanning much of chapters 9–10.¹⁶ Cogan and Tadmor regard 9:1–6, 10b–28, 30–37; 10:1–27 as the core narrative, to which 9:7–10a has been added using stereotypical language also found in 1 Kgs 14:10–11; 16:4; 21:23–24—they avoid calling this language Deuteronomistic.¹⁷ For them, the only other addition to the narrative is 9:29, which is an isolated fragment. Hasegawa posits an original Jehu Narrative in 2 Kgs 9:1–6a, 6bβ, 6bδ, 10b–13, 14b–27ba, 27bβb, 30–35; 10:1–6a, 7–9, 12–17a, 18–19a, 20, 21aβb–25a, 28; Deuteronomistic editing in 9:6ba, 6bβa, 7a, 8–10a, 27bβa, 28, 36; 10:10–11, 17aβa, 19b, 21a, 25b–27; and later additions in 2 Kgs 9:7b, 14a, 29, 37; 10:6b.¹⁸ For Hasegawa, the original Jehu narrative was a royal historical story with apologetic intent and prophetic orientation that was likely composed no later than the early eighth century, when the house of Jehu was still in power.¹⁹ Indeed, Gary A. Rendsburg has shown that the narrative contains a density of linguistic features that suggest it was composed by an Israelian scribe, presumably before the events of 722 BCE.²⁰ Jonathan Miles Robker has proposed substantial Deuteronomistic editing in 9:4aβ; sections of 9:6; 9:7–10a, 14b–15a, 36; 10:10–11, 17b, 27a, and various glossed words or phrases found within 9:4, 16, 28–29, 32, 36; 10:1, 5, 6, 12, 26.²¹ For Robker, the story of Jehu's coup never existed as an independent document, but only as part of a larger narrative of Israel's history.²² This much longer eighth-century document was composed in the time of Jeroboam II and told the political history of the northern kingdom from the reign of Jeroboam I to the writer's own time.²³ Susanne Otto regards 2 Kgs 9:1–10:25a as an independent Jehu record and she finds evidence of Deuteronomistic revision in 10:25b–27, 28–31a.²⁴ These examples are

typical insofar as 10:18–28 is widely regarded as the product of a single scribal hand, perhaps with only minor additions, and as part of a larger story of Jehu's coup that included much of chapters 9 and 10. In this chapter, I question the unity of 2 Kgs 10:18–28 and posit that an independent account of Jehu's destruction of a temple of Baal was substantially revised when it was incorporated into the larger narrative of Jehu's rise.

Repetitions and Contradictions in 2 Kings 10:18–28

In my judgment, 2 Kgs 10:18–28 is not nearly as unified as the scholarly consensus has posited. It contains repetitions and contradictions that point to editorial development. I highlight here four points of tension in the narrative. First, the sequence of the movement of the characters through space makes little sense in the narrative as it currently stands. According to v. 21, Baal's temple was filled from end to end with his cultic personnel. Yet, in v. 22, the master of the wardrobe brings out a special garment for those serving Baal. The verb “bring out,” the Hiphil of **יצא*, implies that those serving Baal are still outside the temple proper, awaiting the special garment before entering the sacred precinct to perform religious rituals. Again, although v. 21 depicts those serving Baal as already being in the temple and v. 23 records Jehu and Jehonadab entering the temple, v. 24 reports that they then entered in order to perform sacrifice. The subject of, “they entered,” **ויבאו*, in v. 24 is not clear, but whether it is Jehu and Jehonadab or those serving Baal, the narrative is confused about who enters the temple when.²⁵

Second, the narrative twice records the destruction of Baal's stele. First, in v. 26, it is brought out and burned.²⁶ Scholars have balked at this depiction of a flammable stone stele and have proposed substituting **אשרת*, understanding it here as a wooden cult object.²⁷ This proposal, though ingenious, lacks any evidentiary support in ancient Hebrew manuscripts or other ancient witnesses to the Hebrew text. As such, it is not compelling. Indeed, the verbal sequence, “bring out and burn,” carries special meaning in biblical tradition, as I note below. This act of ritual destruction has removed the stele from the temple. Nevertheless, according to v. 27, which follows the actions of v. 26, “they tore down Baal's stele.” The verb “tear down,” the Qal of **נתקו*, describes the dismantling or pulling down of erect buildings or cultic objects (for example, Judg 6:30–32; 8:9, 17; 9:45; 2 Kgs 11:18).

As such, its use in v. 27 implies that Baal's stele was still erect in the temple and had not yet been removed as narrated in v. 26. At a minimum, the narrative events are out of sequence. In fact, as I will argue below, these destructive rituals are quite different from one another. In sum, vv. 26 and 27 contain a doublet in which Baal's stele is destroyed twice.

Third, Jehu's instructions to assemble are oddly repetitious.²⁸ According to vv. 18–19 Jehu gathered the whole people, regardless of their religious affiliation within the narrative world of the text, and ordered them to summon a particular group, the prophets and priests of Baal, to a great sacrificial feast for Baal. According to v. 21 the message went throughout all Israel and all those serving Baal came, filling Baal's temple from end to end. It is suspicious within the narrative sequence in vv. 18–19, 21, that, in v. 20, Jehu should further command the consecration of a solemn assembly to Baal. Though not outright contradictory, the several verbs of gathering, summoning, sacred assembling, and arriving are redundant in the narrative and hint at its complicated editorial history.

Fourth, Jehu's instructions to the military personnel who carry out the bloody executions are also repetitious. As the text currently stands, v. 24b reads as background information: "Now, Jehu had stationed for himself eighty men outside and had said, 'The man who lets escape any of the men I bring within your reach—his life in place of his life!'" In the current arrangement of the text, then, the caution in v. 25 to let no one escape—"Let no man get out!"—is redundant. The two instructions are not contradictory, but the repetition contributes to the impression that the narrative is composite.

These narrative tensions require explanation. Julio Trebolle Barrera has proposed a text-critical solution to the interpretive problems posed by the current form of the narrative—one that explains the tensions as arising from manuscript copying errors from a much later period. By attending to the Old Latin translation, he has reconstructed the Old Greek version of vv. 23–25, which he regards as a witness to the oldest Hebrew version of the text.²⁹ According to Trebolle-Barrera, "The conciseness, liveliness, dramatic vigour and internal logic of this [reconstructed] form of the story speak for themselves." In my judgment, however, a text-critical solution does not adequately account for all of the relevant evidence. In particular, it does not explain why, as I show below, 2 Kgs 10:18–28 contains distinct language from two separate streams of biblical tradition. The presence in the text of language and concepts from these two traditions suggests a literary-critical solution to the problem of narrative contradictions and

repetitions in 2 Kgs 10:18–28—a solution that explains the tensions as arising from the compositional history of the text.

*The Language of Ritual Violence and Assembly
in 2 Kings 10:18–28*

In examining the language of ritual violence in 2 Kgs 10:18–28, I am methodologically indebted to the work of Lauren Monroe on the biblical description of Josiah's religious reforms in 2 Kgs 23:4–20.³⁰ Monroe has argued that 2 Kgs 23:4–20 is not the product of a single scribal hand but rather reflects an earlier layer composed in Priestly circles—more particularly, a circle with connections to the Holiness School—that was revised by a scribe with Deuteronomistic affinity. She grounds her literary-critical thesis in a distinction between Priestly apotropaic rites of elimination, through which ritual contagion was removed, and Deuteronomistic *hērem* ideology, according to which defeated enemies were sacrificed to the deity.³¹ According to Monroe, the language used for some of Josiah's actions in 2 Kgs 23:4–20 reflects the former conceptual world, while the language used for others reflects the latter. For Monroe, the two modes of describing violent rituals in 2 Kgs 23:4–20 correspond to two editorial layers in the text.³² To be sure, 2 Kgs 23:4–20 and 2 Kgs 10:18–28 reflect violent rituals with different aims. Within their respective narrative worlds, Josiah's violence aims, at least in part, to cleanse the temple of Yahweh and prepare it for continued use while Jehu's violence aims to decommission the temple of Baal. Nevertheless, Monroe's essential insight is surely correct and applicable to 2 Kgs 10:18–28. These narratives do not describe random acts of destruction but rather rituals of violence with particular intent. Rituals, including rituals of violence, are not invented out of whole cloth but derive their meaning and power from tradition.³³ As such, we might profitably ask of 2 Kgs 10:18–28 the kinds of questions Monroe asks of 2 Kgs 23:4–20. What violent rituals are described in the narrative? With what biblical traditions do these violent rituals have their closest affinity? Does this investigation of ritual language have implications for reconstructing the compositional history of 2 Kgs 10:18–28?

I argue here that the rituals of violence described in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 divide neatly between those that have their closest parallels in Priestly tradition and those that have their closest parallels in Deuteronomistic tradition. Five decommissioning rituals are described in 2 Kgs 10:25–28.

In my judgment, three of these, clustered together in vv. 25–26, have affinity with concepts found in Priestly literature: the corpses of those serving Baal were exposed (v. 25ba); non-sacral personnel entered the temple's most holy precinct (v. 25bβ); and Baal's stele was brought out and burned (v. 26). Two, clustered together in v. 27, have affinity with concepts found in Deuteronomistic literature: Baal's stele and temple were torn down (v. 27a) and the site was turned into a dung heap (v. 27b). In what follows, I outline the evidence for my claim that these two clustered sets of violent rituals reflect distinct conceptual worlds, and I examine the language of assembly in the narrative before proposing a historical-critical solution to the problem of the narrative tensions outlined above.

Jehu's guards and officers exposed the corpses of the slain worshippers of Baal (v. 25ba). This exposure is best understood within the context of what Saul M. Olyan has termed Israelite interment ideology. Olyan has outlined a hierarchy of Israelite burial types from most desirable to least: (1) honorable burial in the family tomb; (2) honorable burial in a substitute for the family tomb; (3) honorable burial in someone else's family tomb; (4) various forms of shameful burial; and (5) nonburial.³⁴ Olyan observes that biblical descriptions of the last two types often use the verb *שָׁלַח, which in other contexts is generally translated as “throw” or “cast.”³⁵ Olyan's fourth category specifies dishonorable interment by the use of additional verbs together with *שָׁלַח (for example, see Josh 8:29; 10:26–27; 2 Sam 18:17; Jer 22:18–19; 26:23; 41:9; cf. 2 Kgs 13:21). Biblical descriptions that would fit Olyan's fifth category, nonburial, sometimes use *שָׁלַח by itself, without additional verbs specifying some form of shameful burial—compare the use of the root in 1 Kgs 13:25; Isa 14:19; Jer 22:19. This is the apparent meaning of the verb elsewhere in the Jehu narratives in 2 Kgs 9:25: “[Jehu] said to Bidkar, his officer, “Take (him) and expose him (הִשָּׁלַחְהוּ) on the field that belonged to Naboth the Jezreelite.” This also appears to be the case with our narrative. In 2 Kgs 10:25, וַיִּשְׁלַחוּ refers to corpse exposure.³⁶

Although corpse exposure is regarded as horrific in a wide variety of biblical contexts (e.g., Lev 26:30; Deut 21:22–23; 28:26; Isa 14:19; 34:3; 66:24; Jer 16:4; 34:20; 36:30; Amos 8:3; Nah 3:3; Ps 79:2–3), this horror is not always expressed in the same terms.³⁷ Indeed, corpse exposure is treated in subtly different ways in Deuteronomistic and Priestly tradition.³⁸ In Deuteronomistic tradition, the horror of corpse exposure is emphasized by the image of animals devouring the deceased.³⁹ Thus, the curses against those who fail to faithfully observe the laws of Deuteronomy include, “Your

carcasses shall become food for all birds of the sky and the beasts of the field, with none driving (them) away" (Deut 28:26). A series of prophetic oracles against Israelite dynasties, likely composed by a Deuteronomistic editor though perhaps incorporating pre-Deuteronomistic elements, each includes a curse of corpse mutilation by animals that is worded similarly to the one uttered against Jeroboam, "Anyone of Jeroboam who dies in the city shall be eaten by dogs and anyone who dies in the field shall be eaten by the birds of the sky" (1 Kgs 14:11; with similarly worded curses in 1 Kgs 16:4; 21:24; 2 Kgs 9:10).⁴⁰ The book of Jeremiah, which is widely regarded as having connections to Deuteronomistic tradition, expresses the horror of corpse exposure by references to animal mutilation in several prophetic oracles (Jer 7:33; 15:3; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20).⁴¹ The curse of corpse mutilation by animals is found in ancient Near Eastern international treaties (see VTE ln. 451, 483–484), which are conceptually related to the notion of covenant in Deuteronomistic tradition.⁴² The ritual defilement described in 2 Kgs 10:25 does not use this language of animal mutilation to describe the horror of corpse exposure.⁴³

In two telling passages, on the other hand, Priestly tradition expresses the horror of corpse exposure in terms of the proximity of the deceased to illegitimate cultic objects of various kinds.⁴⁴ According to the Priestly Holiness Code, the divine punishment for Israelites who engage in idol worship is to have their corpses exposed: "You must not make for yourselves idols (אֱלִילִים), nor erect for yourselves an image (וּפְסֵל) or a standing stone (וּמִצְבֵּה), nor place a figured stone (וּמִצְבֵּה מְשֻׁכָּתִית) in your land to bow down to, for I am Yahweh your God. . . . I will destroy your high places (בְּמִתְיָכֶם) and cut down your incense stands (הַמְזִיבִים), and I will set your corpses beside (or, upon) the corpses of your idols (וְנִתְּתִי אֶת־פְּגָרֵיכֶם עַל־פְּגָרֵי) (גְּלוּלֵיכֶם). I myself will spurn you" (Lev 26:1, 30).⁴⁵ The prophetic oracle in Ezek 6:3b–6, in a chapter with other connections to Priestly tradition, also expresses the horror of corpse exposure in terms of the proximity of the deceased to illegitimate shrines and images: "I will set the corpses of the Israelites before their idols (וְנִתְּתִי אֶת־פְּגָרֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְפָנַי גְּלוּלֵיהֶם) (v. 5a).⁴⁶ Our text, 2 Kgs 10:25, reflects this Priestly concept of corpse exposure in front of illegitimate cultic images as a fitting punishment for those who worship gods other than Yahweh.

In a second act of defilement, non-sacral personnel entered the temple's holiest precinct (v. 25bβ). In the narrative world of the story, several ritual actors enter the temple complex to offer sacrifice. To judge by the sequence of events in v. 25, however, they do not enter the temple's innermost

sanctum. According to v. 25, having slaughtered those serving Baal, Jehu's officers and guards go one step further: "Then they went into the עיר of the temple of Baal." The typical meaning "city" for עיר makes little sense in context and scholars have proposed various text-critical and lexical solutions. Long ago, August Klostermann had suggested emending עיר to דביר, "inner sanctuary."⁴⁷ Though ingenious, the solution has no support in the ancient manuscript witnesses.⁴⁸ Others delete עיר, regarding it as arising when a scribe accidentally copied the visually similar word עד twice.⁴⁹ This does little, however, to resolve the contextual difficulty—the guards had evidently already entered the temple in order to kill those serving Baal. To my mind, a lexical solution is more compelling than a text-critical one. Loren R. Fisher argues for the meaning "temple quarter or . . . inner room of the temple" for Biblical Hebrew עיר in 1 Kgs 20:30; 2 Kgs 10:25; 20:4; Ps 73:20.⁵⁰ He cites other ancient Near Eastern city terminology that refers on occasion to temples but his strongest case is made from the immediate context of the four biblical cases he treats. Bruce K. Waltke also entertains "temple precinct" as a possible meaning of עיר in Mic 5:13.⁵¹ Baruch A. Levine and Lawrence H. Schiffman understand עיר המקדש in the Temple Scroll to refer to the *temenos* of the Jerusalem temple.⁵² In sum, עיר is to be retained on text-critical grounds, and context suggests a meaning like "inner precinct" for the term here, a meaning attested in other biblical texts.⁵³ According to the narrative sequence of events, then, Jehu's guards and officers entered the temple, killed those serving Baal, proceeded to the inner shrine of the temple, where Baal's stele was presumably located, brought it out, and burned it. Why does the narrative include this detail with its architectural vocabulary—"they entered the inner precinct of the temple"? In my judgment, this detail is included to highlight the extent of the temple's violation.⁵⁴

This act of defilement has particular resonance with Priestly literature. To be sure, the concept of temple sanctity is not unique to one stream of biblical tradition.⁵⁵ In the Hebrew Bible, however, Priestly texts are particularly concerned with regulating the functioning of the temple and with limiting access to its innermost rooms.⁵⁶ For example, Lev 8–9 details the elaborate rituals by which priests were anointed before they could perform cultic duties.⁵⁷ According to Lev 16:2–3, 15, 32–34, only the High Priest, once a year, could enter the most sacred shrine.⁵⁸ Deuteronomistic tradition appears less fastidious about such matters. For example, 1 Sam 21:2–10 portrays David as a fugitive from Saul who stopped at a temple, accepted sacred bread, and obtained a sword kept wrapped in a cloth behind the

priest's ephod. The narrative pays no particular attention to where David, the priest Ahimelech, and the foreigner Doeg are within the temple precinct. Indeed, Ahimelech's use of the particle הנה in v. 10 suggests that both he and David were deep inside the temple where the sacred objects were kept. The Deuteronomistic scribes who later transmitted the story saw no need to gloss it so as to exculpate David.⁵⁹ The book of Deuteronomy itself permits greater access to the temple than Priestly writing in so far as any Levite could in theory serve as a priest (Deut 12:5–18).⁶⁰ The logic of contagion in 2 Kgs 10:25, in which non-sacral personnel defile the innermost shrine of a temple by entering it, has special affinity with Priestly tradition in the Hebrew Bible.

In a third act of defilement, Jehu's officers and guards "brought out the stele of the temple of Baal and burned it" (v. 26).⁶¹ This sequence of verbs—to bring out (Hiphil of יצע) and to burn (Qal of שרף)—is characteristic of Priestly apotropaic rites of elimination. The verbal sequence is found in the Hebrew Bible only in Lev 4:12, 21; 16:27; 2 Kgs 10:26; 23:4, 6.⁶² According to the Priestly rituals described in Lev 4:12, 21; 16:27, contagion was physically removed and then consumed by fire.⁶³ Drawing on the biblical descriptions of these Priestly rituals, Monroe attributes to a Holiness substratum the description in 2 Kgs 23:6 of the removal from the Jerusalem temple of the *asherah*, here a wooden cult object, and its burning in the Wadi Kidron.⁶⁴ The ritual logic of 2 Kgs 23:6 follows the Priestly pattern of Lev 4:12, 21; 16:27; contagion was removed and burned. By contrast, the concept of war *ḥērem* lies in the background to Deuteronomistic depictions of destruction through burning, as Monroe shows.⁶⁵ In the *ḥērem* tradition, the enemy was destroyed in situ (Deut 13:17; Josh 6:24; 8:28; 11:11, 13; Judg 9:52; 18:27). Punishment of individuals by fire in Deuteronomistic tradition also involved burning in situ (Judg 12:1). Deuteronomic burning of illegitimate cultic paraphernalia in Deut 7:5 (וּפְסִילֵיהֶם תִּשְׂרֹפוּן בָּאֵשׁ) and Deut 7:25 (פְּסִילֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם תִּשְׂרֹפוּן בָּאֵשׁ) has war *ḥērem* as its explicit context (Deut 7:2, 26).⁶⁶ As such, these texts are best understood as referring to in situ burning. In my judgment, in situ burning is also intended in the Deuteronomic proscription of cultic paraphernalia in Deut 12:3 (וְאֲשֵׁרֵיהֶם וְאֲשֵׁרֹתָם תִּשְׂרֹפוּן בָּאֵשׁ). As much is indicated by the literary structure of Deut 12:2–3. A series of destructive acts are bracketed by "You must surely destroy all the sites," אַבְדוּן אֶת־כָּל־הַמְּקוֹמוֹת (Deut 12:2) and "And you will destroy their name from that site," וְאֲבַדְתֶּם אֶת־שְׁמֵם מִן־הַמְּקוֹם הַהוּא (Deut 12:3). Within this ring composition, the enumerated rituals of destruction are considered elements of the process by which the site (מקום) is destroyed

(*אבד*). As such, they are best understood as taking place at that site. In sum, the ritual sequence in which contagion is brought out and burned is a feature of Priestly tradition whereas in Deuteronomistic tradition enemies and illegitimate cultic objects were burned in situ. By describing the ritual purge of Baal's temple with the verbal sequence "bring out" (Hiphil of *יצע*) and "burn" (Qal of *שרף*), v. 26 betrays its affinity to Priestly conceptions of ritual purge.

In contrast to these three rituals of defilement, which are rooted in concepts shared by Priestly tradition, two further destructive acts in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 have affinity with concepts shared with Deuteronomistic literature. First, Jehu's guards and officers "tore down the stele of Baal," וִיתְצוּ אֶת מַצֵּבַת הַבַּעַל (v. 27a). The verb used here, *נתק*, connotes the destruction of built objects—towers, city walls, houses, altars, etc.⁶⁷ It is used twice in Priestly literature: once to refer to the dismantling and removal of an unclean house (Lev 14:45), discussed further below, and once to refer to the destruction of an oven that has become ritually unclean through contact with animals that were considered ritually unfit for consumption (Lev 11:35). The verb is never used in Priestly texts to refer to the destruction of cultic objects. In contrast, in the Deuteronomic Code, the verb refers to the destruction of cultic objects regarded as illegitimate (Deut 12:3). In the Deuteronomistic preface to the code, the verb carries the same meaning (Deut 7:5). The verb also has this meaning in Exod 34:13; Judg 2:2; 6:28, 30, 31, 32; 2 Kgs 11:18 (//2 Chr 23:17); 23:7, 8, 12, 15; 2 Chr 31:1; 33:3; 34:4, 7. This broader usage, especially in Exodus and Chronicles, suggests that the verb can hardly be considered diagnostic of Deuteronomistic scribal activity. Rather, it belongs to stereotypical language of cultic exclusivity. At the same time, when used to refer to the destruction of cultic objects, the verb has good parallels in Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic literature but no parallel in Priestly literature. As such, I regard the reference to the destruction of Baal's stele in 2 Kgs 10:27 as describing a violent ritual that would have been meaningful within the conceptual world of Deuteronomistic tradition but that would have lacked resonance in Priestly circles.

Verse 27 also uses this verb, *נתק*, to describe the destruction of Baal's temple. The above observation about the verb's distribution in biblical literature holds true when considering its use to describe the destruction of buildings. As I indicated above, only once does Priestly literature use the verb *נתק* to refer to the destruction of a building, namely a house that has become ritually impure due to mildew (Lev 14:45). According to this Priestly rite of elimination, the contaminated house was not just

dismantled but its very stones, timber, and wall plaster were carried outside the city to an unclean place.⁶⁸ As with the verbal sequence “to bring out” (Hiphil of *יצע) and “burn” (Qal of *שרף) discussed above, removal of the contagion formed an integral part of this Priestly ritual of purge. In contrast, the verbal root נתץ describes the destruction of buildings of various kinds without any mention of removal in several texts in the Deuteronomistic History: Judg 8:9, 17; 9:45; 2 Kgs 11:18; 2 Kgs 23:7, 8. The destruction of Baal’s temple in 2 Kgs 10:27 fits this latter usage of the verb.

In a second act of defilement with affinity to Deuteronomistic tradition, after tearing down the stele and temple of Baal, Jehu’s guards and officers “made it a dung heap until today” (וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ לְמַחְרָאוֹת עַד-הַיּוֹם) (v. 27b).⁶⁹ Once more the narrative refers to a calculated act intended to render the site unusable for cultic activity. As much is indicated by the verb וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ, “they made it” (v. 27), which indicates that the site acquired a new function through deliberate designation rather than mere coincidence.⁷⁰ This new function is denoted by מַחְרָאָה, a *hapax legomenon* whose precise meaning I will seek to clarify before I discuss the conceptual world on which this act of defilement depends.⁷¹ The root *חרא is rare in Biblical Hebrew. It occurs elsewhere only in the consonantal text of Isa 36:12 (//2 Kgs 18:27), and perhaps also in the consonantal text of 2 Kgs 6:26, if חרייונים is divided as חרי יונים. In these texts, a meaning for the root similar to “dung” makes good sense in context. The cognate Ugaritic root *hr*’ is attested with the meaning “to defecate” in KTU 1.85 9.⁷² In light of this general semantic range of the root, commentators generally attribute to מַחְרָאָה in 2 Kgs 10:27 a meaning similar to “latrine” or “dung heap.”⁷³ For my thesis here, it is important to distinguish between a “latrine,” which denotes a built structure, and a “dung heap,” where human excrement would simply be discarded.

Archaeological evidence for sanitation in Iron Age Israel—evidence for how the text’s ancient audience dealt with human waste on a daily basis—helps to limit the semantic range of מַחְרָאָה in 2 Kgs 10:27. As much is suggested by the use of the phrase “until today,” which invokes the text’s audience and implies their familiarity with מַחְרָאָה. Despite the fact that the word is a *hapax legomenon*, its referent was quotidian. Only a handful of toilets from Iron Age Israel and Judah have been discovered, despite extensive excavation of the region.⁷⁴ The most famous of these includes a limestone toilet seat with two holes, one for defecation and one for male urination, from the house of Ahiel in late Iron Age II Jerusalem.⁷⁵ In total, there are only two latrines and a further two toilets known from Iron Age Jerusalem. Analysis of the former indicates that lime, in the form of ash,

was added to the cesspits to inhibit the growth of bacteria and fungi and to ameliorate the smell.⁷⁶ They were not intended to be emptied, but to provide an environment for the gradual decomposition of waste. An Iron Age II toilet was also discovered at Bozrah in Edom.⁷⁷ To judge by this archaeological evidence, toilets were extremely rare in the Iron Age Levant.⁷⁸ The few known examples are best described as luxury features of elite urban homes.

In light of this lack of evidence for sanitation systems, sewage was likely disposed of in the street or in the soil surrounding the city.⁷⁹ Isa 5:25 evokes the image of refuse (סִוְהָה) in the street, but it is not clear if the text refers to human excrement or to other forms of household waste. Several biblical texts compare unburied corpses to dung (דִמּוֹן) left on the surface of the earth (2 Kgs 9:37; Jer 8:2; 9:21; 16:4; 25:33; Ps 83:11). This stock poetic image rests on the assumption that excrement could readily be found in open fields, though it is not entirely clear whether the image is intended to evoke human or animal waste. According to the prophetic image in 1 Kgs 14:10, the house of Jeroboam will be swept away as dung (גִּלְלִי) is swept away (*בער II). The prophetic sign in Ezek 4:12–15, in which Ezekiel is instructed to eat a barley cake baked on human dung (גִּלְלִי), implies that human dung was not normally used for cooking fuel.⁸⁰ Although these several biblical texts do not offer a conclusive portrait of sanitary practices in Iron Age Israel and Judah, taken together they suggest that household waste, including human excrement, was likely disposed of in the streets or in the fields surrounding the city. Indeed, the fecal matter in the City of David cesspits indicated the presence of whipworm and tapeworm, the former of which points to contamination of human food by human fecal waste.⁸¹ Such contamination could be the result of human feces being discarded in agricultural fields.⁸²

The plot of the biblical narrative of Ehud's assassination of Eglon, king of Moab, in Judg 3:12–31 hinges on sanitary practice.⁸³ According to the narrative, having stabbed Eglon while enjoying a private audience with him, Ehud departed and locked the door to Eglon's upper chamber behind him. Eglon's retinue discovered the locked door and assumed, "he must be covering his feet (i.e., relieving himself)" (v. 24).⁸⁴ This impression may have been enhanced by the smell of the feces released when Ehud stabbed Eglon—this narrative detail about something going out (יֵצֵא) (הַפְּרִשְׁדָּנָה), although open to debate on philological grounds, must have been of significance to the plot and may also have titillated its ancient audience.⁸⁵ Not wishing to interrupt the king, his servants delayed outside,

giving Ehud time to escape.⁸⁶ The narrative logic of this brief scene implies two features of Iron Age Levantine toilet practice among the elite. First, Eglon's servants' delay depends on the assumption that the king could reasonably be expected to lock the door if he were defecating. Defecation for the elite, then, was a private matter. Indeed, privacy may have played some role in Saul's decision to relieve himself in a cave in 1 Sam 24:4 rather than in the open field, though in that narrative personal security may also have played a role in so far as relieving himself may have involved temporarily letting his guard down.⁸⁷ Second, Judg 3:12–31 assumes that Eglon was in the habit of relieving himself in his private chamber, his “upper room,” where he had just met with Ehud. Had the situation been in any way unusual, Eglon's servants would have become suspicious right away. What architectural arrangement made this dual function of the “upper chamber” possible? By analyzing this narrative, biblical texts with related architectural vocabulary, and archaeological examples of Levantine palaces in the *bīt ḥilāni* style, Baruch Halpern has shown that the royal “upper room” where Eglon and Ehud met “was a throne platform overlooking and accessible from the audience chamber.”⁸⁸ This elevated wooden platform could be sealed off from the audience chamber via wooden doors. Although rock-cut drainage channels are known from the Iron Age Levant, as noted above, indoor plumbing of the type required to connect an elevated wooden platform with a cesspit below ground level is unknown. As such, it appears that Eglon must have been accustomed to relieving himself in a portable vessel, perhaps kept in the space below the elevated wooden platform, which would then have been emptied by one of his retinue elsewhere, in a pit or field.⁸⁹ This second feature comports with the evidence outlined above that human waste was normally disposed of in the streets or in the fields surrounding the city. Thus, although the story is intended to paint a negative portrait of the foreign oppressor Eglon, it assumes a social world that is in line with other biblical evidence for sanitary practice in Iron Age Israel.

Viewed in the context of this limited archaeological and textual evidence for human sanitary practices in ancient Israel, מִחְרָץ in 2 Kgs 10:27 is best understood as referring to a public dumping site for human excrement rather than to some architecturally articulated latrine or toilet.⁹⁰ Toilets, as noted above, were extremely rare and are only attested in elite homes. A decision by Jehu's officers and guards to convert Baal's temple into a private, luxury structure for the elite hardly fits the rhetorical force of the narrative in 2 Kgs 10:27. Jehu's guards tore down the temple of Baal—dismantled its

material structure, as noted above—but they did not erect a luxury toilet in its place. Rather, the rhetoric of the verse contrasts a built structure—the temple of Baal—with an undifferentiated, foul dumping ground. And yet, by invoking a dung heap—rather than, for example, the wilderness—the verse betrays an affinity to a particular conceptual world.

In my judgment, 2 Kgs 10:27 has its closest conceptual parallel in Deuteronomic literature. To be sure, the prophetic sign in Ezek 4:12–15, mentioned above, implies that food cooked on human waste became impure.⁹¹ But it is best to understand Ezek 4:12–15 in the narrow context of impure food rather than reading into it a broader concept of impurity associated with human waste. Indeed, the Holiness Code itself does not discuss human waste. Our text, 2 Kgs 10:27, does not depend on the notion of food impurity. Rather, it shares with the Deuteronomic Code the belief that human excrement repulsed the deity. In Deut 23:13–15 Israelites are instructed to dig a hole outside of the desert camp in a designated location and bury their excrement there. The law is explained, “Since Yahweh your God wanders throughout your camp in order to protect you and to deliver your enemies to you, let your camp be holy; let him not see an unseemly thing (עֲרוֹת דְּבָר) among you and turn away from you” (v. 15). The sight of human waste, according to this text, causes the deity to turn away. This same logic appears to govern our text, 2 Kgs 10:27. As is well known, Deuteronomistic literature acknowledges the existence of deities other than Yahweh.⁹² By converting Baal’s temple into a dumping ground for human waste, Jehu’s guards evidently intend to repulse Baal from his former sanctuary. This logic, by which the sight of human excrement repulses the deity, aligns v. 27 with Deuteronomic rather than Priestly concepts.

Earlier, I noted the doublet in which Jehu twice invokes an assembly, in vv. 18 and 20. The language used for these assemblies likewise has conceptual affinities with particular biblical corpora. According to v. 18, “Jehu assembled the whole people” (וַיִּקְבֹּץ יְהוּא אֶת־כָּל־הָעָם). The verb “assemble” (קִבַּץ) is used with the noun “people” (עַם) as its object elsewhere only in 2 Sam 2:30, to refer to Joab’s assembling of the troops to number them following his pursuit of Abner (וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֶת־כָּל־הָעָם), and in Hab 2:5, to refer to Death’s global appetite (וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הָעַמִּים). The verb is also used in the Deuteronomistic History with other equivalent nouns—“all Israel,” “all the (fighting) men,” “the whole army,” etc.—as its object in Judg 12:4 (וַיִּקְבֹּץ וַיִּלָּחֶם אֶת־כָּל־אֲנָשֵׁי גִלְעָד); 1 Sam 7:5 (וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֶת־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל); 1 Sam 28:4 (וַיִּקְבֹּץ שָׂאוּל אֶת־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל); 1 Sam 29:1 (וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֶת־כָּל־מַחֲנֵיהֶם); 2 Sam 3:21 (וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֶת־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל); 1 Kgs 11:24 (וַיִּקְבֹּץ עָלָיו אֲנָשִׁים);

1 Kgs 20:1 (וַיִּקְבְּצוּ בְּיַד מְלָךְ אֲרָם קִבְּצָאֵת כָּל־חִילוֹ); 2 Kgs 6:24 (וַיִּקְבְּצוּ בְּיַד מְלָךְ־).⁹³ Perhaps the closest parallel to 2 Kgs 10:28 is 1 Kgs 18:19–20, where the prophets of Baal are assembled on Mount Carmel to confront Elijah, prophet of Yahweh. This similarity is likely due to the fact that the Elijah narrative was composed to foreshadow Jehu's coup, as Marsha C. White has argued.⁹⁴ While the verbal root has these several occurrences in the Deuteronomistic History, it is not found in the Priestly literature of the Pentateuch.⁹⁵ The use of the verb in 2 Kgs 10:18 therefore has analogues in Deuteronomistic tradition, but not in Priestly tradition.

Verse 20, by contrast, uses convocation language that bears a stronger affinity with Priestly literature: “Jehu said, ‘Consecrate an assembly to Baal!’” (וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוּא קִדְּשׁוּ עֲצָרָה לְבַעַל). This is the only biblical text in which “assembly” עֲצָרָה appears as the object of “consecrate” *קדשׁ. In fact the noun עֲצָרָה is too rare in Biblical Hebrew to be diagnostic—elsewhere, it occurs only in Lev 23:36; Num 29:35; Deut 16:8; Isa 1:13; Jer 9:1; Joel 1:14; 2:15; Amos 5:21; Neh 8:18; 2 Chr 7:9.⁹⁶ But the verb used here, the Piel of *קדשׁ, is more common in biblical literature and has a starkly divided distribution. It occurs in dozens of Priestly texts: Gen 2:3, Exod 13:2; 28:3, 41; 29:1, 27, 33, 36, 37, 44; 30:29, 30; 31:13; 40:9, 10, 11, 13; Lev 8:11, 12, 15, 30; 16:19; 20:8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32; 25:10; Num 6:11; 7:1. It is extremely rare, however, in Deuteronomy–Kings, occurring only in Deut 5:12; 32:51 (regarded as Priestly); Josh 7:13 (in a chapter regarded as having Priestly affinity, v. 13 perhaps even from the hand of an editor working in Priestly style); 1 Sam 7:1; 16:5; 1 Kgs 8:64.⁹⁷ As such, the language of convocation in 2 Kgs 18:20 bears a stronger affinity to Priestly tradition.

Reconstructing Two Main Layers in 2 Kgs 10:18–28

The literary tensions in 2 Kgs 10:18–28 that I have outlined here—repetitions, contradictions, and distinguishable conceptual backgrounds—suggest that it is a composite text. It does not represent a unified narrative composed by a single author but shows evidence of two main editorial layers, one with an affinity to Priestly concepts and one with an affinity to Deuteronomistic concepts. In my judgment, the evidenced outlined above is not sufficient to posit a definitive reconstruction of the editorial history of the narrative but it does suggest the broad contours of two principal layers in the text.

In order to demonstrate the plausibility of my hypothesis that there are two principal editorial layers in the narrative, I offer below one possible reconstruction of these two layers, which I have termed simply Layer A and Layer B in order to refrain from identifying these layers with other scholarly hypotheses about the editorial history of Kings and Deuteronomy through Kings—I am not arguing in this chapter that a Priestly scribe or a Deuteronomistic scribe wrote or edited our narrative. My reconstruction aims to be methodologically conservative by keeping the number of posited layers to a minimum and by splicing the current form of the text as little as possible—to be sure, the real situation may have been more complicated than the one I reconstruct here.⁹⁸ I schematize my reconstruction into three degrees of certainty according to the strength of the available evidence. In the first instance, I assign some material in the current form of the text to Layer A or Layer B on the basis of the evidence for conceptual affinity I outlined above. These attributions anchor my reconstruction and I render them in bold type. In the second instance, I assign some of the remaining material to Layer A or Layer B on the basis of more or less direct connections of grammar or plot to the material already assigned. I render these less certain attributions in regular type. In the third instance, I assign the remaining material to Layer A or Layer B on the basis of other connections of grammar or plot to material already assigned, or for other reasons as indicated in the footnotes. I render these even less certain attributions in hollow type. What emerges is only one of several possible reconstructions, but this one yields results with explanatory power. More importantly, this reconstruction demonstrates the plausibility of my thesis that there are two principal editorial layers in the narrative.

Layer A, with affinity to Priestly tradition	Layer B, with affinity to Deuteronomistic tradition	Additional glosses
	ויקבץ יהוא את כל־העם	
	ויאמר אלהם אחאב עבד את־הבעל	
	מעט יהוא יעבדנו הרבה	
	ועתה כל־נביאי הבעל וכל־כהניו	כל־עבדין ¹⁰³
	קראו אלי	
	איש אל־יפקד כי זבח גדול לי לבעל	
	כל אשר־יפקד לא יהיה	
		ויהוא עשה בעקבה ¹⁰⁴
		למען האבד
		את־עבדי הבעל

Layer A, with affinity to Priestly tradition	Layer B, with affinity to Deuteronomistic tradition	Additional glosses
ויאמר יהוא קדשו עזרה לבעל		
	ויקראו ¹⁰⁵	
	וישלח יהוא בכל־ישראל ¹⁰⁶	
	ויבאו כל־עבדי הבעל ¹⁰⁷	
	ולא־נשא אִישׁ אִישׁ אשר לא־בא ¹⁰⁸	
	ויבאו בית הבעל ¹⁰⁹	
	וימלא בית־הבעל פה לפה ¹¹⁰	
	ויאמר לאשר על־המלתחה ¹¹¹	
	הוצא לבוש לכל עבדי הבעל	
	וייצא להם המלבוש ¹¹²	
	ויבא יהוא ויהונדב בן־רכב בית הבעל ¹¹³	
	ויאמר לעבדי הבעל חפשו וראו ¹¹⁴	
	פך־ישפה עמכם מעבדי יהוה כי	
	אם ¹¹⁵ עבדי הבעל לבדם	
	ויהוא שם־לו בחוץ שמנים איש ¹¹⁸	
	ויאמר האיש אשר־ימלט מן־האנשים ¹¹⁹	
	אשר אני מביא על־ידיכם נפשו תחת	
	נפשו	
	ויבאו [בית הבעל] ¹¹⁶	
	לעשות זבחים ועלזות ¹¹⁷	
	ויהי ככלתו לעשות העלה ¹²⁰	
	ויאמר יהוא לרצים ולשלישים ¹²¹	
	באו הכוס איש אל־יצא	
	ויכוס לפי־חרב ¹²²	
	וישלוכו הרצים והשלישים	
	וילכו עד־עיר בית־הבעל	
	ויצאו את־מצבת בית־הבעל	
	וישרפוה	
	והצו את מצבות הבעל	
	והצו את־בית הבעל	
	וישמהו למחראות עדה־היום	
	וישמד יהוא את־הבעל מישראל ¹²³	

Schematized in this manner, Layer A yields a coherent, independent account with a simple plot:

Jehu said, “Consecrate an assembly for Baal!” He said to the master of the wardrobe, “Bring out a garment for all those serving Baal!” And he brought out for them the special garment.¹²⁴ Then they entered

[the temple of Baal] to perform sacrifices and burnt offerings. When he had completed the burnt offering, Jehu said to the soldiers and the officers, "Enter and strike them! Let no man get out!" They struck them with the sword. Then the soldiers and officers exposed (their corpses). They went to the inner precinct of the temple of Baal. They brought out the pillar of the temple of Baal and burned it.

The plot of this narrative hinges on the double function of the garment. On the one hand, it was evidently associated with entrance into the temple—Jehu instructs the master of the wardrobe to bring out the special garment, and it is only afterward that Baal's worshippers enter the temple to perform sacrifices and burnt offerings. On the other hand, the garment serves to make the servants of Baal readily identifiable in the butchery to follow—at Jehu's command soldiers and officers entered the temple and killed the worshippers of Baal there, exposing their corpses. As a plot element, the garment highlights Jehu's guile and ruthlessness.

The account credits Jehu with the murder of those serving Baal, but it leaves room for doubt about who was responsible for decommissioning Baal's temple. To be sure, Jehu initiates the festival and takes special care to make those serving Baal readily identifiable. When he commands the soldiers and officers to enter and kill, it becomes clear that he has been orchestrating their deaths all along. However, the subject of the action shifts toward the end of the narrative with the soldiers and officers becoming the subject of the verbs of ritual violence. Initially, they simply carry out Jehu's instructions. But precisely at the point in the narrative where they go beyond Jehu's command, the text specifies them once more as the subject of the verbal sequence—"Jehu said to the soldiers and officers . . . and they struck . . . Then the soldiers and officers exposed . . . They went . . . They brought out . . . and they burned." By restating the subject in this way, the text may credit the soldiers and officers with the violent rituals that decommission Baal's temple. If this explanation of the awkward repetition of subject is correct, then, despite the text's acknowledgment of Jehu's kingship—Jehu gives military and religious commands as one might expect of a king—the account does not read as royal historiography, which might be expected to assign full credit to the king.

Although no motive is given for the slaughter, the account is intelligible as an act of political intrigue related to the cultic personnel of one temple rather than a religiously motivated national purge. Religious architecture, personnel, garments, and paraphernalia are central to the plot; yet the narrative is remarkably free from Yahwistic polemic. Yahweh is not

mentioned and Jehu is not described as righteous for his actions nor as executing Yahweh's judgment on the worshippers of Baal. Indeed, the narrative nowhere condemns Baal worship and Jehu himself offers burnt offerings to Baal.¹²⁵ As such, Layer A does not appear to describe a national religious purge.

Rather, Layer A portrays the murder of those serving Baal at one temple. The construct noun phrase "those serving PN" (mp Qal active participle of *עבד in the construct state followed by DN) occurs elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew only in 2 Kgs 10:19 (itself a late insertion derived from 10:21 as noted above), 21, 22, 23 and is used only of those serving Baal, never of those serving Yahweh.¹²⁶ Its immediate context in 2 Kgs 10:22 suggests that it refers in Layer A to those offering sacrifices to Baal at his temple while wearing special garments. Its semantic range in Layer A should also be understood in the larger context of the root *עבד in Biblical Hebrew. The related expression "servants of PN" (masculine plural of the noun עבָד in the construct state followed by PN) in Biblical Hebrew refers to members of PN's household other than relatives, including members of the royal bureaucracy if PN is a king.¹²⁷ When used in relation to temples or deities, the noun עבְדָה refers to cultic service performed by temple personnel.¹²⁸ If this larger usage of the root *עבד offers some guidance to the interpreter, "those serving Baal" in Layer A is best understood as referring to particular members of Baal's household, which is to say, cultic personnel at his temple. In sum, Layer A depicts the murder of cultic personnel associated with one temple of Baal.

For an isolated phenomenon such as this, a political motive is just as likely, if not more so, than a religious one. Jehu is not explicitly identified as king of Israel but in so far as he gives military orders to soldiers and sacerdotal orders to the master of the wardrobe, the narrative assumes his kingship. Why might a king murder temple personnel? The most obvious answer is that they posed a threat to his rule. In this regard, an analogue may be provided by Saul's destruction of the priests of Nob—eighty-five men who wore a special garment—because they had given support to his political enemy, David (1 Sam 22:6–23). There is no hint in that narrative that worship of Yahweh versus other deities was a motive for murder; rather the slaughter of the priests of Nob is presented in political terms. Layer A of 2 Kgs 10:18–28 may likewise have originally described a political act in which Jehu ruthlessly destroys one temple's cultic personnel who hindered his rule in some way.

As reconstructed here, Layer B does not constitute an independent, coherent account. Its plot hinges on the slaughter of the worshippers of Baal, but it nowhere records their demise. As such, if it ever existed as an

independent account, only fragments of that account have been preserved here. In fact, it is more likely, given Layer B's connections to the surrounding narrative discussed below, that Layer B was originally composed as an editorial layer that incorporated and transformed Layer A. Layer A as revised by Layer B reads as follows:

Jehu assembled the entire people and said to them, "Ahab served Baal a little, Jehu will serve him a lot! And now, summon to me all the prophets of Baal and all his priests! Let no one be missing, because I have a great sacrifice for Baal. Everyone who is missing will not live!" Jehu said, "Consecrate an assembly for Baal!" They summoned (them). Jehu sent throughout all Israel and all those serving Baal came—not one remained who did not come. They entered the temple of Baal and the temple of Baal was filled from end to end. He said to the master of the wardrobe, "Bring out a garment for all those serving Baal!" And he brought out for them the festival garment. Then Jehu, and Jehonadab ben Rechab, entered the temple of Baal. He said to those serving Baal, "Search and see lest there be here with you some of the servants of Yahweh—but rather those serving Baal by themselves!" Now Jehu had stationed for himself eighty men outside. He said, "The man who lets escape any of the men I bring within your reach—his life in place of his life!" Then they entered [the temple of Baal] to perform sacrifices and burnt offerings. When he had completed the burnt offering, Jehu said to the soldiers and the officers, "Enter and strike them! Let no man get out!" They struck them with the sword. The soldiers and officers exposed (their corpses). They went into the inner precinct of the temple of Baal. They brought out the pillar of the temple of Baal and burnt it. **They tore down the stele of Baal. They tore down the temple of Baal and made it a dung heap—until today. Jehu wiped out Baal from Israel.**

Layer B has transformed Layer A in three important and related ways. First, what was presented in Layer A as an act involving a single sanctuary and its personnel is elevated in Layer B to a national act with permanent effect.¹²⁹ Layer B frequently deploys "all/whole/every" and "none" to assure the reader that Baal and his worshippers have been completely eliminated from all Israel. According to Layer B, Jehu assembled "the entire people"; he ordered the summoning of "all the prophets of Baal and all his priests"; he warned, "let no one be missing . . . anyone who is missing will not

live”; and he sent “throughout all Israel.” The narrative confirms that “all the servants of Baal came, not one remained who did not come”; and it summarizes the event with the all-inclusive claim that “Jehu wiped out Baal from Israel.” This frequent repetition of “all” and “none” elevates the single incident described in Layer A to a national act with complete and total effect.

Second, what was intelligible in Layer A as a political or political-religious act is presented in Layer B as one with an unambiguously religious motive.¹³⁰ The narrative opposes worship of Yahweh to worship of Baal—before the bloody slaughter, Jehu instructs the worshippers to search among themselves to make sure that no worshippers of Yahweh are present, but worshippers of Baal only.¹³¹ And the purge is summarized not as the slaughter of worshippers of Baal nor as the destruction of the temple of Baal, but rather as the removal of Baal himself from Israel. As such, Jehu’s actions are given a religious, indeed a Yahwistic, motive. The historian is justifiably skeptical of Layer B’s presentation of Jehu’s actions as being motivated by unadulterated religious zeal and as being a complete, national success—indeed these elements of the narrative are suspect even if one does not accept the editorial reconstruction I have proposed here.¹³²

Third, Layer B much more clearly credits Jehu with decommissioning Baal’s temple. Although it utilizes a standard *wayyiqtol* verb form (וַיִּשְׁמַד)—a form that typically drives plot action in biblical Hebrew narrative—the final line of the account, v. 28, does not read like a new action in the narrative sequence. Instead it appears to summarize all that has preceded. Read in context, “Thus Jehu wiped out Baal from Israel” more clearly conveys the meaning of the line than “Then Jehu wiped out Baal from Israel.” The addition of this line by the editor of Layer B transforms the entire preceding account. Whereas Layer A left room for ambiguity about who should be credited with decommissioning Baal’s temple, Layer B personally credits Jehu with the elimination of Baal—and not merely some of those serving him—from Israel. As such, Layer B reads more like royal historiography than does Layer A. Indeed, Layer B names one of the officers in Jehu’s court, Jehonadab ben Rechab, contributing to the reader’s impression that it was composed by a scribe with royal affiliation.

Layer B does not present an isolated event but connects the story of Layer A to a larger narrative describing and legitimating Jehu’s rise to kingship, with the concomitant demise of the house of Ahab. By placing in Jehu’s mouth the words “Ahab served Baal a little, Jehu will serve him a lot,” the narrative betrays a connection to a larger sequence, one that

included both Ahab and Jehu and that opposed these characters to one another. Indeed, the legal language Jehu uses in layer B to warn the eighty men he stationed outside not to let anyone escape—“His life in place of his life!”—is used elsewhere in Kings only in 1 Kgs 20:39–42, where a prophetic oracle is uttered against Ahab, “Thus says Yahweh: Because you have set free the man whom I doomed, your life in place of his life!”¹³³ Layer B’s presentation of Jehu’s devotion to Yahweh as a legitimate motive for murder connects it with related themes in the larger narrative of Jehu’s coup—for example, 2 Kgs 9:7–10, in which Jehu is commissioned by a prophet, and 2 Kgs 10:10–11, 15–17.¹³⁴ The mention of Jehonadab ben Rechab in v. 23 likewise connects Layer B to the surrounding story—he appears again in 2 Kgs 10:15–17.¹³⁵ Layer B’s assumption of religious exclusivity, in which one could be a worshipper of Baal or a worshipper of Yahweh, but not both, resonates with Elijah’s confrontation of the prophets of Baal in 1 Kgs 18.¹³⁶ Layer B never contained a parallel independent account of the destruction of Baal’s temple. Rather, Layer B incorporated and transformed an independent Layer A as part of a larger story about Jehu’s rise and the destruction of the House of Ahab.

To sum up, then, this investigation of the rituals of violence through which a space dedicated to cultic use—a temple of Baal—was decommissioned suggests a new editorial history for the narrative of Jehu’s coup. The earliest preserved historiographic witness to the events does not come from royal or prophetic circles. Rather, it is best described as a sacerdotal account in so far as it betrays affinity to the conceptual world of Priestly tradition. This earliest record described Jehu’s murder of the cultic personnel associated with a temple of Baal. In this account, Jehu’s officers and guards are portrayed as going beyond Jehu’s command to slaughter the temple’s personnel: they also decommissioned the temple itself by exposing the corpses of the cultic personnel, violating the sanctity of the temple’s inner shrine, and bringing out and burning Baal’s stele. This account, which is intelligible as an independent unit, was incorporated into the larger narrative of Jehu’s coup so that it served as the narrative climax of Jehu’s reign. In the process, the editor transformed Jehu’s murder of the cultic personnel of a temple of Baal into a religiously motivated national purge. While the revised version of the story contributes little to the historical reconstruction of events surrounding the temple destruction it sheds light on the editorial process through which the House of Jehu came to be portrayed so positively in the Deuteronomistic History.¹³⁷ An editor with Yahwistic and royal interests has incorporated the older account into

a larger narrative that opposes the House of Jehu to the House of Ahab and that aligns that political conflict with the battle between Yahwism and Baalism.

Finally, in relation to the larger arguments of this book, let us briefly consider how this biblical presentation of Jehu's decommissioning of cultic space relates to broader patterns of ancient Near Eastern royal power. Mesopotamian royal inscriptions often boast of the king's power to destroy religious spaces in connection with his military conquests.¹³⁸ Ubiquitous references to the burning and destruction of enemy cities in Mesopotamian royal inscriptions imply the annihilation of the shrines and temples located within them, though individual structures are not typically named.¹³⁹ Neo-Assyrian kings frequently claim to have plundered divine images from conquered cities.¹⁴⁰ Although they do not normally mention the shrines in which these gods were kept, at a minimum the removal of images implies that the spaces in which they were kept may have been repurposed for some other image, if not decommissioned altogether. Esarhaddon confirms the Neo-Assyrian imperial practice of image looting when he claims to have returned to their native lands the gods taken by his predecessors (RINAP 4 1 ii 12–24). A stone relief from the palace of Sargon at Dur-Sharrukin offers a visual depiction of temple looting, in this case the looting of the temple of Haldi at Muṣaṣir.¹⁴¹ Scholars have posited a number of ancient Near Eastern analogues to the biblical portrayal of cult centralization under Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:3–6) and Josiah (2 Kgs 23:4–25), which are also analogous in various ways to Jehu's temple decommissioning.¹⁴² Cult reforms of various kinds are attributed to Akhenaten of Egypt, Muwatalli II of Hatti, Tudhaliya IV of Hatti, Nebuchadnezzar I of Babylonia, and Nabonidus of Babylonia.¹⁴³ In broad terms, these several ancient Near Eastern examples share with 2 Kgs 10:18–28 a sense that royal power could be expressed through the decommissioning of cultic space. Full description and classification of these various expressions of destructive royal power lies well beyond my aims in this chapter. To bring our narrative into sharper focus, however, I wish to highlight particular points of contrast between 2 Kgs 10:18–28 and ancient Near Eastern texts depicting the destructive power over religious space exercised by two kings, Sennacherib of Assyria and Nabû-šuma-iškun of Babylonia.

To begin with the former, Sennacherib's Bavian rock inscription depicts his desecration of Babylon's temples (RINAP 3 223 43–54).¹⁴⁴ He boasts that he besieged the city through sapping and ladders (ln. 44–45); he exposed the corpses of its population (ln. 45); he gave his people access

to the city so that they smashed its divine images and kept temple property as plunder (ln. 47–48); he returned to Ekallatum the images of its gods that had been plundered and taken to Babylon (ln. 48–50); he destroyed and burned the city and its buildings (ln. 50–51); he dismantled the temple and ziggurat and dumped their materials into the Arahtu river (ln. 51–52); and he dug canals into the middle of the city to erode what remained (ln. 52–53). Through these actions, Sennacherib intended to permanently return the city to a wild, undeveloped state: “In the future, the site of that city and (its) temples will be unrecognizable, I dissolved it (Babylon) in water and annihilated (it), (making it) like a meadow” (ln. 53–54).¹⁴⁵ Sennacherib’s account of his destruction of Babylon shares with 2 Kgs 10:18–28 motifs of corpse exposure, image destruction, temple dismantling, and permanent retroversion of the site to an unbuilt state.

But the earliest biblical portrait of Jehu’s massacre, Layer A, differs from this Mesopotamian picture of royal power in important respects. RINAP 3 223 highlights the king’s power to destroy cultic spaces in connection with his military prowess to subjugate foreign enemies. But the plot of the biblical narrative depends on deception rather than brute force. Although the text mentions Jehu’s officers and guards, they do not attack a fortified city but assembled worshippers of Baal who have no reason to suspect that anything is amiss. Furthermore, in so far as they suspect nothing, the narrative assumes that the worshippers of Baal see themselves as Jehu’s allies, not his enemies. In comparison to Sennacherib’s military prowess in destroying Babylon, then, Jehu’s deceptive destruction of Baal’s temple in Layer A reflects much more limited royal power.

The second document with which I wish to compare 2 Kgs 10:18–28 is a four-column clay tablet discovered in a private house at Uruk (RIM B.6.14.1).¹⁴⁶ The text lists various sacrilegious acts committed by Nabû-šuma-iškun, a Chaldean from the Bīt-Dākkuri tribe who ruled Babylonia in the middle of the eighth century BCE. The text was evidently written after his reign and blames his demise on his egregious behavior. Its fragmentary nature—the tablet, itself damaged, is a copy of a damaged original, with the scribe indicating at several junctures where his source was broken—makes it difficult at times to recover the precise logic of Nabû-šuma-iškun’s sacrilege.¹⁴⁷ The king’s catalog of offenses appears to include the following: he altered the festival calendar (ii 9–10); he entered the temple of Bēl inappropriately, perhaps with untrimmed hair or incorrect attire (ii 11–16); he made those privileged to enter the temple eat leeks, which were taboo (ii 17–18); he removed the images of Ea and

Madanu from their temples (ii 19–25); he burned alive sixteen Cuthians at the gate of the god Zababa (iii 12'–13'); he blocked the annual festival route of the god Šar'ur by seizing space for his palace (iii 22'–23'); he took the treasure of the Esagila temple and moved it to his own palace (iii 36'–41'); and he installed the gods of the Sealand, the Chaldeans, and the Arameans—i.e., foreign gods—in the Esagila (iii 42'–43'). The broken tablet does not preserve a description of the king's punishment by the gods but the tone throughout makes clear the writer's disapproval of his exercise of royal power. In this regard, RIM B.6.14.1 contrasts with the transmission of Jehu's destruction of Baal's temple in biblical tradition, particularly in Layer B. The catalog of sacrilege in RIM B.6.14.1 reads as an indictment of Nabû-šuma-iškun. In transmitting the traditions about him, RIM B.6.14.1 portrays him as a paradigmatically evil king. Layer B has taken the traditions about Jehu in the opposite direction. By opposing worship of Yahweh to worship of Baal, and crediting Jehu with removing Baal from Israel, Layer B presents Jehu's actions here as paradigmatically pious. Indeed, purge of non-Yahwistic and other forms of unsanctioned cultic practice from Judah are also integral to the biblical depiction of the paradigmatically pious Judahite kings Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:3–6) and Josiah (2 Kgs 23:4–25).

In Chapters 2 and 3, I have explored in greater detail one theme from Chapter 1: royal power over cultic space, namely David's dedication of land free from legal claims to Yahweh and Jehu's decommissioning of Baal's temple. In the next chapter, I pick up a second theme from Chapter 1: the question of centralized and distributed political strategies and their relationship to space.

*Absalom's Gate*ON ROYAL NAVIGATION OF COLLECTIVE
URBAN POLITICS

HAVING EXAMINED ROYAL dedication and decommissioning of cultic space in Chapters 2 and 3, I turn in this chapter to royal attempts to build political support at the level of the town. This chapter thus explores in greater detail a theme on which I touched in my opening example about Solomon in Chapter 1, the relationship between centralized and collective strategies of political action. According to 2 Sam 15:1–6, Absalom sought to win popular support by befriending legal claimants from surrounding towns who came to Jerusalem hoping to get justice from the king.¹ Commentators have emphasized the relationships that Absalom cultivates here with individual Israelites or the bare fact of his location near the city gates, where legal decisions were rendered and where disgruntled legal claimants might be found.² While acknowledging the explanatory power of such approaches, I propose that the narrative's portrayal of Absalom's strategy is more fully understood as entailing the collective politics of towns and tribes. He promised justice in a space with particular political significance, the town gate. In the Iron Age, I contend, southern Levantine town gates were loci for the performance of the authority of town elders, who served as representatives of the town as an independent political unit with structures of collective governance.³ At town gates, town elders met as representatives of the town to mediate between the town and outsiders.⁴ As such, town gates could also be a space within which kings could seek to assert their power over the political unit of the town. By standing in the seat of the town's power, Absalom offers himself as a just monarch with

a particular style of power, one that embraces the distributed, collective politics of towns and tribes.⁵ I outline here the biblical and archaeological evidence for the spatial and political world I am suggesting our narrative assumes.⁶ I then return to 2 Sam 15:1–6 to show how the narrative deploys themes of space and power.

Gates and Towns in the Hebrew Bible

There is abundant biblical evidence for the civic function of Levantine city gates, as several scholars have observed.⁷ The law codes of Deuteronomy reflect a model of judicial power in which city gates were the site of legal decisions rendered by town elders.⁸ For example, the codes envision a situation, within the sphere of family life, in which a disgruntled husband might accuse a woman of not having been a virgin upon their marriage (Deut 22:13–21). Evidently at stake are the legitimacy of heirs born to the couple and the financial arrangements made between the husband and the wife's father. The parents of the wife are instructed to produce the evidence of her virginity before the elders of the city in the gate (Deut 22:15).⁹ The elders, for their part, are admonished by the code to examine the cloth brought by the parents and reach a verdict accordingly. One infers that it is dried blood on the sheet that would serve as witness to the wife's virginity, but given the ease with which blood could be obtained the sheet must have served only as a signifier for a state guaranteed within the relational matrix assumed by the text.¹⁰ If the town elders find in favor of the wife's parents, sanctions are imposed upon the husband. If they find in favor of the husband, the crime against husband and father is considered punishable by death.¹¹ Within the code, then, city gates were a venue for the performance of patriarchal authority both within the nuclear family and between individual households associated with a particular town. That authority was mediated through a collective body, the town elders.

Related themes emerge in Deut 25:5–10, which lays down regulations for the enforcement of levirate marriage.¹² According to this Israelite institution, the brother of a deceased man who left his widow with no children was obligated to marry her and produce an heir for his brother's inheritance. If he was reluctant, the widow could make protest in the city gate to the town's elders, who would then encourage the brother to fulfill his duty or else would subject him to the sanctions of shame if he persisted in his refusal. Although the woman exercised agency in bringing the case before

the elders, again the city gates were a theater for the performance of patriarchal authority within and between families of a particular town. Such authority guaranteed relations of property between men and their male heirs and also guaranteed the trade in intangible markers of status: shame, honor, and filial duty.¹³ The book of Ruth presents in narrative form the legal principles embodied here in Deuteronomy, with Boaz negotiating his marriage to his relative's widow Ruth before the elders in the city gate (Ruth 4:1–11; note also the use of שער, “gate,” to mean “elder” in Ruth 3:11).¹⁴ Related themes emerge in the procedures outlined for bringing before the elders at the city gate other legal situations related to the patriarchal household in Deut 22:18–21 and Deut 22:23–24. In these texts, a body of elders is imagined to mediate relationships between households belonging to the town and town gates provide a locus for their authority.

Gates also served as a location where elders mediated relationships between the town as a collective political body and outsiders. The legal fate of the accidental manslayer is taken up in Deut 19:1–13, Num 35:9–29, and Josh 20:1–9.¹⁵ According to these texts, particular cities were to be designated as havens for those who did not kill intentionally or with premeditation. There, they could reside without fear of retribution from the relatives of the deceased or from society itself. Of the texts dealing with the accidental manslayer, Josh 20:1–9 is particularly relevant. According to editorial additions in v. 4, before entering the city of refuge, the accidental manslayer must present his case before the elders of the town in the gate.¹⁶ This hearing is separate from the trial for the murder itself, which is to take place before the assembly (v. 6). The text not only acknowledges the judicial function of gates, but recognizes the authority of local elders to negotiate relationships between the town and outsiders. Despite the special role imagined for these towns within the larger tribal collective, the text acknowledges the status of towns as independent political units that held the right to determine whether or not an accidental manslayer was admitted.

The importance of the town as a segmentary political unit is also evident in the writings of the eighth-century prophet Amos, whose ministry took place largely at Bethel in Israel.¹⁷ As has been noted by several scholars, in the central section of Amos, the so-called Book of Woes, the prophet twice decries injustice in the city gates (Amos 5:10, 12) and exhorts his audience to establish justice in the gate (v. 15).¹⁸ Prophetic references to justice in the gates can also be found in Isa 29:21 and Zech 8:16, and the theme is taken up in wisdom tradition in Prov 22:22.¹⁹ Here, I wish to point out the political structure envisioned by the Book

of Woes.²⁰ The Book of Woes is addressed to the “House of Israel” (5:1).²¹ Within this section of Amos, the House of Israel is not depicted in terms of its monarch, nor even in terms of its tribes. Rather, the primary segmentary unit of the House of Israel in the Book of Woes is the town, as evidenced especially in Amos 5:3–5. Verse 3 is addressed to the House of Israel as a whole and to its towns in particular, implying that Israel was composed of towns: “Thus says Yahweh to the House of Israel, the town that . . .”²² In warning that the town that marches out to war will return defeated, v. 3 may even assume that individual towns had some power to decide whether or not to join in battle. Furthermore, particular sanctuary towns are held accountable for leading Israel astray—Bethel and Gilgal, and perhaps also Beersheba (v. 5).²³ The call to establish justice in the gates should be understood in this context. Within the prophetic logic of the Book of Woes, Israel, composed of its towns, was responsible for Yahweh’s wrath by failing to establish justice at the level of the town.

The ability of city gates to define membership in a political body, namely the town, is borne out in a biblical idiom used in two narratives from the book of Genesis.²⁴ Gen 23 describes Abraham’s purchase of the cave of Machpelah from Ephron and the Bnei Het.²⁵ Abraham acquires the land in order to use it as a permanent burial site for Sarah, his deceased wife. According to vv. 10 and 18, the legal transaction takes place in the presence of “the Bnei Het, all those entering the gates of [Ephron’s] town.” The expressions are in apposition, suggesting that those entering the gates of the town served as a definition of the political body the Bnei Het. Careful attention to the language of the text indicates that Ephron lacked the authority to transfer land to outsiders. Thus, although Abraham knows whose field he wishes to purchase, he approaches the Bnei Het rather than Ephron. Furthermore, although consideration—400 shekels of silver—is exchanged between Ephron and Abraham only, Abraham is said to have acquired the land from the Bnei Het (Gen 23:20; cf. Gen 25:10; 49:32). It was only this collective political body, the Bnei Het, who held sufficient power to transfer the land held by one of the town’s members to an outsider. In Chapter 2, I offer a more detailed portrait of how land rights functioned in the ancient Near East, including the administrative rights exercised in Gen 23 by the Bnei Het. Here I wish to note that this political body is defined metonymically by the city gates. The corporate political body of the town is likewise defined as “all those leaving the gates of his town” in Gen 34:24, within the narrative of Dinah’s rape by Shechem and the revenge taken by her brothers Simeon and Levi on Shechem and his town.

Additional biblical texts that do not mention gates confirm the notion of the town as a political unit represented by its elders. In the story of Saul's rise to power in 1 Sam 11, for example, Nahash the Ammonite reportedly laid siege to Jabesh-Gilead. According to the text, "all the men of Jabesh-Gilead" offered to surrender to Nahash so that the town would come under Ammonite rule. Later on, however, the text specifies that it is the "elders of Jabesh-Gilead" who conducted the negotiations. The story portrays the town as an independent political unit represented by its elders. In the narrative of Samuel's anointing of David in 1 Sam 16, the elders of Bethlehem run out to meet Samuel asking if he has come in peace. In context, they seem to speak for the entire town.

The importance of the town as a segmentary unit is highlighted further in biblical texts that do not mention elders. The book of Joshua understands Israelite and Judahite tribal territories to consist of towns and their surrounding lands (for example, note the language of Josh 15:21–63; 16:8–9; 17:9, 11–12; 18:20–28; 19:2–8, 15–17, 22–23, 30–31, 38–39, 48).²⁶ According to the description of Solomon's administration in 1 Kgs 4, Solomon divided the whole country into twelve administrative districts, each responsible for provisioning the royal household for one month out of the year. Although some of these districts are defined tribally (vv. 15–18), others are defined by towns and have no stated relationship to tribal boundaries (vv. 9, 12, 14). And according to 1 Kgs 9:10–14, Solomon presented twenty towns to Hiram, suggesting that the town was a basic geopolitical unit within international relations.²⁷

The precise dates of each of the biblical texts I have been discussing here are less important to my thesis than the broad picture both monarchic era texts and post-monarchic era texts paint of the social world that produced the Bible. In sum, these biblical data suggest that town gates were the seat of the collective judicial and administrative power of the town, embodied in town elders, and that the town was regarded as a political unit that, despite obligations to larger political structures, maintained a level of self-governing independence.

Gates and Towns in Texts from Mesopotamia and the Northern Levant

Other documentary evidence from the ancient Near East confirms the civic function of town gates and the collective politics of towns. The most relevant evidence depicts the geopolitical structure of the Southern Levant in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages. Since this book aims to set Israelite

and Judahite royal spatial power within its ancient Near Eastern context, I will very briefly note evidence for related patterns of spatial politics in the Northern Levant and Mesopotamia before returning below to this more directly relevant evidence for the Southern Levant.²⁸ I cite this material here to illustrate how biblical kings exercised spatial power according to recognizable patterns.

Mesopotamian textual evidence confirms that gates were a well-known location of civic and judicial activity.²⁹ Consider, for example, a large Assyrian tablet, dated by its colophon to the sixth year of Sargon II, i.e., c. 716 BCE, and containing a collection of short popular sayings on a wide variety of topics (VAT 8807). The top of column IV of the reverse of the tablet offers a warning against injustice at the gate: "The sycophant stands in court at the city gate, right and left he hands out bribes. The warrior Šamaš knows his misdeeds."³⁰ Or consider a Neo-Babylonian letter from Nabu-etir-napshati to Nadin concerning a dispute over cattle (BIN 1 34:26).³¹ The letter specifies that the litigation takes place before the god at the gate of the country. Or, a text published by Carl Frank mentions a woman who brings a child before the judges at the city gate.³² A wide variety of other texts confirm the judicial function of Mesopotamian gates in broad terms.³³

Judicial authority exercised in Mesopotamian town gates was sometimes closely aligned with centralized monarchic authority and at other times with collective structures of governance based on traditional authority.³⁴ Indeed, recent scholarship has emphasized the cooperation between different types of judicial authority in Mesopotamia.³⁵ As an example of collective judicial power, consider an Old Babylonian letter discovered at Nippur that records the handling of a dispute between Lugatum, owner of an ox, and Ubar-Lalu, under whose care the ox had died (PBS 7 7:20).³⁶ The case was initially heard by the letter's author, Sin-putram, who referred the case to the judges of Nippur. Having heard the case, "The judges pronounced the decision to them in Nippur and they sent Ubar-Lalu to the Garden Gate to take the oath."³⁷ The gate is depicted here as the site where the legal decision rendered by the judges takes effect. Lines 16 and 19 use the plural "judges," which emphasizes shared power. Indeed, the regular use of the plural "judges" in a wide variety of Mesopotamian texts suggests that Mesopotamian judges acted in collegia in the Old Babylonian period.³⁸ This case was referred to the college of judges at a particular city, Nippur. Nippur is an interesting choice because it does not appear to have enjoyed political hegemony in its own right but seems rather to have

conferred kingship on monarchs from other cities. As such, it represented a political power distinct from centralized monarchy.

