

at that time dominant. The "book" is engraved on the tombstone, as symbolizing the appeal to the judgment of God, whether this takes the form merely of an intention to warn off intruders from violating the tomb, or contains the more serious and elevated thought that the judgment of God must be reckoned with and prepared for by all, and that this message and warning is preached at every death and on every grave.

W. M. RAMSAY.

JERUSALEM FROM REHOBOAM TO HEZEKIAH  
(continued).

3. JEHOSHAPHAT: *circa* 873-850.

IT is not easy to estimate the effects upon Jerusalem of the long reign of Jehoshaphat. Owing to the character of the traditions we must deal largely with inferences. Yet the general facts from which these have to be drawn are well attested. The long war between Israel and Judah had at last come to an end. Asa's efforts must have so far strengthened the latter as to render the house of Omri willing to enter an alliance. Had it been otherwise, so ambitious a dynasty, with increasing wealth and political influence, would hardly have consented to a relation in which there was probably more equality between the contracting parties than modern historians have perceived. Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab, was married to Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat<sup>1</sup>; and Jehoshaphat assisted both Ahab at Ramoth-Gilead and Ahab's son, Jehoram, against Moab.<sup>2</sup> It is true that on each of these occasions the king of Israel was the one who made the proposal, and that Jehoshaphat immediately and unreservedly complied. The terms in which he did so are,

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings viii, 18.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings xxii.; 2 Kings iii. 4 ff.

however, no stronger than the forms of Oriental politeness would demand from an ally. As leader of the smaller force Jehoshaphat took, of course, the second place in the expeditions. But when Ahab's second successor, Ahaziah, offered to share in the voyage down the Red Sea, Jehoshaphat was able to refuse him; and even on the campaigns against Aram and Moab he is said—by, be it observed, records which are not Judæan, but Israelite—to have shown a firm and independent temper. Before the battle of Ramoth-Gilead it was he who proposed to consult a prophet of Jahweh, and it was by his repeated urgency that the true prophet was at last found. On the Moabite campaign he showed a similar insistence, and this time the prophet, who was Elisha, consented to give an answer only for his sake. These facts prove religious insight and force of character. A Judæan record adds that Jehoshaphat completed the removal of the immoral elements in Judah's worship which Asa had begun.<sup>1</sup> He also maintained the supremacy of Judah over Edom, and used it not only for the land-trade which Edom commanded, but in order to launch a ship on the Red Sea.<sup>2</sup>

We may take these high qualities of Jehoshaphat as indicative of the morale of Judah and Jerusalem at this time. Whatever evil elements she had still to get rid of, the City possessed an amount of piety and energy which were preparing for her future. The Chronicler<sup>3</sup> indeed supplies an account of Jehoshaphat's reign according to which Jerusalem must already have become a place of great magnificence. His story has sometimes been regarded as an entire fabrication, both because of the number of soldiers

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings xxii. 46.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 47 ff. The text reconstructed after the LXX. and the Hebrew consonants reads thus: *And there was no king in Edom; the deputy of king Jehoshaphat made a ship of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold, but it went not, for the ship was broken in Ezion-Geber.* So Stade and others.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Chron. xvii.-xx.

described as waiting on the king<sup>1</sup> in Jerusalem—one million one hundred and sixty thousand in all—and because the organization attributed to Jehoshaphat has some features characteristic of the Jewish constitution after the Exile.<sup>2</sup> Yet there is evidence that the Chronicler has employed older sources<sup>3</sup>; it is hardly possible that the personal names he cites are inventions; and there is no sufficient motive to adduce for his assigning to Jehoshaphat so thorough an organization of religion and justice if that monarch had not achieved some results of the kind. Written law was certainly in existence, and those who attribute to this or a previous period the Book of the Covenant<sup>4</sup> naturally see in it the code which Jehoshaphat is said to have promulgated and organized. Whether this was so or not, we cannot be wrong in believing that under Jehoshaphat life and religion in Judah were inspired and regulated as they had not been before, certainly not since the days of Solomon. But every such achievement, however small, and even if followed as this was by a time of reaction, must have heightened the position of the City in the eyes of all Israel, and trained the more serious classes of her population in those ideals and habits which fitted her for her future career.

But the course of the purer faith was not yet clear. Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, was married to Athaliah, a daughter of Ahab, and introduced to Judah the idolatry favoured by his wife's family.<sup>5</sup> But the new gods did not help him. First Edom revolted, then Judah was invaded

<sup>1</sup> *Besides those whom the king put in the fenced cities* (Id. xvii. 13-19).

