

Book Level Text Linguistics and the Book of Kings  
Shawn C. Madden, Ph.D.  
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Introduction

Robert Longacre, in his *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence* notes that, when considering a text (of whatever length) “discourse analysis insists that the whole legislates the parts, while in turn, a study of the parts is necessary to the comprehension of the whole.”<sup>1</sup> This was born out of his study of Kenneth Pike’s tagmemic theory that posited that within any field or set there were smaller elements that filled functional slots as parts of a larger unit.<sup>2</sup> Teun van Dijk notes that “the interpretation of an expression is determined by the interpretation of each part of the expression.”<sup>3</sup> This theory has been shown to be useful in the linguistic field and beyond.

Longacre, while demonstrating the tagmemic analysis aspects when applied to a simple English noun phrase, notes that “it is even more important to the study of the constituents of the discourse and the paragraph. It is possible to say that discourses of the simpler sort are composed of paragraphs. But what of a discourse as complex as a novel; what are its constituents? Chapters? Episodes? . . . Do paragraphs build into chapters and chapter into episodes and episodes into the whole? Or should we order differently and say that episodes build into chapters? Or is episode a different sort of unit entirely?”<sup>4</sup> This is a particularly important question for the books of the Bible when an exegete is searching for the overall organization (macrostructure) of a work in order to determine the author’s purpose. Upon what pieces is the book built? And how do they fit together to expound the overall intent and theme of the book? In fact, especially in the biblical corpus, theoretically this question can actually go beyond the book level, especially in recent canonical discussions where the relationships of books to each other within the received canon is thought to be in some cases (the 12 prophets, the books of Psalms) the organization and arrangement is thought to give theological significance.

Related to these questions but from another direction are the questions and observations of historiographers. The main problems historians face when writing on an event concern selectivity and organization. To get their point across they have to determine what of the plethora of material that they have before them to include in their text to make their point and, of that material, what will be the organizational scheme. What parts or pieces to use and how those parts should fit together and how they are fitted together involves aspects of the historiographic field. I am convinced that to properly analyze an historians efforts, methods that that borrow both literary and linguistic tools and approaches give the most effective evaluation.

Concerning the selection of materials to make a point, Peter Jackson, when editing the *Lord of the Rings* and deciding what of the many scenes that he had shot should be included in the films, determined that the films were to be Frodo and One Ring centric. To that end he, much to the dismay of Tolkien fans, did not include the Tom Bombadil episode found in the books. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Longacre, *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence, A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39-48*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 40. He provides a mathematical formula for this:  $T_f: \{\Sigma\}$  and  $\Sigma = \{T_1 \dots T_n\}$ .

<sup>2</sup> Kenneth Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior* (Paris: Mouton & Co., 1971).

<sup>3</sup> Teun A. van Dijk, *Text and Context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse* (London: Longman, 1977), 21.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Plenum Press, 1996), 270.

historian has a similar task. He cannot use everything and so must choose what material best serves his interest and intent and in what order to put it. What material that is available to him will maintain his audience's focus on what he thinks is the most important point.

As for the arrangement of those materials, Jackson is again informative here. When approaching the source text for his movies, Jackson had to determine whether to maintain strictly the arrangement that J.R.R. Tolkien created in his story or to modify it to suit it for the film audience. As a film maker, he interwove scenes from the book that were given separate treatment in the book, the book giving long expositions of certain characters while large sweeps of time and events involving other characters was left to the end of the presentation of the one group and their adventures. An historian has that choice available to him. When depicting an event or series of events he is free to modify orders and arrangements to better suit his argument or his audience.

This presentation will be an exploration of the text linguistic and literary strategies that may be found in the book of Kings, particularly looking for the hierarchical relationships of the various elements within the book in an effort to not only discover the author's purpose<sup>5</sup> for the book but also to observe his linguistic and literary effort and strategy to build the structure of the text to demonstrate his purpose. To that end this presentation will seek the central theme of the book and look to see, as much as time allows, how that theme drove the text. A more detailed analysis (too extensive for this presentation) would look at not only the constituent elements that make up the structure of the text but also to determine their role as functional slot fillers in the building of a historical work to its purpose following Pike and Longacre's efforts.