Gates also served a judicial function in the literature preserved from Ugarit, a city-state on the Mediterranean coast that thrived in the Late Bronze Age.³⁹ According to the Ugaritic tale of Aqhat, the hero Danel “arose and sat at the entrance to the (city-)gate, among the leaders (sitting) at the threshing floor, he judged the widow’s case, made decisions regarding the orphan” (KTU 1.17 v 6–8). The text bears witness to the gate as a space of judgment. Some commentators understand Danel’s actions here as reflecting the motif of the just king, a motif found more explicitly in the Kirta Epic.⁴⁰ In that story, Yasib seeks to depose his ailing father Kirta from the throne and accuses him of failure to fulfill the duties of kingship: “You don’t adjudicate the case of the widow, you don’t judge the legal claim of the wretched” (KTU 1.16 VI 45–47).⁴¹ But even if KTU 1.17 evokes a royal image, it does not depict Danel as judging alone. Rather, it describes him as joining a group of leaders (*adrm*) who exercise collective governance in the city gate.⁴² Indeed, even the Kirta Epic depicts the king as requiring the political support of a collective group—“my seventy ‘bulls,’ my eighty ‘wild deer,’” called also “the ‘bulls’ of [the city of] Khubur”—as he contemplates appointing a successor (KTU 1.15 IV 1–27). In Ugaritic narrative poetry, then, city gates were imagined as having a civic function and collective political structures were understood to play some role in supporting royal power.⁴³

As for political structure, Mesopotamian texts confirm that the town was a segmentary political unit with structures of collective governance in some ancient Near Eastern settings. Daniel E. Fleming has observed the collective political voice of the town in the Mari archive.⁴⁴ This collection of some 25,000 Akkadian documents from the Old Babylonian Period offers a portrait of political life at Mari, situated on the northern Euphrates, between southern Mesopotamia and the Levant. The town was the basic segmentary unit of the kingdoms that expanded and contracted in the region. Thus in A.1289+: iii:8–23, Ibal-pi-el II of Ešnunna offers Zimri-Lim of Mari a treaty in which towns are the primary unit of barter between the kingdoms.⁴⁵ Or, for example, in A.319 = ARM XIV 104 + A.472 town elders are described as acting independently of the town ruler by leaving the safety of the town walls to negotiate peace with an attacker. The evidence is too extensive to be recounted here, but Fleming makes a compelling case for the collective, segmentary nature of towns in the Mari archive and traces the evidence for corporate town governance as early as

the third millennium BCE. He writes, "In political terms, the language of the 'town' seems always to have been corporate in nature, even when subsumed into the exclusionary notions of kingship . . . the 'town' is finally not a place but a population."⁴⁶

Collective town politics is also evidenced in Late Bronze Age Akkadian texts from Emar, which was situated on the middle Euphrates river in northern Mesopotamia. Emar's monarchy evidently had quite limited powers compared to those wielded, for example, by kings in Babylon or Nineveh.⁴⁷ In several land sale documents, town elders conducted legal transactions as representatives of the town's collective power (RE 16,⁴⁸ RE 34,⁴⁹ Emar 144,⁵⁰ Emar 197⁵¹). In these texts, an offense committed by an individual resulted in the retroversion of ownership of the individual's property to the town. The elders of Emar assumed administrative control of the property and were then free as a collective legal entity to sell it to private citizens. In Chapter 2, I offer a general framework for understanding ancient Near Eastern administrative rights in land and discuss some of this evidence from Emar. Here I wish to note that these land sale texts depict the town as an administrative entity capable of entering into legal contracts with individuals. In these legal documents, the collective power of the town is vested in its elders.

This brief foray into evidence for the judicial and geopolitical structure of Mesopotamia and the Northern Levant illustrates how the biblical data discussed here relate to larger patterns of spatial power in the ancient Near East. In several ancient Near Eastern settings, gates served civic functions, including judicial ones. And in several ancient Near Eastern settings, collective governance at the level of the town functioned in tandem with centralized power exercised by individual rulers, in differing configurations.

Towns in Texts Depicting the Southern Levant

Returning to evidence more directly relevant to my interpretation of 2 Sam 15:1–6, let us consider several texts depicting the geopolitics of the Southern Levant in the Late Bronze and Iron Ages. The Amarna archive—a collection of some 382 Akkadian letters from various Late Bronze Age southern Levantine polities to the Egyptian pharaoh, who exercised considerable power over the region during this period—offers a tantalizing portrait of local and international politics in the Southern Levant.⁵² Scholars have long noted how the archive depicts cities and extended territories

governed by cities as the two basic units of the Levantine political landscape in the period, with the Egyptian king evidently playing one local city ruler against another as part of his strategy for controlling the region.⁵³ Individual city rulers feature prominently in much of this diplomatic correspondence. But a collective political voice also emerges in these texts, as Brendon C. Benz has shown.⁵⁴ Consider, for example, EA 100, “This tablet is the tablet of the city of ‘Irkata to the king, our lord. The message of the city of ‘Irkata and of its elders” (ln. 1–4).⁵⁵ Although EA 140 ln. 10 mentions Aduna, king of ‘Irkata, and although EA 100 ln. 29–30 mentions an individual appointed by the king of Egypt over ‘Irkata, no royal voice from ‘Irkata speaks in EA 100. Rather, the town, as a collective political unit, assures the king that they are heeding his command to guard the city (ln. 11–19). Evidently, this involved keeping the town gates locked in a defensive position (ln. 39–42) against forces not loyal to Egypt (ln. 23–29). As a collective political body, then, the town made decisions about its political relationships with Egypt and with Egypt’s enemies. In a similar vein, the town of Tunip as a collective political unit writes directly to the king of Egypt in EA 59, “To the king of the land of Egypt, ou[r] lord, thus (speak) the sons of the city of Tunip, your servant” (ln. 1–2).⁵⁶ As with Gen 23 discussed above, familial language here designates membership in the collective political body of the town. As a final example, consider two letters from the city of Gubla, i.e., Byblos. In EA 139, the city’s ruler ‘Ilu-rapī writes to the king, while in EA 140, both the city of Gubla and its ruler write.⁵⁷ Indeed, EA 138 details how Rib-Hadda, the former ruler of Gubla loyal to Egypt, was ousted by the men of the city of Gubla.⁵⁸ To judge by these letters, collective and centralized political action both functioned in a single system at Gubla. In sum, although much of the Amarna correspondence focuses on the centralized power of individual rulers, other configurations of power were possible in the late Bronze Age Southern Levant. The Amarna letters cited here suggest that some late Bronze Age Levantine towns gave prominence to collective political structures, including some rooted in the language of family.

The Rassam Cylinder (RINAP 3 4) dates from the Neo-Assyrian period and, in part, recounts the military activities of Sennacherib king of Assyria in the Southern Levant c. 701 BCE.⁵⁹ In Chapter 3 I observe its portrayal of the king’s destructive power over space and in Chapter 5 I discuss the cylinder in relation to biblical claims that Hezekiah of Judah reshaped Jerusalem’s water supply system. Here, I wish to observe the text’s portrayal of political organization in the Iron Age II Southern Levant. Two

sections of the cylinder are particularly relevant to my argument here. The first describes Sennacherib's attack on the Philistine city of Ekron, immediately to the west of Judahite territory (ln. 42–48). Even as it asserts the legitimacy of the Ekronite king loyal to Assyria, the text acknowledges the power of “the governors, the nobles, and the people of the city Ekron” to remove the king from office and exile him (ln. 42). These political actors were capable of representing the city to outsiders and they made binding political agreements with neighboring royal powers—with the king of Jerusalem, the kings of Egypt, and the king of the land of Meluhḥa (ln. 42–43). Furthermore, they were capable of mobilizing the city to war with Assyria (ln. 44). At the same time, political power and its accompanying responsibility were not distributed equally among these actors. Sennacherib distinguished between the governors and nobles, who were punished with execution and exposure, and mere conspiratorial citizens, who became spoils of war but whose lives were spared (ln. 46–47).

The second germane section of the Rassam Cylinder focuses on Judah (ln. 49–58). The text recognizes Hezekiah as ruling over the land of Judah from “Jerusalem, his royal city” (ln. 52). The territory he controlled is understood to be composed of “fortified walled cities and surrounding smaller towns” (ln. 49). Cities were the basic geopolitical unit through which Sennacherib redistributed power in the region: “I detached from his [i.e., Hezekiah's] land the cities of his that I had plundered and I gave (them) to Mitinti, the king of the city Ashdod, and Padî, the king of the city Ekron, (and) Şilli-Bêl, the king of the land Gaza, (and thereby) made his land smaller” (ln. 53).⁶⁰ The text makes no mention of collective political action in Jerusalem. If such collective structures existed in Jerusalem—the biblical portrait of the Assyrian Rabshakeh appealing to Jerusalem's residents to reject Hezekiah's rule assumes they did (2 Kgs 18:27–37 and Isa 36:12–20)—they may have been unknown to Sennacherib, who does not appear to have breached the city's fortifications. In sum, this late Iron Age text written by an outsider to the Southern Levant understands the region to be composed of territories controlled by a central city, perhaps including smaller fortified cities and surrounding towns, and governed both by individual rulers and by collective political structures in varying configurations.

Gates and Towns in the Archaeological Record

Turning to archaeological evidence from the Southern Levant, the most distinctive architectural feature of the town relevant to the themes I have been

discussing is the presence of benches built into the structure of the town gate.⁶¹ Approximately twenty Iron Age II Israelite and Judahite city gates are attested in the archaeological record.⁶² The Iron Age II Israelite town gate was typically quite large, circa 20m by 20m.⁶³ It was characterized by a series of opposing pairs of open chambers flanking its main passageway, producing two-chambered, four-chambered, or six-chambered arrangements. Such chambered Israelite gates are attested from the late eleventh through the eighth centuries BCE. Six-chambered gates have been found in Megiddo IVB, Hazor X, Gezer, Lachish IV, and Ashdod, and may also have been present at Tel 'Ira. Four-chambered gates are known from Megiddo IVA, Beersheba V, Beersheba III, Tel Dan, Ashdod 10, and Tell en-Nasbeh. And two-chambered gates are attested in Megiddo IVa, Megiddo VA, Tell Beit Mirsim B3, Tell Beit Mirsim A2, and Megiddo III. Gate chambers ranged in size from 6 to 24 square meters, though even larger chambers are known from tenth-century Ashdod. This Iron Age II chambered gate stands in contrast to the typical Middle Bronze gate from the region, in which the gate's main passageway was flanked by enclosed rooms. The openness of Iron Age II gates, the size of their chambers, the presence of benches and basins in some of their chambers, and the existence of adjacent open spaces has led archaeologists to conclude that city gates served civic functions in the Iron Age II.⁶⁴ This archaeological picture dovetails nicely with the textual evidence I have been outlining. In contrast to the dense network of city alleyways and houses, the gate chambers and the open spaces surrounding the gate would have provided an environment for civic activities and it is evidently there that Iron Age II elders exercised collective political and judicial authority as stated in the biblical texts discussed above.

The association of city gates with collective structures of power that operated with some degree of independence from centralized, monarchic power is further highlighted by the existence of benches in Levantine city gates before the monarchic period. Relevant here are the finds from ancient Israel's neighbor Moab. In the monarchic period, multi-chambered gates are attested at Khirbat al-Mudayna ath-Thamad and Khirbat al-Mudaybi'.⁶⁵ The former of these has been more extensively excavated and benches lining the entry street and the gate chambers have been uncovered. The excavators understand the benches as pointing to the civic function of city gates in the monarchic period. Relevant to the argument I am advancing is the fact that such benches are also attested in Moab before the rise of the monarchy. Khirbat Mudayna al-Mu'arradjeh was excavated by Emilio Olàvarri in the 1980s.⁶⁶ The walled town's simple gate structure contains

benches built into the architecture of the gate itself. The gate structure is dated on the basis of pottery finds to the Iron I period, before the rise of monarchic power in Moab. These benches attest the civic function of city gates in the Levant independent of centralized royal power and thus highlight the collective politics of Iron Age Levantine towns.

Bruce Routledge's analysis of the Mesha stele sheds light on this archaeological picture from Moab.⁶⁷ The stele was erected by Mesha, king of Moab, in the middle of the ninth century BCE on the occasion of his construction of a sacred space dedicated to Chemosh.⁶⁸ It describes not only Mesha's building activities, but also wars fought with Israel and other neighbors. While recent scholarship has understood the stele as depicting Moab as a tribal state or tribal confederacy, Routledge shows the importance of geography in defining the segmentary political structure assumed by the inscription. Routledge observes, "Overall, the [Mesha Inscription] seems to be syntactically organized around hierarchically linked geopolitical units. . . . the primary units of identification and social action are based in locality rather than descent."⁶⁹ Thus expressions such as "land of [city name]" are used repeatedly in the inscription and are understood to be related to other geographically differentiated political segments.⁷⁰ Routledge's work on the Mesha inscription shows the importance of towns, namely Dibon, Ataroth, Madaba (including its satellite settlements Baal-Meon and Qiryaten), and Hawronen, in defining the political structure of Iron Age Moab. In light of this depiction of the Moabite town as a segmentary unit, I suggest that Moabite city gate benches observable in the archaeological record may be profitably understood as representing the seat of the collective power of the Moabite town. The town predated the monarchy in Moab, and the Mesha stele portrays Mesha's attempts to extend a political identity for Moab that superseded and incorporated the town.⁷¹

The archaeological record also suggests that gates were a location within which kings could seek to assert their claim to a town. David Ussishkin has catalogued a number of statues or monumental stelae that were set up by ancient Near Eastern and Anatolian monarchs in existing town or acropolis gates.⁷² He cites as examples a basalt statue of a seated king at Tell Mardikh (ancient Ebla),⁷³ a segment of a colossal statue apparently holding a royal scepter at Alaca Höyük,⁷⁴ fragments of a statue of a man at Boğazköy (ancient Hattusha),⁷⁵ a statue of a royal seated figure at Carchemish,⁷⁶ a statue of a royal figure at Malatya (ancient Melid),⁷⁷ a colossal basalt statue of a man seated on a throne at Tell Tayinat,⁷⁸ a large

dolerite stele erected by Esarhaddon at Zincirli,⁷⁹ a fragment of a large Assyrian-style stele and a stele erected by Esarhaddon at Til-Barsib,⁸⁰ and a monumental Israelite limestone stele at Samaria.⁸¹ Imposed monuments were by no means placed only in gates; fragments of large stele erected by Pharaoh Shoshenq I were unearthed far from the city gates of Megiddo.⁸² In each of the cases Ussishkin cites, the stele or statue seems to have been placed secondarily into an existing gate complex. They thus evidently represented attempts by a monarch to assert authority over an existing town. Along related lines, the late Hittite fortress town of Karatepe includes in its gate a late eighth-century bilingual monumental inscription celebrating the great deeds of King Azatiwada.⁸³ And 1 Kgs 22:10 portrays the kings of Israel and Judah seated beside the gate of Samaria in a very public display of their authority to decide on whether or not to go to war. Gates were thus an important locus for claiming power over the political unit of the town.

To sum up, then, a wide variety of textual and archaeological evidence points to the importance of the town as a political unit in the ancient Southern Levant and to the city gate as a location of civic and judicial activity, especially such activity as carried out by the town's elders, who embodied the town's collective political authority. Furthermore, city gates were a locus within which kings could seek to lay claim to and secure the political support of towns.

Collective Politics and Absalom's Strategy

Returning to 2 Sam 15:2–6, I suggest that Absalom is portrayed here as deploying a strategy of power that attends to such collective politics. The verb forms used throughout the story, *weqatal* verbs, are best understood as referring to habitual action.⁸⁴ As much is confirmed by v. 6, “Absalom acted in this manner toward every Israelite who would come to the king for judgment.” The scene plays out again and again, daily for four years (cf. v. 7).⁸⁵ Habit here betrays intention. Absalom consistently returns to a particular location because that location holds strategic importance. In describing this location, the Masoretic Text—the traditional Hebrew text represented by medieval manuscripts—reads על־יֵד דֶּרֶךְ הַשַּׁעַר, which is often rendered similarly to the new translation from the Jewish Publication Society, “by the road to the city gates.” Such a translation, however, overlooks the testimony of other ancient witnesses to what the original Hebrew text read.⁸⁶ These witnesses suggest that the medieval Hebrew manuscript tradition represents the conflation of two variant wordings, יֵד הַדֶּרֶךְ and יֵד הַשַּׁעַר.⁸⁷

These variants, in fact, represent alternative names for the same architectural feature of city gates, as Baruch Halpern has shown.⁸⁸ In the description of Eli's death in 1 Sam 4, Eli is described once as sitting upon יד דרך (v. 14) and once as sitting upon יד השער (v. 18). Eli, however, has not moved in the scene. The story thus makes clear that the two terms are alternative names for the same architectural feature of city gates, from whence Eli could watch for the returning Israelite army despite his fading eyesight and from whence he could fall and break his neck. Related expressions are found in the description of wisdom calling from the gates in Prov 8:3 (יד שערים) and in the account of David watching the troops march out in 2 Sam 18:4 (יד השער). It is here, in the city gate, rather than in some road leading to it, that Absalom seeks to build political support.⁸⁹

Although the logic motivating his strategic choice of the city gate is not stated explicitly in the narrative, the text provides clues that link the episode with the larger themes I have been discussing. According to the text, Absalom would rise early and call out to anyone bringing a case to be judged by the king (v. 2). Absalom targeted specific individuals, those with legal claims. In using the verb "call out" (*קרא*) the text does not state explicitly how, but implies that Absalom would recognize plaintiffs. Here, the narrative evidently assumes the judicial function of the city gate. The plaintiff would arrive early in the morning, hoping to obtain justice from the king, and would seek justice in the city gate, a location where judges were known to be.⁹⁰ But the king, although evoked by the narrator and by Absalom, was conspicuously absent from the gate. In fact, in the larger narrative world of the books of Samuel and Kings, the House of David shifted the location of judgment to the palace, where the king sat, as stated explicitly in 1 Kgs 7:7 and as implied, perhaps, by 1 Kgs 3:15–16. The narrative logic of v. 2, in which Absalom routinely stations himself at the gate in order to encounter plaintiffs, depends on the assumption that city gates were a well-known location of judicial activity.

Absalom's opening gambit shows an awareness of the tension between collective judicial authority distributed among Israel's towns and the style of centralized power deployed by the current king.⁹¹ "From what town are you?" he calls out to the bewildered Israelite. His question highlights the fact that favorable judgment was not available to the plaintiff in his home town.⁹² The plaintiff's reply aligns segmentation by geography with segmentation by kinship, "From one of the tribes of Israel is your servant." Some have argued that this identification plays on northern, Israelite resentment toward southern, Judahite hegemony.⁹³ The larger narrative

sequence, however, assumes that Absalom has the support of both north and south.⁹⁴ Absalom is crowned in Hebron and David must flee Judahite territory altogether. To my mind, then, the contrast is not between Israel and Judah but between town and tribe on the one hand, and what Absalom highlights next in his exchange with the plaintiff. With great rhetorical subtlety, Absalom delays blame for the plaintiff's situation to the very end of his sentence, "See your claim is right . . . but there is no one to hear you, from the king."⁹⁵ This delayed blame highlights the tension between the centralized, and inaccessible, power of the current king and the distributed power of the town and tribe with which Absalom opened the conversation. To be sure, Absalom's use of chariot and runners in v. 1 clearly points to his royal ambitions.⁹⁶ But Absalom here styles himself as a particular kind of just king, one who will not be isolated in a palace but will be "in the land" (v. 4), i.e., present and accessible in the territory of Israel.⁹⁷ In refusing to accept obeisance and instead embracing and kissing plaintiffs, Absalom further aligns himself with the egalitarianism embodied in the rhetorical allegiances of town and tribe.⁹⁸

The narrative reports that Absalom's strategy is effective: "Absalom stole the heart of the men of Israel" (1 Sam 15:6). The focus here is not on individual Israelites, but on the collective political body, "the men of Israel."⁹⁹ The phrase אנשי ישראל, "the men of Israel," is used in the Hebrew Bible only in the book of Samuel. It refers to a collective body going out to war in 1 Sam 7:11; 17:52; 31:1, 7; 2 Sam 2:17, and it refers to a collective body making decisions about kingship in 1 Sam 8:22; 11:15. The related expression כל איש ישראל, "every man of Israel," is used in several biblical books and in the book of Samuel refers to a corporate political body making decisions about kingship in 1 Sam 11:15; 2 Sam 16:18; 2 Sam 2:20 (cf. 2 Sam 19:42) and a corporate body fighting or making decisions about war in 1 Sam 14:22; 17:19, 24; 2 Sam 17:14, 24. The corporate resonance of "the men of Israel" in the book of Samuel comports with the analysis of 2 Sam 15:1–6 I have offered here. Absalom steals the heart of the collective body "the men of Israel." The narrative understands the Israelite collective as being composed of its tribes and its towns, and acknowledges the tension between the distributed power of Israel's tribes and towns and the style of centralized power wielded by the reigning king.

As with so much of the David Story, our narrative is ambiguous in its presentation of David and his rule.¹⁰⁰ On the one hand, the narrative portrays Absalom as "stealing" (גנב) the heart of the men of Israel (v. 6). As several commentators have noted, the use of the verbal root גנב in Gen

31:20 suggests that its use in 2 Sam 15:6 refers not to legitimate capturing of the people's affections but to deception of some kind, hence the usual translation "steal."¹⁰¹ In using this verb, the narrative presents Absalom as an illegitimate usurper. And yet, by noting the success of Absalom's strategy, the narrative has also offered a penetrating critique of David's rule. In the larger narrative world assumed by our text, as I have sketched it here, the allegiances embraced by Absalom and the plaintiff, town and tribe, were based on distributed, collective power and were inadequately addressed by the current king.¹⁰² Our story thus forms part of a larger narrative arc in the book of Samuel that relates the fulfillment of a divine curse against David for his adultery with Bathsheba and murder of Uriah (2 Sam 12:7–12).¹⁰³

Absalom's strategy here also contrasts with that of Solomon, which I discuss in Chapter 1. The book of Kings presents Solomon as utilizing an exclusionary strategy of power based on the management of extra-group relationships. He imported the architecture of his palace and temple from up the Levantine coast, strengthened his diplomatic ties with prestigious neighbors through marriage, and organized and controlled international trade. Absalom, on the other hand, deploys here a strategy of power focused on managing relationships within the group. In stationing himself in the city gate, a space that served as the traditional seat of the town's collective judicial authority, he acknowledges the importance of the town and of distributed structures of power. The literary portrayal of his strategy reflects the collective politics of Israel's towns and tribes.

In this chapter, I have outlined the evidence showing that Iron Age Southern Levantine town gates were spaces with civic functions, including judicial ones, and that Iron Age Southern Levantine towns were segmentary political units with structures of collective governance. City gates were one space within which Levantine kings could seek to build political support at the level of the town. This chapter has thus explored in greater detail one of the themes from Chapter 1, spatial expression of the tension between centralized and collective strategies of political action. In the next chapter, I take up a final theme from Chapter 1, royal building in Jerusalem.

Hezekiah's Tunnel

ON ROYAL SHAPING OF THE WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

IN CHAPTERS 2 THROUGH 4 I traced in greater detail two themes from Chapter 1: the king's power to shape religious space and the relationship between centralized royal power and the collective politics of towns. In this chapter, I take up a third theme from Chapter 1, royal building in Judah's capital, Jerusalem. I examine here royal shaping of Jerusalem's water supply system. According to 2 Chr 32:2–4, in response to an Assyrian invasion of Judah, King Hezekiah blocked up the springs (העינות) that were outside the city of Jerusalem to prevent the Assyrian army from having access to water. Second Kgs 20:20 attributes to Hezekiah the construction of the pool (הברכה) and the conduit (התעלה) that brought water to—or perhaps into—the city.¹ Scholars generally identify these acts of reshaping Jerusalem's water system with one another, as is implied by 2 Chr 32:30, which notes both the stopping of the upper source of the waters of Gihon (מוצא מימי גיחון העליון) and their redirection downward west of the City of David.² The mention of Gihon in 2 Chr 32:30 has also led to the identification of these Hezekian activities with the Siloam tunnel that Edward Robinson discovered in 1838.³ To cite but one example, Joseph Blenkinsopp writes, “Securing the water supply was, of course, crucial. The measures taken are detailed in the accounts of the reign and the famous Siloam tunnel inscription (2 Kgs 20:20; 2 Chr 32:3–4, 30; ANET, 321). They involved filling the Lower Cistern (*birket el-hamra*, about 200 meters south of Siloam), digging the Siloam tunnel from the Gihon spring to Siloam, and presumably securing the Upper Cistern as well (cf. [Isa] 7:3; 36:7).”⁴

In this chapter, I question the assumption that these biblical texts make the same claim about royal reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply system.

I explore the editorial history of the Hezekiah narratives in order to show that 2 Chr 32:30 is a later gloss and that 2 Chr 32:3–4 and 2 Kgs 20:20 are not literarily dependent on one another. They make independent claims about Hezekiah's power to shape Jerusalem's landscape. I survey the ancient Near Eastern literary motif of royal construction and care of water supply systems. The literary contours of this motif, I argue, confirm that 2 Chr 32:2–4 and 2 Kgs 20:20 make distinct historical claims. I evaluate these claims about Hezekiah's exercise of spatial power, especially in light of recently discovered archaeological evidence from Jerusalem. Finally, I note the literary function of these notices in Kings and Chronicles.

Literary History of the Hezekiah Narratives

This chapter focuses on notices about Hezekiah's shaping of Jerusalem's water supply system in 2 Chr 32:2–4 and 2 Kgs 20:20, and treats briefly the late gloss in 2 Chr 32:30. Each notice plays a distinct role within its current literary setting. It is not possible to assess these notices adequately without first outlining the history of the composition and editing of their larger literary contexts, namely the biblical traditions about Hezekiah. Three biblical passages describe Hezekiah's reign: 2 Kgs 18–20, Isa 36–38, and 2 Chr 29–32. As is well known, the wording of 2 Kgs 18–20 and Isa 36–38 is almost identical for large stretches, suggesting that one text was copied from the other, or else that both drew on a common source. Several scholars accept the view of Wilhelm Gesenius, articulated long ago, that the narrative as a whole appears quite conspicuous in Isaiah, which consists largely of prophetic oracles, while it appears at home among the narratives in Kings.⁵ Recently, however, a few scholars have challenged this view.⁶ They point out that the material is not nearly as at home in Kings as it might at first appear. Uniquely, this is the only time that a prophet known from the prophetic books appears in Kings.⁷ It is the only narrative in Kings in which a prophet operates in a Judaeon, rather than an Israelite, context.⁸ And it is the only section of Kings to contain poetry. In exploring the question of provenance, one must also reckon with the possibility that as the books of Isaiah and Kings continued to be edited and transmitted, the texts likely influenced one another—what Robb Andrew Young terms “cross-pollination” in his treatment of these narratives.⁹ In my judgment, Young is correct to analyze independently the provenance of the narrative's major blocks and to compare the core themes and vocabulary of each narrative block with its context in Isaiah and Kings. To make this

comparison, I divide the narrative into: (1) an extended prophetic account of Sennacherib and Hezekiah in 2 Kgs 18:13, 17–2 Kgs 19:37//Isa 36–37; (2) an account of Hezekiah's illness in 2 Kgs 20:1–11//Isa 38:1–8, 21–22; (3) an account of Hezekiah and a Babylonian envoy in 2 Kgs 20:12–19//Isa 39.¹⁰ In addition, there are two blocks of textual material, one in Isaiah and one in Kings, that have no parallel in the other text and that likely represent later editorial insertions into their respective contexts: (4) an account of Hezekiah's payment of tribute in 2 Kgs 18:14–16; (5) a poetic prayer attributed to Hezekiah in Isa 38:9–20.¹¹

The first narrative block, 2 Kgs 18:13, 17–2 Kgs 19:37//Isa 36–37, is more typical of Isaiah than of Kings.¹² The prophetic oracle in 2 Kgs 19:21–28//Isa 37:22–29 is rich with poetic phrases that are common in Isaiah but are rare or unattested in Kings—for example, *קדוש, הרים קול, חרף, בת ציון, יארם מצור, ישראל*—in part, reflecting the fact that poetry is more typical of Isaiah than Kings.¹³ Furthermore, in 2 Kgs 19:4, 30, 31//Isa 37:4, 31, 32 the root *שאר* is used in a technical sense to refer to the remnant of Yahweh's people. This technical, one might even say prophetic, use of the root occurs elsewhere in Kings perhaps only in 2 Kgs 21:14.¹⁴ But this technical, prophetic usage of the root is more common in Isaiah (cf. Isa 4:3; 10:20–22; 11:11; 28:5; 46:3).¹⁵ The closely related concept of survivors (*פליטה*) is found in Kings only here (2 Kgs 19:30, 31), but is deployed outside of this pericope in Isa 4:2; 10:20; 37:32.¹⁶ The notion of Yahweh's zeal (*קנאה*) is found in Kings only here, in 2 Kgs 19:31, but it is found outside this passage in Isa 9:6; 26:11; 42:13; 59:17; 63:15.¹⁷

In addition, the Rabshakeh's speech, although having some points of contact with diplomatic language, contains themes more appropriate to the prophetic books than to Kings.¹⁸ For example, his speech deploys the theme of Egypt as an unreliable ally, a theme found also in Isa 20:1–6; 30:1–17; 31:1–9; Jer 2:16–18, 36; 46:25; Ezek 16:26; 29:6–7; Hos 7:11, 16.¹⁹ And the claim in 2 Kgs 18:25//Isa 36:10 that Sennacherib had come with Yahweh's help resembles claims about Assyria in Isa 10:5–6.²⁰ The Rabshakeh stands to deliver his speech by “the conduit of the Upper Pool that is on the highway of the Fuller's Field” (2 Kgs 18:18//Isa 36:2), a location unknown elsewhere in Kings and known elsewhere in the Bible only in Isa 7:3. In fact, Isa 7 shares several literary features in common with Isa 36–39, as Peter R. Ackroyd and Edgar W. Conrad have noted.²¹ In addition, as Young points out, Hezekiah's prayer assumes idols are powerless (2 Kgs 19:17–18//Isa 37:18–19), a view of idols shared by Isaiah (e.g., Isa 2:8, 20) but in tension with parts of the Deuteronomistic History that attribute

to divine images some power, even if such images are deemed illegitimate (e.g., Judg 17–18).²²

Admittedly, the pericope also uses some language that is uncharacteristic of Isaiah. The synchronization formula in 2 Kgs 18:13 is more typical of the narratives in Kings (e.g., 2 Kgs 12:7; 22:3; 23:23; 25:2; 25:8); but it also has a good parallel in Isa 7:1. The nominal phrase “House of Yahweh” (בית יהוה) is used in Kings outside of the Hezekiah narratives a few dozen times, but is found in Isaiah outside of the Hezekiah material only in Isa 2:4; 66:20.²³ And the angel of Yahweh, mentioned in 2 Kgs 19:35//Isa 37:36, is unknown elsewhere in Isaiah but is mentioned also in the narratives about Elijah and Elisha in 1 Kgs 19:7; 2 Kgs 1:3, 15. Nevertheless, on balance, the preponderance of evidence suggests that 2 Kgs 18:13, 17–2 Kgs 19:37//Isa 36–37 is more thematically and linguistically at home in Isaiah than in Kings. It was likely composed as part of Isaiah and later copied into Kings.

The evidence for the provenance of the second narrative block, 2 Kgs 20:1–11//Isa 38:1–8, 21–22, is less definitive.²⁴ On the one hand, the concept of a prophetic sign (אֵימָת), which is central to this episode and which connects this chapter with the previous one (see 2 Kgs 19:29 and 2 Kgs 20:9), is not known in Kings outside of the Hezekiah narratives (2 Kgs 19:29; 20:8, 9), but is common in Isaiah (cf. Isa 7:11, 14; 8:18; 19:20; 20:3; 55:13; 66:19). On the other hand, the notion that Hezekiah turned his face toward the wall—presumably the wall of the temple—to pray (2 Kgs 20:2//Isa 38:2) bears some resemblance to 1 Kgs 8:44, according to which warriors on the battlefield could turn toward the place where Yahweh would set his name and pray toward it. I am unaware of any Isaianic text in which facing Yahweh’s temple from a distance enhances the efficacy of prayer. Furthermore, Isaiah’s actions here in pronouncing healing upon Hezekiah are more reminiscent of the miracles performed by Elijah and Elisha in Kings (e.g., 2 Kgs 8:7–10) than of anything in the book of Isaiah. Hezekiah’s claim to have walked before Yahweh echoes the language of Kings rather than Isaiah (1 Kgs 2:4; 3:6; 8:23, 25; 9:4, 6). On the basis of the currently available evidence, then, it is not possible to say definitively in which context this narrative block had its original provenance.²⁵

The third narrative block, 2 Kgs 20:12–19//Isa 39:1–8, focusses on Hezekiah’s dealings with a Babylonian envoy and are curiously out of place. They are tied to the preceding episode by the theme of Hezekiah’s illness, which purportedly is the occasion for the visit of the envoy to Jerusalem (2 Kgs 20:12//Isa 39:1), and by Isaiah’s role as a prophet who

comes before the king (cf. 2 Kgs 20:1//Isa 38:1 and 2 Kgs 21:14//Isa 39:3). But the theme of Babylon does not fit well the immediate context of the story in Isaiah nor in Kings, where the focus is on Judah's relationships with Egypt and Assyria.²⁶ Although exile is foretold in vv. 17–18, there is no hint of a return from exile—a theme shared between this pericope and 2 Kgs 25. In fact, the judgments against Hezekiah seem to foreshadow specific details of 2 Kgs 25.²⁷ On the basis of currently available evidence it is not possible to say definitively whether this third narrative block, 2 Kgs 20:12–19//Isa 39:1–8, had its original provenance within Isaiah or Kings.

Internally, the blocks also show signs of editorial development. I have already mentioned that 2 Kgs 18:14–16 was inserted into Kings while Isa 38:9–20 was added to Isaiah at a relatively late stage. In his famous study, B. Stade had observed grammatical seams and contradictions in the logic of the narrative and had divided 2 Kgs 18:13–19:37 into four editorial layers.²⁸ Benjamin D. Thomas offers a concise summary of Stade's division of the text: "1) 18:14–16 was from a reliable source and was inserted between vv. 13 and 17; 2) 18:13, 17–19:9a belonged to a first report on the attack against Judah; 3) 19:9b–20, 32–37 comprised another version of the same account; 4) 19:21–31 was a poetic elaboration on 19:20, 33–34."²⁹ Building on Stade's work, Brevard S. Childs and Francolino J. Gonçalves divided 18:17–19:37 into 18:17–19:9a; 19:36–37 and 19:9b–19:35.³⁰ Whether or not one accepts their hypothesis, their work points to the complexity of this narrative block.³¹ Before a scribe copied material from one literary setting into another, that material had undergone editorial processes, which are not easily traced.

Importantly for my thesis here, the notice about Hezekiah's reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply system in 2 Kgs 20:20 is literarily distinct from these five blocks of narrative tradition. The notice forms part of the editorial framework closing the description of Hezekiah's reign, but it supplements the main narrative rather than repeating information already contained in it. Its claim about Jerusalem's water supply does not depend on any section of the main narrative as a source. Rather, in terms of the editorial history of Kings, the notice is connected to a series of supplementary notices about particular kings. I discuss these further below. To be sure, the notice influences the impression the book of Kings gives of Hezekiah and his reign. But in my discussion below I will first evaluate the notice as an independent claim about Hezekiah, and will only then note its literary effect as a framing device for the description of his reign.

The description of Hezekiah's reign in Chronicles is quite different from the material in 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37 that I have been discussing.³² Second Chr 29–31 describes religious reforms undertaken by Hezekiah—his cleansing of the Jerusalem temple, his restoration of worship there, his keeping of a great Passover festival, his demolition of illegitimate shrines, and his reorganization of the priests and Levites. This material has no parallel in the Hezekiah narratives in Kings and Isaiah, though it does have some thematic links to the portrayal of Josiah's reign in 2 Kgs 22–23. Together, these chapters in Chronicles offer an even more positive picture of Hezekiah and his reign than does 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37.

Second Chr 32 contains a description of the events surrounding Sennacherib's invasion, some of which are also described in 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37. Major motifs in the account parallel themes in 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37—Sennacherib invaded Judah, an Assyrian envoy was sent from Lachish to Jerusalem, the envoy delivered a speech urging the people to abandon Hezekiah and embrace Assyrian rule, the prophet Isaiah ben Amoz was involved in national affairs, Hezekiah fell ill, and a Babylonian envoy visited Hezekiah. Some of this information is so specific that it suggests that the author of 2 Chr 32 used 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37 as a source—for example, the note about the language in which the Assyrian messengers speak in 2 Kgs 18:28; Isa 36:13; 2 Chr 32:18. Furthermore, the broad sequence of events in 2 Chr 32 parallels the account in 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37—Sennacherib's invasion, the speech, the Assyrian defeat, Hezekiah's illness, and the Babylonian envoy. However, the Chronicler has freely rewritten his source material to suit his positive portrayal of Hezekiah, as Isaac Kalimi has shown.³³ The hook connecting 2 Chr 32 to the preceding material leaves no doubt about the Chronicler's view of Hezekiah, "After these faithful deeds" (v. 1).³⁴ The nations bring gifts to Hezekiah and tribute to Yahweh in Jerusalem following the Assyrian defeat (2 Chr 32:23).³⁵ There is no hint that Hezekiah relied on Egyptian or Ethiopian support; he trusted in Yahweh alone. The Chronicler does not portray Sennacherib as Yahweh's instrument of punishment against Judah.

Most importantly for my thesis here, 2 Chr 32 contains an entire section, vv. 2–8, that describes Sennacherib's preparations for war and that is not found in 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37. This section portrays Hezekiah as a wise and faithful king responding to Assyrian aggression. I discuss this section further below. Here I wish to note that 2 Chr 32:2–8 is an insertion into the sequence of events described in 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37. As such, the notice of Hezekiah's reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply

system in 2 Chr 32:2–8 should be evaluated independently of claims made about him in 2 Kgs 18–19//Isa 36–37 and of the claim made about him in 2 Kgs 20:20.

Hezekiah's reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply system is also mentioned in 2 Chr 32:30a. In my judgment, this verse is a late gloss that reinterprets 2 Chr 32:3–4 and 2 Kgs 20:20. The notice in v. 30a oddly returns to a theme left behind in vv. 3–4. It is grammatically isolated from its context and does not form part of any narrative sequence: **והוא יחזקיהו סתם**, "Now it was this Hezekiah who stopped. . . ." ³⁶ Immediately preceding the notice is an extended description of Hezekiah's riches that echoes the Chronicler's descriptions of David and Solomon (vv. 27–29). ³⁷ The description of his financial success is driven primarily by the repeated use of the verb **עשה** and is thus nicely closed by v. 30b, "Hezekiah prospered in all he did (**מעשהו**)."³⁸ In light of these observations, it appears that the notice of his reshaping of the water supply in v. 30a represents an editorial insertion into an existing description of Hezekiah's success in v. 27–29, 30b. The description (vv. 27–29, 30b) and notice (v. 30a) separate the account of Hezekiah's illness and recovery (vv. 24–26) from the incident with the Babylonian envoys (v. 31), which had followed immediately one on the other in the Chronicler's source (2 Kgs 20:1–19//Isa 38:1–8, 21–22; 39:1–8). Verses 27–30 as a whole, then, were also inserted into their context. ³⁸

The use of the verbal root ***סתם** both in 2 Chr 32:30a and in 2 Chr 32:3–4 can hardly be coincidental. In the Hebrew Bible, only in these verses does the verbal root describe stopping up one's own water supply rather than an enemy's. ³⁹ One of these texts used the other as a source. Which one used the other? Verse 30a contains information found in 2 Kgs 20:20 but not found 2 Chr 32:3–4, namely that water was directed toward the city. Verse 30a is also grammatically isolated from its context. As such, it seems that verse 30a depends on vv. 3–4 and on 2 Kgs 20:20. In glossing 2 Chr 32:3–4, verse 30a has reinterpreted them. The unidentified "waters of the springs outside the city" (v. 3) and "all of the springs and the wadi that flowed in the middle of the land" (v. 4) are now specified as "the uppermost source of the waters of Gihon" (v. 30). ⁴⁰ In this way, v. 30 connects the tradition in 2 Chr 32:3–4 that Hezekiah stopped up water sources near Jerusalem to the tradition in 2 Kgs 20:20 that he brought water to the city. In drawing on 2 Kgs 20:20, the gloss has again interpreted its source. The source in Kings mentions only "the pool" and "the conduit" with which Hezekiah brought water to "the city." The gloss has further specified a particular location from which the waters were

drawn—Gihon—a particular destination—“the City of David”—and a particular route—“downward west.” The gloss in 2 Chr 32:30 thus assembles the separate notices about Hezekiah’s reshaping of Jerusalem’s water supply system in 2 Chr 32:3–4 and 2 Kgs 20:20 into a geographically and architecturally coherent picture.

To sum up, the editorial history of the biblical Hezekian traditions that I have traced in some detail here has an important implication for my thesis in this chapter. Although 2 Kgs 20:20 and 2 Chr 32:3–4 both touch on the theme of Hezekiah’s shaping of Jerusalem’s water supply system, neither text is editorially dependent on the other. As such, their claims about Hezekiah’s reshaping of Jerusalem’s water supply system should be evaluated independently. I return to this evaluation below. First, I will strengthen the observation that the claims are distinct by setting them within their ancient Near Eastern literary context. Reshaping of the water supply system is a common motif in ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions. The literary contours of this ancient Near Eastern motif provide a framework for understanding precisely what each of these brief biblical notices claims about Hezekiah’s reign.

The Literary Motif of the King’s Shaping of the Water Supply System

The ancient Near Eastern literary motif of the king’s shaping of the water supply system reflected an integral element of royal ideology at the intersection of domestic and foreign affairs.⁴¹ An adequate water supply system contributed to the abundance a good king guaranteed his people and helped protect his land in time of war. The biblical claims that Hezekiah reshaped Jerusalem’s water system are best understood against the background of this larger motif in ancient Near Eastern royal ideology.⁴² A full survey of the motif lies well beyond my aims here, but a few texts illustrate the potency of royal claims about water and demonstrate their main literary contours. Broadly speaking, Mesopotamian and Levantine royal literature deployed the motif of the king’s shaping of the water system in one of two ways. In the most common form of the motif, royal texts made a general claim that the king provided abundantly for his people by building or maintaining water supply systems. Much less commonly, royal texts sometimes made a specific claim that the king was victorious in battle partly because of his reshaping of the water supply system.

To begin with the former, Mesopotamian royal texts often emphasize the king's construction and maintenance of the canals that formed the backbone of the region's irrigation system.⁴³ An inscription of *Sîn-Iddinam*, c. 1849 BCE to c. 1843 BCE, known from several exemplars, provides a nice example of the motif and is worth quoting in full:

I, *Sîn-iddinam*, mighty man, provider of Ur, king of Larsa, king of the land of Sumer and Akkad, king who built the Ebabbar, temple of the god Utu, who restored the rites of the temples of the gods, when the gods An, Enlil, Nanna, and Utu granted to me a good reign of justice, whose days are long, by means of my broad wisdom, supremely established, which excels, in order to establish good water for my city (and) land (and) to make magnificent my ways, praise (and) valour for the future, I prayed ardently to the gods An and Enlil. They having agreed to my firm entreaty commissioned (me), by their unalterable [word], to dig the Tigris, to restore (its banks, and) to establish my name for a long life-span. At that time, by the decree of the gods An and Inanna, by the favour of the gods Enlil and Ninlil, by the god Iskur, my personal god, . . . my h[el]per, (and) by the supreme might of the gods Nanna and [Utu], by means of my triumph I grandly dug there the Tigris, the river of abundance of the god Utu. I connected its intake to the border, the boundary of my choice, and directed its great (course) straight into a swamp (thereby) providing perpetual water, unceasing abundance for Larsa, my land. When I dug the Tigris, the great river, the wages of each worker were: 1 gur of barley, 2 sila of bread, 4 sila of beer, 2 shekels of oil, in one day so they received this. I let nobody take less or more. By the might of my land I finished that work there. By the decree (and) decision of the great gods, I restored (the banks) of the Tigris, the broad river, (and) set up my name for the distant future. (RIM E4.2.9.2)⁴⁴

The text commemorates restoration work on the Tigris canal carried out during *Sîn-Iddinam*'s reign and nicely illustrates how a constellation of literary themes central to royal ideology circulated in conjunction with the motif of the king's shaping of the water supply system.⁴⁵ The inscription presents *Sîn-Iddinam*'s work on the canal as evidence of his divine election, piety, justice, wisdom, might, and ability to guarantee abundance for his people—themes all central to royal ideology.⁴⁶ As is typical of the

literary depiction of Mesopotamian royal building projects, the inscription claims divine commissioning of the project.⁴⁷ The text emphasizes abundant agricultural provision by the use of Sîn-Iddinam's title "provider of Ur," by reference to the canal as the "abundance of Utu," and by the claim that it provided "constant water and unceasing abundance."⁴⁸ The text stresses Sîn-Iddinam's personal involvement—first-person verbal forms structure the whole—but it acknowledges the builders who carried out the work by enumerating their wages.⁴⁹ Although the canal supplied water to the whole land, the rhetoric of the text emphasizes the political unit of the town, which formed the base of Sîn-Iddinam's power—Larsa in particular benefited from this restoration work.⁵⁰

Several other royal inscriptions from Mesopotamia touch on these themes, especially the abundance secured by the king's shaping of water systems.⁵¹ For example, Gudea of Lagash, ca. 2144–2124 BCE, claims that when Ningirsu commanded him to build his temple, he promised, "When the foundations of my House will be laid, abundance will surely come at the same time: the great fields will 'raise their hands' to you, dykes and canals will 'raise their neck' to you, water will—for your profit—(even) rise to 'hills' where it never reaches (in other years), under your rule more fat (than ever) will be poured, more wool (than ever) will be weighed in Sumer" (RIM E3/1.1.7.CylA xi 10–17).⁵² A stone foundation tablet describing the building of Fort Sîn-muballiṭ also commemorates the construction of a canal baldly named Ḫammu-rāpi-nuḫuš-nišī, "Hammurabi is the abundance of the people" (RIM E4.3.6.7).⁵³ According to the tablet, Hammurabi, ca. 1792–1750 BCE, turned the banks of the canal into cultivated land and "kept heaping up piles of grain" so that he shepherded the people in "abundance and plenty" (17–24, 34–35). Elsewhere, Hammurabi boasts that he dug Sippar's canal so as to provide "perpetual water" for its land, that he "heaped up plenty and abundance," and that he "established joy for the people of Sippar" (RIM E4.3.6.2 62–69).⁵⁴ Tukulti-Ninurta I, ca. 1233–1197 BCE, made clear the abundance produced by his Pattu-mēšari, "Canal of Justice," when he arranged for regular and perpetual offerings to be made to the gods from "the produce of the water of the canal," perhaps its fish (RIM A.o.78.22 45–47; RIM A.o.78.23 106–108).⁵⁵ Argišti I, king of Urartu, ca. 785/80–756 BCE, built four canals for orchards and vineyards, epitomes of agricultural abundance.⁵⁶ In his Kalḫu annals, Tiglath-pileser III, ca. 745–727 BCE, evokes the lush sound of water, "I dug out the Patti-[Enlil] canal, [which] had lain abandoned for a very long time and [. . .], and I made an abundance of water gurgle (*ḫabābu*) through it"

(RINAP 1 5 4b).⁵⁷ In his so-called “First Campaign Cylinder,” Sennacherib, ca. 705–681, boasts of providing “inexhaustible water” (*māmê dārûti*) for Nineveh (RINAP 3 1 90).⁵⁸ Several of these texts, it should be noted, evoke particular towns as they deploy the motif of the king’s shaping of the water supply system—royal power, I observe in Chapter 4, was often asserted in relation to urban centers.

In some instances, the texts sharply contrast prior barrenness with the abundance established by the king’s construction or refurbishment of the water supply system. For example, Iaḥdun-Lim, ca. 1820–1796 BCE, boasts, “Now in a waste, a land of thirst, in which from days of old no king had built a city, I took pleasure in building a city. I dug its moat [and] called it Dūr-Iaḥdun-Līm (Fort Iaḥdun-Līm). I opened a canal for it and called it Iṣīm-Iaḥdun-Līm (Iaḥdun-Līm has determined (its) destiny)” (RIM E4.6.8.1 35–49).⁵⁹ Sennacherib describes his efforts to renew the water supply of Nineveh: “Its fields, which had been turned into wastelands due to lack of water, were woven over with spider webs. Moreover, its people did not know artificial irrigation, but had their eyes turned for rain (and) showers from the sky . . . I had a canal dug from the border of the city Kisiru to Nineveh (and) I caused those waters to flow inside it. I named it Patti-Sennacherib” (RINAP 3 223 6–8, 11b–12).⁶⁰ The inscription nicely illustrates the contrast between desperate dependence on capricious rainfall and the agricultural security brought about by Sennacherib’s shaping of waterways. Scarcity might also result from an overabundance of water with poor drainage.⁶¹ Ur-Nammu, ca. 2047–2030 BCE, boasts of transforming previously unusable land by draining it, “in a swamp planted with date palms—it was a veritable swamp—he brought forth from the water a field that had an area of 3,600 *bur*. He made its canal four *dana* and 260 *nindan* in length. He laid it out for perpetuity in Ur” (RIME 3/2.1.1.19 9–19).⁶² Proper management of waterways yielded abundantly productive land from dry fields and swamp land.

Although Levantine royal inscriptions do not reference irrigation canals, which were distinctive features of the system of agriculture in Mesopotamia, they also deploy the motif of the king’s shaping of the water supply system in connection with the theme of abundant royal provision, especially provision for particular towns.⁶³ The clearest Levantine example of this motif is found in the ninth-century BCE Mesha Stele.⁶⁴ This building inscription celebrates Mesha’s kingship by noting his major foreign and domestic achievements.⁶⁵ The former include victories in battles with Israel over Ataroth, Nebo, and Jahaz. The latter include a variety of

building projects, including Mesha's reshaping of the water supply systems in Baal-Meon and in Karchoh. Mesha boasts, "I built Baal Meon, and I made in it the water reservoir (האשוח) (ln. 9).⁶⁶ And he claims, "I built the retaining walls (ב) of the reser[voir for the spr]ing (בלאי האש[ן]). Now, there was no cistern (בר) in the innermost part of the city, in Karchoh, and I said to all the people: 'Make, each of you, a cistern (בר) in his house!' And I cut the moat (המכרתת) for Karchoh with the prisoners from Israel" (ln 22–26).⁶⁷ Mesha distinguishes here between household cisterns built by their owners and two types of monumental water systems—one with retaining walls and the other quarried—built under royal management.⁶⁸ One of the latter was constructed with labor supplied by prisoners from Moab's enemy, Israel. As I note in Chapter 4, Bruce Routledge has traced Mesha's success, witnessed in this stele, at uniting geographically based political units in Moab—towns and their surrounding villages and hinterlands—under a larger identity as "the Land of Moab."⁶⁹ Mesha furthers this agenda here, by presenting himself as a benevolent and wise monarch capable of securing the water supply system at the level of the town. The implicit claim is that centralized administration, identified with the person of the king, benefits the political unit of the town. Like the Mesopotamian inscriptions surveyed above, the water systems listed here serve as evidence of the generalized abundance secured by the king.

An Ammonite inscription on a copper bottle found at Tell Sīrān, Jordan, and dated on paleographic grounds to c. 600 BCE may also contain the motif of the king's shaping of the water supply system.⁷⁰ Scholarly interpretation of this short text has clustered around two understandings of its genre. Scholars who understand it as a building or memorial inscription, as I do, translate *m^cbd* in line 1 as "produce of" or "works of" and regard line 4 as containing a series of nouns, including one from the root *šw* meaning "pit," "tunnel," or "cistern."⁷¹ Others regard the inscription as a poem, and read line 4 as containing a series of verbs. The former interpretation is exemplified by Walter E. Aufrecht's translation, "May the produce of 'Amminadab king of the Ammonites, the son of Hissal'il king of the Ammonites, the son of 'Amminadab king of the Ammonites—the vineyard and the garden(s) and the hollow and cistern—cause rejoicing and gladness for many days (to come) and in years far off" (COS 2.25). The debate cannot be settled here. If the former interpretation is correct, it would provide another Levantine example of the motif of the king's shaping of the water supply system deployed in connection with the theme of domestic abundance.⁷²

Descriptions of specific battles provide a second literary context for the motif of the king's shaping of the water supply system. This form of the motif is far less common than generalized depictions of domestic abundance. These texts emphasize the military prowess of the king in reshaping the water supply system to the detriment of his enemies. Among the relatively few extant examples, the motif is more typically employed to describe the actions of an attacking king—defensive victories are not as commonly described in ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions. For example, an inscription of Narām-Sîn, ca. 2254–2218 BCE, known from two Old Babylonian copies from Nippur, describes a revolt against him by a northern coalition led by Kiš and a southern coalition led by Uruk (RIM E2.1.4.6).⁷³ According to the text, when Narām-Sîn defeated the northern coalition outside the city of Kiš, he destroyed its wall, made its canal flood the city, and killed a further 2,525 men within the city (iv 36'–45'). Here, the king's power is demonstrated by his ability to deploy water as a weapon. By dismantling city walls and reshaping the canal system, he permanently marked his victorious power on the landscape and rendered the city incapable of spearheading another rebellion.

These themes are also made explicit in an inscription of Sennacherib. His knowledge of the effects of water on large masonry systems is evidenced by the repairs he undertook to the palace at Nineveh, whose stone foundations had suffered from the eroding effects of the Tebilti River.⁷⁴ Sennacherib put this hydrological knowledge to martial use in order to annihilate Babylon. As I note in Chapter 3, in his Bavian rock inscription he boasts that after defeating Marduk-apla-iddina II, king of Babylon, and after returning the images of the god Adad and the goddess Šala from Babylon to Ekallatum, he rendered Babylon unrecognizable: "I dug canals into the center of that city and (thus) leveled their site with water. I destroyed the outline of its foundations and (thereby) made its destruction surpass that of the Deluge. So that in the future, the site of that city and (its) temples will be unrecognizable, I dissolved it (Babylon) in water and annihilated (it), (making it) like a meadow" (RINAP 3 223 52–54).⁷⁵ Sennacherib draws an explicit parallel here between his destructive use of water and the mythical Deluge.⁷⁶ In doing so, he emphasizes the extent to which he destroyed Babylon completely. He also portrays himself as godlike in his ability to put water to destructive use on a massive scale. The *Atrahasis* epic opens with the gods digging canals and watercourses, including the Tigris and Euphrates.⁷⁷ They create humans to do this drudgery for them but later

grow weary of the noise caused by the expanding human population. To destroy humanity they release water, overwhelmingly, from the torn sky and from the broken land.⁷⁸ In the retelling of this myth in the *Gilgamesh Epic*, flood waters similarly result both because rain falls from the clouds and because Erregal, i.e., Nergal, god of the underworld, tears out the posts that hold the earthly, dammed waters back.⁷⁹ It is this capacity of the gods to unleash the destructive earthly waters that Sennacherib appears to evoke here as he compares his flooding of Babylon to the Deluge.

The motif of the king's shaping of the water supply system sometimes appears in the context of literary accounts of siege warfare. A royal inscription of Shalmaneser III deploys the motif in such a context. Recounting a campaign conducted in the eponymy of Šamaš-bēla-ušur, he boasts, "I approached the city Gannanāte. Marduk-bēl-usāte, the rebel king who did not know what he was doing, came forth to wage war and battle against me. I defeated him, made an extensive massacre, (and) imprisoned him in his city. I uprooted his harvest, cut down his gardens, (and) stopped up his canals" (RIM A.o.102.5 iv 3b–5a).⁸⁰ The inscription immediately proceeds to recount a second campaign conducted in the eponymy of Bēl-bunāiia, during which Shalmaneser III captured, massacred, and plundered Gannanāte. Marduk-bēl-usāte fled to Arman, where Shalmaneser III imprisoned him by laying siege to the city. After capturing Arman, he killed Marduk-bēl-usāte. The events recounted in the second campaign betray the fact that Shalmaneser was unsuccessful in his first attack on Gannanāte—Marduk-bēl-usāte had remained king of Gannanāte despite waging war against Shalmaneser. I therefore take Shalmaneser's claim that he imprisoned Marduk-bēl-usāte in Gannanāte as a reference to siege. As part of that siege, he uprooted the city's harvest, cut down its gardens, and stopped up its canals. The city withstood these measures and Shalmaneser returned, as part of a separate campaign, to destroy it and its king. RIM A.o.102.5 thus serves as an example of the motif of the king's shaping of the water supply system being deployed in the context of a description of siege warfare. The technology required to shape the water supply system could be put to tactical use by an attacking army.⁸¹

An inscription of Ašdūni-iarīm of Kiš, known in a shorter and a longer version, tersely describes his domestic and foreign achievements (RIM E4.8.1.1, RIM E4.8.1.2).⁸² The longer version claims that Ašdūni-iarīm damned up the Nundi canal. In its current literary setting this reshaping of the water system reads like a response to attacks

faced by Kiš: “That summer the four quarters became hostile against me and I built the outer wall of Kiš. In two days I dammed up the Nundi canal” (RIM E4.8.1.1 43–51).⁸³ If so, the king’s shaping of the water supply system may be understood as a defensive act that was intended to reduce the invading army’s access to water, and perhaps also to a harvest should a long siege ensue. The text may thus offer a close parallel to the defensive measures ascribed to Hezekiah and discussed below. The interpretation of the text, however, remains uncertain. The shorter version of the inscription mentions the building of the wall of Kiš without any reference to the summer attack or the canal, raising doubts about the literary coherence of the longer inscription. Furthermore, even taken on its own terms, the long version of the inscription moves rapidly from one topic to another; chronology does not seem to be its main structuring principle. In light of these considerations, it is not clear whether or not in historical terms the damning of the Nundi canal should be interpreted as a response to the summer attacks against Kiš. At a minimum, however, at the literary level, RIM E4.8.1.1 serves as a further example of the motif of the king’s shaping of the water supply system being deployed in a martial literary context.

To sum up, then, in Mesopotamian and Levantine royal literature the motif of the king’s shaping of the water supply system takes one of two forms. More commonly, the motif appears as a standard domestic accomplishment about which the king would boast. In this form, the motif emphasizes the power and wisdom of the king to secure generalized agricultural abundance. Occasionally, the motif is used to describe a tactical success against a particular enemy. In this form, the motif emphasizes the martial power of the king to completely destroy his opponents. There is perhaps also one instance in which the motif is found in the context of military defense, though the evidence is less than definitive. Although considerations of tactical defense must surely have played some role in the practice of royal water construction projects, at the literary level they are almost completely elided in royal texts. At the literary level, the two forms of the motif, domestic achievement and military success, are quite distinct. None of the ancient Near Eastern texts surveyed here describes a particular royal water project as both a domestic achievement and a military success. With this literary distinction in mind, then, I return to my analysis of the biblical texts describing Hezekiah’s reshaping of Jerusalem’s water supply system.

*The Biblical Notices of Hezekiah's Reshaping
of Jerusalem's Water Supply System*

Although scholars generally understand the references to Hezekiah's waterworks in 2 Kgs 20:20 and 2 Chr 32:2–4 as referring to the same building activity, I suggest that these texts make distinct historical claims, which should be evaluated separately. The texts have no editorial connection to one another. They also describe distinct actions. While 2 Kgs 20:20 refers to bringing water within the city, 2 Chr 32:2–4 describes the stopping up of water sources outside of the city. In light of the literary survey undertaken above, I suggest that 2 Kgs 20:20 is best understood as claiming a standard domestic achievement, while the notice in 2 Chr 32:2–4 is best understood in relation to a claim of military success.⁸⁴

2 Chr 32:1–8 describes preparations for battle undertaken by Hezekiah, including his reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply system. Even where this section reports events with some parallel in 2 Kgs 18//Isa 36, the language of this section is quite different from that account. For example, while 2 Kgs 18:13//Isa 36:1 records Sennacherib "going up" (*עלה*) against all the cities of Judah, 2 Chr 32:2 records him "coming" (*בוא*) to make war. In 2 Kgs 18:13//Isa 36:1, the invasion takes place in Hezekiah's fortieth year, whereas in 2 Chr 32:1, it takes place after "these deeds and faithfulness," i.e., after Hezekiah's cleansing of the Jerusalem temple, restoration of worship there, celebration of the Passover, destruction of shrines, and reorganization of priests and Levites, as described in 2 Chr 30–31. Unlike 2 Kgs 18:13//Isa 36:1, 2 Chr 32:1 specifies Sennacherib's military strategy: he intended to conquer the fortified towns of Judah (ויאמר לבקעם אליו) before proceeding to Jerusalem. Furthermore, and most importantly for my argument here, the material in 2 Chr 32:2–5 is unique in so far as no other king in Chronicles or Kings prepares for battle by fortifying walls or reshaping waterways. Verses 6b–8, on the other hand, contain themes more typical of Chronicles in so far as they depict a speech encouraging the people to trust in Yahweh who is with them and who will fight their battle against the enemy hordes—compare 2 Chr 20:15–17, which also has no parallel in Kings. Given the pericope's distinctive language and themes, especially in vv. 2–5, it is difficult to explain it entirely as a free composition with purely literary intent. Instead, it seems likely that the Chronicler drew on source material to compose 2 Chr 32:2–5, reshaped it to suit his literary portrayal of Hezekiah, and added to it a freely composed speech in vv. 6b–8.⁸⁵

In 2 Chr 32:2–4, Hezekiah’s shaping of the water supply system is integrally connected to military themes. The *wayyiqtol* verb forms used in vv. 2–3 imply a clear sequence of events serially linked. In the Chronicler’s account, Sennacherib encamped against Judah’s fortified towns (v. 1). However, it was only afterward, when Hezekiah realized that Sennacherib was intent on attacking Jerusalem itself (v. 2), that he consulted with officials and military leaders about blocking up the water sources around the city so as to make it difficult for the invading army to sustain themselves. Did events transpire as described here? The portrayed sequence of events is not impossible, but close examination of the language of the biblical text and the Assyrian sources suggests a more plausible scenario.⁸⁶

I begin with the observation that the medieval Hebrew manuscript tradition, the Masoretic Text, of 2 Chr 32:4 uses a series of plural forms, which make little sense in their narrative context. These are given in the singular in other ancient witnesses to the original text. But the Masoretic Text is more likely to be correct since an ancient scribe is far less likely to have corrected sensible singular forms to jarring plural ones than the other way around—the text-critical principle of *lectio difficilior*. According to the Masoretic Text, the people assembled and blocked up the water sources surrounding Jerusalem because they reasoned to themselves, “Why should the kings of Assyria come and find abundant water” (למה יבואו מלכי אשור ומצאו מים רבים). The three plural forms used here—kings, come, and find—are jarring in the context of the narrative logic in vv. 2–3, according to which Hezekiah’s actions are a direct response to a single Assyrian king, Sennacherib. These plural forms betray an earlier source used by the Chronicler. According to this source, several water sources throughout the land (בְּתוֹדֵי־הָאָרֶץ) were preemptively stopped up in anticipation of possible invasions by unspecified Assyrian kings.

If the Chronicler’s source here referred to defensive measures taken during the reign of Hezekiah—and it is by no means certain that this was the source’s chronological horizon—the use of the prefix verb form (יבואו) implies that Judah anticipated an Assyrian invasion of the region in the months, years, or even decades ahead. As such, the source may imply Judahite actions that would have invited an Assyrian attack. Indeed, the earliest Assyrian account of Sennacherib’s third military campaign, which was likely composed shortly after the campaign itself, claims provocative action on the part of Judah (RINAP 3 4). According to this royal inscription, Jerusalem had become involved in an anti-Assyrian coalition. Sennacherib claims that the citizens of Ekron had arrested their king Padi, who was an

Assyrian vassal, and handed him over to Hezekiah of Judah to be held captive (ln. 42).⁸⁷ The text further claims that this Philistine-Judahite coalition enjoyed Egyptian support (ln. 43), a detail which finds corroboration in the debate over the reliability of Egypt as an ally in the biblical witnesses to Sennacherib's invasion (2 Kgs 18:21, 24//Isa 36:6–9). Although the biblical sources detailing the confrontation mention neither Padi nor Ekron, 2 Kgs 18:8 claims that Hezekiah exercised control over sections of Philistine territory. And the material inserted into 2 Kgs 18:14–16 acknowledges that Judah had given Assyria reason to invade: “Hezekiah, king of Judah, sent (a message) to the king of Assyria at Lachish, ‘I have sinned. Turn back from me and whatever you impose on me, I will bear’” (v. 14).

The biblical sources also hint that there may have been Babylonian support for a rebellion against Assyria, support which may have predated the events surrounding Sennacherib's third campaign by several years. As I noted above, the broad sequence of the Hezekiah narrative in 2 Kgs 18–20//Isa 36–38 includes (1) an extended prophetic account of Sennacherib and Hezekiah in 2 Kgs 18:13, 17–2 Kgs 19:37//Isa 36–37; (2) an account of Hezekiah's illness in 2 Kgs 20:1–11//Isa 38:1–8, 21–22; (3) an account of Hezekiah and an envoy from the Babylonian king Merodach-Baladan, i.e., Marduk-apla-iddina, in 2 Kgs 20:12–19//Isa 39. Curiously, narrative block (2) includes a prophetic promise that Yahweh will deliver Hezekiah and “this city” from the Assyrian king (2 Kgs 20:6//Isa 38:6). As such, narrative block (2) describes a scene that logically precedes narrative block (1).⁸⁸ Narrative block (3) also describes events that are more likely to have taken place before those described in narrative block (1).

As several scholars have noted, in 703 BCE, shortly after Sennacherib came to power, Babylon asserted its independence from Assyria under the leadership of Marduk-apla-iddina.⁸⁹ The Babylonian throne changed hands some seven times during Sennacherib's reign.⁹⁰ It is early in Sennacherib's reign, however, during the brief attempt at independence under Marduk-apla-iddina that the notion of a Babylonian envoy to Jerusalem from Marduk-apla-iddina makes good sense. In other words, although the biblical text portrays the Babylonian envoy as being occasioned by Hezekiah's illness, it is likely that the envoy's mission was political and firmly anti-Assyrian. The biblical narrative of the Babylonian envoy—in its current form likely written after Hezekiah's death (cf. 2 Kgs 20:19//Isa 39:8) or even after the Babylonian deportation (cf. 2 Kgs 20:17–18; Isa 39:6–7)—may thus be rooted in a memory of Babylonian support for Judahite rebellion against Assyria.⁹¹

Taken together, then, Assyrian and biblical witnesses imply that Judah provoked the Assyrian attack. If so, Jerusalem's leadership likely reckoned with the possibility of an Assyrian reprisal and would have taken steps to prepare for such an eventuality. Quite plausibly, they could have stopped up the water sources around Jerusalem as a defensive measure against some future Assyrian attack. Such defensive measures would likely have been taken in advance and not when Sennacherib stood poised at Jerusalem's doorstep. At the same time, it must be noted that one cannot be certain that the Chronicler's source had indeed attributed the stopping up of water sources surrounding Jerusalem to the time of Hezekiah. Assyrian involvement in the region was long standing and the Chronicler's source may originally have referred to defensive actions taken during the reign of some other king of Judah.

I turn, then, to the second biblical claim about Hezekiah's reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply. The notice in 2 Kgs 20:20 forms part of the editorial framework summing up Hezekiah's reign. It is a supplementary notice that forms part of the source notice for the description of his reign. As part of the editorial framework, the notice is independent of the narratives about war shared in common by Kings and Isaiah. A full treatment of the nature of supplementary and source notices in Kings lies well beyond my aims here.⁹² In my judgment, 2 Kgs 20:20 likely comes from the same scribal hand that framed the reigns of other kings with the formulaic expression, "And the rest of the deeds of [King's Name] . . . are they not written on the scroll of the Annals of the Kings of [Israel or Judah]?"⁹³ The formula often refers to the generic accomplishments of the king—"the rest of his deeds." In some cases the source notice is supplemented with a reference to something more specific: Zimri's treason, Ahab's ivory palace, Joash's war with Amaziah, Jehoash's war with Amaziah, Jeroboam II's recovery of Damascus and Hamath, Shallum's treason, and Hezekiah's waterworks. Three types of information are presented in these more specific notices: war, treason, and construction. In the cases of Zimri, Jehoash, and Shallum the information contained in the notice is also described elsewhere in Kings.⁹⁴ In the cases of Ahab, Joash, Hezekiah, and Jeroboam II, the notices refer to royal activities not mentioned elsewhere in Kings. In fact, Ahab's palace of ivory, Joash's war with Amaziah, and Jeroboam II's recovery of Damascus and Hamath are not known from any other biblical source.⁹⁵ As a group, these supplementary notices have no clear polemical intent. Furthermore, they are provided for only some kings, with no

clear pattern. In my judgment, then, these notices are not a purely literary creation from whole cloth. Rather, an editor likely incorporated these notices into Kings where he had some source material related to the activities described. Any such source material, however, is now lost to us. We have only terse summaries.

Since this supplementary notice in 2 Kgs 20:20 is separate from the core narratives about Hezekiah shared between Isaiah and Kings, I evaluate the claim it makes on its own terms.⁹⁶ At the same time, I acknowledge that the book's ancient audience may have understood v. 20 to refer to structures named in the core narratives about Hezekiah. The pool and conduit mentioned in v. 20 are unnamed and are understood to bring water to, or perhaps into, the city. The water system mentioned in the core narratives is called "the conduit of the Upper Pool that was on the high way to the Fuller's Field" (2 Kgs 18:17//Isa 36:2; cf. Isa 7:3). The Rabshakeh stood by, or upon, this water system to make his speech. In so far as the speech is given outside and within ear shot of the city wall this water system was capable of bringing water to the city. Second Kgs 20:20 may imagine the same water system as 2 Kgs 18:17, but this cannot be definitively asserted. It may instead refer to some other system otherwise unknown to us.

