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EDITORS’ PREFACE

THERE are now before the public many Commentaries, written by British and American divines, of a popular or homiletical character. The Cambridge Bible for Schools, the Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students, The Speaker’s Commentary, The Popular Commentary (Schaff), The Expositor’s Bible, and other similar series, have their special place and importance. But they do not enter into the field of Critical Biblical scholarship occupied by such series of Commentaries as the Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum A. T.; De Wette’s Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum N. T.; Meyer’s Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar; Keil and Delitzsch’s Biblischer Commentar über das A. T.; Lange’s Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk; Nowack’s Handkommentar zum A. T.; Holtzmann’s Handkommentar zum N. T. Several of these have been translated, edited, and in some cases enlarged and adapted, for the English-speaking public; others are in process of translation. But no corresponding series by British or American divines has hitherto been produced. The way has been prepared by special Commentaries by Cheyne, Ellicott, Kalisch, Lightfoot, Perowne, Westcott, and others; and the time has come, in the judgment of the projectors of this enterprise, when it is practicable to combine British and American scholars in the production of a critical, comprehensive Commentary that will be abreast of modern biblical scholarship, and in a measure lead its van.

The Commentaries will be international and inter-confessional, and will be free from polemical and ecclesiastical bias. They will be based upon a thorough critical study of the original texts of the Bible, and upon critical methods of interpretation. They are designed chiefly for students and clergymen, and will be written in a compact style. Each book will be preceded by an Introduction, stating the results of criticism upon it, and discussing impartially the questions still remaining open. The details of criticism will appear in their proper place in the body of the Commentary. Each section of the Text will be introduced with a paraphrase, or summary of contents. Technical details of textual and philological criticism will, as a rule, be kept distinct from matter of a more general character; and in the Old Testament the exegetical notes will be arranged, as far as possible, so as to be serviceable to students not acquainted with Hebrew. The History of Interpretation of the Books will be dealt with, when necessary, in the Introductions, with critical notices of the most important literature of the subject. Historical and Archaeological questions, as well as questions of Biblical Theology, are included in the plan of the Commentaries, but not Practical or Homiletical Exegesis. The Volumes will constitute a uniform series.
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PREFACE

This Commentary has been prepared not less for the readers of the Revised Version of the English Bible than for those of the Hebrew Text. Hebrew words, it is true, appear at times in the main comment. They have been frequently introduced to illustrate the origin of different readings arising through a similarity of letters; then their force is clear without a knowledge of the language. They also appear in connection with certain genealogies, notably those of 1 Ch. VII, VIII, where without their introduction critical comment would be impossible. Elsewhere in ignoring them the reader unacquainted with Hebrew will find the comment clear though less ample.

The Books of Chronicles are secondary; they are of interest mainly through the new view which they give of Israel's history compared with the earlier narratives. This fact has been constantly kept in mind in the preparation of this Commentary. Certain readers will doubtless feel that conclusions in details should have been given with more dogmatism and that the word "probably" should less often occur. But about many matters of detail I am far from certain, although I have no doubt of the general historical, or rather unhistorical, character of Chronicles. I have aimed also to make the work comprehensive in giving the opinions of others.

In regard to the literary structure of 1 and 2 Chronicles I cannot follow the view of those who regard the author throughout as a mere copyist, nor yet of those who hold that apart from his Old Testament quotations he composed freely with no recourse for information to other written sources. I have given the view of a free composition but allowed a recourse to non-canonical written sources. I have given marks of unity of style in portions alleged by some to come from other writers, although I am fully aware
that if the Chronicler were a copyist these marks of unity might be due to his main source. I have little sympathy with that subjective criticism which prescribes beforehand an author's scheme of composition and then regards all contrary to this scheme as interpolations or supplements. Inconsistencies or redundancies are not proofs of a lack of unity of authorship, especially in the work of the Chronicler.

Agreeably to the other volumes of this series, Yahweh appears regularly as the name of Israel's deity. But this transliteration of Yodh (י) by y and Waw (ו) by w has not been applied in other proper names, since in a commentary on books containing so many proper names as 1 and 2 Chronicles, designed to be used in connection with the Revised English Version, it seemed best to retain the spelling of the proper names given in that version. Medial Aleph (א) and initial, medial, and final 'Ayin (י) in italicised names on their first appearance, but not necessarily on their immediate repetition or in juxtaposition with the Hebrew letters, have been represented by the smooth and rough breathings (""'). The hard letters Helh (ח), Tefh (ך), Sadhe (ש), and Kopk (ך) have been represented by h, t, z, and k. (The introduction of z instead of s would have been too violent a change.) But none of these marks have been introduced, except incidentally, in the Roman type, and in some familiar names like that of Israel they do not appear. Modern geographical names appear in the spelling of the authorities cited.

The completion of this volume had already been much delayed through serious illness, when in January, 1906, I suddenly lost the sight of nearly one-half the field of vision in both eyes. I felt then that I should relinquish my task, but Professor Briggs, the general editor, persuaded me to continue it and kindly allowed me to use the services of an assistant. I was fortunate in securing those of Doctor Madsen, a pupil of Prof. C. C. Torrey. He has worked jointly with me upon the book since that date, and while I am solely responsible for the work, his name properly appears upon the title-page. The parts which he has especially prepared under my direction are sections seven, eight, and of nine the Literature, of the Introduction, the commentary and notes on
1 Ch. XXI–XXIX, which had formed the subject of his doctor’s thesis, and the textual notes on 2 Ch. XX–XXXVI. He has also amplified my own comment and textual notes on other portions and contributed notes on the composition of 1 Ch. I–IX, XV, XVI, and 2 Ch. I–IX. He worked out the restoration of the genealogy of Zebulun, 1 Ch. VII, and I am also indebted to him for most efficient aid in preparing the manuscript for the press and in proof-reading.

I wish also to express my appreciation for assistance rendered in many ways by Prof. C. C. Torrey, of Yale University. Too much cannot be said of the care exercised by the publishers in carrying this work through the press.

This volume has many shortcomings, but I trust that it will fill a needed place, since nothing similar has been published in English later than Zoeckler’s commentary in Lange’s Commentary in 1876.

EDWARD LEWIS CURTIS.

New Haven, Conn.,
May, 1910.
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I. TEXTS AND VERSIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Arabic Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARV.</td>
<td>American Revised Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARVm.</td>
<td>American Revised Version, marginal reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV.</td>
<td>Authorized Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Deuteronomic portions of the Old Testament, or their author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dtnc.</td>
<td>Deuteronomic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Elohistic (Ephraimitic) portions of the Hexateuch, or their author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERV.</td>
<td>English Revised Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVS.</td>
<td>English Versions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Received Greek Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (of 1 Esd.)</td>
<td>The Greek text of 1 Esdras (probably original Septuagint and available for 2 Ch. 35. 36).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>Original Greek where leading MSS. (uncials) are corrupt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&quot;</td>
<td>Sinaitic codex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&quot;</td>
<td>Alexandrian codex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>Vatican codex (as pub. by Swete).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GComp.</td>
<td>Complutensian edition (1514-17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>Lucianic recension (Lagarde's edition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>Basilian - Vatican codex (= XI Holmes and Parsons).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hebrew consonant-al text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Holiness Code of the Hexateuch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hex.</td>
<td>Hexateuch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yahwistic (Judaic) portions of the Hexateuch, or their author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>The narrative of J and E combined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kt.</td>
<td>= Ktib, the Hebrew text as written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>= Old Latin Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>= The Massoretic pointed text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>= Kittel's primary Midrashic source of the Chronicler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M²</td>
<td>= Kittel's secondary Midrashic source of the Chronicler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT.</td>
<td>= Old Testament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>= Priestly portions of the Hexateuch, or their author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qt.</td>
<td>= Qere, the Hebrew text as read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>= Redactor, or editor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>= Revised Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVm</td>
<td>= Revised Version, marginal reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SyrP</td>
<td>= Syriac Peshitto Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb Codex</td>
<td>= Ambrosian codex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulv</td>
<td>= Vulgate Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>= Amos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>= The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira, or Ecclesiasticus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Ch.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Chronicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td>= id., taken together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>= Colossians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Cor.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Corinthians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.</td>
<td>= Canticles = The Song of Songs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>= Galatians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>= Ezekiel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezr</td>
<td>= Ezra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>= Genesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>= Habakkuk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>= Hebrews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>= Haggai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>= Hosea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>= Isaiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>= Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>= Deuteronomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fc</td>
<td>= Ecclesiastes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>= Ephesians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Esd.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Esdras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est</td>
<td>= Esther.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>= Exodus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. BOOKS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am.</td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS.</td>
<td>The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira, or Ecclesiasticus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Ch.</td>
<td>1, 2 Chronicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td>id., taken together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>Colossians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Cor.</td>
<td>1, 2 Corinthians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.</td>
<td>Canticles = The Song of Songs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn.</td>
<td>Galatians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez.</td>
<td>Ezekiel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezr.</td>
<td>Ezra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>Galatians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn.</td>
<td>Genesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb.</td>
<td>Habakkuk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>Hebrews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg.</td>
<td>Haggai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho.</td>
<td>Hosea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is.</td>
<td>Isaiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn.</td>
<td>Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt.</td>
<td>Deuteronomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fc.</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td>Ephesians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Esd.</td>
<td>1, 2 Esdras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>Esther.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex.</td>
<td>Exodus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. 1, 2 K.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Kings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. = id., taken together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.</td>
<td>= Lamentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv.</td>
<td>= Leviticus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td>= Malachi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Mac.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Maccabees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi.</td>
<td>= Micah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>= Mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>= Matthew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne.</td>
<td>= Nehemiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu.</td>
<td>= Numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob.</td>
<td>= Obadiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>= Philippians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>= Proverbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>= Revelation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>= Romans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru.</td>
<td>= Ruth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1, 2 S.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Samuel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. = id., taken together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.—K.</td>
<td>= The books of Samuel and Kings taken together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x, 2 Thes.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Thessalonians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x, 2 Tim.</td>
<td>= 1, 2 Timothy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob.</td>
<td>= Tobit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisd.</td>
<td>= Wisdom of Solomon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc.</td>
<td>= Zechariah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. AUTHORS AND WRITINGS.

<p>| AHT. = Ancient Heb. Traditions, see Hom. | Ball = C. J. Ball. |
| AJSL. = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures. | SBOT. = id., Genesis in Sacred Books of the OT. |
| ATC. = Apparatus for the Textual Criticism of Ch.—Esr.—Ne., see Tor. | Baud. = W. von Baudissens. |
| Bennett = W. H. Bennett. | SBOT. = id., Joshua in Sacred Books of the OT. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>Hebräische Archäologie.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boch.</td>
<td>S. Bochart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.</td>
<td>K. Budde, <em>Richter und Samuel</em> in <em>Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A. T.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOT.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>Samuel</em> in <em>Sacred Books of the OT.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bue.</td>
<td>A. Büchler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhl</td>
<td>F. Böttcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>Geographie des Alten Palästina.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHV.</td>
<td><em>Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehe- miah,</em> see Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor.</td>
<td>C. H. Cornill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT.</td>
<td><em>The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the OT.</em> (Eng. trans. of <em>KAT.</em>), see Sch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dav.</td>
<td>A. B. Davidson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syn. §</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>Hebrew Syntax.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB.</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of the Bible,</em> usually Hastings³.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del.</td>
<td>Franz Delitzsch (alw. when not followed by Par., v. i.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del.</td>
<td>Friedrich Delitzsch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>Wo lag das Paradies?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill.</td>
<td>August Dillmann.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>S. R. Driver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>Deuteronomy</em> in <em>The International Critical Commentary.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>An Introduction to the Literature of the OT.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrews.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBi.</td>
<td><em>Encyclopedia Biblica.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS.</td>
<td><em>Early Hist. of Syria and Pal.,</em> see Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ew. §</td>
<td>H. Ewald.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td><em>id.</em>, <em>History of Israel</em> (Eng. trans. of his <em>Geschichte d. V. Israel</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td><em>The Expositor.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expos. T.</td>
<td><em>The Expository Times.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP.</td>
<td><em>Geographie des Alten Palästina</em> by F. Buhl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>George Adam Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGHL</td>
<td>id., The Historical Geography of the Holy Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>id., Jerusalem from the Earliest Times to A. D. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ges</td>
<td>W. Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautzsch (Eng. trans. by Collins and Cowley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFM</td>
<td>George Foot Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gin</td>
<td>C. D. Ginsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gl</td>
<td>E. Glaser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skis</td>
<td>id., Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens, vol. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graf</td>
<td>K. H. Graf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>id., Gesch. Bücher d. A. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>G. B. Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPM</td>
<td>id., Hebrew Proper Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>id., Numbers in International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gu</td>
<td>H. Gunkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>id., Genesis in Handkommentar s. A. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Higher Criticism and the Monuments, see Sayce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdt</td>
<td>Herodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitz</td>
<td>F. Hitzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-J</td>
<td>W. R. Harvey-Jellie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJP</td>
<td>History of the Jewish People, see Schür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holz</td>
<td>H. Holzinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>id., Genesis in Kurzer Hand-Commentar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom</td>
<td>F. Hommel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHT</td>
<td>id., Ancient Hebrew Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPM</td>
<td>History, Prophecy and the Monuments, see McC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hpt</td>
<td>Paul Haupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWB</td>
<td>Gesenius' Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das A. T., ed. Buhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Jewish Encyclopedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>P. Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosmol</td>
<td>id., Die Kosmologie der Babylonier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos</td>
<td>Fl. Josephus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant</td>
<td>Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ</td>
<td>Bell. Jud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ap</td>
<td>contra Apionem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPT</td>
<td>Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamp</td>
<td>A. Kamphausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>ABBREVIATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAT.</td>
<td>— Die Keilinschriften u. d. A. T., see Winck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kau.</td>
<td>— E. Kautzsch, Die heilige Schrift d. A. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB.</td>
<td>— Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke.</td>
<td>— C. F. Keil, Chronicles in Biblical Commentary on the OT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennic.</td>
<td>— B. Kennicott.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki.</td>
<td>— R. Kittel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH.</td>
<td>— id., Biblia Hebraica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesch.</td>
<td>— id., Geschichte der Hebräer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kom.</td>
<td>— id., Die Bücher der Chronik in Handkommentar zum A. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOT.</td>
<td>— id., Chronicles in Sacred Books of the OT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klo.</td>
<td>— August Klostermann.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koe. §</td>
<td>— Fr. E. König, Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuenen</td>
<td>— A. Kuenen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EInl.</td>
<td>— id., Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher d. A. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT.</td>
<td>— An Introduction to the Literature of the OT., see Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>— J. Marquart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McC.</td>
<td>— J. F. McCurdy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPM.</td>
<td>— id., History, Prophecy and the Monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov.</td>
<td>— F. C. Movers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuNDPV.</td>
<td>— Mitteilungen und Nachrichten des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVAG.</td>
<td>— Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCB.</td>
<td>— New Century Bible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now.</td>
<td>— W. Nowack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td>— id., Lehrbuch d. Hebräischen Archäologie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oe.</td>
<td>— S. Oettli, Die Bücher der Chronik in Kurzgefasster Kommentar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLZ.</td>
<td>— Orientalische Literatur-Zeitung.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onom.</td>
<td>— Onomastica Sacra (ed. Lagarde).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTJC.</td>
<td>— Old Testament in the Jewish Church, see WRS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHSP.</td>
<td>— id., The Early History of Syria and Palestine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE.</td>
<td>— Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptol.</td>
<td>— Claudius Ptolemy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ri.</td>
<td>— E. Riehm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWB</td>
<td>id., Handwörterbuch d. bibl. Alterth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob.</td>
<td>Edward Robinson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR. or Res.</td>
<td>id., Biblical Researches in Palestine, etc., also Later Biblical Researches, i.e., Vol. III of second ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayce</td>
<td>A. H. Sayce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>id., Higher Criticism and the Monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat. Pal.</td>
<td>id., Patriarchal Palestine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch.</td>
<td>E. Schrader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT</td>
<td>id., Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schür.</td>
<td>E. Schürer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesch.</td>
<td>id., Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJP</td>
<td>id., History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (Eng. trans. of the second ed. of the above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sk.</td>
<td>J. Skinner, Kings in New Century Bible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>H. P. Smith, The Books of Samuel in International Critical Commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smd.</td>
<td>R. Smend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List.</td>
<td>id., Die Listen der Bücher Esra und Nehemiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>C. Siegfried and B. Stade, Hebräisches Wörterbuch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>B. Stade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesch.</td>
<td>id., Geschichte des Volkes Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOT.</td>
<td>id., with Sw., The Books of Kings in Sacred Books of the OT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw.</td>
<td>F. Schwally, v. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWP</td>
<td>Survey of Western Palestine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th.</td>
<td>O. Thenius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKC</td>
<td>T. K. Cheyne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tor.</td>
<td>C. C. Torrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>id., Apparatus for the Textual Criticism of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah in OT. Semitic Studies, Harper Memorial II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHV</td>
<td>id., The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah in Zeitschrift für die alt. Wissenschaft, Beihefte 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trom.</td>
<td>A. Trommius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord.</td>
<td>id., Concordantiae Graecae in Septuaginta Interpretis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp.</td>
<td>Julius Wellhausen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DGJ.</strong></td>
<td>— id., De Gentibus et Familis Judaeis qua in 1 Chr. 2. 4 numerantur Dissertatio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prol.</strong></td>
<td>— id., Prolegomena to the History of Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TS.</strong></td>
<td>— id., Der Text der Bücher Samuelis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winck.</strong></td>
<td>— Hugo Winckler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gesch. Isr.</strong></td>
<td>— id., Geschichte Israels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRS.</strong></td>
<td>— W. Robertson Smith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTJC.</strong></td>
<td>— id., Old Testament in the Jewish Church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZA.</strong></td>
<td>— Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZAW.</strong></td>
<td>— Zeitschrift für die Altestamentliche Wissenschaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZDMG.</strong></td>
<td>— Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZDPV.</strong></td>
<td>— Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-vereins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numerals raised above the line immediately following the abbreviation indicate the edition of the work cited.

### IV. GENERAL, ESPECIALLY GRAMMATICAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>= absolute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstr.</td>
<td>= abstract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>= accusative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. cog.</td>
<td>= cognate acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. pers.</td>
<td>= acc. of person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. rei.</td>
<td>= acc. of thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. to</td>
<td>= according to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act.</td>
<td>= active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>= adjective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>= adverb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>átw.</td>
<td>= ἄφθατον, word or phr. used once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alw.</td>
<td>= always.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apod.</td>
<td>= apodosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar.</td>
<td>= Arabic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aram.</td>
<td>= Aramaic, Aramean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art.</td>
<td>= article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assy.</td>
<td>= Assyria, Assyrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bab.</td>
<td>= Babylonian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c., cc.</td>
<td>= chapter, chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>= circa, about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus.</td>
<td>= causative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>= confer, compare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod., codd.</td>
<td>= codex, codices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog.</td>
<td>= cognate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col., coll.</td>
<td>= column, columns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com.</td>
<td>= commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp.</td>
<td>= compare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concr.</td>
<td>= concrete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>= conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consec.</td>
<td>consecutive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constr.</td>
<td>construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cstr.</td>
<td>construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. f.</td>
<td>daghesh forte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def.</td>
<td>defective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del.</td>
<td>dele, strike out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dittog.</td>
<td>dittography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dub.</td>
<td>dubious, doubtful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>edition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elsw.</td>
<td>elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esp.</td>
<td>especially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et al.</td>
<td>et aliter, and elsewhere, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f., ff.</td>
<td>and following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>feminine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fig.</td>
<td>figurative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. n.</td>
<td>foot-note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq.</td>
<td>frequentative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gent.</td>
<td>gentilic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haplo.</td>
<td>haplography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>Hebrew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>Hiphil of verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hithp.</td>
<td>Hithpael of verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id.</td>
<td>idem, the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td>imperfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv.</td>
<td>imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef.</td>
<td>indefinite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. e.</td>
<td>id est, that is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>infinitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ins.</td>
<td>inscription, inscriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrans.</td>
<td>intransitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro.</td>
<td>Introduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juss.</td>
<td>jussive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>list of the peculiarities of Ch. in Introduction, pp. 28-36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. c.</td>
<td>loco citato, in the place before cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literal, literally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc.</td>
<td>masculine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod.</td>
<td>modern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH.</td>
<td>New Hebrew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niph.</td>
<td>Niphal of verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj.</td>
<td>object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oft.</td>
<td>often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p., pp.</td>
<td>page, pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers.</td>
<td>person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pass.</td>
<td>passive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf.</td>
<td>perfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi.</td>
<td>Piel of verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pred.</td>
<td>predicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preg.</td>
<td>pregnant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>preposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prob.</td>
<td>probable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron.</td>
<td>pronoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptc.</td>
<td>participle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu.</td>
<td>Pual of verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. v.</td>
<td>quod vide, which see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl.</td>
<td>reflexive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel.</td>
<td>relative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sab.</td>
<td>Sabean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sf.</td>
<td>suffix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>singular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sq.</td>
<td>followed by.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subst.</td>
<td>substantive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syr.</td>
<td>Syriac.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations list.
### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>= times (following a number).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans.</td>
<td>= transitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text. n.</td>
<td>= textual note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>= vide, see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vb.</td>
<td>= verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. i.</td>
<td>= vide infra, see below (usually textual note on same verse).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viz.</td>
<td>= videlicet, namely, to wit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. s.</td>
<td>= vide supra, see above (usually general remark on same verse).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. OTHER SIGNS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>†</td>
<td>indicates all passages cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡</td>
<td>indicates all passages in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‖</td>
<td>parallel, of words or clauses chiefly synonymous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⪒</td>
<td>= equivalent, equals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>plus, denotes that other passages might be cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√</td>
<td>= the root, or stem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'</td>
<td>= sign of abbreviation in Hebrew words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ט</td>
<td>= יִנֶּפָר, and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>= Yahweh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>indicates that Masoretic text has not been followed, but either Vrss. or conjectural emendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Biblical passages are cited according to the Hebrew enumeration of chapters and verses: where this differs in the English, the reference to the latter has usually (except in textual notes) been added in parentheses.
INTRODUCTION.

§ I. NAME AND ORDER.

The Hebrew name for 1 and 2 Chronicles, which were counted as one book in the Hebrew Canon, was *Dibré hayyamim* (דְּבֵרֵי הַעַיִם), *The events of days or times, Daily events*. This expression preceded by the word *book* is of frequent occurrence in 1 and 2 K. (cf. 1 K. 14:11, 15:11 and oft.), also in Est. 2:6, 10 and 1 Ch. 27:27 and Ne. 12:2, but always (except Est. 2:6 and Ne. 12:2) with the days defined, as, for example, the book of the days of King David (1 Ch. 27:27), or of the days of the Kings of Israel (1 K. 14:5). Thus also the Targum further defines the days of this title as “from the days of antiquity” (PRA. iv. p. 85).

It is not altogether unlikely that originally of the Kings of Judah belonged to this Hebrew title (cf. the title in 2 K immediately mentioned).

The Greek title was originally *The things omitted concerning the kings of Judah* in a twofold division (*παραλειπομενων Βασιλεων Ιουδα α, ditto των Βασιλεων Ιουδα β* (Α. Swete). The other uncials omit *Βασιλεων Ιουδα* and *των Β* Ι', but the originality of this addition is witnessed by the nomenclature in the Ethiopic Church and by the Syriac version (Bacher, ZAW. xv. 1895, p. 305). This Greek title was appropriate, since the material of 1 and 2 Ch. apparently supplements the narratives of 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K.

Jerome, while retaining the Greek title *Paralipomenon*, suggested that of *Chronicles*, “since,” he said, remarking on the Hebrew title, “we might more significantly call it the chronicle of the whole of sacred history.” (*Quod significantius Chronicon*
Thus arose the name adopted in our English versions. Luther used the same in his translation *Die Chronika*.

In the printed Hebrew Bibles Chronicles is the last book of the "Writings" or the third division of the Hebrew Canon. This is its place according to the Talmud and the majority of Hebrew mss. Some mss., however, among them the St. Petersburg Babylonian Codex and two in the British Museum, and the Spanish codices generally, place Chronicles at the beginning of the Hagiographa. A Massoretic treatise, *Adahath Debharim* (1207 A.D.), declares this to have been the orthodox Palestinian order. This, however, is very doubtful. Chronicles by its late composition and supplementary character correctly finds its place at the close of the Hebrew Canon. The references in Mt. 23" suggest also that at the time of Christ, or the collection of his sayings, this book closed the Canon. The transposition to the beginning of the Hagiographa probably was because the bulk of its history preceded the dates assigned for most of the remaining Hagiographa. (On the order of the Hagiographa see Paton’s *Esther*, pp. 1-3; Ginsburg’s *Introduction*, pp. 1-8.) While in rabbinical literature Chronicles was regarded with suspicion, its historical accuracy being doubted by Talmudic authorities and it being held to be a book for homiletical interpretation, yet its canonicity, as some have thought, never seems really to have been questioned (*JE. iv. p. 60; Buhl, Canon and Text of the OT. p. 31*).

In the Greek version Chronicles follows the Books of Kings (which include 1 and 2 S.). Occasionally it precedes them or drops out altogether. But these variations were local or individual and find no support in the uncial mss. of the Greek Bible (Swete, *Intro. to the OT. in Greek*, p. 397). The order in the English Bible is derived from the Greek through its use in the Vulgate.

§ 2. THE RELATION OF CHRONICLES TO EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

The Books of Chronicles are usually assigned to the same author as that of Ezra and Nehemiah, which also are reckoned in the Hebrew Canon as one book. This is not only the general opin-
RELATION TO EZRA AND NEHEMIAH

ion of modern scholarship, but also was that of the Talmud, which ascribed them to Ezra. \( \text{Baba bath f. 15. } 1 \text{ Ezra scripsit librum suum et genealogiam in libro Chronicorum ad se.} \) This also was the general view of the rabbins, the Church fathers, and the older commentators, at least as far as the Book of Ezra was concerned, that both that book and Chronicles were written by the same author, presumably Ezra. \( \text{For a list of those holding this opinion see Zoe. pp. 8 f.} \) \( \text{Owing to the separation of Nehemiah from Ezra and the memoirs of Nehemiah being written in the first person, the view became widely prevalent that Nehemiah was the author of the book called by his name.} \) The reasons for finding a common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra–Nehemiah are as follows:

\( \text{(1) The ending of Chronicles and the beginning of Ezra are the same (2 Ch. 36:1–Ezr. 1:1 to go up). This suggests that they were originally one work, a common portion of each book being retained at their point of separation when they were cloven asunder, that their original unity might be recognised. This argument, of course, only has force in view of the order of the books in the Hebrew Canon. The abrupt close of 2 Ch. is most naturally explained on the ground that originally it was continued by the story of the return given in Ezr. 1.} \)

The separation in the Canon is apparently due to the fact that the contents of Ezra–Nehemiah were regarded as the more important, since its narrative was a proper continuation of the sacred history already canonised in 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K., and its narrative chronologically concluded the history of Israel; while Chronicles was only supplementary to 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K., and therefore was not at first very highly valued and was only at a later period received into the Canon.

\( \text{Zoe., following Bleek (Einl. } 4 \text{ § 149), doubts the unity of authorship and thinks the identity of 2 Ch. 36:1–Ezr. 1:1 to be better explained as coming from an editor (the author of 1 and 2 Ch.) who wished the second of two distinct works to be recognised as a kind of continuation of the first. He also holds that the plan of Ezra–Nehemiah in presenting recent history is against an original immediate connection with 1 and 2 Ch. (pp. 9 f.).} \)
(2) The same general character pervades both works. Both show a fondness for the following particulars:

A. Genealogical and other lists of families and persons.

Thus in Chronicles are the genealogies of the families of the twelve tribes and the houses of Saul and David (1 Ch. 1–8); the inhabitants of Jerusalem (9:1–31); the mighty men in David's armies (11:1–47); David's recruits at Zizlag (12:7–14:19); the Levites, priests, and musicians that assisted in the removal of the ark (15:1–11); the families of the Levites (23:1–32); the twenty-four courses of priests (24:1–18); heads of families, Kohathites and Merarites (24:30–44); the twenty-four courses of singers, their names twice repeated (25:1–31); the courses of gate-keepers (26:1–11); overseers of the Temple treasury (26:30–31); Levitical officers outside the Temple (26:32–33); the twelve commanders of the twelve courses of the army (27:1–8); the princes of the tribes of Israel (27:1–12); the twelve officers over David's substance (27:13–23); princes, Levites, and priests sent by Jehoshaphat to give instruction in the law (2 Ch. 17:1–9); Levitical captains under Jehoiada (23:1); Levitical leaders in cleansing the Temple and Levites in charge of offerings in Hezekiah's reign (29:1–17 31:18–20); Levites mentioned in connection with the repair of the Temple and the distribution of offerings at the passover festival in the reign of Josiah (34:1–18 35:9). These are paralleled in Ezra–Nehemiah by the lists of the leaders, and of the families of the laity, the priests, the Levites, the singers, the gate-keepers, the Nethinim, the servants of Solomon, and those without genealogy who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr. 2:41 Ne. 7:4); by the lists of those who returned with Ezra (Ezr. 8:6–23); of those both priests, Levites, singers, gate-keepers, and laity who had foreign wives (Ezr. 10:4–44); of those who signed the covenant, the governor, priests, Levites, and chiefs of the people (Ne. 10:1–29); of the priests and Levites who participated in the promulgation of the law (Ne. 8:3–9:4); of the builders of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne. 3:27–31); of the princes (?), priests, and Levites who participated in the dedication of the wall (Ne. 12:27–28 14:9); of the residents of Jerusalem (corresponding to the list of 1 Ch. 9) (Ne. 11:1–19). We also have pedigrees corresponding to those in Chronicles, those of Ezra (Ezr. 7:4) and of Jaddua (Ne. 12:10–11).

B. Both works show a fondness for the description of the celebrations of special religious occasions.

In 1 and 2 Ch. are descriptions of the bringing up of the ark (1 Ch. 15:1–16), of the dedication of the Temple (2 Ch. 5–7), of the restoration of the worship of Yahweh and the celebration of the passover under Hezekiah (2 Ch. 29–31), and of the passover under Josiah (2 Ch. 35); and in Ezra–Nehemiah are descriptions of the erection of the altar at
the time of Joshua and Zerubbabel (Ezr. 3), of the dedication of the Temple (Ezr. 6:14), of the celebration of the passover (Ezr. 6:14), of the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles in connection with the reading of the law (Ne. 8:14), and of the dedication of the walls (Ne. 12:14).

C. In the attention paid to the priests, the Levites, and especially to the musicians or singers and the gate-keepers, which latter classes are not mentioned elsewhere in the OT.

The musicians are mentioned in 1 Ch. 9:15-23, 2 Ch. 5:12-13, 20:19, 21:20, 23:15-19, 29:30, Ne. 12:27, 29, 34:35, and in Ezr. 3:10. The gate-keepers are mentioned (often with the singers) in 1 Ch. 23:14, 29, 30, 26, 38:12-13. The gate-keepers are mentioned in Ezr. 2:1, 7:11, 10:12, Ne. 7:10, 12:1, 13:4-7 (Be. pp. xiv, f.).

Thus, whatever are the sources of these writings, exactly the same interest and motive of compilation or authorship appear in both, hence the conclusion that both are from the same person is irresistible. This is still further supported by the following fact:

(3) Both works exhibit in a marked degree the same linguistic peculiarities. This is fully exhibited in the list of the Chronicler's peculiarities of diction given on pp. 27 ff.

§ 3. DATE.

The data for determining the exact period of 1 and 2 Ch. taken from those books are very meagre. The books close with a reference to a decree of Cyrus in the first year of his reign (537 B.C.), hence they cannot be earlier than that date. Money also is reckoned in darics (1 Ch. 29:1), the Persian coinage introduced by Darius I. (521-486 B.C.), hence they do not fall within the beginnings of the Persian period (537-332 B.C.). Then again the genealogy of David's family is apparently brought down to the sixth generation after Zerubbabel (who flourished 537+) (1 Ch. 3:12-21). This makes the date for 1 and 2 Ch., reckoning thirty years for a generation, not earlier than about 350 B.C. The Greek, Syriac, and Latin texts, however, read 1 Ch. 3:12-21 differently (see in loco), bringing the genealogy down to the eleventh generation after Zerubbabel. This would place the date, reckoning again thirty
years for a generation, at about 200 B.C. Thirty years, however, are probably longer than an actual generation among the Hebrews. Kamphausen reckoning on the descent of the Hebrew kings fixes the length at twenty-three years (Chronologie der hebr. Königge, pp. 38 f.); Kittel makes a generation even less, only twenty years (Komet. p. 26). On this last basis eleven generations after Zerubbabel would extend only to about 300 B.C. Yet G, G, and L probably have simply interpreted the difficult text, and hence do not really furnish a trustworthy basis for a date. The reading of the Vrss. was preferred by Kuenen (Einl. I. 2, § 29, 1); also by Wildeboer (Die Litteratur des A. T. § 25, 2).

But since 1 and 2 Ch. originally were joined to Ezra–Nehemiah, the period of the Chronicler can also be determined from those books. The list of the high priests given in Ne. 12**–** extends to Jaddua, who according to Josephus (Ant. xi. 7, 8) was high priest in the time of Alexander the Great. Darius is referred to as the Persian (Ne. 12**) in a way that suggests that the Persian kingdom had already fallen and that the time of Alexander (336–323 B.C.) had been reached. Thus the close of the fourth century B.C., or 300, may be confidently given as the period of the Chronicler.

The scholars who regarded Ezra as the author of 1 and 2 Ch. and also of the Book of Ezra, have refused to allow the implications just mentioned drawn from 1 Ch. 3**–**, holding either that the passage contained no list of six or more generations after Zenibbabel (Davis, DB. p. 125), or that it was an insertion (Keil held both of these views, Comm. p. 82); and likewise those who held that Nehemiah wrote his book have regarded the lists of priests in Ne. 12**–** either as an insertion (Lange Crosby, Ne. p. 2) or as a list of descendants of the priestly family, the last of whom, Jaddua, might have been known to Nehemiah in his extreme old age (Keil, Intro., trans. by Douglas, § 149).

§ 4. PLAN, PURPOSE, AND HISTORICAL VALUE.

The Books of Chronicles are a history of the kingdom of Judah from the enthronement of David to the fall of Jerusalem. This history begins with a long introduction, consisting in the main of a series of genealogical tables, showing the origin of Israel from the beginning of mankind, and their connection with other peoples
(material derived from the Hexateuch), and giving likewise the clans or families of the tribes of Israel, with particular regard to those of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin (the three tribes most important for the post-exilic community), and also a list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (1 Ch. 1-9). Then commences the history proper, introduced with an account of the death of Saul (1 Ch. 10). This history is written throughout from a priestly point of view. The writer is concerned above everything else with the life of Israel centred in the worship at the Temple in Jerusalem. He dwells at length upon the removal of the ark by David (1 Ch. 13, 15-16); upon his thought of a temple (1 Ch. 17) and his preparations for its building (1 Ch. 21, 22, 28, 29); upon its structure and furniture and dedication under Solomon (2 Ch. 2-7); upon its repairs in the reigns of Joash, Hezekiah, and Josiah (2 Ch. 24-26, 29-34, 34-38). And in connection with these last two repairs are given notable descriptions of passover festivals celebrated at the Temple (2 Ch. 35-38).

The ministry of the Temple is also fully described. The divisions of the Levites and the priests and the singers and the gatekeepers, which are represented as established by David, are given at length (1 Ch. 23-26). These ministers also not only take a prominent part in all the events connected with the Temple mentioned above, but appear repeatedly in other history. Priests and Levites resort unto Rehoboam on the division of the kingdom (2 Ch. 11-14). They are appointed by Jehoshaphat as teachers of the law (2 Ch. 17-18) and as judges (2 Ch. 19-20). Levites take a prominent part in the coronation of Joash and the death of Athaliah (2 Ch. 23-24). Priests withstand Uzziah when he would burn incense in the Temple (2 Ch. 26-27).

The activity of the singers, or musicians, is prominent. They are mentioned not only in connection with the removal of the ark (1 Ch. 15, 16) and the dedication of the Temple (2 Ch. 5-7), but they appear with the army of Jehoshaphat (2 Ch. 20), at the coronation of Joash (2 Ch. 23), at the cleansing of the Temple and the celebration of the passover under Hezekiah (2 Ch. 29-30), and at similar events under Josiah (2 Ch. 34-35). Their descent is also elaborately given (1 Ch. 6-7).
The writer, then, is of the same school as the author of the Priests' Code. Equally with him he delights in all that pertains to the ministry of the sanctuary. He also has the same fondness for statistics, and exhibits repeatedly similar exaggerations. He gives the weight or value of the gold 100,000 talents, silver 1,000,000 talents, which David prepared as king for the Temple (1 Ch. 22*); also 3,000 talents of gold and 7,000 of silver which David gave from his private purse (1 Ch. 29*); and then again of gold 5,000 talents and 10,000 darics, of silver 10,000 talents, of brass 18,000 talents, of iron 100,000 talents, contributed by the rulers for the building of the Temple (1 Ch. 29'); and likewise he gives in thousands the number of sheep and cattle offered at religious festivals (1 Ch. 29* 2 Ch. 29* 30* 35*); and the number of warriors: those who came to make David king, from the tribes of Israel, 6,800, 7,100, 4,600, 3,700, 3,000, 20,800, 18,000, 50,000, 37,000, 28,600, 40,000, and 120,000 (1 Ch. 12* 2 Ch. 29* 30* 35*); the officers of David in twelve divisions of 24,000 each, one division serving a month (1 Ch. 27*); the warriors of Rehoboam 180,000 (2 Ch. 11*); of Abijah 400,000 (2 Ch. 13*); of Jeroboam 800,000, of whom 500,000 were slain (2 Ch. 13*); of Asa from Judah 300,000, from Benjamin 280,000 (2 Ch. 14*), and of Zerah his opponent 1,000,000 (2 Ch. 14*); of Jehoshaphat in five divisions of 300,000, 280,000, 200,000, 200,000, and 180,000 each (2 Ch. 17*); of Amaziah 300,000 and 100,000 more who were hired (2 Ch. 25*); of Uzziah 307,500 under 2,600 chiefs (2 Ch. 26*); and of Ahaz (the total number of whose warriors is not given) 120,000 who were slain in one day (2 Ch. 28*).

The writer likewise, after the manner of P, indulges in registers of names. These not only appear in the genealogical tables of the introduction (1 Ch. 1-9) and in the classification of the ministers of the Temple and the officers of David (1 Ch. 23-27), but in lists of heroes who came to David at Zizlag (1 Ch. 12*); of priests, Levites, musicians, and gate-keepers who took part in the removal of the ark (1 Ch. 15-16*); of princes, Levites, and priests sent throughout the land to give instruction in the law (2 Ch. 17*); of captains (Levites) who conspired to place Joash on the throne (2 Ch. 23*); of heads of the children of Ephraim who commanded the return of
the captives of Judah in the reign of Ahaz (2 Ch. 28:14); of Levites who assisted Hezekiah in cleansing the Temple (2 Ch. 29:13-15); of superintendents of offerings (Levites), also in the reign of Hezekiah (2 Ch. 31:14); of overseers of the repair of the Temple, and of rulers of the Temple (all Levites) under Josiah (2 Ch. 34:1-35:26).

The history is thus throughout of the character of the Priests' Code, both in its subject-matter and form of presentation, and is written entirely from the point of view of that legislation and thus as a supplement to 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K. The priestly history of Israel of the earlier books ceases with the concluding stories of the Book of Judges. Samuel and Kings, while witnessing to a few examples of priestly revision, convey no picture of Israel's history as it should have been had the priestly legislation originated with Moses and been upheld and carried forward by the pious David and his godly successors. To remedy this defect was clearly the object of the Chronicler. He thus introduced a great deal of new material, mentioned above, concerning the Temple and its ministry and religious celebrations. But he was not simply concerned with institutions and ceremonies and Levitical classes; he was equally interested in the divine rule. He interpreted Israel's life, after the pattern in the Priests' Code of its national beginning under Moses, as that of a church with constant rewards and punishments through signal divine intervention. This method had already in some measure been pursued, with Deuteronomy as a standard, in the earlier histories. The Chronicler, with the Priests' Code as his standard, aiming to give a more complete and consistent history, while drawing largely as a basis upon Samuel and Kings, modified their narratives. He made more universal the connection between piety and prosperity, and wickedness and adversity, heightening good and bad characters and their rewards and punishments, or creating them according to the exigencies of the occasion. Thus grandeur is added to David by lists of warriors who came to him at Ziglag and of hosts who made him king at Hebron. On the other hand, his domestic troubles, his adultery, and the rebellion of Absalom are passed over in silence.

The history of Solomon is similarly treated. No mention is made of the intrigue by which he came to the throne, or of his
idolatries or troubles near the close of his life. After the disruption no mention is made of the N. kingdom except incidentally. Its history is entirely ignored as that of an apostate or heathen nation.

Rehoboam, of whom nothing commendable is written in Kings, is approved and exalted in the early years of his reign (2 Ch. 11), clearly that he as well as his people may stand in sharp contrast to Jeroboam and the northern tribes; and then later in explanation of the invasion of Shishak, he is accused, with all his people, of having forsaken the law of Yahweh (2 Ch. 12:11).

Abijah, of whom in Kings only evil is recorded and whose brief reign of three years is absolutely colourless save in the mention of war between him and Jeroboam, is also transformed and exalted after the manner of Rehoboam, and is not only given a great victory over Jeroboam, but made a preacher of the righteousness of the Priests' Code (2 Ch. 13).

Asa according to Kings was a good king, and he removed idols and an abominable image made by the queen-mother, but it is said "the high places were not taken away." The Chronicler, however, makes him at first the remover of high places, and gives him a mighty army and a victory over a Cushite host of 1,000,000 men of which the earlier narrative knows nothing (2 Ch. 14:14). Later the Chronicler quotes the passage concerning the high places but applies it to Israel, the N. kingdom, over which Asa had no control. Asa, according to the earlier narrative, invoked the aid of Syria against Baasha, King of Israel. This act is made the subject of prophetic rebuke, and Asa, from then on, is painted in dark colours as the oppressor of the prophet and the people. This wickedness, doubtless, was designed to be connected with his diseased feet mentioned in Kings. The Chronicler also adds that he sought, in his disease, not the Lord but physicians.

Jehoshaphat is commended in Kings for doing "that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh" (1 K. 22:2), but the record of his reign is very brief. This gave the Chronicler a full opportunity, and hence, although Jehoshaphat is rebuked for his alliance with Ahab (an alliance mentioned in Kings), and the wreck of his merchant-vessels built in conjunction with Ahaziah, King of Israel (also men-
tioned in Kings), is declared to be a punishment for the sin of such a partnership, he is yet exalted exceedingly. He is endowed with riches and honour in abundance. His army is very great, although apparently entirely superfluous, since a divine interposition of panic and self-destruction destroys an immense host of invaders from eastern Palestine (2 Ch. 20). But the name of the King seems to have suggested the special form of his good works. Jehoshaphat means "Yahweh judges," and to him are assigned the commendable acts of sending teachers of the law throughout the land and the appointment of judges (2 Ch. 17:1-19).

Joram, who according to Kings did that which was evil, is magnified in wickedness and disaster. In his reign Edom revolted from Judah, and the Chronicler connected this, as the older narrative did not, directly with Joram's sins. Moreover, he also saw in Joram a seducer of his own people, and threatened him with fearful plagues through a letter from Elijah, who, according to the older narrative, had already died in the reign of Jehoshaphat. These plagues befall the monarch through a sack of Jerusalem by a horde of Philistines and Arabians, and a fearful incurable disease whereby the King's bowels fell out (2 Ch. 21).

After the death of Ahaziah, who reigned only a year, Athaliah the queen-mother seized the throne, until at the end of six years she was deposed and slain through a conspiracy directed by Jehoiada the priest, and Joash was crowned. This conspiracy gave the Chronicler the opportunity to make one of his most marked reconstructions of history. According to the earlier narrative the conspirators are captains of the royal mercenary body-guards; according to the Chronicler they are captains of Levites, and the whole narrative is rewritten in the interest of the exaltation of the Levites and the preservation of the sanctity of the Temple (2 Ch. 23). The reign of Joash was unfortunate in the extreme. He suffered the loss of all the treasures of the Temple and of the palace in purchasing the withdrawal of Hazael, King of Damascus, from Judah, and later he was assassinated. The Chronicler tells how he deserved this fate. He makes him, after the death of Jehoiada the priest, an apostate from the worship of Yahweh and the murderer of the son of his old benefactor the priest. He adds also to his
calamities by stating that at the time of his death he suffered
great diseases (2 Ch. 24).

Amaziah waged a most disastrous war with Joash, King of
Israel. The wall of Jerusalem was broken down and the treasures
of Temple and palace taken. Amaziah also met his death through
a conspiracy. These dire events needed an explanation and the
Chronicler introduces an apostasy of Amaziah in the worship of
Edomite gods and threatens him through a prophet with de¬
struction (2 Ch. 25\textsuperscript{**} ).

Uzziah, one of the best (2 K. 15\textsuperscript{*} ) and most prosperous of the
kings of Judah, became a leper and made his son Jotham regent.
The Chronicler finds a cause for this leprosy in a usurpation of
priestly prerogative in the burning of incense in the Temple, and
he says, “The leprosy broke forth in his forehead before the priests
in the house of Yahweh beside the altar of incense” (2 Ch. 26\textsuperscript{*} ).

Ahaz was not a good king, and to deliver himself from the com¬
bined forces of Syria and Israel he successfully invoked the aid of
Assyria and seems to have suffered no great loss (2 K. 16). But not
so did the Chronicler write his history. He delivers him into the
hand of the King of Syria with a very great loss in captives; and
also into the hand of the King of Israel with the slaughter of 120,-
ooo men in one day and the capture of 200,000 wives, sons, and
daughters. Edomites and Philistines also invade his land and the
King of Assyria distresses him (2 Ch. 28\textsuperscript{*} ).

Hezekiah was a good king and in the older narrative he re¬
formed the worship of Yahweh and departed not from the divine
commandments. The Chronicler accordingly magnifies at length
his conduct, giving great prominence to the priests and Levites
(2 Ch. 29). But Manasseh his son was an exceedingly wicked
king, and he reigned the unusual period of fifty-five years. The
Chronicler explains this anomaly by a repentance of Manasseh
after an imprisonment, of which the older narrative knows
nothing, in Babylon (2 Ch. 33\textsuperscript{*} ).

Josiah was a good king and reformed the worship of Yahweh.
As in the case of Hezekiah, the Chronicler magnifies this element of
his reign, but Josiah met an untimely death at the battle of Me¬
giddo. This required explanation, and hence it is recorded that
he was disobedient to a warning given by Necho from the mouth of God (2 Ch. 35:11).

The Chronicler introduces on critical occasions warning and exhorting seers or prophets. At the invasion of Shishak, Shemaiah addresses Rehoboam (2 Ch. 12:1); at the overthrow of Zerah, Azariah exhorts Asa (2 Ch. 15:10), and when Asa invokes foreign aid Hanani reproves him (2 Ch. 16:9); and Hanani's son Jehu likewise reproves Jehoshaphat for his alliance with Ahab, and Jehaziel encourages Jehoshaphat in the conflict with Moab and Ammon (2 Ch. 20:1), and Eliezer prophesies against Jehoshaphat for his partnership with Ahaziah (2 Ch. 20:1); Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest testifies against the people in the days of Joash (2 Ch. 24:2); and Oded speaks unto the men of Israel in the reign of Ahaz (2 Ch. 28:3). A few of these are mentioned in the earlier books but are unknown on these occasions or with such edifying speeches. They are clearly supplements by the later writer.

In many minute particulars the earlier accounts are glossed or revised. Of Saul's death it is added that he died for his trespass and because he asked counsel of one having a familiar spirit (1 Ch. 10:13). The statement that David and his men carried off the idols of the Philistines (2 S. 5:10) is changed to that of their destruction by fire at the command of David (1 Ch. 14:12). Nothing else, evidently, was regarded as suitable for such abominations from such a pious king. The ark entrusted to the care of Obed-edom does not remain in the house of Obed-edom (2 S. 6:11), but with this household in its own house (1 Ch. 13:1). This would keep it from defilement. Both Samuel the Ephraimite (1 S. 1:1) and Obed-edom the Gittite (2 S. 6:15) are given a Levitical descent (1 Ch. 6:60. 68:16. 26:8) as required of the servants of the tabernacle and the ark in P.

Goliath the Gittite slain by Elhanan the Bethlehemite (2 S. 21:15) becomes Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite (1 Ch. 20:5). This removes the discrepancy with the story of David's conquest (1 S. 17). David's sons are changed from "priests" (2 S. 8:16) into "the first at the hand of the king" (1 Ch. 18:1). A non-Levitical priesthood supported by David was unthinkable to the Chronicler.
Yahweh, who led David to number Israel (2 S. 24*)}, since a direct divine temptation was not agreeable to the later theology, becomes Satan (1 Ch. 21*); and agreeably to the later angelology the destroying angel is placed between the earth and the heaven (1 Ch. 21**) instead of remaining simply by the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite (2 S. 24*). The price paid by David for the threshing-floor is changed from fifty shekels of silver (2 S. 24*) into six hundred shekels of gold (1 Ch. 21*), since, forsooth, the former sum was too paltry to be given by such a monarch as David for the future site of the Temple. Fire also is said to have fallen from heaven and kindled David's sacrifice, and also Solomon's, at the dedication of the Temple (1 Ch. 21* 2 Ch. 7*). This is a mark of the later wonder-seeking theology. The high place at Gibeon where Solomon sacrificed is explained as the seat of the brazen altar and the tabernacle (2 Ch. 1*), particulars unexpressed in the parallel narrative in 1 K. (3*). Thus the act of Solomon is kept within the priestly law. The gift of cities by Solomon to Hiram, King of Tyre (1 K. 9*), becomes, to preserve, doubtless, the integrity of the Holy Land, the reverse—a gift of cities by Hiram to Solomon (2 Ch. 8*). The removal of Pharaoh's daughter from the city of David into her house newly built by Solomon (1 K. 9*') is motived because the place in proximity to the ark must be kept holy (2 Ch. 8*). These striking glosses and changes by no means exhaust the number made by the Chronicler. Wherever he makes use of the earlier canonical narratives they are present in a greater or less degree.

Thus the entire history of the kingdom of Judah has suffered reconstruction, and it is clear that the Books of Chronicles are a tendency writing of little historical value. The picture which they give of the past is far less accurate or trustworthy than that of the earlier Biblical writings; indeed, it is a distorted picture in the interest of the later institutions of post-exilic Judaism; and the main historical value of these books consists in their reflection of the notions of that period. Yet at the same time some ancient facts, having trickled down through oral or written tradition, are doubtless preserved in the amplifications and embellishments of the Chronicler. These we shall have occasion to point out in our
PLAN, PURPOSE, AND HISTORICAL VALUE

commentary. They are few indeed compared with the products of the imagination, and must be sifted like kernels of wheat from a mass of chaff (cf. S. A. Cooke, Notes on OT History, p. 67).

The following new material, exclusive of names and notices in the genealogical section, 1 Ch. 1-9, has been presented by Kittel, by the use of heavy type, in his commentary as historical: (1) the additions to the list of David's heroes (1 Ch. 11:11-17); (2) the family of Rehoboam (2 Ch. 11:1-20); (3) the name of the father of the mother of Abijah (2 Ch. 13:1); (4) the number of Abijah's wives and children (2 Ch. 13:15); (5) the teaching delegation sent by Jehoshaphat (2 Ch. 17:1); (6) details of the military might and building operations of Uzziah (2 Ch. 26:16-17, 14); (7) the same of Jotham (2 Ch. 27:1-6; v. 6 in part only); (8) the invasion of the Edomites and Philistines in the reign of Ahaz (2 Ch. 28:17); (9) the conduit built by Hezekiah (2 Ch. 32:2-7); (10) the place of Hezekiah's grave (2 Ch. 32:30); (11) the enlargement of the wall of Jerusalem by Manasseh (2 Ch. 33:15). Of these (4) and (5) are probably of no historic worth; others are doubtful; some may be accepted, especially (6)-(11). (See the commentary in locis.) Genuine history has also been found in these additions of the Chronicler: (1) Abijah's victory (2 Ch. 13:1-22); (2) Asa's victory (2 Ch. 14:8-11); (3) Jehoshaphat's victory (2 Ch. 18:1-14); (4) Uzziah's resistance to the priests (2 Ch. 26:16-23); and (5) the repentance of Manasseh (2 Ch. 33:15-18). The ground urged for this, as far as the victories are concerned, is that the continued existence of the little kingdom of Judah for three hundred and fifty years with enemies on the south and revolted Israel on the north is hardly to be explained except on the hypothesis of some such successes as the Chronicler describes (2 Ch. 13:16, 14:9, 18, 20:17), gained by Judah (Ba. pp. xxx-xxxiii). This is a plausible but a specious argument. The kingdom of Judah was too poor a country to be very attractive to its neighbours or to entice distant hordes to make such invasions. Raids may have been made into Judah and some reminiscences of these may be behind these stories (see commentary), but nothing further can be affirmed. The motive for (4) and (5) is so strong that no historical probability on the ground of their record can be asserted. A change of religious policy by Manasseh in his old age, considering how his reign is viewed by the prophets, is utterly unlikely. Winckler, in connection with his theory of the contact of the kingdoms of northern Arabia with Israel, has found historical reminiscences in the Chronicler's allusions to the Meunim (2 Ch. 26:1, 1 Ch. 4:11, 2 Ch. 20:6), the Arabians (2 Ch. 17:11, 21:14), and the Hagarites (1 Ch. 5:14-18). The basis for this inference is the claim that the chronology of the appearance of these people in Ch. is correct. They are mentioned just when historically they might be expected (Musri, Meluhha, Ma'in, MVAG. 1898, pp. 42 ff.; KAT. pp. 149 ff.,
On the other hand it is strange that the older and more historical Books of Samuel and Kings contain none of these notices or similar ones, and it is readily credible that these names might have been current in post-exilic times (if not certain that they were), and thus at hand for the Chronicler to introduce as the enemies of Israel (We. Prol. p. 208; Noeldeke, EBi. I. col. 274).

§ 5. THE RELIGIOUS VALUE.

The religious value of Chronicles lies in the emphasis given to the institutional forms of religion. Forms, ceremonies, institutions of one sort or another, are necessary for the maintenance of religious life. The Chronicler, it is true, overemphasised their importance and his teachings are vitiated by a false doctrine of divine interference without human endeavour, and a false notion of righteousness consisting largely in the observance of legal forms and ceremonies. Yet in his own time, unless he had been a direct forerunner of Christ, he could not have been expected to give a different message, and in his day his message rendered a most important service. He belonged not only to the same school of writers as the author or authors of the Priestly element of the Pentateuch, but was kindred with the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and especially Malachi. "The course of events since the restoration had made the Temple with its high priest and its sacrificial system a centre for the community much more than it had been before, but this very fact had a providential significance in view of the future. It was essential for Israel's preservation that the ceremonial obligations laid upon it should be strictly observed, and that it should hold itself aloof socially from its heathen neighbours" (Dr. Minor Prophets, II. in NCB. p. 297). However narrow the Chronicler's teachings may be considered and however artificial their products, without the shell of the Judaistic legalism and ecclesiasticism it is difficult to see how the precious truths of divine revelation in Hebrew prophecy could have been preserved. Otherwise amid the encroaching forces of the Persian, Greek, and Roman civilisations they would have been dissipated and no place would have been prepared for the appearance of Christ and the growth of Christianity. The work of the Chronicler fostered the
needed spirit of Jewish exclusiveness in its list of genealogies; it enhanced Jerusalem as the rallying-point and centre of Jewish life; it favoured the maintenance of a hierarchy and emphasised the outward forms of religion in sacrifices and national festivals, but all this contributed largely to the religious solidarity and strength of the people and gave them a tough quality.

Through these writings the past also was idealised and glorified as a norm for present activity and future development. Nothing better than the authority of the past could have served in those days to intensify the loyalty and devotion of the ancient Jew. The divine law of retribution and special providence, which the Chronicler taught, was a most powerful factor also for preserving the Jewish Church. It must also never be forgotten that it was under the tutelage of men like the Chronicler that the Maccabees were nourished and that the heroic age of Judaism was inaugurated.

§ 6. SOURCES.

A. The source of canonical material. According to the sketch just given the Chronicler supplemented and in a measure revised the history of Israel narrated in the canonical books, especially I and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K. These then constitute a main source of his work. The following are the parallels between his and the earlier writings. (These parallels include the Chronicler's modifications of the canonical material and hence are not as restricted as some lists which omit all observations and additions of the Chronicler. For these details see commentary.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Ch.</th>
<th>Gn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:5-12,</td>
<td>10:2-4. 6-8. 13-18a. 22-29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4-4,</td>
<td>38:7. 38f. 46:18a Nu. 26:18 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1,</td>
<td>46:18a Nu. 26:18a Ru. 4:19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 AND 2 CHRONICLES

1 Ch. 3:1-9,
   " 3:1-4,
   " 4:24,
   " 4:25-26,
   " 5:3,
   " 5:20, 26,
   " 5:21-23 (6:7),
   " 6:1-4. 7 (11:19. 22),
   " 6:1-18 (15:1-28),
   " 6:19-40 (64:11),
   " 9:1-17,
   " 10:1-18,
   " 11:1-9,
   " 11:10-17,
   " 13:1-14,
   " 14:1-7. 8-17,
   " 15. 16,
   " 17,
   " 18,
   " 19,
   " 20:1-3,
   " 20:4-
   " 21,

2 Ch. 15-15,
   " 15:1-7,
   " 15:8-21 (2),
   " 3:1-5,
   " 5:2-7,
   " 7:11-23,
   " 8,
   " 9:1-12. 13-28,
   " 9:29-31,
   " 10:1-11,
   " 12:1. 2. 9-10,
   " 13:1. 2. 22 (14:1),
   " 14:1. 2 (2. 1), 15:1-10,
   " 16:1-4. 11-14,
   " 18:1-24,
   " 20:1-21,
   " 21:1-10. 18,
   " 22:1-4. 7-9,
   " 22:18-23:30,
   " 24:1-11. 13-17,
   " 25:1-4. 11. 17-28,

2 S. 3:2-4. 5. 11-16, cf. 13.
1 and 2 K.
Gn. 46:10 Ex. 6:15 Nu. 26:11 t.
Jos. 19:2.
Gn. 46:4 Nu. 26:4 t.
cf. 2 K. 15:14. 15. 17. 18. 211.
Ex. 6:18. 19. 20. 22 Nu. 31:10.
" 6:8 1 S. 1:8. 2.
Ne. 11:10-14.
1 S. 31.
2 S. 51:1-2. 6-10.
" 6:1-11.
" 5:1-10. 17-20.
" 7.
" 8.
" 10.
" 24.

1 K. 3:1-14,
   " 5:12-20 (1-10),
   " 6. 7:12-21.
   " 8.
   " 9:10-22.
   " 11:1-4.
   " 12:1-20.
   " 14:1-21.
   " 15:1. 2. 7. 8.
   " 15:11-16.
   " 15:17-20.
   " 22:21-31 (50),

2 K. 8:17-24,
   " 11 (11:1-20).
The simplest explanation of the parallels (and the true one already assumed above and now universally accepted) is the direct quotation or paraphrase of the canonical books by the Chronicler and their modification by him, or, what amounts to the same thing, by a forerunner whose work he copied (a view mentioned below though not accepted).

The evidence for this direct use is very clear. It is seen in the verbal agreements which appear in every parallel. (See commentary.) Corruptions in the earlier texts are also repeated in the later. Cf. in 1 Ch. חקק III* וご覧, זכרון 11.1, ותל 14.1, והיהו 17.9, ומוה 18.1, ורע 19.1, ובו 20.1; in 2 Ch., 'מעי וילנש וגו' and 4.18, ותבכי 4.17, ויהי 7.

The canonical text is also sometimes so closely followed as to introduce irrelevant expressions. Cf. 1 Ch. 6.1 (6) 6.2 (7) (but present form possibly due to transcriber, v. in loco) 14.1 (רש) 15.20 (now David was abiding in J.) 20 (the staff, etc.). The variations also between the two texts show the dependence of one upon the other. Chronicles, as might be expected from its less frequent transcription, in many instances preserves the more original reading (cf. 1 Ch. 17.45 21.8 3.10. 1.4 7 11.14. 13.8. 9. 10. 14.7 מַעְלֵי, 12. 16 17.2. ס. 18.11. 17.19. 10. 20. 2 Ch. 2.17 (18) 4.). An antiquated term is often replaced by a later one (cf. 1 Ch. 10.18 18.15 * ? 19.1 21.1. 1.

Statements jarring the Chronicler's sense of religious propriety or doing violence to his conception of the course of history were omitted or modified (see § 4, pp. 9-15).

Other departures from the text are such as might be expected from one who was not a servile copyist. The Chronicler abridges frequently (cf. 1 Ch. 11.4. 16.17. 16.19 21.1 2 Ch. 7.12 3.7. 18.17 71.4 36.11), and occasionally introduces words to emphasise an idea or to give clearness, and also pious phrases (cf. 1 Ch. 11.15 18.13 2 Ch. 18m).
This direct use, however, was formerly questioned, because the variance between the parallels seemed destructive to the infallible inspiration of the Chronicler. Hence arose the theory (held by many commentators, and represented in its final and most perfect form especially by Keil) that the Chronicler and the writers of the canonical books both used common sources, and that the parallels were independent extracts from common sources, each made from a point of view peculiar to itself (Keil, Intro. § 141).

To illustrate this view: In the account of Saul's death (2 S. 31 and 1 Ch. 10) there is agreement almost word for word until the treatment of the corpse of the King. The writer of 1 S. says: The Philistines cut off his head, stripped off his armour and put his armour in the house of Ashtaroth, and then fastened his body to the wall of Bethshean. The Chronicler says: They took his head and his armour and they put his armour in the house of their gods and fastened his head in the temple of Dagon. The original source of both of these accounts Keil held must have contained an account of both head and trunk, which the author of 1 S. followed as far as the trunk was concerned and the Chronicler as far as the head.

Again in comparing 2 Ch. 2 with 1 K. 5:18-22 (1:18), in the former we read that when Solomon purposed to build the Temple he sent to Hiram, King of Tyre, and asked for a cunning workman and for timber and hewers of timber, promising much grain and wine and oil in return, while in 1 K. only timber and cutters of timber are requested and no promise of oil is mentioned. Here again Keil held that these are extracts from a common source, one writer emphasising one particular and the other another.

This supposition of Keil (an unnatural one compared with that of direct use and really not worthy of further consideration) breaks down completely if the results of recent scholarship in reference to the sources of the canonical books can at all be trusted, since these sources always appear in Chronicles in the same combinations in which they are found in the canonical books, and never apparently otherwise; i.e., they appear always edited and not in their original form.

The names in 1 Ch. 1:1-29 are grouped as they appear in Gn. 10:1-12, 21-23, a combination of three sources, P, J, and R (Dr. Gn.). Gleanings from Gn. 35, 38, 46 representing P, J, and R appear in 1 Ch. 2. (No one, however, has ever seriously argued that the Chronicler had access to the sources of the Pentateuch, since, forsooth, to Keil and those of his school the Pentateuch had no sources in the modern sense.)
In 1 Ch. 18 || 2 S. 8 is a combination of three sources. Glosses in 2 S. 5*. 7b 23' (Budde, SBOT.) are reproduced in 1 Ch. 11*. 16*. The parallels with 2 S., however, are not favourable for presenting combinations because underlying 2 S. is almost entirely a single source. In 1 and 2 K. it is different, and here, following the analysis of Stade and Schwally (SBOT*), a number of sources appear combined in nearly every parallel in 2 Ch. In 1*18 || 1 K. 3*18 three; in 1*14*17 || 1 K. 10*18*18 three; in c. 2 || 1 K. 5*18*18 (1*-18) two; in 3*1*5*1 || 1 K. 6*, 7*11*11 three; in 5*1*7*19 || 1 K. 8 three; in 9*1*11 || 1 K. 10*1*18 two; in 10*1*11* || 1 K. 12*1*14 four; and thus in a similar manner throughout the entire list of parallels. (The analyses of Ki., Kau., Sk., give a similar result.)

The Chronicler then used our present canonical books and not their sources for all matter common to both works. He might still, however, have used their sources for material not found in the canonical books, but of this there is not the slightest evidence and in form all new material (excluding genealogical matter and the list of David's additional heroes, 1 Ch. 11*11*11) is of the composition or style of the Chronicler.

B. SOURCES ALLEGED BY THE CHRONICLER. After the manner of the author of 1 and 2 K., the Chronicler refers to written sources. These are of two classes; first, those with general titles: (a) A Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, for the reigns of Jotham, Josiah, and Jehoiakim (2 Ch. 27* 35* 36*). (b) A Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, for the reigns of Asa, Amaziah, Ahaz, and Hezekiah (v. i. (o)) (2 Ch. 16* 25* 28* 32*). (c) A Book of the Kings of Israel, for genealogies (1 Ch. 9*) and the reigns of Jehoshaphat (2 Ch. 20*) (v. i. (m)) and Manasseh (2 Ch. 33*). (d) A Midrash of the Book of the Kings, for the reign of Joash (2 Ch. 24*).

Secondly, those with specific prophetic titles: (e) The history (lit. words or acts, so also below) of Samuel the seer. (f) The history of Nathan the prophet. (g) The history of Gad the seer. These three are given for the reign of David (1 Ch. 29*). (h) The prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite. (i) The visions of Iddo the seer. These two and also (f) are given for the reign of Solomon (2 Ch. 9*). (j) The history of Shemaiah the prophet. (k) The history of Iddo the seer. These two are given for the reign of Rehoboam (2 Ch. 12*). (l) The Midrash of the prophet Iddo for the reign of Abijah (2 Ch. 13*). (m) A history of the prophet Jehu which
is inserted in the Book of the Kings of Israel, for the reign of Jehoshaphat (v. s. (c)). (n) A writing of Isaiah the prophet, for the reign of Uzziah (2 Ch. 26**). (o) The vision of Isaiah the prophet in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, for the reign of Hezekiah (v. s. (b)). (p) A history of the seers for particulars concerning Manasseh (2 Ch. 33**).

Authorities thus are given for the history of all the kings of Judah except Jehoram, Ahaziah, Amon, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. (Naturally none are given for Athaliah and Jehoahaz.) Also the following works are referred to: (q) A genealogical register compiled in the day of Jotham and Jeroboam II (1 Ch. 5**). (r) The later history of David? (1 Ch. 23**). (s) The chronicles (lit. words) of David in which the census taken by Joab was not entered (1 Ch. 27**). (t) A collection of lamentations (2 Ch. 35**).

The first three of these works (a) (b) (c) are generally allowed to represent a single work whose full title was, The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, or Judah and Israel, and the title of which in (c) is abbreviated—Israel representing the entire people and not specifically the N. kingdom, since under (c) the reigns of Jehoshaphat and Manasseh are treated. This work, which is cited as an authority for reigns as early as that of Asa and as late as that of Jehoiakim, was clearly a comprehensive one, but not the canonical Books of Kings, because it is cited for matters not in those books—i.e., genealogies (1 Ch. 9*), the wars of Jotham (2 Ch. 27?) and the prayer of Manasseh (2 Ch. 33**) and the abominations of Jehoiakim (2 Ch. 36*). Neither was it the sources mentioned in 1 and 2 K. for the political history of Israel and Judah, since they were two distinct works. It may, however, have been a work dependent upon those sources (Be. p. xl.; Graf, GB. p. 192; Dr. EBi. I. col. 768, LOT.** p. 532), or since the real historical material derived from this book apart from that in the canonical books is extremely meagre it may have been dependent upon those books, a Midrash or commentary on them (Kuenen, Einl. p. 160). In their earliest form 1 and 2 K. may have contained fuller information than in their present Massoretic form. A warrant for this inference lies in the occasional fuller text of G, which implies an earlier, fuller Heb. text (Bu. Gesch. Alt heb. Lit. p. 229).
In reality no one can decide the exact basis of any unknown work. Many and extensive volumes may lie before an author whose work is restricted and meagre.

Whether the Midrash (e) was the same as this Book of Kings is uncertain. The peculiar title would suggest a distinct work (so Be., Zoe., Oe., Ki.); on the other hand it is not apparent why if, as its title shows, it was a comprehensive work dealing with the kings generally, it should not be the same work as the one just mentioned (so Ew. Hist. i. p. 187; We. Prol. p. 227; Francis Brown, DB. I. p. 395; Dr. (the probability) EBi. I. col. 768).

The word Midrash (שרר 2 Ch. 13:24* from שרר to seek) in Rabbinic literature denotes an exposition, an exegesis. This frequently took the form of stories (such as those of Judith, Tobit, etc.), and the probability is that the Midrash of Kings was a reconstructed history of Israel embellished with marvellous tales of divine interposition and prophetic activity, such as have been reproduced in Ch.

The prophetic writings (e) to (p) are not in all probability distinct works, but are illustrations of the usual Jewish manner of citing sections of comprehensive works. As in the NT. we read, “Have ye not read in the Book of Moses in the place concerning the Bush” (Mk. 12:26), or more aptly, “Know ye not what the scripture saith in Elijah” (Rom. 11:1). The “histories” of Nathan, Gad, and the others are then the sections of which Nathan, Gad, etc., were the catchwords in the Book of Kings, i.e., the Midrash with the possible exception of (n) where the reference is probably to the Book of Isaiah (cc. 36–39), and also (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), not unlikely refer to sections of our canonical books (v. commentary). This is proved first because the history of the prophet Jehu (m)
and the vision of Isaiah (o) are expressly mentioned as in this Book of Kings, and secondly because the Chronicler never cites the authority of the Book of Kings and the history of a prophet for any one reign except where they are coupled together. The main sources used by the Chronicler are then, in all likelihood, only two, the canonical books and this Midrashic History of Israel, and if this latter was dependent upon the canonical books then in reality he had no really historical material apart from those books in their original form (v. s.). Whether the Midrashic history contained all his extra-canonical genealogical material, or whether he gathered some from elsewhere through written or oral sources, it is impossible to determine.

It is also possible that the Chronicler has cited sources simply to produce the impression that he is writing with authority, and that their titles are mere literary adornments suggested by those in the Book of Kings. This is essentially the view of Torrey, who, speaking of the comprehensive work so generally held to have been used by the Chronicler, says, “It is time that scholars were done with this phantom ‘source,’ of which the internal evidence is absolutely lacking, and the external evidence is limited to the Chronicler’s transparent parading of ‘authorities’; while the evidence against it is overwhelming” (AJSL. xxv. p. 195). The uniformity of the Chronicler’s non-canonical material certainly supports this view, yet at the same time it is also plausible that the Chronicler may have had before him one or more sources from which he derived subject-matter which he freely composed in his own way. Certainly some of the new historical reminiscences preserved in Chronicles were, in all probability, derived from written sources.

Eliminating the canonical quotations, the remainder of Chronicles is so marked and homogeneous in style that it has been usually (and properly) treated as the work of a single author, i.e., the Chronicler. (Thus We. Prol. p. 227; Dr. EBi. I. Art. Chronicles; and especially Torrey, AJSL. xxv. Nos. 2, 3, 1909.) In recent years, however, this remainder has been analysed into sources. This presentation has such scholarly support that it is worthy of statement, and throughout our commentary we give, with criticism, its conclusions.

In an article published in 1899 (in ZAW.) Büchler, a German scholar, argued that our present 1 and 2 Ch. are a revised edition of a work that
SOURCES

originally made no distinction between the priests and the Levites. This distinction he held was introduced later by the Chronicler, who magnified the position of the Levites and brought in the Levitical musicians. Under the influence apparently of Büchler's investigations, Benzinger, in his commentary (appearing in 1901), presented also the view that the Chronicler was much more an editor and mere compiler than in any way an independent writer. This result was reached through a study of the parallels with 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K. Some of these parallels agree essentially verbally with their source, others show a considerable departure from the canonical text. These latter are held to come not from the hand of the Chronicler but from a forerunner whose work he copied; and as the Chronicler was only in the main a mere copyist in his treatment of the canonical writings, so likewise, it was inferred, must he have been in his treatment of his other source or sources. Hence his work contains almost no original composition beyond inserted notices respecting Levites and musicians. (Movers had presented in 1833 essentially this view, Untersuchungen, pp. 163 ff.) Thus in 1 Ch. 10–29 only cc. 23–27 are from the Chronicler. Of the remainder, cc. 10, 11, 13, 14, 17–19 are from S. Chapter 12 reveals no special interest in anything Levitical; and cc. 15 records six Levitical families instead of the usual three and modest numbers, hence, except a paragraph concerning Levitical singers (vv. 16–18), both of these chapters are not from the Chronicler; c. 15 coming from uncertain sources and c. 15 from the work of a forerunner. Chapter 21 contains, with the absence of a sufficient theological motive, too great departures from 2 S. to have been written by the Chronicler; hence it is from another work, which appears continued in cc. 22, 28, 29. This work is admitted to be of the same vein and spirit of the Chronicler, showing an interest in the religious cultus alleged to have been developed by David, but is held to differ from the Chronicler's work: (1) in its more modest presentation of contributions for the Temple, 29:4 (to be compared with 22:14–15, a paragraph owing to the great numbers assigned to the Chronicler); (2) in the Deuteronomic colouring and in the lack of interest in P, since no objection is raised to David's sacrifice at the threshing-floor of Ornan.

In 2 Ch. 1–9, which presents a history of Solomon's reign, following, with the single exception of a paragraph on Solomon's chariots and horses, the order of 1 K., the departures from the canonical text (2 Ch. 1:18–2:21 (2:1–11)) are supposed to be too great to have come from the Chronicler, since the Tyrian artist is Huram-Abi, instead of Hiram (2 Ch. 2:18–19 (see commentary), 1 K. 7:14), with his mother a Danite instead of a widow from Naphtali (2 Ch. 2:10–11 1 K. 7:15), and he is a worker not simply in metals but weaving, etc., and the place Japho, unnamed in 1 K., is mentioned. Wanting also are the numbers of the workmen given in
1 K. 5* f. (11 f.) and the embassy from Hiram to Solomon (1 K. 5').
The Deuteronomistic reason for building the Temple, i.e., a dwelling-place,
is changed also into a priestly one, i.e., a place of worship (2 Ch. 2* (11) 1 K. 5* (1)).
In the description of the Temple and its furniture, owing again
to the variations from the account given in 1 K., the Chronicler is held
to have had another source before him, and in part is this held also of
the dedication.

The remainder of 2 Ch. (cc. 10-36) is assigned by Benzinger to different
sources, according to the character of the material. The Chronicler
throughout is a copyist. He only composes introductory and concluding
sentences and notices of the Levites. Kittel, in his commentary (1902),
accepts the theory of Benzinger and builds largely upon his conclusions.
He endeavours also to unify the various sources, and distinguishes (with
a variety of type and letters on the margin) the work of the Chronicler
and his predecessors. He warns one, however, against regarding the
conclusions thus expressed as final. He points out, by his mechanical
devices: (1) the material derived from the canonical books; (2)
material next in age of various sort and origin, yet mostly of historical
value (v. s. p. 15); (3) material from a Levitical writer, a forerunner of
the Chronicler, who wrote between 500 and 400 b.c.; (4) Midrash
material of two sorts (M and M*), taken in all likelihood from the cited
sources of the Chronicler; and finally (5) material of a period later than
the Chronicler, added by another Levite.

This theory of the composition of Chronicles, as we have said, rests
on the assumption that the Chronicler was essentially a mere copyist;
but even if at times he follows most closely his canonical sources there is
no reason why at other times he should not have been as free and
original as the Levite who is introduced as his forerunner. Exact con¬
sistency is not necessary to the Oriental mind, and especially to a writer
like the Chronicler. A Deuteronomistic colouring, along with a colouring
of the Priests' Code, implies no diversity of authorship, since every Jew
would be naturally versed in Deuteronomy as a people's book, one
probably read and studied far more by every pious Jew than the Priests'
Code, even by a Levite. Neither also, with a variety of traditions before
him, is there any reason why the same writer might not differently at
times enumerate Levitical families or statistics concerning the Temple.
The unity of style and composition, so individual and marked, already
mentioned, is against this patchwork theory of composition, although
its possibility in view of our limited knowledge cannot be denied.
§ 7. PECULIARITIES OF DICTION.

In common with other late books of the OT., Ch. (including Ezr.-Ne.) exhibits many peculiarities of phraseology and syntax. Many old words are made to do service in new ways either rare or unknown in the older language, and new words, the product of the late religious organisation and viewpoint, appear frequently. Also the incoming Aramaic, already a well-known language, had its influence on the Hebrew of the Chronicler, as is shown both by the presence of Aramaic loan-words and by many common Aramaic constructions. The many peculiarities of syntax, which are against the common usage of the earlier writers, indicate that the compiler and author, who was bilingual, either used Hebrew with some difficulty or that the language itself was decadent in his day. In addition to its common late characteristics, this group of writings has marked peculiarities of style and vocabulary. Words and phrases not found at all elsewhere are met frequently both in passages from older sources which have been worked over and, particularly, in additions bearing the certain marks of the compiler. No OT. writer reveals himself more certainly. The reader feels almost instinctively when he passes from an excerpt from an older source to a paragraph by the compiler himself. Sentences are often awkward and unnecessarily involved. The author's pet phrases are introduced without stint and almost without fail on every possible opportunity. No doubt many of the marks of slovenly and careless composition which are so common are due to copyists' errors (see § 8 Text), but so many of them are certainly original that the compiler cannot be vindicated as a careful composer. Probably not a few errors of his text which have been ascribed to copyists were simply due to his own carelessness when copying from his sources.

The following list contains the more marked peculiarities of the Chronicler's writings, including new words and phrases, old ones with a new or unusual sense, and syntactical usages peculiar to him, and also all of these found frequently in other late books as well as occasionally in earlier writings, but which are particular favourites with the Chronicler, hence characteristic of his style. For con-
venience those found only in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. are marked with an asterisk (*). It should be borne in mind, however, that words or expressions marked rare or peculiar may have been common usage in the Chronicler’s day, this statement being due merely to our meagre supply of literature of that period.

1. הָבָא howbeit, but, 2 Ch. 16:19; 33:17 Ezr. 10:16, also Dn. 10:7. (In older Heb. with an asseverative force, verily, of a truth Gn. 42:10; 2 S. 14:21 K. 1:6 K. 4:14 and with slight adversative force, nay, but Gn. 17:19 (P) †.)

2. רָאָי letter, 2 Ch. 30:6 Ne. 2:7; 6:17; 11, also Est. 9:29 †.

3. מֹסָד possession, i Ch. 7:8 9:2 Ch. 11:14 31:1 Ne. 11:8 and often in Ez. and P.

4. מָמָא promise or command, sq. inf., i Ch. 21:17 27:22 2 Ch. 11:14 18:21 29:27 Ne. 11:11 35:12 Ne. 9:18, also 2 S. 24:4 2 K. 8:8 Dn. Est. and elsewhere.

5. עָנָא * purple, 2 Ch. 2:1 (a late form of עֲדָן), cf. Aram. עֲנָא Dn. 5:7. 11.

6. מָלְאָנָא lands, designating districts of Israel’s territory i Ch. 13:2 2 Ch. 11:15 cf. Gn. 26:5, including Israel’s territory Ezr. 3:5 (text dub.) 9:1. 11 Ne. 10:10; in any sense pl. is almost wholly late i Ch. 14:17 22:29 2 Ch. 9:12 12:13 15:10 17:16 20:8 32:13. 11. 17 34:8 Ezr. 9:7 Ne. 9:28 10:16, v. No. 91.


8. מִשָּׁר Niph. separate oneself (reflex. of Hiph.), i Ch. 12:9 Ezr. 6:6 9:10. 11 Ne. 9:25-28, also Nu. 16:6 (P); be separated * i Ch. 23:13 Ezr. 10:8 †.

9. מִזָּה, מִזָּה byssus, i Ch. 4:15 27:2 Ch. 2:3 3:15 5:12, also Est. 1:6 18 and Ezr. 2:17 (where Cor. strikes out with ב) †.

PECULIARITIES OF DICTION

17. troop, of divisions of the army (Ch. 7:1 Ch. 25:10-12 Ch. 26:11, also
Jb. 29:20 Mi. 4:4).

18. *body, corpse, (Ch. 10:1 (late, cf. NH. and Aram.).

19. *treasury, (Ch. 28:11 also 28:9 (restored text) (cf. NH.; a
loan-word from or through Persian).

20. common-land, suburbs, (Ch. 5:64 + 40 t. Ch. 6:13 Ch. 26:11 31:11, also in Ez. and often in P.

21. Niph. hasten one's self, hurry, (Ch. 26:8, also Est. 6:11, Qal
Est. 3:8 8:7 (NH. id.).

22. drachma, Ne. 7:11 Ne. 7:11 (Ps. 96:5 Ps. 29:11.

23. seek Yahweh in prayer and worship, (Ch. 16:11 (Ps. 105:1 28:2 Ch. 12:14 15:16 Ch. 22:1 26:7; Ez. 25:7 (Ch. 19:26 30:17; 2 Ch. 22:1 Ch. 15:10 20:11 Ezr. 6:10; 2 Ch. 17:31 34:4 Ezr. 4:10.

24. commentary, exposition, (Ch. 13:24 7:1.

25. *holy adornment, only 2 Ch. 20:8 in prose, elsewhere in
poetry (Ch. 16:8 = Ps. 96:5 Ps. 29:11.

26. *how, (Ch. 13:11, also Dn. 10:1 (an Aram. form).

27. *praise Yahweh, of technical Levitical function, (Ch. 16:8 23:1 25:2 Ch. 5:11 10:1 20:8 20:9 30:8 Ezr. 3:18. 11:11 Ne. 5:11, cf. (Ch. 20:2 Ch. 20:11; 11:8 abs. v. 23:2 2 Ch. 7:8 11:21 29:10 31:12 Ne. 1:8, v. No. 47.

28. great number, (Ch. 19:1 2 Ch. 11:2 31:11, also Je. 49:11; multitude, (Ch. 11:1 (corrupt v. in loco) 13:14 20:11 11:13 32:1, also Dn. 11:11 11:13 and freq. in Ez., but only exceptionally in early prose.

29. *kind, (Ch. 16:11, also Ps. 144:11 (also in B. Aram. Dn. 3:7.

30. *Hiph. rejects (= earlier Qal), (Ch. 28:1 2 Ch. 11:14 29:12.

31. be enraged, 2 Ch. 26:10 11 (weaker in earlier usage).

32. refined, (Ch. 28:1 29:4, also Is. 25:5 Ps. 12:7.

33. *come out, appear, of leprosy, (Ch. 26:18.

34. binders, joints, (Ch. 22:2 2 Ch. 34:11.

35. joy, (Ch. 16:17 Ne. 8:8, Ezr. 6:10 (Aram.) (an Aram. word).

36. month numbered not named, (Ch. 12:8 27:1 27:4 27:5 27:6 11:11 10:11 2 Ch. 2:8 + 12 t. 2 Ch., Ezr. 3:1 + 10 t. Ezr., Ne. 7:7 8:11, also 1 K. 12:8 12:9 Ezr. and oft. in P.

37. *seer, (Ch. 21:9 (= 2 S. 24:12) 28:9 2 Ch. 9:12 10:9 29:9 33:18. 19, also 2 K. 17:8 Is. 29:13 39:16 (28:14 cf. BDB.) Mi. 3:7 Am. 7:12, and applied to singers * (Ch. 25:2 2 Ch. 29:8 35:17.

38. strengthen oneself, (Ch. 11:12 13:15 (take courage)
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34 1 K. 20 (gain strength); sq. "withstand, hold strongly with," Ch. 13 (Use in earlier books, "put forth strength, use one's strength.")

39. strength, of royal power, Ch. 13; put forth strength, Ezr. 6 (Aram.) Ne. 12; general use in Ps. and rare in earlier writings.

40. be sick, Ch. 16 (usually modern)

41. sickness, sufferings, 2 Ch. 24

42. division, course, technical term of organisation of priests and Levites, Ch. 23 24; Ne. 11 27; also Dn. 17; Ezr. 3 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

43. good works, pious acts, 2 Ch. 6 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

44. trumpet, as sacred instrument for use by priests only, Ch. 13; Ne. 12; 2 K. 12; Ps. 98; and Nu. 10.

45. according to the good hand of my God upon me, Ne. 2; Ezr. 7 8; cf. Ne. 2; Ne. 7; om. Ezr. 7 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

46. Hiph. praise, of ritual worship, Ch. 16; Ezr. 3; Ne. 12; 2 Ch. 5; see also 2 K. 12; Ps. 98; and Nu. 10. (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

47. thank and praise, Ch. 16; 23; 2 Ch. 5; Ezr. 3; Ne. 12; cf. Ch. 20; 2 Ch. 7; Ps. and Nos. 46, 27.

48. day by day (earlier), Ch. 12 2 Ch. 8; Ezr. 3; 6 (Aram.) Ne. 8 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

49. be enrolled by genealogy, Ch. 4; 51; 7; 17; Ne. 12; 17 2 Ch. 32; Ezr. 2; Ne. 7 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

50. generations, Ch. 12; 51; 8; 9; 26; also Ru. 4; and freq. in P.

51. Hiph. use the right hand, Ch. 12 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

52. aged, decrepit, Ch. 36 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

53. footstool, 2 Ch. 9 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)

54. set up, prepare, Ch. 9 12 14 15 28 2 Ch. 12; 17; 33 t. Ch., and Ezr. 3; esp. with set the heart, Ch. 29; 2 Ch. 12; 19 20; 30; Ezr. 7 (Put forth strength, put one's strength.)
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55. מְדַגֵּר gather, Qal 1 Ch. 22:4 Ne. 12:4 Ps. 33:7 Est. 4:11 Ec. 2:3 3:4 †.
56. נָפַץ Niph. be humbled, humble oneself, 1 Ch. 20:2 2 Ch. 7:14 12:7, 7:11 13:1 30:11 32:28 33:11. 11:11 = 34:21 36:11, also Lv. 26:13 (H) 1 S. 7:30 etc.; Hiph. humble, subdued, 1 Ch. 17:18 (= 2 S. 8:2) 2 Ch. 28:13, also Ju. 4:28 Dt. 9:3 Is. 25:6 Jb. 40:16 Ps. 81:10 107:11 †.
57. הבָּשׁ bowl, 1 Ch. 28:17, 17, 17, 17, 17 Ezr. 11:10 18:17 †.
58. הבָּשָׂר * blemished, 1 Ch. 15:17 (cf. B. Aram. אָשָּׂר Dn. 3:2).
59. הבָּשָׂר * crimson, carmine, 2 Ch. 28:11 34:7, possibly also Ct. 7:4 for הַשֵּׂר, † (a Persian loan-word).
60. הָלָה writing, 1 Ch. 28:19 2 Ch. 21:14 36:25 = Ne. 7:14 Ezr. 4:17, also Ez. 13:16 Dn. 10:1 Est. 1:14 1:8 2:4 8:3 11:15 9:7 †.
61. הבָּשָׂר of rows of shew-bread only, 1 Ch. 9:23 23:14 Ne. 13:11; הָלָה הַשֵּׂר 1 Ch. 28:19 2 Ch. 29:18 †; הָלָה הַשֵּׂר 2 Ch. 13:11 †; הָלָה הַשֵּׂר 2 Ch. 2:1 †; הָלָה Lv. 24:31 (P) †. (Earlier form was הָלָה מְשָׂרֶה.)
62. הבָּשָׂר * Hiph. jest, 2 Ch. 36:17 † (cf. NH. Hiph. id., הוא and נָפַץ Ethpa. id.).
63. הבָּשָׂר Hiph. mock, deride, always in bad sense, 2 Ch. 30:14 Ne. 2:15 3:16, also Jb. 21:17 Ps. 22:14 Pr. 18:13 (for מַפֶּר, cf. BDB.) † (cf. NH. id.).
64. הבָּשָׂר * scholar, 1 Ch. 25:4 † (late and NH.).
65. הבָּשָׂר chamber, cell, of the rooms of the Temple, 1 Ch. 9:23 23:28 11:2 2 Ch. 31:1 Ezr. 8:10 Ne. 10:11. 11:1 13:1 15:7 19:4, also oft. in Ez.; of room at high place 1 S. 9:27 and 11:16 (accepted as original We., Dr., Klo., Bu.) †. The word is used in the sense of store-room only in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. Cf. הַשְּׂר, No. 77.
66. הבָּשָׂר consecrate, 1 Ch. 29:3 2 Ch. 13:16-29:3, also Ez. 43:28 Ex. 38:24 29:33-32:35 Lv. 8:16-16:21 Nu. 3:1 (all P), and Jb. 17:11 1 K. 13:14.
67. הבָּשָׂר kingdom, sovereign power, 1 Ch. 11:4 + 27 t. Ch., Ezr. 1:4-5 7:1 8:1 Ne. 9:22 12:22, also 26 t. Est., 16 t. Dn., Ex. 4:16, 5 t. Ps., 3 t. Je., and elsewhere. (In earlier writings usually הָלָה or הָלָה.)
68. הבָּשָׂר commit a trespass, 1 Ch. 21:5 5:10 2 Ch. 12:2 26:18. 18 28:11. 30 30:1 36:4 Ezr. 10:6 16 Ne. 11:13-17, also freq. in Ez. and P; הבָּשָׂר trespass, 1 Ch. 9:10 10:1 2 Ch. 28:19 20:18 33:10 36:14 Ezr. 9:2 10:9, also Dn. 9:1 Jb. 21:14 and freq. in Ez. and P.
69. הבָּשָׂר Niph. be present, 1 Ch. 29:17 2 Ch. 5:15 29:28 30:31 31:34 32:29. 35. 11:15 Ezr. 8:6, also Est. 1:4-11 and Gn. 19:18 (J) 1 S. 13:14 16 21:1 †.
70. הבָּשָׂר offer free-will-offerings,* 1 Ch. 29:6 6:5. 8. 14. 17. 17 Ezr. 1:2 28:39 30:9; offer oneself, volunteer, 2 Ch. 17:18 Ne. 11:13, also Ju. 5:19 †. (Cf. same in B. Aram. Ezr. 7:11 15. 16. 16 †.)
71. הבָּשָׂר sheath, 1 Ch. 21:17, also Dn. 7:17 (Aram.) † (NH. id.; a Persian loan-word).
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72. "hath extended loving-kindness, Exz. 7th 9th.
73. * riches, 2 Ch. 11th 11h, also Jos. 22th (P), Ec. 5th 6th † (prob. an Assy. or Aram. loan-word).
74. * oversee, overseer, 1 Ch. 15th 23th 2 Ch. 21th 17th 34th.† Exz. 3th 4th †; also in the titles of 55 Pss. and in the title Hb. 3th.
75. * Niph. be expressed by name, 1 Ch. 12th 16th 2 Ch. 28th 31th Exz. 8th, also Nu. 11th (P) †.
76. * take as wife (usually with ἴ), 1 Ch. 23th 2 Ch. 11th = (v. in loc. 13th 24th Exz. 9th 11th 10th Ne. 13th, also Ru. 1th. A late usage.
77. * chamber (a rare parallel of נֶפֶר, q. v. No. 65), Ne. 3th 12th 13th †.
78. * submit, yield to, 2 Ch. 30th †; Niph. ἴ id., 1 Ch. 20th; וְיָשֶׂבָה give their pledge to send away, Exz. 10th; 21th 12th set the heart to do a thing, 1 Ch. 22th 2 Ch. 11th, also Dn. 10th Ec. 13th 17th 7th 8th 10th †.
79. * Nethinim, 1 Ch. 9th Exz. 24th 28th = Ne. 7th 8th 12th Exz. 7th 11th (Aram.) 8th 11th 12th Ne. 3th = 10th 11th 14th †.
80. * enumeration, census, 2 Ch. 21th †.
81. * service of God, 1 Ch. 6th 22nd 9th 12th 23th 14th 24th 11th 25th 1st 26th 28th 12th 11th 13th 14th 15th 29th 31th 11th 35th 11th 16th 16th 18th 18th Ne. 10th †, also oft. in Ez. and P.
82. * proclaim, 2 Ch. 30th 36th = Exz. 1th, Exz. 10th Ne. 8th, also Ex. 36th (P) †.
83. * help, 1 Ch. 12th 29th † (text dub., cf. textual notes; if correct Aram. loan-word).
84. * help of divine assistance, 1 Ch. 12th 15th 2 Ch. 14th 18th 28th 26th 32th, also freq. in Ps., less freq. in earlier books; Niph. 1 Ch. 5th 2 Ch. 26th.
85. * next to (in a series), 2 Ch. 17th 11th 12th 31th Ne. 3th 11th 12th Ne. 13th, esp. late.
86. * according to the guidance of, 1 Ch. 25th 3th 4th 6th 2 Ch. 23th 26th 20th Exz. 31th, also Je. 5th 33th.
87. * exceedingly, 1 Ch. 14th 22th 23th 29th = 2 Ch. 1th 16th 17th 20th 26th †.
88. * rise (for earlier ἴ), 1 Ch. 20th 21st 2 Ch. 20th Exz. 24th = Ne. 7th Ne. 8th, also Est. 4th and freq. in Dn.
89. * appoint, institute, establish (in earlier books station), 1 Ch. 6th 15th 17th 16th (= Ps. 105th 15th 17th 22th 2 Ch. 8th 9th 11th 11th 19th 19th 20th 24th (cf. Ezr. 24th) 25th 11th 30th 31st 33st 35th Exz. 3th Ne. 4th 6th 7th 10th 12th 13th 14th, also Dn. 11th 11th 13th; make a stand (in a covenant), 2 Ch. 34th.
90. * stand on standing-place, 2 Ch. 30th 34th 35th Ne. 13th, Dn. 8th 10th †; with ἴ for ἴ Ne. 9th †; no verb Ne. 8th †.
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91. ♦ peoples of the lands, 2 Ch. 13* 32* 17 (מְנִי מְנִי) Ezr. 3* 9* 11 Ne. 9* 10* v. No. 6.
92. ♦ possess power, be able, 1 Ch. 29* 2 Ch. 2* 13* 22* also Dn. 10* 11* 12*†; om. נָּכָנ 2 Ch. 14* 20*†.
93. ♦ west, 1 Ch. 7* 12* 26* 18* 10 2 Ch. 3* 31* 33* also Is. 43* 45* 59* Dn. 8* Ps. 75* 103* 107* and Ju. 20* (corrected text, cf. Moore, Ju.)†.
94. ♦ riches and honour, 1 Ch. 29* 2 Ch. 11* 17* 18* 32* also K. 3* Pr. 3* 8* Ec. 6*†.
95. ♦ ancient, 1 Ch. 4*† (an Aramaism, cf. Dn. 7* 18* 29*).
96. ♦ the fear of Yahweh came upon, 2 Ch. 14* 17* 19* 20* (דְּבָא יִבְרָא אֵל)† (elsewhere דְּבָא יִבְרָא).
97. ♦ set free from duty, 1 Ch. 9* 2 Ch. 23*†.
98. ♦ some sort of open portico, 1 Ch. 26* 20*† (probably Persian loan-word; cf. סִינְוּר 2 K. 23*).
99. ♦ hip or buttock, 1 Ch. 19* (2 S. 10* סְגִיבי)†.
100. ♦ cymbals, 1 Ch. 13* 15* 16* 25* 2 Ch. 5* 29 Ezr. 3* Ne. 12*†.
101. ♦ he-goat, 2 Ch. 20* Ezra. 6* (Aram.) 8* also Dn. 8* 10* 17*†.
102. ♦ need, 2 Ch. 2* (Aram. word).
103. ♦ receive, take, accept, 1 Ch. 12* 21* 2 Ch. 29* 8* Ezr. 8* also Pr. 19* Jb. 2* Ezr. 4* 9* 37† (a common Aram. word, cf. Dn. 6* 7* 11*†).
104. ♦ heads of fathers' (houses), 1 Ch. 7* 8* 10* 11* 9* 34 15* 23* 24* 26* 27* 28* 2 Ch. 1* 19* 23* 26* 29* 31* 4* 8* 11* Ne. 7* 9* 11* 12* 21* 22* also Ex. 6* Nu. 31* 32* 36* also Jos. 14* 19* 21* 1 (all P)†; the phrase with יִבְרָא expressed 1 Ch. 5* 6* 7* 7* 8* 9* 24* also Ex. 6* Nu. 1* 7* 17* 25* Jos. 22* שָׁנָה (alone in same sense) 1 Ch. 5* 7* 8* 9*† and (appar. combined with the idea of first in a series) 23* 11* 19* 22*.
105. ♦ abundantly, 1 Ch. 4* 12* 22* 2 6* 8* 10* 14* 29* 2 Ch. 1* 9* (= 1 K. 10* 7) 24* 11* 14* 15* 16* 17* 18* 20* 24* 4* 27* 29* 30* 34* 35* Ne. 9* also Zc. 14*.
106. ♦ ten thousand, myriad, 1 Ch. 29* 7 Ezr. 2* = Ne. 7* Ezr. 2* Ne. 7* 11 also Ps. 68* Dn. 11* Ho. 8* Jon. 4*†.
107. ♦ property, goods, 1 Ch. 27* 28* 2 Ch. 20* 21* 17 31* 32* 35* Ezr. 1* 8* 10* also Dn. 11* 14* 15* and Gn. 12* 13* 31* 36* 46* Nu. 16* 35* also Gn. 14* 11* 11* 15* 15*†.
108. ♦ Hiph. act wickedly, 2 Ch. 20* 22* Ne. 9* also Jb. 34* Ps. 106* Dn. 9* 12* 12* 12* (1 S. 14* corruption, cf. Sm. Sam.)†.
109. ♦ great joy, 1 Ch. 29* 2 Ch. 30* Ezr. 3* 11* 6* Ne. 8* 12* a common expression of the Chronicler.
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110. הַרְכָּבָה * prince, chief, ruler, of religious office, 15th. 117 24th. 1 Ch. 35* cf. 1 Ch. 15th. 1 7. 7t. 10 (Is. 43th. corrupt), and esp. יִרְשָׁב * chiefs of the priests, 2 Ch. 36th. Exz. 8th. 9th 10th.†

111. מִשְׁנֹה * singer, 1 Ch. 6th. 9th + 11 t. Ch., Exz. 2nd. 6th. 7th = Ne. 7th. 7t. 7th Exz. 7th 10th Ne. 7th + 12 t. Ne. †

112. מִשְׁנֹה * act of slaying, 2 Ch. 30th.†

113. נְפִּיאֵשׁ * Niph. be negligent, 2 Ch. 29th.†

114. נֹפָל weapon, 2 Ch. 23th. 32th. Ne. 4th. 7th, also Jb. 33th. 36th. Jo. 2*†; sprout Ct. 4th.

115. יָשֶׁג hear me (beginning a speech), 1 Ch. 28th 2 Ch. 13th. 15th 20th. 28th 29th †; cf. Gn. 23d. (hear us), vv. 11. 12. (all P).

116. נָעִים * gate-keepers, of Temple, etc., a sacred function, 1 Ch. 9th. + 19 t. Ch., Exz. 2nd. 7th = Ne. 7th. 7th Exz. 7th 10th Ne. 7th + 7 t. Ne. (also 2 S. 18th but corrupt for מַשְׁאֵה and 2 K. 7th. 7th but of secular function).

Also the following list of syntactical peculiarities appear either exclusively in Ch. (including Ezr.-Ne.) or are frequent elsewhere only in late books.

117. Sentences are often abbreviated in a peculiar manner, producing an awkward reading; a the subject omitted (where earlier writers would not venture to do so), 1 Ch. 9th. 2 Ch. 18th. end (1 K. 22th otherwise) 19th. 35th; b expressed without a verb, 1 Ch. 15th. 2 Ch. 11th. (?) 15th. 16th. 18th. 21th. 26th. 28th. 29th. 30th. 11th. Cf. Ew. Syn. § 303 6.

118. The inf. cstr. is often used almost as a subst., 1 Ch. 7th. 7th. 8th 9th. 23th. 2 Ch. 3th. 24th. (cf. Ezr. 3th.) 33th. Exz. 11th. Ne. 12th. Cf. Ew. Lehrb. § 236 6.

119. The art. 7 for the relative (derived from its demonstrative use), 1 Ch. 26th. 29th. 7th 2 Ch. 1th. (םַיִּלְדַּא) 29th. Exz. 8th. 10th. 11. This use is very doubtful in early writings, vss. in Jos. 10th. 1 S. 9th (cf. Dr. Notes on Sam.). Cf. Ew. Syn. § 333 b, also foot-note on p. 209, Koe. iii. § 52, Ges. § 138f.

120. The relative omitted (in prose almost entirely confined to Ch.-Ezr.-Ne.), 1 Ch. 9th. 12th. 15th. 29th (but v. in loco) 18th 2 Ch. 13th. (cf. Je. 5th) 14th. (cf. Is. 40th.) 15th. 16th. 20th. 24th. 28th. 29th 30th. 31st. 32nd. Exz. 1th. 11th. Ne. 8th. 13th. Cf. Ew. Syn. § 333 b, Ges. § 155f.

121. שָׁרִי in two strange idioms is almost equivalent to the relative what, 1 Ch. 15th. (םַיִּלְדַּא) 2 Ch. 30th. (םַיִּלְדַּא) †. See textual notes on these passages.

122. The relative כָּל combined with the prep. 2. 1 Ch. 25th. (v. in loco) 27th.
PECULIARITIES OF DICTION 35

123. The combination of two plural forms (contrary to better usage), 1 Ch. 7: 7. 11. 14 etc., also No. 91 above. Cf. Zunz, Gottwald, Vorträge, p. 23.


125. Subordinate temporal and causal clauses are placed at the beginning of the sentence (where in the earlier language either they were introduced later, or, if placed at the beginning for sake of greater prominence, וווענ was prefixed), I Ch. 21: 2 Ch. 5: 7: 12: 11: 15: 20: 31: 17: 22: 24: 26: 11: 26: 10: 29: 31: 33: 34: Ezr. 9: 4: 10: also Est. 9: 1: Dn. 8: 10: 11: 12: 10b: 11: 12: 11: 4: 12b. Cf. Dr. Notes on Sam., on 1 S. 17.

126. The inf. (with ה prefixed) at the end of a sentence, I Ch. 15: 16: 22: (יִּדְּוֶה) 25: 2 Ch. 5: 22b: 25b: (2 K. 14: otherwise) 36: and Ezr. 3: 12.

Also prepositions in usages either new or much more frequent than in earlier books.


128. ה as the sign of the acc. (from Aram. influence): a with certain verbs (contrary to earlier usage), וֹּז frequently, וֹּז only in Ch.—Ezr., יִּה י 1 Ch. 26: 29, 72: 1 Ch. 29: Ne. 11: יִּה 2 Ch. 32: 7, also 1 Ch. 16: 17: 18: 25: 29: 2: 2 Ch. 5: 6: 17: 24: 34: Ezr. 8: 2b: b at the end of an enumeration, 1 Ch. 28: 2 Ch. 24: 26: 28: 29: c marking the definite object after an indefinite I Ch. 29: 2 Ch. 2: 23: 1: 23: d after the suffix of a verb (as in Syriac) I Ch. 5: 23: 2 Ch. 25: 10: 28: cf. Ne. 9: 2; defining the suffix of a noun I Ch. 7: 2 Ch. 31: 18 Ezr. 9: 10: 14: Cf. Ges. § 117n.

129. ה with the inf., expressing tendency, intention, obligation (less freq. in earlier writings), 1 Ch. 6: 9: 10: 22: 2 Ch. 2: 8: 11: 19: 26: 31: 36: Ne. 8: 11b; esp. after מ or נ it is not possible (permitted to, there is no need to, ה מ י 1 Ch. 23: 2 Ch. 5: 20: 22: 35: Ezr. 9: י מ 1 Ch. 5: 15: 2 Ch. 12: Ezr. 6: (Aram.). Cf. Dav. Syn. § 95 b, Ges. § 114, Dr. TH. §§ 202-206.
The Hebrew Text.—The text of Chronicles is in fair condition, though by no means up to the standard of many of the older Old Testament books. The late date of composition, together with the fact that these books probably were less read, hence less copied, than most of the Jewish Scriptures, would lead us to expect a better text. The many lists of proper names, where the context could not assist the scribe to the true reading, are responsible for a large number of the textual errors, but the narrative portions also are not free from serious corruptions showing that the text must have been handled freely for a considerable time. The late reception of Chronicles into the OT. Canon (cf. Wildeboer, Origin of the Canon of the OT. p. 152) allows for a considerable period of such freedom. The Hebrew mss. contain few variants and these involve largely only the Masoretic accentuation, and give little aid for restoring the true text. Baer, in his edition of the text (Liber Chronicorum), notes nineteen variations between the oriental (Babylonian) and occidental (Palestinian) texts, only fourteen of which concern the consonantal reading. Of these six are due to the confusion of י and י, three to unimportant omissions of letters, and the remainder are equally insignificant. In seven instances the Qr. of the oriental text calls for the occidental reading.
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In the case of those portions of Chronicles which are parallel to the older canonical books the textual critic is particularly fortunate. The text of the sources with their versions may be used in addition to the versions of Chronicles as an aid for restoring the original text of Chronicles, as vice versa Chronicles is often useful for the criticism of the text of the older books, frequently preserving the original reading (v. p. 19). These older books, however, must be used with extreme caution for the purpose of emending the text of Chronicles, since many changes are due to the intention of the Chronicler. The text of the older books was already in a corrupt state when the Chronicler used them as sources. Frequently he made changes in the interest of better sense, doing the best he could with a difficult or corrupt reading, and often he simply incorporated from his source an early corruption. The task of the textual critic of Chronicles is not to restore the original source reading of a given passage, but only to rewrite the text as nearly as possible as it came from the hand of the Chronicler. The failure to observe this principle has often caused confusion.

The Greek Versions.—The Greek version of the books of Chronicles (commonly supposed to be the Septuagint rendering of these books) is an extremely literal translation, belonging in this regard in the same category with the Greek of Ezekiel, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. The Massoretic text is followed so closely that there can be no doubt that its translator had our Hebrew recension before him. We are not so well supplied with old Greek mss. as in the case of many Old Testament books, but we possess a complete text of Chronicles in the uncials A (V century), B (IV century), and N (VIII–IX centuries), and for 1 Ch. 9" τὸ πρῶτον to 19" N (IV century) is also available. Numerous cursives (about thirty) dating between the tenth and fifteenth centuries should be added to this list, but how many of these have any independent value has not yet been determined.

In addition to this ordinary Greek version, the first book of Esdras, which begins with the translation of the last two chapters of 2 Ch., is an important witness for obtaining the original text of these chapters. This translation is much freer than the received text and has a different Hebrew recension behind it. The book is
preserved in the uncial A, B, and N (except most of last chapter, cf. Holmes and Parsons), but not in N; also in nearly thirty cursive.

Before any critical use can be made of these two versions—for they are distinct versions—their respective ages must be determined. That our received text of Ch. is really the translation of Theodotion has been maintained by such scholars as Grotius (1644), Whiston (1722), Pohlmann (1859), and Sir Henry Howorth (1893, 1901-2), but the evidence has been set forth most convincingly by C. C. Torrey (see AJSL. vol. XXIII. pp. 121 ff., and especially ATC. pp. 60 ff.). He maintains that i Esd. represents the only extant remains of the real Septuagint of Ch.-Ezr.-Ne., and this was later supplanted by the version of Theodotion, whose origin was soon forgotten and which was therefore accepted as the true Septuagint. The argument has generally been that since our Greek version bears the marks of late origin compared with the version preserved in i Esd., and since Theodotion’s translation of Daniel supplanted the older translation, it is plausible to suppose that the same thing has occurred here and our received text is really the rendering of Theodotion. Torrey, in addition to this, has collected much direct evidence that the received text is Theodotion’s, and this he states along the following lines (ATC. pp. 60 ff.). (1) Theodotion’s habit of transliterating words of difficult or uncertain meaning, and often without any apparent reason, is one of his most striking characteristics (cf. Field, Hexapla, I. pp. xxxix-xlvi; also Swete, Introduction, p. 46) and this is also the common practice of the translator of Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. Seventy such words are listed and they appear regularly distributed throughout these books. Some of them are identical with transliterations by Theodotion elsewhere. (2) Unusual translations in the Theodotion rendering of Daniel are duplicated in the Chronicler’s books. (3) According to the custom of this translator, gentilic names are transliterated exactly instead of being given the Greek adjective ending, though these have often been substituted later in the mss., especially in L. In view of our meagre supply of extant passages from Theodotion’s translation (Daniel being merely a revision of the old Greek), from which
his characteristics must be determined, this evidence is surprisingly strong.

Moreover, evidence is not entirely lacking that the Greek version of Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. current before the time of Theodotion and apparently accepted as the Septuagint was not our "canonical" version, but a somewhat free translation of a different Hebrew recension and of which 1 Esd. formed a part. If our Greek was the accepted Septuagint in the time of Josephus, it is not surprising that he should have culled the story of the three youths from 1 Esd. (Ant. xi. 3, 2-8–1 Esd. 3-4), since this story is wanting elsewhere, but it is strange, as has frequently been noticed, that he should have quoted in other places from 1 Esd. in preference to the authoritative Septuagint version. In Ant. xi. 1, 1. Кύρος ὁ βασιλεύς λέγει Ἐπει με ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγιστος τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπεδείξε βασιλέα, . . . τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομήσω ἐν Ιεροσολύμων ἐν ἤ Ἰουδαίᾳ χώρᾳ follows closely the text of 1 Esd. 21 but cf. 2 Esd. 1, which we should expect Josephus to prefer. So also Ant. xi. 2, 2 βασιλεὺς Καμβυσῆς Ῥαθύμῳ τῷ γράφων τὰ προσπίπτοντα καὶ Βεελζεβῷ καὶ Σεμελῷ γραμματεῖ καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν τοῦ συντασσομένου καὶ οἰκούσιν ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ Φοινίκῃ τάδε λέγει is certainly taken from 1 Esd. 22 but departs widely from 2 Esd. 4 (notice the transliteration where 1 Esd., followed by Josephus, translates). If Josephus knew 2 Esd. as the Septuagint rendering of the canonical Hebrew text and 1 Esd. as the translation of a variant uncanonical fragment, his preference for the latter is unaccountable. His action is perfectly clear, however, if we suppose him to have been acquainted with only one Greek version, the Septuagint, of which 1 Esd. was a part. Again, a quotation from the Greek version of 2 Ch. 216 made by the Greek historian Eupolemus, writing about 150 B.C., contains the clause εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὁ ὑπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῆς γῆς ἔκτισεν, which, as Torrey argued, is almost certainly taken from a version of which 1 Esd. formed a part (cf. ATC. p. 77, esp. f. n. 22).

The accepted Greek text (Theodotion's), therefore, is only of value for recovering the authoritative Hebrew of the second century A.D., and beyond the limited assistance from Josephus, is our
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chief early authority for criticising the text of 1 Ch. 1 to 2 Ch. 34. Field (Hexapla, vol. I.) notes a few readings from the version of Aquila (c. 125 A.D.) 1 Ch. 15:7 25:1-2 29:4, and a larger number from that of Symmachus (c. 200 A.D.) 1 Ch. 5:9 11:4 15:2 21:8 25:1-2 26:8 2 Ch. 12:1 15:9 19:1 23:1 26:3 30:6 31:1 32:4 33:3 34:8, but these are not extensive enough to be of much value. For the criticism of 2 Ch. 35-36 we may add the testimony of the true Septuagint as preserved in 1 Esd. 1. This dates from before 150 B.C., as is evidenced by the Eupolemus fragment (v. s., cf. Schür. Gesch. III. pp. 351 f.).

Both the old Septuagint (1 Esd.) and Theodotion are available in two forms, the Lucian recension, based upon the Syro-Palestinian tradition, and in mss. representing the Egyptian tradition. The Lucianic text is found in the cursives 19, 93, and 108,* and these are the basis of Lagarde’s edition of these books in Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum pars prior. The remaining mss. represent the Egyptian tradition and may be divided into two groups; one led by B includes also N and 55, the second includes A and the rest of the cursives. The remaining uncial N is uncertain, but seems to follow the A group more frequently than the B. The mss. of the B group are probably Hexaplaric (cf. Tor. ATC. pp. 91 ff.).

The Lucian recension is a thorough revision of the earlier Syro-Palestinian tradition. The many arbitrary changes, together with the natural textual corruption, make the task of detecting the earlier basic text a difficult one, hence Lagarde’s Lucian text must be used with extreme caution. Doubtless some of its many conflated readings go back to the true Hebrew text, but this cannot be assumed even when the reading would be a great improvement on our Massoretic tradition. Much of the plus of L does not even have a Hebrew original behind it. The Syro-Palestinian tradition back of the Lucian recension probably did not differ very widely from the Egyptian. The latter is better preserved by the A group of mss. than by B and its followers. A has frequently been represented as extensively corrected from the Massoretic text, but close examination shows that no such comparison with the Hebrew could

* It appears from Swete, Introduction, pp. 154, 156, that 19 does not contain Ch. or 1 Esd. and that Ch. is wanting in 93, but cf. Holmes and Parsons, vols. II. V., where they are given in the lists of mss. containing these books and variants from them are frequently noted.
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have been made, since nearly every page contains palpable blunders which, in that case, would not have been allowed to stand. A conforms more closely to the Hebrew because it has, on the whole, the better text, not because it has been made to conform, hence it should always be given the preference over B, other testimony being equal. The B ms. for Ch. is in especially poor condition. The proper names are often damaged beyond recognition, dittographies are only too common, and omissions by homoeoteleuton are very frequent. When compared with the A group and with the Syro-Palestinian tradition B often furnishes valuable aid toward regaining the original rendering, but it should not be quoted as Septuagint or even as the Greek text, an all too common practice. Generally speaking, when the A and B groups and the L recension agree they furnish the original Greek rendering, but it sometimes happens, especially in proper names, that none of these agree with the Massoretic text when the latter was doubtless the translator’s original, all the Greek texts having become corrupted.

In the commentary the received Greek, i.e., the version of Theodotion, has been quoted as $^\text{a}$ and the Septuagint (in 2 Ch. 35–36) as $^\text{b}$ of 1 Esd. Generally speaking, when the reading of certain Greek ms. has been cited, these are regarded as representing the original Greek rendering, hence a variant Hebrew text, but frequently a variant Greek reading found in one or more ms. has been presented merely because it is of possible worth. When the original has been regained by a comparison of corrupt readings, it is cited with an asterisk ($^*$).

THE LATIN VERSIONS.—The Old Latin version would be of special value for the criticism of the text of Chronicles, since the Septuagint, from which it was made, has disappeared for all except the last two chapters (v. s.). Unfortunately the Old Latin fared little better. No extant ms. contains any extensive portion of these books, but a number of fragments can be culled from the Latin fathers, who quoted extensively from them. Sabatier (Bibliorum sacrorum Latinæ versiones antiquæ, vol. I. 1741) collected from these and ms. sources the ancient Latin version of the following passages: 1 Ch. 18 20. 24 b. 11 b. 12 a. 17 a. 11 b. 12 b. 28 b. 2 Ch. 6 a. 11 b. 22 a. 11 b. 24 b. 15 b. 16 b. 17 b. 18 a. 8 b. 19 b. 11 20 b. 18. 24 b. 25 b. 26 b. 30. 31. 26 14 b. 15.
These excerpts, however, must be compared with more recent editions of the Latin fathers before they can be trusted. In the case of 1 Esd. we are better off, the Old Latin being preserved in three mss. (Paris ms. Bibl. Nat. lat. 111, the Madrid ms. E. R. 8, and a Lucca ms., cf. Swete, Introduction, p. 95). This version is of some value for recovering the Syro-Palestinian tradition of the Septuagint.

The Latin version of Jerome, commonly called the Vulgate, was a new translation made from the standard Hebrew text of the end of the fourth century A.D., and independent of the Septuagint. Its late origin detracts from its critical value for textual purposes. By comparing it with the Theodotion Greek it frequently aids in the removal of corruptions which made their way into the Hebrew text at a comparatively late date. Its chief value, however, lies in the realm of interpretation, where it supplies an early rendering of the consonantal Hebrew text for the most part as it now stands, which is often superior to the modern influenced by Massoretic tradition.

The Syriac Versions.—The first Syriac translation of Chronicles is now a part of the Peshito, but originally Chronicles was not received into the Syriac Canon. Indeed, when the book was subsequently translated it did not meet with general acceptance. This Syriac version seems to have been the work of Jews of Edessa. While in most Old Testament books the Peshito follows the Hebrew text faithfully and even literally, with here and there extensive influence from the Septuagint, Chronicles stands alone as the translation of a mere Jewish Targum and exhibits all the faults which might be expected from such origin. One of its most striking characteristics is found in the fact that the text has very frequently been conformed to the text of Samuel and Kings. This is even true of extended passages, as where 1 K. 12:1-10 followed by 1 K. 14:1-7 are substituted for 2 Ch. 11:1-12:20. The substitute has the authority of the best mss. and must be accepted as the original Syriac text, i.e., the original translators had the text of S.-K. before them. Numerous other instances might be cited where the text agrees with S.-K. against Ch. in which we may possess the original Syriac text, but where its testimony is absolutely worthless for the
criticism of the Hebrew text. Since there can be no doubt that either the translators, or perhaps some later copyist, frequently conformed Chronicles to its sources, the Peshito (S) may never be cited in support of readings of S.-K. as original in Chronicles. This fact, together with the character of its origin, makes the Peshito text of Chronicles practically worthless for critical purposes. For discussion, see Fränkel, JPT. 1879, pp. 508 ff.

The Peshito text of Chronicles is available in a number of editions, but all go back to the Paris Polyglot of 1645. The London Polyglot (Walton’s), published shortly after, reproduces the Paris text without change. The first edition was printed from a very poor ms., “Syr. 6” of the Bibliothèque Nationale. Recently W. E. Barnes has published the variant readings of the mss. available to-day, and of the printed editions (An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version, 1897). Walton’s edition corrected by this apparatus furnishes a good Peshito text.

The Syriac version of Paul of Tellai was made in 616–7 A.D., from a Greek ms. ultimately derived from the Septuagint column of Origen’s Hexapla. This was first made known to Europe by Andreas Masius, who died in 1573, and he had a ms. which, with other books, contained Chronicles, but this has disappeared. The British Museum possesses a catena (Add. 12,168) containing fragments of Chronicles and the Books of Esdras. The fragments of Chronicles are found on Foll. 57a–60a (Wm. Wright, Cat. of Syr. MSS. in Brit. Mus. Part II. p. 905), just published by Gwynn (Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible, 1909, Part II. pp. 5–17). The portions of 1 Esd. and Ne. were published by Torrey (AJSL. Oct. 1906, pp. 69–74), but the ms. contains nothing of 1 Esd. 1. The Syro-Hexaplar text of 1 Esd., however, is found elsewhere and has been published by Lagarde (Libri veteris testamenti apocryphi syriace), hence we have its testimony for the recovery of the original Septuagint text of 2 Ch. 35, 36 (1 Esd. 1).

THE ARABIC VERSION.—The Arabic version of Chronicles is available in printed form in the Paris and London Polyglots (v. s.), but is of little or no critical value. It is far removed from the original Hebrew, and as a translation of the Peshito text (cf. Burkitt,
DB. I. p. 137) simply duplicates the testimony of that uncertain version (v. s.).

The Ethiopic Version.—The Books of Chronicles are not extant in the Ethiopic version, which, however, does contain the first Book of Esdras. This is of value for regaining the Egyptian recension of that portion of the Septuagint (v. s.).

The Targum.—The Aramaic paraphrase of Chronicles, like the Targums of the other books of the Hagiographa, never had official significance and was a commentary rather than a translation. It was made from our Massoretic text and possesses little critical value. The text was first published by Matthias Friedrich Beck from an Erfurt ms. in 1680 and 1683. Later (1715) David Wilkins published the Aramaic text from a ms. in the Cambridge Library with a parallel Latin translation (Paraphrasis Chaldaica in Librum priorem et posteriorem Chronicorum). It was also published by Lagarde in his Hagiographa Chaldaice, Leipzig, 1873. For a full discussion see Kohler and Rosenberg, Das Targum der Chronik, in Jüd. Zeitschrift, 1870, pp. 72 ff., 135 ff., 263 ff.

§ 9. THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND LITERATURE.

The Books of Chronicles, from their supplementary and, through their genealogical material, their unedifying character, have never been a favourite field of study and investigation, hence their literature has always been relatively meagre. The books also, in their variations from the other canonical writings, presented to early students peculiar difficulties. Jewish scholars in the period of the Talmud regarded them with suspicion, and later shrank from the many problems which their genealogies presented (JE. IV. p. 60; R. Simon, Hist. Crit. du V. Test. I. IV.). Jerome, on the other hand, was extravagant in their valuation, declaring, “He who thinks himself acquainted with the sacred writings and does not know these books only deceives himself” (Epist. ad Paulinum de Studio Scripturarum). And again, “All knowledge of the Scripture is contained in these books” (Pref. in libr. Paralip., Epist. ad Domnionem). This valuation rested, however, without doubt upon an allegorical interpretation and not upon any apprehension of the real character of 1 and 2 Ch. No one seems to have fol-
lowed Jerome in his estimate, and while the books were generally vindicated by the few Jewish and Christian scholars who commented upon them through the general assertion that they rested upon authentic sources and by explaining away all appearances of error, yet at the same time their discrepancies were made the basis of arguments against the authority of the sacred Scriptures (cf. Calmet, *Comm. in V. T.* IV. p. 510). (Spinoza had ridiculed the attempts of Jewish scholars to remove the discrepancies between the narratives of Chronicles and those of the earlier books and expressed his wonder that they had been received into the sacred Canon by those who rejected the Apocryphal books, *Trac. Theol. Politici*, cc. ix. and x.)

G. F. Oeder in his *Freie Untersuchungen über einige Bücher des A. T.* (1771) spoke of their many corruptions (Ke.). But for real criticism and a worthy explanation we begin naturally with the introduction of Eichhorn (1780–1782, 3rd ed. 1803). Eichhorn went beyond the simple assertion of the Chronicler's use of authentic and reliable sources to a theory upon which the variations and agreements between Chronicles and the earlier books might be explained. In regard to the genealogies he recognised that the Chronicler drew from 'the earlier canonical books, but along with them he held that he had access to registers carefully kept by the Levites and preserved in the Temple, serving as titles to inheritances. These registers, subject to copyists' mistakes, were not always repeated in their complete form and many pedigrees were abridged, hence the genealogical variations in 1 Ch. The basis of the Chronicler's description of David and Solomon was an old life of those two monarchs, also the basis of the narratives in 1 and 2 S. and 1 K., which in the course of transmission through many hands had suffered many changes, and in which the Chronicler also made changes, such as his introduction of Satan, the kindling of sacrifices by fire, etc.; also from historic records the Chronicler mentioned the lists of the priests and Levites, the contributions for the Temple, and other things of a similar nature. The various works cited by the Chronicler such as "the words of Shemaiah the Prophet and Iddo the Seer" (2 Ch. 12:1), "the Midrash of the prophet Iddo" (2 Ch. 13:18), "the words of Jehu" (2 Ch.
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The writing of "Isaiah the son of Amoz" (2 Ch. 26n), and the works mentioned in 2 Ch. 32n 33n, Eichhorn regarded as distinct writings of contemporaries of Israel's kings, now lost; while the Midrash of the Book of Kings and the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel (2 Ch. 25n 27 28n 35n 36n) and the Book of the Kings of Israel (2 Ch. 20n) were secondary works; the last two being one and the same work and identical with the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah cited in 1 and 2 K. (Einl. ii. 595). Eichhorn held strongly to the reliability of 1 and 2 Ch., owing to the careful use of historical sources by the author.

This representative view of Eichhorn was sharply criticised by De Wette (in his Beiträge zur Einleitung, 1806). He, by comparison, showed that Eichhorn's supposition of the Chronicler's use of the underlying sources of 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K. was untenable. No real evidence was present that both the authors of the canonical books and the Chronicler had drawn their material from the same source; but far more likely all common passages were due to the use by the Chronicler of the canonical books. De Wette then examined the variations between the writings and he showed that through the Chronicler came marks of his late period, slovenly or careless writing, confusions and alterations of meaning, and that his additions were marked by a preference for the concerns of the Levites, a love of marvels, apologies and preference for Judah and hatred of Israel, and embellishments of the history of Judah. Thus the unreliability of the Chronicler was abundantly shown.

Of the Chronicler's sources De Wette made little. "Several writers," he said, "might have taken part in producing our present Chronicles. Who will contend about that? But as the work lies before us it is entirely of one character and one individuality and thus may be assigned to one author" (Beiträge, p. 61). The question of the reliability of the Chronicler was largely bound up in that of the Pentateuch, and of the general view of the Old Testament Scriptures. Scholars or writers of a so-called rationalistic tendency disparaged these books and accepted the conclusions of De Wette (a good example is seen in F. W. Newman's History of the Hebrew Monarchy, 1847), while on the other hand conservative or
orthodox scholars held the general view of Eichhorn in regard to sources and defended the trustworthiness of 1 and 2 Ch. throughout. Even upon those of a freer tendency, De Wette's work made less of an impression than might have been expected. Bertholet, who was willing to accept De Wette's low estimate of the historical worth of Chronicles (*Einl.* III. p. 983), argued in behalf of the use of common sources by the writers of Kings and Chronicles. Ewald also, who had a clear conception of the general character of the books, still in his history used them as a source of information very nearly upon a par with the other Old Testament books. The view in general was that the Chronicler, while often introducing the notions of his own age, yet carefully followed his sources, which, though more free and homiletic than the older canonical books in their treatment of history, yet were scarcely inferior as records of history—though when the two could not be reconciled the former were to be received as of greater authority. (*Cf.* Bertheau's treatment throughout his commentary, 1854, 1873; Dillmann, *PRE.* II. p. 694, 1854, *PRE.* p. 224, 1878.)

De Wette's work was answered twelve years later in a small treatise by J. G. Dahler (*De Librorum Paralipomenon Auctoritate atque Fide Historica Argentorati, 1819*). Each alleged discrepancy, taken up in order from the beginning of 1 Ch. and through the two books, was examined by itself and explained away or harmonised; and the author concluded concerning the Chronicler: "*Absolvendum eum esse nisi in injustis criminationibus, et idem ejus historiam puram esse atque integram.*"

Dahler, as most of the apologists who followed him, overlooked the fact that the judgment of a work must be determined by the impression made by its phenomena grouped as a whole and that phenomena taken singly can ordinarily be explained away. It had been the great merit of De Wette's treatise that he "shaped the superabundant material to convey the right impression."

Dahler's work was refuted by C. W. P. Gramberg in *Die Chronik nach ihrem geschichtlichen character und ihrer Glaubwürdigkeit geprüft* (Halle, 1823). This work was of little weight, owing to its charge of extreme falsification by the Chronicler.

In 1833, C. F. Keil published his apology for Chronicles—*Apologetischer Versuch über die Bücher der Chronik und über die Integrität des Buches Esra.* This work, essentially in its main contention, reproduced later in his *OT. Intro.* and *Commentary on 1 and 2 Ch.*, held, as already noted above (see p. 20), that the Chronicler did not draw his material from
the earlier canonical books of the OT., unless in the list of the patriarchal families (1 Ch. 1-2), and hence the parallelism between 1 and 2 Ch. and 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K. is due to common sources underlying each (the view of Eichhorn). Cf. examples mentioned above, p. 20. The varied charges brought by De Wette were refuted in detail and the Chronicler was absolved from all error of statement, although later Keil recognised in one instance that he was guilty of misapprehension (Intro. II. p. 82).

In 1834 appeared Kritische Untersuchung über die biblische Chronik, by F. C. Movers, a German pastor residing near Bonn. This work, although defending in a large measure the historical reliability of 1 and 2 Ch., since the author held to the Mosaic origin of the Levitical institutions, was characterised by much critical acumen. In the matter of sources the author advanced views practically identical with those current at present. He held that the Chronicler used first of all the canonical books, and secondly one other source, the Midrash or Commentary upon the Book of Kings. This Book of Kings was neither our Book of Kings, nor the "Chronicles" or Annals mentioned in Kings, but a work which the authors of Samuel and Kings had used, and whose author had made use of the Chronicles or Annals mentioned in Kings. But the Midrash or Commentary on this Book of Kings was a post-exilic work more didactic than purely historical, a connecting link between the canonical Scriptures and the Apocrypha. Of this work and of the canonical Scriptures the Chronicler was essentially a copyist. Movers' view in this respect is that of Benzinger and Kittel, already mentioned (see p. 25).

The problem of Chronicles was also discussed in detail by K. H. Graf, in his Die Geschichtlichen Bücher d. AT. (1866). Graf examined the narratives of Chronicles in the light of those of the canonical books, and his conclusions were similar to De Wette's respecting the work as a tendency writing largely unhistorical in character. He differed from Movers, holding that the Chronicler was not a mere copyist and that to him as an independent writer belonged the characteristics of his work and not to a Midrashic source. On the other hand, he rejected the notion that he had no other sources than the canonical books and allowed historical reminiscences in his new material. The next most fruitful discussion of our problem is Wellhausen's brilliant chapter on Chronicles in his Prolegomena sur Geschichte Israels (1878, 1882, Eng. trans. 1885). There the position of De Wette is restated and the Chronicler's work is exhibited essentially in the character which we have given, although we are inclined to find more of historical reminiscence in certain instances than Wellhausen allows, but his sketch of the Chronicler's work as a whole is correct. For the recent views of Benzinger and Kittel respecting the composition of Chronicles see pp. 25 ff.
LITERATURE.

(Authors of the most important works are indicated by the heavy type.)

Text.—S. Baer and F. Delitzsch, Liber Chronicorum (1888) (text with critical and Massoretic appendices by Baer and an introduction by Del.); David Ginsburg, Libri Chronicorum (1894), pp. 1676-1808 (text based upon the Bomberg Bible of 1524-5, with variant readings in the foot-notes); R. Kittel, The Books of Chronicles in Hebrew (1895) (in Haupt’s Sacred Books of the OT) (the unpointed text, with critical notes trans. by B. W. Bacon); R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, II. (1906) pp. 1222-1320 (text with foot-notes citing variants in mss., Vrss., and Bibl. sources).

Translations and Commentaries.—Hieronymus (d. 420), Quaestiones Hebraice in Paralipomena in appendix to vol. III. of his works (pub. in Migne’s Patrologia Latina, vol. 23, coll. 1365-1402); Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus (1st half of 5th cent.), Quaestiones in Paralipomena (pub. in Migne’s Patrologia Graeca, vol. 80, coll. 801-58); Procopius Gazaees (1st half of 6th cent.), Commentarii in Paralipomena (pub. in Migne’s Patrologia Graeca, vol. 87, part I. coll. 1201-20); Rabanus Maurus (c. 776-856), Commentaria in libros duos Paralipomenon (pub. in Migne’s Patrologia Latina, vol. 109, coll. 279-540); David Kimhi (1160-1235) (Kimhi’s commentary on Ch. was pub. in the Rabbinic Bible of 1547 and elsewhere); Levi ben Gerson (1288-1344) wrote com. on Ch. (Rich. Simon, Hist. Crit. p. 28); Alphonsus Tostatus (Tostado), Comment. (on hist. books of the Bible, 1507); R. Joseph fil. David Aben Jechiya (Comment. in Hagiogr. 1538) (Carpzov); R. Isaac bar R. Salomo Jabez (Hagiogr. Constantinople) (Carpzov); Basil. Zanchius, In omnes divinos libros notationes (1553); Erasmus Sarcerus (1560) (Carpzov); Vict. Strigel, Libb. Sam., Reg., et Paralipom. (1591); Lud. Lavater, Comm. in Paralip. (1599); Sebastian. Leonhardus (1613) (Carpzov); Nic. Serarius, Comment. in libr. Reg. et Paralip. (1617); Casp. Sanclus, Comment. in 4 libr. Reg. et 2 Paralipom. (1625); Jac. Bonfrerius, Comment. in libr. Reg. et Paralip. (1643); Hug. Grotius, Annotatt. in Vet. Test. (1644) (Paralip. in edition of 1732 (Basil) vol. I. pp. 175-89); Arthur Jackson, Help for the Understanding of the Holy Scrip.; or Annot. on the Hist. part of the OT. 2 vols. (1643 and 1646); Thomas Malvenda, Commentaria in sacram Scripturam (1650); Christ. Schotanus, in Biblioth. historice sacra V. T. vol. II. (1662); D. Brenius, Annot. Paral. (in Opera Theologia, 1666, foll. 21-23); Fran. Burmann, Comment. . . . Paralip. . . . (1660-83); Jacob Cappel, Observationes in Lib. Paralip. (in Comment. et Not. Crit. in V. T. by Lud. Cappel, 1689, pp. 651-4); S. Patrick, A Commentary upon the Historical Books of the OT. (1694; Ch. in new edition, vol. II. (1842) pp. 464-618); Jo.

LITERATURE

I AND 2 CHRONICLES
A COMMENTARY ON
1 CHRONICLES
COMMENTARY ON 1 CHRONICLES

I-IX. GENEALOGICAL TABLES WITH GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTICES.

I. Primeval genealogies with a list of kings and phylarchs of Edom.—This chapter serves to introduce the genealogies of the tribes of Israel by showing Israel's place among the nations and thus corresponds to the ethnic discussions with which modern writers frequently open their histories. Its matter is derived entirely from Gn. 1-36. All the genealogies of those chapters are included in this compilation except that of the descendants of Cain (Gn. 4:18-22). The author's method of abridgment, in giving lists of names (vv. 1-14 et al.) without stating their relation to one another, shows that he assumed his readers to have been thoroughly familiar with the narratives of Genesis.

While the source is clear, the question has recently been raised whether the chapter is substantially in the form in which it was left by the Chronicler or whether an original nucleus by him received numerous additions until the genealogical material of Gn. was exhausted. Benzinger maintains that the original text comprised only vv. 1-14a (b) 15-25a. The Vatican text of C lacks vv. 15-25, which are in the Hexapla under the asterisk (Field), and a sort of doublet exists in vv. 17-18 and vv. 24-25. These facts have furnished the ground for assuming the secondary character of vv. 15-25. But the significant words ὅτα τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ Ἀραβίᾳ, found in this lacuna of C, are certainly a remnant of v. 17—so marked in Swete's edition—thus making it extremely probable that the original C contained the whole passage. (This omission by Origen is only one of many illustrations which might be cited of the poor quality of the text which he had; see Tor. ATC. pp. 94 f.) The parallels, vv. 17-18 and vv. 24-25, are not indicative of two sources, since in one the compiler is tracing the collateral lines, while in the other it is his purpose to give the lineal descent of Abraham. The transposition
of vv. 11-14 (= Gn. 25:11-14) and vv. 12-23 (= Gn. 25:1-4) has no significance, since it is easily explained, the descendants of Ishmael, the first-born, being placed first and those of Isaac, by the compiler's habit, come last. Equally trivial is the repetition of the substance of v. 12 in v. 13. The descendants of Esau (vv. 14-17) are as much in place here as the descendants of Ishmael and of Abraham by Keturah. Hence there is little cause to doubt that the first chapter of the Chronicler's history has come down to us in essentially the same form in which it left his hand.

1-4. The ten antediluvian patriarchs and the three sons of Noah.—This list of names is a condensation of Gn. 5 by the omission of the chronological statements and those of descent from father to son; and the list in Gn. is apparently modelled after the Babylonian one of ten ancient kings which has been preserved by Berossus (Dr. Gn. p. 80, KAT. pp. 531 f., Gordon, Early Trad. of Gn. pp. 45 ff.). The names appear in some instances to have been derived from the Babylonian list and are also directly connected in a large measure with the names found in the genealogies of Gn. 4 (J).—1. Adam] i.e., man or mankind, an appropriate name for the first man, the father of the human race; hence a proper name (Gn. 4:1-5, RV. wrongly in Gn. 3:17. 1, v. דָּוִד, BDB.).—2. Seth] (Gn. 4:1-5. 1.) derived in Gn. 4, probably from mere assonance, from רָאִים “to appoint,” hence, “substitute”; the meaning or derivation is otherwise entirely obscure.—Enosh] (שֵׁנוֹש) (Gn. 4:5. 1.) poetical word for man and probably in folk-lore a name like Adam for the first man. The third Babylonian name Amelon or Amilarus has also the same meaning.—3. Hanoch] (רָאִים) (Gn. 4:5. 1.) to be connected with קָנָה (קָנָה) (Gn. 4:1. 1.), with the meaning of “smith,” and thus corresponding with the fourth Babylonian name Ammenon, which is equivalent to “artificer.”—Mahalahel] (Māhalalēl) (Gn. 5:8, also a Judahite, Ne. 11:1. 1). The meaning is “praise of God.” It is possibly a Hebraised form of the fifth Babylonian name Megalarus, a corruption of Melalarus.—Jared] (Gn. 5:11, also a Calebite 4:18. 1), from the root meaning to go down, but the significance of the name is not apparent.—3. Hanoch] (רָאִים) (Gn. 5:11, also the first-born of Cain, Gn. 4:17. 1, also a son of Reuben, 1 Ch. 5:1). He, from his “translation,” is the most notable of the ten patriarchs (Gn.
The name may mean "dedication," and might in the story of Cain be connected with the building of the first city (Gn. 4:17), or if derived from parallel Babylonian king Enmeduranki, who probably was the mythical high priest of a place linking heaven and earth, the name might imply dedication to the priesthood. This, considering Enoch's religious character, is more plausible. The initiation of Enoch into heavenly mysteries, according to the later Jewish story, probably arose from a connection between him and the Babylonian parallel, since the latter was the possessor of such knowledge.—

Methushelah (Gn. 5:29), "man of missile." The corresponding name in Gn. 4:26 is Methusael = Babylonian mutusha-ili, "man of God." The corresponding name in the Babylonian list Amempsinus = amel-Sin, "man of the god Sin"; hence "missile," shela, is probably another title of Sin, i.e., of the moon-god.—

Lamech (Gn. 4:25, 5:32). The important position of the Lamech in the line of Cain, where he is the father of the representatives of three social classes—nomads, musicians, and smiths—and in the line of Seth, where he is the father of Noah and grandfather of the representatives of the three races of mankind, reveals the probable identity of the two persons in origin, but whence the name is derived is still obscure, probably from an ancient Babylonian god.—

Noah (Gn. 5:29 and frequent in story of the flood, Gn. 6-10, Is. 54:18 Ez. 14:14). The Noah of Gn. 5:27 (J) is clearly the husbandman who produced wine (Gn. 9:20), and thus gave man rest, refreshment, and comfort in his toil. Why the hero of the flood also bore this name is not clear, since no certain connection is discernible between the name Noah (נְוָה) and Ut-napishtim, the name of the Babylonian hero of the deluge.—

Shem (W. Gn. 5:31-32), signifying "renown," i.e., glory, and apparently was a name of Israel (cf. Gn. 9:26 Blessed be Yahweh the God of Shem, i.e., of Israel).—

Ham (V. Gn. 5:32, 6:13 7:11 9:18, 25, 27 10:1, 13, 14, 21 11:10 13:19). Ham stands for Egypt in Ps. 78:14 105:17 106:15. Thus Ham appropriately represented the peoples southward from Palestine.—
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Japheth] (v. 8 Gn. 5:6 7:9 11:9 11:27 10:2. 11 †). According to Gn. 9:17 the word is from the root (י"ל), meaning "to be open" (so BDB., Margoliouth in DB. suggests a derivation from י"ל "to be fair)," but the real origin is still obscure. It primarily comes without doubt from some appellation of the peoples or country lying to the north and west of Israel, because in those directions the descendants of Japheth are found (vv. 1-7). Japheth may have represented originally the Phoenicians, since the expression dwelling in the tents of Shem (Gn. 9:7) points to a land adjacent to Palestine (DB. Extra vol. p. 80).

2. Japheth] so too Gn. 5:11-12, but 5 Kardar, 3 Cainan, in both places, show a different pronunciation of the diphthong which may have been in use in the Chronicler's day, cf. Ki. SBOT. pp. 52 f., Kom. pp. 2 f.

5-7. The descendants of Japheth.—These verses are taken directly without change from Gn. 10:3-4 (P). Whatever variations the two texts now exhibit are due to the copyists of one or the other unless the text used by the Chronicler differed from the archetype of ל. This is also true of all other cases where the Chronicler clearly reproduces the exact words of his parallels. For variations see textual notes. These nations or peoples must all be sought to the north and west of Palestine.—5. Gomer] (v. 8 Gn. 10:5. Ez. 38*, name of a person Ho. 1:5 †) a people of Asia Minor identical with the Gimirrai of Assyrian inscriptions. Their territory in Armenian is called Gamir. It corresponds to Cappadocia. They are the Kimmerians of the Greeks.—Magog] (Gn. 10:4 Ez. 38* 39* †) from collocation in Ezekiel and from assonance is closely related with the Gimirrai of Assyrian inscriptions. Their territory in Armenian is called Gamir. It corresponds to Cappadocia. They are the Kimmerians of the Greeks.—Magog] (Gn. 10:4 Ez. 38* 39* †) from collocation in Ezekiel and from assonance is closely related to Gog, which apparently is the Gagaia of the Amarna tablets, a designation of northern barbarians. The traditional identification with the Scythians is plausible (EBi. II. coll. 1747 f.).—Madai] i.e., the Medes mentioned frequently in the OT.—Javan] (v. 7 Gn. 10:1-4 Is. 66:12 Ez. 27:10 Dn. 8:21 10:21 Zc. 9:12, pl. Jo. 4:1 (3): †) the Greeks, or more properly the Ionians.—Tubal and Meshech] (mentioned always together Gn. 10:4 Ez. 27:13 32:23 38:1, 39, except Is. 66:13, where Tubal occurs alone and Ps. 120:4, where Meshech, alone). They are the Tibali and Mushku of the Assyrian inscrip-
tions and the Moschoi and Tibarenoi of Herodotus (iii. 94, vii. 78). In the Assyrian period their home was north-east of Cilicia and east of Cappadocia; later they retired further to the north to the mountainous region south-east of the Black Sea (Dr. Gn.).—

Tiros] (Gn. 10* †) formerly identified with the Thracians (so Jos. Ant. i. 6. 1) but now generally with the Tyrseni (Tyrosenoi), a piratical people of the northern shores and islands of the Ægean Sea (Hdt. i. 57, Thuc. iv. 109). Tiros has also been regarded as the same as Tarshish v. 1 (W. Max Müller, Orient Lit. Zeitung, 15 Aug. 1900, col. 290).—6. Ashkenaz] (Gn. 10* Je. 51* †). Their home, according to Jeremiah, was in the region of Ararat, and they are undoubtedly the Ashkuza, Ishkuza of the Assyrians; an ally of the Assyrians from the reign of Asarhaddon onward, and possibly identical with the Scythians (KAT. p. 101); the Hebrew name has arisen apparently through a confusion of letters (יוּשָּׁנָא instead of נוֹשָּׁנָא).—Riphath*] not yet clearly identified or located; according to Josephus (Ant. i. 6. 1), the Paphlagonians.—

Togarmah] (Gn. 10* Ez. 27* 38* †). The references in Ez. indicate a northern country furnishing horses and mules, usually identified with the Armenians and by some connected with the city Tūgarimmu of the Assyrian inscriptions (EBi. IV. col. 5129, Del. Par. p. 246).—7. And the sons of Javan] to be sought naturally among the countries or peoples belonging to the Greeks.—Elishah] (Gn. 10* Ez. 27* †), a land that according to Ezekiel furnished “blue and purple,” hence, since these dyes were procured from shell-fish, a Grecian maritime country: lower Italy and Sicily have been suggested (Dill.), the Æolians (Аεολες) (Del.), Elis (Ηλις) (Boch.), Carthage as though called Elissa (SS.).—

Tarshish] (Gn. 10* and frequent elsewhere), commonly identified with Tartessus in Spain, yet not conclusively so. Tarsus in Cilicia has also been named (EBi. IV. col. 4898).—Kittim] (Gn. 10* Nu. 24* Is. 23* Je. 2* Ez. 27* Dn. 11* †) represents Cyprus. The name is derived from the city Kition on the south-east shore of the island.—

Rodanim †] (Gn. 10* wrongly Dodanim) people of the Island of Rhodes.

6. Ἱραθεία] about thirty mss. (Kennic., Gin.), Ἱ and Gn. 10* Ἱραθεία, which is to be restored as the original (Kau., Ki.).—7. Ταρσειθεσία] Gn. 10* Ταρσειθεσία. The final נ probably arose through the influence of the
preceding הָשָׁאָלָה and is to be removed (Kau., Kl.).—Gn. רְמִית. The former is the true reading, supported in Gn. by some Heb. mss. (Gin.) and С and accepted by Ball (SBOT.), Dill., Holz., et al.

