

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## THE CODE SPOKEN OF IN II KINGS 22—23

ALEXANDER FREED

BROWN UNIVERSITY

IN an article "The Code Found in the Temple", (Vol. XXXIX, pp. 45—51) Professor Berry makes an attempt to discredit the view held by modern critics that the code found in the year 621 B. C. by the High Priest Hilkiah, was the *D* code. He goes further in his new discovery and argues that the code was, to our astonishment, *H*. The comparisons and inferences which he makes seem quite inadequate to establish the contention. For example, he argues that Dt. is based on Lev. because he finds many passages in Dt. which seem to him an expansion of those in Lev., rather than the originals of which the Lev. passages are a condensation. He seems to disregard the fact that the principal motives of *H* and *D* are entirely different in character, so that what is of vital importance for one is not so important for the other; this, in spite of the fact that in almost all instances in which he suggests that Dt. is expanded there is a different reason given for the observance than in *H*. This indicates that the author had something to impress more than the author of *H*, but not because he expanded it on the basis of *H*. But even if this argument were valid, why ignore the fact that there are numerous places where *H* is expanded and *D* is brief. The passages in which *H* may be regarded as expanded from *D* are the following:

Lev. 17 10—14

Lev. 17 15—16

Lev. 18 8 20 11

Dt. 12 16, 23—25 15 23

Dt. 14 21

Dt. 23 1

Lev. 19 33, 34	Dt. 10 17-18 <sup>1</sup>
Lev. 19 27-28, cf. 21 5, 6	Dt. 14 12
Lev. 19 31, 20 6 27	Dt. 18 11
Lev. 19 35-36	Dt. 25 13-15
Lev. 20 1-5	Dt. 18 10 12 31
Lev. 22 19-25	Dt. 17 1, cf. 15 21
Lev. 23 15-21	Dt. 16 9-11
Lev. 23 35-43	Dt. 16 13-15
Lev. 24 17-20, 21, 22	Dt. 19 21
Lev. 25 35-37	Dt. 23 20.

Turning to the arguments in favor of the *H* code drawn from a comparison with the account in II Kings 22—23, we may for the sake of clearness and accuracy quote Professor Berry's own words and then consider whether they prove his point or the contrary.

He writes: "The document found is called by the term 'book of the covenant' in II K. 22 2-3, 21. *D* is described as the 'words of the covenant' in Dt. 28 69 (English 29 1), and the term covenant appears elsewhere in *D*. References to a covenant, implying a description of the code *H* as a covenant, are found in Lev. 26 9, 15, 25, as well as in v. 42, 44, 45 which are perhaps a later addition." According to Professor Berry this description may apply to both codes, since we find in both the word "covenant". But when we find the term "words of the covenant" (it seems that the term "words" and "book" are used in Kings interchangeably) in the description in II K. 23 . which is the exact term found in Dt. 28 69, I think there is no doubt that *D* is meant and not *H*. Furthermore the passages in Lev. which mention the word "covenant" do not apply to the code as a covenant; they simply speak of an existing covenant between Jehovah and his people.

He goes on: "It is also called 'the book of the law', II K. 22 8, 11. This phrase is not found either in *D* or *H*, but it is a

<sup>1</sup> Although Professor Berry considers this passage to be an expansion of Lev., I find it to be an elaboration. Dt. deals only with stones used for weight, and the ephah for measure. But Lev. enters into more details. It specifies meteyard, weight and measure; and besides the ephah it names the hin.

natural descriptive term for either." Here he apparently excludes from *D*, 28 61 where the term "book of the law" is found, although it does not appear in Lev. He also ignores the fact that the document is called in II K. 23 24, "words of the law" (here again "book" and "words" are used interchangeably). The same term "words of the law" is found in Dt. 17 19 28 58, but not in Lev. It seems that all the descriptive terms are found in Dt., but not in Lev., and so favor *D* and not *H*.

