

A Political History of the Jehu Dynasty from its  
Foundation Through the Reign of Jeroboam II

Jay H. Rosenbaum

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements  
for the Masters of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree  
and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion  
New York, N.Y.

April 7, 1975

Advisor: Professor Martin A. Cohen

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION	1-3
I - THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN ISRAEL BEFORE THE REIGN OF JEHU THAT LED TO HIS RISE TO POWER	4-7
II - THE JEHU REVOLT	8-30
III - THE REIGN OF ATHALIAH BEFORE THE JEHOIADA REVOLT	31-36
IV - THE JEHOIADA REVOLT	37-47
V - THE REIGN OF JOASH OF JUDAH	48-54
VI - THE REIGN OF JEHOAHAZ OVER ISRAEL	55-58
VII - THE REIGN OF JEHOASH OF ISRAEL	59-62
VIII - THE REIGN OF AMAZIAH	63-70
IX - THE REIGN OF JEROBOAM II	71-76
EPILOGUE	77-81
FOOTNOTES	82-122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	123-127

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to present a political history of the Jehu dynasty from its foundation on through the reign of Jeroboam II. Political analysis and theory will be applied in reconstructing the one hundred year period during which Jehu and his descendants ruled Israel.<sup>1</sup> Judah's political history will also be analyzed, focusing at times on Israel's relationship to her during this time period.

In researching this topic, the book of II Kings, Chapters 9 through 14, was used as the primary source, with other chapters in II Kings utilized where needed. Hebrew commentaries served as the basic secondary source in attempting to understand the biblical data. In the order of their overall usefulness, the following commentaries were drawn upon: Levi ben Gershon (Ralbag), Rashi, Mezudat David, Malbim, Mezudat Zion, and Perushe ha-Ramban. Rashi, Mezudat David, and Malbim compared the biblical account in II Kings to those found in Chronicles. Rashi also presented an historical reconstruction of his own, while Malbim usually repeats II Kings with the insertion or deletion of words without significantly altering the meaning of the biblical

account. Ralbag was the most helpful and interesting commentary, providing a philosophical and political approach to the biblical material. Perushe ha-Ramban utilizes grammar analysis of terminology to provide a brief legal analysis for a very limited number of verses. Mezudat Zion ignores many of the complicated and important biblical data and usually gives a deuteronomistic explanation for the verses on which it comments. All the Hebrew commentaries without exception are deuteronomistic in their explanation of the tragedies that befell the rulers and countries of Israel and Judah.

English sources were used as additional, secondary material. Biographical and rudimentary encyclopedia articles gave historical background. The Encyclopaedia Judaica proved the most helpful. English commentaries and histories provided analysis and explanations -- of the biblical accounts from a sociological, grammatical, and historical point of view. Christian and Jewish commentaries were all useful (for a full list, see bibliography). Statements of revolutionary and political theory shed new light on the biblical material and provided the tools for the reconstruction presented in this thesis.

Throughout the thesis, the methodology used, basically remains constant. First, the biblical account is stated, followed by citation of the relevant secondary sources, with political and historical analysis of the biblical material coming last. This format is changed in cases where the reconstruction depends on support from the secondary sources, secondary source citations then being mixed with analysis. In analyzing this period of history, each King is discussed separately, except in cases where they interact with one another.

While the intent of this thesis is a full reconstruction of the political history of this period, where reasonable evidence could not be adduced, excessive theorizing was avoided.

CHAPTER I - THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN ISRAEL BEFORE  
THE REIGN OF JEHU THAT LED TO HIS RISE  
TO POWER

Understanding the Omri dynasty's replacement by the Jehu dynasty depends on a brief survey of the political history of Israel from its inception.<sup>1</sup> During the reign of Rehoboam over the United Kingdom, the northern section of the country rebelled and formed its own state with Jeroboam as its king.<sup>2</sup> The reason for the split was the unwillingness of the power elements who supported Rehoboam to share the considerable wealth of the kingdom with the power elements supporting Jeroboam.<sup>3</sup> The general populace who supported the rebellion in the north expected a new king and a separate country to lighten their heavy tax burdens.<sup>4</sup> After the revolt the populace learned Jeroboam's real intent to replace Rehoboam's monarchy with an equally harsh one under Jeroboam.<sup>5</sup> In political terms the situation was one of two or more power elements vying for control and wealth, manipulating the populace in order to attain its goals. Although the fight for independence from Judah was over, the war for power and political control within Israel had just begun.

One characteristic of the northern state was its internal instability from the time of its foundation in 922 B.C.E., to the establishment of the Omri dynasty in 876 B.C.E.<sup>6</sup> No single political group within Israel became powerful enough to dominate the entire kingdom for more than a generation or two at a time.<sup>7</sup> Fighting between the various ruling elements in Israel caused the internal political instabilities. Probably the power groups fighting each other at this time had previously been united against Rehoboam of Judah. This state of political instability finally came to a halt with the establishment of the Omri dynasty.<sup>8</sup>

Immediately before the establishment of the House of Omri, Israel was in a state of political chaos and social instability. This situation was highlighted by the assassination of two kings (Elah and Zimri) in the span of one week,<sup>9</sup> and the simultaneous claim by two powerful individuals for the throne of Israel.<sup>10</sup> The power elements in Israel probably provoked this situation hoping to resolve the question of who could consolidate his power on a permanent basis to gain political control and stabilize the social situation in Israel.<sup>11</sup> Civil war raged in Israel between the forces led by Omri and

the followers of his rival Tibni.<sup>12</sup> Omri finally gained the upper hand and established what the Assyrian royal chronicles called the House of Omri.<sup>13</sup>

The Omri dynasty brought wealth and prosperity to the northern kingdom. This prosperity, however, was limited to the upper class.<sup>14</sup> This period is one of change for various social and economic groups.<sup>15</sup> The merchant class in Israel became richer and more influential than before.<sup>16</sup> The opportunity for increased wealth was provided by the international alliances Omri and his descendants formed for the purpose of trade. The alliances that are visible in the Bible are those between Israel and Tyre, (sealed by the marriage of Ahab to Jezebel)<sup>17</sup> and Israel and Judah, (sealed by the marriage of Jehoram to the daughter of Ahab).<sup>18</sup>

While the merchant class was prospering under the Omri dynasty, other groups in Israel were not. Petty landholders lost their land to the merchants.<sup>19</sup> The apprentices and artisans experienced the widening of the economic and social gap between themselves and their masters.<sup>20</sup> The property of the landed aristocracy was seized by the King, (cf. Nabot story).<sup>21</sup> Ahab's wife, Jezebel, the court, and the ruling class were followers of Baal.<sup>22</sup> This alienated the conservative

Yahwist elements in Israel and caused great dissatisfaction among the seer priests.

Fertile ground for revolution existed under these economic and social conditions. It was not difficult for the Old Guard,<sup>23</sup> the landed aristocracy, surpassed in power by the newly risen merchants, to find supporters for a revolution against the House of Omri. The only missing ingredient in the revolutionary recipe was the appropriate moment, which came during the rule of King Joram.<sup>24</sup>

## CHAPTER II - THE JEHU REVOLT

During the reign of Joram, the Old Guard had its opportunity to end the Omri dynasty. Israel was suffering the effects of an unstable international situation in which it was losing money and land. Moab and Aram were the causes of this international unrest. When Ahab died, King Mesha of Moab went to war to break away from Israelite control.<sup>1</sup> Judah and Edom allied with Israel, but even with this alliance the campaign against Moab was only partially successful.<sup>2</sup> Aram, in the meantime, took advantage of the turmoil to make several raids on Israel, even besieging Samaria, the capital city.<sup>3</sup>

Israel's army was not satisfied with the results of the war with Moab and was awaiting an opportunity to revolt against Joram.<sup>4</sup> The opportunity for the revolt came during the war against Aram.<sup>5</sup> Joram, wounded in battle, returned to Jezreel and left Jehu, his general, in complete control of the army.<sup>6</sup>

Jehu was the perfect person to lead the revolt and assume control of the government. He was a military leader who had the status of a hero and the loyalty of his men.<sup>7</sup> As a national leader, he had the requisite political knowledge (which he had acquired from contacts

in court circles) and the ability to bring political factions, such as the Rechabites, together.<sup>8</sup> Jehu's origin was probably in the conservative landed class of Israel, as is illustrated by his name.<sup>9</sup> This factor made him acceptable to the seer-priests, whose support was necessary to ensure the long range success of the coup.<sup>10</sup>

The seer-priesthood's opposition to the House of Omri is traceable to the reign of Ahab. It represented the landed class in Israel. When Ahab confiscated the property of these people, the seer-priests voiced their objection. The Nabot story (I Ki; 21:1-22) and the Shunammite episode (II Ki; 8:1-6) exhibit the loyalties and support of the seers and their opposition to Ahab and his descendants. The magnitude of the hostile feelings that existed between Ahab and the priesthood is further exhibited by Ahab's calling Elijah his enemy.<sup>11</sup>

The support of the seer-priests was crucial to the coup. They had popular influence and spoke for Yahweh. In the fighting stage of the coup, the seer-priests could rally popular support for Jehu or at least neutralize the population segments which might be hostile to him. After the coup, the seers

could legitimize it in the name of Yahweh,<sup>12</sup> and bring the populace to peaceful acceptance of Jehu's kingship.

Jehu, relatively certain of his support, prepared for the coup. First he called his officers and chiefs of staff together for a meeting.<sup>13</sup> At this point the officers, not suspicious, assumed the meeting was an ordinary council of war<sup>14</sup> called by their general. During the meeting, an unnamed prophet (identified by the Hebrew commentaries as Jonah ben Amittai)<sup>15</sup> sent by Elisha, ran into the meeting. Jehu acted as surprised as his officers did at this intrusion.<sup>16</sup> The officers were further puzzled when Jehu was taken into a private room by the prophet, where he was secretly anointed.<sup>17</sup>

Jehu was anointed with olive oil, the only king of Israel to be anointed.<sup>18</sup> He was anointed with oil to avert a possible controversy over his right to be king,<sup>19</sup> and to exhibit that Jehu had received the "beracha", the public signification of support by the necessary national politico-religious consensus.<sup>20</sup> Samuel the prophet had set the precedent for anointing a rival king by anointing David while Saul was still alive.<sup>21</sup> In addition to anointing Jehu,

the prophet told him to begin executing the coup, giving him instructions regarding special targets for attack.

When Jehu emerged from the room, he told his officers the prophet's message in a seemingly detached manner.<sup>22</sup> Thus, he tested the loyalty of his men and prevented his being labeled a traitor.<sup>23</sup> Although Jehu and Elisha were dependent upon officer support for the coup, they were not initially certain they could obtain it. This element of uncertainty and possible danger was exhibited by Elisha's sending of an emissary in his place and by the emissary's flight immediately after he anointed Jehu.<sup>24</sup> The possibility of a revolt against Jehu by his subordinate officers must have existed at the time of his anointment. After Jehu saw that the officers' initial response to the prophet's message was positive, he told them about his anointment. He stressed that the directive for his becoming king came from Yahweh, and that was the reason he was anointed rather than appointed king. Jehu also stressed that the main purpose of the prophet's mission was to anoint him king.<sup>25</sup> The officers, upon hearing the complete message of the seer, proclaimed Jehu as their king.<sup>26</sup> This action

on the part of the officers demonstrated their opposition to Joram and willingness to act in the coup.

Knowing that he had the support of the soldiers under his command, Jehu conspired against Joram with his fellow officers defending Ramoth-gilead against Hazael.<sup>27</sup> The plan of the coup was to kill Joram who was in Jezreel recovering from his wounds. Jehu instructed his officers how to kill Joram efficiently and how to seize power afterward. He used the theory usually employed in executing coups:<sup>28</sup> Jehu emphasized the need for secrecy, speed, and surprise.<sup>29</sup> He also stressed the need to neutralize potential opposition.<sup>30</sup> Jehu restated the need for killing Joram at the outset of the action. He and his officers knew that if Joram escaped from Jezreel after the coup started, he could rally troops to his defense and turn the coup into a bloody civil war.<sup>31</sup> Jehu also knew that if the knowledge of the coup reached Joram after it started, the coup would not be successful.<sup>32</sup>

Jehu and his army approached Jezreel. Joram was surprised by their approach, not recognizing the possibility of their attacking him and King Amaziah of Judah. Joram sent out riders to meet Jehu.<sup>33</sup>

The riders did not return.<sup>34</sup> Perhaps Joram believed the approaching troops were Arameans under the command of Hazael. The troops were finally identified by the "watchman" (a tower lookout?), who informed Joram.<sup>35</sup> Upon his identification, Joram rode out to meet Jehu.<sup>36</sup> Did Joram ride out because he thought he was needed in the field?<sup>37</sup> Or did he ride out because he feared an assassination and was fleeing?<sup>38</sup> The second possibility seems unlikely because there is no indication that Joram took his royal bodyguard or even a chariot driver with him.<sup>39</sup> Cavalry was not used for attacking fortified cities.<sup>40</sup> Did Joram ride out of the city to meet Jehu as a sign of respect for his general? The reason Joram left the city will probably never be documented, but there is a hint that Joram thought that he was needed in the field because of the speed of Jehu's approach, which suggested urgency.<sup>41</sup>

Jehu revealed the plot to Joram only when there was no possibility of escape - Joram was already in the hands of Jehu's men.<sup>42</sup> Jehu then himself killed Joram with an arrow.<sup>43</sup> It was crucial that Joram be killed while isolated from his troops because

Jehu was not prepared to fight other segments of the army. He was travelling so rapidly that he could not have brought siege machines with him. And an intra-army fight would have led to divisiveness after the coup.