There are two concepts that I keep in mind when approaching the biblical texts. Baruch Halpern noted that, ". . . it is not legitimate to assume, as has often been done, that the editors were unable to see the contradictions, as we moderns do, that the editors [writers, historians] were, in effect, less sentient than we. This is not just arrogant; on the historical record, it is absurd".<sup>6</sup> This serves as an important reminder to we modern folk that the author (editor/redactor) read the same text that we are reading and if there was something amiss in it he would have caught it and corrected it. What we think that we see as an error is more than likely not and so it is incumbent on us to do the hard work to figure out what to us appears to be a problem. And, in that vein, Longacre notes that, ". . . variation in a text is not random but motivated. In brief, where the author has a choice in regard to a lexical item or a grammatical construction, his particular choice is motivated by pragmatic concerns or discourse structure".<sup>7</sup> To this observation I would add, not only linguistic or literary choices but options that are incumbent on any historian when he has a number of characters and events to include in his narrative. To put it succinctly, the writer of Kings knew what he was doing and what he did he did on purpose and with purpose. Our lesson is to take the text seriously from its linguistic, literary, theological, and historical positions and to glean as much as we can from what the author intended to convey by observing the means he used to present his material and how he intended for it to be used by what he included and the emphasis and arrangements that he made.

---

<sup>5</sup> Fairly simple, I think, for the book of Kings—2 Kings 17. Although some commentators (Montgomery and Gehman, *ICC* and Sweeney, *Old Testament Library*) see this chapter as a "homily" or "sermon", I see it as the theme around which the book is written.

<sup>6</sup> Baruch Halper, *The First Historians* (Pittsburgh (?): Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), xxiv-v.

<sup>7</sup> Longacre, *Joseph*, xv.

The book of Kings was chosen for this endeavor due to my own interest and the fact that it is a recognized historical work with an identifiable opening and closing and with a stated purpose.<sup>8</sup> Due to the time limitations of this presentation this will be more of a general, broad level exploration, leaving the detailed work to later.

I have come to see the book of Kings to be organized in the following chunks: Book, Narratives, Episodes, Acts, Scenes, paragraphs/clauses with some commentary interludes within the historic narrative. Within that book I evaluate ‘narratives’ as material that deals with one king and within those narratives there may be episodes dealing with major portions of a king’s reign. Within episodes I see divisions into acts, and within acts I see scenes. Scenes then may be divided into paragraphs, sentences, or clauses, depending on the size and scope of the scene. Acts concern particular subjects within the life or reign of a king and are generally more subject oriented. Scenes then within the act are more specifically location or time bound. Though the terminology is borrowed from the stage, in many ways a historical book may be more closely evaluated with modern film than even a play. Like a film, an author is not restricted to a physically bound stage and the logistics of moving people on and off the stage in a timely manner that could restrict the freedom of storytelling. The writer of a book and the producer of a film, on the other hand, may change people, places, and times with great freedom, allowing for juxtaposition of places, people, and objects to get their point or argument across, a freedom that a playwright does not normally enjoy. So the terminology originates in the play but the analogy is many times more connected to film than the stage and so too the freedom to artistically build the argument.

In the case of Kings we find the added aspect of the author presenting history in the sense of a *Geschichte* or evaluation of events rather than a pure chronicle and mere presentation of the events without comment. For me good history is written rhetorically, to present an argument or evaluation of cause and effect, and when approaching such a text search must be made for the author’s purpose for his presentation. This may be found in a direct statement by the author or as van Dijk would say, in the “semantic coherence” of the text or the “topic of discourse.”<sup>9</sup> In Kings I find a direct statement in 2 Kings 17. Montgomery notes, “It has for subject not mere History, but the lessons of History. There is honest self-judgment in this product of Hebrew historiography. The schism of Israel from the God-ordained Davidic kingdom was due to Solomon’s sins, the fall of the North to its continued defiance of the True Religion, and again the ruin of Judah to the inescapable fate deserved by Manasseh’s sin. The remarkable note is that, when all was lost, someone found the history of that tragic period worth recording as a lesson of God’s discipline of his people.”<sup>10</sup>

### Exposition

In its overall structure The book of Kings is a Historical Narrative Discourse and the historical thesis statement is found in 2 Kings 17.6-23 where we find the author saying why Israel went into exile and then lists the actual charges of the violation of the covenant. In Hebrew Narrative Discourse, Robert Longacre (and others) argues that the backbone or mainline of the information

---

<sup>8</sup> In actuality, again, Kings itself could be evaluated as a tagmemic element in the overall syntagmeme of the Deuteronomic history—i.e., how does it fit in the epic that spans Joshua to Kings or even Genesis to Ezra-Nehemiah?

