tim and Noah were paradigms of obedience to their gods, just as kings and priests touted themselves to be. The cosmic mountain, the visible link between heaven and earth, the center of space and time, locus of abundance and refuge, is, like its mundane copy, the temple, the proper place for the righteous to worship the gods or God.

The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in II Reg 21,1 – 18 and the Redactional History of the Book of Kings

By Ehud Ben Zvi

(Department of Religious Studies, University of Alberta)

According to 1 – 2 Kings, Manasseh was the worst king of Judah; moreover, his deeds angered the deity to the extent that God’s response to them was an irrevocable sentence of punishment against Judah. Consequently, the account of his reign is one of the most important pieces in 1 – 2 Kings and one of the most important test cases for any comprehensive theory about the redactional history of the Book of Kings.

Does this account support or contradict the idea that there was a basic and comprehensive historiographic/theological work (dtr-H) that was reinterpreted and partially reshaped by two redactional traditions, one »prophetic« oriented (dtr-P) and the other »Torah« (Deuteronomy) oriented (dtr-N)?

1 The importance of this account for any theory about the redactional history of 1 – 2 Kings has been recognized. For instance, both Nelson and Provan have studied the account from the point of view of different double redactional proposals. See, R. D. Nelson, The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History, JSOTSup 18, 1981, 65–69; I. W. Provan, Hezekiah and the Book of Kings, BZAW 172, 1988, 145–47. Provan is certainly right when he claims that »if there once existed a pre-exilic version of the books of Kings which extended as far as Josiah, then some version of 2 Kings 21 must have been present in this edition« (Provan, Hezekiah and the Book of Kings, 145). Provan finds no evidence of this pre-exilic account of Manasseh. On the other hand, Nelson, who proposes a Josianic version of the Book of Kings, concludes that some verses in the account of Manasseh (v. 1 – 3*, 16 – 18) belong to the pre-exilic edition.

2 Obviously, this hypothesis does not rule out the existence of interpretative notes, as well as entire additional units, that do not belong to either dtr-H or any of the two proposed redactional traditions (dtr-P and dtr-N). For the proposal that the dtr. history is the work of one historian dtr-H and two subsequent redactors or circle of redactors (dtr-P and dtr-N) see, R. Smend, »Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur
The hypothesis that one main historiographical and theological work (dtr-H) stands behind the received books of 1—2 Kings can be supported by evidence pointing to the existence of:

a) a comprehensive framework;

b) recurrent language pointing to a recurrent set of ideas and messages;

c) a comprehensive and recurrent system of literary devices that anchors pre-dtr-H material to a singular place in the entire narrative in a way that gives a sense of literary unity to the entire work, and express (or supports) the main theological positions of the proposed work.

deuteronomischen Redaktionsgeschichte,* in H. W. Wolff (ed.), Probleme biblischer Theologie, Fs. G. von Rad, 1971, 494–509; W. Dietrich, Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. FRLANT 108, 1972; T. Veijola, Die Ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der Deuteronomischen Darstellung, AASF 193, 1977; T. Veijola, Das Königreicn der in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie. Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, AASF 198, 1977; and E. Würthwein, Die Bücher der Könige 1. Kön 17—2. Kön 25, ATD 11,2, 1984, esp. 485–515. See also E. Würthwein, Das erste Buch der Könige Kapitel 1—16, ATD 11,1, 1977; H. Spieckerman, Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit, FRLANT 129, 1982; and G. H. Jones, 1—2 Kings, NCB, 1984. Although a considerable number of scholars agree concerning the existence of the mentioned three deuteronomistic »strata« or »traditions« in the Book of Kings, and in the dtr. history, they do not necessarily agree concerning the specific contents of dtr-H, dtr-P, and dtr-N, their message, or even their unity. For instance, Würthwein distinguishes between dtr-P1 and dtr-P2 and he does not consider dtr-N a fully homogeneous circle either (see Würthwein, Die Bücher der Könige, 496–501). Würthwein also attributes to the dtr-N circle many verses, and units, that others (e.g. Spieckerman) ascribe to dtr-H (e.g. II Reg 21:2b–3, see below); and his description of the position of dtr-N circles on kingship, and on Davidic kingship, stands in tension with Veijola’s proposals. As it will be seen below, the material that, according to the methodological premises guiding this paper, belongs to the compositional dtr-H level or to any of the two mentioned redactional traditions (dtr-P and dtr-N) does not necessarily overlap the work of the proposed authors and redactors. To be sure, the proposal concerning dtr-H, dtr-P and dtr-N has encountered a strong opposition. For alternative proposals see, for instance, F. M. Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 1973; R. D. Nelson, The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History; H. D. Hoffman, Reform und Reformen. Untersuchungen zu einem Grundthema der deuteronomischen Geschichtsschreibung, ATANT 66, 1980; B. Peckham, The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History, HSM 35, 1985; A. Lemaire, Vers L’histoire de la Rédaction des Livres des Rois, ZAW 98 (1986), 221–36; B. Halpern, The First Historians. The Hebrew Bible and History, 1988; I. W. Provan, Hezekiah and the Book of Kings.

3 Obviously, if the unit under discussion does not contain pre-dtr-H material, then criterion c is inapplicable.
Support for the existence of specific redactional traditions could be found in the existence of a set of units containing distinctive language, pointing to a distinctive set of ideas, or messages, in dialogue with the original work, and providing a new interpretation for it.

The criteria mentioned above will be our guidelines in our endeavor, to draw »the most probable conclusion« about the existence of these three proposed strata of redaction and interpretation in the account of king Manasseh's deed, in II Reg 21,1 – 18.

It should be noted that the stress in this essay is on the words »work« and »redactional tradition«. The concept of one work is much more useful than the concept of one author. The first points to a unit of language and ideas, and leaves open the question whether there was only one author that wrote the entire discernible unit, or more. In this way it does not rule out the possibility that in some cases — obviously not all, otherwise there is no basic text to start with — both the language and the images found in one account may be the basis on which additional and »complementing« accounts were composed, without changing either the »style« or the message of the work as a whole. For the same reasons, the concept of redactional tradition is more useful than the concept of editor/redactor.

