**The Story of Adoram Who Was In Charge of the Tax**

**and the Traditions Regarding the Division of the Monarchy**

Many scholars wrote about the story of the Assembly in Shekhem. However, the short episode that concludes the story and tells of Rehoboam sending Adoram to collect a tax of forced labor from the population, which ends in Adoram’s death, generated very little discussion.[[1]](#footnote-1) Most of the attention revolves around the different variants of the name “Adoram” and its parallel appearance in Chronicles as “Hadoram” (2Chr 10:18); this character is also usually identified with the “Adoniram” mentioned in the list of Solomon’s ministers and anecdotes (1Kgs 4:6; 5:28; compare LXX 3Kgdms 2:46h). There are also those who identify him with “Adoram who was in charge of the tax,” mentioned in a list among David’s ministers, meaning that he had lived through three generations (2Sam 20:24).[[2]](#footnote-2) Other discussions describe Rehoboam’s political foolishness that is reflected, among others, in his decision to send Adoram to collect the tax, a command that shows that Rehoboam did not understand the outcome of the failed assembly at Shekhem.[[3]](#footnote-3)

 This paper will discuss the notice of Adoram’s death by stoning in 1Kgs 12, on the assumption that this description reflects a literary tradition that was formed and transmitted over time. I have no intention of determining whether Adoram served in his position for one generation or three; it is better to assume that the literary tradition on this topic in its different permutations entered the lists of ministers and the deeds of different kings.[[4]](#footnote-4) In general, this paper does not intend to reconstruct historical processes that allegedly took place in reality, but rather to try and trace the different versions of the story regarding the division of the monarchy as they appear in the central textual witnesses, and especially the particular tradition regarding Adoram as told within this context.

 It is well known that the Septuagint on 1Kgs 12 (3Kgdms) includes, in verses 12:24a-z, a lengthy addition that repeats sections of the story of Jeroboam and Rehoboam. These sections are recounted differently in the Masoretic Text (MT) and the consecutive Septuagint (G\*). This story is a kind of repeated version of the story of Jeroboam and Rehoboam and is therefore sometimes called the “alternative story” (hereafter, “AS”). The AS also includes a version of the Shekhem assembly story, but does not include the episode about Adoram. Most scholars assume the AS, as preserved in the LXX, to be a later adaptation of the MT version for the Rehoboam ad Jeroboam stories. Therefore, they did not attribute any particular importance to the omissions in the AS version since these arose, in their opinion, from editorial circumstances or from some type of midrashic reason.[[5]](#footnote-5) The scholars who view the AS as reflective of an earlier version of these stories paid less attention to the traditions that were preserved only in the MT.[[6]](#footnote-6) The current framework will not allow a discussion of all the differences between the MT and the AS, however, my extensive research on the topic shows that in this case one version did not develop from the other, but rather the two versions developed, separately, from the same source. This means that the differences between the two versions are highly significant for the study of the stages of the literary development of the Shekhem assembly story, and especially, in this case, of the notification about Adoram as found at the end of the story in the MT version but lacking in the AS version.

**1. The Conclusion of the Shekhem Assembly Story in the Different Versions**

The final verses of the Shekhem assembly story (1Kgs 12:13—20) were preserved in three central versions. Below I present these versions side by side (with an English translation): the MT, the parallel text in the consecutive Septuagint (G\*), and the AS version as found in the LXX vss 12:24s-u. The latter text is brought in its original Greek and in its reconstruction to Hebrew, as most modern scholars believe that the AS in 1Kgs 12 (12:24a-z) was not originally written in Greek but was translated from a Hebrew *vorlage*.[[7]](#footnote-7) Despite the difficulties involved in any reconstruction of Hebrew from preserved Greek texts, a careful reconstruction, based on the parallels that exist in the preserved Hebrew texts, may serve as a fairly efficient tool for emphasizing and analyzing the similarities and differences between the different versions.