<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen, *Proleg.* 2nd ed. 198 f.

<sup>3</sup> xvii. 7-9 and xix. 4-11 are parallel and independent accounts of the establishment of the Law.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 235.

<sup>5</sup> It may have been in consequence of opposition to this that he found it necessary to slay all his brothers and other princes of Judah. 2 Chron. xxi. 1-7. In verse 4 for Israel read Judah.

by Philistines and Arabs,<sup>1</sup> Libnah fell away from Judah,<sup>2</sup> the king lost to the invaders his treasure, his wives and his sons save one,<sup>3</sup> and finally himself succumbed to an incurable disease.<sup>4</sup> These fatalities must have strengthened the party of the purer religion, and the impression would be confirmed when, after a reign of a year, Ahaziah, the next king, was slain along with Jehoram of Israel by Jehu, the fanatic destroyer of the worship of Baal.<sup>5</sup>

#### 4. ATHALIAH: *circa* 842-836.

In the Book of Kings we now encounter a series of more detailed narratives of the history of Judah, and as their stage is Jerusalem we recover that close and vivid view of the City which we have lost since the days of Solomon, but which henceforth is visible off and on for some centuries. These records, which are fragmentary,<sup>6</sup> may be supplemented from the narrative of the Chronicler, who drew from the same sources. The Chronicler has greatly altered the story in harmony with the conditions of his own time, but he has preserved some original data omitted by the compiler of Kings.<sup>7</sup>

Our increased materials commence by presenting us with the most perplexing event in the history of the dynasty of David. We encounter a great apparent paradox. At the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 16 f.      <sup>2</sup> 2 Kings viii. 22.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Chron. xxi. 17.    2 Kings x. 13 ff. describes the brethren of Ahaziah as slain by Jehu.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Chron. xxi. 18 f.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Kings ix. 27.

<sup>6</sup> Observe, for instance, in the narrative of the revolt against Athaliah, 2 Kings xi., how abruptly Jehoiada is introduced as if he had been already mentioned. Plainly the compiler is here employing only part of the documents at his disposal; see next note.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. the Chronicler in 2 Chron. xxiii. has substituted for the military guard by whom, according to Kings, Jehoiada effected the revolution against Athaliah, the priests and Levites; but he adds in its proper place what the editor of Kings has omitted of the original data, viz. who Jehoiada was: id. xxii. 11.

very time that the revolution in favour of the religion of Jahweh succeeds in Northern Israel, and the house of Ahab is extinguished by it; in Judah, on the contrary, we see a daughter of Ahab seize the throne, after the death of the king her son, slaughter (as she supposed) all the seed of David, and reign securely for a period of six years. How was this possible? How could Judah tolerate so long the one interregnum from which her dynasty suffered? Recent historians have called the fact a mystery, but we find at least partial answers to it in three features of the revolt which overthrew Athaliah, and which is described in detail by the sources.

In that revolt a decisive part is played by a body of foreign troops, called the Carians<sup>1</sup> whose presence is natural at the court of one who was really a Phœnician princess, and by whose aid doubtless she achieved her usurpation. Secondly, it is clear that during her reign Athaliah, whose name, be it remembered, implies a certain recognition of Jahweh, had left untouched His worship in the Temple. This may explain the temporary acquiescence of His adherents in the new régime. But, thirdly, the queen had probably on her side a strong native party. The policy of her house made for increased culture among their peoples. It not only favoured commerce, but, in opposition to the conservative elements of Hebrew society, as represented by the Rechabites, emphasized, in accordance with the characteristic Phœnician polity, the city as the chief factor in national life. Here were sufficient temptations to form a strong Athalian party in Jerusalem. One

<sup>1</sup> Kari, 2 Kings xi. 4. In the consonantal text of 2 Samuel xx. 23 the same name is used for David's bodyguard, but is corrected by the Massorettes to Kerethi. It has been proposed by some modern scholars to make the same correction in 2 Kings xi. 4, but it is more probable that here it is really Carians who are meant: "a famous mercenary people in antiquity" whom "it would not surprise us to find at Jerusalem in the days of Athaliah" (G. F. Moore, *Encycl. Bibl.*).

of the most remarkable features of the subsequent history is the ease with which Jerusalem produced parties in favour of foreign influences. These not only meant a wider and a freer life, but were especially favourable to the enhancement of the City at the expense of the country. Just as a strong Greek faction existed in Jerusalem in Maccabean times, and was enthusiastic for Greek fashions which led to the embellishment of the City and the exhilaration of her life ; so it is natural that among the Jews of Athaliah's time there should be a Canaanite or Phœnician faction inspired by similar motives. The story of the revolution indicates that Jehoiada feared opposition from the City, and relied upon *the people of the land*.