There is no doubt that the Book of Kings is composed of a large series of sequential and clearly separate reports about the deeds of the different kings of Israel and Judah. These separate reports, with the exception of the reports concerning Solomon, are arranged according to a basic outline:

a) Opening formula (...onne...amam)

b) Evaluative comment (...rise heruse/Bi'ni h)

c) A report about the deeds of the king concerning the cult sometimes appears. This report refers explicitly to the grounds on which the evaluative comment was based. Its language, which is quite recurrent, points to a general contextual meaning for some of the report's expressions.

d) Reports on special events that occurred during the kingship of the relevant king may be present. These reports are based mainly on pre-dtr sources, and in most of the cases, they report political events.

---

4 For a clear example of relatively late »editors« who were able to write notes that seem to be deuteronomistic in both contents and style, see A. Rosé, »Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated« in J. A. Tigay (ed.) Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism, 1985, 132 – 47.

5 The Solomonic report represents a special case because of the importance of the Solomonic traditions. Several layers of dtr. interpretation can be discerned in this account, which stands beyond the scope of this work.

6 No clear dtr. language is attested in these units, and they do not seem to be post-dtr.
However, in most of them, there is a clear tendency to underline the way in which »foreign (or internal) politics« affected the Temple, its buildings (e.g. II Reg 18,16), its treasure (e.g. II Reg 12,19), and its rites (I Reg 14,27 – 28; II Reg 16,10 – 16).

e) Concluding, and transitional, formula (...33βη...Ή3Τ im
...133 * Y? *l)

Summing up,

although occasionally one may find additional units;
although the inner content of some units may be enlarged by additional material, not found in the dtr-H edition of the Book of Kings, and especially concerning points c and d (e.g. Elisha stories);
although an inner interpretative process is probably responsible for expressions and ideas that were not found in the dtr-H material (e.g. the dtr-N material, and see below);

this outline, and its formal language, are the basic framework upon which the entire Book of Kings was composed, and no conceivable edition of this book could take place before the existence of this framework. Therefore, the first edition of 1 – 2 Kings as book, i.e., dtr-H, can be discernible, at least theoretically, by the main outline and the language associated with it.

Turning to the account of Manasseh’s deeds in order to test the accuracy of this conclusion, we find as follows:

a) Opening formula:

After the transitional II Reg 20,21, the real account of the reign of Manasseh begins in II Reg 21,1, with the common pattern used in the accounts concerning the kings of Judah:

This pattern is found in I Reg 22,42; II Reg 8,26; 14,2; 15,2.33; 18,1; 21,19; 22,1; 23,31.36; 24,18. In I Reg 15,2 and I Reg 15,9 – 10 the note is omitted; in our verse (II Reg 21,1) the note is absent.

7 Sometimes, further information is added after the expression that opens with (e.g. I Reg 14,30; 15,7; 22,47 – 50; II Reg 12,21; 14,19 – 22; 20,20; 24,29 – 30).
8 For instance, Hezekiah and Josiah received a second evaluation comment (II Reg 18,5 – 6; 23,25), probably both dtr-N, and see below.
10 The name of Manasseh’s mother was חנה נֶּפֶשׁ. There is no real support for the idea that she was of foreign origin, and that the omission was due to a «conspiracy» to conceal her foreign origin. Even though the name does not occur elsewhere in the Bible as a name for a woman, it occurs in Jes 62,4 and its meaning there is the entire people of Israel. Moreover, since the total number of attested female names in
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b) Evaluative comment:

וירש ידע עתני זה, חותבות עתים אשר והירש זה, מפי בנ יسرائيل

(II Reg 21,2).

i) The first part of this verse is the regular value judgment (e.g. II Reg 8,18; 23,32.37; 24,8,19, passim). Significantly, when the value judgments on the kings of Judah, as they appear in 1–2 Kings, are arranged along a temporal axis they show a clearly discernible pattern:

A) From the days of Rehoboam to the temporary interruption of the davidic dynasty in the days of Athaliah:

1) The first two kings did what was evil in the eyes of YHWH (Reho- boam – Abijam)
2) The next two kings did what was right in the eyes of YHWH (Asa – Jeoshaphat)
3) The next two kings did what was evil in the eyes of YHWH (Jeho- ram – Ahaziah).

After the death of Ahaziah, Athaliah, a non davidic queen, became the ruler of Judah. According to the Book of Kings, her rule was not on behalf of a scion from the house of David, but on her own behalf. Moreover, she tried to exterminate this house. According to the narrative, she came very close to her goal, but failed. Her reign was considered to be intermediate period between the two davidic periods. Significantly, the second one began with a new covenant (II Reg 11,17).

B) From the restoration of the davidic dynasty and the new covenant until the last days of the Judean monarchy.

1) The first four kings did what was right in the eyes of YHWH (Jehoash – Amaziah – Azariah – Jotham).
2) The next four kings show an alternate pattern. Two of them (Hezekiah and Josiah) not only did what was right in the eyes of YHWH, but also were the only two kings who received a positive value judgment, without any reservation. The other two (Ahaz and Manasseh) not only did what was evil in the eyes of YHWH, but also were the worst kings of Judah. In the eyes of the author of the Book of Kings, the sins of Manasseh were of such a kind that the divine response to them was the destruction of the Judean Kingdom, of Jerusalem and the Temple (II Reg 24,4; see also Jer 15,4 – dtr – ). However, since this destruction occurred

both, biblical and epigraphical sources, is too small, no valid conclusion can be drawn from such silent evidence.

11 This axis is originally the historical chronology of the kings, but it also functions as the literary chronology in which the plot of the story is being developed.
half a century after Manasseh’s death, and following the reign of six other kings, one may ask why the destruction is explained in terms of the deeds of Manasseh, and not as a punishment for the deeds of the last king, or the last monarchic generation. The answer lies in the importance of the paradigmatic opposition between Manasseh and Josiah.

