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THE aim of the present work is to provide a critical and grammatical commentary upon the Hebrew text of Kings, after the model of Dr. Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. In writing the Notes, the needs of beginners in the study of the Hebrew language have been prominent in my mind, and so I have endeavoured to deal with some fulness with questions of grammar, while at the same time making reference to the best authorities upon the subject. For the purposes of textual criticism it has seemed worth while to utilize as largely as might be the evidence of the Versions. Thus, as far as possible, all variants and additions of the Versions have been cited, where it may reasonably be supposed that these form original elements of the text from which the Version in question was made; upon the view that such readings are worthy of record, even where no definite verdict can be passed as to their value in relation to the Massoretic text. The structure of Kings, and the characteristics of the various sources of the work, have also been dealt with in brief. The Appendix contains the more important contemporary inscriptions which throw light upon the narrative of Kings.

In making use of the work of my predecessors in the same field, I trust that I have in every case made acknowledgement of my obligations. I feel, however, that special acknowledgement is due to Prof. B. Stade for the
debt which these Notes owe to his valuable articles on
the text of Kings which have appeared from time to time
in the Zeitschrift of which he is the editor. Lest it should
be thought that in places I have drawn too largely upon
his arguments and results, it must be pleaded that in such
cases my aim has been to place these results within the
reach of English students, for whom too often, through
ignorance of German, they are inaccessible.

It is a special pleasure to me to express my gratitude
to Dr. Driver. To his teaching and example is due most
of what may be of value in this book; and I have never
been without his kindly encouragement and ready sugges-
tion upon points of difficulty.

In conclusion, my thanks are due to Mr. J. C. Pembrey, M.A.,
Oriental Reader at the University Press, for the great pains
which he has taken in revising and passing the sheets for
the press.

C. F. B.

S. John's College, Oxford,

November, 1902.
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INTRODUCTION

§ 1. Structure of Kings.

The fact that Kings, like the other historical books of the Old Testament, is based upon pre-existing written sources is universally recognized; and the evidence upon which this elementary proposition is based need not here be set forth. That the main editor or compiler of these sources was a Deuteronomist, i.e. that his work was inspired by the religious revival which took place in the eighteenth year of Josiah (B.C. 621) under the influence of the newly discovered book of Deuteronomy, appears both from his religious standpoint and from his phraseology. This editor is therefore hereinafter cited under the symbol R⁰ (Deuteronomist Redactor).

To R⁰ is due the stereotyped form into which the introduction and conclusion of a reign is thrown, and which constitutes, as it were, the framework upon which the narrative as a whole is built. The regularity of the method of R⁰ in the construction of this framework is worthy of special notice. The form in which the account of a reign is introduced is as follows. For kings of Judah:—1. A synchronism of the year of accession with the corresponding reigning year of the contemporary king of Israel, probably calculated by R⁰ himself. This, commencing with Abijah, naturally ceases with Hezekiah, upon the fall of the kingdom of Israel. 2. Age of the king at accession. 3. Length of his reign. 4. Name of the queen-mother. This, together with 2, 3, is drawn from the Annals (משלי דברי הימים) which are so constantly cited by R⁰. 5. A brief verdict upon the king’s character, framed in accordance with the Deuteronomist standard. For kings of Israel:—1. A synchronism of the year of accession

1 Cf. the writer's article in Hastings, BD. pp. 857 f.
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with the corresponding reigning year of the contemporary king of Judah. 2. Length of the king’s reign, drawn from the Annals. 3. A brief verdict as to his character, always unfavourable, and generally consisting of two parts: a. Statement of the general fact that he did evil in the sight of Yahwe; b. More special mention of his following the sins of Jeroboam 1. The conclusion of the account of a reign takes the following form:—1. An indication of the principal source employed by R0, containing further details as to the king in question. Usually we read 2:—

1 The usual formula is as follows:—
He did not depart from
He walked after (in) the sins of J.
He clave to
He walked in the way of J. and in his sin (sins)

So I. 16. 26 (Nadab), v. 34 (Ba’asha), 16. 26 (Omri), II. 8. 3 (Jehoram), 10. 31, cf. v. 29 (Jehu), 13. 2 (Jehoash), v. 11 (Jehoash), 14. 24 (Jeroboam II), 16. 9 (Zechariah), v. 18 (Menahem), v. 24 (Pekahiah), v. 28 (Pekah). In all these cases the antecedent of the relative follows almost the same terms; cf. II. 17. 21. I. 16. 30 (Ahah), II. 17. 22 ‘he did evil without’ sin, referring to sins of Jeroboam, and in II. 21. 17 of Manasseh (Ezra 18:18) are spoken of in the same terms.

2 When further details, general or special, are mentioned as existing in the source, these usually stand immediately after sin (sins); e.g. I. 11. 41 Omri, and precedes.

Slight variations of the stereotyped form are:—

1. ‘He did not depart from’ I. 16. 23 (Asa).
2. Total omission of sin (sins) five times, viz. I. 14. 19 (Jeroboam), 16. 20 (Zimri), II. 14. 18 (Amaziah), 15. 11 (Zechariah), 15. 15 (Shallum); with further details, II. 20. 20 (Herekiah).

Reading sin (sins) five times, viz. I. 16. 27 (Omri), II. 1. 18 (Ahaziah of Israel), 14. 15 (Jehoash of Israel), 16. 19 (Ahaz), 21. 25 (Amaziah); twice, I. 16. 5 (Ba’asha); I. 16. 15 (Ahaziah); 22. 46 (Jehoshaphat).

3. ‘in place of’ sin (sins) five times, viz. I. 14. 19 (Jeroboam), II. 16. 11, 15, 26, 31 (Zechariah Shallum, Pekahiah, Pekah).
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2. Mention of the king's (a) death and (b) burial:

3. Notice of the due succession of the king's son:

The following table exhibits the regularity with which this system is carried out. When any fact above mentioned as belonging to the introduction is omitted in that position, but added subsequently in the narrative of the reign or in the summary, this is indicated by the sign +:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 8. 3, 11. 4-6, 42</td>
<td>David I 2 a b I. 2. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kings of Judah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Major Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>14. 21, 22, 31</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 (6) + 4 Rehoboam I 2 a b 3 14. 29, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijah</td>
<td>15. 1-3</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Abijah I 2 a b 3 15. 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>15. 9-11</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Asa I 2 a b 3 15. 23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>22. 41-44</td>
<td>2 3 4 6 Jehoshaphat I 2 a b 3 22. 45, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td>11. 8. 16, 17</td>
<td>2 3 5 Jehoram I 2 a b 3 II. 8. 23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah</td>
<td>8. 25-27, 9. 29</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 + 1 Ahaziah 2 b 9, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athaliah</td>
<td>11. 3</td>
<td>+ 3 Athaliah ... ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoash</td>
<td>12. 1-4</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Jehoash I 2 a b 3 12. 20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>14. 1-4</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Amaziah I 2 a b 3 14. 18, 20b (22b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td>15. 1-4</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Azariah I 2 a b 3 15. 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>15. 33-35</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Jotham I 2 a b 3 15. 36, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>16. 1-4</td>
<td>2 3 5 Ahaz I 2 a b 3 16. 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>16. 1-3</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Hezekiah I 2 a b 3 20. 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>21. 1, 2</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Manasseh I 2 a b 3 21. 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>21. 19-22</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Amon I 2 a b 3 21. 25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>22. 1, 2</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Josiah I 2 a b 3 28. 39, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>25. 31, 32</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Jehoiakim I 2 a b 3 24. 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiachin</td>
<td>23. 36, 37</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Jehoiachin ... ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zedekiah</td>
<td>24. 8, 9</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 Zedekiah ... ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Once with singular active verb used impersonally: נבש וקנב 'And (one) buried him,' II. 21. 36 (Amon).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Kings of Israel</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. 25, 26</td>
<td>Nadab</td>
<td>15. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 19-21</td>
<td>Ba'asha</td>
<td>16. 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 8, 13</td>
<td>Elah</td>
<td>16. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a, 19</td>
<td>Zimri</td>
<td>16. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 23, 25, 26</td>
<td>Omri</td>
<td>16. 27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 29-31*</td>
<td>Ahab</td>
<td>22. 39, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 51, 52</td>
<td>Ahab</td>
<td>II. 1. 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 8. 1-3</td>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 29, 31, 36</td>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 1, 2</td>
<td>Jehoash</td>
<td>10. 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 10, 11</td>
<td>Jeroboam II</td>
<td>13. 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 8, 9</td>
<td>Shallum</td>
<td>14. 28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 13</td>
<td>Menahem</td>
<td>15. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 17, 18</td>
<td>Pekah</td>
<td>15. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 23, 24</td>
<td>Hoshea</td>
<td>15. 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the body of the narrative there are certain formulae which are employed for the introduction of a historical notice to indicate that it is more or less contemporaneous with the events of the narrative immediately preceding. The frequency with which these formulae occur, especially in the brief citation of facts from the Annals, renders the inference fair that they are due to the hand of R<sup>D</sup>, and represent his method of piecing together the extracts derived from his sources. Of such formulae the most frequent is IN; but we also find the expressions בְּנֵי הָיוָה, לָמָּי, ובְּנֵי הָיוָה. Cf. note, p. 35.

Besides the construction of the framework of the book and the welding of the material, R<sup>D</sup> is also responsible for a number of passages of varied length which point and enforce the religious purpose of his composition. These passages generally take the form of a commentary upon the causes which were operative in bringing about the developments of history, framed in accordance with the Deuteronomic model. Very frequently, also, R<sup>D</sup> allows himself considerable latitude in the expansion and adaptation of
the *speeches* contained in the narrative, in illustration of the same standpoint. In passages of this character the hand of $R^5$ may readily be distinguished. They exhibit a constant recurrence of strongly marked phrases, to be found elsewhere for the most part only in Deuteronomy or in the books which exhibit the influence of Deuteronomy, and therefore presumably derived from that source. Other expressions stand alongside of these Deuteronomic expressions, and are of a piece with the thoughts to which they give voice; and these possess an individuality of their own, and are peculiar (or nearly so) to Kings.

The phrases characteristic of $R^5$ receive comment in the *Notes* as they occur. For convenience of reference, however, a list is here given.

Deuteronomic phrases:—

5. יִפְלֹא עִם וּשְׁנֵה, p. 14; cf. I. 12. 15.
6. בֶּן בֶּן, בֶּן בֶּן (לבֶּנִים, בֶּנִים), pp. 14, 125.
8. הַיָּלֶד, p. 30.
9. עָמַם אֱלֹהִים בְּעוֹד, p. 31.
10. יִשָּׂרָאֵל לָאָלָמָה, p. 53.
11. קְרֵב לַגְּדֶשׁ יְהוָה הַרֹב, of *Yahwe's choosing* Jerusalem, p. 115.
14. הָאָלָמָה נַחֲצָי, p. 121.
15. יִשָּׂרָאֵל נַחֲצָי, p. 122.
16. יִשָּׂרָאֵל נַחֲצָי אֶלֶף אָלָמָה, p. 122.
17. יִשָּׂרָאֵל נַחֲצָי, p. 122.
18. יִשָּׂרָאֵל נַחֲצָי, p. 122.
19. יִשָּׂרָאֵל נַחֲצָי, p. 124.
20. יִשָּׂרָאֵל נַחֲצָי, p. 125.
The following phrases, though not derived directly from Deuteronomy, belong to $R^D$ in common with Jeremiah, whose writings exhibit strong Deuteronomic affinities:
Phrases and modes of expression wholly or nearly peculiar to R are as follow:

58. הָאָשָׁר הֵלָךְ וַיָּדַע, and similar references, p. 31.
60. לְהַשֵּׁם וַיֹּאַר נִי גּוֹז, p. 170.
61. אֲלֵה יִתְחָזְךָ נִי גּוֹז, p. 15.
62. נַעֲמָה נָעַשְׂתָה לָשָׁמ, p. 28.
63. אַשֵּׁר בָּנְךָ נִי גּוֹז, p. 31.
64. לְהַשָּׁמ שֶׁתֶּשֶּׁמ, p. 115.
65. לְבָב שָׁלֵם עַל נִי גּוֹז, p. 128.
66. וַיֵּרְא (לְשָׁתָה) מַלְאַךְ אָשֶׁר (רַחֵי) לְמָשֵׁת, p. 186.
67. מְשָׁהֵת בּוֹרִי, p. 186.
68. עַמְרֵי מְשֹׁב, p. 186.
69. נְבוּרֵי נְצָר, p. 187.
70. נְבֵי נְצָר, p. 187.
71. יָדְעוּ הַמַּעֲשֶׂה לָעֹז עַל נִי גּוֹז, p. 249.
72. אֲלֵה יִתְחָזְךָ פָּרָג, p. 268.
73. אֲלֵה יִתְחָזְךָ פָּרָג נִי גּוֹז, p. 27.

As Kings now stands, the earliest possible terminus a quo for the composition of the book is the date of the latest event related, viz. Jehoiachin's release from prison in the thirty-seventh year of his captivity, i.e. B.C. 561, some twenty-five years after the fall of Jerusalem. As, however, the writer states that the privileges granted by Evil-Merodach to Jehoiachin were continued 'all the days of his life' (II. 25. 30), the strong presumption is created that the words were not penned so early as B.C. 561, but some time later, viz.

1 Cf. also the phrases noticed by Dri. LOT. in the later ch. of 2 Kings.
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subsequently to Jehoiachin's death, whenever that may have occurred. Agreeable to such an exilic date as is implied by the last two chapters of 2 Kings are certain passages in the body of the work which seem to presuppose the captivity of Judah. These are I. 11. 39; II. 17. 19, 20; 23. 26, 27, and perhaps, though not so clearly, I. 9. 7-9; II. 20. 17, 18; 21. 10-15; 22. 15-20; cf. notes ad loc. To these we may add the reference in I. 5. 4 to Solomon's dominion as extending over all the kings 'beyond the River,' a statement which, as referring to the country west of the Euphrates, implies that the writer is living in Babylon on the east side of the river (cf. note on עַבְרֵי הָמָה, p. 49).

On the other hand, there are certain indications which show that the main editing of Kings by R^0 must have taken place prior to the decay and fall of the Judaean monarchy. Chief among these is the use of the phrase 'unto this day' (לְעַל גוֹד הָיָה) in the statement that the condition of affairs which the writer is describing continues to exist up to the time of writing. If this phrase always or most frequently occurred in the course of lengthy narratives excerpted by R^0 from his sources, there might be room for the theory that a statement which was true as it stood in the old pre-exilic narratives had, through oversight on the part of an exilic editor, been allowed to stand after, through changed conditions, it had lost its force, or rather had become untrue and misleading. But, as a matter of fact, the expression is employed in connexion with terse statements of facts derived from the Annals, and in such cases can be due to no other hand than that of R^0 himself, who, in using the phrase, either formulates his own statement, or intelligently admits a statement which he is able to verify. The cases of the use of 'unto this day' which should be noticed as implying the continued existence of the kingdom of Judah are the following:—I. 8. 8 (the ends of the staves of the ark still to be seen projecting from the Adytum into the Holy Place); 9. 21 (the Canaanites still subjected by Israel to forced labour, as they had been under Solomon); 12. 19 (the division between the ten tribes and the house of David still in existence); II. 8. 22 (Edom still
successful in shaking off the yoke of Judah); 16. 6 (the Edomites still hold Elath, from which the Judaeans were expelled by Rezin, king of Aram). For other occurrences of 'unto this day,' not necessarily presupposing a pre-exilic date, but illustrating the frequency of the formula as employed by R\(\text{D}^\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\), cf. note on p. 107.

Again, it seems to be clear that, at the time when R\(\text{D}^\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) is writing, the Davidic dynasty still possesses a monarch reigning at Jerusalem. David has, and is still to have, a lamp before Yahwe at Jerusalem continually; cf. No. 60 of the phrases of R\(\text{D}^\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) above noticed. The expression 'before Yahwe at Jerusalem' (I. 11. 36) implies further that the Temple is still standing intact, a point which is also assumed in the dedication prayer of I. 8. 15–53, which owes its present form to R\(\text{D}^\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) (cf. pp. 112 ff.). Throughout this prayer the leading petition is that supplication made in or towards Yahwe's Temple built by Solomon may meet with a favourable answer; cf. vv. 29, 30, 31 ff., 33, 35, 38, 42, 44, 48. We may notice also I. 9. 3, which likewise occurs in a section in which the hand of R\(\text{D}^\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) is prominent:-'I have hallowed this house which thou hast built to put my name there for ever; and mine eyes and my heart shall be there perpetually.' Upon these grounds it may be concluded that the main editing of Kings (viz. that by R\(\text{D}^\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\)) must have taken place prior to the destruction of the Judaean kingdom, and that such sections of the book as imply an exilic standpoint are therefore of the nature of later redactional additions and interpolations.

For the work of R\(\text{D}^\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\), influenced, as we have seen him to be, by the spirit and language of Deuteronomy, the \textit{terminus a quo} is the discovery of Deuteronomy in the year B.C. 621, the \textit{terminus ad quem} the destruction of Jerusalem B.C. 586. And since the writer's standpoint seems to indicate that he wrote before the glamour of Josiah's reformation had wholly or nearly faded during the latter days of the Judaean monarchy, the assumption is fair that he undertook and completed his book not later than B.C. 600\textsuperscript{1}.

