

OMRI IN CONTEXT: AN ISRAELITE KING BETWEEN HISTORY AND THEOLOGY

Kevin Brown

This paper was presented at the 9th Australasian Centre for Wesleyan Research Conference in Sydney, 7-9 September 2018.

The practice of comparing and contrasting the Hebrew Scriptures with their Ancient Near Eastern background has proven immensely helpful for a better understanding of the biblical text. This paper will briefly outline how the contextual approach developed by William Hallo and Lawson Younger can be adapted to achieve the goal of illuminating a chosen biblical passage against its wider linguistic, cultural, and archaeological background. The focus will be upon 1 Kgs 16:24 which describes Omri's purchase of Samaria. This biblical account will be placed in comparison and contrast with the annals of Ashurnasirpal II which describe his acquiring of Kalhu as the site for the capital city. King Omri and King Ashurnasirpal II were contemporaries. Both kings relocated their nation's capital and founded the new site within a close chronological timeframe. Yet the record of establishing each city differs considerably. This paper will briefly consider the texts concerned, but in particular, highlight the way that a contextual method allows us to see in the biblical account an aspect of the text that would otherwise remain hidden.

Application of a Contextual Method to the Account of City Foundations

Christopher Hays urges us to read ancient Near Eastern texts and to recognise that the Hebrew Scriptures are 'exceedingly "respiratory": they breathe in the culture of their times.'¹ With that image in mind, I would like to introduce this project, which is an adaptation of a contextual method of study, an approach exemplified in the work of William Hallo and Lawson Younger. In Hallo and Younger's three-volume set *The Context of Scripture*, they sought to both compare and contrast the biblical account with its ancient Near Eastern context.² Hallo described the contextual method as a means to 'modify the strictly comparative approach by paying equal attention to possible contrasts' and in this way to 'silhouette the biblical text against its wider literary and cultural environment and thus to arrive at a proper assessment of the extent to which the biblical evidence reflects that environment or, on the contrary, is distinctive and innovative over against it.'³ The focus for this study is a comparison of founding two capital cities; Samaria by Omri and Kalhu (Nimrud/ Calah) by Ashurnasirpal II. The story of King Omri and Samaria is told in 1 Kgs 16:24, the account of Ashurnasirpal II and his move of capital city to Kalhu is repeated several times in the annals of this Assyrian king.

The biblical text describes Omri's rise to sole rule as taking place in the thirty-first year of Asa king of Judah, in approximately 880 BCE.⁴ Omri reigned six years in Tirzah before moving the capital of Israel to Samaria.⁵ 'He bought the hill of Samaria from Shemer for two talents of silver and built a city on the hill, calling it Samaria, after Shemer, the name of the former owner of the hill.' To allow time for

¹ C.B. Hays, *Hidden Riches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 4.

² W.W. Hallo and K.L. Younger Jr, eds., *The Context of Scripture*, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1997-2002), W.W. Hallo, *The Book of the People* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).

³ Hallo, *The Book of the People*, 23-24.

⁴ Albright dated Omri's reign to 876-869 BCE, see W.F. Albright, 'The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel,' *BASOR*, No. 100 (Dec., 1945), 20f. Thiele proposed dates of 888 to 880 for Omri's rivalry with Tibni and then 880-874 for his sole reign. See E.R. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* 3rd ed., (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) and E.R. Thiele, *The Synchronisms of the Hebrew Kings- a Re-Evaluation: I* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1963), 129-131. Thiele disagrees with Albright's conclusions because Albright based his dating around the assumption that the statement in 2 Chronicles 16:1 is reliable. However, accepting the statement that Baasha built Ramah in the thirty-sixth year of Asa conflicts with the consistent dating of fourteen references in Kings and two others in Chronicles. P.L. Maier, *Josephus: The Essential Writings* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1988), 149, 388-389, affirms dates between 881-873 BCE. Finkelstein proposed dates of 884-842 BCE as the forty-year period of Omride rule under four successive kings, see I. Finkelstein, *The Forgotten Kingdom: The Archaeology and History of Northern Israel* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013), 83.

