THE PROPHETIC HISTORY
AND THE REDACTION OF KINGS

by

STEVEN L. McKENZIE

Rhodes College, Memphis, TN 38112

Since the advent of Martin Noth's groundbreaking monograph (1943) describing the Deuteronomistic History the consensus among biblical scholars has been that the Former Prophets in the Hebrew Bible represent a single, extended history of Israel. Increasingly, however, recent scholarship has challenged Noth's position regarding the date and authorship of the Deuteronomistic History on two fronts. Cross (1973, pp. 274–289) has enhanced upon the literary arguments of earlier scholars for more than one redactor of Kings. On the basis of contrasting themes in the Deuteronomistic History, Cross concluded that its primary edition was Josianic and that an Exilic editor updated it with slight revisions. Several recent publications have adopted Cross's basic conclusions and have attempted to refine them.[1] On the basis of literary criteria, Smend (1971) has also posited more than one redaction of the Deuteronomistic History. His initial proposal has been expanded by Dietrich (1972), who has argued for distinct prophetic and nomistic redactions of the Deuteronomistic History in addition to the fundamental, Exilic history. Veijola (1975 and 1977) has analyzed specific portions of the Deuteronomistic History, primarily in Samuel, using Dietrich's results. The conclusions of this Göttingen school have been accepted by Klein (1983) in his recent commentary on 1 Samuel (especially pp. xxix–xxx).

In his masterful treatment of Samuel, McCarter (1980, especially pp. 18–20 and 1984, especially pp. 6–8) has integrated the observations of the Göttingen literary critics into the theory of a double redaction of the Deuteronomistic History as formulated by Cross. McCarter has identified the developmental stage of Samuel which immediately underlies its Deuteronomistic editing as prophetic in orientation and agreeing generally in its dimensions in 2 Samuel with the material attributed by Veijola

---

1. Friedman, (1980 and 1981), Levenson (1975, 1980, and 1984), McKenzie (1985), Nelson (1981), and Peckham (1983).

to a prophetic redactor (DtrP). McCarter further characterizes this underlying Prophetic History as Northern in origin. It presents a view of the monarchy that is resigned to the existence of the institution under the wary eye of Yahweh's servants, the prophets. A cautious acceptance of David as Yahweh's elect in the Prophetic History betrays a certain Southern influence, which causes McCarter to date it around the collapse of the Northern kingdom at the end of the eighth century.

The editorial techniques of this Prophetic Historian involved borrowing older sources and reporting them intact with prefaces, appendices, and occasional insertions from the editor's hand. In 1 Samuel the prophetic writer used the Ark Narrative, a cycle of old stories about Saul, and an apologetic narrative about David, sometimes called the "History of David's Rise," as the basis for the three parts of his history. He rearranged elements of these sources, supplemented and combined them, in order to make clear the significance of the prophetic office. The overall points of the Prophetic History in 1 Samuel are: the adequacy of prophetic leadership (chaps. 1–7); Israel's rebellious demand for a king who will only cause them trouble (chaps. 8–15); and the feasibility of a monarchical government with a king of Yahweh's choosing through prophetic designation (chaps. 16ff). Thus, it is Samuel as Yahweh's representative who anoints Saul (10:1; cf. 16:13), informs him of the rules he must follow as Yahweh's chosen (10:24), and announces Yahweh's rejection of Saul and his dynasty when he fails to measure up (13:13; 15:26–29; cf. 28:16–19).

In 2 Samuel the work of the prophetic editor is clearest in the so called "Succession Narrative" of 2 Sam 9–20 and 1 Kgs 1–2. Here the prophetic writer has prefaced an old apology for Solomon (2 Sam 13–20; 2 Kgs 1–2) with his heavily reworked account of the Ammonite war, David's affair with Bathsheba, and Nathan's condemnation (2 Sam 10–12).[2] 2 Sam 11–12 contrasts sharply with the older sources in its perspective on David and its characterization of Nathan.[3] The Prophetic History should continue as the underlying layer of 1–2 Kings as it was for 1–2 Samuel if McCarter's conclusions about it are correct. The purpose of this paper is to offer an initial attempt to characterize the nature and extent of the Prophetic History underlying the book of Kings.

2. See McCarter (1981 and 1984).

3. Cf. McCarter (1981, pp. 361, 364, and the bibliography cited on p. 364, n. 13). In 2 Sam 12 Nathan rebukes David; prophecy directs monarchy. In 1 Kgs 1–2 Nathan takes orders from David as to whom he is to anoint! Nathan is accompanied in 1 Kgs 1–2 by Bathsheba, the very partner of David in the adulterous union of 2 Sam 11.

1 Kgs 11

This transitional chapter brings Solomon's reign to a close and prepares for the account of the division of the kingdom by describing Solomon's sins and the adversaries whom Yahweh raised up to punish him. Dietrich identified three levels within this passage, showing that an older story of Jeroboam's rebellion was displaced by Ahijah's oracle (vv. 29–39), leaving only the older framework (vv. 26–28, 40) in place.[4] Then, Dietrich noticed evidence of literary reworking within Ahijah's oracle.[5] Dietrich has recovered a running narrative (vv. 29–31, 33a, 34a, 35abα, 37aβγb) which has been frequently interrupted by brief, interpretive insertions (vv. 32, 33b, 34b, 35bβ, 36, 37aα, 38abα). While one may quarrel with certain details of Dietrich's literary division[6] it is generally convincing. What is striking is the language and ideology shared by the insertions identified by Dietrich as secondary. The hand of the Josianic Deuteronomist (Dtr 1) in this material is unmistakable, not only in the strongly Deuteronomistic language but also in the promotion of the Judean, royal ideology of an enduring fiefdom (*nîr*) for David in Jerusalem. Dietrich's earlier running narrative may be seen as the work of the Prophetic Historian. The Prophetic Historian has reworked an account of Jeroboam's opposition to Solomon in order to stress Ahijah's oracle to Jeroboam. This oracle attests the Northern ideology of kingship, namely that Yahweh chooses the king of Israel. He has taken the kingdom away from the Davidides and has given it to Jeroboam. In accord with Dietrich's literary critical research, I suggest that the Prophetic Historian has inserted his composition into the stories of Solomon's adversaries. Then, the narrative of the Prophetic History has itself been subsequently revised by Dtr 1.

