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ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to contribute to a dynamic scholarly debate regarding the relationship of the biblical books of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. The wider frame of reference, in which this study is set, is on the one hand, the prevailing view since de Wette that the main source of Chronicles is Samuel-Kings by and large in its existing form, and on the other, the recently revived older theory of a common source behind both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. The present investigation looks at the merits of the latter, particularly the challenge it poses to the view of Chronicles being dependent on Samuel-Kings, as the portions of Kings and Chronicles dealing with divided monarchy in general and the reform of Josiah in particular are considered.

After preliminary matters in the introduction, the regnal framework and the royal cultic reforms as presented in Kings and Chronicles are examined in chapters one and two. One of the major conclusions drawn from text and literary critical studies of the regnal formulae of these two historiographical works is that the framework of Israelite rulers in Kings may be a later (=post-chronistic) development in that book, since close links are observed between the parts of regnal formulae of Judean monarchs in Kings that are absent from Chronicles and the framework of the rulers of Israel included only in Kings. The cultic reform accounts in Kings display a set of common characteristics often considered ‘deuteronomistic’. Since these language characteristics are also shared by the reform narratives in Chronicles, it is argued that, in this sense, Chronicles in its reform accounts is no less ‘deuteronomistic’ than Kings. Of the only two cultic reform narratives that are found in Kings but not in Chronicles, the one relating to Jehu includes a subtle link to the Elijah-Elisha cycle that occurs again only in Kings, thus implying that both Jehu’s reform account and the Elijah-Elisha cycle with which it is closely connected were originally absent from the main source of Chronicles. A major investigation is launched in chapter three into the parallel texts of one of the more prominent shared cultic reform accounts, that of king Josiah (2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 and 2Chr 33:4-7 + 33). The study culminates with a tentative proposal of a primary form of Josiah’s reform report that lies behind the two parallel texts. The next chapter investigates how that earlier reform account was expanded in Kings, as well as the many connections with other texts both within and outside the book of Kings in the process of its evolution. With the findings of the study of the texts of Josiah’s reform in Kings and Chronicles in the major part of the thesis endorsing the main tenets of common source theory, the final chapter then hints at similar processes for other parts of Kings relating to the story of the divided monarchy, where the texts may have developed from the shorter material identifiable also as the main source for Chronicles.
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Kings and Chronicles in their presentation of the divided kingdom exhibit a number of common characteristics, which since long ago have been the basis for establishing a relationship between the two biblical histories. In the pre-critical period these histories were seen as reliable witnesses to Israel’s past and were understood as having been based on prior material known to the writers of both. Eichhorn, ‘a prominent representative of the period of the research history of Chronicles when the pre-critical phase reached both its culmination and its twilight’, favoured a source hypothesis, in support of the traditional view of the pre-critical period, according to which the accounts in 1 and 2 Kings on the one hand and 2 Chronicles on the other derive from a common source and that Ezra (author of Chronicles in the understanding of pre-critical era) often utilized other sources beside taking excerpts from materials of the common source with extensive histories of Israel and Judah.

With the appearance of the first volume of de Wette’s Beiträge at the beginning of the 19th century, however, the pre-critical views on the relationship of biblical books dealing with the united and divided monarchies changed radically. Mainstream scholarship since de Wette assumes that ‘by the time the author of Chronicles wrote, much of the literature that we associate with the Hebrew Bible was already written’. Accordingly, the view has found wide acceptance since it was first argued by de Wette, that the Chronicler (thereafter Chr) had used Samuel and Kings as a source. This wide acceptance may be demonstrated by an excerpt from the chapter devoted to Chronicles in Noth’s Überlieferungsgeschichte Studien. Noth, concerning the relationship of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, wrote as follows:

For the history of the Judaean kings (1 Chron. 10-2 Chron. 36) Chr.’s main source was the traditional books of Samuel and Kings in the form that we now know them; that much is obvious and uncontroversial. While Chr. was thus following the work of Dtr., he obviously did not know of it in its original form. It had already been split up into

1 Peltonen (1996:60).
2 See Eichhorn (1787), II:606-56).
4 Knoppers (2004:66). Mathys, although he dates Chronicles to the Hellenistic period, is not so certain as Knoppers is that most of the literature of the Old Testament was already written by the time of the composition of Chronicles. He suggests that approximately 20-25% of the Hebrew Bible was written after 333 BCE and views the Hellenistic era as significant for the Jewish world in terms of its consciousness of written tradition; see Mathys (2000:41-155; 2002:278-93, esp. 280).
individual 'books' and had been expanded with all kinds of supplements into the form in which we find it today. This latter point can be established from the fact that Chr. not only had 2 Sam. 21.18-22 (cf. 1 Chron. 20.4-8) and 2 Sam. 23.8-39 (cf. 1 Chron. 11.10ff), but also 2 Sam. 24 (cf. 1 Chron. 21) in his source. On the whole Chr. stuck pretty closely to the narrative thread of Samuel-Kings. Most of the places where he deviates from this source of his, whether by omissions, changes or expansions, can be satisfactorily explained as being due to his own particular purposes.

One of the effects of early modern scholarship on the study of the two biblical histories has been the emphasis on Chr's theological interests and biases whenever Chronicles deviates from the canonical books of Samuel and Kings. The confidence, with which the modern interpreters of Chronicles attributed every difference in that book from its canonical counterparts in Samuel and Kings to Chr's theological interests and purpose, however, has been muted by findings and evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls discovered in the Judean Desert between 1947 and 1956. The work of Werner Lemke Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History (1963) has noticeably advanced our knowledge in this regard. He has shown in his examination of synoptic texts of the two histories that not every deviation in Chronicles from Samuel and Kings derives from Chr's Tendenz, but that some differences were already part of Chr's Vorlage. Lemke's study was facilitated by fragments from the Dead Sea Scrolls related to Samuel, especially by 4QSam. Studying these together with the Greek witnesses to Samuel-Kings when analysing the synoptic passages of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, Lemke (1963:240; 1965:362-63) suggested that Chr's Vorlage was not the proto-Masoretic text but rather belonged to a Palestinian text type. He further concluded that as a consequence it can no longer be held that where the respective Masoretic texts of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles differ that this is in every case due to the tendentious interests of Chr.

Lemke's methodology in studying the relationship between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings was in part adopted by McKenzie in his study called The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History (1985). As the title indicates, McKenzie also moved beyond the elementary enquiry of Lemke relating to the manner in which Chr utilized the canonical books of Samuel and Kings. Pursuing the thesis formulated by

---

6 For a related question of Chr's historical reliability, examined from the perspective of the history of Chronicles research, see Peltonen (1996).
8 See Ackroyd (1967:501-515, esp. 507-508) for the significance of this conclusion when approaching the question of Chr's theology.
9 For this see also Cross (1995:138-41; 1964).
10 This conclusion is nowadays generally accepted in studies and commentaries on Chronicles. See, for example, the recent commentary on 1 Chronicles by Knoppers (2004).
F. M. Cross (1973) of double redaction of the Deuteronomistic History, McKenzie suggested that only the first edition (Dtr 1 in the terminology of Cross) of the Deuteronomistic History was available to Chr. In other words, he contended that the principal source used by Chr was an earlier edition of Samuel-Kings (understood under the umbrella of ‘Deuteronomistic History’), which ended with the death of Josiah. Recently, a similar interest in Chr’s Vorlage set against the discussion about multiple redactions of Kings has been expressed by Barrick whose study of the accounts of Josiah’s reform in both biblical histories, Kings and Chronicles, leads him to consent to McKenzie’s original proposal (1985) that Chr used for his history the ‘unrevised “Josianic” version of Kings’. Barrick contends that ‘[t]he proposition that the Chronicler used a version of K[ings] H[istory] substantially different from today’s versions is more easily imagined by scholars who accept a pre-Exilic original than by those who accept a later original and fewer intervening revisions’ (2001:422). This contention makes it problematic, however, to account for those elements in Chronicles that have close parallels with elements in Kings, which are not considered to be part of the early, pre-exilic, edition of Kings/Deuteronomistic History also used by the author of Chronicles. Therefore a later than pre-exilic origin of such a version may have been equally, or perhaps even better, imaginable. Macy (1975), who views Chronicles being dependent on earlier Deuteronomistic material or materials not identical with Samuel-Kings, considers these materials to include ‘the entire history of the Kingdom of Judah’, since the formulaic evaluation ‘to do right/evil in the eyes of Yahweh’ appears in both Kings and Chronicles also in the formulae of the last Judean kings.

Macy’s study The Sources of the Books of Chronicles: A Reassessment (1975), exploring issues relating to sources used in the production of Chronicles, makes a

---

11 McKenzie somewhat changed his views since his 1985 monograph, in which he utilized Cross’s singla Dtr 1 for the Josianic and Dtr 2 for later exilic editor of the Deuteronomistic History. In his 1991 study The Trouble with Kings, though still espousing the view of a primary Deuteronomistic work composed in Josianic times, he considered this history to be written by a single author/editor that was only lightly updated by several post-Deuteronomistic additions. Still later, he abandoned completely a pre-exilic date for the History. He now considers the Deuteronomistic History to be an exilic work written by a single historian, thus favouring the position of Noth; see McKenzie (1996; 1998; 1999b; 2000). Yet, as McKenzie regards the Deuteronomistic History being enlarged by post-Deuteronomistic additions – although these were made according to him in no systematic way – he may be close to Van Seter’s view of the Deuteronomist as creative historian (Van Seters 1983; cf. McKenzie 1994:300-302), whose work was supplemented with several additions by later writers. For highlighting this point see Römer & de Pury (1996:100-101).

12 Barrick (2002:109). See below chapters three and four for more in-depth conversation with aspects of Barrick’s study on Josiah’s reform.
significant contribution to the studies of the relationship between the biblical books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. On the basis of a close examination of the standard formulaic notices, which Kings and Chronicles regularly employ at the beginning and the end in the narratives of each king’s reign, Macy in his 1975 thesis formulated a conclusion, before this was argued anew in studies of Auld and Ho (see further below), that both Chr and Dtr (or the author/editor of Kings) depended on an earlier common source or sources which they utilized, each according to the aims and purposes of his own work. Macy called this primary source ‘Deuteronomistic’ or stemming from the ‘Deuteronomistic school’, this being dependent upon the occurrence of the evaluative phrase ‘to do right/evil in the eyes of Yahweh’ in the formulaic notices. He may not be entirely correct in calling this common material ‘Deuteronomistic’ as the study of the phrase ‘to do right/evil in the eyes of Yahweh’ will further show, but the conclusion deriving from his study that Chronicles in its formulaic notices is not dependent on Kings in the canonical form has some merit in it as this study later will demonstrate.

Of the three Harvard theses (Lemke 1963, Macy 1975, McKenzie 1985) reviewed in passing here, all of which deal with different aspects of the relationship of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, it is the work by McKenzie (1985) which features in Auld’s early discussions relating to his radical proposal of reconsidering this relationship. In a more forthright way than Macy mentioned above, Auld in his seminal work *Kings without Privilege* (1994) challenged mainstream scholarship relating to the composition of the books of the Hebrew Bible from Deuteronomy to Kings and Chronicles. He put forward the view that Samuel-Kings and Chronicles are based on common source material from which they each developed in their distinctive ways. Auld first gave consideration in writing to the main thought of this argument in an essay (1983) that has further developed some issues arising from his study of prophetic terminology in Jeremiah and Kings (1984). Studies of the

---

13 See also Rezetko (2003:215 n. 2) who mentions others before Auld consenting to the idea of a common source employed by the author(s) of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles.

14 See chapter one of this thesis.


16 A similar view to that of Auld concerning the relationship of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles has been expressed by Ho (1994; 1995), though with some differences. Craig Ho, while being in agreement with Auld about Samuel-Kings and Chronicles deriving from a common source, delimits that material differently, including in it some parts of 1Sam relating to king Saul (e.g. 1Sam 28).

17 See now Auld (2004:3-9) for evolution of that argument.
synoptic accounts of Solomon’s vision (1992; 1993), in which Auld set out to probe his initial proposal of a prior material underlying both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, led him to a more substantially developed argument in book-length form, where he outlined in broad contours the proposed main source to both biblical histories establishing it on their shared text. He provided a variety of arguments in support of the identification of this primary material underlying the extant versions of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, and also adumbrated implications for wider topics such as the notion of Deuteronomistic History and the history writing, the study of the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Deuteronomy as well as implications for Pentateuchal studies.

Auld’s Kings without Privilege with its wide-ranging implications for the criticism of the Hebrew Bible elicited a number of responses and criticisms. These include issues relating to the method and criteria for recovering ‘original’ material used by both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles,18 issues of coherence of that primary material, especially as regards its opening with the narrative of Saul’s death (1Sam 31//1Chr 10),19 issues of provenance of characteristic terminology (Deuteronomistic language vs. language of common source),20 questions regarding late vs. early Biblical Hebrew21 and issues of Chronicles presupposed knowledge of material in Samuel and Kings that was not in the common source – most notably the Succession Narrative and Elijah-Elisha stories.22 In light of these counter-challenges, Auld has since made some modifications to his original proposal,23 but also has used the opportunity to develop the main tenets of Kings without Privilege further.24 The shared source material underlying Samuel-Kings and Chronicles he now calls the ‘Book of Two Houses’, its focus being on the royal and the divine houses in Jerusalem. Furthermore, he reveals the integrity of that ‘Book’ in the way it portrays the prophetic figures who function as intermediaries through which a divine word is communicated to kings.

23 See e.g. his response to McKenzie in Auld (1999b:91-99).
24 See the essays collected in Auld (2004).
In his *Kings without Privilege* (pp. 9-10), Auld anticipating criticism which the proposal that Samuel-Kings on the one hand and Chronicles on the other derive from a common core might bring about, namely the objection of the Hebrew language of Chronicles being much later than that of Samuel and Kings, offered a brief treatment of this linguistic aspect pointing to the studies of Barr (1989) and of Verheij (1990) which each found elements in Samuel and Kings that are otherwise deemed late when occurring in Chronicles. This language issue has more recently received serious consideration from Rezetko (2003) who offered more than a dozen examples of linguistic features often labeled as ‘late’ Biblical Hebrew, but which do not prove the diachronical nature of the relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. It may be significant in this regard to point out that in the same collection of essays in which Rezetko’s important discussion occurs Young (2003:315) gives space to the idea that Chronicles may ‘represent the eastern version of the primary history represented in Samuel and Kings’.25

The proposal of Auld that posits a common source to Samuel-Kings and Chronicles fits into a larger context in the field of the research of the Former Prophets in recent years, within which reservations have been expressed about the books from Deuteronomy through Kings belonging to a corpus of ancient Israelite literature called the Deuteronomistic History. While on one hand many continue to assert the concept of the Deuteronomistic History, there has been a growing dissatisfaction with this model. The debate arising from that asks what constitutes ‘Deuteronomism’ with doubts being cast on the current redactional models of the Deuteronomistic History and even the main tenets of the notion of the Deuteronomistic History itself being undermined.

Noth in his *Überlieferungsgeschichte Studien* observed cohesive elements within the books from Deuteronomy through Kings, which prompted him to postulate a single author of the Deuteronomistic History who collected and put together the various existing sources, arranged them according to a purposeful design and gave them a unifying theme. Several scholars in recent times, however, have pointed out distinctive features of particular texts within Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, so that the notion of the Deuteronomistic History being a coherent piece of national history is undermined and found unsatisfactory.26 Instead,
the emphasis is placed by these scholars on the composition and editing of individual books\textsuperscript{27} or blocks\textsuperscript{28} within the corpus of the Former Prophets.

Another issue that leads to scholarly discontent with the notion of the Deuteronomistic History concerns the lack of consensus about the Deuteronomistic influence and tendencies. In the past, ‘Deuteronomic’ was a term generally reserved in biblical research for the book of Deuteronomy or for the so-called source D in the Pentateuch. Since Noth, who applied ‘Deuteronomic’ to a proto-Deuteronomy and ‘Deuteronomistic’ to the additions in Deuteronomy and the material unifying the books from Deuteronomy through Kings, there has been a predilection in scholarship towards variety in the use of these terms. This is partly caused by different approaches to the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis that have evolved since Noth’s original thesis, represented mainly by the Cross school which views there being two Deuteronomists (Dtr1 and Dtr2) and by the Smend school which reckons with at least three redactors (DtrG, DtrN and DtrP). In addition, the hands of ‘Deuteronomistic’ redactors have been detected in parts of the Tetrateuch, in the Latter Prophets, namely Jeremiah, and in the prophetic collection such as the Book of the Twelve. Coggins (1995) and others have recently exposed this wide and diverse usage and understanding of what the terms ‘Deuteronomic’ or ‘Deuteronomistic’ convey in current scholarly discussion with a warning of the danger of pan-Deuteronomism and calling for some sort of control or better defined criteria pertaining to this issue.

The foregoing considerations regarding the perplexing state that surrounds the current discussion of the Deuteronomistic History are further addressed by Person in his study *The Deuteronomic School: History, Social Setting and Literature* (2002). Person proposes four new perspectives from which to move the debate about the Deuteronom(ist)ic work and literature forwards: 1) application of text-critical results in the study of redactional processes of the Deuteronom(ist)ic History, 2) consideration of a post-exilic setting for most of the Deuteronom(ist)ic endeavor, 3) use of comparative material from Ancient Near East for the study of Deuteronom(ist)ic scribal activity, and 4) exploration of the influence of a predominantly oral culture on the Deuteronom(ist)ic scribal practice.

\textsuperscript{27} For ‘books’ model, see e.g. Westermann (1994), McConville (1997:3-13), Guillaume (2004:229).

\textsuperscript{28} For ‘blocks’ model, see e.g. Würtzwein (1994:1-11), Eynikel (1996).
Of these four perspectives, it is the first one that places emphasis on the link between text-critical and redactional studies, which is of special significance and deserves further attention. Person (2002:24) is critical of the analytical methods of scholars engaged in multiple redactions of the Deuteronomistic History as they ‘rely solely on redaction criticism to distinguish one Deuteronomic redaction from another’. He brings into discussion some representative studies, including his own, which combine text-critical observations with the redaction-critical issues pertaining to Deuteronomistic History. These studies in particular cases illustrate that the MT is more expansive text than the LXX and represents in these instances a later stage in the textual tradition than the Hebrew text underlying the LXX. Several of the studies, which Person discusses in his monograph, also show that the MT in its later additions, which are not present in the LXX, contains phraseology expressive of Deuteronomistic diction. This is one of Person’s starting points for his further argumentation about the setting of the Deuteronomists and the presence of the Deuteronom(ist)ic activity in the post-exilic period. While Person’s argument concerning the socio-political context and the chronological boundary of the Deuteronomic school’s activity is open to dispute, his emphasis on how textual matters contribute to redaction-critical issues is to be applauded.

Other scholars as already mentioned by Person, as for example Ulrich, Tov, Rofe or Auld, point out the relevance of textual data for literary criticism. Auld in his essay *The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic?* suggests that ‘we should direct more of our attention to extant texts and comparisons between them: between MT and Qumran; between Hebrew and Greek; between the LXX of Alexandria and of Antioch; between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles’ (1999a:126). In a context of ideological and theological concerns of the Deuteronomists, Römer and de Pury in their article on the *Deuteronomistic Historiography* contend that ‘the file on the relation between Samuel / Kings and Chronicles deserves to be taken up again’ (2000:137-38). If greater attention is paid to the counterparts of Samuel-Kings (seen by many as being part of the Deuteronomistic History) in Chronicles, this will contribute to the redactional issues of the former as well as illuminate the literary processes associated with the latter.

---

29 A remark made by Römer & de Pury especially in the wake of Auld’s alternative approach to the Deuteronomistic History according to which these collections attest to their common ancestor.
It is with this background of wider considerations regarding how to approach the biblical text which this present study seeks to take into account. Its main focus are the narratives relating to the divided kingdom as portrayed in the two biblical histories, Kings and Chronicles, with special emphasis in the central part of the study placed on Josiah’s reform. Within the studies of Kings, two prominent features have been observed that constitute a significant part of Kings narrative: 1) the regnal framework which provides a structure for each king’s account, and 2) the cultic reforms that are characteristic of a good number of reigns. Although Chronicles portrays only the history of southern kingdom and not of both as Kings does, it too has these dominant features observable in its history. The regnal resume occurs for almost every king in Chronicles and the reforms appear with a number of southern monarchs just as is the case in Kings. The regnal framework and the cultic reforms are the focus of the detailed study of chapters one and two respectively. Within dominant scholarly view, under which Kings is taken as part of the Deuteronomistic History, emphasis is placed on the regnal framework as being a Deuteronomistic scheme of organizing the material.30 Similarly, the reform accounts are understood as a theme in Kings derived from the Deuteronomistic hands.31 The detailed comparative study of the framework and the reforms in both Kings and Chronicles shows, however, that these appear to be the backbone of an earlier monarchic story, an underlying composition to be found in the shared portions of Kings and Chronicles.

The first chapter that examines anew the regnal formulae in Kings and Chronicles finds convergent results with those of Macy who suggested that Chronicles does not make a direct use of Kings in recording the regnal framework of Judean monarchs but uses an earlier source or sources underlying the present book of Kings. Macy did not deal in his study with the regnal framework of the northern kings occurring only in Kings. Observations of textual and literary links between this framework and the parts of the regnal formulae of southern monarchs in Kings without their counterparts in Chronicles lead us to the conclusion that these were made on a secondary level, being part of a subsequent development of Kings from its base text used also by Chronicles. Although deriving from a different set of considerations and evidence, this conclusion converges with the proposals of Auld

31 See e.g. Hoffmann (1980).
who suggested that the stories of the Northern kingdom did not belong to Chr’s 
Vorlage but in Kings were added at a later stage to the source used by both authors of 
Kings and Chronicles. Similarly, the second chapter which explores the language of 
the royal cultic reforms in shared and non-shared material of Kings and Chronicles 
finds that, for example, Jehu’s reform occurring only in Kings is more closely bound 
up with Kings special material relating to the stories of Elijah, Ahab and Jezebel than 
with other reform accounts shared by Kings and Chronicles. Thus it would appear 
that the reforms specific to Kings belong to an addendum in Kings and not to the 
core material that was available also to Chronicles.

In present day scholarship on the Deuteronomistic History, which to a 
significant degree departs from Noth’s original notion of a historical work composed 
by a single author, researches distinguish between several successive strata or 
separate blocks of Deuteronomistic redactions.32 One may note that in some of these 
studies it is maintained that there was a monarchic history at the heart of the early 
Deuteronomistic redaction(s). Provan (1988) who argues for the Hezekian 
Deuteronomistic redaction contends, for example, that the first Deuteronomistic 
History ‘was simply a history of the monarchy from Saul to Hezekiah, with its 
necessary prologue in 1 Samuel 1-8, and perhaps in Judges 17-21’ (1988:169). He 
holds the view that although there existed some contacts between this history and the 
laws now found in Deuteronomy, the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua as such did 
not belong to this first Deuteronomistic edition but ‘were added, along with Judges, 
at a later time’ (1988:169). Eynikel (1996:357-64), another scholar with an interest in 
the multiple layers of the Deuteronomistic History, regards the work of his earliest 
redactor RI to begin with 1Kgs 3 and end with 2Kgs 18, later to be extended by 
RII/Dtr 1 to 2Kgs 23:30. It was only RIII/Dtr 2 who combined this material with 
other blocks (Joshua-1Sam 12; 1Sam 13-2 Sam [1Kgs 1-2]) to form a single whole. 
The earlier ‘Josianic’ redactor (RII/Dtr 1) according to Eynikel, however, ‘limited 
himself to Kings, to the history from Solomon to Josiah’ (1996:362). Würthwein 
(1994:1-11), who doubts the existence of a single continuous historical work in 
Joshua through Kings, views the oldest Deuteronomistic block as consisting simply 
of the book of Kings with its royal story, Samuel, Judges and Joshua prefixed Kings 
history only at a later stage. Similarly Kratz states that ‘the beginning of the 
Deuteronomistic redaction does not lie in Deuteronomy but in Samuel-Kings and

from here extends forwards into (Genesis-)Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges’ (2005:158).

In sum, it appears that the emphasis which these studies place on the royal story in (Samuel-)Kings as the oldest and the most basic element within Deuteronomistic redactions is not dissimilar to the idea of a core monarchical story in Samuel-Kings which may have also formed the basis for the book of Chronicles. Kratz (2005:184-85) in his presentation of the basic document or writing (DtrG), which did not extend beyond Samuel-Kings, does not include in it a third of the material known as the ‘succession narrative’ (2Sam 9-20 + 1Kgs 1-2) and the substance of prophetic stories of Elijah and Elisha (1Kgs 17-2Kgs 10), which he ascribes to a secondary Deuteronomistic revision (DtrS) of the basic document. Since Chronicles has no mention of these accounts in its narrative, it is legitimate to suppose that it depended on material approximating to Kratz’s notion of an earlier substratum within Samuel-Kings. Consideration of a basic or primary composition within Samuel-Kings, which Chronicles would use rather than Samuel-Kings in its canonical form, resonates with the proposal of Auld that Samuel-Kings and Chronicles derive from a common source. The advantage of this model in literary and redaction-critical studies is that by bringing Chronicles into play a text-critical control is gained to a certain degree over the redactional issues in the books of Samuel and Kings.

A major investigation is therefore launched in chapter three into one sample of the synoptic accounts of Kings and Chronicles pertaining to the divided kingdom, namely that of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 and 2Chr 34:3-7 + 33. A detailed comparative study of these two texts does not confirm the majority view that the account in Chronicles is an abbreviated version of the reform report in Kings. Rather, it provides clues towards establishing an earlier report of Josiah’s reform, which on the one hand provided the basis for Kings editors in developing the report into a full-blown account of the reform and on the other hand was used by Chr in his history although in a much less extensive way than in Kings. Following this comparative study is a chapter devoted to the examination of how the ‘original’ reform report may have developed into the comprehensive account of Josiah’s reform measures which we now encounter in Kings. A rich network of relations is observed between this extended report of the reform and other parts of Kings as well as sections of the Old Testament beyond the book of Kings, and it is concluded that the formation of the present reform report in Kings was an ongoing process of
editing and reshaping of an earlier narrative in the hands of Kings' editors who incorporated into it new and relevant material until it gradually reached its final shape in our inherited text.

The findings with regard to the account of Josiah's reform in Kings through a comparative study of its counterpart in Chronicles have wider ramifications for studying the processes involved in the literary and textual development of the book of Kings. These ramifications are explored in the final chapter, in which the focus is moved from studying the synoptic accounts of Josiah's reform to the examination of a few other biblical texts pertaining to the period of the divided monarchy. This further examination of the material relating to the history of the divided kingdom finds validity in the approach that views the book of Kings as a developed form of a shorter account of material common to both biblical histories. Auld (1994:1) in the introduction to his Kings without Privilege with regard to his novel proposal on a common inherited material wrote:

However, although I myself have no time in the immediate future to develop the issues further, I hope others will be interested to explore the issues form the perspective I am recommending. Even if they detect only rubble from yet another failed attempt, that in itself may save them from similar mistakes.

We believe that the following pages do not detect 'rubble from yet another failed attempt' but discover building blocks of a thesis that has a prospect of casting light on long-observed problems.
CHAPTER ONE

Regnal Formulae

A cursory view of the accounts of the divided kingdom in Kings and Chronicles indicates that they both present material relating to the history of Judah in a chronological framework, which consists of formulaic introductions, theological evaluations and stereotyped conclusions to each king’s reign. Apart from a chronological framework, Kings and Chronicles in their portrayal of the divided kingdom share material pertaining to events surrounding the schism, the war and military campaigns, the temple treasures, prophecy, succession of rulers and, significantly, the cultic reforms by Judean monarchs.\(^1\) The major difference between the two historiographical works relating to the divided kingdom rests in the inclusion of the narrative of the northern kingdom and the prophetic stories of Elijah and Elisha in Kings, whilst the incorporation of notices about various building projects, army organizations, large royal families and wealth and narratives with prophetic speeches occurs in Chronicles.\(^2\) Noth (1991\(^2\):100-117), the pioneer of the notion of the Deuteronomistic History, regarded the chronological information, succession of monarchs, war notices and particularly anything that concerns the temple and its treasures in the book of Kings as the material which Dtr derived from ‘the Books of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah’, but he saw the regnal formulae with inclusion of the negative and positive verdicts on the kings as Dtr’s own device of organising the traditional material. It is interesting to observe that Chronicles on the one hand includes war and military notices, stories relating to the temple treasures and other material, whose parallels in Kings are considered to have originated from older chronicles, and on the other hand, has much of the material, for example the regnal framework with the judgements on individual kings, whose counterparts in Kings are thought to have come from Dtr himself. Subscribing to the view of the Deuteronomistic History being the work of a single author, who worked in the early postexilic period, Hoffmann (1980) argued for the theme of the cult and the cultic reforms being the major organising principle of that work. Again, it is noteworthy that the reforms of the kings of Judah appearing in Kings feature also significantly in

---

\(^1\) This is not an exhaustive, but rather illustrative enumeration serving orientation purposes. For the synoptic material of Kings and Chronicles, see helpful tools by Vannutelli (1931-34), Bendavid (1972) or Kegler & Augustin (1991\(^3\)), and synopsis in English translation by Endres \textit{et al} (1998).

\(^2\) For the discussion of Chr’s \textit{Sondergut} see e.g. Welten (1973) and the constructive critique of Welten’s work by Kelly (1996:111-34); on Chr’s special material see also Macy (1975:38-40), Sugimoto (1989:101-190).
Chronicles. All the great religious reforms, which are noted in Kings starting with Asa and concluding with Josiah, occur in Chronicles as well. Further, much of the cultic phraseology and the language which Hoffmann adduced at the end of his analysis to be typical of a Deuteronomistic historian, which occur in Kings, are also part of Chronicles cultic vocabulary. Since the regnal framework and cultic reforms are part of the skeleton of the narratives relating to the divided monarchy in both Kings and Chronicles, they will receive a more detailed treatment below.

1. Studies of Regnal Formulae in Kings

Unlike the situation surrounding Chronicles, the regnal formulae in Kings have received large scholarly attention. The stereotyped language of the formulae and their regular occurrence throughout the book of Kings have been traditionally taken as a good sign pointing to there having been one hand behind the regnal framework. In a number of studies during the last three or so decades, however, these formulaic expressions on the basis of their stylistic characteristics have been recognised as playing an important role in the understanding of Kings compositional history.

Helga Weippert in an article published in 1972 studied the judgement formulae, which are part of the regnal framework, in order to unravel the redactional strata of Kings. Using stylistic analysis and criteria, Weippert differentiated between six schemes within the judgement formulae (IS1, IS2, IN, IIS, IIN and IIIS with S referring to formulae for Judean and N for Israelite kings), which she attributed to three different redactors of Kings RI, RII and RIII (the last two resembling Dtr 1 and Dtr 2 of the Cross school).

---

3 In the light of differences between Kings and Chronicles in the accounts of Solomon, Rehoboam and Abijah, it is sometimes taken as a surprising element that, for instance, the reforms of Asa and Jehoshaphat are present in Chronicles; see Japhet (1997:211-12).

4 For a partial list of cultic vocabulary occurring in both Kings and Chronicles, see appendices A, B, C on pp. 198-202.

5 Earlier works taking this view include Eichhorn (1787: II:518-19), Wellhausen (1889:276-79, 294-98), Burney (1903:x-xii), Cornill (1907:209), Driver (1913:186), Oesterley & Robinson (1934:105), Noth (1991:34), particularly, assigned the stereotyped regnal summary in Kings to the hand of a Deuteronomistic historian whom he held responsible for the whole literary complex of Deuteronomy-Kings. The idea of a single Deuteronomistic compiler/redactor/author composing the formulaic framework for the kings of Israel and Judah has been further expressed in Old Testament introductions and commentaries on Kings, such as Eissfeldt (1965:284), Fohrer (1968b:229), Gray (1970:5, 25), Hobbs (1983:xx, xxiv, 106), Wirthwein (1984:489-96). Scholars, however, disagree with each other, placing the Deuteronomistic composer of the regnal formulae in different periods of time.
Weippert’s important discussion was influential for a number of studies that followed that used an analysis of regnal formulae as a heuristic device in unfolding the redactional strata in Kings. Two early responses to Weippert came from Barrick (1974) who basically agreed and more or less refined her argument and from Cortese (1975) who, however, rejected it arguing that variations within the formulae can be satisfactorily explained on the basis of a single author.

Another major piece of work on judgement formulae after Weippert’s study came from Nelson (1981) who partly rejected Weippert’s view. Nelson accepted only that the regnal formulae of the last four kings are markedly different from the rest and are to be seen as the work of later redaction.

Campbell (1986), while notably influenced by Weippert, at significant points also diverged from her views, distinguishing between three patterns – A, B and C – of judgement formulae that are only partially in agreement with Weippert’s redactional schemes. He concluded that the ‘A’ and ‘B’ formulae derived from different pre-Deuteronomistic sources of southern and northern provenance while ‘C’ was from the Deuteronomist. Campbell developed quite a distinctive view of the composition of the book of Kings identifying the oldest document lying behind Samuel-Kings with what he called the ‘Prophetic Record’ that extended from 1Sam 1 to 2Kgs 10:28.

Lemaire’s view (1986) on the judgement formulae approximated to Weippert’s, except that he saw two editors at work in Weippert’s designated stratum RII rather than one. He proceeded to argue for several subsequent redactions of the books of Samuel and Kings, the last one (7th) constructed under Jehoiachin in exile.

Provan (1988), who began his thesis by reviewing Weippert’s and the above mentioned studies, proceeded with an investigation of the themes of שְׁמוֹי and David in regnal formulae and elsewhere in Kings. The examination of these two themes suggested to him that there existed a pre-exilic Deuteronomistic redaction of Kings which ended with an account of Hezekiah’s reign. This is close to the view of Halpern and Vanderhooft (1991), other researchers of Kings, who paid attention in greater detail to regnal formulae. Their approach was more comprehensive in that

---

6 Only a brief account of these studies can be given here. For more extensive treatment of Weippert’s theory and a number of responses and reviews, which it elicited, see Provan (1988:35-55), Van Keulen (1996:35-40) Eynikel (1996:34-50) and Aurelius (2003:21-57).

7 See also Van Seters (1983:315-16), Römer (1990:282-85) and Aurelius (2003:24-57) objecting to Weippert’s theory along similar lines.
they incorporated into their analysis death and burial formulae, reference notices, notations of queen mothers and other elements of the regnal framework. The analysis led them to contend that 'the Books of Kings and the whole Deuteronomistic History took shape in three phases: a first Hezekian edition—H(Dtr)hez—which coincides with Weippert’s RI (but starting at the beginning of the kingdom); a Josian H(Dtr), conforming to the 'second part' of Weippert’s RII and an exilic H(Dtr)x corresponding to Weippert’s RIII'.

Another author, who in his study extensively built on Weippert’s theory of regnal formulae, is Eynikel (1996). He started analysing the texts from Weippert’s model and constantly referred to her insights. He refined her findings concerning the extent of individual redactions, especially the first one (RI), the beginning of which he placed not with Jehosaphat/Jehoram as Weippert did but with Solomon. Subsequently, he developed a redactional theory of Kings, close to Halpern and Vanderhooft, where he identified three redactions: the first after Hezekiah (RI), the second after Josiah (RII/Dtr 1) and the last during (or after) the exile (RIII/Dtr 2), the first two of which (contrary to Halpern and Vanderhooft’s view) did not extend beyond the book of Kings.

There exists considerable diversity among these approaches but they agree at least on two main points. They conclude with respect to the compositional history of Kings that first, there existed one or more pre-exilic editions of Kings and second, the exilic edition was minor and less substantial in extent than the pre-exilic one(s). Thus it follows in one main stream of Kings scholarship that the data contained in the regnal framework plays a vital role in the study of various editions of the book of Kings and indeed of Deuteronomistic History. The regnal formulae in Chronicles received a different treatment outlined below.

2. Studies of Regnal Formulae in Chronicles

The regnal formulae in Chronicles have been treated much less extensively than in Kings. Where they received some attention this has mainly been done, not because they are part of the Chronicler’s account as such, but as supportive evidence for the different Deuteronomistic editions of Kings.

---

8 Phrased in the words of Eynikel (1996:49).
Significant attention to the regnal formulae in the book of Chronicles was paid by Macy (1975) in his doctoral thesis on Chr’s sources. He dealt in detail, besides analysing source notices in both Kings and Chronicles, with two other elements of the regnal framework: accession formulae and death-burial notices. Since his important study will be referred to throughout this study on regnal formulae, it is sufficient for the moment to call attention to his final observations. From a thorough examination of the formulae as they appear in both Kings and Chronicles he concluded that Chronicles formulae did not depend on the formulae in Kings in its present form. Rather, both Chr and Dtr must have used an earlier ‘Deuteronomistic’ source for their regnal framework.11

Macy’s insights on regnal formulae have been welcomed as constructive by a few scholars, but again, mostly with regard to the question of clarifying editorial levels of Kings (resp. Deuteronomistic History). McKenzie (1985:174-76) made use of Macy’s observations when he sought to resolve the question of the extent of Chr’s use of the Deuteronomistic History. Similarly Halpern (1981:48) was interested, when he referred to Macy’s study, what light the divergence between Kings and Chronicles in accession formulae and burial notices casts on the composition of the Deuteronomistic History.12

The regnal data in Chronicles have been studied and considered more seriously by Barnes (1991) when he proposed a hypothesis of a Judahite king list. Being convinced by McKenzie’s argument that Chr was familiar only with the Josianic edition of the Deuteronomistic History, Barnes attempted to resolve the problem of the source of the Chronicles regnal formulae for the last four kings. He suggested that Chr, while taking information from Dtr 1, had also at his disposal the Judahite kings list which was similar, though independent of the king list underlying the second Deuteronomistic edition. Barnes (1991:142-45) made some fine observations about how this hypothesis may help to clarify the interesting phenomenon of repetition in Chronicles. However, towards the end of his chapter on this subject he again saw his study contributing to the issue of Deuteronomistic traditions lying

---

12 See also Halpern and Vanderhoof (1991:197).
behind the present books of Samuel and Kings rather than to the problem of the sources underlying the present book of Chronicles.

Most recently the regnal formulae in Chr’s work have been examined by Glatt-Gilad (2001:184-209), who found greater variation among these formulae in Chronicles than in Kings. He concluded that the differences in Chronicles from Kings derive from the historiographic interests of Chr and contribute to his particular view of the king in question. The investigation below will engage with Glatt-Gilad and the above mentioned scholars’ conclusions as it proceeds to study in detail the regnal framework for Judean monarchs in both Kings and Chronicles.

3. Regnal Formulae in Kings and Chronicles

The regnal framework in Kings and Chronicles has a fixed structure consisting of introductory and conclusion formulae, which can be further subdivided into the following elements: an accession formula that comprises of the age of the king at his accession,13 a duration formula which includes the length of the king’s reign and his capital city, a queen mother formula, an evaluative formula, a referral formula that consists of content and reference citations, a supplementary notice, a death and burial formula, and lastly a succession formula. Since these formulae display an array of rich information for it to be compared in Kings and Chronicles, they are studied below at some length.

3.1. Accession Formula

The first of the opening stereotyped phrases in the regnal framework is the accession formula consisting of the age of the king at his coming to the throne. In Kings, part of the accession formula is also formed by a synchronistic notice, which in Chronicles with exception of the regnal framework of Abijah14 never occurs.

13 In Kings, the age of the monarch in accession formula is preceded with synchronism until king Hezekiah.
14 The name of this king appears differently in Kings and Chronicles. In MT Kgs he is always called אָשֶׁר while in MT Chr he is named אָשֶׁר (1Chr 3:10; 2Chr 11:20, 22; 12:16; 13:1-4, 15, 17, 19, 22-23) or אָשֶׁר (2Chr 13:20-21). One possibility to account for the varying form has particularly attracted scholars: since the ending 'yam' may refer to a Canaanite deity Chr corrected the name giving it the more Yahwistic ending 'yah' (Gordon 1953:77 n. 1, 182; De Vries 1985:184; Dillard 1987:101; Jones 1994:422-23). However intriguing this solution may be, it is less compelling when we take into consideration variants of the name in the ancient versions that occur in Kings. A few Hebrew Ms, Syr and one Targumic evidence read אָשֶׁר in 1Kgs 14:31; 15:1, 7, 8. LXX7 in all these cases reads ᾬπκου and LXX8 renders the name as ᾬπκα. See further Lemke (1965:359-60). Stig Norin (1986:168 n. 21), who surveyed epigraphic as well as biblical material on personal names ending with ᾬν/ν, states that...
There are greater irregularities in the opening formulae of the first three Judean monarchs after Rehoboam in Kings. The accession formulae in the cases of Abijah and Asa are incomplete in Kings, as they do not include information about the age of the monarch at his accession. Similarly in Chronicles, Abijah’s formula is incomplete and Asa’s does not appear at all. Jehoshaphat’s formula occurs in ancient witnesses of Kings in two different places and there with different synchronistic notices. In the Greek text of 1Kgs 16:28a Jehoshaphat is said to ascend to the throne in the eleventh year of Omri but in the MT and Kaige recension in 1Kgs 22:41 in the fourth year of Ahab.\(^\text{15}\) In the corresponding verse to 1Kgs 22:41 (//1Kgs 16:28a LXX) in Chronicles, it is stated simply that Jehoshaphat ‘began to reign over Judah’ before his age at the time of his accession to the throne is mentioned in the same verse (2Chr 20:31).

The opening formula of Jehoshaphat in 2Chr 20:31 with the phrase that he ‘began to reign over Judah’ is of further special interest. The expression אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא ‘over Judah’, that is shared by 1Kgs 22:41\(^\text{16}\) and 2Chr 20:31 relating Jehoshaphat’s formula, is also shared by 1Kgs 15:1 and 2Chr 13:1 concerning the synchronism of Abijah. Abijah’s and Jehoshaphat’s synchronistic notices are the only ones in Kings, which include אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא אֶלֶף נְנֵי הָעָם אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא מִשְׁתַּמָּש (PN) thereof in the year...[PN] began to reign over Judah’.\(^\text{17}\) Nearly all other synchronisms of Judean monarchs in Kings comprise the formulaic phrase אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא אֶלֶף נְנֵי הָעָם אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא מִשְׁתַּמָּש ‘in the year...[PN] king of Judah began to reign’.\(^\text{18}\) Since it is precisely only in the cases

---

\(^{15}\) See Tetley (2005) for the most recent discussion on chronology of kings of Israel and Judah.

\(^{16}\) In 1Kgs 16:28a the phrase rendering אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא אֲשֶׁר וַיַּרְא occurs only in LXX\(^9\) but not in LXX\(^8\). Shenkel (1968:53), however, regards this omission in LXX\(^9\) as being ‘due simply to textual disturbance.’

\(^{17}\) The order of the wording of this phrase in both 2Kgs 22:41MT and 2Kgs 22:41 Kaige recension is reversed. While in these texts the sentence begins with the name of the king, the Greek version of 1Kgs 16:28a has the usual order that starts with synchronism.

\(^{18}\) 2Kgs 8:16 (Jehoram); 8:25 (Ahaziah); 12:2:2 (missing in LXX); 14:1 (Amaziah); 15:1 (Azariah); 15:32 (Jotham); 16:1 (Azaz); 18:1 (Hezekiah). The synchronistic notice of Joash in 2Kgs 12:2 is shortened in that it does not include מִשְׁתַּמָּש. Asa’s synchronism in 1Kgs 15:9 is the only one, in which MT has מִשְׁתַּמָּש, while LXX reads εἰς ἡμέραν (rendering Hebrew מִשְׁתַּמָּש). Asa’s formula, however, comes right after Abijah’s and before Jehoshaphat’s – we have noted, in overall, greater irregularities in the accession formulae of these early Judean kings. A comment should also be made about the second synchronistic notice of Ahaziah in 2Kgs 9:29, which is an attempt by a late interpolator (see Kittel 1900:233, Montgomery 1951:396, Würthwein 1984:332, Otto 2001:51) to
of Judean kings Abijah and Jehoshaphat that Chr records in their opening formulae the phrase with  הָיִשָּׁרָה, could this be an indication that Chr had before him a text that lacked the synchronistic notices, which in Kings do not contain  הָיִשָּׁרָה but rather employ הָיִשָּׁרָה? Rogers (1992:276-81) on the basis of comparisons of ancient textual witnesses made a convincing case that Jehoshaphat’s regnal formula was originally without the synchronistic notice. This would leave us with the synchronism of Abijah as the only one present in the source used by Chr and thus probably the earliest synchronistic notice in the regnal formulae of Judean kings. If that is the case, it appears that Abijah’s accession formula with its synchronistic notice occurring in both Kings and Chronicles served as the catalyst for the evolution of synchronistic notices in Kings, leading in a subsequent stage of Kings’ development to include the synchronistic notices of Judean monarchs, all of which appear in slightly different form from Abijah’s (and Jehoshaphat’s) notice as they have הָיִשָּׁרָה rather than הָיִשָּׁרָה. More corroborating evidence of the substantial divergences in the regnal formulae between the material used by Chr and the present text of Kings will be shown further below.

3.2. Duration Formula

The duration formula relates specifically to the length of the king’s reign and to the capital city from which the king ruled. In substance, Kings and Chronicles agree with one another in their portrayals of this second aspect of the opening formulae. Apart from the discrepancy in the data in Chronicles with regard to Jehoiachin’s reign (2Chr 36:9), which has been shown by Green (1982:105) to be a matter of textual confusion, there is only one divergence between Kings and Chronicles pertaining to the notice of duration of a king’s reign. This relates to the placement of the phrase reporting the length of Asa’s reign in the synoptic texts. In Kings, Asa’s duration formula appears in its usual place at the beginning of the account of this king (1Kgs 15:10), while in Chronicles the reference to the period of Asa’s rule is placed

---

19 Others have argued that some or all synchronistic notices in Kings are secondary; see e.g. Eynikel (1996:122-29), Campbell (1986:139-40), Bin-Nun (1968:419; 424-29). Cf. Montgomery (1934:48).
towards the end of the narrative of Asa in association with his death (יהוה נרחבס ואבכית א StreamReader 2Chr 16:13).

Asa’s account in Chronicles, as is well known, is highly chronologically schematised. We read about Asa right at the beginning of Chr’s narrative that ‘in his days the land rested for ten years’ (2Chr 13:23; cf. 14:5). Next follows a date within Chronicles special material of ‘the third month of the fifteenth year of Asa’s reign’ relating to the gathering of ‘all Judah, Benjamin, and those sojourning with them from Ephraim, Manasseh and Simeon’ for the ceremony of covenantal renewal (2Chr 15:9-15). The ensuing chronological notice appears with reference to the absence of war till Asa’s thirty-fifth regnal year (2Chr 15:19) and is followed by an announcement of Asa’s conflict with Baasha in his thirty-sixth year (2Chr 16:1). Towards the end of Asa’s reign he contracts a foot disease that is stated by Chr to have occurred in Asa’s thirty-ninth regnal year (2Chr 16:12). This is followed soon after with the notice of him dying in the forty-first year of his reign (2Chr 16:13). The formula relating to the length of Asa’s reign having been transposed in Chronicles from its usual place at the beginning of the regnal framework to the closing part of Asa’s story thus clearly serves Chr’s purpose of structuring Asa’s reign chronologically.

In addition to recognising that the reference to the length of Asa’s reign having been made at the end of Asa’s narrative fits into Chr’s scheme of periodization, it is frequently noted by commentators that the chronological framework of Asa’s account in Chronicles significantly diverges from the chronological data provided by the book of Kings. The narrative in Chronicles mentions that Baasha, king of Israel, raged a war against Judah in the thirty-sixth year of Asa’s reign (2Chr 16:1), which is preceded by a note that there was no war until Asa’s thirty-fifth year (2Chr 15:19). According to the account of the northern kingdom in Kings, however, Baasha reigned in Israel from Asa’s third till his twenty-sixth or twenty-seventh year (1Kgs 15:33; 16:6, 8), which means that by Asa’s thirty-sixth year of reign Baasha would have been some nine or ten years dead. Baasha was succeeded on the throne of Israel by Elah, who was overthrown by his general Zimri so that it was eventually Zimri’s son Omri who reigned over Israel in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Asa in Judah according to Kings.

Scholars and commentators usually note two basic approaches that have been proposed regarding the problem of divergent chronology between the Asa account in Kings and that in Chronicles. One approach attempts to bring in harmony the
chronological data in the two books by contending that the data in 2Chr 15:19 and 16:1 refer to years following the schism (יִשַׂרְאֵל in these verses is seen as a late addition), thus corresponding to the fifteenth and sixteenth year of Asa’s reign. However, it is doubtful that the events here should be dated in relation to the schism since this would have been the only case in the whole book of Chronicles with its numerous chronological notices where such a reckoning of the dates takes place. This approach, therefore, is not helpful since it creates new problems while purporting to solve other ones. The alternative approach places greater emphasis on the theological interests of Chr. in composing the Asa account. In this view the chronological data are seen as a vehicle for Chr’s retribution theology. Although one may reckon with the theological consideration of Chr being a prominent factor behind the chronological framework of Asa in Chronicles, Lemke makes a valid point that this does not necessarily imply that ‘the Chronicler deliberately changed the chronology of Kings’ for this purpose. McKenzie (1985:101) also contends that Chr would not have so blatantly contradicted the chronological information in Kings where it not for the force of some other sources available to him in composing the account of Asa’s reign. Whether or not Chr used some other source for his account of Asa, the issue of Chr contradicting the narrative in Kings in composing the chronological framework of Asa’s reign may have a simple solution, if it is admitted that Chr perhaps did not have access to the information about the succession of northern rulers, which we now have from the received book of Kings. Not knowing from his main source that Baasha was already dead by the thirty-sixth year of Asa, it is then conceivable to see how Chr may have had the liberty, with which he imposed the periodization scheme on the account of Asa’s reign without deliberately contradicting the data that would not have been part of his source material. Further observations in the study of other elements of regnal formulae will corroborate this conclusion regarding the limits of Chr’s major source.

23 Lemke (1963:150 n. 27; emphasis supplied).
24 Cf. in this regard Coggins’ comment: ‘it is worth remembering that the Chronicler did not give the dates of northern rulers, so that the difficulty only arises if we compare the two presentations’ (1976:206).
3.3. Queen Mother Formula

The formula relating to the queen mother’s name, while occurring almost regularly in the accounts of Judean kings reigning in the early period after the kingdom’s division, is an object of conspicuous divergence between Kings and Chronicles in the regnal framework of Manasseh and of the kings that ascended to the throne after him. More precisely, the name of the queen mother in both Kings and Chronicles is given from Rehoboam to Hezekiah with the exception of Jehoram and Ahaz, but for the rest of the kings following the reign of Hezekiah it is absent from Chronicles.

It has been convincingly argued that the consistent absence of the queen mother’s name in Chronicles in the regnal framework of the later kings of Judah is not due to textual corruption, nor is it attributable to the theological bias of Chr. From this it follows that the change regarding the queen mother’s name in Chronicles after Hezekiah, while it has served to some as supportive evidence for differentiating the redactional stages of the Deuteronomistic History, is a patent indication of Chr’s source material being different at this part of the regnal framework from the present book of Kings. Macy (1975:119), who acknowledges this, suggests that the missing names rather than being attributed to a later deletion in one text should be seen as a corollary of the subsequent restoration in the other. The fuller form of the queen mother formula for kings following Manasseh with inclusion of both patronym and the place of origin would support such conclusion.

25 On occasion there are slight differences between Kings and Chronicles in the actual name of the queen mother (cf. 1Kgs 15:2/2Ch 13:2; 2Kgs 18:2/2Chr 29:1). In the case of Asa’s mother, Chronicles does not have the name in the formula as Kings does (1Kgs 15:10), but it appears later in the narrative in a non-formulaic context (2Chr 15:16/1Kgs 15:13).

26 The Greek text of Chronicles provides the queen mother’s name for Jehoahaz (2Chr 36:2) and Jehoiahim (2Chr 36:5) but, as is well documented, most of 2Chr 36:1-8LXX is either an intrusion from LXX Kings or its Hebrew Vorlage had incorporated material from 2Kgs 23:30-24:6. See the discussion on the nature of these supplements from Kings in Allen (1968:483-91; 1974a:216), Klein (1967:93-105; 1968:492-95) and Rehm (1937:48-50).


28 See McKenzie (1985:175-76), Provan (1988:139-41) and Halpern and Vanderhoft (1991:197-99) who argue for authorial change of Deuteronomistic History in Hezekiah, based partly on the change in Chr’s source in the queen mother’s name after Hezekiah’s accession. In Chronicles’ studies several scholars work with the hypothesis, similarly as in Kings, of multiple editions in Chronicles, the idea originated with Cross (1975). Thus it has been argued that the original work of Chr (resp. Chr 1) was extended and revised by later editors (Chr 2 and Chr 3) though these are not to be understood as systematic revisions of Chronicles towards Kings. McKenzie also proposed that the Vorlage of Chr 1 in Kings did not extend past Josiah’s reign and that for the last four kings Chr 1 used sources other than the Deuteronomistic History.
3.4. Evaluative Formula

The evaluative formula is largely formed by the theological statement 'he did right/evil in the sight of Yahweh' and by further remarks such as comparisons with David or with the father of the king in question.29

3.4.1. ‘He Did Right/Evil in the Sight of Yahweh’

In studies of Kings, the phrase is often asserted to be typical of the Deuteronomistic presentation of monarchs. Accordingly, commentators of Kings frequently refer to this stereotypical expression as being characteristic of the Deuteronomistic commendation or condemnation of the reigns.

Despite a number of studies which make the evaluative formulae in Kings to be a case of Deuteronomistic activity, there have been voices arising recently that call into question the notion of the coherent Deuteronomistic composition running from Deuteronomy through Kings.30 Rösel (1999), contributing to these trends by his recent critical assessment of the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis, reviews in the first part of his study the concept of sin and punishment within the books from Deuteronomy to Kings where he brings under discussion the motif conveyed by (1999:17-19). This motif is noted by Rösel to occur frequently in Kings and Judges but relatively rarely in Deuteronomy, concerning which he says that ‘[t]he scarcity of this motif in the book of Deuteronomy and its programmatic texts is remarkable and this to a particular extent for those, who reckon with a single author of a coherent Dtr history’.31 Rösel further briefly examines occurrences of in Kings and Judges and remarks on the apparent difference between them in the two books when taking into account the immediate context in which these phrases are found. He draws a conclusion, important for the present discussion, that the motif conveyed by does not stand firmly as evidence for the unified authorship of the Deuteronomistic work.

29 Mention should also be made of the theme, which is rather typical of the regnal framework in Kings. See the discussion of on pp. 179-188.
31 ‘Die Seltenheit dieses Motivs im Buch Deuteronomium und seinen programmatischen Texten ist doch bemerkenswert und dies in besonderem Maße für den, welcher mit einem Autor eines einheitlichen dtr. Geschichtswerk rechnet.’ (Rösel 1999:18; emphasis his). The phrase can be found in Deuteronomy four times (4:25; 9:18; 17:2; 31:29) but the motif related to the context in Judges and Kings occurs only in Deut 4:25 and 31:29. For the full list of occurrences elsewhere see Hoffmann (1980:331).
When we turn to the phrase הממ-יתפָּר with a positive connotation and investigate occurrences of this motif within the corpus from Deuteronomy to Kings we discover that it is to be found only in Deuteronomy and in the book of Kings, in the latter almost three times more. In most occurrences in Deuteronomy (6:18; 12:25, 28; 21:9LXX) the phrase is closely linked with the expression מָשַׂא מַעְתָּכַשׂ. A link such as this does not exist in Kings. In other cases in Deuteronomy (6:17-18; 12:28; 13:19), the phrase is found within the immediate context of ‘keeping commandments’ (חָשְׂרֵיהוֹת תַּלְמוּד הַרְחָבָה) and has often been designated as typical Deuteronomistic language. This does occur in a few instances in Kings, although none of these instances appear in the regnal framework. The four cases of ‘doing right in Yahweh’s eyes’ that are further linked or occur in the environs of language close to cases in Deuteronomy (1Kgs 11:33, 38; 14:8MT; 15:5), do not belong to regnal formulae. These observations leave us with the conviction that the phrase המ-יתפָּר in its occurrence in the regnal framework of Kings (and Chronicles) does not originate from the language of Deuteronomy, but is peculiar or inherently belongs to the regnal framework. A similar contention can be made about the occurrences of המ-יתפָּר in the regnal formulae. Although this phrase has somewhat wider use in the Old Testament, appearing repeatedly in Judges as well as in the framework of northern rulers in Kings, its rare occurrence in Deuteronomy suggests that its basis for the use in Deuteronomy through to 2 Kings does not lie with Deuteronomy itself, neither is it, as Rösel (1999:17-19) convincingly argued, a unifying motif of the Deuteronomistic work.

Data from Chronicles may also throw some light on the issue. Chr faithfully records from his source the expressions המ-יתפָּר הבש בֹּעֵל הוהי that are not far removed from the notion of ‘keeping Yahweh’s commandments’. The phrase המ-יתפָּר together with other elements of regnal evaluations is used in her analysis as a criterion for differentiating various schemes that are attributed to different redactors. Since it logically follows from her argument that it is these redactors, with whom the phrases המ-יתפָּר in regnal formulae originate, the idea of a Dtr’s hand lying behind the evaluations disappears.

33 2Kgs 10:30-31 could be added to these verses which is also not a part of a regnal framework. It employs the terms המ-יתפָּר that are not far removed from the notion of ‘keeping Yahweh’s commandments’.
34 The claim may find some support in Weißept’s study and those following her in attempts to trace the compositional history of Kings by identifying its different redactional strata. As mentioned above Weißept focuses in her study on the variations occurring within the judgement formulae. The phrase המ-יתפָּר together with other elements of regnal evaluations is used in her analysis as a criterion for differentiating various schemes that are attributed to different redactors. Since it logically follows from her argument that it is these redactors, with whom the phrases המ-יתפָּר in regnal formulae originate, the idea of a Dtr’s hand lying behind the evaluations disappears.
35 המ-יתפָּר occurs in 2Chr 14:1; 20:32; 24:2; 25:2; 26:4; 27:2; 28:1; 29:2; 34:2. המ-יתפָּר occurs in 2Chr 12:14; 21:6; 22:4; 33:2; 33:22; 36:5, 9, 12.
connotation appears outside the regnal framework only in 2Chr 33:6 (shared with 2Kgs 21:6) and in 2Chr 29:6 of Chr’s special material. The other phrase, יִכָּכַּה כָּכַּה, is not mentioned in Chronicles outside the regnal formulae at all. This signifies the prominent role of these expressions in the regnal framework shared with Kings.

In conclusion, it may be stated that rather than being understood as typical phraseology of the Deuteronomistic work stretching from Deuteronomy to Kings, the phrases יִכָּכַּה כָּכַּה should be viewed as originating primarily from the regnal framework in Kings with their counterparts being faithfully preserved in Chronicles, since it is more narrowly the regnal framework with which they are deeply wedded and where they feature most significantly.

3.4.2. ‘Like David his Father’

The evaluative formula further consists of a comparison with one’s fathers or to rulers of the northern kingdom. The most frequently made comparison in these evaluative formulae is to David, but there are some variations between Kings and Chronicles regarding this element. David as exemplar is mentioned in both histories in the evaluative formula of Ahaz (2Kgs 16:2//2Chr 28:1), Hezekiah (2Kgs 18:3//2Chr 29:2) and Josiah (2Kgs 22:2//2Chr 34:2) and in Kings additionally in the formula of Asa (1Kgs 15:11) and Amaziah (2Kgs 14:3).

The two additional references to David in the formulae in Kings merit closer inspection. Unlike in 1Kgs 15:11 with its reading רָחָשׁ סֵדֶּרֶךְ, the evaluative formula of Asa in 2Chr 14:1 includes לַאֲלֵהֵי נַחֲלֵי חֹוֹד after יִכָּכַּה כָּכַּה. The difference between Kings and Chronicles over the wording in the evaluative formula of Asa may be compared with a similar kind of divergence between the two historiographical works in the evaluative formula of Ahaz. Here the text in 2Chr 28:1 reads רָחָשׁ סֵדֶּרֶךְ after לַאֲלֵהֵי נַחֲלֵי חֹוֹד while the parallel verse in 2Kgs 16:2 has a fuller expression לַאֲלֵהֵי נַחֲלֵי חֹוֹד כָּכַּה. Seen within this perspective of divergent readings of Ahaz’s evaluation, the issue regarding the more original reading of the evaluation of Asa may not be eventually resolved. Also, the possibility should not be excluded from

---

36 Another small divergence between 2Chr 14:1 and 1Kgs 15:11 is the addition of לַאֲלֵהֵי נַחֲלֵי חֹוֹד next to יִכָּכַּה in Chronicles. Although apart from 2Chr 14:1 the conjunction לַאֲלֵהֵי נַחֲלֵי חֹוֹד does not occur in the evaluative formulae, it is attested with slight variations elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible: in Deut 6:18; 12:28; Jos 9:25; 1Sam 12:23; 2Kgs 10:3; 2Chr 31:20; Ps 25:8; 125:4; Jer 26:14; 40:4. Cf. 1Sam 29:6; 2Kgs 10:30; Neh 9:13; Mic 7:4. Hence יִכָּכַּה in 2Chr 14:1 is probably a scribal addition.
further consideration that this minor divergence in the wording may have resulted from accidental change perhaps during the transmission process rather than from deliberate alteration on the compositional level.  

The other formula where there is difference in Kings and Chronicles over the reference to David as comparator occurs in the regnal framework of Amaziah. The evaluation of Amaziah ends in 2Chr 25:2 with the phrase נֶכֶּשׁ, whereas the parallel text in 2Kgs 14:3 reads נֶכֶּשׁ. The reading in Kings offers strikingly a two-fold comparison, mentioning Amaziah’s ancestors David and Joash, which has suggested to Lemke (1963:198) a possibility that the text in 2Kgs 14:3 may have been secondarily glossed. Further to this, Chr in the parallel text does not appear to be replacing his Vorlage of Amaziah’s evaluative formula with a special terminology, since נֶכֶּשׁ occurs once in the text shared by Kings and Chronicles (1Kgs 15:14//2Chr 15:17), and on several occasions in non-shared material of Kings (1Kgs 8:61; 11:4; 15:3; 2Kgs 20:3) as well as of Chronicles (1Chr 12:39; 28:9; 29:19; 2Chr 16:9; 19:9). The shared material of Asa (1Kgs 15:14//2Chr 15:17) with the term נֶכֶּשׁ occurring in close association with נֶכֶּשׁ is particularly relevant here, since this appears in the account of Asa’s reform that follows the evaluative formula of Asa in the earlier part of this king’s narrative (1Kgs 15:11//2Chr 14:1). The concept of נֶכֶּשׁ as it is applied to the king Asa, where it appears a few verses later after the mention that Asa ‘did what was right in the eyes of Yahweh’ could also have originally underlain the description of Amaziah as it appears in Chronicles – this time following directly and qualifying negatively the statement that Amaziah ‘did what was right in the eyes of Yahweh’. Another attractive possibility that may not be completely eliminated from consideration is Macy’s suggestion that ‘[d]tr and C used slightly variant recensions of a source which contained these formulae’.  

