

inscription, as accompanying him to Egypt when he finally defeated Tirhakah and reduced Thebes.<sup>a</sup> On this occasion these kings were either in command of units of their own nationals or were hostages for the loyalty of their subjects in the Assyrian rear.

**21.18.** The 'garden', or rather 'enclosure' (root *gnn*, 'to screen off') of Uzza is mentioned as a burial-ground only in the case of Manasseh and his son Amon. As these were notorious apostates, addicted to astral worship and 'passing children through the fire', probably as a rite in the cult of Aṭtar-Melek, the Venus-star, called in Arabic Uzza, we have proposed to see in 'the enclosure of Uzza' a precinct of the cult of this deity.<sup>b</sup> If *gan bētō* is genuine, which G<sup>L</sup> will not admit, it is likely that the precinct in question is to be located in the palace-complex. Otherwise we have suggested that it is to be identified with 'the garden (or enclosure) of the king' (*melek*), which again we take as the enclosure of this deity. From Neh. 3.15 it is known that this feature was by the Pool of Siloam and it is suggestive that this is near the confluence of the Kidron Valley with the Valley of Hinnom (*Wādī ar-Rabābī*), where human sacrifice to Melek was practised (II Chron. 28.3; Jer. 32.35). It is contended, on the other hand, that the reason for the change of burial-place in the case of Manasseh and Amon was simply lack of room in the old royal necropolis at the southern extremity of the old city on the southeastern hill.<sup>c</sup> It is pointed out that the situation is noted in II Chron. 32.33, which states that Hezekiah was buried 'in the ascent (*ma'alē*) of the sepulchres of the sons of David', by which Vincent<sup>d</sup> understands an upper storey in a tomb, and Simon<sup>e</sup> a monumental avenue leading to the tombs of the reigning kings, itself flanked by tombs of non-reigning members of the royal house. It is certainly significant that the burial of Hezekiah should be noted in Chronicles in this exceptional way and that there is no longer any reference to kings buried in the city of David. The view that the enclosure or walled precinct (*gan*) of Uzza was in the palace-complex adjacent to the Temple seems to be supported by Ezek. 43.7-9, where reference is made to the encroachment of palace on Temple and the defiling of the holy precinct by the funerary monuments (*piḡrē mal'ekihem, bāmōtām*)

<sup>a</sup>Luckenbill, *ARA* II, § 876.

<sup>b</sup>'The Desert God 'Aṭtar in the Literature and Religion of Canaan', *JNES* VIII, 1949, p. 80.

<sup>c</sup>So J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament*, 1952, pp. 206-8.

<sup>d</sup>*RB* XXX, 1921, pp. 422ff.

<sup>e</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 207.

of the kings. Wellhausen suggested that Uzza was a contracted form of Uzziah, which we think unlikely, though Eissfeldt (*HSAT*, p. 537) is apparently inclined to accept this view, regarding the place as an extension which King Uzziah made to the palace.

(d) THE DEUTERONOMISTIC INTRODUCTION AND APPRAISAL  
OF THE REIGN OF AMON: 21.19-22

**21.19.** Amon was twenty-two years of age when he became king, and he ruled in Jerusalem two years, and his mother's name was Meshullemeth the daughter of Haruz from Jotbah.<sup>20</sup> And he did evil in the sight of Yahweh as his father Manasseh had done.<sup>21</sup> And he walked in all the way his father had walked and served the idols which his father had served and bowed down to them.<sup>22</sup> And he forsook Yahweh the God of his fathers and did not walk in the way of Yahweh.

From the chronology of his successors it is apparent that Amon was not elevated to co-regency in the reign of his father, who died in 641 at the age of 65. The failure of Manasseh to appoint a co-regent in spite of his age is the first lapse of this custom in Judah since Azariah (Uzziah) became co-regent with Amaziah in 791, and is a significant token of the status of Judah as a vassal kingdom of Assyria. So careful were the rulers of Assyria that there should be no leader round whom national resistance might rally that Manasseh is found twice as a hostage, probably, for the loyalty of his people, in Nineveh and Egypt. Thus we may understand why no co-regent was appointed.

The ethnic affinity of Haruz is thought by Montgomery to be Arab, the name being attested in inscriptions from Sinai and the Hejaz; he cites, however, a Phoenician instance of the name. The locality Jotbah, given as two stages from Ezion-Geber in Num. 33.34, hence feasibly identified with *at-Ṭaba*, a site at a spring about 20 miles north of Aqaba, suggests that the family of Meshullemeth was indeed of Arab or Edomite origin.

(e) THE DEATH OF AMON: 21.23f.

From the Annals of Judah.

**21.23.** Now the retainers of Amon conspired against him and killed the king in his palace.<sup>24</sup> But the people of the land struck down all those who had conspired against king Amon and the people of the land made his son Josiah king in his place.

**23.** Joash perished also by the hand of two of his retainers (12.20f.), who may have been the tools of the priestly party, whom the king's

fiscal policy had antagonized. The reason for Amon's death is not mentioned. N. M. Nicolsky<sup>a</sup> suggests that with the decline of Assyrian power Egypt was already pushing her influence in Palestine, as the 29-year-old menace of Psammetichus to Ashdod (Herodotus II, 147) indicates (cf. possibly Jer. 2.18, 36f.), so that the assassins of Amon may have been Egyptian agents, and the 'people of the land', who set Josiah on the throne, may have opposed a pro-Egyptian party in the interests of national independence. A. Malamat<sup>b</sup> notes the coincidence of the death of Amon in 640-639 with the suppression of revolt in the west by Ashurbanipal in 639 immediately after the great revolt of Elam in 642-639 BC. Ashurbanipal certainly advanced as far as Acco and may have been prompted to settle Elamites and Persians in Samaria as a preventative measure, if Ashurbanipal is to be identified with 'Osnappar', to whom such a settlement is attributed in Ezra. 4.9f. Malamat therefore concludes that the assassination of Amon represented a revulsion against his pro-Assyrian policy, but that the action of 'the people of the land' was taken in apprehension on the advance of Ashurbanipal. This would account for the fact that Ashurbanipal makes no mention of an expedition against Judah. It would be strange, however, if the nationalists were the retainers of the king rather than 'the people of the land', and we prefer Nicolsky's view that the retainers were suborned to remove the pro-Assyrian Amon by Egyptian agents.

21.24. The conspirators miscalculated, since the people rose against them and placed Josiah on the throne. The antagonism between the 'servants' of the king and 'the people of the land' is significant in view of the probability that the latter term refers to the free Israelite subjects of the realm or their representatives (see above on 11.14), and the former to the feudal retainers of various degree of the king in his crown property of Jerusalem. The same social distinction may be observed in the repeated reference to Jerusalem and Judah.

(f) THE DEUTERONOMISTIC EPILOGUE ON THE  
REIGN OF AMON: 21.25f.

21 <sup>25</sup>And as for the rest of the acts of Amon which he did, are they not written in the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah? <sup>26</sup>And

<sup>a</sup>'Pascha im Kulte des jerusalemischen Tempels', *ZAW* XLV, 1927, p. 184.

<sup>b</sup>A. Malamat, 'The Historical Background of the Assassination of Amon, King of Judah', *IEJ* III, 1953, pp. 26-29. The same view was tentatively proposed by Noth, *History of Israel*, 1960<sup>2</sup>, p. 272, and by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, 'Josiah's Revolt against Assyria', *JNES* XII, 1953, pp. 56-58.

THE REIGN AND REFORMATION OF JOSIAH: 22.1-23.30 713  
they buried<sup>a</sup> him in his tomb in the enclosure of Uzza, and Josiah his son reigned in his place.

21.26. According to MT, Amon was buried in a new tomb prepared for himself. GL reads 'his father's tomb', but, as new ground had been broken for Manasseh in the enclosure of Uzza, it is unlikely that congestion would be felt already. Josiah also was buried 'in his own tomb'.

3. THE REIGN AND REFORMATION OF  
JOSIAH: 22.1-23.30

Between the formal Deuteronomistic introduction (22.1-2) and epilogue (23.25, 28) to Josiah's reign this section consists of a very circumstantial account of the finding of a law-book in the Temple and the reformation which was apparently inspired and directed by it (22.3-23.24).

Within this narrative account of the reformation there is at least one main element of secondary matter. The response of Huldah the prophetess, who was consulted after the discovery of the lawbook, is elaborated in 22.16-20, where the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple is visualized. The statement here that Josiah will come to the grave in peace (v. 20) seems at first sight to be from before Josiah's violent death at Megiddo. That may well be, but it may, like the reference to the final disaster of 586, be later, from one who was interested in the *šālôm*, or well-being, of the kingdom rather than of the individual king. Some response of Huldah is certainly to be expected here in the pre-exilic compilation, but this is so much worked over by the exilic redactor that earlier and later matter is impossible to distinguish.

Another passage generally taken as secondary is the account of Josiah's desecration of the shrine of Bethel (23.14ff.) and his sparing of the prophet's tomb (23.16-20). We cannot dismiss this matter so summarily as Pfeiffer does<sup>b</sup> on the assumption that Josiah had no jurisdiction over the province of Samaria. The limitation of the suppression of local sanctuaries 'from Geba to Beersheba' (23.8) would appear to be the strongest argument for the view that the Bethel incident is an interpolation. This, however, merely refers to a phase in the first main stage of the reformation, of which, we

<sup>a</sup>G, S, V, and T read the plural. The singular of MT, however, may denote the indefinite subject.

<sup>b</sup>*Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1941, pp. 181, 402.

believe, the whole passage gives a telescoped account. In the rapid decline of the fortunes of Assyria, perhaps even before the fall of Nineveh in 612, an application of the principles of Josiah's reformation to the Northern province was possible without fear of reprisal. Just how seriously the tradition of Josiah's activity in Bethel must be taken is indicated by Alt's view<sup>a</sup> that the inclusion of Bethel and Ophrah in the tribe of Benjamin rather than Joseph (Josh. 18.22f.) is to be dated to this period,<sup>b</sup> and, indeed, the passages in question in Joshua cannot well refer to any other period before or since Josiah's reign. Notwithstanding the historicity of the events, the incident is suspect as a later interpolation by the use of *et* copulative with the perfect,<sup>c</sup> cf. the reference to Bethel in 23.4 (see *ad loc.*).

It seems likely, too, that the passage dealing with arrangements for Temple repairs (22.4b-7) has been worked over, being influenced by 12.12ff., 15ff., the phraseology of which it repeats.

The question of the sources of the narrative of Josiah's reformation is not easy to decide. Since the events are so near the date of the first Deuteronomistic compilation of Kings before the fall of Jerusalem, it is natural to assume that the Deuteronomist should expatiate on matter which was so congenial to his principles, and that he would require no source for what was a matter not only of personal interest, but of personal recollection.

Here, however, we should note the observation of T. Oestreicher<sup>d</sup> that a distinction must be drawn between the historical narrative of the finding of the lawbook, the covenant dispensed by Josiah, and the passover (22.3-23.3, 21-25) and the account of the actual reforms of Josiah (23.4-20). These are limited to the purging of the Temple of the fertility-cult and astral worship, which symbolized servitude to Assyria, and the suppression of local cult-centres first in Judah and then in the Assyrian province of Samaria, and are as much political as religious measures. They represent, moreover, only part of the whole Deuteronomic law, with which we believe Josiah's law-book to be identical. Here, surely, we have reality as distinct from ideal,

<sup>a</sup>Judas Gaue unter Josia', *KS* II, pp. 276-88.

<sup>b</sup>So Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 1953<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>c</sup>Budde ('Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias', *ZA* XLIV, 1926, p. 194), however, feebly suggests that the many instances of this usage throughout this section are a sign not of late redaction, but of hasty insertion by the compiler from other sources which are not elaborated, or marginal notes which have eventually crept into the text.

<sup>d</sup>*Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz*, 1923.

and we agree with Oestreicher that, as the style indicates, 23.4-20, redactional matter excepted, is based on the Annals of Judah. The historical narrative, on the other hand (22.3-23.3, 21-25), is directly from the Deuteronomist, the compiler himself or one of his circle among the Temple personnel. Also from the Annals of Judah is the account of the death of Josiah (23.29f.).

Besides the influence of the second Deuteronomist, the redactor, in the response of Huldah (22.16-20) and possibly in the elaboration at least of the Bethel incident (23.15-20), this appears again in the statement that the wrath of God was irrevocable in spite of the reformation, resulting in the rejection of Jerusalem (vv. 26f.), and the appraisal of Josiah (v. 25) possibly belongs to the same source.

In this section of Kings, then, we are in the mainstream of the Deuteronomic tradition, and in order to understand the scope and significance of the reformation under Josiah it is necessary to determine, if possible, the origin of that tradition.