\textsuperscript{1} So Kue. \textit{Ond.} § 26; Wellh. C. pp. 298 ff., &c. König, on the contrary, holds that the editor of Kings compiled his work not earlier than B.C. 588, i.e. during the Exile (\textit{Einleitung}, § 53. 3).
From the preceding examination and conclusion as to the date of the main redaction of Kings, it is clear that the pre-exilic book must have received certain additions at the hand of a later editor or editors before it attained the form in which we now possess it. The chief of these additions is the appendix, which carries the history down to the year B.C. 561. To this appendix belongs certainly II. 24. 10—25. 30, and, presumably, 23. 31—24. 9. The conclusion of the pre-exilic book has, however, probably been worked over by the second editor, and so adapted to receive his addition that it is now impossible exactly to discover its position. Any of the vv. 25, 28, 30 of ch. 23 might have formed a conclusion scarcely more abrupt than the present conclusion, ch. 25. 30. Ch. 23. 29a, if not intentionally imitated in style in ch. 24. 1a, must be by the same hand, i.e. presumably the hand of the second editor. But again, it is unlikely that RO should have appended the usual summary of a reign in v. 28 without mentioning the manner of the king's death. The statement of v. 25b seems at first sight to presuppose the writer's acquaintance with the characters of all the succeeding kings of Judah, but may be a later insertion, as vv. 26, 27 certainly are. On the whole, the most suitable ending to the pre-exilic book would be vv. 29, 30, 28 of ch. 23, in that order.

It is noticeable that, apart from the difference of standpoint involved in the destruction of the Judaean kingdom and the Exile, the mould of mind of the author of the appendix and of the passages above noticed (p. xvi) which presuppose the captivity of Judah is essentially the same as that of RO. Thus it is reasonable to employ the symbol RO^2 in referring to a later redactor of the same school of thought. It must not, however, be supposed that RO^2 is in every case necessarily one and the same writer, since it is obvious that more than one Deuteronomist may have had a hand in the revision of Kings. In point of fact it can be argued with high probability that such was the case. For the Deuteronomic passage II. 17. 34b—40 almost certainly refers to the Samaritans of post-exilic times (cf. note ad loc.); yet it may fairly be assumed that if the author of the appendix had written in post-exilic times he would have given some account of the restoration from exile.
Kings, as it stands in the Hebrew Bible, has, again, undergone still later revision than that of R². This is clear from certain variations in form and order between the MT. and the recension of the text which is represented by the LXX. While in some cases the condition of the LXX text is greatly inferior to that of MT., yet, on the other hand, it is clear that in a number of sections LXX preserves a superior arrangement in order, or a simpler form, of narrative, which points to the fact that MT. has suffered dislocation and interpolation at the hands of a reviser or revisers of a date later than the separation of the two recensions. As instances of this we may notice I. 4. 20—5. 14; 5. 15—7 in the main, 8. 1–13, 11. 1–13 (cf. notes ad loc.), and the position of MT. I. 21 after 19, so that 22 succeeds 20 without a break in the narrative. It is noticeable in certain cases that the additions which are found in MT. are just those passages which are coloured by the influence of the Priestly Code (P) in the Hexateuch. Cf. notes on I. 6. 11–14; 8. 1–11. Supposing, therefore, for the sake of simplicity that the author of the interpolations and changes in order as seen in MT. was one and the same redactor, he may conveniently be represented by the symbol RP (Priestly Redactor).

Thus the pedigree of our Books of Kings may be represented as follows:—

Original Sources:—Book of the Acts of Solomon, Chronicles of the Kings of Judah, Chronicles of the Kings of Israel, &c. &c.

Pre-exilic Redactor
influenced by Deut. [R²]

| Exilic and post-exilic Editors
influenced by Deut. [R²]

Post-exilic Editor
influenced by Priestly Code [R²]

Hebrew original of LXX Text.

Mesorotic Text.
§ 2. Characteristics of the Chief Ancient Versions of Kings.

For the general characteristics of the Ancient Versions of the Old Testament, and a just estimate of their value for the purposes of textual criticism, the reader is referred to Dr. Driver's Excursus in the Introduction to his Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, § 3, pp. xxi–lvi. All that is here attempted is a brief account of the Versions of Kings, framed upon the lines laid down by Dr. Driver in dealing with Samuel in § 4 of the same Introduction.

1. The Septuagint.

A. Before a Version can be used to good purpose for the criticism of the MT., it is important to recognize the fact that all variations from this latter are not due either to paraphrase or to a different reading in the Hebrew original from which the translation was made. The texts of the Versions, like the MT., were liable to corruption, and we find as a matter of fact that corrupt readings do exist in LXX, to a greater or less extent in different books.

But this corruption of single words or sentences is not the only feature in the Greek text which appears to belong to the vicissitudes of transmission. We also not infrequently meet with conflate or double renderings which are apparently due to the addition of a second translation of a passage, made by some scribe in the margin of the MS., probably because he considered that the first rendering did not adequately represent the sense of the original. This second translation came later on to be incorporated by another scribe in the text itself.

(a) Instances of corruptions in the Greek text. These are far more numerous in Cod. B than in Luc.:

1. 9. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ for λίθων. Luc. Α., Β., Θ. read λίθων.
ib. ἔχειν ἀδροῦς for ἀδρος (read by Luc.).
1. 49. ἔσται ἐν ἑτέρῳ καὶ ἐξαναστησάτω. This represents the latter word. The translation of the former, καὶ ἐξαναστησάτω (al. exempl.), has fallen out owing to the resemblance between the two Greek words.
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2.6. ἀρχόν ὡς αὐτῷ κατάγεις for ὥς κατάγεις. The opposite change, ὥς for ὡς, perhaps occurs in v. 9 (supposing, with Luc., Vulg., the original to have been ἀρχάσαι, not ἀρχάσαι).

4. 10. The whole v. corrupt in Luc. (cf. note ad loc.).

4. 11. ἀντὶ Δὰν for 'Αβινάδαθ. ἀντὶ φασεί for Ναφᾶθ.

4. 20 (MT. 5. 7). ἀραβία ὦντως for ὦντω (read by Luc.).

5. 4 (MT. 5. 18). ὡς ἀμφότεροι probably for ἀμφότερα (read by Luc., Cod. A).

5. 5 (MT. 5. 19). ἄνθρωπος οἰκοδόμησε for οἰκοδόμησε (read by Luc.).

5. 6 (MT. 5. 20). ἡρὰς ἕλεις for ἕλει (Luc.).

7. 3 (MT. 7. 15). τὸ αἰλάμ for τῇ αἰλάμ (Luc.), apparently representing an original ἀλαμ (cf. note on 7. 15).

ib. Luc. καὶ ὄντως for καὶ ὄντως (LXX), representing an original ἔν (cf. note).

7. 9 (MT. 7. 20). ὑπῆρξαν τῷ πίστις for τῷ πίστις (Luc.), i.e. ἰδίᾳ.

7. 10 (MT. 7. 23). ἵνα πείσον ἐχέλουε (Luc.).

7. 45 (MT. 7. 8). ἵνα βασιλεὺς ἐν οἴκῳ καθίσεται ἐκεί for ἐν οἴκῳ καθίσεται (Luc.).

8. 16. τοιαύτη μείνα for εἰναι (Luc.). Initial μ by dittography from preceding ἵσαξαναλήμ.

8. 39. ἄρα Luc. καὶ δικαιώσεις for καὶ δώσεις (LXX).

8. 59. ἄτι ἐν ἡμέρα ἐναντιόν for ἐν ἡμ. αὐτοῦ (Luc.).


11. 36. ἦν Luc. θλήσεις for θέσις (LXX).

15. 27. ἰδίᾳ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν perhaps for ἐν ἑαυτῶν αὐτῶν (Cod. A). Luc. ἰδιοκάσων αὐτῶν appears to be an attempt to improve the first reading.

16. 15. οἱ ἐπὶ Γαβαδών for Γαβαδών, v. 17.

16. 16b, 17 ff. ἀνέκρ. Παρνησί. ἀντὶ Παρνησί. ἀντὶ Παρνησί. ἀντὶ ἰδίᾳ γαβαδών for εἰς εἰς (Luc.).

18. 5. ἡμείς ἐκ τηρῶν for κτηρίων (Cod. A. Cf. Luc.).

18. 10. ὑπαρχεῖν καὶ ἐνέπροφεν according to Klo., for καὶ ἐνέπροφεν, i.e. ἐνέπροφεν.

18. 32. τὸ δάλασσει probably an alteration of the transliteration δαλά (Luc.). So v. 38.
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18. 45. בְרֵית קָלָּאָה for קָלָּאָה or קָלָּה. Luc. has further altered ΛXX into קָלָּאָה.

19. 3. γῆ for τῆς (τῆς Cod. A).

21. 14 ff. (MT. 20. 14 ff.). נְעַנִיתוֹ תָּנַנְתָּ for תָאָנְנָתָּ (Luc.).

22. 33 (MT. 20. 33). דִּיָנְנֵיעַת for דִּיָנְנֵיעַת (Luc.).

22. 13. רַחַּנְנֵ וְזָנְנֵ for זָנְנֵ רַחַּנְנֵ (Luc.).

22. 16. מִדְנָנְנֵ נִּנְנָנְנֵ for נָנַנְנֵ (Luc.).

22. 26. מַזְנָנְנֵ בּוֹדַהurance for בּוֹדַהurance (Luc.).

II. 3. 21. הַרְמֶנְה and לְשֵׁנְה for לְשֵׁנְה (Luc.), an alteration due to the preceding קָלָּאָה, see. i.e. Ἰδίων for Ἰδίων.

5. 17. δισκος γομόρ for γόμορ (Luc.).

6. 5. לְבָנְנֵ לְבָנְנֵ for לְבָנְנֵ (Luc., 'A., Σ., Θ.).

10. 6. בְּהַרְנֵ לְבָנְ for לְבָנְ of ΛXX, where הַרְנֵ is taken as sign of accusative.

10. 26. מַבְנְבַּ for מַבְנַ (Luc.).

11. 12. מְמָ for מְמָ (Luc.).

12. 2. מְמָ for מְמָ (Luc.).

12. 8 (MT. 12. 9). מְמָ for מְמָ (Luc.).

12. 15 (MT. 12. 16). מְמָ for מְמָ (Luc.).

14. 7. מְסָל מְסָל for מְסָל (Luc. גֶּמֶל, Cod. A. גֶּמֶל).

14. 11. מַלְמָל for מַלְמָל (Luc. מַלְמָל, Μ., Ν.).

15. 20. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LXX).

15. 25. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LXX).

16. 6. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LXX).

17. 6. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LXX). Cf. also 18. 11.

18. 20. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (cf. note ad loc.).

19. 12. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LUC.).

20. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LUC.).

23. 5. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LUC.). So v. 11.

23. 6. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LXX).

23. 36. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (LXX).

25. 17. מַלְמָ for מַלְמָ (Cod. A.).
Instances of double renderings are more frequent in Luc. than in Cod. B:

1. 36. ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου = Luc. πιστεύει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου, μου τοῦ βασιλέως; οὗτος εἶναι κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου, κύριος μου βασιλεύς.

1. 40. Μαθαθίαμ ἐν χρονικαὶ καὶ εὐφραντομένῳ εὐφρασίᾳ μεγάλῃ ἠδονα ἐν αἰώνιοι καὶ ἐχαίρον χαρὰ μεγάλῃ.

1. 47. ὁμοίως = Luc. καὶ γὰρ ἔδειξεν οἱ δοῦλοι... καὶ ἐστηλῆθαι μόνον (ὡς οὖν in second rendering).

2. 5. Μαθαθίαμ = Luc. ἐν τῇ θεώ καὶ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ... μου.

3. 4. καὶ ἐργαὶ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἐλεήμονες καὶ ἔλεημον καὶ ἔλεημον, καὶ ἐκλυθὸς ἐν δῷ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι, ἀπαρατὰ... (cf. note ad loc.).

3. 34 (MT. 7. 12b). κυκλόθεν... κατατέτασμα probably represents an original ἀλυσιν (ὁπίσθι) read a second time as ἀλυσιν (cf. note ad loc.).

7. 3 (MT. 7. 15). ὁμοίως = Luc. περιηθηκον... σπαρτικόν.

7. 6 (MT. 7. 18). καὶ ἔργαν κρεμαστῶν, δύο στίχων... ἔργαν κρεμαστῶν, στίχων ἐν τῷ στίχῳ, representing μηνοῦς... (cf. note ad loc.).

7. 9 (MT. 7. 20). ἵππημα τοῦ μελάδρων representing ἰππημα repeated from beginning in place of ἤμα μελάνων. Luc. also repeats ἐν' ἀμφότερων τῶν στιχῶν.

7. 22 (MT. 7. 36). τῶν ἡλίων = κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔσω, ὡς εἰς λαῖμα καὶ doubly rendered.

7. 32 (MT. 7. 47). [οἱ οὗτοι] = Luc. oἱ ἐπιοτικῶν ἐξελθοῦν... ὡς ἐπιοτικῶν τοιοῦτα ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους σφόδρα (cf. note ad loc.).

8. 28. ἐπιστῆς = ἐπιστῆς τοῦ πρὸς στὶ.

8. 60. τοῦ οὖν = ὁ θεὸς, ἀπὸ τοῦ... (cf. note ad loc.).

8. 66. Διὸς τοῦ βασιλείαν = Luc. καὶ εὐλογησεν αὐτῶν, καὶ εὐλόγησεν καὶ ἀπείρω τῶν βασιλεία (cf. note ad loc.).

11. 43. εἰς τὴν γῆν Ζαμῆπα for εἰς τὴν Γ. (Luc.), representing an original ἄραια (cf. note ad loc.).
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15. ἐν τοῖς ... ὡν = Luc. καὶ εἰσηγόμεν Ἀσά ἐστὶ τῶν οἴκων ἱερίου ... καὶ εἰσηγόμεν ἐστὶ τῶν υἱῶν.
16. 33. τοῦ εὐδοκείμενος ... εὐκοποίησαν apparently represents a doublet ἰεροῦ τῆς ἤλιου.
18. 38. ἡ κυριακὴ μαρτυρία = Luc. καὶ τὸ ὕπορ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὸ ὕπορ τὸ ἐν τῷ θαυμᾷ.
18. 43b. ἐμφασίζω. Cf. note ad loc.
18. 44. ὁμέρος = Luc. ἐν αὐτῷ. Cf. no/l ad loc.
20. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ἀναφέρεται τοῦ προστάτου τῶν θεῶν; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as προστάτου.
22. 20. ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 23. ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
22. 25 (MT. 20. 25). ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἂν ἀναφέρεται τῷ Κύριῳ τούτῳ θεῷ; ἐπιλέγεται read a second time as τοῦ θεοῦ.
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7. 5. ἤκος = Luc. ἐν τῷ σκότει ἁθή διανοώντος. So v. 7, ἐν τ. σκ. ἁθή διαφώσκοντος.

7. 10. ἤρθη ὁ Ἰωάννης = Luc. καὶ ἔθεσαν εἰς τὴν πύλην τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐκβλέποντο τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῆς πόλεως.

8. 1. οὐκ ἦν λέγειμα πάντας = Luc. καὶ παρέστατο ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἕπτα ἕτη καὶ ἐδόθην εἰρ. (ὡς rendered (1) as participle, (2) as perfect.)

9. 17. ὑπήρξε = Luc. τὸν κοσμοτόν τοῦ ὀχλου.

10. 29. φορώτατον Ἄμι γὰρ καὶ = Luc. οἷς ἀντίστη ἂν αὐτῶν ἰδοῦ ὀπίσω αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.

11. 2. ἤθελεν = Luc. ὁ Ὀχοζίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς (Ὑπόπ).

11. 9. καθήκον οὐκ = Luc. ἀ συμπέρα εἴρησ (firstly ἐπειδή).

11. 14. συνήρθεν = Luc. καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ ... καὶ οἱ στρατηγοί.

11. 15. τὰς γυναῖκας = Luc. ἐξαγάγετε αὐτήν ἐκεῖθεν τῶν συμμάχων, καὶ εἰσαγάγετε αὐτήν ὀπίσωθεν οἷςκ οὺν τῶν στρατηγῶν (ὑπερήφανος ἀνήρ).

12. 10. ἀναμένει = Luc. ἡ βαρέως ἐφοδιάσθη.


13. 18. τὴν ἁγίαν = Luc. τῆς καθήδρας τῶν συμμάχων.

15. 5. καὶ ὄλον = Luc. ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ... καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν αὐτῆς.

16. 32. Cf. note ad loc.

17. 17. ἤκος = Luc. ἐν τῷ ἀναμένει ἐν τῷ ὑδραγωγῷ.

18. 3. καθήκον = Luc. καὶ ἀνείδισκοι καὶ ἀλεγροῦ.

18. 28. ἡμέραν = Luc. καὶ τὸ ὀστρήμον σου καὶ τὸ ἐνθυμήματα σου.

19. 13. ἡμέρα = Luc. τῆς ἐπιφάνειας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ νεκροῦ.

19. 6. ἡμέρα = Luc. ἐπιλήθουν, καὶ ἐπιλήθουσα.

20. 23. ἤθελεν . . . ἔσχισεν = Luc. καὶ συνεστάφησαν . . . ἐν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπεβολεύσαν αὐτῷ.

21. 23. ἔσχισεν = Luc. καὶ συνεστάφησαν . . . ἐν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπεβολεύσαν αὐτῷ.

22. 6. ἡμέραν = Luc. τὸ ἀλογο τῆς Ἀσπρᾶθ.}

23. 12. ἡμέραν = Luc. καὶ καθίλευσαν αὐτὰ ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἐξήραναν αὐτὰ καὶ συνεστάφησαν, apparently a triple rendering.

23. 16. ἔσχισεν = Luc. καὶ ἐπιστρήφεται . . . καὶ ἐξέστησε.
B. There are also characteristics of the Version which appear to be due to the translator. The more important of these may now be noticed, with a few illustrations.

(1) Paraphrase.

(a) This usually takes place for the sake of making clear the sense of some Hebrew word or phrase which would be liable to be misunderstood in the Greek if literally translated:

1. 2. 32. ἀλμα τῆς ἀδελφας αὐτοῦ.
4. 20 (MT. 5. 7). ἔθις ἑαυτοῦ ἄπω ἄμα.
4. 22 (MT. 5. 2). ον ἄν ἄντω.
8. 56. ὁ οὐ δισφόνησεν λόγος.
9. 27. ἥτις ἀληθῶς ἐδόθας θυσίαν.
10. 4. ὁ κατάλειμμα.
19. 18. ὁ ἑπειρεμένος αὐτῷ.
22. 34. ἐντόθι.