37 Kalimi (1995:114) regards נֶכֶּשׁ in 2Chr 14:1 as an instance of Chr’s harmonisation with Deut 12:28. If this is the case, however, then נֶכֶּשׁ in 2Kgs 16:2 should no less be considered as an instance of harmonisation.  
38 Cf. the use of נֶכֶּשׁ in 1Kgs 15:3, where it appears in Abijam’s evaluative formula (only in Kings).  
3.4.3. ‘He Did/Did Not Walk in the Way of His Father/King of Israel’

Another phrase occurring in the evaluative formulae that deserves consideration relates to walking in the way of one’s ancestor or in the way of the kings of Israel. This formulation occurs in the evaluative formulae of kings Jehoshaphat (1Kgs 22:43//2Chr 20:32), Jehoram (2Kgs 8:18//2Chr 21:6), Ahaziah (2Kgs 8:27//2Chr 22:3), Ahaz (2Kgs 16:3//2Chr 28:2) and Josiah (2Kgs 22:2//2Chr 34:2). It has a form as follows:

There are divergences between Kings and Chronicles in two details of this phrase: first, in the grammatical number of כבְּ in Chronicles and second, in the use of כָּז. The differences in these details between Kings and Chronicles are consistent, so that Kings never employs a plural form of כבְּ in the regnal framework, while Chronicles never includes כָּז in juxtaposition with כבְּ in evaluative formula.

As regards plural and singular forms of כבְּ, the book of Kings is consistent throughout in its use of כבְּ in singular form within a regnal framework. Also in other ancient versions Kings does not exhibit any departure from this convention; Hebrew כבְּ in Kings’ regnal framework is regularly rendered in Greek versions by οὐδὲ ὅσον. The same, however, cannot be said about the usage in Chronicles where כבְּ occurs in both singular and plural forms. The shifting between forms can also be seen in Greek texts of Chronicles, but the inconsistency within Chronicles goes even further in that the change of form takes place in different places in LXX and MT. This seems to point to a secondary character in how the term כבְּ was handled in Chronicles. The singular form of כבְּ as it consistently appears in Kings should be therefore regarded as the more original form in regnal formula.

The second point concerns the presence of כָּז as for instance in רֹאֶה הַיָּמִם of Josiah’s evaluative formula in 2Kgs 22:2 and its absence in the parallel text of 2Chr 34:2. The term כָּז, accentuating totality, occurs also in the evaluative formula of Jehoshaphat in 1Kgs 22:43, but is absent in the parallel text of 2Chr 20:32. This conforms to a wider pattern throughout the synoptic passages of Kings.

40 כבְּ occurs in the regnal framework of Chronicles in singular form in 2Chr 20:32 MT; 2Chr 21:6 MT, LXX; 2Chr 22:3 LXX\(^4\) and in plural form in 2Chr 20:32 LXX; 2Chr 22:3 MT, LXX\(^5\); 2Chr 28:2 MT, LXX; 2Chr 34:2 MT, LXX.

41 It appears that Chronicles having plurals, where Kings uses singular forms, is part of a wider phenomena in that book. See e.g. רֹאֶה הַיָּמִם (1Kgs 8:15//2Chr 6:4); רֹאֶה הַיָּמִם (2Kgs 21:3/2Chr 33:3); רֹאֶה הַיָּמִים (2Kgs 21:3/2Chr 33:3); וְכָּז (2Kgs 21:6/2Chr 33:6).

42 However, in the Greek supplement of 1Kgs 16:28b כָּז is lacking.
and Chronicles in which יָשָׁר is recorded more often within word-for-word parallels in Kings than in Chronicles. We would suggest at this point that Chr was not simply careless about transcribing faithfully יָשָׁר from his source text. Rather his Vorlage in the synoptic passages was less expansionist than the present text of Kings. However, since there are differences relating to the occurrence of יָשָׁר among the ancient witnesses of Kings themselves, the expansionist tendency may not be attributable to Kings authors/redactors but rather to later scribes of Kings.

3.4.4. ‘Walking in the Way’ and ‘Not Departing’

In the evaluative formulae of Jehoshaphat and Josiah, ‘walking in the way of one’s ancestors’ is closely linked with ‘not departing’. Parallel texts in Kings and Chronicles regarding Jehoshaphat include after ‘he walked in (all) the way of his father Asa’ a phrase that reads ‘(and) he did not turn aside from it’ (יָשָׁר לְאֶלֶת הָאָרֶץ in 1Kgs 22:43; יָשָׁר לְאֶלֶת הָאָרֶץ in 2Chr 20:32). Similarly the texts with regard to Josiah read ‘and he did not turn aside to the right or to the left’ (יָשָׁר לְאֶלֶת הָאָרֶץ in 2Kgs 22:2//2Chr 34:2).

The latter phrase is of particular interest since its employment in 2Kgs 22:2 has often been attributed to the Dtr’s hand. Thus, for instance, Weinfeld (1972:304) contends that יָשָׁר לְאֶלֶת הָאָרֶץ is a ‘stock phrase of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist’ but also claims its link with wisdom literature (cf. Prov 4:27). Spieckermann’s argument particularly stands out as he asserts from occurrences of the phrase in Deuteronomy and Joshua that יָשָׁר לְאֶלֶת הָאָרֶץ in 2Kgs 22:2 means ‘not

43 See 1Kgs 7:40//2Chr 4:11 (LXX Chr reads differently); 1Kgs 8:66//2Chr 7:10 (יָשָׁר is missing in LXX, Kgs); 1Kgs 10:4//2Chr 9:3; 1Kgs 12:18//2Chr 10:18 (יָשָׁר is alternated by יָשָׁר in Chr); 1Kgs 14:26//2Chr 12:9 (LXX Kgs is longer); 1Kgs 15:18//2Chr 16:2 (יָשָׁר is missing in LXX, Kgs); 1Kgs 22:23//2Chr 18:22 (יָשָׁר is included in LXX Chr); 1Kgs 22:43//2Chr 20:32 (יָשָׁר is missing in LXX, Kgs); 2Kgs 22:2//2Chr 34:2; 2Kgs 23:2//2Chr 34:30 (יָשָׁר is missing in LXX Kgs). The case of 1Kgs 12:21//2Chr 11:1 is truly complicated with many variants: MT Kgs – ‘all the house of Judah and tribe of Benjamin’; MT Chr – ‘house of Judah and Benjamin’; LXX Chr – ‘Judah and Benjamin’; LXX supplement – ‘all the men of Judah and Benjamin’. From these variant readings MT Kgs appears to be the most extended text which may indicate that MT Kgs belongs in this case perhaps to the latest stage of development. Finally, it should be noted that 1Kgs 12:16//2Chr 10:16 may be the only exception to the pattern presented here, in which case it is Chr who records יָשָׁר that is not in Kings. But this might be due to Chr’s pan-Israel interest.

44 See the preceding note.

45 Cf. Person (1997:54) who contends, noting the יָשָׁר variants in ancient texts in his study of parallel passages of 2Kgs 18:13-20:19 and Isa 36-39, that these variants are ‘the result of scribal additions for the sake of specificity’. On the variants of יָשָׁר in the ancient witnesses of Jeremiah, see Janzen (1973:65-68) who also considers these as expansions rather than elements lost in transmission or translation.
to turn aside from the commandments in Deuteronomy'.46 Provan, who grants that 2Kgs 22:2 is an evaluation of the king, views the dependence of this verse in its entirety upon the depiction of an ideal kingship in Deut 17:14-20.47 He is further concerned to show that 2Kgs 22:2 is related to the whole account of 22:3-23:25 'in its perspective that Josiah alone has done right in Yahweh’s sight'.48

A close examination of the context of the collocation אַלּוֹ + בִּימֵי תּוֹרָתָו in 2Kgs 22:2 and the passages in Deuteronomy and Joshua reveals, however, that the notion of a close relationship between 2Kgs 22:2 and these other texts may be misleading. The passage in Deut 17:20, which Provan considers in support of his view of the assessment of Josiah in Kings, has evidently a ‘commandment’ as the object of the verb אַלּוֹ in its reading אַלּוֹ + בִּימֵי תּוֹרָתָו. Similarly in Deut 28:14 the reference in regard to אַלּוֹ is made to the ‘words which Yahweh commands’ – אֶלָּה אֵלֹהִי מְצַוְתֵּךְ צְרִיךָ. In Joshua 1:7 and 23:6 the phrase הַמַּעֲשֵׂהּ הַיּוֹם אֶלָּה אֵלֹהִי refers to observing the law in the immediately preceding clauses. Finally, though there is no object specifically mentioned in the phrase הַמַּעֲשֵׂהּ הַיּוֹם אֶלָּה אֵלֹהִי occurring in Deut 5:32, the context of the preceding clause makes it clear enough that ‘Yahweh’s commandment’ is involved. Contrary to all these texts just mentioned there is no explicit reference to ‘commandments’, or ‘the words which Yahweh commanded’ or to ‘observing the law’ in the passage pertaining to Josiah in Kings.49 The phrase הַמַּעֲשֵׂהּ הַיּוֹם אֶלָּה אֵלֹהִי in 2Kgs 22:2, however, has its antecedent in the ‘path of David’ (דֶּרֶךְ דוֹד) signifying therefore ‘not to turn aside from following the way of a person’. Eynikel arrives at the same conclusion when he examines Weinfeld’s list of Deuteronomistic expressions, particularly those related to אַלּוֹ. He notes that in two of Weinfeld’s listed

46 Spiemann (1982:43). Apart from its occurrence in the evaluative formula of Josiah in 2Kgs 22:2/2Chr 34:2, אַלּוֹ + בִּימֵי תּוֹרָתָו is employed with the literal sense of ‘turning aside from the road one is going on’ in Deut 2:27 and 1Sam 6:12. Further occurrences are in Deut 5:32; 17:11, 20; 28:14 and Josh 1:7; 23:6.

47 ‘The author of 2Kgs 22:2... seems to be claiming that Josiah is the ideal king who is referred to in Deut 17:14-20, one who behaves in accordance with the law written in the book’ (Provan 1988:116).

48 Provan (1988:116). See also his commentary (1995:270) where he argues that 2Kgs 22:2 is ‘the first of many references in 2Kings 22-23 that link Josiah with the law of Moses in general and the figure of Moses in particular.’ Similarly Venema (2004:64) states with regard to 2Kgs 22:2 that ‘already in the introduction Josiah is implicitly linked with the torah of Moses’ (emphasis his). Though not denying that there are links with the law (and with Moses) in 2Kgs 22-23, it will be demonstrated below that in 2Kgs 22:2 particularly there is no such reference to the law nor to Moses as Provan and Venema would like us to acknowledge.

49 Contra Venema 2004:64 who asserts that ‘the vocabulary of 2Kgs 22:2 is a vague reminder of the “book of the torah” (Deut. 17:18-20; Josh. 1:7-8), and at the same time of the book of Deuteronomy’ (emphasis his).
passages, 1Kgs 22:43 and 2Kgs 22:2, קָשַׁה is not used to indicate ‘turning aside from Yahweh and/or his laws’, but that it involves ‘turning aside from the path of a person’, in one case Asa, in the other David. Eynikel by noting these two passages together in their use of קָשַׁה made a valuable observation. The text in 1Kgs 22:43 does not strictly mention קָשַׁה together with קָשַׁה as the text in 2Kgs 22:2 does. Nevertheless drawing on the similar circumstance in which both texts appear the affinities between the two cannot be denied. The passages are closely related not only by including קָשַׁה and קֶדֶר (קֶדֶר meaning in this context ‘moral course of a person’) but also by their occurrence in the same formal context, i.e. regnal framework. In the light of this, 2Kgs 22:2 does not appear to be related directly with the passages in Deuteronomy and Joshua. The phrase קָשַׁה קֶדֶר פּוֹחֲנָנִי-אָמֶרָנִי קָשַׁה may mean nothing more and nothing less than just what it says, that Josiah ‘walked in the way of David his father and did not turn right nor left’, just as it is said about Jehoshaphat earlier (1Kgs 22:43) that he ‘walked in the way of Asa his father and did not turn from it.’ Whatever our thoughts about the Chronicles composition, the links between the two texts in Kings are even strengthened by the fact that they both have their parallels in Chronicles (1Kgs 22:43//2Chr 20:32; 2Kgs 22:2//2Chr 34:2).

The relationship between the evaluative formula of Jehoshaphat and Josiah points to a more significant role played by the immediate context, which is the regnal framework itself, in assessing these formulae. The links within the regnal frames of royal accounts appear to be superior to the seeming relations outside the regnal framework in the sections of the Bible recognized by scholars to be the Deuteronomistic History. Similarly, we have observed with regard to the phrases ‘he did right/evil in the eyes of Yahweh’ that they are more distinct in their occurrences within the regnal formulae from their appearances elsewhere. Outside the regnal framework the occurrences of these expressions in Kings have closer relations with the texts in Deuteronomy, but not within the regnal resumés. It may be instructive to note at this point that the regnal framework with the phrases such as ‘he walked in the way…and did not depart’ and ‘he did right/evil in the eyes of Yahweh’ in the evaluative formulae in Kings forms also a significant part of the narrative of the

50 Eynikel (1996:118; emphasis his). For Weinfeld’s list, see Weinfeld (1972:339).
52 Eynikel (1996:118) similarly considers 2Kgs 22:2 to come from a different author than the texts in Deuteronomy.
divided kingdom in Chronicles. It is perhaps this context, the regnal framework shared by both Kings and Chronicles, that is the primary context of these expressions and not the wider portion of material within the Hebrew Bible called the Deuteronomistic History.

3.4.5. Evaluative Formula of Abijah (only in Kings)

As it has just been noted the evaluative formulae also appear regularly in Chronicles. There are, however, two exceptions to this pattern which concern the evaluation of Abijah and Jehoahaz. While the absence of the latter in the Chronicles history need not concern us, since this appears merely to be a matter of scribal error, the absence of the former has wider implications. The evaluative formula of Abijah is not only missing in Chronicles but its occurrence in Kings differs markedly from all other evaluative formulae related to the kings of Judah in that book. To fully appreciate the specificity of the Abijah formula in Kings, the issues linked with this formula in the context of Abijah’s narrative in both Kings and Chronicles need to be explored in greater detail.

The account on Abijam in 1Kgs 15 is relatively short. It begins with a note on synchronism with the reign of Jeroboam (v. 1) and continues mentioning the length of Abijam’s reign and the name of his mother. There follows a negative evaluative formula (v. 3) and an allusion to the promise to David as a reason for Abijam being retained on the throne (vv. 4-5). Then a notice comes about Rehoboam and Jeroboam being at war (v. 6) followed by a closing summary, which contains reference to other records about Abijam’s life and a notice of his death and burial (vv. 7-8).

The story of Abijah in 2Chr 13, on the other hand, is of much greater length and of a different essence. The account starts as in Kings with a synchronism and the duration of Abijah’s reign followed by a notice of his mother’s name (vv. 1-2a). But

---

53 So Japhet (1993:1063), Rudolph (1955:334), after mentioning proposals by Curtis & Madsen (1910:520) on one hand about Chr’s deliberate omission and by Benzinger (1901:134) on the other with reference to accidental loss of the text, refrains from passing his own judgement on the absence of the evaluative phrase for Jehoahaz in Chronicles. For Williamson (1982a:412-13) it is not clear why Chr should omit the formula for Jehoahaz. To us it seems reasonable to side with Japhet who views the most likely explanation of the omission as a scribal error. In this connection, the text of Jer 52 in the LXX might be brought to attention, which in contrast to Jer 52:2 MT, 2Kgs 24:19, 2Chr 36:12a and 1Esd 1:45 does not record the evaluative formula of Zedekiah. Has this state of affairs in LXX of Jer 52 resulted from a scribal error similarly as the text relating to Jehoahaz in 2Chr 36:22? Answering this question affirmatively, Person (1993:185-86; 1997:103, 110; 2002:48) is then certainly wrong proposing that LXX of Jer 52 lacking the formula is the most original reading. For further criticisms of Person’s view regarding this issue see Stipp (1998); Talshir (2000a:484-87).

54 See note 14 above on the differences in the name of this king between Kings and Chronicles.
the name given in Chronicles is different, as well as the name of his grandfather, which comes immediately after.55 There is no evaluative formula as in Kings. Instead, after the note on constant warfare between Abijah and Jeroboam (v. 2b) there comes a lengthy account of a battle between these two kings which Kings does not report (vv. 3-20). Then a note follows on Abijah’s marriages and children also not found in Kings (v. 21). The account of Abijah’s reign closes with reference formula and a note on Abijah’s death and burial (v. 22).

The absence of an evaluative formula related to Abijah in Chronicles has often been noted in scholarly literature.56 The remarks on the missing evaluation have been aided by the contrasting picture that is offered about this king in Kings and Chronicles. While in Kings nothing good is said about Abijah and his reign, in Chronicles this king is seen in much more favourable light which is demonstrated by his faithfulness and piety in his speech and by a note on the large progeny Abijah enjoyed, considered clearly to be a sign of a divine blessing. Given these opposing accounts in the two histories it is maintained that Chr simply omitted the negative appraisal of Abijah in Kings because it did not fit his ‘theological understanding of the king’s career’,57 or it is asserted that having at his disposal alternative source material Chr was ‘correct[ing] Dtr’s negative assessment of Abijah (1Kgs 15, 3-5) by omitting it’.58 The note on ‘omission’ by Chr, whatever way it may accommodate the more positive portrayal of Abijah in Chronicles, may not, however, in the light of Chr’s overall treatment of evaluative formulae, be a full argument. As mentioned above, with the exception of Jehoahaz that may be a case of scribal ‘lapsus oculi’59 and Abijah, it is Chr’s practice throughout to provide a regnal evaluation of Judean kings. Thus Chr does not avoid recording faithfully from his source a word of either praise or criticism on a king, even though it may contrast with the depiction of events pertaining to that king in Chr’s account later. Asa, for example, is positively assessed that ‘he did good and right in the eyes of the Lord’ (2Chr 14:2) and commented on that his heart was ‘true all his days’ (15:17). Yet in the narrative that follows he is rebuked that he ‘did not rely on Yahweh’ (16:7). Similarly we find evaluative

55 The name of Abijah’s mother is in Chronicles ‘Micaiah the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ whereas in Kings she is called ‘Maacah the daughter of Absalom’. See e.g. Japhet (1993:670-71) on the difficulties created by this divergence.
formulae of Uzziah and Manasseh taken by Chr from his source, but not fully representative of all the events concerned with their reigns which are narrated in Chronicles. Since Chr does not set aside the evaluations of other kings found in his Vorlage, but with a certain freedom of interpretation integrates them, it seems that he would not have passed over the evaluation of Abijah had he had it in his source.

A further support for this contention may be provided by studying the evaluative formula of Abijam, as it occurs in 1Kgs 15:3, itself. It reads as follows:

The formula may appear at first sight to be similar to others with a negative evaluation of Judean kings. It brings a negative verdict upon a king expressing that Abijam ‘walked in all the sins of his father’ and that his heart ‘was not true to Yahweh’. What is significant and different about this expression is that it contains reference to המָשָּׁה, ‘sin’ which no other evaluative formula related to southern kings does. To facilitate comparison we list all the negative evaluations of Judean kings in a chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehoboam</th>
<th>1Kgs 14:22</th>
<th>2Chr 12:14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>וֹתַעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jehoram</th>
<th>2Kgs 8:18</th>
<th>2Chr 21:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יָרָתְהוּ</td>
<td>יָרָתְהוּ</td>
<td>יָרָתְהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahaziah</th>
<th>2Kgs 8:27</th>
<th>2Chr 22:3-4a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָמְרָתְהוּ</td>
<td>נָמְרָתְהוּ</td>
<td>נָמְרָתְהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahaz</th>
<th>2Kgs 16:2b-3a</th>
<th>2Chr 28:1b-2a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לָאַתְהוּ</td>
<td>לָאַתְהוּ</td>
<td>לָאַתְהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manasseh</th>
<th>2Kgs 21:2</th>
<th>2Chr 33:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amon</th>
<th>2Kgs 21:20-21</th>
<th>2Chr 33:22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jehoahaz (only in Kings), Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, Zedekiah</th>
<th>2Kgs 23:32, 37, 24:9, 19</th>
<th>2Chr 36:5b, 9b, 12a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
<td>הָעַתְהוּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluative formulae usually include ‘he did evil in the eyes of Yahweh’ and most of them also contain the phrase ‘he walked in the way of ...’. Not a single formula from those listed above pertaining to southern kings reads ‘he walked in the

---

60 See more on this point Deboys (1990:59-60).
sin' as the assessment on Abijam, which appears only in Kings, does. Thus we see that in its use of הָשָׁם 'sin' the evaluative formula of Abijam is markedly different from other evaluations relating to kings of Judah.\(^{61}\) Being distinct from these formulae, this suggests that Abijam's formula is a later addition in Kings. It is further interesting to observe that Abijam's evaluation by its reference to הָשָׁם considerably resembles assessments of northern kings. In the material pertaining to the northern kingdom, which appears only in Kings, the evaluations of Israelite rulers typically employ expressions with references to הָשָׁם 'sin'.\(^{62}\) The closer relationship of Abijam's formula in its use of הָשָׁם with the evaluative formulae concerning the northern kings has further significant implications. It is tempting to conclude that the evaluative formulae on northern kings, because of their affinity with the evaluation of Abijam, may also not have been part of a source-text known to Chr but could have been added later together with the evaluation on Abijam with which they share the link in הָשָׁם. Still more supporting evidence will emerge from the following study on referral formula regarding the later additions in Kings, not found in Chronicles.

3.5. Referral Formula

The first of the concluding formulae of each reign is formed by a referral formula, which points to other materials for further information. This formula is a fairly regular element, in both Kings and Chronicles, of the regnal framework. Only a few rulers do not have in their regnal resumes the reference to other documents for further information. These in both Kings and Chronicles include Ahaziah, Athaliah, and three out of the last four kings of Judah, namely Jehoahaz, Jehoakin and Zedekiah. Additionally, Chronicles does not have a referral formula for the kings Jehoram and Amon. Another difference between Kings and Chronicles regarding the distribution of referral formulae relates to their occurrence in different places in the regnal frameworks of Joash and Josiah in the two historiographical works. While in Kings the formulae referring to other materials appears at a standard place preceding the accounts of the deaths and burials of the kings Joash and Josiah (2Kgs 12:20; 23:28), in Chronicles they appear almost at the very end of the structuring frame followed only by a succession notice (2Chr 24:27; 35:26).

---

\(^{61}\) It needs to be noted that הָשָׁם occurs at another occasion in the regnal formulae of southern kings – in the reference notice of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:17//2Chr 33:19). This appears, however, in so-called specifying comments, discussed later (see pp. 32-34), and is not a part of regnal evaluation in an opening formula.

\(^{62}\) 1Kgs 15:26, 34; 16:19, 26; (16:31) etc.
The varied placement of the referral formulae between Kings and Chronicles in the Josiah narrative plays an important part in the argument of Williamson about a further stage in the literary development of the Deuteronomistic History witnessed, according to him, by the account of Josiah’s death in Chronicles.63 Williamson (1982b:244-45; 1987b:11-12) contends that since the referral formulae in Chronicles occur at the same points where they appear in Kings, except for 2Chr 35:26-27, this presupposes that Chr followed a form of Kings in which a referral formula was present following the report of Josiah’s death and not before. Dillard (1987:288-89) and, in more detail, Talshir (1996:222-26) each points out the weakness of Williamson’s argument precisely in his assumption that Chr would locate pedantically a referral formula at the same point as Kings. Talshir shows from the example of the introductory formulae for the reigns of Rehoboam and Jehosaphat that Chr’s treatment of introductory formulae is not particularly strict in following Kings, from which she implies that Chr may not necessarily have followed the form of his source with regard to concluding formulae. Williamson’s argument is also mistakenly based on the uniqueness of Josiah’s referral formula in its different position in Chronicles from Kings. As we have noted above, and as Talshir also rightly argues, the same phenomenon of different placement of referral formula in Chronicles from Kings also occurs in the account of Joash (2Kgs 12:20-22; 2Chr 24:25-27).64 The significance of the issues identified in the discussion so far naturally leads to the following closer scrutiny of the structure of referral formulae.

In his study of Chr’s sources Macy offered some useful insights into referral formulae (his ‘source notices’) in Kings and Chronicles.65 These formulae consist of two major parts, a content citation and a reference citation.66 The content citation indicates what may be found in the reference that follows. It has a standard form which can be further divided into three parts: (A) identification phrase, (B) formulaic element and (C) specifying comment (a further note about the king’s character, his

---

64 Curiously, the Joash’s referral formula has gone unnoticed in the earlier exchanges between Begg (1987:1-8) and Williamson (1987b:9-15). It has been brought to debate only later by Talshir (1996:225).
66 Macy (1975:152, 155) called these ‘content citation’ and ‘source citation.’ Other scholars use labels such as ‘summation notice’ for content citation and ‘source’ for ‘reference’ citation (e.g. Glatt-Gilad 2001:186).
activities or his reign). The second major part of the referral formula then names the particular document. This structure can be seen more clearly in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERRAL FORMULA</th>
<th>KINGS</th>
<th>CHRONICLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content citation:</td>
<td>(A) identification: [PN] המלך</td>
<td>[PN] המלך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) formulaic element: הולך</td>
<td>הולך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) specifying comment: various</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference citation:</td>
<td>e.g. 2Kgs 23:28 (Josiah)</td>
<td>e.g. 2Chr 35:27 (Josiah)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1. Content Citation

As the table above shows, the first part of the content citation is formed by an identification phrase such as [PN] המלך. While Kings uses this phrase in every instance, there is slightly more variation in the formulae in Chronicles. Sometimes only [PN] המלך is used (1Chr 29:29; 2Chr 12:15), in other cases [PN] המלך or [PN] המלך is attested (2Chr 9:29; 16:11), and no identification phrase is used in 2Chr 24:27 (cf. 2Kgs 12:20). The formulaic element, which is the second part of the content citation, differs markedly in Chronicles from Kings. In Chronicles this includes referring to an individual king’s deeds as those being first and last. In Kings, however, the formula is (all) which he did’, which also appears in the content citations relating to the northern rulers in Kings. In some instances, the formulaic element is missing in Kings, and in others it is absent in Chronicles as the table on the following page shows. This is similar to the distribution of the third element of the content citation, the specifying comment, which similarly appears irregularly in the two books. Moreover, as with the formulaic element, the specifying comments are likewise ‘totally distinct and unrelated’ in Kings and Chronicles (Macy 1975:153).

The features of these specifying comments in the two historiographical works are worthy of further exploration. The annotations in Kings, as Macy (1975:153; 155) has already observed, are generally related to ‘political and administrative aspects of king’s reign’. They refer to the king’s might (1Kgs 15:23; 22:46; 2Kgs

---

67 Macy’s labels are used throughout this study in dividing content citation into ‘identification’, ‘formulaic element’ and ‘specifying comment’. We also follow Macy (1975:153) in designating these as A, B, C respectively.

68 Reference citations, particularly in Chronicles, vary in their structure. More on this see pp. 34-36.
**Content Citations in Chronicles and Kings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronicles</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijah</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athaliah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joash</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzziah</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joatham</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>A, C, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoaziah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiachin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zedekiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* The table has been adapted and reworked into more detailed form from Macy (1975:154).
20:20), to his battles (1Kgs 22:46) and building activities (1Kgs 15:23; 2Kgs 20:20). Only in the case of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:17) is the annotation related to the religious aspect of the king. The specifying comments in Chronicles, on the other hand, speak little of political activities (2Chr 24:27; 27:7). They do not mention (with the exception of referral formula related to David without a parallel in Kings) the king’s might and they do not report on secular building activities. They reflect rather religious interests, reporting on building religious sites (2Chr 24:27; 33:19), on sin and rebellion (2Chr 33:19) and on the kings’ piety (2Chr 32:32; 35:26). The content of specifying comments for the kings of the divided kingdom shared by Kings and Chronicles is very distinct in both histories. Macy (1975:157-58) concluded from his study of these comments and other marked differences in the reference formulae that Chr ‘[did] not depend on Kg for the content or the vocabulary of its source notices’, but that he ‘patterned his notices after a slightly different ancient formula than the one found in Kg.’

The book of Kings further includes referral formulae with specifying comments for ten northern kings. Just as the Kings’ special comments concerned with kings of Judah address political achievements, so do these concerned with kings of Israel. The characteristic elements of the comments related to northern kings are the frequent reference to the king’s ‘might’ (חַיְי), which is found with six kings as the table below shows, and the more uniform pattern in which חַיְי occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT CITATIONS RELATED TO NORTHERN KINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 14:19 Jeroboam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:31 Nadab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 16:5 Baasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 16:14 Elah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 16:20 Zimri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sense of חַיְי related to kings’ actions in both Chr’s passages (2Chr 35:26; 32:32), has been a subject of some debate. A range of meanings has been proposed for חַיְי occurring in these two texts: ‘mighty acts’ (Kuyper 1963:491; Elliger 1978:24), ‘martial and...technological achievements’ in case of Hezekiah (Whitley 1981:525), ‘faithful deeds of the king’ related to the ‘promise of Yahweh’s covenant’ (Riley 1993:92), ‘mankind’s proper response to God’ (Routledge 1995:194 n. 54), ‘acts by which a person demonstrates zeal for Yahweh’s temple’ (Clark 1993:183), ‘great deeds’ (Gerleman 1978:160), ‘pious acts’ (Sakenfeld 1978:151-58), ‘good works, pious deeds’ (Williamson 1977:51) etc. The plural of חַיְי occurs 18 times in the Hebrew Bible (as against of 228 occurrences of singular form)—and of these, only in 2Chr 6:42; 32:32; 35:26; Neh 13:14 and Isa 55:3 חַיְי is postulated of a man. Chronicles passages (32:32; 35:26) are often considered together with Neh 13:14 because of similar context. (Note the term חַיְי explicated by relative clause ‘...חַיְי יהוה’ in Nehemiah text.) Nevertheless Neh 13:14 is the only instance where the phrase חַיְי יהוה occurs in Nehemiah ‘remember formula’. (This formula is found in positive form in 5:19; 13:22, 31 and negative form in 6:14 and 13:29.) On the grounds of distribution alone Williamson (1977:51) thus discounts the word חַיְי as evidence for common authorship of Chr and Ezra-Nehemiah.
This term כַּפָּלָה occurs in Kings also in the referral formulae of three Judean kings, Asa (1Kgs 15:23), Jehoshaphat (1Kgs 22:46) and Hezekiah (2Kgs 20:20). However, it is nowhere found with regard to kings of Judah in the regnal framework material in Chronicles. This observation is particularly interesting in respect of the view that Chronicles includes a number of battles and military events in its accounts. Thus the author of Chronicles would have no reason for consistently omitting this term (cf. 2Chr 16:11/1Kgs 15:23; 2Chr 20:34/1Kgs 22:46; 2Chr 32:32/2Kgs 20:20). Rather, what it suggests is that כַּפָּלָה may have been introduced to the notations of southern rulers in Kings at a time when the framework of northern kings with its considerable occurrence of כַּפָּלָה was included in the book of Kings. Chr thus may not have been familiar from his main source with either כַּפָּלָה in the notations of kings of Judah or with the framework of northern rulers where this term in Kings significantly occurs. This conclusion is supportive of our earlier contention regarding the limitations of the major source used by Chr in relation to the present book of Kings.

### 3.5.2. Reference Citation

The second major part of referral formulae is formed by the reference citation. This again varies significantly between Kings and Chronicles. Firstly, when Kings states where further information can be found, it mentions את הספר בִּסְמָה הָיְתָה 'the book of
chronicles’ (lit. ‘the book of the acts of the days’). Chronicles in referring to other materials for further information does not use this expression, although, interestingly enough, it itself bears the title נַעֲרָיָה הָיָם. 72

Secondly, the reference citations are usually introduced in Kings with סְבָנָה but in Chronicles with הנה. The distinctive use of the particles סְבָנָה and הנה is almost regularly maintained throughout the parallel texts of both histories. In Kings אֲוָדָי הָאֱלֹהִים (or its equivalents אֲוָדָי הָאֱלֹהִים; אוֹדָי הָאֱלֹהִים) introduces all the reference citations related to the kings of Judah. Moreover, Kings employs this expression in thirteen instances in referral formulae for the Israelite kings. Only in five remaining instances related to the kings of Israel is the particle הנה used. On the other hand, Chronicles predominantly uses הנה. Reference citations in Chronicles are introduced with הנה eleven times out of the sixteen instances for the kings of Judah. In two of Chronicles reference citations there is no particle used (2Chr 13:22; 26:22) and in one case, which is probably a result of a conflation, Chr has both הנה and סְבָנָה (2Chr 25:26).

Only in two cases does Chr start the citation with סְבָנָה רְבִּיתֶה which have parallels in Kings (2Chr 9:29//1Kgs 11:41; 2Chr 12:15//1Kgs 14:29). In the light of these two instances of the identical use of סְבָנָה in both Kings and Chronicles, the claim by Sivan and Schniedewind (1993:214) that Chr used הנה because he ‘did not know the asseverative...סְבָנָה’ is misleading. Equally unlikely is their assumption that Chr replaced סְבָנָה with הנה because הנה was ‘current in post-exilic Hebrew’ (loc. cit.) for Gesenius (1884:426) contends quite the opposite saying that ‘in Samaritan and Rabbinic סְבָנָה is commonly used for הנה’. 73

If Kings reference citations are the background for Chr’s composition of his formulae, one would expect closer resemblances in the form and language than that which appears. An example of a reference notice from a later text, the book of Esther, may elucidate the point. The referral formula in Est 10:2 reads פֹּלֵלָת הָאֱלֹהִים נַעֲרָיָה כּוֹס הַמַּעֲשֶׂה מַעֲשֶׂה וְחָסִידֵי הַמַּעֲשֶׂה עַל עֵתִי חָיִים אֶל הָיָם וְאֶל הָאֱלֹהִים מֵעַל חָיִים עַל עֵתִי חָיִים. It is well known and attested in commentaries that the author or reductor of Esther

---

71 There is only one occurrence of סְבָנָה רְבִּיתֶה in Chronicles when it speaks about the census numbers not recorded in התּוּתֶה תַעֲלָה (1Chr 27:24). This text however does not have a parallel in Kings.

72 For discussion on the name of Chronicles in early Jewish and Christian period, see Knoppers and Harvey (2002:227-43).

drew on earlier traditions for the reference notice in 10:2. The citation in Esther in its use of סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד resembles markedly the standard formula for citing documents used in Kings. By analogy, if Chr depended for his reference citations on Kings, his formula would display closer affinities, we believe, just as the example of reference citation in the book of Esther shows. It is further instructive to observe that the reference notice of Esther contains the term סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד. We noted this term occurs in several reference notices in Kings and predominantly in those that are related to northern kings.

The final part of a reference citation consists of the title of the actual work. In Kings, the reference is made to סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד with regard to the accounts of Judean monarchs. Accordingly, the source for Israelite rulers mentioned in Kings bears the name סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד. The only other record which Kings introduces in its referral formulae pertains to the King Solomon. It simply reads סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד (1Kgs 11:41). Chronicles, on the other hand, is less homogeneous in citing documents in its reference notices. For the majority of kings, it refers to a composition of general character under varying names: סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד (2Chr 16:11); סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד (2Chr 20:34); סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד (2Chr 25:26; 28:26; 32:32); סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד (2Chr 27:7; 35:27; 36:8); סָפָר בֵּית הַיָּהִים לְולֵכָּה יָהֳעַד (2Chr 33:18MT). Moreover, Chronicles contains references to the works of various prophets (1Chr 29:29; 2Chr 9:29; 12:15; 13:22; 20:34; 26:22; 32:32; 33:19LXX), which are sometimes said to be included in the general work of the differing titles mentioned above (2Chr 20:34; 32:32). The nature of that single document, however, continues to be debated among scholars. It does

---

75 Loader (1992:279 n. 3) in his commentary on the book of Esther notes: 'Die rhetorische Frage, nebst Begriffen wie „Buch der Chronik“ (sêfer dißer hayyânîn) und „Stärke“ (gˇhârad) sind typisch für die abschließende Wertung von Königen in Deuteronomistische Geschichte (vgl. 1 Kön 11,41; 14,29; 15,7,23 usw.).'
78 That Chronicles refers by slightly different titles to one and the same general work is generally accepted in studies of that book; see Japhet (1993:21-22) with earlier literature cited there.
79 It is of interest to note that when Chronicles refers to general work(s) it never mentions 'The Book of the Kings of Judah' (or similar) alone but always has 'Israel' included together with 'Judah' in the title. On the word 'Israel' used in Chronicles reference citations see Williamson (1977:106, 128).
80 For recent contribution to this debate see Rainey (1997:30-72). See also Schniedewind (1995:211-30).
not concern us for our present purposes, whether the prophetic works of the other category that are also thought to belong to that same document are authentic or invented. The point needs to be emphasised solely that Chronicles in its references to other records always differs from Kings.

Resulting from his detailed study of ‘source notices’ in which he observed ‘clear differences in every part’, Macy (1975:158) brought forward a suggestion that ‘the Chr may have had much greater independence from Kg than is generally recognized.’ Our own study of referral formulae corroborates his conclusions. What is more, on the basis of the study of the part of referral formulae formed by specifying comments, we proposed that Chr may have had independence from Kings to such an extent as being unacquainted with the Kings referral formulae related to northern kings. This adds up to the view of Chr not being familiar from the source available to him with the regnal framework of Israelite rulers appearing only in Kings.

3.6. Supplementary Notice

The supplementary notice, which gives additional information relating to the king in question, appears following the referral formula in several royal accounts in Kings and Chronicles. Regarding the first two kings of Judah, Rehoboam and Abijah, the notices in particular relate to war with Jeroboam (1Kgs 14:30//2Chr 12:15; 1Kgs 15:7//2Chr 13:2). In the case of Asa, the supplementary notice pertains to Asa’s foot disease (1Kgs 15:23//2Chr 16:12), and in Chronicles is slightly expanded according to Chr’s theology of punishment and retribution. The regnal framework of Jehoshaphat has the referral formula unusually early within its structure, so that the following supplementary notice spans across a few verses in the two biblical histories. Both Kings and Chronicles include in that notice the story of a shipping expedition involving the Israelite king Ahaziah, although with some differences (1Kgs 22:49-50//2Chr 20:35-37). Kings has additionally the note on cultic reform (1Kgs 22:47) – which in Chronicles appears outside the regnal framework and in a different form (2Chr 19:3) – and further includes a comment regarding the presence of a deputy in Edom (1Kgs 22:48). The supplementary notice in the regnal framework of Amaziah – in Chronicles being coloured by Chr’s theology – deals

---

81 In Chronicles, the supplementary notice concerning Abijah (2Chr 13:2) precedes the referral formula (2Chr 13:22) and is augmented with Chr’s special material (2Chr 13:3-21).
82 More on this see below pp. 51-58.
with a conspiracy against this king and his eventual assassination (2Kgs 13:19//2Chr 25:27). Jotham has, in his regnal framework, different notes in Kings and Chronicles. In 2Kgs 15:37, the supplementary notice relates to the Assyrian threat, while in 2Chr 27:8 the age and length of Jotham’s reign are repeated from 2Chr 27:1//2Kgs 15:33. Neither of these notices, however, seem to belong to the original structure of Jotham’s regnal framework, both of them being likely later additions. Certainly the repetitive notice in 2Chr 27:8 is secondary. And as for the comment in 2Kgs 15:37 relating to Yahweh’s sending Rezin and Pekah against Judah, Fritz (2003:339) notes that this is an addition arising from the narrative about Ahaz that followed. We have already noted that the referral formula in the cases of two kings, Joash and Josiah, appears in Chronicles in different places in comparison with Kings, being followed by succession formula (2Chr 24:27; 35:26-27). Accordingly, the supplementary note, which depicts how these two kings met their deaths, follows the referral formula per se only in Kings. In Chronicles instead the same information as in the Kings supplementary notice (2Kgs 12:21-22a; 23:29-30a) is treated as part of the main narrative (2Chr 24:25a; 35:20-24a). Even so, Chronicles still includes a kind of supplementary notice after the death and burial formula of Joash and Josiah. In 2Chr 24:26 the supplementary comment is a continuation of the story that has gone before, giving details of those who conspired against Joash (cf. 2Kgs 12:22a), but in 2Chr 35:25 it contains new information (not included in the parallel account of Kings) about Jeremiah’s and other people’s lamentation for Josiah. After the Josiah narrative, there is no supplementary notice in Kings or Chronicles that would follow the referral formula in the accounts of the last four kings of Judah.

In their study of the regnal framework of the kings of Israel, Halpern and Vanderhoof note that the regnal formulae of northern monarchs likewise contain supplementary notices. These, however, are usually more varied in their occurrence and in overall are of a different character in comparison to the ones relating to the kings of Judah shared by Kings and Chronicles. As Halpern and Vanderhoof (1991:213 n. 85) observe, in contrast to the supplementary notices bearing on the kings of Judah, the notices occurring in the regnal formulae of northern kings ‘where they pertain to the king whose regnal account they follow, they mainly concern

---

83 There is also a second supplementary notice regarding Amaziah which, however, in both Kings and Chronicles comes after Amaziah’s succession formula and deals with his rebuilding Elath (2Kgs 14:22//2Chr 26:2).

84 Note the similarities of 2Kgs 15:37 in the phrase התיהו ב…I in those days Yahweh began with 2Kgs 10:32.
prophecy'. While this is taken by Halpern and Vanderhooft as supportive of their argument regarding differentiation of layers within the Deuteronomistic History, it seems to us more probable that the supplementation notices of northern kings, with their different placement within the framework scheme and different focus from the ones relating to kings of Judah, point to the northern chronological framework, of which they are part, being more distant from the framework of southern monarchs, leading us to suggest that they may belong to a different stage of Kings composition than the chronological framework of Judean monarchs shared by both biblical histories.

3.7. Death and Burial Formula

The death and burial formula as part of the regnal resumé of each king usually consists of three elements: a notice of the death of king, a notice of his burial and the place of his burial. When a monarch dies peacefully, the phrase המות והבשורה is customarily used in Kings and Chronicles relating to kings of Judah suggesting that the death was of natural causes rather than being a consequence of war or conspiracy. In the circumstance of an untimely death, a phrase with some form of the root מות is employed. Thus, for example, Josiah’s death in Kings is depicted by the hiphil form מות ובהו ‘and he killed him’. A slightly different and more expansive text in Chronicles employs qal form מות ‘and he died’. The different use of the root מות reflects the divergent situations of the two versions: in one version Josiah is said to be slain by Necho (2Kgs 23:29); in the other he is wounded encountering the pharaoh and dies after being brought into Jerusalem (2Chr 35:23-24). Similarly, relating to Ahaziah’s violent death the verb מות is used differently in the two historiographical works. This time, however, מות (qal) appears in 2Kgs 9:27, while

---

85 Prophecy-fulfilment schema occurs in the supplementary notices of Baasha (1Kgs 16:7); Ahab (1Kgs 22:38) and Zechariah (2Kgs 15:12). The supplementary notices of Jeroboam (1Kgs 14:20) and Jephthah (1Kgs 10:35) refer to regnal length, but the one relating to Jeroboam is found only in MT. (Two supplementary notices, in 1Kgs 15:32MT and 2Kgs 15:16, do not relate to the Israelite king whose regnal formula they follow.)


87 See the death notices of Rehoboam (1Kgs 14:31//2Chr 12:16); Abijah/h (1Kgs 15:8//2Chr 13:23); Asa (1Kgs 15:24//2Chr 16:13); Jehoshaphat (1Kgs 22:51//2Chr 21:1); Jehoram (only 2Kgs 8:24); Azariah/Uzziah (2Kgs 15:7//2Chr 26:23); Jotham (2Kgs 15:38//2Chr 27:9); Ahaz (2Kgs 16:20//2Chr 28:27); Hezekiah (2Kgs 20:20//2Chr 32:32); Manasseh (2Kgs 21:18//2Chr 33:20); Jehoiakim (2Kgs 24:6//2Chr 36:8 LXX). A curious case of מות והבשורה appears outside the death and burial formula in 2Kgs 14:22//2Chr 26:2. This seems to relate to king Amaziah, who is however reported in his regnal resumé to have died of conspiracy (2Kgs 14:19//2Chr 25:27). On the subject of the construction מות + והבשורה, see further Alfrink (1943:106-118).
is employed in 2Chr 22:9. Apart from Josiah and Ahaziah, three other kings are described in both Kings and Chronicles as dying an untimely death: Joash (2Kgs 12:22//2Chr 24:25), Amaziah (2Kgs 14:19//2Chr 25:27) and Amon (2Kgs 21:23//2Chr 33:24) are all portrayed in both histories as vanishing from the throne because of conspiracies plotted against them. In addition to these, 2Chr 21:19 refers to the turbulent death of king Jehoram who is depicted by Chr to have died of ‘terrible illness’ (ךְַ֛לֹּא-טְרֵ֖ר הָֽאָדָֽם אַחֵ֖רִי). In this case Chronicles differs from Kings, in which no mention of Jehoram’s illness is made and where he is reported to ‘have lain down with his fathers’ (גֵּיאָ֖ה חַלְלָֽה לְעָלָם אָבָֽיָּ֑י). Jehoram’s death notice is the only instance in which Kings and Chronicles give contrasting reports regarding the death notices of Judean monarchs. Whether or not Chr found information about Jehoram’s illness in his source, it seems clear that the account of Jehoram’s end is largely Chr’s own elaboration in keeping with his theological interests. This can be particularly observed in the phrase immediately following the announcement of Jehoram’s death that states that ‘his people did not make for him a burning like the burning for his ancestors’ (ךְַ֛לֹּא עָלָֽם לְעָלָם אַחֵ֖ריָּֽי). For a similar elaboration, only in an opposite direction, one may turn to Chr’s account of the death and burial of Asa. In 2Chr 16:14 we read that Asa was laid on a bier filled with spices and further that they ‘made a very great burning for him’ (كةַ֥ר הַיָּֽאָרָֽי הָֽוָֽאָרָֽי). These are representatives of Chr’s greater freedom in dealing with death and burial formulae from his source. More such instances are observed further below.

The second element of death and burial formula pertaining to the notice of the burial itself includes the obvious term כַּ֚בֵּר ‘to bury’ accompanied by phrases כַּ֚בְּרָה מָ֚יָּה ‘with his fathers’, כַּ֚בְּרָה מָ֚יוֹת ‘in his tomb’, כְּבַ֚רַת בָּ֚יָּה ‘in the garden of his house’ and the like. The verb כַּ֚בֵּר is encountered within the burial notices of both Kings and Chronicles in two different themes, in qal (כַּבַּר) and niphal (כָּבָּר). Although there is no precise scheme discernible in the use of the verbal pattern of כַּ֚בֵּר within the burial notices, Kings shows a greater predilection towards the use of niphal while Chronicles employs qal in most cases.89

88 For the view that Chr drew on older traditions for composition of his Sondergut in Jehoram’s story see e.g. Rudolph (1955:265-69), Myers (1965:123), Williamson (1982a:303-9), Dillard (1987:164), Japhet (1993:805-18), though there are marked differences in degree to which these scholars attribute Chr’s special material on Jehoram to older sources. For the view of Chr’s Sondergut regarding Jehoram being purely his own creation see Begg (1989:35-51).

89 See more on this Smit (1966:173-74), who notes that Kings favours the use of niphal in eleven cases against five with qal, while Chronicles prefers qal in twelve cases against three in niphal. A further complicating issue is the rendering of כַּ֚בֵּר in the versions, as Macy (1975:139) notes: ‘the Gk
However, these are not the only specifics in each book relating to a burial notice. In Kings the verb יָבַשׁ is accompanied on a number of occasions, but to a various degree in LXX and MT, by the phrase רָאָשׁ עַל. Turning to Chronicles, the phrase רָאָשׁ עַל following יָבַשׁ occurs less often, while on the other hand this book elaborates to a greater extent on the place of burial. Typical for these elaborations within Chronicles are the phrases employing the noun יָבַשׁ 'tomb'. Accordingly, one reads about Asa that he was buried ‘in the tomb he had hewn out for himself’ (2Chr 16:14), Jehoram and Joash that they were buried ‘not in the tombs of the kings’ (2Chr 21:20; 24:25), Ahaz not ‘in the tombs of kings of Israel’ (2Chr 28:27) and Hezekiah that he was buried ‘on the ascent to the tombs of the sons of David’ (2Chr 32:33). It may be, as Provan (1988:137) suggests, that the phrases יָבַשׁ עַל-רָאָשׁ (2Chr 21:20; 24:25), יָבַשׁ עַל רֵעֵהוּ (2Chr 28:27), יָבַשׁ עַל רָאָשׁ (2Chr 32:33) in Chronicles additional material and the expression יָבַשׁ עַל-רָאָשׁ relating to Josiah in 2Chr 35:24 refer to one and the same place for which Chr uses different names. This would correlate with the observation made earlier of Chr’s particular method of using slightly different expressions for one and the same referent. In the study of referral formulae (p. 41) it was noted that Chr used a variety of names when referring to a composition of general character as a source of information on kings’ reigns.

Regarding the third element of death and burial formula, the geographic location of burial, Chr again accords himself greater latitude in handling this part of the burial notice. In Kings the actual site of burial for Judean monarchs from Rehoboam to Ahaz is commonly designated to be ‘the city of David’ (תֵּרֵס) and for Manasseh and Amon ‘the garden of Uzza’ (וֹזָר). While in Chronicles וֹזָר is nowhere mentioned, the book is quite consistent in denoting the place of burial for kings of earlier period, similarly as in Kings, to be תֵּרֵס or its equivalents תֵּרֵס (2Chr 25:28MT) and תֵּרֵס (2Chr 28:27MT). In two instances,

traditions of Kg and Chr also show no clear pattern in the use of conjugations and sometimes even contradict their Hebrew predecessors.

90 In Kings, יָבַשׁ is used in burial notices of only three kings, Ahaziah (2Kgs 9:28), Amon (2Kgs 21:26) and Josiah (2Kgs 23:30), of which the last one is shared with Chronicles (2Kgs 23:30/2Chr 35:24). On the use of nominal forms יָבַשׁ and רָאָשׁ see discussion in Fabry (TDOT 12:492) and Michel (1977:54-56).

91 There are only few differences among ancient witnesses. Some Greek mss together with LXX read that Hezekiah (2Kgs 20:21) and Josiah (2Kgs 23:30) were buried ‘in the city of David’ (ἐν πόλει Δαοῦ), and further LXX notes concerning Jehoiakim (2Kgs 24:6) that he was buried ‘in the garden of Uzza’ (ἐν καταφύγιοι Οζᾶ).

92 LXX in both 2Chr 25:28 and 28:27 has ‘the city of David’. According to Allen (1974a:210; 1974b:98) the LXX reading ἐν πόλει Δαοῦ in the former verse is original (דָּוָא הָיְפֻס in 25:28 is, thus, the case of Hebrew substitution: ‘The error surely came about by confusion with דָּוָא הָיְפֻס v. 13’.
in which Kings refers to the burial place of Judean kings as being עֵדֶת דֶּרֶך, however, Chronicles substitutes this part with his own substantial elaboration that in both cases involves direct speech: 2Chr 22:9b states regarding king Ahaziah that ‘they buried him for they said: “He is the son of Jehoshaphat, who sought YHWH with all his heart”’ (יִכְרָבָה מִן אֶתְנָר פִּיקְרָהָה וַהוּ אֶתְנָר דֶּרֶךְ עֵדֶת דֶּרֶך); and 2Chr 26:23 reports with reference to Uzziah that ‘they buried him with his fathers in the burial field that belonged to the kings for they said: “He is leprous’ (יִכְרָבָה אֵת עֵמֶאֶת מֶשֶׁר הָכֹלָה).}

A conclusion may be drawn from the above analysis with regard to the accounts of deaths and burials of Judean kings in the two biblical histories that in a number of cases Chronicles is more elaborate and specific in its notices on monarchic deaths and burials in comparison with Kings. The character of many details related to burial acts in Chronicles discloses a greater role being played by its author in supplementing and expanding the death and burial formulae from the earlier source material.\(^93\)

The death and burial formulae feature in some discussions relating to the development of the book of Kings, which merits close inspection. Among those who argue for the early edition of Kings ending with the account of Hezekiah, Provan (1988:134-38) offers in support the observation that the phrases ‘buried with his fathers’ (יִכְרָבָה עֵמֶאֶת) and ‘in the city of David’ (עֵמֶאֶת עֵמֶאֶת) appear in the regnal formulae of Judean kings till the account of Ahaz but not thereafter. Similarly Halpern and Vanderhoof (1991:183-97) contend that since death and burial formulae for Judean kings up to Ahaz are consistent in referring to burial with one’s fathers in the city of David, they are the creation of one author who worked in Hezekiah’s time. These arguments, however, rely a great deal upon the MT and do not sufficiently appreciate the relative worth of variant readings among ancient witnesses. When the MT is placed alongside other ancient versions, such as LXX\(^B\) and LXX\(^L\), it reveals that there are differences between these ancient witnesses as regards the construction מָלְאָכָה נַחָלָהוֹ following כֶּרֶב in the formula of every third king

---

\(^93\) This has been noted in studies by e.g. Macy (1975:142-44); Halpern and Vanderhoof (1991:238 n. 146). Cf. the view of Dillard (1987:172) who contends that Chr uses ‘his reports of the death and burial of the kings to show his approval or disapproval of their reigns.’
from Rehoboam to Hezekiah.94 Worth mentioning, for example, is the burial notice of Ahaziah (2Kgs 9:28) who is noted to be buried ‘in his tomb with his fathers’ (דָּבָר נֵכְדֵא עֲמֵנָיו) in the MT but only ‘in his tomb’ (דָּבָר נֵכְדֵא) in LXX\(b\) and LXX\(d\). Halpern and Vanderhoft (1991:191 n. 26) devise a case of haplography in the Vorlage of Greek texts in 2Kgs 9:28. However, it is more probable that the MT is expansive in this instance, appending דָּבָר נֵכְדֵא to the statement in the death and burial formula that had already mentioned Ahaziah’s final resting place.95 The reading of LXX\(d\) pertaining to Jeboiahim in 2Kgs 24:6 (see also 2Chr 35:24LXX), although being debated whether it is original or secondary,96 is representative of the phrase יָרָתַתְיו being employed in the regnal formulae of Judean kings even after the account of Ahaz. The fact that this particular instance is discussed in scholarly literature as regards to its genuineness97 does not make the issue regarding the use of יָרָתַתְיו in burial notices easier. In view of these observations, therefore, the opinion that takes יָרָתַתְיו simply as the author’s means of distinguishing between different literary layers of Kings is not compelling. Moreover, in light of the variety of the use of יָרָתַתְיו evinced among ancient witnesses, some Kings commentators contend that this phrase following יִהְיֶה should be understood as belonging to a scribal convention rather than being an authorial formulation.98 It may be significant in this regard to note that Chronicles, where it does not include its special material in the death and burial formulae, introduces the phrase יָרָתַתְיו after יִהְיֶה less often than Kings.99

A different situation obtains relating to the phrase דָּבָר נֵכְדֵא ‘in the city of David’ also used in the argument for Hezekiah’s edition of Kings. Regarding the usage of this expression there is considerable agreement among ancient witnesses of Kings as the phrase is consistently employed in the death and burial formulae of Judean

94 More precisely, the accounts of five kings out of twelve differ with regard to the distribution of the phrase יָרָתַתְיו following יִהְיֶה in their burial notices; see the table on the following page.
95 Cf. the reading יָרָתַתְיו in the burial notices of Amon and Josiah in 2Kgs 21:26 and 23:30. (But note also LXX\(d\) referring to burial ‘in the tomb of his father’ regarding Amon in 2Kgs 21:26, and MT having יָרָתַתְיו regarding Josiah in 2Chr 35:24.)
96 See e.g. Benzing (1899:197); Nelson (1981:86); Würtzwein (1984:469) who regard the LXX\(d\) reading to be original, while e.g. Montgomery (1951:553), Seitz (1989:106), Na’aman (2004:246) to be secondary.
97 See acute comment by Seitz (1989:106 n. 4) over scholarly disagreements regarding LXX\(d\) of 2Kgs 24:6: ‘Lucian can be considered lectio difficilior by one group of scholars and an accurate supplement by another.’
98 See e.g. Stade and Schwall (1904:139, 142-43). Cf. Montgomery (1951:273, 279) and Würtzwein (1985:181 n. 4) who, for example, takes יָרָתַתְיו in 1Kgs 14:31MT as a case of ditography.
99 See 2Chr 12:16//1Kgs 14:31; 2Chr 27:9//2Kgs 15:38 and 2Chr 13:23//1Kgs 15:8 LXX.
### Distribution of יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד 'With His Fathers' Following יָרָכֶנ in Death and Burial Formulae of Kings of Judah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>MT Kgs</th>
<th>LXX(^b) Kgs</th>
<th>LXX(^c) Kgs</th>
<th>MT Chr</th>
<th>LXX(^b) Chr</th>
<th>LXX(^c) Chr</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>1Kgs 14:31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 12:16 Rehoboam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijam</td>
<td>1Kgs 15:8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 13:23 Abijam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>1Kgs 15:24</td>
<td>(spec material)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(spec material)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(spec material)</td>
<td>Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehosaphat</td>
<td>1Kgs 22:51</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 21:1 Jehosaphat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td>2Kgs 8:24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 21:20 Jehoram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah</td>
<td>2Kgs 9:28</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 22:9 Ahaziah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joash</td>
<td>2Kgs 12:22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 24:25 Joash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>2Kgs 14:20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2Chr 25:28 Amaziah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2Chr 26:23 Uzziah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:38</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(spec material)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(spec material)</td>
<td>Jotham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 27:9 Ahaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>2Kgs 20:21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2Chr 28:27 Hezekiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>2Kgs 21:18</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>2Chr 33:20 Manasseh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>2Kgs 21:26</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>2Chr 35:24 Josiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>2Kgs 23:30</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>(יְהַבֵּס יַעֲבֵד)</td>
<td>2Chr 36:8 Jehoiakim **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>2Kgs 24:6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2Chr 36:8 Jehoiakim **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* LXX\(^b\) lacks the whole phrase 'he was buried with his fathers' in 1Kgs 16:28h.
** The Greek translator in 2Chr 36:8 appears to follow a Hebrew Vorlage also underlying the Lucianic text of 2Kgs 24:6; see Allen (1974:216 n. 5).

NB: There is no death and burial formula for the exiled kings Jehohaz, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah in Kings and Chronicles, for Amon in Chronicles and for Jehoiakim in MT Chronicles and 1Esdras.
monarchs until Ahaz. After the account of this king the phrase may be found only among some Greek witnesses, including LXX, pertaining to closing formulae of kings Hezekiah and Josiah. Similarly, there is greater consistency in the way the phrase תֵּאָשָׂא (or its equivalents לִחְשָׁא or לִשָּׁא) are employed in the closing formulae of Judean kings until Ahaz in Chronicles. As noted above, only in two instances is the reference to the place of burial for kings reigning between Rehoboam and Ahaziah absent from Chronicles: in 2Chr 22:9 regarding Ahaziah and in 2Chr 26:23 concerning Uzziah. In both cases the additional information provided by Chr is in accord with his own theological concerns.

Following Ahaz, the references to the burial place of Hezekiah vary among biblical texts in that MT Kings has no record about his burial, while LXX and some other Greek manuscripts of 2Kgs 20:21 mention that Hezekiah was buried בֵּין הָעָרֶשׁ הַמֵּאָרֶשׁ 'in the city of David' and 2Chr 32:33 refers to his burial בֵּין הָעָרֶשׁ הַמֵּאָרֶשׁ 'on the ascent to the tombs of the sons of David'. This is not a place for a detailed discussion relating this textual diversity. More significant for our purposes are the references to the burial place of the ensuing king Manasseh, who is noted in 2Kgs 21:18 to have been buried בֵּין הָעָרֶשׁ הַמֵּאָרֶשׁ 'in the garden of his house in the garden of Uzza'. In 2Chr 33:20, the burial place of this king is stated as being רָבָּא 'in his house' (MT) or εν τοιαυτυ τοιαυτει 'in the garden of his house' (LXX). It emerges from this observation that Chr derives his information about Manasseh’s burial from a source significantly close to Kings at this point. The considerable affinity regarding the burial notice of Manasseh between Kings and Chronicles may militate against proposals of some scholars that Chr knew only Hezekiah’s edition of Kings. Rather, Chr’s major source relating to the divided monarchy followed through the accounts of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon, Josiah and probably the last four kings of Judah, but at the same time was different from the present book of Kings as it would not have included, for example, the names of queen mothers in the regnal resumés of the last few Judean kings. What about the change then of burial place in the account of Manasseh from being ‘the city of David’ in the accounts of Judean kings until Ahaz to now ‘(the garden of) his house (the garden of Uzza)” that is attested in both

100 See note 92 above on these variants in Chronicles.
101 The idea that Chr may have known only the edition of Kings which reached as far as Hezekiah is, for example, entertained by Provan (1988:141). Halpem (1981:35-54) on the one hand takes the view that Chr relied on an older Hezekian source but, on the other, allows that Chr was also familiar with Kings (1981:52), or more precisely with a Josianic edition of Kings (Halpem and Vanderhoof 1991:237-38).
Kings and Chronicles? Some scholars, most recently Na’aman (2004:245-54), propose that this change in written sources reflects the actual change in burial practice. Whatever the historical reality behind this alteration in sources may be, the argument for Hezekiah’s edition of Kings based on death and burial formulae may not be substantiated by the fact that the phrase לְעָצָתֵנִי מֵאָבֹתֵנוּ ‘with his fathers’ has a varied occurrence in ancient versions and therefore does not count as evidence.

3.8. Succession Formula

The regnal formulae in both Kings and Chronicles usually conclude the royal accounts with a statement on succession in a pattern as follows: יִשְׁלֹחֵן [PN] לְעָצָתֵנִי מֵאָבֹתֵנוּ. The divergences from this pattern may be observed in the succession formulae of kings Amaziah, Amon and Josiah, in which it is the populace installing a future king, and in the notices of exiled rulers Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim whose successors are installed by foreign monarchs.102

In each biblical history the regnal framework of one of the Judean kings has the anomaly of having two succession notices. Kings in the account of Amon includes next to the narration about installing his successor by יִשְׁלֹחֵן אֶל עָצָתֵנוּ מֵאָבֹתֵנוּ (2Kgs 21:24//2Chr 33:25) also the standard succession formula יִשְׁלֹחֵן אֶל עָצָתֵנוּ מֵאָבֹתֵנוּ (2Kgs 21:26). Chronicles, on the other hand, adds to the standard succession formula in the framework of Jehoram (2Chr 22:1b//2Kgs 8:24) the note about נִשְׂרָת הָעָרִים ‘inhabitants of Jerusalem’ appointing a new leader (2Chr 22:1a). The addition in Chronicles is usually taken to belong to a later development within this book, linked with Chr’s special material relating to the account of Arab raids (2Chr 21:16-17).