The law-book found in the Temple in the 18th year of Josiah (22.3) has been identified with the nucleus of the Book of Deuteronomy since the time of Jerome,<sup>a</sup> and, given a new status by the critical study of De Wette in 1805, this theory with modifications has prevailed among critical scholars with few exceptions, who claim a post-exilic date for Deuteronomy.<sup>b</sup> The fact that the principles of the legal nucleus of the Book of Deuteronomy are carried into effect, at least as far as concerns the renunciation of the local fertility-cult and the suppression of local cult-centres in favour of 'the place that Yahweh had chosen to put his name in', indicates a close correspondence between Josiah's law-book and the nucleus of Deuteronomy.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>E. Nestle, *ZA* XXII, 1902, pp. 170ff., 312ff.

<sup>b</sup>E.g. R. H. Kennett, *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, 1924; G. Hölscher, *ZA* XL, 1922, pp. 161-255; and more recently G. A. Berry, *JBL* LIX, 1940, pp. 133ff.

<sup>c</sup>This, however, is, in our opinion greatly exaggerated by H. H. Rowley (*The Growth of the Old Testament*, p. 30) in his statement: 'In one respect only did the reform not implement the provisions of Deuteronomy, and the account in 2 Kings draws special attention to this. . . . It notes that the country priests did not come to minister in Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii. 9), and so even here points to Deut. xviii. 6ff.' The matter is not quite so simple, and it is significant that the account of Josiah's reformation makes no reference to social legislation in Deuteronomy, nor the constitutional limitation of the royal authority (Deut. 17.14ff.), nor the provisions for the holy war, etc. Only the principles of the purity of the cult are mentioned, with the fact of the covenant and passover, as Alt has emphasized ('Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums', *KS* II, pp. 252ff., so Noth, 'Die Gesetze im Pentateuch', *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 1957, p. 66; *The Laws in the Pentateuch* . . . , p. 46 n.122).

From the fact that the law-book found in the Temple was read publicly with apparently full comprehension twice in a part of the same day (22.8, 10) it is most unlikely that it was as full as the canonical Deuteronomy. The reference to the said law-book as 'the book of the law' (*sēper hattōrā*) would seem to limit it to the legal portion of the canonical Deuteronomy, excluding the introductory discourse (chs. 1-11) and epilogue (chs. 31-34), and the Song and the Blessing of Moses (chs. 32, 33). The specific reference to the tribal gathering at Shechem (ch. 27) may also be omitted. This leaves chs. 12-26, and the blessings and curses in ch. 28, which made such an impression on Josiah (22.11-13). This matter may be still further reduced, as Eissfeldt suggests,<sup>a</sup> by reckoning with doublets in the legal portion of Deuteronomy (chs. 12-26) and passages like 16.21-17.7, which interrupt the subject of the context and are evidence of later redaction. Though the introductory discourse in Deuteronomy should no doubt be omitted from the nucleus of the book, which was identical with the law-book of Josiah's reformation, we think that some sort of historical introduction as Deut. 1-11 presents it was probably part of the law-book. The relation between the *Heilsgeschichte* (the recital of Yahweh's salvation of his people from the Exodus to the settlement in the Promised Land) and the law, which is exemplified in the Decalogue and in the repeated references to the experience of Israel in Egypt and her deliverance in the strictly legal portion of Deuteronomy (chs. 12-26), is fundamental as the basis of Yahweh's claim to the obedience of his people and as the ground of their faith in his abiding favour. This, then, could not well have been omitted in the Josianic law-book, to which no doubt it formed the preamble, though in a reduced form, and probably not so extensive as Pfeiffer supposes in admitting Deut. 4.49; 6.1-8.20, and 10.12-11.25 to the law-book.<sup>b</sup>

The date of the original Deuteronomy is of vital importance for a true assessment of the Josianic reformation. Three views may be taken into serious consideration. The first is that the book was written *ad hoc* in the reign of Josiah immediately before the reformation, its discovery by Hilkiah being a pious fraud. In this case, however, the provision for the services of rural Levites (Deut. 18.6f.), which was not observed in the reformation (cf. 23.9), would scarcely have been introduced by the priests of the Temple, who were obviously anxious

<sup>a</sup>Einleitung . . . pp. 191ff.; *The Old Testament* . . . , pp. 225f., 231f.

<sup>b</sup>Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 187.

to maintain their distinctive status. Sellin once<sup>a</sup> related the book to Hezekiah's reform (18.4) and centralization of the cult in Jerusalem (18.22), but, though there seems no adequate reason to doubt that reform did take place under Hezekiah, there is no evidence that it was based on such a law-book. This, however, may have been the occasion when a collection and revision of the traditions of Israel was begun, which was to come to light in the law-book which supported the reformation of Josiah. To this subject we shall revert. Finally there is the view that the original Deuteronomy, the law-book of the Josianic reformation, was from the early monarchy or even from the time of the judges.<sup>b</sup> This view is most important. Surely if the original Deuteronomy had been a product of Jerusalem in the time of Hezekiah or Josiah, to say nothing of later, the author would not have localized the giving and solemn reception of the law at Shechem. The attitude to the king in Deut. 17.14-20 most closely reflects the democratic tradition of the northern tribes (I K. 12.1-17 and especially Hos. 3.4; 8.4, 10; 13.11), especially as Deut. 17.15 evidently visualizes not hereditary monarchy,<sup>c</sup> as in Judah, but the designation of the king according to God's choice, indicated probably in the charisma, in the sacral assembly. Hence we think it probable that soon after the fall of the Northern kingdom a collection of Northern Israelite traditions, crystallized formerly in the sacrament of the renewal of the covenant in the old assembly of the sacral confederacy at Shechem, had been made, possibly by Israelites who had found refuge in Judah. This may have stimulated the reformation of Hezekiah, who may have had hopes of reuniting his subjects of Judah with the Israelites remaining.<sup>d</sup> This collection, which, we believe, was an excerpt from a much larger whole, in which the *Heilsgeschichte* probably occupied a much fuller space more proportionate to its place in the canonical Deuteronomy, was modified in the light of practical difficulties in the centralization of the cult under Hezekiah and Josiah. We must not, however, expect exact correspondence between Josiah's reformation and the law-book, which we accept as the legal nucleus of Deuteronomy. What we know of Deuteronomy is the result of a good deal of redactional elaboration and the account

<sup>a</sup>Introduction to the Old Testament, 1923, p. 74.

<sup>b</sup>T. Oestreicher, *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz*, 1923; A. C. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, 1924; *Deuteronomy: the Framework and the Code*, 1932; E. Robertson, *The Old Testament Problem*, 1950.

<sup>c</sup>The reference to the dynasty in Deut. 17.20 is probably a Judaean adaptation of the North Israelite tradition. <sup>d</sup>So A. C. Welch, *Post-Exilic Judaism*, 1935, pp. 23ff.

of Josiah's reformation in Kings shows correspondence with Deuteronomy only in as far as concerns the cult. In view of this situation the caution of Budde<sup>a</sup> is warranted, that the law-book had never the force of statutory law, nor was this probably ever visualized, but it was a programme, which, in effect, could not be fulfilled in all its details. This is evidenced by the modification in the provision made for the provincial Levites. It was found impracticable to admit them to the holy office, as Deut. 18.6f. laid down, so a compromise was made by admitting their right to perquisites from offerings according to Deut. 18.3-5.<sup>b</sup>

We may ask why, in his reformation in Judah, Josiah should have revived a legal tradition from Northern Israel.

Apart from the possible appeal to the remnant Israelites, we may conclude from the fact that this ancient law was invoked as authority for the suppression of local places of worship, primarily in Judah, that the popularity of these was so great that no legislation from the Jerusalem priesthood could break it. For the rural shrines were also sanctuaries of Yahweh served by Levites, who were recognized as 'brethren' of the priests of the Temple (23.9); even though the cult there, with its emphasis on seasonal rituals, incorporated elements of Canaanite nature-worship. Moreover, those cult-centres were placed where people of the various districts had long been accustomed to realize the solidarity of kinship, like Samuel and his people at the local sanctuary of Ramah (I Sam. 9.12ff.), and David and his kinsfolk at Bethlehem (I Sam. 20.29). In many cases these cult-places were doubly hallowed because notable common ancestors were occasionally buried there and commemorated by their standing stones on burial-mounds (*bāmōt*) as, probably, in the sanctuaries at Gezer and Hazor.<sup>c</sup> To break this attachment a divine directive was invoked in the law of the old tribal amphictyony, forgotten in Judah, but part of the Northern Israelite tradition, and so having the force of fresh authority in the south. To give this law its full force, of course, it was necessary to present it in its full context, hence the renewal of the covenant, and the passover, which was already associated with the

<sup>a</sup>ZAW XLIV, 1926, p. 188.

<sup>b</sup>Budde (*op. cit.*, p. 202) emphasizes the impracticability of admitting all the Levites to the Temple service at the time of their concentration by Josiah in Jerusalem, but he suggests that after a while they were sent home, and it was then possible to employ visiting Levites according to Deut. 18.7f.

<sup>c</sup>Y. Yadin and others, *Hazor I*, pp. 85ff., Pl. XXVIII; XXIX, 1; XXX, 1; R. A. S. Macalister, *Gezer II*, fig. 485.

original context of the law. It may be, in fact, that this great communal meal of all Israel was designed to reconcile men to the loss of the communal meals at local sanctuaries, whereby the solidarity of the clans was realized. The fact that both the inauguration of Josiah's reform and the nucleus of the Book of Deuteronomy (12-28) is cast in the convention of the covenant-sacrament<sup>a</sup> of the sacral confederacy in the days of the settlement suggests a connection between the lawbook which prompted Josiah's reformation and the nucleus of Deuteronomy.

Though this is, we think, the explanation of Josiah's use of an old tradition from Northern Israel, we may still ask if the king did not at the same time intend to reunite the Northern Israelites with his own subjects of Judah on the basis of this tradition. The main difficulty in this view is that the covenant dispensed to the people by Josiah in the tradition of Moses (cf. Ex. 24.3-8) and Joshua (Josh. 24) is said to have been with the elders of Judah and Jerusalem (23.1), as Noth emphasizes.<sup>b</sup> But, if the covenant on the basis of the law-book was made in 622, when the book was found, Samaria was still an Assyrian province, with which Josiah did not presume to interfere until later, perhaps even not until the fall of Nineveh in 612. He may, however, as early as 622 have visualized a reunification of all Israel. The mention of Judah and Jerusalem as the parties to the covenant, on the other hand, may simply reflect the hand of the Judaean scribe. In this connection we may note throughout this passage the conspicuous absence of the theme of Yahweh's covenant with the Davidic house. Since the time of Solomon and the development of the Temple cult in Jerusalem, while the tradition of the *Heilsgeschichte*, Yahweh's covenant with Israel, and the law, had not been abandoned, the emphasis had come to rest more and more upon the Davidic covenant and the divine choice of Jerusalem. The Temple, though it was the new shrine of all Israel under Solomon,

<sup>a</sup>This pattern, discerned in Ex. 19 and Josh. 24, and in the Qumran Manual of Discipline i. 16-ii. 18 in the light of imperial vassal-treaties best known from the Hittite archives of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, is emphasized as suggesting the structure of Deut. 4.44-30.20 by K. Baltzer (*Das Bundesformular*, 1960) and G. von Rad (*Deuteronomy*, 1966, pp. 21-23). The expansion of laws as covenant-obligations in this context by explanatory and hortatory passages, though containing later Judaean, and even exilic, matter, probably also reflects practice in the covenant-convention from earliest times and through the monarchy, as noticed by J. J. Stamm (*The Ten Commandments in Recent Research*, 1967), and H. Graf Reventlow (*Gebot und Predigt im Dekalog*, 1962).

<sup>b</sup>*The Laws in the Pentateuch* . . . , p. 46.

was so only ideally after the disruption of the kingdom, and was then practically a royal chapel, as Joash (12.4ff.), Ahaz (16.10-16), and Manasseh (21.4f.) had pointedly shown. Now under Josiah in his 18th year the attempt of Hezekiah to provide in the Temple a real central shrine for all elements of Israel may have been remembered and followed. In any case, even apart from the possible appeal to Northern Israelite sentiment, which may have been more ideal than realistic, the suppression of the local cult-centres in Judah demanded some such expedient as the renewal of the old ideal of the sacral confederacy based on the covenant-sacrament at the central sanctuary.

The time was ripe for national self-assertion expressed in the progressive steps of Josiah's reformation. Though Nineveh did not fall till 612, the decline had already been apparent under Ashurbanipal, who had to suppress a rising under his own brother in southern Mesopotamia in 650-648. In 625 Nabopolassar, an Aramaean, had successfully asserted his independence as king of Babylon, and Assyria, distracted on her southern front, was further crippled by repeated onslaughts by the Medes from the Iranian plateau, the Lydians from Anatolia, and by inroads of Scythian barbarians from beyond the Caucasus. So Judah saw the dawning of the day of freedom, though Josiah proceeded cautiously step by step before venturing into the Assyrian province of Samaria. We are, however, not well enough informed of the chronological sequence of these events in Palestine for a positive reconstruction, since the history of the period is probably telescoped in the account in Kings.