It is noteworthy that the image of each one of these kings is related to the image of the others as follows:

* Ahaz is the prototype of Manasseh.
* Hezekiah is the prototype of Josiah.
* If Josiah’s deeds are the thesis then Manasseh’s deeds are the antithesis. The point is that Josiah’s deeds, as described in the Book of Kings, represent the enforcement of the d/dtr ideals, and conversely Manasseh’s deeds, as described in the book, represent whatever is detestable according to d/dtr standards.

3) The last four kings of Judah did what was evil in the eyes of YHWH. After them, the davidic dynasty ceased to reign in Judah, and the so-called exilic period began. Although their deeds were wrong, these kings were not considered responsible for the destruction of Jerusalem (see II Reg 24,4). Thus, according to dtr-H, God does not implement a system of royal personal reward. This position is underlined by two other dtr-H pieces, II Reg 3,2 and II Reg 17,2. The first palliates the negative value judgment on Jehoram, the last Ahabite king, and the second palliates the negative value judgment on Hoshea, the last Israelite king. The worst king is never the last, nor the last king the worst.

Moreover, the existence of a literary pattern that unifies otherwise independent value judgments and turns them into one literary, and probably theological, discourse may explain the nature of the »sources« behind the evaluations of kings, about whom almost nothing is said in the Book of Kings, except for the dtr. framework note, or some dtr.

---

12 The description of Ahaz is also contrasted to the description of the former four »pious« kings, cf. II Reg 16,4 with II Reg 12,4; 14,4; 15,4,35.
13 The different accounts are connected not only thematically but also by their language, and see below.
15 This term is inadequate to describe the Judeans or the Judean community that remained in the Land of Judah.
16 Cf. the common opening formula of these two notes ...
17 Significantly, neither Jeroboam nor Ba’asha were deposed, but Nadav and Elah; it is noteworthy that both Nadav and Elah reigned only two years.
coined expressions (e.g. Abijam). Furthermore, this hypothesis provides the key for the understanding of the way in which the author describes Amon’s kingship, the only one that does not fit the pattern. Since Amon reigned between Manasseh and Josiah, the two main players of the dtr-H story at its climax, there was no role for him in the system of thesis and antithesis, type and prototype that holds together this group of kings. Consequently, Amon’s report is like an appendix to Manasseh’s period and none of his deeds is included in the narrative, except his tragic end. Perhaps Amon’s case illustrate the limitations of literary patterns in the dtr. history. Literary patterns could and did influence the narrative; however, they did not totally obliterate well known facts, such as the simple existence of king Amon, which was probably documented in the King List, and perhaps, in the common memory of the living community. It is noteworthy that the logic of this pattern (basic to the dtr-H narrative) might lead to hope and not to despair. It proclaims that the crucial point in the whole history of Judah is the cultic one, and the pure dtr. cult is the only one acceptable in the eyes of YHWH. If its setting is in the post-monarchic community, then we may understand that one of its practical goals was to assert that after 586, and until the Temple was rebuilt, there was no proper place for offerings; i.e., during this time, no legitimate sacrifices could be offered to YHWH.

To sum up: The value judgment concerning Manasseh not only fits well with the general system of value judgments, but it is also one of the system’s cornerstones. Consequently, it should be considered as dtr-H material.

18 This pattern may explain some strange value judgments in the Book of Kings, for example the evaluation of Amaziah, whose deeds seem to differ from what a dtr. king was supposed to do, see 2 Reg 14.8 ff., 1 Chr 25.14a (which reflects, probably, a monarchical source). The custom of taking the gods’ images is well attested in the ancient Near East. See also 2 Sam 5.21. 2 Reg 14.6 seems to be a dtr-N note, i.e., it was written after the conclusion of the dtr-H history.

19 Notes concerning with the process of royal succession and specially its irregular features, are found in the concluding formula, after ...יתו אדוע (e.g. 2 Reg 12.20 – 22; 14.18 – 21; 23.29 – 30; however, the exception is Amon’s note, that precedes the concluding formula (2 Reg 21.23 – 24) probably in order to underline the nexus between his death and his deeds. It is noteworthy that the other kings, whose fate was similar, were considered among those who did right in the eyes of YHWH.

20 A complete discussion of this pattern is beyond the scope of this work. It may have some influence on the narratives about the last kings of Israel, and on the redactional level of the accounts concerning David and Solomon.
ii) The second part of II Reg 21,2 is very similar to II Reg 16,3, and to II Reg 17,8.

II Reg 16,3 refers to Ahaz. Only one of his putative abominations is mentioned explicitly in his report: passing his son through fire (II Reg 16,3); i.e., just the first abomination mentioned in the list of »abominations of the goim« (Dtn 18,9–11), precisely the very list that stands behind the description of Manasseh’s abominations and the abominations of the people Northern Kingdom (cf. Dtn 18,10–11 with II Reg 21,6, and with II Reg 17,17).

The main difference between II Reg 17,8 and II Reg 16,3; 21,2b, besides the expression כרותו, is that the evildoer in the latter is the king, i.e., one person; on the contrary the evildoers in II Reg 17,8 are the people of Israel. The historiographico-theological position according to which the destruction of the kingdom (either Judah or Israel) was the necessary result of the misdeeds of the people and not of those of a certain king, is one of the basic positions discerned in the dtr-N tradition (see section III). It is noteworthy that this position is not reflected in II Reg 16,3 (dtr-H), nor II Reg 21,2.

To sum up: II Reg 21,2b points to the dtr-H work.