8–16. The Hamites.—This passage is also without change from Gn. 10:6–14; 11:13–15; vv. 6–7 (P), 8–11 (J). The intervening verses, Gn. 10:1, the summary Gn. 10:11–13 descriptive of the kingdom and cities of Nimrod, are omitted as irrelevant in a brief outline. Geographically the Hamites were south and south-west of Palestine and included also the so-called Canaanite peoples of Palestine.—8. Cush] (Gn. 10:6 and frequent elsewhere) (see vv. 6–7) the land and people of upper Egypt, commonly called Ethiopia.—Mizraim] Egypt. The Hebrew word is usually accepted as a dual referring to upper and lower Egypt, though also regarded simply as a locative form (EBI. III. col. 3161).—Put] (Gn. 10:6, Je. 46:8 Ez. 27:10 30:38 Na. 3:1), usually reckoned as the Libyans (so rendered by С in Je. and Ez.) but more probably the Punt of the Egyptian inscriptions, the district of the African coast of the Red Sea, "from the desert east of upper Egypt to the mod. Somali country" (W. Max Müller in DB.).—Canaan] reckoned as a son of Ham because so long under Egyptian control and from the religious antagonism of Israel toward the Canaanites.—9. The sons of Cush], as the notes below show, were located on the Red Sea and eastward in Arabia. This might imply a migration from Africa across the straits into Arabia.—Seba] (Gn. 10:7 Ps. 72:10 Is. 43:1), formerly after Josephus identified with Meroe between the Nile and the river Atbara, but more recently after indications by Strabo, with a district on the west shore of the Red Sea.—Havilah] (Gn. 2:11 10:8 25:11 S. 15:1 Ch. 1:11). These passages require several Havilahs or they indicate the uncertain geographical knowledge of the ancients regarding southern Arabia and Africa. As represented here it may be on the African coast, a little south of the straits of Bab-el-Mandeb (Dr. Gn.), or Havilah is a large central and north-eastern Arabian district of which sometimes one part is referred to and sometimes another (EBI. II. col. 1974).—Sabtah] (Gn. 10:8) probably to be connected with the old Arabian town Sabata, an ancient trading emporium, the capital of Hadramaut.—
Ra‘ma] (Gn. 10:1 Ez. 27:2) in Ez. associated with Sheba and thus without doubt a district of Arabia (the 'Ραμμανται of Strabo).—Sabeca] unknown but to be sought in Arabia.—Sheba] (Gn. 10:1 mentioned frequently) the wealthy district or people of south-western Arabia famous for traders.—Dedan] (Gn. 10:1 also mentioned frequently). The references point to both northern and southern Arabia, due most likely to the extension of the trade of the people who were probably a tribe of central or southern Arabia. The name occurs in Sabean and Minean inscriptions.—10. Cush]. The original writer of Gn. probably thought Cush represented Ethiopia. Many modern writers, however, think of a Cush representing the Kasshu of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Κοσσαίοι of the Greek writers, a predatory and warlike tribe dwelling in the mountains of Zagros near Elam, who were so influential that they provided Babylon with its third dynasty of kings for some five and a half centuries, beginning about the middle of the eighteenth century B.C.—Nimrod] (Gn. 10:1 Mi. 5:1) not yet clearly identified. Two theories prevail concerning him: (1) that he is a historical character, most likely Nazi-maraddash, one of the later Kassite kings (c. 1350 B.C.) (Haupt, Andover Rev. 1884, Jul. p. 94, Sayce, Pal. Pal. pp. 91, 269); (2) that he is the same as the mythological Babylonian hero Gilgamesh (KAT. p. 581).—11. And Egypt begat]. The change of form of expression is due to the use of the document J by the compiler of Genesis.—Ludim] (Gn. 10:11 Je. 46:1, sg. Ez. 30:8). In the last two of these passages this people is mentioned with Cush and Put (see v. 9). Otherwise than thus a people of Egyptian or adjoining territory, they are unknown and have not been identified. —'Anamim] (Gn. 10:11) not yet identified.—Lehabim] (Gn. 10:11) equivalent to Lubim, the Libyans (Na. 3:2 Ch. 12:16 Dn. 11:1), who dwelt on the western border of Egypt.—Naph-tuhim] (Gn. 10:11) not yet definitely explained or identified (for conjectures see EBi. II. col. 1697).—12. Pathrusim] (Gn. 10:11) the people of Pathros (Is. 11:9 Je. 44:1 Ez. 29:13 30:11), upper Egypt. The word is an Egyptian compound meaning south-land.—Cashluhim] unidentified.—The following clause, from whence the Philistines went forth, is misplaced. It should
follow *Caphtorim*, the people of Caphtor, since that country is repeatedly mentioned as the ancient home of the Philistines (Am. 9; Dt. 2; Je. 47), see further textual note. Caphtor is usually identified with Crete yet also and perhaps with more probability with the southern coast of Asia Minor, called by the Egyptians *Kefto* (see EBi. III. col. 3715). In either case its people are children of Egypt through political relationship of the Philistines with Egypt.—**13. Sidon his first born.** Sidon was later eclipsed by Tyre, but its original greater prominence is seen in the fact that when Tyre had gained a reputation the Phoenicians were still called Sidonians (Dt. 3; Jos. 13; K. 11; 16).—**Heth** (frequent in Gn.) represents the Hittites, the *Cheta* of Egyptian monuments and *Hatti* of the Assyrian, who from 1600 to 700 B.C. were an independent power north and north-east of Palestine with centres at Kedesh on the Orontes and Carchemish on the Euphrates. Offshoots of this northern nation seem to have settled at Hebron and elsewhere in Palestine. Any ethnic connection of the Hittites with the Canaanites is uncertain. Jastrow (EBi. II. col. 2094) regards *Heth* in Gn. as a gloss.—**14. This verse with vv.**, giving various Canaanitic peoples, is a supplementary addition to J in Gn. (SBOT. Oxf. Hex., Gu., Dr., et al.). For similar enumerations cf. Gn. 15; Ex. 3; 13; 23; 33; 34; Dt. 7; 20; Jos. 3; 9; 11; 12; 24.—**The Jebusite** the tribe anciently inhabiting Jerusalem (Jos. 15; 2 S. 5; et al., mentioned frequently).—**The Amorite** (very frequent) with a double usage: (1) the people ruled by Sihon east of the Jordan, Nu. 21, et al.; (2) the pre-Israelitish people west of the Jordan, a usage especially in E and D (Dr. Dt. p. 11), very frequent also in the inscriptions—in Amarna letters, northern Palestine, in Assyrian inscriptions the land of the Hebrew kingdoms and in general "the West" (EBi. I. col. 641). (On an early Amoritic Semitic invasion both of Babylonia and Palestine, see Pa. EHSP. pp. 25 ff.) The Amorite is a racial name while Canaanite is a geographical name, and thus the two become general designations of the pre-Israelitish inhabitants of Palestine (Dr. Gn. p. 126).—**The Girgashite** (Gn. 10; 15; Dt. 7; Jos. 3; 24; Ne. 9; †). Their location is uncertain.—**15. The Hivite** mentioned frequently and
usually taken as a petty people of central Palestine connected
with Gibeon, Jos. 9:11, also with Shechem, Gn. 34:11, with Her-
mon, Jos. 11:1, and Mt. Lebanon, Ju. 3:1. Perhaps in these last
two passages Hitites should be read (EBi. II. col. 2101). The
following five names do not occur in other lists and are geographi-
cal, representing the inhabitants of five cities of northern Palestine.
—The Arkite] of Arka, mentioned frequently in Assy. ins. and a
city of importance in the Roman period, the birthplace of Alexan-
der Severus (A.D. 222–235), the mod. Tell Arka, about twelve miles
north of Tripolis (EBi. I. col. 310).—The Sinite] of a place not
positively located but appearing in the Assy. ins. Siannu grouped
with Arka (EBi. IV. col. 4644).—16. The Arvadite] of Arvad
(Ez. 27:11), mentioned in the Amarna letters and frequently in
Assy. ins., the mod. Ruad, twenty-five miles north of Arka (Baed.'
p. 354).—The Zemarites] (Gn. 10:16) of a city or fortress Simirra,
mentioned frequently in Amarna letters as Sumur and Assy. ins.,
known to the Greeks, the mod. Sumra (Baed.' p. 351), six miles
south of Arvad.—The Hamathite] of the well-known and fre-
quently mentioned Hamath on the Orontes, fifty miles east-north-
east of Arvad, mod. Hama (Baed.' pp. 368 f.).

17–23.—The Semites.—These verses, wanting in G\textsuperscript{B}
and placed by Ki. as a subsequent addition (but V. S.), were taken ori-
ginally without change from Gn. 10:21–22, vv. 21–22 (Ch. v. 11) P, vv.
21–22 (Ch. vv. 11–12) J. The Semites geographically were, in the
main, in a central zone between the Japhethites and the Hamites.
Political considerations and a knowledge of racial affinities as well
as the geographical situation may have influenced their grouping.
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17. 'Elam] mentioned frequently in Assy. ins. Elama, Elamma, Elamtu, and in the OT. (Gn. 10:22 Is. 11:21 22 Je. 25:49-50 seven times) Ez. 32:4 Dn. 8), a land and people east of Babylonia, lying directly at the head of the Persian Gulf to the north and east. Civilisation early flourished there, and about the twenty-third century B.C. an Elamitic suzerainty was exercised over Babylonia. Racially the Elamites were entirely distinct from the Semites. Their inclusion among the Semites was due either to their proximity to Assyria (Dr. Gn.) or because in very early times the land was peopled in part at least by Semites (Del. Par. p. 321).—Asshur] the kingdom and people of Assyria, frequent in inscriptions and OT., situated in the upper portion of the Mesopotamian valley about the middle course of the Tigris. The people were closely akin to the Phœnicians, Arameans, and Hebrews. As conquerors from the fourteenth to the eighth centuries B.C. they have well been called the Romans of the East.—Arpachshad) (vv. 11-11 Gn. 10:31 11:10-11) obscure, formerly identified with Ἀρπαχσαχίτως (Ptol. vi. 1. 2), the hill country of the upper Zab, in Assy. ins. Arrapha (Del. Par. pp. 124 f.), Arbaха (Sch. COT. I. p. 97), but this does not explain the final syllable; hence a compound of גבול—Arabic ( Arabic "boundary" and Keshed = Chaldeans, hence boundary or land of the Chaldeans (Sch. COT. I. p. 98); or after the Assyrian Arba-kišādi, "land of the four sides or directions" (Del. Par. p. 256); or of four banks, i.e., of Tigris and Euphrates (Jen. ZA. xv, p. 256); or a contraction of Ar = Ur, the ancient home of Abraham and pa the Egyptian article and Keshed, i.e., Arpachshad, Ur of the Chaldeans (Hom. AHT. p. 292); or a contraction through copyist's error of גבול representing Arrapha, etc. (see above) and Keshed, the passage having originally read Elam and Asshur and Arpach and Keshed (Cheyne, EBi. I. col. 318). This last would be the most plausible were it not for the appearance of Arpachshad in Gn. 11:10-11.—Ludd] (Gn. 10:26 Is. 66:1 Ez. 27:9 30:1) naturally Lydians of Asia Minor, Assy. Luddu, also obscure since it is difficult to see why in this connection they should be mentioned between Arpachshad and Aram, and they were not at all a Semitic people. Jensen would identify them with a land of
Luddu mentioned in Assy. ins. and apparently on the upper Tigris (Deutsche Lit. Ztg. 1899, No. 24, v. Gu. Gn.).—Aram] frequent in OT. and ins.; not a land, rather the name of a Semitic people dwelling north-east of Palestine widely spread. Their inscriptions of the eighth century B.C. have been found at Zenjirli in the extreme north of Syria, and inscriptions at Tema, north of Medina, show them to have been in north-western Arabia about 500 B.C. Other inscriptions show them to have been on the lower Tigris and Euphrates. Indeed, in Babylonia and Assyria a large portion of the population, if not the larger, was probably Aramean at a very early date. But their especial land was Mesopotamia, yet while the Assy. ins. never place them west of the Euphrates, that was their home par excellence in the OT. They are distinguished by special names as "Aram of the two rivers" (Gn. 24*® Dt. 23*® Ju. 3*®) (rivers uncertain, naturally the Euphrates and Tigris, but according to some the Euphrates and Chabor), "Aram of Damascus" (2 S. 8*®), "Aram of Zobah" (2 S. 10*®). From their position or other causes their language became widespread, both as a language of commerce and diplomacy (Is. 36*®), and after the exile it supplanted Hebrew as the language of the Jews (Noeldeke, EBi. I. col. 276 ff.).—The four following peoples or districts are in Gn. the sons of Aram, which statement was probably originally here (v. i.).—"Uz] (v. 4*® Gn. 22*® Jb. 1*® Je. 25*® La. 4*®). The connection here and in Gn. 22*®, where Uz is a son of Nahor, suggests a people or district to the north-east of Palestine, while its appearance in the list of the Horites (Gn. 36*®) and in connection with Edom (La. 4*®) suggests a tribe or locality south-east of Palestine. The name has not yet been clearly identified in the Assy. ins. (but see Del. Par. p. 259).—Hul] (Gn. 10*®) unidentified although possibly to be seen in Hal'ta (Del. Par. p. 259), a district near Mt. Masius.—Gether] (Gn. 10*®) unidentified.—Meshech] in Gn. 10*® Mash †, which is without doubt the true reading, representing the district of Mt. Masius. (On Meshech see v. 4®.)—18. Shelah] (v. 4® Gn. 10*® 11*® 11*® 14*® 14*®). Cf. v. 1®. Since Shelah is the second element of Methuselah (cf. v. 1®), it is probably the name of a god. (Cf. Mez, Gesch. d. Stadt Harran, p. 23, v. Gu. on Gn. 11*®)
Eber] an eponym simply derived from Hebrews (אבר) or from the geographical term indicating the early home of the Hebrews “beyond the river,” i.e., the Euphrates (Jos. 24:1) or Jordan, cf. “beyond the Jordan” (אבר ירדן) Gn. 50:11. Jos. 17:1 Dt. 1:1 et al. (some thirty times), BDB.—19. Peleg] (v. 28 Gn. 10:21 11:17. 18. 19 †) derivation and representation uncertain. Sayce connects with the Babylonian palgu, “a canal,” and makes the land Babylonia divided by canals (Expos. T. viii. p. 258). Hommel compares the land of el afaq in central Arabia (Gu. Gn.). Usually the division of the land is interpreted as referring to the dispersion of population, Gn. 9:10 10:11.—Joktan]. This appears in the primitive tribe Kahan of Arabian genealogists, but this fact is usually assumed to be derived from the OT. and thus of no historical value. The name then in its Biblical origin is still entirely obscure, but the thirteen sons, vv. 20-22, are clearly Arabian tribes or localities, only a few of whom can now be definitely identified.—20. Almodad] unidentified, a compound possibly of אל “God” and יהוה either active or passive God loves or is loved (BDB.), or the word means the family Maudad in ins., especially the Gebanites in their relation to the kings of Ma‘in (Gl. Skiz. ii. p. 425). It is possibly to be connected with places in Hadramaut (see Holz. Gn.).—Sheleph] appears in tribal and local names Salef, Safi, near Yemen (Gl. ib.).—Hazarmaveth] mentioned in Sab. ins. and preserved in the mod. Hadramaut, the name of a district in southern Arabia a little east of Aden.—Jerah] (Gn. 10:21 †) not clearly identified (but see Gl. ib.).—21. Hadoram] (Gn. 10:11, in 1 Ch. 18:12 Ch. 10:16 names of persons). Possibly Dauram in the neighbourhood of San‘a.—Usal] (Gn. 10:11 Ez. 27:1 †) generally identified with San‘a, capital of Yemen. Glaser disputes this and seeks it near Medina (EBi. IV. col. 5239, Gl. Skiz. ii. pp. 427 ff.).—Diklah] (Gn. 10:21 †) unidentified.—22. ‘Ebal] (Obal Gn. 10:10) usually connected with the local name ‘Abil in Yemen.—Abima‘el] (Gn. 10:21 †) unidentified. —Sheba]. See v. 6. Perhaps here a colony of the main people is meant.—23. Ophir] (Gn. 10:22). Whether this Ophir is the same as the land of gold and the terminus of the voyages of Solomon’s fleet is uncertain. BDB. regards it as an entirely
distinct place. Others identify the two and place Ophir on the eastern coast of Arabia stretching up the Persian Gulf (EBi. III. col. 3513 ff.).—Havilah]. See v. 4. This must be a Havilah connected with the district in Arabia.—Jobab] (Gn. 10*9, elsewhere name of a person, cf. 1*) generally regarded as unidentified. Glaser discusses the sons of Joktan with the following conclusion: “Almodad, Shalaf, Hadramaut, and Jaraḥ represent the entire southern coast of Arabia from Bab-el-Mandeb to beyond Mahra; Hadoram, Uzal, and Diklah the Serat range from Ṣan’a to Medina; Obal, Abimael, and Sheba the Tihama from ’Asir and from Ḥidjaz (eventually from Yemen) and the Sabērland; Ophir, Ḥawilah, and Jobab, eastern and central Arabia unto ’Asir-Ḥidjaz” (Skiz. ii. pp. 435 f.).

17. [Gn. 10*8 and Gn. 10*9 + ⃖ ניזא, which should be supplied (and the following ↓ dropped), since these words have probably fallen from the text by a copyist’s error (Ki., Bn.), although it is possible that the Chronicler assumed that the relation of Uz, etc., to Aram would be understood, and hence the omission, cf. v. 4 (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). פ ניזא for ניזא is doubtless a corruption of ניזא ניזא before which נ must have fallen out.—גנ,] six mss., ⃖, and Gn. ⃖. A district Mash appears well attested by the cuneiform inscriptions. ניזא appears in v. 8 Gn. 10* Ps. 120*, and from greater familiarity was probably inadvertently substituted by a copyist (Bn.), yet perhaps already in the Chronicler’s text of Gn., since נ there has 모.ו.י.—18. ניזא] פ ניזא כאשכא כאשכא as פ of Gn. 10*9. This plus is certainly not original here. Note the addition of כאשכא in פ of v. 8.—20. ירר | פ גאמה, נ לארטור, נ(Authaur), נ אסארומ. Ptolemy (vi. 7. 25) and Strabo (xvi. 4. 2) speak of Ḥaramautai and Ḥaramautai, and Sabean inscriptions write דאמסו alongside of דאמסו (ZDMG. xix. pp. 239 ff., xxxi. 74 ff.), hence Ki. (SBOT.) points דאמסו—or דאמסו—cf. דאמסו and דאמסו. Since דאמסו is a foreign word and as such might have been changed by the Hebrews in order to provide it with a meaning, and since דאמסו might well have been transliterated דאמסו by Greeks, Ki. now (Kom.) retains pointing of פ.—22. ניזא] Gn. 10*9 בִּנְיָמ. The descendants of Japheth are fourteen, of Ham (omitting Nimrod), thirty, and of Shem, twenty-six, making seventy in all, representing the seventy nations of the globe which played an
important part in Jewish thought. Cf. also the occurrence of seventy in Nu. 11:1 Lk. 10:27.

24–27. The descent of Abram from Shem.—Abridged from Gn. 11:10–30 (P) by retention of the names of the patriarchs only, cf. vv. 1–10. This list in the priestly document was clearly designed to bridge over a period of considerable length of which there was nothing to record. The names appear to be derived from tribes or places, or possibly in some instances from deities (see Shelah, Re’u, and Teraḥ), and also some are found in the older list of J (Gn. 10:25 and see above, vv. 10 ff.).—Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah, Eber, Peleg] (see vv. 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17).—Re’u] (Gn. 11:10, 11, 12, 13) probably the name of a god (EBi. IV. col. 4087, cf. Mez above, v. 14).—Serug] (Gn. 11:10, 11, 12, 13) a district and city, Sarugi in Assy. ins., near Haran, well known to Arabic and Syriac writers of the Middle Ages.—Naḥor] (Gn. 11:11, etc., fifteen times, Jos. 24:1). The name of a deity (Jen. ZA. xi. p. 300, Skipwith, JQR. xi. p. 254) and also without doubt a tribe whose city was Haran.—Teraḥ] (Gn. 11:11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22) Jos. 24:1 identified with an ancient deity (Tarhi, Turgu) whose worship was widespread in northern Mesopotamia and adjoining districts and whose name has been preserved apparently in the element ῥαμ of many Cilician Greek names (Jen. ZA. vi. p. 70, Hittite, p. 153).—27. Abram that is Abraham]. In the narratives of Gn. the progenitor of Israel is first known as Abram (11:10–17) until (17:1) his name is changed to Abraham, and henceforward he is known by the latter name. The name Abram is equivalent to Abiram, “the (divine) father is lofty,” and Abraham is only another way of spelling the name, although it is possible that two persons, of the two different names, may have been fused into one, “Abram a local hero of the region of Hebron” and “Abraham the collective name of a group of Aramean people, including not only the Hebrew clans but also the Ishmaelites and a number of other desert tribes” (Pa. EHSP. p. 41). The historical character of Abraham is maintained by Ewald (Hist. i. pp. 300 ff.), Kittel (Gesch. i. § 16), Cornill (Hist. People of Is. p. 34), Hommel (AHT. pp. 156 ff.), McCurdy (HPM. §§ 344–348), Ryle (in DB.), and others, but the basis for this belief seems somewhat sentimental.
Abraham’s character is a creation of the prophetic period and he seems to have been created to connect together the peoples kindred to Israel in a genealogical system of relationship. It is possible that he came from an ancient deity worshipped in southern Judah, especially at Hebron. A suggestive name for this deity is seen in Ram ( רם) lofty (cf. “Elyon” most high, Gn. 14:21). A southern Judean clan bore the name of Ram (רָם). Sarah (princess), the wife of Abraham, has been clearly identified as a goddess (Jen. ZA. xi. p. 299).

28–33. Sons of Abraham, Ishmael, and Keturah.—28. The sons of Abraham, Isaac and Ishmael]. This statement has no exact parallel in form in Genesis. Isaac, although the younger, is mentioned first, since Israel came from him. Vv. 28–29 are condensed from Gn. 25:11–18 (P) and vv. 30–31 from Gn. 25:1–4 (J). The change of order from that of Genesis introducing the sons of Ishmael before those of Keturah is noticeable.—Isaac] probably represents a tribe whose original name may have been Isaac-el (ינשאכָל) corresponding to Ishmael, Israel, etc. This tribe seems to have dwelt in southern Judah, since the home of the patriarch is placed there. Why the tribe should form a link in the genealogy and become prominent in the story is not clearly known. The relationship between Israel and Edom clearly demanded for both a common father, and he might well be seen in an ancient tribe which had been absorbed into both. A deity has been found also in Isaac through the expression “Fear [of] Isaac” (Gn. 31:44) (Luther, ZAW. xxi. p. 73).—Ishmael] (Gn. 16:11. 18 et al.) the personification and without doubt the ancient historical name of a group of tribes regarded as near kinsmen of Israel dwelling in the northern part of the Sinaitic Peninsula and, according to the sons mentioned below, extending further into Arabia.—Nebaioth] (Gn. 25:11 28a 36a Is. 60v †), and Kedar] (Gn. 25:19 Is. 21v 42v 60v Je. 2iv 49v Ez. 27v †). Both of these tribes are mentioned in
Assy. ins. among the conquests of Ashurbanipal (Del. Par. pp. 296 f., 299). The latter appears the more widely spread and prominent; both dwelt at some distance east of Edom and Moab and the latter at the time of Ashurbanipal extended up to the Hauran. Whether the Nebaioth were the later Nabateans is uncertain. (See EBi. III. col. 3254.)—Adhbe′el] (Gn. 25′ †) also in Assy. ins. with home south-west of the Dead Sea toward the Egyptian frontier (Del. Par. p. 301).—Mibsam] (Gn. 25′, also in the genealogy of Simeon i Ch. 4′ †) not mentioned elsewhere.—30. Mishma] (Gn. 25′, likewise in the genealogy of Simeon i Ch. 4′ †) possibly the name is preserved in Jebel Misma, one hundred and sixty miles east of Teima, or in another Jebel Misma one hundred and twenty miles north-west of it (Dill., see Dr. Gn. p. 242).—Dumah] (Gn. 25′ Is. 21′, perhaps there Edom, Jos. 15′ in Judah, where we should probably read Rumah †) the oasis Duma now usually called al-Jof, on the southern border of the Syrian desert, mentioned by Ptolemy and Arabic geographers (Dr. ib.).—Massa] (Gn. 25′ †) in Assy. ins. and located near the Nebaioth (Del. Par. pp. 302 f.).—Hadad] (Gn. 25′) not identified.—Tema] (Gn. 25′ Jb. 6′ Is. 21′ Je. 25′ †) mod. Teima, south-east from the northern end of the Elamitic Gulf.—31. Jetur and Naphish] (Gn. 25′ i Ch. 5′ q, v, †).—Kedmah] (Gn. 25′ †) not identified.—32. Keturah] (Gn. 25′ †). The name means "frankincense" and might appropriately be chosen as the name of the mother of tribes trading in or producing that commodity. The sons of Keturah were tribes dwelling east and south-east of Israel which the Hebrew historian recognised as kin to Israel but held them less closely related than those called Ishmaelites (v. s.), and hence the Chronicler called their mother a concubine, a term not used of her in Gn., or else from the feeling that Sarah properly was Abraham's only wife.—Zimran] (Gn. 25′ †) usually connected with the city Zabram (Ptol. vi. 7. 5) west of Mecca on the Red Sea. As a tribal name it may have been derived from Zemer ( לדג), mountain goat. Very likely the same people appear in the "Zimri" (Je. 25′).—Jokshan] (Gn. 25′ †) unknown.—Medan] (Gn. 25′ †). Comparisons of doubtful worth have been made with a Wady
Medan near Dedan and with a Yemenite god Madan (EBi. III. col. 3002). This probably is not a real name but has arisen by a copyist's error from the following word.—Midian] (Gn. 25: f and frequently) a well-known people early disappearing from history, dwelling east of the Gulf of Akaba, whose nomad branches made forays into Edom (Gn. 36a Nu. 22: 7) and across Gilead into Palestine (Ju. 6-8). The name Midian appears in Moab on or near the Gulf of 'Akaba (Ptol. vi. 7. 2), mod. Madyan (EBi. III. col. 3081).—Jisbak] (Gn. 25: †) unidentified unless with Yabak, a district in northern Syria mentioned in Assy. ins. (KB. I. p. 159).—Shuah] (Gn. 25: †) the tribe of Job's friend Bildad (Jb. 2: 11). This has been identified with Suhu of the Assy. ins., a district on the Euphrates near Haran, but this is doubtful.—Sheba and Dedan]. Cf. v. 1. Different sources give different genealogical relationships. The Chronicler has here omitted from his source the sons of Dedan, given in Gn. 25: .—

33. 'Ephah] (Gn. 25: Is. 60, cf. in Judah and Caleb 1 Ch. 2: 1.) probably the Hayapa, a north Arabian tribe mentioned in Assy. ins. (Del. Par. p. 304). It dwelt in the district of Midian (Noeldeke, EBi. III. col. 3081).—'Epher] (Gn. 25: name in genealogy of Judah 1 Ch. 4: , Manasseh 5: †) possibly a ditography of the previous 'Ephah. This tribe and the three following, Hanoch, Abida', and Elda'ah (Gn. 25: † except Hanoch cf. v. 1, a Reubenite 5'), have not yet been clearly identified. (Cf. Gl. Skiz. p. 449.)
34-42. The sons of Isaac and Esau, including the sons of Seir.—V. " has no exact verbal parallel in Genesis; v. " is condensed from Gn. 3610; v. " from Gn. 3611, where Timna is described as the concubine of Eliphaz and mother of Amalek; v. " is taken verbatim from Gn. 3610; vv. 31-32 are taken verbatim, with slight omissions, from Gn. 3613-14 (P).—34. 'Esau] (Gn. 2510, a frequent in Gn.) identified with Edom (Gn. 3611); ancestor of the Edomites, Gn. 3611 (cf. v. "); "probably originally a god whom the Edomites regarded as their ancestor" (Noeldeke, EBL II. col. 1182).—Israel]. In Gn. the second son of Isaac was primarily called Jacob (Gn. 2510). Israel is the name given later in connection with a special revelation (Gn. 3210 3510). The Chronicler prefers Israel to Jacob in speaking of the people (91) and so the OT. writers generally. Jacob is more poetic. The truth lying back of the two names is probably that an older tribe, Jacob or Jacob-el, was fused into Israel.—35. Cf. Gn. 3610, where the mothers of the sons are given: Adah of Eliphaz and Basemath of Reu'el and Oholibamah of Je'ush, Ja'lam, and Korah.—Eliphaz] (Gn. 3610, one of Job's friends Jb. 211 et al.) from Teman v. ".—Reu'el] (Gn. 3610, Moses' father-in-law Ex. 211 Nu. 1011, a Gadite Nu. 211, a Benjaminite I Ch. 91). For the first half of the name cf. v. ".—Je'ush] (Gn. 3610, a personal name I Ch. 710 811 2311 11 2 Ch. 1111).—Ja'lam] (Gn. 3610 11 11).—Korah] both personal and clan or guild name in Israel doubtless historically showing a connection with Edom (cf. 211 91).—36. (Cf. Gn. 3610) Teman] is elsewhere in OT. the name of a district in northern Edom (Am. 111 Je. 4911 Ez. 2511 Hb. 31, the home of Job's friend Jb. 211 cf. I Ch. 111).—Omar] (Gn. 3611 11).—Zephi] (Zapho Gn. 3611 11).—Ga'slam] (Gn. 3610 11).—Kenaz]. Cf. v. " elsewhere connected with Caleb (Jos. 1511 Ju. 111 311 11) showing that the Calebites were closely allied with the Edomites.—Timna] in Gn. 3611 the concubine of Eliphaz and the mother of Amalek. In Gn. 3611 I Ch. 111 Timna is the sister of Lotan, and in Gn. 3611 I Ch. 111 chief or clan of Edom. These variations are not surprising considering the origin of genealogies. Gunkel regards Gn. 3610 as an insertion in P. —'Amelek] an ancient people south of Canaan, and marauders.
1. 34-42.

DESCENDANTS OF ESAU

Their place in Gn. 36* as a subordinate clan of Esau points to their later position of inferiority or extinction (cf. 1 Ch. 4**).

37. These clans from Gn. 36* are otherwise unknown. But as the names of other clans or individuals cf. Naḥath 6* 2 Ch. 31*, Zerah 2* 4* 6* 9* 2 Ch. 14* (9*), Shammah 1 S. 16* 2 S. 23* * *, probably 1 Ch. 27* (BDB.). All of these sons of Eliphaz and Réuel are given in Gn. 36* * as chiefs of Edom; and also in Gn. 36* Jeush, Jalem, and Korah.

38. Se'ir) in Gn. 36* called the Horite, showing that the writer there had in mind the earlier inhabitants of the land of Edom. Hence they properly are sons of the country Se'ir rather than of the race Edom. Seir, the territorial name meaning "hairy," is probably equivalent to "wooded," "covered with brushwood." The name appears in the Sā'aira of the Egyptian inscriptions (EBi. II. coll. 1182 f.).—Lotan) (Gn. 36* * * * (9)) possibly to be connected with Lot (Gn. 11* 12* et al.), derived from the ancient name of the country east of the Jordan; in Egyptian inscriptions Ruten, Luten (Pa. EHSP. pp. 38, 59, 123).—Shobal) (v. * * Gn. 36* * * * * * * * * * (9)). On meaning of name as young lion cf. Gray, HPN. p. 109.—Zibe'on) (v. * * Gn. 36* * * * * * * * * *). The name means hyena (Gray, HPN. p. 95).—'Anah) (v. * * Gn. 36* * * * * * * * * * * * * *). The present text of Gn. gives Anah (36*) a daughter of Zibeon (36*) and a son of Zibeon.—Dishon) (Gn. 36*, son of Anah 36* * * * 1 Ch. 14* * *, chief Gn. 36* * * * * *). The name means pygarg, a kind of antelope or gazelle (cf. Dt. 14*).—Ezer) (v. * * Gn. 36* * * * * *).—Dishan) (v. * * Gn. 36* * * * * * * * * * * * (9)) clearly a mere variant of Dishon.—39. Lotan). Cf. v. * *—Hor'i) (Gn. 36*, a Simeonite Nu. 13*). As a clan name this is striking. Perhaps originally in Gn. it was the Gentilic adjective. (On meaning cf. Dr. Dt. 21*).—Homam) (Hemam Gn. 36* * *). This name possibly has connection with Heman 2* since Zerah was Edomitic as well as Judaic, cf. v. * *—Timna'). Cf. v. * *—40. Shobal) (Cf. v. * *—'Aljan) (Alwan Gn. 36* * * * * *). Cf. v. * *—'Eljon, the Most High, the name of a deity.—Manahath) (Gn. 36* * *). Cf. 1 Ch. 2* 8* but probably with no connection with the foregoing. 'Ebal) (Gn. 36* * *). Cf. with possible identification in name (not
locality) with 'Ebal of 11.—Shephi] (Shepho Gn. 36 from a chief of Judah i Ch. 21. 11'). Probably the name is identical with Onan, Gn. 38 i Ch. 21.—Zib'lon]. Cf. v. 11.—Aijah] (Gn. 36, father of Rizpah 2 S. 3' 21. 11 11 meaning hawk, cf. Lv. 11 M. 14. 11.'Anah]. Cf. v. 11. Gn. 36 adds: "This is Anah who found the hot springs (?) in the wilderness, as he fed the asses of Zibeon his father."—41. 'Anah]. Cf. v. 11.—Dishon]. Cf. v. 11.—Hamran] (Hemdan Gn. 36†). The form in Chronicles suggestive of עב ו he-ass, Hamor the father of Shechem, considering the other animal names in this section, is not improbably the true one.—Eshban] (Gn. 36†).—Jithran] (Gn. 36, also man or clan of Asher i Ch. 711†). Cf. Jether, a common name.—Cheran] (Gn. 36†).—42. Ezer]. Cf. v. 11.—Bilhan] (Gn. 36†, a Zebulunite i Ch. 711†). Some connect with Bilhah the concubine of Jacob (Stade, Gesch. i. p. 146, A. 1).—Zawan] (Gn. 36†).—Ja'akan] (Akan Gn. 36†) perhaps arisen from and Akan [אַ֫קַּנִּי] or possibly to be connected with "the sons of Jaakan" Nu. 3311. Dt. 10. 11.—Dishan]. Cf. v. 11.—'Uz]. Cf. v. 11.—Aran] (Gn. 36†).


The introductory καὶ of the latter points to Β as original Β. This is adopted by Ki. and Bn. since the son of the promise, though the younger, precedes in v. 11. 36. υίοι] about thirty mss. and Gn. 3611 ος. Κ. here and in Gn. Σώφαρ = υίοι. This may represent an ancient scribal error (υ for η), wherefore the reading of Gn. is probably original.—36] Κ, Β, Τ, Gn. 361' υιοι. —37] Κ, Β, Τ, Gn. 3611 υιοι. —38. [ο]α] Κ. The ιαμαλη and ιαμαλη δι καὶ τηλοκ Ελιφας ο'τεκ ιαμαλη are doubtless harmonising glosses, probably originating in Κ. The text of Ch. is not likely a persistent variant as Bn. maintains. The Chronicler may have misread Gn., taking υιοι with the preceding as a masc. name (cf. v. 11 = Gn. 3610) and reading the following, there was a concubine to Eliphas the son of Esau, and she bare to Eliphas Amalek.—37. υιοι] Gn. 3611 ους and Gn. 361 ους instead of υιοι, so Ki. ΣΒΟΤ, Ball, ΣΒΟΤ, on Gn. 361. Ki. Κομ. retains υιοι.—39. [ο]α] Κ. Σαφὴς, hence Bn., Ki. BH. —40. [ο]α] many mss., Β, and Gn. 361 ους, adopted by Ki. and Bn.—36] Gn. 361. Κ. Σώφαρ, of which ιαμαλη is probably a mu-
A correspondence between the three lines of descent from Noah through Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and the three lines from Abraham through Isaac, Ishmael, and the sons of Keturah, has been found. As the descendants of Noah appear in seventy peoples, so likewise the descendants of Abraham may be reckoned as seventy tribes, Ishmael furnishing twelve; Keturah, thirteen; Isaac, two; Esau, sixteen (five sons and eleven grandsons); Seir, twenty-seven (including Timna v. 19) (Be.). Another reckoning omits Timna (v. 19) but includes Ishmael (Oe.). Others reject the idea of seventy tribes having been designed by the Chronicler (Ke., Zoe.). This latter appears quite probable.

43-51a. The kings of Edom.—Taken from Gn. 36:19-61 (J generally but Dr. P). Since no king is the son of his predecessor and their residences change, it is probable that these kings were rulers and comparable to the judges in Israel or represented different dynasties frequently changed as in northern Israel. The phrase before there reigned a king of the children of Israel (v. 2) may either mean before a king reigned in Israel, i.e., before Saul, or before a king of Israel reigned over Edom, i.e., before the conquest of Edom by David (2 S. 8:19). This latter interpretation is to be preferred (Buhl, Edomiter, p. 47, Dill., Holz., Gu.).—43. Bela, the son of Beor. The name is so similar to "Balaam the son of Beor" (Nu. 22:1-24) that some have regarded the two persons as identical (EBI. I. col. 524, Gray, Nu. p. 324). Bela also son of Benjamin, 8:1, Reubenite 5:26—Dinhabah] (Gn. 36:1) location unknown.—44. Jobab] (Gn. 36:1, cf. v. 28) otherwise unknown.—Zerah] Cf. v. 17.—Bozrah] (Gn. 36:26 Is. 34:1 63:1 Je. 49:17 Am. 1:11) mod. Buṣaireh, twenty miles south-east of the Dead Sea and thirty-five miles north of Petra (Dr. Gn.).—45. Husham] (Gn. 36:17, cf. Ḥashum Ezr. 2:10 Ne. 7:2).—Teman]. Cf. v. 20.—46. Hadad] (Gn. 36:17, cf. also vv. 19, 22) an Edomite who troubled Solomon 1 K. 11:24 †) the name
of an Aramean deity found in the names Ben-hadad, Hadadezer.—Bedad] (Gn. 36:1†) possibly to be connected with a range of hills called el-Ghaweileh, on the eastern side of the upper Arnon (Dr. Gn., Gu. Gn.).—47. Samael] (Gn. 36:1†).—Masrekah] (Gn. 36:1†). The name may mean “place of choice vines,” cf. Nahal Sorek “wady of choice vines” (Ju. 16).—48. Sha’ul] (Gn. 36:1†) the same name as that of Saul, King of Israel, and also of clans of Simeon (4:18) and of Levi (6:43).—Rekab] (Gn. 36:1†, name of a well Gn. 26:1, and Assyrian city Gn. 10:1†).—The River] is certainly not the Euphrates and the place Rahaba a little south of the mouth of the Habor (Dr. Gn.), but the river of Egypt, i.e., the Wady el-Arsh (Gn. 15:14) (Winck. Gesch. Isr. I. p. 192).—49. Baal-hanan] (Gn. 36:1†, an official of David 1 Ch. 27:1†). The name “Baal is gracious,” a synonym of Hannibal (cf. also Elhanan, Johanan), points to the worship of Baal in Edom (Dr. Gn.). (Still “Baal” is more a generic title than that of a specific deity.).—Achbor] (Gn. 36:1†, also a courtier of Josiah 2 K. 22:14 and perhaps Je. 26:23 36:1†, BDB.). The name means “mouse.”—50. Hadad] (Hadar Gn. 36:1, but some forty mss. and Samaritan mss. read Hadad). Cf. v. 44.—Pa’i] (Pa’u Gn. 36:1†). Perhaps we should follow O of Gn. and read Pe’or (נפייר), a mountain and city north-east of the Dead Sea not definitely located (cf. Nu. 23:14 Dt. 3:9). The mention of his wife and her maternal ancestry is striking; possibly through this connection he laid claim to the kingship. The names occur only here and in Gn. 36:1, except Mehetabel, “God confers benefits,” which is the name of an ancestor of the false prophet Shemaiah (Ne. 6:15).—Meza’ahab] means “waters of gold.”—51. And Hadad died] not in Gn., probably a copyist’s or the Chronicler’s blunder, thinking that the list of kings continued.

51-54. Tribal chiefs of Edom.—Taken from Gn. 36:1-41 with briefer introductory formula and omission of the concluding summary. Why the Chronicler should have given these as chiliarchs, tribal chiefs, when he omitted in the previous lists this title given in Gn. 36:1-19. 26-33, is not clear unless he felt that they were the followers of the kings. This list has been differentiated from the
previous ones because the chiefs were heads of territorial subdivisions and not purely tribal and possibly ruled after the conquest by Israel (Dr.).—51. *The chief of Timna’* and similarly in the names following.—Timna’. *Cf.* v. *—Athah* (*Alwah Gn. 36*†) perhaps identical with Alwan v. 40.—Jetheth* (Gn. 36*†).—52. Oholsibamah* (in Gn. 36*†) the wife of Esau, 36*† as here †).—Elah* probably the seaport usually called Elath.—Pinon* (Gn. 36*†) probably Punon of Nu. 33*†, between Petra and Zo’ar (Onom. 299, 123).—53. Kenas*.* Cf. v. *—Teman*. *Cf.* v. *—Mibṣar* and Magdi’el* (Gn. 36*†) both in the Onom. (277, 137) located in the district of Gebal (south of the Dead Sea), and the former, under the name of Mabsara, as a considerable village belonging to Petra.—*Iram* (Gn. 36*†). A king of Edom ‘Arammu is said to be mentioned in Assy. ins. (Ball, Gn. p. 94).
II-IX. The descendants of Jacob.—The pedigrees of the sons of Jacob are arranged according to the geographical position of the territory occupied by the several tribes. With Judah (2:1-4:1) as the proper starting-point, the Chronicler passes through Simeon (4:1-11) on the south, sweeps around the Dead Sea through the east-Jordanic tribes, Reuben (5:1-11), Gad (5:17-18), and the eastern half-tribe of Manasseh (5:19-19) from the south to the north, and, after inserting Levi (5:17-6:16 (6:1-41)), with his cities in both eastern and western Palestine (Jos. 21), at this convenient point, crosses into the northern part of western Palestine to Issachar (7:1), Zebulun (7:11 corrected text, see on c. 7), Dan (7:12 corrected text), Naphtali (7:14), Manasseh (7:15-19), Ephraim (7:20-25), and Asher (7:26-28), completing the circle with Benjamin (cc. 8, 9:1-9) and the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (9:10-13) unless this list came from another and later hand. Asher should appear earlier in the list, but see comment on 1 Ch. 7:1-41. (In 27:14 Asher is wanting.) More space is given to the descendants of Judah than to those of any other tribe, one hundred verses in all, while the tables of the house of Levi occupy eighty-one, Benjamin fifty, and a scant eighty-six suffice for the other ten tribes combined. Before inquiring further into the question of authorship—or, more properly, editorship—it may be observed that this is exactly what should be expected from the Chronicler. Chronicles–Ezra–Nehemiah is primarily a Levitical history of the Judean people. In the body of the work events of the N. kingdom are ignored, except as they touch Judean affairs. Hence it is not strange that the Chronicler should have collected the most genealogical notices for Judah and Levi. Benjamin also would receive special attention, since according to the post-exilic conception that tribe remained loyal to the house of David and was part of the S. kingdom (v. EB1, art. Benjamin, § 7).

The analysis of these chapters depends upon the idea of the Chronicler's character and purpose. With the premise that he intended these chapters only to serve as an introduction to his history of the Davidic kings, the task of striking out those parts of the genealogies carried down beyond the time of David becomes merely mechanical. But this premise cannot be sustained only on the ground that these tables precede the
THE SONS OF ISRAEL

II. 1-2. The sons of Israel.—These are introduced as a basis for the subsequent enumeration of the families of Israel. They are given as follows, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun, the six sons of Leah, Dan, son of Bilhah Rachel's maid, Joseph and Benjamin, sons of Rachel, Napthali, also a son of Bilhah, and Gad and Asher, sons of Zilpah Leah's maid. The position of Dan before the sons of Rachel, instead of after, is striking. Otherwise the order is the same as in Gn. 35:11-28 and Ex. 1:4 (omitting Joseph), late priestly narratives (P), where Dan follows Benjamin. The tribes, however, are not enumerated uniformly in
Dt. 33:24 et al. (For a full exhibition of the orders of arrangement,
of which there are some seventeen different ones in the Bible, and
for a discussion of the subject, see EB1. art. Tribes by G. B.
Gray, also art. in Exp. Mar. 1902.)

II. 3–IV. 23. The genealogies of Judah.—This passage con-
tains: (1) the descendants of Judah to Hezron's sons Jerahmeel,
Ram, and Caleb (2:1-9); (2) the descendants of Ram down to
David and his nephews (2:10-17); (3) descendants of Caleb, including
the family of a son born to Hezron in his old age (2:18-21); (4) the
descendants of Jerahmeel (2:18-19); (5) a supplementary table of
Jerahmeelites (2:18-19); (6) supplementary tables of Calebites
(2:20-23); (7) supplementary tables of the descendants of Ram (c. 3);
(8) a second genealogy of Judah (4:1-11).

At first sight we seem to have here a confused mass of genealogical
matter accumulated through various insertions (the view of Bn., Ki.).
Both 2:1-3 and 2:4-10 contain tables of Calebites, but if either were a
later addition we should expect the interpolator to have placed his
supplement in direct connection with the other, but now they are
separated by vv. 4-10. Similarly we should expect c. 3, if secondary,
to be placed after 2:10-11. On the other hand, as the work of the Chron¬
icler, the order is natural. First he gives his primary genealogical
material in the order Ram, Caleb, and Jerahmeel, and then appends
supplementary matter (v. i.) concerning each in reverse order. This
reversal of order is the Chronicler's habit (cf. 11:8. 15:8. et al.). (2:1
gives the sons of Hezron as Jerahmeel, Ram, and Chelubai (טבדא). Since
Ram is considered first (2:1), we should expect his name to appear
after that of Chelubai, according to the Chronicler's habit of consider¬
ing the last first (v. s.). The name Ram may have fallen from the
text of v. 9 by haplography, since the first word of v. 10 is also Ram,
being reinserted later in its present place. In that case final 3 of
בדא represents the initial 1 of בדא. One is tempted to find support
for this suggestion in Ge 38 where פדא actually follows דאבל, but since פדא also precedes it, the former could be due simply to dit-
tography. However, it is not necessary to suppose that the Chronicler
would be consistent with his usual scheme.)

The first table of Caleb's descendants (2:18-19) is regarded as secondary,
by Benzinger, who finds the original list of Calebites in vv. 18-40a. This
is possible, especially if only one table of Calebites is ascribed to the
Chronicler, but against it may be urged that as Jerahmeel of the sons
of Hezron comes first in v. 9, the Chronicler would be likely to place the
list of his descendants last. Since the position of Ram's descendants seems to be firmly fixed (2¹⁴ a.), the proper place for the table of the Calebites is between these two, that is, just where it is found. Benzinger has also unnecessarily considered the passage concerning the family of Segub (2²⁻²) to be out of place, but this passage forms a necessary introduction to v. ²⁶ (corrected text v. ²⁵). Although the latter is a doublet to v. ²¹, since Ashur is probably the same name as Hur, and Ephrathah is to be identified with Ephrath, the Chronicler who differentiated Hur and Ashur elsewhere (4⁴¹) may have done so here also. Then ²⁶⁻²³ was introduced by the Chronicler in this place because the birth of Segub, Hezron's death, Caleb's marriage to his father's wife, and the birth of Ashur are successive events in Caleb's life. This is further attested by the chronological order shown in v. ²⁴, and Asubah died, and Caleb took, etc. On this principle vv. ²⁴⁻²⁵ constitute a perfect unity.

²⁴⁻⁴¹ is doubtless an appendix to the descendants of Jerahmeel, since v. ²⁴, these were the sons of Jerahmeel, is certainly a closing formula. Hence we have an appendix for each of the three sons of Hezron, Jerahmeel (2⁴⁻⁴¹), Caleb (2⁴⁻⁴⁴), and Ram (c. 3). The first of these was probably put in the form of an appendix either because the compiler recognised the variant tradition regarding the genealogy of Sheshan (cp. v. ²⁶ and v. ²⁰) or because he differentiated the two Sheshans, hence vv. ²⁶⁻²⁷ had no direct connection with Jerahmeel. The second appendix with its geographical names and the third with its list of kings constitute proper material for postscripts. The reverse order of these additions is so suggestive of the Chronicler that it is safe to ascribe them to his original compilation in the absence of any strong evidence to the contrary.

The first verse of ²⁴⁻²⁶ is regarded by Benzinger as a superscription in which five descendants of Judah, Perez, Hezron, Caleb (so read for Carmi, v. ¹.), Hur, and Shobal, are co-ordinated as sons, while according to ²² a. they are members of a descending line. He further supposes that the Chronicler then took these up in reverse order. He strikes out as secondary the verses which interrupt this scheme, viz. vv. ²⁴⁻²⁶. It is doubtful, however, if v. ¹ ever was intended as a superscription to vv. ²⁻²⁰. This verse is directly connected with v. ², with which it shows the Judean descent of the Zorathites, cf. ²¹. The Chronicler apparently used the device of putting the first five descendants in juxtaposition as a convenient abridgment (cf. ²¹ a. ²² a.), since their relationship was well known or could be learned from c. ². Where he passes beyond well-known names (v. ²) the relationship is indicated. The following genealogies seem to be nothing more than short tables of Judean families which the compiler considered worth preserving. There is no good reason why they could not have come from the Chronicler, nor is there much ground upon which to argue for their authenticity. On the age of the material, see c. ⁴.
The source from which the Chronicler derived those genealogies not found in the OT. is uncertain. There is little likelihood that he had a book of Judean genealogies. More probably he used all the material which came to hand, connecting the names when possible with one of the older branches of the family. Identity of names was sufficient for this purpose (see below on 2:10).

II. 3-8. Sons of Judah.—These verses, except v. 9, contain gleanings from the historical books. The writer seems hard put to find descendants for certain branches of Judah.—3. The sons of Judah 'Er, Onan, etc.], derived from Gn. 38, cf. Gn. 46:11. —And 'Er the first born of Judah, etc.]. This remark is taken verbatim from Gn. 38:7, hence Bn. without reason infers the passage secondary to Ch. The omission to record the similar fate of Onan, Gn. 38:10, is noticeable. Here, however, as elsewhere the Chronicler assumes that his readers are familiar with the narratives of the Hexateuch. The story of the untimely death of Er and Onan implies that two of the ancient clans of Judah early disappeared.—The Canaanite mothers Shu'a and Tamar indicate a union of Israelite Judean stock with Canaanites. Reminiscences of early tribal history were thus preserved in folk-tales. For descendants of Shelah cf. 4:9 Ne. 11:1.—4. And Tamar his daughter-in-law bore to him Perez and Zerah] derived from Gn. 38:10. Perez and Zerah were the youngest clans of Judah. Zerah, perhaps the autochthonous, was according to Stade of pure Canaanitish stock originally and at first surpassed Perez, but later declined (Gesch. I. p. 158).—5. The sons of Perez: Hezron and Hamul], also a direct quotation from Gn. 46:11, cf. Nu. 26:10. On Hezron see vv. 1-3. Beyond the family of the Hamulites, Nu. 26:10, no descendants of Hamul are given elsewhere in the Old Testament. (On the name see textual notes.)—6. The sons of Zerah: Zimri and Ethan and Heman and Calcol and Darda. Zimri is Zabdi of Jos. 7:11 (for change of spelling see text. note). Ethan the Ezrahite, Heman, Calcol, and Darda sons of Mahol, are mentioned in 1 K. 5:1 (41) as distinguished wise men whom Solomon surpassed. Hence since Ezrahite (עֵזְרָה) might be explained as a descendant of Zerah (BDB.) and may be regarded as an attributive of Heman, Calcol, and Darda, the Chronicler evidently
placed these wise men as descendants of Zerah (Meyer, *Entst. Jud.* p. 161). This identification has generally been accepted (Be., Ke., Mov., but not by Zoe.). *Ethan* and *Heman* occur also in 1 Ch. as the names of two Levitical singers of the time of David, Ethan = Juduthun, 6″ (4″) 15″. 18, and an *Ethan* is also given among the ancestors of Asaph, 1 Ch. 6″ (4″), and *Heman* 1 Ch. 6″ (4″) 16″. 44 25″. 44. From the point of view of the Chronicler, since this *Ethan* and this *Heman* are Levites they cannot have been identical with those of our passage. Pss. 88 and 89, however, according to their titles are *mascils* of Heman the Ezrahite and Ethan the Ezrahite. Since Ps. 88 is also Korahite it is probable that Ezrahite Ethan and Heman in the titles of these Psalms represent both the Levitical singers and the wise men of 1 K. 5″ (4″). In short, the one Ethan and the one Heman of Israel’s early traditions, synonyms of wisdom, seem each in the genealogical system or notes of the Chronicler to have been evolved into two persons. Ewald (*Hist. III.* p. 278) thought that the two great singers of the tribe of Judah were taken by the Levitical music schools into their company and family and were afterward in the titles of Pss. 88, 89, reckoned to the tribe of Levi. When these wise men lived, whether they were cotemporaries of Solomon or traditional wise men of a more ancient past, we have no means of knowing. According to *Seder Olam Rabba* (ed. Meyer, p. 52), they prophesied in Egypt. (For a fanciful interpretation of their names connecting them with Job and his three friends see Klo. on 1 K. 5″.)—7. *And the sons of Carmi*. The plural (43) *sons of* is sometimes used in genealogical lists when only one son or descendant follows, cf. vv. 1. 10. 11. 44 Gn. 36″ 46″ Nu. 26″.—*Achar the trouble of Israel, etc.* 1 Achan Jos. 7″. 18″. 22″. 32″ (see text. note). The brevity of this notice of *Achar* and the omission of Zabdi the connecting link between Achar and Carmi is another assumption of familiarity with the narratives of the Hexateuch.—8. *Azariah*. Nothing further is known of this *Azariah*. Whether the Chronicler meant an immediate or remote descendant of Ethan cannot be determined. The name is very common. No other Zerahites are given elsewhere in the Old Testament except Sibbecai the Hushathite, and Maharai the Netophathite, two of David’s captains, 27″. 18.
3. The root שׁוֹד with the meaning spared BDB is favoured by the name יָשָׁם on a seal (EBi, art. Hamul). ג' ישו (שִׁישֶם by dittography of the preceding I) = יָשָׁם = יָשָׁם from יָשׁו + בְּהַר brother-in-law of God. This seems a more likely derivation, cf. 4, but the meaning is dub., see Ki. SBOT, Kom., SS., We. DGC, p. 22.—6. מֵרָם Jos. 7:1, ג' ישו(s) in both passages. The confusion of נ and פ is phonetic, of ר and פ graphic.—רַבּי] many MSS., ג' פ, פ, י. K. 5:20 וְרָם, adopted by Ki.—7. According to Jos. 7:1 Carmi was the son of יָשָׁם = זָהָב (v. s.), hence מֵרָם may have fallen from the text or the Chronicler assumed this relationship was known.—רַבּי] Jos. 7:1 וַיְרַא. In the former we have an assimilation of the name of the man to that of the valley of Achor (Dill.) or the latter arose from a scribal error, cf. ג' in Jos. אָשֶׁר.

9-55. The Hezronites.—Whatever may have been the relative position of this clan of Judah in the early history of the tribe, to the Chronicler Hezron was the all-important clan. Of it he reckoned by descent not only the royal family of David but also the great clans of Jerahmeel and Caleb. The accounts given of them are evidently from various sources. V. * (excepting the word Ram, see below) is derived from some old source other than the Old Testament. Vv. 10-12 appear to be taken directly from Ruth. Vv. 11-17 in contents are drawn from 1 and 2 S. Vv. 18-20, regarded by Ki. as an insertion (but see above), are derived partially from the Hexateuch, although considerable matter is new. Vv. 21-24 are entirely independent of anything elsewhere in the Old Testament. Of these, vv. 21-22, according to Ki., who follows We., represent early material, vv. 23-24 late, vv. 24-26 early, v. 27 late, v. 28 early, v. 29 late, vv. 30-31 early, vv. 32-34 late.

9. The sons of Hezron.—Hezron] vv. 18. 21. 24. 41, appears also as a son of Reuben Gn. 46. 6 Ex. 6:1 Nu. 26:11 1 Ch. 5:1, and as the name of a place indicating the southern boundary of Judah Jos. 15:1 (cf. also Kerioth-Hezron Jos. 15:11). לֵכָּה is to be connected with לֵכַח enclosure (HWB, BDB.). A Hezronite then is a villager or dweller in a permanent settlement, a kraal, in contrast to movable encampments. לֵכַח appears in the names of several localities of southern Judah and Simeon besides the two mentioned; Hazar-addar Nu. 34:1, Hazar-gaddah Jos. 15:17, Hazarsusah in Simeon Jos. 19:1, cf. 1 Ch. 4:11, Hazar-shu'al in southern
Judah Jos. 15"-1 Ch. 4" Ne. 11", in Simeon Jos. 19". Names from this root are also common elsewhere (v. BDB.). Under Hezron then we may have indicated only semi-nomads inhabiting a fixed abode and the name may have come from no political clan but only from a social class from which the Hezronites of Nu. 26". ii were evolved, and which occasioned this son of Perez and likewise the son of Reuben.—Jerahmeel, vv. 34. 35. 36", represents a clan dwelling in the days of David in southern Judah, 1 S. 27" 30".—Ram as a second son of Hezron is suspicious because (1) the Old Testament elsewhere knows of no Judean clan Ram co-ordinate with Caleb and Jerahmeel, (2) the descendants of Ram, which follow vv. 14"-18 are given not in families and cities as in the case of those of Jerahmeel and Caleb, vv. 36"-38. 39"-41", but simply in the pedigree of David. Ram is plainly introduced as a son of Hezron by the Chronicler from Ru. 4". The original statement from another source was evidently, and the sons of Hezron Jerahmeel and Chelubai, and this was the introduction to vv. 36". 37". 38". 39", where the descendants of Jerahmeel and Caleb are given.—Chelubai, equivalent to Caleb vv. 11"-14 q. v.

10-12. The ancestry of David.—Ram begat 'Aminadab, etc.]. Omitting the words prince of Judah, derived from Nu. 1", this pedigree of Jesse is taken verbatim from Ru. 4"-5". It is apparently artificial, for 1 and 2 S. know only of Jesse the father of David the Bethlehemite. Salma or Salmon was the reputed founder of Bethlehem, cf. vv. 41". 42". Nashon the son of Aminadab, according to P, was the prince of Judah during the Exodus, Nu. 17 2 et al. Out of these materials the author of Ruth, or some other genealogist, with the added names of Boaz and Obed, possibly ancestors of Jesse, constructed this genealogy, placing Ram as the son of Hezron at its head. Two facts probably led to the selection of Ram: (1) in genealogical lore, the ancient Ram was the son of Jerahmeel 1 Ch. 2", but David plainly was not a Jerahmeelite, hence the father's name could not be used in his pedigree, and we have not Hezron, Jerahmeel, Ram, but simply Hezron, Ram; and (2) the appropriate meaning of the word "lofty," cf. We. DGJ. pp. 17 f., Bertholet, Com. on Ru., p. 69.
13-17. The family of Jesse.—13. And Jesse begat his first born Eli’ab, etc.]. According to 1 S. 16:1. 17:12 Jesse had eight sons, Eliab, Abinadab, and Shammah, and four others whose names are not mentioned, and David the youngest. Φ gives eight here, adding Elihu from 27:11, which ϒ there has probably by corruption (בְּנֵיָ֣הנָּם bēne-ḥannah) becoming רְבִּיָּאָם ribbīyām, (Eliab). Was the number eight or seven? According to Budde (SBOT.) the sections containing 1 S. 16:1. 17:12 are among the latest additions to the book from a Midrash after 400 B. C. Another Midrash, equally current then, may have been followed by the Chronicler or invented by him, giving the number seven and also the names of the three sons, Nathan’el, Raddai, and Ozem, which are not given elsewhere. The genuineness of the name Nathan’el is doubtful, since (according to Gray, HPN. p. 233) it is of post-Davidic formation. Raddai and Ozem (see v. 16) could well be genuine as far as their forms go.—16. And their sisters Zeruiah and Abigail]. These are recorded for the sake of their distinguished sons. According to 2 S. 17:1 Abigail was the daughter of Nahash and hence she has been regarded as a step- or half-sister of David (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., et al.). Probably, however, the ϒ of 2 S. 17:1 is corrupt and Jesse should be substituted for Nahash (G, H, We. TS., Klo., Bu. SBOT.).—And the sons of Zeruiah Abishai, Jo’ab, and Asah’el]. These heroes are repeatedly named as sons of their mother 1 S. 26:2 2 S. 218, etc. The name of their father is nowhere mentioned. Of the three brothers, Asahel according to the narrative of 2 S. 218-22 was clearly the youngest, but which of the other two was the older is uncertain. The order here suggests Abishai; that of 2 S. 214, Joab.—17. And Abigail bore ’Amasa and the father, etc.] derived from 2 S. 17:8.—The Ishmaelite] the true reading (v. i.).
DESCENDANTS OF CALEB

18-24. The family of Caleb.—Caleb appears in the history of David as a clan inhabiting southern Judah and apparently distinct from Judah (1 S. 25:30). According to the narrative of the Hexateuch, Caleb the cotemporary of Joshua, the reputed founder of the clan, was a Kenizzite (Nu. 32:18 Jos. 14:14), and since Kenaz appears among the grandsons and dukes of Edom (Gn. 36:14: An 1 Ch. 1:14), the clan Caleb was originally of Edomitic origin, kindred with the Amalekites. They claimed the conquest of Hebron and Debir (Jos. 15:13 Ju. 11-12). Carmel was also one of their towns. Through the influence of David during his reign at Hebron they were probably incorporated into the tribe of Judah. They are not mentioned subsequently in OT. history until Caleb appears in our genealogical lists, vv. 11-24. 41-44 41-44. His prominence here shows at once that Calebites must have been conspicuous in post-exilic Judah, forming possibly the bulk of the tribe, since the Chronicler knows so few other families. In these lists are assigned to Caleb or his descendants towns of southern Judah,—Ziph, Mareshah, Hebron, Korah, etc., vv. 43-44, clearly the pre-exilic dwelling-places of the clan, and also towns further north, Kirjath-jearim, Bethlehem, Eshtaol, Zorah, etc., vv. 43-44. These latter towns, without doubt, were the post-exilic homes of the Calebites. During the exile they were dispossessed from their southern Judean homes apparently by the Edomites, who after the fall of Jerusalem took possession of southern Judah, compelling the earlier inhabitants to move northward. The Edomites themselves were driven northward by the Nabateans (see Mal. 1), cf. Ez. 35:10, 36 (We. DGJ. pp. 28 ff., Meyer, Entst. Jud. p. 115, Torrey, JBL. XVII. 1. 1898 pp. 16 ff.). Singularly enough in view of the prominence given to Caleb in 1 Ch., there is no direct mention of Calebites in Ezra and Nehemiah; only an indirect reference in Ne. 3:5, where among the repairers of the wall is Rephaiah the son of Hur, ruler of half the district of Jerusalem. Now Hur represents clearly, from the appearance of the name among Caleb’s descendants in vv. 11-41, a Calebite family.
In the notices of the Calebites and Jerahmeelites (vv. 8-9) in this chapter have been seen reminiscences of an original migration of a portion of Israel from the south into Canaan (S. A. Cook, *Notes on OT*, p. 40, *et al.*). Such an immigration of Calebites, at least, most likely took place (Moore, *Ju*, p. 31), but a simpler explanation of these notices is that the descendants of these clans desired an honourable place among the post-exilic Jews and the Chronicler, favouring this desire, gave them a prominent place in his work. The theory that the Jerahmeelites played any such conspicuous part in the history of Israel as is alleged by the editor of *EBi.* is utterly without foundation.

18. *And Caleb begat sons from 'Azubah his wife daughter of Jerioth*. Under Azubah (ץָּבָּה, forsaken) is probably a reference to the abandoned home of the Calebites in southern Judah (v. s.), and the daughter of Jerioth (גּּרְיוֹת, tents) probably looks back to the early nomadic life of the Calebites (We. *DGJ*, p. 26).—*And these were her sons Jesher, Shobab, and Ardon*]. These sons of Azubah represent pre-exilic Calebite families which dwelt in southern Judah. *Shobab* is also the name of a son of David (14:2).—19. *When 'Azubah died then Caleb took to himself Ephrath*. Since Ephrath is equivalent to Ephratha (v. 4), a name of Bethlehem (5:14, 6:5), and possibly the name of a district in northern Judah (cf. Ps. 132:1, Del.), this new marriage clearly expresses the movement of the Calebites northward and their settlement in northern Judah (v. s., cf. v. 4).—*Hur* the leading family or stock of post-exilic Calebites (cf. Ne. 3:2, v. s.). Identifying him with Ashhur (4:4), he appears as the father, *i.e.*, founder or coloniser, of Tekoa and his sons of Bethlehem, Bethgader, Kirjath-jearim (vv. 4-4). (Such a shortening as of Ashhur into Hur is not uncommon, cf. Ahaz = Jehoahaz *COT*. I. p. 255.).—

20. *And Hur begat Uri, etc.*]. This genealogy of Bezalel, the reputed skilled workman of the Tabernacle, is taken verbatim from P, Ex. 31:2-35, cf. 2 Ch. 1. It illustrates how material has been brought together in these lists. The identity of a name seemed a sufficient cause to give a genealogical connection. Probably, however, the prominence of the family of Hur and its possession of artisans led to the origination of this descent of Bezalel. Vv. 11-12 are singular in this connection, interrupting the story of Caleb’s matrimonial alliances (but *v. s.*).—21. *And afterwards*]. The refer-
ence is plainly to v. 1.—*Machir father of Gilead*] a son of Manasseh mentioned as the father or conqueror of Gilead in Nu. 26" 32" Jos. 17† Dt. 3*. In Ju. 5 Machir stands for the tribe of Manasseh. He was clearly the most important clan of the tribe.—*Segub*] not mentioned elsewhere, possibly an error of transcription for Argob, the district inhabited by Jair (Dt. 3** Jos. 13**), who in v. 22 appears as his son.—*22. Jair*] given as a son of Manasseh (Nu. 32" Dt. 3† Jos. 13**), also one of the minor Judges (Ju. 10†).—*And he had twenty three cities in the land of Gilead*. With Jair are repeatedly connected the tent villages *Havvoth Jair* v. 22 Dt. 3** Nu. 32° Jos. 13**; thirty cities Ju. 10‡‡; sixty cities, wrongly placed in Bashan, Jos. 13†† 1 K. 4**: The number given for these towns evidently fluctuated. They represent the northern portion of Gilead.—*23. Geshur and Aram*] Geshur, an Aramean tribe dwelling in the region of Argob and at the time of David an independent kingdom 3* 2 S. 3* 13*: Aram, a generic geographical term for the country including northern Mesopotamia, Syria, and as far south as the borders of Palestine (cf. 1††). Here the Arameans adjoining Geshur are evidently meant.—*Kenath and her daughters sixty cities*] a district perhaps the modern *Kanawat* east of Argob in Bashan (cf. Nu. 32**). When these were lost to Israel is unknown, probably before the reign of Omri, since then on the border fortress between Israel and Syria was Ramah (St. Gesch. I. p. 150).—*All these were the sons of Machir*] the summary of a section originally larger probably than vv. 11—13. The introduction in the midst of a list of Hezronites from the three sons, Jerahmeel, Ram, and Caleb, of those through another son by a later marriage renders the contents of vv. 11—13 surprising, and especially are they strange in connecting in any way the Hezron of Judah with members of the tribe of Manasseh. Whether the historical fact of the incorporation of Judaites with Manassites lies back of this or whether the whole notice arises from a misunderstanding of genealogical material is uncertain. In the latter case Hezron may represent a Reubenite clan of that name (cf. 5*) which coalesced with Gileadites (Meyer, *Entst. Jud.* p. 160, Steuernagel, *Einw. Isr. Stämme*, p. 19). In the former case it is possible that in post-exilic times a colony of Jews had settled east of Jordan in
I CHRONICLES

Gilead, and that through this fact arose this genealogical connection between Hezron of Judah and Machir (Bn.). In Jos. 19 mention is made of Judah [on the Jordan], which has been thought to point to such a colony (yet the phrase may be a corruption). Judas Maccabeus undertook a campaign in that district in order to rescue Jews from the hand of the heathen. Ki., on the other hand, holds vv. 9 to contain ancient material referring to a union of families of Manasseh, refugees from northern Israel, with those of Judah about 600 B.C.; cf. the emphasis placed upon the cities of Jair in Dt.—24. And after Hezron died Caleb went in unto Ephrath the wife of his father [another genealogical notice of the settlement of the district of Bethlehem by the Calebites, cf. vv. 19-20]. The taking of a father's wife was asserting claim to the father's possessions (cf. 2 S. 16 and 1 K. 2), and well expressed the legitimacy of Caleb's residence in northern Judah.—And she bore Ashhur clearly a repetition of v. 19. Ashhur and Hur must be identical.—The father of Tekoa]. Hur was probably the exilic or post-exilic founder of Tekoa, or the family settled there. Tekoa, mod. Teku'a, is about five miles south of Bethlehem. The place is frequently mentioned (4 Ch. 11, 19, 2 S. 14, Am. 1 Je. 6).

18. reproduces א. א has for א, האב, את, את, את, את. א combines א, א, and σ accepit uxorem nomine Asubah de qua genuit Jerioth. This Ki. (SBOT,) follows, but in Kom., BH. he follows σ regarding Jerioth instead of א, את, את. א yields And Caleb son of Hezron begat of Asubah his wife and of Jerioth (AV., RV., Kau., Be., Oe.). Caleb then has children of two wives, but the context suggests those of only one wife, Azubah, 18b. 18b. J. H. Mich. met this difficulty by regarding Jerioth as another name for Azubah, the waw in א, את being explicative. Ke. and Zo. follow σ regarding Jerioth the daughter of Caleb and mother of the sons of v. 19b. On the whole, we prefer the reading of We., preferred by Bn. It still leaves the harsh construction of א, את denoting the mother and not the child (א, את is probably a gloss to render this obvious). A parallel construction, however, may be found in Is. 66, where הiph. has the force to cause to bear, or א may be taken as equivalent to א, את, cf. 2 S. 24. א adhered to by Ke., AV., RV. is clearly corrupt. א has אתבב יבלב
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25–33. The families of the Jerahmeelites.—Jerahmeel in the time of David was an independent clan like that of Caleb, inhabiting the Negeb of Judah (1 S. 27:10 30:1). It is not mentioned in subsequent history. Whether it played any part in the post-exilic Jewish community, or whether this genealogy having been preserved with that of Caleb was therefore recorded by the Chronicler, we do not know (v. s. on vv. 11–13). All the names given are comparatively early ones and favour the antiquity and historicity of the list.—25. Ram] v. 11, cf. vv. 18–19 Jb. 321. A possible connection has been seen between this family and Abram. The name by some is supposed to represent an ancient deity (v. s. 11).—Bunah and Oren †].—Ozem] v. 11 †.—His brother *. So we must probably read in place of the proper name Ahijah.—26. 'Atarah}. This name of the mother of the most widely extended family of the Jerahmeelites is to be compared for its original meaning and derivation with Hezron, v. 1, and probably arose from the Jerahmeelites inhabiting Ataroth (Ataroth), protected places (We. DgJ. p. 15). Ataroth alone appears as a local name, Nu. 32:16* Jos. 161, and also in combination Jos. 161 18* Nu. 32*1 Ch. 2*1. That Atarah was a second wife probably shows that the earlier sons of Jerahmeel represented nomad families, while her descendants those of a more settled life.—Onam] v. 12, also the name of a family of Edom 1 Gn. 36†, perhaps connected with Onan the son of Judah, v. 1.—27. Ma'az and Jamin and Eker]. Maaz and Eker are mentioned only here. Jamin is among the sons of Simeon, Gn. 4610.—28. Shammai]. Cf. 210. 11. 32. 141.—Jada'] v. 13, for compounds of root from which it comes (זדה), see 13.—Nadab] v. 14 a frequent name.—Abishur] v. 15 †.—29. Abihail *] name of the wife also of Rehoboam 2 Ch. 111 and a man's name, a Levite Nu. 34, a Gadite 1 Ch. 51, and the father of Esther Est. 24* 5†.—Ahban and Molid †].—30. Seled †].—Appaim] v. 15 †.—31. Jish'i] 214 4* 51 †, a name thus of frequent occurrence.—Sheshan] vv. 11. 43. 15 †.—Ahlai] 114 †.—32. Jether] a frequent
name.—33. *Peleth*] Nu. 16:1 a Reubenite. Possibly there is connection with Beth-pelet a city of southern Judah, Jos. 15:17 Ne. 11:4—Zaza]]—These were the sons of Jerahme'el] the conclusion of this list of Jerahmeelites. None of these families or persons are mentioned elsewhere in the Old Testament (except Sheshan below), and hence nothing more can be said concerning them. The fact that Onam is also the name of a family of Edom and Jamin of one of Simeon suggests a close relationship with those tribes.

25. עות] the name of a fifth son, Ahijah, AV., RV., Kau., ו, ע; the name of the mother of the preceding four sons, א following ע having fallen out, the text having stood ו ע Onem of Ahijah, Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe. א דדועה אביה = יקנ has been followed, so Ki. א יוסמה = יקנ, We. DGJ., p. 15.—29. *Onom*] read with many mss., ג, ברוט. —30. עות] also v. ו. Ki. emends to וידנה after ג א'ףדוע, א' ת'ע, since a name עות is suspicious, We. DGJ., but ג may be a corruption of א'ףדוע ג—דוע also v. ו, see Ges. § 152a.—31. עות] ג א' יֵשֶׁמְת, א' [בְּשֵׁית], both of which Ki. (SBOT.) thinks point to a divine appellative at the end, hence following the indication of ג א' יֵשֶׁמְת he reads עות א' ת'ע א' נוּב א' also v. ו, cf. We. TS., on 1 S. 14:1.

34-41. The pedigree of Elishama a descendant of the Jerahmeelite Sheshan.—34. *And Sheshan had no sons but daughters*. To reconcile this statement with v. ו it has been assumed that הלק was a daughter of Sheshan, "sons" there indicating only descendants (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.) This is possible, but for vv. ו-י the Chronicler probably had an entirely different source from that of vv. י-י. (Ki. regards them as a late section added to the work of the Chronicler, giving another and fuller story of the lines of descent from Sheshan and placed here as an appendix to the families of the Jerahmeelites.)—Jarhi]. Of this Egyptian nothing further is known, and also nothing further of the fourteen descendants recorded in vv. י-י. Although many of the names occur elsewhere, in no case can they be probably identified with those persons. We do not know also when Elishama (v. י), whose pedigree is so carefully recorded, flourished. Since Sheshan is the tenth in descent from Judah, older
commentators thought of him as residing in Egypt not far from the period of the Exodus and placed the period of Elishama fourteen generations later or near the close of the period of the Judges (Ke.). More likely Elishama represents some one near the time of the Chronicler. If, however, Jarha lived as early even as 1000 B.C., and Elishama about 600 B.C., there is nothing in the character of the names given against the genealogy being genuine. They stand in sharp contrast with others which appear to be made up from names current in the Chronicler's own time (Gray, HPN. p. 235).

42-55. Families of Caleb.—Cf. vv. 19-21. Vv. 42-45, 47, 49... belong together and come apparently from the same source as vv. 38-41. Vv. 46, 49, 50 appear also of common origin, and belong to the late material of 1 Ch. (We., Ki.).—42. The brother of Jeraḥmeel] v. *.—Mesha*] an early family of Caleb (if text is not altered) of which nothing further is known; in 2 K. 3 the name of a king of Moab. 6 has Maresha, see below.—Ziph] two places of this name are given among the towns of Judah: one Jos. 15*, still unidentified, the other Jos. 15, cf. 1 S. 23* * 26*, the modern Tell Ziph one and three-quarters hours south-east of Hebron (Baed.* p. 170). This latter is here referred to.—Maresha*] the name of a well-known town of the Shephelah, Jos. 15* 2 Ch. 11* 14* 15. 20* Mi. 11*, the modern Merash (Baed.* p. 116). It is difficult, however, to bring this place in connection with Hebron, although Hebron may in some way have been colonised therefrom. Wellhausen regards the name, from the preceding words "sons of," as purely gentilic, and not to be connected with the town. Probably both Mesha and Maresha are due to dittographies from v. * and the verse originally read Sons of Caleb the brother of Jeraḥmeel, . . . his first-born the father of Ziph and the father of Hebron. The name of this first-born may lie hidden in Mesha* or Maresha. —43. And the sons of Hebron]. The descendants now given are mostly, if not all, geographical names.—Korah]. The connection suggests a town of southern Judah, although mentioned elsewhere in the OT. only as a family or descendant of Levi.—Tappuah] equivalent to Beth-tappuah Jos. 15*, the mod. Taffuh west of Hebron (SWP. III. pp. 310, 379; Baed.* p. 152).—Rekem]
otherwise unmentioned, probably a town of southern Judah. A town of this name is given as belonging to Benjamin Jos. 18, also the name of a king of Midian Nu. 31 Jos. 13.--Shama', perhaps the same as Eshtemoa' (Hithp. of same stem) Jos. 15, cf. the mod. Semu' a identified with Eshtemoa (Rob. Res. II. p. 194). The location of Eshtemoa in the immediate neighbourhood of Hebron favours this identification.—44. Raham]. The root (דנה) appears in Jerahmeel.—Jorkem] probably Jokdean Jos. 15, mentioned before Juttah, mod. Yafa, east of Hebron (Baed. p. 169).—Shammai] (in v. * a Jerahmeelite tribe, in 1 Edomite), not identified as a geographical name, perhaps gentilic; a name of common occurrence, cf. v. *—45. Ma'on] Jos. 15 i S. 25, mod. Main south of Hebron (SWP. III. pp. 404, 415; Baed. p. 144).—Beth-sur] Jos. 15* 2 Ch. 11* Ne. 3*, mod. Beit Sur, four miles north of Hebron (SWP. III. p. 311; Baed. p. 112).—46. And Ephah the concubine of Caleb* etc.]. This verse is entirely obscure. Neither Ephah, Haran, Moza, nor Gazaz can be identified with any places, families, or persons mentioned elsewhere. Ki. joins with v. * and marks as a later addition to 1 Ch.—47. Jahdai]. The connection with the foregoing is not given and the name has been taken as that of another wife or concubine of Caleb; more probably Jahdai is a descendant of Caleb whose name in the original connection has fallen from the text. Of the following sons none are otherwise known unless Pelet is identical with Beth-pelet a town of southern Judah Jos. 15. The verse according to We. and Ki. is to be connected with v. *—48. Ma'acah] entirely unknown, since this cannot be connected with the Aramean Maacah or with various persons mentioned elsewhere in the Old Testament of the same name (3 7 8 11 etc.).—Sheber ] and Tirhanah ] are equally unknown.—49. And Sha'aph begat*], a continuation of v. *—Madmannah] from Jos. 15 a well-known town of southern Judah, possibly Umm Deinneh, twelve miles north-east of Beersheba (SWP. III. pp. 392, 399).—Sheva ] except Qr. 2 S. 20, entirely unknown.—Machbena] perhaps the same as Cabbon, a city of southern Judah Jos. 15 (BDB.).—Gibe'a] possibly the same as Gibeah Jos. 15*, mod. Jeba, eight miles west of Bethlehem (SWP. III. p. 25), although a
locality further south would be more natural. The name "hill" can readily be thought of as belonging elsewhere.—And 'Achsa was the daughter of Caleb]. Thinking that the Chronicler distinguished more than one Caleb and that the son of Hezron differed from the son of Jephunneh Mov. regarded this clause as an interpolation from Jos. 15", cf. Ju. 1". It is wanting in $. Ke., recognising two Calebs, ben Hezron and ben Jephunneh, held the latter, the father of Achsa, to have been a descendant of the former, and bath, daughter, here to signify in a wide sense female descendant. The original framers of these genealogies probably sought no explanation of a Caleb ben Hezron and a Caleb ben Jephunneh, but identified the two and gave Achsah as a daughter in each case.—50. These were the sons of Caleb]. This summary looks backward, not forward, cf. v. », and closes the list of pre-exilic Calebites in their ancient homes in the vicinity of Hebron.

The sons of Hur the first-born of Ephratha]. These words introduce a new paragraph giving the Calebites of the post-exilic period (see above vv. 11 ').—Shobal the father of Kirjath-jearim, 51, Salma the father of Bethlehem, Hareph the father of Beth-gader]. These three, sons of Hur, are either the post-exilic founders of the three towns mentioned, or an adoption of the reputed founders of those places by the later Calebite settlers. According to Ru. 4" 1. Salma was the great-great-grandfather of David.—Beth-gader] (", Jos. 12")", Gedor, see 4".—52. And the sons of Shobal . . . were Re'ajah*, half of the Manahites*]. This passage is utterly obscure. The emendations are derived from v. " 4".—53. The Ithrites and the Puthites and the Shumathites and the Mishrites]. Nothing further is known of these families of Kirjath-jearim. Two of David's heroes were Ithrites 2 S. 23": 1 Ch. 11":; their connection, however, may have been with Yattir 1 S. 30" (Klo., Sm.).—And from these went forth the Zor'ahites and the Eshta'olites]. From these families or the Mishraites alone came the inhabitants of Zor'ah (mod. Surah, SWP. III. p. 158) Jos. 19": Ju. 13":", etc., and of Eshta'ol (mod. Eshua near Surah, SWP. II. p. 25) Jos. 15": 19": Ju. 13", etc.—54f. The sons of Salma] the heading of the following places and families. On Salma cf. vv. 1: 1:—Netophathites] Ne. 12", cf. 2 S. 23": 2 K. 25", the inhabitants of Netophah,
Ezr. 2\textsuperscript{nd} Ne. 7\textsuperscript{nd}, probably a village near Bethlehem, identified with the ruin \textit{Um Toba} north of Bethlehem (SWP. III. p. 52), or possibly \textit{Beit Nettif} (Rob. Res. II. pp. 16 f., but see Baed. p. 124).—\textit{Ataroth-beth-jo'ab} an unknown place.—\textit{Half the Manahites the Zorites}. Cf. v. 41. One half of this otherwise unknown family seems to have dwelt at Kirjath-je'arim and the other at Zorah.—\textit{And families of the scribes inhabiting. Ja'bez, Tir'athites, Shim'a-thites, Sucathites}. The mention of the scribes shows clearly that we have a post-exilic notice, since it is doubtful whether families of them existed earlier. The location of Jabez is unknown, cf. 41. In the three families Jerome recognised three different classes of religious functionaries, \textit{canentes alque resonantes et in tabernaculis commorantes}. \textit{T} explains somewhat similarly, except that the \textit{Sucathites} are those "covered" with a spirit of prophecy. Be. follows \textit{T}, except that he regards the first class as gate-keepers (Aram. יִדְגְּרֵי — Heb. וַחֲנֳעָה). \textit{We.} (\textit{DGJ.} pp. 30 f.) finds underlying the three names a technical term for sacred music, שִׁמְצּוּת the Halacha or sacred tradition, and שָׁוָא which he connects, following Be. and \textit{T}, with השב booth (so also Ki.). Buhl (\textit{HWB.} 10) derives the last two names from unknown places. Ke. interprets as descendants from the unknown Tira, Shemei and Sucah. Bn. finds too obscure to explain.—\textit{These are the Kenites who came from Hammath † the father of the house of Rechab} an obscure statement. The Rechabites, Je. 35\textsuperscript{st}, probably became an integral part of the post-exilic Jews, and families of scribes, perhaps from their ancient loyalty to Yahweh (2 K. 10\textsuperscript{th} 1), seem to have been reckoned as belonging to them along with their other connection with Salma. That the Rechabites were also Kenites (Ju. 1\textsuperscript{st} 411 is S. 15\textsuperscript{st}) is not improbable. An indication of their position in post-exilic Judaism may be seen in the fact that one of their number, Malchijah ben Rechab, was the overseer of one of the Judean districts, Ne. 314.

This text is probably corrupt. \textit{G} has instead of מַרְשֶׁת which Ki. follows and strikes out before as a gloss (\textit{Kom.}, \textit{BH.}). מַרְשֶׁת following may have arisen from the preceding v. 41 (a similar confusion from the present text appears in \textit{G}, where in place of

1-9. David's children.—The sources of this list are 2 S. 3* 5* 13*. With the exception of Ammon, Adonijah, Absalom, Solomon, and the daughter Tamar, these children are known only by name. Some names have suffered in our passage through transcription. Instead of Daniel v. 1 we should read after 2 S. 3* Chileab (v. i.). Otherwise the names of the sons born in Hebron present no variations. Of those born in Jerusalem the Chronicler gives Shim'a (שניא) v. 4, for Shammua (שומע) 2 S. 5*, Elisha'am (אילישאמ) v. 4 for Elisha'u (אילישאע) 14* 2 S. 5* which should be read here (Bn., Ki.). The textual corruption in this latter case is very evident, since Elisha'am appears as the name of a son in v. * 2 S. 5*.* The two names Eliphelet (איליפלאט) v. 4, and Nogah (נוג) v. 1, which are wanting in 2 S., have clearly been developed in transcription and should be struck from the text (Ki.). Instead of Elja'da (אילגאד) (v. 1 2 S. 5*), the original true name probably was Ba'alja'da (בעלגאד), given in 14*, the change having been made to avoid the use of Baal (Ki., Dr. TS.). Bath-shu'a (בתשעא) v. 4, instead of Bath-sheba (בתשהא) 2 S., 1 K., is a phonetic variation arising from the similar sound of בbh and w. The length of David's reign in Hebron and of that in Jerusalem are taken from 2 S. 5*.
10-14. The line of descent from Solomon to Josiah.

These are the kings of Judah who reigned during this period.

15-16. From Josiah to Jehoiachin.—15. The sons of Josiah]. The four sons are mentioned because with Josiah the regular succession from father to son of the kings of Judah ceased. Their names and order of enumeration present difficulties. Three sons of Josiah are mentioned in 2 K. whose births were in the following order: Jehoiakim, 2 K. 23**: Jehoahaz, 2 K. 23**: Zedekiah, 2 K. 24**: According to Je. 22:1 Shallum was another name of Jehoahaz. The Chronicler then has either given Johanan an otherwise unknown eldest son of Josiah, and has misplaced in respect to birth Shallum, who should be recorded as older than Zedekiah (Shallum and Zedekiah were sons of the same mother Hamutal, 2 K. 23**: 24**), or Johanan stands for Jehoahaz (as a copyist error, Ki.) and Shallum was regarded as still a different son.—16. The sons of Jehoiakim]. On the plural sons cf. 2*.—Jeconiah] Je. 24:29, called also Coniah, Je. 22:38, 37, the king Jehoiachin 2 K. 24:14.—Zedekiah his son] is otherwise unknown; probably an error, having arisen because Zedekiah succeeded upon the
throne his nephew Jehoiachin (cf. v. 11, 2 K. 24:11). The statement may be from a glossator.

17-24. The house of David from the captivity in the line of Jehoiachin.—17 f. And the sons of Jeconiah the captive She'altiel his son and Malchiram and Pedaiah and Shen'assar, Jekamiah, Hoshama and Nedabiah]. The adjective captive (assir ע'ג) having lost the art. was taken in ס, י, י, also AV., RVm., as a proper name. In י it makes a part of the following name. Kimchi, followed by some of the older commentators, regarded the last six as sons of Shealtiel, since Zerubbabel v. 19 appears in Hg. 11. 11. "et al. Ezr. 3: et al. as his son, i.e., grandson. But the copula before Malchiram suggests the usual interpretation, i.e., that all of them were sons of Jeconiah. י introduces his son (12) after each name, giving a continuous line of descent from Jeconiah, and in v. 19 Pedaiah is omitted and Zerubbabel and Shimei are made the sons of the preceding Nedabiah. This last is clearly wrong. Of these sons nothing further is known unless Shenazzar is identical with Sheshbazzar “the prince of Judah” (Ezr. 1:11). This is probable (cf. Meyer, Entst. Jud. pp. 75 ff., Rothstein, die Genealogie des K. Jojachin, p. 29) (v. i.). Koster regards Shenazzar as a fiction of the Chronicler in order to make of the Persian officer an Israelite (Wiedерstellung Israels, pp. 28 f. 40). Meyer regards the Davidic descent as real. Rothstein identifies Shenazzar with Pedaiah (op. cit. pp. 27 ff.)—19. The sons of Pedaiah Zerubbabel and Shime'i]. In Ezr. 3:5 Ne. 12:1 Hg. 1:11. 11. 22. 21, cf. Mt. 1:11 Lk. 3:31, Zerubbabel who was the prince of Judah under whom the Jews returned from Babylon is called the son of Shealtiel. This also is the reading of סב, Salathiel taking the place of Pedaiah. סב also omits Shimei. The usual explanation, however, has been that Pedaiah was Zerubbabel’s real father, but succeeding Shealtiel, of whom no sons are mentioned, as the head of the family of David or Judah, Zerubbabel was called his son. Of Shimei nothing further is known.—And the sons* of Zerubbabel: Meshullam (cf. 5:18) and Hananiah and Shelomith their sister] otherwise unknown; the unusual mention of the daughter Shelomith shows either a marked personality or the founder of a family.—20. And
Hashubah and Ohel and Berechiah and Hasadiah, Jushabhesed five] are also otherwise entirely unknown. It is not evident why these sons should have been enumerated as five; possibly they were children of one mother or born in Palestine after the return (Be.) (see text. n.). The names of Zerubbabel's children have been thought to express the hopes of Israel at that time, Meshullam meaning "Recompensed," cf. Is. 42--; Hananiah, "Yahweh is gracious"; Shelomith, "Peace"; Hashubah, "Consideration"; Ohel, "Tent," i. e., "Dwelling place of Yahweh"; Berechiah, "Yahweh blesses"; Hasadiah, "Yahweh is kind"; Jushabhesed, "Kindness returns" (Be.).—21. And the son of Hananiah Pelațiah and Jeshiah his son, on son for sons, cf. 2--; the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah, the sons of Shecaniah. This list has been interpreted in two ways. (1) Hananiah was the father of six sons before four of whom sons was written because they were founders of distinguished families of the time of the writer (Be.). (2) From sons of Rephaiah to the end of the chapter is a genealogical fragment representing branches of the family of David, whose connection with Zerubbabel was unascertainable (Ke., Mov. p. 30). Instead of הָבָא חָנָנָי, חָנָנָי הָבָא have הָבָא "his son" and the verse reads And the son of Hananiah was Pelatiah and Jeshiah his son, and Arnan his son, and Obadiah his son, and Shecaniah his son. This is preferred by Bn., Ki., Kuenen, Einl. pp. 114 f. et al. and brings the descendants of David, including those of vv. 19—, to eleven generations after Zerubbabel, and thus, it may well be assumed, to the time of the Chronicler (v. Intro. pp. 5 f.).—22–24. Of the persons here named nothing further is known. In v. 22 the sons of Shemaiah are enumerated as six. Since only five are given, a name has either fallen from the text, or we should omit and the sons of Shemaiah and read and Hattush (v. i.). None of the names here given as descendants of Zerubbabel appear in the genealogies of Christ recorded in Mt. 1 . Lk. 3 . Some have thought to identify or connect Hattush with the one recorded in Ezr. 8 . Ki. holds that if this is the case he is the son of Shecaniah and, as mentioned, and the sons of Shemaiah should be struck out. Then and the sons at the begin-
ning of the verse is correct and the number six is accounted for. The name Hattush, however, is not infrequent (Ne. 3:10, 12).

17–24. Rothstein in his somewhat fanciful monograph on these verses (op. cit. s.) presents the following: In vv. 17, read יִמְלַע לֹא and omit נָבִא at end of v. 17. Shealtiel and Malchiram were born before Jehoiachin was released by Evil-Merodach and were probably put to death by Nebuchadrezzar, in view of the rebellious character of the Jews, that the line of David might be childless. The name Shealtiel, “I have asked of God,” was given because the father had prayed for a son, and the name Malchiram, “My king is exalted,” because it was of double meaning, a possible expression of allegiance to the Babylonian king or of trust in Yahweh the King. Pedaiah and the other sons were born after their father’s deliverance. This is revealed in the meaning of Pedaiah, “Yahweh hath redeemed,” and of the other compounds of Yahweh, which are similar expressions of hope and trust. Sheshbazzar on the other hand is not the name of another son, but the Babylonian name of Pedaiah which reappears in the Sheshbazzar of Ezr. 1. Sheshbazzar and Pedaiah are the same person. The correctness of Pedaiah’s fatherhood of Zerubbabel (v. 14) is maintained. Zerubbabel’s name implies his birth in Babylon, while his brother Shimei=Shemaiah “Yahweh hath heard” was born in Palestine. At the beginning of v. 20 read נַעֲשָׂה (v. also s.) and revise the names reading יָתַּקְבֵּעַ “Yahweh considers,” instead of נְעָשָׂה (v. s.), and יָמַעְשָׂה (סָמָע) “Yahweh causes to live,” instead of נַעֲשָׂה (v. s.) and יָתַּקְבֵּעַ “Yahweh brings quietness,” instead of יָמַעְשָׂה (v. s.). V. 20 should read נַעֲשָׂה . . . נַעֲשָׂה instead of נַעֲשָׂה נַעֲשָׂה the verse mentioning only the sons of Hananiah, וַנִּקְדְּשֵׁה instead of וַנִּקְדְּשֵׁה נַעֲשָׂה, the verse mentioning only the sons of Hananiah, the remaining names of the section, in v. 21, are correctly transmitted and full of meaning. In וַנִּקְדְּשֵׁה נַעֲשָׂה “Unto Yahweh are mine eyes” is a confession and prayer of trust in Yahweh for the fulfilment of promised deliverance from present humiliation.

17. יִמְלַע. The preceding word ending in נ has caused the loss of the art.—18. יָמַעְשָׂה] has been identified with מַעַקְשָׂה of Ezr. 1⁴ (v. s.). A comparison of the Greek MSS. of 1 Esd. 2¹ and 2 Esd. 1⁴ shows that שֵׁם בָּשָׂרָאָמָר was the original form in G of Ezr., hence probably read שֵׁם בָּשָׂרָאָמָר originally.—19. שֵׁם בָּשָׂרָאָמָר] is either abbreviated from שֵׁם בָּשָׂרָאָמָר, or a textual error (BDB.).—19. יָמַעְשָׂה] may be a correction from Hg. or Ezr. (v. s.), either by the original translator or by a later scribe. Possibly something has fallen from the
IV. 1–23. Fragmentary genealogies of families of Judah.

The meaning, date, and connection of these genealogical notices are very if not entirely obscure. They look almost like a gathering of genealogical pebbles rolled together from various quarters, consisting of older and younger parts that are kept together only by the common connection with the tribe of Judah (Zoe.). Several of the leading "fathers" are Calebites, i.e., Shobal, Hur, Ashshur, Chelub, Kenaz, Othniel, and Caleb. Hence the lists represent members of that clan, and Caleb should be substituted for Carmi in v. 1 (We., Ki., Zoe.). Whether the names and relationships reflect pre-ex. conditions or post-ex. is difficult to determine. Ki. in SBOT. regarded the passage, with the exception of v. 1 and a few phrases, as from the older sources of Ch. along with 28–32, 41–45, 47, 48. We.'s view is similar, that in the main pre-ex. conditions are reflected. Be. held, on the other hand, from the mention of a number of the names in the history given in Ezr. and Ne., that we have a classification of the tribe of Judah actually made in the time between Zerubbabel and Ezra, so that these apparently broken and incoherent genealogies were plain to the readers of the time of the Chronicler. Meyer also finds in the passage a reflection of the same conditions when the Calebites had settled westward in Judah (Entstehung, p. 164). Bn. finds also post-exilic conditions (Kom. p. 13). Ki. in Kom. adopts this view.

1. Introduction.—The sons of Judah; Perez, Hezron, Caleb*, Hur, Shobal]. נ and all Vrss. have Carmi (כרמים), but clearly from 2:1. 10 we should read Caleb (We., Ki., Zoe., Bn.) (perhaps originally מָכָל easily transmuted into כָּלֵבל, cf. 2 Mim). According to 2:1. 10. 11. 10. these sons of Judah are not co-ordinate, but after the analogy of ד', a line of descent. The treatment, however, in the following vv. suggests co-ordinate sons of whom the youngest, Shobal, is considered first, v. 2, then the next older, Hur, vv. 3–10, and then the next, Caleb, vv. 11–14. Next should follow sons
of Hezron and of Perez. The sons of Shelah vv. 11-22 may then be regarded as an appendix.

Bn. finds in v. 18 either a fragment of the line of Hezron and in vv. 17-19 the line of Perez; or following 24 (as the text stands!) where Ashhur is a son of Hezron, the line of Hur having been restricted to vv. 14-17 and that of Hezron through Ashhur appearing in 24 + 4:19, he regards these verses (24 + 4:19) as the original Hezron list of c. 4, which originally stood after the Caleb list, vv. 11-14, and he holds also The sons of Perez were Jehaleel and Esrah to have fallen out before vv. 16-20, and thus he would bring everything into order. Ki. adopts essentially this second alternative. Both Bn. and Ki. regard the sons of Shelah, vv. 11-22, as a later addition.

2-10. Sons of Shobal and Hur.—2. And Reaiah the son of Shobal. Cf. 219. Reaiah is a family name among those who returned with Zerubbabel, Ezr. 217 Ne. 718.—Jahath] is a frequent Levite name (6:11 10:42) 2310 242 2 Ch. 3419 †).—Ahumai † and Lahad †] entirely obscure. Instead of Ahumai we should probably read after Ἀχίμας (Gray, HPN. p. 279), especially if a compound of Ἄχιμας, since all other proper names which are compounds are spelled thus (see list under Ἄχιμας, BDB.).—These are families of the Zorathites. Cf. 220, where Zorathites are connected with families of Kiriath-jearim whose father was Shobal. Zorah, mentioned in Ne. 119, was a residence of post-exilic Jews, and hence of interest to the Chronicler. Ki. (SBOT.) regards v. 19 as from a later hand than v. 18.—3. And these are the sons of Hur, father of 'Etam]. Ἦρ is meaningless. This restoration is the most plausible (v. i.). 'Etam is obscure. Since Hur appears in v. 1 as the founder of Bethel, we might conclude (adopting the reading above) that v. 1 refers to the post-exilic localities of the Calebites and identify Etam with the one near Bethel (2 Ch. 119) mod. Ain Aitam (Bn.) (Etam, DB.). But Jezreel and Gedor, the names of towns of southern Judah (Jos. 1544-45), suggest that our record is of pre-exilic conditions and Etam may be the one in Simeon near Rimmon, cf. v. 21. No decision can be reached.—Ishma †] and Idbash †] are entirely obscure, also their sister Hazzeleponi or the Zelelponite † or Zelel shade (cf. Zillah Gn. 419) (v. i.).—4. Penuel and 'Ezer] persons,
families, or localities otherwise unknown. The former cannot be connected with Penuel east of the Jordan (Bn. mentions Penuel a clan of Benjamin 8th); 'Ezer may be identified with 'Ezrah v. 17.—The location of Hushah is unknown. Two heroes of David's guard were Hushites, 2 S. 21 23 i Ch. 11 20 27.—Gedor]. Cf. v. 12, mentioned with Halhul and Beth-zur, Jos. 15, and generally identified with mod. Jedur (Rob., Res. ii. p. 13), six and one-half miles north from Hebron. Beth-gader (2nd) is the same place.—These are the sons of Hur the first born of Ephrathah the father of Bethlehem]. Cf. 20. The words after Hur are acc. to Ki. (SBOT.) a gloss.—6. Ashhur]. Cf. 24.—Father of Tekoa'] a gloss acc. to Ki. (SBOT.) cf. 24.—The reference under the wives Hel'ah and Na'arah is obscure. No such places or districts have been identified in Judah. (A town Na'arah was on the borders of Ephraim, Jos. 16.) Possibly Na'arah (יְנַנְיָה), "maiden," is enigmatic, denoting earlier settlements or conditions, and Helah (יְנָה), "weak," later and less favourable ones. The names of several children of both wives, however, may be connected with southern Judah, the pre-exilic home of the Calebites.—6. Ahuzzam †]. Cf. Ahuzzath the friend of Abimelech, Gn. 26.—Hepher] the name of a town mentioned with Tappuah (Jos. 12) and Socoh 1 K. 4, and hence evidently of southern Judah.—Temeni †] the word (תֵּמֵנִי) means a Southerner, i.e., of southern Judah, cf. Teman (patronymic Τημανος) the name of Edom, Gn. 36, etc.—And the Ahashtarites †] (אָחָשְׁתֹּרָאָה) entirely obscure. The word has been given a Persian origin (BDB.). Be. thought there was no occasion for this. A textual corruption, however, may underlie it and the reference still be to early abodes or families of the Calebites. Or it may have originally stood without the connective in apposition with the preceding names, being, at the time of the Chronicler, a family name of those who traced their origin to the places of southern Judah previously mentioned. Possibly also it simply summarises the previous families as the Ashhurites (EBi. II. col. 1921) (v. i.)—7. Zereth † and Zohar *]. The latter is the family name of Ephron of Hebron, Gn. 23 25, and of a son of Simeon, Gn. 46.—Ethnan] (אֵתְנָן) probably identical with Ithnan (אֵתְנָן) a city of southern Judah Jos. 15.—8. And Koz†]. The
abrupt introduction of Koz is striking. Perhaps he has fallen from the list of the sons of Helah and should be supplied, so 풀. He is thus restored at the end of v. 7 by Ki. (v. i.). Possibly his name was struck out from these lists intentionally, since Hakkoz appears as a post-exilic priestly family (24* Ezr. 2*. Ne. 7*) and the writer desired that the Judean Calebite or non-Levitical origin of this family might not appear. The identity of names, however, may be purely accidental (cf. 24*).—Anub †] probably to be connected with 'Anab (עָנַב), Jos. 15*. a town near Debir, mod. 'Anab (SWP. III. pp. 392 f.). The names Koz (קֹז) thorn, and 'Anub (עָנַב) grape, suggest an allegory, a thorn here bringing forth a grape, cf. Mt. 7* (Zoe.).—Of Zobehah † and the families of Aharhel † son of Harum † nothing further is known. Instead of Zobehah probably Ja'bez should be read (v. i.).—9. And Ja'bez was more honorable than his brethren]. The abrupt introduction of Ja'bez if not corrupted into Zobehah (v.i) is striking. He probably belonged to the family of Koz and was the reputed founder of Jabez (2*), and hence represents Calebite scribes of the family of Hur who had enjoyed some special prosperity. The cause of this prosperity is given in vv. 18-19. His mother had given him a name of ill omen, but he had prayed that its significance might not be fulfilled and God granted his request.—Now his mother called his name Ja'bez (עָבֶז) saying I have borne him with pain (עָבֶז) a popular etymology and explanation of the name Jabez. Cf. similar explanations of the names Moab and Ammon (Gn. 19*), and of the sons of Jacob (Gn. 29* 31* 32* 33* 35* etc.). The transposition of the letters to יָבֵז is noticeable. The name is equivalent to יָבֵז, meaning He causeth pain.—10. And Ja'bez called on the God of Israel saying, Oh that thou wouldest surely bless me and enlarge my border and that thy hand would be with me and thou wouldest keep back evil so that no sorrow shouldest befall me]. A prayer that the evil signified by his name might be averted.—And God granted that which he asked]. This explains v. *.
seems to have fallen from ומלך. Kau. follows ughters of Hur the father of 'Etam (also Bn.).—
Zelepom, meaning, Give shade thou that turnest to me (BDB.). It is better to see in שֵׁנֶג a dittography from the following שְׁנֶג. The name then is שֵׁנֶג or perhaps שֵׁנֶג. One is tempted to write שֵׁנֶג shade of God.—6. שֵׁנֶג] some mss., שֵׁנֶג, שֵׁנֶג Oossam.—perhaps a corruption of the Ashurites (v. s.).—7. שֵׁנֶג] read with Qr. רְבּוֹת, שֵׁנֶג Zdap.—perhaps שֵׁנֶג, adopted by Kilo. PRE. iv. 94, followed by Ki., Bn.—8. Ki. following Kilo. inserts שֵׁנֶג among the sons of שֵׁנֶג, also suggesting as possible that שֵׁנֶג = שֵׁנֶג = שֵׁנֶג in popular etymology derived from שֵׁנֶג (v. s.). It is not necessary to suppose with Kilo. that the name read שֵׁנֶג, cf. שֵׁנֶג.—10. שֵׁנֶג] a particle of wishing, BDB. שֵׁנֶג 1b (3), Ges. § 151e, or of condition with conclusion suppressed, Oe., Kau., Ges. § 167a.—שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג is difficult to translate. שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג. The readings שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג have been suggested. Ki. thinks an error lies in the verb and reads שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג. Better retain שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג שֵׁנֶג noun-suffix as object of inf., Ges. § 115e; penult syllable closed, Ges. § 61a.

11-16. The sons of Caleb.—11. And Calub] i.e., Caleb (cf. 2 and above on v. 1).—Of Shuhah † nothing is known. שֵׁנֶג has in place of the brother of Shuhah, “the father of Achsah” Jos. 15", clearly a makeshift in an obscure passage. Buhl (HWB. 19) suggests the reading Hushah, cf. v. 3.—Mehir † and Eshton † are also entirely obscure.—12. Beth-rapha] a place or family otherwise unknown. A Benjamite Rapha is mentioned 8, and Rapha collective sing., or plural Raphaim (mss. vary), 20 refer to the giant aboriginal race of Palestine. A vale (הָרָפָא) of Rephaim near Jerusalem is also mentioned, Jos. 15 2 18" 2 S. 5 2. —Paseah] a post-exilic family name of Nethinim, Ezr. 2 19 Ne. 7 11, cf. Ne. 3. —Tehinnah † father of the city Nahash]. This looks like a reference to some post-exilic Jewish settlement, but is utterly obscure.—Recab †. (probably original כ, see text. n.) have Recab, and this probably furnishes the true reading and explanation of the families given in vv. 12. They were Recabites, cf. 24. —13. And the sons of Kenaz 'Othniel and Seraiah]. Cf. Ju. 11 where Othniel is called the son of Kenaz, and is either the nephew or brother of Caleb (Moore in loco favours the latter). 'Othniel probably represents a clan. Seraiah (not an infrequent name
from the time of David onward) as the brother of Othniel is mentioned only here. It smacks so strongly of an individual and the later period of Israel's history that it probably represents a post-exilic connection, cf. v. 14 (cf. Gray, HPN. p. 236).—And the sons of Othniel Hathath †] entirely obscure.—14. And Me'onothai †] (מֵֽנוֹנָתָ֑י) probably represents inhabitants of Ma'on, cf. 21*. One would expect a connection with Othniel to have been indicated. Possibly Hathath represents a mutilation by copyist of Me'onothai or its original, or perhaps and Me'ono-thai has fallen from the text after Hathath (v. i.).—Ophrah] entirely unknown. The word occurs as the name of the city of Benjamin, Jos. 18* 1 S. 13†, and also as that of one of Manasseh Ju. 6†.—And Seraiah begat Joab the father of the Ge-harashim] i.e., Valley of Craftsmen, for they were craftsmen*. Ge-harashim is mentioned with Lod and Ono Ne. 11*, and it may be identified with the ruin Hirsha east of Lydda (DB.). Of this Joab nothing further is known. Probably a Kenizzite Othnielite Seraiah was the reputed father of a Joab who established a post-exilic colony or settlement of craftsmen near Ono and Lod. Indeed in post-exilic times if not earlier the Kenites, whom some have regarded as the smiths or craftsmen of ancient Israel (Sayce, Art. Kenite, DB.), may have been reckoned as Calebites.—15. And the sons of Caleb the son of Jephunneh] Nu. 32* Jos. 14* †. The link connecting Caleb with Kenaz is apparently omitted as well known. The enumeration of descendants of Othniel before those of Caleb son of Jephunneh is in accordance with the method in this chapter of mentioning the younger members of a family first, cf. Shobal v. † before Hur, and Hur before Caleb or Kenaz.—Caleb the son of Jephunneh] a Kenizzite, Jos. 14* †, one of the twelve spies whom Moses sent into Canaan, Nu. 13* 14*, who was rewarded for this service with the ancient city of Hebron, Jos. 14* †.—Ir † * and Elah † and Na'am †] entirely obscure. One is tempted to join Ir (יר) city, with Elah and find a reference to the city Elath (אֵלָת), Dill., Gn. 36*. At all events Elah is an Edomitic name which may be seen in El-paran (אֵל-פָּרָן) the wilderness south of Judah. Possibly post-exilic Calebites looked upon the ancient Edomitic city of Elath as having belonged once to their clan.—
And the sons of Elah, Kenaz\*]. This statement is surprising unless Elah as suggested is the name of the district of Elath or El-paran, which might have been the early home of the Kenizzites, or the name of the tribe of which Kenaz was an offshoot. Ki. thinks a name has fallen from the text and that another son was enumerated with Kenaz. Both Bn. and Ki. regard v. 14 as an insertion. This is probable; some one missed an allusion to Caleb the hero of Judah and inserted a bit of genealogical lore concerning him.

11. This statement is a correction from 2:17. Ki. reads, hence Ga read, as in which in turn originally was the brother of Eshton was Kenaz, an early gloss to connect with v. 14. —12. Ki. recognises the difficulty raised by this unknown Eshton being represented as a son of Tekinnah and of Kenaz at the same time, which he explains as a mixture of families. But Eshton is merely a corruption of Eshton (cf. Edom) — hence Ga read, since it supplies a connecting link with v. 15. Ki. adopts Bn. and Ki. —15. Ma was, adopted by Bn. and Ki. —16. Hapa 'Adal, Hir et Ela = , hence the sons of Kenaz referring to the contents of vv. 14—15. The clause then would be a gloss, since vv. 14—15 without doubt continue the list of Calebites.

16—20. Sons of Perez?—16. Jehallelel] only here and as a personal or family name of the sons of Merari (2 Ch. 19:22). Since the connection of Jehallelel and Ezrah (v. 17) is not given, Ki. following Bn. (v. s.) supplies: "And the sons of Perez, Jehallelel and Ezrah." In view of the sonship of Ziph one is tempted in the place of Jehallelel to read Jerahmeel, since in Ezrah is the son of Mesha, son of Caleb, brother of Jerahmeel (EBI. II. col. 2340).—Ziph]. Cf. Edom. Ziph] is fem. of Ziph, possibly a dittography.—Tiria] and Asar'el] entirely obscure. The latter may be a form of Israel (see text. note).—17. And the sons of Ezrah] Ezrah possibly same as Ezer v. 4.—Jether]
common name, cf. 2 n.—Mered †].—'Epher] name of son of Midian 1 n. Gn. 25, and of member of tribe of Manasseh 5 n.—Jalon †].—17 b. 14, repeated in 14, AV., RV., gives incomplete meaning. Usually the clauses are rearranged as follows: (16b)

And these are the sons of Bithiah † the daughter of Pharaoh, whom Mered took, i.e., to wife, (17b) and she conceived [and bore] Miriam and Shammai and Jishbaḥ † the father of Eshtemoa' (16b) and his Jewess wife bore Jered the father of Gedor and Ḥeber the father of Soco and Jekuthi'el † the father of Zanoah (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Kau.). Ḥ adopted by Ki., requiring only a slight change in the text, gives the following: And Jether begot Miriam and Shammai and Jishbaḥ the father of Eshtemoa' and his Jewish wife bore Jered the father of Gedor and Ḥeber the father of Soco and Jekuthiel father of Zenoah; and these are the sons of Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh whom Mered took . . . The names of the sons of Mered by Bithiah must then have fallen from the text.

This rendering presents three lines of maternal descent among the grandsons of Ezrah (v. 17b), since a Calebite wife must be assumed where none is particularly mentioned.—Miriam] elsewhere in the OT. only of Moses' sister, is here evidently a man's name.—Sham¬māi]. Cf. 2 n.—Eshtemoa'] 6â (11) Jos. 15, 21 1 S. 30 the present village es Semu'a south of Hebron (SWP. III. p. 412).—Jered †] except antediluvian patriarch, Gn. 5 n.—Ḥeber] a name also of the son of Asher 7 n. 1 Gn. 46 IV. Nu. 26, of a Benjaminitine 8, and of the Kenite husband of Jael Ju. 4, 11. 11 5 n. In this last is an association with southern Judah. Cf. also Ḥebron containing the same root.—Gedor]. Cf. v. 1.—Soco]. Two places bore this name, one near the valley of Elah Jos. 15 IV. 1 S. 17 I K. 4 2 Ch. 11, 28 modern Kh. Shuweikeh (SWP. III. p. 53; Rob. BR. II. pp. 20 ff.), and the other south-west of Hebron near Eshtemoa', Jos. 15, also identified, modern name same as the other (SWP. III. pp. 404, 410; Rob. BR. I. p. 494). This latter is probably the one here mentioned.—Zanoah]. Two places also bore this name, one near Beth-shemesh, Jos. 15 IV. Ne. 3 11, mod. Zanu'a (SWP. III. p. 128; Rob. BR. II. p. 16), the other south-west of Hebron, Jos. 15, mod. Kh. Zanuta (SWP. III. pp. 404, 410 f.; Rob. BR. II. p. 204 note). Here again the latter is
probably the one referred to in the text. This passage as a whole points to some interesting traditions respecting the origin of the families of southern Judah. In the “daughter of Pharaoh” we may see some intermixture of an Egyptian element in the families.  

—19. Another entirely obscure genealogical fragment.—*Hodiah*] the name of several post-exilic Levites, Ne. 8:9, 10(11) 14a.—*Naham †*.—*Ke'ilah*] place of Judah frequently mentioned, Jos. 15a, Ne. 3:1 (especially in connection with David r S. 23a *), identified in mod. *Kla* east of Eleutheropolis and north-west of Hebron.—*Garmite †*.—Before *Eshtemoa* the word *father* has probably fallen out.—*Ma'acathite †*. There may be some connection between this person or family and Maacah, the concubine of Caleb mentioned in 2:-20. *And the sons of Shimon † Amnon and Rinnah † Ben-hanan and Tilon † and the sons of Jish' i Zoheth † and the son of Zoheth . . .*]. This verse is entirely obscure. The name of the son of Zoheth has fallen from the text and the relationship between *Rinnah and Benhanan* (Rinnah son of Hanan) is not clear. Probably a connective should be placed between them.—*Ammon*] elsewhere name of David’s eldest son slain by Absalom, 3:2 S. 3:13a.—*Jish’i*. Cf. 2n.

16. נָעָשׁ This Ki. adopts with the remark that possibly even before the time of the Massorites the name *Israel* was altered where employed for individuals in order to preserve it in the original form for the chosen people only. Cf. *Avag kal Iwaxum*.—17. Heb. *אֶתְּפָּר* kal *Iwaxum*. (see Gin.), G, P, so Kau., Ki., adopted.—17b. The transposition given above requires *אֶתְּפָּר* after *אָבִּי* (see BDB). under *טפ*., hence Ki. restored.—19. *טפ* kal *Dana* (or *Daleila*) *תָּפֹת* *Keilah*, kal *Σουμια* (Σουμια) *ταφερ Ἰωμᾶν*, kal ναος *Naum*.*Σε*(ω) *Σουμια* probably represents *Σουμία* or κύριον, thus establishing a connection with v. 30. *Naum* is doubtless a corruption from *Naxum = סוח*, hence the phrase, if original, fell out by homoeoteleuton. Ki. *BH* restores as follows:  

—20. Qr. and G*κυρίον*.  

21–23. Sons of Shelah.—A brief notice of families of reputed descent from Shelah, whose stock seems to have almost entirely disappeared. *Cf.* for the only other descendants
recorded 9 Ne. 11.—The sons of Shelah son of Judah were 'Er father of Lecah † and La'dah † father of Maresha and families of the linen workers of Beth-ashbea † and Jokim † and men of Chozeba † and Jo'ash and Saraph † who ruled in Mo'ab and returned to Bethlehem *. 'Er elsewhere is the brother of Shelah, who died untimely (cf. 2*). Since Maresha is the well-known town of the Shephelah and Lecah not unlikely is the same as Lachish (Meyer, Entst. p. 164) and Chozeba is probably identical with Chezib (Gn. 38) = Achzib Jos. 15 Mi. 1* apparently also in the Shephelah, Beth-ashbea †, otherwise unknown, is to be sought in the same region. In the place of returned to Bethlehem, AV., RV. have following a Jashubilehem, a proper name parallel with Saraph, but the rendering given (Ki.) having the support of c, h, is undoubtedly correct.—Now the records are old] i.e., those of these families of Shelah.—These are the potters and the inhabitants of Net'aim † and Gederah]. Net'aim is otherwise unknown. Gederah is mentioned in Jos. 15*. RVm. translates them rendering, those that dwell among plantations and hedges.—The clause, They dwelt there in the king's service] is an evident look backward.—These obscure vv. ** probably preserve the family traditions and relationships of certain weavers and potters of the post-exilic times. The reference to Moab and a return points to some story similar to that of Ruth. A connection between Joash and Saraph, especially from their ruling in Moab, and the post-exilic clan Pahath-moab “Governor of Moab,” Ezr. 2* 8* Ne. 3** 7* 10* (11), has been seen (cf. however, Pahath-moab, DB.). Bn. holds v. ** entirely unintelligible.

A very readable exposition of these obscure verses in the light of the discovery of jar handles in S. Pal. inscribed with names similar or identical to those here given is presented in the Pal. Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 1905, by R. A. Stewart Macalister, under the title, The Craftsmen’s Guild of the Tribe of Judah, pp. 243 ff., 328 ff.

21. In פָּשַׁן a corruption of פָּשַׁנָּה has been found, see EBi. Names § 42.—22. νῦν ηὐστέρησεν Be., adopted by Ki., adopted by Ki., έν ήστερησεν διήγησεν διόνυσεν. renders the entire verse after the style of an old midrash: Et qui stare fecit Solem virisque Mendaciti, et Securus et Incendens qui principes fuerunt in Moab, et qui reversi sunt in Lahem.
24–43. Genealogy, geography, and history of Simeon.

The notices of Simeon naturally follow those of Judah owing to the close connection between the tribes, cf. Ju. 1*. The lot of Simeon was south of Judah, and his cities, Jos. 19*, were within Judah's limits and in Jos. 15* included in the lists of that tribe. The account falls into four parts: vv. 24–27 his sons and the genealogy of Shimei; vv. 28–33 their dwelling-places; vv. 34–36 their princes; vv. 37–40 historical notices. Of these, vv. 24–27 are derived from canonical sources (v. i.). The genealogy of Shimei, the list of princes, and the historical incidents at the close are of unknown origin. The last were introduced by the Chronicler simply to show additional dwelling-places.

24–27. The sons of Simeon and the genealogy of Shimei.

—24. These names appear in Gn. 46* Ex. 6* Nu. 26* for variations see textual note. Nothing is known of the clans which they represent.—25 f. A line of descent from Sha'ul, whose mother was a Canaanitess, Gn. 46* Ex. 6*, i.e., the clan contained Canaanitish elements.—Mibsam] and Mishma'] are names also of descendants of Ishmael Gn. 25*, suggesting thus a commingling of the Simeonites with Arabians.—Hamuel is interesting as one of the few OT. names compounded with הָאָמֶל "father-in-law," i.e., kinsman. Hamuel = "a kinsman is God" or "kinsman of God." hammuel wrongly Hammuel = "heat, wrath, of" or "is God."—Zaccur is a frequent post-exilic name.—27. Nothing further is known of this Shimei who surpassed his brethren in the number of his household or clan.

28–33. The dwelling places of Simeon.—This passage is a transcription with slight changes (v. i.) of Jos. 19*.*—28. Be'er-sheba'] the well-known outpost of southern Judah present ruin Be'er es Seba' (SWP. III. p. 394).—Moladah] Ne. 11*, perhaps the Malath of Jos. (Ant. XVIII. 6. 2) identified by Robinson (BR. II. p. 201) with Tell el Milh, east of Be'ersheba'. This is questioned by Buhl (GAP. p. 183) and Conder (SWP. III. pp. 403, 415).—Hazar-shual 29 Bilhah] or Bilah (see text. note), 'Ezem] and Tolad] have not been identified, likewise Beth'el'] equivalent to Beth'el S. 30] unless Beit Aula west of Hulul (SWP. III. p. 302).—Hormah] according to JE in Nu. 21* received its name "de-
struction” from defeat of the Canaanites before the entrance of Israel into the land of Canaan. According to Ju. its original name was Zephath and the change took place through its destruction by Judah and Simeon. Arguing from the name Zephath it has been located at Sebatha (Buhl, GAP. p. 184). This is doubtful (see Moore on Ju.)

The city belonged to Judah, and is frequently mentioned Nu. 14th Dt. 1st Jos. 12th 15th 19th.—Ziklag] the city given to David for a residence by Achish King of Gath, S. 27th, perhaps Asluj a heap of ruins south of Beersheba (Rob. BR. II. p. 201), but more generally identified after Conder (SWP. III. p. 288) with Zuhelike south-east of Gaza (so Buhl, GAP. p. 185). It was a post-exilic residence, Ne. 11th.—31. Beth-marcaboth] house of chariots, not identified.—Hasar-susim] enclosure of horses, identified in the ruin Susim ten miles south of Gaza (DB.).—Beth-biri] probably corruption of Beth-lebaoth Jos. 19th. A possible reminiscence of the Lebaiyoth mentioned in the Tell el Amarna tablets; not identified.—Sha’araim] Sharuhem Jos. 19th. This latter preserves the true and ancient name of the place, since it appears in the list of the towns conquered by Thotmes III. (Müller, Asien und Europa, pp. 158, 161). The town seems to have early lost its importance or disappeared, and the name may have been corrupted into Sha’araim. It has been identified in the ruin Tell esh Sheriah, twelve miles north-west of Beersheba (SWP. III. p. 262).—These were their cities until David reigned] a parenthetical clause introduced by the Chronicler, either a reference to David’s census (Ba.) or more probably implying that from the time of David onward these cities no longer belonged to Simeon (Be., Oe.). This was clearly the case with Ziklag, assigned by Achish King of Gath to David and afterward transferred to Judah. Some of them are given also in the list of the towns of Judah in Jos. 15th, cf. also S. 30th. Moladah, Hazar-shual, Beersheba, and Ziklag appear in Ne. 11th as residences of post-exilic Judaïtes.—32. And their villages] belongs with the cities enumerated in vv. 11th, and is not a designation of those following.—Etam] is a textual corruption or substitution for Ether, cf. Jos. 15th 19th 1 S. 30th (where Ether), not yet clearly located, although placed at the ruin ‘Aitun near Eleutheropolis (SWP. III. p. 261).—Ain-
rimmon] Jos. 15:19 Ne. 11:18 Zc. 14:18, a proposed identification is Kh. Umm er Rumanim north-east of Beersheba (SWP. III. p. 261, Buhl, GAP. p. 183).—Token †] not yet identified.—'Askan] 6:16 Jos. 15:19 21 (SBOT. 1 S. 30:6, a priestly city not yet identified.—Four *]. 'Ain-rimmon was wrongly read as two places, hence  through corruption has five.—33. Ba'al] a curtailment of Ba'alaph-be'er ra'mach-tegab. "Mistress of the well, the high place of the South" Jos. 19:1, clearly some old place of worship whose locality is unknown.—And they had a genealogical enrollment] i.e., the members of the tribe of Simeon inhabiting these places had records showing their proper tribal descent and hence held a true place in Israel. This observation is the Chronicler's substitute or paraphrase of the phrase according to their families Jos. 19:1.

34-43. Princes and conquests of Simeon.—A paragraph slightly annotated taken from some old source (Ki.). It contains a list of names vv. 34-37, an explanation of the persons mentioned v. 36, their conquest or raid in the direction of Philistia vv. 34-36 and in the direction of Edom vv. 36-37.—34-37. The descent of three of these Simeonites is given: Joshah one generation, Jehu three, and Ziza five, but their connection with families of Simeon is not given, unless, in the case of Ziza (v. 35), instead of Shemaiah (Shim'on) we read Shimei (Shim'on) cf. vv. 34-37. Judging these names as a whole, they are of a late formation (Gray, HPN. p. 236).—38. These enumerated by name, etc.] This explanatory statement probably came from the Chronicler (Ki. SBOT.).—39. And they came to the entrance of Gerar,* etc.] Ger has Gedor cf. v. 1, but a slight emendation gives Gerar (G, Ki., Graf, Buhl, die Ed. p. 41), which, considering the locality of Simeon, is probably the true reading. The expedition then was toward Philistia.—40. For the inhabitants there formerly were of the children * of Ham] a clause, perhaps editorial (Ki. SBOT.), explaining the security felt by the inhabitants or the liberty felt by the Simeonites in seizing their territory. The Hamites represent either Egyptians, Ethiopians, or more probably Canaanites. Cf. the similar quiet and peace of the inhabitants of Laish Ju. 18:17.—41. And came these who were written by name in the days of Hesekiah king of Judah]. Whether
the record (Be.) or the raid (Ke., Zoe., RV.) of these Simeonites was made in the days of Hezekiah is uncertain from the Hebrew text; probably the latter and the written record may only refer to their mention above vv. 41-42. — And they smote their tents and the Me'unim who were found there. The Me'unim are usually connected with the Edomitic city Ma'an south of the Dead Sea, twenty-five miles west of Petra (Be., Ke., Oe., Zoe., Bn.) (this is doubtful, Buhl, die Ed. p. 41), or with the Arabian Mineans (Gl. Skiz. p. 450, Yemen, Ency. Brit., Winckler, KAT. p. 143). The μυαυος favours this, cf. also 2 Ch. 26:1. — And they exterminated them. There is no reference here to a religious motive in the use of the word לנה to destroy (BDB. cf. 2 Ch. 20:18 2 K. 19:1 Is. 37:2). — Unto this day. Cf. v. 4, i.e., unto the time of the composition of the Chronicler's source. — 42. And of them of the sons of Simeon five hundred men went to Mt. Seir. The relation of these Simeonites to those previously mentioned is entirely uncertain. The words from the sons of Simeon have been held to draw a distinction between these five hundred and the Simeonites previously mentioned (Graf, Der Stamm Simeon, p. 30), and contrariwise to identify them (Be.). — 43. The remnant of the Amalekites] i.e., those who had survived the attacks of Saul and David (1 S. 14:15 2 S. 8:9) and other foes. These conquests of Simeon whereby the tribe gained new possessions remind one of the similar expedition of Dan (Ju. 17, 18), and we are inclined to receive the record as genuinely historical (cf. Graf, Der Stamm Simeon, p. 30 ff.). This historicity is doubted by Stade (Gesch. I. p. 155) and Wellhausen (Prol. pp. 212 f.). The late origin of the names in vv. 41-42 (v. s.) may be said also to point in the same direction. The motive, however, for the fabrication of such a story is not readily apparent. Some of the older writers saw in this conquest of Mt. Seir the establishment of an Israelitish kingdom there which served to explain the oracle concerning Dumah Is. 21:1 (Mov. p. 136) and (by Hitzig) the kingdom of Massa (?) Prov. 30:31 (cf. Nowack, Prov. p. xix.). For a full discussion of the movements of the tribe of Simeon and also further views on this passage, which is accepted as recording history, cf. art. by H. W. Hogg, EBt. IV. coll. 4527 ff.
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The records of Reuben, Gad, and the eastern half-tribe of Manasseh are arranged in general on the same plan as that of Simeon. There is (1) a genealogical introduction giving the sons of the progenitor of the tribe and any immediate descendants (omitted for Gad and eastern Manasseh), (2) an account of the territory occupied by each tribe, (3) a list of princes or chiefs, and (4) historical incidents connected with new dwelling-places. (2) and (3) are transposed for Reuben and Gad. It is difficult to see how this order could have been the result of various interpolations. We have rather a piece of work which has come down to us in essentially the same form in which it left the Chronicler's hand.

1–10. Reuben.—The tribe of Reuben early became insignificant, losing its territory through the encroachments of Moab and being probably absorbed in Gad. Like the account of Simeon,
that of Reuben also falls into four paragraphs: vv. 1-2 a list of Reuben's sons with remarks on the birthright; vv. 4-5 the genealogy of Beerah, a Reubenite prince carried away captive by Tigrath-pileser; vv. 7-9 the genealogy and dwelling-place of Beerah's brethren; v. 10 a notice of a war with the Hagrites. The Chronicler gives the sons of Reuben as they are found in Gn. 46* Nu. 26* *. The source of the genealogy of Beerah is unknown. Vv. 8b. * may have been composed by the Chronicler from Jos. 13* and Nu. 32* *. The incident in v. 10 is introduced to show how the Reubenites came to possess new dwelling-places east of Gilead.

1-3. And the sons of Reuben the first born of Israel]. These words are separated from their predicate by the following parenthetical statements vv. 1b-2, and hence are repeated again in v. 2. —For he was the first born but since he defiled the couch of his father the birthright was given to Joseph son of Israel]. Reuben's defilement of his father's couch and his subsequent loss of his birthright are derived from Gn. 35* 49*, and the passing of the birthright to Joseph from Gn. 48*. The adoption by Jacob of Ephraim and Manasseh was equivalent to giving Joseph a double portion or the inheritance of a first-born Dt. 21*-21. —But he is not enrolled in the genealogy according to the birthright]. This refers to Joseph—in the tribal registers Reuben held the first place. Cf. Gn. 46* Ex. 6* Nu. 26*. *—For Judah was mighty among his brethren and a prince was from him]. In reality, however, the pre-eminence of the first-born seemed to belong to Judah, of whom was the house of David.—4-6. The sons of Joel]. The connection of Joel with Reuben strangely enough is not given. Ki., A, substitutes Carmi (v. 5), but the occurrence of Joel in v. 5 is against this. The sons of Joel are the persons following. Their names are not inconsistent with the implied date: Ba'al as a proper name could only be early (see Gray, HPN. p. 237). That a remnant of the tribe of Reuben should have suffered the captivity of their Sheikh during the Assyrian invasion (2 K. 15*) is historically not improbable. No record of this is mentioned elsewhere.—7-9. And his brethren] i.e., the brethren of Be'erah, and hence apparently his contemporaries
of the Assyrian period (Be., Bn.) and not of the time of Saul (v. 11) (Ke., Zoe., Gray, HPN. pp. 237 f.). This latter assumption, however, is justified from the territory assigned to the Reubenites. They in all probability had been dispossessed entirely from the land of Moab by the time of Tiglath-pileser (b. c. 745-728).—Bela'] represents a wide-spread clan whose descent, like that of Be'erah, is also from Jo'el, but by a different and shorter line.—Shema'] is not unlikely Shime'i or Shema'iah (v. 1).—'Aro'er] well-known city on the north bank of the Arnon Dt. 2: 3 14 Is. 12: 13, mentioned as southern boundary of Reuben Jos. 13: 3.—Nebo] east of Jericho, Nu. 32: 13 33: 1 Is. 15: 1 Je. 48: 11, the name also of a mountain Dt. 32: 34.—Baal-meon] probably a gloss, since it is a town lying between Nebo and 'Aro'er, mentioned in Nu. 32: 13 Jos. 13: 1 Je. 48: Ez. 25, or else we have an example of the Chronicler's lack of geographical knowledge. Both Nebo and Baal-meon are mentioned on the Moabite Stone.—Entrance of the wilderness] i.e., the eastern boundary of their territory was the wilderness which extends east of Moab and Gilead to the Euphrates.—In Gile'ad]. Gilead while usually designating territory north of Moab extending from Heshbon to the Yarmuk, is also applied to the country as far south as the Arnon (Dr. Dt. 3: 11).—10. An independent notice of the activity of the Reubenites.—Hagrites]. In the Assyrian inscriptions the Hagrites [Hagaranu] are mentioned along with the Nabateans [Nabatu] among the conquests of Sennacherib and located in north-eastern Arabia (COT. II. pp. 31 f.). In the same locality they are placed by Strabo and Pliny. Later in the Syriac, the name was used as a general designation of the Arabians, and at the time of the Chronicler either this had taken place or a portion of them had migrated westward and were pressing on the eastern frontier of Palestine (Gl. Skiz. 1 f. 407 f.). Their proximity to Palestine is clearly indicated in Ps. 83: 41. A connection between Hagar the mother of Ishmael and the Hagrites is most probable, although it has been questioned (Dill. Gn. 25: 11). That fighting was carried on with Arabian tribes in the days of Saul is most likely and a reminiscence of this may be here found. The lack of orderly connection between the sons of Reuben and the notices following, and the lack of such
connection between the notices also, suggest to some that we have here not an original composition of the Chronicler but a grouping of fragmentary traditions respecting the tribe of Reuben.

1. עֲשׂוּי pl. of extension Ges. § 124a, Koe. iii. § 260h; so used elsewhere Ps. 63 132 Jb. 17 except Gn. 49, but allows pl. and parallelism suggests it; Ball, SBOT. so emends.—[v. הֵכִיתו] כְּלוֹנֵי i.e. brothers, also v. הֵכִיתו כְּלוֹנִי. but the context indicates that the birthright and not the blessing is concerned (Bn.).—[קְרֵי נְזוֹ] adversative Koe. iii. § 375f. On inf. cf. Ges. § 114. 2. R. 2, Dr. TH. 202 (a), Dav. Syn. § 95 (b).—2. הִנְבִיא rare use of י to introduce a new emphatic subject, cf. BDB. 5 e (e).—4. הֵכִיתו כְּלוֹנִי is evidently an effort to establish a connection with the preceding verse. —[קְרֵי נְזוֹ] כְּלוֹנֵי Baalit seems to have grown out of a dittography of וב. On inf. י_description כְּלוֹנִי, so also כְּלוֹנִי = Baal (= Baal).—6. הֵכִיתו כְּלוֹנֵי an incorrect way of spelling כְּלוֹנֵי כְּלוֹנִי 2 K. 15 16, הֵכִיתו כְּלוֹנִי 2 K. 17, arising probably from a natural mispronunciation repeated in v. and 2 Ch. 28.—9. This inf. phrase is found elsewhere with the proper name Hamath, cf. Am 6 Ju. 3 Jos. 13, etc., except Ez. 47, where Cornill reads Hamath.—[קְרֵי נְזוֹ] instead of the more usual כְּלוֹנֵי Dr. TH. 190.—10. הֵכִיתו כְּלוֹנֵי Karaites adopted by Bn. (who reads יְשִׁיבָה), because it gives better sense than יְשִׁיבָה. —[קְרֵי נְזוֹ] כְּלוֹנֵי = כְּלוֹנִי 2.

11-17. Gad.—The sons of Gad are introduced by the statement that they lived “over against” the Reubenites (v. 11). This departure from the usual introductory formula, the sons of, is likely responsible for the omission of Gad’s sons as given in Gn. 46 Nu. 26. The enumeration of the chiefs of Gad with their brethren (vv. 13-14), and the notice concerning their territory and date (vv. 14-17), are followed by the account of a war which resulted in the extension of their territory (vv. 17-22). This time the three east-Jordanic tribes combined in a raid upon the neighbouring Bedouins. Very likely this is an expansion, of a midrashic nature, of the same incident recorded in v. 15 (so Bn.), but the Chronicler found them different enough to use both.—11. The omission of the lists of sons of Gad, as given in Gn. 46 Nu. 26, is noticeable.—Bashan] here and in vv. 11-17, the dwelling-place of Gad with Salecah, mod. Salkhad, as the north-east limit. This use of Bashan for Gad’s territory is peculiar (Bn. regards the word here as
a gloss; Ba. in v. 11 emends to Jabesh). Bashan elsewhere is the name of the country north of the Yarmuk and according to Dt. 31 Nu. 32 Jos. 13 the territory of Gad was in Gilead south of Bashan. Not unlikely the Chronicler, having located Reuben in Gilead, was misled to place Gad in Bashan.—12. Jo'el the first and Shapham † the second and Ja'na'i † and Shaphath]. Jo'el perhaps the same as the Reubenite Jo'el of vv. 4—7, a family or clan whose members might be reckoned as belonging to either or both of the tribes.—13. Of their fathers' houses]. The term father's house is used (1) of an entire tribe, since this is named as a common father Nu. 17 Jos. 22; (2) generally, of the division next after the tribe, the clan, Nu. 3; (3) of the division after the clan, the family Ex. 12 I Ch. 71. Cf. Dill. Ex. 6—Micha'el] "Who is like God." A name only occurring in the post-exilic literature 6 * 7 * 8 * 12 * 27 * 2 Ch. 21 Ezr. 8—Meshullam] "Kept safe," i.e., by God, also another name especially frequent in the post-exilic lists 3 * 8 * 9 * 11 * 2 Ch. 34 Ezr. 8 * 10 * Ne. 3 * 6 * 8 * 10 * 12 * 11 * 12 * 11 * 11.—Sheba' perhaps an abbreviation for Eisheba' "God swears" (?) EBi. II. col. 3291.—And Jorai † and Jacan † and Zia' † and 'Eber]. These names with those of v. 11 correspond well to ancient clan names. Apparently eleven clans of Gad are enumerated. GB while mentioning only seven names in v. 11 has the numeral eight instead of seven. This suggests that in v. 11 originally stood eight names, giving the tribal number of twelve clans. The seven or original eight are mentioned separately because their descent is traced in vv. 11 (v. i.) from Guni ('גועי), which may be a corruption of Shuni ('שוני) a son of Gad (Gn. 46 Nu. 26), or the converse, since Guni is a clan name of Naphtali.—14—16. These are the sons of Abihail] i.e., those persons or families mentioned in v. 11. Abihail elsewhere name of a Levite Nu. 3, and the father of Esther (Est. 2 9).—The son of Huri † the son of Jaroah † the son of Gile'ad the son of Micha'el the son of Jestishai † the son of Ja'hdô † the son of Buz... the son of 'Abdi'el the son of Guni]. There is a break in the pedigree at Buz according to MB (so Bn., Ki., Kau.), but Ahi ('אָהִי) appears as a fragment and it is better after GB to make the line of descent con-
A WAR OF THE EASTERN TRIBES

18-24. Conflict of Reuben, Gad, and the Half-tribe of Manasseh with adjoining Arabian tribes.—This account follows the genealogy and location of Gad, perhaps to keep a proportion in closing the section on each tribe with a notice of a war, cf. v. 18 vv. 23-24; or since vv. 18 1 concerning the half-tribe of Manasseh end with the fall of the tribe, the narrative of a success in which they shared is placed more fitly earlier.—18. On the prowess of the men of Gad and Manasseh cf. 12-11. On the number 44,760 cf. Jos. 4, where 40,000 from the eastern tribes cross the Jordan with Joshua. In Nu. 11-11 11 Reuben has 46,500 men of war, Gad 45,600, and all Manasseh 32,000. In Nu. 26-11 11 Reuben has 43,730, Gad 40,500, and all Manasseh 52,700.—19. Hagrites]
see v. 16.—Jetur and Naphish and Nodab] Arab tribes. The names of the first two are among the sons of Ishmael Gn. 25:11 Ch. 1:29. Jetur gave the name to the district Iturea, whose inhabitants were celebrated in the Roman times for their prowess in arms (GAS. HGLH. p. 544). Nothing further is known of the other two.—20. And they were helped against them] i.e., by God (for a similar use of the Niph. of ḫy cf. 2 Ch. 26:6 Ps. 28:7).—And all that were with them] i.e., the three tribes associated above with the Hagrites. The pragmatism of the Chronicler comes out strongly in this verse.—21. For a similar enumeration of booty, cf. Nu. 31:14.—22. Unto the captivity] i.e., the Assyrian captivity under Tiglath-pileser cf. v. 18. The period of this war is not mentioned. The account, according to Bn., is an amplification of that of v. 15, and from another hand than that of the Chronicler, although entirely in his spirit (cf. v. 16). A historical basis for the narrative lies in the struggles between the children of Israel east of the Jordan and their Bedouin neighbours.

12. תגנה יניע] Ges. § 124v cf. Ex. 6:11 Nu. 1:7 et al.—13. נטשה] nine mss. ערכו, C א וברך.—14. חרי] dub. one ms. (Kennis.)/swagger which was probably read by C, ה.—工商银行 Baer Ṣṭṝ, א Iedda, hence Ki. ירתש.—ו ו møד] C transposes and renders as one proper name ḡו[アウグ] while ḡ also has one proper name Za[アウグ]Xv, which is certainly corrupt; L omits ו.—18. של[アウグ]ו] going out to the host, i.e., those able to go to war, cf. 7:12 Nu. 1:32 Nu. 1:12 Nu. 1:15 et al. On construction Ges. § 116h.—19. יניע] Cn. 25:8 יניע—20. נטשה] prep. ו with the suf. of the third pers. pl. + the relative ו (✈️ before a guttural). ו is used instead of וב in the later books, Ec., La., Jon., Ct., Ch. (3 times, 25:1, see note, 27:7) and once in Ezr. (8:18), and late Pss. cf. Ges. § 36.—ו ו ו] And he suffered himself to be entreated by them, inf. abs. with change of subj., after a perf. Ges. § 113x. For a similar use of יניע in Niph. tolerativum, cf. Gn. 25:1 2 S. 21:4 24:2 Ch. 33:14. 18 Ezr. 8:17 Is. 19:21.—21. ונסח] one ms. (Kennis.)arsi, so also C ל䦃.

23-24. The half of Manasseh east of the Jordan.—The genealogy of Manasseh is inserted later when the tribe is considered as a whole (7:14 נו), hence we have only the dwelling-places and the heads of fathers’ houses of the eastern half-tribe of Manasseh in vv. 11-14.—23. From Bashan] i.e., from the territory occupied
26-28. A summary of the fate of the two and a half tribes.

—25. And they transgressed] (םְרֵע לָו). The word is a priestly word found in P, Ez., and Ch. frequently and almost exclusively. The subject here is the two and a half tribes. Cf. v. 11.—And they went a whoring after, etc.] (שֹׁאַה פָּלַגְם). Cf. Ex. 34:14. Dt. 31:18 Lv. 17:20 Nu. 15:1 Ju. 21:8. The expression denotes apostasy from Yahweh in the worship of other gods. This figure with a similar force with the use of the noun is frequent in the prophets (esp. Ho., Ez.). For a discussion of its full meaning cf. Dr. Dt. 31:14.—26. And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit] (דַּעְת הַקְּלָלֶה). Spirit here denotes an unaccountable and uncontrollable impulse. Cf. for parallel usage 2 Ch. 21:2 Ezr. 1:8 Je. 51:11 Hg. 1:4.—Pulu is identical with Tilgath-pilneser (cf. v. 17). The error of the Chronicler in mentioning them as two distinct persons has arisen from his source 2 K. 15:21, where they are thus mentioned. Pulu was the original name of the Assyrian king who
assumed Tiglath-pileser on his usurpation of the throne. Hence
the confusion of the sacred writers. In Babylonia Tiglath-pileser
continued to be known by his original name Pulu (cf. COT. I. p.
219, DB. Tiglath-pileser).—Halaḥ and Habor (and Hara and) the
river of Gozan]. These names are derived from 2 K. 17:18
with the exception of Hara (שָׂר), which is out of place (as well
as the conjunction and before and after it) if not meaningless
(v. i.). The Chronicler identifies the fate of the eastern tribes
through the ravages of Tiglath-pileser with that of Israel in gen¬
eral after the fall of Samaria. Habor] is the mod. Khabur (ancient
Chaboras), the well-known tributary of the Euphrates rising in
Karajab Dagh (ancient Mons Masius), and emptying, after a
course of some two hundred miles, into the Euphrates south-east
of the mod. town of ed Deir. Gozan] clearly a district through
which the Habor flowed, to be identified with the Gauzanitis of
Ptolemy, and the Gu-ra-na (nu) of the Assyrian inscriptions
(COT. I. 267, KAT. 6 269). The meaning and location of Halaḥ
are not so certain. G in Kings has “rivers of Gozan” implying
that Halaḥ as well as Habor was a river, but such a one has
not been satisfactorily located. It is probably a province (Assy.
Halaḥki) not so very far from Harran (KAT. 6 p. 169).—Unto this
day]. These words probably have arisen by a misunderstanding
of the text of 2 K., which has and cities of the Medes (v. i.).

23. יי' דלי ותיצי. 6. כ. על תועש. כ. על כ. דל. לְפִי
is doubtless a gloss.—24. יט. ג. דלי. ג. וי' לְפִי
Gin. quotes two Targums to support
the omission of which is wanting also in כ. כ. כ. and so Ki.—
ןינורית. on pronunciation cf. 3. 36.—26. יט. דלי. דלי
are probably derived from דלי ותיצי. דלי ותיצי. דלי of 2 K. 17
18, and the deviations seem to have arisen either from careless transcription
or because the Chronicler quoted from memory (Be.). דלי may
be a reminiscence of the reading, which appears in כ of 2 K.
17, 18, so Be., Ki., Bn. That דלי has arisen from דלי דלי
appears probable from the fact כ gives both in 2 K. 17 (not 18).
Klo. gives this as the original reading. Ke. thought of the Chronicler’s
statement resting on another authority.

V. 27–VI. 66 (VI. 1–81). Genealogy and geography of
Levi.—This section contains: (1) the line of high priests from
Aaron to Jehozadak (i.e., to the exile), introduced by a genealogical
table showing Aaron's relationship to Levi, 5:37-41 (6:11); (2) lines of descent of singers from Levi through his three sons, Gershon, Kehath, and Merari, 6:1-16 (11:1-19); (3) the genealogical tables of the three singers, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, 6:18-22 (11:47); (4) notices concerning the services of Levites and sons of Aaron, 6:23-32 (11:48); (5) a list of the high priests to Ahimaaz (i.e., to the time of David), 6:29-30 (10:22); (6) the cities assigned to the sons of Aaron, 6:31-44 (11:49); (7) the tribal territory in which the cities of the Levites lay, 6:45-46 (11:49); (8) the cities of the Kehathites (exclusive of sons of Aaron), 6:47-71 (11:71); (9) the cities of the Gershonites, 6:48-71 (71:78); (10) the cities of the Merarites, 6:49-52 (71:81). These records of the tribe of Levi present a number of difficulties and their meagreness considering the importance of the tribe of Levi is striking. They are repeated with more or less fulness, however, when the writer treats of the classes of the priests and Levites and singers (23:2-24:10; 25:1-2).