(a) THE DEUTERONOMISTIC INTRODUCTION TO THE  
REIGN OF JOSIAH: 22.1-2

22 <sup>1</sup>Josiah was eight<sup>a</sup> years old when he became king, and he reigned thirty-one years in Jerusalem, and his mother's name was Jedidah the daughter of Adaiah from Bozkath. <sup>2</sup>And he did right in the sight of Yahweh and walked in the whole way of David his father;<sup>b</sup> he did not turn to the right or left.

22.1. There is no need to emend the number to 18 with Klostermann

<sup>a</sup>Two MSS of G add 10, thus making Josiah 18 when he became king. This reading is probably prompted by grammatical precision; the numerals from 2 to 10 taking the roun in the plural. There are certain exceptions to this rule, however, such nouns as *yōm*, *šānā*, *ʾiṣ*, *nepeš*, etc., being found almost invariably in the singular after numerals from 2 to 10, see *GK* § 134c and f.

<sup>b</sup>The normal editorial formula omits the conjunction, which in this case is a dittograph in MT after *w* of the pronominal suffix in the preceding word.

after two MSS of G (see p. 720 n.<sup>a</sup>). Jehoiakim the son of Josiah being 25 when he acceded (23.36), must have been born when Josiah was 14 or 15, which was not impossible. The first duty of a Semite is to perpetuate his name in posterity, the more so if he is of the royal line. Since the death of Josiah may now be accurately dated, thanks to the Babylonian Chronicle of Nabopolassar in 609, he acceded in 639. We have calculated that Manasseh died in 641. Hence either Amon or Josiah acceded without an accession year. In the circumstances of the death of Amon Josiah was probably elevated immediately in 639.

Bozkath is listed in Josh. 15.39 between Lachish (*Tell ad-Duweir*) and Eglon (probably *Tell al-Hesi*) to the south-east of Lachish, which suggests a location at one of the *tells* in the foothills or plain between the two, perhaps *Tell an-Najila*, *Tell al-Quneitra*, or perhaps *Tell as-Seih Ahmed al-'Areineh*.

(b) THE FINDING OF THE LAW-BOOK: 22.3-15

Historical narrative, probably from the compiler or one of the Deuteronomistic circle, probably a priest of Jerusalem (continued at v. 20a).

While recognizing that the ancient tradition of the covenant community which is expressed in Deuteronomy and Josiah's reformation was much more vital in the life of the Northern kingdom, where the old sanctuaries of the sacral community had been in the days of the settlement, it must be emphasized that the latest central shrine of the community was Jerusalem. Here, as Weiser has stressed in his study of the Psalms,<sup>a</sup> the tradition of the covenant was preserved in the most important religious festival, the Feast of Tabernacles at the New Year season, throughout the monarchy, which was also the occasion when the Kingship of God was celebrated. Moreover, as von Rad<sup>b</sup> has urged, the traditions of the old covenant community had experienced a resurgence in Judah under the 'am hā'āreš, the heads of families in the provinces of Judah, in protest first against the alliance of the Davidic House with the House of Ahab, with its political absolutist tendencies and religious syncretism (ch. 11) and the effort of the professional soldiers and royal retainers in Jerusalem to determine the government and policy of the kingdom (21.23f.). It

<sup>a</sup>*The Psalms*, 1962, pp. 35-52.

<sup>b</sup>*Studies in Deuteronomy*, 1953, pp. 60-69.

was they who had set Josiah on the throne (21.24); and their influence is again seen at the end of his life, when they set his son Jehoahaz on the throne (23.30).

It is clear that in his covenant and reformation (ch. 23), Josiah came to terms with those heirs of the covenant tradition in Judah. This would explain the dual aspect of his reformation, political unification and national resistance to Assyria, and religious reform and consolidation. With the decline of Assyria, the time for the former was ripe: since the organization of practically all Judah as an Assyrian province since Hezekiah's abortive rebellion in 701, the latter was necessary to reassert the Jewish self-consciousness, which had already apparently protested against effacement at the death of Amon, possibly by pro-Egyptian officials among his retainers. Both aspects of this movement in Judah in Josiah's time are expressed in what von Rad aptly calls the 'militant piety' of Deuteronomy.<sup>a</sup> The holy war in the book of Deuteronomy, with the various practices associated with it, is an element of genuine antiquity, being in fact one of the most distinctive expressions of the solidarity of the sacral community Israel in the days of the settlement, as it was in early Islam, where it was one of the 'pillars of the faith'. But the prominence of the theme in Deuteronomy in exhortations (e.g. Deut. 6.18; 7.1ff., 16-26; 11.23ff., 12.29; 19.1), with the conventions of the holy war, both ancient and brought up to date (e.g. Deut 20; 21.10, 14; 23.10-14; 24.5; 25.17-19), suggests to von Rad, following E. Junge,<sup>b</sup> that here we have a clue to the Judaeon circles which gave the distinctive development to the traditions of Israel in the book of Deuteronomy.

In view of the role of the Levites in Deuteronomy, B. Mazar<sup>c</sup> has emphasized the political as well as the religious role of the latter, which has been stressed by Alt.<sup>d</sup> Mazar<sup>e</sup> notes their settlement

<sup>a</sup>Deuteronomy, 1966, p. 25.

<sup>b</sup>Der Wiederaufbau des Heereswesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia, 1937.

<sup>c</sup>'The Cities of the Priests and Levites', SVT VII, 1960, pp. 193-205, on the basis of the list of Levitical settlements in Josh. 21.

<sup>d</sup>'Festungen und Levitenorte im Lande Juda', KS II, 1953, pp. 310-16, where it is contended that the placing of the Levites was for strategic purposes under Josiah, cf. Albright (*Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 1953<sup>3</sup>, pp. 123ff.), who dates the settlement as in Josh. 21 mainly under David and for military purposes. Mazar dates the settlement of Levites specifically in the end of David's reign, possibly when Solomon was co-regent and during Solomon's reign. It may have been continued in Rehoboam's fortification of his frontiers after the disruption of the kingdom, as II Chron. 11.13-17 suggests. See further on this question à propos of Josh. 21, J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 1967, pp. 26-31.

<sup>e</sup>Op. cit., pp. 199-205.

throughout the kingdom, especially in frontier areas, where doubtless they served to counteract the political and religious influence of the Canaanites in the early monarchy (I Chron. 26.30). Such elements, with the local notables of Judah (*'am hā'āres*), were the natural custodians of the traditional ideals of the sacral community on which Josiah might rely for a nationalist revival after the Assyrian domination since 701 and for a military revival since the reduction of feudal forces which that involved. Thus, as developed in Judah, with the new prominence given to the theme of the holy war, Deuteronomy relates closely to the revival under Josiah. We think, however, that it reflects rather the aims of the priests and Levites who gave expression to the policy of the 'people of the land'. The limited role of the Levites in the account of Josiah's reform (23.9) indicates a compromise between Josiah and his supporters throughout the country, a concession, no doubt, to the higher priesthood in the capital.

<sup>22</sup> <sup>3</sup>And it came about in the eighteenth year of king Josiah<sup>a</sup> that the king sent Shaphan the son of Azaliah the son of Meshullam the scribe to the Temple of Yahweh saying, <sup>4</sup>Go up to Hilkiah the chief<sup>b</sup> priest, and let him melt<sup>c</sup> the silver which has been contributed to the Temple of Yahweh which the warders of the threshold have gathered from the people, <sup>5</sup>and let them give it into the charge of the masters of works who are appointed over the Temple of Yahweh that they may give it to those who undertake the work which is in the Temple of Yahweh for the repair of the Temple, <sup>6</sup>to the craftsmen, the builders, and the stone-hewers,<sup>d</sup> and for the purchase of timber and hewn stone to repair the dilapidation of the Temple. <sup>7</sup>But let no account be taken with them of the silver which is given into their charge, for they deal honestly. <sup>8</sup>And Hilkiah the chief<sup>b</sup> priest said to<sup>e</sup> Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the Temple of

<sup>a</sup>G<sup>BL</sup> adds 'in the eighth month', and G<sup>A</sup> 'in the seventh month'. Obviously they retain a tradition that the reformation was inaugurated at the New Year festival, and this is not unlikely. As the occasion when the people of the provinces made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem it was a fitting occasion for the covenant (23.3) and if, as we believe, this was a revival of the tradition of the old sacral confederacy (cf. Deut. 31.10) the New Year Feast of Tabernacles was the *Sitz im Leben*.

<sup>b</sup>In this rare occurrence of the title *hakkōhēn haggādōl*, which became current in post-exilic times, *haggādōl* is suspect as an exilic gloss, the more so as at vv. 10, 12, 14 Hilkiah is termed simply 'the priest' cf. on 12.10, pp. 586f. But the title is supported by the title *kōhēn hārō'š* as distinct from *kōhēn hammišne* in 25.18.

<sup>c</sup>Reading *wyattēk* with G<sup>L</sup>, V, and T for MT *wyattēm* ('and let him sum up the whole amount'), a sense not otherwise attested. Thenius after G<sup>BA</sup> reads *wahatēm* ('and seal it up' i.e. 'stamp it'), which is feasible, though further from MT. The reading we adopt is supported by *hittikū* in v. 9.

<sup>d</sup>Reading *gōz'rim* for *gōd'rim* ('masons'), which is already expressed in *bōnīm*.

<sup>e</sup>Reading *el* for MT *al* with certain Hebrew MSS and the Versions.

Yahweh. And Hilkiah gave the book to Shaphan, and he read it. <sup>a</sup>And Shaphan the scribe came to the king and reported to the king and said, Your servants melted the silver which was found in the Temple and gave it into the charge of the masters of works who are appointed in the Temple of Yahweh. <sup>10</sup>And Shaphan the scribe told the king saying, Hilkiah the priest gave me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king. <sup>11</sup>And it came about that, when the king heard the words of the law-book, he tore his robes. <sup>12</sup>And the king ordered Hilkiah the priest and Ahikam the son of Shaphan and Achbor the son of Micaiah, and Shaphan the scribe and Asaiah the king's minister, saying, <sup>13</sup>Go consult the oracle of Yahweh on my behalf <sup>a</sup>and on behalf of the people who are left in Israel and in Judah <sup>a</sup>on account of the words of this book which has been found, for great is the wrath of Yahweh which is kindled against us because our fathers have not listened to the words of this book to do according to all that is written in it. <sup>b</sup> <sup>14</sup>So Hilkiah the priest and Ahikam and Achbor and Shaphan and Asaiah went to Huldah the prophetess the wife of Shallum the son of Tikvah the son of Harhas <sup>c</sup>the keeper of the robes, who lived in Jerusalem in the Second Quarter, and they spoke to her. <sup>15</sup>And she said to them, Thus says Yahweh God of Israel, Say to the man who sent you to me . . .

**22.3.** According to II Chron. 34.3, Josiah's campaign against the fertility-cult in Jerusalem began in the 12th year of his reign (628). This may well be, but his iconoclasm in 'Ephraim and Manasseh' at this time, though not impossible, in the decline of Assyrian power, is unlikely in view of the statement of II K. 23.8, which limits Josiah's initial activity to 'from Geba to Beersheba'. The account in Chronicles, in mentioning two stages of the reformation in 628 and 622, does appear to preserve an important fact, that the religious reformation proceeded in stages, first the purging of the Temple and the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, then the suppression of local cult-centres throughout Judah, including regions taken from Hezekiah by Sennacherib and now claimed again for Judah, when Assyria was too embarrassed to protest. This stage was associated with the finding of the law-book and the covenant. This evoking no response from Assyria, a third stage may well have been the extension of the reformation to Bethel and the north, which, with the pre-

<sup>a</sup>Cf. II Chron. 34.21 *ūbē'ad hannīš'ār bēyīsrā'el ūbīhūdā*, where the singular of the participle implies the reading *hā'ām*, as in Kings, hence our reading *ūbē'ad hā'ām hannīš'ār bēyīsrā'el ūbīhūdā*.

<sup>b</sup>Reading with G<sup>1</sup> *'ālāw* for MT *'ālēnū*, cf. II Chron. 34.21 *'al-hassēper hazze*.

<sup>c</sup>The name in the MT form is peculiar and defies etymological explanation. It is given as Hasrah in Chronicles, which may be the proper form, being connected with the root *hāsēr*, and may indicate that his mother had lacked milk.

occupation of Assyria with Nabopolassar and the Medes and northern enemies from 625 till her final collapse in 612, was quite practicable. In his account of the decisive stage of the reformation which came upon the finding of the law-book, in which he is so vitally interested, the Deuteronomistic compiler has probably telebadgered these three stages of the reformation. Shaphan means 'rock-badger', and is one of several apparently animal names in this passage, which seems to suggest that they were fashionable at this period; see further on vv. 12, 14.

On the office of scribe see on I K. 4.3.