The account of Ahijah's oracle assumes the previous report of Solomon's sins in 11:1–13. This passage has also received significant reworking by Dtr 1. Verses 4, 6, and 11–13, at least, display his hand. However, the underlying Prophetic History undoubtedly told of some sin of Solomon, perhaps relating to his marriages of foreign women. The editorial technique here is typical of the Prophetic Historian and bears

4. Dietrich (1972, pp. 15–20, 54–55). Dietrich has also pointed out that the language in v. 26 about Jeroboam's rebellion (*wayyārem yād bammelek*) is different from the language introducing the other two adversaries of Solomon (vv. 14, 23—*wayyāqem śātān*).

5. Compare the somewhat similar literary results of Weippert (1983).

6. In particular, the references to "ten tribes" in v. 35bβ indicates that it should not be assigned to the secondary level of redaction with the latter's stress on the one tribe of Judah left to the Davidides. The assignment of v. 33a is also questionable.

similarities to 2 Sam 11–12. In both cases one suddenly encounters an extremely negative view of the king after what has otherwise been a favorable or, at worst, neutral report based on older traditions.[7] In each case, the prophet's announcement of punishment is quickly fulfilled as reported in the traditions following in 2 Sam 13–20; 1 Kgs 12. In 2 Sam 11–12 the prophetic account stands virtually intact without Deuteronomistic insertion. In 1 Kgs 11 Dtr 1's hand has been heavy, but the remnants of an underlying narrative are still discernible.

The Prophetic History, then, continues to underlie the Deuteronomistic History through the reign of Solomon. The Prophetic Historian has gathered many of the traditions now in 1 Kgs 3–10 as a characterization of the reign of Solomon.[8] His conclusion to the story of Solomon comes in chapter 11, where he describes how Solomon's wives led him astray. He then inserts three older accounts of Solomon's adversaries (11:14–40), so that they appear to have arisen as a punishment for Solomon's sins. The third of these (vv. 26–40) includes an oracle by the Prophetic Historian, ascribed to Ahijah, predicting the tearing of the kingdom from the Davidides. This oracle remains in vv. 29–31, 33a?, 34a, 35, 37. The symbol of the torn garment and the language about "tearing away the kingdom" are very similar to the Prophetic Historian's account of Samuel's word to Saul in 1 Sam 15:27–28.

1 Kgs 12:1–13:34

The tensions in the present narrative of Israel's revolt (12:1–20) are best seen as the results of textual corruption, not of different narrative sources or editorial levels.[9] The reading of the Old Greek is best.

7. 1 Kgs 3–10 contain a number of what appear to be older documents: traditions about Solomon's wisdom (3:16–28; 5:9–14); lists of Solomon's officials (4:1–19); traditions about Solomon's wealth and power (4:20–5:1; 5:2–8; 9:26–28; 10:1–13, 14–29); Solomon's dealings with Hiram (5:22–26; 9:10–14); Solomon's work force (5:27–32; 9:15–23); and Solomon's building projects, including the Temple and its dedication (6:2–10; 6:14–7:50; 8:1–11, 62–64).

8. See n. 7. Dtr 1 has supplemented this collection at several points. He may be responsible for including the older description of the Temple and its dedication, since this would seem more in line with his concerns than with those of a Northern, prophetic writer. Solomon's speech in 8:12–61 is almost entirely the work of Dtr 1, though vv. 50b–53 are the work of the Exilic editor, Dtr 2, in my opinion (McKenzie, 1985, p. 204). Other traces of the hand of Dtr 1 occur in 8:65–66 and 9:1–9 (mixed with Dtr 2 additions). 9:15–23, which contradict 5:27–32 and the prophetic warning in 1 Sam 8:17 as to the origin of the king's labor force, may have been added by Dtr 1.

9. See Nielsen (1959, pp. 171–208) and those whom he cites for a treatment of the passage on the literary level. Trebolle (1982) attempts to combine text and redaction criticism in his discussion of the passage.

Jeroboam's quiet return to his hometown of Sarerah upon the death of Solomon was originally recounted in 11:43 as in LXX^B. Also, as in the LXX, Jeroboam was not mentioned in 12:3 or 12:12. He was originally named again only in 12:20. The original reading in 11:43 was lost from the textual tradition represented by the Masoretic Text by haplography occasioned by the similarity of *'ābîw* (*tou patros autou*) and *'ăbôtāw* (*tōn paterōn autou*). The lost material was then inserted in the Masoretic Text at 12:2 (not reflected in the Old Greek). That verse itself has also suffered a haplography, indicated by the LXX reading at 11:43. The mention of Jeroboam's return to Sarerah in Ephraim has been lost from the Masoretic Text as the result of homoioteleuton (*miṣrayīm . . . 'eprayīm*). The corruption in 12:2 (MT) caused the contradiction with 12:20 and led to the addition of Jeroboam's name in 12:3 (MT).