⁵ 1 Kgs 16:23-24.

construction of the palace and fortifications at Samaria prior to relocation, the purchase of the hill of Samaria would need to be dated early in Omri's sole reign, perhaps mid 880 BCE.⁶

The reason for pursuing a contextual study of the founding of two cities is due to the extensive account from Kalhu that may throw further light upon the minimalist account of Omri and Samaria. The choice to compare and contrast the beginnings of these particular cities is because of the contemporary reigns of Omri (884-873 BCE) and Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 BCE) and therefore the close chronological association of capital city foundations. Ashurnasirpal II succeeded his father to the throne of Assyria in 883 BCE and reigned until 859 BCE.⁷ His annals include repeated accounts of the founding of a new capital for the empire at Kalhu.⁸ In 879 BCE or shortly thereafter, Ashurnasirpal II proudly described his work on the new capital, 'the city Calah I took in hand for renovation. I cleared away the old ruin hill (and) dug down to water level. From water level to the top, (a depth of) 120 layers of brick, I filled in the terrace. I founded therein a palace ... as my royal residence (and) for my lordly leisure (and) decorated in a splendid fashion'⁹ This places the dates for the acquisition of respective hills and establishment of a palace in Samaria and Kalhu in a very close chronological relationship, perhaps within months of each other.

What must be recognised, however, is the difference in the dates of composition. The royal inscriptions of Ashurnasirpal II are composed in the first person and dated to his reign.¹⁰ Dating the composition of 1 Kings 16 and the account of Omri and Samaria is much more complex. Final compilation of what we know as the Book of Kings was certainly post-exilic. The extent of time after the exile is still a matter of scholarly debate. Finkelstein's broad reference to composition 'two and [a] half centuries after the Omride dynasty' helps to clarify that a chronological gap does certainly exist between the texts at the heart of this study.¹¹ He also proposed that 'original northern texts' could have been written 'as early as the first half of the eight century BCE.'¹² But even the postulated earlier texts suppose an elapse of time between Omri's choice of Samaria for his capital and a written record of that purchase. The assumption at this point of the study is that a gap in the dating of key texts need not negate the opportunity for comparison and contrast.

The Purchase of a Hill: Samaria

The biblical text explains that Omri 'bought the hill of Samaria from Shemer for two talents of silver ... calling it Samaria, after Shemer, the name of the former owner of the hill.'¹³ The question to explore at this juncture is why Omri did not simply exercise his royal power and acquire the property. Alt surmised that perhaps Samaria was in a Canaanite region and was purchased by Omri from a Canaanite community called 'Shemer.'¹⁴ Maybe as Wright argued, Omri used his power to have himself 'adopted' as a son to make the purchase legal.¹⁵ Or perhaps B. Mazar's 'brilliant piece of detective work' is more likely in that it positions Omri in the tribe of Issachar and therefore related to Shemer or the Shomron family and able by customary law to acquire the land.¹⁶ What this discussion assumes is that Omri's actions in obtaining the property are a desire to legally purchase an ancestral estate. Stager's conclusion

⁶ Fisher, for example, dated the palace of Omri to ca. 880 BCE. See G.A. Reisner, C.S. Fisher, and D.G. Lyon. *Harvard Excavations at Samaria 1908-1910* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924), I, 93. Likewise, Kenyon stood by the date of 880 BCE. See J. W. Crowfoot, K. M. Kenyon, and E. L. Sukenik. *Samaria-Sebaste I: The Buildings at Samaria* (London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1966), 1, 94.

⁷ A. Kirk Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC (1114-859 BC)*. RIMA 2 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 2:189.

⁸ See for example, Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.1, iii, lines 132-133 (RIMA 2:212); Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.17, v, lines 1-4 (RIMA 2:252); Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.26, lines 46-49 (RIMA 2:281); Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.29, lines 9-11 (RIMA 2:287); Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.30, lines 24-26 (RIMA 2:289).