Turning to the story of Amon, the special case of two succession formulae in Amon’s regnal framework in Kings is often left unexplained, while much more discussion is directed towards explaining the absence of the second succession notice together with the referral formula and burial notice in Chronicles. Some scholars contend that Amon was simply unworthy of reference to his royal records and burial in the view of Chr,103 while others see a case of textual corruption caused by haplography (from יִשְׁלֹחֵן אֶל עָצָתֵנוּ מֵאָבֹתֵנוּ to יִשְׁלֹחֵן אֶל עָצָתֵנוּ מֵאָבֹתֵנוּ) in the account of Amon in

102 Amaziah (2Kgs 14:21//2Chr 26:1); Amon (2Kgs 21:24//2Chr 33:25); Josiah (2Kgs 23:30//2Chr 36:1); Jehoahaz (2Kgs 23:34//2Chr 36:4); Jehoiachin (2Kgs 24:17//2Chr 36:10). The Judean king Ahaziah has no succession formula which does not need explanation since the power in Judah after Ahaziah is usurped by Athaliah.
This attention to Chronicles, however, does not help in resolving the problem of double occurrence of a succession notice in the regnal resumé of Amon in Kings. Perhaps a fitting explanation for this may be found in the literary technique of ancient redactors/scribes of resumptive repetition. A later redactor of Kings, who noted missing a referral formula and burial notice in his source material on Amon, simply added these stereotyped parts of the regnal framework to his source. Following his added material he partly repeated the last phrase from the primary source to which he made an addition. Though haplography in Chronicles is an attractive possibility, resumptive repetition in Kings, seems to us better to account not only for the shorter closing formula of Amon in Chronicles, which could well be original, but also for an unusual double occurrence of a succession formula in Kings.

4. Concluding Remarks on Regnal Formulae

One or two conclusions can be made on the basis of the study of regnal formulae. First there are clear differences in the portrayal of some parts of these formulae between Kings and Chronicles, but only few of these differences can be attributed to Chr's theological interests. These interests have been mostly observed in Chronicles in the expanded death and burial formulae. In some of the differences between the two biblical books in their regnal formulae of Judean kings it is not immediately obvious, whether these are to be attributed to the author of Chronicles or whether they originated with redactional or scribal activity in the text of Kings. Others, however, clearly point to Chr having a Vorlage different from the present book of Kings. This has been observed for example in the instances of queen mother formulae, where it has been suggested that Chr's source text did not include these formulae in the accounts of the later Judean kings. This finding is close to Macy's conclusions who contended that Chr used an earlier 'Deuteronomistic source' common to both Kings and Chronicles rather than the canonical book of Kings for its chronological framework of kings' reigns.

Second, various observations so far in this chapter converged in the suggestion that the framework of the northern kings may be a later addition to Kings, not known

---

105 Macy (1975:171). Calling this early common material 'Deuteronomistic', Macy made this judgement primarily on the language of evaluative formulae 'to do right/evil in the eyes of Yahweh'. However, as we have shown above, this phraseology is not necessarily 'Deuteronomistic' but inherently belongs to the regnal framework of the two biblical histories.
to Chr from his source material. This was primarily demonstrated in Abijah’s formula occurring only in Kings and its connections with regnal resumés of northern kings, and in the term הָרָה also being present only in the regnal formulae of Judean monarchs in Kings and it having again connections with the framework of northern rulers. The language in synchronistic notices in Kings suggested to us that they may not be primary in Kings but rather are dependent on the very first synchronistic notice, which Kings shares with Chronicles. Our final chapter will take further the implications from the present study of regnal formulae in Kings and Chronicles with regard to the development of the material dealing with the northern kingdom occurring only in Kings. Thus far we have seen the regnal framework of Judean kings playing a significant part in texts shared by Kings and Chronicles. No less significantly, however, the accounts of royal cultic reforms feature in the two biblical histories. It is these accounts in the shared and non-shared material of Kings and Chronicles which are the focus of the following chapter.
CHAPTER TWO

Cultic Reform Accounts

Another set of passages deserving a closer look as suggested at the beginning of the preceding chapter is cultic reform accounts that deal with a destruction of religious objects and installations. These texts, describing an elimination of undesirable cultic entities, display common characteristics in the use of language that can be most clearly observed within the related synoptic material of Kings and Chronicles pertaining to the reforms of Judean kings.¹ There are four kings of Judah (Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah) and one priest (Jehoiada), who appear in the shared contexts of the two histories, to whom reforms are attributed. The reform notices of Asa (excepting 1Kgs 15:13//2Chr 15:16) and Jehoshaphat in Kings have fewer verbal correspondences with their counterparts in Chronicles, in comparison with those pertaining to Hezekiah and Josiah, and Jehoiada. Accordingly, the latter group with more significant links is studied first, being followed by an examination of the reform accounts of Asa and Jehoshaphat, before attention is paid in the final part to the reform accounts in the non-shared material of Kings and Chronicles.

1. Reform Accounts in Kings and Chronicles with More Significant Links

**Jehoiada**

1Kgs 11:18

וַיָּנָהֻּ הַכֹּהֵל וַיִּשְׁתָּחְצֵּרּוֹ הַמִּזְבַּח אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵדַע עַל הַמִּזְבַּח הַשִּׁבָּה הַשָּׁבָה [Qere=implies, הַמִּזְבַּח אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵדַע עַל הַמִּזְבַּח הַשָּׁבָה הַשָּׁבָה]

2 Chr 23:17

וַיָּנָהֻּ הַכֹּהֵל וַיִּשְׁתָּחְצֵּרּוֹ הַמִּזְבַּח אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵדַע עַל הַמִּזְבַּח הַשָּׁבָה הַשָּׁבָה

**Hezekiah**²

2Kgs 18:4

וַיָּנָהֻּ הַכֹּהֵל וַיִּשְׁתָּחְצֵּרּוֹ הַמִּזְבַּח אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵדַע עַל הַמִּזְבַּח הַשָּׁבָה הַשָּׁבָה [Qere=implies, הַמִּזְבַּח אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵדַע עַל הַמִּזְבַּח הַשָּׁבָה הַשָּׁבָה]

2 Chr 29-31

(2Chr 31:1)

וַיָּנָהֻּ הַכֹּהֵל וַיִּשְׁתָּחְצֵּרּוֹ הַמִּזְבַּח אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵדַע עַל הַמִּזְבַּח הַשָּׁבָה הַשָּׁבָה [Qere=implies, הַמִּזְבַּח אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵדַע עַל הַמִּזְבַּח הַשָּׁבָה הַשָּׁבָה]

¹ For a helpful discussion of some of the typical terminology occurring in the reform accounts see Barth (*TDOT* 10:110-11).

² The text related to Hezekiah’s reform in Chronicles is broader than the verse noted in the table. In general terms, chapters 29-31 of 2Chr are regarded as dealing with aspects of Hezekiah’s reform. The verse noted in the table above (31:1) has the most significant links with the version of Hezekiah’s reform in Kings and includes some of the most characteristic terminology of the reform reports shared by the two histories.
The table above exhibits frequently used stereotyped expressions related to a destruction of a cult. The verbs pro, mo and nia/ai:4 suggesting breaking, tearing and cutting down cultic installations are part of an essential vocabulary stock in the text of both Kings and Chronicles describing reformation activity associated with the priest Jehoiada and the kings Hezekiah, Josiah and (in part) Asa. Furthermore, these verbs can be found in the reform notices linked with the Judean leaders in the fixed phrases: nam pro (2Kgs 23:12; 2Chr 34:4,7); naaa mo (2Kgs 18:4//2Chr 31:1; 2Kgs 23:14) and rnox nia/ai: (2Kgs 18:4//2Chr 31:1; 2Kgs 23:14). This standard language pertaining to the reform accounts of synoptic contexts is usually considered, with regard to its presence in the book of Kings, as being tied to the Deuteronomistic mode of expression. Such a view seems to be underscored by the

---

3 Josiah’s reform spans across 2Kgs 23:4-20 and 2Chr 34:3-7. Only selected verses of these accounts are included in this table, namely the ones that most clearly display language that conforms to the overall pattern of typical phrases of reform accounts elsewhere in Kings and Chronicles.

4 The two terms pro and mo are used in the reform texts of Kings and Chronicles synonymously, which means that where Kings uses pro, Chronicles employs mo (2Kgs 18:4//2Chr 31:1; 2Kgs 23:14//2Chr 34:4,7). The only exception to this evenly divided usage seems to be 1Kgs 15:13/2Chr 15:16 where both Kings and Chronicles employ pro. But the circumstance of this parallel usage seems to be equally exceptional because pro is linked in these two almost identical verses with the specific term rnox, which is unique and does not occur in the rest of the Bible. The same phenomenon of evenly divided usage of pro and mo can be observed in comparable texts dealing with abolition of Canaanite worship in Exodus and Deuteronomy. Whereas Exod 34:13 employs pro, in similar contexts Deut 7:5 and 12:3 use mo.

5 See the table on these verbs and expressions in appendix A on p. 198.

6 On this see the comments made by commentators at various points of their exposition of the book of Kings; e.g. on the language of 2Kgs 18:4 being wholly ‘deuteronomistic’ see Long (1991:194), Hobbs (1985:252). Seow (1999:260) speaks in connection with the language of 2Kgs 18:4 about Hezekiah
occurrence of the very same expressions in the prescriptive texts of Deuteronomy (7:5; 12:3). More striking is the fact, however, that the characteristic language of the reform accounts, usually closely associated with the corpus of Deuteronomistic literature, is to be found utilized to a greater extent by Chr who adds the distinctive terminology of ‘breaking’ (ךַּתִּית) and ‘cutting down’ (ךַּפּוּת) to his account of Asa’s reform (2Chr 14:2), and in the additional תִּקְנֵהוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ (2Chr 31:1) adjusts in compliance with this language the text of Hezekiah’s cultic policies. Chr’s tendency towards an increased use of this stereotypical cult destruction terminology found in the reform reports of shared contexts by the two histories invites a question whether Chr was not indebted for this terminology only to these immediate reform accounts rather than to the wider Deuteronomistic corpus, stretching from Deuteronomy to 2Kings.

As has been noted, parallel terminology does occur in Deuteronomy (7:5 – כַּתִּית וַעֲשָׂרָה עַשְׂרֵין מְאֹד פָּזַע, כְּבָרָה מְאֹד פָּזַע וַעֲשָׂרָה מְאֹד פָּזַע; 12:3 – כַּתִּית וַעֲשָׂרָה עַשְׂרֵין מְאֹד פָּזַע). No less noticeable, however, is the presence of similar language elements in the book of Exodus (34:13 – כַּתִּית וַעֲשָׂרָה עַשְׂרֵין מְאֹד פָּזַע; cf. Exod 23:24 – only כַּתִּית וַעֲשָׂרָה). The passages with cult destruction terminology are part of wider literary units in Exodus (23:20-33; 32-34) and Deuteronomy (7; 12). And it is precisely between these texts, that the points of contact have more often been observed and discussed rather than between the passages with phraseology of cult destruction in Deuteronomy and Kings within what is usually taken by scholars to be one body of literature in the Old Testament, the so called Deuteronomistic historical work. An important factor for being ‘portrayed as being faithful to the deuteronomist law’. The strongest proponent of the Deuteronomistic factor in the stereotyped language of reform notices in Kings (and other historical books) is Hoffmann (1980), who in his study, devoted to the theme of cultic reform in the Deuteronomistic narrative, considers the Deuteronomist as an inventive author rather than the redactor of older sources in the Nothian sense.

Chr has been viewed in relation to the language of Asa’s reform measures in 2Chr 14:2 as the one ‘following the spirit of the Deuteronomist precept in Deut 7:5’ (Japhet 1993:706), or as the one who ‘expounded [גרה] in terms familiar from Deuteronomy 7’ (Auld 1994:90). Despite obvious similarities with Deut 7:5 (and 12:3) we believe such statements, noting exclusively parallels between Chronicles passage and Deuteronomy, may give misleading impressions about the relations between these texts. Chr indeed expands an originally briefer passage, but rather in terms familiar from shared accounts with Kings, since there are equally (or even more) significant parallels with 2Kgs 18:4//2Chr 31:1. Note e.g. the term כְּבָרָה occurring in both 2Kgs 18:4//2Chr 31:1 and Chr’s expansion in 2Chr 14:2 which Deuteronomy does not know.

Discussions centre around the nature and origin of so-called ‘deuteronomist’ elements in the first four books of the Pentateuch. The crucial passages in Exodus which show some affinity with the style, language and thought of Deuteronomy are Exod 12:24-27a, 13:3-16; 20:1-17, 23:20-33; 32-34 (Vervenne 1994:254). For Noth (1991:28 n. 1), these passages contained later insertions in a Dtr style. Perlitt (1969:219-22), however, considered it impossible to envisage a procedure by which sporadic insertions in a Dtr style would be made to the Tetrateuch. He argued for Deuteronomistic
considering the texts with cult destruction terminology in Exod 23:24, 34:13 and Deut 7:5, 12:3 together is that they exhibit a similar contextual background with stress being placed on the abolition of Canaanite worship. Formal aspects of the pericopes containing the language descriptive of cult destruction within these two books are also very similar. The compositional mode is that of speech: in Exod 23:24, 34:13 it is divine speech; in Deut 7:5; 12:3 it is speech of Moses. This is different from the reform accounts in Kings, where the terminology of cultic destruction occurs in a narrative, conveying the past. Such considerations may give support to the view that the typical phrases denoting destruction of cultic objects might have arisen first within the story of the monarchy depicting the reforms of Jehoiada, Hezekiah, Josiah (and partly Asa), and only at the subsequent phase have they been transposed to the context of warnings against the cultic practices of the Canaanites, finding their expression in the texts of Exod 23; 34 and Deut 7; 12. The thought of Levinson (1997:148) who contends that ‘the Deuteronomistic editors brand[ed] the Israelite cultic norms that they wish[ed] to abrogate as objectionable practices of the displaced Canaanites’ implying a late format in legal corpus is not in basic disagreement with our conclusion of cult-destruction language in Deuteronomy and Exodus being editorial and secondary to the original literary context in the story of the monarchy.

One may note that outside the royal narratives in Kings and Chronicles, a parallel terminology linked with destruction of cult occurs, in addition to texts in Deuteronomy and Exodus, in the story of Gideon (Judg 6). However, Eynikel (1996:252 n. 368) emphasizes that Judg 6:25-32 is closely related to the episode from the Elijah cycle in 1Kgs 18:20-40; he maintains that the Gideon story in Judges (against Hoffmann’s thesis) does not belong to the same authorial/redactional layer as the cult reform accounts in Kings (1996:252-53). Moreover, Auld (1989:257-67)

editing being more pervasive, penetrating the whole of the Tetrateuchal material. Brekelmans (1966:90-96) and Lohfink (1963:121-24) suggested the passages in Genesis-Numbers that resemble the language and thought of Deuteronomy to be called ‘proto-deuteronomic’, thus proposing an earlier dating for these texts compared with those in Deuteronomy. On the other side of the opinion pole on these matters are the views of e.g. Van Seters (1994:355) or Blum (1990:164) who regard so-called ‘deuteronomic’ elements in the Tetrateuch as post-deuteronomic reworkings by either a late Yahwist (Van Seters) or the editors of the D-Composition (Blum). In this debate a quest comes to the fore for solid criteria in establishing the ‘Deuteronomistic’ character of passages in the Tetrateuch. See in this regard studies by Ausloos (1997:47-56; 1998:77-89).


10 We have not attempted here to make judgments on the priority of texts between Exodus and Deuteronomy in this subsequent stage of literary development. On the relationship between the texts of these two books see the works cited above in note 8.
observes a number of links between the Gideon episode in Judg 6-8 and other biblical traditions, and suggests a late date for this narrative. Conclusions of both, Eynikel and Auld, would add to our contention that we may be dealing in the Gideon narrative, similarly as in Deuteronomy and Exodus but perhaps at yet another level, with secondary adaptation of cult-destruction terminology that had its primary occurrence in the reform accounts of the story of monarchy.

Likewise at a subsequent stage, but in a different manner from the literature of the legal corpus and from the Gideon episode, the book of Chronicles treats the specific terminology pertaining to the destruction of the cult. It has been observed that the phrases, which were first introduced in the reform accounts of the monarchy, are re-used by Chr in a way which expands and elaborates on these inherited narratives. The evidence of this was seen particularly in Chr’s reform reports of Asa and Hezekiah.

2. Reform Accounts in Kings and Chronicles with Fewer Correspondences

ASA
1Kgs 15:12  
2Chr 14:2  
2Chr 15:8

Jehosaphat
1Kgs 22:47  
2Chr 19:3

The texts which report the reforms of Asa and Jehoshaphat differ from those set forth in the previous section in that there are significantly less links between Kings and Chronicles in the portrayal of the reforms of these two kings. Moreover, the few terms that are shared cannot be identified with any of those noted previously in association with the activity of cult destruction.

In the examination of the reform notices pertaining to Asa and Jehoshaphat, questions concerning their location within the overall structure of Asa and Jehoshaphat narratives in the two histories, and the relationship between them in

---

11 One exception is 1Kgs 15:13//2Chr 15:16 where Kings and Chronicles portray in an almost identical terms Asa’s removal of his mother Maacah from the office and a destruction of her idol. We included this instance in the previous section (3.1.) together with the reform notices with more significant parallels.

12 Neither the verbs לָכַּה, נָכַה, מַלַּה, נָסַּה, מַסָּה, מַּסָּה are shared by Kings and Chronicles in their accounts of Asa (excepting 1Kgs 15:13//2Chr 15:16) and Jehoshaphat’s reforms.
Kings and Chronicles initially emerge. In what follows, an overview of the narrative sequence is provided for each king. Starting with Asa, the sequence of events regarding the reign of this king, as it is displayed in each history, is this: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1Kgs 15:9-11</th>
<th>Introductory notice</th>
<th>2Chr 13:23-14:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:12a</td>
<td><strong>Cultic reform notice</strong>&lt;br&gt;Further notice of reform&lt;br&gt;[Removal of high places]&lt;br&gt;Asa’s building activity&lt;br&gt;War with Zerah&lt;br&gt;Oracle of Azariah</td>
<td>2Chr 14:2&lt;br&gt;2Chr 14:3-4&lt;br&gt;2Chr 14:4 (cf. 2)&lt;br&gt;2Chr 14:5-6&lt;br&gt;2Chr 14:7-14&lt;br&gt;2Chr 15:1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:12b</td>
<td><strong>Reform notice</strong>&lt;br&gt;Covenant celebration</td>
<td>2Chr 15:8&lt;br&gt;2Chr 15:9-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:13</td>
<td><strong>Reform notice</strong>&lt;br&gt;Further measures related to cult&lt;br&gt;<strong>High places not removed</strong>&lt;br&gt;War with Baasha and its aftermath&lt;br&gt;Hamman’s oracle and Asa’s reaction&lt;br&gt;Concluding notices</td>
<td>2Chr 15:16&lt;br&gt;2Chr 15:17&lt;br&gt;2Chr 15:19-16:6&lt;br&gt;2Chr 16:7-10&lt;br&gt;2Chr 16:11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:14-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:16-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:23-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The account of Asa’s reform in both Kings and Chronicles immediately follows an introductory note regarding the king. In Chronicles, the reform notice is expanded by additional information and serves as an introduction to Chr’s own material related to Asa’s building programme, the war with Zerah, Azariah’s oracle, and covenant renewal. The second reform notice appears following Azariah’s oracle in this larger Chr’s expansion. After its departure from a shared introductory treatment of Asa’s reign with intervening non-synoptic material, Chronicles account rejoins Kings in its report of Asa’s removal of his mother Maacah and her cult. In Kings there is no such interruption and the notice of Maacah’s removal is a direct continuation of the reform notice made after the introduction to the king. 

Things are more complicated in relation to Jehoshaphat and the portrayal of his reign in both histories. First, there is no common ground between Kings and Chronicles in the context in which the reform notices occur in these two books; and second, there is a chronological divergence between the Septuagint and the Masoretic traditions concerning Jehoshaphat’s narrative seen in the occurrence of a doublet regnal summary of Jehoshaphat in the Greek text. The table detailing the events of Jehoshaphat’s reign is as follows:

---

13 In creating this table we were aided by a similar chart in Knoppers (1996:605).

14 Clearly, Asa’s reign is treated at much greater length in Chronicles than in Kings. Accordingly, scholars find several issues deserving attention when dealing with the longer account in Chronicles, most prominent among them (1) the question of sources, (2) the problem of chronology and (3) the issue of Chr’s themes characteristic of his theology. See Rudolph (1952:367-71); Dillard (1980:207-18); Williamson (1982a:255-58); Dillard (1987:115-17); Japhet (1993:702-5, 715-16, 731-32).
The treatments of Jehoshaphat in Kings and Chronicles differ from each other considerably. That is demonstrated not only in the amount of space devoted to this king but also in the broader literary contexts in which the story of Jehoshaphat occurs. In Kings, the wider setting of Jehoshaphat’s narrative is the interest in the Northern Kingdom (1Kgs 15:25 – 2Kgs 8:16). The more immediate context is the reign of Ahab (1Kgs 16:29 – 1Kgs 22). This is fittingly illustrated in the episode of Ahab’s and Jehoshaphat’s campaign against Ramoth-Gilead (1Kgs 22:1-40), where the background makes the ‘primary function of that narrative to account for Ahab’s death’15 – contrary to Chronicles (2Chr 18:1-19:3), where the same episode appears in a context that elucidates a moral evaluation of Jehoshaphat, describing his involvement in a foreign alliance as evil. Apart from this episode related to Jehoshaphat, the book of Kings contains the standard summary of Jehoshaphat’s reign (2Kgs 22:41-46, 51 MT, LXXB) with two additional notes (vv. 47-48 MT, LXXB) and the brief story of a maritime venture (vv. 49-50 MT, LXXB).16 Jehoshaphat’s regnal summary occurs in LXXB, also following 1Kgs 16:28, and Shenkel (1968:43-44) supposes this summary to be original in the old Greek text in

16 One other account in Kings mentions Jehoshaphat, the battle report in 2Kgs 3. However, there exists variation among ancient witnesses in relation to Jehoshaphat’s name in that his name is attested only in MT and LXXB but not in Lucanian texts. In LXXB the king of Judah is either anonymous, or identified as Ahaziah. Shenkel (1968:98-108) makes a convincing case that the king of Judah was originally in this chapter anonymous and that the insertions of proper names in both MT (together with LXXB) and the Lucianic text are later developments.
comparison to the one occurring in LXX\textsuperscript{18} in 1Kgs 22:41-51. Thus in the Hebrew chronology, Jehoshaphat’s summary appears after the concluding note on Ahab at the end of the Ahab narratives (1Kgs 22:40), while in the old Greek chronology, which Shenkel thinks to be primary, it comes right after the accession formula at the opening of the Ahab accounts (1Kgs 16:28).\textsuperscript{17} Notwithstanding the divergences in the location of the regnal summation of Jehoshaphat in the Hebrew and Greek texts of Kings, it is within this body of material commenting on the reign of Jehoshaphat (1Kgs 16:28a-h LXX\textsuperscript{B1}; 1Kgs 22:41-51 MT, LXX\textsuperscript{B}) that the reform notice of Jehoshaphat emerges in Kings’ history.

Both passages relating to Jehoshaphat in Kings – Ahab’s and Jehoshaphat’s expedition to Ramoth-Gilead (1Kgs 22:1-35) and the regnal summary with additional notes (1Kgs 22:41-51 MT, LXX\textsuperscript{B}) – have their counterparts in Chronicles (2Chr 18:1-34; 20:31-21:1) within Chr’s much extended coverage of Jehoshaphat’s reign (chaps. 17-20). A cult measure taken by Jehoshaphat is mentioned in Chronicles’ special material added to the episode of Jehoshaphat’s alliance with Ahab (2Chr 19:1-3).\textsuperscript{18} There the king’s reform activity is mouthed by the prophet Jehu ben Hanani (19:3) as a positive thing balancing Jehoshaphat’s failure in entering into a foreign alliance. The location of the reform notice in Jehu’s speech that is Chr’s own ending to the Ramoth-Gilead incident shared with Kings, however, is highly suspect. The notice originally belonged somewhere else. The regnal resumé relating to Jehoshaphat’s career as witnessed by Kings may well have provided that original setting for the notice. In a similar way as in the account concerning Asa where Chr split Asa’s reform notice into two (2Chr 14:2; 15:8) and inserted his own material in between, so also here Chr adjusts the reform notice of Jehoshaphat, transferring it from its original setting in Jehoshaphat’s regnal summary to serve his purpose in associating it with the end of the Ramoth-Gilead story.

It might be relevant at this point to remark on another feature common to Chr’s coverage of Judean kings Jehoshaphat and Asa. In both accounts pertaining to these kings Chr includes mention of the implementation of cultic reform with regard to high places. The note concerning the removal of high places appears in Chr’s text dealing with Asa and Jehoshaphat near the beginning in each of their accounts by Chr (2Chr 14:4 [cf. v.2]; 17:6). Interestingly enough, it is only in connection with

\textsuperscript{17} For more detailed discussion of these two versions see Shenkel (1968:43-60).

\textsuperscript{18} The notice is repeated with some language variation and an addition of the note concerning the removal of high places in 2Chr 17:6.
these two kings – in contrast to the book of Kings – that a note occurs in Chronicles that ‘the high places were not removed’ (2Chr 15:17; 20:33). More space will be devoted to this phenomenon later. For the moment we will return to the issue of the placement of Asa and Jehoshaphat’s reform notices.

An initial, only a cursory, look at the location of the reform notices in the texts of Kings and Chronicles related to the two Judean kings, and that of Jehoshaphat in particular, may not offer much in terms of seeing the close parallels between the notices in the two histories. In fact, in the case of Jehoshaphat the divergent location of the mention of Jehoshaphat’s cultic reform in Kings and Chronicles has often resulted in commentators on these texts not noticing the link between the two at all. That there is a relation, however, can be most strongly demonstrated by the special use of terminology, particularly the choice of verbs that are shared by the two books in these notices.

The account of the reform of Asa in 1Kgs 15:12 involves two verbs, רכז and רמ. Both terms are equally significant in the description of the reforms in Chronicles, רכז occurring in 2Chr 15:8 and רמ in 2Chr 14:2. Besides these two verbs, Chronicles does not employ any other verb depicting the reform in these two verses, apart from those appearing in the imported expression יִֽעֲשׂה יִֽשָּׁר אָתָּה הִתֵּשֶׁב אֶל מִצְוֹת אֱלֹהִים (2Chr 14:2b). The term רכז in the hiphil stem, as has been observed, is uniquely used within Kings (in 1Kgs 15:12) as well as within Chronicles (in 2Chr 15:8) in the context of cult destruction. רמ in the hiphil, employed in 1Kgs 15:12 and 2Chr 14:2, occurs more frequently denoting removal of objects associated with cult in each of the two histories and the contexts in Kings and Chronicles are occasionally slightly more varied. Still, the presence of רמ in 1Kgs 15:12 and 2Chr 14:2 features significantly, alongside רכז in 1Kgs 15:12 and 2Chr 15:8, establishing a definite link between Kings and Chronicles in these reform passages.

Not altogether dissimilar is the situation relating to the account of Jehoshaphat’s reform in the two histories. Again, it is particularly a verb, in this case the verb רמ in piel, that is shared by 1Kgs 22:47 and 2Chr 19:3. Also this term,

---

19 See e.g. commentaries by Japhet (1993) or Williamson (1982a).
20 Hoffmann (1980:88); Auld (1994:90). Auld notes that the verb רכז in the hiphil is reserved elsewhere in Kings only for ‘a fire rite’ associated with children. Few of these instances have their parallels in Chronicles too; see the table on רכז in appendix B on p. 199. Outside 1Kgs 15:12//2Chr 15:8, there seems to be only one other occurrence of רכז (hif) in a cult destruction context – in Zech 13:2.
21 See the table on רמ in appendix B on p. 199.
conveying a sense of the elimination of entities linked with cult, has a rather distinctive appearance in these two segments. 22 The verb might have been used once more in a generally parallel context of Kings and Chronicles, in texts dealing with Josiah’s reform — 2Kgs 23:24 (버郴א יַכְּמֶד ...,ָּשָׁלַת וְשָׁבַ תֹּהַת) and 2Chr 34:6 — if we allow for the commonly accepted conjecture in a difficult Chronicles passage, reading מירבד instead of מירבד (Ketib) or מירבד (Qere). 23

Another indication of the close relationship between the cultic renovation passages in the two histories pertaining to Asa and Jehoshaphat is the usage of the phrase יָבֶא לַשׁ. This expression forms a tie with the verb יָבֶא in Asa’s reformation texts (1Kgs 15:12; 2Chr 15:8 — יָבֶא לַשׁ), as well as with the verb יָבֶא in Jehoshaphat’s reform notices (1Kgs 22:47; 2Chr 19:3). What is further significant to note is that the usage of יָבֶא לַשׁ in relation to the verbs of cult elimination is a rather distinctive feature of these reform notices. 24 That is yet another indication that the texts dealing with the measures undertaken by Asa, and also by Jehoshaphat, in Kings and Chronicles are undoubtedly related.

The major point of divergence between the two histories in their reform accounts of Asa and Jehoshaphat lies in the use of terms denoting entities associated with cultic practices. Passages in Kings that portray the reforms of Asa and Jehoshaphat use קֵשׁ (1Kgs 15:12; 22:47) and לַשׁ (1Kgs 15:12), terms that are not found in Chronicles. On the other hand, Chronicles, besides its use of more common קֵשׁ (2Chr 14:2) and לַשׁ (2Chr 19:3), employs מַשְׁמַר (2Chr 14:2), an expression that never occurs in cultic contexts in Kings, and מַשְׁמַר (2Chr 15:8).

22 יָבֶא (pi) ‘remove, destroy, exterminate’ occurs in the shared context of Kings and Chronicles only in 1Kgs 22:47 and 2Chr 19:3, and perhaps in 2Kgs 23:24 and 2 Chr 34:6 (see below n. 23). It has further occurrences in Kings non-synoptic material in the context of judgment oracles relating to Northern kingdom (1Kgs 14:10MT; 16:3 [some Mss; otherwise hif]; 21:21). See the table on יָבֶא in appendix B on p. 199.
23 MT text seems corrupt near the end of 2Chr 34:6. The reading מַשְׁמַר תֹּהַת of Codex Leningradensis differs from other Mss manuscripts which have מַשְׁמַר תֹּהַת in Ketib (see BHK). Qere, which differs from Ketib in word division, reads מַשְׁמַר תֹּהַת, while Septuagint’s τὸς τὸνος αὐτῶν may suggest as its Vorlage מַשְׁמַר תֹּהַת (a case of metathesis). (However, some contend that such an inference may not be warranted, since τὸς τὸνος αὐτῶν could have been translator’s rendering of an obscure text. In support of this view comes the fact that τὸνος does not render תֹּהַת in 2Chr 29:4; 32:6 — the two places with תֹּהַת occurrence in Chronicles). Perhaps the best suggestion to account for corruption in Ketib reading מַשְׁמַר תֹּהַת is offered by Seeligmann (1961:202 n. 1), who sees the case of confusion in the interchange between the laryngeal letters y and n. He thus reads מַשְׁמַר תֹּהַת — an emendation that is accepted by many commentators and also here.
24 The only other passage in Kings and Chronicles, where יָבֶא (בֶּא) occurs in connection with the verb of cultic destruction is 2Chr 34:33.
which has only a single appearance of its plural form in the other history (2Kgs 23:13).  

In scholarly discussions, most attention from all the above mentioned cultic terminology has been paid to the term יָשְׁרָפִיל in the context of debates on Kings and Chronicles histories. It is our contention that in these debates it has been somewhat overstated that Chr was especially careful to avoid any mention of יָשְׁרָפִיל in his record at every single point where the Kings text preserves this term (1Kgs 14:23, 15:12; 22:47 and 2Kgs 23:7). The reference to יָשְׁרָפִיל in 1Kgs 14:24 is made in the paragraph treating Judah's cultic abuses during the reign of Rehoboam (1Kgs 14:22b-24) that includes the whole range of cultic installations and entities; יָשְׁרָפִיל figures only as one component within a whole passage that is completely absent from in Chronicles. The verse 2Kgs 23:7 in which יָשְׁרָפִיל occurs is in association with some kind of structures in the house of Yahweh doomed to destruction, and also in association with the Asherah cult and women weavers, has often been found problematical. It is of interest to note, in addition to this text's complexity, that it is again rather the whole cluster of sentences and phrases within which יָשְׁרָפִיל emerges in the expansive story of Josiah's reform in Kings, which is not found in Chronicles. Drawing on these observations, it becomes apparent that there are only two contexts with an יָשְׁרָפִיל occurrence in Kings that have relatively close counterparts in Chronicles in which this term does not occur. These are the texts under our discussion associated with Asa and Jehosaphat's reforms (1Kgs 15:12; 22:47). And it may be that only in relation to these two accounts may we speak of Chr's omission of יָשְׁרָפִיל per se. In 2Chr 15:8 יָשְׁרָפִיל is replaced by רַעְשָׁן, the expression reserved for cultic objects rather than cultic personnel, and in 2Chr 19:3 by רַעְשָׁן, the term used once more by Chr in his material on Jehoshaphat (2Chr 17:6). Analogous to Chr's introduction of רַעְשָׁן in 19:3 (replacing יָשְׁרָפִיל) following its appearance in his own material (17:6) is his use of רַעְשָׁן in 2Chr 14:2 in substitution for יָשְׁרָפִיל, which appears also (with little difference as רַעְשָׁן) in his own special material relating to Manasseh (2Chr 33:15).

25 On distribution of all these terms, see the table in appendix C on pp. 200-202.
26 It is quite possible that there was one more instance of יָשְׁרָפִיל in the text of Kings originally, in 2Kgs 23:24. The LXX version of 2Chr 35:19 that is closer to Kings in this particular verse, mentions יָשְׁרָפִיל; Klein (1967:93 n. 4) proposes that LXX of 2Chr 35:19 reflects an early text of 2Kgs 23:24.
27 Cf. Auld (1994:89) who in the context of this discussion considers the Kings plus in 1Kgs 14:22b-24 as an expansion within the developing book of Kings not known to Chr.
Although the reform accounts of Asa and Jehoshaphat occur in different places within the narratives of Kings and Chronicles pertaining to these two kings, their relationship can be firmly established. The link between them is not to be viewed in terms of shared stock expressions of reform reports as has been the case with the reform notices in the previous section, but in terms of a shared distinct use of verbs and a particular adverbial phrase. The original location of the reform notices concerning the two kings seems to be better preserved by the book of Kings, while a greater rearrangement occurred on the side of Chr who in one instance split the notice inserting his own material in between and in the other transposed the notice to another setting using it there for his theological purpose.

3. Reform Accounts in Non-shared Material of Kings and Chronicles

In the book of Kings, two cultic reform notices occur within the scope of texts which have their focus on the kings of the northern kingdom, and therefore they do not appear in the other history. The notices pertain to the northern kings Jehoram and Jehu, and will be dealt with here consecutively.

**JEHORAM**

2Kgs 3:2

The short reform notice of Jehoram is found within the regnal formula relating to this king in 2Kgs 3:1-3. The LXX has a double reading of the regnal formula for Jehoram, which appears following the concluding notice on the reign of Ahaziah (2Kgs 1:18a-d). The whole passage in the Greek doublet differs in several details from the text placed in 2Kgs 3:1-3; and it has been a matter of some discussion whether the Greek passage in 2Kgs 1:18a-d preserves an earlier stage in the development of the book of Kings, or whether it is a result of a secondary arrangement within the textual tradition represented by the Septuagint. Shenkel (1968:68-72) analyzed in detail the regnal formulae for Jehoram in 2Kgs 1:18a-d (LXX B) and 3:1-3 (LXX B, MT), and concluded that LXX B of 2Kgs 3:1-3 reflects the Kaige revision bringing the text into greater conformity with MT, whereas the LXX B of 2Kgs 1:18a-d points to a non Kaige-revised text that preserved an Old Greek

---

29 The name occurs with variation as Jehoram (e.g. in 2Kgs 1:17; 3:1, 6) or in a contracted form as Joram (e.g. 8:16, 25, 28). For convenience, the longer form Jehoram that appears in regnal formula (2Kgs 3:1) is used throughout this chapter.
reading with a Hebrew Vorlage other than the Masoretic text. Stade and Schwally (1904:181), who likewise understood the Greek text in 2Kgs 1:18a-d as preserving an older version of the regnal formula, have already indicated, for example, that the LXX’s reading καὶ ἔθημαθη ὅργη κύριος (+ ἡ π’ αὐτῷ καὶ LXX¹) ἐπιλέξει τὸν οἶκον Αχαμαβ in 2Kgs 1:18d, which does not occur in 2Kgs 3:3, may have been ‘an original element of the text’ and not a later expansion.30

When we turn to the reform notice pertaining to Jehoram that is of immediate concern we may also observe a difference in the two versions of this notice. In both, 2Kgs 1:18c (LXX) and 2Kgs 3:2 (LXX/MT), the removal (τε) of the pillar(s) of Baal is noted. To this, however, the Greek text of 1:18c additionally reads καὶ συνέτρυψεν αὐτάς. It is difficult to judge on the basis of limited evidence whether καὶ συνέτρυψεν αὐτάς (= τοῦ ἑλέους) was part of an original reading, or whether this was the work of a later editorial hand in order to bring the reform text of Jehoram into greater conformity with other reform passages.31 While it is true that τεμεῖο does not occur anywhere else linked with τε ‘to remove’, this noun in the reform texts is mainly attested in conjunction with τεμεῖο to ‘break’.32 And as we shall see later, such a connection occurs also in the double reading of LXX¹ and VL in the text pertaining to the reform of Jehu.

The notice of Jehoram’s reform is closely tied with the subject of Baal worship which features significantly in the record of the Omride dynasty and in the narrative of Jehu’s reign. Ahab, Omri’s son, is first said to have promulgated Baal’s cult in the northern kingdom. He erects an altar for Baal in the house of Baal which he built in Samaria (1Kgs 16:32) and makes an Asherah (1Kgs 16:33). Ahab’s sons succeeding him on the throne also engage in the matters related to the cult of Baal, though each of them differently: while Ahaziah is reported to serve and worship Baal (1Kgs 22:53), Jehoram, his brother, is mentioned to act in opposition to Baal’s cult (2Kgs 3:2). The Kings text reports that the worship of Baal in the northern kingdom is finally eliminated by Omri’s dynastic successor Jehu (2Kgs 10:18-28).

30 In addition to Stade and Schwally (1904:181) and Shenkel (1968:68-72), the view that the text of the Septuagint in 2Kgs 1:18a-d represents more original reading has been preferred by Benzinger (1899:128); Sanda (1912:18); Olmstead (1915:178-79; 209); Trebolle Barrera (1982a:21). For the opposite understanding see Kittel (1900:184, 191); Montgomery (1951:351); Hobbs (1985:3-4).
31 No agreement exists on this issue. Stade and Schwally (1904:181) in this case suggest that καὶ συνέτρυψεν αὐτάς is ‘a later expansion as in [MT 2Kgs] 23,14’ but see e.g. Timm (1981:38 n. 54) who thinks quite the opposite and submits that the statement in all likelihood is authentic. For further supporting evidence he refers to texts such as 2Kgs 18:4 or 23:14.
32 2Kgs 18:4/2Chr 31:1; 2Kgs 23:14; 2Chr 14:2; cf. Ex 23:24; 34:13; Deut 7:5; 12:3.
Leaving aside the account of the contest between Yahweh and Baal in the material of Elijah’s cycle (1Kgs 18-19; 2Kgs 1), in which the focus is more on the prophet Elijah than on the Israelite kings, an interesting observation can be made about the rest of the passages that deal with the topic of Baal’s cult in relation with Israelite kings. In these, the subject of religious practices related to the cult of Baal seems to have been developed into a chiastic structure.

A – Ahab introduced cult of Baal (1Kgs 16:31-33)  
B – Ahaziah worshipped Baal (1Kgs 22:54)  
B’ – Jehoram acted against Baal’s worship (2Kgs 3:2)  
A’ – Jehu eradicated cult of Baal (2Kgs 10:18-28)

Close links that have been observed between Ahab’s religious practices and those of Manasseh are discussed later (pp. 189-92), showing that Ahab’s narrative has been informed in this respect by Kings’ account of Manasseh, shared with Chronicles. The ramification of this is that the text of Jehoram’s reform, associated by the common theme of Baal worship with Ahab’s passage in 1Kgs 16:30-33, belongs most likely to the very same later redactional layer within Kings.

The reform notice of Jehu, which as we have seen is also closely tied with the subject of Baal worship, is discussed below.

**Jehu**

2Kgs 10:26-28

Jehu’s reform is encoded in a text, which has often been seen as problematical among textual and literary critics. The reform notice of Jehu is preceded by a passage (2Kgs 10:23-25) in which we already encounter difficulties of a text-critical nature.33 Focusing on vv. 26-28, a difficulty arises with the plural רָמוּנ (v. 26) in the majority of Hebrew manuscripts,34 which does not correspond with the singular ending of רָמוּנ in the same verse. On the other hand, a number of ancient versions and a few Hebrew manuscripts attest singular רָמוּנ (constr. state) in v. 26.35 Stade (1885:278) understood the plural רָמוּנ in v. 26 as a scribal error, but did not consider the

34 Cf. BHS and Kennicott (1776-80).  
35 2 mss read רָמוּנ in singular in v. 26 according to de Rossi (1784-88). With regard to Greek versions, Brooke-McLean-Thackeray (1930:334) mention that mss d e g h m n p q t v w z c 2 e 2 attest to רָמוּנ. The reading of singular is also supported by Armenian and Syro-hexaplar versions. LXX reads erroneously רָמוּנ which has been preserved in ‘uestem’ of VL and in ‘uestimenta’ of Ethiopian version; see Trebolle Barrera (1982b:200 and n. 9).
synchronous an original reading either. Arguing that נראיה, a stone object, cannot be burned ( behaves), he suggested reading נראיה for נראיה in the Hebrew text. Stade’s emendation of נראיה, favoured by a number of exegetes, has been challenged by Gray (1970:558) who insists on retaining the term נראיה on the basis that (1) the etymology of נראיה signifies merely a standing object, which says nothing about its material substance, (2) even if נראיה does designate a stone object, the efficient method of breaking down the large piece of stone was to subject it to fire and then pour cold water over it. Gray’s only suggestion then is to read in v. 26 a singular נראיה instead of the plural נראיות, in agreement with the versional evidence.38

The passage that follows in v. 27, which reads נראיתו Feminine Singular, has often been viewed as a repetition of what was said immediately before in v. 26, or as a doublet of the phrase immediately following that reads נראיתו Feminine Singular. This has led to further suggestions of corrections to the text, particularly in the light of another occurrence of נראיתו in v. 27 and a double occurrence of נראיה in that same verse.39

Relating to the term נראיתו in v. 27 there is again a discrepancy among ancient witnesses concerning the singular and plural forms. The majority of Hebrew mss have the singular נראיתו, but LXX and a few Hebrew mss attest to a plural form.40 Since נראיתו occurs in v. 27 in a less usual conjunction with the term נבר, Stade (1885:279) suggested נראיתו in v. 27 be emended, reading נבר instead. This emendation has been more readily accepted by commentators in an attempt to resolve the problem of the double use of נבר/נראיתו in vv. 26, 27.42 Assuming נבר and


37 Another challenge questioning the motivation behind Stade’s emendation of נראיתו to נראיתו comes from arguments pointing to other biblical passages such as Ex 32:20; Deut 9:21; 1Kgs 15:13; 2Kgs 23:4, 11, 15, where objects are mentioned being burnt whose substance would have been inconsumable (Gugler 1996:194 n. 742 and Mulzer 1992:191 n. 616 following Hoffmann 1980:346). Begg (1985:208-9; 213-14) who looks at the very same problem in the story of golden calf (Ex 32:20) notes close parallels in this regard with Ugaritic material. On the basis of these close parallels he concludes that the problem of the ‘factual applicability of [destructive] actions to the object in question’ (1985:214) is an imaginary one.

38 Gray (1970:558). His proposal has been followed e.g. by Robinson (1976:101), Jones (1984:471), Fritz (1998:56) in more recent commentary also prefers the singular נבר.

39 See e.g. Klostermann (1887:426), Ehrlich (1914:304).

40 Kernicott (1776-80:660) notes 4 mss and de Rossi (1784-88) adds 2 other mss that read plural נבר. LXX3 has τὸς στὴράς (cf. LXX1 - πόσας τὸς στήρας).

41 See the table on נבר in appendix A on p. 198 for more typical combinations of words with נבר appearing in the context of cult destruction.

42 See, e.g., Benzinger (1899:154), Sanda (1912:117), Gray (1970:558), Robinson (1976:101-2), Jones (1984:471). In addition to these, Kittel (1900:242), Burney (1903:306) and Montgomery (1951:416) are sympathetic to the view that נבר is a likely reading in v. 27.
not ἵππος being originally used in the initial clause of v. 27, some scholars take the first clause as more genuine in comparison to the reading ἴππος Ἰάκωβος διήνυσσε, that follows after, since this second clause of v. 27 does not occur in LXXB. Others, however, point out that the absence of the phrase in LXXB can be explained in terms of parablepsis due to homoiooteleuton (ὕππος...ἵππος), thus weakening the argument which favors the first clause in v. 27 as being more original than the second one. Various propositions towards a solution of textual difficulties in vv. 26 and 27 having been noted thus far, it is apparent that the problem posed by the text of Jehu’s reform notice has not been satisfactorily settled.

A different approach to the text-critical problem of the passage dealing with Jehu’s reform from those mentioned above has been exemplified by Trebolle Barrera (1982b:198-209), who pays greater attention to the double readings in VL and LXXL. Analyzing data from Hebrew, Greek and Latin texts of 2Kgs 10:25b-28, he contends that the doublets in VL and LXXL involve two variant readings: one being identified by him as the proto-Lucianic reading and the other belonging to the Kaige recension (1982b:199-203). There are significant differences between VL and LXXL in their arrangement of the doublets. This leads Trebolle Barrera to conclude that VL juxtaposes the alternative variant of the Kaige recension to the proto-Lucianic text without making direct recourse to the double reading in LXXL, where the Kaige version is integrated with the proto-Lucianic reading rather smoothly (1982b:200).

It is further maintained by Trebolle Barrera that the proto-Lucianic text, with which the reading of Kaige recension was combined forming doublets independently in each, LXXL and VL, is the reading of Old Greek with a Vorlage different from the MT (1982b:200). According to this Old Greek reading, preserved in the LXXL and

42 Stade and Schwally (1904:233); Montgomery (1951:416); Trebolle Barrera (1982b:206).
44 VL (4Rg 25b-28): et percussit eos qui colebant bahal gladio et secivit templum bahal et accepit idolui bahal et contruuit eum et proiecit eum at sinistrâ templi et templu bahal posuit in sterculino et eradicauit templum bahal de israel et percussit eos qui scruebient bahal gladio et abierunt in ciuitatem praecursores et triari at domum bhal et profilerunt westem bhal et succederunt eam et detraxerunt titulos bhal et aus et domum eius euerturum et proiecerunt eam in sterculino et eradicauit ieu bhal de israel (Text taken from Fischer 1983:84.)
LXXL (4Rg 25b-28): καὶ ἔπαται νύμφη καὶ οἱ παρατάχθησαι καὶ οἱ τραπέζαι ἐν στάμναις ῥυμαίαις καὶ ἔρριψαν καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὡς τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἔξυραν τὴν στήλην τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ ἔξυραν τὴν στήλην τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ κατάεσαν τὰς στήλας τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ καθέλου ὡς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐδίδων· \textit{Iou} τὴν στήλην τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ καταετέραν αὐτὴν καὶ ἔρριψαν αὐτὴν ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλείου ἔδειξε ἐν καταράξει ἡγία τῆς ἱμηρίας τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ ἠδοτε τὸν βασιλείου καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἱερατή. (Text taken from Fernández Marcos & Busto Saiz 1992:113.)
VL at 2Kgs 10:25b-27, the action of the reform was performed solely by Jehu. His reforming acts according to the Old Greek text in view of Trebolle Barrera were as follows:47

Jehu « pulled down » (katheilen, nē) the temple, « brought out » the pillar (elaben, lqḥ instead of usual hwsy²), « broke in pieces » the pillar (synetripsen, sbr) and « cast out » (erripsen, šlē) the rest.

This course of actions is different from MT and LXX in vv. 25b-27 in three ways: 1) in the subject exercising the reform, 2) in the order of the reforming actions and 3) in some of the terminology describing the reform. Trebolle Barrera argues that the sequence of the reforming actions – κααί ‘bring out’, συς ‘break’ (or της ‘burn’) and της ‘cast out’ – as noted in the reading of the Old Greek text, represents rather the usual order of activities detailing the destruction of foreign worship.48 He gives examples of this sequence of the verbs occurring in 2Kgs 23:6 and 23:12 (LXXI).49

A relevant final point in Trebolle Barrera’s discussion concerns the alternative readings της (non Kaige in LXXI and VL) and γης (MT, LXXI) linked with της in 2Kgs 10:26-27. Drawing on other cases, where της is used rather than γης in conjunction with της in the context of destruction of cultic objects (2Kgs 18:4; 23:14; 23:12 LXXI) Trebolle Barrera concludes that Old Greek in 10:26-27 (LXXI κααί ουντριπτετου; VL et contruit eum) should be preferred as the more original reading (1982b:209). The fact that a number of emendations and corrections to the difficult passage of MT in 2Kgs 10:25-27 have been proposed by critics, suggests in itself that this text as it now stands in the MT cannot reflect the exact original reading.

The study of the final part of 2Kgs 10:27 may throw some more light on the account of Jehu’s reform, showing that this text has a distinctive flavour, which distances it from the other reform accounts, particularly those shared by Kings and Chronicles, and makes it instead closer to the material that is narrated only in Kings, known as the Elijah-Elisha cycle. At the end of 2Kgs 10:27, the verse just studied, a phrase occurs which mentions the ‘house of Baal’ that it was made a ‘latrine’ to this

47 Jehu « destruye » (katheilen, nē) el templo, toma la estela (elaben, lqḥ en lugar del usual hwsy²), « rompe » la estela (synetripsen, sbr) y « arroja » (erripsen, šlē) sus restos’ (Trebolle Barrera 1982b:208).
48 Trebolle Barrera (1982b:207). A phrase involving the verb γης occurs either at the beginning or at the end of the chain of these actions.
49 Trebolle Barrera (1982b:206-208). Cf. our argument on pp. 76-77, however, where we show that in a more narrower sense the verb της in 2Kgs 23:6 and 12 does not refer directly to the removal of cultic object as in e.g. 2Chr 33:15 but to a dispensation of its elements (της) to the place of impurity.
day (דָּאָם). Of a particular interest in this phrase is the reading תֶּרֶם (=Ketib; תֶּרֶנְנָם Qere). Though the word תֶּרֶנְנָם is a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Bible, it appears to convey a sense of ‘latrine’ or ‘dung’. A related term, possibly derived from תֶּרֶנְנָם, occurs in 2Kgs 6:25 and 18:27//Isa 36:12, with the meaning ‘(dove’s) dung’. In general terms, the idea conveyed by these expressions is that of excrement, filth or dung. It may be a puzzle for some that תֶּרֶנְנָם occurs in 2Kgs 10:27, the text chiefly dealing with the destruction of an illegitimate cult, where one might have expected more likely a term of defilement (קֶשֶׁת) or similar instead. However, as it becomes clearer from the following discussion, תֶּרֶנְנָם plays a significant role in the context of Jehu’s reform. It actually links the account of Jehu’s reformation with the motif of dung that runs through the stories of Jehu, Jezebel and Elijah. This theme of dung, urine and blood is recurrent in Kings since the arrival of Elijah on the scene with the final mention of it in the text of Jehu’s reform in 2Kgs 10:27.54 The first reference to this motif may perhaps already be found in 1Kgs 18:27 in the story of the contest between Elijah and the prophets of Baal, where Elijah mocks the prophets asking them among other things, whether their god is not away defecating.55 Then in 1Kgs 21:21 and 2Kgs 9:8 we read about cutting off from Ahab ‘the one who pees on the wall’ (םְדֵנְנָנָן).56 Similarly another liquid is also described as spouting ‘on the wall’ in these stories: the text in 2Kgs 9:33 tells about the blood of Jezebel being ‘spattered on the wall’ (םֵרֹנָנָנְנָנָנ הָּגָּאָל). The blood motif can further be observed in 1Kgs 18:28 and especially 21:19; 22:38, in which the blood of Naboth and Ahab is referred to as being licked by dogs. In 2Kgs 9:37 the corpse of Jezebel is described as becoming ‘dung’ (םְדֵנְנָנָנ) on the field, and finally, the house of Baal as being turned to a ‘latrine’ in 2Kgs 10:27. Thus 2Kgs 10:27 forms a significant part of a particular motif within the story of the strife between Elijah’s Yahwism and Jezebel’s Baalism. The motif of dung, (blood and urine,) which links

50 LXXII reads καὶ ἐπῆτέξκειν αὐτῶν εἰς λιπρόδες ἐκ τῆς ἱμέρας ταύτης and LXXI has καὶ τῶν οἴκου τοῦ Βασιλέως ἐκ τοῦ κοπρίου ἐκ τῆς ἱμέρας ταύτης.
51 תֶּרֶנְנָם in Qere is thought to be supplied by masoretes as a euphemism for תֶּרֶנְנָם. See 2Kgs 6:25; 18:27 for similar cases of a later correction by Qere.
52 See e.g., HALOT 1:572; DCH 5:229.
53 See e.g., BDB 351a; DCH 3:305.
54 We owe this point and much of the following discussion to Mr. Robert Meretz (personal communication).
55 The term רֶפֶּת in 1Kgs 18:27 is often discussed with one suggestion among others being supported by the Targum that it is a euphemism for relieving himself; see e.g., Fohrer (1968a:16).
56 This phrase also occurs once in divine speech with regard to Jeroboam (1Kgs 14:10).
the account of Jehu’s reform more closely with the Elijah-Elisha cycle suggests that the story of Jehu’s reform does not belong to the same layer with the other cultic reform accounts in Kings, shared with Chronicles, but is probably a part of a further stage within the Kings development, to which also the stories of Elijah, Jezebel and Jehu belong.

MANASSEH

In the book of Chronicles, the only cult reform approved of that is not shared by the two histories appears in Chronicles’ record of the reign of Manasseh. It is well known that the account of Manasseh in Chronicles is very close to Kings in its first part (2Chr 33:1-10//2Kgs 21:1-10a) but radically different in the second (2Chr 33:11-17 cf. 2Kgs 21:10b-16). While in Kings Manasseh is described as thoroughly wicked, where in vv. 10b-16 all the blame for Judah’s downfall is laid upon him, in Chronicles in the part that differs from Kings (2Chr 33:11-17) Manasseh is portrayed as repentant king. He is taken to exile in Babylon where he humbles himself before Yahweh; and he, on account of this, returns him to Jerusalem. It is in this context that we read only in Chronicles about Manasseh’s positive reforms. These are the result of his conversion in Babylon and restoration by Yahweh upon the throne in Jerusalem. The passage with reforms reads as follows:

2Chr 33:15
2Chr 33:16

Manasseh’s reform is centered around the removal of cultic objects from the temple and the elimination of altars from the temple and the city of Jerusalem. While it is noticeable that the terminology used to describe Manasseh’s reform is not strictly characteristic of reform reports shared by Kings and Chronicles, there are a few elements of this report that are related to one of the texts dealing with elimination of cult in Kings. In Chronicles’ report of Manasseh’s reform we read about the removal of בְּרֵשִׁים from the house of Yahweh. In a similar way we read about the removal of מַדְחָן from the temple in Kings’ depiction of Josiah’s reform. The text in 2Kgs 23:6a reads

The links in מַדְחָן – מַדְחָן – מַדְחָן are sufficient enough to demonstrate

57 Japhet (1993:1010) notes that the passage consisting of Manasseh’s cultic reform ‘is phrased in non-Deuteronomistic terminology’.
that the two texts are related.\textsuperscript{58} It may seem less probable to contend that the reading of the removal of מвяз from Yahweh’s house stood originally in the text related to Manasseh and that later editors of Kings, because of their different perspective of Manasseh as king, replaced Manasseh’s exile and conversion episode with the verses condemning the king (2Kgs 21:10b-16), while attributing the removal of מвяз to Josiah. On the contrary, it is more probable that this reading belonged originally to the text related to Josiah’s reform and that Chr adopted this account of the elimination of the cultic entity from the temple and placed it in his own version of Manasseh’s story. This possibility is even more likely in the light of the fact that Chr acted in a rather similar manner when he dealt with the cultic reform of Asa. There we saw the reform report, which in Kings is held together in vv. 12-15 of 1Kgs 15, split in Chronicles and separated by Chr’s own material. Chr might have treated his Vorlage\textsuperscript{59} dealing with the reform of Josiah in a similar way in that he might have divided the text and transferred the phrase with the removal of מвяз to the story of Manasseh where he expanded his account with his own additional material.

Further, we may observe the expansion of Manasseh’s reform in Chronicles as having similar elements with Chr’s expanded text of Asa’s reform. There are striking parallels in the use of the term מביר in connection with the removal of cultic objects ( מביר מזבח in 2Chr 14:2; מביר התנשא in 2Chr 33:15); in the mention of repairing the altar for Yahweh (2Chr 15:8; 33:16); sacrificing to Yahweh (2Chr 15:11; 33:16) and finally in commanding Judah to worship Yahweh (2Chr 14:3; 33:16).\textsuperscript{60} Even the added note in Manasseh’s text about people’s sacrificing on high places but only (בר) to Yahweh in 2Chr 33:17 echoes a similar comment in Asa’s reform text. There it is stated – this time in the shared text with Kings (1Kgs 15:14//2Chr 15:17) – that the high places were not taken out of Israel. The particle בר, qualifying the immediately preceding statement related to high places, is used in this way only in 1Kgs 15:14//2Chr 15:17 (the shared text of Asa) and 2Ch 33:17 (Chr’s expansion on Manasseh). While on the one hand similarities can be observed in the use of ל between 1Kgs 15:14//2Chr 15:17 and 2Ch 33:17, a strong candidate for exerting an influence on the added note with regard to high places in 2Ch 33:17 appears to be

\textsuperscript{58} To the links above we may add the verbal correspondence in מביא, though admittedly this term occurs in a slightly different context in each verse. For a more detailed treatment of the correspondences mentioned above see pp. 75-77.

\textsuperscript{59} We argue in the following chapter that Chr’s Vorlage, however, cannot be equated with the present account of Josiah in Kings but with a prior and much briefer version of that narrative.

\textsuperscript{60} Smelik (1992:184).
the original phrase relating to the worship on the high places in Jehoshaphat’s formula – now better preserved in 1Kgs 22:44 – that reads מָהֵן הַמַּעֲמָה לְאֶלֶד הָאֱלֹהִים מִקְרָא הַמַּעֲמָה מִקְרָא הַמַּעֲמָה. We discuss this case in more detail later in the section on pp. 182-83.

Another interconnection with regard to the text of Manasseh can be noted among Chr’s passages dealing with reforms: the particular combination of the verbs מָהֵן and מָרֵי in 2Chr 33:15 appears also in the extended narrative on the Passover as a part of Hezekiah’s reform, in 2Chr 30:14, but nowhere else in a cultic destruction context within the Hebrew Bible. It can be inferred that this parallel in Chr’s own text of Hezekiah’s reform developed concurrently with Chr’s adaptation of the older reform notice in his account of Manasseh.

We may conclude from the above that Manasseh’s reform in Chronicles has been built around one phrase shared by Kings and Chronicles (2Kgs 23:6a; 2Chr 33:15a) which states that a cultic object (מָהֵן מַעֲמָה) has been taken out from the house of Yahweh outside the city. The phrase was originally employed in Chr’s Vorlage relating to Josiah’s reform, which Chr adapted to his text describing Manasseh’s exile and conversion, being redeveloped in line with some aspects of his presentation of Asa as a cultic reformer. On the other hand, some of the phraseology with which Chr reworked the older reform notice and attributed to Manasseh (מָהֵן and מָרֵי in 2Chr 33:15), occurred in Chr’s expansive reshaping of Hezekiah’s reform (2Chr 30:14).

4. Concluding Remarks on Cultic Reform Accounts
The study of the cultic reform accounts has shown that the most characteristic terminology regarding the reform notices appears in the accounts of Judean monarchs with close links between Kings and Chronicles. The analysis of the reform reports of Jehoiada, Hezekiah, Josiah (and partly Asa) suggested that the typical phrases denoting cultic reforms may have first arisen within the story of monarchy before being reused in the material of Exodus and Deuteronomy warning against the cultic practices of the Canaanites.

Kings and Chronicles both also narrate the reform of Asa and Jehoshaphat. Although the reforms of these two Judean monarchs in Kings have less strong links
with their counterparts in Chronicles, a firm relationship between them has been shown to exist through linkage of specific terms and expressions.

In Kings non-shared material, the reform accounts of Jehoram and Jehu show some textual divergence among its ancient witnesses. More significantly, however, it emerged from the study above that these reform reports have further characteristics, which on one hand detach them from the accounts of the reforms of Judean rulers in Kings (with their counterparts in Chronicles), and on the other hand, associate them with the material dealing with Ahab, Jezebel and Baal worship that is specific only to Kings. This was particularly observed in the account of Jehu’s reform in its link of ‘dung’ theme with the material known as Elijah-Elisha cycle. On the basis of this, the suggestion was proposed that the reforms of Jehoram and particularly that of Jehu should not be affiliated with the same layer within the composition of Kings, to which also other royal cultic reforms belong, but perhaps are part of a further stage within the literary growth of the book of Kings, a stage that would have also included the material pertaining to the Ahab narrative and the Elijah-Elisha cycle, with which these reforms have close affinity.

Finally, it has been noted that in addition to the reforms in Chronicles that have their counterparts in Kings, this book also includes a positive reform of Manasseh. This account in Chronicles of the positive reforming measures by Manasseh grew out of one phrase from Chr’s source that originally occurred in the reform of Josiah in Chr’s Vorlage, which in turn served to provide the phraseology in another verse in the development of another reform account in Chronicles, that of Hezekiah. The conclusion from the examination of Manasseh’s reform occurring only in Chronicles that it employs the text, which originally stood in the account of Josiah’s reform has a significant implication for the study of the next chapter, in which our main focus will be the synoptic texts of Josiah’s reform in Kings and Chronicles.
CHAPTER THREE
Accounts of Josiah’s reform in Kings and Chronicles
(test case – part one)

Following the study of the regnal formulae and reform reports in the previous chapter, we have chosen the story of Josiah’s reform as a test case to probe in more detail the relationship between the texts of Kings and Chronicles pertaining to a divided monarchy. Using the accounts of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 and in 2Chr 34:3-7 + 33 it is hoped they will reveal something of the relationship between the two histories in miniature that will have wider implications for understanding the relationship between the texts of Kings and Chronicles narrating the story of the divided monarchy as a whole.

As has been noted by previous studies, there is some similarity between the accounts of Josiah’s reform in the two histories regarding various actions Josiah undertakes. In both, Kings and Chronicles, Josiah is portrayed as eliminating high places, altars, asherahs and other cultic objects. He reduces cultic entities to a powder, which he casts on graves. He also annihilates priests. Furthermore, in both accounts there is a recognition of Josiah’s activities in the north. To these parallels in content can be added Kings’ reference to the reform activity in the temple which—though not having a parallel in Chr’s portrayal of Josiah’s reform—is reflected in Chronicles in the account of Manasseh and which was identified as being originally part of Chr’s Vorlage of Josiah’s story.

The relationship between the two Josiah’s reform reports in their content has been seen at a glance. A more thorough investigation will follow, which will commence with an analysis of the corresponding links in the reference to the purge of the temple as an initial reform measure in Kings, and (most likely) in the text of Chr’s Vorlage.

