Introduction

Grammatical type: verb.

Occurrences:

Sir 1 occurrence: 47.13 B

Ep 1 occurrence: Davies 2.088.1 = Renz Arad 7/88 (Tell Arad Ostracon 88, end 7th c.)

Q 6 occurrences (plus 4 in biblical citations):

1QM 12.3
4Q 510,1,1
4QFlor 1.3,12f. (citation of Ex 15.17)
4QFlor 1.10 (citation of 2Sm 7.11–14)
11Q13(Melch) II,23 citation of Isa 52.7
4Q365 6b 3 (citation of Ex 15.18)

TempScr 57.2

BH 347 occurrences:

Qal:

Gn 36.31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39 = 1Ch 1.43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50; Gn 36.32; 37.8;
Ex 15.18, Josh 13.10,12,21, Jdg 4.2; 9.8,10,12,14
1Sm 8.7,9,11; 11.12; 12.12,14; 13.1; 16.1; 23.17; 24.21
2Sm 2.10; 3.21; 5.4,5; 8.15; 10.1 = 1Ch 19.1; 15.10; 16.8;
1Kg 1.5,11,13,17,18,24,30,35; 2.11,15; 6.1; 11.24,25,37,42,43; 12.17; 14.19,20,21,31;
15.1,2,8,9,10,24,25,28,29,33; 16.6,8,10,11,15,22,23,28,29; 22.40,41,42,51,52;
2Kg 1.17; 3.1,27; 8.15,16,17,24,25,26; 9.13,29; 10.35,36; 11.3 = 2Ch 22.12; 12.1,2,22; 13.1,9,10,24;
14.1,2,16,23,29; 15.1,2,7,8,10,13,14,17,22,23,25,27,30,32,33,38; 16.1,2,20; 17.1; 18.1,2; 19.37; 20.21;
21.1,2,18,19,26; 22.1; 23.31,33,36; 24.6,8,12,18; 25.1,27.
Is 24.23; 32.1; 37.38; 52.7; Jr 1.2; 22.11,15; 23.5; 33.21; 37.1; 51.59; 52.1,4; Ezk 20.33; Mc 4.7;
Ps 47.9,93.1; 96.10=1Ch 16.31; 97.1; 99.1; 146.10;
Pr 8.15; 30.22, Qoh 4.14; Jb 34.30; Est 1.1,3; 2.4 (f); Dn 9.2
1Ch 3.4; 4.31; 18.14; 29.26, 27,28;
2Ch 1.13; 9.30,31; 10.17; 12.13,16; 13.1,2,23; 16.13; 17.1,7; 20.31; 21.1,5,20,22; 22.1,2; 23.3; 24.1,2,27; 25.1;
26.3,23; 27.1,2,8,9; 28.1,27; 29.1,3; 32.33; 33.1,2,20,21; 34.1,3,8; 36.2,5,8,9,11,20.

Hiphil:
Jdg 9.6,16,18; 1Sm 8.22; 11.15; 12.1; 15.11,35; 2Sm 2.9, 1Kg 1.43; 3.7; 12.1,20; 16.16,21; 2Kg 8.20; 10.5; 11.12 = 2Ch 23.11; 14.21; 17.21; 21.24; 23.30,34; 24.17, Is 7.6, Ezk 17.16, Jr 37.1; Hos 8.4, Est 2.17, Dn 9.1 (hophal), 1Ch 11.10; 12.32,39; 23.1; 28.4; 29.22, 2Ch 1.8,9,11; 10.1; 11.22; 21.8; 22.1; 26.1; 33.25; 36.1,4,10.

Qere/Kethiv: none?

Text doubtful:
A.1 Dn 9.1: the unique hoph is hard to explain. If accepted, it could mean that Darius was made king by Cyrus, or that Darius was established on the throne. However, Rowley (1935:52f) suggests that in view of the witness of the Versions (Pesh, LXX, Vg, Th) it should be taken as an active verb, perhaps originally a hiph used as the Arm aph 'amlek, “to reign”, and later erroneously pointed by the Masoretes as a hoph.
A.2 Ps 10.16: some scholars, e.g. Loretz (1988:415–16), suggest reading *ַמַל for מַלְקָה.

2. Root and Comparative Material
A.1 The AH root מַל, from which are derived the verb מָלַק and the noun forms מָלָה, מַלֶה, מַלְכָה, מַלֵּךְ, מַלְכוּת, מַלְכִּים, מַלְכִּים, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, מַלְכֹּת, مُّلُکُート, )Seybold, Ringgren, TW VI 932–33: TWOT VIII 352–53).
A.3 There is a homonymous Sem root mlk with the sense “advice” (noun), “to give counsel” (vb), etc., and is found in Akk, Arm, and the later period of AH (ni Neh 5.7). Langlamet (1970:179–80) has a useful summary of studies up to the late 1960s.
A.4 Some have regarded the two senses as developing from a single root: e.g. Nöldeke 1886:727, “to decide, advise”; Gesenius 1886 “to seize, hold”; Delitzsch Assyrisches Handworterbuch 1896: “to advise, deliberate”; Haupt 1915:54f. “to advise”; KB 1953 suppl; Fronzaroli (1965:246–69) OldWSem or PS root mlk underwent semantic changes in the three branches of Sem: in Akk mlk became limited by the wider use of šarru; in Arb mlk
developed special political-cultural nuances, and was subsequently influenced by the widespread use of *mlk* in WSem in the sense “king”; Caquot (1960:40) and Eilers (1964–66:97 n.3, 133, 142) see the basic original Sem meaning as “counsel”, which became personified as an agent noun “counsellor>leader>king”.