The original reading of this narrative represents an older tradition left essentially intact. The fulfillment notice in v. 15 is an insertion, as indicated by the repetition of *lō šama͑ hammelek 'el* in vv. 15, 16.[10] The insertion may be assigned to the Prophetic Historian since the language and interests of the Deuteronomistic revision of 11:29–40 are absent from 12:15. There is no other literary evidence in the passage for reworking by the Prophetic Historian. Still, the perspective on monarchy that emerges here agrees with that expressed by the Prophetic Historian elsewhere, and the story may have been colored by him. Thus the Prophetic History included the story of the division in 12:1–20a.[11]

The passage in 12:26–13:34 contains two originally distinct narratives. Underlying the account of Jeroboam's cultic sins in 12:26–33 is a polemic against the Aaronides on the part of an old Mushite priesthood centered first at Shiloh, later at Nob.[12] This polemic condemned Jeroboam for the bull iconography adopted by him at his Bethel shrine and for what was perceived at least as the non-Levitical priesthood at Bethel. Dtr 1 has adapted the condemnation of Jeroboam for these matters as a part of his own polemic and has added his concern for centralization of the cult in Jerusalem.

10. *Contra* Dietrich (1972, p. 25), who sees only v. 15aβb as secondary.

11. The oracle of Shemaiah in 12:21–24 is usually regarded as a late insertion. The arguments are given by Dietrich (1972, p. 114, n. 116). But compare Grønbaek (1965, pp. 421–430) who regards v. 21 as older and historical. The Southern setting of the story and the obedient response of King Rehoboam indicate that the story does not stem from the Prophetic History.

12. See Cross (1973, p. 199). Ahijah is also from Shiloh (14:2), and the Prophetic Historian may have borrowed the old stories about Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 12–14 from the Shilonite priesthood. Compare the treatment of Halpern (1976).

Chapter 13 contains an old prophetic tradition which has been reworked in vv. 1–5. The striking *vaticinium ex eventu* in 13:2 points decisively to the hand of Dtr 1.[13] However, except for vv. 32aβ–34, which also attest Deuteronomistic language and concerns, the rest of chapter 13 seems to derive from the old prophetic tradition (cf. Dozeman, 1982, pp. 381–382). This tradition has been artificially attached to the old polemic underlying 12:26–33 by the identification of the originally nameless king in 13:1–10 with Jeroboam[14] and by the identification of the occasion of the prophet's oracle with Jeroboam's festival in Bethel. Dietrich (1972, pp. 115–116) has pointed out the literary seam that exists in 12:32–33 by illustrating how v. 33 repeats most of the elements in v. 32.

There are good reasons to ascribe the original linking of these two accounts to the Prophetic Historian. The very length of the prophetic tradition in chapter 13 raises the possibility of an earlier stage of redaction. Dtr 1's main interest is in the prophet's condemnation of Jeroboam in 13:1–10, not in the saga which follows about the young prophet's fatal mistake. Dtr 1 could easily have omitted the rest of the tradition after v. 10. His inclusion of the entire tradition is more understandable if it came to him as part of a larger, continuous narrative rather than a single tradition. Retelling ancient traditions, with minor but significant revisions, and linking them together accords with the editorial technique of the Prophetic Historian observed by McCarter throughout his commentaries on Samuel. The linking of the prophetic story involving a nameless king of Israel with Jeroboam is also similar to what the Prophetic Historian has done in 1 Kgs 21–22. The interest which this passage displays in the prophetic office, combined with an attitude of suspicion or even pessimism where the monarchy is concerned, is again typical of the Prophetic Historian as characterized by McCarter.

There are, then, three levels of material in 12:26–13:34. Two ancient traditions lie at base, an old polemic against the iconography and priesthood at Bethel and an old prophetic legend. Only the latter remains substantially intact. The Prophetic Historian combined the two accounts with 12:32a, 13:1a, identifying Jeroboam as the object of the prophetic denouncement. Dtr 1 displaced the ancient description of Jeroboam's calves with his polemic so that Jeroboam's sin became the movement away from cultic centralization motivated by paranoia about losing his

13. See Cross (1973, pp. 279–280). Cf. Dozeman (1982).

14. The reference to Jeroboam by name in 13:1b is part of an addition. The name in 13:4 is also secondary, as indicated by its absence in the Old Greek there. Cf. Dietrich (1972, p. 115).

kingdom. Dtr 1 also displaced the young prophet's oracle with the polemical threat against the Bethel altar in 13:2. He changed the original oracle into a "sign that Yahweh has spoken" (vv. 3, 5), in contrast to v. 32aα where the oracle against the altar has yet to be fulfilled (cf. Dozeman, 1982, pp. 383–384). Dtr 1 has shifted the focus of this passage as a whole away from a prophetic message to a polemic against Jeroboam and the North. To that end he has made the identification of the king in chapter 13 with Jeroboam more explicit by adding 13:1b. The material in 13:32aβ–34 has also been composed by Dtr 1. The condemnation of the temples on the *bāmôt* in the cities of Samaria in 13:32b (these are not explicitly condemned in 12:25–33) reflects Dtr 1's concern for centralization. The language in 13:33–34 belongs to Dtr 1. He repeats here the condemnation of Jeroboam's priests found earlier.