(b) At other times paraphrase appears to be used for no apparent reason, merely at the whim of the translator:

1. 3. 17. καὶ ἐπέκομεν.
5. 12 (MT. 5. 26). ἐγένοmach ἐν μίσου ἡμῶν.
9. 5. ἤγγισαν ὁμολογών ἐν Ἰσραήλ.
17. 13. ἐξαράτες.

(c) Somewhat different are the cases in which phrases are arbitrarily altered by the translator, because it seemed to him that some better expression could be substituted:

1. 2. 29. ἐξαράτες τῶν κεράμων τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.
2. 38. τὰ οἰapy ἐπὶ ὅρμος ἐν τῷ ἐξαιρεθὲν.
9. 6. ἐξαράτες ἐστατοῦμεν.
10. 5. ἤγγικα ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξ ἐν ἑάνες ἐγένετο.

(d) Or again, paraphrase may take place when the expression used in the original was somewhat offensive in the eyes of the translator. Under this head comes, e.g., the removal of anthropomorphic expressions applied to God:
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I. 3. 10. ἐνόπτωσιν Κυρίου.
II. 2. 11. υπὸ τῶν αἰχμάτων (of the translation of Elijah).
24. 3. ἐν τῶν θυμῶν Κυρίου.

(c) The last form of paraphrase to be noticed is the translation of a word or phrase by guess, the context being taken as a guide to the sense:—

I. 10. Βελτιστότατα.
17. 21. ἐν οἷς ἔλεησαν.
18. 21. ἔλθον ἐκ τῆς ἐρμής, guided by the preceding ζήσας.
21. πι (MT. 20. 11). θαυμάζω ὁ ἁρπαγμός, guided by ἡ μή rendered ὁ κυρίος from Talmudic ἐκά.

(2) In striking contrast to the paraphrastic tendency, we find renderings in which extreme literality appears to have been the aim of the translator.

(a) Thus at times attempts are made to represent in Greek the Hebrew constructions, or to preserve the fancied force of Hebrew words, and the result is a rendering which is often grotesque.

Examples of Hebraisms from I. 1. 2 are the following:—

1. 7. ἡ θεοθήκη καὶ ἐποίησεν ὑπίσω (contrast Luc. καὶ ἀντέλαιμον αὐτοῦ).
1. 12. ἡ θεοθήκη καὶ ἐποίησεν ὑπίσω συμβουλεύοντας σοι ἐπὶ συμβουλίαν.
1. 13. ἡ ἁρπαγμός ἐπελεηθεὶς καὶ ἀφεθεὶς.
1. 14. ἠμαθήτης ἡ μεγάλη ἀληθεία καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη σοι καὶ ἐγώ ἐλεημοσύναιμαι.
1. 17. ἡ μισεμάρθυντα σος διὰ μοισας ἐν τῷ θεῷ σου (but Luc. κατὰ τοῦ σου θῆ.
1. 51. διὰ λαμβρᾶς ἀπηγγέλτῃ ... λέγοντες (but Luc. καὶ ἀπηγγέλλω λέγοντες).
2. 2. τῆς κατάμαχος ἐγὼ ἔμει πορεύομαι. Cf. II. 4. 13; 10. 9; 22. 20.
2. 37. τῆς κατάμαχος τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμέρας σου καὶ διάβολος (but Luc. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας σου ἡ διάβολος).
2. 42. τῆς κατάμαχος ἐντὸς ὑπὸ ἀγκάσκων γεύσεως ἔτι διὰ τὸν ἀποκαλεῖ.
Sometimes difficult words, instead of being guessed at, are interpreted very literally according to the sense of the root:

I. 6. 20. ἐν συνελευθερωμένη.
7. 28. τὸν μετὰ συνελευθερωμένη.
16. 20. ἐφάπτεται ἡ σκέψεις αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ σκέψεις.
Π. 10. 19. ἐν παρενομένη.
12. 3. ἐφάπτεται αὐτῶν, apparently connecting the Hebrew word with ῥημα.

(c) Another device in the case of a hard word was simply to transliterate it into Greek letters. Such transliterations are very characteristic of Kings, particularly of the second book:

I. 4. 19. ἐπάνω μαχι'π, Luc. Νασιβ. 
5. 11 (MT. 5. 25). ἡ μαχι'π (al. exempl. μαχαί).
ib. ἡ κόρος.
ib. ἡ (correctly ἤ) Βαλθ.
6. 7; al. (MT. 6. 3). ἡ μαχαί.
6. 10; al. (MT. 6. 5). ἡ καθαίρει.
6. 22; al. (MT. 6. 23). ζυγίζησιν.
7. 14; al. (MT. 7. 27). ζυγίζησιν.
14. 28. Φιλή, Luc. θεκού. 
18. 32, 38. ἐπαλὴ Luc. θαλαδ.
19. 4. ἦ ταῖ ῥαδμιν, Luc. ῥαδμαεῖν.
Π. 2. 14. ἑχθαῖ μιᾷ.
3. 4. ἐκεῖ ἀνείθε.
4. 34. ἐκεῖνος Luc. καὶ ιερᾶ.
4. 39. ἀνείθε.
4. 42. ἐκεῖνος Cod. A βασιλέωθ (but cf. note ad loc.).
5. 19. ἔφασεν ἐφαρμα, Luc. χαρμα.
6. 8. ἐπιστηθέν εἰς ἐκλεμονι, Luc. φελμονι.
(3) Another characteristic is the insertion of additional words and sentences by the translator.
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(a) Such additions are frequently made to fill out the sense, and to make the meaning more clear. Very frequently the subject of a verb is added when the reference seems to be ambiguous:

I. 2. 22. δραμάτων τον έκδοτος.
2. 32. το αίμα αυτῶν, added as obj. of ἔριν.
2. 35. εἰς την πρέσα.
3. 9. εἰς διαμορφήν, explaining the force of ἰσοτῆτην.
3. 15. κατά πρόσωπον τοῦ θυσίατηρίου του.
3. 27. τῇ εἰρωνείᾳ Δάντε ἀπάντη αὐτῷ, added to remove the seeming ambiguity of the king's command.
4. 21 (MT. 5. 8). δ βασιλεία, subj. of Ἣ ἡδονή.
15. 19. διάδοου, before ὅταν.
18. 24. δ ἀλήθειαν, after ἀλήθεια.
19. 19. εἰς βουσίν, after οὐρανόν.

(b) Additions are also very frequently made for the sake of bringing one passage into strict conformity with another:

I. 2. 26. τῇ διαθήκῃ, τῷ βασιλείῳ being the usual (Deuteronomical) phrase.

2. 29. καὶ θύσιον αὐτῶν, to agree with v. 31.
2. 37. καὶ ὡρασμὸν αὐτῶν δ βασιλείας ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, in agreement with v. 42.

9. 20. καὶ τοῦ Χαρασᾶ, ... καὶ τοῦ Περγασαίου, added to make up the number of the seven heathen nations of Palestine.
12. 20. καὶ Βενεμίδ, to agree with vv. 21, 23.
21. 23. καὶ ὡς δεῖκες κολάσας, to agree with v. 28.

The relationship of the recension of Lucian to that of Cod. B cannot here be discussed; but it is clear that the author had access to sources which preserved unimpaired original readings of which

---

1 Discussed in the notes on the text.
2 The origin of the text of Codd. A and B in 3 Kings has been discussed at length by S. Silberstein in ZATW., 1893-4.
we should otherwise have remained in ignorance. Instances of such readings in the text of Kings will be found in the notes.

Cf. I. 1. 28; 2. 5; 11. 18; 13. 11; 18. 5. II. 3. 51; 5. 1; 7. 7; 10. 11; 12. 5; 15. 10; 17. 2, 7, 27; 18. 34; 24. 13; 25. 4.

2. The Targum.

The chief characteristics of this version may be noticed very briefly.

(a) A very marked tendency to do away with anthropomorphic or otherwise seemingly unworthy expressions used with reference to God:

1. 17. נבשא ירדהו אלוהים, Targ. So constantly.
3. 10. ידע את אביו, Targ. בְּמַעַרְתִּי.
8. 15. כָּכָהו, Targ.
8. 24. ונזר כיסר, Targ. כָּכָהו, Targ. לֹא יִתֵּן יְהוָה מַעַרְתִּי.
8. 29. מִזְמַר נְעֹשֵׂה, Targ. מִזְמַר נְעֹשֵׂה, Targ. So v. 52.
8. 33. יְהוָה יָשָׁב, Targ. יְהוָה יָשָׁב.
9. 6. מְבַסֶּר עֶלְיוֹן, Targ. מְבַסֶּר עֶלְיוֹן.
9. 9. כְּךָ יִשְׂמֹךְ יְהוָה, Targ. כְּךָ יִשְׂמֹךְ יְהוָה.
9b. יְבַשֶּׁל מְשַׁעֵת, Targ. יְבַשֶּׁל מְשַׁעֵת, to avoid applying the name מְשַׁעֵת to false gods.

(b) A general tendency to paraphrase:

1. 33. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ. Poetic. So vv. 38, 45.
3. 38. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ. מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה, Targ. So v. 44.
1. 42. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ. מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה, Targ. So several times.
2. 7. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ. מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה.
2. 24. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ. מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה.
3. 16. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ. מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה, מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה, מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה, מִזְמַר מֱשָׂא יְהוָה, a softening down of the original.
3. 18. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ.
6. 4. וַיְמַלֵּא, Targ.

1 Cf. Dri. Sam. p. liii. The value of Luc. for the emendation of the MT. of Kings has been noticed by I. Hooykaas, *Iets over de griekse vertaling van het Oude Testament* (Rotterdam, 1888).
(c) A tendency to make explanatory insertions, without any equivalent in the original:—

I. 1. 24. אֲמַנְדוּת in the phrase אֲמַנְדוּת אֲלֹהַי. So constantly.

5. 13. וַחֲנֹנָב עַל מִלְּהוּ בֵּית וּרְוֵי תְעֹנֶהוּ לְמִלְּחָמָה בַּעֲלָמָה וּרְוִי; perhaps a haggadic explanation of עֲבָד הָעָלָה לְכָשָה הַתְּעַעֵשָׁה ...

6. 6. לָכַה רֵי שְׁלִיחַ נַחֲת עַל יוֹדָא.

8. 2. בִּיְוָהוּ שְׁלִיחַ שְׁלֵיחַ לִי הָיוֹ�א קְרֵא. MT. simply הבית.

8. 9. לָכַה הֵבַי הֵבַי עָשָׁר הָעָלָה בְּטָאוֹ.

As a whole this version represents a recension much nearer to MT. than that of any other ancient version.

3. The Peshitta.

This translation appears to have been made from a Hebrew text similar in many respects to that presupposed by LXX, though more nearly related to MT. than the LXX original. Instances of the agreement in readings between Pesh., LXX, and Luc. will be found in the notes. Cf. I. 2. 26, 29; 6. 9; 7. 10, 15; 8. 37; 10. 8.

II. 6. 2. As has been noticed by Dri. in the case of Samuel, the original of Pesh. seems to have been related to that of Luc.: cf. I. 1. 40; 4. 34; 18. 29. II. 2. 14; 10. 14; 14. 29; 19. 15. Affinities with the Vulg. may also be noticed: cf. I. 7. 7, 42;

1 A conspectus of the variations between Pesh. and MT. in 1 Kings has been given by J. Berlinger, Die Peschitta zum 1. (3.) Buch der Könige und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX. und Trg. (Berlin, 1897).
9. 18. Cases in which Pesh. agrees with LXX, Luc., Vulg. against MT. are frequent.

The general characteristics of the Version are those of a close and accurate, though not too servile, representation of the original. Paraphrase is occasionally employed—most frequently in the case of words or phrases which appeared to the translator to need elucidation, and here and there slight additions have been made to the text for the same reason. The following instances may be noticed.

(a) Paraphrase:—

I. 1. 36. 'So may (Yahwe) do.'

1. 50. and took refuge at the horns of the altar.'

2. 42. 'In the day that thou goest forth from Jerusalem and crossest the brook Kidron.'

3. 16. 'to plead their case before king Solomon.'

3. 18. 'and after three days.'

8. 26. 'which thou didst swear.'

12. 32. 'on the full moon.'

14. 10. 'as the grapes of a vineyard are swept away when the vintage is finished.'

20. 33. 'and he caused him to sit with him.'

21. 11. 'who dwelt in the city with Naboth.'

II. 2. 10. 'thou hast made a large request.'

3. 7. 'I will go up like thee.'

4. 42. 'from the city of the mighty men.'
5. 11. 11. 'and I should be healed of leprosy.'

7. 2, 17, 19. 'the man.'

9. 11. 'his folly.'

23. 11. 'and he slew.'

23. 29. 'against Mabbag.'

(b) Additions:

I. 1. 10. 'son of Jehoiada,' after 'of David,' after 'son of Jehoiada.'

1. 11. 'the prophet,' after 'of Jehoiada.'

1. 21. 'in peace,' after 'of Jehoiada.'

1. 39. 'and Nathan the prophet,' after 'David.'

8. 22. 'and prayed,' after 'and Nathan the prophet.'

11. 18. 'Dwell with me,' after 'and prayed.'

19. 1. 'the prophets of Ba'alph and of the sanctuaries,' for simple 'dwell with me.'

II. 4. 13. 'prosperously,' before 'in peace.'

6. 12. 'It is none of us,' for simple 'in peace.'

10. 15. 'And he said to him,' before 'and Nathan the prophet.'

11. 14. 'according to the custom of kings,' for simple 'and Nathan the prophet.'

14. 27. 'son of Jehoahaz,' after 'son of Jeshua.'

15. 29. 'and Abel-Meholah and all Beth-Ma'achah,' for simple 'and Nathan the prophet.'

18. 27. Insertion of negative: 'and he said to him,' after 'and the man.'

19. 35. 'and beheld,' after 'and he said to him.'

In certain cases the renderings of Pesh. seem to exhibit connection with Targ.; cf. I. 1. 33, 38, 45.

Targ. אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם, Targ. אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם.

Targ. אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם, Targ. אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם, Targ. אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם.

אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם, Targ. אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם, Targ. אֶלֶּחֶם, Pesh. אֶלֶּחֶם.
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Cases of corruption in the text of Pesh. are not numerous, and are nearly confined to confusion or transposition of letters in proper names: I. 4. 10 שֵׁה, Pesh. מַעְסֵד; 4. 12 בְּשֵׁה, Pesh. מַעְסֵד; 5. 4 מַעְסֵד, Pesh. מַעְסֵד; 22. 10 כָּכָל, Pesh. כָּכָל; II. 2. 25 כָּל, Pesh. כָּל; 4. 23 שֵׁה, Pesh. שֵׁה for כָּל; 4. 25 שֵׁה, Pesh. מַעְסֵד; 9. 2 מַעְסֵד, Pesh. מַעְסֵד; 9. 27 כָּכָל, Pesh. כָּכָל; 14. 7 כָּכָל, Pesh. כָּכָל; 15. 16 כָּל, Pesh. כָּל; 17. 31 כָּל, Pesh. כָּל; 18. 2 כָּל, Pesh. כָּל; 21. 1 כָּל, Pesh. כָּל; 21. 18, 26 כָּל, Pesh. כָּל.

Cases of double renderings may be found in I. 20. 33 כָּכָל, Pesh. מַעְסֵד; 22. 34 כָּכָל, Pesh. מַעְסֵד.

4. The Latin Versions.

(a) The Old Latin Version is known to us only in a fragmentary form. For Kings we possess the fragments collected by Sabatier (chiefly from the Fathers), and published in 1743 in his Bibliorum Sacrorum Antiquae Versiones Latinae, vol. i; extracts from the margin of a Gothic MS. (tenth century) at Leon in Spain.

1 The question whether the Old Latin represents one version or several distinct translations is discussed by H. A. A. Kennedy in Hastings, BD. iii. p. 48.

2 It should be noticed, however, that F. C. Burkitt (The Old Latin and the Itala, p. 9, in the Cambridge Texts and Studies, vol. iv) regards it as 'by no
published by Vercellone in 1864 in *Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae editionis*, vol. ii; *Palimpsestus Vindobonensis*, published by J. Belsheim in 1885, containing I. 11. 41—12. 11; 13. 19—29; 14. 6—15; 15. 34—16. 28; 18. 23—29; II. 6. 6—15; 10. 5—13; 10. 24—30; 13. 14—22; 15. 32—38; 17. 1—6, 15—20; *Ein neues Fragment des Quedlinburger Italac-Codex*, published by A. Düning in 1888, containing I. 5. 9 (MT. 5. 23)—6. 11. To these may be added the quotations in Augustine’s *Speculum* (i.e. the *Liber de divinis scripturis siue Speculum*, which in the N. T. is quoted amongst O. L. MSS. as m), not included by Sabatier in his work; and the edition of Lucifer by Hartel (*Corp. Script. Eccles.*, Vienna, 1886) may be used to advantage to check the quotations of Sabatier from this writer. The Version, as based upon the Greek text, possesses a secondary value for the purposes of textual criticism. The fragments of Kings which have survived, especially those from the margin of the Gothic MS., testify to a close connexion of the original Greek with the MSS. which were in later times employed by Lucian in the formation of his recension of the LXX. As might have been expected, the text of the Old Latin is not identical with Luc., many of the doublets and other glosses which are found in Luc. having presumably crept into the Greek text subsequently to the formation of the Latin translation; but, on the whole, the testimony of the Old Latin points to a high antiquity for the type of Greek text preserved by Luc. The following points of connexion between Old Latin and Luc. may be noticed:—


Luc. *καὶ ές ο λαὸς ἐκόρικεν ἐν χορῷ καὶ εὐφρασίανεν εὐφρασίαν μεγάλην ητόλον ἐν αὐλίας καὶ ἔχαρον χαρᾷ μεγάλῃ, καὶ ἔχεσσεν ἢ γῆ ἐν τῷ φωνῇ αὐτῶν.*

means certain that this interesting document does not represent readings extracted and translated from some Greek codex, so that it may have no connexion with the Old Latin properly so called.'