Read on its own terms, 2 Kgs 20:20 claims a domestic building achievement, broadly comparable to the accomplishments described in the ancient Near Eastern texts surveyed above. How does this biblical claim relate to archaeological evidence? Ancient Jerusalem received its water supply in part from access systems connected to the Gihon spring.⁹⁷ Until quite recently, a scholarly consensus identified one of these systems, the Siloam tunnel, with the water channel attributed to Hezekiah in 2 Kgs 20:20.⁹⁸ The Siloam tunnel contained an inscription thought on paleographic grounds to date to the last quarter of the eighth century BCE.⁹⁹ The inscription's vivid description of the opening of the tunnel reads like an eyewitness account.¹⁰⁰ As such, its date, which broadly coincides with Hezekiah's reign, is thought also to be the date of the tunnel. In conflating biblical claims about Hezekiah's reshaping of Jerusalem's water system, scholars have generally ascribed to the tunnel a defensive purpose—the bringing of water within the city wall, hastily executed in preparation for Sennacherib's attack.¹⁰¹ The tunnel thus seemed to represent the rare situation in which a biblical claim appeared to be directly supported by both archaeological evidence and an ancient inscription. As such, the view that

the Siloam tunnel is referred to in 2 Kgs 20:20, 2 Chr 32:2–4, 30 and was dug during Hezekiah's reign has enjoyed wide support among scholars.

Recently, based on excavations at the City of David near the Gihon spring, Ronny Reich, Eli Shukron, Alon de Groot, and Atalya Fadida have challenged this consensus on two fronts. First, they show that the spring identified with biblical Gihon was already surrounded by massive fortifications in the Middle Bronze Age II, which survived into the Iron Age.¹⁰² The implication is that the Siloam tunnel, which brought water from the Gihon spring to the Siloam pool, was not dug because the Gihon was easily accessible to an invading army.¹⁰³ Reich and Shukron reject the view that Hezekiah built the tunnel because of tactical considerations as implied, in their view, by the Hebrew Bible. But this line of critique depends on the conflation of 2 Kgs 20:20 and 2 Chr 32:3–4. I have shown here that 2 Kgs 20:20 claims a domestic achievement, while 2 Chr 32:3–4 refers to an act of military defense.

In a second line of critique, these scholars argue that the Siloam tunnel is several decades older than previously thought.¹⁰⁴ Reich and Shukron reconstruct the following sequence of events in the history of the systems connected to the Gihon spring.¹⁰⁵ Before the digging of the Siloam tunnel, several ancient components of the water system had been operational since the Middle Bronze Age. Among these were Tunnel IV, which was connected to the so-called Rock-Cut Pool, including the so-called Round Chamber in its northwestern corner. The northern branch of the Siloam tunnel was begun from Tunnel IV southward, which allowed a small amount of water in the Siloam tunnel to serve as a spirit-level for the diggers. Once the Siloam tunnel had been completed, it was connected directly to the Gihon spring via Tunnel VI. As a result, ancient components of the water system stopped flowing, including the Rock-Cut Pool. The newly-dry, ancient Rock-Cut Pool, including the Round Chamber, was subsequently turned into a dwelling, in part by filling its floor with about 3 meters of debris.¹⁰⁶ This dwelling has been dated on the basis of the pottery in the fill below its sealed floor to the last part of the ninth century BCE.¹⁰⁷ Reich and Shukron summarize the implications of these data: "The inevitable conclusion of this situation is that Tunnel IV, or the entrance to the northern part of the Siloam Tunnel, was dug at the very latest at the end of the ninth century or in the early part of the eighth century BCE. An unavoidable conclusion of this study is that the hewing of the Siloam Tunnel cannot be attributed to Hezekiah. This project was carried

out under one of the Judahite kings who predated him, probably during a period as early as the days of Jehoash. When Hezekiah was facing the threat of an Assyrian siege, the Siloam Tunnel had already been functional for several decades."¹⁰⁸ The argument hinges on the date of the floor of the Round Chamber. In a forthcoming publication, Yuval Gadot offers a comprehensive critique of the archaeological arguments of Reich and Shukron and Christopher Rollston reasserts the value of epigraphic evidence in dating the Siloam tunnel inscription to the late eighth century.¹⁰⁹ The debate over the tunnel's date cannot be settled here.

If the Siloam tunnel predates Hezekiah's reign by some decades, what are we to make of the claim in 2 Kgs 20:20? The text may refer to some other water tunnel, as David Amit has suggested.¹¹⁰ Jerusalem's population expanded in the eighth century, possibly as early as the late ninth century, particularly on the Western Hill.¹¹¹ The population there would certainly have required access to water. In Amit's view, the remains of an Iron Age II water channel discovered west of the Jaffa Gate might have been part of a water supply system that served the Western Hill.¹¹² The claim in 2 Kgs 20:20 that Hezekiah brought water to the city might refer to a water supply system servicing the Western Hill, or to some other undiscovered channel. If, on the other hand, the Siloam tunnel dates to the late eighth century, then 2 Kgs 20:20 would surely be correct in attributing its construction to Hezekiah. Although the Siloam tunnel inscription reflects the perspective of the workers who excavated the tunnel, a project of this scale in the royal capital would surely have been undertaken under royal auspices.

What literary effect do the notices about Hezekiah's reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply have in their contexts in Kings and Chronicles? In this chapter, I have traced the importance of royal claims about securing the water supply. The king's building and maintenance of water supply systems is described in several ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions, attesting the importance of claims about water to the image of the ideal king. At the literary level, the descriptions in 2 Kgs 20:20 and 2 Chr 32:3–4 of Hezekiah's reshaping of Jerusalem's water supply system reflect this broader pattern. To depictions of Hezekiah's many royal accomplishments these texts add the claim that he reshaped Jerusalem's water system. The texts thus contribute to the larger biblical portrait of Hezekiah's reign as a success—a portrait more qualified in Kings than in Chronicles.¹¹³ Yet the two claims are subtly different from one another. Read in the context

of ancient Near Eastern depictions of royal water projects, 2 Kgs 20:20 portrays Hezekiah as an architect who secures provision of water for his royal capital, while 2 Chr 32:3–4 depicts Hezekiah as a tactician who limits an invading army's access to water.¹¹⁴ Both present Hezekiah's power to shape Jerusalem's landscape as evidence of his good reign. As such, they are firmly rooted in broader patterns of ancient Near Eastern royal ideology that I have mapped here.

Summary

IN THIS BOOK, I have mapped unexplored aspects of royal production of space in Iron Age Israel and Judah, setting them in the context of broader patterns of power in the ancient Near East. In situating the arguments I make in this book in broader discussions about space and power in the humanities and social sciences, Chapter 1 also considered the biblical portrayal of Solomon's monumental building projects in Jerusalem. The chapter showed how the temple's foreign architecture was an expression of a style of centralized power consistently attributed to Solomon in the book of Kings, one that depended on the management of extragroup relationships. Chapters 2 and 3 continued my exploration of royal power to shape cultic space. In Chapter 2, I set the account of David's purchase of Araunah's land in 2 Sam 24 in its ancient Near Eastern social context by highlighting several land transfer texts from Mesopotamia and the Levant. These make evident the limits of royal administrative power over land and show how the king's dedication of land to the gods was an important demonstration of his piety. In purchasing Araunah's land and erecting an altar on it, David set aside this land for cultic use and protected it from legal claims. By depicting David as a pious and scrupulous ancient Near Eastern king, the narrative offers further proof of the special relationship between David and Yahweh.

Chapter 3 considered ancient Near Eastern royal destruction of space devoted to cultic use. I traced in biblical tradition the conceptual background of the decommissioning rituals attributed to Jehu in 2 Kgs 10:18–28. The presence in the chapter of rituals from two streams of biblical tradition and a number of repetitions and points of tension in the narrative led me to posit two editorial layers in the text. An original account of Jehu's decommissioning of a temple of Baal has been expanded

into an account of national and religious significance tied to the larger story of Jehu's rise, Ahab's demise, and the triumph of Yahwism over Baalism. I compared these two versions of the narrative to other ancient Near Eastern depictions of royal destruction of cultic space. Compared to the description of Sennacherib's destruction of cultic space in Babylon (RINAP 3 223 43–54), biblical tradition understands Jehu's power as much more limited, being exercised domestically and through deception rather than brute force. Whereas Nabû-šuma-iškun's destruction of cultic space is offered as proof of his paradigmatically evil reign (RIM B.6.14.1), Jehu's decommissioning of Baal's temple is celebrated in biblical tradition.

In Chapters 4 and 5 I explored in greater detail two further themes raised in Chapter 1. Chapter 4 considered the tension between centralized royal power and the distributed collective power of towns. I showed how the account of Absalom's attempt to build support for his rule in 2 Sam 15:1–6 depends on certain assumptions about the structure of the social world held by the text's ancient audience. In the Iron Age, southern Levantine gates were spaces with civic functions, including judicial ones. Towns were segmentary political units with structures of collective governance. The town gate served as the seat of the town's power and provided a space within which kings could seek to assert their power over the town. I outlined the evidence for these features of the social world that produced 2 Sam 15:1–6 and read the narrative in light of them.

Chapter 5 looked at another royal construction project in Jerusalem, Hezekiah's reshaping of the city's water supply system. I traced the literary contours of the ancient Near Eastern motif of the king's construction and care of the water supply system. Claims about royal power over water are usually offered as proof of the king's ability to secure generalized agricultural abundance for his people. Much less frequently, they are also made in the context of descriptions of military success. In light of the larger literary treatment of royal power over water systems in the ancient Near East, I showed how 2 Kgs 20:20 and 2 Chr 32:2–4 make distinct claims about Hezekiah's shaping of Jerusalem's water supply, which I evaluated in light of archaeological and other textual evidence.

In these ways, this book has offered a geography of royal power in the biblical world that supplements scholarly explorations of ancient Near Eastern royal ideology and royal patronage of monumental shaping of ancient Near Eastern landscapes.¹ As others have shown, ideal ancient Near Eastern kings founded cities, fortified city walls, erected monuments,

built temples and palaces, and expanded the territory under their control. Here, I have shown how kings also dedicated land to the gods, decommissioned temples, used town gates as a space for asserting their power over towns, and built and maintained water supply systems. This book has thus mapped previously unexplored dimensions of royal spatial power in the biblical world.

Notes

CHAPTER 1

1. Classic studies shedding light on aspects of monarchic power in the biblical period include J. Alberto Soggin, *Das Königtum in Israel: Ursprünge, Spannungen, Entwicklung* (BZAW 104; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967); Klaus Seybold, *Das davidische Königtum im Zeugnis der Propheten* (FRLANT 107; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); Manfred Görg, *Gott-König-Reden in Israel und Ägypten* (BWANT 6.5; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1975); Trygve N.D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConBibOT 8; Lund: Gleerup, 1976); Tomoo Ishida, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* (BZAW 142; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977); Keith W. Whitelam, *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979); Baruch Halpern, *The Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel* (HSM 25; Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1981); Gary N. Knoppers, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies* (2 vols; HSM 52, 54; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1993–1994); Hermann Michael Niemann, *Herrschaft, Königtum und Staat: Skizzen zur soziokulturellen Entwicklung im monarchischen Israel* (FAT 6; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, P. Siebeck, 1993). More recent studies include Dale Launderville, *Piety and Politics: The Dynamics of Royal Authority in Homeric Greece, Biblical Israel, and Old Babylonian Mesopotamia* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003); Reinhard Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik* (FAT 2.3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); Mark W. Hamilton, *The Body Royal: The Social Poetics of Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Biblical Interpretation Series 78; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Matthew J. Suriano, *The Politics of Dead Kings: Dynastic Ancestors in the Book of Kings and Ancient Israel* (FAT 2.48; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010). On royal ideology expressed spatially in art and architecture, see Victor Hurowitz, *I Have Built You*

an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings (JSOTSup 115; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); Rüdiger Schmitt, *Bildhafte Herrschaftsrepräsentation im eisenzeitlichen Israel* (AOAT 283; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001); Douglas J. Green, “I Undertook Great Works”: *The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions* (FAT 2.41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

2. For reasons outlined below, I do not consider the narrative of the temple’s construction and dedication as dating from the time of Solomon himself. The bulk of it, in my view, was composed in the late monarchic period. Consider, for example, 1 Kgs 8, which contains a number of speeches placed in the mouth of Solomon. I would schematize the editorial history of the chapter as follows. The Deuteronomistic editor(s) inherited material describing the installation of the ark in Jerusalem and the dedication of the temple, especially in vv. 1–11, 12–13, 62–66; the Deuteronomistic editor(s) glossed this older material to reframe it in key ways and composed fresh material in vv. 14–61; finally, one or more post-exilic editors added several glosses, many in a Priestly style, especially in vv. 1–11. To my mind, much of the material in the chapter reflects a late-pre-exilic perspective. Although exile is threatened in the chapter, and the possibility of return held forth, it is the people who will undergo exile and return, rather than the House of David. In the future envisioned by Solomon’s speeches, David’s descendants may lose the right to rule, but there is no hint that they could be removed from Yahweh’s land altogether, or that they would need to return. Furthermore, according to v. 8, the poles that carried the Ark of the Covenant of Yahweh extended from the Holy of Holies and were visible, “until this day.” In the writer’s own time, then, the temple had not yet been destroyed. These observations suggest that the chapter comes largely from the late-monarchic period, after the reality of the threat of exile had been made clear by the Assyrian conquest of the north, but while the temple still stood in Jerusalem, and while the House of David still dwelt there. On the pre-exilic date of the basic temple building tradition in 1 Kgs 6–7 and the dedication in 1 Kgs 8, see Mordechai Cogan, *I Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 248–251, 257, 271–273, 290–293. On the late pre-exilic date of the basic tradition in 1 Kgs 6–7, see Erhard Blum, “Der Tempelbaubericht in 1 Könige 6, 1–22: Exegetische und historische Überlegungen,” in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)* (ed. Jens Kamlah; ADPV 41; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 291–316. John Van Seters, who attributes the account to a Deuteronomistic writer, concedes, “The text of 1 Kings 6–7 is factual to the extent that its description, including the temple’s size and general layout, and some of its principal furnishings, is based on the temple of the immediately preceding preexilic period” (“Solomon’s Temple: Fact and Ideology in Biblical and Near Eastern Historiography,” in *Studies in the History, Literature and Religion of Biblical Israel* [Changing Perspectives 1; New York: Routledge, 2014], 96).

On the editorial history of the book of Kings as a whole, see the section “Working with Ancient Evidence,” and see especially Baruch Halpern and André Lemaire, “The Composition of Kings,” in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. André Lemaire, Baruch Halpern, and Matthew J. Adams; VTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 123–154.

3. The fact that an elevated area of the city was specially dedicated in this way is by no means unique. Daniele Morandi Bonacossi notes, “It was characteristic of Middle Bronze Syrian cities (and of Levantine urban landscapes generally) that they were divided into a lower city and an acropolis, both of which were fortified with huge defensive earthen ramparts . . . These massive earthworks, fruit of an enormous effort of logistics, must also have fulfilled a politico-ideological function, as symbols of power which expressed the relations of emulation and competition between the great Syrian peer-polities and their ambitions regarding regional power” (“The Northern Levant (Syria) During the Middle Bronze Age,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant* [ed. Margreet L. Steiner and Ann E. Killebrew; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014], 422).
4. The structural similarities between the description of Solomon’s building projects in 1 Kgs 5–8 and other ancient Near Eastern royal building accounts has been particularly highlighted by Victor Hurowitz (*I Have Built You an Exalted House*). He observes that such accounts include the divine command to build, preparations for building, a description of the building, the dedication, and blessing for the builder and his descendants. On building accounts and Solomon’s temple, see also Clifford Mark McCormick, *Palace and Temple: A Study of Architectural and Verbal Icons* (BZAW 313; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 102–104. Although ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions often blur building and rebuilding, i.e., repair, undertaken by monarchs, the biblical account quite clearly portrays Solomon as undertaking new construction. Mordechai Cogan is correct to reject Konrad Rupprecht’s theory that Solomon extended an existing Jebusite sanctuary. See Konrad Rupprecht, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem: Gründung Salomos oder jebusitischen Erbe?* (BZAW 144; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977); Cogan, *1 Kings*, 252.
5. Albrecht Alt, “Verbreitung und Herkunft des Syrischen Tempeltypus,” in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (2 vols.; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1953), 100–115; Othmar Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (trans. Timothy J. Hallett; New York: Seabury Press, 1978), 112; Gabriel Barkay, “The Iron Age II–III,” in *The Archaeology of Ancient Israel* (ed. Amnon Ben-Tor; trans. R. Greenberg; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 336–337; J. Edward Wright, *The Early History of Heaven* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 76; Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship* (trans. D.R. Ap-Thomas; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 151; Walter Dietrich, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.* (trans. Joachim Vette; Biblical Encyclopedia 3; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 94.

6. Frances Pinnock writes, “Another architectural type, which is now believed to be essentially an innovation of the Old Syrian period, albeit with some fore-runners in the Early Syrian period, is the classical *in antis* temple of the *Langraum* type, with two variants with a single cella or tripartite with an additional room between the porch and the cella. This type found lasting favour in the Syro-Palestinian region extending into the Iron Age, with its most famous, albeit archaeologically unknown example being the temple of Solomon in Jerusalem of the tenth century BC” (“Syrian and Northern Mesopotamian Temples in the Early Bronze Age,” in *Tempel im Alten Orient* [ed. Kai Kaniuth et al.; CDOG 7; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013], 385). Jens Kamlah notes that this type of temple—a Syrian longroom temple with anteroom—did not extend into the Iron Age in the Southern Levant. Rather, wherever temples of this type existed in the Southern Levant in the Bronze Age—at Pella, Megiddo, and Shechem—their form changed in the Iron Age. See Jens Kamlah, “Temples of the Levant—Comparative Aspects,” in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)* (ed. Jens Kamlah; ADPV 41; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 521. On Southern Levantine temple form, see also Amihai Mazar, “Temples of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages and the Iron Age,” in *The Architecture of Ancient Israel from the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods* (ed. Aharon Kempinski and Ronny Reich; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 161–187. On parallels between the biblical description of Solomon’s temple and excavated Syrian temples, see William F. Stinespring, “Temple, Jerusalem,” *IDB* 4:542–547; David Ussishkin, “Building IV in Hamath and the Temples of Solomon and Tell Tayanat,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 104–110; Theodor A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem: von Salomo bis Herodes; eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus* (2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1970–1980), 1:44–58; Jean Ouellette, “The Basic Structure of Solomon’s Temple and Archaeological Research,” in *The Temple of Solomon: Archaeological Fact and Medieval Tradition in Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Art* (ed. Joseph Gutmann; Religion and the Arts 3; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 1–20; Christopher J. Davey, “Temples of the Levant and the Buildings of Solomon,” *TynBul* 31 (1980): 107–146, esp. 142–143; Volkmar Fritz, “Temple Architecture: What Can Archaeology Tell Us about Solomon’s Temple?” in *Essential Papers on Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. Frederick E. Greenspahn; New York: New York University Press, 1991), 116–128; John H. Monson, “Solomon’s Temple and the Temple at ‘Ain Dara,” *Qadmoniot* 29 (1996): 33–38 (in Hebrew); Mark S. Smith, *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus* (JSOTSup 239; Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 85–87. Gösta W. Ahlström argues instead that Solomon’s temple reflected an indigenous Israelite style (*Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine* [SHCANE 1; Leiden: Brill, 1982], 34–36; *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Paleolithic Period to Alexander’s Conquest* [JSOTSup 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], 531).

7. On the temple at Tell Tayinat, see Robert C. Haines, *Excavations in the Plain of Antioch II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 53–55, plate 103; Timothy P. Harrison, “West Syrian Megaron or Neo-Assyrian Langraum? The Shifting Form and Function of the Tell Ta’yīnāt (Kunulua) Temples,” in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)* (ed. Jens Kamlah; ADPV 41; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 3–21. On the temple at ‘Ain Dara, see Faisal Seirafi, Agob Kirichian, and Maurice Dunand, “Recherches archéologiques à Ayin Dara au nord-ouest d’Alep,” *Annales archéologiques arabes de Syrie* 15.2 (1965): 3–20; Mirko Novák, “The Temple of ‘Ain Dāra in the Context of Imperial and Neo-Hittite Architecture and Art,” in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)* (ed. Jens Kamlah; ADPV 41; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 41–54.
8. Cogan, *I Kings*, 252.
9. See Paolo Matthiae, “Unité et développement du temple dans la Syrie du Bronze Moyen,” in *Le temple et le culte: compte rendu de la vingtième Rencontre assyriologique internationale, organisée à Leiden du 3 au 7 juillet 1972* (ed. E. Van Donzel et al.; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1975), 43–72, esp. 51–52; Frances Pinnock, “The Urban Landscape of Old Syrian Ebla,” *JCS* 53 (2001): 13–33, esp. 22; K. Aslihan Yener, “Alalakh Spatial Organization,” in *The Amuq Valley Regional Projects: Surveys in the Plain of Antioch and Orontes Delta, Turkey, 1995–2002, Volume 1* (ed. K. Aslihan Yener; Chicago, Ill.: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2005), 106; Jacob Lauinger, “The Temple of Ištār at Old Babylonian Alalakh,” *JANER* 8 (2008): 181–217; Morandi Bonacossi, “The Northern Levant,” 426.
10. Smith, *Pilgrimage Pattern*, 88–90; Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, “Israelite Aniconism: Developments and Origins,” in *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. Karel van der Toorn; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997), 189; Othmar Keel and Christoph Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel* (trans. Thomas H. Trapp; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 168; Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, “Cherubim,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P.W. van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 362–367.
11. Some decades ago, David Ussishkin revived the hypothesis of Carl Watzinger and Kurt Galling that Solomon’s palace was a north-Syrian *bit ḥilāni*-style palace, several examples of which have been excavated at Zincirli and Tell Halaf. See Carl Watzinger, *Denkmäler Palästinas: eine Einführung in die Archäologie des Heiligen Landes* (2 vols.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1933–1935) 1:95–97; Kurt Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1937), 411; Ussishkin, “Building IV,” 104–110; B. Hrouda, “Ḥilāni, bit,” *RLA* 4 (1975): 406–409; Ronny Reich, “Palaces and Residences in the Iron Age,” in *The Architecture of Ancient Israel*,

- from the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods (eds. Aharon Kempinski and Ronny Reich; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 204–206. Ussishkin categorized Palace 1723 at Megiddo as also belonging to this style, and other scholars added to the typology Palace 6000 at Megiddo and a structure at Bethsaida. To my mind, a more convincing typology of Levantine monumental architecture is provided by Ilan Sharon and Anabel Zarzecki-Peleg, who distinguish between the north Syrian *būt ḥilāni* and a local Southern Levantine architectural form they call the Lateral-Access Podium Structure. In light of their refined typology, I am reticent to classify Solomon’s building as a *būt ḥilāni* palace. See Ilan Sharon and Anabel Zarzecki-Peleg, “Podium Structures with Lateral Access: Authority Ploys in Royal Architecture in the Iron Age Levant,” in *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel in Honor of William G. Dever* (ed. Seymour Gitin, J. Edward Wright, and J.P. Dessel; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 145–167.
12. Reich, “Palaces and Residences,” 203. See also Edward Lipiński, “Hiram of Tyre and Solomon,” in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. André Lemaire, Baruch Halpern, and Matthew J. Adams; VTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 258.
 13. Vassos Karageorghis, *Kition: Mycenaean and Phoenician Discoveries in Cyprus* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1976), fig. 18; Reich, “Palaces and Residences,” 203.
 14. David Ussishkin, “King Solomon’s Palaces,” *BA* 36 (1973): 92–94; Tahsin Özgüç, *Altintepe I: Mimarlık anıtları ve duvar resimleri* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1966), 44–46, plates V, VI, XVII, XVIII, and XIX.
 15. In ancient Near Eastern building accounts, only one of the structuring themes identified by Victor Hurowitz typically includes any mention of foreign involvement in the project: the theme of preparations for building. Darius, for example, claimed to have imported materials from all over the world in order to build his palace at Susa. According to his Susa palace inscription (Darius Susa F), cedar arrived from Lebanon, lumber from Gandara and from Carmania, gold from Sardis and from Bactria, lapis lazuli and carnelian from Sogdiana, turquoise from Chorasmia, silver and ebony from Egypt, ivory from Ethiopia, from Sind, and from Arachosia, and stone columns from Elam. See Roland G. Kent, *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon* (AOS 33; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1950), 144. This theme highlights the luxurious nature of the building’s construction. The impression given is that no effort is spared in building and the best materials possible are secured, including from abroad. The biblical account of Solomon’s temple shares this emphasis on luxurious materials imported from foreign lands. But it highlights the motif of foreign involvement in the building project in two additional, atypical ways. First, the theme of the decision to build takes an unusual form in the book of Kings. Normally, the reason for building and the approval of the god for the project take the same form as the rest of the account, whether narrative or discourse. But the narrative of the construction of

Judah's most sacred site begins not with a prophetic oracle or dream theophany authorizing its construction, nor with a sacred assembly of Israel's elders and tribes commissioning the project, but with diplomatic correspondence between Solomon and a foreigner. Second, where ancient Near Eastern accounts typically emphasize the king's personal role as builder, the biblical account notes expert foreign labor. Solomon brought the coppersmith Hiram from Tyre to fashion the bronze furnishings for the temple. Hiram cast the bronze columns, with their capitals, that marked the entrance to the temple. Hiram fashioned the bronze sea that stood outside the temple. And Hiram made ten lavers and stands and other bronze utensils for the temple cult. Compared to most other ancient Near Eastern building accounts, 1 Kgs 5:15–9:25 places greater emphasis on the involvement of foreigners in the construction project.

16. Volkmar Fritz observes the importance of the building account to the biblical narratives about Solomon. He writes, "The detailed report of the setup and dedication of the temple in 1 Kgs 6–8 has to be seen as the center of the story of Solomon. The other narratives and short notes about Solomon's wisdom, his building projects, and his trade in 1 Kgs 3–5 and 9–10 serve to frame this central piece" (*1 & 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary* [trans. Anselm Hagedorn; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003], 68).
17. The Solomonic narratives describe the importation of new building materials. In late antiquity, the reuse in new monuments and buildings of architectural or sculptural elements taken from conquered regions became a recognized expression of spatial power. This phenomenon of *spolia no* doubt had practical advantage—reusing marble columns, for example, may have been cheaper than making new ones—but it also served ideological ends by putting on public display the ruler's spoils of war. On *spolia*, see Beat Brenk, "Spolia from Constantine to Charlemagne: Aesthetics versus Ideology," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 41 (1987): 103–109; Dale Kinney, "Rape or Restitution of the Past? Interpreting Spolia," in *The Art of Interpreting* (ed. Susan C. Scott; University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 53–68; Joachim Poeschke, Hugo Brandenburg, and Gerda Henkel Stiftung, eds., *Antike Spolien in der Architektur des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Munich: Hirmer, 1996); Richard Brilliant and Dale Kinney, eds., *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine* (Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2011).
18. See especially Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith; Oxford: Blackwell, 1991). On Lefebvre's work as it has been taken up within the discipline of geography, see Andy Merrifield, "Place and Space: A Lefebvrian Reconciliation," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 18 (1993): 516–531; Stuart Elden, *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible* (New York: Continuum, 2004); Andy Merrifield, *Henri Lefebvre: A Critical Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Kanishka

- Goonewardena et al., *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre* (New York: Routledge, 2008); Henri Lefebvre, *State, Space, World: Selected Essays* (ed. Stuart Elden; trans. Neil Brenner and Gerald Moore; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).
19. For example, Émile Durkheim offered a sociological explanation of religion, Sigmund Freud a psychoanalytical one, and Karl Marx a political-economic one. Approaches to religion by important thinkers are summarized in Daniel L. Pals, *Eight Theories of Religion* (2d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). See Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life: A Study in Religious Sociology* (trans. Joseph Ward Swain; New York: Macmillan, 1915); Sigmund Freud, *Totem and Taboo: Resemblances between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics* (trans. A.A. Brill; New York: New Republic, 1927); Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion* (trans. W.D. Robson-Scott; New York: H. Liveright, 1928). Religion was not a major theme of Marx's voluminous writings. Marx's often quoted dictum, "Religion is the opium of the people," which I understand against the background of his larger work on alienation and class struggle, is found in the introduction to his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. On his views on religion, see John Raines, "Introduction," in *Marx on Religion* (ed. John Raines; Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002).
 20. Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational* (trans. John W. Harvey; 2d ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1946).
 21. Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (trans. Rosemary Sheed; New York: Sheed & Ward, 1958), 367–387; Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (trans. Willard R. Trask; San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1987), 20–67. For an extended definition of hierophany, see also Chapter 1 of his *Patterns in Comparative Religion*.
 22. Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (trans. Willard R. Trask; New York: Pantheon Books, 1954), 77–78; Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, 42–43, 60–61; Mircea Eliade, "Sacred Architecture and Symbolism," in *Symbolism, the Sacred, and the Arts* (ed. Diane Apostolos-Cappadona; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 105–129, esp. 115. On the symbolism of the architecture, furniture, and iconography of Solomon's temple, see Jon D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), 90–99; Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, "'Who Is the King of Glory': Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism," in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King* (ed. Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 18–31; Othmar Keel, "Paraphernalia of Jerusalem Sanctuaries and Their Relation to Deities Worshipped Therein During the Iron Age IIA–C," in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)* (ed. Jens Kamlah;

- ADPV 41; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 317–342; Bernd Janowski, “Der Ort des Lebens: Zur Kultsymbolik des Jerusalemer Tempels,” in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)* (ed. Jens Kamla; ADPV 41; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 368–397.
23. See especially Jonathan Z. Smith’s essays, “The Wobbling Pivot,” and “Map Is Not Territory,” in *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978). Smith’s work is taken up, for example, in Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 83.
24. Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 127; Frank H. Gorman, *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (JSOTSup 91; Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1990), 32; Yehoshua Gitay, “Geography and Theology in the Biblical Narrative: The Question of Genesis 2–12,” in *Prophecy and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of G.M. Tucker* (ed. Stephen Breck Reid; JSOTSup 229; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 205–216; Robert S. Kawashima, “The Priestly Tent of Meeting and the Problem of Divine Transcendence: An ‘Archaeology’ of the Sacred,” *Journal of Religion* 86 (2006): 226–257; Seong Il Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain: Textual Presentations of Sacred Space in the Hebrew Bible” (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2008). On Eliade’s influence in biblical studies, see also the comments of David J. Clines, “Sacred Space, Holy Places and Suchlike,” in *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays 1967–1998* (JSOTSup 292–293; 2 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 2:542–554; Theodore Hiebert, *The Yahwist’s Landscape: Nature and Religion in Early Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 9; Daniel C. Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:12–17; 35:1–3 in Exegetical and Theological Perspective* (FRLANT 227; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 32–36.
25. The vast differences between culture-historical, functional-processual, and post-processual archaeology do not concern me here. For a history of archaeology that relates theoretical developments to the social contexts of their production, see Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Trigger discusses biblical and Israeli archaeology on pp. 272–275.
26. For a history of theoretical work on space, from ancient to modern times, see Edward S. Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). Casey discusses the work of Newton, Descartes, and Leibniz on pp. 137–179. See, for example, Galileo Galilei, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems, Ptolemaic and Copernican* (trans. Stillman Drake; foreword by Albert Einstein; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953); Isaac Newton, *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* (trans. A. Motte;

- ed. F. Cajori; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962); René Descartes, “Letter of February 5, 1649,” in *Descartes: Philosophical Letters* (trans. A. Kenny; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 239–240; René Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy* (trans. Blair Reynolds; Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 1988); Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, “Mr. Leibniz’s Fifth Paper: Being an Answer to Dr. Clarke’s Fourth Reply,” in *The Leibniz–Clarke Correspondence: Together with Extracts from Newton’s Principia and Optiks* (ed. H.G. Alexander; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958), 55–96. For a comparison of Newton and Descartes, see Chapter 3 of Alexandre Koyré, *Newtonian Studies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).
27. On the revolutionary nature of Galilean science, see Alexandre Koyré, *Galileo Studies* (trans. John Mepham; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1978). On the mathematization of nature, see also Part 1 of Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Science and Transcendental Phenomenology* (trans. D. Carr; Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970).
 28. See Chapter 5 of Newton’s *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended*, published posthumously (London: Tonson, Osborn, and Longman) in 1728.
 29. Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Royal Cities of the Old Testament* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971); Volkmar Fritz, *The City in Ancient Israel* (Biblical Seminar 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Zeev Herzog, *Archaeology of the City: Urban Planning in Ancient Israel and Its Social Implications* (Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Archaeology Press, 1997); C.H.J. de Geus, *Towns in Ancient Israel and the Southern Levant* (Palaestina antiqua 10; Leuven: Peeters, 2003).
 30. In this regard, my work here also contrasts with McCormick, *Palace and Temple*, 41–44. McCormick treats the textual description of Solomon’s temple as a verbal icon having no necessary relationship to the temple’s material existence. The approach has its merits. My work, however, remains concerned with the materiality of space.
 31. Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 26.
 32. For example, Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 20–24, 80–83, 321–328, 340–346. On Lefebvre’s relationship to Marx’s legacy, see Elden, *Understanding Henri Lefebvre*, 15–48. Elden argues that Lefebvre reformulates the kind of dialectical reasoning that Marx inherited from Hegel so that the synthesis is no longer the result of thesis and antithesis but continuously in dialogue with them. This new form of dialectical reasoning is applied by Lefebvre to space (*Understanding Henri Lefebvre*, 169–198). On Lefebvre and Marx, see also Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 32–36; David Harvey, *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development* (London: Verso, 2006), 85–86, 130–148; Neil Smith, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* (3rd ed; Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 123–131.
 33. On the main features a new science of space, see Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 8–9. Lefebvre seeks to introduce “the idea of a diversity or multiplicity

of spaces quite distinct from that multiplicity which results from segmenting and cross-sectioning space *ad infinitum*” (*Production of Space*, 27). Elden points out, “Lefebvre and Heidegger both realize the Cartesian understanding of space as calculable and controllable allows social and technological domination” (*Understanding Henri Lefebvre*, 183).

34. For terse definitions of this triad, see Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 33, 38–39.
35. Soja, *Thirdspace*, 53–82; Elden, *Understanding Henri Lefebvre*, 190; Harvey, *Spaces of Global Capitalism*, 130–148.
36. Roland Boer, *Marxist Criticism of the Bible* (London: T & T Clark, 2003), 87–109; Christl M. Maier, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008); Mark K. George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009); Mary E. Mills, *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy* (LHB/OTS 560; London: T & T Clark, 2012), 59–60; Jaime L. Waters, *Threshing Floors in Ancient Israel: Their Ritual and Symbolic Significance* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 23–25. See also several volumes of collected essays produced by the Space, Place, and Lived Experience in Antiquity program unit of the Society of Biblical Literature's Annual Meeting, and its antecedent: Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp, eds., *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative* (LHB/OTS 481; London: T & T Clark, 2008); Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp, eds., *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces* (LHB/OTS 490; London: T & T Clark, 2008); Mark K. George, ed., *Constructions of Space IV: Further Developments in Examining Ancient Israel's Social Space* (LHB/OTS 569; London: Bloomsbury, 2013); Gert T.M. Prinsloo and Christl M. Maier, eds., *Constructions of Space V: Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (LHB/OTS 576; London: Bloomsbury, 2013); Jorunn Økland, *Constructions of Space III: Biblical Spatiality and the Sacred* (LHB/OTS 540; London: Bloomsbury, 2016). See also the collected essays in David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt, eds., *Imagining Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (JSOTSup 359; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
37. Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich; trans. Ephraim Fischhoff; 4th ed.; 2 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 2:941–955; Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (New York: Free Press, 1964), 124–132, 325–392; Antonio Gramsci, “State and Civil Society,” in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 206–276.
38. On Weber's view of authority, see Abraham Malamat, “Charismatic Leadership in the Book of Judges,” in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (ed. Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 152–168; Norman Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated*

- Israel 1250–1050 B.C.E.* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1979), 223–224, 610–612, and esp. 627–631; Baruch Halpern, *The Emergence of Israel in Canaan* (SBLMS 29; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 187–188. On Weber’s movement away from the notion of an ideal type, see Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 141–143.
39. James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). Scott offers a critique of the concept of hegemony on pp. 77–107.
 40. Anthony Giddens cautions against the generalizing to all societies of features that are specific to modern ones, citing as an example the precisely delimited territorial boundaries of modern nation-states (*The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* [Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1984], 164).
 41. Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power: Volume 1, A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
 42. On space and power in the ancient world, see especially Adam T. Smith, *The Political Landscape: Constellations of Authority in Early Complex Polities* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003). Smith takes up Lefebvre’s work and defines his project in terms of what he calls “relational space” (*Political Landscape*, 69–75). See also Ömür Harmanşah, *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013). While their focus is on archaeological evidence, my goal here is to emphasize the use of spatial language in relation to power. On space and power in a later period than I examine here, see Paul J. Kosmin, *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire* (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 2014).
 43. Daniel E. Fleming, *Democracy’s Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Anne Porter, *Mobile Pastoralism and the Formation of Near Eastern Civilizations: Weaving Together Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Daniel E. Fleming, *The Legacy of Israel in Judah’s Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Brendon C. Benz, “The Varieties of Sociopolitical Experience in the Late Bronze Age Levant and the Rise of Early Israel” (PhD diss., New York University, 2013); Adam Miglio, *Tribe and State: The Dynamics of International Politics and the Reign of Zimri-Lim* (Gorgias Studies in the Ancient Near East 8; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2014).
 44. Giddens, *Constitution of Society*, 2.
 45. Giddens, *Constitution of Society*, xvi.
 46. Giddens, *Constitution of Society*, xx–xxi. Giddens offers a neat definition of structure within the theory: “In structuration theory ‘structure’ is regarded as rules and resources recursively implicated in social reproduction; institutionalized features of social systems have structural properties in the sense that

relationships are stabilized across time and space. ‘Structure’ can be conceptualized abstractly as two aspects of rules—normative elements and codes of signification. Resources are also of two kinds: authoritative resources, which derive from the co-ordination of the activity of human agents, and allocative resources, which stem from control of material products or of aspects of the material world” (*Constitution of Society*, xxxi).

47. Anthony Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1979), 5.
48. For engagement with and critique of structuration theory, see John B. Thompson, *Studies in the Theory of Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); Margaret Scotford Archer, *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Christopher G.A. Bryant and David Jary, eds., *Anthony Giddens: Critical Assessments* (4 vols.; New York: Routledge, 1997); Rob Stones, *Structuration Theory* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005). On difficulties with structuration theory in the study of the ancient Near East, see Bruce Routledge, *Moab in the Iron Age: Hegemony, Polity, Archaeology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2004), 1–26.
49. Richard E. Blanton, Gary M. Feinman, Stephen A. Kowalewski, and Peter N. Peregrine, “A Dual-Processual Theory for the Evolution of Mesoamerican Civilization,” *Current Anthropology* 37 (1996): 1–14. On the development and influence of their dual-processual model, see, for example, Barbara J. Mills, “Alternative Models, Alternative Strategies: Leadership in the Prehispanic Southwest,” in *Alternative Leadership Strategies in the Prehispanic Southwest* (ed. Barbara J. Mills; Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 2000), 10; Tina L. Thurston, *Landscapes of Power, Landscapes of Conflict: State Formation in the South Scandinavian Iron Age* (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2001), 123; Gary M. Feinman, “A Dual-Processual Perspective on the Power and Inequality in the Contemporary United States: Framing Political Economy for the Present and the Past,” in *Pathways to Power: New Perspectives On the Emergence of Social Inequality* (ed. T. Douglas Price and Gary M. Feinman; New York: Springer, 2010), 255–287.
50. Daniel E. Fleming writes, “The balance of royal and collective Israelite power meant that the heirs to kings who launched new houses were understood to be vulnerable and could easily be deposed if they failed to gain the support of the wider political body of Israel, in whatever form. Israel’s monarchy was not ‘unstable’ but rather constrained by a decentralizing political tradition that allowed turnover of royal houses” (*Legacy of Israel*, 294).
51. Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).
52. For a comprehensive survey of scholarship on the Deuteronomistic History, see Thomas Römer and Albert de Pury, “Deuteronomistic History (DH): History of

- Research and Debated Issues,” in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 24–141. They discuss precursors to Noth’s work by Wilhelm de Wette, Karl-Heinrich Graf, Heinrich Ewald, Abraham Kuenen, and Julius Wellhausen, among others, on pp. 25–45.
53. Some of the most important contributions to the discussion have been excerpted and republished in Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville, ed., *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000). See also the several essays in Thomas Römer, ed., *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (BETL 147; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000); Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds., *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Jan Christian Gertz et al., eds., *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur “Deuteronomismus”-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (BZAW 365; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006).
 54. His 1968 article was republished in Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274–289.
 55. In his 1805 dissertation on Deuteronomy, W.M.L. de Wette suggested that the law book, whose discovery in the temple is described here, was the book of Deuteronomy or some part of it. The theory is also put forward in his 1806–1807 work, republished as W.M.L. de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971). Recently, Lauren Monroe has argued that the Priestly concept of the elimination of impurity is discernible in 2 Kgs 22–23, with the closest conceptual parallels in the Holiness Code (Lev 17–26). Monroe thus proposes that an early version of 2 Kgs 22–23 was told by Priestly, more specifically Holiness, circles before the narrative was revised by the addition of the Deuteronomistic concept of *ḥērem*. See Lauren Monroe, *Josiah’s Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). I discuss her work further in Chapter 3.
 56. A revised version of Nelson’s 1973 dissertation under Patrick D. Miller was published as Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).
 57. Helga Weippert, “Die ‘deuteronomistischen’ Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher,” *Bib* 53 (1972): 301–339; Iain Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 172; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988); Baruch Halpern and David Vanderhooff, “The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries B.C.E.,” *HUCA* 62 (1991): 179–244;

- Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 61–80, 153–164; Erik Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OtSt 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 33–136; André Lemaire, “Toward a Redactional History of the Book of Kings,” in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville; SBTS 8; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 446–461; Antony F. Campbell and Mark A. O’Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000); W. Boyd Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah’s Reform* (VTSup 88; Leiden: Brill, 2002); Bernard Lehnart, *Prophet und König im Nordreich Israel: Studien zur sogenannten vorklassischen Prophetie im Nordreich Israel anhand der Samuel-, Elija- und Elischa-Überlieferungen* (VTSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 2003); Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2005); Jeremy M. Hutton, *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 396; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).
58. On the story of their discovery and the impact of Ugaritic studies, see Mark Smith, *Untold Stories: The Bible and Ugaritic Studies in the Twentieth Century* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001).
 59. William F. Albright, “The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse,” *JPOS* 2 (1972): 69–86; William F. Albright, “The Oracle of Balaam,” *JBL* 63 (1944): 207–233; William F. Albright, “The Psalms of Habakkuk,” in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Theodore H. Robinson on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, August 9th, 1946* (ed. H.H. Rowley; Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1950), 1–18; William F. Albright, “Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII,” *VT* 9 (1959): 339–346; William F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths* (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religions 7; London: Athlone, 1968), 1–28, 42–52.
 60. One of their two joint doctoral dissertations, completed in 1950 at Johns Hopkins University, was published as Frank Moore Cross, Jr., and David Noel Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (SBLDS 21; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975).
 61. His 1966 Yale dissertation was published as David Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (SBLDS 3; Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972).
 62. Avi Hurvitz, *Beyn Lashon le-Lashon* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972) (in Hebrew); Avi Hurvitz, “Linguistic Criteria for Dating Problematic Biblical Texts,” *Hebrew Abstracts* 14 (1973): 74–79; Avi Hurvitz, “The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code,” *RB* 81 (1974): 24–56; Avi Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to*

- an Old Problem* (CahRB 20; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982); Avi Hurvitz, “The Historical Quest for ‘Ancient Israel’ and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations,” *VT* 47 (1997): 301–315. Important contributions have also come from Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976); Andrew E. Hill, “The Book of Malachi: Its Place in Post-exilic Chronology Linguistically Reconsidered” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1981); Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (ed. Raphael Kutscher; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982); Ron Bergey, “Late Linguistic Features in Esther,” *JQR* 75 (1984): 66–78; Ron Bergey, “Post-exilic Features in Esther: A Diachronic Approach,” *JETS* 31 (1988): 161–168; Mark F. Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (JSOTSup 90; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990); Richard M. Wright, *Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source* (LHB/OTS 419; London: T&T Clark International, 2005). See also the several essays, with arguments for and against the approach, in Ian Young, ed., *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (JSOTSup 369; London T&T Clark, 2003).
63. Gary A. Rendsburg, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (SBLMS 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990); Gary A. Rendsburg, “Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew,” in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (ed. W.R. Bodine; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 65–88; Gary A. Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings* (Occasional Publications of the Department of Near Eastern Studies and the Program of Jewish Studies, Cornell University 5; Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2002).
 64. Seth L. Sanders, *The Invention of Hebrew* (Traditions; Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009).
 65. Daniel Pioske, *David’s Jerusalem: Between Memory and History* (Routledge Studies in Religion; New York: Routledge, 2015).
 66. Sanders, *Invention of Hebrew*, 108. Sanders cites Amihai Mazar, “Three 10th–9th Century BCE Inscriptions from Tel Rehov,” in *Saxa loquentur: Studien zur Archäologie Palästinas/Israels; Festschrift für Volkmar Fritz zum 65.* (ed. Cornelis G. den Hertog, Ulrich Hübner, and Stefan Münger; AOAT 302; Munich: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003), 171–184; Ron E. Tappy, P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., Marilyn Lundberg, and Bruce Zuckerman, “An Abecedary of the Mid-Tenth Century BCE from the Judaean Shepelah,” *BASOR* 344 (2007): 5–46; Ronny Reich, Eli Shukron, and Omri Lernau, “Recent Discoveries in the City of David, Jerusalem,” *IEJ* 57 (2007): 156–163.
 67. Sanders, *Invention of Hebrew*, 109–112. Sanders notes that Greenstein and Schniedwind have argued that writing in this period is best attributed to provincial scribes. See Edward L. Greenstein, “The Canaanite Literary Heritage in the Writings of Hebrew Scribes,” *Michmanim* 10 (1996): 19–38; William M.

Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

68. Sanders, *Invention of Hebrew*, 113–122.
69. Sanders, *Invention of Hebrew*, 108.
70. Sanders, *Invention of Hebrew*, 122–33.
71. Fleming, *Legacy of Israel*, 40–47, 91–113, 290–303.

CHAPTER 2

1. For example, at Tell Abu Hawam, Megiddo, Tel Qasile, and Tel Dan. See Robert W. Hamilton, “Excavations at Tell Abu Hawām,” *QDAP* 4 (1934): 10, Plate XI; Israel Finkelstein, David Ussishkin, and Baruch Halpern, *Megiddo III: The 1992–1996 Seasons* (Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University 18; 2 vols; Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 2000), 2:588–590; Ziony Zevit, *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches* (New York: Continuum, 2001), 125–126; Andrew R. Davis, *Tel Dan in Its Northern Cultic Context* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 20; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 29. Compare, for example, 2 Kgs 21:3 and the inscription of Yehimilk of Byblos (*KAI* 4). A helpful synopsis of the ideology of Syro-Palestinian temples is Michael B. Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East* (WAWSup 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 124–130. Hundley writes, “in Syria-Palestine, the king’s maintenance of the temple was deemed essential for his continued good relations with his patron deity and thus foundational to his and his people’s welfare” (*Gods in Dwellings*, 129).
2. Akhenaten boasts in his so-called Earlier Proclamation that the land on which he had founded a temple and administrative center for his god the Aten had not previously been owned by god nor king, but was found by him “widowed.” For text and translation, see William J. Murnane and Charles C. Van Siclen III, *The Boundary Stelae of Akhenaten* (Studies in Egyptology; London: Kegan Paul, 1993), 11–68, esp. 37–38. Tukulti-Ninurta I claims to have founded a new capital, Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, on previously uncultivated land with no previous house or dwelling and to have built new temples for several gods there (RIMA 0.78.24 41–52; cf. RIMA 0.78.22). On the rhetoric of ancient Near Eastern royal boasts of founding new cities, with temples, in previously untouched land, see Ömür Harmanşah, *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 25–28. On Sargon II’s founding of a new capital, Dur-Sharrukin, and his construction of new temples there, see the discussion below. J. Nicholas Postgate writes, “Among the many pious duties of the kings of Assyria was their obligation to preserve the temples of their

- gods, and to found new ones” (*Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees* [Studia Pohl: Series Maior 1; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969], 6).
3. As John W. Wright notes, in the parallel version in Chronicles, Joab is blamed for the plague because he failed to complete the census ordered by David (“The Founding Father: The Structure of the Chronicler’s David Narrative,” *JBL* 117 [1998]: 55). But the emphasis in 2 Samuel is quite different. Compare Matty Cohen, “II Sam 24 ou l’histoire d’un décret royal avorté,” *ZAW* 113 (2001): 17–40. David M. Gunn observes, “the motif of David and Joab at cross-purposes is characteristic of many of the stories of Joab” (*The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation* [JSOTSup 6; Sheffield: Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield, 1978], 126 n.7).
 4. On the language and extent of boundaries in 2 Sam 24, see Zecharia Kallai, “The United Monarchy of Israel—A Focal Point in Israelite Historiography,” *IEJ* 27 (1977): 103–109, esp. 106; John Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 232; Nili Wazana, *All the Boundaries of the Land: The Promised Land in Biblical Thought in Light of the Ancient Near East* (trans. Liat Qeren; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 58, 134, 136, 219.
 5. Nick Wyatt emphasizes politics in the narrative, as do I. For Wyatt, the purchase is a political maneuver and the Jebusite king holds a coregency over the city. I offer here a different explanation of the need for a complete transfer of land in the narrative, an explanation rooted in the literary context of ancient Near Eastern texts describing land transfers to the gods. See Nick Wyatt, “‘Araunah the Jebusite’ and the Throne of David,” *ST* 39 (1985): 39–53.
 6. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 410–411, 414–415. Antony Campbell writes, “This is in the context of establishing an altar that will be claimed as the place for the future temple (implicit here; explicit in 1 Chr 22:1)” (2 Samuel [FOTL 8; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005], 207. Compare Joel S. Kaminsky, *Corporate Responsibility in the Hebrew Bible* [JSOTSup 196; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 101. This seems also to be the unstated assumption of Jaime L. Waters, who discusses the transformation of land with primarily agricultural function into a permanent site of cultic activity and notes, “Because the threshing floor is owned by Aravnah/Ornan, David must purchase it” (“Threshing Floors as Sacred Spaces in the Hebrew Bible” [Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2013], 80, 81, 84–86). Since the Deuteronomistic History does not identify this site with the temple where Yahweh will establish his name, I concur with Kurt L. Noll’s assessment that the god of 2 Sam 24 does not seem offended by a king who offers sacrifice that Deuteronomy does not sanction (“Is the Scroll of Samuel Deuteronomistic?” in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History* [ed. Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala; Ancient Israel and Its Literature 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013], 136). On the transformation of the tradition in Chronicles,

- see Julian Morgenstern, *The Fire upon the Altar* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963), 18–21; Isaac Kalimi, “The Land of Moriah, Mount Moriah, and the Site of Solomon’s Temple in Biblical Historiography,” *HTR* 83 (1990): 345–362; Sara Japhet, *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 372–373; Yairah Amit, “Araunah’s Threshing Floor: A Lesson in Shaping Historical Memory,” in *Performing Memory in Biblical Narrative and Beyond* (ed. Athalya Brenner and Frank Polak; Bible in the Modern World 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 13–23; Ryan E. Stokes, “The Devil Made David Do It . . . or Did He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the ‘Satan’ in 1 Chronicles 21:1,” *JBL* 128 (2009): 91–106; Alexander Rofé, “Writing, Interpolating and Editing: 2 Samuel 24 and 1 Chronicles 21 as a Case Study,” *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 3 (2014): 317–326.
7. Robert P. Gordon, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary* (Library of Biblical Interpretation; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Regency Reference Library, 1988), 321. A. Graeme Auld writes, “Both altar and the means for sacrifice are offered free, but David refuses the Jebusite’s offer: he holds that sacrifice should cost the worshipper (v. 24)” (*I & II Samuel: A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011], 618). Auld, commenting on 1 Sam 6:13–16, notes, “The Israelite population there do not share David’s later scruples (2 Sam 24:24) about not using for an offering what he had not paid for” (*I & II Samuel*, 80).
 8. Ephraim A. Speiser, “Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel,” *BASOR* 149 (1958): 17–25; P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 512–514; Song-Mi Suzie Park, “Census and Censure: Sacred Threshing Floors and Counting Taboos in 2 Samuel 24,” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 35 (2013): 21–41.
 9. P. Kyle McCarter provides a very helpful summary of the main points of tension in the narrative (*II Samuel*, 514–515). See also Campbell, *2 Samuel*, 206–208; Anneli Aejmelaesus, “David’s Three Choices: Textual and Literary Development in 2 Samuel 24,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila; BZAW 41; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 137–151.
 10. As Auld notes, Yahweh’s anger burned only once before in the book of Samuel, against Uzzah in 2 Sam 6:7 (*I & II Samuel*, 603).
 11. Indeed, Konrad Rupprecht argues that the chapter represents a reworking of an old cult legend about the founding of a Jebusite shrine at a threshing floor outside Jerusalem. In this reworking, credit has been transferred to David. See Konrad Rupprecht, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem: Gründung Salomos oder jebusitisches Erbe?* (BZAW 144; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977). On Jebusite connections of the Jerusalem sanctuary, compare Werner Fuss, “II Samuel 24,” *ZAW* 74 (1962): 145–164; Fritz Stolz, *Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem: Studien zur altorientalischen, vor- und frühisraelitischen Religion* (BZAW 118; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970), 9; Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite*

- Religion in the Old Testament Period* (OTL; 2 vols; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 1:130.
12. For example, see Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958), 141; Eugene Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 157–158; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 504–508; Stephen Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1984), 112–114; William M. Schniedewind, “Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple Tendenz in the Greek Text of Samuel–Kings,” *HTR* 87 (1994): 108; Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 311–312; Campbell, *2 Samuel*, 206; Auld, *I & II Samuel*, 602–603, 611–612, 617–618; Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Lost in Reconstruction? On Hebrew and Greek Reconstructions in 2 Sam 24,” *BIOSt* 40 (2007): 89–106; Alexander Rofé, “Midrashic Traits in 4Q51 (So-Called 4QSam^a),” in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 76–78; A. Graeme Auld, “Imag[in]ing Editions of Samuel: The Chronicler’s Contribution,” in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 128–130; Innocent Hambaza, “4QSam^a (2 Sam 24:16–22): Its Reading, Where It Stands in the History of the Text and Its Use in Bible Translations,” in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 39–51.
 13. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 504–508.
 14. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 515. He further notes that Timo Veijola’s approach falls outside of this taxonomy in so far as Veijola isolates successive Deuteronomistic revisions to the text. See Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1975).
 15. For example, see Herbert Schmid, “Der Tempelbau Salomos in religionsgeschichtlicher Sicht,” in *Archäologie und Altes Testament: Festschrift für Kurt Galling* (ed. Arnulf Kuschke and Ernst Kutsch; Tübingen: Mohr, 1970), 241–250; Rupprecht, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 5–17.
 16. For example, see Fuss, “II Samuel 24,” 145–164; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 515–516.
 17. On the difficulties posed by the lines concerning Gad, see McCarter, *II Samuel*, 516; Jörg Jeremias, *Die Reue Gottes: Aspekte alttestamentlicher Gottesvorstellung* (BibS[N] 65; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975), 66–69.
 18. In her full survey of the term in the Hebrew Bible, Judit M. Blair concludes that it refers to destruction, possibly by infectious disease, sent by Yahweh. It is frequently personified, but does not refer to a mythological demon. See Judit M. Blair,

- De-demonising the Old Testament: An Investigation of Azazel, Lilith, Deber, Qeteb and Reshef in the Hebrew Bible* (FAT 2.37; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 96–176.
19. For example, see L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J.J. Stamm, “דָּבָר דָּבָר,” *HALOT*, 1:212.
 20. Cf. Ezek 7:15.
 21. Bubonic plague proper is widely believed to have enjoyed its first outbreak long after our period, in the time of Justinian I. See the several essays in Lester K. Little, ed., *Plague and the End of Antiquity: The Pandemic of 541–750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). On Mesopotamian disease and medicine, see Jo Ann Scurlock and Burton R. Andersen, *Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine: Ancient Sources, Translations, and Modern Medical Analyses* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2005).
 22. Jean-Robert Kupper, “Le recensement dans les textes de Mari,” in *Studia Mariana* (ed. André Parrot; Leiden: Brill, 1950), 99–110; Speiser, “Census and Ritual Expiation,” 17–25. Compare McCarter, *II Samuel*, 512–514.
 23. On census at Mari, see also Stephanie Dalley, *Mari and Karana: Two Old Babylonian Cities* (New York: Longman, 1984), 142–143; Wayne T. Pitard, “A Historical Overview of Pastoral Nomadism in the Central Euphrates Valley,” in *Go to the Land I Will Show You: Studies in Honor of Dwight W. Young* (ed. Joseph E. Coleson and Victor H. Matthews; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 303–304; William J. Hamblin, *Warfare in the Ancient Near East to 1600 BC: Holy Warriors at the Dawn of History* (London: Routledge, 2006), 192–193; Daniel E. Fleming, *The Legacy of Israel in Judah’s Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 212–213 n.28; Mario Liverani, *The Ancient Near East: History, Society and Economy* (trans. Soraia Tabatabai; London: Routledge, 2014), 230.
 24. ARM I 42. Translation from Jack M. Sasson, *The Military Establishments at Mari* (*Studia Pohl* 3; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 8–9. Compare related concepts in A. Leo Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia: Official Business, and Private Letters on Clay Tablets from Two Millennia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 96–97; Jørgen Laessøe, *People of Ancient Assyria: Their Inscriptions and Correspondence* (trans. F.S. Leigh-Browne; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), 64–65; Cyril J. Gadd, “Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tall Brak, 1937–38,” *Iraq* 7 (1940): 22–66, esp. 26–27.
 25. Speiser, “Census and Ritual Expiation,” 19–20.
 26. Speiser, “Census and Ritual Expiation,” 24–25.
 27. This view is shared by McCarter, *II Samuel*, 514. McCarter admits that 2 Sam 24 shares themes in common with the general prophetic critique of monarchy and its propensity to conscript and tax the population, which in turn required census taking. For example, 1 Sam 8:11–18 warns against the burdens the king will impose on the population. But McCarter is surely right in thinking that a more ancient taboo drives the narrative logic of 2 Sam 24.

28. Speiser, “Census and Ritual Expiation,” 24.
29. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 512–514.
30. Compare related military usage of the verb in Josh 10:18; Judg 21:9; 1 Sam 13:15; 14:17; 2 Sam 2:30.
31. To be sure, rituals would have also been conducted after battle. On post-battle purification in the ancient Near East, see Olivier Masson, “A propos d’un rituel hittite pour la lustration d’une armée: le rite de purification par le passage entre les deux parties d’une victime,” *RHR* 137 (1950): 5–25; Jason A. Riley, “Does YHWH Get His Hands Dirty? Reading Isaiah 63:1–6 in Light of Divine Postbattle Purification,” in *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts* (ed. Brad E. Kelle, Frank Ritche Ames, and Jacob L. Wright; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 243 n.1; J. van Dijk, “Un rituel de purification des armes et de l’armée: essai de traduction de YBC 4184,” in *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae* (ed. M.A. Beek; Studia Francisci Scholten Memoriae Dicata 4; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 107–117.
32. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 514.
33. Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 172–177.
34. Volkert Haas and Gernot Wilhelm, *Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna* (AOAT 3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), 206f, as cited in Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 174.
35. Hans Ehelolf and Ferdinand Sommer, *Das hethitische Ritual des Pāpanikri von Komana (KBo V 1 = Bo 2001): Text, Übersetzungsversuch, Erläuterungen* (Boghazköi Studien 10; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1924) as cited in Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 174. On connections between Hittite and biblical sacrificial offerings, see also Yitzaq Feder, “A Levantine Tradition: The Kizzuwatnean Blood Rite and the Biblical Sin Offering,” in *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer* (ed. Y. Cohen et al.; Studien zu den Bogazkoy-Texten 51; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 101–114.
36. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 175. Compare also KUB v 7 trans. ANET 497–498, where payment is made to avert the god’s anger.
37. I thank Jeremy Schipper for drawing my attention to the differing rules governing free-will and votive offerings in the Holiness Code.
38. Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 1878–1879. Isaac Abravanel, *Commentary on the Torah* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Bnei Arbel, 1964), ad loc.
39. On royal power over land in the ancient Near East, see Moshe Weinfeld, “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East,” *JAOS* 90 (1970): 184–203; Casper J. Labuschagne, “The Našû-nadānu Formula and Its Biblical Equivalents,” in *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Prof. M.A. Beek at the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. M.S.H.G. Heerma

- van Voss, P.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, and N.A. van Uchelen; SSN 16; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974), 176–180; Jonas C. Greenfield, “Našû-nadânu and Its Congeners,” in *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein* (ed. Maria de Jong Ellis; Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 19; Hamden, Conn.: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1977), 87–91, esp. 89; Zafrira Ben-Barak, “Meribaal and the System of Land Grants in Ancient Israel,” *Bib* 62 (1981): 73–91; Zafrira Ben-Barak, “The Confiscation of Lands in Israel and the Ancient Near East,” *Shnaton* 5–6 (1981–82): 101–117 (in Hebrew); J. David Schloen, *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East* (SAHL 2; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001), 230; Roger S. Nam, *Portrayals of Economic Exchange in the Book of Kings* (BibInt 112; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 143–145; Daniel Oden, “Power over Land in Late Bronze Age Syrian Legal Tablets and Its Characterization in 1 Kings 21:1–16” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2012).
40. Max Gluckman, *The Ideas in Barotse Jurisprudence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), 75–112. On the relevance of Gluckman’s work for understanding land rights in the ancient Near East, see Stephen C. Russell, “Abraham’s Purchase of Ephron’s Land in Anthropological Perspective,” *BibInt* 21 (2013): 153–170; Stephen C. Russell, “The Hierarchy of Estates in Land and Naboth’s Vineyard,” *JSOT* 38 (2014): 453–469.
41. Gluckman, *Ideas*, 77.
42. In developing a generalized model for land rights, Gluckman draws on observations on relations to property in Raymond Firth, *We, the Tikopia: A Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1936); Godfrey Wilson, *The Land Rights of Individuals among the Nyakyusa* (Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, 1938); Audrey I. Richards, *Land, Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia: An Economic Study of the Bemba Tribe* (London: International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, 1939); Isaac Schapera, *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate* (Lovedale, South Africa: Lovedale Press, 1943); William Allan et al., *Land Holding and Land Usage among the Plateau Tonga of Mazabuka District: A Reconnaissance Survey, 1945* (Capetown: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, 1948); Ward H. Goodenough, *Property, Kin and Community on Truk* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951); Taslim Olawale Elias, *Nigerian Land Law and Custom* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951); Vernon G.J. Sheddick, *Land Tenure in Basutoland* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1954).
43. On the varying systems of land tenure in the ancient Near East, see Igor M. Diakonoff, “Sale of Land in Pre-Sargonic Sumer,” in *Papers Presented by the Soviet Delegation at the XXIII International Congress of Orientalists* (Moscow: Pub. House of USSR Academy of Sciences, 1954), 5–32; Igor M. Diakonoff, “The Commune in the Ancient Near East as Treated in the Works of Soviet Researchers,” *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology* 2 (1963): 32–46; Ignace J. Gelb, “On the Alleged

Temple and State Economies in Ancient Mesopotamia,” in *Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra* (ed. L. Aru et al.; Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di giurisprudenza dell’Università di Roma 40–45; Milan: A. Giuffrè, 1971), 6:137–154; J. Nicholas Postgate, “Land Tenure in the Middle Assyrian Period: A Reconstruction,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 34 (1971): 496–520; Maria de J. Ellis, *Agriculture and the State in Ancient Mesopotamia: An Introduction to Problems of Land Tenure* (Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 1; Philadelphia: University Museum, 1976); Bernard F. Batto, “Land Tenure and Women at Mari,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 23 (1980): 209–239; Robert McC. Adams, “Property Rights and Functional Tenure in Mesopotamian Rural Communities,” in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff* (ed. J. Nicholas Postgate et al.; Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1982), 1–14; Benjamin R. Foster, *Administration and Use of Institutional Land in Sargonic Sumer* (Mesopotamia 9; Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982), 113; J. Nicholas Postgate, “*Ilku* and Land Tenure in the Middle Assyrian Kingdom—A Second Attempt,” in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff* (ed. J. Nicholas Postgate et al.; Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1982), 303–312; Mario Liverani, “Land Tenure and Inheritance in the Ancient Near East: The Interaction between ‘Palace’ and ‘Family’ Sectors,” in *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East* (ed. Tarif Khalidi; Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1984), 33–44; Burchard Brentjes, ed., *Das Grundeigentum in Mesopotamien* (Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte Sonderband 1987–1988; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1988); Ignace J. Gelb, Piotr Steinkeller, and Robert M. Whiting, Jr., *Earliest Land Tenure Systems in the Near East: Ancient Kudurrus* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1991); Benjamin R. Foster, review of Ignace J. Gelb, Piotr Steinkeller, and Robert M. Whiting, *Earliest Land Tenure Systems*, *JAOS* 114 (1994): 440–452; Johannes M. Renger, “Institutional, Communal and Individual Ownership or Possession of Arable Land in Ancient Mesopotamia from the End of the Fourth to the End of the First Millennium BC,” *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 71 (1995): 269–320; Michael Jursa, “Economic Change and Legal Innovation: On Aspects of Commercial Interaction and Land Tenure in Babylonia in the First Millennium BC,” in *I diritti del mondo cuneiforme (Mesopotamia e regioni adiacenti ca. 2500–500 A.C.)* (ed. Mario Liverani and Clelia Mora; Pavia: IUSS Press, 2008), 601–628; Raymond Westbrook, “Introduction: The Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law,” in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law* (ed. Raymond Westbrook; HdO 72; 2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1:55–56; Heather D. Baker, “Babylonian Land Survey in Socio-Political Context,” in *The Empirical Dimension of Ancient Near Eastern Studies* (ed. Gebhard J. Selz; Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2011), 293–323.

44. Several observations he makes about royal power over land among the Lozi help shape the questions I ask here as I reconstruct how land rights functioned in

the biblical world. Among the Lozi, the king is regarded as owner of all land. Yet such ownership is better understood as territoriality or wardenship and land available to the king for private use was more restricted. In Gluckman's terms, the king enjoyed rights of administration in all land, but rights of production only in some land. Gluckman enumerated the Lozi king's rights in land as follows: "(1) he can claim allegiance from any one settling on or using his land; (2) he is held to be the immediate owner of all land in his territory not yet taken up by his subjects; (3) this gives rise to a power to request that land allocated to subjects but not yet used by them be returned to him; (4) he inherits any land for which no heir of the dead holder can be found, and takes over land abandoned by a family or left by a banished family; (5) his ownership is held to be the basis of his right to demand a portion of the produce as tribute; (6) he can control the settlement of the people on the surface of the land; and (7) he has the power to legislate about holding and use of the land" (*Ideas*, 79). Royal power over land among the Lozi is thus limited. Although the king enjoyed wardenship of all land, he could not simply seize for private use the property of a landholder. Such land would only revert up the hierarchy of estates with good cause, namely the death of a landholder with no heir, the abandonment of land by a landholder, or treason with its resulting banishment from the land. Gluckman notes, "In saying that the primary holder retains his holding in the secondary estates granted in his estate, I again emphasize that this is a revisionary or residual right; i.e. he can exercise it only if the secondary holder abandons the estate or is expelled from the group. Any estate, once granted, is held securely against all comers, including the grantor—and I repeat, even if he be the king" (*Ideas*, 92).

45. On connections between households, ancestors, and land in this narrative, see Herbert C. Brichto, "Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife—A Biblical Complex," *HUCA* 44 (1973): 31–32; Francesca Stavrakopoulou, *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestor Veneration in Biblical Land Claims* (LHB/OTS 473; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 11; Hans-Joachim Seidel, *Nabots Weinberg, Ahabs Haus, Israels Thron: Textpragmatisch fundierte Untersuchung von 1 Kön 21 und seinen Bezugstexten* (Berlin: LIT, 2012), 163–164; Stephen C. Russell, "Ideologies of Attachment in the Story of Naboth's Vineyard," *BTB* 44 (2014): 13–28; Russell, "The Hierarchy of Estates," 453–469.
46. On the syntax of Naboth's declaration, compare 1 Sam 26:11 and the closely related constructions in 2 Sam 23:17; 1 Chr 11:9. The syntax of Naboth's declaration also seems a functional equivalent to the construction in 1 Sam 24:7, where DN is used instead of IN to introduce what will never be done. By invoking Yahweh these pronouncements move beyond mere declaration. Yahweh is invoked as a guarantor that the action will never be carried out. Through what mechanism could ancient Near Eastern deities serve as guarantors of human action? Anne Marie Kitz has mapped compellingly the ancient Near Eastern concept of a curse, a prayer to the divine world to render harm. Kitz shows how oaths are,

- formally speaking, conditional self curses. It is this ancient Near Eastern concept of cursing that lies in the background to Naboth's invocation of Yahweh here. See Anne Marie Kitz, *Cursed Are You! The Phenomenology of Cursing in Cuneiform and Hebrew Texts* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 96–133. On oaths, see also Robert S. Kawashima, "On the Word of an Israelite: Oaths and Testimonies in the Bible" (paper presented at the Oxford Seminar in Advanced Jewish Studies, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, November 13, 2013).
47. Ancient Near Eastern law did not distinguish between criminal and civil cases in the same way that modern law does. Raymond Westbrook notes, "From the pattern of treatment and remedies, we can distinguish three main categories: wrongs against a hierarchical superior; serious wrongs against the person, honor, or property of an individual; and minor harm to an individual's person or property" ("Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law," 75). This first category included offenses against gods and kings.
 48. In reconstructing this history, I draw especially on the work of Zafrira Ben-Barak, who has offered a most compelling account of the history of these lands. See Ben-Barak, "Meribaa and the System of Land Grants," *Bib* 62 (1981): 73–91.
 49. On land rights in this narrative, see Herbert Petschow, "Die Neubabylonische Zwiesgesprächsurkunde und Gen. 23," *JCS* 19 (1965): 103–120; Gene M. Tucker, "The Legal Background of Genesis 23," *JBL* 85 (1966): 77–84; Raymond Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 113; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 24–35; Russell, "Abraham's Purchase," 153–170.
 50. On the shared legal tradition in the ancient Near East, see especially Westbrook, "Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law," 1–90.
 51. Oden, "Power over Land."
 52. For very helpful private discussions of the grammar and legal logic of this text, I am grateful to Daniel Oden and Bruce Wells. Except for lines 7–9, the translation offered here is adapted from Donald J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953), 40. Wiseman translates lines 7–9 as "Apra has turned against a private enemy and as his punishment has murdered (him)." Wiseman's translation is certainly grammatically possible since a logogram is used for the main verb. But the translation offered here better fits the legal logic of the text. Ignacio Márquez Rowe evidently also understands the grammar of the text as I do. See Ignacio Márquez Rowe, "Anatolia and the Levant: Ugarit," in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law* (ed. Raymond Westbrook; HdO 72; 2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1:705, 1:708–709, 1:711, 1:716.
 53. On betrothal, see Westbrook, "Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law," 45, 48, 65.
 54. Indeed, other tablets from Alalakh attest the royal or governmental purchase of entire villages at great cost (AT 52; 53; 54; 54; cf. AT 76; 78); evidently, the central bureaucracy could not simply seize them. For texts and translations, see Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets*, 47–48, 52.