Ahaziah attempted to flee after Joram warned him of Jehu's treachery.<sup>44</sup> But Jehu and his men followed Ahaziah and killed him.<sup>45</sup> Ahaziah was probably attempting to escape to Samaria, where news of the coup would not yet have travelled.<sup>46</sup> Ahaziah was killed because he was a relative of Joram.<sup>47</sup> Because he was a relative of Ahab, he was subject to the anti-Ahab feelings prevalent in northern Israel.<sup>48</sup> Ahaziah was also an ally of Joram and therefore a possible leader of a counter-coup, and because Judah might have taken advantage of the temporary confusion in Israel to make it a vassal of Judah (were it not for the confusion which resulted in Judah from the death of Ahaziah).<sup>49</sup>

When Jehu entered the city, he found Jezebel adorned as a queen watching him from a window.<sup>50</sup> Was this because she wanted to marry him and form a new alliance or because she wished to show composure until

the end?<sup>51</sup> Jezebel, realizing that Jehu was about to kill her, called him a murderer and robber of the crown of Joram.<sup>52</sup> Jehu then called for Jezebel's execution.<sup>53</sup> He asked the palace guards to exhibit their support for the coup by executing Jezebel themselves.<sup>54</sup> The palace guard could not resist the strength of Jehu's army, and by killing Jezebel, they were implicated in the revolt and forced to give the rebels their permanent support. In this way Jehu avoided a confrontation between the forces of the army and palace guard. This confrontation would have occurred if the palace guard felt that their lives were threatened by Jehu.

Jezebel was killed for a number of reasons. It was partially done to fulfill Elijah's prophecy.<sup>55</sup> Jezebel could have been the power behind the throne of Joram,<sup>56</sup> which would make her the "real" ruler of Israel. In that case Jezebel could have foiled the coup by requesting Phoenician troops (Phoenicia being Joram's ally and Jezebel's homeland) to intervene on her behalf. Jezebel was probably killed at the insistence of the seers and fanatic Yahwists as well. Their support was needed to make the coup successful.

The next item on Jehu's agenda was obtaining the cooperation of the elders, rulers of Samaria and Jezreel, and those who raised the sons of Ahab.<sup>57</sup> To inform these people of his intentions regarding the goals of the coup, Jehu wrote them a letter.<sup>58</sup> In political terms these people were the military commanders of the city, barons, local political leaders, and professional soldiers. The letter was addressed to the royal chamberlain.<sup>59</sup> In the letter Jehu told him either to meet him in combat or to capitulate to him.<sup>60</sup> These high officials chose the latter alternative.<sup>61</sup>

Why did Jehu send the letter to the leaders gathered in Samaria? Jehu could not take the capital by surprise anymore. The "leaders" were probably in Samaria discussing the action to take in regard to the coup. Jehu needed the capital city to rule the country.<sup>62</sup> These men had the ability to appoint a new king (from among Joram's children) who could challenge Jehu for the throne of Israel.<sup>63</sup> They also had troops and armaments, which they could pledge to the king of their choice.<sup>64</sup> An outright assault on Samaria would weaken Jehu's army and hurt his popularity. And Jehu as coup leader and king designate did not want to subject himself to the unnecessary danger which his going to

Samaria would have represented.

After Jehu received the first letter of capitulation from the elders, he sent them another letter.<sup>65</sup>

In the second letter he asked the leaders in Samaria to exhibit their loyalty to him by decapitating the sons of Ahab and sending their heads to him in Jezreel.<sup>66</sup>

Jehu ordered that the heads of Ahab's sons be placed next to the gate entrance to the city of Jezreel.<sup>67</sup>

This action showed the inhabitants of the city, as well as those who heard about it, the great power possessed by Jehu.<sup>68</sup> The gate of a city was a place of judgement.<sup>69</sup>

Jehu's action thus exhibited that he was now the judge (that is, the king) of the people of Israel, not just Jezreel. This theory rests on the fact that the

children of Ahab were killed in the capital on the orders of Jehu, which means he had defacto control of the country. The exhibition of decapitated heads

also suggests a public execution and gave warning to the consequences involved in opposing Jehu. He wanted

Ahab's children killed because they were possible contenders to the throne of Israel and therefore a threat

to a stable rule by Jehu.<sup>70</sup> The possibility also existed that foreign governments would back a counter-coup led by one of Ahab's sons. Their motivation for

such an action would have been the reestablishment of a dynasty whose foreign policy was familiar and dependable.

After the children of Ahab were killed, Jehu continued his purge of the house of Ahab.<sup>71</sup> The killing this time took place in Jezreel. The victims of the purge were the rich supporters, government officials, and family friends of Ahab and Joram.<sup>72</sup>

With the coup progressing according to plan, Jehu began his triumphant march to Samaria from Jezreel. On the way to Samaria Jehu captured and killed the brothers of Ahaziah.<sup>73</sup> The killing of Ahaziah's brothers was necessary from a military standpoint. They could have desired to avenge Ahaziah's death and to lead Ahaziah's troops against Jehu. A possible reason for Jehu's capturing Ahaziah's brothers rather than executing them immediately was the need to interrogate them to determine whether troops from Judah were coming to Israel to oppose him. The Hebrew commentaries state that these relatives of Ahaziah were the sons, not the brothers of Ahaziah and related to Ahab,<sup>74</sup> but this would not change Jehu's actions or reasoning.

Continuing his march to the capital, Jehu met

Jehonadab the Rechabite on the road to Samaria.<sup>75</sup> Jehonadab was a friend of Jehu,<sup>76</sup> and the leader of the Rechabites, an ascetic order that was conservative both politically and religiously.<sup>77</sup> The Rechabites were militant Yahwists who supported Jehu in the coup.<sup>78</sup> Following the military theory used in a coup, Jehonadab and his army of Rechabites were probably guarding the road to Samaria to isolate the city from the rest of the country. This would have delayed potential reinforcements attempting to reach Samaria and trapped the leaders of the opposition inside the city. Jehonadab joined Jehu in his chariot and they rode into Samaria together.<sup>79</sup>

Jehonadab rode into Samaria with Jehu to rally support for the coup among the conservative elements in Israel. This action also showed that the motivation for the coup was broader than the fulfillment of Jehu's personal ambitions.<sup>80</sup> Judging by the known religious zeal of Jehonadab, part of the coup's ideological claim was a return to loyalty to Yahweh. Jehu and Jehonadab entered Samaria, and killed the bureaucrats, officers, and financial supporters of King Ahab and Joram.<sup>81</sup> The opposition army had been either disbanded or

neutralized before Jehu entered the city. This had been accomplished through a directive from the commanders of the city to their troops<sup>82</sup> and reinforced by the presence of Jehu's and Jehonadab's armies. When Joram's forces saw that they were trapped in Samaria by Jehonadab's forces, they willingly laid down their arms at the orders of their commanders to save their lives.

After completing the coup and assuming the kingship of Israel, Jehu plotted to destroy the Baal cult in Samaria.<sup>83</sup> The evidence for Jehu's control of Israel is found in II K<sup>ing</sup> 10:21 which states, "And Jehu sent through all Israel, and the worshippers of Baal came." First Jehu proclaimed a grand sacrifice to Baal, requiring attendance by all Baal followers.<sup>84</sup> The followers of Baal did not find Jehu's action suspicious. They probably assumed that Jehu was continuing the policy established by Ahab and Joram.<sup>85</sup> The people who came to the Baal temple in response to the Jehu proclamation were probably the newly deposed ruling class and wealthy merchants. The average person would not have had the funds to go to Samaria. The Baal temple was not large enough to accomodate all the worshippers of Baal.

Jehu planned to check to ascertain that no Yahwists were in the Baal temple before he commanded the killing to begin.<sup>86</sup> He did so because the elite of Israel felt that they were required to be present at the Baal sacrifice, even if they were followers of Yahweh, out of respect and allegiance to Jehu and fear of him. Jehu went as far as offering sacrifices to Baal as an additional precaution against killing loyal Yahwists in the Baal temple, apparently reasoning that they would not go as far as sacrificing to Baal.<sup>87</sup> To make the plot more believable to the intended victims, Jehonadab the Rechibite joined with Jehu in the sacrifice to Baal.<sup>88</sup> Jehu was ready to act on the plan. He ordered his officers and soldiers to kill all the followers of Baal who were in the house of Baal in Samaria.<sup>89</sup> Jehu stressed the importance of killing the followers of Baal to his soldiers by stating, "If any of the men whom I bring into your hands escape, his life shall be for the life of him."<sup>90</sup> Jehu felt the killing of the followers of Baal was important because, as stated above, the court, ruling class, merchant class, and power elements behind Ahab were followers of Baal.<sup>91</sup> His act of calling a great sacrifice to Baal was used

to lull them into belief in his good will and to gather them all in one location.<sup>92</sup> Another possible motivation for the plot was that Jehu wanted to kill certain political leaders and local elders that might oppose his rule at a later time, (possibly even the leaders that met in Samaria that gave him their support) but was unable to do so for political reasons. When the people sacrificed to Baal they gave Jehu justification for liquidating them. Supporting the theory that Jehu seized the opportunity to kill his opponents is the biblical statement that "vestments" were given to the people in the Baal temple.<sup>93</sup> These vestments were probably given to key people,<sup>94</sup> marked for death by Jehu. This ensured their easy identification by his troops so they would not escape when the killing began.

The members of the Baal cult were also killed to appease the Rechabites and seer-priests.<sup>95</sup> These two groups supported Jehu in the coup and probably demanded the destruction of the Baal cult in Samaria as partial payment for their help. Destroying the Tyrian Baal in Samaria legitimized Jehu's coup in the eyes of the artisans and small farmers. For them Jehu demonstrated that his revolt against Joram was motivated and executed

because of his zeal for Yahweh,<sup>96</sup> which he exhibited by destroying Baal worship soon after he came to power.

Besides killing the members of the Baal cult, Jehu destroyed the Baal temple.<sup>97</sup> The site of the Baal temple was later used as a latrine as a sign of contempt for the house of Ahab.<sup>98</sup>

Although Jehu destroyed the Tyrian Baal, he allowed other idol worship to continue in Israel,<sup>99</sup> thereby encouraging loyalty from non-Yahwists and promoting stability within diverse segments of the population. Albright states that a large part of the population was not strictly loyal to the Yahweh cult even after the coup.<sup>100</sup> Another motivation behind Jehu's destruction of the Baal cult and simultaneous tolerance of other cults was the Baal cult's foreign origin and lack of popular support.<sup>101</sup> The indigenous Canaanite cults, on the other hand, were widely advocated and drew support from many different social and economic groups.<sup>102</sup> Idol worship was also allowed in order to encourage abandonment of loyalty to the Jerusalem temple.<sup>103</sup> The golden calves in Beth El and Dan (II Ki 10:29) were Yahweh shrines founded by Jeroboam I to counteract the political influence of the Jerusalem temple.<sup>104</sup> Beth El and Dan were probably

controlled by seer-priests and did not pose a threat to Jehu. Jehu's central concern in permitting idolatry was the loss of control of the populace through the seer-priest which would have resulted from disbanding the popular cults.

Throughout the coup narrative the Bible legitimizes the killings and political actions taken by Jehu. He is depicted as a loyal Yahwist chosen by Yahweh to save Israel from the idolatrous house of Ahab.<sup>105</sup> Jehu learned of his mission through the seer-priests who were the spokesmen for Yahweh.<sup>106</sup>

The biblical viewpoint is that the Jehu revolt was inspired by the prophets.<sup>107</sup> It was Elisha who gave a sign which started the revolt.<sup>108</sup> Although the revolt came during the reign of King Joram, the seer-priesthood had been planning for it since the time of Ahab.<sup>109</sup>

But throughout the biblical account of the coup, actions by the seer-priests are reported only before the plan for a coup was made known to anyone beyond Jehu.<sup>110</sup> Why do the seers not appear fighting side by side with Jehu in his battle for Yahweh? The first but not the most convincing reason is that the seers

did fight in the coup against Joram. According to this theory writers of the biblical account excluded this element of their activity because of the negative feelings against Jehu which were prevalent after Israel became an Assyrian tributary. This anti-Jehu feeling took the form of nationalistic feeling in Israel.<sup>111</sup> Another reason for the seer-priests' dissociation from the coup was its excessively bloody nature.<sup>112</sup> This argument does not follow the process of legitimization for the revolt presented in the Bible.

It would seem more feasible that the seers were not involved in the actual execution of the coup. They remained uninvolved to avoid being exterminated by Joram in case the coup failed. Otherwise Joram would have had a legitimate excuse to crush the upper echelon of the seer-priesthood which had been causing trouble for the dynasty since the time of Ahab.<sup>113</sup> He could have shown that these individual seers were enemies of the state and that the coup was not ordered by Yahweh, using for evidence the fact that it had failed. If Joram had killed the upper echelon seers, he would then have replaced them with lower echelon seer-priests, (who would have been loyal to him) thus exhibiting his

true nature - that of a follower of Yahweh.<sup>114</sup> As an additional precaution, Elisha sent an obscure, nameless seer to anoint Jehu instead of going himself. If the coup failed, or failed to materialize, Elisha, the head seer in Israel, could say that the seer who went to Jehu acted unilaterally and not on his instructions.

Immediately before Jehu killed Joram he told his troops that he was doing so because of the idol worship of his mother Jezebel.<sup>115</sup> He then reminded Bidkar, his captain, about the public decree from the Lord which was pronounced against the house of Ahab.<sup>116</sup> He made those statements to his officers and men so that they could bear witness that Jehu killed Joram out of his zeal for Yahweh.

Ideologically, Jezebel was killed because of Elisha's decree and not because of the will of Jehu.<sup>117</sup> This is documented by Jehu's speech after she was killed.<sup>118</sup> The soldiers and people of Israel must have looked upon the killing of a king and queen as a fearsome act requiring justification. Legitimization of Joram's killing by Jehu was important to avoid a counter-revolt against Jehu after the coup was over.