1. Purging the Temple

2Kgs 23:6
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2Chr 33:15
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The previous chapter showed that Chr adapted the text describing reform activity in the temple from his Vorlage of Josiah’s reform into his version of Manasseh’s story. We may now look more closely at the links which the two verses, relating originally
to Josiah’s activity in the temple, share. Both, 2Kgs 23:6 and 2Chr 33:15, albeit they employ different terms (Kings הָרְשָׁע whereas Chronicles לְשׁוֹנ), refer to the same cultic entity as a major item being taken out of the house of Yahweh – for which they use identical phrase מִיַּרְשָׁע תַּאֲפָה. Both texts indicate that the object (הָרְשָׁע תַּאֲפָה) is taken or thrown outside Jerusalem/the city (Kings הָרְשָׁע תַּאֲפָה; Chronicles הָרְשָׁע תַּאֲפָה). Kings further specifies that it is taken ‘to the brook Kidron’ (נַחַל קִדְרְון). Despite the fact that there is no such detail narrated in Chronicles, a case can be made that the phrase referring to Wadi Kidron might have been present in Chr’s Vorlage of Josiah’s reform. Although the Wadi Kidron is never mentioned in the inherited text of Chronicles pertaining to Josiah or Manasseh, it occurs twice in Chr’s special material relating to the reformative events in Hezekiah’s time (2Chr 29:16; 30:14). From these two occurrences it can be deduced that Chr actually utilized the expression נַחַל קִדְרְון from his Vorlage of Josiah’s reformation, relocating the phrase to his expansive account of Hezekiah’s reform.

The verb פָּרַשׁ in Chr’s account of Manasseh’s reform (33:15), occurring also in his record of the reform of Hezekiah (30:14) but not of Josiah, has virtually no parallel in the present text of Kings in this particular usage denoting elimination of objects of cultic significance (except for one isolated case of LXX1 and VI. in 2Kgs 10:27). Where Kings does employ פָּרַשׁ in the text of Josiah’s reform (vv. 6, 12) it always uses this term in conjunction with דָּשׁ ‘dust’. It seems, however, that פָּרַשׁ in 2Kgs 23:6, 12 might have originally been much more closely linked with items of cult, having the cultic entity itself and not the ‘dust’ (דָּשׁ) of it as its direct object. The particular combination of פָּרַשׁ and דָּשׁ occurring in 2Kgs 23 and once in Deuteronomy (9:21) is probably a secondary embellishment in Kings. This might clearly be the case in the expression פָּרַשׁ תַּאֲפָה אֲלֵה תַּאֲפָה מִיַּרְשָׁע פָּרַשׁתָּא in v. 12, where the excision of מִיַּרְשָׁע does not violate the structure of the phrase (cf. similar syntactical construction in Ex 32:20) nor the meaning in its immediate context. The immediately

1 Kings and Chronicles use these differing terms for the same referent consistently as can be seen in 2Kgs 21:7//2Chr 33:7.
2 The other two references to the ‘brook Kidron’ in the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings are in vv. 4, 12. The brook Kidron appears to play a significant role in the elimination of a cultic object also in the story of Asa in 1Kgs 15:13//2Chr 15:16.
3 2Kgs 10:27b is rendered in the LXX1 קאὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν τήν στῆλην τοῦ Βααλ καὶ συνάτρυψεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἔρριψεν αὐτὴν ἐκ τῶν θυσίας τοῦ Βααλ, καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Βααλ ἔθετε εἰς κοπρίαν ἐκ τῆς ιμερᾶς τοῦτος (text taken from Fernández Marcos & Busto Saiz 1992:113), and in the VL et proccidi eum at (sic) sinistrâ templi et tempulõ bahal posuit in sterculino (text taken from Fischer 1983:84).
preceeding text-critically problematic clause הן אנש ב in the MT⁴ has no bearing on the view of אַשֶּׁר אָסָר being in this text secondary. There is no reference for instance to 'grinding to powder' ( %-) or to 'burning' ( %) in v. 12, that would make mention of dust/ashes in this verse more appropriate.

The second instance of the occurrence of קֵשׁ + פֶּרֶשׁ in 2Kgs 23 is in the second part of v. 6 where it refers to the dust of Asherah pole being thrown upon the burial ground. Yet it is reasonable to argue that the term קֵשׁ alone (without it being attached to פֶּרֶשׁ) may have originally stood rather in the first part of the verse - between either אלָמַת קֹרֶן or מַעַת לְדֵרוֹשׁ אֲלֵה יָהוֹ הַדָּוִד and בֵּית הָיוֹ. This part of the verse with inclusion of קֵשׁ would form the original much briefer statement narrating simply that the cultic object was taken from temple and thrown out of Jerusalem to the brook Kidron. The phrase הביא kênh קֵשׁ אֶל that introduces the second part of the verse is repetitive in its reference to the brook Kidron and this may point to it being secondary. The following קֵשׁ לְפָרֶשׁ יִשָּׁר אֶל-בְּהוֹשָׁבָה עֲלֵיהֶם בְּבוֹ 'burning' ( %) in order to emphasise the complete destruction of the illicit cult object found in the house of Yahweh. As for the Chronicles history, the expansion of the 'original' report takes off in another direction in 2Chr 33:15. There is no such elaboration as in 2Kgs 23:6 relating to the destruction of an idolatrous object being taken out of the temple. An earlier version of Kings account of Josiah's purification of the temple, which could be identifiable with Chr's Vorlage, may therefore be tentatively outlined as follows:

Aspects of Josiah's reform activity in or near the temple are in Kings also narrated in vv. 4, 7, 11, 12. Equivalent parallels to these texts are not found in

---

⁴ The expression נְפָשׁ (MT) which can mean either 'he ran from there' (from the root נָפַשׁ) or 'he crushed from there' (from נָפַשׁ) makes little sense in its present context in v. 12. There seems to be a wrong word division - mem at the beginning of נְפָשׁ probably belongs with preceding term. Standard treatments of this problematic text go back to Kimchi who suggested revocalization of נְפָשׁ to נָפַשׁ (as mentioned by Burney 1903:360). From this it follows that some consider the verb as נָפַשׁ 'run' in hiphil; see e.g. Theinus (1873:444) 'er liess mit aller Schnelle forschaffen'; BDB 930a; Cogan & Tadmor (1988:289) who read נְפָשׁ 'he hastened them, kept them distant'. Others propose the verb נָפַשׁ 'crush' in hiphil; see e.g. Rudolph (1951:215), Montgomery (1951:540) and Washburn (1991:74 n. 52) who read נָפַשׁ 'broke them up there/crushed them there'. Cf. Burney (1903:360) who adopts gdl of נָפַשׁ, and Eynikel (1996:257-58) who prefers the meaning 'mistreat, oppress'. Less likely is the suggestion to emend to נָפַשׁ as proposed by Gray (1970:731), followed by Jones (1984:623-24).
Chronicles – neither in the account of the reform of Josiah nor of Manasseh. Barrick (2002:106) contends that ‘the purging of the Temple and its precincts which Kings attributes to Josiah (2 Kgs. 23:4a-bu, 6-7, 9, 11-12) the Chronicler credits to Manasseh (2 Chron. 33:15-17)...’ and in this way Chr’s unique report of Manasseh’s reform ‘accounts for [his] omission of 2 Kgs. 23:4, 6-7, 9, 11-12.’ (2002:20). Barrick’s presentation on this point, however, remains at a quite general level in which individual verses of Manasseh’s account of the reform are not subjected to any detailed analysis as regards their relationship to Josiah’s account in Kings. Contrary to Barrick’s contention this analysis has shown that Chr’s account of Manasseh’s reform relates strictly speaking only to v. 6a in Kings report of Josiah. Could it be then that Chr’s Vorlage of Josiah’s reform contained – as far as the purge of the temple is concerned – only the report of the removal of a single cultic entity from the temple complex, yet a report of particular significance? It will be shown later that the verses in Kings dealing with actions pertaining to the temple and its precincts that do not have counterparts in Chronicles (vv. 4, 7, 11, 12), can be better accounted for as being Kings own additions. They extend the report while also incorporating material alluding to the cultic innovations of previous rulers, most notably Manasseh.

2. Elimination of High Places, Altars, Asherahs and Other Cultic Installations

2.1. Defilement of High Places

The account of Josiah’s reform begins in Chronicles – after the report of the purge of the temple has been removed and employed by Chr in the story of Manasseh – with elimination of high places (места). The concern for the temple and the attention paid to high places are the two distinct elements figuring in the structure of the present text

---

5 We are aware of scholarly debate regarding the English rendering ‘high place(s)’ for the Hebrew מנשה, which goes back to the Latin excelsum/a and the Greek ἐξελλάθιας suspicions about this conventional understanding have been expressed by Emerton (1997:116) and Kogan & Tishchenko (2002:319-52); cf also Gleis (1997:246). The translation ‘high place(s)’ is, therefore, used throughout the present study only for convenience regardless of whether this conveys the real sense of the Hebrew מנשה or not.
of Josiah's reform in Kings.\(^6\) The topic regarding נסב that dominates Josiah's account in this book can be contrasted with the brief occurrence of the נסב theme in Chronicles. Only once is נסב mentioned in 2Chr 34:3-7, but it is encountered no less than ten times in 2Kgs 23:4-20 MT.\(^7\) Of these references to נסב, Josiah's direct action against high places is referred to in six cases in the MT (vv. 8 [2x], 13, 15 [3x]).\(^8\) In another four instances נסב is used in conjunction with priests (נסב הראה; vv. 9, 20), with houses or shrines (נסב הראה; v. 19) and once in a phrase that mentions priests burning incense in 'the high places' (נסב תֹּאס, v. 5). A closer inspection of verses that define Josiah's direct action against high places finds his deeds being referred to as defiling (נָטָל; vv. 8, 13 [MT]), breaking down (נָטָל; vv. 8 [MT], 15) and burning (נסב; v. 15 [MT]) the cultic installations.

The reference to 'burning' (נסב) of a high place that occurs in v. 15 (MT) is a disputed case. There are repeated occurrences of the verb נסב in 2Kgs 23, but a clause using the combination of נסב with נסב which is without an example elsewhere in the Old Testament seems to sit uncomfortably in its immediate context in the MT of v. 15.\(^9\) The text in the MT reading נסב תֹּאס ('the burnt the high place') may have been affected by another נסב that follows shortly after in that very same verse.\(^10\) The LXX does not mention נסב nor נסב, but reads instead καὶ συνετρισμένοι τοῖς λίθοις αὐτοῦ and continues καὶ ἐλεύθερον εἰς χόνοι... ('and he broke in pieces its stones and he beat [them] to dust...'). The Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint's reading καὶ συνετρισμένοι τοῖς λίθοις αὐτοῦ would have נסב תֹּאס with a suffix obviously referring to an altar. In that case נסב תֹּאס between אֹהָל בְּצְדָקָה and נסב earlier in that verse appears intrusive.\(^11\) It could be a later gloss, accommodating the text underlying the Septuagint to the version of MT. If this is so, LXX is giving clues

---

\(^6\) O'Brien (1989:253) observes the presence of an alternating pattern in the final text of 2Kgs 23:4-14, in which 'a report of cultic reform in the temple is followed by a report of cultic reform against the high places' (mentioning vv. 4, 6-7, 11-12 related to the temple and vv. 5, 8-9, 13-14 to the high places). He views the pattern reappearing in a similar manner in 23:15-20 where 'an account of Josiah's activities at Bethel in vv 15-18 is followed by an account of his destruction of high places elsewhere in Samaria in vv 19-20'.

\(^7\) Seven times in LXX.

\(^8\) In three cases in LXX (vv. 8 [1x], 15 [2x]).

\(^9\) The phrase נסב תֹּאס stands in the MT in an awkward relation with the following asyndetic expression נסב תֹּאס. Against the arguments of some commentators (Klostermann 1887:481; Kittel 1900:303; Benzinger 1899:194; Burney 1903:361; Skinner 1893:422; Montgomery 1951:540) that burning of high place may seem an improbable action to undertake, see now Barrick (2002:47-48 n. 66) and earlier Sanda (1912:349).


\(^11\) Sanda (1912:349).
in this verse to the older reading, where references to גפם did not appear in that text. That this is the case is confirmed by the editorial considerations of scholars, who do not necessarily subscribe to the LXX version, who view v. 15 as being a conflated text and contend that there was no mention of זהב in the original version of this verse. Thus e.g. Spieckermann in his literary analysis of the minute detail considers the earliest text of v. 15 to contain simply <ךא ראתם את בית אל-legateאלט כמלך (> ‘moreover <the king> pulled down the altar at Bethel’).\(^{12}\) Similarly Barrick (2002:47 and n. 66), though on different grounds, proposes one of the possible readings of the original text in v. 15 to include only זהב אדomite הנותג (> ‘and thus see questionable; rather, demons in the meaning of re-pointedалиים’). Thus it can be concluded that Josiah’s activity against זהב being described as ראתם אדomite הנותג in v. 15 does not belong to the earliest stratum of Josiah’s account in Kings. It is not attested in LXX which seems to point more faithfully to the original text. The expression זהב אדomite הנותג can be confidently ascribed to a later stage of the development of Josiah’s story, a stage peculiar to the MT version of Kings.

Another term used in Kings’ reform report of the treatment of זהב by Josiah is the verb גפם ‘break down’. This verb occurs in v. 8b in connection with ותות את השירım ‘the high places of the gates’ (MT).\(^{13}\) The relationship of 8b with 8a, where a verb גפם ‘defile’ is used to depict Josiah’s elimination of זהב, has long been regarded as being redactional.\(^{14}\) A few critics argue that v. 8b comes from an older annalistic

---

\(^{12}\) Spieckermann (1982:427). Everything else in that verse, including the references to the destruction of the high place, are all according to Spieckermann post-deuteronomistic additions.

\(^{13}\) The expression גפם את השירım (MT) is problematic. First, the ancient versions differ in rendering MT’s זהב. Targum’s consonantal text בותי is ambiguous in that it can be understood as either singular or plural. The main text of the Peshitta reads אדתא, while the original Pesh reading אדתא אדתא found in 9almam follows the MT. In place of the Hebrew גפם ואת, LXX\(^{8}\) has תונ איקנ תונ פמלת, whereas LXX\(^{1}\) includes תונ איקנ תונ בפיולת, and Vg speaks of aras portarum. Second, it is not clear what is meant by MT’s plural גפם. On account of this many commentators suggest an emendation by re-pointing to גפם (e.g. Benzinger 1899:193; Burney 1903:359; Stade and Schwally 1904:294; Sanda 1912:344; Montgomery 1951:532, 539; Jones 1984:621), suggestion already made by Houbigant (1753) as referred to by Barthélemy (1982:419), and more than a century later also by Graetz (1875:287 n. 1) and Hoffmann (1882:175). Two most frequently cited passages for elucidating the meaning of re-pointed גפם in 23:8 are Lev 17:7 and 2Chr 11:15, where גפם is thought to mean he-goats—or rather, demons in shape of he-goats (cf. HALOT 2:1341). For a fuller discussion see Eynikel (1996:236-38) and Barrick (2002:80). Gray (1970:730) emends to read גפם (gatekeepers) and thus translates the passage ‘the shrine of the gate-keepers’. His interpretation, however, is questionable; see Emerton (1994:457) for a fair refutation of this view. Barthélemy (1982:419), Smith (1975:116) and Emerton (1994:455-67) see no need for re-vocalization of גפם, while they make efforts to understand the MT as traditionally pointed.

\(^{14}\) See e.g. Gressmann (1924:327-28) regarding earlier views on the relationship of vv. 8a, b and 9.
source. The majority among scholars, however, ascribe the second half of v. 8 to a later hand. Despite the verbal construction of the passage, consisting of a w'qatal form, figuring prominently in these arguments in which v. 8b is seen compositionally uncertain, there are other propositions advanced for considering the text a secondary addition. Yadin (1976:9) and Hollenstein (1977:333) note that the location of הָמָן in that half-verse is specified in an unusual way by means of a double reference; הָמָן is said to be placed ‘at the entrance of the gate of Joshua the governor of the city’ and ‘on one’s left at the gate of the city’. The prominent concern to describe the exact location of הָמָן may indicate that the first readership was not familiar with the position of the cultic installation. The appeal to the name Joshua, the city governor after whom the text says the gate was named, was made perhaps in order to heighten the historical credibility of the note. All in all this implies as Hollenstein (1977:333) contends that v. 8b could be a later note based on aetiology, ‘explaining some feature at the city gate that was associated with Josiah’s reform’ as Jones (1984:621) tentatively adds. If the interpretation of v. 8b based on aetiological notion is correct, Barrick (2002:80) subsequently points out that ‘this would account for anomalous use of נֵזָש...rather than the expected יֹם’ with regard to Josiah’s action of elimination of הָמָן.

In the Kings text of Josiah’s reform the verb הָמָן linked with הָמָן appears—beside its occurrence in the late v. 8b—also in v. 15, in which the destruction of the altar is mentioned alongside the destruction of the high place. It was observed above in the study of הָמָן + הָמָן that the structure of v. 15 is particularly complex. The use of

---

15 E.g. Hardmeier (2000:124-25; 138-39). Nelson (1981:80-81) calling v. 8b ‘annalistic’ was influenced in this his designation by Montgomery (1934:46-52), who believed that several cases of the use of w'qatal forms in Kings (e.g. 2Kgs 18:4; 23:8, 10, 12) recalled ‘lapidary style’ of royal official records.


17 The w'qatal criterion, the form being a sign of redactional activity, is employed by Šanda (1912:362; Aramaic influence); Würthwein (1976:415); Hollenstein (1977:333); Rehm (1982:216); Jones (1984:621). The w'qatal form where it is taken as an indication of late usage in past-time context, however, has been recently challenged by Rezetko (2001). His observations call for caution in using w'qatal form as a literary critical criterion on a diachronic level. Other evidence than the presence of w'qatal construction in a text needs to be brought forward if a passage is to be designated late or secondary.

18 From this contention, Yadin then goes on to argue that v. 8 actually refers to the המ in Beersheba. For a sound refutation of this claim see Herzog et al (1977:55-56).

19 In addition to the two scholars named above, also Würthwein (1976:415) and Barrick (2002:80) subscribe to the view that v. 8b is a late aetiological note. Cf. Barthélemy (1982:419).
in this verse is made to describe at one time ‘breaking down’ of נֵבָא as well as נֵבֻּ. A number of scholars have observed some uneasiness in the flow of composition of this verse with ‘high place’ featuring alongside ‘altar’ in the present text. This has led to the explanation that the references to נֵבָא were made at a later stage and that the original wording of v. 15 consisted only of references to נֵבֻּ. It is interesting to observe that in this suggested original wording of v. 15 the term of cult destruction נֵבַּ appears linked with the altar, since this linkage is particularly close to the standard language pertaining to the reform accounts shared by Kings and Chronicles. Consequently, the construction of נֵבַּ with נֵבָא in v. 15 exists only at a secondary level. By the same token it was concluded earlier that the connection of נֵבַּ with נֵבָא in v. 8 was occasioned by a later editorial hand. This leaves only one alternative – to view נֵבָא linked with נֵבֻּ as a construction belonging to the original report.

Josiah’s defiling high places (נֵבֻּ + נֵבָא) is referred to in vv. 8a and 13. The verb נֵבָא is not a frequent term in Kings. In fact, it is specific to 2Kgs 23 occurring in vv. 8, 10, 13 and 16. In v. 8a where the defilement of נֵבָא is mentioned first in this chapter, this occurs in the context of a reference made to priests who served at these נֵבָא, and who were being removed from ‘the cities of Judah’. It is generally accepted that vv. 8a and 9 (often regarded as a unit together) treat the theme of cult centralization in Jerusalem which is essential to the final version of Josiah’s reform report in Kings. A number of scholars, when uncovering redactional layers, see a cult centralization theme playing a significant role also in the original shorter version of the report. One may question, however, whether the theme of centralization was always present in the text of Josiah’s reform since the earliest stage of its composition or whether the theme emerged only at some point during the gradual revisions of the original material. That material in its earliest form may have included from vv. 8a and 9 merely the statement that ‘Josiah defiled the high places’. On the one hand, Barrick (2002:183) in his recent monograph discusses his reconstructed ‘original’ version of the reform report that included, according to him,

20 E.g. O’Brien (1989:261) says: ‘The provenance of 2 Kgs 23:15 is somewhat obscured by the complexity of its formulation. In v 15a there is an abrupt shift from the mention of the altar in Bethel to the high place. The difficulty created by this is reflected in the phrase immediately preceding the main verb נָתָט. It emphasizes that both the altar and the high place were pulled down and appears to be a clarifying addition.’

21 Except in 2Kgs 23, the term is frequently mentioned in Lev, Num and Ezek. In Ezek נֵבָא often relates to נֶבַע—the word which is used in Kings but never in Chronicles.
the centralization aspect expressed in vv. 8a and 9. On the other hand, when he speculates about the source of this ‘original’ version being some kind of royal memorial inscription (2002:141), he states that there must have been ‘a measure of adaptation’ when the reform report was drawn from the inscription. The example he gives of such adaptation is the addition of ‘the relocation and change in status of the bamoth-priests’ in vv. 8a + 9. This contributes to the view that the oldest material may have contained from vv. 8, 9 no reference to a centralization aspect but perhaps only the statement that ‘Josiah defiled the high places’. Turning to the second occurrence of הַמָּז in v. 13 the phrase comprising of Josiah’s defilement of high places occurs in a context, in which focus is directed towards הַמָּז erected by Solomon. The state of affairs surrounding v. 13 is more debated, since there are obvious similarities – but so too differences – between this verse and 1Kgs 11:5 (MT), 7 and 33. Because of these associations between v. 13 and the cultic innovations depicted in 1Kgs 11, the scholarly view is not so unified concerning the verse’s originality. Barrick argues on the basis of great congruity in the list of deities between 23:13 and 11:33 (in opposition to marked difference between 23:13 and 11:7-8a) that these two verses are primary, belonging to the same compositional level. Consequently, according to Barrick’s analysis, 11:7(-8) comes in a stratum later, and 11:5, which does not occur in LXX, is only a secondary elaboration in the MT. Eynikel also observes significant agreements in the list of deities between 11:33 and 23:13. It should be noted however, that 11:33

---


23 Barrick (2001:441-42; 2002:205, 210-11). It is generally recognized that 1Kgs 11 exhibits a variety of problems in MT, revealing complicated compositional history. LXX differs considerably from MT in vv. 1-8 and this adds to the textual complexity seen when comparing the two versions of the narrative. While some, e.g. Provan (1988:68 n. 31) or Eynikel (1996:266-67) reject the LXX reading as a later smoothing out of disordered MT caused by redactional process, others, e.g. Knoppers (1993:140), prefer the reading in LXX as closer to the original Hebrew narrative. According to Barrick (2002:208) in the most recent study ‘the MT and the LXX versions of [1Kgs 11:1-8] evolved differently from a common ancestor.’ See the reconstruction of this proposed ‘ancestor’ in Barrick (2002:208-9).

24 Eynikel (1996:265). Moreover, he notes agreements in the divine names with 11:5. However, as Barrick (2002:210) states, v. 5 is a later ‘doublet of sorts’ in the re-arranged MT. It is not present in the shorter text of LXX.
with which 23:13 shares the closest links, does not occur in the LXX alternative account of division of the kingdom in 3Kgdms 12:24o. The list of deities in 11:33 belongs to the part of Ahijah's speech to Jeroboam (1Kgs 11:31b-38), which is considered to be an elaboration of the more primitive oracle in 1Kgs 11:29-31a (more or less corresponding to 3Kgdms 12:24o). If, as e.g. Knoppers and others argue that 11:33 is a part of subsequent (deuteronomistic) elaboration within the developing book of Kings, it has a significant implication for the composition of 23:13 with which v. 33 is closely related. 23:13 then cannot be viewed original as to the report of Josiah's reform in Kings but must also be considered a part of successive strata, perhaps an elaboration drawn on a simple statement in the original version of the reform report that 'Josiah defiled high places'.

In the account of Josiah's reform in Chronicles, the action against is never depicted by the verb 27 (or indeed by any other term, or as found in later additions to Josiah's account in Kings). Instead, the account in Chronicles uses a term with a basic import 'purify' which is antithetical to the meaning conveyed by used in Kings. Both terms belong to the same category with shared notions of purity and impurity. They occur predominantly in Leviticus, Numbers and Ezekiel. Though they can be abundantly found in qal and piel conjugations, in the two histories – in Kings and in Chronicles both appear in piel. With their inherent concepts of purity and impurity and function in Kings and Chronicles respectively in the context of illicit worship. In Josiah's story, the term in Kings conveys defilement of, whereas in Chronicles purging from, high places. In 2Chr 34:3b, the action of purification associated with has further a geographical dimension to it: Josiah is said to begin to purge Judah and Jerusalem from high places and other cultic objects. Purification of Judah and Jerusalem is also reiterated in 34:5 with the verb used, whereas in 34:8, which is Chr's addition not found in

---

25 The links are made even stronger by the singular readings in 11:33 occurring in LXX, Pesh and some Vulgate Mss (as against plurals in the MT) and are preferred by a number of scholars. Thus Gray (1970:291) states: 'in view of the reference in the end of the verse to 'David his father' the singular should probably be read for the MT plural.', or Provan (1988:101) asserts: '11:33 originally concerned Solomon rather than people'. The singulars are also favored more recently by Knoppers (1993:186-88); Eynikel (1996:62) and Barrick (2002:197). For contrasting opinion see Noth (1968:243); Nelson (1981:113); Campbell (1986:29 n. 18); Mulder (1998:590-91); Barthelemy (1982:363). (Cf. discussion in Eynikel 1996:61-62.)


27 The only occurrence of the verb in Chronicles is in the account of the reign of Zedekiah (2Chr 36:14).
the parallel text of 2Kgs 22:3 in the account of temple repairs, mention is made of purification of the land (יִֽכְּרָנַּת) and of the temple (יִכְּרָנַת). The phrases referring to Josiah’s purification of Judah and Jerusalem in 34:3b and 34:5 are part of a framework delimiting Josiah’s reform activities to the south, which appears to be Chr’s own way of structuring the account. Therefore, it seems likely that the original story of Josiah’s reform employed the verb יִכְּרָנַת in connection with יִכְּרָנַת as it appears in Kings. This has been later altered by Chr who employed יִכְּרָנַת instead of יִכְּרָנַת, and used it together in construction with ‘Judah and Jerusalem’ in such as way as to form an inclusio to the account of Josiah’s reform in the south. The additional support for the contention that the verb יִכְּרָנַת, occurring in 2Chr 34, replaced the original יִכְּרָנַת linked with יִכְּרָנַת in an earlier account of Josiah’s reform is provided by the heightened interest in the usage of יִכְּרָנַת by Chr in his special material relating to Hezekiah’s reform. יִכְּרָנַת occurs in 2Chr 29:15, 16, 18 carrying obviously the same notion of purge from illicit cultic objects as when it appears in Chr’s account of Josiah. This is different from the usage of יִכְּרָנַת in the story of Naaman (2Kgs 5:10, 12, 13, 14), the only account in Kings where this verb is employed, and rather in qal than piel, in the context of Naaman’s ‘cleansing’/healing from leprosy.

2.2. Destruction of Altars

2Kgs 23:12

The religious reform that involves action against altars is in the account of Josiah in each, Kings and Chronicles, conveyed by language consisting of the construction יִכְּרָנַת + יִכְּרָנַת that is in wider terms characteristic of the reform accounts shared by these two histories. The verb יִכְּרָנַת, beside its use in a typical construction with יִכְּרָנַת, is also employed in Josiah’s account in Kings depicting the action against יִכְּרָנַת (vv. 8b and 15). It was pointed out earlier (pp. 80-82), however, that these phrases involving יִכְּרָנַת + יִכְּרָנַת do not belong to the primary material relating to the reform report in Kings.

28 There is one more occurrence of יִכְּרָנַת in the account of Hezekiah, 2Chr 30:18, which however relates to cultic purification of priests.
one instance the verb יְשַׁרְתוּ is employed in 2Kgs 23 in the text that contains a description of the reform activity pertaining to the temple. In v. 7 it is linked with the peculiar expression מִעְטָרָתָם תְּשִׁירָה within a context, which is indirectly associated with the focus of the previous verse on the elimination of Asherah’s cult through its reference to the women weaving שִׁירָה to Asherah. It will be seen later (pp. 127-35) that v. 7, in which יְשַׁרְתוּ occurs in connection with מִעְטָרָתָם תְּשִׁירָה, together with v. 4 is a subsequent addition providing more detail than the earlier material which dealt simply with the removal of the cultic object ( يولא in v. 6a) from the temple.

The action against altars, characterized by the basic terminology יְשַׁרְתוּ + תְּשִׁירָה, is in Kings account of Josiah reported in two verses. In v. 12 the altars which Josiah demolished are depicted in more detail with regard to their location and their provenance. First, the verse mentions that Josiah broke down the altars that were on the roof of the upper chamber of Ahaz, 29 which is followed by another phrase emphasizing that these altars were constructed by the kings of Judah. In a similar vein in the later part of the verse it is stated that Josiah destroyed the altars built by king Manasseh at the temple’s two courts. The preceding relative clause referring to the kings of Judah is not unique in its occurrence in this verse (v. 12) within the report of Kings as in the same chapter it also occurs in vv. 5 and 11 (with the difference of יְשַׁרְתוּ being used instead of תְּשִׁירָה). A suggestion has been proposed by some scholars that these statements about the kings of Judah, being understood as generalized allegations, are secondary to the primary text. 30 Following the reference to ‘kings of Judah’ in v. 12 (אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה מָלֵךְ יְהוּדָה), the statement about altars being destroyed which Manasseh erected (אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה מָלֵךְ יְהוּדָה) partly repeats the language of the clause referring to kings. The mention of altars being built by Manasseh finds also a recognizable parallel in the account of Manasseh in 2Kgs 21:5//2Chr 33:5. Taking into account a possibility explored by previous

29 MT reads יְשַׁרְתוּ קֹלָם ‘the upper chamber of Ahaz’ is grammatically problematic following the noun קֹלָם with the article, thereby is thought to be a later explicative gloss (Burney 1903:360; Stade and Schwall 1904:295; Gray 1970:731; Hollenstein 1977:335; Jones 1984:623; O’Brien 1989:260 n. 113; Knoppers 1994:178 n. 9; Eynikel 1996:254-55, 347; Barrick 2002:31 n. 11; 76 and n. 43). It can be further noted that LXX 1 alters the text in its usual fashion, adding βασιλέως Ἰουδαίας after Αχαζ and substituting Κατελήφαν Αχαζ for the LXX 2 reading Κατελήφαν βασιλείας Ἰουδαίας. (The addition of ‘the upper chamber of Ahaz’ seems to have influenced the reading in the following phrase in LXX 3 which has changed plural ‘kings of Judah made’ to singular ‘king of Judah made’. LXX 4 and MT both read plurals.)

scholars that the note regarding the kings of Judah represents a later addition and seeing close ties in terminology between this expression and the following one about altars being destroyed which Manasseh erected which also connects with the account of Manasseh’s reign in 2Kgs 21/2Chr 33, it may be suggested that these phrases have been formulated in the course of subsequent supplementation of an originally quite brief piece of information concerned with the destruction of altars. Some further considerations while studying Chr’s text regarding the action against the altars will provide confirmation that much of v. 12 in Kings is a development of what was originally a concise statement about Josiah’s dealing with the altars.31 Before that, however, an attention needs to be paid to the second instance in 2Kgs 23 referring to the destruction of altar at Josiah’s reform.

Verse 15 mentions the destruction of the altar along with the high place. The difficulties created by this particular combination in v. 15 were touched on earlier when discussing how מרדכי אדני ירшки occurs in the MT of that verse. A conclusion has been drawn agreeing with proposals of other scholars that מרדכי had no place in the original phrasing of v. 15 and that the earliest stratum of the compositional development of this text would deal only with the destruction of altar(s). This is close to what we concede to be the earliest reading from which much of v. 12 later emanated. Furthermore, the statement about the action against altars in the earliest material of Josiah’s reform in Kings is noticeably comparable to the account of such action in Chronicles. It is Chr’s treatment of Josiah’s activity with regard to altars which will now be examined.

Chr mentions the destruction of altars in 2Chr 34 in two places. Verse 4 relates to the reforms in Judah; v. 7 describes Josiah’s northern activity. The reforming measures in v. 7 seem to be deliberately drawn in a form parallel with those described in v. 4.32 Attention will be focused therefore on the reforming activity related to the destruction of altars which is described in v. 4 as being of primary value. This verse begins by portraying the destruction of altars in the following words: והיה לו ביום אספתו שלמה. What is of interest at the beginning of this verse is the designation of the verb כנ動作 in plural form in the MT. Hence the particular

31 The last part of verse 12 reading ויהי ביום אספתו שלמה in MT is repetitive of language elsewhere in 2Kgs 23 (namely vv. 4 and 6). Furthermore, there is a significant divergence in this part of v. 12 between MT and LXX. These considerations contribute to the view which regards the end of v. 12 as being part of a secondary development.
32 Odgen (1978:30).
reforming act of demolishing altars is not in a strict sense carried out by Josiah himself but by his agents who do the task מבר 'before his face'. The plural מבר in the MT seems to interrupt the chain of activity, in which every action associated with reform is assigned to Josiah alone (vv. 3b-7; יָשֵׁב לְשֹׁם פָּרֹצָה...הָעֵד). The major Greek versions (LXXB and LXXI) render the verb מבר in the singular but they disagree over the related detail.33 Another ancient Greek text (LXXA) does not follow the pattern of either LXXB nor LXXI but reads the verb in the plural as the MT.34 This incongruity among Greek witnesses in rendering the phrase with מבר contributes to the view that the MT reading in 2Chr 34:4 must be primary. Additional support for this understanding can be offered on the basis of an analogy with the text occurring in another part of the same chapter that has a parallel in Kings. In 2Chr 34:24 the verb מבר (followed by מבר) is used in the plural in the phrase that denotes the reading of the book found in the temple before the king. The phrase reads מבר מבר נא מבר ר谴责 מבר. In the parallel text in 2Kgs 22:16 on the other hand מבר, employed in the same context, occurs in the singular with מבר as its subject. The parallel phrase in Kings thus reads מבר מבר נא מבר. The expression מבר מבר מבר occurring in Chronicles does not necessarily point to Chr's greater sense for accuracy as it was Shaphan alone who earlier had read the book before the king (2Kgs 22:10//2Chr 34:18) but rather alludes to an aspect of Chr's own style characterized by his tendency towards the use of the plural.35 In both cases in Chronicles, 34:4(MT) and 34:24, we observe the plural form of the verbs being used and in both cases being followed by the expression מבר מבר. The parallel text for the latter verse, 2Kgs 22:16, conveys the singular form; and it may well be that in the source which Chr used both verbs מבר and מבר occurred in singular. Accordingly it can be stated that Chr in these two instances adjusted his source material in conformity with his customary mode of writing, opting for plurals used here particularly in combination with the expression מבר מבר.

33 LXXB reads κατά πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ τὰ θυσιαστήρια τῶν Βααλείμ. LXXI has κατά πρώτης αὐτῶν θυσιαστήρια τῶν Βααλείμ.
34 LXXA offers καταστρέφων κατά πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ τὰ θυσιαστήρια τῶν Βααλείμ. Cf. Curtis & Madsen (1910:504). It is further noticeable that each of these three Greek versions render the verb מבר by different equivalents. Both καταστρέφω (LXXB) and κατασκάτω (LXXI) are fairly common in rendering מבר by Greek versions. The verb κατασκάτω (LXXA) translates מבר in majority of cases. However, at least in one other instance apart from present case, Judg 8:17 LXXB, it also translates מבר; (cf. Hatch–Redpath 1998:4743-46).
The text in 2Chr 34:4 in its initial part describes the destruction of altars, where the altars are defined as being those belonging to Baals (יָאָלֵים). The text of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23 refers to altars being demolished in vv. 12 and 15 but without any particular specification of them being related to Baal. We find יָאָלֵים occurring in the reform report in Kings at another occasion but not in specific connection with יָאָלֵים. The initial phrase in 2Chr 34:4 that relates altars with Baal, though it does not have a corresponding parallel in the Kings account of Josiah, is not unique to Chronicles in the Old Testament. Earlier in the history of the Judean kingdom, king Manasseh is mentioned in both Kings and Chronicles as erecting altars to Baal(s) (יָאָלֵים in 2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3), and the same expression also occurs — included only in the Kings narrative — in Ahab’s story (1Kgs 16:32). Judges reports how Gideon, instructed by Yahweh, destroyed the altar of Baal (Judg 6:25-32).

While Chr’s account of Josiah’s reform has in common the use of ‘Baal’ with some other biblical texts as has just been noted, the parallel account in Kings is in this respect very different. On two occasions ‘Baal’ is encountered in 2Kgs 23, once in association with vessels in the temple (v. 4) and once in the context of the cultic practice of burning incense (v. 5). The occurrence of בַּאָל outside this passage, however, is nowhere attested; and nowhere else except here and in Jeremiah and Hosea does ‘Baal’ appear in the context of בַּאָל. This may imply that Chr probably did not derive his בַּאָל linked with יָאָלֵים from the source corresponding in detail to 2Kgs 23. Rather, his mention of בַּאָל linked with יָאָלֵים is more reminiscent of the text shared by Kings and Chronicles relating to the reign of Manasseh, where it is stated that Manasseh יָאָלֵים יָאָל (2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3). Did Chr add יָאָל to the text of his source on Josiah after the pattern of usage he found in the earlier story of Judean kings? Or had he already had יָאָל in the source material he used? How, or from what source, was the theme of ‘Baal’ in Josiah’s account in Kings developed? In both Kings and Chronicles the theme of ‘Baal’ after it appears in the accounts of Manasseh’s reign does not appear again until in connection with king Josiah. Could it be that ‘Baal’ was introduced to the text of Josiah’s reform in Kings under the influence of its occurrence in Manasseh’s story—very differently though from the manner the term was taken and re-used from that same story by Chr in his version of Josiah’s reign? Or was the theme of ‘Baal’ elaborated by later editors of Kings from a much briefer and more original account of Josiah’s reform that would also have served as a source to Chr and in which ‘Baal’

36 For occurrences in Jer and Hos, see p. 91 in this study.
was mentioned in connection with Josiah’s elimination of altars: אֲיָרָה חָרָם הוֹדֵל לָא מַעֲשֵׂה הָאָרֶץ? Perhaps this second suggestion is more likely: editors of Kings are viewed as having expanded the theme of Baal from a briefer note in an earlier account of the reform, stating that Josiah ‘broke down the altars of Baal’.38 A interesting observation can be made then that while Chr in his ובוות קְרָא מִשְׁמַרְתָּא בֶּרֶכֵּי (v. 4) remains more faithful to the original text of Josiah’s reform, the editors of Kings alter and expand the original note in a much more radical way. In their re-writing of Josiah’s elimination of the altars of Baal, ‘Baal’ is moved to another setting within the same account and replaced by a longer text that provides more detail concerning the altars being demolished. In the focal passage in this regard, 2Kgs 23:12, an originally simple report about the altars’ destruction is split into two statements – one refers to roof-top altars which had been built by kings of Judah and the other to altars which had been built by Manasseh. This second phrase of the expansion with its direct reference to Manasseh is a subsequent adaptation of לְסַפֵּר הַאֲרֵמָה בַּבְּרֵכָתוֹ from the account of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:5//2Chr 33:5). The earlier part mentioning roof-top altars constructed by the kings of Judah in its reference to ‘roof-top’ (מעב) as a location of altars is a unique case in the book of Kings. Only in few instances elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, namely in Jeremiah (19:13; 32:29) and Zephaniah (1:5), is a ‘roof-top’ associated with cultic practice. Viewed from this perspective it is perhaps easier to see how ‘altars of Baal’ could have been later substituted for ‘altars on the roof-top’, this being followed by more expansion of the text – elaborating on the original quite brief comment in the report stating that Josiah destroyed the altars of Baal.

One may further observe how ‘Baal’, being replaced by an expanded text in its original location in which it qualified מַעֲשֵׂה, was transposed by the editors of Kings to the two new contexts within the report of Josiah’s reform. One is in v. 5, the verse that is believed by the majority of scholars to be intrusive in the present arrangement

37 We leave open the question whether the verb רֵאַת would have been in the qal or piel theme in that primary text, since 2Kgs 23 uses consistently רֵאַת in qal (vv. 7, 8, 12, 15) while 2Chr 34 only in piel (vv. 4, 7).
38 If this reconstruction of the development of the text in Kings from the ‘original’ account of Josiah is correct, an interesting observation can be made that the phrase אֲיָרָה חָרָם הוֹדֵל לָא מַעֲשֵׂה הָאָרֶץ of the ‘original’ Josiah’s account has a direct parallel in its reference to altars of Baal with the story of Manasseh, which we would regard to belong to the same literary strata in the composition of Kings (and in the composition of Chronicles) with the ‘original’ account of Josiah’s reform—the primary text underlying histories of both Kings and Chronicles (cf. Auld 1994). This close relationship in phraseology testifies to the internal coherence of that primary source.
of the Hebrew text and therefore secondary to the original report. ‘Baal’ occurs in this verse associated with בְּרָעָו and this is unique in Kings, but elsewhere is attested mainly in Jeremiah (7:9; 11:13, 17; 32:29) and Hosea (2:15; cf. 11:2). Jer 32:29 speaks of the destruction of ‘houses on whose roofs incense has been offered to Baal’. The language of this verse not only resonates with the Kings passage in v. 5 that speaks about deposing those who burned incense to Baal but also in its mention of ‘roof-top’ recalls the reference to ‘roof-top altars’ in v. 12. Both these verses in Kings report, as they include expressions ‘those burning incense to Baal’ (v. 5) and ‘roof-top’ (v. 12), are secondary developments of the original shorter text. Since we observe these phrases occurring predominantly in Jeremiah, perhaps the conclusion can be drawn that one of the factors contributing to re-shaping of the original brief report of Josiah’s reform in Kings could have been the influence of Jeremianic texts.

The second context, within which ‘Baal’ was accommodated in the course of subsequent development of the reform account in Kings, is in v. 4. This deals with the reform activity in the temple. In our study earlier in this chapter (pp. 77-78) the view was proposed that the original material describing the reform activity pertaining to the temple consisted of only the report pertaining to the removal of a statue of cultic significance from the temple (2Kgs 23:6//2Chr 33:15). The very same theme of the removal of object(s) of illicit worship from the precincts of the temple appears in v. 4a, this time in a somewhat modified and expanded form. The features of the two related texts are explored below:

2Kgs 23:6a
וַיַּמְלֹךְ הַמָּלָכִים...וַאֲנֵה יָכְבִי לִשְׁמָךְ אֶלֶּהָוָא מַקָּה
2Kgs 23:4a
וַיָּכְבִי לִשְׁמָךְ אֶלֶּהָוָא מַקָּה בְּרָעָו...וַאֲנֵה יָכְבִי לִשְׁמָךְ אֶלֶּהָוָא מַקָּה בְּרָעָו

Both texts use the same verb יָכְבִי to denote removal from the temple; they both explicitly mention temple, though for this referent they use different terms (v. 6 – הַמָּלָכִים; v. 4 – יָכְבִי לִשְׁמָךְ); both specify, but again in different ways, the items that were (or were commanded to be) taken out of the temple (v. 6 – מַקָּה; v. 4 – בְּרָעָו). This investigation suggests that the theme of the removal of object(s) of illicit worship from the temple has been recast in v. 4a to form an expanded report of the reform activity in the temple. Verse 4 situates the

40 In Weinfeld (1972:322) these passages are listed as belonging to Deuteronomistic phraseology. Note, however, that Weinfeld in fact does not list (in nos. 10 & 11 on p. 322) any Deut or Dtr mention of these phrases alongside their occurrences in Jeremiah. For that reason they may not be strictly called Deuteronomistic.
theme into a new context in which the action is described as being carried out by priestly personnel\textsuperscript{41} under the king’s command.\textsuperscript{42} It also elaborates on the subject of concrete items being taken out of the temple. Originally a single cultic entity (referred to as הַמְזִיר in 23:6 or הַסִּינ in 2Chr 33:15) was reported as being removed from the temple. The text in v. 4 speaks of the implements (מֵכָּר) for Asherah and also the implements made for Baal and the hosts of heaven. All three—כָּר, מַעֲשֵׂים and מַעֲשֵׂים—occur together also in Manasseh’s story in 2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3, and we may well suspect that the text in Manasseh’s account exerted some influence on the formulation of this triad in v. 4.\textsuperscript{43} It is here within this triad, that the term ‘Baal’ ends up as one of the two new contexts after having been relocated from the phrase in the primary material (דַּעַל תַּחְמָא עַל חַס הַקּוֹס). On the basis of the above analysis it may be concluded that the reform reports of Josiah in both, Kings and Chronicles, reflect the use of הַמְזִיר + מַעֲשֵׂים to describe the destruction of altars. Chronicles provides less additional detail, yet it is specific in including that the altars destroyed were of Baals. Kings on the other hand presents more complex information as to the location and origin of the altars destroyed. It was noted, however, that in this elaborative account of Kings there are expressions drawn from elsewhere: some from the story of Manasseh, and some having links with Jeremianic texts, which illustrates their secondary nature. Thus the primary material that describes the destruction of altars is reflected more closely by the brief account in Chronicles that speaks merely of the demolishing of altars of Baals. In Josiah’s account in Kings, in which the phrase ‘altars of Baal’ does not occur, it has been suppressed in favour of a longer expansion. Subsequently, the mention of ‘Baal’ in the Kings report is made in two new contexts, which themselves belong to a following stage within the developing composition of Josiah’s reform in that book.

\textsuperscript{41} The tripartite division of priesthood – לְיָדָם וְלֵדָם וְלֵדָם and מַעֲשֵׂים – occurs elsewhere only in 2Kgs 25:18//Jer 52:24 (with the difference of מַעֲשֵׂים used instead of מִכָּר).

\textsuperscript{42} The introductory ‘king commanded’ (occurring also in 22:12; 23:21) together with ‘king sent’ (occurring in 22:3; 23:1) has been recognized as a structural device of the whole account in 2Kgs 22-23; see Lohfink (1987:461). This, however, does not undermine our argument that v. 4 with its introductory phrase ‘king commanded...’ belongs to the later stage of the composition of the text, since, as Barrick (2002:2) notes, this structuring ‘applies only to the final form of the narrative which may incorporate earlier version(s) of the story which could have been structured differently’.

\textsuperscript{43} כָּר, מַעֲשֵׂים and מַעֲשֵׂים occur together in one other text, 2Kgs 17:16. But as we shall later see, this is also dependent on the occurrence in the story of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3).
2.3. Cutting Down Asherahs

Instances of לָזֵהַס are found on several occasions in the reform reports of Josiah in both, Kings and Chronicles.\(^4^4\) The book of Kings, it has been earlier observed, identifies in 2Kgs 23:6 a cultic item taken out of the temple as לָזֵהַס in contrast to the parallel text in 2Chr 33:15, in which the same referent is denoted by לָזְכּ. The account in 2Kgs 23 also mentions לָזֵהַס in vv. 4 and 7, both of which draw on an older report about a single cultic entity being removed from the temple (v. 6).\(^4^5\) Another reference to לָזֵהַס is made later in the narrative in v. 15 that describes ‘burning’ (וּשָׁרֵט) of the cultic symbol. Agreeing with a number of scholars who do not consider this reference to לָזֵהַס to be primary in the account of Josiah’s reform, its occurrence in v. 15 must then belong to one of the stages of gradual supplementation of an earlier text.\(^4^6\) The original reading from which much of v. 15 later emanated may have dealt only with the destruction of altar(s).

The final reference to לָזֵהַס in Kings’ report of Josiah’s reform, which has not been discussed yet, occurs in v. 14 that portrays Josiah as the one breaking down לָזֵהַס, cutting up לָזֵהַס, and filling the graves with bones. The phrases לָזֵהַס and לָזֵהַס in v. 14 are usually considered stock deuteronomistic expressions, therefore editorial and secondary to the original narrative,\(^4^7\) or described as generalizing additions by the editor(s).\(^4^8\) It has been shown to the contrary, however, that these phrases are inherent in the reform texts shared by Kings and Chronicles, and they are subsequently utilized by the authors of Exodus, Deuteronomy and the Gideon story in Judges on one hand and by Chr on the other.\(^4^9\)

**The expression describing the destruction of לָזֵהַס which occurs in v. 14 is also part**

\(^{4^4}\) 2Kgs 23:4, 6, 7, 14, 15; 2Chr 34:3, 4, 7. See appendix C on p. 201 for all the occurrences, approximately 40 times, in the Hebrew Bible. Studies on the subject of Asherah are many and with the new epigraphic and iconographic evidence are increasing. They include most recently Smith (2002:xxx-xxxvi, 108-147); Hadley (2001); Becking et al (2001).

\(^{4^5}\) In v. 4, לָזֵהַס occurs linked with מִלְּחַמָּה and מִלְּחַמָּה; see above pp. 91-92 on the expansion of the theme of the illicit object’s removal in verse 4. Relating to v. 7 which belongs to the same stage of subsequent development with v. 4, see pp. 127-35.

\(^{4^6}\) E.g. Montgomery (1951:534); Würthwein (1984:453); cf. Eynikel (1996:348-49). Considering מְאֹד מְלָאכָה in v. 15 as an addition, this does not hinder the view that the preceding מְאֹד מְלָאכָה in the MT of v. 15 is an inner MT development dependent on this addition. Cf. above, pp. 79-80.

\(^{4^7}\) E.g. Lowery (1991:207-208).

\(^{4^8}\) E.g. Montgomery (1951:534); Nelson (1981:82); Jones (1984:624).

\(^{4^9}\) See above, pp. 53-56.
of the texts shared by Kings and Chronicles regarding Hezekiah’s reform (2Kgs 18:4//2Chr 31:1). That this piece of standard phraseology of the reform texts common to Kings and Chronicles is also characteristic of the original account of Josiah’s reform used by composers of Kings and by Chr will become clear when analyzing the occurrences of בְּשׁוֹר in Josiah’s story in Chronicles.

The word בְּשׁוֹר appears three times in 2Chr 34, twice within the series בְּשׁוֹר וְכָנָן יְבָא (vv. 3, 4) and once in combination with יִכְבָּד only (v. 7). The triad בְּשׁוֹר וְכָנָן יְבָא forming at the end of v. 3 the list of cultic objects from which Josiah purged Judah and Jerusalem seems to have been drawn from the subsequent reading in v. 4 with the occurrence of the very same grouping of cultic entities, to which בְּשׁוֹר belongs. The reference to the destruction of בְּשׁוֹר in v. 7 is made within the context of Chr’s presentation of Josiah’s northern reforms that displays a deliberate continuity with Chr’s portrayal of the reform measures in the south (v. 4). The occurrence of בְּשׁוֹר in v. 4 might therefore be considered of primary significance in the present investigation. In this verse, which divides into several parts that specify the reform activities, the second and the third clauses associated with the verbs יְבָא and יִכְבָּד are of particular interest. The term בְּשׁוֹר does not occur in this text as an object in its usual connection with יְבָא, but in a subsequent phrase linked with יִכְבָּד.50 The verb יְבָא in the second clause of the verse is employed with the less common noun יְבָא, which occurs only three times in Chronicles (2Chr 14:4; 34:4, 7) and five times elsewhere (Lev 26:30; Isa 17:8; 27:9; Ezek 6:4, 6). With regard to the presence of יְבָא in Chr’s account of Josiah’s reform, Barrick (2002:21) makes a trenchant comment. He states that despite other scholars maintaining that Chr summarized Kings account of Josiah’s reform in 2Chr 34:3b-5 resorting to generalized language, the passage in 2Chr 34:4 in its reference to the altars destroyed in Josiah’s presence and to יְבָא being placed somewhere above the altars is ‘oddly specific’. It has not always been a matter of certainty what precisely יְבָא means. The prevailing view in the determination of the function and meaning of יְבָא has until recently been, based on the evidence of Nabatean and Palmyrene inscriptions, that it should be rendered as ‘incense altars’.51 More recent studies re-examining the

50 Nowhere else does the term מְטָר occur in the context of cult destruction with the verb יְבָא but almost as a rule with מְטָר.

51 This interpretation, found in dictionaries and standard works on ancient Israel such as HALOT 1:329, DCH 3:256, Galling (IDB 1:699-700), Beye (TDOT 4:475-77), Albright (1946:215), de Vaux (1961:286-87) goes back to studies of Ingholt (1939:795-802) and Elliger (1939:256-65 and 1943:129-39) who concluded independently of each other that the nature and function of יְבָא was that of incense stands.
Palmyrene evidence suggest, however, that the word refers to ‘shrine’ or ‘sanctuary’.\textsuperscript{52} Irrespective of its factual physical import, דִּישָׁה occurs only a few times in the Hebrew Bible – in Lev 26:30; 2Chr 14:4; 34:4, 7; Isa 17:8; 27:9; Ezek 6:4, 6. The impression is created by this limited group of texts employing דִּישָׁה that it reflects a later use of this word.\textsuperscript{53} In the case of 2Chr 34:4 דִּישָׁה, then, does not belong to the original reform report of Chr’s sources but is a term used by Chr in his elaboration of the older story of Josiah’s reign.

The removal of דִּישָׁה in the account of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles is stated in terms involving the action of יָשַׁב ‘hew down’.\textsuperscript{54} It is of interest to note that in 2Chr 34:4 this verb stands in close proximity to יָשַׁב which, however, belongs to the following clause and together with the other two terms רָשָׁה and דָּשִׁים is the target of the activity of רָשָׁה. An implication can be drawn that יָשַׁב linked with דִּישָׁה in the present text, before the later introduction of דִּישָׁה into this passage, was tied with דָּשִׁים. When דִּישָׁה subsequently became part of Chr’s text, some rearrangement took place in which רָשָׁה was disassociated from יָשַׁב and became part of the activity of רָשָׁה. The reading in v. 7, which is to some extent parallel with v. 4, similarly reflects a further expansion of the text in its inclusion of דִּישָׁה, now combined in phrase with יָשַׁב. Comparing the two verses one may observe a slight difference in the use of the verb for destruction of דִּישָׁה in that v. 4 uses רָשָׁה while v. 7 employs רָשָׁה. Notwithstanding this difference, a conclusion can be drawn on the grounds of דִּישָׁה being a later term in 2Chr 34:4, 7 that the earlier reading underlying Chr’s version of Josiah’s reform had יָשַׁב tied with דָּשִׁים. This has been later superseded by the present reading that links יָשַׁב with דִּישָׁה. The restored earlier text which had יָשַׁב linked with דִּישָׁה corresponds well with the reading in Kings which comprises רָשָׁה + דִּישָׁה (2Kgs 23:14). This demonstrates that the collocation יָשַׁב + דִּישָׁה belongs to the core language of the reform texts and occurs not only in the shared passages of Kings and Chronicles regarding Hezekiah’s reform but is also fundamental to the original text of Josiah’s reform used by both histories.


\textsuperscript{54} The destruction of דִּישָׁה is portrayed in terms of יָשַׁב also in Lev 26:30 and Ezek 6:6.
2.4. Breaking Down Pillars/Images

The phrase denoting breaking of cultic installations, which is characterized by the use of פֶּרֶשׁ + בָּשַׁב, is another expression that reflects the typical language of the reform reports found in the shared contexts of Kings and Chronicles. In the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings it appears in v. 14 preceding מִבֶּית הַמְּדִיחָה, the phrase discussed above pertaining to the destruction of פֶּרֶשׁ. It may be contended that both מִבֶּית הַמְּדִיחָה and מִבֶּית הַמְּדִיחָה in v. 14 that display features of standard language of the reform accounts in synoptic contexts preserve in their formulation the traces of an earlier text of Josiah’s reform, subsequently expanded in Kings.

The verbs פֶּרֶשׁ and בָּשַׁב of the two expressions in v. 14 convey action that is similarly manifest in the account of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles with the parallel occurrence of פֶּרֶשׁ and the use of בָּשַׁב, a term appearing frequently in Chronicles in a synonymous way to בָּשַׁב. Chr’s text of Josiah’s reform, however, has several specifics in its employment of בָּשַׁב and פֶּרֶשׁ. As has been shown above, the verb פֶּרֶשׁ originally linked with פֶּרֶשׁ, was later used by Chr in the text of Josiah’s reform with reference to the destruction of פֶּרֶשׁ (2Chr 34:4, 7). The other verb, בָּשַׁב, is in 34:4 used in combination with פֶּרֶשׁ, פֶּרֶשׁ and בָּשַׁב. A plausible reason for Chr to include the term פֶּרֶשׁ among the list of cultic items that were destroyed (בָּשַׁב) may be the subsequent reference in the same verse to them being beaten to dust and scattered over the graves. This terminology particularly recalls the destruction of the calf narrated in Exodus and Deuteronomy (Ex 32:20; Deut 9:21), in which contexts the description of the calf, as object of cultic worship, is made in terms of פֶּרֶשׁ (Ex 32:2, 4; Deut 9:12, 16). It should be noted that apart from the list of cultic objects in the report of Josiah’s reform, and with exception of 2Chr 28:2, פֶּרֶשׁ is not attested elsewhere in Chronicles. Leaving aside the occurrence of פֶּרֶשׁ in 2Chr 28:2, which

55 On this term see Dohmen (TDOT 8:431-37); Schroer (1987:310-14). The collocation פֶּרֶשׁ בָּשַׁב is sometimes regarded in passages, such as Judg 17:3; 4; 18:14; Deut 27:15; Isa 48:5, as hendiatly; see North (1958:153-54); Schroer (1987:312-13). Note, for example, the NRSV translating פֶּרֶשׁ בָּשַׁב in Judg 17:3 as ‘an idol of cast metal’, but פֶּרֶשׁ בָּשַׁב in Isa 48:5 as ‘my carved image and my cast image’ or פֶּרֶשׁ בָּשַׁב in the passage under discussion, 2Chr 34:4, as ‘the carved and the cast images’.

56 It might be relevant at this occasion to mention Halpern (1976:36) who notes that פֶּרֶשׁ occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament ‘mainly where the calf either of Sinai or of Samaria is specifically alluded to’, and he cites Ex 32:4, 8; 34:17; Lev 19:4; Deut 9:12, 16; 27:15 1Kgs 14:9; 2Kgs 17:16; Hos 13:2 and Ps 106:20.
has been questioned by some scholars, the appearance of this term in 2Chr 34:4 (repeated in 34:3) then seems to have been influenced by the reverberations of some of the terminology within the passage to which it was introduced by Chr with the language of the calf’s destruction in Exodus 32 and Deuteronomy 9.

The other term beside מְשֹׁא and מִשְׁא used in connection with מְשֹׁא in Chr’s account of Josiah in 2Chr 34:4 is מְשֹׁא. This word occurs several times in Chronicles. Its root, בּ, appears first in Chronicles in the construction בּ מְשֹׁא which is employed in the story of Manasseh (2Chr 33:7; cf. parallel מְשֹׁא מְשֹׁא in 2Kgs 21:7). Afterwards, Chr uses מְשֹׁא on several occasions in his accounts of Manasseh, Amon and Josiah (2Chr 33:19, 22; 34:3, 4, 7), in places where there is no corresponding occurrence of it in the stories of these three monarchs in Kings.

Studying the language involved with מְשֹׁא in the text of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles and how it differs from the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, a question arises concerning the phrase with מְשֹׁא in the source material Chr used for his account. Would the original text of Chr’s source contain מְשֹׁא linked with מְשֹׁא as it is in Kings (23:14)? If so, would then Chr in rewriting his source change מְשֹׁא for מְשֹׁא and make further alterations adding מְשֹׁא and מְשֹׁא as objects to מְשֹׁא? Though this possibility cannot be discounted, one needs to bear in mind that Chr does not seem to be against the usage of מְשֹׁא in connection with מְשֹׁא. This combination of terms is shared by Kings and Chronicles in the story of Hezekiah’s reform (2Kgs 18:4//2Chr 31:1), and Chr uses it additionally in his account of Asa (2Chr 15:13). Could it be then that Chr used a source material which slightly departed from the text used by Kings in that it already included the phrase מְשֹׁא + מְשֹׁא in Josiah’s narrative, which was later supplied by Chr with other terms such as מְשֹׁא and מְשֹׁא? This remains a matter of speculation. In any case, both possibilities of original reading, מְשֹׁא + מְשֹׁא or מְשֹׁא + מְשֹׁא would be acceptable for later expanding of the original text by Chr into an expression that reads in the received text מְשֹׁא מְשֹׁא מְשֹׁא מְשֹׁא. The phrase with מְשֹׁא associated either with מְשֹׁא or מְשֹׁא in the source material Chr used would

---

57 See, e.g., Dohmen (TDOT 8:435); cf. a suggestion of emendation in DCH 5:363. In 2Chr 28:2, LXX has γιος, while Peshitta reads כָּסָס in 28:2, on the basis of which some suggested the original Hebrew reading מְשֹׁא. However, great caution is needed regarding the value of the Peshitta of Chronicles for a text-critical argument. Weitzman (1999:111-21) points out that the writer of the Peshitta of Chronicles worked with a defective Hebrew text and had a poor knowledge of the Hebrew language.

58 On the root see see Dohmen (TDOT 12:30-38).
also be fairly close to the text of the original reform report which was employed by the authors/editors of Kings in 2Kgs 23:14.

2.5. Crushing Idols to Powder

Both Kings and Chronicles utilize in their accounts of Josiah’s reform the verb כִּפַּר with reference to ‘grinding’ cultic paraphernalia. כִּפַּר is not a frequent term in biblical texts, and is used elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible to describe ‘crushing’ objects (e.g. grain Isa 28:28; mountains Isa 41:15) as well as people (e.g. enemies 2Sam 22:43; nations Mic 4:13). In the books of Kings and Chronicles, this verb appears in a hiphil theme denoting specifically ‘grinding’ or ‘crushing’ of illicit cult objects.60 In the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, כִּפַּר occurs twice – in vv. 6 and 15. Assenting to the proposition already discussed that the latter verse has developed in stages from the kernel relating to Josiah’s destruction of altar(s), it can be inferred that the appearance of כִּפַּר in v. 15 is not primary but belongs to one of the editorial expansions of the original brief note.61 Its employment in v. 15 seems to have been indebted to the text which is in the present form of Josiah’s account in Kings associated with the destruction of הַמִּסָּח found in the temple: verse 6 first refers to הַמִּסָּח being removed from the temple and then burnt in the Kidron valley, crushed (כִּפַּר) to dust, and the remains from it being dumped in the burial ground. כִּפַּר features in the second half of v. 6 alongside another verb describing the activity following the grinding to dust. This verb, הַמִּסָּח, is used to describe the treatment of the dust of the pulverized cultic entity as it is thrown out onto the graves of common people. The parallel text with regard to pulverization of cultic paraphernalia and the subsequent casting on the graveyard in 2Chr 34:4 shares with the account in 2Kgs 23:6 the use of the verb כִּפַּר to refer to crushing of cultic entities but in depicting the act of

---

expulsion on ‘the graves of those who had sacrificed to them’ it uses תָּפָּר (scatter), unlike in Kings where תָּפָּר (throw out) is employed.62

Scholars have previously noted literary parallels, regarding the manner in which cultic entities are demolished, between Josiah’s destruction of cult objects in Kings (2Kgs 23:6, 12) and Moses’ destruction of the golden calf in Deuteronomy (9:21; cf. parallel in Ex 32:20).63 Begg (1985:208-51) in his detailed study of the biblical passages recounting the calf’s destruction in Deut 9:21 and Ex 32:20 further explored the ways in which the text in Deuteronomy, representing ‘amplifying and specifying rewriting’ (p. 235) of the text in Exodus, is related through verbal links with the passages in Kings that refer to the reform measures of Josiah as well as other reforming kings. What has escaped attention, however, when uncovering the interrelationships between the texts describing the calf’s destruction in Ex 32:20 and Deut 9:21 and further between Deut 9:21 and the texts dealing with reforms in Kings including Josiah’s account in 2Kgs 23, is the relevance of parallel material depicting the destruction of cultic entities in Chronicles, that of Josiah’s reform in particular. To see how the evidence from Chronicles may elucidate some points in the nesting of these literary links, the formulations depicting the calf’s destruction in Ex 32:20 and Deut 9:21 are compared below with the phrases referring to demolishing cultic entities in the parallel accounts of Josiah in 2Kgs 23:6 and 2Chr 34:4.

