

# A Tale of Two Kingdoms: Royal Ideology in Pre-Exilic Judah

James Newman

School of Religious Studies

Faculty of Arts

McGill University, Montreal

December 2019

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Religious Studies.

© James Newman, 2019

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract/Résumé .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 1: The Zion Royal Ideology.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter 2: The Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Archaeology and the Royal Ideologies .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>91</b>

## Abstract

There has been a growing consensus among scholars of the Hebrew Bible that Ancient Judahite kingship was a dynamic institution. By that, it is meant that the ideology which legitimated the monarchy adapted to changing political circumstances and took distinct forms in the pre-exilic period. This thesis analyzes both the Biblical text and relevant scholarly literature to describe and summarize two distinct royal ideologies of Ancient Judah: The Zion Royal Ideology and the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology. It additionally discusses the relevance of archaeological debates concerning the historicity of the United Monarchy to the existence and role of these royal ideologies.

---

## Résumé

Il y a eu un consensus croissant entre les érudits de la Bible Hébraïque que la royauté Judaïte Antique était une institution dynamique. L'idéologie qui a légitimé la monarchie s'est adaptée aux circonstances politiques changeantes et a pris des formes distinctes dans la période préexilienne. Cette thèse analyse le texte biblique et la littérature universitaire pertinente pour décrire et résumer deux idéologies royales distinctes de l'Ancien Juda: L'Idéologie Royale de Sion, et L'Idéologie Royale Deutéronomiste. La pertinence des débats archéologiques sur la véracité de la Monarchie Unifiée pour l'existence et le rôle de ces idéologies royales sera aussi discutée.

## Acknowledgements

Undertaking this degree was made possible through several bursaries granted to me by the School of Religious studies over the years. Access to the large quantity of secondary literature consulted by this thesis was facilitated both by the extensive physical and online collections of the McGill University Library system as well as by the swift delivery of interlibrary loans by the Colombo ILL system.

I am grateful to Pearson Basilières for his attentive proofreading skills. I am grateful to my fellow graduate students Rachel Ko and Amanda Rosini, for their support and bibliographic suggestions.

Most of all, this thesis would never have been possible without the supervision and assistance given by Prof. Patricia G. Kirkpatrick. Her decades of experience in the field of Biblical studies and astute guidance have been utterly indispensable to the production of this thesis. Beyond that, her compassion, understanding, and strong support for me during struggles with personal events, which would force me to take brief leave from my studies, were critical to my recovery and eventual completion of my thesis. She has gone above and beyond the call of duty in her guidance and supervision of me during each step of the thesis process, and I owe her a heartfelt debt of gratitude.

## Introduction

This thesis seeks to determine what we know about how the monarchy was justified in Judah before the exile. This analysis has identified two distinct and contrasting ideologies that were used to justify kingship in Judah. These ideologies will be called the Zion Royal Ideology and the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology.

This work is divided into three chapters. The first chapter will present the concept of Zion Royal Ideology. This ideology is analyzed in a selection of the Royal Psalms. The selection will include Psalms 2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 89, 101, and 110. The idea of the Zion Royal Ideology, which will be established in this chapter, is that the King is elected by Yahweh to rule *unconditionally* from Mount Zion as his viceroy. That is, once Yahweh has elected the Davidic dynasty, the reign of that dynasty and the sovereignty of Mount Zion can never end. The twin traditions of David and Zion are, as Hayes wrote long ago, “taken up immediately at the royal court and proclaimed as part of the redemptive Heilsgeschichte and royal ideology.”<sup>1</sup> This ideology will be explained in greater detail in the first chapter of this thesis. That chapter will also describe the ideology’s relation to the Zion and David traditions and their origins. It will also cover the concept of divine sonship and the kingship of Yahweh and their roles in the formulation of the Zion Royal Ideology.

The second chapter will present an ideology which I call the *Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology*. This ideology draws inspiration from the Deuteronomic law code, specifically the Law of the King, and the Deuteronomistic History. The basic premise of this ideology, in

---

<sup>1</sup> John H. Hayes, "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82, no. 4 (1963): 420.

distinction to that of the Zion Royal Ideology, is that Yahweh elects the Deuteronomistic King through parameters outlined in the divine Deuteronomic law code. Furthermore, the survival of this dynasty is *conditional* on the King's continued obedience to the commandments of Yahweh. This chapter will describe the origins of the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, the development of the Deuteronomistic History and the current debate on its status as a useful historical concept. Issues of this debate, such as the distinction between "Deuteronomic" and "Deuteronomistic" thought, will be explored, as well as the Law of the King and its relation to the royal ideology as practiced in Ancient Judah.

The third chapter will deal with the relation of the Iron Age Chronology debate surrounding the Royal Ideologies. It is essential to consider the contributions of archaeology to the study of the Biblical period. In particular, the Iron Age Chronology debate has substantial ramifications on the existence of a United Monarchy of Israel. Whether there was a United Monarchy or not would ostensibly have a profound impact upon the formation of the royal ideologies I have described. However, this chapter will demonstrate that these royal ideologies are only able to be definitively placed in the era of the Divided Monarchy. Insofar as the Bible presents them to us, they are post-Davidic manifestations which incorporate reimagined traditions. The election of David and the election of Zion are part of national myth and memory by the time a prophet tells Hezekiah that Zion is inviolable. Nonetheless, this thesis will include an analysis of the history and current status of the United Monarchy debate to give a clear picture of the issue. This chapter also presents a detailed argument for why it does not pose a challenge to a Biblical analysis of the royal ideologies.

In addition, this thesis aims to demonstrate that either the Zion Royal Ideology or the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology could have plausibly existed as methods by which the monarchy of Judah legitimated its existence before the exile. A review of the scholarly literature associated with these two ideologies and the associated biblical archaeology is contained throughout the thesis.

## Chapter 1: The Zion Royal Ideology

*“For I have poured out my king on Zion, my holy mountain.”- Psalm 2:6*

Zion was the seat of the Cult, the Crown, and the Creator. It was the site of the central temple of Yahweh’s worship, the administration of the Israelite monarchy, and of Yahweh’s dwelling. Unlike Sinai or Horeb, which are merely sacred mountains in their respective traditions, the tradition of Zion is centred around Yahweh’s choosing of Zion as his residence. So critical is this to Zion that when Rohland first formulated the concept of a “Zion tradition,” he described it primarily as a tradition of election.<sup>2</sup> Ollenburger, summarizing Rohland’s position, listed four central themes surrounding this election of Zion.<sup>3</sup>

1. “Zion is the peak of Zaphon, the highest mountain (Ps 48:3-4);”
2. “The river of paradise flows from it (Ps. 46:5);”
3. “There Yahweh triumphed over the flood of chaos waters (Ps 46.3);”
4. “And there Yahweh triumphed over the kings and their nations (Pss 46.7; 48.5-7; 76.4, 6-7).”, with this motif being the most critical to the tradition.<sup>4</sup>

While this analysis is not of the whole Zion tradition, but the fourth motif is the foundation for a “Zion Royal Ideology” found in specific Biblical monarchic texts. Zion Royal Ideology is not a tradition of stories or legends about an individual King like the David tradition but is instead a proposed political paradigm followed by Judah at some

---

<sup>2</sup> Ben C. Ollenburger, *Zion, the City of the Great King : A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 61.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

point during the pre-exilic monarchy. It is a framework through which the Israelite King governed, and a tradition which served as the foundation for legitimation of the nascent monarchy.

The connection between this proposed royal ideology and the Zion tradition is due to the centrality of Zion to the discussions of the King in the Royal Psalms. As mentioned earlier, Zion is the residence of both Yahweh and his King and the center of creation itself. Divine and royal authority, which are not clearly distinct in the Zion tradition, flow outwards from Zion and over the whole of the Earth. Moreover, Zion is nigh inconsequential to the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology; the word scarcely appears at all in Deuteronomistic literature. Because Zion is the foundation of kingship in the Zion Royal Ideology, this ideology can be described as an outgrowth of the Zion tradition, as opposed to a political component of the Deuteronomistic movement. This ideology is heavily reliant on, but not identical to, the David tradition. Ollenburger remarks that David and Zion are “the central symbols of two different traditions and one cannot simply be identified, or one reduced to the other.”<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the David tradition is not exclusive. The symbol of David is taken up extensively in Deuteronomistic literature, which has a unique ideological perspective, while the symbol of Zion plays a lesser role.

Yet, despite its use of David as a symbol, Zion Royal Ideology does not belong to the time of David. It is unclear if any surviving writings can be directly attributed to the time of David at all. Zion Royal Ideology is a blend of traditions from the legacy of David to the Zion tradition, and its Biblical form comes from the era of the divided monarchy. This

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 58.

thesis is a study of ideologies and the traditions behind them, not of a specific monarch. Moreover, we must remember that the texts which contain Zion Royal Ideology were finally compiled and revised after the Exile.

The date of the emergence of this tradition remains hotly debated among scholars. Due to its theme of Yahweh achieving dominion over the nations, Gerstenberger posited this imperial ideology as best fitting “the exilic or post-exilic community of faithful Judahites.”<sup>6</sup> He did so because he felt that Israel, even during the United Monarchy, had not amassed such strength to where “any true imperial notions” could ever have developed.<sup>7</sup> Only once Israel had experienced the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian empires, and was safe and secure in a situation such as the reign of Cyrus, could Israel have developed and asserted imperial ambitions.<sup>8</sup> Roberts strongly challenged Gerstenberger on this point; he argued that imperial notions do not require a long time to develop, since Sargon the Great innovated imperial traditions in his lifetime.<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, he considered it baffling and “absolutely without parallel” in the Ancient Near East that Israel would develop imperial ideology “precisely in a period of Israel’s most abject weakness.”<sup>10</sup> He also noted a glaring omission in Gerstenberger’s work. Gerstenberger had forgotten to consider that “As far as imperial models go, Israel grew up

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 208-09.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 208-09.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 208-09.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 678.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 678.

in the shadow of Egypt.”<sup>11</sup> Roberts accordingly argued for an early date for the royal Psalms, most of them in the monarchical period.<sup>12</sup>

He also formulated a new definition of the Zion tradition, insofar as it had “a view to legitimizing and undergirding the Davidic state”:

1. “Yahweh is the great king, or suzerain, not only over Israel but over all the nations and their gods;”
2. “Yahweh has chosen the Davidic house as his human agents for the divine rule and confirmed that choice with an eternal covenant; and”
3. “Yahweh has chosen Zion as his royal city, as the earthly dais of his universal rule.”<sup>13</sup>

He believed that, during the time of the United Monarchy, “royal theologians under state sponsorship” drawing from a blend of “native and borrowed beliefs” cobbled together what he called the “Zion tradition” as a framework for legitimizing the state.<sup>14</sup> He described Zion kingship as being rooted in Yahweh’s kingship through creation. Having first triumphed over the chaos waters at Zion, Yahweh will triumph over all the nations (his creation) at Mount Zion through his viceroy, the Davidic King.<sup>15</sup> His interpretation of the Zion tradition assigns the King a ritual-historical role, since “the victories of the Davidic king are simply a participation in and reinstatement of God’s primeval victories.”<sup>16</sup> He notes that various

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 677.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 676.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 679.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

Biblical sources analogize Israel's enemies to the chaos waters.<sup>17</sup> The essence of his theory was that the Zion tradition legitimated the monarchy through granting it an eternal role in Yahweh's universal plan for the whole of his creation.<sup>18</sup> It did so through the King implementing this plan by waging war and doing justice within Israel.<sup>19</sup>

Much of this model is sound; it is obvious that a royal ideology presupposes the existence of a monarchy. However, recent scholarship has raised some issues with his framing of the ideology. There are two tenets of Roberts' model which have come under scrutiny: The assumption of a United Monarchy and the assumption of Yahweh as intrinsically a creator king. The old assumption of a United Monarchy of Israel under the Davidic dynasty has come under fire from various sources in the fields of archaeology, history, and religious studies.<sup>20</sup> Issues such as a lack of archaeological finds in the City of David from the time of the United Monarchy, the dating of the walls of Jerusalem, and the debate over a proposed low chronology for Iron Age I, have eroded the scholarly consensus surrounding the United Monarchy.<sup>21</sup> The ongoing controversy has led scholars such as Nelson to suggest that the concept of the United Monarchy existed only as a "utopian ideal" for Judah, to strive to realize.<sup>22</sup> Even Laato, whose analysis of the Zion tradition rests heavily on the United Monarchy, admits that in the current "stalemate" he can only make a

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 682.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 682.

<sup>20</sup> Antti Laato, *The Origin of Israelite Zion Theology*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (London ; New York, NY: T & T Clark, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018), 44-45.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 44-48.

<sup>22</sup> Richard D. Nelson, "Solomon's Administrative Districts: A Scholarly Illusion," in *History, Memory, Hebrew Scriptures : A Festschrift for Ehud Ben Zvi*, ed. Ian Douglas Wilson and Diana V. Edelman (Winona Lake, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015), 105.

“game-theoretical” argument that the existence of the United Monarchy is a “relevant possible world” as a presumption for the presence of a Zion tradition.<sup>23</sup>

This topic will be further explored and addressed in Chapter 3; for the moment, it is enough to say that we cannot take Roberts’ assumption of its existence at face value.

Furthermore, Roberts’ claim that the Zion tradition’s view of kingship is rooted in Yahweh’s role as King of Creation presumes a static view of divine kingship centred around creation. However, this view has been solidly challenged in recent years through work by Flynn on the development of the metaphor of Yahweh’s kingship. He argued, based on recent literary findings, that Yahweh initially matched a Baal-type role as a warrior king, whose kingship is rooted in martial prowess as opposed to creation, and localized to one realm as opposed to the whole world.<sup>24</sup> He says that evidence can be found throughout a number of books in the Bible, but has made it into the Psalms in the form of Psalm 29, in which “YHWH is clearly the warrior deity whose kingship is limited since the Psalm is devoid of references to the universal-creator king.”<sup>25</sup> If the idea of Yahweh as creator-king developed as a reaction to pressures from Neo-Assyrian imperialism under Tiglath-pileser III, then Zion Royal Ideology could not have been rooted in the function of Yahweh as creator-king as Roberts assumes.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Laato, 45-46.

<sup>24</sup> Shawn W. Flynn, *Yhwh Is King the Development of Divine Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014), 23.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 67.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 2.

I will thus analyze the text of the Psalms to determine, leaving aside the question either of the United Monarchy or the broader study of Yahweh's Kingship for a later point in the thesis, the tenets of Zion Royal Ideology as found in the text. This will serve as a theoretical framework by which the monarchy was legitimized at an early point in its existence.

The texts which I will analyze here are a selection of Psalms identified as "Royal Psalms" for their foci being the human monarch.<sup>27</sup> While examples of the Zion tradition can be found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the Psalms contain the broadest expression of the tradition and incorporate a wide variety of its aspects.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, since the human aspects of kingship are the subject of my analysis, the Royal Psalms are the most obvious source to study.

Psalms 132 and 144:1-11 will be excluded from my analysis for this chapter. They do not, in my analysis, reflect Zion Royal Ideology. Psalm 132 contains an explicitly conditional contractual conception of the monarchy.<sup>29</sup> Psalm 144:1-11 contains no explicit reference to the King, and includes a musing on mortality much more reminiscent of later works like Job and Ecclesiastes than pre-exilic royal ideology.<sup>30</sup> Hossfeld and Zenger agree that Psalm 132 is a postexilic psalm centred on a "futurized" monarchy<sup>31</sup> and that Psalm

---

<sup>27</sup> Hermann Gunkel, *The Psalms : A Form-Critical Introduction*, trans. Thomas M. Horner, Facet Books Biblical Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 23.

<sup>28</sup> Laato, 5.

<sup>29</sup> Ps. 132:11b-12

<sup>30</sup> Ps. 144:3-4

<sup>31</sup> Frank-Lothar Hossfeld et al., *Psalms 3 : A Commentary on Psalms 101-150*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia--a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011), 459.

144:1-11, with its Aramaisms and “anthropological character,” is a late postexilic Psalm.<sup>32</sup> Other prominent Zion psalms, such as Psalms 46, 48, and 76, are also exempted because although they have been essential Psalms in the Zion tradition, these do not deal with the role of the human monarch in Zion. This study is intentionally focused on the human royal aspects of Zion theology, with the intent of exploring key points that constitute Zion Royal Ideology. Nevertheless, Psalm 132 possesses a unique relevance outside of Zion Royal Ideology that will be discussed in Chapter 3.

As my starting point for describing Zion Royal Ideology is the 4<sup>th</sup> motif of Zion theology, a corollary of that motif is that the King will be the agent of Yahweh in that victory. This is illustrated first by Psalm 2.<sup>33</sup>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why do the nations rally, and the peoples number their troops?<sup>34</sup></li> <li>2. The Kings of the Earth have set themselves, and the potentates sit in conclave together, against Yahweh and against his anointed one.</li> <li>3. “Let us break their bonds and cast aside their cords from us.”</li> <li>4. The One Enthroned in Heaven laughs; the Lord mocks them.</li> </ol>	<p>לָמָּה רָגְשׁוּ גּוֹיִם וְלְאֻמִּים יִהְיוּ־רִיק:  יְתִיצְבוּ מְלָכֵי־אָרֶץ וְרוֹזְנִים נוֹסְדוּ־יַחַד עַל־  יְהוָה וְעַל־מְשִׁיחוֹ:  נִגְתָּקָה אֶת־מוֹסְרוֹתֵימוֹ וְנִשְׁלִיכָה מִמֶּנּוּ  עַבְתֵּימוֹ:  יֹשֵׁב בַּשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׁחַק אֲדֹנָי יִלְעַג־לָמוֹ:</p>
--	---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 583-84.

<sup>33</sup> Translations my own unless otherwise stated.

<sup>34</sup> Following Mitchell J. Dahood, *Psalms* (1966), 7.

