

VI

THE CHRONICLER AND DEUTERONOMY

IT has long been recognized that the books of Chronicles show their author to have been acquainted with and strongly influenced by the book of Deuteronomy. Von Rad has collated one side of the evidence with such care that it is sufficient to refer a student to his book.¹ He has pointed out that terms which are common in, and even peculiar to, the earlier work reappear in the later, and that, especially in hortatory passages, the writer reproduced the familiar cadences and formulae of his predecessor. Yet it must be added that, so long as the evidence is confined to similarities of expression and taken from hortatory material, it does not reach very far, for it does not involve agreement with or dependence on the legislation which is peculiar to the Deuteronomic Code. Deuteronomy contains much more than a corpus of legislation: its law is framed in a series of expository, homiletic, and historical passages which introduce and conclude the statutes. This material, which contains, among much else that is valuable, one of the great utterances of Jewish religion, the Shema', was excellently adapted to serve the purpose of a book of devotion. Indeed, this feature of the book may explain why it was preserved in its entirety in the Jewish Canon, long after its peculiar law had passed into desuetude and had given place to the final post-exilic law. Men could continue to use those devout and moving chapters, as both Jews and Christians can and do use them to this day. If a further proof were needed of the esteem in which those parts of the book were held, it might be found in the fact that they were not left in their original condition, but received additions from time to time, which show later writers using their contents for

¹ *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes.*

the guidance of their own generation.¹ Men do not annotate and add to a volume which has already passed into oblivion; they only pay such tribute to material which has proved itself too useful to be forgotten. Because the Chronicler did not so much teach history as teach religion through history, he was the more likely to be influenced by Deuteronomy, for the book supplied to him what it can still supply to reverent students.

The relation of the Chronicler to Deuteronomy will, however, be very different in character, if it can be proved that the resemblances between the two books are not confined to the hortatory passages, but extend to matters of history and legislation. What follows will deal only with that subject, and before entering on certain larger considerations it may be well to group together a few minor points which fall under the same heading.

When Jehoshaphat had to meet an invasion from Ammon, Edom, and Moab he went up to the temple in the presence of the congregation and offered prayer, II. 20: 1 ff. In his prayer he referred to the fact that Yahweh had not permitted Israel at the conquest of Palestine to attack these three tribes, v. 10. This view of the situation appears in an itinerary which was incorporated in Numbers and which derived from E: it is also found in the historical introduction to the book of Deuteronomy, c. 2.² C was therefore familiar with the tradition which formed the basis of that narrative. Again, when C related David's victory over the Philistines at the beginning of his reign, he told how the king captured the gods of the enemy, I. 14: 8-17. But while the author of Samuel was content to say that the victor carried off these gods, C was careful to add that David gave commandment, and they were burned with fire, v. 12. When he did this, he made the king follow the Deuteronomic law in 7: 5, 25.

¹ For the proof of the composite character of these chapters, cf. my *Deuteronomy: the Frame-work to the Code*, passim.

² Cf. my *Deuteronomy: the Framework to the Code*, pp. 168 ff.

A larger question appears in the attitude taken by the two sources on the levites and their position. It has already been noted that C introduced levites as early as the period of David. From that time they are prominent in his narrative, according to which their activity was not confined to their religious duties, but extended to other spheres of the national life. Here, again, proof has been offered that the men were not subordinate to the priests in the exercise of any of these functions. The historian, further, wrote of them as having fulfilled their directly religious duties in both kingdoms until the schism under Jeroboam, and as having been possessed of rights in the kingdom of Israel.

It is important to contrast the prominence here given to this clerical order with the position assigned to them in the historical books. The first mention of levites occurs in the appendix to the book of Judges, where we hear of a levite having come north from Judah, and having been installed by Micah as his family priest. So highly were his services valued that members of the tribe of Dan, on their way to a new settlement, tempted him away to become priest at their clan-sanctuary, Judges c. 17 f.¹ After that the levites disappear from the early historical literature: the books of Samuel and Kings ignore them,² and leave the impression that the only servants of the cult were the priests, except that they mention door-keepers at the temple. As soon, however, as we turn to the book of Ezra, the situation is suddenly and unaccountably changed. The levites not only reappear, but they do so in a new character: they are no longer the sporadic wanderers of the book of Judges, but a clearly defined order who held an equally clearly defined position in the temple-worship. Their status was sharply distinguished from and made strictly subordinate to that of the priests. There is a hiatus here in the history of the priesthood, which obviously demands an explanation. The gap is

¹ I omit mention of the mysterious levite cc. 19 f., because nothing is told us about the man's origin, status, or functions.

² They appear once, 1 Sam. 6: 15.

wider when it is recognized that, according to the received opinion, the books of Chronicles were not yet in existence.

