

sanctuary, as the law seems to have maintained the cult of Yahweh in territory (2 Kings 10.31).
l **Elisha Narratives.** The narratives with the conflict between *Elijah and gs 18; 19; 21) cannot be satisfactorily on the assumption that they deal an idolatry whose existence is estab- ie application of a narrow criterion orthodoxy. We are confronted here cism of a royal regime and style of e morally and culturally alien and le: they cannot be reconciled with the e Israelite community and its social . The excavation of *Samaria has re- andeur of architecture not achieved predecessors, which certainly is an- of Tyrian influence (cf. 1 Kings 5). y of Naboth's vineyard (1 Kings 21) a clash between Ahab's royal desires h's sense of the inalienability of his und. The way in which this is delin- st totally unsympathetic to Ahab: he mply confiscate Naboth's land with a crude power; rather, he offers what as a fair price and is distressed when fuses to bargain with him. Even so, rat he is represented as making an ates the distance between him and an of Israelite social values, which sepa- ly land from the marketplace and as- abiding connection between the con- und well-being of the family and its ssions. The villain of the piece is Jez- hom a peasant's resistance to the will g is incomprehensible, and who re- opposition by poisoning justice at its . disguising murderous oppressiveness gus legal process. We meet here a ueen who not only has established the f her gods in Israel but also, utterly ight into Israelite social values, holds pt the right of her subjects to equality law.

al aspect of this is especially interest- ise there are other passages in the amuel and Kings that emphasize the ponsibility of the king to ensure that lone to his subjects. *Absalom fastens d's neglect of these matters as a prime public discontent (2 Sam. 15.1–6), and ion with the praise of Solomon's wis-

sage stands apart from the other contents of 1 Kings 20 and 22). In both these passages, a king is appealed to as supreme legal authority and he gives a verdict in which he unknowingly passes sentence on himself (cf. 2 Sam. 14).

In a more private context, Elijah is repre- sented as a solitary *prophet who works miracles for a widow of Zarephath, providing for her and her son when they are on the edge of starvation, and who subsequently restores the dead child to life (1 Kings 17.8–24). He is a marvelous pro- vider and life-giver, but he is also a destroyer who calls up fire to consume soldiers sent by Ahaziah to take him, and he comes into the king's presence and tells him that he will die because he has asked guidance from *Baal-zebub, god of Ekron (2 Kings 1.9–17). He runs with such great speed that he can keep up with horse and chariot (1 Kings 18.46), but he is also a prophet who loses heart and who encounters God not in what are usually portrayed as the majestic accompaniments of a *theophany but as a “still small voice” (1 Kings 19.12: AV; NRSV: “sound of sheer silence”).

Two chapters stand somewhat apart from the narratives that have just been described, even though prophets play a part in both of them (1 Kings 20.1–34; 22). The motif of provocative behavior by a king of Aram in order to provide a pretext for aggression against Israel (1 Kings 20) is repeated at 2 Kings 5, in connection with the cure of Naaman's leprosy by *Elisha. In 1 Kings 20.1–34, Ahab is portrayed as conciliatory but firm, as capable of proverbial aptness (v. 11), as adopting the strategy advised by a prophet and as magnanimous in victory. Although his conflict with Micaiah, and so with a true prophetic word, is an important factor in 1 Kings 22, the account is not informed with marked animus against him, except at v. 38, where his death is linked to a prophecy uttered against him by Elijah (1 Kings 21.19). Ahab and Jehosh- aphot, king of Judah, are allies in an attempt to wrest Ramoth-gilead from Aram, an attempt that ends disastrously. In the Septuagint, 1 Kings 21 follows chap. 19, and chap. 22, which is sepa- rated from chap. 20 in the Hebrew text and the English versions, is continuous with it.

Only when he is associated with Elisha is Elijah drawn into the context of prophetic communities (2 Kings 2): there is an audience of fifty prophets

haps at Bethel, *Jericho, and Gilgal (2 Kings 2.1–4), which are more firmly established (2 Kings 4.1–7, 38–41, 42–44; 6.1–7); and al- though the anointing of Hazael of *Damascus and Jehu are attributed to both Elijah (1 Kings 19.15–18) and Elisha (2 Kings 8.7–9.13), it is Elisha's involvement in political intrigue which is more evident. He lends his prophetic authority to the coup d'état by which Jehu overthrows the house of Ahab, and to the bloodbath that dis- poses of Jehoram, Jezebel, all the members of the royal family, and all the practitioners of Jezebel's cult (2 Kings 9.14–10.14).

