

MATTHEW J. SURIANO

The Politics of Dead Kings

*Forschungen
zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe*

48

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Edited by

Bernd Janowski (Tübingen) · Mark S. Smith (New York)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen)

48



Matthew J. Suriano

The Politics of Dead Kings

Dynastic Ancestors in the Book of Kings
and Ancient Israel

Mohr Siebeck

MATTHEW J. SURIANO, BA in History from University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; MA in Ancient History from Jerusalem University College, MA and PhD in Hebrew Bible and Northwest Semitics from University of California, Los Angeles; has taught at University of Southern California's School of Religion and was a Lecturer in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at UCLA with a visiting faculty appointment in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara; currently Visiting Lecturer in Hebrew Bible and Ancient Judaism in the Department of Religious Studies at Indiana University, Bloomington.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151146-2

ISBN 978-3-16-150473-0

ISSN 1611-4914 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2010 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For Lisa, for Alexander

Preface

This work originated as a doctoral dissertation submitted to the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at the University of California, Los Angeles. I am indebted to my advisor and friend, William M. Schniedewind, who supervised and guided this work. I would also like to recognize and thank all members of the committee, from its inception to its completion, beginning with Aaron Burke, Sarah Morris, and including Robert Englund and Elizabeth Carter. Part of my dissertation research was conducted at the Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem while I was the annual George A. Barton Fellow, and I would like to acknowledge and thank the institute's director, Seymour (Sy) Gitin, for his support during this time. In my effort to give adequate acknowledgement, I must include a bit of the book's history. My interest in the subject of this study goes back to the beginning of my graduate education in Jerusalem and it is a credit to two of my earliest mentors, Anson Rainey and Gabriel Barkay. Gaby stoked my interest into the broader issues of death and burial in ancient Israel and Anson made me aware of the issues involved in the sources.

The present book represents a revised, re-organized and augmented version of the dissertation. This revision includes the addition of Chapter Three as well as revised material in what has become Chapter Six. In the latter case, much of the research from the original chapter will appear as an article in the journal *Aula Orientalis*. I would like to thank Bernd Janowski, Mark S. Smith, and Hermann Spieckermann, the editors of the series *Forschungen zum Alten Testament II*, as well as Henning Ziebritzki, the Editorial Director of Theology and Jewish Studies at Mohr Siebeck, for accepting this work. In particular, I would like to express a sincere debt of gratitude to Mark S. Smith for his insight and invaluable comments during the manuscript's continued phase of research, post-dissertation. My gratitude also extends to Herbert Niehr for generously sharing articles that I had difficulty accessing. Likewise, I want to thank Sara Brumfield for her careful reading and checking of sources, and to Tanja Mix at Mohr Siebeck for her enduring editorial assistance.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Lisa and my family for their patient yet enthusiastic support, which remained constant throughout each stage of the book's development.

Matthew J. Suriano

Bloomington, Indiana

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
List of Figures	XIII
Abbreviations	XIV
Chapter One: The Royal Epilogues and the Politics of Dead Kings	1
<i>1.2. Research Objectives</i>	<i>3</i>
1.2.1. Interpretive Model	7
1.2.1.1. Theoretical Precepts	8
1.2.1.2. Transition Rituals and Funerary Rites	13
1.2.2. Theory, Artifact and Text: A Synthesis	16
<i>1.3. Conclusion... ..</i>	<i>21</i>
Chapter Two: The Formulaic Epilogues in the Book of King ...	22
<i>2.1. Introduction.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>2.2. History of Research into the Epilogue Formulary</i>	<i>23</i>
2.2.1. The Study of the Deuteronomistic History.....	24
2.2.2. The Epilogue Formulae: A Brief History of Research	26
<i>2.3. To Be Gathered to/Lie with the Ancestors</i>	<i>32</i>
2.3.1. Interpreting the Phrase: A History of Scholarship	34
2.3.1.1. The Biblical Interpretation	35
2.3.1.2. The Archaeological Interpretation	36
2.3.1.3. The Interpretative Problems	40
2.3.2. A New Approach	41
2.3.2.1. The Social Context	42
2.3.2.2. The Biblical Context	42
2.3.2.3. The Literary Order	42
2.3.3. The Inheritance Implications of “Gathered to His People”	46
2.3.3.1. The Death of Jacob.....	46