When now we turn from the historical books to those which contain the law, there is no difficulty in recognizing the legislation which agrees with the book of Ezra on this subject. The laws about the priesthood which appear in Exodus and Numbers ascribe to Moses the institution of the two orders in the cult of the tabernacle, and derive from his authority the subordination of the levites to the priests. So strong is their attitude on the question of the hierarchy that there are incorporated among them the accounts of two miracles, one of which vindicated the supremacy of the sons of Aaron, while the other related the doom which destroyed certain levites who dared to claim equality with the priesthood. On the other hand the Deuteronomic Code never called the priests the sons of Aaron and never referred to a hierarchy among the cult-officials. The absence from the Code of these two features which are prominent in the book of Ezra and the late law is the more noteworthy because they both appear in the late chapters of Deuteronomy, where it can be proved on other grounds that they have been introduced by a later hand. Instead of making the levite subordinate to the priest the Code used the two terms indifferently. Indeed, its characteristic phrase for describing the cult-officials was that of levitical priests, the meaning of which can only be that there were priests in the country who could not claim levitical descent. The law-givers refused to allow priests who could not claim descent from Levi, not priests who could not claim descent from Aaron, to serve at the sanctuary altars. For it forbade the faithful to resort to any sanctuary which was not served by these men, and it permitted any levite who came with all desire of his soul to become a ministrant at the altar.

This brief synopsis of the situation is sufficient to bring into relief the similarity between C and the Deuteronomic Code, which is the more noteworthy because, in the features

which reveal their similarity, they both differ from the book of Ezra and the legislation in Exodus and Numbers. Neither of them called the priesthood the sons of Aaron, and neither spoke of a hierarchical order among the clergy. Both of them gave a high place, not only in the cult but in the more secular service of the community, to the levites. They differ, however, in two interesting particulars. The law-givers used the terms, priest and levite, indifferently, as though they were not conscious of any distinction: C, on the other hand, recognized both priests and levites as servitors in the temple. Again, the law-givers were conscious of the existence of priests who could not claim levitical descent, and found it necessary to warn the faithful against any recognition of them: there is no trace in C of such a distinction or of a similar danger.

The Chronicler made a sporadic use of the term, levitical priests.¹ The description is confined to him, to the Deuteronomic Code, and to Ezek. 44: 15. Its use in Ezekiel is peculiar, for he has defined the men as the sons of Zadok, and has continued by a statement of their functions, which the later law committed to the wider order of the sons of Aaron. He also gave a reason for the trust the men received: they kept the charge of My sanctuary, when *b'ne Yisrael* went astray from Me. In an earlier verse, v. 10, he declared the levites to have been involved in and largely responsible for this apostasy of Israel. Thus he drew a definite contrast between the levitical priests and the general levites, and agreed with the Deuteronomic Code in using the former expression for the legitimate order. He entirely departed from the Code—and from every one else—by making these

¹ How often he used it is uncertain. Evidently the later copyists were not very exact here, and were inclined to insert a *waw*, and so turned the expression into the more familiar: priests and levites. Instances appear where the M.T. reads levitical priests, while the LXX renders priests and levites: in other cases the exact opposite occurs; once or twice M.T. and LXX have levitical priests. The evidence is sufficient to prove that C employed the phrase, but is too uncertain to show that he attached a special sense to it.

legitimate priests a sept of the Aaronic order. C, on the other hand, followed the Code in the use of the term, and, so far as our evidence goes, applied it to the whole body of the levites.

Thus the attitude of the Chronicler on the subject of the composition of the levitical order and of their status relatively to the priests is not precisely the same as that of the Deuteronomic Code or of the book of Ezra. He occupies a middle position between the two. He distinguished between the two orders, and could speak of priests and levites when he wrote about the temple-cult, a distinction which is still unrecognized in the Code. He used the term, levitical priests, with a slightly different nuance from that which the words bear in the same document. But these distinctions, while they are interesting, are of less importance than those which mark off the law-givers and the historian from the author of Ezra. To confine the priesthood to one clan of the tribe of Levi and to constitute them into a privileged class stand in a different category. How revolutionary these changes were and how novel they once appeared can be gathered from the records of the two miracles by which, according to the late law-givers, they were enforced. To set this arrangement of the temple-officials under the authority of Moses and to safeguard it by relating the divine intervention to maintain it was to declare it the immutable law for Israel. Because it became the final use in the temple, the two documents which ignored it must have been written before it was adopted: and the writers of these two documents were nearer to one another in outlook and attitude than they were to those who followed them.

The question of the status of the levites is closely allied to that of the functions which were assigned to them. Instead of entering into a general discussion which might travel over trodden ground, it is only necessary to concentrate on two passages, both of which occur in the account of Hezekiah's reform. Reference has already been made to both

in the earlier discussion, and attention has been directed to their departure from the terms of the later law.¹ Here it is necessary to point out their agreement with the book of Deuteronomy. In his exhortation to the levites, after he had committed to them the task of purifying the temple, Hezekiah concluded by saying: my sons, be not now negligent, for the Lord hath chosen you to stand before Him, to minister unto Him and that ye should be His ministers and burn incense, II. 29: 11. Except for the mention of burning incense, the functions of the levites are described in similar terms in the Code. In a regulation which dealt with the dues of the levitical priests the law-givers concluded with the statement: for the Lord thy God hath chosen him (i.e. Levi) out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons for ever, 18: 5. Again, after the celebration of passover and the festival of unleavened bread the levitical priests, or the priests and the levites, arose and blessed the people, II. 30: 27. This finds a parallel in one of the early hortatory passages in Deuteronomy: at that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto Him, and to bless in His name unto this day, 10: 8. The divergence between the functions committed to the levites here and in the later law is even more marked in the case of Deuteronomy than in that of the Chronicler. For the hortatory passage is put into the mouth of Moses, and the Code is said to have been delivered to Israel by Moses before the entry into Palestine. But here again Deuteronomy and C combine to occupy a position about the functions of the levites which does not agree with that of the later law, as they did in relation to the status of the same order. Here also such an attitude on the question points to the two documents having been written before that law was issued.