<p>5. Then he drives away their commanders in his anger and disowns<sup>35</sup> them in his wrath.</p> <p>6. “For I have poured out<sup>36</sup> my King on Zion, my holy mountain.”</p> <p>7. I will recite the decree Yahweh said to me, “You are my son, this day I have begotten you.”</p> <p>8. “Ask it of me, and I shall give you the nations as an inheritance, and the ends of the Earth as your property.”</p> <p>9. “You will break them with a rod of iron, dash them to pieces like pottery.”</p> <p>10. So now, O kings, be prudent. Beware, rulers of the Earth.</p> <p>11. Serve Yahweh in fear, and live<sup>37</sup> in trembling, mortal men.</p>	<p>אז יִדְבַר אֱלִימוּ בְּאִפּוֹ וּבְחִרוֹנוֹ יִבְהַלְמוּ:  וְאֲנִי נִסְכַּתִּי מִלְּכֵי עַל-צִיּוֹן הַר-קֹדֶשׁ:  אֲסַפְּרָה אֶל חֶק יְהוָה אֲמַר אֵלַי בְּנֵי אֶתְּהָ אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יִלְדֶּתִיךָ:  שְׂאֵל מִמֶּנִּי וְאֶתְּנָה גּוֹיִם נַחֲלָתְךָ וְאַחֲזָתְךָ אֶפְסֵי-אָרֶץ:  תִּרְעַם בְּשֶׁבֶט בְּרֹזֶל כִּכְלֵי יוֹצֵר תִּנְפְּצֵם:  וְעַתָּה מְלָכִים הַשְׁבִּילוּ הוֹסְרוּ שְׁפָטֵי אָרֶץ:  עֲבָדוּ אֶת-יְהוָה בְּיִרְאָה וְגִילוּ בְּרַעְדָּה:</p>
---	--

<sup>35</sup> See Joseph Lam, "Psalm 2 and the Disinheritance of Earthly Rulers: New Light from the Ugaritic Legal Text Rs 94.2168," *Vetus Testamentum* 64, no. 1 (2014): 43.

<sup>36</sup> See *ibid.*, 37.

<sup>37</sup> See Dahood, 13.

<p>12. Pay homage sincerely, lest he grow angry, and you are destroyed in the way, for his rage is swiftly ignited. Blessed are those who take refuge in him!</p>	<p>נְשָׁקוּ-בַר פְּוִי-אֵינָהּ   וְתֵאבְדוּ דְרֹךְ כִּי-יִבְעַר כַּמְעַט אֶפֶס אֲשֶׁרִי כָל-חֹסֵי בּוֹ:</p>
---	---

This hymn is believed to have been used as a hymn for the coronation of a Davidic king, owing to the declaration of the King's divine sonship in that day.<sup>38</sup> The Psalm is a dramatic tale of conflict with the nations of the world, who plot to overthrow Yahweh's reign and that of his vassal, the King. The threat of the conspiring nations, and perhaps usurpers akin to Absalom and Adonijah, is portrayed as contemporary and dire.<sup>39</sup> But the King, having Yahweh's favour, will triumph over all these foes and destroy them from atop Mount Zion; for, on this day, Yahweh has proclaimed the King's legitimacy and sealed the fate of all his enemies.

This is entirely in step with similar ANE enthronement rituals, and the divine decree has numerous Egyptian parallels.<sup>40</sup> Usually, this decree would contain a list of titles held by the King, but peculiarly, in this passage, the only title ascribed to the King of Israel by

---

<sup>38</sup> J. H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, Studies in Biblical Theology : 2d Series (London: S.C.M. Press, 1976), 111.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 112.

<sup>40</sup> Dahood, 11.

Yahweh's decree is that of his sonship.<sup>41</sup> While Gunkel,<sup>42</sup> Kraus,<sup>43</sup> and Dahood believed that this sonship verbiage implied adoption, referencing language used in Ps 89:27-28 and 2 Sam. 7:14,<sup>44</sup> more recent scholarship by Roberts suggests that this declaration is not an adoption ritual, but instead a statement of the divine birth of the King modelled off Egyptian royal ritual.<sup>45</sup> He noted that the Mesopotamian parallels often cited as examples of adoption formulae have almost nothing in common with the statement in Psalm 2:7.<sup>46</sup> He notes further that the whole institution of adoption may not have existed in Israel at all, and that the adoption formulae in Mesopotamia never used the positive 2<sup>nd</sup> person declaration "You are my son," as in Psalm 2:7.<sup>47</sup> Lam, while saying that the possibility of an adoption language cannot be "categorically" ruled out, agrees with Roberts that the closest analogy for the sonship language used in Psalm 2:7 is Egyptian coronation rituals, where the King is affirmed as the "begotten son of the god."<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, Lam, based on new textual insight from a Ugaritic document, sees the Psalm as primarily a legal document where Yahweh disowns the rulers of the Earth and deeds their lands to his anointed son, the King.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> J. J. M. Roberts, "Whose Child Is This? Reflections on the Speaking Voice in Isaiah 9:5," *The Harvard theological review*. 90, no. 2 (1997): 117.

<sup>43</sup> Lam, 39.

<sup>44</sup> Dahood, 11-12.

<sup>45</sup> Roberts, "Whose Child Is This? Reflections on the Speaking Voice in Isaiah 9:5," 128.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 119-20.

<sup>48</sup> Lam, 45-46.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 44.

This is relevant when it comes to the discussion of the kingship of the human monarch in contrast to the kingship of Yahweh in the Zion tradition. There is an unfortunate trend, in writing about kingship in the Hebrew Bible, to portray divine and human kingship as two opposing models of government, which can only rise and fall at the expense of the other. It's not helped by the fact that in 1 Samuel, Israel's choice of electing a king is framed as a rejection of the kingship of Yahweh.<sup>50</sup> Nor is it helped by the possibility, as argued by Gerald Wilson, that the Psalter is arranged by redactors with certain royal psalms at the seams of the books to "direct the faithful to trust in Yahweh as king rather than in fragile and failing human princes."<sup>51</sup> While the controversy over the proposed redactional agenda of the Psalter is outside the scope of this thesis, I do not believe that all Psalms uphold that contrast based on their own content. If the King is Yahweh's son in this Psalm, then it is clear the categories of divine and human kingship are not clearly distinct. It is inaccurate to portray divine and human kingship, two active themes throughout the Psalms, as in tension with one another in Zion Royal Ideology.

This next Royal Psalm, Psalm 18, consists of the King giving thanks to Yahweh for his miraculous rescue of the monarchy. When the King, said to be David in the introduction, is surrounded by foes, Yahweh physically intervenes, soaring into battle atop a

---

<sup>50</sup> 1 Sam. 8:7

<sup>51</sup> Gerald H. Wilson, "King, Messiah, and the Reign of God: Revisiting the Royal Psalms and the Shape of the Psalter," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*, ed. Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller, Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* (Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2005), 393.

cherub and sending down a storm of hail and fire upon the enemies of his King.<sup>52</sup> The King asks rhetorically,

<p>“For who is god but Yahweh? And who is a mountain<sup>53</sup> but our god?”<sup>54</sup></p>	<p>כִּי מִי אֱלֹהִים מִבְּלִעְדֵי יְהוָה וּמִי צוּר זִוְלָתִי אֱלֹהֵינוּ:</p>
--	---

and declares he is the god who granted him victory and made all nations subject to him.<sup>55</sup>

Here again, we see the Zion tradition’s themes of Yahweh’s defeat of the nations from atop Zion, and Yahweh’s protection of the King.

But a new theme of Zion Royal Ideology is explored here in this Psalm; this Psalm discusses precisely why Yahweh has elected the Davidic dynasty to fill this role in the battle with the nations. The King declares,

<p>21. Yahweh rewarded me for my righteousness; as my hands were innocent, he repaid me.</p> <p>22. For I have kept the ways of Yahweh, and I have not been evil, my God.</p> <p>23. For all his judgements are before me, and his decrees I have never set aside.</p>	<p>יְגַמְלֵנִי יְהוָה בְּצִדְקָי כִּבְרֵי יָדַי יֵשֵׁב לִי: כִּי־שָׁמַרְתִּי דַרְכֵי יְהוָה וְלֹא־רָשַׁעְתִּי מֵאֱלֹהִים: כִּי כָל־מִשְׁפָּטָיו לִנְגִדִי וְחֻקֹּתָיו לֹא־אָסִיר מִנִּי: וְאֵהִי תָמִים עִמּוֹ וְאֶשְׁתַּמֵּר מֵעוֹנֵי:</p>
--	---

<sup>52</sup> Ps. 18:11-18

<sup>53</sup> See Dahood, 118.

<sup>54</sup> Ps. 18:31

<sup>55</sup> Ps. 18:32a, 18:48

<p>24. And I was blameless with him and have guarded myself from offending him.</p> <p>25. And Yahweh repaid me according to my righteousness, as my hands were innocent in his eyes.</p>	<p>וַיִּשְׁבַּח יְהוָה לִי כְצַדִּיקִי כְּבָר יְדֵי לִנְגֹד עֵינָיו:</p>
---	--

The King has been rewarded with this place under Yahweh’s suzerainty because he has kept Yahweh’s commandments and been blameless in his sight. The King is described here by Eaton as “right in conduct, loyal, obedient.”<sup>56</sup> For embodying these traits, the King tells us, Yahweh loved him and liberated him.<sup>57</sup>

Critically, the King is *rewarded* with his role as a loving gift from Yahweh. This is in clear contrast to any form of covenantal arrangement or popular election. The King has found favour in Yahweh’s eyes through his own personal character and conduct and thus has been given eternal kingship and victory in return. Ollenburger describes this role as being essentially “the executor of Yahweh’s rule,”; this reflects a common ANE theme that “the king [...] is a power working in parallel with the creator of the cosmos.”<sup>58</sup> This is not a contract between Yahweh and his King, but a reward from Yahweh to the King. The message is clear: Yahweh rules through his King. The dynasty’s reign and security are vouchsafed by Yahweh himself. The will of Yahweh is impossible to resist, and no force on

---

<sup>56</sup> Eaton, 114.

<sup>57</sup> Ps. 18:20

<sup>58</sup> Ollenburger, 59.

Earth can hope to strike down the King of Israel while Yahweh defends him. Yahweh shall not recant this decision, and there is no hope for anyone who would challenge it.

Subsequent Royal Psalms further describe the motif of Yahweh's king obtaining victory through the gift of his divine patron. Psalm 20 lists victory as among the chief gifts from, and requests to, Yahweh.<sup>59</sup>

<p>3. May he send you help from his sanctuary, and from Zion may he uphold you. [...]</p> <p>6. That we may rejoice in your victory, and in the name of our god hoist the banners. May Yahweh fulfill all your petitions</p> <p>7. Now I know that Yahweh has saved his anointed, that he will hear him from his holy heaven, from the place of his strength he has saved you with his right hand.</p>	<p>יְשַׁלַּח-עֲזָרָךְ מִקֹּדֶשׁ וּמִצִּיּוֹן יִסְעָדֶךָ:  נִרְנְנָה   בִּישׁוּעָתְךָ וּבְשֵׁם-אֱלֹהֵינוּ נִדְגַל יִמְלֵא  יְהוָה כָּל-מִשְׁאָלוֹתֶיךָ:  עֲתָה יִדְעָתִי כִּי הוֹשִׁיעַ   יְהוָה מִשִּׁיחֹו יַעֲנֶהוּ  מִשָּׁמַי קֹדְשׁוֹ בְּגִבּוֹרֹת יִשַׁע יְמִינוֹ:</p>
--	--

It is interesting to see the cultic aspects of Zion featured here in connection with the monarchy. It is from the Temple itself, “his sanctuary,” that Yahweh’s deliverance is granted

<sup>59</sup> Eaton, 117.

to the King. The Jerusalem cult and the monarchy, though not necessarily arising from the same sources, are bound up with one another closely in the Zion tradition.<sup>60</sup>

Psalm 21, in a similar manner to Psalm 20, spells out a litany of gifts from Yahweh to the King and the King's gratitude for them. While victory is a critical element of this Psalm, the Psalm also ascribes to Yahweh several gifts for the King:

<p>4. For you met him with good blessings, you set a crown of pure gold upon his head.</p>	<p>כִּי־תִקְדַּמְנוּ בְּרִכּוֹת טוֹב תִּשִׁית לְרֵאשׁוֹ עֲטֹרַת פָּז:</p>
<p>5. Life he asked of you, and you gave it to him. Length of days forever and ever.</p>	<p>חַיִּים   שָׁאַל מִמֶּךָ נְתַתָּהּ לוֹ אַרְךָ יָמִים עוֹלָם וְעַד:</p>
<p>6. Great is his glory in your salvation, splendour and majesty you have laid upon him.</p>	<p>גְּדוֹל כְּבוֹדוֹ בִּישׁוּעָתְךָ הוֹד וְהֶדֶר תִּשְׁוֶה עָלָיו: גְּדוֹל כְּבוֹדוֹ בִּישׁוּעָתְךָ הוֹד וְהֶדֶר תִּשְׁוֶה עָלָיו:</p>
<p>7. For you will grant him blessings forever, you will make him gaze joyously upon your face.</p>	<p>כִּי־תִשְׁיַתְּהוּ בְּרִכּוֹת לְעַד תִּחַזְּקֵהוּ בְּשִׂמְחָה אֶת־פְּנֵיךָ:</p>

Central here is the permanence of Yahweh's gifts. Tying into the declaration of the King as God's son in Psalm 2, here, the King has been gifted eternal life by Yahweh. Dahood notes that this has clear ANE parallels, particularly concerning King Kirta of Ugarit, who "was also considered to be immortal, but this in virtue of his being the son of El and Asherah."<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Ollenburger, 59.

<sup>61</sup> Dahood, 132.

While the connection is not made within a single Psalm, these ideas of immortality and divine sonship thus clearly manifest in the Zion conception of the King.

And there is another component of this Psalm that further elucidates the relationship of the King to Yahweh in Zion Royal Ideology:

8. For the King trusts in Yahweh, and from the steadfast loving-kindness of the Most High, he shall never swerve.	כִּי־הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּטַח בִּיהוָה וּבְחֶסֶד עָלְיוֹן בְּלִי־מָוֶט:
---	---

The relationship between the King and Yahweh is one of love, also explored in Psalm 18. Zion Royal Ideology does not use the language of marital love but filial love.<sup>62</sup> A father has unconditional love for his son, and likewise, the son for his father. The father rejoices in the accomplishments of his son, and the son seeks to make the father proud by doing his bidding. While a marriage may be ended through divorce, paternity can never be broken. From the day Yahweh has declared the King as his son, this is the love that cements the bond between monarchy and divinity in Israel. Yahweh and the King love each other unconditionally, rejoicing in all that each has done for the other. The father, Yahweh, has given his son (the King) his place and station in life and a mandate to make him proud. With the reinstatement of this irrevokable, unbreakable, loving bond and Yahweh as a father to this son, there can be no effective threat made against him.

---

<sup>62</sup> After all, the King is Yahweh's son. Cf. Ps. 2:7.

Psalm 45, the famous “Royal Wedding” psalm, also embodies aspects of Zion Royal Ideology. While praising “a king and his bride on the occasion of their marriage,” the song incorporates the Zion tradition motif of the king conquering the nations for God.<sup>63</sup> Yet, uniquely, according to Sigmund Mowinckel, this Psalm is a hymn to *the king himself* and not Yahweh.<sup>64</sup> Here a Psalmist praises the King directly for his beauty and triumphs.<sup>65</sup> That said, God is crucial to this Psalm, as the King is commended due to being eternally blessed and enthroned by God.<sup>66</sup>

There is an ambiguity in verse 8 where Dahood reads, “You must love justice and hate iniquity, because God, your God has anointed you.”<sup>67</sup> He bases this on the assumption that the word “אַהֲבֵתָ” at the beginning of the verse is a precative perfect expressing a wish on the part of the author, and reads “עַל־כֵּן” as “because.”<sup>68</sup> This presents a dilemma; if the author is expressing a desire that the King love justice and hate iniquity because of his anointment, then this is in contrast to Zion Royal Ideology’s theme of the King being anointed on account of God loving his righteousness.

I read the verse as follows:

7. You loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore, God, your god	אַהֲבֵתָ צְדָקָה וְתִשְׂנֵא רָשָׁע עַל־כֵּן   מִשְׁחָךְ
---	---

<sup>63</sup> Here named as אֱלֹהִים and not יְהוָה

<sup>64</sup> Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 75.

<sup>65</sup> Ps. 45:3, 5, 10, 18.

<sup>66</sup> Ps. 45:3b, 7a

<sup>67</sup> Dahood, 269.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 273.

anointed you with oil of joy above your fellows.	אֱלֹהִים אֱלֵהֶיךָ שָׁמֵן שֶׁשׂוֹן מִחֲבֵרֶיךָ:
--	---

I read it this way partly because scholars disagree on whether precative perfects even exist in Biblical Hebrew; Provain notes that “It is, after all, self-evident that the perfect verbs under consideration could and can be explained in other ways.”<sup>69</sup> The verb “אַהַבְתָּ” can easily be read as a second person male singular in the past tense, “You have loved.” Moreover, the context of this Psalm is that of a royal wedding where an already-enthroned king is being praised to his bride.<sup>70</sup> It is the bride who is counselled by this song to desire and love the King, and it is plausible that the King’s love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity is one of those traits for which she should admire him. It seems peculiar to give the King a moral lecture in such a context. Furthermore, throughout the Hebrew Bible the term “עַל־כֵּן” is used to mean “therefore,” as in Genesis where the story of Eve being made from the rib of Adam is used as the lead into a famous saying:

24. Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh.	עַל־כֵּן יַעֲזֹב אִישׁ אֶת־אָבִיו וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָיוּ לְבֶשֶׁר אֶחָד:
--	---

I thus argue that it is plausible to read this Psalm as reflecting the idea that the King’s role

---

<sup>69</sup> Iain W. Provan, "Past, Present and Future in Lamentations Iii 52-66: The Case for a Precative Perfect Re-Examined," *Vetus Testamentum* 41, no. 2 (1991): 167.

<sup>70</sup> Ps. 45 11-12

is a reward from God for prior righteousness while not indicating a covenantal component of his position.