2.3.3.2. Ishmael, Moses and the Death of Aaron	47
2.3.3.3. “Gathered to their Fathers” in Judges 2:10	48
2.4. <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	49
Chapter Three: The Socio-Political Significance of Funerary Rites	51
3.1. <i>Introduction</i>	51
3.2. <i>Reconstructing the Royal Tombs of Israel and Judah</i>	51
3.2.1. Elite Burials in Iron Age II Judah	52
3.2.2. Royal Tombs in the Ancient Levant	53
3.2.2.1. Intramural Burials	55
3.2.2.2. Secondary Rites.....	59
3.3. <i>The Desecration of Royal Tombs</i>	63
3.4. <i>The Eradication of the House of Saul</i>	67
3.5. <i>Summary Observations</i>	69
Chapter Four: The Dynastic Notice	71
4.1. <i>Introduction</i>	71
4.2. <i>The Northern Kingdom</i>	72
4.2.1. The House of Omri and the Death of Ahab	73
4.2.2. The House of Jehu	74
4.3. <i>The Kingdom of Judah</i>	75
4.3.1. The United Monarchy and the Establishment of the Dynasty.....	75
4.3.1.1. The Dynastic Oracle	76
4.3.1.2. The Succession Narrative	77
4.3.1.3. The Transition of Solomon (1 Kings 11:21)	82
4.3.2. The Lineage of David and the Kingdom of Judah	83
4.3.2.1. The Interregnum of Athaliah	84
4.3.2.2. The Death of Amaziah.....	84
4.3.2.3. The Ritual Politics of Irregular Succession.....	87
4.3.3. The Latter Kings of the House of David	88
4.3.3.1. The Death of Josiah and Huldah’s Prophecy	89
4.3.3.2. The Fate of Jehoiakim	92
4.3.3.3. Dynastic Legitimacy as an Exilic Theme.....	96

4.4. Conclusion	96
Chapter Five: The Burial Notice	98
5.1. Introduction.....	98
5.2. <i>The Archaeological Quest for the Tombs of David</i>	100
5.2.1. Royal Burial in the City of David	104
5.2.1.1. Weill’s Royal Necropolis	104
5.2.2. Burial in the Garden of Uzza	108
5.2.2.1. The Tombs of Saint Étienne	115
5.2.2.2. The Western Hill	117
5.3. <i>Samaria and the Royal Tombs of the Israelite Kings</i>	118
5.4. <i>The Formulaic Burial Notices in Kings</i>	120
5.5. <i>Synthesis</i>	123
Chapter Six: The Notice of the Successor	127
6.1. Introduction.....	127
6.2. <i>Formulaic Terminology</i>	128
6.2.1. To “Sit upon the Throne”	128
6.2.2. To “Rule in One’s Stead”	131
6.3. <i>Jeroboam II and the Dynastic Throne of Jehu</i>	135
6.4. <i>The Edomite King List</i>	138
6.5. <i>Royal Ancestors and Succession at Ugarit</i>	140
6.6. <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	148
Chapter Seven: Rephaim and Royal Ancestors	149
7.1. Introduction.....	149
7.2. <i>The Rephaim in Near Eastern Literature</i>	149
7.2.1. The <i>rapi’ūma</i> at Ugarit	151
7.2.2. The Rephaim in Phoenician Sources.....	154
7.3. <i>The Rephaim in the Hebrew Bible</i>	158
7.3.1. Rephaim and the Royal Dead in Prophetic Literature	160

7.3.1.1. Isaiah 14.....	161
7.3.1.2. Ezekiel 32.....	163
<i>7.4. Royal Ancestors, a Genealogical Perspective.....</i>	<i>165</i>
7.4.1. The Genealogical Perspectives of Genesis.....	168
7.4.2. The “Fathers” as Royal Ancestors	171
<i>7.5. The Epilogues within Kings and the Hebrew Bible</i>	<i>172</i>
Chapter Eight: The Epilogues and the Royal Ancestors.....	175
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>175</i>
Bibliography.....	177
Scripture Index	197
Source Index	202
Author Index	204
Subject Index.....	209