The name *'ašalyāhū* ('Azaliah') is connected by Noth<sup>a</sup> with the Arabic verb *'ašula* ('to be distinguished'), cf. Ex. 24.11 *'ašilē benē yīśrā'el* ('the notables of the Israelites').

**22.4.** On the title 'chief priest' see p. 723 n.<sup>b</sup>.

On the reading *wēyattek* see p. 723 n.<sup>c</sup>, and on the officials in this and in vv. 5, 6, 7 see on 12.12ff.

**8.** The definite article with *tōrā* ('law') after *sēper* ('book') is possibly an instance of the demonstrative significance of the article, generally limited to certain stock phrases, e.g. *hayyōm*, *hallaylā*, *hāššānā*, see GK § 126a. On the other hand, Hilkiah may have assumed the law to go back to written authority. The book was no doubt a roll, probably written on prepared skin, like the Qumran scrolls, though papyrus also was in use then, as indicated by the impress on clay seals from Lachish.<sup>b</sup>

**9.** Strict grammar would require the use of the preposition *le* and the genitive after the phrase *wēyyāšeb dābār*, but the construction is according to sense, the compound phrase being tantamount to the transitive verb *'ānā*.

**10.** The reading this second time was certainly aloud, which is the proper meaning of *qārā*, cf. Qur'an ('that which is recited'). In the Qur'an many passages are introduced with the divine imperative to the Prophet *'igra* ('recite', not 'read'). It was the death of so many of the reciters of the Qur'an in the wars of reclamation after the death of Muhammad which first occasioned the collection and first editing of the Qur'an as a book which might be read.

**11.** The king's rending of his robes, as well as indicating his own genuine contrition, probably anticipated, if it did not inaugurate, a solemn fast.

<sup>a</sup>IP, p. 193.

<sup>b</sup>D. Diringer, *PEQ*, 1941, pp. 102-4.



22.12. Achbor means 'a mouse', and may be an instance of an animal name apparently in vogue at this time, like Shaphan ('rock-badger') and Huldah ('mole'); cf. Hagab, 'locust'.<sup>a</sup> It may be that the prevalence of such names at this time was a riposte to the banning of Yahweh theophorics in the families of certain determined opponents of the cults of Manasseh. On the other hand, it may be that these animals evoked more admiration in ancient Israel than with us; cf. the Homeric figure of the courage of a fly. Another possible explanation is that the names are caritative in the case of Achbor, a mother's pet name, or nicknames, not necessarily derogatory.

13. On the specific meaning of *dāraš*, 'to consult an oracle', see on 1.2.

On the text see p. 724 n.<sup>b</sup>. If the MT *kātūb 'ālēnū* is read, L. Kopf<sup>b</sup> is probably right in citing the Arabic *kataba 'alā* (Qur'an, Surah 5.32), signifying 'written injunction as evidence against the transgressor'.

MT mentions only Judah, see p. 724 n.<sup>a</sup>. The inclusion of Israel, which we adopt after Chronicles, is probably influenced in retrospect by the memory of the later phase of Josiah's reformation in the Assyrian province of Samaria.

14. The status of the prophetess Huldah is interesting in view of the fact that both the canonical prophets Jeremiah and Zephaniah were already active at that time. It was probably felt that such independent spirits would give an answer which the priests considered *ultra vires*, whereas Huldah, the wife of a minor Temple official, would give the divine authority to what they sought without embarrassing them. Budde<sup>c</sup> suggests that Jeremiah's sympathy with the reformation, involving as it did the suppression of local sanctuaries and the consequent degradation of local priests, explains the bitter hostility which he encountered from his kinsmen in the Levitical community of Anathoth, some four miles north-north-east of Jerusalem.

On the name Harhas, for which we should probably read Hasrah, see p. 724 n.<sup>c</sup>. On the office of keeper of the ritual vestments, see on 10.22 on the similar office in the Baal-temple in Samaria.

The 'Second Quarter' (*hammišne*) of Jerusalem is generally accepted as the northern extension of the old Jebusite city, which

<sup>a</sup>D. Diringer, *Lachish III*, pp. 331-9; also Ezra 2.46.

<sup>b</sup>VT VIII, 1958, p. 180.

<sup>c</sup>ZAW XLIV, 1926, p. 205.

probably developed as a residential area for palace and Temple personnel after the building of the Temple. At the time of Josiah it would be located west of the palace and Temple over the depression of the upper Tyropoeon Valley, 'the Mortar' (*hammaktāš*).

(c) THE RESPONSE OF HULDAH: 22.16-20a

This is so developed by the Deuteronomistic redactor that the original oracle is no longer distinguishable, though it was probably a threat (v. 16) modified by a vague promise of grace to Josiah, beginning at v. 18 and probably ending at v. 19, as the words 'oracle of Yahweh' (*ne'ūm yhwē*) suggest.

22.16<sup>a</sup> Thus says Yahweh, See I shall bring calamity upon<sup>a</sup> this place and its inhabitants, all the words of the book which the king of Judah has read, <sup>17</sup>because they have forsaken me and sent up the smoke of sacrifice to other gods in order to provoke me to anger with all the work of their hands, and my wrath shall be kindled against this place and shall not be quenched. <sup>18</sup>But to the king of Judah who sends you to consult the oracle of Yahweh thus shall you say, <sup>19</sup>Thus says Yahweh God of Israel, As for the words which you have heard, <sup>19</sup>inasmuch as your heart has been susceptible and you have humbled yourself before Yahweh in listening to what I have spoken against this place and its inhabitants that they should be for devastation and curse, and have torn your robes and wept before me, I also have heard; oracle of Yahweh. <sup>20a</sup>Therefore I will gather you to<sup>b</sup> your fathers, and you shall be gathered safely to your tombs and your eyes shall not look upon all the evil which I shall bring upon this place <sup>a</sup>and its inhabitants.<sup>a</sup>

22.16. 'calamity . . . even all the words of the book . . .' indicates the consequences of the curses on transgression of the law in Deut. 28.15ff.

20. It seems reasonable to suppose that the prediction of Josiah's death *bešālōm* was part of the original response of Huldah in so far as a date after the violent death of Josiah seems precluded. The late redactor of the passage, however, may be visualizing the major disaster of the liquidation of the state, Josiah still dying and being buried while the state was intact (*bešālōm*). Fohrer<sup>c</sup> cites this verse as

<sup>a</sup>Reading 'al with the Versions and the parallel passage in Chronicles for MT 'el.

<sup>b</sup>Reading 'el with certain Hebrew MSS, the Versions, and the parallel passage in Chronicles for MT 'al.

<sup>c</sup>Reading the singular *biqēbūrātekā* with the Versions.

<sup>d</sup>Inserting *wē'al-yōšēbāw* with G<sup>l</sup> and the parallel version in Chronicles, *yōšēbāw* having dropped out through a scribal error due to the following word *wayyāšibū*.

<sup>e</sup>*Elia*, p. 50 n.

evidence that the first Deuteronomistic compilation was completed in the reign of Josiah, before his violent death in 609.

(d) THE INAUGURATION OF THE REFORMATION, THE PUBLIC  
READING OF THE LAW AND THE COVENANT: 22.20b-23.3

Historical narrative from a priestly source, probably the Deuteronomistic compiler, continued from the oracle of Huldah in its pre-redactional form in vv. 16-20a with the account of the Passover and the general reference to reforms in Judah in 23.21-25.

22 <sup>20B</sup>So they reported the word to the king.

23 <sup>1</sup>Then the king sent and gathered to himself all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem. <sup>2</sup>And the king went up to the Temple of Yahweh and all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him <sup>a</sup>and the priests and the prophets<sup>b</sup> and all the people both small and great,<sup>a</sup> and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the Temple of Yahweh. <sup>3</sup>And the king stood by the pillar<sup>c</sup> and made the covenant before Yahweh to walk after Yahweh, keeping<sup>d</sup> his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes wholeheartedly and sincerely, establishing the words of this covenant which were written in this book, and all the people committed themselves to the covenant of set resolve.

23.1. The elders were the heads of families representing the people on this memorable occasion as the heirs of the old sacral community. Note the specific mention of Jerusalem apart from Judah *à propos* of the view that a distinction must be made between the inhabitants of Jerusalem as a crown estate and 'the people of the land'; see on 11.14.

2. The subject of *wayyiqra* ('read') is ostensibly the king. The in-

<sup>a</sup>The phrase *w'hakkōh'nīm w'hannēbī'im w'kol-hā'ām l'miqqēṭōn w'ad-gādōl* should probably be omitted, as suggested by the parallel passage in Chronicles. The versions, however, support its inclusion in the present passage. As the preposition *'ittō* indicates, the king was accompanied. 'The men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem' doubtless indicates their representatives.

<sup>b</sup>For MT *hannēbī'im* Chronicles reads *hall'wīyīm* ('the Levites'), which may reflect post-exilic usage. This reading is supported by certain Hebrew MSS, which may reflect the reading of Chronicles. The Levites, however, had a definite status in pre-exilic Israel, particularly in the covenant-sacrament in earlier times, which was now re-enacted, and as custodians of the tradition of Israel and agents of the Davidic dynasty in the early monarchy throughout the territorial state under David and Solomon particularly (see above, pp. 722f.). 'The prophets also, of course, had a status both in cult and community, e.g. Huldah, so prophets would be as appropriate as Levites in this transaction. Both, however, may be omitted in the context, see n.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>c</sup>On the question of *hā'ammūd* or *hā'ōmed* see on 11.14. In the present passage Chronicles reads *ōmdō* ('his platform').

<sup>d</sup>Omitting initial *w*, as suggested by G<sup>B</sup>.

definite subject could be denoted, but in view of the role of Joshua (Josh. 8.34:24), Ezra (Neh. 8.2f.), and Moses (Ex. 24.3-8), and of the function prescribed for the king to administer the law in Deut. 17.18-20, it is probable that Josiah himself read it out aloud on this occasion.<sup>a</sup> This is the first time that the book is termed 'the book of the covenant', and is one more feature which connects it with the nucleus of Deuteronomy and with the sacrament of the renewal of the covenant, in which the recitation of the law and its endorsement was an important element (Deut. 27).

23.3. The only explicit precedent for such a covenant was that in which Joash was involved at his accession. The present case, however, was not the accession of Josiah. In the case of Joash, though he probably assumed the obligations of the covenant, indicated in the handing over of 'the testimony' (*hā'ēdūt*), he was to a degree making a concession to subjects. Here, however, Josiah, as emphasized by Noth,<sup>b</sup> was mediating the covenant according to the traditional role of Moses (Ex. 24.3-8) and Joshua (Josh. 24). G. Fohrer,<sup>c</sup> rightly in our opinion, notes the emphasis on the old type of covenant in the assembly of the sacral confederacy, with which the Northern Israelites were familiar, as distinct from the divine covenant with the Davidic dynasty, with which the people of Judah were familiar. As in the sacrament of the renewal of the covenant at Shechem, a formal renunciation of alien elements in religion is an important part of the transaction. The phraseology 'to keep his commandments, testimonies, and statutes with all his heart and with all his being' is characteristically Deuteronomic. The phrase *wayya'amōd babb'rit* (lit., 'stood in the covenant') suggests to us the Arabic *'i'tamada 'alā* ('to rely upon', hence 'to commit oneself to'), and *'amada 'ilā* ('to resolve'), cf. *'amdān* ('of set purpose'), which inspires our translation. The meaning may, however, be more literal, indicating that the people sat or squatted when the book was read and stood up as a sign of assent when the covenant was executed.

(e) THE REFORMATION: 23.4-15

This passage is probably a telescoped account by the compiler resting ultimately on the Annals of Judah.

<sup>a</sup>Cf. Mishnah, *Soṭa* 7.8, cited by G. Widengren, 'King and Covenant', *JSS* II, 1957, pp. 1-32.

<sup>b</sup>Die Gesetze im Pentateuch', *Gesammelte Studien*, pp. 61ff.; *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, p. 46.

<sup>c</sup>'Der Vertrag zwischen König und Volk in Israel', *ZAW* LXXI, 1959, pp. 1-22.

23 <sup>a</sup>Then the king ordered Hilkiah the chief<sup>1</sup> priest and the second priest<sup>b</sup> and the warders of the threshold to put out of the Temple of Yahweh all the equipment made for Baal and Asherah and all the heavenly host, and he burned them outside Jerusalem in the limekilns<sup>c</sup> of Kidron, and took the dust of them to Bethel. <sup>d</sup>And he suspended the priests whom the kings of Judah had appointed to burn sacrifice<sup>d</sup> at the 'high places' in the cities of Judah and around Jerusalem and those who burned sacrifices to Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the zodiacal signs, and to all the heavenly host. <sup>e</sup>And he brought out the Asherah-symbol from the Temple of Yahweh outside Jerusalem to the Wadi of Kidron and burned it in the Wadi of Kidron and ground it to powder and cast the dust of it on the graves<sup>e</sup> of the common people. <sup>f</sup>And he broke down the houses of the ritual prostitutes which were in the Temple of Yahweh where the women wore robes<sup>f</sup> for the Asherah-figure. <sup>g</sup>And he brought all the priests from the cities of Judah and desecrated the 'high places' where the priests had burned sacrifices<sup>g</sup> from Geba right to<sup>h</sup> Beersheba, and he broke down the shrine<sup>i</sup> of the gate-genii<sup>j</sup> which were at the entrance of the gate of Joshua the city-commandant, which were at the left as one entered<sup>k</sup> the city-gate. <sup>l</sup>But the priests of the 'high places' did not go up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem, but they ate portions<sup>l</sup> among their colleagues. <sup>m</sup>And he

<sup>a</sup>On the inclusion of the adjective *gādōl* see on 22.4.