But above all there was the personality of the queen herself. Athaliah was the only woman who ever reigned in Jerusalem till the accession of the widow of Alexander Jannæus in the first century before Christ. It is noteworthy that the Phœnician race produced about her time several strong women : Jezebel, Athaliah, Dido. The attractions of the culture and the worship, which she represented, the support she derived from foreign troops, and the security which she temporarily enjoyed from rebellion through her tolerance of the native religion, could not have existed in so effective a combination without her own strong capacity for organizing. In themselves, therefore, her usurpation and reign are perfectly explicable. The one mystery is why Jehu, in alliance as he was with movements like that of the Rechabites, which had a strong hold on Judah, did not interfere with her. Perhaps he was from the first too much engrossed by the attacks of the Arameans.

In the revolution against Athaliah, we have the first of those many outbreaks, mixed of priests, soldiers and people, which have the Temple courts for their stage, and so often

recur in the history of Jerusalem. The revolt was carefully arranged, but the disorder of the text which describes it disables us from following the exact details.<sup>1</sup> The main features, however, are clear. The author of the movement was Jehoiada the priest, who held hid in the Temple the six-year-old Joash, saved by Jehoiada's wife from the massacre of the rest of Ahaziah's children. Jehoiada's plan was to bring forward in the Temple this sole survivor of David's house, to have him crowned King, and then to put Athaliah to death. The time he chose for this was the Sabbath, and the instruments the soldiery: the Carians and other guards, who kept both the Palace and the Temple. He secured their Centurions, and arranged with these the details of action. Here it is that obscurity falls on the story, the text being uncertain, because hovering between a statement of the usual routine of the guard and directions for their procedure at the crisis. Wellhausen elides verse 6 as a gloss, and explains the rest as follows. He infers that on week days two divisions of the guard were at the Palace and one in the Temple; but that on the Sabbath two were in the Temple and one at the Palace. Jehoiada planned to bring out Joash at that hour on the Sabbath, at which the two divisions who had *come out* from their quarters in the Palace were relieving at the Temple the one about to *go in*, and indeed verse 9 says that the Centurions brought to Jehoiada for the crisis *each his men, those coming in on the Sabbath with those going out on the Sabbath*. This implies that the Palace, where Athaliah was, was for the time divested of the whole guard. The explanation is at first sight plausible and has been accepted by recent writers. But it is hardly credible that in the ordinary routine of the guard all the force should thus be periodically withdrawn from the palace, which, it must be remembered, was in those days still the principal object of their duty. And although the

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xi. 4 ff.

text is difficult, it seems to imply, in verse 7, that Jehoiada directed only two of the bands—defined as *all who come out on Sabbath and keep the watch of the house of Jahweh for the king*—to surround the young king (verse 8). The remaining third has already been assigned by verse 5 to guard the palace.<sup>1</sup> It is true that verse 9 states that the Centurions brought to Jehoiada both the men who turned into quarters on the Sabbath and the men who turned out. But, as we see from the LXX., the text of this verse is uncertain. In our ignorance of the custom of the guard as well as of the stations assigned to them<sup>2</sup> we must leave the matter undecided.

In the story of how the conspirators achieved their end Stade has seen the fusion of two differing accounts,<sup>3</sup> one of which, 4–12, 18*b*–20, reads the event as wholly political, achieved by Jehoiada and the royal guards; while the second, 13–18*a*, gives it a religious character, brings into it *the people of the land*, and adds Athaliah's dramatic appearance in the Temple, which the first ignores. Stade's analysis has been accepted by most recent writers,<sup>4</sup> but it seems to me very doubtful. To us it is easy to separate the political from the religious, but what writer of these times would think of doing so? Surely not one who, on Stade's own showing, has described the chief priest as the prime conspirator. Why, again, was the Sabbath chosen for the revolt if not with regard to religion and the people?<sup>5</sup> Besides, the supposed second narrative testifies in verse 15 to the soldiers' share in the transaction, and the first, in verse 19, to the association of the people of the land with the priests and the military.<sup>6</sup> There remain the two state-

<sup>1</sup> So the LXX.