List of Figures

Figure 1. The Royal Epilogue Formulary of the Book of Kings	23
Figure 2. Trajectory of Dynastic Legitimacy	33
Figure 3. David’s Epilogue and its Literary Allusions.....	81
Figure 4. Jeroboam II, the Fourth Generation of the House of Jehu.....	136
Figure 5. KTU 1.161 and Dynastic Succession.....	141
Figure 6. The Common Heritage of Royal Ancestors	151
Figure 7. The Royal Epilogues and Eshmunazor’s Sarcophagus	158
Figure 8. The “Fathers” as the Ancestral Identity of Royal Houses.....	171

Abbreviations

<i>AB</i>	<i>Anchor Bible</i>
<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
<i>AfO</i>	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i> , 3 rd ed. Ed. J. Pritchard. Princeton, 1969.
<i>ARA</i>	<i>Annual Review of Anthropology</i>
<i>AS</i>	<i>Assyriological Studies</i>
<i>AulaOr</i>	<i>Aula orientalis</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeological Review</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BHT</i>	<i>Beiträge zur historischen Theologie</i>
<i>BJS</i>	<i>Brown Judaic Studies</i>
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BWANT</i>	<i>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
<i>BZAW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>CBQMS</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</i>
<i>CIS</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum</i>
<i>CRAIBL</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>
<i>COS 1</i>	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> , volume 1. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World. Eds. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger. Leiden, 2003.
<i>COS 2</i>	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> , volume 2. Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World. Eds. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger. Leiden, 2003.
<i>DNSI 1</i>	<i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions. Part One: '–L.</i> By, J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling. (HdO I) Leiden and New York, 1995.
<i>DNSI 2</i>	<i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions. Part Two: M–T.</i> By, J. Hoftijzer, and K. Jongeling. (HdO I) Leiden and New York, 1995.
<i>DUL I</i>	<i>A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One [?(a/i/u)-K].</i> By G. del Olmo Lete, and J. Sanmartín. Trans. by W. G. E. Watson. (HdO I). Leiden and Boston, 2003.
<i>DUL II</i>	<i>A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part Two [L–Z].</i> By G. del Olmo Lete, and J. Sanmartín. Trans. by W. G. E. Watson. (HdO I). Leiden and Boston, 2003.
<i>FOTL</i>	<i>Forms of Old Testament Literature</i>
<i>FRLANT</i>	<i>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</i>
<i>G^L</i>	<i>Lucianic recension</i>

HALOT 1	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Vol. 1. By L. Köhler and W. Baumgartner. Trans. by M. E. J. Richardson. New York, 2001.
HALOT 2	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Vol. 2. By L. Köhler and W. Baumgartner. Trans. by M. E. J. Richardson. New York, 2001.
HdO I	Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section One: The Near and Middle East
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of the Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSupp	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAI	<i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> . 3 vols., eds. H. Donner and W. Röllig. Wiesbaden, 1966.
LXX	<i>Septuaginta</i> , ed. A. Rahlfs. 2 vols. 9 th ed. Stuttgart, 1971.
MT	According to the Leningrad Codex as published in the <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Eds. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. 4th ed, Stuttgart, 1990.
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NEAEHL	<i>New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land</i> . Ed. E. Stern. Jerusalem, 1993.
OBO	<i>Orbis biblicus et orientalis</i>
OG	Old Greek
OLA	<i>Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta</i>
OTL	<i>Old Testament Library</i>
OTS	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
RA	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale</i>
RSR	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
SAAB	<i>State Archives of Assyria Bulletin</i>
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SBL	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
SBLDS	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series</i>
SBLMS	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</i>
SBT	<i>Studies in Biblical Theology</i> (2 nd Series)
SHANE	<i>Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East</i>
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal for the Old Testament</i>
TA	<i>Tel Aviv</i>
UF	<i>Ugarit Forschungen</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	<i>Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</i>
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>

ZAH
ZAW

Zeitschrift für Althebraistik
Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Chapter One

The Royal Epilogues and the Politics of Dead Kings

1.1. Introduction

In the narrative of ancient Israel found in the Book of Kings, the end of a king's life is summed up in a series of formulaic statements that begin with the poetic expression for death: "and [the king] lay with his fathers." The summary statements all revolve around the problem of royal death and succession, encapsulated in a closing statement that consisted typically of a notice of burial (in the royal tombs) and the introduction of the succeeding ruler. Within the block of literature known as the Deuteronomistic History (henceforth, the DtrH),¹ these summary notices play a small, yet significant, role. Together with a series of introductory statements, the literary units serve as prologues and epilogues that frame the various accounts of individual kings in Israel and Judah. The formulaic summaries, however, are more than merely generic literary-bookends that demark the conclusion of one king's reign and the subsequent beginning of the next, the epilogues are also ideological statements that reflect the manner in which political power was devised in ancient Israel and the Levant.