55. Translation from W.H. van Soldt, “The Akkadian Legal Texts from Ugarit,” in *Trois millénaires de formulaires juridiques* (ed. Sophie Démare-Lafont and André Lemaire; Geneva: Droz, 2010), 102–103.
56. Gary Beckman, *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen* (History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 2; Padua: Sargon, 1996), 29–30.
57. Beckman, *Emar*, 54–56.
58. Daniel Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata* (Emar VI.1–4; 4 vols. Paris: ERC, 1985–1987), 3:156–158.
59. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata*, 3:207–208.
60. Walter Mayer, *Ausgrabungen in Tall Munbāqa-Ekalte II: die Texte* (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 102; Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 2001), 74.
61. Wiseman, *Alalakh Texts*, 40.
62. PRU III, 96–98.
63. Martha Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (2d ed.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 176.
64. Ernst Weidner, “Hochverrat gegen Nebukadnezar II: Ein Grossürdenträger vor dem Königsgericht,” *AfO* 17 (1954–56): 1–5.
65. On confiscation of land, see also Wilhelmus F. Leemans, “Aperçu sur les textes juridiques d’Emar,” *JESHO* 31 (1988): 214, 221; Jean-Marie Durand, Review of Arnaud, *Emar VI/1–3* in *RA* 83 (1989): 168.
66. Roth, *Law Collections*, 87.
67. MT 2 Sam 24:20 seems to have suffered from haplography. See McCarter, *II Samuel*, 507.
68. For example, see McCarter, *II Samuel*, 512; Gordon, *I & II Samuel*, 321; Robert Alter, *Ancient Israel: The Former Prophets, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; A Translation with Commentary* (New York: Norton, 2013), 586; Victor H. Matthews, “Remembered Space in Biblical Narrative,” in *Constructions of Space IV: Further Developments in Examining Ancient Israel’s Social Space* (ed. Mark K. George; LHB/OTS 569; London: T&T Clark, 2013), 70.
69. Westbrook, *Property*, 24–35.
70. The book, including its appendix in 2 Sam 21–24, has presented an ambiguous portrait of David, as several scholars have noted, and as I discuss further below. On balance, however, it seems to me that David emerges favorably in Samuel, and in 2 Sam 24 in particular.
71. In addition to the texts cited below, see SAA 12 24, which describes Esarhaddon’s dedication of land to a female deity whose name is not preserved on the tablet, and SAA 12 19 ln. 23–34, r.1–6, in which Sargon II renews a grant made by Adad-nirari III to Assur. For texts and translations, see Laura Kataja and Robert Whiting, *Grants, Decrees and Gifts of the Neo-Assyrian Period* (SAA 12; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1995), 20–21, 24.

72. In his foundational study of Neo-Assyrian royal grants, J. Nicholas Postgate classifies the fifty-four texts he treats into: “1) grants of land from the king to private individuals as a reward for loyalty and faithful service (Nos. 1–26). 2) grants of land from the king to private individuals, made in order to enable them to supply offerings to a temple (Nos. 27–38). 3) grants of land from the king to the priests or officials of a temple, for the benefit of the temple (Nos. 39–41). 4) decrees issued by the king determining the offerings to be received by a temple, and who should give and receive them (Nos. 42–54)” (*Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants*, 2). My distinction here between two types of transfer is structural in so far as it is based on the underlying nature of the rights transferred from one party to another, whether administrative or productive, rather than on the genre or form of the literary depiction of the legal transaction.
73. The primary publication is Otto Schroeder, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920), no. 94. The tablet was republished in Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants*, no. 27.
74. Translation from Kataja and Whiting in SAA 12. On the official’s name as restored here see Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants*, nos. 42–44, ln. 6.
75. Compare Leonard W. King, *Babylonian Boundary-Stones and Memorial-Tablets in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1912), no. XXIV. The tablet describes Nebuchadnezzar I’s grant of five properties to Shamûa and his son Shamâa, priests of the Elamite deity Ria. As fugitives from Elam they had secured Nebuchadnezzar’s patronage and after his defeat of Elam, Nebuchadnezzar installed the image of Ria in Babylonian Khuşşi. Evidently, the land was associated with their office. Cf. Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants*, 6, 57–58.
76. To judge by SAA 1 106, the king evidently held the administrative right to transfer an estate of administration from a local governor to the temple. In such situations, however, the original holder of the estate of administration would have been compensated. In this letter, Ṭab-şill-Eşarra, governor of Assur, writes to Sargon II, “There is an estate of 4,000 hectares of arable land in a village called Qurani in the Halahhu province which the king my lord took and [gave] to the Nabû temple of Dur-Şarruken, and (in doing this) the king my lord [gave] this order to [Kişir]-Aşşur: ‘Give the Governor of the Land a village in return for the village [. . .]!’” (trans. Parpola in SAA 1 106 ln. 6–14). Although not stated explicitly in what remains of the letter, the larger principle of limitations to royal administrative power outlined above suggests that the governor likely agreed to the transfer. The primary publication is Robert F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Collection of the British Museum* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1892–1913), no. 480.
77. Translation from Kataja and Whiting in SAA 12.
78. Translation from Kataja and Whiting in SAA 12.
79. On royal patronage for temple construction in the ancient Near East, see William E. Mierse, *Temples and Sanctuaries from the Early Iron Age Levant: Recovery after Collapse* (HACL 4; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 241–276.

80. Sargon also transferred administrative control of land to temples—our first type of land dedication. Sargon’s economic provision for temples in this fashion is implied when he states, “Perpetual offerings I established as their income” (Display Inscription translated in Daniel D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib* [Oriental Institute Publications 2; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1924], §72). The Display Inscription does not state how this permanent income was provided but a clue comes from SAA 12 19 ln. r.8–15. These fragmentary lines record the transfer of administrative control of 95 hectares of land and mention also exemption from taxation. It appears, then, that Sargon provided land for the construction of temples and shrines for the gods—our second type of land dedication—and he also transferred administrative control of other lands to particular temples—our first type of land dedication. On Sargon’s construction of Dur-Sharrukin, see Simo Parpola, “The Construction of Dur-Šarrukin in the Assyrian Royal Correspondence,” in *Khorsabad, le palais de Sargon II, roi d’Assyrie* (ed. A. Caubet; Paris: Louvre, 1995), 49–77; Pauline Albenda, “Dur-Sharrukin, the Royal City of Sargon II, King of Assyria,” *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 38 (2003): 5–13.
81. Victor Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings* (JSOTSup 115; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 70–74.
82. The many descriptions of the construction project emphasize Sargon’s personal involvement. Sargon boasts, “I planned and thought day and night in order to make this city habitable, and to erect its shrines as abodes for the great gods, and a complex of palaces as my royal residence” (Display Inscription, Room XIV, ln. 31, trans. Parpola, “Construction of Dur-Šarrukin,” 52). Parpola notes that similar wording occurs in Sargon’s Bull Inscription ln. 48 and the Barrel Cylinder form Khorsabad, ln. 43–49. Preserved royal correspondence supports Sargon’s claim here in so far as it details his close management of the minutiae of the project. A letter from Ṭab-šar-Aššur responds to Sargon’s request for an update on the casting of column bases for a royal portico and goes on to provide information on the status of silver-covered and bronze-covered doors for the temples of Sin, Shamash and Nikkal (SAA 1 66). Ṭab-šar-Aššur also corresponds with the king about the transfer of cult objects by boat from the temple of Assur to the new temples in Dur-Sharrukin (SAA 1 54, SAA 1 55). The detailed reports offered in these letters confirms Sargon’s personal oversight of the project.
83. Trans. Luckenbill §74.
84. Trans. Luckenbill §75.
85. Cylinder Inscription trans. in Luckenbill §122.
86. Cylinder Inscription trans. in Luckenbill §120; see parallel wording in SAA 12 19 ln. 19–21.
87. On this text, see Heinrich Otten, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981). On the history of

- Hattusili's reign, see Trevor Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 292–325.
88. On similarities between the Apology of Hattusili III and the story of David in Samuel, see Herbert Martin Wolf, "The Apology of Ḫattušiliš Compared with Other Political Self-Justifications of the Ancient Near East" (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1967); Harry A. Hoffner, "Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography," in *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East* (ed. Hans Goedicke and J.J.M. Roberts; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1975), 49–62; P. Kyle McCarter, "The Apology of David," *JBL* 99 (1980): 489–504; J. Randall Short, *The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David* (HTS 63; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Divinity School, 2010); Andrew Knapp, "David and Hattushili III: The Impact of Genre and a Response to J. Randall Short," *VT* 63 (2013): 261–275.
 89. So Theo van den Hout, *The Purity of Kingship: An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tudhaliya IV* (Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui 25; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 62.
 90. On Hittite sources mentioning Armatarḫunta, see van den Hout, *Purity of Kingship*, 60–64.
 91. Translation by Theo van den Hout in *COS* 1.77.
 92. On Hittite open-air sites with cultic functions, see Kurt Bittel, "Hittite Temples and High Places in Anatolia and North Syria," in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times* (ed. A. Biran; Jerusalem: Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology of Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981), 63–73; Billie Jean Collins, "A Statue for the Deity: Cult Images in Hittite Anatolia," in *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East* (ed. Neal H. Walls; Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005), 13–14; Ömür Harmanşah, "Monuments and Memory: Architecture and Visual Culture in Ancient Anatolian History," in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia* (ed. Sharon R. Steadman and Gregory McMahon; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 623–651, esp. 636.
 93. On the forfeiture of Armatarḫunta's land as noted elsewhere in Hittite sources, see van den Hout, *Purity of Kingship*, 62.
 94. Compare 1 Sam 24:16, "Let him see and plead my case (יִרְאֵה וְיִגִּיד לִּי אֶת־דִּבְרֵי)!"
 95. How would an Iron Age scribe have imagined David's altar on Araunah's land? Or, to put the question differently, are there structures in the archaeological record from the Iron Age Levant that could provide correlates to the type of ritual structure described in 2 Sam 24? The narrative provides clues that help narrow a search for archaeological analogues to David's altar. The text thrice refers to the construction of an altar (בְּנִיחַת, vv. 18, 21, 25) but nowhere mentions an associated temple, house, palace, dining hall, courtyard, etc. Although the cultic site envisioned in 2 Sam 24 was man-made, it was built on open land without other architectural structures—on a threshing floor (vv. 18, 21, 24). The

altar was used for burnt offerings of cattle (vv. 22, 24–25). And it was evidently located outside of the city proper but within view of it (vv. 16, 20). Archaeological parallels can be found to aspects of the altar described in 2 Sam 24, but I know of no analogue that matches all the features of the altar and site described in 2 Sam 24. Among the most well-known burnt offering altars discovered in Israel and Judah are those from Megiddo and Beersheba. Both are made of stone ashlar masonry carved from local limestone, are cuboid with a square plan, are of comparable size to one another—about 5.25 feet square and 3.5 feet high—have protruding “horns” at their top corners, and date from the Iron Age. Altar 4017 at Megiddo appears to have been an open-air altar, but it was located within a larger cultic complex. No temple has been discovered at Beersheba, but much of the site remains unexcavated. It is thus difficult to determine how the altar was originally used. At Tel Arad, a slightly larger eighth-century altar of undressed stones and without horns is known. On these altars, see Ralph K. Hawkins, *The Iron Age I Structure on Mt. Ebal: Excavation and Interpretation* (BBRSup; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 137–138, 146; Zevit, *Religions of Ancient Israel*, 169–170. And what of the location of David’s altar outside the town? Both the cult place on Mt. Ebal excavated by Adam Zertal and the Bull Site of Manasseh excavated by Amihai Mazar consist of stone installations that have sometimes been interpreted as altars, together with a low encircling stone wall that delineated the sites. On Mt. Ebal, see Adam Zertal, “Mount Ebal: Notes and News,” *IEJ* 34 (1984): 55; Adam Zertal, “Has Joshua’s Altar Been Found on Mount Ebal?” *BAR* 12/1 (1985): 43, 49–53; Adam Zertal, “How Can Kempinski Be So Wrong?” *BAR* 12/1 (1986): 49–53; Adam Zertal, “An Early Iron Age Cultic Site on Mount Ebal: Excavation Seasons 1982–1987, Preliminary Report,” *TA* 13–14 (1986–1987): 105–165; Adam Zertal, “A Cultic Center with a Burnt-Offering Altar from the Early Iron Age I Period at Mt. Ebal,” in *Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden: Collected Communications to the XIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament* (ed. M.A. Klaus and D. Schunk; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988), 137–153. Problems with the cultic interpretation of the site are discussed, for example, in Aharon Kempinski, “Joshua’s Altar: An Iron Age I Watch-Tower?” *BAR* 12/1 (1986): 44–49; Beth Alpert Nakhai, “What’s a Bamah? How Sacred Space Functioned in Ancient Israel,” *BAR* 20/3 (1994): 18–29. On the Bull Site, see Amihai Mazar, “The ‘Bull-Site’: An Iron Age 1 Open Cult Place,” *BASOR* 247 (1982): 27–41; Amihai Mazar, “Bronze Bull Found in Israelite ‘High Place’ from the Time of Judges,” *BAR* 9/5 (1983): 34–40. Problems with the cultic interpretation of the site are discussed, for example, in Michael D. Coogan, “Of Cults and Cultures: Reflections on the Interpretation of Archaeological Evidence,” *PEQ* 119 (1987): 1–8. But see Amihai Mazar, “On Cult Places and Early Israelites: A Response to Michael Coogan,” *BAR* 4/4 (1988): 45. Overviews of these sites are also provided in Zevit, *Religions of Ancient Israel*, 176–180, 196–201. See also Mierse, *Temples*, 93–94,

194. While a dominant scholarly tradition regards biblical *bāmāh* as referring to an open-air shrine in the countryside, Lisbeth S. Fried argues that biblical *bāmāh* denotes a sanctuary complex within a city that might contain altars and public buildings for storage or dining. See Lisbeth S. Fried, “The High Places (*Bāmôt*) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation,” *JAOS* 122 (2002): 437–465, esp. 437–441. On open-air Levantine cultic sites, see Baruch Levine, “Lpny YHWH: Phenomenology of the Open-Air-Altar in Biblical Israel,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today* (ed. Avraham Biran and Joseph Aviram; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993), 196–205.
96. Altars are built by Noah (Gen 8:20), Abram/Abraham (Gen 12:7, 8; 13:18; 22:9), Isaac (Gen 26:25), Jacob (Gen 35:7), Moses (Exod 17:15; 24:4), Aaron (Exod 32:5), Balak and Balaam (Num 23:1, 14, 29), Joshua (Josh 8:30), the Transjordanian tribes (Josh 22:10, 11, 16, 19, 23, 26, 29), Gideon (Judg 6:24, 26, 28), the people, i.e., the Israelites (Judg 21:4), Samuel (1 Sam 7:17), Saul (1 Sam 14:35), Solomon (1 Kgs 9:25), Elijah (1 Kgs 18:32), and Uriah the priest at the command of Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:11).
97. On this motif shared between 2 Sam 24 and the literary depictions of Sargon II’s founding of Dur-Sharrukin, see Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House*, 74; Christa Schaefer-Lichtenberger, *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im Alten Testament: eine Auseinandersetzung mit Max Webers Studie “Das antike Judentum”* (BZAW 156; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983), 388 n.75; László T. Simon, *Identity and Identification: An Exegetical and Theological Study of 2 Sam 21–24* (Tesi gregoriana Serie teologia 64; Rome: Pontificia università gregoriana, 2000), 134.
98. I do not find compelling Adrian Schenker’s argument that the chapter reflects David’s moral development in moving from strong self-interest to concern for his people (*Der Mächtige im Schmelzofen des Mitleids: eine Interpretation von 2 Sam 24* [Orbis biblicus et orientalis 42; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982]).
99. The *waw* + prefix conjugation form, וַתַּעֲצֶר, expresses the result of the prior infinitive forms, לְקַנּוֹת and לְבַנוֹת. Syntactically, compare 2 Chr 29:10, “Now I wish to make a covenant with Yahweh, God of Israel, so that his burning anger may turn from us (עַתָּה עִם־לִבִּי לְכַרוֹת בְּרִית לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּשָּׁב מִמֶּנּוּ חֲרוֹן אַפָּי).”
100. Concerning ambiguity in the narrative, Robert Alter writes, “The representation of David is another instance, far more complex and compelling, of the complication of ideology through the imaginative reconstruction of historical figures and events. . . . In this elaborately wrought literary vehicle, David turns out to be one of the most unfathomable figures of ancient literature. . . . He is, in sum, the first full-length portrait of a Machiavellian prince in Western literature. The Book of Samuel is one of those rare masterworks that, like Stendhal’s *Charterhouse of Parma*, evinces an unblinking and abidingly instructive knowingness about man as a political animal in all his contradictions and venality and in all his susceptibility to the brutalization and the seductions

- of exercising power” (*Ancient Israel*, 130–232). On critique of royal power in Samuel, see Jacob L. Wright, *David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 80–96.
101. Modern scholarly treatment of Samuel is rooted in Leonhard Rost’s identification of the independent character of an Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4–7:1; 2 Sam 6), the prophecy of Nathan (2 Sam 7), the account of the Ammonite war (2 Sam 10:1–11:1; 12:26–31), and a Succession Narrative (2 Sam 9–20 and 1 Kgs 1–2). See Leonhard Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David* (trans. Michael D. Rutter and David M. Gunn; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1982). On these blocks of tradition, see Jeremy M. Hutton, *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 396; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 176–227. Rost also acknowledged the likely existence of a source depicting the early days of David, which has become known as the History of David’s Rise (*Succession*, 109). On this narrative, see Hutton, *Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 228–288; Sung-Hee Yoon, *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David’s Rise: A Methodological Reflection and Its Implications* (BZAW 462; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014). 2 Sam 21–24 are regarded as being different in style and character from the main narrative proper. Second Sam 24:1–15 shares some features in common with 2 Sam 21:1–14. Second Sam 23:8–39 is related to 21:15–22. And 23:1–7 and 22:1–51 are two songs. These chapters thus form their own independent, structured appendix to Samuel. On 2 Sam 24 as part of the appendix to Samuel in 2 Sam 21–24, see Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 124–125; Walter Brueggemann, “2 Samuel 21–24: An Appendix of Deconstruction?” *CBQ* 50 (1988): 383–397; Sean M. McDonough, “‘And David Was Old, Advanced in Years’: 2 Samuel XXIV 18–25, 1 Kings I 1, and Genesis XXIII–XXIV,” *VT* 49 (1999): 128–131; Campbell, *2 Samuel*, 184–188; Christoph Levin, *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament* (FAT 87; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 120–121.
102. On the book of Samuel’s justification of David’s legitimacy, see especially Baruch Halpern, *David’s Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2001), 57–103; Joel S. Baden, *The Historical David: The Real Life of an Invented Hero* (New York: HarperOne, 2014), with summary on 253–265.

CHAPTER 3

1. For example, Marvin A. Sweeney writes concerning 2 Kgs 9:1–10:36, “The account of Jehu’s revolt is an early narrative that has been incorporated into the larger Elijah-Elisha cycle and then worked into the DtrH narrative framework. . . . Insofar as Israel and the house of Jehu are not fully secure until the reigns of Joash ben Jehoahaz and Jeroboam ben Joash in 2 Kgs 14, it is best to

- date this cycle to the reign of Jeroboam ben Joash in the first half of the eighth century BCE" (*I & II Kings: A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007], 330–331. Below I summarize other scholarly approaches to the editorial history of the narrative.
2. Lauren A.S. Monroe, *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). Michael Pietsch's 2011 *Habilitationsschrift* submitted to Hamburg University offers a recent comprehensive treatment of 2 Kgs 22–23, including investigation of archaeological data relevant to Josiah's purported cultic reforms. Pietsch regards the text as late-preexilic theological historiography by Deuteronomistic authors. See Michael Pietsch, *Die Kultreform Josias: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte Israels in der späten Königszeit* (FAT 86; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).
 3. For an introduction to Priestly writing in the Hebrew Bible, see Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. Bernhard W. Anderson; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 8–19; Albert de Pury and Thomas Romer, "Le Pentateuque en question: Position du problème et brève histoire de la recherche," in *Le Pentateuque en question: les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes* (ed. Albert de Pury; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989), 9–80; Jean-Louis Ska, "Quelques remarques sur Pg et la dernière rédaction du pentateuque," in *Le Pentateuque en question: les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes* (ed. Albert de Pury; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989), 95–125; Alexander Rofé, *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 28–44; Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden, eds., *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ATANT 95; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009); Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 169–192.
 4. For an introduction to Deuteronomistic literature in the Hebrew Bible, and scholarly debate over it, see the scholarly works cited in the footnotes to Chapter 1. A clear, accessible, and up-to-date introduction is Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2005). On the linguistic profile of Deuteronomic literature see especially Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 321–365.
 5. On the worship of Baal in ancient Israel and Judah, and the relationship between Yahwism and Baalism, see Johannes C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (BETL 91; Leuven: University Press, 1997), 10–41; Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (2d ed; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 65–100; Nathan MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism"* (FAT 2.1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,

- 2003), 41–45, 50, 80, 155; André Lemaire, *The Birth of Monotheism: The Rise and Disappearance of Yahwism* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 2007), 49–54; Esther J. Hamori, *Women's Divination in Biblical Literature: Prophecy, Necromancy, and Other Arts of Knowledge* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 182; James S. Anderson, *Monotheism and Yahweh's Appropriation of Baal* (LHB/OTS 617; New York: T&T Clark, 2015), 47–84.
6. Robert L. Cohn comments, “The narrative of Jehu’s overthrow of the Omride dynasty and destruction of the temple of Baal is the most gripping story in 2 Kings” (2 Kings [Berit Olam; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000], 65). John Skinner claims that the narrative, “arises at times to a height of descriptive power which is unsurpassed in the pages of the O.T.” (Kings [NCB; Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, 1904], 230 as cited in Lloyd M. Barré, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion: The Narrative Artistry and Political Intentions of 2 Kings 9–11* [CBQMS 20; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988], 3 n.4).
 7. Second Kgs 10 does not contain the rich language of collective tribal governance that characterizes other northern material in the Hebrew Bible. In contrast, distinctly Israelite politics are reflected in the biblical description of Omri’s rise to power in 1 Kgs 16, as Daniel E. Fleming has shown. See Daniel E. Fleming, *The Legacy of Israel in Judah's Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 94–97. Fleming points out that once stripped of later editorial material 1 Kgs 16 is structured like a royal public inscription, with a description of Omri’s military successes (vv. 15–18, 21–22) followed by an account of a royal construction project (vv. 24). The latter, notes Fleming, highlights the royal perspective of the narrative—Omri is given sole credit for the building (v. 24). The narrative, despite its royal provenance, acknowledges Israel as a collective decision-making body with the power to appoint and depose kings. Thus, according to v. 16, “All Israel (כל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) appointed as king Omri, commander of the army over Israel.” The same political body, with emphasis on its ability to go to war, is referred to as “the people” (הָעָם) in vv. 15–16, 21–22. Fleming argues, “In his original role, before attacking Zimri, Omri is identified as military commander ‘over Israel’ (v. 16), an identity that equates the whole people with the muster for battle. Those who vote are those who fight. We find the same pattern in Mari references to assemblies of king Zimri-Lim’s Hana people” (*Legacy of Israel*, 96). The Omri narrative thus acknowledges the collective politics of Israel. In contrast, the Jehu narratives do not use this language of collective governance to describe Jehu’s appointment. Fleming writes, “Israel’s king Jehu, who launches a new royal house in a spray of blood and with passionate opposition to Baal, is given considerable and generally positive attention (2 Kings 9–10), but the religious perspective may suggest observers from Judah, however close to the events” (*Legacy of Israel*, 112). Second Kgs 9:14 acknowledges the involvement of “all Israel” in the fight against Aram, though Israel is not portrayed with quite the vibrancy that it is in the Omri narrative. In contrast, 2 Kgs

- 10 admits no role for Israel in Jehu's appointment to the throne. Rather, various officials associated with the royal bureaucracy at Samaria—"the city officials (שרי העיר)," "the elders (הזקנים)," "those guarding Ahab's sons" (האמנים את-בני)," "the palace steward (אשר-על-הבית)," "the mayor (אשר על-העיר)"—played a role in his appointment in so far as they made the decision not to appoint someone from Ahab's house as king (2 Kgs 10:1–5). For the titles of the officials in v. 1, I follow Luc., which appears superior to MT in this regard. See Charles F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), 302. In the narrative world of 2 Kgs 10, the power to elect kings rests with these bureaucrats rather than with the collective political body, "Israel." Furthermore, the term "all Israel" in 2 Kgs 10:21 evidently refers to a territory rather than a political body engaged in decisions about war and kingship.
8. *קרא in 2 Kgs 9:1, 17, 18, 21; 10:15, 19, 21; *שלם in 2 Kgs 9:11, 17, 18 (twice), 19 (twice), 22 (twice), 26, 28, 31; 10:13; *שגע in 2 Kgs 9:11, 20 (used only 7 other times in the Hebrew Bible); *שלח in 2 Kgs 9:17, 19; 10:1, 5, 7, 21; *נכה in 2 Kgs 9:7, 15 (twice), 24, 27; 10:9, 11, 17, 25 (twice); דם in 2 Kgs 9:7, 26, 33.
 9. See Francisco O. Garcia-Treto, "The Fall of the House: A Carnavalesque Reading of 2 Kings 9 and 10," *JSOT* 46 (1990): 54; Cohn, *2 Kings*, 65–66. They outline the narrative's structure as follows: A. Jehu is anointed king (9:1–15); B. Jehu kills Joram outside Jezreel (9:16–26); C. Jehu kills Ahaziah in Beth-Haggan (9:27–29); D. Jehu has Jezebel killed in Jezreel (9:30–37); B'. Jehu massacres the house of Ahab in Jezreel (10:1–11); C'. Jehu massacres the Kinsmen of Ahaziah at Beth-Eked (10:12–14); D'. Jehu massacres the worshipers of Baal and destroys the temple of Baal in Samaria (10:15–28); A'. Summary of reign of Jehu (10:29–36). Lisa M. Wray Beal, citing Garcia-Treto's work, divides each chapter into seven scenes, with chapter 10 also containing a short epilogue. See Lisa M. Wray Beal, *Narrative Control of Approval and Disapproval in the Story of Jehu (2 Kings 9 and 10)* (LHB/OTS 478; New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 46–48.
 10. For example, Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor assert, "A single narrator, working under the impact of the dramatic turn of events, was undoubtedly responsible for these vivid descriptions" (*II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 11; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1988], 118). In their view, "Only at two points does the reader discern that the narrative has been expanded: 9:7–10a are based on the stereotypical phraseology of earlier prophecies (cf. 1 Kgs 14:10–11; 16:4; 21:23–24); 9:29 is a fragmentary chronological notice concerning Ahaziah" (*II Kings*, 118).
 11. Although several conspiracies are framed in Kings as the fulfillment of prophetic judgment against a ruling dynasty, only here is the traitor explicitly commanded by a prophet to carry out Yahweh's bloody sentence. Typically, the judgment is couched as punishment for worship of other deities, or worship in inappropriate ways. Here, the blood of Yahweh's murdered prophets demands vengeance.

12. Lloyd M. Barré writes, “One of the principle problems that engages the interpreter of this story concerns a determination of the narrator’s disposition toward Jehu’s rampant violence. At times it seems that the narrative is supportive of Jehu’s butchery. . . . But . . . one also receives the strong impression that other aspects [of] Jehu’s character were presented in order to evoke the reader’s condemnation” (*Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 1).
13. On the secondary nature of 9:7–10, see, for example, Hermann Gunkel, “Die Revolution des Jehu,” *Deutsche Rundschau* 40 (1913): 289–308, esp. 293–294; Hugo Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels: von Samuel bis Amos und Hosea* (SAT 2.1; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), 313; Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1963), 288; Walter Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 47–48; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 20; Barré, *Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 9–11; Shuichi Hasegawa, *Aram and Israel during the Jehuite Dynasty* (BZAW 434; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 13–14; Jonathan Miles Robker, *The Jehu Revolution: A Royal Tradition of the Northern Kingdom and Its Ramifications* (BZAW 435; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 18–19.
14. The text of the fragmentary Tel Dan Stele is usually restored to include references to the deaths of Joram, king of Israel, and Ahaziah, king of Judah, at the hands of the inscription’s author. References to the god Hadad and the use of Aramaic point to Aramean authorship. Several scholars thus regard Hazael of Damascus as the inscription’s author and make various attempts to reconcile the competing claims of the stele and 2 Kgs 9–10. For recent overviews of scholarship and evidence, see D. Matthew Stith, *The Coups of Hazael and Jehu: Building an Historical Narrative* (Gorgias Dissertations 37; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 90–102; Hasegawa, *Aram and Israel*, 35–46; Robker, *Jehu Revolution*, 240–274. See also Matthew J. Suriano, “The Apology of Hazael: A Literary and Historical Analysis of the Tel Dan Inscription,” *JNES* 66 (2007): 163–176.
15. A helpful summary of older scholarship on the composition of 2 Kgs 9–10 is found in Barré, *Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 8–23.
16. On the editorial history of the text, see also Ernst Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige* (ATD 11/1; 2 vols; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985), 2:340–342; Barré, *Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 4–7; Yoshikazu Minokami, *Die Revolution des Jehu* (GTA 38; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 96–117; Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 79–81, 151; Martin Mulzer, *Jehu schlägt Joram: text-, literar- und strukturkritische Untersuchung zu 2 Kön 8,25–10,36* (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 37; St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1992), 281–287; Stith, *Coups of*

- Hazael and Jehu*, 87–88. Stith offers a useful chart comparing the proposals of McKenzie, Barré, and Mulzer (*Coups of Hazael and Jehu*, 70–81). Werner Gugler is skeptical of reconstructions of the editorial history of the text and treats it in its present form as he seeks to reconstruct the history of Jehu’s revolution (*Jehu und seine Revolution: Voraussetzungen, Verlauf, Folgen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 161–194, 236–238).
17. Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 117–118.
 18. Hasegawa, *Aram and Israel*, 14–27.
 19. Hasegawa, *Aram and Israel*, 13, 28–34.
 20. Gary A. Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings* (Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2002), 111–123; Gary A. Rendsburg, “A Comprehensive Guide to Israelian Hebrew: Grammar and Lexicon,” *Orient* 38 (2003): 5–35. Rendsburg’s linguistic analysis rests on the identification of certain narratives in Kings as Israelian based on their narrative settings or political or thematic interests. Within this corpus of northern texts he observes grammatical and lexical features that differ from standard, Judahite—indeed, Jerusalemite—biblical Hebrew. Rendsburg focuses on lexical or grammatical features of Israelian Hebrew that (1) are found exclusively or almost exclusively in northern texts; (2) possess good parallels in one or more languages to the north of Israel—Ugaritic, Phoenician, or Aramaic; and (3) can be shown to contrast with some feature of Judahite Hebrew. The use of linguistic evidence to argue for the northern provenance of any one of the texts in the corpus runs the risk of appealing to circular logic. To avoid this problem, I classify the several features Rendsburg identifies in 2 Kgs 9–10 into (1) features appearing in dialog in 2 Kgs 9–10, and so plausibly attributable to a Judahite scribe’s depiction of Israelite characters; (2) features attested in narration in 2 Kgs 9–10 but unattested elsewhere in the corpus of northern texts and so of little diagnostic value for identifying the provenance of 2 Kgs 9–10; (3) features occurring in narration in 2 Kgs 9–10 but with text-critical problems that limit their diagnostic value; (4) features attested in narration in 2 Kgs 9–10 and elsewhere in the corpus of northern texts and therefore of stronger diagnostic value in identifying the provenance of 2 Kgs 9–10. The first category includes: the omission of *’et* from prose narrative (2 Kgs 9:1, 3, 7, 10; 10:22); the confusion of prepositions *’el* and *’al*, due to Aramaic interference (2 Kgs 9:3); the lexical item *hēleq* ‘field’, בְּחֶלֶק (2 Kgs 9:10, 36, 37, all in dialog); the lexical item *šepa’* / *šip’āh* “abundance, multitude,” שָׁפַעַת (2 Kgs 9:17) (the nominal form earlier in the verse, שָׁפַעַת, is plausibly explained as being in the construct state); the feminine singular nominal ending *-at* (pointed with either *pataḥ* or *qames*), שָׁפַעַת (2 Kgs 9:17); the third person masculine plural object pronoun *hēm*, עֲדֵיהֶם (2 Kgs 9:18); the preposition *’ad ’el*, עַד־אֶלֵיהֶם (2 Kgs 9:20); the conjunction *’ad* meaning ‘while,’ עַד (2 Kgs 9:22); the lexical item *šibbūrīm* ‘piles, heaps,’ צְבָרִים (2 Kgs 10:8); the lexical item *rēbī’im*, ‘those of the fourth generation,’ רְבֵעִים (2 Kgs 10:30). The second category includes: the lexical item *qsh* in the Pīel, ‘reduce,’ לְקַצוֹת (2 Kgs

10:32). The third category includes: the third person feminine singular *qtl* form of III-y verb ending in *-t*, the *ketiv* form והית (2 Kgs 9:37). The fourth category includes: the omission of *'et* from prose narrative (2 Kgs 9:1, 6, 23, 24; 10:15); the confusion of prepositions *'el* and *'al*, due to Aramaic interference (2 Kgs 9:6); the lexical item *gerem* meaning “bone, self,” גָּרֵם (2 Kgs 9:13); the *yql* preterite in prose, יָכַהוּ (2 Kgs 9:15); the third person singular pronominal suffix *-ennû/-ennāh* attached to *wayyiqtol* form, וַיִּרְמֹסֶנָּה (2 Kgs 9:33); the lexical item *dūd* “pot, basket,” בְּדוּדִים (2 Kgs 10:7). Although no one of these features is in and of itself diagnostic, taken together they—especially those in the fourth category—suggest that language of Chapter 9 bears an affinity to Israelian Hebrew. Chapter 10, on the other hand, has far fewer features that might be characterized as being distinctively Israelian.

21. Robker, *Jehu Revolution*, 17–35.
22. Robker, *Jehu Revolution*, 62.
23. Robker reconstructs this Israelite source, often on the basis of the *Vorlage* of the LXX, as “covering portions of 1 Kings 11–15; most of 16; 20 portions of 22; small portions of 2 Kings 1; most of 2 Kings 9–10; 13–14” (*Jehu Revolution*, 164). He offers a reconstruction and translation of the source in an appendix (*Jehu Revolution*, 303–314). Two other scholars in particular have posited the existence of a northern document that would have included 2 Kgs 9–10. Antony F. Campbell posited the existence of a Prophetic Record originating in northern prophetic circles toward the end of the ninth century and spanning 1 Sam 1–2 Kgs 10, though not including all the material now present in 1 Sam 1–2 Kgs 10. See Antony F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1–2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS 17; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986). Marsha C. White argued that the Elijah legends were a literary creation, patterned on tales about Moses, Elisha, and Nathan, and written as a preface to the story of Jehu’s coup. See Marsha C. White, *The Elijah Legends and Jehu’s Coup* (BJS 311; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).
24. Susanne Otto, *Jehu, Elia und Elisa: Die Erzählung von der Jehu-Revolution und die Komposition der Elia-Elisa-Erzählungen* (BWANT 152; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 73, 255.
25. In this regard, LXX’s use of a singular verb *καὶ εἰσήλεν*, which matches Jehu as the chief offerer in v. 25, does little to resolve the difficulty. And MT’s plural וַיִּבְאֵן is surely to be preferred as *lectio difficilior*. The Lucianic recension places 24b after 24a.
26. In v. 26, MT varies the number of steles involved, while LXX consistently depicts a single stele. The situation is reversed in 2 Kgs 3:2, where MT depicts a singular stele of Baal and LXX steles of Baal.
27. Cf. the reference to Ahab making an *asherah* in 1 Kgs 16:33. Compare also Burney, *Kings*, 306. On the meaning of the term *asherah* in the Hebrew Bible and whether it refers to a goddess, a wooden cult object, or both, see Judith

- M. Hadley, *The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah: Evidence for a Hebrew Goddess* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 4–37, 54–83; Raz Kletter, “Between Archaeology and Theology: The Pillar Figurines from Judah and the Asherah,” in *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan* (ed. Amihai Mazar; JSOTSup 331; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 179–216; Mark S. Smith, *Early History of God*, xxx–xxxvi, 47–54, 108–147; Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 45–46, 155–159.
28. On the repetition of the command to assemble, cf. Julio C. Trebolle-Barrera, *Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9–11* (Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1984), 157.
 29. Julio C. Trebolle-Barrera, “From the ‘Old Latin’ through the ‘Old Greek’ to the ‘Old Hebrew’ (2 Kgs 10:23–25),” *Textus* 11 (1984): 17–36; Trebolle-Barrera, *Jehú y Joás*, 125–162.
 30. Monroe summarizes, “In the preceding pages I demonstrated that by approaching the account of Josiah’s reform from the standpoint of the dynamics of defilement, that is, by considering the ritual language of the text within its appropriate literary traditional contexts, new fault lines emerge that reveal specific aspects of the text’s compositional history, its *Sitze im Leben*, and its political and ideological purposes that to this point have not been fully understood. Apotropaic ritual language in the reform account reflects a composition generated by a scribe trained within the circles of the Jerusalem-centered holiness school. This early narrative was connected to concerns intimately tied to the material, social, and political realities of pre-exilic Judah and the Josianic court. Language that recalls the *hērem* in 2 Kgs 23 reflects the work of a deuteronomic author who sought to transform Josiah into the paradigmatic example of ideal royal leadership in preexilic Judah” (*Josiah’s Reform*, 121).
 31. Monroe, *Josiah’s Reform*, 23–76.
 32. Monroe, *Josiah’s Reform*, 77–119.
 33. To borrow the language of Roy A. Rappaport, rituals are “not entirely encoded by the performers” (*Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999], 24). Rappaport observes, “performers of rituals do not specify all the acts and utterances constituting their own performances. They follow, more or less punctiliously, orders established, or taken to be established, by others” (*Ritual and Religion*, 32). Rappaport reckons with innovation in ritual performance, but argues that even innovative rituals are not normally cut from whole cloth. Entirely new rituals are exceptionally rare. In dialogue with Rappaport’s work, Catherine Bell charts how rituals construct a sense of the past (*Ritual Theory: Ritual Practice* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 118–124).
 34. Saul M. Olyan, “Some Neglected Aspects of Israelite Interment Ideology,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 603–607; Saul M. Olyan, *Social Inequality in the World of the*

- Text: The Significance of Ritual and Social Distinctions in the Hebrew Bible* (JASup 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 225–235.
35. With regard to the examples he cites from the fourth category, Olyan notes, “most of these texts speak of the corpse being thrown (*šlk*, Hiphil) into the burial place, clearly a ritual act of disrespect and disregard” (*Social Inequality*, 230). Cf. Mordechai (Morton) Cogan, “A Technical Term for Exposure,” *JNES* 27 (1968): 133–135. Compare also the discussion of violence against corpses, including Jehu’s treatment of the corpses of the seventy sons of Ahab, in Saul M. Olyan, “The Instrumental Dimension of Violence against Corpses in Biblical Texts,” in *Ritual Violence in the Hebrew Bible: New Perspectives* (ed. Saul M. Olyan; New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 125–136.
 36. So also Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 116.
 37. On corpse exposure in the Hebrew Bible, see also Amy Kalmanofsky, *Terror All Around: Horror, Monsters, and Theology in the Book of Jeremiah* (LHB/OTS 390; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 55; Francesca Stavrakopoulou, “Gog’s Grave and the Use and Abuse of Corpses in Ezekiel 39:11–20,” *JBL* 129 (2010): 67–84; Christopher B. Hays, *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah* (FAT 79; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 38–39, 199–201, 204–206. The phenomenon of corpse exposure was not limited to ancient Israel and Judah. On corpse exposure in the ancient Near East, see Tzvi Abusch, *Mesopotamian Witchcraft: Toward a History and Understanding of Babylonian Witchcraft Beliefs and Literature* (Ancient Magic and Divination 5; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 69; Mario Liverani, “Messages, Women, and Hospitality: Inter-Tribal Communication in Judges 19–21,” in *Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography* (Studies in Egyptology and the Ancient Near East; London: Equinox, 2004), 165–166; Judit M. Blair, *De-demonising the Old Testament: An Investigation of Azazel, Liliith, Deber, Qeteb and Reshef in the Hebrew Bible* (FAT 2.37; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 69.
 38. Note also the caution against leaving an impaled body unburied overnight in Deut 21:22–23 and the presence of this underlying cautionary principle in narrative contexts in Josh 8:29; 10:26–27, where even the corpses of Israel’s enemies are buried on the same day. See Jack R. Lundbom, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2013), 610. In Deut 21:22–23, defilement results from impalement of the corpse rather than its mere exposure.
 39. The horror of exposed corpses being devoured by wild animals is by no means unique to Deuteronomic tradition, as is made clear by the imagery of Ps 79:2. In addition to the texts discussed in this paragraph, the language of animal mutilation of corpses appears in 1 Sam 17:44, 46. There, the death of warriors on the battlefield is depicted as horrific because their carcasses will become food for the beasts and birds (cf. 2 Sam 21:10).
 40. On these prophecies against northern dynasties in 1 Kgs 14:7–16; 16:1–4; 21:21–24; 2 Kgs 9:6–10 and accompanying notices of fulfillment in 1 Kgs 15:27–30; 16:11–13; 2 Kgs 9:25–26, 36–37; 10:10, 17, see Dietrich, *Prophetie und*

- Geschichte*, 9–63; Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 17–63; McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, 61–80, 153–164.
41. On Jer 16:4 and Jer 34:20, see Mark Leuchter, *The Polemics of Exile in Jeremiah 26–45* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 88–90. In Leuchter's view, Jer 34:18–20 also draws on Gen 15:7–21, a Priestly text, in order to critique all who deny the teaching of those like Jeremiah, who are "empowered to direct and adjust Deuteronomistic tradition" (*Polemics of Exile*, 90). On Jeremiah's connection to Deuteronomistic tradition more broadly, see J. Philip Hyatt, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," in *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies* (ed. Leo G. Perdue and Brian W. Kovacs; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1984), 113–127; Winfried Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (WMANT 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); Winfried Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45: mit einer Gesamtbeurteilung der deuteronomistischen Redaktion des Buches Jeremia* (WMANT 52; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981); Ernest W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970); Helga Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW 132; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973); Rainer Albertz, "In Search of the Deuteronomists: A First Solution to a Historical Riddle," in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Thomas Römer; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), 1–17; Robert R. Wilson, "Who Was the Deuteronomist? (Who Was Not the Deuteronomist?): Reflections on Pan-Deuteronomism," in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: "Pan-Deuteronomism" and Scholarship in the Nineties* (ed. Linda Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie (Sheffield: JSOTPress, 1999), 67–82; Carolyn J. Sharp, *Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah: Struggles for Authority in Deutero-Jeremianic Prose* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 13–26.
42. On corpse mutilation in international treaties, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 131. Compare also Delbert R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (BibOr 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964), 68–69. On the concept of covenant in Deuteronomistic tradition and its relation to the legal concept of international treaty, see George E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955); Dennis J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament* (AnBib 21; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963); Robert D. Miller II, "Israel's Covenant in Ancient Near Eastern Context," *Biblische Notizen* 139 (2008): 5–18. Frank Moore Cross observes that covenant language ultimately derives from the sphere of family life in so far as covenants create a familial bond between those unrelated by blood. Mark S. Smith, drawing on the work of Paul Kalluveettil, points out that international treaties express this familial concept at one level of society, but the concept finds expression at other levels of society as well. See Paul Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of*

- Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East* (AnBib 88; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), 7–16; Frank Moore Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 3–21; Mark S. Smith, *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 79.
43. Exposure of the bones of the long dead is referred to in 1 Kgs 13:2; 2 Kgs 23:14, 16, 20; Jer 8:1, but our text, 2 Kgs 10:25, is concerned with the still rotting corpses of those recently killed.
 44. As far as I am aware, Ezek 29:5; 32:4 are the only texts with any potential connection to Priestly tradition that mention animal mutilation in connection with corpse exposure. The image of animal mutilation is thus much more common in Deuteronomistic tradition.
 45. On the meaning “at, beside, by” for לַע, see *IBHS* §11.2.13.
 46. On the connections between Ezek 6 and the priestly Holiness School, see Corrine L. Patton, “Pan-Deuteronomism and the Book of Ezekiel,” in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 207–208.
 47. August Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige* (Nördlingen: C.H. Beck, 1887), ad loc., as cited in Burney, *Kings*, 306.
 48. Burney, *Kings*, 306.
 49. On the possibility of scribal dittography here, see Robker, *Jehu Revolution*, 32.
 50. Loren R. Fisher, “The Temple Quarter,” *JSS* 8 (1963): 34–41. On this meaning in v. 25, see Sweeney, *I & II Kings*, 338.
 51. Bruce K. Waltke, *A Commentary on Micah* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2007), 327–328.
 52. Baruch A. Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” *BASOR* 232 (1978): 13–17; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2010), 312. For a history of the debate over the meaning of this term as it is used in the Temple Scroll, see Sidnie White Crawford, “The Meaning of the Phrase עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ in the Temple Scroll,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 244–249.
 53. The meaning “temple precinct” has been proposed for Phoenician ‘r in KAI 37A = CIS 86. See Brian Peckham, “Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86),” *Orientalia* 37 (1968): 311. Gray cites Ugaritic ḡr with a possible meaning “temple precinct” in KTU 1.3 II 3–5 (*I & II Kings: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970], 562). But this case seems unlikely. See Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Volume II, Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary on KTU/CAT 1.3–1.4* (VTSup 114; Leiden; Brill, 2009), ad loc. Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín note KTU 1.41 22 and KTU 1.87 24 in which sacrifices

- are offered *b ḡr* (*A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition* [3d ed; trans. and ed. Wilfred G.E. Watson; HdO 112; Leiden: Brill, 2015], 320). They regard the noun as referring to “an installation for the funerary cult,” but a meaning like “sacred precinct” could also make sense in context.
54. In this regard, 2 Kgs 10:25 contrasts with the description of Josiah’s purge of the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem: “Then the king ordered Hilkiah the high priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל), the priests of the second rank (כֹּהֲנֵי הַמִּשְׁנָה), and the keepers of the threshold (שְׁמֹרֵי הַסֶּף) to bring out of the Temple of Yahweh all the objects made for Baal and Asherah and all the host of heaven” (2 Kgs 23:4). There, only official temple personnel enter the temple to remove its sacred objects. Josiah’s purge aims to purify Yahweh’s temple and as such its sanctity must be preserved. Jehu’s purge, on the other hand, aims to permanently defile Baal’s temple.
 55. On the question of who can be permitted to serve as priests in non-Priestly Pentateuchal material, see Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 64–70. Haran argues that all the Pentateuchal sources agree that from the very beginning the priesthood was given to the tribe of Levi, but they differ in how they understand priestly duties to function within the tribe.
 56. Israel Knoll draws a distinction between the sanctity practiced within Priestly tradition broadly and that practiced by a subset of Priestly tradition known as the Holiness School (*The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007]).
 57. Jacob Milgrom helpfully sets these rituals in their ancient Near Eastern context in *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics* (A Continental Commentary; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 78–92. Milgrom writes, “anointment ‘sanctifies’ the high priest by removing him from the realm of the profane and empowering him to operate in the realm of the sacred, namely, to handle the sanctums” (*Leviticus*, 81).
 58. Milgrom observes that on Yom Kippur, “the high priest risks his life by entering the adytum—to which entry is forbidden to mortal humans—and purifies the adytum through a smoke screen. The high priest emerges, transfers the removed pollution plus all the sins of the people, which he confesses, onto the head of a live goat, and dispatches the goat to the wilderness” (*Leviticus*, 162).
 59. On the role of this narrative in the larger composition, see Antony F. Campbell, 1 *Samuel* (FOTL 7; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 220–229.
 60. Haran also notes references to Levitical priests in, for example, Deut 17:9, 18; 21:5; 24:8; 27:9; Josh 3:3; 8:33; 1 Kgs 12:31; Jer 33:18, 21 (*Temples*, 62).
 61. As noted above, LXX is consistent in depicting a single stele whereas MT varies the number of steles involved.
 62. The Hiphil of *יעע followed by the Niphal of *שרף is used in Gen 38:24, a text which is unconcerned with contagion. Compare also, within the description of

- priestly dedication of the tabernacle, Exod 29:14, “The flesh of the bull, its hide, and its dung you shall burn (תִּשְׂרֹף) with fire outside the camp (מִחוּץ לַמִּחֲנֶה). It is a sin offering.” Cf. also burning outside the camp in Lev 8:17; 9:11. To be sure, other forms of burning take place in Priestly literature, but I am concerned here with the ritual sequence of bringing out and burning.
63. Jacob Milgrom draws out the implications of the red cow in Lev 4 being a purification offering in *Leviticus*, 33–39.
 64. Monroe, *Josiah's Reform*, 78. On the same page, she attributes 2 Kgs 23:4 to a Deuteronomistic revision.
 65. Monroe, *Josiah's Reform*, 45–76.
 66. An exception may be 1 Kgs 15:13, “Even Maacah his mother he removed from being queen mother because she had made an image for Asherah. Asa cut down her image and burned (it) in the Wadi Kidron (וַיִּכְרֹת אֲסָא אֶת־מַפְלְעֶתָהּ וַיִּשְׂרֹף) (בְּנַחַל קִדְרוֹן).” It is difficult to say, however, whether this note was composed by a Deuteronomistic scribe or whether it was incorporated by a Deuteronomistic scribe from an earlier written source.
 67. See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, “נתחן,” *HALOT* 736.
 68. On the meaning “wall plaster” for עֶפֶר in Lev 14:45, cf. Lev 14:41.
 69. The *qere* (לְמוֹצָאוֹת) evidently reflects a euphemism; the *ketiv* (לְמַחְרָאוֹת) is to be preferred.
 70. Compare Josh 8:28, “Joshua burned Ai and made it (וַיְשִׂימָהּ) an everlasting ruin mound, a desolation to this day.” The verbal root *שִׂם also refers to the destruction of lands, territories, or cities in Isa 14:23; 23:13; Jer 6:8; 12:11; 25:9.
 71. The *qere* here, לְמוֹצָאוֹת, appears to be euphemistic, and I therefore read with the *ketiv* לְמַחְרָאוֹת. Some scholars emend ההרמונה in Amos 4:3 to המחראה, but there is no evidence for this reading in the manuscript witnesses.
 72. See DULAT³ 398, which also discusses the possibility of reconstructing the form in KTU 1.72 12.
 73. For example, Cogan and Tadmor translate as “latrine,” but offer a caveat, “Thus with LXX and medieval commentaries. But perhaps all that is indicated. . . is a ‘dung heap’—i.e. public dump” (*II Kings*, 116).
 74. Oded Borrowski, *Daily Life in Biblical Times* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 80.
 75. Jane M. Cahill, Karl Reinhard, David Tarler, and Peter Warnock, “It Had to Happen: Scientists Examine Remains of Ancient Bathroom,” *BAR* 17/3 (1991): 64–69; Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 71–74.
 76. Karl Reinhard and Peter Warnock, “Archaeoparasitology and the Analysis of the Latrine Pit Soils from the City of David,” in *Illness and Healing in Ancient Times: Exhibition Catalog* (ed. Ofra Rimon; Haifa: Hecht Museum, University of Haifa, 1996), 20–23. See also King and Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel*, 74; Borrowski, *Daily Life*, 80.

77. On the toilet at Bozrah, see Crystal-M. Bennett, "Excavations at Buseirah, Southern Jordan, 1972: Preliminary Report," *Levant* 6 (1974): 1–24, esp. 8, fig. 6.
78. A survey of waste management techniques, including the use of squat toilets, in Mesopotamia from the fourth and third millenniums BCE is provided in Augusta McMahon, "Waste Management in Early Urban Southern Mesopotamia," in *Sanitation, Latrines, and Intestinal Parasites in Past Populations* (ed. Piers D. Mitchell; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2015), 19–39. See also Amir S. Fink, "Levantine Standardized Luxury in the Late Bronze Age: Waste Management at Tell Atchana (Alalakh)," in *Bene Israel: Studies in the Archaeology of Israel and the Levant during the Bronze and Iron Ages in Honour of Israel Finkelstein* (ed. Alexander Fantalkin and Assaf Yasur-Landau; CHANE 31; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 165–196. On the Second Temple period, see Jodi Magness, "Integrating Archaeology and Texts: The Example of the Qumran Toilet," in *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism* (ed. Thomas E. Levy; London: Equinox, 2010), 285–292; Jodi Magness, "Toilet Practices, Purity Concerns, and Sectarianism in the Late Second Temple Period," in *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals* (ed. Benedikt Eckhardt; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 51–70. Roman sanitation systems of a later period were much more highly developed. See Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow, *The Archaeology of Sanitation in Roman Italy: Toilets, Sewers, and Water Systems* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015). On sanitary practice in Roman Palestine, see Jodi Magness, "What's the Poop? On Ancient Toilets and Toilet Habits," *NEA* 75 (2012): 80–87.
79. There is very limited evidence for drainage systems in Levantine cities, as noted by Edward Neufield, "Hygiene Conditions in Ancient Israel (Iron Age)," *BA* 34 (1971): 44–45. A Bronze Age subterranean sewer system existed at Jericho. Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jericho* (London: E. Benn, 1957), 229, plate 45b as cited in Neufield, "Hygiene," 44. And there may have been a drainage system for domestic waste in Bronze Age Tell Beit Mirsim. William F. Albright, *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim: II. The Bronze Age* (AASOR 17; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1938), plate 24 as cited in Neufield, "Hygiene," 44. Bronze Age Bethel also had a drainage system, which may have been built primarily to discharge rain water. William F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), 101 as cited in Neufield, "Hygiene," 44. Neufield also cites the existence of Iron Age Southern Levantine drainage systems in the gates of Megiddo and Gezer ("Hygiene," 44–55).
80. I note differing opinions on how human excrement is conceived within this prophetic sign further below.
81. See Borrowski, *Daily Life*, 80.
82. This line of evidence is not conclusive since the contamination may also have resulted from the extraordinary living conditions occasioned by the Babylonian siege.

83. On this narrative, see J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary* (trans. John Bowden; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 48–56; Baruch Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 39–75; Marc Z. Brettler, *The Book of Judges* (London: Routledge, 2002), 28–38; Susan Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 50–59; Serge Frolov, *Judges* (FOTL 6B; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2013), 105–119; Jack M. Sasson, *Judges 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 6D; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 221–249.
84. The word “feet” is a euphemism for genitalia (e.g., Ex 4:25; Isa 6:2; 7:20). It is possible, then, that the idiom, “cover one’s feet,” used also in 1 Sam 24:4, may be a euphemism for “uncover one’s genitalia.”
85. Halpern reads *וַיִּצֵא הַפְּרָשֶׁדָּהּ* as a reference to anal sphincter release and discusses other interpretations (*First Historians*, 40, 69 n.3). On the smell, see Halpern, *First Historians*, 44. On the philological possibilities, see Frolov, *Judges*, 113–114; Sasson, *Judges 1–12*, 236–237.
86. On the architecture of Ehud’s palace assumed by the story, an architecture that would allow the scene to play out as described, see Halpern, *First Historians*, 43–58.
87. See Halpern, *First Historians*, 69 n.4.
88. Halpern, *First Historians*, 51.
89. Halpern argues that it is through the janitorial access to this space below the elevated platform that Ehud is able to make his escape (*First Historians*, 58). Sasson, who is more cautious than Halpern in reconstructing the architectural structure imagined by the story’s ancient audience, agrees that the story implies use of a chamber pot (*Judges 1–12*, 239, 489 n.56).
90. I do not share Robker’s assessment of the implications of this statement in v. 27, “Interestingly, the Israel Source even suggests that this datum [namely, Jehu’s destruction of the temple of Baal] could not be verified at the time of its composition, as ‘he destroyed the temple of Baal and made it a latrine to this day’; the Israel Source admits that no one would be able to verify this claim, even had they wanted to, as the structure was converted into a latrine, and presumably therefore could not be identified as having previously been a temple” (*Jehu Revolution*, 296). On the contrary, *מִתְרָאָה* in 2 Kgs 10:27 refers to a dumping site and not a built latrine. As such, the ruins of some prior structure at the site might have been discernible.
91. Ka Leung Wong argues that the use of dung in this prophetic act does not imply that human dung was considered ritually unclean. He concludes, “human dung is repulsive and loathsome, but not ritually impure” (*The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel* [VTSup 87; Leiden: Brill, 2001], 135). Compare Bruce Vawter and Leslie J. Hoppe, *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ITC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991), 44. But this interpretation seems to miss

- the force of the debate between the prophet and the deity. The context is that of eating bread made from a variety of grains, against which there are no known biblical prohibitions. As such, when the prophet protests that he has never been defiled through eating (v. 14), he evidently understands the contamination to come from the human dung on which the bread is baked, not the grains from which it is made. Compare Kelvin G. Friebel, *Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's Sign-Acts* (JSOTSup 283; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 249.
92. For example, see Yair Hoffman, “The Conception of ‘Other Gods’ in Deuteronomistic Literature,” in *Israel Oriental Studies XIV: Concepts of the Other in Near Eastern Religions* (ed. Ilai Alon, Ithamar Gruenwald, and Itamar Singer; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 103–118; Juha Pakkala, *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999); Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism* (New York: Oxford, 2003), 48–49.
 93. The verbal root refers to the assembling of the prophetic guild in 1 Kgs 22:6 (יִקְבְּצוּ מִלְּדֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַנְּבִיאִים). On the notion of assembly in Deuteronomistic tradition, see Mark A. O’Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 120; Antony F. Campbell and Mark A. O’Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 230.
 94. According to White, the contest between Elijah and the prophets of Baal in 1 Kgs 18:2–40 anticipates 2 Kgs 9:17–10:25. She argues, “the Elijah legends were created after Jehu’s overthrow of the Omride dynasty to anticipate and legitimize the exterminations” (*Elijah Legends*, 77). For White, the first scene, in which Elijah encounters Ahab (1 Kgs 18:2–18), anticipates the meeting between Jehu and Joram (2 Kgs 9:17–26) while the second scene, the contest itself (1 Kgs 18:19–40), anticipates Jehu’s assembly and slaughter of Baal’s prophets (2 Kgs 10:18–25). She bases her case on parallels between the structural function of characters in the narratives and on linguistic affinities between the texts (*Elijah Legends*, 24–31). On connections between 2 Kgs 10:18–28 and 1 Kgs 18, see also McKenzie, *Trouble with Kings*, 78.
 95. Compare related observations in Minokami, *Revolution des Jehu*, 108–109.
 96. Of these, only in Deut 16:8 is the assembly unambiguously specified as being for a particular deity by the use of the preposition ל (עֲצֵרָה לַיהוָה), as it is in 2 Kgs 10:20. This may also be the meaning of Lev 23:36, though the syntax is ambiguous (וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם אֶשֶׁה לַיהוָה עֲצֵרָת הוּא).
 97. Deut 32:48–52 appears to be a resumptive repetition of Num 27:12–23. For example, see Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 201. On this material as Priestly, see, for example, Simeon Chavel, *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah* (FAT 2.71; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 199 n.13. On Priestly language in Josh 7, see, for example, Ada Taggar-Choen, “Between *Herem*, Ownership,

- and Ritual: Biblical and Hittite Perspectives,” in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond* (ed. Roy Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen; RBS 82; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 433 n.53; Cynthia Edenburg, “Paradigm, Illustrative Narrative or Midrash: The Case of Joshua 7–8 and Deuteronomic/istic Law,” in *The Reception of Biblical War Legislation in Narrative Contexts: Proceedings of the EABS Research Group “Law and Narrative”* (ed. Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel; BZAW 460; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 132. On Priestly glosses in 1 Kgs 8 and on 1 Kgs 8:64–66, see, for example, Nadav Na’aman, *Ancient Israel’s History and Historiography: The First Temple Period, Collected Essays* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 360.
98. A number of documented examples of textual transmission in the ancient Near East provide analogues for scholarly reconstructions of scribal copying, revision, and editing in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. See Stephen A. Kaufman, “The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism,” *HUCA* 53 (1982): 29–43; Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 37–149; Sara J. Milstein, “Outsourcing Gilgamesh,” in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism* (ed. Raymond Person and Robert Rezetko; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, forthcoming); Sara J. Milstein, “Insights into Editing from Mesopotamian Literature: Mirror or Mirage?” in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ed. Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny; Leuven: Peeters Publishers, forthcoming).
99. The verb “he said” and the object “to them,” read awkwardly on their own without previous specification—who speaks to whom? This information is supplied by the first clause of the verse, which belongs to Layer B. I therefore also attribute this second clause to Layer B.
100. The form ועתה, “And now,” connects this clause directly to the previous one, i.e., to Layer B. In a private note, Mark S. Smith has pointed out to me the structural similarity between 2 Kgs 10:18b–19a and 1 Kgs 12:10b–11a. These texts contain words spoken by Jehu and intended to be spoken by Jeroboam, respectively. In both texts, the new king compares himself to his predecessor and then uses the form ועתה, to introduce a command that follows from the comparison. Thus 2 Kgs 10:18b–19a reads, “Ahab served Baal little, Jehu shall serve him much! And now [i.e., therefore] summon to me all the prophets of Baal!” And 1 Kgs 12:10b–11a reads, “My little finger is thicker than my father’s loins! And now [i.e., therefore] my father imposed a heavy yoke on you, but I will add to your yoke!”
101. This clause stating that no one should be absent makes good sense in the context of the immediately preceding material in Layer B, which commands an assembly, but makes little sense without that context.

102. The clause indicating that all who do not report will not live makes good sense in the context of the command to assemble in Layer B, but little sense without that context.
103. The Lucianic recension of v. 19 places “and all his servants,” (καὶ πάντας τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ) after “and all his priests,” (καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοῦ) while MT reverses this sequence (כָּל-עֲבָדָיו וְכָל-כֹּהֲנָיו). As such, it is possible that כָּל-עֲבָדָיו in v. 19 is a gloss borrowed from v. 21. See also the discussion in Burney, *Kings*, 304–305.
104. This late gloss, intended to exculpate Jehu of guilt for worshipping Baal, evidently comes from an editorial hand that was more scrupulous about such matters than the scribes who composed the narrative’s main plot. As such, I treat it as a later gloss. So also Mulzer, *Jehu*, 261–267.
105. The verb would make good sense in the immediately preceding context of either Layer A or Layer B. Its assignment here to Layer B is arbitrary.
106. The verb “he sent” would make good sense in the context of either Layer A or Layer B. But Layer B has already emphasized the necessity of everyone attending the festival. Furthermore, close parallels to this language, “Jehu sent throughout all Israel,” וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוּא בְּכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל, are not found in the Priestly material of the Pentateuch but are found in texts transmitted as part of the Deuteronomistic History: Judg 19:29, “He sent her [i.e., her carved-up corpse] throughout the whole territory of Israel,” וַיִּשְׁלַחָהּ בְּכָל גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל; 1 Sam 11:3, “And let us send messengers throughout the whole territory of Israel,” וְנִשְׁלַחָהּ בְּכָל גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל; 1 Sam 11:7, “He sent throughout the whole territory of Israel,” וַיִּשְׁלַח בְּכָל-גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל; 1 Kgs 18:20, “Ahab sent to all the Israelites,” וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוּא אֶת-חָאָב בְּכָל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. I therefore assign this clause to Layer B.
107. The clause would make sense in the context of either Layer A or Layer B. I have tentatively assigned it to Layer B since Layer B has already emphasized the need for “all” Baal’s prophets and servants to appear.
108. The clause, which notes that there remained no one who did not arrive, seems directly related to the preceding statement that all those serving Baal arrived. I therefore assign it to Layer B.
109. The plural verb makes better sense in the context of Layer B, so that those who enter the temple are specified as “all those serving Baal.”
110. I have assigned this clause to Layer B on the basis of plot. Layer B has just reported that all those serving Baal entered his temple. The note that the temple was filled from end to end seems to depend on this reported action in the narrative.
111. If Layer B is read independently of Layer A, everyone has already entered the temple and it is thus not clear why garments should be “brought out” of the temple for them. Additionally, the third person singular verb without a specified subject, “he said,” harkens back in Layer A to the subject of the last verb in Layer A, Jehu. I have therefore assigned this clause to Layer A. Priestly tradition shows its concern for appropriate attire during ritual activities in Exod 28; 39.

112. The clause follows directly on the preceding command to bring out a garment. I have therefore assigned it to Layer A.
113. I attribute this clause to Layer B on the basis of plot. In Layer B, all those serving Baal have just entered the temple. It makes sense, then, for Jehu and his officer to also enter the temple before he addresses them there.
114. I have assigned this clause to Layer B on the basis of plot. In Layer B, all those serving Baal have already entered the temple and it makes sense for Jehu to address them there, commanding them to search and make sure that no servant of Yahweh has been allowed in. This religious exclusivity, in which one can be an exclusive servant of Baal or an exclusive worshiper of Yahweh, is also seen in the narrative of Elijah's confrontation with the prophets of Baal in 1 Kgs 18.
115. Trebolle-Barrera argues that MT has suffered an omission here by homeoteleuton. As he reconstructs the text, the command to search is given, and then executed. See Trebolle-Barrera, *Jehú y Joás*, 151.
116. Luc. reverses the sequence of MT 24a and 24b. After εἰσῆλθεν Luc. adds εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ προσοχθίσματος, which, if it reflects some Hebrew *vorlage*, represents בית הבעל. Cf. 1 Kgs 16:32. Burney regards this addition as a later gloss (*Kings*, 305). However, Luc. may preserve here an earlier text. I have assigned this clause to Layer A because of its connections to the plot of Layer A. The subject of the plural verb here, "they entered," is best understood as all those who have just donned the festival garment in Layer A.
117. I have assigned this clause to Layer A because of its connection to other material in Layer A in two directions. First, the note that they entered in order to perform sacrifice connects to the immediately following temporal clause stating that Jehu finished performing sacrifice, a clause which I assign to Layer A for reasons outlined below. Second, this clause grammatically expresses the purpose of the preceding verb—"they entered in order to perform sacrifice"—which I assign to Layer A for reasons outlined above. Yoshikazu Minokami cites parallels between the language of 2 Kgs 10:24–25 and 1 Sam 10:8; 13:10 and argues that the combination of peace offerings and burnt offerings is distinctively Deuteronomistic but alien to Priestly tradition (*Revolution des Jehu*, 106–107). But *שלם is found in 1 Sam 10:8, not 2 Kgs 10:24–25, and *זבח and *עלה are found together in Lev 17:8; 23:27; Num 10:10; 15:3, 5, 8.
118. The attribution of this clause is uncertain. I assign it here to Layer B because it connects directly to the following statement that Jehu warned his men not to let anyone go free. Since I tentatively assign that clause to Layer B, I assign this one also to Layer B.
119. The attribution of this clause to Layer B is arbitrary.
120. This clause indicates when the following action takes place; it is directly connected to the main verb to follow, "Jehu said." Since I assign that main verb to Layer A, I also assign this temporal clause to Layer A.

121. The instructions to the רצים and the שלשים connects this command from Jehu to what follows in Layer A; these officers and guards expose the corpses of those they kill.
122. I have assigned this clause to Layer A because it fulfills the command just given by Jehu in Layer A, and it is a prerequisite to the corpse exposure to follow in Layer A.
123. The attribution of this clause is uncertain. I have assigned it to Layer B since Layer B, as I have reconstructed it here, has previously emphasized Israel in its entirety.
124. To judge by its usage in 1 Kgs 10:5//2 Chr 9:4; Ezek 16:13, מלבוש denotes a luxurious garment.
125. On the question of Jehu's culpability for worshiping Baal, cf. Treballe-Barrera, *Jehú y Joás*, 146–147.
126. Compare עבדי פסל in Ps 97:7.
127. For example, Gen 21:25; 24:34; 26:19; 50:7; Num 22:18; 1 Sam 16:15; 21:8.
128. For example, Num 3:7, 8, 26, 31, 36; 4:4, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 47, 49.
129. Without proposing the editorial history I have argued for here, Robker notes, “It is quite possible that Jehu destroyed a temple of Baal. Such a destruction would not necessarily mandate the kind of religious holocaust described in 2 Kings 10; this portrayal of the total destruction of the worshippers of Baal cannot be reconciled with the archaeological record” (*Jehu Revolution*, 296).
130. Though Ziony Zevit does not distinguish between two layers in the narrative as I do, he observes, “The story about the slaughter of Baal worshippers in Samaria, 2 Kgs 10:18–27, is presented as taking place in the heat of the revolution, whereas according to verses 20–21 the gathering of Baal devotees from throughout the kingdom took some time. The internal logic of the described events indicates that the slaughter occurred after the royal bloodletting was over and presumes that circumstances were such that the Baal worshippers did not consider themselves endangered. Thus Jehu's revolution in its historical (as opposed to its literal) setting may not have been perceived originally as having anything to do with religion but rather with other legitimate interests and concerns. This, however, is not to say that religion played no role” (*The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallaxic Approaches* (London: Continuum, 2001), 493. Compare also comments on the transformation of political narratives into religious ones in Hadi Ghantous, *The Elisha-Hazael Paradigm and the Kingdom of Israel: The Politics of God in Ancient Syria-Palestine* (Durham: Acumen, 2013), 126.
131. The narrative logic of the episode depends on an exclusive Yahwism that is unlikely to have existed as early as the ninth or eighth centuries. The entire episode is premised on Jehu's exclusive devotion to Yahweh, as others have noted. For example, see Eben Scheffler, *Politics in Ancient Israel* (Pretoria: Biblia, 2001),

102; Thomas Römer, *The Invention of God* (trans. Raymond Geuss; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2015), 118–120. In this regard, diversity of religious practice in ancient Israel does not constitute a strong argument against an early date for the narrative. Plausibly, a Yahwistic scribe from the circle of the House of Jehu might have used the narrative to advocate an exclusive Yahwism even in the face of contemporaneous religious practice. However, monolatry is embedded in the narrative in another way that is much less likely to have existed at an early date. According to the narrative, Jehu instructs the servants of Baal gathered in the temple of Baal, “Search and see that there be not with you some of the servants of Yahweh, but only servants of Baal” (10:24). The religious logic of Jehu’s speech precludes the possibility that any servant of Yahweh could also worship Baal and that any servant of Baal could also worship Yahweh. Nor is that division limited to the few who happen to be present. Rather, the narrative portrays every servant of Baal throughout the land as being present (10:21). Consequently, the narrative world depicted here is monolatrous in its entirety. For the narrative to have been plausible to its ancient audience, the audience must have shared this view of the world. In other words, the exclusive Yahwism of the narrative cannot be explained adequately as the religious propaganda of a small circle of Yahwistic court scribes. Rather, it must be the product of an entire society grounded in the belief that worship of Yahweh cannot coexist with worship of other deities and vice versa. As such, the evidence for religious diversity in ancient Israel precludes an early date for Layer B.