<sup>9</sup> Teun A. van Dijk, *Text and Context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse* (London: Longman, 1977), 131. So too Longacre, *Joseph*, 17 (3.2.2).

<sup>10</sup> James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951), 44.

is carried in the wayyiqtol clauses. In Appendix A is a layout of the text of 2 Kings 17.6-23 indented along Longacre's Narrative Discourse and Hortatory Discourse Clines, found in Appendix C.<sup>11</sup> Due to space I have not noted the different types of discourse within the pericope. I see only two, narrative and hortatory. The hortatory discourse is found as the statements of the LORD or his prophets, and within this pericope all else is narrative.

Noting van Dijk's injunction concerning semantic coherence, the selectivity concept of historians, and applying Longacre's schema to 2 Kings 17, my thesis is that what is shown to be significant in the discourse structure of 2 Kings 17 will be the governing factor of what elements would have been selected by the historian as he constructed his exposition of the history of Israel and Judah using, for the most part, the conduct of the various kings as his explication. This can particularly be seen in reference to Longacre's discussion of the *peak* of a text or discourse, discussed below.

With that in mind I looked at chapter 17 after I had structured it using Longacre's indentation scheme (Appendix C). Longacre posited that (a) every language has a system of discourse types (e.g., narrative, predictive, hortatory, procedural, expository, and others); (b) each discourse type has its own characteristic constellation of verb forms that figure in that type; (c) the uses of given tense/aspect/mood form are most surely and concretely described in relation to a given discourse type (Longacre 1996: 18-21). . . . The constellation of verb forms that figure in a given discourse type are structured so that one or more privileged forms constitute the mainline or backbone of each type, while other forms can be shown to encode progressive degrees of departure from the mainline."<sup>12</sup> And he admits a bit of circularity to this discussion in that if you see a plethora of wayyiqtol then you have narrative discourse in Hebrew and if you are in narrative discourse you will have a lot of wayyiqtol. Leslie McFall's *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System* includes a set of charts that depicted the translation verbal tense of the Hebrew verbs used in the Revised Standard Version. I took his charts and compiled them to count the number of Hebrew verbal forms and found that you could see Longacre's thesis in the charts (see Appendix D) as the highest concentration of wayyiqtol is found in the narrative books.

As I approached this chapter I saw ten paragraphs based mainly on a change in subject and speaker. This will bear more investigation that will, in the future, look to how the author used those paragraphs to serve the overall intent of the chapter to further explicate the use of the chapter to the whole of Kings. Pike talks about slots and fillers to show the function of tagmemes to the syntagmeme of which they are a part and it is that aspect that I will investigate further later. For the present, as I looked at the paragraphs I noticed that most of the clauses in them were compounded with one or more subordinate clauses and the wayyiqtol clauses were associated with lower cline clauses that gave setting or background information. In discourse function this serves to slow the pace of the narration much as a film does when it is setting up a scene by giving slow panning shots of the area for the scene. So too when there is action, more time spent on an action sequence and few action cuts between scenes tend to slow the action down. In this pericope most of the paragraphs are like that, main wayyiqtol clauses with subordinate clauses and lower cline clauses. The discourse pace is somewhat leisurely. But at verses 16 and 17 things change. I see this as one of what Longacre calls the "zones of turbulence" that is signaling the peak of the section. Concerning this he writes:

---

<sup>11</sup> Longacre, *Joseph*, 79, 121. I followed the NASV for versification. See Appendix C for Longacre's clines (with Madden modifications).

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 58. Ray Clendenen will address this aspect in a paper today (Nov. 17, 2011) entitled "Discourse Type, Slot Machines, and the Hebrew Bible".