1 Cf. edit. by F. Weihrich, Vienna, 1887 (*Corp. Script. Eccles.*).
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2. 5. Goth. et uindicavit sanguinem belii in pace; et dedit sanguinem innocentiam in vita mea, et zona mea, quae erat circa lumbos meos, &c.

3. 18. Sab. peperit etiam hacet mulier filium.


10. 11. Goth. trubes multas valide non dolatas.

10. 16. Sab. et propheta alius senior.


10. 29. Vind. gasia.

12. 18. Sab. caput domus. IJomini.


14. 2. 5. Goth. adducens aquam de mari.


15. 2. 5. Goth. et transiit per siccum in terra.

15. 18. Sab. et lapido bant eum.

15. 20. Goth. ecce aquae venientiam de via eremi Sur ex Edom.
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4. 28. Goth. Si poposci filium a domine, non sic poposci sicut in fectis.
4. 35. Goth. et inspiravit in eum.
5. 19. Goth. chobratha terra.
5. 23. Goth. Et dixit Noaman instan-tius: Accipe etc.
6. 8. Goth. In locum phalminum ob-

vstionem faciamus.

10. 5. Vind. accipias unusquisque nu-

triorum capit eius quae nutrivit ex filii regis.
10. 11. Goth. omnes cognatos eius.

Vind. proximos eius.
10. 29. Vind. set a peccatis Hiero boon

filii Nabat qui peccava fecit Israel non discisset seu rex set abit post

micas peccati quae erant in Bethel et in Dan.

Goth. non recessit Hieru, sequens observantium sucarum peccati.
10. 36. Goth. Et erat annus (secun-

dus) Gotholiae cum regnare coepisset

Hieru filius Namosse, etc.
11. 12. Goth. dedid super eum sanctifi-

cationem.
11. 14. Goth. et scidii Gotholia vesti-

mentum suum.
16. 18. Goth. mesch sabbathorum.
17. 2. Goth. Et fecit malignum in

conspicte Domini pras omnium qui

fuerunt ante eum.
17. 4. Goth. Et invinintex Assyrium

in Oste sagiationem adversus eum, et

missit untius Atrameles Aegyptium in-

habitantem in Aegypto, et erat ferens munera regi Assyriorum ab anno in annum.

Vind. et missit untius at Atrameles

Ethiopem habitantem in Aegypto, et

offerebat Oste munera regi Assyrio-

rum ab anno in annum.

Luc. Vhy ματσάμαν υλν παρά του κυρίου

μου; οὖν οὖ τετολκέας;

Luc. καὶ ἑντάσατον ἐκ αὐτών.

Luc. καὶ ἔλαβεν ἑνεκὴ Δαβὶ κ.τ.λ.

Luc. Εἰς τὸν τότα τοῖς φαλμοι ποιή-

σώμεν ἔνθεν ὁ.

Luc. τὸν κατορτίαν τὸ δύχα λιον.

Luc. ἐστίν έκατος τοῦ κυβαλίον τοῦ

υλοῦ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ.

Luc. πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιστειάσατος αὐτοῦ.

Luc. πάλη αὐτῶν Ἰσραήλ ὑλοῦ

Ναβάτ, διὰ ἐξαντλα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὡς

ἀπεστή ἐκ αὐτῶν Ἰου. ὡς αὐτῶν

ἐπορεύοντο, τῶν δαμάλων τῆς ἀμα-

τίας τῶν χρυσῶν τῶν ἐν Βαβυλὼ καὶ

ἐν Δάν.

Luc. ἐς τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀγαθόν.

Luc. καὶ διέρρηξε τὸ ἱματισμὸν αὐτῆς

Γοδολά.

Luc. Δαβὶ τόχον καὶ Βολιδᾶς.

Luc. καὶ βέλων σωτηρίαν ἐν Ἰσραήλ.

Luc. τῶν θεμιστῶν τῆς καθήματας τῶν

σωβάτων.

Luc. καὶ ἔστησε τὸ σωτηρίαν ἵππων

κυρίων παρά πάντας τοὺς γενομένους

ζηροποιθέντας αὐτοῦ.

Luc. καὶ εἰρήν ἐς βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων

ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἐντολῇ, δι’ ἑκ αὐτῶν

ἐπορεύοντα ἄγγελον τοῦ Ἀβρααμαλήκ

τοῦ Ἀκῆς τοῦ κατακόμβα τοῦ Ἀγήντη,

καὶ ὡς ὠνὴ φίρων ἀναὶ

τοῦ βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ἔριτον καὶ

ἔναντι.
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17. 4. Vind. et iniuriem facit ei rex Assyriorum.

18. 34. Goth. + Ubi sunt dii terrae Samariae?

19. 7. Goth. auditum malinam.

23. 11. Lucifer + in domo domus, quam aedificaverint reges Israel excelsi illi Babal et omni militiae caeli.

(δ) The general characteristics of the Vulgate of the Old Testament have been dealt with by Nowack, Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik (Göttingen, 1875). Cf. also H. J. White in Hastings, BD. iv. pp. 883 ff. Jerome describes his method of translation in the introduction to his commentary on Ecclesiastes. He claims for his version a certain independence, as a direct translation from the original Hebrew; but states at the same time that he has kept fairly closely to the LXX where there is no great discrepancy between this version and the Hebrew, and confesses to having had before him and made use of the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Instances from Kings of Jerome’s employment of these later Greek versions may be noticed; and it will be seen that here, as in other books, the version of Symmachus seems to have been most frequently used as a model:—

1. 4. 13. וְלָ֣כְכוֹן אֲבָרָ֖הוּ חָבָ֑ר וַיֹּאמְרֻתָֽו־וֹ אָֽשִׁי וְפַרְשָׁרָ֖ו וְעָלֵֽי־אֵֽרְגֹּב. Vulg. ipsa praerat in omni regione Argob.

6. 8. בְּלָלָ֖ו הָאָֽשִׁי. Vulg. per cochlæam.

9. 18. נָבָ֖ו יְבִֽרְיָ֑ה וַיֹּאמְר וַֽיְבִֽיא לְהוֹא. Vulg. in terra solitudinis.


1 '... hoc breuiter admonens, quod nullius auctoritatem secutus sum; sed de Hebraeo transferens, magis me Septuaginta interpretum consuetudinio conspexit: in his dumtaxat quae non multum ab Hebraicis discrepabant. Interdum Aquilae quoque et Symmachi et Theodotionis recordatus sum, ut nec notitiae nimia lectoris studium deterrerem, nec rursus contra conscientiam meam, fonte veritatis omissa, opinionum riulos consecurer.'
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11. 36. οὐ περ τοῦ διαμένων λέχρων, Vulg. ut remanet lucerna.
12. 7. τά ἑν καὶ εἰς αὐτοῖς, Vulg. et petitioni eorum cesseris.
16. 3. μετανοοῦ ἄνθρωποι, Vulg. dementam posteriora Baasa.
20. 12. Ἰν συνασφαλιστε, Vulg. in umbraculis. Similarly in v. 16.
20. 38. καὶ ἔδειξεν Α. ἐν στόμα, Vulg. aspersione pulvers.
II. 3. 4. δὲ καὶ η εἰς τῆς βοσκίματα, Vulg. nutriabit pecora multa.
4. 7. οὖν ὁ Στομαγος σου, Vulg. et redde creditori tuo.
9. 11. Ἰν τις ἔδειξεν Α., Vulg. et quid locutis est.
11. 10. τοῦ στερμοῦ, Vulg. arma.
12. 6. καὶ η ἔδειξεν Α. καὶ ἔδειξεν τοῦ δικαιοῦ του οἶκου, ὅπου ἐν εἰρήνῃ δέημου ἐπισκέψις, Vulg. et instaurent sarta tecta domus, si quid necessarium viderint instauratione.
23. 24. καὶ ἔδειξεν τοῦ Α. τὰ μορφώματα, Vulg. figuras idolorum.

The Hebrew text employed by Jerome seems to have been very similar to, though not identical with, MT. His version possesses the characteristics of a good translation, and aims at giving the sense of the original rather than at extreme literality of rendering. Phrases and sentences are sometimes filled out in order to make their meaning clearer; cf. I. 2. 40 svolque ad Achis in Gath ad requirendum servos suos, et adduxit eos de Gath; 3. 5 καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ Postula quod vis ut dem tibi; 3. 13
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Examination of the three columns makes the fact plain that Luc.

exhibits a different scheme of synchronism to MT. from Omri of Israel (I. 16. 23) down to Jehoram of Israel (I. 1.17). This scheme conflicts with the synchronisms which go before and follow after, and which belong to the system of MT.; but, so far as it goes, is self-consistent, and is the cause of the placing of the narrative of Jehoshaphat's reign (MT. I. 22. 41ff.) before that of Ahab at the close of I. 16 in both Luc. and LXX, and of the substitution of ὀρθός for δέσιμος in the narrative of II. 3 in Luc. On the other hand, LXX, which agrees partly with Luc. and partly with MT., is clearly a patchwork of the two schemes. Two traces of the scheme of Luc. have crept into MT.; viz. in I. 16. 23, where the synchronism according to MT. scheme should be the 27th or 28th year of Asa; and in II. 1. 17, where the Lucianic synchronism co-exists with that of MT. in II. 3. 1. The other inconsistencies of MT. are probably for the most part due to textual corruption. Thus in II. 13. 10 the reading of 39th for 37th brings about agreement both with the preceding and following synchronisms; in II. 15. 1 the substitution of 14th for 27th removes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kingdom</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Length of reign</th>
<th>Synchronism</th>
<th>Length of reign</th>
<th>Synchronism</th>
<th>Length of reign</th>
<th>Synchronism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 14. 20</td>
<td>I Jeroboam</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 14. 21</td>
<td>J Rehoboam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 15. 1</td>
<td>J Abijah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18th of Jeroboam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18th of Jeroboam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18th of Jeroboam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 15. 9</td>
<td>J Asa</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20th of Jeroboam</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24th of Jeroboam</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24th of Jeroboam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 15. 25</td>
<td>I Nadab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd of Asa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd of Asa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd of Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 15. 33</td>
<td>I Baasha</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3rd of Asa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3rd of Asa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3rd of Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 16. 8</td>
<td>I Elah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26th of Asa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20th of Asa (v. 6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20th of Asa (v. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 16. 15</td>
<td>I Zimri</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27th of Asa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>wanting'</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2nd of Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 16. 23</td>
<td>I Omri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13th of Asa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31st of Asa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31st of Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 16. 29</td>
<td>I Ahab</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38th of Asa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2nd of Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2nd of Jehoshaphat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 22. 52</td>
<td>I Ahaziah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17th of Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17th of Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17th of Jehoshaphat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 1. 17</td>
<td>I Jehoram</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2nd of Jehoram J</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18th of Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2nd of Jehoram J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 8. 3</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18th of Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18th of Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18th of Jehoshaphat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 8. 16</td>
<td>J Jehoram</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th of Jehoram I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 8. 25</td>
<td>J Ahaziah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11th of Jehoram I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 9. 29</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>11th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>11th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>11th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>11th of Jehoram I</td>
<td>11th of Jehoram I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 10. 35</td>
<td>I Jehu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1st Reign</td>
<td>2nd Reign</td>
<td>3rd Reign</td>
<td>4th Reign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Athaliah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jehoash</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7th of Jehu</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7th of Jehu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23rd of Jehoash J</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23rd of Jehoash J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>Jehoash</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37th of Jehoash J</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37th of Jehoash J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd of Jehoash I</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>Jeroboam</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15th of Amaziah</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27th of Jeroboam</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27th of Jeroboam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>38th of Azariah</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>38th of Azariah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>Shallum</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>39th of Azariah</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>Menahem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39th of Azariah</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39th of Azariah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>Pekah</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50th of Azariah</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50th of Azariah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2nd of Pekah</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2nd of Pekah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17th of Pekah</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17th of Pekah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Hoshea</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12th of Ahaz</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12th of Ahaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3rd of Hoshea</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3rd of Hoshea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>Jehoiachin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>Zedekiah</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the double inconsistency, if we make R assign 51 years to the reign of Jeroboam II in place of the 41 years of II. 14. 23. The 12th year of Ahaz in II. 17. 1, which disagrees with preceding synchronisms, is in agreement with the ten years assigned to Pekahiah in Luc. II. 15. 23 in place of the two years of MT.; and thus may belong to a different scheme.

The inconsistencies of R's system of chronology, as compared with the chronology of the period as known to us from the Assyrian inscriptions, are conveniently stated in G. W. Wade's Old Testament History, pp. 319 ff.
LIST OF PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED.

'A. = Aquila's Greek Version, as cited in Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, and in F. C. Burkitt, Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila (3 Kgs. 21 (20 MT.) 7-17; 4 Kgs. 23. 12-27), 1897.

AV. = Authorized Version.

Baed. = K. Baedeker, Palestine and Syria, 3rd edit., 1898.

Benz. = I. Benzinger, Die Bücher der Könige, 1899.


CIG. = Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.

CIS. = Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.

Cod. A. = Codex Alexandrinus of the Septuagint.

COT. = E. Schrader, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O. T. (trans. from the 2nd German edit.), 1885.

D = The Deuteronomic editor (in citations from Joshua and Judges).

DB. = Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by W. Smith, 2nd edit. of vol. i, 1893.

Dri. = S. R. Driver.

Authority = Authority and Archaeology Sacred and Profane, 1899.


LOT. = An Introduction to the Literature of the O. T., 6th edit., 1897.


Tenses = A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew, 3rd edit., 1892.

E = The Elohistic document in the Hexateuch.
Abbreviations

Ew. = H. Ewald, History of Israel, vols. iii and iv, 1871.
Ew. § = H. Ewald, Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the O. T. (trans. from the 8th German edit.), 1881.
Field = F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretem Graecorum in totum V. T. fragmenta, 1875.
Ges. or Ges. Thes. = W. Gesedius, Thesaurus linguae Hebraeae, 1829.
G-K. = Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, as edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch (trans. from the 26th German edit. by A. E. Cowley, 1898).
Grä. = H. Grätz, Geschichte der Israeliten, 1875.
H = The code known as 'the Law of Holiness' in Leviticus.
J = The Jahvistic document in the Hexateuch.
JE = The work of the compiler of the documents J and E in the Hexateuch.
KB. = Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, Bd. 1, 2, 1889–1890.
Abbreviations

Kö. = F. E. König.

Kue. = A. Kuenen.

Ond. = *Hist.-krit. Onderzoek*, 2nd edit., 1887 (German trans., 1890).

Luc. = Lucian's recension of the Septuagint as edited by P. Lagarde (*Liberorum V. T. canoniconum pars prior*, 1883).
LXX = Cod. B of the Septuagint according to the text of H. B. Swete (*The O. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. i, 1887).
MT. = Masoretic Text (D. Ginsburg, 1894; Baer and Delitzsch, 1895).
P = The Priestly Code in the Hexateuch.
PEF. = *Palestine Exploration Fund*.
Mem. = *Memoirs*.
Qy. St. = *Quarterly Statement*.
R² = The Deuteronomic Redactor of Kings (cf. pp. ix ff.).
R²³ = Later Deuteronomic Editors of Kings (cf. p. xviii).
R² = The Priestly Redactor (or Redactors) of Kings (cf. p. xix).
Abbreviations

Rost = P. Rost, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tigralt-Pilesers III*, 1893.
R. Sm. = W. Robertson Smith.

\[ \text{OTJC}^{3} = \text{The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 2nd edit., 1892.} \]

\[ \text{Rel. Sem.}^{3} = \text{The Religion of the Semites, 2nd edit., 1894.} \]

RV. = Revised Version.

\[ \varepsilon = \text{Symmachus' Greek Version, as cited in Field, } \text{Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt.} \]


Sta. = B. Stade, various articles on the text of Kings in *ZATW.*

Sta. § = B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik, 1er Theil, 1875.*


\[ \varepsilon = \text{Theodotion's Greek version, as cited in Field, } \text{Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt.} \]


Th. = O. Thenius, *Die Bücher der Könige, 2e Aufl., 1873.*

Vet. Lat. = The Old Latin Version.

Vulg. = The Vulgate.


\[ \text{Z.A.} = \text{Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.} \]

\[ \text{ZATW.} = \text{Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft.} \]

\[ \text{al.} = \text{et aliter, 'and elsewhere.'} \]

\[ \text{‘ו = ר’Sип = ' &c.'} \]

\[ \text{‘ר = ו’ס = ‘ such a one (unnamed).’} \]

\[ \text{† indicates that all occurrences in O. T. of a particular word or phrase have been cited.} \]
NOTES
ON
THE BOOKS OF KINGS

I. 1. 1–2. 46. Close of the history of David. Establishment of Solomon as his successor.

1. i. אֲבָנָי ] A regular idiom. Lit. ‘entered into days,’ just as we should say, advanced in years. So Gen. 18. 11; 24. 1; Josh. 13. 1; 23. 1, 2.

[With the clothes,] which are immediately suggested to the reader by the previous יְבִּשַׁלָּמֶה. This use of the article with well-known objects is very common in Heb., and imparts a peculiar vividness to the narrative. Cf. v. 39 הָעַלֶּפֶת וְלָשׁוּנָה; ch. 17. 10 בְּיוֹם וּלְיַעַר, ‘in the vessel,’ almost, ‘in your vessel,’ v. 12 בְּיוֹם וּלְוֶשׁ ‘in the jar,’ used in every household for the purpose specified; II. 8. 15; I Sam. 10. 25; 18. 10; al. Da. § 21d.