Death, burial and succession: taken together, this complex affects the sovereignty of a given dynasty, marking their patrimonial claims of power by means of royal tombs and the patrilineal descent of leadership. The key formula of the epilogue is the opening notice: "and PN₁ lay with his fathers." This phrase is used throughout Kings (though with some selectivity) to acknowledge the death of a ruler in Israel or Judah. The phrase is expressed through the combination of a term related to mortuary practices (שָׁכַב, "to lie [down]"²) and an ancestral image (אֲבוֹתָהּ, "the fathers").³ But does this phrase represent a specific allusion to the act of burial? If so,

¹ NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Citation in this study will follow the English translation (published in 1981), Deuteronomistic History.

² BEUKEN, art. שָׁכַב §*kab*, 664–667. The specific verb, of course, is קָבַר ("bury") found in either the *Qal* or *Niphal* stems. The verb in question, שָׁכַב, connotes burial (and thus, death), through the image of [the dead] lying down inside the tomb.

³ Although some modern translations avoid gender specific language regarding the term אֲבוֹתָהּ (the NRSV renders it as "ancestors"), this study will consistently translate the term as "fathers" in order to better convey its patrimonial sense.

why is it typically followed by a description of burial? If it is not related to mortuary practices, why does the phrase draw upon a verb commonly used for interment in order to describe an individual's death? More importantly, what is the formulaic significance of this phrase? It is proposed in this study that the phrase "lay with fathers" served as a literary means of expressing uninterrupted dynastic succession. Although the phrase holds its own unique meaning, its semantic sense is relayed through the statements that follow it in the epilogue, which describe the place of burial and introduce the successor. To understand this relationship is to understand a key aspect of the socio-political structure of power in ancient Israel, where sovereignty was built upon kinship-models and legitimacy was expressed through genealogical constructs.⁴

The formula's unique terminology represented a ritual process termed here royal funerary rites.⁵ This is not to reduce the phrase to a single act, burial, but rather to equate it with a series of social actions that were initiated by the death of a king. The rites and ceremonies subsumed under the term "royal funerary rites" focused on the departure of the dead, the defunct king,⁶ from the world of the living.⁷ As such, the ritual process

⁴ See the analysis by F. M. Cross of kinship terminology in the monarchy of Judah (CROSS, *Epic to Canon*, 3–21). The discussion, however, is concerned more with divine covenant and what Cross calls "kinship-in-law," which involves the inclusion of non-blood relations into a larger group (either through marriage or adoption).

⁵ The ritual itself remains vague at best, as burial practices and mourning rites are both known, but their larger context is not. Furthermore, it is not clear how (and when) commemorative rites would have fit into this ritual context. Therefore, this study will not attempt to define ritual more than a culturally established set of actions "that [are] designed and orchestrated to distinguish and privilege what is being done in comparison to other, usually more quotidian, activities." BELL, *Ritual Theory*, 74; cf. also *Perspectives and Dimensions*, 136–137. This definition of what Bell calls "ritualization," is quoted by David Wright (*Ritual in Narrative*, 11–13) in his discussion of the term. In other words, ritual is created through the intrinsic relationship between meaning and action within a specific context; cf. similarly LANERI, *Funerary Rituals*, 2–3. For a recent attempt to define ritual within a larger study of royal funerary rituals in early Mesopotamia, see COHEN, *Death Rituals*, 7–14.

⁶ The literature on the subject of death in past cultures frequently uses the term "defunct," for the deceased ruler (who is effectively decommissioned by death). An explanation of the term in this sense, where it is applied to the dead in general and called the "sociology of death," is found in BOTTÉRO, *Mesopotamia*, 268.