Psalm 72 is not written from the perspective of the King, as various other royal Psalms, but in honour of him and his heir.<sup>71</sup> Described by Mowinckel as a congregational petition delivered and officiated by a priest, the Psalm seems to have the priest take on a quasi-prophetic role by not only requesting a blessing but pronouncing with certainty that the King will do various righteous deeds such as rescuing the needy from death and saving them from oppression and violence.<sup>72</sup> Most commentators agree that this Psalm was likely recited as a component of a royal enthronement ceremony.<sup>73</sup> It once more incorporates classic Zion motif of royal conquest of the nations, including enrichment of the King's territorial domain and the subjugation of the nations and their kings to Yahweh's King.<sup>74</sup> Likewise, it also emphasizes the advancement of the cult of Yahweh, "who alone does marvellous deeds,"<sup>75</sup> that "the whole earth be filled with his glory."<sup>76</sup>

18. Blessed be the God Yahweh, God of Israel, who alone works wonders.	בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עֹשֶׂה נִפְלְאוֹת לְבָדּוֹ:
19. And blessed be his glorious name forever and may all the earth be filled with his glory, Amen and Amen!	וּבְרוּךְ שֵׁם כְּבוֹדוֹ לְעוֹלָם וָיָמָּא כְּבוֹדוֹ אֶת־ כָּל הָאָרֶץ אָמֵן   וָאָמֵן:

<sup>71</sup> Ps. 72:1

<sup>72</sup> Mowinckel, 69.

<sup>73</sup> Eaton, 120.

<sup>74</sup> Ps. 72:8-11

<sup>75</sup> Ps. 72:18b

<sup>76</sup> Ps. 72:19b

The essential point of the Psalm, as expressed succinctly by Eaton, is that “The King, enabled by God, is to rule with compassion, bringing prosperity to society and nature and enjoying lasting, world-wide dominion.”<sup>77</sup> The King’s passionate rule and prosperity is not an obligation for the King to achieve, but a natural product of his divinely blessed government. The oscillation between priestly benediction and prophetic prediction in the Psalm points to the certainty that this divine blessing would be given, and the eternity of the King and his successors’ reign is the core component of the inviolability of Zion and her King.

Psalm 101 is an outlier among the traditional royal psalms, for there is no explicit royal reference in the text itself. However, the fact that the speaker frequently speaks of actions that affect the entire land and all its people, and of having the blameless act as counsel to him, has led scholars from Gunkel onward to describe it as an individual royal vow, with some debate as to whether it was recited at a ceremony enthroning the king or renewing his rule.<sup>78</sup> The most curious part of this Psalm is its query asking of Yahweh, “when will you come to me?”<sup>79</sup> Writing in *Hermeneia*, Hossfeld and Zenger argue it is an “open question” of just how Yahweh is supposed to come to the king, as a dream or vision, in the Temple, or in some physical manifestation.<sup>80</sup> While pre-exilic, the Psalm does not seem particularly interested in Zion Royal Ideology and displays none of its common

---

<sup>77</sup> Eaton, 120.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 122.

<sup>79</sup> Ps. 101:2a

<sup>80</sup> Hossfeld et al., 14.

motifs. This is likely because the Psalm is about the King dealing with his own personal conduct in life and state affairs internal to Israel. It makes sense, therefore, that Zion Royal Ideology, with its long-term perspective and external goals, is not the focus of the Psalm. It is here, however, that the concept of the deity's spatial relationship to the King is introduced. This idea is expanded upon in Psalm 110.

Due to its ambiguous language, it has been said that “No Psalm has evoked as many hypotheses and as much discussion among scholars as the 110<sup>th</sup> Psalm.”<sup>81</sup> The text in the Masoretic Text is often described as corrupted, with multiple ancient variants giving wildly different readings of certain verses.<sup>82</sup> The *Sitz im Leben* of this psalm is also hotly debated, as it is unclear what part of a ritual this could have served and who would be speaking to the king as Yahweh in the second person. It blends traditional Zion motifs with priestly rhetoric, particularly in the contentious 4<sup>th</sup> verse. Here, the King is described as “כֹהֵן לְעוֹלָם” :עַל־דְּבָרָתִי מִלְכִי־צֶדֶק”, which has been rendered as both “A priest forever in the manner of Melchizedek”,<sup>83</sup> or “A priest of the Eternal according to his pact; His legitimate king, my lord.”<sup>84</sup> Wilson reads it as “My [heavenly] king (is) righteous.”<sup>85</sup> There are difficulties with each reading, such as the fact that “צֶדֶק” generally refers to “justice” in the Tanakh, instead of royal legitimacy, and that justice is not at all a theme of this Psalm.<sup>86</sup> But it is also perplexing as to what relevance Melchizedek has to this Psalm. Dahood notes, “nothing in

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 143.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 141.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 140.

<sup>84</sup> Dahood, 112.

<sup>85</sup> Wilson, 400.

<sup>86</sup> Hossfeld et al., 143.

Genesis indicates that Melchizedek will remain a priest forever.”<sup>87</sup> It is possible that the reference to Melchizedek could be harkening back to Jebusite Zion traditions. Hilber<sup>88</sup> and Laato<sup>89</sup> see this as a reference to Melchizedek as a priest-king of Yahweh in Jerusalem.

Many agree that the Psalm confers a priestly role upon the King in the divine oath of verse 4. It has been posited by some that the priest-king motif, so ostensibly unlike the rest of the Hebrew Bible’s conception of kingship, must be post-exilic in origin and perhaps even a pro-Maccabean reference to the priest-king Simon.<sup>90</sup> Dahood sees it as more ancient, referencing David’s sons becoming priests in 2 Sam 8:18, and Solomon bringing a thousand burnt offerings to the altar at Gibeon in 1 Kings 3:4 as evidence that Israelite kings fulfilled priestly roles and enjoyed priestly privileges.<sup>91</sup> Hilber sees Egyptian parallels here while noting that the Egyptian king is depicted as a high priest throughout Ancient Egyptian iconography, even “the sole priestly functionary” in some sources.<sup>92</sup> He also argues (implicitly in favour of a pre-exilic date) that a Psalm so explicitly endorsing Judean military conquest would have “easily roused the concern of Persian authorities” had it been produced in a post-exilic setting.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Dahood, 117.

<sup>88</sup> John Hilber, "Psalm Cx in the Light of Assyrian Prophecies," *Vetus Testamentum* 53, no. 3 (2003).

<sup>89</sup> Laato, 185.

<sup>90</sup> Hossfeld et al., 144.

<sup>91</sup> Dahood, 117.

<sup>92</sup> Hilber, 362.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 365.

I am inclined to agree with a pre-exilic date, as does Eaton<sup>94</sup> and Laato.<sup>95</sup> The presence of kings fulfilling similar priestly roles in other parts of the Hebrew Bible, such as by performing cultic sacrifices,<sup>96</sup> and the strong Zion motifs of the Psalm are markers of an early date. Among those motifs is that of Zion as Yahweh's mountain. This is emphasized even more strongly here than in other Psalms. Zion is not only the mountain where Yahweh's king is installed, as in Psalm 2, but is the royal residence of Yahweh himself.<sup>97</sup> The intimate proximity of their thrones is further emphasized by the Psalm having the King seated directly at Yahweh's right hand as if physically enthroned beside him.<sup>98</sup> Hilber, noting parallels to Assyrian texts of that category, sees this as one of many aspects of the Psalm that categorizes it as an early prophetic oracle.<sup>99</sup> He considers this compatible with the view, shared by Eaton<sup>100</sup> and Laato<sup>101</sup> that the Psalm was used in an enthronement ritual, pointing out that the Psalm's style of "cultic prophecy" was used extensively in Assyrian enthronement rituals.<sup>102</sup>

Several trends emerge from these Psalms that characterize Zion Royal Ideology. The first is, to quote Roberts, that Zion is the mountain where "God has defeated the kings and their peoples there" with the corollary that the King is the agent of Yahweh's victory from

---

<sup>94</sup> Eaton, 124-25.

<sup>95</sup> Laato, 186.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. 1 Sam. 13:9; 2 Sam. 6:13, 17-18, 24:25; 1 Kgs. 3:4, 15, 8:5, 62-64, 9:25, 12:33, 13:1-2; 2 Kgs. 16:4, 12-15.

<sup>97</sup> Laato, 186.

<sup>98</sup> Ps. 110:1

<sup>99</sup> Hilber, 358.

<sup>100</sup> Eaton, 124.

<sup>101</sup> Laato, 185.

<sup>102</sup> Hilber, 361.

Zion.<sup>103</sup> This is the most common Zion motif in the Royal Psalms.<sup>104</sup> If nothing else, Yahweh is a man of war,<sup>105</sup> and it is no surprise that just as he triumphed over and subdued the forces of chaos from Zion, he will likewise triumph over and subdue the nations from Zion to spread his order across creation.<sup>106</sup>

A second theme seen throughout these Psalms is Zion as the dwelling place of both Yahweh and the King.<sup>107</sup> Ollenburger describes this as “the central feature of the Jerusalem cult tradition” and goes as far as to say that the whole of the Zion tradition and cult at Jerusalem “depended upon the prior notion of Yahweh’s presence there.”<sup>108</sup> The mountain, through its election by Yahweh, served as the dwelling place of both the deity and the King. This spatial relationship was so close that the King was said to sit at the right hand of God himself.<sup>109</sup> Zion is the mountain from where the King and Yahweh survey their domain and the fount from which flows their power. Roland states that the Zion tradition is essentially a tradition of divine election; first of Zion, then of the King.<sup>110</sup>

Regarding the election of the King, one of the defining aspects of Zion Royal Ideology is that kingship is a reward. In the Royal Psalms, kingship is not an arrangement hashed out between Israel and the deity, but a gift from Yahweh as a reward for the King’s

---

<sup>103</sup> J. J. M. Roberts, "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, no. 3 (1973): 329.

<sup>104</sup> Ps. 2:8-9; Ps 18:29, 37-43, Ps. 21:8-12, Ps. 45:5, Ps. 72:8-10, Ps. 110:5-6

<sup>105</sup> Ex. 3:15

<sup>106</sup> Roberts, "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition," 329.

<sup>107</sup> Ps. 2:6, Ps. 20:2, Ps. 110:1, Ps. 110:2

<sup>108</sup> Ollenburger, 23.

<sup>109</sup> Ps. 110:1

<sup>110</sup> Ollenburger, 61.

righteousness.<sup>111</sup> Because David found favour in God's eyes through his righteous deeds, he has been gifted the Kingship by Yahweh and appointed to be the executor of His will on Earth in general and Israel in particular. Of course, the reference to David is not necessarily organic to Zion Royal Ideology, as Laato notes this is a blend of two distinct traditions: The Zion tradition and the David tradition, which arose independently of one another.<sup>112</sup>

A corollary of this reward is that it is eternal.<sup>113</sup> Whosoever opposes the King, Yahweh shall "swallow them up in his wrath, and fire will consume them."<sup>114</sup> The King and his dynasty shall reign forever as Yahweh's agents who, through their victory over the nations, shall ensure that Yahweh's glory will fill the whole Earth.<sup>115</sup>

The final theme of Zion Royal Ideology seen in these Psalms is that of the King as the son of Yahweh, expressed explicitly in Ps. 2:7. Though the concept is expressed in 2 Sam. 7:1-29 and Psalm 89:27-28, it is here in Psalm 2:7 that this finds its strongest expression.<sup>116</sup> The description of the King as Yahweh's son is a reflection of royal divinity and of the close and affectionate familial relationship between the two, which characterizes Zion Royal Ideology.

As stated earlier, this component of Zion Royal Ideology is essentially an ideology of divine love likened to sonship. The King is Yahweh's son, having merited this status

---

<sup>111</sup> Ps. 18:20-24, Ps. 45:7

<sup>112</sup> Laato, 59.

<sup>113</sup> Ps. 18:50, Ps. 21:4-8, Ps. 45:2, 6, Ps. 72:5-7, 17, Ps: 110:4

<sup>114</sup> Ps. 21:9b

<sup>115</sup> Ps. 72:19

<sup>116</sup>Gerald Cooke, "The Israelite King as Son of God," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73, no. 2 (1961): 206-07.

through righteousness. The love of a father to a son is, in principle, unconditional - it is rooted neither in oath nor contract, but in a transcendent, intimate connection. The King shall reign forever because Yahweh stands behind him eternally as a fatherly mentor and supporter. The King will, as a faithful son, honour his divine father by carrying out his vision through gracious stewardship of Israel, maintenance of the Jerusalem cult, and destruction of all Israel's enemies.

To summarize the findings of this chapter, the central platform of Zion Royal Ideology is

1. Yahweh has elected Zion as the seat of his power
2. Yahweh has elected the King to be his son to reign over his people from Zion
3. That the precedent be done forever, unconditionally and without effective challenge,
4. Carry out His will by obtaining victory over the nations and filling the world with the glory of Yahweh.

Zion Royal Ideology is the dominant ideology throughout much of Judah's history. It is briefly interrupted by the Deuteronomistic reforms but makes a strong comeback before inevitably perishing in the Exile. This will be elaborated on in the next chapter. The King which can most truly be said to embody this ideology is Hezekiah. In deciding to wage war against the King of Assyria, he is assured by a divine prophecy of the inviolability of Zion and the city of Jerusalem.<sup>117</sup> Nonetheless, we can see the Deuteronomistic influence in the importance of the Mosaic covenant in the evaluation of both his reign and the fall of the Northern Kingdom of Israel.<sup>118</sup> While Zion Royal Ideology legitimized the monarchy

---

<sup>117</sup> 2 Kgs 20:32

<sup>118</sup> 2 Kgs 18:6; 11-12

through most of its existence, the time period in which it did so is remembered in a time when Zion Royal Ideology has long since fallen by the wayside.

The next chapter will discuss the other pre-exilic royal ideology found in the Hebrew Bible, the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology. This royal ideology is associated with the Deuteronomist's reforms that began under King Josiah - reforms affecting many facets of religious and political life in Ancient Judah, including the legitimation of the monarchy. It will discuss how the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology rose, fell, and rose again. It will also discuss the substance of this ideology and describe how it made a profound break with the Zion Royal Ideology.

## Chapter 2: The Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology

*“And in that day you will cry out because of your king, whom you have chosen for yourselves; but Yahweh will not answer you in that day.” – 1 Sam. 8:18*

In the previous chapter, I discussed the Zion Royal Ideology found in the Psalms. In this chapter, I will identify a different royal ideological framework that I have identified with the Deuteronomistic History. At present, there is profound controversy surrounding this concept. Many now suggest that these books do not constitute a single work of history and challenge the perceived relationship between Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets. I will begin by addressing this controversy and proceed to explain how a coherent royal ideology can nonetheless be found within the works often called “The Deuteronomistic History.”

Before getting into that analysis, let us keep in mind that Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology is also a blend of traditions. These texts, which we describe as Deuteronomistic, have been described as not reflecting a uniform “Deuteronomism,” but rather a “conversation with the book of Deuteronomy” among the Former Prophets.<sup>119</sup> While we are not as ignorant about the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology in the time of King Josiah as we are about whatever David and Solomon may have thought about Zion, we must nonetheless continue to be cognizant of the fact that Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, like Zion Royal Ideology, comes to us in texts which have taken their final forms after the Exile. So, in the same way, that the symbol of Zion meant something different to David than to Hezekiah,

---

<sup>119</sup> K. L. Noll, "Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate? (a Thought Experiment)," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31, no. 3 (2007): 344.

the symbol of the Deuteronomic covenant meant something different to the author of the Law of the King in Deuteronomy than it did to Deuteronomists chronicling the reigns of the kings of Judah.

The Deuteronomistic History is the hypothesis, which was first advanced by Martin Noth, that the books of Deuteronomy to 2 Kings form a single literary work that seeks to account for the destruction of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah from an exilic perspective.<sup>120</sup> While scholars as early as Spinoza were aware of the affinity between Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets, and the concept of a “Deuteronomistic” redaction goes back at least as far as de Wette, Noth’s rejection of the idea of a Hexateuch in favour of the idea of a single literary continuity from Deuteronomy-2 Kings is the foundation of the modern understanding of the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis.<sup>121</sup> A central feature of Noth’s doctrine is that the Deuteronomist was a single author/editor, who both redacted earlier traditions and “constructed a complex view of Israel’s history, including a sequence of successive eras, in order to explain the final catastrophe.”<sup>122</sup>

Over the decades since Noth first published his studies on the subject, critiques of the hypothesis have spurred significant revisions. Noth himself would even revise his theory of a single author/editor to suggest that the prayer of Solomon in 1 Kings 8 underwent redaction by “several authors/editors.”<sup>123</sup> Frank Moore Cross would revise the

---

<sup>120</sup> Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History : A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction* (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 25.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 15-16; 21.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>123</sup> Leslie J. Hoppe, "The Strategy of the Deuteronomistic History: A Proposal," *cbq The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 79, no. 1 (2017): 2.

broader Deuteronomistic History in 1968 by proposing a theory of double redaction: Dtr. was first written/redacted in the time of King Josiah, the Deuteronomistic king par excellence, and then redacted again after the exile by adding in the post-Josiah portions of 2 Kings and sections dealing with the exile to earlier Deuteronomistic works.<sup>124</sup>

In the early 70's, Rudolf Smend and his student Walter Dietrich would argue for a different revision of the hypothesis, retaining Noth's idea of the exilic origins of the Deuteronomistic History, but subdividing it into different compositional strata with a first, pro-monarchic historically centered focus: DtrH (The Deuteronomistic Historian), then a series of hard-anti-monarchic and pro-prophetic additions: DtrP (The Prophetic Deuteronomist), and finally a series of soft-anti-monarchic additions centering around the obedience of the Law: DtrN (The Nomistic Deuteronomist), with expanded legal additions in the form of DtrN1, DtrN2, etc.<sup>125</sup>

However, in more recent times, several scholars have called into question the idea that there even is such a thing as the Deuteronomistic History. Much of this critique surrounds the use of the label "Deuteronomistic," with scholars like Wurthwein and Auld suggesting that the earliest portions of the Deuteronomistic History are found in Kings rather than Deuteronomy while Knauf argues that "only the books of (Samuel and) Kings could be labelled as 'Deuteronomistic history.'"<sup>126</sup> Rösel, in a comprehensive analysis of various Deuteronomistic "leitmotifs", such as the sin-divine reaction-punishment-salvation motif or the cultic "Reform und Reformen"[sic] motif, concludes that no coherent ideology

---

<sup>124</sup> Römer, 28.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., 29-30.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 38.

or motif undergirds the Deuteronomistic History at all and argues that we should thus “abandon the theory of a single and uniform Deuteronomistic History.”<sup>127</sup> Likewise, Eynikel argues that the works that comprise the Deuteronomistic History are in fact, “a variety of blocks written independently,” that belonged to different books and were editorially compiled later.<sup>128</sup> Noll rejects the “History” aspect of the Deuteronomistic History, and the concept of “Deuteronomism,” proposing instead that “what we have in the Former Prophets is a conversation with the book of Deuteronomy”, a “Deuteronomic debate” with historical writers responding to Deuteronomy positively while negatively responding to the development of “Deuteronomic thought”.<sup>129</sup> The state of the theory of Deuteronomistic History is so fragmented that at the turn of the millennium, Knoppers remarked that, “One can no longer assume a widespread scholarly consensus on the existence of a Deuteronomistic History.”<sup>130</sup>

Much of this debate is a matter of semantics, with the bulk of the controversy centring around the label “Deuteronomistic” as an appropriate descriptor. Nonetheless, there is a common thread running from the books of Deuteronomy through to Second Kings, as noted by Römer, of both the theme of exile and the worship of foreign gods being the cause of the exile.<sup>131</sup> Even if that thread does not have its origins in the book of Deuteronomy, that doesn’t mean the thread isn’t present in the Deuteronomistic History.