21 A fourth occurrence of this language occurs in I Reg 14,22. Here, according to the MT the evildoer is Judah, not Rehoboam alone. This is the only case in the entire dtr. history where the value judgment concerns Judah, and not its kings. Significantly, the LXX version reads Rehoboam, instead of Judah. The testimony of the LXX, and the uniqueness of the MT reading, suggest a late »pious« alteration of the text. It is noteworthy that both Ahaz, and Rehoboam, the opening figure of a group of kings that did evil in the sight of YHWH.

22 For Josiah’s opposite acts see, II Reg 23,10,24.

23 It is noteworthy that although Ahaz is compared with the kings of Israel (II Reg 16,3; dtr-H) implying that they were the evildoers; the note in II Reg 17,17, which almost parallels II Reg 21,6, refers to the deeds of the people of Israel, and not special deeds of their king, or kings, unlike both II Reg 16,3 and II Reg 21,6. Turning the responsibility for the divine punishment (i.e. destruction of the kingdom) to the people is one of the principal features of dtr-N (see section III in this work), and is attested in II Reg 17,8.

24 For this meaning of כרותו, see II Reg 17,19; cf. Lev 18,3; 20,23; see also Lev 18,30.

25 Significantly, the »sin of Jeroboam« is not mentioned in II Reg 17,7–18.

26 Würthwein claims that II Reg 21,2b belongs to dtr-N, mainly because its language closely resembles the language of Deuteronomy (see Würthwein, Die Bücher der Könige, 440 – 42). However, one may note that the same holds true for the theologically
c) The cultic report

i) verse 21,3

This verse seems to be closely related to II Reg 23,8.4a, and to II Reg 17,11.16 – 17.

The subject in II Reg 17,11.16 – 17, unlike the other two, is the people of Israel and not any Israelite king (see above). However, there is a clear relationship between the account of Manasseh and the account/theological explanation of the fall of Samaria. The distinctive character

most significant phrase in the framework of Würthwein’s version of dtr-H, that is,İR יִשְׂרָאֵל רֹאֶשׁ (cf. Dtn 6,18; 12,25; 13,19; and Würthwein, Die Bücher der Könige, 491 – 92). In fact, all the deuteronomistic writers were influenced by the language and the ideas of either Deuteronomy or, more likely, proto-Deuteronomy. Thus, it seems that neither the language nor the concepts of Deuteronomy are reliable criteria for discerning different dtr. traditions. The case for the dtr-H character of II Reg 21,2b and of other short notes linking between two or more evaluative notes within the framework of the Book of Kings is supported by an analysis of the message of these notes. Clearly, the mentioned network of references actually reinforces the system of prototypes and antitypes that characterizes the framework of the book. It also enhances the central position of the accounts of Ahaz, Hezekiah, Manasseh and Josiah, which is a fundamental issue in the carefully designed «symmetrical» system of royal evaluations mentioned above. Moreover, the same features characterize the system of cross references linking between the cultic reports of the dtr. framework (see below). This second system supports and underscores the message of the framework (i.e. dtr-H) that the fate of Judah was dependent on the actions of the king (cf. the system of remarks about the «sin of Jeroboam» in the evaluations of the kings of Israel, also dtr-H) and that God does not implement a system of personal retribution. On the basis of the evidence, and since the requirements for discerning a distinct redactional tradition mentioned in the guidelines – above – are not fulfilled, it seems only natural to conclude that the systems of cross references supporting the message of the framework belong to the dtr-H composition/redactional tradition.

27 See Dietrich, Prophetie und Geschichte, 32. The main lines of the following comparative table are taken from his work (p. 32).
of the latter was underscored in our previous discussion (people’s responsibility vs. king’s responsibility for the destruction). Here, Manasseh is contrasted with Josiah (according to the thesis-antithesis motif), and with his father Hezekiah, (according to Hezekiah’s role as Manasseh’s literally proto-antitype, and see II Reg 18,4,22)\(^\text{28}\). On the other hand, Manasseh is compared with Ahab, one of the two archetypes of the kings of Israel (see I Reg 16,33a)\(^\text{29}\). Significantly, Ahaz (the prototype of Manasseh) was also compared with the kings of Israel (II Reg 17,2, cf. II Reg 8,18 [Jehoram]), and Ahaziah the last dvidic king before the interregn of Athaliah, was compared with the house of Ahab (II Reg 8,27)\(^\text{30}\). We may conclude that II Reg 21,3 belongs to the proposed dtr-H work.

\(^{28}\) Since the dtr-H story claims that that both Hezekiah and Josiah removed/destroyed the bamot, the dtr-H account of Manasseh must include a report about the re-building of the bamot. Moreover, since dtr-H reports that Hezekiah and Josiah removed/destroyed the bamot, the dtr-H value judgement of these two kings cannot include the common comment «the people continued to sacrifice and make offerings at the bamot,» for according to dtr-H there were no bamot at that time. In addition since the mentioned comment occurs only in the value judgments of the kings who failed to remove the bamot even if they did what was right in the eyes of YHWH (e.g. I Reg 22,44; II Reg 12,4; 14,4; 15,4,35), there is no room for the comment in the value judgment of Manasseh or of any of the kings who reigned after Manasseh and did evil in the eyes of YHWH. The «unexpected» result is that the dtr-H framework seems to suggest that the people ceased making offerings at the bamot, or at very least ceased to be responsible for these offerings, since from the days of Hezekiah to the very last days of the First Temple. If this is the case, then the claim for the decisive character of the deeds of Manasseh, and for a non-personal divine system of retribution, is strongly underscored. It is noteworthy that the Book of Kings connotes meaning by selective silence in other occasions. For instance, since there is no reference in the Book of Kings to Assyria, or the Assyrian hegemony over Judah, after the report concerning the confrontation between Hezekiah and Assyria, the text seems to suggest that the rebellion was so successful that changed the political situation in the area forever. Of course, this suggestion exalts the figure of Hezekiah, who is described as the first dtr reformer. For a different analysis of the references to the bamot in the framework of the dtr history, see Provan, Hezekiah and the Book of Kings.

\(^{29}\) I Reg 16,33b–c may be a result of later redactional activity.