<sup>2</sup> See below.

<sup>3</sup> ZATW, v. 279 ff.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Kittel, Benzinger and Skinner.

<sup>5</sup> Except on what we have shown above to be the unlikely assumption that *all* the guard was on that day assembled at one time in the Temple.

<sup>6</sup> The hypothesis of a double account takes these clauses to be harmonising insertions.



ments of Athaliah's death, in 16 and 20; but they agree as to where and how this took place; and it would be very arbitrary to suppose that the annalist, not distinguished for his style, could not have thus repeated himself. The story may therefore be regarded as a unity, and the conspiracy as one that was what such a conspiracy in favour of the house of David against Athaliah could not but be: that is, at once political and religious. The movement started with the priest, and naturally he took care to arrange for the support of the soldiers; but he was evidently sure of the people of the land, and probably he chose the Sabbath for his action in order to secure their presence in large numbers. In verse 19 it is said that *the people of the land rejoiced, and the City*—observe how it is distinguished from them—*was quiet*. We see, therefore, that it was against the mixed population of Jerusalem, favourable (for reasons given above) to Athaliah and her worship, that Jehoiada took his precautions. These were successful; the City did not rise. The opposition between the City and the Country at this stage of the history is exceedingly interesting.

As to the topographical details of the narrative, we only learn that the passage of the king between the Temple and the Palace was made by a gate called the Gate of the Foot-Guards.<sup>1</sup> There was probably also a horse-gate, whose name may be disguised in the *Gate of Sur*<sup>2</sup>; but this was not necessarily the same as *the entry of the horses* through which Athaliah sought to escape. This is the earliest proof we have met with of horses being established in Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup>

##### 5. JOASH circa 836–797.

The story of the Temple revolt is succeeded by one of its

<sup>1</sup> רָצוּם.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 6: שַׁעַר סוּר, for which the LXX. gives πύλη τῶν ὀδῶν, and 2 Chron. xxiii. 5 שַׁעַר הַיְסוּד, *gate of the foundation*. For סוּר has been suggested.

<sup>3</sup> See EXPOSITOR, 1905, pp. 97 f.

administration and repair. The succession of records, which have the Temple for their scene or subject, raises a question that will be better dealt with when we have examined this new addition to them.

Joash was brought up by Jehoiada the priest, and at least so long as the latter survived the king remained loyal to the purer religion.<sup>1</sup> The sanctuary of Baal was destroyed, and the only qualification which the Deuteronomic editor makes in his praise of the new régime is the one usual with him at this date: *the high places were not removed*, or, in other words, the worship of Jahweh was not yet confined to the Temple.<sup>2</sup> The growing importance of the latter, however, its increasing command of the popular regard and consequently of the people's contributions, is well illustrated by the story just alluded to. By this time Solomon's buildings were at least a century old and dilapidated.<sup>3</sup> Orders were given by the young king to the priests to make the necessary repairs from their revenues. Besides offerings in kind, these revenues included three classes of payment in the money of the period, which was, of course, not coined money but weights of metal attested by the king's stamp.<sup>4</sup> There were, first, assessments for religious purposes on individuals; second, freewill offerings; and third, quit-moneys, *sin* and *guilt moneys*—names which probably cover omissions in ritual as well as moral faults.<sup>5</sup> Joash ordered that the first two of these classes of revenue should be devoted to the repairs<sup>6</sup>; and directed

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xii. 2; the Hebrew text is ambiguous; the LXX., *all the days in which Jehoiada the priest instructed him*, is more explicit in its limitation.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Kings xii. 1-4.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Chron. xxiv. 7 imputes the dilapidations to *Athaliah the malefactor and her sons* (LXX. ? priests).

<sup>4</sup> 2 Sam. xiv. 26.

<sup>5</sup> The atonement for these in the Levitical legislation was by sacrifices. In the above list nothing is said of payments to the priests for their delivery of the Toróth; cf. Micah iii. 11.