Ex 32:20 2Chr 34:4

The two texts depicting the pulverization of the calf, Ex 32:20 and Deut 9:21, employ the term תָּפָּר (in qal), which is also used (in hiphil) in Josiah’s reduction of the illicit cult in 2Kgs 23:6 and 2Chr 34:4. The verse in Deuteronomy, which Begg (1985:235) finds more ‘verbose, elaborate and specificatory’ than the text in Exodus, links תָּפָּר with תָּפָּר. This particular combination also occurs in 2Kgs 23:6, but is absent from 2Chr 34:4 just as it is not found in Ex 32:20. Following the action involving תָּפָּר, the next reform measure is portrayed in Deut 9:21 by לָשֶׁת + תָּפָּר.  

62 In the account of Josiah’s reform, Chr employs the verb תָּפָּר also in 34:7. However, the text of this verse, though to a great extent repetitive of 2Chr 34:4, is not a parallel to 2Kgs 23:6 in the way the text of 2Chr 34:4 is.

Again, this formulation also appears in 2Kgs 23:6 but neither in 2Chr 34:4 nor in Ex 32:20. On the other hand, the corresponding text to Deut 9:21 uses in Ex 32:20 the verb תַּקִּד. Obviously this is not exactly the same term as employed in the depiction of Josiah’s further action in Chronicles. Nevertheless קֶבֶץ of 2Chr 34:4 and תַּקִּד of Ex 32:20 are semantically rather closer to each other in their connotation of ‘scatter’ when compared with קָשֶׂה used in Deut 9:21 and 2Kgs 23:6.64 Finally, the combination תַּקִּד + קְשָׂה appearing in Ex 32:20 recalls the collocation קֶבֶץ + קְשָׂה in 2Chr 34:4. In contrast, Deut 9:21 links קָשֶׂה with בָּהֵן, which corresponds to the reading וִיתָקַד that occurs in 2Kgs 23, though not in v. 6 but a little later in v. 12.

The foregoing discussion of verbal linkage does not undermine the substance of Begg’s argument that the portrayal of the destruction of the golden calf in Ex 32:20 has been reworked and expanded in Deut 9:21.65 What the above mentioned links seem further to suggest is that the text relating to Josiah’s destruction of cultic entities in 2Chr 34:4, showing some affinity with Ex 32:20 in the way in which these two verses are distanced from Deut 9:21 and 2Kgs 23:6, may be preferable as the more original reading than the corresponding formulation in 2Kgs 23:6. At the same time it needs to be reckoned that 2Chr 34:4 includes late elements too. The final two words, בָּהֵן פָּרָס, display marks of secondary addition. They do not square easily with the preceding בָּהֵן, which would require to be in construct state or at least without the definite article in order to accommodate בָּהֵן פָּרָס.66 Perhaps this addition referring to those who sacrificed to illicit cultic entities is part of the same

64 Note the dictionaries, e.g. Holladay (1988:92-93) or DCH 3:134, 144, attributing the first meaning to both verbs as that of ‘scatter’; cf. HALOT (2:280, 283).
66 Various proposals have been offered to resolve this problem. Béregich in the apparatus of BHK suggests a conjecture of בָּהֵן to construct state בָּהֵן, presuming this to have been in the Hebrew Vorlage of ancient versions (see e.g. LXX reading καὶ ἔφυγεν ἐκ τῆς πρόσωπος τῶν μάταιων τῶν θυσιάζων αὐτοῦ); thus also Curtis & Madsen (1910:504). Rudolph proposes in the apparatus of BHS (see further his 1955:318) to insert בָּהֵן יָד which in his view has fallen out of the original text by homoioteleuton. Washburn (1991:63-65) and Barrick (2002:21-22) who take a very different stand from the earlier proposals maintain that בָּהֵן, being a transitive verb, needs a direct object, and they opt for בָּהֵן פָּרָס, thus translating ‘he...scattered before/over the graves [the remains of] those who had sacrificed to them’. However, their argument against viewing בָּהֵן פָּרָס as the collective object of בָּהֵן, which is the usual understanding, is not persuasive since the missing pronominal object/suffix of בָּהֵן can be easily understood as the case of ellipsis; see GKC §117E. Gibson (1994:110), Because there is no unanimity among interpreters of this biblical passage concerning its grammatical difficulty it seems best to resort to the view that בָּהֵן פָּרָס is a later, grammatically not too careful, addition.
modifications to the original text which started a few verses earlier: in the account of Amon in 2Chr 33:22, a similar statement is made about ‘sacrificing’ to illicit cultic objects with the verb נָּעַשׁ employed next to נָּגַם, whilst the parallel text in 2Kgs 21:21 uses נָּמָח together with נָּגַם, and in this in all likelihood preserves the original string of verbs.67 Returning to 2Chr 34:4, apart from the final two words, the part of this verse that begins with the mention of crushing (נָּמָח) cultic entities may point to the reading that precedes the formulation in 2Kgs 23:6. That reading would involve נָּעַשׁ rather than נָּגַם, and would not include נָּמָח. The reconstructed text might have read: יָשָׁם יִשָּׁמֶשׁ על פני הקברות.

A plausible explanation exists for the development of the second half of 2Kgs 23:6 from the primary text just outlined. In the discussion comparing 2Kgs 23:6 and 2Chr 33:15 it has been proposed that the verb נָּעַשׁ originally appeared in the first part of the verse rather than the second. It was also suggested that the statement in v. 6 was originally much briefer than the present text, consisting only of the report about a cultic object being taken out of the temple and thrown out of Jerusalem to the brook Kidron, and that the second part of the verse, starting with נָּמָח, was adapted and transferred from another section of the original material pertaining to Josiah’s reform (p. 77). This contention can now be substantiated and further specified with the help of the parallel text in 2Chr 34:4. In Chr’s account of Josiah’s reform the crushing (נָּמָח) with subsequent dispersing (נָּעַשׁ) on the burial place is not mentioned with reference to a particular cult object located in the temple but it is stated to take place with regard to a variety of cultic entities. The action is reported in close relation with the mention of cultic objects being cut down (נָּמָח) and smashed (נָּעַשׁ). It may well be that in the original report of Josiah’s reform in Kings, identifiable with Chr’s Vorlage, the act of ‘crushing’ cultic objects together with ‘dispersing’ on the graves came later in the narrative and was associated more generally with the destruction of altars (cf. 23:12), pillars and asherahs (cf. 23:14). Only at a subsequent stage of re-drafting the earlier version of Josiah’s reform, the phrase relating to ‘crushing’ and ‘dispersing’ has been transposed from its original

67 The verb נָּעַשׁ is used four times in the last two chapters in Chronicles (33:16, 17, 33; 34:4), but only once in the corresponding chapters in Kings (23:20). The sole string of verbs נָּמָח and נָּגַם, occurring in 2Chr 33:22 appears elsewhere in Kings and Chronicles only in 2Chr 33:16 (Chr’s special material on Manasseh), while the combination of נָּמָח and נָּגַם, found in 2Kgs 21:21 appears also in the shared material of Kings and Chronicles in 1Kgs 9:6//2Chr 7:19, 1Kgs 9:9//2Chr 7:22 and 2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3. It is thus more probable that the text in 2Kgs 21:21 is more original in its choice of verbs, and the one in 2Chr 33:22 in its preference of נָּעַשׁ over נָּמָח is later.
setting of being associated with the destruction of a variety of cultic entities to be linked specifically with the measures carried out against a cultic statue in the temple. This would have taken place because of the heightened interest of Kings editors in emphasizing the total annihilation of the cultic object found in the temple. The rearrangement of the material would have allowed for further alterations being made to the original phrase relating to ‘crushing’ and ‘dispersing’ the cultic entities on the burial ground; the verb נָעַשׁ originally occurring in the passage about removal of the cultic object from the temple replaced the term for ‘scattering’ (נָשַׁנּו) and has been further augmented with נָעַשׁ, the word supplementing also the preceding verb נָעַשׁ.

The term נָעַשׁ appears to be specific to the final version in Kings of Josiah’s reform. It occurs five times in 2Kgs 23, more often in this chapter than in any other chapter in the Hebrew Bible. In 2Kgs 23 it is linked twice each with נָעַשׁ (vv. 6, 12) and נָעַשׁ (vv. 6, 15) and once with נָעַשׁ (v. 4). We may also note that while both נָעַשׁ and נָעַשׁ are used elsewhere in connection with idolatrous objects – נָעַשׁ in Isa 2:20; Ezek 20:7, 8; 2Chr 30:14; 33:15 and נָעַשׁ in Ex 32:20, 2Chr 15:16; 34:4, 7 – nowhere in these texts is the reference made to נָעַשׁ as the ‘dust’ of illicit cultic entities. The only exception is Deut 9:21, the text derived from Ex 32:20 which in its development has been influenced as well as itself exerted an influence on the shaping of the story of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24, with which it shares a number of significant links.68 Therefore, it is likely that just as נָעַשׁ is not found in Ex 32:20 but belongs to the more elaborate text of Deut 9:21, so also the occurrences of נָעַשׁ in 2Kgs 23 are not part of the original version of Josiah’s reform but belong to the literary growth of Josiah’s account in Kings. The references to נָעַשׁ in v. 6 being of secondary nature have been discussed above. The employment of נָעַשׁ in conjunction with נָעַשׁ in v. 15 might be safely regarded as belonging to a later stage of production of Josiah’s text in Kings since as it was argued elsewhere the basic nucleus of v. 15 rests in the comment about Josiah destroying altar(s). Also the phrase ending v. 4 which refers to נָעַשׁ being carried to Bethel is regarded by most commentators as a secondary addition.69 Lastly in v. 12, similarly as in v. 6, the term נָעַשׁ appears as the direct object of נָעַשׁ. It has been suggested earlier that the combination נָעַשׁ + נָעַשׁ in v. 6 in the received text of Kings belongs to a later adaptation and re-writing of the primary

68 See the links explored in Begg (1985:236, 238-39) and in an earlier literature cited there.
69 See e.g. Montgomery (1951:529), Gray (1970:732), Jones (1984:618). The majority of these commentators, however, argue for the secondary status of the final part of v. 4 on the basis of w-qatal criterion, regarding which we have expressed some doubts (see above p. 6 n. 16). For our view, that the whole v. 4 is late and secondary, see pp. 127-30.
version of Kings account of Josiah’s reform with the verb יָרָה originally appearing in the expression that describes the removal of the cultic statue from the temple. The occurrence of יָרָה + בָּשׁ in v. 12, then, therefore merely follows the construction appearing already secondarily in v. 6, in which it has been an outcome of the changes made during the rearrangements of the primary material. During these rearrangements the placing of the phrase הרִחְצֵי אֲדֹנָי הָרָעָה לְפָנֵי יָהֳעַן to v. 12 would have been a limited attempt to compensate for the relocated and modified phrase concerning crushing and dispersing cultic objects now occurring in v. 6, which being in the original material associated with the destruction of a variety of cultic objects would have occurred nearby the texts that mention the destruction of altars (v. 12), asheras and pillars (v. 14). A final point to note is that v. 12 shares some distinctive features with Deut 9:21. The mutual influence between Deut 9:21 and 2Kgs 23 as these texts gradually expanded from older materials has already been acknowledged.

It can be concluded that the discussion about Josiah’s destruction of cultic entities being conducted against a background of the study of the text dealing with Moses’ destruction of the calf has been enriched by bringing into consideration the text of Josiah’s actions in Chronicles. This has proved to have a transforming effect on the understanding of the development of the older materials dealing with Josiah’s reform.

2.6 Burning Human Bones

Josiah’s actions in the course of his religious reform included as an instrument of destructive force the use of fire. In the reform account in Kings the destruction by fire relates to human bones as well as to entities of cultic significance. The verb יָרָה associated with ‘burning’ is found seven times in 2Kgs 23 MT, twice in reference to human bones (vv. 16, 20) and in five cases describing the destruction of cultic objects (vv. 4, 6, 11, 15 [2x]). The first occurrence of יָרָה in 2Kgs 23 associated with cultic objects is made in v. 4 where it follows the mention of the removal of

---

70 It occurs, rendered as κατασφαλεῖ, six times in 2Kgs 23 LXX. Verse 15 in the LXX includes only one reference to ‘burning’ and not two as in the MT.
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cultic vessels from the temple. The verb כָּכָּב refers in this verse to cultic paraphernalia which, after they are taken out of the temple, are burnt outside of Jerusalem in קֵדְמָה of Kidron. It has been proposed above (pp. 91-92) that the theme of the removal of objects of illicit worship in v. 4 is a later expansion of the same theme concerned with the removal of the statue of cultic significance in v. 6a. From this it follows that the occurrence of כָּכָּב in v. 4 is not primary but belongs to the later elaboration in this verse of the theme of cultic objects’ removal. A further point of interest relates to the interconnectedness of the final form of vv. 4 and 6. The links which these verses share in the use of for instance the verbs כִּבָּשׁ and כָּכָּב and the expressions קָדְרָיָה and אֶרֶץ might be due to a mutual influence in the growth of the material of these two passages from the original core, more or less represented by v. 6a. It may be observed by having a closer look at the phrase קָדְרָיָה אֶרֶץ בֵּית קִדְרֹן ‘he burnt it at the brook Kidron’ in v. 6, how the process of mutual influence within the expansion may have taken place. This expression shares a link with the expansionist v. 4 in its use of כָּכָּב while at the same time it repeats the reference to קָדְרָיָה אֶרֶץ from the immediately preceding text. The secondary character of קָדְרָיָה אֶרֶץ in v. 6 is thus easily discerned.

The verb כָּכָּב occurs twice in v. 15 (MT) linked with the destruction of cultic entities. First, it appears in the variant כִּבָּשׁ הָאָרֶץ. The secondary character of this reading specific to the MT has already been discussed in connection with occurrences of כִּבָּשׁ in 2Kgs 23. The second mention of כָּכָּב in v. 15 is made with reference to כִּבָּשׁ. It has been noted in discussing the occurrences of כִּבָּשׁ in 2Kgs 23 that the report on the burning of כִּבָּשׁ in v. 15 also belongs to the subsequent development of Kings composition, though not being so late as the MT variant in the same verse pertaining to burning of כִּבָּשׁ.

The final case to be considered, in which כָּכָּב is used to indicate the burning of a cultic entity, appears in v. 11. This verse, which mentions burning of chariots of sun, is not without complications. Scholars recognize uncertainties regarding the location of the events described in this verse as well as the provenance of terminology occurring in the passage. The expression כִּבָּשׁ נַחֲלָתָם ‘chariots of sun’ used as an object of כָּכָּב in the latter part of v. 11 occurs unparalleled elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. In the immediate context of v. 11 its appearance is in connection with solar worship. Consequently, ‘chariots of sun’ appearing in the second half of

71 See the discussion of this term on p. 129 n. 5.
the verse cannot be separated from the first part of the verse referring to ‘horses’ (םְבוֹל) dedicated to the sun. And since the text in v. 11 as a whole ‘conveys some notions associated more closely with the second [temple],’ it is highly probable that the use of הָרֶם in the phrase הָרֶם לֹאמֶךָ מְנַחֵם comes from the pen of later authors/editors of Kings and not from the author of the original report.

After paying attention to the occurrences of הָרֶם in Josiah’s story in Kings, which involve the elimination of cultic entities, there are two remaining instances of הָרֶם in 2Kgs 23 to be discussed that are employed to designate the destruction of human bones. With regard to bone-burning the text in v. 16 states that Josiah ‘sent and took the bones out of the tombs, and burned them upon the altar.’ A few lines later v. 20 reports that Josiah ‘slew all the priests of the high places who were there, upon the altars, and burned the bones of men upon them.’ On a related point turning to the account of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles it should be observed that despite the predominant use in Josiah’s story in Kings of the verb הָרֶם in connection with elimination of cultic paraphernalia, in the account in Chronicles this is never the case. To the contrary, the use of הָרֶם in 2Chr 34 revolves around the destruction of human bones as it is in the case of 2Kgs 23:16 and 20. Several issues are involved in the discussion of these two verses in Kings and the related text in 2Chr 34:5, which reports that Josiah ‘burnt the bones of the priests on the altars’.

First, as recently noted by Barrick (2002:40) the two texts describing the destruction of human bones in Josiah’s account in Kings portray slightly different pictures with regard to bone-burning. 2Kgs 23:16a reports that the bones burnt on the altar were those from nearby tombs on the mountain. Verse 20, on the other hand, mentions יִשָּׁר תַּמּוֹם ‘bones of people’ burnt on the cultic installation, this being preceded in the same verse by the reference to slaughtering priests on the altars. In this detail, narrating the slaughter of priests before reporting on the bone-burning, v. 20 seems to be distanced from v. 16a where there is no mention of such action relating to priests taking place. The slaughter of priestly personnel followed by bone-burning, however, is recorded in the story of the man of God (1Kgs 13:2) in a manner almost identical with 23:20, which may suggest that these two verses in their

---

72 Taylor (1993:181). In other words, Taylor (1993:179) thinks regarding the description of topographic places in 23:11 that it more likely ‘reflects the situation of the post-exilic temple’. See also our discussion of v. 11 on pp. 149-54.
final form belong to the same literary stratum of the book of Kings, being probably of later date than the material in 23:16a.\textsuperscript{73}

The view is widely held with regard to the related text in 2Chr 34:5 that this verse is Chr’s compilation of material derived from 2Kgs 23:16 and 20.\textsuperscript{74} The passage in Chronicles does not mention יִנְהָה ‘bones of people’ (cf. 23:20) nor does it state that the bones burnt were those from nearby tombs (cf. 23:16). Instead 2Chr 34:5 refers to יִנְהָה ‘bones of priests’ being burnt on their altars. Despite the mention of יִנְהָה in 2Kgs 23:20, the occurrence in particular of the verbs יִנְהָה and יִנְהָה in 2Chr 34:5 and the sequence in which they are found in this verse indicates that 34:5 shares links primarily with 2Kgs 23:16. In both 34:5 and 23:16 the verb יִנְהָה used in the context of bone-burning is followed by a verb conveying the notion of purity/impurity – נֵיה in 34:5 and טָמֵא in 23:16.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
2Kgs 23:16 & 2Chr 34:5 \\
יִנְהָה יִנְהָה יִנְהָה & יִנְהָה יִנְהָה יִנְהָה
\end{array}
\]

Obviously יִנְהָה has a different function in 2Chr 34:5 than טָמֵא used in 2Kgs 23:16. In the final form of Josiah’s account in Chronicles, יִנְהָה יִנְהָה יִנְהָה in v. 5 and יִנְהָה יִנְהָה יִנְהָה יִנְהָה in v. 3 together belong to a formal framework bracketing the section 3b-5 of Josiah’s activities in the south. It seems that this has been a deliberate device by Chr to create a kind of inclusio by these expressions. Thus it is highly probable that Chr altered the original wording יִנְהָה יִנְהָה (reflected in 23:16) to suit his purposes here. Studying particular terminology in 34:5 by means of comparison with expressions used in 23:16, one may concede that the text of the original reform report concerning Josiah’s action in relation to יִנְהָה, the text which Chr also used, included the reference to bones being burnt followed by a subsequent note on Josiah’s pollution of the altar.

As already observed, 2Chr 34:5 differs from 2Kgs 23:16 in its details regarding the bones burnt on the altar. While the verse in Kings relating to this issue mentions יִנְהָה ‘bones’ from nearby tombs, the verse in Chronicles refers to יִנְהָה ‘bones

\textsuperscript{73} A similar conclusion about primary significance of the bone-burning in 23:16a over the one in 23:20 is made by Barrick (2002:40, 48).

\textsuperscript{74} Curtis & Madsen (1910:504); Japhet (1993:1023). Rudolph (1955:319) and Williamson (1982a:399) suggest to compare 2Chr 34:5a also with 2Kgs 23:14 alongside 23:16 and 20.

\textsuperscript{75} Qere reading, יִנְהָה, is supported also by LXX

\textsuperscript{1} וְיִנְהָה וְיִנְהָה וְיִנְהָה וְיִנְהָה ‘their altars’. Ketub reading, יִנְהָה, appears to be a scribal error, a slip of the pen.
of priests.' There is no need to suppose, however, that Chr was influenced in his choice of ‘priests’ in the expression לְשׁוֹנָה בְּנֵי כָּל־בֵית נָעַשָּׁה by Kings account in 23:20 since, as Barrick (2002:23) points out, ‘2 Chron. 34:5a does not say that the bones burned were those of priests slain in the course of Josiah’s pogrom as in 23:20’ [emphasis his]. Other factors may have contributed to the variation of לְשׁוֹנָה בְּנֵי כָּל־בֵית נָעַשָּׁה in Chronicles. It is quite possible that the term לְשׁוֹנָה was incorporated into 2Chr 34:5 under the constraints of the changes made in the final part of the preceding verse (34:4) that resulted in the inclusion of לְשׁוֹנָה בְּנֵי כָּל־בֵית נָעַשָּׁה in that verse.\(^76\) Whatever the most decisive factor in attributing the bones to לְשׁוֹנָה in 2Chr 34:5, it seems that this has emerged independently from the development in 2Kgs 23 in which v. 20, being distanced from v. 16 and sharing closer ties with 1Kgs 13:2, belongs to a later stratum in the composition of that chapter.

The question which remains to be dealt with concerns the identification of ‘bones’ in the primary material of Josiah’s reform. Did the original text identify the bones as those taken from the tombs on the mountain in a similar vein as it is described in 2Kgs 23:16a? The Chronicler provides no such detail in his account and it is quite possible that the ‘bones’ originally were not given any further specification and that the text simply read: רֹאשׁ אֵין חָצָר קָדְשָׁה עֲלֵיהּ כָּל־בֵית נָעַשָּׁה. The comment in 2Kgs 23:16a about the bones having come from nearby tombs relates more closely to the narrative that follows concerning Josiah espying a particular tomb. It will be demonstrated later (pp. 169-70) that this part of v. 16a which depicts the scene of Josiah seeing the tombs on the mountain and taking the bones from there to be burnt on the altar developed alongside the additional material in vv. 16b-18.

Another issue arising from consideration of the texts denoting bone-burning in 2Kgs 23 and 2Chr 34 relates to Barrick’s observation that while in Kings’ reform report the burning of bones on the altar is presented as taking place in the north, in Chronicles this is described as happening during Josiah’s purge of Judah and Jerusalem.\(^77\) In 2Kgs 23:16 the bone-burning scene follows the episode in the preceding verse which describes the destruction of the altar in Bethel. This gives the impression that the bone-burning mentioned in v. 16 happened in the Bethel area in the north. However, as has already been discussed, much of v. 15 evolved

\(^76\) Cf. Barrick (2002:23) who is convinced that לְשׁוֹנָה mentioned in 2Chr 34:5 are ‘either identical with, or a sub-group of, the deceased “sacrificers” (hazzoréhimit), referred to in 34:4.

\(^77\) Barrick (2002:22).
secondarily around the core phrase relating to Josiah’s destroying altar(s). Thus originally there would have been nothing at this point within the sequence of events depicting the reform which would indicate the geographical change to Bethel. Concluding with Barrick (2002:48) that ‘v. 15 is a secondary addition, inserted into a narrative which already contained v. 16a’, it seems highly probable that the bone-burning scene in v. 16a originally followed the text of v. 14—that is to say, its earlier version without יסנה תילושהמ ונעשת איה and which included the phrase referring to dispersing dust on the graves (חימח ויהי על התורה) that was later relocated and adjusted to the earlier part of the narrative in v. 6. 78 Only secondarily, by insertion of v. 15, the bone-burning scene in Kings has been located in the north, while in the original version of Josiah’s reform—without v. 15—the burning of bones would have naturally been understood as taking place during the reforms in Judah. 79 This in substance receives support from Chr’s account of the reform where there is no reference to the change of location made prior to the bone-burning scene in 34:5. It is only after this episode in v. 6 that the reform activity in the north is recorded in Chronicles. This last comment leads to the following section discussing the reforms in the North.

3. Josiah’s Reform Activity in the North

Enquiry into the biblical material regarding Josiah’s activity in the north has often led biblical scholars to discussions about the size and boundaries of the Judean kingdom in Josiah’s days. Scholarly opinion varies to a large degree in this respect. Some scholars hold the view that following the retreat of Assyria from the country Josiah enjoyed years of prosperity and independent rule and expanded the territory of his kingdom to include substantial areas that were formerly part of the northern kingdom of Israel. 80 Others, however, regard it as unrealistic to see Josiah being

---

78 See the reconstructed original text of Josiah’s reform on p. 121.
79 That the bone-burning scene in 2Kgs 23:16 may have been originally located in Judah and not in the north is similarly argued by Barrick (2002:46-50, 61).
powerful enough to extend his rule deep into the territory of Samaria.\(^81\) Their view is that Josiah’s activity outside the Judean heartland was no more than small encroachment into the foreign territory, extending his presence in the north only as far as Bethel.\(^82\) It is worth pointing out that in the biblical accounts of Josiah’s reign it is nowhere explicitly stated that Josiah annexed the territories of the former Northern Israel to his kingdom.\(^83\) As a matter of fact, the mention of the northern territory in the accounts of Josiah in Kings and Chronicles is confined to the portions of the narrative describing Josiah’s reform told from a particular angle (2Kgs 23:15-20; 2Chr 34:6-7), and to the portions dealing with Josiah’s death (2Kgs 23:29-30; 2Chr 35:20-24). Given the nature of the context in which the references to the northern territory occur, it should not be assumed that accurate historical information concerning the size and the scope of Judean kingdom in the early seventh century BCE can be distilled out of these notices. More importantly, the text in which these notices are found is subject to compositional history, which makes the question of the historical situation of the seventh century Judah less relevant in respect of study of the original and later versions of Josiah’s reform. This also implies that the text referring to Josiah’s activity in the north cannot be accepted or rejected as being part of the original or later versions of Josiah’s reform purely out of historical consideration. Its occurrence in the early version, for instance, could already be attributed to the literary interests of the composers of the original text rather than to attest to Josiah’s actual conquering of vast land in the north.

In the two biblical accounts of Josiah’s reform the most frequently quoted references to the northern territory are found in 2Kgs 23:19 and 2Chr 34:6. Though both these texts refer to Josiah’s reform activity in the north they differ in the use of the terminology for the description of that territory. In 2Kgs 23:19 the reforming measures are described to take place ‘in the cities of Samaria’, while in 2Chr 34:6 ‘in the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim and Simeon and as far as Naphtali’. The tribal terminology used for the description of people and territory of the kingdom of Israel occurs more often in Chronicles and


\(^82\) According to Zevit Bethel ‘was taken by Hezekiah when he revolted against Assyria c. 705-701 BCE.’ This suggests to him that ‘Josiah’s northern foray may have been a purely internal affair – not a matter of flexing muscles on foreign territory’ (2001:474 n. 82). For the view that the northern border of Judah never extended in the first temple period beyond the region of Bethel, see now Lipschits (2004:350-55).

\(^83\) Noted by Ahlström (1993:764).
seems rather characteristic feature of that book. For instance, the phrase ‘Manasseh and Ephraim’, that is never found in Kings, appears in Chronicles again in the narrative relating to Josiah’s reign: in 2Chr 34:9 the collection of money for the restoration of the temple is said to come from ‘Manasseh and Ephraim’ among others, whereas the parallel text in 2Kgs 22:4 mentions only the collection of money ‘from the people’. In Chr’s special material of Asa, the people which Asa gathered together with people from Judah and Benjamin for the renewal ceremony are designated as those ‘from Ephraim, Manasseh and Simeon’ (2Chr 15:9). Similarly, Chr employs tribal terminology in his special material of Hezekiah, mentioning Manasseh, Ephraim, Issachar and Zebulun as the origin of the people participating in the celebration of Passover (2Chr 30:11, 18). After the celebration of Passover finished, it is further stated in Chronicles that the reforming activity under Hezekiah took place in the land of Judah and Benjamin as well as in the land of Ephraim and Manasseh (2Chr 31:1). It can be concluded from these considerations of the use of terminology in Chr’s special material, which involved tribal designations for the people and the land north of kingdom of Judah, that the territory described in tribal terms in 34:6 is wholly Chr’s own expression. The source material for Chr’s elaboration on the geographical extent of the reform can be identified with the passage in Kings that states that Josiah was active ‘in the cities of Samaria’ (23:19).

The action which Josiah performed ‘in the cities of Samaria’ is described in 2Kgs 23:19 as a destruction of the houses of the high places. The parallel text in 2Chr 34:6, however, is not at all clear with regard to the description of Josiah’s activity in the north since the present text of 2Chr 34:6 lacks a verbal constituent of speech. The phrase דִּיתֶּה דַּלֶּת =Ketib; דִּיתֶּה יָדָד Qere)89 in this verse has been difficult to interpret. Seeligmann, however, suggested a persuasive conjecture to read instead of דִּיתֶּה in this complicated case on the basis of several instances of the letters ו and ב being confusingly interchanged in the Hebrew text.90 If the textual

84 Other references to the territory of ‘Ephraim and Manasseh’ within that account are made in 2Chr 30:1, 10.
86 So Auld (1998a:76).
87 Washburn (1991:65) for example regards v. 6 as ‘an incomplete sentence’. See further discussion on the syntax of v. 6 in Odgen (1978:30).
88 Codex Leningradensis reads דִּיתֶּה דַּלֶּת (Ketib); cf. BHK and Barthélemy (1982:314-15).
89 E.g. יִפְה in 1Sam 17:7 Ketib but יִפְה Qere and many Mss; יִפְה in 2Kgs 20:13 but יִפְה in the parallel passage Isa 39:2; יִפְה in Ps 97:11MT but יִפְה (Qere) =MT) in Ps 97:11LXX; Seeligmann (1961:202 n.
90 E.g. יִפְה in 1Sam 17:7 Ketib but יִפְה Qere and many Mss; יִפְה in 2Kgs 20:13 but יִפְה in the parallel passage Isa 39:2; יִפְה in Ps 97:11MT but יִפְה (Qere) =MT) in Ps 97:11LXX; Seeligmann (1961:202 n.
emendation is accepted, this would lead to a straightforward reading in 34:6 'the destroyed their houses round about', which can be compared with the statement made in 2Kgs 23:19 'and also all the houses of the high places Josiah removed'. It appears to be significant in examining these passages closely that the verbs רָצַח and (recovered) 222 of these two verses occur once more in the texts of Josiah's reform. The verb רָצַח, which is used in 2Kgs 23:19, appears in 2Chr 34:33, while the term 222, recovered in 2Chr 34:6, is used in 2Kgs 23:24. The following table illustrates the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Kgs 23:19</th>
<th>2Chr 34:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָשַׁלָּת הָעֵדֶּסֶת אַלָּחֶם אֶל עַעְמַתֵּן</td>
<td>וְנָשָׁלָת הָעֵדֶּסֶת אַלָּחֶם אֶל עַעְמַתֵּן נָשַׁלָּת הָעֵדֶּסֶת אַלָּחֶם אֶל עַעְמַתֵּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָשַׁלָּת הָעֵדֶּסֶת אַלָּחֶם אֶל עַעְמַתֵּן</td>
<td>מַעְתָּר לָוָּא הָעֵדֶּסֶת אַלָּחֶם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Kgs 23:24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָשַׁלָּת הָעֵדֶּסֶת אַלָּחֶם אֶל עַעְמַתֵּן נָשַׁלָּת הָעֵדֶּסֶת אַלָּחֶם אֶל עַעְמַתֵּן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These four passages, which employ either the verb רָצַח or 222, have further interesting links that may be observed. The first two verses of each biblical book in the table, 2Kgs 23:19 and 2Chr 34:6, both refer to Josiah's activity in the north. The other two verses, 2Kgs 23:24 and 2Chr 34:33, both appear loosely connected with the main narrative of Josiah's reform in their respective histories, being separated from the main account by other episodes (in Kings by the story of the celebration of the Passover; in Chronicles by the report of the discovery of the scroll and the episode of covenant-making). This demonstrates that the two verses in Kings are related to those in Chronicles despite the fact that in their present form there appears to be very little vocabulary shared between them. It also shows that the verbs רָצַח and 222, which these texts share in the reverse order, were once part of the original version of Josiah's reform and later were interchanged in one of the successor texts.

In the examination of the verses dealing with Josiah's activity in the north, 2Kgs 23:19 and 2Chr 34:6, there remains to be considered the aim or the focal point of that endeavour. In 2Kgs 23:19 a reference is made to the removal of רָצַח 'the houses of high places', in 2Chr 34:6 it is 222 'their houses', i.e. the houses of the priests mentioned in v. 5, that are stated to be eliminated (reckoning with the

conjectured הבן). Some commentators translate הבן in 2Chr 34:6 as ‘their sanctuaries’ or ‘their temples’ thus implicitly emphasizing the connection with the parallel passage in 2Kgs 23:19. Interestingly, הבן never occurs in Chronicles. Yet it is possible to suppose that this expression may have been originally included in Chr’s source. We may briefly digress to expand this point.

In Kings הבן in either its singular or plural expression is mentioned altogether five times (1Kgs 12:31; 13:32; 2Kgs 17:29, 32; 23:19). The reference to הבן in 1Kgs 13:32 that is based on the wording in 2Kgs 23:19a is part of the story of the man of God (1Kgs 12:33-13:32) that more recently is thought to be an addition to the earlier account of Kings.90 The occurrences of הבן in 2Kgs 17:29, 32 are part of the account of the fall of Samaria that generally is thought to be of composite character and whose later section (2Kgs 17:24-41) has been variously attributed to the late exilic or postexilic period.91 Both the story of the man of God and the report of the fall of Samaria belong to material in Kings that is not present in Chronicles.

1Kgs 12:31 reports that Jeroboam built הבן as part of his programme of cultic innovations in northern Israel after the split of the kingdom.92 Though the

92 LXX has ἔδωκεν ἐπί βιβλίον and Vg reads fana in excelsis, both being plural constructions. The MT reading הבן in 1Kgs 12:31 cannot be a possible reference to a cultic structure located in Bethel. Against this view of Provan (1988:80; 1995:110) and Barrick (1996:624 and n. 19 with earlier literature; 2002:47), followed by Campbell & O’Brien (2000:376), Cogan (2001:359) and Kogan & Tishchenko (2002:341-42, 347) stands the fact that there is no evidence of a sanctuary in Bethel referred to specifically as הבן elsewhere in the Old Testament. Furthermore, Bethel as a location is not mentioned in 12:31 at all. Barrick contends on the basis of the whole pericope (12:26-32 + 12:33-13:34) revolving primarily around Bethel that the reference הבן in 12:31 must be to the Bethel sanctuary. However, by giving primary attention to the whole passage 12:26-13:34 insofar as the significance of Bethel is concerned, Barrick fails to recognize in this context the importance of the compositional development of this pericope, which he himself discusses in another place. According to his compositional scheme of the book of Kings mentioned elsewhere, the original immediate context of 12:31 is the shorter passage 12:26-32 (Barrick, 2002:107). From this perspective of having a much narrower immediate context to v. 31, it is less compelling to understand הבן in this verse as
narrative in 1Kgs 12:26-32 and 13:33-34 as such is not found in Chronicles, Jeroboam’s policies it depicts in 12:28, 31 and 13:33 do occur incorporated among Chr’s special material relating to Rehoboam (2Chr 11:14-15) and Abijah (2Chr 13:8-9). The initiatives of Jeroboam that are shared by both histories include: making golden calves (נהר – 1Kgs 12:28; 2Chr 13:8; cf. 2Chr 11:15), appointing non-levitical priests (1Kgs 13:33; 2Chr 13:9; cf. 2Chr 11:14), establishing priests of high places (יִשְׁם – 1Kgs 13:33; 2Chr 11:15), and ordaining as priest anyone who came for consecration (1Kgs 13:33; 2Chr 13:9). The nature of these related texts between Kings and Chronicles concerning Jeroboam indicates that Chr was not necessarily familiar from his source with all the material included in 1Kgs 12:25-13:34. The notices relating to Jeroboam’s religious policies reported in 2Chr 11:14-15 and 13:8-9 have counterparts within 1Kgs 12:25-32 and then in 13:33-34. These passages serve as brackets to the story of the man of God in Kings, the account of which is nowhere found in Chronicles. Thus a plausible suggestion can be made that Chr worked with a narrative of Jeroboam’s cultic installations in the elementary form that could be identified with an early version used by authors/editors of Kings in the production of 12:25-32 and 13:33-34, into which the story of the man of God (12:33-13:32) was inserted. On the basis of the foregoing considerations the original version of Jeroboam’s cultic inventions may have included the following:95

a specific reference to the sanctuary in Bethel. If, as some scholars have suggested (e.g. Toews 1993:101), v. 32b with its repeated mention of Bethel is part of a later gloss, then the contention that יִשְׁם יִשְׁם in v. 31 referring to the Bethel sanctuary is the ‘most contextually compatible understanding of 12:31a’ (Barrick 1996:624) has little ground. The perfectly reasonable proposition, then, is that there are several sanctuaries built by Jeroboam in view in 12:31. In fact, this has been the more common understanding of this verse (see e.g. Montgomery 1951:259; Gray 1970:313; Jones 1984:260; De Vries 1985:160-61; Noth 1968:268; Knoppers 1994:27-28; Van Seters 2000:215 n. 31; Fritz 2003:146; cf. also modern English translations NRSV, NJPS, NIV). This view is based either on the understanding of יִשְׁם יִשְׁם as a collective plural (see GKC §124q[c]), or on the witness of ancient traditions, LXX and Vg, which employ plural constructions ‘houses’, ‘sanctuaries’. For the priority of LXX reading δικοῦς εἰπ’ ὑψηλῶν ‘houses on high places’ see now an interesting discussion in Schenker (2004:36-40).

93 Contra Goldingay (1975:103-104).

94 Barrick (2002:109) contends that Chr used ‘the unrevised “Josianic” version of Kings’, which did not include the story of the man of God. According to him, 1Kgs 12:33-13:34 was added in stages to the later versions of Kings’ history (2002:107). Though one may agree that the story of the man of God is a late composition, the ending of that story as delimited by Barrick, however, may not be correct as belonging to the addition, since 1Kgs 13:33 clearly has a parallel in 2Chr 13:9.

95 Since the original material concerning Jeroboam is used in Chronicles in the context of Chr’s own material marked by his strong theological interests it seems reasonably certain that the early version of Jeroboam’s account is better preserved in Kings. The reconstructed text therefore follows the substance of what appears in the present text of 1Kgs 12:28-32 + 13:33. (Italics in the reconstructed report designate the text which Chr failed properly to integrate.) Due to Chr’s thorough incorporation of Jeroboam’s account into his own material, the parallels between Kings and Chronicles are not exact
He made calves of gold,

And he set one in Bethel and the other in Dan
And he built houses of high places
and made priests from among the people
who were not from the Levites.

And he made a festival and he set up the altar
To sacrifice to the calves that he had made.
And he made priests for the high places from among the people.

This early version of Jeroboam’s cultic accomplishments has been developed in Kings into an extended account (12:25-13:34), which included Jeroboam’s motivation for cultic innovations (12:26-27, 28b), the statements relating to sin (12:30; 13:34) and the story of the man of God (12:33-13:32), whereas in Chronicles this originally brief account of Jeroboam’s accomplishments has been utilized within Chr’s special material regarding Rehoboam (11:5-23) and Abijah (13:3-21).

On a closer look at the two specific passages in Chronicles, which incorporate Jeroboam’s policies (2Chr 11:13-17; 13:8-12), they both display Chr’s vast interest in Levites. Perhaps it was this aspect of Chr’s writing that led toChr’s Vorlage concerning Jeroboam given that other elements of 1Kgs 12:31 closely tied with the mention of ‘houses of high places’, such as appointing other priests and disregarding Levites, do occur in Chronicles (2Chr 11:14-15; 13:9) – not being included in Chr’s final account. It would appear from viewing the context with strong Chr’s interest in Levites, in which the references to Jeroboam occur, that in applying the report of Jeroboam’s innovations to his own materials, Chr was so preoccupied with his theological interests and with his concern for the Levites, that he did not succeed in properly integrating this report when utilizing it within his own accounts.

The original text of Jeroboam’s cultic accomplishments can be ascribed to the same primary material underlying Kings and Chronicles that also comprised the original account of Josiah’s reform. It has been indicated above that the report of Josiah’s reform in the primary material would have included the removal of the high places in the cities of Samaria (in the final form of Kings reflected in 2Kgs 23:19, while in 2Chr 34:6 the high places has been altered to the houses of the priests mentioned in the preceding verse). If the conclusions of this investigation are correct in acknowledging that occurred in the primary material in both, the text of

but only approximate. Cf. also Zevit’s proposal (1985:60-61 repeated in 2001:448-49) of the original account of Jeroboam’s cultic policies used by the authors of Kings, the content of which is to a certain degree similar to the reconstructed account proposed here.
Jeroboam’s innovations and the report of Josiah’s reform, the implications seem to support the inner consistency of that original material, in which Josiah’s elimination of the high places in the north functioned as a subtle literary reference to תְּמוֹנָה רֵאָה which were established by Jeroboam. Whatever the historical reality of Josiah’s cult reform in Samaria, the significance of the subtle literary links and connections cannot be easily overlooked and underestimated. It leads to a recognition that in the creation of these texts, in their primary form, the composers revealed their literary interests and artistry.

In Kings, the primary report describing Josiah’s removal of תְּמוֹנָה רֵאָה in the cities of Samaria in 23:19 is expanded with a clause that refers to kings of Israel participating in constructing these installations. This addition on one hand disassociates the building of the houses of high places from being directly attributed to Jeroboam as stated in the account of Jeroboam’s cult innovations in the primary material. On the other hand, it widens the perspective within the secondary stratum of Kings to include kings of Israel more generally in the activity of cultic innovations in the northern kingdom. This insertion is then consonant with the nuances of the story of the northern kingdom in which the northern rulers are condemned for doing evil and for ‘provoking’ Yahweh to anger. Particularly significant in this regard is the mention of תָּמִים ‘to provoke’ (implying the provocation of Yahweh) in the insertion of 23:19 which constitutes a tie with the story of Northern kingdom where the kings are said to ‘provoke’ (תָּמִים) Yahweh to anger time and again. The final part of 23:19 which states that Josiah did תְּמוֹנָה רֵאָה ‘according to all that he had done in Bethel’ seems to be a later editorial link. It functions as a bridge between the early material of Josiah’s reform, which dealt only with the removal of תְּמוֹנָה רֵאָה in the cities of Samaria, and later expansions of that material regarding the particular activity at Bethel (23:16-18), a possible reference to 1Kgs 13. This editorial link is followed by 23:20 which also comes from a later hand (except the last phrase תָּמִים תְּמוֹנָה), again possibly connecting with 1Kgs 13 since there are striking parallels between 2Kgs 23:20 and 1Kgs 13:2.

Thus the argument has come to the point of concluding that the original version of Josiah’s reform was to a large degree limited in its treatment of Josiah’s reform

---

96 Note still a broader perspective recorded in 2Kgs 17, where people of Israel are said to have built תְּמוֹנָה (2Kgs 17:9) and little later Samarians to have built תְּמוֹנָה רֵאָה (2Kgs 17:29 MT).
97 See also discussion further below pp. 171-73.
activities in the north. It mentioned only that Josiah removed the high places from the cities of Samaria – and as such this note may play rather a role as a literary remark alluding back to Jeroboam within the original material. In Chronicles the original note relating to Josiah’s activity in the north has been developed in the way more characteristic of Chr, where ‘the cities of Samaria’ became ‘the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim, and Simeon, and as far as Naphtali’, and ‘the houses of high places’ has been adjusted to ‘their houses’, referring to the houses of the priests mentioned in Chr’s addition of previous verse. The text in 2Chr 34:7, with the exception of the final phrase ‘and he returned to Jerusalem’, is Chr’s own development with repetition of most of what is said in 2Chr 34:4. Both Kings and Chronicles finally resume with the statement that Josiah ‘returned to Jerusalem’ (2Kgs 23:20b, 2Chr 34:7b), which once again points to the accounts of Josiah’s reform in Kings and Chronicles having common roots.

4. Additional Note Regarding the Reform

The two verses, 2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a, are not within their respective books, Kings and Chronicles, part of the main narrative units that deal with the reform report. In Kings, v. 24a is separated from the major text of the reform by the story of Passover (vv. 21-23); in Chronicles, v. 33a by the narratives describing temple repairs (vv. 8-12), finding the book of the law and Huldah’s oracle (vv. 13-28), and covenant (vv. 29-32). This does not mean, however, that v. 24a in Kings and v. 33a in Chronicles are unrelated or have nothing in common with each other and with the major narratives portraying Josiah’s reform in their respective histories. As has been shown earlier (p. 111), 2Kgs 23:24 and 2Chr 34:33 use the verbs הָעְפָּרָה and הָעְפָּרָה respectively, which appear once each within the major texts pertaining to the reform in the two histories. הָעְפָּרָה in the (recovered) text of 2Chr 34:6 and הָעְפָּרָה in 2Kgs 23:19. An implication has been drawn from this that both הָעְפָּרָה and הָעְפָּרָה, shared by Kings and

Chronicles, were once part of the original text regarding Josiah’s reign and that later in one of the succeeding versions of the original text these verbs were interchanged.

2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a attend to some further aspects of Josiah’s reform. Verse 33a in Chronicles deals primarily with חגב ‘abominations’, whereas v. 24a in Kings is more specific about evildoers that Josiah eradicated. It mentions חגב ‘mediums’, וב ‘wizards’ and חגב ‘teraphim’ usually linked with practice of divination,”99 and further includes חגב ‘idols’ and חגב ‘detestable objects’. No terms typical of divination or necromancy occur in the parallel text of Chronicles. While there does not seem to be an obvious reason why Chr would have left out from his source the expressions חגב, וב and חגב associated with divination, it is more conceivable that these were added to the original report of Josiah’s reform in Kings on the basis of the story of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:6//2Chr 33:6).100

Conceding that the terms חגב, וב and חגב conveying the notion of divination are secondary, being dependent on the account of Manasseh’s divinatory practices in 2Kgs 21:6//2Chr 33:6,101 it remains to consider חגב and חגב in 2Kgs 23:24a where 2Chr 34:33a reads חגב. In its emphasis on the aspect of ‘abomination’ in cultic context, the term חגב used in Chronicles is close to חגב employed in Kings, which is a word signifying the idea of ‘detestation’ in association with idolatry.102 The roots of these two terms, חגב and חגב, occur in close relation with one another in several passages of the Hebrew Bible (Deut 7:26; 2Kgs 23:13;

99 The terms חגב and חגב represent a divinatory context elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. They frequently occur together; see Lev 19:13; 20:6, 27 (sg.); Deut 18:10 (sg.); 1Sam 28:3, 9; 2Kgs 21:6 (sg.); 23:24; 2Chr 33:6 (sg.); Isa 8:19; 19:3. In fact, חגב appears in the Hebrew Bible exclusively in parallel with חgeb. The third term חגב, which is recorded 15 times in the Bible, appears in several instances with חגב, particularly in Judges 17-18 and Hosea 3:4. Though the precise meaning of ‘teraphim’ is debated, that it refers to some kind of divinatory objects and is linked with ancestor worship is commonly accepted; see Lewis (DDD 844-50).

100 Two items, specifically חגב and חגב, which occur in 2Kgs 21:6//2Chr 33:6 are repeated in 2Kgs 23:24a. The term חגב in v. 24a, while not necessarily occurring in the story of Manasseh, is commonly taken as belonging to a divinatory context. A number of scholars acknowledge 2Kgs 23:24 in its reference to divinatory practice being reminiscent of 2Kgs 21:6, although they differ with regard to the layers of Kings composition, to which 2Kgs 21:6 and 23:24 should be attributed; see e.g. Nelson (1981:83); Jones (1984:628); McKenzie (1991:114, 136-37).

101 The case of 2Kgs 23:24a and 21:6 is a further supporting evidence of what has already been observed in another context (see p. 92 above), namely that the original reform report of Josiah has been reshaped in Kings partly in light of the story of Manasseh.

102 חגב is a broader term than חגב referring to variety of things and practices (cf. its frequent occurrence in Ezekiel, Deuteronomy and Proverbs). On חגב see further Clements (1996:212-15), Preuß (TWAT 8:880-92), Gerstenberger (TLOT 3:1428-1432); on חגב see Freedman/Welch (TWAT 8:461-65), Gruber (DDD 2-3).
Jer 16:18; 32:34-35; Ezek 5:11; 7:20; 11:18, 21). Moreover, a close relationship can be also observed in few other passages between the two terms relating to idolatry, פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה, occurring in 2Kgs 23:24a. 104

The texts in Deut 29:16 and Ezek 20:7, 8 employing פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה share some specific characteristics, which do not occur anywhere else. First, they are part of wider contexts (Deut 29:15-16 and Ezek 20:5-9), which treat the story of exodus from Egypt: Deut 29:15 reads ‘You know how we lived in the land of Egypt, and how we came through the midst of the nations through which you passed’; Ezek 20:6 contains ‘On that day I swore to them that I would bring them out of the land of Egypt into a land that I had searched out for them, a land flowing with milk and honey, the most glorious of all lands’. Second, they agree in mentioning the very same terms, פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה, from the whole range of possible expressions denoting idolatrous worship. In Deuteronomy such use of פָּרָשָׁה together with פָּרָשָׁה is unique. 105 Third, an aspect of ‘seeing’ is involved in these texts in their treatment of idolatry: Deut 29:16 reads ‘you have seen their detestable things’ (פָּרָשָׁה פָּרָשָׁה); Ezek 20:7 (and similarly v. 8) has ‘throw away the detestable things your eyes are fixed on’ (פָּרָשָׁה פָּרָשָׁה פָּרָשָׁה). With the exception of the framework of the exodus from Egypt, the other two specific features of Deut 29:16, Ezek 20:7, 8 are also present in 2Kgs 23:24a. This verse shares with Deut 29:16, Ezek 20:7, 8 the reference to פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה, and also specifically the ‘visual’ aspect, reading ‘detestable things, which were seen in the land’ (… פָּרָשָׁה פָּרָשָׁה פָּרָשָׁה). 106 In the light of these particular links with Deut 29:16 and Ezek 20:7, 8, the collocation of פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה in 2Kgs 23:24a could be a later reworking of older material.

In view of the findings that the terms פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה and in their usages in 2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a respectively are closely related, conveying the sense of abhorrence or detestation, it is reasonable to conclude that the pairing of פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה in 2Kgs 23:24a is Kings late substitution for פָּרָשָׁה in the original passage, which is now better represented by the parallel text in 2Chr 34:33a. In other words, it

103 Jer 32:34-35 closely follows an earlier material in Jer 7:30-31. Contrary to 7:30-31, however, this late text adds in v. 35 פָּרָשָׁה פָּרָשָׁה with occurrence of פָּרָשָׁה.
104 Deut 29:16; Ezek 8:10 (פָּרָשָׁה applies in this verse to animals rather than idols; see Greenberg 1983:169); 20:7, 8, 30-31, 37,23 (MT).
105 Each term פָּרָשָׁה and פָּרָשָׁה occurs in Deuteronomy only in 29:16; the verbal form פָּרָשָׁה further appears only in 7:26 (2x).
106 Nowhere else is the element of ‘seeing’, featuring in connection with cultic objects or practice, attested in Kings. This is specific in Kings to 2Kgs 23:24a, and elsewhere in the Old Testament to Deut 29:16; Ezek 20:7, 8.
appears that the original text underlying 2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a included only a single term, מזניינ, in relation to idolatry eliminated by Josiah. This expression from older material has been subsequently recast through substitution by other terms with similar connotation in this context (_border_ and further expanded by the language relating to divination (תורה, אכדית, and ירוש). While in the first instance the replacement of the earlier wording in favor of מזניינ and מזניינ may have been influenced by the language at present embedded in Deut 29:16; Ezek 20:7, 8, in the second instance the addition of the language typical of divination seems to be developed in relation to the story of Manasseh.

The passages in 2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a also differ over the particulars defining the land (ירדן), in which the illicit cult existed or from which it was eliminated. The verse in Kings makes reference to idolatry ‘which was seen in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem’ (מזרעי אמתא ותודה והותיקל), while the passage in Chronicles comments on illicit cult being removed ‘from all the lands of the sons of Israel’ (מלך▴א אזכיר). Both phrases show marks of later editing: the former in its inclusion of יرأ as an aspect of ‘seeing’ which, as has been shown above, comports well with the same emphasis in the texts of Deut 29:16, Ezek 20:7, 8 but is otherwise absent from other passages in Kings of similar concern; the latter in its special construction of plural מזרעי followed by possessive ה to stress the aspect of territorial dominion. Whether ‘Judah’ and ‘Jerusalem’ appearing in 2Kgs 23:24a as against ‘Israel’ used in 2Chr 34:33a is to be preferred as primary reading is difficult to determine. Since neither Kings nor Chronicles offer a clear and solid clue in this matter, it appears most probable that these are subsequent divergent developments in each of the two histories, stemming from earlier material which ended simply by inclusion of ‘land’ (ירדן). That this is a valid conclusion is supported by other passages in Kings and Chronicles of the cultic context, in which principally only ‘land’ is mentioned as a place from which the illicit cult is eliminated. For example, with regard to Asa’s reforms, 1Kgs 15:12 reads ירשה הקדש וليكראא. It appears that Chr reformulated the part מזניינ in the corresponding account of Asa’s reforms in 2Ch 15:8 to read מזרעי יודה ותודה ותרב בден קראא לארא אבריא. In the account of Jehoshaphat’s reforms, 1Kgs 22:47 has ירשו הר ירשי ירשים מזרעי which can

---

107 Plural יראא occurs rarely in Kings (only 2x) but is more often found in Chronicles (15x); cf. Kropat (1909:9) who thinks that the plural יראא in 2Chr 34:33 is late.

108 Cf. also further development relating the reforms of the same king in 2Chr 14:4 which reads ירשו הר ירשים מזרעי ‘from all the cities of Judah’.
be compared with יִבְרָעֵת שֶׁהָאֱ_subs in 2Chr 19:3.\textsuperscript{109} One final example comes from Kings special material in 1Kgs 14:24 relating to idolatry during the reign of Rehoboam, which reads ונֵבֶקְרֵצָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. These examples strengthen the case that 2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a both drew on an earlier text that included רָמָא, which did not have any further specifications.

In an attempt to reconstruct the early text lying behind 2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a, it appears that, without many of the specific terms denoting illicit cult that are included in 2Kgs 23:24a (e.g. לַיְבָנִים, אֲחוֹת מִשְׁפָּט) and which have been by the foregoing analysis identified as belonging to later specific developments within Kings, the original text might more closely resemble 2Chr 34:33a. Based on the above argumentation, this text may have read as follows: יִבְרָעֵת שֶׁהָאֱ_subs נֵבֶקְרֵצָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. The question remains, where does this additional notice concerning Josiah’s reform fit within the overall structure of Josiah’s story. Was it included in the original material after the Passover as is the case in Kings or immediately before the Passover account as it is illustrated by Chronicles? This question is discussed further below (pp. 122-26).

5. Towards the ‘Original’ Report of Josiah’s Reform

On the basis of previous analysis some concluding remarks can be offered with regard to the early material dealing with Josiah’s reform. This chapter has commenced with an analysis of the texts describing the reform that are shared by Kings and Chronicles. It has been observed particularly when analyzing the texts in the longer report of 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 that the material, which this account shares with Chronicles, is indicative of a more elementary narrative constituting a nucleus from which the longer account in Kings developed. In other words, the report of the reform in Chronicles, far from being a summary of the narrative of Josiah’s reform in Kings, rather provides clues for establishing an early account of Josiah’s reform that also served as the elementary text from which the more elaborate account of Josiah’s reform in Kings developed. The reconstruction of that original text, on the basis of the preceding analysis in this chapter, is tentatively offered below.

\textsuperscript{109} Cf. again probably later development in 2Chr 17:6 which reads וּבְיִת בֵּית שֶׁהָאֱ_subs ‘from Jud’.
[Josiah] brought out/removed the asherah/statue from the house of Yahweh and threw [it] outside Jerusalem/city to the brook Kidron. He defiled the high places and broke down the altars of Baal. He cut down the asherim and broke the pillars (pesilim) in pieces, crushed [them] and scattered on the graves. He burnt bones upon the altar and defiled it. Also all the bamot-houses which were in the cities of Samaria Josiah removed/put away and returned to Jerusalem.

And Josiah removed/put away all the abominations from the land.

The account starts with the purge of the temple narrating that Josiah removed the object of cultic significance from the house of Yahweh. This is followed by the comment about the defilement of the high places, which introduces a whole list of the reform measures by the king against the illegitimate cult. The reform report makes also a brief note relating to the elimination of the houses of the high places in Samaria. Although this early account concludes with a note on Josiah’s return to Jerusalem, there is an additional notice related to the reform, which comes a little later within the material of Josiah’s reign (on this see further below).

This tentatively proposed ‘original’ narrative of Josiah’s reform, in contrast to number of other attempts to establish earlier material behind the present story of Josiah’s reform in Kings, has the advantage of considering evidence through data provided by the analysis of the parallel accounts of Josiah’s reform in two biblical books (namely Kings and Chronicles). A decade ago, Auld (1994:125) put forward an outline of an ‘earlier’ account of Josiah’s reform based on the study of material shared by Kings and Chronicles, but without elaborating it in full detail. More recently, Barrick uses ‘the Chronicler’s account as a methodological key for

110 For one of more recent attempts see, e.g., Pakkala (1999:178-79).
111 In the footnote to his proposal of ‘primary’ material relating to Josiah’s reform he states: ‘Since Chronicles regularly makes at least small changes to the source reports of cultic modifications, this paragraph will only give an impression of the original wording. But it can hardly be doubted that the long report in 2Kgs 23:4-20 has been substantially expanded, and in more than one stage.’ (Auld 1994:125 n. 1)
unlocking the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings. Though some new insights regarding the primary material of Josiah’s reform are gained through Barrick’s close attention to both 2Kgs 23:4-20 (+24) and 2Chr 34:3-7, Barrick in the end allows for too much data from the report in 2Kgs 23:4-20 to be part of the original composition, contending that its absence in Chronicles is accounted for simply by Chr omitting a number of elements of that report (e.g. 2Kgs 23:4, 7, 9, 11-12). It has already been indicated in this chapter, and will be further shown in the next, that many of these elements ‘missing’ in Chronicles are subsequent developments of the more elaborated account of the reform in Kings.

A related issue closely connected with the above consideration of the primary report of Josiah’s reform pertains to the chronological framework of the larger material of Josiah’s reign and to the question of the location of the primary reform narrative within that larger material. The chronological framework of the story of Josiah, which is different in Kings from Chronicles, has occupied a considerable space in scholarly debates. Does 2Kgs 22-23 with its reporting of major events to have occurred in the 18th regnal year of Josiah reflect the original narrative sequence? Or is 2Chr 34-35 with the course of events described to have taken place in three stages (in Josiah’s 8th, 12th and 18th years of reign) closer to the earlier order of events within the King Josiah story? Both chronological frameworks have been seen as problematic. In Chronicles, the schematic nature of the chronology is suspicious in light of Chr’s theological interests and compositional techniques involving chronological patterning. The version in Kings, which places all the activity to Josiah’s 18th regnal year, is likewise from the historical point of view doubtful since this portrayal of Josiah’s undertakings compresses too many events to just a few weeks between New Year and the Passover feast (2Kgs 22:3; 23:22-23). Furthermore, the order of the narrative in Kings, in which the discovery of the law book precedes the reform, may display a tendentious picture of making the discovery of the book the stirring force behind Josiah’s reform. This invites the conclusion that ‘neither the King’s nor the Chronicler’s chronology should be accepted at face value as true to history’ (Barrick 2002:19).

113 See helpful summary of scholarly views on this matter in Glatt-Gilad (1996:16-31).
Acknowledging that neither version reflects accurate history, the question nevertheless remains concerning which narrative sequence, the one in Kings or the other in Chronicles, is primary in the literary history of the account of Josiah’s reign. Relevant to this enquiry is Barrick’s discussion of whether in Kings the reform report was part of Josiah’s account right from the beginning or whether it joined the narrative of Josiah’s reign at a later point of its development. After probing all other possibilities of how the narrative sequence of Josiah’s story in Kings could have developed, Barrick finds the possibility most likely that an earlier version of Kings might have had the reform report disassociated from the 18th-year narrative section. He contends that such an early version “could have contained the “book”/Huldah-covenant-Passover cluster preceded by the reform report”. This is what he further acknowledges to be actually the narrative sequence preserved in Chronicles.115

The Chr’s narrative of Josiah, in which the reform report occurs soon after the introductory formula of Josiah’s reign, has precedents for this layout in the accounts of Judean kings Asa and Hezekiah.116 The schematic listing below will prove helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asa (Kgs &amp; Chr)</th>
<th>Hezekiah (Kgs &amp; Chr)</th>
<th>Josiah (Kgs)</th>
<th>Josiah (Chr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to king</td>
<td>Introduction to king</td>
<td>Introduction to king</td>
<td>Introduction to king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1Kgs 15:10; Chr differs)</td>
<td>(2Kgs 18:2; 2Chr 29:1)</td>
<td>(2Kgs 22:1)</td>
<td>(2Chr 34:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1Kgs 15:11a; 2Chr 14:1)</td>
<td>(2Kgs 18:3a; 2Chr 29:2a)</td>
<td>(2Kgs 22:2a)</td>
<td>(2Chr 34:2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David as exemplar</td>
<td>David as exemplar</td>
<td>David as exemplar</td>
<td>David as exemplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1Kgs 15:11b; Chr differs)</td>
<td>(2Kgs 18:3b; 2Chr 29:2b)</td>
<td>(2Kgs 22:2b)</td>
<td>(2Chr 34:2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1Kgs 15:12; 2Chr 14:2)</td>
<td>(2Kgs 18:4; 2Chr 29:3-31:21)</td>
<td>Renovations/Law-book/Huldah/Covenant</td>
<td>Renovations/Law-book/Huldah/Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2Kgs 22:3-23:3)</td>
<td>(2Chr 34:8-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2Kgs 23:4-20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115 Barrick (2002:119-23); quotation taken from p. 122 with emphasis being his.
116 Barrick (2002:122-23) makes a similar comment on the earlier version of Kings, his KH-2, which he considers to be Chr’s Vorlage.
117 Chronicles includes a number of chronological notes in the story of Asa (2Chr 13:23; 15:10, 19; 16:1, 12, 13). However, it does not mention the duration of Asa’s reign nor the name of the queen mother at the beginning of Asa’s account, as the book of Kings does (1Kgs 15:10). Instead, Chronicles mentions the queen mother’s name later in the narrative (2Chr 15:16//1Kgs 15:13) and refers to the length of Asa’s reign at the end of his story (2Chr 16:13).
118 2Chr 14:1 has ‘his God’.
There are marked similarities between the accounts of Asa and Hezekiah in Kings and Chronicles on one hand and the account of Josiah in Chronicles on the other with regard to the narrative sequence in their opening paragraphs. After the introduction to king’s reign, each account includes an evaluative formula ‘[he] did right in the eyes of Yahweh’ that is (except for 2Chr 14:1b) accompanied by a comparative element referring to David. The royal accounts of Asa and Hezekiah in Kings with their counterparts in Chronicles move after the note mentioning David to a description of the reform activities of these kings without alluding to the circumstances, which led to the reforms. The story of Josiah in Chronicles conforms to this pattern set by earlier narratives, in which the reforms are introduced early in the stories and without necessarily disclosing the reasons underlying the reform activity, and may therefore represent the primary arrangement of events in the literary history of Josiah’s account.119

Regarding the Tendenz of Chr to include chronological notes into his royal narratives, a comparison with Chr’s story of Hezekiah may illuminate the point that Chr could incorporate chronological notices into his account of Josiah without specifically changing the narrative sequence of his source. After the accounts of Hezekiah, in Kings and Chronicles, mention the exemplary conduct of David (2Kgs 18:3b//2Chr 29:2b) they both continue describing Hezekiah’s reform. While in Kings only one verse is dedicated to Hezekiah’s reform activity (2Kgs 18:4), in Chronicles a much larger portion of the text deals with Hezekiah’s reforming and innovative actions spanning across three chapters (2Chr 29-31). Within this larger material, a more precise parallel to the text of Hezekiah’s reform in 2Kgs 18:4 appears in 2Chr 31:1, which is expanded backwards in Chronicles by the addition of material relating to the purification and dedication of the temple (2Chr 29:3-36) and the Passover (2Chr 30:1-27) and forwards by the addition of the material relating to the temple and its personnel’s provision (2Chr 31:2-21). This whole section (2Chr 29:3-31:21), which expanded the theme of Hezekiah’s reform from the original narrative, is introduced at the beginning by a chronological note: ‘In the first year of his reign, during the first month, [Hezekiah] opened the doors of the house of the Lord...’ (2Chr 29:3). An observation can be made that Chr does not change the order of events inherited from his source when he includes the chronological note in 2Chr 29:3, but only enlarges the component of the original material relating to the reform.