⁷ The term "funerary-rite" is used to distinguish the act of burial from ancestor cults. This terminology follows that of the MORRIS, *archaeology of ancestors*, 150. The terminological distinction is discussed in SCHMIDT, *Beneficent Dead*, 4–12. Schmidt defines four general categories, with funerary rituals (along with mourning customs) and mortuary cults placed alongside the cult of the dead (roughly equivalent to ancestor worship) and necromancy. See also, SKAIST, *Ancestor Cult*, 127–128, n. 3. (Both Schmidt and Skaist base their classifications on the anthropological work of Meyer Fortes.) The distinction

would have included acts of mourning, commemorative rites and other ceremonies, as well as all requisite mortuary practices. When the phrase is understood in such a manner, it becomes possible to recognize the integral relationship that this initial formula has with the two formulaic phrases it precedes in the typical epilogue within the Book of Kings. The most lasting symbol of a funerary rite is the tomb, which itself served as a tangible image of patrimony.⁸ Thus, the phrase is followed immediately by the description of the burial site (in most cases). Rather than negating the funeral sense encoded within the language of the epilogue's first notice, the burial notice that follows confirms the first notice's significance by stating that the defunct king was interred within his patrimony; in essence it localizes the meaning and significance that is created through the ritual process. The third and final statement introduces the succeeding son and expresses the consequences of the ritual process, which are related to division of inheritance and succession of power. Socio-anthropological studies of funerary rites have shown that they often represented a transformative process in which the identity of the participants underwent conversion.⁹ This transformative nature is evident in both the first and last statements of the royal epilogue, as the defunct king becomes an ancestor (by joining his "fathers") and the crown prince becomes the new king ("and...his son ruled in his stead").

1.2. Research Objectives

The study of the royal epilogues, with their reference to the burial of a king, must rely in part upon the archaeological exploration of ancient mortuary practices. Since the early 1970s, archaeological research into mortuary practices has shifted to the study of death within its social context.¹⁰ This shift has slowly made an impact on the various studies of death-ways in ancient Israel, where the concern has been typically theological.¹¹ It is

between the occasional rituals associated with burials (funerary rites) and the regular observance of mortuary cults (ancestor cults) in ancient Ugarit is discussed in SALLES, *Rituel Mortuaire*, 171–184; see also PARDEE, *Marzihu*, 273–287.

⁸ The manner in which funerary rites are illustrative of succession and inheritance, as expressed through patrilinear concepts of ancestry, is discussed in PARKER PEARSON, *Archaeology of Death*, 114–115.

⁹ See, for instance, TURNER, *Forest*, 93–111. A full discussion of these theories is given below.

¹⁰ See the collection of essays in BROWN, *Approaches*. For a review of this work and its impact, see CHAPMAN, *Death, society and archaeology*, 306–312; LANERI, *Funerary Rituals*, 1–10; and BROWN, *Third Millennium*, 301–305.

¹¹ For instance, SPRONK, *Beatific Afterlife*; see also JOHNSTON, *Shades*.

not surprising therefore, that few studies have addressed the political problems caused by the death of a ruler in the ancient kingdoms of Israel and Judah. In fact, there have been only a limited number of works that examine the topic of death in the ancient Near East within a royal (i.e., political) context,¹² and even fewer that move beyond the subject of royal tombs.¹³ This fact is reflective of the paucity of written sources that deal with the death of a king in Mesopotamia and the Levant,¹⁴ which itself may reveal the political delicacy of the topic.¹⁵ Aside from the odd literary sources concerned with the dead king in the afterlife,¹⁶ the few Mesopotamia sources that deal with royal funerals consist almost entirely of administrative documents (lists of funerary provisions and offerings) and are from a diverse range of cultures.¹⁷ In the Levant there are even fewer sources, although there are ritual texts from Ugarit, written in Ugaritic and Hurrian, which are concerned with the problem of dead kings.¹⁸ Yet these texts are

¹² The exceptions include HALLO, *Death of Kings*, 148–165; RICHARDSON, *Assyrian Garden*, 145–216; CHARPIN, “Le Roi et Mort, Vive Le Roi!” 69–95. One of the few scholars who have made several contributions to the study of the royal dead is Herbert Niehr, whose works will be cited throughout this dissertation.