A peculiar feature of Deuteronomy is the interest its law-givers showed in bringing the distinctive law of Israel to the

¹ Cf. pp. 103 ff and 112.

knowledge of the members of the nation. Children were to receive instruction in the meaning of the rituals they witnessed. In order that the parents might be able to fulfil that duty the parents must themselves know the terms of the law they were to teach. Therefore the fundamental demands were to be inscribed on great stones at the first crossing of Jordan; others were cast into the form of a commination and read in the hearing of the people; at the end of every seven years, when the whole community had come together at the feast of booths, the law was to be read in their hearing. The men who were made responsible for reading the law were the levites, Deut. 27: 11-26, 31: 9-13. As Deuteronomy stands alone among the codes of law in providing for this necessity in the national life, so Chronicles differs from the other historical books in relating an effort which was made to meet the need. According to C, Jehoshaphat instituted a commission, the business of which was to teach the law in the towns of Judah, II. 17: 7-9, and this was largely composed of levites.

As these two sources displayed an interest in making known to the people the law which ought to govern their conduct, they were equally interested in the means of guaranteeing the enforcement of the law throughout the land. Deuteronomy commanded the institution of judges and officers 'in all thy gates', 16: 18-20: C credited Jehoshaphat with having instituted a court of first instance in all the provincial towns of Judah, II. 19: 5 ff. The instructions which the king gave to his new officers required them to consider their conduct, for they judged not for man, but for the Lord: the fear of the Lord must be before them and the recognition that there was no iniquity with Him, nor respect of persons nor taking of gifts. The language is closely parallel to that in the Code, where the judges shall not wrest judgement, nor respect persons, nor take a gift. C added that Jehoshaphat set up a court of final instance in the capital, and when he described the questions which might come before that tribunal in v. 10, he used terms which are again

paralleled in Deut. 17: 8 f., where there is mention of a similar court. There is, however, a divergence in the description of the two courts which deserves attention, because it throws light on the relation between C and the Code, and even on the vexed question of the date and origin of Deuteronomy. When C described Jehoshaphat's action in the matter he made his meaning unmistakable. The seat of the court was at Jerusalem, its composition was defined, and its sphere or competence was also marked off. It decided all cases which arose in the capital and so far was on the same level as the other courts in the provincial towns: but it also acted as a court of final instance, since it had power to decide on any cases which were appealed to it from the local courts. The terms of Deut. 17: 8-13, on the other hand, are much more vague. If any difficult case arose which concerned matters of controversy 'within thy gates', men were instructed to have recourse to 'the sanctuary which the Lord thy God shall choose', where they could be sure of finding 'the levitical priests and the judges who shall be in those days'. They must accept the decision which was there issued to them: and from the emphasis which is laid on their acquiescing in the decision it is evident that one aim in the legislation was to put an end to those bitter quarrels which can poison the life of a village. When this regulation is compared with the action ascribed to Jehoshaphat, two features appear which reveal a difference in the situation described. The Code did not speak of a central court and said nothing about Jerusalem. It bade men in a local community, between whom a controversy had arisen which they could not determine for themselves, carry the question to a sanctuary where there was a competent judicatory; and ordered them to accept the decision. But since the sanctuary which the Lord shall choose *may* not mean the temple, and since there is no mention of the revision of a previous decision, this does not imply the institution of a court of final instance. The action which C ascribed to Jehoshaphat developed and completed the legislation in the

Code, since it provided a court which was competent to unify the administration of justice in Israel. But while C referred the movement to a king of Judah and made it concern itself with Judah alone, he dissociated it from all connexion with Josiah's reform. It had nothing directly to do with the centralization of worship.¹

Where the influence of Deuteronomy on C appears most clearly is in the double account of the celebration of passover at Jerusalem under Hezekiah and under Josiah. It is necessary to draw attention to certain features of these two passages.

In the discussion of Hezekiah's reform it has been pointed out that this is the earliest *historical* record of the change in locus for passover from the homes of the people to the sanctuary. It has also been noted that, by ascribing the change to Hezekiah, C did not conceive it to have been the outcome of the discovery of the book of the law in the time of Josiah. But one must go further and say that, instead of basing this alteration in one of the leading rites of the nation on that

¹ The orthodox view of this law in Deuteronomy sees in it evidence of the revision to which the Code was subjected in order to adapt it to the new conditions which followed the centralization of worship under Josiah. Two grave difficulties attend this explanation. The author of the passage in Chronicles who described the institution of a central court of justice at Jerusalem had no difficulty in making his meaning clear. On the other hand the men who revised the passage in Deuteronomy with the intention of describing the same court left its locus uncertain and said nothing about revising the decisions of the inferior courts. Yet it might have been expected that men who were revising an original document would be clear in the terms they used. Again, it is not easy to see why the centralization of sacrificial worship brought with it the institution of a court of the type which is described by the Chronicler. If the business which came before that court had been of a purely ecclesiastical character the connexion might have been understood. But both in Deuteronomy and Chronicles the cases dealt with were not confined to those of a religious character. Accordingly, as the court was required to deal with secular affairs, members of the laity were joined with representatives of the priesthood in deciding them, the judge in the one case, lay members in the other.