1 Kgs 14:1–20

As Dietrich observes (1972, p. 52) in the original form of this tradition Ahijah's oracle must have been simply an announcement of the death of Jeroboam's son. Dtr 1 has again used the occasion as an opportunity to insert his polemic against Jeroboam. The contrast between David and Jeroboam in vv. 7–11 is a part of this polemic. Verses 15–16 are also from Dtr 1's hand. They reflect a time after 722 B.C. and continue the polemic against Jeroboam. However, the use of this occasion to announce the fall of Jeroboam's "house" may not have been original with Dtr 1. The prophecy about Ahijah's burial in v. 13 also contains a threat against Jeroboam's family. Of those who belong to Jeroboam only Abijah will be buried. The threat is made explicit in v. 14. This threat is best attributed to a hand other than Dtr 1, since Dtr 1's oracle has already threatened Jeroboam's house (vv. 10–11).[15] The reference in v. 14 to Yahweh raising up a king for himself accords with the Northern ideology of kingship reflected elsewhere in the Prophetic History. This would mean that the fulfillment notice in vv. 17–18 is also the work of the Prophetic Historian.

1 Kgs 15–16

The oracle of Jehu in 16:1–4, as it now stands, is thoroughly Deuteronomistic. The language of v. 2 is reminiscent of 2 Sam 7:8–9a with, of course, quite different conclusions. This accords well with Dtr 1's contrast between the Davidic dynasty in Judah and the series of dynasties, all falling into the errors of Jeroboam, in Israel.[16] The same

---

15. Dietrich (1972, p. 35, n. 52) notices the doublet but regards v. 14 as a later gloss.
16. Cf. Cross (1973, pp. 278–285).

threat is made against Baasha's "house" (16:4) as was made against
Jeroboam's (14:11). The language of the doublet in v. 7^{17} and of the
fulfillment notices in 15:27–30 and 16:11–13 is also thoroughly
Deuteronomistic, though literary tensions exist in the last two passages.[18]
It is possible that traces of the Prophetic History remain in the two
fulfillment notices. It is also possible that the Prophetic History had an
earlier form of Jehu's oracle and was Dtr 1's source for some of the
account of the history of the North in 16:9–10, 15b–18, 21–22, 24. If the
Prophetic History did have narrative material about the reigns of the
Northern kings from Jeroboam to Ahab, it has been displaced by Dtr 1.
The important point is that, in striking contrast to 1 Kgs 1–14, evidence
is lacking for a pre-Deuteronomistic narrative underlying 1 Kgs 15–16.
One possible explanation for this is that the Prophetic History originally
ended with the reign of Jeroboam. However, this conclusion would leave
unexplained the Southern orientation which McCarter perceived in the
Prophetic History's acceptance of David. We shall have to probe the
remainder of Kings to see whether there is additional evidence for the
underlying Prophetic History and to seek a solution to the problem of
its absence behind 1 Kgs 15–16.

The Elijah Stories

Traditions about Northern prophets, primarily Elijah and Elisha,
dominate the section in 1 Kgs 17–2 Kgs 13. This fact alone requires
explanation in a work written, according to Cross, as a program for the
reform under the Judean king, Josiah. As with the prophetic story in
1 Kgs 13, the inclusion of these Northern prophetic legends in the
Deuteronomistic History is much easier to understand if Dtr 1 is simply
passing on, with some revisions, an extensive prophetic history of Israel.
This proposal is supported by the paucity of Deuteronomistic supple-
ments within these chapters. In the accounts leading up to Elijah's
ascension (1 Kgs 17:1–2 Kgs 2:14) only 1 Kgs 21:20–29, 22:39–53, and
2 Kgs 1:17–18 exhibit obviously Deuteronomistic language.

---

17. This verse uninspiringly reiterates most of vv. 1–2b and appears to be a secondary
insertion, perhaps of a marginal gloss. Cf. Dietrich (1972, p. 10, n. 2). Seebass (1975), in
contrast, argues that v. 7 is original and that vv. 1–4 are a secondary interpretation of v. 7.

18. 15:30 appears to be an addition to the previous two verses, giving a theological
reason for Baasha's destruction of Jeroboam's house. 16:12 seems superfluous after 16:11.
Both describe Zimri's destruction of Baasha's house. Again, the theological reason is given
in 16:13. 15:30 and 16:13 are very similar and reflect the same hand, namely Dtr 1's. Cf.
Dietrich (1972, pp. 23–24).

The allusions to Moses in the Elijah traditions are well known,[19] and they provide a thematic unity to the Elijah episodes. The one major exception to this theme is the account concerning Naboth's vineyard (1 Kgs 21), where Elijah appears not as a great wonder worker, as in the other Elijah episodes, but in a more traditional prophetic role, confronting the king who has sinned and announcing his coming punishment from Yahweh. The view of Elijah in 1 Kgs 21 is more in line with the Prophetic Historian's presentation of the prophetic office than is the view of Elijah elsewhere in these chapters. The Naboth account in the Masoretic Text is sandwiched between the prophetically associated battle accounts of chapters 20 and 22. As many scholars have recognized, these two chapters originally had nothing to do with Ahab.[20] The account in chapter 22 has been linked with chapter 21 as the fulfillment of Elijah's oracle against Ahab. A reason for the occurrence of chapter 20 at this point is suggested by Miller's conclusion that the three battles in these chapters were originally the three victories of Israel over Aram appended to the Elisha cycle in fulfillment of Elisha's oracle in 2 Kgs 13:14–19.[21] Thus, the two accounts in chapter 20 are intimately connected with chapter 22. The arrangement of these accounts is best ascribed to the Prophetic Historian. He has inserted the three accounts of Israel's victories over Aram into the Elijah material.[22] He has thus