V. 27-41 (VI. 1-15). The sons of Levi and the line of high priests from Aaron to the captivity.

This line of high priests is in part a doublet with 6:31-32 (11:32) and is regarded by Bn., and Ki. CBOT., Kom., as a later addition, since a list of priests naturally would follow the genealogical introduction in 6:1 (11:1). As the matter now stands, this introduction is given in 5:27-28 (6:1). The list also is carried down beyond David, while the other material of c. 6 stops with David. Hence it is held to be more natural that this list should be secondary to the other 6:31-44 (11:49) than vice versa, since an interpolation which added nothing would not naturally be made. On the other hand, there is some strong internal evidence against the priority of the second list, 6:31-32 (11:32). Although 5:27-28 (6:1) and 6:1-4 (11:1) do duplicate each other in part, it is not unreasonable to hold that the former passage was intended to introduce priests and the latter Levites. Moreover, 6:1 (11) describes the duties of all the priests, the sons of Aaron, and 6:2 (11:1) is concerned with the cities of all the Aaronides. The list of high priests included between those two verses seems out of place, and it is unlikely that the Chronicler introduced it there. A scribe who expected a list of the sons of Aaron after the verse describing their duties—just as a list of Levites precedes the verse detailing their duties—may then have inserted this partial list of the high priests from 5:28 (6:1), that being the only one available. Without the second list of the high priests, the arrangement of the
material is characteristic of the Chronicler's order, i.e., the genealogy of
the high priests and the genealogy of the Levites; the duties of the
Levites and the duties of the priests; the cities of the priests and the
cities of the Levites.

27 (1). Gershon, Kehath, and Merari. These three sons of
Levi appear in Gn. 46\textsuperscript{11} Ex. 6\textsuperscript{11} Nu. 3\textsuperscript{17} 26\textsuperscript{17}, and represent three
great families of Levites which clearly existed at the time of the
composition of P (cf. 6\textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{(ii)} 23\textsuperscript{1}).—Gershon [גֶּרֶשׁ]
(בְּרֵכֵמ) as in P, elsewhere in Ch. Gershom (גֶּרֶשׁ), cf. 6\textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{(ii)} 23\textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{et al.}—
And the sons of Kehath, 'Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and 'Uzial. Cf.
as a source for these names Ex. 6\textsuperscript{11} Nu. 3\textsuperscript{18} and for their repetition
6\textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{(ii)} 23\textsuperscript{1}. Hebron's appearance as a descendant of Levi and thus
a Levitical family name shows that a portion of the ecclesiastical
tribe of Levi came from priests who had ministered at the sanctu-
ary of Hebron. What underlies the other names is unknown.
Uzial is the only one smacking of artificiality or a late formation
(Gray, \textit{HPN}. p. 210).—29 (3). Sources for the children of
Amram and Aaron are Ex. 6\textsuperscript{11} Nu. 26\textsuperscript{11} \textsuperscript{(except Miriam)} (except Miriam) Nu. 26\textsuperscript{11} \textsuperscript{1}.
Cf. for repetition 23\textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{(except Miriam)} 24\textsuperscript{1}.

30-41 (4-15). The line of high priests.—Eleazar v. \textsuperscript{20} \textsuperscript{(iv)} was, according to P, Aaron's successor in the high priesthood Nu. 20\textsuperscript{11};
Phinehas Eleazar's son and successor, Jos. 24\textsuperscript{42} Ju. 20\textsuperscript{42}. Abishua,
Bukki, 'Uzzi, Zerahiah, Merioth, Amariah (vv. \textsuperscript{20}-\textsuperscript{22}
\textsuperscript{(iv)-\textsuperscript{vii}}) are entirely unknown, not mentioned elsewhere except below 6\textsuperscript{111-17} \textsuperscript{(ii)-\textsuperscript{vii}}
Ezr. 7\textsuperscript{1-4}. Ahitub v. \textsuperscript{44} \textsuperscript{(v)} is given as the father of Zadok 2 S. 8\textsuperscript{17}
1 Ch. 18\textsuperscript{14}. If we look for historical accuracy, he is not to be
identified with Ahitub the father of Ahimelech, the father of Abi-
athar 1 S. 14\textsuperscript{4} 22\textsuperscript{15}, since the establishment of Zadok as priest in the
place of Abiathar is regarded as the fulfilment of the prophecy of
the disestablishment of the house of Eli (1 K. 2\textsuperscript{17}. \textsuperscript{v}). His ap-
pearance as the father of Zadok in 2 S. 8\textsuperscript{11}, our author's source, is
undoubtedly due to a textual corruption (see 1 Ch. 18\textsuperscript{14}). Zadok
v. \textsuperscript{26} \textsuperscript{(iv)} was priest under David with Abiathar 2 S. 8\textsuperscript{11} 15\textsuperscript{15} \textsuperscript{6}, and put
by Solomon in the place of Abiathar (see above). Ahimaaz v. \textsuperscript{86} \textsuperscript{(iv)} was a son of Zadok, cf. 2 S. 15\textsuperscript{17} \textsuperscript{et al.} 'Azariah v. \textsuperscript{86} \textsuperscript{(iv)} is men-
tioned as a son of Zadok 1 K. 4\textsuperscript{1}. The notice of v. \textsuperscript{86} \textsuperscript{(iv)} he it is
that executed, etc., out of place in v. \textsuperscript{86} \textsuperscript{(iv)}, belongs to him, the first
VI. 1-38.] GENEALOGIES OF LEVITES

mentioned, Azariah (Be., Bn., Ki., Ba., Zoe., Oe.). Of Jehonan, 'Azariah, Amariah, Aḥiṭub, Zadok, Shallum, and 'Azariah, vv. 38-40 (*4-11), we have no further record than in the Chronicler’s genealogies, cf. 911 Ezr. 7-11 Ne. 11-11, except in the case of Amariah, who may be identified with Amariah the high priest during the reign of Jehoshaphat mentioned in 2 Ch. 19. Hilkiah v. 12 (*4) is apparently the high priest of the reign of Josiah, 2 K. 22 et al. Seraiah the father of Jehozadak v. 14 (*4) was high priest at the fall of Jerusalem, b. c. 586, and was taken captive and put to death at Riblah (2 K. 25-31), while Jehozadak went into captivity v. 41 (*4), and appears as the father of Jeshua the high priest of the return, Ezr. 3-5, 10-14 Ne. 12-* (Jazadak) Hg. 11 Zc. 611. The purpose of this genealogy is to connect Jehozadak with Aaron and thus legitimise his priesthood. The line of descent including Aaron from the Exodus to the captivity consists of twenty-three members and is artificial in structure, since allowing forty years or a generation for each member, we have 40 x 12 + 40 x 11, or 920 years. This period fits into the priestly chronology of the historical books, whereby 480 years elapsed from the Exodus to the founding of Solomon’s Temple (1 K. 6), and 480 years from thence to the founding of the second Temple (see Chronology of OT., DB.), and the captivity occurred in the eleventh generation of this second period. According to this scheme also 'Azariah the thirteenth member (v. 38 (*4)) ministers in Solomon’s Temple.

As an apparent list of high priests from the entrance into Canaan until the captivity, this genealogy presents some noteworthy features. Members of the house Eli: Eli, Phineas, Ahitub, Ahimelech, and Abiathar (1 S. 14-22), naturally do not appear, since this house was set aside for that of Zadok (1 K. 211-4), but the omission of the high priests Jehoiada (2 K. 11-2 Ch. 221, etc.) and Urijah (2 K. 16-2) and an Azariah in the reign of Uzziah (2 Ch. 26-2) between Amariah of Jehoshaphat’s reign and Hilkiah of Josiah’s, is striking (v. s.).

VI. 1-4 (16-19). The sons of Levi.—On vv. 1-2 (*4-10) cf. 511. *1 (611, 6).—Libni and Shime’i]. Cf. as a source for these names, Ex. 6-11 Nu. 3-11, and their repetition 237, and also 238 2611 where instead of Libni we have La’dan (ךלדנ). Libni without doubt is to
be connected with the priestly city Libnah (Jos. 21:18).—Mahli and Mushi]. Cf. as source Ex. 6:16 Nu. 3:10 and repetition 23:24. Mushi (מְשִׁית) has been connected with Moses, as though the family derived their name from that of Israel's law-giver (We. Gesch. pp. 151 f.); also with Míšri or Musri (EBi.).

5–6 (20–21). A fragment of the pedigree of Asaph. (Be., Bn., Ki., but not Zoe.) Cf. vv. 24–28 (vs. 28). This conclusion is suggested by the pedigree of Heman, which follows, and seems warranted when we compare the list of names (A) with those in vv. 24–28 (vs. 28) (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gershom</td>
<td>Gershom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libni</td>
<td>Jaḥath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaḥath</td>
<td>Shime'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmah</td>
<td>Zimmah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo'ah</td>
<td>Ethan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Iddo</td>
<td>'Adaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerah</td>
<td>Zerah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je'atherai</td>
<td>Ethni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variations between Jo'ah (יְהוּד) and Ethan (יְהוּד) 'Iddo (יְדָו) and 'Adaiah (יְדָו), Je'atherai (יְתָרָא) and Ethni (יְתָרָא), might easily have arisen in transcription. Shime'i may have been omitted from (A) by oversight, or since Libni is wanting in (B), Jaḥath and Shime'i may have been transposed and the tradition may have fluctuated in regard to the descent of Asaph whether through Libni or Shimei (cf. v. 21 and 23, where Jaḥath is the son of Shimei) and B thus have given the latter view.

7–13 (22–28). A pedigree of Heman (Be., Bn., Ki., Ke., Oe., Zoe.).—This pedigree which ends in Abijah is broken or irregular in the present Heb. text: cf. v. 24, where without connection with the foregoing Sha'ul of v. 10 (84) we have The sons of Elkanah 'Amasai and Ahimoth, and in v. 11 (38) we have Elkanah repeated. The second should be omitted (after G, S) and reading his son instead of sons of (בְּנֵי) the verse should read Elkanah his son (i.e., the son of Ahimoth), Zophai his son. In v. 12 (37) at the close should be added Samu'el his son (Ki. after G2). Also in v. 12 Joel should be supplied and the verse read And the sons of Samu'el;
the first-born Joel and the second Abijah (יוֹסֵף וַאֲבִיהָבָּי) (Ki. BH., RV. after Ch L, Ch, v. 18 (xii) 1 S. 8). Joel was the father of Heman (v. 18 (xii)), hence this pedigree is that of Heman, and corresponds to that given in vv. 15b-18 (xii-xv). As in the case above of Asaph, the substantial oneness of these lines of descent is revealed at once by placing them side by side.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehath.</td>
<td>Kehath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amminadab.</td>
<td>Izhar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korah.</td>
<td>Korah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assir, Elkanah, Ebiasaph.</td>
<td>Assir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assir.</td>
<td>Taḥath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḥath.</td>
<td>Uriel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Uzziyah.</td>
<td>'Azariah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha'ul.</td>
<td>Jo'el.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkanah.</td>
<td>Elkanah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasai.</td>
<td>Amasai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥimoth.</td>
<td>Maḥath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkanah.</td>
<td>Elkanah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zophai.</td>
<td>Zuph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naḥath.</td>
<td>Toah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliab.</td>
<td>Eliel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkanah.</td>
<td>Elkanah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samu'el.</td>
<td>Samu'el.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo'el.</td>
<td>Jo'el.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiah.</td>
<td>Heman.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names Kehath, equivalent to Kohath, Izhar, and Korah (B) are derived from Ex. 6. 51.

In respect to the variations: 'Amminadab appears in Ex. 611 as the father-in-law of Aaron, and may have been placed for Izhar in (A) through an oversight (Ch A has Izhar) (v. i.). Assir and Elkanah are either redundant in (A) through a similar cause or have fallen out from (B). Uriel and Zaphaniah are difficult to explain as equivalents. The names 'Uzziyah and 'Azariah are interchangeable (as in the case of the well-known King of Judah). The differences between the other corresponding names have probably arisen through transcription. Cf. the letters in the Hebrew text.
This pedigree is clearly artificial. A portion of its construction comes from 1 S. 1', where Elkanah is mentioned as s. Jeroham, s. Elihu, s. Tohu, s. Zuph. Zuph is probably a district, and Tohu (Toah, Nahath) a family (cf. Tahath 1 Ch. 7*; We. Prol. p. 220). The story of Samuel shows distinctly that he was not a Levite, for then he would have belonged to the Lord without the gift of his mother (1 S. 1*'). He is made a Levite by the Chronicler according to the notions of his own times respecting Samuel's service at the sanctuary. The names of Samuel's sons are derived from 1 S. 8*.

14. 15 (29. 30). The pedigree of Asaiah the Merarite.—This pedigree to correspond with those of vv. 1*-18 (14-32) should present a line of descent of Ethan (vv. 29*-31 (44-47)), but a close similarity of names is here wanting. Still they have been held sufficiently alike to warrant this inference (Be.). 'Asaiah may be the one mentioned in 15* as chief of the sons of Merari. It is noticeable in this pedigree that both Libni and Shimei here are Merarites, while above v. 8* (17) they are Gershonites.

1. so also v. 3 15', 29 vs. vv. 1 6 47, elsewhere Gerson in this c. Gerson in all — 7. Gerson and the Chronicler differentiates Gershom and Gershon in c. 23, it is likely that originally was original here also.—7. 8. Either the compiler had a variant tradition or the text is corrupt. The latter seems probable. Either the compiler had a variant tradition or the text is corrupt. The latter seems probable. Either the compiler had a variant tradition or the text is corrupt. The latter seems probable.
16. 17 (31. 32). David's appointment of the singers.—16 (31).—*House of Yahweh* is used here generally both for the tent where David placed the ark, and the later Temple (cf. 9*).—*After the resting of the ark* i.e., after the bringing up of the ark from the house of Obed-Edom to Jerusalem (2 S. 6*).—17 (32). *The tabernacle of the tent of meeting* (משכן אוהל מועד). A combination of two terms employed in P for the tabernacle and applied to the tent erected by David for the ark (cf. 16*). Technically *Mishkan* (tabernacle, dwelling-place) denoted the wooden portion of the tabernacle, while *'Ohel* (tent) the curtains or hanging (Ex. 26*; 35* 36* 39* 40*; Nu. 3*; also Ex. 39* 40*; where the combination given above is used to indicate the wooden structure).—*According to their right* (משנה ב половין cf. 24* 2 Ch. 30*). The reference apparently is to the order or position prescribed by David for the singers, a subject taken up in detail in c. 25. According to vv. 16* 16* (16) the guild of Heman occupied the central position with that of Asaph on the right and Ethan on the left. The Chronicler thus held that the musical services later adopted in the Temple were established by David in connection with the tent in which he had placed the ark.

16. רָאָב [appointed, a peculiar force cf. 15* 16* 22* 2 Ch. 8* 9* 11* 19* 21* 24* 25* et al. (l. 89).—רָאָב לָע] over the service, cf. BDB. ע', ב. h.
18–32 (33–47). The three singers Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, and their lines of descent.—These three singers, who are assigned to the time of David, represented in reality three choirs or guilds of the post-exilic period and were quite modern in their development, for according to Ezr. 2:44 Ne. 7:4 the sons of Asaph and singers were equivalent, and the singers were distinct from the Levites. (This distinction is held by Sm. p. 26; OTJC.\textsuperscript{2} p. 204; Baudissin, \textit{Gesch. des A. T. Priesterthums}, pp. 142 ff., also DB. IV. p. 92; Nowack, \textit{Heb. Arch.} ii. p. 111; on the other hand, Torrey claims that no such distinction can be found in Ezr. and Ne., \textit{Comp. and Hist. Value of Ezr. and Ne.} pp. 22 f.) Gradually, however, singers were evolved into Levites and the three guilds. Remains of steps of this evolution and fluctuating traditions appear in the Levitical genealogies. In Ex. 6:24 the three sons of Korah are Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph (\textless{} Ebiasaph), \textit{i.e.,} father of Asaph, and hence we should expect to find Asaph a descendant of Korah, but according to vv. 34–38 (38–40) he is not. Also we find Assir and Elkanah placed not co-ordinate but following each other (vv. 19 (38–40) 20 (87)) (yet see \textit{in loco}). Different genealogists certainly worked over these names. The sons of Korah appearing in the titles of the Pss. (42. 44–49. 84. 85. 87. 88) probably mark a step in this evolution earlier than the formation of the three guilds. Korah in 1 Ch. 25 is associated with Tappuah as a son of Hebron. This indicates either a place or Judean family of that name from which came the Levitical Korahites (We. Is. und Jüd. Gesch. pp. 151 f.).

A noticeable difference of length appears in these genealogies: thus Heman has twenty links, Asaph fifteen, and Ethan only twelve.

The relation of the genealogies in 6:1–18 (19–26) to those of the singers in 6:19–22 (23–47). The latter genealogies are probably dependent upon the former, which originally may have been of Levites not classified as singers. The inconsistencies which make this statement doubtful are removed by textual criticism (\textit{u. i.}). The writer simply appropriated these genealogies in order to find Levitical pedigrees for the singers. The genealogy of Heman, 6:19–22 (23–26), is the same as the line of descent through Kehath, 6:19–22 (23–26), Heman being made the son of Joel, the son of Samuel. Thus he becomes contemporaneous with David, between
whom and Samuel there is but one generation, viz., that of Saul. This writer errs in making Mahath (=Ahimoth) the son of Amasai, cf. 6:10 (50) where they are brothers, but see also 2 Ch. 29:1. The genealogy of Gershon, 6:1 (50 f.), is not sufficiently long (only eight generations) to bring the last, Jeatherai, down to the generation of Saul, hence Malchijah, Maaseiah*, Michael, Shimea, and Berechiah were added by the writer of 6:24-28 (44-48), thus making it possible to regard Asaph as the contemporary of David. Similarly, the genealogy of Merari, 6:14 (50 f.), consisting of only eight generations, is too short to reach from Merari to the singer Ethan, the contemporary of David, hence a number of generations were added by the writer of Ethan's genealogy, 6:24-28 (44-48). Moreover, he seems to have departed from the genealogy of Merari after Shimei, and to have added eight generations, Bani, Amzi, Hilkiah, Amaziah, Hashabiah, Malluch, Abdi, and Kishi, before Ethan.

The source of the genealogies of the singers. Of the additional names inserted before Asaph, Berechiah occurs elsewhere in 3:9 (15) 2:2 Ch. 28:2 Ne. 3:4; 6:14 Zc. 1:1 = Jeberechiah Is. 8:17; Shimea (שִׁמְיוֹן) in 6:18 (50) as a Levite (but spelling יִשְׁמַע is very frequent in the writings of the Chronicler, especially as a Levitical name); Michael eight times elsewhere in the writings of the Chronicler and in Nu. 1:13 (P) Dn. 10:14, 2:1; Maaseiah* nineteen times elsewhere in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. and in Je. 21:29; 35:4 37:4; Malchijah twelve times elsewhere in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. and Je. 21:3 38:4. Hence these names are late (except Shimea) and favourites with the Chronicler. Similarly the additional names to the genealogy of Ethan occur in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. as follows: Bani, 13 times (or 15, see BDB.); Amzi, 2; Hilkiah, 5 (besides frequently as the high priest of Josiah's time); Amaziah, 2 (besides frequently as the well-known King of Judah); Hashabiah, 14 (always a Levitical name); Malluch, 6 (also always Levitical); Abdi, 3 (the last three do not occur elsewhere); Kishi, as Kushaiah only in 15:17, but as Kish, 5 times. On this ground alone it is conclusive that these genealogies of the singers were composed by the Chronicler or in his day. Furthermore, 6:14-14a (21-33a), where the ear-marks of the Chronicler are evident (notice וְיִשְׁמַע וּשְׁמַעְתֵּן, 1. 89; וְיִשְׁמַעְתֵּן, 1. 89; זִכְרוֹנִי, 1. 89; cf. 2 Ch. 7:9, 11; והם כֹּלִים, Ne. 12:4), is a part of this same piece. Hence it is most probable that the Chronicler himself gave the singers these pedigrees descending from the three sons of Levi. No doubt the latter had already claimed Levitical descent. The Chronicler may have utilised some current genealogies of the singers to supplement the Levitical tables of 6:14 (50 f.). The identity of one name would be sufficient to make the connection, which may account for the omission of the last four names of the table of Merari (v. s.). The fact that Ethan is used here and in 15:17 f. while elsewhere we find Jeduthun (16:4 25:4 2 Ch. 5:12 29:14) is not significant.
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The Chronicler could have identified the two as well as a later interpolator. The objection has been raised (by Bn.) that elsewhere in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne.—except 15** which is doubtless dependent on this passage—Asaph seems to figure as the chief singer (cf. 16** Ne. 111) and he is always mentioned first. But it is by no means certain that the writer of these genealogies intended to exalt Heman’s guild of singers above the Asaphites. Although Heman is placed first, he is not called the chief. Asaph’s descent is traced from Gershon, the oldest of the sons of Levi, which may imply that his guild was recognised as the oldest. His position on the right hand, possibly an indication of the position this guild occupied in the service at the Temple, was a post of honour, cf. Gn. 48 Ps. 110.

18. [א, ב, ג, הとする] ק, לה -19-21. On תְנַחְנָה, see above w. 12. According to v. 20 was the father of תֵּית, v. 10 makes him out the brother of תֵּית = ת. Possibly v. 20 is dependent on some text which had been after ת - יָּהְסִי - ת (cf. ג quoted above on vv. 1*), or v. 20 is due to the carelessness of the compiler. ג of v. 10 may be corrected from this verse.—22. [א] ת. 22, 23, 24, 25. read with some mss., ק, ו, ו - ב. ק - 28. [א] ת. 29. many mss., ק. (Oriental text), ק, ק, ק, ק has fallen from the text of ק by homoeoteleuton. ק יָּוַּטְנִי יָּוַּטְנִי Kt. (Ki. BH, misleading).

33. 34 (48. 49). A description of the service of the Levites and the priests.—This description is according to P and the assignment there by Moses.—Their brethren the Levites] i.e., all Levites not singers and not priests. The term Levite is social as well as tribal. The subordinate ministry of the Levites is here meant (cf. Nu. 3* &). The duties of the priests are summarised as service at the altar of burnt offering (cf. Ex. 27*), at the altar of incense (cf. Ex. 30*), and in whatever functions were connected with the rooms of the sanctuary (cf. Nu. 4*) (the term holy of holies cannot be restricted here to the innermost sanctuary), also to make an atonement for Israel]. The priests made an atonement through sacrifices for individuals (Lv. 4* 8* 10* et al.) and for the entire people on the day of atonement (Lv. 16*), and also on other occasions of stress and fast (2 Ch. 29*). The term to make an atonement is used here to indicate the priestly ministry in general.

34. יָּוַּטְנִי] inf. cstr. with waw, a continuation of וְיָּוַּטְנִי, Ges. § 114, Dr. TH. 206, Dav. Syn. § 92 R. 4.
35-38 (50-53). The high priests from Aaron to Ahimaaz.
Cf. 5\textsuperscript{4}-51 (64-3).—This genealogy if not the original with the Chronicler (v. s.) is repeated here to give data to the time of David.

39-66 (54-81). The dwelling-places of Levi.—This section, with rearrangement and some slight abridgment, is taken from Jos. 21\textsuperscript{10-19}. In that passage a general statement of the number and locality of the cities of the priests and Levites (Jos. 21\textsuperscript{14-17}) precedes the enumeration of the separate cities of both priests and Levites. Here on the other hand the separate cities of the priests are first enumerated (vv. 39-46 (64-81) Jos. 21\textsuperscript{10-19}) and then is given the general summary (vv. 47-50 (81-84) Jos. 21\textsuperscript{14-19}) and then follows the enumeration of the separate cities of the Levites (vv. 51-60 (85-84)). In this order v. 40 (85) forms no proper introduction to the following verses. It can only introduce according to its place in Jos. vv. 39-40 (64-85). Hence this, with the preceding verse, is held to have come from a marginal annotation made by some reader familiar with the narrative of Jos. and later to have been inserted in the text (Be., Ki.), or the entire list of Levitical cities (vv. 51-60 (85-91)) is a later supplement (Bn.), or a copyist through error re-arranged the original material of the Chronicler. But it is more likely that the Chronicler himself was guilty of this unskilful arrangement. Wishing to separate the account of the priestly cities from that of the Levites, he transposed the verses. That he should have transcribed and left Jos. 21\textsuperscript{14} (v. 40 (85)) where it did not harmonise with the text is not strange. He is guilty elsewhere of similar infelicities (see Intro. p. 19).

39-45 (54-60). The cities of the priests.—Taken from Jos. 21\textsuperscript{10-19}.—39. And these (i.e., the following) are their dwelling places according to their settlements within their boundary] from the Chronicler, since these words are not in his source. The proper introduction (Jos. 21\textsuperscript{14}) is given in v. 40 (85) (v. s.).—To the sons of Aaron, etc.]. With these words commences abruptly the quotation from the book of Joshua.—Of the family of the Kehathites].
Cf. 5\textsuperscript{4} (64).—The first\textsuperscript{*} lot]. The word first, supplied from Jos. 21\textsuperscript{14}, is necessary for clearness of meaning.—40 (55). Hebron] Kirjath-arba Jos. 20\textsuperscript{1}, which, according to Jos. 14\textsuperscript{14}, was the more ancient name, mod. El-Khali, twenty-three miles south
and a little west of Jerusalem; one of the oldest and most notable cities of Palestine, built seven years before Zoan in Egypt (Nu. 13**); the burial-place of Sarah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Gn. 23** 25* 35** 50**); David's residence when king over Judah (2 S. 5*); the place of the death of Abner (2 S. 3*), and headquarters of the rebellious Absalom (2 S. 15*).

—And the suburbs]. Cf. 2 Ch. 11**.—41 (56). This verse harmonises with the previous verse the gift of Hebron to Caleb recorded in Jos. 15**. Both verses (this and the preceding) in the book of Joshua are editorial insertions (Bennett, Jos. SBOT.). They interrupt the narrative.—42 (57). Cities]. The plural is an error. Only Hebron was a city of refuge. Hence after Jos. 21** read city. The Chronicler has here abridged (v. i.).—Libnah]. A city in the lowland of Judah of some historical importance (cf. 2 K. 8* 19* 23*). Its location has not been clearly identified.—Jattir] in the hill country of Judah (Jos. 15** 21* 1 S. 30* †), mod. 'Attir thirteen miles south by west from Hebron.—Eshtemoa]. Cf. 4*.—43 (58). Hilen] Holon Jos. 21*; in the hill country of Judah mentioned in Jos. 15* between Goshen and Gilo; not identified.—Debir] also called Kirjath-sepher (Jos. 15* Ju. 1* †), a place of importance in the Negeb or southern Judah, identified with Dāhāriyeḥ, some ten or twelve miles south-west of Hebron (cf. Moore, Ju. pp. 25 f.).—44 (59). 'Ashan] written 'Ain Jos. 21* (v. i.), mentioned among towns of Judah Jos. 15*, and of Simeon Jos. 19* †: clearly then in southern Judah: not identified.—Beth-shemesh] on the borders of Judah Jos. 15*, but assigned to Dan Jos. 19*, the mod. 'Ain Shems in the valley of Sorek south of the railway from Jaffa to Jerusalem and not far from the half-way point (Baed.* pp. 14, 126). The place was probably an ancient Canaanite sanctuary (cf. for historical references 1 S. 6* 7* 1 K. 4* 2 K. 14* 2 Ch. 25* 28*).—45 (60). Geba'] a town frequently mentioned (8* 1 S. 13* 2 S. 5* 1 K. 15* 2 K. 23* 2 Ch. 16* Ne. 11* 12* Is. 10* Zc. 14*), mod. Jeba' south of the pass of Michmas. It is about four miles north by east from Jerusalem.—'Alemeth] (Almon Jos. 21*) mentioned in the genealogies 8* 9*, identified with mod. Almit, three and a half miles north-east of Jerusalem, beyond 'Anathoth,
which is distinguished as the home of Jeremiah (Je. 1:11; 31:32; 32:10, also mentioned in 2 S. 23:1 K. 20:2 Ezr. 2:2 Ne. 7:17 Is. 10:20), mod. 'Anathoth three miles north-east of Jerusalem.—Thirteen cities. Only eleven are mentioned in the present text of Ch., hence probably Jutta found in Jos. 21:18 and Gibeon in Jos. 21:17 should be supplied in vv. 44 f. (v. i.).

39b-45 compared with Jos. 21:10-18 show the following variations, some of which appear abridgments of the Chronicler and others seem to have arisen in the transmission of his text, and should be restored from Jos. We give as the former: v. 44b the omission of סכני יר혀 before and, and ירחא instead of סכני ירחא in Jos. represents the true text, since the formula from the families of the tribes is not used, see SBOT. on Jos. 21:1); v. 46 גנבים cut down to גננים and read for גננים; v. 47 יָהּ omitted after יֹבְעַת, יֹבְעַת omitted after מִלְכָּת; v. 48 וַיַּעֲמֹר omitted after מַעֲלֵהַ הַר; v. 49 וַיָּתֵר omitted after מִלַּכָּת. The latter omission appears also in v. 40, cf. Jos. 21:14. In vv. 44 f. the sums of the cities as given in Jos. 21:12, 18 are omitted. Variations through careless transmission appear: v. 44b גנבים omitted after התⴻםל; v. 44b עד instead of וַיַּעֲמֹר omitted after מַעֲלֵהַ הַר, which phrase also with גננים have fallen out of vv. 46 f.; v. 48 יָהּ instead of יֹבְעַת, יֹבְעַת omitted after מַעֲלֵהַ הַר. The עַשֵּׁשֶׁכְת of v. 40 is the true reading instead of עַשֵּׁשֶׁכִּי of Jos. 21:18, cf. on Jos. in loco G, SBOT., Dill., and also Jos. 15:19. Probably also with variations due to copyists should be classed: v. 46 יָהּ instead of יֹבְעַת, cf. Jos. 15:19; v. 46 וַיָּתֵר instead of וַיִּלְחָשְׁכִּי with Anathoth after instead of before.

46-50 (61-65). A summary of the Levitical cities.—Taken directly from Jos. 21:19 (v. s.).—46 (61). And the rest of the children of Kehath had by lot out of the families of the tribe of Ephraim and out of the tribe of Dan and out of the half tribe of Manasseh ten cities*]. The present form is corrupt and meaningless and must be thus restored according to Jos. 21:14. Be. suggested that the confusion may have arisen from the deliberate omission of the reference to the tribe of Dan (cf. 7:14). The sons of Kehath, or the first main division of the Levites, omitting from their number the priests, had in the territory of Ephraim and Dan, adjoining Judah, and in West Manasseh ten cities enumerated in part in vv. 46-48 (62-64). The sons of Gershom representing the second main division of the Levites had thirteen cities, enumerated in vv. 49-51 (65-67), in the territory of Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, and the east-Jordanic tribe of Manasseh.—48 (63). The sons of Merari, the third and final
main division of the Levites, had as their possession twelve cities enumerated in part in vv. 48-49 (64). This verse gives a summary of the preceding. —These cities. The word these supplied from Jos. has perhaps fallen from the text. —50 (65). By lot out of place by copyist's error, belongs to the previous verse. This verse in Jos. begins a new paragraph and is here entirely out of place introducing the matter of vv. 46-48 (66-68) (v. s.).

46. [Jos. 216] to be preferred (Bn.), but the is in v.v. 47-49 is preferred by Ki., and also Bennett, as the true reading in Jos. 216, SBOT. —47. according to their families, i.e., of Gershonites, Jos. from families of the tribe, etc. (but v. s.). —48. want the in Jos. 216 (but cf. 6). —49. In Jos. 216 the verse closes with Shechem and after Shechem. —50. wanting in Jos. (but cf. 6 and Jos. 216).

51-66 (66-81). The cities of the Levites (in distinction from the priests). —Taken directly from Jos. 216 with some abridgment, and the text has evidently suffered through transcription. —51 (66). And families of the sons of Kehath had cities of their lot, etc. thus correctly Be., Bn., Kau., Ki., after Jos. 216. —52 (67). The city of refuge since only Shechem was a city of refuge. —53 (68). Instead of Jokmeam Jos. 216 has Kibzaim, which, according to Be., Bn., Ki., is to be preferred. No site corresponding to either name has...
been found.—Beth-horon]. There were an upper and a lower Beth-horon (2 Ch. 8:1) “near the head and the foot respectively of the ascent from the Maritime Plain to the plateau of Benjamin, and represented to-day by Beit 'Ur el foka and Beit 'Ur el tahfa.” The towns are a little over two miles apart and some ten or twelve miles north-west of Jerusalem. For references to these towns and their ascent cf. Jos. 10:16-18, 11:21-22 1 S. 13:2 K. 8:2 Ch. 8:25. Between v.41 (AI) and v.44 (AI), intentionally (Be.) or carelessly (Bn.), has been omitted Jos. 21:22 “And from the tribe of Dan Elteke and its suburbs and Gibbethon and its suburbs.”—54 (69). Aijalon] a city of Dan; mod. village of Yelîd, a little to the north of the Jaffa road, about thirteen miles from Jerusalem. Cf. for references 8:16 Ch. 8:21 Jos. 19:42 21:14 Ju. 1:14. The valley of Aijalon was a famous battle-field (cf. GAS. HGHL. pp. 210-13).—Gath-rimmon] (Jos. 19:14 21:1) not identified; probably a little to the east of Joppa.—55 (70). Instead of ‘Aner (אָנֵר) read after Jos. 21:21 Ta’anach (תַּעֲנָךְ), the frequently mentioned city of the plain of Esdraelon (cf. 7:21 Jos. 12:17 19:16 19:22 21:21 Ju. 1:17 5:24 K. 4:1), mod. Ta’annuk some four and a half miles south-southwest from Lejjun (Megiddo) (BDB.).—Read also instead of Bîle’am (בּילָעָם) Ible’am (יִבְּלָעָם). Cf. Jos. 17:11 Ju. 1:27. Jos. 21:19 has by dittography Gath-rimmon, but 1娥 Iêsâtha, hence Dill., Bennett, SBOT., et al., as above. Ible’am was also in the plain of Esdraelon and its name appears preserved in the Wady Bel ameh in which the village Jenin lies (Baed.4 p. 223).—The words for the rest of the families* of the sons of Kehath are a fragment of Jos. 21:19, which reads: “All the cities of the families of the rest of the children of Kehath were ten with their suburbs.” The compiler or transcriber, having omitted Jos. 21:19, felt compelled to omit the numeral, but retained the adjoining words, then meaningless.—56 (71). From the family of the half-tribe, etc.] a use of family before the name of tribe arising from abbreviation of text in Jos. 21:17 where the word is plural and refers to the Gershonites (v. i.).—Golan] a city of uncertain site which gave its name to the district Gaulanitis mentioned by Josephus (Ant. xvii. 8. 1. xviii. 4. 6), and appears in the mod. Jaulan
east of the Jordan and Sea of Galilee (EBi. II. col. 1748) (Dt. 4’’
a city of refuge, Jos. 20’’ 21’’ †).—‘Ashtarah] mentioned with
Edrei as one of the royal cities of Og King of Bashan (Dt. 1’ Jos.
9’ 12’ 13’’). The name indicates that it was a seat of the worship
of Ashtoreth. Its location has not been clearly fixed. Some
identify it with el Meseirib, some twenty-five miles east of the
southern end of the Sea of Galilee, others with el ‘Ash’ari, some
three miles north of that place (DB. I. pp. 166 f.).—57 (72).
Read according Jos. 21’’ Kishion (ךישון) (cf. Jos. 19’’) instead of
Kedesh (ךדרש) (Dill., Bn.). Conder prefers Kedesh, which he
thinks may be identified near Ta’anach (DB. III. p. 4). The
former place has not been identified.—Daberath] Jos. 19’’ 21’’ †,
the present Deburige at the foot of Mt. Tabor (DDB.).—58 (73).
Ramoth] same as Remeth Jos. 19’’ (Bn.), mod. Er Rameh in
southern part of plain of Esdraelon (Baed. p. 222). Ki. prefers
Yarmuth of Jos. 21’’ (BH.).—‘Anem] (אנה) a scribal error, is
‘Ain-gannim (עין גניום) Jos. 21’’ 19’’, mod. Jenin near the
south-east end of the plain of Esdraelon; a village now of some
importance, with 1,500 inhabitants (Baed. p. 223).—59 (74).
Mashal] (משלח) better after Jos. 22’’ Mish’al (משלאש), site un-
known.—Abdon] (Jos. 21’’ †) mod. ‘Abdeh ten or more miles
north by east of Acco and some five east of Achzib.—60 (75).
Hukok] (הוקוק). Read after Jos. 21’’ Helkath (הלקת), cf. Jos.
19’’ †, the site is uncertain.—Rehob]. This town in Asher has not
been located. It is to be distinguished from the Rehob at the head
of the Jordan valley (Nu. 13’’ 1 S. 10’’ †), and also the one men-
tioned in Jos. 19’’.—61 (76). Kedesh in Galilee] (Jos. 21’’),
Kedesh-naphtali (Ju. 4’), elsewhere simply Kedesh (Jos. 12’’ 19’’
Ju. 4’’ 2 K. 15’’), a city of refuge, the home of Barak, a place
of importance mentioned by Josephus, mod. village of Kedes, west
of Lake Huleh.—Hammon] Hammoth-dor (Jos. 21’’) Hammath
(Jos. 19’’). Probably Hammath is the true reading (cf. Χαμωθ
and the town is the mod. Hammēm a short distance south of
Tiberias (DB. II. p. 290).—Kiriathaim] (קריתאיים) a variation of
Kartan (קרתאן) Jos. 21’’, not identified.—62 (77). Levites as in
Jos. 21’’ must be supplied after the rest (למדני), otherwise the
expression is meaningless.—Two cities of Zebulun, Jokne’am and
Farah, mentioned in Jos. 21ª, have fallen from the text (cf. כוח).

Instead of Rimmon (רֵימְמִון) read Rimmon, since the last syllable has arisen from a union with a following waw (ו) (cf. Jos. 19ª), or perhaps Rimmonah. Jos. 21ª has Dimnah (דִּמְנָה). Rimmon has been identified with Rummaneh north of Nazareth (DB.).

Instead of Tabor (תָּבֹר), which is nowhere mentioned as a city of Zebulun, but on the border of Issachar Jos. 21ª, Jos. 21ª has Nahalal (נַחֲלָל), mentioned also in Jos. 19ª Ju. 1ª, not clearly identified (Moore, Ju. p. 49, but see DB. III. p. 472). Ki. Kom. has a lacuna in place of any name.—63 (78). And beyond the Jordan at Jericho, east of Jordan]. These words are wanting in ו in Jos., although the first three (הַמֵּלֵּטֶר לֵוֹידְרָּה) appear in כ ב. Jos. 21ª. On the expression the Jordan at Jericho cf. Nu. 22ª 26ª Jos. 20ª. The cities mentioned in vv. 31(78)-44(81) correspond exactly with those given in Jos. 21ª-11.

—Bezer] a city of refuge (Dt. 4ª Jos. 20ª) mentioned on the Moabite stone; not identified. The phrase in the wilderness, wanting in ו in Jos. (cf. Jos. 20ª) but appearing in כ ב, and followed by “plain” (סְנָא) in Dt. 4ª Jos. 20ª, shows the location of the city in the flat table-land east of the Jordan.—Jahzah] a city also assigned to Moab (Is. 15ª Je. 48ª) on the border of the territory of the Amorites (Nu. 21ª Dt. 2ª), location unknown.—64 (79). Kedemoth] somewhere north of the upper Arnon, not identified (BDB.).—Mephaath] mentioned as in Moab Je. 48ª, not identified.—65 (80). Ramoth in Gile‘ad] one of the cities of refuge (Dt. 4ª Jos. 20ª), mentioned in wars between Syria and Israel 1 K. 22ª. At the battle of Ramoth-gilead Ahab was slain (1 K. 22ª-41). The location is uncertain: sites suggested Reimun, es Salt, and Jerash, the last directly east of Samaria and some twenty-three miles beyond the Jordan, with probability in its favour (Selah Merrill, E. of the Jordan, pp. 284 ff.).—Mahanaim] a place of note east of Jordan (cf. Gn. 32ª 2 S. 2ª 17ª 19ª 1 K. 2ª 4ª), identification not certain.—66 (81). Heshbon] the former capital of Sihon, King of the Amorites (Nu. 21ª), assigned to Moab (Je. 48ª), mod. Hesbân some fifteen miles east of where the Jordan empties into the Dead Sea.—Jazer] an important town; a district of Reuben was called “the land of
Jazer" (Nu. 32; also mentioned Nu. 32. 24; 1 Ch. 26; and assigned to Moab Is. 16; Je. 48). Jerome placed it eight or ten miles west of Philadelphia and fifteen miles from, i.e., north of, Heshbon (Onom. 86. 24. 131. 18). Merrill regards this as correct and identifies with Khurbel Sar (DB. II. p. 553).

51. אֲנָה (rendered in RV. as a partitive, is better read after Jos. 21* and גְּדוֹלָה, זָאִית, גָּדוֹלָה) is a copyist's error for גְּדוֹלָה in their lot, but this error may have been taken over from Jos. by the Chronicler, since גְּדוֹלָה of Jos. have תְּנָא הָעֲרָא, doubtless a corruption of וּרְפַּא הָעֲרָא. —52. See text. n. on v. 41.—58. Here and in the following verses the numbers found in Jos. are wanting. —55. אֱלֹהִים should be pointed as pl. after Jos. —56. The text of Jos. 21* is doubtless a corruption of תְּנָא הָעֲרָא and ὀργαί.—57. The words the city of refuge of the manslayer appear in Jos. before Golan. —58. רָבָה תָּאָרְצָה] Jos. 21* רָבָה תָּאָרְצָה, but Jos. 19* רָבָה תָּאָרְצָה.

VII. 1-5. The genealogy of Issachar.—Of this section, only v. 1 is derived from canonical sources (v. i.). The remainder was either composed by the Chronicler or is from an unknown source. Instead of closing with an account of dwelling-places, there is a record of the number of fighting men, as is also the case in the records of Zebulun (v. i.) and Asher (cf. v. 4).—1. And the sons of Issachar Tola' and Pu'ah and Jashub and Shimron. Cf. for source Gn. 46* Nu. 26*.' In Ju. 10 we read of one of the minor judges, Tola' the son of Pu'ah, the son of Dodo a man of Issachar and he was dwelling in Shamir. This shows that traditions varied in respect to the relationship of the clans of Tola' and Puah; but the former if not the more ancient was clearly the more pre-eminent. It is possible that the four sons of Issachar are simply reflections of the statement given above in the form, Tola' the son of Pu'ah dwelling in Shamir; Jashub derived from dwelling (דָּשַׁב) (cf. the variation Job דָּשַׁב in Gn. 46*) and Shimron from Shamir (שָׁמִיר); or, vice versa, that the late editor of the "Minor Judges" came on this concise list of names in P and constructed his statements therefrom (cf. H. W. Hogg in OLZ. vol. 3 (1900) col. 367). Shimron has been regarded as standing for the city
of Samaria (Noeldeke, "EBi. III. col. 3275).—2. And the sons of Tola were 'Uzzi and Rephaiah and Jeri'el and Jahmai and Jibsam and Shemu'el heads of their fathers' houses mighty men of valor]. The first, third, and fourth of these names look like those of ancient clans, while the second appears late, and thus is suggested a combination of early and late traditions.—According to their genealogical divisions, etc.]. The writer has probably preserved here and in the following verses midrashic interpretations of David's census (2 S. 24).—3. The sons of 'Uzzi present a group of late names (Gray, "HPN. p. 238).—Five]. The four grandsons were reckoned as sons.—All of them were heads] or altogether there were five heads, five distinct families or clans.—4. And with them]. The reference is to the five clans or families of v. 1 which numbered 36,000 warriors.—5. And the reckoning * of all the families of Issachar, the mighty men of valor, was altogether 87,000]. In v. 1 the sons of Tola, six clans, are numbered at 22,600; in v. 1 the sons of Uzzi, five clans, 36,000. These two together make 58,600, leaving 28,400 to be furnished by the remainder of the tribe, i.e., the clans Puah, Jashub, and Shimron, and also Tola reckoning him as a clan distinct from his sons (v. Bn. in loco). In Nu. 1 the warriors of Issachar were 54,400, in Nu. 26 64,300.

1. הָעַלְיוֹן for the construction see Ges. § 143. Ke., Zoe., Oe., Kau., Bn., prefer to emend to ובוּרָה. גֵּאָה דְּאָרָיִם בְּנֵי לֶבַנִּים, cf. 3. 31. —[Gn. 46, Nu. 26 אֶזְלִיז] Qr. (cf. ג,ו) Gn. ובוּרָה is a text error, "SBOT. (see above for an original בּוּר)."—2. לֶבַנִּים an addition defining הבוּר, appears a corruption (Zoe.) and should be struck out.—[Gn. ובוּר] is better connected with the last half of the verse (Be., Ke., Ki.).—5. בְּשֵׁם הָאָדָם Bn. after Klo. reads בְּשֵׁם הָאָדָם, as in v. 7b 40b and removes the following הבוּר. Possibly an original has fallen out before הבוּר, the preceding word ending in ב. Then ב is a corruption for ה and we should read י and connect with the preceding verse, translating "for they had more wives and sons than their brethren. לֹא should be transposed to a position after הבוּר, and final ב should be struck out.—[Gn. ובוּר] v. Ges. § 124q.

VII. 6–11. The genealogy of Zebulun.—This genealogy which apparently ascribes to Benjamin is peculiar. The introductory words The sons of are wanting; nowhere else in ג are...
the sons of Benjamin limited to three; Jedid'el is elsewhere unknown as a Benjaminite name, a most striking thing when the sons of Benjamin are so often mentioned; and this section as a Benjaminite genealogy forms a doublet to c. 8.

Not only are the names of the sons of Bela (v. 1) entirely different from those in any other list of his sons (cf. 8: Nu. 26:9 and Gen. 46:10), but they are uncommon or unknown to the tribe of Benjamin. While the other lists of Bela's sons differ from each other, showing variant traditions, they are agreed in employing the same names. On the other hand, Esbon is only found elsewhere as a son of Gad (Gen. 46:11, cf. Nu. 26:14); 'Uzzi is a common priestly and Levitical name (I Ch. 5:1; 6:27; 6:26; Ezr. 7:1; Ne. 11:16), appears among the descendants of Issachar (7:3) and once as a Benjaminite (9:1); 'Uzzi'el, though a very common name, is not Benjaminite; Jeremoth (which is rare) is a Benjaminite name in 8:1 (I Chron. 7:22), but there we should probably read Jeroham (I Chron. 8:1) with 8:17, cf. 9:1. (Jeremoth of 12:14 is doubtless a Judean name, v. in loco); 'Iri does not occur elsewhere. Thus we have apparently a variant tradition which has only one certain Benjaminite name and that a common one elsewhere.

The case is similar with the sons of Becher (v. 1). Of these, Zemirah occurs only here (but cf. Zimri 8:14); Jo'ash, Eli'ser, Eli'anan (but cf. Eli'anan 8:14), 'Omri, and Abi'ah are more or less common but unknown as Benjaminite names; the same is likely true of Jeremoth (see above, Jeremoth). The last two names, 'Anathoth and 'Alemeth, on the other hand, are common Benjaminite names. 'Anathoth occurs elsewhere as a personal name only in Ne. 10:19 (11), where the tribe is not given, but is frequent as a place-name in Benjamin. 'Alemeth is also a place-name of Benjamin and is a personal name in 8:14 and 9:16. Only these two, therefore, are certainly Benjaminite and they alone are geographical.

Of the third branch (v. 10) not only Jedid'el but his son Bilhan and his grandsons Chenaanah, Zethan, Tarshish, and Akishahar are not known as Benjaminites. Je'sh (Kt. יֶעַשׁ) is met with in 8:10 (נַעַשׁ), and a Benjaminite Ehud (יהוּד), the son of Gera, is familiar from Ju. 3:14 (+). Benjamin, the son of Bilhan, is unknown.
This genealogy of Benjamin is not only unique in its content but is in the wrong place in a geographical arrangement of the tribes, and a doublet (v. s.). Now, the genealogy of Zebulun is wanting in the Chronicler's account. Kittel (Kom.) indicates his belief that the original text contained this tribe by supposing a lacuna after Naphtali (71). But Zebulun belongs rather after Issachar, whom he follows in thirteen out of seventeen OT. lists, including 21 and 27 (cf. also 12 2. 12 2 Ch. 30), but not 64 (s. 61) where the order is not the Chronicler's but dependent on Jos. 21. In five more—in three of which the principle of arrangement seems to be geographical from south to north—the order of these two is reversed. Thus we have the strange genealogy of Benjamin just where the lost one of Zebulun should be.

Further there is a striking similarity between the list of Zebulun's sons as given in Gn. 46 and the names appearing in the first verse of our list, as follows:

Gn. 46
1 Ch. 7

If the former was the original reading in 1 Ch. 7 plus the Chronicler's addition of, it is easy to see how the present reading arose in copying. was read as ; as (cf. v. , Nu. 26). The last two of course followed as a necessary result of the first from the influence of Gn. 46, and the well-known Zebulunite (cf. Ju. 12) had to be cancelled, as the final required only three names. is then a corruption of (for as a corruption of, cf. v. 14 for (the mothers of), a corruption which may have been in the Chronicler's text of Genesis.

This hypothesis explains: the absence of initial ; the otherwise unknown as a son of Benjamin; the final when Gn. 46 (s) knows ten sons of Benjamin (but corrected text nine, see on 8-9), Nu. 26 five, and 1 Ch. 8 five; the strangeness of the following names; and eliminates the doublet while restoring the missing Zebulun in the proper place.

When once the error had been made, the tendency to make the table plainly Benjaminite would naturally be strong. Bela and Becher in vv. followed of necessity. has carried the matter
still farther by substituting \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \) (doubtless an error for \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \) in vv. 5, 10). Anathoth and Alemeth were added to the list of v. 4, none of the others being geographical, and Ehud was inserted into v. 10 from Ju. 3. It is tempting to suppose that the anomalous Benjamin had the same origin. Then the first scribe simply placed \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \) on the margin, and these words made their way into the text in reverse order as separate names. This tendency to add Benjaminites names is illustrated further by the appendix Shuppim also and Huppim (v. 11) from Gn. 46, which is out of place even as the list stands (cf. \( \text{ךָלְשַׁב} \) v. 6).

In spite of the meagreness of Zebulunite material in the OT., there are some striking points of contact between this genealogy and Zebulun besides the resemblances of the names of v. 6 to Gn. 46. \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \) (v. 7) suggests \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \) (Ju. 12, 19), a “minor judge” of Bethlehem of Zebulun (see Moore, Judges, p. 310). It is significant that \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \) (probably representing the original Greek tradition) in Ju. read \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \), making it still more probable that we have the same name in both passages, the Chronicler having found it with the second and third consonants transposed. This judge is introduced here just as Elon, the other Zebulunite judge, is in Gn. 46, and as Tola, the judge of Issachar (Ju. 10), in Gn. 46 and 1 Ch. 7. A point of contact with Zebulun is found also in the striking name Tarshish, in v. 10, which is unknown as a Hebrew man’s name. As is well known, this name stands in the OT. for all great shipping interests. Now, the special characterisation of Zebulun in Gn. 49 is the fact that he shall be “a haven for ships (ךָנַבְיָה).” Such a connection with Tarshish could be given to no other tribe, and least of all to the inland tribe of Benjamin.* Furthermore, the name Chenanaah, found elsewhere only as the father of the prophet Zeekiah (1 K. 22, 2 Ch. 18), a favourite with Ahab (!), with the meaning “toward Canaan,” i.e., Phœnicia, is singularly appropriate in a tribe of which the same passage in Gn. says, “his border shall be upon Sidon.”

* That \( \text{ךָנַבְיָה} \) and that Tarshish is more appropriate as a Zebulunite name were suggested by Professor C. C. Torrey after reading the preceding.
Aside from this passage Zebulunite names are few in the OT. Among the princes of the tribes during the Wilderness Period was an Eliab the son of Helon as prince of Zebulun (Nu. 1:27; 25:11), and a Gadiel son of Zodi represented the tribe as one of the spies (Nu. 13:10). At the division of the land Elizaphan the son of Parnach was the prince who acted for this tribe (Nu. 34:17). Among the judges we find the Zebulunites Iibzan and Elon (Ju. 12:9) (v. s). The Chronicler's list of the captains of the tribes in the time of David contains the Zebulunite Ishmaiaiah son of Obadiah (1 Ch. 27).  

The emended text of this genealogy is rendered as follows: 6. The sons of Zebulun*: Sered*, and Elon*, and Jahle'el* (or Jedid'a'el), three. 7. And the sons of Sered*: Ezbon, and 'Uzzi, and 'Uzzi'el, and Jerimoth, and 'Iri,† five; . . . 8. And the sons of Elon*: Zemirah†, and Jo'ash, and El'azaar, and Eli'senai, and 'Omri, and Jeremoth, and Abijah. All these were the sons of Elon*. 9. . . . 10. And the sons of Jahle'el* (or Jedid'a'el): Bilhan. And the sons of Bilhan: Je'ush, and Chen'anah, and Zethan†, and Tarshish, and Ahishakar†. 11. All these were the sons of Jahle'el* (or Jedid'a'el) . . .  

The total enrolment of the warriors of Zebulun is here 22,034 (v. 1) + 20,200 (v. 5) + 17,200 (v. 11) = 59,434 against 50,000 (25:17), 57,400 (Nu. 1:11), 60,500 (Nu. 26:11).

While Zebulun's genealogy appears clearly, as stated above, in behalf of the view generally held that the genealogy is that of Benjamin, Jedidael may be regarded as the equivalent of Ashbel mentioned in the list of Benjamin's sons in 8:1 Gn. 46:11 Nu. 26:11—i. e., "Known of God" has been substituted through religious scruples for "Man of Baal" (cf. for similar changes of names 3:4 8:1); then may be emphasised the presence of the Benjaminite names Jerimoth (vv. 1†), Anathoth and Alemeth (v. 1), Benjamin and Ehud (v. 10), and Shuppim and Huppim (v. 11 v. s).
12. The genealogy of Dan.—The first two names in this verse, Shuppim and Huppim, are a late addition to the preceding section derived from Gn. 46 (restored text) Nu. 26, and are a part of the process by which that genealogy was made over from being Zebulunite to Benjaminite (v. s. on vv. **). The endings should be *am* as in Nu. and not *im* as though plural, since the adjectives are Huphamite (חָפָם) and Shuphamite —

The sons of Dan, Hushim his son, one* (v. i.) The name 'Ir doubtless arose from a corrupt text through the influence of 'Iri, v. **. Hushim appears as the one son of Dan in Gn. 46, and in Nu. 26** as Shuham. Hushim as a Benjaminite name in the corrupt passage 8**,** probably helped to corrupt this passage after the preceding had been made a Benjaminite genealogy (v. s.). Aher (אחא), רכ, seems very probably a corruption of the numeral one (“One”), since to add the number was a favourite practice of the Chronicler, cf. vv. ** et al., and lack of genealogical material was a special reason for the addition here.

12. *are a later addition, cf. Gn. 46 Nu. 26 (v. s.).—* [The sons of Dan Hushim his son one] read with Klo. PRE. This seems preferable to finding ב hidden in רָע (Be.). Bacher thinks יכ, יכ, “sons of the city,” euphemistic for יכ, יכ, to which the Chronicler objected because of the idolatry practised by the Danites (Ju. 18* x K. 12**), and compares the Talmudic use of יכ for יכ (Rome); יכ has a similar import and is a gloss to יכ (ZAW. xviii. (1898), pp. 236–8).

13. The genealogy of Naphtali, cf. Gn. 46 Nu. 26** (v. s.).—This brief genealogy is taken word for word from Gn. 46** with the single omission of these before sons of Bilhah which stood in the original clause with reference to the sons of Dan as well as those of Naphtali.

13. יָעַל* 23 mss., Gn. 46 Nu. 26** without the second י. —מָעַל* seven mss., Gn. and Nu. 26** מָעַל.

VII. 14–29. Manasseh and Ephraim. —The Chronicler groups the two sons of Joseph together, giving (1) the genealogy of Manasseh (vv. **), (2) the genealogy of Ephraim (vv. **), (3)
dwelling-places of Ephraim (v. 11), (4) dwelling-places of Manasseh (v. 19). The genealogy of Manasseh, while not without connection with those given in Jos. 17* Nu. 26* is presented in quite an independent form. Kittel (SBOT. Kom.) ascribes it to an older source. To the same source he gives vv. 11 (from and Env.) of the genealogy of Ephraim. There is no reason to doubt that vv. 11-19 belong to the original compilation of the Chronicler, since it can hardly be contended (with Bn.) that the Chronicler does not describe the dwelling-places elsewhere (cf. 4* 5*, etc.). The contents of these verses are derived from Jos. 16* 17*, which were rewritten by the Chronicler. It appears that instead of trying to give all the dwelling-places of these two tribes, the writer intends to describe their combined territory by giving the cities on the southern and on the northern borders. Shechem, belonging to Ephraim, then, defines the boundary between the two tribes. Possibly Ayah, whose site is unknown, was given for the same purpose.

14-19. The genealogy of Manasseh.—14. The sons of Manasseh* which his Aramaic concubine bore: she bore Machir the father of Gilead]. This statement is identical with Gn. 46* Machir appears as the eldest son of Manasseh and as the father of Gilead in Jos. 17* and Nu. 36*. In Gn. 50* the birth of Machir and also of his sons is placed in Egypt. The descent here given from an Aramaic concubine points to a different story and arose probably from the close association and admixture of the Manassites east of the Jordan with the Arameans. In Ju. 5* Machir represents a tribe in Israel, evidently Manasseh. He is called the father of Gilead because the clan of Machir conquered Gilead.—15. And Gilead took a wife whose name was Ma'acah and the name of his sister was Hammolecheth † and the name of his brother Zelophhad *]. Ma'acah represents the small Aramean kingdom, district, or people situated east of the Sea of Galilee near Mt. Hermon, hence either adjoining the territory of Manasseh Dt. 3* Jos. 12* or included in it Jos. 13*. Cf. 2 S. 10* where the King of Ma'acah is hired against David, and Gn. 22* where Ma'acah the tribal father appears as a son of Nahor. Ma'acah the wife of Gilead reflects the same historical circum-
stances as the Aramean concubine, v. 14. Hammolecheth (she who reigns) (מלכה) is to be compared with Milcah (queen) (מלכה) the wife of Naḥor (Gn. 11:1), and reflects probably, with Maʿacah, a close connection with the Arameans. While the name here may be tribal (Gray, *HPN*. p. 116), it undoubtedly was originally a divine title. In Nu. 26:14 (P) Zelophḥad is given as the fourth in descent from Manasseh through Machir, Gilead, and Hepheth.

—16. 17. And Maʿacah the wife of Gilead* bore a son and called his name Peresh † and the name of his brother was Sheresh †; and his sons, Ulam and Rekem; and the sons of Ulam, Bedan †: these are the sons of Gilead, etc.]. These sons or clans are otherwise entirely unknown. For a reoccurrence of the name Ulam cf. 8:15, of Rekem 2:11. Jos. 18:14 Nu. 31:10 Jos. 13:21. For further sons of Gilead connected with the tribe of Judah see 2:12.—18. Ishhod †. —Abi-esser] in Jos. 17* a son of Manasseh and in Ju. 61:9. 11. 18. the family of Gideon.—Mahlah] in Nu. 26:14 37 Jos. 17* one of the daughters of Zelophḥad.—19. Shemida† probably originally stood also in v. 18 as a son of Hammolecheth: a son of Manasseh Jos. 17*, a son of Gilead Nu. 26:14.—Ahjan †.—Shechem] a son of Manasseh Jos. 17*, a son of Gilead Nu. 26:14.—Lekhi † (לְחוּ) possibly corresponds to Helek (לְחָלֹת) Nu. 26:14 Jos. 17*, and Amiam † (אָמְיָם) to Noah (נֹהֶם) daughter of Zelophḥad Nu. and Jos.—The writer here has not clearly distinguished between the clans of eastern and western Manasseh. His scheme differs considerably from those of Jos. and Nu. (see Manasseh in *DB*. III.).

14. The name Ashriel (אַשְריאָל), while suggested by Jos. 17* Nu. 26:14, where Asriel appears among the sons of Manasseh or Gilead, is probably a dittography arising from the following text (Mov., Be., Zoe., Oe., Kau., Bn., Ki.).—15. The present text yields the following: And Machir took a wife of Huppim and Shuppim (i.e., of these Benjaminites families, cf. v. 19) and the name of his sister was Maʿacah and the name of the second Zelophḥad. But according to vv. 14. 18 Maʿacah was the wife of Machir and Hammolecheth his sister. Mov. changed † to † and read and the name of the first was Maʿacah and the name of the second Zelophḥad. But Zelophḥad in Nu. 26:14 37 Jos. 17* is a man. The connection of Machir or his wife with Huppim and Shuppim looks strange also. Hence these words
are better regarded as a gloss from v. 13 or an original position on the margin and the text further emended as follows: non nra npS
meS* vna osn naSon mnn ojyi
na^ro with translation above (Bn., Ki.). Gilead is read instead of Machir as the husband of Maacah because the sons given in v. 17 are called the sons of Gilead, hence in v. 18 Gilead is to be read instead of Machir.

20–29. The genealogy of Ephraim.—(Cf. Ephraim Genealogy, Hogg, JQR. XIII. [Oct. 1900] p. 147.) Viewing this section as a whole, it exhibits little dependence upon OT. sources and shows considerable complication of material or is very corrupt.—

20. 21a. This line of descent abruptly ending in v. 19 may originally have formed a part of one of Joshua and suffered the interruption of vv. 1b–4. Ezer and Ele'ad cannot have been its final members in this connection, because the context regards them as immediate sons and not later descendants of Ephraim. But whatever the design of this line of descent, it has been constructed out of a list of sons of Ephraim similar to that in Nu. 26, 1. These may originally have completed the statement, And the sons of Ephraim. These sons were Shuthelah (נְוַלָּהָ), Becher (בֵּרֵךְ), here Bered (בֵּרֵד), Tahan (תַּחֲנָה), here Tahath (תָּחָת), and also 'Eran (עֵרוֹ) son of Shuthelah (cf. La'adan לָעָד v. 18). The two names Ezer and Ele'ad, v. 17 (the latter occasioning Ele'adah v. 18), seem on the other hand to have belonged to the narrative 1b–4, which is entirely independent of the material of Nu. Zabad (זָבָד) v. 19 may be derived from and Bered (בֵּרֵד). (On whether Becher or Bered belonged to the earliest list of Ephraim's sons, v. Hogg art. s., also EBi. col. 1320).—21b–24. A story explaining the name of Beriah, the founder probably of Beth-horon and possibly a reputed ancestor of Joshua.—And the men of Gath who were natives in the land slew them i.e., Ezer and Ele'ad, because they came down to take away their cattle. This patriarchal story is difficult of explanation. In the light of the story of the sojourn in Egypt, this raid, if by immediate sons of Ephraim, must have been made from Egypt, in spite of the expression “go down” (וַיָּשָׁבוּ). This was the explanation of the earlier commentators, who regarded Ephraim and his children as historical persons. But the use of וַיָּשָׁבוּ, “go down,” points almost
conclusively to a foray from Mt. Ephraim into the plains of Philistia, and this little narrative is probably a reminiscence of some such event (Be., Ki.). Two Ephraimitic families, 'Ezer and Ele'ad, probably were destroyed in such a raid, and the original Ephraim, who mourned many days, was the tribe or the hill country. Cf. Rachel weeping in Je. 31st. Or the narrative may be entirely imaginary, a purely etymological legend to explain the Ephraimitic family name Beri'ah (בְּרֵיעָה as though derived from בְּרִיעָה "in evil"). (On this narrative cf. Ew. Hist. I. p. 380; Sayce, Pat. Pal. p. 202; We. Prol. p. 214; EBi. Beri'ah.)—Beri'ah] a Levitical name 23**, also that of a son of Asher vv. 26. Gn. 4617 Nu. 2644, and in the list of the descendants of Benjamin 811. 11. See further on vv. 26. 24. And his daughter was She'erah † and she built Beth-horon the lower and the upper, and Uzzen-she'erah †]. This verse in its present form is suspicious because elsewhere in the OT. the founders of cities are men.—Beth-horon]. Cf. 611 (6.1).—Uzzen-she'erah] as a place is entirely unidentified and otherwise unknown.—25. And Rephah † his son and Resheph †]. The present text of v. 26 suggests her son instead of his son. Perhaps after Resheph, "his son" should also be supplied (Ki.).—And Telah †] (תל) an abbreviation probably of Shuthelah (שׁוֹדֶל) v. 11.—Tahan]. Cf. Ta'ath v. 11. 26. Ladan] (לדָּן) probably from לְדָּן with ה prefixed see vv. 26. 11), elsewhere a Levite name 23. 26. —Ammihud] and Elishama] are taken from Nu. 11, where the latter the son of the former is the "head" of Ephraim, but only here is Nun (v. 26) the father of Joshua brought into connection with them.—27. This is the only record of Joshua's line of descent and its late and artificial character reveals itself at once.—Nun] (נְנָה) elsewhere in OT. Nun (נְנָה).—28. A brief description of the possessions of Ephraim through the mention of the southern boundary Bethel, mod. Beitin, ten miles north of Jerusalem, the eastern Na'aran (Jos. 16. Na'arah) placed by Jerome and Eusebius within five miles of Jericho, not identified (Bn., but see EBi.), the western Gezer, and evidently the northern Shechem unto the unknown 'Ayyah or 'Azzah.—29. Four principal and well-known towns of Manasseh are here enumerated, beginning with Beth-
shean, mod. Beisân, on the east in the Jordan valley, and passing westward through the plain of Esdraelon, where Ta'anach mod. Ta'annak, and Megiddo mod. el-Lejjân (Baed. p. 224), are located, to Dor mod. Tantura on the coast. Cf. Jos. 17* Ju. 1*.

—These two verses in contents are agreeable to Jos. 16* Ju. 17 but not in form, and hence are either a composition of the Chronicler or from the source of the genealogies given above.

24. 25a. Hogg (op. cit.) restores as follows: He it was that built Beth-horon the lower and the upper and 'Irheres (cf. Timnath-heres Ju. 2* and Hepher (Jos. 12*).—25. many MSS. and editions (including the Bomberg Bible) kai kal Balaaâ kal al kômâi apôthê, cf. Jos. 17*.

30–40. The genealogy of Asher.—30. 31. And the sons of Asher, Jimnah and Jishvah and Jishvi and Beriah and Serah, their sister, and the sons of Beriah, Heber and Malchiel]. This statement is identical with Gn. 46*. In Nu. 26* Jishvah (יוֹשֵׁב) is wanting; and hence Jishvah (יוֹשֵׁב) and Jishvi (יוֹשֵׁב) represent the same clan, the dittography already appearing in Gn. In Jimnah (יִגְנָה) one may see a form of Jamin (יוֹמִי) right hand, i.e., a southern clan. The appearance of Beriah as a clan of Ephraim and a family of Benjamin (cf. v. *) has been alleged to indicate that the tribe of Asher originally came from the region of Mt. Ephraim and was an offshoot of the early Hebrews who settled there (Stuemmagel, Einwand Is. Stämme, p. 31). Possibly then a connection might be found between Jimnah and Benjamin. Heber and Malchiel are of especial interest because they seem identical with the Ḥabiri and Malchiel mentioned in the Amarna tablets (JBL. XI. [1892] p. 120, Hom. AHT. p. 233). A connection also may be seen between Heber and Heber the Kenite (Ju. 4*) (v. Heber EBi.).—The father of Birzaith] a supplementary clause not in Gn. Birzaith is probably the name of a town, not identified (בִּרְצַאיִת “olive-well”).—32–34. And Heber begat Japhlet † and Shomer (?) and Hotham (?) and Shu'a † their sister. And the sons of Japhlet †, Pasach † and Bimhal † and 'Ashvath †. And the sons of Shemer his
brother* Rohgah † and Hubbah † and Aram]. Shemer and Shomer, v. 11, are identical, with preference for the former (Bn., Ki.). A connection between Hubbah (Hebrew) and Hobab (Aramaic) Ju. 4" (cf. Heber v. 11) has been seen.—35. And the sons* of Helem his brother Zophah † and Jimna † and Shelesh † and 'Amal †]. Helem is undoubtedly the same as Hotham in v. 11, but which is correct cannot be determined. Ki. prefers the latter.—36. 37. And the sons of Zophah Suah † and Hamepher † and Shual and Beri † and Jimrah †, Bezer and Hod † and Shammah and Shilshah † and Jithran and Be'era].—38. And the sons of Jether, Jephunneh and Pispa † and Ara †]. Jether is clearly the same as Jithran v. 11.—39. And the sons of Ulla, Arah, Hanniel and Ripsa]. Ulla stands clearly by corruption for one of the previously mentioned "sons," but which one it is impossible to determine. As is seen from the daggers above, fully one-third of the names of the descendants of Asher occur only here, and the remaining third, omitting vv. 11 †, do not occur elsewhere in connection with Asher. The names are not distinctly personal, and many of them undoubtedly represent places as well as families (cf. Bezer v. 11 a Reubenite town Dt. 4"; Shu'al v. 11, and Shilsha v. 11 = Shalisha, the names of districts 1 S. 13' 91). Jithran v. 11 is the name of a Horite clan, Gn. 36", and Arakh v. 11 of a family of the return Ezr. 2". These names as a whole, then, are ancient, either preserved in Asherite families of the time of the Chronicler or taken from some ancient record about the Asherites (Gray, HPN. pp. 239 f.).—40. On derivation of these statistics cf. v. 1.—26,000]. According to Nu. 11 Asher numbered 41,500 men and according to Nu. 26" 53,400. The census here, however, is evidently confined to the clan of Heber.

34. In place of who with following † read who his brother, cf. v. 11 (Bn., Ki.).—35. Instead of read as the context demands.—37. two mss. (Jaale), cf. v. 11.—40. part. of only in the writings of the Chronicler, cf. 91 16" Ne. 5' (l. 16).

VIII. The genealogy of Benjamin.—(Cf. Hogg, JQR. XI: Oct. 1893, pp. 102 ff.) The conditions here reflected are clearly
post-exilic, as appears for the following reasons: (a) The places
of residence, not mentioning Jerusalem, are towns recurring in
the post-exilic history—Gibea (v. 2), cf. Ezr. 2; Lod and Ono
(v. 3), cf. Ezr. 2; Gibeon (v. 4), cf. Ne. 7. (b) Many of the
names belong also to that period, viz.: Meshullam, Hanan, Elam,
Hananiah, Anthothiah (Anathoth), cf. Ne. 10, 11, 14, 15, 16.
(c) The coincidence between the residence in or connection with Moab
(v. 5) and the name Pahath-moab representing an important family
among the post-exilic Jews (Ezr. 2; etc.). (Be conjectures
that the birth of this Pahath-moab, “prince of Moab,” is referred
to in v. 6.) (d) The Benjaminites had a considerable part in the
post-exilic community along with the children of Judah and the
Levites.

1–5. The sons of Benjamin.—And Benjamin begat Bela’ his
first born, Ashbel the second and Aharah the third and Noahah the
fourth and Rapha the fifth. And the sons of Bela’ were Addar
and Gera and Abihud and Abishua and Na’amân and Ahoa’
and Gera and Shephuphan and Huram. This list of sons and
grandsons of Benjamin is a development of the original list of Gn.
46 where the sons of Benjamin, in the restored text (Ball.
SBOT.), appear as three sets of triplets: Bela’, Becher, Ashbel; Gera,
Na’amân, Ahi ram; Shupham, Hupham, and Ard. These appear
also in Nu. 26–28, with the variation that Becher and Gera are
lacking, probably through an error of transcription (the former
perhaps having found a place among the sons of Ephraim Nu.
26), and that Na’amân and Ard are subordinated as sons of
Bela’. (In Gn. 46 not only is Na’amân the son of Bela’ but
also Gera, Ahi ram, Shupham, and Hupham; and Ard becomes
the son of Gera.) Tradition then fluctuated between assigning nine
sons immediately to Benjamin or a portion of them mediately
through Bela’. Examining now the names in our text, if we omit
Abihud and Abishua’ (to be considered below) we find that the
others are apparently simply those of the underlying list of Gn.
given, where not identical, in corrupted forms and with repetition.
Becher (בֵּית), which seems to be entirely lacking, lies hidden in
first-born (בֵּית); Aharah (אָהָרָה) and Ahoa (אַחֹא) are tran-
scribers’ variations of Ahi ram (אֵיחָרָה); Noahah (נוֹאָה) and
Rapha (רָפָּה) are likewise probably variations of Na'amān (נָאָמָן) and Gera (גֵּרָה); Addar (אֲדָר) of Ard (אָרָד) and Huram (חָרוֹם) of Hupham (חָוָּם) (Hogg, op. cit.). Since Nokhā and Rapha are between Ahiram and Ard, Shupham and Hupham, after the order in Nu., have been, with less probability, found in them (Ke., Zoe., Bn.). In regard to Abihud and Abishua', which follow Gera in vv. 4, these proper names seem to have arisen from the qualifying phrases father of Ehud (according to Ju. 314) and father of Shua (שיָע) appears as a Judahite or Canaanite personal name in Gn. 381, but most likely here is a corruption of Shu'al (שְׁוָאֵל) a district of Benjamin, 1 S. 1317). Of these "sons" the hidden Becher appears in the family of Sheba', who revolted against David (2 S. 204), and in Bechorath in the line of the descent of Saul (1 S. 9). Saul probably was of the clan of Becher (Marquart, Fundamente, pp. 14 f.). In Nu. 26 Becher is among the families of Ephraim. Sheba' the Bichrite was also from Mt. Ephraim 2 S. 20. Such a close connection and interchange between Benjamin and Ephraim is natural. Ashbel is equivalent to Ishba'al (אִשְׁבָּאֶל), man of Baal, the name of Saul's son (cf. v. 11). Gera appears in Ju. 314 as the father, i.e., family, of Ehud. The other sons or clans of Benjamin are not mentioned elsewhere except in the genealogical connections just given.

6-28. The descendants of Ehud (?).—These verses, 111, present apparently, with their descent from Ehud the Benjaminites hero and judge, a list of five heads of fathers, i.e., post-exilic families: Elpa'al (vv. 14-15), Beriah (vv. 16-18), Shema' (Shime'i) (vv. 19-21), Shashak (vv. 20-22), Jeroham (Jeremoth) (vv. 22-27), with their sons, i.e., households or sub-families (vv. 28-31), residing in Jerusalem v. 28 (?)(v. i.). Vv. 1-411, which give their descent or connection with Ehud, are exceedingly obscure and corrupt, not only from customary errors of transcriptions in lists of names, but also from legendary or historical notices which, probably made originally as marginal notes, became later a portion of the text.—6. And these are the sons of Ehud]. The text fails to give these sons of Ehud who are the heads of fathers (i.e., of families) of Geba', unless at the end of v. 7 (Be., Ke., Zoe.) or hidden in the utterly obscure sentence
And they carried them captive to Mahanath (םהנהה בֵּית מַהֲנָא). This latter is the view of Hogg (op. cit.), who finds therein the proper names Iglaam (after the גיילאא‎ rendering of וּגְלַאא‎ in v. 7) and 'Aleme {cf. 11). (That should have been corrupted into ולא מַהֲנָא arose from the reading of והלֹה as a verb and thus seeking an expression to correspond to the verbal idea.)

—7. And Na'amah and Ahijah and Gera]. These three names are clearly a dittography from vv. 4—5, where they appear in the same order. Ahijah (אַּחִיָּהּ) is a variation of an original Ahiram {אַחִירָם).—He carried them away captive: and he begat 'Uzza and Ahihud]. One is tempted to see in these obscure words a continuation of the dittography. Cf. the texts Hogg renders them: And Iglaam begat 'Uzza and Ahishahar]. Ahishahar {אחישחר), a Benjaminite name in 7vi and suggested by Shaharaim in v. "vi, is substituted for Ahihud (אחיהוד). (The text אַחִיָּהּ אַחִירָם becomes אחיהוד שחרים琥ד.) With adherence to the Massoretic text, these verses have yielded the statement that Ehud’s sons mentioned at the end of v. 7 were carried to Manahath, a place of uncertain situation (cf. 24), by Na'amah, Ahijah, and Gera, the last being the principal instigator of their removal (Be., Ke., Zoe.). Others, rejecting this interpretation, regard the verses as corrupt beyond restoration (Kau., Ki., Bn.).—8-11. And Shaharaim begat in the field of Moab after he had sent them away Hushim and Ba'ara his wives, and he begat from Hodesh his wife Jobab, etc. . . . these his sons are the heads of fathers; and from Hushim he begat Abitub and Elpa'al. These verses, like the preceding, appear corrupt beyond only the most tentative restoration; Shaharaim is without connection with foregoing text; begat v. 8 has no object; Hushim is elsewhere a man’s name (7vi). The grammatical constructions are also very harsh. A suggested restoration of vv. 8—11 is, And Shaharaim begat in the field of Moab, after he had driven them (i.e., the Moab-
the words omitted arising from a gloss written by some one who wished to show that the sons of Hushim had rights of age earlier than the founding of Lod and Ono v. 11 (Bn.). The rendering of Hogg (see above for the beginning of v. 1) is: And he (Iglam) begat in the field of Moab Mesha their sister and Hushim (and his wife was Ba'ara). And Ahishahar begat Jobab, etc. These were his sons heads of their fathers' houses. Possibly, for another rendering of v. 1, a fem. proper name is concealed in אָשִּׁים (Hogg, see above for the beginning of v. 1). Then אָשִּׁים is a corruption for אָשִּׁים, and בְּשִׁיר (which read אָשִּׁים) is to be struck out, and we have and Shaharaim begat in the field of Moab of Shelho (?) his wife, Hushim and Ba'ara.—11. According to the text, the sons of Shahrain by his wife Hushim are here enumerated. If, however, we connect the מ of מִחְיוֹז with the last word of v. 10, reading מִחְיוֹז their fathers, Hushim becomes the subject of begat (דְּלוֹר). (The text originally may have been דְּלוֹר הָעֵשִׁים.) And hence he is the father of Abitub and Elpa'al and (omitting the misplaced clause and the parenthetical clauses) of Bertah, Shema' v. 11, Shashak, and Jeremoth v. 14. These five names, repeated in vv. 16. 16. 16. 16. 17, clearly go together as sons of a common ancestor. Ahio v. 16 (אַחִיו) is not a proper name, but after מִחְיוֹז or מִחְיוֹז his brother or his brothers (Be., Oe.), or reading מִחְיוֹז their brothers (Ki., Bn., Hogg).—12a. And the sons of Elpa'al were 'Eber, Misham and Shemed]. This clause appears to have wrongly come into the text through some transcriber's blunder, inasmuch as Elpa'al's sons are given below in vv. 17. 17, and the names of three there are sufficiently similar to these to establish their identity. וַהֲנֵר מַשְׁלֹם יִשְׂרָיִל הָעֵבֶר מַשְׁעָה סֵפֶר (SWM).—12b. He built Ono and Lod and their dependencies (daughters)]. The reference is to Elpaal (Zoe., Oe., Hogg).—Ono] mod. Kefr 'And, some seven miles east and a little south from Jaffa and five miles north of Lod (in later literature Lydda), mod. Ludd, which is eleven and three-quarters miles south-east from Jaffa on the railway to Jerusalem (SWP. II. pp. 251. 267, Bae'd. I p. 11, cf. Schlür. Gesch. II. p. 183, n. 33). These towns are mentioned in
the OT. only in the writings of the Chronicler and then usually together as towns inhabited by the children of Benjamin (Ne. 11*), and of which sons, with those of Hadid, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. 2* Ne. 7*). The towns themselves, however, are ancient. Ono occurs in the list of Palestinian towns conquered by Thothmes III, and, according to Mariette, Brugsch, and others, but not W. Max Müller, Lod also (v. Lydda EBi.). Their possession by the post-exilic Jews, which is clearly referred to in this building, seems to have taken place not immediately on the return of the Jews from Babylon, as might be inferred from the references (given above) in Ezra and Nehemiah, but at the close of the Persian and the beginning of the Grecian period, when the Jews gradually spread out from the territory in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem. First in 145 B.C. did the district of Lydda come into the possession of the Jews through a decree of Demetrius II (1 Mac. 11* Meyer, Entst. Jud. p. 107, Schür. Gesch. I. p. 183). Hence the inference that this statement is very late (Bn.). The references to Moab, v. * and Aijalon, v. 11, may refer to similar colonisations or settlements of Jews.—13. And Beriah and Shema'] sons of Hushim; a continuation of the enumeration of v. 11 (v. s.). Beriah, cf. 711. 11. Shema' (Sham/i v. 11) probably the name of a place 211 1, a Reubenite 51, a priest Ne. 81 †.—These] i.e., Beriah and Shema'.—Aijalon] Jos. 19* 21* Ju. 1* et al., the present village of Ydib, a little to the north of the Jaffa road, about thirteen miles from Jerusalem (SWP. III. p. 19, Baed. p. 93).—These put to flight the inhabitants of Gath]. This statement is entirely obscure. Owing to the common name Beriah here and in 711, this route of the men of Gath may be regarded as connected with the event underlying the narrative of 711 (Be., Oe., Bn.; this connection is not favoured by Ke., Zoe.). The story of 711 looks like the reminiscence of some pre-exilic happening, but since here we are concerned with late post-exilic families, this sentence probably arose from a marginal note.—14. And their brethren* Shashak † and Jeremoth]. On the emendation and connection of this verse with the foregoing see v. 11.—15. 16. The six sons of Beriah. Zebadiah a common name v. 17 (where perhaps a dittography from this verse) 12* 26* 2 Ch. 17* 19* Ezr. 8* 10*.
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(name of city Nu. 21:33, Jos. 12:16). 'Eder, cf. 23:24 (also name of a city Jos. 15:19). Michael, see 5:1 (Steuernagel, Einwanderung Is. Stämme, p. 30, reads מיכאל and connects with the clan of Asher of that name, cf. 7:1). Ishpah †. Joha also 11:14.—17. 18. The seven (?) sons of Epa'al. Zebadiah, see v. 19. Meshullam, see 5:16, probably Mish'am in v. 19. Hiski †. Heber mentioned among the sons of Beri'ah of the tribe of Asher 7:1, probably the same as 'Eber v. 19. Ishmerai † probably Shemed in v. 19. Izli'ah †. Jobab, cf. v. 19, otherwise name of Arabic people Gn. 10:17, King of Edom Gn. 36:17, Canaanitish King of Madon Jos. 11:1.—19-21. The nine sons of Shimei (שֶׁם, in v. 19). Jakim also 24:18. Zichri common, vv. 11, 17, 9, 26, 27. 2 Ch. 17:14, 23:1, 28:17, Ne. 11:7, 12:1. Zabdi, three other persons are mentioned of this name: (1) 37, (2) Ne. 11:7, (3) Jos. 7:1. El'ılanai †, but probably the same as the name Eli'enai, occurring as the name of five distinct persons in (1) 3:4, (2) 4:9, (3) 7:1, (4) Ezr. 10:9 with Ne. 12:9, (5) Ezr. 10:9. Zillethai, cf. for another occurrence of the name 12:9. Eli'el, name of eight additional persons or families: (1) v. 11, (2) 5:24, (3) 6:10, (4, 5) 11:17, (6) 12:1, (7) 15:8 with 11, (8) 2 Ch. 31:11. 'Adai'ak, seven other persons or families of this name are mentioned: (1) 6:11, (2) 9:11 Ne. 11:13, (3) 2 Ch. 23:1, (4) Ezr. 10:11, (5) Ezr. 10:11, (6) Ne. 11:17, (7) 2 K. 22:1. Berai'ah †. Shimrath †.—22-25. The eleven sons of Shashak. Ishpah †. 'Eber, cf. v. 19, a common name: (1) the son of Shelah 1:37, (2) a Gadite chief 5:16, (3) a priest Ne. 12:9. The tradition of the name is uncertain; Baer adopts Ebed (אֶבֶד), so ג. Eli'el, see v. 19. 'Abdon, also as name of distinct persons or families: (1) v. 9:9, (2) 2 Ch. 34:18, (3) Ju. 12:11. Zichri, see v. 19. Hanan, common name v. 9:9, 11:18 Ezr. 2:4 Ne. 7:10 10:11. 11:13, 13:11. Hananiah, also a very common name from the time of Jeremiah onward, see BDB. 'Elam, a geographical name Gn. 10:27 et al., that of a Korahite 26:1, and of two prominent families in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah Ezr. 2:8, 10:3 Ne. 7:10 10:3 and Ezr. 2:4 Ne. 7:12. The post-exilic occurrence of the name suggests a connection with Elam, Persia. This Cheyne regards as highly improbable and suggests its origin from an abbreviation 'Ale'meth (אֲלָמֶת) or
'Almon (עֶלְמוֹן), a Benjaminite name (cf. 7 and v. s. v.4) (EBi. II. col. 1254). 'Anthothijah †, to be associated with the Levitical Benjaminite town Anathoth, Jos. 21.18 Is. 10.10 Je. 11 et al.; a personal name 7 and Ne. 10.19. Iphdeiah †. Penu'el (Peni'el Qr.) cf. 4. — 26. 27. The six sons of Jeroham (Jeremoth v.14). This name appears in the pedigree of the prophet Samuel 1 S. 21.1 Ch. 6.11.12 (m. 41); also as that of five other persons or families: (1) 9.13, (2) 12.1, (3) 27.26, (4) 2 Ch. 23.1, (5) Ne. 11.19. Shamsherai †. Shehariah † (cf. Sheharaín v.4). 'Athaliah, the name of the Queen of Judah 2 K. 11.1, and of a member of the family of Elam Ezr. 8.1. Ja'aresiah †. Elijah, besides being the name of the prophet, is only elsewhere given in the OT. as the name of a priest, Ezr. 10.41, and an Israelite a son of Elam Ezr. 10.41, who had foreign wives. Zichri, cf. v.19.— 28. These were heads of fathers, i.e., of families, according to their genealogies they were heads] a reiteration after the manner of P.— These dwell in Jerusalem] i.e., all of these families whose heads are enumerated. This dwelling is clearly meant to be of the time of the Chronicler. — It is doubtful, however, whether this verse belonged originally in this context. It agrees verbatim with 91 with the omission of the words of the Levites (ניתליילתי) and seems to have come into its present place along with v.26 = 91, from c. 9. The subscription stating that these families dwell in Jerusalem is contrary to the tenor of this chapter, which has already placed Elpa'al as the builder of Ono and Lod, and Beria'h and Shema' at Aijalon. The form of statement In Gibeon dwell, etc., is parallel to nothing in c. 8, while in c. 9 it has a parallel in v.1. Hence the inference with apparent correctness has been drawn that vv. 26—28 originally stood in c. 9 and are here an insertion (Mov., Meyer, Entst. Jud. p. 161). Others have felt that the double record was due to the Chronicler and appropriate not only here in the list of the Benjaminites but also in c. 9, as the proper introduction to the narrative of Saul, c. 10 (Be., Ke., Zoe., Ba.). Still again, the original place has been thought to have been here and its repetition due to the fact that 91—92 is a supplement to the work of the Chronicler, and after its insertion a transcriber who had texts before him both with and without this supplement copied 81 = 92 twice (Bn.) (on
29–38. The genealogy of the house of Saul, repeated in 9**. 29. In Gib'eôn dwelt the father of Gibeon Je'uel,* and the name of his wife was Ma'acah and his first born son 'Abdon then Zur and Kish and Ba'al and Ner* and Nadab and Gedor and Ahio and Zecher and Mikloth*]. Gibeon mod. village of el Jib, five or six miles north of Jerusalem, the seat of a Hebrew sanctuary i K. 3* et al., and mentioned many times in the OT. and occurring in connection with the post-exilic history of the Jews Ne. 3’ 7**. Its post-exilic importance, or its association as the place of the sanctuary 2 Ch. 1*, may have led to its substitution in the text in place of an original Gibeah, the home of the family of Saul. Je'uel, derived from 9** (יֵעֵל, Qr. יְעֵל). Ma'acah, name of frequent occurrence cf. 2** 3*. 'Abdon, cf. v. 11. Zur (زوار), name of a prince of Midian Nu. 25* 31* Jos. 13**; here undoubtedly to be connected with Zeror (זרור) in Saul's pedigree, 1 S. 9*. Kish, father of Saul 1 S. 9* et al. Ba'al, perhaps the original was Abiba'al (אביבאאל) (cf. Marquart, Fundamente, p. 15). It has also been compounded with the following Nadab (נבא), but the intervening Ner, given in 9*, also here in 9* is against this; yet, at any rate, Baal is probably an abbreviation (Noeldeke, EBi. Names § 57). Ner and also Mikloth † (v. 19*), from their mention in vv. 13*, should be inserted as in 9** † (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Bn., Ki.). Ner, elsewhere always of the father of Abner the captain of Saul's host (cf. 1 S. 14* et al.). Gedor, as a personal name only here; on place-name cf. 4*. Ahio, as a personal name cf. 2 S. 6* †, where We. reads his brother as the reading in v. 11. Dr. prefers there the proper name Ahio (TS. p. 204). † has his brother here. Zecher †, in 9* Zechariah.—32. Shimeah †) 9* Shimeam †.—Now these indeed opposite their brothers dwell with their brothers in Jerusalem]. This sentence is difficult to understand in its connection. The usual interpretation has been that these refers to the family of Mikloth or Shimeah, and that in opposite their brothers the reference is to Benjaminites dwelling in Gibeon or elsewhere outside of Jerusalem, while with their brothers refers to fellow tribesmen in
Jerusalem (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). The emphasis certainly is on the dwelling in Jerusalem. Ki. regards the words as a late gloss. Ba. suggests “The heading of a list which has been lost.” Bn. brings to a close here a paragraph of Benjaminite families in Gibeon of the period of the Chronicler. Vv. 16-17 giving the line of Saul, he regards as of doubtful origin, although probably from the Chronicler and with its heading, which should correspond to 1 S. 9:1, missing. Hogg, after finding in vv. 18-19 the descendants of the clan of Gera, sees in vv. 13-14 the descendants of Becher, “the only other Benjaminite clan known to history.” He reads בְּנֵי חֵכְרִי "And the sons of Bichri were Abdon, etc.” V. 19 he connects with v. 18 as a part of an element having arisen in its present form from its original place in c. 9.—33. And Ner begat Abner*] (Be., Oe., Kau., Ki., Bn.). (קִשׁ Kish. also 9:9.) Abner is clearly the true reading, since in 9:4 (v. also v. 10) Ner and Kish are apparently brothers, and in 1 S. 9:1 Kish is the son of Abiel, and in 1 S. 14:1 both Ner and Kish are sons of Abiel, according to the reading now generally adopted (see Sm. Com. in loco) (Ki. retained קִשׁ Kish, regarding the Ner here mentioned as “the progenitor of the line from which Saul was descended”). Zoe. gives the same view, but thinks owing to the prominence of Abner originally there was in the text, “And Ner begat Abner and Kish begat Saul.”—Jonathan and Malchishua are given among Saul’s sons in 1 S. 14:10, where also Eshbaal (אֶשֶׁבֶּל) is to be found in Ishvi, Jonathan, Malchishua, and Abinadab are mentioned as slain with their father on Mt. Gilboa (1 S. 31:2 and 2 S. as Ishboseth בֹּשֶׁת Bosheth “shame” taking the place of Baal). These changes were made to avoid the abhorred name Baal and such recensions seem to have been made at a later date than the composition of 1 Ch. (cf. Ashbel v. 4). Abinadab probably belongs also to the original text of 1 S. 14:10, since Jonathan, Malchishua, and Abinadab are mentioned as slain with their father on Mt. Gilboa (1 S. 31:2 and 2 S. as Ishboseth Bosheth “shame” taking the place of Baal). The former gives the meaning “Baal contends,” and is preferred by Nestle (Eigennamen, p. 121) and Noeldeke (EBi. Names, § 42), the latter supported by עָבֶּל Mepīḇaʿal, “Hero of Baal,” by Bn., Ki.
In 2 S. 10* et al., this son of Jonathan is called Mephiboseth (מְפִיבָסֶת). Bosheth is a substitution for Baal (v. s.), while Mephi (מְפָה) is probably a corruption of Meri (מר). This latter already appears in י, here and 9* in מְפְעִיבָסָא. — Micah] frequent personal name, cf. 5*-35. Pithon ]— Melech ["king" probably with reference to deity, and like Baal an abbreviation. י has מְלָכָה, ל מַלְכָּה (לָכָה). — Tarea' ] (חָרֵא) ] Tahrea' ] 9*.— Ahas ] besides the King of Judah, as a personal name only here. — 36. Jeho'addah] (יהוֹעָדָה) ] Ja'rah (יָעֵרָה) ] —Alemeth]. Cf. 7*-Azama'veth] (אָזָמה' וַת). "Death is strong," occurs also as the name of one of David’s heroes 11* 2 S. 23*, and of one of his officers 27*, and as either a family or place name in 12*, and that of a place, mod. Hismeh, four miles north-east of Jerusalem, hence of Benjamin, Ezr. 2* Ne. 12* with Beth Ne. 7*. —Zimri] name of King of Israel 1 K. 16* et al., of the prince of Simeon Nu. 25*, cf. also 2*-Mo'sa], the name elsewhere only 2*.—37. Bin'a ]— Raphah]. Cf. for occurrence of name elsewhere 20* 2 S. 21*. Raphiah 9*, cf. for occurrence of name 3* 4* 7* Ne. 3*.—El'asah] name not infrequent, (1) 2*, (2) Je. 29*, (3) Ezr. 10*.—Azel or Azal ] (unless Zec. 14*].—38. 'Azrikam his first born]. י, have his first born instead of בּוֹחֵר בָּא. Bocheru, which latter reading has clearly arisen from the falling of one of the six sons from the text and thus supplies the deficiency. The absence of the connective before בְּךָר בָּא shows also that the word originally was first born. Some mss. of י (cf. Holmes) supply a son Asa at the close (but not יבּוֹחֵר בָּא). י divides the name 'Azrikam into בּוֹחֵר בָּא and מָעַר. — Ishma'el] occurs frequently as a proper name in the late Hebrew and Jewish period, (1) Je. 40**, (2) 2 Ch. 19*, (3) 23*, (4) Ezr. 10*.—She'ariah ].—'Obadiah] frequent name. —Hanan] see v. *.—The names in vv. 39*-441 of the descendants of Saul are clearly designed to be personal, and since no necessarily late names appear among them and since they are free from repetitions such as appear in the artificial genealogies of the priests and Levites (cf. 5* et al. 6* et al. 6* et al.), there is no reason to doubt their genuineness (Gray, HPN. p. 241). Twelve genera-
tions from Saul are given, which would bring the record down to near the period of the exile.

39. 40. Not given in c. 9.—'Eshek [his brother] i.e., the brother of Azel (Be., Ke.), if the verse has its right context.—Ulam] only here and 714.—Je'ush] see 718.—Eliphelet] name of son of David 3* 14* and two persons mentioned in Ezr. 8* 10*.—Bow men]. Cf. 2 Ch. 14*.—One hundred and fifty]. This number fits in well with those given of families in Ezr. 2* 8*.—These verses may be taken as a fragment without close connection with the foregoing (Bn.) or following directly on v. 11 (Meyer, Enst. Jud. p. 161, Hogg). Hogg reads Shua (שוע) or perhaps Shu'al (שועל) in place of 'Eshek (אסף) and finds thus a continuation of a line of descent from Gera v. 1. Then, of course, his brother refers to the connection with Ehud v. 1.

IX. 1-34. The inhabitants of Jerusalem.—This section in vv. 1* 17. 11* has marked affinity with Ne. 11* 18. Both passages enumerate the inhabitants of Jerusalem on the same general plan, with striking coincidences in the names of the residents.

(1) The children of Judah according to the clans of Perez, Shelah (v. 1*), and Zerah, with representatives of the same name for the first two, since 'Uthai (וותי) (v. 4) is equivalent to 'Athaiah (אשתיה) (11*), and 'Asaiah (אסי) (v. 5) to Ma'asiah (משי) (11*). (2) The children of Benjamin, with Sallu son of Meshullam in each (v. 7 11*). (3) The priests with Jedaiyah, Jehoiarib, Jachin in each (v. 10 11*), 'Azariah (עזריה) equivalent plainly to Seraiah (.Align), since their pedigrees are the same, i.e., the son of Hilkiah, the son of Meshullam, the son of Zadok, the son of Meremoth, the son of Ahitub, the ruler of the house of God (v. 11 11*), and 'Adaiah, the son of Jeroham with the same names Pashhur and Malchjah in his pedigree (v. 11 11*12) and Ma'asai the son of 'Adiel the son of Jahserah . . . the son of Meshillemith the son of Immmer . . . . . (משילמה) (v. 14), equivalent to "Amashsai the son of 'Azarel the son of Ahzai the son of Meshillemoth the son of Immmer" (משילמה) (11*). (4) The Levites with Shemaiah the son of Hashshub the son of 'Asrikam the son of Hashabiah and Mattaniah the son of Mica the son of Zikri (or Zabdi) the son of Asaph and 'Obadiah ('Abda) the son of Shemaiyah (Shammua) the son of Galai the son of Judasih in each (vv. 14* 11*). (5) The gate-keepers with 'Akkub and Talmon in each (v. 17 11*).
These similarities have found an explanation in the continuity of the families of Jerusalem before and after the exile, our chapter giving the former, and Ne. ii the latter (Ke., Zoe., Oe.). Such actual continuity with its preservation in records can hardly be seriously maintained, although it probably was the notion of whoever gave this chapter its place in 1 Ch. (Bn., Smd. List. p. 7, Meyer, Entst. Jud. p. 101). This writer is usually regarded as the Chronicler, but since the Chronicler has treated other matters in cc. 1–8, and since he systematically considers the duties of the Levites and gate-keepers (vv. 17–19) in 26, it has been held that this chapter is an interpolation (so Bn.). Its author seems to have taken a register of post-exilic inhabitants and given it a place here on the supposition that this register represented also pre-exilic conditions (Smd. List. p. 7, Bn.). The chapter seems related to Ne. ii, through their both having a common source (Be., Smd., Ba., Bn., Ki.), and the differences between them may be due to changed conditions of population in Jerusalem—Ne. ii representing those of the time of Nehemiah and our chapter those of the time of the Chronicler (Ki.). Both chapters are regarded by Meyer (Entst. Jud. pp. 189 f.) as free fancies of the Chronicler without historical worth. This is possible.

In favor of the Chronicler's composition of this chapter may be alleged the fact that the Chronicler in the preceding chapters with few exceptions deals with the dwelling-places of the tribes. The city of Jerusalem could not well have been overlooked, it is argued, and yet could not be assigned to any one tribe, hence the list of inhabitants from three tribes, Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. (The words my. And of the children of Ephraim and Manasseh, are wanting in Ne. ii, and since none such are enumerated in the following verses, are probably a gloss. Yet v. 1.) (For further points on introduction v. i. vv. 2–8.)

1. And all Israel was registered]. This sentence appears like a reference to the foregoing genealogies of 1 Ch. and has been so taken (Ke., Zoe., Oe.), but the following statement, “behold they are written, etc.,” rather implies that v. 1 is an independent introduction to this section (Be.) from the hand of the interpolator (Bn.). All Israel is not the ten tribes taken in contrast to Judah.
(Be.) but either all the tribes in general (Ke., Zoe., Bn.), or better, Judah and the elements which adhered to the S. kingdom after 722 B.C. (Ki.). — The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah] thus כ, ה, Meyer, Entst. Jud. p. 100; "The Book of the Kings of Israel" מ, AV., RV., Zoe., Kau., Ki., and generally. Judah, then, according to this latter rendering, is the subject of the following verb and the next clause reads "and Judah was carried away captive, etc." On this "Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" cf. 2 Ch. 27:35, where it is mentioned in connection with Jotham, Josiah, and Jehoiakim (v. Intro. pp. 21 ff.). Here the reader is referred to this work for the registration of all Israel, while the writer confines himself to that of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. — They were carried away, etc. This can refer only to all Israel as represented in Judah. The subject need not be Judah of the text, but can readily be supplied. The sentence serves as an introduction to the following enumeration, since the captivity had become the dividing point in historical reckoning.—

2. A modification of Ne. 11:1. — First] i.e., chief, after the suggestion of Ne. 11:1, "And these are the chief men of the province who dwelt in Jerusalem" (אלאי התושבים של ירושלים), and the list vv. 4—9 is taken as that of chief men (Ba.); or the first after the return from the captivity, i.e., the inhabitants of the land in the first century after the restoration (cf. use of נחלים in Ne. 5:7) (Be.); but the position of this chapter shows that the writer designed to give pre-exilic inhabitants and it is better to take first with that force (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Meyer, Bn., Ki.). — In their possessions and their cities. These words are almost meaningless here. They can only signify that the inhabitants of the land generally were divided into the four following classes. They are an abridgment of "In cities of Judah dwelt each one in his own possession in their cities" (Ne. 11:1), where the point is that those enumerated in the following verses as inhabitants of Jerusalem formerly resided outside of the city in which they had now chosen of their own free will to dwell (Ne. 11:1). — Israel, the priests, the Levites, and the Nethinim. These words also are taken from Ne. 11:1, from which "and the sons of Solomon" has been omitted, possibly because at this time this designation had ceased, "sons of Solomon" being compre-
hended under the Nethinim. *Israel, i.e., laymen not of Levitical
descent (cf. *Ezr. 2:10 10a et al.). The Nethinim, Temple servants
reckoned as inferior to the Levites, although later probably amalga-
mated with them. They are only mentioned here and in *Ezr.
2:16 10 7 8. 11 17 50 *Neh. 3:11 14 16 17 10 18 (28) 11. 11. They probably
were of Canaanitish origin—most likely to be connected with the
Gibeonites ( *Jos. 9:23) and the foreigners mentioned in *Ezr. 4:47.
—3. And in Jerusalem dwell certain of the children of Judah and
certain of the children of Benjamin]. These words appear also
in *Neh. 11.—*And certain of the children of Ephraim and Manas-
seh]. These words apparently have been added to this post-exilic
register to make it fit pre-exilic conditions. According to the
Chronicler, members of Ephraim and Manasseh adhered to the
S. kingdom (2 *Ch. 28:30 11. 14 34). They are not, however, men-
tioned by him in connection with the restoration.

4-6. The sons of Judah.—4. *Neh. 11:3 begins with "From the
sons of Judah," which may be supplied as the heading of this
verse (Ki.) or the equivalent of this heading may be seen in the
son of Judah, with which the verse ends and which is not found
in *Nehemiah.—'Uthai †] Athaiah *Neh. 11:1 (v. s.). The names,
whichever is original, are obscure and of uncertain meaning.—
'Ammihud]. Cf. 7.—'Omer]. Cf. 7.—'Imri]. *Neh. 3:1.—'Bani].
Cf. 6, a frequent name in Ezr.-*Neh.—This line of descent is
entirely obscure and different from the one given in *Neh. 11.—
Perez]. The most conspicuous clan of Judah (cf. 2:4).—5. The
Shilonites] (יִשְׁלְון יִשְׁלְון) correspond with the Shelan-
ites (יָשִּׁלְהָנֵי) given in Nu. 26:16 as the family or clan from Shelah
the son of Judah, cf. 4.—*Asaiah]. Cf. 4: Ma'asai *Neh. 11: (v. s.),
whose line of descent through six ancestors from "the Shilonite"
is given.—6. Zerah]. Cf. 2* the third clan of Judah.
—Je'uel]. Cf. 9. Not given in *Neh., where the corresponding
verse (11*) reads "and all the sons of Perez," the last word an
and ninety] in *Neh. 11* the number is "468 men of strength," i.e.,
capable of military service. The larger number may indicate the
increase of population of this clan at the time when this chapter
was written.
7-9. The sons of Benjamin.—7. Sallu the son of Meshullam] given also in Ne. 117 †, but with a decidedly different pedigree. It is not improbable that "son of Hodaviah son of Hassenuah" (יְהֹדֵויאֵה בֶן חֲסֵנָעָא) is a corruption or derivation of "Judah son of Hassenuah" (יְהוֹדֵויאֵה בֶן חֲסֵנָעָא) Ne. 119 (יְהוֹדֵויאֵה בֶן חֲסֵנָעָא) and Hodaviah are confused in Ezr. 2th and 3th), and hence the pedigree of this Sallu son of Meshullam has here been entirely omitted.—

8. Ibneiah † has been seen in "Gabbai" or "Gabbai Sallai" of Ne. 114.—The other heads here mentioned, Elah and Meshullam, are without correspondences in Ne.—9. The number in Ne. is 928.

10-13. The priests.—Here the correspondence with Ne. is very exact (v. s.). The material, however, is given more compactly, since only one enumeration is given v. 11, cf. Ne. 1111. 1111. Six priestly families are mentioned, Jedaiah, Jehoiarib, and Jachin, v. 11, without pedigrees, apparently because these three names appear among the priestly families who received courses or appointments for service in the Temple at the time of David: Jedaiah, the second course 24; Jehoiarib, the first 24; Jachin, the twenty-first 24. Jedaiah also appears as a family name in the list of the priests who returned with Zerubbabel Ezr. 2th Ne. 7th, and as the name of two chiefs of the priests of the same period Ne. 12th. Jehoiarib or Joiarib (Ne. 1119) is the name of a priestly house of the days of Joiakim whose head was Mattenai Ne. 12th, and from which the Maccabees were descended (1 Mac. 21). Persons of this name also are mentioned among the priests who went up with Zerubbabel Ne. 12th, and with Ezra Ezr. 8th. "Adaiah and Mac'asiah (v. s.) v. 11 belong most likely to the same category as the other three families, since, while not names of priestly houses mentioned in 24-14, the former is given as a descendant of Malchijah, who held the fifth priestly course (24), and the latter from Immer, who held the sixteenth (24). "Azariah v. 11, for which we should read Seraiah, after Ne. 1111, probably represents a similar priestly family that appears among the list of the priestly families of the time of Joiakim Ne. 121. A priest of the same name is given in Ne. 121 among those who returned with Zerubbabel. The genealogy of Seraiah, however, is that of the high priest
Seraiah, the father of Jehozadak, who went into captivity, with the variation of Meshullum for Shallum and the insertion of Meraioth. Cf. 5:18 (6:10). While it is possible that this is the true genealogy of this Seraiah and that he represents the high priest's family, the view is plausible that this genealogy has arisen through the gloss of some one who identified Seraiah with the high priest of that name (Bn.). 'Azariah most likely came into the text from "Azariah the father of Seraiah" (5:18 (6:10)). The ruler of the house of God may refer either to Ahitub or 'Azariah (Seraiah). This latter may have arisen from 2 Ch. 31:11, where Azariah of the reign of Hezekiah is given that office, or it may describe an actual office of the time of this record. This office may not mean that of the high priest, since in 2 Ch. 31:1 several such rulers are mentioned. The sum of the numbers of these priestly families given in v. is 1,760, while in Ne. ii:6 we have 822, 242, and 128, a total of 1,192. V. 14 not only contains this single summary but groups together phrases found scattered in Ne. ii. And their brethren the heads of their fathers' houses has its correspondence in ii:1; mighty men of valor, in ii:14; the work of the service of the house of God, in ii:11. In addition to the names given here, Ne. ii:14 mentions an overseer, "Zabdiel the son of Haggedolim."

14-16. The Levites.—14. Shema'iah appears in Ne. ii:14 with the same pedigree except that instead of closing with from the sons of Merari (מֵהוּי מְרָאִי) the line closes with "son of Buni" (בּוּן). This latter may have arisen from the former (Be.). The name is frequent and given in connection with the Merarite Juduthun in v. 14 and 2 Ch. 29:1. (Ne. ii:14 has no parallel in our passage.)—15. Bakbakkar † is a strange name, perhaps the same as Bakbu'jah Ne. ii:11.—Heresh † and Galal] are wanting in Ne. ii.—Mattaniah, etc.] in Ne. ii:11 (v. s.) is styled "the chief to begin the thanksgiving in prayer," RV. The text probably is corrupt (see Mattaniah, EBi.).—16. 'Obadiah] (v. s.).—And Berechiah son of Asa the son of Elkanah who dwelt in the villages of the Netophathites] entirely wanting in Ne. ii; appears like a marginal gloss added by some one to complete the list of Levitical singers rather than the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Elkanah represents the family of Heman, the Keathite, otherwise not
represented here (cf. 611(11)). The villages of the Netophathites are mentioned in Ne. 1211 as the residences of "the singers." Netophah has been identified with "Umm Toba," north of Bethlehem (SWP. III. p. 52), or Be'it Net'hef, about twelve miles west of Bethlehem (Rob. BR. II. pp. 16f., rejected by Bn., Baed. p. 124). The number of the Levites (in Ne. 1111 284) is entirely omitted. This list of the Levites is principally that of the guilds of singers.

17-34. The gate-keepers and their duties.—In this section only vv. 17. 21 are paralleled in Ne. 11 and the remainder is a further description of the personnel and duties of the gate-keepers of the Temple and possibly of some additional Levites. The statements, however, are somewhat contradictory and confused. Conditions of the writer's own time v. 17, of the Davidic period v. 28, and of the Mosaic period are not sharply distinguished. Likewise the status of the gate-keepers is not definitely outlined. They are introduced as though distinct from the Levites (v. 17 compared with v. 17), and yet they are called Levites (vv. 18. 22). Their office goes back to the Mosaic period (vv. 19. 21), and yet David and Samuel are said to have ordained them in their office (v. 22). They appear in the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and yet they, or at least a portion of them, are given residence in villages outside of the city (vv. 22. 24). In the description of their duties the writer passes at once, without any indication of the fact, in v. 25 (Be., Ke., Oe., Zo., Bn., Ki.), or in v. 24 (Ba., ARV.), to the duties of the Levites in general. And finally in v. 24 the statement is made that these are the singers and in v. 24 we have a subscription apparently of an altogether different paragraph, i.e., a list of the chief men of the Levites who dwelt at Jerusalem. A partial solution of these difficulties may be found in the following considerations: (1) The gate-keepers, probably in the earliest post-exilic period, were regarded as distinct from the Levites, and this distinction was made in the first list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, reflected in vv. 17 Ne. 1111. 18, but later they, or at least the chief gate-keepers, were reckoned as Levites (vv. 19. 24 c. 26). (2) The tradition respecting their origin may have been this: first, that along with the other officials of the Temple they were instituted by David and Samuel (v. 24 cf. 1611 2611.), and then, secondly, that
this institution applied only to the subordinate gate-keepers who resided in the country (vv. 22-24), while the chief gate-keepers who resided in Jerusalem (v. 27) traced their office to the Mosaic period (vv. 18-19). (3) The abrupt transition of subject may be due to corruptions of the text or the omission of verses originally written (v. i.).

17. Shalúm, Aḥkub and Talmon] are among the six families of gate-keepers who returned with Zerubbabel according to Ezr. 241. Shalúm does not appear in Ne. 111, probably through a抄ist’s oversight. He is mentioned with the others in Ne. 123 under the name Meshullam (see also v. 19).—Ahīman] アハマン) wanting in Ne., and elsewhere only the name of a son of an Anakite Nu. 131 Jos. 151 Ju. 12, is suspicious and may have arisen from the following their brethren (בַּנְיָמִין) (Ba.), written perhaps to take the place of Ater, which may have been dropped from the original text, since four names are needed (cf. Ezr. 24 and 104, where Ater (אֶתֶר) may have been corrupted into Uri (עֵירו)). Or this fourth name, Ahīman, may have been coined to meet the requirement of v. 3, the original document of the inhabitants of Jerusalem having only three names.—18. And up to this time]. The reference is to the period of the writer, i.e., of the Chronicler (Ki.), or of his interpolator (Bn.). At that time Shalúm was stationed in the king’s gate on the east side of the Temple area. The eastern gate of the court of Solomon’s Temple may have been called the king’s gate and the ancient name may have been preserved in the second Temple; or this name, since the natural entrance for the King would have been directly from the palace on the south, may have been derived from Ezekiel’s temple, in which the royal entrance is placed on the east (Ez. 461).—Of the camp of the sons of Levi] that is, the Temple with its chambers and courts, an expression derived from Nu. 217, and paralleled in the “camp of Yahweh” 2 Ch. 31, and doubtless used to indicate that the families of the gate-keepers (v. 17) already at the time of Moses were “in office” (cf. v. 19).—19. Shalúm] clearly the same as the Shalüm of v. 17, and identical with Meshelemiah 261, Shelemiah 261.—Keepers of the thresholds], i.e., gate-keepers. Cf. for the use of this term 2 Ch. 341 2 K. 1212231251 Je. 351.—Of the tent] i.e.,
either of the tabernacle or the Temple; the term could apply to 
either (see v. 19) and probably was used with that intent; or the 
writer may have meant David’s tent (2 S. 6:17) (Zoe., Oe.).—And 
their fathers were over the camp of Yahweh keepers of the entrance]. 
There is no record of this in P, but since the Korahites were 
given descent from Kehath (Ex. 6:11), and since the Kehathites 
held the first place among the servants of the holy place and were 
responsible for the holiest vessels (Nu. 4:23), this tradition could 
easily have arisen. The camp of Yahweh is the tabernacle, and 
the entrance is the entrance into the court of the tabernacle (Ke.), 
or the reference is to the camp of Israel and its entrance (Ba.). 
The former, the more usual explanation, is to be preferred.—20. 
And Phinehas the son of Eleazar was ruler over them in time past]. 
This tradition may have arisen from Nu. 25:7, where in v. 4 is 
mentioned the “door of the tent of meeting” where all the congre¬
gation of Israel were gathered, and in v. 7, “Phinehas arose from 
the midst of the congregation and took a spear in his hand,” as 
though he were an officer there on duty, in command of the keep¬
ers of the gate.—May Yahweh be with him! ] an instance of the 
Jewish and Oriental custom of uttering a pious wish when men¬
tioning the name of a distinguished righteous dead person.—
21. Zechariah, etc.] a continuation of the glorification of Shallum 
v. 18, since (identifying Shallum with Meshelemiah and Shelemiah) 
(26a. 11) Zechariah was his son. Zechariah clearly was a man of 
prominence in the priestly traditions, “a discreet counsellor” 
(26b). In connection with vv. 18-19 the tent of meeting must be 
understood as the tabernacle at Gibeon (Bn., Ki.) or the tent 
for the ark during the time of David, while as a continuation 
of vv. 16-17 clearly the Mosaic tent is meant (Bn.). Vv. 18-19 are 
parenthetical and probably a gloss, since by making the gate¬
keepers’ office an institution of the Mosaic period they appar¬
ently contradict the statement of v. 18, where David and Samuel 
are its founders (Bn., Ki.) (yet v. 19).—22. All of them who were 
chosen for gate-keepers at the thresholds were 212]. This state¬
ment is a continuation of v. 18. Cf. Ne. 12, where the number 
is 172.—They were reckoned by genealogies in their villages]. 
The emphasis is on the final phrase in anticipation of v. 18.—
David and Samu'el the seer established them in their office of trust. This statement respecting the work of David is agreeable to the Chronicler's view of his having organised the personnel of the sanctuary, priests 24th, Levites 23nd 24th, singers 25th, gate-keepers 16th and implicitly in 26th. Samu'el is called the seer after 9th, also so called in 26th 29th, likewise Hanani 2 Ch. 16th. This is the only record of Samuel's participation in arrangements for the sanctuary and it is a good example of Jewish Midrash. Historically, his activity could only have been in connection with the tabernacle placed by the Chronicler at Gibeon (16th 2 Ch. 1st), since he died before the death of Saul, and hence before the reign of David.—

23. They and their children were at the gates of the house of Yahweh, the tent-house, for guards. This statement refers to the families of gate-keepers living in Jerusalem. The two expressions, the house of Yahweh and the house of the tent, seem used to cover both the case of the Temple and the period of David before the Temple was built. The second expression then either refers to the tent of the ark on Mt. Zion (cf. 16th) or the tabernacle at Gibeon; or the writer may not have distinguished between them. This last is most likely. For guards, i.e., guardians of the gates, cf. Ne. 7th.—

24. Cf. the arrangement of the gate-keepers in 26th.—

26. And their brethren who were in their villages were obliged to come every seven days, from time to time, to be with these. No mention elsewhere is made of the gate-keepers dwelling in villages. The singers, however, did so (see v. 11th). These, i.e., the gate-keepers mentioned in v. 11th.—

26. For the four chief (heroes of) gate-keepers were in continual office (trust) i.e., they did not rotate from time to time as the under gate-keepers. The four clearly represented the four families of v. 11th. —They are the Levites. From this it would seem that the under gate-keepers who resided in the villages were not yet reckoned as Levites. The writer possibly has meant to distinguish two classes of gate-keepers: first those of the four families of v. 11th, who traced their office to the time of Moses, were acknowledged of Levitical descent, resided in Jerusalem, and whose representatives held the continual office of chief gate-keepers and whose duties are described in vv. 11th; secondly the under gate-keepers, who resided
out of Jerusalem, traced their office to David and Samuel, and performed their duties at stated intervals, and were not reckoned as Levites (v. s.).—And they were over the chambers and the treasuries of the house of God]. These words either introduce a new paragraph speaking of the duties of the Levites in general and not of the gate-keepers (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Kau., Bn., Ki.) or the four chief gate-keepers are still the subject (🥺, EVs., Ba.). In 26* s., after the enumeration of the gate-keepers, a list of individual Levites who were over the treasuries is given. Chambers, store-chambers in which tithes and sacred vessels were kept. Cf. 2 Ch. 31* s. 11 Ne. 13* e. These were both a part of the Temple itself (judging from the plan of Solomon's and Ezekiel's Temples, see DB. and EBi.), and possibly separate buildings in the courts (26* s.) (Bn.). Very little, however, is known of Zerubbabel's Temple.—27. They lodged round about the house of God, for upon them rested the duty of watching, and they had charge of opening (the temple) every morning]. The subject is either the Levites who had charge of the stores of the Temple and hence were required to guard them with care day and night, or, as the last clause suggests, the principal gate-keepers. Opening (יוֹסָד) may also be rendered key, as elsewhere Ju. 3* Is. 22* †, hence they were over the key, i.e., it was incumbent upon them to open the storehouses every morning (Be.).—28. And some of them had charge of the utensils of service]. Probably the more costly traditional gold and silver utensils (28* s. Dn. 1* 5* s.) are here referred to, since they were to be accurately counted. —29. The holy utensils] from the connection would appear to have been those used in the offerings of the products of the soil. —30. A statement suggested by the last word of v. *; perhaps a gloss (Bn., Ki.). Its motive is to show the limitation of the work of the Levites in connection with the spices. On the work, cf. Ex. 30* s.—31. Shallum] is the family name and Mattithiah the first born represents a different period of time from that in which Zechariah was the first born (cf. vv. 11. 26*). The name Mattithiah is frequent 15* s. 16* 25* s. Ezr. 10* Ne. 8* †, but none of its bearers can be identified with this person.—In the office of trust over the pastry of flat cakes]. Cf. Lv. 2* s. 6* s. (14 s.)
711 "", etc.—32. *Kehathites*. One of the three great divisions of the Levites, cf. Nu. 311. 11. 17.—*Their brethren* with reference to the Levites mentioned in v. 11. For the way of arranging the show-bread, see Lv. 24 8.—33. A subscription out of place, since the singers are not mentioned in the immediately foregoing verses. It either was written in reference to vv.14-14, which relate principally of singers (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.), or it closed a list of singers who dwelt in the Temple chambers and were freed from other service (בְּלִשְׁנָה תַּמְרוּם), which has been omitted from the text (Bn., Ki.).—*For day and night they were in their work* the reason why they were freed from other service. On peculiar sentence v. i.—34. Another subscription, either going with v. 33 referring to all the Levites mentioned in vv.14-14, or it is a repetition of 8° and has come in here with vv. 33-34 and has been adjusted to the context by the insertion of the Levites, see 8°.

4. A comparison with Ne. 114 suggests that several names have dropped from this line, thus:

Ne. 114 want in G, since the transliteration would be the same as that for cf. G. 115, read with Nu. 26°, so Be., Ke., Oe., Kau., Bn., Ki.— the first-born appears wrong when none of Asaiah's brothers are given. G read which is certainly wrong as far as the suffix is concerned (after מֵשְׁנָה). Possibly the original was מֵשְׁנָה בְּנֵי cf. Ne. 114. 111 incorrectly '6. Ne. 111. שֵׂרָי, so Be., Ke., Oe., Kau., Bn., Ki.— so G.—13 presents in a long series of constructs (Dav. Sym. § 26). Probably, however, before מְלָאכַת a has fallen from the influence of the final letter of מְלָאכַת has fallen from the text (Ges. § 128e), or according to Ne. 111 an is has been omitted (cf. 23°).—15. Since has no prefixed, read instead *carpenterius*. Instead of ' instead of Cheyne reads "the leader in the song of praise," and places after *Matah*... *son of Asaph* (*EBi*. ii. col. 2019).—16. *some mss.* Ne. 111. 32 Mss. read, 18. *mss.* pl. Ges. § 124b or e.—20b. ' and ' an accusative of the obj. Ges. § 125a f. n.—22. and the Lord was with him."—23. *for guards*, cf. Ne. 7, BDB.
35–44. The genealogy of Saul.—A duplicate of 8\textsuperscript{19}–\textsuperscript{21} (see pp. 164–7).
This history of David falls into two parts: (1) x–xx containing an account of his reign; (2) xxi–xxix preparations for the building of the Temple and the orders and arrangements of the servants of the Temple. (xxi serves as connecting link between the two sections, since it could be appropriately classed with either.)

X. The death of Saul.—The entire connection of David with Saul is passed over and the Chronicler begins his history of David with an account of the death of Saul taken from 1 S. 31:11, with a few slight variations due partly to intention, partly to accident, and in some instances preserving a better text than the present \( \text{腓} \) of 1 S.

1. The narrative of the battle of Mt. Gilboa is introduced abruptly, the Chronicler taking for granted that the events which led to it were well known to the reader. The introductory clause *Now the Philistines fought against Israel* is a general statement which was conveniently supplied by the source. In 1 S. it serves to reintroduce the main theme after a digression concerning David's attack upon the Amalekites.—*Each man of Israel fled*] implying that the defeat turned into a panic in which each man cared for his own life. This has been substituted by the Chronicler for the more general statement in 1 S. "and the men of Israel fled," and was doubtless intentional to make the account of the defeat more vivid.—*And fell down slain in mount Gilboa*]. According to 1 S. 28:1, the Philistines were encamped at Shunem (the mod. Solam) and the Israelites were gathered together on Mt. Gilboa (the mod. Jebel Fuku'a). This ridge commands the entrance to the southern angle of the Plain of Esdraelon through Dothan, and also the main highway from Esdraelon to the Jordan,
viz., that through the Valley of Jezreel. It was, therefore, a point of extreme importance to Israel and to the Philistines alike. To the former it was the connecting link between the tribes north of Esdraelon and those to the south, while to the latter it meant control of the important trade-route which drained the rich grain-fields of the Hauran and passed on to the gardens of Damascus. The Israelites failed to profit by the advantage they had gained in possessing themselves, in advance, of the key to the situation.

2. And the Philistines pursued Saul and his sons closely] is paralleled by the action of the King of Syria who commanded his charioteers at the battle of Ramoth-gilead to attack only the person of the King of Israel (1 K. 22:31).—Jonathan, Abinadab, Malchishua. Cf. The archers hit him. The Heb. idiom has it, “the archers found him.”

3. Draw thy sword and thrust me through]. Cf. Ju. 9:1. But his armorbearer would not] either because of his reverence for his lord (Sm.), or, more likely, from fear of blood-revenge (cf. 2 S. 21:13), which would be all the more certain to overtake one who slew the Lord’s anointed (cf. 1 S. 26:9).

4. Then Saul took his own sword and fell upon it]. One of the rare cases of suicide in the OT., cf. v. 2 S. 17:11 1 K. 16:10, also 2 Mac. 10:14-14:6. The abridgment, all his house, for “his armorbearer and all his men” of 1 S., can scarcely be a reference to Saul’s servants (Ba.), yet it is certain that Saul’s house did not perish at that time (cf. 2 S. 2:4). This is probably nothing more than a careless statement by the Chronicler. Still, Bn. prefers the text of Chronicles. 5. The valley from which the men of Israel saw the defeat was that of Jezreel (cf. Ho. 1:1). They foresook their cities] one of which was doubtless Beth-shan, where the bodies of Saul and his sons were exposed (1 S. 31:10-12). The tenure of the Philistines was of short duration, for in 2 S. 2:9 we find Abner making Ish-bosheth king over Jezreel. Yet this kingship may have been one of vassalage to the Philistines. 6. And took his head] implying that he had been beheaded, a fact directly stated in the parallel.

10. And they put his weapons in the house of their gods] just as the sword of Goliath had been deposited at the sanctuary at Nob (1 S. 21:9). The variation of the text of v. 10b and 1 S. 31:10b suggests that in the original both readings were found:
i.e., the passage read, His weapons they placed in the house of Astarte, his skull they nailed in the house of Dagon and his body they exposed on the wall of Beth-shan (Be., Zoe., Oe., Bn.): otherwise 1 S. preserves the original text (We., Dr., Ki., Sm.) and, as is most likely, we have here a modification of the Chronicler.—In the house of Dagon] to whom there were temples at Gaza (Ju. 161 ff.) and at Ashdod (1 S. 5 1 Mac. 1011-111). Dagon may be derived from יִשָּׁ, fish, hence has been described by David Kimhi as having the head and arms of a man and the body and tail of a fish, or from יֵשָׁ, corn, whence Philo Byblius makes him a god of husbandry. The latter seems more appropriate for the inhabitants of the Philistine plain, but the uncertain origin of these people leaves the question open (cf. Del. Par. p. 139; Sayce, Rel. Bab. pp. 188 ff.; Scholz, Götzdienst, pp. 238 ff.; Baud. in PRE. III. pp. 460 ff.; Jen. Kosmol. pp. 449 ff.).—11. 12. All the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead]. These paid a debt of gratitude to Saul (cf. 1 S. 111-11) by recovering his body and those of his sons—according to 1 S. in a raid by night—and giving them honourable burial in a sacred place, under the oak in Jabesh. Burying the dead was considered an act of piety (cf. Tob. 112).—The doubtful phrase “and burnt them there” of 1 S., considered original by Sm., was omitted by the Chronicler, since burning was looked upon as something abominable (Am. 21).—The exact site of Jabesh-gilead is uncertain. The name is still preserved in Wady Yabis. Eusebius places it six Roman miles from Pella. Oliphant sought it in the ruins Meriamin, and so more recently Merrill (but see Buhl, GAP. p. 259). Robinson conjectured the ruins ed Deir on the south side of the wady but somewhat off the road from Beisan to Jerash (so GAS.).—13. 14. This reflection upon the death of Saul with the observation that Yahweh turned the kingdom unto David is direct from the Chronicler, and after his manner cf. 2 Ch. 122 1311 2110 2411 2511 271 2818. The cause of Saul’s death is found in his trespass of not keeping the word of Yahweh, probably with reference to the disobedience recorded in 1 S. 1311 1511-11, and Saul’s consultation with the witch of Endor 1 S. 281 8. In v. 14 Saul is apparently misrepresented, since according to 1 S. 28 Saul did ask of Yahweh but the Lord did not
answer him. Doubtless the thought of the Chronicler was not far from that of the mod. commentator who writes, “Saul had neglected to seek the favour of Jehovah with proper zeal and then inquire of Him” (Zoe.).

1. preferred as the original form by Bu., Sm. 1 S. 31\(^1\) preferred as the original form by Bu., Sm. 1 S. 31\(^1\) ruined, in distributive sense cf. Gn. 9\(^6\) 10\(^6\) 40\(^1\). Ex. 12\(^6\) and often.—2. also v. i.—2. and often.—3. with proper zeal and then inquire of Him (Zoe.). On the Chronicler’s usage with cf. Ju. 20\(^6\) 1 S. 14\(^6\). The spelling is found elsewhere, in 1 S. 13\(^6\) and some 27 other times.—3. 1 S. 31\(^6\) is a mod. On the substitution of for or may be due to the influence of Aramaic, which does not use. Bu. regards as the original.—

The Chronicler has preserved the better order and according to Bu. the better text. If belonged to the original text it should precede (Dr.).—1 S. 31\(^6\) is a mod. Probably the Chronicler’s text is an abridgment. The verb presents a difficulty. Dr. takes it from “trembled.” Sm. thinks that takes the word from , we think more likely from , an apocopated Hoph. or for (Klo.), cf. 1 K. 22\(^6\) = 2 Ch. 18\(^6\) and 2 Ch. 35\(^6\). renders here and 18\(^6\) 35\(^6\) by the same word , . Bu. gives the clause up as hopelessly corrupt.—4. seems wanting in by haplography.—Before has the text. The Chronicler’s text is better (Bu., Sm.).—5. which after is to be preferred (Bu.).—6. is omitted after Bu. regards both as additions to the original text. is wanting in by haplography.—6. an abridgment of 31\(^6\) preserving more nearly the original text and an abridgment of 1 S. of which the present text is an abridgment in the cities of (Klo., Bu., Sm.). Dr. retains the present text of 1 S.—6. are the subject of 1 S.—6. are the subject of 1 S. 31\(^6\) in 1 S. has here 1 S. preserves the object the head and weapons of Saul (so Be., Ke., Zoe., OE., Sm.). Since, however, the inf. implies a personal subject it may be well to understand messengers as the object of or and point as a Qal (Klo., Ki., Bu.).—7. the former is to be preferred (Bu., Sm.).—10. probably a direct departure
XI. 1-3. David made king over all Israel.—The Chronicler omits, as foreign to the purpose of his narrative, David’s reception of the news of Saul’s death, his reign over the tribe of Judah, and his contest with the house of Saul (2 S. 1-4), and proceeds at once to David’s establishment as king over all Israel. The narrative is a close copy of 2 S. 5-11.

1. In 2 S. instead of “all Israel” “all the tribes of Israel came,” who represented the adherents of the house of Saul in distinction from the tribe of Judah over which David was reigning. The Chronicler, having in view the main fact rather than the details of the history which he is passing over in silence, uses Israel as including Judah with the rest (cf. vv. 1-11).

3. According to the word of Yahweh by the hand of Samuel]. These words are the Chronicler’s contribution to the narrative taken from 2 S. It has been inferred that the Chronicler had among his sources a “Testament of Samuel” (Bn.), but perhaps it is sufficient to think of 1 S. 15:16.

1. סָּמִ֣לָה — וַיַּגְּמֹר כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל 2 S. 5:12 עַל־מִצְרָיִ֣ם [יְרוּשָׁלַ֔יִם].

2. מִצְרָיִ֖ים. — So also in © and שְׂמֹר in ©.

The third סָּמִ֣לָה is wanting in 2 S. 5:5; מִצְרָיִם] 2 S. 11:1: —תַּלְמוּדָ֖יִם. —ןָעָ֑ם. — The third סָּמִ֣לָה is probably a scribal error, Ges.
4-9. The capture of Jerusalem.—This is a somewhat free and modified transcript of 2 S. 5*-*^*. The chronological notices of 2 S. 5*-*^* are omitted here to be inserted in a more appropriate place (29}).—4. Chronicles has all Israel engaged with David in the assault upon Jerusalem, while 2 S. speaks of "the king and his men," i.e., his body-guard or warriors. The Chronicler has added the archaeological note explaining Jerusalem as though anciently called Jebus. This is after the usage of P, cf. Jos. 15* 18* ii Ju. 19* i. Jebus as the ancient name of the city is probably a mere fancy derived from the fact that the Jebusites dwelt there at the time of David. In the Amarna tablets the name Ureusaleim repeatedly occurs, while there is no trace of a name corresponding to Jebus. Jerusalem is also given as the name in Ju. 1*. i Jos. 15* ii 2 S. 5* (cf. Moore on Ju. 19i*).—And there were the Jebusites the inhabitants of the land]. In 2 S. we have "against the Jebusites the inhabitants of the land," which phrase sets forth directly the thought of an attack upon non-Israelites as the purpose of David, while Chronicles has turned the words into a description of the conditions of the time of David.—5. Chronicles gives but the first part of the defiant speech of the Jebusites to David, omitting the scornful boast of the impregnable of Jerusalem, that the blind or the lame could defend it (2 S. 5*). Probably the reference to them was no longer understood.—6. This verse is far smoother and quite different from the obscure parallel in 2 S. Although this prowess of Joab with its reward is nowhere else mentioned, it probably was not an invention of the Chronicler, and his later position as commander-in-chief may have had some connection with the capture of Jerusalem in spite of the fact that he led the men of David earlier (2 S. 21*).—8. Millo] part of the fortifications of Jerusalem; location and meaning are obscure (cf. 2 S. 5* i K. 9ii* ii 11*). The Chronicler placed it in the city of David 2 Ch. 32* (for discussion GAS. J. II. pp. 40 ff.).—And Joab restored the rest of the city]. This statement has no
parallel in 2 S. The rest of the city means the city apart from the citadel; David thus rebuilt the fortress and Joab the rest of the city. This legend concerning Joab may have arisen from the prominence of the family of Joab in post-exilic Israel, 4 Ezra 2:8 (We. TS.).

4. The qal and 2 S. adopted by Kl., SBOT., favoured by Bn., and agree with 2 S. 5:8 favours 1 S. and follows 2 S. 6:8—9. [The art. follows 2 S. and agrees with l.|. 4:5—6:18. 2 S. omits [of whom the city dwellers] 2 S. 5:5 of whom the city dwellers. CL follows 1 S. is suspicious, especially with the art., so perhaps the original was and to the palace (Bn., Kl.).—nja (nja^iv) is here used with the meaning to rebuild with the added notion of enlarging, cf. 2 Ch. 11:26, merely rebuilding, 2 Ch. 30:11 (BDB.).—Yowm—it is translated: Joab gave his right hand to the rest of the men who were in the city." This paraphrase is based upon the rendering of to keep alive (so Ba.). But the meaning to restore is supported by CL περιτοιχισμένος, and the use of οίον in Ne. 3:10.—9. 2 S. 5:10 + οίον.

10:47. David's mighty men.—This section is taken from 2 S. 23:1-39 with the exception of the introductory v. 10, and vv. 41-47 which give the names of sixteen additional mighty men not recorded elsewhere. These additional names and the superscription, v. 38, have suggested that the entire list, vv. 38-47, came from a source independent of 2 S. (Bn.) and perhaps the source of 2 S. (Graf). Another explanation is that vv. 41-47 are out of place, belonging in c. 12 between v. 7 and v. 8 (Bu. in Com.). The names in vv. 41-47 are in many instances if not all of persons from east of the Jordan. The first twelve of these heroes given in vv. 10-18 are mentioned again as monthly commanders of the army of David (27:1-18).

10. And these were the chief of the mighty men who belonged to David who held strongly with him in respect to the kingdom, together with all Israel to make him king]. These words explain the Chronicler's introduction of the list of the mighty men at this point in his narrative. He regarded them as participants in the coronation of David. In fact, many of these mighty men probably
won their places in subsequent campaigns of David and were unknown at this time (We. Proл. p. 173). — According to the word of Yahweh unto Israel] is a good example of the Chronicler’s religious comment and viewpoint of David’s reign.

11–14. The three mightiest. — This section is incomplete. Vv. 11–14 of 2 S. 23 have been omitted by a copyist (v. i.), so that the name of the third hero Shammah is lacking and his exploit is assigned to Eleazar the second hero, whose own exploit has been omitted. — 11. Instead of Jashobeam we should read Ishbaal, and instead of thirty, three, of whom Ishbaal was the foremost, coming before Eleazar and Shammah. After 2 S. also eight hundred should be read instead of three hundred. — 12. Dodai [*]. v. i. — Ahophite. Cf. v. 11. — 13. Pas-dammim] wanting in 2 S. 29, Ephes-dammim (1 S. 17) (v. i.) — 14. They stood, etc. Read after 2 S. 29, he stood, etc.

10. cf. 2 S. 3° Dn. 10° and for references 2 Ch. 1°. — 11. which Kl. prefers here. But the probability is that Ch., the harder reading, has preserved the original, since the sum is given in 2 S. 23° (cf. Bn.). — 12. Pas-dammim] wanting in 2 S. 29° (cf. 8°). — 13. Pas-dammim] wanting in 2 S. 29° (cf. 8°). — 14. They stood, etc. Read after 2 S. 29°, he stood, etc.
15-19. The exploit of three mighty men at Bethlehem (2 S. 23\(\textsuperscript{12-15}\)).—The compiler of 2 S. probably thought that the actors of this story were the three mighty men just mentioned, but since they are three of the thirty chief and the thirty have not yet been mentioned, they are probably entirely different and the story is out of its original connection (We. T.S., Dr., Bu., Bn.). V.\(\textsuperscript{13b}\) appears to have been the true conclusion of vv.\(\textsuperscript{12-14}\), and vv.\(\textsuperscript{14-16}\) probably came after the list of the thirty (in 2 S. vv.\(\textsuperscript{14-17a}\) after v.\(\textsuperscript{15}\)) (so Bu., SBOT.). The variations between Ch. and 2 S. are few and unimportant.—15. Unto the stronghold* of 'AduUam see below.—The Philistines were in the Valley of Rephaim, a plain south of Jerusalem. According to Josephus (Ant. vii. 12. 4) it was twenty stadia south of Jerusalem and reached to Bethlehem. Cf. 14\(\textsuperscript{1}\) Jos. 15\(\textsuperscript{1}\) 18\(\textsuperscript{1}\) 2 S. 5\(\textsuperscript{1}\). \(\textsuperscript{12}\) 23\(\textsuperscript{1}\) Is. 17\(\textsuperscript{1}\), Buhl, GAP. p. 91.—

18. And the three brake through the host] an exploit probably made by night and possible through the loose discipline of the time, cf. 1 S. 26\(\textsuperscript{4-11}.\) —The water was too precious to drink, hence David poured it out, as a libation offering, unto Yahweh.—19. Shall I drink the blood of these men] for the risk at which the water was brought made it equivalent to their blood, cf. the command not to eat the blood of animals but “to pour it out on the ground like water,” Dt. 12\(\textsuperscript{14}.\) \(\textsuperscript{13-31}\) 15\(\textsuperscript{11}.\)
ing. 2 S. רָצוּנִי.] 2 S. the same. Read לָנָכָה after v. 16 (We, T.S., Dr., Bu., Kau., Ki., Bn.). Adullam was a hill fortress, not a cave, cf. Baed. 4, p. 124. Buhl, GAP. p. 97.–1320] an equivalent suggested by the following יִיתֶם for the more unusual יִתֶם of 2 S., if the latter is the true reading.—16. יִתֶם [2 S. 234—17. יִתֶם] 2 S. 234 the same. On the apocopated form of Ch. see Ges. § 75bb. —12. 2 S. נַעַר a well of living water, but better properly a cistern. The change may have been intentional. To-day no well is found at the gate of Bethlehem, Rob. BR. I. pp. 470, 473; SWP. iii. p. 28; so also v. 18. יִתֶם.—14. יִתֶם נַעַר] 2 S. 234 תָּאשֵׂף נַעַר] Pi. י, 2 S. נַעַר Hiph.—19. יִתֶם נַעַר] 2 S. 234 התאשף וּנַעַר in such an expression is the better usage.—12. necessary to complete the sentence is lacking in 2 S. The original of 2 S., however, may have been different (see Bu., Sm.).—12. יִתֶם] in 2 S. preceded by יִתֶם which is restored here by Oe., Kau., who went at the risk of their lives. The prep. in that case is בּוּלֵש מ as here in בּוּלֵש מ in the following clause. Without this restoration the ב is that of accompaniment, Ges. § 119, cf. Gn. 9: Lv. 17, the blood of these men shall I drink with (i.e., and therewith) their lives (Ke., Ki.).—18. בּוּלֵש מ an explanation of the previous בּוּלֵש מ from the Chronicler.

20-25. Exploits of Abishai and Benaiah (= 2 S. 234-11).—The immediate connection of these verses with the preceding and the reference in the present Hebrew text to the three suggest that the two heroes Abishai and Benaiah were members of the triad who broke through unto the well at Bethlehem and constituted a second triad of heroes distinct from the first three and also distinct from the thirty. This view apparently appears in II and AV. and RV., and was generally that of ancient interpreters. The prevailing modern view, however, is that those who drew the water at Bethlehem are entirely unknown and that, further than in their exploit, they do not constitute a triad of heroes distinct from the thirty, and in short only one such triad is mentioned, viz. Ishbaal, Eleazar, and Shammah. The text presents a certain amount of confusion and uncertainty. Abishai and Benaiah, while not equal to the three (vv. 81-84), yet clearly form a class by themselves, but whether distinct from the thirty (according to Dr., Mar.) or enrolled among the thirty (according to Kau., Bu., Ki.) is not clear.—20. 21. And Abishai,* the brother of Jo'ab, was the thirty's* chief, and he swung his spear over three hundred slain and he had renown like
the three. Among the thirty* behold he* was in honor and he became their captain, yet he did not attain unto the three]. For further events in the life of Abishai cf. 18° I S. 26° 2 S. 16° 18° 21°. —
22. Benaiah the son of Jehoiada* from Kabsel was a man of valor*, mighty in deeds. He slew two young lions having gone to their lair,* and he went down and slew a lion in a pit on a snowly day]. The prowess of Benaiah in conflict with wild beasts is here vividly set forth; in the following verse his prowess as a warrior.—Kabsel] was a town in south Judah, unidentified, cf. Jos. 15° Ne. 11°. —23. Five cubits high] a touch of description wanting in 2 S., as also like a weaver’s beam, derived probably from the story of Goliath, 1 S. 17° 2 S. 21°. Another resemblance to the Goliath story is the fact that the Egyptian was slain with his own weapon, 1 S. 17°. —24. And he had renown like* the three mighty men]. Cf. v. °.

20. מֵאָגֶז] 2 S. 23° correctly מֵאָגֶז, so also ג, cf. 2°.—רַצְמָה] 2 S. Kt. the same; Qr. פִּנָּחָשׁ, but some mss. (see Gins.) and 2 S. have פִּנָּחָשׁ, the true reading, adopted by Be., We. TS., and scholars generally (not by Ke., Oe.).—עֹד] Qr. and 2 S. עֹד, so also ג,ח. The ע” is preferred by Mar., who reads נו וַיֵּצֵא, he was not reckoned among the three. Others generally read נו.—Instead of כשנָבָא we read with Bu. and Sm. כשנָבָא. Dr. retains מ in 2 S. with a similar meaning. “Abishai and Benaiah had a name beside the Three” though not fully equal to theirs.” Kau., Ki., and Bn. read כשנָבָא נו] 2 S. 23° the same; a comparison with v. °° shows that we should read כשנָבָא נו (We. TS., and scholars generally). Dr., Mar., Sm., translate “more than the thirty, etc.,” which puts Abishai and also Benaiah (see v. °°) in a distinct class by themselves apart from the thirty. In favour of this is the fact that the number thirty is complete without them (cf. 2 S. 23°). Others translate “from among the thirty,” thus enrolling the two with them (Kau., Ki.).—ושנָבָא] retained by Ki. with the rendering “stand er zweifach in Ehren”; rejected by Kau., Bn., who (as above) substitute מ from v. °°, which is the reading of We., Dr., and Bu. in 2 S., where we have מ, a certain corruption. Sm. prefers to read מ. —22. מ] before מֵאָגֶז should be omitted as ג in 2 S. 23°, since Benaiah and not his grandfather is clearly described (We. TS., Dr., Kau., Ki., et al.).—מֵאָגֶז מְשָׁפָן] usually rendered mighty in deeds but by Bu., since his origin is here described, mighty in possessions, the striking thing being that a man of wealth should be a hero.—
—The title given in v. 26 (wanting in 2 S.) to this section shows that the Chronicler regarded this list as independent of those mentioned above. The addition of the sixteen names in vv. 27-38, carrying the number far beyond thirty, has probably led to the removal of any relation to the thirty by the omission of that reference in v. 39 and of the summary in v. 40. Compared with 2 S. the list is better preserved in Chronicles. The great majority of these men, apart from this list and the one in 2 S., are otherwise unknown and hence require no comment. Nine of them, with Jashobeam, Eleazar, and Benaiah (v. s.), however, appear in the Chronicler’s list of the captains of David’s host (27-38).

—'Arbathite] from Beth-árabah, a town of Judah or Benjamin (cf. Jos. 151. 4).—33. 'Azmaveth]. Cf. 121.—Baharumite] (improper spelling v. 4) from Bahurim, a town of Benjamin (v. i.).—Sha'albonite] from Sha'albim, a town of Dan (cf. Jos. 1911), near Aijalon.—34. Hashem] 2 S. 231 Jashen (v. i.).—Gizonite] uncertain (v. i.).—Hararite] uncertain.—35. Sacar] 2 S. 231 Sharar (v. i.).—Eliphal] 2 S. 231 Elipelet (v. i.).—36. This verse is entirely uncertain, probably corrupt (v. i.).—37. Carmelite] from Carmel, a town near Hebron.—Na'arai] 2 S. 231 Pa'arai (v. i.).—38. V. i.—39. Berothite] from Beeroth, a town of Benjamin.—40. 'Ithrite]. Cf. 21.—41. Uriah the Hittite] the officer whose wife David took.—Zabad] wanting in 2 S. This completes the list given in 2 S., where is added “thirty and seven in all” (2 S. 231). Zabad may have belonged with the list in 2 S. and for some reason have fallen from the text, thus making a complete number of thirty-seven (cf. 2 S. 231). Chronicles, lacking Elika (see v. 31), furnishes 3 + 2 + 30 = 35 names. Usually, however, Zabad is grouped with the fifteen new names in vv. 41–47.
second half is uncertain. We. TS. has [30].—30. The former attested by [31] and as proper name by Zc. 619, is read (ילוח) by Bu. (SBOT.) and Mar in 2 S.—31. The former with the art. is correct.—32. It is uncertain which is correct, but the former is preferred by We. TS., Bu., yet the latter by Ki.—33. Ch. is supported by [34] of 2 S. We. TS., Bu., read [35] read. The reference is to Bahurim, cf. 2 S. 32 16 17 19 1 K. [36]. 2 S. has [37]. The former is preferred in 2 S. by Mar.—38. Ki. prefers the former. Bn. the latter, since supported by [39] in 2 S.—40. Ki. prefers the former. Bn. the latter, since [41] (Ki., Bn.), but it is impossible to determine which name is correct, probably because is too common to have likely suffered corruption.—42. The reading of 2 S. is of the name of a place; if followed (Ki., but all is uncertain, Bn.), then [43] represents a proper name, Bani 2 S.—44. Ki. reads [45] after 2 S. the Gadite (Ki.) or the Geraite, i.e., of the Benjaminite clan of Gera (Mar.).