⁹ For the date see W. De Filippi, 'A Reappraisal of the Ashurnasirpal Text in Kings's College, Halifax,' *Revue D'Assyriologie Et D'archéologie Orientale* 68, no. 2 (1974): 141-48; 144; and J.E. Reade, 'Texts and Sculptures from the North-West Palace, Nimrud,' *Iraq* 47 (1985): 203-14; 205. Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.30, lines 24-26 (RIMA 2:289).

¹⁰ See for Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.1, line 9 (RIMA 2:194), and Sparks, *God's Word in Human Words*, 63.

¹¹ Finkelstein, *The Forgotten Kingdom*, 84.

¹² Finkelstein, *The Forgotten Kingdom*, 3. Other scholars can be found who argue for sources used in the composition of Kings, such as king lists or a prophetic record. See, for example, A.F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1- 2 Kings 10)* (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986), 1.

¹³ 1 Kings 16:24

¹⁴ A. Alt, *Der Stadtstaat Samaria* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954), 5-21. See also Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*, I, 297. I agree with De Vaux, that while Alt's proposition is interesting it is rather 'uncertain and improbable.' R. De Vaux, *Revue Biblique* 63, no. 1 (1956): 101-06, 102.

¹⁵ Wright, 'Samaria,' 69.

¹⁶ L.E. Stager, 'Shemer's Estate,' *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 277/278 (Feb - May, 1990): 93-107; 104, referring to B. Mazar, 'The House of Omri,' *Eretz-Israel*. 20 (1989): 215-19. See also Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979), 333-334, and R. E. Tappy, 'The Archaeology of Israelite Samaria,' *Harvard Semitic Studies* 50, Vol.2 (2001): 1-665, 4.

is that Omri was able to 'retain his ancestral ties' by naming the capital after the owner of the hill.¹⁷ This is an interesting conclusion to draw from Omri's actions because his recorded assessment in 1 Kings is entirely negative. The formulaic judgment in which the Omri account is set is odd when held in tension with behaviour that would seem to be honourable and even generous. The question for this view is why such a large amount of money would be necessary for a purchase within the tribe. The payment made for the hill of Samaria is described as 'two talents of silver.' Both a light and heavy talent are known from the Levant and Mesopotamia, but whichever standard weight is used, two talents represent a substantial payment in silver.¹⁸ The equivalent payment in silver shekels would approximate to six to seven thousand shekels. On modern scales the payment would weigh in between sixty and seventy kilograms if the light standard talent is used, and twice that for the heavy talent.¹⁹

We are left assuming that payment must have been weighed out to Shemer somehow, and a contemporary portrayal of just such a financial transaction is provided on the Rassam Obelisk.²⁰ While not depicting a sale of land, the Rassam Obelisk displays tribute being weighed and presented to King Ashurnasirpal II. The Rassam Obelisk was broken up in antiquity, but some pieces have been located and assembled to make out several panels.²¹ Face A, part 3 (fragment iv) provides a striking visual image of oblong pieces of tribute, presumably precious metals, being weighed.²² Ashurnasirpal II is pictured standing within or on the outer wall of the town with an attendant, officials, eunuchs and an especially important looking official loading oblong blocks into a balance.²³ One eunuch to the left of the balance is waving his hand to indicate the tribute being offered. Another eunuch stands responsible for the weights, while a 'tributary wearing a headband, a fringed tunic with belt and a flap over his shoulder' and a squared beard loads one of the pans.²⁴ Reade surmised that the dress and beard of the tributary may indicate high rank.²⁵ The framework of the balance itself is shown in three sections: the bottom section is plain, the second section has lion's feet, and the upper section has hooves and then a stepped top.²⁶ Two piles of tribute are shown: weighed and unweighed, with three blocks in the pan.²⁷ We have no way of knowing exactly how two talents of silver were weighed for the purchase of the hill of Samaria. But the discovery of the Rassam Obelisk provides an insight into a contemporary balance complete with frame, weights, pans and officials to record the transaction.²⁸

Biblical accounts of land purchases can be drawn upon to compare with Omri's investment. These include Abraham's purchase of the field of Machpelah for four hundred shekels of silver.²⁹ David paid fifty shekels of silver for oxen and a threshing floor.³⁰ Jeremiah bought a field from his cousin and weighed out seventeen shekels of silver for the purchase.³¹ We note immediately that these land sales are significantly less than the two talents (six to seven thousand shekels) paid by Omri for Samaria. Perhaps we need to look at Omri's purchase of Samaria in a new light?