Nevertheless, Elisha is represented as having used his miraculous powers to assist a king of the house of Ahab (Jehoram) in his wars against *Moab (2 Kings 3.4–27) and Aram (2 Kings 6.8–7.19), and on his deathbed he teaches Jehoash, of the line of Jehu, how to work magic against Aram (2 Kings 13.14–19). There are unpleasant features about the portrayal of Elisha: his powers can be malevolent (for example, when he calls up bears to destroy some boys who had called him names; 2 Kings 2.23–25) or sensational (he brings an axe head that had sunk in the Jordan to the surface and makes it float; 2 Kings 6.1–7). This happens in the course of building ex- tensions to a prophetic community, and other miracles have a similar context: a flask of oil is multiplied into a great supply (2 Kings 4.7); Elisha counteracts poison in a communal pot (2 Kings 4.38–41); he feeds a company of a hundred with twenty barley loaves and fresh ears of grain (2 Kings 4.42–44). It is in the setting of a family whose hospitality he has enjoyed that he puts an end to the sterility of the Shunammite woman and then restores her child to life after he dies in the harvest field (2 Kings 4.8–37; cf. 1 Kings 17.8–24).

Conclusion. The contents of 1 and 2 Kings are varied, and there are many topics that are not narrowly related to the law of the single sanctuary. This criterion influences the portrayal of Solomon, and it is influential in the view taken of Hezekiah and, above all, Josiah. The praise of Hezekiah is mixed with a criticism of his behavior during the visit to Jerusalem of Merodach-baladan, king of Babylon (2 Kings 20.12–19). Approval of other Judean kings is mingled with the criticism that they failed the acid test by not suppressing the high places: Asa

is linked, are condemned: *Zedekiah did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord as Jehoiakim had done. Jerusalem and Judah so angered the Lord that in the end he banished them from his sight (2 Kings 24.19–20).

See also Israel, History of; Judah, The King- dom of; Kingship and Monarchy.

WILLIAM MCKANE

Kingship and Monarchy. Ancient Near Eastern texts almost unanimously presuppose the insti- tution of kingship as a social organizing princi- ple. Kingship in Mesopotamia is “lowered from heaven” or is coeval with *creation. The Assyrian King List, for example, can hypothesize a time when kings “lived in tents,” but not a time before kingship. The image of the “first man” as the “image of God” and as lord over creation (Gen. 1.26–28) is not unrelated: YHWH is often por- trayed in Israelite literature and iconography in solar terms; just as the sun, the “major” astral body, “rules” over the sky (Gen. 1.16–18), just as YHWH rules over creation, so the relationship between humanity and the world is modeled as one of royal domination from the very outset.

Near Eastern myths, too, principally portray the order of divine organization as monarchic. *Egyptian, Greek, *Hittite, *Ugaritic, and Mes- opotamian myths all recount tales of martial conflict whereby one of the gods emerges as their king. In most instances, the monarchic order is portrayed as an innovation, replacing an earlier paternal domination of children. Interestingly, in the cases of Mesopotamian and Greek myth, the new kingship is functionally elective: the pantheon appoint a king-elect from among their number, to lead them into battle; the appointee wins the battle; and, as a result, the appointee wins confirmation on the throne. The royal ideal is thus one of elective autocracy. In Babylonian myth, the winning of the throne is also the start- ing point for the creation of the cosmos, which is the foundation for the heavenly structure that serves as the high god's palace, the counterpart of his earthly temple.

Kings and other administrators in the ancient Near East regularly portray themselves, like the state gods, as champions of the weak and the oppressed. The king was the upholder of the social order—much like the divine king who

resisted the threats and encroachments of *chaos. But fixing the social order, to judge from Mesopotamian law codes, involved attempting to fix prices and attempting to ensure the inviolability of property. It also involved occasional amnesties, and general release from debt. Ultimately, the king presented himself as the personification and defender of what was just, the supreme judicial authority.

Near Eastern kingship was overwhelmingly an urban phenomenon. Cities lent themselves to monarchic organization precisely because of the complexity of administration involved. Kings took responsibility for, and pride in, the fortification of towns: the *Gilgamesh Epic ends with a return to the subject of the mighty walls of Uruk, which were the hero's immortality. Kings thus enjoyed the right not to tax, but to direct corvée and conscription for the public good—for defense, conquest, and the construction of irrigation and navigation systems.