<sup>b</sup>Probably, as 25.18 suggests, the singular should be read.

<sup>c</sup>Reading *mišrēpōt* ('burning-places', hence limekilns) after Klostermann, suggested by G<sup>L</sup> *en tō empurimō*, for MT *šadēmōt* ('flat plots', singularly inappropriate to the ravine of the Kidron below the Temple).

<sup>d</sup>Reading *leqatšēr* with G<sup>L</sup>, S, and for the obviously corrupt MT *wayeqatšēr*.

<sup>e</sup>Reading plural with G<sup>L</sup>, S, V, and T for the singular *qeber*, which might just possibly be used collectively.

<sup>f</sup>Reading *kulnīm* for MT *bāttīm* ('houses'), as suggested by G<sup>L</sup> (*stolās*) and the transliteration *cheltieim* in G<sup>BA</sup>. One MS of G, however, and Theodotion support the MT, transliterating. Šanda, therefore suggests that *bāttīm* is cognate with the Arabic *batt* ('woven garment'), and that MT is possibly to be read *baddīm*. This is accepted by G. R. Driver, *JBL* LV, 1936, p. 107.

<sup>g</sup>Reading *šām* for MT *šāmmā(h)*, though the final otiose *h* is often used in the Qumran biblical MSS.

<sup>h</sup>Reading *wad* for MT *ad* after the literalism of G, S, and T.

<sup>i</sup>Reading *bēi* for MT *bāmōt* ('high places') after G.

<sup>j</sup>For MT *šē'ārīm* Hoffmann proposed *šē'irīm* ('satyrs'), cf. II Chron. 11.15 (a cult instituted by Rehoboam) and Lev. 17.7. Obviously guardian deities of the threshold of the gate were intended, who were also propitiated probably in the Passover rite of smearing the lintel and doorposts. We personally prefer the reading *šō'arīm* ('gate-keepers'). Perhaps the allusion is to the bull-colossi which represent the guardian genii of the entrance in Assyrian palaces.

<sup>k</sup>Reading *bā' šā'ar* after G<sup>L</sup> and T, the preposition being generally omitted before the objective after a verb of motion in Hebrew.

<sup>l</sup>The reference here is to a privilege enjoyed by the rural priests, hence we take the reference to be their perquisites from the meat of the sacrifices, cf. Ex. 29.26; Lev. 8.29, etc., hence we prefer Kuenen's emendation *mišwat*, *mišwōt* ('statutory perquisites'), cf. Neh. 13.5, or *mēnāyōt* ('portions'), for *maššōt* ('unleavened cakes'),

desecrated the furnace<sup>a</sup> which was in the Valley of ben Hinnom<sup>b</sup> for passing<sup>c</sup> one's son or one's daughter through the fire to Melech.<sup>d</sup> <sup>e</sup>And he abolished the horses which the kings of Judah had provided for the sun at the entrance<sup>e</sup> to the Temple of Yahweh towards the chamber of Nathan-melech the chamberlain, which was in the purlicus, and the chariot<sup>f</sup> of the sun he burned in the fire. <sup>g</sup>And also the altars which were on the roof,<sup>g</sup> which the kings of Judah had made, and the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the Temple of Yahweh the king demolished<sup>h</sup> and beat them up small on the spot<sup>h</sup> and threw out the dust of them into the Wadi of Kidron. <sup>i</sup>And the king polluted the 'high places' which were east of Jerusalem, which lay on the south of the Mount of Olives,<sup>i</sup> which Solomon the king of Israel had built for Ashtoreth<sup>j</sup> the 'abomination' of the Sidonians and for Chemosh the 'abomination' of Moab, and for 'the king', the 'abomination' of the Ammonites. <sup>k</sup>And he smashed the standing-stones and cut down the Asherah-symbols and filled their places with men's bones. <sup>l</sup>And as for the altar which was in Bethel, the 'high place' made by Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin, that altar and the 'high place', he demolished<sup>k</sup> and smashed up the stones of them, beating them<sup>k</sup> to dust, and he burned the Asherah.

<sup>a</sup>In the proto-Hebraic script there is practically nothing to distinguish *š* and *ny* if the latter are written closely together. Such portions, however, at least of the bloodless meal-offering, were eaten with unleavened bread (*maššōt*) (Lev. 6.14-18), to which I Sam. 2.36 may literally refer.

<sup>b</sup>*šepet* should possibly be read, as G suggests, MT having the vowels of *bōšet* ('shame') substituted.

<sup>c</sup>Reading with Q, certain Hebrew MSS, and the Versions *ben h.* for MT *bēnē h.*

<sup>d</sup>Omitting MT *lebilti* with two Hebrew MSS and G<sup>BA</sup>, as suggested by the preposition *le* before the following infinitive construct, which, with *lebilti* of MT, would be a *hapax legomenon*.

<sup>e</sup>Assuming that MT uses the vowels of *bōšet* with the consonants of Melek, the title of the god manifest in the Venus-star.

<sup>f</sup>Reading with G, S, and V *mēbō'* for MT *mibbō'*.

<sup>g</sup>Reading singular with G for plural of MT.

<sup>h</sup>Omitting MT *'alīyat 'āhāz* as a late gloss (so Kittel, Stade), this being supported by the following relative clause 'which the kings of Judah had made'. Šanda, taking 'the upper chamber of Ahaz' to be an observatory.

<sup>i</sup>Reading after Ehrlich *waydiqqēm šām* for the impossible MT *wayyāroš miššām* ('and broke in pieces from there') *r* closely resembling *d*, and *š q* in the proto-Hebraic script. Benzinger proposed *wayyōšī'ēm miššām* ('and brought out from there'), which is better supported by the Versions. Ehrlich's emendation, however, is nearer MT in the proto-Hebraic script. Kimchi's suggestion *wayyāreš* ('and he banished'), with an impersonal object, does not recommend itself.

<sup>j</sup>A deliberate misvocalization in MT, *mašhūt* ('destroyer') for *mišhā* ('oil').

<sup>k</sup>The second part of the name is vocalized in MT with the vowels of *bōšet*.

<sup>l</sup>Reading with G *wayšabēr 'et-šābānāw* for the unlikely MT *wayyisrōp 'et-habbāmā* ('and he burned the "high place"'). It is unlikely that *habbāmā* should be so soon repeated in the verse, and the sequel supports Ehrlich's reading. We should further read MT *hēdaq* as the infinitive absolute *hādēq*.

23.4. On the question of 'the chief priest' and 'the second priest' see pp. 723 n.<sup>b</sup> and 730 n.<sup>b</sup>. The chief priest and the second priest are individually named in Jer. 52.24, where they are mentioned, as here, together with the warders of the threshold.

On the reading *mišrēpôt qidrôn* for *šadēmôt qidrôn* see p. 730 n.<sup>c</sup>. M. R. Lehmann<sup>a</sup> offers a new interpretation. He reads *šadēmôt* as *šedēmôt*, which has, he supposes, developed from *šedē môt* 'fields of Mot', the Canaanite god of drought and sterility, the phrase being alleged in the Ras Shamra text (*UT*, 52, 10-11). Here Ugaritic *š*, however, would correspond to Hebrew *š*, which presents a difficulty which Croatta and Soggin<sup>b</sup> barely avoid by postulating in MT *šadēmôt* a borrowing from Ugaritic literature. The best support for Lehmann's theory is that in Isa. 16.8, Hab. 3.17, and Jer. 31.40 *šedēmôt*, though apparently a feminine, is followed by the verb in the masculine singular, which would be intelligible if the word were originally *šedē môt*. Apart from the last passage, which, like II K. 23.4, refers to the Kidron Valley, the word does not, as Lehmann supposes, refer to barren land or imply pagan cults. In Deut. 32.32 and Isa. 16.8 it is associated with vines, as also in the Ugaritic text cited by Gordon. Such evidence would lead us to postulate a meaning 'terraces', possibly derived from some lost root *šadam*, 'to level', whence the general meaning 'field', i.e. for corn, as in Hab. 3.17. In Jer. 31.40 in a similar passage dealing with the Kidron Valley as a place of burial and burning MT has *šrēmôt*, probably a corruption of *šadēmôt* or *šedēmôt*. Perhaps in these two passages the word is to be connected with *šid* ('lime') and read *mēšidôt* ('limekilns').

The statement that 'he took the dust of them to Bethel', introduced, as it is, with *w* before the perfect, a late usage, seems a later addition, and is in any case a rather impracticable operation.

5. The introduction of the officials of the alien cults at this stage between the destruction of the equipment of these cults (v. 4) and the ejection of the Asherah cult from the Temple (v. 6) suggests an intrusion, which is supported by the late usage of *w* with the narrative perfect in *wēhišbūt. kēmārim* is a derogatory reference, being reserved for priests of pagan cults. *mazzālôt* (lit. 'stations', cf. Arabic *nazala*, 'to alight', hence 'to camp') may refer to the constellations, but

<sup>a</sup>VT III, 1953, pp. 361-71.

<sup>b</sup>J. S. Croatta and J. A. Soggin, 'Die Bedeutung von מִזְבֵּחַ im Alten Testament', ZAW LXXIV, 1962, pp. 44-50.

probably, as Akkadian *manzaltu*, refers to the stations or signs of the Zodiac, as Aquila's translation suggests.

The consciousness of a distinction between Jerusalem and its neighbourhood and the land of Judah may be noted. Alt,<sup>a</sup> in studying local administration in various phases of the settlement of the area, particularly under the Babylonian and Persian domination, concludes that new administrative divisions tended to respect traditional limits, and Judah proper was the country from Bethlehem to just north of Hebron, as distinct from Jerusalem, the crown possession of the house of David, with its strategic northern extension to Mizpah just south of Bethel. In the latter, Josiah was free to do as he cared. In abolishing local cult-centres in the former he was over-riding local liberties. More particularly in his thesis that the topographical list in Josh. 15.21-62 really represents the administrative division of the realm of Josiah, which was reorganized on the same traditional principles, he maintains that Judah proper was limited to the districts of Bethlehem and Bethsur.<sup>b</sup> It is uncertain how far the reformation of Josiah extended beyond these strict limits of Judah proper. One would imagine that the political incorporation of the Philistine plain, which Alt plausibly posits, would, from its short duration, leave little scope for thorough religious reform. On this subject a Hebrew ostrakon from the excavation of a small fortress on the coast near Yibneh confirms that Josiah actually extended his realm to the sea.<sup>c</sup> There is no reason to doubt the historicity of the Bethel incident, considering the fact that it was only two miles from Mizpah in Judah, though the date of this remains uncertain. The political organization of Josiah visualized in Josh. 15.21-62 must have been in project rather than in effect in view of the death of Josiah in 609. Alt argues that this drastic abolition of local cult-centres in Judah and the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem was not a

<sup>a</sup>Bemerkungen zu einigen jüdischen Ortslisten', KS II, pp. 291ff.

<sup>b</sup>'Judas Gaue unter Josia', KS II, pp. 285-7.

<sup>c</sup>See J. Naveh, 'A Hebrew Letter from the 7th Century BC', IEJ X, 1960, pp. 129-39, pl. 17. This ostrakon, which is a letter of a peasant appealing against the commandant Hoshaiyah for the return of a garment taken in distraint in default of the contribution of corn in harvest, is a striking illustration of the operation of one of the laws in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 22.26; cf. Deut. 24.10-13; Amos 2.8) and might suggest that Josiah's religious reformation also extended to the Philistine plain, particularly if the reference to a period of rest from work denoted the weekly Sabbath. The law, however, which enjoined the return by nightfall of a garment taken in pledge or distraint, is part of the casuistic law in the Book of the Covenant which Alt ('The Origins of Israelite Law') feasibly takes to be the Israelite application of general Canaanite law and custom.

natural political measure, but is intelligible only in the light of the religious sanction of the Deuteronomic law. Josiah was able to take this step, upon which his predecessors had not successfully engaged, because the bond between the king and Judah outside the city-state of Jerusalem had been broken since Sennacherib's conquest and provincial reorganization in 701.<sup>a</sup>

23.6. There is no reason to doubt that the Asherah was an image of the Canaanite mother-goddess. The deep ravine of the Kidron Valley, falling away steeply from the hill on which the Temple stood, was the natural dumping-ground for refuse from the Temple, which would be swiftly swept away by the winter floods of the wadi, which used to serve as a sewer for the northern part of the Arab city. Rubbish might also be burned here, and the lower slopes of the western escarpment of the Mount of Olives are still marked by tombs of priestly families of the Greek period, the higher slopes being occupied by common Jewish graves, many of which, since the division of Jerusalem in 1948, are now desecrated. From the last phase of the monarchic period the rock-hewn tomb of a royal chamberlain and his slave-wife at the village of Silwan is notable. This may possibly be Shebna or Shebaniah, the chamberlain of Hezekiah, on whose rock-hewn tomb Isaiah animadverts (Isa. 22.15ff.).