19. See most recently Carlson (1969), Carroll (1969), Cross (1973, pp. 191–194), and Cohn (1982). The allusions are most obvious in the theophany of 19:9–18, but Elijah reminds one of Moses in other ways. The provision for the widow (1 Kgs 17:8–16) recalls the provision of manna in the wilderness (Exod 16:13–36). The narrative in 17:17–24 has been alleged to present Elijah as a "man of God" in the tradition of Moses (cf. Schmitt, 1977). Obadiah's fear of Elijah's disappearance (1 Kgs 18:12) and Elijah's ascension (2 Kgs 2:11–12a, 15–18) are reminiscent of Moses' death and secret burial (Deut 34:5–8). Elijah's altar on Mt. Carmel (1 Kgs 18:30–32) resembles Moses' altar in Exod 24:4. Elijah's fire from heaven (2 Kgs 1:5–12) recalls the fire from Yahweh at the defense of Moses' authority (Num 16:35). Elisha ministers to Elijah (1 Kgs 19:21) as Joshua is Moses' $m\check{e}\check{s}\bar{a}r\bar{e}t$. Joshua divides the Jordan (Josh 3:14–16) as Moses divided the sea (Exod 14:21–22). So Elisha divides the Jordan as Elijah had done (2 Kgs 2:8, 14). The spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha (2 Kgs 2:15) as Joshua possesses the "spirit" and is invested with Moses' authority (Num 27:18–20).

20. See Miller (1966, p. 441) and the bibliography cited there.

21. See Miller (1966, pp. 441–454). The LXX order of these chapters (20, 22, 21) supports the original connection of the material in chapters 20 and 22.

22. I take no position here on the debated issue of the original shape of the Elijah materials. See Steck (1968) and Dozeman (1979, p. 90, n. 1) for the major bibliography on this question. The Elijah materials could have come to the Prophetic Historian as a unit, an "Elijah Cycle" or even as an "Elijah–Elisha Cycle," or the Prophetic Historian could have collected them. The older stories about Elijah share allusions to Moses and, especially

made the death of the king of Israel in the third battle a fulfillment of
his revised oracle of Elijah in 21:17–19.

These prophetic passages are part of the layer underlying the Deuter-
onomistic editing, rather than being inserted subsequent to it (*contra*
Miller, 1966). The Deuteronomistic passages in this context assume the
extended narrative and prophetic perspective of the Prophetic History.
The extremely negative evaluation of Ahab by Dtr 1 in 16:29–34 is
incomprehensible without the portrayal of Ahab and Jezebel as adver-
saries of Elijah in chapters 17–19, especially in the light of Ahab's
penitence in the Deuteronomistic addition in 21:20–29. This latter pas-
sage assumes not only the account of Naboth's murder with its prophetic
perspective but also the earlier prophetic commission of Elijah in 21:17–
19. In fact, Dtr 1 has apparently replaced the Prophetic History's
account of Elijah's execution of this commission with his own oracle
against the royal family. Verses 20–29 make no mention of Naboth or
any specific sin of Ahab.[23] The language in v. 22 is reminiscent of earlier
condemnations of Jeroboam (13:34; 14:16), Nadab (15:26), Baasha
(15:34), Elah (16:13), and Omri (16:26) for cultic violations. This Deuter-
onomistic passage alters the focus of the Elijah narratives to correspond
to Dtr 1's interests. The focus shifts from Elijah to Ahab, and Dtr 1 is
concerned with predicting the end of Ahab's "house" in the same terms
as he predicted the end of Jeroboam's and Baasha's "houses" (1 Kgs
14:10–11; 15:29–30; 16:2–4, 11–14). It is striking that the "house" to be
destroyed is referred to as Ahab's not Omri's. This is because Dtr 1
views Ahab as the worst king of Israel and, therefore, the major figure in
the dynasty. It is because of Ahab's wickedness that the dynasty is
destroyed. Even later in the fulfillment of the prophecy it is Ahab's
house, not Ahaziah's or Jehoram's, which Jehu annihilates (2 Kgs 10:11).
It is not unusual that the prophecy against Ahab's house occurs after his
death. The houses of Jeroboam and Baasha are destroyed in the days
of their sons. However, Omri's dynasty continues till the days of Ahab's
grandson, Jehoram. This fact has compelled Dtr 1 to compose the
explanation in 1 Kgs 21:27–29. Ahab's repentance postpones the end
of his dynasty, but it does not change the prophetic threat about his
death (21:19).

---

in chapters 17–19, a concern for Yahweh's storm theophany (cf. Shenkel, 1968, pp. 87–88).
My main interest here is in the pre-Deuteronomistic layer of Kings. The important point is
that the Prophetic Historian makes use of older traditions and that the Elijah stories were
united when they reached Dtr 1.

23. Similarly, again Dietrich (1972, pp. 11–12) assigns vv. 20bβ–24 to his DtrP.

In the death of the king of Israel in chapter 22 the Prophetic Historian provides a fulfillment of the prophecy against Ahab in 21:19. As Miller (1966) has argued, in 22:1–38, as it stands, the story of Jehoram's wounding and eventual death (cf. 2 Kgs 8:28–9:28) has largely displaced the story of Jehoahaz's restoration of Ramoth Gilead as the third victory of Israel over Aram, prophesied by Elisha (2 Kgs 13:14–19, 25).[24] The interest of the Prophetic Historian in compiling these accounts is the efficacy of the prophetic word. In relating the death of Ahab he illustrates the fulfillment of three prophetic oracles, those of Micaiah,[25] Elijah, and the nameless prophet of 20:35–43.[26] The original story about the restoration of Ramoth-Gilead to Israel, transmitted by the Prophetic Historian, had no mention of a king of Judah.[27] The Prophetic Historian would have no reason to introduce a Judean king into the narrative. His presence in the current story is due to the work of Dtr 1. According to his polemic contrasting the Davidic dynasty with the series of evil Northern dynasties, he has overshadowed the story of the restoration of Ramoth with material based on 2 Kgs 8:28–9:28, identifying the kings of Israel and Judah as Ahab and Jehoshaphat. He has done this on the basis of the righteous reputation of Jehoshaphat and of the remembrance, passed on by him (1 Kgs 22:44), of Jehoshaphat's relations with the Omrides.