A.5 Others believe that there have always been two separate but homonymous roots: e.g. *Gesenius* 121895: I Moab, Ph “to be king”; Arb, Eth “to possess, be master of something”; II Arm, NH, Ass “to counsel, deliberate, decide”; von Soden AHw 1966:7,593ff II *malāku* (m) “to advise”, versus III *malāku* (from Ug, Can *mlk*) “to rule, give orders”; Vogt 1957:472 Akk *malāku* “to advise” has nothing to do with WSem *malkum* “king”, since the latter was a tribal chief who did not deliberate or decide.

A.6 Kopf (1959:261–62) notes that although dictionaries often define the meaning of the Arb cognate root as “to possess”, in fact it means “to take possession”. In the occurrence of the niph in Neh 5.7 יָּהָם וַיִּלָּח בַּיִּשְׁרִי-לֹא, which is often regarded as from MLK II, “to take counsel”, he believes that the sense is in fact like the Arb *mlk* יָּהָם נֶפֶשׁ, “his spirit took possession of him”, and means “my heart seized me”, i.e. “I was beside myself”.

B.1 Eilers (1964–66:142 n.4) tentatively suggested a derivation from *mā* *laka*, meaning “what is yours?” > “property”, cf. Arb *milkon*, or “what befits you” > “counsel”, cf. Akk *malkum*. This rather assumes the existence of a phrase in the form *mā* *laka* for a stage of Sem so early that it would precede every occurrence of MLK in the Sem langs.

B.2 Another idea, cited without reference in Seybold (*TW* VI:933 : TDOT VIII 353), is to derive *mlk* from the root *hlk*, hi ptc *mālīk*, “conducting”. Again, this relies on a speculative reconstruction of the grammatical forms of early Sem, and the assumption that a preformative *m-* could displace a *h-* to become part of a new and widespread root.

B.3 Brown (1993: 77) makes a phonetic comparison between Greek *Fávaξ* and AH דלד, citing similar alternations of each individual phoneme in other Sem and IE words. This does not seem likely, given the wide usage of the root in several Sem languages, and Brown does not suggest what the original behind the Gr and AH forms could be.

B.4 G.R. Driver (1950:50), following Haupt (1915:56), suggested that the hiph of דלד in Hos 8.4 was connected with the Arm aphel דלד, “to give counsel”, and additionally that the following verb should be associated with the Arb יָּגָר/ם, “to give advice”. But since the usual rendering of the verse “they make kings.... they make princes” makes perfect sense in the context, his suggestion has not been generally accepted (Rudolph 1966:156–57 ; Wolff 1965: ??; ET 1974:132; Macintosh 1997: 297).
3. Syntagmatics

A.1 Many of the occurrences of כֻּלּוֹ in the Qal are in the 3pms pf or impf, mostly with a king as subj, sometimes explicitly referred to as such.

A.2 The rare instances of the verb in the feminine are used of humans as follows: Athaliah, with feminine ptc 2Kg 11.3 = 2Ch 22.12, and of Vashti’s replacement, 3psf impf in Est 2.4. The other occurrences of the verb in the feminine are not used of humans, but of the fig tree and the vine in Jdg 9.10,12 (f impv). In 2Ch 36.20 the nomen rectum of the inf cons is יָרָה, which is thus effectively the subject of the phrase, and unusual in conjunction with כֻּלּוֹ in being both grammatically feminine and an abstract noun (compare the similar phrase at 1Ch 4.31, with David as the “subject”).

A.3 Being an intransitive verb, כֻּלּוֹ in the Qal is particularly associated with prepositions: יַלְיָה of subjects or territory, ב of the centre of royal rule, and לֹאכ to denote the ruler succeeded by the subject of the verb.

A.4 Formulae

The majority of occurrences in the Qal appear as part of regnal formulae, in the style of annals and chronicles, especially in the Books of Kings and Chronicles (e.g. “In the nth year of X king of A, Y became king (כֻּלּוֹ) over B. For x years he reigned (כֻּלּוֹ) in C and the name of his mother was Z daughter of N.”) and in Gn 36 and 1-2Kg (“X died/lay with his fathers and was buried in B, and there reigned (כֻּלּוֹ) in his stead (וַתְּפַלֵּח) Y son of Z/his son”). For greater detail, see S.R. Driver (1913:186), Burney (1903:ix–xii), *Skinner (1893:12), Montgomery (1951:31–32).