42-47. The sixteen persons including Zabad (v. 41) added by the Chronicler to the list given in 2 S. are all otherwise unknown and we have no other source for determining the correctness of the names given.—42. 'Adina the son of Shisha the Reubenite, chief
of the Reubenites and with him thirty]. These words would well fit into a statement of a gathering of Reubenites unto David similar to that of the Benjaminites, the Gadites, and the Manassites mentioned in c. 12. Then the names following would be a fragment of the list of the thirty who were with 'Adina and the original place of these verses might well be c. 12 between v. 1 and v. 8 (Bu. v. s.). In favour of this is the fact that the gentilic adjectives in vv. 41-47 represent places east of the Jordan. If this view is not taken, then instead of thirty with him (שְׁנִיַּיִל), we should read over thirty (כְּלֵי שֶׁנִּי) (Be., Ki., Bn.). According to Ba. thirty with him is a marginal note designed to follow v. 41.—43. The Mithnite] is entirely obscure.—44. The 'Asherathite] i.e., from Ashtaroth, a city of Bashan, Dt. 1* Jos. 9* et al.—The 'Aro'erite]. The reference probably is to Aror in Moab (cf. 5*). Another Aror was in southern Judah, 1 S. 30*.—45. The Tizite]. The place referred to is entirely unknown.—46. The Mahavite] v. i.—47. The Meqobaiite] v. i.

46. מַהֲבָה] is an impossible form for a singular gentilic name, Kau. and Ki. give it up as hopelessly corrupt. Be. suggested מַהֲבָה the Mahanaim east of the Jordan. מַתְּנָאִית] has Masaon possibly representing מַתְּנָא from Beth Meon, a city of Reuben, Jos. 13* (מַתְּנָא, מַתְּנָא, are corruptions of מִתְנָא).—47. מַבָּיִית] is also a corruption. Kau. and Ki. attempt no rendering. Possibly we should read מַבָּיִית from Zobah (cf. v. 41) (Be., Ba.).

XII. 1-23 (1-22). David’s recruits when estranged from Saul.—In 1 S. 22* we are told how David became captain of a band made up of his kinsfolks, fellows in distress, debtors, and discontented and desperate men generally. That is a narrative of history, while in this present chapter we have a Jewish Midrash or interpretation whereby David’s recruits become the choicest and most valiant representatives of the tribes of Israel, and come to him in such numbers that instead of some four hundred or six hundred men (1 S. 22* 27*), he has under him a great host like the host of God (v. 41). Our chapter then has no real historical worth. The names it contains, however, probably are not fictitious, but are those of leading men of the tribes some of whom in actual life may have been associated with David.
The chapter is assigned by Bn. to the Chronicler’s sources; according to Kl. vv. 1-8 may have been written by the Chronicler, but contain here and there material of good historical worth; vv. 9-28 he assigns to M. The heavy style of vv. 1-8 (Kr) suggests that they were written by the Chronicler (cf. 11:10 23:27), and the exaggerated statement of v. 8 (Kr) is certainly characteristic of him (cf. especially 22:14 24:1). In the light of the loyalty of Benjamin to Saul, even long after his death (2 S. 16:9-20), the statement that large numbers of Benjaminites deserted to David (vv. 10 17 (21 14)), and among them even a Gibeathite, one from Saul’s home town, is historically suspicious. Benjamin formed a part of the kingdom of Ishbaal (2 S. 20). Since certainly in post-exilic times Benjamin held a high position in the Jewish community (Ne. 11:157), it was an act of pious imagination to relieve this tribe, and especially those families which were represented in this late community, from the odium which would attach to those who followed the house of one whom Yahweh slew (104). Only in a work like the Chronicler’s where David is exalted far above even the builder of the Temple (cf. cc. 22 ff.) and where Saul is ignored, except to show his ignominious end, should this vindication of late Benjamine families be expected. Hence this treatment of the Benjaminites points to the authorship of the Chronicler. Some of the names may be old, for he would probably include the reputed ancestors of well-known Benjaminitite families of his own day. Just how much of this passage may be from an older source is, therefore, uncertain. The name Be‘aliah (נ隊י), v. 8 (Kr), is certainly old (v. i).

1-8 (1-7). The recruits from Benjamin at Ziklag.—1. On David’s sojourn at Ziklag cf. 1 S. 27:1-7.—While he was under restraint through Saul] i.e., while because of Saul he was not free to come and go in Israel.—Helpers in war]. Cf. the use of the verb (ךלדי) to help in vv. 10 (18) 11 (11).—2. Using both the right hand and the left in [slinging] stones and in [shooting] arrows with the bow]. The Benjaminites are mentioned elsewhere as left-handed and expert slingers (Ju. 3:10 20:16).—Of the kinsfolks of Saul of Benjamin]. This statement is probably wide of the historic truth, since even on the death of Saul the tribe of Benjamin remained faithful to his house, cf. 2 S. 2:16-21, and much less can we believe that such desertions to David took place during Saul’s lifetime. The prominence of the Benjaminites in post-exilic Israel may have contributed to the origin of such stories.—3. Ahi’ser] elsewhere the name of the chief of the Danites. Nu. 1:12 2:27. 10:1†.—Joash the son* of Shema‘iah *† (or Jehosh
The local reference is to Gibeath of Benjamin or of Saul the mod. Tell-el-Ful, two and a half miles north of Jerusalem.—And Jiz‘el [Jezu‘el or Jezo‘el, Kt.] and Pelet [21] sons of ‘Asmavo‘el]. ‘Asmavo‘el is the name also of one of David’s mighty men (11ii cf. 8v).—Beraca‘h [and Jehu the ‘Anathothite]. Anathoth was a Benjaminite town, the mod. ‘Anata, three miles north-east of Jerusalem (SWP. III. 7).—4. Ishma‘iah [the Gibeonite]. Owing to Saul’s treatment of the Gibeonites, a Gibeonite might well have passed over to David. Cf. 2 S. 211.—A mighty man among the thirty and over the thirty]. It is noticeable that the list of mighty men given in 11ii 8 is not called the thirty in Chronicles. Ishma‘iah’s name also is not in that list, hence the conception of the thirty here appears to be different from that of the author of 2 S. 23.—5 (4b). The Gederothite i.e., from Gedera, a town of S. Judah Jos. 15*, perhaps the ruin Jedre‘h nine miles south of Ludd (SWP. III. 43), or since the context seems to require a Benjaminite town, perhaps the village Jedre‘h north of Jerusalem (SWP. III. 9), or possibly the town was Gedor Jos. 15* south-west of Bethlehem mod. Jedur (Bn.).—6 (5). El‘uzai [and Jerimoth (cf. 7) and Be‘aliah]. This last name (יִבְלָיָה), Yahweh is Baal, represents an early period when no objection was taken to the identification of Yahweh with Baal (cf. for similar names 81 8v 911 11 14h).—Shemarjahu [and Shephai‘jahu]. Written in the shorter form (יְשָׁמָרַיָה, יְשָׁפָהוּ), these names are quite common.—The Horuphitel or Hariphite]. A Hareph appears among the sons of Caleb (21v).—Sons of Hariph are mentioned among those who returned with Zerubbabel.—7 (6). Ishshijahu [a name not infrequent in shorter form Ishshiah. Cf. 7 24v et al.—Jo‘ezer [Jashob‘am]. Cf. 11v. —The names Elkanah and ‘Azarel are frequent.—Korahites]. We are to think of persons from the town of Judah rather than members of the Levitical clan, cf. 2v.—8 (7). From Gedor*] v. s. v. 4 (b) cf. 4v. Clearly from v. 4 (b) on we have a list of Judeans rather than Benjaminites, as though two lists had here been combined (Be.). Perhaps the introductory words for the Judeans have fallen from the text (Ba.). (Ke. held that all were Benjaminites, some residing in Judean cities.)
1. because of. DBD. and c.—2. This phrase occurs also in 2 Ch. 17* and Ps. 78* (where should be struck from the text as an explanatory gloss). Omit connecting with and, or possibly the original read (cf. Ps 78, 3*). Then a dittography of the following caused the trouble.—3. Qr. some mss. read and perhaps a corruption of "God sees" (EBi.) (cf. v. 4*).—6. Qr. with the first form agree. text of Baer. text of Ginsburg and Ki. BH. Heb. mss. vary, O—O.

9-16 (8-15). The recruits from Gad.—Chronologically (following the Hebrew text) this paragraph precedes vv. 1-2 (7), since David dwelt in the fortress (v. 1* (8)) before he went to Ziklag.—9 (8). Separated themselves i.e., from the other Gadites who were on Saul's side (Be., Ke., Zoe.). The verb expresses more than the simple going over to David which is the rendering of Kau. and Ki.—To the stronghold in the wilderness. When David was fleeing from Saul he sought refuge in the stronghold of Adullam (8* 1* 8* 1* 8* 1*) and in others (1 S. 23* 1*) located in the wilderness of Judah. It was during this period of his life that these Gadites are represented as coming to him. The reference is not to any particular stronghold.—Men of the host for battle. This expression indicates that these recruits were trained soldiers (cf. 7*).—Arranging the spear and the shield i.e., in order for battle, a peculiar expression also found in Je. 46*. The more usual one is given in v. 2*. On their likeness to lions in the fierceness of their appearance or onset, and to roes for swiftness, cf. 2 S. 1* 2*.—11 (10). Mashmannah. Machbannai.—14 (13). Machbannai.—15 (14). Heads of the host i.e., chief warriors (Ke., Zoe.), better, leaders or commanders (Be., Kau., Ki., RV.). Ki. after carries forward this idea of leadership to the next clause: the least one over a hundred, the greatest over a thousand. With this rendering one would expect h instead of t. The true interpretation is that the smallest, or weakest, could cope with a hundred, and the greatest, or strongest, with a thousand (Be., Ke., Zoe., Kau., RV.). Cf. Is. 30* Lv. 26*—16 (15). In the first month i.e., the month
Nisan (April), the period of the barley harvest, when the Jordan is at its flood (cf. Jos. 3:14). In the summer the Jordan is easily fordable, but after the melting of the snows on the mountains in the spring it is hazardous to cross.—And they put to flight all [the inhabitants of] the valleys on the east and on the west. The writer evidently has in mind that the adherents of Saul opposed the passage of these Gadites to join David.

9. On the plural force of רעים cf. Gn. 10:12. Kön. iii. § 256 e. רעים. The pathah under ר is due to the close connection with the following word. כרל omit the phrase and also have והיה רעים דרשנース, implying that the Gadites came from the wilderness evidently to Ziklag (cf. v. 5). Instead of רעים והיה רוות cf. the Venetian pointed text, 1526, curiously had רעים, perhaps through the influence of Je. 46:1 (Be.). רעים] on use of inf. see Ges. § 1140.

17-19 (16-18). Additional recruits from Benjamin and Judah. This paragraph reads like an insertion from another narrative between the accounts of the recruits from Gad and Manasseh. The omission of the mention of personal names is striking, and especially the vivid and dramatic form of the narrative.—17 (16). Benjamin and Judah. The point of view is post-exilic, cf. v. 1.—Untq the stronghold. Cf. v. 12.—18 (17). And David answered and said. The Hebrew idiom employs two verbs in introducing speakers in a colloquy where in English usually only one is used.—If in peace you have come unto me to help me then shall mine heart be at one with you; but if to betray me to my adversaries, although no wrong is in my hands, may the God of our fathers see and judge. On this beautiful commitment by David of his cause to God, with his assertion of innocence, cf. 1 S. 24:11-12.—19 (18). Then the spirit took possession of 'Amasai lit. put him on, as a garment, clothed itself with him. Cf. 2 Ch. 24:2 Ju. 6:4 (see Moore in loco).—Chief of the thirty (Kt.). In 11 we have found according to the true reading that Abishai was chief of the thirty, hence Ki., after the interpretation of Be. and others, reads here Abishai instead of 'Amasai. Others (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.) prefer to identify Amasai with Amasa (אמסת), whom Absalom made his commander-in-chief and later David,
and whom Joab treacherously slew (2 S. 17:19* 18* (12) 20*).—And he said]. These words are wanting in א, but are given in ג.—

Thine [are we] O David,
And with thee O son of Jesse,
Peace, peace to thee,
And peace to thy helpers
For thy God hath helped thee.

This response is a beautiful bit of Hebrew poetry. David's whole career from the point of view of the OT. narrators had been marked by evidences of divine assistance.—The band]. David's company of four hundred or six hundred men (1 S. 22* 27*). The word band is usually used of marauders (cf. v. 18 2 Ch. 22* 1 S. 30* 11 K. 11* et al.).

18. וּלְבַד (וּלְבַד) equivalent to וּלְבַד. Only here is וּלְבַד used as a substantive.—וּלְבַד [וּלְבַד] neg. circumstantial clause Ges. § 156c. Use of י with prep. is chiefly poetic and late, cf. v. 34.—19. וּלְבַד וּלְבַד Qr. וּלְבַד וּלְבַד. The former is generally preferred and is the reading of ג, ב, י.—חרב וּלְבַד. ב also read יִרְבּ, repeating it, and has otherwise amplified the verse and also the preceding verse.—The pl. יִרְבּ should be read after ג, י.

20-23 (19-22). The recruits from Manasseh.—20 (19). And of Manasseh some deserted to David] lit. fell. For the use of the verb יָלַד with this force cf. 2 Ch. 15* 2 K. 25* Je. 21* 37* 39* 52*.—When he went with the Philistines against Saul]. Cf. 1 S. 28* 29**. The clause is used to describe the very time when David received his recruits from Manasseh. As soon as he returned to Ziklag they came v. 11 (11) and assisted him in his raid against the Amalekites v. 11 (11).—And he did not help them*] a continuation of the previous clause.—Because on advice the tyrants of the Philistines had him sent away saying: At the price of our heads he will desert to his master Saul]. The phrase at the price of our heads is suggested by 1 S. 29*1. The thought is that David would reconcile himself to Saul through some act of treachery involving the death of the Philistines.—21 (20). When he returned (lit. went) to Ziklag there deserted unto him from Manasseh 'Adnah †, etc.]. This verse fixes more exactly than v. 11 (11) the time of the accession of these recruits and defines their person-
ality. Except 'Adnah (2 Ch. 17:1 †) and Zillethai (cf. 8:9), their names are not especially rare.—Chiefs of the thousands of Manasseh]. The writer is thinking of the military divisions of the tribe of Manasseh according to P (cf. Nu. 31:14-19, 41).—22 (21). And they]. It is difficult to determine whether the pronoun refers to the seven Manassites just mentioned (Ke., Zoe.) or all the recruits vv. 1-21 (Be., Oe.).—The band is the Amalekites who sacked Ziklag during David's absence (v. s. and 1 S. 30:16).—23 (22). This verse explains the host, the last word of the preceding verse.—Like the host of God] i.e., a very great host. The epithet, “of God,” is used to distinguish a thing that is very great (Dav. Syn. § 34 R 6). (Cf. 1 S. 14:Ps. 36:80:Jon. 3:.) On the wide remove of the writer from historical fact see above.

20. פְּעֵמָה]. While David and his men might be taken as the subject, it is better to read with (?) the verb sing. פָּעֵמָה with David as the subject (Ki.).—21. מַעֲלָת]. The choice of מַעֲלָת here may have been determined by מַעֲלָת 1 S. 29:1.—22. The word רֹעַנ (l. 17 ?) is used of the Amalekites in 1 S. 30:16:23. מַעֲלָת מִלְּמַדְתָּן] (l. 48). This phrase is given elsewhere without מַעֲלָת. This verse is not unlikely from the hand of the Chronicler instead of from his source.

24-41 (23-40). The number of the soldiers who made David king at Hebron.—These verses are another account of the events already related in 11:1-4. Their object is to show the completeness of the assembly of all Israel to make David king, and especially to set forth the military pomp of the occasion.—24 (23). And these are the numbers of the heads of the armed men of the host]. The word heads occasions a difficulty. Ordinarily heads (וֹסְדֵי) are interpreted leaders, commanders, or chiefs: and so here by (G, H, Be., Ki. This meaning, however, does not agree with the context, since the number of the heads in that sense is only given of the house of Zadok (v. 29 (89)), of Issachar (v. 30 (89)), and of Naphtali (v. 30 (89)): all of the other numbers are of the units of the tribes. Hence it has been thought with probability that the heading originally belonged to a list which, like vv. 30 (89) 31 (97), contained the names and numbers of chiefs and warriors (Be.). Others interpret heads as polls, persons (Ba.), after Ju. 5:9 (a usage not paralleled elsewhere with but requiring מַעֲלָת, see
Moore *in loco*), or as bands, divisions, after Ju. 7**. ** 9**. ** 11 (Ke., Zee., Oe.). *The host* is the army of Israel after the usage of P.—To turn the kingdom of Saul to him according to the word of Yahweh]. Cf. 10**. **. **7 (24). *Bearing the shield and spear*] the large shield (סָרָן) covering the whole man in contrast with the small shield (גַּלְגַּל) carried as a protection against arrows. The spear (יָדָּם) was a lance for thrusting.—The number of Judah is noticeably small compared with the numbers from the northern tribes. Ke. explains that since David had already reigned seven years at Hebron, Judah and Simeon needed to send only relatively few men, merely to witness the ratification of his kingship by others. The enigma really remains unsolved.—28 (27). *And Jehoiada the prince of the house of Aaron*] identified with the father of Benaiah (11**. ** 2 S. 8**.) (Raschi, Kimchi, Be., Ke., Zee., Oe., Ba.); a simple uncritical reflection of Jehoiada the priest that brought Joash to the throne (2 K. 11, 12) (We. Prol. p. 174). The former view probably was the design of the writer, since according to 1 K. 2**. **, Benaiah slew Joab in the Tent of Yahweh, and hence from the point of view of the Chronicler, having such access to the sanctuary, he naturally would have been of Levitical descent and his father might well have been a leader of the Levites—distinct from Abiathar the priest—at the time of David's coronation. In the following verse Benaiah's cotemporary Zadok is mentioned as a young man (יָדָּם), thus in the proper age relation to Benaiah's father.—29 (28). *And Zadok*. This Zadok, who with twenty two captains of his father's house is represented as associated with Jehoiada, is probably designed to be the priest who with Abiathar was at the court of David (2 S. 8**.) and who later supplanted Abiathar entirely (1 K. 2**.). The twenty-two captains are a reflection of the twenty-two priestly classes of the post-exilic period 24**. ** Ne. 12**. **. (We., Bn.), yet the twenty-two classes are doubtful.—30 (29). For until now] i.e., up to the time of David's coronation, the event which the writer is describing.—The great part of them kept their allegiance to the house of Saul] lit. kept the charge of the house of Saul, a form of expression used frequently of the care of the sanctuary (23** Nu. 1**. ** et al.). The writer com-
I CHRONICLES

pletely ignores the fact that according to 2 S. 21 not only Benjamin but all Israel except Judah adhered to the house of Saul until the death of Ishbaal.—31 (30). Of or in their fathers' houses]. This is the usual rendering (cf. 5*). But Be. preferred according to their fathers' houses, i.e., that was their order (for this use of cf. BDB. 5 i (a)).—32 (31). And from the half-tribe of Manasseh i.e., from Manasseh west of the Jordan. The other half, east of the Jordan, is mentioned in v. 11.—Who were designated by name]. Cf. 16* 2 Ch. 28* 31* Nu. 1* Ezr. 8*.* The writer assumes that a roll of individuals was kept and thus these eighteen thousand were summoned to come to make David king.—33 (32). And from the children of Issachar those having an understanding of the times knowing what Israel should do]. This applies to the two hundred heads or leaders. The meaning probably is that they were skilled in astrological lore and thus knew what Israel should do (T and some of the Rabbins, Be., Oe., BDB. 2 b cf. Est. 1*), though others have found here only the thought of prudent men who knew what the times demanded (Ke., Zoe., Ba.). This characterisation of members of the tribe of Issachar has been brought into connection with the inquiries made at Abel, a town of Issachar, according to 2 S. 20* (We. Prol. p. 174).—And all their brethren at their command]. The number of these is strangely omitted, and perhaps has fallen from the original text.—38 (37). One hundred and twenty thousand]. The round number of forty thousand for each tribe.—These contingents that came to make David king present a total as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,600 “from Levi,”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,700 with Jehoiada, Zadok, and 22 captains)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>20,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Manasseh</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issachar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebulun</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphtali</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>28,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asher</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribes E. Jordan</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribes W. Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

339,600
The basis upon which these numbers were reckoned it is impossible to determine. The writer's object clearly is to magnify the part taken by the tribes of the subsequent Northern kingdom in David's coronation. He has imparted a pleasing colour to his statistics by the variety of phrases with which he describes the tribal hosts.—

\[24.\] 

24. \(\text{G has \(}\text{דִּבְּרָה ( behaving instead of רְשֵׁי). This probably was written by a careless transcriber through the notion that the verse was a subscription of the preceding verses. — On the omission of \(\text{יָאָשָׁה before \(\text{שָׁמִים, see Ges. § 155d. Bn. after \(\text{G inserts \(\text{יָאָשָׁה] v. \(\text{יֵלַע, those equipped for the host, i.e., for war, cf. Nu. 31:32\n}}\)

Jos. 4:18. This phrase is parallel with \(\text{נָבָי וְאָשָׁף v. \(\text{51, —}},

\text{34. \(\text{נָבָי וְאָשָׁף [setting in order for war with every kind of weapon of war, cf. v. \(\text{יֵלַע] Ges. § 114p. \(\text{G, B, and some Heb. mss. have \(\text{נָבָי preferred by Kau., Bn., while the text is adhered to by Be., Ke., Zac., Oe., Ki. Here and in v. \(\text{יֵלַע is apparently used as a synonym of \(\text{רַע, which word actually appears in v. \(\text{יֵלַע in some mss. (q. v.) Perles suggests as original in both passages the word \(\text{דִּבְּרָה which in Babylonian as \(\text{saddru has the technical meaning \"arranging (an army) in battle array.\" A copyist then inserted \(\text{רַע as a gloss to this foreign word in both places, whence arose the form \(\text{רַע by combination of the two (OLZ. 8, 1905, col. 181).—}},

\text{35. \(\text{רַע [with one heart, lit. \"with not a heart of two kinds," cf. Ps. 12\n}}\), for construction Ges. § 123f. Dav. Syn. § 29 R. 8. On \(\text{לָל cf. v. \(\text{10,—35. \(\text{רַע [with one heart] v.v. \(\text{ רַע and \(\text{רַע. It is uncertain whether we should draw a distinction between these (Now. Arch. I. p. 362), although the former has been regarded as the heavier weapon used by great warriors (2 S. 22:23b) (EBi. art. Spear).—}},

\text{37. \(\text{כָּרָב וְאָשָׁף] cf. v. \(\text{נָבָי, —39. \(\text{כָּרָב preferred by Kau., Bn. (id. or \(\text{כֹּל, cf. v. \(\text{רַע.}}

\text{203 Hosts assembled at Hebron} (24^\text{-}41). The basis upon which these numbers were reckoned it is impossible to determine. The writer's object clearly is to magnify the part taken by the tribes of the subsequent Northern kingdom in David's coronation. He has imparted a pleasing colour to his statistics by the variety of phrases with which he describes the tribal hosts.—40. 41 (39. 40). Cf. for descriptions of similar joy and feasting 29. 30^2 Ch. 7:10 1 K. 8:66^2 Ch. 30:16. While sacrifices are not mentioned here, they would naturally accompany a coronation festival with its oaths of treaty or allegiance (cf. Gn. 31:44). Food of flour] i.e., bread stuffs made of wheat or barley, usually in the form of thin flat round cakes.—Pressed cakes of figs]. Cf. 1 S. 25:30^1. In making these the figs are sometimes first beaten in a mortar and then pressed into a cake (DB.).—Bunches of raisins]. Cf. 1 S. 25:30^2 2 S. 16^1. These were dried grapes, probably also pressed into cakes.
XIII. 1-14. The removal of the ark from Kiriath-jearim.

—This narrative is taken from 2 S. 6:1-11, but is provided by the Chronicler with an introduction vv. 1-4 fitting it into his conception of the organised hosts of Israel and of the activity of the Levites at that time. In giving the removal of the ark immediately after David’s coronation and capture of Jerusalem (11:8) the Chronicler has departed from the order of 2 S., where accounts of David’s building himself a house, and of his family and of his victories over the Philistines (2 S. 5:18), precede the mention of his removal of the ark. The Chronicler has clearly placed this last event first in order to magnify David’s concern for the worship of Yahweh. David’s religious acts are the main thing with the Chronicler. Others are mere episodes in the King’s career.

1. For such consultation with all officers of the realm cf. 28:1 2 Ch. 1*. This representation may be due to the Chronicler’s desire to minimise the suggestion of the arbitrary authority of the King seen in the books of S. and K. (Ba.).—2. All the assembly of Israel] i.e., the assembly of officers.—Let us send in every direction (Oe., Ba.) or let us send quickly (Be., Ke., Zoe., Ki.).] The former rendering (RV.) is the better according to the meaning of the verb (עָלָה), cf. Gn. 28:14 Is. 54:10 (but v. i.).—Who are left in all districts of Israel] i.e., those who did not come to make David king in Hebron. The writer closely connects the removal of the ark with the assembly of the hosts described in the previous chapter.—The priests and the Levites]. The narrative in 2 S. has no word concerning the participation of the priests and the Levites. Their introduction here is due to the point of view of the Chronicler. Everything must be done according to P.—In their cities that have pasture lands]. An express provision of the Levitical and priestly cities was that pasture lands, the immediately adjoining suburbs, should go with them (Nu. 35:1-2, see also Jos. 14:1-22:8, 1 Ch. 6:1-2, 2 Ch. 11:14).—3. And let us bring up [lit. round] the ark of our God]. The Chronicler varies in his use of terms designating the ark. In passages independent of Biblical sources he calls it the ark of God v. 15:1-3, 11, 16; 2 Ch. 11, the ark of the covenant of God 16:1, the ark of Yahweh 15:11 16:1 2 Ch. 8:11 and the ark of the covenant of Yahweh 16:1 22:12 28:11, and in the Biblical excerpts he
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has allowed to remain unchanged ark of God vv. 4, 7 and the ark of the covenant of Yahweh 2 Ch. 5: 12, and has substituted for the ark of Yahweh, the ark of God vv. 11, 11 (the ark) 14: 16, and for the ark of Yahweh, the ark of the covenant of Yahweh 15: 26, 26, 26, and the same also for the ark of God 17. Thus while a tendency is shown toward preferring the term God to Yahweh, since in no instances is the ark of Yahweh allowed to stand in a Biblical extract, yet since this term is used by the Chronicler himself, we have no real consistency of usage. The preference, however, of the Dtlic. term the ark of the covenant of Yahweh is noticeable.—For we have not sought it in the days of Saul] i.e., we have made no inquiry concerning it (cf. 1 S. 7: 4).—5. From Shihor of Egypt. In Is. 23: 4 Je. 2: 16 Shihor clearly stands for the Nile. The name properly seems to have been that of an arm or branch of the delta or canal of the Nile (Shihor, DB., EBi.). In this passage and the parallel one Jos. 13: the name is more applicable to the Wady el'Arish or the Brook of Egypt, which is elsewhere taken as the south-western limit of the Promised Land (Nu. 34: 1 Jos. 15: 4 1 K. 8: 2 Ch. 7: 15 Is. 27: 2) (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.). Ki. thinks of the most eastern arm of the Nile delta; Bn., that Shihor is in our text through careless transcription. Probably at the time of the Chronicler one thought of the Nile as well as the Wady el'Arish as the ideal boundary of the ancient kingdom of Israel (cf. Spurrell on Gn. 15: 4).—Even unto the entrance of Hamath] the northern boundary of Israel (Nu. 13: 34 Jos. 13: Jg. 3) identified with the Bekā', a broad valley between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon watered by the Orontes, in which was located the city of Hamath, mod. Hamā.—Kiriath-jearim] a city of the Gibeonites west of Jerusalem (identification uncertain) (cf. Buhl, GAP, pp. 166 f.). The ark was placed there after its return by the Philistines (1 S. 7: 4).—6. From this verse to the end of the chapter the narrative is taken directly from 2 S. 6: 11 with few variations (yet a marked one in v. 14), and the text is on the whole here better preserved than in 2 S. —Ba'alah] was another name for Kiriath-jearim (Jos. 15: 4 18: 11). The name shows that the place was an ancient sanctuary or seat of Baal-worship.—Yahweh enthroned above the cherubim whose name is called over it] i.e., over the ark; signifying that
the ark belonged especially to Yahweh (Oe., Bn., v. i.). This
description of God probably did not belong to the original text
— Abinadab. Cf. 1 S. 7. In 2 S. 6 the house of Abinadab
is located on a hill and ‘Uzza and Ahio are his sons. The
Chronicler has omitted these particulars and also the verb and
they bore it (יָשַׁבְו). — 8. On the instruments of music v. i.,
and cf. 15. — 9. Chidon] the name probably of the owner
of the threshing-floor. — 10. That Uzza met his death from some
cause now utterly unknown while the ark was being brought, may
be historical, and the reason assigned would be most natural (cf.
15). On the other hand, the story may have originated in an
endeavour to explain the meaning of the local name Perez ‘ussa
v. 11. — 14. And the ark of God abode by the house of 'Obed-edom
in its own house] i.e., the ark was in its tent alongside or near the
house of Obed-edom. This statement is a modification of that of
2 S. 6 (v. i.) where the ark is represented as placed in the house
of Obed-edom. The Chronicler, however, evidently could not
conceive of the ark placed in an ordinary dwelling and modified
the text accordingly. On Obed-edom as a Levite cf. 15.
XIV. David in Jerusalem.—This chapter is taken from 2 S. 5:11—18. As already remarked, the Chronicler has varied the order in 2 S., giving the first place to David’s removal of the ark, c. 13, and now the second to his buildings, his family, and his victories.

1. 2. David’s assistance in building from Tyre.—The embassy from the Phoenician King with gifts of cedars and skilled
slaves was a recognition of David’s great power, his friendship being worth cultivating, and this prosperity indicated that God had established David as king over Israel, for his kingdom was exalted on high.

1. 1 Chron. Qr. has מַעֲרֹת preferred by Ki. (see his note SBOT.), and also occurring in 2 Ch. 22. 10 f. 8*. 18a. In S. and K. we have מַעְרֹת. This is what we should expect from a compound of מַעַרְרָה, which is generally seen in Hiram (v. BDB., after מַעַרְרָה; also v. Ahumai 4). מַעֲרֹת is, of course, possible like מַעְרֹת נַחֲיָה—מַעֲרֹת נַחֲיָה 2 S. 5* [תִּכָּרְא נַחֲיָה—מַעֲרֹת נַחֲיָה] 2 S. 5* [תִּכָּרְא נַחֲיָה—מַעֲרֹת נַחֲיָה]. The Chronicler is fond of using the inf. of purpose and substitutes it for the waw consec.—2. מַעֲרֹת 2 S. 5* נַחֲיָה. It is difficult to determine whether the omission of the מ is a slip or intentional by the Chronicler to show why David knew that Yahweh had established him as king.—3. מַעֲרֹת must be taken as a Niph. pf. fem. and so מַעֲרֹת of 2 S., where מ is always 3ms. The Chronicler has substituted the common word of late Heb. מַעֲרֹת, and also inserted for emphasis מַעֲרֹת, a phrase peculiar to Ch., to intensify the verb, cf. 22. 23. 29. 38 2 Ch. 11. 20, with רָע 16. 17. 18. 26 (l. 87).

3-7. David’s sons born in Jerusalem. (Cf. 3* 2 S. 5* 14-18.)—The Chronicler has omitted from 2 S. the mention of the concubines, either as derogatory to David (Bn., but cf. 3*) or because according to 3* the sons here mentioned were only those of wives (Be.). The names of the sons correspond to those given in 2 S., except as in 3* בֵּית-ָוָל (q. v.) we have the two additional names Elpelet and Nogah vv. 16-17, and correctly Be’elída (בֶּלֶידָּה) instead of Eliada (ביֵלְיָדָה), cf. 3*.

3-7. Besides the omission of מַעֲרֹת before מַעֲרֹת, the Chronicler has omitted the reference to Hebron, but has preserved the true reading מַעֲרֹת instead of מַעֲרֹת. He has also given מַעֲרֹת instead of מַעֲרֹת, and also we have in v. 4 מַעֲרֹת instead of מַעֲרֹת, followed by the additional words מַעֲרֹת מַעֲרֹת. The retention of מַעֲרֹת (v. 4) is meaningless, since the record 2 S. 3* 14, to which it refers, is omitted. For variation in the names see above.

8-12. David’s victory at Baal-perazim. (Cf. 2 S. 5* 17-21.)—The Chronicler follows here very closely the text of 2 S. The only specially noteworthy variations are his removal at the end of v. 8 of the reference to the stronghold, which perhaps he did not under-
stand and which in meaning is not perfectly plain (see Sm.); his substitution of Elohim for Yahweh vv. 10, 11, and the new statement in v. 12, q. v.—8. Over all Israel. David as King of Judah had not been a menace to Philistia and it is possible that he thus ruled with some kind of consent from the Philistines, but they naturally could not countenance the extension of his power over all Israel.—9. In the valley of Repha'im] very near Jerusalem, through which passes the railway from Jaffa (Baed. p. 15) (GAS. HGHL. p. 218).—10. Inquired of Yahweh] by the sacred lot, the Urim and Thummim or the Ephod (cf. Ju. i 1 S. 23. 2-19 30).—11. Ba'al-perazim] should probably be identified with Mt. Perazim of Is. 28*. The site is unknown. The meaning is “Lord of breakings.” If the name is not more ancient than David, to wit, that of some sanctuary of a god, then Baal is equivalent to Yahweh, who, as the remainder of the verse implies, had given them the victory that day.—12. In 2 S. 5* we read that the Philistines left the images of their gods and that David and his men took them away. Here we read that David commanded and the images were burned with fire. The Chronicler could not think of any other disposal of idols by David than their destruction according to the law, Dt. 7*. 13-17. David's victory over the Philistines in the valley (— 2 S. 5**. 11 with the addition of v. 11).—V. 11 has been abridged with the loss of Repha'im, the name of the valley. Elohim, as above, has been substituted for Yahweh in vv. 10-11 and inserted in v. 12, giving and God said. Emphasis has been placed on David's inquiry of God by inserting the word again.—13. In the valley]
Philistines are to be attacked on flank or rear.—15. When thou hearest, etc.]. The omen for attack was to be the sound of the wind in the trees: the wind was regarded as a manifestation of Yahweh (cf. 2 S. 22:11 1 K. 19:11 1 Jb. 38:1). It is not necessary to think that the trees before this event were regarded as sacred.—16. From Gibe'on even to Gezer]. The former (cf. 8:16) indicates the quarter of attack and the latter (cf. 6:18 6:17) the Canaanitish city the probable place of refuge and escape of the Philistines. The distance is some sixteen miles. This scene of the battle may account for the Chronicler's omission of Rephaim in v. 14.—17. The Chronicler has given an exaggerated significance to this victory quite in the line of his desire to glorify David.

13. 2 S. 5:1 has וַיָּלֵךְ instead of וַיַּלְמוּ אֶלֹהִים and אֵל instead of אֵלֶּה (see v. 1) with וַיִּשְׁמַע. —14. (V. s.) וַיָּלֵךְ אֶל רָאוֹאֵית אלֹהִים מְעַלָּהָו [2 S. וַיָּלֵךְ אֶל רָאוֹאֵית אֶלֹהִים]. The text of 2 S. is preferable. A frontal attack is forbidden and one commanded on the rear. Chronicles gives the wrong connection to וַיָּלֵךְ אֶל רָאוֹאֵית אֶלֹהִים, and yet adapted it probably by changing its force from behind them to that of following in a straight direction after them. וַיָּלֵךְ אֶל רָאוֹאֵית is either an original addition of the Chronicler, or possibly the original of 2 S. was וַיָּלֵךְ אֶל רָאוֹאֵית אֶלֹהִים and we have by oversight in Chronicles an interchange of prepositions (Be., Bn.).—In both texts read אֵל instead of אֵלֶּה (Dr., Bu., Ki., BDB.).—15. "paraphrase with much loss of originality and vigor" of 2 S. 5:16 וַיָּלֵךְ אֶל רָאוֹאֵית . The former is the true reading, cf. Is. 28:28 "where Perasim and Gibeah are mentioned together as scenes of celebrated victories. The Philistines are in the O'Kon pop south of Jerusalem. David advancing from the south does not approach them in front, but makes a circuit and assails their rear. From Gibeah, on the north-west of Jerusalem, would thus just indicate the quarter from which his attack would be made" (Dr.).

XV.—XVI. The bringing of the ark to the city of David.—This narrative differs, especially in its elaboration, from the parallel in 2 S. 6:11-12. In 2 S. the impulse for the second removal of the ark is derived from the blessing which the ark had brought to the house of Obed-edom and which had taken away the fear of the King (v. 11, cf. v. 4), and the removal itself is described as performed by the King and the people without the mention of a priest
or a Levite. In Chronicles, on the other hand, this blessing of the house of Obed-edom is mentioned only incidentally (13\textsuperscript{11} - 2 S. 6\textsuperscript{11}) and is not made the motive which led David to carry out his original intention of bringing the ark to Jerusalem. The King, apparently having realised that the failure of the first attempt was due to a non-compliance with the Levitical law, now proceeds to bring up the ark with due ecclesiastical state and ceremony.

If we exclude 15\textsuperscript{10-11} (v. 29) and in 16\textsuperscript{1} the words, and Obed-edom and Jeiel . . . and Asaph (v. i.), the narrative runs smoothly and is probably the composition of the Chronicler. The sixfold division of the Levites (vv. 1\textsuperscript{-11}) is somewhat peculiar and has been given as the ground for assigning 15\textsuperscript{11-11} to an older source (so Bn., Ki.), but the text does not imply that Elishaphan, Hebron, and Ussiel were co-ordinated with Kehath, Merari, and Gershon as sons of Levi. Subordinate members of a family might have become heads of classes beside those named after their forefathers (cf. 2 Ch. 29\textsuperscript{11}). According to Nu. 3\textsuperscript{21}, the family of Elisaphan, the son of Uzziel, had charge of the ark and in the light of Nu. 4\textsuperscript{1} where the transportation of the sacred utensils is committed to the sons of Kehath only, it is surprising that the descendants of any but this family should be represented. The tradition that there were only three sons of Levi was firmly established by the time of P (see on 5\textsuperscript{11} (6\textsuperscript{1})). Hence we think it simpler to suppose that the Chronicler himself introduced the representatives of the three great divisions of the Levites beside those from the family of Kehath. These men with their brethren do not represent necessarily all the Levites, but merely those assigned to this task, which accounts for the small number.

The Psalm fragments (16\textsuperscript{14}) may be later interpolations (Hitzig, Reuss, Bn.) or more probably they were introduced by the Chronicler (Ki. Kom. p. 70).

The evidence that 15\textsuperscript{11-11} was added later, is as follows: (1) The corrected text of v. 18 (v. i.) refers to twelve singers whose names are found to that number, followed by the names of two gate-keepers, but in vv. 30\textsuperscript{1} the whole number are classified as singers, including the well-known gate-keeper Obed-edom (cf. 15\textsuperscript{18} 16\textsuperscript{1} 26\textsuperscript{1} 31\textsuperscript{8} 31\textsuperscript{11} and one new name Asasiak (v. i.). (2) Although the Chronicler gives lists of singers elsewhere, he never classifies them according to their instruments (except 16\textsuperscript{4} v. i.). (3) The phrase וַיִּשְׁתַּחַר (v. 20) is found elsewhere only in the titles of Pss. (9\textsuperscript{1} 46\textsuperscript{1} 48\textsuperscript{1}, see BDB.), and the same is true of וַיִּשָּׁתֵן (v. 8, cf. Ps. 6\textsuperscript{1} 12\textsuperscript{1}). וַיִּשָּׁתֵן precedes the latter in both Pss. cited, and in Chronicles וַיִּשָּׁתֵן follows the phrase. If the Chronicler had been interested in these musical terms, we should expect them elsewhere in a narrative so replete with references to the
singers. (4) The notice concerning the elsewhere unknown gate-
keepers (v. 21) seems to take the place of the two in v. 18. On the
other hand, v. 22 may have come from the Chronicler, since he knows
a Chenaniath, a Kehathite (26a), who would be a suitable prince of the
carrying. The Chronicler thought the singers needed instruction (25'),
and he might well have thought the bearers of the ark also required
directions after the ill-fated ending of the first attempt (13'). Either
the reference to Chenaniath in v. 21 is also secondary or v. 22 is from
the Chronicler.

The development of 15a-24 seems to have been somewhat as follows:
The Chronicler wrote vv. 18-21. 21. 22. An interpolator interested in the
classification of singers according to musical instruments added vv.
19-21 taking all the names except Asasiah from the preceding lists. He
found the text of v. 18 in its present corrupt form (v. i.) and so concluded
that all the names were those of singers. There is no indication in the
present text of v. 18 that Mikneiah concludes the list of the singers.
Then, supposing the names of the gate-keepers to have fallen out after
Asasiah (v. 19), he added two gate-keepers (v. 22), probably appropriating
the names from 9a. The final clause of v. 22 originated in a marginal
gloss contradicting the statement in v. 21.

The interpolator of vv. 19-21. 22 also inserted the words, and Obed-edom
and Jeiel, and Asaph into 16. Obed-edom and Jeiel were added
since otherwise only one harp-player would have been mentioned (cf.
15a) and the insertion of and Asaph assigns to him the cymbals as in
15a. Since the phrase, Obed-edom also the son of Jeduthun, in 16 is
probably a gloss (v. i.), there is every reason to doubt that Obed-edom
was known to the Chronicler as anything but a gate-keeper, and since
his position as a singer (15a 16) rests in all likelihood upon the inter-
polator's misunderstanding of 15a, there is little probability that in
history the family of Obed-edom were ever anything except gate-keepers.

XV. 1-16. The general preparation for bringing up the
ark.—These verses have no direct parallel in 2 S. Six Levites
were assigned the task of carrying the ark, the Chronicler possibly
thinking of a representative of each of the three great classes of
the Levites as at one end and three representatives of the Kehath-
ites at the other. The two priests who were appointed doubtless
had the task of covering the ark (cf. Nu. 4a). These were
commanded to sanctify themselves.—1. And he made for himself
houses]. The reference is either to the erection of other build-
ings besides the palace which David had built with the assistance
of Hiram (14a) (Be.) or to the internal construction of the
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palace as a residence for wives and children (Ke., Zoe., Oe.).—
**And he prepared a place for the ark God**.] Some kind of a
permanent enclosure is clearly meant where a tent could be
erected for the ark. The old tabernacle, according to Chron¬
icles, was at Gibeon (2 Ch. 1*, cf. 1 Ch. 16** 21**).—**2. Then**
i.e., after the ark had been three months in the house of Obed¬
edom (13**) (Be., Ke., Zoe.), or better after the preparation
mentioned in v. 1 when, according to the writer, David is ready
to renew the attempt to bring up the ark.—The observation about
the Levites is made in view of the death of Uzza (13**). It is im¬
plied that the Law had not been observed in carrying the ark on
a cart (13**). For the law cf. Nu. 1** 4** 7* 10**.—**3. This state¬
ment or its equivalent is lacking in 2 S., although such an assembly
might be inferred from 2 S. 6** where all Israel is mentioned.—**5.
Uriel**]. The name occurs in the Kehathite genealogy of Elkanah
6** (n**). He is mentioned first because the Kehathites had the
duty of carrying the furniture of the sanctuary, Nu. 4**.—**6.
Asaiah**]. A Merarite of this name with his genealogy is mentioned
in 6** (n**).—**7. Joel**]. One of this name is mentioned in 23 as a
son of the Gershonite Ladan and the head of a family.—**8. Eliza¬
phan**]. Cf. 2 Ch. 29** where Elizaphan also represents a division
of the Levites. In Nu. 3** the prince of the Kehathites is Elizaphan
the son of Uzziel.—Shemariah**] a name of frequent occurrence
(cf. 9**).—**9. Hebron**] a son of Kehah in 5** (6**) 6** (n** 23** Ex.
6** Nu. 3**.—El'el**] in the genealogy of Heman 6** (m** and the
name of a Levitical overseer appointed by Hezekiah 2 Ch. 31**, elsewhere in Chronicles as the name of non-Levites cf. 5** 8**. m
11**. 12** (n**).—**10. 'Uzziel** like Hebron a son of Kehah in pas¬
sages given above v. 1—Amminadab] the name of a son of Kehah
in 6** (m**) but there the name is a textual error for Ithah.—**11. Zadok
and Abiathar the priests**]. This double priesthood is mentioned
in 2 S. 8** (cf. 1 Ch. 18** for true text) 15**. 19** 20** and came
to an end in the reign of Solomon when Abiathar was deposed
(1 K. 2**. m).—**12. Of the Levites**] is here used in the general
sense, including the priests, cf. v. 11.—Sanctify yourselves] (cf.
2 Ch. 5** 20*. n** 30*. n** 31** 35*) by the washing of the
body and the garments and the keeping aloof from every defile-
ment, avoiding sexual intercourse (cf. Gn. 35:2 Ex. 19:14. 15. 16).
—Unto the place which I have prepared for it]. Cf. vv. 1. 9.
On the construction see textual note.—13. The verb bear (נשש) may be supplied in the first clause (Oe., RV., cf. v. 1; ה has presentes, on § 6 v. i.).—Made a breach upon us]. Cf. 13:1.—For we did not seek it (or him) aright]. The text is ambiguous, the pronominal object of the verb may either refer to the ark as in 13 (g. v.) (Ba.) or to God (Ke., Zoe., Oe., and most). The former, however, is to be preferred: We did not search out and bring up the ark in the right way.—14. David’s request is complied with.—15. Upon their shoulders]. Cf. Nu. 14:7, but see text. n.

1. נְקִי is here taken with the force of הנְקִי by Be., Kau., Ki., while Ke., Zoe., Oe. give the force to prepare (see הָנֵשׁ BDB. II. 3).—2. רָאָם] on use of inf. cf. Ges. § 114f.—7. נְקִי] read נְקִי, see on 6.—12. מָצָּה] equivalent to מָצָּה Ex. 23:18. On the omission of the relative see Ges. § 156 (d), Dav. §§ 144, 145 Rem. 5, Ew. § 333 b; for the same construction where preposition precedes verb 2 Ch. 1:4 and very similar 1 Ch. 29:2 2 Ch. 16:30. On the omission of the relative see Ges. § 156 (d), Dav. §§ 144, 145 Rem. 5, Ew. § 333 b; for the same construction where preposition precedes verb 2 Ch. 1:4 and very similar 1 Ch. 29:2 2 Ch. 16:30. On the omission of the relative see Ges. § 156 (d), Dav. §§ 144, 145 Rem. 5, Ew. § 333 b; for the same construction where preposition precedes verb 2 Ch. 1:4 and very similar 1 Ch. 29:2 2 Ch. 16:30. On the omission of the relative see Ges. § 156 (d), Dav. §§ 144, 145 Rem. 5, Ew. § 333 b; for the same construction where preposition precedes verb 2 Ch. 1:4 and very similar 1 Ch. 29:2 2 Ch. 16:30.

16-24. The musical arrangements for bringing up the ark.
—On the composite character of this section, see above.—16. And David commanded] expresses the Heb. idiom more nearly than the spake to of EVs. (v. i.).—The chiefs of the Levites]. The reference may be to the six enumerated in vv. 17-18 repeated in v. 19.—With
psaltery, harp, and cymbals]. These three instruments are often mentioned together by the Chronicler vv. 13 16 2 Ch. 5 29 Ne. 12. The cymbals expressed by meziltayim are mentioned only in Chronicles. In 2 S. 6 Ps. 150 the Heb. word for cymbals is zelqālim (cf. 13), although we cannot distinguish between the instruments (Now. Arch. I. pp. 272 f.).—17. On the three singers, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, cf. 6—22 25 27. Their brethren twelve] should be read instead of their brethren of the second degree (v. i.). The singers here mentioned are given again in v. 16 and in part in 16 (v. s.).—Zechariah] has been identified with the Zechariah of 9 26 (EB. IV. col. 5390). The name is an Asaphite, probably family, name in 2 Ch. 20 Ne. 12. The following Ben, wanting in v. 16, should be read Bani (v. i.). A Bani appears in the line of descent of the singer Ethan (6 51) and as an Asaphite (Ne. 11).—'Uzzaiel] (so read also in v. 16 instead of 'Asiʾel, Jeʾiel) the name also of a musician, a son of Heman, in 25, and of a son of Jeduthun in 2 Ch. 29.—Shemiramoth]. A Levite of this name appears also in 2 Ch. 17. 1. Jehiel] the name of a son of Heman 2 Ch. 29 Qr., also elsewhere frequent.—Unni] wanting in 16, a Levite in Ne. 12 Qr. 1. Eliab] a frequent name, not elsewhere of a musician.—Beniah] in an Asaphite pedigree 2 Ch. 20.—Maaseiah] wanting in 16.—Mattithiah]. Cf. 9, a son of Jeduthun 25. 1. Elipelehu] and Mikneiah] both wanting in 16.—Obed-edom]. This historical Philistine caretaker of the ark, a native of Gath, 2 S. 6, is transformed by the Chronicler, or the school which he represents, into a Levite of the division of the gate-keepers, v. 16 26, and as a Korahite gate-keeper (26), he is a Kehathite. On his appearance as a singer see above and on 16.—Jeʾiel] a name of frequent occurrence; in an Asaphite genealogy 2 Ch. 20. The name is doubtless used for the same individual as Jehiah (v. 15) but which is correct cannot be determined.—The gatekeepers] i.e., Obed-edom and Jeiel, cf. 9 17. With the Chronicler both singers and gate-keepers are fully recognised as Levites. 19—21. The singers are now divided into three divisions according to their musical parts. —With cymbals]. Cf. v. 11. These instruments fell to the conductors to mark the time (art. Music, DB.).—To sound aloud]
perhaps equivalent to beating time (Ke., Zoe.).—With psalteries. 
Cf. v. 14, stringed instruments perhaps not unlike the Greek lyre.
—Set to Alamoth] lit. to (the voice of) young women, i.e., in soprano
and Ki. refuse to translate.—'Azaziah] wanting in v. 14 and 16, hence
may not be original.—With harps. Cf. v. 14, stringed
instruments whose difference from the psalteries is not entirely
clear, but they were probably more harp-like.—Set to the Sheminith
lit. upon the eighth, i.e., prob. to a deep octave or in the bass,
cf. Ps. 6:12.—To lead]. The musicians led the service of song.
—22. Chenaniah]. Cf. v.17, the name also occurs of Levites in
26:1 and as Conaniah, which Ki. after G prefers here, 2 Ch. 31:35.
Chief of the Levites in the carrying] i.e., he had charge of the
duty of carrying the sacred furniture and directed the carrying
(of the ark) because he was skilful. This is the usual interpreta-
tion, but the word massa, meaning bearing, carrying, uplifting,
is rendered uplifting of the voice, song, by G, EVs., Oe. ( '"prophecy');
—23. Berechiah]. For the occurrence of the name in kindred lists
cf. v. 17 6:12 (9: 9).—Elkanah]. Cf. as above 9:11. Elkanah,
derived from the father of Samuel, appears in the genealogy of
Heman, cf. 6:10-11 (11-7). 11-15 (14-20). The introduction of two gate-
keepers here in addition to those of vv. 11-14 is striking and suggests
that this section is composite.—24. Shebaniah] also the name of a
priest in Ne. 10:4 (12:19), and of Levites in Ne. 9:10-18 and per-
Neither name occurs elsewhere as that of either a priest
or a Levite.—Nethan'el] the name of priests in Ezr. 10:19 Ne. 12:11,
of Levites in 26:2 Ch. 35:1 Ne. 12:19.—'Amasai] not elsewhere
a priest's name, but in the genealogy of the Kehathite Heman, 6:19
(8:28), and of the Kehathite Mahath, 2 Ch. 29:6. —Zechariah] not
elsewhere the name of a priest; of Levites see v. 11. —Benaiah] not
elsewhere as a priest's name; as Levite see v. 11. —Eliezer] a
priest's name in Ezr. 10:14. —Sounded with trumpets] (חצץ) the long straight metal horns with flaring mouths,
mentioned almost entirely as a sacred instrument (v. 11 13:2 Ch.
from the shophar, the curved horn of a cow or ram used in early
Israel especially in signals of war (Ju. 3:6, 7; 1 S. 13:2, S. 21, etc.), but also by the priests (Jos. 6:1, Lv. 25:1). The seven priestly trumpeters before the ark were doubtless suggested by Jos. 6:1—

'Obed-edom and Jeiel* were gate-keepers for the ark] a curious repetition from v. 11 (q. v.), probably a gloss.

16. a late use of * with the force command followed by inf. + 5 of pers. (l. 4), cf. 2 Ch. 14:8 29:3 31:3 Est. 1:9; so Kau., Ki.—[inf. instead of the direct discourse in older writings, Ew. § 338 a, cf. 13:27 2 Ch. 11:18.—saying] inf. expressing means, Ew. § 230 d, Ges. § 1140.—On use of 2 cf. Ew. § 282 d, Ges. § 1190, BDB. On 3 should be struck out: a dittography.—17. [ should be struck out: a dittography.—18. * * hence with reference also to # we should read * (Ki.).—19. * * * * * * hence is suspicious. After subtracting the two gate-keepers, the following list contains twelve names. Accordingly we conjecture that the original read on oncyi

and with them their brethren twelve, the first two consonants of oncyi having come in by dittography caused to fall out.—*. [ which is wanting in G, v. 10, and 16:4, but it would naturally be omitted before the copulative, since it is used nowhere as a proper name. Probably 1 and 3 have been transposed and the copulative before the resulting ve has been connected with the preceding word, accordingly read *.

The spellings of the first and of the last of these names are supported by v. 10 * and partially by 16:4 (q. v.).—without 3 suggests some disturbance of the text (see Ki. SBOT.). G has 3. The preceding name is dubious, cf. G.—19. * [On constr., Dr. TH. 188, Ges. § 131d.—22. hence K. reads want in G, and so omitted by Ki., Bn.—* erased by Ki., Bn., the former rendering * with reference to carrying the ark, the latter being uncertain, v. s.—v. inf. abs. Oe. regards it as a noun or ptc.—24. * ] Hiph. ptc. from denom. * Kt. Ges. § 530 (for Stade, Gram. 280) or * Baer, also BDB. Qr. Ges. § 530, Baer, Koe. i. § 305 c). Cf. 2 Ch. 5:18 7:4 13:18 29:21, Piel 2 Ch. 5:11 (l. 44).—אנה] read after v. 11:4.

Following the clue of 16:4 Bn. and Ki. give the original of vv. 11:4 as follows: The Levites appointed Asaph the son of Berechiah the chief and Zechariah the second in rank, then Uziel, and Shemiramoth, Jehiel, Eliab, Beniah, Mattithiah, and Obed-edom and Jeiel, the gate-keepers.
The names omitted are regarded as coming from a later annotator who has also added vv. 17-36; v. 36b is a still later gloss (but see above).

25-XVI. 3. The bringing up of the ark.—The Chronicler took these verses from 2 S. 6:1-15, making such alterations as were necessary according to his view of the affair, which is shown in the preceding passage.—25. So David, etc. The connection is with v. 1 after the details concerning the preparation have intervened. 2 S. makes no mention of the elders of Israel and the captains of thousands.—The ark of the covenant of Yahweh] in 2 S. "the ark of God" or "the ark of Yahweh," cf. vv. 11, 12, with 2 S. 6:11-12. This change is a touch of the school of the Chronicler, cf. 13:1.—26. When God helped the Levites]. The Chronicler piously introduces the divine agency as the cause of the auspicious beginning of their undertaking. 2 S. has "when they that bare the ark had gone six paces."—That they sacrificed seven bullocks and seven rams]. According to 2 S. David is the sacrificer and the sacrifice is "an ox and a fatling." Ke. and Zoe. harmonise the passages by making them refer to two distinct occasions, 2 S. describing the start and 1 Ch. the conclusion of the journey. But the sacrifices of the conclusion are mentioned in 16:1. Ba. points out that the small offering of 2 S. is represented as David's and the large one of Chronicles as that of the King and his elders. For special sacrifices consisting of the same numbers of the same animals cf. Jb. 42:11, Nu. 23:15, also 2 Ch. 29:1.—27. With a robe of byssus]. Not only David but also the Levites and singers are represented as wearing processional robes of white linen. —And upon David was an ephod of linen] from 2 S. is perhaps a gloss. According to 2 S. David wore only an ephod, which was a scant skirt or kilt, and thus he was liable to shameful exposure (EBi. II. col. 1306) 2 S. 6:11-12. According to the Chronicler, David wears the priestly robe. The Chronicler omits all reference to David's dancing save incidentally in v. 36. The scandal of the exposure of his person is passed over in silence.—28. 2 S. mentions David along with Israel and introduces only one musical instrument, the shophar or horn (cf. v. 11) occurring in Chronicles only here. On the other instruments, the addition to the text of 2 S., cf. vv. 10-31. —29.
It is a mark of the unskilful art of the Chronicler that this single verse of the episode of Michal's judgment on David should be here introduced when the story as a whole with its reflection on David is omitted.—1. *Peace-offerings* were largely eaten by the worshippers; hence indicative of feasting.—2. *He blessed the people*. The king as well as the priest exercised this function; cf. Solomon's blessing (1 K. 8:41) omitted by the Chronicler (2 Ch. 7:14).—3. *A portion* uncertain whether of flesh or wine (v. i.).

26. [strike out ἵνα, a dittography, so Kau., Ki.—τινὰς—N Γ, Γ, 26, 66+ ἦν, which is superfluous here, cf. v. i.—27. οὖν] either a denom. verb from BAram. ἵνα ναῦς Dn. 31 or from ἵνα with ἐν inserted, BDB. Be. thought οὖν a corruption of ἐστοτειεῖν γενόμενον (as in 2 S. 6:9) through illegibility, and this emendation is accepted by BDB. (v. 26 p. 101). More likely the change was intentional, as the omission of ἵνα would show. The statement also that "the Levites that bare the ark" danced would then be inappropriate, while a description of their sacred vestures is a natural touch of the Chronicler.—אשא. Either the art. is to be omitted or read ἁπάντως instead of ἀναφέρετος, cf. v. 25. —הָשָׁא is an explanatory gloss (Zoe., Bn.) by a reader who understood מַעְלָה to refer to the lifting up of the voice in song, cf. v. 23 (Kau.).—29. [2 S. 6:10 התו]. The latter is striking in pre-exilic literature, Dr. TH. 133, Dav. § 58 e, and is probably a corruption. —אשא. On the perfect cf. Dr. TH. 165.—רביִךְ יְשֵׁכִית instead of נַקְשֵׁכִית in 2 S., a substitution made either to suggest a more dignified movement or because more intelligible. רָכָה is an אַּלַּכָּה. and would a בֵּית לֵבָי.—XVI. 1. [2 S. 6:10 אָנָּא, cf. 1331. After 2 S. has יָעַבֵּר 로ֹעָבָה יְהוֹшуָה—בַּכָּוָה. מִנָּהוּ 2 S. 6:10+ אֲנָּא, cf. 1331. The Chronicler condenses לִלָּה הַיִּשָּׁר אֲנָּא (the ordinary word for loaf, Ju. 8:1 S. 24 10 Pr. 6:2 Je. 37:2) 2 S. לִלָּה elsewhere only in P of a sacrificial cake, implying that the people received cakes connected with the peace-offerings.—2 S. has in לִלָּה, not ג, the numeral, רַעָם, with each gift.—The exact meaning of לִלָּה שָׁרַי is unknown; the renderings in the Vrss. vary (for full discussion cf. Dr. TS., pp. 207 f.).

XVI. 4-6. The Levites appointed for service before the ark.
—These verses are original with the Chronicler with the omission of the words, and Obed-edom and Jeiel, and Asaph, from v. 2 (v. 1). The appointees already mentioned (1517 8.) were set aside
merely for the purpose of bringing the ark in state to Jerusalem. They consisted of three chief singers with twelve of their brethren and seven priests. Here we have only one chief singer with seven of his brethren and two priests. The reason for this reduction in the numbers is to be sought in vv. 18-20. The Chronicler thought the tabernacle with the altar of burnt-offering was at Gibeon at this time. The occasion of bringing up the ark to Jerusalem was so important as to call for the participation of all the priests and Levites. When this had been accomplished, they were divided for service in both places. Asaph and seven of his brethren were assigned to service before the ark in Jerusalem, while Heman and Jeduthun and the rest of those mentioned by name (v. 8) were appointed to the worship in the tabernacle at Gibeon. Only two priests were appointed for services as trumpeters before the ark. Thus the reductions are not in the same proportion. We should expect Asaph with but four of his brethren. The number two for the priests may have been suggested by 15:11 or Nu. 10:1, while a large number of priests was indispensable at the altar of burnt-offering. Since the service before the ark is represented as of a musical character entirely, the larger number of singers appointed to that service is accounted for, also the number seven may have influenced the Chronicler (cf. 15:10).

4. The administration of the Levites was one of prayer and song as is implied by the following words, both to commemorate and to thank and to praise Yahweh the God of Israel. These indicate three forms of service, the first a liturgical prayer at the presentation of that part of the meal-offering which was burnt, i.e., the memorial (cf. Lv. 21:1-6; 5:13; 6:11) Nu. 28:1-2, and explanations of the titles of Pss. 38 and 70, espec. Briggs, Psalms, i. Intro. § 39 (b); the second refers to the use of Psalms that prominently confess and give thanks to God; and the third to praises like those of the Hallelujah songs (Zoe.). The Levites were assigned the duty “to thank and to praise Yahweh” at the daily burnt-offerings and at all burnt-offerings (23:1) of which the meal-offering constituted a part (Nu. 28:1-2), hence all three of these liturgical forms are connected with the burnt-offering. Since the Chronicler represents that no regular sacrifices were
made in Jerusalem at this time (cf. 21*-*.), it may be inferred that these Levites were to conduct the musical liturgy before the ark at the same time that the offerings were being made on the altar at Gibeon with corresponding musical service. The two priests also (v. *) sounded the two silver trumpets as if present at the burnt-offerings (2 Ch. 29*-* Nu. 10*-*-*).—6. Jaḥasi'el] does not appear in 15*.*. For occurrences of the name cf. 12*-* 23* Ezr. 8*.*

4. יָשָׁשָׁש] read יָשָׁשָׁש as also in 15*.*.* q. v., so Ki.—in 15*.* in n'mm but cf. 15*.*.

7. An interesting statement showing that Psalms of thanksgiving (Hodu Psalms) were assigned to a particular class of singers (Bn.).

8–36. A Psalm of thanksgiving.—This is a compilation from verses found in the Psalter, vv. 1*–*–Ps. 105*–*, vv. 11*–*–Ps. 96, vv. 21*–*–Ps. 106*–*. The variations from the text of the Psalter are slight. The original place of these verses was in the Psalter, since vv. 1*–* are clearly a fragment of Ps. 105. (This is now universally admitted, although Hitz. and Ke. held the original place to have been in Ch.) Hence, since v. 11* corresponding to Ps. 106*1*, is the doxology marking the close of the fourth book of the Psalter, it is a fair and usual inference that the Psalter had already been arranged in five books at the time of the Chronicler. Yet it may be further said that if the small fragment vv. 21*–* existed independently of Ps. 106 (so Cheyne), and if the whole section, vv. 21*–*, is an insertion of a later date than the period of the Chronicler (so Bn.), this inference cannot be made.

8–22—Ps. 105*–*. According to Briggs, the first five verses are an introductory gloss, making the Ps. into a Hallel.—8. 9. Two tetrameter synthetic couplets:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Give thanks unto Yahweh, call upon his name;} \\
\text{Proclaim among the peoples his doings.} \\
\text{Sing unto him, make music for him;} \\
\text{Muse upon all his wondrous deeds.}
\end{align*}
\]

The Hebrew shows assonance between the first and third, and the second and fourth lines, these ending in the sounds ש and ל.
spectively. Each couplet consists of three clauses, the first two short composing one line, and the third a tetrameter and so a line by itself. In the first couplet the first clause calls upon the worshipper to pay divine honours, the second clause is a stronger repetition of this call, and the third commands him to proclaim the deeds of his God among the peoples; in the second couplet the movement is similar.—Call upon his name] may also be rendered “proclaim his name,” which is preferred by Briggs, but the former is better suited to the structure of the stanza. The second couplet shows that this clause strengthens the preceding command instead of anticipating the following.—Make music for him]. The verb (זנ) may either mean to sing to (י) God, Ps. 27:101-104, or it may be used of playing musical instruments, Ps. 33:cf. 144:1 (parallel to חנשא), 71:98:147:149. The parallelism of Ps. 144:1 suggests that the latter meaning may have been intended here, so Briggs.—These two couplets are based upon Is. 12, i.e., which reads as follows:

“Give thanks unto Yahweh, call upon his name;
Proclaim among the peoples his doings.
Commemorate for his name is exalted,
Make music (זנ) unto Yahweh for he hath
done excellent things,
Let this be known in all the earth.”

The first two lines were taken verbatim; the last three were reduced to the same form as the first two. The words “in all the earth”—parallel to “among the peoples”—may have been original in Ps., but not in Chronicles.—10. Glory in his holy name] i.e., his name as sacred and separate from all defilement.—Of them that seek Yahweh]. Briggs substitutes as original the personal pronoun, him, instead of the divine name for the sake of the assonance.—11. Seek his face continually] that you may gain knowledge of his greatness, even as when men sought the face of an earthly king, 1 K. 10:5.—No assonance appears in this verse, but in 12 there is an apparently intentional resemblance of sound (niphle’othau . . . mophethau) in the midst of the lines instead of at the ends.—Commemorate] celebrate by recounting,
His wondrous deeds which he has done] and his marvels] espec. the miracles of the Exodus, cf. Ps. 105:17. This is done in Pss. 105 and 106, but most of these wonders of Hebrew history are omitted here.—13. The original text of Ps. probably read, “Ye seed of Abraham, his servant, Ye sons of Jacob, his chosen one” (so Briggs), which in Chronicles has become, Ye seed of Israel, his servant (pl. in G is not likely original), Ye sons of Jacob, his chosen ones. The Chronicler copied the pronominal suffixes from the present text of Ps., where the assonance has been destroyed by a copyist’s misunderstanding, by which the plural his chosen ones, i.e., the sons of Jacob, has been substituted for the singular his chosen one, i.e., Jacob rather than Esau (Briggs). Israel was doubtless substituted for Abraham, since it makes a more obvious, though less poetic, parallel, cf. v. 11.—14. He, Yahweh, is our God; In all the earth are his judgments] an assertion of the world-wide rule of Yahweh.—15–22. The Psalmist then recalls the covenant which Yahweh made with the three patriarchs in turn, with Abraham] Gn. 15, 17, 22:10–11, his oath unto Isaac], Gn. 26:1–4, unto Jacob for a statute], Gn. 28:1–4, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant], Gn. 35:9–12; and how when they were but a few in number (so read instead of ye, v. i.), cf. Gn. 34:28, he suffered no man to wrong them], as in the relation of Abraham to the Canaanites, of Isaac to the men of Gerar, of Jacob to Laban and to Esau, and reproved kings for their sakes], Pharaoh Gn. 12:1, and Abimelech Gn. 20:1. The patriarchs are represented as anointed kings only here and in the parallel Ps. In Gn. 20 (E), Abraham is termed a prophet.—23–33—Ps. 96:1d. The strong beginning of Ps. 96 is weakened by omitting vv. 1a–2a, since they are inappropriate here (Be.). In these verses an appeal is made to all the earth (v. ii), and Yahweh is proclaimed as the one efficient God who alone has done wondrous deeds among all peoples (v. ii). He is contrasted with the gods of other peoples which are things of nought and have done nothing for their worshippers, cf. Is. 40:17–18:44:2. Je. 21 Ps. 115:1–5, while Yahweh made the heavens (v. ii). All peoples are admonished to bring offerings unto Yahweh and to worship him (vv. ii–iii). All nature shall rejoice, the heavens and the earth, the sea with all its life and the field with all its life,
and the trees of the forest, for Yahweh cometh to judge the earth. The conclusion of Ps. 96, v. 114, is omitted in Chronicles, since the Ps. does not come to an end with v. 11.—34–36 – Ps. 106: 47–51. The first of these verses is a common liturgical phrase with which Pss. 106, 107, 118, and 136 begin and makes also an appropriate closing, Ps. 118: 1, cf. also Je. 33: 11 Ezr. 3: 11 Mac. 4: 2.—35. And gather us together and deliver us from the nations]. In Ps. "and deliver us from the nations" is a clear reference to the dispersion and so inappropriate to the time of David. The writer sought to remove this significance of the phrase by inserting the words, and deliver us.—Verse 36, the doxology of the fourth book of Ps., is not unsuitable here.

37-43. Levites appointed for service.—A continuation of vv. 44—37. A résumé of vv. 44—38. And 'Obed-edom and his brethren sixty-eight and Hosa to be gate-keepers]. We must either read his with ב, ב (Bn.) or transpose and Hosa to a position before and their brethren, etc. (Kau., Ki.). The phrase and 'Obed-edom the son of Jeduthun* is probably a marginal gloss which made its way into the text in the wrong place. The glossator finding Obed-edom represented as a singer in 15 16 gives him a place in the family of Jeduthun, the singer (see below on v. 45). In 26 the gate-keepers of the family of Obed-edom number sixty-two.—On Hosa cf. 2610.—39. Thus according to the Chronicler there were two sanctuaries, the ark brought to Jerusalem constituting one and the tabernacle with its other furniture at Gibeon constituting the other (21 2 Ch. 12). At this latter Zadok and his brethren ministered.—On the high place which was at Gibe'on cf. 1 K. 3.—40. On the continual offerings cf. Ex. 29 Nu. 28.—And to do all that is written, etc.] i.e., everything which was the priests' duty to do in the sanctuary.—41. With them] i.e., with Zadok and his brethren at Gibeon were placed the two guilds of singers represented by Heman and Jeduthun, while the guild of Asaph (v. 42) ministered before the ark at Jerusalem.—And the rest of the chosen] refers to all the singers chosen at this time.—Who were designated by name] i.e., those so designated in 15 16 who did not serve in Jerusalem (v. 43).—42. And in possession of them were trumpets and cymbals for musicians and other instruments used in sacred song*] lit. and instruments of the song of God. With song of God, cf. song of Yahweh, Ps. 137 2 Ch. 29.—And the sons of Jeduthun at the gate] is dubious. Chronicles does not know of any sons of Jeduthun who were gate-keepers except "Obed-edom the son of Jeduthun," v. 41, a late gloss possibly dependent upon the statement here. Some words may have fallen from the text between Jeduthun and at the gate.—43. Taken from 2 S. 6 18° and thus is a continuation of v. 41.

37. with direct object, Ges. § 1173—1374. et al.—38. 이웃] is merely a copyist's variation of 이웃, obj. of v. 41.—39. 이상] obj. of 이웃 of v. 41.—42. BDB. ע 3. b.

—wanting in ב and to be omitted as a dittography.
I CHRONICLES

from v. 4 (Kau., Bn., Ki.). Be holding that כולם שרי were equival-
et to the כולם of v. 4 rearranged v. 4 somewhat after the order of v. 1 reading: ישאר המורדים אשר קנר בספומת לחרות יציץ כי לקלחו בקלחו בהדרת המלחיים נמסרו [2 S. 21].

XVII. The promise to David in view of his purpose to build a temple for Yahweh.—Taken with slight variations from 2 S. 7. According to Dt. 1210 unity of worship should become law after the Israelites had passed over Jordan and when Yahweh had given them "rest" from all their enemies round about, and had chosen a place "to cause his name to dwell there" (i.e., when the Temple should have been built). This "rest" came in with David and Solomon, cf. 2 S. 711, 1 K. 512 (We. Hist. of Isr. pp. 19 f., n.). If the narrative in 2 S. 7 is as late as the Exile (so Sm. Comm.) the writer probably knew of this Deuteronomic provision and sought to show why this unity of worship was not ushered in by David through the erection of the Temple when "Yahweh had given him rest from all his enemies round about" (v. 1). To the Chronicler, David, the man of blood, in no wise fulfilled this condition (cf. 1 Ch. 2213), hence he omitted from 2 S. 71 the words "Yahweh had given him rest, etc.,” and substituted I will subdue all thine enemies (v. 11) for "I will cause thee to rest from all thine enemies" (2 S. 711).

1-16. Nathan’s message to David.—1. 2. When David dwell in his house] probably the one built with the aid of the King of Tyre, 141 = 2 S. 511.—Nathan, the prophet] (vv. 1-11 and parallels in 2 S. 7, 2 S. 121 + 6 times in 2 S. 12, 1 K. 13 + 10 times in 1 K. 1, 2 Ch. 298 Ps. 518 (title) BS. 471; in the phrase "acts of Nathan the prophet” 1 Ch. 299, 2 Ch. 911; and frequent as a personal name elsewhere) was the well-known court prophet during David’s reign and one of the supporters of Solomon at his accession, 1 K. 1.—Lo, I dwell in a house of cedar and the ark of the covenant of Yahweh is under curtains]. The contrast between David’s regal palace and the humble resting-place of the ark was sufficient to indicate his intention to his religious adviser, who immediately responded, Do all that is in thy heart, for God is with thee.—3. Nathan’s first impression that God would favour David’s undertaking was a
It came to pass the same night, that the word of God came to Nathan, doubtless in a dream. It shall not build me a (lit. the, v. i.) house to dwell in] is expressed in 2 S. in the form of a question equivalent to a negative. For I have not dwelt in a house from the day I brought up Israel, i.e., from Egypt (so 2 S.), unto this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle. This statement was not literally true, since the sanctuary at Shiloh seems to have been a fixed structure (see Dr. in DB. IV. p. 500 a, also EBi. IV. col. 4925, § 2).—7–14. H. P. Smith finds traces of rhythmical structure in this oracle, but not without extensive emendation (see Com. in loco).—7f. I took thee from the pasture, from following the sheep] as narrated in 1 S. 16. From this humble origin Yahweh had made David a prince over Israel and promised to make his fame like that of the great men of the earth. It is implied that David’s honour is great enough without the added credit of building the Temple.—9. And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them] i.e., the establishment of the people in the promised land in safety from their enemies was not yet accomplished, hence the time for the building of the Temple as set forth in Dt. 12. had not yet come (v. 5.).—10. Will build thee a house] certainly means a dynasty and not a building.—11. Thou must go to be with thy fathers]. 2 S. “thou shalt sleep with thy fathers” is the more usual phrase (cf. Gn. 47 (J) Dt. 31 1 K. 2111 2 Ch. 26, etc.), while that of Chronicles has no exact parallel, yet cf. 1 K. 2 Gn. 15. The motive for the change in Chronicles is difficult to determine. Boettcher (Aehrenlese) thought the expression to go was more indeterminate and that it was introduced by one believing in the continuation of David’s life.—12. A direct reference to the Temple to be built by Solomon, with which is coupled the fundamental Messianic promise. In 2 S. the verse may be a gloss (so Sm.).—13. The foreboding of iniquity with its punishment contained in 2 S. 7 is omitted evidently to avoid a sombre thought. “So sensitive is the Chronicler for the honour of David and his house that he cannot even endure in the mouth of Yahweh a reference to its faults” (Ki.).—As I took it from him that was before thee] i.e., from Saul, who is mentioned by name in 2 S. (v. i.).—14. But I will settle him in
The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

*My house* must be taken parallel to *my kingdom*, thus referring to the people of Israel.

1. Ch. has *have where* and 2 S. 7 have. The Chronicler by his last phrase has given a clearer description of the position of the ark.—2. Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. has elsewhere *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

2. S. 7*. The Chronicler by his last phrase has given a clearer description of the position of the ark.—3. Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. has elsewhere *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

3. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

4. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

5. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

6. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

7. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

8. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

9. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

10. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".

11. Ch. has *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee.* The change of Chronicles (2 S. has the more original text) is due to the point of view of the Chronicler, who regards the kingdom as a theocracy, *cf.* "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh" 281, "thine is the kingdom, O Yahweh" 29", "upon the throne of Yahweh" 29".
Egyptian oppression, but this is a thought alien to the context, in which rather the blessings secured by the settled government of David are contrasted with the attacks to which Israel was exposed during the period of the judges.—2 S. S. Ts., Dr., Bu. prefer for the text of 2 S. as more agreeable to the context. Bn. prefers in Ch. as demanded by the context.—12. This verse is obscure both here and in the parallel text of 2 S. (v. 1.).—18. What shall David continue to say unto thee? * for thou knowest thy servant.] This rendering is of a text corrected from 2 S. (v. i.). David’s heart is too full for utterance, yet God will understand his servant.—19. Again the text is doubtful.—20.
All that men have heard reveals the uniqueness of Yahweh, beside whom there is no other God.—21. According to Geiger (*Urschrift und Uebersetzungen*, p. 288) this verse in its most original form contained a contrast between Israel’s God and the gods of other nations. His reconstructed text (v. i.) is rendered as follows: And who is like thy people Israel? (Is there) another nation in the earth which a god went to redeem to himself for a people and to give to himself a name and to do for them great and terrible things in driving out from before his people a nation and its gods. But the Chronicler, or rather his forerunner in 2 S., applied all this to Israel by the change of another (אֶתְנָב) to one (אַחַד) and other changes until Chronicles read: And who is like thy people Israel? a unique nation which God went to redeem to himself as a people, giving to thyself a name by great and terrible things in driving out nations from before thy people, which thou didst redeem from Egypt. Chronicles passes from the third to the second person, not an unusual construction.—22. It is Israel’s glory that the true God had chosen them in preference to any other nation, that they should be his people and he should be their God. —23. The King prays that the message borne by Nathan, the prophet, may be established forever.—24. Saying, *Yahweh of hosts is the God of Israel* *and the house of thy servant David is established before thee*. The prayer seems to be that the people may say that Yahweh is Israel’s God, and that David’s house has the legitimate right to rulership by divine choosing. The change from third to second person is awkward, but possible (v. s. v. 16). Thus King David puts the rights of his house to rule beside the right of Yahweh to be the God of Israel, and wishes them as firmly established. He justifies the boldness of this petition by recalling the divine revelation which he had received through Nathan,—26 thou hast revealed to thy servant that thou wilt build him a house.—27. The prayer closes with an assertion of the confidence of the worshipper that Yahweh has blessed his house and what he has blessed, shall be blessed forever. In this the text differs from that of 2 S., where the last verse is a prayer for this blessing. Bertheau regarded the text of 2 S. as the original because the request for the fulfilment of a promise and also for
new blessing has its proper place at the close of the prayer. This very fact, however, Benzinger alleges as the reason why we should look for the change of a perfect into an imperative, and not the converse. The request for fulfilment he finds in v. 11. The leading thought, he says, of David's prayer is that Yahweh through his revelation has already brought a blessing and made a beginning with salvation (vv. 10-11); therefore David's house will endure, for whatever Yahweh once blesses, remains blessed forever, and this thought is disturbed by the introduction of the imperative.
XVIII. 1-13. A summary of the foreign wars of David.—
Taken with slight variations from 2 S. 8:1-14.  David defeats the Philistines and acquires Gath with its dependencies and conquers Moab, Zobah, Damascus, and Edom. As a consequence of the defeat of the King of Zobah, the King of Hamath sends gifts, hence David controls practically all of Syria south of Hamath except the Phoenician cities and the remaining cities of Philistia.—1. *Gath and its daughters* ] instead of the unintelligible “bridle of the mother city” RV. of 2 S. 8:1.  Whether the reading of Chronicles is the original is impossible to determine.  We. TS. and Dr. think it derived from 2 S.—2. The Chronicler omitted from 2 S. the passage, “and he measured them with the line, making them to lie down on the
ground; and he measured two lines to put to death, and one full line to keep alive,” possibly because this harsh treatment of the Moabite captives cast reflections upon the character of David after the previous kindness shown him by the Moabite King, 1 S. 22:4. Of that incident the writer of 2 S. 3:17 seems to have had no knowledge (Sm.), but the Chronicler certainly must have been acquainted with it. This fact, then, rather than the excessive cruelty of the measure, probably influenced him, cf. 20:1.—And brought tribute] probably, as in the days of Mesha, this consisted of wool, 2 K. 3:1.—3. Hadadezer*. Chronicles has here and elsewhere Hadarezer, cf. vv. * 16. * 19. * 11, as also in all the parallel passages in 2 S. The original form of the name was of course Hadadezer, as in 2 S. 3:1, and 1 K. 11:14. The component Hadad appears in the name Ben-hadad, carried by a number of kings of Damascus of later times, 1 K. 15:16. * 2 Ch. 16:1. * 1 K. 20:1, etc. Of these Ben-hadad II. is known in Assyr. ins. as Dadda-id-ri (var. *idri) = Aram. Hadad-*idri = Heb. Hadadezer (KB. i, p. 134, n. 1). Hadad was the name of a Syrian deity. The name signifies Hadad is help (Dr.) (see Sm.).—Zobah] an Aramean state of consequence during the reigns of Saul (1 S. 14:11) and David, mentioned in Assyr. ins. as Subutu or Subiti (see Del. Par. pp. 279 ff., Schr. KAT. pp. 182 ff.), and situated according to Noeldeke between Damascus and Hamath (EBi. I. col. 280 § 6).—Unto Hamath] is an addition to the text of 2 S. Whether from a glossator or, as is more likely, from the Chronicler, the statement is an inference from vv. * * * 15. Hamath is identical with the mod. Hamah on the Orontes about one hundred and fifteen miles north of Damascus.—As he went to establish his hand by the river Euphrates]. The subject is either Hadadezer (Be., Zoe., Dr.) or more probably David (Oe., Ba., Sm.).—4. A thousand chariots and seven thousand horsemen] but according to 2 S. David took a thousand and seven hundred horsemen and no mention is made of the chariots. Since of 2 S. agrees with Chronicles, the Chronicler did not likely alter the text, but rather reproduced what he found.—David hamstrung all the chariot horses] as a measure to insure peace, cf. Jos. 11:4. The Hebrews among their hills were slow in adopting cavalry and chariots, but David now began their use, for he reserved from them
[horses] for a hundred chariots.—5. Aram of Damascus. The Aramean kingdom with Damascus as its chief city played an important role in the history of Syria until it was finally overthrown by Tiglath-pileser III in 732 B.C. Damascus itself is a city of extreme antiquity, although early references to it are few and uncertain. It appears as *Timasku* in the list of the Syrian conquests of Thotmes III, and as *Timasği, Dimasğa*, in the Amarna letters. The independence of Damascus was also threatened by this attack upon Zobah, hence the willingness to succour Hadadezer.—6. Then David put garrisons* in Aram of Damascus] as was his custom to do to subjected peoples, cf. v. 11.—The writer piously ascribes the credit for David's victories to Yahweh, cf. v. 11.—7. Shields of gold] is a somewhat doubtful rendering, more likely arms or armour (Ba. Exp. Times X. pp. 43 f.). Of gold would refer to the decoration.—8. *Ţibhath* (so read also in 2 S. 8* †) and *Cun †* (2 S. Berothai) are otherwise unknown. Furrer (ZPV. viii. p. 34) identifies the latter with the mod. *Kuna* near *Bereitan.*—Wherewith Solomon made the brazen sea and the pillars and the vessels of brass] is an addition from the hand of the Chronicler, whence it made its way into 6 of 2 S.—9. To'û, king of *Hamath*] (2 S. To'i) is otherwise unknown. *Hamath*, regularly mentioned as the northern boundary of Israel, on the western side of Hermon immediately north of Dan. This kingdom had plainly been threatened by the Arameans whom David defeated.—10. *Hadoram, his son*] (2 S. Joram). Nothing further is known of him. The name appears as that of an Arabian tribe in 1st (q. v.).—Upon the defeat of Hadadezer Tou hastened to send his son to bless David, i.e., to congratulate him, possibly to acknowledge his suzerainty, and to purchase his favour with gifts. —11. These also did king David dedicate to Yahweh] together with the spoils of war from the nations, *Edom, Mo'ab, *Ammon, the Philistines, and *Amalek.* 2 S. adds "and from the spoil of Hadadezer, son of Rehob, king of Zobah." We have no other mention of a war of David with Amalek except that in 1 S. 30, where we are told that David distributed the spoil among his friends in Judah (vv. 6–7).—12. And when he returned he smote *Edom* in the Valley of Salt eighteen thousand]. This is probably the
original text here, an abridgment of 2 S. 8", "And David made a name. And when he returned from his smiting of Aram, he smote Edom, etc." of Chronicles, Moreover Abshai the son of Zeruiah, is due to a curious misreading of a copyist (v. i.). The Edomites may have taken advantage of the absence of David and the army, when they were far north, to make a hostile raid, as the Amalekites did when David left Ziklag to go north with the Philistines (1 S. 30). The Valley of Salt is only mentioned in connection with Edom, 2 Ch. 25" 2 K. 14' Ps. 60'. On account of its proximity to the salt mountain, Khashm Usdum, and to the Salt Sea, it has been identified with the plain es-Sebkhah, at the southern end of the Dead Sea.—13. And he put garrisons in Edom] as he had done in Damascus, v. 4. The pious formula which closes v. 4 is repeated here verbatim.

1. np'i 2 S. Bn. 2 S. nonn 2 S. 8' 2 S. 8' noo pi, which is quite unintelligible (see Sm.).—2. On omission see above.—3. On omission see above. 2 S. Ch. preserves a corrupt spelling, which since it appears in of 2 S., 'Abrahat, may have been found in this form by the Chronicler.—Ch. has omitted 'nehathah, wanting in 2 S. Bn. thinks it is a corruption of at Helam, see 191.—4. And he put garrisons in Edom] as he had done in Damascus, v. 4. The pious formula which closes v. 4 is repeated here verbatim. 2 S. 8' 2 S. 8' + 2 S. the better idea, Yahweh gave victory to David.—7. np'i wanting in 2 S. 8' 2 S. Bn. Greek 2 S. 8'.—8. np'i 2 S. Bn. Greek 2 S. 8'. It is found in the Vrss.—9. np'i wanting in 2 S. Bn. Greek 2 S. 8'. The form the object of 2 S. 8'.—10. np'i correct over against of 2 S. (Be., Dr., Bu., Sm.).—11. np'i wanting in 2 S. 8'.—12. np'i true reading confirmed by of 2 S., where in Gn. 22'. Kau. reads w.m. 2 S.—13. np'i wanting in 2 S., an addition by the Chronicler, v. s.—14. np'i 2 S. 8' 2 S. Bn. Nothing is known of a city of either name.—15. np'i wanting in 2 S., an addition by the Chronicler, v. s.—16. np'i 2 S. 8' 2 S. Bn. Nothing is known of a city of either name.
2 S. and is the more probable form (Dr., Bu.).—10. ויאת the Chronicler clearly omitted. Instead of לָבָא the original after ג (Bu., Ki.). This by a copyist has been corrupted into בֵּן, and then some hand has added the missing name of the mother לָבָא. The words of the title of Ps. 60, "יהי", support the reading of Be., yet the title most probably is subsequent to the text of Ch. with לָבָא (Bu., SBOT., somewhat after Be., who read And Joab the son of Zeruiah smote Edom when he returned from the conquest of Aram). Ke. read as Bu. except יָשַׁב instead of יָשָׁב. The functions of the recorder (לָבָא, lit. the one who causes to remember) are nowhere defined exactly. Most likely his duty consisted in reminding the King of important business (see Bn. Arch. p. 310, Now. Arch. I. p. 308).—16. Zadok, the son of Ahitub]. Cf. 5* (6*).—Achimelech* the son of Abiathar]. V. i., cf. 24*—Shavsha was scribe]. The spelling is doubtful (v. i.). The scribe (לָבָא) was the King's secretary, an office distinct from that of the recorder. Shavsha's two sons acted as scribes in the reign of Solomon (1 K. 4*)—17. Benaiah the son of Jehoiada'] see 20* was over the Cherethites and
the Pelethites] the King’s guard (cf. 2 S. 15:18 207 + v. "Qr. 1 K. 11:4.").—And David’s sons were about the king] is the Chronicler’s paraphrase for 2 S. “And David’s sons were priests” because he could not understand how any could be priests except, according to P, the sons of Aaron (see Intro. p. 13).

14. 2 S. 8:14 has before it. B, 2 S. 8:17 the true reading for Ch., but since Abiathar is mentioned as priest before, during, and after David’s reign, most modern scholars prefer to read in 2 S. after Abiathar the son of Ahimelech (Dr.). The change, however, should go further and we should read in 2 S., but not in Ch., Ammonites and priests of Ammonites (see Bu. Com.).—supported against of 2 S. by 2 S. 10:8 and 1 K. 5:17. by error.—

XIX–XX. 3. David’s war with the Ammonites and their Aramean allies.—Taken from 2 S. 10:4–18 11:1 12:25. 31. The Chronicler has omitted the narrative of David’s kindness to the house of Saul, 2 S. 9, because he passes over entirely David’s relation to Saul; and he has also omitted the episode of David’s crimes in connection with Bathsheba, 2 S. 11. 12, because it reflects upon the character of the King. In this story of the Ammonite war the direct variations from that of 2 S. are of minor importance, chiefly those of a magnifying character to give David greater glory, or to simplify the narrative (see especially below vv. 7. 16. 16).

XIX. 1–15. The King of Ammon insults David.—1. Na- hash the king of the children of ‘Ammon] (v. 2 S. 10:4 1 S. 11:1 14 and perhaps also 2 S. 17”) was already on the throne during the time of Saul (1 S. 11:4 .), but this does not imply a very long reign, since we have no exact chronology for the events of either Saul’s or David’s reign.—2. When the King of Ammon died, David resolved to show kindness to his son Hanun because of some kindness which the father had shown him. What this kindness was, the history does not tell us. Bertheau suggests it may have been during the time when David was persecuted by Saul. Hiram’s love for David led to a similar mission upon the accession of Solomon (1 K. 5:14 “1”).—3. The princes of Ammon, suspecting another
aggressive move on the part of the Hebrew King, warned their lord in the scornful question, *Thinkest thou that David desires to honor thy father because he hath sent comforters unto thee?*—4. With a reckless determination to provoke war, Hanun insulted the ambassadors of David.—The beard was held in high esteem among the Hebrews. To remove the beards and shorten the robes of the ambassadors to near the waist, was an insult indeed.—5. David saved the feelings of his messengers and upheld his own dignity by directing that they should remain at Jericho until their beards should be grown.—*Jericho* (יריחו) is the well-known town in the lower Jordan valley, the mod. *Eriha*, about fourteen miles (as the crow flies) from Jerusalem.

6–15. The first campaign.—6. 7. The Chronicler has quite rewritten 2 S. 10, which reads “The children of Ammon sent and hired (of) Aram Beth-rehob and Aram Zoba twenty thousand footmen and (of) the King of Maacah a thousand men and (of) Ishtob twelve thousand men.” We. *TS.* and Bu. omit “a thousand men,” since the Chronicler has a total of 32,000. The sources or the motives of the changes introduced in the text by the Chronicler are mostly obscure. That he should convert footmen into chariots is obvious enough to make the victory of David so much greater; and possibly a similar motive, and his love of detail setting forth magnificence, may have led him to insert as the compensation the enormous sum of a thousand talents of silver. According to 2 Ch. 25* Amaziah hires 100,000 men for a hundred talents. “Ishtob” may have been omitted as obscure
or because originally joined with Ma'acah or through oversight. Aram-naharaim may have been substituted for Beth-rehob because the Chronicler identified the latter with Rehob of Jos. 19**, which as a possession of Asher could not belong to the Arameans. Since Arameans from beyond the River took part in the second campaign (v. 14'), Aram-naharaim was an easy substitute. The assembling of the host at Medeba is a touch of detail description, but scarcely corresponds to the actual fact, since Medeba is a city of northern Moab. In some way it may have been confused with Rabbah of Ammon.—Aram-naharaim] "Aram of the two rivers," i.e., probably the Tigris and the Euphrates, cf. 11”.

—Aram-ma'acah] (Dt. 3' Jos. 13”) was a small Aramean kingdom not far from Damascus in Gaulanitis.—Zobah]. Cf. 18*.

Medeba] (Nu. 21** Is. 15* Jos. 13* 11†; also Moabite Stone המדבר, line 8) was about six miles south from Heshbon.—9. The children of Ammon awaited Joab's attack at the gate of the city, doubtless Rabbath Ammon, while the Aramean forces were at some distance in the field.—10. 11. Joab prepares to attack the Aramean allies himself with the flower of the army, because they were probably the stronger, while his brother Abishai with the rest of the people draw up before the Ammonites.—On Jo'ab and Abishai* see 21*—12. If the forces of Joab should show themselves unable to cope with their Aramean antagonists, Abishai should send him re-enforcements, and in case Abishai should be put to the worse, Joab promised to help him.—14. 15. Joab's help, however, was not needed, for the Ammonites lost heart when they saw their Aramean mercenaries in full flight, and retreated within the walls of their city.—And Jo'ab came to Jerusalem]. For the time the campaign was closed.

6-7. סקנורש ודרורנא. The remainder of these verses is quite different in 2 S. (v. 9).—8. 2 S. 10* שם וגו' בנות דוד. Dr. accepts 2 S., the construction being that of opposition. Bu. follows Ch. putting מנה in construct, but both of these readings convey the wrong idea that the host consisted of mighty men. The original undoubtedly was כִּי יִתְנַשֶּׁר דנְבֵרֵים (Th., Graetz, Oe., Bn.), since the mighty men were David's body-guard.—9. בחוה בנה] 2 S. 10* שם וגו' בנות דוד. Ch. has the original reading (Be., Bn.). The city is Rabbah, the royal city of Ammon.—וִּיהַלְכֶּם וְעֹלָם 2 S. repeats the
16–19. The second campaign.—In this the Arameans come with re-enforcements from the far north in order to regain their lost prestige.—16. The Arameans had apparently returned to the north, where they rallied and sent messengers and brought out the Arameans that were beyond the River, i.e., the Euphrates. According to 2 S. it was Hadadezer who sent for the northern Arameans. Either his authority extended to the region of Mesopotamia or he only applied to the Arameans of that country for assistance.—Shophach] (v. 19, Shobach 2 S. 10:6. 18 †) the commander of Hadadezer's army, was placed in command of the new troops.—17. David in turn gathered all the fighting men of Israel together, crossed the Jordan, and came upon them; or better perhaps after 2 S. (v. i.) and came to Helam, an unknown place.—And set the battle in array against them]. These words are superfluous and have arisen from a repetition of the text (v. i.).—Apparently David commands in person on this expedition.—18. The Arameans were again defeated.—Seven thousand chariots] 2 S. 10:4 “seven hundred chariots,” an intentional change by the Chronicler to magnify David's victory. But the change of “forty thousand horsemen” (2 S.) to forty thousand footmen can only be explained on the ground that the Chronicler preserves the original text. Otherwise no footmen would be mentioned in 2 S.—19. This
victory was complete and the Arameans were reduced to the position of a subject people.

16. [2 S. 10] The Chronicler has abridged and simplified the narrative of 2 S. by omitting the clauses “and they were assembled together,” “and they came to Helam.” The latter may be a wrong insertion in 2 S. (Bn.). He also has retained one plural subject throughout referring to the Arameans, thus they sent messengers and they brought out, etc., where 2 S. has “Hadadezer sent messengers and brought out,” etc.—[2 S. 10, so also v. 16. 17. to be read with 2 S. 10. Qr. and he came to Helam (Be., Bn., Kl.). This proper name occurs twice in 2 S. 10, in v. 16, the gathering-place of the Arameans, and secondly in v. 17 parallel to its substitution here. It is possible that in the first instance Helam, read by Cornill in Ez. 47 after Sibraim and situated between the border of Damascus and the border of Hamath, is meant. If this is accepted, Helam was the northern rallying-point for the Arameans called from beyond the River (2 S. 10) and the reading of upon them is correct and 2 S. 10 should be corrected from Ch. and not vice versa. are to be struck out as a dittography from the following and the preceding words.—17. [2 S. 10. 18. 19. to be read with 2 S. 10. The text of Ch. is to be preferred as original. Dr. and Bu. read i.e., a year after David first sent messengers to Hanun, 19. 2 S. 10 has with in apposition as the subject of and destroyed the land of the children of Ammon, and he came and besieged Rabbah] a paraphrase of 2 S. “And David sent Joab, and his servants with him, and all Israel; and they destroyed the children of Ammon, and besieged Rabbah.” The Chronicler

XX. 1-3. The conquest of Ammon.—1. And it came to pass, at the time of the return of the year, at the time when kings go out] is doubtless what the Chronicler copied from 2 S. 11, but there the original was “at the time when the messengers went forth,” i.e., a year after David first sent messengers to Hanun, 19. 2 S. 10 (see Sm.).—And Jo'ab led forth the strength of the host and destroyed the land of the children of Ammon, and he came and besieged Rabbah] a paraphrase of 2 S. “And David sent Joab, and his servants with him, and all Israel; and they destroyed the children of Ammon, and besieged Rabbah.” The Chronicler
sharpens the narrative by making it more individualistic.—It seems a curious oversight on the part of the Chronicler to have retained from 2 S. *Now David was abiding in Jerusalem*, the words introducing the story of Bathsheba and out of place in the Chronicler’s narrative, since in the following verses David is clearly in the field with the army.—*And Jo‘ab smote Rabbah and destroyed it*. Cf. 2 S. 12\\thinspace m where the text is faulty (see Sm.). According to what seems to have been the original text of 2 S., Joab captured a fortification which protected the city’s water. With victory thus assured, he sent for David that the latter might have the glory of taking the city. By the Chronicler’s abridgment, the King appears abruptly on the scene in time to take part in the sacking of the city.—*Rabbah* (2 S. 11\\thinspace Am. 14\\thinspace Je. 49\\thinspace and frequent) the mod. ‘Amman, thirteen and one-half miles north-east from Heshbon, twenty-eight and one-half miles east from the Jordan, was the capital of the Ammonites (cf. Baed. pp. 142 ff.; Buhl, GAP. p. 260; and on the history of the place Schür. *Jewish People*, II. i. pp. 119 ff.).—2. *And David took the crown of Milcom* the national god of Ammon (1 K. 11\\thinspace m * 2 K. 23\\thinspace m) and probably distinct from Molech (see Moore, *EBI*, III. col. 3085). The name has not been found outside the OT. If this emendation is correct, this statement implies that an image of the deity was found at Rabbah. A parallel to the idol’s crown has been found in that of the Delian Apollo.—*And he found the weight a talent of gold and in it was a precious stone*. The weight is probably an exaggeration, since it came upon David’s head, i.e., it was worn by him.—3. This verse has been interpreted to mean that David tortured the captives, and also that he put them at forced labour. The latter seems the more likely, hence we render, *And he set them at saws and at picks and at axes.*

1. *ךְּנָּהָ* wanting in 2 S. 11\\thinspace m. On other variations from the text of 2 S. see above.—2—3 S. 12\\thinspace m.—*יוּּד דְּרַּך* supplied by the Chronicler.—*לְהִי* their king, so also 2 S. *כִּי מְלַחָה(א)מְלַחָהַ בֵּאָרַּבִּא וַּלְּחֵב וַּלְּחֵּב* in 2 S. *מְלַחָה חַּבְּרָר בֵּאָרַּבִּא וַּלְּחֵב* (other MSS., מְלַחָה;—ז). Tulli aulem David coronam Melchom de capite ejus. Jewish commentators interpret as a proper name, מְלַחָּה (cf. 1 K. 11\\thinspace m * 2 K. 23\\thinspace m), adopted by We., Dr., Sm., Kau., Oe., Bn., and others.—*יָדֶם וַּלְּחֵב*
SLAUGHTER OF PHILISTINE CHAMPIONS

4-8. Philistine champions slain.—Corresponds with 2 S. 21:11-14. The Chronicler passes over the story of Tamar and Absalom, Absalom’s rebellion, and the atoning vengeance on the house of Saul, recorded in 2 S., as foreign to the purpose of his history. This brought him to the account of the slaying of the four sons of a Philistine giant, 2 S. 21:11-14. The account of the destruction of the first the Chronicler omits probably because he thought it unworthy of David that he should wax faint and require to be rescued by one of his men, 2 S. 21:15-17. He gives then simply the story of the death of three sons of the giant, but departs from the narrative of 2 S. by changing the statement “Elhanan slew Goliath the Gittite” into “Elhanan slew the brother of Goliath the Gittite,” v. 4. This change by the Chronicler was undoubtedly made to reconcile this story with that of 1 S. 17, where Goliath the Gittite falls by the hand of David. The discrepancy in S. is due to the different sources of the stories.—

4. Sibbecai the Hushathite (2 S. 21:11; 1 Ch. 11:39 and the corrected text of the parallel 2 S. 23:11; 1 Ch. 27:11 †), i.e., Sibbecai from the town of Hushah (cf. 4:9). He was of the Judean family of Zerah.—Sippai † (Saph 2 S. 21:14 †) otherwise unknown.—5. The place of this war, Gob in 2 S., was probably omitted because obscure, just as Gezer was substituted in the preceding verse (v. i.).—Elhanan, the son of Ja’ir (2 S. 21:15; and another of David’s chiefs 2 S. 23:11; 1 Ch. 11:11 †).—Lahmi † is a fiction from the lehem of Bethlehem in the text of 2 S. 21:13 (v. i.)—Goliath the Gittite (1 S. 17:48; 21:9; 22:18; 2 S. 21:14 †).—The staff of whose spear was like a weaver’s beam. It is a mark of the Chronicler’s carelessness that he should have retained this clause descriptive of Goliath when, according to his text, Goliath merely identifies Lahmi.—6. 7. The unnamed giant was slain by Jonathan the son of Shime’a. This nephew of David is apparently called Jonadab in 2 S. 13:8.
4. A corruption of 2 S. 21⁴⁹ which  ג has (Be., Zoe., Oe., Ki., Bn.).— ב 2 S. גב in גוב. The Chronicler probably substituted גזר for the obscure גוב, which is likely the original form. It is considered the original here by Zoe. and Ki., while Be. preferred גזר in both places. But גזר was a Canaanite city. Klo. reads גאש.—זא (many mss. and editions גזא) 2 S. גב wantıng in 2 S., and probably an addition of the Chronicler (Be., Zoe., and Bn. think the word may have fallen from the text of 2 S.).—5. גב גזר has ב liked גזר after גזר (Qr. גזרו) 2 S. גזרו (omitting גזרו, which is a ditto from the following clause). The Chronicler has changed the original text given in 2 S. to avoid a discrepancy with 1 S. 17, where David slays Goliath (v. 5). גזר is clearly to be preferred to גזר (Bu.). Ba. favours the assumption that Goliath is a title and not a proper name and thus harmonises the two statements concerning the death of Goliath.—6. גזר a corruption (Dr., Bu.).—זא גזר (many mss. and editions גזרו) 2 S. גזר wantıng in 2 S. גזר. The Chronicler has omitted the numeral because he has omitted the story of the death of the first of the four brothers. גזר should be pointed גזר י וישו מ ו, Ges. § 691, cf. 31. אלו these, v. BDB.

XXI–XXIX. The preparations for the building of the Temple and the personnel of the servants of the Temple.

In these chapters David is said to have made such preparations for the building of the Temple as to make him deserve the entire credit for its erection. It is to him that the Temple site is revealed in consequence of the sinful numbering of the people and the propitiatory sacrifice (21–22¹⁰). The material necessary for the building and its furnishings, greatly in excess of what could possibly have been used, is represented as collected by him, gold, silver, bronze, iron, timber, hewn stones (22¹⁰, ²⁰), and even precious stones, with variegated stuff and fine linen (see on 29¹¹), in astonishing abundance. Workmen in wood and in stone, in gold, in silver, in bronze, and in iron are also supplied without number (see on 22¹⁰ ²). Even the plans are prepared in advance and delivered to Solomon by David with proper public ceremony (28¹¹ ²). The princes are commanded to give the young King all possible assistance in carrying out the great undertaking (22¹¹ ²), Solomon
himself being admonished to conduct himself piously to secure prosperity for the work (28:11). Thus every problem is anticipated and solved by David. Solomon becomes merely the representative who carries out the predetermined plans, and is thus robbed of the credit for that performance which the earlier historical writings put down as his greatest glory. The organisation of the Temple servants, which grew up during the long period between the completion of the Temple and the post-exilic period of the writer, is also credited to David in defiance of historical facts.

Modern critics have usually considered the greater part of cc. 21–29 to be from the Chronicler (so Ki., SBOT.). But recently, Büchler has come to the conclusion that cc. 22. 28 f. are a part of an extensive extra-canonical source which he thinks the Chronicler used here and elsewhere (Zur Geschichte der Tempelmusik und der Tempelpsalmen, ZAW. 1899, pp. 130 f.). Benzinger carries Büchler's position still further, maintaining that c. 21 (ultimately taken from 2 S. 24), excepting vv. 6, 9 f., is from the same source, but he ascribes 22:14–19 28:18–19 30:1 29:18–30 to the Chronicler (Kom. pp. 61, 62, 64). Kittel now adopts Benzinger's position (Kom.). Büchler's whole theory is based upon radical textual emendation which discredits his results (l. c., pp. 97 ff.). The Chronicler's omission, in the preceding chapters, of everything which is in any way compromising to the character of David, properly prepares for this presentation of the crowning acts of his life. The passage must be late post-exilic, and since we find many indications of the Chronicler's hand (v. i.), we can see no good reason why practically the whole section should not have been written by him.

XXI. 1–XXII. 1. David's census and the plague.—This passage is dependent upon 2 S. 24, but deviates from it in a number of important particulars. (1) Satan (v. 1) instead of Yahweh (2 S. 24:1) is the instigator of the census. (2) The officers of the army, there associated with Joab (2 S. 24:1), are omitted, and also the description of the country traversed and the time occupied in taking the census (2 S. 24:1–9). (3) The results of the census differ (cp. v. 4 with 2 S. 24:1). (4) According to Chronicles no count of Levi and Benjamin was made (v. 4), while according to 2 S. all the tribes seem to have been counted. (5) David sees the destroying angel “between earth and heaven” (v. 14), while in 2 S.
he is simply described as “by the threshing-floor” (2 S. 24:8). (6) The elders appear with David, and both are clothed with sack-cloth and fall prostrate (v. 11). This description is wanting in Samuel. (7) Chronicles also adds the representation that Ornan on seeing the angel went into hiding with his four sons (v. 19). (8) The price paid for the threshing-floor varies (cp. v. 8 with 2 S. 24:14). (9) The fire from heaven is not mentioned in 2 S. (10) Vv. 16–22 are wanting in 2 S. Although these variations are extensive and Chronicles has reproduced 2 S. 24 in a freer manner than in the earlier parallels, there is little ground for the view that the Chronicler must have used an intermediate source. Of the main variations, (1), (5), (6), (7), and (9) might be expected from any late writer including the Chronicler; (2) is an abridgment most natural from him; (3) rather reveals the Chronicler after the gloss has been omitted (see v. 11); (4) is in accord with his religious attitude. Even if an earlier hand were certain, (8) must be an exaggeration due to the Chronicler, while (10) is recognised as coming from his hand (except 22:1, which is certainly an integral part of the preceding paragraph, v. i.).

Benzinger, followed by Kittel, holds that since these variations cannot be explained on any one principle, neither by the theology of the Chronicler, overlooking exceptions, nor as an abridgment, the Chronicler did not take the chapter directly from 2 S. However, too much stress should not be laid on the variations in this case, since the Chronicler would doubtless have omitted this account as doing David discredit had he not found a new use for it, i.e., to show how the site for the Temple was selected, a thing not hinted in 2 S. The changes seem natural enough from the Chronicler. He abridges what is to David’s discredit (2 S. 10:1–19) and expands that which does him credit (2 S. 24:19).

1–8. The census.—1. Now Satan rose up against Israel and moved David to number Israel]. According to 2 S. 24:1 Yahweh moved David to number the people. Some commentators have held that Satan has fallen from the text of 2 S. (Ew., Zoe., Oe., et al.), but this finds no support in textual criticism. The introduction of Satan, who appears in Jb. 1:6 2:1 as an angel bringing complaints about men before God (cf. also Zc. 3:1–4), is due to the Chronicler, who desired to remove the offence caused by the state-
ment that Yahweh was the direct instigator of an act portrayed as sinful. David sinned by ordering a census to be taken without having been commanded to do so by God (cf. Ex. 30:14 and the lustratio populi Romani, introduced by Servius Tullius, which took place on Mars-field after each census, see Varro, de Re Rustica, ii, 1.; Livius, i. 44, cf. iii. 22; Dionysius, iv. 22). According to Thenius, Zoe., Ba., et al., the arrogance of David revealed in the census was the principal cause of Yahweh's anger. But such conduct, though possibly the basis of the popular view taken of a census, is not hinted in David's prayers (vv. 8-11); the census is regarded by the writer as a sin per se. A connection between an epidemic and the crowding of people in narrow quarters for enumeration has been found by some.—For the use of Israel instead of “Israel and Judah” (2 S. 24:1) see below, v. 1.—2. And David said to Jo'ab, and to the princes of the people, go number Israel. The census was a military measure, hence was entrusted to Joab and only those “that drew sword” (v. 4) were numbered. On Jo'ab, cf. 21v.—From Be'ersheba even to Dan] i. e., the extreme southern and northern limits (see Buhl, GAP. pp. 69 f.). Beersheba, the modern Bır-es-Seba', on north bank of Wady es-Seba' (cf. 4v), lay twenty-eight miles (as the crow flies) south-west from Hebron, and was an ancient sanctuary (cf. Am. 5v). For biblical derivations of the name, cf. Gn. 21v (E), 26v (J) (see Buhl, GAP. p. 183, with references there). Dan, the modern Tell-el-Kadi, had the original name of Laish (וָלַשׁ) Ju. 18v, Leshem (לְשֵׁם) in Jos. 19v. It lay in the extreme north of Palestine, and according to Onom. (2nd ed. Lag. 249. 32, 275. 33) was four Roman miles west from Panias (see Buhl, GAP. pp. 238 f., with references there; also GAS. HGL. pp. 473. 480, who identifies Dan with the modern Banias). For the Chronicler's habit of defining limits from south to north, cf. 2 Ch. 19v 30v Ne. 11v, also 1 Ch. 13v.—3. And Jo'ab said, Let Yahweh increase his people as much as one hundred times, is not my lord the king, are not all of them servants of my lord? (v. i.). Popular superstition connected a plague, and consequently a large decrease of the population, with the taking of a census. Joab diplomatically called this fact to his lord's attention by wishing for him Yahweh's
blessing in a great increase of people. He also assured the King of the loyalty of his subjects.—Why will he be a cause of guilt unto Israel?] i.e., the community guilt which results from the sins of one or a part of its members, cf. Lv. 4 Ezr. 10. 11.—5. And all Israel were a thousand thousand and a hundred thousand that drew sword]. This number falls short of those given in 2 S. 24 (800,000 + 500,000 = 1,300,000) by 200,000. This decrease was probably intentional on the part of the Chronicler, since he had excepted Levi and Benjamin (v. 4) from the census, an explanation which is favoured by the round number of the decrease, 100,000 for each tribe, or 200,000 in all. V. 10 is a gloss (v. i.). The numbers in both lists (2 S. and here) are at variance with those in Nu. 1. 2. and 26. 6. This verse, wanting in 2 S., is from the Chronicler. Its historicity was maintained by Be., Ke., Zoe. The Chronicler excepted Levi because the law required that this tribe should not be numbered among the children of Israel (Nu. 2, cf. 24), i.e., for military service. They might be numbered by themselves, however, for religious purposes (Nu. 3 26). Some commentators have held that Benjamin was not numbered because the census was interrupted (27) by a countermand from David (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). We., followed by Bn., makes the ground of the omission of Benjamin the fact that the holy city lay within its borders. But Jerusalem was sanctified by the Temple and this was before even the site of the Temple had been consecrated through the sacrifices of David. The Chronicler would scarcely overlook this fact when in v. 10 he explains why David sacrificed in Jerusalem. It is more probable that he was influenced by the fact that the tabernacle of Yahweh, which the Chronicler considered the centre of worship in David's time, was set up at Gibeon within the borders of Benjamin (Jos. 18).—7. Therefore he (God) smote Israel] anticipates the account of the plague. According to 2 S. 24 it is David's heart which smites him for his sin, and leads to his repentant cry to Yahweh, while here God first shows his displeasure. It is not necessary to suppose that the Chronicler wished to represent that David's confession was wrung from him by the appearance of the pestilence (Ba.). He simply emphasised the divine leading in establishing the site for the Temple.
1. “rise up,” a late usage for earlier פֶּה, cf. 2 Ch. 20:4 Dn. 8:10 (BDB. פֶּה Qal. 6 c; l. 88). Zoë, following וָהֻנְּי, rendered stood, but וָהֻנְּי and other variations of וָהֻנְּי have וָהֻנְּי consurrexit, וָהֻנְּי פֶּה. — וָהֻנְּי the same form in 2 S. 24:1, but there + 2 against, while here + inf., cf. 2 Ch. 32:11 (= 2 K. 18:28 = Is. 36:19) where only in Ch. the inf. follows. Also so used in 2 Ch. 18:3, which is certainly from the Chronicler, cf. 2 Ch. 32:18 (without doubt from the Chronicler). — 2. ↑ 2 S. 24:3. Same change in vv. 11, 12 = 2 S. 24:11, 12. The Chronicler seems to prefer רָוִי, cf. 17:1 = 2 S. 7:1, 17:2 = 2 S. 7:1, 17:3 = 2 S. 7:1, 11 = 2 S. 5:1. — אל נַשַׁבֵּשׁ רָוִי בָּאֲרוֹנָהוּ] 2 S. 24:2. — 2 S. 24:9. וּבָאֵרָהוּ — read doubtfully וּבָאֵרָהוּ — (in sense of muster) in 2 S. 24:9. וּבָאֵרָהוּ appears also in 2 Ch. 16:9 (intensive stem) .— 2. ↑ 2 S. 24:1 has וּפְּשִׂכַּה נְבָא וּפְּשִׂכַּה, so also Ju. 20:1 S. 3:8 S. 3:17 24:9 1 K. 5:1 Am. 8:1.—↑ לַהָי הָאֹדֶם] cohortative, cf. Ges. § 48c for form, § 108d for use.— 3. ↑ 2 S. 24:9. The suffix makes Yahweh the real ruler. This is the Chronicler’s stand-point, cf. especially 29:11.—↑ 2 S. 24:9. The repetition is customary in S. (cf. 2 S. 12:2). The Chronicler’s use corresponds to that in Dt. 1:11.—↑ לַהָי אָדֶם כֹּהוֹ דָּבָרָיו לְקוֹדֵשׁ לְעַמָּנוּ] is at variance with 2 S. 24:10 נְשָׁבַב, which is a more attractive reading. Be. thought the text in Ch. was the result of reconstructing a corrupt text by conjecture. Oe. preferred the reading in 2 S., because the increase of one hundred times is not yet a fact. Although Bn. thinks וָהֻנְּי, kal וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי may have been corrected from 2 S., he regards it as probable that the text of 2 S. was also original in Ch. The continuation of וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי makes it altogether probable that וָהֻנְּי is corrected from 2 S., hence has no independent value. Origen’s text (Field) contained only this last clause. ↓ וָהֻנְּי may better be taken as a nominal sentence, with וָהֻנְּי as the subject and וָהֻנְּי as the predicate, which should be translated “Is not my lord the king” (cf. Is. 33:23 וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי וָהֻנְּי; and on the rather unusual use of וָהֻנְּי with a nominal clause Ges. § 15d). A ↓ may have fallen out before כֹּהוֹ, but is not indispensable. וָהֻנְּי must be understood before the second clause as in Ju. 9:6, 9:8, 11:1 and probably also in Gn. 20:6. This gives a smooth reading and explains the double question which follows: why does my lord require this thing, for is he not the king (over these or a hundred times as many), and why will he be a cause of guilt unto Israel, for are they not his servants.—↑ cf. Ezr. 10:18, 18, also 2 Ch. 24:18 24:18. 18, 11, 11, 11, 11, elsewhere Ps. 69:4 Lv. 4:5 5:8 22:16 Am. 8:14; Torrey says of it “used chiefly by the Chronicler” (CHV. p. 19, on Ezr. 9:1 l. 7.). — 4. Abridged from 2 S. 24:4. ↓ וָהֻנְּי of 2 S. 24:4 is replaced.
by the more common יִשְׂרֵאֵל. Both are used parallel in Jb. 17, 21, s. s. v. 9.—5. יָהָ֣והַיִּמְזַ֜ר חַיָּ֣ה וְיִשְׂרֵאֵ֖ל. יִשְׂרֵאֵל is certainly used for the whole kingdom in v. 4. It will also be noticed that in v. 1 the Chronicler used יִשְׂרְאֵל in the general sense to include the whole of 2 S. 24. The writer’s intention seems to have been to ignore the separation implied in the term “Israel and Judah.” David’s kingdom was one kingdom, hence יִשְׂרְאֵל seems to be used in the same sense here. V. 8 then is a gloss and the internal evidence given for this is supported by its absence from G. (The phrase could have been lost from the text of G (or its underlying Heb.) by homoeoteleuton, but the other evidence is strong against its originality.) The Chronicler certainly would not reduce the number of 2 S. 24* from 500,000 to 470,000 (Bn.). The glossator was influenced by 2 S. 24*—6. יִשְׂרֵאֵל יִזְכָּר חָיָ֣ה אֶל. The Chronicler brought out the contrast between “the sword of man” and “the sword of Yahweh” which serves to make David’s answer (v. 11) clearer than in 2 S. 24*.

9–13. Gad’s commission.—9. And Yahweh spake unto Gad David’s seer]. Gad is mentioned twice elsewhere in Ch., 29* 2 Ch. 29*; cf. also 25* where Heman is said to be the King’s seer. Gad figures as a prophetic counsellor of David whilst a fugitive from Saul, 1 S. 22*†.—12. For triads of divine judgments cf. Lv. 26*, 1 K. 8* 2 Ch. 20* Je. 14* 15 21* 24* 25* 29* 32* 34* 38* 42* 44* Ez. 5* 6*; also 7* 12*; for the angel of Yahweh as an expression for pestilence, 2 K. 19*. The Chronicler brings out the contrast between “the sword of man” and “the sword of Yahweh” which serves to make David’s answer (v. 11) clearer than in 2 S. 24*.

10. יִשְׂרֵאֵל] 2 S. 24* לְבִיָּנ. G לְבִיָּנ in both places. We., Bu., et al., adopt the reading of Ch. in both places.—11. יִשְׁתָּמַר] not in 2 S.; an Aram. loan-word, late (BDB.), cf. 12* 2 Ch. 29* 2 Ezr. 8* (l. 103).—12. יִשְׂרֵאֵל יִזְכָּר חָיָ֣ה but G יִזְכָּר חָיָ֣ה. The reading of Ch. is original (Be., Zoe., et al.)—תַּשֶּׁמֶר] an error for יִשְׁתָּמַר; 2 S. 24* יִזְכָּר חָיָ֣ה, G יִזְכָּר חָיָ֣ה (Bn., Oe., Ki., Bn.).—13. רָשָׁת] 2 S. 24* רָשָׁת התוּכָה. Zoe. prefers the reading of Ch., and Oe. the text of 2 S. We (on 2 S. 24*), followed by Ki. and accepted in BDB, holds that רָשָׁת arose from a misreading of יִשְׂרָה, which was original in Ch. This is an attractive possibility owing to the general resemblance of the letters, but the Chronicler introduces the first two alternatives with וְ, hence we should naturally expect the text as
given. Moreover, the second clause in 2 S., shows that something more than the flight (תָּנֵךְ) of David was necessary to make this punishment equivalent to the others. It is far simpler to suppose a γ to have fallen out after ה, as the sense demands, so הָ, hence the clause read originally וַיַּעֲבֹד וַיָּמַע כָּל לְמַשַּׁת and the sword of thine enemies overtaking thee. Cp. for an exact parallel Je. 4210. The same use of the participle occurs in the last clause of the third alternative (cf. 2 S. 2418 help), but there כִּים וְשֶׁלֶם.

14-17. God's judgment and David's repentance.—14. And there fell (וַתַּפְּלַט) from Israel because they became the victims of the sword of Yahweh; 2 S. 2411 “And there died (וַתָּשֶׂם) from the people” in consequence of the pestilence. The Chronicler emphasises the divine side (v. s. v. 7).—15. And he (God) repented him of the evil]. For repentance of God cf. Gn. 6* Ex. 3211 I S. 1511 Je. 1811 4210 Jon. 310.—And the angel of Yahweh was standing by the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite]. The threshing-floor of Ornan lay on the top of Mt. Zion, where later the Temple was built (cf. 2211). 2 S. does not connect the incident with the site of the Temple. On Jebusite, cf. 14 11. Ornan is the only Jebusite mentioned by name.—Verse 16, not found in the parallel text of 2 S., is an embellishment by the Chronicler based upon the phrase “when he saw the angel that smote the people” (2 S. 2411) (Be.). In the older narratives the angels of Yahweh have a human form (cf. Gn. 18 Ju. 6* 13*), but here the angel hovers between earth and heaven.

16. And he repented him of the evil]. The difficulty with the text of Ch. lies in the indefinite מִי, since the angel has already been mentioned (v. 10) and has accomplished his work outside of Jerusalem (v. 9). Moreover, God gives this command only to countermand it at once. Be., followed later by Oe. and Bn., pointed out that the reading in Ch. arose in the following manner: ‘ה יְהֹוָה (2 S. 2410), in a text which did not separate words, was mistakenly read וַיַּפְּלַט and this the Chronicler changed to וַיַּפְּלַט מִי, according to his custom (v. s. v. 7). However, the text of Ch. should not be changed, for it is the original of the Chronicler.—יִרְשָׁד אֶת the other mss. and editions זו, וַיַּפְּלַט, וַיָּמְע, but כָּל הָעָנָב. a clause not found in 2 S. but necessary here to explain why God sent an angel against Jerusalem and immediately repented (Be., Bn.).—בָּעָר enough, cf. 1 K. 19* Gn. 4511. 2 S. 2418 Kt.
18-27. The purchase of Ornan’s floor and the expiatory sacrifice.—18. And the angel of Yahweh commanded Gad. The appearance of the angel of Yahweh consecrated this spot, cf. Gn. 28.11 Ju. 6.11-12 13.17-18. In 2 S. Yahweh gives the command, but in the narratives in Judges the angel commanded sacrifices to be made. These may have influenced the representation of the Chronicler. —20. And Ornan turned about and saw the angel; and his four sons with him hid themselves] since to see the angel of Yahweh was the same as seeing Yahweh himself, which portended death (cf. Ju. 6.11 13.17 Tob. 12.1-2 also Gn. 32.10 Ex. 20.13 33.14 Is. 6.1).—Now Ornan was threshing wheat] is wanting in 2 S. 24, but might easily be inferred from v. 11 (cf. the similar addition in G of 2 S. 24.18 καὶ ἠμέρας θερισμοῦ πυράν) and appears to have been introduced by the Chronicler in view of the following statement of v. 11 and Ornan went out from the threshing-floor. V. 11 ends abruptly with Ornan and his sons in hiding, but in a similar fashion in v. 18 David and the elders are left fallen upon their faces because of the presence of the angel.—21. And as David came unto Ornan] is wanting in 2 S. but is made necessary by the insertion of v. 11. The Chronicler fittingly makes the King speak first.—Place] more than the actual area of the threshing-floor (Ba.), which would have been sufficient for an altar (2 S. 24.11 *) but not for the site of the Temple. This change goes with the increase in the purchase price (v. 11).—23. And wheat for the meal offering] is not found in 2 S. In later times the meal-offering (cf. Lv. 21.16) was united with the burnt-offering (cf. Nu. 15.1-3). The sacrifice recorded in Ju. 13.11 may have influenced the Chronicler.—25. And David gave Ornan for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight]. According to 2 S. 24.11 David paid fifty shekels of silver for the threshing-floor and
the oxen. It is not likely that we have here two variant traditions, nor that one is a corruption of the other. If fifty shekels of silver is too small a price, by comparison with Gn. 23:14, six hundred shekels of gold is certainly too high. We have here a characteristic exaggeration of the Chronicler (Th.) not only for the sake of exalting David (We.) but also to emphasise the value of the Temple site (v. s. v. 9), which should not be paid for in silver but in gold. (Note the later descriptions of Solomon’s Temple, in which nearly everything is described as covered with gold.) While no importance can be attached to the ancient harmonising effort whereby each of the twelve tribes was made to pay fifty shekels, and thereby the six hundred in Chronicles was accounted for (Raschi), this suggests what may have been the Chronicler’s reasoning in reaching six hundred shekels as the price of the Temple site. The Chronicler makes David pay fifty shekels of gold for each tribe since the Temple should be the place of worship for all.—

26. And he called upon Yahweh and he answered him with fire from heaven upon the altar of burnt-offering]. God showed his acceptance of David’s sacrifices with fire from heaven as at the consecration of Aaron (Lv. 9:1, cf. also 1 K. 18:36; 2 Ch. 7:1; 2 Mac. 2:10). This altar is thus put on a par with the former one (Ki.).

19. [better זכר סוח ויחו than זכר סוח ייחו] 2 S. 24:19, Be., Oe., Gin.—[This change was necessitated by the alteration in v. 11. Gad spoke “in the name of Yahweh” but not at his direct command (v. s. v. 19).—20. Be. corrected this verse from 2 S. 24:9. Ke. correctly asserted that v. 9 is not parallel to 2 S. 24:9, but the latter is reproduced in v. 11. The result of Be.’s correction is a doublet in vv. 10 and 11.—21. כavanaugh is rendered by Σ θων βασιλεα (= βασιλεα, and being incomprehensible after מַעְבֹדַב, but translated by A (which has των βασιλεων like B) κρυβομενου. Also has των βασιλεων, but θανομενου for θανοιμενου. Μ, Τ, follow Μ. Ki. regards כavanaugh as the original reading, and the mistake by which it was read כavanaugh led to the insertion of מַעְבֹדַב, which he supposes to have been originally מַעְבֹדַב (SBOT.), thus finding three steps (Kom.) in the development of the verse. 1. As Ornan turned about, he saw the king going about, etc. 2. As Ornan turned about he saw the angel going about, etc. 3. As Ornan turned about and he saw the angel, his four sons hid themselves with him, etc. Furthermore, he regards the verse as a gloss in its original
form, since it conflicts with v. 11. The theory falls from its own weight. No reason is apparent why a glossator should insert this verse in Ki.'s original form, since it adds nothing and explains nothing. C has the supposed original form מִצַּלְמֶל, and also the reading מִצַּלְמָן, which is regarded as the result of misreading מִצַּלְמֶל for מִצַּלְמָן. (See Tor. Ezra Studies, p. 112.) The Chronicler desired to add more witnesses to the presence of the angel at this spot, since this fact consecrated the Temple site, and for this purpose the narrative is recorded. The introduction of the four sons of Ornan is thus accounted for. Otherwise the angel plays a much more important part in this narrative than in the account in 2 S. (cf. vv. 18, 19. 19—respectively 2 S. 24f. 17. 18. 19).—22. מִצַּלְמֶל מִצַּלְמָן לַעֲצֵי לְזֵית מַדַּנְא. [cf. Gn. 23.] threshing sledges. For a description of them, see Bn. Arch. pp. 209 f., Now. Arch. i. pp. 232 f., DB. i. p. 50.—24. מַדַּנְא בָּנָה וַיֶּבֶשֶׂ בַּקֹּדֶשׁ. Ba. and Ki. correct to מַדַּנְא לוּ חַלְנוֹת. on basis of ס, but מַדַּנְא may be an inf. abs. in וַיֶּבֶשֶׂ as other מַדַּנְא verbs, cf. 2 Ch. 7f. וַיֵּבֶשֶׂ.—27. מְדַנְא מְדַנְא is a Persian loan-word (see BDB.).

28-XXII. 1. The site for the Temple determined.—At that time, when David saw that Yahweh had answered him in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite when he sacrificed there . . . then David said, This is the house of Yahweh God and this is the altar of burnt-offering for Israel.] V. 11 has usually been understood at that time when David saw, etc., then he was wont to sacrifice there (Luther, Be., Ke., Oe.). Ba. rightly points out that v. 11 is a protasis to which 221 forms the apodosis, vv. 11, 12 being parenthetical. The translation he was wont to sacrifice there is doubtful, since the fear of the angel of Yahweh (v. 11) did not prevent David from going to Gibeon to sacrifice after this event. Before the Temple was built Solomon sacrificed at Gibeon (2 Ch. 1f.).—It follows that v. 11 and 221, as protasis and apodosis, cannot come from different sources (as Bn. and Ki. maintain). The unity of this section is also shown by the fact that this is the house of Yahweh God (cf. Gn. 2811) and this is the altar of burnt-offering for Israel (221) are brought out in contrast to the tabernacle of Yahweh which Moses made in the wilderness and the altar of burnt-offering respectively, which were at that time in the high place at Gibeon (v. 11). The purpose of these verses is to show how, as a consequence of the census and plague, the threshing-place of Ornan became the consecrated site for the Temple.
XXII. 2–19. David’s preparation for the Temple.—This chapter is a free composition by the Chronicler, full of general and exaggerated statements, with a number of short quotations from earlier canonical books woven together. No careful, definite statement suggests a trustworthy historian or even the use of an earlier source. That David contemplated building a temple is likely (2 S. 7), and he may have made some preparation for it, but the Chronicler’s description must have been drawn by inference from the older canonical books, assisted by a vivid imagination.

2–5. General preparation.—Not a studied account of material prepared for the Temple, but rather a careless list of such things as happened to occur to the writer. Cedar (ךֶּנֶּר) is the only timber mentioned, though fir (צָרָה) (1 K. 5:11, 13, 14, 15) and olive-wood (שֶׁמֶן) (1 K. 6:20, 21, 22) were also used.—2. David is here represented as anticipating the action of Solomon in setting non-Israelites at forced labour, for he commanded to gather together the sojourners that were in the land of Israel; and he set masons, etc. The historical fact seems to have been that Solomon made a levy upon pure Israelites to carry out his building operations (cf. 1 K. 5:11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16). A later writer taking exception to the reduction of Israelites to practical slavery made the levy consist of non-Israelites (1 K. 9:15). The Chronicler following this later view represents the levy as consisting of sojourners, but makes David responsible for calling them together just as he anticipates every other need in connection with the building of the
Temple. With characteristic inconsistency the Chronicler later represents Solomon as making the levy (2 Ch. 21:18). The sojourners (גֵּרְם) were foreigners who for one reason or another left their native clans and attached themselves to the Hebrews. Like the ḫ_CONN among the Arabs, the גֵּר was personally free, but without political rights. By the performance of certain duties he rendered a return for his protection. His lot was often hard, as is evidenced by the repeated exhortations to deal justly with him Dt. 15:14 27, to show him kindness Dt. 10:18 26, to refrain from oppressing him Ex. 22:23 (both JE) Lv. 19:34 (H) Dt. 24:7 Je. 7:3 Zc. 7:18. He was entitled to the Sabbath rest Ex. 20:18 23 (both JE) Dt. 5:14. In P the גֵּר represents the proselyte of the post-exilic community, cf. Ex. 12:39 Lv. 24:2 Nu. 9:15 15:19 38. —3. Iron in abundance] exclusive of the 100,000 talents given by the princes (291).—Binders] obscure. Here they are represented as made of iron, but in the only other place where the word is found (2 Ch. 34:11) they are of wood. Possibly they were merely iron or wooden pins used to make the joints fast (BDB. "clamps or the like").—The bronze was for use in making the two pillars which stood in front of the Temple, the sea with its supporting oxen, and various sacred utensils.—4. Cedar-trees] of Lebanon, the much-prized building-material of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings as well as among the Syrians, were then abundant on the Lebanon range east of the Phœnician coast and probably also on Hermon and the Antilebanons, also on the Amanus Mountains further to the north, and elsewhere.—Sidonians and Tyrians] the inhabitants of the two well-known Phœnician cities, on which cf. 1111.—5. For David said to himself] is better than and David said, etc., since v. 4 states the reason for David’s preparation as narrated in vv. 1-4.—Solomon my son is young and tender, etc.] (cf. 291) agrees with the Chronicler’s representation that the father and not the son was the moving spirit of the great undertaking.
takes offence at the word in this connection and corrects to
"masons" or "stone-cutters," comparing 2 K. 12:22 (JBL. vol. XXIV, 1895, p. 29), but the Chronicler's motive for introducing
the word is evident, cf. 2 Ch. 2:14—I. 89.—I. 15.—3.
also in 22:8, 89, etc., I. 105.—appears also in 2 Ch. 34:1, where the construction is the same, a verse agreed to be the work
of the Chronicler, I. 34.—I. 54.—4. . . . cf. Tor.
CHV. p. 20; I. 132.—I. 97] I. 105.—5. EVs. said. Ki. renders
meaning Qal 2). EVs. render these passages thought. (cf. Gn.
8:25) may be understood as well as lastly, hence, For David said to
himself.—I. 105.—cfr. on I. 120.—I. 6.—cfr. on I. 87.—see Ges. § 1088 (a).
cohortative used to express self-encouragement, see Ges. § 1088 (a). On Chronicler's use of word cf. v. 1, also for� (I. 54).—I. 105.—This verse is cited by Driver (LOT. 11, p. 539) as one of the
Chronicler's strangely worded sentences.

6-13. David's charge to Solomon.—7. As for me, it was
my purpose to build a house unto the name of Yahweh my God]
is dependent upon I K. 8:11, which is followed almost verbatim except in the change of person. The Chronicler represents
David as telling Solomon his son what the latter says of David
in his prayer of dedication (I K. 8:10.).—8. The word of Yah-
weh came to David through the prophet Nathan, commanding
him not to build a Temple (2 S. 7:1 = I Ch. 17), but no rea-
son is given. Elsewhere David's wars are given as the reason
why he could not build the house of Yahweh (I K. 5:17 (7)), but
only because they did not leave him time for other undertakings
(Ki.). The Chronicler was the first to state that David could
not build the Temple because he had shed much blood (cf. 28:1),
which may be nothing more than a religious interpretation of
I K. 5:17 (7).—9. And I will give him rest from all his enemies round
about]. Cf. I K. 5:9b. 10 (4:18 5:1).—For his name shall be Solomon]
(שלום peace, שלם peaceful), but he is also called Jedidiah
(добродетель beloved of Yah, 2 S. 12:1 ).—10. With only slight varia-
tions, this verse is a repetition of 2 S. 7:10, = I Ch. 17:10, but
the order of the last three clauses is reversed. With the first
clause cf. also I K. 5:10 (7 8).—13. Be strong (cf. 1 K. 21) and of
good courage; fear not neither be dismayed]. Cf. 28:10 2 Ch. 32:
Jos. 10:1, also Jos. 1 (where יִנְצַרְתָּן takes the place of נר).
7. יכ] Qr. יכ; other mss. וב Kt. and Qr., also וב Kt. and Qr. Θ τίθον, ת 필 mi. AV., Ke., Zoe., Oe. follow Qr., but the emphatic יכ (cf. 28*) favours the Kt. (RV., Be., Ki.).—9. התמקח] cf. 28* 1 K. 817. 11 (= 2 Ch. 6* 6) 1 K. 10* (= 2 Ch. 9*) 2 Ch. 1* 29*—8. יכ] l. 105.—10. סונ] cf. 28* 1 K. 2* Ps. 79*; also Ges. § 124m.


14-16. Transfer of material.—14. Now behold by my hard labor I have prepared for the house of Yahweh a hundred thousand talents of gold and a thousand thousand talents of silver]. The amounts are impossible, and out of all proportion to the actual cost of the Temple. The intrinsic value of this gold and silver is very nearly equal to five billion dollars in our money and its purchasing value was still more. Even if the light talent was intended (Ke., Zoe., et al.), reducing the value one-half, the amount remains incredible. According to 1 K. 10*, Solomon's yearly income amounted to only 666 talents of gold, cf. also 1 K. 9* 9* 10*—15. 16. Moreover, there are with thee in abundance workmen, hewers and workers of stone and timber; and all who are skilful in every work of gold, of silver, and of bronze, and of iron, without number]. These two verses were certainly intended to be read together and their separation causes trouble (v. i.). Without number refers to the skilful workers of gold, etc. The metals were weighed, not numbered. This construction preserves the balance for the whole section (vv. 14-15). In v. 16 the Chronicler records the material, which David prepared, in two groups: (1) the metals, (2) the timber and stone. In vv. 15 16 he tells of two groups of workmen whom David gathered together: (1) those who did the rougher work in stone and timber, (2) the skilful artisans who worked in metals. The order of these two groups is reversed the second time in accord with the Chronicler's habit. (Notice also timber and stone v. 15, and stone and timber v. 16.) The ma-
terials were without weight... in abundance (v. 11), and the workmen were in abundance... without number (vv. 12, 13).

14. υπερ. Αν. καθά τὴν πτωχείαν μου, AV. in my poverty, so BDB., RV. in my affliction. BN. renders my hard-pressed situation (bedrängten lage), explaining that David was poor compared with the rich Solomon. But the whole account is an effort to exalt David even above Solomon, who has little to do except carry out the plans of his father. HWB. gives Miβe for this passage, which is followed by KI. In Ps. 107:4 poverty is regarded as an affliction (παῦση), but, possibly in Gn. 31:1 and certainly in Dt. 26:1, παύση means oppressive toil. Be., followed by Ke., rendered durch meine mühevoll Arbeit. The parallel υπερ. in 29 favors by my hard (or painful) labor. In any case the μ is instrumental (so in the translations of Be., Ke., KI.), cf. Ps. 18:10 Is. 10:4 Ho. 12:11 and see Ges. § 119. —15. ἀντ. skilful, used of artisans of tabernacle and Temple, cf. Ex. 28:31 35:37 36:1. ' 2 Ch. 2:13 11. 16. לאработ ותְיוֹן וריִהְיֵי וּניִירְיָא [RV. of the gold, the silver, and the brass, and the iron, there is no number, so Ke., Zoe., et al. Ki. Kom. translates Gold, Silber, Ers und Eisen ist unermesslich viel vorhanden. These renderings are dependent upon the Massoretic punctuation, which creates two difficulties. (1) We should expect the Chronicler to use ἀντ. as in vv. 12, 13, instead of παῦση, when speaking of metals which were reckoned by weight and not by number. (2) No good reason can be assigned for the repetition of this list which has been given with more detail in v. 11. It does not appear from the text that the metals are the main thing and must be grouped together again to add force to the exhortation, as Ke. suggested. Without emending the consonant text, both difficulties are removed by connecting ἀντ. with the preceding verse, so referring to the μεταλλά ἀνεμερίζων of v. 11. So G seems to have understood καὶ πᾶς σωφὰς ἐν παρθενίᾳ γενν., ἐν χρυσῷ, ἐν δρυμῷ, ἐν χαλκῷ καὶ ἐν σιδήρῳ, ὅπε ὑπεράνε ἀρνίσματος. (It is not necessary to suppose that G did not read the article; see Ges. § 126m.) & brings out this meaning clearly by repeating ἀντ. “workers” before each metal and by translating ῾αντ. ἄν, ἵνα δοθῇ τῷ ἄντῷ, they (masc.) were not to be numbered.

17–19. David’s charge to the princes.—18. For he hath delivered the inhabitants of the land into my hand]. Not the Israelites but the original Canaanitishe peoples are intended, cf. 11 Jos. 2 18:7 Nu. 32:11.—19. The ark of the covenant of Yahweh] was at this time on Mount Zion in a tent which David had prepared for it, cf. 15:18 8:1 K. 8:1 = 2 Ch. 5:—And the holy vessels of God].
The Chronicler drew upon what was done in the reign of Solomon (1 K. 8 - 2 Ch. 5) for what he represents as commands of David.

XXIII-XXIX. The last acts of David.—This passage is best understood as a unit from the hand of the Chronicler, whose title is contained in 23:1-3, *When David was old and full of days, then (1) he made Solomon his son king over Israel, and (2) gathered together all the princes of Israel, (3) with the priests, (4) and the Levites. These last acts of David, which concern his son, the princes, the priests, and the Levites, the Chronicler recounts in reverse order, as is his habit elsewhere.

According to 2 Ch. 29, Hezekiah brings in “the priests and the Levites,” then in vv. 8-11 he addresses the Levites and assigns them their task and in vv. 11-15 he addresses the Levites and assigns them their task and in vv. 11-15 he addresses the Levites and assigns them their task. In 2 Ch. 29 cp. “And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the trumpets,” with “and the trumpets together with the instruments of David,” v. 17. For further instances cf. 21:15 22:1. 18 25 26.

Beginning with the Levites (c. 23), the Chronicler narrates how David divided them into courses in preparation for the new service in the Temple. The increase in their duties which would result from the building of the Temple, and the lighter nature of them (v. 19), led David to reduce the age at which they should begin service to twenty years (v. i.). Then David, with the assistance of Zadok and Ahimelech, divided the priests into courses (24:1-18). (24:11 is a later insertion, see in loco.) The account of the organisation of the singers (c. 25) and that of the gate-keepers (c. 26) follow. The third act of David’s old age, to gather together the princes of Israel (23:1), is doubtless introduced to give an opportunity to describe the military forces and the civil service as well organised (c. 27), so that Solomon could devote all his activity to carrying out the plans of his father concerning the Temple. This chapter (27) differs from the preceding, since the organisation or reorganisation of the religious functionaries is represented as taking place at this time, while the military and civil officers are simply exhibited as already organised. This was to be expected, since the former were being prepared for new
duties which should come with the completion of the Temple, while the latter had their duties throughout the reign of David. The last act of David, "He made Solomon king" (23:18), is narrated in cc. 28 f.

**XXIII. The Levites.**—With this chapter the Chronicler begins to record the last acts of David. After the superscription (vv. 1-3), he briefly states what provisions David made for the Levitical oversight of the building of the Temple (vv. 4-8), followed by a list of the heads of Levitical houses who were divided into courses (vv. 9-22), the introduction of a new legal age for service (vv. 24-27), and the duties of the Levites (vv. 27-29).

Ki. assigns 23:18 and Bn. 23:28 to a hand later than the Chronicler. The list of Levites, however, should properly be placed first, since the priests were a subdivision of the tribe of Levi, 23:18 naturally preceding c. 24. Benzinger adduces the following reasons against the Chronicler's authorship of 23:24-28: (1) the description of the Levitical service is general and out of place here; (2) vv. 25-27 contain a correction of v. 8; (3) the Chronicler in his preference for the singers would not have placed this service last. But the general description (1) is rather a mark of the Chronicler; no actual contradiction (2) exists between vv. 24-27 and v. 8, since the former deals with the legal age of the Levites after the Temple should be completed and the latter with the more ancient legal age (see below on 23:4, also 23:1); and (3) the sequence of duties accounts sufficiently for the order (cf. c. 25). An account of this Levitical service is not out of place here, since it follows the appointment of the younger Levites to public duties and leads up to the description of the priestly organisation.

1. 2. The superscription to cc. 23-29.—1. **When David was old and full of days**] a statement defining the time of the acts which follow.—**Then he made Solomon his son king**] not a nomination to the kingship, the actual anointing and elevation to the throne taking place later (29:1) (Ke., Oe.), but a sub-title which introduces c. 28 (Bn.). Verse 2 gives the remaining sub-titles, which the Chronicler has taken up in reverse order (v. s.).

1. [תַּחְתָּא] not the adj. but 3pers. sg. pf. of the verb. [חָלָה] so also in 2 Ch. 24:16; usually as an adj., cf. Gn. 35:8, Jb. 42:17.

3–5. **The oversight of the service of the Temple.**—3. **Now, the Levites were numbered from thirty years old and upward.** Since
The Levites were numbered according to the old custom (Nu. 4:32, 38, 39, 40). The Law also knows of a numbering from twenty-five years old and upward (Nu. 8:26).

This number is found only here. According to Nu. 3:18 the males from one month old and upward numbered 22,000 in Moses' time, or 23,000 according to Nu. 26:60. Those between the ages of thirty and fifty were 2,750 + 2,630 + 3,200 = 8,580 (Nu. 4:4, 5, 6) (cf. v. 4).