119 This is also the point made by Barrick (2002:122-23).
His account of Hezekiah’s reform, even after editing, continues to be placed between the reference to the person of David (2Chr 29:2b) and the section relating to Sennacherib’s campaign (2Chr 32:1-23), just as in the parallel story of Hezekiah in Kings. Similarly in Chr’s account of Josiah’s reign, there is no need for us to hypothesize that Chr changed the narrative sequence of the original account when he included the chronological notices referring to Josiah’s 8th and 12th regnal years.

As shown above, Chr’s source following the precedents of the accounts of Asa and Hezekiah may well have included Josiah’s reform right after the evaluative formula accompanied with the comparative notice mentioning David. The following table shows the narrative sequence in the primary material of Josiah’s reign and how differently it developed in Kings from Chronicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence in 2Chr 34-35</th>
<th>Primary Narrative Sequence of Josiah’s Story</th>
<th>Sequence in 2Kgs 22-23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension formula (34:1a)</td>
<td>Ascension formula (22:1a)</td>
<td>Queen mother’s name (22:1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative formula (34:2a)</td>
<td>Evaluative formula (22:2a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David as example (34:2b)</td>
<td>David as example (22:2b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion in 8th yr. (34:3a)</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of reform in 12th yr. (34:3b)</td>
<td>Temple renovations</td>
<td>Temple renovations (22:3-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple renovations (34:8-13)</td>
<td>Huldah’s oracle</td>
<td>Huldah’s oracle (22:12-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huldah’s oracle (34:20-28)</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Reform (23:4-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant (34:29-32)</td>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>Passover (23:21-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional notice (34:33)</td>
<td>Additional notice</td>
<td>Additional notice (23:24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover (35:1-19)</td>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>Note on incomparability (23:25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharao Neco’s encounter (35:20-23)</td>
<td>Reference formula</td>
<td>Yahweh’s judgement (23:26-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death and burial formula (35:24)</td>
<td>Reference formula</td>
<td>(Reference formula?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah’s lamentation (35:25)</td>
<td>Pharao Neco’s encounter</td>
<td>Pharao Neco’s encounter (23:29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference formula</td>
<td>Deatth and burial formula</td>
<td>Death and burial formula (23:30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original narrative sequence suited Chr well in that he made only a few additions preceding the reform report, in which he introduced two chronological notices (mentioning king’s 8th and 12th regnal years) with an emphasis being placed on Josiah’s piety.
A different situation, though, obtains in Kings, in which the reform report is moved from its original setting nearer the beginning of Josiah’s account to a place following the material dealing with the law book and Huldah’s oracle. As discussed by others elsewhere, the placement of the reform narrative after the temple renovations and finding the law book has a strategic importance in Kings. It leads one to believe that the key factor for initiating the reform was the discovery of the law book. The place that suited best for the new location of the reform report does not come till after the covenant narrative, where originally there was only a brief notice about further reforms. As a consequence of the replacement of this note by a much longer account of Josiah’s reform, the brief notice with further reforming actions was moved to its present place in Kings after the section dealing with celebration of Passover.

In conclusion, the account of Josiah’s reign in Kings not only shows greater changes in order from the original narrative than shown by the account in Chronicles. It will also be observed in the following chapter that in Kings the Josiah’s reform report itself has undergone a more substantial rewriting than in Chronicles.
CHAPTER FOUR

Literary development of Josiah's reform in Kings
(test case – part two)

It has generally been accepted by scholars that the reform report of Josiah as presented in Kings is an elaborated account that is comprised of layers of literary development.¹ In the preceding chapter of this study, attempts were made on the basis of an examination of 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 and 2Chr 34:3-7 + 33 to identify the likely form of the earlier text that lies behind the present passage of Josiah’s reform in Kings and that also served as basis for the account of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles. It is a study of the processes involved in the development of this earlier material relating to the reform of Josiah that gradually led to the formation of the narrative in its present form of 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24, which will be the focus of the following analysis. Several points in this investigation will be of particular importance: how the themes of older material, as for example the theme of purging the temple, were re-used and expanded in the developed version of the reform in Kings; how the new issues were introduced through links with other texts of the expanding book of Kings; and how the present composition of Josiah’s reform in Kings developed also in dependence on texts and traditions outside the book of Kings.

1. Purging the Temple: 2Kgs 23:4, 6-7

The theme of purging the temple appears first in the account of Josiah’s reform measures in the primary material. As studied previously, it revolves around the issue of the removal of the statue of cultic significance from the temple and describes the destruction of the statue at the brook Kidron.² This first reform measure in the original version becomes a full-blown account describing the cleansing of the temple in the expanded text of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24, with the material


² See the tentatively proposed ‘original’ text of Josiah’s reform on p. 121.
dealing more directly with the Jerusalem temple found in vv. 4, 6-7 and the material which deals with precincts of the temple in vv. 11-12.3

It has already been noted in an examination of the occurrences of ‘Baal’ in the final version of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 that v. 4 is a more detailed account of the theme drawn from the original reform report, which concerned the removal of object(s) of illicit worship from the house of Yahweh. While the original material, recoverable from portions of v. 6, recorded only that יהוה (according to Kings; מז according to 2Chr 33:15) was taken out of the temple, the text in v. 4 develops this into ‘cultic implements made for Baal, for Asherah, and for all the host of heaven’ being ordered to be removed from Yahweh’s house – perhaps under the influence of the occurrence of all three elements in 2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3. The scene of purging the temple is thus set into a larger narrative context in v. 4, in which the removal of idolatrous objects is reported to take place under king Josiah’s command to his priestly personnel.

Other particulars of Kings expansion in v. 4 can be better assessed when this verse is set side by side with the now expanded v. 6 and the ‘original’ wording tentatively suggested by the analysis in a previous chapter:

(Proposed original text of 2Kgs 23:6a י peasant around the temple, 2Kgs 23:6a י peasant around the temple, 2Kgs 23:4a ו Thế mãnhו והם_yaml הלוחות האטימל וקרון, 2Kgs 23:4a ו Thế mãnhו והם_yaml הלוחות האטימל וקרון)

In its reportage of the destruction of vessels made for Baal, Asherah and the host of heaven v. 4 partly re-uses expressions such as קדש and קדש והם_yaml הלוחות האטימל וקרון and partly from an older narrative preserved in v. 6 dealing with the destruction of the cultic object, and partly uses the same terminology, such as קדש, which appears in the secondary expanded portion of verse 6.4 This may point to v. 4 and the secondary expansion of v. 6 originating in a particular neighborhood.

---

3 That the theme of purging the temple receives significant attention in the present text of Josiah’s reform in Kings has been generally recognized in the scholarly literature; in this regard see e.g. McKay (1973:30); O’Brien (1989:253). Cf. Eynikel (1996:155-58) who in rather general terms divides 2Kgs 23:4-14 into two sections, one that treats the reform in the Jerusalem temple (vv. 4-9) and the other outside the temple (vv. 10-14). Barrick (2002:20, 27, 106) includes also v. 9 as referring specifically to the reform in the temple. However, this his contention is unwarranted.

4 The term קדש used in the original reform report only in connection of burning human bones (2Kgs 23:16a//2Chr 34:5; cf. v. 20, which together with 1Kgs 13:2 belongs to the stratum later than v. 16a) is redefined in the expanded text of 2Kgs 23:4-20 (+ 24) and becomes frequently employed in connection with burning cultic entities (vv. 4, 6, 11, 15 [2x in MT; 1x in LXX]). See pp. 103-5 above.
Another peculiarity in v. 4 concerns the depiction of the place, where the illicit cultic objects were disposed. The phrase תְּחֵן תַּהֲפֵךְ חַדְּרֵי קַדְּשִׁים...אֲשֶׁר פְּרֻשָּׁהָ נָה relating to burning (רַע) of cultic implements employs with the unusual term תְּחֵן חַדְּרֵי קַדְּשִׁים, which occurs only five times in the Hebrew Bible (Deut 32:32, 2Kgs 23:4, Isa 16:8, Jer 31:40(?) and Hab 3:17). In three biblical passages (Deut 32:32, Isa 16:8 and Hab 3:17), תְּחֵן חַדְּרֵי קַדְּשִׁים appears in close association with vine. This is also the case of the Ugaritic equivalent šdmt to Hebrew תְּחֵן חַדְּרֵי קַדְּשִׁים occurring in CTA 23.10 and also in CTA 2.1.43 (if the reconstructed phrase šdmt.bg [pnm] ‘terraces with [vine]’ in the badly damaged mythological text from Ugarit is accepted). The association with vine in several passages where תְּחֵן חַדְּרֵי קַדְּשִׁים in Hebrew (or šdmt in Ugaritic) texts occurs has prompted scholars to postulate the connotation ‘terrace’ for the Hebrew term, although other renderings have also been made such as ‘field, territory’. In its immediate context, in which תְּחֵן חַדְּרֵי קַדְּשִׁים appears linked with רָמָי in 2Kgs 23:4, this phrase has a close parallel with the expression רָמָי תְּחֵן חַדְּרֵי קַדְּשִׁים in Jer 31:40, a verse which belongs to the additional material in Jeremiah expanding the theme of the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem. In particular, it describes the renovation of Jerusalem as Yahweh’s city and thus reverses the images of destruction of the city in Jer 7:30-8:3.

The final part of 2Kgs 23:4, אֲשִׁ יָש עַל עַפָּר אֵין, referring to Josiah’s carrying ashes (רָע) to Bethel, has remained a puzzle for interpreters precisely because of the lack of clarity surrounding the circumstances, in which such an action by Josiah would take place. Scholars therefore tend to view this phrase together with v. 5 as a secondary addition to the original reform report, (not least because of the use of the...
wqatal form\(^{11}\)). Worthy of note is the reference to הָעַד ‘dust’ in v. 4, the use of which in construction together with הָעַד is observed by Eynikel (1996:215) to be unique in the Old Testament. The final phrase of v. 4 in its use of הָעַד displays greater affinity with the secondarily expanded text of v. 6 with a double occurrence of the very same expression. Though there is not enough information available to determine in a definitive way to which stage of the growth of Josiah’s reform report in Kings the phrase \(\text{not mentioned} \) belongs, at least it seems certain that as with the rest of v. 4 this phrase does not form part of the earliest stratum of Josiah’s narrative in Kings.

The theme from the older material relating to purging the temple, which was preserved in 2Kgs 23 mainly in portions of v. 6, is not only expanded by secondary additions in v. 6 and by v. 4, elaborating more in detail on the removal of cultic objects from the temple, but also by v. 7 which focuses on matters dealing with the elimination of physical complexes relating to the temple. Verses 4 and 7 share interesting literary connections as they develop the issues from earlier material relating to the temple purification. Before exploring these, however, textual matters of v. 7 are in need of close examination.

First of all, two expressions in verse 7 give rise to difficulty in interpretation: the term נַתְנָן הָעַד in the first part of the verse, and the word נַתְנָן הָעַד in the second part [where the women wove] houses for Asherah, is perplexing. LXX\(^{12}\) offer ἵππες, which is understood by some either as a transliteration of ἵππες ‘tunics’,\(^{12}\) or as a corrupt transliteration of ἵππες in the MT.\(^{13}\) LXX\(^{14}\) reads στολάς ‘clothes’, Tg מַעְטֵה ‘curtains’ and Pesh מַעְטֵה ‘garments’\(^{14}\). This has suggested to Sanda (1912:344) to vocalize the Hebrew word as מְעַטָּה, linking it with the Arabic batt, meaning ‘woven garment’, which has been accepted by a number of studies as a

---

\(^{11}\) We have pointed out earlier in this thesis, however, that the use of wqatal form as an argument for a later addition is dubious; see p. 81 n. 17 above.

\(^{12}\) E.g. Klostermann (1887:479); Benzing (1899:192), Burney (1903:359), Stade and Schwally (1904:293), Gray (1970:730).

\(^{13}\) E.g. Montgomery (1951:539). He thinks that χελλαίμαθι is inferior to βελλαίμαθι (sic), which is attested at least in one other Greek manuscript. Cf. Tov (1973:90 n. 15) who proposes a Vorlage ‘בֵּלַיִמָא’ (?) for χελλαίμαθι, while ‘בֵּלַיִמָא’ for βελλαίμαθι.

\(^{14}\) For Tg מֵעַטָּה, see Aramaic dictionary by Jastrow (1950:781); for Syriac מֵעַטָּה, see dictionary by Smith (1903:247).
competent explanation for the Hebrew riddle. Whatever solution one might suggest for this conundrum, there is always a possibility that the MT’s התִּשְׁבַּיִּים goes back to the literary stage of the development of the text under the editor(s) hands. That this is actually the case will become clearer after examining the second problematic issue in v. 7 that relates to the occurrence of התִּשְׁבַּיִּים.

The note about Josiah breaking down התִּשְׁבַּיִּים in the first part of v. 7 has occasioned much discussion especially with regard to the identity of התִּשְׁבַּיִּים. It has traditionally been assumed in scholarly opinion that v. 7, with its reference to התִּשְׁבַּיִּים understood as ‘male cult prostitutes’, attests to there being an institution of cultic prostitution in ancient Israel. This assumption, however, has now been challenged by a growing number of studies which do not see any connection between התִּשְׁבַּיִּים and cultic prostitution in Israel and Judah, nor a similar kind of relation with regard to qדֶמְל/qדֶסֶל/qדֶסֶה in the ancient Near East. Among recent suggestions it has been proposed to view התִּשְׁבַּיִּים as ‘members of the non-Yahwistic or Yahwistic/syncretistic priesthood’ (Barstad 1984:31), ‘cultic functionaries’ (Westenholz 1989:248), ‘priestly class of ancient Canaanite origin’ (Dijkstra 2001:119), or as Zevit imagines them ‘cultic poets and musicians, bearers of Syrian mythic traditions’ (2001:463). It is within this wider horizon of the debate over the particular designation of the word בתִּשְׁבַּיִּים in the Hebrew Bible that a new understanding of the expression בתִּשְׁבַּיִּים in the original reading of 23:7 has emerged in scholarly discussion. In a substantial part of her article devoted to the investigation of Hebrew בתִּשְׁבַּיִּים from the literary-historical and sociological

15 These include Driver (1936:107); Montgomery (1951:539); Jones (1984:619); Day (1986:407); BHS, HALOT 1:166; cf. Cogan & Tadmor (1988:286); Knoppers (1994:185 n. 21). The view of Murmelstein (1969:223-24), followed by De Moor (TDOT 1:441) and Wurthwein (1984:457), that the weaving of בתִּשְׁבַּיִּים in 23:7 represents a euphemism for sexual intercourse, which has no textual support, is to be rejected.

16 Most recently defended by Day (2004:2-21).

17 For various critical assessments of the view linking בתִּשְׁבַּיִּים with practice of cultic prostitution see Barstad (1984:22-33); Gruber (1983:167-76; 1986:133 n. 1 reprinted); Oden (1987:131-53); Westenholz (1989:245-63); Frymer-Kensky (1992:199-202); Schäfer-Lichtenberger (1995:124-40); Bird (1997:37-80); Gangloff (2001:19-20); Zevit (2001:462-63); Dijkstra (2001:119). See further Olmo Lete & Sanmartín (1998:179-81) for discussion of only Ugaritic material in reference to qדֶמְל. Regarding biblical material, the sexual connotation of the Hebrew terminology entered the discussion primarily through the appearance of בתִּשְׁבַּיִּים in connection with בת in the story of Judah and Tamar (Gen 38) and in Deut 23:18-19 and Hos 4:14. But as Miller notes, ‘[t]he association of the feminine term [גדיֶסֶל] with the word for “harlot” may...be a way of referring to its connection with worship practices that were regarded as idolatrous and apostate, the condemnation of which is often put in sexual terms, as, for example, in Jeremiah’ (2000:206). For the argument of polemical usage of בת in connection with בת, see Binger (1997:118-20).
perspective, Bird focuses on a detailed analysis of the individual cases of נֵעֶפֶת in all the attestations of the masculine noun in the Hebrew Bible. Studying the overall context in which נֵעֶפֶת occurs in the account of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23, Bird observes that ‘[i]n the chapter as a whole the reference to qdšm is anomalous’ and notes with regard to how the personnel is treated in this particular account that the mention of נֵעֶפֶת ‘does not fit the pattern of accommodating legitimate, though tainted, cult personnel or extirpating illegitimate religious specialists’ (1997:65). She rightly points out that in understanding the passage the emphasis has wrongly been put on the removal of the נֵעֶפֶת, while a careful reading shows that ‘[t]he essential content of v. 7 is the destruction of some type of structures associated with the temple, whose significance for the reform program is spelled out by reference to their use in the Asherah cult.’ (Bird 1997:67). In view of the limitations which the Hebrew term נֵעֶפֶת possesses, which Bird also finds evident in 23:7, she suggests that the original text in this verse read נֵעֶפֶת, and was only later reinterpreted to become נֵעֶפֶת. A similar proposal to read the text as נֵעֶפֶת (instead of נֵעֶפֶת) was made by Na’amăn in an article published a year earlier than Bird’s suggestion. Na’amăn (1996:18) explains that נֵעֶפֶת ‘dedicated treasures buildings’ would have functioned as ‘the stores in which the treasures of the temple were assembled’, and further maintains that these storehouses consisted of ‘a combination of depositories and workshops’, where also נֵעֶפֶת נֵעֶפֶת were woven, and to which v. 7 refers as a target of Josiah’s reforming activity.

Apart from this conceivable occurrence of נֵעֶפֶת in the discussed passage, the term figures in several passages of Kings and Chronicles that concern royal dedications to the temple – 1Kgs 7:51//2Chr 5:1; 1Kgs 15:15//2Chr 15:8; 2Kgs 12:19; cf. verb נֵעֶפֶת in 2 Sam 8:10-11//1Chr 18:10-11. Closely related to these texts portraying the donations to the temple are the accounts detailing the despoliations of temple treasuries during the era of the divided kingdom. It is worthy of note that the incidents dealing with the subject of wealth and national treasuries concern primarily the Judean kingdom and are frequently reported in both histories, Kings and Chronicles. In three instances, in the accounts of Rehoboam (1Kgs 14:26//2Chr 12:9), Asa (1Kgs 15:18//2Chr 16:2) and Amaziah (2Kgs 14:14//2Chr 25:24), Kings and Chronicles are very close or almost identical. With regard to the accounts of the reigns of Joash and Ahaz, the portrayal of national wealth, lost or voluntarily given

to the stronger power differs rather considerably in the two histories: in 2Kgs 12:18-19 Joash voluntarily submits consecrated objects from temple and royal treasuries to the king of Aram in order to prevent him from attacking Jerusalem, while in 2Chr 24:23 the king of Aram is reported as invading Judah and Jerusalem and sending the spoil gained to the king of Damascus; Ahaz is described in 2Kgs 16:8 as paying tribute to Tiglath-pileser because of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition, while in 2Chr 28:21 he is depicted plundering the temple in order to give tribute to the Assyrian king as a consequence of attacks from the Edomites and Philistines. Similarly, the story of Hezekiah in Kings and Chronicles displays concern for the treasury but in each book quite differently. Kings narrates two treasury incidents during the reign of Hezekiah: in the first Hezekiah takes silver from the temple and palace treasuries to pay tribute to the King Sennacherib (2Kgs 18:15), in the second he is reported as showing the Babylonian emissaries ‘all his treasure house’ (2Kgs 20:13). By contrast, in Chronicles there is only one treasury incident reported relating to Hezekiah. This account portrays Hezekiah as building for himself ‘treasuries for silver, for gold, for precious stones, for spices, for shields, and for all kinds of costly objects’ (2Chr 32:27). Finally, both books make reference to despoliations in relation to the Babylonian exile, though again, with significant differences (2Kgs 24:13; cf. 2Chr 36:18). Irrespective of divergences between the two histories in several instances regarding the despoliation notices, the inclusion of these notices by the authors of both, Kings and Chronicles, in their texts suggests that the incidents relating to national treasuries and dealing with transfer of the national wealth to a foreign power were important and had already been a concern of the sources which the authors of Kings and Chronicles had at their disposal and used.

The notices regarding the receipt, maintenance and disbursement of the temple and palace jewels and funds employ specific language, which includes, among others, phrases such as אֵין דְּרוֹת ‘dedicated objects’, מָלַל ‘vessels’, מְזָהָה שֶׁשֶּׁש ‘silver and gold’, רֶבֶש ‘treasury’. Although there is obviously no relationship in theme or content between the stories of national treasuries and the portrayal of Josiah’s reform in Kings, some of the language just mentioned relating to treasury narratives finds resonances and echoes in formulations and expressions of the two verses in the present account of Josiah’s reform, vv. 4 and 7, expanding the theme of purging the temple from the earlier Josiah’s narrative. It has long been a puzzle for commentators of Kings that the term לִמְצָה should have been employed in v. 4 in the context of
illegitimate worship, while such usage with exception of Dan 11:8 is not attested elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. In Kings, פָּרַשׁ predominantly occurs referring to cultic implements of Yahwistic worship where these implements are also regarded as being part of temple treasures (1Kgs 7:45, 47, 48, 51; 8:4; 15:15; 2Kgs 12:14; 14:14; 24:13; 25:14, 16). In several such contexts, the vessels (פָּרַשׁ) are described as having been transferred—either being brought in or taken out of the temple. Turning to 23:4 it is perhaps not without significance that the vessels (פָּרַשׁ) ‘made for Baal and Asherah and all the host of heaven’ are also said to be transferred—this time having been ordered by the king to be taken out of the temple and destroyed. Another expression echoing the language pertaining to the management of temple treasures is the original phrase פָּרַשׁ־זֶּרֶם ‘houses of dedicated gifts’ in v. 7 (following Na’aman 1996 and Bird 1997). Staying with the subject of storehouses accommodating the temple’s treasures, it is true that there is no reference to פָּרַשׁ ‘treasury’ in vv. 4 and 7. On the other hand, it might be relevant to point out the occurrence of פָּרַשׁ ‘to weave’ in v. 7, a very different word in its meaning from פָּרַשׁ ‘treasury’ but perhaps not so graphically, sharing with פָּרַשׁ two consonants in its root. פָּרַשׁ ‘weave’ does not occur very often in the Old Testament. It is not mentioned again in Kings, and appears only once in the shared material of Samuel and Chronicles. In v. 7, פָּרַשׁ ‘weave’ is employed together with a disputed word פָּרַשׁ in the phrase פָּרַשׁ פֶּרָשַׁל ‘weaving there houses for Asherah’. It may be useful here to recall despoliation notices and bring attention to a frequent occurrence of פָּרַשׁ in connection with פָּרַשׁ in the phrase(s) פָּרַשׁ–פָּרַשׁ פֶּרָשַׁל ‘treasuries of the house of Yahweh/king’. Perhaps in light of this phraseology, the enigmatic פָּרַשׁ found in near proximity with פָּרַשׁ in v. 7 may not be surprising. The context and usage of פָּרַשׁ ‘treasuries’ could have stayed in the Kings editor’s mind and have misled his pen while creating for his new context of the reform account graphically similar but semantically different term פָּרַשׁ.


20 See the counterparts in Chronicles: 2Chr 4:16, 18, 19; 5:1, 5; 15:18; 24:4; 25:24; 36:7, 10; 36:18, 19. Other instances of פָּרַשׁ in Kings with their parallels in Chronicles include 1Kgs 10:21//2Chr 9:20 conveying the sense of ‘household utensils’, 1Kgs 10:25//2Chr 9:24 ‘vessels’ of gold/silver in the context of tribute payment; 2Kgs 11:8, 11//2Chr 23:7 (cf. in 23:10) and 2Kgs 20:13//2Chr 32:27 ‘weapons’. Apart from 2Kgs 23:4, פָּרַשׁ is used in Kings special material in 1Kgs 6:7 referring to ‘tool’ of iron and in 1Kgs 17:10; 19:21; 2Kgs 4:3, 4, 6; 7:15 referring to various utensils of household.


22 in a phrase פָּרַשׁ פֶּרָשַׁל ‘like a weaver’s beam’ (2Sam 21:19//1Chr 20:5; cf. the same phrase occurring in 1Sam 17:7 and 1Chr 11:23).
alongside with other terminology with the meaning accommodating to the subject matter of v. 7 that deals with the theme of purification of the temple. The result of this has now been the difficult reading הר הוהי אנות ואחרים לא אמרו. Even if the details of such a process of evolution of the final part of v. 7 could appear to some to be slightly less compelling, still the innovative use of פסחש in v. 4 and the presence of נכן בו in v. 7 all indicate that vv. 4 and 7 both expand the theme of purging the temple from the original Josiah’s narrative with the language of despoliation notices lurking in the background and contributing to this development.

In summary, the account belonging to the primary material of Josiah’s reform portraying purging the temple, which has been preserved in 2Kgs 23 in portions of v. 6 and describes the removal of cultic object from the temple and its destruction outside Jerusalem at the Wadi Kidron, has subsequently been developed into a substantial piece of material with the perspective of purging the temple being extended by secondary developments in v. 6 and by the additional vv. 4 and 7. This enlargement of the theme of purging the temple has been directed towards the goal of stressing the utter elimination of the non-Yahwistic cult from Jerusalem temple; not only is the Asherah pole, as v. 6 states, cast out but also all the vessels in service for the Baal, Asherah and the hosts of heaven are commanded to be destroyed (v. 4) and the structures in the temple complex used in promoting an illicit cult are eliminated (v. 7). The growth of the older account into the present form of Kings reform report in vv. 4, 6-7 was influenced by several factors, drawing on expressions and language from elsewhere in inherited material on the divided kingdom. Thus it has been noted, for example, that the reference to Baal, Asherah and the host of heaven in v. 4 is reminiscent of the language in the story of Manasseh shared by Kings and Chronicles (2Kgs 21//2Chr 33). Verse 4 has also been developed interdependently with the additions in v. 6 as the terms such as פאוש or פאוש show. Finally, the background of despoliation notices occurring in a number of places in both Kings and Chronicles in some of its language shows it as having been influential in the evolution of the theme of purging the temple in both, vv. 4 and 7.


The account of Josiah’s reform measures continues in v. 8 by describing Josiah’s action against the high places, which is contained within the narrative that treats in particular the priesthood of the high places (vv. 8a, 9) and has been associated with
the centralization theme. Although the aspect of centralization is generally recognized in the final form of Josiah’s account in Kings, it is not at all clear that it did play a significant role in the early version of the reform rather than resulted from later editorial work.\[^{23}\]

In 2Kgs 23:8a + 9 the reform is directed at נָאָר ‘high places’ and at פַּרְבּוֹלָה ‘the priests of high places’. On a closer look at vv. 8a + 9, it will be noted, however, that the focus of these verses is not primarily on נָאָר and their defilement. Even if v. 8a is read on its own, its structure suggests that the primary concern of this text lies with פַּרְבּוֹלָה rather than with נָאָר.\[^{24}\] Within the context of the wider narrative, this emphasis on priesthood (אֱלֹהִים) in vv. 8a + 9 does not seem wholly to concur with what has gone before in the reform report. In the earlier part of the reform account, with its focus on purging the temple, the object of the reforming action is plainly the illicit cult and not the perpetrators or the people themselves who participated in cultic practices. Consistent with this pattern of targeting cultic practices is solely the reference to the defilement of high places (נָאָר אֱלֹהִים) in vv. 8a + 9. Hence the emphasis on priesthood in vv. 8a + 9, which overrides the basic concern for high places as such, is intrusive and must be a result of secondary editing.

The present text of vv. 8a + 9, which being an expansion of the original reference to Josiah’s defilement of נָאָר gives prominence to the theme of priesthood, envisages the priests being brought out of the cities of Judah, who sacrificed on the high places from Geba to Beersheba, and also reports about the priests of the high places as not coming to Jerusalem unless\[^{25}\] they had eaten unleavened bread. This passage has been compared by scholars with a text in Deut 18:6-8, which concerns the rights of Levites, but the exact nature of the relationship between the two has been difficult to settle.\[^{26}\] Some scholars emphasize that there exists a link between 2Kgs 23:8-9 and Deut 18:6-8, acknowledging that the factual prescription from the

\[^{23}\] Cf. Jones (1984:617), who views centralization of the cult not as an aspect of the original reform report but being an emphasis of later revisers.


\[^{25}\] For this understanding of נָאָר in v. 9 see Barrick (2002:190-92), Ahlström (1982:68-69), and further bellow p. 137.

\[^{26}\] The question of relationship between 2Kgs 23:8-9 and Deut 18:6-8 goes back as far as Wellhausen’s study of the Levites and the priesthood in Ancient Israel is concerned to his Prolegomena. Wellhausen (1885:121-51; esp. p. 124) in his scheme of the historical development of the Israelite priesthood treated priests of high places to be equal to Levites and thought of 2Kgs 23:9 as referring to the failure of the regulation from Deut 18:6-8 being carried out. On Wellhausen’s thesis and his influence on the treatments of the history of priesthood in Ancient Israel see studies by Gunneweg (1965), Cody (1969) and Nielsen (1955:264-83); see further McConville (1984:124-29).
code of Deuteronomy has been to some extent modified in the reform report of Kings.27 Others, however, assert that these two texts have nothing in common since the Levites in Deut 18:6-8 and the priests of high places in 2Kgs 23:8-9 are two distinct classes of priesthood and that therefore no simple equation can be made between them.28 These views, however different they may be, all uphold a certain common approach to the two texts they treat. First, they rest largely on a conventional reading of 2Kgs 23:9, which understands the priests of high places in this verse being prevented from altar privileges (אִשֵּׁי יְהֹוָה taken as ‘but’), and second, they rest on an understanding that Deut 18:6-8 was already perhaps a part of the Josianic law code available to the Deuteronomistic writer of 2Kgs 23:8-9. Though these assumptions are shared by opposing treatments of the two texts in question, they seem to be more in favour of the treatment which views Deut 18:6-8 and 2Kgs 23:8-9 as basically being in contravention, leading to the conclusion that the priests mentioned in Kings cannot be thought of along the same lines as the Levites referred to in Deuteronomy.

Illustrative of this line of reasoning is Nurmela (1998:69), who assumes that the author of Josiah’s story was familiar with the stipulations of Deuteronomy. On the basis of this belief and the traditional reading of 2Kgs 23:9 he then says that ‘the Deuteronomistic author would not have recorded a violation against the code advanced by his own circle without commenting on it; especially as the context of 2 Kings 22-23 is a pivotal one for this circle’s historiography.’ For Nurmela it follows that the priests of the high places referred to in 2Kgs 23:8-9 cannot be considered on equal terms with the Levites mentioned in Deut 18:6-8.

The fundamental premises, however, on which this and similar conclusions are based, are not entirely compelling and do not escape criticism. Barrick has recently pointed out that the traditional understanding of 2Kgs 23:9 with אִשֵּׁי יְהֹוָה in the adversative sense ‘but’ is on syntactical grounds untenable.29 The grammar of this verse with the verbs נָחַל in imperfect tense and הָיָה in perfect tense used in combination with אִשֵּׁי יְהֹוָה, yields a significantly different sense of the passage: ‘But the


bamot-priests would/could not go to the altar of Yahweh Unless/until they had eaten unleavened bread with their brothers.’ (Barrick 2002:192). The implication is that the priests of the high places have their access to the altar in Jerusalem conditioned by the requirement of having eaten unleavened bread. Upon this understanding of 2Kgs 23:9 the apparent incongruity with Deut 18:6-8 seems to be muted: the priests of high places in v. 9 are not reported to be without altar privileges, only having their privileges restricted by the condition of having eaten unleavened bread in a specific context.

Concerning the related issue that the legislation of Deuteronomy reflects the state of affairs prior to the composition of 2Kgs 23:8-9, this has also been challenged. Lohfink (1981:68) has raised questions regarding an implication frequently made from the note in 2Kgs 23:9 that the Jerusalem priesthood acted in contradiction to legislation in Deuteronomy, saying that ‘[Deut 18:6-8] was not yet in the law at this time’. Still on a larger scale, Lohfink and Braulik have proposed that the laws on Israel’s leaders in Deut 16:18-18:22, to which the legislation concerning the Levites in 18:6-8 belongs, come from the redactions of exilic and post-exilic times. Taking into account these considerations, it brings an added dimension to the discussion concerning the relationship between 2Kgs 23:8a + 9 and Deut 18:6-8. Though whether these two texts are related or not may not at this point in the study be satisfactorily resolved, a significant analogy can be proposed. Just as Lohfink suggests Deut 18:6-8 came from a redaction of exilic or post-exilic times, so also 2Kgs 23:8a + 9 – as a redrafted text of an original core with focus on Josiah’s defilement of high places, which now gives a prominent place to priests (זקנים) over high places (מן) – may come from the pen of Kings authors/editors working in exilic or post-exilic times.

After examining vv. 8a + 9, brief attention should be given to v. 8b, a passage which deals specifically with the high places of the gates (וּצָלְעָה). It has been noted earlier in this study (pp. 80-81) that v. 8b combines זכר + תֹּמות in portraying the elimination of high places in contrast to זכר + תֹּמות which appears in the first part of the verse and which has been identified as belonging to the original text of Josiah’s reform. The second half of v. 8 has probably been added later into already growing material in vv. 8a and 9 revolving around the theme of the priests of the high places.

If it is maintained that v. 8b is a later interpolation, this may be suggestive of multiple hands being involved in the development of vv. 8-9 from the original kernel in the reform report of Kings.

3. Defiling the Topheth: 2Kgs 23:10

A new topic is introduced in 2Kgs 23:10, which seems to share little or almost nothing with the surrounding text. This verse of the developed reform account in Kings addresses the issue of the cultic activity that involved passing one’s child through fire (רמצת + זכר), and in scholarly literature is frequently discussed in contexts relating to the burning of children. ‘Passing one’s child through fire’ (רמצת + זכר) together with ‘burning one’s child’ (רמות + זכר) are two major expressions that occur in the Hebrew Bible in association with a fire ritual involving children. According to Barrick (2002:83) the verb רמות in the latter expression ‘is a straightforward indication that the act(s) in question included the physical burning, but not necessary incinerating, of children’. The biblical usage of the second construction רמצת + זכר seems to suggests, as Barrick (2002:83) observes, that the object of the cultic activity in question has passed literally through fire, the results of which must have been similar to the action described by רמות + זכר, i.e. burning of a child but not necessarily incinerating.31

The cultic activity involving children as victims of fire ritual, conveyed by the expressions ‘passing one’s child through fire’ or ‘burning one’s child’, is recorded five times in Kings: 2Kgs 16:3; 17:17, 31; 21:6 and 23:10.32 Only 2Kgs 23:10, however, connects this ritual explicitly with Topheth, a cult place located in the valley of Ben Hinnom, and with the Molech cult. Both ‘Topheth’ and ‘Molech’ occur several times in the Hebrew Bible, all in contexts that relate to fire ritual involving children. The occurrence of Tophet outside Kings is confined to a few instances in Jeremiah (7:31-32; 19:6, 11-14) and possibly one in Isaiah (30:33).33 The attestations of Molech are found in Jer 32:35, the text which also refers to the Hinnom valley but

31 For a different understanding see Weinfeld (1972:140-41); Zevit (2001:550-52).
32 2Kgs 3:27 suggests a child sacrifice in view and frequently appears in discussions concerning the above mentioned texts. However, this verse does not contain expressions ‘passing one’s child through fire’ nor ‘burning one’s child’, typical for the other verses.
33 The MT וַיִּשְׁנָא in Isa 30:33 is difficult, and is often emended to be tied to Hebrew וַיְשַׁנָּה; see e.g. Blenkinsopp (2000:422-23); Dearman (1996:59 n. 2) followed by Zevit (2001:521 n. 32). On Topheth see further Day (1989:24-28).
without reference to Topheth, and in Lev 18:21 and 20:2-5, a section of Levitical legislation belonging to the Holiness Code.  

The book of Deuteronomy has two references to a ritual involving children: Deut 18:10 enlists ‘passing one’s child through fire’ (יָשָׁב + צָעָה) among divinatory practices; Deut 12:31 refers to ‘burning of a child’ (יָשָׁב + צָעָה) in a context that has sacrificial overtones. One may note, finally, that references to the ritual are also attested in Ezek 16:20-21, 20:31; 23:37, 39, Isa 57:5 and Ps 106:37, the material assigned with greater consensus in scholarly literature to a fairly late period in Israel’s history.

Part of the problem in discerning how the biblical texts referring to the ritual involving children relate to each other is that they display greater fluidity in detail concerning the description of the actual activity carried out. As Dearman (1996:62) notes:

[s]ome texts do not mention צעָה (cf. Deut 18:10; 2 Kings 16:3; 21:6; Jer 7:31; 19:5). Some texts use the phrase “give (ל צע) to molek” rather than the phrase “passing through the fire” (Lev 18:21; Lev 20:2-3). Others substitute the phrase “to burn (יָשָׁב) children in the fire” (Jer 7:31; 19:5). Several texts lack the reference to location in the Hinnom Valley and/or tophet (Lev 18:21; Lev 20:2-3; Deut 18:10; 2 Kings 16:3; 21:6; Jer 32:35).

This has led scholars to conclusions of different practices being involved in different contexts.

2Kgs 23:10, as has been noted above, is the sole verse in Kings that relates to a fire ritual involving children, which makes also explicit reference to Topheth and to the cult of Molech. In this way, the passage closely resembles Jeremiah’s texts with a

---

34 In addition to these, the reference to the Molech cult is also considered to be present in Isa 30:33, in which some favour emendation of צע to צע; see HALOT 1:592; Blenkinsopp (2000:422-23); Schmidt (2000:913 [tentatively]); Clements (1980:253-54); cf. Day (1989:17). Others emend צע to צע also in Isa 57:9; see Zevit (2001:530 n. 57); cf. Day (1989:50-52). The mention of צע in the MT of 1Kgs 11:7, seen as a confusion of Molech with Milcom, is generally excluded from the Molech cult debate. For a detailed investigation of the subject of the Molech cult with the study of a number of other implicit references in the Hebrew Bible, see the monographs by Day (1989) and Heider (1985); for brief overviews of the issues involved, see Day (2000:209-212); Heider (DDD 1090-97 and ABD 4:895-98).

35 While Day (1989:15-20; 2000:210-12) and Smith (2002:171-81) see in these texts the reference primarily to human sacrifice, others differentiate more between individual contexts, in which the texts relating to a ritual involving children are found. Zevit (2001:550-52 and n. 129) thus discusses three different contexts with different practices: 1) child sacrifice (Isa 57:5-13; 2Kgs 3:27; Ps 106:37); 2) dedication to a deity (e.g. Jer 32:35; Deut 18:10; 2Kgs 16:3; 17:17) and 3) possibly a funerary ritual (Jer 7:32; 19:5; 32:35; 2Kgs 17:31). Barrick (2002:91-2) proposes these contexts: 1) ‘a special emergency rite involving the sacrifice of a child’ (2Kgs 3:27); 2) ‘a ritual “passing” of children for divinatory purposes’ (Deut 18:10; 2Kgs 16:3; 17:17; 21:6; 23:10) and 3) ‘a sacrificial “burning” of children’ (e.g. Deut 12:31; 2Kgs 17:31). Cf. Weinfeld (1972:140-49, 154); Cogan (1974:77-83).
prominent occurrence of Topheth and with one verse referring also to Molech in a fire rite context. Though 2Kgs 23:10 is regarded by a number of scholars as a secondary text in the reform report of Josiah, similarities of this verse with the passages in Jeremiah have been little explored in the literary analyses of the development of the original reform report. However, a significant new reassessment of the relationship between 2Kgs 23:10 and the texts in Jeremiah is Barrick’s recent examination of 23:10 in connection with Jer 7:31; 19:5; 32:35, in which he entertains the possibility that 23:10 might have actually been dependent on the prose texts in Jeremiah, though later in his argument he also proposes that 23:10 ‘is a late inter-textual harmonization of Lev. 18:21 and 20:2-5 with Deut. 18:10’.

The relationship between 2Kgs 23:10, within its larger context of the reform report of Josiah, and the units in Jer 7:30-8:3; 19:1-13; 32:29b-35 is worth pondering further. First, in all three passages of Jeremiah relating to a fire ritual involving children, specific mention is made of תבנה ‘high places’. Jer 7:31 begins תבנה ונתן תבנה ‘they have built the high places of Topheth’ and, only slightly differently, Jer 19:5 and 32:35 read מבנה ונתן מבנה ‘they built the high places of Baal’. The references to תבנה in these three texts of Jeremiah constitute half of all the references to high place(s) in the whole Jeremiah corpus. This may appear significant in regard to 2Kgs 23, the chapter in its present form having a dense concentration on the תבנה theme, even though v. 10 referring to the fire rite does not specifically contain תבנה but speaks only of the defilement of Topheth. Both the three texts in

---


37 Barrick (2002:81-103; quotation from p. 102).

38 As for תבנה in Jer 7:31, LXX and Tg have singular forms but MT and 4QJera attest the plural. In Jer 32:35 only Tg has singular תבנה. Regarding the targumic reading in Jer 7:31, Gordon (1975:54) comments that ‘[t]he vowels were added at a quite late stage in the history of the transmission of the Targums’. Since the consonants of the Aramaic תבנה can represent either the singular or plural form of the word, Tg is not a particularly strong witness in this case (apart from LXX) and in Jer 32:35 in favor of the singular form of its Hebrew Vorlage. For criticism of suggestions to emend the plural תבנה in Jer 7:31 to a singular form see Gleis (1997:209-10).

39 The other three are Jer 17:3 (This verse is missing in LXX through a possible haplography; see Parke-Taylor 2000:28); 26:18 (33:18LXX reads δυνατός) and 48:35 (31:35LXX reads βοηθήσον). For the rendering of Hebrew תבנה by Greek βοηθήσε in Jer 7:31; 32:35 (39:35LXX) and 48:35 (31:35LXX) see the discussion in Barr (1985:20-27).
Jeremiah (7:31; 19:5; 32:35) and the complex account of the reform in 2Kgs 23 portray a negative view of מזא. They possibly represent a subsequent stage in the development of this negative portrayal of high places that had already been present in the original report of Josiah’s reform with the description of Josiah’s defilement of high places in 2Kgs 23:8a.

Second, all three texts in Jeremiah share with 2Kgs 23:10 the employment of מזא ‘to defile’ in the contexts of fire ritual involving children. As has been observed previously (p. 81), מזא was the particular verb used in connection with מזא in the original version of Josiah’s reform (משבך מצא; 2Kgs 23:8a). In the expanded account of the reform this verb further appears in v. 10, in which its application to Topheth might have been indebted to its earlier use with מזא. At the same time מזא is employed in v. 10 also in the context of a fire ritual involving children and this accords with other instances in the Old Testament where מזא appears within the wider contexts of a fire ritual. Beside the texts in Jer 7:30; 19:13; 32:34, other cases include Ezek 20:26, 31; 23:38; Lev 20:3 and Ps 106:39. It is hoped that reviewing these with special attention being paid to passages in Jeremiah will contribute to the elucidation of the nature of their relationship to 2Kgs 23:10.

Among the three passages in Jeremiah that include a mention of מזא in the broader context of a fire ritual involving children, Jer 19:13 is the most problematic and therefore ought to be treated first. Jer 19:13 belongs to the larger section of 19:1-13, which narrates the story of a broken flask interwoven with the Topheth theme. Topheth, to which the state of the city of Jerusalem is likened in divine judgment, serves as a focal point in this text. It is in the last verse (v. 13) within this divine pronouncement that the reference to defilement/uncleanness is made. The term מזא in the MT, lit. ‘the unclean ones’, is syntactically difficult and not easy to interpret in its immediate context. It is taken by some as being in an attributive position and qualifying סנה רנסא בחר מליכי חרב in the first part of the verse. McKane (1986:447) thus proposes that מזא serves in the verse as a ‘limitation’, implying that ‘not all the houses in Jerusalem had been destroyed’. The verse might read as follows, ‘The houses of Jerusalem and the houses of the kings will be like

40 Jer 19 is usually understood to consist of a nucleus describing broken flask episode (1-2a, 10-11a) and its further development dealing with Topheth theme (2b-9; 11b-13); see recently, e.g., Craigie et al (1991:256). It is the latter specifically, the Topheth theme, which is of greater interest in relation to its links with the reform report in 2Kgs 23. For the view that Jer 19:1-13 is a unified narrative, see Holladay (1986:536-38) and Lundbom (1999:836).

Topheth, the unclean ones, namely all the houses upon whose roofs offerings were made to the whole host of heaven...’ – not all the houses will come under destruction, only those profaned through idolatry. Accordingly, this approach understands, in the light of the reference to the houses ‘upon whose roofs offerings have been made to the whole host of heaven...’ in the second part of v. 13, the defilement of the houses as being caused by idolatrous practices. Such understanding is close to other instances in Jeremiah where the defilement is described as being caused by an illicit cult (שֵׁרֶשׁ in Jer 7:30; 32:34).

The text in Jer 19:13, however, yields to a different understanding, if the termOSE ใน the MT is subject to emendation. Because of the obscure position of the MT’s OSE within the sentence, in which it appears, some scholars propose it to be emended to OSE ‘defiled’ (or simply to OSE ‘unclean’) and take it as standing in a predicate position, thus reading the verse as ‘and the houses of Jerusalem and the houses of the kings of Judah shall be like the place of Topheth defiled – all the houses upon whose roofs offerings were made...’. In this understanding of the passage the means of the defilement are not explicitly stated. Taking into consideration the preceding verses in ch. 19, which portray images of a destroyed city and people (vv. 6-9), some envision the defilement to be from dead bodies. Illustrative of this is Carroll’s comment that the houses ‘will be treated like Topheth, i.e. profaned with corpses’. Barrick (2002:215-16) suggests a similar issue featuring in the events described in 2Kgs 23:10, in which the manner of defilement is also not expressed. Barrick contends, arguing from Jer 7:32-33 and 19:6-9, that contact with human corpses as the means of Josiah’s defilement of Topheth may have actually been envisioned by the editor of this addition in Kings.

It can be observed from the analysis of the reference to defilement/uncleanness in Jer 19:13 that there are two interpretations with different implications for the relationship of this verse to other texts that employ OSE in the wider contexts of a fire ritual involving children. While one interpretation of Jer 19:13, stating that ‘houses will be defiled’, seems to be closer in line with 2Kgs 23:10, the other approach by viewing defilement in v. 13 being caused by idolatrous practices shows more

---

resonance with the other two passages in Jeremiah that include הָשֵׂעַ in their wider contexts relating to a fire ritual (Jer 7:30-8:3; 32:29b-35). It is to these two remaining passages in Jeremiah and few other references to הָשֵׂעַ in fire ritual contexts that the next section will turn.

The texts in Jer 7:30-8:3 and 32:29b-35 both mention הָשֵׂעַ in verses immediately preceding the reference to the fire ritual in the Valley of Ben-Hinnom. Jer 7:30 and 32:34 both concern הָשֵׂעַ set in the ‘house called by [Yahweh’s] name’ as objects causing defilement (הָשֵׂעַ) of Yahweh’s name/temple and then are followed by the text denouncing a fire ritual involving children (יהוה in 7:31; הָשֵׂעַ + לֹּא in 32:35).44

Even more direct links between fire ritual and the theme of defilement can be observed in a few texts in Leviticus, Ezekiel and Psalms. Lev 20:3 refers to the defilement of the sanctuary (הָשֵׂעַ הָעָרֶב) resulting from offspring being given (יִתְנָה) to Molech. Ezekiel 20:26 is the only verse in the Old Testament employing הָשֵׂעַ in which Yahweh is the subject of the defiling action: ‘I defiled them through their very gifts, in their offering up all their firstborn, in order that I may horrify them, so that they might know that I am the Lord.’ In verse 31 within the same chapter people are warned that they defile themselves (הָשֵׂעַ in נִשָּׁף) when they offer their gifts and make their children pass through the fire. There are only two occurrences of הָשֵׂעַ in the whole book of Psalms with one of these two, Ps 106:39, appearing in the context of a fire rite (vv. 37-39). The meaning of הָשֵׂעַ appears here in this Psalm to be similar to the last one mentioned in Ezekiel: people defile themselves by their acts, i.e. by sacrificing their children to אָרַב ‘demons’ (v. 37) and by pouring out innocent blood (v. 38).

How does 2Kgs 23:10 relate to these texts with the theme of defilement occurring in contexts of fire ritual involving children? It has been observed that in Jer 7:31 and 32:34, belonging to the wider units of 7:30-8:3 and 32:29b-35 that relate to a fire ritual, it is the objects of illicit worship that cause the defilement.45 In Lev 20:3, Ezek 20:(26), 31 and Ps 106:38 the mention of defilement is directly linked with the fire ritual involving children. In 2Kgs 23:10, however, there is one marked

45 The question relating to Jer 19:13 within the wider context of 19:1-13 remains open, depending on the view of הָשֵׂעַ in the MT; see our discussion on pp. 142-43.
difference, demonstrated in a subtle way, from these other materials. For it is not the illegitimate cult nor anything else associated with the fire ritual, which defiles. This time the verb ḳeε is used to denote Josiah’s own act against the place known for its illegitimate cultic practices. In one respect, the employment of ḳeε in 2Kgs 23:10 belongs to an elaboration of an earlier narrative of Josiah’s reform where this term was linked primarily with Ṣe. However, in the new setting of v. 10, ḳeε is also used within the context of a fire ritual in a manner contrasting with its use elsewhere in contexts of fire ritual involving children.46 Although the texts in Leviticus, Ezekiel and Psalms are relevant here, it appears that 2Kgs 23:10 was formed particularly in relation to the texts revolving around the fire ritual in Jeremiah since there are some other links between the developed text of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23, of which v. 10 is part, and the texts in Jeremiah 7; 19 and 32. We have already noted, for example, the specific use of Ṣe in the three passages of Jeremiah and the high presence of this term in lately developed 2Kgs 23. Further, the terms ḳeε and Ṣezeń of Jer 7:31 and 32:34 find some reminiscence in the language of 2Kgs 23:13 that narrates Josiah’s acts against the high places of non-Yahwistic deities (referred to as built by Solomon; cf. 1Kgs 11:5, 7, 33). Two of the deities mentioned in v. 13 in relation to the defilement of the high places are specifically termed as ǧn, Astarte ‘the detestable idol’ of the Sidonians and Chemosh ‘the detestable idol’ of Moab.47 Thus v. 13 also seems to corroborate to some extent v. 10 as counterbalancing the use of language in Jeremianic fire rite contexts.

With a wider horizon it is emerging from examination of material in Kings and Jeremiah that there was not only one way influence from Jer 7:30-8:3; 19:1-13 and 32:29b-35 on the shaping of 2Kgs 23:10 in the developing account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, but it is likely that the texts pertaining to fire ritual involving children in Jeremiah have also been influenced by features from the material relating to fire ritual in Kings shared with Chronicles. Two texts in Kings and their counterparts in Chronicles in particular relate to this issue, the stories of king Ahaz (2Kgs 16:1-20//2Chr 28:1-27) and Manasseh (2Kgs 21:1-18//2Chr 33:1-20).

These two stories share several characteristic features. Except for the final part of Manasseh’s story in Chronicles (33:11-17), both Ahaz and Manasseh are

46 Again, one exception could be Jer 19:13 if Ṣezeń is emended to Ṣezeń (or simply to Ṣezeń).
47 Sg. ǧn is used in the Hebrew Bible only in 1Kgs 11:5, 7 (2x), 2Kgs 23:13 (2x), Dan 11:31 and 12:11.
portrayed negatively in the two histories. The accounts begin with the note in regnal frameworks to these two kings that Ahaz and Manasseh did not do what was right (=did evil) in the eyes of Yahweh (שָׁרֵת הָרְעָה in 2Kgs 16:2//2Chr 28:1; שָׁרֵת הָרְעָה in 2Kgs 21:2//2Chr 33:2). There follow lists of illegitimate cultic practices, within which the accounts of both kings include the reference to fire ritual involving children (2Kgs 16:3b-4//2Chr 28:2b-4; 2Kgs 21:3-9//2Chr 33:3-9). One may note that concerning Ahaz’s account in Kings and Chronicles the reference to fire ritual actually appears first in the list following the introductory royal formula. The stories of kings Ahaz and Manasseh both also mention the phrase ‘according to the abominations of the nations whom Yahweh dispossessed before Israelites’ (2Kgs 16:3//2Chr 28:3; 2Kgs 21:2//2Chr 33:2)—with a small difference that in Ahaz’s story this phrase is placed after the reference to fire ritual involving children, while in the story of Manasseh it appears at the start of the narrative before the listing of Manasseh’s cultic practices.

In the light of these shared features between the accounts of Ahaz and Manasseh in the two histories, a passage can be brought into consideration from Jeremiah which is commonly acknowledged to be the earliest of the three texts in Jeremiah relating to a fire ritual involving children: Jer 7:30-31 appears structurally similar to the narratives relating to kings Manasseh and (slightly less) Ahaz in the two historical books. The parallel components of Jer 7:30-31 and the accounts of Manasseh and Ahaz in Kings and Chronicles (with inclusion also of Deut 18:9-11 for further comparison) can be seen displayed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JER 7:30-31</th>
<th>2KGS 21:2-7//2CHR 33:2-7 (MANASSEH)</th>
<th>2KGS 16:2-4//2CHR 28:2-4 (AHAZ)</th>
<th>DEUT 18:9-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evil in the eyes of Yahweh 7:30a</td>
<td>Evil in the eyes of Yahweh 21:2a//33:2a</td>
<td>Not right in the eyes of Yahweh 16:2b//28:1b</td>
<td>Reference to fire rite 18:9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to cultic practices including fire rite 7:31</td>
<td>Reference to cultic practices including fire rite 21:3-7//33:3-7</td>
<td>Reference to fire rite 16:3b//28:2b-3a</td>
<td>Reference to cultic and divination practices incl fire rite 18:10-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, Jer 7:30 begins with the evaluative expression ‘do evil in Yahweh’s eyes’, which is similar to the evaluations regularly occurring in the regnal
formulae of kings in Kings and Chronicles, and further appears in Jeremiah only in 18:10; 32:30 and 52:2 (MT). The expression יֵשׁ עַל מְדִינָתוֹ מִדְּרָשָׁה יְהוָה in Jer 18:10 points to its use within the more organically connected account of the oracle of Yahweh with an antithetic structure (see 18:7-8 being balanced by 18:9-10). There are no signs of the presence of deuteronomistic language in Jer 18:7-10⁴⁸ and the phrase ‘in my (Yahweh’s) eyes’ (v. 10) according to Lundbom (1999:812) echoes the earlier statement ‘in the eyes of the potter’ (v. 4) in the part of chapter 18 picturing the work of the potter. In both Jer 7:30 and 32:30 the expression יֵשׁ עַל מְדִינָתוֹ מִדְּרָשָׁה יְהוָה belongs to a context relating to a fire ritual involving children, while its occurrence in Jer 52:2 (MT) has a parallel in 2Kgs 24:19//2Chr 36:12 which is part of the regnal formula of king Zedekiah. Although the phrase ‘do evil in the eyes of Yahweh’ is often regarded as a stock expression of the deuteronomistic literature,⁴⁹ it has been demonstrated earlier in this thesis that it is peculiar to the regnal framework of the common text of Kings and Chronicles rather than being characteristic of the material in Deuteronomy through Kings (plus Jeremiah) in general.⁵⁰

In Jer 7:30 after the mention of the people of Judah doing evil in Yahweh’s eyes, a reference is made to יֵשׁ עַל מְדִינָתוֹ מִדְּרָשָׁה set in the temple, which is followed in the next verse by a depiction of illegitimate cultic activities. This is comparable with the structure of the passage in 2Kgs 21:2-7//2Chr 33:2-7 regarding Manasseh and to a lesser degree with 2Kgs 16:2-4//2Chr 28:2-4 regarding Ahaz. In 2Kgs 21:2//2Chr 33:2 after the evaluative comment that Manasseh ‘did evil in the eyes of Yahweh’, a reference is made to יֵשׁ עַל מְדִינָתוֹ מִדְּרָשָׁה of the nations, which is followed in the next couple of verses by a depiction of the cultic offences of Manasseh. As noted above, a slightly different situation appears in Ahaz’s story in which the reference to יֵשׁ עַל מְדִינָתוֹ מִדְּרָשָׁה is made after the mention of fire rite involving children. Still, these similarities in structure suggest that the author of Jer 7:30-31 used as the basis for his text the format of the passage borrowed from the shared texts of Manasseh and to a lesser degree of Ahaz in the two histories.

There are also other indicators pointing to Jer 7:30-31 being more heavily dependent on the shared text of Manasseh. The story of Manasseh in its portrayal of cultic practices frequently refers to building activity: Manasseh builds high places (21:3//33:3), he erects altars for Baals (21:3//33:3) and builds altars in the temple

⁵⁰ See chapter two of this thesis.
(21:4//33:4) and for the hosts of heaven (21:5//33:5). Similarly, Jer 7:31 mentions building activity in context relating to cultic practice. It refers to building the high places of Topheth using the verb achsen, which is the same verb used prominently in the shared texts regarding Manasseh, occurring in 2Kgs 21:3, 4, 5//2Chr 33:3, 4, 5. It may, therefore, be that the passage in Jer 7:31 with its use of achsen + achsen was first influenced by the shared material on Manasseh, before achsen + achsen later appeared in parallel passages of Jer 19:5 and 32:35. If the shared material of 2Kgs 21:2-7 and 2Chr 33:2-7 lies behind the composition of Jer 7:30-31, this may also explain the appearance of the extended phrase achsen achsen uai, not just achsen achsen achsen in Jer 7:31, as achsen would have been more natural to include under the influence of 2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3. Another piece of information concerning Jer 7:31 that is of interest for the present study is the tense used in achsen achsen uai. The w-qatal form of the verb that appears in this phrase (as well as in parallel text of 2Kgs 21:5), is also used in two verses in the shared text of Manasseh in Kings and Chronicles, 2Kgs 21:4//2Chr 33:4 and 2Kgs 21:6//2Chr 33:6 (3x). This can be another pointer to the influence of the story of Manasseh shared by the two histories on the development of Jer 7:30-31.52

While it has been observed that the structure of Jer 7:30-31 (a) resembles that of the texts relating to Manasseh and to a lesser degree Ahaz and (b) has probably been formed in dependence on them, it is important to note that Jer 7:30-31 also significantly departs in one point from these texts. The passages relating to Ahaz and Manasseh in 2Kgs 16:3//2Chr 28:3 and 2Kgs 21:2//2Chr 33:2 include the allegation that both kings followed abominable practices (manit) of the nations which Yahweh drove out before Israel.53 Jeremiah does not refer to manit but rather has something different in 7:30. This verse in its second part reads: ‘they have set their abominations (msiptf) in the house that is called by my name, defiling it (ixbbS).’ On the one hand it appears that the phrase of the second part of 7:30, talking about msiptf in the house of Yahweh, depends in its content on recounting different cultic objects being set up in the house of Yahweh in Manasseh’s story (2Kgs 21:4, 5, 7//2Chr

51 Cf. Jer 19:5 and 32:35, both of which following Jer 7:31 use achsen + achsen but unlike Jer 7:31 they do not link this construction with Topheth.


53 It is interesting to observe that the warning not to follow the abominable practices of the nations is found in a fire-rite context also in Deut 18:9-10. In other contexts, this phrase occurs only in 1Kgs 14:24 and 2Chr 36:14; cf. Ezek 12:16.
On the other hand, the phrase is innovative in its use of the new language, אֶפֶל and ממ, which has nowhere been employed describing objects and practices in the texts regarding kings Ahaz or Manasseh. The term ממ, being freshly introduced in the composition of Jer 7:30-31, subsequently occurs a number of times within wider contexts of fire ritual involving children in Jer 19:13; 32:34; Ezek 20:26, 31; 23:38; Lev 20:3 and Ps 106:39.

As has been shown earlier in this chapter, the developed unit of Jer 7:30-8:3 together with two other texts of Jeremiah (19:1-13; 32:29b-35) in the use of ממ within the context of a fire rite involving children then became influential on the formation of the late text in Josiah’s reform in Kings, 2Kgs 23:10.