1) The opening formula (“Antrittsformel”, Begrich 1929:182–88) contains some or all of the following elements:

a) the relative chronology of the neighbouring kingdom; e.g. 1Kg 15.25, and see below in c) and d) marked “syn”.

b) the king’s age at his accession, for Judahite kings; e.g. 1Kg 2.11; 14.20; 15.9, and see below in c) and d) marked “dur” (= duration).

c) the length of his reign;

b) יָלִי indicating the king’s dominion;

d) כֻּלּוֹ: 1Sm 13.1 (dur), 2Sm 5.5^2 (dur), 6 (dur), 1Kg 2.11 (dur); 11.42 (dur); 15.1 (synchr), 25 (synchr), 33 (synchr, dur); 16.8 (synchr), 23 (synchr, dur), 29 (synchr); 22.41 (synchr), 52 (synchr), 2Kg 3.1, 9.29, 10.36, 13.1,10, 15.8,17,23,27, 17.1; 1Ch 29.26, 27.
øGl8m5Yu: 2 Sm 8.15, 1K 15.25 (dur); 16.29 (dur); 22.52 (dur); 1Ch 18.14, 2Ch 1.13, 9.30, 10.17, 20.31.

e) ø indicating the seat of government:
øGl8m5Yu: Josh 13.10,12,21; Jdg 4.2; 2Sm 5.5² (dur); 15.10; 1Kg 2.11² (dur); 11.42 (dur); 14.21² (dur); 15.2 (dur),10 (dur),33 (dur, synchr), 16.8 (synchr), 15(dur), 23 (dur), 29 (dur); 22.42 (dur), 52 (synchr); 2 K 3.1, 8.17,26, 10.36, 12.2, 13.1,10, 14.2,23, 15.2,8,17,23,27,33, 16.2, 17.1, 18.2, 21.1,19, 22.1, 23.31,36, 24.8,18; Jr 52.1; 1 Ch 3.4, 29.27 (bis), 2 Ch 12.13, 13.2, 20.31, 21.5,20, 22.2, 24.1, 25.1, 26.3, 27.1,8, 28.1, 29.1, 31.3,21, 34.1, 36.2,5,9,11.

øGl8m5Yu: Gn 36.32; 1 K 16.29 (dur); 2 Kg 15.13.

2) The second type of formula ("Schlußformel", Begrich 1929: 190–94) describes the death of the king and the succession of another, legitimately or not, using תֹּל and the waw consecutive impf:
øGl8m5Yu: Gn 36.33,34,35,36,37,38,39 = 1Ch 1.44,45,46,47,48,49,50, 2Sm 10.1 = 1Ch 19.1; 1Kg 11.43; 14.20,31; 15.8,24,25,28; 16.6,10,28; 22.40,51; 2Kg 1.17; 8.15,24; 10.35; 12.22; 13.9,24; 14.16,29; 15.7,10,14,22,25,30,38; 16.20; 19.37; 20.21; 21.18,26; 24.6; Is 37.38; Jr 37.1; 1Ch 29.28; 2Ch 9.31; 12.16; 13.23; 17.1; 21.1; 24.27; 26.23; 27.9; 28.27; 32.33; 33.20; 36.8; cf. Est 2.4 (f).

תֹּל does not appear in 1Kg 16.22, but the phrasing is otherwise very similar.

Ishida (1988:96–106) observes that יִשְׂרָאֵל is part of a formula describing usurpation, e.g. 1Kg 15.27–28; 16.9–10, 2Kg 15.10; 15.25,30.

A.5 Both ingressive and durative senses appear to coexist in יִשְׂרָאֵל, hence 2Kg 13.1,10; 14.23 with a single pf vb to cover accession and duration of reign beside 2 pf vbs in 1Kg 16.23, and pf followed by impf in 1Kg 15.25;16.29, 2Kg 3.1. This is relevant to the discussion of the significance of the phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל תָּמִת, where it has been argued that the pf has only an ingressive sense if it comes after the subject (see below in Exegesis).

A.6 The inf cons is also common in the annalistic occurrences and is usually found with prepositions:
øGl8m5Yu: Gn 36.31 //1Ch 1.43
øGl8m5Yu usually with age at commencement of reign, 1Sm 13.1, 2Sm 2.10, 5.4; 1Kg 14.21; 22.42, 2Kg 8.17,26; 12.1; 14.2; 15.2,33; 16.2; 18.2; 21.1,19; 22.1; 23.31,36; 24.8,18; Jr 52.1; 2Ch 12.13,20,31; 21.5,20; 22.2; 24.1; 26.3; 27.1,8; 28.1; 33.1,21; 34.1; 36.2,5,9,11.

øGl8m5Yu (not indicating age) 1Kg 16.11: see below on יִשְׂרָאֵל.
can be used to indicate a point in the reign, “in the nth year of his reign” e.g. 1 Kg 6.1, 2Kg 24.12; 25.1, Jr 1.2; 51.59; 52.4, Est 1.3, Dan 9.2, 2Ch 16.13; 17.7; 29.3; 34.3, 8; but 1Kg 2.15 in purpose clause.

2Kg 25.27 (cf. // at Jr 52.31, אשר מלך ומלך): Albright (1932:101–102) renders as “in the first official year” (of Awil-Marduk), following Lewy (1925: 25 n.3). Begrich (1929: 61 n.1) and Montgomery (1951: 54–55, 566–67) take the opposite view: they understand it as equivalent to the Akk phrase rēš šarrūti, lit. “at the beginning of his kingship” i.e. “in his accession year”, the period between his accession but before the first official year of his reign which started from the New Year in Nisan.