Claiming the right to govern by divine election, kings also relate their temple-building activities. The completion of a temple is modeled by them as a mundane repetition of the heavenly creation myth. The building of a temple also is taken as a sign of the gods' imprimatur on the builder's royal dynasty. Likewise, the New Year ritual in *Babylon, and, later, in *Assyria, combines a rehearsal of the creation myth with a renewal of the high god's temple: the king leads the high god in procession to reoccupy the temple, and at the same time renews his own kingship, after a ritual battle against *chaos. The king consistently presents himself as warrior, builder, creator, favorite, even adoptee of the gods.

Israelite conceptions of kingship reflect both continuity with, and departure from, earlier traditions. For one thing, earliest Israel was decidedly nonurban, consisting of small agricultural settlements principally in the central hill country, Transjordan, and the upper Galilee. It is impossible to identify any major urban center as Israelite before *David's conquest of *Jerusalem. Israelite monarchy, therefore, originated as a national monarchy, not as a city-state kingship. Correspondingly, Israel is the only ancient Near Eastern culture to have preserved written memories of a time before the evolution of kingship or to have constructed any account of a transition from what later tradition would construe as a theocracy to monarchic organization. (There were, however, periods when Assyrian kings presented themselves as stewards of the gods, rather

than as kings, and early *Sumerian kings adopted the same recourse.)

In this connection, a number of Israelite texts express reservations about the institution of kingship—a sentiment elsewhere unparalleled. Offered a dynasty, for example, the premonarchic warrior *Gideon makes the paradigmatic reply, "I will not rule over you, and my son will not rule over you; YHWH will rule over you" (Judg. 8.24). Although the text proceeds to condemn Gideon for appropriating priestly status and constructing an *ephod (Judg. 8.24–27), similar sentiments recur in an account of the transition to monarchy (1 Sam. 8.4–20; 10.19; 12.12): the urge to enthrone a human king conflicts on this theory with the ideal of YHWH's kingship over Israel (and Hos. 13.10).

Scholars for the most part find two sources underlying the account of the origins of Israelite kingship in 1 Samuel 8–12, but differ about their precise delineation. Nevertheless, both sources seem to replicate the pattern for divine kingship: in one (1 Sam. 8; 10.17–27; 11; 12), *Saul is elected king with YHWH's approval, defeats *Ammon, and is confirmed as king; in the other (1 Sam. 9.1–10.16; 13–14), Saul is anointed king-designate, defeats the *Philistines, and is said to have "captured the kingship" (1 Sam. 14.47). There is a homology with YHWH's kingship over Israel, said to have originated in his election in order to bring Israel out of Egypt and into *Canaan, and confirmed at the completion of the *Exodus (Exod. 3.16–17; 6.7–8; 19–23); the same pattern already occurs in the Song of the Sea (Exod. 15; twelfth–eleventh century BCE), where YHWH's perpetual kingship and acquisition of a shrine (Exod. 15.18) is predicated on his defeat of Egypt and the establishment of Israel in Canaan.

Numerous psalms follow the same pattern, praising YHWH as the creator or as the victor in some cosmic or mundane martial conflict, in the context of the celebration of his kingship. Likewise, the book of *Judges describes the pattern of mundane leadership in terms of a leader's election by YHWH, defeat of a threat or oppressor, and assumption of administrative power (Judg. 2.11–19; 3.7–12.7). And the books of Samuel-Kings let the same myth inform their historiography: kings whose succession is irregular win battles or overcome obstacles and threats, before their accession formula (that is, their historiographic confirmation on the throne) appears. The "myth of the Divine Warrior" regu-

larly informs Israelite views of mundane, as well as divine, leadership.

Other Near Eastern conceptions of kingship are equally pervasive among the Israelites. The first Israelite kings eschewed temple-building, no doubt out of deference to their constituents' distributed and varied cultic traditions. David did bring a central icon, the *ark, to his capital. But *Solomon was the first to build a temple, and in the capital, which articulated claims of an eternal Davidic dynasty—as well as claims that Solomon, and the later Davidides, are sons of YHWH, entrants into the court of the divine king (see Son of God). Notably, the Israelite kingdom established by Jeroboam by secession from the kingship of Solomon's successor prescinded from establishing its cultic centers in the political capital. Yet the leader of the secession, Jeroboam, was moved to erect cultic establishments at Bethel and *Dan to establish himself, too, as a temple builder (see Golden Calf). His actions implied independence from *Judah yet disavowed any unchangeable divine election of his dynasty. When Omri's son, *Ahab, later erected a temple in *Samaria, his capital, the same dynamic was in effect. The revolutionary, *Jehu, destroyed the temple in the capital, ensuring a separation of capital and temple in the northern kingdom for the rest of its duration.