<sup>6</sup> 2 Kings xii. 5 (Engl. 4) must be amended to read thus: *And Joash said*

the priests to see to this individually—each from his own transactions, takings or possessions (? the word occurs only here and is uncertain <sup>1</sup>). Such a direction implies at least the beginnings of those individual and hereditary rights in the Temple revenues which we know to have existed in other sanctuaries of the time.<sup>2</sup>

But the arrangement failed. By the twenty-third year of the king the priests had not repaired the dilapidations. Joash therefore arranged, with their consent, that they should resign their income from the two sources above-mentioned and give it to others to do the work. Jehoiada set a box with a hole in the lid on the right of the entrance to the Temple,<sup>3</sup> and in it the priests of the threshold put *all the money* that came into the Temple. At intervals, when the box was full, the king's scribe came up from the Palace, weighed the money, and gave it to those in charge of the Temple business, who paid it out to the workmen in wages and for the purchase of materials. The money was confined to repairing the dilapidations; none of it was used

*to the priests, All the money of the hallowed things that is brought into the house of Jahweh: the money that every man is rated at* (read with LXX. כֶּסֶף כָּכָר וְכֶסֶף אִישׁ אִישׁ, and omit the next clause, כֶּסֶף גְּבֻשׁוֹת יִצְרָכוּ as a gloss referring to Lev. xxvii. 2 ff.) *and all the money which comes into any man's heart to bring into the house of Jahweh.*

<sup>1</sup> כָּכָר (v. 6. Engl. v. 5). Following the Targum, the Engl. versions render this *from his acquaintance*, taking the word מִכָּר from the root כָּר. But the word may be as naturally derived from נָכַר, to *exchange, give over or sell*, and is so taken by the LXX., ἀπὸ τῆς πρᾶξεως αὐτοῦ. Cf. the Assyrian makkeru (the same form as the Hebrew, with, the doubled middle radical) rendered by Delitzsch (*Assyr. Handwörterbuch*) "property," "possessions." It is not improbable that the Hebrew had the same general sense; yet it may rather mean *transactions*. *Encyc. Bibl.* col. 3,843 suggests "customers."

<sup>2</sup> For Babylonia compare Johns, *Babyl. and Assyr. Laws, Contracts and Letters* (1904), p. 215.

<sup>3</sup> The Hebrew of 2 Kings xii. 10 states that the box was set *beside the altar on the right as a man comes into the house of Jahweh*. But the altar lay in the middle of the court; and 2 Chron. xxiv. 8, omitting mention of it, says only that they set the box *outside the Temple gate*. . . . Stade, following LXX. A, reads for הַמִּצְבֵּה, הַמַּשְׁבֵּה, *the maššebah*; Klostermann הַמִּצְבֵּה הַיְמָנִית, *beside the right doorpost*. If Robertson Smith's argu-

to provide vessels or ornaments for the House.<sup>1</sup> The priests were allowed to retain the sin and guilt moneys.

The story is instructive. The Temple is still a royal sanctuary, and the king has the disposal of its revenues, with the consent of the priests, whose interests are forming but not yet fully vested. The annalist does not conceal the negligence of the priests, as the Chronicler does, who confines to the Levites the blame of not carrying out the repairs. The superior honesty of the lay administrators is emphasized. With the king's hold upon the revenues we may take the fact mentioned further on, that when Hazael of Aram threatened Jerusalem with the forces which had swept across Northern Israel and taken Gath, Joash bought him off with the gifts which he and his predecessors had consecrated to the Temple, as well as with the treasures of the Temple and the palace.<sup>2</sup> These last included, of course, the king's own accumulations of precious metals, partly deposited in the sanctuary for security. But if we may judge from the analogy of other ancient temples, they also comprised the Temple funds, and deposits by private persons. Sanctuaries in those days were banks, and as other monarchs, when they drew upon such stores, either afterwards replaced them or gave an equivalent in land, Joash would doubtless do the same. This is the third instance of the spoliation of the Temple to buy off an invader or bribe an ally.<sup>3</sup>

We can now discuss the question raised by these detailed narratives which have the Temple for their subject or for their scene. Are we to consider them as borrowed from a work which was exclusively a history of the Temple? Or do they belong to the general annals of Judah? The former hypothesis, first advanced by Wellhausen, is much favoured  
ment be admitted, that the pillars, Jachin and Boaz, were originally altars (*Rel. of the Semites*, Add. Note L) this might be the solution.