A.7 Non-formulaic uses of בֵּית in the Qal:

Gn 36.31: והלאה והמלכים אשר מלך הָאָדָם פְּנֵי רָשָׁע מֵלֶךְ מֵלֶךְ לְהַבֵּית יֶשֶׁר

Gn 37.2: כְּאֹתֶרֶת וּלְחִזָּה המלך המלך עד: העם_plugin

Ex 15.18 כְּאֹתֶרֶת וּלְחִזָּה המלך העם

Jdg 9.8: וְאָחָשַׁב הַמֵּלֶךְ הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּמֵלֶךְ לְרַבִּים

Jdg 9.10: וְאֵלֶּה הַמֵּלךְ הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

Jdg 9.12: וְאֵלֶּה הַמֵּלךְ הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

Jdg 9.14: וְאֵלֶּה הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 8.7: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 8.9: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 8.11: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 11.12: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 12.12: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 12.14: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 16.1: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 16.17: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 23.17: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Sm 24.21: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

2Sm 3.21: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

2Sm 15.10: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

2Sm 16.8: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 1.5: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 1.11: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 1.13: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 1.17: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 1.18: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 1.24: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 3.30: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז

1Kg 3.35: המלך הַמֵּלֶכֶת לְפַלְשִׁים בְּנֵי גּוֹז
Qal fin vb: with explicit subj

(see Exegesis below): 3pms pf + subj used in the sense “X has become king (and is reigning)”: 2Sm 15.10; 2Kg 9.13 of human kings, and
Ps 93.1; 96.10; 97.1; 99.1; 1 Ch 16.31 of the Lord (all 3pms pf pausal, preceded by subj). Cf Is 24.23; 52.7, Mc 4.7, Ps 47.9 (all vb, subj). Also relevant: Ex 15.18 (subj + 3pms impf) Ps 146.10 (3pms impf + subj).

A.10 In the discussion of the significance of the יָֽהָֽשָּׁה passages, word order plays a prominent role (and to a lesser extent the pausal form of the verb). In narrative, subj-verb occurrences are at 1Sm 11.12 (impf); 12.12 (impf); 1Kg 1.13 (impf); 1.17 (impf); 1.18 (pf); 1.24 (impf); 1.30 (impf); Vb-subj occurrences are at 2Sm 15.10, 2Kg 9.13 with pf as mentioned above; 1Kg 1.11; 12.17.

A.11 Impv: Jdg 9.8,10,12 (all f); v14 m.

A.12 Ptcp: Jr 33.21 (m sg), 2Kg 11.3= 2Ch 22.12 (f sg).

A.13 Inf abs preceding: 1Sm 24.20 (impf); Gn 37.8 (impf)

A.14 Inf cons:

+ יָֽשָּׁה: 1Ch 4.31; 2Ch 36.20;

יָֽשָּׁה (purpose clause): 1Kg 2.15, Qoh 4.14

יָֽשָּׁה: 1Sm 8.7, 16.1, Jb 34.30, 2Kg 23.33 Qere

Kethiv 1Kg 15.29 (but note var. יָֽשָּׁה in many MSS, and the similar phrase with יָֽשָּׁה in 1Kg 16.11).

יָֽשָּׁה 2Kg 23.33, but Qere, Versions and Q *יָֽשָּׁה

A.15 In the hiph the vb means “to make king”. The subject varies, even when referring to the same event, between Yahweh, an individual in authority such as another king, priest or prophet, and a nation or group of national representatives. For instance, Saul is described as having been made king by the people of Israel (1Sm 11.5), by Samuel (1Sm 8.22), and by Yahweh (1Sm 15.11, 35). Solomon is made king by David (1Kg 1.43, 1Ch 23.1), though Solomon attributes his reign to Yahweh (1Kg 3.7, 2Ch 1.8,9) and in 1Ch 29.22 he is made king by the assembly of military and civic leaders. In Chronicles the various contingents who made David king at Hebron are listed, though it is emphasised that all the fighting men of all the tribes and all the rest of Israel were involved in the decision (1Ch 12.23–40 especially 32, 39 x2); but in 1Ch 28.4 David says that Yahweh chose to make him king. Ishida (1988:97–98, 101–105) argues that יָֽשָּׁה is a formula for the role of the people under arms in making someone king, e.g. 1Sm 11.15, 1Kg 12.20, cf. 2Kg 17.21, 1Kg 16.16, and in 2Kg 11.12 the subject must be יָֽשָּׁה as in the following verse. Ishida makes the important point that the hiph verb is used of a subj in a position of strength as well as
authority, able to force his own choice when the succession was unclear. Thus the hiph is a technical term for king-making as a political action, cf. 2Kg 10.5 (Ishida 1988:104–105).

Individual subjects are in the minority, presumably because popular support and acclaim are necessary, but Ishboseth is made king by Abner (2Sm 2.9), and Rehoboam makes Abiah his successor (2Ch 11.22).