7. The masculine *qēdēšim* is here used to denote ritual prostitutes of both sexes, who functioned in rites of imitative magic in the fertility-cult. On the reading *kuttōnīm* see p. 730 n.1. The robes were probably for those serving Asherah as well as for the image. On ritual garments see on 10.21.

8. The provincial priests are now concentrated in the central sanctuary, as Deut. 18.6-8 generally visualizes, but, contrary to Deut. 18.6f., they were not admitted to the holy office, and, whereas Deut. 18.6 visualizes an occasional visit or voluntary migration to the central sanctuary, Josiah gave the rural priests no option, but, at least for the time being, concentrated them in Jerusalem, observing, however, the Deuteronomic provision for the perquisites of the Levites (Deut. 18.3-5). Regarding the correspondence between Deuteronomy and the Josianic reformation, it must be remembered that there is no mention of the application of any Deuteronomic measures except in the cult, much in the Deuteronomic system being now no longer practicable, e.g. the holy war and many social observances. The careful note on the modification of the status of the

<sup>a</sup>Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums', KS II, pp. 257ff.

rural priests from what was visualized in Deuteronomy, however, does emphasize the connection between that book and the law-book of Josiah. At the same time, as against the view of the production of the law-book *ad hoc*, it suggests that the book had been produced before it was applied by Josiah, who found it necessary to modify the prescription concerning the rural priests. This minor status and restricted privilege seems to be indicated where the degradation of the family of Eli is visualized in I Sam. 2.36 ('Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priests' offices that I may eat a piece of bread'). 'From Geba to Beersheba' describes the limits of the Kingdom of Judah. The former may be either *al-Jib'* one and a half miles east of *ar-Rām* (Rama of I K. 15.22), as that passage indicates, or Gibeah of Saul (*Tell al-Fūl*) two miles south of *ar-Rām* and about three miles north of the Damascus Gate in Jerusalem. Beersheba is mentioned in Amos 5.5 (cf. 8.14) as a shrine to which the Israelites from the Northern kingdom made pilgrimage. The Chronicler apparently had Beersheba in mind in referring to Josiah's desecration of provincial shrines in 'Simeon' (II Chron. 34.6). Beersheba is associated in patriarchal tradition with Isaac, and we think that the shrine was 'the "high place" of Isaac' (Amos 7.9). This limitation of the reformation has been taken to throw suspicion on the references to the extension of Josiah's activity to Bethel in vv. 4 and 15ff., and both passages are further suspect owing to the usage of *wē* with the narrative perfect. There is, however, no reason to doubt that eventually, probably after 622, Josiah took this step, encouraged by the failure of Assyria to respond to his defiant rejection of the astral cult in Jerusalem and the assertion of his authority over the Philistine plain.

23.9. See p. 730. n.1. If *maššōt* instead of *mišwat*, *mišwōt*, or *me'nāyōt* is read the reference is presumably not to the eating of unleavened bread (*maššōt*) alone, but to the parts of the offering which accompanied the unleavened bread (Lev. 6.14-18).

10. Topheth of EVV, actually a common noun, as the definite article suggests, is feasibly explained by W. R. Smith<sup>a</sup> as the fireplace, by which he visualizes a framework set on the fire to hold the victim. He suggests that the word is Aramaic, cf. Syriac *tḥiyā* and Arabic *ʿuṭfiya*, a stand, sometimes simply of large stones, set about the fire on the ground. If this is really an Aramaic form, the Hebrew cognate may be *šāpat*, used in 4.38 and Ezek. 24.3 of setting a pot on the fire. Granted the Aramaic form of the root, the Aramaism may be

<sup>a</sup>The Religion of the Semites, 1894<sup>2</sup>, pp. 372ff., 377n.

explained otherwise than by Smith's assumption of Aramaean influence in the time of Ahaz, under whom child sacrifice is first mentioned in Judah (16.3). The Aramaism may be rather explained, on the ground that it was a rite of the cult of Melek-Aṭtar, the Ammonite god, whose cult, though probably already established in pre-Israelite Jerusalem, is noted among the cults sponsored by Solomon for his foreign harem. It must be admitted, however, that what is known of the dialects of Moab and Ammon in this period indicates that they were akin to Hebrew in phonetics, rather than to Aramaic. This gruesome hearth was located in the Valley of 'the son of Hinnom' (so Josh. 18.16), called in Josh. 15.8 simply the Valley of Hinnom, which is given as the boundary between Judah to the west and Benjamin (including Jebusite Jerusalem) to the east. These references indicate not the Kidron Valley, which W. R. Smith seems to visualize,<sup>a</sup> but the broad space where the *Wādī ar-Rabābī* (the Valley of Hinnom) turns east to join the Kidron Valley just north of *Bīr 'Ayyūb* (probably En Rogel), which, J. Simons<sup>b</sup> justly observes, was better adapted than the restricted space further up these valleys for a ritual assembly.

23.11. This is the only indication in the Old Testament that the horse was sacred to the sun, but W. R. Smith<sup>c</sup> notes the sacrifice of four horses (a chariot team) cast into the sea at the annual festival of the sun at Rhodes in the early Roman imperial period. Evidence from Palestine in the Israelite period of the horse as sacred to the sun may be the terra cotta figurine from the ninth century at Hazor of the horse's head with the solar emblem of the cross within a disc on its forehead.<sup>d</sup> The connection of the horse with the sun may be owing to its eastern provenance with the Aryan invasions c. 1800, cf. the Sumerian term for 'horse', 'the ass of the East'. From the Aramaean inscriptions from Zenjirli in the eighth century, when Assyrian influence was being felt, it is known that the sun was worshipped along with Baal-Hadad, as now in Judah under Manasseh and Amon. The chariot associated with the sun suggests the Assyrian title of the sun-god *rākīb narkabtī* ('chariot-rider').<sup>e</sup> A relic of this cult-object may be the winged wheels between which a deity sits on a coin

<sup>a</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 272.

<sup>b</sup>*Jerusalem . . .*, pp. 11 ff.

<sup>c</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 293.

<sup>d</sup>Y. Yadin, *BA* XXI, 1958, pp. 46 ff., fig. 16.

<sup>e</sup>M. Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1898, p. 461.

stamped YHD (Jehud) from the Persian period near Gaza.<sup>a</sup> In the Aramaic inscriptions from Zenjirli<sup>b</sup> a deity Rekub'el is mentioned, always before Shemesh, which may indicate a minor deity as charioteer of the sun-god. The sun-cult in the Temple is attested in Ezek. 8.16.

The name Nathan-melech is ambiguous. The second element may be a title either of Yahweh or of 'Aṭtar ('Molech' or 'Milcom').

On the ambiguity of *sāris* see on I K. 22.9.

*liškā* is found in I Sam. 9.22 of a dining-hall adjoining the local sanctuary of Ramath. In Jer. 35.2-4 it signifies a room appropriated to one of the Temple personnel where Jeremiah offers the Rechabites wine, cf. Ezek. 40.17, where *šākōt* are chambers of priests, Levites, singers, and other Temple staff.

*parwār*, if, as generally supposed, a Persian word, indicates the hand of a later redactor in the present passage. The word is used in Aramaic, but not before the Persian period. In Persian it means an open pavilion; hence it may signify here a verandah, which would not be quite contrary to the Aramaic meaning 'suburb' or 'adjunct'.

23.12. On *'alīyat 'āhāz*, which is a gloss influenced by 20.11, where it suggests the correct reading, now supported by 1 QIs<sup>a</sup>, see on 20.11. The roof altar as a place of sacrifice to Baal is mentioned in Jer. 32.29, and is strikingly attested by the worship of the king in the Ras Shamra text (*UT*, Krt, 60-84 || 156-175). In the latter case, however, the king is in a state of ritual seclusion, hence the place of sacrifice 'on the rampart of the wall' is not perhaps the normal place of sacrifice to Baal. The roof was particularly appropriate to the worship of the heavenly bodies (Jer. 19.13; Zeph. 1.5). On the two courts of the pre-exilic Temple see on 20.4 and 21.5. The present passage is probably a late gloss suggested by 21.5, and the late usage of *w*<sup>e</sup> with the narrative perfect supports this assumption. On the reading *way<sup>e</sup>diqqēm šām* see p. 731 n.<sup>h</sup>.

13. The compound prepositional phrase *'al-pe nē* may mean 'opposite' in any direction, e.g. Josh. 15.8 of the hill west of Jerusalem over the Valley of Hinnom. In the present passage it means the hill opposite Jerusalem to the east, 'in front of' meaning, as generally in the East, one's orientation to the rising sun. This is the earliest reference to the Mount of Olives, MT *har hammašhūt* being probably

<sup>a</sup>G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Palestine in the British Museum (Galilee, Samaria, and Judaea)*, 1914, p. 181, n.29.

<sup>h</sup>G. Cooke, *NSI*, 61, 62.

a parody of *har hammišhā*, which, however, according to regular Old Testament usage, means 'mountain of anointing'. V translates *mons offensionis*, of which a trace survives as the name of the top south of the summit of the Mount of Olives *Jebel Baṭn al-Hawa* ('the mountain of the belly of the infernal abyss'). The reflection is probably upon the alien cults located here, see on I K. 11.7.

**23.15.** This ill-constructed sentence is suspect also by the usage of *wē* with the narrative perfect. On the reading *wayēšabbēr 'et-ʿabānāw* see p. 731 n.<sup>k</sup>. We further suggest reading the infinitive absolute *hādēq* for MT *hēdaq*.

(f) A FURTHER ELABORATION OF JOSIAH'S DESECRATION  
OF BETHEL: 23.16-20

This section reflects the interest of the Deuteronomists in the fulfilment of prophecy (cf. I K. 13). A different hand is at work here from that of the redactor in v. 15, who has already noted the destruction of the altar of Bethel, and the section may be from the Deuteronomistic redactor.

**23** <sup>16</sup>Then Josiah turned and saw the tombs which were there in the hills<sup>a</sup> and he sent and took the bones from the tombs and burned them on the altar and desecrated it according to the word of Yahweh which the man of God proclaimed<sup>b</sup> when Jeroboam stood at the festival by the altar, and he turned and lifted his eyes upon the tomb of the man of God<sup>b</sup> who proclaimed these things; <sup>17</sup>and he said, What is that monument that I see? And the men of the city said to him, This is the tomb<sup>c</sup> of the man of God who came from Judah and proclaimed these words which you have carried into effect on the altar at Bethel.<sup>d</sup> <sup>18</sup>So he said, Let him be. Let no one move his bones. So they spared his bones with the bones of the prophet<sup>e</sup> from Samaria. <sup>19</sup>Moreover, all the shrines of the 'high places' which were in the cities of Samaria, which

<sup>a</sup>G reads *bā'ir*, but the tombs of common people were not in the city, but usually on some nearby rocky escarpment, where the soft limestone might be easily fashioned into a tomb, or natural caves so adapted. This is a common feature of sites of ancient occupation in Palestine. Hence MT must be retained.

<sup>b</sup>This is added by G, the passage, probably a complete line in ancient MSS, having dropped out, the scribe's eye playing him false because of the two phrases *'ašer qārā'* before and after the omission.

<sup>c</sup>We should expect *qeber* to be in the construct, but it is just possible to retain the definite article of MT with *qeber* before the definite *'iš hā'ēbhim*, rendering with Montgomery, 'The tomb? That of the man of God. . .'. GK (§ 127g) posits the ellipse of *qeber*, translating, 'the grave is the grave of the man of God. . .'. We prefer the reading of G<sup>L</sup>, however *ze qeber* . . ., *z* resembling *r* at the end of the preceding word, after which it was omitted by scribal error.

<sup>d</sup>Reading *b'ēl-ʿēl* with certain Hebrew MSS for MT *bēt'ēl*.

<sup>e</sup>Omitting MT *bā'*, see on v. 18.

the kings of Israel had made, provoking Yahweh<sup>a</sup> to anger, Josiah abolished, and he treated them according to all that he had done at Bethel. <sup>20</sup>And he slew all the priests of the 'high places' which were there by the altars and burned human bones upon them and returned to Jerusalem.

**23.16.** On the reading *bāhār* and ancient local burial see p. 738 n.<sup>a</sup>.

The redactor shows a curious interest in the literal fulfilment of prophecy, which is a feature of the Deuteronomistic compilation of Kings, cf. Deut. 18.21f. The reference is to the incidents in I K. 13.