Essentially, *peak* is a kind of zone of turbulence in which predictable discourse features are skewed so that certain typical features are removed or partially suppressed, while other features are introduced. It represents a kind of *gear shift* (Madden emphasis) in the dynamic flow of discourse. Only rarely does a language have a special peak-marking features that are used only at peak; rather it is the *shift* from one set of features to another that marks the onset of a peak in a given discourse. . . . Furthermore, peak constitutes a reference point—a quite significant one—in reference to which other parts of the discourse can be plotted.<sup>13</sup>

In verses 16 and 17 there is a string of main clauses all built on the wayyiqtol with neither subordinate clauses nor sublevel clauses. Leading up to verses 16 and 17 there is an almost leisurely listing of the sins of Israel, taking time to go into a bit of detail about how the sons of Israel violated the covenant with the LORD. So too, for the most part, the verses following 16 and 17. But verses 16 and 17 are a staccato of the charges against Israel coming at us as a string of machine gun bullets. Movie wise we are in the midst of the Bourne conspiracy movies where the action is almost too rapid to follow. Linguistically we are at the zone of turbulence.

I see this verse as the peak of the chapter and with the **וַיְהִי כִּי** in verse seven, I see this portion of the chapter as the historical thesis of the book. My question at this point is whether the book itself is built on the elements found in the peak.

The verses appear to be set up as a simple chiasmus with 16.1 and 17.4 as the end elements delineated with “the LORD.” That sets up 16.5 as the center element noting the sin of serving the Baal, which is depicted in the book of Kings as the most grievous of their many sins. The three elements before the notation on “serving the Baal” concern worshipping “gods” other than the LORD; the two calves of Jeroboam’s sin, the “Asherah”, and the “host of heaven”. This ties in nicely with 16.1 and the charge of forsaking the commandments of the LORD, especially as they concern violations of the first two commandments—the worshipping of anyone or thing other than the LORD and the making of idols, even an image of the God of Israel. Of course this is followed by the sin of “serving the Baal.” These are most often depicted as not only the sin of the king but a nationwide sin as well with the king in the forefront of that practice, often forcing it or “causing it.” The sins of the kings of Israel (and Judah on occasion) are laid out for the most part as either following the sin of Jeroboam, worshipping the two calves (which some commentators identify as the violation of the second commandment, the commandment against idols, even idols of the LORD—note Aaron’s description of the calf in Exodus 32.4-5) or committing the sin of Ahab, the violation of the first commandment. The three elements following the Baal charge concern private practices; passing their children through fire, divination, and enchantments.

My question to myself then is, if these verses are indeed the thesis or theme of the book of Kings, then noting van Dijk’s argument for “semantic coherence” I should find the book of Kings built in some way upon what I find in the verse.

---

<sup>13</sup> Longacre, *Joseph*, 18. See also, Longacre, “Discourse Peak as Zone of Turbulence” in *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form*, Jessica R. Wirth, ed. (Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, 1985), 93. “. . . a slowing down of the camera by means of repetition and paraphrase.” *Ibid.*, 97. “The importance of the identification of peak is that it enables us to get at the overall grammar of the discourse. If we can identify a discourse peak, then we can identify pre-peak and post-peak sections. These, plus special beginning and ending sections, give us a surface grammar of discourse that is not dissimilar from the recognition of the subject, verb, and object of the clause level in a language. The verb as a central constituent of the clause can be compared with the peak as a central constituent of the discourse.”

With that in mind I took a list that I had begun on the book of Kings showing the reigns of the various kings of Israel and Judah (Appendix B). I noted their chapters, how many verses were used for each king, how many years the kings reigned and how they were depicted as to how they did in their relationship to David, Jeroboam, and Ahab. I have also begun a simple word search on the words that I found in verses 16 and 17.

It is interesting to me that the first sin named is that of the calves even though the sins of Solomon would precede that chronologically. This I see as a link to Israel's first sin in the desert concerning the first calf. If this bears out we have a direct tie into a somewhat deuteronomic aspect to the effort of the writer of Kings. The author sees the present state of Israel as caused by their sin that goes back to the same sin as their fathers (vs. 14). Besides being first named the sin of the calves, the sin of Jeroboam, is the most often mentioned in the delineation of the performance of the kings. With the possible exception of Hosea, all of the kings of Israel are charged with following Jeroboam in the sin of the two calves. Hosea is described as having done evil, but "not as the kings of Israel who were before him." I have not checked the commentaries for thoughts on what that phrase indicates but, Hosea aside, the institution of the calves as an alternate to the temple in Jerusalem is the most often named sin of the kings of Israel.

The making of Asherah is one of the most prominent of sins, finding reference all the way back to Exodus and the injunction to destroy the Asherah when Israel found them. Which they did not do. It is a sin that transcended the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. It is depicted in the book as both a national sin, particularly in that Manasseh set up an Asherah in the temple and as a personal sin in the many high places with Asherah that we find mentioned.