Group subjects: Abimelech is made king by the lords of Shechem (Jdg 9.6, 16, 18), Rehoboam is made king by Israel (1Kg 12.1, 2Ch 10.1) as are Jeroboam (1Kg 12.20, 2Kg 17.21), Omri (1Kg 16.16), and unspecified monarchs (Hos 8.4). Half of Israel attempts to make Tibni king (1Kg 16.21), Edom appoints itself a king (2Kg 8.20, 2Ch 21.8), and Judah takes Azariah and Uzziah as kings (2Kg 14.21, 2Ch 26.1). The “people of the land” are responsible for making both Josiah and his son Jehoahaz king (2Kg 21.24; 23.30, 2Ch 33.25; 36.1). The leaders of Samaria promise Jehu not to use their prerogative of appointing a king (2Kg 10.5). The inhabitants of Jerusalem appoint Ahaziah (2Ch 22.1), The subject is unclear in 2Kg 11.12, but it may be the army or the people who confer the kingship on Joash; in the parallel in 2Ch 23.11 it is Jehoiada and his sons.

Foreigners appoint kings too: Pharaoh replaces Jehoahaz with Jehoiakim (2Kg 23.34 2Ch 36.4), Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon appoints Zedekiah instead of Jehoiachin (2Kg 24.17, 2Ch 36.10, Jr 37.1, Ezk 17.16), and Aram, Ephraim and the son of Remaliah are said to be plotting to appoint the son of Tabeal (Is 7.6). The Persian king makes Esther queen (Est 2.17).

A.16 The use of the hiph at 2Kg 24.17 in place of the usual Qal in the formula “he became king in his stead” underlines the dependence of the Judaean monarchy on the Babylonian king.

3. Lexical and semantic fields
A.1 חלָה occurs in synonymous parallelism with חָמל (Gn 37.8); לָֽשֹׁב על הָבָּשׁ (1Kg 1.13, 17, 24, 30, 35, Ps 47.9); כַּוְּבַע הַמִּזְנֶה נָעִיד על; כַּוְּבַע הַמִּזְנֶה נָעִיד על.
A.2本国 very frequently (e.g. Jdg 9; 1Kg 11.37, Jr 23.5, Pr 8.15); with the idea of possessing the kingdom (1Sm 24.21, 1Kg 2.15); with trading in cedar (Jr 22.15); with judgement and righteousness (Jr 22.15; 23.5)
A.3 Where本国 or本国 refers to becoming king, aspiring to kingship or being made king they can be associated with本国 (Jdg 9.8); making a covenant (本国 2Sm 3.21; 2Ch 23.3); the sound of the shofar (2Sm 15.10, 2Kg 9.13); the provision of a chariot and
runners (1Kg 1.5); the laying of garments on the steps for the new king to walk on (2Kg 9.13); sacrifices and rejoicing (1Sm 11.15).

4. Versions
LXX:
A.1 Βασιλεύω is the verb almost always used to render both the Qal and the hiph. In the latter case, it is used to mean “to make someone a king”, e.g. in Ho 8.4: this transitive use is not attested prior to the LXX (Muraoka 2002, s.v.).
A.2 For the contentious passages “Yahweh/God is King” etc. (see under Exegesis below), LXX is not very helpful, since in Pss it tends to render mechanically, as Ulrichsen points out (1977:373) in refuting Kapelrud’s interpretation of the aorist ἐβασίλευσεν as ingressive 1963:230 against Kraus 1961:648f. However, Ex 15.18 has the pres ptc, as does 1Ch 16.31 (against the aorist of its parallel, LXX Ps 95.10 (MT 96.10), and Is 52.7 the future.

B.1 Exceptions to the use of βασιλεύω are:
a) the omissions in Josh 13.21, 1Kg 2.11 (once), Jr 33.21 (not extant in LXX); 1Ch 3.4 (once); 29.27 (all three), Est 2.17, 2 Ch 26.3 (once); 27.8 (not extant in LXX); 29.3; 34.3,38; 36.20. Some occurrences of קַלָּח Qal in the Old Greek sections of Kingdoms preserved in MSVaticanus coincide with omissions (1 Kg 11.24; 12.17; 14.19), and at 1 Kg 2.15 the infinitive is rendered as εἰς βασιλέα.
b) βασιλέως 1Kg 2.15 (εἰς βασιλέα for κλῆς), 1Ch 4.31 (ἐως βασιλέως for ἄρα με Βασιλεύω )
c) βασιλεία 2Kg 24.12; 25.1,27, 2Ch 17.7; 34.3,8; Jr 51(28).59 ; 52.4 (τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ κλῆς); 2Ch 36.20 ἐως βασιλείας κλῆς; Jr 1.2 ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ κλῆς;
d) 2Ch 21.5 (1st) κατέστη ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ; 2Ch 29.3 ὡς ἐστή ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ
e) 1Sm 11.15 ἔχρισεν Σαμουήλ ... (τὸν Σαουλ) εἰς βασιλέα for ἐν Βασιλείᾳ εἰς βασιλέα
f) 1Kg 3.7 ἐδωκας for ἐδώκει

g) 1 Ch 28.4 τοῦ γενέσθαι με βασιλέα for ἐν Βασιλείᾳ
h) 2Ch 36.1 καὶ ἔχρισαν καὶ κατέστησαν εἰς βασιλέα for ἐν Βασιλείᾳ, ἐν Βασιλείᾳ for ἐν Βασιλείᾳ, cf. 2Ch 36.4 κατέστησεν for κατέστησεν
i) The hoph in Dn 9.1 is rendered by βασιλεύω: transitively with a pl subj in LXX, and intransitively with a sg subj in “Th.”
j) See Begrich (1929:179n2) for discussion of the reading of MSS A and B ężba⟩λενσεν < */modal* in 1Kg 22.41.