¹⁷ Stager, 'Shemer's Estate,' 104.

¹⁸ See R. Kletter, 'Weights and Measures,' in *New Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. K.D. Sakenfeld (Nashville: Abingdon, 2009), V:835.

¹⁹ For discussion on the silver economy see for example, S. Gaspa, 'Silver Circulation and the Development of the Private Economy in the Assyrian Empire (9th–7th Centuries BCE): Considerations on Private Investments, Prices and Prosperity Levels of the Imperial élite,' in *Dynamics of Production in the Ancient Near East*, ed. García Juan Carlos Moreno (Philadelphia: Oxbow, 2016); R. S. Nam, *Portrayals of Economic Exchange in the Book of Kings* (Leiden: Brill, 2012); J. S. Holladay, Jr., 'Hezekiah's Tribute, Long-Distance Trade, and the Wealth of Nations ca. 1000-600BC: A New Perspective,' in *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel in Honor of William G. Dever*, eds. S.J. Gitin, J.E. Wright, and J.P. Dessel (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 309-331; K. Radner, 'Money in the Neo-Assyrian Empire,' in *Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia*, ed. J. G. Dercksen (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, 1999), 126-157; and F.M. Fales, 'Prices in Neo-Assyrian Sources,' *SAAB* 10 (1996): 11-53.

²⁰ A later depiction of scales being used to weigh booty is found on a relief from the palace of Sargon II in Dur-Sarruken. See Radner, 'Money in the Neo-Assyrian Empire,' 135, and Holladay, 'Hezekiah's Tribute,' 324.

²¹ J.E. Reade, 'The Rassam Obelisk,' *Iraq* 42, no. 1 (1980): 1-22.

²² Reade, 'The Rassam Obelisk,' 12, and Plate IV. Kletter noted that the Hebrew word for Talent, *kikkar*, literally means 'loaf.' See Kletter, 'Weights and Measures,' V:835. It is then fascinating to hear Reade's description of this tribute stacked as oblong blocks, shapes reminiscent of loaves.

²³ Reade, 'The Rassam Obelisk,' 12.

²⁴ Reade, 'The Rassam Obelisk,' 12.

²⁵ Reade, 'The Rassam Obelisk,' 12.

²⁶ Reade, 'The Rassam Obelisk,' 12, and Plate IV.

²⁷ Reade, 'The Rassam Obelisk,' 12, and Plate IV.

²⁸ Gaspa's comment is that checking the weighing of silver was common in every transaction. That being the case, we can imagine that some of the officials shown with the king are witnesses to the transaction. See Gaspa, 'Silver Circulation,' 134. A similar set of scales in use is depicted from Sargon II's sack of Mušāšir. See P.E. Botta and E. Flandin, *Monument de Ninive*. Vol. 2 (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1849-50), pl. 140; Radner, 'Money in the Neo-Assyrian Empire,' 135 and fig. 2, 205; J.S. Holladay, 'Hezekiah's Tribute, Long-Distance Trade, and the Wealth of Nations ca. 1000-600 BC: A New Perspective,' in *Confronting the Past. Archaeological and Historical Essays in Ancient Israel in Honor of William G. Dever*, eds. S.J. Gitin, J.E. Wright, and J.P. Dessel (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), fig. 4, 324.

²⁹ Gen 23:3-20.

³⁰ 2 Sam 24:24.

³¹ Jer 32:6-12.

Theological judgment of yet another evil northern king sits in tension with seemingly generous behaviour that provided a substantial sum in exchange for land. Earlier ‘tensions’ in the book of Kings can be found in 1 Kings 11 and 12 where a positive assessment is made of Jeroboam I. Jeroboam is promised a reign ‘over all that your soul desires,’ and ‘an enduring house.’³² Those promises are withdrawn when he builds golden calves at Dan and Bethel, but this positive assessment of a northern king may not stand alone, if our growing argument regarding 1 Kgs 16:24 is correct.