After the report of Ahab's grisly death according to prophetic announcement (1 Kgs 22:37–38), the Prophetic History related an encounter of Elijah with Ahaziah.[28] The picture of Elijah and his word to Ahaziah in

24. Miller (1966, especially pp. 444–446). Compare the treatment of the passage by De Vries (1978, especially pp. 93–99). De Vries concludes that "I Kings 22 has been developed from the historical background of the events recorded in II Kings 8:28ff" (p. 99). He does not, however, deal sufficiently with Miller's argument that Ramoth was in Israel's possession in Jehoram's day, nor does his treatment adequately explain the connection of chapter 22 with the battles in chapter 20.

25. De Vries (1978, pp. 33–51) demonstrates the composite nature of the Micaiah story, but his reconstruction of two narrative sources is not convincing. Compare the treatment of Schweizer (1979).

26. This old prophetic story indicates that the death of the king of Israel was an original part of the account of the third victory over Aram prophesied by Elisha (2 Kgs 13:14ff).

27. Cf. Miller (1966, p. 448). Portions of the story indicate a lack of awareness of the king of Judah at an earlier level: vv. 1, 3, 6, 9, 11–13, 15–17 (reading with the LXX), 19–28, and 34–38. These verses by themselves provide a relatively coherent narrative for much of the story.

28. The identity of the king as Ahaziah occurs only in the composition by the Prophetic Historian (1:2–8, 16–17). As with the other prophetic stories in 1 Kgs 17–2 Kgs 13, the king was originally nameless.

2 Kgs 1:2–8, 16–17 conforms to the work of the Prophetic Historian. As with earlier oracles from the hand of the Prophetic Historian, Elijah condemns Ahaziah for his apostasy and announces the punishment—death. Between the two announcements of Ahaziah's death the Prophetic Historian has incorporated an old prophetic legend about Elijah (2 Kgs 1:9–15). One notices in this story the motif of the mighty man of God and the Mosaic imagery found in the other old Elijah traditions. Following the death of Ahaziah the Prophetic History related the final old tradition about Elijah—his ascension.

The Elisha Stories

After the report of Ahab's death Dtr 1 has assembled the concluding formula for Ahab (22:39–40)[29] and the introductory formulas for Ahaziah (22:51–53) along with his account of Jehoshaphat's reign (vv. 41–50). There are also Deuteronomistic formulas at 2 Kgs 1:18 and 3:1–3. The contradiction between 1 Kgs 22:51 and 2 Kgs 3:1, on the one hand, and 2 Kgs 1:17, on the other, regarding the accession year of Jehoram of Israel is striking and significant. Shenkel (1968) and Miller (1966) have shown that the older, more original chronology contained in the Old Greek has been altered in the Masoretic Text. 2 Kgs 1:17 preserves the older chronology, while 1 Kgs 22:51 and 2 Kgs 3:1 reflect the revised chronology. The Masoretic chronology has been shifted because of the identification of the king of Judah in 2 Kgs 3:2–27 with Jehoshaphat.[30] Originally, Elisha was the central figure in this story and the only one mentioned by name (except perhaps for Mesha). The Prophetic Historian placed the tradition here in his history by necessity. The statements in 2 Kgs 1:1; 3:4–5 indicated that Moab revolted immediately upon the death of Ahab. But because 2 Kgs 3:2–27 was associated with Elisha it could be recounted no earlier than the transition of prophetic leadership from Elijah to Elisha (2 Kgs 2; cf. 3:11). The story illustrates the supernatural power wielded by Elisha in other episodes about him. It also illustrates the prophetic control over international politics important not only in the Elisha materials but to the Prophetic Historian elsewhere in his work. Miller and Shenkel have both pointed out that the Deuteronomist has revised the narrative in language very similar to his revision in 1 Kgs 22 (compare 2 Kgs 3:7, 11

---

29. The statement that Ahab "slept with his fathers" has been taken as proof that 22:1–38 is post-Deuteronomistic because this formula is used elsewhere only for kings who die in peace. I agree with De Vries (1978, pp. 97–99) that the Deuteronomist has simply borrowed an earlier formula, the implications of which he did not fully understand.

30. See the excellent treatment of this passage by Shenkel (1968, pp. 93–108).

with 1 Kgs 22:4–5, 7). However, Dtr 1 is not responsible for identifying Jehoshaphat as the king of Judah in this tale, since he has already given the death-burial notice for Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:47–50).[31] Dtr 1's revisions again attest his polemic against the Northern monarchy in favor of the Davidides. It is the king of Judah in 3:11 who calls for a prophet in order to consult Yahweh. The king of Israel, in contrast, blames Yahweh for the predicament (3:10). The king of Israel is condemned for the apostate tradition of the Omrides in which he stands (3:13). Most important is Elisha's remark in 3:14 that places Yahweh's favor squarely on the side of the Davidic dynasty against the Northern monarchy. Were it not for the king of Judah, Yahweh would have nothing to do with the king of Israel. Once more, Dtr 1 has shifted the focus of the prophetic narrative away from the prophet to his nationalistic polemic.

