



The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 142) by Tomoo Ishida

Review by: Jeffrey H. Tigay

Israel Exploration Journal, Vol. 31, No. 3/4 (1981), pp. 249-251

Published by: [Israel Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27925810>

Accessed: 20/04/2012 10:02

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Israel Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Israel Exploration Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

was remembered as one of the key religious monuments of the past' is hardly warranted.

The role of this temple in the Muslim decision to upgrade the sanctity of the Temple Mount is never demonstrated. That the decoration of the Dome of the Rock intentionally followed the art tradition of the First Temple is an engaging idea, though never seriously substantiated. Trees, realistic-type fruits, vine-like plants and jewelled decorations are ubiquitous objects precluding any specific identification with Solomonic traditions. Weakest of all is the connection between the Solomonic Temple and Muhammad's night journey. Neither the literary nor iconographic traditions invoked offer any tangible indication of the influence of one on the other.

Soucek, however, has given us a vivid account of an even more important phenomenon, the process of the Islamization of one of the holiest sites in the world. Starting from perhaps purely political and propagandistic motivations, the religious component grew, and in the course of generations acquired a legitimacy of its own.

In a short, concluding article, Gutmann makes little attempt to relate the Solomonic structure (of either history or legend) with the illustrations of Spanish medieval Hebrew manuscripts on which he focuses. These illustrations dating from the thirteenth century onwards emphasize the cultic objects associated with the Temple of the past, and more importantly with that of the messianic Temple of the future. He also asks two intriguing questions: why this plethora of cultic objects and from what sort of iconographic tradition do they derive? His answer to the first relates to the messianic hopes of the Jewish community, hopes which were inextricably bound up with the rebuilding of the Temple. As for the second, Gutmann rejects any earlier Jewish or contemporary Christian influences, suggesting instead that what we have here is an indigenous Spanish Jewish tradition with no traceable antecedents.

The book is attractively arranged, with ample illustrations, an index and selected bibliography. It is also well annotated, offering the interested reader a wide range of references for further reading.

LEE I. LEVINE

Tomoo Ishida: *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* (*Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 142), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1977. xii + 211 pages.

The concept of charismatic leadership was introduced into the study of Israelite history by Max Weber. The most influential application of this concept to Israelite history was by Albrecht Alt, but in Alt's view 'charismatic leadership... allowed no institutional consolidation, and... could not be transferred... or inherited...' (A. Alt: *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, Garden City, New York, 1967, p. 232). Thus charismatic leadership and the dynastic principle were mutually exclusive. Alt's reading of the sources led him to the conclusion that the Israelite monarchy was originally charismatic, and therefore non-dynastic. The hereditary monarchy which developed especially in Judah was a deviation from genuine Israelite tradition, and the dynastic instability of the northern kingdom was due to the stronger hold of the genuine tradition there.

The apparent compatibility of some biblical passages with this thesis, coupled with the prestige of Alt, has secured its wide acceptance. Dissenters, however, have not been lacking, most notably G. Buccellati in his essay *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria* (Rome, 1967), T.C.G. Thornton: Charismatic Kingship in Israel and Judah, *Journal of Theological Studies* 14 (1963), pp. 1-11, and H. Tadmor: 'The People' and the Kingship in Ancient Israel, *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale* 11 (1968), pp. 57-68, but prior to the appearance of the volume under review the question had not been subjected to a comprehensive re-examination.

Ishida's study, essentially his Hebrew University dissertation of 1974, is a critical synthesis of scholarly discussion of this question and related subjects. Ishida conceives the issue in broad terms, examining numerous aspects of the formation and development of monarchic institutions and ideology in Israel and searching them for information pertinent to the debate. A sampling of the topics covered *apropos* of the main issue includes a fine literary-historical analysis of the

sources in Samuel and studies of the covenants between David and YHWH and David and Israel, the population of the City of David, and the roles of the Ark, the Temple, the *'am hā'āreš* and the Queen Mother. Even when the author endorses a current view on these topics, he presses further to discover their implications for the present study.

Ishida's argument that the Israelite monarchy was dynastic from the outset unfolds as follows. The proponents of monarchy in Israel explicitly modelled it upon that of other nations, and all monarchies in the ancient Near East in historical times were hereditary (Ch. 2). The ideological conflict on the eve of the monarchy was over monarchy versus theocracy (1 Sam. 8:7 and Judg. 8:22–23, both of which are taken as expressions of the anti-monarchic views in Samuel's time), not over dynastic versus charismatic rule. In fact, attempts at hereditary leadership had already been made under Eli and Samuel. The monarchy was established to remedy the military inadequacies of the previous *šōfēṭ* régime by creating a strong standing army with stable leadership, which its proponents must have realized required a hereditary monarchy. Indeed, the only passages to imply that Saul's monarchy was charismatic (i.e., alienable) are found in accounts of his rejection and, as Ishida keenly observes, these reflect the *Tendenz* of narratives shaped to legitimize the succession of David (Ch. 3). The 'history of the rise of David' seeks not only to exculpate David in his conflict with Saul but also to portray David as Saul's legitimate dynastic successor. The need to legitimate David's succession to Saul was greater in the north, and only after Davidic authority over the northern tribes was also stabilized did the dynasty turn to a second argument for legitimacy, divine election (Ch. 4).

The dual election of the House of David and Jerusalem forms the theme of Chapters 5 and 6. Nathan's prophecy legitimated David's rule on the ground that he brought security and prosperity; it explains his failure to receive divine permission to build a temple even though he enjoyed God's favour; and it legitimates Solomon as his successor and temple-builder. Elements of Nathan's prophecy are illuminated by ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions and shown to

have dynastic implications.