[לְיַעַר אָנֵי] The imperfect expresses the habitual character of the king’s condition: ‘he was not,’ or, ‘used not to be warm.’ This usage is somewhat rare in prose: cf. ch. 8. 8 מַעֲלֶה וְלָשׁוּנָה; Gen. 2. 25 אֲבָנָי וּלָשׁוּנָה; 1 Sam. 1. 7b אֲבָנָי וּלָשׁוּנָה; 2. 25ב אֲבָנָי וּלָשׁוּנָה. Dri. Tenses, §§ 30, 42 B, 85 Obs.

2. אַלַּי ] A ceremonious form of address which is almost constant. אָבַר אָרָי 2 Sam. 14. 15† (cf. אָבְרֵי 1 Sam. 26. 15†). אֲבָנָי alone is comparatively rare.

1 This section forms the continuation of 2 Sam. chh. 9–20, and is probably by the same author. See Dri. LOT. 179, and especially Wellh. C. 260.
A common form of apposition, the second substantive defining more closely the meaning of the first. Cf. ch. 3. 16; ch. 7. 14; Gen. 21. 20; Deut. 22. 28; Isa. 23. 12; al. G-K. § 131, 2a; Ew. § 287 (b); Da. § 29b.

And let her stand.' Imperf. with a consec. the continuation of the cohortative הביך. Dri. Tenses, § 113, 2; Da. § 55a. The phrase is used idiomatically of those who were in constant attendance upon a superior: cf. ch. 10. 8; 12. 8 (|| 2 Chr. 10. 6); Jer. 52. 12; Deut. 1. 38. Of the service of הוהי, ch. 17. 1; Ezek. 44. 15; Judg. 20. 28; al.

'Attendant,' 'care-taker'; in the masc. לְיָשָׁן Isa. 22. 15 as a title of Shebna the superintendent of the palace, and also, it seems, in a Phoenician inscription from Lebanon probably to the eighth century B.C., of a guardian or governor of a city, 'Son of the New City, servant of Hiram, king of the Sidonians,' CIS. I. i. 5.

The word—unless Cheyne is right in connecting it (Isaiah, ii. 153) with the Assyrian šaknu, 'a high officer,' from šakin, 'to set up, place'—will be derived from בּשָׁן which in the Hiph'il means to deal familiarly with; Num. 22. 30 הַלָּעֵל נַעֲשָׁה בִּנְכָה יִת הַנָּטַע 'Did I ever deal familiarly to do?' i.e. 'was I ever wont to do?' Ps. 139. 3 'With all my ways thou art familiar'; Job 22. 21 'Become familiar with him.'

Pesh. מְדַמֵּשׁ 'serving'; LXX, Vulg. more freely διδόμενον, faoeat; Targ. מְדַמֵּשׁ 'near to him.'

So Pesh., Θ., 'ο ἐξαρχία (Syro-Hex. מְדַמֵּשׁ), Targ. מְדַמֵּשׁ; LXX, Luc., Vulg. There is no reason for doubting the originality of MT. Such a change from 3rd to 2nd pers. is quite in accordance with Hebrew usage in cases in which a superior is addressed. Cf. 1 Sam. 25. 28 הַלָּעֵל נַעֲשָׁה יִת הַנָּטַע; 22. 15; al.

Vulg. Sunamitidem, Targ. מְדַמֵּשׁ, LXX, Luc. מְדַמֵּשׁ, Pesh. מְדַמֵּשׁ. The title is also applied (II. 4. 12, &c.) to Elisha's hostess at Shunem. Song 7. 1,
is usually thought to be a variation; cf. rendering of Pesh., and modern name of the village.

was one of the cities assigned to the tribe of Issachar, Josh. 19. 18; 1 Sam. 28. 4 it is mentioned as the place where the Philistines encamped, near to the Israelite encampment at , and also to v. 7; II. 4. 8+, a city visited by Elisha, not very far from Mt. Carmel, v. 25. The site appears to have been that of the modern Solam, a village on the south-west slope of the Jebel Nebi Dahi (called 'little Hermon'), about five miles north of Jebel Fuk'wa (Mt. Gilboa), and three miles north of Zer'in (Jezreel). Cf. Rob. BR. ii. 324; Stanley, SP. 344; Baed. 243.

4. So LXX, Vulg., Targ.; , Luc., Pesh. Though , are common expressions, yet used absolutely is still more frequent. MT. may therefore be retained.

5. The participle expresses the continuous development of Adonijah's plans, Dri. Tenses, § 135, i. A single event of brief duration, such as the open declaration of his claims, would have been represented by the perf., or by the imperf. with in cons. . 'He made,' i.e. 'instituted.' For this use of , cf. 2 Sam. 15. 1 ' , '. The usual bodyguard of a king. Cf 1 Sam. 22. 17; ch. 14. 28; II. 11. 4; al.

6. 'Had not grieved him.' means to hurt, either bodily, Eccl. 10. 9 , or mentally, Isa. 54. 6 ; 2 Sam. 19. 3, such mental pain sometimes culminating in anger, as seems to be the case here and in 1 Sam. 20. 3, 34; Gen. 34. 7. . LXX and one of the Septuagint seems to presuppose that he had not held him back'; cf. 18. 44. So Klo. Against this reading is the following which, as used of a past event, is opposed to the notion of holding back before an action. The other Verss. give the sense 'reprove,' and seem to be guessing from the context; Luc. and one of the Septuagint seems, Vulg. nec corripuit eum, Pesh. .

7. 'Out of his days'; i.e. at any time during the whole course of his life. An idiomatic expression; cf. 1 Sam. 25. 28
The First Book of Kings

Job 38. 12+; Job 27. 6 The object, as used in English, will be found to fit each of these cases.

The object, as being the interesting member of the sentence, is brought to the beginning and receives a slight emphasis. This is not uncommon. Cf. 1 Sam. 15. 1; 1 Sam. 25. 43; ch. 14. 11; al. Dri. Tenses, § 208, 1.

R.V., by accommodation to Eng. idiom, substitutes a pass.; 'He was born.' Cf. ch. 14. 10; as one sweeps away dung,' or, 'as dung is swept away'; ch. 22. 38; al. The assumed cognate participle as subj. is sometimes actually expressed; Deut. 22. 8; Isa. 28. 4. Ew. § 294b, Da. § 108, Rem. 1. Klo.'s emendation is quite unnecessary.

And his words (i.e. negotiations) were with Joab.' The idiom is similar to 2 Sam. 3. 17; er. Deut. 12. 30; Doubtless after'; Ruth 2. 3; Jer. 50. 21; Lev. 26. 33; Ezek. 5. 2, 12; 12. 14; Deut. 1. 36, al. These persons are not mentioned elsewhere as holding positions of importance about the court of David or Solomon. Neither, one of the twelve officers who provided victuals for Solomon's household (ch. 4. 18), nor the Benjamite of Gera seems to have been of sufficient importance to satisfy the mention in this passage; and the name occurs nowhere else. Hence, the text is probably corrupt. Among suggested emendations, the most worthy of notice is that of Klo. who follows Luc. kal Zapaiaia kal oi étraiou aitroí, i.e. ... wizes, so far as regards the

1. Job 27. 6 is similar if with R.V. we supply an object 'me' to render; 'my heart shall never reproach me.' But more obviously the object is in the sense; 'my heart shall not reproach any one of my days.'
second word, and emends the first מִשְׁאָר. This suggestion מִשְׁאָר is to some extent supported by the enumeration in v. 19, and would imply that the other princes did side with Adonijah, as seems to have been the case from v. 19 onwards. Th.'s emendation מִשְׁעָר, derived partly from Jos.'s explanation of/root as מִשְׁעָר of πλεον πλοιος, is plausible. LXX, Vulg., Pesh., Targ. agree with MT.

David's army of picked warriors; 2 Sam. 10. 7; 16. 6; 20. 7; 1 Chr. 19. 8; 28. 1; 29. 24; Song 4. 4. The names of the principal men among them are given in 2 Sam. 23. 8–39; 1 Chr. 11. 11–47.

This construction takes the place of the stat. constr. because מִשְׁעָר (with the article) was the regular title for the army mentioned, and is regarded almost as a proper name, Da. § 28, Rem. 5°. Such a method of avoiding the stat. constr. is especially frequent with proper names; Judg. 18. 28; 19. 14 מֵעֵת מִשְׁעָר; ch. 15. 27; 17. 9; al.

An idiomatic use of מִשְׁעָר; 'by' or 'close to.' Cf. Gen. 35. 4 מֵעֵת מִשְׁעָר; Josh. 7. 2; Judg. 18. 3; 19. 11; 2 Sam. 20. 8; al.

The serpent'; so called from crawling; Deut. 32. 24 מֵעֵת מִשְׁעָר; Mic. 7. 17. This root corresponds to Ar. to withdraw, lag behind, and is quite distinct from מֵעֵת Job 32. 6 = Ar. = Aram. to fear. Wellh. (Reste Arab. Heidtumms, 2° Ausg. 146) compares מֵעֵת with the Ar. name of Saturn, Zužal, i.e. (Lane, Lex., 1220) he who withdraws, the planet being so named because it is remote, and said to be in the Seventh Heaven.

Pesh. מֵעֵת מִשְׁעָר, Targ. מֵעֵת מִשְׁעָר, i.e. spring of the fuller, being used of treading linen with the feet. Mentioned as one of the landmarks upon the boundary line between Judah, Josh. 15. 7, and Benjamin, Josh. 18. 16; during Absalom's rebellion the hiding-place of Jonathan and Ahimaaz whilst awaiting news from Jerusalem, 2 Sam. 17. 17. The spring has with great probability been identified with the modern 'Spring of the Virgin,' called 'Ain Umm ed-Deraj, i.e. 'spring of the mother of
steps,' the source which supplies the pool of Siloam. Opposite the fountain there is a rough flight of stone steps leading up the rock to the village of Siloam, and called by the fellahin Ex-Zebuighel, i.e. "الزابغيل. See PEF. Qy. St., 1869-70, p. 253; DB. i. 943 f.

11. סָּלֹאָם ... נָבָאָם] Luc. καὶ ἰδοὺ Ναβαάμ πρὸς Βασίλειον ὑπεράρματος καὶ συνανόμωσεν καὶ εἶπεν, i.e. נָבָאָם ... נָזָר יְהֹוָה. This is rather preferable to MT., as being less abrupt. So Klo.

12. מִלְךָ ... מִלְךָ] 'Let me counsel thee ... and save thou,' equivalent to 'Let me counsel thee ... that thou mayest save.' The Imperative with מִלְךָ, stands in place of the usual cohortative with weak מִלְךָ, expressing with greater force the purpose of the action described by the previous verb. Cf. Gen. 12. 2; 20. 7; 21. 3; II. 5. 10; al. See Dri. Tenses, § 65; Ew. § 347; G-K. § 110, 2b; Da. § 65d.

13. וּכְלָה] Like וּכְלָה, recitativum, introducing the direct narration. Cf. ch. 11. 22 and 14. 10; Gen. 29. 32, 33; I Sam. 2. 16; 10. 19; al. Inverted commas are the equivalent in English. RV. rendering 'assuredly,' is not to be followed. Cases like Gen. 18. 20 וּכְלָה, the cry on account of Sodom and Gomorrah is verily great'; Ps. 118. 10, 11, 12 וּכְלָה, 'in the name of Yahweh I will surely cut them off,' where וּכְלָה is joined closely to the verb, are quite different.

14. מִלְךָ ... מִלְךָ] The two clauses are placed in parallelism, and thus their co-ordination in time is marked with as great vividness as is possible. Cf. vv. 22, 42; II. 6. 33 וּכְלָה מִלְךָ; Gen. 29. 9; al. Without verbo in the first clause, ch. 14. 17; II. 2. 23; 4. 5; al. Dri. Tenses, §§ 166-169; G-K. § 116, 5, Rem. 4; Da. § 141.

15. מִלְךָ] Lit. 'I will fill up thy words,' i.e. give them the confirmation of my testimony; so, 'I will confirm thy words.' Elsewhere, מִלְךָ means to fulfil a prediction by subsequent actions; ch. 2. 27; 2 Chr. 26. 21.

16. מִלְךָ] A contraction or corruption of מִלְךָ מִלְךָ, מִלְךָ מִלְךָ (ם).
The pronoun is necessary to mark and emphasize the change of subject in clause 6, in contrast to the subject of clause a, 아הת

20. [So LXX, Pesh.; but read נפש for עון] with Targ. and many Codd. So Th. הנですよ is employed to summarize the conclusion of all that has gone before. Bathsheba draws together the threads of her speech, and explains why she has brought the state of affairs under the king's notice. This use of הנですよ is very common. Cf. e.g. 1 Sam. 25. 26, 27; Gen. 3. 22; ch. 2. 9; 8. 25. Klo.'s violent emendation is quite unnecessary.

22. 'תור' [Expressing concentration of attention. Cf. 2 Chr. 20. 12; Jer. 22. 17.]

24. 'תור' [The interrogation is indicated by the tone in which the words are spoken. Cf. ch. 21. 7 "ואלה חכמים על לע רשא; II. 5. 26; 9. 19; 1 Sam. 11. 12; 21. 16; 22. 7; Gen. 27. 24; al. G-K. § 150, 1; Da. § 121.]

25. הלשון וה שכבר] [So LXX, Vulg., Pesh., Targ.; but Luc. καὶ τὸν ἀξίωματος τιμᾶν, i.e. מַעְשֵׂה יִשְׁרָאֵל (as in v. 19; cf. v. 7; ch. 2. 22), is to be followed. So Hoo. Against MT. it is improbable (i) that Nathan should have omitted express mention of Joab, and (ii) that he should have made an assertion, הלשון והshortcode, which would at the moment seem to implicate Benaiah, who next to Joab was one of David's principal generals.

26. בַּי אֵל] [For the re-enforcement of the suffix pronoun by the personal pronoun, cf. 1 Sam. 19. 23; שִׁלּוּם מֹר וּדוֹר, Hag. 1. 4. 'תור' מַעְשֵׂה יִשְׁרָאֵל; G-K. § 135, 20; Ew. § 311; Da. § 1.

27. [לֶבַך] [Luc. וּלְךָ וּלְךָ מַעְשֵׂה, i.e. מַעְשֵׂה. So Klo., Hoo., correctly. MT. seems to have been altered after v. 19. As Klo. notices, the title of submission, appropriate in the mouth of Bathsheba when speaking of her son, is out of place as coming from Nathan.

28. בִּנְקָא] [Infrequent in single direct questions. When so employed it is usually equivalent to num? Judg. 5. 8 מַעְשֵׂה יִשְׁרָאֵל; Am. 3. 6; Isa. 29. 16; Jer. 48. 27; Job 6. 12; 39. 13. In Gen. 38. 17 מַעְשֵׂה יִשְׁרָאֵל it represents An? Da. § 112 end.]
From proximity with, used to express origin from; a more idiomatic expression than the simple מַנְאָסֶה is very usual when מַנְאָסֶה is the source named. See instances cited on 2. 15.

יָהוּ from; a more idiomatic expression than the simple מַנְאָסֶה is very usual when מַנְאָסֶה is the source named. See instances cited on 2. 15.

יָהוּ from; a more idiomatic expression than the simple מַנְאָסֶה is very usual when מַנְאָסֶה is the source named. See instances cited on 2. 15.

יָהוּ from; a more idiomatic expression than the simple מַנְאָסֶה is very usual when מַנְאָסֶה is the source named. See instances cited on 2. 15.

יָהוּ from; a more idiomatic expression than the simple מַנְאָסֶה is very usual when מַנְאָסֶה is the source named. See instances cited on 2. 15.

יָהוּ from; a more idiomatic expression than the simple מַנְאָסֶה is very usual when מַנְאָסֶה is the source named. See instances cited on 2. 15.

יָהוּ from; a more idiomatic expression than the simple מַנְאָסֶה is very usual when מַנְאָסֶה is the source named. See instances cited on 2. 15.
the city of David on the west side of Gihon in the ravine, the מֹתֶן referred to being probably that of the יִרְיָנָה. The topography of מְדָאָג מִנְיָה is a much disputed subject. See DB. i. 1186.

35. [תנ"ע] Lit. one placed in the forefront, so 'leader.' The word in early Hebrew is characteristic of the more elevated style, and is frequent in Sam., Ki., especially in prophetic utterances. 1 Sam. 9. 16; 10. 1; 13. 14; 25. 30; 2 Sam. 5. 2; 6. 21; 7. 8; ch. 14. 7; 16. 2; II. 20. 5.

36. [אֶפֶם וּבֶן יְאָשֵׁר] So Vulg., 'A., 2., and substantially Targ. אֶפֶם מִלְיָה הֱדוֹנָה קָודָם מַשְׁלַח. Pesh. 2 Codd. Kennicott and i de Rossi מִלְיָה מַשְׁלַח מְשַׁלְחֵה. Cf. Jer. 28. 6. LXX Τῆν ὑπάρχοντα προσώπου δὲ τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ βασιλέως. Luc. Γένοιτο ὑπάρχοντα προσώπου δὲ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ βασιλέως εἶναι Κύριος δὲ θέας σου, κύριόν μου βασιλέα. A double rendering. Pesh. מַשְׁלַח is almost certainly a paraphrase of the somewhat harsh expression of MT. LXX, Luc. must have read מַשְׁלַח for מַשְׁלַח, and then probably added the necessary object מַשָּׁלָח. Klo. follows this, emending מַשְׁלַח לַחַד מַשָּׁלָח, וּבֶן יְאָשֵׁר מְשַׁלְחֵה; and so Hoo. But to say מַשָּׁלָח 'true,' i.e. 'may it come true,' and then to continue מַשָּׁלָח, is mere tautology. There is no reason for the rejection of MT.