At this point a striking literary contrast must therefore be drawn between Omri and Samaria, and his son Ahab and Naboth’s vineyard. Ahab’s offer was to exchange land or purchase the vineyard, and yet Naboth refused. ‘Let me have your vineyard ... In exchange I will give you a better vineyard or, if you prefer, I will pay you whatever it is worth.’³³ Naboth’s reply, ‘The Lord forbid that I should give you the inheritance of my fathers,’ has been taken to imply a knowledge of, and respect for Levitical laws regarding tribal lands.³⁴ Not all scholars have agreed with this reading of the text. Rofé, Blum, Cronauer and Knauf have dated the story to the Persian period, thereby removing the account from effective comparison with Omri’s purchase of Samaria.³⁵ However, Na’aman, Russell and Guillaume each have different reasons for considering that the basic story originated in the monarchic period.³⁶ Na’aman’s work undermines the literary conclusions of Rofé thereby also impacting those who follow in Rofé’s steps.³⁷ Na’aman argues that the archaeological evidence uncovered in Jezreel points to construction under Ahab and the Omrides. If that is correct, then the contrast between Omri and Samaria, and Ahab and Naboth’s vineyard is striking. Even if the basis for the inalienability of biblical lands is found to be lacking and Naboth simply refused to ‘swap grandad’s vineyard’ for personal reasons, Omri is shown in contrast to have acted honestly.³⁸ Yet Omri is said to have ‘sinned more than all those before him,’ thereby placing 1 Kgs 16:24 in tension with the theological assessment in which it is set.³⁹ The comparison of Omri’s payment with inner biblical land purchases raised the suggestion that Omri may have acted very generously. The contrast between Omri and Ahab accentuated the question of how Omri’s actions in paying for land should be viewed. To better understand Omri’s actions in purchasing Samaria, we will move from comparisons with biblical land transactions to a contrast with his Assyrian contemporary.

Acquiring a Hill: Kalhu

Below the mound that Ashurnasirpal II chose as the site for his future capital lay the ruins of a city established by Shalmaneser I, almost four hundred years previously. The annals of Ashurnasirpal II repeat several times that the city and its infrastructure had fallen into ruins.⁴⁰ Yet some accounts state that Ashurnasirpal II ‘transformed a village on the Tigris into one of the greatest cities of the world.’⁴¹ Max Mallowan, who dug Nimrud/ Kalhu in the 1950s, explained that, ‘we know from the evidence of certain primitive relics [that] there had been a succession of hamlets since 3000BC.’⁴² Ashurnasirpal II is clear that the city had fallen into ruin, but he makes no mention of a village that may have existed on the hill. If the Assyrian king cleared away a village to make way for his new capital, then we are left with a much more interesting contrast with Omri and his purchase of Samaria. Just as Samaria was occupied by Shemer’s estate prior to construction, so the hill that would become the capital of Assyria had residents. If the claim is correct, that a village lay upon the top of the ruins of ancient Kalhu, then no word is said concerning the villagers or their homes.

³² 1 Kgs 11:37-38 and 12:26-33.

³³ 1 Kgs 21: 2-3.

³⁴ Lev 25: 8-10; 23. See also Deut 25: 5-10 and Josh 13-21. For ‘inheritance’ see Josh 13:7. I.W. Provan, *1 and 2 Kings*. New International Bible Commentary (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 157; and J.A. Davies, *1 Kings*. An EP Study Commentary (Darlington: EP Books, 2012), 388.

³⁵ A. Rofé, ‘The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the story,’ *VT* 38 (1988): 89-104; E. Blum, ‘Dier Nabothüberlieferung und die Kompositionsgeschichte der Vorderen Propheten,’ in *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65 Geburtstag*, BZAW 300, eds. R.G. Kratz, T. Krüger, and K. Schmid (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 111-28; P. T. Cronauer, *Stories about Naboth the Jezreelite: A Source, Composition, and Redaction Investigation of 1 Kings 21 and Passages in 2 Kings 9* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 167-85.