132. Gugler, for example, has expressed skepticism about the presentation of a religious revolution and instead regards Jehu as engaged in a straight military coup (*Jehu und seine Revolution*, 230–234).
133. The expression occurs twice in 1 Kgs 20:39–42. On the connection between 2 Kgs 10:24 and 1 Kgs 20:39–42, see Stuart A. Irvine, “The Rise of the House of Jehu,” in *The Land That I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honour of J. Maxwell Miller* (ed. J Andrew Dearman and M. Patrick Graham; JSOTSup 343; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 109; Sweeney, *I & II Kings*, 338. On the legal background of this language, see Exod 21:23; Lev 24:18. The legal background of the language is highlighted in 1 Kgs 20:39–42, where Ahab is asked to adjudicate a legal case. Similar language but with a different meaning is used in Job 16:4.
134. On the prophetic commissioning of Jehu in 2 Kgs 9:7–10, see Tomoo Ishida, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* (BZAW 142; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977), 177; Barré, *Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*, 20; Burke O. Long, *2 Kings* (FOTL 10; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991), 131; Na’aman, *Ancient Israel’s History*, 158; Rachele Gilmour, *Juxtaposition and the Elisha Cycle* (LHB/OTS 594; London: T&T Clark, 2014), 198.

135. Jer 35:6–19 presents Jehonadab ben Rechab as ancestor of the Rechabites. Marvin A. Sweeney notes, “The enigmatic Jehonadab ben Rekeb plays a key role, particularly since he is identified as a zealous supporter of YHWH. He is otherwise known from Jer 35, where he is portrayed as the founder of the Rekabite house. . . . The narrative contrasts the zealous Jehonadab with the faithless Ahab” (*I & II Kings*, 338). On the Rechabites, see also Leuchter, *Polemics of Exile*, 95.
136. On connections between the narratives about Jehu and Elijah, see Long, *2 Kings*, 121, 138, 140–141; Irvine, “Rise,” 108; White, *Elijah Legends*, 77; McKenzie, *Trouble with Kings*, 78; Zevit, *Religions of Ancient Israel*, 493; Jeremy M. Hutton, *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 396; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 153.
137. On the positive portrayal of Jehu in the book of Kings, see David T. Lamb, *Righteous Jehu and His Evil Heirs: The Deuteronomist’s Negative Perspective on Dynastic Succession* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). Hutton points out that a Deuteronomistic editor, “impugns Jehu’s Yahwistic legacy,” in *2 Kgs* 10:29 (*Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 4).
138. On Neo-Assyrian destruction of foreign temples, see Steven W. Holloway, *Aššur is King! Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Period* (CHANE 10; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 194–197. On plunder and disfigurement of royal images, see Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: lešakkēn šemô šām in the Bible* (BZAW 318; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 138.
139. Destruction of enemy cities is a regular boast in ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions; I mention but one example. In Chapter 2 I observe the Rassam Cylinder’s portrayal of geopolitical segmentation in the Iron Age Southern Levant and in Chapter 5 I discuss it in relation to biblical claims that Hezekiah reshaped Jerusalem’s water supply system. It also depicts the king’s destructive spatial power. In boasting of his military success in the Southern Levant, Sennacherib writes: “On my second campaign, the god Aššur, my lord, encouraged me and I marched to the land of the Kassites and the land of the Yasubigallians, who since time immemorial had not submitted to the kings, my ancestors. In the high mountains, difficult terrain, I rode on horseback and had my personal chariot carried on (men’s) necks. In very rugged terrain I roamed about on foot like a wild bull. (20) I surrounded (and) conquered the cities Bīt-Kilamzaḥ, Ḥardišpu, (and) Bīt-Kubatti, their fortified walled cities. I brought out from them people, horses, mules, donkeys, oxen, and sheep and goats, and I counted (them) as booty. Moreover, I destroyed, devastated, (and) turned into ruins their small(er) settlements, which were without number. I burned with fire pavilions (and) tents, their abodes, and reduced (them) to ashes” (trans. A. Kirk Grayson and Jamie Novotny in RINAP 3 4 18–21).

140. Several other Neo-Assyrian kings claim to have plundered gods; for example, Adad-nirari II (RIM A.o.99.2 69), Tukulti-Ninurta II (RIM A.o.100.5 7), Assurnasirpal II (RIM A.o.101.1 i 85, iii 40), Shalmaneser III (RIM A.o.102.6 ii 7, iv 19; RIM A.o.102.10 ii 3; RIM A.o.102.14 48, 126; RIM A.o.102.16 23; RIM A.o.102.28 27; RIM A.o.102.29 10; RIM A.o.102.30 20; RIM A.o.102.34 6; RIM A.o.102.40 i 11, iii 1); Sennacherib (RINAP 3 4 39).
141. Paul-Émile Botta and Eugène Flandin, *Monument de Ninive T. 2: Architecture et sculpture* (Paris: Gide & Baudry 1849), pl. 141.
142. On the question of possible ancient Near Eastern analogues to biblical cultic centralization, see Moshe Weinfeld, “Cult Centralization in Israel in Light of a Neo-Babylonian Analogy,” *JNES* 23 (1964): 202–212; Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.* (Yale Near Eastern Researches 10; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 219–224; Nadav Na’aman, “The King Leading Cult Reforms in His Kingdom: Josiah and Other Kings in the Ancient Near East,” *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 12 (2006): 131–168; Reinhard G. Kratz, “The Idea of Cultic Centralization: And Its Supposed Ancient Near Eastern Analogies,” in *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckerman; BZAW 405; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 121–144; Hanspeter Schaudig, “Cult Centralization in the Ancient Near East? Conceptions of the Ideal Capital in the Ancient Near East,” in *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckerman; BZAW 405; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 145–168. Scholarship has raised doubts about the veracity of the biblical claims of cultic centralization in the time of Hezekiah and Josiah. For example, see Lisbeth S. Fried, “The High Places (Bamôt) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation,” *JAOS* 122 (2002): 437–465; Juha Pakkala, “Why the Cult Reforms in Judah Probably Did Not Happen,” in *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckerman; BZAW 405; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 201–235. For a recent treatment arguing that some cultic reform took place under Josiah, see Pietsch, *Die Kultreform Josias*, 471–491.
143. See the survey in Na’aman, “The King Leading Cult Reforms,” 131–168.
144. On Sennacherib’s destruction of Babylon’s religious spaces and the fate of its divine images, see Eckart Frahm, *Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften* (AFOB 26; Vienna: Institut für Orientalistik, 1997), 225–227; Galo W. Vera Chamaza, *Die Omnipotenz Assurs: Entwicklungen in der Assur-Theologie unter den Sargoniden Sargon II., Sanherib und Asarhaddon* (AOAT 295; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002), 92–110; Na’aman, “The King Leading Cult Reforms,” 154–158.
145. Translation from Grayson and Novotny in RINAP.
146. See Steven W. Cole, “The Crimes and Sacrileges of Nabû-šuma-iškun,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 84 (1994): 220–252;

Grant Frame, *Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157–612 BC)* (RIMB 2; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 117–122.

147. Frame, *Rulers of Babylonia*, 117–118.

CHAPTER 4

1. An earlier version of this chapter was published as Stephen C. Russell, “Gate and Town in 2 Samuel 15:1–5: Collective Politics and Absalom’s Strategy,” *JAH* 3 (2015): 2–21. I am grateful to the journal’s publisher Walter de Gruyter for permission to reproduce some of that material here. The most significant revision is the addition of the sections titled “Gates and Towns in Texts from Mesopotamia and the Northern Levant” and “Towns in Texts Depicting the Southern Levant.” I have also revised my argument throughout to reflect my growing sense that varying configurations of collective and centralized power were possible in the Late Bronze and Iron Age Levant.
2. The focus on individual relationships is reflected, for example, in the work of Robert Alter, who notes, “the demagogue enlists support by flattering people’s special interests” (*The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel* [New York: Norton, 1999], 283). Cf. related comments in Robert D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel* (New American Commentary 7; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 397; Eugene H. Peterson, *First and Second Samuel* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1999), 204. On the legal setting of the story, see, for example, Keith Bodner, *The Rebellion of Absalom* (London: Routledge, 2013), 58. John W. Wright observes, “the gate spatially reinforces Absalom’s tactics,” but he does not reckon with the collective politics at play here (“A Tale of Three Cities: Urban Gates, Squares, and Power in Iron Age II, Neo-Babylonian, and Achaemenid Judah,” in *Second Temple Studies III: Studies in Politics, Class and Material Culture* [ed. Philip R. Davies and John M. Halligan; JSOTSup 340; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002], 24). The importance of collective politics in the biblical narratives about Absalom is recognized by Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, though he does not take up 2 Sam 15:1–6 (*King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* [ConBOT 8; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1976], 122–124). My analysis here also contrasts with those who understand the story as reflecting tension between Israel’s supposed tribal past and the present reality of monarchy. According to Martin A. Cohen, “The plaintiffs are described not as Judahites or Israelites, but as individuals belonging to ‘one of the tribes of Israel,’ a term recalling the premonarchical political structures” (“The Rebellions during the Reign of David: An Inquiry into Social Dynamics in Ancient Israel,” in *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History and Literature in Honor of I. Edward Kiev* [ed. Charles Berlin; New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1971], 107). In my estimation, the

narrative does not assume a tribal past that gave way to a monarchic present. Rather, strategies of political action based on locality or kinship are presumed within the narrative to operate at the same time as the monarchy. Compare related comments in Hanoch Reviv, *The Elders in Ancient Israel: A Study of a Biblical Institution* (trans. L. Plitmann; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989), 94–95; Nili S. Fox, *In the Service of the King: Officialdom in Ancient Israel and Judah* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 23; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2000), 65. On the coexistence of competing strategies of political action in ancient Israel, see especially Daniel E. Fleming, *The Legacy of Israel in Judah's Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 179–192.

3. On collective structures of governance in ancient Israel and Judah, especially as represented by “elders,” see C. Umhau Wolf, “Traces of Primitive Democracy in Ancient Israel,” *JNES* 6 (1947): 98–108; J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Les Chefs du Peuple d’Israël et leurs Titres,” *RB* 57 (1950): 40–61; John L. McKenzie, “Elders in the Old Testament,” *Bib* 40 (1959): 522–540; Abraham Malamat, “Kingship and Council in Ancient Israel and Sumer,” *JNES* 22 (1963): 247–253; Baruch Halpern, *The Emergence of Israel in Canaan* (SBLMS 29; Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1983), 199–205; Reviv, *The Elders in Ancient Israel*; R. Alistair Campbell, *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 20–28; Rainer Kessler, *The Social History of Ancient Israel: An Introduction* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2008), 40–78.
4. Bruce Wells notes, “The Hebrew Bible indicates that a variety of persons and groups, including the king, the elders, local assemblies of citizens, state officials, and priests, could function as judges” (*The Law of Testimony in the Pentateuchal Codes* [BZAR 4; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004], 19). In addition to the bibliography cited elsewhere in this chapter, he points to John M. Salmon, “Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel: An Historical Investigation of Old Testament Institutions” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1968), 221–343, 378–417; Moshe Weinfeld, “Judge and Officer in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 7 (1977): 65–88; Richard A. Puckett, “Law and Authority in Ancient Israel: An Analysis of Three Stages in the Development of Israelite Jural Authority” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1994), 203–214; Sophie Lafont, “Le juge biblique,” in *La Conscience du juge dans la tradition juridique européenne* (ed. Jean-Marie Carbasse and Laurence Depambour-Tarride; Paris: PUF, 1999), 541–556. Robert R. Wilson correlates judicial authority with social structure. He argues that in the pre-monarchic period, the patriarch had legal authority at the level of the household, while at the level of the clan, the elders exercised authority at the town gate. There seems to be no evidence for judicial proceedings at the level of the tribe. In the monarchic period, Wilson envisions a much more strongly centralized system

of judicial authority, with the king at its apex. See Robert R. Wilson, "Enforcing the Covenant: The Mechanisms of Judicial Authority in Early Israel," in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall* (ed. Herbert B. Huffmon, Frank A. Spina, and Alberto R.W. Green; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 59–75. On the international context of local law in the post-exilic period, see Anselm Hagedorn, "Local Law in an Imperial Context: The Role of Deuteronomy in the (Imagined) Persian Period," in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 57–75.

5. On the ancient Near Eastern motif of the just king deployed in the narrative, see Keith W. Whitelam, *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979), 137–142; Max E. Polley, *Amos and the Davidic Empire: A Socio-Historical Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 119–121.
6. I understand our narrative, 2 Sam 15:1–6, to be written in the Iron Age II. As noted in Chapter 1, Seth L. Sanders has shown that Hebrew emerged as a written vernacular in the late ninth and early eighth centuries BCE (*The Invention of Hebrew* [Traditions; Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009]). In light of his work, I do not think that our narrative could have been written any earlier than this period, quite some time after the events it purports to portray. Second Sam 15:1–6 is not an isolated account but is connected to other aspects of the story of David in the book of Samuel, and in particular the story of challenges to his rule and his flight to Transjordan, as discussed further below. In light of its language and content, a wide consensus of scholarship, particularly in the United States, views much of the biblical material in the book of Samuel as being composed in the monarchic era, before the Jewish exile to Babylon in 586 BCE. Rather than entering into the ongoing debate over the details of the editorial history of the book of Samuel, I ground my analysis here in this broad consensus that views this material as being written sometime in the late ninth through sixth centuries BCE. In what follows I cite a wide range of archaeological and textual evidence that confirms that the structure of the social world imagined by 2 Sam 15:1–6 matches quite closely the structure of the social world that produced this text in the Iron Age II. A comprehensive recent treatment of the editorial history of the book of Samuel is Jeremy M. Hutton, *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 396; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009). He offers an exhaustive survey of scholarly approaches to the sources used by the Deuteronomistic Historian with particular attention to arguments for a document with prophetic focus recoverable within Samuel–Kings (*Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 79–156). Hutton offers a concise schematization of his own view of the development of 2 Samuel on p. 222.

7. On the civic function of Iron Age Israelite gates, see Ludwig Koehler, *Hebrew Man: Lectures Delivered at the Invitation of the University of Tübingen, December 1–16, 1952* (trans. Peter R. Ackroyd; London: SCM Press, 1956), 149–175; Donald A. McKenzie, “Judicial Procedure at the Town Gate,” *VT* 14 (1964): 100–104; Victor H. Matthews, “Entrance Ways and Threshing Floors: Legally Significant Sites in the Ancient Near East,” *Fides et Historia* 19 (1987): 25–40; Eckart Otto, “שַׁעַר *ša’ar*,” *ThWAT* 8: 358–403; Eckart Otto, “Zivile Funktionen des Stadtttores in Palästina und Mesopotamien,” in *Meilenstein: Festgabe für Herbert Donner zum 16 Februar 1995* (ed. Manfred Weippert and Stefan Timm; ÄAT 30; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 188–197; Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 31; C.H.J. de Geus, *Towns in Ancient Israel and in the Southern Levant* (Palaestina antiqua 10; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 33–37. Compared to these studies, I emphasize here the collective politics of towns. The civic function of Iron Age Moabite gates is noted by Bruce Routledge, *Moab in the Iron Age: Hegemony, Polity, Archaeology* (Archaeology, Culture, and Society; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 175–176.
8. On elders in the book of Deuteronomy, see Timothy M. Willis, *The Elders of the City: A Study of the Elders-Laws in Deuteronomy* (SBLMS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001). Willis emphasizes the local function of elders in Deuteronomy and argues that they were only later portrayed as having a national role. In this regard, Willis diverges from Joachim Buchholz, *Die Ältesten Israels im Deuteronomium* (GTA 36; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988); Jan Christian Gertz, *Die Gerichtsorganisation Israels im deuteronomischen Gesetz* (FRLANT 165; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).
9. Moshe Weinfeld imagines both elders and appointed judges functioning within a single legal system—cf. Deut 16:18, “Judges and judicial officials you shall appoint for yourselves in each of your city gates.” See Moshe Weinfeld, “Elders,” *Encyclopedia Judaica* (ed. Cecil Roth; Jerusalem: Encyclopedia Judaica, 1972), 6:578–580; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 234. A related position is taken by Jacob Milgrom, “The Ideological and Historical Importance of Judge in Deuteronomy,” in *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume: Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World* (ed. Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch; 3 vols; Jerusalem: E. Rubenstein, 1983), 3:129–139, esp. 138. Bernard M. Levinson argues instead for a diachronic development, with appointed judges displacing the judicial authority of elders (*Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1997], 124–126). Alexander Rofé argues for a similar diachronic development, *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), 103–119.
10. I do not share Samuel R. Driver’s assessment that the biblical text here reflects “the procedure of a primitive-minded people” (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* [ICC; 3d ed; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902], 255).

- For several suggestions resolving the apparent impracticality of the law, see Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1996), 476–477.
11. Richard D. Nelson argues, “The central issue seems to be less her earlier sexual behavior per se than its outcome in a marriage under false pretenses, shaming both father and husband” (*Deuteronomy: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002], 271).
 12. On levirate marriage, see Donald A. Leggett, *The Levirate and Goel Institutions in the Old Testament* (Cherry Hill, N.J.: Mack Publishing, 1974); Eryl W. Davies, “Inheritance Rights and the Hebrew Levirate Marriage,” *VT* 31 (1981): 138–144, 257–268; Raymond Westbrook, “The Law of the Biblical Levirate,” in *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 113; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 69–89; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 482–483. I share Westbrook’s view of a common ancient Near Eastern legal tradition shared by the ancient Levant and Mesopotamia, including the issues of inheritance that lie at the core of levirate marriage. On the interpretation of the levirate tradition in rabbinic sources, including comparisons to relevant cross-cultural data, see Dvora E. Weisberg, *Levirate Marriage and the Family in Ancient Judaism* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2009).
 13. Indeed, the public nature of city gates allowed them to be used for the enforcement of various community values. The worship of deities other than Yahweh is punishable by death at the city gates according to Deut 17:2–5; the people were instructed to inscribe God’s teaching in the city gates according to Deut 6:9; and family status could be established or repudiated in the city gates according to Ps 69:13; 127:5; Prov 31:23; Job 29:7; 31:21. In relation to Deut 6:9, Jeffrey H. Tigay notes that houses rarely had gates and the instruction therefore most likely refers to the gates of the city. According to Tigay, the command exploits the public nature of the city gates. See Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 79.
 14. On levirate marriage in Ruth, see Westbrook, “The Law of the Biblical Levirate,” 69–89; James A. Loader, “Of Barley, Bulls, Land and Levirate,” in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 123–138; Jeremy M. Schipper, *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYB; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 9, 15, 35, 103–104, 166–169.
 15. Henry McKeating argues that the cities of asylum were a seventh-century development (“The Development of the Law of Homicide in Ancient Israel,” *VT* 25 (1975): 53–55). Along similar lines, Baruch Levine sees town asylum as developing conceptually from altar asylum, which would have been rendered impractical by Deuteronomic centralization (*Numbers 21–36: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* [AB 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000], 566–568). Jeffrey Stackert discusses the urbanization of asylum and demonstrates the literary dependence of Num 35:9–34 on Deut 19:1–13 in *Rewriting the Torah: Literary*

- Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (FAT 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 31–112.
16. The pericope may represent a Deuteronomistic reworking of Priestly tradition as suggested by LXX^b, which does not contain the apparent additions in a Deuteronomic style, including the portion about city gates in v. 4. See J. Alberto Soggin, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 197; Robert G. Boling, *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (AB 6; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982), 472; Alexander Rofé, “Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated,” in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 137–138; Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 226–231; Pamela Barmash, *Homicide in the Biblical World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 92–93; Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah*, 99–100.
 17. On the date and location of the prophetic ministry of Amos, see James Luther Mays, *Amos: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 1–4; Hans Walter Wolff, *Joel and Amos* (trans. Walderman Janzen, S. Dean McBride, Jr., and Charles A. Muenchow; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 89, 106–113; Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 24A; New York: Doubleday, 1989), 83–88, 141–144.
 18. Mays, *Amos*, 93, 101; Polley, *Amos*, 136; Jörg Jeremias, *The Book of Amos: A Commentary* (trans. Douglas W. Stott; OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 92–93.
 19. On wisdom tradition, justice, and Amos 5, see Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 245–246.
 20. On the literary structure of the Book of Woes, see Jan de Waard, “The Chiastic Structure of Amos V, 1–17,” *VT* 27 (1977): 170–177; Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 231–234; Robert B. Coote, *Amos among the Prophets: Composition and Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 74–75, 79–86; Shalom M. Paul, *Amos* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 158; Jason Radine, *The Book of Amos in Emergent Judah* (FAT 2.45; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 29–30. Marvin A. Sweeney emphasizes the rhetorical unity of the Book of Woes (*The Twelve Prophets* [Berit olam; 2 vols.; Collegetville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 2000], 1:231–232).
 21. On geopolitical terminology in Amos, especially the use of the name “Israel,” see Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 98–139.
 22. In this translation, “to the House of Israel” is transposed from the end of the verse. Cf. Paul, *Amos*, 160 n.17.
 23. Wolff regards Beersheba as an insertion here (*Joel and Amos*, 228). On puns in the pronouncements of judgment against Gilgal and Bethel, see Paul, *Amos*, 163–164.

24. Ephraim A. Speiser, “‘Coming’ and ‘Going’ at the City Gate,” *BASOR* 144 (1956): 20–23; Geoffrey Evans, “‘Coming’ and ‘Going’ at the City Gate: A Discussion of Prof. Speiser’s Paper,” *BASOR* 150 (1958): 28–33; Reviv, *The Elders in Ancient Israel*, 147–152.
25. On the ancient Near Eastern legal background of this text, see Herbert Petschow, “Die Neubabylonische Zwiagesprächs-surkunde und Gen. 23,” *JCS* 19 (1965): 103–120; Gene M. Tucker, “The Legal Background of Genesis 23,” *JBL* 85 (1966): 77–84; Raymond Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 113; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 24–35; Stephen C. Russell, “Abraham’s Purchase of Ephron’s Land in Anthropological Perspective,” *BibInt* 21 (2013): 153–170.
26. On descriptions of territory in Joshua, see especially Nili Wazana, *All the Boundaries of the Land: The Promised Land in Biblical Thought in Light of the Ancient Near East* (trans. Liat Qeren; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 185–276.
27. On the social obligations of reciprocity in the narrative, see Roger S. Nam, *Portrayals of Economic Exchange in the Book of Kings* (BibInt 112; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 76–84.
28. The gate was also associated with judiciary authority in Pharaonic Egypt. See G.P.F. van den Boorn, “Wḏ’-ryt and Justice at the Gate,” *JNES* 44 (1985): 1–26. Even a single text could reflect both centralized and distributed power, suggesting that they are best understood as reflecting complementary elements within a single system. According to the decree of Horemheb, last ruler of the Eighteenth Dynasty, judges appointed by the pharaoh listen to “the words of the Palace, the laws of the (portico of the) gate.” See Kurt Sethe, ed., *Urkunden des Neuen Reichs* (Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums 4; Berlin: Graz, 1961), 2155 18; K. Pflüger, “The Edict of King Haremhab,” *JNES* 5 (1946): 260–276. By metonymy, the palace and the gate represent here the pharaoh’s judicial authority. Yet, according to the same text, *kenbet* councils could be established ad hoc for the administration of justice at the local level. See Bruce G. Trigger, *Ancient Egypt: A Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 83–84; Ben Haring, “Administration and Law: Pharaonic,” in *A Companion to Ancient Egypt* (ed. Alan B. Lloyd; 2 vols.; Chichester, West Sussex: Blackwell-Wiley, 2010), 1:226. Horemheb is regarded as playing a key role in reauthorizing local administrative and judicial power after the highly centralized reign of Akhenaten. See Nicholas-Christopher Grimal, *A History of Ancient Egypt* (trans. Ian Shaw; Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 243. For an overview of Egyptian law, see four essays by Richard Jasnow on “Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period,” “Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period,” “New Kingdom,” and “Third Intermediate Period,” and the essay by Joseph G. Manning on “Demotic Law,” all in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law* (ed. Raymond Westbrook; HdO 72; Leiden: Brill, 2003). See also Sandra Lippert, *Einführung in die*

altägyptische Rechtsgeschichte (Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 5; Berlin: Lit, 2008).

29. In addition to the material discussed here, see further examples in “abullu 1 b)” in CAD 1:84; “bābu A 1” in CAD 2:15–22.
30. Trans. W.G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), 214–220.
31. Clarence Elwood Keiser, *Letters and Contracts from Erech Written in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies 1; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), plates XII–XIII.
32. Carl Frank, *Strassburger Keilschrifttexte in sumerischer und babylonischer Sprache* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928), text 37 line 12.
33. Several texts from Nuzi emphasize their legally binding nature by highlighting the fact that they were written in the city gate. In this regard, the entry for “abullu” in CAD 1:84 cites TCL 9 19:17; HSS 9 22:30; JEN 403:30; HSS 9 96:22; JEN 470:27; JEN 492:29; JEN 546:30; JEN 478:11; JEN 300:33; HSS 9 21:32. One text notes that the written tablet serves as a record of the legal transaction that had transpired in the city gate: “(the tablet) was written after its proclamation in the entrance in the Tiššae gate of Nuzi” (JEN 402:25; cf. HSS 9 18:41). Cf. HSS 14 568:16–17, translated and discussed in Maynard Paul Maidman, *Nuzi Texts and Their Uses as Historical Evidence* (SBLWAW 18; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 225–227. The efficacy of transactions conducted at the city gate evidently stemmed from their public nature. Thus an Old Assyrian text instructs its addressee to “bring witnesses at the gate entrance” (BIN 6:75–18). Another Old Assyrian letter confers something like the power of attorney on a businessman’s partners in the city gate, “there in the gate office act as my representatives in the consigning of the merchandise” (TCL 19 69:27; cf. also TCL 19 67:26; OIP 27 57:29; TCL 21 270:34; TCL 20 130:36’; CCT 2 1:33; TCL 19 53:22). The power of the city gate as a symbol of legal efficacy is also witnessed in JEN 317:30, “PN has taken his silver at the gate (i.e., publicly),” and in AASOR 16 21:18, which mentions “the copper cubit of the city gate of Nuzi,” i.e., the standardized and legally binding unit of measurement.
34. A number of texts suggest that palace gates served as loci for the hearing of court cases in some Mesopotamian cities. This venue suggests the close alignment of judicial authority with the palace. Thus VAS 6 128:6 (=VAT 5475) refers to “the judge at the gate of the palace,” as a witness to monthly rations, YOS 3 46:23 reports that a fugitive slave girl was taken to the palace gate, and BIN 1 24:16 announces, “I will send him (in fetters) with his adversary in court to the palace gate before the chief . . . -official.” See “bābu” in CAD 2:17 for further examples of palace gates and CAD 2:19 for examples with temple gates. In these texts, a single judge acts, apparently as a representative of the palace bureaucracy. An Old Babylonian text refers to judges and city elders as two distinct groups simultaneously hearing a legal case (Bruno Meissner, *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen*

- Privatrecht* [Assyriologische Bibliothek 11; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893], 80:3). In this text, the judges may be envisioned as representing an authority separate from that of town elders.
35. Bruce Wells argues that judges and elders worked cooperatively within the judicial systems represented in biblical and Mesopotamian texts (“Competing or Complementary? Judges and Elders in Biblical and Neo-Babylonian Law,” *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 16 (2010): 77–104. According to Norman Yoffee, “Within Mesopotamian cities, local assemblies were constituted by community members and traditional leaders. . . . These assemblies exercised judicial privileges, settling disputes among community members, and could stand in opposition to the palace and royal court” (*Myths of the Archaic State: Evolution of the Earliest Cities, States and Civilizations* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 61). See also M.A. Dandamaev, “The Neo-Babylonian Elders,” in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff* (ed. M.A. Dandamaev et al.; Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1982), 38–41; Brendon C. Benz, “The Varieties of Sociopolitical Experience in the Late Bronze Age Levant and the Rise of Early Israel” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2013), 91. F. Rachel Magdelene contends, “The Neo-Babylonian corpus divulges that legal administration was in the hands of several classes of persons, including the king, judges (*dayyānū*), diverse state officials, temple officials, and various temple and lay assemblies” (*On the Scales of Righteousness: Neo-Babylonian Trial Law and the Book of Job* [BJS 348; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 2007], 56). Shalom E. Holtz observes that in the Neo-Babylonian period, temple officials seem to have had jurisdiction over matters involving temple interests, while a variety of individuals and groups could try other cases (*Neo-Babylonian Court Procedure* [Cuneiform Monographs 38; Leiden: Brill, 2009], 267–68).
 36. Arthur Ungnad, *Babylonian Letters of the Hammurapi Period* (Publications of the Babylonian Section 7; Philadelphia: University Museum, 1915), 27–29.
 37. Trans. Ungnad in PBS 7.
 38. See CAD 4:33 “*dajānu*”; Arnold F. Walther, *Das Altbabylonische Gerichtswesen* (LSS 6.4–6; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1917), 5; Julius G. Lautner, *Die richterliche Entscheidung und die Streitbeendigung im altbabylonischen Prozessrechte* (Leipzig: T. Weicher, 1922), 68.
 39. Cf. Michael C. Astour, “Un texte d’Ugarit récemment découvert et ses rapports avec l’origine des cultes bachiques grecs,” *RHR* 164 (1963): 1–15.
 40. Douglas J. Green, “*I Undertook Great Works*”: *The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions* (FAT 2.41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 150.
 41. F. Renfroe, “The Foibles of a Feeble Monarch,” *UF* 22 (1990): 279–284.
 42. The plural Ugaritic noun *adrm* here is usually understood to mean “leaders” or “notables” in this context, and Danel would therefore be understood as part of a collective decision-making body. See Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín

- Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition* (3d ed; trans. and ed. Wilfred G.E. Watson; HdO 112; 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2015), 1:21. Nick A. Wyatt instead understands the word to refer to “trees,” i.e., to a shaded space for judgment just outside the city gate (*Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilmilku and His Colleagues* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 267).
43. How this literary depiction relates to the system of judicial and political administration that functioned at Ugarit in the Late Bronze Age remains less clear. On poetry and politics at Ugarit, see Aaron Tugendhaft, “How to Become a Brother in the Bronze Age: An Inquiry into the Representation of Politics in Ugaritic Myth,” *Fragments* 2 (2012): 89–104; Aaron Tugendhaft, “Sovereignty: Politics and Poetics in the Baal Cycle,” *JAOS* 132 (2012): 367–384. For an overview of the legal texts from Ugarit—for the most part concerning land conveyance, but also dealing with manumissions, adoptions, and other local matters, as well as international treaties, edicts, and verdicts—and the system of legal administration they represent, see Ignacio Márquez Rowe, “The Legal Texts from Ugarit,” in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (ed. Wilfred G.E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt; HdO 39; Boston: Brill, 1999), 390–422; Ignacio Márquez Rowe, “Anatolia and the Levant: Ugarit,” in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law* (ed. Raymond Westbrook; HdO 72; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 719–736. The highest judiciary official at Ugarit was the *skn*. For an overview of the functions of the *skn* official, see Wilfred van Soldt, “Studies on the Sakinu-Official (2): The Functions of the Sakinu of Ugarit,” *UF* 34 (2002): 805–828. Iribilu, the *skn* of Riqdi, exercises judicial power in confiscating land in RS 17.61. See Michael Heltzer, *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1976), 55–56; Fox, *In the Service of the King*, 155. The king’s seal frequently appears on legal documents from Ugarit and legal transactions are frequently said to occur “before” a particular king. See Adrian Curtis, “God as ‘Judge’ in Ugaritic and Hebrew Thought,” in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (ed. Barnabas Lindars; Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988), 3; Márquez Rowe, “Legal Texts,” 392, 397.
44. Daniel E. Fleming, *Democracy’s Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 170–190.
45. Fleming, *Democracy’s Ancient Ancestors*, 173. Fleming cites the discussion in Dominique Charpin, “Un traité entre Zimri-Lim de Mari et Ibâl-pî-El II d’Ešnunna,” in *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs: études sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli* (ed. Dominique Charpin and Francis Joannès; Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1991), 149–155.
46. Fleming, *Democracy’s Ancient Ancestors*, 171.
47. Daniel E. Fleming, “A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Emar in Ancient Syria,” *UF* 24 (1992): 59–71. Sophie Démare-Lafont notes that the tablets from Emar contain “no mention of judges nor of administrative officials who work for the

- palace or the temple. . . . At Emar, collective institutions stand above various private persons endowed with civic responsibility” (“The King and the Diviner at Emar,” in *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society* [ed. Lorenze d’Alfonso, Yoram Cohen, and Dietrich Sürenhagen; AOAT 349; Munich: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008], 217).
48. For the text and its translation, see Gary Beckman, *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen* (History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 2; Padua: Sargon, 1996), 29–30.
 49. Beckman, *Emar*, 54–56.
 50. Daniel Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata* (Emar VI.1–4; 4 vols.; Paris: ERC, 1985–1987), 3:156–158.
 51. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata*, 3:207–208.
 52. The most recent edition of the corpus, including an overview of the discovery of the tablets and research into them, is Anson F. Rainey, *The El-Amarna Correspondence: A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets* (ed. William Schniedewind and Zipora Cochavi-Rainey; HdO 110; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2015). Important editions and studies of the corpus include C. Bezold and E.A.W. Budge, *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum* (London: Longmans, 1892); Samuel A.B. Mercer, *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1939); J.A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, Erster Teil: Die Texte* (Aalen: Otto Zeller Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964); William L. Moran, *The Amarna Letters* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).
 53. See, for example, Carl Niebuhr and Jane Hutchison, *The Tell El Amarna Period: The Relations of Egypt and Western Asia in the Fifteenth Century B.C. According to the Tell El Amarna Tablets* (London: David Nutt, 1901); Albrecht Alt, “The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine,” in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 133–169; Halpern, *Emergence of Israel in Canaan*, 65–85; Nadav Na’aman, “The Canaanite City-States in the Late Bronze Age and the Inheritances of the Israelite Tribes,” *Tarbiz* 55 (1986): 463–488 (in Hebrew); Donald B. Redford, *Egypt, Canaan and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 141, 192–213; Wayne Pitard, “Before Israel: Syria-Palestine in the Bronze Age,” in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (ed. Michael D. Coogan; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 25–57. On the relationship of archaeological and textual evidence for the political landscape of the region in the Late Bronze Age, see Stephen H. Savage and Steven E. Falconer, “Spatial and Statistical Inference of Late Bronze Age Polities in the Southern Levant,” *BASOR* 330 (2003): 31–45; Stephen H. Savage and Steven E. Falconer, “The Bronze Age Political Landscape of the Southern Levant,” in *Politics and Power: Archaeological Perspectives on the Landscapes of Early States* (ed. Steven E. Falconer and Charles E. Redman; Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009), 125–150.

54. Benz, “Varieties of Sociopolitical Experience,” Chapter 2; Brendon C. Benz, “In Search of Israel’s Insider Status: A Reevaluation of Israel’s Origins,” in *Israel’s Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience* (ed. Thomas E. Levy, Thomas Schneider, and William H.C. Propp; Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2015), 457–466, esp. 459–463. Benz writes, “While the political will of cities and centralized lands was often identified with and articulated by their individual leaders in the Amarna letters, there are instances in which the citizens and/or representative decision-making bodies of a city or a centralized land took collective political action” (“In Search,” 459). He also cites Mogens Herman Hansen, who observes that in several settings “the word for city . . . came to denote the political community” (“Introduction: The Concepts of City-State and City-State Culture,” in *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures* [ed. Mogens Herman Hansen; Copenhagen: Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 2000], 16).
55. Translation from Rainey, *El-Amarna Correspondence*, 1:549. For a discussion of this text, see Benz, “In Search,” 460.
56. Translation from Rainey, *El-Amarna Correspondence*, 1:413. For a discussion of this text, see Benz, “In Search,” 460.
57. Benz, “In Search,” 460. Note also the treatment of these texts in Pinhas Artzi, “‘Vox Populi’ in the El-Amarna Tablets,” *RA* 58 (1964): 159–166; Ammon Altman, “The Revolutions in Byblos and Amurru during the Amarna Period and Their Social Background,” in *Bar-Ilan Studies in History* (ed. Pinhas Artzi; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1978), 3–24.
58. Benz, “In Search,” 460.
59. For text and translation, see A. Kirk Grayson and Jamie R. Novotny, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sennacherib, King of Assyria (704–681 BC): Part 1* (RINAP 3/1; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012), no. 4.
60. Translation from Grayson and Novotny in RINAP 3.
61. Volkmar Fritz, *The City in Ancient Israel* (Biblical Seminar 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 177. On the architectural form of Levantine city gates and their defensive function, see Zeev Herzog, *Das Stadttor in Israels und in den Nachbarländern* (Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern, 1986). The cultic function of city gates, especially at Dan and Bethsaida, is discussed in Tina Haettner Blomquist, *Gates and Gods: Cults in the City Gates of Iron Age Palestine; An Investigation of the Archaeological and Biblical Sources* (ConBOT 46; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1999). On cultic activity at the Bethsaida gate, see also Monika Bernett and Othmar Keel, *Mond, Stier und Kult am Stadttor: Die Stele von Betsaida (et-Tell)* (OBO 161; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).
62. Zeev Herzog, “Settlement and Fortification Planning in the Iron Age,” in *The Architecture of Ancient Israel: From the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods* (ed. Aharon Kempinski and Ronny Reich; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 271. See also Herzog, *Stadttor*.

63. Herzog, “Settlement and Fortification,” 267.
64. So Herzog, “Settlement and Fortification,” 271.
65. Summarized in Routledge, *Moab in the Iron Age*, 175. See G.L. Mattingly, J.I. Lawlor, J.D. Wineland, J.H. Pace, A.M. Bogaard, and M.P. Charles, “‘Al-Karak Resources Project 1997: Excavations at Khirbat al-Mudaybi’,” *ADAJ* 43 (1999): 127–144; Robert Chadwick, P.M. Michèle Daviau, and Margreet Steiner, “Four Seasons of Excavations at Khirbat al-Mudayna on Wadi ath-Thamad, 1996–1999,” *ADAJ* 44 (2000): 257–270; Robert Chadwick, “Iron Age Gate Architecture in Jordan and Syria,” *Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Mesopotamian Studies* 36 (2001): 125–134; Robert Chadwick, “Changing Forms of Gate Architecture in Bronze and Iron Age Transjordan,” in *Studies in Iron Age Moab and Neighbouring Areas in Honour of Michèle Daviau* (ed. Piotr Bienkowski; Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series 29; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 183–214.
66. Emilio Olàvarri, “Sondeo Arqueologico en Khirbet Medeineh junto a Smakieh (Jordania),” *ADAJ* 22 (1977–1978): 136–149; Emilio Olàvarri, “La Campagne de Fouilles 1982 à Khirbet Medeinet al-Mu’arradjeh près de Smakieh (Kerak),” *ADAJ* 27 (1983): 165–178. See also Benjamin W. Porter, *Complex Communities: The Archaeology of Early Iron Age West-Central Jordan* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013), 79–82.
67. Routledge, *Moab in the Iron Age*, 133–153.
68. A comprehensive treatment of the inscription from a variety of scholarly perspectives is found in J. Andrew Dearman, ed., *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
69. Routledge, *Moab in the Iron Age*, 146–147
70. Routledge writes, “the [Mesha Inscription] incorporates two seemingly competing representations of Moabite political society: Moab as a hierarchically segmented system of territories ruled by Mesha, in which Dibon is one of several major subdivisions; and Dibon as Mesha’s expanding power base, one that comes eventually to incorporate all of Moab by conquest” (*Moab in the Iron Age*, 147).
71. Routledge argues, “‘the land of Moab’ was well established as a collective identity available to the inhabitants of Moab during the ninth century. . . . the novelty of the [Mesha Inscription] lies in Mesha’s apparently successful mobilization of this identity as the organizing principle for a territorial polity” (*Moab in the Iron Age*, 150).
72. David Ussishkin, “The Erection of Royal Monuments in City-Gates,” in *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç* (ed. Kutlu Emre et al.; Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989), 485–496.
73. Alberto Davico and Serena M. Cecchini, “Il Settore A,” in *Missione archeologica italiana in Siria: II Rapporto preliminare della campagna 1965 (Tell Mardikh)* (ed. G. Castellino; Rome: Istituto di studi del Vicino oriente, Università, 1966),

- 19–30, esp. 21; Paolo Matthiae, “Le Sculture in Pietra,” in *Missione archeologica italiana in Siria: II Rapporto preliminare della campagna 1965 (Tell Mardikh)* (ed. G. Castellino; Rome: Istituto di studi del Vicino oriente, Università, 1966), 103–142, esp. 104–113; Paolo Matthiae, *Ebla: An Empire Rediscovered* (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 135.
74. Machteld J. Mellink, “Archaeology in Asia Minor,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 69 (1965): 136; Hâmit Zübeyr Koşay and Mahmut Akok, *Alaca Höyük Excavations: Preliminary Report on Research and Discoveries, 1963–1967* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından, 1973), 19.
75. Unpublished material cited in Ussishkin, “Erection of Royal Monuments,” 486.
76. C. Leonard Woolley, *Carchemish, Part II: The Town Defences* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1921), 92–93.
77. Louis Delaporte, *Malatya, Arslantepe: 1, La Porte des lions* (Paris: Boccard, 1940), 35–38; Benno Landsberger, *Sam'al: Studien zur Entdeckung der Ruinenstaette Karatepe* (Ankara: Turkischen Historischen Gesellschaft, 1948), 76–79; Hans G. Güterbock, “When Was the Late Hittite Palace at Sakçagözü Built?” *BASOR* 162 (1961): 49–50.
78. Ussishkin cites private conversations with J.D. Hawkins and Israel Finkelstein about the location of the statue and the possible inaccuracies of the excavation reports (“Erection of Royal Monuments,” 488). See also Ignace J. Gelb, *Hittite Hieroglyphic Monuments* (Oriental Institute Publications 45; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1939), 39.
79. Carl Humann and Robert Koldewey, *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli II: Ausgrabungsbericht und Architektur* (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1898), 11–43.
80. On the Assyrian-style stele, see D.G. Hogarth, “Carcamesh and Its Neighbourhood,” *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 2 (1909): 179; François Thureau-Dangin, *Tell Ahmar* (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1929), 189; François Thureau-Dangin and Maurice Dunand, *Til-Barsib* (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1936), 155–156. On the stele of Esarhaddon, see Thureau-Dangin, *Tell Ahmar*, 189–190; Thureau-Dangin and Dunand, *Til-Barsib*, 151–155.
81. John W. Crowfoot, Kathleen M. Kenyon, and Eleazar L. Sukenik, *Samaria-Sebaste I: The Buildings at Samaria* (London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1942), 15; John W. Crowfoot, Grace Mary Crowfoot, and Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Samaria-Sebaste III: The Objects from Samaria* (London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1957), 35.
82. Clarence S. Fisher, *The Excavation of Armageddon* (Oriental Institute Communications 4; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), 58–61; P.L.O. Guy, *New Light from Armageddon: Second Provisional Report (1927–29) on the Excavations at Megiddo in Palestine* (Oriental Institute Communications 9; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), 44.
83. See K. Lawson Younger, Jr., “The Phoenician Inscription of Azitawada: An Integrated Reading,” *JSS* 43 (1998): 11–47.

84. On the use of *weqatal* verbs throughout the text, see the evidence of 4QSam^a and LXX^L nicely presented in P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 354–355. Cognizant of the habitual action implied here, Wilhelm Caspari notes, “15.1–6 gives a brief introduction that is not yet story but background, not action but iteration” (“The Literary Type and Historical Value of 2 Samuel 15–20,” in *Narrative and Novella in Samuel: Studies by Hugo Gressman and Other Scholars 1906–1923* [trans. David E. Orton; ed. David M. Gunn; JSOTSup 116; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991], 73).
85. MT reads “forty,” which hardly makes sense in the larger chronology. Most modern commentators therefore read “four,” with LXX^L. See Robert P. Gordon, *1 & 2 Samuel: A Commentary* (Exeter, England: Paternoster Press, 1986), 271; Anthony S. Campbell, *2 Samuel* (FOTL 8; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 141; Richard G. Smith, *The Fate of Justice and Righteousness during David’s Reign: Rereading the Court History and Its Ethics According to 2 Samuel 8:15b–20:26* (LHB/OTS 508; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 181 n.98.
86. These ancient versions align as follows: 4QSam^a על יד הדרך; MT, Tg., and LXX על יד דרך השער; Lat. and OL על דרך השער; Peshitta על יד שער המלך. See Eugene Charles Ulrich, Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 139; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 354.
87. See P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1979), 114.
88. Baruch Halpern, “Eli’s Death and the Israelite Gate: A Philological-Architectural Correlation,” *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 52*–63*; Baruch Halpern, *David’s Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001), 42. Compare *bap.īgr*, literally “the nose of the gate,” in KTU 1.17 v 6 cited above.
89. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg mistakenly locates the scene at the palace, leading to a misreading of the political situation implied by the narrative (*I and II Samuel: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964], 336).
90. Robert Gordon notes in this regard Jer 21:12, “Execute justice in the morning!” (*I & II Samuel*, 270).
91. Much of biblical tradition imagines collective and monarchic structures of judicial administration operating within a single system. Exceptional in this regard are Exod 18:13–26 and Ezra 7:12–26, which imagine judicial authority operating exclusively from the top down. On the relationship between Exod 18:13–26 and Ezra 7:12–26, see Stephen C. Russell, “The Structure of Judicial Administration in the Moses Story,” in *Israel’s Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience* (ed. Thomas E. Levy, Thomas Schneider, and William H.C. Propp; Cham, Switzerland: Springer International, 2015), 317–329.
92. Henry Preserved Smith misses the rhetorical effect here (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899], 340).

93. Albrecht Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (3 vols.; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1953–1959), 56 in volume 2; J. Alberto Soggin, *Das Königtum in Israel: Ursprünge, Spannungen, Entwicklung* (BZAW 104; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967), 75; Smith, *Fate of Justice*, 181. A similar assumption is evidently made in R. Norman Whybray, *The Succession Narrative: A Study of II Samuel 9–20; I Kings 1 and 2* (SBT 2.9; London: SCM Press, 1968), 17; Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel*, 336.
94. So Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 122. Mettinger cites as holding the same view Martin Noth, *The History of Israel* (2d ed.; London: A. & C. Black, 1960), 201; Geoffrey Evans, “Reheboam’s Advisers at Shechem and Political Institutions in Israel and Sumer,” *JNES* 25 (1966): 274; John Bright, *A History of Israel* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 204; Hayim Tadmor, “‘The People’ and the Kingship in Ancient Israel: The Role of Political Institutions in the Biblical Period,” *Cahiers d’histoire mondiale* 11 (1968): 51.
95. Baruch Halpern observes, “David has just given hearings to two petitioners—Nathan, and Joab’s Wise Woman of Tekoa—whose cases cloaked their real purposes” (*David’s Secret Demons*, 363).
96. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 356; Joel Baden, *The Historical David: The Real Life of an Invented Hero* (New York: HarperOne, 2014), 199.
97. Compare the use of the verbal root *טפח with the preposition כ in 1 Sam 8:2; 2 Chr 19:5. Compare F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp, “The Syntagma of *bat* Followed by a Geographical Name in the Hebrew Bible: Reconsideration of Its Meaning and Grammar,” *CBQ* 57 (1995): 451–470. Absalom’s subtlety here is noted by Cohen, “Rebellions,” 107. Cf. Arnold A. Anderson, *2 Samuel* (WBC 11; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 195; Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel*, 397. On the responsibility of ancient Near Eastern monarchs to render justice, see Smith, *Fate of Justice*, 182.
98. Baden writes, “For all the praise that the biblical authors and subsequent tradition lavish on David, the main accomplishment that the Bible attributes to him as king is the conquest of foreign nations in 2 Samuel 8. . . . But if expanding Israel’s territory was worthwhile from a royal perspective, from the standpoint of the people David it was not so admirable. . . . What Absalom promised was a return to the good old days—to the way things had been before David changed everything. This is the symbolic import of Absalom’s promise to restore justice at the city gates. His revolt was a populist movement, and David was anything but a populist. Absalom also may have represented for the Israelite people a chance to have a king of their own choosing again. Even though he was a son of David, he could be *their* son of David, a king acclaimed by the people, as Saul had been, and as David had not” (*Historical David*, 201). On the motif of obeisance, see Lydie Kucová, “Obeisance in the Biblical Stories of David,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and Brian Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 241–260.

99. On the use of the singular, “heart,” cf. Num 32:7, 9.
100. On ambiguity in the David Story, see Robert Alter, *Ancient Israel: The Former Prophets, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; A Translation with Commentary* (New York: Norton, 2013), 230–233.
101. Charles Conroy, *Absalom, Absalom! Narrative and Language in 2 Sam 13–20* (AnBib 81; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 105 n.35; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 356; Campbell, *2 Samuel*, 245; Smith, *Fate of Justice*, 181.
102. In commenting on David’s eventual victory over Absalom, Baden writes, “Absalom’s rebellion revealed much about David’s power in Israel. In victory, David had proved, once again, that he had the military prowess to maintain his authority. Even against the tribal armies of all Israel, David and his personal, professional militia were dominant. The basis of his rule remained the same as it had been when he first took power: David still ruled as conqueror. At the same time, the fact of a popular uprising demonstrated that despite anything he had accomplished during his years on the throne, David remained deeply disliked” (*Historical David*, 219). Thomas Schneider has argued that the name David itself reflects the military prowess of the king (“The Philistine Language and the Name ‘David,’” *UF* 43 [2011]: 569–580).
103. Halpern, *David’s Secret Demons*, 39. On the incident with Uriah, see Jacob L. Wright, *David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 80–97.

CHAPTER 5

1. The directional *heh* on הַעִירָה is ambiguous: Hezekiah may have brought water to or into the city. On directional *heh* in Biblical Hebrew see Bruce K. Waltke and Michael P. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §10.5. A pool and conduit are also mentioned in the Hezekiah narratives in 2 Kgs 18:17//Isa 36:2, where the Assyrian delegation arrives at Jerusalem: “They went up and arrived and stood by the conduit of the upper pool that is beside the highway of the fuller’s field,” וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיַּעֲמְדוּ בַתְּעֵלַת הַבְּרֶכָה הָעֲלִיּוֹנָה אֲשֶׁר בְּמִסְלַת שְׂדֵה כֹּבֵס. Compare also Isa 7:3, where Yahweh commands the prophet Isaiah and his son to meet King Ahaz “at the end of the conduit of the upper pool on the highway of the fuller’s field,” אֶל-קֵצֵה תְּעֵלַת הַבְּרֶכָה הָעֲלִיּוֹנָה אֶל-מִסְלַת שְׂדֵה כֹּבֵס. Isa 22:9 mentions the “waters of the lower pool,” מִי הַבְּרֶכָה הַתַּחְתּוֹנָה.
2. On מוֹצֵי מַיִם, compare 2 Kgs 2:21; Isa 41:18; 58:11; Ps 107:33, 35.
3. Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions: A Journal of Travels in the Years 1838 & 1852* (2d ed.; 3 vols.; London: J. Murray, 1856), 1:337–343.
4. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 334.

5. Wilhelm Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (4 vols.; Leipzig: Vogel, 1820–1829), 2:932–936. For a list of scholars who have followed Gesenius' view in this regard, see Robb Andrew Young, *Hezekiah in History and Tradition* (VTSup 15; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 123 n.1. Gesenius also argued that the text of Kings is superior to that of Isaiah. Klaas A.D. Smelik points out, however, that such text-critical observations are not relevant to the question of the original provenance of the Hezekiah narratives. See Klaas A.D. Smelik, "King Hezekiah Advocates True Prophecy: Remarks on Isaiah xxxvi and xxxvii // II Kings xviii and xix" in *Converting the Past: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Moabite Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 97.
6. See especially Smelik, "King Hezekiah Advocates," 93–128. For a list of other proponents of this view, see Young, *Hezekiah*, 124 n.2. Edgar W. Conrad argues, against the traditional view that Isa 36–39 closed an originally independent document, that the Hezekiah narrative "has a transitional function in the book. It points back to the Ahaz narrative and forward to a yet-undetermined narrative of deliverance from Babylonian captivity" (*Reading Isaiah* [OBT 27; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991], 50–51.)
7. Smelik observes that not even Jeremiah appears in 2 Kgs 25:22–26 although that passage appears to be a summary of Jer 40–43 ("King Hezekiah Advocates," 98).
8. Young, *Hezekiah*, 127.
9. Young, *Hezekiah*, 149.
10. Young, *Hezekiah*, 123–136. Young groups (2) and (3) together.
11. Note the consistent short spelling of Hezekiah's name in 2 Kgs 18:14–16. Outside of these verses, the short spelling is used in Kings only in 2 Kgs 18:1, 10, 13, all in editorial notices.
12. Young notes that some scholars have pointed to a supposed analogy in which Jer 52 and 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30 are almost verbatim (*Hezekiah*, 126). See Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39: A Continental Commentary* (trans. Thomas H. Trapp; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 360–361; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 459. Jer 51:64 contains an editorial note closing the prophecies of Jeremiah and these scholars offer Jer 52 as proof that a narrative account from Kings could be appended to a prophetic book to serve as evidence of the fulfillment of the words of the prophet. In this view, a narrative account in 2 Kgs 18:17–37 was likewise appended to the prophecies of Isaiah. Young notes, however, "the analogy does not hold up very well: the book of Isaiah lacks a clear break which would signal that the preceding collections had all but crystalized, nor does the transition into the narrative bring the prophet's message to an end. Most telling is the fact that nothing in Isa 36–39 is expressly foretold in the prophecies of Isaiah ben Amoz, hence the literary function of these chapters is altogether different from that of the closing chapter of Jeremiah" (*Hezekiah*, 126–127).
13. *בַּת צִיּוֹן* is found in Isa 1:8; 3:16, 17; 10:32 (*qere*); 16:1; 52:2; 62:11 but is unattested in Kings outside of this pericope; the root *חָרַר* is used in Isa 4:1; 25:8; 30:5; 47:3;

- 54:4; 65:7, but is unattested in Kings outside of this pericope, except as part of a personal name in 1 Kgs 4:3. קול הרים is used in Isa 13:2; 58:1, 4, but is unattested in Kings outside of this pericope. קדוש ישראל is found in Isa 1:4; 5:19, 24; 10:20; 12:6; 17:7; 29:19; 30:11, 12, 15; 31:1; 41:14, 16, 20, but is unattested in Kings outside of this pericope. יארי מצור is found in Isa 7:18; 19:6, but is not found in Kings outside of this pericope—elsewhere in the biblical corpus this phrase is found only in Amos 8:8; 9:5. הר ציון is found in Isa 4:5; 8:18; 10:12; 18:7; 24:23; 29:8; 31:4, but is unattested in Kings outside of this pericope.
14. A closely related sense of the root is found in 2 Kgs 25:11–12, 22, though to my mind these are still essentially different from the technical, prophetic use of the root. The root occurs without a technical, prophetic meaning in 1 Kgs 15:29; 16:11; 19:18; 22:47; 2 Kgs 3:25; 7:13; 10:11, 14, 17, 21; 13:7; 17:8. The root thus occurs several times in Kings, but almost never with technical, prophetic force.
 15. On the prophetic notion of the remnant in Isaiah, see E.W. Heaton, “The Root שאר and the Doctrine of the Remnant,” *JTS* 3 (1952): 27–39; Ursula Stegemann, “Der Restgedanke bei Isaias,” *BZ* 13 (1969): 161–186; Werner E. Müller, *Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); Jutta Hausmann, *Israels Rest: Studien zum Selbstverständnis der nachexilischen Gemeinde* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1987). On the use of the root supporting the thesis that this narrative had its original provenance in Isaiah, see Young, *Hezekiah*, 132.
 16. See Young, *Hezekiah*, 133 n.27. Young cites also Isa 15:9, but to my mind the root is not used there in its technical prophetic meaning.
 17. Note especially the wording יהיה צבאות תעשה זאת in 2 Kgs 19:31//Isa 37:32 and Isa 9:6.
 18. Smelik, “King Hezekiah Advocates,” 98, 110–111. Several scholars have observed connections between the Rabshakeh’s speech and Assyrian diplomatic language. See Chaim Cohen, “Neo-Assyrian Elements in the First Speech of the Biblical Rab-Šākê,” *IOS* 9 (1979): 32–48; William R. Gallagher, *Sennacherib’s Campaign to Judah: New Studies* (SHCANE 18; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 169–216; Peter Machinist, “The Rab Saqeh at the Wall of Jerusalem: Israelite Identity in the Face of the Assyrian ‘Other,’” *HS* 41 (2000): 151–168. In my view, however, Ehud Ben Zvi and Dominic Rudman are correct to point out the stronger connections to biblical prophetic language in the speech. See Ehud Ben Zvi, “Who Wrote the Speech of Rabshakeh and When?” *JBL* 109 (1990): 79–92; Dominic Rudman, “Is the Rabshakeh Also among the Prophets? A Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings XVIII 17–35,” *VT* 50 (2000): 100–110. Compare also Paul S. Evans, *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-Critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18–19* (VTSup 125; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 12. Yigal Levin argues that the speech reflects the perspective of an Israelite, whose country had been destroyed, warning Judah of a similar fate (“How Did Rabshakeh Know the Language of Judah?” in *Marbeh Hokmah: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East in Loving Memory*

- of Victor Avigdor Hurowitz [ed. Shamir Yonah; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2015], 323–337). On the rhetoric of intimidation, see Theodore J. Lewis, “‘You Have Heard What the Kings of Assyria Have Done’: Disarmament Passages vis-à-vis Assyrian Rhetoric of Intimidation,” in *Isaiah’s Vision of Peace in Biblical and Modern International Relations: Swords into Plowshares* (ed. Raymond Cohen and Raymond Westbrook; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 75–100.
19. See Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 460. Ben Zvi observes, “According to Rabshakeh’s speech, there is no mutual exclusion between reliance on Egypt and reliance on YHWH. The speech presupposes that Hezekiah relied on Egyptian support (להנהגה בטהת לך על); nevertheless, it assumes that Hezekiah also relied on YHWH (vv. 22, 30). Yet, according to Isa 31:1, 3 and Isa 30:1–5, the treaty with Egypt preempts divine assistance. Consequently, we may conclude that Isa 31:1, 3; 30:1–5 and Rabshakeh’s speech do not represent the same line of tradition or authorship” (“Who Wrote the Speech of Rabshakeh,” 84). On the Rabshakeh’s speech and Isaianic themes, see also Young, *Hezekiah*, 129–131. I am not arguing here that Isa 36–37 and Isa 30:1–17; 31:1–9 share the same author. Rather, I am noting that the themes of 2 Kgs 18:13, 17–2 Kgs 19:37//Isa 36–37 are more typical of prophetic tradition, especially Isaiah, than of Kings.
 20. Ben Zvi notes, “It is noteworthy that, according to Neo-Assyrian texts, different gods may call the king of Assyria to action (e.g., Sargon claimed that Marduk called him to come up against Marduk-Applu-Iddina, i.e., Merodach Baladan, the king of Babylon at that time). However, all these gods are Mesopotamian gods. Mesopotamian gods were also Assyrian gods. After all, the Assyrians were not monotheist. Assur was the principal god but not the only one. Significantly, we do not find clearly non-Mesopotamian gods, like Egyptian gods, like the Urartian Haldia, like YHWH, calling the Assyrian king” (“Who Wrote the Speech of Rabshakeh,” 85 n.21).
 21. The parallels are summarized by Conrad, who draws especially on Ackroyd’s work. The narratives open with an enemy army posing a threat to Jerusalem (Isa 7:1; 36:2), and in particular the threat is described in relation to the “conduit of the upper pool on the highway of the Fuller’s Field” (Isa 7:3; 36:2). The invading army causes distress for the king (Isa 7:1; 37:2). Isaiah brings a message of comfort to the king (Isa 7:4–9; 37:6–7). The king receives a sign (Isa 7:10–16; 37:30–32; 38:7, 22). Despite deliverance, the threat of future destruction remains (7:15–17; 20; 39:6–7). See Peter R. Ackroyd, “Isaiah 36–39: Structure and Function,” in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P.* (ed. Wilhelmus C. Delsman; AOAT 211; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 3–21; Peter R. Ackroyd, “The Biblical Interpretation of the Reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah,” in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G.W. Ahlström* (ed. W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer; JSOTSup 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 247–259; Rolf Rendtorff, “Zur Komposition des Buches Jesaja,” *VT* 34 (1984): 295–320; Conrad, *Reading Isaiah*,

- 38–40; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, 291, 459; Smelik, “King Hezekiah Advocates,” 98, 100; Paul M. Cook, *A Sign and a Wonder: The Redactional Formation of Isaiah 18–20* (VTSup 147; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 130; Young, *Hezekiah*, 128. Isa 7 appears also to be inserted into its context. See H.G.M. Williamson, *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 73–112.
22. Young, *Hezekiah*, 131–132. On the divine image or images in Judg 17–18, and associated discussion of the editorial history of these chapters, see Yaira Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* (BibInt 38; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 325–326; E. Aydeet Mueller, *The Micah Story: A Morality Tale in the Book of Judges* (Studies in Biblical Literature 34; New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 58–59; Victor H. Matthews, *Judges and Ruth* (New Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 169–172.
 23. See 1 Kgs 3:1; 6:37; 7:12, 40, 45, 48, 51; 8:10, 11, 63, 64; 9:1, 10, 15; 10:5, 12, 27; 14:26, 28; 15:15, 18; 2 Kgs 11:3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 15, 18, 19; 12:5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19; 14:14; 15:35; 16:8, 14, 18; 21:4, 5; 22:3, 4, 5, 8, 9; 23:2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 24; 24:13; 25:9, 13, 16.
 24. Although Isaiah’s judgment (2 Kgs 20:1) and Hezekiah’s prayer (2 Kgs 20:3) concern only the king and his illness, Isaiah’s message of mercy (2 Kgs 20:6) mentions Assyria and Jerusalem (“this city”). The story likely originated as an independent account focusing on Hezekiah and Isaiah. It has now been stitched into its current context by the notion of the sign (cf. “this is the sign for you” in 2 Kgs 19:29 and 2 Kgs 20:9) and by reference to the attack on Jerusalem (2 Kgs 20:6). Young argues that 2 Kgs 20//Isa 38–39 had its original provenance as part of the book of Kings (*Hezekiah*, 133–136).
 25. The account in Kings has been updated in several ways. The motif of fulfillment on the third day has been added (2 Kgs 20:5, 8). The scheme of repentance followed by forgiveness has been made tighter—compare 2 Kgs 20:4 with Isa 28:4 and 2 Kgs 20:8 with Isa 28:22. Hezekiah has been given a choice of sign—compare 2 Kgs 20:9–10 with Isa 28:7–8. A reference to “my servant David” has been added in 2 Kgs 20:7. These comparisons give some sense of how the current text of Kings has been updated, but they have little bearing on the question of the original provenance of the shorter, older version of the story.
 26. Verse 13, according to which Hezekiah showed the envoy all the treasure in his realm, conflicts with 2 Kgs 18:14–16, according to which Hezekiah had already given Sennacherib all the silver in the temple and palace. As noted above, 2 Kgs 18:14–16 has no parallel in Isaiah and seems to be a late editorial insertion.
 27. Young notes, “The oracle of Isaiah in 2 Kgs 20:17–18 is pivotal to the overall prophecy-fulfillment scheme of that work as a whole: the proclamation in verse 17, ‘All that is in your house, and all that your fathers have laid up in store to this day will be carried to Babylon’ is brought to fruition in 2 Kgs 24:13; 25:13–17, while the promise that ‘Your sons . . . will be taken away and will become

- officials in the palace of the king of Babylon' in verse 18 foreshadows the fates of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah which close the book" (*Hezekiah*, 135). More broadly, the notion that one's children could be punished for one's sins is reminiscent of Deut 5:9 but is also implied by the prophetic logic of Isa 43:27 and Isa 65:7–8.
28. Bernhard Stade, "Miscellen. 16. Anmerkungen zu 2 Kō. 15–21. Zu 18,13–19,37," *ZAW* 6 (1886): 172–186.
 29. See Benjamin D. Thomas, *Hezekiah and the Compositional History of the Book of Kings* (FAT 2.63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 353.
 30. Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (SBT 2.3; London: SCM Press, 1967), 69–103; Francolino J. Gonçalves, *L'expédition de Sennachérib en Palestine dans la littérature hébraïque ancienne* (EBib 7; Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1986), 373–444; Thomas, *Hezekiah*, 353–374.
 31. For a thorough critique of the division of 2 Kgs 18:17–19:37 into two, see Gallagher, *Sennacherib's Campaign*, 149–159.
 32. For a comparison of the account in Chronicles to that in Kings//Isaiah, see Isaac Kalimi, "Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah: The Chronicler's View Compared with His 'Biblical' Sources," in *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography* (ed. Isaac Kalimi and Seth Richardson; CHANE 71; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 16, 49–50. See also Hans Jürgen Tertel, *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives* (BZAW 221; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 156–171; Amber Warhurst, "Merging and Diverging: The Chronicler's Integration of Material from Kings, Isaiah, and Jeremiah in the Narratives of Hezekiah and the Fall of Judah" (Ph.D. diss., University of St. Andrews, 2011).
 33. See Steven L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 159–160, 167–168; Kalimi, "Sennacherib's Campaign," 33–35.
 34. Compare related observations in Kalimi, "Sennacherib's Campaign," 21.
 35. Chronicles makes no mention of the tribute paid by Hezekiah to Sennacherib in 2 Kgs 18:14–16. McKenzie and Kalimi both regard the Chronicler as deliberately omitting this detail when he rewrote his source material. See McKenzie, *Chronicler's Use*, 159; Kalimi, "Sennacherib's Campaign," 33. However, as I noted above, 2 Kgs 18:14–16 has no parallel in Isaiah and thus represents a late insertion into Kings. As such, the Chronicler may have worked with a source text that did not include the mention of tribute in 2 Kgs 18:14–16.
 36. This syntactical construction—third person independent pronoun followed by a personal name followed by a verb—is found in the Hebrew Bible only in Ezra 7:6; 2 Chr 32:12, 30; 33:23. To judge by a comparison of 2 Chr 32:12, *הוא יחזקיהו*, *הוא* *הסיר*, to its *Vorlage* in 2 Kgs 18:22, *הוא אשר הסיר חזקיהו*, the syntax should be understood as including an unmarked relative clause. I therefore translate the opening of 2 Chr 32:30 as "Now it was this Hezekiah who stopped. . . ." Compare

- Gen 36:24, הוּא עֲנָה אֲשֶׁר מָצָא, “It was this Anah who found. . . .” On unmarked relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew, see Joüon-Muraoka §146e.
37. Compare related vocabulary in 1 Chr 29:12, 28; 2 Chr 1:11–12; 3:6; 9:1, 9–10, 22, 24, as noted by Ralph W. Klein, *2 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 468. On archaeological evidence for economic prosperity during the reign of Hezekiah, see Jacob M. Myers, *II Chronicles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 13; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), 193; Andrew G. Vaughn, *Theology, History, and Archaeology in the Chronicler’s Account of Hezekiah* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 19–174. Vaughn summarizes, “archaeological data reveal that Hezekiah undertook a general program of economic buildup, and that the economic buildup and infrastructure of Hezekiah’s reign rivaled that of Josiah. A thorough reinvestigation of the *lmk* jars further reveals that Hezekiah established storehouses throughout the kingdom of Judah as part of this economic buildup. Thus, these historical data substantiate the description of Hezekiah found in 2 Chr 32:27–30” (*Chronicler’s Account of Hezekiah*, 172). With regard to the claim made in v. 30 proper, that Hezekiah reshaped Jerusalem’s water supply system, Vaughn concedes that archaeological data neither substantiate nor repudiate the claim (*Chronicler’s Account of Hezekiah*, 173–174).
38. McKenzie notes, “Verses 27–30 tell of Hezekiah’s prosperity and probably derive from sources outside of K[ings]. The only exception may be the statement in v. 30 that Hezekiah prospered in all his works, which could be an addition by Chr” (*Chronicler’s Use*, 162).
39. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible the root is used to describe actions against an enemy: Gen 26:15, 18; 2 Kgs 3:19, 25.
40. Or perhaps, “the source of the waters of the Upper Gihon.” Ordinarily, however, an adjective cannot modify a name directly. See Waltke and O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §14.2e.
41. In stating the importance of this literary motif I am not endorsing the entirety of Karl Wittfogel’s thesis of a “hydraulic society,” according to which water control was a means of population control in many ancient settings (*Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957). To be sure, Wittfogel’s thesis has its merits. Stanley D. Walters points out that Mesopotamia’s complex irrigation systems required an administrative structure for their maintenance and management and he traces this structure in the Lu-igisa archive—which on internal evidence seems to have come from Old Babylonian Larsa—including references to Nur-Sin, head of what Walters calls “the irrigation bureau,” Išr-kubi, a canal inspector, and Lu-igisa himself, whose role remains unclear. See Stanley D. Walters, *Water for Larsa: An Old Babylonian Archive Dealing with Irrigation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970). Walters notes, “very many of Wittfogel’s rubrics can be clearly illustrated from the Lu-igisa archive, and are in turn highly fruitful in generating interpretative ideas

for the Old Babylonian period. Characteristics of a ‘hydraulic society’ include: a wide-spread network of irrigation canals, the massive deployment of workers, a large-scale managerial bureaucracy, restrictions on private property, and a centralized despotic authority. Larsa under Sumuel seems to qualify as a ‘compact irrigation society’ (*Water for Larsa*, 165). A more recent attempt to connect demography and technology in the history of Mesopotamian canals is found in Mario Liverani, *The Ancient Near East: History, Society and Economy* (trans. Soraia Tabatabai; London: Routledge, 2014), 65–68. On the shaping of waterways by Mesopotamian kings, see Ömür Harmanşah, *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 11, 25, 26, 29, 32, 73, 87, 91, 116–117, 191.