In the Israelite ideal, the king is one nominated (or anointed) by YHWH, by prophetic means, and adopted by the people—YHWH proposes and the people dispose. But the opportunity exists, in the aftermath of divine designation, for popular elements responsible for confirming the king to impose conditions on the king's sovereignty. The operation of this principle is evident in 1 Kings 12, where the Israelites propose to elect Rehoboam as their king, on the condition that he lower taxes. Rehoboam refuses; the people therefore reject him as king, and elect Jeroboam. Similarly, both David (2 Sam. 2.4–9; 5.1–3) and *Absalom (2 Sam. 15.1–12) campaign for election; David actually campaigns for reelection after Absalom's revolt (2 Sam. 19.10–44). Although elements of the royal establishment laid claim to a perpetual divine dynastic grant (Ps. 89), even the laws of Deuteronomy 17.14–20 acknowledge that kingship, given divine nomination of the candidate, was elective. In practice, this often meant that the king was made by army democracy—as in the cases of Solomon, Baasha, Omri, Jehu, Uzziah, and others.

The laws of Deuteronomy 17–18 also attempt to limit the king's latitude in forming policy. They limit priesthood to "*Levites," install Levitic priests as the supreme judiciary, and protect the institution of *prophecy. They further attempt to restrict the king's ability to accumulate wealth. Scholars concur that the Deuteronomic law code is late in origin. Still, the attempt to limit the ability to tax, the urge to restrict the king's right to disenfranchise priesthods, the urge to protect *prophets (Deut. 18.18–22; 1 Kings 22.26–28; Jer. 26.16) all reflect traditional ideals and rural views of central governmental authority.

Notwithstanding popular resistance to royal encroachments on the economy in particular, Israelite kings enjoyed the power both to tax (1 Kings 4.7–19; 12; 2 Kings 15.20; 23.35) and to conscript for warfare (2 Sam. 20.4) and for public works (1 Kings 5.27–30; 11.28; cf. 9.22). Moreover, archaeological remains at important towns, such as *Megiddo and *Hazor, indicate that the kings projected their power into the countryside in the form of massive fortifications and impressive public buildings. To date, this phenomenon is less well represented in the Israelite heartland, the hill country. However, starting in the tenth century BCE, and accelerating in the eighth century, public buildings are constructed in proximity to the gate complexes of some urban centers, such as Tell Beit Mirsim, *Lachish, and Tell el-Far'ah (biblical Tirzah).

In the same period, increasing royal intervention in local economies is documented by the standardization of *weights, and probably, by indications of incipient industrialization, as at the site of Horvat Rosh Zayit, inland from Akko. And, at the end of the eighth century, *Hezekiah of Judah was able to concentrate the rural population of his kingdom in a set of fortresses.

There had always been some tension between the royal establishment and the kinship structures—the rural lineages—which were the seat of succession and conflict resolution before the monarchy and continued to function as such after the introduction of kingship. Early on, the state acknowledged an interest in restricting the feud (2 Sam. 14.11), one of the nonstate forms of conflict resolution in the society. But as the revolt of Absalom ended with the complete triumph of the professional royal army over the irregulars of the countryside, central control could be asserted over not only the succession but other aspects of statecraft as well. As early as the

time of Solomon, a system of royal administrators was set in place for the purpose of extracting taxation and corvée (1 Kings 4.7-19; 11.28), bypassing traditional tribal forms of organization. It is likely that Jeroboam and the later kings of the northern kingdom undid this innovation; the Samaria ostraca furnish evidence of at least dabblings in a system of such administrators only in the eighth century (one group of ostraca reflects administration through the lineages at that time). However, even the lineage heads through whom some kings administered taxation would have been royal appointees in some sense, and certainly familiars of the establishment (see 2 Sam. 19.32-41).

It was only in the seventh century, after Hezekiah's emergency urbanization, that the monarchy achieved complete domination over the lineages. The urban geography of that era in Judah (Israel having been deported) reflects the resettlement of Judah, after its depopulation by Assyria in 701 BCE, by state orchestration. Gone are the extended-family compounds that characterize Israelite settlements until the late eighth century. Gone are the large, rambling settlements of that earlier era. Instead, the state, and the kingship, were able to stamp the ideals of the royal cult, the Jerusalem *Temple, onto the country as a whole, resulting in a policy, under *Josiah, of centralization of worship and of power. This development, and the disappearance of the monarchy in the restoration community (538 BCE), paved the way for the detachment of the monarchic ideology from its origins in relations with the agrarian hinterlands of the capital. In the Second Temple period, the idea of YHWH's anointed—the *messiah, notionally a son of YHWH—was transferred from the human king whose election was a matter of negotiation and limitation, to a future king, not wholly human, whose reign would usher in a regime of justice, of the defense of the oppressed, and of requital of the guilty. In the myth of a kingless postexilic Judah, the old, high ideals of Near Eastern kingship took renewed hold, without the brake of political realities to restrain the ambitions or the imaginings of their adherents.