\(^{30}\) Obviously, if one is interested in the historical value of these testimonies for the reconstruction of the monarchic period, one should ask which of the three testimonies reflect directly, or rely on pre-dtr-H sources. In this case the mention of לים亿元以上 למילון יבטים - not mentioned in Deuteronomy nor elsewhere in the Bible - probably points to such a pre dtr-H source, especially, when the alternative language found in II Reg 21 and II Reg 17 is the regular language found in Deuteronomy. Furthermore, the testimony in II Reg 23 mentions further cultic features of the Temple, unknown from other sources (e.g. II Reg 23,7,11). A discussion of the redactional history of the account of the Josianic reform is beyond the scope of this essay.
ii) verse 21,4
This may be an explanatory note, in which v. 4a is probably based on v. 5 and v. 4b on v. 7c. Alternatively, Burney and Montgomery proposed to see v. 4 as relying on a pre-dtr source\(^{31}\). Whatever position one might adopt, the result would be the same: Verse 4 is not a part of the dtr-H composition.

iii) verse 21,5
This verse resumes the narrative that began in v. 3 (dtr-H). Like v. 3 it is clearly related to the account of the Josianic reform (see II Reg 23,12). Thus, it is another example of the basic (dtr-H) pattern of thesis and antithesis between Manasseh’s account and Josiah’s account.

iv) verse 6
The list from »...יִשְׁמְתָה וְיָהְבָּבְרוֹ« to »וַיִּתְנַשֵּׁא« is an abbreviated form of the list occurring in Dtn 18,10–11; furthermore, the relative order in which the different »abominations« are mentioned in the D-list is the same order in which we found them in II Reg 21,6. Even the כָּשֶׁך, which occurs only in the parallel account in II Chr 33,6 appears in its predicted place according to the list in Dtn 18,10–11, and that might be a testimony for an alternative textual version. A shorter version of this list is found in II Reg 17,17, and we have already discussed its literary relations with the accounts of Ahaz and Josiah (see above).

The expression »לִפְנֵי חֲרֵצִים וְלִפְנֵי זֶה« may be an interpretative addition triggered by the similar expression in v. 15, which is related to the dtr-P tradition (see below). Nevertheless, since this expression, and those closely related to it, are so common (cf. Dtn 4,25; 9,18; 31,29; 32,16; Jdc 2,12; I Reg 14,9,15; 15,30; 16,2,7,13,26,33; 21,22; 22,54; II Reg 17,11,17; 22,17; 23,19,26); it seems that there is no real ground for any conclusion in this respect.

v) verse 7
The end of this verse show clear dtr language (cf. I Reg 11,32; Dtn 12,5,21; 14,24; I Reg 9,3; 11,36; 14,21), and it seems to be a harmonizing piece in which two traditions merged together. According the first, Jerusalem is the place upon which YHWH »put« the divine name (see

---

See for instance, H. Hollenstein, Literarkritische Erwägungen zum Bericht über die Reformmaßnahmen Josias 2 Kön xxiii 4 ff., VT 27 (1977), 321–36 [according to Hollenstein, the first layer consisted of II Reg 23,4 (without Bethel's note) + v. 6 – 8a + v. 11 – 12]; Spieckerman, Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit, 79 ff.; and Hoffman, Reform und Reformen, 169 ff.

I Reg 11,36; 14,21); according the second YHWH »put« the divine name upon the Temple (see Dtn 12,5–6; I Reg 9,3, and probably Dtn 12,21; 14,24). The probable harmonizing character of this part of the verse does not seem to support a relatively earlier date for this expression. Nevertheless, probably, the first part of the verse may be considered dtr-H. Although, the language מַלְכָּה הָלָה היא is a hapax, and strangely enough the word לִשְׁמָה does not occur elsewhere in 1–2 Kings, there is no doubt that II Reg 23,6–7 refers to this Asherah.

To sum up: The report of the cultic deeds of Manasseh that ends in v. 7, or probably v. 7a, clearly supports the idea that there was a dtr-H work.

The next unit, according to the dtr-H outline, deals with political events, and many times with their impact on Temple life. This unit is absent in some accounts; and it is also absent from Manasseh’s account.

d) Concluding and transitional formulas

II Reg 21,17–18 are formally identical to the other concluding formulas that refer to a peaceful royal succession, from father to son (e.g. I Reg 15,7–8; II Reg 8,23–24; 15,6–7.16.19–20; 20,20–21). This formula is a recurrent literary device that bears a recurrent meaning and provides a sense continuity to the entire work.

The present analysis of Manasseh’s account supports the conclusion that there was a main historical and theological work, a »first edition« of the Book of Kings. This work shows a consistent formal structure,

---

32 These are the only two occasions in the Book of Kings in which the narrative mentions an Asherah in the House of YHWH.

33 Concerning the burial place of Manasseh, also his son Amon was buried at the same place (II Reg 21,26). According to the Book of Kings, the burial place of the kings of Judah, from Jehoash through Ahaz, was the »City of David« (see II Reg 12,22; 14,20; 15,7,38; 16,20). The burial place of Hezekiah is not mentioned (II Reg 20,21), and concerning Josiah, the narrative mentions only that his body was carried to Jerusalem in order to be buried there. Among the four last kings of Judah, three of them were not buried in Jerusalem at all, and the fourth did not »enjoy« a royal burial (Jer 22,18–19). Probably, נְשֵׁי was the new burial place for the kings of Judah, from Hezekiah’s days on. This change was probably related with the enormous expansion of Jerusalem in the last part of the eighth century and during the seventh century. The omission of any mention of the burial place of Hezekiah, might be understood as a »pious« redactional device in order to set aside this »glorious« from his »infamous« descendants. The same »pious« reasoning may have led the redactor to the omission of Josias’ burial place. In addition, summary language, like our אִם הָרָא הָדוֹסָה, is not uncommon in concluding formulae (see I Reg 22,46 and II Reg 20,20). Obviously, such a statement in the concluding formula underscores the negative value judgment that Manasseh received in the dtr. history. For a different approach to this question, see Provan, Hezekiah and the Book of Kings, 134–38, 153–54.
consistent language, and a consistent message. In this work we find a sophisticated network of meaning, connecting the value judgments on the kings of Judah, and a pattern of literary type and prototype, thesis and antithesis, that not only related the most important figures who played a role in the main drama of this history: the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, but also heavily influenced the literary account of their respective deeds.