42. Douglas J. Green surveys the depiction of royal domestic achievement in West Semitic inscriptions and compares it to Assyrian royal ideology. He extends the work of Italian scholars who note a binary opposition between order and disorder in the depiction of Assyrian royal military accomplishments. Green argues that a similar opposition exists in two primary images related to domestic achievement: the king as gardener and the king as builder. The texts he surveys contrast the enemy’s territory, which lies ruined and barren, with the king’s land, which is full of construction and fertility. The texts portray movement from disorder to order and attribute it to the king. In treating the image of the king as gardener, Green notes instances in which the king constructs irrigation works, wells, and other water systems, thus ensuring abundance during his reign. See Douglas J. Green, “I Undertook Great Works”: *The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions* (FAT 2.41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), esp. 52–53, 57–58, 60, 82–83, 107, 129–131, 277, 308, 310–311. With regard to the construction of royal power at Urartu, Paul E. Zimansky observes, “The Testimony of Urartian display inscriptions suggests that the king’s role in the initiation of construction projects was on par with military leadership as a conspicuous royal function” (*Ecology and Empire: The Structure of the Urartian State* [SAOC 41; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1985], 60). Marc Van de Mieroop argues that founding a new city was apparently regarded as an act of hubris that invited the punishment of the gods and this act is therefore downplayed in Mesopotamian royal inscriptions (*The Ancient Mesopotamian City* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996], 59–60). But Ömür Harmanşah argues that “Among the Assyrian Empire and the Syro-Hittite polities of the Early Iron Age, founding cities was a shared building practice, a source of official discourse and cultural identity. . . . Founding royal cities therefore emerged as a political strategy of the imperial power and a stage for the spectacle of the state” (*Cities and the Shaping of Memory*, 3, 7).
43. In addition to their irrigating function, canals could also serve to delineate ownership of land, as monuments and boundary markers did. Indeed, canals often opened up new lands for cultivation, which were settled accordingly. One of

- the earliest references to canals comes from the so-called Stele of the Vultures, erected in the twenty-fifth century BCE to mark the victory of E-anatum of Lagash over the adjacent city-state of Giša (Umma). On this richly decorated limestone stele, see Irene J. Winter, “After the Battle is Over: The ‘Stele of the Vultures’ and the Beginning of Historical Narrative in the Art of the Ancient Near East,” in *Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (ed. Herbert L. Kessler and Marianna Shreve Simpson; Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts Symposium Series 4; Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1985), 11–32. A dispute arose between the two states over agricultural land lying between them. In submitting to E-anatum, the leader of Giša swore that on pain of divine punishment he would never again trespass into Lagash’s territory, “Forever and evermore, I shall not transgress the territory of the god Ningirsu! I shall not shift (the course of) its irrigation channels and canals! I shall not rip out its monuments!” (RIM E1.9.3.1 xx 16–xxi 3). The logic of the oath depends on the assumption that irrigation canals—and monuments—served to delineate territory. Canals frequently mark the borders of the administrative regions established by Ur-Nammu (RIM E3/2.1.1.1.21). Note also the “boundary canal of the god Ningirsu” (RIM E3/2.1.1.1.22 i.9”–12”). On Mesopotamian canals and their various functions, see also Thorkild Jacobsen and Seton Lloyd, *Sennacherib’s Aqueduct at Jerwan* (OIP 24; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935); Fuad Safar, “Sennacherib’s Project for Supplying Arbil with Water,” *Sumer* 2 (1946): 50–52; Walters, *Water for Larsa*, 143–166; Julian Reade, “Studies in Assyrian Geography, Part I: Sennacherib and the Waters of Nineveh,” *RA* 72 (1978): 47–72, 157–180; Ariel M. Bagg, “Irrigation in Northern Mesopotamia: Water for the Assyrian Capitals (12th–7th Centuries BC),” *Irrigation and Drainage Systems* 14 (2000): 301–324; Ariel M. Bagg, *Assyrische Wasserbauten: landwirtschaftliche Wasserbauten im Kernland Assyriens zwischen der 2. Hälfte des 2. und der 1. Hälfte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* (Baghdader Forschungen 24; Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 2000); Stephanie Dalley, “Water Management in Assyria from the Ninth to the Seventh Centuries BC,” *Aram* 13–14 (2001–2002): 443–460; Tony J. Wilkinson, *Archaeological Landscapes of the Near East* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003), 71–99; Jason Ur, “Sennacherib’s Northern Assyrian Canals: New Insights from Satellite Imagery and Aerial Photography,” *Iraq* 67 (2005): 317–345.
44. Translation from Douglas Frayne, *Old Babylonian Period (2003–1595 BC)* (RIME 4; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 159–160. For an overview of twenty-one known exemplars of this inscription, together with an edition of one of them, BLMJ 41 58, see Joan Goodnick Westenholz and Aage Westenholz, *Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum: The Old Babylonian Inscriptions* (Cuneiform Monographs 33; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 93–100.
45. Goodnick Westenholz and Westenholz note, “it is not certain whether the *íd idigna* of the text refers to the channel of the Tigris itself or to a canal or tributary of the Tigris” (*Cuneiform Inscriptions*, 94). On the identity of the water system

here, see also Piotr Steinkeller, “New Light on the Hydrology and Topography of Southern Babylonia in the Third Millennium,” *ZA* 91 (2001): 22–84. On Sin-Iddinam’s shaping of the water supply system, see Wilkinson, *Archaeological Landscapes*, 97–98; Brian Fagan, *Elixir: A History of Water and Humankind* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), 130–131.

46. The inscription also makes a direct link between domestic and foreign affairs: work on the canal is carried out in order to permanently signal Sin-Iddinam’s valor, i.e., military prowess. To my mind, the text thus demonstrates the fluidity with which scribes deployed a wide variety of traditional royal themes in connection with the motif of the king’s shaping of the water supply system. At the same time, valor here is a generic description unconnected to any specific battle or campaign. On wisdom in connection with the motif of the king’s shaping of waterways, compare RIM E4.2.14.15 25–31 (Rim-Sin I, ca. 1822–1763 BCE).
47. It may be especially in their capacity as providers that the gods are evoked in this regard—the Tigris is called here “the river of abundance of Utu.” On the gods as providers, see Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 23–74. Religious rituals associated with royal canal construction are described at length in Sennacherib’s Bavian Rock Inscription, “In order to open that canal, I sent an exorcist (and) a lamentation singer and . . . [...] Carnelian, lapis lazuli, muššāru-stone, ḫulālu-stone, pappardilū-stones, precious stones, turtles (and) tortoises whose likeness(es) are ca[st] in silver (and) gold, aromatics, (and) fine oil, I gave as gifts to the god Ea, the lord of underground waters, cisterns, and . . ., (and to) the god Enbilulu, the inspector of canals, (and) to the god En’e’imdu, the lord of [dike(s) and canal(s)]. I prayed to the great gods; they heeded my supplications and made my handiwork prosper. This (sluice) gate of the watercourse opened by itself [without (the help)] of spade or shovel and let an abundance of water flow through. Its (sluice) gate was not ope[ned] through the work of human hands. According to the heart’s desire of the gods, I made (it) gurgle with water. After I inspected the canal and made sure its construction was performed correctly, I offered pure sacrifices of fattened oxen (and) an abundance of sheep to the great gods, who march at my side (and) who make my reign secure. I clothed those men who dug out this canal with linen garments (and) garments with multi-colored trim, (and) I placed gold rings (and) gold pectorals on them” (trans. A. Kirk Grayson and Jamie Novotny in RINAP 3 223 27–34). Rituals associated with the urban water supply system are also found in a Hittite text giving instructions to commanders of border garrisons, “Whatever springs (are) in the city, sacrifices are established for (those) springs: Let them celebrate them and attend to them. They must definitely attend (also) to those springs for which there is no sacrifice. Let them not omit them. They must consistently sacrifice to the mountains and rivers for which there are rites” (KUB 13.2 iii 4–8, trans. Gregory McMahon in COS 1.84 §34’).

48. Compare the claim of Rīm-Sîn I that Enlil commissioned him to dig a canal that would bring the water of abundance to the land of Sumer and Akkad (RIM E4.2.14.15 19–22).
49. Cf. RIM E4.2.14.15 32–47, where Rīm-Sîn I, ca. 1758–1699 BCE, both emphasizes his personal involvement by using first-person verbal forms and acknowledges the assembled peoples who carried out the actual work. In year 34 of Hammurabi's reign, Nabī'um-Mālik, the *šāpir mātīm* of Larsa, strengthened the embankments on some three canals according to BM12820, published as no. 8 in Moshe Anbar and Marten Stol, "Textes de l'Époque Babylonienne Ancienne III," *RA* 85 (1991): 13–48. Sennacherib boasts of massive water projects undertaken with a mere seventy men, "(To) a later ruler, one of the kings, my descendants, who deliberates (the matter) in (his) heart but is not able to believe (it), (and) [says] 'How did he have this canal dug out wi[th] (only) these few men?': [I swear] by the god Aššur, my great god, that I dug out this canal with (only) these [men]. Moreover, I completed the work on it within one year (and) three months; [...] was completed (and) I finished digging its excavation" (trans. Grayson and Novotny in RINAP 3 223b–26). Hammurabi of Babylon instructs another Sin-Iddinam, whom he appointed over Yamutbal, to have those with fields adjacent to the Damanu canal regularly maintain the canal. See Claude H.W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters, Volume 1* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), 320–321; Marc Van de Mieroop, *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 90–91.
50. On Sin-Iddinam's reign, see Albrecht Goetze, "Sin-Iddinam of Larsa: New Tablets from His Reign," *JCS* 4 (1950): 83–118; William W. Hallo, "New Texts from the Reign of Sin-iddinam," *JCS* 21 (1967): 95–99; Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East c. 3000–300 BC* (2 vols.; London: Routledge, 1995), 1:80.
51. The motif of the king's shaping of waterways is more often deployed in connection with the abundance enjoyed by his people. Sometimes, however, it points to the unique luxury enjoyed by the crown. For example, by redirecting the waters of the river Ḫusir, Tiglath-pileser I, ca. 1114–1076 BCE, claims to have watered, "a garden for [his] lordly leisure," in the midst of which he constructed a palace (RIM A.o.87.10 71–74). Assurnasirpal II, ca. 883–859, boasts, "The canal cascades from above into the gardens. Fragrance pervades the walkways. Streams of water (as numerous) as the stars of heaven flow in the pleasure garden. Pomegranates which are bedecked with clusters like grape vines [...] in the garden [...] I,] Ashurnasirpal, in the delightful garden pick fruit like [...]" (RIM A.o.101.30 48–52, trans. Grayson). A stone relief from the North Palace of Assurbanipal, ca. 668–627 BCE, in Nineveh depicts canals watering a lush garden, most likely the pleasure gardens created by Sennacherib (ME 124939A). On Mesopotamian royal gardens, see Stephanie Dalley, *The Mystery of the Hanging Garden of Babylon: An Elusive World Wonder Traced* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

52. Excerpt from Dietz Otto Edzard's translation in *Gudea and His Dynasty* (RIME 3/1; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997). Compare the agricultural abundance described by Gudea in RIM E3/1.1.7.CylB xi 15–23. Gudea's inscriptions also testify to the use of canals for transportation—they describe him boarding his cargo boat and heading to the city of Nina, as noted by Aldo Tamburrino ("Water Technology in Ancient Mesopotamia," in *Ancient Water Technologies* [ed. Larry W. Mays; New York: Springer International, 2010], 34).
53. On this tablet now in the Louvre (N iv 3489), see Lucy P. Matthews, "The First Dynasty of Babylon: History and Texts" (Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham, 1970), 136–139; Ilmari Kärki, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften der altbabylonischen Zeit* (Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 1980–), 2:13–15. Compare RIM E4.3.6.1 where Hammurabi boasts of having built the canal Aia-hegal, "(the goddess) Aia is abundance." As noted above, the language used to describe the king's shaping of waterways draws a parallel between the king and the god in their respective roles as abundant providers.
54. The inscription is known in both Akkadian and Sumerian versions from Sippar. Excerpts here are from Frayne's translation of the Akkadian version in RIME. On this text, see Matthews, "First Dynasty of Babylon," 109–119; Kärki, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften*, 2:6–10. On shaping of waterways as evidence of Hammurabi's good governance, see Van de Mieroop, *King Hammurabi*, 82–83, 88, 90–91.
55. Excerpts from Grayson's translation in RIMA. On the shaping of the water supply system by Tukulti-Ninurta I, see Ariel M. Bagg, "Irrigation," in *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East* (ed. Daniel T. Potts; Oxford: Blackwell, 2012), 274; Harmanşah, *Cities and the Shaping of Memory*, 84–88.
56. Giorgi Melik'išvili, *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi* (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960), text 137 as cited in Adam T. Smith, "The Making of an Urartian Landscape in Southern Transcaucasia: A Study of Political Architectonics," *American Journal of Archaeology* 103 (1999): 46. Paul E. Zimansky observes that some twenty-seven Urartian inscriptions, from the reigns of four kings, mention the construction of canals (*Ecology and Empire*, 66–67). Assurnasirpal II, ca. 883–859 BCE, also makes reference to orchards in RIM A.o.101.1 iii 132–136 and RIM A.o.101.17 v 5–9 (cf. RIM A.o.101.30 36–37).
57. Translation from Hayim Tadmor and Shigeo Yamada, *The Royal Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BC) and Shalmaneser V (726–722 BC), Kings of Assyria* (RINAP 1; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 26–28. On this wall slab from Nimrud (BM 118934), see also Richard D. Barnett and Margarete Falkner, *The Sculptures of Tiglath-Pileser III (745–727 B.C.)* (London: British Museum, 1962), relief 35 and plates XCI–XCIII. The slab contains reliefs showing the siege of a town and the removal of divine images from a conquered town. The text emphasizes royal construction projects and good governance. On the evocative use of *ḥabābu*, compare RINAP 4 1 vi 34; RINAP 4 2 v 54.

58. Excerpt from the translation of Grayson and Novotny in RINAP. On Sennacherib's boast here, compare RINAP 3 2 66; RINAP 3 3 60; RINAP 3 4 87; RINAP 3 8 2'. On Sennacherib's shaping of the water supply system, see Reade, "Studies in Assyrian Geography, Part 1," 47-72; Ur, "Sennacherib's Northern Assyrian Canals," 317-345; Grayson and Novotny, *Sennacherib*, 20; Dalley, *Hanging Garden of Babylon*, 83-106.
59. Excerpt from Frayne's translation in RIME. On this cone inscription from Mari (AO 18236), see François Thureau-Dangin, "Iaḥdunlim, roi de Hana," *RA* 33 (1936): 49-54. On this important fortress-city, see Jonathan D. Safren, "The Location of Dūr-Yaḥdun-Lim," *RA* 78 (1984): 123-141; Jonathan D. Safren, "Dūr-Yaḥdun-Lim: The raison d'être of an Ancient Mesopotamian Fortress-City," *JESHO* 32 (1989): 1-47, with the canal discussed on 14-15. Safren notes that several letters of Kibri-Dagan, governor of Terqa, and Yaqqim-Addu, governor of Sagaratum, relate to the proper maintenance of Iṣim-Iaḥdun-Lim: *ARM* III 1, 4, 5, 76, 79; *ARMT* XIII 123; *ARM* XIV 12, 14, 23. Compare, in a text already cited, Tukulti-Ninurta I's claim that he built a new cult city for Assur on the opposite bank of the Tigris, "in uncultivated plains (and) meadows where there was neither house nor dwelling, where no ruin hills or rubble had accumulated, and no bricks had been laid. I called it Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta. I cut straight as a string through rocky terrain, I cleared a way through high difficult mountains with stone chisels, I cut a wide path for a stream which supports life in the land (and) which provides abundance, and I transformed the plains of my city into irrigated fields" (trans. Grayson in *RIM* A.o.78.23 94-105).
60. Excerpt from the translation of Grayson and Novotny in RINAP. On this text, Sennacherib's Bavian Rock Inscription, see also Daniel D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib* (OIP 2; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1924), 79.
61. Securing an abundant water supply might also involve damming up old water systems. Assur-uballiṭ I, ca. 1365-1330 BCE, notes that when he built Patti-ṭuḥdi, "Canal of Abundance," he filled with earth a well that had been dug and reinforced with limestone, bitumen, and baked bricks by his predecessor (*RIM* A.o.73.3 5-23). The well "was not suited to the requirements of an orchard," and the canal was evidently intended as a more appropriate water supply system. Remarkably, the inscription notes that a future king who wished to use the well could remove the earth so as to access its water. This note strikes a different tone than many royal building inscriptions that impose curses upon future generations who would undo the work of the king. The inscription thus demonstrates the extent to which ancient Mesopotamian water supply systems were regarded in pragmatic terms and were modified according to contemporaneous needs.
62. Excerpt from Frayne's translation in RIME.
63. On the rich terminology for irrigation systems in Mesopotamia, see Marten Stol, "Kanal(isation)," *RLA* 5 (1980): 355-365.

64. For analyses of the inscription from various perspectives, see the collected essays in J. Andrew Dearman, ed., *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
65. Note the use of the deictic particle in ln 3, “I built *this* high place for Kemosh in Karchoh,” which suggests that the inscription was written to be placed in the religious complex Mesha built for Kemosh. See Klaas A.D. Smelik, *Writings from Ancient Israel: A Handbook of Historical and Religious Documents* (trans. Graham I. Davies; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 36–37. Compare James Maxwell Miller, “The Moabite Stone as a Memorial Stela,” *PEQ* 106 (1974): 9–18; Joel Drinkard, “The Literary Genre of the Mesha’ Inscription,” in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab* (ed. John Andrew Dearman; ABS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 131–154.
66. On the philology and archaeological correlates of the water systems mentioned in the stele, see Jonathan Kaplan, “The Mesha Inscription and Iron Age II Water Systems,” *JNES* 69 (2010): 23–29. On the archaeology of Moab’s water supply system and its connection to the claims made in the Mesha Inscription, see Bruce Routledge, “On Water Management in the Mesha Inscription and Moab,” *JNES* 72 (2013): 51–64. On Levantine urban water supply, see C.H.J. de Geus, *Towns in Ancient Israel and in the Southern Levant* (Palaestina antiqua 10; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 119–134.
67. For a discussion of the broken text, see, for example, John C.L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: Volume 1. Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 82; Smelik, *Writings from Ancient Israel*, 29–50. The point I make here does not depend on a particular hypothetical reconstruction of the text. On Mesha’s command to dig cisterns, compare Esarhaddon’s command to the Babylonians he had restored from servitude, “I encouraged them to (re)settle the city, build houses, plant orchards, (and) dig canals” (RINAP 4 104 v 10; RINAP 4 105 vii 12; RINAP 4 111 vi 1’). Note also the contrast provided by 2 Kgs 3:19, where Elisha commands the kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom as they march against Mesha, king of Moab: “You shall attack every fortified town and every choice city; you shall fell every good tree and stop up all springs of water; and every good plot you shall ruin with stones.”
68. See especially Kaplan, “Mesha Inscription,” 26–29.
69. Bruce Routledge, *Moab in the Iron Age: Hegemony, Polity, Archaeology* (Archaeology, Culture, and Society; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 133–153, esp. 150.
70. On the inscription, see Henry O. Thompson and Fawzi Zayadine, “The Tell Siran Inscription,” *BASOR* 212 (1973): 5–11; Frank Moore Cross, “Notes on the Ammonite Inscription from Tell Sîrân,” *BASOR* 212 (1973): 12–15; Charles R. Krahmalkov, “An Ammonite Lyric Poem,” *BASOR* 223 (1976): 55–57; Oswald Loretz, “Die ammonitische Inschrift von Tell Siran,” *UF* 9 (1977): 169–171;

- Robert Coote, “The Tell Siran Bottle Inscription,” *BASOR* 240 (1980): 93; Green, *I Undertook Great Works*, 266–281.
71. Coote translates the word as “product of” and understands the inscription to refer to the contents of the bottle (“The Tell Siran Bottle Inscription,” 93).
 72. Green understands the water system in the inscription as supplying a private royal pleasure garden rather than the general public (*I Undertook Great Works*, 277–278).
 73. The texts likely represented copies of monumental inscriptions in the courtyard of Enlil’s temple in Nippur. See Piotr Michalowski, “New Sources Concerning the Reign of Naram-Sin,” *JCS* 32 (1980): 233–246. On connections between these Nippurian copies and other accounts of the great rebellion against Nārām-Sin, see Steve Tinney, “A New Look at Naram-Sin and the ‘Great Rebellion,’” *JCS* 47 (1995): 1–14.
 74. The repairs are recorded in building accounts appended to Sennacherib’s annals. The relevant section of the earliest of these, written on a cylinder soon after his campaign, reads, “The fo[rm]er palace, whose longer side was thirty *nindanu* and whose shorter side was ten *nindanu*, which earlier kings, my ancestors, had had constructed, but whose construction they had carried out inexpertly, (and) alongside of which the Tebilti River had flowed from [dis]tant [days], caused erosion in its foundations, (and) shaken its base: I tore down [that] small pala[ce] in its entirety and improved the course of the Tebilti River and directed its outflow. In [a] pro[pitious month, on] a favorable day, in the hidden depths of its subterranean waters I bonded together strong mountain stone sixty (*nindanu*) along (its) longer side (and) thirty-four (*nindanu*) along (its) shorter side, then I raised (that) area out of the water and converted (it) to dry land. In order to prevent its foundation from being weakened over the passage of time by cresting flood(s), I surrounded its damp course with large limestone slabs (and thereby) reinforced its base. Upon them, I filled in a terrace to a height of 160 courses of brick, then added (it) to the dimensions of the former palace and (thus) enlarged its structure” (trans. Grayson and Novotny in RINAP 3 1 73–78.). On this earliest account, see also Luckenbill, *Annals of Sennacherib*, 94–96. Compare several later texts: RINAP 3 2 44–52; 3 44–52; 4 71–80; 15 v 47b–vi 19; 16 v 71–vi 38; 39 11–29a; 42 20b–28a; 43 7b–20a; 46 106b–122a; 49 7b–20a. For a comprehensive synthesis of the iconography, architecture, and textual descriptions of the palace see John Malcolm Russell, *Sennacherib’s “Palace without Rival” at Nineveh* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991).
 75. Excerpt from the translation of Grayson and Novotny in RINAP.
 76. Cf. Shalmaneser III’s use of the Deluge motif in RIM A.o.102.5 ii 2b–3. The Assyrian army is depicted with mythological water imagery in Isa 8:6–8a, “Because this people has rejected the waters of Shiloah that flow gently—My Lord will certainly bring up against them the mighty, massive waters of the River, the king of Assyria and all his multitude. It shall rise above all its channels, and

- overflow all its beds, and sweep through Judah and overflow and reach up to the neck.” On destructive water imagery in the Hebrew Bible, see Stephen C. Russell, *Images of Egypt in Early Biblical Literature: Cisjordan-Israelite, Transjordan-Israelite, and Judahite Portrayals* (BZAW 403; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 163–170. See also Herbert G. May, “Some Cosmic Connotations of *Mayim Rabbim*, ‘Many Waters,’” *JBL* 74 (1955): 9–21.
77. On this epic, see Wilfred G. Lambert and Alan R. Millard, *Atra-ḥasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969); Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1–38.
78. Although *Atrahasis* does not depict the creation of the world in terms similar to *Enuma Eliš*, they share the same view of the structure of the cosmos: water is stored in the sky and underground.
79. On the Gilgamesh Epic, see Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982); Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 39–153; Andrew R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). On the use of the flood story in Gilgamesh, see Tigay, *Evolution*, 214–240; Bernard F. Batto, *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 23–33.
80. Excerpt from Grayson’s translation in RIMA.
81. The ability of an attacking army to limit a besieged city’s access to water could prove decisive. See Israel Eph’al, *The City Besieged: Siege and Its Manifestations in the Ancient Near East* (CHANE 36; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 64–66. The strategic importance of controlling the water supply during a siege is illustrated by a wall relief from the palace of Assurnasirpal II, c. 883–859 BCE, that depicts a bucket being lowered from a besieged city via a pulley system only to have its rope cut by an Assyrian soldier (BM 118906). On this relief, see Jørgen Laessøe, “Reflexions on Modern and Ancient Oriental Water Works,” *JCS* 7 (1953): 5–26; Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands: In the Light of Archaeological Study* (2 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), 460–461; Pauline Albenda, “A Syro-Palestinian (?) City on a Ninth Century B.C. Assyrian Relief,” *BASOR* 206 (1972): 42–48; Bagg, “Irrigation,” 266; Eph’al, *City Besieged*, 65 n.80. Curiously, the rope mechanism is pictured as running inside the city wall. Albenda argues that the relief depicts a system for drawing water within the city rather than outside of it. Yet the Assyrian soldier appears to have open access to the rope before the city walls have fallen. Regardless of the the precise mechanism it depicts, the relief demonstrates the importance of controlling access to water during a siege. The importance of such control is also illustrated by omens known from copies in the library of Assurbanipal at Nineveh, “An enemy will besiege your city, and he will dig a well at dawn . . . he will drain the water of your wells into his wells and capture your city at sunset by thirst” (CT 30 45 83-81-15, 415 rev. 11) and “an

- enemy will capture your city at sunset by thirst” (rev. 8), as cited in Eph’al, *City Besieged*, 66 n.83. On the influence of siege warfare on biblical literary imagery, see Jeremy D. Smoak, “Assyrian Siege Warfare and the Background of a Biblical Curse,” in *Writing and Reading War: Rhetoric, Gender, and Ethics in Ancient and Modern Contexts* (ed. Brad E. Kelle and Frank Ritzel Ames; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 83–91.
82. On these texts, BM 108854 and AO 5645, see also George A. Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 336–337. A third inscription mentioning the king is discussed in Joachim Marzahn, “Ašduniarim von Kiš: eine unbekannte Inschrift,” in *Munuscula Mesopotamica: Festschrift für Johannes Renger* (ed. Barbara Böck, Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, and Thomas Richter; AOAT 267; Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 1999), 267–277.
83. Excerpt from Frayne’s translation in RIME.
84. Kalimi observes, “In spite of having the longer account of Sennacherib’s campaign, 2 Kings (along with Isaiah) does not detail Hezekiah’s preparation for the war. Even 2 Kings 20:20b, which tells about the king’s water supply project, does not relate it to the Assyrian conflict” (“Sennacherib’s Campaign,” 16).
85. Although the author of 2 Chr 32:2–5 may have utilized source material now lost to us, his account could also be explained as being based on known material to which he likely had access, namely Isa 22:8–11. See Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 388 n.22. Kalimi notes, “Most likely, the main lines of the description in [2 Chr 32:2–6a] basically depend on Isaiah 22:9–11a, where the prophet responds to the events of 705–704 B.C.E.” (“Sennacherib’s Campaign,” 17). If this view is correct, where Isa 22:8–11 presents preparations for battle as signaling a lack of faith, 2 Chr 32:2–5 present the same actions as signaling the wise actions of a king who consults his trusted officers and officials. David is the only other king in Samuel–Kings//Chronicles who takes counsel (יעץ) with military officers (שרים), in 1 Chr 13:1. In addition to 2 Chr 32:3, Hezekiah consults his officers in 2 Chr 30:2. Rehoboam takes counsel with the elders (הזקנים) in 1 Kgs 12:6//2 Chr 10:6; the verb has Jeroboam as its subject in 1 Kgs 12:28 but no object is specified; the king of Aram takes counsel with his servants (עבדיו) in 2 Kgs 6:8; Jehoshaphat takes counsel with the people (העם) in 2 Chr 20:21; the verb has Amaziah as the subject in 2 Chr 25:17, but no object is specified. In my view, however, the reshaping of the water supply system in Isa 22:9, “You (pl.) gathered the waters of the lower pool,” should not be equated with the defensive stopping up of the water sources outside Jerusalem described in 2 Chr 32:3–4.
86. Important studies of Sennacherib’s invasion of Judah include Gallagher, *Sennacherib’s Campaign*; Lester L. Grabbe, ed., “*Like a Bird in a Cage*”: *The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE* (JSOTSup 363; London: T&T Clark, 2003); Hayim Tadmor, “Sennacherib’s Campaign to Judah: Historical and Historiographical

- Considerations,” in *“With My Many Chariots I Have Gone Up the Heights of Mountains”: Historical and Literary Studies on Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel* (ed. Mordechai Cogan; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2011), 653–675; Isaac Kalimi and Seth Richardson, eds., *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography* (CHANE 71; Leiden: Brill, 2014).
87. David Ussishkin argues, “An alliance against Assyria was formed between Judah, Egypt and the Philistine cities of the Coastal Plain, possibly with Babylonian support” (“Sennacherib’s Campaign to Judah: The Archaeological Perspective with an Emphasis on Lachish and Jerusalem,” in *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography* [ed. Isaac Kalimi and Seth Richardson; CHANE 71; Leiden: Brill, 2014], 75). Cf. Gallagher, *Sennacherib’s Campaign*, 272–274.
88. See related observations in Marvin A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39: With an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 16; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996), 455.
89. Kuhrt, *Ancient Near East*, 2.583; Liverani, *Ancient Near East*, 491–492; Gallagher, *Sennacherib’s Campaign*, 270–272.
90. Marc Van de Mieroop, *A History of the Ancient Near East ca. 3000–323 BC* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 252–255.
91. For an evaluation of the notices about the Babylonian envoy to Jerusalem in 2 Kgs 20:12–21//Isa 39:1–8; 2 Chr 32:31; Josephus, *Antiquities* X ii 2, see John A. Brinkman, “Merodach-Baladan II,” in *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim, June 7, 1964* (ed. Robert D. Biggs; John A. Brinkman; Chicago: Oriental Institute Museum, 1964), 31–33. On the date of the Babylonian envoy to Judah, see also Iain W. Provan, V. Philips Long, and Tremper Longman III, *A Biblical History of Israel* (Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 2003), 273; Paul Collins, *From Egypt to Babylon: The International Age 1550–500 BC* (London: The British Museum Press, 2008), 162; Young, *Hezekiah*, 68–69.
92. On these notices and their editorial contexts, see Hugo Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels: von Samuel bis Amos und Hosea* (SAT 2.1; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), xiii; Alfred Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1956), 30–60; Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. of part 1 of the 1967 ed. of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981), 63–66; John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 292–302; Baruch Halpern and David Vanderhooft, “The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries B.C.E.,” *HUCA* 62 (1991): 179–244; Erik Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OtSt 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 33–136; Menahem Haran, “The Books of the Chronicles ‘Of the Kings of Judah’ and ‘Of the Kings of Israel’: What Sort of Books Were They?” *VT* 49 (1999): 156–164; Simon B. Parker, “Did the Authors of the Books of Kings Make Use of Royal Inscriptions?” *VT* 50 (2000): 357–378;

- Kevin L. Spawn, “As It Is Written” and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament (BZAW 311; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 22–40; Meindert Dijkstra, “‘As for the Other Events . . .’: Annals and Chronicles in Israel and the Ancient Near East,” in *The Old Testament in Its World* (ed. R.P. Gordon and J.C. de Moor; OtSt 52; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 15–44; Nadav Na’aman, “The Sources Available to the Author of the Book of Kings,” in *Recenti tendenze nella ricostruzione della storia antica d’Israele* (ed. Mario Liverani; Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2005), 105–120; Christoph Levin, “Die Frommigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda,” in *Houses of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 129–168; Katherine M. Stott, *Why Did They Write This Way? Reflections on References to Written Documents in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Literature* (LHB/OTS 492; London: Continuum, 2008), 52–60; Mark Leuchter, “The Sociolinguistics and Rhetorical Implications of the Source Citations in Kings,” in *Soundings in Kings: Perspectives and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship* (ed. Mark Leuchter and Klaus-Peter Adam; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 119–134; Matthew J. Suriano, *The Politics of Dead Kings: Dynastic Ancestors in the Book of Kings and Ancient Israel* (FAT 2.48; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 22–49; Thomas, *Hezekiah*, 84–89.
93. The editorial formula is used of Solomon (1 Kgs 11:41, where the cross-referenced scroll is instead the Annals of Solomon), Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:19), Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14:29), Abijah (1 Kgs 15:7), Nadab (1 Kgs 15:31), Baasha (1 Kgs 16:5), Elah (1 Kgs 16:14), Zimri (1 Kgs 16:20), Omri (1 Kgs 16:27); Ahab (1 Kgs 22:39), Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:46), Ahaziah (1 Kgs 2:18), Joram (2 Kgs 8:23), Jehu (2 Kgs 10:34), Joash (2 Kgs 12:20), Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 13:8), Joash (2 Kgs 13:12), Jehoash (2 Kgs 14:15), Amaziah (2 Kgs 14:18), Jeroboam II (2 Kgs 14:28), Azariah (2 Kgs 15:6), Zechariah (2 Kgs 15:11), Shallum (2 Kgs 15:15), Menahem (2 Kgs 15:21), Pekahiah (2 Kgs 15:26), Pekah (2 Kgs 15:31), Jotham (2 Kgs 15:36), Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:9), Hezekiah (2 Kgs 20:20), Manasseh (2 Kgs 21:17), Amon (2 Kgs 21:25), Josiah (2 Kgs 23:28), and Jehoiakim (2 Kgs 24:5). Halpern and Vanderhooft observe, “There is no such notice for Jehoram, whose death is related in a narrative centered on Jehu’s deeds, not his own (2 Kgs 9:24–26)” (“Editions of Kings,” 212 n.84).
94. On Zimri’s treason, see 1 Kgs 16:9–10. On the confrontation between Amaziah and Joash, see 2 Kgs 14:8–14. On Shallum’s conspiracy, see 2 Kgs 15:10.
95. The only biblical references to houses of ivory are 1 Kgs 22:39 and Amos 3:15.
96. In the case of 2 Kgs 20:20, it is difficult to determine when the supplementary notice was added. Halpern and Vanderhooft note the correlation between the success indicated by the expanded source citations and the positive evaluation in the regnal formulae and conclude that, down to the reign of Hezekiah, they were written by the same scribe (“Editions of Kings,” 220).

97. On the modern hydrogeology of the Gihon Spring, which is quite sensitive to rainfall events, see Ronit Benami Amiel, Tamir Grodek, and Amos Frumkin, "Characterization of the Hydrogeology of the Sacred Gihon Spring, Jerusalem: A Deteriorating Urban Karst Spring," *Hydrogeology Journal* 18 (2010): 1465–1479.
98. Various interpretations of the engineering of the Siloam tunnel have been proposed. Gill and Lancaster and Long have argued that the tunnel exploited existing fissures in the karst system under Jerusalem. See Dan Gill, "Subterranean Waterworks of Biblical Jerusalem: Adaptation of a Karst System," *Science* 254 (1991): 1467–1471; Steven P. Lancaster and G.A. Long, "Where They Met: Separations in the Rock Mass near the Siloam Tunnel's Meeting Point," *BASOR* 315 (1999): 15–26. A related proposal was made by Ruth Amiran as early as 1968. See Ruth Amiran, "The Water Supply System of Jerusalem," *Qadmoniot* 1 (1968): 13–18 (in Hebrew). The theory seems quite plausible in general terms, but is not supported by a detailed examination of the evidence from the tunnel itself. See Amos Frumkin and Aryeh Shimron, "Tunnel Engineering in the Iron Age: Geoarchaeology of the Siloam Tunnel, Jerusalem," *Journal of Archaeological Science* 33 (2006): 227–237. Amihai Sneh, Ram Weinberger, and Eyal Shalev hypothesize that the tunnel was cut close to the natural level of the groundwater ("The Why, How, and When of the Siloam Tunnel Reevaluated," *BASOR* 359 [2010]: 57–65). On the length of the tunnel during the biblical period, see David Ussishkin, "The Original Length of the Siloam Tunnel in Jerusalem," *Levant* 8 (1975): 82–95.
99. The evidence is summarized succinctly in Ronald S. Hendel, "The Date of the Siloam Inscription: A Rejoinder to Rogerson and Davies," *BA* 59 (1996): 233–237. Hendel makes the case for an eighth century date in response to the claim by John Rogerson and Philip R. Davies that the inscription and tunnel date to the Hasmonean period ("Was the Siloam Tunnel Built by Hezekiah?" *BA* 59 [1996]: 138–149). On the date of the inscription, see also Jo Ann Hackett et al., "Defusing Pseudo-Scholarship: The Siloam Tunnel Ain't Hasmonean," *BAR* 23/2 (1997): 41–50, 68; Ernst Axel Knauf, "Hezekiah or Manasseh? A Reconsideration of the Siloam Tunnel and Inscription," *TA* 28 (2001): 281–287; Stig Norin, "The Age of the Siloam Inscription and Hezekiah's Tunnel," *VT* 48 (1998): 37–48. Gary A. Rendsburg and William M. Schniedewind argue that the inscription has linguistic affinities with Benjamite Hebrew. See Gary A. Rendsburg and William M. Schniedewind, "The Siloam Tunnel Inscription: Historical and Linguistic Perspectives," *IEJ* 60 (2010): 188–203. Jane M. Cahill offers a response to Rogerson and Davies that summarizes the archaeological evidence ("A Rejoinder to 'Was the Siloam Tunnel Built by Hezekiah?'" *BA* 60 [1997]: 184–185).
100. Scholars generally identify a spot in the middle of the tunnel, where there appears to be a sudden turn from two teams of workers excavating from

opposite directions, as the meeting point where the tunnel was opened. Avi Faust proposed that the tunnel was completed toward the Siloam pool, near the Siloam tunnel inscription (“A Note on Hezekiah’s Tunnel and the Siloam Inscription,” *JSOT* 90 [2000]: 3–11). This hypothesis ignores the clear evidence on the walls of the tunnel for changes of direction. At several locations, the tunnelers changed course, leaving a trace of the direction in which they had previously been heading. These changes in direction make it clear that two teams of workers began at both ends of the tunnel and met in the middle.

101. For example, see Naseeb Shaheen, “The Siloam End of Hezekiah’s Tunnel,” *PEQ* 109 (1977): 107; Victor Sasson, “The Siloam Tunnel Inscription,” *PEQ* 114 (1982): 111; Yigal Shiloh, “Underground Water Systems in the Land of Israel in the Iron Age,” in *The Architecture of Ancient Israel: From the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods: In Memory of Immanuel (Munya) Dunayevsky* (ed. Aharon Kempinski, Ronny Reich, and Hannah Katzenstein; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 287. Important exceptions include H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCB; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982), 380; Judith M. Hadley, “2 Chronicles 32:30 and the Water Systems of Preexilic Jerusalem,” in *Let Us Go Up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Iain W. Provan and Mark J. Boda; VTSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 273–284.
102. Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron, “The History of the Gihon Spring in Jerusalem,” *Levant* 36 (2004): 211–223, esp. figs. 4–6; Ronny Reich, Gideon Avni, and Tamar Winter, *Jerusalem Milestone: A Guide to the Archaeological Sites* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2009), 63–64; Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron, “A New Segment of the Middle Bronze Age II Fortifications in the City of David,” *TA* 37 (2010): 141–153; Ronny Reich, *Excavating the City of David: Where Jerusalem’s History Began* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Biblical Archaeological Society, 2011), 166–169.
103. Compare Rendsburg and Schniedewind, “Siloam Tunnel Inscription,” 189.
104. Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron, “The Date of the Siloam Tunnel Reconsidered,” *TA* 38 (2011): 147–157; Alon de Groot and Atalya Fadida, “The Pottery Assemblage from the Rock-Cut Pool near the Gihon Spring,” *TA* 38 (2011): 158–166.
105. Reich and Shukron, “Date of the Siloam Tunnel,” 153–155.
106. Reich and Shukron, “Date of the Siloam Tunnel,” 153.
107. De Groot and Atalya “date the pottery from the pool to the Iron IIA, probably not late in this period, at the end of the 9th century BCE” (“Pottery Assemblage,” 158).
108. Reich and Shukron, “Date of the Siloam Tunnel,” 154.
109. Rollston establishes an epigraphic sequence based on inscriptions from stratified contexts; the Siloam tunnel inscription is not one of his benchmarks for reconstructing an epigraphic sequence.

110. David Amit, “Water Supply to the Upper City of Jerusalem during the First and Second Temple Periods in Light of the Mamilla Excavations,” in *New Studies in the Archaeology of Jerusalem and Its Region: Collected Papers, Vol. III* (ed. David Amit, Guy Stiebel, and Orit Peleg-Barkat [Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2009], 94–108 [in Hebrew]).
111. Scholars differ in their assessment of the date and degree of expansion. This disagreement does not affect my thesis here. See Magen Broshi, “The Expansion of Jerusalem in the Reigns of Hezekiah and Manasseh,” *IEJ* 24 (1974): 21–26; Gabriel Barkay, “An Unknown City Wall in Jerusalem of the First Temple Period,” *New Studies on Jerusalem* 7 (2002): 39–44 (in Hebrew); Israel Finkelstein and Neil A. Silberman, “Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of Pan-Israelite Ideology,” *JSOT* 30 (2006): 265–269; Nadav Na’aman, “When and How Did Jerusalem Become a Great City? The Rise of Jerusalem as Judah’s Premier City in the Eighth–Seventh Centuries B.C.E.” *BASOR* 347 (2007): 21–56; Avraham Faust, “On Jerusalem’s Expansion during the Iron Age II,” in *Exploring the Narrative: Jerusalem and Jordan in the Bronze and Iron Ages* (ed. Eveline Van der Steen, Noor Mulder-Hymans, and Jeannette Boertien; LHB/OTS 583; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 256–285.
112. Rendsburg and Schniedewind regard the Siloam tunnel itself as part of a system supplying the Western Hill (“Siloam Tunnel Inscription,” 189). See also Stephen G. Rosenberg, “The Siloam Tunnel: A Feat of Survey,” in *New Studies on Jerusalem: Papers of the Fifth Conference, 23 December 1999* (ed. Avraham Faust et al.; Jerusalem: Yad Y. Ben Zvi, 1999), 3–20.
113. On the depiction of Hezekiah’s reign as a qualified success in Kings, see, for example, Marvin A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 73–76.
114. I noted above that the description of Hezekiah’s military preparations in 2 Chr 32:2–8 appears to consist of material taken over from some source to which the Chronicler has appended a freely composed speech in vv. 6b–8. The speech attributes military success to Yahweh’s intervention, rather than Hezekiah’s tactics. Verse 22 likewise emphasizes Yahweh’s role in achieving victory. In some sense, then, the portrait of Hezekiah as a tactician has been muted by the Chronicler in so far as the freely composed speech emphasizes Yahweh’s role rather than Hezekiah’s. Indeed, the Chronicler does not mention Hezekiah’s military success over the Philistines noted in 2 Kgs 18:8. As such, the Chronicler’s treatment of Hezekiah’s military activities as I have outlined them here may still be read as part of a larger literary pattern in which the Chronicler has drawn comparisons between Hezekiah and Solomon, a “man of rest” (1 Chr 22:9). On the question of literary similarities and differences between the depictions of David, Solomon, and Hezekiah in Chronicles, see H.G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Book of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 119–125; Rosemarie

Micheel, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik* (Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 18; Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1983), 15; Mark A. Throntviet, "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Book of Chronicles," in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* (ed. M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie, and Gary N. Knoppers; JSOTSup 371; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 105–121; Young, *Hezekiah*, 257–284; Song-Mi Suzie Park, *Hezekiah and the Dialogue of Memory* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 197–253.

CHAPTER 6

1. See especially Victor Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings* (JSOTSup 115; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); Douglas J. Green, "I Undertook Great Works": *The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions* (FAT 2.41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Ömür Harmansah, *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Bibliography

- Abravanel, Isaac. *Commentary on the Torah*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Bnei Arbel, 1964.
- Abusch, Tzvi. *Mesopotamian Witchcraft: Toward a History and Understanding of Babylonian Witchcraft Beliefs and Literature*. Ancient Magic and Divination 5. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. "Isaiah 36–39: Structure and Function." Pages 3–21 in Wilhelmus C. Delsman, ed., *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P. Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 211. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Biblical Interpretation of the Reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah." Pages 247–259 in W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer, eds., *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G.W. Ahlström*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 31. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- Adams, Robert McC. "Property Rights and Functional Tenure in Mesopotamian Rural Communities." Pages 1–14 in J. Nicholas Postgate et al., eds., *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1982.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Lost in Reconstruction? On Hebrew and Greek Reconstructions in 2 Sam 24." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 40 (2007): 89–106.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "David's Three Choices: Textual and Literary Development in 2 Samuel 24." Pages 137–151 in Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, eds., *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 41. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Ahlström, Gösta W. *Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine*. Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 1. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

- Ahlström, Gösta W. *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Paleolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 146. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Albenda, Pauline. "A Syro-Palestinian (?) City on a Ninth Century B.C. Assyrian Relief." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 206 (1972): 42–48.
- Albenda, Pauline. "Dur-Sharrukin, the Royal City of Sargon II, King of Assyria." *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 38 (2003): 5–13.
- Albertz, Rainer. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. Old Testament Library. 2 vols. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Albertz, Rainer. "In Search of the Deuteronomists: A First Solution to a Historical Riddle." Pages 1–17 in Thomas Römer, ed., *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- Albright, William F. *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim: II. The Bronze Age*. Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 17. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1938.
- Albright, William F. "The Oracle of Balaam." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63 (1944): 207–233.
- Albright, William F. "The Psalms of Habakkuk." Pages 1–18 in H.H. Rowley, ed., *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Theodore H. Robinson on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, August 9th, 1946*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1950.
- Albright, William F. "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII." *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959): 339–346.
- Albright, William F. *The Archaeology of Palestine*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Albright, William F. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths*. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religions 7. London: Athlone, 1968.
- Albright, William F. "The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse." *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 2 (1972): 69–86.
- Allan, William, et al. *Land Holding and Land Usage among the Plateau Tonga of Mazabuka District: A Reconnaissance Survey, 1945*. Capetown: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, 1948.
- Alt, Albrecht. "Verbreitung und Herkunft des Syrischen Tempeltypus." Pages 100–115 in volume 2 of *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3 vols. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1953–1959.
- Alt, Albrecht. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3 vols. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1953–1959.
- Alt, Albrecht. "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine." Pages 133–169 in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Trans. R.A. Wilson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.
- Alter, Robert. *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel*. New York: Norton, 1999.
- Alter, Robert. *Ancient Israel: The Former Prophets, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; A Translation with Commentary*. New York: Norton, 2013.

- Altman, Ammon. "The Revolutions in Byblos and Amurru during the Amarna Period and Their Social Background." Pages 3–24 in Pinhas Artzi, ed., *Bar-Ilan Studies in History*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1978.
- Amiel, Ronit Benami, Tamir Grodek, and Amos Frumkin. "Characterization of the Hydrogeology of the Sacred Gihon Spring, Jerusalem: A Deteriorating Urban Karst Spring." *Hydrogeology Journal* 18 (2010): 1465–1479.
- Amiran, Ruth. "Water Supply Tunnels." *Eretz Israel* 1 (1951): 35–38. [In Hebrew]
- Amiran, Ruth. "The Water Supply System of Jerusalem." *Qadmoniot* 1–2 (1968): 13–18. [In Hebrew]
- Amit, David. "Water Supply to the Upper City of Jerusalem during the First and Second Temple Periods in Light of the Mamilla Excavations." Pages 94–108 in David Amit, Guy Stiebel, and Orit Peleg-Barkat, eds., *New Studies in the Archaeology of Jerusalem and Its Region: Collected Papers, Vol. III*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2009. [In Hebrew]
- Amit, Yaira. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Biblical Interpretation Series 38. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Amit, Yaira. "Araunah's Threshing Floor: A Lesson in Shaping Historical Memory." Pages 13–23 in Athalya Brenner and Frank Polak, eds., *Performing Memory in Biblical Narrative and Beyond*. Bible in the Modern World 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.
- Anbar, Moshe, and Marten Stol. "Textes de l'Époque Babylonienne Ancienne III." *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 85 (1991): 13–48.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 24A. New York: Doubleday, 1989.
- Anderson, Arnold A. *2 Samuel*. WBC 11. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Anderson, James S. *Monotheism and Yahweh's Appropriation of Baal*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 617. New York: T&T Clark, 2015.
- Archer, Margaret Scotford. *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Arnaud, Daniel. *Recherches au pays d'Aštata*. Emar VI.1–4. 4 vols. Paris: ERC, 1985–1987.
- Artzi, Pinhas. "'Vox Populi' in the El-Amarna Tablets." *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 58 (1964): 159–166.
- Astour, Michael C. "Un texte d'Ugarit récemment découvert et ses rapports avec l'origine des cultes bachiques grecs." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 164 (1963): 1–15.
- Auld, A. Graeme. "Imagin[ing] Editions of Samuel: The Chronicler's Contribution." Pages 119–131 in Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenkerin, eds., *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Auld, A. Graeme. *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.

- Baden, Joel S. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Baden, Joel S. *The Historical David: The Real Life of an Invented Hero*. New York: HarperOne, 2014.
- Bagg, Ariel M. *Assyrische Wasserbauten: landwirtschaftliche Wasserbauten im Kernland Assyriens zwischen der 2. Hälfte des 2. und der 1. Hälfte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Baghdader Forschungen 24. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 2000.
- Bagg, Ariel M. "Irrigation in Northern Mesopotamia: Water for the Assyrian Capitals (12th–7th Centuries BC)." *Irrigation and Drainage Systems* 14 (2000): 301–324.
- Bagg, Ariel M. "Irrigation." Pages 261–278 in Daniel T. Potts, ed., *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2012.
- Baker, Heather D. "Babylonian Land Survey in Socio-Political Context." Pages 293–323 in Gebhard J. Selz, ed., *The Empirical Dimension of Ancient Near Eastern Studies*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2011.
- Barkay, Gabriel. "The Iron Age II–III." Pages 302–373 in Amnon Ben-Tor, ed., *The Archaeology of Ancient Israel*. Trans. R. Greenberg. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Barkay, Gabriel. "An Unknown City Wall in Jerusalem of the First Temple Period." *New Studies on Jerusalem* 7 (2002): 39–44. [In Hebrew]
- Barmash, Pamela. *Homicide in the Biblical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Barnett, Richard D., and Margarete Falkner. *The Sculptures of Tiglath-Pileser III (745–727 B.C.)*. London: British Museum, 1962.
- Barré, Lloyd M. *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion: The Narrative Artistry and Political Intentions of 2 Kings 9–11*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 20. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988.
- Barrick, W. Boyd. *The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah's Reform*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 88. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Barton, George A. *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929.
- Batto, Bernard F. "Land Tenure and Women at Mari." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 23 (1980): 209–239.
- Batto, Bernard F. *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.* Yale Near Eastern Researches 10. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Beckman, Gary. *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen*. History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 2. Padua: Sargon, 1996.
- Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory: Ritual Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Ben-Barak, Zafriira. "Meribaal and the System of Land Grants in Ancient Israel." *Biblica* 62 (1981): 73–91.

- Ben-Barak, Zafrira. "The Confiscation of Lands in Israel and the Ancient Near East." *Shnaton* 5–6 (1981–1982): 101–117. [In Hebrew]
- Bennett, Crystal-M. "Excavations at Buseirah, Southern Jordan, 1972: Preliminary Report." *Levant* 6 (1974): 1–24.
- Benz, Brendon C. "The Varieties of Sociopolitical Experience in the Late Bronze Age Levant and the Rise of Early Israel." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2013.
- Benz, Brendon C. "In Search of Israel's Insider Status: A Reevaluation of Israel's Origins." Pages 457–466 in Thomas E. Levy, Thomas Schneider, and William H.C. Propp, eds., *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2015.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Who Wrote the Speech of Rabshakeh and When?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 79–92.
- Bergen, Robert D. 1, 2 *Samuel*. New American Commentary 7. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1996.
- Bergey, Ron. "Late Linguistic Features in Esther." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 75 (1984): 66–78.
- Bergey, Ron. "Post-exilic Features in Esther: A Diachronic Approach." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31 (1988): 161–168.
- Bernett, Monika, and Othmar Keel. *Mond, Stier und Kult am Stadttor: Die Stele von Betsaida (et-Tell)*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 161. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Berquist, Jon L., and Claudia V. Camp, eds. *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 481. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Berquist, Jon L., and Claudia V. Camp, eds. *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 490. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Bezold, Carl, and E.A. Wallis Budge. *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum*. London: Longmans, 1892.
- Bittel, Kurt. "Hittite Temples and High Places in Anatolia and North Syria." Pages 63–73 in Avraham Biran, ed., *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*. Jerusalem: Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology of Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981.
- Blair, Judit M. *De-demonising the Old Testament: An Investigation of Azazel, Lilith, Deber, Qeteb and Reshef in the Hebrew Bible*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.37. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Blanton, Richard E., Gary M. Feinman, Stephen A. Kowalewski, and Peter N. Peregrine. "A Dual-Processual Theory for the Evolution of Mesoamerican Civilization." *Current Anthropology* 37 (1996): 1–14.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 19. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

- Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth. "Who Is the King of Glory': Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism." Pages 18–31 in Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager, eds., *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Blum, Erhard. "Der Tempelbaubericht in 1 Könige 6,1–22: Exegetische und historische Überlegungen." Pages 291–316 in Jens Kamlah, ed., *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- Boda, Mark J. *Praying the Tradition: The Origin and the Use of Tradition in Nehemiah 9*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 277. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Bodner, Keith. *The Rebellion of Absalom*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Boer, Roland. *Marxist Criticism of the Bible*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Boling, Robert G. *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 6. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982.
- Boorn, G.P.F. van den. "Wd'ryt and Justice at the Gate." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 44 (1985): 1–26.
- Borrowski, Oded. *Daily Life in Biblical Times*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Botta, Paul-Émile, and Eugène Flandin. *Monument de Ninive T. 2: Architecture et sculpture*. Paris: Gide & Baudry, 1849.
- Brenk, Beat. "Spolia from Constantine to Charlemagne: Aesthetics versus Ideology." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 41 (1987): 103–109.
- Brentjes, Burchard, ed. *Das Grundeigentum in Mesopotamien*. Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte Sonderband 1987–1988. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1988.
- Brettler, Marc Z. *The Book of Judges*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Brichto, Herbert C. "Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife—A Biblical Complex." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44 (1973): 1–54.
- Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
- Brilliant, Richard, and Dale Kinney, eds. *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*. Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2011.
- Brinkman, John A. "Merodach-Baladan II." Pages 6–53 in Robert D. Biggs and John A. Brinkman, eds., *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim, June 7, 1964*. Chicago: Oriental Institute Museum, 1964.
- Broshi, Magen. "The Expansion of Jerusalem in the Reigns of Hezekiah and Manasseh." *Israel Exploration Journal* 24 (1974): 21–26.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "2 Samuel 21–24: An Appendix of Deconstruction?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 383–397.
- Bryant, Christopher G.A., and David Jary, eds. *Anthony Giddens: Critical Assessments*. 4 vols. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Bryce, Trevor. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Buchholz, Joachim. *Die Ältesten Israels im Deuteronomium*. Göttinger theologischer Arbeiten 36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.
- Burney, Charles F. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Busink, Theodor A. *Der Tempel von Jerusalem: von Salomo bis Herodes; eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1970–1980.
- Cahill, Jane M. “A Rejoinder to ‘Was the Siloam Tunnel Built by Hezekiah?’” *Biblical Archaeologist* 60 (1997): 184–185.
- Cahill, Jane M., Karl Reinhard, David Tarler, and Peter Warnock. “It Had to Happen: Scientists Examine Remains of Ancient Bathroom.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17/3 (1991): 64–69.
- Campbell, Antony F. *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1–2 Kings 10)*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 17. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986.
- Campbell, Antony F. *1 Samuel*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 7. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Campbell, Antony F. *2 Samuel*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 8. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Campbell, Antony F., and Mark A. O’Brien. *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Campbell, R. Alistair. *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Casey, Edward S. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Caspari, Wilhelm. “The Literary Type and Historical Value of 2 Samuel 15–20.” Pages 59–88 in David M. Gunn, ed., *Narrative and Novella in Samuel: Studies by Hugo Gressman and Other Scholars 1906–1923*. Trans. David E. Orton. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 116. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991.
- Chadwick, Robert. “Iron Age Gate Architecture in Jordan and Syria.” *Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Mesopotamian Studies* 36 (2001): 125–134.
- Chadwick, Robert. “Changing Forms of Gate Architecture in Bronze and Iron Age Transjordan.” Pages 183–214 in Piotr Bienkowski, ed., *Studies in Iron Age Moab and Neighbouring Areas in Honour of Michèle Daviau*. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series 29. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Chadwick, Robert P.M., Michèle Daviau, and Margreet Steiner. “Four Seasons of Excavations at Khirbat al-Mudayna on Wadi ath-Thamad, 1996–1999.” *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 44 (2000): 257–270.
- Charpin, Dominique. “Un traité entre Zimri-Lim de Mari et Ibâl-pi-El II d’Ešnunna.” Pages 139–166 in Dominique Charpin and Francis Joannès, eds., *Marchands*,

- diplomates et empereurs: études sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1991.
- Chavel, Simeon. *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.71. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis*. Studies in Biblical Theology 2.3. London: SCM Press, 1967.
- Clines, David J. "Sacred Space, Holy Places and Suchlike." Pages 542–554 in vol. 2 of David J. Clines, *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays 1967–1998*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 292–293. 2 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Cogan, Mordechai (Morton). "A Technical Term for Exposure." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 27 (1968): 133–135.
- Cogan, Mordechai. *I Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 10. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Cogan, Mordechai, and Hayim Tadmor. *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 11. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1988.
- Cohen, Chaim. "Neo-Assyrian Elements in the First Speech of the Biblical Rab-Šākê." *Israel Oriental Society* 9 (1979): 32–48.
- Cohen, Martin A. "The Rebellions during the Reign of David: An Inquiry into Social Dynamics in Ancient Israel." Pages 91–112 in Charles Berlin, ed., *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History and Literature in Honor of I. Edward Kiev*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1971.
- Cohen, Matty. "II Sam 24 ou l'histoire d'un décret royal avorté." *Zeitschrift für die alt-testamentliche Wissenschaft* 113 (2001): 17–40.
- Cohn, Robert L. *2 Kings*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Cole, Daniel H., and Elinor Ostrom. "The Variety of Property Systems and Rights in Natural Resources." Pages 37–57 in Daniel H. Cole and Elinor Ostrom, eds., *Property in Land and Other Resources*. Cambridge, Mass.: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2012.
- Cole, Steven W. "The Crimes and Sacrileges of Nabû-šuma-iškun." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 84 (1994): 220–252.
- Collins, Billie Jean. "A Statue for the Deity: Cult Images in Hittite Anatolia." Pages 13–42 in Neal H. Walls, ed., *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005.
- Collins, Paul. *From Egypt to Babylon: The International Age 1550–500 BC*. London: The British Museum Press, 2008.
- Conrad, Edgar W. *Reading Isaiah*. Overtures to Biblical Theology 27. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Conroy, Charles. *Absalom, Absalom! Narrative and Language in 2 Sam 13–20*. Analecta Biblica 81. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- Coogan, Michael D. "Of Cults and Cultures: Reflections on the Interpretation of Archaeological Evidence." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 119 (1987): 1–8.

- Cook, Paul M. *A Sign and a Wonder: The Redactional Formation of Isaiah 18–20*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 147. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Coote, Robert B. *Amos among the Prophets: Composition and Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Coote, Robert. "The Tell Siran Bottle Inscription." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 240 (1980): 93.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. "The Meaning of the Phrase עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ in the Temple Scroll." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001): 244–249.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. "Notes on the Ammonite Inscription from Tell Sirān." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 212 (1973): 12–15.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr., and David Noel Freedman. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 21. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Crowfoot, John W., Kathleen M. Kenyon, and Eleazar L. Sukenik. *Samaria-Sebaste I: The Buildings at Samaria*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1942.
- Crowfoot, John W., Grace Mary Crowfoot, and Kathleen M. Kenyon. *Samaria-Sebaste III: The Objects from Samaria*. London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1957.
- Curtis, Adrian. "God as 'Judge' in Ugaritic and Hebrew Thought." Pages 3–12 in Barnabas Lindars, ed., *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Mari and Karana: Two Old Babylonian Cities*. New York: Longman, 1984.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Dalley, Stephanie. "Water Management in Assyria from the Ninth to the Seventh Centuries BC." *Aram* 13–14 (2001–2002): 443–460.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *The Mystery of the Hanging Garden of Babylon: An Elusive World Wonder Traced*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Dandamaev, M.A. "The Neo-Babylonian Elders." Pages 38–41 in M.A. Dandamaev et al., eds., *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1982.
- Davey, Christopher J. "Temples of the Levant and the Buildings of Solomon." *Tyndale Bulletin* 31 (1980): 107–146.
- Davico, Alberto, and Serena M. Cecchini. "Il Settore A." Pages 19–30 in G. Castellino, ed., *Missione archeologica italiana in Siria: II Rapporto preliminare della campagna 1965 [Tell Mardikh]*. Rome: Istituto di studi del Vicino oriente, Università, 1966.

- Davies, Eryl W. "Inheritance Rights and the Hebrew Levirate Marriage." *Vetus Testamentum* 31 (1981): 138–144, 257–268.
- Davis, Andrew R. *Tel Dan in Its Northern Cultic Context*. Archaeology and Biblical Studies 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Dearman, J. Andrew, ed. *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Archaeology and Biblical Studies 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Delaporte, Louis. *Malatya, Arslantepe: 1, La Porte des lions*. Paris: Boccard, 1940.
- Descartes, René. "Letter of February 5, 1649." Pages 239–240 in *Descartes: Philosophical Letters*. Trans. A. Kenny. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Descartes, René. *Principles of Philosophy*. Trans. Blair Reynolds. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 1988.
- Diakonoff, Igor M. "Sale of Land in Pre-Sargonic Sumer." Pages 5–32 in *Papers Presented by the Soviet Delegation at the XXIII International Congress of Orientalists*. Moscow: Pub. House of USSR Academy of Sciences, 1954.
- Diakanoff, Igor M. "The Commune in the Ancient Near East as Treated in the Works of Soviet Researchers." *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology* 2 (1963): 32–46.
- Dietrich, Walter. *Prophetie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Dietrich, Walter. *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.* Trans. Joachim Vette. Biblical Encyclopedia 3. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Dijk, J. van. "Un rituel de purification des armes et de l'armée: essai de traduction de YBC 4184." Pages 107–117 in M.A. Beek, ed., *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae*. Studia Francisci Scholten Memoriae Dicata 4. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Dijkstra, Meindert. "As for the Other Events . . .": Annals and Chronicles in Israel and the Ancient Near East." Pages 15–44 in R.P. Gordon and J.C. de Moor, eds., *The Old Testament in Its World*. Oudtestamentische Studiën 52. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, F.W. "The Syntagma of *bat* Followed by a Geographical Name in the Hebrew Bible: Reconsideration of Its Meaning and Grammar." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 451–470.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962–1969.
- Drinkard, Joel. "The Literary Genre of the Mesha' Inscription." Pages 131–154 in John Andrew Dearman, ed., *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Archaeology and Biblical Studies 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Driver, Samuel R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. International Critical Commentary. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Durand, Jean-Marie. Review of Arnaud, *Emar VI/1–3* in *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 83 (1989): 163–191.
- Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life: A Study in Religious Sociology*. Trans. Joseph Ward Swain. New York: Macmillan, 1915.

- Edenburg, Cynthia. "Paradigm, Illustrative Narrative or Midrash: The Case of Joshua 7–8 and Deuteronomistic Law." Pages 123–138 in Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, eds., *The Reception of Biblical War Legislation in Narrative Contexts: Proceedings of the EABS Research Group "Law and Narrative."* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 460. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Edzard, Dietz Otto. *Gudea and His Dynasty*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods 3/1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Ehelolf, Hans, and Ferdinand Sommer. *Das hethitische Ritual des Pāpanikri von Komana (KBo V 1 = Bo 2001): Text, Übersetzungsversuch, Erläuterungen*. Boghazköi Studien 10. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1924.
- Elden, Stuart. *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible*. New York: Continuum, 2004.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Myth of the Eternal Return*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. New York: Pantheon Books, 1954.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Trans. Rosemary Sheed. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1958.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1987.
- Eliade, Mircea. "Sacred Architecture and Symbolism." Pages 105–129 in Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, ed., *Symbolism, the Sacred, and the Arts*. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- Elias, Taslim Olawale. *Nigerian Land Law and Custom*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951.
- Ellis, Maria de J. *Agriculture and the State in Ancient Mesopotamia: An Introduction to Problems of Land Tenure*. Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 1. Philadelphia: University Museum, 1976.
- Eph'al, Israel. *The City Besieged: Siege and Its Manifestations in the Ancient Near East*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 36. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Evans, Geoffrey. "'Coming' and 'Going' at the City Gate: A Discussion of Prof. Speiser's Paper." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 150 (1958): 28–33.
- Evans, Geoffrey. "Reheboam's Advisers at Shechem and Political Institutions in Israel and Sumer." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 25 (1966): 273–279.
- Evans, Paul S. "The Hezekiah-Sennacherib Narrative as Polyphonic Text." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33 (2009): 335–358.
- Evans, Paul S. *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-Critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18–19*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 125. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Eynikel, Erik. *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Oudtestamentische Studiën 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Fagan, Brian. *Elixir: A History of Water and Humankind*. London: Bloomsbury, 2011.

- Faust, Avraham. "A Note on Hezekiah's Tunnel and the Siloam Inscription." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 90 (2000): 3–11.
- Faust, Avraham. "On Jerusalem's Expansion during the Iron Age II." Pages 256–285 in Eveline Van der Steen, Noor Mulder-Hymans, and Jeannette Boertien, eds., *Exploring the Narrative: Jerusalem and Jordan in the Bronze and Iron Ages*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 583. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.
- Feder, Yitzaq. "A Levantine Tradition: The Kizzuwatnean Blood Rite and the Biblical Sin Offering." Pages 101–114 in Y. Cohen et al., eds., *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 51. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Feinman, Gary M. "A Dual-Processual Perspective on the Power and Inequality in the Contemporary United States: Framing Political Economy for the Present and the Past." Pages 255–287 in T. Douglas Price and Gary M. Feinman, eds., *Pathways to Power: New Perspectives on the Emergence of Social Inequality*. New York: Springer, 2010.
- Fink, Amir S. "Levantine Standardized Luxury in the Late Bronze Age: Waste Management at Tell Atchana (Alalakh)." Pages 165–196 in Alexander Fantalkin and Assaf Yasur-Landau, eds., *Bene Israel: Studies in the Archaeology of Israel and the Levant during the Bronze and Iron Ages in Honour of Israel Finkelstein*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 31. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Finkelstein, Israel. "The Settlement History of Jerusalem in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C." *Revue biblique* 115 (2008): 499–515.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil A. Silberman. *David and Solomon: In Search of the Bible's Sacred Kings and the Roots of the Western Tradition*. New York: Free Press, 2006.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil A. Silberman. "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of Pan-Israelite Ideology." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30 (2006): 259–285.
- Finkelstein, Israel, David Ussishkin, and Baruch Halpern. *Megiddo III: The 1992–1996 Seasons*. Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University 18. 2 vols. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 2000.
- Firth, Raymond. *We, the Tikopia: A Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1936.
- Fisher, Clarence S. *The Excavation of Armageddon*. Oriental Institute Communications 4. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Fisher, Loren R. "The Temple Quarter." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 8 (1963): 34–41.
- Fleming, Daniel E. "A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Emar in Ancient Syria." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 24 (1992): 59–71.
- Fleming, Daniel E. *Democracy's Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Fleming, Daniel E. *The Legacy of Israel in Judah's Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

- Foster, Benjamin R. *Administration and Use of Institutional Land in Sargonic Sumer*. Mesopotamia 9. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982.
- Foster, Benjamin R. Review of Ignace J. Gelb, Piotr Steinkeller, and Robert M. Whiting, *Earliest Land Tenure Systems*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994): 440–452.
- Fox, Nili S. *In the Service of the King: Officialdom in Ancient Israel and Judah*. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 23. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2000.
- Frahm, Eckart. *Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften*. Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 26. Vienna: Institut für Orientalistik, 1997.
- Frame, Grant. *Rulers of Babylonia: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157–612 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Babylonian Periods 2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Frank, Carl. *Strassburger Keilschrifttexte in sumerischer und babylonischer Sprache*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928.
- Frayne, Douglas. *Old Babylonian Period (2003–1595 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Frayne, Douglas. *Sargonic and Gutian Periods, 2334–2113 BC*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods 2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Frayne, Douglas. *Ur III Period, 2112–2004 BC*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods 3/2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Totem and Taboo: Resemblances between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. Trans. A.A. Brill. New York: New Republic, 1927.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Future of an Illusion*. Trans. W.D. Robson-Scott. New York: H. Liveright, 1928.
- Friebel, Kelvin G. *Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's Sign-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 283. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Fried, Lisbeth S. "The High Places (*Bāmôt*) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122 (2002): 437–465.
- Fritz, Volkmar. "Temple Architecture: What Can Archaeology Tell Us about Solomon's Temple?" Pages 116–128 in Frederick E. Greenspahn, ed., *Essential Papers on Israel and the Ancient Near East*. New York: New York University Press, 1991.
- Fritz, Volkmar. *The City in Ancient Israel*. Biblical Seminar 29. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Fritz, Volkmar. *1 & 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary*. Trans. Anselm Hagedorn. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Frolov, Serge. *Judges*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 6B. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Frumkin, Amos, and Aryeh Shimron. "Tunnel Engineering in the Iron Age: Geoarchaeology of the Siloam Tunnel, Jerusalem." *Journal of Archaeological Science* 33 (2006): 227–237.

- Fuss, Werner. "II Samuel 24." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 74 (1962): 145–164.
- Gadd, Cyril J. "Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tall Brak, 1937–38." *Iraq* 7 (1940): 22–66.
- Galilei, Galileo. *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems, Ptolemaic and Copernican*. Trans. Stillman Drake. Foreword by Albert Einstein. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.
- Gallagher, William R. *Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah: New Studies*. Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 18. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Galling, Kurt, ed. *Biblisches Reallexikon*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 1.1. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1937.
- Garcia-Treto, Francisco O. "The Fall of the House: A Carnavalesque Reading of 2 Kings 9 and 10." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 46 (1990): 47–65.
- Gelb, Ignace J. *Hittite Hieroglyphic Monuments*. Oriental Institute Publications 45. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1939.
- Gelb, Ignace J. "On the Alleged Temple and State Economies in Ancient Mesopotamia." Pages 137–154 in vol. 6 of L. Aru et al, eds., *Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra*. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di giurisprudenza dell'Università di Roma 40–45. Milan: A. Giuffrè, 1971.
- Gelb, Ignace J., Piotr Steinkeller, and Robert M. Whiting, Jr. *Earliest Land Tenure Systems in the Near East: Ancient Kudurrus*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1991.
- George, Andrew R. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- George, Mark K. *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space*. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- George, Mark K., ed. *Constructions of Space IV: Further Developments in Examining Ancient Israel's Social Space*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 569. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Gertz, Jan Christian. *Die Gerichtsorganisation Israels im deuteronomischen Gesetz*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 165. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Gertz, Jan Christian, et al., eds. *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Der Prophet Jesaja*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Vogel, 1820–1829.
- de Geus, C.H.J. *Towns in Ancient Israel and in the Southern Levant*. Palaestina antiqua 10. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Ghantous, Hadi. *The Elisha-Hazael Paradigm and the Kingdom of Israel: The Politics of God in Ancient Syria-Palestine*. Durham: Acumen, 2013.
- Gibson, John C.L. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: Volume 1. Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.

- Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Gill, Dan. "Subterranean Waterworks of Biblical Jerusalem: Adaptation of a Karst System." *Science* 254 (1991): 1467–1471.
- Gill, Dan. "Geology Solves Long-Standing Mystery: How Did Hezekiah's Tunnelers Meet?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20 (1994): 20–33, 64.
- Gill, Dan. "The Geology of the City of David and Its Ancient Subterranean Waterworks." Pages 1–28 in A. de Groot and D.T. Ariel, eds., *Excavations at the City of David IV, 1978–85*. Qedem 35. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996.
- Gilmour, Rachele. *Juxtaposition and the Elisha Cycle*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 594. London: T&T Clark, 2014.
- Gitay, Yehoshua. "Geography and Theology in the Biblical Narrative: The Question of Genesis 2–12." Pages 205–216 in Stephen Breck Reid, ed., *Prophecy and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of G.M. Tucker*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 229. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Gluckman, Max. *Essays on Lozi Land and Royal Property*. Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, 1943.
- Gluckman, Max. *The Ideas in Barotse Jurisprudence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Goetze, Albrecht. "Sin-Iddinam of Larsa: New Tablets from His Reign." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 4 (1950): 83–118.
- Gonçalves, Francolino J. *L'expédition de Sennachérib en Palestine dans la littérature hébraïque ancienne*. Etudes bibliques 7. Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1986.
- Goodenough, Ward H. *Property, Kin and Community on Truk*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951.
- Goonewardena, Kanishka, et al. *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Gordon, Robert P. *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Regency Reference Library, 1988.
- Görg, Manfred. *Gott-König-Reden in Israel und Ägypten*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 6.5. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1975.
- Gorman, Frank H. *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 91. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Gottwald, Norman. *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250–1050 B.C.E.* Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1979.
- Grabbe, Lester L., ed. "Like a Bird in a Cage": *The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 B.C.E.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 363. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

- Gramsci, Antonio. "State and Civil Society." Pages 206–276 in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Gray, John. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
- Grayson, A. Kirk. *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (to 1115 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Grayson, A. Kirk. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC 1 (1114–859 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Grayson, A. Kirk. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC 2 (858–745 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Grayson, A. Kirk, and Jamie R. Novotny. *The Royal Inscriptions of Sennacherib, King of Assyria (704–681 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 3. 2 vols. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012–2014.
- Green, Douglas J. "I Undertook Great Works": *The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions*. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 2.41. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. "Našû-nadānu and Its Congeners." Pages 87–91 in Maria de Jong Ellis, ed., *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*. *Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 19. Hamden, Conn.: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1977.
- Greenstein, Edward. "The Canaanite Literary Heritage in the Writings of Hebrew Scribes." *Michmanim* 10 (1996): 19–38.
- Gressmann, Hugo. *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels: von Samuel bis Amos und Hosea*. *Schriften des Alten Testaments* 2.1. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- Grimal, Nicholas-Christopher. *A History of Ancient Egypt*. Trans. Ian Shaw. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Groot, Alon de. "The Water Systems of Jerusalem in the Period of the First Temple." Pages 102–123 in D. Amit and R. Gonen, eds., *Jerusalem in the Period of the First Temple*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1990. [In Hebrew]
- Groot, Alon de, and Fadida Atalya. "The Pottery Assemblage from the Rock-Cut Pool near the Gihon Spring." *Tel Aviv* 38 (2011): 158–166.
- Gugler, Werner. *Jehu und seine Revolution: Voraussetzungen, Verlauf, Folgen*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Gunkel, Hermann. "Die Revolution des Jehu." *Deutsche Rundschau* 40 (1913): 289–308.
- Gunn, David M. *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 6. Sheffield: Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield, 1978.

- Gunn, David M., and Paula M. McNutt, eds. *Imagining Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 359. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Güterbock, Hans G. "When Was the Late Hittite Palace at Sakçagözü Built?" *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 162 (1961): 49–50.
- Guy, P.L.O. *New Light from Armageddon: Second Provisional Report (1927–29) on the Excavations at Megiddo in Palestine*. Oriental Institute Communications 9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Haas, Volkert, and Gernot Wilhelm. *Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.
- Hackett, Jo Ann, et al. "Defusing Pseudo-Scholarship: The Siloam Tunnel Ain't Hasmonean." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23/2 (1997): 41–50, 68–69.
- Hadley, Judith M. *The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah: Evidence for a Hebrew Goddess*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hadley, Judith M. "2 Chronicles 32:30 and the Water Systems of Preexilic Jerusalem." Pages 273–284 in Iain W. Provan and Mark J. Boda, eds., *Let Us Go Up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Haettner Blomquist, Tina. *Gates and Gods: Cults in the City Gates of Iron Age Palestine; An Investigation of the Archaeological and Biblical Sources*. Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series 46. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1999.
- Hagedorn, Anselm. "Local Law in an Imperial Context: The Role of Deuteronomy in the (Imagined) Persian Period." Pages 57–75 in Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson, eds., *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Haines, Robert C. *Excavations in the Plain of Antioch II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Hallo, William W. "New Texts from the Reign of Sin-iddinam." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967): 95–99.
- Halpern, Baruch. *The Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 25. Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Halpern, Baruch. *The Emergence of Israel in Canaan*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 29. Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Halpern, Baruch. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Halpern, Baruch. "Eli's Death and the Israelite Gate: A Philological-Architectural Correlation." *Eretz Israel* 26 (1999): 52*–63*.
- Halpern, Baruch. *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001.

- Halpern, Baruch, and André Lemaire. "The Composition of Kings." Pages 123–154 in André Lemaire, Baruch Halpern, and Matthew J. Adams, eds., *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 129. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Halpern, Baruch, and David Vanderhoof. "The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries B.C.E." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62 (1991): 179–244.
- Hambaza, Innocent. "4QSam^a (2 Sam 24:16–22): Its Reading, Where It Stands in the History of the Text and Its Use in Bible Translations." Pages 39–51 in Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker, eds., *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Hamblin, William J. *Warfare in the Ancient Near East to 1600 BC: Holy Warriors at the Dawn of History*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Hamilton, Mark W. *The Body Royal: The Social Poetics of Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Biblical Interpretation Series 78. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Hamilton, Robert W. "Excavations at Tell Abu Hawām." *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 4 (1934): 1–69.
- Hamori, Esther J. *Women's Divination in Biblical Literature: Prophecy, Necromancy, and Other Arts of Knowledge*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman. "Introduction: The Concepts of City-State and City-State Culture." Pages 11–34 in Mogens Herman Hansen, ed., *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures*. Copenhagen: Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 2000.
- Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Haran, Menahem. "The Books of the Chronicles 'Of the Kings of Judah' and 'Of the Kings of Israel': What Sort of Books Were They?" *Vetus Testamentum* 49 (1999): 156–164.
- Haring, Ben. "Administration and Law: Pharonic." Pages 218–236 in vol. 1 of Alan B. Lloyd, ed., *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*. 2 vols. Chichester, West Sussex: Blackwell-Wiley, 2010.
- Harmanşah, Ömür. "Monuments and Memory: Architecture and Visual Culture in Ancient Anatolian History." Pages 623–651 in Sharon R. Steadman and Gregory McMahon, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Harmanşah, Ömür. *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Harper, Robert F. *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Collection of the British Museum*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1892–1913.
- Harrison, Timothy P. "West Syrian Megaron or Neo-Assyrian Langraum? The Shifting Form and Function of the Tell Ta'yīnāt (Kunulua) Temples." Pages 3–21

- in Jens Kamlah, ed., *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- Harvey, David. *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London: Verso, 2006.
- Hasegawa, Shuichi. *Aram and Israel during the Jehu Dynasty*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 434. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Hausmann, Jutta. *Israels Rest: Studien zum Selbstverständnis der nachexilischen Gemeinde*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1987.
- Hawkins, Ralph K. *The Iron Age I Structure on Mt. Ebal: Excavation and Interpretation*. Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplement. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Hays, Christopher B. *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 79. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Heaton, E.W. "The Root ארש and the Doctrine of the Remnant." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 27–39.
- Heltzer, Michael. *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1976.
- Hendel, Ronald S. "The Date of the Siloam Inscription: A Rejoinder to Rogerson and Davies." *Biblical Archaeologist* 59 (1996): 233–237.
- Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Herzog, Zeev. *Das Stadttor in Israels und in den Nachbarländern*. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern, 1986.
- Herzog, Zeev. "Settlement and Fortification Planning in the Iron Age." Pages 231–274 in Aharon Kempinski and Ronny Reich, eds., *The Architecture of Ancient Israel: From the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- Herzog, Zeev. *Archaeology of the City: Urban Planning in Ancient Israel and Its Social Implications*. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Archaeology Press, 1997.
- Hiebert, Theodore. *The Yahwist's Landscape: Nature and Religion in Early Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Hill, Andrew E. "The Book of Malachi: Its Place in Post-exilic Chronology Linguistically Reconsidered." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1981.
- Hillers, Delbert R. *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*. Biblica et orientalia 16. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.
- Hoffman, Yair. "The Conception of 'Other Gods' in Deuteronomistic Literature." Pages 103–118 in Ilai Alon, Ithamar Gruenwald, and Itamar Singer, eds., *Israel Oriental Studies XIV: Concepts of the Other in Near Eastern Religions*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Hoffner, Harry A. "Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography." Pages 49–62 in Hans Goedicke and J.J.M. Roberts, eds., *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1975.

- Hogarth, D.G. "Carcamesh and Its Neighbourhood." *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 2 (1909): 165–184.
- Holloway, Steven W. *Aššur is King! Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Period*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 10. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Holtz, Shalom E. *Neo-Babylonian Court Procedure*. Cuneiform Monographs 38. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Hout, Theo van den. *The Purity of Kingship: An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tudhaliya IV*. Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui 25. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Hrouda, B. "Hilāni, bīt." Pages 406–409 in vol. 4 of Erich Ebeling et al., eds., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928–.
- Hudson, Michael, ed. *Urbanization and Land Ownership in the Ancient Near East*. Bulletins Series 7. Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum, 1999.
- Humann, Carl, and Robert Koldewey. *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli II: Ausgrabungsbericht und Architektur*. Berlin: W. Spemann, 1898.
- Hundley, Michael B. *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*. Writings from the Ancient World Supplements 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Hurowitz, Victor. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 115. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Hurvitz, Avi. *Beyn Lashon le-Lashon*. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972. [In Hebrew]
- Hurvitz, Avi. "Linguistic Criteria for Dating Problematic Biblical Texts." *Hebrew Abstracts* 14 (1973): 74–79.
- Hurvitz, Avi. "The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code." *Revue biblique* 81 (1974): 24–56.
- Hurvitz, Avi. *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem*. Cahiers de la Revue biblique 20. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982.
- Hurvitz, Avi. "The Historical Quest for 'Ancient Israel' and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations." *Vetus Testamentum* 47 (1997): 301–315.
- Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Science and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Trans. D. Carr. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Hutton, Jeremy M. *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 396. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Hyatt, J. Philip. "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy." Pages 113–127 in Leo G. Perdue and Brian W. Kovacs, eds., *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1984.

- Irvine, Stuart A. "The Rise of the House of Jehu." Pages 104–118 in J. Andrew Dearman and M. Patrick Graham, eds., *The Land That I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honour of J. Maxwell Miller*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 343. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Ishida, Tomoo. *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 142. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild, and Seton Lloyd. *Sennacherib's Aqueduct at Jerwan*. Oriental Institute Publication 24. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- Janowski, Bernd. "Der Ort des Lebens: Zur Kultsymbolik des Jerusalemer Tempels." Pages 368–397 in Jens Kamlah, ed., *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. v. Chr.)*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- Japhet, Sara. *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- Jepsen, Alfred. *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1956.
- Jeremias, Jörg. *Die Reue Gottes: Aspekte alttestamentlicher Gottesvorstellung*. Biblische Studien 65. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.
- Jeremias, Jörg. *The Book of Amos: A Commentary*. Trans. Douglas W. Stott. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- Johns, Claude H.W. *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters, Volume 1*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- de Jong, Matthijs J. *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets: A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Subsidia Biblica 14.1–14.2. 2 vols. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.
- Jursa, Michael. "Economic Change and Legal Innovation: On Aspects of Commercial Interaction and Land Tenure in Babylonia in the First Millennium BC." Pages 601–628 in Mario Liverani and Clelia Mora, eds., *I diritti del mondo cuneiforme (Mesopotamia e regioni adiacenti ca. 2500–500 A.C.)*. Pavia: IUSS Press, 2008.
- Kalimi, Isaac. "The Land of Moriah, Mount Moriah, and the Site of Solomon's Temple in Biblical Historiography." *Harvard Theological Review* 83 (1990): 345–362.
- Kalimi, Isaac. *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Kalimi, Isaac. "Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah: The Chronicler's View Compared with His 'Biblical' Sources." Pages 11–50 in Isaac Kalimi and Seth Richardson,

- eds., *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 71. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Kalimi, Isaac, and Seth Richardson, eds. *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 71. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Kallai, Zecharia. "The United Monarchy of Israel—A Focal Point in Israelite Historiography." *Israel Exploration Journal* 27 (1977): 103–109.
- Kalluveetil, Paul. *Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East*. Analecta Biblica 88. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.
- Kalmanofsky, Amy. *Terror All Around: Horror, Monsters, and Theology in the Book of Jeremiah*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 390. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Kaminsky, Joel S. *Corporate Responsibility in the Hebrew Bible*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 196. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Kamlah, Jens. "Temples of the Levant—Comparative Aspects." Pages 507–534 in Jens Kamlah, ed., *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- Kang, Seong Il. "Creation, Eden, Temple and Mountain: Textual Presentations of Sacred Space in the Hebrew Bible." Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2008.
- Kaplan, Jonathan. "The Mesha Inscription and Iron Age II Water Systems." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 69 (2010): 23–29.
- Karageorghis, Vassos. *Kition: Mycenaean and Phoenician Discoveries in Cyprus*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1976.
- Kärki, Ilmari. *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften der altbabylonischen Zeit*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 1980–.
- Kataja, Laura, and Robert Whiting. *Grants, Decrees and Gifts of the Neo-Assyrian Period*. State Archives of Assyria 12. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1995.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 29–43.
- Kawashima, Robert S. "The Priestly Tent of Meeting and the Problem of Divine Transcendence: An 'Archaeology' of the Sacred." *Journal of Religion* 86 (2006): 226–257.
- Kawashima, Robert S. "On the Word of an Israelite: Oaths and Testimonies in the Bible." Paper presented at the Oxford Seminar in Advanced Jewish Studies, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, November 13, 2013.
- Keel, Othmar. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Trans. Timothy J. Hallett. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.
- Keel, Othmar. "Paraphernalia of Jerusalem Sanctuaries and Their Relation to Deities Worshipped Therein during the Iron Age IIA–C." Pages 317–342 in Jens Kamlah, ed., *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples*

- in the Levant* (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.). Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- Keel, Othmar, and Christoph Uehlinger. *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*. Trans. Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Keiser, Clarence Elwood. *Letters and Contracts from Erech Written in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917.
- Kempinski, Aharon. "Joshua's Altar: An Iron Age I Watch-Tower?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 12/1 (1986): 44–49.
- Kent, Roland G. *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. American Oriental Society 33. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1950.
- Kenyon, Kathleen M. *Digging Up Jericho*. London: E. Benn, 1957.
- Kenyon, Kathleen M. *Royal Cities of the Old Testament*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Kessler, Rainer. *The Social History of Ancient Israel: An Introduction*. Trans. Linda M. Maloney. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2008.
- King, Leonard W. *Babylonian Boundary-Stones and Memorial-Tablets in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 1912.
- King, Philip J., and Lawrence E. Stager. *Life in Biblical Israel*. Library of Ancient Israel. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Kinney, Dale. "Rape or Restitution of the Past? Interpreting Spolia." Pages 53–68 in Susan C. Scott, ed., *The Art of Interpreting*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
- Kitz, Anne Marie. *Cursed Are You! The Phenomenology of Cursing in Cuneiform and Hebrew Texts*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- Klein, Ralph W. *2 Chronicles: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Kletter, Raz. "Between Archaeology and Theology: The Pillar Figurines from Judah and the Asherah." Pages 179–216 in Amihai Mazar, ed., *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 331. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Klostermann, August. *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*. Nördlingen: C.H. Beck, 1887.
- Knapp, Andrew. "David and Hattushili III: The Impact of Genre and a Response to J. Randall Short." *Vetus Testamentum* 63 (2013): 261–275.
- Knauf, Ernst Axel. "Hezekiah or Manasseh? A Reconsideration of the Siloam Tunnel and Inscription." *Tel Aviv* 28 (2001): 281–287.
- Knoll, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*. 2 vols. Harvard Semitic Monographs 52, 54. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993–1994.

- Knoppers, Gary N., and J. Gordon McConville, eds. *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- Knudtzon, J.A. *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, Erster Teil: Die Texte*. Aalen: Otto Zeller Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964.
- Koehler, Ludwig. *Hebrew Man: Lectures Delivered at the Invitation of the University of Tübingen, December 1–16, 1952*. Trans. Peter R. Ackroyd. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E.J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994–1999.
- Koloski-Ostrow, Ann Olga. *The Archaeology of Sanitation in Roman Italy: Toilets, Sewers, and Water Systems*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.
- Koşay, Hâmit Zübeyr, and Mahmut Akok. *Alaca Höyük Excavations: Preliminary Report on Research and Discoveries, 1963–1967*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından, 1973.
- Kosmin, Paul J. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Koyré, Alexandre. *Newtonian Studies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Koyré, Alexandre. *Galileo Studies*. Trans. John Mepham. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1978.
- Krahmalkov, Charles R. "An Ammonite Lyric Poem." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 223 (1976): 55–57.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. "The Idea of Cultic Centralization: And Its Supposed Ancient Near Eastern Analogies." Pages 121–144 in Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckerman, eds., *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 405. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Kucová, Lydie. "Obeisance in the Biblical Stories of David." Pages 241–260 in Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and Brian Aucher, eds., *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kuhr, Amélie. *The Ancient Near East c. 3000–300 BC*. 2 vols. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Kupper, Jean-Robert. "Le recensement dans les textes de Mari." Pages 99–110 in André Parrot, ed., *Studia Mariana*. Leiden: Brill, 1950.
- Kupper, Jean-Robert. *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957.
- Kutscher, Edward Yechezkel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Ed. Raphael Kutscher. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982.
- Labuschagne, Casper J. "The Našû-nadānu Formula and Its Biblical Equivalents." Pages 176–180 in M.S.H.G. Heerma van Voss, P.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, and

- N.A. van Uchelen, eds., *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Prof. M.A. Beek at the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Studia semitica neerlandica 16. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974.
- Laessøe, Jørgen. "Reflexions on Modern and Ancient Oriental Water Works." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 7 (1953): 5–26.
- Laessøe, Jørgen. *People of Ancient Assyria: Their Inscriptions and Correspondence*. Trans. F.S. Leigh-Browne. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963.
- Lafont, Sophie. "Le juge biblique." Pages 541–556 in Jean-Marie Carbasse and Laurence Depambour-Tarride, eds., *La Conscience du juge dans la tradition juridique européenne*. Paris: PUF, 1999.
- Lafont, Sophie. "The King and the Diviner at Emar." Pages 207–217 in Lorenze d'Alfonso, Yoram Cohen, and Dietrich Sürenhagen, eds., *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape, and Society*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 349. Munich: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.
- Lamb, David T. *Righteous Jehu and His Evil Heirs: The Deuteronomist's Negative Perspective on Dynastic Succession*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Lambert, Wilfred G. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Lambert, Wilfred G., and Alan R. Millard. *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Lancaster, Steven P., and G.A. Long. "Where They Met: Separations in the Rock Mass near the Siloam Tunnel's Meeting Point." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 315 (1999): 15–26.
- Landsberger, Benno. *Sam'al: Studien zur Entdeckung der Ruinenstaette Karatepe*. Ankara: Turkischen Historischen Gesellschaft, 1948.
- Langdon, Stephen. *Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1912.
- Lauinger, Jacob. "The Temple of Ištar at Old Babylonian Alalakh." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 8 (2008): 181–217.
- Launderville, Dale. *Piety and Politics: The Dynamics of Royal Authority in Homeric Greece, Biblical Israel, and Old Babylonian Mesopotamia*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Lautner, Julius G. *Die richterliche Entscheidung und die Streitbeendigung im altbabylonischen Prozessrechte*. Leipzig: T. Weicher, 1922.
- Leemans, Wilhelmus F. "Aperçu sur les textes juridiques d'Emar." *Journal for the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 31 (1988): 207–242.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *State, Space, World: Selected Essays*. Ed. Stuart Elden. Trans. Neil Brenner and Gerald Moore. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.
- Leggett, Donald A. *The Levirate and Goel Institutions in the Old Testament*. Cherry Hill, N.J.: Mack Publishing, 1974.

- Lehnart, Bernard. *Prophet und König im Nordreich Israel: Studien zur sogenannten vorklassischen Prophetie im Nordreich Israel anhand der Samuel-, Elija- und Elischa-Überlieferungen*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 96. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. "Mr. Leibniz's Fifth Paper: Being an Answer to Dr. Clarke's Fourth Reply." Pages 55–96 in H.G. Alexander, ed., *The Leibniz–Clarke Correspondence: Together with Extracts from Newton's Principia and Optiks*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958.
- Leichty, Erle. *The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680–669 BC)*. Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 4. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Lemaire, André. "Toward a Redactional History of the Book of Kings." Pages 446–461 in Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville, eds., *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- Lemaire, André. *The Birth of Monotheism: The Rise and Disappearance of Yahwism*. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 2007.
- Leuchter, Mark. *The Polemics of Exile in Jeremiah 26–45*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Leuchter, Mark. "The Sociolinguistics and Rhetorical Implications of the Source Citations in Kings." Pages 119–134 in Mark Leuchter and Klaus-Peter Adam, eds., *Soundings in Kings: Perspectives and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Levin, Christoph. "Die Frommigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda." Pages 129–168 in Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen, eds., *Houses of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Levin, Christoph. *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 87. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Levin, Yigal. "How Did Rabshakeh Know the Language of Judah?" Pages 323–337 in Shamir Yonah, ed., *Marbeh Hokmah: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East in Loving Memory of Victor Avigdor Hurowitz*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Levine, Baruch A. "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 232 (1978): 13–17.
- Levine, Baruch. "'The Lord Your God Accept You' (2 Samuel 24:23): The Altar Erected by David on the Threshing Floor of Araunah." *Eretz-Israel* 24 (1993): 122–129. [In Hebrew]

- Levine, Baruch. "Lpny YHWH: Phenomenology of the Open-Air-Altar in Biblical Israel." Pages 196–205 in Avraham Biran and Joseph Aviram, eds., *Biblical Archaeology Today*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993.
- Levine, Baruch. *Numbers 21–36: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 4A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Levinson, Bernard M. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Lewis, Theodore J. "'You Have Heard What the Kings of Assyria Have Done': Disarmament Passages vis-à-vis Assyrian Rhetoric of Intimidation." Pages 75–100 in Raymond Cohen and Raymond Westbrook, eds., *Isaiah's Vision of Peace in Biblical and Modern International Relations: Swords into Plowshares*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Lipiński, Edward. "Hiram of Tyre and Solomon." Pages 251–271 in André Lemaire, Baruch Halpern, and Matthew J. Adams, eds., *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 129. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Lippert, Sandra. *Einführung in die altägyptische Rechtsgeschichte*. Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 5. Berlin: Lit, 2008.
- Little, Lester K., ed. *Plague and the End of Antiquity: The Pandemic of 541–750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Liverani, Mario. "Land Tenure and Inheritance in the Ancient Near East: The Interaction between 'Palace' and 'Family' Sectors." Pages 33–44 in Tarif Khalidi, ed., *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East*. Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1984.
- Liverani, Mario. "Messages, Women, and Hospitality: Inter-Tribal Communication in Judges 19–21." Pages 160–192 in *Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography*. Studies in Egyptology and the Ancient Near East. London: Equinox, 2004.
- Liverani, Mario. *The Ancient Near East: History, Society and Economy*. Trans. Soraia Tabatabai. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Loader, James A. "Of Barley, Bulls, Land and Levirate." Pages 123–138 in Florentino García Martínez, ed., *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 53. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Long, Burke O. *2 Kings*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 10. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Loretz, Oswald. "Die ammonitische Inschrift von Tell Siran." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 9 (1977): 169–171.
- Lowie, Robert H. *Primitive Society*. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1920.

- Luckenbill, Daniel D. *The Annals of Sennacherib*. Oriental Institute Publications 2. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1924.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2013.
- MacDonald, Nathan. *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism."* Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Machinist, Peter. "The Rab Saqeh at the Wall of Jerusalem: Israelite Identity in the Face of the Assyrian 'Other.'" *Hebrew Studies* 41 (2000): 151–168.
- Magdalene, F. Rachel. *On the Scales of Righteousness: Neo-Babylonian Trial Law and the Book of Job*. Brown Judaic Studies 348. Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 2007.
- Magness, Jodi. "Integrating Archaeology and Texts: The Example of the Qumran Toilet." Pages 285–292 in Thomas E. Levy, ed., *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism*. London: Equinox, 2010.
- Magness, Jodi. "Toilet Practices, Purity Concerns, and Sectarianism in the Late Second Temple Period." Pages 51–70 in Benedikt Eckhardt, ed., *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Magness, Jodi. "What's the Poop? On Ancient Toilets and Toilet Habits." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 75 (2012): 80–87.
- Maidman, Maynard Paul. *Nuzi Texts and Their Uses as Historical Evidence*. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 18. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Maier, Christl M. *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.
- Malamat, Abraham. "Kingship and Council in Ancient Israel and Sumer." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 22 (1963): 247–253.
- Malamat, Abraham. "Charismatic Leadership in the Book of Judges." Pages 152–168 in Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller, eds., *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1926.
- Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power: Volume 1, A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Márquez Rowe, Ignacio. "The Legal Texts from Ugarit." Pages 390–422 in Wilfred G.E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 39. Boston: Brill, 1999.
- Márquez Rowe, Ignacio. "Anatolia and the Levant: Ugarit." Pages 719–736 in Raymond Westbrook, ed., *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 72. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Marzahn, Joachim. "Ašduniarim von Kiš: eine unbekannte Inschrift." Pages 267–277 in Barbara Böck, Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, and Thomas Richter, eds., *Munuscula*

- Mesopotamica: Festschrift für Johannes Renger*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 267. Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 1999.
- Masson, Olivier. "A propos d'un rituel hittite pour la lustration d'une armée: le rite de purification par le passage entre les deux parties d'une victime." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 137 (1950): 5–25.
- Matthews, Lucy P. "The First Dynasty of Babylon: History and Texts." Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham, 1970.
- Matthews, Victor H. "Entrance Ways and Threshing Floors: Legally Significant Sites in the Ancient Near East." *Fides et Historia* 19 (1987): 25–40.
- Matthews, Victor H. *Judges and Ruth*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Matthews, Victor H. "Remembered Space in Biblical Narrative." Pages 61–75 in Mark K. George, ed., *Constructions of Space IV: Further Developments in Examining Ancient Israel's Social Space*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 569. London: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Matthiae, Paolo. "Le Sculture in Pietra." Pages 103–142 in G. Castellino, ed., *Missione archeologica italiana in Siria: II Rapporto preliminare della campagna 1965 (Tell Mardikh)*. Rome: Istituto di studi del Vicino oriente, Università, 1966.
- Matthiae, Paolo. "Unité et développement du temple dans la Syrie du Bronze Moyen." Pages 43–72 in E. Van Donzel et al., eds., *Le temple et le culte: compte rendu de la vingtième Rencontre assyriologique internationale, organisée à Leiden du 3 au 7 juillet 1972*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1975.
- Matthiae, Paolo. *Ebla: An Empire Rediscovered*. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- Mattingly, G.L., J.I. Lawlor, J.D. Wineland, J.H. Pace, A.M. Bogaard, and M.P. Charles. "Al-Karak Resources Project 1997: Excavations at Khirbat al-Mudaybi'." *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 43 (1999): 127–144.
- May, Herbert G. "Some Cosmic Connotations of *Mayim Rabbim*, 'Many Waters.'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955): 9–21.
- Mayer, Walter. *Ausgrabungen in Tall Munbāqa-Ekaltē II: die Texte*. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 102. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 2001.
- Mays, James Luther. *Amos: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Mazar, Amihai. "The 'Bull-Site': An Iron Age 1 Open Cult Place." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 247 (1982): 27–41.
- Mazar, Amihai. "Bronze Bull Found in Israelite 'High Place' from the Time of Judges." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 9/5 (1983): 34–40.
- Mazar, Amihai. "On Cult Places and Early Israelites: A Response to Michael Coogan." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 4/4 (1988): 45.
- Mazar, Amihai. "Temples of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages and the Iron Age." Pages 161–187 in Aharon Kempinski and Ronny Reich, eds., *The Architecture of Ancient Israel from the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.

- Mazar, Amihai. "Three 10th–9th Century BCE Inscriptions from Tel Rehov." Pages 171–184 in Cornelis G. den Hertog, Ulrich Hübner, and Stefan Münger, eds., *Saxa loquentur: Studien zur Archäologie Palästinas/Israels; Festschrift für Volkmar Fritz zum 65. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 302*. Munich: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. *I Samuel*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1979.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. "The Apology of David." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 489–504.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. *II Samuel*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament*. Analecta Biblica 21. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.
- McCormick, Clifford Mark. *Palace and Temple: A Study of Architectural and Verbal Icons*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 313. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- McDonough, Sean M. "And David Was Old, Advanced in Years': 2 Samuel XXIV 18–25, 1 Kings I 1, and Genesis XXIII–XXIV." *Vetus Testamentum* 49 (1999): 128–131.
- McKeating, Henry. "The Development of the Law of Homicide in Ancient Israel." *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 46–68.
- McKenzie, Donald A. "Judicial Procedure at the Town Gate." *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964): 100–104.
- McKenzie, John L. "Elders in the Old Testament." *Biblica* 40 (1959): 522–540.
- McKenzie, Steven L. *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984.
- McKenzie, Steven L. *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 42. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- McMahon, Augusta. "Waste Management in Early Urban Southern Mesopotamia." Pages 19–39 in Piers D. Mitchell, ed., *Sanitation, Latrines, and Intestinal Parasites in Past Populations*. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2015.
- Meissner, Bruno. *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht*. Assyriologische Bibliothek 11. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893.
- Melik'išvili, Giorgi. *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi*. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960.
- Mellink, Machteld J. "Archaeology in Asia Minor." *American Journal of Archaeology* 69 (1965): 133–149.
- Mendenhall, George E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955.
- Mercer, Samuel A.B. *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1939.
- Merrifield, Andy. "Place and Space: A Lefebvrian Reconciliation." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 18 (1993): 516–531.
- Merrifield, Andy. *Henri Lefebvre: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

- Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series 8. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1976.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. "Cherubim." Pages 362–367 in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P.W. van der Horst, eds., *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. "Israelite Aniconism: Developments and Origins." Pages 173–204 in Karel van der Toorn, ed., *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997.
- Michalowski, Piotr. "New Sources Concerning the Reign of Naram-Sin." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 32 (1980): 233–246.
- Micheel, Rosemarie. *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 18. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1983.
- Mierse, William E. *Temples and Sanctuaries from the Early Iron Age Levant: Recovery after Collapse*. History, Archaeology, and Culture of the Levant 4. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Miglio, Adam. *Tribe and State: The Dynamics of International Politics and the Reign of Zimri-Lim*. Gorgias Studies in the Ancient Near East 8. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2014.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Ideological and Historical Importance of Judge in Deuteronomy." Pages 129–139 in vol. 3 of Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch, eds., *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume: Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: E. Rubenstein, 1983.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*. A Continental Commentary. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 3A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Miller, James Maxwell. "The Moabite Stone as a Memorial Stela." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 106 (1974): 9–18.
- Miller, Robert D., II. "Israel's Covenant in Ancient Near Eastern Context." *Biblische Notizen* 139 (2008): 5–18.
- Mills, Barbara J. "Alternative Models, Alternative Strategies: Leadership in the Prehispanic Southwest." Pages 3–18 in Barbara J. Mills, ed., *Alternative Leadership Strategies in the Prehispanic Southwest*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2000.
- Mills, Mary E. *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 560. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Milstein, Sara J. "Insights into Editing from Mesopotamian Literature: Mirror or Mirage?" In Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny, eds.,

- Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, forthcoming.
- Milstein, Sara J. "Outsourcing Gilgamesh." In Raymond Person and Robert Rezetko, eds., *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, forthcoming.
- Minokami, Yoshikazu. *Die Revolution des Jehu*. Göttinger theologischer Arbeiten 38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Mommsen, Wolfgang J. *The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Monroe, Lauren A.S. *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Monson, John H. "Solomon's Temple and the Temple at 'Ain Dara." *Qadmoniot* 29 (1996): 33–38. [In Hebrew]
- Montgomery, James A., and Henry S. Gehman. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*. International Critical Commentary 5. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951.
- Moor, Johannes C. de. *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 91. Leuven: University Press, 1997.
- Moran, William L. *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Morandi Bonacossi, Daniele. "The Northern Levant (Syria) during the Middle Bronze Age." Pages 408–427 in Margreet L. Steiner and Ann E. Killebrew, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Morgenstern, Julian. *The Fire upon the Altar*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Trans. D.R. Ap-Thomas. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Mueller, E. Aydeet. *The Micah Story: A Morality Tale in the Book of Judges*. Studies in Biblical Literature 34. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Müller, Reinhard. *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Müller, Werner E. *Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.
- Mulzer, Martin. *Jehu schlägt Joram: text-, literar- und strukturkritische Untersuchung zu 2 Kön 8,25–10,36*. Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 37. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1992.
- Murnane, William J., and Charles C. Van Siclen III. *The Boundary Stelae of Akhenaten*. Studies in Egyptology. London: Kegan Paul, 1993.
- Myers, Jacob M. *II Chronicles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 13. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965.

- Na'aman, Nadav. "The Canaanite City-States in the Late Bronze Age and the Inheritances of the Israelite Tribes." *Tarbiz* 55 (1986): 463–488. [In Hebrew]
- Na'aman, Nadav. "New Light on Hezekiah's Second Prophetic Story (2 Kgs 19,9b–35)." *Biblica* 81 (2000): 393–402.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "The Sources Available to the Author of the Book of Kings." Pages 105–120 in Mario Liverani, ed., *Recenti tendenze nella ricostruzione della storia antica d'Israele*. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2005.
- Na'aman, Nadav. *Ancient Israel's History and Historiography: The First Temple Period, Collected Essays*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "The King Leading Cult Reforms in His Kingdom: Josiah and Other Kings in the Ancient Near East." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 12 (2006): 131–168.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "When and How Did Jerusalem Become a Great City? The Rise of Jerusalem as Judah's Premier City in the Eighth–Seventh Centuries B.C.E." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 347 (2007): 21–56.
- Nakhai, Beth Alpert. "What's a Bamah? How Sacred Space Functioned in Ancient Israel." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/3 (1994): 18–29.
- Nam, Roger S. *Portrayals of Economic Exchange in the Book of Kings*. Biblical Interpretation 112. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Nelson, Richard D. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Joshua: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Neufield, Edward. "Hygiene Conditions in Ancient Israel (Iron Age)." *Biblical Archaeologist* 34 (1971): 42–66.
- Newton, Isaac. *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended*. London: Tonson, Osborn, and Longman, 1728.
- Newton, Isaac. *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*. Trans. A. Motte. Ed. F. Cajori. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.
- Niditch, Susan. *Judges: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Niebuhr, Carl, and Jane Hutchison. *The Tell El Amarna Period: The Relations of Egypt and Western Asia in the Fifteenth Century B.C. According to the Tell El Amarna Tablets*. London: David Nutt, 1901.
- Niemann, Hermann Michael. *Herrschaft, Königtum und Staat: Skizzen zur soziokulturellen Entwicklung im monarchischen Israel*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 6. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, P. Siebeck, 1993.

- Noll, Kurt L. "Is the Scroll of Samuel Deuteronomistic?" Pages 119–148 in Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala, eds., *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History*. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Norin, Stig. "The Age of the Siloam Inscription and Hezekiah's Tunnel." *Vetus Testamentum* 48 (1998): 37–48.
- Noth, Martin. *The History of Israel*. 2d ed. London: A. & C. Black, 1960.
- Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Trans. Bernhard W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Noth, Martin. *The Deuteronomistic History*. Trans. of part 1 of the 1957 ed. of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- Novák, Mirko. "The Temple of 'Ain Dāra in the Context of Imperial and Neo-Hittite Architecture and Art." Pages 41–54 in Jens Kamlah, ed., *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 92. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Oden, Daniel. "Power over Land in Late Bronze Age Syrian Legal Tablets and Its Characterization in 1 Kings 21:1–16." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2012.
- Økland, Jorunn. *Constructions of Space III: Biblical Spatiality and the Sacred*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 540. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Olávarri, Emilio. "Sondeo Arqueológico en Khirbet Medeineh junto a Smakieh (Jordania)." *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 22 (1977–1978): 136–149.
- Olávarri, Emilio. "La Campagne de Fouilles 1982 à Khirbet Medeinat al-Mu'arradjeh près de Smakieh (Kerak)." *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 27 (1983): 165–178.
- Olmo Lete, Gregorio del, and Joaquín Sanmartín. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Trans. and ed. Wilfred G.E. Watson. 3d ed. Handbook of Oriental Studies 112. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Olyan, Saul M. "Some Neglected Aspects of Israelite Interment Ideology." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 601–616.
- Olyan, Saul M. *Social Inequality in the World of the Text: The Significance of Ritual and Social Distinctions in the Hebrew Bible*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Olyan, Saul M. "The Instrumental Dimension of Violence against Corpses in Biblical Texts." Pages 125–136 in Saul M. Olyan, ed., *Ritual Violence in the Hebrew Bible: New Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *Letters from Mesopotamia: Official Business, and Private Letters on Clay Tablets from Two Millennia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

- Otten, Heinrich. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981.
- Otto, Eckart “שָׁאֲרִי ša‘ar.” Pages 358–403 in vol. 8 of G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995.
- Otto, Eckart. “Zivile Funktionen des Stadttors in Palästina und Mesopotamien.” Pages 188–197 in Manfred Weippert and Stefan Timm, eds., *Meilenstein: Festgabe für Herbert Donner zum 16 Februar 1995*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995.
- Otto, Rudolf. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational*. Trans. John W. Harvey. 2d ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Otto, Susanne. *Jehu, Elia und Elisa: Die Erzählung von der Jehu-Revolution und die Komposition der Elia-Elisa-Erzählungen*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 152. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001.
- Ouellette, Jean. “The Basic Structure of Solomon’s Temple and Archaeological Research.” Pages 1–20 in Joseph Gutmann, ed., *The Temple of Solomon: Archaeological Fact and Medieval Tradition in Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Art*. Religion and the Arts 3. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Özgülç, Tahsin. *Altintepe I: Mimarlık anıtları ve duvar resimleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1966.
- Pakkala, Juha. *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History*. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Pakkala, Juha. “Why the Cult Reforms in Judah Probably Did Not Happen.” Pages 201–235 in Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckerman, eds., *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 405. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Pals, Daniel L. *Eight Theories of Religion*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Park, Song-Mi Suzie. “Census and Censure: Sacred Threshing Floors and Counting Taboos in 2 Samuel 24.” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 35 (2013): 21–41.
- Park, Song-Mi Suzie. *Hezekiah and the Dialogue of Memory*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.
- Parker, Simon B. “Did the Authors of the Books of Kings Make Use of Royal Inscriptions?” *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 357–378.
- Parpola, Simo. *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part I: Letters from Assyria and the West*. State Archives of Assyria 1. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1987.
- Parpola, Simo. “The Construction of Dur-Šarrukin in the Assyrian Royal Correspondence.” Pages 49–77 in A. Caubet, ed., *Khorsabad, le palais de Sargon II, roi d’Assyrie*. Paris: Louvre, 1995.
- Patton, Corrine L. “Pan-Deuteronomism and the Book of Ezekiel.” Pages 200–215 in Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie, eds., *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Paul, Shalom M. *Amos*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

- Peckham, Brian. "Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)." *Orientalia* 37 (1968): 304–324.
- Peterson, Eugene H. *First and Second Samuel*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1999.
- Petschow, Herbert. "Die Neubabylonische Zwiegesprächsurkunde und Gen. 23." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 19 (1965): 103–120.
- Pflüger, K. "The Edict of King Haremhab." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 5 (1946): 260–276.
- Pietsch, Michael. *Die Kultreform Josias: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte Israels in der späten Königszeit*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 86. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013.
- Pinnock, Frances. "The Urban Landscape of Old Syrian Ebla." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 53 (2001): 13–33.
- Pinnock, Frances. "Syrian and Northern Mesopotamian Temples in the Early Bronze Age." Pages 385–405 in Kai Kaniuth et al., eds., *Tempel im Alten Orient*. Colloquien der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 7. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013.
- Pioske, Daniel. *David's Jerusalem: Between Memory and History*. Routledge Studies in Religion. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Pisano, Stephen. *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*. *Orbis biblicus et orientalis* 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1984.
- Pitard, Wayne T. "A Historical Overview of Pastoral Nomadism in the Central Euphrates Valley." Pages 293–308 in Joseph E. Coleson and Victor H. Matthews, eds., *Go to the Land I Will Show You: Studies in Honor of Dwight W. Young*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- Pitard, Wayne. "Before Israel: Syria-Palestine in the Bronze Age." Pages 25–57 in Michael D. Coogan, ed., *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Ploeg, J.P.M. van der. "Les Chefs du Peuple d'Israel et leurs Titres." *Revue biblique* 57 (1950): 40–61.
- Poeschke, Joachim, Hugo Brandenburg, and Gerda Henkel Stiftung, eds. *Antike Spolien in der Architektur des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*. Munich: Hirmer, 1996.
- Polley, Max E. *Amos and the Davidic Empire: A Socio-Historical Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 12. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Porter, Anne. *Mobile Pastoralism and the Formation of Near Eastern Civilizations: Weaving Together Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Porter, Benjamin W. *Complex Communities: The Archaeology of Early Iron Age West-Central Jordan*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013.
- Postgate, J. Nicholas. *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees*. *Studia Pohl: Series Maior* 1. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

- Postgate, J. Nicholas. "Land Tenure in the Middle Assyrian Period: A Reconstruction." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 34 (1971): 496–520.
- Postgate, J. Nicholas. "Ilku and Land Tenure in the Middle Assyrian Kingdom—A Second Attempt." Pages 303–312 in J. Nicholas Postgate et al., eds., *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1982.
- Prinsloo, Gert T.M., and Christl M. Maier, eds. *Constructions of Space V: Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 576. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Provan, Iain. *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 172. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.
- Provan, Iain W., V. Philips Long, and Tremper Longman III. *A Biblical History of Israel*. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 2003.
- Puckett, Richard A. "Law and Authority in Ancient Israel: An Analysis of Three Stages in the Development of Israelite Jural Authority." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1994.
- Pury, Albert de, and Thomas Romer. "Le Pentateuque en question: Position du problème et brève histoire de la recherche." Pages 9–80 in Albert de Pury, ed., *Le Pentateuque en question: les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989.
- Pury, Albert de, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds. *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- Radine, Jason. *The Book of Amos in Emergent Judah*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Raines, John. "Introduction." Pages 1–14 in John Raines, ed., *Marx on Religion*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.
- Rainey, Anson F. *The El-Amarna Correspondence: A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets*. Ed. William Schniedewind and Zipora Cochavi-Rainey. 2 vols. Handbook of Oriental Studies 110. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Rappaport, Roy A. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Reade, Julian. "Studies in Assyrian Geography, Part I: Sennacherib and the Waters of Nineveh." *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 72 (1978): 47–72, 157–180.
- Redford, Donald B. *Egypt, Canaan and Israel in Ancient Times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

- Reich, Ronny. "Palaces and Residences in the Iron Age." Pages 202–222 in Aharon Kempinski and Ronny Reich, eds., *The Architecture of Ancient Israel, from the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- Reich, Ronny. *Excavating the City of David: Where Jerusalem's History Began*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Biblical Archaeological Society, 2011.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "The History of the Gihon Spring in Jerusalem." *Levant* 36 (2004): 211–223.
- Reich, Ronny, Gideon Avni, and Tamar Winter. *Jerusalem Milestone: A Guide to the Archaeological Sites*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2009.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "Light at the End of the Tunnel." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 25 (1999): 22–35.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "The System of Rock-Cut Tunnels near the Gihon in Jerusalem Reconsidered." *Revue biblique* 107 (2000): 5–17.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "Reconsidering the Karstic Theory as an Explanation to the Cutting of Hezekiah's Tunnel in Jerusalem." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 325 (2002): 75–80.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "The Urban Development of Jerusalem in the Late Eighth Century B.C.E." Pages 209–218 in Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew, eds., *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "On the Original Length of Hezekiah's Tunnel: Some Critical Notes on David Ussishkin's Suggestions." Pages 795–800 in Aren M. Maeir and Pierre de Miroschedji, eds., *"I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times": Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "The Date of City-Wall 501 in Jerusalem." *Tel Aviv* 35 (2008): 114–122.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "A New Segment of the Middle Bronze Age II Fortifications in the City of David." *Tel Aviv* 37 (2010): 141–153.
- Reich, Ronny, and Eli Shukron. "The Date of the Siloam Tunnel Reconsidered." *Tel Aviv* 38 (2011): 147–157.
- Reich, Ronny, Eli Shukron, and Omri Lernau. "Recent Discoveries in the City of David, Jerusalem." *Israel Exploration Journal* 57 (2007): 156–163.
- Reinhard, Karl, and Peter Warnock. "Archaeoparasitology and the Analysis of the Latrine Pit Soils from the City of David." Pages 20–23 in Ofra Rimon, ed., *Illness and Healing in Ancient Times: Exhibition Catalog*. Haifa: Hecht Museum, University of Haifa, 1996.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. "Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew." Pages 65–88 in W.R. Bodine, ed., *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

- Rendsburg, Gary A. *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings*. Occasional Publications of the Department of Near Eastern Studies and the Program of Jewish Studies, Cornell University 5. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2002.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. "A Comprehensive Guide to Israelian Hebrew: Grammar and Lexicon." *Orient* 38 (2003): 5–35.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. "No Stelae, No Queens: Two Issues Concerning the Kings of Israel and Judah." Pages 95–107 in Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough, eds., *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the "Other" in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007.
- Rendsburg, Gary A., and William M. Schniedewind. "The Siloam Tunnel Inscription: Historical and Linguistic Perspectives." *Israel Exploration Journal* 60 (2010): 188–203.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "Zur Komposition des Buches Jesaja." *Vetus Testamentum* 34 (1984): 295–320.
- Renfroe, F. "The Foibles of a Feeble Monarch." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 22 (1990): 279–284.
- Renger, Johannes M. "Institutional, Communal and Individual Ownership or Possession of Arable Land in Ancient Mesopotamia from the End of the Fourth to the End of the First Millennium BC." *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 71 (1995): 269–320.
- Reviv, Hanoch. *The Elders in Ancient Israel: A Study of a Biblical Institution*. Trans. L. Plitmann. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989.
- Richards, Audrey I. *Land, Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia: An Economic Study of the Bemba Tribe*. London: International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, 1939.
- Richter, Sandra L. *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: lešakkēn šemô šām in the Bible*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 318. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Riley, Jason A. "Does YHWH Get His Hands Dirty? Reading Isaiah 63:1–6 in Light of Divine Postbattle Purification." Pages 243–268 in Brad E. Kelle, Frank Ritche Ames, and Jacob L. Wright, eds., *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- Robertson, David. *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 3. Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- Robinson, Edward. *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions: A Journal of Travels in the Years 1838 & 1852*. 2d ed. 3 vols. London: J. Murray, 1856.
- Robker, Jonathan Miles. *The Jehu Revolution: A Royal Tradition of the Northern Kingdom and Its Ramifications*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 435. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated." Pages 131–147 in Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

- Rofé, Alexander. *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Rofé, Alexander. *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Midrashic Traits in 4Q51 (So-Called 4QSam^a)." Pages 75–88 in Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker, ed., *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Writing, Interpolating and Editing: 2 Samuel 24 and 1 Chronicles 21 as a Case Study." *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 3 (2014): 317–326.
- Rogerson, John, and Philip R. Davies. "Was the Siloam Tunnel Built by Hezekiah?" *Biblical Archaeologist* 59 (1996): 138–149.
- Rollston, Christopher A. "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel: The Old Hebrew Epigraphic Evidence." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 344 (2006): 47–74.
- Römer, Thomas. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Römer, Thomas. *The Invention of God*. Trans. Raymond Geuss. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Römer, Thomas, ed. *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 147. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- Römer, Thomas, and Albert de Pury. "Deuteronomistic History (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues." Pages 24–141 in Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds., *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Rooker, Mark F. *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Rosenberg, Stephen G. "The Siloam Tunnel: A Feat of Survey." Pages 3–20 in Avraham Faust et al., eds., *New Studies on Jerusalem: Papers of the Fifth Conference, 23 December 1999*. Jerusalem: Yad Y. Ben Zvi, 1999.
- Rost, Leonhard. *The Succession to the Throne of David*. Trans. Michael D. Rutter and David M. Gunn. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1982.
- Roth, Martha. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor*. 2d ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Routledge, Bruce. *Moab in the Iron Age: Hegemony, Polity, Archaeology*. Archaeology, Culture, and Society. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Routledge, Bruce. "On Water Management in the Mesha Inscription and Moab." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 72 (2013): 51–64.

- Rudman, Dominic. "Is the Rabshakeh Also among the Prophets? A Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings XVIII 17–35." *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 100–110.
- Rupprecht, Konrad. *Der Tempel von Jerusalem: Gründung Salomos oder jebusitischen Erbe?* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 144. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.
- Russell, John Malcolm. *Sennacherib's "Palace without Rival" at Nineveh*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991.
- Russell, Stephen C. *Images of Egypt in Early Biblical Literature: Cisjordan-Israelite, Transjordan-Israelite, and Judahite Portrayals*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 403. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Russell, Stephen C. "Abraham's Purchase of Ephron's Land in Anthropological Perspective." *Biblical Interpretation* 21 (2013): 153–170.
- Russell, Stephen C. "The Hierarchy of Estates in Land and Naboth's Vineyard." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38 (2014): 453–469.
- Russell, Stephen C. "Ideologies of Attachment in the Story of Naboth's Vineyard." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 44 (2014): 13–28.
- Russell, Stephen C. "Gate and Town in 2 Samuel 15:1–5: Collective Politics and Absalom's Strategy." *Journal of Ancient History* 3 (2015): 2–21.
- Russell, Stephen C. "The Structure of Judicial Administration in the Moses Story." Pages 317–329 in Thomas E. Levy, Thomas Schneider, and William H.C. Propp, eds., *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International, 2015.
- Safar, Fuad. "Sennacherib's Project for Supplying Arbil with Water." *Sumer* 2 (1946): 50–52.
- Safren, Jonathan D. "The Location of Dūr-Yahdun-Lim." *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 78 (1984): 123–141.
- Safren, Jonathan D. "Dūr-Yahdun-Lim: The raison d'être of an Ancient Mesopotamian Fortress-City." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 32 (1989): 1–47.
- Salmon, John M. "Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel: An Historical Investigation of Old Testament Institutions." Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1968.
- Sanders, Seth L. *The Invention of Hebrew*. Traditions. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Sasson, Jack M. *The Military Establishments at Mari*. Studia Pohl 3. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Sasson, Jack M. *Judges 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 6D. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.
- Sasson, Victor. "The Siloam Tunnel Inscription." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 114 (1982): 111–117.
- Savage, Stephen H., and Steven E. Falconer. "Spatial and Statistical Inference of Late Bronze Age Polities in the Southern Levant." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 330 (2003): 31–45.

- Savage, Stephen H., and Steven E. Falconer. "The Bronze Age Political Landscape of the Southern Levant." Pages 125–150 in Steven E. Falconer and Charles E. Redman, eds., *Politics and Power: Archaeological Perspectives on the Landscapes of Early States*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009.
- Schaefer-Lichtenberger, Christa. *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im Alten Testament: eine Auseinandersetzung mit Max Webers Studie "Das antike Judentum."* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 156. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983.
- Schapera, Isaac. *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate*. Lovedale, South Africa: Lovedale Press, 1943.
- Schaudig, Hanspeter. "Cult Centralization in the Ancient Near East? Conceptions of the Ideal Capital in the Ancient Near East." Pages 145–168 in Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckerman, eds., *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 405. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Scheffler, Eben. *Politics in Ancient Israel*. Pretoria: Biblia, 2001.
- Schenker, Adrian. *Der Mächtige im Schmelzofen des Mitleids: eine Interpretation von 2 Sam 24*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 42. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- Schipper, Jeremy M. *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Schloen, J. David. *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*. Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001.
- Schmid, Herbert. "Der Tempelbau Salomos in religionsgeschichtlicher Sicht." Pages 241–250 in Arnulf Kuschke and Ernst Kutsch, eds., *Archäologie und Altes Testament: Festschrift für Kurt Galling*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1970.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. *Bildhafte Herrschaftsrepräsentation im eisenzeitlichen Israel*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 283. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001.
- Schneider, Thomas. "The Philistine Language and the Name 'David.'" *Ugarit Forschungen* 43 (2011): 569–580.
- Schniedewind, William M. "Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple Tendenz in the Greek Text of Samuel—Kings." *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994): 107–116.
- Schniedewind, William M. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Schroeder, Otto. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920.
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

- Scurlock, Jo Ann, and Burton R. Andersen. *Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine: Ancient Sources, Translations, and Modern Medical Analyses*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2005.
- Seidel, Hans-Joachim. *Nabots Weinberg, Ahabs Haus, Israels Thron: Textpragmatisch fundierte Untersuchung von 1 Kön 21 und seinen Bezugstexten*. Berlin: LIT, 2012.
- Seirafi, Faisal, Agob Kirichian, and Maurice Dunand. "Recherches archéologiques à Ayin Dara au nord-ouest d'Alep." *Annales archéologiques arabes de Syrie* 15/2 (1965): 3–20.
- Seitz, Christopher R. *Zion's Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36–39*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Sethe, Kurt, ed. *Urkunden des Neuen Reichs*. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums* 4. Berlin: Graz, 1961.
- Seybold, Klaus. *Das davidische Königtum im Zeugnis der Propheten*. *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 107. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Shaheen, Naseeb. "The Siloam End of Hezekiah's Tunnel." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 109 (1977): 107–112.
- Shaheen, Naseeb. "The Sinuous Shape of Hezekiah's Tunnel." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 111 (1979): 103–108.
- Sharon, Ilan, and Anabel Zarzecki-Peleg. "Podium Structures with Lateral Access: Authority Ploys in Royal Architecture in the Iron Age Levant." Pages 145–167 in Seymour Gitin, J. Edward Wright, and J.P. Dessel, eds., *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel in Honor of William G. Dever*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Sharp, Carolyn J. *Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah: Struggles for Authority in Deutero-Jeremianic Prose*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Shea, William H. "Commemorating the Final Breakthrough of the Siloam Tunnel." Pages 431–442 in Yoël L. Arbeitman, *Fucus: A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988.
- Shectman, Sarah, and Joel S. Baden, eds. *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 95. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009.
- Sheddick, Vernon G.J. *Land Tenure in Basutoland*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1954.
- Shiloh, Yigal. "The Rediscovery of Warren's Shaft: Jerusalem's Water Supply during Siege." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 7 (1981): 24–39.
- Shiloh, Yigal. "Underground Water Systems in the Land of Israel in the Iron Age." Pages 275–293 in Aharon Kempinski and Ronny Reich, eds., *The Architecture of Ancient Israel, from the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods: In Memory of Immanuel (Munya) Dunayevsky*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.

- Shiloh, Yigal, and Donald T. Ariel. *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985: 5. Extramural Areas*. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2000.
- Shimron, Aryeh E., and Amos Frumkin. “The Why, How, and When of the Siloam Tunnel Reevaluated: A Reply to Sneh, Weinberger, and Shalev.” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 364 (2011): 53–60.
- Shimron, A., A. Frumkin, J. Rosenbaum, Y. Deutch, and M. Dvoracek. “The Significance of Geological Structures, Cave Sediments and Hydraulic Lime in the Interpretation of the History of the Subterranean Waterworks beneath Ancient Jerusalem.” *Geological Survey of Israel Current Research* 12 (2000): 247–256.
- Shimron, Aryeh E., et al. “The City of David Waterworks: A Geographical and Engineering Overview.” Pages iii–xvi in E. Baruch, ed., *New Studies on Jerusalem: Proceedings of the Fourth Conference*. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1998. [In Hebrew]
- Short, J. Randall. *The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David*. Harvard Theological Studies 63. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Divinity School, 2010.
- Simon, László T. *Identity and Identification: An Exegetical and Theological Study of 2 Sam 21–24*. Tesi gregoriana Serie teologia 64. Rome: Pontificia università gregoriana, 2000.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. “Quelques remarques sur Pg et la dernière rédaction du pentateuque.” Pages 95–125 in Albert de Pury, ed., *Le Pentateuque en question: les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989.
- Skinner, John. *Kings*. New Century Bible. Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, 1904.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D. *Writings from Ancient Israel: A Handbook of Historical and Religious Documents*. Trans. Graham I. Davies. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D. “King Hezekiah Advocates True Prophecy: Remarks on Isaiah xxxvi and xxxvii // II Kings xviii and xix.” Pages 93–128 in *Converting the Past: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Moabite Historiography*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D. “A Literary Analysis of the Shiloah (Siloam) Tunnel Inscription.” Pages 101–110 in Graham I. Davies, J.K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin, eds., *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 420. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Smith, Adam T. “The Making of an Urartian Landscape in Southern Transcaucasia: A Study of Political Architectonics.” *American Journal of Archaeology* 103 (1999): 45–71.
- Smith, Adam T. *The Political Landscape: Constellations of Authority in Early Complex Polities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

- Smith, Henry Preserved. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 239. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Smith, Mark S. *Untold Stories: The Bible and Ugaritic Studies in the Twentieth Century*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*. New York: Oxford, 2003.
- Smith, Mark S. *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Smith, Mark S., and Wayne T. Pitard. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Volume II, Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary on KTU/CAT 1.3–1.4*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 114. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Smith, Neil. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. 3d ed. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.
- Smith, Richard G. *The Fate of Justice and Righteousness during David's Reign: Rereading the Court History and Its Ethics According to 2 Samuel 8:15b–20:26*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 508. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Smoak, Jeremy D. "Assyrian Siege Warfare and the Background of a Biblical Curse." Pages 83–91 in Brad E. Kelle and Frank Ritzel Ames, eds., *Writing and Reading War: Rhetoric, Gender, and Ethics in Ancient and Modern Contexts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Sneh, Amihai, Ram Weinberger, and Eyal Shalev. "The Why, How, and When of the Siloam Tunnel Reevaluated." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 359 (2010): 57–65.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Das Königtum in Israel: Ursprünge, Spannungen, Entwicklung*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 104. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Joshua: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Judges: A Commentary*. Trans. John Bowden. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- Soja, Edward W. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Soldt, W.H. van. "Studies on the Sakinu-Official (2): The Functions of the Sakinu of Ugarit." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 34 (2002): 805–828.
- Soldt, W.H. van. "The Akkadian Legal Texts from Ugarit." Pages 86–124 in Sophie Démare-Lafont and André Lemaire, eds., *Trois millénaires de formulaires juridiques*. Geneva: Droz, 2010.

- Sommer, Benjamin D. *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Spawn, Kevin L. "As It Is Written" and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 311. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Speiser, Ephraim A. "Coming' and 'Going' at the City Gate." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 144 (1956): 20–23.
- Speiser, Ephraim A. "Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 149 (1958): 17–25.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Stade, Bernhard. "Miscellen. 16. Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 15–21. Zu 18,13–19,37." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 6 (1886): 172–186.
- Stavropoulou, Francesca. "Gog's Grave and the Use and Abuse of Corpses in Ezekiel 39:11–20." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129 (2010): 67–84.
- Stavropoulou, Francesca. *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestor Veneration in Biblical Land Claims*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 473. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Stegemann, Ursula. "Der Restgedanke bei Isaias." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 13 (1969): 161–186.
- Steinkeller, Piotr. "New Light on the Hydrology and Topography of Southern Babylonia in the Third Millennium." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 91 (2001): 22–84.
- Stinespring, William F. "Temple, Jerusalem." Pages 542–547 in vol. 4 of G.A. Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Stith, D. Matthew. *The Coups of Hazael and Jehu: Building an Historical Narrative*. Gorgias Dissertations 37. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Stokes, Ryan E. "The Devil Made David Do It . . . or Did He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the 'Satan' in 1 Chronicles 21:1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128 (2009): 91–106.
- Stol, Marten. "Kanal(isation)." Pages 355–365 in vol. 5 of Erich Ebeling et al., eds., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928–.
- Stolz, Fritz. *Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem: Studien zur altorientalischen, vor- und frühisraelitischen Religion*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 118. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.
- Stones, Rob. *Structuration Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Stott, Katherine M. *Why Did They Write This Way? Reflections on References to Written Documents in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Literature*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 492. London: Continuum, 2008.
- Stronach, David. "Parterres and Stone Watercourses at Pasargadae: Notes on the Achaemenid Contribution to Garden Design." *Journal of Garden History* 14 (1994): 3–12.

- Suriano, Matthew J. "The Apology of Hazael: A Literary and Historical Analysis of the Tel Dan Inscription." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 66 (2007): 163–176.
- Suriano, Matthew J. *The Politics of Dead Kings: Dynastic Ancestors in the Book of Kings and Ancient Israel*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.48. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *Isaiah 1–39: With an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 16. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *The Twelve Prophets*. Berit olam. 2 vols. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
- Tadmor, Hayim. "The People' and the Kingship in Ancient Israel: The Role of Political Institutions in the Biblical Period." *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* 11 (1968): 46–68.
- Tadmor, Hayim. "Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah: Historical and Historiographical Considerations." Pages 653–675 in Mordechai Cogan, ed., "With My Many Chariots I Have Gone Up the Heights of Mountains": *Historical and Literary Studies on Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2011.
- Tadmor, Hayim, and Shigeo Yamada. *The Royal Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BC) and Shalmaneser V (726–722 BC), Kings of Assyria*. Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 1. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Taggar-Choen, Ada. "Between Herem, Ownership, and Ritual: Biblical and Hittite Perspectives." Pages 419–434 in Roy Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen, eds., *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*. Resources for Biblical Study 82. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Tamburrino, Aldo. "Water Technology in Ancient Mesopotamia." Pages 29–51 in Larry W. Mays, ed., *Ancient Water Technologies*. New York: Springer International, 2010.
- Tappy, Ron E., P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., Marilyn Lundberg, and Bruce Zuckerman. "An Abecedary of the Mid-Tenth Century BCE from the Judaeen Shepelah." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 344 (2007): 5–46.
- Tertel, Hans Jürgen. *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 221. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- Thiel, Winfried. *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 41. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.
- Thiel, Winfried. *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45: mit einer Gesamtbeurteilung der deuteronomistischen Redaktion des Buches Jeremia*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 52. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.

- Thomas, Benjamin. *Hezekiah and the Compositional History of the Book of Kings*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Thompson, Henry O., and Fawzi Zayadine. "The Tell Siran Inscription." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 212 (1973): 5–11.
- Thompson, John B. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Throntviet, Mark A. "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Book of Chronicles." Pages 105–121 in M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie, and Gary N. Knoppers, eds., *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 371. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Thureau-Dangin, François. *Tell Ahmar*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1929.
- Thureau-Dangin, François. "Iaḥdunlim, roi de Hana." *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 33 (1936): 49–54.
- Thureau-Dangin, François, and Maurice Dunand. *Til-Barsib*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1936.
- Thurston, Tina L. *Landscapes of Power, Landscapes of Conflict: State Formation in the South Scandinavian Iron Age*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2001.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1996.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H., ed. *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- Timmer, Daniel C. *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:12–17; 35:1–3 in Exegetical and Theological Perspective*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 227. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- Tinney, Steve. "A New Look at Naram-Sin and the 'Great Rebellion.'" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 47 (1995): 1–14.
- Trebolle-Barrera, Julio C. "From the 'Old Latin' through the 'Old Greek' to the 'Old Hebrew' (2 Kgs 10:23–25)." *Textus* 11 (1984): 17–36.
- Trebolle-Barrera, Julio C. *Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9–11*. Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1984.
- Trigger, Bruce G. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Trigger, Bruce G. *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Tucker, Gene M. "The Legal Background of Genesis 23." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966): 77–84.
- Tugendhaft, Aaron. "How to Become a Brother in the Bronze Age: An Inquiry into the Representation of Politics in Ugaritic Myth." *Fragments* 2 (2012): 89–104.

- Tugendhaft, Aaron. "Sovereignty: Politics and Poetics in the Baal Cycle." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 132 (2012): 367–384.
- Ulrich, Eugene Charles, Jr. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 19. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Ungnad, Arthur. *Babylonian Letters of the Hammurapi Period*. Publications of the Babylonian Section 7. Philadelphia: University Museum, 1915.
- Ur, Jason. "Sennacherib's Northern Assyrian Canals: New Insights from Satellite Imagery and Aerial Photography." *Iraq* 67 (2005): 317–345.
- Ussishkin, David. "Building IV in Hamath and the Temples of Solomon and Tell Tayanat." *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966): 104–110.
- Ussishkin, David. "King Solomon's Palaces." *Biblical Archaeologist* 36 (1973): 78–105.
- Ussishkin, David. "The Original Length of the Siloam Tunnel in Jerusalem." *Levant* 8 (1975): 82–95.
- Ussishkin, David. *The Conquest of Lachish by Sennacherib*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, The Institute of Archaeology, 1982.
- Ussishkin, David. "The Erection of Royal Monuments in City-Gates." Pages 485–496 in Kutlu Emre et al., eds., *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989.
- Ussishkin, David. "The Water System of Jerusalem during Hezekiah's Reign." *Cathedra* 70 (1994): 3–28. [In Hebrew]
- Ussishkin, David. "Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah: The Archaeological Perspective with an Emphasis on Lachish and Jerusalem." Pages 75–103 in Isaac Kalimi and Seth Richardson, eds., *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 71. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Van de Mieroop, Marc. *The Ancient Mesopotamian City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Van de Mieroop, Marc. *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A Biography*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
- Van de Mieroop, Marc. *A History of the Ancient Near East ca. 3000–323 BC*. 2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- Van Seters, John. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Van Seters, John. *The Biblical Saga of King David*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Van Seters, John. "Solomon's Temple: Fact and Ideology in Biblical and Near Eastern Historiography." Pages 85–97 in *Studies in the History, Literature and Religion of Biblical Israel*. Changing Perspectives 1. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Vaughn, Andrew G. "Palaeographic Dating of Judaean Seals and Its Significance for Biblical Research." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 313 (1999): 43–64.

- Vaughn, Andrew G. *Theology, History, and Archaeology in the Chronicler's Account of Hezekiah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Vawter, Bruce, and Leslie J. Hoppe. *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Veijola, Timo. *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 193. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1975.
- Vera Chamaza, Galo W. *Die Omnipotenz Assurs: Entwicklungen in der Assur-Theologie unter den Sargoniden Sargon II., Sanherib und Asarhaddon*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 295. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.
- Vincent, H. *Underground Jerusalem: Discoveries on the Hill of Ophel (1909–1911)*. London: Horace Cox, 1911.
- Waard, Jan de. "The Chiasmic Structure of Amos V, 1–17." *Vetus Testamentum* 27 (1977): 170–177.
- Walters, Stanley D. *Water for Larsa: An Old Babylonian Archive Dealing with Irrigation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Walther, Arnold F. *Das Altbabylonische Gerichtswesen*. Leipziger semitische Studien 6.4–6. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1917.
- Waltke, Bruce K. *A Commentary on Micah*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2007.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael P. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Warhurst, Amber. "Merging and Diverging: The Chronicler's Integration of Material from Kings, Isaiah, and Jeremiah in the Narratives of Hezekiah and the Fall of Judah." Ph.D. diss., University of St. Andrews, 2011.
- Waters, Jaime L. "Threshing Floors as Sacred Spaces in the Hebrew Bible." Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2013.
- Waters, Jaime L. *Threshing Floors in Ancient Israel: Their Ritual and Symbolic Significance*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.
- Watzinger, Carl. *Denkmäler Palästinas: eine Einführung in die Archäologie des Heiligen Landes*. 2 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1933–1935.
- Wazana, Nili. *All the Boundaries of the Land: The Promised Land in Biblical Thought in Light of the Ancient Near East*. Trans. Liat Qeren. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press, 1964.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Trans. Ephraim Fischhoff. 4th ed. 2 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Weidner, Ernst. "Hochverrat gegen Nebukadnezar II: Ein Grossrüdenträger vor dem Königsgericht." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 17 (1954–1956): 1–5.

- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Cult Centralization in Israel in Light of a Neo-Babylonian Analogy." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 23 (1964): 202–212.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184–203.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Elders." Pages 578–580 in vol. 6 of Cecil Roth, ed., *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Jerusalem: Encyclopedia Judaica, 1972.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Judge and Officer in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East." *Israel Oriental Studies* 7 (1977): 65–88.
- Weippert, Helga. "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher." *Biblica* 53 (1972): 301–339.
- Weippert, Helga. *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 132. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.
- Weisberg, Dvora E. *Levirate Marriage and the Family in Ancient Judaism*. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2009.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 4th ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1963.
- Wells, Bruce. *The Law of Testimony in the Pentateuchal Codes*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004.
- Wells, Bruce. "Competing or Complementary? Judges and Elders in Biblical and Neo-Babylonian Law." *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 16 (2010): 77–104.
- Westbrook, Raymond. "The Law of the Biblical Levirate." Pages 69–89 in *Property and the Family in Biblical Law*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 113. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Westbrook, Raymond. *Property and the Family in Biblical Law*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 113. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Westbrook, Raymond. "Introduction: The Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law." Pages 1–90 in vol. 1 of Raymond Westbrook, ed., *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 72. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Westbrook, Raymond, ed. *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 72. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Westenholz, Joan Goodnick. *Royal Cities of the Biblical World*. Jerusalem: Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem, 1996.
- Westenholz, Joan Goodnick, and Aage Westenholz. *Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum: The Old Babylonian Inscriptions*. Cuneiform Monographs 33. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Wette, Wilhelm M.L. de. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971.