¹³ The interest in royal tombs has been stoked by recent discoveries in modern Syria and Iraq, and only a select bibliography can be given here (though the scholarship will be reviewed in Chapter Three). For the MB II–LB tombs of the palace at Qatna, see AL-MAQDISSI et al., *Königliche Hypogäum*, 189–218; cf. more recently, NIEHR, *Royal Funeral*, 1–24. On the discovery of additional tombs in the palace at Kalḫu (Nimrud, Iraq) and their historical significance, see DALLEY, *Yabâ, Atalaya*, 83–98; and DAMERJI and KAMIL, *Gräber Assyrischer Königinnen*.

¹⁴ One notable exception is the extended ritual for the cremation of a Hittite king or queen, which exists in several sources that describe the fourteen-day ceremony, see OTTEN, *Hethitische Totenrituale*. For a recent translation, see KASSIAN, KOROLEV, and SIDEL'TSEV, *Hittite Funerary Ritual*. Another exception is the death and commemoration of Panamuwa, the king of Sam'al, which is described in KAI 215 1:16–23. This inscription, however, does not describe how the king was buried.

¹⁵ On this problem in Mesopotamian sources, see briefly MICHALOWSKI, *Death of Shulgi*, 224. William Hallo's qualifying remarks about the nature of the literature are appropriate, see HALLO, *Death of Kings*, 164 n. 138.

¹⁶ Notably, KRAMER, *Death of Ur-Nammu*, 104–122.

¹⁷ For instance, from southern Mesopotamia during the ED IIIb periods there are Sumerian documents that list funerary provisions: the so-called “funeral of Baranamtara” (= *TSA* 09 [CDLI P221370] and *VS* 14, 137 [CDLI P020152] as well as *Nik* 1, 134 [CDLI 221903]) – all of which are from Lagash/Girsu. (The citation of Sumerian texts will include the numbering of the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative [<http://cdli.ucla.edu/>].) These texts were recently analyzed in COHEN, *Death Rituals*. The Old Sumerian texts compare with a later document from northern Mesopotamia, dating to the Neo-Assyrian period, that lists funerary offerings; see MCGINNIS, *Neo-Assyrian Text*, 1–15 and DELLER, *Sealed*, 69–71.

¹⁸ For the Ugaritic ritual, KTU 1.161, see PARDEE, *Les textes rituels* 2, 816–825. (This ritual text is discussed in Chapter Six.) For the Hurrian ritual, KTU 1.125, written

difficult to understand, let alone relate to the archaeologically attested remains of royal tombs at Ugarit (Ras Shamra, Syria).¹⁹ Because of the limited nature of the written sources regarding the death and burial of a king (what few texts exist are usually ambiguous and difficult to interpret), it becomes essential to analyze the material record of royal tombs, which provide a solid (though still limited) source for understanding the political implications of dead kings.

There are no royal tombs within the archaeological remains of the Kingdom of Judah, although certain structures in Samaria have been proposed to be the tombs of the kings of Israel. Given the paucity (and uncertainty) of evidence, the insight drawn from the archaeology of death and burial is restricted in its manner of approach, which are: analogues drawn from elsewhere in the ancient Levant (such as Qatna and Ugarit), and the analysis of elite (albeit non-royal) customs indigenous to the southern Levant. This limitation is not as drastic a problem as it may initially appear. To begin with, the initial statement of the royal epilogues, “he lay with his fathers,” is euphemistic; it is an indirect way of stating that the king died.²⁰ The observation is certainly consistent with the more-or-less furtive attitude concerning a king’s death in written sources found elsewhere in the ancient Near East. But the poetic aspect of the euphemism draws from burial customs found throughout the southwestern Levant, from the Middle Bronze through the Iron Age. To address the problem of royal funerary rites in the kingdoms of Israel and Judah it is imperative to begin by recognizing the social significance of death and burial specific to this part of the Levant. The household was the defining symbol in the societies of ancient Israel and much of the Levant.²¹ Furthermore, burial was a symbolically charged action and the family tomb was emblematic of the kin-based social structure of ancient Israel.²² Thus, the manipulation of images drawn

in the alphabetic-cuneiform script of Ugarit, see DIETRICH and MAYER, *Hurritisches Totenritual* 79–89.