4. 5. Of these twenty-four thousand were to oversee the work (i.e., of building, v. 1.) of the house of Yahweh. The Temple was built, according to the Chronicler, under the direct oversight of the Levites. These 24,000 were to have general oversight of the work. Associated with them in some way in this oversight were 6,000 officers and judges, 4,000 gate-keepers, and 4,000 singers. Just why these should have a part in building the house is obscure, unless the Chronicler thought of them as having the oversight of the building of their respective quarters. The fact is supported by 2 Ch. 34:11, where the singers, scribes, officers, and gate-keepers had a part in the oversight of the builders. It is hardly satisfactory to regard these words as glosses in 2 Ch. 34:11 (Bn., Ki.), since one of these passages supports the other. Thirty-eight thousand overseers would be unnecessary, but such an exaggeration is natural from the Chronicler (cf. 22:29-30). These overseers were chosen from the existing body of official Levites, namely those over thirty (v. 1.), and not from those whose service was to begin at the age of twenty at the completion of the Temple (cf. vv. 4-5).—Which I made]. The use of the first person indicates that vv. 1-1 contain the words of David. The Chronicler refers to the musical instruments of David elsewhere, 2 Ch. 29:27 Ne. 12, cf. Am. 6:21.

3. This Niph. is used positively only here.—ןָבִיתִים pl. with sf., from נֶבֶית; here and in v. 11 head, poll, in which sense only P and late, cf. Ex. 16:18 38:25 Nu. 1:1 12:20 13:14. נָבִית is a nearer definition of נָבִית, excluding women.—דָּשָׁה K. always to agree with v. 41, but see n. there.—4. מֵעָלָה] act as overseer, is used in
2 Ch. 21. 17, Ezr. 3. 9. 2 Ch. 34. 11 of overseeing the workmen in building or repairing the Temple. The Levites acted as overseers during the repairing of the Temple under Josiah (2 Ch. 34. 11), and also at the rebuilding when Zerubbabel was governor (Ezr. 3. 11, where the same phrase לֶאֶזְרְבַּבֵּל is used), hence it is likely that the function of these Levites had to do with the oversight of the building of the house. The Levites did not oversee the work of ministry, but performed it (vv. 11, 12).—5. בַּגָּלֶת נְשֶׁיָּה and בַּגָּלֶת נְשֶׁיָּה are an effort to make a smoother reading.

6-23. Heads of Levitical houses.—Twenty-two heads of fathers’ houses are usually found here, and various attempts have been made to increase this number to twenty-four, since there were twenty-four courses of priests (24. 11), of singers (25. 11), and of gate-keepers (26. 11), but all have been more or less arbitrary. The statement of Josephus (Ant. vii. 14. 7) that David divided the Levites into twenty-four classes may have been derived from 24. Bertheau restored the number twenty-four by inserting Jaaziah with his three sons Shoham, Zaccur, and Ibri (24. 11) into v. 11, omitting Mahli of v. 10 as a repetition. Berlin, more recently, departs from Bertheau only in making this Jaaziah either the son of Mahli of v. 10 or of Jerahmeel the son of Kish (JQR. XII. pp. 295 f.). These emendations are based upon the supposition that our text has only twenty-two heads of fathers’ houses, while according to the true interpretation of v. 10 (q. v.) twenty-three should be counted. Very likely one name has been lost from the text through corruption, but just where and how remains dubious.—

6. On names Gershon, Kehath, Merari, cf. 511 (61).—7. La’dan and Shime’i] La’dan also in 26, elsewhere Libni and Shime’i, cf. 611 Ex. 617 Nu. 311. Zöckler escapes the difficulty by considering La’dan a descendant of Libni. More recently this view has been put forward with confidence by Berlin (l. c. p. 292 B). The variation may be the result of different traditions. La’dan also occurs as the name of an Ephraimitite 711. —8-11. Ladan had three sons (v. 1) and Shime four (v. 10), two of which united to make one fathers’ house, since they had few sons (v. 11). A second Shime with three sons is found between these two (v. 11). Although v. 11 connects this Shime’i with the family of La’dan, his relationship is not indicated. J. H. Michaelis, following Kimchi, con-
sidered this Shimei a son of La'dan (Hic Schimhi, inquit, non est Gersonis filius v. 7 sed unus ex Lahdaniis v. 9). Berlin (l. c.) holds that he is a brother of La'dan, both being the sons of Libni (v. i. text. n.). Still another solution has been suggested by Ben-zinger, who considers v. ** a gloss which has crept into the wrong place and properly belonged with v. 10, adducing as proof that v. ** belongs with v. 8. But v. ** as a gloss to v. 10 is more inexplicable than where it now stands, and v. ** is unnecessary after v. 8. V. ** itself is best explained as a gloss inserted to escape the difficulty caused by the two-fold appearance of Shimei. After striking out v. **, the first Shimei (v. **) is to be identified with the second son of Gershon (v. 7), and Shimei (שִׁמְיָה) of v. 10 is probably a textual error for Shelomoth (שלום). In 24** a Jahath is chief of the sons of Shelomoth, but there the latter is represented as a son of Izhar. Then v. 11 is a glossator's attempt to restore the nine fathers' houses which had been increased to ten by this error (Bn. regards this verse as a correction). The family of Gershon formed nine fathers' houses in the original text, viz.:

Gershon

v. 7 Ladan

Shimei

v. 8 Jehiel Zetham Joel

v. 9 Shelomoth Haziel Haran

v. 10 Jahath Ziza Jeush Beriah

—8. Jehiel the chief] i.e., chief of those over the treasuries of the house of God 26** 29*.—Zetham] and Jo'el] appear as sons of Jehiel in 26** q. v. Jo'el is possibly the same as Joel in 15** 11.—9. Shelomoth] v. i.—Hazi'el ].—Haran] appears elsewhere only as the name of Abram's brother, the father of Lot Gn. 11**†, cf. also the place-name יְרוֹם Nu. 32** = בְּרֹם ′ב Jos. 13**.—10. Jahath] possibly the same as in 6** 21 (10. 41).—Ziza] is probably the correct reading, cf. v. 11 and text. n. Ziza is also the name of a Simeonite 4**, and a son of Rehoboam 2 Ch. 11**†.—Je'ush]. Cf. v. 11, also the name of a son of Rehoboam 2 Ch. 11**.—Ber'ah]. Cf. v. 11, a common name.—12. The sons of Kehath are given elsewhere in
the same order, cf. 5" (6°) 6" (6") 26" Ex. 6" Nu. 3".—13. To sanctify him as a most holy one] (v. i.).—To burn incense]. Cf. Ex. 30".—14. The sons of Moses were reckoned among the tribe of Levi] and did not share the advantage of the sons of Aaron. For an ancient tradition of them cf. Ju. 18".—15. The sons of Moses]. Cf. Ex. 18'i. and for the birth of Gershom Ex. 2".—Eleazar]. Cf. also v. 11, a common Levitical name.—16. Shuba’el*] (v. i.) became ruler over the treasuries (26") and is mentioned also in 24". 16.—17. Rehobiah]. Cf. 24" 26". Like that of Gershon, the family of Kehath is divided into nine heads of fathers’ houses. —18. Shelomith]. See text. n. on v. 1. —19. Jeriah]. Cf. 24" 26". —Amariah]. Cf. 24", also 5" (6°).—Ja’hazi’el]. Cf. 24". Also the name of a Benjaminite 12° (6"), of a priest of David 16", of a Levite 2 Ch. 20", of an ancestor of one of the families of the restoration Ezr. 8°.—Jekame’am]. Cf. 24". —20. Micah]. Cf. 24". 24°; a name not uncommon, cf. 5°.—Isshiah] Cf. 24". 10, and as the name of another Levite 24"; elsewhere the name of one of David’s helpers 12°, a man of Issachar 7°, one of those with foreign wives Ezr. 10°. —21–23. Possibly six heads of fathers’ houses were derived from Merari in the original text, but all restorations must rest on conjecture alone (v. s.). —21. 22. With the possible exception of 24°. (g. v.) tradition agrees that Merari had two sons Mahli and Mushi, cf. 6° (11°) Ex. 6°. Nu. 3°.—Eleazar and Kish]. Cf. 24". Benzinger regards v. 11 as a gloss by the same hand as v. 11. This is not probable, but Eleazar may be counted as a fathers’ house without considering v. 11 a gloss. According to the later law, where there were no sons, daughters inherited, and with the express purpose of preventing a man’s name from being lost to his family (Nu. 27°), but such daughters must marry only into the family of the tribe of their father (Nu. 36°). In v. 11 it is stated that these conditions were fulfilled in the case of Eleazar and doubtless the verse was added to show why Eleazar was also counted among the fathers’ houses though he was known to have had no sons.—23. Mahli] the grandson of Merari is mentioned only in 24" and 6° (7°), but as the name of a son of Merari v. 11 24". 11 6°. 1° (11°) Ezr. 8° Ex. 6° Nu. 3°.—‘Edar] is also mentioned in
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24* †; cf. also place-name 'Eder in extreme south of Judah Jos. 15* †.—Jeremoth] in 24* written Jerimoth (v. i.), cf. 7'. This list of the sons of Mushi is only found here and 24**.

6. [place-name] Baer, Gin.; some MSS. artyb. Probably should be Pi. artyb, BDB., Bn., cf. 24*.—7. Berlin (v. s.) supposes the original to have read: [place-name] —9. Qr. [place-name], Cb 'Awhewu, a corruption of Zalumeth = hzew, — cf. v. 18 24**. = 26*. 8. Qr. is followed by Zoe., Oc., Ki., Bn., but there is no necessity for reducing all these names to the same form.—10. wp in v. v. —11. wp in v. 11, Qr. Zisa, N Zisa and one ms. cited by Kennic. wp, which is probably original, so BDB.—11. Qr. [place-name] for one class of officers, see BDB. wp wp 2 c, or possibly for one appointment, which suits 24* 13.—13. Qr. [place-name] ut ministraret in sancto sanctorum, so Q, Zoe., Oc., but the holy of holies elsewhere wp wp. Without the art. the phrase is used of holy things connected with worship, cf. Ex. 30* Lv. 2*, accordingly EVs. read that he should sanctify the most holy things. Then the suffix must be a subjective genitive. The most natural rendering "to sanctify him, a most holy one" was accepted by Be., Ke. Ki. mentions it as a possibility, but leaves the question doubtful, since the expression is not used of persons elsewhere.—16. wp [place-name] cf. Ezr. 2* = Ne. 7**.—16. [place-name] pl. when only one son follows, cf. 2*. — 17. wp, 24* wp wp, Qr. here Zouba, which should be read with Oc., Bn., Ki., cf. Sab. proper noun psouba.—18. Zouba, wp, v. s. v. text. n.—19. Qr. [place-name] Cb 'Ozba, A Iaiza, N Jahasiel. Ki. supposes wp to be the result of a dittography from the preceding wp and then resolves this wp into wp on the basis of Cb. This change introduces a second wp into this list and also in 24* *., which though not impossible is not likely. Such forms as wp (v. 9) and wp exist side by side, cf. wp wp (4*) and wp wp (11* 27*). The evidence of Cb is vitiated by the fact that in 16* and 2 Ch. 20* wp is rendered 'Oz' (e)thl. Ki. questions the latter but passes over the former without comment.—23. wp wp, wp in both places 'Aremoth, A Iarimoth and Ierimoth, N Jerimoth.

24–27. Legal age for Temple service.—24. From twenty years old and upward]. Various attempts have been made to reconcile this statement with that in v. 1, according to which the Levites were numbered from thirty years old and upward. The older commentators explained the apparent discrepancy on the ground
that David first numbered the Levites from thirty years old according to the Law (Nu. 4) and then later from twenty years old since there was no further need of transporting the sanctuary (so J. H. Mich., also Kimhi). That the Chronicler had two variant traditions contained in different sources has also been suggested (Be.). After describing all attempts to get rid of the discrepancy as makeshifts, Ke. arbitrarily emends v. 9, reading twenty for thirty. Recent commentators ascribe vv. 9, 10 to a later hand. In later times, apparently, the Levites were eligible to service from twenty years old and upward. The scarcity of numbers was the probable cause for the change (cf. Ezr. 2:68). The Chronicler, however, makes this practice the rule for the whole post-exilic period (Ezr. 3:9) and also carries it back as far as the reign of Hezekiah (2 Ch. 31:17). He would hardly leave the matter there. The proper time for the institution of the new custom was at the building of the Temple. As the Chronicler ascribed the organisation of the Temple service to David (cf. 2 Ch. 3:1), so he made him responsible also for this change. In v. 9 he necessarily gave the enumeration from thirty years old and upward, since this enumeration was made that David could provide for overseeing the building of the Temple and only experienced Levites would be chosen for this task (see vv. 6, 7). When David divided the Levites into courses (v. 9) to do the work for the service of the house of Yahweh (v. 4), after it should be completed, the younger men from twenty years old and upward were included among those eligible for service.—27. For by the last words of David, the number of sons of Levi was from twenty years old and upward]. No new census is supposed, as EVs. imply. David decreed that the younger men should also serve but did not provide for a recount.

24. מִשְׁמַרְיָתּוֹ [cf. Nu. 1:17 Ex. 30:15—but חֵן נַעֲשָׂה יִשְׂרָאֵל] cf. Nu. 1:17 Ex. 30:15—but חֵן נַעֲשָׂה יִשְׂרָאֵל]. v. 9 text. n.—הָעָבְדִים [other ms]. כֹּל, cf. Ne. 1:18 and Ezr. 3:8 with Ne. 13:8 both pl. Only another way of writing the same form.—27. דַּבְרֵי עָוֵר תְּרוֹמָה יִשְׂרָאֵל] Be. following Kimhi rendered "In the later histories of David" and so also Oe., Ba.; but Be. was influenced by the theory that the Chronicler used two sources. Better render by the last words (or commands) of David, as Π justa pra-
28-32. Duties of the Levites.—29. For the showbread] lit. bread of rows, cf. 9",—and for the fine flour for the meal-offering] cf. Lv. 21. 1.,—whether for the unleavened wafer] cf. Lv. 2",—or of that which is baked in a pan] cf. Lv. 2 6 (11),—or that which is mixed] cf. Lv. 6 (11),—and for the measures of capacity and the measures of length] cf. Ex. 29* 30*. The Levites may have been the keepers of standard measures, cf. Lv. 19*.—30. On the morning and evening burnt-offerings cf. Ex. 29* Nu. 28*.*—31. And (to stand, etc.) at every offering of a burnt-offering]. EVs. and to offer all, etc., is a mistranslation (v. i.). Besides the Sabbaths (cf. Nu. 28* 1.) and new moons (cf. Nu. 28* 11), there were three annual historical feasts (Ex. 23* 11), Passover and Mazzoth (Nu. 28* 11), Pentecost (Nu. 28* 11), and Tabernacles (Nu. 29* 11).—32. According to the Law, the Levites should keep the charge of the tent of meeting (Nu. 18* 1) and the charge of the sons of Aaron their brethren (Nu. 3* 18* 1) but they were expressly forbidden to approach the vessels of the holy place (Nu. 18*, cf. however r Ch. 9*) and the priests were given the charge of the holy place (Nu. 18*). Büchler (l. c.) has used this as evidence of a priestly source which has become confused by the Chronicler's introduction of the Levites, but a variant tradition ascribes this duty to Levites (Nu. 3* 18*). The Chronicler could have secured all his facts from Nu. 3 without consulting Nu. 18.
EVs. render incorrectly and to offer all burnt-offerings. This verse is a part of v. 19 and can only be translated and at every offering of burnt-offerings (Kau.). The priest had the exclusive duty of offering the burnt-offering but the Levite had to stand . . . to thank and to praise (v. 19) while the offering was being made. Some commentators have held that the verse refers to the duty of the Levites to procure and prepare the animals for sacrifice (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.), an attempt to account for the apparent anomaly of Levites offering the burnt-offering. By the same misunderstanding of the text, Bühler (†. c. p. 131 f. n.) has been led to the conclusion that v. 19 belonged to a source which concerned itself only with the priests.—22. omits משכון ומשלח, which may be an intentional correction from Nu. where this duty is given to the sons of Aaron, or more probably the omission is due to homoeoteleuton.

XXIV. 1–19. The courses of the priests.—The account of the duties of the Levites in serving the priests (23–23) is followed immediately by the description of David's organisation of the priests (24–24). These were divided into twenty-four courses which cast lots for places. The order, Levites (c. 23), priests (c. 24), was likely determined by the fact that the priests were a subdivision of the tribe of Levi; 23 could not follow 24–24. Schürer (Gesch. II. p. 237) has questioned the genuineness of 24–24, suspicious that this list was not framed until the Hasmonean period, since the class of Jehoiarib, from which the Hasmoneans sprang (1 Mac. 21), is placed first contrary to Ne. 21–21, but this evidence is not conclusive and can only be used to question the relative position of the class of Jehoiarib. That may have been altered through later influence.

1–19. The twenty-four courses of priests.—1. The sons of Aaron are given in the same order in 5 (6) Ex. 6–6. An abridgment of Nu. 3. Nadab and Abihu offered strange fire before Yahweh and were devoured by fire (Lv. 10–10 Nu. 3).—2. Zadok and Ahimelech, the leading representatives of the two families of Aaron, were associated with David in dividing the priests into their courses. Earlier writers would probably have assigned this task to David alone, but not so the Chronicler (cf. 2 S. 8 with 1 Ch. 18; also 25). Ahimelech is associated with Zadok in v. 19 and in 18 where Abimelech should be read Ahimelech with Vs.). According to v. 1 and 18 (2 S. 8) Ahimelech was the son of Abiathar, but in 1 S. 22 an Ahimelech
is the father of Abiathar. That grandfather and grandson should bear the same name is in accord with common Semitic practice (cf. 5th t. 6th t.) and Phoenician Eshmunetar Inscription lines 13 f.), but the only known son of Abiathar was named Jonathan (2 S. 15th 1 K. 1st) and elsewhere Zadok and Abiathar (instead of Ahimelech) are associated as the priests, both in the time of David (2 S. 15th 17th 1 Ch. 15th) and in the time of Solomon (1 K. 4th, cf. also 1 K. 1st with 1st), hence the probability that the two names were transposed through corruption in 2 S. 8th before the Chronicler wrote (see EBt. art. Abiathar).—4. Chief men. Possibly the heads of individual households which constituted the subdivisions of a fathers’ house (cf. Jos. 7th-11th) (Ke., Zoe., Oe.), though more probably the heads of fathers’ houses are intended (Be.). The last clause of v. 4th should be taken with what follows—and they, i.e., David, Zadok, and Ahimelech, assigned them, of the sons of Eleazar sixteen heads of fathers’ houses and of the sons of Ithamar eight fathers’ houses. Some Levites who were not of the family of Zadok ministered in the second Temple although they were not eligible to the high priesthood. At least, a certain Daniel of the sons of Ithamar returned with Ezra (Ezr. 8th). The Chronicler assumed this later superiority of the Zadokites also for the time of David and assigned sixteen classes to the sons of Eleazar—i.e., to the Zadokites—and eight to the sons of Ithamar. These numbers sixteen and eight are clearly artificial, since they are related to each other as the rights of a first-born to a single younger brother (cf. Dt. 21st). Upon the deaths of Nadab and Abihu without sons, the right of the first-born fell to Eleazar. The high priesthood also fell to the Zadokites as the right of the first-born.—5. So they divided them by lot one like the other (lit. these with those)]. Apart from having a double share of classes and the high priesthood, the descendants of Eleazar—Zadok had no advantage over their fellow-priests, for in both families were found princes of the sanctuary and princes of God. These two terms are probably synonymous, being different designations also for the “chiefs of the priests” of 2 Ch. 36th (Ba., Bn.).—6. Shemaiah the son of Nathan’el, the scribe] is only known from this passage.—One fathers’ house being taken
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for Eleazar and one* taken for Ithamar] (v. i.).—7-18. The same
courses were maintained in the time of Josephus (Ant. vii. 14. 7,
Vita 1). Individual courses are mentioned elsewhere, Jehoiarib
(Joarib), 1 Mac. 21 Bab. Taanith 29 a; Joarib and Jedai'ah,
Baba kamma ix. 12; Abijah, Lu. 18; Bilgah, Sukka v. 8 (see Schur.
Gesch.* II. pp. 232 ff.). Jehoiarib, Jedai'ah, Harim, Malchijah,
Mijamin, Abijah, Shecaniah, Bilgah, Ma'aziah occur in either
one or both lists of priests in Ne. 10 a. (8 a.) and 12 a. Se'orim,
Huppah, Jeshebe'ah, Happisses, and Gamul do not occur elsewhere.
On Jehoiarib, Jedai'ah, Jachin, cf. 91. The descendants of
Jedai'ah, of Harim, and of Immer returned from the exile under
Zerubbabel (Ezr. 21 11 = Ne. 711114), but Pashur (Ezr. 211 =
Ne. 7") is wanting here. The children of Hakkoz were debarred
from the priesthood after the return since they could not find
their record in the genealogies (Ezr. 211 = Ne. 711). Jeshua may
be the head of the "house of Jeshua" of Ezr. 211 = Ne. 711. No
connection between Eliashib and the post-exilic high priest of
that name (Ne. 31) is probable, since the name was a common
one. Jakim and Pelahiah occur only here as the names of
priests. Jeheskel is also the name of the well-known priest and
prophet, son of Buzi, Ez. 11 2411.

1. * omits the second תִּמְנָא יִבְנַי, so also Origen's text (Field), but א
is probably original.—הָיוּדִיוֹכ] א 'בָּאָשׂ here and in v. 511 (69) Ex.
611 Lv. 10a Nu. 31—3. א adds כָּלָה נַקְדָּשׁ אֲדוֹרָה.—5. כָּלָה
read with other MSS. דָּוָא, so א, א, א, א, א. א.—6. תִּמְנָא הַנְּתִנּוֹ . . . הַנְּתִנּוֹ רַחַם.
Some late MSS. read תִּמְנָא רַחַם instead of תִּמְנָא הַנְּתִנּוֹ; א els els . . . els els;
א els els . . . els els. Most commentators correct
the second תִּמְנָא תִּמְנָא (Grotius, Ges., Zoe., Kau., Ba., Bn.). Be. retained
א, finding a relation in the proportion eight to sixteen and תִּמְנָא
to תִּמְנָא תִּמְנָא, i.e., two lots were drawn for Eleazar to each one for
Ithamar. Ke. pointed out that the text would then imply that the two
lots were drawn for Ithamar, not for Eleazar (cf. also Oe.). Ki. has
sought to overcome this objection by transposing Eleazar and Ithamar,
but Eleazar is elsewhere mentioned first (vv. 1. 12. 14. 11). A comparison
of 251-4 with 251 shows that there the houses were taken alternately
until the two smaller families were exhausted; then the remaining
names of the large family of Heman were divided into two groups.
These were taken alternately (cf. 25111) until all had been assigned.
According to this analogy, the older and simpler emendation—the
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to 272—gives the true original. The lot alternated between
the descendants of Eleazar and the descendants of Ithamar until the
number of the latter was exhausted, when the remaining eight houses
of Eleazar were assigned places by lot. Then Nos. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12,
14, 16, in vv. 14-16 were members of the family of Ithamar, the rest
belonging to the family of Eleazar.—13. אֱלָעָּר] אי omission but אֶל
Ishbaal, אֶל Isbaal. Ki. conjectures that the original form was אֶל
which was omitted in the copy of Greek and intentionally altered
in אֶל because of the offence caused by the form אֶל. Gray (HPN.
p. 24) follows Ki.—19. אֶל אֶל Ki. points אֶל אֶל because of the preced¬
ing אֶל.

20–31. A supplementary list of Levites.—This second
list of the sons of Levi has many names in common with 23:11
but also adds several new ones. The family of Gershon is
omitted and a new subdivision is added to the family of Merari.
Six new heads or chiefs, Jehdeiah, Isshiah, Jathath, Shamir,
Zechariah, and Jerahmeel, supplant six of the older heads of fathers'
houses and are represented as the chiefs of their descendants, but
are not necessarily their sons. Bertheau held that these verses
were written in order to add the chiefs of the classes enumerated in
23:11 but in some cases the writer did not have the information
which he needed and so simply repeated what he had already
given in 23:11; and the family of Gershon was omitted, since the
writer had nothing to add, hence to include this family would
make an unnecessary repetition. The fact that only six such
chiefs are given out of a possible twenty-three or twenty-four is
against this view. The account of the Levites, given in c. 23, is
connected so closely with the priests (24:11) that the natural place
for a supplementary list of Levites would be after the latter rather
than between the two. The Chronicler would be as likely to
place such an additional catalogue here as a later glossator. The
fact that some of the names here are repeated from 23:11 does not
in itself militate against the proposition that the Chronicler was
the author of both passages. Nevertheless, there are good reasons
for suspecting the Chronicler's authorship of this second list of
Levites, and for ascribing it to a later hand (so Ki. SBOY., Bn.).
Shuba'el (Shebu'el) is called the chief of the sons of Gershon in
23:11 but here his place is taken by Jehdeiah. In 23:17, Rehobiah
is called the chief of the sons of Eliezer but here (v. *1) he is sup-
planted by Isshaiah. The same is true of Shelomith (Shelomoth)
(cf. v. *1 with 23*4); Micah and Isshiah (cf. vv. *2 *3 with 23*4); and
Kish (cf. v. *1 with 23*4). All of these names could have been in-
cluded in 23*4 *3, since they do not add to or subtract from the
number of fathers’ houses. As they stand we have two chiefs for
the same house in six cases. Either new families had gained the
chief positions formerly held by the chiefs of c. 23 or the Chronicler
gave preference to his friends which a later writer contradicted.
“The rest” at the head of this list suggests a supplementary
catalogue not only to c. 23 but also to cc. 25, 26, since the sing-
ers, gate-keepers, and other officers were also Levites. The quo-
ation of a part only of 23*4, “and he had no sons,” in v. *1, un-
wittingly gives the opposite meaning to this passage. According
to 23*4 Eleazar must be counted as a father’s house (cf. 23*4 *1),
but here he is excluded. “These were the sons of the Levites
after their fathers’ houses” (v. *3) is a strange subscription to
what purports to be only a partial list of the Levites (cf. “the rest”
v. *4), but is easily understood as a quotation of the first part of
23*4 (v. i. v. *4). “These likewise” (יִדְנָא יִדְנָא) (v. *1) occurs only
here, though the phrase would be in place in 25* or 26*4. Properly,
this lot should be cast for all the Levites, not for the part of them
in this list to whom “these” must refer. The lots might have been
cast in the presence of Zadok and Ahimelech (v. *6) very fittingly,
but we should expect “chiefs of the Levites” in the light of 15*4 *6,
or only David after 23*4. However, v. *6*5 is simply repeated from
v. *4.—20. And of the rest of the sons of Levi] not those who re-
main after the priests had been subtracted (Be.) nor those who
assisted the priests in the service of the house (Ke., Zoe., Oe.), but
glossator’s title to a list containing additional names. That this
list contains many names set forth in 23*4 *4 cannot be urged against
this conclusion (as Be.), since those names are given in order to
place the new ones in relationship to them.—Shuba’el]. Cf. 23*4.
—Jehdeiah] is also the name of an officer of David 27*4 †.—21.
Rehabiah]. Cf. 23*4.—Isshiah] occurs again in v. *1, cf. 23*4.—
23*4.—24. Micah]. Cf. 23*4.—Shamir] here only as a personal
name, but as a place-name Ju. 10:9 Jos. 15:41.—Isshiah. Cf. 23:* Zechariah] a very common name, especially in the writings of the Chronicler.—26. 27. The sons of Merari: Mahli and Mushi and* the sons of 'Uzziah. The sons of Merari: of 'Uzziah* Bani (?) and Shoham and Zaccur and 'Ibri]. The writer inserted among the sons of Merari as he found them in 23:* the family of 'Uzziah, who had three or four sons. This 'Uzziah was not a son of Merari but the head of a family claiming descent from him, otherwise he would have been added directly to Mahli and Mushi without the intervening the sons of. The addition of his son after 'Uzziah in v. 26 (B Benno, EVs. Beno) contradicts this fact directly by making 'Uzziah a son of Merari, wherefore it is necessary to consider the sons of before, or his son after, 'Uzziah a gloss. Kittel does the former (i.e., he resolves בְּנֵיה into בְּנֵי) but it is neither likely that Merari had another son besides Mahli and Mushi (cf. 6:* 23:* Ex. 6:* Nu. 3:* 26) nor that the original writer would have had the boldness to add another son to the two so well known. The second alternative, i.e., to regard his son after 'Uzziah as a gloss, is more likely and has the support of C. Beno (EVs.) in v. 27 must either be struck out with the following copulative or it is a corruption for Bani, a common late name, which text is supported by C (viol airov = בְּנֵי) (v. i.).—The origin of this family of Uzziah cannot be determined. Shoham occurs nowhere else as a proper name and 'Ibri only as the gentilic of Hebrew. Zaccur occurs only once outside of Ch.-Exz.-Ne., Nu. 13:* (P).—28. And he had no sons] is repeated from 23:* evidently as an abridgment of that verse (v. s.).—Kish]. Cf. 23:*—Jeraḥme'el] also the name of the well-known family in southern Judah, cf. 2*: and of the son of King Jehoiakim Je. 36:1.—30. After copying 23:* (= v. 26) the writer continued with the first clause of 23:* (= v. 26).—31. No difficulty need be found in the fact that twenty-four heads of families are not given in this list. The glossator based this statement upon what was done in the case of the priests (vv. * * ) and did not trouble himself to make his catalogue correspond to the right number.

20. לָנוּ מֹשֶה with C but compare the style in vv. 46.*—21. Bn. omits מָנוּ with C but compare the style in vv. 46.*—23. C and Vrss. are defective. Add
COURSES OF THE SINGERS

XXV. The courses of the singers.—The singers formed a distinct and important class in the Temple worship when the Chronicler wrote. Their special duties and privileges were the result of historical development just as in the case of the Levites proper and the Aaronites, but the Chronicler believed that the system of his own time originated with David. Probably three distinct classes, the sons of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (= Ethan) respectively, were already prominent in the time of the Chronicler. According to this chapter they were divided into twenty-four courses corresponding to those of the priests (24 ֹ) and probably also of the Levites originally (23 ֹ). Doubtless the Chronicler thought that corresponding courses of each of these orders served at the same time, the Levites to prepare the sacrifices, the priests to make the offering, while the singers stood by and sang praises to Yahweh (23 ֹּ). The Chronicler’s order, Levites (c. 23), priests (c. 24), and singers (c. 25), was not unlikely influenced by this sequence of duties. We cannot be certain from this chapter that there were twenty-four courses of singers even in the Chronicler’s time, since the number may simply represent an ideal of the writer. The peculiarity of the last nine names (v. ִּ) rather supports the latter possibility.

This chapter is certainly a unity and from the Chronicler. Recently proposed analyses have created more difficulties than they have explained. Asaph is the only one of the three families of singers mentioned in vv. ֻּ, but it does not follow, as Kittel thinks, that this chapter in its original form only dealt with Asaphites. The presence of מֶּ in v. ִ really proves that all three families were enumerated in the following verses, since the name—unless it is a gloss resulting from a dittography
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so Bn. and Ki. on another page)—must have been inserted to call attention to the advantage the Asaphites received in having the first lot fall to them (cf. what Josephus says of the first of the twenty-four courses of priests, Vita, I.: πολλὴ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο διαφορά). The artificial character of the last nine names of v. 1 (v. i.) indicates nothing concerning their source. They are as difficult to understand from a glossator as from the Chronicler, and the number twenty-four points to the latter. It cannot be shown that the Chronicler was not interested in this number without doing violence to the text.

1-8. The singers according to their families.—1. David and the chiefs of the serving host[1] i.e., the chiefs of the Levites (cf. 15[2]) who were in active service—those between the ages of thirty and fifty years (v. i.).—Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (= Ethan) were descended from Gershom (read Gershon), Kehath, and Merari respectively according to 6[3]-32 (11[4]-17), thus representing the three chief families of the Levites (cf. 15[5]-17. 16[6] ff. 2 Ch. 5[7] 29[8] ff. 35[9]).—Who should prophesy? The Chronicler gives to the service of song the same dignity as to the service of exhortation, i.e., he ranks the singers with the prophets of Israel, thus placing them above the ordinary serving Levites. Elsewhere he calls them seers, a term to him synonymous with prophets (cf. v. 4 and references there cited) and in 2 Ch. 20[10] he makes a singer actually figure in a prophetic capacity. A close connection, however, always existed between the musical function and the prophetic office (cf. i S. 10[11]-10[12]).—With lyres, with lutes and with cymbals] (see Bn. Arch. pp. 272 ff., also art. Music in DB. and EBii., cf. 15[13]). —And the number of them]. The number is not the one recorded in v. 7 but refers to the numbers in the succeeding verses, i.e., four sons of Asaph (although the number is not expressly stated in v. 1), six sons of Jeduthun (v. 4), and fourteen sons of Heman (v. 9). The total number of these together with their brethren is given in v. 7. (An exact parallel is found in Ezr. 2[14] = Ne. 7[15] where also some families are mentioned in the succeeding verses although their number is omitted, the total sum being given at the end, Ezr. 2[16] = Ne. 7[17].) Hence vv. 1[18] cannot be considered an insertion on the ground that v. 1[19] demands that a number should follow which is not found until v. 7 (Bn., Ki.).—2. This list of the sons of Asaph is otherwise unknown, Zaccur, also v. 1[19], being the only
one mentioned elsewhere as a son of Asaph (Ne. 124 cf. also Zichri 1 Ch. 94 = Ne. 111 where יִבְרְיָה should be read for יֵבְרְיָה). On the name cf. 44 and 247. —Joseph] also v. *, besides the frequently mentioned son of Jacob, is the name of a man of Issachar Nu. 131, of one who took strange wives Ezr. 104, of a priest Ne. 124. —Nethaniah] also v. *, is found only once elsewhere as a Levite name 2 Ch. 174. —Asar'elah]. Cf. Jesar'elah v. * †. —The sons of Asaph were under the guidance of their father and he in turn prophesied at the direction of the King.—3. Only five sons of Jeduthun are given although he is said to have had six. Shime'i (שִׁמְיָה) of v. 17 must be the missing name, since it is not found in vv. 14 as are all the others enumerated in vv. 9–4, hence it should be inserted after Jesha'iah (thus §). —Of these six sons of Jeduthun only Mattithiah is mentioned in another place, cf. 154 164, but there he is not called a son of Jeduthun. On the name cf. 94.—Gedaliah] also v. *, not elsewhere the name of a Levite, but the name of a priest Ezr. 104, and otherwise not infrequent.—Isri*) so read with v. 11 instead of Zeri † (v. i.). —Jesha'iah] also v. *, besides the well-known prophet Isa'iah, is a Levitical name 26 Ezr. 811, a grandson of Zerubbabel 311, a chief of the sons of Elam Ezr. 81, a Benjaminite Ne. 11. —Shime'i*) also v. 11, eleven times elsewhere in the writings of the Chronicler as a Levitical name, and otherwise frequent.—Hashabiah] also v. *, is a name found only in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. (15 times in all), mostly of Levites.—4. A Mattaniah appears as an Asaphite in 94 = Ne. 111 Ne. 112 124. 2 Ch. 204 294. With the possible exception of 2 Ch. 204 a son of Asaph is not intended, since the name is used of a later individual. The name appears fifteen times in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne., and elsewhere only 2 K. 24. —Bukkiah] also v. * †. —'Uzzi'el] in v. 12 'Azar'el. The former is a frequent Levitical name and the latter appears as the name of priests in Ne. 111 124 (v. i.). —Shuba'el*]. So read with § and v. ** instead of Shebu'el (Ki.). Also the name of a son of Gershom 234 2411 264 †. —Jeremoth] v. ** Jeremoth, is found fourteen times in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne., but not elsewhere.—Hananiah] also v. **, is a frequent name, but not elsewhere Levitical.—Hanani] also v. **, was the name of a chief musician in the time of Nehemiah Ne. 12*; and is
not infrequent.—Eli'athah] also v. "†.—Giddalti] also v. " †.—Romamti-‘ezer] also v. " †.—Joshbekashah] also v. " †.—Mallothi] also v. " †.—Hothir] also v. " †.—Mahasti’oth] also v. " †.—It has long been recognised that the last eight or nine words, although intended here for proper names, are almost impossible as the names of real individuals. With only slight changes in the vocalisation and in the separation of the consonants, they form a prayer, which may be translated as follows:

Be gracious unto me, Oh Yah, be gracious unto me,
Thou art my God whom I magnify and exalt.
Oh my help (or Thou art my help) when in trouble, I say.
He giveth (or Give) an abundance of visions.

(V. i.) Why what was possibly an ancient prayer should thus be resolved into proper names cannot be determined. The difficulty is not removed by assigning it to a later hand. See Ew. Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr. p. 680; We. Prol. p. 219; WRS. OTJC. p. 143; Köberle, Tempelsänger, pp. 116 f.—5. Heman, the king’s seer]. Gad is called “David’s seer” (21*), Asaph simply “the seer” (2 Ch. 29*) and Jeduthun “the king’s seer” (2 Ch. 35*), or if there is correct Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun were the King’s seers (οἱ προφῆται τοῦ βασιλείου; see further on v. †.—In the words of God] may mean either in divine affairs (cf. 26*), or by the commands of Yahweh (cf. 2 Ch. 29*).—To lift up his * horn God gave, etc.]. To lift up the horn would stand alone here in the sense of blow the horn (Be., Ba., BDB.). Better ignore the Massoretic pointing (Athinach under ℵ²) and connect with the following (v. i.). Elsewhere the phrase means to heighten the power of any one (cf. 1 S. 21* Ps. 89* 92* 148* La. 21*). God exalted the power of Heman by giving him many children (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Bn., Ki.).—6. All these] may refer to all the sons of Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman (Ke., Zoe., Oe.), but better only to the fourteen sons of Heman (Be.). Not only the singular their father but also the similar statements after the sons of Asaph (v. †) and of Jeduthun (v. †) support this conclusion.—In his characteristic fashion the Chronicler reverses the order of the
instruments in repeating them from v. 1.—7. The total number finds its natural place here after the enumeration of the heads of houses (cf. v. 1). With each of the above twenty-four were associated eleven of their brethren, i.e., members of the singers' guild, so that the total number was two hundred and eighty-eight \((24 \times 11)\). These were the accomplished musicians, skilful ones (スキル), who were distinguished from the mass of the singers, the scholars (学術), as is shown by v. 1. Presumably the latter are included among the 4,000 singers who were assigned some work in overseeing the building of the Temple (cf. 23:14).

1. **The usual rendering the captains of the hosts (EVs., Ki., et al.) may be understood as referring either to the commanders of the army or as synonymous with princes of Israel considered as the host of Yahweh (cf. Ex. 12:41). Keil preferred the latter and identified these princes with those mentioned in 23:24 (so also Zoe., Oe., Bn.). But there is no reason why David should be assisted either by the commanders of the army or by the princes of Israel. When David divided the priests he was assisted by the two leading priests, Zadok and Ahimelech (24), so by analogy he should be assisted by the princes of the Levites here. Previously David commanded the princes of the Levites (שבירתシリーズ) to appoint singers from their brethren (15). Although מֹשֶׁה is not used of the Levites elsewhere, as Keil pointed out, the phrase may refer to them in this case, since מֹשֶׁה is used of the Levites in Nu. 4:3, 8:9. In all of these passages מֹשֶׁה is used in connection with the age at which the Levites were qualified for service in the tent of meeting. In Nu. 4:3, 8:9, the phrase reads לְעָבֹד לְעֵяָבֹד בֵּית יִהוּדָה מֻלָּחְרוֹת פֶּסֶפֶת usually rendered "service for the work in the tent of meeting," and in Nu. 8:9 לְעָבֹד לְעֵяָבֹד מֻלָּחְרוֹת פֶּסֶפֶת "from the service of the work." In the latter case, the sense is certainly "active service." Now it is to be noted that in our passage this same לְעָבֹד follows מֹשֶׁה. If מֹשֶׁה were intended to describe the service rendered by the singers, it should have appeared in connection with its qualifying clause מֶלֶכֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל. Immediately following מֹשֶׁה is most naturally taken as a genitive modifying מֹשֶׁה in the same sense as in Nu. 8:9, and is better rendered the chiefs of the serving host.—לְעָבֹד מֹשֶׁה could be rendered co-ordinate genitives depending upon the same nomen regens, cf. Ges. § 1294. 1. מֹשֶׁה is written מֹשֶׁה in v. 9; therefore read מֹשֶׁה, hence read מֹשֶׁה, so Ki.
Either spelling may be original, but since hof as a common Levitical name might easily take the place of the less usual ḫof, the latter may be preferred with ḫ, although the writer may have used both forms, see on 2 Ch. 26. — V. 18. — d

Furthermore, he held that if the Massoretic pointing be accepted for ḥof, etc., it was necessary to suppose that the portion of the verse from ḥof on was taken from a context different from that of the first five words. Oe. rightly pointed out that this change from first to second person in three verbs is very doubtful. He rendered the last two lines, Ich preise und erhebe im Unglück sitzend rede ich überaus viele Gesichte or im Unglück sitzend verwelke ich er gab reichlich Gesichte. The text of Kau., followed recently by Bn. and Ki., and the rendering of Oe. are alike difficult, since ḥof gives poor sense as the object of the two preceding verbs. From Ps. 34, we should expect “God” as the object. Such is the case, if the relative is understood before ḥof. (The omission of the relative is not unknown in poetry and is common in the Chronicler’s writings, see 1 120.) Hence it is neither necessary to change the pointings of the verbs nor to suppose different contexts. Accordingly the first part of the verse is better rendered Be gracious unto me, Oh Jah, be gracious unto me. Thou art my God, whom I magnify and exalt. In what follows, instead of ḥof read ṣeṭeph ḥof. The verb of the last line may also be rendered as an imperative, like ḥof at the beginning of the verse. In that case read ṣeṭeph instead of ḥof. The full text is as follows:

With ḥof comp. ḥof may be also connected with the fourth line thus balancing the second, and taken as a P. inf. abs. from ḥof ( = ḥof), Ges. § 75a, and the couplet rendered Thou art my help when in trouble, Fulfilling abundantly visions. — 5. Instead of ḥof read ṣeṭeph with Ki.—6. ḥof for ḥof. — 8. ḥof is apparently the cstr. before a sentence (Be., Ke., et al., cf. BDB. ḥof). — 9 [an Aramaic word.

9–31. The singers according to their courses.—The order of succession was determined as follows: the sons of Asaph received
courses numbered 1, 3, 5, 7; the sons of Jeduthun 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, 14; the sons of Heman 6, 9, 11, 13, 15-24. From this Bertheau judged that two lists of seven were first arranged, the one including the sons of Asaph (v. 1) and the second, third, and fourth of the sons of Heman (v. 4), and the other the six sons of Jeduthun (v. 1) and the first of the sons of Heman (v. 4); then from each list lots were drawn alternately. The last ten sons of Heman finally drew for the remaining positions 15-24. Since three separate urns could not have been used, Keil proposed that all must have been placed in one urn. But this does not explain why the sons of Asaph received courses with odd numbers and of Jeduthun with even. If two such lists were formed (Be.), they could have been composed of twelve names each as well as seven, since it is no more difficult to see why all the last places should have fallen to the Hemanites, than to believe that the lot would fall to the four sons of Asaph before taking one of the three sons of Heman included in the first series. No doubt we have here not a record of an actual lot but a simple rearrangement of the names in vv. 1-4 by the Chronicler himself. His scheme is apparent. He began with a son of Asaph and then alternated with the sons of Jeduthun, taking the sons of both families in the order given in vv. 3-4, with the single exception that Zacchur and Joseph (v. 4) were transposed. For the sixth place, he skipped the family of Jeduthun and took the first son of Heman instead. After exhausting the list of Asaph’s sons, he took up those of Heman in their stead, in the same order as v. 4, alternating these with the remaining sons of Jeduthun. With the fourteenth course he had also exhausted the list of Jeduthun’s sons, to which he naturally added the next succeeding name from his list of Heman’s sons. The last nine names of Heman’s sons remained and these he divided into two groups, putting the first five in one list, and the last four in another. Within these lists the names are again taken in the same order as in v. 4. The whole arrangement is manifestly artificial. No break in the scheme justifies the conclusion that a part of this list was added later, as Kittel supposes. The division into twenty-four courses of twelve each would certainly be natural from the Chronicler.
9. כי אד אד הו ופ אדו אדו before פַּל. The number 288 (v. 9) and the analogy of the following verses demand that אד ופ should be added after פַּל (וכ., בַּנ., קי.). There seems to be some confusion also in the last part of the verse.—According to בַּנ., this is a ditography from פַּל. קי. strikes it out as a gloss. כי certainly read it.—On רו (v. 11), רו (v. 12), רו (v. 13), רו (v. 14), רו (v. 15), רו (v. 16), cf. vv. 11-14 textual notes.

XXVI. The gate-keepers and other Levitical officers.—Chapter 26 concludes the account of David's organisation of the Levites. The genealogical connections of the gate-keepers are described in vv. 11-11, and their appointments in vv. 12-19. In the former division are twenty-four heads of houses distributed among three families. The appointments (vv. 12-19) were distributed to the families according to the points of the compass, so it became necessary to divide one of these families in order to make four divisions—Zechariah, the first-born of Meshelemiah (Shelemiah), receiving a special commission (v. 14). The administrators of the treasuries (vv. 14-19) follow the gate-keepers naturally. Similarly the keepers of the treasuries follow the account of the gate-keepers in where the former are also classed as gate-keepers (9-10). The chapter closes with an account of the Levitical officers for the outward business of Israel (vv. 19-20).

1-11. The genealogies of the gate-keepers.—1. Of the Korahites. Korah was the name of an Edomite (Gn. 36-11-13), of a son, i.e., a descendant, of Hebron (2), and of the head of a Levite family (Ex. 6-14 Nu. 16-10). The genealogy of Heman, the singer, is traced through Korah to Kehath (6-14 6-14); the "sons of Korah" are mentioned in the titles of a number of psalms (42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 84, 85, 87, 88); and "the sons of the Korahites" appear as singers in 2 Ch. 20-14. Here Meshelemiah, a member of the fourth generation after Korah (cf. 9-13), is the head of a family of gate-keepers. Benzinger (Kom. p. 74) argues from these data that the tribe of Korah rose from a non-Levitical, even non-Israelitish origin, to become gate-keepers and later singers, but identity of name is hardly sufficient support for this connection of families which may have acquired the same name quite independently. The Chronicler certainly knew the Korahites as sing-
ers (2 Ch. 20:19) as well as gate-keepers. According to 6:18 f. (88 f.) the singers of the family of Heman claimed Levitical descent through Korah and Kehath, but other branches of this line of descent must have been employed in other service, and so a family of gate-keepers may have traced their descent from Levi through Kore, Abiasaph, Korah. The general effort of the late classes of Temple servants to show Levitical descent (cf. Ezr. 2:28) doubtless resulted oftentimes in conflicting claims, and at any rate the oldest patriarchs of the tribe would likely be appropriated by widely different families. Hence these genealogical connections are of little or no value for determining the true standing and relationship of the late families.—Meshedebiah]. Cf. 9:9.—Kore]. Cf. 9:9.—Ebiasaph].

2. 3. Zecchariah] of the sons of Meshedebiah, is mentioned again in v. 11, and occurs also in 9:9, cf. also 24:1.—Jedeb'ial] is also the name of a Zebulunite 7:11 (q. v.), and of one of David's heroes 11:4, cf. 12:1 (98).—Zebadiah] a frequent name but only in the writings of the Chronicler.—Jahnia'el].—'Elam] besides the name of the country east of Assy., a frequent post-exilic name, but only in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne., cf. 8:1.—Jehohanan] a frequent name, especially with the Chronicler.—Eli'eho'enaia] also the name of a returning exile Ezr. 8:1.—4. 5. The Chronicler identified 'Obed-edom with the Gittite by the same name (13:1 = 2 S. 6:14), as is indicated by the clause for God blessed him (Bn.). Obed-edom is known elsewhere as a gate-keeper (15:4, 16:4), and by a later glossator is classed as a singer (15:1 16:4 q. v.). In the present context Obed-edom may be taken as belonging, through Korah, to the family of Kehath, since the Merarites are not taken up until v. 18, and v. 18 limits the gate-keepers to these two families (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). Since he is also called a son of Jeduthun (16:14) Kittel places him in the family of Merari, but that phrase is probably a gloss (v. in loco).—None of these eight sons of Obed-edom are otherwise known to us. The names Shema'iah, Jehosabad, Jo'ah, and Nathan'el occur very frequently in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. as the names of priests and Levites and are more or less common elsewhere. 'Ammi'el is also an east-Jordanic name 2 S. 9:17, a Danite Nu. 13:1 (P), and the name of David's father-in-law 1 Ch. 3:1. Sacar only occurs elsewhere as the father of one of David's
heroes 11th, while Issachar is only found as the name of the son of Jacob and the tribe bearing his name. The name Pe'ulathai is otherwise unknown.—7. The sons of Shema'iah: 'Othni ↑, and Repha'el ↑, and 'Obed, and* Elsad, and* his brethren mighty men of valor (lit. sons of strength) Elihu, and Semachiah ↑. These six men are otherwise unknown. The name 'Obed is found only in Ru. 411. 31 and in Ch., and Elsad is the name of a Gadite in 12th ↑. Elihu is not an uncommon name. With Semachiah may be compared the Levitical name Isma'iah 2 Ch. 31st ↑.—Verse 9 belongs logically after v. 1, but it is doubtless in its original place. The Chronicler evidently overlooked this statement and so added it later.—10. Hosah] appears also in vv. 11, 14 and in 16th, where he is also associated with 'Obed-edom as a gate-keeper ↑.—Shimri] is the name of another Levite 2 Ch. 29th, also of a Simeonite 41st, and of the father of a hero of David 11th ↑.—For there was not a first-born]. Θ adds the statement that the first-born had died, which is doubtless an inference from the present reading. Possibly the article has fallen out before first-born (אֶלְמֶדֶן), which would permit the rendering for he was not the first-born.—11. Hilkiah] is a very common name.—Tobaliah ↑.—Zechariah]. On name cf. v. 1.—Not one of these appears as a son of Hosah elsewhere.—The total number of gate-keepers was ninety-three (62 + 18 + 13), cf. 9th 16th. Since the Chronicler knows of four thousand gate-keepers in David's time (23), he probably intended these ninety-three as the chief men.

1. hosah in 9th any belongs, G⁸ here Abū Zaphar. ḥosah was a Gershonite (66th ↑) but ḥosah was descended from Kehath through Korah (cf. 9th 61st, 62st Ex. 61st, 18th, 31), hence read either ḥosah or ḥosheph (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Gin., Ba., Bn.), the latter being preferable.—ешם] so vv. 8; v. 14, and משל; 9th הכנרת; 9th יתנש; 9th. 17 יתנש; 6. יתנש] elsewhere only in Dn. 11th, where the sg. is used. Here abstr. for concr. dominions — rulers; possibly we should read שְׁמוֹנֲה. Θ reads שְׁמוֹנֲה. After other mss. cited by Kennicott, also G, prefix 1 to both words (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ki., Bn.).

12–19. The appointments of the gate-keepers.—The Chronicler described the Temple as if it were already in existence. The
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royal palace was attached to the south of the Temple area, hence no watchers were necessary there. The Chronicler clearly had the post-exilic Temple of Zerubbabel in mind, thus he was describing conditions of his own time or idealising them.—12. *Even of the chief men* i.e., the ninety-three chiefs who are enumerated above. —13. *The small like the great* not as well the small as the great (EVs.), since the literal meaning of the phrase is *the like of the small is the like of the great*. The house of Hosah with only thirteen chief men (v. 11) fared the same as the house of Obed-edom with sixty-two (v. 4).—14. *Shelemiah* the same as *Meshel- emiah* v. 1. —*Zechariah* is mentioned above in v. 9.—*Counselor with prudence* is probably no more than an effort to explain why the subordinate Zechariah should have been ranked equally with the three chief houses of gate-keepers (vv. 11-11).—15. The guarding of the southern gate and the store-house (cf. Ne. 12) fell to Obed-edom and his sons cf. vv. 4-6. The Chronicler probably thought of this store-house as identical with the treasury building, hence his addition "with Obed-edom" in 2 Ch. 25, cp. with 2 K. 14. —16. The western side fell to the lot of *Hosah*, cf. vv. 10-14. Strike out to *Shuppim* (v. 1). —*At the gate of the chamber* (v. 1). —*At the ascending highway*, a street which led up to the western side of the Temple from the Tyropeon Valley, the principal approach from the lower city and from the Western Hill.—17. 18. The number of gate-keepers serving at one time was as follows: six on the east, four on the north, eight on the south —i.e., four for the gate and apparently two at each of two doors of the store-house—and six on the west —i.e., four at the highway and two at Parbar—a total of twenty-four. No relation between this number twenty-four and the twenty-four courses of priests (24) and of singers (25) is apparent, nor does there seem to be any connection with the twenty-four heads of families named in vv. 11-11. The Chronicler's preference for the number twelve, also twenty-four as a multiple of twelve, is a sufficient explanation.—*Parbar* a Persian word meaning *possessing light*, was apparently a colonnade or some kind of structure on the western side of the Temple area identical with the *Parvarim* (Rv. the precincts) in 2 K. 23 (see Dr. art. Parbar, DB.).
13. For every gate, an idiom common in Ch. and late Heb. (l. 124).—14. should read with Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Gin., et al., but the versions probably read our text. cal Zachapla, vol Σωδον Ῥέος Μελαχα our text. Zacharie is likely a correction also. Zachariah suggests that Μελαχα originated in an Aramaic gloss to שֶׁזֶר. Should be struck out. Hosah alone is in place (cf. v. 16) and certainly had our text. Zacharue is likely a correction also. (f. 174).—14. Should be struck out. Hosah alone is in place (cf. v. 16) and certainly had our text. Zacharue is likely a correction also. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁб or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μελαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μεルαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μεלαχα must have read הֶשֶׁב or הָשָׁב. According to 2 K. 23 29 28 12 2 Ch. 31 1 Je. 35 1 Ez. 40 17 17 43, hence Μεלαח may have read נדמ or נדמ. On str. followed by 2 see Ges. § 130a.—19. Μεלαח also read מְדַרְמ — מְדַרְמ, but מְדַרְמ is probably original, cf. v. 1.

20-28. Administrators of the treasuries of the sanctuary. Two classes of treasuries are differentiated, those of the house of God, and those of the dedicated things (v. 18). The former were under the hands of Gershonites (vv. 19-21) and the latter under Kehathites (vv. 22-28).—20. And the Levites, their brethren, etc. (v.i.) is a superscription to the following section.—Over the treasuries of the house of God] i.e., for the fine flour, wine, oil, etc., cf. 9,—and over the treasuries of the dedicated things] cf. v. 18. The same two divisions seem to be made in 9 9 9 9 (Bn.).—21. 22. The sons of La‘adan, the descendants of the Gershonites through La‘adan]. The second clause is in apposition with the first. On La‘adan cf. 23,—The heads of the fathers’ (houses) of La‘adan the Gershonite, Jehi’el and his brethren* Zetham and Jo‘el were over, etc.] Cf. 23. The sons of Jehi’eli is a gloss (v. i.). Jehi’eli is an incorrect reading. Jehi’eli* is the same individual mentioned in 23 29. The name is common in Ch.–Ezr.–Ne., but not found elsewhere.—His brethren*] read as plural (v. i.), is
added to show the inferior position of Zetham and Joel, cf. 23a
29a.—23. Kehath rather than the four families which sprang
from him, should be expected here, since only Amramites are
mentioned as over the treasuries. Possibly the others are added
because special offices of the Izharites and Hebronites follow
(vv. ** *.), but there is no further mention of the Uzzielites.—24.
And] omitted in translation. Render with v. **, of the Amramites
... was Shuba'el* (cf. 23a) ... ruler over the treasuries.—25.
And his (Shuba'el's) brethren of Eli'ezri. His brethren is used
because all are descended from two brothers, Gershom and
Eliezer, sons of Moses, cf. 23a * (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). Benzinger
prefers the reading of כ his brother.—Eli'ezri] and Rehabiah.
Cf. 23a. * —Jesh'diah] and the three following individuals are
only known from this passage. On name cf. 25a.—Joram] is a
common name.—Zichri] is also the name of an Asaphite 9a (cf.
Ne. 11a). The name occurs twelve times in Ch.—Ezr.—Ne. of
eleven individuals, elsewhere only Ex. 6a (P).—Shelomith]. Also
v. * and in v. ** Shelomith. The spelling of the name fluctuates
between these two elsewhere and is doubtful. Two other Levites,
an Izharite 23a 24a. * and a Gershonite 23a, bore this name, also
a son of Rehoboam 2 Ch. 11a and the head of a post-exilic family
Ezr. 8a.—26. Which David, the king ... had dedicated]. Cf.
18a = 2 S. 8a, 2 Ch. 5a.—27. To repair the house]. Apparently
the Chronicler thought David also provided for future needs.—28.
Saul the son of Kish]. Cf. 8a = 9a.—Abner the son of Ner]. Saul's
cousin, cf. 1 S. 14a. * , etc.—Jo'ab the son of Zeruiyah]. Cf. 2a.
The Chronicler presumes that every one who led forth the army
of the Israelites into battle consecrated of the booty to Yahweh.

20. Read בְּּוּ סָם with כִּזָּה פֹּלָא אֲפָרָו, so J. D. Mich., and
most commentators after him.—21. 22. The text is certainly corrupt
if these verses come from the Chronicler, since Zetham and Joel are here
sons of Jehieli, but in 23a they are his brothers. כ* adds to the con-
fusion and gives no aid. כ, which usually has the fullest reading,
here follows כ in v. * , but omits יִבְּרִי וּבִנֵי from v. * and inserts the
copulative before שָׁם. כ may have been corrected from 23a, but also
internal grounds point to יִבְּרִי וּבִנֵי as a gloss. The gentilic form is out
of place in v. * , also in v. * , where it is simply repeated, and יִבְּרִי pointed
as singular, as in כ, is useless, but as plural contradicts יִבְּרִי וּבִנֵי.
29–32. Officers for the outward business.—29. Chenaniah] appears elsewhere as the name of a master of the carrying (15th century BC).—For the outward business over Israel. Cf. “Levites who had the oversight of the outward business of the house of God” (Ne. 11:1).—Officers] i.e., some minor officials, possibly scribes (cf. ἡγεμόνες). As early as Deuteronomy (17:9. 19. 21) priests and Levites are assigned duties as judges. In later times the priests and Levites seem to have exercised a certain amount of authority in outward things throughout the land (cf. 1 Mac. 21, Jos. Ant. iv. 8. 14), which was probably the case in the time of the Chronicler, who ascribed to David the inauguration of the customs of his own time.—30–32. One thousand and seven hundred Hebronites were appointed to have oversight over the business (מִלְחָמָה) of Yahweh and for the service (דִּבֵּר) of the King in western Palestine (v. 31). Their work seems to have been the same as that of their brethren performed in eastern Palestine, i.e., for every affair (דָּבוּר) of God, and [every] affair (דָּבָר) of the King (v. 31). Just how this service was related to that of the sons of Chenaniah, the officers and judges (v. 30), is not clear, nor can their duties be determined with certainty. If we suppose them to have been collectors of taxes, both for the Temple and for the King, the account follows naturally the appointment of the treasurers (vv. 28–29). That there should be only one thousand seven hundred overseers for western Palestine with ten and one-half tribes, when there were two thousand seven hundred for the two and one-half tribes of Eastern Palestine, seems strange. Possibly these numbers contain a hint of the importance of the district of Gilead in the
Chronicler’s own time. Judas Maccabeus found many Jews in Gilead (1 Mac. 5:4).—J‘azer (cf. 6:4 (11)) also seems to have been an important trans-Jordanic Jewish centre (1 Mac. 5:4.).—Hashabiah is not found elsewhere as a Hebronite. On name cf. 25:9.—Jerijah]. Cf. 23:19 24:11.


XXVII. The organisation of the army and the officers of David.—The preceding chapter closes with an account of the Levites who were assigned semi-secular duties. The organisation of the army (vv. 1-14), the list of tribal princes (vv. 15-34), the royal treasurers and overseers (vv. 35-37), and the King’s counsellors (vv. 38-39) naturally follow.

Although the Chronicler has given the list of David’s mighty men in cc. 11 ff., such a doublet does not necessarily point to different authors (cf. Bn. Kom. p. 79, Ki. Kom. p. 99). While the Temple is the centre of interest in cc. 21 ff., it is also apparent that the writer wishes to magnify David in every possible way. Solomon built the Temple but David here receives the greater credit, since he collected the material, money, and skilled workmen (c. 22). He, too, prepared for the service in the Temple by organising Levites, priests, singers, and gate-keepers (cc. 23 ff.). According to 2 S. 23:8 (1 Ch. 11:16) David had many mighty men, but they were not organised. The Chronicler would scarcely attribute the preparation of the plans of the Temple (c. 28) and the organisation of the personnel of the cult (cc. 23 ff.) to David because “Solomon...is young and tender” (22:29), and then overlook the military and official bodies. David was pre-eminently a military leader and Solomon a man of peace. Hence the Chronicler represents that David had a large body-guard organised into twelve courses of 24,000 each. This account forms an essential part also of the history of David’s preparation for the Temple. A well-organised army and trained officials would aid materially in the successful completion of this great undertaking. The Chronicler does not ignore this fact, for according to his account, David appeals to these classes for aid (22:17 28:6 29:5.), and depends upon them to furnish the necessary political support (28:1-5). Rather than being a later bungling piece of work inserted in an unsuitable place (Bn.), c. 27 seems to fit into the scheme of the Chronicler perfectly. The number 24,000 also suggests the Chronicler (cf. 24:7-8 25:8.), and a body-guard of 288,000 men is about the kind of an exaggeration (cf. 2 S. 15:18) to expect from the writer of 22:14.
1–15. The organisation of the army.—Solomon organised a force of officers, one for each month, to provide victuals for the King and his household (1 K. 4:14). For this account the Chronicler substituted a large body-guard who served the King “in every matter by courses,” but ascribed their organisation to David. The names of the twelve officers are taken from II 14-5. —1. After this superscription a fuller account might be expected, but the catalogue which follows (vv. 14–27) contains only the twelve classes, the number belonging to each, and the name of the commanding officer, hence Bertheau thought only a partial account was here given.—2. Ishba’al* (v. 1) the son of Zabdi’el] does not contradict “the son of a Hachmonite” (II 14), since the latter is the name of a family (Oe.). He belonged 3, to the family of Perez (cf. 2:1) from whom David also was descended (2:17).—4. Ele’azar the son of Dodai*] is restored from II 14 (v. 1).—And his course (and) Mikloth the ruler, is obscure. A Mikloth occurs in 8:97*, but there is no ground for connecting him with the one mentioned here †.—5. Benai’ah, the son of Jehoiada*. Cf. II 14–16 18:27, also v. 14.—The priest] is considered a probable gloss by Oe., since Benai’ah was a military leader, and Bn. strikes it out because Jehoiada is nowhere else called a priest, nor even a Levite. But a Jehoiada occurs as a military leader for Aaron (12:27) and Levites figure in a military capacity (12:27).—6. Cf. II 14–16 = 2 S. 25:1–2. —‘Am’mizab’ad †.]—7. Cf. II 14–16 = 2 S. 23:—‘Asah’el] was slain by Abner in the early part of David’s reign (2 S. 21:22), to which the clause and Zebadiah his son after him clearly refers. The name Zebadiah occurs only in the writings of the Chronicler (nine times in all).—8. Shamhuth the Zerahite*. Cf. II 14–16. —9–15. The order of the names from v. 1 onward varies slightly from that in II 14*. Helez and ‘Ira’ (II 14*) are transposed, as are also Abi’eser and Sibbecai (II 14*). Ithai (II 14) is omitted, so also Ithai (II 14) between Heled and Benai’ah (II 14*), the last two also being transposed.—Sibbecai, the Hushathite]. Cf. 20*. Abi’eser] was a citizen of ‘Anathoth, a Benjamite town (cf. 6:6 (63)).—Maharai] of the family of Zerah (cf. 2:1) Cf. II 14*—‘Othni’el] by his relation to Caleb (Jos. 15:7 Ju. 13:3) was incorporated into the tribe of Judah.
16-24. The tribal princes.—The two verses concerning the census (vv. 21-24) indicate the probable purpose of this section, viz., to show that David followed the legal method in making an enumeration of the people (c. 21). When, according to P, Yahweh commanded Moses to take the sum of the people in the Wilderness of Sinai (Nu. 1:2), Aaron and a prince from each of the twelve tribes (Nu. 1:16) were associated with him in the work and only the males from twenty years old and upward were counted (Nu. 1:2). David likewise here had twelve princes of tribes besides Zadok, the representative of the house of Aaron (v. 17), and only those from twenty years old and upward (v. 18) were numbered. No previous order is followed in this catalogue of the tribes (cf. 2:1-6, Gn. 35:1-4, 46:9-49:1). Gad and Asher are wanting. The six sons of Leah come first, in the order of their birth (cf. Gn. 29:16-30:21 and 35:25), then follow six tribes (or divisions of tribes) of whom Rachel was the legal mother, Bilhah’s son Naphtali (cf. Gn. 30:1-8, 35:25), the grandsons and son of Rachel (cf. Gn. 30:1-8, 46:9, 35:25-18) and Bilhah’s remaining son Dan (cf. Gn. 30:10). Gad and Asher have neither fallen from the text (Zoe.) nor is it likely that they have been omitted accidentally (Ba.). The number twelve was full without them, and coming last in several lists (2:1 Gn. 35:25) they were the ones to be omitted. It
is significant that we have six princes from Leah and six from Rachel, if Zadok, the priest, who represented the whole people rather than a part of a tribe (cf. 29*), is excluded. Of the twenty-five individuals whose names appear in this list of the princes only five are otherwise known. Zadok, David and his brother Eli’ab,* and Abner the cousin of Saul, cf. 26*, are well known. Hashabiah is possibly identical with the person mentioned in 26*. Most of the other twenty names are common.—16. Elizer the son of Zichri]. Cf. 23* and 26*.—Shephatiyah]. Cf. 12*.—Ma’acah] as masc. personal name 11* Gn. 22* (J) and K. 21* †.—17. Hashabiah]. Cf. 25*.—Kemu’el] is the name of a son of Nahor Gn. 22* and of an Ephraimite Nu. 34* †.—For Aaron, Zadok] is expected rather at the beginning of the list (cf. Nu. 1*), but is also in place after Levi.—18. ‘Omri] is also a Zebulunite name 7* (q. v.), and a Judean 9*—Micha’el]. Cf. 5*.—19. Ishma’iah]. Cf. 12* †.—Jerimoth]. Cf. 25*.—‘Essri’el*]. Cf. 5* Je. 36* †.—20. ‘Azaziah] as a Levite name 15* 2 Ch. 31* †.—Hoshea’], Jo’el], and Pedaiah] are frequent.—21. Gile’ad]. Cf. 5*. The term might designate all eastern Palestine. (See GAS. HGHL. pp. 548 f.)—Iddo]. Cf. Ezr. 10* (Kt.) †.—Zechariah]. Cf. 24*.—Ja’asi’el*. Cf. 11* †.—22. ‘Asar’el]. Cf. 25*.—Jero’ham] is frequent.—23. Because Yahweh had said, etc.]. David refrained from counting all, since such an act would imply a doubt of God’s promise in Gn. 22*.—24. But finished not]. Cf. 21* †.—Neither was the number put in the book* of the acts of days of king David] because naturally to the Chronicler no record would be made in the royal annals of such an impious and disastrous census.

25–31. The officers over the King’s possessions.—Twelve officers are here enumerated, another instance of the Chronicler’s
preference for this number.—25. *And over the king's treasures* i.e., those in Jerusalem in contrast to those in the field, etc.—'Asmaveth] also the name of one of David's heroes (11" 2 S. 23") of the father of two of David's mighty men (12*), and a Benjaminite name (8*—9") †.—26. 'Exri †.—Chelub]. Cf. 41 †.—27. Shime'i the Ramathite]. Whether he was from the Ramah in Benjamin (Jos. 18") (Be., Ke., Zoe.) or Ramah (Ramoth) of the Negeb (Jos. 19* 1 S. 30") cannot be determined. On name cf. 25†.—For the stores of the wine]. Cf. 2 Ch. 11†.—Zabdi (cf. Jos. 7* 7* 8* Ne. 11* (?) †) the Shipmhit] may have been an inhabitant of Shepham (Nu. 34* 1*) (Be., SS. who vocalise 'חֵפָּם) or of Siphmoth in the Negeb of Judah (1 S. 30") (Ke., Ri. HWB., Ba., Bn.), with site unknown.—28. The sycomore-trees] were proverbial for their abundance in the Shephelah, cf. 1 K. 10*—2 Ch. 1*—9†. The Shephelah properly means lowland. George Adam Smith (HGHL. pp. 201 ff.) would limit the technical designation to the low hills west and south-west from the hill-country of Judah, but Buhl (GAP. p. 104, n. 164) has shown that several passages (Dt. 1* Jos. 9* 2 Ch. 26*) favour the broader significance given in the usual rendering of γλαυκόν (γλαύκον or γλαύκων). (See also EBi. IV. col. 4455 and Dr. in DB. III. pp. 893 f.)—Ba'al-hanan the Gederite] from Gederah or Gedor, cf. 12*. Ba'al-hanan was also the name of a king of Edom 1* Gn. 36*. †.—Stores of oil]. Cf. 2 Ch. 11*.—Jo'ash] also a Zebulunite 7* (q. v.) †.—29. Sharon] the name of the coast-plain from Joppa northward to Carmel, noted for its fertility.—Shitrai †.—Shaphat] also name of a grandson of Zerubbabel 3", a Gaddite chief 5", a prince of Simeon Nu. 13*, and the father of Elisha 1 K. 19* 19* 2 K. 3* 6†.—'Adlai †.—30. Obil] a form of the Arabic word abama (בּעָל) able to manage camels.—The Ishmaelites]. That an Ishmaelite and also a Hagrite (v. 11 Heb.) appear in this list does not indicate an earlier source for the names as Benzinger supposes. The name Obil, which occurs only here, with its appropriate meaning points rather to an artificial origin.—Jehdeiah]. Cf. 24* †.—Meronothite]. Meronoth (Meronoth) seems to have been near Gibeon and Mizpah, cf. Ne. 3*.—31. Jaziz †, the Hagrite]. Cf. 5* 11 Ps. 83* 11.
27. \(27. \text{ On } \text{ for } \text{ see } \text{ Ges. } \text{ § 36.} \)

29. \(29. \text{ and } \text{ so } \text{ also } \text{ T. } \text{ } \text{ and } \text{ so } \text{ Kt. } \text{ preferable, } \text{ BDB.} \)

32-34. The King’s counsellors.—This catalogue has Jo‘ab, the captain of the host, and Abiathar, in common with previous similar lists, also Jehoiada the son of Benaiah instead of Benaiah the son of Jehoiada (v. i.), cf. 18\textsuperscript{th}-2 S. 8\textsuperscript{th}-8\textsuperscript{th} and 2 S. 20\textsuperscript{th}-8\textsuperscript{th}.—32. David’s lover. EVs. render uncle, which is a common meaning of the Hebrew word (יְדֵי), but no uncle of David by the name of Jonathan is known elsewhere, while Jonathan, a son of Shimea (Shimei), David’s brother, is mentioned in 20\textsuperscript{th}-2 S. 21\textsuperscript{th}, hence Be., Zoe., Oe., Ba., Bn. take the word (יְדֵי) in the general sense of kinsman, here nephew. Zoe. cites Je. 32\textsuperscript{th} as parallel, but there son (יְדֵי) has certainly fallen from the text (cf. vv. 9, 10, other Heb. mss., and Kt). The uncles of David are nowhere given; Jonathan is one of the most common Hebrew names; G, T, certainly took the common meaning uncle. A nephew would not likely be chosen as a counsellor, nor is there any reason why either tradition or the Chronicler arbitrarily should make this nephew David’s leading counsellor. On the other hand, the only Jonathan who was an adviser of David was the son of Saul (cf. 1 S. 19. 20). The Chronicler certainly selected Ahithophel and Hushai from parts of 2 S. (v. i.), which he did not quote, so he may also have wished to refer briefly here to the romantic story of David and Jonathan. The word יְדֵי is used most often as loved one (lover), Ct. 1\textsuperscript{st} + 30 times in Ct., also in Is. 5\textsuperscript{th}, where it is equivalent to friend (BDB). Lover is not too strong a word to describe the friend of 1 S. 18\textsuperscript{th} * 20\textsuperscript{th} * 2 S. 1\textsuperscript{st}. A man of skill, a fair rendering of the next clause (יוֹבָכָל) (cf. 2 Ch. 26\textsuperscript{th} 34\textsuperscript{th}), is certainly an apt description of Jonathan, the son of Saul (cf. 2 S. 1\textsuperscript{st} 11). And he was scribe (וֹבָכָל) could not describe him, but the form suggests that these words are a gloss, which is made more probable by their absence from G and from Origen’s Septuagint text (Field). A glossator found a scribe mentioned in 18\textsuperscript{th} 2 S. 8\textsuperscript{th} and 2 S. 20\textsuperscript{th}, and missing the office here, added this phrase to the first officer, ignoring the fact that he was already described as a counsellor (יְדֵי). Although Jonathan had long been dead (1 S. 31\textsuperscript{th}), Ahithophel had
also been dead for some time (2 S. 17''), and the list does not purport to give the officers living in David's old age. The proper place for Jonathan is at the head of this catalogue, since he was David's first counsellor.—**Jehi'el, the son of a Hachmonite.** A son of a Hachmonite is mentioned once elsewhere (11''). The word meaning "wise" is particularly appropriate here, of the tutor of the King's sons.—**33. Ahithophel** a most trusted counsellor of David, whose word was as "the oracle of God" (2 S. 16''), joined himself to Absalom during the revolt of the latter (2 S. 15''), then killed himself when his counsel was not followed (2 S. 17'').—**Hushai, the Archite** befriended David during the same rebellion, cf. 2 S. 15''-16'' 16'-17''. The "border of the Archites" was not far from Beth-el Jos. 16.—**The king's friend.** Cf. 2 S. 15'' 16'' also 1 K. 4''. "The friend" and "the well beloved friend" were titles of honour in Egypt (see Erman, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 72). (Cf. also 1 Mac. 2'' 3'' 6'' τῶν φίλων; 10'' 11'' 2 Mac. 8' τῶν πρώτων φίλων.)—**34. Jehoiada', the son of Beniaiah** is elsewhere "Beniaiah, the son of Jehoiada" (see references above v. 1). Bertheau would simply transpose, but against this change are Ke., Zoe., Oe., et al. A priest is expected before Abiathar (cf. 18'' = 2 S. 20'') and since Jehoiada is designated "the priest" in v. 1 (v. s.) the text is probably correct as it stands. (On the same name for grandfather and grandson, cf. 24'.)—**Abiathar.** Cf. 24'.—**Jo'ah** David's sister's son, 2''.

**XXVIII—XXIX. David's last assembly and his death.—**

David is represented as calling a general assembly to ratify the choice of Solomon as his successor, but according to the historical record in 1 K. 1, Solomon owed his succession to the machinations of his mother, Bath-sheba, and the prophet Nathan. According to the Chronicler, Solomon was the appointee of God himself (28' *cf. 22* '). The principal purpose of the assembly was to acquaint the public with the project of building a temple and so secure the popular support (28''), hence Solomon was publicly advised of his responsibility (28''-3''); the plans were transferred to him (28'''-'''); he was given encouraging assurances of support (28'''-'''); and the princes were called upon to aid the project by personal contributions (29''-'). As Solomon signalised the completion of the Temple
by a prayer of dedication (1 K. 8:41), blessings (1 K. 8:41), dedicatory sacrifices (1 K. 8:41), and a sacred feast (1 K. 8:41), so David, according to this account, marked the completion of his preparations for the building of the Temple by a prayer (29:9-10), blessings (29:10), sacrifices (29:11), and a sacred feast (29:12). The history of David closes with the anointing of Solomon as King (29:13), the account of his death and a summary of his reign (29:14).

XXVIII. 1-10. Solomon presented to the assembly as the divinely chosen successor to the throne.—1. Now David assembled all the princes of Israel] a general term including all the princes designated in the following list, i.e., the princes of the tribes] mentioned by name in 27:11-13, the princes of those who served the king by courses] mentioned by name in 27:11-13, the princes (or captains) of thousands and the princes (or captains) of hundreds] repeated from 27, the princes over all the property and the cattle of the king] those mentioned by name in 27:11-13.—And his sons with the eunuchs]. J. H. Michaelis (recte Syr. regis et filiorum eius, c. 27:11. Male Vulg. filiosque suos) and moderns (Be., Ke., Oe., Ki., EVs.) connect and his sons with the preceding—the possessions of the King belonging also to his sons—but the mention of the King’s sons is to be expected here and they are certainly in place in such an assembly, cf. 1 K. 1:11 (v. i.).—2. My brethren]. The King was regarded as the brother of his subjects, cf. Dt. 17:12 also 1 S. 30:28 2 S. 19:11 (112).—As for me, etc.]. Cf. 22:7.—A house of rest for the ark] i.e., a permanent abode. It had been carried about from place to place previous to this time.—The footstool of our God] refers to the “mercy-seat” (הֶרֶם בּוּדָא) (cf. v. 11) upon the ark (cf. Ex. 25:23) (Be., Ke., Oe., Bn.).—I had prepared] does not refer to the preparations of 22:2-4, since those were made to aid Solomon (22:4). The Chronicler here represents that David made ready to build before God had commanded him not to do so (c. 17 = 2 S. 7).—3. Cf. 22:1.—4. 5. As Yahweh chose Judah from all the tribes (cf. 59), the house of Jesse from Judah (cf. 1 S. 16), and David from among all his brethren (cf. 1 S. 16:11) to be the reigning prince (cf. 11:1 17:12 2 S. 7:1 1 K. 8:1), so he selected Solomon from among the many sons of David to sit upon the throne of the kingdom.
of Yahweh (cf. 29\textsuperscript{a} 17\textsuperscript{a}). Solomon is thus clothed with divine authority.—6. 7. V. \textsuperscript{a} is repeated from 22\textsuperscript{b} (q. v.). With v. \textsuperscript{a} cf. 17\textsuperscript{a}, and with v. \textsuperscript{b} cf. 1 K. 3\textsuperscript{a} 8\textsuperscript{a} 9\textsuperscript{a}.—8-10. David closes this portion of his address with a personal admonition first to the congregation of Israel (v. \textsuperscript{a}) and then to his son Solomon (vv. \textsuperscript{b} \textsuperscript{c}). With v. \textsuperscript{a} cf. Dt. 4\textsuperscript{a} 1\textsuperscript{b} 30\textsuperscript{a} 1. Lv. 25\textsuperscript{a}.—With a perfect heart]. Cf. 29\textsuperscript{a} 11 1 K. 8\textsuperscript{a}.—Yahweh hath chosen thee, etc.] v. s. vv. \textsuperscript{a} \textsuperscript{b}.

The address is interrupted by the transfer of the plans of the Temple to Solomon. David resumes his admonition to Solomon in v. \textsuperscript{a}, beginning as he leaves off here.

1. [loko\textsuperscript{a}] elsewhere in Hiph. in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne., 1 Ch. 13\textsuperscript{a} 15\textsuperscript{a} (both from the Chronicler) 2 Ch. 5\textsuperscript{a} (= 1 K. 8\textsuperscript{a}) 11\textsuperscript{a} (= 1 K. 12\textsuperscript{a}). 15\textsuperscript{a} is ascribed to an extra-canonical source by Büchler, Bn., Ki., but v. in loco.—[loko\textsuperscript{a}]. A very common word of the Chronicler.—[loko\textsuperscript{a}]. The Chronicler uses the word for royal officers is late (BDB. על, 1 b), cf. 27\textsuperscript{a} 2 Ch. 17\textsuperscript{a} 22\textsuperscript{a} Est. 1\textsuperscript{a} Pr. 29\textsuperscript{a}.—[loko\textsuperscript{a}] used elsewhere in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. as a general term for movable possessions, 27\textsuperscript{a} 2 Ch. 31\textsuperscript{a} 32\textsuperscript{a} Ezr. 8\textsuperscript{a} 10\textsuperscript{a} all of which are probably from the Chronicler, l. 107.—[loko\textsuperscript{a}]. wanting in G\textsuperscript{a}, \textsuperscript{b} kal τῶν ἐναθέων σῶν τοῖς εὐνοχοῖς, \textsuperscript{b} filiosque suos cum eunuchis. Bertheau stated the following reasons for taking ἐναθέων with the preceding ἔνθες: (1) \textsuperscript{a} is the sign of the gen. before ἔνθες and would hardly be the sign of the acc. before the next word; (2) if the sons of David had been intended, they would not be given in this position. The first is no valid objection in the Chronicler's writings. As regards the order, if we turn to c. 27, we shall observe that up to this point the Chronicler has included in this verse all the officers to the end of v. \textsuperscript{b} (v. s.). Jonathan, the next in order (27\textsuperscript{a}), had long been dead (v. s. 27\textsuperscript{a}), and following him is the tutor of the King's sons (27\textsuperscript{a}). It is a well-known fact that eunuchs frequently had charge of the education of young princes (see DB. I. pp. 793 f., art. Eunuch), hence the King's sons with the eunuchs are not out of order here, as Be. contended, but exactly where they should be expected. By construing ἐναθέων with the following, with \textsuperscript{b}, we also have a satisfactory explanation of ἔνθες, which is otherwise peculiar in this list of accusations.—2. [loko\textsuperscript{a}] l. 115.—[loko\textsuperscript{a}].—4. [loko\textsuperscript{a}]. \textsuperscript{a} τῶν γεφυράτων μα βασιλεία, \textsuperscript{b} ut me eligeret regem, hence Oe. thinks \textsuperscript{b}, \textsuperscript{b} read γεφυράτων l. 67.—7. [loko\textsuperscript{a}].—8. [loko\textsuperscript{a}].—9. [loko\textsuperscript{a}]. especially Dt., Je., and subsequent writings (BDB. \textsuperscript{a} 7 h). Used elsewhere in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. only in 2 Ch. 6\textsuperscript{a} (= 1 K. 8\textsuperscript{a}), cf. also \textsuperscript{a} only in Dt. 6\textsuperscript{a} Je. 44\textsuperscript{a}; also Ezr. 9\textsuperscript{a} 11 Ne. 9\textsuperscript{a}, which are from the Chronicler (see Torrey, CHV. pp. 14 ff.).—8. Israel is the
11–19. The transfer of the plans.—11. The pattern (רוּבִיָּה), literally “construction,” was probably a description in words of the dimensions, material, etc., similar to what is found in Ex. 25:8, and not a drawing. David delivered to Solomon the pattern of the porch, cf. 2 Ch. 3:1 K. 6:1; and of the houses thereof (v. i.), i.e., the rooms of the Temple building, the ḫēḵāl or holy place, the ḍebṭr or holy of holies, and the side-chambers (1 K. 6:41); and of the treasuries, probably the side-chambers; and of the upper chambers, cf. 2 Ch. 3:1; and of the inner chambers, the porch and holy place according to Be., Ke., Zoe.; and of the house of the mercy-seat, i.e., the holy of holies.—12. David, as here represented, also worked out all the details for the courts and for the surrounding buildings, and delivered to his son the pattern of everything which he had in his mind (lit. spirit). This use of spirit (רוּחַ) as the seat or organ of mental acts is late, cf. Ez. 11:20 (BDB., נפש 6).—For the treasuries of the house of God and for the treasuries of the dedicated things] (cf. 26:8) describes more closely one use to which all the chambers round about were put.

—Verse 13. is ambiguous. And for the courses, etc., may be taken as a continuation of for the courts and for all the chambers (v. 11), i.e., that David delivered also a description of the courses of the priests, etc., to Solomon; or the verse may continue the description of the uses of all the chambers round about (v. 11). Benzinger points out that the word pattern (רוּבִיָה) could hardly be used for a description of the courses, and
Certainly connected this verse with v. 11. Bertheau (followed by Ke., Zoe., Oe.) held that all of this verse is a further description of the uses of the chambers, while v. 11 is a continuation of the things described by pattern, hence he understood he gave him the pattern before v. 11. —14. The Chronicler was probably influenced by the account of the tabernacle in Ex. 25, where Yahweh gives Moses the pattern of "the tabernacle" and the pattern of "all its vessels" (Ex. 25:9).

—For all vessels of every kind of service]. The pleonastic style is characteristic of the Chronicler.—15. And a weight for the golden candlesticks and their lamps] i.e., David appointed (ἵππια τοῦ θεοῦ) (v. 11) a certain weight for the candlesticks (cf. 2 Ch. 4:9). —Candlesticks of silver] not mentioned elsewhere; thought of as used in the priests' chambers (Ke., Oe.); in reality a mere fancy of the Chronicler. The same applies to the tables of silver mentioned in the following verse.—16. Elsewhere only one table of showbread is mentioned (cf. Ex. 25:29, 37:10 40:1 1 K. 7:24 2 Ch. 3:11 29:1), except 2 Ch. 4:29, q. v.—17. As in the foregoing verses, he gave the pattern must be understood.—The flesh-hooks (i.e., forks for lifting meat) are mentioned elsewhere only in Ex. 27:30 38:4 1 K. 7:42 2 Ch. 3:11 29:1), except 2 Ch. 4:29, q. v.—18. As in the foregoing verses, he gave the pattern must be understood.—The bowls were used for sprinkling the blood of the victim against the altar, cf. 2 Ch. 29:17, and the cups were those with which the drink-offering was poured out, Ex. 25:29 37:10 Nu. 4:7 1 K. 7:42 2 Ch. 3:11 29:1). —The bowls were possibly a covered dish (Be., Ke., et al.); mentioned elsewhere only in Ezr. 1:10 8:17.—18. Altar of incense]. Cf. Ex. 30:1-10 2 Ch. 26:14.—And the pattern of the chariot, the cherubim]. The cherubim are thought of as constituting God's chariot as in Ps. 18:10 11. The Chronicler probably had the vision of Ez. 1:18-28 (cf. BS. 49) in mind.—19. All this in writing is from the hand of Yahweh upon me, causing me to understand, even all the works of the pattern]. As Moses received the pattern of the tabernacle and its vessels by divine inspiration (Ex. 25:9-11 27:1), so the Chronicler, while giving David the credit for preparing the plans for the Temple, declares that Yahweh was the source of David's knowledge. "The hand of Yahweh upon . . . " is a frequent expression for divine inspiration (cf. 2 K. 3:18 Ez. 1:3 3:14, etc.).
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11. a pattern according to which anything is constructed, P and late (BDB.), cf. vv. 12, 18, 19. This, omitting דס, which is unreadable unless דוט is supplied, is the correct rendering, generally adopted, with the suffix referring to the Temple. Bn. corrects דס to דס also in restored text of v. 19 † a loan-word from or through Persian (BDB.) l. 19.—יהי only here by the Chronicler in the sense of seat or organ of mental acts. This use is occasional and late (BDB.).—12. בֹּדֶהַ תָּלָהֶהוֹן] l. 15.—13b-14. כָּא here and in the following verse abridged.—15. כֹּסֶה לְנָעַרְתָּנֹים is as acc. of the obj. dependent upon v. 11 (also Zoe., Oe.) and only as in free subordination to וְרַמֵּס (Zoe.). The text is obscure.—16. כֻּבְרָתָה] other mss. כֻּבְרָתָהוֹן יַלְדוֹתֵנוּ לְדוֹתֵנוּ] 17b, 18. כָּא the sign of the acc., Be., Ke., et al.—18. כָּא restored with כָּא, but see Ke.—19. כָּא has been construed in three different ways. Bertheau connected it with the preceding מָיְיַה כָּא “writing from the hand of Jahve came upon me,” hence he rendered the passage das alles hat durch eine mir nur Norm gegebene Schrift von Jahve’s Hand Jahve gelehrt, and understood the law of Moses to be meant, since Ex. 25 ff. was the basis for this passage. Keil connected מָיְיַה כָּא with the preceding מָיְיַה כָּא “writing from the hand of Jahve came upon me,” i.e., a writing which was divinely inspired, but not necessarily received immediately from Yahweh as in the case of Moses (so also Zoe.). Oettli construed the words as Ke., but since a writing composed by David could not be said to teach him, he connected מָיְיַה כָּא with מָיְיַה כָּא, which is not an impossible construction in Ch.—19. כָּא is used by the Chronicler in 2 Ch. 30a and Ne. 9g, cf. also Ne. 8g. 18 (see Tor. CHV. p. 24).—18. כָּא is quoted by Dr. among “the heavy combined sentences, such as would be avoided in the earlier language by the use of two clauses connected by וְ.” (LOT. 11, p. 539).

20. 21. Encouraging assurances to Solomon.—20. Be strong, etc.], cf. v. 18 22b, for Yahweh will not fail thee nor forsake thee] a Deuteronomistic phrase, cf. Dt. 31b. Jos. 1.—All the work for the service of the house of Yahweh] i.e., all the work of building the house.—Now behold the pattern of the porch (of the Temple) and of the houses thereof, and of the treasuries thereof, and of the upper rooms thereof, and of the inner chambers thereof, and of the house of the mercy-seat, even the pattern of the house of Yahweh*] restored from כ, is doubtless original and dropped out by homoeoteleuton, see Tor. ATC. p. 67, Ezra Studies, p. 73.—21. And behold the
courses, etc.] described in cc. 23–26. The presence of the priests and Levites, who are not mentioned in 28', is not implied.—

Every willing man that hath skill]. This combination (ניצִב
בָּלָם), not found elsewhere, may have been suggested by “whosoever is of a willing heart” (Ex. 35') plus “every wise-hearted man” (Ex. 35''). The idea that skilful men should offer their services for the building of the sanctuary was certainly suggested to the Chronicler by Ex. 35'".

20. At the end of the verse restore from נוּנָנ נוּנָנ נוּנָנ נוּנָנ נוּנָנ נוּנָנ נוּנָנ נוּנָנ (v. 2).—

21. Be. struck out but similar uses of ב elsewhere by the Chronicler are against this. Ke. thought it was used to emphasise the following phrase. Dr. calls it the ב of “introduction,” LOT. II, p. 539, No. 45 (l. 130). As in 5" 26" 29", apparently used to introduce a nominative similarly to a late use of נ (see Ges. § 117 i) and probably should be explained in the same way.

XXIX. 1–9. David’s appeal for free-will offerings and the response.—Here again the account of the Chronicler is modelled after the history of the tabernacle (v. s. 28'). As Moses appealed to the people for free-will offerings (Ex. 35"–9, cf. 25"–9) and the latter responded to that appeal (Ex. 35"–9), so David is represented as appealing to the princes of Israel, and receiving their gifts.—1. Solomon whom alone God hath chosen], cf. 28", is yet young and tender] and therefore cannot carry out his father’s plans without assistance, cf. 22".—The palace] (יָבוֹא) a word used ordinarily for a Persian palace or fortress, cf. Ne. 1' Est. 1"–21. 11. 31", etc., Dn. 8", also of the fortified courts of the Temple, Ne. 2", but here, in v. 11 and possibly in Ne. 7", of the Temple itself, a term descriptive of its grandeur. So used also in the Talmud (see Tor. CHV. p. 36; l. 12).—2. With all my might]. Cf. “by my painful toil” 22" (q. v.).—David had prepared gold, silver, and bronze] the materials which the people gave for the tabernacle (Ex. 35" cf. 25"), also stones of onyx] (כִּיסָא) a precious stone, possibly onyx or beryl, but identifications are dub. and Vrss. vary; found in Havilah, according to Gn. 211. The phrase stones of onyx is also used
combined with and stones for setting in Ex. 25: 35, where these stones are described as “for the ephod and for the breast-plate,” whence the Chronicler probably derived the phrase.— Variegated stuff and fine linen*] to be used for the priestly vestments (v. i.).—3. I give unto the house of my God] not necessarily his whole private fortune, according to the text, but cf. v. 4. The object of the verb follows in v. 5.—Above all that I have prepared] i.e., above all prepared in his official capacity, cf. 22:4. David’s gift would amount to over one hundred millions of dollars of our money if weighed by the heavy standard, or one-half that amount by the light standard. This amount is a pure fiction, as the similar exaggeration in 22:4. Solomon was the first to secure the gold of Ophir (2 Ch. 8:9 = 1 K. 9:10), but such an anachronism is not strange from the Chronicler.—The King set aside his private gift to overlay the walls of the houses] i.e., the various rooms of the Temple proper, cf. 28:7, also 2 Ch. 3:1, and also 5 to supply gold for the things of gold and silver for the things of silver even for every work by the hands of artificers, thus furnishing the precious metals for the most sacred things.—To consecrate himself] lit. “to fill his hand,” is a phrase used regularly of induction into a priestly office, cf. Ex. 28:19, also 2 Ch. 13:19, but here figuratively, “who will offer willingly like one consecrating himself to the priesthood?”—6. The princes over the king’s work] are those recorded in 27:11.—7. Gold, five thousand talents] or about one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, or one-half this amount by light standard (cf. v. 4 and 22:4).—Ten thousand darics] slightly less than fifty-six thousand dollars. The use of daric, a Persian coin, is clearly an anachronism. Why this small amount in darics should have been added to the large amount in talents does not appear. The older explanation was that the sum in darics represents the amount contributed in coin (Ke., Zoe., Oe.).—8. Jehiel]. Cf. 26:1.—9. These gave with a perfect heart] i.e., without grudging, cf. 28:8.

1. יִשָּׁבַע. On the omission of the relative by the Chronicler see l. 120. Possibly יִשָּׁבַע is a copyist error for יִשָּׁבַע. —חָיֶה is used of the Temple only here, v. 7, and Ne. 7, and of “the fortified court or
enclosure of the temple" Ne. 21, all passages from the Chronicler (v. s.)

means stibium in the form of a black mineral powder used for darkening the edges of the eyelids; in Is. 541 possibly a dark cement, setting off precious stones, but We. and TKC. correct to μακρινός. Here μακρινός is usually taken as a stone of dark colour. Ki. corrects to μακρινός here also, but this is doubtful.—κρυμμένος τοῦ περιβάλλοντος σιδηρο-μάρμαρος (cf. χρυσόν) meaning marble, occurs only here and as σιδηρόμαρμα only Est. 1 Chr. 5. Elsewhere σιδηρόμαρμα is a common word for “fine linen." πέτρα is usually understood as a variegated stone here, Be., Ke., et al., but the word is used nowhere else for a stone, and elsewhere means exclusively “variegated woven stuff.” In Ex. 26: 27; 35: 36; 38: 39 the weaver of “blue and purple and scarlet” is called a “variegator” (οἰκής). Now, it is exactly this “blue and purple and scarlet” and also fine linen (σίδηρος) which we should expect here from Ex. 25: 35 after which the Chronicler’s account is modelled (v. s.). Hence it is probable that μακρινός is a marginal gloss intended originally to explain the difficult μακρινός, but which crept into the text after μακρινός instead of before it. This gloss caused the addition of the following 1, which, which G probably did not read (cf. פָּנָה כֹּל אֲדֹנִי with פָּנָה כֹּל אֲדֹנִי). Accordingly the original read פָּנָה כֹּל אֲדֹנִי—] l. 105.—3. A strangely worded sentence, see Dr. LOT. 14, p. 539.—[a] a very late word (BDB.), cf. Ec. 2: 1. RELATEDLY AMALGAMATED] l. 87.—4. [b] used in the Pu. of precious metals also in 28: 11 (from the Chronicler), and in Ps. 127: 1; and of settled wines in Is. 25: 1. 32.—α eliminated †.—5. [c] in sense of workmanship only 22: 28 (both from the Chronicler) in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne.; and elsewhere 1 K. 7: 5, and a phrase of P Ex. 31: 1. 25: 22: 43 ( = 2 K. 20: 22) Ezr. 3: 7, also in Ch. 4: 11 and Ne. 11.—[hitherto] Hith. in the sense of offering a free-will-offering (for the first Temple), also vv. 9. 10. 11. 12. (for the second Temple) Ezr. 1: 28: 3 (BDB.). These verses are certainly from the Chronicler (l. 70).—6. [i] usually ἀπὸ τοῦ ναοῦ, cf. 27: 2 Ch. 1: 1, but ἀπὸ τοῦ ναοῦ in Ezr. 8: 22. On δυγματεῖα, τοῦ ναοῦ] l. 15.—[j] so also in Ezr. 8: 1. 16; G χρυσοῦς, Π σιδήρου; probably = δαπάνες, cf. χρυσοῦς Ezr. 2: 30; Ne. 7: 11. 12. 11 †, which represents δαπάνες, so Tor. CHV. pp. 17 f., on Ezr. 8: 16. For other views see DB. III. p. 421 b, and references in BDB. with authorities there cited.—[k] cf. Ezr. 2: 24 = Ne. 7: 20 (Romes) Ne. 7: 11. 12. (Romes, and Ezr. 2: 20 (Romans); and elsewhere Ho. 8: 1 Jon. 4: 1 Ps. 68: 1 Dn. 1: 11 † (l. 106).—8. [m] ἐν τῷ ναῷ, cf. v. 17.—9. [n] עַד הָרְעֵבכָּם] l. 70.—
The source of 22:18-28:1-12. Are these thirty-five and one-half verses from an earlier source (so Büchler, Bn., Ki.), or a free composition by the Chronicler? The following words or phrases found elsewhere in Ch.-Ezr.-Ne. only in verses which may safely be ascribed to the Chronicler occur here as follows (see textual notes for references):

- as a general term for movable possessions
- (meaning workmanship)
- (as Hiph. meaning offering a free-will offering)
- (meaning royal officers)
- the Chronicler has rewritten from 2 S. 7, thus representing Israelitish royalty as belonging to Yahweh.

Israel the king of kings 28", Swn 28", pm 28", n'jan 28", ana 28", Swn 28", WH omitted 29", O'r*m 29", 'nrS (S introducing a nominative) 29", a total of twenty-four expressions recurring forty times in twenty-six out of thirty-five and one-half verses, certainly establishing a strong probability that this is a composition by the Chronicler if there is any force at all in the philological argument.

Furthermore, many expressions show the Chronicler's point of view distinctly, and it can be shown that the writer was dependent upon material collected or composed by the Chronicler, indicating that our passage is at least no older than the latter.—According to 29^1 and 28^1 a man prospers as he keeps the commandments of Yahweh. The same thought is expressed by the Chronicler in 2 Ch. 24^10 26^6 31^11.—28^1 includes almost all the officers mentioned in c. 27, suggesting that the latter, which is from the Chronicler, was before the writer.—With the Chronicler has rewritten from 2 S. 7, thus representing Israelitish royalty as belonging to Yahweh. He shows the same point of view in David's prayer 17^14 (which the Chronicler has rewritten from 2 S. 7, thus representing Israelitish royalty as belonging to Yahweh). He shows acquaintance with 26^18, which is from the Chronicler.—The Chronicler's style is apparent throughout the passage. The
10-19. David's closing prayer.—10. The God of Israel, our father. Cf. the fuller expression, "the God of Abraham, of
Isaac, and of Israel, our fathers” (v. 11).—13. We thank . . . and praise] i.e., we are continually thanking and praising.—14. David humbly confesses that by their free-will offerings (vv. 13-14) he and his people are only returning to God what he had first given. Verse 15 continues the same thought. Yahweh is the real possessor of the land and Israel’s rights are only those of the stranger (יִשְׂרָאֵל) and sojourner (בְּשָׁרוֹן), i.e., they are entirely dependent upon Yahweh’s good will, cf. Ps. 39:11 119:11, also Gn. 23. Their days on the earth are as a shadow] in their visitation, cf. Jb. 8:1.—and there is no hope] EVs. abiding after G (いろむおう). The word is used elsewhere only in Ezr. 10:4 Je. 14:9 17:10 50:1. The thought is, there is no hope or salvation (cf. the parallel clause in Je. 14:1) in man apart from Yahweh, an answer to the question “who am I and who are my people?” (v. 11).—18. O Yahweh, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Israel, our fathers (cf. v. 17) keep this forever as the imagination of the thoughts of the heart] i.e., keep thy people in this same generous spirit which has shown itself in their free-will offerings,—and establish their hearts unto thee], cf 1 S. 7:1.—19. A perfect heart], Cf. v. 9.—The palace]. Cf. v. 1.

11. Be. inserted יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ after יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ and so also Kau., Bn. Ki. inserts it before the second יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ. An emendation of the text does not seem necessary, since יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ may have merely an intensive force (see BDB. יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ i.e.), in which case render yea, everything in the heavens and in the earth.—14. יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ nouns occurs also in 2 Ch. 2:9 13:22 and without יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ with the same meaning 2 Ch. 14:9 20:17; elsewhere only in Dn. 10:1. 11. יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ with the meaning abundance is late, cf. Ec. 5:19, where it is parallel to יִשְׂרָאֵל (l. 28).—יום] must be taken as neuter, it is from thy hand, but Qr. יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ as masc. referring back to יִשְׂרָאֵל is better.—17. Bn. describes יֵשָׁרֶשׁ as an explanatory gloss on the basis of יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ, but it is not certain that יִהְשָׁרֶשׁ did not read יִשְׂרָאֵל see l. 119.

20-25. The close of the assembly and Solomon’s accession to the throne.—20. At David’s command to bless Yahweh, all the assembly blessed Yahweh, the God of their fathers, and bowed down and prostrated themselves before Yahweh and before the king]. Both verbs are used of divine worship and of homage to a royal person, cf. Ex. 4:13 K. 1:11.—21. As was customary on
such occasions, sacrifices in abundance, represent the peace-offerings of which the people partook (Oe.).—22. The Chronicler omitted the account of Adonijah’s attempt to seize the throne (1 K. 1) and the consequent exaltation of Zadok to be chief priest alone (1 K. 2). Instead, Solomon is represented as regularly appointed and anointed, apparently without opposition, and Zadok was anointed to be priest at the same time, while David was still living. According to 1 K. 1, it was Zadok who anointed Solomon.—23. In 1 K. 2 the statement “Solomon sat upon the throne of David” follows the account of David’s death.—On the throne of Yahweh]. Cf. 28.—24. Also all the sons of king David] refers to Adonijah’s submission to Solomon (1 K. 1), after his attempt to become David’s successor (1 K. 2).—25. Royal majesty which had not been on any king before him] can only refer to David and Saul, since the Chronicler ignores Ish-bosheth. Barnes renders “royal majesty which was not on any king more than on him,” as the Hebrew word for before is used in Jb. 34, thus bringing Solomon’s reign into comparison with those of all the kings of Israel, cf. 2 Ch. 11, 1 K. 3.

22. is wanting in C, and is doubtless a gloss intended to harmonise this verse with 23, where David is said to have made Solomon king over Israel (Bn., Kl.).—24. is wanting in C, and is doubtless a gloss intended to harmonise this verse with 23, where David is said to have made Solomon king over Israel (Bn., Kl.).—25. Royal majesty which had not been on any king before him] can only refer to David and Saul, since the Chronicler ignores Ish-bosheth. Barnes renders “royal majesty which was not on any king more than on him,” as the Hebrew word for before is used in Jb. 34, thus bringing Solomon’s reign into comparison with those of all the kings of Israel, cf. 2 Ch. 11, 1 K. 3.

26-30. Closing notices of David’s reign.—27. This chronological summary is repeated from 1 K. 11. More exactly, David reigned seven years and six months at Hebron (cf. 2 S. 5).—29. Now the acts of David the king, first and last] is the Chronicler’s usual closing formula, cf. 2 Ch. 9, 12, 16, etc.—Doubtless the Chronicler was influenced by the books of Kings in appending to the account of each reign a reference to sources for further information, but 1 K. has no such closing citation for the reign of David. The Chronicler was not satisfied to omit it for David and cites the acts of Samuel the seer, and the acts of Nathan the prophet, and the acts of Gad the seer. There can be little doubt that these are nothing more than references to the narratives in which Samuel, Nathan, and Gad are mentioned in our books of Samuel. The
order is the same as that in which they appear in the earlier historical books. If the Chronicler knew anything about these men with which we are not familiar from the books of Samuel, he kept that information to himself. Where he does mention Nathan (c. 17) and Gad (c. 21), he simply uses material found in 2 S. (cc. 7. 24). He probably quoted the acts of these three men, instead of simply referring to the one book which contained all of them, since such an enumeration of works would emphasise the importance of David’s reign.—Samuel, the seer (נביא) and Nathan, the prophet (נביאים) and Gad, the seer (נביאים). These three seem to have had distinct functions as suggested by the different titles, or at least there were three distinct prophetic offices in the early times. In the earlier books the first two titles cling to Samuel (1 S. 9:11. 11. 11) and Nathan (1 K. 14. 10. 11. 12. 12. 12. 12. 12. 12. 12. 12) but the text varies in regard to Gad (in 1 S. 22 he is called the prophet and in 2 S. 24 the prophet, David’s seer). Ro’eh, the title of Samuel, seems to have signified in the ancient times a “divining priest,” like the Babylonian barrä “seer,” taking its origin from the custom of “inspecting” the liver of the sacrificial animal for omens; hōzeh, the title of Gad, which may also be translated seer or gazer (GAS. The Book of the Twelve Prophets, I. p. 17), probably originated in the custom of reading the signs of the heavens, etc.; nabi’, the title of Nathan, doubtless signified one who laid claim to direct revelation through an ecstatic condition brought on by music and singing like the howling dervishes (Jastrow, JBL. XXVIII, 1909, pp. 42 ff.). But that these distinctions were ever clearly maintained in Israel is open to question. Certain it is that the term nabi’ under the influence of Elijah and his successors threw off the earlier and cruder significance and came to be the special title of the true prophets of Yahweh of the later day. At the same time it is likely that the terms hōzeh and ro’eh were later used as mere synonyms of nabi’ without any evil meaning being attached to them as has been alleged (Jastrow, op. cit.). This was certainly the case in the time of the Chronicler, whose retention of the distinguishing titles of the earlier books does not imply a careful differentiation of their meaning on his part.—30. With all his reign and his might] i.e., with the whole account of his reign,
including all the times that passed over him (cf. Ps. 31(11)), the vicissitudes of his life, and over Israel, the events of the nation, and over all the kingdoms of the lands, those countries with which David came into contact, as Philistia, Edom, Moab, Ammon, etc. With the phrase kingdoms of the lands, cf. 2 Ch. 12(17) 20(16).

26-27. C omits כל ישראל מלך. — I K. 21, the parallel to v. 17, has after שבעים and so C, E, D, T. — 30. C adds the first verse of 2 Ch. 1.
A COMMENTARY ON
2 CHRONICLES
COMMENTARY ON 2 CHRONICLES.

I-IX. THE HISTORY OF SOLOMON.

In relating the history of Solomon (c. 977–937 B.C.), the Chronicler has omitted as foreign to his purpose, or conveying a too unfavourable impression of Solomon, the following particulars given in 1 K. 1-11: the circumstances attending Solomon’s accession to the throne (1 K. 1-2); his marriage with Pharaoh’s daughter and the sacrifices at the high places (1 K. 3:1); the story of his judgment between the harlots (1 K. 3:15-28); the list of his officers and the provision for his court, and the account of his wisdom (1 K. 4:5-9 (4)); the mention of his palace and the adjoining buildings (1 K. 7:1-12); and likewise his worship of foreign deities, and the trouble of his latter days (1 K. 11). And also in the account of the Temple the Chronicler has omitted the promise inserted in the midst of its description (1 K. 6:11-12); the statement of the length of the period of its construction (1 K. 6:24), and portions of the description of its ornamental work (1 K. 6:33-36) and of its lavers (1 K. 7:14-18). And he has otherwise abridged, also, the account of the building and its furniture; its general dimensions (1 K. 6:1-10 compared with 3:1-7); the most holy place (1 K. 6:24 compared with 3:8); the two cherubim (1 K. 6:18 compared with 3:9); the two pillars (1 K. 7:15-18 compared with 3:10-17). Characteristic insertions also have been made in the narrative: the explanation of the high place at Gibeon (1:4); the choir of Levites with the priests (5:1-14); a quotation from a Levitical psalm (6:1); fire and cloud from Yahweh (7:1); the appointment of priests and Levites (8:14-16), and minor annotations and changes. Much of the narrative also, while clearly dependent upon Kings, has been practically rewritten, especially the negotiations with Hiram (1 K. 5:20-28 (1-13)) compared with 2:1-14 (2:14-15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K.</th>
<th>Ch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Accession and Marriage</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations for Worship at Gibeon</td>
<td>1:4 wanting in K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahweh's Revelation at Gibeon</td>
<td>10:9-10 abridged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Wealth and Horse-trade</td>
<td>11:17 taken from 1 K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Judgment between the Harlots</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Officers, Provision, and Wisdom</td>
<td>2:12 rewritten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Negotiations with Hiram</td>
<td>2:1 (10 f., 21 f.) repeated and abridged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Workmen</td>
<td>3:1-7 abridged with slight new matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Structure of Temple</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise</td>
<td>3:1-7 abridged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Most Holy Place</td>
<td>3:10-11 rewritten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cherubim</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Work</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Occupied in Building the Temple</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Palace</td>
<td>3:16-17 greatly condensed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pillars before the Temple</td>
<td>4:1 wanting in K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brazen Altar</td>
<td>4:4 reproduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Basin</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bases of the Lavers</td>
<td>4:4 abridged and annotated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lavers</td>
<td>4:18 wanting in K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Candlesticks</td>
<td>4:11-15 rewritten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels that Solomon Made</td>
<td>5:1 no change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of the Work</td>
<td>5:14 musical service added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ark Brought In</td>
<td>7:1-2 condensed, new feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Address and Prayer</td>
<td>6:42 almost no variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Blessing of the People</td>
<td>7:1-2 annotated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrificial Ceremonies</td>
<td>7:1-10 annotated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Feasting</td>
<td>7:19-21 enlarged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahweh's Covenant with Solomon</td>
<td>8:1-3 reconstructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Given to Hiram</td>
<td>8:1-4 considerable change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon's Cities and Levy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. 1–13. The promise to Solomon at Gibeon.—Vv. 1–4 are from the Chronicler, while vv. 5–11 depend upon 1 K. 3:14. 11a 4.—1. For Solomon’s accession to the throne cf. 1 Ch. 23:1 29f.—Strengthened himself] (וָפֹצָה יָדוֹ) a common expression in Chronicles to denote one’s firm establishment in rule or in the maintenance of power (cf. 12:3 13:2 15:1 16:1 17:1 21:1 23:1 25:1 27:1 32:1 1 Ch. 11:1 19:18, see also Dn. 10:11; use of verb in earlier books both rarer and more distinctive, l. 38). —And magnified him exceedingly]. Cf. 1 Ch. 29f.—

2. And Solomon gave commandment to all Israel, etc.] a characteristic touch of the Chronicler (cf. 1 Ch. 13:18, where David consults with all Israel respecting the removal of the ark). The narrative of Kings knows nothing, in connection with Solomon’s visit to Gibeon, of such pomp as is implied in this and the following verse.—3. The high place]. The Chronicler adopts this expression from 1 K. 3:1, where Gibeon is called the great high place. The sanctuary at Gibeon was undoubtedly an ancient one of Canaanitish origin. Gibeon is the mod. ed Dschib, five or six miles northwest of Jerusalem (cf. Buhl, GAP. pp. 168 f.). —Because there was the tent, etc.]. Cf. 1 Ch. 21f. This is the Chronicler’s explanation of Solomon’s sacrifice at Gibeon. The remark has no historical
foundation, but otherwise the act of Solomon would have been a violation of the law of P (Lv. 17:1-4). Whatever "tent of meeting" ancient Israel may have had, it had been replaced by the temple at Shiloh (1 S. 3:1 Je. 7:14-16 26:7).

4. Cf. 1 Ch. 15, 16. —
5. The brazen altar . . . was there] a further vindication of the legitimacy of Solomon's sacrifice at Gibeon. On the brazen altar and Bezalel cf. Ex. 31:8 38:21.

And Solomon and the assembly sought him] i.e., Yahweh (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Kau., Bu., Ki.). It, with reference to the altar, is the rendering of G, AV., RV. The former is preferable.

7-13. Taken from 1 K. 3:18-21 4:1. The passage in Chronicles is just two-thirds as long as that in Kings, and has been condensed with much skill, gaining in force. The somewhat verbose mention of the favour shown to David (1 K. 3:1) has been appropriately shortened. The allusion to the son on the throne appears in the form of the Messianic promise, a clear suggestion of 2 S. 7, which (according to SBOT.) is later than this narrative in Kings. The idea of Solomon's weakness is omitted and the phrase "go out and in" (1 K. 3:4) is happily used to express the object of the request for knowledge and wisdom that he might go in and out royally before his people. The dream also of Kings (vv. 1:11) has disappeared.
The revelation is thus a more direct one, given in that night (v. 1) instead of merely “by night” (1 K. 34). Elohim (v. 1) has been substituted for Yahweh (1 K. 34, cf. 1 Ch. 13). V. in Kings with its Deuteronomic promise of “length of days” on the condition of obedience has been entirely omitted, possibly because it was recognised that Solomon did not attain extreme old age.—9. Let thy promise (word), etc., the promise that Solomon, his son, should succeed to the throne, build the house of Yahweh, and that his throne should be established forever (1 Ch. 22). This promise had already been partially established, for thou hast made me king, hence with firm faith Solomon prays for its complete fulfilment. 10. Wisdom (ה onResponse) and knowledge (ידע) since these are necessary to one who would judge righteously, cf. 1 K. 34.—That I may go out and come in before this people]. The Chronicler represents Solomon as a man of peace, hence these words probably do not refer to Solomon as the head of the host (cf. 1 Ch. 11 i S. 1818. 18) (Bn.) but rather include any transaction of business (Ba.).—11. Because this was in thy heart]. Cf. 1 Ch. 22, 28.—12. Such as none of the kings have had that have been before thee]. Cf. 1 Ch. 29.


14–17. Solomon’s wealth.—Taken from 1 K. 1014–11 and repeated in part in 911–11. The Chronicler has omitted the story of the harlots (1 K. 310–11) and the account of Solomon’s civil government and the prosperity and greatness of his kingdom given in 1 K. 4–5 (c. 4). These in 1 K. illustrate the fulfilment of the divine promise which came in answer to Solomon’s prayer at Gibeon. The Chronicler passed over the story of the harlots probably because it contained so little of the religious element, and he probably chose as an illustration of material glory these few verses instead of the longer passage for the sake of abridgment, and because he was not interested in any form of government that was not ecclesiastical.
This passage appears twice, more or less fully, in both 2 Ch. and 1 K., before and after the account of the building of the Temple in each, as follows:

2 Ch. 1st-17 taken from 1 K. 10th-22.
2 Ch. 9th-22 taken from 1 K. 5th 10th 5th 10th.

It will be seen that the first account in Ch. is taken from the second in K., and the second in Ch. from the first in K. (being supplemented by parts from the second in K.). In K. the two accounts are variant, differing in the number of chariots, the first ascribing 40,000 "stalls of horses for the chariots" to Solomon and the second giving him only 1,400 chariots at the end of his reign. The Chronicler regarded these as two separate summaries of the chariots of Solomon, one at the beginning and the other at the close of his reign, and reversed the order, since it was more appropriate that Solomon should begin his reign with 1,400 chariots and later have 40,000 (so read in 2 Ch. 9* v. in loco) than that the reverse should be true. The introductory word in the second account in K., 70th n he gathered together, i.e., organised, supported the Chronicler in placing that account first.

14. Chariots and horsemen]. These were not used by Israel in their early warfare, since they at first occupied the mountainous parts of Palestine, but when under David they became an aggressive state and extended their borders, chariots and horsemen were gradually introduced (cf. for chariots 1 Ch. 18* = 2 S. 8*), and under Solomon, as here expressed, the purchase of chariots and horses became a regular trade.—A thousand and four hundred]. In 1 K. 5* (4th) 40,000 stalls of horses for chariots are mentioned, in 9th 4,000 (v. v.).—Chariot cities]. Cf. 8* 1 K. 9th.—15. Silver and gold]. Their abundance came through Solomon’s commerce. Cedars], the most durable, and so valuable, timber, which came from the forests of Lebanon, and thus was an import.—Sycamores], not the tree known by that name in England and America, but a tree of the genus of the fig (cf. 1 Ch. 27* whose wood, since it grew close at hand, was very plentiful for Jerusalem.—16. Horses]. The horse mentioned in the OT. was the war-horse.—Egypt]. Horses were introduced into Egypt by the Hyksos (during the period of the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasties, 1788-1580 B.C., Breasted, History of the Ancient Egyptians, p. 425), and in later dynasties the “stables of Pharaoh contained thousands of the best horses to be had in Asia” (Ib. p. 195), hence the importation
of horses and chariots, which were widely used in Egypt, into Pal-
estine would have been most natural (v. 17). The securing of horses
from Egypt is also strongly favoured by Dt. 17 Is. 31. But it is
possible that instead of Egypt (Mizraim) we should read
Muzri (Muzri) and think of a land in Asia Minor (v. i.).—17. Six
hundred of silver] i.e., shekels, in value about $380.—And so for all
the kings of the Hittites and of Syria they used to bring them out by
their means, or they (chariots and horses) used to be exported (v. i.)
by their means]. Horses and chariots were brought also out of
Egypt by the king's traders for the Hittite and Syrian kings at the
same price as for Solomon.—The Hittites], a people mentioned
frequently among the inhabitants of Canaan (Gn. 15 Ex. 3. 17 13 et al.),
but their proper home was in the north—even in the high
lands of Asia Minor, Cilicia, and Cappadocia. They dwelt in
power between the Euphrates and the Orontes, centred at Kadesh
and Carchemish, but were finally subdued in the eighth century by
the Assyrians.—Syria] (Aram), Mesopotamia, but often applied
to the kingdom of Damascus and the adjoining petty kingdoms,
Maacah, Geshur, Rehob, and Zobah (EBii.). A trade with the kings
of these people and districts would be less natural from Egypt than
from the nearer Muzri of Asia Minor.

14. has the true reading supported by all
the Vrss. in K.—15. wanting in 퓁 of I K. 10, but G (both
here and K.) to χρύσαν και το ἄργον. Probably originally from Ch.
—16. חֵית] I K. 10 חֵית. Instead of drove of horses (still preferred
by Kau.), Be. already discerned here ח and the name of a place (so
G in K., but here), which is the view of most modern scholars, either
Kue or Koa, a district of Cilicia (Winckler, Alt. Unter. 168 ff. Alloriental.
Forschungen, i. 28, Bn., Ki., Bur., Sk.), or, better, a place in the
direction of Egypt (Stade and Schwally, SBOT.). In the former case is
Musri, a N. Syrian land S. of the Taurus, which often figures in Assyrian
inscriptions. With this agrees Ez. 27, since Togarmah, the source of
horses, war-horses, and mules, lies in that direction. But Dt. 17 Is.
31 decidedly favour the reference to a place near Egypt. Cf. also
Jerome's Onomasticon, 273. 86, 111. 8 Coa quae est juxta Αἰγύπτιον.
Hence we render and Solomon's import of horses was from Egypt (or
from Musri) and from Koa: the traders of the king used to bring them
from Koa at a price (so Ki. BH., Bn.). Kau. retains but omits חֵית
and renders "And the royal merchants were accustomed to bring a
drove for payment." This is preferred by Whitehouse, *EBi.* I. col. 726. The question of the true reading must remain sub lite.—17. The Chronicler has | 1 K. 10:25 | הַשְּׁנִי | וּמַלְסִי | אֶזְרָא | תּוֹרֵא | (Heb. *Ivi.*) | (Heb. *Ivi.*) | of | 1 K. *m.l.* | which is preferred by *Ki.*

I. 18–VII. The Building and Dedication of the Temple.

I. 18–II. 1. Solomon's purpose and the levv of workmen.
—18 (1). This verse is entirely from the Chronicler.—A house for the name of Yahweh]. *Cf.* 1 K. 5:17 (1) 1 Ch. 22:10. 11 28-29 (1).—And a house for his kingdom] i.e., the royal palace and group of buildings described in 1 K. 7:14 but only mentioned incidentally by the Chronicler in 21:1 (2) 7:8 (1).—1 (2). Derived from 1 K. 5:16 (1) (11 r.); here out of place; repeated in vv. 11 (1) (11 r.), which see. The reason for this repetition is not clear. The doublet occurs also in | 1 K. | where cp. 2nd.r. with 5:11 (1). *[Heb. 8:11 f.]*. Sometimes the Chronicler may have written from memory and later repeated in full, having noticed that his first mention was incomplete (Be.).

I. 18. [with force of command or purpose followed by inf. (l. 4).—II. 1. [sing. after lents, a usage of Ez. and P; Ges. § 134 g. —[sing. after הַשְּׁנִי, another usage of P. Ges. § 134 g. Wanting in 1 K., where פּוֹנַשׁ appears before בַּשׁוֹד.

2–9 (3–10). Solomon's message to Hiram.—This is based upon 1 K. 5:11–19 (1) (4) but quite rewritten by the Chronicler, or taken from another source (Bn., Ki.). The following particulars given in 1 K. are wanting in Ch.: (1) The embassy from Hiram to Solomon (1 K. 5:16 (1)). (2) David's hindrance in building the Temple (1 K. 5:17 (1)). (3) The rest given to Solomon (1 K. 5:18 (1)). (4) The promise of Yahweh to David (1 K. 5:19 (1)). The last three, however, are embodied in 1 Ch. 22:5–10. And the following are added in Ch.: (1) The dealings of Hiram with David (v. 8 (1)). (2) A description of the Temple as a place of offerings and as being very great (v. 8 (1). (3) Words of self-depreciation (v. 8 (1)). (4) A petition for a skilled worker in metals and cloth who also is an engraver (v. 8 (1)). (5) An enumeration of the kinds of wood desired (v. 8 (1)). (6) The contribution to Hiram's servants (v. 8 (1)).—2 (3). Huram], 1 K. 5:16 (1) Hiram, see 1 Ch. 14:1. —As thou didst do, etc.]. The sentence is incomplete. Supply, "So do with me." On the transaction cf. 2 S. 5:11 1 Ch. 14:1. According to 1 Ch. 22:5 David had
already procured an abundance of timber for the Temple.—3 (4). The Chronicler thinks of the Temple chiefly as the place of the ministration of the priests and the Levites, cf. 1 Ch. 23:16, and avoids the thought of the building being the dwelling-place of God. He enumerates the incense of sweet spices burned every morning and evening (Ex. 30:7), the perpetual shew-bread (Ex. 25:30), the daily morning and evening sacrifices (Nu. 28:1-2), and the extra offerings of the Sabbaths (Nu. 28:15), of the beginning of months (Nu. 28:16-17), and of the set feasts (Nu. 28:18-29:22).—Forever this (i.e., such service) is (binding) upon Israel. Cf. Nu. 19:1 i Ch. 23:30. 4 (5). Cf. 1 Ch. 29:1 Ex. 18:10—5 (6). The heaven of heavens, the highest sphere of the heavens, cf. 6:1 i K. 8:13.—But to offer incense before thee. The purpose is not to erect a dwelling-place for Yahweh, which would be presumptuous, but merely a place of sacrifice, i.e., worship.—6 (7). Kings knows of no such request for a workman, but states that Solomon sent and brought such a skilled metal-worker from Tyre (1 K. 7:14). The skill in weaving and engraving is an addition of the Chronicler. His need of such a workman is shown in 1 Ch. 20:2 (see corrected text).—With the wise men, etc.] Cf. 1 Ch. 22:4. 7 (8). Cypress and algum trees. Only cedar trees are mentioned in 1 K. 5:27 but cypress also in 1 K. 5:14. Since the algum trees are clearly the same as the altnug trees of 1 K. 10:11, i.e., sandalwood or ebony (Bn.), the Chronicler is here apparently involved in an inaccuracy in deriving them a product of Ophir, from Lebanon (Be., Ke., Zoe., Ba., Bn., Ki.).—And my servants, etc.] taken from 1 K. 5:11.—9 (10). In the message of 1 K. no compensation is specified (1 K. 5:11), but later it is recorded that Solomon, presumably for the timber received, gave Hiram yearly for his house 20,000 cors of wheat and 20 cors of oil (1 K. 5:12). Here the gift is for the support of the labourers, whether yearly or simply a gross amount is not stated, and 20,000 cors of barley and 20,000 baths of wine are added, and the amount of oil is increased from twenty cors to 20,000 baths; or, since 10 baths = one cor, a hundredfold (G in 1 K. has the same amount); a cor represents about eight bushels.

10–15 (11–16). The answer of Hiram.—This is based upon 1 K. 5:8–21 (11–16), and as in the case of Solomon's message is either
rewritten or taken by the Chronicler from another source (Bn., Ki.).
The main variation is the reference to the skilled workman sent
agreeable to Solomon’s request (vv. 10-11). Chronicles
emphasises the fact of a written reply from Hiram, which is not
directly stated in Kings.—11 (12). This verse comes in so awk-
wardly with the allusion to Solomon in the third person instead of
the second as in the previous verse, that possibly it should be trans-
posed with v. 16 (11) (Kau., Bn., Ki.) giving the reflection of Hiram
on receiving the request from Solomon and thus introductory to the
written reply and parallel with 1 K. 5:17. The avowal of Yahweh
as the maker of heaven and earth by Hiram is a noticeable touch
by the Chronicler, who has no difficulty in seeing in the heathen
king a reverer of Yahweh.—12 (13). Huram-abi], the name
of the skilled workman in 1 K. 7:14, called Hiram. The latter
half of the name (abi) should be rendered as a title of respect my
father (Be., Zoe., Oe., Ba.), or better, my trusted counsellor, cf. Gn.
45:6; δευτέρου πατρός (6) add. to Est. 3:16 (v. 6 of add.); τῷ πατρὶ τοῦ
Mac. 11:2 (Tor. AJS L. Jan. '09, p. 172, n. 17).—13 (14). In
1 K. 7:14 the mother of this workman is a widow of the tribe of
Naphtali. The reading of the Chronicler may have come from
the influence of Ex. 31:6, where Oholiab, one of the artificers of
the tabernacle, is of the tribe of Dan. Cf. further on this verse
v. 16 (17).—14 (15). Cf. v. 9 (13). The expression my lord puts Hiram
relatively on the footing of a vassal. There is nothing like this
in Kings.—15 (16). Yapho, mod. Yaffa, the port of Jerusalem,
is not mentioned in Kings.

16-17 (17-18). Solomon’s workmen.—These are represented
as taken after a census from the aliens in Israel. This is the Chron-
icler’s adaptation or abridgment of 1 K. 5:4-8 (4-8), where two
levies of workmen are mentioned, evidently a combination of two
sources (Kau.? Ki., Bur., SBOT.). The first levy (vv. 7-11),
30,000 out of all Israel, sent 10,000 a month in turn to Leba-
non, is entirely passed over by the Chronicler. The second levy,
the burden bearers and hewers and overseers (vv. 9-11), (11-13),
the Chronicler gives, but prefices the list with the statement of a census
taken by Solomon of all the aliens in Israel, whose number exactly
equals that of the workmen, i.e., 153,600 (v. 14 (14)), and whom
Solomon divides and sets to work according to the arrangement given in Kings (v. 17 (ii)). The Chronicler's motive of reconstruction is clearly to free native Israelites from the stigma of hard, serf-like labour. This burden is imposed upon foreigners.—16 (17). With which David his father numbered them]. Cf. i Ch. 22. —17 (18). Three thousand and six hundred overseers]. This probably was the original reading in Kings and not the present text, three thousand and three hundred.

2. קמש[ introduces a comparative sentence of two clauses of which the second member is wanting.—3. כ+ 변.—סימל[ spices, used in incense; only used in pl. abs., cf. 13, elsewhere only in P.—שמרון[ tech. term used only of the shew-bread, cf. Lv. 24:1. i Ch. 9:23 * 28:4 2 Ch. 13:11 29:1 Ne. 10:4. Pl. Lv. 24:1. See also 13*1. Here along with רעפ governed by הָֽלִישָׁא through zeugma.—זרע[ adv. in gen. relation Koe. iii. § 318d. The idea of perpetuity and the word יִשָּׁא are derived from Lv. 24:1.—5. רכ[ ז revealed to whom] this reading is attested, so Vrss. Here the lat. only probable, a Pers. loan-word (BDB.) for the more usual רכ[ יוהי].—4. רכ[ יוהי] deep red purple.—5. רכ[ ש] crimson only here and v. 13*3 prob. a Pers. loan-word (BDB.) for the more usual רכ[ יוהי] (Bn.).—6. רכ[ יוהי] deep blue purple.—7. רכ[ יוהי] modifies רכ[ יוהי] and רכ[ יוהי]. so also 9*1, the latter || to 1 K. 10:11. לד[ מת form. along with רכ[ יוהי] explicative. Behold thy servants shall be with my servants even to prepare, etc. (Ke., RV.), but Oe., Kau., Ki., begin a new sentence (or continuation of רכ[ יוהי]) (Be.) And timber in abundance must be prepared for me. Ges. § 114f.—ברשת[ inf. abs. as an adv. with adj. force Ges. § 113k.—9. רכ[ יוהי] Ges. § 106m.—10. רכ[ יוהי] 1 K. 5*םחל[— רכ[ יוהי] the true reading, so Vrss.—11. רכ[ יוהי] Heb. tense has force of subj. Dr. TH. 38 (β).—12. רכ[ יוהי] Ges. § 106k, Dr. TH. 10.—13. רכ[ יוהי] with the force of namely BDB. 5 ِא (d). The artisan's name Hiram is given in 1 K. 7* as Hiram.—13. רכ[ יוהי] 1 K. 7*כ[ עם וְרֵאש]. רכ[ יוהי] = הָֽלִישָׁא and may go back only to a dittography, but notice the following infinitives.—15. רכ[ יוהי] Aram. cf. Ecclus. 8* + often.—ורכ[ יוהי]rafts, Aram. etym. doubtful. 1 K. 5*רכ[ יוהי] also רכ[ יוהי].—17. רכ[ יוהי] 1 K. 5* לִשָּׁא.

III. 1-2. The place and date of the building of the Temple.—1. Entirely independent of Kings.—In the mountain of Moriah]. The Temple mount in Jerusalem is identified with the mountain in the land of Moriah where Abraham offered Isaac (Gn. 22). The name occurs only here and there and in the latter passage it may represent a textual corruption, earlier, however,
than the time of Chronicles.—Where Yahweh appeared unto David his father in the place which David had prepared in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite*. Cf. 1 Ch. 21*.*. After the revelation of Yahweh at the threshing-floor, David began at once to prepare to build there the Temple (1 Ch. 22*-*).—2. The date of this verse is taken from 1 K. 6* with the omission of "the four hundred and eightieth year of the Exodus," and likewise the name of the second month, "Ziv," given in Kings. Solomon came to the throne about 977.—In the second month]. Any reference to the day of the month is wrongly in the text (v. i.). The second month was approximately from the middle of April to the middle of May.

3-7. The general dimensions of the porch and the holy place.
—Abridged from 1 K. 6*.*. 11*-* 12*.* omitting entirely the matter of vv. 11*-* in Kings, i.e., the mention of the windows, the side chambers of the Temple, its method of construction, and the side door and the stairs.—3. And these are the foundations which Solomon laid in building the house of God] i.e., this is the ground plan of the house. The reference is to the dimensions immediately given.—The length after the former measure]. Before the exile the Hebrews used a cubit longer by a handbreadth than the one in use after the exile (Bn. Arch. pp. 179 f.) and the dimensions of the Temple, says the Chronicler, were according to this earlier measure. The two cubits of Egyptian origin were in the ratio of 7 to 6; the earlier one was 527 mm. (20.74 inches), the latter 450 mm. (17.72 inches) (Now. Arch. p. 201). The height of the Temple, thirty cubits, given in Kings, is omitted, being out of place in the ground plan, cf. v.*. —4. And the porch which was in front of the house: its length was twenty cubits before (i.e., according to) the breadth of the house and the height twenty cubits*]. (Oe., Ki.) Since the Temple was only thirty cubits in height, the reading of ἵκ, one hundred and twenty cubits for the height of the porch, is universally regarded as a textual corruption. The numeral hundred was probably inserted in the text by some one who was thinking of Herod's Temple, the porch of which was 100 cubits in height. For height, thirty cubits have been preferred to twenty (Be.). For another rendering see below. The overlaying of the porch with gold is not mentioned in Kings,
although perhaps implied 1 K. 6:10-11. Such overlaying with gold as is mentioned here and in vv. 25-28. probably never took place, since such gold-plating is not mentioned in connection with the plundering of the Temple by foes (1 K. 14:2 2 K. 14:4) nor when stript by King Ahaz in financial straits. The metal covering by Hezekiah mentioned in 2 K. 18:4 was probably not gold (Bn., EBi. iv. col. 4932).—5. And the greater room (Heb. house) i.e., the holy place. With cypress wood]. In Kings only cedar is mentioned except for the floor (1 K. 6:8 11).—Palms and garlands], bas-relief work (cf. 1 K. 6:9 15 17 26).—6. And he garnished (Heb. overlaid] the house], the whole Temple (Be. and so evidently most comm.); the holy place (Kau.), which is more agreeable to the context. With costly stones]. The idea evidently is of precious stones set in the walls, although it has been suggested that they were costly flagstones for the floor (Kau.).—Parwaim], apparently the name of a gold-producing place conjectured in Arabia (BDB.), yet really dubious. Sprenger (Die alte Geogr. Arabiens, pp. 54 f.) identifies with farwa in SW. Arabia, citing the Arabian historian Hamdani (c. 940 A.D.), while Glaser (Skiz. pp. 347 ff.) finds Parwaim in el-farwain mentioned by the same historian as a gold-mine in NE. Arabia (see Guthe, PRE.* 14, p. 705).—This verse has no parallel in 1 K.—7. A continuation of the description of the holy place. And he carved cherubim on the wall], an inference from 1 K. 6:19, which appears to conflict with 1 K. 6:14. Cherubim were on the walls of the Temple described by Ezekiel (41:10).

1. כָּסַף has הוּא as subject of קרְאָה. This gives the true text (Kau., Bn., Ki.). To adhere to קָרֶה gives a very harsh reading, viz. Then Solomon began to build the house of Yahweh on Mount Moriah where he [Yahweh] appeared unto David his father which [house] he [Solomon] prepared in the place of David [i.e., that D. had appointed] in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite. See RV.—2. ובשֵׁם wanting in three mss., כ, ב, and to be omitted as a dittography (Be., Ke., Oc., Zee., Kau., Bn., Ki.). “In the second [day]” RV., would naturally be expressed by כָּסַף וְבִשֵׁם יְהֹוָה. Ges. § 134p.—3. הבשֵׁם looks toward several following subjects, Koe. iii. § 349n. כָּסַף inf. used as a subst. Koe. iii. § 233a. This Hoph. inf. also used by the Chronicler of the founding of the Temple in Ezr. 3:8.—4. כָּסַף is mean-
The following readings have been proposed: אֲשֶׁר (Oec., Ki.) after מִשְׁה (which has מִשְׁה after מִשְׁה and מִשְׁה twenty cubits for the height) and מִשְׁה twenty cubits for the height. The clause is entirely lacking in K. The clause is plainly a corruption, since a porch of the height of 120 feet would be a tower. Since the height of the Temple was thirty cubits, some prefer to read מְשָׁה after מְשָׁה and מְשָׁה twenty cubits for the height (Be.). Also is read מְשָׁה twenty cubits for the height. The porch which was in front of the main room of the building was ten cubits broad and the length according to [Heb. before] the breadth of the building twenty cubits. Since a statement of the height is out of place in a description which purports to give the ground-plan (cf. v. v.), where the Chronicler omits the height given in 1 K.), and the breadth is expected, this reading is preferable. More likely, however, the Chronicler placed these dimensions in the order in which they appear in his source (1 K. 6:9), hence we prefer מְשָׁה after מְשָׁה and מְשָׁה twenty cubits and the porch which was before the house: the length according to the breadth of the house was twenty cubits and the breadth ten cubits. This requires the least number of changes and the last three words could easily be corrupted into מְשָׁה after מְשָׁה and מְשָׁה twenty cubits. The most holy place.—Greatly condensed from 1 K. 6:1-10. Cf. 1 K. 6:14. The third equal dimension of the most holy place has been omitted by the Chronicler.—Of six hundred talents, a particular not given in Kings. According to the lightest calculation for a talent (i.e., the latest Jewish weight system 45 lbs.) the weight would be 27,000 lbs. (DB. iv. 906 a). The more usual light weight given for a talent is 108.29 lbs. (BDB.); that would give 64,974 lbs. Both amounts seem incredible. The amount is doubtless a free invention of the Chronicler. Possibly he thought of fifty talents for each tribe, v. i Ch. 21v.—9. The nails were intended to fasten the sheets of gold on the wainscoting (Ke., Zoe., Bn.).—And the weight of the nails was one shekel for fifty shekels of gold*. Thus read after a slight correction of the Heb. text underlying מִשְׁה (v. i.).—Upper
chambers], not mentioned elsewhere in the description of the
Temple in 2 Ch., but in 1 Ch. 28:11 (q. v.).

8. [In 1 K. the term is רבי, the hindmost cham-
ber, I K. 6:16, also in 2 Ch. 3:4 from I K. 7:16 and 2 Ch. 5:2, 6
from I K. 8:4. י couldn also appear in I K. 6:8 (as glosses SBOT.)
(a late Dic. passage).—9. This equally difficult reading (two-pound nails) no doubt goes
back to a Heb. original, הבטנה לשון, which is probably a corruption of הבטנה שון (note הבטנה שון a corruption for הבטנה in 2 S. 21:10, v. BDB.). Hence
we render, and the weight of the nails was one shekel for fifty shekels of
gold (i.e., for one mina), which gives a proper proportion and one which
any writer might propose.

10–14. The cherubim.—Abridged from 1 K. 6:17–18.—10. And
he made in the most holy room two cherubim, woodwork,* and he*
covered them with gold], a combination of 1 K. 6:14 and 11. In
1 K. 6:11 the wood is olive.—11. And the wings of the cherubim in
their length were twenty cubits]. Each wing extended five cubits,
and since they stood across the holy place with wing tips against
the wall and with tips touching one another, their combined length
was twenty cubits, the breadth of the room. The remainder of
the verse carries out this description.—12. This verse describing
the position of the other cherub shows that the position of the two
cherubim side by side was identical. The Chronicler has omitted
from 1 K. 6:14 the height of the cherubim, ten cubits, and their iden-
tity of form (1 K. 6:15).—13. And their faces toward the house] i.e.,
toward the holy place. They had clearly only single faces and
not the composite ones of Ezekiel’s cherubim.—14. The veil be-
tween the holy place and the most holy is not mentioned in 1 K.,
nor is such a veil described in Ezekiel’s Temple. However,
Zerubbabel’s Temple probably had it, though this is not certain.
The Chronicler derived the description either from the Temple
of his day or from the veil of the tabernacle Ex. 26:11 (see DB. iv.
15-17. The two pillars before the Temple.—Abridged from 1 K. 7:18-25, cf. Je. 52:11. The Chronicler has omitted in his description their metal, brass; their circumference, twelve cubits (1 K. 7:18); the checkerwork of the capitals (1 K. 7:19), and the lilywork surmounting the capitals (1 K. 7:19-20).—15. Two pillars. Cf. v. 17. —Thirty-five cubits in height]. In 1 K. 7:18 2 K. 25:17 Je. 52:11 the height of the pillars is given as eighteen cubits; thirty-five are only mentioned here and in G of Je. 52:11. This latter dimension has been explained as representing the double length of the two pillars, assuming that each was about seventeen and a half cubits long (Mov. p. 253), or as a reckoning including the five cubits of the capital and other additions in their construction (Ew. Hist. III. p. 237), or as a misreading of the numerical sign נט (eighteen) for נל (thirty-five) (Ke., Zoc., Oe.) (to be rejected because we have no evidence of the use of such signs in ancient Hebrew and thus OT. writing), or, which is the most probable, as a corruption arising from the text of Kings (העשתו שלם אברח) becoming illegible in some way and thus read שלם חם אברח (Be.) or something similar (Bn.). Possibly the Chronicler read a text of 1 K. 7:18 in which הקָנָה, compassed about, had become illegible (or corrupted to הקָנָה, added), in which case he would have interpreted the twelve cubits of circumference as an addition to the height; hence his 35 = 18 + 12 + 5 (capital). From the description given in 1 K. 7:18-21 (with v. 11
corrected from Je. 52** and omitted by the Chronicler (although a partial description appears in 4**), they were hollow bronze pillars four finger-breadths in thickness, eighteen cubits (about 30 ft.) in height, and twelve cubits (about 20 ft.) in circumference. Each was surmounted (1) by a molten chapter or capital five cubits in height, which (2) was covered with a bronze network, and (3) over the network hung two chains in four loops (Je. 52**) of 100 pomegranates each (v. **). Each capital either curved outward at the top in a lily shape or was surmounted by a lily-shaped ornament (Bn., Sk.; Bur. rejects the lily shape altogether).—16. And he made chains like a necklace*. The reading in the oracle (יְבַל, RV., etc.) in this description of the pillars is clearly wrong. The slightest change in Hebrew letters of similar form (ברובים instead of gives the reading above (Bn.; instead of on a ring, on the edge Be., Ki.). Around the ball-shaped or rounded cup-shaped capitals of the pillars were strung chains upon which the metallic pomegranates were hung, according to 1 K. 7** apparently two rows of 100 pomegranates each.—17. Cf. 1 K. 7**. These two pillars were either a part of the porch supporting a lintel (a view based largely on Ez. 40**, Now. Arch. II. p. 33), or, better, free on either side before the porch (as is suggested by v. ** and this verse). These pillars were in Solomon’s Temple because they were a usual feature of Semitic temples, symbols of the deity, a survival in this form of the ancient stone pillars the Mazzeboth (cf. 14*) (Bn. EBi. IV. col. 493; WRS. Rel. Sem. p. 208). (The bowls, fitting receptacles for sacrificial fat, on the tops also suggested to WRS. that they might have served as altars or candlesticks, op. cit. pp. 488 f.).—Jachin means “he will establish,” “the Stabisher,” an appropriate name for Yahweh. The meaning of Boaz is not so clear. It is usually rendered “In him is strength,” which would be a suitable appellation of Yahweh.

15. תַּעַזֵּזְתָּה and the plated capital דַּרֶך, see BDB. Its use is guaranteed by the Aram. אֶלַּשָּׁה. I K. 7** has תַּעַזֵּזְתָּה. 16. נָּלָכַת in the oracle, possibly a gloss from 1 K. 6** (Ba.), but more likely a corruption of נָלָכַת (with prep.) necklace Gn. 41** Ez. 16**. G, A, construed the chains as fifty cubits in length, extending thus from the most holy place through
the holy place (forty cubits) and the porch (ten cubits).—17. 173] perhaps originally 17-332 “Baal of strength,” and then since Baal had become opprobrious as a name of Yahweh, the author of 1 K. made this contraction (Klo.).

IV-V. 1. The Furniture of the Temple.

1. The altar.—This altar of bronze is not given among the furniture of the Temple described in 1 K., although mentioned in 1 K. 8 frequently and an altar which Solomon built is also mentioned 1 K. 9.

According to We. (Prol. p. 44, n. 1) and Bn. (Kom. on 1 and 2 K. p. 47, EBi. IV. col. 4937) a description of the altar stood in the original text of 1 K. and thus supplied the Chronicler with his information, but later was struck out of 1 K. by an editor (R?) on the theory that the brazen altar of the Tabernacle had been preserved and was set up in the court of the Temple. But in that case some trace of the missing passage would be expected in the text of 1 K., but there is none (Bur. p. 102). The failure of the altar to appear among the furniture has been also explained on the ground that the two pillars as receptacles for the sacrificial fat served for altars (v. s. 31 WRS.). But this is very improbable. More likely Solomon used the bare rock for his sacrifice—the great rock es Sakhra now under the dome of the Mosque of Omar, which is believed to have stood in front of the Temple and has every indication of having been an altar (DB. IV. p. 696) (Sk. 1 K. 8). The reference then to the brazen altar in 1 K. 8 may be a late addition, and the earliest reliable mention would be in the story of Ahaz, 2 K. 16 (GAS. J. pp. 64 f.). The question remains, however, how came the brazen altar of Ahaz if not built by Solomon.

In form, accepting the measurements of the Chronicler, the altar was probably like that of Ezekiel's Temple (43 0, i.e., a series of terraces culminating in a broad plateau or table. The base then would have been twenty by twenty cubits. If the dimensions given by Hecataeus (in Jos. Apion, I. 22) are correct, the Chronicler doubtless took his figures from the altar of Zerubbabel's Temple, i.e., the Temple of his day. The latter was made of unhewn stone.