Jezebel reminded Jehu<sup>119</sup> that the situation had occurred to Zimri, another ambitious general of Israel.<sup>120</sup>

The children of Ahab were liquidated to eliminate rallying around the house of Ahab; ideologically, the sins of Jezebel and Ahab extended to their sons as well.<sup>121</sup> Ahaziah was killed because he was the son-in-law of Ahab and a follower of the ways of Ahab.<sup>122</sup> His brothers were killed because they too were blood relatives of Ahab.<sup>123</sup>

In few instances does the Bible give the political or military reasons why the victims of the coup were killed. Because Yahwism was the constitutive ideology of Israel, Jehu was forced to give religious reasons for the political and military decisions he had made. All leaders must utilize popular ideology for claims of legitimacy; Yahwism was the political vehicle in this case.<sup>124</sup> In two particular instances the political motivation for Jehu's actions are clear. In the first instance he ordered the heads of Ahab's children brought to Jezreel during the night, implicating the inhabitants of the city in the execution.<sup>125</sup> Even in this instance he legitimized their death by stating that they were executed because Yahweh decreed it.<sup>126</sup>

The second incident in which Jehu's political tactics were clearly exhibited was in his letter to the leaders of Samaria,<sup>127</sup> and his execution of the family, friends, and officers of Ahab in Samaria.<sup>128</sup> If Jehu had been consistent in killing all officers and political leaders who supported Ahab, he would have also killed the leaders in Samaria, especially the leaders who brought up the sons of Ahab (II Ki 10:1). The decree of Yahweh spoken through Elijah (II Ki 10:17), which ordered the execution of the house of Ahab and its supporters, also applied to the officials in Samaria who received Jehu's letter. These two verses show that Jehu applied the decree of Yahweh against the house of Ahab where it was politically expedient and ignored the decree where it was not. Elisha legitimized Jehu's selective application of Yahweh's decree against the house of Ahab to the populace and the military.

Of all the Hebrew commentaries that addressed themselves to the legitimacy of Jehu's actions in the coup, Ramban presented the most complete explanation of all. He stated that Jehu was not allowed to destroy the house of Ahab for his own personal gain, even

though God had decreed that it be destroyed. Jehu was allowed to destroy it because he acted out of true love for God and not out of desire for personal gain.<sup>129</sup>

As a result of the coup and the Omri dynasty, Israel's foreign relations changed drastically. Judah and Phoenicia broke their ties and treaties with Israel. They acted in response to Jehu's assassination of Ahaziah, king of Judah, and Jezebel, the daughter of a Phoenician king.<sup>130</sup> It is reasonable to assume that Jehu wished to free Israel from its pacts with Judah and Phoenicia; otherwise other methods for dealing with Jezebel and Ahaziah would have been utilized. These ties were severed because they did not benefit the landed aristocracy who supported the Jehu coup.<sup>131</sup> The treaties instead benefited the merchant class in Israel and brought with them the cult of the Tyrian Baal.<sup>132</sup> The seer-priesthood, other allies of Jehu, were naturally opposed to Baal worship. Israel's treaty with Judah might have been involved with some concession of power to Judah by Israel, which Israel could now resist since the leadership of Judah was still closely allied with the Omri dynasty.<sup>133</sup>

As a result of the broken treaties with Phoenicia and Judah, Israel was left without allies and vulnerable to attack by foreign powers. In the first year of Jehu's rule, Israel lost territory and status as an international power.<sup>134</sup> Hazael was able to conquer Transjordan because of Israel's weakened position.<sup>135</sup> Jehu paid tribute to Shalmaneser III of Assyria to hold Hazael of Syria in check.<sup>136</sup> The black obelisk of Shalmaneser shows this occurrence.<sup>137</sup>

In the aftermath of the Jehu coup, three main features stand out. First, the Old Guard, the landed gentry, was back in power. Second, Jehu firmly established his dynasty, which lasted four generations.<sup>138</sup> Third, although Jehu was king, he did not have the power that Omri and Ahab had once possessed. Their consolidation of power was part of the motivation in ending the Omri dynasty.<sup>139</sup> The wealthy class wanted a king it could control.

The territory, wealth, and international prestige lost by Israel under Jehu was not regained until the reign of Jeroboam II,<sup>140</sup> the last of the long-reigning kings of the Jehu dynasty.

CHAPTER III - THE REIGN OF ATHALIAH BEFORE THE  
JEHOIADA REVOLT

When word of King Ahaziah's death during the revolt in Israel reached Jerusalem, Athaliah, the queen mother, assumed control of the government of Judah.<sup>1</sup> Her first act as ruler was liquidation of the possible contenders for the throne of Judah,<sup>2</sup> as her husband Joram had done.<sup>3</sup> The people that she had killed were probably her grandchildren and others of Davidic lineage. Joash, the infant son of Ahaziah, escaped Athaliah's sword<sup>4</sup> with the help of Jehosheba, daughter of King Joram and sister of Ahaziah.<sup>5</sup> It is likely that Joash was never in danger from Athaliah and was placed in Jehosheba's care by Athaliah. Joash could give Davidic legitimacy to Athaliah's rule.<sup>6</sup> It was no accident that it was the youngest member of the royal seed who was spared. Because of his age, Joash posed no immediate threat to Athaliah, and she could say that she was ruling Judah in his behalf until he was old enough to assume the kingship of the country. Jehosheba was a good caretaker of Joash because of her relationship to Athaliah. Jehosheba was a member of the royal family, stepdaughter or half sister of

the late king, Ahaziah, by the same mother.<sup>7</sup> Jehosheba was a possible candidate for the rule of Judah herself. If she had wished to undermine the authority of Athaliah as the Bible suggests, she would have chosen an older member of the royal family to save and possibly have married him. It is not likely that a member of the royal household could be kept hidden for the period of time that the Bible suggests.<sup>8</sup> The only way Jehosheba could have planned to overthrow Athaliah when she came to power was to align herself with a legitimate heir to the throne of David able to depose Athaliah. Joash was obviously not capable of doing this.

There is no evidence that any major internal political change occurred in Judah as a result of Athaliah's accession to the throne. The Bible makes no mention of purges within her government except for the killing of the royal seed<sup>9</sup> and probably a few of the royal family's close supporters. Bright states that Athaliah was the power behind the throne of Ahaziah,<sup>10</sup> further supporting the theory of internal political status quo.

In the area of international politics, Athaliah followed the politics pursued by her husband Jehoram

and father-in-law Jehoshophat.<sup>11</sup> The exception to this policy was the cessation of foreign relations with Israel (after Ahaziah was killed by Jehu).<sup>12</sup> This possibly lasted for only a brief time and in any case was instigated by Jehu, not Athaliah.

Judah's defense and trade treaty with Israel had been established during the reign of Jehoshophat.<sup>13</sup> Its purpose was to increase international commerce. This would benefit the merchant class in Judah while it developed trade in Israel under Omri and Ahab.<sup>14</sup> This is reflected in the joint, but unsuccessful effort to revive the port of Ezion-geber.<sup>15</sup>

The Israel-Judah pact was sealed by the marriage of Athaliah, daughter of King Ahab of Israel, to Jehoram, son of King Jehoshophat and heir to the throne of Judah.<sup>16</sup> Judah also made an alliance with Phoenicia during Jehoshophat's reign to increase trade profits.<sup>17</sup> The alliance was created either to promote a three-way trade between Judah, Israel, and Phoenicia, or because Athaliah was the progeny of Jezebel and Ahab,<sup>18</sup> and therefore half Phoenician and naturally interested in a pact between Phoenicia and Israel. It is possible that both factors were in operation.

The period from the reign of Jehoshophat through that of Athaliah was one of international instability in Judah. The Arameans and Assyrians were a menace to Jehoshophat.<sup>19</sup> During the reign of Jehoram, Philistine and Arabian marauders invaded the royal palace and took its treasures, the royal wives, and all the princes except Ahaziah.<sup>20</sup> Ahaziah was later killed in Israel by Jehu.<sup>21</sup>

The Baal cult was established in Jerusalem during the reign of Jehoram as a result of the influence of his wife, Athaliah.<sup>22</sup> This act probably enraged the conservative Yahwist temple based elements in Judah.<sup>23</sup> Although Athaliah was a follower of Baal, it is likely that she did not emphasize this fact after she took over the throne of Judah. The central ideology is illustrated by the Yahwist names of the kings of Judah.<sup>24</sup> Athaliah had difficulty legitimizing her rule because she was not from the Davidic line.<sup>25</sup> She could not afford to alienate the populace further by emphasizing the worship of Baal over Yahweh. Baal worship, after all, was generally limited to the court aristocracy and did not involve the general populace.<sup>26</sup> The marriage of Jehosheba to Jehoiada, the priest,<sup>27</sup> illustrated the importance and power of the Jerusalem temple.

During his reign, Jehoram barred the internal instability of Judah by killing his brothers and their partisans when he mounted the throne.<sup>28</sup>

This instability can be seen again in Athaliah's act of murdering the royal seed. Because of the unstable political situation, it was important for her (Athaliah) to have the support of a central ideological and constitutive body which could provide stability and legitimacy to the ruler. The Temple served this purpose; therefore, it would have been counter-productive for Athaliah to openly undermine the ideology and authority of the temple by publicly stressing the importance of the Baal cult. At the same time, she could not eliminate the Baal cult from Jerusalem because foreign allies (especially Phoenicia) might look upon this act as being hostile to them. It was also known that Athaliah was a follower of Baal,<sup>29</sup> and her sudden elimination of Baal from Jerusalem might have been viewed as an act of trickery and insincerity by segments of the populace. The only reasonable course of action open to Athaliah lay in showing that she did not oppose the temple of Yahweh, in agreeing to give

it nominal support (she appeared in the temple before she was assassinated).<sup>30</sup> and in de-emphasizing her commitment to the Baal cult.

#### CHAPTER IV - THE JEHOIADA REVOLT

The conditions which made a revolt against Athaliah possible are not given in the Bible. The only way to ascertain the cause of the revolt and why it happened is to reconstruct the time period based on the little information available concerning the political situation in Judah during the rule of Athaliah. This reconstruction must utilize an understanding of political institutions and their mode of function.

The people of Judah were not pleased that Athaliah was their ruler.<sup>1</sup> Athaliah was part Phoenician and a follower of Baal.<sup>2</sup> She probably was not able to detach herself ideologically from the label of devotee of Baal.<sup>3</sup> The nationalistic feelings against the Baal cult in Judah during her rule were particularly strong.<sup>4</sup> These nationalistic feelings, in addition to Athaliah's inability to claim descent from the Davidic line, were probably used against her by lower echelon officials who had the public's ear (e.g. the head priest, who ultimately led the revolt against her).<sup>5</sup> At the time of the coup against Athaliah, the officers of the army and palace guard opposed her,<sup>6</sup> but the reason for this is not given in the Bible.

The Temple-based Yahwistic priesthood was probably powerful during Athaliah's reign. During the reign of Jehoshophat, Athaliah's father-in-law, prominent priests were appointed to the temple.<sup>7</sup> Evidence of the wealth and power of the priesthood was their ability to hire mercenary troops, to buy or requisition arms, and to create an alliance between the king and the priests through the marriage of Jehoram's daughter to Jehoiada the priest.<sup>8</sup> Athaliah was probably forced to rely upon the priesthood for her legitimization as ruler of Judah. Another illustration of the great power of the priesthood was the fact that the leader of the coup against Athaliah was a Temple priest, Jehoiada.

An additional factor that might have led to the revolt was the possible loss of wealth and power by the rich merchants who supported Athaliah, a result of the end of the trade pact with Israel,<sup>9</sup> and the declining international status of Judah during Athaliah's rule.<sup>10</sup> Athaliah's power base in the merchant class was threatened by the unstable international situation and the merchant's concomitant financial problems. It is also probable that the people in government were not pleased with their

positions in the governmental ladder and were happy to support a coup that would move them a few rungs higher. The priests were obviously not satisfied with the amount of power that they had and did not want to be accountable to the throne for their actions (a result of Jehoshaphat's temple reform).<sup>11</sup> They naturally seized the opportunity to break away from a king or queen's control.<sup>12</sup>

As stated above, the causes of the revolt can only be hypothesized. It is possible that the revolt occurred six years after Athaliah took control of Judah<sup>13</sup> because at that point prince Joash was old enough to give public credence to a revolt against Athaliah based on his right to take the throne.

In the beginning of Athaliah's seventh year of rule, Jehoiada the priest called together the officers of the palace guard, temple security and foreign mercenaries<sup>14</sup> in his employ for a secret conference in the Temple of Yahweh.<sup>15</sup> During the course of the meeting, Jehoiada told them of his desire to overthrow Athaliah and asked for their support. (II Ki 11:4). These high-ranking military officers agreed to give Jehoiada their support. He then showed them Joash, in whose name the coup was to be executed.<sup>16</sup> The Bible

uses the word "covenant" to describe the conspiracy against Athaliah,<sup>17</sup> whereas in II Ki 9:14 the word, "conspiracy" is used to describe Jehu's plot against Joram. Perhaps this difference can be explained by the fact that Jehoiada was a priest and the direct spokesman for Yahweh. This meant that the officers plotting against Athaliah were considered to be making a covenant with Yahweh. It was done through Jehoiada to reinstate the Davidic line in Judah. Therefore they were not considered to be conspiring to overthrow a legitimate monarch.

Jehoiada planned the coup solely with the officers.<sup>18</sup> This act kept the plot a secret until the time of its execution. Only officers need to know the plan of a coup; soldiers will automatically follow the orders of their officers.