<sup>1</sup> Verses 13 f. The Chronicler reports differently.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Kings xii. 17, 18.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Kings xiv. 26, xv. 18.

at present. Struck by the features which the story of Joash's repair of the Temple and that of Josiah's (ch. xxii., xxiii.) possess in common, Wellhausen<sup>1</sup> proposed to assign them to a pre-Deuteronomic history of the Temple and to trace to the same source the narratives of the Temple revolt against Athaliah and of the rearrangement of the altars by Ahaz<sup>2</sup>; as well as the account of the building of the Temple and the records of its spoliation.<sup>3</sup> Yet in a work written in the interests of the Temple we should hardly have expected to find the subordination of the priests to the king and their gross negligence so explicitly set forth as we have seen them to be in a section of the supposed book which deals with the Temple only; while in others of the alleged extracts the events treated—the Temple building, the crowning of Joash, and the murder of Athaliah, the finding of the law-book, and the successive borrowings from the Temple treasures—have not to do with the Temple alone, but are of the most general political interest.<sup>4</sup> We may therefore consider as insufficient the argument for the existence of a special history of the Temple, and as more probable the hypothesis that these detailed narratives were drawn by the editor of the Book of Kings from the national annals of Judah. But if that be so, we have to infer the rapid growth of the importance of Solomon's Temple. Of this growth the records provide us with the most natural explanations. We see from them that the prominence of the Temple is not the exaggeration of a priestly narrator, but the solid result of causes which may be illustrated from the history of other sanctuaries in the Semitic world. For, first, the Temple in Jerusalem was

<sup>1</sup> 4th ed. of Bleek's *Einleitung*.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Kings xi., xvi.

<sup>3</sup> So also Kittel, Cornill, Benzinger.

<sup>4</sup> Since the above was written I find that Professor Skinner has much the same criticism against Wellhausen's theory, *Century Bible, Kings*, p. 343.

the king's; strongly situated in the closest proximity to the palace and the garrison, which rendered it a natural centre for political movements. The stability of the Davidic dynasty ensured for its priesthood a sense of security and the opportunity to form traditions and rights which cannot have been enjoyed by the priests of any of the sanctuaries in Northern Israel. But, secondly, the Temple, besides being the royal sanctuary, had won considerable command of the national life outside Jerusalem. *The people of the land* came up to it, and the priests could count on their adherence.<sup>1</sup> Thirdly, the Temple was growing in material wealth. Its treasures were accumulating, and when these were taken from it to meet some national emergency they seem to have been quickly restored. To other Temples, kings repaid their forced loans by gifts of lands or new treasure, and that this happened also in the case of the Judæan Temple appears from the fact that there were always funds in it when they were required. But, above even these royal and popular opportunities, with all the training and influence in affairs which they provided, the Temple priesthood enjoyed the inspiration and the credit of the purer religion of which they were the guardians. Everything points to the fact that in politics, as in religion, they played a part similar to that of the prophets of Northern Israel. It is certainly to them that we owe the legal code and most of the other literature of the period.<sup>2</sup>

We see then that the Deuteronomic exaltation of Jerusalem was no sudden or artificial achievement, but the result of a slow growth which took centuries for its consummation, and was due to a multitude of processes, political and religious, of which indeed we have only seen the beginnings.

The Chronicler states that after Jehoiada died Joash,

<sup>1</sup> See above on the revolt against Athaliah.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 295.

enticed by the princes of Judah, forsook the house of Jahweh and worshipped Asherim and idols.<sup>1</sup> Prophets were raised up to testify against him, and one of these he ordered to be stoned in the Temple. With this crime the Chronicler connects the invasion of Hazael, emphasizing the divine justice of the penalty by recording that Hazael's army was a small one compared with [the great host of Judah,<sup>2</sup> and that it destroyed the princes of the land.<sup>3</sup> The Chronicler adds that the same crime caused a conspiracy against Joash, who, overcome by disease, was slain on his bed. The Hebrew text of Kings says that the conspirators *smote Joash in the house of Millo that goes down to Silla*. As it stands this gives little sense, and the versions testify to so early a corruption of the text that it is perhaps vain to attempt to restore it.<sup>4</sup>

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Chron. xxiv. 15 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Deuteronomy xxxii. 30.

<sup>3</sup> The Chronicler cannot have invented the story (so also Benzinger).

<sup>4</sup> The readiest emendation is suggested by Lucian's version: *at the house of Millo which is on the descent* (of Silla); and Silla may be taken as a *street* or *way* (so Thenius, as if = מִלּוֹ); cf. Assy. sul(l)u. But other Greek versions found no word in the text for *the descent*, and read Silla with an initial Ayin instead of a Samekh, or even as Galaad; cf. Winckler, *Gesch.* i. 178, who places the assassination in Gilead; but this is improbable.