2-6. The brazen sea and the lavers.—The description of the sea is taken directly from 1 K. 7. This was a huge cylindrical or hemispherical tank resting on the backs of twelve oxen facing outward, three each toward the four cardinal points of the compass.
The tank stood in the southeast angle of the court.—

2. *Molten sea*. The casting of such an immense article of metalwork in one piece has been questioned; and it has even been suggested that the tank was wooden and, since the ancients preferred hammered work, plated with bronze (Bn. EBi. IV. col. 4340). The name *sea*, according to Josephus, was given from its size (*Ant.* viii. 3, 5), but it may also be connected with the symbolical character of the basin.—

*Ten cubits from brim to brim* i.e., in diameter. The numbers of this verse are only approximate, since 10 cubits (17.22 ft.) in diameter would give a circumference of 31.4159 cubits instead of 30 cubits (51.66 ft.).—

3. *And under its brim were gourd-like knops encompassing it round about* (ten in a cubit?) encircling the sea round about. *In two rows were the gourd-like knops, cast when it was cast*. Whether this encircling garland-like ornamentation was of the fruit or the flowers of the gourd is uncertain.—

4. This verse in 6 of i K., lacking, however, the statement of the capacity of the tank, precedes v. This is the natural order.—

*Three thousand baths*, i K. 7th "two thousand baths." Both estimates appear too large, since at the smaller figure, reckoning a bath at 65 pints (DB. IV. p. 912) or at 64.04 pints (EBi. IV. col. 5997), the capacity would have been 16,250 or 16,010 gallons, but the dimensions 10 cubits in diameter, 30 in circumference, and 5 in depth in a cylinder give only 10,798 gallons (figuring with the long cubit, 20.67 in., we obtain about 15,000 cubits), and if a hemisphere 6,376 gallons (EBi. IV. col. 4340). The true capacity was probably somewhere between these figures.—

6. The full description of the bases of the ten lavers and also their size, given in i K. 7th, is omitted by the Chronicler. —

*To wash in them*. This is the Chronicler's interpretation of the use both of the sea and the lavers. But they were ill adapted for the purpose of cleansing, especially the sea, unless it was a receptacle from which water was drawn, although it received this meaning in the furniture of the tabernacle (Ex. 30th). Both the sea and the lavers probably had a symbolical meaning (an interpretation now generally adopted). The sea represented the waters or the flood upon which Yahweh as the God of rain was enthroned (Ps. 29th), or the primeval flood or deep over which his creative power
was manifested (cf. Gn. 1:6; Ps. 24:9). The lavers with their wheels and decorations of cherubim (1 K. 7:27) not inappropriately might then symbolise the clouds (cf. the cherubim of Ezekiel and cherub of the storm upon which Yahweh rode (Ps. 18:10)). The bulls probably also were symbols of deity; cf. the calf of the wilderness (Ex. 32:19) and those set up at Bethel and Dan (1 K. 12:31).

2. Oxen; 1 K. 7:29, knops (gourds), the true reading although G and F have that of K. The change to oxen was made by some ignorant copyist who thought the oxen were here mentioned.—םֹלְמָּם (םולע), needed for clearness of meaning.—ןכמ (ךכמ), wanting in K. and G. —ten in a cubit (Be., RVm.), is grammatically inadmissible. The phrase means for ten cubits (G, E, U), which is meaningless, since the gourds ran around the tank for thirty cubits, hence probably a gloss in 1 K. by some one who mistook the diameter for the circumference (St. SBOT., so essentially Bur.).—הכֵּס כְּסִים (כסים), is grammatically inadmissible. The phrase means for ten cubits (E, G, U), which is meaningless, since the gourds ran around the tank for thirty cubits, hence probably a gloss in 1 K. by some one who mistook the diameter for the circumference (St. SBOT., so essentially Bur.).—may be regarded there as a gloss (Bn.).—ץֹעֵּש (שעי), 1 K. 7:30.—To fit the oxen misread for knops (gourds) in this verse with the following verse G has דּוֹו כִּהְמֶּשׁ תַּוְּדִּיֵּשׁ הַבּוֹרֶּשׁ מַכְּוֵּשׁ כָּלִּיֵּשׁ אָבָּרֵשׁ (דּוֹו כִּהְמֶּשׁ תַּוְּדִּיֵּשׁ הַבּוֹרֶּשׁ מַכְּוֵּשׁ כָּלִּיֵּשׁ אָבָּרֵשׁ) יַּהוֲּוֹ דּוֹו כִּהְמֶּשׁ תַּוְּדִּיֵּשׁ הַבּוֹרֶּשׁ מַכְּוֵּשׁ כָּלִּיֵּשׁ אָבָּרֵשׁ. G agrees with K. —בּוּת (ות), 1 K. 7:31.—In Ch., superfluous after מָעַי, is due to a glossator familiar with 1 K. (Be., Oe., Ki.), or simple pleonasm (Ke., Zoe.). Bn. would strike out either מָעַי or בּוּת. G has קֵלֶקֶלֶסַּר, i.e., בּוּת.

7 f. The candlesticks, tables, and basins.—The candlesticks (lampstands) are not mentioned in 1 K. among the regular furniture of the Temple, but only incidentally in the summary of golden articles (1 K. 7:27), a passage recognised as of late origin (St. SBOT., Bur.). They do not appear also among the spoil of 2 K. 25:11, and thus their appearance in the parallel Je. 52:10 is a gloss. Hence, ten candlesticks, though regarded as historic by Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba., et al., are probably an imaginary product. Some light, doubtless, was in the Temple (cf. 1 S. 3:1), very likely one lampstand, possibly not unlike that of the second Temple and the tabernacle (cf. the vision of Zechariah c. 4, Ex. 25:11), but if elaborate its omission from the earliest list of Temple furniture is singular.

On the other hand it is urged: "There must have been some ground for the tradition of ten lampstands. Probably these did exist—but
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brazen, not golden ones, in Solomon's Temple, or they were added soon after, for there must have been some way of lighting the interior of the house. They would be kept burning day and night, as house lamps in the East are at the present day. They might have been put on pedestals—the Eastern fashion—but most likely they were set on the ten tables about which we read in 2 Ch. 4:17 (W. T. Davies, DB. IV. p. 701).

7. Cf. v. 18 1 K. 7:49.—According to the prescription concerning them] i.e., the prescription in reference to their structure (cf. Ex. 25:31-37).—In the temple] (יהול), the holy place; according to 1 K. 7:49 they were before the most holy place. Their exact position in the room, if there, cannot be determined; probably they extended down its sides.—8. Ten tables]. Since elsewhere only one table is mentioned for the shew-bread in the Temple (13:29 1 K. 6:20 7:49), likewise also in Ezekiel's Temple (41:1: altar=table), and since the position of these tables was the same as that of the ten candlesticks (v. 7), these ten tables have been held to have been for the support of the ten candlesticks (Be., Zoe., Bn., EBi.). In the mind of the writer, however, they were doubtless for the shew-bread and in reality an exaggeration like the ten lampstands (cf. v. 18 1 Ch. 28:9). (Ke. held for the shew-bread; Oe. uncertain, perhaps for both; Ba. not for the shew-bread.).—A hundred basins of gold], not mentioned in 1 K. except generally (1 K. 7:9); their use is uncertain, probably for receiving and sprinkling the sacrificial blood (Be., Ba.) or for pouring libations (cf. Am. 6:9) (Ke., Zoe., Oe.).

9. The courts of the Temple.—These are described according to the arrangement at the time of the Chronicler, when, under the influence of Ezekiel, there was an inner court restricted for the use of the priests and an outer one for the people. The inner court mentioned in 1 K. 6:19 is the court of the Temple, while the great outer court (1 K. 7:11) was the court extending around all of Solomon's buildings (cf. GAS. J. ii. p. 256). The term here used for the great outer court (יררד) occurs only in 1 and 2 Ch. and Ez. The doors are not mentioned in 1 K.

10-18. The position of the brazen sea and the works of Hiram.—Taken directly from 1 K. 7:19-47, which explains the awkward introduction here of the statement respecting the place of the sea.—11. The pots], for boiling flesh, an ancient way of
preparing sacrificial food (cf. 1 S. 2*).—*Shovels* utensils for cleaning the altar (Ex. 27).—*Basins*, used for catching the blood and throwing it against the altar (cf. v.).—12. *The two pillars*. Cf. 3*.*—*The two bowls of the capitals which were on the pillars*. The tops of the pillars were either open and cup-like, or ball-like and closed. The absence of the mention here of any additional lilywork favours its rejection (cf. view of Bur. 3*).—13. *And the four hundred pomegranates, etc.*. Cf. notes on 3*.*—14. Cf. v.*.—15. Cf. v.*.—16. Cf. v.*.—*The flesh hooks* (RV.) i.e., sacrificial forks (v. i.).—17. *In the plain of the Jordan*, lit. in the oval (valley) of the Jordan.—Succoth and Zeredah. The latter of these names is the Chronicler's equivalent of "Zarethan" of the text of 1 K. (7*), also mentioned as near the city Adam (Jos. 3*). This is probably the mod. ed Damieh on the west bank of the Jordan, twenty-four miles from its mouth. Succoth on the east bank is usually identified with Tell Deir 'Alla, about one mile north of the Jabbok (GAS. HGHL. p. 585).—Instead of in the clay ground, etc., the passage probably in 1 K. originally read, at the ford of Adamah, etc. (v. i.).

10. 7 MSS., -1, K. 7* after have here which may be supplied here (Bn.). Retaining the present text of Ch. is an example of an adj. used nominally (Dav. Sym. § 32, R. 5).—11. Since this same man is mentioned in v. 16 and 21, Ki. reads (SBOT.), yet probably the Chronicler followed the text of 1 K.—*His bronze* Text of Ch. is the original (so Th., St., Klo., Kam., BN., Ki., Bur., on 1 K. 7*).—12. *The two fillets without doubt* (Bn., Ki., Bur., on 1 K. 7*), but to be omitted there as a dittography from previous verse (SBOT. of K., Ki. BH. of K.); the Chronicler reproduced the error of K.—*13. *in* in 1 K. should be *in* (Bn., Ki., Bur.), but the Chronicler probably found the error already in 1 K.—*14. art. to be supplied as in 1 K. 7* (Bn., Ki., Bur.), while Bn. rightly considers that of Ch. (retained by Kau.) the more original, since basins have already been mentioned in
17. Huram, the trusted counsellor of King Solomon; v. 5. on 21, and on construction cf. Koe. iii. pp. 256 f. a word appearing in NH.; 1 K. 715. 17. instead of Shkh, which latter gives the true reading (see Bur.). Be., Ke., Oe., prefer Shkh as the true reading in Ch. Kau., Bn., Ki., adhere to the present text as the Chronicler's reconstruction of the corrupt text of 1 K. This latter is quite likely.—17. pno, a word appearing in NH.; 1 K. dpdd. —17. onargillosa, hence RV. in the clay ground. Be. thought of the hardened earth prepared to receive the molten metal, the clay moulds, a rendering followed by Oe., Kau., Ki., but Moore on Ju. 715, followed by BDB., Bn., emends to at the crossing of Adamah, regarding Adamah as identical with Jos. 314, which is there said to be near.—17. Shelah (the original according to Bn.) 1 K. Shir. —17. Ram. —18. Amram repeated in 1 K.—18. wanting in 1 K. Its introduction gives a slightly different force to the sentence. In K. the meaning is that the vessels were too numerous to be weighed, in Ch. that the number was very great because no regard was had to the amount (weight) of brass used. The present text of 1 K. is harsh and probably not the original.

19-22. The golden furniture of the Temple.—Taken from 1 K. 715-40.

This passage in 1 K. has been regarded as a late addition to the original account of the Temple furniture, for the following reasons: (i) the improbability of such lavish expenditure on articles like hinges, etc.; (2) the mention of a golden altar of which there is no historical evidence in pre-exilic times; (3) a discrepancy between the reference to the cedar altar for the shew-bread in 1 K. 614 and the reference in 1 K. 714 to the table of gold; and also all the articles mentioned should naturally have been given along with the cherubim and table (altar) of cedar, in c. 6; (4) the mere enumeration of the articles, when the brazen furniture is so elaborately described, points in the same direction (Bn., Sk.).

The Chronicler has tables (v. 19) instead of sing. to conform with 1 Ch. 2810 and probably with v. 5, and the doors of the two rooms are of gold (v. 16) instead of the hinges (1 K. 714) (but v. 5.). For brevity, also, the Chronicler has omitted the position of the golden candlesticks (v. 15 compared with 1 K. 714).—19. The golden altar]. This appears later in the altar of incense of the tabernacle (Ex. 3014.), but it is lacking in the Temple of Ezekiel, and probably had no place in Solomon's Temple (DB. II. p. 467).—The tables],
in 1 K. 7** “the table.” The Chronicler has pluralised to conform with v. q. v.—20. And the candlesticks] the lampstands (cf. v. i).
—According to the prescription]. Cf. v. i. The reference here is not to their form, but their use. 21. And the flowers] the flower-like ornaments of the stands on which the lamps rested (cf. Ex. 25** a.).

22. The snuffers, etc.] the utensils for the care of the lamps and of the golden altar of incense.—And the hinges of the temple of the inner doors of the most holy place and of the doors of the temple, that is the temple room (the holy place), were of gold*. This is the true reading (v. i.). The corrupt text makes the entire doors plated with gold. According to 1 K. 6** the doors were of olive wood, overlaid with gold.

19. The original of 1 K. 7** may have been and Solomon placed (תני) all the vessels which he had made (ותשו) in the house of Yahweh (Bn.). SBOT. has still a different text; but our present text of 1 K. was before the Chronicler.—According to the prescription]. Cf. v. i. The completion of the furnishing of the Temple.—A copy of 1 K. 7**.—1. The things that David his father had dedicated]. Although this statement is in 1 K. 7**, the books of 1 and 2 S. and 1 and 2 K. contain no record of such dedication by David beforehand of utensils directly made with the Temple in view. It has, therefore, been thought that the word vessels (utensils) might, after its common meaning, include weapons and thus the spoil of war which David did dedicate to Yahweh (cf. 1 Ch. 18** 2 S. 8**). (Sk.).

V. 1. As read] eleven mss., 1 K. 7** + נָלָבִּים—דרת א. read after 1 K. כְּנֶפֶשׁ, כִּי, כִּי. The waw has been drawn from וְגוֹ וְגוֹ from eighteen mss., כְּנֶפֶשׁ, כִּי, 1 K. (Ki. BH.).
V. 2-VII. 10. The Dedication of the Temple.

V. 2-14. The bringing of the ark.—A copy of 1 K. 8:1-11 with the addition of a notice of the priests and the Levites and their musical service (vv. 11b-12a). In 1 K. this section represents an old narrative revised especially by a priestly editor.—2. Then] i.e., after the completion of the Temple and all its furniture.—Even all the heads of the tribes, the princes of the fathers' houses] a true description of the elders.—Zion]. Cf. 1 Ch. 15:1.—3. At the Feast] the Feast of Tabernacles, the harvest festival at the close of the ingathering of fruit crops.—In the seventh month]. Nothing in the narrative of the Chronicler is at variance with this. In 1 K. it must be reconciled with the statement that the Temple was finished in the eighth month (1 K. 6:38). The building may have been finished earlier than the utensils; hence the dedication may have been in the next year (Sk.).—4. And the Levites took up the ark]. According to 2 K. 8:6, the Chronicler's source, the priests took up the ark. This reflects the older usage (cf. Jos. 3:15 6:11 8:11 (JE.). The Chronicler changed priests into Levites to bring the action into conformity with the regulation of P which assigned the duty of bearing the ark to the Levites (Nu. 3:14 4:5); yet in v. 6 he allowed the double expression, the priests the Levites, to stand, possibly because certain utensils might well have been borne by the priests, and in v. 7 the word priests was properly retained (from 2 K. 8:6), since when the Temple was reached only the priests could lawfully place the ark in the holy of holies (cf. Nu. 4:13).—5. The tent of meeting and all the holy utensils that were in the tent], the Mosaic tabernacle and all its furniture, which, according to the Chronicler, was at Gibeon (2 Ch. 1:1); or the tent David erected for the ark (2 S. 6:17 1 Ch. 15:1 (Be.). The former was without question in the mind of the priestly editor of 1 K. who inserted this reference, and also this was the view of the Chronicler. The term tent of meeting is only used of the tabernacle.—6. Sacrificing before the ark]. Cf. the numerous sacrifices by stages when David brought up the ark (2 S. 6:14).—7. Cf. v. 6.—8. The exact position of the ark under the cherubim is carefully defined.—9. And the staves were long so that the ends of the staves were seen
from the holy place before the oracle]. One standing in the holy place could see in the darkness of the most holy place the projecting ends of the staves by which the ark was carried.—But they were not seen without]. But one outside of the holy place could not see them. So generally; v. i. This is better than the interpretation: “But did not extend beyond the door” (Sk.).—And there they are unto this day]. The retention of this clause from 1 K. 8 is an example of the Chronicler’s unconcern at times to harmonise his text with actual conditions, since the ark and its staves had been long since destroyed.—10. Now there was nothing in the ark except the two tables]. The form of expression implies that other things besides the two tables might have been expected in the ark. A late Jewish tradition placed within the ark a golden pot of manna and Aaron’s rod (Heb. 9). A modern view is that the ark contained one or two sacred stones (St. Gesch. I. pp. 457 f.; Now. Arch. II. pp. 5 f.; TKC. EBi. I. col. 307), “a fetish” in which Yahweh dwelt (Sm. Hist. p. 71). But if Moses gave laws to Israel and brought the people into covenant relation to Yahweh, then two stone tablets containing the ten words are reasonably the historic contents of the ark (DB. I. p. 151).—Horeb] the mount of Yahweh’s revelation in the wilderness, in E followed by D, while Sinai in J followed by P.—11. And it came to pass when the priests had come out of the holy place]. This statement from 1 K. (8) and continued in the words of v. 11b, that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of Yahweh (1 K. 8b), is interrupted by the Chronicler with the intervening vv. 11b-12a. The Chronicler expands the allusion to the priests (1) by mentioning how all the priests took part in the service and not simply those to whom in course the service might have fallen (v. 11b); (2) by describing the musical service at the conclusion of which the house was filled with the cloud of Yahweh (vv. 11b-12a).—Now all the priests who were at hand had sanctified themselves without keeping (their) courses]. Ordinarily the priests served in turn in twenty-four divisions (1 Ch. 24), but on this occasion all officiated without reference to their turn. This was the custom at the three great annual festivals (Schür. Gesch. pp. 279 f.).—12. And the Levites, who were singers all of them]. In a similar manner with the priests, all the Levitical singers, who ordinarily
served in turn in twenty-four courses (1 Ch. 25:31), took part in the dedication.—Asaph, Heman, and Judithun] the leaders or the representatives of the three Levitical choirs (cf. 1 Ch. 6:9. (1 K.) 15:1, 25:1).—With cymbals, psalteries, and harps]. Cf. 1 Ch. 15:1—A hundred and twenty priests sounding with the trumpets]. The blowing of the trumpets was a duty of the priests. The hasoserah was the priestly instrument par excellence (DB. iv. p. 816). The one hundred and twenty represent five taken from each of the twenty-four divisions.—13 f. And it came to pass when, as one person, even the trumpeters and the singers were causing one sound to be heard to praise and to give thanks unto Yahweh, and when they raised a sound with trumpets and with cymbals and with the instruments of song and when they praised Yahweh, saying, For he is good; for his loving kindness endureth forever: then the house was full of the cloud, the house of Yahweh]. The Chronicler introduces the appearance of the cloud coincident with a great burst of music and praise, while the simpler narrative of 1 K. presents more clearly the thought that, when the ark had been placed in the holy of holies, the cloud filled the holy place, as visible token that Yahweh had taken up his abode in the new Temple.

2. After יָשָׂר and before יָשָׂר יָשָׂר יָשָׂר יָשָׂר יָשָׂר יָשָׂר I K. 8:1 has שִׁלָּחַא wanting in ג of 1 K. and hence a gloss.—3. I K. 8:1 has שִׁלָּחַא (a gloss) after שִׁלָּחַא; and שִׁלָּחַא before שִׁלָּחַא omitted by the Chronicler because in his day the old Canaanite names of the months had long since been dropped and numbers were used in their place. That is the seventh month is an addition to the original text of K. (SBOT., Bur.). Kau. holds the text of K. the true one for Ch. Certainly the retention of that is the seventh month is awkward without the retention of Ethanim, but such awkwardness of the Chronicler is not unknown elsewhere (cf. 1 Ch. 14:4 “in Jerusalem”).—4. I K. 8:1 has הֲרָעָבנה, haramnah, and before וַיֶּעָל ‏, ἱλάτη, I K. 8:1 + וַיֶּעָל ‏, ἱλάτη, I K. 7:1 also ב, ב, ב. The omission of the ו is perhaps due to a copyist (Ke., Zoe., Bn., Ki.). Since וַיֶּעָל is in Ch., it is probable that v. 1b, recognised as a gloss in 1 K. 8:1 (St. SBOT., from R², Bur., since wanting in כ før.), was introduced into 1 K. from Ch. (Bn., Ki.). Yet וַיֶּעָל appears also in 23:10; and it is doubtful whether the Chronicler and his readers through their familiarity with Deuteronomy laid any stress upon precision of statement in the use of the phrase the priests the Levites; the two classes were perfectly distinct in their own mind, as much so as if the conjunction and had been used between them.—5. כָּפָאו] I K. 8:1 +
2 CHRONICLES

VI. 1-42. Solomon's address to the people and dedicatory prayer.—Taken (save vv. 11, 14) with almost no variation from 1 K. 8:1-40. In the addition in v. 14 is given an interpretation of the statement that Solomon stood before the altar (v. 13) (before which properly it was lawful only for the priests to stand). The interpretation shows that he did not really stand before the altar, but upon some sort of a brazen improvised pulpit not mentioned elsewhere. In vv. 11-14 a new and by far more beautiful conclusion is given to the prayer, taking the place of 1 K. 8:14 (v. 11 and portions of vv. 10-11 are also omitted).

1-3. Introduction.—1. Yahweh hath promised to dwell in thick darkness (cloud) either a reference to the cloud which had filled...
the Temple indicating that Yahweh had taken up his abode in the newly built Temple (Be.); or to be understood through the missing line (v. i.) *The sun hath Yahweh set in the heavens.* The passage then means that Yahweh, instead of confining himself to the realms of light, or in contrast to the realms of light, which are subordinate to him, dwells in the thick darkness or cloud, and hence says Solomon, I have built him a Temple whose dark inner shrine may fitly serve as his dwelling-place.—2. *But.* This antithesis arises from the Chronicler's change of the text (v. i.). The change is unfortunate. It emphasises Solomon's building of the Temple instead of the fact that the Temple had been built agreeably to the nature of God, which seems to be the meaning of i K. 8*11*, which reads *I have surely built thee a lofty mansion.*—And] wanting in i K. (v. i.).—3. *And the king turned his face about.* The writer thought of the previous words uttered by Solomon, with his face toward the Temple and his back to the assembled people, whom he now blessed and addressed. In i K. these words mark the beginning of the Deuteronomic section, embracing the speech and prayer of Solomon.

1. These vv. 11. appear in 6 of i K. after 814-22 with the following additional words שמש בקן זכריו, which furnish the additional line (v. s.) which is incorporated into the text of i K. as original by We., Ki., Bn., Bur., Sk., et al, but ס is adhered to as the original by St. SBOT. except נמא instead of נמא. ס was the text of the Chronicler.—2. שמש בקן נמא] i K. 8 11. שמש בקן נמא] i K. 8 11.

4-11. Solomon's address to the people.—A statement of the reasons which led to the building of the Temple, based largely upon 2 S. 7*10*.—4. *And hath with his hands fulfilled it.* Yahweh had promised the building of the Temple and had through Solomon fulfilled this promise.—*Saying.* The promise is now introduced.—5. *Cf. for the first part 2 S. 7*1 i Ch. 17*1. The turn, however, is different here. There the thought is that Yahweh had only dwelt in tents and did not, therefore, care for a "house of cedar"; here, that hitherto no place had been chosen nor yet person to carry out his design.—*That my name might be there.* Where Yahweh dwelt there was his name, a term expressive of the divine nature and almost if not quite equivalent to person, *cf. Dt.
12. Under David both the place and the dynasty were chosen.—7. David cherished the design of building the Temple, but it was overruled (2 S. 7:1-1 Ch. 17:18).—9. Cf. 2 S. 7:1-1 Ch. 17:18.—11. Wherein is the covenant] i.e., the tables of the covenant (cf. 5:16).

12-42. Solomon's prayer of dedication.

12-13. The position of Solomon.—12. Before the altar] the great altar which was in the court (cf. 4:1).—And he stretched forth his hands] the universal attitude of prayer (Ex. 9:22).—13. This verse is from the Chronicler. The narrative of 1 K. does not mention any structure upon which Solomon knelt, nor yet his kneeling posture. The notion of the structure may have arisen from the desire to remove Solomon from before the altar as a place sacred for the priests (We. Prol. p. 186, Bn.). This view is rejected by Oe.

14-17. Prayer for keeping the promise to David.—Acknowledged as relatively fulfilled in Solomon and the Temple (v. 15), but a larger fulfilment is desired (v. 16).—14. The incomparableness of Yahweh as a covenant God is described, cf. Dt. 3:7.—That walk before thee with all their heart]. With such the covenant is kept.—15. As it is this day]. Solomon, David's promised son, was reigning and the Temple, the promised house, had been built (2 S. 7:1-1 Ch. 17:18).—16. There shall not be cut off, etc.]. Cf. 7:1 K. 2:4 Je. 33:15. The conditional character of this promise is worthy of notice.

18-21. Prayer for answers at this house.—Expressing in general terms the burden of all the following seven specific petitions which are that Yahweh will hear (1) the oath of ordeal (vv. 18-19), (2) prayer under defeat (vv. 20-22), (3) prayer for rain (vv. 20-22), (4) prayer under various calamities (vv. 20-22), (5) the prayer of the stranger (vv. 20-22), (6) the prayer of the army (vv. 20-22), (7) prayer in cap-
tivity (vv. 18-19).—18. With men] an addition of the Chronicler; a possible softening of the cruder conception of mere dwelling on earth with the thought of spiritual communion.—20. Yahweh is conceived as being away from the Temple to which he is asked to look day and night, and yet his name dwells in the Temple. He is both present and absent.—21. When thou hearest, forgive]. Every answer to prayer includes the forgiveness of sin (Sk.).

22 f. The oath of ordeal.—When one is charged with crime and made to affirm his innocence by taking an oath of curse, or having one invoked upon him by the priest, Yahweh is asked to decide, by fulfilling the curse if he is guilty, or leaving him unharmed if innocent (cf. Ex. 22:10 Nu. 5:1-26).

24 f. Prayer in defeat.—If the people are defeated in war Yahweh is asked in view of their supplication to forgive them and establish them in their land. The phrase and bring them again into the land has been thought inconsistent with prayer in this house, and hence the text by slight emendation has been made to read and cause them to remain in the land (Klo., Bn.). But this is not necessary. Such a slight inconsistency does not affect the clear meaning of the petition.—And if thy people Israel be smitten down before the enemy, because they have sinned against thee]. That defeat in battle was evidence of Yahweh’s displeasure caused by previous sin against him is frequently taught in the OT. (cf. Jos. 7:11. 1 Ch. 21:10). Beginning with the belief that God caused the righteous to prosper and brought misfortune upon the wicked (cf. Ex. 23:26. Lv. 26, Dt. 28), the ancient Hebrew also inverted the doctrine, believing that prosperity proved previous righteousness and adversity antecedent sin. Thus a natural catastrophe not only resulted in the destruction of a man’s property, but ruined his reputation as well.

26 f. Prayer in drought.—Cf. Dt. 11:11-17 28b. Drought was interpreted as a divine punishment for sin, v. s. vv. 14-17, cf. 1 K. 17:1—Which thou hast given to thy people for an inheritance]. Cf. v. 14 which thou gavest to them and to their fathers, and v. 11 which thou gavest unto our fathers. The land was considered a sacred gift to Abraham, and a holy inheritance of his seed after him, cf. Gn. 12:et al.
28–31. Prayer in various calamities.—This covers every case of misfortune (cf. v. 30).—28. Caterpillar] "consumer" (EVs.), properly a kind of locust (cf. Jo. 11).—In the land of their gates] i.e., cities. The gates were considered sacred, which perhaps accounts for the use of "gates" for "cities" (cf. Dt. 12 et al., v. EBi. II. col. 1645).—29. Who shall know every man his own plague and his own sorrow] i.e., let Yahweh hearken unto every suppliant who has recognised that his misfortunes are a just divine punishment.—30. According to all his ways] does not mean that God should recompense him according to his acts, for he has just suffered punishment on their account; rather, may Yahweh render according as he perceives the sincerity of the sinner's repentance.—For thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of the children of men]. Yahweh's recompense is just even if it may not appear so, for he only is able to perceive man's true condition.

32 f. Prayer of the foreigner.—No condition is placed upon the foreigner. Thus the teaching here is broader than that of the promise of Is. 56:1, which requires of the foreigner the keeping of the Sabbath day as a condition of being heard by Yahweh.—33. For thy name is called upon this house]. The name of Yahweh was pronounced upon the house, i.e., the house was called by his name and he became its owner. This involved responsibility for its welfare on the part of Yahweh (cf. EBi. III. col. 3266).

34 f. Prayer in war.—This petition is parallel to vv. 28–29, but there the prayer is for aid against an enemy which has been victorious because of Israel's sin, while here the writer is thinking of a petition for aid when Yahweh shall send Israel forth in a righteous war. With the following petition it is usually regarded as an exilic addition in 1 K. (i.e., D*) (so Kau., St. SBOT., Sk.).

36–39. Prayer in captivity.—Cf. Dt. 30:1. Lv. 26:41–42. This petition in 1 K. 8 is considerably longer (vv. 40–42). The Chronicler substituted a more beautiful ending to the prayer in vv. 34–36.

40–42. The conclusion of the prayer.—Written by the Chronicler. This differs widely from the conclusion given in 1 K. 8:42, where the plea for a hearing of prayer, after Dt. 9:23, is based
VI. 12-42.

PRAYER OF DEDICATION

upon Yahweh’s possession of Israel through their redemption from Egypt. Here, on the other hand, with customary post-exilic forms of invocation, the plea rings with greater exultation in the thought of the Temple being the resting-place of Yahweh, the abode of his ark and of his priests, and in remembrance of the good deeds of David or (better) the divine covenant with him.—40. *Let thine eyes be opened*. Cf. v. 10 1 K. 8 11 Ne. 1 Dn. 9. —And thine ears attentive*. Cf. 7 Ne. 11 Ps. 130.—The prayer of this place* i.e., the prayer directed toward this place, cf. v. 18 (Be.), rather than in this place (Ke., RV.).—41. Parallel with Ps. 132, from which it was probably taken.—*Arise Yahweh*] the first words of the ancient song of the ark, Nu. lo. —For thy resting, etc., Yahweh and his ark had hitherto had no permanent dwelling-place in Israel.—Be clothed with salvation*. Attributes are represented in the OT. as clothing put on (cf. Jb. 29 Ps. 93 104 Is. ii), Salvation is equivalent to righteousness.—And let thy pious ones (those devoted to the service of Yahweh) rejoice in prosperity.—42. *Turn not away the face of thine anointed*] i.e., hear his prayer. The anointed, then, is Solomon. The words are from Ps. 132.—Loving kindnesses of David] either shown to David, especially the promises made to him (cf. Is. 55) (so RV., Be., Kau., Zoe., Oe., Ki.), or, less good, after 32, the good deeds of David (RVm., Ke.).
making an easier construction (יו נְבוּרָה is not common).

—22. יְהוָה קֹדֶשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ. a change by the Chronicler for an easier construction.

—23. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ, which is preferred by Kau., Ki., Bn., and Bur. on K., but SBOT. and Ki. on K. have יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ after Ne. 108.

—24. יְהוָה קֹדֶשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ) simply acc. of place. The Chronicler has similarly inserted מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ in vv. 3–6. • 29 read after i K. 8v and שָׂמַיִם demanded by the parallelism of the following clause (Ki., Bn.).

—26. קֹדֶשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ to be vocalised יְהוָה קֹדֶשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ after i K. 8v (Oe., Kau., Bn., Ki., also AV., RV.). Ba. prefers (with RVm. and ש) because thou answerest them.

—27. Note the omission of the יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ, cf. vv. 26–28. Ki. inserts, after מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ an order of words—subject, conjunction, and verb—not infrequent in P (Lv. 1:2, 4:51, et al., also Is. 28:4 Mi. 5:18 Ps. 621) (see Bur., i K. 8v).—The יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ and Ba. inserts, after מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ i K. 8v (Oe., Kau., Bn., Ki.). Oe. reads, after שָׂמַיִם, בָּאָר גָּאוֹן וְכָל תָּכֹּן. Ba. suggests וַיִּשָּׂא by making a breach in his gates. This verse breaks off abruptly without final verb—aposiopesis (Ges. § 167).

—29. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ cf. v. 23. After מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ many mss., 1 K. + בְּקָדָשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ (הוֹיָא אָדָם מֵאֵיכָו) wanting in i K. 8v. —32. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ without אָדָם מֵאֵיכָו, a reading followed by Klo. in i K. 8v. —After מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ i K. 8v has יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ, which seems to have been omitted through an oversight by the Chronicler or by a抄ist by homoeoteleuton. —33. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ wanting in i K. 8v, but there in כְּגוֹן וִכְלָכְלוֹ (cf. v. 26) similarly i K. 8v has מִן instead of מִן. —35. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ i K. 8v —אָדָם מֵאֵיכָו. The former, required by the person of the verbs, may be the original (St. SBOT., Bur.). —After מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ i K. 8v has יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ instead of מִן. —34. מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ i K. 8v —אָדָם מֵאֵיכָו. The Chronicler has added the pronoun for the sake of clearness.

—36. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ cf. v. 26. After מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ i K. 8v has כְּגוֹן and בָּאָר גָּאוֹן וְכָל תָּכֹּן, but of i K. also omits it, and the lack of the article with יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ and the word is an insertion (St. SBOT.). —37. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ. The reading of Ch. is probably correct (Bur.), but St. SBOT. retains יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ. The former is usually rejected before both (Bur. after מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ, מִן of i K. and מ of Ch.). —38. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ. Connection requires after מִן before יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ (Ki., Bn.). —39. יְהוָה קָדֵשׁ עַל אֶרֶץ wanting in i K., and which of Ch. which Bn. reads.
VII. 1–22. The closing events following the prayer of dedication.—In 1 K. 8:4–9 the first of these events is Solomon’s blessing of the people (vv. 4–11), which is entirely omitted by the Chronicler, perhaps because he had already removed Solomon in a sense from his position before the altar, placing him upon a brazen pulpit (6:11), and perhaps because he regarded such a blessing as the especial function of a priest, or perhaps simply because he thought tradition had supplied a better conclusion in the story of fire descending from heaven which he narrates. This story certainly enhanced the importance of the occasion and testified that the divine approbation was given as clearly at the completion of the Temple as at the time of the original selection of its site (1 Ch. 21:30). The statement that with the descent of the fire the glory of Yahweh filled the house and that the priests could not enter (v. 11), is most natural in this connection. Yet since the cloud had also manifested itself before Solomon’s prayer, according to the narrative given in 1 K. 8:1–10 and reproduced in 5:11, it has been assumed that here another written source was used by the Chronicler (Bn., Ki.), yet the Chronicler could have invented this narrative even as he added the miraculous fire in 1 Ch. 21:30.

1. Now when Solomon had made an end of praying]. These words are from 1 K. 8:64.—The fire, etc.]. Cf. 1 Ch. 21:29 and especially for this and the following verse Lv. 9:24. That offerings were at hand on the altar for sacrifice after the prayer of dedication is most natural; hence the omission of any reference to their preparation is not striking (cf. also 5:1).—2. Cf. 5:11 Ex. 40:31–32. The pavement] clearly a marked feature of the court of the Temple (cf. Ez. 40:17). These verses show how the narrative of P concerning the appearances of Yahweh in connection with the tabernacle, influenced at the time of the Chronicler the story of Solomon’s Temple.

4–7. The sacrifices of the King and people.—Taken from 1 K. 8:62–64, with the addition of the musical service of the priests and the Levites mentioned in v. 1.—5. Twenty-two thousand oxen and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep]. The correctness of these figures cannot be tested because the number of persons present at the dedication is difficult to estimate. The number 120,000
(10,000 for each tribe) appears to be artificial. In Roman times 256,500 paschal lambs are said to have been slaughtered in a few hours (Jos. B. J. vi. 9, 3).—6. According to their offices] i.e., in their appointed positions (auf ihren Posten, Kau.). The Levites also stood in similar stations with the musical instruments designed for sacred service which David had made (cf. 1 Ch. 23* Am. 6*) to give thanks unto Yahweh (for his loving kindness endureth forever) when David praised through their ministry (lit. their hands). The emphasis is on the fact of the Levites using instruments "which David had introduced when he praised God by the playing of the Levites" (Ke.).—And the priests sounded, etc.]. Cf. 5*.

1. Moreover, Solomon hallowed the middle of the court that was before the house of Yahweh]. This statement, taken substantially from 1 K. 8*, purports to be the description of a temporary altar, but probably preserves the memory of the real and only altar of Solomon's day, viz., the top of the rock in front of the house, cf. note on 4*.

—Because the brazen altar which Solomon had made was not able to receive, etc.]. The glossator who introduced the brazen altar into 1 K. 8* probably thought of a smaller structure than that which the Chronicler describes (4*), hence this remark is less appropriate here than in 1 K.

8–10. The feast.—Taken from 1 K. 8*, with the following notable modifications. In the original text of Kings the feast, presumably that of the Tabernacles, lasted seven days, and on the eighth day the people were dismissed to their homes. This duration of the feast is in accordance with the Deuteronomic law (Dt. 16*). In Chronicles we have not one festival, but two; first that of the Dedication of the Altar, seven days, and secondly that of the Feast of Tabernacles, seven days. This first appears in 1 K. 8* in the and seven days even fourteen days, but those words are wanting in BL, and the way in which the next verse commences with reference to the eighth day shows that they formed no part of the original text, but have crept in, probably through the influence of Chronicles or the tradition which Chronicles represents (Ki., Bn., Bur., SBOT., et al.). The Chronicler seems to have taken exception to the use of the Feast of Tabernacles, which served for a special purpose, for the dedication of the Temple, and makes the King therefore cele-
brate a double feast: the dedication of the Temple from the eighth to the fourteenth day of the seventh month, and the Feast of Tabernacles from the fifteenth to the twenty-second day, the people being dismissed on the twenty-third (v. 18) (SBOT. on K.). He also introduces on the eighth day of the second festival a holy assembly (v. 8) after the law of P, which added this to the Feast of Tabernacles (Lv. 23:44), and thus his day of dismissal is the ninth day, the twenty-third day of the seventh month (v. 18). (The Feast of Tabernacles commenced on the fifteenth day of the month and its last day was the twenty-first day; the following day of holy convocation was the twenty-second, and the day after that the twenty-third.)

—8. So Solomon held the feast at that time seven days] i.e., the Feast of Tabernacles from the fifteenth to the twenty-first of the seventh month (v. s.).—From the entrance of Hamath unto the brook of Egypt] the extreme northern and southern boundaries respectively, cf. 1 Ch. 13:4. The brook of Egypt is usually identified with mod. Wady el Arish, south-west of Palestine in the wilderness of Paran (cf. EBi. II. col. 1249; DB. I. p. 667).—9. On the eighth day] the twenty-second of the seventh month.—The dedication of the altar seven days] from the eighth to the fourteenth (v. s.).—10. Unto their tents] not unusual for homes, cf. Ps. 111:9 Ju. 19: et al.

11-22. The vision in answer to Solomon’s prayer.—Based upon 1 K. 9:1-5, yet containing the independent vv. 16-18.

This new matter, from the common expression my ears shall be attentive (תנש המים), seems akin to the new ending to the dedicatory prayer, and hence the entire paragraph, since the text of 1 K. also in other points is not always closely followed, is held by Bn. and Ki. to have come from another source than 1 K., but there is really no reason why the Chronicler need not have written it.

12. For a house of sacrifice]. This phrase, while in full accord with the Deuteronomic idea of the choice of the sanctuary as a dwelling-place of the divine name (given in 1 K. 8: and v. 18), yet expresses more distinctly the priestly idea of the Temple as the place of sacrifice.—13. This and the two following verses in their condition and promise are parallel with the form of Solomon’s prayer in the previous chapter (cf. 6:11-12).—14. My people upon
whom my name is called]. This idiom means that they belong to Yahweh, hence Yahweh owes them protection, cf. 6."—15. Cf. 6*—20. And I will make it a proverb and a by-word among all peoples] the Deuteronomic punishment for disobedience, cf. Dt. 28* also Je. 24*.

1. noSiy niSaai i K. 8*—2. Dr. TH. § 128, p. 89 f.n.; Ges. § 116b.—3. Ges. § 113a; Ew. § 351 c. Such a form of the inf. abs. is not entirely unknown elsewhere, cf. Ges. §§ 75f., 113c.—4. wanting in i K. 8* though there in G.—1 K. after whom has כ醫生 instead ofở in Ch. Kau. prefers as the necessary correlative form with מה.—5. i K. 8*—6. i K. has יושב.—7. The Chronicler introduces the altar as Solomon's, in view of its size, i K. mentions no such great altar (cf. 4*).—8. In i K. 8* has שמענה הנבואה and precede the gloss (v. s.) close the verse, but between them and סכמה יושב I K. has the words שמענה הנבואה and סכה יושב.—9. This verse, save in the words בשמים הביאו, is entirely independent of i K. 8*—10. In i K. 8* the dismissal is on the 8th day (of the feast) instead of the 23rd of the month of the seventh month. And instead of simply I K. has שמענה הנבואה and בשמים הביאו I K. 8* follows בשמים הביאו some mss., i K. 8*—11. The Chronicler introduces the altar as Solomon's, in view of its size, i K. mentions no such great altar (cf. 4*).

17. After i K. 9* has I K. 10* is now resumed and introduced with a parallel to I have sanctified this house in the statement I have chosen this place for myself, etc.—16. The text of i K. 9* is now resumed and introduced with a parallel to I have sanctified this house in the statement I have chosen this place for myself, etc.—16.
VIII. 1–18. Various Doings of Solomon.—Taken with some changes from 1 K. 9:10–11.

1–2. The exchange of cities with Hiram.—1 K. 9:10–11. This transaction has been given an entirely different appearance by the Chronicler. According to the narrative of Kings, Solomon gave the King of Tyre twenty cities (towns or villages) in payment for timber and gold, and Hiram was displeased with them, although he seems to have annexed them under the name Cabul to his kingdom. But according to the narrative of Chronicles, Solomon received the cities from Hiram and rebuilt or embellished or fortified and colonised them with Israelites. The two statements have been harmonised (1) by the assumption that Solomon first ceded the twenty cities to Hiram, who, because they were in bad condition or of little worth (cf. 1 K. 9:11), restored them to him, whereupon Solomon built them up (Jos. Ant. viii. 5, 3, Seb. Schmidt, Starke, Dahler, Ke.); (2) by the assumption that Solomon gave Hiram twenty Israelitish cities for which the latter gave him twenty Phoenician cities, and that Kings refers to the former gift and Chronicles to the latter...
(Kimchi and other Jewish commentators). In reality, however, the Chronicler has remodelled the statement of Kings (Be., Oe.), the thought being probably offensive to him that Solomon should part with any of his territory to Hiram, or incredible that the rich and glorious Solomon should have been so pressed for money that he would sell a portion of his territory, hence the passage was changed to convey the opposite meaning. That the passage in Chronicles is directly dependent upon that of Kings and not a free composition is seen in the parallelism between the introductory verses.—1. Twenty years]. Seven years were spent in building the Temple (1 K. 6:1) and thirteen in building the palace (1 K. 7:1).—2. Built] with the force of rebuild or enlarge (BDB. חַשֵּׁב 1 i.) or fortify (Bn., Ki.); so also built in the following verses.

3-6. The store and military cities which Solomon built.—Taken with considerable variation from 1 K. 9:17-19. The Chronicler has entirely omitted the contents of 1 K. 9:17-19. which speak of Solomon's levy caused by a number of building operations, and of his acquisition of Gezer through Pharaoh his father-in-law; and omitting the reference to Gezer in v. 17, he has rearranged the contents of the verse and given also a new introduction to the paragraph in the statement of a campaign not mentioned elsewhere against Hamath-zobah, probably with reference to Tadmor, which the Chronicler has constructed out of Tamar (v. i.).—3. Hamath-zobah]. Cf. 1 Ch. 18:4. This campaign, since it is not mentioned in 1 K., is generally entirely ignored in histories of Israel or Solomon. Neither Bn. nor Ki. discusses its historicity. Certainly it is very doubtful; yet Winckler thinks it not at all incredible (Gesch. Is. II. p. 266, KAT. I. p. 239).—4. Tadmor] in the text of 1 K. 9:18 is Tamar (תָּמָר), but the Qr. or margin has Tadmor (תַּדְמֹר). This is followed by all versions (Palmyram) and was formerly accepted as the true reading of 1 K. Tadmor was the later Palmyra situated north-east of Damascus; but the other towns mentioned in 1 K. 9:18 are all in S. Palestine, and in Ez. 47:16 48:19 a Tamar (תָּמָר) is placed in the extreme south; hence the text of 1 K. seems to be the true reading and the reference is to Tamar in S. Judah (Bn., Ki., Bur., et al.), but the Chronicler has glorified this obscure southern city into the Tadmor of the north, and, as mentioned above, composed v. as an introduc-
tion.—And all the store cities which he built in Hamath]. This statement has no parallel in 1 K., but is simply the Chronicler's completion of the reference to Tadmor as one of a line of fortified posts on the northern frontier of Solomon's kingdom.—5. In 1 K. 9:11 only the lower Beth-horon is mentioned. Upper Beth-horon and fortified cities with walls, doors, and bars are an addition of the Chronicler. On the location of the Beth-horons cf. 1 Ch. 6:22 (vii).—6. Ba'alath] Jos. 19:14 1 K. 9:11 †, not clearly identified.

7-10. Solomon's bond-servants.—Taken from 1 K. 9:11-12.—8. Whom the children of Israel consumed not]. The reading of 1 K. 9:11 "whom the children of Israel were not able utterly to destroy" was an unpleasant admission to the Chronicler, hence this change. —Of them did Solomon raise a levy]. According to the clear implication of 1 K. 5:17-19 (12-14), at least the levy of 30,000 men for work in the Lebanons was composed of Israelites, and probably also the levy of 150,000 men. The revolt under Rehoboam (1 K. 12) was based upon this oppressive measure. This passage (from a late addition to 1 K.) is merely an attempt to rescue the reputation of Solomon. (Cf. Sm. Hist. pp. 157 f.).—10. Even two hundred and fifty] is at variance with the number in 1 K. 9:11 "five hundred and fifty" (v. i.).

11. The house of Pharaoh's daughter.—Rewritten from 1 K. 9:16. According to 1 K. 3:1 Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter on her marriage into the city of David until the completion of his palace, when he made also a house for her (1 K. 7:2), and according to 1 K. 9:16 she moved from the city of David into this house. The Chronicler passes over entirely the first statement and interprets the removal as caused by Solomon from a religious motive. The city of David the Chronicler interprets as the holy precincts where the ark had been brought and where, after the notion of Ezekiel (44:1), the presence of Solomon's foreign wife might be regarded as a sacrilege. In 1 K. 9:16 it is also stated that Solomon then built Millo. This is entirely omitted in Chronicles (an evidence according to Bu. of the use here of another written source than K., but such omission is entirely agreeable to the Chronicler's handling of the text).

12 f. Solomon's ministrations at the altar of the Temple.—Rewritten from 1 K. 9:16. According to this verse in Kings, Solomon
offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings three times in a year, clearly on the three annual feasts commanded by the legislation of JE (Ex. 23:1-19) and of D (Dt. 16:1-17). This ministration the Chronicler retains, mentioning also the feasts by name (v. 18b), but in addition to these annual services the weekly Sabbath and monthly ones are added (v. 18a) and thus the ministrations of the King are made to conform more with the fully developed ritual of P (Lv. 23:1-24:21). All trace, also, of any service at the altar of incense (mentioned in 1 K. 9:4), which would be an unlawful act (cf. 26:6), has been removed by the clear definition of the altar as the one which he [Solomon] had built before the porch, i.e., the great brazen altar of burnt-offering (41).—12. Then] after the dedication of the Temple when this service of Solomon commenced.—13. The commandment of Moses] a comprehensive expression for the legislation given in the Pentateuch. Sabbaths, months, and seasons or set feasts cover the fixed times when extra ceremonies in the ritual of offerings were required. These were the weekly Sabbaths and the beginnings of each month, including the Feast of Trumpets, and the three great festivals with their associated days of wavesheaf (with the Passover) and atonement (in the same month with the Feast of Tabernacles) (cf. Lv. 23:25 Nu. 28:2-29:26). On these days it is implied that the King himself took part in some direct way in the sacrificial services.

14–16. Solomon's appointments for service in the Temple and its completion.—A continuation of the elaboration of 1 K. 9:18, parallel only in v. 18b with 1 K. 9:27.—14. For David's order for the divisions of the priests and the Levites and the gate-keepers cf. 1 Ch. 23-26.—15. The king] David.—The treasures] i.e., the furniture of the Temple and the stuff contributed for its services and support, the provision for its ministers (cf. 1 Ch. 26:1-26).—16. The final summary: And all the work of Solomon was accomplished from the day of the foundation of the house of Yahweh unto the completion of the house of Yahweh through Solomon* (Bn., Ki.).

17 f. Solomon's trade at Ophir.—Taken with some changes from 1 K. 9:26–31. According to 1 K., Solomon builds ships at Ezion-geber and Hiram, King of Tyre, provides him with sailors that go with the servants of Solomon to Ophir. According to Chronicles,
Solomon went to Ezion-geber, where Hiram sent him both ships and sailors. This discrepancy has been reconciled on the supposition that the sending of ships was only the sending of material for their construction (Ke., Zoe.); or an identity of meaning has been found by following $\mathbf{G}$, $\mathbf{H}$, in striking ou to him (תל), i.e., Hiram sent likewise to Ophir ships from a harbour on the Red Sea or Persian Gulf where the Phoenicians might have had a trading-post (Oe.). But the discrepancy is real and probably arose through the Chronicler’s careless reading of the text of 1 K., unless one may assume such a lack of geographical knowledge that he really thought ships, as well as sailors, could be sent from Tyre to Ezion-geber. According to Chronicles 450 talents of gold were brought back, while according to Kings only 420. — Ezion-geber and Eloth. These two places were near together at the northern extremity of the Gulf of 'Akabah. The exact site of the former is unknown; on the supposition that the gulf extended formerly further inland, Robinson identified it with 'Ain-el-Ghudyan, fifteen miles north of the present head of the gulf. Elath or Eloth is the modern 'Akabah at the head of the gulf. — Ophir. The exact locality is unknown. It has been placed on the eastern coast of Africa, in India, and in south-eastern Arabia. The latter is the most likely (cf. 1 Ch. 11).
copyist's oversight. Bn., Ki., find, however, in this evidence for another copy than 1 K. before the Chronicler.—1 K. has at close of verse after 등, 11. apparently [pl., perhaps after the analogy of the plurals of place or spatial extension.—13. The same phrase wanting the מ with ו becomes in Lv. 231. To omit מ gives an easier reading, but all mss. have it (Be.); מ essentially (Ke., Zoe.). See apparently revealing (Oe.).—14. instead of inf. abs., Ew. § 280 d (Ke., Zoe., Oe.).

Cf. 1 Ch. 9:15, 155 Ges. § 114k (?).—cf. Dt. 16:6.—14. cf. 1 Ch. 6:18 (111) (l. 89).—cf. 1 Ch. 15:11.—cf. 1 Ch. 23:4 (l. 42).—cf. 1 Ch. 9:17.—cf. at every gate (l. 124).—15. retained by Ke., Zoe., cf. Ew. § 282 a; read with ו (Be., Kau., Ki. Kom.; pl. (בְּשָׁם) Oe., Ke., SBOT.—16. unto the (this) day, i.e., the day on which after the consecration of the completed Temple the regular public worship was commenced in it (Be., Ke., Zoe.). Now all the work of Solomon was prepared until this day, the foundation of the house until its completion: the house of Yahweh was finished (Ke.). সোলোমন তার কাজগুলি পর্যন্ত প্রস্তুত ছিল। তার দৃষ্টিকোণে যাহুদি মসজিদটি পূর্ণ হয়ে গেছে।

IX. 1-12. The visit of the Queen of Sheba.—Taken with almost no variations from 1 K. 10:1-11. —1. Sheba] the land of the Sabeans, often mentioned in the OT., cf. 1 Ch. 1:33. Since Sheba was famous for its trade (Ez. 27:11) and costly wares (Ez. 38:11), its Queen could well have heard of Solomon and his luxurious court. In Is. 60:6 its inhabitants are represented as about to bring gold and frankincense as tribute to Israel and to pay homage to Yahweh.—Hard questions] (הצְּדָּקִים). This word is used in the sense of dark, obscure sayings, or riddles to be guessed (as in the Samson stories, Ju. 14), or simply perplexing questions, the probable meaning here (BDB.). The Queen of Sheba with costly gifts came to test the report of Solomon’s wisdom and glory, of which she had heard in distant Arabia.—2. After she had tested the King’s wisdom and, 3,
had observed the house that he had built—i.e., either the Temple or, what is more likely, the palace (cf. v. 1), or all his buildings considered as one structure—and, 4, the luxurious appointments of his servants; there was no more spirit (breath) in her, she being quite overcome by astonishment. Cf. Jos. 2:5, where the phrase is used for the loss of breath through fear.—And his ascent by which he went up unto the house of Yahweh] AV., RV., but read rather with RVm. of 1 K. 10:2 and his burnt-offering which he offered in the house of Yahweh (v. i.).—6. The Chronicler emphasises that Solomon’s wisdom rather than his wealth causes the great astonishment of the foreign queen by adding to the account in 1 K. the words the greatness of thy wisdom.—8. The words his (Yahweh’s) throne (1 K. 10:2 on the throne of Israel) to be king for Yahweh thy God (an addition of the Chronicler) show in a striking way the theocratic stand-point of the Chronicler, cf. 1 Ch. 28:29.—9. A hundred and twenty talents of gold] a sum equivalent to more than three and one-half millions of dollars.—10. Algum-trees] Cf. 27:21.—12. Besides that which she had brought unto the king. This text of Chronicles implies that Solomon gave the Queen of Sheba all her desire besides the equivalent of that which she had brought to him (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.). This notion may have arisen from the thought that Solomon should in no way be indebted to the Queen. R renders et multo plura quam altulerat ad eum. Bertheau would read besides that which the king (of his free will) gave to her (Sidon). The text of 1 K. 10:14, besides that which he gave her according to the hand of King Solomon, means that Solomon gave to the Queen of Sheba gifts commensurate with his own wealth and power (SBOT.).
2 CHRONICLES

The last clause in G here and in 1 K. is kai ek taurhri etvero. G here has this and also kai oke ἐπὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θυρίῳ. —5. After the same 1 K. 10:5 has the. —6. After the same 1 K. 10:5] wanting in 1 K., an addition of the Chronicler for clearness, taking the place of zhvmpya, written in G, which in 1 K. follows νησις. Instead of ης 1 K. has τὰ. —7. G, B, D of 1 K. 10:8 have preferred there by Klo., Kamp., Bn., Ki. SBOT., Bur., and here by Kau., Ki., Bn. G has this, but G follows B. —8. In 1 K. 10:9 has לֶמֶךְ לִי נַחְלִי תַּחְתֶּךָ. נְבֵא יִשְׂרָאֵל. —9. I have this and also לֶמֶךְ לִי נַחְלִי תַּחְתֶּךָ wanting in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —10. want in 1 K.; must refer to Israel. —11. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —12. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —13. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —14. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —15. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —16. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —17. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —18. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —19. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —20. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —21. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —22. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —23. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —24. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —25. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —26. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —27. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel. —28. want in 1 K.; a more directly Messianic thought, keeping in view the future of Israel.

13–28. The wealth of Solomon.—Taken from 1 K. 10:14—33. The variations are very slight.—13. Six hundred and sixty-six talents of gold] i.e., about twenty millions of dollars, constituted the regular annual income.—15. Each of the two hundred bucklers contained nearly 22 pounds (avoirdupois) of gold, worth nearly 6,000 dollars, and, 16, each of the three hundred shields contained half this amount. The reading, three maneh, in 1 K. 10:15 is incorrect (v. i.).—17. Ivory] was secured by Solomon’s navy, cf. v. i.—21. According to Chronicles the fleet of Solomon went to Tarshish. That this view was incorrect is seen from the products of the East brought back by the vessels and by the reference in 1 K. 22:40 to Jehoshaphat’s ships of Tarshish which were stationed at Ezion-
geber on the Gulf of Elah to go to Ophir. The Chronicler misunderstood in both of these instances the phrase ships of Tarshish, which described a class of vessels such as were used by the Phoenicians in their voyages to Tartessus in Spain, and not their destination as he supposed. The accuracy of his statement, however, has been absurdly defended on the supposition that the vessels made a circuit of Africa to Spain (see Eng. Trans. of Zoe. Com. in Lange Series, pp. 28 f.).—25–28. Cf. 11:11.

13. is wanting in 1 K. 10:5. Since these words appear in 1 K. 10:5, they represent the original text of Ch. (cf. 2:19 also). In their source, 1 K., they are usually regarded as a corruption, and the emendations suggested are numerous. Since 2 has χυρίς τῶν φόρων τῶν οὐτοταγμένων, and 39 = φόρων in 2 K. 23:10, Boe. read 'the same for the hebrew, and SBOT. (on K.) with  הרתים וגו'.—14.  וגו'. Ki. Kom. reads there and here  המה, which has "cities" for "hebrew. Kau. following Kamp. . . .  Abgeschen von dem was einkam von . . . Bn. suggests (כמים ולך וגו') and der König, etc.—15. Arabia 1 K. 14:1. The former is read in 1 K. by Bn., Ki., SBOT. (notes), et al.—16.  וגו'. The text of Ch. is correct, as the foregoing shows. Gold was reckoned in shekels (Bn.).—17.  וגו'. The original text of K. as seen in 6 was probably וגו'. The change in K. to  round top  was made because calves were offensive as symbols of Yahweh. In Ch. "lams" (בבל) was substituted, which later was read footstool (בבל) and was read (Hoph. part.).  BA omits the clause, though retained in 6, מלחין וגו'.—19.  וגו'. The Chronicler omits the clause, though retained in 6, מלחין וגו'.—20.  מלחין טו'.—21. בדו. K. 10:6, 10:10, and 10:12; also  K. 1 K. 10:10, and  K. 10:12.—22. (M. 22.  וגו'.—23.  וגו'.—24.  וגו'.—25. Before  כְּуйנָא המלחים, which the Chronicler omits here, but uses elsewhere, cf. 14:11. The text of Ch., and Solomon had four thousand stalls of horses, is that of
in K., and according to Bur. was probably the original there, but yet of K. may be suspected of having come under the influence of Ch. Moreover, close verbal agreement shows that the Chronicler here followed I K. 59, and so of K. as his source (v. notes on 111). This reading, except in the final pron. suf. (לעם), has the support of C (certainly original of K), the underlying Heb. of which was doubtless the original of Ch., and should be rendered, and Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses for the chariots.—

The former has the support of all Vrss.—26. wanting in Heb. of I K., but present there in C. The verse is taken either from a different text of I K. 10, or from I K. 59 (41) with the subject omitted (I K. וישלחו את and the kings substituted for the kingdoms.—28. The final phrase, is the Chronicler’s happy generalisation of the somewhat obscure passage in K. (see 111).

29–31. The final summary of the reign of Solomon.—Taken with variations from I K. 11111. The variations are as follows: The acts are called the first and the last, which qualifying phrase is added frequently by the Chronicler to the summaries taken from Kings (cf. 12161120 259 269 289 359). Their written source is not “the book of the acts of Solomon,” the one given in I K. 111, but the acts of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the visions of Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat. These sources were not independent works, but were either sections of the canonical books or of the Book of Kings mentioned elsewhere (see Intro. p. 22). Nathan the prophet appears at the beginning of Solomon’s reign (I K. 1), Ahijah near its close (I K. 11111.), hence in the acts or history of Nathan and in the prophecy of Ahijah we probably have references to I K. Whether this is so in the vision of Iddo the seer is more doubtful. This may refer to the Chronicler’s other source (cf. 12139); yet the unknown prophet of I K. 13 is called by Josephus Jadon, a name equivalent to Iddo (Ant. viii. 8, 5), and he may thus have been known at the time of the Chronicler.—31. Slept with his fathers part of the regular formula with which the compiler of 1 and 2 K. closes his account of the reign of each king, denoting either nothing more than that one had died as his fathers had, or more likely implying association with his fathers in the realm of the dead and
thus some condition of future life.—And was buried in the city of David]. Cf. 1 Ch. 15**. This phrase is also a part of the formula just mentioned.

29. יִוְיֶלָל שלמה [Kt. נִוֶּרְי, Qr. נוֹרְיָה — 30. נֵזְר נוֹסְר for the longer text of 1 K. 11**. נוֹרְיָה [Kt. נוֹרְיָה, Qr. נוֹרְיָה — 31. נוֹרְיָה instead of Niph. נוֹרְיָה in 1 K. 11**.}
X—XXXVI. THE HISTORY OF JUDAH FROM REHOBOAM UNTIL THE EXILE.

In contrast with the author of 1 and 2 Kings, the Chronicler ignores the N. kingdom and confines his narrative to the fortunes of Judah. His most noteworthy additions to the earlier history are the introduction of prophets and Levites. The former utter discourses of warning and admonition, and the latter are prominent in events concerning the Temple.

X—XII. The Reign of Rehoboam (c. 937—920 B.C.).—The Chronicler has incorporated into his narrative the entire account of this reign given in 1 K. 12:1—11, 20—14:11, 14:12, with the exception of 14:12—13, omitted owing to its unfavourable view of the religious condition of Judah under Rehoboam. Chapter 10 is almost a verbatim duplicate of 1 K. 12:1—11. The Chronicler's additions to his material from 1 K. in c. 11 are accounts (a) of Rehoboam's fortifications (11:1—11), (b) of the immigration from the N. tribes (11:12—17), and (c) of the royal family (11:18—29); (b) appears to be based upon 1 K. 12:11, but (a) and (c) are independent of 1 K. and may represent other sources. In c. 12 the Chronicler gives much fuller detail respecting the invasion of Shishak—first, in reference to its cause, the religious defection of Rehoboam and his people (12:1—4); and secondly, in giving an account of the invading host (12:5); and thirdly, in introducing a prophetic admonition whereby through the humiliation of Rehoboam and the people the wrath of Yahweh is averted (12:6—19). The picture thus given of the reign of Rehoboam is strikingly different from that of 1 K. There the people are represented as exceedingly apostate (1 K. 14:22—24) and nothing good is said of Rehoboam. The Chronicler, on the other hand, magnifies Rehoboam as a builder of cities and as a ruler of ardent worshippers of Yahweh, only forsaking the law of Yahweh when he was strong,
a supposition necessary to explain the invasion of Shishak, from whom the land was correspondingly delivered upon the humiliation of the King and his princes.

X. Rehoboam's rejection by Israel at Shechem.—An almost verbatim duplicate of 1 K. 12:1-19.—1. Shechem] mod. Nablus, lying under the north-east base of Mt. Gerizim (Baed. p. 215 ff.), mentioned frequently in the early narratives of Israel (Gn. 12* 33* 35* 37* etc.). The assembly of tribes here shows that in spite of the intervening reign of Solomon the N. tribes held still to their ancient right of choosing their sovereign, exercised in the case of Saul and David (1 S. 11* 2 S. 5* 1 Ch. ii*).—2. This verse, already dislocated in Kings, properly precedes v. 1 (v. i.). The Chronicler mentions Jeroboam without introduction, assuming his readers acquainted with the particulars of 1 K. 11* , which he has omitted (v. v. 11). The report which Jeroboam heard was of the death of Solomon.—3. And they sent and called him] (wanting in G of 1 K. 12*) a necessary connecting gloss for the present arrangement of the verses in 1 K. 12:1.—4. The service and the yoke were the required revenue (1 K. 5* (4*)) and the forced labour (1 K. 5* (4*)), neither of which is mentioned in Chronicles.—10. My little finger, etc.]. This proverb-like expression and that of the following verse mean: I have the will and the power to oppress you more severely than my father did.—11. Whips]. The whip was in Egypt an emblem of royalty (EBi. IV. col. 5300).—Scorpions] probably the name given to a whip whose lash was furnished with sharp pieces of metal.—13. And the king answered them roughly]. Such folly shows how thoroughly Rehoboam was permeated with the feelings of an Oriental despot, and how little he understood the weakness of the hold of the house of David upon the N. tribes.—15. His word which he spake by Ahijah]. Cf. 1 K. 11* , a narrative not given in Chronicles, and yet thus assumed to be known.—16. We have no share in David, and no part in Jesse's son: each to thy tents, O Israel, now see to thy house, David]. This same cry, with the exception of the last line, was raised by Sheba in his short-lived rebellion against David (2 S. 20*).—To their tents] not to their homes, but to their places of encampment at Shechem.—17. A verse anticipating subsequent action and thus clearly out
of place (wanting in \( G \) of 1 K. 12), either a gloss in Kings or to be placed after v. \(^1\).—18 f. Adoniram\(^*\). Cf. 1 K. 4\(^*\) 5\(\mbox{f}^*\) (v1). This officer of Solomon's reign probably had quelled dissatisfaction before, but this time he failed.—Unto this day] in the narrative of the Chronicler an anachronism (cf. 5\(\mbox{f}^*\)). The Chronicler at this point, because he is narrating only the history of the S. kingdom, omits verse 20 of 1 K. 12, which contains the statement that Jeroboam was made king by the N. tribes.

1. \( \text{בָּא} \) 1 K. 11 .—2. In \( \text{בָּא} \) of K. this verse is found in 1 K. 11 between v. 40\(\mbox{f}^*\) and v. 41\(\mbox{f}^*\), with the addition in \( \text{בָּא} \), "he returned (?) and went to his city Sareira which is in Mt. Ephraim." Hence as it now stands it should precede v. 1 (Bur.), and is so printed in St. \( \text{בָּא} \). After שָׁם 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) has וַיֶּלֶת .—אִּי מַכְּרוּ שָׁם \( \text{בָּא} \). The former is the true reading (Ki. \( \text{בָּא} \)).—3. Before וַיֶּלֶת 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) has מַכְּרוּ.—4. Before רָתַּם 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) has וַיֶּלֶת , which after \( \text{בָּא} \) should be inserted (Ki. \( \text{בָּא} \)).—5. Instead of רָתַּם וַיֶּלֶת the Vrss. in both K. and Ch. read רָתַּם וַיֶּלֶת .—6. Before רָתַּם וַיֶּלֶת 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) have מַכְּרוּ . which should be inserted (Ki. \( \text{בָּא} \)).—7. Before מַכְּרוּ 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) has מַכְּרוּ which is wanting in 1 K. \( \text{בָּא} \).—8. Before מַכְּרוּ 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) has מַכְּרוּ . which should be inserted (Ki. \( \text{בָּא} \)).—9. Before מַכְּרוּ 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) has מַכְּרוּ . which should be inserted (Ki. \( \text{בָּא} \)).—10. After מַכְּרוּ 1 K. 12\(\mbox{f}^*\) has מַכְּרוּ . which should be inserted (Ki. \( \text{בָּא} \)).
XI. 1-4. Rehoboam dissuaded from attacking Israel.—
With very slight variations from 1 K. 12:1-4, which belongs to the
latest strata of the book.—1. **A hundred and eighty thousand** a
small number compared with those elsewhere in 2 Ch. reckoned to
the S. kingdom: under Abijah 400,000 (13a), under Asa 580,000
(14b), under Jehoshaphat 1,160,000 (17a).—2. **Shemaiah**
mentioned also in 12:1, giving a reproof and a promise of deliver¬
ance in connection with the invasion of Shishak; and his **words**
in 12:1 as a source of the history of Rehoboam.

1. nu ^Dnu in pa© — 1 K. 12:1 i K. pou a nh®.
— 1 K. 12:1 73®.— 1 K. i K. naiSon. — 1 K. np®.— 1 K. 12:2
Sh®.—The Chronicler has thus, without impairing the narra¬
tive, shortened this verse by the omission of five words.—2. **Y®**] 1 K.
12:2, but some mss. and the Vrss. have Y® in 1 K., preferred by
12:3. The Chronicler frequently uses the term Israel in reference to the S. kingdom,
6. 23. Rehoboam’s prosperity.—This section, independent of
1 K., falls into three well-defined paragraphs all of which are either
from the pen of the Chronicler (H-J.) or from three sources
(Bn., Ki.).

Vv. 4-18 may be regarded as either from the Chronicler (Kau., H-J.)
or from an uncanonical source (Bn.), the Chronicler’s pre-midrashic fore¬
runner annotated in v. 16 by the insertion of in Judah and Benjamin
(Ki.). These words, since all the cities enumerated are in Judah (cf. in
Judah in v. 1), if the material is older than the Chronicler, are a gloss.
Benjamin did not historically belong to the S. kingdom, but through the
incorporation of its territory into the S. kingdom after the fall of Samaria
the tribe was later reckoned as having originally sided with Judah, and
this view appears in 1 K. 11:6 (not 12:6). Linguistically these verses
belong to the Chronicler and he may well be regarded as their author.
This likewise is true of the remainder of the chapter, although vv. 18-22
are assigned by Ki. to another source representing material of historical
worth. For marks of the Chronicler cf. כיס (l. 124) (l. 134) v. 11; מ الإرهاب (l. 20); nu Hiph. (l. 30) v. 14; Hiph. (l. 89) vv.
8; הב (l. 78) v. 14; מנה (l. 76) vv. 22; construction of sen¬
tence (II. 117, 129) v. 22; ויר (l. 105) v. 22.
5–12. Rehoboam's fortification of cities.—These cities were on the roads to Egypt, or on the western hills of the Judæan Shephelah, and hence were fortified as a protection against Egypt, and in view of the invasion of Shishak the record of their fortification may well have historical foundation. Compared with the frontier cities fortified by Solomon (1 K. 9:14–17, 18), they illustrate the shrunken condition of Rehoboam's kingdom (GAS. J. II. p. 89). Winckler (KAT. p. 241) holds that their building, i.e., rebuilding, was occasioned through their destruction in insurrections at the time of Rehoboam's accession. 6. Beth-lehem]. 
Cf. i Ch. 2:9.—Etam]. Cf. i Ch. 4:7.—Tekoa]. Cf. i Ch. 4:7.
A town in the Shephelah, mod. eš-Šuwēke, south-southeast from Beth-shemesh (Rob. BR. I. p. 494, n. 7; Buhl, GAP. p. 194; BDB.), to be distinguished from the Soco of i Ch. 4:5.—'Adullam] the fortress mentioned in the history of David (1 S. 22:2), clearly in the Shephelah (Ne. 11:11 Mi. 1:8), conjectured the hill 'Aid- el-ma off the Wady es Sur (GAS. HGHL. p. 229), otherwise not identified.—8. Gath]. Cf. i Ch. 18:1. Gath can scarcely have belonged to Judah at the time of Rehoboam, since at the time of Solomon it had its own king (1 K. 2:1), and it probably remained Philistine until its destruction, c. 750 (Am. 6:1), occasioned not unlikely by Uzziah (26:1), but whoever wrote 9:9 had placed Philistia under Solomon.—Mareshah]. Cf. i Ch. 2:7.—Ziph]. Cf. i Ch. 2:7.
9. Adoraim†] mod. Dūra west of Hebron.—Lachish] a notable frontier town frequently mentioned (cf. Jos. 10 Mi. 11:2 K. 18:11), mod. Tell-el-Hesy, recently excavated, thirty-three miles south-west from Jerusalem, and east from Gaza (Baed. p. 118).—'Azekah] Jos. 10:10 15:1 S. 17:1 Je. 34:1 Ne. 11:9 †, not identified.—10. Zorah] Jos. 15:15 19:12 Ju. 13:1 16:18 a. 11 Ne. 11:7 †, mod. Šara, fifteen miles west of Jerusalem (BDB.).—Aijalon]. Cf. i Ch. 6:10 †.—Hebron]. Cf. i Ch. 3:6 4:17 11:1.—In Judah, except Zorah and Aijalon, which were in the territory of Dan (Jos. 19:10); hence it has been assumed that these later came into the possession of Benjamin (Ke., Zoe., Oe.), but the words are a comprehensive term for
the S. kingdom. They are held by some to be a gloss (v. s.). —

11 f. This picture of fortresses victualled and garrisoned throughout the land seems to imply that they were intended to keep Judah in subjection (v. s. Winckler) and to justify the rendering of the last clause and so Judah and Benjamin became his (Ba.), but we prefer the view that they were fortified as a protection against Egypt.


13-17. The immigration to Judah. — 13. And the priests and Levites that were in all Israel coming out of all their territory took their stand with him. Faithful servants of Yahweh, from the Chronicler’s point of view, would necessarily side with Rehoboam. — 14. Their open lands] the land round the Levitical cities in which the community had common rights and which according to P was never to be sold (Lv. 25:4 Nu. 35:4, cf. 1 Ch. 6:11 (a1)). — And their possessions] i.e., their other landed property in cities, including houses, which also were an inalienable possession of the Levites, although not of other Israelites (Lv. 25:11). The priests and Levites thus appear making full sacrifice in leaving their former homes. — For Jeroboam, etc.]. This fact is stated negatively in 1 K. 12:1, a passage which may have suggested this entire paragraph. The emphasis appears to be on unto Yahweh, which is entirely wrong from the historical point of view, since Jeroboam did not repudiate the worship of Yahweh. — His sons] i.e., his successors (Be., Zoe., Oe.). — 15. The Chronicler regarded the schism of Jeroboam in the worship of Yahweh as an entirely idolatrous movement. A polemic against the Samaritans and the newly founded temple at Gerizim has been seen in this passage (Tor. AJSL. xxi. 1909, p. 201). — The high places] (בהים). The word primarily meant “heights,” any conspicuous elevation of the country or landscape (cf. Dt. 32:11 Is. 58:14 Am. 4:1 Mi. 1:1), then (both sing. and pl.) a place of worship, of Yahweh as well as other gods (1 S. 9:13-18).
10. "I K. 3:22, 2 K. 15:2); after the Deuteronomic reform high places came to mean not only an unlawful place of worship, but one entirely dedicated to the service of other gods. The Chronicler probably thus used the word here and elsewhere (cf. 14:15, 15:7, 17:4, 20:22, 21:11, 28:4-8, 31:32, 33:17, 18, 34:1).—And for the he-goats] (הִפְרְסִים) a term applied to the demons (Arabic jinn) popularly believed to inhabit desert and waste places, not as pure spirits, but in corporeal form, ordinarily represented as hairy (hence goat-like) (WRS. Religion of the Semites, p. 120) (cf. Is. 13:10, 34:7, Lv. 17). The epithet applied by the Chronicler in reproach to Jeroboam's innovations has the stigma of our term devils. A connection with an Egyptian god Pan and a borrowing from Egypt (Ke., Zoe., H-J.) are not probable.—And the calves] the two golden calves set up by Jeroboam at Bethel and Dan as symbols of Yahweh (1 K. 12:28-31). This symbolism probably was derived from the Canaanites, among whom the bull was the symbol of Baal (Bn. EB1, I. col. 632).—16. All who were loyal to Yahweh in the N. kingdom are represented as having followed the example of the priests and Levites in going to Jerusalem, not simply to sacrifice, but, as the strengthening of the kingdom shows, to remain permanently.—17. Three years]. The reason of this limitation is due to the invasion of Shishak in the fifth year of King Rehoboam (cf. 12:1, 1 K. 14:25). This invasion, from the Chronicler's point of view, must have been caused by some religious delinquency of Rehoboam and his people (cf. 12:1), and this delinquency, introducing at once a weakening of the kingdom, naturally falls in the fourth year of Rehoboam immediately preceding the invasion, and thus only three years are left for obedience and increase in strength.—In the way of David and of Solomon]. The Chronicler ignores completely the apostasies of Solomon. In 1 K. 11:4-8 Solomon is placed in contrast to David.

14. סスペース in Hiph. only in Ch. with meaning to reject, 1 Ch. 28:2, 2 Ch. 29:1 (I. 30). ספייס with meaning to give a stench (Is. 19) is probably from another root, though of same radicals (BDB.).—17. בְּנֶחָל] ג.sg.

18-23. The royal family.

This section is entirely independent of 1 K. and its source and historical value are necessarily entirely conjectural. Bn. assigns it aus der
...andern Vorlage von Chronisten, and Ki. to the ancient material "for the most part of good historical value." It is extremely probable that Rehoboam was of luxurious habits and that he followed his father in the possession of a considerable harem. The memory of this, with the names of some of his wives and children, may have long continued and been recorded, or the names may have been invented by the Chronicler.

18 f. And Rehoboam took to himself a wife, Mahalath the daughter of Jerimoth the son of David, and* of Abihail the daughter of Eliab the son of Jesse (v. i.).—Jerimoth] not mentioned among the sons of David's wives (cf. 2 S. 3:i-6 5:i-10 1 Ch. 3:i-9 14:i-i), hence either the son of a concubine or possibly Jerimoth (ירימוט) is a corruption of Ithream (יתרף), who was one of the sons of David (1 Ch. 3:i).—Abihail] not mentioned elsewhere; for other occurrences of the name cf. 1 Ch. 2:i.—Eliab] David's eldest brother (1 S. 16:i 17:i).—19. These three sons are not mentioned again.—Jeush]. Cf. 1 Ch. 7:i.—Shemariah]. Cf. 1 Ch. 12:i.—Zaham†].

20. Ma'acah the daughter of Absalom] probably granddaughter, since Tamar is mentioned as his only daughter (2 S. 14:i). Cf. 13:i, where, according to the true text, Ma'acah is called the daughter of Uriel.—Of the three sons, except in the case of Abijah (cf. 12:i) and the daughter, nothing further is known. The name 'Attai appears among the descendants of the Judahite Sheshan (1 Ch. 2:i) and a Gadite (1 Ch. 12:i).—Ziza] the name also of a Simeonite (1 Ch. 4:i), probably a childish reduplicated abbreviation or a term of endearment (Noeldeke, EBi. III. col. 3294).—Shelomith] apparently also a son, since the name occurs of men, Levites (1 Ch. 23:26 26:26:26); head of a post-exilic family (Ezr. 8:8); of women, the mother of a blasphemer (Lv. 24:11), a daughter of Zerubbabel (1 Ch. 3:i).—21. Sixty concubines] thirty, according to 18 and Josephus, Ant. viii. 10, 1. This is preferred as original by Bn.—23. And he dealt wisely] in the policy which he pursued of scattering his sons and giving them an abundant maintenance and also a considerable number of wives. This would be conducive to their contentment and a preventive of rebellion against their brother (but the text may not be sound, v. i.).

18. תָּה] read תָּה with Qr.,  ג, פ.—בֵּיתָהוּ read בֵּיתָהוּ after  ג (so Be., Ke., et al. generally), since only one wife of Rehoboam is meant, as is
shown by the sing. הַשָּׁמַע and הָיְדָה of v. 18.—21. [to early usage, cf. 13
24* Ezr. 9. 10* Ne. 13* Ru. 14 (BDB.).] either an example of a peculiar sentence without verb (l. 117), or more probably the verb given in כִּיָּשֶׁר (קָשֵׁר) has been omitted from the text, and should be restored (Kau., Bn., Ki. H.B., et al. generally).—22. either an example of a peculiar sentence without verb (l. 117), or more probably the verb given in כִּיָּשֶׁר (קָשֵׁר) has been omitted from the text, and should be restored (Kau., Bn., Ki. H.B., et al. generally).—23. wanting in כִּיָּשֶׁר with the doubtful meaning of to distribute (BDB.), כִּיָּשֶׁר, καὶ θεσσαρον, as though ἐκεῖ had here the meaning to spread abroad, increase (cf. 1 Ch. 414). כִּי renders [καὶ ἐκεῖ] from ἀνάμία with the doubtful meaning of to distribute (BDB.), כִּי אבּו, καὶ διδόν, καὶ δικαίος. Perhaps it is best to translate quia sapientior erat et potentior super omnes filios ejus connecting with the preceding verse.—οὐκ ἡπειρόν The meaning of v. 10, according to Winckler, has been distorted through the insertion from v. 9 of κῦνος. It properly belongs with vv. 8-11. Winckler renders Und er baute und zerstörte in allen Gebieten Judas und Benjamin (alle) die festen Städte und er tat hinein Vorräte in Menge. The last clause of v. 10, ἐπὶ οἷς ἔκδικεν, speaks of the King’s own wives and goes with v. 9. On the whole, however, it is better to accept the emendation of Perles.

XII. 1-12. The invasion of Shishak.—An enlargement of the narrative of 1 K. 14-11. The additions are vv. 1-11 (v. s.). (These additions are marked by Ki. as from a Midrash, yet it is allowed that they may have been written by the Chronicler.).—1. When the kingdom of Rehoboam was established and he was strong] i.e., during the first three years of Rehoboam’s reign (cf. 111), he forsook the law of Yahweh]. This, from the Chronicler’s point of view, was a necessary antecedent to the invasion of Shishak. —And all Israel] Cf. 111.—2. Shishak] Shoshenq, the first Pharaoh of the twenty-second dynasty. The results of this invasion are inscribed on the temple at Karnak, where a list of some one hundred and eighty towns captured by Shishak is given. These belong to northern Israel as well as Judah, showing that he exacted tribute there even if he only used violence in the king-
dom of Rehoboam (Max Muller, *EBi*. IV. col. 4486). The occasion of this invasion was probably the weakened condition of Israel through the disruption of the kingdom; and Jeroboam, since he had sought refuge in Egypt (I K. 11:41), may have directly solicited such an interference against Judah.—For they had transgressed against Yahweh] an addition to I K. 14:22, and a characteristic touch of the Chronicler, who thus accounts for the invasion. Cf. I Ch. 10:8.—3. With twelve hundred chariots and sixty thousand horsemen; and the people were without number]. These statements are of the magnifying character of the Jewish Midrash. Kings gives no such detail. For similar exaggerations cf. 13:4 14:7 17:11.—Lubim] the Libyans of northern Africa, west of Egypt. They repeatedly invaded Egypt and mingled with the people and supplied the Pharaohs with a militia. Shishak was of this race. They are also mentioned in 16:9 Na. 3:9 Dn. 11:9 and (םלועים) Gn. 10:6 I Ch. 11:1.—Sukkiyim] not yet satisfactorily explained. G, H, have *Troglydes*, cave-dwellers, hence probably the cave-dwellers of the mountains on the west coast of the Red Sea (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.); from derivation from booth, “dwellers in booths” (Ki.). Spiegelberg (*Ägyptolog. Randglossen z. AT.*) identifies them with the Tktin, who were used as police troops in the nineteenth dynasty.—And Cushites] the Ethiopians, the inhabitants of Cush, a general name for the district lying south of Egypt proper, cf. Am. 9:1. The Libyans and Cushites are mentioned among the allies of Egypt in Na. 3:1.—4. The fortified cities]. Cf. 11:8.—5. Shemaiah the prophet]. Cf. 11:9. This episode is not mentioned in Kings.—You have forsaken me and I indeed have forsaken you in the hand of Shishak]. Cf. 15:3.—6. Humbled themselves] i.e., they fasted and put on sackcloth; cf. 1 K. 21:13—Princes of Israel] in v. 5 princes of Judah.—Righteous is Yahweh]. Cf. Ex. 9:17 Dn. 9:4.—7. In a short time]. Thus *יִדְרָשֵׁה* is to be rendered (RVm., Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba., Ki.), and not some or small deliverance (RV, Kau.).—And my wrath shall not be poured out upon Jerusalem] i.e., the city shall not be destroyed, cf. 34:22.—8. But they will be his servants] in contrast to the destruction which they will escape. This service will be of short duration (v. 7).—That they may know, etc.] i.e., that they may
distinguish between the two services and recognise that the service of Yahweh is not so oppressive as that of foreign kings (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.). *The lands* here refers to foreign countries.—

9–11. The narrative from I K. 14* is commenced in v. 8 is now resumed.—9. *Shields of gold*. Cf. 9**.—10. *Guard*. Literally *runners*; a term applied to a body-guard (cf. 1 S. 22* I K. 1*) and hence to the royal guard connected with the palace and the Temple.—11. The purpose of the shields made by Solomon is here explained.—12. This verse is from the Chronicler, an echo of v. 1. The good things which were found in Judah are piety and fidelity to Yahweh, on account of which Judah was not destroyed (cf. 19*).

13–16. The chronology and sources of the reign of Rehoboam.—13. *And King Rehoboam strengthened himself in Jerusalem and reigned*. These words from the Chronicler indicate Rehoboam’s recovery of authority after the invasion of Shishak.—14. *Because he did not set his heart to seek Yahweh*. This phrase from the Chronicler occurs, in the positive form, of Jehoshaphat 19* and of Hezekiah 30*, and of Ezra with the law as the object Ezr. 7*.*—15. A modification of I K. 14* after the usual manner of Chronicles, cf. 9* I Ch. 29*.*—The words of Shemaiah the prophet and Iddo the seer*. Cf. 9*; not independent works by these two men (Ke.) but the reference is to the sections of the main source of the Chronicler (see Intro. § 6).—*In reckoning genealogies* an
obscure phrase either defining in some way the character or contents of the source just mentioned (Ke., Zoe.) as containing a genealogical register (Oe.), or the title of the work of Iddo (Ba.), or a copyist’s blunder, really belonging with the meaning in order to be enrolled in the genealogies at the close of 11th (Be. after Hitz.), or a meaningless phrase arising from some textual corruption (Bn.), or in the wrong place from a copyist’s error, and to be struck out (Ki. Kom.). —And the wars of Rehoboam and Jeroboam were constant] (lit. all the days) condensed from 1 K. 14th.—16. Taken with abridgment (v. i.) from 1 K. 14th.—Abijah] the true name of the son of Rehoboam, called in Kings Abijam, possibly to avoid confusion with Abijah the son of Jeroboam mentioned in 1 K. 14th (Bur.), or to avoid connecting name of Yahweh (יהוה) with so godless a king (Bn.?), or a euphonic change of the ending ah (Ki.): the real reason remains obscure.

13. יִהוּדִי introduces the quotation from 1 K. 14th, but is superfluous and not according to usage elsewhere.—14. יִהוּדִי opens with opening words, but with היהי as subj. 6 of K. has Rehoboam as subj.—15. יִהוּדִי] either inf. of purpose defining the words of Iddo, or with הב of inscription giving their title (Ba.), or text error or corruptions. 6, kal ἐρυθὼν τῶν, ὡς, perhaps favors this last. 6 has in addition τοὺς γενεαλογομένους, Μ et deligenter exposita, with reference to the acts of Rehoboam.—moshem תִּהֲיֶה בְּנֵי הָרָקְשָׁא וּבְנֵי יִרְכֶּסַ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל וּבְנֵי יֶבְרִיסֵהוּ.—16. מַחֲשָׁבָה] each followed by two genitives, cf. 11th 1 Ch. 1st Ges. § 128a.—دل הלתי pred. of copula understood, Koe. iii. § 426k.—16. In 1 K. 14th after והיָבִי has סַשׁ וְאָבָתִי and after וְיָבִי it has וְיָבִי וְיָבִי, but the latter is wanting in 6Bl, which furnishes the probably true text of Kings.

XIII. 1–23. The reign of Abijah (c. 920–917 B.C.).—This King reigned, according to 1 K. 15th, only three years, and in the brief narrative of 1 K. (15th–16th) Abijah (Abijam) is known only as a ruler “walking in all the sins of his father” and spared only for David’s sake. The Chronicler gives no inkling of this evil character, but on the basis of the statement that there was war between Abijah and Jeroboam (1 K. 15th) depicts him as a great victor over the N. kingdom “because his people relied upon Yahweh” (v. 11th), and his short reign is made one of great glory.
Ki. after Bn. assigns vv. 2-18 to M, v. 19 to the Chronicler. The whole chapter, however, may well be regarded as coming from the Chronicler with use of canonical material in vv. 1-12. The Chronicler’s style appears throughout, cf. inf. with ב ו; ב with inf. after א prá (l. 38) v. 1; ב with inf. after א prá (l. 97) v. 9; the detailed ritual v. 11 (cf. 2 S. 23:1 Ch. 26:1); מזגנינבכת here (l. 44) v. 11 (cf. 1 Ch. 15:9); דר ר פ (l. 92) v. 10 (cf. 1 Ch. 22:29) (Graf, G B. p. 137).

1-2. Introduction.—From 1 K. 15:1. 1b.—1. In the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam] the only example where the Chronicler has given a synchronism from Kings.—2. Ma‘a‘kah*. Cf. 11:15 1 K. 15. Micaiah of the Heb. Text, elsewhere a man’s name, is clearly an error.—The daughter of Uriel]. In 11:15 1 K. 15:5 Ma‘a‘akah is the daughter of Absalom (Abishalom 1 K. 15:5), hence either Uriel was the husband of Tamar, the daughter of Absalom, and thus Ma‘a‘akah was his granddaughter (Ke., Be., Zoe., Oe., Ba.), or a confusion has arisen between Ma‘a‘akah the mother of Asa (1 K. 15:11-12), who really was the daughter of Uriel, and Ma‘a‘akah the daughter of Absalom, the mother of Abijah (Bn. after Thenius, also Ki., who thinks of two Ma‘akahs, but holds that the wife of Rehoboam was the daughter of Uriel, and that this statement of the text is “a good ancient piece of information”). In all probability there was only one Ma‘a‘akah (cf. 11:16-17 and 15:11).—Uriel]. Be. thought possibly the same as the Levite mentioned in 1 Ch. 15:11, but all is obscure in regard to him; neither can it be determined whether Gibeah near Hebron (Jos. 15:21, cf. 1 Ch. 2:39) or the one of Benjamin is meant.—And war was between Abijah and Jeroboam]. This clause taken from 1 K. 15:1b introduces the fine specimen of Midrash which follows.

3. The assembled armies.—The great numbers 400,000 and 800,000 are characteristic of the Midrash, cf. v. 17 14:17-18. The number, however, of Jeroboam’s warriors is the same as that credited to Israel in the census taken by Joab, while that of Abijah’s army is 100,000 less than that credited to Judah (2 S. 24:1). (In 1 Ch. 21:1 Israel has 1,100,000, and Judah 470,000.) How utterly unhistorical these numbers are, appears at once when one reflects upon the small size of the territory of northern Israel and Judah. The entire population of the country at its maximum can hardly
ever have been more than four times its present strength of 650,000 souls (*EBi. III. col. 3550*).

4–12. The address of Abijah.—The appearance of Abijah, who according to 1 K. 15:22 "walked in all the sins of his father" and was spared only for David's sake (1 K. 15), as a preacher and ardent upholder of the Levitical worship of Yahweh is an interesting touch of the Chronicler, who in this speech especially magnifies the importance of the Aaronic priesthood and the ceremonial service according to the priestly law as the source of divine favour and victory.—4. *Zemaraim* appears in Jos. 18 among the cities of Benjamin, mentioned between Beth-arabah and Bethel. This would not exclude its connection with a hill of the same name in *Ephraim*, i.e., on its southern boundary. The place is generally identified with *es-Sumra* to the north of Jericho (*SWP. III. pp. 174, 212 f., Buhl, GAP. p. 180 et al., see DB*). But (according to Be.) the narrative is not favourable to a location so far east. This exhortation from the mountain-top resembles, so far, Jotham's from Mt. Gerizim (Ju. 8:35).—5. *Covenant of salt* i.e., an indissoluble covenant. Cf. Nu. 18:19. The figure is derived from the sacredness of the bond created between parties who have partaken food together, who say of one another, "There is salt between us" (cf. Dill. on Lv. 2:14, Gray on Nu. 18:19, *WRS. Rel. Semites*, p. 270, *Bn. Arch.* p. 91).—6. *The servant of Solomon*. Jeroboam is so referred to in 1 K. 11:7.—7. *Worthless men*. Cf. Ju. 9:11.—8. *Base fellows* (בנֵי בֵּיתָל), ERV. *sons of Belial*, a frequent expression (Dt. 13:18; Ju. 19:20; 1 S. 21:19; 1 K. 21:18) but only here in Chronicles.—9. *Young* (עַזְעָב) scarcely applicable to Rehoboam at the age of forty-one (1 Ch. 22:29; 29; 1 K. 3:1) as equivalent to "an inexperienced young man" (Ke., Ba.). Others read in 12:8, *twenty-one* instead of *forty-one* (Zoe., Oe.).—10. *Tender-hearted* either timid (cf. Dt. 20:8) or weak in understanding. The whole picture of the revolt in this verse is very different from that taken from Kings given in 10:28, where Rehoboam appears hard and defiant and brings about the rupture by his domineering manner. Here the fault is laid entirely on the representatives of Israel, who are characterised as *worthless* and *base fellows*. This view is due to the intensity with
which the Chronicler or his source (Bn.) regards the northern kingdom as apostate, and the southern with its King as the true people of Yahweh. In this the Chronicler may have reflected the feeling of his Jewish contemporaries toward the Samaritans.—8. In the hand of the sons of David] therefore the only legitimate kingdom.—Since ye are a great multitude, etc.]. Abijah thus states the ground of their confidence, which is baseless because they have not a proper priesthood (v. 9).—9. The priests of Yahweh the sons of Aaron]. According to P, the priesthood was restricted to the sons of Aaron (Ex. 28** 29** 40** etc.).—And the Levites]. These subordinate officers are naturally mentioned in connection with the priests, because their position was equally fixed in the sacred law (Nu. 3* 8* 18* etc.).—After the manner of the peoples of other lands] who have no chosen or restricted holy priesthood like that of the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron. A better contrast, however, is given in the Greek rendering (preferred by Bn.) from the people of the land, i.e., from any one, as the remainder of the verse shows. This also is more agreeable to the statements in 1 K. 12** 13**.—To consecrate himself] (lit. to fill his hand), a frequent expression (Ex. 28** 29** 30** 31**, Lv. 8** 16**, Ju. 17**, 1 K. 13* et al.).—With a young bullock and seven rams] agreeable to the law of Ex. 29* except that there only two rams are prescribed. While the personnel of this northern priesthood is illegitimate (cf. also 1 K. 13*), its ritual is described in the main as according to the law.—No gods]. Cf. Je. 2** 5*. The reference here is to the golden calves (cf. Ho. 8*).—10. In contrast to the no gods Yahweh is emphasised as the God of Abijah’s host, and the sons of Aaron as his ministering priests, with the Levites.—In their work]. The term (Mal’ai) is used frequently of Levitical and priestly duties.—11. The daily services appointed for the worship in the tabernacle are here enumerated: the morning and evening sacrifices (Ex. 29**), the morning and evening incense of sweet spices (Ex. 30*), the perpetual offering of show-bread (Ex. 25**), and the lighting each evening of the lamps of the golden “candlestick” which burned until the morning (Ex. 25** 30* 40*).*—12. The

* Contrary to the notion of these passages that the lamps were lighted to burn over night, it has been held that some at least of them were kept burning also during the day, Josephus
contest is pictured as a holy war.—*The trumpets of alarm*. These are made prominent because by their use, according to Nu. 10, the people are remembered before Yahweh and delivered from their enemies. Cf. also Nu. 31.

13-20. The success of Abijah's army.—13. Jeroboam not only has an army double the size of Abijah's (v. 4), but by his strategy places Judah in additional peril, and thus the divine deliverance is enhanced. On the form of strategy cf. Jos. 8. Ju. 20. On the blowing of the *trumpets* cf. v. 3. —14. Gave a shout] i.e., uttered a religious war-cry; cf. Jos. 6. 18 where the same Heb. word is used.—*God smote*]. Some supernatural help is in the mind of the writer; cf. 14(11).—17. 500,000]. Cf. v. 1.—18. They relied, etc.]. Cf. 14(11).—19. Bethel] mod. Beitin, about ten miles north of Jerusalem; the seat of worship for one of the golden calves (2 K. 14). If this narrative were historical a mention or hint of this capture and some fate of the golden calf would probably appear elsewhere in OT. history and prophecy, but Bethel always seems to have been a sanctuary of the N. kingdom, and to have retained the calf (2 K. 10. Am. 7. Ho. 10 Beth-aven=Bethel).—*Jeshanâ†* Cheyne also finds in 1 S. 7(1) where Heb. text has Shen (Crit. Bib.). Josephus mentions a village of the same name in Samaria near the border of Judah (Ant. xiv. 15, 12), probably the mod. 'Ain Sinja, 3½ miles north of Bethel (SWP. II. pp. 291, 302).—*Ephron†* Qr. 'Ephrain, probably the same as Ephraim (Jn. 11(4)) and Ophrah (1 S. 13(7), Jos. 18(4)) and Ephraim mentioned by Josephus (BJ. IV. 9, 9) with Bethel, identified with mod. et-Taiyibeh, four miles north-east of Bethel (DB. I. p. 728).—*And Yahweh smote him and he died*. The same language describes the fate of Nabal (1 S. 25(4)) and implies some sudden and untimely end. This is scarcely consistent, in view of the contrasted gathering of strength of Abijah v. 11, with the chronology of Kings, which makes Jeroboam the survivor of Abijah at least a year. (Cf. 1 K. 14(4) 15(1).)

Beyond the statement of the war between Abijah and Reho-
boam (v. 11), and possibly the location of the battle (Bn.), there appears nothing historical in this narrative. The real result of the war is difficult to determine. The unfavourable judgment of Abijah in 1 K., and the hard pressure there recorded of Baasha upon Asa, as though Asa had inherited an evil situation from his father, certainly cast doubt upon any victory (cf. s. v. 11), yet Graf accepted a success of Abijah as historical (GB. p. 137), so likewise Pa. (EHSP. pp. 194 f.) and McC. (HPM. I. p. 255).

21-23. Conclusion of Abijah's reign.—21. This statement of Abijah's might and the number of his wives and children is accepted as from an ancient tradition by Bn. and marked of historical value by Ki. and thus quoted by Pa. (EHSP. p. 195). But this is improbable. It is better to regard it as a fitting climax to his great victory, penned by the Chronicler. Equally with Abijah's appearance as a preacher and the narrative of his success, it is at variance with the account in Kings where, after the short reign of three years, having apparently no son, he is succeeded in all likelihood by his brother, since the statement that Maacah was the mother of both Abijah and Asa, and that the latter removed her from court (1 K. 15* 10-11), overrides the assertion that the successor of Abijah was his son (1 K. 15*) (We. Prol. p. 210).—22. Commentary] lit. Midrash, see Intro., p. 23.—The prophet Iddo]. Cf. 12*.—23 (XIV. 1). Taken in its first half from 1 K. 15*.—His brother should probably (v.s.) be substituted for his son.—In his days the land had rest ten years]. These words are by the Chronicler. This rest is clearly considered the result of Asa's removal of the high places, pillars, poles, and "sun-images" mentioned in 14* 4 (a.1). Asa's piety required such a reward. The basis of the calculation of ten years is not clear. Perhaps the period was reckoned in the mind of the writer as beginning with the great victory of Abijah over Jeroboam (Be., Ke., Zoe.). In reality the statement is contradicted by the statement of 1 K. 15* that there was war between Asa and Baasha king of Israel all their days since Baasha began to reign in the third year of Asa (1 K. 15* 11).

1. I K. 15* sq. דב נפשו [Y. i-roeb] I K. 15* sq. דב נפשו. —[Y. i-roeb] Dr. TH. § 127 (b), Ges. § 111b, 1 K. י^דרה [Y. i-roeb] I K. י^דרה, cf. 12* 2. י^דרה [Y. i-roeb] elsewhere a man's name, prob. text. err. 1 K. 15* י^דרה, also 11* q. v., so here [Y. i-roeb]—
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prann] also in v. 11, favourite word of the Chronicler, cf. 11 (l. 38). — 8.

an example of a subject separated from its
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verb by ἐν ταῖς ἐφημερίαῖς ἀπὸν, possibly read ἐν ταῖς ἐφημερίαῖς ἀπὸν. —

11. ἐπίκεισθαι Hiph. of verb used in P over thirty times of burning (lit. making smoke) the sacrifices on the altar. —

XIV–XVI. The reign of Asa (c. 917–876). — The Chronicler’s treatment of Asa is based upon the account given in 1 K. 15:9–22. There in vv. 11–16 Asa is commended for his piety. This is greatly enlarged upon by the Chronicler, and Asa’s prosperity is correspondingly magnified (14:1–3 15:1–16). A magnificent victory over an invading force of Cushites not mentioned in Kings is also recorded (14:9–11 15:1–16). The remainder of the account in 1 K. (vv. 17–22), apart from the summary of the reign, concerns the relations of Asa to the N. kingdom. This material is incorporated by the Chronicler into his narrative with the addition of a prophetic rebuke of Asa for his alliance with Syria (16:1–14). His last days, also, are pictured in darker colours than in Kings, where a disease in his feet is mentioned. This in Chronicles is made very great, and the King is said also not to have sought Yahweh, but physicians (16:13).

According to Ki. after Bn., c. 14 and 16:1–14 are from M, while 15:1–18 is from M*. This double origin is assigned from the double accounts of reform, cf. 14:1–4 with 15:1. C. 15, however, is linked with c. 14 (cf. v. 11, where the sacrifices are from the spoil of victory). Historical incoherence in reforms both before and after a victory would not trouble a writer like the Chronicler, and thus prove compilation from two sources. The tale of the victory, however, was not unlike derived by the Chronicler from his Midrashic source, and the grouping there of events
may have influenced him in his narrative, but the chapters throughout bear marks of his peculiar style and may well be regarded as his own composition. The following are marks of the Chronicler's style: In 14* 15* with following inf. (l. 4); in 14* 15* the usual formula (cf. i Ch. 15* 21* 2 Ch. 1* 18*; l. 23); in 14* 15* and elsewhere (cf. 7* 13* et al.); in 14* 16* לַעֲלוֹיָתָיו הָעָלֶים (cf. 13*); in 14* זַעְרֵי (l. 92); in 14* לַעֲלֹיָתָיו הָעָלֶים (cf. 1 Ch. 22*); in 14* דְּוֹר (cf. 1 Ch. 22*); in 14* זַעְרֵי a late word 25* 28* Ezr. 9* 10* 11* Ne. 3* Dn. 11* 12* ↑ (l. 10); the similar phraseology in 15* end of verse and 15* in 15* מַעְרֵי יָנָה (cf. 1 Ch. 13*; l. 6); in 15* מַעְרֵי יָנָה with obj.; in 15* מַעְרֵי יָנָה (l. 44); in 16* the repeated use of יָנָה in 16* the relative sentence without יָנָה subordinated to the preposition (cf. 1 Ch. 15*; l. 120); in 16* יָנָה יָנָה (cf. 1 Ch. 14*; l. 127) (Graf, GB. p. 142).

XIV. 1-7 (2-8). Asa's piety and might.—This whole section is an expansion or illustration of v. 1* (b), which is from 1 K. 15*1. In 1 K. 15*1 it is recorded that Asa put away the sacred prostitutes out of the land and removed all the idols which his fathers had made. The Chronicler, however, entirely omits this statement so utterly at variance with the piety and religious zeal already ascribed to Rehoboam and Abijah; but he expands the reform of Asa into one similar to those mentioned in Kings as wrought by Hezekiah and Josiah—i.e., the removal of the high places (2 K. 18* = 23*).—2 (3.) Foreign altars i.e., the altars of foreign gods, cf. Gn. 35*4 Jos. 24*10. 11 Ju. 10*1 S. 7* Je. 5*.—The high places]. In 1 K. 15* it is stated that Asa did not destroy the high places.—The pillars] the massseboth, the sacred stones set up at a place of worship, originally a primitive expression of the later altar, temple, or idol, and naturally retained as the proper accessories of a sanctuary (cf. Gn. 28*2–9). The Deuteronomic law forbade their use (Dt. 16*2) and commanded their destruction (Dt. 7*12).—The asherim] frequently mentioned with the foregoing and likewise forbidden (Dt. 16*2) and commanded to be destroyed (Dt. 7*12). They were wooden poles set up like the stone pillars at sanctuaries. Their meaning is obscure, scarcely a phallic emblem, possibly a substitute for a tree as a residence of deity, or possibly originally boundary posts, regarded later as sacred. It has also been thought that there was a Canaanite goddess Asherah, equivalent to the great Semitic goddess Astarte, whose symbol or idol was the Asherah post. (Cf. 15*.) But on this scholars are not agreed (Asherah, EB1. I. coll.
332 ff.; Dr. Dt. pp. 201 f.; Lagrange, Études sur les Religions Sémitiques, pp. 119 ff., argues for goddess). Asheroth (pl. of Asherah) are mentioned in 191 331, elsewhere as here Asherim 171 241 311 331 341 41. (5). Sun pillars] (only pl., 3417 Lv. 2610 Is. 171 271 f) probably a form of masseboth (cf. v. 1) (GFM. EBi. III. col. 2976), regarded generally as pillars dedicated to the sun god (זֵרְעָה) (Bn.).—And the kingdom had rest under him (lit. before him) repeated with emphasis in following verse, cf. 1311 (141).—6 (6). This story of the building of cities has probably some historical basis, cf. 1 K. 151; also Je. 411, where a pit built by Asa as a means of defence is mentioned.—7 (8). Shield and spear]. Cf. 1 Ch. 121 (v).—Bucklers . . . and bows]. Cf. 1 Ch. 81. The shield (צלת) of these bowmen was smaller than that of the spearmen.—The total strength of Asa’s army is 580,000, while Abijah, his father, led forth an army of only 400,000 (11, cf. also 111 171).

1. אימר] wanting in 1 K. 151 and so also 1 K. adds אימר. (2) with the force of command (l. 4), or an example, in the following words, of the indirect discourse, cf. 1 Ch. 131.;—6 (6). Zerah the Cushite] גְּרָם הַכַּשִּׁיָּהָיִם] suffix masc. because it precedes.—at our disposal, cf. Gn. 131 BDB. nun II. 4. a (f).—Instead of read בֶּשָּׁם יָהָוֶה when we sought Yahweh our God he sought us. AB also omit קָנָה and read בְּנַי יִצְרוֹת. Hence Winckler (All. Unter. p. 187) proposes to read after Dt. 121. and he has given us rest from our enemies round about and prospered us.

8-14 (9-16). Asa’s victory over Zerah.—Not mentioned in Kings, a good example of Midrash (see the numbers in v. 111 (v)). The story is either without historical foundation (so Kuenen, Einl. pp. 139 f.; St. Gesch. I. p. 355; We. Prol. pp. 257 f.), or with greater probability has a historical basis in an Egyptian or Arabian inroad (Graf, GB. p. 138; Erbt, Die Hebräer, p. 106; v. also i.).—8 (9). Zerah the Cushite] גְּרָם הַכַּשִּׁיָּהָיִם] (1) identified frequently with an Egyptian king, either Osorkon. I or II., of the twenty-second (Bubasite) dynasty, and hence contemporary with Asa. In favour of Osorkon II. is an alleged inscription which reads that all countries of the upper and lower Retennu (i.e., Syria and Palestine) have been thrown under his feet (Naville’s Bubastis p. 51). Cushite or Ethiopian
applied to Osorkon or Zerah must then have arisen from the writer's confused knowledge of Egyptian affairs; he may have been misled by 2 K 19 where Tirhakah is called King of Ethiopia (Sayce, *HCM*, p. 363). The place of battle, *Mareshah* (*v. i.*), favours an Egyptian inroad. (2) *Cushite* may be connected with the Cush of Arabia (*1 Ch.* 51), and thus the inroad may have been from Arabia (so Winckler, *Alt. Untersuch.* pp. 161–166, *KAT.* p. 144; Hommel, *Actes 10th Cong. Interl. des Orientalistes*, p. 112; Paton, *EHSP*, pp. 196 f.). Agreeable to this are the tents and the spoil of sheep and camels mentioned in v. 19 (*ii*). *Zerah* may also represent the Sabean name *Dhirrih*, a title, meaning the magnificent, of several of the oldest princes of Saba (Ba.) (*v. s.* Hommel).—A thousand and three hundred chariots] a gross exaggeration from every point of view.—*Mareshah*. *Cf.* 11* i Ch.* 2*.—9 (10). In the valley] probably the valley at whose head stands Beit-Jibrin (*GAS. HGHL*, pp. 230–233).—*Zephathah* [*], compared doubtfully by Robinson to *Tell-es-Selih* (*BR.* II. p. 31). *GAB* reads northward (*κατὰ βορρᾶν*), and it is questionable whether that was not the original reading, in the valley to the north of *Mareshah* (*יְצֵל instead of הַיְצֵל*) (Bn.).—11 (12). *Cf.* 13* i.* 11. The non-reliance of Asa upon his large army (*v.* 19) is noticeable. The narrative is entirely artificial.—12 (13). *Gerar*] south of Gaza, usually identified with *Umm Jerar* (*Baed.* p. 121).—*And so many of the Cushites fell that there was no recovery* (*Zoe.*, *Oe.*, *Ba.*, *ARV.*), or so that no life was left (*Be.*, *Ke.*, *Kau.*, *Ki.*, *ARVm.*). The latter is better since the following clauses suggest annihilation. —*His host* [*i.e.*, heavenly beings (the older commentators); better, from the statement of *v.* 15, Asa's army (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.).—13 (14). *And they smote all the cities in the neighbourhood of Gerar*. This implies that the inhabitants of this district had been abettors of the Cushites. (Instead of *לֵילְוֹ בָּרוֹרָם* *Arabians.*)—*A terror from Yahweh*. A panic seized the cities through a supernatural terror caused by Yahweh (*cf.* 17* 20*).—14 (15). *Tents of cattle* [*] a strange expression, possibly having arisen from textual corruption. *G* has, in addition, a proper name representing some unknown tribe or place (*τοὺς Ἀμαξονεῖς*) (*cf.* 22* text-note*). The booty suggests an Arabian incursion.
XV. 1–19. The exhortation of Azariah, and Asa's religious reforms.

1. 'Azariah the son of 'Oded] not mentioned elsewhere. Cf. v. 4.—The spirit of God] frequently mentioned as the cause of prophetic action and speech (cf. 1 Ch. 12:18 2 Ch. 20:1 24:10).

2. Yahweh was with you because you were with him]. The prophet refers to the victory and makes it an occasion for advocating the continuance of Asa's reforms (Ke.). Others render Yahweh is with you if (when, while) you are with him (Zoe., Oe., Kau., Ki., ARV.). This rendering is not so good, although a statement of the general lesson to be drawn.—3–6. Variously interpreted: a description of the N. kingdom (Θ); a prophecy of the future (cf. Ho. 3:4) (Θ, Η, as the tenses show, Zoe.); a description of the nature of a general truth with reference either to the past or future (Ke.); a reflection on the whole previous course of Israel's history, parenthetical in Azariah's speech and from the Chronicler (Ba.); a description with general reference (Bn.) yet strongly reminding one of the period of the judges (Be., Oe., Ki.). This last view is as definite as any which can be given. V. 8 reflects the lawless times of the judges; v. 9 the repeated distress, and deliverance on calling on Yahweh; v. 10 the violence and oppression so often described (cf. Ju. 5:6–4); v. 11 the intertribal and interurban contentions (Ju. 8:24 10:17 9:47 12:4). This whole speech of Azariah fits in badly with the occasion of the victory and is an unskilful introduction to the reform of Asa, an ecclesiastical renovation so dear to the heart of the Chronicler.—3. Without a teaching priest and
without law]. The two expressions are synonymous. The giving of legal instruction was a function of the priest (Dt. 33* Je. 18* Ho. 4*).—5. Lands] i.e., districts of the territory of Israel (cf. 11* 1 Ch. 13*).—6. Nation against nation] i.e., one part or tribe of Israel against another.

8. 'Oded the prophet] either a gloss (Be., Ki.), or representing a lacuna which should be supplied after ש, מ, with the reading even the prophecy which Azariah the son of 'Oded had spoken.—Deleterious things] objects connected with idolatry (cf. 1 K. 11* 2 K. 23*).—Cities, etc.]. Since no mention is made of cities taken by Asa, the reference is generally supposed to be to those taken by his father Abijah (13*).—And he renewed the altar]. This statement implies some unrecorded desecration of the altar, or it may embody simply the historical fact of the renewal of the ancient Mosaic and purer imageless worship of Yahweh (cf. Erbt, Die Hebräer, p. 105).

9. Within the territory of the S. kingdom are represented to have been members of the adjoining tribes of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Simeon, who were either permanent residents from the first (cf. 10*), or drawn thither by the feeling that through the piety of Asa Yahweh was with the S. kingdom (cf. 11* 30*). This probably reflects the condition at the time of the Chronicler, when doubtless many Jews traced their descent from families of the ten tribes (cf. Lk. 1*), and the devout sought residence in the land of Palestine.—Simeon]. While historically the tribe was probably absorbed either by the desert tribes south of Judah or into Judah (cf. 1 Ch. 4*), it was reckoned as one of the ten tribes constituting the N. kingdom (1 K. 11*).—10. The third month]. In this was the Feast of Weeks, Pentecost, which according to the later Jewish tradition commemorated the giving of the law, and hence the entrance of Israel into a covenant relation with Yahweh; and thus, if this tradition was as early as the Chronicler or his source, this would explain the month as appropriate for the covenant of v.*. The reason for the date in the fifteenth year of the reign of Asa is entirely obscure, and especially so in view of the following verse, where mention is made of the offering of spoil, presumably of the contest with Zerah, but since according to 13* (14*) "the land was quiet ten years" the contest with Zerah took place.
in the eleventh year of Asa; the war, then, is held to have lasted some four years (Ke., Zoe., Oe.). But possibly the discrepancy arises because the Chronicler here is following a source different from that of the previous chapter (v. s.).—12. They entered into a covenant. On form of expression cf. Je. 34

12. They entered into a covenant. On form of expression cf. Je. 34

13. This resolution was according to the law (Dt. 13:10-17).—Whether small or great] i.e., whether young or old. 14. Shout of joy. Cf. i Ch. 15

16-19, from 1 K. 15:14-18. 16. Ma'acah. Cf. 13:1. Asherah. Whether there was ever a Canaanitish goddess Asherah (BDB.) is a disputed question (DB., EBi.) (cf. 14), but the name seems to have been so used or understood here.—An horrible thing] i K. 15:1†, some kind of idol or idolatrous symbol; simulacrum Priapi with reference to the phallus cult. This interpretation, as good as any, is usually accepted.—And he crushed] wanting in i K. 15:1, added by the Chronicler, bringing the destruction of the horrible thing (miphlezeth) in accord with that of the golden calf (Ex. 32) and the asherah (2 K. 23:1 2 Ch. 34:1).—Valley of Kidron] on the east of Jerusalem, where objects used in heathen worship were regularly destroyed (cf. 29:1 30:11 1 K. 15:12 K. 23:4.8), probably because the place as a burying-ground was considered unclean (Kidron, DB.).—17. From Israel] i.e., Israel in the sense of Judah (cf. 11) (Be., Zoe., Oe., Ba.), but this interpretation is doubtful. Since in 14:16 Asa is said to have removed the high places, the Chronicler probably added here from Israel in the meaning of the N. kingdom (over which Asa had historically no control) and thus harmonised this verse with 14:16 (Ki., Bn.).—18. These dedicated things were possibly spoils of war (cf. i Ch. 18:11), and since mentioned in i K. 15:18 have been regarded as a confirmation from that source of the victories of Abijah and Asa narrated in 13:4-14:7 (Be., Oe., Ba.); another explanation is that they were removed, through fear of Baasha (1 K. 15:19), from some sanctuary and brought to Jerusalem for safe-keeping
XVI. 1-6. The war with Baasha.—Derived from 1 K. 15\textsuperscript{17-18}.

1. \textit{In the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Asa} wanting in 2 K., and with the thirty-fifth year mentioned in 15\textsuperscript{10} historically an impossible date, since according to 1 K. 16\textsuperscript{9-10} Baasha died in the twenty-sixth year of Asa. Hence thirty-fifth (15\textsuperscript{10}) and thirty-sixth are due either to copyists' errors, or to an improper reckoning by the Chronicler. Under the former supposition the original has been held to have been the fifteenth and sixteenth (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.), a view which has been felt to harmonise with the previous statements that during the first ten years of Asa's reign there was peace (13\textsuperscript{11} (14\textsuperscript{4})), and hence (it may be assumed) that in the eleventh year the inroad of the Cushites took place (14\textsuperscript{8-9}), followed by the cultus reform culminating in the celebration and the covenant in the fifteenth year (15\textsuperscript{10-11}), and that then came the war with Baasha in the following year. But such a speedy war with Baasha is unthinkable from the Chronicler's point of view. The covenant and the loyalty could only have been followed by an era of peace, and
this is expressly stated in 15" where it says, "Yahweh gave them rest round about." The Chronicler delayed then the war with Baasha until the close of Asa’s reign in order to place in this connection his sin (cf. vv. 14.), late in his life and near its punishment through the disease in his feet three years later (v. 15), for the Chronicler undoubtedly thus regarded the disease, and, therefore, he placed the war with Baasha in the thirty-sixth year of Asa’s reign. Other explanations of the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth years are a reckoning based on the separation of the N. and S. kingdoms, since the thirty-fifth year of the disruption corresponds to the fifteenth of Asa (Mov., Ba.); or a derivation from the Midrash source of the Chronicler, which had a chronology or scheme of synchronism with the N. kingdom quite different from that of 1 and 2 K. (Bn., Ki.).— Baasha king of Israel]. According to 1 K. 15" Baasha came to the throne of Israel in the third year of Asa, and the war between the two kingdoms was continuous (1 K. 15" 19).— And he built] i.e., as the connection shows, fortified, since Ramah, mod. er-Ram five miles north of Jerusalem, is mentioned in the earlier history (cf. Ju. 4* 19). The town clearly commanded the highway leading to Jerusalem. How far the Chronicler is from being a historian is seen in the fact that no mention is made of the implied loss of the cities mentioned in 15*.—2. Silver and gold]. 1 K. 15" has “all the silver and gold that were left” with reference to the loss through the invasion of Shishak (12* 1 K. 14*). This statement is omitted, doubtless, because such a reference to depleted treasuries would have been quite inappropriate after the prosperity of Asa mentioned above.—The line of descent of Benhadad King of Damascus (c. 885-844 B.C.) (KAT. p. 134) is also omitted.—3. A league is between me and thee as was between my father and thy father]. Whether this statement is merely rhetorical or refers to an actual alliance it is impossible to determine. This successful invocation of Benhadad was later paralleled in the appeal of Ahaz to Tiglath-pileser, King of Assyria, for assistance against Damascus and N. Israel (2 K. 16*).—4. The places smitten are, naturally, on the northern frontier of Israel.—'Ijon] (1 K. 15* 2 K. 15* 1) survives in the name Merj 'Ayun, a rich oval plain at the foot of the mountains of Naphtali, near the bend of the river
Litany, and is identified with Tell Dibbin near the northern end of this plain (EBi. II. col. 2160; Rob. Br. III. p. 375).—Abel Mayim]

1 K. 15* Abel Beth Ma'acah and also 2 K. 15** 2 S. 20† (true reading)

† Abed † mod. Abil el Kamh, a small village on a hill 1,074 feet above the sea, almost directly opposite Banias, and on the main road thence to Sidon and the coast (GAS. in EBi). Mayim

is probably due to textual corruption.—All the store-cities] 1 K.

15*** “all the Chinneroth,” i.e., the fertile district of Gennesaret west of the sea of Galilee, “along with all the land.” The rendering of the Chronicler seems suggested by this text (v. i.).—5. And he caused the work to cease]. This statement also is derived, apparently, from a corruption or misunderstanding of the text (v. i.).

1 K. 15 has “and he dwelt in” (or after £ “returned to”) “Tirzah.”—6. And he built] i.e., fortified.—Geba] mod. Jeba, seven miles north of Jerusalem, the scene of Jonathan’s exploit (1 S. 14 ** ), and from the time of Asa apparently the northern limit of the S. kingdom (2 K. 23*., cf. Zc. 14**).—Mizpah] probably mod. Nabi Samwil, five miles north-west of Jerusalem. The place is frequently mentioned (Ju. 20*.. 21*.. 1 S. 7* et al.). The fortification of these places would protect the S. kingdom from encroachments on the north.

7-10. The rebuke of Hanani.—Asa is severely condemned for his invocation of the aid of Syria, especially after his great victory over the Cushites. 7. Hanani] mentioned in 19* 20* I K. 16*** as the father of the prophet Jehu. The seer] (נהר) also v. †, used elsewhere by the Chronicler only of Samuel (1 Ch. 9** 26** 29**); clearly an archaism; yet regarded as an evidence of an ancient tradition (v. i.).—Therefore is the host of the king of Aram escaped out of thy hand]. The prophet seems to imply that if Asa had relied upon Yahweh he would not only have conquered Baasha, but also the Syrians who were in league with him (v. i.).—


The Chronicler plainly regarded the Cushites of Zerah as an Egyptian host.—9. For the eyes of Yahweh, etc.] an expression of divine omniscience and providential care (cf. Zc. 4* Pr. 15*).—For from henceforth thou shalt have wars]. No additional wars are recorded during the reign of Asa, but the policy of foreign alliances naturally provoked them.
Cf. the similar situation in the case of Ahaz (Is. 7 2 K. 16).—10. For similar treatment of prophets cf. that of Micaiah, 18; of Jeremiah, Je. 20; and, even worse, that of Zechariah, 24, and of Uriah, Je. 26.

11–14. The conclusion of Asa’s reign.—An expansion of 1 K. 15°°—11. First and last]. Cf. 1 Ch. 29. —In the book of the kings of Judah and Israel] (v. Intro, p. 22) 1 K. 15°° “in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah.”—12. In the thirty-ninth year] 1 K. 15°° “in the time of his old age.”—His disease, etc., to the end of verse] wanting in Kings.—And also in his disease, etc.]. Even as in the war with Israel he sought human aid through Syria, so here in his last sickness he seeks it through his physicians. The reference to physicians is unique in the OT., although they are elsewhere mentioned (cf. Gn. 50 in connection with embalming, Jb. 13°° Je. 8°°). The art of healing seems to have been practised by the prophets. Cf. the application to Elisha 2 K. 4°°°, and the healing work of Isaiah 2 K. 20°° Is. 38°°. Possibly this passage reflects the activity of physicians in the Chronicler’s own time. Cf. their praise in BS. 38°°.—13. And died, etc.] wanting in 1 K.—14. 1 K. 15°° “and was buried with his fathers in the city of David his father.” The burial of Asa is described as though of exceeding magnificence or care. The laying of him on a resting-place filled with spices and various perfumes prepared after the perfumers’ art was after the custom of preparing the body thus for the burial (cf. Jn. 19°° Mt. 27°° Mk. 15°° Lk. 23°°). The burning (cf. 21°° Je. 34°°) was not of the body, since cremation was contrary to the customs of the Hebrews, but probably of spices, possibly originally a form of sacrifice for the dead (Now. Arch. I. p. 197; EBi. II. col. 1337).
—5. [אִּשָּׁבְנֵה יַעֲבֹרָה] a corruption or substitution for יַעֲבֹרָה (1 K. 15:15).—6. [וְאָדָם] 1 K. 15:15 yields מִשְׁבַּהַר.—After this K. has וְאָדָם and after מִשְׁבַּהַר the king Asa, and after מִשְׁבַּהַר in Benjamin.—7 and 10. [זָהָר] This title is bestowed elsewhere only on Samuel, 1 S. 9:16-20. 1 Ch. 9:26-20:29. Since therefore an ancient title, Jastrow finds in the use of the term here an evidence at least that the story of Hanani is ancient if not authentic (JBL. XXVIII. 1909, p. 49). But the application of this term to Hanani is made with no reference to the ancient meaning assigned to זָהָר by Jastrow (v. 1 Ch. 29:29), and the Chronicler may have been led to use the archaic term here under the influence of 1 S. 9:16-20. [זָהָר] cf. 1 Ch. 14:4 (l. 87).—זָהָר cf. v. 1. 23. Jastrow would read either זָהָר unto the seers or unto the dead (op. cit. p. 49 f. n. 23).

XVII-XX. The reign of Jehoshaphat (c. 876-851 b.c.).—The Chronicler has made use of all of the narrative given in 1 K. concerning Jehoshaphat (1 K. 15:4-22:50 41-44). A slight portion of this he has rewritten (cf. 18:1-20:4-7), and the whole he has supplemented with a large amount of new material (17:15-19 19:20-40) in which the reign of Jehoshaphat appears one of unusual religious activity and external splendour. The King busies himself with the instruction of his people in the law of Yahweh (17:10) and in the establishment of a system of courts (19:11). His rule is also one of military success. He built castles and store-cities and had a great army (17:11-13). He received large tribute from the Philistines and Arabians (17:14-15), and won a most signal victory over the Moabites and Ammonites through the direct intervention of Yahweh in response to prayer and praise (20:1-12). The King's only shortcomings seem to have been his alliances, recorded in 1 K., with the N. kingdom (19:20-21), which resulted in his exposure to peril at Ramoth-gilead (c. 18) and the loss of his ships (20:17).

While this new material is all of the spirit and style of the Chronicler, Bn. and Ki. find here several sources. Ki. after Bn. analyses as follows: 17:1-14 from 1 K. 15:4-18; vv.15-19 from M; vv. 11-13 from an old historical source; vv. 14-15 from M; 18:1-2 from the Chronicler; vv. 22-28 from 1 K. 22; 19:1-4 from the Chronicler; vv. 4-11 from the Chronicler's fore-runner; 20:1-13 from M; v. 13 from the Chronicler; vv. 24-28 from 1 K.; vv. 28-37 from the Chronicler. But all the extra canonical material is of the spirit and style of the Chronicler, v. i. and cf. in 17:1 וַיִּשַּׁחַ֖ר (l. 38); in 17:19 וַיִּשַּׁחַ֖ר (l. 23); in 17:19 וַיִּשַּׁחַ֖ר with acc. (l. 128); in 17:19 וַיִּשַּׁחַ֖ר.
And Jehoshaphat reigned in his stead i.e., in the place of Asa, a transcription of 1 K. 15:15—

2. Fortified cities have an important place in the narrative of the Chronicler. Rehoboam built them (11:6); Abijah took cities (13:11); Asa built them (14:1) and likewise Jehoshaphat (cf. vv. 11-12 21:1).—Which Asa his father had taken. Cf. 15:4.—

3. The first ways of David his father i.e., the earlier years of David before he fell into the sins of adultery (2 S. 11 ff.) and numbering the people (2 S. 24 1 Ch. 21) (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). But David is wanting in 6AB (6L has it), hence in all probability is a gloss (Ba.). The reference then is to Asa, the father of Jehoshaphat, whose first ways, according to the Chronicler, were good (cc. 14, 15) and his latter evil (c. 16).—

The Baalim i.e., a false god or gods in contrast with Yahweh (cf. Ju. 21). Baal means primarily a "proprietor" or "possessor," hence "master," "lord," and was a common designation of deity like our word "Lord." In early times it was used of Yahweh, as clearly appears from its appearance in proper names (cf. 1 Ch. 8 14) and the prohibition of its use by Hosea (2:21 "it"); but later, since the gods of the Canaanites were generally thus designated, it came to signify a false god.—4. Of his father another reference to Asa (cf. v. 5 6 v. s.).—The doings of Israel. Cf. 11:14.—

5. Tribute i.e., free gifts, perhaps, at the King's accession, rather than royal exactions (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.).—

6. And his heart was lifted up Only here is this expression used in a good sense, elsewhere it has a bad meaning (cf. 26:4 32:18 Ez. 28:4-17 Ps. 131:1 Pr. 18:14, BDB.).—And furthermore he took away, etc.] This statement is not in harmony with that of 1 K. 22:4, quoted by the Chronicler in 20:8, where it is said "the high places were not taken away" but they were frequented by the people.
Such discrepancies did not trouble the Hebrew historian.—The high places and the asherim. Cf. 14* (a).

7-9. The commission for teaching the law.—This narrative is a duplicate of the account of the establishment of the judiciary given in 19*-11 (Bn., Ki.). No record of such events is found in Kings, and it is not impossible that Jehoshaphat, perhaps through the influence of his alliance with the N. kingdom (v. i.), introduced some new organisation for the administration of justice or law (Winckler, KAT.* p. 252; Erbt, Die Hebräer, p. 109), yet v. i. 19*¹-¹¹. The appointment of laity in connection with Levites and priests has been regarded as a mark of an ancient and reliable tradition (Bn., Ki.). Otherwise, however, this section bears every evidence of being late and written by the Chronicler. The book of the law of Yahweh is a reflection of Deuteronomy, and the names of the commissioners as a whole belong to a period later than the ninth century (Gray, HPN. p. 231). Already, also at the time of the Chronicler, must have begun the study, exposition, and teaching of the law by members of the laity who were later reckoned among the Scribes.—7. In the third year]. This date is given to show that Jehoshaphat at the very outset of his reign concerned himself with the instruction of his people in the law.—Ben-haïl† signifies "son (man) of might," cf. Abi-haïl 11*; yet possibly it does not belong as a proper name in the text, but as in G, L, is descriptive of the princes, even sons of valour (v. i.).—8. And with them the Levites]. The tendency of the Chronicler is to dignify the Levites, and thus he assigns to them the priestly duty of teaching (cf. v. * 35* Ne. 8*¹-¹¹ DB. IV. p. 93).—9. And they taught in Judah]. The priests were the guardians of the law (Ho. 4* c. Je. 18*¹, cf. Dt. 17*¹. 19*¹-² 33*¹), and hence its teachers, and under Jehoshaphat an impulse may have been given for instruction in the law through the priests and others, although such a general measure as is here mentioned is probably not historical.—The book of the law of Yahweh v. s.

10-19. The greatness of Jehoshaphat and his army.—The summary of Jehoshaphat’s reign given in 1 K. 22*¹-²² shows that it
was one of prosperity and peace with the N. kingdom. His might is there mentioned, and since he was a good king who "walked in all the ways of Asa his father," and "turned not aside from doing that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh," 1 K. 22:4, the Chronicler naturally ascribes unto him much greatness, with possibly some real historical reminiscence (v. i.).—10. Then a terror from Yahweh, etc.]. The Chronicler represents a supernatural dread of Judah, caused by Yahweh, coming upon the neighbouring peoples, presumably as a reward for Jehoshaphat's zeal for the law (cf. 14:11 (11) 20 Gn. 35*).—11. The Arabians]. The term Arab primarily means "people of the desert," and came into use among the Hebrews as indicating a particular people, i.e. the inhabitants of northern Arabia, relatively late (first used in this strictly ethnographical sense in Ne. 2:6); and Arabians in the writings of the Chronicler probably reflects the powerful kingdom of the Nabataeans already established in his day, south and south-east of Judah, and he mentions them here and elsewhere (cf. 22:26*) to present intelligibly to his readers an event (whether real or assumed) like that of Jehoshaphat's glory. The Philistines would be understood by his readers from their knowledge of the canonical books, the Arabians from present conditions (Noeldeke, EBi. I. col. 274). It is yet possible, however, that some tribute from the Philistines and desert tribes was historical, a real result of Asa's victory over Zerah (14:11 (11) 26) (so at least as far as the Arabians are concerned, Winckler, KAT. p. 252). For a similar tribute of flocks or their product cf. 2 K. 3:1,—12. Castles and cities of store]. Cf. v. 1. —13. And he had great property]. (BDB.) The context shows that by this property the writer meant military supplies (so Ke.). The rendering "work for equipping and provisioning the fortresses" (Be.) is certainly not so good.—14. The soldiers were enrolled according to their families.—'Adnah] is also the name of a Manassite, 1 Ch. 12:11 (11).—16. Who willingly offered himself unto Yahweh]. Cf. Ju. 5. It is unfortunate that the Chronicler has not explained why this phrase of honour was applied to 'Amasiah. —17. Equipped with bow and shield] i.e., light-armed troops, for which Benjamin was famous. Cf. 1 Ch. 12 and (on shield) cf. 1 Ch. 12:26 (26) 2 Ch. 14:1 (1).—18. The total number of these warriors is,
of Judah 780,000, of Benjamin 380,000, making a grand total of 1,160,000. This is the largest force assigned anywhere to the S. kingdom. On the gross exaggeration of such numbers cf. 13, and for other lists 11. From Jehoshaphat’s connection with the N. kingdom and his assistance rendered in war (cf. c. 18) it is probable that he maintained something of an army, and so far some historical truth underlies this section.

10. a terror from Yahweh. Subjective genitive, Ges. § 128g.
—and wealth a late usage, cf. 1 Ch. 13:1 2 Ch. 11:2. 11. and silver for tribute ARV., Kau., after V et vectigal argenti, but better silver a burden, i.e., a great quantity (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Kl.). a late form, elsewhere either τραπέζων (21 or 22) or τραπέζων (26).—12. with co-ordinate adj. denotes continuance, cf. Ex. 19:10 1 S. 28 2 S. 3: et al., v. Ges. § 113w. forresses, pl. of νυμφαίον, a late word (cf. ים אופר 1 Ch. 29), also pl. 27:1. store cities, cf. 2 Ch. 8:14. looking forward has the force of a neut sing., cf. 3:1. And this was their enrolment according to the houses of their fathers of Judah captains of thousands: Adnah the captain, etc.— XVIII. 1-34. Jehoshaphat in alliance with Ahab.—Taken from 1 K. 22:40 almost verbatim except in the case of 1 K. 22:14, which is rewritten or replaced in 18:1. The narrative in 1 K. belongs to the prophetic stories forming a part of the history of Ahab, and is the only instance of an extensive excerpt from the history of N. Israel in Chronicles. It was apparently introduced for the honourable part which Jehoshaphat performed in seeking the word of Yahweh through Micaiah, and especially as a background of the reproof given for the alliance with Ahab in the following chapter.

1-3. Jehoshaphat allies himself with Ahab.—Vv. 1:1 are from the pen of the Chronicler.—1. And had wealth and honour in abundance a duplicate of 17:14.—And he formed a marriage alliance with Ahab through the marriage of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat with Athaliah the daughter of Ahab (2 K. 8:19). From the disruption at the death of Solomon until the reign of Je-
hoshaphat, the N. and S. kingdoms seem to have been openly hostile to each other. How a reconciliation was effected between the two, whether by war or negotiation, is unknown, but, in view of the military service rendered to Israel in the Syrian wars (1 K. 22 2 K. 18:14) and against Moab (2 K. 3:5), Judah appears to have been a dependency of Israel. Yet, notwithstanding the denunciation given in 19:4, this alliance must have contributed much to the welfare of the S. kingdom, and probably laid the foundation for its prosperity under Jehoshaphat. Possible influences of the alliance have already been noticed (v. 5).—2. At the end of years] an indefinite expression of time substituted by the Chronicler for “and it came to pass in the third year” (1 K. 22:26), where the reference is to the period of peace between Syria and Israel (1 K. 22:17). The Chronicler probably referred to the marriage affinity, and means that some time after this Jehoshaphat visited Samaria.—And Ahab killed, etc.]. Ahab is represented as receiving Jehoshaphat on a friendly visit with great honour, and inducing him to join in the expedition against Ramoth-gilead, but the probability is that Ahab first decided on the expedition and then called upon Jehoshaphat to join him, whereupon the latter comes to Samaria (Klo., Bn. on 1 K. 22:36).—Ramoth-gilead]. Cf. for location 1 Ch. 6:66 (88). This frontier town was taken from Israel by the Syrians during either the reign of Baasha (1 K. 15:29) or more probably in the reign of Omri (1 K. 20:34), and not restored according to the treaty made after the battle of Aphek (1 K. 20:34), hence the expedition of Ahab.—3. From here through the chapter the narrative of 1 K. 22:26 is followed almost verbatim. While Jehoshaphat in the language of diplomacy in this verse expresses unanimity and full co-operation with Ahab, the subsequent narrative seems to reveal an underlying reluctance on the part of Jehoshaphat to enter upon the undertaking from doubt in regard to its successful issue. For changes in the verse compared with 1 K. 22:6 v. i.
4–27. The prophecy of Micaiah.—This is one of the most illuminating narratives in the OT. respecting the prophets of Yahweh. Micaiah vs. the four hundred shows that as sharp a line of cleavage ran between prophets of Yahweh in the days of Elijah and Elisha as in the days of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, when these latter denounced false prophets who clearly spoke in the name of Yahweh (Je. 23:16, 28:9, Ez. 12:2, 13:3). The appearance of four hundred prophets of Yahweh at the court of Ahab reveals that this story was written from a different point of view from 1 K. 17–19, where, under Ahab and Jezebel, the prophets of Yahweh are banished and slain and only Elijah appears left. Some prophets of Yahweh, then, were time-servers, ready to compromise with the worship of Baal and to prophesy according to royal pleasure, while others stood, like Elijah, for the worship of the righteous Yahweh alone. With these latter, Micaiah must be classed. These prophets were the forerunners of Amos, Hosea, and the other authors of OT. written prophecy. Some OT. writers only recognised this second class, while others took a broader view and enable us to trace more accurately the actual events of history.—5. The prophets]. These were prophets of Yahweh, since the King was inquiring after the word of Yahweh (v. 1).—6. Is there no prophet of Yahweh here besides] i.e., in addition to the four hundred who had spoken with such unanimity. Jehoshaphat evidently felt that Ahab had only called the prophets who were subservient to his desire and responded accordingly.—9. Clothed in garments] i.e., in royal attire. —In a threshing-floor]. A threshing-floor would be a large, flat, open, and elevated place, and hence convenient for such a convocation; but probably the phrase should be struck from the text (v. i.).—And all the prophets were prophesying before them] perhaps by lifting up their voices in unison, or by certain dervish-like manifestations of ecstasy (cf. v. 11).—10. Horns of iron] an emblem of offensive power (Dt. 33:17 Am. 6:1 Je. 48:31 Dn. 8:8). Such symbols were customary with the prophets. Cf. Je. 27:1 28:9 where Jeremiah wears a bar as a symbol of captivity and Hananiah, a prophet of the type of Zedekiah, breaks it from off his neck.—12. Behold the prophets have with one mouth spoken* good unto king] so 6 (v. i.).—14. The first reply of Micaiah is clearly
ironical, although not without a touch of politeness in favouring the
King's desire.—16. This vision is usually (and correctly) taken to
indicate the outcome of the campaign: Ahab will fall and the peo-
ple will return home.

Ba. interprets differently. He renders Yahweh hath said, These have
a master who is no master, i.e., Ahab was no shepherd but a spoiler of his
people, and Ba. thinks that the words in peace cannot fittingly apply to a
return of Israel home after a disaster in battle. The vision means, then,
that the man who has misgoverned Israel will not be permitted to lead
to victory.

18. Ahab would remove the depressing effect of the oracle upon
Jehoshaphat by insinuating that it proceeded from personal hos-
tility.—19. Micaiah indicates his words by a vision showing how
Yahweh was leading Ahab to destruction through a spirit of false-
hood in the mouths of his prophets. The scene is of Yahweh as
a heavenly king holding a court or council. For Yahweh's method
of dealing with Ahab cf. Ps. 18:16 (17).—20. The Hebrew allows
either a spirit or the spirit. If we read the former, one out of the
rest of the angelic beings who attend Yahweh, then we find here
in its most elementary form the doctrine of the later Jewish and
Christian Satan; but this interpretation is doubtful. The spirit
is the personified spirit of prophecy (cf. v. 18). The spirit, then,
which moved the four hundred prophets was the true spirit of
prophecy, though leading them into falsehood. The real deceiver
is Yahweh. Such a conception, however repugnant to us, was
agreeable to the Hebrew mind. Cf. Yahweh's hardening the heart,
Ex. 4:10 7:9 10:1 11:7 13:11; sending an evil spirit between Abime-
lech and the men of Shechem, Ju. 9:1; inciting David to wrong,
2 S. 24:1.—23. Zedekiah insultingly challenges Micaiah to vindi-
cate his prophecy.—24. Micaiah accepts the challenge and says
that Zedekiah shall perceive its truth in the disaster which shall
overtake him, a fugitive hiding for his life.—On inner chamber, cf.
—26. Bread of affliction and water of affliction] i.e., bread and
water in scant measure, cf. Is. 30:4.—27. The test of prophecy ac-
cording to Micaiah is its fulfilment. Cf. v. 14 Dt. 18:11.—And he
said hear ye, etc.]. These words are a marginal gloss taken from
Mi. 1, and form no part of the original narrative of 1 K. 22. They were inserted by some one who identified Micaiah with Micah, the prophet of the days of Hezekiah.

4. first of all, first, cf. Gn. 25 1 S. 5 (Dr.) 1 K. 14 (Bur.).—wanting Σ (β) —. the latter, as the forms show, is correct. — wanting Σ (β) —. The original in 1 K. was found in twenty-nine MSS. (Ki. BH., St. SBOT.). The changes were made to avoid the association of with false prophets. — wanting Σ (β) —. The latter, as the forms show, is correct. — wanting Σ (β) —. The changes were made to avoid the association of with false prophets. — wanting Σ (β) —. The latter, as the forms show, is correct. — wanting Σ (β) —. The changes were made to avoid the association of with false prophets.

4. oil first of all, first, cf. Gn. 25 1 S. 5 (Dr.) 1 K. 14 (Bur.).

The latter, as the forms show, is correct.

Micaiah with Micah, the prophet of the days of Hezekiah.
28–34. The defeat of the allies.—29. Ahab disguised himself probably to escape a central attack such as was made on Jehoshaphat, and also perhaps from the superstitious notion that by changing his identity he could in some way escape the evil foretold by Micaiah.—31. And Jehoshaphat cried out] probably to his men, but the Chronicler understood it as a prayer and added the remainder of the verse, which does not appear in 1 K. 22.—34. Ahab’s first impulse when wounded seems to have been to leave the battle (v. 27), but when he noted the fierceness of the fight he had himself propped up in his chariot and kept his place against the enemy. This is a splendid testimony to his prowess, even as one also is given in the command of the King of Syria to fight only with him (v. 26). The Chronicler omits the details given in 1 K. 22:4–10 of Ahab’s death and burial, because they would have been irrelevant in his narrative.

29. מִשְׁתַּחֲרוּתָה] either an example of inf. abs. used for the cohortative in excited speech Ges. § 113dd, or to be changed after Vrss. The former is allowed by Bur., BN., et al., but rejected by St., Sw. in SBOT. on 1 K., which gives the latter reading after ג, ש, זה, מְנָשֶׁה אֲחֵי וַעֲשַׁרֵי, preferred by Ki. BH., but גב of Ch. has כָּרָדְלָנְעָפוּ מֵע — וַעֲשַׁרֵי | apparel.—אֲחֵי | about thirty MSS., פ, ה, 1 K. 22:24 sg.—30. After וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲרוּתָה | read after כ, 1 K. בְּאָם [and] אֲחֵי וַעֲשַׁרֵי, 1 K. בְּאָם — without art.—31. אֲחֵי | 1 K. 22:4 + אֲחֵי וַעֲשַׁרֵי | 1 K. בְּאָם. The former to be preferred (Klo., Ki., Bur., et al.)
XIX. 1–3. Jehoshaphat reproved for his alliance with Ahab by the prophet Jehu.—A section clearly from the Chronicler. The N. kingdom in the mind of the Chronicler was entirely apostate from Yahweh, and hence the association of Jehoshaphat with Ahab was completely sinful and worthy of rebuke.—

1. In peace] with possible allusion to the words of Micaiah, 18:16. —2. Jehu the son of Hanani]. Cf. 1 K. 16:1 and, on Hanani, 2 Ch. 16:7. The Chronicler consistently introduces here Jehu, since Hanani his father appears in the reign of Asa the father of Jehoshaphat; but this does not exactly agree with 1 K. 16:1, where "Jehu son of Hanani" appears prophesying against Baasha, some forty years earlier than the death of Ahab.—The seer]. This term may apply either to Hanani (as assumed in note on 16:17) or to Jehu (Ke., Oe., Kau., Ki. Kom.).—That hate Yahweh]. Whether sg. or pl. (v. i.), the reference is clearly to Ahab. This historically is a total misconception of Ahab, who was a reverer of Yahweh, as is seen from his summoning the prophets of Yahweh (18:20) and in the names of his children Athaliah, Ahaziah, and Jehoram, which all are compounds of Yahweh.—Wrath] spoken with reference to the invasion of the Moabites and the Ammonites, c. 20 (Be., Ke., Zoe., Ba.).—3. Good things]. Cf. 12:20.—The Asheroth] a feminine pl. occurring twice elsewhere (Ju. 3:17 prob. a text. error, 2 Ch. 33:1), equivalent to Asherim (cf. 14:3 and 15:20). For this act of piety by Jehoshaphat, cf. 17:1.—And hast set thy heart to seek God]. Cf. 17:1.
4-11. The appointment of judges.—This section has already been referred to in connection with 17:1, with the suggestion that a tradition of historic value might underlie both. Yet on the other hand one cannot escape the force of Wellhausen's view that the story of Jehoshaphat's activity concerning the administration of justice may be due to the meaning of his name, "Yahweh is Judge" (Prol. p. 191). The Chronicler and those of his school felt called upon to idealise the kings of Judah, and most naturally idealised Jehoshaphat after the meaning of his name. They ascribed to him the foundation of a system of courts corresponding perhaps to those of their day (We. op. cit., Ki. Kom.) when in all probability a central sanhedrim existed at Jerusalem and local ones in other cities. Yet the judiciary given as established by Jehoshaphat corresponds very closely with that mentioned in Dt. 16:18-19 and might well have been derived from that source. In Dt. we read of judges in all thy gates (16:18), and likewise of a court of appeal at the central sanctuary, for if there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment... thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites and unto the judge at the central sanctuary, i.e., Jerusalem (Dt. 17:1). All jurisdiction among the Hebrews was originally invested in the family and administered by its head (Gn. 38:13-15; 31:4 cf. Dt. 21:1-12). Then in more organised and settled life this family authority was supplemented and restricted by a court composed of the elders of the village or city (Dt. 19:1-21:1). Under the monarchy the king also was an administrator of justice (2 S. 8:14-15; 15:8-10; I K. 3:19-22; Je. 22:14 Is. 16; Je. 23:1). An appeal apparently might be taken to him from a lower court, or one might go to him in the first instance. The priests also, since they were the mediators of divine law (Dt. 33:10 Je. 18:1 Ho. 4:1), and thus of divine decisions, were always concerned somewhat with the administration of justice (cf. Ex. 21:1-22:1: I S. 2:9: decisions at a sanctuary or from God would be delivered by a priest, cf. also decisions of Moses, Ex. 18:21-22). When then a central sanctuary was established, the chief priest naturally became a supreme judge. An interesting feature of the description of the judiciary, both here and in Dt., is the retirement of the king personally into the background in the exercise of the function.
properly belonging to the sovereign. Dt. speaks of the judge and the Chronicler gives this position to the ruler of the house of Judah. Probably the king in Israel delegated the administration of justice, although still held responsible for it, to others. Thus princes and members of the royal house are frequently alluded to as exercising judicial functions (Is. 1:9 3:4 Mi. 3:1 Je. 21:11 22:14 Ez. 45:1).