Jehoiada meticulously laid out the plans of the coup against Athaliah to the officers.<sup>19</sup> A Sabbath was chosen for executing the coup since that would maximize the element of surprise.<sup>20</sup> The movement of troops in the Temple area was least noticeable then, because troops generally were prominent in the Temple area on the Sabbath.<sup>21</sup> The Sabbath was probably also the time that the queen came out of the palace and went

to the Temple of Yahweh. This simplified the killing of Athaliah because it isolated her from the palace guard and placed her in the Temple which would be controlled by Jehoiada and the segment of the palace guard loyal to him. Another probable reason for choosing Sabbath is that Jehoiada presided over the Temple service and could give immediate legitimacy to the coup in the name of Yahweh, whom he would innocently appear to serve. A large number of people would be in the Temple (especially if the day was the New Year as well as the Sabbath),<sup>22</sup> and Jehoiada could rally their support against elements loyal to Athaliah such as her bodyguard. The people in the Temple could act as future witness that Joash was anointed king over Judah in the prescribed manner<sup>23</sup> and that the true heir to the Throne of "David" was the king.

Jehoiada took great care that no harm came to Joash during the coup. He arranged for Joash to be guarded throughout the execution of the coup.<sup>24</sup> Jehoiada could not risk an assassination of Joash by hostile forces since this would remove his prepared claim to legitimacy - Joash would be a natural target while in the Temple at the time of his coronation as

king.<sup>25</sup> Ralbag states that Jehoiada ordered the army of priests to guard Joash as an added precaution because Jehoiada was completely sure of their loyalty to him and the coup.<sup>26</sup> If Joash were killed during the course of the coup, the ideological claim of the coup; restoring the rightful heir to the throne of David, would die with him. Athaliah would be able to make it appear that Jehoiada killed Joash in a selfish attempt to usurp the throne of Judah.

Jehoiada's plan for the coup (as well as his role in the coup and governmental position after the coup) indicates that he was far more powerful than an average priest. Jehoiada was a leader of the group deposed from leadership by Athaliah or Jehoram. His wife was King Joram's daughter, Jehosheba.<sup>27</sup> He had funds sufficient for hiring the mercenaries necessary for executing the coup.<sup>28</sup> His marriage to Jehosheba may have been the bond in the pact between the king and the aristocracy behind him. Jehoiada's position in the Temple was probably that of a security officer. Jehoiada's wife was charged with guarding Joash by Athaliah.<sup>29</sup> Jehoiada was familiar with the officers of the palace and Temple guards,<sup>30</sup> and he knew how to secure mercenary troops and where to utilize them.<sup>31</sup>

Jehoiada also had access to the Temple arsenal.<sup>32</sup> Jehoiada acted like general Jehu in that he planned the coup, unlike Elisha, who merely gave the word to start the coup. Jehoiada followed what is now considered standard coup theory in formulating his plan for the take-over. He used the party militia of priests and levites, and relied on speed and surprise in the coup.<sup>33</sup> Jehoiada deployed his troops in the most effective way,<sup>34</sup> and he was able to control the "streets" during and after the coup. He must have known the importance of doing so.<sup>35</sup> Last but not least of Jehoiada's qualifications was his political training, which enabled him to run the country after the coup was over.<sup>36</sup>

The coup against Athaliah was executed according to plan. The military followed Jehoiada's instructions to the letter.<sup>37</sup> Joash was anointed with the crown and insignia, (which the Hebrew commentaries explain as meaning the Torah)<sup>38</sup> and the people in the Temple happily accepted Joash as their king. The anointment of Joash made Athaliah an enemy of the state which was a legitimate reason for killing her. Athaliah was killed immediately after she learned of the coup and before she could rally support to counter the coup.<sup>39</sup>

After the initial stage of the coup was past and Joash was established as king, two covenants were made among Yahweh, the king, Jehoiada and the people. Jehoiada had the power to make the covenants and therefore to determine the terms of their fulfillment.<sup>40</sup> In the first covenant the people and the king promised to serve Yahweh.<sup>41</sup> Yahweh was served in the Temple, which was supervised by Jehoiada. The second covenant was contingent on the first.<sup>42</sup> In political terms the people would follow Joash if he followed the laws of Yahweh as Jehoiada interpreted them. Since Jehoiada was the spokesman for Yahweh, these two covenants gave him the right to be the king's top advisor and his guardian.

The word "Am" was used in the covenants. In the context in which "Am" appears, the word probably means "the general governing body of Judah."<sup>43</sup> The covenants were made because the governing body did not have enough power at that time to liquidate the whole governing body of Judah. Jehoiada therefore needed the support of lower governmental officials before he killed the higher governmental people. He therefore publicly indicated his willingness

to spare the lower officials if they accepted his government.

After the covenants were accepted by all parties concerned, the populace destroyed the alters of Baal.<sup>44</sup> This occurred immediately after the death of Athaliah.<sup>45</sup> The Baal Temple was destroyed for broader reasons than popular contempt for Athalia (as Gray suggests)<sup>46</sup> and the house of Ahab. It represented the end of Athaliah's rule in Judah and showed to the people Joash's zeal for Yahweh. The active part played by the populace in destroying Baal gave the people a chance to participate in the coup and commit themselves to Joash and Jehoiada.

The Bible mentions that Mattan, the priest of Baal, was killed when the Baal Temple was destroyed.<sup>47</sup> If Mattan was important enough to be singled out by name as a victim of the coup, it is possible that he was Athaliah's liason to the Yahweh Temple or at least was connected to the Temple of Yahweh. The reason for this was that the ideology of Judah was Yahwism. Mattan was probably labeled a Baal priest to legitimize his assassination. The evidence for Mattan's connection with the Temple of Yahweh is II Ki 11:18, which states that immediately after

Mattan's death "the priest appointed officers over the house of the Lord,"<sup>48</sup> replacing Mattan and the court-appointed priests of Athaliah. This verse also might indicate that segments of the royal body-guard and Temple guard loyal to Athaliah were replaced.

Other victims of the coup were the court and cabinet of Athaliah. In II Ki 11:20 it states, "And they slew Athaliah with the sword." This phraseology may connote public execution. Further evidence for the liquidation of Athaliah's high government officials is the statement in II Ki 11:16 which first reported her death. It is unlikely that Athaliah herself would have been killed so late in the coup. The delay would have given her time to rally support against the forces of the coup, and Joash's life would have been in danger as long as she lived. There is no reason to expect that Jehoiada would have taken such an unnecessary risk after he took elaborate precautions in safeguarding Joash's life. If only the death of Athaliah had been required for Jehoiada to seize power in the name of Joash, she would have been assassinated without a coup. By definition a coup is sudden

overthrow of a government and its leader: Athaliah's regime had to be eliminated.

The Bible reports that Jerusalem was quiet after the coup.<sup>49</sup> The populace had accepted the new regime of Joash,<sup>50</sup> opposition forces had been eliminated, and Jehoiada controlled the streets through police who were loyal to him.

CHAPTER V - THE REIGN OF JOASH OF JUDAH

Joash was seven years old when he was placed on the throne of Judah in the year 835 B.C.E.<sup>1</sup> In the beginning of his forty year reign, Joash was controlled by the temple priesthood.<sup>2</sup> He was not old enough to run the country without assistance.<sup>3</sup> The priest who engineered the coup against Athaliah was now reaping the reward of the labor. Jehoiada, the chief priest, ran the country in the name of Joash, who gave Davidic legitimacy to his rule. Evidence for Jehoiada's rule over Judah is found in II Ki 12:3 where it states, "Jehoiada the priest instructed him" ("him" meaning Joash). Malbim states the word instructed in this verse means told. He further states that Jehoiada did merely not teach Joash what to do but actually told him what to do.<sup>4</sup> Other Hebrew commentaries state that Joash made mistakes in governmental policy after Jehoiada stopped instructing him, which they say stopped when Jehoiada died.<sup>5</sup> These commentaries imply that Joash did everything that Jehoiada told him to do, which made Jehoiada the real ruler of Judah.

During Joash's reign, idol worship existed in Judah, even when the country was controlled by the Jerusalem priesthood.<sup>6</sup> It is likely that idol worship existed to serve the foreigners in Judah at that time, and posed no threat to the temple priests, as Baal worship might have done. The reason that the "high places" did not threaten the authority of the Yahweh priests was that priests were in power and not vying for power as they were under the reign of Athaliah.<sup>7</sup> It was impossible for a cult priest to legitimize ideologically his rule in Judah, where the ruling ideology was controlled by the Temple.<sup>8</sup> Tolerating the "high places"<sup>9</sup> was a politically sound move on the part of Jehoiada. The officials of the "high places" probably kept order among their followers, and instructed them to be loyal to Joash and his government. Under this system of toleration, the government was able to control segments of the population with little police action.

Joash's emancipation from priestly control came in his twenty-third year as king of Judah.<sup>10</sup> The Hebrew commentaries place Joash's emancipation after the death of Jehoiada, the head priest, but

the biblical data indicates that it came before Jehoiada died.<sup>11</sup> Joash wanted control over the state treasury, (meaning the Temple funds)<sup>12</sup> and subordination of his chief vizier, Jehoiada to him.<sup>13</sup> Joash used the issue of Temple repairs to acquire the power that he wanted.<sup>14</sup> He chose this issue because it was visible,<sup>15</sup> which meant that he could legitimize his action of taking control of the treasury to the people of Judah.

In implementing his plan for seizing the treasury, Joash first told the priests to repair the Temple.<sup>16</sup> He left the manner in which the repairs were to be done to their discretion (II Ki 12:5-6). Joash made his order known to the public.<sup>17</sup> When the priests failed to make the repairs,<sup>18</sup> Joash decreed that the priests were no longer to have complete control over the Temple funds.<sup>19</sup> The priests' inactivity legitimized Joash's action,<sup>20</sup> The priests had been shown to be incompetent and perhaps dishonest.<sup>21</sup>

The Temple funds were taken out of the hands of the priests and placed in a collection box.<sup>22</sup> The funds in the collection box could not be removed through the same hole through which they entered.<sup>23</sup>

This prevented the priests from stealing the funds. The chief priest and royal scribe were the only people who had access to the funds in the collection box<sup>24</sup> and were responsible for counting it as well.<sup>25</sup> In political terms, the manner in which the Temple funds were collected acted as a system of checks and balances between the palace and Temple. The priests and their backers would know the amount of funds Joash controlled. The royal scribe and chief priest distributed the funds allocated for repairing the Temple.<sup>26</sup> With only two people handling these funds, it was less likely that they would be misplaced. Gold and silver vessels were not made for the Temple.<sup>27</sup> Joash did not want the priesthood to get an extra share of the state revenues. The individual priests received a share of the Temple revenues already.<sup>28</sup> The Bible further reports that the system used for controlling the treasury and repairing the Temple was successful.<sup>29</sup>

Judah's foreign affairs during the reign of Joash were disastrous.<sup>30</sup> Joash lost the territory of Gath to Hazael of Aram.<sup>31</sup> He also gave Hazael the state treasury from the Temple, in exchange for not attacking Jerusalem.<sup>32</sup> Joash probably had

a weak army before Hazael's invasion. There is no mention of Joash fighting Hazael after he captured Gath. Joash did not fight Hazael before the Temple treasury was surrendered.<sup>33</sup>

The Bible reports that Hazael made a show of power near Jerusalem, and then left with the Temple funds.<sup>34</sup> Joash probably felt that fighting Hazael's army would be futile, causing the destruction of Jerusalem besides the loss of the treasury. It is possible that Joash's army was weak, because he did not have the necessary funds to raise a large well equipped fighting force. The cost of repairing the Temple and the priestly check on Joash's military spending were the probable reasons he could not raise a powerful army.

Joash's rule ended with his assassination.<sup>35</sup> The Bible states that the motive for Joash's assassination was revenge, for his killing the sons of Jehoiada.<sup>36</sup> Jehoash was assassinated by members of the palace guard.<sup>37</sup> It is unlikely that an outsider could get close enough to Joash to kill him. The account of Joash's assassination in II Chronicles shows that his assassination was motivated by the Temple priests.<sup>38</sup> The priests possibly had Joash killed

to cover up for their error in not giving him adequate funding for his army, which might have saved the Temple funds from Hazael. Joash acted as a living reminder to the people of Jerusalem of the priests' blunder in this matter.

Amaziah was a co-regent with Joash for a period of two years before Joash was assassinated.<sup>39</sup> It is possible that Amaziah was involved in the assassination plot against his father. The upper echelon priests could have offered Amaziah complete control of Judah after Joash was eliminated if he maintained an equilibrium of power between the palace and the Temple. After the death of Joash there is no change mentioned in government leadership, except Amaziah's accession to the throne of Judah.<sup>40</sup> This further exhibits that Joash's assassination was planned by high ranking officials in his government.

Amaziah might have been the ruling figure in Judah while Joash was still alive, because of the drop in Joash's popularity, after he lost the Temple funds to Hazael.<sup>41</sup> While Amaziah was at the head of the country, Joash was possibly building up power away from the watchful eye of the priesthood.<sup>42</sup>

Joash was probably soliciting support from second or third echelon ruling elements in Judah who aspired to have more power. The priesthood probably learned that Joash desired to rule Judah again (either on the throne or through his son, Amaziah) and had him liquidated. If Joash's plot had materialized, the top echelon ruling elements in Judah would have lost some of their power and control.

## CHAPTER VI - THE REIGN OF JEHOAHAZ OVER ISRAEL

Jehoahaz ascended the throne of Israel peacefully after the death of Jehu, his father,<sup>1</sup> in the year 813 B.C.E.<sup>2</sup> He became king of Israel without changing the governmental structure institutes of Jehu. The internal political structure of Israel, must therefore have been relatively stable.