The sin of bowing down to the "hosts of heaven" provides the weakest support for my thesis in that it is found only in Deuteronomy, here and in 2 Kings 21, being listed as one of the sins of Manasseh. This points to the possibility that, though the charges are listed here while Judah is still an intact kingdom in this portion of the historical narrative, its sins are in the mind of the author and so are also listed as a means of anticipating the demise of Judah for its own failings.

The serving or worship of Baal is, of course, the worst of the sins listed and so in this text takes the key or pivotal position. This is the sin that goes beyond the calf worship instituted by Jeroboam and which helps set up the dichotomy between the sins of violating the first two commandments. It too is an ancient sin, finding itself condemned back to the time of the Judges. Though originally in the text of Kings it is a sin originating in the kingdom of Israel it is listed as one of the sins of Manasseh showing that it transcended the borders and involved even the house of David to the point that even the goodness of Josiah could not undo the evil of this sin.

Deuteronomy 18.10 lists the sins of passing children through the fire, divination, and enhancements together, all as detestable. Within the book of Kings "divination" (קסם) is listed only here and in the Manasseh passage. So too "omens" (נחש). The passing of children through the fire is listed as a sin of Ahaz as well as Manasseh.

## Conclusion

While acknowledging more work to be done in regard of the fuller text of 2 King 17.6-23 and much more work in the whole of the book of Kings, I do believe that I have a solid thesis here. This is born out also in the fact that the main narrative of the book of Kings concerning the individual Kings focuses more on how they themselves violated the covenant with the LORD or how they led their people to also do so and not on any positive accomplishments. Not much past the middle narrative on Solomon and the very few kings of Judah who did right is there anything

positive said about the kings of either kingdom. Their reigns are listed in negative terms related to their sins and violations of the covenant and fairly reflective of the listing of the sins shown in this passage.

## Appendix A

2 Kings 17.6-23

	5	4	3	2	1	1	2	3	4	5	
¶ Introduction-Setting											
בשנת התשיעית להושע											6.1
לכד מלך-אשור את-שמרון											6.2
ויגל את-ישראל אשורה											6.3
וישב אתם בחלה ובחבור נהר גוזן											6.4a
וערי מדי: פ											6.4b
ויהי											7.1
כי-חטאו בני-ישראל ליהוה אלהיהם											7.2
המעלה אתם מארץ מצרים											7.3
מתחת יד פרעה מלך-מצרים											7.4
וייראו אלהים אחרים:											7.5
ויגלו											8.1a
בחקות הגוים											8.1b
אשר הוריש יהוה מפני בני ישראל											8.1c
ומלכי ישראל											8.1d
אשר עשו:											8.1e
ויחפאו בני-ישראל דברים											9.1a
אשר לא-כן על-יהוה אלהיהם											9.1b
ויבנו להם במזות בכל-עריהם											9.2a
ממגדל נוצרים עד-עיר מבצר:											9.2b
ויצבו להם מצבות ואשרים											10.1a
על כל-גבעה גבהה											10.1b
ותחת כל-עץ רענן:											10.1c
ויקטרו-שם בכל-במות											11.1a
כגוים											11.1b1
אשר-הגלה יהוה מפניהם											11.1b2
ויעשו דברים רעים להכעיס את-יהוה:											11.2
ויעבדו הנללים											12.1a
אשר אמר יהוה להם											12.1b
לא תעשו את-הדבר הזה:											12.3
ויגד יהוה בישראל וביהודה											13.1
ביר כל-נביאי כל-חזה לאמר											13.2
שבו מדרכיכם הרעים ושמרו מצותי חקותי											13.3a
בכל-התורה											13.3b
אשר צויתי את-אבותיכם											13.3c
ואשר שלחתי אליכם ביר עבדי											13.3d
ולא שמעו											14.1
ויקשו את-ערפם כערף אבותם											14.2a
אשר לא האמינו ביהוה אלהיהם:											14.2b
וימאסו											15.1a
את-חקיו ואת-בריתו											15.1b1



אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת אֶת־אֲבוֹתָם	which He made with their fathers	15.1b2
וְאֵת עֲדוּתָיו	and His warnings	15.1e1
אֲשֶׁר הָעִיר בָּם	with which He warned them.	15.1e2
וַיֵּלְכוּ	And they walked	15.2a1
אַחֲרֵי הַהֶבֶל <sup>14</sup>	after vanity	15.2a2
וַיִּהְיֶה־לָּהֶם	and they became vain,	15.2a3
וְאַחֲרֵי הַגּוֹיִם	and after the nations	15.2a4
אֲשֶׁר סָבִיבָתָם	which surrounded them,	15.2a5
אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֹתָם	which the LORD had commanded them	15.2a5
לְבַלְתִּי עֲשׂוֹת כְּהֵם:	not to do like them.	15.2a6
וַיַּעֲזְבוּ אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם	They forsook all the commandments of the LORD their God	16.1
וַיַּעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם מַסֵּכָה שְׁנֵי עֲגֻלִים	and made for themselves molten images, two calves,	16.2
וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֲשֵׁרָה	and they made an Asherah	16.3
וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְכָל־צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם	and they worshipped all the host of heaven	16.4
וַיַּעֲבְדוּ אֶת־הַבַּעַל:	and they served the Baal.	16.5
וַיַּעֲבִירוּ אֶת־בְּנֵיהֶם וְאֶת־בָּנוֹתֵיהֶם בָּאֵשׁ	and they made their sons and their daughters pass through the fire,	17.1
וַיִּקְסְמוּ קְסָמִים	and they practiced divination	17.2
וַיַּנְחֲשׂוּ	and they did enchantments,	17.3
וַיִּתְמַכְרוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרָע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה לְהַכְעִיסוֹ:	and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of the LORD, to provoke Him.	17.4
וַיִּתְאַנֶּף יְהוָה מְאֹד בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	So the LORD was very angry with Israel	18.1
וַיִּסְרֶם מֵעַל פָּנָיו	and removed them from His sight;	18.2
לֹא נִשְׁאַר רַק שִׁבְטַת יְהוּדָה לְבָדוֹ:	none was left except the tribe of Judah.	18.3
גַּם־יְהוּדָה לֹא שָׁמְרָה אֶת־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם	Also Judah did not keep the commandments of the LORD their God,	19.1
וַיֵּלְכוּ בְּחֻקֹּת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ:	but walked in the customs which Israel had done.	19.2
וַיִּמְאַס׃ יְהוָה בְּכָל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל	The LORD rejected all the descendants of Israel	20.1
וַיַּעֲזֹב וַיִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד־שׂוֹטְטִים עַד	and afflicted them and gave them into the hand of plunderers,	20.2a
אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁלִיכֵם מִפְּנֵיו:	which He had caused them to be cast from before him.	20.2b
כִּי־קָרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל בֵּית דָּוִד	When He had torn Israel from the house of David,	21.1
וַיַּמְלִיכוּ אֶת־יֶרֶבְעָם בֶּן־נֶבֶט	they made Jeroboam the son of Nebat king.	21.2
וַיִּדַח יֶרֶבְעָם אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאַחֲרֵי יְהוָה	Then Jeroboam drove Israel away from following the LORD	21.3
וַהֲחַטִּי'אָם חַטָּאָה גְדוֹלָה:	and caused them to sin a great sin.	21.4
וַיֵּלְכוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכָל־חַטֹּאוֹת יֶרֶבְעָם	The sons of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam	22.1a
אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה	which he did;	22.1b
לֹא־סָרּוּ מִמֶּנָּה:	they did not depart from them	22.2
עַד אֲשֶׁר־הִסִּיר יְהוָה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל פָּנָיו	until the LORD removed Israel from His sight,	23.1
כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד כָּל־עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים	as He spoke through all His servants the prophets.	23.2
וַיִּגַּל יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל אֲדָמְתוֹ אֲשׁוּרָה	So Israel was carried away into exile from their own land to Assyria	23.3
עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה: פ	until this day.	23.4

<sup>14</sup> Longacre, *Joseph*, 86 for a discussion of preterites being Setting.