TEXT

The MT and the AS versions are similar regarding the central plot lines of most of the assembly story. At the end of the story, Rehoboam accepts the advice of his young advisors and rejects the people’s request, refusing to ease their burden (12:13—14; s24). Following this, the people called for a rebellion against the House of David: “What share do we have in David, what part in Jesse’s son? To your tents, Israel!” (12:16; t24; compare 2Sam 20:1), and the tribes dispersed while rejecting the sovereignty of the House of David, “So Israel went to their tents” (12:16; cf. 24u).[[8]](#footnote-8) At this point, the MT includes a few prominent additions (pluses) as compared to the shorter AS version. The first addition is v.15, which is completely absent in the AS version: “So the king did not listen to the people, for this turn of events was from the Lord, to fulfill the word the Lord had spoken to Jeroboam son of Nebat through Ahijah the Shilonite.” These components are not part of the plot, but are the interpretation of the objective narrator who witnesses the events and analyzes the reason behind Rehoboam’s failed actions. This verse also largely refashions the content of the story; for while the original story sought to emphasize Rehoboam’s political error, and critiqued him for not listening to the people or heeding the advice of the elder advisors, v. 15 replaces the political aspects with a theological explanation and attributes Rehoboam’s decision to the divine plan - “for this turn of events was from the Lord, to fulfill the word the Lord had spoken.” These words refer to the episode of the tearing of the garment and the prophecy that appears in the Deuteronomistic layer of the story of Ahijah, at the end of the Solomon story (1Kgs 11:9-13, 32-38). Verse 15 includes expressions that are characteristic of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic school, such as “to fulfill” (Deut 8:18; 9:5; 29:12; 1Kgs 2:4; 2Kgs 23:24; Jer 11:15), and “to fulfill (the root קו"ם in the *hiphil* +)the word the Lord has spoken” (1Kgs 2:4; 8:20).[[9]](#footnote-9) It seems, therefore, that v. 15 in the MT belongs to a Deuteronomistic editing stratum that is similar to many Deuteronomistic writings in the book of Kings, which aim to emphasize the principle of the fulfillment of prophecy and provide a theological explanation for events.[[10]](#footnote-10) By contrast, the AS seems to reflect here, as in other instances, a relatively earlier form of the story that does not include a Deuteronomistic or Deuteronomistic-like layer of editing.

 Another verse in the assembly story that appears only in the MT and is absent in the AS and in the consecutive Septuagint (G\*) is v.17: “But as for the Israelites who were living in the cities of Judah, Rehoboam still ruled over them.” As many have demonstrated, this verse is stylistically similar to writings in Chronicles that mention Israelites dwelling in the cities of Judah, such as “The people of Israel and Judah who lived in the cities of Judah…” (2Chr 31:6), or “The entire assembly of Judah rejoiced, along with the priests and Levites and all who had assembled from Israel, including the foreigners who had come from Israel and also those who resided in Judah” (2Chr 30:25, compare 1Chr 9:3). The chronistic style and the fact that it is absent in all the other central versions except for the MT may show that 12:17 is a very late addition to the text, written in the style of Chronicles, and may even be taken from Chronicles (compare 2Chr 10:17), where Israelites from the North are depicted as being under Judaean rule in the cities of Judah. This text seems to project ideological perceptions from the days of the Second Temple onto the earlier days of the founding of the Northern Kingdom.[[11]](#footnote-11) If this is true, then this serves as another testimony that the AS version, which lacks this verse, reflects an earlier version than that of the MT.