or on any other law book, the historian ascribed its adoption in Judah to the decision of the king. Hezekiah issued the letters of invitation to the remanent Israelites. When it became evident that a postponement of the ceremony into the second month was advisable it was again the king with the support of the princes and the congregation, who decided on the further change. When, again, some of the Israelites incurred guilt through their want of the necessary ceremonial cleanness it was Hezekiah who interceded on their behalf. Throughout the movement which changed the locus of passover the king was the dominant figure. Further, when he took this step, Hezekiah acted without precedent. In other cases, when C described the conduct of the reforming kings, he stated that the men restored the conditions which had prevailed in the temple under David. In this case he did not, for the simple reason that, according to his view of the situation, he could not. After his description of the passover under Josiah he stated that there was no passover like to it kept in Israel since the days of Samuel the prophet, neither did any of the kings of Israel keep such a passover as Josiah kept, II. 35: 18. The change of locus for passover to the sanctuary was first effected in Judah by Hezekiah on his own authority.

This gives significance to two suggestive hints as to the way in which the proposed change was received in the kingdom. One reason which is given for the postponement of the ceremony into the second month is that the priests had not sanctified themselves in sufficient numbers, II. 30: 3. Their co-operation became necessary, as soon as what had hitherto been a family rite was celebrated at the sanctuary. The statement is made in order to explain why the ceremony was postponed from its age-long date, and is combined with another reason. It need not therefore involve any censure on the priests, but may merely imply a hesitation on their part to adopt the proposed change of locus, especially since it emanated from no other authority than that of the king. It was natural that men who were responsible for the

conduct of the cult, were not ready to accept so profound a change, and even hesitated in view of the new duties and responsibilities which it put upon their shoulders. In contrast with the unreadiness of the priests, C set down with a certain satisfaction that no opposition to the change appeared on the part of the laity, for the thing was right in the eyes of the king and of all the congregation, v. 4. Whatever their religious leaders may have thought or done, the worshippers in Judah offered no opposition to the royal enactments. The two statements on the attitude of priests and people, which are introduced together, show that the community were conscious of the novel character of the royal decree.

In the discussion of Hezekiah's reform it has also been pointed out that the leading feature of C's account of the passover is the desire Hezekiah showed that the remanent Israelites should share in the ceremony. The question at once arises how the king of Judah could ever have expected these men to come to any sanctuary for this particular rite. Had he invited the men to join their brethren in the festival of unleavened bread his action would have been explicable and even natural. For *mazzoth* was one of the three festivals at which every faithful Israelite was expected to resort to a sanctuary. The Judean king would then have offered the remanent Israelites the opportunity of taking part in one of those ancestral rites, which had been denied to them from the time when the Assyrian conquerors ravaged their country and destroyed its shrines. But if the men had been in the habit of celebrating passover in their own homes, this was the one outstanding ritual of their faith which, since it required neither priest nor altar, was unaffected by the conquest. Yet C's account emphasizes throughout that the royal invitation was to come to Jerusalem for passover; and when he mentioned the festival of *mazzoth* which followed he merely stated that the Israelites who remained in Jerusalem took part in that also. On the supposition that passover was a family rite in Israel, Hezekiah was not merely

inviting the men to join their brethren in Judah: he was asking them to abandon their age-long practice in worship. He might hope to effect such a change in Judah, where he was the representative of the Davidic line; but he had no such influence among the men whom he was addressing. In spite of this, according to C, he not only issued the invitation but found some who were willing to accept it.

These considerations, in turn, give significance to a statement about the attitude of the remanent Israelites to passover, which appears in 30: 5. There it is said that the men had not kept it לרוב, in great numbers, or for a long time, in such sort as it is written. The remark follows directly on Hezekiah's invitation to come to Jerusalem, and is couched in such terms as to make it clear that the men's condition had interfered with the performance of their religious duties, especially in connexion with passover. But if the meaning was that since the time of the conquest the men had ceased to practise the rite altogether, it was unnecessary to add that they had not been practising it in such sort as it is written. That final clause must be interpreted in the light of the connexion in which it stands. On the one hand it must refer to some method of celebrating passover which had ceased because of the subject condition to which the Israelites had been reduced: on the other hand it must refer to the opportunity which Hezekiah was bringing within their reach by inviting them to join with their brethren at the temple. Not only so but, as far as the Israelites were concerned, the method of celebration which had ceased among them was said to be 'as it is written' in a regulation which they recognized.

Now there is only one law in the Pentateuch which connects passover with the sanctuary, and this definitely made the change of locus a novelty: thou mayest not sacrifice the passover within any of thy gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee: but at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to make His name to dwell in, there thou shalt sacrifice the passover, Deut. 16: 5 f. If the Deuteronomic

Code be recognized as the law of northern Israel, all the difficulties in connexion with C's account of Hezekiah's action disappear. The Israelites had been in the habit of celebrating passover at a sanctuary, as it was written. The Assyrian conquest had made it impossible to practise the rite because their sanctuaries were wrecked. They had not therefore been able to celebrate after the 'sort' which their law commanded, but which the Judean king brought within their reach. Hezekiah in his action was not inviting the men to surrender their ancestral practice and to join their brethren in the south in a method of celebration which was as novel to them as it was to Judah. Nor is it necessary to ask what authority a Judean king could have had which might lead him to suppose that Israel would make so great a change at the mere invitation of an outsider. He could invite the men to fulfil the regulations of their own law when he offered them the opportunity to come to Jerusalem.