**Pesh**:

**A.1** For both Qal and hiph, 'amleḵ, “to be king”, and transitively, “to make king” (the pe’al means “to advise”).

**B.1** The exceptions are:

a) 'amleḵ...bmalkuṭeh “he was king... in his reign” 1Sm 13.1;

b) i) qām bmalkuṭā lit. “he acceded to the kingdom”, 1Ch 29.27 (3x), 28; 2Ch 12.13 (2nd), 16; and the 1st occurrence in the following—24.1, 25.1, 26.3, 27.1, 29.1 (and once more without corresponding Heb); 33.21, 34.1, 36.2, 36.9, 11. Perhaps used for variety, to supplement use of 'amleḵ, and usually corresponding to בָּמַלְכָּה, so perhaps influenced by the similarity to Arm bmalku, “in the kingdom”.

ii) qām bmalkuṭeh, similar to the above, i.e. “he succeeded to the throne” 2Ch 13.23 (14.1), 17.1, 33.1;

The BH inf cons plus m suf often appears to be rendered by Pesh malKūtā, as in the following (see remarks on b) above):

c) i) dmalkuṭā 2Kg 24.12,

ii) dmalkuṭeh Jr 51.59, 2Ch 29.3, Est 1.3, Dn 9.2.

d) i) lmalkuṭeh 2Kg 25.1, Jr 1.2, 52.4, 2Ch 16.13; 17.7; 34.3, 8; Dn 9.2 (Urmia)

ii) lmalkuṭā 2Ch 20.31 (2nd); 21.1.5(1st), 20(1st); 22.2(1st)

e) lmalkā 1Ch 4.41 (as if < "?

f) hū nqūm 'laykon “he shall stand over [i.e. lead] you” 2Ch 23.3.

g) d’ehweh malkā “that I should be king” 1Kg 2.15 for rendering לִמלָךְ, = 1Ch 28.4 (BH hiph).

h) 'aqīm bmalkuṭeh lašleymon “he established Solomon in his kingdom” 1Ch 29.26 (exegetical rendering, to correspond to 1Ch 23.1 and 29.22 (both hiph))

i) 'damma d’aykā d’aslem mallkūtā lgarsayē, “until he handed the kingdom over to the Persians” 2Ch 36.20.

The occurrences in 1Kg 15.2, Is 32.1, 2Ch 9.31; 26.23; 27.8 are not rendered.

The alternative renderings of the hiph are in Jdg 9.6, 2Ch 1.9 'aqīm, “appoint”; Ezk 17.16, 2Ch 10.1; 36.4; 21.8 'aqīm malkā “establish as king”, 1Ch 12.39(38) lamqāmu lDawīd bmalkūtā, “to establish David in the kingship”, cf. 1Ch 12.32(31), Dn 9.1 (BH
hoph), 2Ch 1.8,11; 6.1; 23.11; 36.1. Ho 8.4 is ambiguous in Pesh, and could mean “make/be king” or “give counsel”.

**Tg:**

A.1 Regularly mlak, and for the hiph, the aph ’amleḵ.

B.1 Exceptions:

a) malkutā, “kingdom”: 2Kg 24.12 (= 2Ch 17.7); Est 1.1,3 (Tg Rishon); Ex 15.18 (exegetical: “the Lord, his kingdom [is] for ever and ever”): Is 24.23 (exeg: “the kingdom of the Lord of Hosts shall be revealed”), Is 52.7 (exeg: “the kingdom of your God has been revealed”), Mc 4.7 (exeg: “the kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed”)

b) lmihwā Malkā, “to be king”: 1Sm 8.7; 16.1; 1Kg 2.15, cf. Jr 22.15 “will you resemble a king”.

c) tyʾl lmḥśn mlkwtʾ “she will enter to take possession of the kingdom” Tg Rishon Est 2.4.

d) ’amleḵ for תְּנַס Qal: 1Ch 29.28.

e) mmny mlkʾ Jb 34.30 for תְּנַס.

**Vg:**

A.1 For the Qal, Jerome uses regnare in the vast majority of occurrences. Given his abilities as a translator, it is surprising that he does not vary the rendering more than he does, but perhaps he preferred to retain the annalistic style of Kings and Chronicles.

A.2 There is one other common rendering, imperare “to rule” Jdg 9.8,12,14; 1Sm 8.11; 12.12,14; 2Sm 3.21; 1Ch 1.43 (1st); 2Ch 36.20 (+ rex); Dn 9.1. Also rex fieri “become king” 1Ch 1.43 (2nd).

A.3 Hiphil: Usually constituere regem “appoint as king”. Also constituere ducem “appoint as leader” 2Ch 11.22; constituere alone 2Kg 24.17, 1Ch 23.1; facere regem “make king”, 1Sm 11.15, 1Kg 16.15, 2Kg 11.12, 2Ch 1.9; ponere regem “appoint as king” Is 7.6; facere regnare “make to reign” 1Kg 3.7, Est 2.17.