- White, Marsha C. *The Elijah Legends and Jehu's Coup*. Brown Judaic Studies 311. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Whitelam, Keith W. *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979.
- Whybray, R. Norman. *The Succession Narrative: A Study of II Samuel 9–20; I Kings 1 and 2*. Studies in Biblical Theology 2.9. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 28–39: A Continental Commentary*. Trans. Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Wilkinson, Tony J. *Archaeological Landscapes of the Near East*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003.
- Williamson, H.G.M. *Israel in the Book of Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Williamson, H.G.M. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. New Century Bible. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Williamson, H.G.M. *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.
- Willis, Timothy M. *The Elders of the City: A Study of the Elders-Laws in Deuteronomy*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Wilson, Godfrey. *The Land Rights of Individuals among the Nyakyusa*. Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, 1938.
- Wilson, Robert R. "Enforcing the Covenant: The Mechanisms of Judicial Authority in Early Israel." Pages 59–75 in Herbert B. Huffmon, Frank A. Spina, and Alberto R.W. Green, eds., *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- Wilson, Robert R. "Who Was the Deuteronomist? (Who Was Not the Deuteronomist?): Reflections on Pan-Deuteronomism." Pages 67–82 in Linda Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie, eds., *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: "Pan-Deuteronomism" and Scholarship in the Nineties*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1999.
- Winter, Irene J. "After the Battle is Over: The 'Stele of the Vultures' and the Beginning of Historical Narrative in the Art of the Ancient Near East." Pages 11–32 in Herbert L. Kessler and Marianna Shreve Simpson, eds., *Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts Symposium Series 4. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1985.
- Wiseman, Donald J. *The Alalakh Tablets*. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953.
- Wittfogel, Karl. *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Wolf, C. Umhau. "Traces of Primitive Democracy in Ancient Israel." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 6 (1947): 98–108.

- Wolf, Herbert Martin. "The Apology of Hattušiliš Compared with Other Political Self-Justifications of the Ancient Near East." Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1967.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Joel and Amos*. Trans. Walderman Janzen, S. Dean McBride, Jr., and Charles A. Muenchow. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Wong, Ka Leung. *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 87. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Woolley, C. Leonard. *Carchemish, Part II: The Town Defences*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1921.
- Wray Beal, Lisa M. *Narrative Control of Approval and Disapproval in the Story of Jehu (2 Kings 9 and 10)*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 478. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Wright, J. Edward. *The Early History of Heaven*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Wright, Jacob L. *David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Wright, John W. "The Founding Father: The Structure of the Chronicler's David Narrative." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998): 45–59.
- Wright, John W. "A Tale of Three Cities: Urban Gates, Squares, and Power in Iron Age II, Neo-Babylonian, and Achaemenid Judah." Pages 19–50 in Philip R. Davies and John M. Halligan, eds., *Second Temple Studies III: Studies in Politics, Class and Material Culture*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 340. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Wright, Richard M. *Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 419. London: T&T Clark International, 2005.
- Würthwein, Ernst. *Die Bücher der Könige*. Das Alte Testament Deutsch 11/1. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985.
- Wyatt, Nick. "'Araunah the Jebusite' and the Throne of David," *Studia Theologica* 39 (1985): 39–53.
- Wyatt, Nick A. *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilimilku and His Colleagues*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands: In the Light of Archaeological Study*. 2 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Yeivin, S. "Bamah." Pages 150–152 in vol. 4 of Eleazar P. Sukenik et al, eds., *Encyclopedia Biblica*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1964.
- Yener, K. Aslihan. "Alalakh Spatial Organization." Pages 99–144 in K. Aslihan Yener, ed., *The Amuq Valley Regional Projects: Surveys in the Plain of Antioch and Orontes Delta, Turkey, 1995–2002, Volume 1*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2005.
- Yoffee, Norman. *Myths of the Archaic State: Evolution of the Earliest Cities, States and Civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Yoon, Sung-Hee. *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David's Rise: A Methodological Reflection and Its Implications*. Beihefte

- zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 462. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.
- Young, Ian, ed. *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Young, Robb Andrew. *Hezekiah in History and Tradition*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 155. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Younger, K. Lawson, Jr. "The Siloam Tunnel Inscription: An Integrated Reading." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 26 (1994): 543–556.
- Younger, K. Lawson, Jr. "The Phoenician Inscription of Azitawada: An Integrated Reading." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43 (1998): 11–47.
- Zertal, Adam. "Mount Ebal: Notes and News." *Israel Exploration Journal* 34 (1984): 55.
- Zertal, Adam. "Has Joshua's Altar Been Found on Mount Ebal?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 12/1 (1985): 43, 49–53.
- Zertal, Adam. "How Can Kempinski Be So Wrong?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 12/1 (1986): 49–53.
- Zertal, Adam. "An Early Iron Age Cultic Site on Mount Ebal: Excavation Seasons 1982–1987, Preliminary Report." *Tel Aviv* 13–14 (1986–1987): 105–165.
- Zertal, Adam. "A Cultic Center with a Burnt-Offering Altar from the Early Iron Age I Period at Mt. Ebal." Pages 137–153 in M.A. Klaus and D. Schunk, eds., *Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden: Collected Communications to the XIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988.
- Zevit, Ziony. *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallaxic Approaches*. London: Continuum, 2001.
- Zimansky, Paul E. *Ecology and Empire: The Structure of the Urartian State*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 41. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1985.

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible

Genesis

1–3 4
2:3 57
8:20 142n96
12:7 30
12:7, 8 142n96
13:18 142n96
15:7–21 152n41
21:25 162n127
22:9 142n96
22:13 17
23 27, 71, 76
23:3–10 27
23:6 27
23:10, 18 27, 71
23:20 71
24:34 162n127
25:10 71
26:15, 18 188n39
26:19 162n127
26:25 30
28:24 154n62
31:20 82–83
34:24 71
35:1–3 30
36:24 188n36
49:32 71
50:7 162n127

Exodus

4:25 157n84
5:3, 15 19
9:15 20
12:13 19, 20
13:2 57
17:15 30, 142n96
18:13–26 180n91
21:23 163n133
24:4 142n96
28:3, 41 57
29:1, 27, 33, 36, 37, 44 57
29:14 155n62
30:11–16 20, 24
30:12 19, 23
30:29, 30 57
31:13 57
32:5 142n96
32:32–33 21
34:13 52
40:9, 10, 11, 13 57

Leviticus

4 155n63
7:8 22
8–9 50
8:11, 12, 15, 30 57
8:17 155n62
9:11 155n62
11:35 52

Hebrew Bible (Cont.)

14:15 52
 14:45 52
 16:2–3, 15, 32–34 50
 16:19 57
 17–26 124n55
 17:8 161n17
 20:8 57
 21:8, 15, 23 57
 22:9, 16, 32 57
 22:17–25 23
 22:23 23
 23:27 161n17
 23:36 57, 158n96
 24:18 163n133
 25:10 57
 26:1, 30 49
 26:25 19
 26:30 48

Numbers

3:7, 8, 26, 31, 36 162n128
 4:4, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28,
 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 39,
 41, 43, 47, 49 162n128
 6:11 57
 7:1 57
 8:19 19, 20
 10:10 161n17
 14:12 19, 20
 15:3, 5, 8 161n17
 17:11 20
 17:11f 19
 17:13, 15 20
 17:13–14 20
 22:18 162n127
 23:1, 14, 29 142n96
 27:12–23 158n97
 29:35 57
 35:9–29 70
 35:9–34 170–171n15

Deuteronomy

5:9 187n27

5:12 57
 6:9 170n13
 7:5 52
 12:3 52
 12:5–18 51
 16:8 57, 158n96
 17:2–5 170n13
 17:9, 18 154n60
 19:1–13 70, 170–171n15
 21:5 154n60
 21:22–23 48, 151n38
 22:13–21 69
 22:15 69
 22:18–21 70
 22:23–24 70
 23:10–15 22
 24:8 154n60
 25:5–10 69–70
 27:9 154n60
 28:21 19
 28:26 48, 49
 32:48–52 158n97
 32:51 57

Joshua

3:3 154n60
 7 158–159n97
 7:13 57
 8:10 22
 8:28 155n70
 8:29 48, 151n38
 8:30 142n96
 8:33 154n60
 10:18 132n30
 10:26–27 48, 151n38
 12 8
 15:21–63 72
 16:8–9 72
 17:9, 11–12 72
 18:20–28 72
 19:2–8, 15–17, 22–23, 30–31,
 38–39, 48 72
 20:1–9 70

- 20:4 70
 20:6 70
 22:10, 11, 16, 19,
 23, 26, 29 142n96
 22:17 19, 20
 24 8
- Judges**
 2 8
 2:2 52
 3:12–31 54–55
 3:24 54
 6:24, 26, 28 142n96
 6:28, 30, 31, 32 52
 6:30–32 45
 8:9, 17 45, 53
 9:45 45, 53
 12:4 56
 13:23 22
 17–18 87
 17:18 186n22
 19:29 160n106
 20:15, 17 22
 20:26 22
 21:4 142n96
 21:9 132n30
- Ruth**
 3:11 70
 4:1–11 70
- 1 Samuel**
 4 81
 4–7:1 143n101
 4:14 81
 4:18 81
 6 23
 6:1–16 24
 6:3 23
 6:13–16 17
 6:14–15 31
 7:1 57
 7:5 56
 7:11 82
 7:17 142n96
- 8:2 181n97
 8:11–18 131n27
 8:22 82
 10:8 161n17
 11:3 160n106
 11:7 160n106
 11:8 22
 11:15 82
 12 8
 13:10 161n17
 13:15 132n30
 13:16 129n7
 14:17 132n30
 14:22 82
 14:35 142n96
 15:1 81, 82
 15:4 22
 15:6 82
 16 71
 16:5 57
 16:15 162n127
 17:19 82
 17:44, 46 151n39
 17:52 82
 21:2–10 50–51
 21:4–5 22
 21:8 162n127
 22:6–23 61
 24:4 55, 157n84
 24:7 135n46
 24:16 140n94
 24:16, 20 141n95
 24:18, 21, 24 140n95
 24:18, 21, 25 140n95
 24:22, 24–25 141n95
 26:11 135n46
 29:1 56
 31:1, 7 82
- 1 Samuel 1–2 Kings 10 149n23**
- 2 Samuel**
 2:17 82
 2:20 82

Hebrew Bible (Cont.)

- 2:30 132n30
 4:4 25, 26
 6 24, 143n101
 6:7 129n10
 7 143n101
 8 181n98
 9 25, 26
 9–20 143n101
 9:4 25
 9:7 25
 9:9 25
 10:1–11:1 143n101
 11:10–11 22
 12:7–12 83
 12:26–31 143n101
 15:1–6 14, 68, 69, 75, 82,
 108, 168n6, 180n84
 15:2 81
 15:2–6 80–83
 15:6 82–83
 15:7 80
 16:1–4 25, 26, 27
 16:4 25
 16:18 82
 17:14, 24 82
 18:4 81
 18:17 48
 19:24–30 25, 26
 19:25 26
 19:30 26, 36
 19:42 82
 21–24 137n70, 143n101
 21:1–14 143n101
 21:15–22 143n101
 22:1–51 143n101
 23:1–7 143n101
 23:17 135n46
 24 14, 16–39, 40, 107
 24:1 17
 24:1–15 143n101
 24:2–9 18
 24:3 39
 24:9 21
 24:10 18
 24:10–14 18
 24:10, 17 39
 24:13, 15 19
 24:15 19, 20
 24:16 18
 24:16a 18
 24:17 18
 24:17–19 18
 24:18 30, 37
 24:18–19 18
 24:18–25 17
 24:20 30, 37, 137n67
 24:21 20, 38
 24:21, 22 30
 24:21, 25 18, 19
 24:21b 37
 24:22 37
 24:23 30
 24:24 37
 24:25 38

1 Kings

- 1–2 143n101
 2:4 87
 2:18 200n93
 3–5 117n15
 3:1 3, 186n23
 3:6 87
 3:15–16 81
 4 72
 4:3 184n13
 4:9, 12, 14 72
 4:15–18 72
 5–8 113n4
 5:1 3
 5:14 3
 5:14–8:50 1
 5:15–9:25 117n15
 5:15–28 3
 5:21–28 2

- 5:32 2
 6-7 2, 112n2
 6-8 117n16
 6:37 186n23
 7:7 81
 7:12, 40, 45, 48, 51 186n23
 7:13-45 2
 8 8, 112-113n2, 159n97
 8:1-11 112n2
 8:8 112n2
 8:10, 11, 63, 64 186n23
 8:12-13 112n2
 8:14-61 112n2
 8:23, 25 87
 8:44 87
 8:62-66 112n2
 8:64 57
 8:64-66 159n97
 9-10 117n15
 9:1, 10, 15; 10:5, 12, 27 186n23
 9:4, 6 87
 9:25 37, 142n96
 9:26-28 3
 10:1-13, 24 3
 10:5 162n124
 10:10, 15, 25 3
 10:15, 22, 28 3
 11-15 149n23
 11:1-8 3
 11:24 56
 11:41 200n93
 12:10b-11a 159n100
 12:28 198n85
 12:31 154n60
 13:2 153n43
 13:6 198n85
 13:25 48
 14:7-16 151-152n40
 14:8-14 200n94
 14:10 54
 14:10-11 43, 44, 146n10
 14:19 200n93
 14:26, 28 186n23
 14:29 200n93
 15:7 200n93
 15:13 155n66
 15:15, 18 186n23
 15:27-30 151-152n40
 15:29 184n14
 15:31 200n93
 16 145n7, 149n23
 16:1-4 151-152n40
 16:4 43, 44, 49, 146n10
 16:9-10 200n94
 16:11 184n14
 16:11-13 151-152n40
 16:14 200n93
 16:15-16 145n7
 16:15-18 145n7
 16:16 145n7
 16:21-22 145n7
 16:24 145n7
 16:32 37, 161n16
 16:33 149n27
 16:35 200n93
 18 64, 158n94, 161n14
 18:2-18 158n94
 18:2-40 158n94
 18:19-20 57
 18:20 160n106
 18:32 142n96
 19:7 87
 19:18 184n14
 20:1 57
 20:15, 27 22
 20:30 50
 20:39-42 64
 21 24-25, 27, 34
 21:1 25
 21:3 25
 21:4 27
 21:21-24 151-152n40
 21:23-24 43, 44, 146n10
 21:24 49

Hebrew Bible (Cont.)

- 22 149n23
 22:6 158n93
 22:10 80
 22:35 43
 22:39 200n95
 22:47 184n14
2 Kings
 1 149n23
 1:3, 15 87
 2:21 182n2
 3:2 149n26
 3:6 22
 3:19 195n67
 3:19, 25. 188n39
 3:25 184n14
 3:27 22
 5:17 22
 6:8 198n85
 6:24 57
 6:26 53
 7:13 184n14
 8:1–6 26, 27
 8:7–10 87
 8:23 200n93
 8:29 43
 9–10 40, 44, 45, 146n9,
 147–149nn15–16, 149n23
 9:1, 3, 7, 10 148n16
 9:1, 6, 23, 24 149n16
 9:1, 17, 18, 21 146n8
 9:1–6, 10b–28, 30–37 44
 9:1–6a, 6bβ, 6bd, 10b–13,
 14b–27ba, 27bβb, 30–35 44
 9:1–10:25a 44
 9:1–10:28 42–45
 9:1–10:36 143–144n1
 9:1–15 146n9
 9:3 148n16
 9:4, 16, 28–29, 32, 36 44
 9:4aβ 44
 9:6 44, 149n16
 9:6–10 151–152n40
 9:6baa, 6bβa, 7a, 8–10a,
 27bβa, 28, 36 44
 9:7 42, 43
 9:7, 15, 24, 27 146n8
 9:7, 26, 33 146n8
 9:7–10 64, 147n13, 163n134
 9:7–10a 43, 44, 146n10
 9:7–10a, 14b–15a, 36 44
 9:7b, 14a, 29, 37 44
 9:10 49
 9:10, 36, 37 148n16
 9:11, 17, 18, 19, 22, 26, 28,
 31 146n8
 9:11, 20 146n8
 9:14 145n7
 9:14–15 43
 9:15 43, 149n16
 9:16–26 146n9
 9:17 148n16
 9:17, 19 146n8
 9:17–10:25 158n94
 9:17–26 158n94
 9:18 148n16
 9:21 43
 9:22 148n16
 9:24–26 200n93
 9:25 48
 9:25–26 43
 9:25–26, 36–37 151–152n40
 9:27–28 42
 9:27–29 146n9
 9:29 44, 146n10
 9:30–37 146n9
 9:33 149n16
 9:36–37 43
 9:37 54, 149n16
 10 145–146n7, 145n7
 10:1, 5, 6, 12, 26 44
 10:1, 5, 7, 21 146n8
 10:1–6a, 7–9, 12–17aa, 18–19a,
 20, 21aβb–25a, 28 44

- 10:1–11 146n9
 10:1–27 44
 10:6b 44
 10:7 149n16
 10:8 148n16
 10:9, 11, 17, 21 146n8
 10:10, 17 151–152n40
 10:10–11, 15–17 64
 10:10–11, 17aβa, 19b,
 21aa, 25b–27 44
 10:10–11, 17b, 27a 44
 10:11 43
 10:11, 14, 17, 21 184n14
 10:12–14 42, 146n9
 10:13 57, 146n8
 10:15 149n16
 10:15–28 146n9
 10:18 56–57
 10:18–19 46
 10:18–25 158n94
 10:18–27 162n130
 10:18–28 14, 40–67,
 107–108, 158n94
 10:18b–19a 159n100
 10:19 160n103
 10:20 46, 56–57, 158n96
 10:20–21 162n130
 10:21 45, 46, 146n7,
 160n103, 163n131
 10:22 45, 61, 148n16
 10:23 45, 64
 10:23–25 46
 10:24 45, 163n131, 163n133
 10:24–25 161n117
 10:24a 149n25, 161n116
 10:24b 46, 149n25, 161n116
 10:25 46, 48, 49–50, 51,
 149n25,
 153n43, 153n50, 154n54
 10:25–26 48
 10:25b–27, 28–31a 44
 10:25ba 48
 10:25bβ 48, 49
 10:26 45, 46, 51, 52, 149n26
 10:27 45, 46, 48, 51–53, 55–56,
 157n90
 10:27a 48
 10:27b 48, 53
 10:28 57, 63
 10:29–36 146n9
 10:30 148n16
 10:32 148–149n16
 10:34 200n93
 11:3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 15, 18,
 19 186n23
 11:18 45, 52, 53
 12:5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17,
 19 186n23
 12:7 87
 12:20 200n93
 13–14 149n23
 13:7 184n14
 13:8 200n93
 13:12 200n93
 13:21 48
 14 143n1
 14:14 186n23
 14:15 200n93
 14:18 200n93
 14:28 200n93
 15:6 200n93
 15:10 200n94
 15:11 200n93
 15:15 200n93
 15:21 200n93
 15:26 200n93
 15:31 200n93
 15:35 186n23
 15:36 200n93
 16:8, 14, 18; 21:4, 5 186n23
 16:9 200n93
 16:10–16 37
 16:11 142n96
 17 8

Hebrew Bible (Cont.)

- 17:8 184n14
 18–19 89
 18–20 85
 18:1, 10, 13 183n11
 18:3–6 65, 67
 18:8 203n114
 18:13 87, 99, 186n25
 18:13, 17 88
 18:13, 17–19:9a 88
 18:13, 17–19:37 86, 87, 101
 18:13, 17–19:37 185n19
 18:13–19:37 88
 18:14 101
 18:14–16 86, 88, 101,
 183n11, 186n25, 187n35
 18:17 102, 182n1
 18:17–19:9a 88
 18:17–19:37 88, 187n31
 18:17–37 183n12
 18:18 86
 18:21, 24 101
 18:21–20 101
 18:22 187n36
 18:25 86
 18:27 53
 18:27–37 77
 18:28 89
 19:4, 30, 31 86
 19:9b–19:35 88
 19:9b–20, 32–37 88
 19:20, 33–34 88
 19:21–28 86
 19:21–31 88
 19:29 87, 186n24
 19:30, 31 86
 19:31 86, 184n17
 19:35 87
 19:36–37 88
 20 186n24
 20:1 88, 186n24
 20:1–11 86, 87, 101
 20:1–19 90
 20:2 87
 20:3 186n24
 20:4 50, 186n25
 20:5, 8 186n25
 20:6 186n24
 20:7 186n25
 20:8 186n25
 20:8, 9 87
 20:9 87, 186n24
 20:12 87
 20:12–19 86, 87–88, 101
 20:12–21 199n91
 20:17–18 88, 101, 186n27
 20:19 101
 20:20 15, 84–91,
 98–106, 200n93, 200n96
 20:20b 198n84
 20:39–42 163n133
 21:3 37, 127n1
 21:14 86, 88
 21:17 200n93
 21:25 200n93
 22–23 9, 89, 124n55, 144n2
 22:3 87
 22:3, 4, 5, 8, 9; 23:2,
 6, 7, 11, 12, 24 186n23
 23 150n30
 23:4 154n54, 155n64
 23:4–20 47
 23:4–25 65, 67
 23:7, 8 53
 23:7, 8, 12, 15 52
 23:14, 16, 20 153n43
 23:23 87
 23:28 200n93
 24:5 200n93
 24:13 186n27
 24:13; 25:9, 13, 16 186n23
 25 88
 25:2 87
 25:8 87

- 25:11–12, 22 184n14
 25:13–17 186–187n27
 25:22–26 183n7
 29:17–18 86
- 1 Chronicles**
 11:9 135n46
 13:1 198n85
 20:21 198n85
 21 16–17
 21:20–21 30
 22:1 128n6
 22:9 203n114
 29:12 188n37
- 2 Chronicles**
 1:11–12 188n37
 3:6 188n37
 7:9 57
 9:1, 10, 22, 24 188n37
 9:4 162n124
 10:6 198n85
 16 18
 19:5 181n97
 20:15–17 99
 23:17 52
 25:17 198n85
 29–31 89
 29–32 85
 29:10 142n99
 30–31 99
 30:2 198n85
 31:1 52
 32 89
 32:1 89, 99, 100
 32:1–8 99
 32:2 99, 100
 32:2–3 100
 32:2–4 84–91, 98–106
 32:2–4, 30 15, 103
 32:2–5 99, 198n85
 32:2–6a 198n85
 32:2–8 89–90, 203n114
 32:3 198n85
 32:3–4 90, 103,
 105–106, 198n85
 32:4 100
 32:6b–8 99, 203n114
 32:12 187n36
 32:12, 30 187n36
 32:18 89
 32:22 203n114
 32:23 89
 32:24–26 90
 32:27–29, 30b 90
 32:27–30 188nn37–38
 32:30 84–91, 98–106,
 187n36, 188nn37–38
 32:30a 90
 32:30b 90
 32:31 90, 199n91
 33:3 37, 52
 33:23 187n36
 34:4, 7 52
- Ezra**
 7:6 187n36
 7:12–26 180n91
- Nehemiah**
 8:18 57
- Job**
 29:7 170n13
 31:21 170n13
- Psalms**
 69:13 170n13
 73:20 50
 78:50 19, 20
 79:2 151n39
 79:2–3 48
 83:11 54
 91:6 19
 97:7 162n126
 107:33, 35 182n2
 127:5 170n13
- Proverbs**
 8:3 81
 22:22 70

Hebrew Bible (Cont.)

- 31:23 170n13
- Isaiah**
- 1:4 184n13
- 1:8; 3:16, 17 183n13
- 1:13 57
- 2:4 87
- 2:8, 20 86
- 4:1 183n13
- 4:2 86
- 4:3 86
- 4:5 184n13
- 5:19, 24 184n13
- 5:25 54
- 6:2 157n84
- 7 86
- 7:1 87, 185n21
- 7:3 86, 102, 185n21
- 7:4–9 185n21
- 7:10–16 185n21
- 7:11, 14 87
- 7:15–17 185n21
- 7:18 184n13
- 7:20 157n84
- 8:6–8a 196n76
- 8:18 87, 184n13
- 9:6 86, 184n17
- 10:5–6 86
- 10:12 184n13
- 10:20 86, 184n13
- 10:20–22 86
- 10:32 183n13
- 11:11 86
- 12:6 184n13
- 13:2 184n13
- 14:19 48
- 14:23 155n70
- 15:9 184n16
- 16:1 183n13
- 17:7 184n13
- 18:7 184n13
- 19:6 184n13
- 19:20 87
- 20 185n21
- 20:1–6 86
- 20:3 87
- 22:8–11 198n85
- 22:9 182n1, 198n85
- 22:9–11a 198n85
- 23:13 155n70
- 24:23 184n13
- 25:8 183n13
- 26:11 86
- 27:4, 31, 32 86
- 28:4 186n25
- 28:5 86
- 28:22 186n25
- 29:8 184n13
- 29:19 184n13
- 29:21 70
- 30:1–5 185n19
- 30:1–17 86
- 30:5 183n13
- 30:11, 12, 15 184n13
- 31:1 184n13
- 31:1, 3 185n19
- 31:1–9 86
- 31:4 184n13
- 34:3 48
- 36–37 86, 87, 89, 101, 185n19
- 36–38 85, 101
- 36–39 86, 183n6, 183n12
- 36:1 99
- 36:2 86, 102, 182n1, 185n21
- 36:6–9 101
- 36:10 86
- 36:12 53
- 36:12–20 77
- 36:13 89
- 37:6–7 185n21
- 37:18–19 86
- 37:22–29 86
- 37:30–32 185n21
- 37:32 86, 184n17

- 37:36 87
 38–39 186n24
 38:1 88
 38:1–8, 21–22 86, 87, 90, 101
 38:2 87
 38:6 101
 38:7, 22 185n21
 38:9–20 86, 88
 39 86
 39:1 87
 39:1–8 87–88, 90, 199n91
 39:3 88
 39:6–7 101, 185n21
 39:8 101
 41:14, 16, 20 184n13
 41:18 182n2
 42:13 86
 43:27 187n27
 46:3 86
 47:3 183n13
 52:2 183n13
 54:4 184n13
 55:13 87
 56–66 11
 58:1, 4 184n13
 58:11 182n2
 59:17 86
 62:11 183n13
 63:15 86
 65:7 184n13
 65:7–8 187n27
 66:19 87
 66:20 87
 66:24 48
- Jeremiah**
- 2:16–18, 36 86
 6:8 155n70
 7:33 49
 8:1 153n43
 8:2 54
 9:1 57
 9:21 54
- 12:11 155n70
 15:3 49
 16:4 48, 49, 54, 152n41
 19:7 49
 21:6 19, 20
 21:12 180n90
 22:18–19 48
 22:19 48
 25:9 155n70
 25:33 54
 26:23 48
 33:18, 21 154n60
 34:20 48, 49, 152n41
 35:6–19 164n135
 36:30 48
 40–43 183n7
 41:9 48
 46:25 86
 51:64 183n12
 52 183n12
- Ezekiel**
- 4:12–15 54, 55
 5:17 19
 6 153n46
 6:3b–6 49
 6:5a 49
 14:19 19
 16:13 162n124
 16:26 86
 28:23 19
 29:5 153n44
 29:6–7 86
 32:4 153n44
 38:22 19
- Hosea**
- 7:11, 16 86
 13:14 19
- Joel**
- 1:14 57
 2:15 57
- Micah**
- 5:13 50

*Hebrew Bible (Cont.)***Nahum**

3:3 48

Habakkuk

2:5 56

3:5 19

Zechariah

8:16 70

Malachi

1:6–10 17

Amos

3:15 200n95

4:3 155n71

4:10 19

5:1 71

5:3 71

5:3–5 71

5:5 71

5:10, 12 70

5:15 70

5:21 57

8:3 48

8:8 184n13

9:5 184n13

*New Testament***2 Corinthians**

8:1–5 17

*Qumran texts (Dead**Sea Scrolls)*

4Q422 3:8 20

4QSam^a 30, 180n84,
180n86

11QT 27:4 22

Temple Scroll 50

on David's purchase of
threshing floor 18,
20, 22, 30*Rabbinic Sources*

Midrash Lev. Rab. 7:3, 11 22

Midrash Tanḥ B 3:9a 22

Mishnah Rosh

ha-shana I 3 21

Sipra Nedaba 4:8 22

Tosefta Menah 10:2 22

*Other Ancient Sources***ANET (Ancient Near Eastern Texts)**

321 84

AO (Alter Orient)

5645 198n82

18236 194n59

**AOAT (Alter Orient und Alter
Testament)**3 IV.50^f. 22**Apology of Hattusili III 35–36, 38****Aqhat, Ugaritic tale of 74****ARM (Archives royale de Mari).***See also* Mari letters

I 42 131n24

XIV 104 74

AT (Alalakh Tablets)

17 28–29

52 136n54

53 136n54

54 136n54

76 136n54

78 136n54

Atrahasis epic 96–97, 197n78**Bavian rock inscription of****Sennacherib**

65–66, 96–97, 191n47, 194n60

**BIN (Babylonian Inscriptions, Nies
Collection)**

1 24:16 173n34

1 34:26 73

6:75–18 173n33

**BLMJ (Bible Lands Museum
Jerusalem)**

4158 190n44

BM (British Museum)

12820 192n49

108854 198n82

118906 197n81

118934 193n57

CAD (Chicago Assyrian Dictionary)

- 2:17 173n34
 2:19 173n34
 4:33 174n38
COS (Context of Scripture)
 1.84 (*BEL MADGALTI* instr.)
 §34' 191n47
 2.25 (Tell Siran inscr.) 95
CT (Cuneiform Texts from Tablets in the British Museum)
 30 45 83–81–15, 415,
 rev. 8 197–198n81
 30 45 83–81–15, 415,
 rev. 11 197n81
Darius Susa F (palace of Darius, Susa) 116n15
Dur-Sharrukin inscriptions
 Bull Inscription, ln.
 48 139n82
 Display Inscription,
 Room XIV, ln. 31
 34–35, 139n82
EA (El-Amarna tablets)
 59 76
 100 76
 138 76
 139 76
 140 76
Ekalte
 2 29
Emar, Akkadian texts from
 Emar 144 29, 75
 Emar 197 29, 75
 RE 16 29, 75
 RE 34 29, 75
Enuma Eliš 197n78
Gilgamesh epic
 VII iv 49–52 21
 X vi 36–39 21
 Deluge in 97
Hammurabi Law Code
 §30–31 30
 §5 26
KAI (Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften)
 4 (inscription of Yehimilk of Byblos) 127n1
 37A = CIS 86 153n53
Kalḫu annals 93–94
KBo (Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi)
 V 1.2–3 22
Khorsabad, Barrel Inscription
 ln. 43–49 139n82
Kirta Epic 74
Kizzuwatna documents 22
KTU (keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit)
 1.15 IV 1–27 74
 1.16 VI 45–47 74
 1.17 v 6–8 74
 1.41 22 153–154n53
 1.72 12 155n72
 1.85 9 53
 1.87 24 153–154n53
KUB (Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi)
 13.2 iii 4–8 191n47
Mari letters. See also ARM
 A.319 = ARM XIV
 104 + A.472 74
 A.1289+: iii:8–23 74
 from Shamsi–Adad to
 Yasmaḫ–Adad 20–21
ME 124939A 192n51
Middle Assyrian Laws B ii
 22–2663 30
N iv 3489 (Louvre tablet) 193n53
Nuzi texts
 AASOR 16 21:18 173n33
 CAD 1:84 173n33
 CCT 2 1:33 173n33
 HSS 9
 18:41 173n33
 21:32 173n33
 22:30 173n33

Other Ancient Sources (Cont.)

96:22 173n33
 HSS 14 568:16–17 173n33
 JEN 300:33 173n33
 JEN 317:30 173n33
 JEN 402:25 173n33
 JEN 403:30 173n33
 JEN 470:27 173n33
 JEN 478:11 173n33
 JEN 492:29 173n33
 JEN 546:30 173n33
 OIP 27 57:29 173n33
 TCL 9 19:17 173n33
 TCL 19
 53:22 173n33
 67:26 173n33
 69:27 173n33
 TCL 20 130:36' 173n33
 TCL 21 270:34 173n33

PBS
 7 7:20 73

RIM (Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia)
 A.o.73.3 5–23 194n61
 A.o.78.22 127n2
 A.o.78.22 45–47 93
 A.o.78.23
 94–105 194n59
 106–108 93
 A.o.78.24 41–52 127n2
 A.o.87.10 71–74 192n51
 A.o.99.2 69 165n140
 A.o.100.5 7 165n140
 A.o.101.1 i 85, iii 40 165n140
 A.o.101.30 48–52 192n51
 A.o.102.5
 ii 2b–3 196n76
 iv 3b–5a 97
 A.o.102.6 ii 7, iv 19 165n140
 A.o.102.10 ii 3 165n140
 A.o.102.14 48, 126 165n140
 A.o.102.16 23 165n140

A.o.102.28 27 165n140
 A.o.102.29 10 165n140
 A.o.102.30 20 165n140
 A.o.102.34 6 165n140
 A.o.102.40 i ii, iii 1 165n140
 B.6.14.1 66–67, 108
 E1.9.3.1 xx 16–xxi 3 190n43
 E3/1.1.7.CylA xi 10–17 93
 E3/1.1.7.CylB xi 15–23 193n52
 E3/2.1.1.19 9–19 94
 E3/2.1.1.21 190n43
 E3/2.1.1.22 i.9"–12" 190n43
 E4.2.9.2 92–93
 E4.2.14.15
 19–22 192n48
 25–31 191n46
 32–47 192n49
 E4.3.6.1 193n53
 E4.3.6.7 93
 E4.6.8.1 35–49 94
 E4.8.1.1 97
 43–51 98
 E4.8.1.2 97

RINAP (Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period)
 1 5 4b 94
 3 1 73–78 196n74
 3 1 90 94
 3 2 44–52 196n74
 3 2 66 194n58
 3 3 60 194n58
 3 4 (Rassam Cylinder) 76–77, 100–101, 164n139
 3 4 87 194n58
 3 8 2' 194n58
 3 44–52 196n74
 3 223 66
 6–8, 11b–12 94
 27–34 191n47
 43–54 65–66, 108
 52–54 96
 3 223b–26 192n49

- 4 1 ii 12-24 65
 4 1 vi 34 193n57
 4 2 v 54 193n57
 4 71-80 196n74
 4 104 v 10 80
 4 105 vii 12 80
 4 iii vi 1' 80
 15 v 47b-vi 19 196n74
 16 v 71-vi 38 196n74
 39 11-29a 196n74
 42 20b-28a 196n74
 43 7b-20a 196n74
 46 106b-122a 196n74
 49 7b-20a 196n74
 royal grants, Nos. 1-26,
 27-38, 39-41, 42-54
 138n72
 royal grants, Nos. 42-44
 138n74
 as sources 13
- RS (Ras Shamra)**
 16.145=PRU III 169 29
 16.249 29-30
- SAA (State Archives of Assyria)**
 1 54 139n82
 1 55 139n82
 1 66 139n82
 1 106 138n76
 12 138n74, 138nn77-78
 12 1 31-33
 12 19 139n80, 139n86
 12 19 ln. 23-34, r.1-6 137n71
 12 24 137n71
 12 90 33-34
- Ugaritic Texts.** *See* Aqhat; Kirta; KTU;
 Ras Shamra
- VAT (Vorderasiatisches Museum,
 Berlin)**
 5475 = VAS 6 128:6 173n34
 8807 73
- VTE (Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon)**
 ln. 451, 483-484 49
- Yehimilk of Byblos, inscription
 of 127n1**
- YOS (Yale Oriental Series)**
 3 46:23 173n34

Index of Subjects

- Abraham
altar built by, 30, 142n96
cave of Machpelah, purchase of, 27, 30, 71
sacrifice of, 17, 30
- Abravanel, Isaac, 23
- Absalom, rebellion of, 68–69, 80–83, 181n98, 182n102
- Ackroyd, Peter R., 86, 185n21
- acropolis and lower city, in Middle Bronze age, 113n3
- Adad-nirari II (Neo-Assyrian ruler), 165n140
- Adad-nirari III (Neo-Assyrian ruler), 31–33, 127n2
- affliction, biblical, 19–20
- Ahab (king of Israel)
deconsecrating cultic space and, 40, 42, 63–64, 145–46n7, 163n133
ivory palace of, 102
purchase of cultic space and, 25, 27, 37
- Ahaz (king of Judah), 37, 182n1, 183n6
- Ahaziah (king of Judah), 42, 137n14
- Ahiel, house of (Iron Age II Jerusalem), 53
- Ahimelech (priest), 51
- Ahlström, Gösta W., 114n6
- ‘Ain Dara, temple at, 2
- Akhenaten (pharaoh), 65, 127n2, 172n28
- Alalakj VII temple, 2
- Albenda, Pauline, 197n81
- Albright, William Foxwell, 10
- Alter, Robert, 142–43n100, 166n2
- Amarna archive, 75–76, 177n54. See also *Index of Ancient Sources*
- Amaziah, 102, 198n85
- ambiguity in biblical text, 6, 39
- Amiran, Ruth, 201n98
- Amit, David, 105
- Amminadab (king of the Ammonites), 95
- animal mutilation of corpses, 49, 151n39, 153n44
- Apology* of Hattusili III (king of Hatti), 35–36, 38
- Aqhat, Ugaritic tale of, 74
- Aram, Israel’s fight against, 43, 145n7
- Argišti I (king of Urartu), 93
- Ašdūni-iarīm of Kiš, 97–98
- Ashdod, town gates of, 78
- asherah* (cult object)/Asherah (deity), 51, 149–50n27, 154n54, 155n66
- assembly, invocation of, 46, 56–57
- Assur (deity)
cult city built by Tukulti-Ninurta I for, 194n59
land grant of Adad-nirari III to, 31–33
as principle Assyrian god, 185n20

- Assurnasirpal II (Neo-Assyrian ruler),
33–34, 165n140, 192n51, 193n56,
197n81
- Assur-uballiṭ I (first ruler of Middle
Assyrian empire), 194n61
- asylum, cities of, 71, 170–71n15
- Atalya, Fadida, 104, 202n107
- Atrahasis* epic, 96–97, 197n78
- Auld, A. Graeme, 129n7
- Azatiwada (Hittite king), 80
- Baal, decommissioning of temple of.
See Jehu, decommissioning of
Baal's temple by
- Baal-Meon, water supply in, 95
- Baden, Joel S., 181n98, 182n102
- bāmāh*, 142n95
- Barré, Lloyd M., 147n12
- Bathsheba, David's adultery with, 83
- Bavian rock inscription of Sennacherib,
65–66, 96–97, 191n47, 194n60
- Beal, Lisa M. Wray, 146n9
- Beersheba
burnt-offering altar at, 141n95
as sanctuary town, 71
town gates from, 78
- Ben Zvi, Ehud, 184–85nn18–20
- Benz, Brendon, 6
- Benz, Brendon C., 177n54
- Berquist, L., 5
- Bethel
Amos (prophet) in, 70
drainage system at, 156n79
judgment pronounced against, 171n23
as sanctuary town, 71
- Bethlehem, 71
- betrothal, concept of, 28
- Bible. *See* *Index of Ancient Sources* for
specific citations
- biblical world, geography of royal power
in. *See* royal spatial power in Iron
Age Israel and Judah
- bīt hilāni*-style palaces, 55, 115–16n11
- Blair, Judit M., 130–31n18
- Blanton, Richard, 6, 7–8, 13
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph, 84
- Bnei Het, 27, 30, 71
- Boaz (husband of Ruth), 70
- Boer, Roland, 5
- Boğazköy (ancient Hattusha), 79
- Book of Woes (in Amos), 70–71
- Bozrah, Edom, toilet from, 54
- bringing out and burning, 45–46, 51–52
- bubonic plague, 19, 131n21
- Burney, Charles F., 161n16
- burnt offerings, 22–23
- Cahill, James M., 201n99
- Campbell, Antony F., 10, 128n6, 149n23
- canals, purposes of, 189–90n43, 193n52
- Carchemish, royal seated figure from, 79
- Caspari, Wilhelm, 180n84
- census and ensuing pestilence, expia-
tion for, 17–24, 39
- Childs, Brevard S., 88
- city gates. *See* gates, towns, and local
politics
- civil and criminal cases not distin-
guished, 136n47
- Cogan, Mordechai, 44, 113n4, 146n10,
155n73
- Cohen, Martin A., 166n2
- Cohn, Robert L., 145n6
- collective urban politics. *See* gates,
towns, and local politics
- Conrad, Edgar W., 86, 183n6, 185n21
- corpse exposure, 48–49
- criminal and civil cases not distin-
guished, 136n47
- Cross, Frank Moore, 9, 10, 152n42
- cult centralization, 65, 67, 165n142
- cultic spaces, decommissioning of, 14,
65–67. *See also* Jehu, decommission-
ing of Baal's temple by

- Darius (Persian ruler), 116n15
- David. *See also* threshing floor of
 Araunah, David's purchase of
 Absalom, revolt of, 68–69, 80–83,
 181n98, 182n102
 adultery with Bathsheba and murder
 of Uriah, 83
 ambiguity in biblical text and, 6, 39
 anointed by Samuel, 72
 census and ensuing pestilence, expia-
 tion for, 17–24
 city gate, watching troops march out
 from, 81
 History of David's Rise, 143n101
 Saul's hereditary lands and, 25–26,
 36
- Davies, Philip R., 201n99
- De Geus, C.H.J., 4
- de Groot, Alon, 104, 202n107
- de Wette, W.M.L., 124n55
- Dead Sea Scrolls (Qumran texts). *See*
Index of Ancient Sources
- decommissioning/desecration of cultic
 spaces, 14.65–67. *See also* Jehu, de-
 commissioning of Baal's temple by
- Deluge, references to, 96–97,
 196–97n76
- Démare-Lafont, Sophie, 175–76n47
- Descartes, René, 4, 5
- Deuteronomistic History
 defined, 41–42
 on gates, towns, and local politics,
 171n16
 Hezekiah narrative and, 86–87
 Jehu's decommissioning of temple of
 Baal and, 41, 44, 47–53, 56–58
 as source, 8–10
 sources used by, 168n6
 threshing floor of Araunah, David's
 purchase of, 128n6, 130n14
- Dinah, raped by Shechem, 71
- Doeg the Edomite, 51
- Driver, Samuel R., 169n10
- dung heap of Jehu. *See* Jehu, decommis-
 sioning of Baal's temple by
- Durkheim, Émile, 118n19
- E-anatum of Lagash, 190n43
- Ebla (Tell Mardikh)
 basalt statue of seated king
 from, 79
 temple D at, 2
- Eglon (king of Moab), assassination of,
 54–55
- Egypt, royal spatial power in. *See* Near
 Eastern royal spatial power; *specific*
pharaohs
- Ehud, assassination of Eglon king of
 Moab by, 54–55
- Ekron (Philistine city), 77, 100–1
- Elden, Stuart, 120n32
- elders at city gates. *See* gates, towns,
 and local politics
- Eli, death of, 81
- Eliade, Mircea, 4
- Elijah (prophet), 57, 87, 149n23,
 158n94
- Elisha (prophet), 26, 42, 87, 195n67
- Elumu, stele of Sin in, 33
- Emar, Akkadian texts from, 29, 75,
 175–76n47. *See also* *Index of*
Ancient Sources
- Enlil (deity), 92, 192n48, 196n73
- Enuma Eliš*, creation story in, 197n78
- Ephron (owner of cave of Machpelah),
 27, 30, 71
- Esarhaddon (Neo-Assyrian ruler), 65,
 80, 137n71, 179n80, 195n67
- exclusionary strategy of power and
 Solomon's use of foreign architec-
 tural style, 3
- exclusive Yahwism, 162–63n131
- exposure of corpses, 48–49
- Eynikel, Erik, 10

- Faust, Avi, 202n100
- feet, as euphemism for genitalia, 54, 157n84
- Feinman, Gary M., 7
- “First Campaign Cylinder” of Sennacherib, 94
- Fleming, Daniel E., 6, 13, 74–75, 123n50, 145–46n7
- Flood, references to, 96–97, 196–97n76
- foreign temple style, Solomon’s use of, 2–3, 114n6, 116–17n15
- Fort Sin-muballit, 93
- Frank, Carl, 73
- Freedman, David Noel, 10
- Freud, Sigmund, 118n19
- Fritz, Volkmar, 4, 117n16
- Fuller’s Field, 86, 103, 182n1, 185n21
- Gad (prophet), 18, 30, 37
- Gadot, Yuval, 105
- Galilei, Galileo, 4
- Galling, Kurt, 115n11
- Gannanāte (city rebelling against Shalmaneser III), 97
- Garcia-Treto, Francisco O., 146n9
- gates, towns, and local politics, 14, 68–83, 108
- Absalom, rebellion of, 68–69, 80–83, 181n98, 182n102
- archaeological evidence for, 77–80
- in Hebrew Bible, 69–72
- kings asserting claims to towns at gates, 79–80
- in Mesopotamia and Northern Levant, 72–75
- sanctuary towns and cities of asylum, 71, 170–71n15
- in Southern Levant, 75–77
- tribal past and, 166–67n2, 167–68n4
- geography of royal power in biblical world. *See* royal spatial power in Iron Age Israel and Judah
- George, Mark K., 5
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, 85, 183n5
- Gezer, town gates of, 78
- Giddens, Anthony, 6–7, 122–23n46, 122n40
- Gihon, spring of, 84, 90–91, 103–4, 188n40, 201n97. *See also* Hezekiah’s tunnel and royal shaping of water supply system
- Gilgal
- judgment pronounced against, 171n23
- as sanctuary town, 71
- Gill, Dan, 201n98
- Giša (Umma; city-state), 190n43
- Gitay, Yehoshua, 4
- Gluckman, Max, 24, 133n40, 135n44
- Gonçalves, Francolino J., 88
- Goodnick Westenholz, Joan, 190n45
- Gorman, Frank H., 4
- Gramsci, Antonio, 5–6
- Green, Douglas J., 189n42, 196n72
- Greenstein, Edward L., 126n67
- Gudea of Lagash, 93, 193n52
- Gugler, Werner, 148n16, 163n132
- Gunn, David M., 128n3
- Halpern, Baruch, 10, 55, 81, 157n85, 157n89, 181n95, 200n93, 200n96
- Hammurabi of Babylon
- Law Code of, 30
- water supply systems and, 93, 192n49, 193n53
- Haran, Menahem, 154n55
- Harmanşah, Ömür, 189n42
- Hasegawa, Shuichi, 44
- Hattusha (now Boğazköy), 79
- Hattusili III (king of Hatti), *Apology* of, 35–36, 38
- Hazael of Damascus, 44, 147–48n14
- Hazor X, town gates of, 78
- Hebrew Bible. *See Index of Ancient Sources* for specific citations

- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 120n32
- Hendel, Ronald S., 201n99
- Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm, 180n89
- Herzog, Zeev, 4
- Hezekiah's tunnel and royal shaping of water supply system, 14–15, 84–106, 108
- biblical accounts of, 99–106
- cult centralization and, 65, 67, 165n142
- destructive spatial power of king and, 164n139
- as domestic achievement, 102–5
- envoys sent to Hezekiah, 86, 87–88, 89, 90, 101
- Fuller's Field as location of conduit, 86, 103, 182n1, 185n21
- Gihon spring, 84, 90–91, 103–4, 188n40, 201n97
- illness of Hezekiah, 86, 87, 89, 90
- literary effect of Hezekiah's tunnel narrative, 105–6
- literary history of Hezekiah narratives, 85–91
- as military narrative, 99–102, 203–4n114
- Near Eastern literary motif, royal shaping of water system as, 91–98, 106
- poetic prayer attributed to Hezekiah, 86
- Rassam Cylinder and, 76, 77
- Sennacherib and Hezekiah, 86–87, 89, 99–103, 198n84
- short spelling of Hezekiah's name, 183n11
- Siloam, pool and tunnel of, 84, 103–5, 201–2nn98–100, 202n109, 203n112
- Temple, Jerusalem, Hezekiah's restoration of, 99
- tribute, Hezekiah's payment of, 86
- hierarchical superiors, offenses against, 136n47
- Hiram of Tyre, 117n15
- History of David's Rise, 143n101
- Holiness Code and Holiness School, 22–23, 47, 49, 56, 124n55, 153n46
- Holtz, Shalom E., 174n35
- Horemheb, decree of, 172n28
- House of David, promise to, 9
- House of the Forest of Lebanon, 2–3
- Hundley, Michael B., 127n11
- Huwitz, Victor, 113n4, 116n15
- Hurvitz, Avi, 11
- Hutton, Jeremy M., 10, 168n6
- “hydraulic society” thesis, 188–89n41
- Iahdun-Lim, on water supply system, 94
- Ibal-pi-el II of Ešnunna, 74
- 'Ili-milku son of 'Ili-ba'lu, threshing floor of, 29
- in antis* temple of *Langraum* type, 114n6
- inscriptional material from ancient Israel, 12–13
- Isaac (son of Abraham), 30, 142n96
- Ishtar, land dedicated by Hattusili III to, 36
- Israelian Hebrew in 2 Kings, 148–49n16
- Jabesh-Gilead, 72
- Jacob (son of Isaac), 30, 142n96
- Jehoash (king of Judah), 102, 105
- Jehonadab ben Rachab, 63, 64, 164n135
- Jehu, decommissioning of Baal's temple by, 14, 40–67, 107–8
- Ahab, overthrow of, 40, 42, 145–46n7
- assembly instructions, 46, 56–57
- corpse exposure, 48–49
- in Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions, 41–42, 44, 47–53, 56–58, 64
- dung heap, site turned into, 53–56
- executions, instructions for carrying out, 46

- Jehu, decommissioning of
 Baal's temple by (*Cont.*)
 literary history of, 42–45
 monolatry, assumption of, 162–63n131
 movement of characters through
 space in, 45
 non-sacred personnel entering holi-
 est precinct, 48, 49–51
 reconstruction of two main levels of
 story (Layer A and Layer B), 57–64
 relationship to broader cultural pat-
 terns of Near Eastern royal power,
 65–67
 repetitions and contradictions in
 story, 45–47
 ritual violence, language of, 47–56
 royal bureaucracy, role of, 145–46n7
 sacrifices to Baal and, 45, 49, 60–62,
 153–54n53, 161n17
 sacrifices to Baal by Jehu, 45, 60, 62,
 161n17
 stele of Baal, destruction of, 45–46,
 48, 51–52, 149n26, 154n61
 Jericho, sewer system at, 156n79
 Jeroboam I (king of Israel), 44, 49, 54
 Jeroboam II (king of Israel), 44, 102,
 143–44n1, 159n100
 Jeroboam ben Nebat, 9
 Jerusalem. *See also* Hezekiah's tunnel
 and royal shaping of water supply
 system; Temple, Jerusalem
 Ahiel, house of (Iron Age II
 Jerusalem), 53
 Gihon spring, 84, 90–91, 103–4,
 188n40, 201n97
 seals and seal impressions from City
 of David, 12
 Siloam, pool and tunnel of, 84, 103–5,
 201–2nn98–100, 202n109, 203n112
 Jezebel (wife of King Ahab), 25, 42, 43
 Jezreel (city), 25, 43, 146n9
 Joab (officer of David), 21, 39, 128n3,
 181n95
 Joash (king of Judah), 102
 Joash ben Jehoahaz, 143n1
 Jonathan (son of Saul), 25
 Joram (king of Israel), 42, 43–44, 137n14
 Josiah (king of Judah)
 evidence and sources used and, 9–10,
 11
 Jehu's decommissioning of temple
 of Baal and, 47, 65, 67, 154n54,
 165n142
 “The Scroll of Instruction” discovered
 in Temple by, 9, 124n55
 Kalḫu annals, 93–94
 Kalimi, Isaac, 89, 187n35, 198nn84–85
 Kalluveettil, Paul, 152n42
 Kamlah, Jens, 114n6
 Kang, Seon Il, 4
 Karatepe, 80
 Karchoh (city), 95, 195n65
 Kawashima, Robert S., 4
 Kenyon, Kathleen M., 4
 Khirbat al-Mudaybi', 78
 Khirbat al-Mudayna ath-Thamad, 78
 Khirbat Mudayna al-Mu'arradjeh, 78–79
kippūrīm, 21
 Kirta Epic, 74
 Kiš, 96, 97–98
 Kitz, Anne Marie, 135–36n46
 Kizzuwatna documents, 22
 Klostermann, August, 50
 Knoll, Israel, 154n56
 Kowalewski, Stephen A., 7
 Kupper, Jean-Robert, 20
 Lachish IV, town gates of, 78
 Lancaster, Steven P., 201n98
 land
 limited royal administrative power
 over, 24–31
 ownership, concepts of, 24
 royal dedication of land to gods, tradi-
 tion of, 31–36

- Langraam* temple type, 114n6
 Larsa (city), 92, 93, 189n41, 192n49
 Lateral-Access Podium Structure, 116n11
lectio difficilior, 100
 Lefebvre, Henri, 4, 5, 120–21nn32–33
 Lehnart, Bernard, 10
 Leibniz, Gottfried, 4
 Lemaire, André, 10
 Levantine royal spatial power. *See* Near Eastern royal spatial power
 Levenson, Jon D., 4
 Levin, Yigal, 184n18
 Levine, Baruch A., 50, 170n15
 levirate marriage, 69–70, 170n12
 Levison, Bernard M., 169n9
lmk jars, 188n37
 local urban politics. *See* gates, towns, and local politics
 Long, G. A., 201n98
 Lozi people, Zambia, 24, 134–35n44
 Lucianic recension (LXX^L), 146n7, 149n25, 160n103, 161n116, 180nn84–85
 Lu-igisa archive, 188n41
 LXX (Septuagint), 149n23, 149nn25–26, 154n61, 155n73, 171n16, 180nn84–86
 LXX^L (Lucianic recension), 146n7, 149n25, 160n103, 161n116, 180nn84–85

 Machpelah, cave of, 27, 30, 71
 Magdelene, F. Rachel, 174n35
 Maier, Christl M., 5
 Malatya (ancient Melid), 79
 Manasseh (king of Judah), 37
 Manasseh (tribe), Bull Site of, 141n95
 Mann, Michael, 6
 Marduk (deity), 185n20
 Marduk-apla-iddina II (Merodach-Baladan; king of Babylon), 96, 101, 185n20
 Marduk-bēl-usāte (king of Gannanāte), 97

 Mari, cone inscription from, 194n59
 Mari Letters. *See also* *Index of Ancient Sources*
 David's census and, 20–21
 gates, towns, and local politics in, 74–75
 as source, 13
 Zimri-Lim's assemblies in, 145n7
 Marx, Karl, 4, 118n19, 120n32
 Masoretic Text (MT)
 on David's purchase of threshing floor, 137n67
 on gates, towns, and local politics, 80, 180nn85–86
 Hezekiah's tunnel in, 100
 Jehu's decommissioning of Baal's temple and, 146n7, 149nn25–26, 154n61, 160n103, 161nn115–16
 Mawatalli II of Hatti, 65
 Mazar, Amihai, 141n95
 McCarter, P. Kyle, 18, 21–22, 131n27
 McCormick, Clifford Mark, 120n30
 McKeating, Henry, 170n15, 188n38
 McKenzie, Steven L., 10, 187n35
 Megiddo
 burnt-offering altar at, 141n95
 palaces of, 116n11
 stele of Shoshenq I, 80
 temples of, 114n6, 127n1
 town gates from, 78, 80, 156n79
 Melid (now Malatya), 79
 Meribaa (son of Jonathan), 25–26, 36
 Merodach-Baladan (Marduk-apla-iddina II; king of Babylon), 96, 101, 185n20
 Mesha of Moab and Mesha stele, 79, 94–95, 178nn70–71, 194nn65–67
 Mesopotamia, royal spatial power in. *See* Near Eastern royal spatial power
 Miglio, Adam, 6
 Milgrom, Jacob, 22, 23, 154nn57–58, 155n63, 169n9

- military narrative, Hezekiah's tunnel as, 99–102, 203–4n14
- military rules of purity and census taking, 21–22
- military successes of Sennacherib in Southern Levant, 164n139
- Mills, Mary E., 5
- Minokami, Yoshikazu, 161n117
- Moab
 - Mesha of Moab and Mesha stele, 79, 94–95, 178nn70–71, 194nn65–67
 - town gates in, 78–79
 - water supply in, 95
- monolatry, 162–63n131
- Monroe, Lauren, 40, 124n55, 150n30, 155n64
- Morandi, Daniele, 113n3
- Moses, 30, 142n96
- Mount Ebal, cult place excavated at, 141n95
- MT. *See* Masoretic Text
- Muşaşir, temple of Haldi at, 65
- Naboth (Israelite from Jezreel), 25, 135–36n46
- Nabû-šuma-iškun of Babylonia, sacrilegious acts of, 65, 66–67, 108
- Nahash the Ammonite, 72
- Narām-Sîn (Akkadian ruler), 96, 196n73
- Nathan (prophet), 143, 149, 181n95
- Near Eastern royal spatial power. *See also specific rulers*
- canals, purposes of, 189–90n43, 193n52
 - civil and criminal cases not distinguished, 136n47
 - destruction and decommissioning of cultic spaces, 14, 65–67
 - founding of royal cities, 189n42
 - gates, towns, and local politics, 72–77
 - Solomon's building accounts compared, 113n4
 - water supply systems, royal shaping of, 91–98, 106
- Nebuchadnezzar I (Babylonian ruler), 65
- Nebuchadnezzar II (Babylonian ruler), 30, 138n75
- Nelson, Richard D., 9–10, 170n11
- Newton, Isaac, 4
- Nimrud, wall slab from, 193n57
- Nineveh, water supply for, 94
- Nippur (city), 73–74, 96, 196n73
- Noll, Kurt L., 128n6
- Noth, Martin, 8–9
- notices, supplementary, in biblical texts, 102–3, 200n93
- Nuzi, texts from, 173n33. *See also Index of Ancient Sources*
- O'Brien, Mark A., 10
- Oden, Daniel, 27–28
- Olàvarri, Emilio, 78
- Olmo Lete, Gregorio del, 153–54n53
- Olyan, Saul M., 48, 151n35
- Omri (king of Israel) and Omride dynasty, 145nn6–7, 158n94
- Otto, Rudolf, 4
- Otto, Susanne, 44
- ownership, concepts of, 24
- Padi (king of Ekron), 100–1
- payments, expiatory, associated with census, 20, 23
- Peregrine, Peter N., 7
- pestilence, biblical, 19–20, 39
- Phoenician architectural style,
 - Solomon's use of, 2–3
- Pietsch, Michael, 144n2
- Pinnock, Frances, 114n6
- Pioske, Daniel, 12

- Porter, Anne, 6
- Postgate, J. Nicholas, 127–28n2, 138n72
- power, royal. *See* royal spatial power in Iron Age Israel and Judah
- Priestly tradition
 burnt offerings in, 22
 construction of Solomon's temple in, 112n2
 defined, 41–42
 on elimination of impurity, 124n55
 on gates, towns, and local politics, 171n16
 Holiness Code and Holiness School, 22–23, 47, 49, 56, 124n55, 153n46
 Jehu's decommissioning of temple of Baal and, 41, 47–53, 57–58, 64
- Provan, Iain, 10
- purity and purification
 military rules of purity and census taking, 21–22
 post-battle rituals, 132n31
 Priestly tradition, on elimination of impurity, 124n55
- Qumran texts (Dead Sea Scrolls). *See* *Index of Ancient Sources*
- the Rabshakeh (officer of king of Assyria), 86, 103, 184n18, 185n19
- Ramoth-Gilead, battle at, 43
- Rappaport, Roy A., 150n33
- Rassam Cylinder, 76–77, 164n139
- Rehoboam (king of Israel), 198n85
- Reich, Ronny, 104, 105
- Rendsburg, Gary A., 11, 44, 148n20, 201n99, 203n112
- Rīm-Sîn I (ruler of Larsa), 191n46, 192n48, 192n49
- ritual violence, language of, 47–56
- Robertson, David A., 10
- Robinson, Edward, 84
- Robker, Jonathan Miles, 44, 149n23, 157n90, 162n129
- Rock-Cut Pool, Siloam tunnel system, 104
- Rofé, Alexander, 169n9
- Rogerson, John, 201n99
- Rollston, Christopher, 105, 202n109
- Römer, Thomas, 10
- Rost, Leonhard, 143n101
- Round Chamber, Siloam tunnel system, 104–5
- Routledge, Bruce, 79, 95, 178nn70–71
- Rowe, Ignacio Márquez, 136n52
- royal spatial power in Iron Age Israel and Judah, 1–15, 107–9
 at city gates, 14, 68–83, 108 (*see also* gates, towns, and local politics)
 destruction and decommissioning of cultic space, 14, 40–67, 107–8 (*see also* Jehu, decommissioning of Baal's temple by)
 evidence and sources, 8–14
 exclusionary strategy of power and Solomon's use of foreign architectural style, 3
 purchase of cultic space, 14, 16–39, 107 (*see also* threshing floor of Araunah, David's purchase of)
 Solomon's Temple and House of the Forest of Lebanon, 1–3, 4, 14, 107
 theoretical approaches to ancient space and, 3–5, 119n25
 theoretical approaches to political power and, 5–8
 water systems, royal reshaping of, 14–15, 84–106, 108 (*see also* Hezekiah's tunnel and royal shaping of water supply system)
- Rudman, Dominic, 184n18
- Rupprecht, Konrad, 113n4, 129n11

- sacrifices
 of Abraham, 17
 to Baal, 45, 49, 60–62, 153–54n53, 161n17
 burnt offerings, 22–23
 David's purchase of threshing floor
 and, 16–17, 17–24, 22–23, 31, 37, 38, 129n7
 of defeated enemies, 47
 expiatory, 17–24, 37, 38
 Jehu sacrificing to Baal, 45, 60, 62, 161n17
 not sanctioned by Deuteronomy, 128n6
 of Sargon II, 34–35
 water supply systems and, 191n47
 Safren, Jonathan D., 194n59
 sanctuary towns, 71, 170–71n15
 Sanders, Seth L., 12, 126–27n67, 168n6
 sanitation and sewer systems in Iron Age Israel, 53–56
 Sanmartín, Joaquín, 153–54n53
 Sargon II (Assyrian ruler)
 construction of temples in Dur-Sharrukin by, 34–35, 38, 139n82
 founding of Dur-Sharrukin by, 127n2
 letter from Ṭab-šar-Aššur, 139n82
 letter from Ṭab-šill-Ešarra, governor of Assur, 138n76
 Marduk calling to battle, 185n20
 relief from palace at Dur-Sharrukin
 showing temple looting, 652
 renewal of grant made by Adad-nirari III to Assur, 127n2
 transfer of administrative control of land to temples by, 139n80
 Sasson, Jack M., 20–21
 Saul (biblical king), 25–26, 72
 Schenker, Adrian, 142n98
 Schiffman, Lawrence H., 50
 Schneider, Thomas, 182n102
 Schniedewind, William M., 126–27n67, 201n99, 203n112
 Scott, James, 6
 “The Scroll of Instruction” (discovered in Temple by Josiah), 9, 124n55
 Sennacherib of Assyria
 desecration of Babylonian temples by, 65–66, 108
 Ekron, attack on Philistine city of, 77
 Hezekiah and, 86–87, 89, 99–103, 198n84
 on military successes in Southern Levant, 164n139
 pleasure gardens of, 192n51
 water supply systems and, 94, 96–97, 191n47, 192n49, 192n51, 196n74
 Septuagint (LXX), 149n23, 149nn25–26, 154n61, 155n73, 171n16, 180nn84–86
 sewer and sanitation systems in Iron Age Israel, 53–56
 Shalev, Eyal, 201n98
 Shallum (king of Israel), 102
 Shalmaneser III (Neo-Assyrian ruler), 97, 165n140, 196–97n76
 Sharon, Ilan, 116n11
 Shechem, rape of Dinah by, 71
 Shoshenq I (pharaoh), 80
 Shukron, Eli, 104, 105
 Siloam, pool and tunnel of, 84, 103–5, 201–2nn98–100, 202n109, 203n112. *See also* Hezekiah's tunnel and royal shaping of water supply system
 Sin (deity), stele in Elumu to, 33
 Sin-Iddinam, inscription of, 92–93, 191n46
 Sippar, canal of, 93, 193n54
 Skinner, John, 145n6
 Smelik, Klaas A. D., 183n5, 183n7
 Smith, Adam T., 122n42
 Smith, Mark S., 152n42, 159n100
 Sneh, Amihai, 201n98
 Solomon
 administrative districts under, 72
 altar to Yahweh, 37

- House of the Forest of Lebanon, 2–3
 importance of Temple building account to biblical narrative about Solomon, 117n16
 Near Eastern royal building accounts compared, 113n4
 palace of, 2, 115–16nn1
 Temple in Jerusalem, building of, 1–3, 4, 14, 107
 Speiser, Ephraim A., 20–21
 spolia, 117n17
 Stackert, Jeffrey, 170–71n15
 Stade, B., 88
 steles
 Baal stele, Jehu's destruction of, 45–46, 48, 51–52, 149n26, 154n61
 Elumu, stele of Sin in, 33
 of Esarhaddon, 80
 Megiddo, stele of Shoshenq I, 80
 Mesha of Moab and Mesha stele, 79, 94–95, 178nn70–71, 194nn65–67
 Samaria, Israelite limestone stele at, 80
 Tel Dan Stele, 147n14
 Vultures, Stele of the, 190n43
 Stendhal, *Charterhouse of Parma*, 142n100
 structuration theory, 7, 122–23n46
 supplementary notices, in biblical texts, 102–3, 200n93
 Susa, Darius's palace and inscription at, 116n15
 Sweeney, Marvin A., 143–44n1, 164n135
 ʿAb-šar-Aššur, letter to Sargon II from, 139n82
 ʿAb-šill-Ešarra (governor of Assur), 138n76
 Tadmor, Hayim, 44, 146n10, 155n73
tēbibtum, 21
 Tel Arad, burnt-offering altar at, 141n95
 Tel Dan and Tel Dan Stele, 78, 127n1, 147n14
 Tel 'Ira, 78
 Tel Qesile, 127n1
 Tel Rehov, seals and seal impressions from, 12
 Tell Abu Hawam, 127n1
 Tell Beit Mirsim, 78, 156n79
 Tell en-Nasbeh, 78
 Tell Halaf, palace at, 115n1
 Tell Mardikh. *See* Ebla
 Tell Sīrān, inscription on copper bottle found at, 95
 Tell Tayinat, 2, 79
 Temple, Jerusalem
 Hezekiah's restoration of, 99
 Solomon's building of, 1–3, 4, 14, 107
 threshing floor purchased by David as site of, 16–17
 Thomas, Benjamin D., 88
 threshing floor of Araunah, David's purchase of, 14, 16–39, 107
 altar constructed on, 140–41n95
 census and ensuing pestilence, as expiation for, 17–24, 39
 cultic space, securing land as, 36–38
 good king, portrayal of David as, 31, 34, 39
 as later site of Solomon's temple, 16–17
 limited royal administrative power over land and, 24–31
 reasons for formal purchase of, 16–17, 23–24, 30–31, 38–39
 royal dedication of land to gods, tradition of, 31–38
 sacrificing on pagan land, 17
 Tigay, Jeffrey H., 170n13
 Tiglath-pileser I (Assyrian ruler), 192n51
 Tiglath-pileser III (Assyrian ruler), 93–94
 Tigris canal, restoration of, 92–93, 190–91nn45–46
 Til-Barsib (town), 80
 town gates. *See* gates, towns, and local politics

- Trebolle Barrera, Julio, 46
- Tudhaliya IV of Hatti, 65
- Tukulti-Ninurta I (Neo-Assyrian ruler)
 canal built by, 93, 193n55
 founding of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta,
 127n2, 194n59
- Tukulti-Ninurta II (Neo-Assyrian ruler),
 165n140
- Tyrian builders of Solomon's Temple,
 2, 117n15
- Ugaritic texts. *See also Index of Ancient Sources*
 decipherment of, 10
 sale of threshing floor in, 29
 on town gates, 74, 175n43
- Umma (Giša; city-state), 190n43
- Urartu (kingdom), 2, 93, 189n42,
 193n56
- urban politics. *See* gates, towns, and
 local politics
- Uriah the Hittite, murder of, 83
- Ur-Nammu, on water supply, 94
- Uruk (town), 66, 96
- Ussishkin, David, 79, 115n11, 199n87
- Van de Mieroop, Marc, 189n42
- Van Seters, John, 112n2
- Vanderhooft, David, 10, 200n93,
 200n96
- Vaughn, Andrew G., 188n37
- Veijola, Timo, 130n14
- violence, ritual, 47–56
- virginity of woman at marriage, 69,
 170n11
- Vultures, Stele of the, 190n43
- Walters, Stanley D., 188–89n41
- Waltke, Bruce K., 50
- water supply system in Jerusalem. *See*
 Hezekiah's tunnel and royal shap-
 ing of water supply system
- Waters, Jaime L., 5, 128n6
- Watzinger, Carl, 115n11
- Weber, Max, 5–6
- Weinberger, Ram, 201n98
- Weinfeld, Moshe, 169n9
- Weippert, Helga, 10
- Wells, Bruce, 167n4, 174n35
weqatal verbs, 43, 80, 180n84
- Westbrook, Raymond, 136n47, 170n12
- Westenholz, Aage, 190n45
- White, Marsha C., 10, 67, 149n23,
 158n94
- Willis, Timothy M., 169n8
- Wilson, Robert R., 167–68n4
- Wiseman, Donald J., 136n52
- Wittfogel, Karl, 188–89n41
- Wong, Ka Leung, 157–58n91
- Wright, John W., 166n2
- Wyatt, Nick A., 128n5, 175n42
- Yahwism, exclusive, 162–63n131
- Yehimilk of Byblos, inscription of, 127n1
- Yoffee, Norman, 174n35
- Yom Kippur, 154n58
- Young, Robb Andrew, 85, 86, 183n12,
 186–87n27, 186n24
- Zarzecki-Peleg, Anabel, 116n11
- Zertal, Adam, 141n95
- Zevit, Ziony, 162n130
- Ziba (servant from Saul's household),
 25, 26, 36
- Zimansky, Paul E., 189n42, 193n56
- Zimri (king of Israel), 102, 145n7
- Zimri-Lim of Mari, 74, 145n7
- Zincirli (town), 80, 115n11