---

<sup>127</sup> H.N. Rösel, "Does a 'Leitmotiv' Exist in Deuteronomistic History?," in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Thomas Römer (Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press : Uitgeverij Peeters, 2000), 211.

<sup>128</sup> G.N. Knoppers, "Is There a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?," *ibid.*, 123.

<sup>129</sup> Noll, 344.

<sup>130</sup> Knoppers, 120.

<sup>131</sup> Römer, 40.

Whether or not the Deuteronomistic History has a single author, as Noth initially suggested, it certainly appears to have a single editor; at the very least it has a coherent editorial slant towards explaining the exile and denouncing foreign worship. Moreover, Knoppers has affirmed the existence of “important indications of unity in the Deuteronomistic History” such as “the prophecy-fulfillment schema”, “the division of Israelite history into sequential periods”, and lesser-known indications like “the use of divine wrath formulae”, and “the use of intermarriage with the autochthonous Canaanite nations as a *topos* to explain Israel’s decline”, all of which suggest a cohesion within these texts.<sup>132</sup>

This thesis presumes that there exists a sufficiently coherent royal ideology which finds expression in the texts of Deuteronomy to Second Kings and can be tentatively identified with the Deuteronomistic History. I will, therefore, analyze certain passages from these works to illustrate the Deuteronomistic History’s idea of Kingship.

The essential starting place for a study of Kingship in the Deuteronomistic History is the Law of the King in Deuteronomy 17:14-20.

<p>14. When you have come to the land which Yahweh, your god, is giving you, and you have taken possession of it and settled it, and you say, “I will set a king over myself</p>	<p>כִּי־תָבֹא אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נֹתֵן לָךְ וַיִּרְשָׁתָהּ וַיֵּשְׁבָתָהּ בָּהּ וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲשִׁימָה עָלַי מֶלֶךְ בְּכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר סְבִיבֹתַי:</p>
--	---

---

<sup>132</sup> Knoppers, 134.

like all the other nations that surround me.”

15. You may indeed set a king over you, which Yahweh your God shall choose; you may set one from among your brothers as king over you. You shall not set a foreign man over you who is not your brother.

16. But he shall not amass many horses for himself, and he shall not send the people back to Egypt to acquire more horses, for Yahweh has said to you: “You are not to return that way again.”

17. And he shall not amass many wives for himself, and they shall not turn his heart away, nor shall he amass much silver and gold for himself.

18. And it shall be that when he sits on the throne of his kingdom, he shall have

שׁוֹם תְּשִׁים עָלֶיךָ מֶלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר יְהוָה  
אֱלֹהֶיךָ בּוֹ מִקְרֵב אַחֲיֶיךָ תְּשִׁים עָלֶיךָ מֶלֶךְ לֹא  
תֹכֵל לָתֵת עָלֶיךָ אִישׁ נָכְרִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־אֶחָיֶךָ  
הוּא:

רַק לֹא־יִרְבֶּה־לּוֹ סוּסִים וְלֹא־יָשִׁיב אֶת־הָעַם  
מִצְרַיִם לְמַעַן הַרְבּוֹת סוּס וַיְהוֶה אָמַר לָכֶם  
לֹא תִסְפוּן לָשׁוּב בַּדֶּרֶךְ הַזֶּה עוֹד:

וְלֹא יִרְבֶּה־לּוֹ נָשִׁים וְלֹא יִסּוֹר לְבָבוֹ וּכְסָף וְזָהָב  
לֹא יִרְבֶּה־לּוֹ מְאֹד:

וְהָיָה כְּשִׁבְתְּךָ עַל כִּסֵּא מַמְלַכְתְּךָ וְכָתַב לְךָ אֶת־  
מִשְׁנֵה הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת עַל־סֵפֶר מִלְּפָנַי הַכְּתוּבִים  
הַלְוִיִּם:

וְהִיְתָה עִמּוֹ וְקָרָא בּוֹ כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּו לְמַעַן יִלְמַד  
לְיִרְאָה אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו לְשֹׁמֵר אֶת־כְּלֵד־בְּרִיתִי  
הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת וְאֶת־הַחֻקִּים הָאֵלֶּה לַעֲשׂוֹתָם:

<p>written for him a copy of this law in a scroll in the presence of the Levitical priests.</p> <p>19. And it shall remain with him, and he shall read from it all the days of his life in order that he may learn to fear Yahweh his God and keep all the words of this Law and these statutes and do them.</p> <p>20. In order that his heart shall not be exalted above his brethren and not turn aside from the commandment to the right or the left so that the days of his reign and his children shall be extended over Israel.</p>	<p>לְבִלְתִּי רוּם-לְבָבוֹ מֵאֶחָיו וּלְבִלְתִּי סוּר מִן-  הַמִּצְוָה יָמִין וּשְׂמֹאל לְמַעַן יֵאָרֶךְ יָמָיו עַל-  מַמְלַכְתּוֹ הוּא וּבָנָיו בְּקִרְבֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל: ס</p>
--	--

When reading this law, one is immediately struck by the extent to which the authority and abilities of the King are limited. His inability to acquire horses prevents the establishment of a professional cavalry for his army, his inability to increase his wealth limits the investments he can make and his inability to practice polygamy drastically hinders his ability to form marital alliances with foreign realms. Moreover, it is astonishing that a Judahite King would not even be allowed to exalt himself over others, not even as *prima inter pares*, and can best be described as a particularly pious individual who studies the law presented to him by the Levitical priests.

This is an aberration in the ANE, and even within the Deuteronomistic History itself. As described by Knoppers, ANE Kings would commonly take a leadership role in activities such as “(re)construction of palace and temple, fortification of the city, victory in battle, national prosperity, international trade, international recognition, patronage of the cult, [and] administration of justice.”<sup>133</sup> Naram-Sin of Akkad not only took on the responsibility of “securing the foundations” of the state but was also awarded divinity for it.<sup>134</sup> Within the Deuteronomistic History, Knoppers points out that the Deuteronomist assumes that “monarchs are to enforce centralization, appoint priests, serve in some judicial capacity (at least as a final court of appeals), lead major feasts, and head the military.”<sup>135</sup> as Greenspahn’s recent work has pointed out that even the idea that Deuteronomy mandates centralization of the cult at all rests on dubious grammatical grounds.<sup>136</sup> Nonetheless, Deuteronomy’s divergences do not necessarily preclude its reinterpretation by other works in the Deuteronomistic History;<sup>137</sup> it also does not preclude the existence of some familiar ideas on kingship shared across the Deuteronomists.

It has long been suggested that Deuteronomy began as an independent work that was not authored by the Deuteronomist, the *Urdeuteronomium*, a kernel of which survives

---

<sup>133</sup> Gary N. Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings," *cathbiblquar The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (2001): 393.

<sup>134</sup> Piotr Michalowski, "The Mortal Kings of Ur: A Short Century of Divine Rule in Ancient Mesopotamia," in *Religion and Power : Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*, ed. Nicole Maria Brisch (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2008), 34.

<sup>135</sup> Knoppers, 408.

<sup>136</sup> Frederick E. Greenspahn, "Deuteronomy and Centralization," *vetustestamentum Vetus Testamentum* 64, no. 2 (2014): 232.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, 234.

in the present Deuteronomy amidst heavy editing.<sup>138</sup> This is chiefly apparent in how poorly Deuteronomy serves as a “hermeneutical cypher to evaluate and understand the monarchy.”<sup>139</sup> The Deuteronomist, for instance, does not appear to care that Solomon violates the three fundamental prohibitions of polygamy, cavalry, and amassing wealth in the Law of the King.<sup>140</sup> His wealth is a direct blessing from God for his wisdom, the Deuteronomist views his cavalry and chariots to be a testament to the power of his administration, and his wives are only a problem insofar as some of them are foreigners and cause him to worship other gods.<sup>141</sup> As previously discussed, in Deuteronomy, the King is not explicitly granted a leadership role in the elimination of foreign worship, while the Deuteronomist assumes otherwise, and Deuteronomy suggests a general division of powers that is simply absent in the Deuteronomist.<sup>142</sup>

The reason for these differences has been argued by some to lie in the context in which the Deuteronomic text was written. Levinson tentatively suggested that Deuteronomy arose as a protest against King Manasseh by court scribes who backed the reforms of the previous King, Hezekiah.<sup>143</sup> In his eyes, their motivation was to create a “utopian legal program for cultural renewal,” which drew inspiration from Neo-Assyrian state treaties and subverted them through mandating exclusive loyalty to Yahweh.<sup>144</sup> Dutcher-Walls dates

---

<sup>138</sup> Gerald Eddie Gerbrandt, "Kingship According to the Deuteronomistic History" (Scholars Press, 1986), 104.

<sup>139</sup> Knoppers, 394.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 411.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., 410-11.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 404-08.

<sup>143</sup> Bernard Levinson, "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah," *VT Vetus Testamentum* 51, no. 4 (2001): 527.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 527-28.

Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah and sees its purpose as largely pragmatic: the restrictions keep the King from being seen as a threat to his Assyrian overlords (by not permitting the king to form marital alliances outside Assyrian hegemony, building up a personal military that could suggest a threat towards Assyria, and attempting to wrest control of the economy from Assyria) in order to keep Judah out of Assyria's crosshairs.<sup>145</sup> Knoppers suggests, without giving a hard date, that "Much of Deuteronomy's political, social, and cultic legislation seems to reflect the concerns and priorities of scribes, officials, and priests at the temple court in Jerusalem."<sup>146</sup> Römer, however, doubts that the Deuteronomic Law of the King is pre-exilic, given that it would be absolutely without parallel to any known ANE regimes.<sup>147</sup> As he assumes no Judahite King would have tolerated a restriction of his power in an official publication, he suggests that it is a narrative device added to the Deuteronomistic History to form the backdrop to the monarchy's failure in Samuel-Kings.<sup>148</sup>

Knoppers identified a major problem with Römer's claim. Since the Deuteronomist portrays Solomon's violations of the Law of the King as positives, there is thus "no indication that these notices function as an explicit or implicit criticism of Solomon" or of the existence of the institution of the Judahite/Israelite monarchy.<sup>149</sup> If the Law of the King is purely a narrative device the Deuteronomist invented to criticize the institution of the

---

<sup>145</sup> Patricia Dutcher-Walls, "The Circumscription of the King: Deuteronomy 17:16-17 in Its Ancient Social Context," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121, no. 4 (2002): 615-16.

<sup>146</sup> Knoppers, 408.

<sup>147</sup> Römer, 80.

<sup>148</sup> Römer, 80.

<sup>149</sup> Knoppers, 411.

monarchy, he seems to almost entirely ignore its implications when evaluating the monarchy in Samuel-Kings. While Römer has a valid point when he says that Deuteronomy's conception of the monarchy is utterly without parallel in the ANE, both Levinson and Dutcher-Walls have offered plausible explanations of the motive behind the document. While I cannot definitively state that the text is either a protest against Manasseh or a program for maintaining good relations with Assyria, I affirm that the Law of the King is pre-exilic in origin and will hence treat it as contributing to a Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology that existed in Judah prior to the exile.

How, then, does the Deuteronomist use the Law of the King? A number of scholars from Von Rad to Gerbrandt argue that portions of the Deuteronomic law of kingship, specifically verses 18-19, were added by the Deuteronomist.<sup>150</sup> This is partly because of the reference to the law as a book, a trait common among passages assumed to be Deuteronomistic additions, and partly due to it having a positive role for the king in the context of a list of prohibitions.<sup>151</sup> Knoppers doubts this and points out that, with the notable exception of Josiah, "The authors of Samuel-Kings do not display any sustained interest in whether kings [...] read the Torah scroll."<sup>152</sup> While Josiah does read from it, he reads from it publicly rather than in private study as vv. 18-19 would suggest.<sup>153</sup>

This point of debate is shadowed by the broader dissonance between Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic thought. Levinson states that the latter possesses an expanded role for

---

<sup>150</sup> Gerbrandt, 105.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid.

<sup>152</sup> Knoppers, 403.

<sup>153</sup> Knoppers, 403.

the King, where he serves as “the final court of judicial appeal, “defender and presider over *cultus*,” war leader, provider of “economic relief,” and possesses the title of Yahweh’s son.<sup>154</sup> Yet, the Deuteronomic law code is not discarded by the Deuteronomistic History. That is made evident by the fact that the text is still in the final redaction. Therefore, it is worth investigating any overlap between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist on the subject of Kingship. Perhaps, as Knoppers writes, the Deuteronomist manages to “make even Deuteronomy speak with a new royal voice.”<sup>155</sup>

Firstly, both Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist agree that the king ascends to the throne through popular request and divine assent. The Deuteronomic formula for the request for a King is repeated almost to the letter in Samuel-Kings.<sup>156</sup> Both further agree that Yahweh, after receiving the request for a King, has the prerogative to choose who shall become King.<sup>157</sup> The most crucial aspect of the kingship ideology shared between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist is its conditionality. The purpose given in the kingship code for the King’s obedience is “so that the days of his reign and his children shall be extended over Israel.”<sup>158</sup> The throne of Israel/Judah can be lost through infidelity to Yahweh’s commands. This is a turning point in the royal ideology of pre-exilic Judah.

---

<sup>154</sup> Levinson, 529.

<sup>155</sup> Knoppers, 412-13.

<sup>156</sup> 1 Sam. 8

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Deut. 17:15, 1 Sam 9:16

<sup>158</sup> Deut. 17:20

In the Deuteronomistic History, this comes to pass almost as soon as kingship is established. In 1 Samuel 13, after Saul constructs an altar at Gilgal to bring a burnt offering, Samuel rebukes him and declares,

<p>13. And Samuel said to Saul: “You have acted stupidly, you have not kept the commandment of Yahweh, your god which he has commanded you, for then Yahweh would have established your reign over Israel forever.”</p>	<p>וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂמוּאֵל אֶל-שָׁאוּל נִסְכַּלְתָּ לֹא שָׁמַרְתָּ  אֶת-מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר צִוְּךָ כִּי עָתָה  הִכִּין יְהוָה אֶת-מַמְלַכְתְּךָ אֶל-יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד-  עוֹלָם:</p>
<p>14. “But now your kingdom shall no longer stand, Yahweh has sought himself a man after his own heart, and Yahweh has commanded him to be a leader over his people, for you have not kept that which Yahweh commanded you.”</p>	<p>וְעַתָּה מִמְלַכְתְּךָ לֹא-תִקּוּם בְּקִשׁ יְהוָה לֹא אִישׁ  כִּלְבָבוֹ וַיִּצְוֶהוּ יְהוָה לְנָגִיד עַל-עַמּוֹ כִּי לֹא  שָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת אֲשֶׁר-צִוְּךָ יְהוָה: פ</p>

The context of this decree is somewhat strange because it is unclear what Saul’s sin was, given that his establishment of an altar in vv. 14:35 passes without comment. Gerbrandt builds on this by pointing out another critical aspect of the Deuteronomistic King. This aspect is that “the king was ultimately responsible for the cult.”<sup>159</sup> He points out

<sup>159</sup> Gerbrandt, 156.

that the Deuteronomist has David<sup>160</sup> and Solomon<sup>161</sup> offer sacrifices while also praising Hezekiah<sup>162</sup> and Josiah<sup>163</sup> for “interfering with the cult whereas other kings are condemned for not doing so.”<sup>164</sup> McKenzie, along with Gerbrandt,<sup>165</sup> suggests the issue was that Saul was implicitly usurping the authority of Samuel to carry out sacrifices, negating the proper role a prophet played in a holy war.<sup>166</sup> This section of the Deuteronomistic History shows the means by which the Kingship over Judah may be lost, and paves the way for the introduction of David into the Deuteronomistic History.

While scholars have often identified Josiah as the origin of the Deuteronomistic History chronologically, it is conceptually centred around King David.<sup>167</sup> The story of David’s rise and fall are of considerable narrative significance, and even more so is the portrayal of kingship in the Deuteronomistic History and the covenant made with David in the seventh chapter of 2 Samuel:

<p>8. “And now thus say to my servant David, ‘Thus says Yahweh of Hosts, I plucked you from the pasture from following the sheep to be leader over my people, over Israel.’”</p>	<p>וְעַתָּה כֹּה־תֹאמַר לְעַבְדִּי לְדָוִד כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֲנִי לְקַחְתִּיךָ מִן־הַגֹּזֵה מֵאַחַר הַצֹּאן לְהִיזֹת נָגִיד עַל־עַמִּי עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל:</p>
--	--

<sup>160</sup> 2 Sam. 24:25

<sup>161</sup> 1 Kings 8:63

<sup>162</sup> 2 Kings 18:4

<sup>163</sup> 2 Kings 23:4-20

<sup>164</sup> Gerbrandt, 156.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.

<sup>166</sup> Steven L. McKenzie, "1 Samuel," in *The New Oxford Annotated Bible : New Revised Standard Version : With the Apocrypha : An Ecumenical Study Bible*, ed. Michael David Coogan, et al. (Oxford [England]; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 419.

<sup>167</sup> Gerbrandt, 160.

9. 'And I was with you wherever you went, and I have cut off all your enemies from before you and have made you a great name among the names of the greatest men on Earth.'

10. 'And I will set a place for my people Israel and will plant it that they may dwell in a place of their own and no longer be disturbed and afflicted by the children of iniquity as in the past.'