## Appendix B

Overall Evaluation of the book of Kings			vss	yrs	Performance of the Kings	Prophet
The Solomon Narrative	Judah	1 Kings 1.1-11.43	434	40		
Rehoboam Narrative	Judah	1 Kings 12.1-24, 14.21-31	35	17		
Jeroboam Narrative (begins with a vayyiqtol as setting, <i>Joseph</i> , 86)	Israel	1 Kings 12.25-14.20	71	22		Ahijah, MofG,
Rehoboam and the sins of Judah	Judah	14.21-31	10	17	High places, pillars, Asherim, קִדְּשֵׁימִ, abominations of the nations	
Abijam Narrative	Judah	1 Kings 15.1-7	7	3	sins of fathers before him, not wholly devoted as David	
Asa Narrative	Judah	1 Kings 15.8-24	17	41	Right like David, put away קִדְּשֵׁימִ, removed idols, removed mother, left high places	
Nadab-Baasha Narrative (Transition?)	Israel	1 Kings 15.25-31	7	2	sins of his father (calves)	
Baasha Narrative	Israel	1 Kings 15.32-16.7	8	24	sin of Jeroboam	Jehu
Elah Narrative	Israel	1 Kings 16.8-14	7	2	idols	
Zimri Narrative	Israel	1 Kings 16.15-20	6	7d	walked in ways of Jeroboam	
Omri Narrative	Israel	1 Kings 16.21-28	8	6	walked in ways of Jeroboam	
Ahab Narrative	Israel	1 Kings 16.29-22.40	209	22	incited by Jezebel, followed idols as the Amorites, Baal	Elj, unnamed, MoG, Michaiah,
Jehoshaphat Narrative	Judah	1 Kings 22.41-50	10	25	Right like Asa, but left high places	
Ahaziah Narrative	Israel	1 Kings 22.51-2 Kings 1.18	21	2	served Baal like Ahab and Jezebel (parents) and in the way of Jeroboam	Elj
Jehoram/Elijah Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 2.1-8.15	191	12	2.3.1., not like Ahab-he put away pillar of Baal, but followed Jeroboam.	Els
Jeroam Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 8.16-24	9	8	walked in the ways of house of Ahab	
Jehu Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 8.25-10.26	68	28	destroyed Baals but walk as Jeroboam	Els
Joash Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 11.1-12.21	42	40	did right but left the high places	
Jehoahaz son of Jehu of Israel Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 13.1-9	9	17	evil, followed sins of Jeroboam	Els
Jehoash son of Jehoahaz of Israel Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 13.10-13	16	16	evil followed sins of Jeroboam	
Amaziah Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 14.1-22	22	29	right but not like David, left high places	
Jeroboam Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 14.23-29	7	41	evil, followed sins of Jeroboam	Ho, Am
Azariah (Uzziah) son of Amaziah Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 15.1-7	7	52	right like Amaziah, but left high places	Is, Ho, Am
Zechariah son of Jeroboam Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 15.8-12	5	6m	evil, followed sins of Jeroboam	
Shallum Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 15.13-16	4	1m	reigned one month, no comment as to right or evil	
Menachem Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 15.17-22	6	10	evil, followed sins of Jeroboam	
Pekahiah Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 15.23-26	4	2	evil, followed sins of Jeroboam	
Pekah Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 15.27-31	5	22	evil, followed sins of Jeroboam	
Jotham Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 15.32-38	7	16	right like Uzziah, but left high places	Is, Ho, Mi
Ahaz Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 16.1-20	20	16	did not do right like David, walked in sins of kings of Israel, made son pass through the fire, burned incense on high places	Is, Ho, Mi
Hosea Narrative	Israel	2 Kings 17.1-6	6	9	did evil, only not as the kings of Israel before him	
Reason for the Book		2 Kings 17.7-41	35			
Hezekiah Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 18.1-20.21	95	29	did right as David and removed high places, broke bronze serpent	Is, Ho, Mi
Manasseh Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 21.1-18	18	55	evil according to the abominations of nations, rebuilt high places, erected altars to Baal, worshipped hosts of heaven, built altars in the house of the LORD for the hosts of heaven, made son pass through fire, witchcraft & divination, mediums & spiritists, set carved image of Asherah in house of the LORD	
Amon Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 21.19-26	8	2	evil as his father Manasseh, forsook the LORD	
Josiah Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 22.1-23.30	50	31	right, walked in way of David, did not turn from right or left, no king like him who turned to the LORD with his whole heart	Je, Zep
Jehoahaz Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 23.31-34	4	3m	evil as his fathers. reigned 3 months	Je
Jehoiakim Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 23.34-24.5	9	11	evil as his fathers	Je
Jehoiachin Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 24.6-16	11	3m	evil as his fathers	Je
Zedekiah Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 24.17-25.7	11	11	evil as his Jehoiakim	
Gedaliah Narrative	Judah	2 Kings 25.8-30	23	7m?	made governor, no comment	