The Chronicler separated the change of locus in passover from all connexion with the book of the law which was found in the temple, since he made Hezekiah introduce the change in Judah: he also acknowledged the authority of the Deuteronomic Code in northern Israel.¹

The outstanding peculiarity of C's account of Josiah's passover, as has already been noted, is the detailed descrip-

¹ I may be pardoned for adding a note, though it is not strictly germane to the subject under discussion. Rudolph in his recent discussion of the *Elohists von Exodus bis Josua* has examined the double law about passover which appears in Exodus, c. 12, and has expressed agreement with the common opinion according to which the earlier of these, vv. 1-14, is referred to P. Yet, if that law is made post-exilic or even post-Josianic, the remarkable feature of it is that it makes no reference to sanctuary, altar, or priest. Passover retains its primitive character and bears no trace of the change which must have come over it, as soon as it was transferred to the temple. Nor is this all, for unlike the rest of P's legislation it is not referred to Moses, but is retained as a rite which was practised in Egypt. Thus it antedated sanctuary, altar, and priest, as it demanded none of the three. A law of this character must be earlier than the post-exilic period.

tion which he gave of the use which was followed in the celebration. Since, however, the event formed part of the king's larger work of reform, it may be well, before entering on an analysis of the chapter which described that use, to recognize the divergence of the two sources in the order in which they placed the successive stages of the reform. According to C, Josiah began to seek the Lord in the eighth year of his reign, when he was 16 years old, II. 34: 3. In the twelfth year he began the purification of the land, and carried it out from Judah and Jerusalem to Ephraim, Manasse, and Simeon, as far as Naphtali, vv. 3-7. This must mean the twelfth year of the reign, since it is stated in v. 8 that the work of the temple repairs, which began in the eighteenth year of the reign, followed the purification of the land and the house. The verses which describe that purification *may* be a much abbreviated version of II Kings 23: 4-20, since both accounts end with the clause 'and he returned to Jerusalem'. In the eighteenth year of the reign, at the age of 26, the king proceeded to the repair of the temple, which led to the discovery of the book of the law and the consultation of the prophetess, vv. 8-28. After this appears the account of the royal covenant in the temple, vv. 29-32. The king's work for reform of religion is then summed up in v. 33: Josiah took away all the abominations out of all the countries that pertained to the children of Israel and made all that were found in Israel to serve, even to serve the Lord their God. All his days they departed not from following the Lord, the God of their fathers. After this follows the description of the royal passover which is introduced with the abrupt statement: and Josiah kept a passover unto the Lord at Jerusalem. No date is given except in the concluding sentence, 35: 19.

On the other hand K began with the king's eighteenth year, but whether of his reign or of his age is not stated. In that year Josiah initiated the temple repairs, II. 22: 3, which brought to light the book of the law on the purport of which the prophetess was consulted. This was followed by the

covenant in the temple, 23: 1-3, and that in turn by the purification of the temple in which the covenant had just been instituted and by the purification of the land of Palestine, vv. 4-20. Thereafter Josiah instituted the passover, as it was written in this book of the covenant, and he put away them that had familiar spirits and the wizards and the teraphim and the idols and all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem that he might perform the words of the law which were written in the book that Hilkiah the priest found in the house of the Lord, vv. 21-4.

The order of events in K obviously raises grave difficulties. As it stands it has compressed the entire work of Josiah's reform into one year of hectic activity, 22: 3, 23: 23, whereas C was able to allow six years for the purification of the temple and of the land of Palestine, before the temple repairs were taken in hand. It has made the king begin to repair the temple before the sanctuary was purified, which involves the admission that the covenant into which the pious king brought his people was concluded in the presence of heathen emblems. These questions must, however, be left to students of the text of the book of Kings. What is more strictly relevant to the present inquiry is to note the effect of the order of events, as that appears in K. It brought the royal series of reforms into integral relation to the law by making them the consequence of the discovery. Only after the momentous discovery did Josiah set on foot the purification of the temple and the land. He also instituted the passover at Jerusalem in agreement with this book of the covenant; and he proceeded to another purge of Judah and Jerusalem, about which it is said that it was on the basis of this law. Naturally, since the successive reforms were carried out in obedience to the book, the starting-point for all Josiah's activity must have been its discovery in the temple. On the other hand, the discovery of the book with the resultant covenant stands isolated in the account of the Chronicler, and is brought into no integral relation to the work of

reform. The purification of the temple and of the land had been effected before its discovery, and the clause which connected passover with the law-book is absent. The Chronicler credited Hezekiah with having begun the movement for associating Judah and Israel in worship at the temple and for changing the locus of passover, and so separated these two reforms from any connexion with the book of the law. When he described Josiah's later reforms he did not describe the royal action as founded on this discovery. It is even a suspicious circumstance that, while the records differ widely in their general attitude, the block of material which describes the discovery of the book is practically identical in its terms in the two sources.

In his brief account of Josiah's passover **K** made no reference to the presence of men from Israel, and stated that the rite was celebrated at Jerusalem. **C**, on the other hand, did not mention the locus, but twice stated that men from Israel were among the worshippers, 35: 17 f. He also noted that passover was combined with the festival of unleavened bread, v. 17, and added that the event took place on the fourteenth day of the first month, v. 1. Since there was no obvious reason for mentioning the exact day of the festival it may be supposed that he was contrasting the celebration under Josiah with that which was instituted by Hezekiah. Nor did he require to explain the presence of members of Israel, since their right to be present had already been established. There was, therefore, no need to summon these men: the custom had been assured. The one requirement laid down by the earlier king, that Israel should repent and return to the Lord, had been satisfied. Their land had been purged of its heathen emblems, and under the influence of the new reform its inhabitants had turned to serve the Lord their God, nor did they during Josiah's reign turn back from following the God of their fathers, 34: 33.