III

The Book of Kings, and especially dtr-H, is a royal book. Formally, it is arranged according the different regnal figures. In terms of content, most of the deeds accounted in the book are either royal acts (including those dependent on regnal initiative) or are related to the king in some way (like the rebellion of Jehoiada, the so-called B account of Sennacherib’s campaign, etc.). Moreover, it is stated, or implied, that the three factors that shaped the divine »decision making« concerning the fate of the kingdom, and its people were: a) a promise given to David (i.e., to a king, e.g. I Reg 15,4; II Reg 8,19). b) The behavior of the king (e.g. II Reg 8,18 – 19). c) The »fact« that the fate of the kingdom was sealed after Manasseh’s deeds (II Reg 23,26; 24,4). The existence of a monarch-oriented historiography, as well as theology, is not surprising if we consider certain ancient Near East parallels, and mainly the historical fact that the actions of the ruling center, headed and represented by the king, actually determined the fate of the kingdom. Nevertheless, this theological historiography faced three problems:

1) What can be its message to a community that has no king, like the post-monarchic communities34?

2) The main point made by this theological historiography is that the legitimate cult is the deuteronomic one, the one implemented by the Josianic reform. This cult is related to the Book of Deuteronomy, or to a proto-Deuteronomy, and the dtr. language in the history points continuously to this book. However, if Deuteronomy (or a proto-Deuteronomy), is considered normative (i.e., Torah), then this Torah is at odds with the kind of theodicy found in the Book of Kings. The Book of Deuteronomy clearly states that the fate of the people depends on the people’s actions (e.g. Dtn 4,25 ff., 6,14 f.; 11,8 – 9,21 ff.,26 ff.; 28,15 ff.,58 ff.; 30,16 ff.).

3) If the main message of the dtr-H history (no legitimate sacrificial cult is possible, unless it is carried out according to several d/dtr.

34 No one doubts that the Book of Kings underwent at the very least one post-monarchic edition.
normative ritual rules) was accepted by the post-monarchic communities; and accordingly these communities really ceased to offer sacrifices (no sacrificial cult can take place outside the Temple, and there is no Temple)\(^{35}\); under these circumstances could the dtr-H history guide them in their new religious/cultic life?

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that although Deuteronomy contains important cultic ordinances, it is not a book which deals only, or even mainly, with cultic statues. It provides laws that if supplemented by relevant interpretation may rule many areas of a communal life.

Significantly, the dtr-H is focused on the cultic aspects of the deuteronomic law, but did not stress, and even scarcely mentioned all the other aspects. Obviously, this apparent narrowness may be understood as a response to urgent problems. Probably, immediately after the destruction of the Temple, the main pressing issue was whether to resume (or to legitimate) sacrificial rituals outside the Temple or to stop worshiping God with sacrifices. The dtr-H answer could be only one: the second alternative\(^{36}\). However, in this respect, dtr-H points only to what the community cannot do; it does not carry a clear message about what the community should do.

The dtr-N redactional tradition is an attempt to cope with the problems mentioned above by means of a reinterpretation (actualization?) of a received text (basically dtr-H)\(^{37}\). Dtr-N refers to the Law of Moses and its statutes as totally normative; and consequently, it introduces some explicit notes about the way in which several kings followed the Law. For instance:

\[
\text{1 Reg 2,3} \\
\text{1 Reg 9,4}
\]

\(^{35}\) That is not to say they had no way to worship God. For instance, many synagogal (or proto-synagogal) psalms found their way to the Book of Psalms, and probably they do not represent the entire corpus of synagogal liturgy of that time.

\(^{36}\) The point that no sacrificial cult can take place outside the Temple is underscored in dtr-H by its emphasis on the theme of the \(\text{bamot}\) (e.g. I Reg 15,14; 22,44; II Reg 12,4; 14,4; 15,4,35; 16,4; 18,4; 21,3; 23,5). Significantly, the dtr-H history reports only one "historical" case of resuming the sacrificial cult outside the Temple, once it was abolished: Manasseh's reversal of Hezekiah's reform. Precisely, the type of deed that, according to dtr-H, led to the irrevocable sentence of punishment against Judah. Can the message to the post-monarchic community be more blunt?

\(^{37}\) Cf. Würtzheim, Die Bücher der Könige, 488.
Ehud Ben Zvi, The Account of the Reign of Manasseh

And compare with Jos 1,7-9, which belongs to the same redactional tradition:

Even a superficial reading of these notes points to the existence of both a common theme and a common language. It is also clear that this language, in spite of its heavy dependence on the text of Deuteronomy, is different from the quite stereotyped dtr-H. However, the most important difference between these notes and dtr-H is that the notes are not focused on the cultic aspects of Deuteronomy, but on the acceptance of the entire Torah (= Deuteronomy) as a way of life. Thus, it seems that a new revised version of the dtr history came to be, in order to provide a meaningful history for the dtr-post-monarchic communities.