The stories about Elisha in 2 Kgs 4:1–8:6; 13:14–21 have been transmitted essentially intact by both the Prophetic Historian and Dtr 1. There are no obvious Deuteronomistic or prophetic retouchings in these stories. These traditions probably came to the Prophetic Historian as an "Elisha cycle". The picture of Elisha in 2 Kgs 4:1–8:6; 13:14–21 continues to be that of a wonder working man of God in the footsteps of Elijah. This is, again, at variance with the more standard portrayal of prophets elsewhere in the Prophetic History as bearers of Yahweh's word to the king. It is this latter view of the prophetic role which one finds in 2 Kgs 8:7–15, where Elisha, carrying out the commission originally given to Elijah, designates Hazael as king of Aram.[32] The role of Yahweh's prophet as one who directs international politics conforms to the perspective of the Prophetic Historian.

The same understanding of prophecy controlling politics is indicated in 2 Kgs 9 where Elisha's representative anoints Jehu, thus fulfilling the commission to Elijah (see n. 32). Here the Prophetic Historian has inserted into the Elisha collection an older account of Jehu's revolt. He has prefaced the older account with his composition detailing the

31. This identification, as Shenkel has shown (1968, pp. 93–101), has occurred in the development of the Masoretic Text, influenced by the similarity of 2 Kgs 3:2–27 with 1 Kgs 22 in the final form of the Deuteronomistic History. The Old Greek, reflected in the Lucianic recension, identified the king of Judah in 2 Kgs 3:2–27 as Ahaziah. The king of Israel was identified by both the Old Greek and the Masoretic Text as Jehoram. The identity of Jehoshaphat as the king of Judah here has led to the shift in the Masoretic chronology as Shenkel (1968) and Miller (1966) have shown.

32. On the relationship of Elijah's commission in 1 Kgs 19:15–17 and Elisha's execution of it see Carlson (1969, especially pp. 438–439).

anointing (9:1–6, 10b). He has also inserted into the story of Joram's death a fulfillment remark (9:25–26) referring to Elijah's oracle against Ahab (1 Kgs 21:19).[33] Again, however, the account of Jehu's revolt has been reworked by Dtr 1.[34] In 9:7–10a, Dtr 1 has supplemented the prophet's anointing of Jehu with a threat against the Omride dynasty ("house of Ahab") comparable to threats against the dynasties of Jeroboam and Baasha. He has also added references throughout the chapter to Ahaziah because of his Judean perspective (9:16b, 23b, 27–29; 10:12–14). In preparation for the account of Jehu's rebellion, Dtr 1 has placed the story leading up to Ahaziah's visit to Samaria (8:28–29) along with Deuteronomistic formulas for Jehoram of Judah and Ahaziah (8:16–27) before the Prophetic Historian's account of the revolt. Finally, Dtr 1 is responsible for at least 9:36–37 (see n. 34); 10:10–11, 17, if not for the insertion of the entire account of Jehu's destruction of Jezebel and the remainder of Ahab's house, in 9:30–10:17. His concern in this material is to depict graphically the fulfillment of the prophecies announcing the end of Ahab's house, since Ahab was the worst of the evil Northern monarchs. Again, his polemic against the North in contrast to David is his motive. Aside from 10:18–27, which is an old account of Jehu's nationalistic piety against the foreign Baal cult, the remaining material in 10:28–13:13 is Southern in origin and reflects the concerns of Dtr 1.

Most of 1 Kgs 17–2 Kgs 13, then, was in the Prophetic History. The Prophetic Historian may even be responsible for uniting the Elijah and Elisha cycles (see n. 22). His major change in this older material was to move the prophetic traditions about Israel's three victories over Aram. The three victories are anticipated in the account of Elisha's death and must have provided an epilogue to the Elisha cycle. The Prophetic Historian has shifted the account of these three battles, using the final battle in which the king of Israel is killed, as a fulfillment of Elijah's oracle against Ahab because of the murder of Naboth. Dtr 1 has reworked the account of the third battle on the basis of the story in 2 Kgs 8:28–9:28 in order to provide a contrast between Ahab and Jehoshaphat.

The End of the Prophetic History

There is no sign of the Prophetic Historian's hand following the account of Elisha's death in 2 Kgs 13:14–21. The only other Northern

33. The fulfillment statement may refer to the original oracle of Elijah replaced by Dtr 1 with 1 Kgs 21:20–24. Cf. Dietrich (1972, p. 51).

34. Cf. Dietrich (1972, p. 60).

prophet mentioned is Jonah in the Deuteronomistic account of the reign of Jeroboam II (2 Kgs 14:25). The reference to Jonah prophesying the enlargement of Israel's borders under Jeroboam is reminiscent of Elisha's oracles of victory or direction of warfare for Israel earlier in 2 Kgs. Since the other Northern prophets in 2 Kgs were all included in the Prophetic History, Dtr 1's account here may be based on the Prophetic History as well. Yet the Prophetic History must originally have extended to the final days of Israel or shortly after its destruction. Otherwise, its Southern orientation in the acceptance of David's election is not understandable.[35] This is the same problem raised by the absence of the Prophetic History underlying 1 Kgs 15–16. In both cases it is best explained as the result of the editorial work of Dtr 1.