The Bible reports that the Asherah, a fertility symbol, was in the capital during Jehoahaz's reign.<sup>3</sup> The report of the Asherah in Samaria came after his first military campaign with Aram.<sup>4</sup> Asherah was a foreign goddess, possibly introduced to Samaria by Adad-Nirari III or Assyria, who saved Israel from total destruction by Hazael.<sup>5</sup> Idol worship existed in Israel during the time of Jehu,<sup>6</sup> but there is no report of Asherah worship in the capital. The fact that Asherah is specifically mentioned in II Ki 13:6 indicates the possibility that it was not in the capital during Jehu's time. This hypothesis is mentioned here because there is circumstantial evidence to support it.

The foreign political situation in Israel during Jehoahaz's reign was grim. The trade and defense pact

between Israel and Judah, which was interrupted during the reign of Jehu, was not re-established. In II Ki 12:7, which tells of Joash's rule of Judah, and in II Ki 13:1, which reports the beginning of Jehoahaz's reign over Israel, there is no allusion to a treaty between Israel and Judah, nor is such an allusion to be found anywhere else in these two chapters. It is possible that Israel and Judah would not have suffered from Hazael of Aram as much as they did **if** they had jointly opposed him.<sup>7</sup>

The Bible reports that Aram oppressed Israel greatly during the reign of Jehoahaz.<sup>8</sup> Aram's first campaign against Jehoahaz was lengthy and costly to Israel.<sup>9</sup> This campaign ended when Israel was saved by a nameless deliverer.<sup>10</sup> The English commentaries claim that Israel's deliverer was Adad-Nirari III of Assyria.<sup>11</sup> The Hebrew commentaries say that Israel's deliverer was Jehoash.<sup>12</sup> If Jehoash was indeed Israel's deliverer, Jehoahaz would have been able to claim ideological legitimacy to rule Israel. He could claim that Yahweh chose his son, Israel's deliverer to save Israel from destruction. Even if Jehoash was not Israel's "deliverer" Jehoahaz may have claimed that Jehoash

saved Israel anyway, for the reason mentioned above. In practical terms, Jehoahaz's role as protector exhibited to the people that he and his son were able to save them in times of trouble and that it was to their benefit to have Jehoahaz as their king. This strengthened Jehoahaz's control over the people. Jehoahaz might have suspected that Aram would trouble Israel in the future, in which case Jehoahaz could utilize Jehoash's status as hero (which he had acquired during the first war with Aram) to rally the people around him or his son. Thus Jehoahaz would be able to field a fighting force with which to oppose Aram, while maintaining order among the populace as well. Ralbag disagrees, stating that the only reason Israel was not destroyed by Aram was because of God's covenant with the Fathers, and not because of Jehoahaz's merit.<sup>13</sup> Israel's second campaign with Aram ended in defeat for Israel.<sup>14</sup> Jehoahaz's chariot corps was destroyed by Aram, and his army retreated.<sup>15</sup> After this defeat, Jehoash became Jehoahaz's co-regent.<sup>16</sup> Jehoash's popularity as hero and defender of Israel was probably utilized to maintain order and control among the frightened populace of Israel.<sup>17</sup> The people of Israel were

told that their hero, Jehoash, would protect them from total subjugation by Aram.

Jehoahaz died a peaceful death, and Jehoash became the sole ruler of Israel without incident.<sup>18</sup> Jehoash retained the same governmental and popular structure that his father Jehoahaz and grandfather Jehu had before him. Hence, Jehoash went to Elisha for advice.<sup>19</sup> Elisha, the seer who conspired with Jehu against Joram,<sup>20</sup> was the representative of the conservative land-owning elements of the population.<sup>21</sup>

## CHAPTER VII - THE REIGN OF JEHOASH OF ISRAEL

During the reign of Jehoash (796-781 B.C.E.),<sup>1</sup> Israel once more went to war with Aram. This time it took the offensive.<sup>2</sup> Jehoash sought Elisha's permission to undertake this venture.<sup>3</sup> Elisha's opinion was crucial because he represented the aristocratic land-owners and the seer-priests who controlled the ideology of Israel. Joash's consultation of Elisha testified to the great powers that the seer represented.<sup>4</sup> Elisha's power lay in his role as spokesman for the most important elements in Israel.<sup>5</sup> Jehoash also needed Elisha to legitimize the war with Aram in order to gain popular support. Elisha's approval was indicated by placing his hands on the bow held by Jehoash.<sup>6</sup>

After Elisha and Jehoash agreed that it was in Israel's best interest to go to war against Aram, they discussed the military goals to be pursued. Elisha, representing the landed class in Israel,<sup>8</sup> wanted Jehoash to regain as much land as possible.<sup>9</sup> Shooting the arrows eastward<sup>10</sup> probably symbolized Jehoash's main target of attack. Ralbag states that the arrows were shot in that direction to fool

Aram<sup>11</sup> into thinking that Israel was going to attack to the east. Joash's act of striking the arrows on the ground<sup>12</sup> further symbolized his military objectives. Elisha was displeased with the amount of land Jehoash desired to retake from Aram<sup>13</sup> and indicated this displeasure to Jehoash.<sup>14</sup> Elisha wanted Jehoash to fight Aram for more land than Jehoash had indicated.<sup>15</sup> The text suggests that Jehoash followed his original plan and did not recapture all the territory Elisha wanted him to retake.<sup>16</sup> It has been suggested that Jehoash did not recover Trans-jordan.<sup>17</sup>

The Bible suggests a number of reasons why Jehoash declared war on Aram. The Moabites were invading Israel at the time Jehoash and Elisha were discussing the possibility of going to war with Aram.<sup>18</sup> The biblical material and the Hebrew commentaries indicate that the Moabites invaded Israel yearly, and that they captured food, horses, and men.<sup>19</sup> The Moabite raids might have increased in intensity and number because of Israel's war with Aram.<sup>20</sup> The rich land owners were not pleased with these destructive raids,<sup>21</sup> and probably encouraged the war hoping to diminish the scope and number of Moabite raids.

Israel's opportunity for victory over Aram came when Adad-Nirari III of Assyria mounted a campaign against Aram. The campaign reached as far as Damascus before being crushed. Ben-hadad II was laid under ruinous tribute.<sup>22</sup> Israel's first opportunity for victory against Aram may have come when Hazael died and Ben-hadad II, his son, assumed leadership of Aram.<sup>23</sup> Hazael's death may well have led to internal instability, and Ben-hadad could have encountered opposition for the throne of Aram. While Ben-hadad was occupied with these domestic difficulties, Aram was sufficiently weakened to make possible a victory for Israel.

Jehoash seized this opportunity to retake the cities that Hazael had captured from Jehoahaz.<sup>24</sup> The Bible mentions that Jehoash captured cities twice (see II Ki 13:25) but does not mention that he captured other areas. Perhaps only cities<sup>25</sup> are mentioned because the territory of a city included all the farmland around it, along the line of a city-state. Or perhaps Jehoash's main objectives were populated cities, which would explain Elisha's dissatisfaction with Jehoash's proposed targets.<sup>26</sup>

The conquest of cities benefited the merchant class more than the rural landed class, especially if

the cities were situated on major trade routes. Could Jehoash have made a pact with the merchant class in Israel; a pact which was expanded by his son and successor Jeroboam II?<sup>27</sup> If Jehoash had made such a pact, it was by no means an indication that he was seeking to undermine the landed class. The cities recaptured by Jehoash might have been controlled by the landed class. These cities could have provided the landed class with markets in which to sell their farm goods.

## CHAPTER VIII - THE REIGN OF AMAZIAH

Amaziah became king over Judah after the assassination of his father, Joash.<sup>1</sup> It is likely that he maintained close contact with the priesthood, not attempting to exert power over them. He consulted the priesthood on important matters of state, at least in the beginning of his rule. The Bible provides the name of Amaziah's mother and states that she was a Jerusalemite.<sup>2</sup> This information may have been provided to show that Amaziah's mother came from a priestly family.

Amaziah's blood connection to the priesthood as well as his willingness to work with the priests was probably the reason he was chosen to succeed Joash as king. Amaziah could have been assassinated at the same time his father was, for he was co-regent with Joash,<sup>3</sup> and another member of the Davidic line placed on the throne of Judah if the priesthood felt threatened by him (even though he was the rightful designated heir to the throne).<sup>4</sup> But Amaziah was acceptable. "He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord."<sup>5</sup> This statement about Amaziah is made when he first took office, before

the kingdom was securely established under his control.<sup>6</sup> The biblical passage is actually stating Amaziah's qualifications for being the king of Judah.

Sacrificing at the "high places" was permitted during the reign of Amaziah,<sup>7</sup> as it was during the reign of Joash.<sup>8</sup> The "high places"<sup>9</sup> were allowed to exist for political reasons, in that they served the needs of the people who were further removed from Jerusalem and posed no threat to the Temple cult. If they had posed a threat, they probably would have been disbanded. They might have served the merchants in Elath as well.<sup>10</sup> The priests at these local shrines probably instructed their followers to support Amaziah's government. This enabled Amaziah to keep order among various segments of the population of Judah.

After Amaziah had established his rule, he avenged his father's death.<sup>11</sup> He killed the assassins of Joash following Near Eastern custom<sup>12</sup> in order to show that he had not usurped the throne from his father. Amaziah killed only those people actually involved in the assassination. Killing the entire families of his father's assassins<sup>13</sup> might have

functioned as a greater deterrent against future assassinations of kings. If Amaziah had killed the families of the assassins he would have angered the priesthood and possibly caused an internal rift within the government.<sup>14</sup> The priests behind Joash's assassination may have guaranteed the families of the assassins immunity from punishment. Amaziah acted leniently (his action was obviously out of the ordinary because the Bible makes special mention of it)<sup>15</sup> with the families of the assassins because he did not feel threatened by them. They literally served Amaziah when he first became king of Judah. They were his "servants."<sup>16</sup>

The priesthood supported Amaziah's treatment of the assassins of Joash.<sup>17</sup> They claimed that Amaziah was following the law of Yahweh by killing only the actual murderers of his father and not their children.<sup>18</sup> Amaziah was portrayed as righteous for having spared the children for the wrongdoing of their fathers.<sup>19</sup> This is in direct contradiction to the sins of Jezebel.<sup>20</sup> Ideologically Amaziah could easily have killed the children of his father's assassins.

During Amaziah's rule, Judah went to war with

Edom and defeated her in the Valley of Salt.<sup>21</sup> Edom had been an ally of Judah,<sup>22</sup> but Judah went to war against her to gain control of the trade route to Elath.<sup>23</sup> Jehoash of Israel was Amaziah's ally in the war against Edom,<sup>24</sup> but Israel's troops never actually fought in the war.<sup>25</sup> As a result of the war, Judah collected the spoils of victory but was probably left with a weakened army. Israel desired the territory and spoils gained by Judah in the Edom campaign,<sup>26</sup> and set out to capture them.

As previously stated Jehoash had been willing to help Amaziah in his war against Edom.<sup>27</sup> Malbim states that Jehoash went so far as to send troops to Judah to fight with Amaziah, though these troops never actually fought.<sup>28</sup> Judah refused the military help of Israel because the leaders in Judah did not want to share the spoils from the Edomite campaign with Israel.<sup>29</sup> The spoils and territory which Judah had gained gave them added advantages over Israel. Over an extended period of time this would upset the balance of power between the two countries.<sup>30</sup> Jehoash obviously did not want the power balance to change in Judah's favor. He used the forces he had sent Judah to subvert Amaziah's army.<sup>31</sup> Jehoash probably took this action only after the weakness of

Amaziah's army had been ascertained. Jehoash was careful to avoid forcing Judah into a war that Israel could not win. Jehoash subverted Amaziah's forces to shame him into declaring war on Israel, a successful tactic.<sup>32</sup> The main reason Jehoash wanted a war against Israel was to gain control of the Elath trade route that Amaziah had taken from Edom.<sup>33</sup>

Amaziah declared war on Jehoash to save face. It was necessary for him to show his people that the wrongdoing of Jehoash's men<sup>34</sup> would not go unpunished. Jehoash's response was exactly what Amaziah had hoped it would be. Jehoash probably was not able to declare an unprovoked war on Judah directly; the ideological strength of the Jerusalem Temple, the center of the cult of Yahweh, was central to both Judah and Israel.<sup>35</sup>

Jehoash chose the battleground for the war against Judah. This place was naturally to his advantage.<sup>36</sup> Perhaps Jehoash was able to invade Judah<sup>37</sup> and fight the war there because Israel deployed its troops favorably before war was declared, and Judah did not. After Jehoash defeated Amaziah's army,<sup>38</sup> he advanced to Jerusalem<sup>39</sup> and destroyed part of the city wall.<sup>40</sup>

Jehoash captured Amaziah before he entered Jerusalem.<sup>41</sup> This facilitated Jehoash's relatively bloodless entry into Jerusalem. There is no mention in the Bible of a battle over Jerusalem or any resistance to Jehoash and his men once they entered Jerusalem. Jehoash released Amaziah in Jerusalem.<sup>42</sup> In return, Amaziah probably told the army and populace in Judah to surrender to Jehoash. Jehoash's main objective in Jerusalem was to loot the Temple and palace treasures.<sup>43</sup> These funds increased Jehoash's personal wealth and possibly his power.

The section of the city wall destroyed by Jehoash was the gate of Ephraim.<sup>44</sup> This destruction of the gate might have been used to exhibit Israel's superiority over Judah.

Departing from Jerusalem, Jehoash took hostages.<sup>45</sup> They were children of high-ranking officials and military officers.<sup>46</sup> He thereby ensured the cooperation of their fathers in his treatment of Judah as Israel's tributary.<sup>47</sup>

If Joash had not desired to make Judah a tributary, he would probably have killed Amaziah and the high officials of Judah, rather than taking their children hostage.<sup>48</sup> Jehoash allowed Amaziah<sup>49</sup> and his court to survive because he needed them to

rule Judah. With Amaziah ruling, Jehoash was spared most of the expense of maintaining order and control in Judah through the use of troops.