11. 'in the time when I appointed judges over my people Israel. And I shall give them rest from all their enemies. And moreover, Yahweh says to you, Yahweh will make you a house. '

12. 'And when your days are fulfilled, and you shall sleep with your forefathers, the issue of your body I shall raise up after you and I shall establish his kingdom.

13. 'He shall build a house for my name. And I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever.'

וְאֶהְיֶה עִמָּךְ בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר הִלַּכְתָּ וְאֶכְרַתָּה אֶת־  
כָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ מִפְּנֵיךָ וְעָשִׂיתִי לְךָ שֵׁם גָּדוֹל כְּשֵׁם  
הַגְּדֹלִים אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ:

וְשִׁמְתִי מְקוֹם לְעַמִּי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִטְעַתִּיו וְשָׁכַן  
תַּחְתָּיו וְלֹא יִרְגַז עוֹד וְלֹא־יִסִּיפוּ בְּנֵי־עוֹלָה  
לְעַנּוֹתָיו כַּאֲשֶׁר בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה:

וּלְמִן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי שְׁפָטִים עַל־עַמִּי  
יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהִנִּיחֹתִי לְךָ מִכָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ וְהִגִּיד לְךָ  
יְהוָה כִּי־בֵית יַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ יְהוָה:

כִּי יִמְלֹאוּ יָמֶיךָ וְשָׁכַבְתָּ אֶת־אֲבֹתֶיךָ וְהִקִּימֹתִי  
אֶת־זֶרְעֶךָ אַחֲרָיִךְ אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֶיךָ וְהִכִּינֹתִי  
אֶת־מַמְלַכְתּוֹ:

הוּא יִבְנֶה־בֵּית לְשִׁמִּי וְכִנְנֹתִי אֶת־כִּפְסָא  
מִמְלַכְתּוֹ עַד־עוֹלָם:

אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה־לּוֹ לְאָב וְהוּא יְהִי־לִי לְבֵן אֲשֶׁר  
בְּהַעוֹתוֹ וְהִכְחֹתִיו בְּשִׁבְט אַנְשִׁים וּבְנִגְעֵי בְּנֵי  
אָדָם:

<p>14. 'I will be to him a father, and he will be to me a son. If he does wrong, I shall beat him with a rod of mortals and the blows of human beings.'</p> <p>15. 'But my steadfast loving kindness will not depart from him, as I took it from Saul who I cast away from before you.'</p> <p>16. 'And your house and your kingdom will be established forever before you; your throne shall be established forever.'</p>	<p>וְחֶסְדִּי לֹא־יִסּוּר מִמֶּנּוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר הִסְרֹתִי מֵעַם  שָׂאוֹל אֲשֶׁר הִסְרֹתִי מִלְּפָנָיִךָ:  וְנֶאֱמַן בְּיָתֶךָ וּמַמְלַכְתְּךָ עַד־עוֹלָם לְפָנָיִךָ כְּסֶאֱדָךָ  יְהִי נֶכּוֹן עַד־עוֹלָם:</p>
--	--

This covenant not only entails the construction of a house for Yahweh, in the literal sense, but Yahweh's establishment of a dynasty of successors to David. Kruse reminds us, however, that this is not the actual foundation of kingship in the Deuteronomistic History. David had already been king for several years at this point, so this was solely the foundation of the Davidic Dynasty, the *House* of David as a promise to the man.<sup>168</sup> Kruse even goes as far as to state that not even his House is the recipient of the covenant, but David exclusively, to assure that, in the narrative, his successors "cannot claim any covenant rights on the basis of this unique and untransferable privilege given to David."<sup>169</sup> This is critical to

<sup>168</sup> Heinz Kruse, "David's Covenant," *Vetus Testamentum* 35, no. 2 (1985): 151.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

the assessment of the Davidic Covenant, for while the Covenant speaks in the language of eternity, it explicitly cautions David's descendants not to abuse the privilege which was granted to their ancestor.<sup>170</sup> Gerbrandt sees this as “qualifying” the theoretically eternal covenant with David, “if not making it conditional.”<sup>171</sup>

This is expanded upon later in the Deuteronomistic History, where a dying David cautions his son Solomon in 1 Kings 2:

<p>2. “I am going the way of all the Earth, be strong and be a man.”</p>	<p>אֲנִכִּי הַלֵּךְ בְּדַרְךְ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ וְחִזְקֶתָ וְהָיִיתָ לְאִישׁ:</p>
<p>3. “And keep the charge of Yahweh your God: To walk in his ways, to keep his statutes and his commandments and his judgements and his testimonies as written in the law of Moses, in order that you may be made to prosper in all which you do and wherever you turn.”</p>	<p>וְשָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת־מִשְׁמַרְתֵּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְלַכֵּת בְּדַרְכּוֹ לְשֹׁמֵר חֻקֹּתָיו מִצְוֹתָיו וּמִשְׁפָּטָיו וְעִדּוּתָיו כַּכְּתוּב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה לְמַעַן תִּשְׁכַּל אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר תִּפְנֶה שָׁם:</p>
<p>4. “In order that the Yahweh’s word may endure, which he spoke to me saying, ‘If your sons keep their way to walk before me in truth in all their heart and all their soul,</p>	<p>לְמַעַן יִקִּים יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרֹוֹ אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר עָלַי לְאמֹר אִם־יִשְׁמְרוּ בְנֵיךָ אֶת־דַּרְכֵּם לְלַכֵּת לִפְנָי</p>

<sup>170</sup> 2 Sam. 7:14b

<sup>171</sup> Gerbrandt, 164.

says he, a man will never be cut off from the throne of Israel.”	בְּאֲמֹת בְּכָל-לְבָבָם וּבְכָל-נַפְשָׁם יֹאמְרוּ לֵאמֹר- יִפְרֹת לְךָ אִישׁ מֵעַל בְּסֵא יִשְׂרָאֵל:
--	--

Here, there is no ambiguity about the conditionality of the covenant. The success of the Davidic dynasty is forever predicated on the faithfulness of subsequent kings to Yahweh and his commands. Gerbrandt sees this covenantal charge as recalling both the Law of the King and the divine charge to Joshua, in that the king is advised to learn the written law of Moses, study it regularly, and never depart from it.<sup>172</sup>

The law is the central axis upon which the entire Deuteronomistic History’s view of Kingship revolves, if not the Deuteronomistic History itself. Kingship arises from, is regulated by, and is lost through disobedience of Yahweh’s law. In Zion Royal Ideology, kingship was *rewarded* for faithfulness to the law. In the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, kingship is *sustained* by faithfulness to the law. The Deuteronomist legitimizes Judah’s kingship through a popular request made within the explicit parameters of the law. While sharing with Zion Royal Ideology the idea that Kingship was rewarded to the House of David for its righteousness, it further innovates this idea by grounding the sustenance of the monarchy in continued obedience to Yahweh’s law. In later years, when the kingdom falls, the Deuteronomists look back and point to disobedience to the law as the cause.

Another contrasting element of the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology is that it is less sacral in nature than that of Zion Royal Ideology. Despite both the Psalms<sup>173</sup> and the

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., 174.

<sup>173</sup> Ps. 2:7

Deuteronomistic History<sup>174</sup> referring to the King as Yahweh's son, the relation of Yahweh to the King takes on a different role in the latter. While the Psalms envision the King as ruling perfectly in tandem with Yahweh as his viceroy, the Deuteronomist sets human kingship as something to be contrasted with divine kingship. Yahweh states, in 1 Samuel 8:

<p>7. And Yahweh said to Samuel, “Listen to the voice of the people in all that they say to you, for they have not rejected you but have rejected me from reigning over them.”</p>	<p>וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־שְׁמוּאֵל שְׁמַע בְּקוֹל הָעָם לְכֹל  אֲשֶׁר־יֹאמְרוּ אֵלַיךָ כִּי לֹא אֶתְּךָ מֵאֲסוּ  כִּי־אֲתִי מֵאֲסוּ מִמֶּלֶךְ עָלֵיהֶם:</p>
--	--

While the people do indeed have the right to request this in Deuteronomy, and Yahweh acceded to their request, it is portrayed as infidelity to Yahweh. “To ask for a king *like the nations* is then a rejection of Yahweh and his ways,” concludes Gerbrandt, and the existence of a king will further escalate the tensions between Israel/Judah and Yahweh.<sup>175</sup>

For much of the history of the study of the Deuteronomistic History, it was presumed that these negative approaches to Kingship in 1 Samuel were the product of a weaving of monarchic and anti-monarchic sources into the narrative, an idea that goes back to Wellhausen and predates even Noth's Deuteronomistic History.<sup>176</sup> Wellhausen particularly zeroed in on this contrast between Yahweh's kingship and human kingship in the text as evidence of post-exilic anti-monarchic origin, believing that the former concept

---

<sup>174</sup> 2 Sam. 7:14

<sup>175</sup> Gerbrandt, 109.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., 18.

“could only have come into existence after Israel had experienced a human kingship.”<sup>177</sup>

Noth followed suit since he believed that the Deuteronomist saw the kings as the primary agents of Israel/Judah’s infidelity to Yahweh.<sup>178</sup>

Römer, likewise, believes that 1 Sam 8 couldn’t possibly have come from the Josianic Deuteronomists<sup>179</sup> on account of their critical view of the monarchy.<sup>180</sup> Albertz disagrees, pointing out that in these chapters Yahweh’s reaction to the request for a king is far gentler than his reaction to religious syncretism, and that the later praise of the House of David in the Deuteronomistic History shows that the Deuteronomists saw the monarchy as playing a genuinely positive role in the furtherance of Yahweh’s plans.<sup>181</sup> Gerbrandt also argued that these passages were not “anti-kingship,” stating that the Deuteronomist’s willingness to criticize specific monarchs such as Saul or Manasseh was not any stronger opposition to kingship itself than American criticism of former president Richard Nixon in Gerbrandt’s own day was an attack on America’s republican institutions.<sup>182</sup>

I agree with the concept of a general pro-monarchic unity through the Deuteronomistic History. That Yahweh accedes to the people’s request for a King and

---

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>179</sup> Römer believes in the existence of three stages of “Deuteronomistic scribal activity”, the first dating to around 620 BCE in the court of Josiah and dealing with ideological legitimation for his centralization programme, the second dating to the exile and formulating the law of centralization and reasserting the importance of the now-destroyed Temple, and the third “probably” dating to the Persian period and recentering the law of centralization around “the prohibition and destruction of what are regarded as illegitimate cults.” See Römer, 64.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., 94.

<sup>181</sup> Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, 2 vols., vol. 2 (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 393.

<sup>182</sup> Gerbrandt, 40.

appoints two dynasties himself, and that this is expressly permitted in the Deuteronomic Kingship Code is evidence that the Deuteronomists were not avowed opponents of the institution of monarchy. Moreover, one is reminded of the common refrain and conclusion in the book of Judges:

<p>21:25. In those days, there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes.</p>	<p>בִּימֵי הָהֵם אֵין מֶלֶךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אִישׁ הֵיטֵר בְּעֵינָיו יַעֲשֶׂה:</p>
---	--

This comes at the end of a series of atrocities from the Concubine of Gibeah to the near-annihilation of Benjamin and is a strong indication of the pro-monarchic views of the Deuteronomist.

Gerbrandt's conclusion about the role of the King in the Deuteronomistic History was that "the Deuteronomist expected the king to lead Israel by being the covenant administrator; then he could trust Yahweh to deliver. At the heart of this covenant was Israel's obligation to be totally loyal to Yahweh."<sup>183</sup> The Deuteronomic law is framed as a covenant between Israel/Judah and Yahweh. Since the King is elected to rule over Israel, he naturally takes on the role of representing Israel in this covenantal arrangement. It is almost axiomatic that the fall of a nation's government brings with it significant material consequences for the fate of the nation's people. As the King is guaranteed his throne only so long as he keeps the covenant, and the threat of chastening violence is explicitly described as a consequence of failure, it is self-evident that the material fate of Israel is

---

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., 102.

intimately tied to that of the King. The Deuteronomistic ideal of kingship thus contains another dynamic in which the King's role is to ensure the survival not merely of his dynasty but of Israel itself through his faithfulness to Yahweh and obedience to the law.

So, from a select analysis of the Deuteronomistic History, working on the framework that its roots are pre-exilic and its overall stance supports the legitimacy of a monarchic perspective, we can point to the central platform of the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology:

1. The people have legally requested to be ruled by a monarch, a request to which Yahweh has given his blessing.
2. This monarch shall rule over Yahweh's people indefinitely but conditionally.
3. This monarch shall continue to reign only if they obey the commands of Yahweh, as written in the Law of Moses.
4. The monarch shall ensure Israel's faithfulness to Yahweh through pursuing the centralization of the cult and elimination of foreign worship.

Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology is predicated on the Law and takes both Yahweh's Law and popular request as the legitimation for its rule. Whether or not this law was first written in the court of Josiah is vigorously debated by scholars, though it is highly likely that Josiah made substantial use of at least a kernel of Deuteronomy to promote his royal agenda. A book-find was well known as an oracular device in the royal courts of the Ancient Near East.<sup>184</sup> It has been compellingly argued by Ben-Dov that Josiah may have requested an oracle; subsequently, a book, an item so frequently "subject to various manipulations in

---

<sup>184</sup> Jonathan Ben-Dov, "Writing as Oracle and as Law: New Contexts for the Book-Find of King Josiah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 2 (2008): 225.

the realm of religion,” was promptly found and used as a legitimation for his religious reform campaign.<sup>185</sup> He also identifies this event as a turning point in Judahite religion that marks a transition from “traditional Jerusalemite religion [...] based on a divinely ordained monarch who enjoyed the support of a band of prophets and diviners” towards “a more restrained, somewhat elitist religion, in which the book[Deuteronomy] played an important part”.<sup>186</sup> This is where Zion Royal Ideology’s official endorsement is briefly lost, and Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology begins.

Yet, Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology does not enjoy official support forever. After Josiah meets his demise at the hands of Pharaoh Necho II, he is succeeded by Jehoahaz.<sup>187</sup> Jehoahaz is described thusly by the Deuteronomistic History: <sup>188</sup>

<p>32. He did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh, just like all that was done by his ancestors.</p>	<p>וַיַּעַשׂ הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר-עָשׂוּ אֲבוֹתָיו:</p>
--	---

Jehoahaz reverts to doing what Yahweh saw was evil, and it is an evil that all his ancestors have done. All but one, since the text earlier says of his father:

---

<sup>185</sup> Ibid., 234.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid., 239.

<sup>187</sup> 2 Kgs. 23:30

<sup>188</sup> 2 Kgs. 23:32

<p>23. And before him, there never was a King who turned to Yahweh with all his heart, with all his soul, with all his might according to the entirety of the law of Moses, and neither did any arise after him.</p>	<p>וְכִמְהוֹ לֹא־הָיָה לְפָנָיו מֶלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־שָׁב אֶל־יְהוָה  בְּכָל־לִבָּבוֹ וּבְכָל־נַפְשׁוֹ וּבְכָל־מְאֹדוֹ כְּכֹל  תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה וְאַחֲרָיו לְאֶקָם כְּמֵהוּ:</p>
--	---

The Deuteronomistic History sees Josiah as unique in his devotion to the law, and Jehoahaz as typical in his infidelity to the law. How could Jehoahaz have felt confident abandoning the law? Logically, he must have felt that his reign was not conditional on his fidelity to the law. Since he assumed that his reign was not conditional in his devotion to the law, it follows that an official reversion to unconditional Zion Royal Ideology occurred under his reign. Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology may have been remembered and carried forth into exile by the Deuteronomists, but it fell out of favour with the monarchy after the death of Josiah. Thus, Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology briefly interrupted the official support of Zion Royal Ideology before being discarded by the monarchy upon the death of Josiah. Zion Royal Ideology ended when the monarchy fell, but Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology lived on among the exiled Deuteronomists. They interpreted the exile as a direct result of the royal abandonment of the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, and this is reflected in the Deuteronomistic History we find in the final redaction of the Biblical text.

It may also be said that just as Zion Royal Ideology reflects a love between Yahweh and the King akin to a father and a son, the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology reflects a love between Yahweh and Israel akin to a husband and wife. The two are joined together by a

legal contract with obligations of fidelity on both their parts. The most crucial distinction from the filial love of Zion Royal Ideology is that the bond between a husband and wife can be severed through divorce. This divorce can occur if one partner is unfaithful to the other; in the Deuteronomic law code, an adulterous woman is put to death.<sup>189</sup> Likewise, if the King is unfaithful to the commandments of Yahweh, the contractual bond between the King, Israel and Yahweh is void; Israel shall perish with the King. When Judah goes into Exile, this is precisely what occurs, albeit with an extant remnant of the people. The implications of that remnant are a discussion beyond the scope of this thesis.

So far, Zion Royal Ideology and Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology have both been described from the perspective of the Biblical text. However, simple Biblical analysis is insufficient when making projections about Ancient Judahite society. It has become increasingly apparent over the years that the integration of archaeological analysis into Biblical studies is essential for Biblical projections to be relevant in light of new archaeological evidence. Therefore, the third chapter will focus on the archaeological issue most pertinent to the discussion of pre-exilic monarchy: The Iron Age Chronology debate. This debate has profound ramifications for whether a United Monarchy under the Davidides ever existed, and consequently has substantial consequences for these proposed royal ideologies. I will discuss and analyze the Iron Age Chronology debate and then explain precisely how this affects, if at all, my analysis of the Zion and Deuteronomistic Royal Ideologies.

---

<sup>189</sup> Deut. 22:22

### Chapter 3: The Royal Ideologies and Archaeology

In the previous chapters, I outlined two forms of Kingship ideologies present in the Biblical text. These were *Zion Royal Ideology*, characterized by the unconditional divine election of an invincible King to reign from Zion, and the *Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology*, characterized by a conditional legitimization of Kingship in the laws of Deuteronomy. Both chapters were based primarily on studies of both the Biblical text and secondary Biblical scholarship. These chapters demonstrated that these ideologies are distinctly espoused in different parts of the Bible.

This chapter will mostly depart from the Biblical text in order to analyze the archaeological record. It is insufficient, in a thesis such as this, to solely examine the Biblical text without reference to contemporary archaeological scholarship about Israel and Judah. Recent controversies in archaeology surrounding issues such as the Iron Age chronology debate and the political affiliation of Khirbet Qeiyafa have critical import on whether there was ever a United Monarchy or whether Judah had developed into a centralized kingship polity prior to the destruction of the Kingdom of Israel. Findings at the Assyrian sites also shed light on the ideology of Assyria and its relationship to Judah; they can potentially offer insight as to the climate of Judahite monarchic thought in this period.