How does this new revised version reconcile the dtr-H theodicy with Deuteronomy? The answer seems quite obvious: by supplementing relevant dtr-H accounts with notices referring to the evil deeds of the people, for instance:

Even when there is no explicit reference to the Torah, see for instance the use of 'כší in II Reg 18,5, which is probably dependent of the B narrative, see II Reg 18,20-21.22.24. This narrative, with a text close to our text, was included in the dtr-H history (E. Ben Zvi, Judah in the days of the Assyrian Hegemony [Tel Aviv Univ., MA thesis], 150–51); however, its language is not the characteristic language of dtr-H, and for instance 'כší never occurs in dtr-H value judgments. For another example, see the use of 'כší in hiphil, which occurs in I Reg 2,3; II Reg 18,7, but not elsewhere in 1–2 Kings.
First, these two examples show how the very dtr-H terminology of evil-doing is used in order to describe the deeds of all the people. Second, they certainly contain some clear dtr-N expressions, similar to those attested in the first group of dtr-N notes quoted above, and including an explicit reference to Jahweh in I Reg 9,6. Another account showing the same features is the large report (II Reg 17,7 – 20,34 – 40) of the deeds of the Israelites (from the Northern kingdom) that led to the destruction of their kingdom.

Given the importance of the account of Manasseh in dtr-H history, and the proposed character of the dtr-N redactional tradition, we should find supplementary and interpretative dtr-N notes. We expect that these notes will share motifs and expressions with the other dtr-N notes mentioned above.

In II Reg 21,8 – 9, we read as follows:

These verses as a whole, and some specific expressions in particular, do resemble other dtr-N notes (for instance cf. Jos 1,6,7; II Reg 17,13.14.40). The emphasis on all the commandments, all the Torah (i.e., all Deuteronomy) is clear when we compare these two verses with the dtr-H report on Manasseh, which is focused almost entirely on the cultic misdeeds of the king. Especially interesting is the way in which, Manasseh turn out to be a kind of false »teaching« prophet (cf. Jer

39 * Cf. the language in vv. 7,13.14.15.16a.19.34b.36.37 with the language of other dtr-N notes mentioned in this work.

* There is a clear evidence for the existence of reworked/reinterpreted dtr-H »units« (see our previous discussion on II Reg 21,3 and II Reg 21,6).

* As stressed above, the account is written in plural, i.e., the subject is always the people.

40 The expression ...ל וא is an hapax, but the occurrence of יָשָׁר instead of the regular יָשָׁר (e.g. I Reg 14,24; 21,26; II Reg 16,3; 17,8; 21,2) is according to the use of the verb in Dtn 9,3, and cf. Dtn 2,21 ff.; 31,4, and see Am 2,9.
23,13.32)\(^{41}\). In this way, there is a place for the evil acts of Manasseh, but also for the evil deeds of the people.

To sum up: There is a dtr-N interpretative note in the account of Manasseh, and it is consistent with the ideas, the language, and the function of the dtr-N redactional tradition\(^{42}\).

IV

According to the Book of Deuteronomy, there is only one legitimate way to seek knowledge concerning the future: asking the prophet. Moreover, the relevant text (Dtn 18,14 – 17) implies that YHWH will or may raise up a prophet (at least one) in each of Israel’s generations. Furthermore, since there were faithful prophets, but also false prophets, there was a need for a clear test in order to distinguish between them. Deuteronomy provides the rule: »if the prophet speaks in the name of the LORD and the oracle does not come true, that oracle was not spoken by the LORD; the prophet has uttered it presumptuously: do not stand in dread of him« (Dtn 18,22, NJPSV).

If Deuteronomy, or at least Dtn 18, was taken as normative, as was the case in dtr communities, or »schools«, then two exegetical inferences could be drawn:

1) Since the prophecies of the faithful prophets always come true, a chronological list of these prophecies should be real »history«.

2) Since it seems highly unlikely that the prophet/prophets were always silent concerning the main politico-religious events of the Israelite history (like the violent downfall of a ruling dynasty, as well as the

\(41\) Significantly, later, the Book of Chronicles takes this image, makes a reversal, and Manasseh turns out to act as a real »chronist« prophet (II Chr 33,16).

\(42\) It is noteworthy that verse 15 reads:

\[\text{The present context of this verse is problematic; one expects the ...ךכ, but there is no็น after it. Whatever »history« this note might have, it is noteworthy that it stands as a countervoice to II Reg 21,10 - 14 (dtr-P, see section IV), and points to the sin of all generations, (not to the »singular« sin of Manasseh). Although there is no conclusive evidence for relating this verse to the dtr-N redactional tradition, and it may have been a late marginal note which may be related to Jer 7,25 ff.; it existence suggests that the main discussion with the received text that dtr-N begun, was probably not just an episode. »Historical« reviews of Israel past (e.g. Ez 20; Ps 106; Neh 9; Sir 44 – 50; Jdt 5:5 ff.; CD 3; Sap 10; I Macc 2:51 ff.; III Macc 6:2 – 8; IV Macc 18:9 – 19; Acts 7:2 – 53; Heb 11) do not not explain the destruction of both the Temple and of Jerusalem, as motivated by Manasseh's personal sins. The same is true concerning the rabbinical traditions.\]
ascension of a new one)\textsuperscript{43} then an exegetical treatment of Dtn 18 leads to the conclusion that faithful prophets should have foretold, at least some of these events.

The dtr-H history seems to contain units related to, or reflecting, prophetic materials that were available to the dtr-H author/redactor. In most of the cases, this material belongs to the so called prophetic »historiography« (e.g. II Reg 18,17 – 19,37). One of the requirements of this genre is that whatever the prophet said, it came to be true\textsuperscript{44}. However, since these units contain only separate stories that even if they were put together (in spite of their thematical and linguistically diversity), no sequence of prophecies representing, and making sense, of the dtr-H historical narrative can be discerned. On the other hand, the mentioned exegesis of Dtn 18 points precisely to such a sequence of prophecies.