The initiative on the occasion, as in the case of Hezekiah's passover, was taken by the king. He kept the passover,

and did not need, like his predecessor, to consult either his princes or the congregation at Jerusalem. Under the earlier king a celebration at the temple was a novelty, the invitation to the Israelites was unexampled, and the change of date was an interference with the practice of the nation. Under the later king the change of locus had already been effected, the inclusion of the members of the northern kingdom had been accepted, and there was no need to alter the date, since that alteration had arisen from the special conditions in Hezekiah's time. On C's view of the course of events, Josiah needed to do no more than follow the example of his predecessor. Also, as the earlier king had issued instructions to the temple-clergy about their functions, the later king issued similar instructions to the same men: in both cases the instructions were chiefly given to the levites. Josiah bade them follow the practice under David and Solomon by dividing themselves into courses. They would thus be able to serve the successive relays of worshippers who are here called their brethren, 35: 4 f.¹

The description of the use at Josiah's passover has received a great deal of attention from scholars. Though they differ widely in the results at which they arrive, they all agree that the account is so confused in its character and shows such signs of inconsistency in its attitude that it cannot be accepted in its present form. No modern commentator fails to recognize that the chapter has received a good deal of revision.

The account began with the statement that the levites were instructed to slay the paschal victims and prepare for their brethren according to the divine command issued by Moses, v. 6. An apparent parallel to this appears in the record of Hezekiah's passover at 30: 17, but there it was stated that the levites slew the victims for those of the laity

¹ It may be necessary here to add that I hold no brief for the historical accuracy of the account of Hezekiah's reform. My one concern is to point out the self-consistency of C's narrative, when it is examined by itself and as a whole.

who were ceremonially unclean, which implies that, except in such cases, the older custom of each head of a father's house slaying the lamb for his household was maintained. No law which committed the slaying of the victims to the levites appears in the Mosaic torah. It is possible that, when the locus of passover was changed to the sanctuary, the practice as to slaughter may have varied, and that at one time the task was committed to the clergy and this ritual form was put under the authority of Moses. The question will then arise as to the precise meaning of the brethren for whom the levites were thus to prepare. If the phrase means the worshippers, as in the preceding verse, the direction may imply that the levites completed the preparation of the victims, and so presided over the ceremony. If, however, these brethren were the priests, the slaying of the victims was the mere preliminary to the manipulation of the blood, which in vv. 10 f. was reserved to those priests. On the earlier explanation the instruction may belong to the original: on the second it may be an addition preparing for the later verses, which gave the priests not a place, but the leading place in the ritual. While the question cannot be determined without an examination of the following instructions, certain indications point to the verse being an interpolation. Thus it is at least peculiar to find in two consecutive verses the brethren of the levites used for the general body of the worshippers and for the priesthood. Allied to this is the sudden emergence of the priests on the scene at the opening of a series of instructions directed to the levites. Again, the appearance of an appeal to the authority of the Mosaic law immediately after a reference to the practice of David and Solomon is reminiscent of other cases which have already been noted, where such an appeal to the Mosaic law was the sign of a reviser.

The paschal victims for the occasion were provided by the king, who gave his to the people, by the princes who destined theirs for the people, for the priests, and for the

levites, by the rulers of the temple on behalf of the priests, and by the leading levites for their brother levites, vv. 7-9. The last two verses have been suspected of being composite and have been assigned to separate sources. Thus it has been noted that v. 8a mentions the liberality of the secular princes to the people, the priests, and the levites, but does not, as in the other three cases, mention the amount of their gifts. In his commentary Kittel judged it possible to make the people parallel to the priests and levites, but he evidently came to feel this artificial, for in *B.H.* Edit. II he proposed to omit the clergy. Since, however, there was no obvious reason for inserting the mention of the priests and levites, the deletion appears arbitrary. In vv. 8 b 9 Kittel holds that, when the author detailed the gifts of the priestly and levitical leaders to the lower clergy, he wished to substitute priestly leaders for the secular princes. He therefore made this an addition. Yet C took no umbrage at the princes' offerings on the occasion of Hezekiah's passover, 30: 24: nor does the author of Ezra show any reluctance in detailing gifts to the sanctuary from the same donors. Benzinger, on the other hand, would omit the clerical offerings as a later addition: in his view some one missed any mention of the clergy having borne their part in the great event. But why drag in a later hand? Surely it is not impossible that the original author marked the significance of the national passover by making all the leaders of the people, secular and clerical, generous in their contributions to it. There is no sufficient ground for suspecting the verses.

Of much greater significance is it to note that the paschal victims were taken from the צאן or lambs and kids, and בקר or larger cattle. The donors gave animals taken from both these classes לפסחים i.e. as passover victims. Now Deuteronomy 16: 2 is the only law which permitted the passover to be taken from the flock or the herd.