 The other central detail missing in the AS, yet found in the MT, is of course the story of Adoram and the tax (12:18). An examination of the story in the MT shows that even without the AS account, this story does not flow smoothly within the narrative of the Shekhem assembly story. The assembly story ends with the tribes’ call for a rebellion against Davidic rule, after which they dispersed, rejecting this rule (12:16). Rehoboam’s subsequent action, according to the MT, is not exactly what one would have expected. After the tribes’ revolt we may have expected some military action on Rehoboam’s part, or, alternatively, attempts at reconciliation. Instead, we read that Rehoboam sent Adoram to levy a labor tax on all of Israel, a seemingly routine act. The narrator does not mention that Adoram came with an especially large force to impose control and power after the revolt, nor does he recount any negotiations on Rehoboam’s part or that of his messenger Adoram.[[12]](#footnote-12) This task was met with severe opposition. The people stoned Adoram to death: “King Rehoboam sent out Adoram, who was in charge of the tax, but all Israel stoned him to death” (18). A synchronic reading of the story may explain this outcome rationally, as Rehoboam is depicted as a foolish politician who errs in all his decisions.[[13]](#footnote-13) However, the continuation of v. 18, "and King Rehoboam managed to get into his chariot and escape to Jerusalem,” exposes an additional difficulty that cannot be solved by a simple synchronic reading. According to the beginning of the verse, Rehoboam sent Adoram to collect the tax. Since Rehoboam sent Adoram, he was clearly not with Adoram at the time and place where he was stoned, and we can assume that he had remained where he was, perhaps even in Jerusalem. It is therefore difficult to understand how Rehoboam found himself running for his life as described in the continuation of the verse, “and King Rehoboam managed to get into his chariot and escape to Jerusalem” (12:18b).

 The AS version presents a solution to these difficulties. In the AS version, the part of the verse that describes Rehoboam’s escape in his chariot comes right after the notification of the results of the Shekhem assembly. The assembly ends with the people’s call to revolt, “To your tents, Israel” (24t), like the words of Sheba son of Bikhri (2Sam 10:1), while Rehoboam found himself in the midst of a rebellion and managed to get into his chariot and flee to Jerusalem (24u). The words that appear in the MT, that tell of Rehoboam sending Adoram to collect the tax and the latter being stoned to death, “King Rehoboam sent out Adoram, who was in charge of the tax, but all Israel stoned him to death” (18a), are lacking in the AS and do not relate to Rehoboam’s escape from the assembly. This shows that the story of Adoram does not belong to the assembly sequence.[[14]](#footnote-14) Since the story of Adoram and the tax is not characteristic of a later editor’s comment, such as vss. 15 and 17 in the MT, it was perhaps preserved in the MT as separate and independent information, or perhaps as part of a separate story that was not integral to the assembly one.[[15]](#footnote-15)

 The ending of this short independent story about Adoram is perhaps found in its conclusion (v. 19), which sums up the issue in the MT (in both Kings and Chronicles): “And Israel has been in rebellion against the house of David to this day.” This verse, too, is absent in the AS version, and it continues with the same issue as the Adoram story. The word פש"ע (“been in rebellion,” v. 19) that appears in this context coheres with the story of revolt against Adoram, as it concerns a group violating a national obligation (such as paying taxes), or a kingdom revolting against a reigning king, such as “Moab rebelled [ויפשע] against Israel” (2Kgs 1:1).[[16]](#footnote-16) We are told that Mesha, the king of Moab, “raised sheep, and he had to pay the king of Israel a tribute of a hundred thousand lambs and the wool of a hundred thousand rams” (2Kgs 3:4), but after Ahab’s death he stopped paying the tribute, whereupon we are told that “the king of Moab rebelled [ויפשע] against the king of Israel” (2Kgs 3:5). Connecting v. 18a with v. 19 as one literary unit that starts with Adoram’s tax mission and the conclusion (both of which are missing in the AS) creates a short item such as the one that recounts Edom’s rebellion against Judah in the days of Jehoram son of Jehoshaphat the king of Judah, which similarly ends with “Edom rebelled [ויפשע] against Judah and set up its own king” (2Kgs 8:20—22a). Both cases briefly inform of the rebellion of a national entity that was subject to Judaean rule, ending with “and … rebelled against the House of David/Judah until this day”:

TEXT

 Although the notification about Adoram is brief and succinct, it contains, in a small way, narratological and societal elements like those reflected in the Shekhem assembly story: The Northern tribes collapsed under the brutal labor tax set by the Davidic king, and they decided to revolt; and when Adoram came to collect the labor tax, he was stoned to death (12:18a). This act is a rebellion against the House of David, and from here on, as the narrator summarizes, “Israel has been in rebellion against the house of David to this day” (12:19). This short notification can be viewed as a kind of alternative version to the assembly story, which may have itself evolved out of an earlier story about the division of the monarchy. Each belongs to a different genre and was certainly the product of different authors and different agendas. The story of the assembly at Shekhem is a wisdom story that most certainly emerged from the learned circles, while the notification about Adoram is formulated as an archival note. The plot lines are different, as the notification about Adoram does not include all the dramatic elements, and the confrontation between the people and Rehoboam testifies to a deep acquaintance with court life and the court advisors. However, the notification about Adoram also shows that the people were seething, with no reliance upon any single leader, and teaches that the rebellion arose following the difficult labor tax that Solomon and his successor had forced upon the tribes of Israel. The author of the MT version connected the two stories at the exact point where they both describe a violent rebellion against the king or his representative; in the assembly story Rehoboam attempts to reach his chariot to escape Israel’s call for revolt, and the notification about Adoram describes a stoning which ends in his death at the hands of the people.

 At the end of the Adoram story the narrator sums up and says, “And Israel has been in rebellion against the house of David to this day” (12:19). According to the narrator, this is the sole reason for the division of the monarchy that existed in his day, as opposed to other reasons that were given in other stories.[[17]](#footnote-17) The story of the Shekhem assembly attributed the division to Rehoboam’s failed leadership, when not heeding the people’s request. The Deuteronomistic editing of this story (1Kgs 12:15) and in other places (such as 11:9—13) preferred a theological explanation, for example, divine retribution for Solomon’s sins. In the Northern Kingdom they probably told a different story about the foundation of the Kingdom, one which placed Jeroboam’s charismatic personality in the forefront, as well as the story of the meteoric rise of a slave from Solomon’s court, in charge of the labor tax of the House of Joseph, who rebelled against his king and achieved greatness. This story was only partially preserved in the MT (1Kgs 11:26—28, 40; 12:20a), but other sections are reflected both in the AS and the consecutive Septuagint, which will be discussed in a separate study (also see section 3, below). Since Jeroboam, in this story, is described as the one in charge of the labor tax of the House of Joseph ("סבל בית יוסף") who rebels against his master, the story of Jeroboam’s rise to power probably also included the release from Solomon’s forced labor. The story of Adoram serves the same function but attributes the rebellion to a spontaneous outburst of the entire people (without mentioning Jeroboam), perhaps out of the author’s wish to ignore the kings of Israel or other forms of leadership that compete with the House of David.

**2. Rehoboam’s Coronation (MT 1Kgs 12:20)**

The story of the assembly at Shekhem, as viewed from the similarities between the two main versions (the MT and the AS), ends with the tribes of Israel returning to their places. On the one side, the Northern tribes returned home after the failed assembly – “So the Israelites went home” according to the MT (12:16), or “And all the people dispersed from Shekhem, and each went to his own tent” (according to the AS version (24u). On the other side, Rehoboam fled to Jerusalem (18b), followed by the tribe of Judah (MT 12:20b), or by the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, according to the AS version (24u) and the consecutive Septuagint version (3Kgdms 12:20).[[18]](#footnote-18) Before the end of the story there is one more issue that does not have a parallel in the AS version, in addition to the notification about Adoram and the conclusion (18—19a) – the notification in 12:20a that recounts Jeroboam’s return from Egypt, and his coronation over all Israel: “When all the Israelites heard that Jeroboam had returned, they sent and called him to the assembly and made him king over all Israel.” The formulation of this verse recalls a similar verse and a half that is set within the assembly story, vss 2—3a, but it contradicts their content. Verses 2—3a recount that the people called upon Jeroboam, while he was still in Egypt, to come and join the assembly at Shekhem: “When Jeroboam son of Nebat heard this, when Jeroboam the son of Nebat heard this, and he was still in Egypt, for he had fled from the presence of King Solomon and had been dwelling in Egypt, and they sent for Jeroboam, and he and the whole assembly of Israel went to Rehoboam” (1Kgs 12:2—3). This may imply that Jeroboam joined the assembly. However, according to v. 20, it was only after the failure of the Shekhem assembly and the people’s decision to rebel against the House of David that they heard of Jeroboam’s return, and only then called him.[[19]](#footnote-19) The two verses are very similar in language but do not accord with each other.