**17.** *šiyūn* ('monument') is found in connection with burial only in Ezek. 39.15, where, to be sure, it is used not of regular burial, but of a mark set up by the bones of a dead man protruding from the ground until a proper burial may be arranged. The tomb of the prophet obviously bore some conspicuous mark, which is all that *šiyūn* signifies. The pillar, or standing stone (*maššēbā*) set up at Rachel's grave (Gen. 35.20) may have been such a memorial.

**18.** Neither in I K. 13 nor elsewhere is there any reference to a prophet coming from Samaria to Bethel, and, in fact, the city of Samaria was not founded in the time of Jeroboam I, to which the other incident refers. Hence we suppose that *bā'* is written loosely here through the influence of the clause concerning the prophet of Judah (*'ašer bā' mihūdā*) and ought to be omitted. We suppose that *šōmērōn* in this late passage refers not to the city, but anachronistically to the Northern kingdom, and the prophet is the old prophet of Bethel of I. K. 13.

**20.** We note that only in the late elaboration of the account of Josiah's reformation is there any mention of the bloody elimination of the priests of the 'high places' of the Northern province, an enormity which would have reflected no credit to Josiah.

(g) THE GREAT PASSOVER, GENERAL REFORMS,  
AND APPRAISAL OF JOSIAH: 23.21-25

Historical narrative continued from v. 3.

**23** <sup>21</sup>And the king commanded all the people saying, Keep a Passover to Yahweh your God as it is written in this book of the covenant. <sup>22</sup>Indeed there was no celebration such as this Passover since the days of the judges who governed Israel nor all the days of the kings

<sup>a</sup>Inserting *'et-yhwh* after the transitive verb with G, S, and V.

of Israel and the kings of Judah. <sup>23</sup>Only in the eighteenth year of king Josiah was this Passover kept to Yahweh in Jerusalem.

24 And moreover Josiah drove out the exponents of necromancy and of familiar spirits, and the household figurines, and the idols, and all the abominations which were seen in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, in order to establish the words of the law which were written in the book which Hilkiah the priest found in the Temple of Yahweh.

25 And like him there was no king before him, he turning to Yahweh with all his will, and with all his being, and with all his strength according to all the law of Moses, and after him arose none like him.

23.21. The etymology of *pesah* is uncertain. It has been connected with *pāsaḥ* ('to hobble', e.g. I K. 18.21); hence, it is suggested, 'to jump', as the angel of destruction 'jumped' the houses of the Israelites on the night of the Exodus. A more recent view is that of B. Couroyer<sup>a</sup> that it is an Egyptian word meaning 'blow, stroke', i.e. that which Yahweh struck in the last plague of Egypt. Both these views depend on the association with the escape from Egypt, which is really secondary. De Vaux<sup>b</sup> rightly emphasizes that the rite has all the appearance of a nomad custom, probably much older than the Exodus. The word may be connected with the Akkadian *pasāhu* ('to appease'), which has been suggested, and the rite may have been connected, as de Vaux suggests (*ibid.*), with the migration of the nomad shepherds to their spring grazings. In this case the rite would come into A. van Gennep's categories of *rites de passage*, connected with a change of season or locality, which primitive man never underwent without prophylactic rites. It may be that the health of the animals was provided for in this way in view of the lambing and the possible ill effects of the lusher grazings after the poor pickings of winter. We offer the suggestion that the word is cognate with the Arabic verb *fasaḥa* ('to be clear'). One immediately thinks of the celebration of the feast on the night of the full moon in the middle of the spring month Abib, and the Arabic verb does denote atmospheric clearness, usually of dawn. It denotes also clearness of milk, and we suggest that this is the significance of *pesah*, the rites of *pesah* being designed to mark the time when the milk of the ewes and goats is clear of impurities after birth, and it is safe both hygienically and ritually for human consumption. Whatever the etymology of *pesah* and the origin of the rite, it was eventually invested in Hebrew

<sup>a</sup>'L'origine égyptienne du mot "Pâque"', *RB* LXII, 1955, pp. 481-96.

<sup>b</sup>*Ancient Israel*, p. 489.

tradition with a historical significance as a sacrament of the great deliverance from Egypt.

In the earliest description of the Passover, in J (Ex. 12.21-27), it is noteworthy that there is no association with the Feast of *maṣṣōt* (Unleavened Bread), which in turn is described independently of the Passover in the earliest passage where it is noted, in E (Ex. 23.15), where it is a feast to which, like the Feasts of Weeks and Tabernacles, pilgrimage (*ḥag*) is made to a central shrine. It will be noted that in Josiah's Passover there is no mention of *maṣṣōt*.

In Deut. 16.1-8, where the Passover is combined with the Feast of Unleavened Bread and dated not on a given day, but generally in the month Abib, it is generally claimed by critics that vv. 1, 2, 4b-7, which describe the Passover, are originally independent of vv. 3, 4a, 8, which refer properly to the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The main grounds of this separation of the feasts is that vv. 1, 2, 4b-7 refer to the Passover apparently as a one-day festival, the meal being eaten at night at a central sanctuary and the people dispersing next morning 'to your tents'. The ordinance for the Feast of Unleavened Bread, on the other hand (vv. 3, 4a, 8), visualizes a seven-day feast. It is possible, however, that what the dispersal 'to your tents' signifies is not, as often, 'home', but the reference may be to the worshippers living in tents by the sanctuary for a seven-day feast including Unleavened Bread and indicate the end of the ritual.<sup>a</sup> There is no doubt that the Passover as a nomadic festival was artificially associated with the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which was connected with the rites of desacralization of the new crop at the beginning of the barley harvest, and that in this passage we have evidence of this combination of traditions. In emphasizing the difference between this ordinance for the Passover in Deut. 16.1, 2, 4b-7 and the Passover rites in other early traditions, the young of cattle as well as sheep and goats being not roasted, but boiled (Deut. 16.7), Nicolsky<sup>b</sup> argues that this is determined by Josiah's centralization of the rite in the Temple which had facilities for boiling such ample sacrifices. This, of course, could apply to any local sanctuary, e.g. Shiloh in I Sam. 2.13-15, and leaves the question of the association of Passover and Unleavened Bread in Josiah's festival unsolved.

The earliest texts on Passover describe it as the feast of a family or a limited community and not as a pilgrimage involving general

<sup>a</sup>J. Pedersen, *Israel* III-IV, pp. 387ff.

<sup>b</sup>'Pascha im Kulte des jerusalemischen Tempels', *ZAW* XLV, 1927, pp. 242-4.



pilgrimage to a central shrine. The novelty of Josiah's Passover, on the other hand, consists in the elevation of the Passover to the status of a pilgrimage feast celebrated at the central sanctuary with a real national significance.

It will be noted that neither this passage nor the account of the limited reformation of Hezekiah in 18.4 takes any account of the Passover attributed to Hezekiah by II Chron. 30. This seems, then, to be a reflection of Josiah's Passover, though A. C. Welch<sup>a</sup> treats it seriously without any question. W. Rudolph<sup>b</sup> argues that the Passover ordinance which prescribes the celebration of the festival at the central sanctuary (Deut. 16.5ff.) was not formulated till after Hezekiah's time and so militates against the historicity of the tradition of Hezekiah's passover. This is not so self-evident as Rudolph supposes. It is true that the promulgation of the nucleus of the Deuteronomic law is probably to be dated to the time of Josiah's reformation, but it may still represent Northern traditions which were brought to Judah by refugees from the North in Hezekiah's reign. Again, there is no reason to doubt that, as II Chron. 30.1a, 5a states, Hezekiah sent an appeal to the Israelites in Samaria and Galilee and that he may even have projected a public Passover in Jerusalem as a national manifesto (II Chron. 30.1b, 5b). But in view of the fact that the Passover is not mentioned in the account of Hezekiah's reformation in Kings and of the explicit statement of II K. 23.22 that there was no precedent for Josiah's passover since the time of the judges, it is questionable if Hezekiah was able to hold such a Passover at Jerusalem as II Chron. 30 describes.

The Deuteronomistic account of Josiah's Passover exasperates us by its silence as to the specific motive for the innovation. Nicolsky (*op. cit.*) would see in the celebration of Josiah's Passover, which was probably already associated with the deliverance from Egypt,<sup>c</sup> an assertion of nationalist feeling at a time when there was a danger of Judah exchanging Assyrian for Egyptian vassalage, which was what actually happened in 609. Certainly, as he points out, Egypt under Psammetichus I (671-617) was already challenging Assyria in Palestine, as the tradition of the 29 years' menace to Ashdod

<sup>a</sup>Post-Exilic Judaism, pp. 23ff.

<sup>b</sup>Chronikbücher, HAT, ed. Eissfeldt, 1955, p. 299.

<sup>c</sup>Mowinckel latterly saw an innovation in the association of the Passover with the whole theme of the Exodus instead of with only certain elements in that theme. The association of the Passover with the whole theme of the Exodus in the J source of the Pentateuch he regards as secondary and owing to the influence of D.

(Herodotus II, 147) suggests. He makes the feasible suggestion that danger of Egyptian domination was the major problem confronting Judah on the accession of the young Josiah. If that were so, and if the institution of the Passover by Josiah in Jerusalem were designed as an anti-Egyptian demonstration, it is odd that the anti-Egyptian party who put Josiah on the throne should have waited 18 years for this demonstration.<sup>a</sup>

A. S. Kapelrud<sup>b</sup> has recently suggested that the Passover with its theme of the great deliverance from Egypt as a preliminary to the covenant was given special prominence to counteract Assyrian influence in the New Year festival. In view of the Israelite development of the latter with its predominant theme of the Kingship of God from an earlier Canaanite New Year liturgy, the Feast of Tabernacles at the autumnal New Year had certainly become sufficiently coloured by Israelite experience to withstand undue influence from the analogous Assyrian festival. The triumph of God as King over the menacing forces of chaos, which was characteristic of this occasion, was further particularized by the experience of the covenant and its ritual and social obligations, which was also associated with this occasion, as Deut. 31.10 indicates.<sup>c</sup> We should emphasize the theme of the Kingship of God developed from the Canaanite New Year liturgy with remarkably persistent use of Canaanite imagery. This association in Israelite worship, with danger of assimilation of Canaanite religion, is surely reflected in the insistence of the early calendar in Ex. 23.10-19 (E) and the Ritual Code (Ex. 34.10ff. J) that this festival should be kept 'before the Lord God of Israel', that is to say at the central assembly of the

<sup>a</sup>Nicolsky further suggests that the Passover in the Temple was a prophylactic ritual to protect the Temple and its personnel from the wrath of God apprehended because of the contamination of alien cults. He bases his theory on Zeph. 1, though we consider that he overdraws his evidence for the conception of a night of wrath comparable to the passage of the angel of destruction on the night of the Passover in Egypt. The evidence of the Passover as a festival in the centralized cult emphasizes the significance of the rite as a sacrament of deliverance and as a rite effecting the solidarity of the community, and it is hard to see how a national assembly of this nature was necessary to effect a prophylactic rite for the Temple, especially as it was preceded by probably several months of purging of alien contaminations.

<sup>b</sup>A. S. Kapelrud, 'The Role of the Cult in Old Israel', *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. P. Hyatt, 1965, pp. 51ff.

<sup>c</sup>Thus Weiser and von Rad are right in seeing the New Year festival as the occasion for the sacramental celebration of the covenant, though in our opinion they err in the exclusive emphasis they lay upon that element in the festival.

sacral confederacy, which at such an assembly asserted its solidarity on the basis of the experience of the sovereign grace and power of God in the great deliverance and the covenant. As Deut. 31.10 indicates, the covenant-sacrament was the main theme of this festival 'every seventh year', though we believe that this did not exclude the theme of the Kingship of God. Otherwise we believe that the emphasis in the annual festival was laid on the Kingship of God, though this did not exclude the theme of the covenant and its obligations, which Mowinckel recognized as an element in the annual festival, which he thought of as Yahweh's Enthronement Festival.<sup>a</sup>

Finally, the persistence of the theme of the Kingship of God at the New Year festival in Nahum (e.g. 1.15[2.1], cf. Isa. 52.7), on which Deutero-Isaiah could rebuild (cf. especially Isa. 52.7 and the hymns of praise to God as Lord of history) indicates the permanent significance of the theme of the Kingship of God in the liturgy of the autumn festival in Israel, which was sufficiently strongly impregnated with Israelite tradition to resist assimilation to the ideology of the Assyrian New Year festival where it differed from that in Israel. The new emphasis given to the Passover in Josiah's reformation has undoubtedly a nationalistic significance, though there is no evidence that as a public sacrament in the Temple at Jerusalem it was more than a unique inaugural rite.