37. [ז"כ] Read מַשָּׁלָח Kt. with LXX, Vulg.

38. [הָרָבי מַשְׁלָח] David's bodyguard, doubtless composed of foreigners, mentioned only during his reign; v. 44; 2 Sam. 8. 18 (|| 1 Chr. 18. 17); 15. 18; 20. 7, 23 (Q're). The names are gentilic in formation; G-K. § 86, 2, Rem. 5. In I Sam. 30 יְשֵׁהִים are connected with the Philistines; cf. v. 14 with v. 16; and this is also the case with סָרַךְ which occurs Ezek. 25. 16; Zeph. 2. 5. This latter is rendered Κρήτης by LXX, and hence it is thought that יְשֵׁהִים, from which the Philistines are said (Am. 9. 7; Deut. 2. 23; cf. Jer. 47. 4) to have emigrated, denotes Crete. מְשַׁלְחֵה has been

1 Sayce, following Ebers, formerly identified יְשֵׁהִים with the Egyptian קאָף-וֹר or 'greater Phoenicia,' i.e. the coast-land of the Delta (The Higher Criticism, 136), but has now abandoned this view (Academy, April 14, 1894, p. 314).
supposed, though without ground from analogy, to be a contraction of גוגו. Th.'s objection to the view that the מישׁיא were foreigners, on the score that David, who was so patriotic and devoted to the worship of the only God, would not have surrounded himself with a foreign bodyguard, will not hold good, in view of the important positions occupied by Uriah the Hittite 2 Sam. 11. 15, and by Ittai the Gittite 2 Sam. 18. 2.

In v. 33 the better reading is הָרַע לָא. There are many scattered instances of הָע used in place of לָא after a verb of motion; ch. 20. 43 (21. 4 לָא); 22. 6 (|| 2 Chr. 18. 5 לָא); 1 Sam. 2. 11; 2 Sam. 15. 20; Mic. 4. 1 (|| Isa. 2. 2 לָא); Isa. 22. 15 (לָו ... לָא); 66. 20 (56. 7 לָא); Ezek. 1. 20 (v. 12 לָא); 44. 13 (לָא ... לָא); Jer. 1. 7; 31. 11 (לָא ... לָא); 36. 12; al.

40. So Vulg., and second rendering of Luc.; (Vet. Lat. second rendering organisantes in organis; Pesh. 'were striking sistra'). LXX, and first rendering of Luc. εὐχάριστον ἐν χαροῖς. So perhaps Targ. سمך ונתנה. Vet. Lat. first rendering cantabat canticis et melodiis. Ew., following LXX, reads לָא on the ground that it is unlikely that 'all the people' would be able to play flutes. But, as Th. remarks, the form לָא never occurs (always תָּוֶה), and round dances, which would be denoted by לָא, would be unsuitable in a hasty procession. To this we may add the consideration that the stress seems to be laid upon the noise which was made; וַחֲנִיָּה יָבָלָא. Klo.'s emendation מִשָּׁהוּ לָא (cf. Isa. 30. 29) is unnecessary. A denom. לָא = 'to play the flute' may well be formed from לָא. 'וַחֲנִיָּה יָבָלָא' The sound of the shouting is compared to the deep rumbling produced by the splitting of the ground during an earthquake. In Num. 16. 31 the phrase מִשָּׁהוּ לָא is used of an earthquake phenomenon. Th.'s objection to MT. is insufficient.

1 But may have the meaning 'musical instrument'; Psachim 111b they hung a harp in the hollow of the tree'; Targ. Jerus. on Ex. 32. 19 'and harp in the hands of the sinners'; Targ. Ps. 5. 1 'and harp in the hands of the sinners'. See Levy or Jastrow, s. v. Studia Biblica, ii. p. 34.
41. 'They having finished eating'; a circumstantial clause with the personal pronoun standing as subject. So very frequently; II. 5. 18 ἡδονὴ γε γεμιζότω ἑαυτῷ ἴδιον ἐπήκουν, 'he leaning on my hand'; Gen. 18. 2; 18. 8; al. Dri. Tenses, § 160.

Wherefore is there the sound of the city in tumult?' So Vulg., excellently, Quid sibi vult clamor civitatis tumultuantis? This is properly an accus. of state, and forms a kind of secondary predicate. Cf. ch. 14. 6 (בָּא יָדִי הֲבִיא אֶלֶם בִּשְׁלֹשָׁהָ תּוֹמַעְתֵּה) of course referring to the suffix of יָדִי (דְּב לְדוּד וְרָפֵא); Song 5. 2 (כי יָדוּד וְרָפֵא)

For the use of the word בָּא, cf. Isa. 22. 2; Jer. 6. 23; Ps. 46. 7.

42. 'Nay but;' [Cf. v. 14 note.] Not 'a man of valour;' but 'a man of worth;' as also in the expression בָּא יָדִי v. 52. That בָּא יָדִי can have this meaning is shown by its application to a woman; Ruth 3. 11; Prov. 31. 10; cf. v. 29. Targ., here and in v. 52; ch. 2. 2 (see note); 2 Sam. 23. 20, seeks to reproduce this special sense by בָּא רָוִי אָסִּיס 'a man who fears sin.'

43. 'Nay but;' With a slight adversative force, 'Nay but,' in repudiation of Adonijah's suggestion that he is the bearer of good tidings. In late Heb. this adversative signification is strongly marked, 'howbeit;' Dan. 10. 7, 21; Ezra 10. 13; 2 Chr. 1. 4; 19. 3; 33. 17. In classical Heb., though weaker, it is never really absent: Gen. 17. 19 'Nay but Sara thy wife shall bear thee a son;' in response to Abraham's wish that Ishmael might be his representative; 42. 21 (however much we may try to repudiate it, our guilt has found us out; 2 Sam. 14. 5 (but) Gehazi points out that the woman anticipates any refusal of the king to take up her cause by pleading that she is a widow; II. 4. 14+ (but) the offers of v. 13, but the bestowal of a son. Thus 'verily' or 'of a truth,' the translation of RV. in all these five passages except Gen. 17, is insufficient.

45. 1 Sam. 4. 5; Ruth 1. 19 (דַּרְכֵּם וְלַעֲרֵיהֶם; Ruth 1. 19)

47. Luc. inserts καὶ εὐσημένια μήνας after τὸν κύριον ἕμοι τὸν
The First Book of Kings

This seems to point to a Hebrew original in which יְהֹוָה, at the beginning of the verse, had been by mistake written a second time after יְהֹוָה יִפְרָד, and then, making no sense in that position, had been altered into יְהֹוָה יָבֹא. Klo. sees in μονός a variant of לְבֵית.

[NOTE] KT., Pesh.; Q're, LXX, Vulg., Luc., Targ. The latter should have the preference.

48. יְהֹוָה יִפְרָד after upon the authority of LXX, Luc. εἰς τὸν στερμαρόν μου. So Th., Klo. The happiness of the event consisted not in the fact that David was to have a successor, which was only natural, but that this successor was to be one of his own family—his son. Pesh., Targ. insert בְּרֵאשִׁית. They probably translated from a text in which, like MT., יְהֹוָה יִפְרָד had fallen out, and thus felt the necessity for some such insertion.

רֶאשֶׁת רַחֲמֵי יְהוָה Mine eyes beholding it'; a circumstantial clause. The idiom occurs again Deut. 28. 32; 2 Sam. 24. 3; Jer. 20. 4.

50. הָרָעֲשָׁת הַחַדְּשָׁתָת The four corners of the brazen altar, made of one piece with it (Ex. 27. 2 וּנְשָׁתָה קרנוּת עַל אֲרוֹב מַטִּים), and apparently projecting, for they could be grasped (here, and v. 51; 2. 28), and also broken off (cf. Amos 3. 14 וּנְשָׁתָה קרנוּת הַחַדְּשָׁת).

51. הָרָעֲשָׁת The four corners of the brazen altar, made of one piece with it (Ex. 27. 2 וּנְשָׁתָה קרנוּת עַל אֲרוֹב מַטִּים), and apparently projecting, for they could be grasped (here, and v. 51; 2. 28), and also broken off (cf. Amos 3. 14 וּנְשָׁתָה קרנוּת הַחַדְּשָׁת).

52. יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ Properly 'to-day' (ב having a temporal force, as e.g. in 1 Sam. 5. 10 'ב יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ), so 'now,' and then acquiring the special sense 'first of all': Gen. 25. 31 מַעַרְבִּיהָ יָדָא בֵּית יְהוָה וַעֲקֵר לֹא יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ; 1 Sam. 2. 16 כַּמָּרִים נַעֲשָׂת בֵּית יְהוָה יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ;

53. יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ 'That he will not slay.' The oath which is implied would take some such form as יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ (cf. II. 6. 31; 1 Sam. 3. 17; 25. 21), and thus by the suppression of the apodosis מִן 'if' of the protasis, gains the sense of an emphatic negative. This is very common; cf. ch. 2. 8; II. 2. 2; 3. 14; 1 Sam. 3. 14; al. Da. § 120; Ew. § 356.

54. יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ 'There shall not fall even a single hair of him to the ground.' The fem. יִרְאוּ is a nomen unitatis; cf. Judg. 20. 16 יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ Yihwah, G-K. § 122, 4. Yihwah.
properly means 'starting from one of his hairs'; cf. Deut. 15. 7
'a poor man, even (starting from) one of thy brethren.' This use of מ, called מ'וכל (Moe. "otiose), is very
frequent in Ar. when a negation, prohibition, or interrogation with
precedes; Qor. 6. 38 'We have neglected nothing whatsoever (lit. starting from anything) in the
Book'; 67. 3 'Thou canst see no sort of diversity in God's creation'; ibid. 'Seest thou any gap?' The other occurrences of the proverbial
phrase are 1 Sam. 14. 42; 2 Sam. 14. 11; the verb מ is used in the sense of
going up upon an altar, ch. 12. 32, 33; II. 16. 12; 23. 9; 1 Sam. 2. 28; and conversely מ is
used of descent from the altar here and in Lev. 9. 22. In Ex. 20. 26 steps
to the altar are expressly forbidden, and hence it has been
thought that the ascent was by an inclined plane, leading up to a
ledge (perhaps the יָלָּה (Ex. 27. 5) which ran round the altar. Solomon's altar, according to 2 Chr. 4. 1, was ten cubits high, and
therefore must have been approached by an incline, or by steps;
and the altar described by Ezekiel is pictured as having steps
leading up to it (43. 17 מְנַבָּה יָסָר). Jos. (Wars, v. 5, § 6) states that in Herod's Temple the ascent to the altar was by an
inclined plane.

2. 1. [3 קָרַב מַר] So Gen. 47. 29.

[2 קָרַב מַר] is used of a man's last commands; cf. especially 2 Sam.
17. 23; II. 20. 1; || Isa. 38. 1; Deut. 31. 25; and conversely מ is
used of descent from the altar here and in Lev. 9. 22. In Ex. 20. 26 steps
to the altar are expressly forbidden, and hence it has been
thought that the ascent was by an inclined plane, leading up to a
ledge (perhaps the יָלָּה (Ex. 27. 5) which ran round the altar. Solomon's altar, according to 2 Chr. 4. 1, was ten cubits high, and
therefore must have been approached by an incline, or by steps;
and the altar described by Ezekiel is pictured as having steps
leading up to it (43. 17 מְנַבָּה יָסָר). Jos. (Wars, v. 5, § 6) states that in Herod's Temple the ascent to the altar was by an
inclined plane.
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The First Book of Kings

Targ. rec0n, (cf. ch. 1. 42, note), and several Codd. Vulg. esto vir fortis seem to presuppose הפעם על הנב. The regular phrase, however, is בלב הנב, cf. ch. 1. 52; 1 Sam. 18. 17; 2 Sam. 2. 7; al.; and Luc. accordingly in all these passages keeps 진. This makes it probable that думы здесь is only a paraphrastic addition.

3. 4. This passage, in its present form, is due to the pre-exilic Deuteronomic compiler (RD). Notice especially the phrases חמשים הנב and חמשים הנב Deut. 11. 1; cf. ch. 8. 58 note; Deut. 8. 6; 10. 12; 11. 22; al. ‘לך אשר’ Deut. constantly; للمנה, and וינב Deut. 29. 8; ‘לך אשר’ Deut. 9. 5; Deut. 4. 29; 6. 5; al.

3. אתשהוסל ‘Understand’ (so as to manage successfully). For אתשהוסל with accus., cf. Ps. 64. 10; 106. 7; Deut. 32. 29; and with the special nuance of our passage, Deut. 29. 8 לא תנו המנה ויאשר ולא תנו המנה. In the application of the word to clause י, לא כל אשר תנה המנה there is a slight zeugma.

4. אתשהוסל The use of the word is illustrated by Prov. 17. 8 לא כל אשר תנה המנה; 1 Sam. 14. 47 (emend המנה; י驾校ו; לא אשר תנה המנה). The promise referred to is the substance of 2 Sam. 7. 12–16 (Nathan’s prophecy).

אodore לא יпеיתר] The phrase והנה is peculiar to Kings; ch. 3. 6 (as here, followed by הבוא); 8. 23, 25 (|| 2 Chr. 6. 14, 16); 9. 4 (|| 2 Chr. 7. 17). Elsewhere the phrase is והנה לא יpeeיתר; II. 20. 3 || Isa. 38. 3 (followed by הבוא); 1 Sam. 2. 30; Gen. 17. 1; 24. 40; 48. 15; Ps. 56. 14; 116. 9.

אodore לא יпеיתר] The second אתשהוסל introduces the express words of the promise after a brief summary of the conditions; ‘Said he.’ Such cases of resumption after an intervening sentence are not uncommon in Heb.; cf. ch. 1. 30 בכם ניב 등 ... ואodore: 8. 30 בכם ניב ... והנותר ... והנותר ... והנותר ... והנותר; 8. 41, 42 etc. ... הנכסים ... הנכסים ... הנכסים; 1 Sam. 29. 10 ... הנכסים ... הנכסים ... הנכסים ... הנכסים ... הנכסים; Lev. 17. 5 ... הנכסים ... הנכסים ... הנכסים; al. The second אתשהוסל is omitted by Cod. Kennicott 170, Th., Kamp., and not expressed by Luc., Vulg.

1 See Introduction.
II. 3-5

Cf. ch. 8. 25 ([| 2 Chr. 6. 16]; 9. 5 ([| 2 Chr. 7. 18]; Jer. 33. 17. נ is dat. of reference, ‘pertaining unto thee.’

[II] Lit. ‘from (sitting) upon,’ so ‘off.’ A regular idiom; cf. the phrases שָׁעִיל הָעָלָה 1 Sam. 25. 23; Gen. 24. 64; שָׁעִיל הָעָלָה ch. 1. 53; שָׁעִיל הָעָלָה Gen. 40. 17; Deut. 28. 21; al.

5. רָאָשָׂה | ‘How that he slew them.’ The נ is epexegetical of the somewhat vague preceding expression ‘גָּאָשָׂה עַשֶּׁה תָּאָס אָנָא.’ Other instances of the Imperf. with נ consec., ‘how that’ or ‘in that,’ used to explain a preceding הָעָשֶׁה, are ch. 18. 13 אָנָא עָשָׁרוּ עַשְׁרוּ עַשְׁרוּ; 1 Sam. 8. 8; Gen. 31. 26. See Dri. Tenses, § 76a; Da. § 47 end.

A very unnatural expression. (i) As it stands it can only mean, (a) ‘He placed the blood of war upon peace,’ or (b) taking נהוטי абсолютно, ‘He set (i.e. paraph. shed) the blood of war during time of peace.’ But such an absolute use of Nahot, followed neither by ב or ל of that upon which the object is placed, nor by a second accus. or by ל expressing the result of the action denoted by the verb, is extremely improbable. (ii) Why is the blood of Abner and Amasa called נהוטי מסה? This is inexplicable. Doubtless we ought, with Klo., Hoo., to emend נהוטי美德שנה after Luc. καὶ ἔδινεν, Vet. Lat. et vindicavit, i.e. Leakage of Nahot, the only change being the substitution of פ for פ. Joab’s crime consisted in having avenged in time of peace, blood shed in war—the blood of Asahel justifiably shed by Abner in self-defence. Thus נהוטי מסה is fully explained, and forms an admirable antithesis to נהוטי. For the use of נהוטי cf. Deut. 32. 43. וָדָה עַבְרִי יָשָׁש LXX καὶ ἐγένετο seems to have had MT. reading; while Vulg. et essuit, Targ. וָדָה רְוָאָשָׂה רְוָאָשָׂה לֹאָה כוֹו, Pesh. כָּמוֹması | are probably paraphrastic explanations of the same.

Here we have the same difficulty as to the application of נהוטי מסה. The reading of Cod. A, Luc. alwa לֶמַעְשָׂה is favoured by the fact that Luc. preserves the correct text just before. Accordingly, Bö. suggests נהוטי לֶמַעְשָׂה; Th. לֶמַעְשָׂה; Klo. "נהוטי or נהוטי or נהוטי. The last expression is the best; cf. v. 31
Doubtless, as Th. suggests, the corruption arose through the previous word standing directly above it in the MS. from which the copy was made. Targ. and Pesh. presuppose which may well have arisen from the word.

6. The employment of the jussive form with כל is rare. Other instances are, Gen. 24. 8; 1 Sam. 14. 36; 2 Sam. 17. 12; Ezek. 48. 14; Gen. 4. 12; Deut. 13. 1; Joel 2. 2. See G-K. § 109, 1b; Dri. Tenses, § 174 Obs. For the expression (נ) כְּנֻיָּה see G-K, § 109, 1b; Dri. Tenses, § 174 Obs.