B.1 Less literal renderings of the Qal: habere regem “have a king” Gn 36.31(2nd); succedere in regnum “succeed to the kingdom” Gn 36.38; accipere regnum “accept the kingdom” Jdg 9.10; constituere regem “appoint as king” 1Kg 11.24; facere regnare “make to reign” Jb 24.30.
B.2 For the construction (date) + לֶחֶם, לֶחֶם, לֶחֶם, יִשְׂרָאֵל, Jerome often uses a noun: e.g. *in regni sui/eius* “in his reign” 2Kg 24.12; 25.1; 2Ch 16.13; 29/3; 34.3.8; Jr 1.2; 51.59; 52.4; Dn 9.2 (hoph); *imperium sui* “in his rule” Est 1.3; perhaps *הלַע יָהָה* : *in regem* 1Kg 2.15; *regis* 1Kg 6.1, rege 2Kg 9.29. *ad regem* 1Ch 4.31, *ad regnum* Qoh 4.14.

B.3 More paraphrastic renderings: *numquid rex noster eris* Gn 37.8; *quoniam invasisti regnum pro eo* 2Sm 16.8.

B.4 Anomalous renderings of the Hiphil: *rex fieri* “become king” 1Ch 11.10, 12.39(38) (2nd); 28.4 (hiph); *ungere (!)* “anoint” 1Ch 29.22.

5. Exegesis

A.1 The most important occurrences of לֶחֶם in the Qal from a theological point of view are those in which the subj is God or Yahweh. There are 13 occurrences of this type: Ex 15.18; 1Sm 8.7, Is 24.23; 52.7, Ez 20.33, Mc 4.7, Ps 47.9; 93.1; 96.10 (= 1Ch 16.31) 97.1; 99.1; 146.10. (These should be compared with the 41 occurrences where the Lord is described as מְלֹא: see entry on מְלֹא: see Preuss 1991:174). The examples felt to have most theological significance are in the perf tense, with God or Yahweh as subject: God — Ps 47.9; Is 52.7; Yahweh — Ps 93.1; 96.10; 97.1; 99.1; 146.10.

A.2 Those instances in which Yahweh as subj precedes the vb, מְלֹא נַחֲלָה (Ps 93.1; 96.10; 97.1; 99.1), were interpreted by Mowinckel (1922:3, 6; 1962:107) in an ingressive sense, “Yahweh has become king!” This interpretation of the phrase is the cornerstone of his theory that these and certain other psalms were associated with an annual enthronement festival for Yahweh, similar to that held in Babylon for Marduk. In this context מְלֹא נַחֲלָה was a cultic shout marking the climax of this New Year Festival, and the psalms involved Mowinckel termed “Enthronement Psalms”. He cited the similar proclamations of the enthronements of Absalom and Jehu (2Sm 15.10, 2Kg 9.13), but inaccurately, reversing the verb-subj order. Gunkel accepted certain aspects of this theory, but saw the idea of God’s enthronement as a literary theme and not a reflection of cultic practice *(1930:36–37), so regarded the enthronement psalms as eschatological in nature (1933:100–116).

A.3 Many objections regarding the Babylonian parallels have been raised (Porteous 1938; Eissfeldt 1928; Tadmor EM 7:305–11), most recently by Welten (1982). Generally speaking, the emphasis has shifted away somewhat from supposed similarities with the Babylonian akītu festival towards Ugaritic texts describing the reinstallation of Baal during the autumn New Year celebration (see W. Schmidt 1961: 72–79, de Moor 1971:56–58, 77-80,
Loretz 1988:428). But some scholars, most notably Kraus (1979:103–12; ET 84–91), deny the existence of an enthronement festival for Yahweh, at least until the post-exilic period.

A.4 However, the argument over whether Psalms 93, 96, 97, 99, and also 47, reflect the existence of a New Year enthronement festival for Yahweh ultimately hinges on the interpretation of הַמֵּלֶךְ הָיָה. A good deal has been written on the problem, summarised by Gelston (1966), and more recently by Ollenburger (1987:24–33) and Brettler (1989:141–58). There are two interrelated questions, first whether the vb הַמֵּלֶךְ is essentially durative (“is king”) or ingressive (“has become king”), and second whether the word order, subj-verb versus verb-subj, either affects the sense of the verb or emphasises the subject.