As touched upon in Chapter 1, there is presently a stalemate in the debate surrounding the existence of the Biblical United Monarchy.<sup>190</sup> The crux of the debate is whether the archaeological evidence can demonstrate that Jerusalem was the center of a

---

<sup>190</sup> Laato, 45.

single monarchic polity encompassing the Biblical borders of a unified Israel. The Conventional Chronology suggests that the relevant archaeological period, *Iron IIA*, covers approximately 1000 BCE to 925/900 BCE, roughly coinciding with the reigns of David and Solomon in the Bible, while the Low Chronology proposes that Iron IIA lasted from 930/920 BCE to approximately 800 BCE.<sup>191</sup>

Until very recently, the existence of a Solomonic United Monarchy was not seriously questioned. Since the 1950s, scholars such as William F. Albright and Ernest Wright argued that an archaeological period, dubbed *Iron IIA* by the Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land (EAEHL), lasted from approximately 1000 BCE until the invasion of Pharaoh Shoshenq I in 925 or 918 BCE and coincided with the Biblical United Monarchy.<sup>192</sup> Iron IIA became synonymous with the enlightenment and prosperity which the Bible ascribes to the reigns of David and Solomon. This paradigm became more formalized when Yigael Yadin developed an “archaeology of the United Monarchy” centred around the assumption of the richly developed Stratum VA-IVB of Megiddo as “the Solomonic city *par excellence*” in 1958.<sup>193</sup>

The identification of this and other sites with King Solomon largely rested on a single Biblical passage, I Kings 9:15:

---

<sup>191</sup> Israel Finkelstein and Eli Piasezky, "The Iron Age Chronology Debate: Is the Gap Narrowing?," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 74, no. 1 (2011): 51.

<sup>192</sup> Amihai Mazar, "The Debate over the Chronology of the Iron Age in the Southern Levant," in *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating: Archaeology, Text and Science*, ed. Thomas E.; Higham Levy, Thomas (London: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2005), 16.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<p>15: “And this is the record of the corvée labour which King Solomon raised for building the House of Yahweh, his own house, Millo, the wall of Jerusalem, Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer.”</p>	<p>שְׁלֹמֹה הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־הֶעֱלָה   דְּבַר־הַמָּס וְזֶה  וְאֶת־הַמִּלּוֹא וְאֶת־בֵּיתוֹ יְהוָה אֶת־בַּיִת לְבָנוֹת  וְאֶת־מְגִדּוֹ וְאֶת־חֶצְרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם חוֹמַת וְאֶת  וְאֶת־גֶּזֶר:</p>
---	---

Yadin wrote of this passage, “It seems that there is no example in the history of archaeology where a passage helped so much in identifying and dating structures in several of the most important tells of the Holy Land as has I Kings 9:15.”<sup>194</sup> His “decision to attribute that layer to Solomon was based primarily on the 1 Kings passage”, not only during the excavation of Megiddo but also during his excavation of Hazor.<sup>195</sup> Likewise, with the excavations at Gezer, Solomonic identification was made “with the aid of the brief Biblical passage from Kings.”<sup>196</sup> Yadin’s paradigm was an example of Biblical archaeology in the literal sense of the term.

Beyond 1 Kings 9:15, the United Monarchy archaeological paradigm rested mainly on two pieces of evidence: Similarities between city gates in the three Solomonic cities, and the presence of red-slipped hand-burnished pottery vessels which were customarily dated to the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE.<sup>197</sup> These gates were designed with six chambers, four entryways,

<sup>194</sup> Yigael Yadin, "Megiddo of the Kings of Israel," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 33, no. 3 (1970): 67.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., 68.

<sup>197</sup> Israel Finkelstein, "King Solomon's Golden Age: History or Myth?," in *The Quest for the Historical Israel : Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel : Invited Lectures Delivered at the Sixth Biennial*

precise alignment of their stone masonry, and were also found in Lachish and Ashdod.<sup>198</sup> These have been dated by Dever to the 10<sup>th</sup> century on the basis of “the fact that the foundation and early use levels of the gate and its streets are characterized by a unique style of hand-burnished pottery.”<sup>199</sup> Howie concurred, in the 50s, based on their similarity to the Temple gateway described in Ezekiel and the assumption that Ezekiel’s description was modelled on Solomon’s building plans.<sup>200</sup> The reason for red-slipped hand-burnished wares being dated to this period was given by Holladay: “The prior introduction of red slips, as opposed to red bands, etc., comes only one archaeological phase, perhaps only one generation, earlier” than the well-dated campaign of Sheshonq I in 926 BCE.<sup>201</sup> His argument (that this pottery’s presence and introduction preceded the campaign of Sheshonq I) was that the pottery was between two destruction layers during “a long period of peaceful occupation.”<sup>202</sup> Holladay concluded, “this makes it possible to suggest that unburnished red slips might, provisionally and with great caution, be taken as markers of the hitherto archaeologically obscure Davidic monarchy.”<sup>203</sup> This altogether formed the non-Biblical justifications for the United Monarchy: similarities between elaborate gates, and the

---

*Colloquium of the International Institute for Secular Humanistic Judaism, Detroit, October 2005*, ed. Brian B. Schmidt (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 111.

<sup>198</sup> William G. Dever, *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? : What Archaeology Can Tell Us About the Reality of Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2002), 132.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>200</sup> G. J. Wightman, "The Myth of Solomon," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 277/278 (1990): 8.

<sup>201</sup> John S. Holladay, "Red Slip, Burnish, and the Solomonite Gateway at Gezer," *ibid.*: 63.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*, 63.

provisional dating of a particular form of pottery to the period immediately preceding the reign of Sheshonq I.

It would soon become apparent that these were uncertain archaeological foundations for the United Monarchy. While Kenyon was thoroughly convinced of the Solomonic nature of the gates at Megiddo, Hazor, and Gezer,<sup>204</sup> her excavations of Samaria led her to conclude that certain traditionally “Solomonic” pottery from the Iron Age should be dated to the much later reign of King Omri owing to the “undoubtedly close connection of the pottery” from the “Solomonic” Hazor Stratum X and the first strata of the Omride period in Samaria.<sup>205</sup> This was evident to her as there was “no identifiable Iron Age walls or deposits earlier than those of the citadel” built by Omri. It stood to reason that the “Solomonic” pottery, red-slipped hand-burnished wares found in fills under the Omride floors of the citadel, was likely much younger than had been traditionally imagined.<sup>206</sup> This was strongly rejected at the time by many scholars, including Wright, who claimed that “one can never be certain that the pottery in [a fill] is homogenous” and “most of the pottery in the fill below the floors would be expected to come from an earlier occupation”, so “this pottery is most easily dated in the tenth century or ninth century at the latest.”<sup>207</sup> Her pottery findings would be taken up again, however, by Wightman, to offer what he called a “low chronology” for the Israelite Iron Age, which placed the construction of the massive

---

<sup>204</sup> Kathleen M. Kenyon, *The Bible and Recent Archaeology* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978), 66.

<sup>205</sup> Kathleen Mary Kenyon, "Megiddo, Hazor, Samaria and Chronology," *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 4 (1964): 145.

<sup>206</sup> Wightman, 5.

<sup>207</sup> G. Ernest Wright, "Israelite Samaria and Iron Age Chronology," *ibid.*, no. 155 (1959): 21.

“Solomonic” architecture in the time of the divided monarchy. However, he still maintained a belief in the existence of a United Monarchy under David and Solomon.<sup>208</sup>

Nonetheless, it would be a long time before the idea of the United Monarchy itself would be attacked in archaeology. While attacks from Biblical historians started cropping up in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s from figures such as Garbini, Davies and Thompson, it was in 1996 that Israel Finkelstein launched his groundbreaking critique of the United Monarchy from an archaeological perspective.<sup>209</sup> He pointed out that recent evidence suggested the Megiddo gate postdated the “Solomonic” stratum and that similar gates have been found in the very late Iron Age II context (such as Lachish and Tel Ira). Therefore, the presence of the famous six-chambered gates could hardly serve as an archaeological anchor.<sup>210</sup> He also raised the issue that most of these archaeological dates rest heavily on that lone Biblical passage, 1 Kings 9:15, yet we don’t know whether it was written in the time of Solomon or far more recently.<sup>211</sup> It was in this article that he first presented his own proposal for a Low Chronology that would soon become increasingly popular: “The real settlement transformation [of the North] took place c. 900 BCE rather than c. 1000 BCE” and that “the area to the south of Jerusalem was relatively empty until the 8<sup>th</sup> century

---

<sup>208</sup> G. J. Wightman, "The Myth of Solomon," *ibid.*, no. 277/278 (1990): 19.

<sup>209</sup> Israel Finkelstein, "The Archaeology of the United Monarchy: An Alternative View," *Levant* 28, no. 1 (1996): 177.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, 179.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*

BCE.”<sup>212</sup> Nonetheless, at this time, Finkelstein plainly stated that “all this has nothing to do with the question of the historicity of the United Monarchy.”<sup>213</sup>

However, it was not long before Finkelstein began to suggest that his archaeological critiques had a bearing on the historicity of the United Monarchy after all. By 2005, Finkelstein was stating, bluntly, that “the great biblical story of the United Monarchy is left with no physical evidence.”<sup>214</sup> He concluded that the entire premise on which the “Solomonic” strata of Megiddo, Hazor, and Gezer were dated was circular reasoning centred on 1 Kings 9:15.<sup>215</sup> As mentioned earlier, Holladay had dated the red-slipped hand-burnished wares to the “Solomonic building period,” partly because of their proximity to what he assumes is the destruction layer caused by Sheshonq I and also its presence alongside “archaeological and architectural criteria” which themselves are partly defined by “Biblical and historical data.”<sup>216</sup> Finkelstein identified the logic as such: The great Solomonic constructions at Megiddo, Hazor, and Gezer as described in the Bible are a historical truth | because these constructions are found alongside pottery that is dated to the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE | that were dated to the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE because they were first found among impressive architectural constructs | that were assumed to be Solomonic because the Bible reports that Solomon was a great “builder king.”<sup>217</sup> Moreover, the verses

---

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid., 185.

<sup>214</sup> "King Solomon's Golden Age: History or Myth?," 115.

<sup>215</sup> "A Great United Monarchy? Archaeological and Historical Perspectives," in *One God – One Cult – One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*, ed. Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann (Germany: DeGruyter, 2010), 6.

<sup>216</sup> Holladay, 62-63.

<sup>217</sup> Finkelstein, "A Great United Monarchy? Archaeological and Historical Perspectives," 6.

in Kings pertaining to the history of Solomon are, with “no question,” datable to no later than the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century BCE; there is no archaeological evidence of scribal activity in Judah in the supposed days of Solomon.<sup>218</sup> Finkelstein concluded that the specious evidence that United Monarchy rested upon were: red-slipped hand-burnished wares circularly dated to the 10<sup>th</sup> century, the monumental building strata assigned to the 10<sup>th</sup> century on the basis of the circularly dated pottery, and the biblical verse which was not written in the days of Solomon and was taken at face value. Without those pieces of evidence, there was simply no archaeological evidence to support the existence of a United Monarchy under the reigns of David and Solomon.

Finkelstein’s Low Chronology (LC) has not been without significant criticism. By explicitly placing himself in the “centrist camp,” perhaps to move the Overton window away from the overwhelming United Monarchy consensus he was challenging, Finkelstein came under intense critique from both supporters and opponents of the Conventional Chronology.<sup>219</sup>

From the conventional camp, William Dever defended Finkelstein against what he considered his “co-opting” by even later chronology supporters by pointing out that Finkelstein merely lowers the chronology of a pre-exilic Israelite state and doesn’t reject *any* historicity of it, as many late chronology supporters do.<sup>220</sup> However, he nonetheless lambasted Finkelstein for making a “dramatic about-face” on Iron I chronology by suggesting that he possesses an “inherent iconoclasm” and is motivated by “political

---

<sup>218</sup> "King Solomon's Golden Age: History or Myth?," 112.

<sup>219</sup> "Digging for the Truth: Archaeology and the Bible," 14-15.

<sup>220</sup> Dever, 43.

correctness.”<sup>221</sup> As recently as 2017, Dever has argued that “there is almost no empirical evidence” for Finkelstein’s Low Chronology, considering it an “argument from silence,” owing to it mainly being based upon a refutation of the previous archaeological paradigm for the United Monarchy rather than on positive evidence for his alternative model.<sup>222</sup> Another regular critique from Dever, repeated just two years prior to the writing of this thesis, is that Finkelstein is “idiosyncratic” in his advocacy of the Low Chronology.<sup>223</sup> This particular point has been addressed by Finkelstein as early as 2002, where he noted that the Low Chronology was supported, or at least supported in part, by Singer-Avitz, Munger, Herzog, Knauf, Ussishkin, and many more.<sup>224</sup> Poignantly, Finkelstein has remarked that “I can only hope to be always able to stand similarly alone” when he considers the significant scholars who back his chronology.<sup>225</sup>

Kenneth Kitchen, also in the conventional camp, threw his hat into the ring with a spirited critique, primarily of the late chronology supporters but of the entire project of revising Biblical chronology, in his work *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. He rejected any application of any sort of theory into the study of Biblical archaeology; He denounced as “philosophical cranks” those who have “politically correct, postmodernist, or

---

<sup>221</sup> Ibid., 42.

<sup>222</sup> *Beyond the Texts : An Archaeological Portrait of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2017), 262.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid.

<sup>224</sup> Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, ""The Bible Unearthed": A Rejoinder," review of *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts*, Israel Finkelstein, Neil Asher Silberman, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 327 (2002): 66-67.

<sup>225</sup> Israel Finkelstein, "A Low Chronology Update: Archaeology, History, and Bible," in *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating: Archaeology, Text, and Science*, ed. Thomas E.; Higham Levy, Thomas (London: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2005), 39.

whatever else” perspectives that he considers “fantasy agendas.”<sup>226</sup> He launched scathing attacks on the “Dumb-cluck socio-anthropologists”<sup>227</sup> and “Neo-Nazi thought police”<sup>228</sup> who inserted “too much anthropological claptrap theory”<sup>229</sup> and “ideological claptrap,” respectively, into their analyses of archaeology. He was much more reserved in his criticism of Finkelstein’s chronology, suggesting, for instance, that it is unreasonable for Finkelstein to reduce “four full strata, six main phases, at 23 and 17 (or 16) years each respectively” at Hazor into a 100 year period, since this would mean there was “hardly time for the good citizens of Hazor to catch their breath in one phase before the next was almost upon them.”<sup>230</sup> Regarding Finkelstein’s down-dating of the red-slipped hand-burnished wares, he remarked that “recent work at Tel Rehov (Rehob) would indicate these wares were already in use in the tenth century and simply continued in service during the ninth. Thus, their presence in the ninth century does not affect their earlier popularity, in the tenth, and has no bearing on the link with the united monarchy.”<sup>231</sup>

From a position supporting a very late chronology, Keith Whitelam critiqued Finkelstein for not going far enough, particularly in his lingering support for the “Immigration model of Israelite origins” despite critiques of the archaeology of the United Monarchy, claiming that Finkelstein played an extensive role in what he called “a construction of the past, an invention of Israel, which mirrors perceptions of contemporary

---

<sup>226</sup> K. A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003), xiv.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, 467.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, xiv.

<sup>229</sup> *Ibid.*, 473.

<sup>230</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, 146.

Palestine of the 1920s at a time of increasing Zionist immigration.”<sup>232</sup> Finkelstein, as far as Whitelam was concerned, was a scholar apt to use any “rhetorical device” in order to “deny Palestinian history.”<sup>233</sup> Finkelstein’s description of the emergence of the monarchy was lambasted by Whitelam as “A picture of the European nation state transposed to Palestine.”<sup>234</sup> He describes Finkelstein’s work on the monarchy as follows: “His focus is solely upon an imagined Israelite past which helps to underpin claims to the land, ‘historic Samaria and Judea’, the modern West Bank, which is crucial to modern conceptions of identity and a claim to the land on the basis of ‘historic right’”.<sup>235</sup> As far as Whitelam is concerned, as long as Finkelstein’s assessment of the monarchy still involved a belief in the existence of an “Ancient Israel,” then it remained a flawed and inaccurate distortion of history.

Thomas Thompson, another supporter of a late chronology, once remarked that “the belief that a history of Israel’s origins can be written through a direct synthesis of the Bible and archaeology” is “quite old fashioned.”<sup>236</sup> Thompson went further than Finkelstein in attacking the pottery evidence for the United Monarchy, claiming not only that Dever rolled down the hill three large boulders overlying the “Solomonic gates” that complicated the gates’ identification, never to be recorded, and that “all pottery discrepancies were

---

<sup>232</sup> Keith W. Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel : The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge, 1997), 74.

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

<sup>236</sup> Thomas L. Thompson, "Historiography of Ancient Palestine and Early Jewish Historiography: W.G. Dever and the Not So New Biblical Archaeology," in *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States*, ed. Volkmar Fritz and Philip R. Davies, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 35.

consciously discarded prior to recording,” which impugned the scholarly integrity of Dever himself!<sup>237</sup> Dever denied this and said the fact that Thompson had to resort to such accusations showed the weakness of the late chronology case.<sup>238</sup> While Thompson considered Finkelstein to have added “new dimensions” to the field of archaeology, “neither its importance nor much of the data is particularly new in our field”<sup>239</sup> since he had long since argued that even the concept of ancient Israel is just “a scholarly figment.”<sup>240</sup>

Mazar has proposed, in distinction to the Low and Conventional Chronologies, a Modified Conventional Chronology, which places Iron IIa between ca. 980 and 840/830 BCE.<sup>241</sup> With regard to the United Monarchy, he remarks that the gap between him and Finkelstein is only “60 years” for the commencement of Iron IIa, and considers it “no coincidence” that this conforms to the traditional time-frame for the reigns of David and Solomon.<sup>242</sup> He, moreover, points out the intense overlap between the United Monarchy question and the archaeological discussions in Finkelstein’s literature, suggesting that if the low chronology is an archaeological plan made to fit a particular “historical paradigm” then it isn’t so different from the conventional chronology which Finkelstein asserts tried to fit the archaeological evidence into the Biblical narrative.<sup>243</sup>

---

<sup>237</sup> Ibid., 31.