He continues: "The consternation of King Josiah, II K. 22 11, and the reference to the words of the book as foreboding of disaster, II K. 22 16, show that the book contained threatenings, which are found in both codes. principally in Dt. 28 and Lev. 26. The specific threatening that 'this place', presumably the city Jerusalem, should be a desolation, II K. 22 19, is not found in *D* but is in Lev. 26 31-32." I have studied carefully the verses in Lev., but cannot detect the specific place, the city Jerusalem. Here are the verses: "And I will make your cities a waste, and will bring your sanctuaries into desolation, and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours. And I will bring the land into desolation; and your enemies that dwell therein shall be astonished at it." It is surely improbable that by "your cities", "your sanctuaries", and "I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours" Jerusalem is meant. But even so why state that such reference is not found in Dt? In Dt. 28 36 it says, "The Lord will bring thee and thy King whom thou shalt set over thee into a nation that thou hast not known"; is not the King in Jerusalem, and if so does not Dt. speak of a specific place? Also Dt. is definite in the element of threatening throughout chapter 28.

"Abolition of all forms of worship of other gods is narrated in II K. 23 4-6, 10-13 and is in accord with Dt. 17 3 12 2-3, and Lev. 17 7 19 3 26 1, 30." It is obvious here that the *D* code was the cause of the abolition, for II K. 23 4-6, 10-13, 14, 15 which tell the manner in which the abolition was executed, corresponds to the passages in Dt. but not to Lev. II K. 23 12 is in accord which the narrative in Dt. 9 21.

"The abolition of sodomites, II K. 23 7, is in accord with Dt. 23 17 (Hebrew 23 18) and Lev. 18 22 20 13." Here Professor

Berry disregards the fact that the terms קִדְשָׁה and קִדְשׁ used in Dt., and קִדְשִׁים used in Kings, do not correspond to the term used in Lev. "Kadesh is strictly a 'sacred Prostitute' — one dedicated to some deity."<sup>2</sup> As it is used in Kings, it clearly applies to a 'sacred prostitute', for it says: "And he broke down the homes of the 'Kedeshim', that were in the house of the Lord". This term is not found in Lev.

"Further it is generally agreed that part of II K. 23 8 should be read, 'And he brake down the high places of the satyrs'; the worship of satyrs is forbidden in Lev. 17 7 but not mentioned in *D*."

He reminds us of the fact that the worship of satyrs is not mentioned in *D* and so this does not correspond to the code found, but he fails to note that the worship of "Ashera", "Host of Heaven", "Sun", and "Moon" that are spoken of in Kings are found in *D* but not in *H*.

"Further II K. 23 9<sup>a</sup> says that the priests of the high places did not officiate at Jerusalem; this is directly contrary to the regulation of Dt. 18 6-7 which prescribes that they shall do so." It is clear that Kings speaks of the 'priest' and Dt. of the 'Levite'. Also that Dt. does not command the Levite to go to Jerusalem in order to officiate but only "if a Levite come" then he may officiate. So Kings does not say that the 'priest' could not officiate: it simply says "the priests of the high places come not up". There is no contradiction, and no reason here why *D* is not the code found. He ends: "The account in II Kings, therefore, favors the view that the code was *H* and not *D*." How far this bold statement is justified we have tried to indicate.

We may add a few points of the same general character, which tend to confirm the usual view.

II K. 23 3, referring to the code, King Josiah said "And to keep his testimonies" (עֲוֹתָיו); this phrase is found in Dt. 6 17, 20 and not found in Lev. II K. 23 3, 25, "with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might." This phrase is a favorite of Dt., it is repeatedly found, 6 5 10 12 11 13, 18 13 4, but is not found in Lev. II K. 22 19, "astonishment and a curse" (לְשִׁמְהָה)

<sup>2</sup> Driver, *Gu.* 38 21.

וְלִקְלָהּ); the same expression is found in Dt. 11 28 28 37, but not in Lev.

II K. 22 13 the consternation of the King about what he read in the document and his sending to “inquire of the Lord for me and for my people” (using the term ‘me’ and ‘people’ instead of the more natural term ‘us’, which he uses later at the end of the verse), suggest that he was familiar with Dt. 28 36, where it says: “The Lord will bring thee and thy King whom thou shalt put over thee, unto a nation that thou hast not known”. The reply of Hulda the prophetess that the King is expressly exempted from the doom of the unfaithful city also suggests the knowledge of the passage in Dt. 28 36.