¹⁹ For one of the few attempts to reconstruct the royal cult of the dead at Ugarit, see NIEHR, *Topography of Death*, 219–242. This insightful essay deals specifically with the cult of royal ancestors and not the ritual process of the royal funerary ritual; see also IDEM., *Beitrag zur Konzeption*, 173–174.

²⁰ In one sense, the use of a politically expedient expression for a king’s fate that avoids stating directly that he has died, is seen in the well-known Hittite phrase used of a defunct king: “When in Ḫattuša a great sin has occurred, in which the King or Queen becomes a god.” This is the first line of the fourteen-day ritual, see OTTEN, *Hethitische Totenrituale*, 18–19.

²¹ SCHLOEN, *House of the Father*, 45–48. Schloen uses the term “root,” as in root-metaphor or root-symbol, following the work of Paul Ricoeur.

²² The connection between the family tomb and patrimony in ancient Israel has been recognized and studied, see BRICHTO, *Kin*, 10; and VAN DER TOORN, *Family Religion*, 207–208.

from social practices (burial) was a deliberate tactic of political dynasties in ancient Israel. For this reason, the proceeding study will employ the term “socio-political” throughout its discussion.²³

It is important to establish a theoretical basis in approaching the subject of death and burial in the biblical world.²⁴ Because the evidence for funerary-rites in ancient Israel is so pervasive, the small number of studies that have addressed royal death-rites in this area have used the material record of burial remains as an analogue to better understand the tombs of David, as cited in the Hebrew Bible. These studies raise certain conceptual issues that will be addressed in later chapters, yet it should be noted here that their objectives were circumscribed by questions that served religious or literary agendas and not problems that reflected the social and political context of the tombs.²⁵ Two recent essays devoted to the study of royal death-rites in the Hebrew Bible only investigated the question of royal ancestor-worship,²⁶ despite the fact that the evidence for ancestor worship in

²³ Schloen uses the term “socio-historical” because the nature of his study is society as a whole, SCHLOEN, *House of the Father*, 49–63. In contrast, the project here is conducted top-down and the focus is entirely upon royal dynasties; therefore the term “socio-political” is appropriate. Note the following quote (albeit focused on divine kingship): “The historians want to know how the ceremonial image and the stability of the state relate to each other, whereas the anthropologists want to know how a society constructs a transcendent symbolic idiom, and how human beings are transformed into divine kings.” CANNADINE, *Introduction*, 14. The “transcendent symbolic idiom,” constructed through royal funerary rites, is the ancestral image of the ruling dynasty, which is evoked in terms that are constitutive for Israelite society as a whole.

²⁴ One of the first studies of death in the Hebrew Bible that engaged social scientific theory, the Oxford doctoral thesis of Brian Schmidt (published originally in 1994), devoted only a small section the topic of royal ancestors. SCHMIDT, *Beneficent Dead*, 276–278. Schmidt draws from Mesopotamian examples of ancestor cults, using a definition that is similar to Durkheim’s concept of the cult of the dead, in order to dismiss any royal funerary rites (or mortuary cults) in ancient Israel and Judah. The point of Schmidt’s work is to refute the existence of ancestor worship in ancient Israel. Although this present work will not engage in any reconstruction of ancestor worship (or Israelite cult of the dead), it will seek to show that the concept of royal ancestry is, in fact, enforced by dynastic succession, and specifically located within the royal capital (and thus, grounded within the realm of the palace).

²⁵ Two recent examples are NA’AMAN, *Death Formulae*, 245–254; and the response in STAVRAKOPOULOU, *Exploring*, 1–21. The discussion of these studies is one of religious practices that relate either to cultic purity or a cult of the dead. For Na’aman the question stems directly from the change in literary style found in the formulaic statement of burial in the epilogues of Kings (beginning with Hezekiah). These two studies will be fully analyzed in the subsequent chapters of this work.

²⁶ HALLO, *Royal Ancestor Worship*, 381–401. Hallo redefined the question by theorizing a concept of “ancestor veneration” that was distinct from the normative practice of worship in ancient Israel, however the essay by the venerable Assyriologist placed most of its emphasis on Mesopotamian sources. The essay by Francesca Stravrakopoulou is a