See also Queen and Queen Mother.

BARUCH HALPERN

Kiss. Biblical occurrences of "kiss" can be classified into three groups. First, reference to the kiss as a romantic *gesture is found in the *Song of Solomon (1.2; 7.9; 8.1).

Second, the kiss appears most frequently as a sign of greeting, such as *Joseph kissing his brothers (Gen. 45.15), *Aaron kissing *Moses in the wilderness (Exodus 4.27), and the prodigal son being kissed by his father (Luke 15.20). Several New Testament letters conclude with an admonition to greet one another with a holy kiss (Rom. 16.16; 1 Cor. 16.20; 2 Cor. 13.12; 1 Thess. 5.26) or a kiss of love (1 Pet. 5.14). Kissing can also be part of a ritual. Examples include the *anointing of *Saul by *Samuel (1 Sam. 10.1) and the anointing of Jesus by the woman of Bethany (Luke 7.38).

Third, a kiss can also be a sign of dishonesty and treachery. *Jacob gives a kiss as part of his deception of *Isaac (Gen. 27.26-27), and Joab kisses Amasa while killing him (2 Sam. 20.9-10). Proverbs 27.6 advises that "profuse are the kisses of an enemy," and *Judas betrays Jesus with a kiss (Mark 14.45-46; Matt. 26.48-49; Luke 22.47-48).

DANIEL N. SCHOWALTER

Know. The biblical Hebrew verb most commonly translated "to know" is *yādaʿ*. Besides the neutral or secular sense of being aware of or acquainted with (Gen. 30.26; Num. 11.16; Deut. 2.7; Josh. 2.9; 1 Sam. 28.24; Job 42.11), the verb and its derivatives have a complex range of meanings.

Knowledge becomes a biblical topic as early as Genesis 2.9 with the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The tree's name is probably a merismus, a literary device to describe the totality of something by naming the first and the last in its semantic spectrum (here, the full range of knowledge).

In Genesis 4.1, sexual knowledge comes from *Adam and *Eve's experience of the greatest possible intimacy, namely *sexual intercourse. The verb in this sense may have either a man or a woman as its subject (Gen. 4.1; 19.8; Num. 31.17; cf. Matt. 1.25), includes *homosexual intercourse (Gen 19.5), and can occasionally signify rape (of women and men: Gen. 19.5, 8; Judg. 19.22, 25).

The organ of knowledge is the heart (Jer. 24.7; Ps. 49.3), which suggests that knowledge is experiential and not merely speculative. One knows war (Judg. 3.2) or God's displeasure (Num. 14.34) by experiencing it. Yahweh's special relationship with *Moses is described as knowing Moses face to face (Deut. 34.10; cf. Exod. 33). While *Samuel certainly knows who Yahweh is,

he does not know God until he experiences a *theophany (1 Sam. 3.7).

Yahweh wants to be known, reaching out to Israel by revelatory acts, most importantly delivering Israel from Egyptian slavery (Exod. 1-15) and by joining with Israel in the theophanic *covenant ceremony at *Sinai (Exod. 19; 24). In biblical terminology, the response to *revelation is knowledge; knowledge is akin to what elsewhere might be called *faith.

Beginning in the book of Exodus (see especially 6.1-7), the motif of knowing Yahweh becomes a dominant biblical theme, recurring especially in Deuteronomy, Hosea (who deliberately blurs the sexual and religious meanings of knowing to illustrate God's closeness to Israel), Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Knowledge and knowing in this case have a technical connection to the language of covenant-making. Hosea 4.1-6 equates knowledge with keeping the covenant laws, the *Ten Commandments: Yahweh will

reject those who reject knowledge. Isaiah 5.12-13 warns that *exile, a covenant curse (Lev. 26.33), is the consequence of lack of knowledge. In Jeremiah's famous "new covenant" oracle, Yahweh declares that the law will be written on all hearts and "all shall know me" (Jer. 31.31-34).

In the New Testament, the revealed Christ becomes the source of the knowledge of God, a theme developed most notably in the gospel of John (1.10; 14.7) and in Paul's letters (Eph. 3.4-6; Phil. 3.8-11).

See also Gnosticism.

MARY JOAN WINN LEITH

Koheleth. See Ecclesiastes, The Book of.

Koran. See Qur'ān and the Bible, The.