 The first text, in 12:2—3a, raises several additional difficulties. First, in the consecutive Septuagint (G\*), which usually follows the MT (apart from AS 12:24a-z), there is no parallel at this point; instead, a related text appears in a different place, as part of 11:43, information that is missing also in the AS version.[[20]](#footnote-20) Second, its content is difficult. It is not clear what it was that Jeroboam had heard. We may assume that he heard of Solomon’s death (mentioned at the end of the previous chapter), but the text does not make this explicit, prompting exegetes throughout the ages to propose several possibilities.[[21]](#footnote-21) The more significant difficulty is found at the end of the sentence: It is not clear what Jeroboam did as a result of the rumor he had heard. The text does not relate any information on this issue, but merely mentions what was already recounted about Jeroboam’s escape to Egypt: “…and he was still in Egypt, for he had fled from the presence of King Solomon and had been dwelling in Egypt” (12:2b, compare 11:40).[[22]](#footnote-22) The end tells of an action taken by the people, and not by Jeroboam: “So they sent for Jeroboam” (12:3). Third, although this verse seems to imply that Jeroboam joined the assembly, in the assembly story itself Jeroboam does not play any significant role. Throughout the story the people are presented as a collective entity, leaving no place for a separate hero. Jeroboam appears again later on, in the MT story, only in the description of the people returning after three days to hear Rehoboam’s response: “Three days later Jeroboam and all the people returned to Rehoboam, as the king had said, ‘Come back to me in three days’” (1Kgs 12:12). However, even here, in the conversation that took place between the people and the king, there is no repeated mention of Jeroboam, and he has no role in the plot. In addition, even here, this mention of Jeroboam is missing in the parallel section of the Septuagint and in the AS version. It seems that the mention of Jeroboam in v. 12 in the MT also serves to create the impression that he had taken a part in the management of the assembly, although this does not arise from the details of the plot itself, certainly not from the LXX version (G\*) which lacks these verses.[[23]](#footnote-23)

 It is therefore possible that the clumsy formulation of 12:2—3a stems from it being added at a later stage, based on the formulation of 12:20.[[24]](#footnote-24) The two verses open with the words “When… heard” and continue with the words “So they sent for him,” but in the first (MT 12:2) the formulation is not clear, does not fit its context, and is missing in the Septuagint version. The second (12:20), by contrast, has a fairly clear course of actions that accord with the sequence, and the text is documented in the Septuagint version as well. It is therefore possible to assume that 12:2—3 (as well as the mention of Jeroboam in v. 12) were added to the MT version in order to integrate Jeroboam into the assembly narrative, and grant him a role in the organization and initiative of the assembly at Shekhem, even though he, in fact, plays no role in the story.[[25]](#footnote-25) The story of the assembly at Shekhem was created as a separate literary tradition that tells the story of the division without any dependence upon the Jeroboam story, and the minor additions of Jeroboam were intended to integrate this tradition with the traditions of his rise to power.

 If this is the case, then v. 20, which served as a literary basis for the creation of the addition in vss. 2—3a and mentions Jeroboam, is not, in fact, connected to the assembly story. However, it seems earlier than the editorial stratum that intervened in the final editing of the assembly story, as found in the MT. The assembly story, which does not organically include Jeroboam, stemmed from a source different from the story of Jeroboam’s rise to power, as noted above. The tradition of Adoram (12:18a, 19) similarly does not need the character of Jeroboam as its hero, since the uprising in this story seems to originate from the people, and not from any particular leader. Verse 20a is therefore also not part of the Adoram story, but it could be a part of the conclusion or be a later, summarizing stratum of the Jeroboam story, of which only fragments were preserved in the MT (1Kgs 11:26—28, 40; compare 11:17—22), and more detailed sections were preserved in the AS (24b-f). It seems, therefore, that the singular story of Adoram developed independently and was integrated within the complex of traditions of the division of the monarchy only in the MT and in the consecutive Septuagint.