<sup>238</sup> Dever, *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? : What Archaeology Can Tell Us About the Reality of Ancient Israel*, 134.

<sup>239</sup> Thompson, 34.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid., 37.

<sup>241</sup> Mazar, 16.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>243</sup> Ibid., 25.

A similar objection to the Low Chronology came from Baruch Halpern on a narrative level. He acknowledges that, historically, there have been obvious errors in the archaeological arguments used to support the United Monarchy. For example, "One doesn't just find a building in the ground and then decide that it is the 'stables of Solomon', as P.L.O. Guy did at Megiddo in the 1920s."<sup>244</sup> Nevertheless, he rejects the "temptation of laziness," which he feels characterized the minimal and low-chronological impulses that claimed, "Either David and Solomon are mythical, or they were minor, local rulers."<sup>245</sup> While he admits that all evidence of David's activity is textual, it is unthinkable to him that a king up to 586 BCE could successfully "invent ancestors of relatively recent vintage who participated in the construction of a temple or the creation of a dynasty", and that nowhere else in the Ancient Near East do we find anyone "inviting derision by claiming to build a temple he did not build. And no-one failing to take credit for the tiniest achievement possible."<sup>246</sup> Apart from citing the Tel-Dan stela that potentially attests to a "House of David",<sup>247</sup> he notes that the Biblical text goes to tremendous lengths to try and defend the innocence of David and Solomon from charges of murder, tyranny, collusion with the Philistines, and other accusations; one does not try and conjure up alibis and excuses to defend the actions of wholly fictional characters whose narratives one completely controls.<sup>248</sup> To that end, he concludes that "David and Solomon existed. They even reigned

---

<sup>244</sup> Baruch Halpern, "David Did It, Others Did Not," in *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating: Archaeology, Text, and Science*, ed. Thomas E.; Higham Levy, Thomas (London: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2005), 425.

<sup>245</sup> Ibid.

<sup>246</sup> Ibid., 426.

<sup>247</sup> Ibid., 436.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid., 435.

over a unified Israel,” and the task of archaeology, at this point in time, is to determine not whether or not David and Solomon existed but precisely what they did while in office.<sup>249</sup>

Ever since Finkelstein first spread the United Monarchy dispute from the history and religious studies departments to the archaeology departments, the controversy has reached a stalemate. Recent debates about the United Monarchy and archaeological chronology usually flare-up, before dying down again, with publication of new excavation results. An example is the finds at Khirbet Qeiyafa. Excavators Yosef Garfinkel and Saar Ganor identify it as a Judahite urban centre and claim in a recent book that this site is the very first Davidic fortified city ever to be unearthed.<sup>250</sup> Finkelstein and Fantalkin regard it as instead affiliated with the Northern Kingdom of Israel based on the presence of Cypro-Geometric Bichrome Ware juglets found at the site which have parallels only in the Northern site of Tel-Qiri.<sup>251</sup> Avraham Faust suggested in 2018 that the use of sophisticated ashlar stones in the construction of the governor’s residence at Tel Eton in the 10<sup>th</sup>-century shows, contrary to the claims made by some revisors of chronology, that advanced construction did indeed exist in this period.<sup>252</sup> Excavation work throughout Israel is ongoing, and the controversy is unlikely to be settled definitively for some time.

---

<sup>249</sup> Ibid., 425.

<sup>250</sup> Yosef Garfinkel et al., *In the Footsteps of King David : Revelations from an Ancient Biblical City* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2018), 1.

<sup>251</sup> Alexander Fantalkin and Israel Finkelstein, "The Date of Abandonment and Territorial Affiliation of Khirbet Qeiyafa: An Update," *Tel Aviv* 44, no. 1 (2017): 56.

<sup>252</sup> Avraham Faust and Yair Sapir, "The Governors Residency at Tel Eton, the United Monarchy, and the Impact of the Old-House Effect on Large-Scale Archaeological Reconstructions," *Radiocarbon Radiocarbon* 60, no. 3 (2018).

While this debate is ostensibly about archaeology, this controversy is ultimately an argument of historical narratives. One narrative sees the rise of the Kingdom of Israel as essentially mirroring the Biblical text: A charismatic David founds a polity in Jerusalem that covers much of the Levant and which reaches an enlightenment under Solomon before collapsing into two loosely related kingdoms in the North and South. The other suggests that Israel and Judah emerged as separate entities, with Jerusalem developing into an administrative center no earlier than the late 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE.<sup>253</sup> “If there was a historical United Monarchy,” writes Finkelstein, “it was that of the Omride dynasty and was ruled from Samaria,” and Judahite texts written after the fall of the North retconned Omride glory and power as having originally belonged to the Davidides.<sup>254</sup> One narrative is the story of a great man founding a great nation; the other is a story of a nation thrust into greatness by the tragic circumstances befalling its rivals.

I do not purport to be able to resolve the United Monarchy controversy in this thesis. Since an indefinite amount of time remains before archaeology can conclusively establish one narrative or another, it is the task of this chapter to articulate how these competing archaeological and historical narratives impact my assessment of the two kingship ideologies present in the Biblical text.

The most significant impact that the chronology debate has is upon the contemporary status of Zion Royal Ideology. The notion that Yahweh has anointed his King to rule from Zion forever and judge the nations would be an astounding claim if it were to

---

<sup>253</sup> O. Sergi, "Judah's Expansion in Historical Context," *Tel Aviv Tel Aviv* 40, no. 2 (2013): 230.

<sup>254</sup> Finkelstein, "A Great United Monarchy? Archaeological and Historical Perspectives," 21-23.

come from a chief of a small tribal polity which was dwarfed by its neighbours. Such a claim in such a context is something more befitting Yertle the Turtle than a chief who is conscious of his situation. Nevertheless, as previously established, Judah was well acquainted with notions of empire, having grown up in the shadow of the great empire of Egypt.<sup>255</sup> More importantly, Zion Royal Ideology, as we know it, does not truly belong to the time of David.

None can deny that the hand of the Deuteronomists has been active across the Tanakh, even in the Royal Psalms. For instance, Psalm 18 is quoted almost verbatim in 2 Samuel 22.<sup>256</sup> More importantly, even when Zion Royal Ideology is portrayed in the Psalms, it is often heavily filtered through the lens of the Deuteronomists. While I excluded the royal Psalm 132 from my analysis of Zion Royal Ideology in Chapter 1, the Psalm is indeed deeply centred around the tradition of Zion and its inviolability, with lines such as:

<p>13. For Yahweh has chosen Zion, desiring it for his habitation.</p> <p>14. "This is my resting place forever and ever; I will live here for I have desired it.</p>	<p>כִּי־בָחַר יְהוָה בְּצִיּוֹן אֲוֶה לְמוֹשָׁב לּוֹ: זאת־מְנוּחָתִי עַד־יִעַד פֶּה־אֲשֵׁב כִּי אֹתִיהָ: צִדָּה בָרַךְ אַבְרָם אֲבִיוֹנִיהָ אֲשָׁבִיעַ לְחַם: וּכְהַנִּיהָ אֲלַבֵּשׁ יֵשַׁע וְחַסִּידֶיהָ רַגְלֵי יִרְגְּנוּ:</p>
---	---

<sup>255</sup> Roberts, "The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms," 677.

<sup>256</sup> M. Marttila, "The Deuteronomistic Heritage in the Psalms," *J. Stud. Old Testam. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 37, no. 1 (2012): 69.

<p>15. I will bless her with ample provisions; I will satiate her poor with bread.</p> <p>16. And I will clothe her priests with security, and her pious will let forth a joyous cry.</p> <p>17. There I cause a horn to grow for David. I have set a lamp for my anointed one.”</p>	<p>שָׁם אֶצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן לְדָוִד עָרְכָתִי נֵר לְמְשִׁיחִי:</p>
--	--

But despite the straightforward reference to Zion’s inviolability, the Psalm has an overtly conditional approach to the kingship,

<p>12. “If your children keep my covenant and my solemn charges which I shall teach them and their children also, they shall sit on your throne forever and ever.”</p>	<p>אִם־יִשְׁמְרוּ בְנֵי־ךָ   בְּרִיתִי וְעֻדְתִּי זֹו אֶלְמָדָם גַּם־ בְּנֵיהֶם עַד־עַד יֵשְׁבוּ לְכִסֵּא־לְךָ:</p>
--	---

The Deuteronomist here aptly uses Zion, but not to advance what I have called Zion Royal Ideology. Martilla observes that this Psalm draws heavily from Nathan’s oracle to Solomon

in 2 Sam. 7, but introduces a condition to the covenant of the oracle; in a sense, it is more in line with Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology than the Deuteronomistic Historian himself.<sup>257</sup>

But despite the Deuteronomistic Historian's interest in the reigns of David and Solomon, we must remember that the United Monarchy is being remembered by the Deuteronomistic Historian after its time has ended. The Deuteronomistic Historian also remembers Zion after Zion has been conquered. Can we say, conclusively, that David espoused an ideology of Zion's election centred around him defeating the nations by force at Mt. Zion? Certainly not. Laato, despite believing in a United Monarchy, makes it clear that David did not unite the monarchy by conquest. He remarks, "The historical David seems to have been a clever politician who managed to unite the Israelite tribes under one monarchy by means of marriage contacts and by choosing the Shilonite cult symbol [...] he also managed to create good diplomatic contacts to Tyre (2 Sam 5:11) and to Toi, the king of Hamath."<sup>258</sup> As for Solomon's part, he "continued David's diplomacy and managed to establish *Pax Israelitica* in Canaan by considering Egyptian political interests in particular."<sup>259</sup> As much as David would have indeed asserted that the divine was on his side, he was most likely not sabre-rattling about the destruction of all the nations at Zion.

Additionally, as discussed in the first chapter, Flynn has shown that not even the Israelite/Judahite conception of Yahweh's kingship was static. His demarcations of Baal-type and El-type divine kingship may be useful in resolving the dilemma proposed by a low chronology. Flynn suggests that, at an early stage in Israelite religion, Yahweh's kingship

---

<sup>257</sup> Ibid., 90.

<sup>258</sup> Laato, 63.

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., 64.

was patterned after Ba'al, a warrior-king deity who establishes kingship after achieving victory over the god of the sea.<sup>260</sup> This kingship, in contrast to El-type creator-kingship, is not universal but localized to a particular jurisdiction.<sup>261</sup> He noted that this was made explicit in Deuteronomy 33, describing Yahweh as a king localized *in* Jeshurun, a title for Israel.<sup>262</sup> Victory over the enemies of Yahweh is the fourth tenet of Zion Royal Ideology and goes hand in hand with the task of a warrior-king.

In a related context, Laato discusses the Zion tradition as incorporating the Ugaritic traditions of Baal in what he describes as a Storm-god motif.<sup>263</sup> While Laato, following his game-theoretical assumption of the existence of the United Monarchy, believes Baal-type divine kingship reached its apogee during the reign of King Solomon, he makes clear that the roots of this tradition predate the establishment of the monarchy and Israel itself and would not have been unknown in the early pre-exilic milieu.<sup>264</sup>

In this Baal-type warrior-kingship, Yahweh Sabaoth protects his city, Jerusalem, from atop his holy mountain of Zion, guiding Israel to victory over its enemies.<sup>265</sup> What, then, is the role of the Davidic King in this conception? As it has been established, the Earthly King is a son and viceroy of the Divine King. The King of Israel carries out Yahweh's victory, and in a parallel with Baal granting his weapons to king Zimri-Lim,<sup>266</sup>

---

<sup>260</sup> Flynn, 29.

<sup>261</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid., 60-61.

<sup>263</sup> Laato, 99.

<sup>264</sup> Ibid.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., 114.

<sup>266</sup> Ibid., 180.

Yahweh in Psalm 2 sees Yahweh granting the King the “rod of iron” to smash his enemies to pieces as if they were pottery vessels.<sup>267</sup> Laato draws a parallel here with Psalm 110, where Yahweh grants the “sceptre of your strength” to the King, which shall extend forth from Zion to rule amongst his enemies.<sup>268</sup> While Laato links this ideology to Solomon’s construction of certain symbolic pillars in his Temple,<sup>269</sup> and this certainly gives grounds for Zion Royal Ideology in a scenario where the United Monarchy existed, I do not hold that the assumption of a great Israelite polity centred in Jerusalem is necessary for these interpretations of kingship to be plausible. Whether or not a king or chief ruled a vast empire need not preclude him from having ambitions of one, nor from establishing a cultic sanctuary in his city and connecting it to the heroic warrior-god who protects this domain through his king. It is plausible, therefore, that Zion Royal ideology may have initially legitimized itself through the Davidides drawing on Baal-type divine kingship in the absence of a great United Monarchy.

The Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology emerged long after the supposed fall of the United Monarchy. Additionally, the ideology of the Deuteronomists is much more well-established in the Biblical text, and one may find the editorial hand of the Deuteronomists at work throughout many earlier sources in the Bible. The legal reforms introduced by the Deuteronomists are well situated in a Judahite locale, and the existence of the United Monarchy is obviously not of substantial import to the plausibility of the existence of the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology.

---

<sup>267</sup> Ps. 2:9

<sup>268</sup> Laato, 186.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid., 187.

While the *Sitz im Leben* of Zion Royal Ideology is dependent, practically, on the existence of some form of centralized polity in the city of Jerusalem, The Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology emerges instead in the context of Assyrian hegemony over a struggling Judahite polity, which may or may not have governed the whole of the land. Central to both Dutcher-Walls' and Levinson's theories about the origin of Deuteronomic kingship is that Judah, at that time, dwelled in the shadow of the most powerful expansionist empires to date and crafted its new royal ideology either out of fear of provoking Assyria<sup>270</sup> or in imitation of the dominant politics of Assyria.<sup>271</sup>

Building upon Assyria's role in shaping the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, an analysis of how Assyria disseminated its ideology in the Levant has recently been written by Shawn Zelig Aster.<sup>272</sup> Ostensibly, Assyria had no interest in ideological reeducation, but merely in extracting wealth from its provinces and client states.<sup>273</sup> Nevertheless, Assyria conveyed a religious and political ideology to its subjects. This was done partly for the "niceties of justice," but also to convince its subjects to pay what Assyria demanded.<sup>274</sup> Aster notes that when Judahite emissaries would be guided through Assyrian palaces when they came to pay their tribute, they would look upon grandiose reliefs of tribute-bearers on the walls of the palace and royal officials would explain to them what Aster identifies as the two fundamental tenets of Assyrian royal ideology: "the 'heroic principle of royal omnipotence'

---

<sup>270</sup> Dutcher-Walls, 615-16.

<sup>271</sup> Levinson, 527-28.

<sup>272</sup> Shawn Zelig Aster, "Treaty and Prophecy: A Survey of Biblical Reactions to Neo-Assyrian Political Thought," in *The Southern Levant under Assyrian Domination*, ed. Shawn Zelig Aster and Avraham Faust (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018), 89.

<sup>273</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*

and the universal reach of the Assyrian empire.”<sup>275</sup> In this ideology, Assyria and its king reigned above all the nations of the world. The king embodied the will of the god Assur, “a deified form of the city of Assur,” and acted as his “representative” on earth.<sup>276</sup> While the king was not a god in his own right, he “was portrayed as having superhuman abilities” and was tasked by Assur with stretching the dominion of Assyria as far as he could.<sup>277</sup> The king possessed a certain divine aura, called *melammu*, which was granted by the gods and made him invincible.<sup>278</sup> He also possessed a “just scepter that enlarges the land,” which legitimized his conquests.<sup>279</sup> We further know from archaeological records that the Assyrians would impose ideologically charged “loyalty oaths” on vassal states in order to assure their cooperation and contribution to the growth of the empire.<sup>280</sup>

Aster argues that this Assyrian influence led to the formation of the Deuteronomistic law codes. Specifically pointing to the vassal treaty of Esarhaddon, he notes that the entire book of Deuteronomy follows the same ANE treaty paradigm of “A historical introduction”, followed by “specific provisions that the vassal (Israel) is to observe in recognition of his obligations to the suzerain (God),” before concluding with “a series of curses (Deut. 28) to be visited on the vassal in case of violation.”<sup>281</sup> He then moves on to draw parallels to Assyrian ideology in the Psalms and prophetic texts. For instance, he posits that the phrase “הוֹד וְהִדָּר” in Psalm 21, which I previously rendered as “splendour and majesty” bestowed

---

<sup>275</sup> Ibid., 92.

<sup>276</sup> Ibid., 93.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid.

<sup>278</sup> Ibid., 93-94.

<sup>279</sup> Ibid., 93-94.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid., 94-95.

<sup>281</sup> Ibid., 97.

upon the King, corresponds to the Assyrian *melammu*.<sup>282</sup> Since the gift of the invincible light of *melammu* by the gods was crucial to legitimating the Assyrian monarchy, Aster posits that the bestowal of “הוֹד וְהִדָּר” upon the King of Israel/Judah by Yahweh draws upon this concept from Assyrian ideology.<sup>283</sup>

Aster sees this as placing the Psalm, which I previously identified with Zion Royal Ideology, in a context more befitting Deuteronomistic chronology. However, the idea of kings being bestowed gifts by the divine was a concept in Canaanite religion, as mentioned earlier concerning the divine gift of weaponry to King Zimri-Lim.<sup>284</sup> Moreover, absent from Psalm 21 is any discussion of faithfulness to the commandments of Yahweh, an integral component of Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology. While traits are not necessarily the same as weapons, it is unlikely to me that the text, which so strongly emphasizes the unconditional eternity of the covenant between Yahweh and the King, is suited to a Deuteronomistic context.

A further issue which the archaeology forces us to consider is the extent to which deviant forms of Yahweh-worship existed in pre-exilic Judah. While the royal ideologies I have described present Yahweh as, at the very least, the sole god of interest, archaeologists have uncovered many material finds from Judah that depicted gods other than Yahweh.<sup>285</sup> Kuntillet Arjud is one particularly famous example in the archaeological community, with

---

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., 100.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid.

<sup>284</sup> Laato, 180.