How can this tension be resolved? One way is by redactional activity, and the existence of a dtr-P redactional tradition has been proposed. Obviously, the main criteria for the existence of a redactional tradition is not »exegetical necessity« but the existence of a recurrent language that points to a recurrent set of ideas, and messages. The basic test case – outside the account of Manasseh – concerns the prophecies about the downfall of Solomon’s kingdom (partial downfall), the downfall of the Houses of Jeroboam, Ba’asha, and Ahab, and the downfall of the entire Northern Kingdom, and notes mentioning their fulfillment (see I Reg 11,31 – 35*; 14,7 – 11*; 16,1 – 4; 21,19 – 24*; II Reg 9,6 – 10*, and cf. I Reg 12,15; 15,29; 16,11 – 12; 22,38; for Jehu’s House see II Reg 15,12 and cf. II Reg 10,30)\textsuperscript{45}. A comparative study of these pericopes, and of their relationship to dtr-H leads to the following conclusions:

* There is a set of prophecies and fulfillments that if arranged in a temporal order provide a general understanding of the »historical« process, and its causes.
* These prophecies and their fulfillment notes do not belong to the dtr-H framework.
* These prophecies and their fulfillment notes do not point to any important historico/political event that is not attested in the basic dtr-H history.

\textsuperscript{43} These kind of events were legitimated by the claim that the former king/s offended the deity. Consequently, the usurper was described as a »servant« of the deity, the one who faithfully fulfills god’s commands, and obviously not as treacherous officer, greedy for power. Thus, these events were understood as having religious importance.

\textsuperscript{44} Concerning »prophetic historiography,« see A. Rofé, The Prophetical Stories, 1988, 75 – 79.

\textsuperscript{45} For a table showing the relationship among these notes, and others, see Dietrich, Prophetie und Geschichte, Tabelle zu Kapitel I »Form«, additional page.
In most of the cases, a basic structure of prophetic speech is discernable (i.e., messenger formula, e.g. ...חכ parc; indictment, e.g. ...ץאש; and announcement of punishment, e.g. ...ויהי מא... or ...הכור...). This basic structure occurs many times in the prophetic books. It cannot be attached to a specific author, or to a special time; nevertheless, it is clear evidence of the influence of prophetic language and outlook on the received Book of Kings.

Some groups of prophecies can be discerned according to some key expressions [e.g. I Reg 14,10; 21,21; II Reg 9,8 (cf. I Reg 16,11); I Reg 14,7; 16,2; see also the use of שִׁפָּא in I Reg 11,31; 14,8; II Reg 17,21].

We may conclude that these points support the idea that there was a prophetic redactional tradition that supplemented the dtr-H history with prophecies and notes about their fulfillment. As a whole, this redactional tradition provided a new dimension to the dtr-H history, and in this way solved exegetical tensions between the dtr-H history and Dtn 18. Turning to Manasseh's account, we read in II Reg 21,10 – 14:

The following conclusions can be drawn:

* The theme of this unit, as well as its message, is similar to those attested in other dtr-P notes.
* The formal structure of this unit is the same one attested in most of the previously mentioned dtr-P notes.
* This unit does not provide any new factual information about Manasseh's deeds.
* The relationship between the fate of Samaria, and the House of Ahab, on the one hand and the fate of Jerusalem, and Manasseh on the other hand occurs also in the dtr-H history.
* The language of II Reg 21,10 – 14 points to similarities with the language found in dtr-P and prophetic literature, and especially in the Book of Jeremiah.

Prophetic, in the sense of Dtn 18,18 – 22, but clearly not in the sense of «a warning voice calling for repentance» like in II Reg 17,13. Because of the nature of his mission, the prophecies of a warning prophet are conditional. A discussion on the deuteronomistic approaches to prophecy and prophets stands beyond the limits of this paper. A forthcoming article deals with this topic.
i) The expression ... occurs also in I Reg 9,9; 14,10; 21,9,21.29; II Reg 22,16.20; and outside 1 – 2 Kings in Jer 11,11; 19,3; 45,5, see also the close related expressions in Jer 6,19; 11,23; 42,17; 49,37 (cf. Jer 4,6; 23,12) 47.

ii) The expression נבניקニー (i.e. a general form, without mentioning any name) occurs elsewhere in 1 – 2 Kings in II Reg 17,13(dtr-N),23; 24,2. But the prophets in II Reg 17,13 are warning prophets calling for repentance; that is, their role does not parallel the role of the prophets in II Reg 17,23; 21,10; 24,2 48.

iii) A very similar expression to כל שמעה והצלחה של asia occurs in Jer 19,3 (cf. I Sam 3,11).

iv) In Jer 12,7 we read: נשמת את נוחתי תהייה שנים נפש בך and this verse resembles II Reg 21,14.

v) The pair הבךرسمית occurs in Jer 30,16 (cf. Jes 42,22,24) 49

vi) The expression ... is not found elsewhere in the Bible.

Therefore, II Reg 21,10 – 14 shows the expected features of the dtr-P redactional tradition concerning formal structure, theme, message, and language 50. Moreover, it suggests a probable relation between the Jeremianic tradition and the dtr-P redactional tradition. A more conclusive position on this respect depends on the results of further studies in this area that stand beyond the scope of this work.

To conclude: The analysis of the account of Manasseh’s deeds in II Reg 21,1 – 18 does support the idea that there was a basic and comprehensive historiographico/theological work (dtr-H) that was reinterpreted and partially reshaped by two redactional traditions, one prophetic oriented (dtr-P), and the other »Torah« (Deuteronomy) oriented (dtr-N) 51.

---

47 Other occurrences of related expressions in II Sam 12,11; 17:14; II Chr 7,22; 34,24 and Dn 9,12.
48 It is noteworthy that the language of II Reg 17,23 resembles the language of II Reg 24,3 according to which the Judah »was removed« from YHWH’s sight because of Manasseh’s sins.
49 For the pair תלבוס see Jes 28,17.
50 According to Wüthwein, II Reg 21,10 – 14 belongs to dtr-P1. Wüthwein’s dtr-P1 includes all the accounts considered here as belonging to dtr-P (see Wüthwein, Die Bücher der Könige, 442, 496 – 98).
51 My thanks are due to Prof. Gene M. Tucker, Emory University, Prof. John H. Hayes, Emory University, and to Prof. Diana Edelman for reading and commenting on a draft of this article.