## Appendix C

Verb Rank in Narrative Discourse <sup>15</sup>	
Band Levels	Hebrew Clausal Elements
Band 1: Storyline	1. Preterite: primary <sup>a</sup>
Band 2: Secondary	2.1. Perfect 2.2. Noun + perfect (with noun in focus)
Band 3: Background Activities	3.1. הַגָּהּ + participle 3.2. Participle 3.3. Noun + participle
Band 4: Setting	4.1. Preterite of הָיָה, ‘be’ 4.2. Perfect of הָיָה, ‘be’ 4.3. Nominal clause (verbless) 4.4. Existential clause with שֵׁנִי
Band 5:	5. Negation of verb clause: irrealis (any band) <sup>b</sup>
<sup>a</sup> 1. demotes to 2.2. by preposing a noun. 1. demotes to 5. by preposing אֵלֵּי ‘not’ [Preterite > Perfect]. <sup>b</sup> “Momentous negation” promotes 5. to 2.1./2.2.	

Verb Rank in Hortatory Discourse <sup>16</sup>		
Band Levels	Hebrew Clausal Elements	
Band 1: Primary line of Exhortation	1.1. Imperative (2p) 1.2. Cohortative (1p) 1.3. Jussive (3p) <sup>a</sup>	(unranked) (unranked) (unranked)
Band 2: Secondary line of Exhortation	2.1. אֵלֵּי + jussive/imperfect 2.2. Modal imperfect	
Band 3: Results/Consequences (Motivation)	3.1. וְ (consecutive) perfect <sup>b</sup> 3.2. אֵלֵּי וְ + imperfect 3.3. (Future) Perfect	
Band 4: Setting (Problem)	4.1. Perfect (of past events) 4.2. Participles 4.3. Nominal clauses	
<sup>a</sup> 1.3 substitutes for 1.1 in deferential avoidance of 2p. <sup>b</sup> 3.1 may substitute for band 1—but this possibility involves substitutions of the form of predictive discourse.		

<sup>15</sup>Longacre, 81, diagram 3.

<sup>16</sup>Longacre, 121.

Appendix D  
 from Leslie McFall, *Enigma of the Hebrew Verb*  
 compiled by Shawn C. Madden

	Table 1 וְקָטַל forms	Table 2 קָטַל forms	Table 3 וַיִּקְטַל forms	Table 4 יִקְתַּל forms	Table 5 וַיִּקְתַּל forms	Total
Gen	208	891	2,112	523	82	3,816
Ex	568	503	890	754	60	2,775
Lev	713	190	189	888	6	1,986
Num	419	419	748	638	36	2,260
Dtr	624	536	256	964	45	2,425
Jos	185	429	594	184	10	1,402
Jud	99	448	1,136	214	32	1,929
1 Sam	210	629	1,316	393	53	2,601
2 Sam	115	501	1,059	319	38	2,032
1 Kg	188	646	1,037	319	39	2,229
2 Kg	116	644	1,216	241	47	2,264
Isa	487	1,026	256	1,366	146	3,281
Jer	559	1,394	480	1,027	86	3,546
Ezek	829	860	515	836	27	3,067
Hos	67	155	43	230	30	525
Joe	29	67	7	59	3	165
Amo	101	91	29	127	5	353
Ob	15	18	0	23	0	56
Jon	3	33	84	19	6	145
Mic	57	53	6	133	15	264
Nah	17	34	4	36	0	91
Hab	4	35	15	70	10	134
Zep	26	36	2	52	4	120
Hag	15	26	16	12	2	71
Zec	149	125	115	153	11	553
Mal	45	73	9	37	6	170
Pss	70	1,148	332	1,851	222	3,623
Prv	51	196	31	757	39	1,074
Job	51	517	258	1,115	123	2,064
S-S	5	104	4	59	4	176
Rut	26	65	133	69	6	299
Lam	7	258	29	64	10	368
Ecc	48	155	3	206	15	427
Est	17	152	161	59	11	400
Dan	89	101	99	98	37	424
Ezr	9	76	86	22	3	196
Neh	24	230	257	91	16	618
1 Ch	42	375	471	92	14	994
2 Ch	91	635	976	199	36	1,937