4. Astral Worship: 2Kgs 23:5, 11-12

The present text of Josiah’s reform in Kings moves from narrating Josiah’s defilement of Topheth in v. 10 to describing the removal of horses dedicated to the sun and the elimination of sun chariots in v. 11. This verse shares a common feature with vv. 5 and (partly) 12 in that they are concerned with the worship of astral entities.55 But while in scholarly treatments of these texts v. 5 is generally considered to belong to the latest stratum of the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, vv. 11 and 12 are often ascribed to a literary layer different from that of v. 5. Verse 11 with parts of v. 12 is usually seen as belonging to the oldest material within the reform narrative.56 The chief reason for attributing an early date to these two verses is the unique reference within the Hebrew Bible to the ‘horses...dedicated to the sun’ and to the ‘sun chariots’ in v. 11, to which the mention of ‘altars on the roof’ in v. 12 is

54 Thus, Kimchi could be right associating the term אֶפֶל in Jer 7:30 with syncretistic practices presented in the texts of Ahaz and Manasseh; see McKane (1986:178). It is, however, irrelevant to ponder over what historical value the statement has, whether it is referring back to actual Manasseh’s or later (Jehoiakim’s?) period in Judah’s history; see in this regard Thiel (1973:129); Lundbom (1999:495). The links studied above between Jer 7:30-31 and the texts of Ahaz and Manasseh may be purely literary and serve rather ideological purposes to the editors of Jeremiah in later times. An attractive possibility and way forward in this regard is presented by Sharp in her recent study Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah (2003) who argues for later traditionist perspectives being present in the book of Jeremiah rather than significant components of material going back to the historic figure of Jeremiah.


also closely associated as part of the theme of astral worship in these texts.\textsuperscript{57} Looking closely, however, at some other significant language of vv. 11 and 12 it will be observed that the argument which designates these verses as being original stands on less secure ground, and that vv. 11 and 12 form an integral part of the material introduced to the reform report of Josiah during a subsequent editing of the ‘original’ reform account.\textsuperscript{58}

Verse 11 locates the cult ‘at the entrance’\textsuperscript{59} to the house of Yahweh by the chamber of Natan-melech, the official, which was in the parwarim/colonnades(?) (\textit{תֵּבֶן תַּחְתֵּי הַמַּעֲמָקִים תּוֹמְאָיו}). The word \textit{תֵּבֶן} of this verse designating ‘chamber’ is found once in each, Samuel (MT) and Kings, but occurs more often in Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah and Jeremiah, and is most characteristic of Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{60} In Samuel \textit{תֵּבֶן} refers to a hall in a local sanctuary serving as a place for eating sacrificial meals (1Sam 9:22; cf. 1:18 LXX). That \textit{תֵּבֶן} generally signifies a hall or chamber usually associated with a religious structure is apparent from texts elsewhere in the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{61} What is significant about \textit{תֵּבֶן} in 2Kgs 23:11, however, is its association with a named person, which is a specific feature not only of this verse but particularly of a number of verses in Jeremiah (35:4; 36:10, 20, 21; cf. 36:12) and one in Ezra (10:6). This link of v. 11 with verses in Jeremiah, in which \textit{תֵּבֶן} are ‘identified more specifically by the personal names of their builder and/or present owner (or tenant)’\textsuperscript{62}, contributes to our contention made previously of the possible influence of features from Jeremiah on the later development of Josiah’s reform in Kings.

The ‘chamber’, \textit{תֵּבֶן}, is attributed in 2Kgs 23:11 to Nathan-melech, a court official, who is in this verse further identified as \textit{נַחַטָא} but elsewhere is unknown in

\textsuperscript{57} Hollenstein (1977:334), for example, speaks about ‘Konkretion und Details’ in v. 11, which he considers as part of ‘pre-deuteronomistic’ source. Spieckermann (1982:107) mentions in this regard ‘die Abwesenheit jeglicher dtr Diktion und die beschriebenen religionsgeschlichen Details’.

\textsuperscript{58} Cf. Campbell & O’Brien (2000:461-62) who contend that vv. 5, 10-12 and 15-20 all belong to later revision of the account of Josiah’s narrative in Kings which they call ‘royal focus of the dtr revision’ (citation from p. 462).

\textsuperscript{59} The reading \textit{about} finds support in ancient versions (LXX, Pesh, Vg). For MT’s \textit{about} being a later development see Toloni (1997:143-69).

\textsuperscript{60} The occurrences of this term in the Hebrew Bible are 1x in Samuel (MT), 1x in Kings, 5x in Chronicles, 9x in Ezra-Nehemiah, 8x in Jeremiah (only chaps. 35, 36) and 23x in Ezekiel. In LXX of Samuel, \textit{about} rendered by the Greek \textit{κατάλογος} occurs also in 1Sam 1:18, on which see McCarter (1980:55, 61).

\textsuperscript{61} This is noted in \textit{HALOT} 2:536-37. Some texts, e.g. Jer 36:12, 20, 21, also suggest affiliation of \textit{about} with a royal palace.

\textsuperscript{62} Kellermann (\textit{TDOT} 8:36-37).
biblical narrative. His name, ‘Natan-melech’, contains a theophoric part \(-mlk\),\(^{63}\) regarding which some scholars have invoked a relationship with the immediately preceding verse that mentions the ritual of passing one’s child through fire to Molech. Heider, for example, comments that 2Kgs 23:10-11 ‘raises the possibility that [Natan-melech’s] very name might incorporate a reference to that part of the cult which was performed in the valley below.’\(^{64}\)

Another issue relating to the name of Nathan-melech in 2Kgs 23:11 has recently been raised in connection with some of the epigraphic material, as one of the Hebrew bullae bears the inscription בֹּנֶן תּוֹרָב. McCarter in two of his recent publications of this artifact from the collection of Shlomo Moussaieff attempted to link the owner of the bulla in ancient times with the name of Nathan-melech mentioned in 2Kgs 23:11.\(^{65}\) That such attempts need greater caution is pointed out by Fox, who brings up Avigad’s strict methodological criteria for establishing a reliable link between biblical and epigraphic data with regard to personal names.\(^{66}\) Though admitting some pitfalls in Avigad’s methodology due to scant data,\(^{67}\) this has little bearing on the fact that McCarter’s identification falls short in one very basic criterion, which is to have next to the corresponding personal name also a matching title or epithet. Nathan-melech appearing in 2Kgs 23:11 is termed סִינוֹם and this is different from the designation בֹּנֶן תּוֹרָב of the person bearing the same name occurring on the bulla studied by McCarter. Adding some further uncertainties regarding McCarter’s proposal, such as the bulla belonging to the material of an uncontrolled provenance and the limitations inherent in relying solely on the method of paleographic dating, it is safer to adopt Fox’s ‘cautious approach’ (2000:32) and consider McCarter’s attempt, until there is more information from epigraphic sources available, rather tenuous and unconvincing.

As noted above, Natan-melech is called סִינוֹם in 2Kgs 23:11, which is generally considered to be an Akkadian loanword referring to a certain class of higher official,

\(^{63}\) On the group of names occurring in the Old Testament compounded with \(-mlk\) element see McCarter (1999:145-46 n. 11).
\(^{64}\) Heider (1985:231); see also Weinfeld (1972:151).
\(^{66}\) According to Avigad (1987:237) ‘[i]n addition to a corresponding PN, there should be (1) a matching title or epithet and (2) genealogy of three generations and (3) chronological synchronism’ in order to ‘establish a sound identification’ (Avigad’s criteria cited from Fox 2000:36-37).
\(^{67}\) For a recent study with modifications made to Avigad’s methodological criteria see Mykytiuk (2004).
or a castrated servant or official. In the Bible the references to אַלְפָּד are noted at passages depicting foreign courts, namely Egyptian (Gen 37:36; 39:1; 40:2, 7), Babylonian (2Kgs 20:18//Isa 39:7; Dan 1:3, 7-11, 18) and Persian (Est 1:10, 12, 15; 2:3, 14, 15, 21; 4:4, 5; 6:2, 14; 7:9). Only on two occasions does אַלְפָּד occur to designate a court personage in the time of Samuel/Saul and David (1Sam 8:15; 1Chr 28:1). Later during the period of a divided monarchy the Bible describes the attendant of Israelite king Ahab as אַלְפָּד in the episode of Ahab and Jehoshaphat’s encounter with the prophet Micaiah (1Kgs 22:9//2Chr 18:8), this being the only episode in which the reference to אַלְפָּד is shared by Kings and Chronicles. In addition to the mention of אַלְפָּד in Ahab’s court, Kings refers to אַלְפָּד in two episodes that are part of the material relating to the northern kingdom, the story of the Shunamite woman (2Kgs 8:6) and the episode treating the downfall of Jezebel (2Kgs 9:32). It is noteworthy that in both these cases אַלְפָּד are termed courtiers who attend to women, the Shunamite woman and the queen Jezebel. The term of the present discussion also appears in 2Kgs 20:18 in the prophecy of Isaiah to the king Hezekiah, in which the sons of Hezekiah are predicted to become אַלְפָּד in the Babylonian court, and then in the last three chapters of Kings that denote, apart from 2Kgs 23:11, courtiers and one higher official of Judean kingdom being taken to Babylon (2Kgs 24:12, 15; 25:19). While the term אַלְפָּד in the narrative of Hezekiah (2Kgs 20:18) has a parallel in the book of Isaiah (39:7), occurrences of this term in the account of the last Judean kings before Babylonian exile (2Kgs 24; 25) share rather prominent links with Jeremiah (29:2; 52:25). It further appears that the employment of אַלְפָּד in Jeremiah points to a process of continuation of use of this term in the last chapters of Kings—that is, all the narratives in which אַלְפָּד is used in Jeremiah (29:2; 34:19; 41:16; 52:25) relate to the same period of Judean history as the narratives employing אַלְפָּד in the final two chapters of Kings. In addition to these considerations, perhaps it is not then surprising to find אַלְפָּד added in the MT of Jer 38:7 to the name Ebedmelech, which in the present form of the MT accords well with the usage of אַלְפָּד in 2Kgs 23:11. This later development within MT follows in the footsteps of earlier.

68 The precise nuances of Akkadian ša rēši as that of אַלְפָּד in the Hebrew usage have long been debated and need not concern us here. For more detailed discussion see Kedar-Kopfstein (TDOT 10:344-50); Mankowski (2000:123-25); Fox (2000:196-203) and the literature cited there.

69 In contrast to 9 appearances of אַלְפָּד in Samuel-Kings, this term is quite rare in Chronicles, appearing only 2x (1Chr 28:1; 2Chr 18:8//1Kgs 22:9).

70 The context of these two episodes, in which service is done to women, has suggested to some greater plausibility for interpreting אַלְפָּד as ‘eunuchs’; see e.g. Gray (1970:527; 551); cf. Tadmor (1995:317-25).
formative processes, in which texts of Kings and Jeremiah employed כותנה in their
development from the older traditions related to the final years of the Judean
kingdom. Finally, it is significant to note at this point that the shared text of Kings
and Chronicles relating to this period, which might be reminiscent of those older
materials, has no mention of כותנה.\footnote{Nonetheless, we are aware of many problems entailing the parallel texts of Kings and Chronicles pertaining to the reigns of final four kings of Judah. The detailed discussion of the precise character of the relationship of the text in Kings and Chronicles relating to this period would require a separate study.}

Returning to the discussion of 2Kgs 23:11, the final term כותנה, which
describes the location of the cult, is the most problematic. There exists a great
uncertainty surrounding כותנה in 2Kgs 23:11, which is often regarded as a variant
form of a similar word כותנה occurring in 1Chr 26:18.\footnote{See Benzinger (1899:193); Driver (1900:673); Burney (1903:360); Stade and Schwally (1904:294); Skinner (1893:421); Curtis & Madsen (1910:285); Sanda (1912:347); Montgomery (1951:539); Jones (1984:623); Cogan & Tadmor (1988:288-89); Maier (1989:26); Runnalls (1991:325). However, Yahuda (1947:88); Rudolph (1955:172) and lately Taylor (1993:179-82) regard the two words as separate.} Although there have been
suggestions in the past of כותנה being derived from various languages (Egyptian,
Sumerian),\footnote{For suggestion of Egyptian connection see Yahuda (1947:88); for Sumerian Ostreicher (1923:54) followed by Gressmann (1924:323).} a commonly accepted proposal by most scholars has been to view it as a
derivation from the Persian fra-bar designating a ‘columned structure open at the
sides’,\footnote{Yadin (1983,1:238).} hence obtaining the sense of ‘colonnade’ in late Hebrew.\footnote{As early as Gesenius in Thesaurus philologicus (1840:1123) suggested a derivation from the Persian word meaning ‘summer-house’ or an ‘open kiosk’. The Persian connection is held e.g. by Davies (1902:708 n. 1); Driver (1900:673); Stade and Schwally (1904:294); Gray (1970:737); Hobbs (1985:335); cf. Cogan & Tadmor (1988:289). For the appearances of the word prbr in Aramaic-Lydic inscription, origin of which is assumed to be Persian, see KAI no. 260; Hofijzer & Jongeling (1995:935). For references to כותנה in the Temple Scroll see Yadin (1983, 1:235-39). In later Jewish use, e.g. in Mishnaic Hebrew, the term refers to ‘outskirts’ or ‘suburb’; see Jastrow (1950:1218).} An innovative contribution to the debate is made by Runnals who proposes on the basis of the function of כותנה to view the origin of the word as being within Hebrew usage.\footnote{Runnals (1991:329-31). Cf. Washburn (1991:72-73).} She states it ‘should be placed alongside other Hebrew nouns which have been
constructed by the reduplication of the root and, in particular, suggests the
emergence of כותנה ‘from a reduplication of an original biconsonantal root pr’
(Runnals 1991:329, 330). In either way, being a Persian loanword or originating
lately within the Hebrew language, כותנה is commonly acknowledged as being
introduced in 2Kgs 23 by the editors of postexilic period. Of no less interest in this
regard are the occurrences of רכש in the Temple Scroll of the second temple period, in which this term is used in a manner that is comparable with the biblical usage of רכש.  

Notwithstanding the fact that the horse and chariot imagery connected with the solar cult has led some interpreters to ascribe v. 11 to the original material of Josiah’s reform in Kings, 78 this verse in its overall perspective does not conform to this conclusion. As the foregoing analysis has shown, v. 11 employs terminology linked with the portrayal of the location of a cult that points to a later development within the Kings narrative. 79 There is no mention, for example, of לֶשֶת ‘chamber’ in 1Kgs 5-8/2Chr 2-5 relating to Solomon’s temple and palace, nor is the structure called רכש found in these texts. On the other hand, רכש in v. 11 displays a feature, whereby it is associated with the personal name Natan-melech, which is reminiscent particularly of texts in Jeremiah. It has also been observed that Natan-melech’s title in v. 11, סֹּלֶם, is increasingly employed in the last chapters of Kings and in Jeremiah. Finally, the term רכש of v. 11 while absent in early materials finds some resonances in texts of the second temple period.

One further observation is relevant regarding the phraseology of v. 11. This verse in its context of worship of the sun specifically mentions כָּלֵי הַשָּׁנָה ‘kings of

---


78 It has sometimes been suggested that the image of horses and sun chariots in v. 11 finds support in archaeological findings of horse and rider figurines from Iron age levels of ancient Palestine (see e.g. Kenyon 1974:142; Smith 1990:31-32; cf. Holland 1977:149-52; Ahlström 1984:22-23). But this has been firmly rejected by Taylor (1993:58-66) and Keel & Uehlinger (1998:343-44) because of several inconsistencies between these artifacts and 2Kgs 23:11. The so-called ‘sun disks’ on the horse figurines can be better accounted for as ‘mane[s] with a forehead ornament’ according to Keel & Uehlinger (1998:343). Taylor (1988:563-64; 1993:32-33, 178) suggested a correspondence between 2Kgs 23:11 and 10th century BCE Taanach cult stand (and also Hazor terracotta quadraped of the same period). But this, too, has been seriously doubted since the interpretation of the figure in the top register of the Taanach stand as a horse, which Taylor then connects with sun worship, is unclear and open to question. Some take the image to be bovid rather than equid (e.g. Zevit 2001:321), others reject the solar Yahweh cult interpretation of the Taanach stand altogether (e.g. Keel & Uehlinger 1998:158-60; Day 2000:161). Finally regarding the horses and sun chariots mentioned in v. 11, Keel & Uehlinger (1998:158-60, 343-44) suggested an Assyrian connection, viewing a correspondence in the note of v. 11 with the Assyrian practice of divination by the aid of horses and the sun god in the periods of Sargon and Senacherib (cf. also Spieckermann 1982:245-56). Yet Uehlinger’s suggestion (1995:76) that this Assyrian divinatory practice was adopted in Judah under king Hezekiah is highly unlikely considering that Hezekiah is understood as a reforming king in Judah. Given the uncertainty surrounding these various proposals about horses and sun chariots in v. 11, noting also the late elements in v. 11 in the depiction of the place where horses were stationed and, further, observing greater similarities of v. 11 with v. 5 (see below) which is usually considered late, this substantiates our conclusion that the present shape of the whole v. 11 comes from the later editors of Kings.

Judah’, the phrase that has been noted to have a prominent occurrence once again in Jeremiah (1:18; 8:1; 19:3; 13; 20:5; 44:9). In 2Kgs 23 reference to ‘kings of Judah’ is made not only in v. 11 but also in vv. 5 and 12, thus occurring in the verses which involve a common theme of astral worship. It is of further interest that vv. 5 and 11 share beside the notion of astral worship and the reference to ‘kings of Judah’ an element of marked verbal similarity in their opening phrases.

The verb נָמַס in hiphil, meaning ‘put an end to’, occurs only in these two verses in the whole book of Kings. It is frequently attested, however, in prophetic speeches of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, and also less frequently in Isaiah and Hosea, with deity as the subject of the action.

Within these speeches Yahweh is often said to act in judgment. Two of these pronouncements are particularly relevant to the present discussion. In Jer 48:35 Yahweh declares that he ‘will bring to an end in Moab...those who offer sacrifice at a high place and make offerings to their gods’; in Ezek 30:13 Yahweh says that he will ‘destroy the idols and put an end to the images in Memphis’.

Comparing these texts with the account of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24, one may observe that Josiah performs almost the same role as Yahweh in Jer 48:35 and Ezek 30:13, putting an end to priests (כָּמֵס; v. 5), previously appointed to burn incense on the high places, and to horses (נַחֲיָן; v. 11) dedicated to the sun.

The phrase כָּמֵס in v. 5 is an open subject within scholarly debate, especially with regard to the identification and function of כָּמֵס, which is a rare term in the Hebrew Bible, occurring only in two other places. In Hosea 10:5 כָּמֵס refers to cultic personnel in the context of calf worship at Beth-aven. But it is the occurrence of כָּמֵס in the second text, Zeph 1:4, which may shed light on the significance of this term in 2Kgs 23:5. The immediate setting in Zeph 1:4-5 is that of the oracle of judgment against Judah and Jerusalem, in which Yahweh declares that

---

80 Campbell & O’Brien (2000:461) note: ‘[a]s a category, the kings of Judah attract Jeremianic interest’.
81 On נָמַס in hiphil see, e.g., Stolz (TLOT 3:1298-99); Haag (TDOT 14:384-85). See also further discussion in Barrick (2002:68-69).
82 There are 40 occurrences of נָמַס in hiphil in the Hebrew Bible, of which more than a half are in prophetic speeches of Ezekiel (10x), Jeremiah (5x), Isaiah (4x) and Hosea (2x).
83 Outside Old Testament, however, cognates to Hebrew כָּמֵס, nouns derived from the root קמ, are common. They are found, conveying the sense of ‘priest’, in El Amarna, Phoenician, Egyptian Aramaic, Nabatean, Palmyrian, Aramaic; Old Assyrian, Mari Egyptian and Syriac texts; see HALOT 1:482, Hoftijzer & Jongeling (1995:515-16).
he will cut off from this place ‘the remnant of Baal’, אֵלֶּה תְּמִידי, ‘the name of priests(?)’, and ‘those who bow down on the roofs to the host of heaven’ and ‘those who bow down and swear to Yahweh and swear by Milcom’. In both Zeph 1:4-5 and 2Kgs 23:5 appear in contexts which concern astral worship (especially in Zeph 1:5; for מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ in 2Kgs 23:5). Spieckermann in fact proposed in the Old Testament to be identified as astral priests. He based this contention on observation of parallels between the biblical usage of מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ and the occurrence of the Aramaic מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ in association with astral deities in KAI 225 and 226. The traditional understanding of מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ in the Bible has been that of priests of foreign gods, which have been contrasted with מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ, which are perceived as Yahwistic priests. Ben Zvi (1991b:67-68) contends, however, that such a strict distinction between מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ and מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ is unnecessary and unrealistic. The term מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ is used in the Hebrew Bible for Yahwistic as well as non-Yahwistic priests (see e.g. 2Kgs 11:18, Gen 47:22; Ex 2:16), while מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ may simply convey that these were participants in ‘wrong worship’ (Ben Zvi 1991b:68). What the verses in 2Kgs 23:5 and Zeph 1:4-5 appear also to suggest, however, is a possible association between מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ and a particular involvement in the worship of astral deities.

A further element linked with astral phenomena in the account of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 not studied yet appears in v. 12. This relates to worship on the roof-tops (ָֽיָהָם), a feature of the astral cult which appears also in Jer 19:13; 32:29 and the above-mentioned Zeph 1:5. In Josiah’s reform report, 2Kgs 23:12 with its reference to worship on roof-tops continues the theme of the astral or solar cult from the preceding verse, which mentioned horses dedicated to the sun and sun chariots. At the same time, however, it also develops earlier material lying behind the received text of v. 12, which primarily dealt with Josiah’s destruction of altars.

84 The MT in Zeph 1:4 adds מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ after מִקְקָדְשֵׁהוּ, which is generally considered a late gloss; see Ben Zvi (1991b:69-72) and the literature cited there. For the opposite view see Berlin (1994:75), Sweeney (2003:68-69).
85 Following LXX that reads καρα τοῦ Μελγού.
86 The triad מַעֲנֵי, מַעֲנֶה and מַעֲנָה is representative of the notion of astral worship also in Deut 4:19; 17:3 and Jer 8:2. The unusual term מַעֲנֵי in 23:5, perhaps ‘constellations’, is a loanword from Akkadian mazzaltu (manzazzu) ‘location, position of the stars’; see Mankowski (2000:86-87).
When studying the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings in relation to its counterpart in Chronicles, we have argued that the original text in v. 12 consisted of a simple statement relating to Josiah’s destruction of altars of Baal (מזרחי). It has also been suggested that the part referring to ‘Baal’ in the original account was later transposed to be part of expanded material in vv. 4 and 5. In verse 12 the displaced material has subsequently been supplanted by two elaborate portrayals of altars: one depicting altars on the roof of the upper chamber of Ahaz made by the kings of Judah (משה), and the other portraying altars made by Manasseh in the two courts of the temple (משה). The first description of altars being destroyed by Josiah is a continuation of the theme of astral worship from v. 11, while the second portrayal establishes a link with the story of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:5//2Chr 33:5). The final part of v. 12 reading ושר ומדת את תלדה אתרפס אחר לאלהי קדם displays close ties in some of its language with v. 6 as now secondarily developed, and we have argued elsewhere (pp. 102-3) that this part of the verse is a late attempt to compensate for alterations being made to the original material during the course of the literary growth of that material.

In the above study of the development of the verses with astral phenomenon in the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, parallels have been noted with several other passages of the Old Testament. The most revealing among them for its number of specific links with 2Kgs 23 is the book of Jeremiah, which in addition to Jer 19:13 and 32:29 mentioning worship on the roof-tops includes a further reference to astral worship in Jer 8:2. It is worthy of note that all these three texts in Jeremiah relating to the astral cult belong distinctively to the material that also deals with the cultic activity involving children as victims of fire ritual (7:30-8:3; 19:1-13; 32:29-35), which we have studied above (pp. 141-45) with regard to its connections with 2Kgs 23:10. The text in Jer 19:13 with its mention of worship on the roof-tops contains within the same verse the reference to defilement in the context of the Topheth theme usually linked with a fire ritual involving children. Similarly Jer 32:29 mentions worship on the roof-tops in the context of Yahweh’s oracle, vv. 26-35, that includes the theme of fire ritual. It is, however, Jer 7:30-8:3 which seems to be the most intriguing with regard to its parallels with the expanded narrative of Josiah’s reform.

90 See the tentatively proposed ‘original’ form of the account of Josiah’s reform on p. 121.
91 See our discussion in the section ‘Destruction of altars’ on pp. 85-92.
92 On the possible astral aspects of the Molech cult see Koch (1999:36-45).
in Kings since there is a linkage between the two not only in language related to the themes of fire ritual involving children and worship of astral deities but also partly in the arrangement of the material. The unit in Jer 7:30-8:3 concerns specific sins and offences of people that led to the pronouncement of disapproval and divine judgment. The first part of the unit with its doom perspective exposes the cultic practice of fire ritual in the valley of ben Hinnom (7:30-34), while the second part includes in its depiction of dishonouring the dead a trenchant comment on the idolatrous practice of astral worship (8:1-3). This sequence of themes in Jer 7:30-8:3, in which the issue of fire ritual involving children is followed by the mention of astral worship, is actually reflected in the narrative of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:10-12. Here too first v. 10 points to the condemnation of cultic ritual involving children in the valley of ben Hinnom through Josiah’s action of defilement of Topheth and then vv. 11-12 follow narrating the elimination of the astral cult. Our earlier study of the theme of fire ritual has indicated that 2Kgs 23:10 may have been drafted in particular in relation to the materials mentioning fire rite involving children in Jeremiah (7:30-8:3; 19:1-13 and 32:29b-35). The accompanying theme of astral worship in the light of correspondences between these same materials in Jeremiah and the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings (see e.g. the worship on the roof-tops attested in Jer 19:13; 32:29b and 2Kgs 23:12) may well have been developed in the reform account in the same vein as the theme of fire ritual, that is, through the contributing factor of materials from Jeremiah. The topical sequence in 2Kgs 23:10-12 first relating to the practice of fire ritual involving children and subsequently bringing in the notion of astral worship, which reflects the pattern in Jer 7:30-8:3, only strengthens the case for the Jeremianic texts having been instrumental in assisting the literary growth of the narrative of Josiah’s reform in Kings.93

To summarize, despite the frequently expressed view that v. 5 is a late addition to the reform account while vv. 11 and (partly) 12 are considered to belong to the original material of Josiah’s reform, the evidence mustered here suggests that v. 5 and vv. 11-12 are all later expansions of the source material relating to Josiah’s reform, which develop the theme of worship of astral deities. It has been shown that in addition to the topic of astral worship, v. 5 has noteworthy parallels with vv. 11-12 in specific terminology as well as in the arrangement of the opening phrases, from

---

93 This point will be substantiated by observation of one more significant link between materials in Jeremiah and Kings report of Josiah’s reform; see pp. 170-71 below.
which it may be concluded that v. 5 was introduced to Josiah’s narrative together with vv. 11-12. It is also reasonable to deduce from observations of the number of links between 2Kgs 23:5, 10-12 and the texts in Jeremiah not only in terminology but also in the themes and the arrangement of material that the traditions in Jeremiah were conducive to the development and significantly contributed to the present shape of the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings.

5. Solomon’s High Places: 2Kgs 23:13

The high places built by Solomon for Astarte, Chemosh and Milcom are the focus of Josiah’s reform activity in 2Kgs 23:13, a verse that displays distinct ties with cultic innovations depicted in 1Kgs 11. It is in 1Kgs 11:7 that we read about Solomon building ‘a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Milcom’ the abomination of the Ammonites’ (cf. 1Kgs 11:5MT), and in 1Kgs 11:33 that we encounter a note about worshipping deities, ‘Astarte the goddess of Sidonians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the Ammonites’.

The preceding chapter of this thesis has suggested that, given the close verbal linkage between the wording of 23:13 and 11:33, these two verses belong to the same literary layer and are primary to the elaboration in 11: 5(MT) and 7(-8). In any case, however, neither 23:13 nor 11:33 can be considered in their respective contexts to be part of Kings original material. Barrick (2001:442 n. 80) contends that 11:33 belongs to a subsequent expansion of ‘Urtext’, which dealt with Ahijah’s prophecy to Jeroboam (vv. 31b + 36-37a + 38) and which did not offer an explanation for the division of the kingdom, but only stated that ‘Yahweh is the ultimate cause’. Others have argued that 11:33 is part of an elaboration of a more primitive oracle of Ahijah, the core of which basically consisted of 11:29-31(a). It should also be noted that the LXX alternative account of the division of the kingdom in 3Kgdms 12:24o is a much shorter text than 1Kgs 11:29-39 and has no details about a theological justification for the schism, but only announces the split of the monarchy. 

94 Scholarly consensus is to read ‘Milcom’ (following LXX and Pesh) for MT’s corrupt ‘Molech’; see Mulder (1998:554-56); Cogan (2001:328); cf. Puech (DDD 575-76).
95 See pp. 83-84, where we have presented and followed Barrick’s view (2002:205, 210-11) on this.
to the view that 1Kgs 11:33 belongs to an addition to the original material, which was without theological justification for the kingdom’s division.\(^{98}\)

While Barrick concedes that 1Kgs 11:33 supplements the earlier material, he arrives at a different conclusion regarding the status of 2Kgs 23:13 in the context of Josiah’s reform. He maintains that, although the attribution of מֵאָבֶה to Solomon in v. 13 is probably legendary, this verse is indicative of some cultic phenomena, which existed in the period of Josiah’s reign and did not remain undisturbed by Josiah’s reforming measures. Barrick continues to suggest that the locational notice in v. 13 refers to a Silwan cemetery. Proposing a link between the tombs of the Silwan necropolis and the cultic installations mentioned in v. 13 he states:

perhaps they were imagined to have been part of the “house” Solomon allegedly built for Pharaoh’s daughter, and/or the bamoth he allegedly built for three foreign deities; perhaps several of these and/or the foreign-looking monolithic tombs had by Josiah’s day become associated with cultic practices to which the reformers objected.\(^{99}\)

Barrick’s proposal based in part on archaeological findings, may seem novel and attractive at first sight. However, the evidence for the tombs of the Silwan necropolis corresponding to the structures that would have been imagined in Josiah’s times to be מֵאָבֶה built by Solomon is by no means conclusive. The Silwan tombs, surveyed most recently by Ussishkin (1993), are structures hewn into the west slope of the Mount of Olives.\(^{100}\) The text in 2Kgs 23:13, on the other hand, does not say, as even Barrick admits,\(^{101}\) that מֵאָבֶה were cut out of the mountain. This verse simply states that מֵאָבֶה were located ‘east of Jerusalem ( membrum יִשְׂרָאֵל) to the south of the Mount of destruction ( membrum נַפְּלֵי הַמַּכֵּבָּת).’ Furthermore, Ussishkin (1993:316) notes a feature of the Silwan necropolis, which distinguishes it from other cemeteries in Judah—namely ‘its location high up on a cliff and the difficult access to the tomb entrances’.

---

98 That some such original material was part of Chr’s source, which could have been lost in the course of Chr’s adaptation of his Vorlage, is indicated by the reference to Ahijah’s oracle in 2Chr 10:15. However, in no way does this imply that Chr knew in its entirety the text of 1Kgs 11. It only suggests that he might have been familiar with some primitive form of Ahijah’s oracle, perhaps similar to the notice in 3Kgdn 12:24b. See further Barrick (2001:419-50; 2002:196-215) for an argument that much of 1Kgs 11 belongs to later editions of Kings, which were not part of Chr’s source.

99 Barrick (2002:213-14); citation taken from p. 214.

100 These are generally dated to the 8th century BCE; see Ussishkin (1993:325-28).

101 Barrick (2002:214 n. 122). In order to substantiate his contention of a possibility of cultic installations being ‘carved out of the mountain...rather than erected on top of it’ (2002:214), Barrick refers to מֵאָבֶה ‘in the mountain’ in 1Kgs 11:7. However, the whole phrase מֵאָבֶה במַכְבֵּבָת, of which מֵאָבֶה is part in 11:7, is missing in LXX and is usually considered to be a gloss; see e.g. Gray (1970:273), Jones (1984:236), Würthwein (1985-131), De Vries (1985:142). Thus the text from 1Kgs 11:7 contributes nothing to one’s understanding of a likely historical reality concerning the location of מֵאָבֶה referred to in 2Kgs 23:13.
Another distinguishing mark of the Silwan cemetery is its lack of ‘bone repositories’, typical of ‘family tombs of that period’ (1993:328 n. 27), which suggests that the tombs in Silwan were not meant for continuous use. Rather, as Ussishkin (1993:328) remarks, the tombs in the necropolis were mainly intended ‘for the burial of a single person or for a couple’, implying that these were tombs of ‘high-ranking officials’. In the light of these considerations of the specific features of the Silwan cemetery it seems unlikely that some of its structures would have been ‘recycled’ in Josiah’s time for cultic use such as recorded in 2Kgs 23:13.

In addition to Barrick’s problematic interpretation of the locational notice of Solomon’s מָנוֹס in 2Kgs 23:13, one of his other arguments made in the context of the discussion of 2Kgs 23:13 also bristles with difficulties. Barrick (2002:211) lists Solomon’s מָנוֹס of 23:13 together with ‘komer-priests’ of 23:5 as referring to phenomena that ‘existed in the Josianic era and were affected by his religious pogrom’ despite the fact that v. 5 with ‘komer-priests’ is regarded at another point of his thesis to be an addition, inserted at a later stage to the original reform report of the Josianic version of Kings (2002:66-73, 107). This inconsistency combined together with his slightly unconvincing attempt to interpret the datum in 2Kgs 23:13 in reference to the Silwan cemetery weakens Barrick’s overall argument for v. 13 being primary in Josiah’s reform report in Kings.

The passage in 2Kgs 23:13 relates primarily to the notion of מָנוֹס being defiled. We have argued earlier (pp. 78-85) that the defilement of high places (מָנוֹס + מָנוֹס), which also appears in v. 8 of the reform report, belongs to the composition of the primary source of Josiah’s reform. Did the original text convey also information about where and by whom מָנוֹס were built as v. 13 does? Concerning other locational notices within the reform report in Kings – for example dust/ashes taken to Wadi Kidron (v. 4b), high places of the gates at the entrance to the gate of Joshua (v. 8b) or the altar and the high place at Bethel (v. 15) – it is accepted by the majority of scholars that they are part of secondary expansions of original material. By the same token it is thus possible to contend that the reference to the location of מָנוֹס in v. 13 is a feature of the Kings editors’ elaboration of the note from primary material, which narrated simply the desecration of מָנוֹס at Josiah’s undertaking the reform. The additional information about king Solomon and the gods Astarte, Chemosh and Milcom in v. 13 corresponds to the note of Solomon worshipping these deities in
1Kgs 11:33, and we have contended above that they must have come from the same later editorial hand.

Finally, it is to be observed that the reference to king Solomon in v. 13 follows the mention of two other Judean kings, Manasseh and Ahaz in the preceding verse, both in connection with idolatrous practices. We have noted that the notices of these kings together with references to ‘kings of Judah’ (חכית יהוד) in vv. 5, 11 and 12 do not belong to the earliest stratum of the reform report. Thus the reference to king Solomon in v. 13 fits well with the overall structure of the expanded account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, in which the kings of Judah are charged by later editors with practices and activities associated with idolatrous worship.

6. Filling places of Illegitimate Cult with Human Bones: 2Kgs 23:14b

The elimination of מִשְׁמַע and סִימֹן in 2Kgs 23:14, which we have earlier argued to be part of the primary source, is supplemented in the latter part of v. 14 with the statement about the sites of these cultic places being filled with human bones. The phrase כי גילה את העמדות השקריות והשעום ‘and he filled their places with human bones’ has been a puzzlement for some scholars: Eynikel (1996:272) regards this expression as being ‘special because it has little in common with other verses in the dr history’, and Barrick (2002:41) concurs, considering the phrase in its context as ‘highly unusual’.102 Yet this text may have a specific function within the structure of the narrative of Josiah’s reform in its present form in Kings. Long (1991:275) suggests that the writer of the passage dealing with the bones in v. 14 ‘makes a bridge to the following incident’, which takes up ‘the high place’ of Jeroboam and the legendary bones that characterize his memory. It can be noted that בְּדוֹר המ要紧 ‘human bones’ of v. 14b appears also in v. 20 followed by a concluding remark about Josiah’s return to Jerusalem. In the final form of the text of Josiah’s reform in Kings, the two phrases referring to בְּדוֹר המ要紧 in vv. 14 and 20 form an inclusio, bracketing the whole section which concerns Josiah’s reform activity outside Jerusalem in the north. Thus it is possible to conceive that the additional בְּדוֹר המ要紧, while constituting a bridge with the following incident, also serves as a structuring device in the elaborated text of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24. The later editor of the narrative of Josiah’s reform in Kings used בְּדוֹר המ要紧 in vv. 14 and 20 as framing

102 See also Barrick (2002:143 n. 109).
brackets, demarcating the portion of the reform account, which in its present context deals with the expansion of the reforms to the north.  

7. Altar and High Place in Bethel: 2Kgs 23:15

The focus of the narrative of Josiah’s reform moves to Bethel in 2Kgs 23:15. The note about Bethel in this verse is consistent with the overall arrangement of the account of Josiah’s reform by later editors of Kings who introduced framing brackets in vv. 14b and 20 using the expression הֶכָּהַתֶּבַע, in order to demarcate Josiah’s activity in the north more clearly. It has been maintained at several points of this study that v. 15 emanated secondarily from the kernel relating to Josiah’s destruction of altar(s). In the ‘original’ account of the reform proposed on the basis of a comparative analysis of the two biblical narratives of Josiah’s reform, one reference to altars was made in association with Josiah’s action against the altars of Baal and the other in connection with Josiah’s bone-burning on the altar (which thus defined a cultic installation). We have already discussed (pp. 89-90) how the phrase in the

103 Barrick (2002:41) refers to 14b as being part of ‘a Wiederaufnahme bracket with v. 20aβ’. In other words, he views הֶכָּהַתֶּבַע in v. 14b as belonging to the original version of the reform report and הֶכָּהַתֶּבַע in v. 20 as being part of a later edition. Alluding to Wiederaufnahme in this instance, however, is problematic on two accounts. First, Barrick (2002:41 n. 49) when making a case for Wiederaufnahme brackets in vv. 14b and 20aβ notes the study of Kuhl (1952:1-11) who wrote about Wiederaufnahme as follows: ‘Es läßt sich...die Beobachtung machen, daß die Wiederholung dadurch bedingt ist, daß in den ursprünglichen Text ein Einschub erfolgt ist, und daß nach solchem Einschub der ursprüngliche Faden der Erzählung durch Wiederholung der letzten Worte, ja ganzer Sätze und zum Teil sogar größter Abschnitte, wieder aufgenommen wird. Wir wollen diese eigentümliche Erscheinung zum Unterschied von anderen Wiederholungen mit dem Ausdruck »Wiederaufnahme« bezeichnen, da hierbei ja der ursprüngliche Text wieder aufgenommen wird.’ (1952:2).

Cf. the same subject studied earlier by Wiener (1929) who termed the phenomenon ‘resumptive repetition’ (1929:2). In Barrick’s analysis (2002:108), the original text of the reform report (his KH-2) included among others vv. 13, 14b, 16(misc) + 18. Then the next version of Kings history (his KH-3) included vv. 13, 14a(?), 14b, 15(?), 16a + 18. Finally the addition of vv. 19-20 (together with vv. 16b-17) was made according to Barrick in the post-exilic version (his KH-4). The editor of KH-4, if resorting to Wiederaufnahme according to Kuhl’s definition, would have to resume with the words from v. 18 at the end of his insertion of vv. 19-20, and not with words from v. 14b that are placed somewhat earlier in the narrative of KH-3 which he edited. Barrick’s argument for Wiederaufnahme as classically stated by Kuhl here fails. It may be more likely, as we have argued above, that הֶכָּהַתֶּבַע forming an inclusio in vv. 14b and 20 belongs in both verses to the same literary layer and originated from the hand of the Kings editor who skillfully used this expression as a structuring device in his elaboration of the earlier text of the reform. Secondly, the practice of Wiederaufnahme or resumptive repetition while already recognized by medieval commentators (e.g. Rashi, Nachmanides), whether being editorial technique or authorial device or both or neither is the subject of continuing debate among scholars; see e.g. Seeligmann (1962:302-25); Talmon (1978:9-26); Trebole-Barrerra (1982:12-35); Fishbane (1985:85-86); Long (1987:385-99); Anbar (1988:385-98); Brettler (1989:433-35; 1997:601-12); Gordon (1992:131-58); Quick (1993:289-316); Peckham (1995:366-71); Person (1999:239-48).

104 See the tentatively proposed ‘original’ text of Josiah’s reform on p. 121.
primary material mentioning the elimination of the altars of Baal was transformed in the subsequent editing of the ‘original’ account in Kings into what we read of altars’ destruction in v. 12. The language involving הָרָעָה and מַשָּׁה from the original material concerning the demolition of altars is also borrowed in v. 15, in which it is applied to Josiah’s breaking down of the altar in Bethel. This new element of v. 15 with its reference to the cultic installation in Bethel appears to have been made as though to anticipate the coming scene in vv. 16-18. Nonetheless, as we shall see below, this addition of v. 15 at the same time creates difficulties with the immediately following verse, v. 16.

2Kgs 23:15 is overloaded in the received text with terms relating to the destruction of the altar and high place in Bethel; and this testifies to a long textual history. As has been shown above (pp. 79-80), 23:15 LXX indicates that the inclusion of מַשָּׁה belongs to the most recent alterations made to this verse. In its earlier stage of literary/textual development, v. 15 concerned the destruction of the altar at Bethel with the vocabulary of הָרָעָה and מַשָּׁה being drawn from the primary account of Josiah’s reform and supplemented with the terminology, such as מַשָּׁה הֲכָנָה and מַשָּׁה כְּנַה, taken from the secondarily developed verse 6. Only in its latest stage was v. 15 expanded by inclusion of מַשָּׁה and by the reference to burning of מַשָּׁה as the MT has it now.

The late occurrence of מַשָּׁה in v. 15 gives the impression of an attempt on the part of an editor or scribe to reinterpret altar in that verse perhaps in light of 1Kgs 12:25-33, although this passage does not mention Jeroboam erecting מַשָּׁה but rather מַשָּׁה הֲכָנָה (v. 31). Finally the reference to Jeroboam, son of Nebat who ‘caused Israel to sin’, which goes with the addition of מַשָּׁה in v. 15, resembles the accusations against Jeroboam in the material relating to the northern kingdom, and may in fact have been added in v. 15 in relation to these. The mention of Jeroboam in the expanded version of Josiah’s reform in Kings also fittingly concurs with another reference to northern kings in this account: in v. 19 reference is made to kings of Israel erecting מַשָּׁה, thus provoking Yahweh. This part of v. 19, being itself an addition, is a further link between the elaborate story of Josiah’s reform in Kings and the account of the apostasy of the northern kings.

---

105 It is relevant to point out in this regard van Seters’ comment that ‘[t]he description of how the altar was demolished is simply borrowed from the previous texts’ (2000:219).

In the Kings account of Josiah's reform, the passage in 2Kgs 23:16-18 looks like a conclusion to the story of the man of God in 1Kgs 13. The links between the two narratives have been subjected to numerous studies, some of which while touching on the nature of this relationship also gave attention to the wider context of 2Kgs 23:15-20 in Josiah's reform account.\(^{108}\) Several issues arise from considering these passages, and these will be addressed here.

To start with, the narrative of Josiah's reform in 2Kgs 23:15-16 does not seem to progress smoothly. In verse 15 we read about the altar in Bethel being destroyed (תַּנָּא), but the following verse, presumably referring to the same altar in the received text, reports that it was used for burning bones and defiled. The implication of this is that one of the two verses mentioning 'altar' (תַּנָּא) must be secondary and this is, indeed, what we have concluded above about verse 15. The depiction of the altar in v. 16 with its reference to burning bones on the altar is primary and belongs to the original material of Josiah's story.\(^{109}\)

The account of Josiah's reform continues in 2Kgs 23:16-18 with the 'cemetery scene'\(^{110}\) that reveals connections with the story of the man of God in 1Kgs 13, while at the same time a few points of difference can be observed between the two passages. One of them is that in 2Kgs 23 the prophet who shared the tomb with the man of God is stated to have come out from Samaria (תַּנָּא v. 18). In 1Kgs 13, however, he is portrayed as the one residing in Bethel (תַּנָּא v. 11).\(^{111}\) A likely

---

\(^{108}\) In addition to commentaries, see e.g. treatments by Barrick (2002:28-60); Van Seters (2000:213-22; 1999:223-34); Herr (1997:69-78); Simon (1997:130-54; 300-307); Eynikel (1990:227-37). Majority of scholars view 2Kgs 23:16-18 (or 15-20) as continuation or conclusion to 1Kgs 13 (e.g., Van Seters 2000:216; Simon 1997:131-32; Roë 1988:171-72; Jones 1984:616-17; Jepsen 1971:171-82), although they vary considerably in their insights about the literary development of these texts. Dozeman's argument (1982:381-82) against the ending of the narrative in 2Kgs 23:16-18 and contention that 'the theme of 1 Kings 13 is resolved by 13:32a' (p. 382) is not particularly convincing; see criticisms by Walsh (1989:359 n. 10).


\(^{110}\) An expression borrowed from Barrick (2002:58).

\(^{111}\) Barrick (2002:58 n. 109) is not sure of whether תַּנָּא אָבוּרָה יְהוֹיָדָע in 2Kgs 23:18 refers to the old prophet from Bethel who features in the narrative of 1Kgs 13. It should be noted, however, that the distinction between the two men in 1Kgs 13 – one called the 'man of God' (the one from Judah) and the other the 'prophet' (the one from Bethel) – is consistently maintained throughout the narrative in 1Kgs 13 and appears also to be upheld in 2Kgs 23:16-18. Barrick, expressing his doubts about identification of the prophet in 23:18, refers to Montgomery's translation 'and they left his bones alone, the bones of the prophet who came from Samaria' (1951:535), who opts for interpretation of תַּנָּא as direct object marker in 23:18 and not as a preposition 'with' as other commentators do. This is in
explanation for this divergence arises from viewing a larger context, in which the phrase mentioning the prophet ‘who came (אכ) from Samaria’ in 2Kgs 23:18 occurs. The verb ‘to come’ (אכ), which makes the description of the prophet in v. 18 out of tune with the one in 1Kgs 13, also appears in the immediately preceding verse (v. 17) in the phrase depicting the man of God (יהוה מביא ראב).112 Thus it seems probable that the editor or later scribe happened thoughtlessly to repeat אכ from an earlier line when subsequently referring to the prophet whose bones were next to the bones of the man of God (v. 18).113

A further point of difficulty relates to the geographic term קרש in the prophet’s portrayal in 2Kgs 23:18. It is a historical datum that ‘Samaria’ did not yet exist in the days of Jeroboam when the prophet is reported in the biblical narrative to have lived. In 1Kgs 13 the old prophet’s location is consistently given as being that of Bethel. Accordingly, ‘Samaria’ is considered by commentators and biblical scholars to be an anachronism in 2Kgs 23:18.114 It is also possible, however, that its occurrence in this verse has resulted from confusion surrounding the integration of the ending of the story of the man of God with an already existing narrative of Josiah’s reform which, as we have argued above (pp. 108-10), used the term קרש in relation to Josiah’s activity in the north.

The scene portrayed in 2Kgs 23:16-18 occurs with some variation in the ancient witnesses, especially with regard to its making reference back to 1Kgs 13. In the Hebrew text, there is an awkward repetition of מקדש מצא at the end of v. 16: ‘according to the word of Yahweh that the man of God proclaimed who proclaimed these things.’ The double occurrence of מקדש מצא in the text of the MT as it stands seems redundant, which has

our view untenable position, because Montgomery is then forced to regard the two texts (1Kgs 13 and 2Kgs 23:16-18) as being inconsistent in their reference to the Judahite, who in 23:17 and elsewhere in 1Kgs 13 is called ‘the man of God’ but in 23:18, according to this interpretation of מקדש ‘the prophet’. Although theoretically both renderings of מקדש in 2Kgs 23:18 – object marker and/or preposition – are possible (cf. Clines in DCH 1:450 who notes that in transitive constructions a confusion may occur between understanding of מקדש as object marker and preposition), the context clearly favors understanding of this term in v. 18 as being that of preposition. This is also supported by the ancient versions (LXX, Vg), which translate מקדש as a preposition ‘with.’

112 This is a typical phrase, by which the man of God is also identified in 1Kgs 13:12, 21; cf. related expressions in 1Kgs 13:1, 14.
113 This has earlier been proposed, e.g., by Benzinger (1899:194) who regards מקדש in v. 18 as ‘gedankenlose Gleichmachung mit v. 17’; see also Gray (1970:738); Jones (1984:625); cf. Stade and Schwally (1904:296).
led to attempts to excise the second קָרֵב עַד or even the whole final part of the verse.\textsuperscript{115} The apparent redundancy in the MT may be easily explained on the basis of the LXX reading, which points to the text of the MT suffering from haplography. The LXX version, being retorted to Hebrew, reads after יֹהֵם לְאֹתָהּ in v. 16 which suggests that the whole line has been dropped out in the MT through homoioteleuton (יֹהֵם לְאֹתָהּ to יֹהֵם לְאֹתָהּ).\textsuperscript{117} The LXX preserves details which are felt to be lacking in the narrative flow at the end of v. 16 in the MT. For example it refers to Josiah noticing the tomb of the man of God, which (as one might have expected) leads in the following verse to his question about the tomb.\textsuperscript{118} This may indicate a genuine reading being preserved in the LXX of 2Kgs 23:16, which precedes the corruption of the text in the MT.\textsuperscript{119} A significantly different issue concerning variant readings of ancient witnesses emerges in 2Kgs 23:18, in which the LXX\textsuperscript{L} contains a more expansive reading than other ancient texts. This deviation of the Lucanian reading in v. 18, however, is explicable in terms of peculiar characteristics linked with this particular Greek recension.\textsuperscript{120}

In engaging with the issues outlined above, Barrick (2002:58-60) capitalises on the few differences and oddities regarding 2Kgs 23:16-18 and its relationship to 1Kgs 13 and postulates an independent tradition concerning the burial tomb of the prophet from Samaria being shared with the man of God from Judah, which was


\textsuperscript{116} In Greek: ἐν τῷ ἔστάσιν Ιεροσόλημα ἐν τῇ ἐφότη ἐπὶ τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ καὶ ἔπιστρέφεις ἔρχεται αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ τοῦ άνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ λαλήσαντος τοὺς λόγους τούτους.


\textsuperscript{118} Jones (1984:624).

\textsuperscript{119} For recent discussions on haplography and the issue of omissions vs. additions in ancient texts see Freedman & Miano (2003:685-98); Freedman & Dolansky Overton (2002: 99-115, 297-323); Freedman & Lundhomb (1999:28*-38*).

\textsuperscript{120} In place of MT’s יְהֹוָה יֵשֶׁב בָּשָׂמֶךָ יְהֹוָה יֶחְדָּשׁ יָשֹׁר the LXX\textsuperscript{L} reads καὶ διακόλοβη τὰ όστα τοῦ προφήτου τοῦ πρεσβύτερου τοῦ κατακτησόντος ᾿Εβαθήλ, μετὰ τῶν όστων τοῦ άνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ήκουσέως ἐξ ᾿Ισραήλ καὶ λελαλήσαντος πάντα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα ᾿Εποίησε ᾿Ισραήλ. The LXX\textsuperscript{L} here expands the older material in its usual manner by replacing pronouns with proper person’s identification and by ‘completing the “unsaid” in the scheme prediction/fulfilment’ (Fernández Marcos 1987:292). For fuller discussion of distinctive features of LXX\textsuperscript{L} see Fernández Marcos (1987:287-304; 1990:219-29).
located near Jerusalem and which was unaffected by Josiah’s devastating enterprise at his reform. According to Barrick (2002:60) this tradition that is reflected in 23:16b-18 ‘antedates [1Kgs 13:1-32] and was one constituent element in its evolution, and evolved along with it.’ One may agree with Barrick that 2Kgs 23:16b-18 is in its development interconnected with 1Kgs 13:1-32. Doubts are cast, however, on whether there exists a sufficient ground in the differences between these two texts for advancing a thesis of an originally independent tradition lying behind 2Kgs 23:16b-18. It has been suggested above that the unusual portrayal of the prophet in these verses is indicative of an imperfect editor’s introducing or copyist’s reproducing material relating to the ending of the story of the man of God in 1Kgs 13. In the other instances of discrepancy, the differences are easily explained in terms of minor language adjustments prompted by the context of an already existing account of Josiah’s reform into which the ending of the story of the man of God was integrated. Barrick’s idea of an independent tradition lying behind 2Kgs 23:16b-18, therefore, seems to have a little or almost no support in the differences between this text and 1Kgs 13.121

In his discussion of 2Kgs 23:16-18, Barrick separates v. 16a with its focus on the bones being taken out of the tombs and burnt on the altar from the rest of the narrative in vv. 16b-18. This part of v. 16 is regarded by Barrick (2002:59) as ‘unique in biblical record and probably ha[ving] a basis in fact independent of 1 Kgs. 13:1-32.’ Barrick considers v. 16a in a more straightforward manner as belonging to the original report of Josiah’s reform and this in part correlates with our own proposal earlier in this thesis, where we have suggested that v. 16a in its reporting of Josiah’s bone-burning belongs to the original reform account used by both Kings and Chronicles. The point of departure between Barrick’s understanding and our view relates to the extent of v. 16a, which may be safely ascribed as being part of the early source material. Barrick understands the entire v. 16a (יָשָׂהוּ הַגְּדֵה הַאֱלֹהִים הַשָּׂרָה נַנְn) to be part of the primary material of Josiah’s reform report. However, on the basis of comparative analysis with the

121 Moreover, the proposal of an originally independent tradition lying behind 2Kgs 23:16b-18 does not seem to be treated with sufficient clarity in Barrick’s study. For example, at one point of his thesis Barrick includes Josiah’s ‘esp[y]ing a particular funerary “monument”’ of v. 17 as part of the early text (2002:50), yet a few pages later he suggests that some of vv. 17-18 might be secondary (2002:60, cf. 75) and further in his scheme of the compositional history of Josiah’s reform he includes the whole of v. 17 into the post-Exilic version of Kings history (2002:108). These divergent conclusions in Barrick’s thesis make his overall argument for an independent tradition laying behind vv. 16b-18 less compelling.

168
account of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles it has been suggested in the preceding chapter that only the part of v. 16a that relates more specifically to the burning of bones and defiling the altar (יִשְׂרָאֵל) can be regarded as reflecting the text in the original report.\footnote{122}{See the discussion on p. 107. For Barrick’s views of v. 16a see the entry in the biblical index of his monograph (2002:269).}

This brief note subsequently developed into a fuller account with details about the origins of the bones, thus providing a broader setting for the incident of Josiah’s burning bones on the altar. In the expanded narrative Josiah is envisioned to turn around and notice the tombs ‘on the mountain’\footnote{123}{In 2Kgs 23:16, where MT, LXX\textsuperscript{1}, Tg, Pesh have רֹאֶה ‘on the mountain’, LXX\textsuperscript{B} renders רֹאֶה ‘in the city’. This appears to be a scribal error.} (נְסָיָה), which is followed by his order to take the bones out of the tombs (יִשְׂרָאֵל) that are then burnt on the altar. With this introduction to the bones, the earlier account that dealt primarily with Josiah’s burning the bones on the altar and defiling the cultic installation is set into a new narrative frame with a view, at the same time, of introducing the ‘cemetery scene’ in vv. 16b-18. A significant catchword in this regard is the expression קָהַל קְרֵא ‘tomb(s)’ appearing twice in the additional introductory part of v. 16a, which then re-appears in vv. 16b (LXX) and 17 with a reference to a particular ‘tomb’ that caught the eye of Josiah. In addition to the use of קָהַל, the phrases of v. 16aa and vv. 16b-17 share the focus on Josiah’s gestures and movements. In v. 16aa we read that Josiah ḥאַנָּה...וּאֱלֹהִים ‘turned and saw the tombs’, which is somewhat repeated in v. 16b (LXX) with respect to one particular tomb – ḥאַנָּה וּאֱלֹהִים ‘he turned and lift up his eyes towards the tomb of the man of God’.\footnote{124}{See the argument above (pp. 166-67) that this phrase is part of the section lost in 2Kgs 23:16 MT due to homoioteleuton.} This is then followed by another phrase of motion/ vision in v. 17 in which Josiah asks: מְזֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֵימָּה אִשָּׂא אֶת רָאָה ‘What is that monument that I see?’ The reading of v. 16aa, therefore, cannot be separated from the narrative thread that follows in vv. 16b-18. These phrases in v. 16aa build on the original note in v. 16a\textbf{b} about Josiah’s burning the bones and defiling the altar as they provide an explanation for the origins of the bones Josiah burnt and at the same time serve as an introduction to the wider scene that follows in vv. 16b-18.\footnote{125}{Note that there was no need in the ‘primary’ version of Josiah’s reform for an elaborate introduction to the bones, which Josiah burnt on the altar, since the origin of the bones was simply implied in the statement referring to יִשְׂרָאֵל immediately preceding the reference to Josiah’s bone-burning. See our proposed ‘original’ account of Josiah’s reform on p. 121.}
A conclusion can be drawn from this analysis that the opening of v. 16a has been drafted alongside the development of material in vv. 16b-18, all of which has evolved, as many obvious parallels disclose, in a particular relationship with the narrative about the man of God in 1Kgs 13.

One further factor may have played a role in the way in which the early material relating to Josiah’s bone-burning and defiling the altar has expanded into the present form of 2Kgs 23:16-18. In the primary material, the note rather than pointing to disregard of the dead seems more to emphasise the idea of the altar being ultimately defiled and made cultically impure, with the bones being instrumental in this process. The subsequent literary stratum in Kings, which supplies this early note with an introduction to the origins of bones (v. 16aα) and follows appending the ‘cemetery scene’ (vv. 16b-18), moves the emphasis of the original narrative from the defilement of the altar to highlighting the desecration of tombs and (dis)respect of human remains. This shift in emphasis may have been influenced by a text that has already been noted as playing some role in the literary growth of the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings. Jer 7:30-8:3, previously noted in connection with a fire ritual involving children and with astral worship, includes also a reference to the desecration of tombs. Jer 8:1-2 mentions bones of kings, officials, priests, prophets and the inhabitants of Jerusalem being brought out of the tombs and spread before astral deities, which they worshipped. It is thus possible to suggest a further link between the text in Jer 7:30-8:3 and the developed account of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 2Kgs 23:10 and the topic of astral worship (Jer 8:2; 2Kgs 23:11-12). The third link is the issue of the desecration of human remains (Jer 8:1-3; 2Kgs 23:16-18), there being an interesting twist to this theme in 2Kgs 23:18 in that the bones of the man of God and of the prophet are not desecrated but left undisturbed.

Barrick (2002:173-81; 2000:3-16), contrary to this view, asserts that ‘the burning in 23:16 was more to disgrace the persons whose bones they were...than the altar on which they were burned and which, in any event, would have been defiled by contact alone’ (quotation from 2002:178). However, the fact that v. 16 states that the bones were burnt on the altar and not somewhere else combined with the fact that immediately after the phrase mentioning the bone-burning on the altar there follows a note presumably referring to the altar, on which the bones were burnt, gives stronger support to the view that ‘bones’ play rather an instrumental role in the defilement of the cultic installation. Barrick (2002:60, 181), in order to maintain his contention that burning bones on the altar in v. 16 concerns more the desecration of bones rather than of the altar, has to take the phrase rather as a secondary addition.
In conclusion, it may be stated that 2Kgs 23:16-18 developed from a simple note reading that Josiah ‘burnt the bones on the altar and defiled it’ into a pericope, which has close ties with the story of the man of God in 1Kgs 13 and probably evolved alongside the development of that story in 1Kgs 13. Other influences on the growth of 2Kgs 23:16-18, however, also cannot be excluded and we have observed that there further exist close connections between 2Kgs 23:16-18 and Jer 7:30-8:3 particularly in the notion of the desecration of tombs.


Based on the investigation of the texts in 2Kgs 23:19-20 and 2Chr 34:6-7 relating to Josiah’s activity in the north, it has been established earlier in this study (pp. 108-16) that a more original reading may lie behind these passages which reported Josiah’s elimination of תְכֵנַת יֹהָה in Samaria and concluded with a comment on Josiah’s return to Jerusalem. If that analysis is accepted, the reading תְכֵנַת יֹהָה from the primary material may have expanded in 2Kgs 23:19-20 in two specific ways.

First, a new clause in v. 19 ascribes the erection of תְכֵנַת יֹהָה in the cities of Samaria later removed by Josiah to the kings of Israel. This addition resonates with similar expressions relating to ‘kings of Judah’ in vv. 5, 11 and 12 (אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁתַּמְשַׁרְוָנָה, אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁתַּמְשַׁרְוָן), all of which have been suggested above (pp. 86, 154-55) to belong to further stages of the development of the reform account in Kings. Moreover, kings מְלָכי יִשְׂרָאֵל in v. 19 are made accountable by their act of building תְכֵנַת יֹהָה for ‘provoking’ Yahweh.127 The crucial term תִּשְׁמַר echoes in this instance a number of texts in the story of the northern kingdom, in which Israelite kings are typically blamed for causing Israel to sin, provoking Yahweh to anger.128

Secondly, the final part of 2Kgs 23:19 which reads תְכֵנַת יֹהָה together with what follows in 23:20 (expect תְכֵנַת יֹהָה) appears to be a late attempt to reconcile the primary reading regarding Josiah’s elimination of תְכֵנַת יֹהָה in Samaria (23:19a) with the secondarily developed account of a ‘cemetery scene’ in

---

127 Note that the MT in 2Kgs 23:19 does not have תִּשְׁמַר after תְכֵנַת יֹהָה, while the divine name is attested in ancient versions (LXX, Pesh, Vg). This sort of variation among ancient witnesses is also found in 2Kgs 21:6 (cf. 2Chr 33:6) and Ps. 106:29. In 1Kgs 16:33, the LXX differs substantially from the MT with regard to the phrase containing תִּשְׁמַר. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible there are only three clear instances, 1Kgs 21:22, Hos 12:15 and Neh 3:37, in which תִּשְׁמַר does not have the deity as an explicit object (not counting 1Sam 1:7 and Ezek 32:9).

128 See the term תִּשְׁמַר occurring in 1Kgs 15:30; 16:2, 7, 13, 26, 33; 21:22, 22:54.
23:16-18, which in its present form implies the event taking place in Bethel. This tendency of ‘collapsing’ two distinct issues – the one regarding the temple in Samaria and other the place of (altar in) Bethel – by a later editor into one can also be found in 1Kgs 13:32, in which the compass of the prediction from 1Kgs 13:2 against the altar in Bethel is enlarged to include a pronouncement against the temple in Samaria. Hence it may be concluded on the basis of correspondences between 2Kgs 23:19 and 1Kgs 13:32 in their inclusion of references to ‘Samaria’ as well as ‘Bethel’ that the expansion of the text of Josiah’s reform in 23:19 belongs to the same literary layer as 13:32. Both texts probably reflect one of the latest adjustments between the original material of Josiah’s reform, which included that Josiah eliminated the temple in Samaria (23:19a), and the subsequently developed narrative of the man of God in 1Kgs 13 + 2Kgs 23:16-18.129

The statement in 2Kgs 23:19 maintaining that Josiah did to the temple in Bethel ‘according to all the acts that he had done in Bethel’ is followed by further explanatory remarks in the next verse. These remarks on one hand concern Josiah slaughtering the priests of the high places and on the other the burning of human bones. But as may be observed, only the second of these two actions, the burning of bones, is stated in 2Kgs 23:16-18. Both actions as mentioned in 2Kgs 23:20 can be found in the present text of 1Kgs 13:2, on the basis of which closer ties have been suggested above (pp. 105-6) between these two verses. 1Kgs 13:2, however, in its final form is not without problems as noted by Barrick (2002:40) and others.130 This verse finds its fulfillment in 2Kgs 23:16-18, but only if the slaughter of the priests of high places, not occurring in these verses, is set aside. It thus appears highly probable that the slaughter of the priests of high places is a later insertion into 1Kgs 13:2, belonging to the same literary layer as 2Kgs 23:19b-20, which includes the mention of both the slaughter of the priests of high places and the burning of human bones. Among these later accretions may be added 1Kgs 13:32 which shares with 2Kgs 23:20 the reference to Bethel and to Samaria.131

In view of the above analysis it may be concluded that the primary material of Josiah’s reform, which in its latter part comprised Josiah’s bone-burning and altar-

129 Cf. similar, yet in some details different, argument by Barrick (2002:39).
130 See further e.g. Herr (1997:71); Dietrich (1972:117); Noth (1968:292-93).
131 This position is in a certain way similar to that of Jepsen (1971:171-82) who viewed 1Kgs 13:1-32a as a unity and understood 2Kgs 23:16-18 being part of the same narrative, and further argued that this narrative was later supplemented by additions in 1Kgs 13:2bβ, 32b, 33; 2Kgs 23:19-20.
defiling (2Kgs 23:16aβ) followed by a brief depiction of reform activity in Samaria (2Kgs 23:19a), has undergone substantial expansion and glossing in the book of Kings. It has been supplemented in stages, first by the ‘cemetery scene’ in 23:16aα + 16b-18 that has evolved alongside the progression of the account in lKgs 13, and then by further adjustments and glossing in 23:19b-20, making even closer the relations between Josiah’s cemetery episode in 23:16-18 and the major part of the story of the man of God in lKgs 13 which, as has been shown above, was further similarly glossed in parts of vv. 2 and 32.