There follows a description of the preparation of the victims, vv. 11 f. The worshippers slew the animals, the priests manipulated the blood, and the levites skinned

the carcasses. Since the first verb is indefinite and has no subject, and since the share of the two classes of the clergy in the ritual is defined, this is a legitimate rendering of the verse. Yet the disagreement between the procedure here and that which was ordered in v. 6 is patent. It serves to confirm the impression that v. 6 is a later addition. I suggest that it is possible to trace three stages in the development of the ritual which was observed at passover. So long as the rite was practised in the homes of the nation, the house-father acted as priest; he slew the victim and manipulated the blood by dashing it against the lintel and door-posts of the house, as in Exod. c. 12. With the change in locus came a change in the method, especially in relation to the blood. Since the house had disappeared and with it the lintel and the door-posts, the blood was treated like that of any other sacrifice, it was now dashed against the altar by the priests. But the custom of lay slaughter was retained. That is C's view of the situation in v. 11. At a later date, however, the entire preparation of the victims came into the hands of the clergy, the levites slaying them and the priests manipulating the blood, as in v. 6. That this was considered the final stage was marked by its being put under the authority of Moses.

The following verses, however, present a much more difficult and involved problem. There are two questions which, for the sake of clarity, may be separately discussed. The first concerns the source and purpose of certain burnt-offerings which appear in vv. 12, 14, 16, and the relation these must be supposed to have held to the passover. Alongside these burnt-offerings appear what are called the holy offerings, v. 13, which were of an entirely different character, since instead of being consumed on the altar they were boiled and distributed among the worshippers, more after the fashion of the *shelamim*. What connexion did these have with the passover on the one side and with the burnt-offerings on the other? At the first mention of the burnt-offerings it is stated that they were removed and were handed over to the worshippers in order to be offered to the

Lord, and so in regard to the cattle. The arrangement is said to have been according to the book of Moses, v. 12. The only source in the text from which these offerings can have been derived is the animals dedicated by the king and the leaders of the nation: but these were expressly destined as paschal victims. The diversion of a number of these animals from their original purpose to serve as burnt-offerings cannot have been according to the book of Moses. For the sacrificial calendar in Num. c. 29 makes no mention of burnt-offerings at the celebration of passover, as in v. 16 here: in this respect passover forms an exception among all the other festivals, major or minor.¹ What makes the reference to the book of Moses more peculiar is to find it stated in v. 16 that all the service of the Lord was prepared, to keep the passover and to offer burnt-offerings, according to the commandment of king Josiah. Even if it were supposed that the animals destined for burnt-offerings were selected from the paschal victims of the king and the leaders it is necessary to ask when the separation was made. As the text stands this was done after the paschal victims had been killed, had been drained of blood, and had been skinned. In that case the ritual prescribed by the book of Moses was not followed, for the feature of the burnt-offering in the law was that it was a holocaust. Finally the two words with which the verse closes, **וכן לבקר** and so they did to the cattle, are quite mysterious.²

In view of these difficulties the verse must be suspected to be the addition of a reviser, and this demands closer attention to the later mention of the burnt-offerings. In v. 14 the writer wished to explain why the levites were credited

¹ For a similar appearance of these offerings at Hezekiah's passover, cf. p. 111.

² When LXX^{Ch} translated εἰς τὸ πρῶτον and LXX^{Esd} πρῶτον they evidently read **לִבְקָר** for **לִבְקָר**; but the two words are sufficiently cryptic in their position without being made even more mysterious in their sense. I suggest that we should carry back the words and read them at the close of v. 11.

with having prepared the passover victims for themselves and for the priests. The reason he gave was that the priests were busy with the burnt-offerings. But that this explanation of the situation was secondary is clear from the repetition of the statement about the work of the levites, as well as from the fact that the priests were given the special title of sons of Aaron. When, again, the clause about the burnt-offerings is removed from v. 16, there remains the statement that all the service of the Lord was prepared, to keep the passover, according to the commandment of king Josiah. This is in agreement with the main narrative which made the king keep the passover, v. 1, and which stated that the service was prepared according to the royal commandment, v. 10. On the other hand the burnt-offerings were presented as it is written in the book of Moses, v. 12.

The perplexity of a student is, however, increased by the appearance of a third form of offering in v. 13. These, which are called holy offerings, cannot have been the animals dedicated for the purposes of passover, because the paschal victims are said to have been roasted with fire, while the others were boiled in cooking-vessels. As little can they have been the burnt-offerings, because not only was the flesh boiled, but it was afterwards distributed among the worshippers. Both methods of treating the flesh constituted a breach of the law as to burnt-offerings. Nor do the peace-offerings supply a parallel to the ritual described here. These holy offerings stand entirely without parallel, not merely in the ritual of passover, but in all the ordinary sacrificial system.

The mention of these holy offerings brings forward the second major difficulty in connexion with the passover, viz. the method in which the flesh of the victims was treated. The distinction in the verse appears at first to be very clear. The worshippers or the clergy—the verb is indeterminate—**בשלו באש** or 'roasted with fire' the passover: the holy offerings **בשלו** 'they sod' in pots, caldrons, and pans. In the former case it is noted that the treatment of the flesh of the paschal victims was **כמשפט** or according to the ordinance. The same

could not be said about the holy offerings, because there is no ordinance prescribing sacrifices of this peculiar character. On the other hand there are two ordinances which define the method of preparing the flesh of the paschal victims. In Exod. 12: 9 it was commanded: Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, **בשל מבשל במים**, but **צלי באש**, roast with fire. In Deut. 16: 7 the legislators were content to order thou shalt **בשל** the flesh and eat it.