Fifteen years after Jehoash looted Jerusalem,<sup>50</sup> Amaziah was assassinated.<sup>51</sup> The plot involved the palace guard, temple priests, and Amaziah's son and co-regent Azariah.<sup>52</sup> The Bible reports that Amaziah learned of the conspiracy in time.<sup>53</sup> Even with foreknowledge, however, Amaziah was unable to quell the conspiracy.<sup>54</sup> He was not able to take refuge in Jerusalem and fled to Lachish where he was killed.<sup>55</sup> Amaziah's inability to use the palace guard for protection suggests the guards complicity in the assassination. The Bible also indicates that Amaziah was not protected by Azariah, his son and successor, and was therefore forced to flee from Jerusalem.<sup>56</sup> Thus Azariah too, must have been involved in the assassination. There is no mention in the Bible of Azariah's execution of Amaziah's assassins. This further points to his complicity in the death of Amaziah.

There are three main reasons why Amaziah was assassinated. First, the ruling elements in Judah, including Azariah, wanted to break away from Israel's

control.<sup>57</sup> Amaziah handed Judah as a tributary of Israel. II Ki 14:28 reveals Judah's tributary status to Israel: "And Jeroboam recovered Hamath and Damascus for Judah in Israel." After Amaziah's death, Azariah restored some autonomy and developed Elath.<sup>58</sup>

The second reason for Amaziah's assassination was that Judah's army officers wanted more power.<sup>59</sup> After the assassination, Azariah enlarged Judah's army,<sup>60</sup> which was probably weak from the war with Israel and years of tributary status.

The third reason for Amaziah's assassination was popular opposition to the government's support of Judah's tributary status. Amaziah was probably blamed for Judah's trouble. The people were probably told that the country's problems would be solved with Amaziah gone. The Bible indicates that the people were pleased with Azariah's kingship, probably for this reason.

CHAPTER IX - THE REIGN OF JEROBOAM II

Jeroboam II was the last long-reigning king from the Jehu dynasty, 786-746 B.C.E.<sup>1</sup> The Bible credits him with restoring to Israel the lands captured by Aram.<sup>2</sup> Jeroboam was victorious over Aram for two reasons: First, the money Jehoash took from Amaziah and the revenue from Judah, were used by Jeroboam to acquire mercenary troops and to build a powerful army capable of defeating Aram. Second, Aram was experiencing difficulties from other countries besides Israel. This made Aram vulnerable, especially if it was forced to deploy troops along the Israelite border. Historical evidence stresses that Adad-nirari III and Shalmaneser IV weakened Aram.<sup>3</sup> Assyrian kings may have had a pact with Jeroboam, forcing him into attacking Aram. Their battle plan aimed at causing Aram to fight a war on many fronts at the same time. This served to weaken Aram's self defense.

Aram's foodstuffs were being depleted as a result of the war with Assyria. Aram depended on the food produced by the territories which Israel was attacking. Aram therefore was forced to supply troops and maintain order among its hungry populace without having sufficient

supplies to do both.

Before Jeroboam went to war against Aram, he consulted the ruling elements in Israel. The seer Jonah ben Amittai<sup>4</sup> approved his plan. The Hebrew commentaries credit Jonah with anointing Jehu and urging him to revolt against Joram.<sup>5</sup> This is unlikely because of the long interval between the anointment of Jehu and the reign of Jeroboam. But Jeroboam's consultation with the seer illustrates that he had the same support as Jehu and Jehoash, who also consulted Elisha before going to war with Aram.<sup>6</sup> A crucial part of political and military decision making was conducted in conjunction with the seer-priests. Jeroboam, like Jehoash and Jehu, lacked the power or ability to act independently of the rich and powerful people in Israel. The consultation process shows that the supporters of the Jehu coup achieved their goals, including having a controllable king. Omri and Ahab had been too independent and had consolidated too much power for themselves.<sup>7</sup> This made them difficult to control. When Jeroboam later amassed great wealth, power, and land, the Jehu dynasty was eliminated.

Jeroboam was given permission to fight Aram.

because the ruling landed class in Israel anticipated the benefit of its outcome.

After the campaign against Aram, Judah received its independence from Israel. According to Malbim this occurred in Jeroboam's twenty sixth year of rule.<sup>8</sup> Judah also received the territory of Damascus and Hamath recaptured by Jeroboam.<sup>9</sup>

With Aram defeated, Israel was probably the strongest nation in the area except for Assyria; therefore it was to Israel's advantage to have an ally whom she could trust. Judah had been a tributary of Israel for so long<sup>10</sup> that she posed no military threat to Israel. By showing Amaziah that Judah could benefit from an alliance with Israel and by giving Judah independence and territory as a sign of good faith, Jeroboam obtained the ally he needed.

Jeroboam planned a trade pact with Judah.<sup>11</sup> Judah controlled the port of Elath,<sup>12</sup> which Israel needed for development of international trade. As a result of such trade, Jeroboam became the wealthiest king of the Jehu dynasty.<sup>13</sup>

Jeroboam controlled a considerable amount of territory.<sup>14</sup> The Bible makes no mention of any great wars besides the war with Aram during Jeroboam's

wealth was not depleted or strained. There is no hint in II Kings of social or political instability during his reign. Jeroboam had forty-one years<sup>15</sup> to entrench himself firmly in the political and economic life of Israel. The rich and powerful merchant class was probably under his control. They realized they owed their wealth to Jeroboam. He was thus able to establish a measure of independence from the dominant landed class in Israel. He was able to invest the war booty from Aram to increase his wealth still further.

But Jeroboam was becoming a threat to the old landed element in Israel. They knew from the case of Omri that the wealthier and more powerful a king, the more difficult he is to control. Though the landowners were probably prospering under Jeroboam, their monetary gains were insufficient to compensate for their loss of power. It would have been ideologically difficult to discredit Jeroboam because he had been duly enthroned as a king chosen by Yahweh to save Israel from Aram and he had accomplished that task.<sup>16</sup> Nonetheless that they may have attempted to do so is suggested by II Ki 4:24, where Jeroboam is accused of "doing evil" and failing to properly follow Yahweh.

The accounts of Jeroboam's victories may have been retold to depict him as Yahweh's tool and to show that Israel was saved because of the suffering of the people and not because of the merit of Jeroboam, and interpretation suggested by II Ki 14:26,27.

Apparently this was unsuccessful. Israel's landed elements waited for Jeroboam to die before they made their move to re-capture their power. Almost immediately after his son Zechariah ascended the throne,<sup>17</sup> he was publicly assassinated,<sup>18</sup> and his assassin seized the throne.<sup>19</sup> The assassin was clearly a public person who had been part of the governments of Jeroboam II and Zechariah and was supported by the landed elements.

Zechariah's assassination might have revealed the bad social conditions in Israel. The general populace had not recovered from the troubles which were stated in II Ki 14:26. Shallum was the only assassin to execute a king publicly in either Judah or Israel during the hundred year period from Jehu to Zechariah, the only one who had no ideological claim to the throne. The landed aristocracy supported Zechariah's assassination ideologically by stating Yahweh had promised that the dynasty would rule for only four generations.

For the second time in a hundred years, the landed aristocracy of Israel had ended a dynasty which they had originally supported. Because of the resultant apparent discrepancy with Yahwistic ideology, Zechariah's assassin had to be killed.<sup>20</sup> This occurred one month after he became king.<sup>21</sup> Hence the claim could be made that Yahweh's will had been carried out by destroying the assassin - an illegitimate pretender to the throne.

## EPILOGUE

The chapters of II Kings examined in this thesis follow the deuteronomistic tradition of the book of Samuel. This is evidenced by the fact that all the kings of the Jehu dynasty are regarded as sinners and strayers from Yahweh's laws, as David and Saul did at one time or another. In both these books, seer-priests act as Yahweh's messengers, announcing the end of the rule of Saul and the Omri dynasty. Eissfeldt states that all the kings of Israel mentioned in the book of Kings are condemned.<sup>1</sup> II Ki 9-14 conveys the message that there is no perfect being except Yahweh, and since no human being is perfect, he should not possess the uncontrollable power reserved for Yahweh alone. Deuteronomy supports this assumption by stating that a king must not accumulate excessive wealth.<sup>2</sup> Wealth represents power. The historical accounts in the book of II Kings take on new meaning in light of the concept of royal power and modern political analysis.

The kings and institutions such as the Temple priesthood and seer-priesthood exhibit the same mode of political operation. They all go through the process of establishing, maintaining and justifying their power

and authority. Each of these processes was necessary to insure a lasting and successful rule. It was necessary for a king to justify his right to rule (especially if he deposed another king) in order to control the populace in the most effective and least expensive manner. He did so by showing his love for the country and its constitution, and demonstrating his allegiance to the people. Halbag and Ramban<sup>3</sup> show this principle in operation during Jehu's coup. Joash's covenant with the people after the coup against Athaliah<sup>4</sup> afford another example of a king legitimizing his rule to the nation. It is similar to the oath of office taken by the president of the United States, where he swears to uphold the constitution. The only difference between Joash's covenant with Yahweh and the inauguration of a president is that Yahwism was the constitutive ideology of Israel. It has also been shown that Jehu, in executing his coup against Joram, acted in the same manner as a modern day general.<sup>5</sup>

The maintenance of control, authority, and power by individuals and institutions has been examined in this thesis. It has further been demonstrated that certain institutions exist in order to safeguard the power of different groups like the seer-priesthood

and the landed aristocracy. Examples of kings maintaining their power are Jehu and Athaliah, who killed the contenders for their thrones. Others are Joash, Amaziah, and Azariah of Judah, who allowed the "high places" to function during their reigns.<sup>6</sup> These kings could have supported the "high places" (where Yahweh was served)<sup>7</sup> to counterbalance the power of the priests of the Jerusalem Temple. The "high places" had a large number of followers. The officials at these places were in a position to insure the loyalty of their followers, especially if the "high places" and their officials were controlled by the king. It is clear from the Bible that an institution may be sound even if the individuals running it are not. The institution of the monarchy was retained because it was needed to control the internal and external affairs of the country.

The Hebrew commentaries used in this thesis exhibit an understanding of politics. At times the English commentaries used were not able to arrive at satisfactory reasons for political events such as the war between Jehoash and Amaziah. Nonetheless, in many cases the explanations of the Hebrew Commentaries are theological. They do not explain how

Yahwism was applied by the ruling elements in Israel for control and legitimation.

In the process of reconstructing the Jehu dynasty with the application of contemporary political analysis, the concept of power was stressed. One of the points explained is that a king does not possess all the power and control that he may seem to have, and that people or groups or people actually control a king. The best example of this is Jeroboam II. Jeroboam was reported to be the richest and most powerful king of the Jehu dynasty. After his death, his son and his successor was quickly assassinated. As previously stated, the reason for Zechariah's assassination was that the power and wealth accumulated by Jeroboam (which Zechariah probably inherited) made him a threat to the powerful individuals in Israel who originally supported him. The concept that people who are not in public office possess power and influence is also operative in modern-day politics. This power becomes visible when governments pursue policies that on the surface appear to be solely motivated by justice and morality, with no apparent special benefit to any group or individual. Under closer analysis and scrutiny, these political policies

are seen to benefit a select few, as was shown to  
be the case with the Jehu dynasty.

INTRODUCTION      -      FOOTNOTES

1. John Smith, The Interpreters Bible, A Commentary In Twelve Volumes, ed. George A. Buttrick et. al. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954) III, 231. (will be abbreviated from now on as I.P.)
2. C.F. John Bright, A History of Israel, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), p. 225., (on theology to evaluate history), c.f. Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (Great Britain: Western Printing Services LTD. Bristol, 1965), p. 283., (on judgment of the individual kings)

CHAPTER I

-

FOOTNOTES

1. c.f. I Kings 12.16-20 (for beginning of kingdom of Israel)
2. I Kings 12.19-20
3. Harry M. Orlinsky, Understanding The Bible Through History And Archeology, (New York: KTAV Publishing, 1972), p. 150.
4. Ibid., p. 148.
5. Ibid., p. 150.
6. Bright op. cit. p. 234.
7. Orlinsky op. cit. p. 160.
8. Bright op. cit. p. 236.
9. I Kings 16.8-11. I Kings 16.15-18
10. I Kings 16.2
11. c.f. Bright op. cit., p. 236, on the need for stability
12. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 160.

13. Ibid., c.f. B. Levi, Della, Vida, "Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research" no. 90 (Jerusalem and Baghdad: 1943), pp. 30-34. (influence of Phoenicia on countries other than Israel)
14. Ibid., p. 162, c.f. Bright op. cit., p. 238. (Israel's source of wealth during reign of Omri) c.f. Albright "Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research" no. 87 (Jerusalem and Baghdad: 1942), pp. 23-29. (on the international situation during time of Omri)
15. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 162, Bright op. cit., p. 238.
16. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 162.
17. Bright op. cit., p. 238.
18. II Kings 8.16-18, c.f. Bright op. cit., p. 238.
19. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 162, Bright op. cit., p. 241, The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962) (will be abbreviated from now on as I.D.B.)
20. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 162.