The author discusses attempts to create a new tradition, centred on the Davidic dynasty and Jerusalem, to become the common tradition of the people made one under this dynasty, the introduction of Jerusalem into ancient Israelite traditions (e.g., the *'Aqedah*) and the assimilation of Jerusalem's ancient traditions (e.g., El Elyon and Melchizedek) to Yahwism in order to confer ancient sanctity on the city. The election of David and Jerusalem became the basis for recasting the ancient sacred history in light of national unity, culminating in monarchy and empire, for polemic against the northern tribes (e.g., Ps. 78), and for the Judean royal ideology and messianism (Ch. 6).

Ch. 7 returns to dynastic issues. It deals with factors determining the choice of successor within dynasty and with the cause of dynastic instability in the northern kingdom. The author agrees with Buccellati, Thornton and Tadmor against Alt that the explanation is not to be found in northern adherence to the charismatic principle. He argues that dynastic instability was due to (1) military failures of the overthrown dynasties, (2) tribal rivalries in the north and (3) antagonisms between the ruling class and the people over such matters as taxation, corvée and religion. Of these factors, the first and third also obtained in dynastically stable Judah, while the second did not, so it must have been tribal rivalry — admittedly difficult to demonstrate — which was decisive in the north. No northern dynasty lasted long enough to establish a credible claim to divine election, and none created a mystical union between itself and a combined political-religious capital. It was in these factors, not a rejection of the dynastic principle, that the northern kingdom differed from Judah. The monarchy is thus shown to have been a political institution based on the dynastic principle in both kingdoms.

Ishida's discussion is based on a wealth of information. The biblical sources are subjected to a literary-critical analysis which is neither credulous nor hypercritical and which is based on a thorough review of prior scholarship and marked by sensitivity to the political motives and uses of historiographic literature. The author's extensive knowledge of ancient Near Eastern literature illuminates many an issue. Ample

bibliography accompanies each topic covered, and the volume concludes with twenty-five pages of indices of biblical and non-biblical texts, ancient terms, modern authors and topics, which add to its usefulness as a work of reference for any subject connected with the early history of monarchy in Israel.

Some matters have not been dealt with. The discussion of the problems which necessitated the establishment of a monarchy focuses only on the military situation, and the judicial problems which are also explicitly mentioned by the proponents of monarchy (1 Sam. 8) are not taken into account (p. 52). Accepting Alt's insistence that dynastic leadership was incompatible with charismatic, Ishida shows that Alt was wrong in denying that the former was operative in the original conception of the Israelite monarchy. But the very dichotomy between heredity/transferability and charisma need not be accepted, as it was not by Weber. The Davidic dynasty certainly possessed routinized, hereditary charisma (cf. Thornton, pp. 1-3, 9), just as the charisma of other offices was sometimes transferable (cf. Num. 11:17, 25-26; 2 Kings 2:9, 15).

Given the failure of ancient authors to address explicitly certain issues that interest modern historians, scholars must inevitably resort to a certain amount of conjecture and supposition. An example is the author's supposition that by the time Saul was acclaimed king the people had long since prepared for this office, so that Saul's acclamation represented not a spontaneous decision to resort to monarchy but merely a recognition that Saul was the man they were looking for to fill the office (pp. 51-52). This is plausible, but since it serves as the basis for a refutation of Alt, that refutation is weakened. Ishida's suppositions are identified as such, they are reasonable and they withstand comparison with competing suppositions.

The author sometimes succumbs to the natural tendency to force every available piece of evidence into his mould. The most serious barrier to his view that kingship was always hereditary among Israel's neighbours is the Edomite king list in Gen. 36:31-39 and 1 Chron. 1:43-51a, which lists a succession of eight unrelated kings. The author circumvents this problem by arguing that

these *m^lākḥīm* were actually local chieftains unrelated chronologically or geographically, and that the king list structure was erroneously imposed by the Israelite compiler (pp. 22-23). As a parallel one might invoke the way the compiler of the Sumerian king list imposed a linear pattern on the list of cities exercising hegemony in southern Mesopotamia. However, the fact that an Israelite compiler created such a scheme is a problem, since according to the author's thesis such a succession should not have seemed natural. The explanation in any case seems like special pleading in the context of the present study, but that does not mean it is wrong.

These reservations do not diminish the author's achievement. The volume is a learned and judicious study of important issues broadly defined, resourcefully approached and thoroughly documented.

JEFFREY H. TIGAY

Patricia Maynor Bikai: *The Pottery of Tyre*, Aris and Phillips Ltd., Warminster, Wilts., 1978. ix + 92 pages, 94 plates. £24.

Any excavation on the Phoenician coast which introduces new material from this relatively unexplored region is to be welcomed, since we lack data for the study of the development of the pottery and other Phoenician materials. In this case, the importance of the report cannot be underestimated because of the meticulous work done in the field and even more the clear method by which the material is presented, a method which also supplies students of this culture with the most important comparative material.

This is an unusual report: it sums up a small excavation in a limited area, but is entirely devoted to the clarification of the development of the Phoenician pottery types. Luckily, this small area produced an unusual quantity of vessels and sherds which enabled the excavator to present a careful analysis and draw conclusions based on significant statistical data.

The periods treated in this book are the Early Bronze Age, the Late Bronze Age and the Iron Age down to 700 B.C.E.; unfortunately, all the later layers were completely destroyed by Roman