7. 'Let them be among, &c.' Cf. Am. 1. 1

8. 'The Benjamite.' So Judg. 3. 15; 2 Sam. 16. 11; 19. 17. Cf. נַשְׁגָּה פָּרִי 1 Sam. 16. 18; נֶשֶׁגָּה פָּרִי 1 Sam. 6. 14; נֶשֶׁגָּה פָּרִי ch. 16. 34; נֶשֶׁגָּה פָּרִי Judg. 6. 11. In 1 Chr. 27. 12 קָרָה 'a curse made sick,' and so 'a sore or severe curse.' Cf. with similar use of a passive participle, נִשְׁגָּה פָּרִי Jer. 14. 17.

9. So Targ., Pesh. LXX omits. Luc., Vulg. תַּקֵּשׂ; so Th., Klo., Kamp. MT. should be retained; see note on ch. 1. 20.

10, 11. This short mention of David's death and burial, and the statement of the length of his reign, is in its present form the work...
II. 6–13

of RP, whose method of introducing and summarizing the account of a reign is noticed at length in *Introd.*

10. יִרְעָה The ancient city of Jerusalem taken by David from the Jebusites, called יִשְׂרָאֵל 2 Sam. 5. 7; || 1 Chr. 11. 5; יִשְׂרָאֵל ch. 8. 1. Zion is expressly named in 1 Macc. 4. 37 f.; 7. 33 as the hill upon which the Temple stood, and this is further borne out by such expressions as 'זְרוּעַ חַתֹּם וָרָא *Isa. 8. 18; וָרָא לְאֵלי Ps. 2. 6; וָרָא לְאֵלי Ps. 74. 2; al.' In 2 Chr. 33. 14 it is said of Manasseh that 'he built an outer wall to the city of David, on the west side of Gihon in the ravine (*note on ch. 1. 33*), even to the entering in at the fish gate; and he compassed about the Ophel, &c.'

Thus it seems clear that the site of יִרְעָה was upon the somewhat low south-east hill of Jerusalem (יהוֹשֻׁעַ), the Temple being upon the north, and Solomon's palace upon the south, closely adjoining the Temple*. The tradition which places Zion upon the south-west hill appears to be no earlier than the fourth century a.d.; and the modern maps which so locate it are certainly incorrect. See Sta. Ges. i. 315 f.; *Encyc. Brit.* ed. 9, Art. *Jerusalem* (Pt. II); Baed. 21 f.

13. יִרְעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל... יִשְׂרָאֵל] LXX, Luc. add καὶ προσευσθήσαντο αὐτῷ, i.e. מְלָכָה יִשְׂרָאֵל; possibly genuine, and accepted by Klo. Th. is doubtful, remarking that it is quite as likely to have been inserted by a copyist from v. 19, on the consideration that Adonijah would not have acted with less deference than king Solomon.

---

*1 The name יִשְׂרָאֵל applied to the city, Judg. 19. 10, 11; 1 Chr. 11. 4, 5* (cf. Josh. 15. 8; 18. 16, 28 P), is probably no real archaism, but a literary derivative from the name of the ancient inhabitants. Cf. Moore (*Judges*, p. 413), who quotes Judg. 1. 7, 21; Josh. 15. 63 (*JE*), as showing that the city was called Jerusalem before the time of David, and concludes that 'the question has been set at rest by the Amarna tablets (about 1400 b.c., before the Israelite invasion) in which the name Urusalim repeatedly occurs, while there is no trace of a name corresponding to Jebus.'

*2 This agrees with the statement of Ezek. 43. 7, 8; 'And the house of Israel shall no more defile my holy name, neither they nor their kings... in their setting of their threshold by my threshold, and their doorpost beside my doorpost, and there was but the wall between me and them.'
So 1 Sam. 16. 4. Lit. ‘Is thy coming peace?’ the abstract substantive being used instead of an adjective. So very frequently with this word; Gen. 43. 27; Judg. 6. 24 he called it, Yahwe is peace; 1 Sam. 25. 6; 2 Sam. 17. 3; Isa. 60. 17; Mic. 5. 4; Ps. 120. 7; 147. 14; Prov. 3. 17; Job 5. 24; 21. 9; cf. also Num. 25. 12 my covenant—peace, i.e. ‘my peaceful covenant.’ With other words; Ex. 17. 12 and his hands were firmness; Ps. 110. 3 thy people is freewillingness; &c. See Dri. Tenses, § 189, 2.

14.Mine was the kingdom.] II. 9. 5; Judg. 3. 19, 20.

15. ‘Mine was the kingdom.’ 11 is greatly emphasized by position: cf. Job 15. 19; LXX, Luc., Pesh., Vulg., some Codd. add מ.

Expressing attention concentrated in expectancy; cf. the phrase בעל ch. 1. 20. In its other occurrences, Ezek. 29. 2; 35. 2† (a variation of מִמֵּיהַ לֹא אָסַר [30] מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּיהַ מִמֵּי

Describes a purpose at the point of time at which it is about to be put into execution. II. 12. 18; Jer. 42. 15, 17; 44. 12; Dan. 11. 17.

[16] Klo. compares II. 12. 18; but this is not quite parallel, the subject of the infin. מִיְּדוּ לֹא עֲבֵד, as in the other passages above cited, the same as that of מִשָּׁם, while the subject of מִיְּדוּ is different from that of מִשָּׁם. Two Codd. De Rossi and all Verss. presuppose the easier reading מִיְּדוּ לֹא עֲבֵד.

The ordering of events in a manner opposed to human calculations is, as Klo. notices, specially spoken of as a divine interposition. Judg. 14. 4; cf. Prov. 16. 1. There is a similar use of מִיְּדוּ לֹא עֲבֵד ch. 12. 24; II. 6. 33; Josh. 11. 20; Ps. 118. 23; al.

The participle used of the immediate future as it merges into the present; the futurum instans. ‘I am about to ask,’ almost equivalent to the simple present ‘I ask.’ Cf. v. 20.
II. 14-19

So Vulg., Pesh., Targ.; but LXX, Luc. to προσώπον σου, i.e. κύριον σου; and in vv. 17, 20 LXX reads οὐχ ἀναστρέψεις τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ for οὐχ ἤνεξίνα, and μὴ ἀναστρέψης τῷ προσώπῳ σου for οὐχ ἤνεξίνα. On the contrary, ἤνεξίνα at the end of v. 20 is rendered οὐχ ἀναστρέψεις σου. In all these cases, Luc., Targ., Vulg. (paraph. in v. 17, neque enim negare hibi quidquam potest), Pesh. (אָנִי for אָנִי in v. 17) agree in supporting the reading of MT.

The usage of the expression χαίρεις εἰς τινί is as follows. It occurs, as in the LXX text of these passages, of turning one's own face away from anything, only in Ezek. 14. 6 שָׂחֵב הַשִּׁאנוֹן מִנְּאָרָיו לְלָכָהוּ; cf. Ezek. 18. 30 where there is probably an ellipse of χαίρεις εἰς τινί to turn one's own face towards, Dan. 11. 18, 19. On the other hand, the expression is used as here in vv. 16, 17, 20 of MT., of turning away the face of another in repulse, in II. 18. 24; || Isa. 36. 9 χαίρεις εἰς τινί εἰς κόσμον καὶ Νήσον, and Ps. 132. 10; || 2 Chr. 6. 42 χαίρεις εἰς τινί εἰς κόσμον καὶ Νήσον. So also in the opposite expression of the acceptance of an overture, ἀνεκτήσας ἀνέκτησα, it is always the face of another person which is raised.

Thus evidence is all in favour of the retention of MT. text in vv. 16, 17, 20.

18. וַדָּבָר] A formula of assent; cf. 1 Sam. 20. 7; 2 Sam. 3. 13.

19. וָאָמַר] So Vulg., Pesh., Targ. LXX, Luc. ραί (LXX αἰτ-έομεν αὐτῷ presuppose ραί ῥαί! or ραί ραί! Böh. prefers MT., supposing that LXX reading points to an alteration on the part of the Alexandrian Jews, who thought that such an act of obeisance was unworthy of king Solomon. Th. also points out that the ceremonial which follows—the placing of a throne for the queen-mother and her sitting at the king's right hand—is in favour of MT.

The importance of the position of the queen-mother וָאָמַר is attested by ch. 15. 13; || 2 Chr. 15. 16 (cf. II. 10. 13; Jer. 13. 18; 29. 2), and by the frequent special mention of her name; ch. 14. 21, 31; 15. 2, 10; 22. 42; II. 8. 26; 12. 2; al. Thus, as far as can be judged, there would be nothing incongruous in the king's bowing to her.
Klo. adopts LXX reading, describing the action denoted by MT. as 'gegen alle Etiquette'; but as a matter of fact we know too little about the customs of ancient eastern monarchs to be able to dogmatize upon what might fittingly have taken place, and what not so.

20. Here the close connexion of לְ to the jussive by means of Maqaf causes a retraction of the tone, just as in the case of the Imperf. with consec. Cf. 1 Sam. 9. 20; 2 Sam. 17. 16; al.

21. The passive verb is impersonal, and the object of the action denoted by it follows in the accus.; 'Let there be giving as regards Abishag,' so, 'Let one give,' or, 'Let her be given.' So with the same verb Num. 32. 5; 1 Sam. 18. 13; 1 K. 2. 17; 2 Sam. 21. 11; Gen. 27. 42; al. See G-K. § 121, 1; Ew. 295b; Da. § 79.

22. 'And why?' 'why then?' The 1 is very forcible, and here gives a sarcastic turn to the sentence. Cf. II. 7. 19, 'Pray, if Yahwe were to make windows in heaven, could this thing come to pass?' Other instances of the 1 with מִלְכָּת are Num. 14. 3; 20. 4; Judg. 6. 13; 12. 3. See Dri. Tenses, § 119 γ, n. 1.

With accent מִלְכָּת before the following מִלְכָּת, instead of מִלְכָּת. This accentuation is always adopted before words beginning with מ, נ, or ב, for the sake of avoidance of hiatus. See Sta. § 372a.

R.V. ‘Ask for him the kingdom ... even for him, and for Abiathar &c.’ A somewhat dubious rendering. As the text stands מִלְכָּת can scarcely be correct, and must be omitted as dittagraphy from the first two letters of the following word.

All Verss., however, LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., and probably Targ. (paraph. מִלְכָּת), presuppose מִלְכָּת אֶרֶץ בּוֹשֵׁם יוֹדָה מִלְכָּת, 'And on his side are Abiathar the priest, and Joab &c.' As Th. says, it is natural that a second reason for asking the kingdom for Adonijah should be mentioned. So B. For this sense of מִלְכָּת, cf. Ex. 32. 26; Josh. 5. 13; Mal 1. 6; Lev. 26. 1; Josh. 1. 16.
The addition of LXX, Luc., after Joab’s name, \( \delta \delta \psi \Delta \sigma \theta \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \) \( \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \rho \omicron \) appears to be merely a gloss, \( \delta \delta \psi \) being Joab’s usual title, and \( \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \rho \omicron \) explaining the reference of \( \omicron \omicron \), ‘To him Joab . . . is an ally.’

Klo., starting from the addition of \( \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \rho \omicron \) in LXX, Luc., and comparing the Targ. paraphrase ‘ל וות אנתה ברה, supposes that a word has fallen out at the end of the sentence in MT., and accordingly would supply \( \pi \omicron \omicron \); ‘To him and to Abiathar . . . there is an alliance.’ But against this it is to be noticed that the word which is constantly used in the historical books to denote a conspiracy or alliance is never \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) but always \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) (cf. II. 11. 14; 12. 21; al.), and again, it seems very doubtful whether Targ., if it had had \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) at the end of the sentence, would have represented it by \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) at the beginning.

23. ‘ל וות אנתה ברה’ II. 6. 31; 1 Sam. 3. 17; 14. 44; 20. 13; 25. 22; 2 Sam. 3. 9, 35; 19. 14; Ruth 1. 17. In the mouths of heathen a plural verb is used; ch. 19. 2; 20. 104.

If the substance of the oath be a negation, it is usual to introduce it by \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) ‘if’; ch. 20. 10, \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) ‘if the dust of Samaria suffice for handfuls &c.’; II. 6. 31; \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) ‘So may the gods do to me, and more also, if the dust of Samaria suffice for handfuls &c.’; 1 Sam. 3. 17; 25. 22. In analogy with this we should expect \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) if the substance be an assertion; and this occurs once; 2 Sam. 19. 14. It is usual, however, to break off after the oath, and introduce its subject by \( \pi \omicron \omicron \), the break in connexion being represented in English by a dash. So in our passage; ‘God do so to me and more also—Adonijah hath spoken this word against his life’; ch. 19. 2; \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) ‘So do the gods, &c.—to-morrow I will make &c.’; 1 Sam. 14. 44; 20. 13; 2 Sam. 3. 9; Ruth 1. 17.

\( \pi \omicron \omicron \) is thus very frequently used to introduce an assertion after the oath \( \pi \omicron \omicron \), and with a suppression of \( \pi \omicron \omicron \); cf. v. 24; ch. 1. 30; 18. 15; 1 Sam. 14. 39; 20. 3, 21; 25. 34; al. (about nineteen times in all). In such a case \( \pi \omicron \omicron \) occurs only once,
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Num. 14. 28, outside of Ezekiel where it is characteristic and uniformly takes the place of the usual construction with ו; 5. 11; 17. 16, 19; 20. 33; 33. 27; 34. 8; 35. 6+ (this last a gloss according to Cornill).

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.

[Num. 14. 29, outside of Ezekiel where it is characteristic and uniformly takes the place of the usual construction with ]

At the cost of his life; Beth pretii. Cf. 2 Sam. 23. 17

who went at peril of their lives; Prov. 7. 23; Lam. 5. 9. So ch. 16. 34; Josh. 6. 26

baboon; 1 Chr. 12. 19

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.

'At the cost of his life'; Beth pretii. Cf. 2 Sam. 23. 17

who went at peril of their lives; Prov. 7. 23; Lam. 5. 9. So ch. 16. 34; Josh. 6. 26

baboon; 1 Chr. 12. 19

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.

[Num. 14. 29, outside of Ezekiel where it is characteristic and uniformly takes the place of the usual construction with ]

At the cost of his life; Beth pretii. Cf. 2 Sam. 23. 17

who went at peril of their lives; Prov. 7. 23; Lam. 5. 9. So ch. 16. 34; Josh. 6. 26

baboon; 1 Chr. 12. 19

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.

[Num. 14. 29, outside of Ezekiel where it is characteristic and uniformly takes the place of the usual construction with ]

At the cost of his life; Beth pretii. Cf. 2 Sam. 23. 17

who went at peril of their lives; Prov. 7. 23; Lam. 5. 9. So ch. 16. 34; Josh. 6. 26

baboon; 1 Chr. 12. 19

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.

[Num. 14. 29, outside of Ezekiel where it is characteristic and uniformly takes the place of the usual construction with ]

At the cost of his life; Beth pretii. Cf. 2 Sam. 23. 17

who went at peril of their lives; Prov. 7. 23; Lam. 5. 9. So ch. 16. 34; Josh. 6. 26

baboon; 1 Chr. 12. 19

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.

[Num. 14. 29, outside of Ezekiel where it is characteristic and uniformly takes the place of the usual construction with ]

At the cost of his life; Beth pretii. Cf. 2 Sam. 23. 17

who went at peril of their lives; Prov. 7. 23; Lam. 5. 9. So ch. 16. 34; Josh. 6. 26

baboon; 1 Chr. 12. 19

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.

[Num. 14. 29, outside of Ezekiel where it is characteristic and uniformly takes the place of the usual construction with ]

At the cost of his life; Beth pretii. Cf. 2 Sam. 23. 17

who went at peril of their lives; Prov. 7. 23; Lam. 5. 9. So ch. 16. 34; Josh. 6. 26

baboon; 1 Chr. 12. 19

If the oath introduced by חת with a suppressed 'ין has a negative substance, כנ occurs constantly.
II. 24-29

[Text continuation]
This is translated by Th. ..., and adopted by him as genuine on the ground that a scribe's eye might very well have passed by mistake from the first הָלַשְׁנָה to the second. So Bo., Klo. The words exhibit no attempt to justify the action of Solomon, nor does there seem to be any other reason for their addition by a later hand; a consideration which favours their genuineness.

LXX, Luc. add καὶ βοήθησον αὐτὸν, through desire, as Th. remarks, for conformity with v. 31.

Klo. would emend ἀνέθετο for βοήθησον. This is unsupported by any Vers., and though it may seem at first sight to be required by the words of v. 30 καὶ ἀνέθετο βοήθησον, yet this is not really the case. The king, in issuing the command βοήθησον, supposed that Joab could be brought away from the altar and executed, but Benaiah, meeting with his refusal to leave the asylum, returned to the king for further instructions.

Added out of consideration for the dignity of his position. Cf. II. 9. 34, and contrast II. 9. 10; Jer. 22. 19; Isa. 14. 19; Ps. 79. 3, where the loss of burial is mentioned as a mark of deep dishonour.

It is very rare to find the tense not thrown forward with 1 conse. in 1st and 2nd sing. of verbs יָוָה (or יָב). This and יָוָה Jer. 10. 18; יָוָה Am. 1. 8, are probably all the cases which exist. Dri. Tenses, § 110, 5, Obs.

‘From upon me’; the blood being regarded as resting upon the head of the guilty person; so vv. 33, 37; 2 Sam. 3. 29. Cf. Jon. 1. 14 אָלַת עַל עַל עַל כִּכָּה; 2 Sam. 16. 8; S. Matt. 27. 25.

1 Sam. 25. 39; Judg. 9. 57.

LXX, Luc. ἀλάμα τῆς ἀθρασμοῦ, a paraphrase based upon the supposition that ἀθρασμός refers, not to Joab's own blood, but to the blood unjustly shed by him.

So ch. 12. 15; Ruth 2. 12; Ps. 121. 2; al. Cf. the analogous use of ἀθρασμός ch. 1. 27 note.
34. 'Went up'; in accordance with the expression מָלַת הָוָה
in ch. 1. 53 note.