A.5 Mowinckel originally argued (1922:6) that the verb was ingressive when pointed in MT as הַמֵּלֶךְ (Pss 93.1; 96.10 = 1Ch 16.31; 97.1; 99.1. Few have followed him in taking the punctuation into account. Even though Revell believes that pausal forms mark the ends of units of poetry and were fixed by 200 AD at the latest, it does not appear that the existence of a pausal form has any bearing on the aspect of the verb, though Brettler (1989:144) wonders whether it shows that the phrase served as “a self-sufficient cultic exclamation”. Some have accepted the ingressive sense of the verb הַמֵּלֶךְ, for other reasons, e.g. Loretz 1988:413–34 (1979:491, 461). Almost all scholars from Mowinckel onwards have based their arguments concerning the interpretation of הַמֵּלֶךְ הָיָה on a comparison with the use of הַמֵּלֶךְ in prose narrative, especially in the “proclamation” formulae in 2Sm 15.10 and 2K 9.13. But the sense of these uses in prose is not undisputed, with some stressing the role of word order and others the general context in determining the exact significance of הַמֵּלֶךְ הָיָה or הַמֵּלֶךְ אֶבֶן הָשָׁלֹם הָבָרָה. (The context of Ezk 20.33 would seem to indicate that the impf there means, “I will be king”— see Zimmerli 1960:218–19). The arguments are complex, and it is not possible to do more than give a crude summary of the different positions taken by various scholars (the conclusions of a particular individual on the Aktionsart of the verb or the word order do not necessarily imply support for or denial of Mowinckel’s theory of a pre-exilic New Year Enthronement of Yahweh festival).


Durative, with emphasis on subj if subj precedes: (“It is Yahweh who is king”): Köhler (1953), Ridderbos (1954) and Michel (1956) with an ingressive sense for the reverse order, Gelston (1966), Jeremias (1987:36, 151), Preuss (1991:179f, ET 157, and n.145: emphasis on subj preceding verb)


The current consensus appears to be that context alone can decide the precise meaning “is”/“has become” for ָָכָל in a given passage (Scoralick 1989:22–24). However, Day (1990:75-81) rightly points out that the perf outside the psalms can hardly mean just “is king”: at most, in the proclamations of the kingship of Absalom and Jehu, it means “is (now) king”. Janowski (1989:444–45) takes a similar line, but on the basis of the verb ָָכָל which occurs in frequent parallelism with ָָכָל and also has both an ingressive and a durative sense, both generally and in these passages.

A.6 On the question of the significance of word order, the Arad Ostraca 88 from the second half of the seventh century has the pronoun preceding the verb (the pers pron. is sui generis, see JM§146 a 4; b 3)). Renz (1995:304 n.1) compares the Moabite Mesha’ inscription, which reads ... אֶלָּahrenheit יָּבּו进城...(lines 2–3, 28–29). Lines 21–23, 25–30 of the Mesha’ inscription give 11 further examples of the pronoun preceding the perfect verb (e.g. אֶלָּاهرة), as Mesha seeks to draw attention to his own achievements. Similarly Sir 47.13 has the phrase ָָכָל שָלֵּא… It would therefore seem from Sir and Ep that in general a pronoun or subject preceding the verb serves to place emphasis on the subject. On the other hand, Muraoka (1985:35) observes that in BH when the subject is God, it often precedes the verb. This would imply that the subj-verb order in יָּמִית had no especial significance, but was normal in the circumstances.

However, Caquot (1959:327) wonders whether the speculation concerning the word order of the Enthronement Psalms is too elaborate. He regards the rhetoric as more important than the actual syntax: in the case of Ps 47.9 the word order gives a chiastic structure, ָָכָל אֶלָּاهرة יָּבּו, but the two actions are on the same level, he believes.

A.7 Conclusion: ָָכָל Qal contains both ingressive and durative senses, the balance to be decided by the context. Word order is a matter of emphasis on the subject or action of the verb e.g. “Jehu is king!” rather than on the exact meaning of the verb. The problems probably have more to do with rendering the Heb vb into European languages than the semantics of ָָכָל itself, which appears to encompass durative, ingressive and stative aspects.
at once with ease. Certainly it would be unwise to rely too much on the interpretation of \( \text{ø2l} \) in arguing either for or against the use of certain psalms as hymns for an annual enthronement of Yahweh.

A.8 Much has been written about the use of \( \text{ø1l} \) with subjects other than Yahweh, but almost all of this is found in studies that attempt to determine the sense of the \( \text{ø2l} \) passages and not for the “secular” usages of the verb. However, Renz (1995:304 n.2) argues that in 2Sm 5.5 \( \text{ø1l} \) means “reigned”, since we are looking back, whereas in the Arad Ostracon 88 the speaker is still alive and ruling, and informing his correspondent of the fact, so that the meaning there must be “I became/have become king”, “I now rule”.

Ultimately, the problem lies not so much in the Hebrew verb \( \text{ø1l} \) itself but in the attempt to render it into European languages with a different system of tenses. There are similar difficulties with verbs such as \( \text{ø2l} \) and \( \text{ø1l} \), though there are fewer theological implications involved with these and so they have received much less attention. Even an English verb such as “sit” can have both an ingressive and a durative sense (“to sit down” versus “to be seated, sitting”), and as with \( \text{ø1l} \) etc. the precise meaning can only be decided by the context, if at all.

B.1 Nyberg (1935:39), generally followed by Cazelles (1949:24) and Östborn (1955:23, 34, 38, 54–57), argues that generally in Hosea the word \( \text{ø1l} \) refers to a deity named Melek, not a human king, and that the hiph \( \text{ø1l} \) in Ho 8.4 refers to the Israelites making themselves deities beside Yahweh. Few commentators have accepted Nyberg’s theory. In particular Gelston (1974:72–73; 82–83) points out that a deity Melek (as opposed to Molech) is otherwise unknown, and most of the references to kings in Hosea can be taken at face value.
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