4. And Jehoshaphat dwelt in Jerusalem i.e., permanently. He no longer visited the court of the N. kingdom, but for a time at least confined himself to the sacred city and concerned himself with the sacred business of justice.—And he went out again]. The first time had been in the third year of his reign, when the commissioners of the law were sent out (17:9).—From Beersheba] the southern limit of his kingdom (cf. 1 Ch. 21:1) to the hill country of Ephraim] the northern limit of his kingdom, acquired by conquest (cf. 17).—And brought them back unto Yahweh]. Possibly an apostasy from Yahweh is thought of in connection with the alliance with northern Israel (c. 18); yet a similar activity is ascribed also to Asa (15:11).—5. And he set judges, etc.] V. s.—6. For ye judge not for man but for Yahweh]. The judges were representatives of Yahweh (cf. Ex. 18:17 21:1 Dt. 1:14).—7. Take heed and act i.e., take heed to act in pious awe of Yahweh.—For there is no iniquity with Yahweh our God or respect of persons or taking of a bribe]. This insistence that the judge should be in these particulars like unto Yahweh is worthy of notice. Cf. the description of Yahweh as judge, Gn. 18:21 Dt. 10:17.—8. A higher court is established at Jerusalem with jurisdiction in both religious and civil cases (v. s.). The former are expressed under the judgment of the Yahweh and the latter under controversies. Under the first expression also the Chronicler may have meant those cases to be decided according to the Pentateuch, which he believed already then to have been written, and under the second, cases requiring arbitration simply. The latter might well fall to the care of the heads of the fathers houses of Israel, i.e., the lay members of the court. On Israel representing the S. kingdom, cf. 12:4.—And for the controversies of the inhabitants of Jerusalem*. These controversies are not to be considered restricted to those of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, yet they presented their causes directly to this higher court.—10. The cases which
might come from other places before the court are now somewhat awkwardly enumerated.—*Between blood and blood* i.e., whether a man might be guilty of murder or only of manslaughter (cf. Ex. 21:12–14).—*Between law and commandment, statutes and judgments* i.e., under what laws cases should be judged, covering thus also all questions of the interpretation of the law.—11. *Amariah the chief priest*. Amariah is mentioned in 1 Ch. 5:7 (6:11) as the third chief priest after the first in the Temple (see corrected text), hence he would come in appropriately in the reign of Jehoshaphat.—*In all matters of Yahweh* i.e., in all religious or ecclesiastical matters, cf. v. 4.—*Zebadiah the son of Ishmael*] otherwise unknown. In 17 a Levite among the commissioners to teach the law has the same name.—*The ruler of the house of Judah*. The Chronicler thinks of the old tribal organisation with its head apart from the king being preserved.—*All the king's matters* i.e., civil cases coming under the king's jurisdiction; the controversies of v. 4.

5. יֵאָבֵד (יֵאָבֵד) [for every city, cf. 1 Ch. 26:28 (l. 124).—6. רָעָב (רָעָב) G read רָעָב, וּלְבָנָהּ, מִשְׁפָּה, רְוִיוֹן, in vos redundabili. Oe. emended רָעָב to רָעָב thy “and it shall be with you according to (your) judgment.” Better supply Yahweh as subject (Ke., et al.).—7. רָעָב (רָעָב). See R. in Dt. 10:17—8. יֵאָבֵד. Σ cf. R. These newly appointed judges could not be described as “returning” to Jerusalem, hence Kii. Ke., et al. referred the words to the statement in v. 4; but then this statement should precede v. 5, and the pl. must be explained on the rather doubtful assumption that Jehoshaphat and his retinue constitute the subject, although the sg. is used in v. 4. Better follow G, Η, and read רָעָב, and before it רָעָב, i.e., and for the controversies of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so Kau., Bn., Ki.—10. יֵאָבֵד. כָּסָע (כָּסָע) casus pendens, cf. Ges. § 143d. G, Η, omit 1—4 . . . בֵּית [cf. Gn. 1:—וּלְבָנָהּ] perhaps an Aram. loan-word; mostly in Ez. and Ec., and only here in Ch.

**XX. 1–30. The victory over the Moabites and the Ammonites.**—A religious tale of great marvel. The only history back of this story probably is the fact that Jehoshaphat, associated with Jehoram, was engaged in a campaign against the Moabites. This campaign is described in one way in 2 K. 3:14–27, where it is embellished with wonders to the glorification of Elisha the prophet of northern Israel; here the campaign wholly transformed is described in another way, and all semblance to historical reality is lost; only
the \textit{Moabites} remain as the enemies of Israel. Jehoshaphat is no longer associated with Jehoram, nor yet is he the attacking party, but is suffering invasion in his own land; his army also does not fight, but only prays (vv. 14-17). Edifying prayers and prophetic admonitions (vv. 18-19), and a startling wonder from Yahweh (vv. 20-21), which at the same time serves to show the importance of the worship of Yahweh through the Levites with services of song, are the principal features of the narrative. The influence of the prophetic tale of 2 K. may be seen in the feature of the self-destruction of enemies which appears in both (cf. 2 K. 3:29 with v. 20).

An attempt to defend the historicity of this narrative has been made by assuming an invasion of three kindred tribes to settle in western Palestine, coming by way of the southern end of the Dead Sea, harassed by the population of that district and ruptured (sic destroyed) by internal dissensions, and leaving a very great spoil, because, coming to settle, they brought all their property with them (Ba. Com. p. xxxi.). But in view of the thoroughly Midrashic character of the narrative such conjectures are idle.

1-4. The invasion.—1. \textit{After this}] i.e., after the events described in the previous chapter, where Jehoshaphat is represented engaged in works of piety and peace.—\textit{The sons of Moab and the sons of Ammon and the Meunim} (v. i.). The last people, so named from Ma’an, a city south of the Dead Sea, or representing an Arabian people (cf. 1 Ch. 4:11), appear as the children or inhabitants of Mount Seir in vv. 18-21.—2. \textit{The sea}] i.e., the Dead Sea.—\textit{From Edom} (v. i.). This reading Edom instead of Syria ( gv, RV.) requires only the change of a single consonant (סנננ ננ ננ). Syria lies far to the north of the Dead Sea, while Edom lies immediately to the south and south-east of the sea.—\textit{Hazazon-tamar} (Gn. 14:7) on the basis of this verse identified with En-gedi (Jos. 15:11 1 S. 23:11 Ct. 1:1 Ez. 47:10); mod. Ain Jidi, overlooking the western shore of the Dead Sea, 680 feet below the sea-level and 612 above that of the lake (EBi. II. col. 1293). There is little doubt but that this identification is correct. The name Hazazon seems preserved in the \textit{Wady Husaseh} north-west of En-gedi. \textit{Tamar}, meaning \textit{palm-tree}, is very appropriate.
Palm-trees are known to have flourished there (mentioned by Josephus, Ant. ix. 1, 2, and Pliny, HN. V. 15 (17)). The suggestion of the identification of Hazason-tamar with Tamar of Ez. 47* to the south-west of the Dead Sea (DB.) has little in its favour. A pass leads from En-gedi up into the hill-country of Judah. For a description of the route of this invading army, see GAS. HGHL. p. 172.—3. And proclaimed a fast. This was usual in view of any impending calamity (Jon. 3* ••) and involved the assembling of the people (1 K. 21* •• Je. 36* • Jo. 2*).

1. Since the Ammonites are already mentioned in this verse, and since three groups of people are mentioned in vv.18. 19. 20, read מֵעֲמָנוֹ with סָמָנוּ with Be., Ke., et al., cf. 26* I Ch. 4* ••.—2. וַיָּדְדוּ used as the French on and the German man, v. Ges. § 144f.—[ןַעֲמָךְ] other MSS. מִזְמָךְ, great number a late usage, cf. 1 Ch. 26*.—3. והם also in ס, but improbable here. Read מַתְנָי with most commentators (v. s.). ס, לְהַמְסַר, seems to have read לְֹרָם.—3. מָמִינוּ ... מָמִינוּ he set his face, i.e., he determined, equivalent to רָנוּ ... רָנוּ in 2 K. 12*.

5–13. Jehoshaphat's prayer.—This prayer contains the following elements: (1) an invocation of Yahweh as all-powerful (v.1); (2) the land now threatened had been given by him as a perpetual possession (v.2); (3) a sanctuary has been built in this land for him, with faith in his presence to deliver in every time of need (vv. 3* ••); (4) these enemies are requiting evil for good upon this his land (vv. 4* ••); (5) Israel is powerless before these enemies and can only look unto him for help (v. 5*).

5. Before the new court] i.e., directly in front of the Temple, toward which Jehoshaphat prayed, on the inner side of the outer court where the people were assembled (cf. 4* Ez. 46* ••). This outer court was called new not because restored or extended under Asa or Jehoshaphat (Ke., Zoe.), since it did not properly exist at that time (cf. 4*), but probably because when the second Temple was built it was recognised as new, and this name clung to it even until the time of the Chronicler.—6. God in the heavens] an expression of divine omnipotence (cf. Dt. 4* Jos. 2* Ps. 115*).—7. Abraham thy friend]. Cf. Is. 41*.—9. If evil come upon us, etc.]
a brief summary of the cases in Solomon's dedicatory prayer in which Yahweh would hear the people's cry, cf. 6:11-15.—10. And mount Seir]. With the Moabites and Ammonites were joined also Edomites (cf. v. 1).—Whom thou didst not allow Israel to invade, etc.]. According to Dt. 2.10 Nu. 20.8-11, the children of Israel, on the journey to Canaan, were forbidden to contend with the Edomites or the Moabites or to take their land.—11. To cast us out of thy possession]. The invading hosts are represented as pur¬posing to make a permanent settlement in Judah.—12. The attitude of complete helplessness assumed by Jehoshaphat in spite of his great army (17:11-15) reminds one of the similar wail raised by Joshua after the defeat at Ai (Jos. 7).—13. In their distress the entire population has gathered to intercede with Yahweh (cf. Jo. 2:1 Jon. 3).

5. אֵלִיָּהוּ [nine MSS. and G אָלִיָּהוֹ] cf. Is. 13:4. The usual expression of the Chronicler is פֹּלָשְׁתֵּים וגוֹ as, 1 Ch. 29:8 2 Ch. 12:17 19:20—8. מַעְרָב omitted by G א, probably because of the following יִשָּׂרָאֵל used to designate Temple and precincts also in 1 Ch. 22:9.—9. שָׁמַי if correct, judgment, so G. θῆμι of the apodosis of a conditional sentence, v. Ges. § 108/.—11. כָּלֹנָה הִשָּׁב. Doubtless is original, since the Chronicler regards the kingdom as belonging to Yahweh, cf. 1 Ch. 17:12 (cp. 2 S. 7:12) 28:29:11. 12, and G could easily arise from the reading of כָּלֹנָה, but not vice versa.—13. נִשְׂרָה יְהֹואָדָד כַּלָּא. Bn. after G supplies י before כַּלָּא and strikes out כְּכַלָּא as unsuitable after כַּלָּא. Ki. Kom. considers כְּכַלָּא a gloss, but כַּלָּא is used with כִּנֵיה הָנִישָׁר in 31:9, and with כִּנֵיה הָנִישָׁר in Ez. 31:6. G adds כִּנֵיה הָנִישָׁר, possibly original, but may have been added merely for completeness. Hence it is sufficient to supply כִּנֵיה with G.

14-19. The assuring promise of Jahaziel.—Jehoshaphat's prayer is answered by a promise of deliverance from Yahweh through Jahaziel, a Levite of the sons of Asaph.—14. Jahaziel the son, etc.]. On the occurrence of the name Jahaziel, cf. 1 Ch. 16. The appearance of a Levite singer as a prophet is noticeable, yet fully in accord with the entire description which gives such a large place to worship, and especially to the use of praise, in gaining the
victory (vv. 13–14, cf. also v. 11).—Mattaniah]. In 1 Ch. 25 this name appears among the sons of Heman, and its frequent occurrence elsewhere shows that it represented persons or a person or family of importance in early post-exilic Judaism. Mattaniah appears as a son of Asaph, with the connecting link Micah in the pedigree of Uzzi, an overseer of the Levites at Jerusalem (Ne. 11), and also with the further link Zaccur in the pedigree of a Zechariah, a musician who took part in the dedication of Jerusalem Ne. 12. Mattaniah with this same connection also, though written Zichri and Zabdi instead of Zaccur, appears among the post-exilic inhabitants of Jerusalem (1 Ch. 9 and also with the further link Zaccur in the pedigree of a Zechariah, a musician who took part in the dedication of Jerusalem Ne. 12).—Sons of Asaph]. Cf. 1 Ch. 6:25–26 (m–n).—Upon him was the spirit of Yahweh]. Cf. 15:1–15. For the battle is not yours but God's]. Cf. 1 S. 17:16. By the ascent of Ziz] not mentioned elsewhere; probably Ziz should be read Haziz (v. i.), and the locality is the Wady Hasasa (v. i. and v. 1).—Wilderness of Jeruel] unidentified, probably to the south-east of the wilderness of Tekoa (v. 1), toward Wady Hasasa.—17. Take your place, stand still and see the salvation of Yahweh]. These words, omitting stand still, are found in Ex. 14 in Moses' address to the children of Israel at the shore of the Red Sea.—18. Both Jehoshaphat and the people in thanksgiving for the glorious promise reverently prostrate themselves upon the ground.—19. And the Levites . . . stood up to praise Yahweh] possibly while the rest of the people were prostrating themselves or remaining for the time being prostrate. The Levites are naturally mentioned in connection with praise to Yahweh, since the assembly is in the court of the Temple (v. i.) and they would be on hand for such a service.—Sons of Kehath] one of the three great clan divisions of the Levites (cf. 1 Ch. 6:7–18. 44 (16. 22. 41) 15:2 Ch. 20:10 34, without sons, i.e., Kehathites 1 Ch. 6:16 (21)). The sons of Korah, on the other hand, from their mention in the titles of the eleven Pss. (42–49, 84, 85, 87, 88), were clearly a guild of singers, probably that
which was represented by Heman (1 Ch. 6:19) (v. also on 1 Ch. 26:1).

14. בֵּיתוֹן may indicate בֵּיתוֹן, but are probably corrupt.—16. גָּלָה.] גָּלָה, גָּלָה, גָּלָה may indicate בֵּיתוֹן, but are probably corrupt.—16. גָּלָה. גָּלָה, גָּלָה, other mss. גָּלָה. גָּלָה. גָּלָה may be a corruption of גָּלָה, cf. Wady Hasads and plateau Hasads, cf. Buhl, GAP. p. 97.—גָּלָה end, late synon. of יְם (BDB.). Elsewhere Jo. 2:11 Ec. 3:12a.—גָּלָה founded of God. גָּלָה = בֵּיתוֹן.

20-30. The victory and the spoil.—On the day following the assembly at the Temple the people marched forth into the wilderness of Tekoa, some fourteen miles south of Jerusalem, and with singers at their head, approached the invading hosts. When the singers began to sing, unseen agencies caused the invaders to turn one against the other until they were completely destroyed, so that Jehoshaphat and his people found only a slain host, from which they secured immense and valuable booty requiring three days for its gathering. On the fourth day, after assembling in a valley, where they blessed Yahweh and thus called the place the Valley of Blessing, they returned with music unto the Temple; and through the fear of Yahweh from the report of this victory among the surrounding countries rest and quiet came to the kingdom of Jehoshaphat.

20. The wilderness of Tekoa] the open country around Tekoa (cf. 1 Ch. 21).—Believe ye in Yahweh your God so shall ye be established]. Isaiah used the same words applied negatively in his address to Ahaz (Is. 7:12).—21. In holy attire] i.e., in priestly garments (cf. 1 Ch. 16:41). The singers probably are to be thought of as Levites of the Temple service.—Give thanks unto Yahweh, etc.] a direct refrain often found in the Psalms, but always with the additional words (after Yahweh) for he is good, which have been omitted either by a copyist or more likely because familiar, and hence readily supplied (cf. 1 Ch. 16:41).—22. Liars-in-wait] not Judeans by the suggestion of Yahweh (as in Jos. 8:1) (Ba.), since they were not to fight (v. 11), nor a portion of the invading host, the men of Seir thus conspiring against the Moabites and Ammonites (cf. v. 14) (Ke., Zoe., H-J.), but supernatural divine agencies (Be., Oe.,
Bn.), which suddenly coming upon the advancing host or taking possession of them, caused them to be enraged against one another in deadly combat (v. 23) — a means not unlike that of the lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab’s prophets (cf. 18:15). — *And they were smitten* i.e., defeated and destroyed — a summary of that which is described in the next verse. — **23. For the children of Ammon and Moab stood up against the inhabitants, etc.** Cf. Ju. 7:18 1 S. 14:20 2 K. 3:11. Such internecine strife caused by Yahweh appears also in the later prophets in the future destruction of the enemies of Israel (cf. Ez. 38:11 Hg. 2:2 Zc. 14:2). — **24. And when Judah came upon an outlook point of the wilderness.** The writer pictures Jehoshaphat and his men advancing toward the invading host and then from some elevation seeing the host all lying slain. — **25. They found cattle* in abundance and goods (i.e., the general stuff of such an invading host) and garments* and precious things (such as arms, utensils, ornaments, or any wrought article)*. Cf. the spoil taken from Zerah’s host (14:9) and from the Midianites (Ju. 8:21). — **26. In the valley of Berakah* i.e., in the valley of Blessing. This name appears preserved in both Berèkut, an abandoned village west of Tekoa, containing ruins of great age (Buhl, GAP. p. 97), and in a Wadi Bereikut near Tekoa (Be., Bn.). — **27. Then all the men of Judah and Jerusalem journeyed back with Jehoshaphat at their head returning to Jerusalem with joy since Yahweh had caused them to rejoice over their enemies.** Cf. on last clause Ezr. 6:12 Ne. 12:27. — **28. And the fear of God, etc.** Cf. 17:1. — **29. And his God gave him rest round about.** Cf. 14:1 15:2.

20. בְּעָשָׁה [cf. 1 Ch. 28:27] — בְּעָשָׁה (but חָשָׁה) weak 1 used with the imperfect to express the design or purpose of a preceding act (Dr. *TH*. § 60); for imperative followed by imperfect, v. Koe. iii. § 364. Niph. so used after Hiph. also in Is. 7:1. — 21. מִיַּעַד [with יָא also in 2 K. 6:4] meaning appoint late, cf. 1 Ch. 6:53 (l. 89). — לִיֵּהָ יִשְׂרָאֵל [cf. 1 Ch. 16:3]. — יָעַב [דָּוִד], thirteen mss., 3 add דָּוִד. — 22. מִיַעַד with retrospective omitted, v. Ges. § 155. — בְּעָשָׁה וּבֵיהֵמָה בֵּעָשָׁה [Bue. (ZAW. ’99, p. 100 n.) proposes the reading בֵּיהֵמָה בֵּ测评ה (1 K. 8:11 Je. 7:1) and considers the phrase equivalent to יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל in 2 Ch. 13:19] and considers the phrase equivalent to יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל in 2 Ch. 13:19. Whilst the word is not elsewhere joined with יִשְׂרָאֵל, its use with יִשְׂרָאֵל in Ps. 42 supports the usage here. — יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל is used parallel to יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, cf. Ps. 104:14. — 24. מִיַעַד מִיַעַד] outlook point, as a common noun also in Is. 21:1. By a
peculiar Heb. idiom the article is used to designate a thing, primarily yet unknown but present in the writer's mind as a definite object, i.e., the Chronicler vividly pictured Jehoshaphat's march to its destination, a certain high vantage-point in the wilderness which becomes the definite point to him, cf. Ges. § 136c, also Bur. on i K. 13. — End of Jehoshaphat's reign. — From i K. 22 with some variations (v. i.).

31. And Jehoshaphat reigned over Judah. This apparently superfluous statement is due to the Chronicler's source, i K. 22, a verse marking the beginning of the narrative of the reign of Jehoshaphat where it says (He) began to reign over Judah in the fourth year of Ahab king of Israel, but the Chronicler will not date the accession of a king of Judah by a year of the ungodly king of the schismatic N. kingdom. The remainder of this verse is essentially identical with i K. 22. — Azubah] the name also of a reputed wife of Caleb (cf. 1 Ch. 2). — Shilhi.] Nothing further is known of this father and his daughter. — 32. And he walked in the way of Asa his father. Cf. 17. — 33. Howbeit the high places were not taken away. This statement from i K. 22 is not exactly consistent with 17 (q. v.) and the Chronicler's entire description of Jehoshaphat's piety. Neither as yet, etc.]

34. Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat the first and the last] the Chronicler's usual formula (cf. 12). — In the acts (words) not an independent work written by Jehu the son of Hanani (cf. 19), but a section of the Book of the Kings of Israel containing his name (v. Intro. pp. 21 f.).
35–37. The destruction of Jehoshaphat’s fleet.—From 1 K. 22:1–5, quite rewritten. This passage in 1 K. is not entirely clear, but its present text was before the Chronicler. This relates that Jehoshaphat built ships of Tarshish (i.e., a particular kind) to sail to Ophir for gold, but the vessels were wrecked. Then Ahaziah proposed to join with Jehoshaphat in this marine undertaking, but Jehoshaphat declined the alliance. The Chronicler, on the other hand, places Jehoshaphat in alliance with Ahaziah, a very wicked king, and relates that they jointly built ships to go to Tarshish and that the ships were wrecked because Jehoshaphat had allied himself with Ahaziah. The calamity then befalling the good king Jehoshaphat in the loss of his vessels is explained through his sin of allying himself with a king of Israel. Attempts have been made to harmonise the two narratives on the ground of their incompleteness. Thus Jehoshaphat accepted the aid of the King of Israel in building but not in navigating the ships (Ba.).—35. And after this] i.e., after the marvellous deliverance recorded in vv. 1–10. No time limit is given in 1 K., but the statement Jehoshaphat made ships immediately follows the statement (1 K. 22:1 omitted by the Chronicler) and there was no king in Edom: a deputy was king, i.e., Edom was still controlled by Judah, hence shipbuilding was undertaken by Jehoshaphat on the Gulf of Akabah south of Edom. —The time in Jehoshaphat’s reign is fixed by the mention of Ahaziah the immediate successor of Ahab, who reigned only some two years.—The same did very wickedly] a statement of the Chronicler to emphasise the sin of Jehoshaphat’s alliance.—36. To go to Tarshish] 1 K. 22:1 ships of Tarshish, i.e., a class of ships used in the Tarshish trade, but the Chronicler misunderstood the meaning of the phrase and assumed that they were to go to Tarshish (cf. 9:11). In 1 K. 22:1 the destination of the ships is
XXI. The reign of Jehoram (c. 851–843 B.C.).—The Chronicler introduces his account of this reign with the verse in 1 K. (22:8) concluding the summary of the reign of Jehoshaphat (21:1). He then mentions the other sons of Jehoshaphat (v. 2), their father's generous treatment of them (v. 3), and their destruction by Jehoram after he came to the throne. These particulars are not related in 1 K. Then is given the account of Jehoram's accession and evil character, taken from 2 K. 8:9-19 (vv. 5-7), and the account of the revolt of Edom, taken from 2 K. 8:10-11 (vv. 8-10). The remainder of the narrative, which consists of a threatening letter from Elijah (vv. 13-16), an account of a sack of Jerusalem by the Philistines and others (vv. 16-17), and an account of Jehoram's horrible end through disease (vv. 18-19), is independent of 1 and 2 K. This new material seems to be either embellished traditions or history simply imagined in a way suitable, according to the Chronicler's theory, to the evil character of Jehoram.

Ki. following Bn. assigns vv. 3-4 to the Chronicler's forerunner (Bn. non-canonical) and vv. 13-18 to M, but these verses have all the marks of the style of the Chronicler. Be. maintained, but without sufficient reason, that Elijah's letter had marks of another writer, mentioning the Hiph. of גָּרַע v. 18 and v. 11 elsewhere not in Ch. (but the occurrence in
v. 11 certainly offsets the occurrence in the letter), the rare pl. מַעֲרִית (v. 8) and זָרַע (v. 14, Pr. 18:1) and the expression זַעֲקַעְרָה (v. 10) not elsewhere in Ch. Graf argued correctly, on the other hand, the appearance of expressions used by the Chronicler elsewhere, הָעַרְיָה (v. 11), cf. 11:17 17:20 21:8 22:3 28:3 34:3 (the expression yet is too common on which to lay weight), cf. v. 17 v. 8 22:7: 8, and cf. in v. 18 the parallelisms with v. 19 (in the former probably read יְהִי instead of יְהִי Ki. BH.).—Marks of the Chronicler in other verses: prefixed מַעֲרִית (v. 4); מַעֲרִית v. 1 (cf. 11); מַעֲרִית v. 18 (cf. 33:17 Ch. 5:8 Ezr. 1:1); the Philistines and Arabians v. 11, cf. 17:11; לַיְם מַעֲרִית (I. 132) v. 19.

1-7. Jehoram's accession and character.—Vv. 1-3 are without parallels in Kings.—1. Slept with his fathers, etc.] Cf. 9:1.—2. Azariah.] The second of this name should be struck out (v. i.).—Israel] used for the S. kingdom, also in v. 4, cf. 12:2.—3. And their father gave, etc.] Cf. the somewhat similar treatment by Rehoboam of his sons.—Because he was the first born] mentioned as though Jehoram had no other special qualification to be his father's successor.—Slew all his brethren, etc.] because of their non-concurrence with his and his wife's (Athaliah's) idolatry (cf. v. 10) (Ke., Zoe.), probably from tyrannical jealousy (Oe.); but all explanations are mere conjectures.—5-7. Parallel with 2 K. 8:17-18. —6. According to that which the house of Ahab did] i.e., according to the doings of the house of Ahab.—The daughter of Ahab]. Cf. 18:1.—7. House of David]. 2 K. 8:19 has Judah. The Chronicler may have made the change because he felt on account of the Captivity that the Davidic promise was restricted to the Davidic house.—As he promised to give a lamp to him and his children always]. The Chronicler uses the lamp as a figure of life (cf. Jb. 18:24 Pr. 13:24v), i.e., that the seed of David should never be destroyed (2 S. 7:10-11).

1. מַעֲרִית (v. 8) so also 1 K. 22:1, where probably a dittography; omitted by ₩ in both places, rightly in 1 K. (St. SBOT.).—בַּעַרְיָה] 1 K. + וָאָמ which the Chronicler omitted because of the preceding dittography.—2. מַעֲרִית] כִּפְתָּר וָאָמ may be original, since in accord with the Chronicler's habit, cf. 1 Ch. 2:3 6:1 7:2 25:4 et al., but the original list probably contained only one Azariah, hence a name has disappeared if this numeral was originally in the text.—בַּעַרְיָה] about forty mss. and the Vrss. יְהִי, which is followed by Ki., but Israel is used for Judah in v. 18:3 28:7 and elsewhere, and the change to Judah is easier.
8–10. The revolt of Edom.—With minor changes and slight omissions, from 2 K. 8:10–11. V. 1b (2 K. 8:10) is of doubtful meaning.—8. In his days Edom revolted. Edom was subdued by David, 2 S. 8:17; 1 Ch. 18:1, and, unless for a time it regained its independence during the reign of Solomon (cf. 1 K. 11:14, Noeldeke, EBii. II. col. 1184), it remained subject to the united kingdom and Judah until the reign of Jehoram and the event here described. During the reign of Jehoshaphat it was clearly subject to Judah, as the account of his ship-building operations shows (cf. 20:17).—9. And Jehoram passed over, etc. entered Edom with his army to subdue it.—And he rose by night, etc. The sequel (v. 10) shows that the expedition of Jehoram was a failure, and hence an account of a defeat must have been contained in the primary source of v. 10 (2 K. 8:10). Possibly it read, “And Edom arose by night and encompassed him and smote him and the captains of the chariots” (Stade, Gesch. I. p. 537 n. 1, and ZAW. XXI. pp. 337 ff.).—10. Unto this day] words of 2 K. 8:10, and simply quoted by the Chronicler because in his source.—Libnah] a town not far from Lachish, on the south-western border of Judah near Philistia (cf. 1 Ch. 6:11). Since it is said to have revolted, it has been regarded as a Philistine city (Sk.), but it was reckoned as a priestly city (Jos. 21:14). Sennacherib besieged it (2 K. 19:4).

11–15. The letter of Elijah.—A pure product of the imagination, since Elijah had nothing to do with the S. kingdom, and
clearly was not living at this time (2 K. 3:2.), although such an inference might have been drawn from 2 K. 1:1. From its literary correspondence with the rest of the chapter, the letter was probably written by the same author. The motive of the letter is to heighten Jehoram's character as an obstinate and outrageous sinner, since he had neglected to heed a divine warning of the calamities which afterward befell him.—11. Moreover he made, etc.] i.e., in addition to his wickedness described in v. 4, which may be taken as the supposed cause of the revolt of Edom, Jehoram directly institutes high places, or seats of idolatrous worship (cf. 14:4).—To play the harlot] i.e., to worship deities other than Yahweh. The people were thought of as married to their God, and any foreign worship was regarded as whoredom or harlotry. (Cf. 1 Ch. 5:4.)—12. In the ways of Jehoshaphat thy father nor in the ways of Asa king of Judah.] Both Jehoshaphat and Asa are regarded as especially good kings (cf. 14:4 17:20).—13. Like as the house of Ahab caused harlotry. Ahab through the influence of his wife, Jezebel, was potent in introducing the worship of foreign gods in Israel (cf. 1 K. 16:34).—And also has slain thy brethren. Cf. v. 4.—14. With a great stroke. The reference is to the calamity of vv. 11—16. And thou shalt have great sickness, etc.] the disease described in vv. 11—16. [Day by day] i.e., a prolonged sickness.

16 f. The raid into Judah. No inkling of this raid with its disastrous consequences is given in Kings, and while it may have some historical foundation in a raid of nomads into southern Judah
yet as described with its disastrous consequences it probably never took place (yet accepted throughout by Pa. EHSP. p. 214). The narrative, however, does not necessarily imply a sack of Jerusalem, as has often been supposed (Be.), but quite otherwise (v. i.). The history of the city was too well known for the writer to have presumed upon such a fiction.—16. Spirit]. Cf. 1 Ch. 5. —The Philistines and the Arabians]. Cf. 17, where these very people are mentioned as giving tribute to Jehoshaphat.—Which are beside the Cushites]. Cf. 14 (9) 1 Ch. 1. The geographic knowledge of the ancients of Ethiopia and southern Arabia was very indefinite. Herodotus considered all the land east of the Nile Arabia (II. 8, 12, 15, 19), which could thus be described as beside the Cushites.—17. And they came up into Judah and broke through into it] that is, they made a raid into the land.—And they took as plunder every possession which was found belonging to the royal house and his sons and his wives]. This language most naturally, taken by itself, suggests that the royal palace at Jerusalem was plundered, but it need not imply anything more than the taking of royal stuff which, with children and wives, might have been in camp (so essentially Ke., Zoe., Ba.). This also seems to have been the view taken by the Chronicler in 22 (q. v.), if there is followed.—And there was not left, etc.]. This statement taken with v. 4, where Jehoram slew all his brothers, is difficult to reconcile with 2 K. 10, where brethren of Ahaziah (Jehoahaz) king of Judah to the number of forty-two are mentioned. Whence came these latter if the royal house of David had been so thoroughly exterminated (We. Prol. p. 210)? The two narratives are really irreconcilable.—Jehoahaz] elsewhere Ahaziah (22). The two names are compounds of Yahweh and the verb to seize, but written in the reverse order.

18. and wanting in G.—17. הבשיטבוי) break through or into, cf. 1 Ch. 17 2 S. 23 and Hiph. Is. 7. —There is no Psalms 218, but cf. v. 15.—one ms., G, $, $, ויקתהש. 18–20. The end of Jehoram.—18 f. In his bowels with an incurable disease, etc.]. The writer probably thought of some violent and incurable chronic diarrhoea. (For a detailed description of the malady, see Ke., Zoe.).—19. And it came to pass after a pro-
longed time and at the time when the end [of his life] came, during two days his bowels were going out by reason of his sickness and he died] (v. i.).—Made no burning for him] i.e., of spices, cf. 16. The King was treated with less respect than his fathers.—20. Cf. v. i. The Chronicler is quoting here from 2 K. 8 and then from 2 K. 8.—Without being desired] i.e., without being lamented (v. i.).—But not in the sepulchre of the kings] an addition of the Chronicler to enhance the vileness of Jehoram.

18. . . . T's succederet dies. The phrase occurs only here and means after a prolonged time, cf. Dn. 8, expressed more briefly by Ju. 14 14 15 a difficult passage, since the preceding implies a longer time than two days. To remove this contradiction, and, and most commentators have translated two years (so EVs.). rendered not recte, and so Oe. Others render and he departed, mourned by none, Ke., Zoe., Kau., K.i., EVs. More recently Bn. has suggested that Cl may be right, and that tradition told of a sudden death after two days' illness. The Midrash made a long illness out of this, and the confusion arose from a gloss, by a better-informed reader. But Cl doubtless read . It is better to consider as a phrase describing the approaching end of life as a consequence of the disease, an accusative of duration of time introduced by as the sign of the acc.; and, an impf. of continued action (Ges. § 107b); translating and at the time when the end came, his bowels were going out during two days. Ke.'s explanation is similar, “about two days (before the issue of the end of the disease) then the bowels went out.”—] at the time of his sickness, but perhaps should be read (BDB. θησίδιον).—20. an addition by the Chronicler, cf. 2 K. 8. Luther, following ambulavitque non recte, rendered er wandelte das nicht fein war (i.e., he lived undesirably) and so Oe. Others render and he departed, mourned by none or without being desired, Ke., Zoe., Kau., K.i., EVs.

XXII. The reign of Ahaziah and the usurpation of Athaliah (c. 843–836 B.C.).—The brief reign of Ahaziah (843–842) was marked by the continuance of the alliance between the N. and S. kingdoms, which involved Ahaziah in the revolution of Jehu and led to his untimely end. The Chronicler has used all the material of 2 K. concerning this reign and the usurpation of Athaliah, with
the exception of the narratives of the death of Ahaziah and the massacre of the princes of Judah. In giving the account of these (vv. 1-9) he has followed, without a clearly discernible motive, another source (v. i.).

Kt., in the main, after Bn., assigns v.1 to M and holds that vv. 2-4a are M's recension of 2 K., and likewise vv. 7-9 are from M. While the Chronicler doubtless drew the variant information of vv. 1, 7-9 (v. i.) from a Midrashic source, the narrative yet bears the marks of his composition, especially in v. 8b in the use of רָעָה (l. 23), וָאֵין לוּבִי (l. 129), and וַיְיהֵרֶף (l. 92).

1-6. Ahaziah's character and brief career. — Taken, after a composite introductory verse, from 2 K. 8:18-19. — 1. And the inhabitants of Jerusalem] decide, according to the Chronicler, who shall be king, probably in view of the disasters which the Chronicler holds to have befallen the royal house. Cf. the enthronement of Jehoahaz the son of Josiah by the people after the disaster at Megiddo, 2 K. 23:29. Such unusual action would imply that the succession was disputed. — Ahaziah the youngest son. Cf. 21:17. — For all the eldest, the band who came with the Arabians to the camp slew. This describes the fate of the royal princes who seemingly were slain while in the field in camp by a marauding band at the time of the Philistine and Arabian invasion (21:1-4). G, however, read differently, making the word camp a tribal or geographical name of the Arabians (v. i.). — 2. Forty-two years] 1 K. 8:19 twenty-two. This latter number is much nearer correct, since according to 21:20 (2 K. 8:17) Jehoram the father was only forty years old at the time of his death. G has here twenty. — The daughter of Omri. Omri was the father of Ahab, the founder of the dynasty, 1 K. 16:16. Daughter is here used with the meaning of granddaughter, since Athaliah was unquestionably the daughter of Ahab (cf. 18:12). — 3. For his mother was his counsellor to do wickedly] an addition to the text of 2 K. 8:19. — 4 f. For they were his counsellors after the death of his father to his destruction. He walked also after their counsel] also an addition to 2 K. 8:19. The Chronicler thus emphasises the evil influence of the association of the house of David with that of Ahab. — And he went with Jehoram, etc.] The alliance between the N. and S. kingdoms thus continued (cf. 18:1), and the war also
with the Syrians, in which Israel seems to have gained a certain advantage, since Ramoth-gilead (cf. 18'), although still the centre of military operations, was at this time in the possession of Israel (cf. 2 K. 9'').—Hazael, the former general of Ben-hadad King of Syria (cf. 16'), and now by usurpation, if not also assassination, his successor (cf. 2 K. 8'').—And the Syrians]. Another reading is archers (v. i.).—Wounded Joram]. The two names Jehoram (v. i) and Joram are the same, simply spelled in a shorter or longer form (v. i.).—6. And he returned to be healed in Jezre'el of the wounds with which he had been smitten (lit. which they had smitten him)]. Thus this sentence is to be read after 2 K. 8''.—Jezre'el, mod. Zerin at the east end of the plain of Esdraelon, about midway between Megiddo and Bethshean. It is located on an abrupt hill, terminating the range of Gilboa, some two hundred feet above the plain, of which it commands a fine view. Jezre'el was a city of residence for the royal family of the N. kingdom. Ahab had a palace there (1 K. 21').—Ramah, i.e., Ramoth-gilead.—And Ahasiah* . . . went down]. The expression went down seems to imply that the visit was made from Jerusalem (cf. 2 K. 9''), although some think that he went down from Ramoth-gilead.

1. [is corrupt. 以色列] gives no aid, except by suggesting that it may have fallen from the text after אברב. —2. [2 K. 8''] which was probably original here (v. s.).—Ahab is doubtless a correction, cf. 2 K. 3.—5. [2 K. 8''] wanting in and 2 K., possibly a gloss (Bn.).—[2 K. 25'] also written אליהו, cf. v. 4. Both forms occur in 2 K.—[2 K. 18'] point to the original vocalisation, see St. SBOT. on 1 K. 23'' a few ms., and a K. אביא and so Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Kau., Ki. Kom., EVs.—6. [2 K. 8''] about twelve mss., אביא, אביא, אביא, אביא, והם which read with Be., Ke., Oe., Kau., et al.—[2 K. 25'], the former is more natural, but the latter allowable, cf. Dr. TH. § 27 (γ), also St. SBOT.—2 K. adds the subject יראות, which is supported by אביא, אביא. —[2 K. 8''] a copyist's error for וחוזה, which is found in fifteen ms., Vrss., and 2 K.

7-9. The death of Ahaziah.—This differs from the account given in 2 K. in the following particulars. There the death of the
princes is placed subsequent to Jehu's attack upon Ahaziah (2 K. 10:1), while the Chronicler or his source places their death apparently first. Ahaziah also, according to 2 K., rides forth with Joram and meets Jehu, and witnessing the death of Joram flees and is pursued by Jehu and wounded in his chariot near Ibleam by one of Jehu's men, but he reaches Megiddo and dies there. Then his servants carry him to Jerusalem (2 K. 9:27). Here, on the other hand, Ahaziah is represented as caught while hiding in Samaria and slain, having been brought forth to Jehu. This narrative is irreconcilable with the other and probably comes from some narrator who, thinking of the close association between Ahaziah and the house of Ahab, and its evil consequences, imagined that he sought refuge in Samaria and was from thence dragged forth and slain.—

7. And from God was the destruction of Ahaziah so that he came to Joram; i.e., it was divinely purposed that Ahaziah should go to Joram to his destruction.—

And when he came he went out with Joram unto Jehu. The two kings, according to 2 K. 9:1, rode out together, each in his own chariot, to meet Jehu. —Whom Yahweh had anointed to cut off the house of Ahab. According to 1 K. 19:14, Yahweh commanded Elijah to anoint Jehu king over Israel. This was carried out by one of the sons of the prophets commissioned by Elisha (2 K. 9:1), and the act was done furthermore, according to the compiler of Kings, with the direct purpose that the house of Ahab might be destroyed (2 K. 9:14).—

8. And the sons of the brethren. C omits sons and preserves probably the true reading (v. i.). If sons is correct, then these victims were little lads, since their grandfather Joram was only forty years old on his death in the previous year. The phrase ministering also means, properly, serving as state officials or officers of the army (v. i.), and it seems probable that these victims were so intended, and that we have here a tradition of the death of brothers or kinsmen of Ahaziah quite different from that of 2 K. 10:1, where forty-two of them were slain by the command of Jehu, on their way to visit their cousins of the house of Ahab. The latter also, as already noted, met their death a day or two after the death of Ahaziah, while these are slain apparently before that event.—

9. And he sought Ahaziah and they took him—now he had hidden himself in
Samaria—and they brought him to Jehu and put him to death] a
totally different representation of the death of Ahaziah from that
given in 2 K. 9\* (v. s.).—And they buried him] apparently in
contrast to leaving his body unburied, as was usual with a person
who met a violent death at a king’s command. According to 2 K.
9\* his servants carried his body from Megiddo, where he died from
the effect of his wound, in a chariot to Jerusalem, “and buried him
in his sepulchre with his fathers in the city of David.” But the
Chronicler seemingly could not bring himself to record so honour¬
able a fate for a king so reprobate and such an object of divine
judgment; and the burial granted him the Chronicler allowed
given only for the sake of his pious grandfather: for they said
he is the son of Jehoshaphat who sought Yahweh with his whole
heart.—And the house of Ahaziah had no strength to hold the king¬
don] hence it passed into the control of Athaliah.

7. PDian f
tread down, trample.—from סבל with infinitive
pointing to positive consequence, Koe. iii. § 406e.—a late
idiom, Dr. TH. p. 157 n.—more clearly in 2 K. 9\*.
BDB. Niph., Ges. § 51d.—wanting in ג and 2 K. 10\* where it
was the brethren of Ahaziah who were slain. This was likely original here
and a glossator inserted פ, since Ahaziah’s brethren had already been
slain according to the Chronicler’s account, v. *.—O'nirD\] denotes
royal officers, cf. 17\* Ch. 27\* 29\* Est. 1\* Pr. 29\*, BDB.—9. Daughter of the king
(read sg. חיה— with ג, ה, פ, so
Oe., Ki.—inf. with יָאו, an unusual construction, Dr.
TH. § 202 (I.), Ges. § 141. (1. 129).

10–12. The usurpation of Athaliah.—Taken from 2 K. 11\*–4
with slight variations. The usual formulas introducing and closing
a reign are omitted in the case of Athaliah, because she had unlaw¬
fully seized the government.—10. All the royal seed] i.e., all the
male seed, not necessarily limited to the children of Ahaziah.—11.
Daughter of the king] i.e., a daughter of King Jehoram, but proba¬
bly by another wife than Athaliah (so Jos. Ant. ix. 7, 1).—In the
bed chamber] presumably that of the royal palace, from which
Joash was transferred to the Temple (v. *).—The wife of Jehoiada
the priest] wanting in Kings and probably a mere surmise on the
part of the Chronicler due to the fact that the infant prince en-
joyed the protection of Jehoiada and was placed by him on the throne; yet a negative cannot be proved. Ew. held that the statement was certainly genuinely historical (Hist. IV. p. 135). (Perhaps also GAS. J. II. p. 100.)

10. 2 K. 11 [אֵשֶׁת] Ch. preserves the original text.—2 K. is supported here by some mss. and Vrss. and should be followed, so Be., Oe., Kau., et al.—[אֵשֶׁת] added by the Chronicler.—11. 2 K. [אֶת נְדָב] and so [אֶת נְדָב], and since n could have crept in through the influence of the following n, the reading of 2 K. is regarded as original by Ki., Gray, HPN. p. 255, Cheyne in EBi. art. Jehosheba. But [אִשָּׁת] may be original (cp. the uncials ε and Θ) and [אִשָּׁת] supports [אִשָּׁת], hence the text, though uncertain, had better be allowed to stand.—[אֵשֶׁת] wanting in [אִשָּׁת], which text, however, is not likely original [אִשָּׁת], cf. al., ס. 2 K. adds יְרֵא מַעֲשֵׂהּ חָבָר, but Ch. has יָדְעוּ הַגּוֹיִם וַיָּשֶׂהוּ הָאֱלֹהִים כִּי אִיתָהוּ קָדָם שָׁאָל אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים אֵין גַּעַר וַיָּשֶׂהוּ מַעֲשֵׂהּ חָבָר, hence it has been conjectured that the closer description of Jehoshabeath fell out (the words 'ונריית רמא) remaining), and was later added on the margin, whence it crept into the text after the second Jehoshabeath (Bn.). The possibility remains that the Chronicler himself in copying from 2 K. accidentally omitted the words after [אֵשֶׁת] and subsequently inserted them where they now stand.

—2 K. [אֵשֶׁת] Ch. preserves the original reading, cf. St. SBOT.—[אֵשֶׁת] was added by the Chronicler apparently to make [אֵשֶׁת] clearer. The latter seems to be a gloss in 2 K., St. SBOT.—יִשְׂרָאֵל [אֵשֶׁת] 2 K. Ch. again preserves the better text, St. SBOT.—יִשְׂרָאֵל [אֵשֶׁת] 2 K. 11 [אֵשֶׁת]—12. 2 K. 11 [אֵשֶׁת].—בְּיָדוֹ נָא אָדָם [אֵשֶׁת] 2 K.

XXIII-XXIV. The reign of Joash (c. 836-796 B.C.).—In the main a simple reproduction, with marked revision and amplification in places, of 2 K. 11-12. Nowhere else does the Chronicler's method of interpreting history and introducing notions of his own time as controlling factors in the earlier history more clearly appear. (These chapters are allowed to be his composition by Ki., but only c. 23 by Bn., who holds c. 24 in the main from the Chronicler's source.) The outline of the narrative is as follows: The youthful prince Joash, who had been hidden six years, is crowned and received as king, while the old queen-mother Athaliah is slain. A covenant is made by the people to serve Yahweh. The temple of Baal is destroyed and his priest slain (c. 23). Then comes an
account of the activity of Joash, who repairs the Temple and serves Yahweh during the life of Jehoiada the priest, who had placed him upon the throne. But after the priest's death he yields to the princes of Judah and cultivates the worship of Baal. For this he is denounced by the prophet Zechariah, who at the command of the King is stoned. The religious defection and murder of the prophet are not mentioned in 2 K. and may be a surmise of the Chronicler or one of his school, because some sin was thought necessary to explain the disasters which, related next, befell Joash through Hazael King of Syria. After these events his servants conspired against him and slew him.

XXIII. 1-11. The coronation of Joash.—Based upon 2 K. 11:1-13, but completely rewritten, with the following points of agreement and difference. Both narratives agree in the fact that Jehoiada conspired, at first, with the centurions (v. 1 2 K. 11:1). But according to 2 K., these centurions were officers of the Carites and runners, i.e., the royal foreign body-guard elsewhere called Cherethites and Pelethites (2 S. 8:15 15:20), who took a prominent part in the enthronement of Solomon (1 K. 1:44). These captains are brought into the Temple and there, with an oath, the youthful prince being shown to them, the compact is made. In Chronicles the Carites and runners, or foreign troops, are not mentioned and the centurions are clearly Levitical chiefs, whose names are given. They also act as the intermediaries for a much larger conspiracy. Through them the Levites and the principal men of Israel are gathered out of all the cities of Judah and all this congregation enters into a covenant, and unto this multitude it is declared that the King's son shall reign. According to 2 K., the youthful prince is crowned and hailed first as king in the midst of the foreign troops, who have been arranged for his protection and stand guard within and without the Temple. According to Chronicles, the companies, who have been arranged and stand guard, are Levites and companies of the people, and only priests and Levites are admitted within the Temple and special care is taken that no others enter the sanctuary. The narrative of 2 K. is probably an accurate account of the event. The coronation of the young prince was a bold coup d'état undertaken by the priest.
with the assistance of the foreign body-guard. Solomon was made king in a somewhat similar manner. A conspiracy such as is described in Chronicles formed with leaders throughout all Judah, who assemble at Jerusalem, could hardly have escaped the notice of Athaliah or met with no counter movement on her part; but according to both narratives, she was completely surprised. The motive of the Chronicler’s reconstruction of the narrative is clear. In view of the stringency with which the Temple in his time was guarded from profanation by foreigners, he could not conceive that the high priest could have called upon the royal foreign body-guard for service in the Temple. Hence he transformed the Carites and runners into Levites, and made the whole movement an ecclesiastical one. But we have the express testimony of Ezekiel that foreigners were admitted into the sanctuary (Ez. 44:4). Hence there is no reason to doubt that the early kings did guard the Temple with foreign troops, and from this historical point of view the revision of the Chronicler was a mistaken one. A reconciliation of the two accounts has been sought on the theory that both accounts mention merely the main points of the proceedings—the author of 2 K. emphasising the part taken in the affair by the royal body-guard, the Chronicler on the other hand emphasising that taken by the Levites; so that both accounts mutually supplement one another and only when taken together give a complete account of the circumstances (Ke., Mov., H–J.). But this is not tenable.

1. *Strengthened himself*] a favourite phrase of the Chronicler (cf. 11). 2 K. 11 has “sent.”—*Azariah the son of Jeroham, etc.*] not in 2 K. The fact that these personal names are given has been regarded as an evidence of the writer’s exact historical information (so Ke., Zoe.), but where history was a blank the Chronicler and his school were fond of reconstructing it in detail with such elements as personal names. (Cf. the lists of names in 1 Ch. 23–26.) In 2 K. the *centurions* are over the *Carites and runners* (v. s.).—2. This verse is lacking in 2 K. (v. s.).—3. *And all the congregation*] i.e., through their representatives, *made a covenant with the king in the house of God*. This formal state affair in Chronicles takes the place of the private compact of Jehoiada with
the captains of the guards mentioned in 2 K. ii«.—As Yahweh hath spoken concerning the sons of David] wanting in 2 K., a characteristic touch of the Chronicler to colour the whole transaction as far as possible with religious motives.—4 f. This is the thing which you shall do a third part of you that come in on the Sabbath] taken verbatim from 2 K. ii«, which continues, “shall be keepers of the watch of the king’s house; (6) and a third part shall be at the gate Sur and a third part at the gate behind the guard so shall ye keep the watch of the house and be a barrier (7) and two companies of you, even all that go forth on the Sabbath, shall keep the watch of the house of Yahweh about the king.” This passage is not entirely clear, since the exact routine and disposition of the Temple and palace guards are unknown. The text also appears not without corruption. The usual explanation of the passage, regarding v. * as an unintelligible gloss, is that on weekdays one-third of the guard was at the Temple and two-thirds at the palace, but on the Sabbaths the reverse. Jehoiada now arranges that the three companies should be concentrated together at the time of the change of the guards at the Temple and that Athaliah should have no troops at her disposal at the palace (Ki., Bn., St. SBOT., Bur., Sk.). According to another and older interpretation, retaining v. *, it was the custom on the Sabbath for two-thirds of the royal guards to be free and one-third to be on duty at the palace. This last third Jehoiada orders to be subdivided into three companies, one to guard the king’s house, i.e., the palace; one the gate Sur, perhaps an entrance to the palace; and the third the gate behind the guard, another entrance probably to the palace, perhaps “the gate of the guards” (2 K. ii19). Thus communication with the city would be cut off and Athaliah held as in a trap by her own guards (a supposition not exactly in keeping with her subsequent entrance into the Temple, v. * 2 K. ii18, yet v. i.). The two divisions of the guard who are off duty Jehoiada orders to assemble at the Temple and surround the King (Be., Oe., Ba.). How far the Chronicler understood the original arrangement is uncertain. He was concerned in substituting the priests and the Levites for the foreign guard, and since he retained the text of 2 K. as far as possible, consistency is not to be sought in his account.
Under those that come in on the Sabbath he understood the priestly and Levitical courses of that day. Of these he made three divisions, one gatemen at the thresholds, i.e., the entrances presumably of the Temple; one at the house of the king; and one at the gate of the foundation (יִלְדָּם),—2 K. at the gate Sur (יִלְדָּם). Both readings are unintelligible. Probably the original in Kings was at the horse gate (יָד) (cf. v. 14). The reasons of the appointment at these three stations are not clear, unless we interpret after the following verse, to protect the sanctity of the Temple, but why then should one station be at the house of the king? The probability is that the Chronicler neither understood nor cared about the details of the arrangements.—And all the people shall be in the courts of the house of Yahweh wanting in 2 K. But according to the Chronicler’s narrative (vv. 11), the conspiracy was sufficiently widespread to cause a crowd of the adhering people to be present. The Chronicler also may have thought of the usual gathering in his day at the Temple on the Sabbath.—6. But let none . . . for they are holy wanting in 2 K. On the last clause cf. 35.—And all the people shall observe the injunction of Yahweh i.e., shall not enter the sacred precincts of the Temple. In 2 K. 11 the words shall observe the injunction appear with a different meaning in the command that the guards shall keep the watch of the house of Yahweh about the king, i.e., shall be on guard at the Temple, where the King was.—7. The Levites] an addition of the Chronicler. In 2 K. 11 this command is given to the royal guards.—Into the house] 2 K. within the ranks. The representations are quite different. According to the Chronicler any one who should attempt to enter the sacred precincts of the Temple is to be slain, according to the narrator of 2 K. any one who should attempt to pass the ranks of the guards who were encircling Joash should be slain. The object of the former command is to preserve the sanctity of the Temple. The object of the latter is to protect the prince from any possible violence.—And be ye with the king when he comes in and when he goes out] i.e., on all occasions. In 2 K. the last clauses are reversed, “when he goes out and when he comes in,” i.e., when he left the Temple and entered the palace (cf. v. 10).
8. The Levites and all Judah] 2 K. 11", "the captains over hundreds."—Those that were to come in on the Sabbath and those that were to go out]. Thus the whole guard, and not two-thirds, was assembled at the Temple.—For Jehoiada the priest dismissed not the courses] i.e., he retained in the Temple both the priests and Levites who were coming in to serve and those who had finished their turn of service. 2 K. has "and they [i.e., the guards just mentioned] came to Jehoiada the priest."—9. And Jehoiada the priest delivered, etc.]. This statement, while perfectly natural in Chronicles, since the priests and Levites would not be thought of as ordinarily armed, yet appears out of place in 2 K. 11", since the royal guards would naturally have their own weapons; so that it is felt to be a gloss there, taken from Chronicles (Ki., Bn., St. SBOT., Bur., Sk.). Ewald thought that the weapons were David's own spear and shield which had been preserved in the Temple and played some part at every coronation ceremony (Hist. IV. p. 136). But this is an improbable fancy.—10. And he set all the people] 2 K. 11", "and the guard stood."—From the right (south) corner of the temple unto the left (north) corner of the temple by the altar and by the temple round about the king]. The guards extended from one corner of the Temple to the other, enclosing thus within a semicircle the altar and the front of the Temple. The last phrase, round about the king, seems out of place, since the King had not yet been brought out, unless it is used by anticipation. The troops have been regarded as placed in a circle half facing east and half west, thus encircling the King (Be.) (but v. i.).—11. The testimony] (so also 2 K. 11") i.e., the law-book which was laid upon him or given him with the symbolical meaning that he should rule according to its precepts (Be., Ba., H-J.). But there is no evidence of such a custom and the context and the construction demand some emblem of royalty (Oe.), hence testimony (הזי), in 2 K. is probably a corruption of bracelets (תרגום), which were an insignia of royalty (cf. 2 S. 1") (Bn., Ki., Bur., Sk., St. SBOT. after We. Comp. p. 361). The corruption probably antedates the Chronicler, and testimony should be read in his text.—And Jehoiada and his sons]. In 2 K. 11" the subject of anointed is indefinite. The Chronicler thought of this act as a priestly func-
tion.— *And they said* 2 K., "and they clapped their hands and said."

1. "xem. l-ai. [v. 11] 2 K. 114 חלש. The latter was inappropriate to the Chronicler because the Levitical centurions (v. s.) would be closely associated with Jehoiada the priest.—[Heb. יְוִיָּדָא] wanting in 2 K. \(b\) appositive, Dav. Synt. § 73 R. 7, Koe. iii. § 289k.—[*] 1 Chr. 27\(m\).—[ Ezra 1 Zaxaria = נְרָחִית; 2 Ex. 21] 2 K. els 1\(a\) x\(a\) + נַעְלֵי, 1-1 conflates. \(b\) (supported by \(a\)) preserves original ג, but probably the latter is the original ל reading, yet cf. 2 K. 114.—

2. "[Heb. יְוִיָּדָא] + אָדוֹדָא; wanting in 2 K. 114.—[אָדוֹדָא] 2 K. יוהו.—[אָדוֹדָא] a scribal addition from 2 K.—3b is wanting in 2 K.—

3. "an addition by the Chronicler.—[לְכַלַּת] an addition by the Chronicler.—[לְכַלַּת] an addition by the Chronicler.—

4. "wanting in 2 K.—

5. "an addition by the Chronicler.—

6. "wanting in 2 K.—

7. "an addition by the Chronicler taking the place of الوוא לא נְאֹה [אָדוֹדָא] wanting in 2 K.—

8. "an addition by the Chronicler taking the place of [2 K. יוהו] set free from duty, cf. 1 Ch. 9\(m\) Qr.—

9. "wanting in 2 K.—

10. "along by the altar and the house (temple), but \(b\) in the sense along by is a doubtful usage. Klo. (2 K.) interpreting the passage as it stands, thinks of two lines of men, one facing the altar and the other the house, and each forming a semicircle, בָּאֶל. Kau. renders *bis sum altar und [wieder]* "bis sum Tempel hin and considers the following words a gloss (in 2 K.), since the King does not appear until v. 8, so also St. SBOT. Bur. (2 K.) following a hint in \(s\) reconstructs בָּאֶל [לְכַלַּת] round about
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the altar and the temple and regards it as a gloss inserted to explain after that word had been wrongly placed. The Chronicler copied the phrase from 2 K. without regard to its exact meaning.—11. The latter seems to have been original here, yet the Chronicler may have thought of Jehoiada and his sons as the actors. Either כ or ס has suffered intentional alterations and has been made to agree in number with the preceding or with the following verbs, respectively.—12. The Chronicler shows the sg. probably original, so St. SBOT.

12–15. The death of Athaliah.—Taken from 2 K. 11:14, with slight changes and additions in vv. 13, 14. (v. i.).—12. Of the people running]. In 2 K. 11:14 the word running (חָדַד) refers to the "guard" mentioned in v. 4 2 K. 11:8. (cf. 12:8).—And praising the king] wanting in 2 K.—13. By his pillar at the entrance] i.e., at the King’s customary place, which the Chronicler probably thought of at the entrance from the outer or people’s court into the inner or priests’ court. In 2 K. 11:14 the expression is "by the pillar according to his custom," and the writer may have meant by the side of one of the two great pillars of the porch called Jachin and Boaz (cf. 3:11).—And the trumpets] i.e., the trumpeters.—And the singers with musical instruments also leading the singing of praise] wanting in 2 K., a characteristic addition of the Chronicler.—14. And Jehoiada the priest commanded, or possibly, And Jehoiada the priest went out unto the captains] (v. i.).—15. And they laid hands on her] (Kau., Ki., Sk.) better than, And they made way for her, the rendering of ancient Vrss. (except ק), Be., RV.—Horse gate] lit. gate of horses, an entrance into the palace (cf. v. 9). The connection of this gate, if any, with the horse gate of the city wall, which seems to have been near the palace, is not clear (cf. Ne. 3:16 Je. 31:4).

et al.—read with G, Ω, and the corrected text of 2 K. Kau., Ki.—so also in 2 K. Haupt on 2 K. 111, SBOT. Kau. regards the phrase as a meaningless gloss in 2 K. which was either taken over by the Chronicler or later interpolated into his work.—nw’] 2 K. nijn.—nin’cn kS] 2 K. npvi hu.—15, "yr hod Sh] 2 K. ii** nian to.—nw’Dn] 2 K. PDini.

16–21. The covenant, the destruction of the temple of Baal, and the enthronement of the King.—Taken from 2 K. 111–44 with a few minor changes, except vv. 11–17, which, with exception of the first clause, are additions by the Chronicler. This section shows very clearly that the movement to supplant Athaliah by Joash was religious as well as political, and like the revolution of Jehu, against Baal-worship, probably Tyrian, and introduced through the influence of the northern alliance, by Joram, and continued under Athaliah to the neglect of the worship of Yahweh.—16. And Jehoiada made a covenant between himself and between all the people and between the king to be the people of Yahweh i.e., Jehoiada, the people, and the King obligated themselves to recognise Yahweh as their God. 2 K. 111 read "between Yahweh" in place of between himself. The Chronicler omitted the first as superfluous and introduced the second to give Jehoiada greater prominence.—17. And all the people, etc. This violence against the house and priest of Baal shows that Jehoiada's movement was religious as well as political (v. s.).—Mattan is probably a contraction of Mattan Baal (gift of Baal, a name common in Phoenician), appearing in Muthumballes, a name in Plautus (Poem. V. 2, 35) (COT. p. 88).—18. And Jehoiada appointed overseers of the house of Yahweh so far, 2 K. 111, implying the restoration of the worship of Yahweh in the place of that of Baal; Under the authority of the priests and the Levites with the remainder of the verse an addition of the Chronicler, who naturally could conceive of no officers of the Temple not subject to the priests and Levites, if indeed not from among them.—Whom David had distributed, etc. According to the Chronicler, David determined the personnel of the servitors in the Temple (cf. 1 Ch. 23, 24, 26), while the sacrificial ritual was
according to the law of Moses, i. e., P or the entire Pentateuch (cf. 1 Ch. 6:24), but both the personnel and the ritual of the singers he regarded as established by David (1 Ch. 6:15-25). The probability, however, is that the Chronicler wrote of the courses and not the personnel according to the reading of Ο (v. i.).—19. And he set the gate-keepers, etc.] a continuation of the addition of the Chronicler, who thus held that Jehoiada re-established the complete Davidic equipment of the Temple—in reality the equipment of the Chronicler's own time, i.e., priests with attendant Levites and Levitical singers and gate-keepers (on the last cf. 1 Ch. 26:1-15).—That no one unclean in any respect should enter in] not simply persons ceremonially unclean, but also aliens who might be so designated (cf. Is. 35:5-15).—20. The nobles and the rulers of the people] is a substitute for “the Carites and the guard” of 2 K. 11:19 (cf. v. i.).—And they brought the king, etc.] a description of the removal of the newly crowned King from the Temple to the palace and a continuation of the narrative of v. 11.—Through the upper gate] a gate of the Temple, cf. 27:1. In 2 K. “by the way of the gate of the guard,” probably a gateway connecting the precincts of the Temple with those of the palace—hence a gate of both Temple and palace. The Chronicler, writing when the palace had ceased to exist, would naturally fix a locality by its connection with the Temple. The use of the term “guard” also he avoided (v. s.).

The episodes of the entrance and death of Athaliah, of the formation of the covenant, and of the destruction of the temple of Baal (vv. 12-15 2 K. 11:12-15), interrupting the direct narrative in 2 K. of the coronation and enthronement of Joash, taken with the double notice of the death of Athaliah (v. 16 v. 11 K. 11:16-17), suggest that extracts from two documents have been placed together in 2 K. 11: vv. 1-12: 18b-18 representing one document and vv. 11-16a the other (the view of Stade, ZAW. 1885, pp. 280 ff., SBOT. accepted by Bur., Sk., et al.).

16. יְאוּב. 2 K. 11:17 תַּחְתָו וְיִנַּו followed by Ki.—2 K. 11:17, which probably arose through dittography (Klo., St.), is wanting.—17. יְאוּב. so also 2 K. 11:18, but Ο in both places sg., hence St. corrects in 2 K., but no weight can be attached to Ο in such cases.—18. יְאוּב. Text of 2 K. probably original here, though Ο may be corrected from v. 11.—2 K. only אָב לֹא; Ch. original.—19. יְאוּב. likely a scribal addition, cf. Ο, ת, Α, 2 K. only לֹא אָב לֹא; Ch. original.—20. יְאוּב. two mss. cited by Ken-
nicott, G, 1, 8, 10 ויהו ויהי, cf. 5* where Vrss. also add copulative. Oe., Kl. Kom. BH. read 1 with Vrss. 1 may have been omitted by a scribe, since the Levites were not permitted to offer the burnt-offering, although the Chronicler doubtless intended to convey the meaning that the priests should offer the burnt-offering while the Levites stood by with rejoicing and with singing. See on 1 Ch. 23:—

There seems to be a lacuna between ויהי and ויהי, since all priests and not special officers (but lit. offices פרח) were permitted to offer the burnt-offering. פלח also is not used elsewhere meaning distribute (1 Ch. 24:* do not support it, BDB. פלח Qal 2). G inserts at this point קא איךט* וס דרפהזא רכ וֹל לֵּפֶה הַמוֹשֶׁה קא רֹד לֵּאשׁוּה וּניָסֶר אֶת חֲטָלְאֵקְו חַבּוּרֵה וּחיָלִים פָּרַשׁ פָּרַשׁ יָוִים וּלְכַל רוּד עִלְׁבָּךְ וּוְחָזָךְ. This addition removes the difficulty in א, and has the marks of the Chronicler (note the significance of ישב, the word חלַף, and the co-ordinate genitives), hence was a part of the original text and fell out by homeoteleuton. The whole passage may be rendered, Jehoiada placed the offices of the house of Yahweh in the hand of the priests and the Levites and he appointed the courses of the priests and the Levites, which David divided, over the house of Yahweh to offer, etc.—

many ms., G, A, ויהי, ויהי] at the hands of David, i.e., according to the system of song inaugurated by David. Possibly יי has fallen from text, cf. 29* על ויהי דֶּלֶּל רוֹד ויהי, but Vrss. support א, cf. Ezr. 3:*—


2. All the days of Jehoiada]. It is doubtful whether this limitation is found in 2 K. 12:* (v. i.).—3. And Jehoiada took for him two wives] since he stood in loco parentis.—And he begat sons and daughters]. The Chronicler magnifies his favourites by giving them the honour of large families (cf. 11:* 13:).

XXIV. 1-3. An introductory notice of the King’s reign.

—Taken from 2 K. 12:* (11:*—12:), from which the synchronism with the N. kingdom as usual is omitted (v.* (*)), and also, as incompatible with the new régime under Joash and Jehoiada, the statement that the high places were not removed and were frequented by the people (v.* (*)). The Chronicler also adds v. *.

1. בֵּית אֱלֹהִים [כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ אֱלֹהִים מִשׁוֹצֵא בְּבִית אֱלֹהִים + כֹּל יוֹםּ A, "All his
days wherein Jehoiada the priest instructed him” C, β, Ki., RV.;
“All his days forasmuch as Jehoiada instructed him” Th., Kamp.,
Kau., Bur., Sk.—3. Wanting in 2 K.

4–14. The repair of the Temple.—Based upon 2 K. 12:1-11,
but completely rewritten. This passage in 2 K. describes the origin
of certain regulations for the repair of the Temple which probably
remained in force to the time of the exile (cf. 2 K. 22). Previous
to the reign of Joash the Temple had been maintained at the expense
of the King; but then the attempt was made by Joash, doubtless
owing to the impoverished condition of the royal exchequer, to
make the Temple self-supporting. He tried first to lay the responsi-
bility upon the priests, and ordered the repairs to be made from
money which they received as dues or free-will offerings from the
people. But Jehoiada and the other priests failed to comply with
this order. Thereupon, having been rebuked, they were freed from
this obligation and also deprived of the privilege of collecting the
money, but all the money brought to the Temple the priests were
allowed to retain, save that brought for guilt-offerings and sin-
offerings, which was ordered placed in a chest and from thence,
under the supervision of the King’s scribe and the high (?) priest,
applied for the repair of the Temple. While the plan provided
money sufficient for the repair of the Temple, not enough accrued
for refurnishing the utensils of the Temple. This narrative in
Kings, reflecting little credit upon the priests, was unthinkable from
the point of view of the Chronicler. It allowed that the King was
superior to the priests, and the real guardian and master of the
Temple. To demand also the dues of the priests, even for such a
worthy and ecclesiastical object, was an infringement of their sacred
rights and privileges. No blame then could attach to Jehoiada and
the others for their passive resistance of this illegal invasion. Hence
the narrative was rewritten. The priests and the Levites were
summoned to go among the people and collect money for the repair
of the Temple. They proceeded slowly. So the King, to hasten
matters, placed a collection-box at the Temple and urged the
contribution of the ancient tax levied by Moses in the wilder-
ness; and to this the people and rulers responded most joyfully
and most liberally. A great abundance of money was collected,
more than enough for the house, and with this balance gold and silver utensils were made for the Temple.—4. And it came to pass afterwards] a mere phrase of transition.—5. The Levites]. Only priests are mentioned in the narrative of 2 K.—Go out into the cities of Judah]. In 2 K. nothing is said about collecting money outside of Jerusalem, but the priests are to apply for the repairs all the money that came into the Temple treasury both from regular assessments and free-will offerings (2 K. 12*).—The Levites hastened it not] 2 K. 12* “In the twenty-third year of king Jehoash the priests had not repaired the breaches of the house.”—6. The tax of Moses] the half shekel required of every male for the support of the sanctuary according to Ex. 30* 38* (v. also i.).—7. For Athaliah the wicked one and her sons, etc.]. These statements are wanting in 2 K. Since according to the Chronicler Ahaziah’s uncles and brothers had all been slain (21* 22*), we have either an example of the Chronicler’s complete disregard of historical consistency, or sons is used figuratively denoting adherents (Ba.). The reading “her priests” has been proposed (Oe., Bn.) (v. i.).—Broke into the house of God] probably in the sense of plundered.—And also all the consecrated furniture of the house of Yahweh they used for Baal] i.e., in the worship of Baal, cf. Ho. 2* (*).—8. And set it at the gate of the house of Yahweh on the outside]. According to 2 K. 12* the chest was placed by the altar, but from the Chronicler’s point of view laymen were not permitted within the court where the altar stood, hence the change of its position in the narrative of the Chronicler to the outside.—10. Then all the princes rejoiced and brought [the tax] and cast [it] into the chest unto the full] i.e., either until all had given (Be., Kau., BDB. 712 Pl. d) or until the chest was full (G, B, Zoe., Oe., Ki.). The latter is preferable.—11. And it came to pass when they brought the chest for the oversight of the king by the hand of the Levites] i.e., the chest was brought by the Levites for the inspection of the King, or more probably for royal inspection through the Levites, who represented the King (Ke., Oe., Zoe., Ki.).—The scribe of the king and the inspector of the chief priest]. The latter officer is apparently an invention of the Chronicler to place the high priest on the same level with the King; “if the King sends his
scribe the high priest also does not appear personally but causes himself to be represented by a delegate, cf. 2 K. 12:11 "(1)" (We. Pro. p. 200).—12. The doers of the work of the service in the house of Yahweh] i.e., those having charge of the Temple (cf. 1 Ch. 9:15).—14. Whereof were made vessels for the house of Yahweh] a direct contradiction of 2 K. 12:11, where it is stated that utensils for the Temple were not made—the contributions evidently not sufficient for this. The Chronicler's representation forbade such a lack.

4. Wanting in 2 K.—[cf. 1 Ch. 18:—was with the heart of Joash, i.e., it was his intention, cf. 1 Ch. 22:—On simple pf. after ḫfh see Koe. iii. § 370b.—5. ḫfh with ḫfh + ḫfh = out of the abundance of hence as often as and in combination with ḫfh = yearly, cf. 1 S. 7:14 Zc. 14:18 (see BDB. p. 191b).—an explanation for the delay in making the repairs different from 2 K. 12:—6. ḫfh + ḫfh which, although agreeing with 2 K. 12:11, is probably a scribal expansion.—the chief [priest], cf. v. 11 31:2 2 K. ḫfh + ḫfh root ḫfh carry, lift, hence burden, portion, only here and v. 8 of sacred contribution, tax (BDB.), cf. offering to Yahweh Ez. 20:—the ḫfh leads Bn. to read ḫfh, but ḫfh doubtless read our ḫfh as Hiph. pf. Koe. regards ḫfh as a second σουμ μέτρα after ḫfh (iii. § 376b) and ḫfh as in apposition with the preceding noun (ib. § 282). The latter is more simply explained as a gen., so Zoe., Oc., Kau., EVs.—7. ḫfh wickedness, godlessness, i.e., Athaliah the (embodied) godlessness.—[cf. 1 Ch. 11 1 considered unnecessary by Be., Oc., but added by Kau., Bn., Ki. ḫfh is a suggestion of Oc. and Bn.—8. ḫfh and he commanded, the command itself being omitted for conciseness as often after ḫfh, cf. Jo. 21: Ps. 105:4 1 Job. 9: Koe. iii. § 369k.—[as in 2 K. 12:10 not in cstr. as Ew. § 282 d, but a form like ḫfh appears only with the article (Ges. § 350), so St. SBOT. on 2 K. 12:10, see Koe. iii. § 310d.——9. ḫfh proclamation, cf. 30:36 Ezr. 1:10 Ne. 8:—[cf. ḫfh, ḫfh + ḫfh considered unnecessary by Be., Oc., but added by Kau., Bn., Ki. ḫfh is a suggestion of Oc. and Bn.—10. ḫfh to be classed with other cases of inf. abs. after prep. Koe. iii. § 225b. earlier ḫfh, cf. 2 K. 13:15, Ew. § 315 c (3).—11. ḫfh at the time when, cstr. before a relative sentence, cf. Ps. 4:1 Job. 6:17, Ew. § 332 d.—[freq. impf., Dr. TH. § 30, Koe. iii. § 157b.—wants wanting in 2 K. 12:11, wanting in 2 K. 2 K. ḫfh by removing contents, so empty. ḫfh with the imperfect for older, Ew § 343 c.—
15-22. The apostasy of Joash.—Wanting in 2 K., introduced by the Chronicler, since some such apostasy was necessary from his point of view to explain the disasters of the Syrian invasion, vv. 15-16. *A hundred and thirty years old was he when he died and they buried him in the city of David with the kings*. This long life of Jehoiada and respect paid at his death are delightful touches of the Chronicler to the honour of the priest. How ill it fits into the narrative is seen from the fact that his wife Jehoshabeath (22:10), the daughter of Jehoram and sister of Ahaziah, cannot well have been older than twenty-five or twenty-six years at the time of the massacre of the royal family by Athaliah, while Jehoiada according to the age here given would have been then an old man between ninety and one hundred. According to 2 K. 12:1 he was alive and active in the twenty-third year of the reign of Joash, and presumably lived some years beyond the period of the restoration of the Temple.—17. *Came the princes of Judah*. The existence of a party at court favouring the worship of Baal and desiring its restoration is historically extremely probable. This movement may be regarded as a revolt of the nobility against the hierarchy (Erbt, *Die Hebräer*, p. 121). Certainly some ulterior motive besides the mere desire of Baal-worship must have been behind it.—18. *The Asherim and the idols*. Cf. 14:1. Both terms are probably used here with about the same force—that of the latter.—*And wrath was upon Judah, etc.* manifested in the invasion of Hazael, vv. 14-15.—20. *And the spirit of God clothed* i.e., took possession of him, cf. 1 Ch. 12:9, also 2 Ch. 15:1.—*Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest* not mentioned elsewhere in the OT.—*And he stood above the people*. He addressed them from some elevation. Cf. Je. 36:10 where Baruch
reads Jeremiah's roll from the window of an upper chamber, and Ne. 8* where Ezra reads the Law from a pulpit of wood (Ba.). A reference to the elevation of the inner, the priests' court, compared with the outer, or people's court (Ke., Zoe.), does not seem appropriate.—Because ye have forsaken, etc.]. Cf. 15.—21. And they conspired against him]. Perhaps the proceedings were the same as in the case of Naboth (1 K. 21* *), i.e., a mock trial and a formal execution at the commandment of the king (Ba.). This martyrdom of Zechariah is mentioned by Christ (Mt. 23* Lk. 11* *11) in a way that shows that the Jewish Scriptures were practically the present Heb. Canon beginning with Genesis and closing with 1 and 2 Chronicles.—In the court of the house of Yahweh]. The tradition of the NT. times defined this more exactly “between the sanctuary and the altar.”

23—24. The Syrian invasion.—Based upon 2 K. 12* *11, although the narrative has been entirely rewritten. According to 2 K., Hazael, King of Syria, who had made an inroad into the territory of Philistia and taken the city of Gath, proposed to move against Jerusalem and was bribed by the treasures of the Temple and the palace to leave the city unmolested. According to the Chronicler, the Syrians came against Judah and Jerusalem and destroyed all the princes of the people and sent their spoil unto the King of Damascus. Thus the Chronicler brings upon the princes a just retribution for their seduction of Joash into idolatry (v. *11). The Syrians also with a small force gained a victory over a very great host, because they had forsaken Yahweh the God of their fathers—a good illustration of the Chronicler’s pragmatic construction of history.—24. And upon Jo’ash they executed judgments]
a fitting summary showing the Chronicler's view of this contact between Judah and Syria, and his sole interest in the narrative.


26. And when they departed from him]. This immediate connection between the departure of the Syrians is not found in 2 K. — For they had left him very sick] (lit. in many diseases) also not mentioned in 2 K., and probably a retributive touch of the Chronicler, who felt that Joash should suffer to the uttermost for his sins. Cf. the sicknesses of Asa (16:11) and Joram (21:4). Ke. saw in the diseases wounds received in battle with the Syrians. — For the blood of the son* of Jehoiada the priest]. Neither this motive nor any other is recorded in 2 K. for the assassination of Joash. — On his bed] also lacking in 2 K. 12:10, which says that he was slain "at the house of Millo," an obscure reference. — And they buried him in the city of David, but not in the sepulchres of the kings]. The parallel (2 K. 12:11) reads, "And they buried him with his fathers in the city of David." The Chronicler's modification was doubtless due to his desire to make the end of Joash as unfortunate as possible and therefore he refused him a place in the tombs of the kings. — 26. Zabad] 2 K. 12:11 "Jazacar" (v. i.). — Shimeath the Ammonitess and . . . Shimrith the Moabitess] a curious change of the Chronicler. In 2 K. 12:11 we have "Shimeath" and "Shomer," the names of the fathers of the conspirators. Here they have become their mothers and their descent is made half heathen. Thus the fate of Joash is made still more opprobrious, and the Chronicler likewise expresses thus his aversion to the marriage of Hebrews with foreigners—their offspring are murderers (Tor. Ezra Studies, pp. 212 f.). — 27. And the greatness of the burden upon him]. The burden is not the tribute exacted from him by the Syrians (Kau.), an old opinion, since that is not mentioned in Chronicles, nor the tribute collected for the Temple, also an old opinion, but the prophetic utterances against him (Ke., Ki., Bn., Ba., RVm.). — And the rebuilding] (lit. founding). Cf. vv. 11. — The Midrash of the Book of Kings]. Cf. Intro. p. 23.

23. כניעתי on pf. at the coming round, circuit, i.e., at the completion (of the year), cf. Ex. 34:27 (JE) i S. 119, Ps. 197.
XXV. The reign of Amaziah (c. 796-782 B.C.).—A reproduction of the narrative of 2 K. 14:1-11, with the characteristic modifications and embellishments of the Chronicler. The statements of 2 K. 14:1 that "the high places were not taken away" and that "the people still sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places," are omitted, doubtless because too derogatory to Amaziah in the beginning of his reign, when he won the victory over the Edomites. The story of this victory very briefly narrated in 2 K. 14:17 is enlarged by the Chronicler. The size of the army of Amaziah is given (v. 1), and details of the slaughter of the Edomites (v. 19); and especially a new episode is introduced in the account of the rejection, at the command of a prophet, of troops hired at a large expense of northern Israel (vv. 14-19). This rejection furnishes (according to Bn.) a ground for the subsequent victory over the Edomites as a reward of obedience and reliance upon Yahweh. Yet quite contrary to this notion of reward is the plundering of the cities of Judah by these mercenaries mentioned in v. 11. Hence this plundering has been taken as an interpretation, found in one of the sources of the Chronicler, of the disaster which befell the S. kingdom through Amaziah’s unfortunate contest with the N. kingdom (2 K. 14:14-16), this source having made the disaster very inconsiderable, while the Chronicler himself, on the other hand,
accepted the record of 2 K. and allowed the disaster to remain to its full extent but supplied an adequate reason by introducing the sin of the worship of the gods of Edom (vv. 14-15) (Bn.).

Agreeable to the above view, Bn. and Ki. assign vv. 14-15 to M, but they have the marks of the Chronicler's style: in v. 14 Hiph. (l. 89), הָעֹלָה הַיָּהּ הַיָּהּ (l. 14), and with acc. also in v. 15 (l. 128), מֵאָרָה מְאָרָה (cf. 11:13-17), מְאָרָה מְאָרָה (cf. 11:14); in v. 16 כִּשָּׁהְקֵית (cf. 13:17-18); in v. 17 כִּשָּׁהְקֵית (cf. 19:11 Ezr. 10:1) and כִּשָּׁהְקֵית (l. 84); in vv. 18-19 מְאָרָה מְאָרָה (l. 17); in v. 19 מְאָרָה מְאָרָה (l. 38); and in v. 20 מְאָרָה מְאָרָה (l. 10).—Graf thought that some historical event not recorded in K. was at the basis of the story of the hire of the Israelitish troops and their subsequent plundering (GB. p. 158). This seems not unlikely, and the narrative then may be the Chronicler's interpretation of these facts from whatever source he may have derived them.

1–4. The beginning of the reign of Amaziah.—Taken with slight omissions and variations from 2 K. 14:1-8—2. But not with a perfect heart [with reference to the apostasy described in v. 14]. In the place of this 2 K. 14:1 reads, “Yet not like David his father: he did according to all that Joash his father had done.” Then comes v. 15, concerning the retention of the high places, which the Chronicler has omitted (v. s.).—3. His servants who had killed the king his father]. Cf. 24:1 2 K. 12:1 (v. 11).—4. But he put not their children to death]. The sparing of the children of the guilty was evidently a new departure in jurisprudence, indicating an advance in the moral sentiment of the community. When Naboth was condemned his children perished with him (2 K. 9:25), and likewise the children perished with the father in the story of Achan (Jos. 7:25).—But did according to that which was written in the law in the book of Moses]. The writer of 2 K. found in this mercy of Amaziah an application of the command given in Dt. 24:16. This principle was emphasised by the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Je. 31:19 Ez. 18:18).
5-13. The campaign against Edom.—This is tersely described in 2 K. 14: in a single verse, and there is no reason to suppose that the additions of the Chronicler rest upon any additional information, but are wholly a product of Midrashic fancy. The Edomites subjugated by David and made tributary to Judah had revolted successfully during the reign of Jehoram (21°). Whether the conquest of Amaziah resulted in the permanent possession of Edom by Judah is uncertain. Perhaps no real conquest took place. Indeed the whole campaign has been felt to be improbable, since Edom was then tributary to Assyria, and Judah possibly a vassal of northern Israel (the view of Winck. KAT.* p. 261, also Bn. cf. HC. 2 K. 14).—5. Three hundred thousand]. The army of Amaziah is thus much smaller than that ascribed to Asa, 14:* and also to Jehoshaphat, 17:* This diminution of troops (according to Ke.) furnished a reason for hiring additional ones from northern Israel.—6. A hundred talents of silver] if heavy weight, some 9,650 pounds of silver, or if light weight, about half that amount.—7. A man of God] the most general OT. designation of a prophet; used of Moses 30* Ch. 23: Dt. 33: Jos. 14: Ezr. 3; also of David 8: Ne. 12:*; also of the angel who clearly in the guise of a prophet appeared unto Manoah and his wife, Ju. 13:*; cf. for general use 1 S. 2:* 9:*; 1 K. 12:* 13:* 17:* 20:* 2 K. 1* et al.—Let not the army of Israel go with thee]. From the point of view of the Chronicler, an alliance with Israel was sinful and could only be followed by evil consequences, cf. 19: 20.—All the children of Ephraim] an explanation of the preceding Israel, since Israel is often used as equivalent to the S. kingdom (cf. 12:).—8. But go thou, i.e., by thyself, do valiantly, be strong for the battle, for God shall not suffer thee to fall before thy enemy for God has power to help and to cast down]. For other renderings of this verse, whose text is corrupt, v. i. The sinfulness of any alliance with the N. kingdom is brought out very strongly.—9. Yahweh is
able to give thee much more than this] a very beautiful teaching.

—10. Wherefore their anger was greatly kindled against Judah and they returned home in fierce anger]. Mercenary troops serve not only for their hire, which these men are represented to have received, but also for renown and booty which, through dismissal, they would lose. This loss they are represented to have made good in a way by plundering cities of Judah (cf. v. 11).—11. The valley of Salt] from 2 K. 14, mentioned also as the place of Joab’s victory over the Edomites, cf. 1 Ch. 18. —12. And ten thousand did the children of Judah carry away alive, etc.]. Of this capture and massacre the record in 2 K. knows nothing, although the rock (Sela*) is mentioned as a place (2 K. 14) often identified with Petra, but this is by no means certain (cf. Moore, Ju. on 16).—13. From Samaria even unto Beth-horon]. Samaria was evidently the point from which the troops started on their raid and Beth-horon its limit southward. On the location of Bethhoron cf. 1 Ch. 7. The raid may be thought of as having taken place while Amaziah was in Edom.
14-16. Amaziah’s idolatry.—An introduction to the disastrous war with the N. kingdom not given in 2 K. (v. s.).—14. The gods of the children of Seir. It is a curious fact that of the ancient religion of the Edomites, so closely associated with Israel, nothing definite is known beyond the names of certain deities derived from theophorous proper names.—15. Who have not delivered their people from thy hand? (cf. vv. 11*') and hence were no gods. The test of deity was ability to deliver. The fundamental reason for worshipping Yahweh was the deliverance from Egypt (Ex. 20* cf. Is. 37*).—16. Have we made thee a counsellor for the king? With this question corresponds the answer, I know that God hath counselled to destroy thee.

17-24. The disastrous war with the N. Kingdom.—Taken from 2 K. 14*'*, with additions in vv. 17*—20 to connect with the introduction (vv. 14*—15), and also an addition in v. 21.—17. Took counsel? or possibly we should render was counselled with the implication that it was by divine agency (cf. v. 18). The phrase (נִשׁוּץ) is introduced by the Chronicler to connect the passage closely with the foregoing verse. Otherwise the verse agrees essentially with the text of 2 K. 14*.—Let us look one another in the face] (cf. v. 11) a challenge to war in sheer insolence (Be., Zoe., Sk.) or a vassal’s assertion of independence (Bn., Winck. KAT.*) or a proposal to meet one another as equals, Amaziah seeking satisfaction for the raid of the mercenaries (v. 14) (Oe., Ba.). This last is a plausible suggestion if the account of the raid is historical; but 2 K. does not mention the raid. The proposal may have been for a meeting
with the view of a marriage alliance (v. 11).—18. This fable, reminding one of Jotham’s parable (Ju. 9:7), was a cutting insult to Amaziah, implying that he was in no way on an equality with the King of Israel. Whether the particulars of the fable were significant, reflecting actual events, is unknown.—20. For it was of God, etc.] an addition of the Chronicler connecting the narrative with vv. 14-16.—21. Looked one another in the face] (i.e., joined in battle) either a direct or an ironical application of the words of v. 11. If ironical, cf. the similar double application of the phrase "lift up the head," Gn. 40:7—8.—Beth-shemesh]. Cf. 1 Ch. 6:60.—Which belongeth to Judah]. This statement in 2 K. 14:9 shows that the story of this contest is of northern Israelitish origin.—22. And then fled every man to his tent] i.e., fled to his home, cf. 7:10 10:14.—23. The son of Jehoahaz] i.e., the son of Ahaziah, cf. 21:1. —And broke down the wall of Jerusalem from the Gate of Ephraim unto the Gate of the Corner, four hundred cubits] i.e., a portion of the oldest northern wall which was probably built in the time of Solomon (cf. GAS. J. i. p. 206, and on the location of this wall, pp. 241 ff.).—Gate of Ephraim] i.e., the gate through which the road to Ephraim passed, on the line of the street running to the present Damascus Gate.—Corner gate*] (v. i.) probably the north-west angle of the wall (cf. GAS. J. ii. p. 116).—24. With Obed-edom] an addition of the Chronicler to 2 K. 14:14. The family of Obed-edom, according to 1 Ch. 26:16, had charge of the storehouse of the Temple.

17. [יִתְנַשְׁל בְּתוֹפָה.] wanting in 2 K. 14:9. [יִתְנַשְׁל] 2 K. + (יִתְנַשְׁל) cf. Nu. 23:14 Ju. 19:12 2 K. 25:1. Possibly pointed according to 2 K. when יִתְנַשְׁל was intended, so Oe. (יִתְנַשְׁל accompanying the expression of a wish, cf. Gn. 19:31 31:4 and ref. above, Koe. iii. § 358g.—נִתְנַשְׁל] let us look one another in the face, cf. v. 11 (v. 6.), is probably a shortened form for הנִתְנַשְׁל הָעַרְאֶה מְסִי, Ges. § 156a, n. 1.—18. [יִתְנַשְׁל] (twice) G transliterated, בְּתוֹפָה, אֲחֹיָא אֲחֹיָא, אֲחֹיָא, the last being original G, cf. Tor. ATC. p. 65.—19. [יִתְנַשְׁל] wanting in 2 K. 14:19 (but supported by Vriss.), may be a later insertion by some one who read as first pers., so Be., St. SBOT. on 2 K. 14:18, but the insertion may be from the Chronicler. G read both as second pers.—[יִתְנַשְׁל] is certainly a mis-reading of 2 K. יִתְנַשְׁל, so Ki. Kom. BH., Be., St. SBOT. on 2 K., but probably the original in Ch., cf. G. "§, here as elsewhere, appears to be
corrected from 2 K.—[קינכט] should probably be pointed קינכט.—
Hiph. as intrans. dub. 2 K. קינכט inv. Niph. ❑ נבשא, I in superbiam, ❑ מנרע. The insertion of ה has connected the word with what precedes, contrary to 2 K. ❑ probably read קינכט and ❑ קינכט. ❑ was doubtless corrected fr. 2 K. Read קינכט or קינכט, so Oe., Ki.—
[קינכט] wanting in 2 K.—[קינכט] 2 K. קינכט. ❑ transposes קינכט original in K.; Bur. thinks קינכט original there with sarcastic force.—20. ❑ a characteristic addition by the Chronicler, cf. 10:22. ❑ corrected from 2 K., omits.—[קינכט] ❑ א/usepov tov εἰς τῶν φιλωτάσων אביו els eis xepias = εἰς τῶν φιλωτάσων, ❑ + Iwas, I in manus hostium. Oe. suggested קינכט. Perhaps read, as suggested by ❑ קינכט, וית, to give him into their hand. If text is correct כ is without the art. as in familiar expressions, Dav. Syn. § 22 R 3, Koe. iii. § 294f.—21. ❑ transposes קינכט and קינכט and קינכט קינכט, so Bn., Ki., St., Bur., Sk.—קינכט] 2 K. קינכט. Ch. also original in K., so Bn., Ki., St., et al.—קינכט] doubtless a scribal error for קינכט of Vrss. and 2 K., so Ke., Zoe., Oe., and most commentators.—24. ❑ Inserts קינכט before קינכט, which is considered its original position in 2 K. by Bn. (on 2 K.), St. SBOT. The late form of the verb in K. suggests that it was added to fill a lacuna, see Ges. § 116p (6 קינכט).—קינכט] קינכט wanting in 2 K.—קינכט] hostages, so also 2 K. 14:14  †.

25–28. The end of Amaziah’s reign.—Taken from 2 K. 14:17–19, with a characteristic addition of the Chronicler in v. 17 (v. i.).—25. This verse, a copy of 2 K. 14:17, is without point in the narrative of the Chronicler, who systematically ignores the N. kingdom. In 2 K. it is a note inserted by a scribe to mark the interval between the death of Jehoash, just mentioned, and the death of Amaziah immediately described.—26. Book of the kings of Judah and Israel]. The Chronicler substitutes for “the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah” of 2 K. 14:1 his own principal noncanonical source (cf. Intro. p. 22).—27. Now from the time that Amaziah turned away from after Yahweh] a characteristic addition of the Chronicler, who thus gives from his point of view an adequate cause for the conspiracy. It was probably a popular insurrection in favour of the young Uzziah, a result of the
misfortunes into which the state had been plunged by the folly of Amaziah in provoking the war with northern Israel.—*Lachish*].

Cf. 11*.—28. *In the city of David*]. The reading *city of Judah* of א is clearly a scribal error (v. i.), yet in the Assyrian inscriptions Asarhaddon called Manasseh king of the *city of Judah* (GAS. I. i. p. 268).

26. א a characteristic addition to the text of 2 K. 1418 cf. 91 in Ch. 2919.—ללחיש three MSS., ת, מ, omit מלח. Seven MSS., מ, 2 K. 1420 מ for מלח. Since the Chronicler uses both forms, מלח 2 Ch. 2221 מלחו ויהו ויאראלו, the original is uncertain.—27. לשון wanting in 2 K. 1422 ישעיהו רִבְּרָב ופוסק וסידرى ימי משער קַנַּפִּים, so also מ.—28. הוהו וסידرى ימי משער קַנַּפִּים a characteristic addition to the text of 2 K. 1423 so also מ. predicate, introduced by ! after time-determinations, Dr. TH. § 127 (י), Koe. iii. § 3661. —28. אונא וиндивид תאו וינמשו התהלוכת ימי משער קַנַּפִּים הוהו וסידرى ימי משער קַנַּפִּים, the change to act. in Ch. necessitating the insertion of the object.—ונכרא וירוחו ימי משער קַנַּפִּים twelve MSS., Vrss., 2 K. ויר, and so most commentators.

XXVI. The reign of Uzziah (c. 782-737 B.C.).—The book of Kings contains only a very meagre account of the reign of Uzziah (2 K. 1510), and yet his reign was one of the longest in Judah and, according to the glimpses given in the prophetical books, one of unusual prosperity (cf. especially Is. 2 f.). This prosperity is brought out in the Chronicler's account in vv. 8-11, which are entirely independent of 2 K., but have a place in the Chronicler's reconstruction of that narrative. According to 2 K. 154, Uzziah was a leper, and the Chronicler, compelled by his theory of royal history to find a cause for this affliction, does so in the presumptuous sin of unlawfully offering incense (vv. 11-15); and this act of pride is closely linked with the King's prosperity and greatness (vv. 14-15). On the source of vv. 8-11 see the note introductory to the comments upon them.

1-5. Uzziah's accession to the throne.—Vv. 1-4 are a transcript of 2 K. 1416-1517; v. 3 is from the Chronicler.—1. *And all the people of Judah took Uzziah . . . and made him king*]. This action was occasioned by the untimely death of Amaziah. Ordinarily the people are not mentioned as determining the royal succession (cf. 221). Since Uzziah was only sixteen years old and Amaziah was fifty-four at his death, probably older brothers and
thus a first-born, were set aside in favour of Uzziah.—ugasiah) 2 K. 14." Azariah," and so 2 K. generally, while the Chronicler has 'Uzziah (v. 1). The connection between the two names is not entirely clear. They are quite similar in Hebrew עזיה and זָרִיאוֹ, and the latter may have arisen through a corruption of the former (DB. IV. p. 843). The names are somewhat similar in meaning; Azariah means "Yahweh has helped," Uzziah, "Yahweh is my strength." This fact may have led to their interchange.

—2. He built Eloth, etc.]. On Eloth or Elath v. i. Elath (cf. 8') had apparently been captured by Amaziah in his war against Edom (25") and then lost during the disastrous war with northern Israel, and its recovery was one of the first exploits of Uzziah.

This is the natural meaning of this verse, especially in its connection here, but in 2 K. 14" it is a part of the narrative of the reign of Amaziah, hence its first half, He built Eloth and restored it to Judah, is held to refer to Amaziah and to belong in the history of Amaziah with the account of the war against Edom (2 K. 14") (KAT. p. 261, Bn.). Then the second half of the verse belongs with the preceding verse or is a gloss.

5. The Chronicler now omits 2 K. 15", which says that the high places were not taken away and that the people still sacrificed and burnt incense in them, and writes this verse to explain the prosperity of Uzziah described in vv. 6-11.—Zechariah]. This prophet is not mentioned elsewhere. It is barely possible that the name is derived from the mention of Uzziah in the book of Zechariah (14)—Who gave instruction in the fear* of God (v. i.).

1. גיורע so also vv. 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27 i. s. 16, 17 i. s. 27 i. s. 16, 6, 7, and 2 K. 15", 25; י坏事 Ho. 1 Am. 1 Zc. 14* and 2 K. 15", 25; י坏事 2 K. 14* 15", 7, 17, 22, 1 Ch. 3", י坏事 2 K. 15", 5; in Assy. inscr. Aṣṣur'd, (COT. 2 K. 15*), but now denied (KAT. p. 262, DB. IV. pp. 844f.). Thus Azariah appears only once outside of 2 K., and that in Ch., while Uzziah is found four times in 2 K. Both forms of the name are used for a descendant of Kehath, cp. i Ch. 6* (24) and 6* (25), also for a son of Heman (with 'el for Yah), cp. i Ch. 25* and 25* (24, 25*).—2. גיורע] C Aṣṣur, H Ailath, 2 K. 14* י坏事, and so Ki. SBOT., Kom., but י坏事 also in 2 Ch. 8* i. K. 9", 2 K. 16*, 1" and י坏事 in Dt. 2* 2 K. 16*, 1".—רחב [בכפי temporarl clause introduced by י坏事 with inf., see Koe. iii. § 401a.

XXVI. 1-23] REIGN OF UZZIAH

6-15. Uzziah's military and industrial prosperity.—This section is without parallel in 2 K. and yet seems to contain historical reminiscences.

Bn. thinks the Chronicler's immediate forerunner (Die Vorlage) had here reliable ancient traditions, and Ki. sees in it (save v. 15 and vv. 16 and 17) material taken from some ancient reliable source. The composition, however, is throughout that of the Chronicler, and there is no reason why these verses may not have been entirely written by him, though possibly they were taken from his chief source the Midrash (v. p. 22). The following are the marks of the Chronicler's composition in v. 11: in vv. 1-11, in v. 15 in l. 84; in v. 16 in l. 127 and l. 128; in v. 17 in l. 87; in v. 18 in l. 17; in v. 19 in l. 86; in v. 20 in l. 28.

6. **Gath**. Cf. 1 Ch. 7. Jabneh] mentioned in OT. only here, unless after 6 in Jos. 15, and as Jabneel Jos. 15, mod. Yebna, twelve miles south of Joppa and four miles from the sea. Known by its Greek name Jamnia, it figures considerably in Jewish history from the time of the Maccabees and onward. After the fall of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) the great Sanhedrin removed thither, and for quite a period it took the place of Jerusalem as the religious and national centre of the Jews (JE. vii. p. 18).—**Ashdod** the famous Philistine city about half-way between Joppa and Gaza, two or three miles from the sea, the mod. Esdud (Jos. 11 15 1 R. S. 5 et al.).—And he built cities among the Philistines] (v. i.).—7. 'Abrian]. Cf. 17. Gur-ba'al] an unidentified place, and the reading is doubtful (v. i.).—**Meunim**. Cf. 1 Ch. 4. And the Ammonites gave tribute]. 6 has "the Meunim" (v. i.), which reading is adopted by Bn. as demanded by the context from the connection with the Philistines and Arabians and the following statement that Uzziah's name spread abroad even to the entrance of Egypt, a direction quite opposite from that of the territory of
Ammon. Ki., on the other hand, retains ‘Ammonites. This is agreeable to the mention of table land in v. 19 (v. i.) and their later conquest by Jotham (27*). Probably they should be retained and the notice considered as of no historical value. On the tribute, cf. 17* 27*.—And his name spread abroad even to the entrance of Egypt] i.e., his fame, or better, his power (Be., Ke., Zoe.).—9. The corner gate] the north-west corner of the wall (cf. 25*).—The valley gate] formerly located at or near the Jaffa gate on the west of the city (Rob. BR.* i. p. 43; Schick, ZDPV. viii. p. 272); but more probably near the south-west corner of the wall (cf. Ne. 21* 31*) (so Guthe, MuNDPV. 1895, pp. 10 ff., also Mitchell, JBL. 1903, pp. 108 ff., cf. GAS. J. i. pp. 177 ff.).—At the angle]. Cf. Ne. 31* 28*. While there might be many of these angles where the wall turned (Bn.), yet some particular one seems to have been meant, probably at north-east corner (BDB.).—10. Towers] for the protection of his herds (cf. 1 Ch. 27* Mi. 4*).—In the wilderness] the pasture land of Judah.—Cisterns]. The Heb. word may also mean wells, but artificial reservoirs were constructed in Palestine from the earliest times for the storage of water for man and beast.—The lowland] the Shephelah; cf. 1 Ch. 27* 2 Ch. 11* 9*.—The table land] i.e., the elevated plateau between the Arnon and Heshbon east of the Jordan, since mishmor denotes this (Dt. 3* 4* Jos. 13* 18. 17. 31 20* Je. 48* 31) (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.). This agrees with the subjugation of the Ammonites implied in v. 1; but it is doubtful whether the restriction of meaning to the territory east of the Jordan is necessary.—11. Going out to war in detachments by the number of their muster] descriptive of the thorough organisation of the host (Ke., Zoe.). This is better than to think the word in detachments (םירבד) refers to marauding expeditions (Ba.).—12. The heads of the fathers’ houses]. Cf. 1 Ch. 9*. The troops were mustered by households or families.—Even the mighty men of valour] i.e., landed proprietors and other well-to-do people (cf. 2 K. 15*).—Two thousand six hundred] a number agreeable to actual conditions during Uzziah’s reign. These are assumed to have been the commanders of the troops.—13. Three hundred and seven thousand and five hundred]. Cf. the armies of Amaziah, 300,000 (25*), and
the greater ones of Asa (14") and Jehoshaphat (17").—14. Shields]. Cf. 14" ('") 17" Ch. 5".—Spears]. Cf. ib.—Helmets] mentioned with the shield in Ez. 27" 38; cf. also 1 S. 17" Je. 46" fig. Is. 59".—Cuirasses] mentioned also in 18" K. 22" 1 S. 17" Ne. 4" ('") fig. Is. 59".—Bows and sling-stones] the weapons of the light-armed troops assigned so frequently to Benjamin (14" ('") Ch. 12" Ju. 20").—15. And he made contrivances the invention of inventive men . . . to shoot arrows and great stones]. Such engines of warfare are not mentioned elsewhere in the canonical OT., but were probably used by the Assyrians in the days of Uzziah, and he may have introduced them as weapons of defence for Jerusalem (so apparently Bn.), or their mention may merely reflect the methods of defence used in the period of the Chronicler (so EBi. IV. col. 4310, cf. GAS. J. ii. pp. 121 f.).

That the statements of these verses are in substance historical appears from the following facts: (1) Hezekiah seems largely to have had control of Philistia, and this is most reasonably explained upon the ground of the strong military policy of Uzziah; (2) Jerusalem made a strong defence during the reign of Hezekiah against the Assyrians and this was probably due to the preparations made by Uzziah; (3) the prosperity of the days of Ahaz revealed in the prophecies of Isaiah (v. s.) (DB. IV. p. 844). The mention also of Arabians in the Assyrian inscriptions among the defenders of Jerusalem against Sennacherib has been thought to sustain the statement that Uzziah subjugated them (this, however, is rather remote) (v. DB. s.).

6. נוירוס נועבז] can only mean cities in the territory of Ashdod, but then the additional נועבז is strange. Probably נועבז is a copyist's repetition and the text should read נוירוס נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז (Ba.). Winckler thinks that original text of source was נוירוס נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז, and that the remainder of the verse has come from a marginal note which first read נוירוס נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז (i.e. Jabneh), and that this had been reconstructed into its present form (KAT. p. 262).—7. נוירוס נועבז] Qr. נוירוס נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז א"כ נוירוס נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז (i.e. : (1) also the text of נוירוס N in Turbaal adopted by Ki. Kom.; (2) נוירוס נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז adopted by Bn. after Winck., who sees in נוירוס נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז נועבז a name of Edom in the Amarna Tablets (Gesch. i. 46). We then read against the Arabians in Gur and against the Meunim.

16–23. Uzziah’s leprosy and the conclusion of his reign. —Based on 2 K. 15. The narrative of 2 K. simply records that Uzziah was a leper; but the Chronicler (or his forerunner, Bn.) adds the cause, which he finds in his presumptuous exercise of the priests’ sacred right of burning incense and in his anger against the high priest and his associates when they rebuked him. This is doubtless a mere legend to explain the King’s leprosy, since that disease was felt to be a token of special divine judgment (cf. the leprosy of Miriam Nu. 12, and Gehazi 2 K. 5, v. also Bn. Arch. pp. 481 f.). A reflection of a real controversy between Uzziah and the priesthood has been seen in this story (Bn., Ki.), and the possibility of such an historical kernel must be admitted, but no indication of it is given elsewhere.—16. To offer incense upon the altar of incense] an especially sacred act, and, according to P, lawful only for the seed of Aaron (cf. v. 18 Ex. 30 16 Nu. 16 18).—17. And Azariah the priest] not identified or mentioned apart from this narrative (cf. v. 18); a favourite name in priestly genealogies (cf. 1 Ch. 5 6 11).—19. And while he was wroth with the priests the leprosy broke forth, etc.] Cf. the sudden appearance of leprosy in Gehazi, 2 K. 5 20. Yahweh had smitten him adapted
from 2 K. 15:17, which is here taken up.—21. In a separate house] (v. i.). The King as a leper kept by himself and retired from royal functions.—For he was cut off from the house of Yahweh] is not found in 2 K., a natural observation from the Chronicler, who laid great stress on worship.—22. Did Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz write]. The reference is either to an independent work by Isaiah (Ke.), which is most unlikely, or a part of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah (Be., Zoe.), or possibly the statement is derived from the fact that the present book of Isaiah mentions Uzziah.—23. And they buried him with his fathers in the field of the burial which belonged to the kings; for they said, he is a leper] i.e, he was not buried in the tombs of the kings, lest they should be defiled by a leprous body, but in the field adjoining these tombs. The Chronicler thus departed from the statement of 2 K. 15:17, “And they buried him with his fathers in the city of David.”

16. [a late idiom, Dr. TH. p. 157 n. ] he became haughty, lit., his heart was lifted up, cf. 32° Ps. 131 Pr. 18° Ez. 28° 11, and in the same sense without ל יs. 3° Je. 13° Ez. 16° Zp. 3°, cf. ye. 1 Ch. 27° 19. [out of humour, rejected, but only here enraged, a late sense like Aram. rage against.— with the apodosis as an emphatic copulative after a temporal conditional inf., Koe. iii. § 415.— rise, come out, usually of sun, only here of leprosy.—20. [wanting in 1°,<br/>

[late] hasten (late), cf. Est. 6° and in Qal pass. pt. Est. 18° 8° f.— 21. [— 21. And in the winter-house; in the house of eruption; The house of spreading, i.e., a house rendered unclean by the spreading of the leprosy after an attempt had been made to cleanse it (Lv. 14°) was appropriated for the King’s use.— not in 2 K.— 22. [wanting in 1°,<br/>

wanting in six mss. and 3 ; probably dropped as inconsistent with the
XXVII. 1–9. The reign of Jotham (co-regent c. 751–737; reigned c. 737–735 B.C.).—From 2 K. 15**, with slight changes and the addition of new material in vv. 1–4, which, like 26**,**, contain a tradition probably of historical worth (Pa. *EHSP.* p. 232). They show that Jotham continued the vigorous policy of his father. (For source-analyses of vv. 1–4 see vv. 1–10.)—1. A copy of 2 K. 15**.—Zadok] possibly the high priest mentioned in 1 Ch. 5** (6** (Be.).—2. Only he did not enter into the temple of Yahweh] a reference to Uzziah’s sacrilege (26** **) naturally wanting in 2 K.—And the people did yet corruptly]. The fuller statement of 2 K. 15** is, “Only the high places were not removed; the people still sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places.”—3. He built the upper gate of the house of Yahweh] from 2 K. 15**; the remainder of the verse and vv. 1–4 are independent of 2 K. (v. s.). The upper gate was probably the one in the north wall of the Temple court mentioned in Je. 20 as “the upper gate of Benjamin” (Bn., Sk.).—Ophel]. Cf. 33** Ne. 3**†, a spur south of the Temple by some held identical with the city of David (so GAS. *EBi.* II. col. 2418, cf. also *J.* i. pp. 152 f.). Cf. on this verse and the following the activity of Uzziah (26** *), which Jotham in all probability continued.—5. He fought also with the king of the children of Ammon] accepted by Ki. as a trustworthy tradition, but rejected by Bn. on the ground that the S. kingdom had nothing to do with the Ammonites, and hence either a fiction or a misreading of Meunim the people of Ma’on (cf. 26* *).—A hundred talents of silver and ten thousand measures of wheat] i.e., in United States value and measure some $187,500 and 120,331 bushels. This statement is assigned by Ki. to the Chronicler, while otherwise v. 7, from and on the wall, and v. 8 are assigned to some ancient reliable source (cf. 26** **).—6. This verse is clearly an observation of the Chronicler.—7. Corresponds with the summary of 2 K. 15**.—The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah] (v. Intro. p. 22). The Chronicler omits 2 K. 15**, “In those days the Lord began to send against Judah Rezin the king
of Syria and Pekah the son of Remaliah,” a statement out of harmony with his view of the reign and character of Jotham (cf. v. 4).—8. A repetition probably from a copyist of v. 1, yet cf. 28*.


1. pson] 2 K. 15** is followed by a superfluous [prof] added by the Chronicler.—
2. it] 2 K. 15** is followed by a superfluous [prof] added by the Chronicler.

—8. A repetition probably from a copyist of v. 1, yet cf. 28*.


XXVIII. The reign of Ahaz (c. 735-715 b.c.).—In this chapter we have one of the best examples of the reconstruction of history by the Chronicler (or his Midrashic source (Bn., Ki.)). According to 2 K. 16* Is. 7* Rezin, King of Syria, and Pekah, King of Israel, together invade Judah. But the Chronicler pictures their invasion as two separate and distinct events, both fraught with signal disasters far exceeding those mentioned in 2 K. or Is. (vv. 11*) and accompanied also with prophetic activity and influence (vv. 14*). According to 2 K. 16* Ahaz sought successfully the help of Tiglath-pileser against the combined hostility of Syria and Israel, but according to Ch. (vv. 16*17) the Assyrian King was invoked against the Edomites and the Philistines, and his aid availed nothing, but resulted rather in the oppression of Judah.

According to 2 K. 16* Ahaz sent unto Tiglath-pileser, to secure his services, a present of the treasures of the Temple and of the palace; but according to Ch. (v. 17) these treasures were vainly given to secure immunity from the oppression of the Assyrian King. According to 2 K. 16* Ahaz introduced into the Temple a new altar, copied from one at Damascus, and modified the ritual of sacrificial worship. This in Ch. (v. 17) becomes an act of sacrifice to the gods of Damascus.
Ahaz cut up the bases or stands of the lavers of the Temple (cf. 4
1 K. 7* &.) and also the base of the great laver (4* 1 K. 7* &.)
clearly to secure money for the tribute paid to the King of Assyria,
and he made some structural changes, not clear, in an entrance to
the Temple; in Ch. (vv. ii.* ) he cuts in pieces generally the utensils
of the Temple and closes the building, erecting in the mean time
altars in every corner of Jerusalem and in every city of Judah
high places to burn incense unto other gods. The motive for
this new treatment of the reign of Ahaz is clear. It brings into
greater relief punishment for sins. The disasters which befell
Judah are multiplied, and Ahaz becomes more and more con¬
spicuous as a sinful and wicked ruler. His reliance upon Assyria
brings only trouble. The Chronicler could not conceive of it
otherwise. He thus entirely reconstructs the history.

The sources of this chapter, omitting vv. 1-2a (911) 10-14 from 2 K.,
according to Ki. (Kom.) (after Bn.), are vv. 1b-2a from the Chronicler;
vv. 5-14. 15b M; and vv. 17-18, separating v. 16 and v. 17 and of a different
character, are from another source, one of historical value. These last
are, however, parallel to 2 K. 16* (so Ki. Kom.) and might even have been
introduced in a Midrashic reconstruction of 2 K. 16* &. They are also
closely bound in unity with the remainder of the chapter by the reference
to captives in v. 17 (cf. vv. 6: ii. 16). The following marks of the Chron¬
icler’s style appear in w. 10: in v. omission of rel. after בקע (l. 120),
כתר (l. 127); in vv. 10-11 שסירת (l. 1); in v. 11 list of proper names; in v. 12 והנה (l. 10); in v. 13 נינה (l. 75) and ה in הניה
(l. 128b); in vv. 14 נם (l. 68); in v. 15 verb omitted (l. 117b); and
in v. 16 זכרי ידוע וינון (l. 124).

1-4. The character of the reign of Ahaz.—Taken from 2 K.
16*-14 with a few characteristic additions.—2. And made also molten
images for the Baalim] an addition of the Chronicler, yet the
use of images in worship during the reign of Ahaz is abundantly
proved by Is. 2*-11. 2*-3. Moreover he burnt incense in the valley
of the son of Hinnom] wanting in 2 K. Added by the Chronicler as introductory to the mention of the sacrifice of his son, since
this valley was the seat of human sacrificial worship (cf. Je. 7*).
The valley of the son of Hinnom lies to the south and south-west
of Jerusalem, the mod. er-Rababi (cf. GAS. J. i. pp. 173 ff.)—
And he burnt his children] in 2 K. 16* “And made his son pass
through the fire," i.e., sacrificed his son (v. i.). The stories of Abraham’s sacrifice of Isaac (Gn. 22) and of Jephthah’s vow (Ju. 11* 14* 4.) show that human sacrifice was not unknown in the early days of Israel, but it probably was of very rare occurrence until the period of Ahaz, who clearly fostered the rite, as did also Manasseh (33* 2 K. 21*), and thus in the later years of the kingdom of Judah it became a not uncommon feature of religious worship (cf. 2 K. 17* 21* 23* Mi. 6* Je. 7* 19* Ez. 16* Ps. 106*).—

4. And he sacrificed, etc.] (2 K. 16*) not merely allowed the people to do so, as the best of his predecessors had done.—Under every spreading tree] a Deuteronomic and Jeremianic expression (Dt. 12* 1 K. 14* 2 K. 16* (here copied) 17* Je. 2* 3*). The usual rendering “green” is slightly misleading. The reference is not so much to colour as to condition and size. A large, fine tree is meant.

5-7. The disasters through Syrian and Israelitish invasions.—Recorded as punishments for the idolatry of Ahaz. The results of the war here given are very different from those mentioned in 2 K., where the allied armies besieged but could not take Jerusalem (16*) and caused the loss of Elath (16*). The Chronicler’s account has been held to supplement the other (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.), and probably some historical events grossly exaggerated underlie the stories of the captives taken and of the great slaughter. —5. The king of Syria] i.e., Rezin (cf. 2 K. 16* Is. 7* 8*).—A
great multitude of captives]. Nothing like this is recorded in 2 K. —And he was also delivered into the hand of the king of Israel. In 2 K. and Is. the invasion of the two kings is a joint one. Here the representation is of two independent ones (v. s.). —6. For Pekah slew in Judah one hundred and twenty thousand in one day]. Nothing of this is mentioned in 2 K. Such a great number of the slain is a usual feature of the Midrash (cf. 13*). —7. And Zichri]. On the occurrence of the name cf. 1 Ch. 8*, for that of the following names, v. i. Zichri probably was a real hero of northern Israel in this war (Bn.). —The king's son] if historical, probably a brother or uncle of Ahaz. —Ruler of the house] i.e., of the palace, probably the treasurer or steward is meant (cf. Is. 22* 36*). —That was next to the king] scarcely the captain over the host, but the grand vizier, sometimes called the recorder (םיקיניו) (cf. Now. Arch. I. p. 308).

5. cf. 1 Ch. 18*. —7. cf. Zaxapua. This is interesting because ז الصحي abbreviation of רזא𝚣, EBi. III. col. 3292. —cf. 1 Ch. 6*. —cf. 1 Ch. 3*.

8–15. The return of the captives. —A good example of Midrash. —8. Two hundred thousand, women, sons, and daughters] the men are assumed to have been slain (cf. v. 11 Nu. 31* 1). —9. But a prophet of Yahweh was there]. For similar intervention of prophets cf. 12* 15 20*. —Oded]. Since the name means “restorer” it may have been suggested by the incident, yet the same name appears of a prophet or a prophet’s father in 15*. —On account of the wrath of Yahweh the God of your fathers against Judah he hath delivered them into your hand]. Therefore this victory was not due to Israel’s prowess or an evidence of the righteousness of their cause, and hence also Judah should have been treated with restraint instead of with rage which hath reached up to heaven, i.e., to God, and thus commanded his attention and rendered Israel liable to punishment. —10. The purpose also of
 enslaving the people of Judah is most severely condemned.—

*Are there not surely with you, you even, trespassers against Yahweh your God?* The writer had probably in mind the guilt of the defection of the N. kingdom, especially in worship (cf. 13* *.), hence they should not incur additional guilt by enslaving their brethren. One Hebrew might hold another in bondage for a limited period (cf. Ex. 21* *.; Lv. 25* *.-46 Dt. 15* *.-11), but such wholesale slavery of fellow-countrymen by reprisal in war was never contemplated.—

15. *The city of palm trees* an alternative name of Jericho (cf. Dt. 34* Ju. 1* 3*).—*Beside their brethren*. Jericho, it is assumed, belonged to the N. kingdom but was in close proximity to the territory of the southern.

16-21. The intervention of the King of Assyria.—According to 2 K. 16* Ahaz sought the assistance of Tiglath-pileser III against the combined attack of the Kings of Syria and Israel, and this corresponds to the actual historical situation, but the Chronicler's narrative of the return of captives destroys the need for such an intervention or aid at least against Israel, hence the Chronicler introduces as the cause of this application for help the Edomite and Philistine invasions.

The Edomite invasion, however, and such an order of events are suggested by the mention of the Edomite capture of Elath (2 K. 16* according to the true reading RVm.) in the verse immediately preceding the statement that Ahaz invoked the aid of Tiglath-pileser.
18. *At that time* i.e., the time of the disasters from Syria and Israel, a chronology derived from 2 K.—*The king* of Assyria]. Tiglath-pileser III.—17. *For again* either with reference to the former attacks of the Edomites (cf. 21* *) or with the meaning of "besides," "moreover," i.e., in addition to the attacks of the Syrians and the N. kingdom (Ke., Zoe.). That Judah suffered at this time a loss of territory through the encroachments of Philistines as well as Edomites is not unlikely, yet no mention of such a fact appears in 2 K. or in Is.—18. *Beth-shemesh*]. Cf. 1 Ch. 6* **•).—Aijalon]. Cf. 1 Ch. 6* **•).—Gederoth] (Jos. 15* †) mod. Katra, south-west from Jabneh.—Soco]. Cf. 11*.—Timnah] mod. Tibne, near Beth-shemesh.—Gimzo] mod. Jimzu, three miles south-east of Lydda.—19. *King of Israel* equivalent to King of Judah, cf. 11* 12* 19* 21* —He acted without restraint] i.e., in irreligion or idolatry.—20. *Came unto him* in a hostile sense (Be., Ke.), yet this is not necessarily implied by the Heb.—*And distressed him and did not strengthen him*]. Tiglath-pileser is thus represented as having come to Judah, not as a deliverer, but as an oppressor and exacter of tribute, taking even the treasures of the Temple and palace (v. 21). The narrative of 2 K. and the Assy. ins. know of no such advent of Tiglath-pileser in Judah, and it is not at all probable that either he (Ke.) or a detachment of his army (Oe.) entered Judah.—21. *For Ahaz plundered the house of Yahweh, etc.*] an adaptation and wrong setting of 2 K. 16* . An adjustment has been sought by a pluperfect rendering—*For Ahaz had plundered, etc.* (Ke., Zoe., Oe.), but the Chronicler's meaning is clearly different. He connects this plundering the Temple with an oppression of the Assyrian and not with a gift to secure his help (Bn.).—*But it helped him not*]. Tiglath-pileser continued his oppression. The gift, according to 2 K. 16* , did help Ahaz in securing the intervention of the Assyrians, who attacked the kingdoms of Damascus and northern Israel, and removed Judah's danger from that quarter, but the Chronicler recognised nothing of this. Ke. and Oe. reconcile this statement with 2 K. by the interpretation that "It did not really help him," since thereby Tiglath-pileser only strengthened himself and made use of his power to oppress Ahaz.
22–25. The idolatry of Ahaz.—Based upon 2 K. 16 16-11, but with entire reconstruction of narrative (v. s.).—22. And in the time of his distress [i.e., when Tiglath-pileser distressed him (v. 11)], but v. 11 suggests the distress of the Syrian invasion. Ki. follows כ and connects with preceding verse (v. i.).—23. For he sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus]. The basis of this statement is the erection of an altar patterned after one in Damascus (2 K. 16 16-11) (v. s.).—The gods of the kings of Syria helped them]. Historically, since Damascus fell before Tiglath-pileser in 732 B.C., the reference can only be to Syria’s short-lived successes against Judah (cf. v. 1), but the reference fits in badly. Ba. reads “the gods of the kings of Assyria,” which would fit the historical conditions better, but those gods were not the gods of Damascus. It is simpler to think of confusion on the part of the Chronicler.—24. And Ahaz gathered together, etc.] These statements rest upon 2 K. 16 11 1, which the Chronicler has interpreted in his own way (v. s.). He saves the sanctity of the Temple by having Ahaz’ idolatries outside of its precincts, as though he had abandoned altogether the worship of Yahweh. In reality Ahaz introduced innovations in the Temple worship, which he seems to have assiduously cultivated. There is no reason, then, to think that the Temple was closed during his reign.

22. כ יכ ותננ יכוב כ תי יכ ותננ יכוב and joined to v. 11. This Ki. follows and renders כ יכ ותננ יכוב (SBOT., Kom., but not BH.), also HWB. 11, BDB.—משנה] impf. consec. after a determination of time Dr. TH. 127 (8), Koe. iii. § 361.—משנה] a late usage of the pronoun prefixed to the proper name for emphasis (BDB. p. 215 e):
“that king Ahaz” the subj. of ἡ χρονική. Ο το άραν ας βασιλέως, reading ραλ for άραν.—23. άραν άραν] ο ἐλάδας ἡ χρονικής (ο μετρικός) = καταφέρεις a verb common in Ch.—ἱηρικ] cf. 1 Ch. 18.Ⅳ. Ⅰ. ms. and ο δεικτικός, cf. v. Ⅰ. Here the pl. is certainly in place.—καταφέρεις] read Qal σινθιρία, σ due to dittography, Ges. § 532. BDB.—24. άραν άραν] ο έλερσις. έλαδας] συνέλευσις wanting in άραν, but its presence in άραν is testified by Bab. A.—25. κατέλει άραν] cf. 11 11 Est. 21 4 811. 12. 17, Kohe. Ⅲ. § 90.—καταφέρεις... άραν] cf. pl.

26. 27. The conclusion of Ahaz’ reign.—Taken with variations from 2 K. 18Ⅲ. Ⅺ.—26. Book of the kings of Judah and Israel. Cf. Intro. p. 22.—And was buried in the city even in Jerusalem; and they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings of Israel. Thus, according to the Chronicler, Ahaz was dishonoured for his wickedness by not being buried in the royal tombs. This is an intentional departure from the text of 2 K. 16Ⅲ, which says “[Ahaz] was buried with his fathers in the city of David.” For other similar departures cf. 21 24 26Ⅲ.

27. [καταφέρεις] ο, 2 K. 16Ⅲ καταφέρεις and 2 K. + καταφέρεις. ο, 2 K. καταφέρεις. The former is usual in Ch., 1 Ch. 4Ⅲ 2 Ch. 28Ⅲ + 35 t. 2 Ch. 29-32 also 2 K. 20Ⅳ Je. 15Ⅳ Is. 11 (and καταφέρεις) Ho. 11 Mi. 11 (but in last three may be text. error for κατάζων); the latter more common in 2 K. and elsewhere, 2 K. 16Ⅲ 18Ⅲ + 34 t. (2 K. 18-21) Is. 36Ⅲ + 31 t. (Is. 36-39) Je. 26-19 1 Ch. 31 2 Ch. 29Ⅲ 27 30Ⅲ 32Ⅲ, (and καταφέρεις) 2 K. 18Ⅲ + 6 t. Pr. 25.Ⅳ. Assy. inscrip. Ḥāsāh(i)w COT. on 2 K. 18Ⅲ.

XXIX-XXXII. The reign of Hezekiah (c. 715-686 ? B.C.).—Hezekiah, according to 2 K., was a reformer in religious worship, removing the high places and the brazen serpent which had been worshipped (2 K. 18Ⅲ), and likewise he was marked for his devotion to Yahweh and adherence to the commandments of Moses (2 K. 18Ⅲ). He thus became a fruitful subject for the Chronicler, who describes at length his reopening of the Temple (c. 29), his celebration of the Passover (c. 30), and his appointment of the servitors of the Temple (c. 31). All of these acts are treated from the point of view of the Chronicler’s own time and without the evidence of the use of historical records.

XXIX. The reopening of the Temple.
Sources: According to Ki. (after Bn.), vv. 1-3 are from 2 K., vv. 1-18 M; vv. 19-30 the Chronicler; vv. 19-30 M; vv. 23-30 are assigned to the Chronicler because they emphasise the activity of the Levites in the service of music and song. Bn. calls attention to the divine command for the service (v. 19) and also the command (v. 20) and instruments of David (v. 21), the words of David and of Asaph the seer (v. 29) (cf. 1 Ch. 15:25a, where Heman is called a seer, 2 Ch. 35:16, where Jeduthun is also so called). While the introduction of the Levitical singers is emphasised, yet there is no such abruptness as implies an author different from that of the remainder of the chapter. Considering the chapter as a whole, the connection between v. 1 and 28 shows that both chapters 29 and 28 are in all probability by the same author—in all likelihood the Chronicler. The marks of the Chronicler in the vv. 1-28 (assigned to M) are as follows: In v. 1, הָעָשְׂרִים (l. 115); in v. 6, בּוֹלֵל (l. 68); in v. 15, לְמִקְדָּשׁ (l. 117b); in vv. 16-18, the list of Levites; in vv. 16, לְהָבֵית (l. 103); in v. 17, לְמִקְדָּשׁ (l. 30), מִקְדָּשׁ (l. 67), פֶּלֶם (l. 68); in v. 18, מַעֲרָה (l. 4); in v. 19, מְלָא דִּי (l. 65); in v. 20, יִתְבֹּד (l. 105), יִשְׂפָּר (l. 81).

1. 2. Hezekiah's accession.—Taken from 2 K. 18:1-4, with the omission of the synchronism with Hoshea King of Israel (2 K. 18). 3-11. The command to open the Temple.—With the rest of the chapter, from the Chronicler. The whole narrative is largely, if not entirely, imaginary, since in reality the Temple was not closed during the reign of Ahaz (v. comment on 28). Yet this cleansing of the Temple has been taken as historical, meaning a rebuilding of the Temple (Winckler, KAT. 189 p. 272) (cf. note on Millo 32).—3. In the first month] i.e., of the sacred year, viz., Nisan (cf. 30). Hezekiah is assumed to have come to the throne shortly before this (cf. v. 17).—Opened the doors, etc.] a summary of that which was accomplished during the first month.—4. Into the broad place on the east]. This locality must be sought in the topography of the period of the Chronicler. The assembly of the priests and Levites suggests the inner court of the Temple (so Be., Bn.), but the term is used for an open space outside the precincts of the Temple extending to the water-gate, where the people were wont to assemble (cf. Ezr. 10 Ne. 3 8:18), and since the Temple was regarded as closed and neglected the Chronicler may well have placed the assembly there.—5. Sanctify yourselves]. Cf. v. 15 1 Ch. 15:16. —And sanctify the house of Yahweh] as was accomplished by its cleansing and through the offerings and services described in this
The filthiness (םַרְוַת) often used of menstruation and hence a very strong term for impurity (v. BDB.); scarcely here the abominations of idolatry, i.e., utensils connected with idolatrous worship (the view of Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.), since the Temple was supposedly closed, but the accumulated filth from its neglect. Cf. uncleanness (םַרְוָת) v. 14.—From the holy place (בְּהֵיכָל) from the entire Temple area (cf. holy place in v. 9).—6. Our fathers], Ahaz and his contemporaries, since v. 7 suits these only. —And they have turned their faces from the dwelling place of Yahweh and have given him the back]. These words are figurative, meaning they have ceased to worship Yahweh in his Temple (cf. Je. 21 32).—7. Also they have shut up the doors of the porch, etc.]. According to 28, Ahaz had closed the Temple and naturally all the Temple worship of Yahweh ceased also. This is quite contrary to the facts narrated in 2 K. 16-18, where Ahaz is represented as modifying the ancient ritual, but where there are no indications of a cessation of the worship of Yahweh, but quite the reverse. On the lamps, incense and burnt-offerings, cf. 13.8. And the wrath of Yahweh was against Judah and Jerusalem]. Cf. 24 32. This wrath was seen in the disaster which befell Judah during the reign of Ahaz, recorded in c. 28 (cf. 28).—A terror] i.e., a terrifying spectacle; the word is used in Dt. 28 Ez. 23 and also in Je. 15 24 34 and 29 with reference to the impending exile of Judah. In the last passage it is joined as here with astonishment and hissing, which also occur in Je. 25.—As you see with your eyes]. The disasters are meant which befell, according to c. 28, the people under Ahaz, through the wars with the Syrians, Ephraimites, Philistines, Edomites, and the oppression of the Assyrians.—10. Now it is in my heart]. Cf. 1 Ch. 22.—To make a covenant with Yahweh] i.e., to pledge oneself to keep the law of Yahweh (cf. 15 34 2 K. 23).—11. For Yahweh hath chosen you, etc.]. Cf. Dt. 10, also Nu. 3 8.
12-19. The cleansing of the Temple.—In response to the King's exhortation, fourteen Levites at once come forward, two each representing the three great Levitical families Kehath, Merari, and Gershon (cf. 1 Ch. 6:19), two the family of Elizaphan (cf. 1 Ch. 15:7), where the family is also co-ordinated with Kehath, Merari, and Gershon), and two each the three divisions of singers Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (cf. 1 Ch. 25:1), and under their direction the Temple is cleansed.—12. Maḥath the son of 'Amasai] also in the genealogy of the Kehathite Samuel (1 Ch. 6:18 q. v., cf. also 31:13, where Maḥath again appears).—Jo'el the son of 'Azariah] likewise in the genealogy just mentioned (1 Ch. 6:18).—Kish the son of 'Abdi] also in the genealogy of the Merarite Ethan (1 Ch. 6:18 written Kishi).—'Azariah]. Cf. 31:11, where he would seem to have been appointed ruler of the Temple.—'Jehalel'el] not elsewhere among the lists of Levites, but the name of a man of Judah (1 Ch. 4:18).—Jo'ah the son of Zimmah] in the fragmentary genealogy of a descendant of Gershon probably Asaph (1 Ch. 6:18 q. v.).—'Eden]. Cf. 31:13. 13. Shimri]. Cf. 1 Ch. 26:1 a Levite, 422 the name of a Simeonite, 11:4 a father of one of David's heroes †.—'Jē'el or Jē'el] a frequent Levitical name but not elsewhere connected with Elizaphan.—Zechariah and Mattaniah]. Both of these names occur elsewhere among Asaphites. For the former, cf. 2 Ch. 20:16 Ne. 23:4, for the latter Ne. 11:17 2 Ch. 20:14.—14. Jehu'el †].—Shim'e] a frequent Levitical
name but not elsewhere connected with Heman.—Shema'iah] a very frequent name; also that of a descendant of Jeduthun in 1 Ch. 9:25.—'Uss'iel] a Levitical clan name (cf. 1 Ch. 15:22), also not infrequent of individuals, a Hemanite musician in 1 Ch. 25:16. 15. And sanctified themselves]. Cf. v. 1 Ch. 15:14.—By the words of Yahweh] i.e., according to divine appointment either because the King's command was agreeable to the law (Be., Ke., Zoe.) or given at the instigation of a prophet (a suggestion of Ba. and unlikely), or an example of hypostatization, the pl. being used where the sing. might be expected (cf. 30:16).—16. And the priests went in unto the inner part of the house of Yahweh] i.e., into the Temple proper, the holy place and the most holy place without distinction, where only the priests were allowed to enter.—All the uncleanness]. Cf. v. 1.—And the Levites took it]. Thus the work of cleansing the Temple was divided between the priests and the Levites.—To the brook Kidron] on the east of the city. The place was regarded as unclean, cf. 15:1.—17. On the first of the first month] i.e., the first of Nisan (cf. v. 4).—To sanctify] i.e., to cleanse.—And on the eighth day came they to the porch of Yahweh]. Eight days were consumed in cleansing the Temple courts, and then eight more in cleansing the Temple building, hence On the sixteenth day of the first month they finished their work.—18. And then they came within unto Hezekiah the king] i.e., within the palace.—And the table of show bread]. In 4:11 and 1 Ch. 28:4 tables are mentioned (cf. also 4:1).—19. All the vessels which king Ahaz in his reign had rejected in his trespass have we prepared and sanctified]. The reference is to the vessels described in 28:4 (q. v.) as "cut in pieces." Ke. and Zoe. refer directly to 2 K. 16:14, 15, and think of the brazen altar of burnt-offering, the brazen sea and the lavers. Be. and Oe. refer likewise to 2 K. 16:14, 15. It is not impossible that the author had these in mind; then we may render set up and sanctified (Ba.).—And behold they are before the altar of Yahweh] the altar of burnt-offering in the court. This favours the reference to lavers which with the altar were in the court.

On the other hand it must be remembered that the writer was drawing largely upon his imagination, and evidently cared little about accuracy of detail, or making his account especially consistent either with his own previous narrative or, much less, with that of 2 K.
20–36. The renewal of worship in the Temple.—On the day after the completion of the Temple, the King and the princes early in the morning presented a sevenfold sacrifice of bullocks, rams, lambs, and he-goats as a burnt-offering and a sin-offering for the royal house, the sanctuary (i.e., the priests and Levites), and the people generally (vv. 20–21). This service was accompanied with one of song rendered by the Levites (vv. 20–21). Then followed gifts of free-will offerings (vv. 21–22).—20. And he assembled the officials of the city] as was customary on state occasions.—21. The seven bullocks, rams, and lambs were for a burnt-offering (cf. v. 20), while the seven he-goats were for a sin-offering (cf. v. 20); combined together they were an offering completing the purification of the Temple and its rededication. The burnt-offering was a petition for acceptance and reconciliation or atonement with Yahweh (Lv. 1–16). It was not necessarily connected with any particular form of transgression, but served to express worship in general and to atone, give a covering, for general sinfulness. The sin-offering, on the other hand, was expressly for this latter purpose and for specific sins. In Ezekiel it is prescribed for the dedication of the altar (43–4), the annual cleansing of the sanctuary (45–4), the consecration of a prince and the people on festive occasions (45–4), and for the return of a priest to duty after purification (44–4). In P it was prescribed for the covering of minor offences (cf. Lv. 4–12). Seven victims were offered because seven was a sacred number (cf. for other sacrifices of sevens Nu. 28–9. Ez. 45–9).—For the kingdom and for the sanctuary and for Judah] i.e., for the royal house, for the priests, and for the people generally.—22. And the priests received the blood and threw it (from a bowl) against the altar] according to the ritual of the burnt-offering (cf. Ex. 29–11. Lv. 1–11).—23. And they (the King and the representatives of the assembly) laid their
hands upon them] according to the ritual of the sin-offering (cf. Lv. 4:14). This ceremony is also prescribed in the case of the burnt-offering (Lv. 1:4), but is mentioned here to emphasise the sin-offering.—24. With their blood upon the altar. The blood of the sin-offering was manipulated differently from that of the burnt-offering. It was placed upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering and poured at its base (Lv. 4:14).—To make atonement] lit. to cover over, a technical expression. Through the sacrifice a covering was secured so that guilt was no longer seen, but blotted out; and thus was hidden the sin of the neglect of the sanctuary and the failure to worship Yahweh.—For all Israel] not only the members of the S. kingdom, but of all the twelve tribes (cf. 30) whose remnants were still in Palestine.—25. With cymbals, etc.] Cf. 1 Ch. 15:16.—According to the commandment of David]. Cf. 8:1.—And of Gad the king's seer and Nathan the prophet]. Cf. 1 Ch. 29:15. Neither Gad nor Nathan is mentioned elsewhere in connection with the music or songs of the Temple.—For by the hand of Yahweh was the command by the hand of his prophets] i.e., Yahweh had commanded David through his prophets, presumably Gad and Nathan, to arrange the praise services of the Temple.—26. With the instruments of David]. Cf. 1 Ch. 23:1. The instruments of v. 14 are evidently meant.—And the priests with the trumpets]. The blowing of the trumpets fell to the priests (cf. 5:11 1 Ch. 15:16).—27. 28. During the offering of the burnt-offering until it was ended the whole congregation stood worshipping, and the song of the Levites accompanied with the music of the stringed instruments and the trumpet-blowing of the priests continued (Ke.).—30. A supplementary service is not meant, but the writer calls attention to the fact that the songs of the Levites were the words of David and Asaph the seer, meaning without doubt psalms such as were being collected in his own time into the Hebrew Psalter; and he wishes also to emphasise the joyful and worshipful demeanour of the Levites.—And they bowed down and worshipped] probably only a concluding ceremony (so Ke.).—31. Then Hezekiah answered] responded to the services of sacrifice and song.—Now ye have consecrated yourselves unto Yahweh] addressed to the priests and Levites who through the
ceremonies just performed had been reconsecrated to the service of Yahweh.—Sacrifices and thank-offerings] ([אֲשֶׁר הָעַרְבָּה] i.e., sacrifices which were thank-offerings. The first term is generic. The thank-offering was a sacrifice offered for some special benefit received; here an expression of joy over the renewal of the worship of Yahweh in the Temple (for ritual cf. Lv. 7* *). These sacrifices, with the exception of the fat which was burnt on the altar and the breast and right thigh, which fell to the priests, were eaten by the offerer and thus were an occasion of a festive meal. In the case of the burnt-offering and sin-offering the offerer received nothing for his own use (the former was burnt entire and the unburnt portions of the latter belonged to the priests). Hence the burnt-offerings from the assembly are mentioned as given by everyone of willing heart. They were a greater evidence of unselfish piety than the thank-offerings.—33. And the consecrated things] ([נָשַׁבֵּץ] i.e., the sacrifices, the thank-offerings (v. i.).—Six hundred oxen and three hundred sheep]. Since these were thank-offerings, they were eaten by the people.

—34. But the priests were too few, so that they could not flay all the burnt-offerings, wherefore their brethren the Levites did help them]. This latter statement is strange in view of Lv. 1* * , where the killing and flaying the burnt-offering is the duty of the offerer, i.e., one of the laity. The writer here, however, regards the flaying as the duty of the priests in which the Levites might assist, either because these were public offerings presented in the name of community (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.), or because this marks an intermediate stage in the development of the cultus. (The Talmudic literature assigns the slaughter to the priests.) (Bn.)—For the Levites were more upright in heart to sanctify themselves than the priests]. This judgment is either a reflexion of the Chronicler's personal bias for the Levites at the expense of the priests (hence Bn. assigns vv. 1* * to the Chronicler in distinction from his Midrash source), or was inferred from the record of the subserviency of the priest Urijah to Ahaz (2 K. 16**), as though the priests had been more in the idolatrous movement of Ahaz than the Levites (Ki.). This is accepted as the fact, as it may have been, by Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.

—35. And also the burnt-offerings were in abundance, with the fat
of the peace-offerings, and with the drink-offerings for the burnt-offerings]. Another reason why the Levites helped the priests in the flaying of the victims was because the priests besides attending to the proper altar service (the sprinkling of the blood and burning of the sacrifices upon the altar) were obliged to burn the fat of the peace-offerings and manipulate the drink-offerings. The peace-offerings were the thank-offerings (v. "). The drink-offerings were of wine and probably poured like the blood at the base of the altar (cf. Nu. 15:1-11 v. Gray in loco; WRS. Rln. of the Semites, p. 230).—And the service of the house of Yahweh was established]. Everything necessary for the cleansing and rededication of the Temple was accomplished (Be.); better the regular cultus of the Temple was re-established (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba.).—36. Because of that which God had established for the people] i.e., the restoration of the Temple worship, which is regarded as a divine benefaction.—For the thing happened suddenly]. This change from apostasy to loyalty to Yahweh took place almost immediately on Hezekiah's accession to the throne (cf. v. *). It was a common impulse of both King and people, apparently without any preparation. This, too, then was a ground of great joy.

21. שְׁהָרֹן he-goat is a late Heb. word abs. Dn. 8:11, cstr. sg. with שְׁהָרֹן Dn. 8:1 (fig. of Alex.), pl. (lit.) here and Ezr. 8:14 (דִּבְרֵי הַשֵּׁם) †.—Bn. regarding kingdom as synonymous with Judah reads כַּלְכֵל שִׁיר. Ki. translates "königliche Regierung."—יכָּלַכַּל possibly with the thought that Judah had been expressed under בַּדְּנֵלָה, i.e., סְפִּיר יָוִים and he commanded (cf. vv. vv. 11, l. 4).—23. הַשֵּׁם] the usual word for the he-goat of the sin-offering (cf. Ez. 43:24 Lv. 9:11 + 9 t. Lv. Nu. v. BDB.).—24. פֹּה] and they made a sin offering, cf. Ex. 29:6 Lv. 6:9—25. בִּשְׁלֹחַ] and they commanded (cf. Ex. 29:6 Lv. 6:9).—26. בָּרָב] מַסְדִּיק—בָּרָב] מַסְדִּיק wanting in מַסְדִּיק בָּרָב] retrospective word suppressed, cf. 20:24:11, Ges. § 155.—רֵי [ with epexegetical force, Dav. Synt. § 136 R. 1 (c), Koe. iii. § 375c.—28. שָׁמְשֹׁן] cf. 1 Ch. 15:10, l. 44.—30. חֲלֹל] only inf. and pt. of חלַל are followed by ה, Koe. iii. p. 274 n. 2.—31. שִׁית] collective with pl., a frequent construction, Koe. iii. 346 e β. —33. יַחַשֹּׁר] cf. 35:16 Ne. 10:11 Nu. 18:1 Ez. 36:1—36. מְנִיך] the art. as rel., see Dav. Synt. § 22 R. 4, Ges. § 138h, Koe. iii. § 52c, l. 119.

XXX. The celebration of the Passover.—Nothing of this event is mentioned in 2 K., and as here described it is probably
a purely imaginary occurrence, suggested by the Passover under Josiah (2 K. 23:1). Since Hezekiah was held to have been a reformer equally with Josiah, it was felt he too must have celebrated in a similar manner the Passover.

The chapter is assigned by Kl. Kom. (after Bn.) to M* except vv. ** (and the Levites, etc.), which, from the reference to the musical service of the Levites, are assigned to the Chronicler. M* is given as a source instead of M, because to the latter is assigned the description of the celebration of the Passover under Josiah (c. 35), which in v. 18 (cf. 2 K. 23:11) seemingly forbids a similar celebration under Hezekiah. This description here appears also an imitation of the other, with an endeavour to surpass it. In both the Levites have prominence (cf. vv. * with 35:9); the King and officials provide the animals for the Passover (cf. v. * with 35:9); with the Passover other offerings are brought (cf. v. * with 35:9); and the celebrations surpass also any since Solomon (cf. v. * with 35:9). The celebration under Hezekiah also surpasses that under Josiah, since this latter was for the Judeans only, but the former for all Israel and strangers (vv. *; the latter lasted only a week (35:9), but the former two weeks (v. *). Thus while both descriptions may have been in the same Midrashic source, it is argued that they were not from the same author (Bn.). Yet it is doubtful, however, whether both narratives in 2 Ch. may not have been written by the Chronicler under the influence of the current views of both of these celebrations. The following are the marks of the Chronicler’s style, omitting vv. **:

1-12. The invitation to the Passover.—1. All Israel] the people of the N. kingdom.—And also letters he wrote to Ephraim and Manasseh] is added to avoid misunderstanding the meaning of Israel. Ephraim and Manasseh are mentioned not as tribes, but as representatives of Israel. This invitation presupposes the Dtish. law. It is very difficult, if not impossible, also to conceive of Hezekiah as having historically sent such an invitation to the inhabitants of the semi-hostile N. kingdom at the commencement of his reign before the fall of Samaria (v. following verse).—2. To keep the passover in the second month}. The law
(of P) provided that persons unable to keep the Passover in the first month should celebrate it in the second month (cf. Nu. 9:11).

The whole connection shows that the writer designed this month to be the second month of the first year of Hezekiah's reign (so Be., Zoe., Oe., Ba.). Cf. the use of 1 consec. in rḥbšn v. 1; the contrast between the second month and "the first month" in 29:17; and the statement of v. 8 respecting the priests, which is to be connected with the account of cleansing the Temple, which was not finished until the 16th of the first month (29:11) (v. i.). Ke., on the other hand, feeling the historical improbability of the invitation being given while the N. kingdom was standing, and especially in view of the implication of the captivity of Israel given in v. 1 and the destruction of the high places in Ephraim and Manasseh mentioned in 31:1, held that this Passover took place after the fall of Samaria in the sixth year of Hezekiah. But here, as elsewhere, the Chronicler is not troubled by historical inconsistencies.