10. Additional Note to the Main Text of the Reform Account in 2Kgs 23:24a

Much of the discussion concerning the literary growth of the additional note to the major narrative unit dealing with Josiah’s reform, which appears in Kings after the Passover passage (2Kgs 23:21-23), has already been covered (pp. 116-20) in the section devoted to the relationship of 2Kgs 23:24a and 2Chr 34:33a. The primary material behind these two half-verses appears to be more closely followed by Chronicles, and we have argued that the wording of that text may have read פָּנָה הוּא אֶל הָאָדָם הַבְּשֻׁמָּה מִפְּרוּשָׁתֹת. On the basis of the relative affinity between רענ in 2Chr 34:33a and יְשַׁעְנָה in 2Kgs 23:24a, where both terms convey the idea of detestation, and the fact that רֱעֶנָא and יִשְׁעַנָּה of 2Kgs 23:24a occur together several times in the Old Testament, a conclusion has been drawn that רֱעֶנָא in the primary text of the additional note was later replaced in Kings by פָּנָה וּרְעֶנָא. Perhaps the reworking in Kings of the earlier phrase has been inspired by materials in Deut 29:15-16 and Ezek 20:5-9 which, we noted, share interesting links with the passage in 2Kgs 23:24a. Apart from the terms of detestation and idolatry, the developed text in 2Kgs 23:24a includes expressions such as יִשְׁעַנָּה and מִשְׁמַר, which are commonly associated with the notion of divination. Greater similarities have been noted in the divination terminology between 2Kgs 21:6 and 2Kgs 23:24a, which has led us to a proposal that the development of the additional note in 2Kgs 23:24a was shaped by the account of Manasseh’s divinatory practices. Finally, some further supplementation of the original reading may have been achieved in 2Kgs 23:24a by minor additions such as יִשְׁעַנָּה, specifying the land, from which the idolatrous practices were eliminated.
11. Concluding Remarks

It is widely acknowledged that "the biblical text is the result of a continuous process of redactional activity. Literature produced by one person, group, or school was reread and rewritten by later readers and writers."\(^{132}\) The foregoing discussion of the development of the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings has noted an ongoing activity of later editors in a number of ways in the literary growth of that narrative from the earlier work. These may be summarized in the following points.

First, the major issues and themes belonging to the primary report of Josiah’s reform are enlarged in Kings by secondary developments and supplemented with details in order to emphasise certain implications of these earlier themes. Thus it has been observed, for example, that the issue of the removal of the cultic statue from the temple in the original material has received substantial attention from later editors as it has been developed in Kings into a detailed account of the elimination of all the illegitimate cult and its paraphernalia from the Jerusalem temple and its precincts.

Second, the reform account in its present form in Kings builds on and develops an already established fine thread between the primary report of Josiah’s reform and one other text, namely the story of Manasseh in 2Kgs 21/2Chr 33. It has been shown earlier that the original text of Josiah’s reform dealt with Josiah’s removal of the statue of cultic significance from the temple, which coincides with the account in 2Kgs 21//2Chr 33 about Manasseh erecting this cultic object (ตร in 2Kgs 21:6; Đầu in 2Chr 33:6). The reform report of Josiah in Kings now thickens the thread with Manasseh’s story from its source, establishing a number of significant links with Manasseh’s account. Thus, for example, it has been noted that the appearance of Baal, Asherah and the host of heaven in 2Kgs 23:4 may have been inspired by 2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3 with its mention of all these three subjects. In 2Kgs 23:12 the reference to altars in the two courts of the temple being built by Manasseh pertains to their erection by Manasseh, noted in 2Kgs 21:5//2Chr 33:5. Lastly, the development of divination terms in 2Kgs 23:24 by a later hand is related to the use of divination terminology in 2Kgs 21:6//2Chr 33:6. These parallels between the expanded account of Josiah’s reform in Kings and the story of Manasseh shared by Kings and Chronicles are the consequence of subsequent supplantations and reworkings of the older account of Josiah’s reform in the Kings narrative. If they are placed alongside other developments in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24, such as the note about Josiah

\(^{132}\) De Troyer (2003:1).
eliminating astral worship and defiling the place of fire ritual involving children, which also echo the themes in Manasseh’s story, an impression is created that Josiah in the reform report in Kings acts as the one reversing the transgressions of Manasseh. This emphasis on Josiah’s reforming measures in terms which relate to Manasseh’s misdeeds, combined with the effort by later editors of Josiah’s narrative in Kings to lionize Josiah and amplify his actions, leads to a climax in 2Kgs 23:25, wherein Josiah is said to have ‘turned to Yahweh with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses’ and to have been above any comparison with other kings before and after him. Following this magnification of Josiah, however, there continues the Manasseh theme in the next verse, which despite previous assertions of Josiah’s greatness and obedience to Yahweh states that ‘Yahweh did not turn from the fierceness of his great wrath, by which his anger was kindled against Judah, because of all the provocations with which Manasseh had provoked him’ (2Kgs 23:26). One may observe an interesting ironic twist in this pronouncement with regard to all that has gone before in the narrative relating to Josiah’s reforming activities, prompting a question: why would one want to take pains adding a great deal of detail to Josiah’s reform while still reporting a few lines later that Manasseh’s sins have destined the reform to vanity? Why was it necessary to provide the report of Josiah’s reform with details, giving an impression that Josiah corrected Manasseh’s transgressions, if the blame for the exile would still afterwards be laid on Manasseh’s shoulders? Similar questions like these have led to a proposal among some scholars for different redactional layers in this material. Particularly the proponents of the so-called double redaction of the Deuteronomistic history have suggested that 2Kgs 23:25 with magnification of Josiah belongs to the Josianic redaction ending on an optimistic note, while the verses starting with 2Kgs 23:26 are part of the second, exilic, redaction of the Deuteronomistic history, which updates the earlier edition to the circumstances of the exilic period, ascribing the exile to the corruption and sinfulness of Josiah’s predecessor Manasseh.\textsuperscript{133} The same theme of attributing exile to the wickedness of Manasseh appears also in 2Kgs 21:11-15 and 24:3-4. However, van Keulen rightly contends that in the case of 2Kgs 23:26-27 this theme does not strictly need to be seen as an addition to the preceding text which spoke of Josiah’s magnification.\textsuperscript{134} He points out that the occurrence of הָבַשׁ in v. 26 forms the link with the preceding verse, where the same verb occurs displaying

\textsuperscript{133} See e.g. Cross (1973:286); Nelson (1981:83-85); Friedman (1981:7-8).

Josiah’s total commitment to Yahweh, while in v. 26 it describes Yahweh’s reaction with anger on account of Manasseh’s misdeeds. These contrasting actions of Yahweh and Josiah in vv. 25 and 26, bound together with the use of the same verb 3tw, indicate literary connection between these verses.

It follows from this that the elements of the expanded account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, which prompt one to consider Josiah as a figure reversing Manasseh’s misdeeds, together with the note magnifying Josiah in v. 25 and the subsequent record of the doom of Judah caused by Manasseh’s transgressions in vv. 26-27 belong to the same editorial strand in Kings, with the main point in these later developments being the seriousness and prominence of Manasseh’s sins. The editors of Josiah’s account in Kings went into such a considerable detail in their expansion of the original narrative in order to demonstrate that even Josiah, the great reformer, was unable to do away with the disaster brought about on Judah by provocations of Manasseh. If Josiah, who by and large reversed Manasseh’s misdeeds was still unable completely to rectify the faults of Manasseh’s rule, who can? No one can. As van Keulen (1996:197) notes ‘the message imparted in 2Kgs 23, then, is that nothing can make up for the kind of idolatry Manasseh committed’. This may well have spoken to the exilic or even post-exilic audiences warning them against idolatrous practices, which in the past led to disasters with permanent consequences like the one of exile being caused by Manasseh’s transgressions against the divine.

Third, the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings evolves alongside other literary expansions in other parts of Kings. It has been observed that 2Kgs 23:13 with the mention of Solomon’s mas belongs to a literary stratum of Kings, part of which must have been also some early form of 1Kgs 11, which expanded the primitive oracle of Ahijah and elaborated the theme of the division of the kingdom by making a theological justification for the schism with Solomon being held responsible. Another text which belongs to the literary growth of 2Kgs 23 and has links with other late developments in Kings is the conclusion in vv. 16-18 to the story of the man of God from 1Kgs 13. This is more a obvious case, where both 1Kgs 13 and 2Kgs 23:16-18 (except the part in v. 16 referring to Josiah burning the bones and defiling altar) may be considered as later insertions during the process of literary evolution of the book of Kings. It is further interesting to observe in this regard the relative proximity between the developed chapters 1Kgs 11 and 13 and then also the closeness in the reform report of Josiah between their corresponding links in 2Kgs.
23:13 and 23:16-18. It has also been observed that the points of contact between 2Kgs 23 and other texts in Kings are then further confirmed by subsequent additions, such as for example in 2Kgs 23:19-20 and glosses in 1Kgs 13:2, 32.

Finally, traditions of Jeremiah have been found of particular significance in the study of the development of the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings. This is not surprising given the fact that scholars have long recognized phrases and idioms in Jeremiah being shared with Deuteronomy and the books of former prophets. These have been conventionally termed as ‘Deuteronomistic terminology’. The passages in Jeremiah (7:30-8:3; 19:1-13; 32:29b-35), which we have explored to a certain extent in relation to the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings, have been in one way or another assigned to the deuteronomistic influence on Jeremiah.\(^{135}\) While some scholars pursue elaborate theories of deuteronomistic redaction(s) of Jeremiah,\(^{136}\) others, however, have raised more cautious voices with regard to a deuteronomistic shaping of the prose texts of this book. Sharp (2003:155) in her recent study of Jeremiah proposes that ‘the various points of semantic contact long noticed between Jeremiah and the DtrH are likely due to more than one kind of literary relationship’. Her analyses of 2Kgs 17, Deut 18 and the relevant passages in Jeremiah lead her to suggest a ‘mutual-influence model of the relationship between the DtrH and the book of Jeremiah’ and to a proposal that the traditions of Jeremiah might have been more influential on other materials of the Hebrew Bible than has been previously thought.

In another article, Brettler argues against a simplistic view of one-way influence from Deuteronomy to Jeremiah and suggests rather a more complex relationship by stating that ‘Deuteronomy influenced Jeremiah, but once this happened, the ‘new’ book of Jeremiah had in some sense become Deuteronomic, and influenced Deuteronomy.’\(^{137}\) The ‘mutual-influence’ model seems to us to account best for the

---

\(^{135}\) For various views of Jer 7:30-8:3 regarded to belong to the deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah, see e.g. Mowinckel (1914:31); Rudolph (19681:54); Hyatt (1984:254-55); Thiel (1973:128-34); Nicholson (1970:68-69). Concerning Jer 19, this text is traditionally thought to have been comprised of an original core that was later overlaid with deuteronomistic editing; see e.g. Rudolph (19682:125-27), Hyatt (1984:257), Nicholson (1973:163). For Jer 32:16-44 being perceived as a passage from deuteronomistic editors, see e.g. Hyatt (1984:260); Thiel (1981:32); Nicholson (1975:79). Rudolph (19681:213-14) considers Jer 32:29b-35 to be an insertion that borrows language from a deuteronomic redaction (C source), while Holladay (1989:207) regards 32:28-29 to be ‘part of a late addition’ and the following 32:30-35 to be ‘a pastiche from genuine parenetic material elsewhere, notably 19:13 and 7:30-31, and from genuine poetry.’

\(^{136}\) See e.g. recently Albertz (2003:302-45).

\(^{137}\) Brettler (1999:171-88); citation taken from pp. 187-88. For suggestion of mutual influence between Jeremiah and Deuteronomy see also Levin (1985:64), and between Kings and Deuteronomy see Lowery (1991:31).
links we have observed in this study between some portions of Kings and Jeremiah. It has been argued that the theme of fire ritual involving children might have first found its place in the text of Jer 7:30-31 from the material relating to the reigns of Ahaz and Manasseh shared by Kings and Chronicles. Once this text from shared material of Kings and Chronicles established itself in its new context in Jeremiah, where it has expanded and transformed into a fuller account of 7:30-8:3, this developed material then contributed with its themes of fire ritual involving children, astral worship and disrespect of the dead to the formation of the extended account of Josiah’s reform in Kings.

The preceding analysis leads to a conclusion that there were multiple causes and factors that assisted in the development and contributed to the literary growth of the primary account of Josiah’s reform in Kings. The final shape of that account in the inherited text of 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 with its manifold picture of the reform measures and a rich network of links with other materials of the Hebrew Bible only confirms the complex literary history behind it.
CHAPTER FIVE

Ramifications for the Composition of the Story of the Divided Monarchy in Kings

The initial enquiry into the relationship of Kings and Chronicles in their portrayal of the divided monarchy at the beginning of this study, based on comparative analysis of the regnal formulae and the royal cultic reforms, has indicated that the present book of Kings displays considerable differences from the source material relating to the period of the divided monarchy that was available to the author of Chronicles. Following the initial enquiry, the detailed analysis of the parallel texts of Josiah’s reform in the two histories showed that first, the Kings version is a more expanded form of an earlier narrative of Josiah’s reform and second, it was this earlier text that also served as a source for the story of Josiah’s reform in Chronicles rather than the vastly elaborate account in the inherited book of Kings. These conclusions are not incompatible with the proposals of Auld (1994) that Kings and Chronicles preserve an earlier source material common to both in their shared parts. As has been exemplified above in the study of biblical accounts of Josiah’s reform, we were able to disclose how the book of Kings in one of its parts has grown into its present form from a more elementary text that has also served as a source for the reform report in Chronicles. In what follows, some other terms used by the two histories and texts in Kings relating to the divided kingdom will be examined in order to see whether a similar pattern of expansion in Kings from an earlier material shared with Chronicles emerges.

1. ‘High Places’ in Kings and Chronicles and Literary Development in Kings

The subject of ‘high places’ has been much discussed in past research, mainly in relation to what the word נַמְצָא precisely means but also, to a lesser extent, in relation to redactional theories of Kings. Relevant for the present investigation is this second aspect of studies of נַמְצָא that relates to the theories of the compositional development of Kings. Iain Provan in his monograph Hezekiah and the books of Kings (1988) devotes considerable space to the discussion of נַמְצָא in Kings within the context of the literary history of that book. Provan organizes his study around two specific themes of entries on the southern kings, the נַמְצָא theme and the theme of David. In

1 On this aspect of נַמְצָא see more recent treatment by Kogan & Tishchenko (2002:319-52).
his treatment of נז in Kings he defends the view that the Hezekian historian recognized the high places as Yahwistic, while the later exilic editor regarded them as idolatrous. This delineation of the נז and David themes, however, has been questioned by scholars and criticized for being overly simplistic.² For example, Provan (1988:68) views נז in 1Kgs 11:7(-8)³ as referring to cultic installations for foreign gods (thus being idolatrous), but he assigns this passage to the same author as passages with references made to נז in the evaluative formulae of the righteous kings of Judah (1Kgs 15:14; 22:44; 2Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35), which are clearly understood by Provan to be Yahwistic provincial shrines. In details such as these, Provan’s thesis does not seem to resolve satisfactorily the problems associated with the ambiguous nature of נז in Kings.

A more fruitful direction for the study of ‘high places’ and its ramifications in the compositional theories of Kings may be explored if the book of Chronicles is included alongside Kings in this discussion. Giving attention to the occurrences of נז in Chronicles, one sees the issues involved from a new perspective.⁴ The references to נז as they occur in Kings and Chronicles are presented in the table below.⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KINGS</th>
<th>KINGS // CHRONICLES</th>
<th>CHRONICLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 3:2,3</td>
<td>1Kgs 3:4 // 2Chr 1:3</td>
<td>1Chr 16:39; 21:29; 2Chr 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 11:7</td>
<td>1Kgs 11:1-40 // 1Kgs 12:31,32; 13:33 (2x) // 2Chr 11:15</td>
<td>2Chr 14:2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 13:2,32</td>
<td>1Kgs 13:1-32</td>
<td>2Chr 17:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 14:23</td>
<td>1Kgs 14:22b-24</td>
<td>2Chr 21:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4,35 (all 2x)</td>
<td>1Kgs 15:14 // 2Chr 15:17</td>
<td>2Chr 28:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 17:9,11,29,32 (2x) [2Kgs 17:1-17]</td>
<td>1Kgs 22:44 (2x) // 2Chr 20:33</td>
<td>2Chr 33:17,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 23:5,8b,9,13,15 (3x),19,20 [2Kgs 23:4-20 cf. 2Chr 34:3-7]</td>
<td>2Kgs 16:4 // 2Chr 28:4</td>
<td>2Kgs 18:4 // 2Chr 31:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Kgs 18:22 // 2Chr 32:12</td>
<td>2Kgs 18:22 // 2Chr 32:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Kgs 21:3 // 2Chr 33:3</td>
<td>2Kgs 21:3 // 2Chr 33:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Kgs 23:8a // 2Chr 34:3</td>
<td>2Kgs 23:8a // 2Chr 34:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Though the actual term נז occurs only once, in v. 7, the text in vv. 7-8 implies several נז being built by Solomon.
⁴ See also Auld (1994:86-88) for the study of נז in Kings and Chronicles.
⁵ The occurrences of נז in the table are based on the MT. In the LXX, נז additionally occurs in 2Kgs 17:32 but is less frequently attested in 2Kgs 23 and does not appear in 2Chr 14:4.
The middle column in the table displays passages with the occurrence of בְּמִי/בְּמִי in Kings that have their counterparts in Chronicles while the side columns refer to texts with בְּמִי occurring only in one history or the other. It is noticeable that in majority of cases where בְּמִי occurs only in Kings (left column) it is part of a larger portion of text which itself does not appear in Chronicles (indicated in square brackets). Thus for instance בְּמִי which is mentioned in 1Kgs 11:7 is in the chapter that deals with Solomon’s infidelity none of which forms part of the Chronicles account. Obviously, the mere occurrence of בְּמִי in such texts has a little role to play in resolving the question regarding these larger units being on the one hand present in Kings and on the other absent in Chronicles.

On two occasions בְּמִי occurs in Kings in contexts that are similar to Chronicles but in these parallel contexts in Chronicles the phrases with בְּמִי do not appear. The first instance is the appearance of בְּמִי in two verses at the beginning of the account of Solomon’s reign (1Kgs 3:2, 3). The text in 1Kgs 3:1-3 is the introduction to the story of Solomon’s vision at Gibeon, which is narrated in both Kings (1Kgs 3:4-15) and Chronicles (2Chr 1:3-13). The second circumstance relates to the regnal framework of the southern kings which is a characteristic feature of both histories. בְּמִי in Kings occurs in the context of the regnal framework of Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah and Jotham (2Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:5, 35) but the parallel context of regnal formulae of these monarchs in Chronicles is without a reference to בְּמִי. A further point of interest is that בְּמִי is found in Kings in the context of the regnal framework also of Asa and Jehoshaphat where the parallel context in Chronicles this time includes a mention of בְּמִי. It is this second circumstance relating to diverse occurrences of בְּמִי in the regnal frameworks of Kings and Chronicles that deserves close examination. The texts that involve בְּמִי in the regnal formulae of Kings and Chronicles are displayed, alongside a few other related passages, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KINGS</th>
<th>CHRONICLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asa 1Kgs 15:14</td>
<td>Asa 2Chr 15:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הבמות לאפרה ושארלא וק לעבראשה והיה שלם מלאה</td>
<td>הבמות לאפרה ושארלא וה עבוד השלחנים מלאה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf. 2Chr 14:2</td>
<td>Cf. 2Chr 14:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ותקבך אתך ותוכלך אתך עליך</td>
<td>ותקבך אתך ותוכלך אתך עליך</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The expressions involving מָאָה occur in the regnal formulae as a criterion of the king’s evaluation. This use of מָאָה in the regnal framework is particularly prominent in Kings where there are six kings of Judah – Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah and Jotham – who are assessed in the regnal summary on the basis of their attitude towards מָאָה. In Chronicles, on the other hand, occurs in the regnal framework of only the first two rulers mentioned in this regard in the book of Kings.

Two other points of significance relate to the use of מָאָה in Chronicles. First, there is a marked contrast in the treatment of מָאָה with regard to the accounts of Asa and Jehoshaphat and the accounts of other southern kings, particularly those mentioned in association with מָאָה in Kings. As already noted, Chronicles states in the regnal formulae of Asa and Jehoshaphat that מָאָה were not taken away (2Chr 15:17; 20:33). At the same time, however, it is with these two kings that Chronicles declares that מָאָה were removed (2Chr 14:2, 4; 17:6). The accumulation of information related to מָאָה in Chronicles in the accounts of Asa and Jehoshaphat in contrast with the silence on this subject throughout the regnal framework of Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah and Jotham is in comparison to Kings rather remarkable. Thus it may suggest that it was mainly the kings Asa and Jehoshaphat about which Chr’s sources possessed some information with regard to מָאָה. The second point of interest is the occurrence of the phrase מָאָה ‘The people, however, still sacrificed at the high places, but only to Yahweh their God’ in Chr’s special material pertaining to Manasseh (2Chr 33:17). The reference to people
sacrificing on ‘high places’ is not made anywhere else in Chronicles but is frequent in Kings where it appears closely tied with the statements about the removal of מזב. Therefore it seems highly probable that Chr is indebted for this phrase in his special material relating to Manasseh to his sources containing the material shared with Kings. A likely occasion to consider would be the regnal summary of Jehoshaphat where Kings and Chronicles share the report about מזב not being removed but only Kings subsequently mentions that people continued to sacrifice on ‘high places’ (2Kgs 22:44b). Chronicles, on the other hand, refers to people who ‘had not yet set their hearts upon the God of their fathers’ (2Chr 20:33b), which betrays characteristics of Chr’s own style. Chr might have felt free to relocate the original phrase from Jehoshaphat’s regnal formula to his special material on Manasseh (2Chr 33:17) and substitute it in 2Chr 20:33 with text of his own.

The foregoing discussion has already pointed out that Chronicles does not refer to מזב in the regnal formulae of Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah and Jotham in contrast to Kings where such reference in the cases of all these four kings is made. The prevailing view on this issue of difference over מזב in the regnal frameworks of Kings and Chronicles assumes that the references to מזב occurring in the Kings history were simply omitted by Chr in his writing. The most frequently stated reason for these omissions is that the reigns of the southern monarchs, to which Kings applies the phrase containing מזב, are often divided in Chronicles into good and bad periods and that therefore Chr, instead of including evaluative statements relating to a king’s attitude towards מזב as the author of Kings does, postpones negative comments to the second half of his presentation of the king’s reign. Considering this perspective one is encouraged to see the logical thought of Chr, where Chr’s omissions are seen to fit into his holistic presentation of the material about the reigns.

6 The verb יָסָר in hiphil stem is a frequent term in Chronicles (occurring 43 times; only 3 times in Kings). The expression ‘set heart upon god/[Yahweh]’ in 2Chr 20:33 appears also in 1Chr 29:18, and a similar phrase ‘set heart to seek god/Yahweh’ is found in 2Chr 12:14; 19:3 and 30:19. (The expression יָסָר יָּמַן ‘set heart’ is found outside Chronicles only in 1Sam 7:3, Job 11:13, Ps 10:17; 57:8; 78:8, 37; 108:2; 112:7; Ezr 7:10.)
7 Rudolph (1955:274); Williamson (1982a:319, 334); Dillard (1987:188, 198, 208, 215); Johnstone (1997b:137, 152, 163-64); Klein (2000:118 n. 9). This point is particularly highlighted by scholars with reference to Chr’s account of Joash, Amaziah and Azariah/Uzziah. In the case of Jotham it is noted that the regnal formula in Chronicles (2Chr 27:2) includes a phrase which shares similarities in language with the expression in Jotham’s formula in Kings referring to מזב (2Kgs 15:34). Nevertheless the term מזב itself in Jotham’s account in Chronicles does not appear. See more on this point in note 9 below.
of Judean kings. However, this interpretation of the absence of the statements relating to the king’s attitude towards רָมะ in the regnal formulae in Chronicles in places where they occur in Kings does not comport well with Chr’s coverage of Asa and Jehoshaphat’s reigns, since the accounts of these two kings are also structured by Chr into good and bad periods of their reigns. And yet the statements relating to רָมะ are not omitted by Chr from the older source but rather preserved. What is more, Chr includes in the cases of both Asa and Jehoshaphat further information about רָมะ which has been considered to be in some dissonance with the statements relating to רָมะ from his major source. On the whole, the case of Asa and Jehoshaphat, therefore, seems to set limitations to the view which contends that the phrases relating רָมะ in the regnal formulae of Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah and Jotham were omitted by Chr. The ambivalence which this view creates within the wider perspective of the use of רָมะ in Chronicles could be overcome, if the absence of the references to רָมะ in Chronicles and its presence in Kings in the regnal formulae of the four Judean kings is assessed from another angle. In fact, we believe that a stronger case can be made to see the references to רָ换句话 as additions within the wider context of Kings than to see them as omissions within the wider context of Chronicles.\[8\]

A close study of the phrases linked with רָ换句话 in the regnal formulae of the southern kings in the book of Kings shows that the first two expressions which pertain to the accounts of Asa and Jehoshaphat are in their formulation slightly different from the other four related texts. It can be observed from the foregoing table that in 1Kgs 15:14 the particle רָּ is does not introduce רְָּ with רָ换句话 as is customary in other cases, but appears in a phrase that comes immediately after. The inclusion of a comment that ‘Asa’s heart was perfect with Yahweh all his days’ differentiates 1Kgs 15:14 from all the other related verses which instead of this comment include a statement about people’s continuation of sacrificing at רָ换句话 (cf. 1Kgs 22:44; 2Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35). In the account of Jehoshaphat, the phrase in 1Kgs 22:44 is very close to the other expressions in related texts except that it uses רָּ at the beginning of the verse where the majority have רָּ. It is interesting to observe that only these two texts, 1Kgs 15:14 and 22:44, which slightly differ in their phrasing from 2Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35 have a parallel in Chronicles. The expressions mentioning רָ换句话 in

---

\[8\] A proposal in this direction has been previously made by McKenzie (1985:104-105) and Auld (1994:86-88).
2Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35 which do not have their counterparts in the other history are very uniform and very rigid. The idea that Chr would transcribe from the regnal framework of his source the phrases with מָעָא that display some variation while leaving out all those of rigid formulation, though theoretically possible, does not seem as likely as the other option which asserts that it was a hand of the author/editor of Kings which added very rigidly the expression בה רֵיחַ רֵיחַ לְעַל חוֹרַת חַזְקַת מִמְנָה to the regnal framework of each, Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah and Jotham, modelling the usage according to the evaluative formulae of Asa and Jehoshaphat.

Furthermore, the rigidity of expression in 2Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35 imposed by Kings writers on an earlier text seems to serve a larger purpose within the context of the book of Kings. That book, unlike Chronicles, tells the story of the Northern kingdom where there is a similar, nevertheless distinctive, pattern of regnal summaries for the kings of Israel as there is in the two histories for the monarchs of Judah. In Kings the regnal framework of northern kings is brought under a common frame with the regnal formulae of the southern kings primarily through synchronistic notices. The northern series, however, seems also to be neatly interwoven with the series of the southern kings through various kinds of literary and stylistic device. It has been observed by scholars in the past that the evaluative formulae of northern kings, while a little more varied at the beginning, show evidence of rigidification near the end of Israel’s story. Nelson (1981:33) particularly notices a more static pattern beginning with the evaluative formula of Jehoash through to the one of Pekah. This rigid pattern of formulation can be detected to have already started with the evaluative formula of Jehoahaz (a king preceding Jehoash), which in its present

---

9 It may be that in addition to phrases mentioning מָעָא in the regnal formulae of Asa and Jehoshaphat an expression referring to מָעָא was also present in Chr’s sources in the regnal formula relating to Jotham. The text in 2Chr 27:2 shares links in a few terms, such as כָּל, עוֹלָה, תְמוּנָה and מְעָא, with the Kings phrase mentioning מָעָא in 2Kgs 15:35. (In other terms, however, 2Chr 27:2 and 2Kgs 15:35 differ considerably. In Chronicles there is a linkage in the phrase מִמְנָה כְּעֶלֶף בְּכָל כָּלַעַל and the verb מָעָא between 2Chr 27:2 and Chr’s special material in 2Chr 26:16.) Even if the phrase mentioning מָעָא was included in Chr’s Vorlage of Jotham’s regnal formula, it does not greatly affect the argument about author/editor of Kings being accountable for the effect of rigidity in regnal formulae created by the repetition of exact phrases containing reference to מָעָא, since there remain three other very fixed expressions mentioning מָעָא in Kings (2Kgs 12:4, 14:4, 15:4) which share no links with Chronicles and could be therefore intended by the editor of Kings to aim at such uniformity for a particular purpose (see the discussion below).
shape in 2Kgs 13:2 is a late reworking. The formulae from Jehoahaz to Pekah run as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>2Kgs 13:2</td>
<td>(reconstructed with aid of v. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoash</td>
<td>2Kgs 13:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeroboam</td>
<td>2Kgs 14:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menahem</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekah</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekah</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The portion of northern material that deals with kings from Joahaz to Pekah is framed in the book of Kings by the accounts of Joash and Jotham and intertwined with the accounts of Amaziah and Azariah/Uzziah from the series of southern kings. It may be highly significant that it is the reports of the reigns of these four kings from the story of Judah that contain in their evaluative formulae the references to חוסה which are not found in Chronicles. The evaluative formulae of the Judean kings are reproduced below so that they may be compared with the evaluative formulae of the Israelite kings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joash</td>
<td>2Kgs 12:3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>2Kgs 14:3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah/Uzziah</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>2Kgs 15:34-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 The account of the northern king Jehoahaz (2Kgs 13:1-9) is considered to be a literary composite. Some, e.g. Gray (1970:591-93); McCarthy (1973:409-10); Jones (1984:497); Provan (1988:166 n. 25); Eynikel (1996:84-86) view vv. 4-6 as a later editorial unit, while others, e.g. O'Brien (1989:205-206); Campbell & O'Brien (2000:431-32) consider the secondary addition starting already with v. 3. Cf. also proposals by De Vries (1978:119); Parker (1997:64); Fritz (1998:69-70). Verse 6 with its comment on the attitude of the Israelites recalls king’s evaluation in v. 2. A suggestion that this is an example of resumptive repetition has been proposed by Cogan & Tadmor (1988:143-44).

It is possible to view under the influence of the later editorial activity within the account of Jehoahaz the original phrasing of v. 2 being altered. Verse 2 in its present form displays close similarities with the secondary v. 6. A later editor, responsible for adding v. 6, could in both verses combine ‘walk after/in sins’ (typical in texts of earlier Israelite kings; 1Kgs 15:26, 34; 16:19, 26, 31) with ‘turning from sins’ (typical in texts of later kings; 2Kgs 3:3; 10:31; 13:11; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28). Verse 2 seems to be originally without inn and the phrase beginning ירחא אינש probably followed immediately after הוהי הדע as is usual in other texts of this section in Kings. (An expression ירחא הוהי at the end of 2Kgs 13:11 is probably also an addition from the same later editor who added v. 6 and rephrased v. 2.)
The phrases which mention מָוֶן not being removed that recur with regularity in the regnal evaluations of Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah and Jotham create the effect of making the evaluation formulae on the whole more static and solidified as though bringing them into greater conformity with the rigid pattern of the evaluative formulae of the northern kings from Jehoahaz to Pekah with which the accounts of these Judean kings are blended together in 2Kgs 12-15. Another observation of linkage between the accounts of north and south in this part of Kings relates to the use of מָוֶן with the negative שְׁלֹא. The use of this combination in southern formulae, particularly in the phrase referring to מָוֶן not being removed (עָרוֹב מָוֶן אלֶּחָספ), runs closely parallel with their use in the northern material in the context of the king’s participation in Jeroboam’s sin (עָרוֹב מָוֶן שְׁלֹא). Connections such as these seem to suggest that phrases referring to מָוֶן occurring in the evaluative formulae of the four southern kings have been employed as a special literary device by the author/editor of Kings, the purpose of which was to integrate more smoothly the northern series of kings into the material pertaining to the kingdom of Judah. This has wider implications. The close links between phrases mentioning מָוֶן in Kings in the accounts of the four kings of Judah and the regnal formulae of northern kings give support to the thought that Chr used the text for his history, into which the material of northern kings had not yet been built, thus implying that the series of northern kings was incorporated into the material of the book of Kings at a later stage. As can be observed from the table on the following page, a substantial part of the series of northern kings is involved in the links with the southern formulae relating to מָוֶן. Thus it is legitimate to apply the reasoning about material that was not present in Chr’s Vorlage not merely to accounts of kings from Jehoahaz to Pekah but virtually to the whole series of northern kings beginning with Nadab to the final king Hoshea.

In the broader context of widely held assumptions about Chr’s treatment of his sources and particularly of the generally accepted contention that Chr omitted the northern material from his sources, a question needs to be asked. Would Chr have been aware, when he left out the material about northern kings, of all the literary connections with the text relating to the southern kingdom so that with the omission of northern material he would have also carefully eliminated every cross-reference to that material in the accounts of the southern kings which he otherwise retained? This
KINGS AND CHRONICLES (SHARED MATERIAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Chronicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah/Uzziah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, Zedekiah)

KINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings (southern king)</th>
<th>Chronicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abijam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baasha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeroboam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekahia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menahem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoshea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nb. There is no evaluative formula in the account of Shallum (2Kgs 15:13).
seems highly unlikely.\(^{11}\) The alternative option, that it was the author/editor of Kings who provided the subtle links within the story of the southern kingdom with the new materials pertaining to the northern kings as he added them to the story of Judah must therefore be counted as a sounder option.

2. Elijah-Elisha Narratives (1Kgs 17-2Kgs 8/2Kgs 9-10)

Traditionally the Elijah-Elisha stories have been understood as pre-Deuteronomistic narratives that were integrated into the composition of Deuteronomistic History by its editor(s).\(^ {12}\) More recently, a guild of scholars ascribe to a number of these stories a later date of composition and take them as post-Deuteronomistic additions.\(^ {13}\) If as Otto (2003:504-508) for example maintains, some of these accounts (e.g. 1Kgs 19:1-18 and the Elisha stories) could have been composed in post-exilic times, a case can be made that they may have not been included in the main source available to the author of Chronicles. The study of the cultic reform of Jehu in chapter two suggested that the narratives of the Elijah-Elisha cycle are part of a literary stratum in Kings that is younger than the primary material which Kings shares with Chronicles.\(^ {14}\)

3. Pivotal Account of Manasseh’s Cultic Policies (2Kgs 21:1-10a/2Chr 33:1-10)

The book of Kings portrays Manasseh in negative light as the king who acted in an evil way and conformed to many idolatrous practices. The negative perspective of Manasseh in Kings has in its first part a close parallel in Chronicles (2Kgs 21:1-10a/2Chr 33:1-10). The text describing Manasseh’s cultic offences and his misdeeds, which is shared by the two histories, has been shown by studies to have affinities with other related passages in Kings. Reverberations have been observed between Manasseh story and the story of Ahab, between Manasseh’s impious deeds and the wrongdoing of Israel in the portrayal of the fall of Northern Israel, and a

\(^{11}\) See Auld (1994:21) and Ho (1995:101-103) in their examination of other synoptic texts of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles formulating questions in a similar vein within the discussion of literary connections between Samuel-Kings variants and pluses in parallel stories with Chronicles and the larger portions of Samuel-Kings not found in the other history.

\(^{12}\) For this view, see e.g. Noth (1991\(^ {1}\):107), Dietrich (1972:48-51; 120-27), Na’aman (1997:153-73).


\(^{14}\) See also Auld’s programmatic essay (1983), in which he some twenty years ago penned an idea that Elijah-Elisha narratives should be viewed as “supplements to the Deuteronomist's work” (1983:16; emphasis his) and therefore not being the part of the text of Kings available to Chronicles.
close association has been made between Manasseh’s misdeeds and Josiah’s reform. As it will be demonstrated below, the material portraying Manasseh and his sins that is shared by Kings and Chronicles is pivotal, with regard to its connections with these other texts within Kings, for understanding processes by which the book of Kings developed. It has already been observed earlier in the study of Josiah’s reform how the Manasseh’s story impacted and partially shaped the literary growth of the account of Josiah’s reform in Kings from a shorter ‘original’ narrative common to Kings and Chronicles. Two other texts in Kings with significant affinities with Manasseh’s story, shared by Kings and Chronicles, will receive attention in the following discussion, the material relating to king Ahab in 1Kgs 16:29-33 and to Northern Israel’s downfall in 2Kgs 17:7-23.

As noted above, parallels have been noted in the past between the passage in Kings introducing Ahab’s reign (1Kgs 16:29-33) and the account of Manasseh (2Kgs 21:1-18). These correspondences have suggested to scholars that the account of Manasseh’s misdeeds was painted after the account of Ahab’s sins. Over against this view of the dependence of the depiction of Manasseh’s cultic offences on the story of Ahab’s misdeeds, however, arguments can be put forward to suggest otherwise, that is, that it is the story of Manasseh shared by Kings and Chronicles, which has exerted influence on the literary development of the account of Ahab that is found only in Kings.

The unit relating to Ahab in 1Kgs 16:30-33 is skilfully welded to form a structured whole. Schniedewind observes a repetition of ‘the comparative statement

---

15 See e.g. McKenzie (1991:126); Ben Zvi (1991a:355-67); Smelik (1992:143-44, 150-51, 154); Schniedewind (1993:649-61); Lasine (1993:163-73); van Keulen (1996:102-103, 146-47, 178); Eynikel (1997:233-61); Schmid (1997:91-92); Halpern (1998:487). Analogies have also been observed between Manasseh and Jeroboam, especially in terms of the way in which both kings lead their nations to sin (see e.g. Smelik 1992:140-42; Lasine 1993:164-69). This is, however, based on the text of the oracle in 2Kgs 21:11-15 that has no counterpart in Chronicles. Some studies suggest that the Manasseh-Jeroboam parallel, though an important one, is more limited in scope than the Manasseh-Ahab parallel (see van Keulen 1996:147-48; cf. criticisms of Lesine by Eynikel 1997:233-34). This would add significance to the part of Manasseh’s story in Kings that has a counterpart in Chronicles, this being the text with most associations with other passages in Kings.

16 Others have recognized the significance of Manasseh’s story for the redactional theories of Kings. See e.g. Ben Zvi (1991a:355-74; 1996:34).


18 See e.g. van Keulen (1996:95); Eynikel (1997:259).
that Ahab was worse than all the kings who were before him' in vv. 31 and 33.\textsuperscript{19} These phrases in the two verses serve as brackets to Ahab’s account, the structure of which is displayed below.

\begin{verbatim}
 v. 30 | v. 31a | v. 31b | v. 32 | v. 33a | v. 33b
 | | | | | |
 | יעה אב אק | יעה אב | יעה אב | יעה אב | יעה אב |
 | ק| ר | ק | ק | ק |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
Both Manasseh’s activity of ‘erecting altar(s) to Baal’ and ‘making Asherah’ are also characteristic of Ahab’s activity in vv. 32 and 33 respectively. Moreover, Manasseh’s ‘bowing down to all the host of heaven and serving them’ becomes in v. 31 Ahab’s ‘serving to Baal and bowing down to him’. Baal is without a doubt elevated to a prominent place in the depiction of Ahab’s cultic policies, which gives rise to the whole theme of Yahweh-Baal contest in the following prophetic narratives in 1Kgs 17-19.20 Lastly, a parallel can be seen between the two accounts in their reference to kings’ deeds that result in Yahweh being provoked (מִזָּהַר) where action of each king leading to Yahweh’s provocation is highlighted by the use of a verb adding emphasis (יָכַה in 2Kgs 21:6//2Chr 33:6 and יִמָּס in 1Kgs 16:33).21 One may agree with van Keulen (1996:103) that this points to a ‘probability that the one [text] influenced the other in shape’, although the course of influence may be in an opposite direction than van Keulen proposes, that is, from the wording of Manasseh’s account to the formulation in the narrative of Ahab.

While on the one hand the account of Ahab has close parallels with the account of Manasseh’s religious practices, it also begins a string of narratives about the northern kings until the account of Jehu with a common theme of Baal worship. Ahab’s son Ahaziah is described in his regnal summary as one who ‘served Baal and bowed down before him’ precisely as his father before him did. Ahab’s other son Jehoram, however, is recorded as having removed the pillar of Baal, and Jehu that he eradicated Baal worship in Israel.

Ahab 1Kgs 16:31-32
Ahaziah 1Kgs 22:54
Jehoram 2Kgs 3:2
Jehu 2Kgs 10:26-28

21 This has been noted by van Keulen (1996:103).
All four instances relating to the northern kings from Ahab to Jehu are connected through association with Baal. Furthermore, Otto observes how the textual treatment of Jehu’s reform is the very opposite of the portrayal of Ahab’s cultic innovations. The reference to worship of Baal in Ahab’s story (1Kgs 16:31-32) constitutes one component part of the narratives of the four northern kings, which have the theme of Baal worship at their centre. Yet this reference to Baal worship is not inherently original within Ahab’s introductory summary (1Kgs 16:30-33) but together with the other elements of this introductory account of Ahab’s misdeeds appears to be based on the primary story of the cultic practices of Manasseh.

The passage relating to the fall of the northern kingdom in 2Kgs 17:7-23 is another text that exhibits close relations with the shared story of Manasseh. Other scholars have already pointed out that it deals with ‘sins’ of the sons of Israel that are largely dressed in southern colours. As an example of Judah’s situation being reflected in these verses may serve the reference to הִבְשָׁן and הָכְלָן being set up ‘on every hill and under every green tree’ (2Kgs 17:10) and the incense being burnt on the high places (2Kgs 17:11). The southern king Ahaz has previously been accused of these very same cultic practices – of burning incense ‘in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree’ (2Kgs 16:4//2Chr 28:4).

The mention of הִבְשָׁן next to הֹלֵשׁ and הָכְלָן in 2Kgs 17:16 reminds one of the same triad occurring in the text of Judean king Manasseh (2Kgs 21:3//2Chr 33:3). That the author of 2Kgs 17 was inspired in his description of Israel’s sin (among other texts also) by the account of Manasseh can be seen in the reference to a fire ritual involving children and to the practice of divination in 2Kgs 17:17, each of which also occur in the catalogue of Manasseh’s misdeeds. For there it is reported that Manasseh ‘made his son pass through the fire and practiced soothsaying and divination, and dealt with mediums and wizards’ (2Kgs 21:6a//2Chr 33:6a). Brettler in his study of 2Kgs 17 contends that ‘[b]laming the demise of the north on the sins committed by Manasseh is...quite logical. After all, according to Kings those sins are responsible for the destruction of Judah; it can naturally be assumed that they had the

---

24 Cf. 1Kgs 14:23 (Rehoboam’s subjects).
same function for the north’ (1995:123). This would be consistent with the late editor of Kings who, while projecting Manasseh’s sin on to the north, was stressing that the destiny that would take place later in Judah would follow the example experienced by Israel.

As it has been observed in the case of the account relating to Ahab, one may again note a significant role played by the primary text relating to Manasseh, shared by both Kings and Chronicles, for the further literary development of the stories regarding the northern kingdom in Kings.

4. Concluding Remarks

In summary, this section has sought to set the results of previous chapters, with respect to the ‘primary’ account of Josiah’s reform and its subsequent expansion in Kings, within the broader framework of a prospect of literary growth of the book of Kings in its portions relating to the divided kingdom from an earlier source underlying both Kings and Chronicles. This has been explored in several ways through a few distinct examples. First, the study of מַעְלָה and its occurrences in the two histories led to a proposal that this expression functions as a structural element in Kings through which narratives relating to the succession of the northern kings were more smoothly integrated by Kings editors into the already existing material pertaining to the kingdom of Judah, used also in the production of Chronicles. Second, some narratives within Kings are considered by an increasing number of scholars to be of post- rather than pre-Deuteronomistic origin. Such is the case with (portions of) the Elijah-Elisha stories. Since the Elijah-Elisha cycle does not appear in Chronicles, an argument has been put forward that within Kings these narratives belong to the additions to the primary material relating to the divided kingdom available to the writer of Chronicles. And third, it has been shown through the example of the account of Manasseh’s cultic practices how a text shared by both Kings and Chronicles, and therefore belonging to a source used by both histories, was influential in various ways in the subsequent development of other narratives in Kings. Overall, the findings of this chapter give further support to the view that comparative studies, in which Chronicles is involved, although these may seem challenging at first, may eventually become more fruitful for formulating theories of the literary development of Kings.
CONCLUSION

In embarking upon this study, a wide frame of reference for the analysis of the accounts of the divided kingdom in Kings and Chronicles was set with the view of understanding the formative processes underlying these texts in the two biblical histories. The first two chapters dealt with material pertaining to the regnal formulae and the royal cultic reforms before the study was narrowed to the analysis of only one episode within these portions of Kings and Chronicles with the reform of the king Josiah as the focus. A comparative study of Josiah’s reform in 2Kgs 23:4-20 + 24 and 2Chr 34:3-7 + 33 has demonstrated that the inherited versions in Kings and Chronicles are developed accounts of a primary source-text which served as the basis for each of them. This briefer ‘original’ account has gone through more substantial editing and expansion in Kings than in Chronicles, and a following investigation has shown possible ways in which the subsequent literary growth of that ‘original’ report of the reform might have taken place in Kings. The final chapter then explored further the issues arising from the earlier analysis. This exploration hinted at the direction in which the book of Kings, in its part relating to the divided monarchy, may have developed and the possible influences behind such development. Though not repeating here the results of the preceding textual and literary explorations in detail, a few concluding remarks are appropriate.

The examination of the regnal formulae in Kings and Chronicles in chapter one determined the course followed in the thesis by disclosing the limitations of Chr’s major source in its material relating to regnal formulae. The study did not confirm the common assumption that the narrative relating to the period of the divided monarchy in Chronicles has as its major source the inherited book of Kings. One of the chief arguments against such identification is that the absence of the large body of texts in Chronicles, when compared to Kings, is closely tied to the absence of a particular expression or short phrase within Chronicles’ synoptic portions. In other words, the large sections of narratives that are part only of the Kings history are structurally linked with a phrase or expression again included only in Kings in those sections that have close parallels in Chronicles. In theory, it would have just been possible to envisage the process by which Chr while omitting the large-scale portions of narratives from Kings also removed from his source all expressions closely related to the narratives he dismissed. However, because of the nature of these relations, whereby in Kings the cross-references in the synoptic sections to the larger self-contained portions of the narratives function as a structural means for the smooth
incorporation of new data, they fit much more easily the concept of expansion within Kings of the shorter core material which would have also been used by Chr. The phenomenon was first noted and discussed by Auld (1992:350-51, 1994:21) in his study of the texts in Kings and Chronicles of Solomon's vision at Gibeon and subsequently by Ho (1996:101-103) in the examination of 1Sam 31:1-13 and 1Chr 10:1-12, where it featured in their arguments towards the existence of a common source for Samuel-Kings and Chronicles.

This thesis has presented some new evidence that may advance the cause for the common source in as far as the story of the divided monarchy is concerned. The study of the distribution of such terminology as מֹשֶׁא or מָשָׂא and the occurrence of the evaluative formula of Abijah in Kings has shown that these elements served Kings editors as structural devices in integrating the text relating to the succession of the northern kings with the prior tradition treating the accounts of the kings of Judah. The theme of 'dung' occurring in the report of Jehu's reform that is specific to Kings may have functioned in a similar way when the material about Ahab, Jezebel and Baal worship – linked with the text of Jehu's reform through the theme of 'dung' – was added by Kings editors to their source material.

The regnal formulae and the royal cultic reforms are two significant features of Kings and Chronicles in each of their materials dealing with the period of the divided monarchy. These two peculiarities appear to be backbones of the narrative shared by the two biblical histories pertaining to the era of the divided kingdom. They display vocabulary such as מִשְׁתַּחַת and מָשָׂא in the evaluative framework or the expressions relating to the destruction of cult (דרש/לובה אָשֶׁר,ֹּּּּפָּסָהּ,ּּּּּּמִשְׁתַּחַת,ּּּּּּּמִשְׁתַּחַת,ּּּּּּּּמִשְׁתַּחַת,ּּּּּּּּמִשְׁתַּחַת) that have often been designated as typical Deuteronomistic phraseology. However, as has been argued through studying the distribution of this terminology in Chronicles alongside its occurrence in Kings, it appears that these phrases originated within the story of the monarchy common to Kings and Chronicles, rather than in the so-called Deuteronomistic History stretching from Deuteronomy to Kings. Close examination of one sample of the reform accounts occurring in both biblical histories, the report of Josiah's reform, has demonstrated a later re-use and adaptation of the language shared by the two versions in the longer and more elaborate text of the reform in Kings. For example, the verb מַעֲמַר, which may in the original narrative of Josiah's reform refer only to the burning of human bones, was re-applied in Kings narrative to
indicate also the burning of cultic paraphernalia. Other similar examples were explored through the detailed study of the synoptic accounts of the reform.

Another aspect emerged from exploring the literary development of the report of Josiah's reform in Kings, namely the multiple causes and influences behind the development. Not only were the themes emerging from the 'primary' reform account of the source shared with Chronicles reinforced and enlarged by secondary additions, but these later additions in the elaborated text in Kings also connect with other literary expansions occurring elsewhere in Kings. This has been observed for example in 2Kgs 23:16-18, which is the conclusion of the story of the man of God from 1Kgs 13, both of which may be considered as later insertions in the process of the literary growth of Kings. Furthermore, an interaction can be seen between the elaborated account in Kings and materials outside Kings, for example the Jeremiah text. Concerning this, a 'mutual-influence' model has been suggested as best in explaining the links between the portions of shared material relating to the reigns of Ahaz and Manasseh on the one hand and Jeremiah on the other, and then between Jeremiah and the enlarged account of Josiah's reform in Kings.

Within the scope of this study, close investigation of the texts of Chronicles alongside those of Kings has shown to be a model with potentially significant heuristic value for an understanding of the literary relationship between the narratives relating to the period of the divided monarchy of the two biblical books. In the final chapter, the cursory examination of the account of Manasseh's cultic practices shared by Kings and Chronicles indicated that this shared story served as a catalyst for other narratives in Kings with which it has a number of significant links and associations. Besides its impact on Ahab's story, the sins of Israel leading to Israel's fall are depicted in terms of Manasseh's misdeeds, thus showing that Judah's fall followed the pattern set already by its northern neighbour. The outcome of this thesis would be further enhanced by an analysis of other synoptic texts dealing with the period of the divided monarchy in addition to those of Josiah's reform and Manasseh's cultic practices studied here.

In studying the parallel texts of Kings and Chronicles as well as other narratives in and beyond Kings, the important issue for this investigation was to detect the direction of the literary influence as the older traditions were developed. We believe that here the way forward lies in further careful word studies. Much has been said of the so called Deuteronomistic terminology which was noted by scholars
to occur in the core passages of the Deuteronomistic History, and among other texts also in the late additions by scribes appearing only in the MT. The presence of this terminology in Chronicles has not been investigated on its own, but is usually studied assuming the prevailing scholarly view that Chr used for his history the book of Kings. This thesis dealt with only some of the terminology that is often designated as typical Deuteronomistic language. The phrase יִתְנַהֲךָ לְאֹתָרֵךְ occurring in 2Kgs 22:2/2Chr 34:2, for example, as suggested by this thesis is not a stock Deuteronomistic phrase but belongs, together with a similar phrase יָתַן לְאֹתְרֵךְ occurring in 1Kgs 22:43 (יָתַן לְאֹתְרֵךְ in 2Chr 20:32), to the primary context of the regnal framework of the monarchic story shared by Kings and Chronicles.

For some time there has been in circulation and used as a reference tool Weinfeld’s list of Deuteronomistic phraseology (1972). Similarly, Auld has recently compiled a list of terminology coming from a source common to Kings and Chronicles that he calls ‘The Book of Two Houses’. It will be interesting to see how much (or how little) these two lists overlap and whether the so-called Deuteronomistic characteristics are more significantly present in Kings synoptic or non-synoptic texts. Studying these lists more closely: Will it show that indeed it is the Deuteronomistic terminology that lies at the core and was primarily influential in the development of the historical book of Kings? Or will it reveal that the linguistic content of the source shared by Kings and Chronicles is generative for the narratives in Kings, as some evidence from this study engaging the narratives relating to the period of the divided kingdom suggested? Answers to these and other similar questions will have to await future study.

1 This is not yet a published work and we would like to express appreciation to Graeme Auld for allowing us occasionally to consult this list in the process of writing this thesis.

2 For the original thought see again the programmatic monograph Kings without Privilege (1994) by Auld.
## Appendix A

### 1. נָשַׁה

Occurrences: 21 times in cultic contexts (out of total 42).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Synoptic context</th>
<th>Non-synoptic context</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) נָשַׁה</td>
<td>2KGS 23:12, 15 = 2CHR 34:4, 7</td>
<td>2Chr 31:1</td>
<td>Deut 7:5; 12:3; Judg 2:2; 6:28, 30, 31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) נָשַׁה</td>
<td>2KGS 11:18 // 2CHR 23:17</td>
<td>2Kgs 10:27</td>
<td>(2Kgs 23:7 - בָּשֶׁשׁ הָנַּס)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) נָשַׁה</td>
<td>2CHR 33:3</td>
<td>2Kgs 23:8, 15; 2Chr 31:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) נָשַׁה</td>
<td>2Kgs 10:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. יתר

(1) נָשַׁ הָנַּס

Occurrences: 7 times in cultic contexts (out of total 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Synoptic context</th>
<th>Non-synoptic context</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) נָשַׁ הָנַּס</td>
<td>2CHR 31:1</td>
<td>2Chr 14:2</td>
<td>Deut 7:5; 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) נָשַׁ הָנַּס</td>
<td>2CHR 34:3, 7</td>
<td>Eze 6:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) נָשַׁ הָנַּס

Occurrences: 16 times in cultic contexts (out of total 288).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Synoptic context</th>
<th>Non-synoptic context</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) נָשַׁ הָנַּס</td>
<td>2KGS 18:4; 2KGS 23:14</td>
<td>Exod 34:14; Judg 6:25, 26, 28, 30; 1Sam 28:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) נָשַׁ הָנַּס</td>
<td>1KGS 15:13 // 2CHR 15:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) נָשַׁ הָנַּס</td>
<td>Various cultic entities - Lev 26:30 (שמות); Mi 5:11 (משה); Mi 5:12 (משה; משה ו ISA 8:14 (משה; משה); Nah 1:14 (משה ו ISA 8:14 (משה; משה); Zeph 1:4 (משה ו ISA 8:14 (משה; משה); Zech 13:2 (משה ו ISA 8:14 (משה; משה))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. שְׁבָה (pi)

Occurrences: 12 times in cultic contexts (out of total 36 [pi]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Synoptic context</th>
<th>Non-synoptic context</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) שְׁבָה</td>
<td>2KGS 18:4 // 2CHR 31:1; 2KGS 23:14</td>
<td>2Chr 14:2</td>
<td>Exod 23:24; 34:13; Deut 7:5; 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) שְׁבָה</td>
<td>2KGS 11:18 // 2CHR 23:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) שְׁבָה</td>
<td>2CHR 34:4</td>
<td>Isa 21:9 (נֶזָה)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. נֶזָה in nif - Eze 6:4, 6
APPENDIX B

A. (hif)

1. CONTEXT OF CULT ELIMINATION

Parallel texts: 2Kgs 15:12 // 2Chr 15:8
Other occurrences: Zech 13:2

2. CONTEXT OF ‘PASSING THROUGH FIRE’ RITUAL

Parallel texts: 2Kgs 16:3 // 2Chr 28:3 LXX, Tg (Ahaz)
2Kgs 21:6 // 2Chr 33:6 (Manasseh)

Non-parallel texts: 2Kgs 17:17
2Kgs 23:10

Other occurrences: Ex 13:12; Lev 18:21; Deut 18:10; Jer 32:35; Ez 16:21; 20:26, 31; 23:37

B. (hif)

1. CONTEXT OF CULT ELIMINATION

Parallel texts: 1Kgs 15:12 // 2Chr 14:2
1Kgs 15:13 // 2Chr 15:16
2Kgs 18:22 // 2Chr 32:12 (also Isa 36:7)

Broader parallel setting (but not texts): 2Kgs 18:4 cf. 2Chr 30:14 (2x) (Hezekiah)
2Kgs 23:19 cf. 2Chr 34:33 (Josiah)

Non-parallel texts: 2Kgs 3:2 (Joram)
2Chr 33:15 (Manasseh)
2Chr 14:4; 17:6 (high places removed)

Other occurrences: Gen 35:2; Jos 24:14, 23; Judg 10:16;
1Sam 7:3, 4; 1Sam 28:3; Jer 4:1; Ez 11:18

C. (pi) ‘eradicate’

1. CONTEXT OF CULT ELIMINATION

Parallel texts: 1Kgs 22:47 // 2Chr 19:3 (Jehoshaphat)

Broader parallel setting (not texts): 2Kgs 23:24 cf. [2Chr 34:6 emendation] (Josiah)

2. CONTEXT OF JUDGEMENT ORACLES RELATING TO NORTHERN KINGDOM

Non-parallel texts: 1Kgs 14:10 MT
1Kgs 16:3 (some Mss; otherwise hif)
1Kgs 21:21

3. OTHER CONTEXTS (OUTSIDE KINGS AND CHRONICLES)

Eradication of evil: Deut 13:6; 17:7, 12; 19:19;
21:21; 22:21, 22, 24; 24:7;
Judg. 20:13

Other: Ex 22:4 (1x pi; 1x hif); Nu 24:22; 1Sam 4:11; Isa 3:14;
4:4; 5:5; 6:13
APPENDIX C

**Kôrîm**

**Occurrences in Kings:**
- 1Kgs 14:24
- 1Kgs 15:12
- 1Kgs 22:47
- 2Kgs 23:7

**Other Occurrences:**
- Gen 38:21 (2x); Deut 23:18; Job 36:14 (?); Hos 4:14

**Food**

**Occurrences in Kings:**
- 1Kgs 15:12
- 1Kgs 21:26
- 2Kgs 17:12
- 2Kgs 21:11
- 2Kgs 21:21
- 2Kgs 23:11

**Other Occurrences:**
- Lev 26:30; Deut 29:16; Jer 50:2; Eze 6:4, 5, 6, 9, 13 (2x); 8:10; 14:3, 4 (2x), 5, 6, 7; 16:36; 18:6, 12, 15; 20:7, 8, 16, 18, 24, 31, 39 (2x); 22:3, 4; 23:7, 30, 37, 39, 49; 30:13; 33:25; 36:18, 25; 37:23; 44:10, 12

**Kôrîm**

**Occurrences in Kings:**
- SINGULAR
  - 1Kgs 11:5
  - 1Kgs 11:7 (2x)
  - 2Kgs 23:13 (2x)
- PLURAL
  - 2Kgs 23:24

**Occurrences in Chronicles:**
- 2Chr 15:8

**Other Occurrences:**

**Alârî**

**Occurrences in Chronicles:**
- 2Chr 14:2

**Other Occurrences:**
- 2Kgs 15:12

**Sun**

**Occurrences in Chronicles:**
- 2Chr 33:15
**Occurrences**

**Occurrences in Kings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 14:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 14:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 15:13 //</td>
<td>2Chr 15:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 16:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 18:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 13:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 17:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 17:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 18:4 //</td>
<td>2Chr 31:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 21:3 //</td>
<td>2Chr 33:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 21:7 ≈</td>
<td>2Chr 33:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:4,6,7,15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Kgs 23:14 ≈</td>
<td>2Chr 34:3,4,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occurrences in Chronicles:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 14:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 15:16 //</td>
<td>1Kgs 15:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 17:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 19:3 ≈</td>
<td>1Kgs 22:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 24:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 31:1 //</td>
<td>2Kgs 18:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 33:3 //</td>
<td>2Kgs 21:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 33:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr 34:3,4,7 ≈</td>
<td>2Kgs 23:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other occurrences:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex 34:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 7:5; 12:3; 16:21; Jdg 3:7; 6:26, 26, 28, 30; Isa 17:8; 27:9; Jer 17:2; Mic 5:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occurrences in Kings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 3:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 3:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 3:4 //</td>
<td>2Chr 1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 11:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 12:31 ≈</td>
<td>2Chr 11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 12:32 ≈</td>
<td>2Chr 11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 13:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 13:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 13:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kgs 14:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1Kgs 15:14 // 2Chr 15:17
1Kgs 22:44 // 2Chr 20:33
2Kgs 12:4
2Kgs 14:4
2Kgs 15:4
2Kgs 15:35
2Kgs 16:4 // 2Chr 28:4
2Kgs 17:9
2Kgs 17:11
2Kgs 17:29
2Kgs 17:32
2Kgs 18:4 // 2Chr 31:1
2Kgs 18:22 // 2Chr 32:12
2Kgs 21:3 // 2Chr 33:3
2Kgs 23:8 ≈ 2Chr 34:3
2Kgs 23:5,9,13,15,19,20

OCCURRENCES IN CHRONICLES:
1Chr 16:39
1Chr 21:29
2Ch 1:3 // 1Kgs 3:4
2Chr 1:13
2Chr 11:15 ≈ 1Kgs 12:31, 32
2Chr 14:2
2Chr 14:4
2Chr 15:17 // 1Kgs 15:14
2Chr 17:6
2Chr 20:33 // 1Kgs 22:44
2Chr 21:11
2Chr 28:4 // 2Kgs 16:4
2Chr 28:25
2Chr 31:1 // 2Kgs 18:4
2Chr 32:12
2Chr 33:3 // 2Kgs 21:3
2Chr 33:17
2Chr 33:19
2Chr 34:3 ≈ 2Kgs 23:8

OTHER OCCURRENCES:

// ... parallel text
≈ ... loosely parallel text or broader parallel setting
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