Mowinckel<sup>b</sup> maintained that Josiah's Passover was the occasion of his covenant. Now the *Sitz im Leben* of the covenant, as Mowinckel himself emphasized, was the autumnal New Year festival, and this is supported on this occasion by the addition of G to 22.3 'in the seventh (*var. lect.* eighth) month'. Thus, on Mowinckel's assumption, the Passover, which, by all traditions was a spring festival, must have been detached from its proper *Sitz im Leben* and have been made the ritual of the sacrament of the deliverance from Egypt, which was the historical context of the law. This is a matter which cannot well be determined, though we prefer to regard the Passover as being celebrated in the spring as marking the end of the main phase of Josiah's reformation which had been inaugurated by the covenant in its traditional context in the New Year festival in autumn. Originally limited to comparatively small kinship groups (*mišpāhōt*) as a domestic festival, it now became a great national festival, and, even though properly associated, as Mowinckel once contended, with only

<sup>a</sup>S. Mowinckel, *Le Décalogue*, 1927, pp. 119ff.

<sup>b</sup>*Psalmstudien* II, 1922, pp. 204-5.

one phase of the Exodus tradition, was still sufficiently associated with that tradition to be a fitting sacrament of the great deliverance and an apt expression of national solidarity.

Josiah's Passover, however, is stated to be not an absolute innovation and we are referred back to the days of the judges. Now, according to the Deuteronomistic schematization of the Israelite invasion of Palestine, the last time that Israel was together for each family or kinship group to observe this domestic occasion in one place was when Israel under Joshua crossed the Jordan in the spring and paused at Gilgal by Jericho, which became the first shrine of all Israel in Palestine. It is uncertain if the Passover noted in Josh. 5.10-12 was really an element in the popular cult at the shrine of Gilgal, where the sacrament and cult-legend of the *Heilsgeschichte*, culminating in the occupation of the Promised Land, and later the covenant tradition, was at home.<sup>a</sup> It may be, after all, a mere incidental note indicating the time of the conquest in the Deuteronomistic account, with nothing really to do with the sacrament of the Exodus and Conquest at the shrine of Gilgal. But whatever its original significance in this context, it was now under Josiah made an essential element in the sacrament of the great deliverance from Egypt.

23.24. On *'ōbōt* and *yiddē'ōnīm* see on 21.6. *terāpīm* were used in divination (Ezek. 21.26; Judg. 17.5; 18.14, 17; I Sam. 15.23; Hos. 3.4; Zech. 10.2), and they may have this significance here. They were apparently figurines or household gods (Gen. 31.19ff., though not, we believe, in I Sam. 19.13ff., where we agree with Albright in translating *terāpīm* as 'rags'). Possibly the many figurines with the features of Asherah and Astarte found at Palestinian sites and used, we believe, in rites of imitative magic to promote fertility rank as *terāpīm. gillūlīm* (root *gil*, 'to roll') are images in the round.

(h) NOTE BY THE REDACTOR ON THE IRREVOCABLE WRATH OF GOD: 23.26-27

23.26 But Yahweh did not turn from the heat of his great anger, for his anger was hot against Judah on account of all the provocative acts whereby Manasseh provoked him. 27 So Yahweh said, I will remove

<sup>a</sup>G. von Rad, 'Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch', *Gesammelte Studien zum AT*, pp. 52-55; *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, pp. 45-48, who regards the occasion as the Feast of Weeks; H. J. Kraus, 'Gilgal . . .', *VT* I, 1951, pp. 181-99, who regards it as the Feast of Maṣṣoth at the beginning of the barley harvest, when the crossing of the Jordan, which both assume to be an important element in the ritual of the sacrament of the deliverance and conquest, was practicable before the rising of Jordan with the melting snow from Hermon.

Judah also from my presence just as I removed Israel, and I will reject this city which I have chosen, Jerusalem, and the Temple, concerning which I said, My name shall be there.

(i) REFERENCE TO THE SECULAR SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF JOSIAH'S REIGN: 23.28

This is a feature of the Deuteronomistic epilogue to the reigns of kings, but in this case the note of the king's death and burial (vv. 29f.) is made in citation of the Annals of Judah.

23<sup>28</sup> Now as for the rest of the acts of Josiah and all that he did, are they not written in the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah?

23.28. At this point we may deplore the restricted use which the compiler made of the Annals, which would contain a description of Josiah's provincial organization, which, according to Alt,<sup>a</sup> is preserved in Josh. 15; 18; 19, to which Noth<sup>b</sup> would add Josh. 13, which he takes to reflect Josiah's reorganization of Transjordan. The truth of this thesis is suggested by the inclusion of Bethel and Ophrah in Benjamin (Josh. 18.22f.) instead of in Joseph, their traditional affinity, the inclusion of the Philistine Ekron, Ashdod, and Gaza in Judah (Josh. 15.45-47), and the fact that Josiah could contest the Pharaoh's march through Palestine at Megiddo (II K. 23.29), which had been the administrative centre of the Assyrian province of that name, which included all Galilee and the great central plain. Unfortunately we have no indication of the chronology of this attempt to revive the united monarchy as under David and Solomon, but conceivably Josiah's progress was gradual, beginning with the cleansing of the Temple from astral cults which were symbols of Assyrian domination, then, when no opposition was met, by the recovery of land in Judah which had been taken by Sennacherib from Hezekiah, with the incorporation of areas in the Philistine plain such as Ekron and Ashdod, where the Assyrians were always careful to have vassals in office with military settlers. The desecration of Bethel unfortunately cannot be dated, but, as it lay but two miles beyond the frontier of Judah, it was a natural step. Since there is no mention of suppression of local sanctuaries in the north except 'in the cities of Samaria' (II K. 23.19), i.e. in the Assyrian province of that name, it is unlikely that Josiah had time to do more than claim Galilee and what territory it was practicable to claim in Trans-

<sup>a</sup>'Judas Gaucunter Josias', *KS* II, pp. 276ff.

<sup>b</sup>*ZAW* LX, 1944, pp. 49ff.

Jordan. To a large extent the topographical lists in Josh. 13; 15; 18; 19 represent Josiah's programme rather than his achievement.

(j) THE DEATH AND BURIAL OF JOSIAH: 23.29f.

From the Annals of Judah.

23<sup>29</sup> In his days Pharach Necho, king of Egypt, made an expedition against the king of Assyria by the river Euphrates and king Josiah went to meet him and he slew him at Megiddo when he saw him.<sup>30</sup> And his retainers drove him dying from Megiddo and brought him to Jerusalem, and they buried him in his tomb, and the people of the land took Jehoahaz the son of Josiah and anointed him and made him king in the place of his father.

23.29. This is a very perfunctory statement of important historical events. Not only does the statement that 'Josiah went to meet' Necho leave us uncertain whether he went with hostile intent, or to parley, or at Necho's summons as to a recalcitrant vassal of his Assyrian suzerain,<sup>a</sup> but the circumstances of Josiah's death are uncertain also. The statement that Necho 'made an expedition against the king of Assyria' is contradicted by Josephus<sup>b</sup> and by the Babylonian Chronicle,<sup>c</sup> from which the following summary of events may be reconstructed. In 629 in southern Mesopotamia the Assyrian army was repulsed before Babylon, and in 625 Nabopolassar was proclaimed king. For the next decade Assyria was on the defensive, and this situation encouraged the Medes under Cyaxares to attack, apparently independently of the Babylonians. In 614 the Medes captured and plundered Ashur, the old capital of Assyria, and united with the Babylonians in an attack on Nineveh, which fell in 612. Now Necho, who had been a vassal of Assyria, attempted to retrieve the situation, ostensibly for Assyria, but actually to anticipate Babylonian control of Syria and Palestine and a possible advance on Egypt herself. Supported by Egypt, an Assyrian king Ashurbanipal maintained a token state in Harran, which in turn fell to the Medes and Babylonians in 610. Still Egypt maintained her support, based apparently on the fortress of Carchemish, commanding an important crossing of the Euphrates (cf. II Chron. 35.20, which is usually taken as a confusion with the disastrous Egyptian campaign of 605 in Jer. 46.2). In the summer of the 17th year of Nabopolassar's reign (609) an Egyptian

<sup>a</sup>So A. C. Welch, *ZAW* XLIII, 1925, p. 255.

<sup>b</sup>*Ant.* X, 5.1.

<sup>c</sup>C. J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh*, 1923.

army advanced over the Euphrates and made a great, though unsuccessful, effort to retake Harran. So far the Babylonian Chronicle. Obviously Josiah saw in Necho's advance a menace to his designs for a reunited Hebrew state, and advanced to meet him at Megiddo.<sup>a</sup> Herodotus (II, 159) seems to retain a tradition of this action, which he locates at *Magdōlos*, referring to Necho's subsequent fortification of *Kadytis* in Syria. Locations for these places have been suggested at Migdal just north of Gaza and at Gaza. Probably Herodotus really meant Megiddo and Kadesh on the Orontes. The account in II Chron. 35.20-24 is much more circumstantial, stating that Josiah went to oppose Necho at the strategic pass of Megiddo, but Necho endeavoured to dissuade him from hostility, seeking only passage to the north. Josiah, however, knowing that this would only frustrate his designs for political independence, persisted, and was slain in battle. From details in the Babylonian Chronicle this encounter is certainly to be dated in the early summer of 609, actually in, or just before, Tammuz, i.e. June-July.<sup>b</sup> In the present passage in Kings it is possible that the preposition 'al before *melek 'aššūr* is a scribal error for 'el, as the Babylonian Chronicle and Josephus demand, though it might still mean 'on behalf of', but the probable explanation is that the Deuteronomistic compiler has simply misunderstood the general political situation.

**23.30.** Our translation of *mēt* as 'dying' rather than 'dead' is suggested by the statement in II Chron. 35.23f. '... and the king said to his retainers, Take me away, for I am badly wounded. His retainers therefore took him out of that chariot and put him in the second chariot that he had, and they brought him to Jerusalem, and he died. . . . On the burial of the kings of Judah after Hezekiah see on 21.18. On 'the people of the land' see on 11.14. From v. 36 it emerges that the people of the land preferred Jehoahaz to his older brother Eliakim (Jehoiakim), who was, in fact, a half-brother (cf. vv. 31, 36). From what we know of Jehoiakim it is likely that Jehoahaz was a man of stronger character than his older brother, who seems to have been an unprincipled political adventurer, who sought his future in submission to whatever major power seemed at the moment likely to prove victorious.

<sup>a</sup>F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, *JNES* XII, 1953, pp. 56-58, suggest that Josiah opposed the Egyptians in support of Nabopolassar, but there is no evidence for this.

<sup>b</sup>D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626-556) in the British Museum*, 1956, pp. 62ff.

#### 4. THE REIGN AND REMOVAL OF JEHOAHAZ: 23.31-35

##### (a) THE DEUTERONOMISTIC INTRODUCTION TO THE REIGN OF JEHOAHAZ: 23.31f.

**23.31** Jehoahaz was twenty-three years old when he became king, and he reigned three months in Jerusalem, and his mother's name was Hamital<sup>a</sup> the daughter of Jeremiah from Libnah. <sup>32</sup>And he did evil in the sight of Yahweh according to all that his fathers had done.

**23.31.** Jehoahaz was the throne-name of the king, or would have been had he survived till his formal accession at the New Year festival in Tishri. His private name, as we learn from Jeremiah's dirge over him, was Shallum (Jer. 22.10ff.).

The statement that Jehoahaz reigned three months is confirmed by the Babylonian Chronicle, which states that Necho's campaign in 609 in northern Mesopotamia lasted from Tammuz (June-July) to Elul (August-Sept.),<sup>b</sup> the death of Josiah taking place on Necho's journey northwards and the deposition of Jehoahaz on his return. From the revolt of Libnah from Judah under Jehoram (8.22) it appears that Libnah, probably *Tell as-Sāfi*, on a spur of the Shephelah dominating the coastal plain south-west of Jaffa and the way to the interior by the Vale of Elah (*Wādī as-Sanī*), maintained a doubtful loyalty to Judah, so that Josiah's marriage with the daughter of a local notable may have had a political purpose.

The name Hamital contains as its first element the kin-name 'husband's father' (i.e. the god of the husband's people) and *tal*, which is taken by Noth<sup>c</sup> as 'dew'. This we think unlikely. We regard it as a dialectic form of Hebrew *šēl* ('shadow', 'protection'), cf. *Šilli-bēl*. The form *tal* for *šēl* is attested in the Aramaic copy of the Behistun inscription from Elephantine. The element *tal* occurs in the name Abital (II Sam. 3.4), the mother of the fifth son of David. Jehoahaz could not have had much opportunity to do evil 'according to all that his fathers had done', and this seems an inference on the part of the Deuteronomist from his miserable fate. His sin, however, may have been that he was too ready to go to Necho at Riblah,

<sup>a</sup>Reading Hamital as in 24.18 and the consonantal text of Jer. 52.1 and with Hebrew MSS. G and V for MT Hamutal. The kin-name *hamu* demands the pronominal suffix.

<sup>b</sup>Wiseman, *op. cit.*, pp. 62ff.

<sup>c</sup>IP, pp. 39, 79.