3. For they had not been able to keep it at that time (i.e., on the 14th of Nisan, the first month) because the priests had not sanctified themselves in a sufficient number and the people had not assembled together in Jerusalem. The regular time for the celebration of the Passover was on the 14th of Nisan, the first month, but at that time (according to 29:11) the cleansing of the Temple had not been finished, and hence it might rightly be assumed that many priests remained unsanctified (v. also 29:10). The priests also are held to be slack in entering into the renewal of the worship of Yahweh (cf. v. 10 29:10). The celebration then of the Passover under those conditions was not feasible, and until the Temple was ready for worship, the people naturally would not have been summoned to Jerusalem. This apparently was the view of the writer, and the occasion of the statements of this verse.—4. All the assembly] that of Jerusalem (cf. v. 1) —5. From Be'er-sheba unto Dan] the limits of the undivided kingdom of David and Solomon (cf. 1 Ch. 21:1). The existence of the N. kingdom was either ignored or more probably the writer assumed that it had already fallen (cf. v. 1). For they had not done in great numbers according to that which had been written]. Only a few hitherto had observed the Passover according to the law (v. i.) —6. And according to the commandment of the king]. The "and" should be omitted (v. i.). Ye children of Israel turn unto Yahweh the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel]
addressed to the people of the N. kingdom with the assumption
that they were apostate from Yahweh, the view of the Chronicler
(cf. 13:2-13).—That he may return unto the escaped remnant which
are left of you from the hand of the kings of Assyria]. This state-
ment naturally presupposes the fall of the N. kingdom through
Shalmaneser and Sargon (B.C. 722-721) (cf. 2 K. 17*), although
it possibly may be satisfied by the some ten years earlier ravages
and deportations of the north and north-east frontiers of N. Israel
through Tiglath-pileser (cf. 2 K. 15*; Ch. 5*). It is not probable,
however, that the Chronicler drew at all this distinction, and it is
profitless to attempt to adjust his statements to the chronology of the
events of the reign of Hezekiah (v. s. v. *). (Indeed this chronology
was not clearly understood by the compilers of 2 K. and the book
of Isaiah, and still remains obscure.)—7. Who trespassed against
Yahweh]. Cf. v. *—So that he gave them to desolation]. Cf. 29*.
—As ye now see]. The disasters of the Assyrian invasion were
most recent.—10. Even unto Zebulun] thus not to the extreme
northern border, unto Dan, as might have been expected (cf. v. *)
Those more northerly sections had been ravaged and the inhab-
habitants deported by Tiglath-pileser (cf. v. *) (Zoe., Oe.), a fact the
writer may possibly have borne in mind (yet cf. v. *).—And they
were laughing them to scorn and were mocking them]. Cf. for
similar action in the S. kingdom, 36*.—12. By the word of Yah-
weh] understood as by the words of Yahweh (29* q. v.) (Be.,
Ke., Zoe.); but probably an example of the hypostatisation of the
word, i.e., the word was conceived of as an entity, almost as a me-
diating spirit between God and man (cf. 29* i K. 13*; 15*; 17*; 18*;
20* i S. 3*]) (cf. Smend, Alt. Rlgngesch. pp. 87, 464). This con-
ception may be regarded as a forerunner of the NT. doctrine of
the Logos.

1. תָּרָנוּת] letters, sg. תֶּרֶנֶּה late, probably a loan-word, Assy. egirtu
(BDB.), cf. v. 6 Ne. 27. 8. 9. 17. 18 Est. 9. 20 †—3. תָּרָנָה] תָּרָנָה + יִשָּׁר + יִר, according to what was sufficient, i.e., in sufficient numbers (Be., Zoe.,
Oe., v. BDB. יִשָּׁר יִר, Ke. ad sufficientiam qualitatively with reference to the
priesthood, "many at that time not having renounced idolatry ").
—5. תָּרָנוּ] late usage of תָּרָנוּ v. l. 89.—בָּרוֹנָת proclamation, cf. 24*—
בָּרוֹנָת in great numbers (Be., Ke., Zoe., Ba., Kau., Ki., Bn., RV.); for a
long time (AV., RVm.); Meistens (Oe.). The former is preferable.—
6. the runners, i.e., royal messengers, a late usage (cf. Je. 51:18 Est. 3:20, 81:14). This usage is quite different from that of 12:18 (g. v.).—[תונוראכ] cf. v. 1. many MSS. 'tw, two 'm, and one 'ec, so also G, B, followed correctly by Ki. Kom., BH.—have the sg.—so that he (Yahweh) may bring back the escaped remnant.—lit. give hand to, i.e., submit to, cf. Ge. 29:9.—an intensive pl. with 'b either predicate with נבונכ or the obj. of a verb understood; cf. use with וו 1 K. 8:16 Ne. 17:11 Dn. 1:9 Ps. 146:10.—by hand, lit. hands.—[קרוח] Hiph. used only here.—[קרוח] Hiph. late, cf. Ne. 2:18 Jb. 21:8 Ps. 22:11; with 'b see Ko. 3:32:—11. they humbled themselves Niph. of יב in reflex. sense common in Ch., cf. 7:14 12:7 7:13 32:33 12:9 34:17 36:12.—12. the people cleansed the city as the priests had cleansed the Temple.—Even the places for incense they took away] probably a gloss defining the altars more particularly to conform with the mention of the burning of incense in 28:11.—And cast them into the brook Kidron]. Cf. 29:4.—15. And the priests and the Levites were ashamed]. Again, as in v. 1 29:4, a certain reproach is placed upon the priests and here the Levites, as though they were not forward in the renewal of the worship of Yahweh, but were only
driven to it by a feeling of shame (cf. 29\textsuperscript{4}) under the influence of which they sanctified themselves.—And they brought offerings into the house of Yahweh] as an atonement for themselves (Ba.); better a reference to the paschal lambs (cf. 35\textsuperscript{11}) and the sacrificial functions connected with them (v. 10) (Ke.).—16. And they stood in their place according to their prescribed duty according to the law of Moses]. No specific law is here meant, but the general law constituting the orders of the priests and Levites with their respective functions.—The priests sprinkling the blood (upon the altar) from the hand of the Levites]. According to Ex. 12\textsuperscript{4}, all the congregation slay the paschal lamb (i.e., each householder his lamb), but on this occasion the lambs were evidently slain by the Levites, owing to the unsanctified condition of the congregation (vv. 17-18). Had the lambs been slain and their blood caught by persons Levitically unclean, the expiatory sacrificial blood would have been defiled. The same ritual was observed at the great Passover celebrated under Josiah (35\textsuperscript{11}), and for a similar reason at the Passover celebrated after the Return, mentioned in Ezr. 6\textsuperscript{1}.—18. Ephraim and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulun]. This list of tribes differs from that in v. 11, but in both cases the writer mentions the tribes merely as an equivalent for the men of the N. kingdom.—Had not cleansed themselves]. The causes of Levitical defilement were very numerous and members of the N. kingdom, who were not in regular connection with the priesthood and sanctuary, might naturally be thought of as in a state of Levitical uncleanness and thus unable lawfully to eat the Passover (cf. Nu. 9\textsuperscript{4}).—19. Yet not according to the purification of the sanctuary] i.e., without having complied with the laws of purification.—20. And healed the people] i.e., forgave them (cf. Ps. 41\textsuperscript{9} Ho. 14\textsuperscript{4} Je. 3\textsuperscript{2}). This ceremonial transgression, like other sins, is conceived of as a disease, in the thought of its effects, to be removed by a healing remedy. Physical sickness, or even death, may have been in the mind of the writer (cf. Lv. 15\textsuperscript{4}, Be., Oe., Ba.; Ke., Zoe., reject this and think only of spiritual results).—21. The feast of unleavened bread]. Cf. v. 11. —With instruments of strength to Yahweh] instruments with which they ascribed strength or power to Yahweh (Ke.); loud instruments (AV., RV., Zoe.), better, with all (their) might (v. i.)
And Hezekiah addressed kindly all the Levites who had shown good skill in their music for Yahweh. The King complimented or encouraged the Levites on their playing.—And they (the people) did eat the offerings of the feast seven days. This is the best of the proposed renderings (v. i.), harmonising completely with the remainder of the verse, since peace-offerings were in reality festive meals of flesh.—Giving thanks unto Yahweh, etc.] Whether this praise included an expression of penitence (so Be., Oe., EVs. making confession) or was rather only praise and thanksgiving (Ke., Zoe.), cannot be determined, although the former is favoured by the usage of מְנַעְשֵׁה, giving thanks (v. i.).—23. The feast was prolonged seven other days, making a two-weeks festival. This was done by reason of the gifts of sheep and cattle from the King and the princes or officials (v. 4). A similar fourteen-days festival was held at the completion of Solomon’s Temple (cf. 1 Kings 8), although then the extra seven days preceded the regular feast.—24. And a great number of the priests sanctified themselves] and therefore the mentioned offerings of cattle and sheep were properly handled (cf. v. 29).—25. The participants in the feast were (1) the people of Judah, including the priests and Levites (the latter may be a gloss, so Ki. BH); (2) the people from the N. kingdom; and (3) the sojourners (מִשְׂרָאֵל), proselytes from both kingdoms. On these last cf. 2 Kings 25:1 where they are gathered for service, but here they have a share with native Israelites in the feast according to the command of Ex. 12:43, 44.—26. From the days of Solomon. The fourteen-days festival at the dedication of the Temple had been similar, but nothing like it had since occurred.
v. 18. Bn. considers 'orun as a later addition.—in a later equiv. of וּלַּנָּה, the only use of noun וּלַּנָּה (cf. 34: 35* Ne. 87 9* 13* Dn. 8â. 117 10*1) (BDB.).—16. נָהָרָנְנָו many mss., G, H 'וה.—17. וּלַּנָּה possibly abs. Koe. ii. § 267b; fem. form with collective sense id. § 255d.—_act of slaying cstr. sg. of וּלַּנָּה, a nominal form with the function and construction of the inf., Koe. iii. § 233d.—18. //--great number, cf. 9* 1 Ch. 12°* 1 S. 2° Lv. 25°†.—בְּלִי] wanting in Vrss., may have crept in from v. 17, or a ditto-raphy from תְּלָנָה. Hithp. pf. 3 p. pl., assimilated before ב, Ges. § 54e. ב with games in pause, hence ב with הָלָנָה (cf. וּלַּנָּה Ezr. 6*9) as in Nu. 87, Ges. § 27q, Koe. i. § 271.—בלך] late usage, cf. 1 Ch. 12°.—רֵעַ. The verse-division is difficult, making it necessary to supply וּלַּנָּה after וּלַּנָּה, with Aben Ezra, and to make the following וּלַּנָּה refer to Hezekiah. Neither is probable, hence strike out (:) with וּלַּנָּה, and most commentators. וּלַּנָּה governs ב, which is followed by וּלַּנָּה understood, and thus cstr. before the following clause, Ges. § 139d n. 3, Koe. iii. § 337y. RVm. reads וּלַּנָּה, hence strike out הָלָנָה, cf. Ch. 12°.—19. וּלַּנָּה] kindliness, cf. Pf. 3° 13° Ps. 11°.—19. וּלַּנָּה] with Vrss., may have crept in from v. 17, or a ditto-raphy from תְּלָנָה. The adj. occurs nowhere else with וּלַּנָּה. He translates The Lord pardons the good even he that seteth, etc. On וּלַּנָּה after וּלַּנָּה, cf. Lv. 9° 16°.—19. וּלַּנָּה wanting in G, H.מ.—21. וּלַּנָּה] conjunctive, Koe. iii. § 375f.—21. וג' כִּי] read יִנָּה כִּי as in 1 Ch. 13°, so Be., Oe., Kau., Ki., Bm.; also strike out, with Kau., Ki. BH., the preceding וּלַּנָּה, hence strike out (:) with the present reading.—22. וּלַּנָּה] spake unto the heart, i.e. kindly, cf. Gn. 34° 5® Ju. 19° 2 S. 19° Is. 40° Ho. 2°.—23. פֶּרֶס] in the present context can only mean those who showed good skill in the art of music (Be., Ke., Bn.). For phrase יִנָּהכִּי cf. Pr. 3° 13° Ps. 11°.—24. פֶּרֶס] is difficult. EVs. render they did eat throughout the feast, but Be., Ke., Oe., SS., they ate the offerings of the sacred season (v. s.). G read וּלַּנָּה and they completed, instead of וּלַּנָּה, adopted by Ki.—הָלָנָה] Hithp. of וּלַּנָּה has force confess in Ezr. 10° Ne. 1° 9° Dn. 9° 26° Lv. 5° 16° 26° Nu. 57, here possibly give thanks †, BDB. v. s.—23. פֶּרֶס] 20 mss., G, H 'ם.—24. פֶּרֶס] to lift up or give for a sacrifice, cf. 35°. א, also Ex. 35° Nu. 1°, etc.—25. פֶּרֶס] omit, but add, כָּל אָבָא הַשָּׁמֶשׁ לְוֶדֶת, after פֶּרֶס, a phrase of D, cf. 23°. Many mss., G, H, O 'ם, so Ba., Ki., but this is probably a correction from v. 10.

XXXI. (Assigned by Bn. and Ki. directly to the Chronicler.)—1. The destruction of idolatrous shrines.—The fourteen days of the feast culminated in an iconoclastic movement which led to the destruction of the high places with all their equipment of pillars, poles (asherim), and altars throughout both the N. and S. king-
doms. In 2 K. 18, action similar to this, though confined evidently
to the S. kingdom, is ascribed to Hezekiah.—1. And brake in
pieces the pillars and hewed down the Asherim. Cf. 14.—Out of
all Judah and Benjamin] the S. kingdom (cf. 11).—And in
Ephraim and Manasseh] representing the N. kingdom.

2–10. The organisation of the priests and of the Levites, and
their bountiful support.—2. Hezekiah appears here as the restorer
of the priestly organisation for the service of the Temple, even as
David was its founder.—The courses] the divisions for service
in the Temple (cf. 1 Ch. 24).—After their courses] after those
already established,—a renewal of the old order which had
fallen into disuse during the reign of Ahaz.—Of the priests and of
the Levites]. The former were appointed for the service of burnt-
offerings and of peace-offerings; the latter to give thanks and praise,
i.e., render the service of music, and (following the order of G
v. i.) to minister in the gates, etc., i.e., to serve as gate-keepers (cf.
1 Ch. 26).—The camp of Yahweh] a figurative expression for the
Temple, derived from the story of the tabernacle in the wilderness
(cf. 1 Ch. 9. 11, Nu. 21).—3. And the portion of the king from his
property he appointed for burnt-offerings . . . according to the
law of Yahweh]. The reference is to the daily, weekly, monthly,
and yearly public offerings (cf. 1 Ch. 23), commanded in Nu.
28. 29. These were, with prescribed amounts of wine, oil, and
meal, a daily sacrifice of two lambs, one in the morning and one in
the evening, and then the additional sacrifices, on each Sabbath
day two lambs, on the first day of each month seven lambs, one
ram, two bullocks, and one he-goat; on each day of the Feast of
Unleavened Bread the same; on the day of first fruits (Pentecost)
the same; on the first of the seventh month the same, less one bul-
lock, on the tenth of the seventh month (the day of Atonement) the
same as on the first (irrespective of the two goats and bullock
mentioned in Lv. 16); on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles,
fourteen lambs, two rams, thirteen bullocks, and one he-goat; and
on each succeeding day of the feast the same less each day one
bullock, until the eighth day, when only one bullock was offered
(cf. Gray, Com. on Nu.). According to Ez. the duty of providing
such public sacrifices devolved upon “the prince,” i.e., the civil
ruler of Israel (cf. Ez. 45:46), and thus the Chronicler naturally thought of such provision made by Hezekiah.—4. The portion of the priests and the Levites] first fruits and tithes, and reserved portions of sacrifices (cf. v. 3).—That they might hold firmly to the law of Yahweh] i.e., devote themselves to the law of Yahweh, or more clearly to the services of worship required by the law. Perhaps the reading of ע (v. i.) should be adopted, that they should hold firmly to the ministration of the house of Yahweh. The object was that the Levites and priests might not be compelled to labour for their subsistence (cf. Ne. 13:16).—5. And when the word (the royal command) was spread abroad the children of Israel gave in abundance, etc.]. This and the following verses describe the fulfilment of the command of v. 4 to give the portion of the priests and the Levites. This portion was understood according to Nu. 18:1, where the first fruits are the due of the priests, and Nu. 18:11, where the tithe is the due of the Levites (cf. also Ne. 12:4). First fruits of grain, new wine and oil, are commanded directly for the priests in Dt. 18 (cf. Ne. 13:16); the first fruit of honey is mentioned only here, although inferentially commanded in Lv. 27:1. (On grain, new wine and oil, cf. 27:1, 17, 29, 32.)—The children of Israel] either the inhabitants of Jerusalem (cf. v. 5) (Be., Zoe., Oe.) or the Judeans in general (Bn.).—And the tithe of all brought they in abundantly]. They were not niggardly in making their tithes, as is further illustrated in vv. 15.—6. And the children of Israel] the inhabitants of the N. kingdom (Be.); better the inhabitants of the N. kingdom who dwell in the cities of Judah, i.e., those who had migrated into Judah and there settled (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Bn., Ba.) (cf. 10:11 11:10 15:1).—And of Judah]. These words appear superfluous and may be omitted as a gloss (Kau., Bn.). If retained, then the contrast is with the children of Israel of v. 5 (v. s.), restricted to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, while the children of Judah here would be the other Judeans.—The tithe of cattle and sheep] not mentioned elsewhere except in Lv. 27:25-26. (A royal tithe of cattle is alluded to in 1 S. 8:12.)—And the tithe of the dedicated things] an obscure, if not impossible, phrase—hence tithe may be omitted as a dittography (Bn.). The dedicated or holy things, then, include all the gifts
which the people brought. The tithe was a holy thing (Lv. 27*), and first fruits might be equally so regarded (cf. first loaves of new harvest, Lv. 23*, fruit of trees of 4th year, Lv. 19*). If tithe is retained, it may be taken as the equivalent of "the heave offerings," "the contributions," the terumoth (Nu. 18*. 11. 10 cf. v. 10), "which was a remnant of that which was consecrated to Yahweh, as the tithe was a remnant of all the cattle and field produce" (Ke., Zoe., Oe.).

On first fruits cf. Ex. 23* 34* (JE.) Dt. 18* 26* (D) Ez. 44* LV. 23 10-11, 17. 30 Nu. 18* (P); on tithes cf. Gn. 28* Am. 4* Dt. 18*. 11. 17 14* Ez. 28. 26* Lv. 27* Nu. 18* 18*. A sharp line of distinction was not originally drawn between tithes and first fruits. They might be identical. The legislation concerning them preserved in the OT., while progressive, is neither uniform nor entirely consistent (v. Dr. Comm. Dt. pp. 166 ff. 290 ff.; Gray, Comm. Nu. pp. 225 ff.; Harper, Comm. Am. and Hos. p. 95; Moore, EBi. IV. col. 5102). The Chronicler also has given an ideal picture of these contributions for the support of the priests and Levites as an object-lesson for his own times.

7. In the third month they began . . . and in the seventh month they finished. The third month, in which Pentecost fell, was the time of the finished grain harvest, and the seventh month, in which the Feast of the Tabernacles fell, was the time of the finished harvest of orchards and vineyards.—10. And Azariah] the name likewise of a priest the son of Zadok, of the time of Solomon (1 K. 4*), and a chief priest of the time of Uzziah (26*. 28*), cf. also 1 Ch. 5*. 4* (6*).—The high priest. (נַפְדַּלֹּת) cf. 1 Ch. 27*.—Of the house of Zadok] distinguished from the house of Ithamar, to which Eli was felt to have belonged, and which, according to 1 K. 27*. 28*, lost the priesthood of the Temple when Zadok received the office in the place of Abiathar. According to Ezekiel, the priesthood was of the house of Zadok (Ez. 44*). In P Aaron is the primal father of the priests.—The offerings] (the frumah heave-offering) the portions of all sacrifices, especially of meal-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, which were reserved for the priests and their families (cf. Nu. 18*. 11). Since the opening of the Temple these had been so abundant that the priests needed but little of the first fruits and tithes for their support.
1. inf. abs. Pl. after prep., a late usage, Koe. iii. § 225b, Ew. § 315 f (3), but cp. n. 1; cf. 24*®—2. Büchler (ZAW. 1899, p. 111) omits here and inserts after ליעל, since it was the duty of the priests to officiate at the sacrifices, and it belonged to the Levites “to minister,” etc., but the Chronicler may have assumed the division of labour to be well known.—C reverses the order, better suited to the context, since the giving of thanks, etc., was not likely “in the gates.”—Buchler wanting in O, כָּלָו, but both probably read מ, cf. 1 Ch. 27*:—3. קָנֵי, in constr. cf. Ges. § 953.—[קָנֵי] wanting in מ, probably due to dittography.—cf. 1 Ch. 27*.—Buchler] governs by מ in קָנֵי, late use with force command, see BDB.

11-21. The care and distribution of the provision made for the priests and Levites.—The contributions of first fruits, tithes, and offerings enumerated in vv. *® were stored, under the care of Conaniah and Shimei and their subordinates, in the chambers of the Temple, vv. *®, while the distribution of these and all priestly portions was in the charge of Kore and his subordinates (vv. *®), who were in the priestly cities, and gave to the priests and the Levites according to their order of service, and according to the enrolment of their families.—11. The chambers of the house of Yahweh]. Around the holy and most holy places of the Temple, in three stories, were series of chambers (cf. 1 K. 6*), adapted for store-rooms.—12. Conaniah.] “Yahweh has established,” EBi. III. col. 3282.—Shime’i] very common name, cf. 1 Ch. 3*® et al.—
13. Jehiel]. Cf. 1 Ch. 15:11.—'Azariah]. Cf. 1 Ch. 15:11—Nahath]. Cf. 1 Ch. 15:6.—'Azahel] name of Levites 17:1 Ezr. 10:4, elsewhere only of Joab's brother 2 S. 21 et al. 1 Ch. 2:19 11:27.—Jeremoth]. Cf. 1 Ch. 7:12—Jozabad]. Cf. 1 Ch. 12:1, here perhaps the same as the chief of the Levites mentioned in 35:1.—Elieel]. Cf. 1 Ch. 5:6 15:11—Ismachiah] "Yahweh sustains."—Maath]. Cf. 29:1 1 Ch. 6:8—Benaiah]. Cf. 1 Ch. 4:5—'Azariah] the chief priest mentioned in v. 18.—Ruler of the house of God]. Cf. 1 Ch. 9:14—14. Kore]. Cf. 1 Ch. 26:1, where Shammua the son of Kore is a chief gate-keeper, and 1 Ch. 26:1, where Meshelemiah the son of Kore is a gate-keeper.—Imnah] (son of Asher 1 Ch. 7:19) only here a Levite, perhaps we should read "Heman" (יהננ instead of יהננ), since Heman (1 Ch. 6:14) and Kore (1 Ch. 26:1) both belonged to the family of Korah.—Was over the freewill offerings of God] not the first fruits (the view of Oe.), which along with the tithes were commanded by the law, but all offerings voluntarily brought to God, those not in the ritual, but pure thank-offerings (cf. Lv. 23:15 Dt. 15:10), in order to distribute of these the reserved portion of Yahweh, i.e., the share of the priests (cf. Lv. 7:10 10:1 11 Na. 5:1) and also the most holy things, i.e., the portions of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings which were to be eaten by the priests in the sanctuary (cf. Lv. 2:12 6:12 7:10 10:17 14:15 Nu. 18:11) (Be., Ke.). The freewill offerings might also include gifts for the Temple—gold, silver, utensils—(so here BDB., cf. in connection with the tabernacle Ex. 35:36, and the second Temple Ezr. 8:51), but better as above.—15. 'Eden] (v. i.).—Miniamin] (v. i.) this form of name Ne. 12:17; 11 usually Mijamin (cf. 1 Ch. 24:16 Ne. 10:7 (=12:17; 11) 12:1 Ezr. 10:18] five persons.—Jeshua Levitical and priestly name of frequent occurrence (cf. 1 Ch. 24:11).—Shemaiah, Amariah, Shecaniah are three names occurring very frequently in lists of Levites. These subordinate Levites were in the cities of the priests (cf. Jos. 20:12) to distribute to their brethren by courses (i.e., according to the divisions of the Levites for service) as well to the great (i.e., the old) as the small (i.e., the young). All Levites who on account of their age or youth or the term of their appointment (cf. v. 16) were in the priestly cities were to receive their portion...
of the offerings. This portion, the understood object of to give, included not only shares of the contributions and the most holy things of v. 14, but also shares of the first fruits and tithes. Practically shares of the most holy things in a literal sense could not be given to residents of the priestly cities, since, as already mentioned, they were required to be eaten at the sanctuary.—16. With the exception of those registered of males from three years, etc.] a limitation of v. 15. In the priestly cities no portions were given to those residents who were in service at Jerusalem, nor to the children of their families, who seem to have accompanied their parents to Jerusalem.—From three years old and upward]. Priests and Levites began to receive public support evidently at the age of three years. Children under three years were reckoned naturally as nursing babes.—For the thing of each day] i.e., as the duty of each day required (RV., Kau.), better for his daily portion (RVm., Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.) (cf. Ne. ii*).—17. And in regard to the registration of the priests it was according to their families (lit. the fathers' houses)—now the Levites from twenty years old and upward were registered by their divisions in their courses (for service)—]. The registration of the priests was strictly genealogical, while that of the Levites was, according to the classes, based upon the time and manner of their service.—From twenty years old and upward]. Cf. 1 Ch. 23*.* 18. And to register (i.e., with the purpose of registering) their children, their wives, and their sons, and their daughters, of the entire congregation (i.e., of the entire priesthood)] according to Be. a continuation of to give (יִנְתַּוּ) (v. 14) after the parenthesis (vv. 16-17) "The men in the priests' cities also were to register their children, etc." So likewise Ke. (whom Zoe., Oe. follow), but he renders to give to their brethren (v. 14) . . . and to the registered of all their children, their wives and their sons and their daughters, to the whole multitude (i.e., of the wives, sons, and daughters) (so also Be., for יִנְתַּוּ). But it is better with Ki. Kom. to regard v. 15 as a continuation of the description of the registration of v. 14. It served as an enrolment of every member of the families of the priests.—For they in their faithfulness were wont to consecrate themselves in holiness]. The enrolment was so complete that every member of the priests' families received his
share (as a reward), because the priests so faithfully, especially in the matter of purifications, performed the duties of their holy office, or the passage may simply mean they sanctified or busied themselves in a holy manner with the distribution of the sacred portions (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ki.). Kau. considers the meaning so doubtful that he leaves the words untranslated.—19. Also for the sons of Aaron the priests, in the suburbs of their cities, in each city, were men appointed by name to distribute to every male among the priests, and to every one registered among the Levites]. This concludes the description of the enrolment and the distribution mentioned in vv. 15-16 (so Ki.). Others regard this as supplementary to v. 14, drawing a distinction between the priests residing in the cities and those in the suburbs (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). But that such a distinction was really drawn between priests residing in the cities or towns and those dwelling in the outlying fields, if there were such dwellers, is extremely improbable (v. i., Bn.). These vv. 17-19 are probably a late addition (so Ki. Kom.).
Bn. adopting substantially the readings of ג (v. s.), gives the following explanation of vv. 14-18: There is no reference to a distribution outside of Jerusalem until v. 19. The distribution (v. 18) takes place under the oversight of the priests instead of "in the cities of the priests"; and v. 18 defines more exactly the distribution: it is made to each one with his offspring, to the males from the age of three years, etc. (סהטים ייחודיים) is regarded by Bn., and rightly, as a gloss). The registrations (v. 17), upon which the distribution was based, were by the priests according to families, by the Levites according to their courses or divisions for service. V. 13 then came from the hand of a reader who observed that v. did not harmonise with v. 15, since v. 15 presupposed that the children were registered, therefore he wrote on the margin, that which later entered the text: בָּשָׂר later corrupted to בָּשָׂר, and also at the end of the verse בָּשָׂר later corrupted into בָּשָׂר בָּשָׂר. Their registration was with all their offspring, their wives, and their sons, and their daughters, of the whole congregation, for they were conscientiously (mit Treue) enrolled. Their wives is wanting in ג. It is uncertain also whether בָּשָׂר congregation can designate the priests and the Levites. Since the conclusion of the verse is corrupt, the present words might be understood of sanctifying, i.e., bringing (Hiph. instead of Hithp.) the holy dues, and one may have sought in the verse the notion [hence בָּשָׂר] that exact lists of the congregation were kept through which could be determined whether all contributed their dues. With this explanation of vv. 14-18 agrees the thought of v. 18, that the product of the land of the priests was distributed only to the male members of the families and those who had been registered.

XXXII. 1–23. The invasion of Sennacherib.—Based upon the narrative of 2 K. 18:16–19:1, but freely composed by the Chronicler with great abridgment and the possible use of other sources (cf. vv. 14). Bn. and Ki assign these verses to M. The former says: "The narrative is neither in style nor diction (nicht literarisch und nicht in Wortlaut) dependent upon 2 K." Yet cf. in v. 14 and 2 K. 18:17 the mention of Lachish. Cf. המ הובושות الجهו אשה (2 K. 18:17) (both utterances of Sennacherib); cf. המ סס (v. 11) with יִשְׁעָה (2 K. 18:4); cf. v. 11 with 2 K. 18:5, the latter contains the thought of the former; v. 13 with 2 K. 18:2; vv. 14 i. with 2 K. 18:10; v. 15 with 2 K. 18:11; v. 13 with 2 K. 18:19; v. 17 with 2 K. 18:19; v. 20 with 2 K. 19:1; v. 20 with 2 K. 19:8; v. 21 with 2 K. 19:27. (On vv. 14-18 v. further i.) These parallels are all sufficient to show the dependence of one narrative upon the other. This chapter is also an immediate continua-
tion of c. 31, as appears from After these things in v. 1, and the use of faithfulness (cf. 31). The following marks of the Chronicler's style also appear: In v. יִסְתַּלְמוּ (l. 38), והַשָּׁם (l. 124) and לָזְלֶק (l. 105); in v. יִשְׂרָאֵל (L. 28); in v. אָמַר (L. 84); in v. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל (L. 6 and 91). These marks, it must be acknowledged, are not very numerous, but yet sufficient to suggest the composition of the Chronicler. The subject may have led him to write a style less awkward than usual.

1. After these things and this faithfulness] the reforms of Hezekiah described in cc. 29-31. The writer has no interest in exact chronology. The invasion of Sennacherib, according to 2 K. 18, was in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign (v. commentaries in loco). The date as fixed by the Assy. ins. was 701 B.C. The question of the second invasion of Sennacherib in 691 (Winckler's view) does not affect the interpretation of the Chronicler's narrative.—And encamped against the fortified cities and he thought to break into them and so bring them unto himself]. According to 2 K. 18, Sennacherib took these cities, and according to the Assyrian account they were forty-six in number (COT. pp. 294 ff.).—And they stopped all the springs and the brook which flowed through the midst of the land]. There are no living springs in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, except the single Gihon, the present Virgin's Spring, at the foot of the hill on which the Temple stands. The writer then is either describing the closing of springs which now no longer exist or of artificial reservoirs; or, the more probable view, we have a mere legendary extension of the diverting of the waters of the Gihon. This Gihon or Virgin's Spring is in a cave on the east side of the city without the wall, and its waters appear originally to have flowed into the Kidron valley and thus would have been a source of supply to besiegers; but later it was diverted through a tunnel cut in the rock south-west and west for a distance of some 1,700 feet through the south head of the east hill, on which the Temple stood, into the pool of Siloam in the south-east part of the city. In this tunnel was discovered, in 1880, an inscription in pure Hebrew recording the making of the tunnel; and, while no date is given, there is no doubt that this is the engineering work of Hezekiah referred to in v. 19 (2 K. 20) and also here. He stopped the brook which flowed through the
midst of the land by diverting the course of its waters so that they no longer flowed down the Kidron valley, but to the pool inside the city wall.—5. And he built up all the wall that was broken and upon it towers* (v. i.) and another* (v. i.) wall without. Hezekiah not only repaired the city wall and built towers upon it, but also, as a further means of defence, an outside wall. This last statement has been thought to be confirmed by the discovery of the remains of an outer wall “which may date back as far as Hezekiah,” enclosing the pool of Siloam on the south-east. (Ba. with reference to Bliss’s Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894-97, pp. 96 ff. 325 f.)—The Millo in the city of David]. Cf. 1 Ch. ii* i*. Winckler regards, without sufficient reason, the Millo as equivalent to the Temple (KAT.* p. 272).—And he made missiles]. The word missiles (נִיסִים used collectively) properly means anything that is cast: hence weapons of defence, darts, or even stones to be hurled from the wall.—6. The broad place of the gate of the city]. Although no particular gate is mentioned, the reference probably is to the broad place on the east mentioned in 29 q. v.—7. Cf. on first half 20* Dt. 31* Jos. i*.—8. An arm of flesh] a merely human support, cf. Je. 17* Is. 21* Ps. 56* (i). The repeated “with us” in vv. 1* may be compared with the “Immanuel,” “God with us,” of Isaiah (Is. 7* 8* 10).—9. After this]. The Chronicler maps the order of events after 2 K. 18, where in v. 11 mention is made of the invasion of Sennacherib corresponding with v. 1 here. The description of Hezekiah’s measure for defence and the confidence of the people (vv. 1*-4) is the Chronicler’s addition to the narrative of 2 K. He also passes over in silence the submission of Hezekiah and payment of tribute recorded in 2 K. 18* and continues the narrative with the account of the embassy from Sennacherib. In this he draws from both of the narratives of 2 K., i.e., 18* and 19*.—Before Lachish]. 2 K. 18*. Cf. on Lachish 25*.—10. Upon what are ye trusting?] Cf. 2 K. 18*.—Ye* dwellers in siege in Jerusalem] (v. i.). The besieged people of Jerusalem are addressed.—To die by famine and thirst]. Cf. 2 K. 18*, where in grosser language the same thought is presented.—Saying Yahweh, etc.]. Cf. 2 K. 18*.—The Chronicler now omits the argument of the Assyrian based upon Hezekiah’s lack of troops and
reliance on Egypt, given in 2 K. 18:28, possibly because the Assyrian’s contempt of Hezekiah’s forces might seem not in accord with the military preparations already ascribed to the monarch (vv. 13-14); and because the reference to Egypt might imply the seeking of foreign aid, which, from the Chronicler’s point of view, would have been unthinkable in the case of the good Hezekiah. —13-15. These vv. continue the argument of 2 K. 18:22, which also appears in 2 K. 19:12-13. The Assyrian urges that Yahweh cannot be expected to save Jerusalem, because the gods of no other people have saved them from the Assyrians.—16. And his servants spake yet more, etc.]. The writer either thus refers to his abridgment of the material of 2 K. or this is a rhetorical statement.—17. He wrote also letters]. Cf. the letter mentioned in 2 K. 19:11 (Is. 37:1).—To reproach the God of Israel]. This motive or act is mentioned in 2 K. 19:14. 15. 16 (Is. 37:17-19).—As the gods, etc.]. Cf. v. 17. Since v. 17 may be said to come as an interruption between v. 16 and v. 17, it is regarded by Bn. as a gloss.—18. And they cried with a loud voice, etc.]. Cf. 2 K. 18:21. The conversation between Rabshakeh, the Assyrian messenger, and the Judean officials (2 K. 18:19) has been omitted.—19. In 2 K. 19:18 the gods of the nations conquered by the Assyrians are called “no gods but the work of men’s hands.”—20. The prayer of Hezekiah is given in 2 K. 19:18 and a message (not a prayer) of “Isaiah the son of Amoz” in 2 K. 19:23-24. This is the only direct reference by the Chronicler to these passages.—21. Cf. 2 K. 19:19-21, where these facts are given more in detail.—And Yahweh sent an angel]. This form of expression compared with that of 2 K. 19:31, “The angel of Yahweh went forth,” is agreeable to the later conception of Yahweh working through agents rather than directly. The angel of Yahweh might be understood as a direct manifestation of deity, but not so an angel sent by Yahweh. The narrative implies the destruction of the Assyrians through pestilence, and this main fact is confirmed by an Egyptian legend recorded by Herodotus (ii. 141) (Sk.).—His god] Nisroch, probably identical with Nusku the Assyrian god of fire (2 K. 19:17 Is. 37:19).—They that came forth from his own loins] his sons Adrammelech and Sharezer (2 K. 19:17 Qr. Is. 37:20). The statement of the Chronicler
is more poignant than that of 2 K.—22. And he gave them rest* on every side].
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18th (- Is. 36) הלא אוסף יתיר לא כבשת אתполитי, the antecedent of אש is used in a late and rare construction qualifying that Hezekiah (BDB. 191). Thus the Chronicler gives the thought a slightly different turn. According to the author of K., Sennacherib says that the God who had suffered his high places and altars to be overturned could not be trusted to render aid to his people. According to the Chronicler, Sennacherib attempts to arouse distrust of Hezekiah.—לארסא] wanting in 2 K. (and Is.).—רמצת ארצות [2 K. (Is.) ג ויהיה הריוועו] wanting in 2 K. (and Is.).—13-16. These verses are clearly dependent on 2 K. 18th. V. iia represents 2 K. 19th rewritten as follows:

V. iia הלא遗址 המ השיאו און דוביה ילב יטניו ומגודוהו 2 K. 19th והנה אדוה השיעת את אשו טוש מלכי אשור ללב יטניו ומגודוהו. The Chronicler has changed the exclamatory sentence of 2 K. into an equally strong ironic question. The phrase the kings of Assyria is changed into the more definite I and my fathers, and peoples is inserted before lands. The remainder of v. iia is taken from 2 K. 18th, thus:
Here the verse in 2 K. is strengthened by the addition of the verb לֹּא and the Chronicler in characteristic fashion expands the gods of the nations into the gods of the nations of the lands, and, as he changed the kings of Assyria into the more definite I and my fathers (v. s.), so he also changed from the hand of the king of Assyria into from my hand. This dependence upon two separated passages of 2 K. explains the inconsistence between the two parts of the verse. It is otherwise peculiar that Sennacherib and his fathers should figure in the first part and in the second Sennacherib should refer only to himself. The following verse 14 is taken from 2 K. v. with the following changes: where 2 K. uses only the latter verb (as in the preceding verse); where 2 K. is substituted for or, and for 2 K. the Chronicler gives us 2 K. 18n. In writing the first part of v. 10, the Chronicler probably had 2 K. v. 10 before him, while the remainder of this verse is simply the answer to the question of v. 10.—15. wanting in G, is, is possibly a ditto-graphy.—17. many MSS., Vrss. —17 sq., cf. v. 11.—18. after a negative proposition serves to intensify the negative, with the force how much less, Ew. § 354 c (2), cf. Koe. iii. § 353a.—18. is often used for royal missives, v. BDB.—18. three MSS., Gsg., Qr. three MSS., Gsg., probably due to sg. in v. 11, cf. v. 11.—21. Qr. —22. adj. Perhaps originally (Ki. BH.), And some of those who came forth from his loins.—22. some MSS. add אִיבָה, and so Bn. The addition is natural but not indispensable.—22. And guided them (AV., RV.), followed by מָשִׁים from round about, is most awkward if not impossible. G kal kartavvovw abside and Η et praxisti eis quietem; hence read וּבָשְׂנָה (v. s.) a frequent phrase, cf. 14 15 20 1 Ch. 22, so Be., Oe., Kau., Bn., Ki.

24-26. Hezekiah's sickness and pride.—An epitome and interpretation of 2 K. 20:11 (Is. 38. 39). Without the details are mentioned (1) Hezekiah's serious sickness, (2) his prayer for recovery, (3) the acceptance of his prayer, (4) the sign of his recovery, (5) Hezekiah's subsequent pride, (6) the anger of Yahweh, (7) Hezekiah's humiliation, and (8) the stoppage of the divine wrath during his days.

On account of this abridgment Bn. assigns these verses to M, since the Chronicler, he thinks, would have reproduced so edifying a narrative as 2 K. 20:11 quite fully. Ki. (Kom.), on the other hand, rightly assigns them to the Chronicler.
24. In those days Hezekiah was sick unto death] a direct quotation of 2 K. 20:1 (Is. 38:1). Those days here can only mean the days of the Assyrian invasion and the deliverance from Sennacherib. (This likewise is the meaning in 2 K. 20. Hezekiah’s reign was twenty-nine years and his days were prolonged after his illness fifteen years; hence the date of his illness was placed in his fourteenth year, which coincided with the date of Sennacherib’s invasion.)—And he prayed unto Yahweh. The prayer is given in 2 K. 20:7 (Is. 38:1).—And he spake unto him] through Isaiah with the promise that his days should be prolonged fifteen years (2 K. 20:10; Is. 38:2).—And gave him a sign] the sign of the shadow moving backward on the sundial (2 K. 20:11; Is. 38:9), omitted by the Chronicler.—25. And Hezekiah did not render according to the benefit to him for his heart was lifted up]. This statement is based upon Hezekiah’s apparent pride in displaying his treasures unto the messengers of Merodach-baladan (v. 14) (2 K. 20:15; Is. 39:1). He should have taken pride not in his wealth but in Yahweh his God and deliverer.—Therefore wrath was upon him and Judah and Jerusalem] an interpretation of Isaiah’s prediction of the Babylonian captivity (2 K. 20:17; Is. 39).—26. And Hezekiah humbled himself over the pride of his heart, he and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the wrath of Yahweh came not, etc. ] a proper inference from Hezekiah’s acquiescence in the word of Yahweh (2 K. 20:18; Is. 39) and the fact that the captivity took place a century later.

27–33. Hezekiah’s wealth and the conclusion of his reign.

Bn. is inclined to give these verses also to M (with the exception, probably, of vv. 31–32); Ki. (Kom.) to the Chronicler with trustworthy historical information from an old extra-canonical source in vv. 31–32 (v. i.).

27. And Hezekiah had wealth and honor exceedingly abundantly]. Cf. the similar statement twice repeated of the good King Jehoshaphat (17:18) and the wealth of Solomon (1:14) and of David (1 Ch. 29:28). The King’s wealth is recorded as an expression of the worth of his character. Silver and gold and spices are mentioned in 2 K. 20:11 (Is. 39) among the treasures which
Hezekiah displayed to the ambassadors of Merodach-baladan.—

Shields] the small, round shield (cf. comment on 1 Ch. 12:18 (AV)), either representing weapons in general (Ke.), costly gilded weapons (Zoe.), treasures, shields like those of Solomon (9:9) (Ba.), or with different text (v. i.) precious things (Ba.). The shields also may be an inference from "the house of his armor" (יד לבר) of 2 K. 20:18 (Is. 39:4).—28. Grain, new wine, and oil]. These are repeatedly thus mentioned together as the products of the land of Israel (31:8 Nu. 18:13 Dt. 7:11 11:2 12:17 14:2 18:2 28:1 Ne. 3:13 10:16 (88) 13:19 Je. 31:19 Ho. 2:10 (88) 8:26 Jo. 1:13 2:19 Hg. 1:1) (BDB.).—And stalls for flocks [*] thus (after E, F) AV. "cotes for flocks"; the RV. follows ח, rendering, "And flocks in folds."—29. Cities] in this connection with stalls and flocks and possessions of sheep and cattle appear out of place, hence the interpretation of "watch towers" has been given after a usage in 2 K. 17:18 (Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe.). This is rightly rejected as inadmissible by Kau., Bn. The text is probably corrupt (v. i.). We should either place cities at the beginning of v. 28 (reading the verb of v. 27 he provided (lit. he made) with that verse), And he made for himself store cities, etc., and acquired possessions of sheep and cattle in abundance, or with a similar construction omit the word cities entirely, And he made store houses, etc. Ki. retains and translates cities. The originality of this is possible with such an awkward writer as the Chronicler. Ba. thinks the cities were meant chiefly as places for refuge for the flocks and herds in time of war.—30. And this same Hezekiah, etc.]. The reference is to the engineering work described in v. 4.—The upper Gihon] the Virgin's Spring (see v. 6). Called upper probably in contrast to the lower flow of water at the end of the tunnel.—And he led them straight down westward to the city of David] RV. "on the west side of the city of David." The Heb. allows either rendering, and our knowledge of the location of the city of David is too indefinite for us to determine which is correct. The former is favoured by Oe., Ki. (nach der Stadt Davids) (cf. v. 4).—31. This verse is joined closely with the last clause of v. 28.—And Hezekiah prospered in all his works and so God abandoned him (i.e., left him to his own free will) in the case of the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon who had been sent to
him to inquire concerning the wonder which had been in the land, in order to know all that was in his heart]. Because Hezekiah enjoyed such unbroken prosperity God left him to his own will, not to bring misfortune upon him, but to reveal to him his pride and thus, as the sequel showed, to bring him in humility unto God (cf. v. 48) (Be., Ke., Zoe.). The verse has also been taken in contrast to the foregoing words of v. 47, the introductory particle (↑️) being rendered "Howbeit" (AV., RV., attamen, Oe., Ba.). It is doubtful, however, whether the Hebrew particle admits such a rendering.—Who had been sent] (G, H, T, Kau., Ki.) is a better reading, involving merely a change in the Hebrew vowel points (v. i.), than that of ♦, "who had sent" (AV., RV.).—The wonder. Cf. v. 47. This was appropriately an object of inquiry by those from Babylon, the seat of the study of the movements of the heavenly bodies. According to 2 K. 20* f., however, the King of Babylon sent the embassy to condole with Hezekiah in his sickness.—32 f. The conclusion of Hezekiah's reign expressed in a formula nearer that of the author of Kings than the usual one of the Chronicler (cf. 2 K. 20*).—His pious deeds] either in respect to God or man or both; thus mentioned only of Hezekiah and Josiah (35* and Nehemiah (Ne. 13*).—The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz]. The reference probably is to the Book of Isaiah, which contains the account of the invasion of Sennacherib and Hezekiah's sickness, since these are the opening words of that book (cf. Is. 1*).—And* in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel] v. Intro. pp. 22 f. (on p. 23 join (o) as an exception, required by the insertion of and, with (n)).—And they buried him in the ascent of the sepulchres of the sons of David]. Bn. regards this burial-place, only mentioned here, as outside of the graves of the kings, and since this befell otherwise, according to the Chronicler, only impious kings (Jehoram 21*, Joash 24*, Uzziah 26*, Ahaz 28*), he thinks this statement cannot be an invention either of the Chronicler or of a like-minded source, but must rest upon an old reliable tradition (Ki. accordingly marks it thus in his translation) (Kom.). The statement doubtless is historic, but it does not necessarily imply a burial-place outside of the royal sepulchres. The word ascent (תֶּלֶת מֵתוֹת) might mean upper locality, hence they
buried him in the higher part of the graves of sons of David, or even as renders: They buried him above the sepulchres of the sons of David. Be., Ke., Zoe., after Thenius, on 2 K. 20, conjecture that the burial in the ascent was due to the lack of room in the hereditary burying-place of the kings. "The chiefest of the sepulchres" (AV.) is not an allowable rendering.—And all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did him honor at his death] perhaps in the burning of spices (cf. 16 21).

24. wanting in 2 K. 20.—26. Ki. BH. suggests , but cf. . Ba. suggests and precious things as in v. 26. desirable vessels, cf. 36 Ho. Na. 20. Je. 25 Dn. 11—28. elsewhere always with , cf. 8 (— 1 K. 9 8 17 on 16 see notes), Ex. 11. —29. or elsewhere read with , , so Ki. Bn. omits the clause. The vocalisation of Bn. describes as an unnecessary attempt to differentiate the word from the previous .—29. or elsewhere read with , or a dittography of of (Bn.). The object of in the latter case was understood with the meaning of (v. 11) and in the meaning of acquire is understood with (v. 11) modifies our text, Koe. iii. § 334 r.—Qr. either assimilated or syncopated, Ges. § 69u.—31. Oe. reads καί with adversative force, Gleichwohl.—32. interpreter Gn. 42, intermediator between God and man Jb. 33 Is. 43, hence here properly ambassador †.—32. 26 with , , .—33. rendered ] ; or ' may be due to a misread dittography of .

XXXIII. 1–20. The reign of Manasseh (686(?)—642 b. c.).—When Manasseh, at the early age of twelve, came to the throne the idolatrous and anti-prophetic party in Judah seems to have obtained control of affairs, and the young King became thoroughly identified with it during his long reign. Under his patronage not only the worship at the high places was revived, but varieties of heathen (Assyrian) worship were introduced. Altars to the host of heaven were placed in the courts of the Temple and an Asherah,
later understood as a graven image, in the Temple itself. Manasseh also sacrificed his son and practised divination. He shed also much innocent blood, probably of those who adhered strictly to the worship of Yahweh. Thus his reign, through its wickedness, was long regarded as having sealed the doom of Judah. In the narrative of Kings, which is entirely written by the Deuteronomic compilers, nothing relieves the blackness and foulness of Manasseh's reign. In the Chronicler's narrative, however, the King suffers captivity and humbles himself and is restored to his kingdom, and, acknowledging Yahweh to be God, he built an outer wall to the city and removed the foreign gods and heathenish altars from its midst.

Neither Bn. nor Ki. assigns this narrative to other than the Chronicler and his canonical source.

1-9. Manasseh's idolatry.—A copy, with only very slight omissions and variations, of 2 K. 21:1-15.—1. 2 K. 21:1 adds the name of his mother, "Hephzi-bah."—2. And he did that which was evil in the eyes of Yahweh] the usual expression in 1 and 2 K. for sins of cultus. These of Manasseh are given in the following verses and are here condemned as a repetition of the abominations of the aboriginal Canaanites (cf. v. 12 K. 20:17, 28:1; 16:17, 18).—3. The high places which Hezekiah his father had broken down]. Cf. 31:1.—And he reared up altars for the Baalim and made Asheroth]. 2 K. 21:1 has in each case the singular "for Baal" and "an Asherah," with the additional clause "As did Ahab king of Israel," and the writer of Kings evidently has in mind the worship of some one Ba'al, like the Tyrian one of Ahab (cf. 17:4), and the erection of some one symbolic post (cf. 14:8), possibly representing the goddess Astarte. The Chronicler thinks, on the other hand, of separate Baals or Canaanitish gods at each high place, with also, correspondingly, the sacred poles.—All the host of heaven] the heavenly bodies (sun, moon, and stars). This worship, introduced under Assyrian influence, or encouraged (since it clearly had not been unknown in earlier times in Israel) (GFM. EBi. III. col. 3355), became at once prevalent, as is shown by its frequent mention in the literature of this period, the century before the exile (cf. Dt. 4:9 17: Zp.
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1v. Je. 8* 19**).—4. And he built altars in the house Yahweh] i.e., for foreign deities or Baals.—Whereof Yahweh said in Jerusalem shall be my name forever]. Cf. 7* 1 K. 8* 9*. The promise or command centralising the worship of Yahweh in Jerusalem found expression in the sole worship of Yahweh in the Temple.—5. All the host of heaven]. Cf. v. 4.—In the two courts]. The Temple of Solomon had only one court, hence this verse in 2 K. (21*) is post-exilic (Bn., St.).—6. In this verse Manasseh is said to have been guilty of six things expressly forbidden in Dt. 18* 1*.

—He caused his sons to pass through the fire] i.e., he sacrificed them unto Yahweh (cf. 28*).—And he practised soothsaying] besides Dt. 18* 11 2 K. 21*, alluded to also in Lv. 19* Ju. 9* Is. 2* Mi. 5* Je. 27* Is. 57* (Dr. Dt.). The kind of divination referred to is uncertain: the word has been connected with the root meaning cloud, hence divination by observing the clouds or sky, or the word “eye,” “to smite with evil eye.” Both of these, however, are now generally rejected, but nothing satisfactory has taken their place. The word is held to be derived from a root meaning “to utter a hoarse nasal sound” (EBi. II. col. 1119).—And he used enchantments] as Joseph did with his cup (Gn. 44* 17), probably by hydromancy, or watching the play of light or rings of liquid in a cup. The term includes divination by observing omens in general.

—And he practised sorcery]. The meaning of this verb has been variously explained: to cut, and hence the derived meaning here to use “herbs or drugs shredded into a magic brew” (cf. witchcraft Mi. 5* 19), or to obscure, to be gloomy, distressed, and finally to be a suppliant, to seek something from the deity (EBi. III. col. 2900).—And he instituted ghosts and familiar spirits] i.e., persons professing to deal with them. For a full discussion of the terms v. Dr. Dt. pp. 225 f. The character of these persons is seen in “the witch of Endor,” 1 S. 28* 4*, who was described as a woman possessing a ghost, and in the maiden of Acts 16* 14, who was possessed with a spirit of divination. Manasseh fostered people of this description.—7. The graven image of the idol which he had made] in 2 K. 21*, “the graven image of the Asherah.” The Chronicler brings out clearly his conception of the Asherah there mentioned: it is an idol. Whether he thought of the fe-
male deity Astarte in this connection is not clear, but another name from that of Yahweh was localised in the Temple.

1. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

2. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

3. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

4. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

5. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

6. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

7. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

8. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

9. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

10. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

11. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

12. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

13. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

14. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

15. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

16. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

17. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

18. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

19. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

20. 2 K. 21* + 20. REIGN OF MANASSEH.

This paragraph, with the exception of the opening words, And
Yahweh spake, is entirely wanting in 2 K., which gives no indication either of Manasseh's captivity or of his repentance and restoration. The passage then has been regarded as a pure invention, an allegory of Israel in exile, and received by the Chronicler with the motive of accounting for Manasseh's unusually long reign—fifty-five years—a reign of that length being unthinkable in the case of a king wholly bad (St. Gesch. I. p. 640), or simply invented by the Chronicler through this motive (We. Prol. pp. 206 f.). Besides the silence of 2 K., against Manasseh's repentance is Je. 15, which, since there the captivity is grounded upon the sin of Manasseh, clearly shows that his repentance must be regarded as a fiction. The case, however, is different with the story of his captivity. Manasseh's name occurs in the Assy. ins. among the list of the kings, tributary to Esarhaddon and Asurbanipal, of the Chatti country, embracing Phoenicia and Philistia. These same lands also were engaged during the reign of Asurbanipal in a rebellion (648–647 B.C.) in support of the King's brother Shamash-shumukin, viceroy at Babylon, and there is no reason why Manasseh might not have been involved in this rebellion or have incurred such suspicion. In that case he may well have been taken captive either to Nineveh or to Babylon, since the inscriptions show that the King received embassies there. Later also Manasseh might have been released and restored to his throne. Such treatment Necho I, King of Egypt, received from Asurbanipal. Hence this captivity and release may be received as historical. (This result was especially reached by Sch. COT. II. pp. 53 ff.; KAT. pp. 367 ff.) Cf. also Sayce, HCM. pp. 458 ff.; Dr. in Hogarth, Authority and Archeology, pp. 114 ff., who, admitting in abstract the possibility of the narrative, finds difficulty in the circumstances in which the statement occurs; TKC. EBi. III. coll. 2926 f.; McC. HPM. II. pp. 377 ff. Winckler, who formerly held this view, AT. Untersuch. p. 122, now places Manasseh's visit to Babylon under Esarhaddon early in his reign. "Manasseh was summoned before Esarhaddon, before whom he defended his conduct and was acquitted. Whether the investigation was held in Assyria or at Babylon it is difficult to determine" (KAT. p. 274).—11. The
king of Assyria] Esarhaddon or Asurbanipal (v. s.).—With hooks]. (1) Figurative of Manasseh's treatment like a wild beast (Ke.), (2) with the meaning of fetters (G, N, T, Be., Oe.), (3) literal: Assyrian kings sometimes thrust a hook into the nostrils of their captives and so led them about, a practice illustrated on many Assyrian reliefs in the British Museum (Ba.), (4) the name of a place, an unknown Hökim (Th. in Be.) (םֵיהֵל a corruption of יְירֵי, Jericho, TKC. v. s. op. cit.). The literal view was probably intended by the writer.—To Babylon] v. s. McCurdy (v. s. op. cit.) thinks this a substitution by a later scribe or copyist for an original to Nineveh.

14-17. Manasseh's enlargement of the city wall and reform of the cultus.—14. This can only mean that outside the existing rampart of the citadel, on the ridge above the present Virgin's Spring, Manasseh constructed another line of fortification, which he carried northward past the Temple Mount and round its northern slope.—15. And he removed, etc.] Cf. vv. 3-7. This statement of the removal of the foreign gods and idols from the Temple and Jerusalem by Manasseh is not exactly consistent with the account of 2 K., which, knowing nothing of Manasseh's conversion, assigns such a cleansing of the Temple and of the city to Josiah (2 K. 23:3-9).—17. Nevertheless the people, etc.] The Chronicler felt the necessity of this statement in view of the permanence of the idolatry nourished during the reign of Manasseh.

18-20. The conclusion of Manasseh's reign.—18. And the rest of the acts of Manasseh]. This formula is derived from 2 K. 21:17, but the remainder of this verse is from the Chronicler and clearly shows a source distinct from 2 K., since it contained his prayer. On the basis of this statement was composed the Prayer of Manasseh, a Hellenistic composition of early date found in the Apocrypha (though not in all mss.) (DB. III. pp. 232 f.). In the English editions of the Apocrypha it occurs just before 1 Mac.—The words of the seers] probably refer to prophetic admonitions addressed to Manasseh, which, with the prayer, were recorded in the Acts (or history) of the kings of Israel (v. Intro. p. 21).—19. This verse seems to have come from a later hand than the preceding, and to be
merely a fuller statement of the same facts.—The words (or the history) of the seers * can scarcely refer to anything else than the words of the seers of v. 18, the title probably of a section of The Acts of the kings of Israel (v. s.)—although an independent work is possible, though not probable (v. Intro. p. 23).—High places]. Cf. 1118.
—Asherim]. Cf. 14*.—Graven images]. Cf. 34*.—20. And they buried him in the garden* of his house]. The reading of the, “They buried him in his house,” is a mistake to be rectified by the true reading of М and 2 K. 21*11. 2 K. adds also “in the garden of Uzza,” probably meaning of King Uzziah. The reference may have been then to one laid out by that King in the court of the palace, and since it is called the garden of his own house, Manasseh may have built a house there within the grounds of which was his sepulchre and also that of Amon (2 K. 21*11), and possibly Josiah, who was buried in his own sepulchre (2 K. 23*11).


21-25. The reign of Amon (641-639 b. c.).—Taken from 2 K. 21*11. Of this King’s brief reign nothing is recorded except that he followed in the evil footsteps of his father. Manasseh clearly was subservient to Assyria, and probably the policy of his son was the same, hence his death may have been caused by an Egyptian party (GAS. J. II. p. 198), possibly representing the Patricians and Priesthood of Jerusalem (Erbt, Die Heb. pp. 162 f.). Others regard the motive as religious, an act of the adherents of the cause of pure religion (Ki. Gesch. p. 330). The cause is really unknown, and it is idle to conjecture. The section is taken from 2 K. 21*11 with v. 11*11 rewritten.—21. Twenty-two years]. If this age is correct, then Amon was only sixteen years old at the birth of Josiah.
McCurdy holds that Amon was probably acting king when his father was in captivity, and hence older than twenty-two on his accession (HPM, p. 389). The name of Amon's mother, "Me-shullemeth the daughter of Haruz of Jotbah," given in 2 K. 21", is omitted.—22. And Amon sacrificed to all the graven images, etc.] 2 K. 23", "And he walked in all the way which his father walked and served the idols which his father served and worshipped them." The Chronicler has abridged and changed this statement because it is inconsistent with Manasseh's repentance, which his own statement allows.—25. The people of the land] the common people in opposition to the courtiers who had conspired against Amon. This vengeance may indicate that the people were favoured by the conditions which prevailed during the reign of Manasseh, as though the entire period had been one of quiet and contented vassalage under Assyria; or it may only be an expression of the loyalty so often felt by the common people for a sovereign.
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XXXIV—XXXV. The reign of Josiah (639-608 B.C.).—The history of Josiah contained in 2 K. cc. 22. 23, apart from the mention of his accession and his death, consists entirely of an account of the discovery of the book of the law and the subsequent reform. The Chronicler abridges this narrative in certain points and modifies, embellishes, and expands it in others. 2 K. knows of no reformatory activity on the part of Josiah until his eighteenth year, when the book of the law was discovered; the Chronicler, on the other hand, makes the young King exhibit special piety ten years earlier, in his eighth year (34°), and in his twelfth year he begins to purge the land of idolatry so that his reformation in
cultus precedes the discovery of the book of the law instead of, as in 2 K., following the discovery. The reason of this change is plain. Such a pious king as Josiah must be represented as pious from his youth and needed not the special cause of the discovery of the book of the law to influence him to remove idolatries. The Chronicler has also omitted all reference to the purging of the Temple in detail (recorded in 2 K. 23:4-24), confining himself to the single statement that he purged the house (v. 4). This omission may have been simply due to brevity, or because in 2 K. 23:4 the idolatrous objects which are removed are clearly those associated with Manasseh, but according to 2 Ch. 33:16 Manasseh himself had purged the Temple of these. The narrative of the discovery of the book of the law is also rewritten. In 2 K. 22:7 the only officers mentioned in connection with the repair of the Temple are Shaphan the scribe and Hilkiah the high priest; but in Chronicles, Maaseiah the governor of the city and Joah the recorder appear (v. 6). The keepers of the door also have become Levites (v. 7, cf. 2 K. 22:7), and the money has been gathered not simply from "the people," i.e., those of the S. kingdom, but also from those of Manasseh and Ephraim and all the remnant of Israel. Also in 2 K. 22:7 the implication is that the money was derived from contributions made at the Temple according to the arrangements made by Jehoash, who placed a chest beside the altar to receive dues or offerings in money brought into the Temple (2 K. 12:11). The Chronicler assumes that the money had been collected by peripatetic Levites.

The breaches of the house also are not those of natural decay, as is implied in 2 K. 22:4, but specifically those of violence done to the Temple by the idolatrous kings of Judah (v. 11). The overseers of all the work also are Levites, a number of whom are mentioned by name (vv. 11-12). These are entirely absent in 2 K. The account of the finding of the book and the inquiry of the prophetess and the entering into the covenant are given essentially alike in both narratives. But the account of the reformation, since that has already been assigned to the earlier years of Josiah, is entirely omitted, with the exception of the celebration of the Passover, which was a feature of Josiah's reform (2 K. 23:16-21). This is
elaborated by the Chronicler in a description of nineteen verses. The Chronicler also gives a somewhat full account of the death of Josiah (35:25-27), which is very briefly narrated in 2 K. 23:25-26.

Sources: Ki. (after Bn.) (omitting the vv. taken from 2 K.) assigns 33:7 to M; vv. 8-11 to the Chronicler; 33:12 (as far as people) to M; vv. 13-14 to the Chronicler; vv. 15-20 (as far as temple) to the Chronicler; vv. 21-27 to M; v. 28 to the Chronicler. It is doubtful, however, whether a Midrash source should be introduced. The passages assigned to M contain nothing necessarily foreign to the Chronicler. The following marks of his style appear in them: c. 34 in v. 8 שָׁבַר (l. 23); c. 35 in v. 10 הֵמָּה (l. 89); in vv. 10-11 מִתְחֹזֶה (l. 81); in vv. 11-12 וְיִשְׂיָר (l. 42); in vv. 12-13 וְיִשְׂיָר (l. 14); in v. 13 מַעֲלֵה (l. 69); in v. 12 the use of 3 in מַעֲלֵה (l. 69); in v. 14 מַעֲלֵה (l. 4).

XXXIV. 1 f. Josiah's accession.—Taken from 2 K. 22:1-10, with the usual omission of the name of the King's mother.—2. And he did that which was right, etc. Cf. similar statements concerning Asa 14:2, and Jotham 27:2, Hezekiah 29:3, but only to Josiah is given the praise: And he did not turn to the right hand or to the left.


3-7. Josiah's piety exemplified in his reformation.—3. For in the eighth year of his reign, etc. The narrative of 2 K. knows nothing of this movement for reform when Josiah was so young and before the discovery of the book of the law. For the reason of the Chronicler's modification v. 5. A reconciliation between the two narratives has been sought on the ground that 2 K. described the consummation of a reform begun at an earlier period, while the Chronicler described the entire reform without reference to chronology (Be., Zoe., Oe.).—The high places]. Cf. 11:18.—The Asherim]. Cf. vv. 4-7 14:1.—The graven images and the molten images]. Cf. vv. 6-7. The former are mentioned in 33:1. The two may be coupled here together to denote every kind of idol (so in Na. 11: Hab. 2:14 Is. 48:2 Je. 10:14 51:17 Dt. 27:11). The graven (carved) image was either of wood (Is. 40:19 44:19 45:19) or of stone (Is. 21:9). But the word (בָּשָׂר, מִשְׁרֵי) is used for idols in general, even for molten ones of metal (Je. 10:14 51:17).—4. This verse
describes more fully the conduct of v. 4, repeating its terms.—Ba'αλ], Cf. 17:33. — The sun pillars]. Cf. 14:11. In 2 K. 23:14 the massēboth, pillars, are mentioned. The hammanim, sun-pillars, a later term, the Chronicler used, perhaps more readily in connection with idolatry.—And he made dust of them]. Cf. v. 4. In 2 K. 23:14 this is said of the destruction of “the Asherah” and “the high places.” Thus also was the golden calf destroyed (Ex. 32:29), and according to the Chronicler the idolatrous image of Maacah 15:4. — And he scattered [the dust] upon the graves of those who sacrificed to them] (v. i.); In 2 K. 23:14 the dust of the Asherah was scattered “upon the graves of the common people.” The Chronicler’s representation is more intense, a sort of retributive pollution even of the resting-place of the impious dead.—5. And the bones of the priests he burned upon their altars]. Cf. 2 K. 23:14 from which this statement of defilement and abhorrence is probably derived.—6. And in the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim and Simeon even unto Naphtali he laid waste their houses * round about]. The reform of Josiah (after 2 K. 23:21) extended over northern Israel. This had already happened in the case of Hezekiah (cf. 30:1-19). The mention of Simeon, whose territory was south of Judah (1 Ch. 4:27), with the northern tribes is due to the fact that it was reckoned as one of the ten tribes forming the N. kingdom (cf. 15:21). — Their houses] idolatrous temples (cf. “the houses of the high places,” 2 K. 23:14).—7. Cf. v. 4.—All the land of Israel] the N. kingdom.
which were "in the cities of Samaria," the latter becoming in 2 Ch. the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim and Simeon even unto Naphtali. Hence it is probable that the account in Ch. referred to these "houses" originally, and in so far the Kt. must be correct. Then, then, is either a corruption of בַּעַת, i.e., and in the cities of . . . he destroyed their houses, or of רַב, cf. 2 K. 23:7. כָּל רַבִּי נְחָוָה [transposed in G.—יִרְשָׁדָה] not likely an isolated and abnormal inf. Hiph. with the vowels of the pf. (Ew. § 238 d, Be., Ke., Zoe.), but is either an error for רוּחַ (cf. v. 9) (Kau., Bu.) or should be pointed רוּחַ (Oe.).

8-13. The repair of the Temple.—Based upon 2 K. 22:1-7 (for main variations v. s.).—8. The clause rendered in AV., RV., When he had purged the land and the house, is an addition to the text of 2 K. 22:1, and in this translation brings that verse into conformity with vv. 1-7. The other proposed renderings (v. i.) make the clause either an expression of the object of the repair of the Temple or an implication that Josiah spent several years in removing all idolatries from the lands. The fact that only here is the purging of the Temple by Josiah mentioned by the Chronicler favours the notion that the clause is a gloss (v. i.).—Shaphan]. This name also appears in v. 11, as the father of Ahikam, also of an Elasah Je. 29 (perhaps the same Shaphan is meant). Shaphan appears also in Je. 36:11. as the father of Gemariah and in Ezk. 8:1 as the father of Jaazaniah. These latter two may have been identical with the Shaphan here mentioned. The name means Coney or Rock-badger, and has been taken with other animal names as an evidence of totemism in Israel (but see Gray, HPN. pp. 103 f.; Jacobs, Studies in Bib. Arch. pp. 84 ff.).—Asgal] (2 K. 22:1). The Chronicler omits his father Meshullam, and Shaphan’s title of "scribe" both mentioned in 2 K. 22:1.—Ma’aseiah the governor of the city and Jo‘ah the son of Jo‘ahas the recorder] not mentioned in 2 K. The names are common.—9. The matter is stated differently in 2 K. 22:4. There Shaphan took a message to Hilkiah that he should “sum,” i.e., reckon the total of the money received in the Temple or, to follow a better reading, “pour it out” from the chest in which it had been collected from contributors entering the Temple; here Shaphan and his companion came to Hilkiah and
gave the money which had been collected throughout the country presumably by Levites (v. s. and cf. 24* *., where the Chronicler has made a similar departure from the narrative in 2 K. 12, introducing Levites as collectors 24* *).—10 f. And they gave ] a repetition of and they gave (AV., RV., delivered) of v. *, i.e., Shaphan and his companions with Hilkiah gave the money into the hand of the workmen who had the oversight of the house of Yahweh and these in turn gave it to the workmen who were working in the house of Yahweh to mend and to repair the house (Ke., Zoe., Kau., AV., RVm.). This latter statement is made more definite by v. **: And they gave it to the carpenters and to the builders to purchase hewn stone, etc. Another interpretation regards the workmen who were working (ועשית המלאה סדור עליה) as identical with or belonging to the workmen who had the oversight (ועשית המלאה הסדר), and renders: And the workmen who were working in the house gave it to mend and repair the house (v. **) and they gave it to the carpenters, etc. (RV., Ki. Kom.). The former of these two interpretations is favoured by the parallel in 2 K. 22*.—Carpenters]. The Heb. word (ורשימ) means not only workers in wood but also in stone and metal.—The houses] the chambers of the Temple (cf. 1 Ch. 28**) which the kings of Judah had ruined]. Whether the writer thought only of ruin by neglect (Ke., Zoe.) or something more positive, as is ascribed to the sons of Athaliah (24* *), is uncertain.—12. And the men worked faithfully at the work]. In 2 K. 22* faithfulness is mentioned in connection with the payment of the money.—And over them were appointed overseers Jahath and Obadiah, Levites of the sons of Merari, and Zechariah and Meshullam of the sons of the Kehathites to direct the work.] This is a characteristic addition of the Chronicler. On the names of the Levites cf. for Jahath 1 Ch. 4* 6* (**) 9* (**) 23* 1* 24*; for Obadiah 1 Ch. 27**, 3* 7* 8* et al.; and on the families cf. 1 Ch. 5* (6*).—And the Levites, all skilled in instruments of song 13* were over the burden bearers and were directors of the workmen doing every sort of work: and from the Levites were the scribes and officers and gatekeepers]. Not only were the four principal overseers, those mentioned by name, Levites, but from the Levitical musicians were taken the subordinate directors of the work, and from the Levites
also the clerical employees and other subordinate officers and the gate-keepers. The Chronicler is anxious to express how entirely the work in every detail was under the supervision of the Levites. When Herod rebuilt the Temple this notion of committing everything connected with the sacred edifice to ecclesiastics was carried even further, since, according to Josephus (Ant. xv. 11, 2.), Herod caused priests to be trained as carpenters and masons for labour on the Temple. The words all skilled in instruments of song, giving prominence thus to the Levitical musicians, and also the last clause of v. 11, may be glosses (so Ki. Kom., after Bn.).

8. noni f>Kn ph "vtoS (i) has been variously rendered, when he had purged, etc. (E., EVs., Luther, De Wette, et al.). But such a construction of the inf. with ἐν is unexampled elsewhere. (2) In order to purge . . . he sent, etc. (Be.). This connection with the following words is against the context, since the verbal object of ἐτολή is ἀπλοῦ. Ki. Kom. also renders thus, and after Bn. regards the words as a gloss. This latter is plausible. (3) While purifying, etc. (Ke., Zoe., Oe., Kau.). This is to be preferred (cf. Ew. § 280 d).—2 K. 22* + ἀλαζῶν τῶν ἱερατῶν 2 K. + ἅλειψις . . . πλατύνει πάσαν πέσην . . . ἐρεπάνω] wanting in 2 K.—αλαζῶν] wanting in 2 K., which adds ἀλαζῶν to the inv. ἱερατῶν, 2 K. 22*—ὑπαρχόντων ἀλαζῶν of 2 K. was either misread or intentionally changed by the Chronicler.—αλαζῶν] 2 K. ἀλαζῶν inserted by the Chronicler.—ἀντικρινόμενοι] for the inv. ἱερατῶν, 2 K. 22*—ὑπαρχόντων ἀλαζῶν inserted by the Chronicler.—[καὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν a fuller statement than 2 K. ἀλαζῶν, v. s. on v. 6.—] + καὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν scarcely arose through error in the Greek nor could ἀρχῶν be original. Possibly the latter represents a corruption of an earlier ἰσχύς, cf. v. 15*.—יושה] 2 K. hence ἰσχύς may be original.—[ט] possibly with 2 K., so Ki., but cf. 1 Ch. 23*.—] ἰσχύς] 2 K. ἰσχύς is probably original, so Be., Ke., Kau., Bn., Ki. BH.—] wanting in 2 K., was introduced by the Chronicler to emphasise the contrast with the workmen that had the oversight, τῶν ἱερατῶν—ἐπιστρέφοντας 1] Qal inf. cstr. of denom. verb ἰσχύς formed from ἰσχύς. 9. ἐπιστρέφοντας] wanting in 2 K. 22*—ἀποκαταλείπονται 2 K. + ἰσχύς — ὑπαρχόντων ἀλαζῶν] transposed in 2 K.—] ἐπιστρέφοντας] transposed in 2 K.—] ἐπιστρέφοντας] Pi. inf. cstr. from denom. ἰσχύς to furnish with beams.12.
phrase in 2 K. 22. —13. omit \( \text{Be.}, \text{Oe.}, \text{Kau.}, \text{Bn.}, \text{Ki. Kom.}, \text{BH.} \). —omitted] wanting in G and therefore struck out by Bn.

14–19. The discovery of the law-book.—Based upon and following quite closely 2 K. 22. —14. This introductory verse is from the Chronicler. Its purpose is to renew the narrative taken from 2 K. after the interruption of vv. i. —And when they brought out the money which was brought into the house of Yahweh, Hilkiah the priest found, etc. —The natural inference would be that the book was found in the place where the money was kept, yet the connection may only be temporal: at the time when, then Hilkiah found, etc. —The book of the law of Yahweh by the hand of Moses. The Chronicler has in mind the Torah or Pentateuch (v. v. i.). The words by the hand of Moses are wanting in 2 K. The book actually found was Deuteronomy, or more exactly the original Deuteronomy, Dt. 5–26. 28 (Dr. Dt. p. lxv., Ryle, DB. p. 598, GFM. EB). I. coll. 1080; f.; others restrict the original D more nearly to cc. 12–26, thus Cornill, Intro. p. 60). —16. And Shaphan brought the book to the king and moreover he brought the king word saying, etc. —The awkward introduction of the book at this point, anticipating the narrative of v. i., has arisen from a misreading of the text of 2 K. 22. (v. i.). The text of 2 K. reads, “And Shaphan the scribe came to the king and brought the king word and said, Thy servants have emptied the money, etc.” (In the unpointed Hebrew text the words “he came” and “he brought” are the same, (יָעַבְדֶּה) and also “the scribe” and “the book” (Dt. p. xlv., Ryle, DB. p. 598, GFM. EB). I. coll. 1080 f.; others restrict the original D more nearly to cc. 12–26, thus Cornill, Intro. p. 60). —17. And they poured out the money that was found, etc. —The phraseology from 2 K. 22. implies collection in the chest instituted by Jehoash (v. s.). —18. And Shaphan read therein. A noticeable departure from the text of 2 K. 22, which has “And Shaphan read it,” implying that he read the entire book before the King, but the Chronicler, assuming the book to be the Pentateuch, recognised at once the incongruity of such a statement and thus changed it. The reading was confined to portions of the book. In like manner also he omitted from v. i. the words of the corresponding verse in 2 K. (22), “And he read it.” —19. The law contained some message of peculiar horror for neglect of the covenant of Yahweh, probably the message of Dt. 28.
20–28. The inquiry of Yahweh through Huldah the prophetess.—On hearing the terrific denunciations of the law-book Josiah at once resolves to consult Yahweh clearly with a view of averting impending calamity, and he sends a commission to a prophetess, Huldah the wife of one of the courtiers, and from her he receives a message of doom for the city and yet of respite for himself.—20. Ahikam] mentioned elsewhere as a well-minded courtier who defended Jeremiah on a critical occasion (Je. 26:4) and who was also the father of Gedaliah the governor of the cities of Judah after the fall of Jerusalem (Je. 39:10 40:1).—Abdon] in 2 K. 22:14 “‘Achbor.” This latter (meaning mouse) is more probably correct, since in Je. 26:1 36:13 El Nathan the son of ‘Achbor is mentioned.—Micah] 2 K. 22 “Micaiah.” The former is an abbreviated form of the latter. The prophet Micah was also called Micaiah (cf. Mi. 1: and Je. 26: Kt.).—Asaiah]. (For occurrences of the name cf. 1 Ch. 4:6 (80) 15:11 96.) This one is not mentioned elsewhere.—The servant of the king] the title of a particular office, although we are ignorant of its precise function (Bn. Arch. p. 258). Servant is used elsewhere with reference to a king (1) of royal officials, Gn. 40: 2 S. 10: 1 and (2) of common soldiers, 2 S. 21: 31 3:8.—21. And for them that are left in Israel] wanting in 2 K. 22:15, which has “for the people and all Judah.” The Chronicler characteristically introduces the remnant of the N. kingdom (cf. v. 4).—Which has been poured out]. Ç, followed by Bn., Ki. BH., has the reading of 2 K., “which has been kindled,” which, since the reading is the more unusual, is probably correct. Likewise, following Ç, S, with Bn. and Ki. BH., we should after 2 K. read because our fathers did not hear the word, etc., instead of because
our fathers did not keep the word, etc.—22. Then Hilkiah and those whom the king commanded. Again a reading of \( \text{commanded} \) supplying the word \( \text{commanded} \) is to be adopted.—Huldah] 2 K. 22 \( \text{f} \) (meaning weasel).—The prophetess]. This title is also given to Miriam (Ex. 15 \( ^{**} \)), Deborah (Ju. 4 \( ^{*} \)), the wife of Isaiah (Is. 8 \( ^{*} \)), and to the false prophetess Noadiah (Ne. 6 \( ^{*} \)). Women, thus, as well as men, gave in Israel communications from Yahweh; yet prophetesses appear not to have been numerous.—Shallum] (a common name, cf. 1 Ch. 2 \( ^{*} \). 4 \( ^{*} \), 5 \( ^{*} \). (6 \( ^{*} \). (6 \( ^{*} \) et al.) possibly identical with Shallum the uncle of Jeremiah (Je. 32 \( ^{*} \)).—Tokhah] better the reading of 2 K. 22 \( ^{*} \), Tikvah (a name meaning hope, also in Ezr. 10 \( ^{*} \)).—Hasrah \( \text{f} \)] 2 K. 22 \( ^{*} \) Harhas \( \text{f} \), the former probably is correct.—Keeper of the wardrobe] (lit. the garments) either the king’s wardrobe or more likely the garments kept at the palace for festive occasions. Cf. 2 K. 10 \( ^{*} \) and on the use of special garments at religious functions, WRS. Rel. Sem. pp. 452 f.—In the second quarter]. Cf. Zp. 1 \( ^{*} \).—24. All the curses]. Cf. Dt. 28 \( ^{*} \). For phraseology similar to that of this verse and the following cf. 1 K. 9 \( ^{*} \). 14 \( ^{*} \). Je. 7 \( ^{*} \). 19 \( ^{*} \). 32 \( ^{*} \).—25. Poured out] better after \( \text{kindled} \) (cf. v. \( \text{i} \)) (v. \( \text{i} \)).—26 \( \text{f} \). The words which thou hast heard . . .]. The text is in some way faulty. Perhaps the reading was: Because thou hast hearkened unto my words (\( ^{*} \)) and thy heart was softened, etc. (v. \( \text{i} \)).—28. And thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace]. Since Josiah was slain at the battle of Megiddo, it looks as though these words were written before his death, and hence are a testimony to the genuineness of the prophecy of Huldah.
wanting in 2 K.—24. [Ch. 22\textsuperscript{15}]

z\textsuperscript{14}—z\textsuperscript{33}

\ldots \text{agreeing so far with 2 K.}—\text{agreed}.

Ch. is more exact in the light of v. \textsuperscript{15} = 2 K. \textsuperscript{25}.

[Qr.,

Ch. \text{ makes a better contrast to becw.}, is

supported by \text{C}, and adopted by \text{Oe., Ki., Bn. On 1 with the impf. see}

Dr. \text{TH. § 125.—26.} \text{taken from 2 K. 22\textsuperscript{14}, a}

harsh construction, but in \text{C}, \text{C}, \text{C}.

In 2 K. \text{G} \text{\textquoteleft Alt \textquoteleft un \textsuperscript{16} λογος \muου, κα\iota \text{κα\iota} \text{λογος} \text{κα\iota} \text{ια κα\iota} \text{δια κα\iota} \text{δια, \text{B} Pro eo quod [quiniam in}

Ch.] \text{auditisti verba voluminis et perterritum [alque emolliitum in Ch.]

est cor tuum, i.e.,}

Hpt. regards the words \text{as a gloss to} v. \text{v.}.\text{Ki. Kom., BH. hold a lacuna.—27.}

\text{Meissner Athyios} \text{2 K. 22\textsuperscript{15}, a}

harsh construction, but in \text{C}, \text{Bn.}

\text{Hpt. regards the words the} \text{as a gloss to} v. \text{v.}.\text{Ki.}

\text{Kom., BH. hold a lacuna.}

—28. \text{wanting in 2 K. 22\textsuperscript{16}.}

29—33. \text{The assembly, the reading of the law, and the}

\text{covenant.}—\text{A reproduction of} 2 K. 23\textsuperscript{1—9}, with interesting va-

triations in vv. \textsuperscript{22—25} and a new conclusion in v. \textsuperscript{26}.—29. \text{All the}

\text{elders of Judah and Jerusalem} \text{the heads of clans and families.—30. \text{The}

Levites]. \text{The Chronicler substitutes these for} \text{the}

\text{prophets} \text{of} 2 K. 23\textsuperscript{15}.—\text{Both great and small} \text{both old and}

\text{young (cf. 15\textsuperscript{1}).} \text{The assembly was a popular one, embracing}

\text{men of all ages and conditions.—The book of the covenant i.e., a}

\text{book which expressed the basis of a covenant (cf. Ex. 24\textsuperscript{15}).—31.}

\text{In his place} \text{2 K. 23\textsuperscript{1} \text{by the pillar,} cf. 23\textsuperscript{15}.—And made a}

\text{covenant} \text{lit. cut a covenant, a phrase derived from the cut-

ting of sacrificial victims into pieces between which the parties}

to the covenant passed (Gn. 15\textsuperscript{15} Je. 34\textsuperscript{14} \text{'}); but there is no}

reason to suppose that this was an essential part of each}

covenant or took place on this occasion. An oath probably

\text{was sufficient with or without a sacrificial meal.—Before}

\text{Yahweh] with invocation of his deity.—To walk after Yahweh,}

\text{etc.} \text{Dtic. expressions, cf. Dt. 13\textsuperscript{1} 10\textsuperscript{15} 6\textsuperscript{17} 26\textsuperscript{16}.—32. And the}

\text{inhabitants, etc.] i.e., kept the law.—33. The Chronicler having}

\text{already introduced Josiah's reform of his own kingdom early in}

\text{his reign (v. \textsuperscript{1})}, puts here similar measures in the districts which}

\text{had belonged to the N. kingdom.—All his days}. \text{After the death}

\text{of Josiah in the reign of Jehoiakim the people lapsed into their}

\text{former evil ways (36\textsuperscript{1}).}
29. The former is the original. 30. substituted by the Chronicler for the text of 2 K. 31. transposed in 2 K. 32. substituted by the Chronicler for the text of 2 K.

XXXV. 1–19. The celebration of the Passover.—According to 2 K. 23:11-12 Josiah commanded the celebration of the Passover “as it was written in the book of the covenant,” and the people responded and celebrated the feast as it had never been observed. This brief statement gave the Chronicler occasion to describe the celebration of the feast in detail, especially in reference to the part therein of the priests and Levites.

1. In Jerusalem. This was the significant thing historically in Josiah’s observance of the Passover: according to the Dt. law it was held at the central sanctuary in Jerusalem. Previously the celebrations had been at the people’s homes or at local sanctuaries throughout the land (Dt. 16). The Chronicler derived v. 1 from 2 K. 23:12.—On the fourteenth day of the first month according to the law Ex. 12: Lv. 23: Nu. 9.

2. Encouraged them. Cf. the similar exhortation of Hezekiah (29:12 30:).—3. That taught all Israel. From the beginning in Israel the priests were the guardians and the teachers of the law, and the Chronicler, in dignifying the office of the Levites, assigns this duty also to them (cf. 17:4. Ne. 8:6).—That were holy unto Yahweh another expression dignifying the Levites (cf. 23:). In P only the priests are called holy (DB. IV. p. 93).—Put the holy ark in the house, etc. This command to the Levites to place the ark in the Temple, and, since they no longer have the burden of carrying it, to serve now Yahweh and the people in making preparation for the Passover (vv. 4-10), has been variously interpreted. (i) On the assumption that the ark had been removed from the Temple by Manasseh or by Josiah during
its repair, the command was to replace it in the Temple and to attend to other duties (so the older commentators, also Be., Oe.; Be. held also that the Levites bore the newly reconsecrated ark upon their shoulders at the celebration of the Passover under the idea that they were bound to do so by the law, but Josiah taught them that the Temple built by Solomon had caused an alteration in that respect). (2) The language is figurative, meaning "Think not on that which formerly before the building of the Temple belonged to your service, but serve the Lord and his people now in the manner described in vv. * e." (Ke., Zoe.). (3) With emendation of the text (v. i.), read: Behold the ark is now in the temple, etc. (Bn.). The meaning, then, is essentially that of (2). Since the ark is in its place and is no longer to be borne, the Levites should attend to their regular duties. This appeared trivial and a reader emended as given in מ.—4. After your fathers' houses] i.e., after the clan or great family divisions.—By your courses] i.e., the divisions for service.—According to the writing of David]. The formation of the Levitical divisions for service in the Temple was ascribed to David (cf. i Ch. 23*).—And according to the writing of Solomon]. The final appointment and arrangement was made necessarily by Solomon (cf. 8*). There is no reason then why this statement may not have come from the Chronicler (contra Bn.).—5. According to the divisions of the fathers' houses of your brethren the children of the people, and (for every division) a part of a Levitical family]. "Each great division of the laity was to be served by a small division of the Levites" (cf. v. *).—6. And kill the passover]. Cf. 30* where the Levites kill the Passover owing to the laity's uncleanness, but here no such reason is alleged. This looks as though at the time of the Chronicler the right of slaying and roasting the paschal lamb had passed from the laymen, heads of the households (Ex. 12* *), to the Levites. If this was the case, Jewish laymen later regained this privilege, yet Levites might also slay the lambs.—And sanctify yourselves]. After the slaying of animals the Levites should wash themselves in view of their further duties.—And prepare, etc.]. Prepare the Passover for your brethren (the laymen), according to the law of Moses (cf. v. 18).—7. And Josiah gave, etc.]. Cf. the similar action of Hezekiah and his
princes (30th).—*Three thousand bullocks* for peace-offerings or sacrificial meals *(cf. oxen vv. 10. 11).*—8. *And his princes* i.e., the various officials.—*For a free-will offering* corresponding to the passover offerings *(Ke., Zoe., RV.); better willingly* *(B, Be., Oe., Kau., Ki., Ba., AV., RVm.)*.—Hilkiah and Zechariah and Jehiel, the rulers of the house of God]. Of these three rulers Hilkiah was the high priest *(cf. 31st)*; Zechariah is usually conjectured to have been the priest next to him, *the second priest* mentioned in 2 K. 25th Je. 52nd *(cf. Pashhur a ruler in the house of Yahweh Je. 26th); Jehiel is conjectured by Be., Ke., Zoe., the chief of the line of Ithamar, which according to Ezr. 8th continued to exist after the exile *(cf. 1 Ch. 24th).* But it is better to think of him simply as the priest third in rank *(Oe.). On occurrence of the name *cf. 31st.*—9. Conaniah, Shemaiah, and Jozabad appear as names of Levites under Hezekiah in 31st-34th. On Nethanel, for occurrence of name *cf. 1 Ch. 21st 15th 24th 26th 17th et al.; Hashabiah, cf. 1 Ch. 6th 9th 9th et al., very common; Jezel also common, cf. 1 Ch. 5th 9th.—11. *And the priests sprinkled*. *Cf. 30th.*—Now the Levites were slaying]. As in the case of the killing, this according to P would seem to have been a layman's part *(cf. v. 29th).*—12. *And they removed the burnt-offerings, etc.*]. The Levites, after killing and slaying the paschal lambs *(v. 11)*, removed from the lambs portions which were burnt upon the altar *(Ḥolah the burnt-offerings), giving these portions to the representatives of families that they in turn might present them to the priest for an offering unto Yahweh. No ritual like this is mentioned in Ex. 12, but it must be assumed that the paschal lambs were treated like the lambs of the peace-offerings, of which certain portions of fat were burned upon the altar *(cf. Lv. 3th-4th)* *(Be., Ke., Zoe., Oe., Bn.)*.—*And so it was done to the oxen]. They were treated in the same way. The fat was burned on the altar *(Lv. 3th-4th)* but the rest eaten *(cf. v. 11).*—13. The paschal lambs were roasted according to the ordinance of Ex. 12th-14th. The *holy offerings*, to wit the oxen, were cooked otherwise and were either eaten as a part of the paschal meal *(Be.) or during the later days of the feast *(Ke., Zoe., Oe.). The former seems demanded by the connection.—14. The people were served first. Then the Levites prepared their own lambs and those of the priests who were engaged until night in burning the fat portions of the lambs.
CELEBRATION OF THE PASSOVER

15. Cf. I Ch. 25:1-4. According to Jewish traditions the Levites sang the "Hallel" while the paschal lambs were being killed in the court of the Temple (*J.E.* IX. p. 553). In spite of all the labour of the priests and Levites, neither the singers nor the gate-keepers were drawn from their posts of duty either to assist them or to prepare their own paschal supper.—

16. *And all the service of Yahweh on that day in preparing the passover and in offering the burnt-offerings upon the altar of Yahweh was arranged (i.e., was executed) according to the command of the king Josiah).* This is a summary of the preceding narrative. All was performed as the King had commanded, or the emphasis may be upon the King's command, i.e., was ordered by Josiah.—

17. *On that day* i.e., the 14th of Nisan. Ke., Zoe., Oe., hold that the expression covers the seven days of the feast agreeable to their interpretation of vv. 11 (q.v.).—*The burnt-offerings are to be interpreted as in vv. 11-14.—* 18. A copy of 2 K. 23:8 with these principal changes: *from the days of Samuel the prophet* instead of "from the days of the judges that judged Israel" (Samuel was regarded as the last of the judges); and with the specific mention of the priests and the Levites and all Judah and Israel who were present and the inhabitants of Jerusalem.—

19. Also from 2 K. (23:8).
2 CHRONICLES

with a few mss. and Vrss.—6. שָׁפֵרָה כְּשָׁפֵרָה] Bn. strikes out, since it is wanting in ב' (Ch.) and since the sanctification should precede the slaying of the paschal lamb, so also Ki. BH. doubtfully. But ב' (1 Esdr.) קָלָה וַתְּדָשׁ וֹדְאָס read יָשֵׁרָה (cf. v. 11). Since the Levites did prepare the holy offerings for their brethren, the people (v. 10), this is the original, hence omit, also with ב' (1 Esdr.) and render and prepare the holy offerings, etc.—7. שֶׁבֶט] cf. 1 Ch. 27. —8. The word not infrequent in Arab. and Aram.—15. הבש] a few mss. and Vrss. הבש.—19. ב' (Ch.) inserts after this verse 2 K. 23. This passage was added in the underlying Hebrew, as is shown by the transliteration קָרַשב דַּכָּרַשְׁבו — קָדָרַשְׁבו — יָשֵׁרָה, not found in 2 K. 23. The older ב' version (1 Esdr.) has another addition at this point which probably represents in mutilated form the Chronicler's original text, cf. Tor. ATC. pp. 83 f., Ezra Studies, pp. 87 ff.

20-26. The death of Josiah.—Much fuller than the account given in 2 K. 23.1, showing that either fuller reminiscences of this sad event had been preserved or that a legend concerning it had already developed. The Chronicler gives the following details, which are entirely wanting in 2 K.: (1) Necho's message to dissuade Josiah from war, (2) Josiah's disguising himself and coming to fight in the valley of Megiddo, (3) the wounding of Josiah by archers, (4) the transfer of the wounded man to the second chariot (Ba.).

Bn. ascribes the narrative to the Chronicler's forerunner (die Vorlage). In this he is followed by Ki. The evidence is seen in the connecting clause, After all this when Josiah had prepared the temple, v. 18. The remainder of the section is ascribed by Bn. to the forerunner and by Ki. to M.

20. Neco the king of Egypt] Necho II, son of Psammetichus, second King of the twenty-sixth dynasty. He reigned from 609 to 594 B.C.—To fight against Carchemish]. The writer here gives the geographical goal, while 2 K. 23 has the personal object, "The king of Assyria." Necho, taking advantage of the tottering condition of the Assyrian Empire, was intent upon restoring the ancient Egyptian sovereignty over the Syrian provinces.—Carchemish] the objective point of Necho's march, the mod. Jerabis (or Jerabus) on the west bank of the Euphrates, directly east of the north-east corner of the Mediterranean, the ancient
capital of the Hittite empire and the gateway from Syria into Mesopotamia. Two years later Necho was defeated at this point by the Babylonian army of Nabopolassar under Nebuchadrezzar, and from that fact the writer introduced it here.—And he went out to meet him] possibly at the command of the Assyrians or through loyalty to them; but since the Assyrian Empire had grown very weak and was near its end, it is far more probable that Judah had for some time ceased to be tributary to Assyria and that Josiah went out to preserve the independence of his kingdom.—21. Whether this embassy with its message was in any way historic, or merely a fiction to assign a cause for the death of the good King, it is impossible to determine. Probably the latter. The writer saw in the message of Necho a divine warning which Josiah did not heed (v. ii). He assumed that a real revelation from God, whom he would have identified with Yahweh, had been made to Necho. The older commentators thought of the command having come to Necho through a dream or a prophet (on the text v. i.).—22. But Josiah did not turn his face from him]. He persisted in hostility.—But he disguised himself]. The story of the death of Josiah appears to have been modelled after that of Ahab. Both kings received a divine warning, both entered the battle in disguise—evidently to avoid the threatened danger—and both were wounded by bowmen and later died (cf. 18 ii. iii. iv.). Yet 6 read and he strengthened himself (v. i.).—Mouth of God]. A real revelation had been made to Necho (cf. v. ii).—Megiddo]. Cf. i Ch. 7. The battle was so far north not because Necho advanced to northern Palestine by the sea (a view suggested by Cheyne, Life and Times of Jeremiah, p. 96, based on Herodotus’s reference to Necho’s naval activity, II. 158), but probably because with northern allies this ancient battle-ground afforded the best place for resisting the Egyptian.—23. For I am sore wounded]. Thus also said Ahab (18 ii).—24. The second chariot] probably a greater and more comfortable one than the war chariot.—And they brought him to Jerusalem and he died]. In 2 K. 23 the King is said to have been slain at Megiddo and brought dead from there. The narrative in 2 K. has also been interpreted to imply that Josiah sought an interview with Necho and was assassinated by him
at Megiddo (Ba.). This is unlikely.—25. And Jeremiah composed an elegy over Josiah. This has not been preserved. On the other hand, Jeremiah is said to have deprecated the extremes to which mourning for Josiah was carried (cf. Je. 22:19).—Unto this day either of the Chronicler or his source; most likely the latter. And they made them an ordinance in Israel] i.e., a custom. They were probably repeated yearly on the anniversary of Josiah’s death. An allusion to this has been found in Zc. 12:11, but that interpretation is very doubtful.—In the lamentations] not the canonical book of Lamentations, but a lost one.—26. A combination of the form found in 1 and 2 K., i.e., And the rest of the acts of Josiah (2 K. 23:24), and that peculiar to the Chronicler, and his acts first and last (cf. 9:21).—And his good deeds. Cf. 32:6—The book of the kings of Israel and Judah] v. Intro. pp. 22 f.

21. דָּעָתְךָ אֲלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל] Be. retained אֲלֹהֵי and rendered nicht wider dich sei du heute. Kau. inserts וַתַּעֲלָה after וַתַּעֲלָה, the latter being used to emphasise the preceding pron. See. More likely we should repoint אך, I will not come against you this day. Ki. BH. reads וַתַּעֲלָה. [בִּין יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל]. The rendering of EVs. against the house wherewith I have war, i.e., the house of my war, was defended by Ke., but is awkward. Better read with 1 Esdr. יִדְּעָה, favoured by Be., Zoe., Kau., since this brings out the contrast, vis., it is not against you, but against your enemy, that I am marching.—22. שֵׁתָה is not supported by the Vrss. C (Ch.) ἐκπαρασῳδή read פוריה and C (1 Esdr.) ἐπεσχέτει read בּוֹסֶה. The following verse seems to imply that the King was not disguised, since the archers made him the object of their attack. In the Ahab incident, the King was shot by chance, cf. 18:4. We should probably read פִירָה, so Be., Zoe., Oe., Bn.—נַע] C (1 Esdr.) ἐρεμίου προσφέρων. Read מ. Winckler holds that an original of vv. 11 has been much corrupted and reconstructs as follows: According to v. 10, Josiah is clearly the one who has received a command from God. Hence after נִשְׂכֶּר some words are missing. The original was something like this: “What have I to do with thee, King of Judah? Not against thee but against the house [of Assyria, i.e., thy vassalship] am I come. Then said Josiah: It is not my wish that I fight (צָלַ צָלַ), but God has commanded me to make haste. Halt [O Pharaoh] before the command of God who has sent me, that he does not destroy thee. And Josiah would not turn back from him because he had been made to fight with him [שֵׁתָה in place of שֵׁתָה] and he did not hearken to Necho on account of the word of God [which he, Josiah, had received]” KAT. 3 p. 277.
REIGN OF JEHOAHAZ

From the death of Josiah to the fall of Jerusalem.—The Chronicler had before him 2 K. 23:10–24:1, from which, with much abridgment and some striking modifications, he took vv. 1–11, but vv. 12–23 he freely composed, giving his own version of the fall of Jerusalem with its cause and the duration of the exile and the decree of Cyrus, which led to the return.

Ki. assigns all this chapter either to the Chronicler or from 2 K., with, however, an interrogation against vv. 6–10.

1–4. The reign of Jehoahaz (three months, 608 B.C.).—1. 2. For a similar enthronement by the people, cf. 26:33.—Jeho'ahaz] a younger son of Josiah (cf. vv. 1–4), and therefore not the natural heir to the throne. His election was probably due to his sympathy with the anti-Egyptian policy of his father or his control by those who represented it. In Je. 22:11 he is called Shallum, which was probably his birth name, while Jehoahaz was the name taken as king. His mother's name, given in 2 K. 23:3, is omitted and also the statement, "And he did that which was evil in the sight of Yahweh according to all that his fathers had done."—3. And the king of Egypt removed him from reigning* in Jerusalem]. 2 K. 23:22 mentions that "Necho bound him at Riblah." The text shows confusion (v. i.). The words bound and remove are very similar in Hebrew.—A hundred talents of silver] about two hundred thousand dollars.—A talent of gold] about thirty thousand dollars. This tribute was lighter than that imposed by Sennacherib (cf. 2 K. 18:14).—4. Eliakim means "God establishes," and Jehoiakim "Yahweh establishes," thus the two names were practically identical. Necho showed his respect for Yahweh by giving him the latter name.—And carried him to Egypt] where he died (cf. 2 K. 23:22 Je. 22:11).
Since the Chronicler habitually omitted the name of the king's mother and the passage is wanting in 1 Esdr., is doubtless original. The Chronicler probably omitted the statement concerning the King's evil doing, since the opposition of the Egyptian ruler indicates that the young King followed the policy of his father, the good Josiah. —§. The Chronicler probably omitted the statement concerning the King's evil doing, since the opposition of the Egyptian ruler indicates that the young King followed the policy of his father, the good Josiah. —3. So (Ch.) follows, adding καὶ μετάθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ βασιλέας ὁ Αἰγυπτιος. This appears to be a conflation of Ch. and K. 1 Esdr. (the original Gr. being preserved in the Alexandrian ms.) supports against the reading of 2 K., but read instead. This is doubtless what the Chronicler wrote, and the king of Egypt removed him from reigning in Jerusalem, so Be., Zoe., Oe., Kau., Ki. Kom., BH., Bn.—2, 3 (Ch.) follows 2 K.—4. τοῖς ὐπερεχόμενοι τοὺς χαλκίους ἄλλους ἐφεξῆς ἦσαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἤλεγχους καὶ ἦσαν δύναμιν τά δύο. (Ch.) has combined the two readings. In the text the conflation is complete. 1 Esdr. has ἵνα ἰσιωθίων instead of ἵνα πρέπει and no notice concerning the change of name, but instead καὶ ἐξόρισεν τοὺς μεγαρχάδες Ἰωακείμ (following the order of words preserved in ποταμοῦ, which is certainly an early misreading of the Athenian name of the king of the Jews which reads οἱ διόνυσοι τοὺς ἐφέκτες τοῦ διόνυσου 2 K. 23* (Ch.) conflates, also adds 2 K. 23* with but slight variations, omitting in reading τοῖς ἰσιωθίων and reading εἰς τοὺς χαλκίους instead of τοὺς χαλκίους. In 1 Esdr. slight changes are introduced in order to harmonise with the misreading of the preceding clause (v. s.), but otherwise it supports.

5-8. The reign of Jehoiakim (608–597 B. C.).—5. Again, as usual, the name of the queen-mother is omitted (2 K. 23*).—6. Nebuchadnessar] a corrupt form of spelling Nebuchadrezzar King of Babylon, 604–561 b. c. This corrupt form is found in 1 and 2 Ch., Ezr., Ne., Est., and a few times in 2 K. and Je, v. BDB. Nebuchadrezzar's father, Nabopolassar, was King of Babylon 625–605 b. c., and on the fall of Nineveh (between 608 and 606) immediately began to extend his empire westward, but the conquest fell largely to his son, who commanded the imperial army at the battle of Carchemish (cf. 35*) 605, where the Egyptians were defeated. Exactly how soon after that event Nebuchadrezzar came up against Jerusalem and compelled the submission of Jehoiakim, is not easy to determine. According to 2 K. 24* it was apparently in 601 or 600 B. C., the usual view. (McCurdy prefers to place it immediately after the battle of
Carchemish, *HPM.* p. 167, likewise Oe.) But after three years Jehoiakim rebelled, and before the Babylonians had subdued his rebellion, died and his son Jehoiachin came to the throne, and after a three months' reign, the city having been besieged and taken, he was carried captive with many others and much treasure to Babylon (2 K. 24:11). In view of these facts the statement *he bound him [Jehoiakim] in fetters to carry him to Babylon* is strange. It has been taken as expressing an intention which was not realised (Be., Ke., Zoe.). *G, II,* render and *he carried him to Babylon,* as though Jehoiakim were held there awhile and then released and permitted to reign again in Jerusalem.—7. The statement of this verse is not supported by anything in 2 K. With the preceding it is without doubt an expression of a tradition, later given in Dn. 1, of an attack upon Jerusalem and the carrying away of a part of the sacred vessels of the Temple during Jehoiakim's reign. The motive for the formation of this tradition, putting the attack in the third year of Jehoiakim (Dn. 1), was because thereby a captivity of seventy years might be obtained. But this early fall of Jerusalem is forbidden by Je. 25:1, and all that is known of the movements of Nebuchadrezzar *v. DB.* I. p. 553.—8. *Book of the kings of Israel and Judah.* See Intro. pp. 22 f.

5. [2 K. 23:1, wanting in 1 Esdr., *cf. v. 2,* wanting in 1 Esdr. 2 K. 23:16 omits, but adds *ידל יוסי וἐν αὐτῷ* with which *G (Ch.)* agrees. The latter also adds at this point a section which varies only slightly from 2 K. 24:1-4, in spite of the fact that v. 4 is dependent on 2 K. 24:1, another case of conflation.—6. [2 K. 24:1, has *בִּיטָשׁ* (Ch.) omits necessarily after its insertion (v. s.).—7. [ עלית חל[ ] *palace* (rather seldom in this sense).—8. [ רֶבֶרְהָאוֹת נַעַר יֶשֶׁבֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל] 2 K. 24:1 (Ch.) + בָּשָׂר הָעָם חַיָּה הַשָּׂר הָעָם — 5 (Ch.) and 2 K. 24:1 + וַיִּשְׁרָתָם וֻזְרָעִים עִם אֵלֶיךָ, which was inserted doubtless from 2 K. 24:1, and as in other cases probably in the underlying Hebrew.—9. [אֲשֶׁר רָאָה יְהוָה] wanting in *G (Ch.)* as also in 2 K.—10. [יָדוֹ] 2 K. 24:1 (Ch.) + וַיִּשְׁרָתָם וֻזְרָעִים עִם אֵלֶיךָ, and the former has the additional clause *kal ἐρήμῳ ἐν Γασσῷ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν,* which must have as the underlying Hebrew *יַעֲבוּר בִּנְיָמִין כִּי אֲנָתָה אֱלֹהֵי בִּנְיָמִין, cf. 2 K. 21:18. *; see Tor. *ATC.* p. 84.—11. [יִשְׂרָיִלְךָ] *Ishiyel,* so also v. 9.

9. 10. The reign of Jehoiachin (three months, 597 B.C.).—9. [Eight] eighteen (2 K. 24:1, *AL,* *G,* Ke., Zoe., Oe., Ba., Ki.). This latter is also favoured by the elegy of Ezekiel over
Jehoiachin (19). Yet the repeated allusions by Jeremiah to the queen-mother suggest that the King was quite a youth (Je. 13. 22 and 29), and it is difficult to think of a motive for shortening the age, hence Be. regards eight as original; and also Bn. as coming from the Chronicler’s forerunner (die Vorlage), and he holds the same also in reference to the ten days which do not appear in 2 K.; yet eighteen is probably correct.—10. And at the return of the year] i.e., in the spring (cf. 1 Ch. 20. 2 S. 11. 1 K. 20). Jehoiakim rebelled probably in the fall and died soon after, and then in the following spring Jehoiachin was deposed. Nebuchadnezzar sent]. In 2 K. 24 it the city is said to have been besieged by the Chaldeans, and Jehoiachin to have surrendered and been taken, with his treasures, and the vessels of the Temple, and the best people of the land, to Babylon. There Jehoiachin remained some thirty-seven years in prison, where he married and begat children (1 Ch. 3).; but at the accession of Evil-Merodach (561 B.C.) he was released from prison and given a place of honour among the captive kings of Babylon (2 K. 25. Je. 52).—His brother], but according to 2 K. 24 Zedekiah was his uncle (cf. 1 Ch. 3).

9. [2 K. 24. The original Greek of both Ch. and 1 Esdr. probably agreed with מ. The addition of the ten days leads to the suspicion that an הָיָה was accidentally omitted after יָשָׁע and later inserted between the lines or on the margin, whence it made its way into the wrong place in the text. יָשָׁע was then added to make the text intelligible. For further discussion v. s.—] 2 K. 24. 10. [2 K. 24 + מָלַא אֶת הָעַנָּה חוֹדֵל מִיתֶּרֶשֶׁל + מָלַא אֶת הָעַנָּה חוֹדֵל מִיתֶּרֶשֶׁל; 2 K. 24. מָלַא אֶת הָעַנָּה חוֹדֵל מִיתֶּרֶשֶׁל; 2 K. 24. wanting in 1 Esdr. The Vrss. seem to be corrections from 2 K.

11–21.—Reign of Zedekiah (597–586 B.C.) and the destruction of Jerusalem.—11. This verse is a copy of 2 K. 24 with the usual omission of the name of the King’s mother, “Hamutal the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah.” Zedekiah was a full brother of Jehoahaz (cf. 2 K. 23) but only a half-brother of Jehoiachin (cf. 2 K. 24).—12. And he did that which was evil in the sight of Yahweh] taken from 2 K. 24. —And he humbled not himself
before Jeremiah] a statement based upon Zedekiah’s attitude to the counsel of Jeremiah respecting the Chaldeans. Jeremiah advised submission. Zedekiah through the opposition of the nobles and vain hopes could not bring himself to this (Je. 21:1-7 34:22 37:10 38:17-28). Yet Zedekiah was not really ill-disposed toward Jeremiah (cf. Je. 37:11 38:19). Neither did Jeremiah speak harshly of him (cf. Je. 34:1).—Out of the mouth of Yahweh]. Thus, according to Jeremiah, came true prophecy (Je. 23:1).—13. And also, etc.] as though rebellion were a sin additional to the refusal to listen to Jeremiah; but the former involved the latter.—Who had made him swear by God]. Zedekiah was placed under an oath of allegiance in the name of Yahweh. On the violation of this oath, cf. Ez. 17:18-21. —He hardened]. The subject is not God but Zedekiah (Be.). —Against returning unto Yahweh the God of Israel]. His violation of his oath and resistance to the advice of Jeremiah are regarded by the writer as apostasy from Yahweh.—14. In this and the following verses the retrospect has been held to extend backward to the reign of Manasseh (Be.), but the conditions were fulfilled during the reign of Zedekiah. A most graphic description of the pollution of the Temple is given in Ez. 8.—15. Sent to them by his messengers rising up early and sending] a form of expression frequent in the Book of Jeremiah (Je. 29:1-35:1 26:1).—16. But they mocked, etc.] accomplished in the treatment of Jeremiah, who was bitterly persecuted, and Uriah, who was put to death (Je. 26:20-21). Other unknown prophets doubtless suffered in the same way, since the reference need not be limited to the reign of Zedekiah. —17. The king of the Chaldeans] Nebuchadrezzar. The original home of the Chaldeans was south-east of Babylonia proper, on the sea-coast, and from thence they pressed into Babylonia, and since Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadrezzar and founder of the new Babylonian dynasty, was of that stock, Chaldea from his time meant Babylonia.—And he slew]. The subject is ambiguous but it is better to make the Chaldean King the subject (Ke., Oe., Ki., EVs.) than God (Be., Zoe.).—In the house of their sanctuary]. The judgment is brought into definite relation with the crime; because they profaned the sanctuary (v. 14) they themselves were slain in the sanctuary (Ke.). Cf. the vision of Ezekiel (9:1-11). The
Temple also was the last refuge or stronghold of the city.—

And his sons] Nebuchadrezzar’s successors. These were Evil-Merodach, Neriglissar, and Nabonidus. The last two were usurpers of a different family from Nebuchadrezzar, although Neriglissar was his son-in-law (EBi. I. col. 452).—Until the reign of the kingdom of Persia] until the conquest of Babylonia by Cyrus in 538.

—21. To fulfil the word by the mouth of Jeremiah the prophet] Je. 25:29, where after seventy years the promise is to punish the King of Babylon and to restore the people of Israel to their own land.—Until the land had enjoyed its Sabbaths] i.e., until the seventy years of the captivity allow the land to enjoy the Sabbaths (the Sabbatical years of rest or non-cultivation), of which the land had been deprived during the previous history of Israel (cf. Lv. 26:34). Hence the Chronicler thought of a period of four hundred and ninety years during which the Sabbatical law (Lv. 25:1-11) had not been observed (from the period of the Judges onward) (Be.), or in view of the God-fearing kings David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, who doubtless observed the law, the four hundred and ninety years must be taken loosely (Zoe., Oe., Ba.). The Chronicler undoubtedly had the notion that “the land obtained rest which the sinful people had deprived it of by their neglect of the Sabbath observance” (Ke.). It must be remembered, however, that the law and notion of the Sabbatical years are in reality of late origin, belonging to P.—Seventy years]. The actual period of the Babylonian captivity was less than this, since the first submission of Judah to the Chaldeans was in 601 or 600 (2 K. 24:1) and the first proper captivity was in the first year of Jehoiachin or Zedekiah, 598 or 597 (2 K. 24:11). The number seventy in the prophecy of Jeremiah was doubtless meant in the first instance to have been taken symbolically. The literalising of it gave rise to the story of the earlier captivity in the third year of Jehoiakim (Dn. 1:1) (v. s.).
22. 23. The decree of Cyrus.—These verses are also in Ezr. 11-12. They are not the proper close of a history, but the introduction; hence their true place is in Ezr. 11-12. 1 and 2 Chronicles originally formed with Ezra one work, and in the separation this paragraph was allowed to remain in each either by chance, or as an evidence that the two writings were originally one, or, with less probability, it may have been appended to 2 Chronicles to give a more hopeful close to the book (even as 2 Kings closes with a notice of the release of Jehoiachin).

22. First year] 538 B.C.; the date is taken from his rule in Babylon (Noeldeke, Aufsätze sur pers. Gesch. 22 a. 1).—Word of Yahweh by the mouth of Jeremiah] his prophecy of the seventy years of captivity followed by a restoration (Je. 2910).—Yahweh stirred up the spirit of Cyrus]. Cf. the promises, Is. 4110 4410 45111. —23. This is the Chronicler’s version of the decree, since Cyrus King of Persia is not the official designation of Cyrus (Dr. LOT, pp. 545f.; Weissbach, ZDMG. 51, pp. 662f.), nor is there any likelihood that he would thus have acknowledged Yahweh. The historicity indeed of any decree on the part of Cyrus for the return and rebuilding of the Temple has been questioned (see Sm. OT. Hist. pp. 344 ff.). (Torrey in his Ezra Studies rejects entirely the historicity of the decree.)

ADDENDA.

In the Introduction, pp. 23 f., it is said that the Vision of Isaiah is expressly mentioned as in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel. This is true according to ¶¶, 2 Ch. 32 f.; but the text there should probably be emended (v. pp. 493 f.), in which case the Vision of Isaiah, in all likelihood, means the canonical Book of Isaiah. This latter view is given on p. 493.

The section 1 Ch. 1–9 requires a few further words of introduction. The genealogical tables serve to bridge the period of Israel’s history from the creation of man to the time of David—a period which the Chronicler doubtless thought had been sufficiently treated from his own point of view in the canonical books. This method of bridging with lists of names or lines of descent was derived from the priestly portion of the Pentateuch where it appears in Gn. 5 and 11 in the genealogies connecting Adam and Shem, and Shem and Abram. These tables also served to explain the origins and relations of peoples, communities, and families. This was largely the purpose of the original record of those derived from Genesis. They arose under the conception that historical beginnings were in the form of family life, and they embodied commingled geographical, racial, political, and chronological relationships.

But these are by no means the only reasons for these tables. A leading motive for their composition must be found in the stress laid during the period of the Chronicler upon purity of descent. A sharp line was then drawn between the Jews and the other peoples of Palestine, with whom union by marriage had become a grievous trespass (cf. Ezr. 9. 10). Certain families, we are also told, were debarred from the office of the priesthood because they could not furnish genealogical registers (Ezr. 2 f. Ne. 7 f.). Hence a genealogy must have been a most valued asset for an
individual, family, or even community; and to provide genealogies or a basis for them for his contemporaries was probably in the mind of the Chronicler when he compiled these tables. Jews claiming descent from any particular tribe or clan, especially from Levi, Jerahmeel, and Caleb, of whom the genealogies are quite full, and men of Ono and Lod and of other towns which are mentioned, and the families of Jerusalem, doubtless received his information with eagerness and favour. These tables, we may believe, were choice literature to them, even as at present the records of colonial families are to many persons in New England.

ERRATA

On p. 124 for שִׁבְיוֹל, and וַעֲבֹר for וַעֲבֹרָה.
INDEXES.

I. ENGLISH.

Aaron, sons of, 127, 269.
Abiathar, 213, 270, 294 f.
Abi-mayim, 379.
Abijah, 10, 369; address of, 375 f.; reign of, 373 f.
Abiram, Abraham, 70 f.; descendants of, 71 f., 77.
Adam, 58.
Adoniram, 364.
Adullam, 188, 366.
Ahab, 416.385, 414, 416.
Ahaz, 12; idolatry of, 461; reign of, 455 f.
Ahaziah, 11; reign of, 418 f.
Ahithophel, 294 f.
Aijalon, 161, 366, 460.
Alamot, 216.
Alemeth, 138, 146, 159.
Algum-trees, 321, 357.
Altar of Temple, 330, 336.
Amalek, 74, 234.
Amaria, 12; reign of, 440 f.
Ammon, campaigns against, 237 f.
Amorite, 64.
Arabians, 15, 383, 394, 417, 419, 449.
Arphachshad, 66, 70.
Asa, 10, 378, 416; reign of, 380 ff.; reforms of, 384 ff.; war with Baasha, 387 ff.; victory over Zerah, 382 f.
Asahel, 88, 191, 290, 482.
Asaph, 130, 134 f., 220, 339, 408; sons of, 275 f.
Ashdod, 449.
Asher, genealogy of, 155 f.
Asherah, 386.
Asherim, 381, 401, 437, 478, 495 f., 500, 503 f.
Ashhur, 90, 92 f., 106.
Ashkenaz, 61.
Ashtaroth, 142.
Asshur, 66.
Atarah, 93.
Aothah, 11 f., 163, 435; death of, 430; usurpation of, 418, 422 f.
Azariah, 480; exhortation of, 384.
Azmaveth, 166, 196, 293.
Baalah, 205.
Baal-perazim, 208 f.
Baasha, 378, 387 ff.
Bashan, 121 ff.
Behail, 196.
Becher, 146, 157 f.
Beersheba, 114, 247, 403, 472.
Benaiah, 189 f., 216, 236, 290, 482.
Benjamin, genealogy of, 147, 156 ff.; sons of, 171; recruits from, 198.
Beriah, 154 f., 101, 264.
Bethel, 377.
Beth-horon, 141, 154, 353, 443.
Bethlechem, 97, 106, 188, 366.
Beth-shan, 154 ff.
Beth-zur, 96, 366.
Bilhah, 114.
Binders, 256.
Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, 22, 446, 454, 493, 518, 521.
Calves, golden, 368.
Candlesticks, 299, 332, 336.
Caphurim, 64.
Carchemish, battle of, 516, 520.
Caterpillar, 344.
Chaldea, 523.
Chaldeans, 522 f.
Chariots, 233 f., 318.
Cherubim, 299, 327.
Chronicles, date of, 5 f.; diction of, 27 ff.; Hebrew text, 36 f.; higher criticism of, 44 f.; literature of, 44 f.; name of, 1 f.; order of, 1 f.; plan, purpose, and historical value of, 6 f.; relation to Ezra and Nehemiah, 2 f.; religious value of, 16 f.; sources of, 17 f.; versions of, 37 f.
Cush, 62 f.
Cushites, 371, 383, 417.
Covenant, 511.
Cymbals, 215, 276.
Cyrus, decree of, 525.

Dagon, 182.
Dan, 247, 472; genealogy of, 150.
David, 324, 345, 414, 441, 468; administrative officers of, 236 f., 292; appeal for offerings, 301; ancestry of, 87 f.; army of, 290; buys Ornan’s floor, 252 f.; capture of Jerusalem by, 185 ff.; campaigns against Ammon, 237 f.; census of, 245 ff.; charge to Solomon, 257; descendants of, 99 f.; foreign wars of, 232 ff.; last acts of, 260 ff.; last assembly of, 295 f.; made king, 184 ff.; mighty men of, 186 ff.; Nathan’s message to, 226 f.; plans of Temple given to Solomon by, 298; prayer of thanksgiving, 229; preparation for the Temple by, 255 f.; sons of, 13, 99, 208, 237; victories over Philistines, 208 ff.
Deuteronomy found, 508.

Eber, 68, 70, 122.
Edom, 71, 74 f., 405, 412; campaign against, 442 f.; conquest of, 234 f.; revolt of, 415; kings of, 77 f.; tribal chiefs of, 78 f.
Egypt, 62 ff., 519; brook of, 349.
Ehud, 146; descendants of, 158 f.
Elam, 66, 283.
Elath, Ethol, 110, 355, 448, 457, 459.
Elhanan, 197, 243.
Eliehoeai, 283.
Elijah, letter of, 415 f.
Elishasha, pedigree of, 94 f., 99.
Elizaphan, 213.
Elkanah, 216.
Elpaal, 160, 163.
Enchantments, 496.

Enosh, 58.
Ephod, 218.
Ephraim, genealogy of, 153 f.
Esau, 74.
Eshtemoa, 111, 138.
Etam, 105, 115, 366.
Ezion-geber, 355, 359, 413.

FEAST OF DEDICATION, THE, 348 f.

GAASH, BROOKS OF, 191.
Gad, sons of, 121 f.
Gad (prophet), commission of, 250.
Gate-keepers, 5, 173 f., 215; appointments of, 284 f.; genealogies of, 282 f.
Gath, 232, 366, 449.
Gedor, 105, 106, 111, 196.
Ge-harashim, 109.
Genealogies, primeval, 55.
Gerar, 116, 383.
Gershon, 127 f., 263 f.
Geshur, 91.
Gibeon, 163, 210, 225, 315 f.
Giloh, 486, 492.
Gilead, 91, 120, 122 f., 288 f., 292.
Girgashites, 64.
Goliath, 13, 243.
Gomer, 60.
Gozan, 126.

Habiri, 155.
Habor, 126.
Hadad, 72, 77, 78.
Hadramaut, 68 f.
Hagrites, 15, 120, 123.
Hakkaz, 271.
Ham, 59, 116; descendants of, 62 ff., 69.
Hamath, 65, 205, 233, 234, 352.
Hammon, 142.
Hamuel, 114.
Hamul, 84.
Hanani, 277, 389, 411.
Hanech, 58 f., 73.
Haran, 96, 264.
Hashubah, 102.
Havilah, 62, 69.
Hazael, 420.
Hazar-susim, 115.
Hazon-tamar, 405 f.
Heber, 111, 155.
Hebron, 70, 137 f., 213, 366; family of, 128; hosts at, 200 f.; sons of, 95.
| He-goats, 368. | Jehoiachin, 100 ff.; reign of, 521 ff. |
| Hezron, 84, 86 f., 92. | Jehoiahim, reign of, 520 f. |
| Hezekiah, 12, 117; celebration of | Jehoiada, 190, 201, 290, 295, 422, |
| Passover by, 471 ff.; opening of | 428, 430, 433; covenant of, 431. |
| the Temple by, 463; reign of, 462 | Jehoshaphat, 10 f., 236, 416; army |
| ff.; sickness of, 490 f.; wealth of, | of, 393 ff.; alliance with Abad, |
| 491. | 395 ff.; fleet of, 412; judiciary of, |
| Hezronites, 86. | 402 ff.; prayer of, 406 f.; reign of, |
| High places, 367 ff., 500. | 391 ff.; victory of, 404 ff. |
| Hillkiah, 502 ff. | Jehoram (Joram), 11; reign of, 413 |
| Hinnom, valley of, 456. | ff. |
| Hiram, 321 f., 355; answer of, 322; | Jehu, 411, 421 f. |
| exchange of cities with, 351 f.; | Jehu (prophet), 401. |
| Solomon's message to, 320. | Jerahmeel, 82, 87, 93, 272, 274. |
| Hiram (artisan), 322, 334. | Jerahmeelites, families of, 93 ff. |
| Hittites, 64, 319. | Jeremuth, 266. |
| Hivites, 64. | Jericho, 238, 459. |
| Holy place, the most, 326. | Jeroboam, 123, 373, 377; army of, |
| Horses, 319. | 374. |
| Host of heaven, worship of, 495. | Jerusalem, 207, 208, 239, 372, 512, |
| Huldah, 500 f. | 519, 521; destruction of, 522 ff.; |
| Hur, 90, 92, 105 f. | inhabitants of, 167 ff.; judiciary of, |
| Huram, 321. | 403 f. |
| Huram-abi, 322. | Jesse, family of, 88. |
| Images, 503. | Joab, 88, 109, 185, 236, 239 ff., 247 |
| Insignia of royalty, 428. | f., 287, 294. |
| Isaac, 71, 74. | Joash, 11; apostasy of, 437 ff.; coro- |
| Isaiah, vision of, 22, 493; writing of, | nation of, 424; reign of, 423 ff. |
| 22, 453. | Joktan, 68. |
| Ishboseth, 105. | Josiah, 12, 100; accession, 503; celeb- |
| Ishmael, 71, 166. | ration of the Passover, 512 ff.; law-book |
| Israel, 74; sons of, 81 f. | discovered, 508 ff.; reformation of, 503 ff.; |
| Issachar, 202, 475; genealogy of, | repair of Temple, 505 ff. |
| 144 f. | Jotham, 123; reign of, 454. |
| Jabez, 98, 107. | Judah, genealogies of, 82 ff., 104 ff.; |
| Jabneh, 449. | immigration to, 367; recruits from, 198; |
| Jacob, 74; descendants of, 80 f. | sons of, 84 f. |
| Japheth, 60; descendants of, 60 f., 69. | Kedar, 71. |
| Jared, 58. | Kedesh, 142. |
| Jattir, 138. | Kehath, 128, 211, 263, 264; sons of, |
| Javan, 60 f. | 408. |
| Jebusites, 64, 185, 251. | Kenan, 58. |
| Jeduthun, 220, 225, 276, 281, 339; | Kenites, 98. |
| sons of, 277. | Keturah, 71 f. |
| Jeduthun, 220, 225, 276, 281, 339; | Kiriath-jearim, 97, 204, 205. |
| sons of, 277. | Kittim, 61. |
| Jeduthun, 220, 225, 276, 281, 339; | Korah, 74 f., 95, 282; sons of, 408. |
| sons of, 277. | Korahites, 196, 284 f. |
INDEX

LACHISH, 366, 447, 487.
Ladan, 203; sons of, 286.
Lahmi, 13, 243.
Lamech, 59.
Lavers, 331 f.
Law, book of, 393; teaching, 393.
Law-book, discovery of, 508; reading of, 511.
Levites, 172, 219 f., 376, 435, 469 f.; appointed for service, 225; teachers, 393, 512 f.; guards of the Temple, 425; cities of, 140 ff.; 204; heads of, 261, 203 f.; lists of, 272 ff.; organisation of, 478; support of, 479 ff.
Lotan, 75.
Lubim, 371, 389.
Lud, 60.
Ludim, 63.
MAACAH, 96, 151 f., 292, 369, 374, 386.
Machir, 91, 151.
Magog, 60.
Mahalalel, 58.
Mahanaim, 143.
Mahli, 265, 274.
Malchiel, 155.
Manasseh (tribe), 123 ff., 471, 475, 504; genealogy of, 150 ff.; recruits from, 190.
Manasseh (king), captivity and restoration of, 497 f.; idolatry of, 495; reign of, 494 ff.
Maon, 96.
Mareshah, 95, 366, 383, 413.
Mattan, 431.
Megiddo, battle of, 517 f.
Merari, 128, 263; sons of, 274, 506.
Meri-baal, 165.
Merodach-baladan, 492.
Meshech, 60, 67.
Methushelah, 59.
Meunim, 15, 117, 405, 449.
Micaiah, prophecy of, 397 f.
Michael, 122.
Midian, 73.
Midrash, 22 f., 378, 449, 458.
Milcom, 242.
Millo, 185, 487.
Miriam, 111.
Moab, Moabites, 113, 232 ff., 405 ff.
Moriah, 324.
Moses, 130, 136, 265; tax of, 435.
Mt. Gilboa, battle of, 180 ff.
Musha, 274; sons of, 266.
Musical instruments, 215 ff., 276, 468.
Musicians, see Singers.
Muzri, 319.
Nabopolassar, 520, 523.
Nahor, 70.
Naphtali, genealogy of, 150.
Nathan, 226 f., 257, 308, 360, 468.
Nebaioth, 71 f.
Nebuchadnezzar, 520 ff.
Neco, 516 ff.
Nethinim, 170.
Netophah, 173.
Nimrod, 63.
Noah, 59; descendants of, 77.
Nebaloth, 71 f.
Offerings, burnt, 467 f., 514; drink, 470; freewill, 482; holy, 514; public, 478; sin, 467 f.; thank, 469.
Ohel, 102.
Omri, 146, 292, 419.
Onan, 84.
Ono, 160 f., 163.
Ophel, 454.
Ophir, 68 f., 355, 359.
Oran, 251 f., 324.
Othniel, 108 f., 290.
PALMYRA, 353.
Parbar, 285.
Parwaim, 325.
Passover, 470 ff., 512 ff.
Patriarchs, antediluvian, 58 ff.
Pedaiah, 101, 103, 292.
Pelatiah, 102.
Peleg, 68, 70.
Pelet, 96, 196.
Pelath, 94.
Philistines, 63 f., 209, 417, 449; champions of, 243.
Pillars, 381; before the Temple, 328 f.; sun pillars, 382, 504.
INDEX

Priests, cities of, 137 ff.; courses of, 269 ff.; in Jerusalem, 171 f.; list of, 127 ff., 137; organisation of, 269, 478; support of, 479 ff.

Princes, tribal, 291 f.

Prophets, 13, 397.

Prophetess, 510.

Psalteries, 215 f.

Pul, 125.

Ram, 71, 82, 87, 93.

Ramoth-gilead, 396.

Rechab, 98.

Rehoboam, 10; cities of, 366 ff.; dissuaded from attacking Israel, 365; family of, 368 f.; reign of, 362 ff.

Reuben, 118 ff.; 123 ff.

Reuel, 74 f.

Rodanim, 61.

Saba, 62.

Sabteca, 63.

Sacrifice, human, 457.

Salt, covenant of, 375; Valley of, 335, 443.

Samuel, 184, 308, 515.

Sarah, 71 f.

Satan, 240, 298.

Saul, 195, 199, 287; death of, 181 ff.; genealogy of, 185, 179.

Scorpions, 363.

Sea, the brazen, 331, 334.

Seer, 13, 308.

Segub, 91.

Seir, 74 f., 405.

Semites, 65 f.

Sennacherib, invasion of, 485 ff.

Servant of the king, 509.

Set, 58.

Shallum, 100, 510.

Shammah, 75, 88.

Shaphan, 122, 502, 505, 508.

Shealtiel, 101, 103.

Sheba, 63, 68, 73, 122; Queen of, 356 f.

Sheelah, 293.

Shelah, 67, 70, 105, 113; sons of, 112 f.

Shem, 59, 70; descendants of, 65 ff., 69.

Shenazzar, 101, 103.

Sheshan, 94.

Shields, 372, 382, 400, 492.

Shishak, invasion of, 370 f.

Shobal, 75, 97; sons of, 105.

Shubael, 265, 272, 277 f.

Sijppim, 150, 152.

Simeon, 385, 504; conquests of, 116 ff.; genealogy of, 114 ff.; princes of, 116 ff.

Singers, 5, 133 ff., 339, 506; as scholars, 279; before the ark, 215 ff., 220; courses of, 275 ff., 281; families of, 276 ff.

Soco, 111, 366, 460.

Sojourners, 255 f.

Solomon, 9, 14, 99 f., 244 f., 256 f., 260 f., 296 f., 300, 313, 513; accession, 306 f.; acts, 351 ff.; address of, 340 ff.; appointments of, 354; bondservants of, 353; cities built by, 352 f.; cities exchanged with Hiram, 351 f.; history of, 313 ff.; levies of, 322 f.; made king, 261; ministrations at the altar, 354; prayer of dedication, 342 f.; promise at Gibeon, 315; sacrifices of, 348; trade at Ophir, 355; vision of, 349.

Sorcery, 496.

Spear, 201.

Sukkot, 371.

Sycomore-trees, 293, 318.

Syria, 319, 461; invasion from, 438, 457 f.

TABLE-LAND, 450.

Tables, 333, 336; in the ark, 338.

Tadmor, 352 f.

Tarshish, 61, 146, 148, 412 f.

Tekoa, 92, 106, 366; wilderness of, 409.

Tema, 72.

Teman, 74.

Temple, age for service in, 266 f.; building of, 244, 320; cleansing of, 465 f.; completion of, 355; cost of, 258; courts of, 335; date of, 324; dimensions of, 324 ff.; furniture of, 330 ff., 335 f.; guard of, 424 ff.; material for, 258; oversight by Levites, 262; place of, 324; plans, given to Solomon, 298; pillars before the, 328 f.; preparations for, by David, 255 f.; by Solomon, 320 ff.; renewal of worship in, 467 f.; reopening of, 463 f.; repairs of, 434 ff., 505; servants of, 245; workmen of, 258.
INDEX

Terah, 70.
Tiglath-pileser, 119, 124, 126, 459 f., 473.
Togarmah, 61.
Tola, 144 f.
Trumpets, 216, 339, 465.
Uz, 67.
Uzal, 68 f.
Uzza, 206.
Uzziah, 12, 448; accession of, 447; death of, 453; leprosy of, 452; prosperity of, 449; sons of, 274.
Uzziel, 213, 215, 277, 466.

Virgin's Spring, 486.

Yahweh, angel of, 488; camp of, 478.

Zadok, 128 f., 201, 213, 454, 480.
Zebulun, 473, 475; genealogy of 145 ff.
Zedekiah, reign of, 522 f.
Zemarites, 65.
Zerah (clan), 75, 84, 170.
Zerah the Cushite, 382 f.
Zerubbabel, 101 f.
Ziklag, 115, 195, 199.
Zorah, 366.
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(Compare also pages 28-36.)
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**Numbers.** By the Rev. G. Buchanan Gray, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford.

"Most Bible readers have the impression that 'Numbers' is a dull book only relieved by the brilliancy of the Balaam chapters and some snatches of old Hebrew songs, but, as Prof. Gray shows with admirable skill and insight, its historical and religious value is not that which lies on the surface. Prof. Gray's Commentary is distinguished by fine scholarship and sanity of judgment; it is impossible to commend it too warmly."—Saturday Review (London).

Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.

**Deuteronomy.** By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

"It is a pleasure to see at last a really critical Old Testament commentary in English upon a portion of the Pentateuch, and especially one of such merit. This I find superior to any other Commentary in any language upon Deuteronomy."

Professor E. L. Curtis, of Yale University.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.

**Judges.** By Rev. George Foot Moore, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in Harvard University.

"The work is done in an atmosphere of scholarly interest and indifference to dogmatism and controversy, which is at least refreshing. . . . It is a noble introduction to the moral forces, ideas and influences that controlled the period of the Judges, and a model of what a historical commentary, with a practical end in view, should be."

—The Independent.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.


"Professor Smith's Commentary will for some time be the standard work on Samuel, and we heartily congratulate him on scholarly work so faithfully accomplished."—The Athenaum.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.
The International Critical Commentary

VOLUMES NOW READY

The Book of Psalms. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D.,
D.Litt., Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopedia and Symbolics,
Union Theological Seminary, New York, and Emilie Grace Briggs, B.D.

"Christian scholarship seems here to have reached the highest level yet
attained in study of the book which in religious importance stands next
to the Gospels. His work upon it is not likely to be excelled in learning,
both massive and minute, by any volume of the International Series, to
which it belongs."—The Outlook.

2 Volumes. Crown 8vo. Price, $3.00 each net.

Proverbs. By the Rev. Crawford H. Toy, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Hebrew in Harvard University.

"This volume has the same characteristics of thoroughness and pains-
taking scholarship as the preceding issues of the series. In the critical
treatment of the text, in noting the various readings and the force of
the words in the original Hebrew, it leaves nothing to be desired.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.

Amos and Hosea. By William Rainey Harper, Ph.D., LL.D.,
late Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature and President of the
University of Chicago.

"He has gone, with characteristic minuteness, not only into the analysis
and discussion of each point, endeavoring in every case to be thoroughly
exhaustive, but also into the history of exegesis and discussion. Nothing
at all worthy of consideration has been passed by. The consequence is
that when one carefully studies what has been brought together in this
volume, either upon some passage of the two prophets treated, or upon
some question of critical or antiquarian importance in the introductory
portion of the volume, one feels that he has obtained an adequately
exhaustive view of the subject."—The Interior.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.

Esther. By L. B. Paton, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Hartford
Theological Seminary.

This scholarly and critical commentary on the Book of Esther presents
in full the remarkable additions to the Massoretic text and the varia-
tions in the various versions beginning with the Greek translation and
continuing through the Vulgate and Peshitto down to the Talmud and
Targums. These are not given in full in any other commentary, yet
they are very important both for the history of the text and the history
of the exegesis.

Crown 8vo. $2.25 net.
VOLUMES NOW READY

Ecclesiastes. By GEORGE A. BARTON, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Bryn Mawr College, Pa.

"It is a relief to find a commentator on Ecclesiastes who is not endeavoring to defend some new theory. This volume, in the International Commentary series, treats the book in a scholarly and sensible fashion, presenting the conclusions of earlier scholars together with the author's own, and providing thus all the information that any student needs."
—The Congregationalist.
Crown 8vo. $2.25 net.


"As a microscopic and practically exhaustive study and itemized statement of the probable or possible sources of the Synoptic Gospels and of their relations, one to another, this work has not been surpassed. I doubt if it has been equaled. And the author is not by any means lacking in spiritual insight."
—The Methodist Review (Nashville).
Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.


"The whole make-up is that of a thoroughly helpful, instructive critical study of the Word, surpassing anything of the kind ever attempted in the English language, and to students and clergymen knowing the proper use of a commentary it will prove an invaluable aid."
—The Lutheran Quarterly.
Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.


"We are pleased with the thoroughness and scientific accuracy of the interpretations. . . . It seems to us that the prevailing characteristic of the book is common sense, fortified by learning and piety."
—The Herald and Presbyter.
Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.


"We do not hesitate to commend this as the best commentary on Romans yet written in English. It will do much to popularize this admirable and much needed series, by showing that it is possible to be critical and scholarly and at the same time devout and spiritual, and intelligible to plain Bible readers."
—The Church Standard.
Crown 8vo. $3.00 net.
Ephesians and Colossians. By the Rev. T. K. Abbott, D.D.,
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discussions of the contents of these Epistles."—Dr. George P. Fisher.
Crown 8vo. $2.00 net.

St. Peter and St. Jude. By the Rev. Charles Bigg, D.D.,
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THEOLOGY has made great and rapid advances in recent years. New lines of investigation have been opened up, fresh light has been cast upon many subjects of the deepest interest, and the historical method has been applied with important results. This has prepared the way for a Library of Theological Science, and has created the demand for it. It has also made it at once opportune and practicable now to secure the services of specialists in the different departments of Theology, and to associate them in an enterprise which will furnish a record of Theological inquiry up to date.

This Library is designed to cover the whole field of Christian Theology. Each volume is to be complete in itself, while, at the same time, it will form part of a carefully planned whole. One of the Editors is to prepare a volume of Theological Encyclopædia which will give the history and literature of each department, as well as of Theology as a whole.
The International Theological Library

The Library is intended to form a series of Text-Books for Students of Theology.

The Authors, therefore, aim at conciseness and compactness of statement. At the same time, they have in view that large and increasing class of students, in other departments of inquiry, who desire to have a systematic and thorough exposition of Theological Science. Technical matters will therefore be thrown into the form of notes, and the text will be made as readable and attractive as possible.

The Library is international and interconfessional. It will be conducted in a catholic spirit, and in the interests of Theology as a science.

Its aim will be to give full and impartial statements both of the results of Theological Science and of the questions which are still at issue in the different departments.

The Authors will be scholars of recognized reputation in the several branches of study assigned to them. They will be associated with each other and with the Editors in the effort to provide a series of volumes which may adequately represent the present condition of investigation, and indicate the way for further progress.

Charles A. Briggs
Stewart D. F. Salmond
The International Theological Library

Arrangement of Volumes and Authors

Theological Encyclopædia. By Charles A. Briggs, D.D., D.Litt., Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.


Old Testament History. By Henry Preserved Smith, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, Meadville, Pa. [Now Ready.]


An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. By Rev. James Moffatt, B.D., Minister United Free Church, Dundonald, Scotland.


Theology of the New Testament. By George B. Stevens, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [Now Ready.]


The Early Latin Church. [Author to be announced later]
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THE LATER LATIN CHURCH. [Author to be announced later.]

THE GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES. By W. F. Adeney, D.D., Principal of Independent College, Manchester. [Now Ready]

THE REFORMATION. By T. M. Lindsay, D.D., Principal of the United Free College, Glasgow. [2 vols. Now Ready]

CHRISTIANITY IN LATIN COUNTRIES SINCE THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. By Paul Sabatier, D.Litt.

SYMBOLICS. By Charles A. Briggs, D.D., D.Litt., Professor of Theological Encyclopaedia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By G. P. Fisher, D.D., L.L.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [Revised and Enlarged Edition.]


PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By Robert Flint, D.D., L.L.D., sometime Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. By George F. Moore, D.D., L.L.D., Professor in Harvard University.

APOLOGETICS. By A. B. Bruce, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. [Revised and Enlarged Edition.]

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD. By William N. Clarke, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Hamilton Theological Seminary. [Now Ready.]

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN. By William P. Paterson, D.D., Professor of Divinity, University of Edinburgh.

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST. By H. R. Mackintosh, Ph.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, New College, Edinburgh.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SALVATION. By George B. Stevens, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University. [Now Ready.]

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By William Adams Brown, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By Newman Smyth, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, New Haven. [Revised and Enlarged Edition.]

THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR AND THE WORKING CHURCH. By Washington Gladden, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio. [Now Ready.]


RABBINICAL LITERATURE. By S. Schechter, M.A., President of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.

OTHER VOLUMES WILL BE ANNOUNCED LATER.
The International Theological Library

VOLUMES NOW READY


"As a whole there is probably no book in the English Language equal to this 'Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,' for the student who desires to understand what the modern criticism thinks about the Bible."—Dr. Lyman Abbott, in The Outlook.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.


"The clearness, self-consistency, and force of the whole impression of Apostolic Christianity with which we leave this book goes far to guarantee its permanent value and success."—The Expositor.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

Christian Ethics. By Newman Smyth, D.D.

"As this book is the latest, so it is the fullest and most attractive treatment of the subject that we are familiar with. Patient and exhaustive in its method of inquiry, and stimulating and suggestive in the topic it handles, we are confident that it will be a help to the task of the moral understanding and interpretation of human life."—The Living Church.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

Apologetics; or, Christianity Defensively Stated. By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D.D.

"We have not for a long time taken a book in hand that is more stimulating to faith. . . . Without commenting further, we repeat that this volume is the ablest, most scholarly, most advanced, and sharpest defence of Christianity that has ever been written. No theological library should be without it."—Zion's Herald.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

Old Testament History. By Henry Preserved Smith, D.D.

"Prof. Smith has, by his comprehensive and vitalized history, laid all who care for the Old Testament under great obligations."—The Independent.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.
VOLUMES NOW READY


"It is a fine example of painstaking, discriminating, impartial research and statement." — The Congregationalist. Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.


"It is only just to say that Dr. Fisher has produced the best History of Doctrine that we have in English." — The New York Evangelist. Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

The Christian Pastor and the Working Church.

By Washington Gladden, D.D., LL.D.

"A comprehensive, inspiring and helpful guide to a busy pastor. One finds in it a multitude of practical suggestions for the development of the spiritual and working life of the Church, and the answer to many problems that are a constant perplexity to the faithful minister." — The Christian Intelligencer. Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

Christian Institutions.

By Alexander V. B. Allen, D.D.

"Professor Allen's Christian Institutions may be regarded as the most important permanent contribution which the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has yet made to general theological thought." — The American Journal of Theology. Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.


"We hope every clergyman will not rest content until he has procured and studied this most admirable and useful book. Every really useful question relating to man—his nature, his fall, and his redemption, his present life or grace, his life after death, his future life, is treated of." — The Canadian Churchman. Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

The Christian Doctrine of Salvation.

By George B. Stevens, D.D., LL.D.

"Professor Stevens has performed a task of great importance, certain to exert wide and helpful influence in settling the minds of men. He has treated the subject historically and has given to Christ the first place in interpreting his own mission." — Congregationalist and Christian World. Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.
VOLUMES NOW READY

The Ancient Catholic Church. By Robert Rainy, D.D., LL.D.

"As a comprehensive work on the formative stage of the Church's experience the volume will easily find its place in the front rank among books on the subject composed in the English language."—The Interior.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

The Reformation in Germany. By Thomas M. Lindsay, M.A., D.D.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

The Reformation in Lands Beyond Germany. By Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D.

"Together these two volumes will at once take their place as the classical English History of the Reformation."—The Expository Times.

"The good balance of material which he has attained by a self-denying exclusion, as well as by much research and inclusion of fresh material, makes the work a real addition to our materials for study."

—The Congregationalist.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.


"The book is a treasury of learning, and its fairness in dealing with the matter in hand is admirable. From first to last, the purpose of the author is not to show upon how slight basis our confidence in the canonicity of the New Testament is based, but rather upon how solid a foundation our confidence rests."—Journal and Messenger.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.


"It seems to me an excellent and most useful piece of work. I do not know anything in English which covers the same ground and am sure Dr. Adeney has put us all in his debt by his scholarly, well-balanced and judicious treatment."—Prof. William Adams Brown.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net.

The Christian Doctrine of God. By William N. Clarke, D.D.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 net. Postage Additional.
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