**3. Summary and Conclusions**

The biblical tradition preserved different memories of the division of the monarchy and the establishment of the Northern Kingdom. We can find at least three, and perhaps four, different explanations for this in the Book of Kings. The first explanation possibly preserves something from the Northern Israeli traditions. In the Kingdom of Israel they probably told stories that placed Jeroboam’s charismatic personality in the forefront, as founder of the Kingdom, and focused on the story of his rise to power from a positive perspective. This position is found in biblical fragments that describe the rise of Jeroboam, born to a woman from the lowest societal class (a “widow” according to the MT, or a “prostitute” according to the AS version). However, like Jephthah (or, from a different context, Sargon the Great, the famous king of Akkad), Jeroboam succeeded in rising through the ranks, becoming a minister in King Solomon’s court, and the one in charge of the labor task force from the House of Joseph. However, Jeroboam rebelled against Solomon at some point and escaped to Egypt. After Solomon’s death, Jeroboam left Egypt and succeeded to rise in power and become the first king of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. As noted above, only a few sections of this story were preserved in the MT (1Kgs 26—28, 40, 12:20), though we are familiar with longer sections of this story from the AS version.

 The Deuteronomistic redaction in Kings preferred a theological-religious explanation for the division of the kingdom, and pinned it on divine punishment for Solomon’s sins that took place toward the end of his life (for example, 1Kgs 11:9—13, 32—39; 12:15). The learned circles and advisors during the biblical period raised a third explanation for the division of the kingdom, namely, the story of the Shekhem assembly in 1Kgs 12. This story pointed to Rehoboam’s political foolishness as the reason for the division: He did not heed the people’s request for easing the burden of forced labor he had imposed upon them, and was not attentive to their distress. The ancient versions of the Bible that circulated during the Second Temple period show that Jeroboam does not appear in this story. It originally focused on the nation as a single entity, on the elder advisors who gave Rehoboam sound advice, on the child-advisors who gave Rehoboam bad advice, and on Rehoboam himself who acted foolishly. Rehoboam did not stop at that, but also arrogantly responded to the people with the famous words: “My little finger is thicker than my father’s waist… My father scourged you with whips; I will scourge you with scorpions” (1Kgs 12:10—11). The people had no choice and they rebelled against the House of David: “What share do we have in David, what part in Jesse’s son?” (12:16). This story has a universal message that holds true across time and place, where a similar message can be found also in many stories from around the world that demonstrate the disadvantages of a strict and inflexible approach as opposed to the clear advantages of flexibility and compromise.[[26]](#footnote-26)

 A comparison between the versions found in the MT, in the consecutive Septuagint, and in the AS, as well as historical literary considerations, show that the short notification about Adoram (12:18a, 19) provides a fourth explanation for the division of the monarchy. Adoram was sent by Rehoboam, probably proximal to the latter’s coronation, to levy a forced labor tax on Israel, but he was stoned to death. Since that time, Israel no longer accepted the authority of the House of David. This note is brief, but it includes several characteristics that are similar to the other traditions. Apart from the Deuteronomistic explanation, all the other explanations mentioned above point to the people’s discontent and uprising following the harshness of the forced labor that Solomon had imposed on the tribes of Israel; however, each version tells the story differently. The historical reality could have been completely different. There are indications that testify to a separate and organic development of these two political entities, Israel and Judah, and not necessarily one political entity that was divided into two kingdoms.[[27]](#footnote-27) However, these are the stories that the biblical traditions chose to portray, and the message that emerges from the MT version is a combined one, attributing the division to several factors: Solomon’s sins; the rebellion of Jeroboam, the leader of the House of Joseph; Rehoboam’s foolishness; and the execution of Adoram.
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