³⁶ N. Na’aman, ‘Naboth’s Vineyard and the Foundation of Jezreel,’ *JSOT* 33.2 (2008): 197-218; S.C. Russell, ‘The Hierarchy of Estates in Land and Naboth’s Vineyard,’ *JSOT* 38.4 (June 2014): 453-469; P. Guillaume, *Land, Credit and Crisis: Agrarian Finance in the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Equinox, 2012), 68.

³⁷ Na’aman, ‘Naboth’s Vineyard,’ 200-204. See also Russell, ‘The Hierarchy of Estates,’ 457.

³⁸ Guillaume, *Land, Credit and Crisis*, 73.

³⁹ 1 Kgs 16:25.

⁴⁰ Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.1, iii, line 132 (RIMA 2:222); Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.17, v, lines 1-4 (RIMA 2:252); Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.26, lines 46-47 (RIMA 2:281); Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.29, lines 9-10 (RIMA 2:287).

⁴¹ J. Boardman, I.E.S. Edwards, N.G.L. Hammond, and E. Sollberger, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd ed. 14 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970-2005), III, Part II, 253.

⁴² M.E.L. Mallowan, *Nimrud And Its Remains*, 2 vols. (London: Collins, 1966), 1, 74.

Ashurnasirpal II proudly states that, in his accession year, the god Šamaš had ‘placed in my hand the sceptre for the shepherding of the people.’⁴³ Are we to imagine that Ashurnasirpal II quietly ‘shepherded’ a village from the slopes of the old city so that he could carry on his plans for development? Or perhaps, in defence of Ashurnasirpal II, we might imagine that he removed the villagers with a promise that they could build new houses in the capital once it was complete.⁴⁴ Either way, we have a striking contrast with King Omri of Israel who compensated the owner of the property on which the capital would be built with a considerable sum in silver. Omri is described in the biblical text as one who ‘did evil in the eyes of the Lord and sinned more than all those before him.’⁴⁵ The tensions within the biblical account are heightened as we place this assessment of Ashurnasirpal II alongside of the seemingly righteous actions of Omri.

Conclusion

Before we reach the story of Omri in 1 Kings 16 we read the positive comments concerning Jeroboam I in 1 Kings 11-12, passages seemingly at odds with his subsequent use as the stereotypical evil northern king. The prophet Ahijah appears to commission Jeroboam to establish a legitimate Yahwist kingdom in the north.⁴⁶ Only later when Jeroboam breaks the terms of this commission is he condemned.⁴⁷ In like manner, the approach taken in this paper has identified the ways in which Omri’s righteous behaviour in paying a substantial sum for Samaria contrasts not just with the actions of Ashurnasirpal II of Assyria, but also with the internal biblical assessment of his evil. The text of Kings speaks itself of drawing upon sources as the basis for composition.⁴⁸ Perhaps an early northern source included a positive assessment of Jeroboam I and also of Omri’s purchase of Samaria. 1 Kgs 16:24 is often overlooked or simply ‘lost’ within the formulaic assessment within which it sits, yet this application of a contextual method has argued that we should re-evaluate the significance of this verse for our understanding of the composition of the biblical text.

Kevin Brown is Principal of Kingsley College, the ministry training arm of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Australia, and a doctoral student with the University of Divinity.

⁴³ Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.1, i, lines 43-45 (RIMA 2:196).

⁴⁴ Ashurnasirpal II Inscription, A.O.101.1, iii, line 133-134 (RIMA 2:222)

⁴⁵ 1 Kgs 16: 25.

⁴⁶ 1 Kgs 11:37-38. Jeroboam is promised a reign ‘over all that your soul desires,’ and ‘an enduring house.’

⁴⁷ 1 Kgs 12:26-33.

⁴⁸ 1 Kgs 11:41; 14:19; 14:29. Chronicles also mentions sources, but of the prophets who spoke within the kingdom period. See for example, 1 Chron 29:29; 2 Chron 9:29; 12:15; 20:34; 24:27; 26:22; 32:32.