<sup>285</sup> Ze'ev Farber, "Religion in Eighth-Century Judah: An Overview," in *Archaeology and History of Eighth-Century Judah*, ed. Ze'ev Farber and Jacob L. Wright (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2018), 432.

its blessings in the name of “YHWH of Teman and His Asherah.”<sup>286</sup> Scholars have debated the depictions of deities found on these vessels, and some suggest that Egyptian gods such as Bes and/or Beset are shown instead of Yahweh.<sup>287</sup> Moreover, the discoveries of dual standing stones in the temples at Arad , and with them a multitude of “pillar figurines’ depicting a female supporting her large breasts with her hands” that have been found at many Israelite family shrines, suggest a pluralist form of worship was widespread in Israel.<sup>288</sup> One wonders, then, if Israelite/Judahite religion in the days of the monarchy was so varied and pluralistic, how much congruence could a multifaceted Israelite/Judahite popular religion have with a royal ideology centred around Yahweh’s election?

Of course, as Strawn and Le Mon point out, “careful readers of the Bible always knew” that Israelite religion often manifested itself in ways that were condemned by the Biblical text.<sup>289</sup> As much as the Deuteronomic *Shema* declares, “Yahweh is one,”<sup>290</sup> the Deuteronomic History is replete with tales of Israel and Judah’s failure to properly follow the demands of monotheism. Moreover, the royal ideologies were, by their nature, simply justifications for kingship. Nicolas Wyatt reminds us that it is improper to speak of Yahweh as the “national” cult when he is more accurately described as being “the dynastic cult.”<sup>291</sup> Whatever gods a family may enshrine in their home, it was Yahweh who chose the king and

---

<sup>286</sup> Brent A. Strawn and Joel M. LeMon, "Religion in Eighth-Century Judah: The Case of Kuntillet Arjud (and Beyond)," *ibid.*, 386.

<sup>287</sup> *Ibid.*, 389.

<sup>288</sup> Oded Borowski, *Daily Life in Biblical Times* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 25.

<sup>289</sup> Strawn and LeMon, 394.

<sup>290</sup> Deut. 6:4

<sup>291</sup> Nicolas Wyatt, "Royal Religion in Ancient Judah," in *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah*, ed. Francesca Stavrakopoulou and John Barton (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 70.

to whom the King directed his worship. The plurality of Israelite/Judahite religious expression is not a challenge to the existence of a royal ideology centred around Yahweh because royal ideologies were just one form of religious expression among many found in Ancient Israel and Judah.

As it is unlikely that significant excavation of the Temple Mount will be conducted soon, and similarly unlikely that irrefutable proof of the existence or non-existence of a Great United Monarchy under the Davidides will ever be found, much of this chapter remains tentative and theoretical. Nevertheless, it remains abundantly clear that some sort of political entities existed in the land of Israel before the exile and that they were governed monarchically. Moreover, their kingship was legitimated with reference to Yahweh. Be it by law or divine fiat, Yahweh was the key legitimizing factor for the royal ideologies. This is what this thesis primarily describes; not when, but how these ideologies legitimated the monarchy. The purpose of these ideologies is to demonstrate to the people that the divine is on the side of the king. Whether or not the first king they legitimated was David and whether or not that king ever ruled over a united Israel is an ancillary inquiry and not ultimately fatal to the existence of these ideologies in the time of the Divided Monarchy. The issue of the ideological legitimization of Judahite Kingship is not dependent on the outcome of the United Monarchy debate.

Scholars of the Bible cannot afford to ignore the developments that are presently taking place in archaeology. So many of our assumptions about the messages being conveyed by the Biblical writers depend heavily on the context from which those messages emerged. The archaeological debate on the Iron Age chronology forces us to carefully

consider how we reconstruct the society that produced the Hebrew Bible. Are the historical books of the Hebrew Bible the story of a great United Monarchy that arose through the charismatic leadership of the hero David before splintering due to infighting and declining over generations as kings turn away from Yahweh? Or is it the story of a nation thrust into prominence and power by forces beyond its control before being forced into exile and freed in much the same manner? Archaeology must always be considered in a discussion about the kingships of the past, but I believe it has been sufficiently demonstrated that there is no significant challenge to the existence of the Zion and Deuteronomistic Royal Ideologies that can be derived from the archaeological evidence in the Iron Age Chronology dispute.

## Conclusion

Over the course of this thesis, I have demonstrated that the Zion Royal Ideology and Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology might well have existed as a means by which the monarchy of Judah legitimated its existence before the exile. I have described the Zion Royal Ideology, the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, and the relation of the Iron Age Chronology dispute in archaeology to the question of the origins of these royal ideologies. My aim is to show that the Judahite conception of kingship was not static; it took distinct forms that are discernible from the Biblical text. As the Judean polity changed and developed over the course of its history, the monarchy's method of legitimizing itself adapted alongside it.

Zion Royal Ideology, the unconditional ideology, flourished in Judah until interrupted by the reforms of Josiah. Josiah promulgated a new ideology, the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, centred on an oracular book-find of the Deuteronomic law code. This ideology was distinguished from the Zion Royal Ideology primarily by its emphasis that the kingship could be lost through non-adherence to the law. Yet, after Josiah's death at the hands of Pharaoh Necho II in 609 BCE, the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology seems to have lost the support of the monarchy. The succeeding kings of Judah had returned to the Zion Royal Ideology and its unconditional view of kingship. The Bible says of Jehoahaz, Josiah's immediate successor, that:

32. He did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh, just like all that was done by his ancestors.	וַיַּעַשׂ הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר-עָשׂוּ אֲבוֹתָיו:
---	--

This would suggest that the reforms of Josiah were abandoned by Jehoahaz, and just like (most) of his ancestors did not uphold the vision and goals of the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology. He could only have willfully failed to do so if he believed his survival was not conditioned on fidelity to the law. Thus, it's apparent that he and his three successors reverted to the unconditional election tradition of the Zion Royal Ideology following the death of Josiah.

Yet while Josiah's demise may have ended the royal endorsement of the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology, it did not entail the end of the Deuteronomistic movement itself. The Deuteronomists survived both the fall of Josiah and the fall of the Kingdom of Judah. During and after the exile, they interpreted the latter as attributable to Jehoahaz and his successors' return to Zion Royal Ideology. Thus, it can be said that Zion Royal Ideology flourished throughout the history of the Kingdom of Judah, was briefly interrupted by the adoption of Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology under Josiah and returned to prominence during the reigns of the last four kings of Judah before being definitively abolished by the Exile. "

A constant theme that I have emphasized in this thesis is that these ideologies are amorphous blends of many different traditions that are remembered and reimagined over the centuries. For example, the role that the symbol, David, plays in these ideologies is profound. David is reimagined in different ways in the Biblical text to serve as an archetypal model for Hezekiah and Josiah, respectively, to be positively compared.<sup>292</sup> As discussed in this thesis, the symbols of Zion and the Deuteronomic law code underwent a similar

---

<sup>292</sup> Joseph Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered : Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel* (2013), 6-5.

process of being reimagined and reinterpreted by the time the Biblical text reached its final form. Consequently, I strived throughout this thesis to make clear that these royal ideologies are not dependent on the historicity of David. In the third chapter, I particularly emphasized this point in relation to the Iron Age Chronology dispute. Blenkinsopp summarized the matter well when he wrote, “Experience attests that once an iconic personality or event from the past enters the realm of legend and myth, becomes lodged in the collective memory of a society, and is reinforced by repetitive ritual action, lack of historical credibility becomes irrelevant.”<sup>293</sup> Whether or not these ideologies can be said to belong to the United Monarchy historically, or whether or not, historically, there was a United Monarchy, are inconsequential; for the biblical writers, the United Monarchy has long since escaped the confines of history and ascended to the realm of myth. Because of this, I have only described the royal ideologies as they were manifested in the days of the Judahite monarchy, whose relevant texts still survive.

Further avenues that could be explored in other works include the effect of the Exile on these ideologies. What became of these ideologies when the monarchy ended? What role, if any, did they play in the post-exilic hopes for a Messianic Davidic Kingdom? It would also be interesting to explore the significance of the fall of the monarchy and with it, these ideologies, to the concept of Yahweh’s kingship. If Yahweh’s election of David and Zion, or Yahweh’s election of David after the people’s election of kingship through the Deuteronomic law, has now been rendered ineffective by the fall of the monarchy, then

---

<sup>293</sup> Ibid., 9.

what does it mean for Yahweh alone to be King over Israel? The legacies of these royal ideologies are worth further study.

The Kingdom of Judah may have come to an end 2500 years ago; however, it left a lasting mark on history and civilization through its Biblical record. Kings throughout history have looked to the Bible to legitimate their rule. They have invoked the Biblical God as granting them a divine right to rule their nations, "*Dieu et Mon Droit.*" How the Kingdom of Judah legitimated itself is thus a relevant inquiry. Many Kings have turned to Judah for legitimation, but to what did the Kings of Judah turn? This is the question that I have sought to answer throughout this thesis, and the answers are found in the Zion Royal Ideology and the Deuteronomistic Royal Ideology.

## Bibliography

- Albertz, Rainer. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. 2 vols. Vol. 2, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Aster, Shawn Zelig. "Treaty and Prophecy: A Survey of Biblical Reactions to Neo-Assyrian Political Thought." Chap. 4 In *The Southern Levant under Assyrian Domination*, edited by Shawn Zelig Aster and Avraham Faust, 89-118. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "Writing as Oracle and as Law: New Contexts for the Book-Find of King Josiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 2 (2008): 223-39.
- Borowski, Oded. *Daily Life in Biblical Times*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Cooke, Gerald. "The Israelite King as Son of God." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73, no. 2 (1961): 202-25.
- Dahood, Mitchell J. *Psalms*. 1966.
- Dever, William G. *Beyond the Texts : An Archaeological Portrait of Ancient Israel and Judah*. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2017.
- . *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? : What Archaeology Can Tell Us About the Reality of Ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2002.
- Dutcher-Walls, Patricia. "The Circumscription of the King: Deuteronomy 17:16-17 in Its Ancient Social Context." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121, no. 4 (2002): 601.

Eaton, J. H. *Kingship and the Psalms*. Studies in Biblical Theology : 2d Series. London: S.C.M. Press, 1976.

Fantalkin, Alexander, and Israel Finkelstein. "The Date of Abandonment and Territorial Affiliation of Khirbet Qeiyafa: An Update." *Tel Aviv* 44, no. 1 (2017): 53-60.

Farber, Ze'ev. "Religion in Eighth-Century Judah: An Overview." Chap. 21 In *Archaeology and History of Eighth-Century Judah*, edited by Ze'ev Farber and Jacob L. Wright, 431-53. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2018.

Faust, Avraham, and Yair Sapir. "The Governors Residency at Tel Eton, the United Monarchy, and the Impact of the Old-House Effect on Large-Scale Archaeological Reconstructions." *Radiocarbon* 60, no. 3 (2018): 801-20.

Finkelstein, Israel. "The Archaeology of the United Monarchy: An Alternative View." *Levant* 28, no. 1 (1996/01/01 1996): 177-87.

———. "Digging for the Truth: Archaeology and the Bible." In *The Quest for the Historical Israel : Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel : Invited Lectures Delivered at the Sixth Biennial Colloquium of the International Institute for Secular Humanistic Judaism, Detroit, October 2005*, edited by Brian B. Schmidt, 9-20. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

———. "A Great United Monarchy? Archaeological and Historical Perspectives." In *One God – One Cult – One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*, edited by Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann, 1-28. Germany: DeGruyter, 2010.

———. "King Solomon's Golden Age: History or Myth?". In *The Quest for the Historical Israel : Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel : Invited*

*Lectures Delivered at the Sixth Biennial Colloquium of the International*

*Institute for Secular Humanistic Judaism, Detroit, October 2005*, edited by Brian B. Schmidt, 107-16. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

———. "A Low Chronology Update: Archaeology, History, and Bible." Chap. 3 In *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating: Archaeology, Text, and Science*, edited by Thomas E.; Higham Levy, Thomas, 31-42. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2005.

Finkelstein, Israel, and Eli Piasezky. "The Iron Age Chronology Debate: Is the Gap Narrowing?". *Near Eastern Archaeology* 74, no. 1 (2011): 50-54.

Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil Asher Silberman. "The Bible Unearthed": A Rejoinder." Review of *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts*, Israel Finkelstein, Neil Asher Silberman. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 327, (2002): 63-73.

Flynn, Shawn W. *Yhwh Is King the Development of Divine Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014.

Garfinkel, Yosef, Saar Ganor, Michael G. Hasel, Eyal Miron, and Alan Paris. *In the Footsteps of King David : Revelations from an Ancient Biblical City*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2018.

Gerbrandt, Gerald Eddie. "Kingship According to the Deuteronomistic History." Scholars Press, 1986.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S. "World Dominion" in *Yahweh Kingship Psalms: Down to the Roots of Globalizing Concepts and Strategies*." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 23, no. 1 (2001): 192-210.

- Greenspahn, Frederick E. "Deuteronomy and Centralization." *Vetus Testamentum* 64, no. 2 (2014): 227-35.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *The Psalms : A Form-Critical Introduction*. Translated by Thomas M. Horner. Facet Books Biblical Series. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Halpern, Baruch. "David Did It, Others Did Not." Chap. 3 In *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating: Archaeology, Text, and Science*, edited by Thomas E.; Higham Levy, Thomas, 31-42. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2005.
- Hayes, John H. "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82, no. 4 (1963): 419-26.
- Hilber, John. "Psalm Cx in the Light of Assyrian Prophecies." *Vetus Testamentum* 53, no. 3 (2003): 353-66.
- Holladay, John S. "Red Slip, Burnish, and the Solomonic Gateway at Gezer." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 277/278 (1990): 23-70.
- Hoppe, Leslie J. "The Strategy of the Deuteronomistic History: A Proposal." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 79, no. 1 (2017): 1-19.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar, Erich Zenger, Linda M. Maloney, and Klaus Baltzer. *Psalms 3 : A Commentary on Psalms 101-150* [Translated from the German text of Psalmen 101-150 / Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, Erich Zenger, Freiburg, c2008]. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Hermeneia--a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011.
- Kenyon, Kathleen M. *The Bible and Recent Archaeology* Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978.

- Kenyon, Kathleen Mary. "Megiddo, Hazor, Samaria and Chronology." *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 4 (1964): 143-56.
- Kitchen, K. A. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Karl Elliger, Wilhelm Rudolph, Hans Peter Rüger, G. E. Weil, and Adrian Schenker. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Knoppers, G.N. "Is There a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?" In *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, edited by Thomas Römer, 119-34. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press : Uitgeverij Peeters, 2000.
- Knoppers, Gary N. "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (2001): 393-415.
- Kruse, Heinz. "David's Covenant." *Vetus Testamentum* 35, no. 2 (1985): 139-64.
- Laato, Antti. *The Origin of Israelite Zion Theology*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies. London ; New York, NY: T & T Clark, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018.
- Lam, Joseph. "Psalm 2 and the Disinheritance of Earthly Rulers: New Light from the Ugaritic Legal Text Rs 94.2168." *Vetus Testamentum* 64, no. 1 (2014): 34-46.
- Levinson, Bernard. "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah." *Vetus Testamentum* 51, no. 4 (2001): 511-34.

- Marttila, M. "The Deuteronomistic Heritage in the Psalms." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 37, no. 1 (2012): 67-91.
- Mazar, Amihai. "The Debate over the Chronology of the Iron Age in the Southern Levant." Chap. 2 In *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating: Archaeology, Text and Science*, edited by Thomas E.; Higham Levy, Thomas. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2005.
- McKenzie, Steven L. "1 Samuel." In *The New Oxford Annotated Bible : New Revised Standard Version : With the Apocrypha : An Ecumenical Study Bible*, edited by Michael David Coogan, Marc Zvi Brettler, Carol A. Newsom and PHEME PERKINS, 399-444. Oxford [England]; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Michalowski, Piotr. "The Mortal Kings of Ur: A Short Century of Divine Rule in Ancient Mesopotamia." In *Religion and Power : Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*, edited by Nicole Maria Brisch. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2008.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. 2 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Nelson, Richard D. "Solomon's Administrative Districts: A Scholarly Illusion." In *History, Memory, Hebrew Scriptures : A Festschrift for Ehud Ben Zvi*, edited by Ian Douglas Wilson and Diana V. Edelman. Winona Lake, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015.
- Noll, K. L. "Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate? (a Thought Experiment)." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31, no. 3 (2007): 311-45.

- Ollenburger, Ben C. *Zion, the City of the Great King : A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Provan, Iain W. "Past, Present and Future in Lamentations iii 52-66: The Case for a Precative Perfect Re-Examined." *Vetus Testamentum* 41, no. 2 (1991): 164-75.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, no. 3 (1973): 329-44.
- . "The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64, no. 4 (2002): 675-86.
- . "Whose Child Is This? Reflections on the Speaking Voice in Isaiah 9:5." *The Harvard Theological Review*. 90, no. 2 (1997): 115.
- Römer, Thomas. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History : A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*. London; New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Rösel, H.N. "Does a 'Leitmotiv' Exist in Deuteronomistic History?". In *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, edited by Thomas Römer, 195-211. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press : Uitgeverij Peeters, 2000.
- Sergi, O. "Judah's Expansion in Historical Context." *Tel Aviv Tel Aviv* 40, no. 2 (2013): 226-46.
- Strawn, Brent A., and Joel M. LeMon. "Religion in Eighth-Century Judah: The Case of Kuntillet Arjud (and Beyond)." Chap. 21 In *Archaeology and History of Eighth-Century Judah*, edited by Ze'ev Farber and Jacob L. Wright, 431-53. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2018.

- Thompson, Thomas L. "Historiography of Ancient Palestine and Early Jewish Historiography: W.G. Dever and the Not So New Biblical Archaeology." In *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States*, edited by Volkmar Fritz and Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Whitelam, Keith W. *The Invention of Ancient Israel : The Silencing of Palestinian History* London: Routledge, 1997.
- Wightman, G. J. "The Myth of Solomon." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 277/278 (1990): 5-22.
- Wilson, Gerald H. "King, Messiah, and the Reign of God: Revisiting the Royal Psalms and the Shape of the Psalter." In *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*, edited by Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 391. Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Wright, G. Ernest. "Israelite Samaria and Iron Age Chronology." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 155, (1959): 13-29.
- Wyatt, Nicolas. "Royal Religion in Ancient Judah." Chap. 5 In *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah*, edited by Francesca Stavrakopoulou and John Barton. London; New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Yadin, Yigael. "Megiddo of the Kings of Israel." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 33, no. 3 (1970): 66-96.