21. I Kings 21.1-3, Orlinsky op. cit., p. 164,  
c.f. Smith, The Interpreters Bible, op. cit.,  
p. 173.
22. Bright op. cit., p. 242, Albright, Archeology  
and the Religions of Israel (Baltimore: The  
John Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 157.
23. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 164.
24. II Kings 9.1-10

CHAPTER II

- FOOTNOTES

1. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 164, Bright op. cit., p. 244.
2. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 164, c.f. Bright op. cit., p. 244 (war with Mesha).
3. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 164.
4. John Gray, I and II Kings, A Commentary, (Philadelphia and Great Britain: The Westminster Press, 1964, 1970) p. 538.
5. I.D.B. op. cit., p. 818.
6. II Kings 9.2,14, c.f. I.B. op. cit., p. 230.
7. II Kings 9.25, Gray op. cit., p. 540.
8. II Kings 10.15 c.f. Bustany Oded, Encyclopaedia Judaica (Jerusalem, Israel: Keter Publishing House Ltd., and McMillian Company, N.Y., 1971) IX, 1328. (will be abbreviated from now on as E.J. plus volume number. Author given to article first time cited only).

9. I.B. op. cit., p. 230, Bright op. cit., p. 245.
10. c.f. Malbim to II Kings 9.6
11. I Kings 21.20-21
12. c.f. Bright op. cit., p. 247.
13. II Kings 9.5
14. Gray op. cit., p. 540.
15. Rashi, Malbim and Mezudat David to II Kings 9.1
16. II Kings 9.5
17. II Kings 9.6
18. Ibid.
19. Malbim to II Kings 9.2
20. Gray op. cit., p. 540.
21. I Samuel 10.1, I Samuel 16.3, c.f. Montgomery and Gehman, The International Critical Commentary, Volume 3, ed. S.R. Driver et. al. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, 1951), p. 400. (abbreviated from now on as I.C.C. (all notes from volume 3)

22. II Kings 9.11
23. I.W. Slotki, Kings - Hebrew Text and English Translation With an Introduction and Commentary  
3rd ed. (London: The Soncino Press, 1961),  
pp. 216-217
24. II Kings 9.3, c.f. Rashi to II Kings 9.1,  
Ralbag, Mezudat David and Malbim to II Kings 9.2
25. c.f. Malbim to II Kings 9.2
26. Gray op. cit., pp. 542,543, Slotki op. cit.,  
p. 213.
27. Ralbag, Mezudat David to II Kings 9.14
28. II Kings 9.15-16
29. II Kings 9.15-16, Ralbag to II Kings 9.14,  
Slotki op. cit., p. 218, Edward Luttwak, Coup  
D'Etat (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1969),  
pp. 48-49.
30. II Kings 9.15
31. c.f. Malbim to II Kings 9.16 (why it was ad-  
vantageous to kill Joram in Jezreel)

32. Slotki op. cit., p. 218.
33. II Kings 9.17
34. II Kings 9.18-19
35. II Kings 9.20
36. II Kings 9.21
37. Slotki op. cit., p. 219.
38. Malbim to II Kings 9.21
39. Gray op. cit., p. 547.
40. c.f. Yigal Yadin, The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands (Great Britain: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), II, 297. (On military tactics used in capturing a city)
41. II Kings 9.20
42. II Kings 9.22
43. II Kings 9.24
44. II Kings 9.23
45. II Kings 9.27

46. Rashi to II Kings 9.27, Slotki op. cit., p. 220.
47. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 178.
48. Gray op. cit., p. 539.
49. c.f. II Kings 11.1 (on change of the throne of Judah after Ahaziah's death)
50. II Kings 9.30
51. Slotki op. cit., p. 221.
52. II Kings 9.31
53. II Kings 9.32
54. II Kings 9.33
55. c.f. II Kings 9.33-37 (on death of Jezebel)
56. c.f. Martin A. Cohen "In All Fairness to Ahab" Israel Exploration Journal (Israel: Israel Exploration Society, 1974), vol 24, no. 2, p. 4, Bright op. cit., p. 242, Albright op. cit., p. 219, (On the power of Jezebel during and after the reign of Ahab)
57. c.f. II Kings 10.2-5 (On Jehu's letter to Samaria)

58. II Kings 10.0
59. c.f. Gray op. cit., pp. 553-554 (on identity of officials who received Jehu's letter)
60. II Kings 10.2-3
61. c.f. II Kings 10.4-5 (on capitulation to Jehu by officials in Samaria)
62. Gray op. cit., p. 553.
63. Rashi to II Kings 10.1
64. II Kings 10.2-3
65. II Kings 10.6
66. Ibid.
67. II Kings 10.8-10
68. Mezudat David to II Kings 10.8
69. I.C.C. p. 409.
70. I.B. op. cit., p. 237.
71. II Kings 10.11

72. Ramban to II Kings 10.11
73. II Kings 10.13-14
74. Malbim to II Kings 10.12-14, Mezudat David to II Kings 10.13
75. II Kings 10.15
76. I.B. op. cit., p. 240.
77. c.f. I.B. op. cit., p. 240, I.C.C. op. cit., p. 409, Gray op. cit., p. 559 (on customs and practices of Rechabites)
78. I.B. op. cit., p. 243.
79. II Kings 10.16, I.C.C. op. cit., p. 410.
80. c.f. Gray op. cit., p. 559 (On use of Rechabites in Jehu's coup)
81. II Kings 10.17
82. c.f. Gray op. cit., pp. 553-554 (on the capture of Samaria by Jehu)
83. II Kings 10.18-21
84. II Kings 10.19-20

85. II Kings 10.18
86. II Kings 10.22-23, Slotki op. cit., p. 227.
87. Meḡudat David to II Kings 10.25
88. II Kings 10.23
89. II Kings 10.26
90. II Kings 10.24
91. c.f. Bright op. cit., p. 238, Albright op. cit.,  
p. 157 (on followers of Baal)
92. I.C.C. op. cit., pp. 410-411.
93. II Kings 10.22
94. Slotki op. cit., p. 227.
95. Oded, E.J. volume 9, op. cit., p. 1329, Meḡudat  
Zion to II Kings 10.16
96. Meḡudat Zion to II Kings 10.16
97. II Kings 10.26,27
98. I.C.C. op. cit., p. 411
99. II Kings 10.29

100. Albright op. cit., pp. 160-161.
101. Albright op. cit., p. 160.
102. Albright op. cit., p. 157.
103. Oded, E.J. volume 9, op. cit., p. 1329.
104. Albright op. cit., p. 156.
105. II Kings 9.7, I.D.B. op. cit., p. 817.
106. II Kings 9.7
107. I.C.C. op. cit., p. 398.
108. II Kings 9.1
109. c.f. Cohen op. cit., p. 6. (on plan to revolt against Ahab)
110. II Kings 9.1-9
111. Gray op. cit., p. 537.
112. Ibid.
113. c.f. Cohen op. cit., p. 4. (on seer-priesthood and Ahab)
114. c.f. Ibid. (ruling ideology of Israel)

115. II Kings 9.22, I.B. op. cit., p. 234.
116. Ralbag to II Kings 9.25
117. Meḡudat David to II Kings 9.30
118. II Kings 9.35-37
119. II Kings 9.31
120. c.f. I Kings 16.8-18 (on reign and death of Zimri)
121. Malbim to II Kings 9.7, Rashi to II Kings 10.9
122. II Kings 8.27, Meḡudat David to II Kings 9.27
123. Slotki op. cit., p. 225, Meḡudat David to II Kings 10.14
124. c.f. Cohen op. cit., p. 4. (on ruling ideology of Israel)
125. II Kings 10.8-10
126. Rashi to II Kings 10.9
127. II Kings 10.1
128. II Kings 10.17

129. c.f. Ramban to II Kings 10.30 (a reason Jehu killed Joram)
130. Bright op. cit., p. 250.
131. c.f. Cohen op. cit., (on group that was opposed to Ahab)
132. c.f. Ibid. (merchant class in Israel during time of Ahab)
133. Bright op. cit., p. 238.
134. Gray op. cit., p. 539.
135. c.f. Mezudat David to II Kings 10.30,32, I.D.B. H.B. MacLean, op. cit., pp. 818-819. (on aftermath of Jehu coup)
136. c.f. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 166, E.J. vol. 9, op. cit., pp. 1329-1330, I.C.C. op. cit., p. 413 (all agree of this point)
137. I.D.B. MacLean, op. cit., pp. 818-819.
138. Rashi to II Kings 10.29
139. c.f. Cohen op. cit., p. 5 (on consolidation of power by Omri)

140. Bright, op. cit., p. 254, c.f. M. Haran,  
Vetus Testamentum, Volume XVII, 1967, pp. 266-  
297. (on recovery of territory lost by Jehu  
during reign of Jeroboam II)

CHAPTER III

-

FOOTNOTES

1. II Kings 11.1, Gary op. cit., p. 71, Slotki op. cit., p. 230, E.J. Vol. 3 op. cit., p. 814.
2. II Kings 11.1, Slotki op. cit., p. 230, Mezudat David to II Kings 11.1
3. Bright op. cit., p. 249.
4. II Kings 11.2
5. Ibid.
6. Reviv, E.J. Vol. 3 op. cit., p. 814.
7. Gray op. cit., pp. 570-571, Slotki op. cit., p. 230.
8. II Kings 11.3
9. II Kings 11.1
10. Bright op. cit., p. 249.
11. c.f. Reviv, E.J. Vol. 3 op. cit., p. 814, Bright op. cit., p. 238. (on policies of Jehoshophat)

12. Bright op. cit., p. 250.
13. Ibid., p. 238.
14. c.f. Ibid. (benefit from Israel-Judah treaty)
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., Orlinsky op. cit., p. 178, Reviv, E.J.  
Vol. 3 op. cit., p. 814.
17. Bright op. cit., p. 238.
18. II Kings 8.18, Orlinsky op. cit., p. 182.
19. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 178.
20. Ibid., p. 182.
21. II Kings 9.27, Ibid.
22. c.f. Bright op. cit., p. 249, Albright op. cit.,  
p. 157. (on establishment of Baal cult in  
Judah)
23. c.f. Albright op. cit., p. 160. (on Baal  
influence in Judah)
24. Ibid.
25. Bright op. cit., p. 249.

26. Ibid.
27. II Chronicles 22.11, Ibid.
28. Ibid., Orlinsky op. cit., p. 182.
29. Bright op. cit., p. 249.
30. II Kings 11.13-16

CHAPTER IV

- FOOTNOTES

1. Bright op. cit., p. 249, Orlinsky op. cit., p. 182.
2. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 182.
3. Bright op. cit., p. 249.
4. I.C.C. op. cit., p. 417, Gray op. cit., pp. 565-566.
5. II Kings 11.4
6. Ibid., c.f. Slotki op. cit., p. 232. (role of Palace Guard in coup against Athaliah)
7. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 180.
8. II Kings 11.10, Slotki op. cit., pp. 230,232.
9. Bright op. cit., p. 250.
10. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 182.
11. Ibid., p. 180.
12. II Kings 11.4
13. Ibid.

14. c.f. Slotki op. cit., p. 230, I.B. op. cit., p. 246. (for identity of officials involved in coup against Athaliah)
15. II Kings 11.4
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. II Kings 11.5
19. c.f. Rashi to II Kings 11.5, Malbim to II Kings 11.8, II Kings 11.5-9. (on troop deployment)
20. Ibid., Gray op. cit., p. 572.
21. c.f. II Kings 11.13-14 (on surprise of Athaliah when she saw Joash on platform in Temple)
22. Gray op. cit., p. 72, I.D.B., MacLean op. cit., p. 909.
23. II Kings 11.12
24. II Kings 11.8
25. c.f. Ramban to II Kings 11.6, Meqadat David to II Kings 11.5 (On need for security for Joash)

26. Ralbag to II Kings 11.5
27. II Chronicles 22.11
28. Slotki op. cit., p. 230.
29. c.f. Reviv, E.J. Vol. 3 op. cit., p. 814.  
(on status of Joash when Athaliah was ruler)
30. II Kings 11.4
31. Slotki op. cit., p. 230.
32. II Kings 11.10
33. Ralbag to II Kings 11.5, c.f. Luttwak op. cit.,  
p. 50. (which explains account in II Kings 11.14  
in light of modern day coup theory)
34. II Kings 11.5-8
35. II Kings 11.17
36. II Kings 12.3
37. c.f. II Kings 11.9-15 (for account of military  
action during coup)
38. c.f. Malbim, Rashi and Mezudat David to II Kings 11.12  
(for explanation of insignia)

39. II Kings 11.15
40. II Kings 11.17
41. c.f. Ralbag, Mezudat David and Rashi to II Kings 11.17 (for fuller explanation of the covenants Joash, Jehoiada, and the people entered into with Yahweh)
42. c.f. Ralbag, Rashi to II Kings 11.17 (for explanation of how the first covenant was contingent upon the second)
43. Slotki op. cit., p. 234.
44. II Kings 11.18, c.f. Malbim to II Kings 11.19 (on destroying the Baal)
45. Mezudat David to II Kings 11.18, c.f. Gray op. cit., p. 566, I.B. op. cit., p. 246, I.C.C. op. cit., pp. 417, 422, 423. (on the destruction of the Baal, when it occurred and who was involved)
46. Gray op. cit., p. 566.
47. II Kings 11.18
48. Ibid.