Dtr 1's use of the Prophetic History focuses on two periods: 1) the division of the kingdom and the reign of Jeroboam and 2) the Omride dynasty. Dtr 1 has heavily edited the previous oracles in the Prophetic History for Jeroboam's reign in order to present his polemic against Jeroboam and the Northern monarchy. Jeroboam is presented as the paradigm of apostasy followed by the succeeding kings of the North. Dtr 1 treats briefly the successors of Jeroboam, showing how the downfalls of their "houses" are predicted by prophetic oracles containing the same threat: "he who dies in the city the dogs will eat and he who dies in the field the birds of the air will eat." The series of dynasties in the North stands in contrast to the single, Davidic dynasty in the South. Dtr 1 casts Ahab and his "house" as the worst of the Northern kings. The careers of two of Israel's greatest prophets, Elijah and Elisha, were associated with Ahab and the succeeding Omrides. Dtr 1 has simply transmitted intact the portion of the Prophetic History dealing with them. However, he sometimes shifts the focus of a story away from the prophet to his polemic against the Northern monarchy. Jeroboam and Ahab are paradigmatic for him of the depravity of the Northern kings. Consequently, other Northern kings are treated in cursory fashion. The climax of this polemic against the North occurs in 2 Kgs 17.[36] Here Dtr 1's selective use of the Prophetic History becomes clear. The stories adopted by Dtr 1 from the Prophetic History illustrate how the Northern kings persistently refused to listen to Yahweh's prophetic messengers (17:13). Hence, one dynasty after another fell until Yahweh's anger

---

35. McCarter (1980, pp. 21–22). Some of the Isaiah stories in 2 Kgs 19–20 bear a resemblance to the old prophetic tales included in the Prophetic History and may reflect the influence of the Prophetic History or Northern prophetic circles on prophecy in Judah after 722 B.C.

36. Cf. Cross (1973, p. 281).

could not be restrained. Then the nation collapsed. Its demise serves as a contrast and also a warning to Dtr 1's contemporaries in Judah where Yahweh, faithful to his promise, maintains the Davidic dynasty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carlson, R. A. 1969. "Élie à l'Horeb." *Vetus Testamentum* 19:416–439.

Carroll, R. P. 1969. "The Elijah–Elisha Sagas: Some Remarks on Prophetic Succession in Ancient Israel." *Vetus Testamentum* 19:400–415.

Cohn, R. L. 1982. "The Literary Logic of 1 Kings 17–19." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101:333–350.

Cross, F. M. 1973. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic.* Cambridge, MA.

De Vries, S. J. 1978. *Prophet Against Prophet: The Role of the Micaiah Narrative (I Kings 22) in the Development of Early Prophetic Tradition.* Grand Rapids, MI.

Dietrich, W. 1972. *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 108. Göttingen.

Dozeman, T. B. 1979. "The 'Troubler' of Israel: ʿkr in I Kings 18:17–18." *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 9:81–93.

————. 1982. "The Way of God and the Man of God from Judah: True and False Prophecy in the Pre-Deuteronomic Legend of 1 Kings 13." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44:379–393.

Friedman, R. E. 1980. "From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr 1 and Dtr 2." *Traditions in Transformation. Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross.* Ed. B. Halpern and J. Levenson, pp. 167–192. Winona Lake, IN.

————. 1981. *The Exile and Biblical Narrative. The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 22. Chico, CA.

Grønbaek, J. H. 1965. "Benjamin und Juda. Erwägungen zu 1 Kön xii 21–24." *Vetus Testamentum* 15:421–436.

Halpern, B. 1976. "Levitic Participation in the Reform Cult of Jeroboam I." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95:31–42.

Klein, R. W. 1983. *1 Samuel.* Word Biblical Commentary 10. Waco, TX.

Levenson, J. D. 1975. "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?" *Harvard Theological Review* 68:203–233.

_____. 1980. "From Temple to Synagogue: 1 Kings 8." *Traditions in Transformation. Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross.* Ed. B. Halpern and J. Levenson, pp. 143–166. Winona Lake, IN.

_____. 1984. "The Last Four Verses in Kings." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103:353–361.

McCarter, P. K. 1980. *I Samuel.* Anchor Bible 8. Garden City, NY.

_____. 1981. "'Plots True or False' The Succession Narrative as Court Apologetic." *Interpretation* 35:355–367.

_____. 1984. *II Samuel.* Anchor Bible 9. Garden City, NY.

McKenzie, S. L. 1985. *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 33. Atlanta, GA.

Miller, J. M. 1966. "The Elisha Cycle and the Accounts of the Omride Wars." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85:441–454.

Nelson, R. D. 1981. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 18. Sheffield.

Nielsen, Eduard. 1959. *Shechem, A Traditio-historical Investigation.* Second revised edition. Copenhagen.

Nordheim, E. v. 1978. "Ein Prophet kündigt sein Amt auf (Elia am Horeb)." *Biblica* 59:153–173.

Noth, M. 1943. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament.* Halle.

Peckham, B. 1983. "The Composition of Deuteronomy 5–11." *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth. Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday.* Ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, pp. 217–240. Winona Lake, IN.

Plein, I. 1966. "Erwägungen zur Überlieferung von 1 Reg 11 26–14 20." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 78:8–24.

Schmitt, A. 1977. "Die Totenerweckung in 1 Kön. XVII 17–24." *Vetus Testamentum* 27:454–474.

Schweizer, H. 1979. "Literarkritischer Versuch zur Erzählung von Micha ben Jimla (1 Kon 22)." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 23:1–19.

Seebass, H. 1975. "Tradition und Interpretation bei Jehu ben Chanani und Ahia von Silo." *Vetus Testamentum* 25:175–190.

Shenkel, J. D. 1968. *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 1. Cambridge, MA.

Smend, R. 1971. "Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Theologie." *Probleme biblischer Theologie. Festschrift Gerhard von Rad.* Ed. H. W. Wolff, pp. 494–509. München.

Steck, O. H. 1968. *Überlieferung und Zeitgeschichte in den Elia-Erzählungen.* Neukirchen–Vluyn.

Trebolle, J. 1982. "Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 15:12–35.

Veijola, T. 1975. *Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung.* Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 193. Helsinki.

————. 1977. *Das Königtum in der Beurteiling der deuteronomistischen Historiographie. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 198. Helsinki.

Weippert, H. 1983. "Die Ätiologie des Nordreiches und seines Königshauses (I Reg 11 29–40)." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 95:344–375.