Now the ordinance to which the writer appeals seems to be the regulation in Exod. 12: 9, with which it is in general agreement. But there are two peculiar features in his apparent quotation from this law. He did not use the word **צלי** 'roasted with fire', which made the meaning of the earlier command unmistakable, and he did use **בשל**, the word used for the method definitely forbidden by the legislators. He qualified the ambiguous word by adding 'in the fire' but, when he thus defined it, he used an expression which is without parallel elsewhere. He went on to describe other offerings which were treated in the forbidden method, and made his meaning very clear by the statement that these were boiled in cooking-vessels. But the holy offerings which he mentioned are without example elsewhere, and especially are absent from the ordinance to which he appealed. One cannot fail to ask why, when he referred back to Exod. 12: 9, he did not quote its exact and unmistakable terms, but introduced an expression employed in the passage to describe a usage which it forbade. One must continue by asking why he introduced a set of offerings treated in the forbidden manner, which were not mentioned in the ordinance to which he made his appeal.

Elsewhere **בשל** appears either with no qualifying word, or with the addition of the vessel which was employed for the purpose. There is no other instance where it occurs with the addition of 'in the fire'. So invariable is the usage that Driver in his note on the passage in Deuteronomy¹ acknowledged that the usual and natural sense of the word

¹ In the *I.C.C.*

was 'boil'. He also noted that Exod. 12: 9 used the verb for the boiling which it forbade, and chose a different word for the roasting which it prescribed. He satisfied himself, however, by a reference to our verse, and quieted his exegetical conscience by saying that, since Chronicles was late, its account must represent the final and uniform method of dealing with the flesh. He did not, however, examine the context in which the verse appeared and so, not recognizing the difficulties which crowd round its interpretation, did not allow for the possibility that the account was not homogeneous. But the evidence for revision in the chapter is too plain to be ignored: and a record of such a character cannot be accepted in order to give a Hebrew word a sense which contradicts, *teste* Driver, its usage throughout the Old Testament. This is especially the case in view of the equally unexampled appearance of those holy offerings in the passover ritual. The only explanation which does justice to the facts of the case is to recognize here again the hand of the reviser. He found in the text the Deuteronomic description of the treatment of the flesh of the paschal victims, and brought it into agreement with Exod. 12: 9 by adding 'in the fire, according to the ordinance'. He explained the use of the forbidden word **בשל** by introducing the holy offerings, other than the paschal victims, which were sodden in pots, caldrons, and pans.¹

At two points, then, the account gave offence to a later reviser. He objected to the presence of cattle among the paschal victims, and therefore he turned them into burnt-offerings, though the law did not provide for sacrifices of that character at passover. He objected to the statement that

¹ For a different interpretation of the offerings, burnt and holy, see Nikolsky's erudite and exhaustive article in *Z.A.W.* 1927, p. 245. The weakness of the article is that Nikolsky has not faced the difficulties in the passage which have been detailed, nor has he sufficiently allowed for the extent to which the chapter has been revised. It is interesting and instructive to compare the Rabbinical attempts to reconcile and explain these difficulties in *Pesach* 6: 3, 4.

these victims were prepared in any other way than by roasting: so he described passover as carried out after the Exodus ordinance and separated the paschal lambs from what were called holy offerings which were boiled and distributed to the worshippers. But the use of animals from the herd and permission to boil the flesh were precisely the elements in the Deuteronomic Code about passover in which it differed from the regulations in Exodus.

At some period, whether under Hezekiah or under Josiah, the practice of celebrating passover at the temple was adopted by the priesthood at Jerusalem. It had already been made the law in the northern kingdom, where the Deuteronomic Code was in force. Since the leading feature of that Code was to enforce *kultische Reinheit*, not *kultische Einheit*, and since the change of locus for passover had no essential relation to the centralization of sacrificial worship, the motive behind the law was probably to avoid abuses which were creeping into the household ritual, because it was uncontrolled by any authority. The change to the sanctuary ensured a purer and more uniform observance of the rite. What motive may have led to the adoption of the change in Judah it is impossible to determine, and in the present study it would be beyond our province to speculate. But two things are clear about the Chronicler's view of the way in which the change of locus was effected. According to him, the movement had nothing to do with the centralization of worship at Jerusalem, for he dated it in the reign of Hezekiah, and he separated Josiah's passover from any connexion with the book of the law found in the temple. He also made the initiative in both cases come from the king. Hezekiah instituted the change on his own authority, and even found his priesthood somewhat reluctant to support it. Josiah kept the passover, and all the service of the Lord in connexion with it was according to the commandment of the king. The use followed in the administration of the rite, according to C, conformed to the Deuteronomic Code in two particular usages which were peculiar to that law.

When the exiles returned to Jerusalem, they were not prepared to allow that so large a change in the form of worship had had its origin in the royal authority, however pious the individual king may have been. Therefore they revised the Chronicler's account of Josiah's reforms, and made the alteration in passover to have been the outcome of the law which was discovered in the temple. The initiative in matters of ritual was transferred from the king to the priests who found that law and who recommended it to Josiah. They, further, insisted that the ritual which was followed at the administration must conform to the use which had prevailed at passover in Judah. Therefore they revised the Chronicler's account of Josiah's passover, and removed from it the two obnoxious features in which it reproduced the characteristic elements of the Deuteronomic Code.