49. II Kings 11.20

50. c.f. Slotki op. cit., p. 234. (on approval by  
populace of coup and Joash)

CHAPTER V

-

FOOTNOTES

1. II Kings 12.1, c.f. Meḡudat David to II Kings 12.2  
(on the way Joash's reign calculated), I.D.B.  
op. cit., p. 909, Hayim Tadmor, E.J. Vol. 10  
op. cit., p. 110.
2. Gray op. cit., p. 586.
3. II Kings 12.1-2
4. Malbim to II Kings 12.4
5. c.f. Rashi, Meḡudat David to II Kings 12.1,  
Ralbag to II Kings 12.4 (on how Jehoiada's  
instruction to Joash was given)
6. II Kings 12.3,4
7. II Kings 12,3, 11.1-20
8. II Kings 12.3, 11.17
9. II Kings 12.4
10. II Kings 12.7
11. II Kings 12.10, c.f. Meḡudat David, Ralbag,  
Malbim to II Kings 12.4 (on death of Jehoiada)

and result to Joash)

12. II Kings 12.5-7, Gray op. cit., p. 589.
13. c.f. II Kings 12.8, 12.3 (on position of Joash to Jehoiada)
14. II Kings 12.5-17
15. c.f. Slotki op. cit., p. 236. (on temple repairs)
16. II Kings 12.6
17. Malbim to II Kings 12.5, 6, 7, 8, 9
18. II Kings 12.7
19. II Kings 12.8
20. Ibid.
21. Malbim to II Kings 12.7-9
22. II Kings 12.9-10
23. Mezudat David to II Kings 12.10
24. II Kings 12.11, c.f. I.B.Smith op. cit., p. 251.  
(title of chief priest)

25. Mezudat David, Rashi to II Kings 12.11,  
I.B. op. cit., p. 251.
26. II Kings 12.12
27. II Kings 12.14
28. II Kings 12.17
29. II Kings 12.16
30. c.f. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 182. (on foreign  
affairs of Judah during time of Joash)
31. II Kings 12.18, I.B. op. cit., p. 252, I.C.C.  
op. cit., p. 4530, E.J. Vol. 10 op. cit.,  
p. 111.
32. c.f. Rashi, Ralbag to II Kings 12.18 (Hazael's  
attack on Joash)
33. II Kings 12.19, Slotki op. cit., p. 238,  
I.C.C. op. cit., p. 430.
34. II Kings 12.19
35. II Kings 12.21
36. II Chronicles 24.25, Malbim, Rashi to II Kings 12.21

37. II Kings 12.21,22
38. II Chronicles 24.25, Gray op. cit., p. 604.
39. Gray op. cit., pp. 74,604.
40. II Kings 12.22
41. II Kings 12.18
42. c.f. II Samuel 18.1-19.3 (Absalom revolt  
against David)

CHAPTER VI       -       FOOTNOTES

1.    II Kings 13.1
2.    Gray op. cit., p. 74.
3.    II Kings 13.6
4.    II Kings 13.3-6
5.    I.C.C. op. cit., p. 433, Hayim Tadmor, E.J.  
Vol. 9 op. cit., pp. 316-317.
6.    Slotki op. cit., p. 240.
7.    c.f. II Kings 12.18-19, 13.3,7 (the parallel  
     reigns of Judah and Israel and wars with  
     Aram)
8.    II Kings 13.3,7
9.    II Kings 13.3
10.   II Kings 13.10
11.   c.f. I.C.C. op. cit., pp. 433-434, E.J. Vol. 9  
     op. cit., pp. 1316-1317, Bright op. cit.,  
     pp. 232-253. (on Israel's deliverance from  
     Aram)

12. Ralbag to II Kings 13.4, Rashi and Mezudat David to II Kings 13.5
13. Ralbag to II Kings 13.4
14. II Kings 13.7
15. II Kings 13.7, E.J. Vol. 9 op. cit., p. 1317, c.f. Mezudat David to II Kings 13.3 (on Jehoahaz's battle with Aram)
16. c.f. Malbim to II Kings 13.14, Mezudat David to II Kings 13.10, Gray op. cit., p. 74. (on co-regency of Jehoash)
17. Malbim to II Kings 13.10
18. II Kings 13.9
19. II Kings 13.14
20. II Kings 9.1
21. Orlinsky op. cit., p.164.

CHAPTER VII

-

FOOTNOTES

1. Ralbag to II Kings 13.22, Gray op. cit., p. 74.
2. II Kings 13.25
3. II Kings 13.14
4. c.f. Ralbag to II Kings 13.14 (an address of Jehoash to Elisha), Gray op. cit., p. 598.
5. c.f. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 164. (on ruling elements in Israel)
6. II Kings 13.16, Ralbag to II Kings 13.16
7. II Kings 13.17
8. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 164.
9. II Kings 13.19
10. II Kings 13.17
11. Ralbag to II Kings 13.17
12. II Kings 13.18
13. II Kings 13.19

14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. II Kings 13.25
17. c.f. Haran op. cit., pp. 266-297. (territory regained by Jeroboam, not Jehoash)
18. II Kings 13.19
19. II Kings 13.19, I.B. op. cit., p. 250, c.f. Mezudat David to II Kings 13.20, Rashi to II Kings 13.20 (on invasion of Moabites in Israel)
20. c.f. II Kings 13.7, Gray op. cit., p. 600 (victory of Aram over Israel)
21. c.f. Ralbag, Mezudat David to II Kings 13.20 (spoils Israel lost to Moab from yearly raids)
22. Gray op. cit., pp. 252, 600, I.B. op. cit., p. 260.
23. II Kings 13.24
24. II Kings 13.25

25. Ibid.
26. II Kings 13.19
27. I.D.B. op. cit., p. 842.

CHAPTER VIII

-

FOOTNOTES

1. II Kings 12.22
2. II Kings 14.2
3. Gray op. cit., p. 604.
4. c.f. Orlinsky op. cit., p. 132. (internal politics of Judah during time of Joash and Amaziah)
5. Slotki op. cit., translation used.
6. c.f. II Kings 14.5 (Amaziah not in complete control when he took office of the king)
7. II Kings 14.4
8. II Kings 12.4
9. II Kings 14.4
10. II Kings 14.22
11. II Kings 14.5
12. Gray op. cit., p. 604.
13. II Kings 14.5-6, c.f. Malbim to II Kings 14.7 (on killing of assassins by Amaziah)

14. c.f. E.J. Gutmann op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 798.  
(relationship between priesthood and king)
15. II Kings 14.6
16. II Kings 14.5
17. II Kings 14.6
18. Ibid., Deuteronomy 24.16
19. c.f. Ralbag to II Kings 14.6 (on righteous act  
of Amaziah)
20. c.f. Malbim to II Kings 9.7 (Jezebel's children  
were killed for her sins by Jehu)
21. II Kings 14.7
22. Gray op. cit., p. 600.
23. Gray, op. cit., p. 606.
24. E.J. Vol. 9, op. cit., p. 1317.
25. E.J. Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 798.
26. Gray op. cit., p. 608.
27. Ibid., p. 606.

28. Malbim to II Kings 14.8
29. E.J. Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 798.
30. c.f. Gray op. cit., p. 606. (international political relations between Judah and Israel)
31. Malbim, Mezudat David to II Kings 14.8,  
E.J. Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 748.
32. II Kings 14.8
33. Gray op. cit., p. 608.
34. c.f. Malbim, Mezudat David to II Kings 14.8
35. c.f. E.J. Vol. 9, op. cit., p. 1324.
36. II Kings 14.11, Ralbag to II Kings 14.11
37. II Kings 14.11
38. II Kings 14.12
39. II Kings 14.13
40. Ibid., c.f. Malbim to II Kings 14.13 (on making a break in Jerusalem wall)
41. II Kings 14.13
42. Slotki op. cit., p. 248.

43. II Kings 14.14
44. II Kings 14.13
45. Ibid.
46. Rashi and Mezudat David to II Kings 14.14
47. c.f. Rashi, Mezudat David, Mezudat Zion, to II Kings 14.14 (reason for hostage taken from Jerusalem by Jehoash)
48. II Kings 14.14
49. II Kings 14.17
50. Ibid.
51. II Kings 14.19
52. c.f. II Chronicles 25.14-16, Rashi to II Kings 14.19,22, Gray op. cit., p. 604, Orlinsky op. cit., p. 182. (on people involved in assassination of Amaziah, and the reason for his assassination)
53. II Kings 14.19
54. Ibid., c.f. Rashi to II Kings 14.19
55. II Kings 14.19

- 56. Ibid.
- 57. Orlinsky op. cit., pp. 182, 184.
- 58. II Kings 14.22
- 59. Gray op. cit., p. 613.
- 60. c.f. Orlinsky op. cit., pp. 182, 184. (changes  
in Judah after death of Amaziah)

CHAPTER IX

FOOTNOTES

1. I.D.B. Vol. 5, H.B. McLean op. cit., p. 842,  
c.f. Mezudat David (on dating reign of Jeroboam II)
2. II Kings 14.25, Rashi and Malbim to II Kings 14.25,  
I.C.C. op. cit., p. 443, c.f. Y. Aharoni,  
The Law of the Bible (Eng. translation - London:  
Burns and Oates Ltd; Philadelphia: Westminster  
Press, 1967), p. 313 (territory of Jeroboam II).
3. Gray op. cit., p. 617, I.C.C. op. cit.,  
p. 445.
4. II Kings 14.25
5. Rashi to II Kings 14.25, c.f. Mezudat David,  
Rashi, Malbim to II Kings 9.1 (on anointing  
of Jehu by prophet)
6. II Kings 13.14
7. c.f. Cohen op. cit., p. 5 (power of the  
Omri dynasty)
8. Malbim to II Kings 14.28 -
9. II Kings 14.28, Mezudat David to II Kings 14.28  
(to explain the verse)

10. Malbim to II Kings 14.28
11. Bright op. cit., pp. 254, 255.
12. II Kings 14.22, c.f. N. Glueck Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, no. 79, (Jerusalem and Baghdad: 1940), pp. 13-15.  
(on the rebuilding of Elath during the time of Jeroboam II)
13. Bright op. cit., p. 254.
14. II Kings 14.25
15. II Kings 14.23
16. II Kings 14.26-27, c.f. Mezudat David to II Kings 14.26 (why Jeroboam was savior of Israel)
17. II Kings 14.29
18. II Kings 15.10
19. Ibid.
20. c.f. Mezudat David to II Kings 15.13 (why Shallum, Zechariah's assassin, reigned for one month)
21. II Kings 15.13,14

EPILOGUE

-

FOOTNOTES

1. c.f. Eissfeldt op. cit., p. 283 (on legacy of kings of Israel)
2. Deuteronomy 17.7
3. c.f. Ralbag to II Kings 9.25 (on relationship of Jehu to Bidkar)
4. II Kings 11.17
5. c.f. Luttwak op. cit., pp. 102-149. (on the planning and execution of a coup)
6. c.f. II Kings 12.4, 14.4, 15.4 (on function of "high places" during the reigns of Joash, Amaziah and Azariah)
7. c.f. Albright op. cit., p. 107. (on "high places")

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aharoni, Yohana The Land of the Bible.  
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
2. Albright, William F. Archeology and the  
Religion of Israel. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins  
Press, 1942.
3. Albright, William F. The Biblical Period  
from Abraham to Ezra. New York: Harper  
and Row, 1963.
4. Altschul, Yehiel, Mezudat David and Mezudat  
Zion to II Kings 9-14.
5. Bright, John A History of Israel. 2nd ed.  
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
6. Cohen, Martin A. "In All Fairness to Ahab"  
Israel Exploration Journal, Jerusalem, XIV  
no. 2, 1974.
7. Davis, Eli "Ahaziah" Encyclopaedia Judaica  
Vol. 2, Jerusalem: The Macmillan Company,  
1971, col. 456. (abbreviated as E.J.)
8. Davis, Eli "Athaliah" E.J., Vol. 3, cols. B15-B16.

9. Davis, Eli "Jeroboam II" E.J., Vo. 9, cols. 1364-1375.
10. Eissfeldt, Otto The Old Testament. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
11. Gershon, Levi ben (Gersonides, Hebrew Acronym: Raibag) commentary on II Kings.
12. Gray, John I and II Kings. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
13. Glueck, Nelson "Third Season of Excavations at Tel El-Khelabeh" Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Jerusalem and Baghdad, no. 79, October, 1940, 13-15.
14. Glueck, Nelson "Further Exploration of Negev" Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Jerusalem and Baghdad, no. 179, April, 1965, 6-29.
15. Guttman, Joshua "Amaziah" E.J., Vol. 2, cols. 798-799.
16. Haran, Menachem Vetus Testamentum. Vol. XVIII, "The Rise and Decline of the Empire of Jeroboam Ben Joash" Holland: 1967, 266-297.

17. Holy Scriptures I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles, Deuteronomy 17.7.
18. Isaac, Solomon ben (Rashi) commentary to II Kings 9-14.
19. Isaak, Alan C. Scope and Methods of Political Science. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1969.
20. Luttwak, Edward Coup D'Etat. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.
21. McLean "Jehu" The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. EJ, New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, 817-819. (abbreviated as I.D.B.)
22. McLean "Jehoahaz" I.D.B. Vol. EJ, 810.
23. McLean "Joash" I.D.B. Vol. EJ, 909-911.
24. Michael, Meir, Malbim Commentary on Kings.
25. Montgomery, James and Gehman, Henry The International Critical Commentary - Kings. Great Britain: T. and T. Clark, 1951.
26. Nahman, Moses ben (Nahamanides, Hebrew Acronym-Ramban) commentary on Kings.

27. Oded, Bustany "Jehu" E.J. Vol. 9, cols. 1328-1330.
28. Orlinsky, Harry M. Understanding the Bible Through History and Archeology. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1972.
29. Pritchard, James B. Ancient Near Eastern Texts. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
30. Slotki, I.W. Kings. London: Soncino Press, 1961.
31. Smith, Norman The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 3, New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952.
32. Speiser, Ephraim A. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Jerusalem and Baghdad, no. 77, 1940, 15-20.
33. Tadmor, Hayim "Jehoash" E.J., Vol. 9, cols. 1315-1316.
34. Tadmor, Hayim "Jehoash" E.J., Vol. 9, col. 1317.
35. Tadmor, Hayim "Joash" E.J., Vol. 10, cols 110-111.

36. DeVaux, Roland Ancient Israel. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1961.
37. Wright, George E. Biblical Archeology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.
38. Wright, George E. The Bible and the Ancient Near East. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1961.
39. Yadin, Yigal The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands. Vol. 2, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.