[Hebrew]
So LXX, Vulg., Targ.; Th., Klo. Cf. 2 Chr. 33. 20
Luc., Pesh. presuppose לֶבַנָּה, and this is favoured
by Kamp. who thinks it extremely unlikely that Joab should have
had a house in the wilderness.

Kamp. suggests קְפָלַת יָדָיו; Judg. 1. 16; Ps. 63. 1.

35. After אָרָרְנוּנָה LXX, Luc. insert καὶ ἡ βασιλεία κατορθοῦντο ἐν
ισραιηλή. These words are those of v. 46b of MT. הַהַוְיָשִׁים
being read as לַיְשֵׁשֽוֹנּוֹ.

The correct position of the sentence seems to be at the end of
v. 35 from which in MT. it was separated by the insertion of the
Shimei section. Solomon's establishment in the kingdom resulted
from the death of his powerful adversaries Adonijah and Joab, and
could not have been much enhanced by the death of Shimei some
three years later. The fact that in LXX, Luc. these words precede
the sentence which relates the elevation of Zadok to the high-priest-
hood, seems to suggest that this latter is an addition of a later editor,
suggested by the detail which refers to Benaiah's succession to Joab.

36. לַאָשִׁים] Luc. adds וְלָכֶם Γηַד, i.e. מַהֲרָנָה as in v. 8, adopted by
Klo., and by Hoo. as coming appropriately at the beginning of the
narrative.

37. תָּנֵר [The Perf. with 1 consec. used in continuation of an
Infin. describing a hypothetical event. So in v. 42 יִבְיָה צַאָה תָּהָלָהָ; 8. 33
קְבֶל עַבוּד בָּבֶד; al. Dri. Tenses, §§ 117, 118; Da. § 55c.

At the end of the verse LXX, Luc. add καὶ ἀρκαν ἀυτὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς
ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησε, i.e. ἀρχήν ἐπὶ ἐκδίκησεν Βασιλεύς. Th., following Bö.,
regards these words as genuine, on the ground that if they had
been an insertion from v. 42 (הָלָה לָשָׁנָה הָבָרָה), בְּיוֹתִיָּהּ would
have been read and שָׁמָּה מָיֵי וּמַאֲבָאָה would not have occurred. So Klo.,
who remarks that since violation of the oath of Yahwe was the
ground of Shimei's execution, the swearing of the oath must be
mentioned in the previous narrative. These reasons, however, are
hardly consistent. Had the passage been genuine, it ought to have
followed v. 38a; after Shimei has expressed his assent to the king's
decision in general terms, the king then proceeds to take an oath of him. But if Shimei had at first taken the oath, he would not have then gone on to use the words of v. 38. The swearing of the oath of Yahwe may well be implied in the account of vv. 37, 38.

38. Ἰερ ρωμίτης] LXX, Luc. ἔπλα ἔτη derived from the beginning of the next verse. This is another instance of the harmonizing tendency of the LXX translator, tending to support the judgement expressed above on the LXX passage in v. 37.

39. θεόν ὑπάτον τὸ ἀκαθάρσιον] The circumscription of the genitive is employed for greater indefiniteness. ἰδίᾳ ἡμῖν might have meant 'the two servants of Shimei.' Cf. ch. 5. 15 Ἰακώβ ἡ μείζων Λόφος, not 'David's friend,' but 'a friend of David'; 1 Sam. 16. 18 νῦν λέγω 'one of Jesse's sons.' Da. § 28, Rem. 5.

40. ἰερίς] Luc. adds εἰς ἰεροσολύμων. If genuine, the words call special attention to the fact that Shimei passed beyond the limits of his parole; though this seems to be clearly enough implied in the preceding ἠμὲν. Klo. supposes Luc.'s reading to be an error for εἰς 'Ιερ., and so adopts ἰερίς. But in this case we should surely expect ἵνα and not ἰερίς.

41. βραβεύς] LXX, Luc. καὶ ἑπτάρειψιν (Luc. ἑπτάρειψις) τοὺς δουλοὺς αὐτοῦ, i.e. ὁ ἄρπαντι τοῦ Ἰουδαίων; doubtless a mere gloss. Solomon was informed of Shimei's having left Jerusalem, and, as Klo. points out, it was of no importance to tell him whether on his return he was accompanied by his runaway slaves or not.

42. οἱ] 'I solemnly admonished thee,' lit. 'protested against,' the β following the verb pointing to the person against whom the admonition is directed. Cf. Gen. 43. 3 ἥσαν τινὸς ἡμῖν ἰαχαία; II. 17. 13; 1 Sam. 8. 9; al.

43. ἰωάννης] 'Good is the matter; I have heard it,' i.e. I intend to obey it. So Klo., who compares commūniter in 2 Sam. 16. 4, is thus used absolutely as a formula of assent in v. 38; ch. 18. 24; cf. Deut. 1. 14; 1 Sam. 9. 10 (ב ieee). This sense is given by Pesh. and apparently by Targ. Vulg., Luc. take quærum as a relative sentence; quæm audivi; δ ὕσωρα; and this is the sense which is
given by RV. Such an omission of the relative is, however, very rare in Heb. *proae*. LXX om. through oversight.

43. 'ֶנהבש] Ex. 22. 10; 2 Sam. 21. 7†. The meaning of the phrase is elucidated by 1 Sam. 20. 42 ^ָנהשונ רבדא אנות בוש. LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. presuppose a past tense בוש, 'he hath requited'; probably correctly. The fact that Shimei by his act of perjury had brought the death penalty upon himself was Yahwe's requital for his wickedness towards David. M.T. may perhaps be a correction to accord with v. 32, where, however, the case is different; יָשָׁנָה אבות.

8. 1—II. 43. History of the reign of Solomon.

The kernel of the narrative is chh. 5. 15—7. 51, the description of Solomon's building operations, with its sequel, ch. 8. Around this are grouped (chh. 4. 1—6. 14; chh. 9, 10) a series of notices, for the most part brief, illustrative of the king's wisdom, magnificence, and prosperity.

Ch. 3 forms an introduction to the whole, detailing Solomon's request for wisdom, with a signal instance of its exercise: ch. 11, as a conclusion, gives a description of the circumstances which paved the way for the disruption of the kingdom.

3. 3—15. The vision at Gibeon. Solomon's request for wisdom.

Ch. 3. 4—15 = 2 Chr. 1. 3—13.

8. 1. There can be little doubt that this verse, together with ch. 9. 16, 17†, originally formed part of the document embodied in the early part of ch. 5 (see note on chh. 4. 20—5. 14).

2, 3. The disapprobation of Ṣabb worship is based upon the law of Deuteronomy, which restricts sacrifice to the central sanctuary; see 12. 4—18, esp. vv. 13, 14. Similar notices are found in ch. 15. 4 (Asa); 22. 44 (Jehoshaphat); II. 12. 4 (Jehoash); 14. 4 (Amaziah); 15. 4 (Azariah); v. 35† (Jotham). In every case the formula is nearly identical, and follows upon a general commendation of the king's conduct; cf. also the condemnation of Rehoboam's worship, ch. 14.
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22, 23 (but this may have been mixed with definite idolatry; cf. v. 24 יִשָּׁנֵי חָרֵדָּה אֲבָרֶי), and the wholesale reprobation of the calf-worship of the Northern kingdom as summarized in II. 17. 7-23.

The old narrative treats כְּפַס הַשֵּׁם worship as a matter of course; so here in v. 4, and in 1 Sam. 9. 12, 14; 7. 9, 17; 10. 8; al. Upon this subject, see R.Sm. OTJC., Lect. viii; DB, Art. Deuteronomy, § 15; Dri. Deut. xlix. ff. Thus vv. 2, 3 both exhibit the influence of Deuteronomy. It is obvious, however, that they cannot be assigned to one author. In v. 3 the subject, as in vv. 1, 4, is Solomon, while in v. 2 the people are specified. Verse 3 simply places two facts side by side without any attempt at correlation;—Solomon loved Yahwe, only he sacrificed and burned incense on the high-places: v. 2 supplies an explanation;—This בְּכֵם worship was a popular custom, due to the fact that the house of Yahwe was not yet built. Hence v. 3 is the work of R, and opens the account of Solomon’s reign by introducing the narrative of the vision at Gibeon; v. 2 proceeds from an exilic or post-exilic editor who, with a view to explaining Solomon’s conduct, inserted the phrase which he found to be frequent elsewhere יִתְנַהְמֵם מְהָבוּים, together with the explanation which follows מָנוּבֹכָנ. וְיִהְיֶה, and, in order to illustrate this latter, probably moved v. 1, which mentions the fact of the house of Yahwe being not yet built, from the position which it properly occupies in ch. 5 LXX (note). In LXX of this ch. v. 1 is wanting and v. 2 fragmentary.

2. יַסְּפִּי [So ch. 5. 17, 19; 8. 17, 20, 44, 48. The original is 2 Sam. 7. 13 זָא אֵיבָנָה בְּתוֹם מִשְׁמַי quoted in ch. 5. 19; 8. 19.

3. יֵשָׁנֵי דְּרָאָב [A distinctively D phrase. Deut. 10. 12; 11. 22; 19. 9; 30. 16. Cf. also 7. 9; 11. 1, 13; 13. 4; 30. 6, 20.

vv. 4-15. This section shows clear traces of the hand of R. In 2 Chr. 1. 3-13 the story appears in a shorter form, and apparently without the additions of the Compiler. That Chr., however, does not exhibit the narrative in its original simplicity is proved by the details of vv. 3-6 and v. 13 מָנוּבֹכָנ אֶלְּלוֹא מַעָּד (cf. ch. 8. 4* note); by the late words מִדָּר v. 10, 12; מִכְּסִים v. 12; and the unclassical expression יִטְנַ הָנָה v. 12.
I Kings 3.

Much expanded by the 3–6 Chronicler.

2 Chr. 1.

I. 2–4

29
The words overlined are the work of R^P; those marked by the dotted line may possibly be due to him. Probably the original form of the narrative was very near to that of Kings, with omission of the insertions of R^P.

The work of R^P may first be considered:—

6. [See note on ch. 2. 4.] Deut. 9. 5: the only place where the two words are joined. אִירָשׁ fem. only here.
Cf. also ch. 8. 23; 2 Chr. 6. 14; Neh. 1. 5; 9. 32; Ps. 89. 29.

A reminiscence of ch. 1. 48b.

So again in ch. 8. 24, 60 (R^P). The phrase calls attention to the fulfilment of a promise or threat, and is
frequent in Deut. and in books which show the influence of Deut. Deut. 2. 30; 4. 20, 38; 8. 18; 10. 15; 29. 27; Jer. 11. 5; 25. 18; 32. 20; 44. 6, 23; 1 Chr. 28. 7; 2 Chr. 6. 15; (1 Ki. 8); Dan. 9. 7, 15. Elsewhere the phrase occurs only in Gen. 50. 20 (E); i Sam. 22. 8, 13†. Gen. 39. 11 is different.

8. עַמִּ֫ךְ כֶּ֨רֶם יַעַ֝ד נֶ֑והַ֥ת לֶ֣מֶצ יִ֑הְבֶּךָ Deut. 6. 14; Jer. 44. 11. Elsewhere...—cf. 4. 37.

10. Cf. Deut. 1. 23; Gen. 41. 37 (E); Josh. 22. 33 (P).

12. The two adjectives are so coupled in Deut. 1. 13; 4. 6.

14. בְּרֶפֶס לְבֵ֛רֶפֶס לָ֖שֶׁר יָוֵ֣יק כְּנ֖וֹךְ ... בְּרֶפֶס לְבֵ֛רֶפֶס לָ֖שֶׁר יָוֵ֣יק כְּנ֖וֹךְ...—cf. II. 23. 25

15. If according to v. 4 'the great high-place' was at Gibeon, it is difficult to understand why Solomon should have returned to Jerusalem to offer sacrifice, except from the Deuteronomistic standpoint. Hence the whole verse, at least in its present form, may be due to R^P.

Mainly a D expression. Ch. 6. 19; 8. 1, 6; Deut. 10. 8; 31. 9, 26; Josh. 3. 12; 8. 33 (sections belonging to the Deuteronomistic editor, marked as D^P; see Dri. LOT: 97); Jer. 3. 16; Josh. 3. 6 bis, 8; 6. 6† (all D^P).
Elsewhere occurs Num. 10. 33; 14. 44; Josh. 4. 7, 18; 6. 8 (all JE); 1 Sam. 4. 3, 4. 5 (LXX om. bearer), and several times in Chr. Josh. 4. 9 JE: elsewhere occurs Num. 10. 33; 14. 44; Josh. 4. 7, 18; 6. 8 (all JE); 1 Sam. 4. 4 (LXX om. bearer); 2 Sam. 15. 24; 1 Chr. 16. 6; Judg. 20. 27. In the curious expressions of Josh. 3. 11, 14, 17 (JE) the term is evidently an interpolation 1.

4. [LXX, Luc. kai dwayne kai eterotuyn, i.e. 'the most great,' adopted by Klo. on the ground that it more appropriately introduces the festive occasion which, as the Chronicler, II. ch. 1, shows, was the inaugural action of the young king's reign.]

[LXX om.; Luc. alopansi.]

[For it was the great high-place,' i.e. the greatest high-place; an idiomatic method of expressing the superlative degree. The article with the adjective implies that the subject is pre-eminently characterized by the quality described. Gen. 44. 12 פֶּרֶה הַיָּהוּ רְכֹשׁ כִּלֵּל ' he began with the eldest and finished with the youngest.’ Da. § 34; G-K. § 133, 3.

[Halil] Probably frequentative; ‘used to offer.’ Thus need not denote the number of victims slaughtered upon this single occasion, but may be a round number describing the many sacrifices which the king offered from time to time.

[LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. presuppose a reading scarcely to be preferred, since the omission of the relative before הבנהש is contrary to usage, and so would in such a case be redundant. The reference of הבנהש must be to הבנהש המושל, which of course connotes the presence of an altar. Th. thinks that the Verss. read את המזבח ואת הבנהש which he renders ‘upon the altar which is in Gibeon,’ a strange use of את which can scarcely be paralleled even by Gen. 38. 21 את הבנהש ואת את בבני מֵעִיֵּם.

1 In pre-Deut. writings the phrases in use are תַּפְלָה, תַּפְלָה in JE in the Hexateuch (only Josh.); תַּפְלָה, תַּפְלָה (וֹאֶּפֶלַה) תַּפְלָה in the old narratives of Sam. and Kings. The latest expression of all is רְפָלַה תַּפְלָה.]
III. 4-11

Klo.'s suggestion (cf. 2 Chr. 1. 6) is quite unnecessary.

5. הבולמ [Gen. 20. 3; 31. 24†. Cf. Job 33. 15]

המ] Used as relative without antecedent; 'ask what I shall give thee.' So exactly ch. 14. 3: 'he shall tell thee what shall happen to the child'; cf. Judg. 9. 48; Eccl. 11. 2. Correctly speaking הנא is really the indefinite antecedent ('anything,' as in 2 Sam. 18. 22; al.), and the relative הנא is omitted. This can be seen from Num. 23. 3: 'he shall tell the child'; cf. Judg. 9. 48; Eccl. 11. 2. In the late Heb. of Ecclesiastes we find the relative expressed after הנא, 'shall tell thee what shall happen to the child.'

6. הנא] The phrase הנא is very unusual. The only other occurrence appears to be Mic. 6. 8: 'and man is silent to what it behoveth.' Cf. the expression י專業ך הנא Gen. 5. 22, 24; 6. 9†. The common phrase is הנא הנא which occurs just before.

7. הנא] An idiom expressing the discharge of duties pertaining to a particular position; 1 Sam. 18. 16; Deut. 31. 2.

8. הנא] ch. 8. 5 (||2 Chr. 5. 6). Cf. Gen. 16. 10; 32. 13. For the nuance of the Imperf. 'cannot be numbered,' cf. Dri. Tenses, § 37†.

9. הנא] Not merely a heart attentive to the directions of Yahwe, but expressing further the result of such attention—'an understanding heart.' For this sense of הנא, cf. n. 11: הנא הנא; Gen. 41. 15: הנא הנא. More commonly it is employed with a negative to express the non-understanding of a foreign tongue; Gen. 11. 7; Deut. 28. 49; al.

10. הנא] Lev. 27. 33; 2 Sam. 19. 36†.

11. הנא] Pesh. קָשָׁה קָשָׁה חָכָם מִלְיָה פַּת הֶבְרִי suggests that now the text is possibly changed, while Vulg. judicare populum istum, populum tuum hunc multum, perhaps points to the same reading with a transposition of דַּקֵּשׁ and בַּע to he in translation. MT. is, however, confirmed by 2 Chr. 1. 10: הנא הנא הנא. 'Hast asked for thyself.' So only in || 2 Chr. 5. 6.
This Datius commodi is employed far more frequently in the sense, ‘ask for some one else’; most commonly in the phrase על שלום

But hast asked.’ The ו connects two contrasted ideas, and, by aid of the tautology והל לך, והלך, gains a rather strong adversative sense, ‘but.’ Somewhat similar, but not so marked, are ch. 2. 26 ו אשר אתה בוים והלך אל אприך ו אちょっと להיות מות דרבו.lessworthy of death art thou, but to-day I will not kill thee’; ch. 11. 33, 34 (דָּש עֲלֵיהֶם); al. This use of והל is common in Prov.; cf. ch. 10 throughout.

The ו simplex places the idea in strict co-ordination with the preceding, thus preserving the assonance which would have been destroyed by והלך.

So Isa. 56. 11 והל לך אל; Ps. 32. 9.

Perfec of certitude used here, as frequently, in a divine promise; Gen. 15. 18; Josh. 6. 2; Judg. 1. 2; al. The action determined upon by the will of the speaker is regarded as already accomplished. Dri. Tenses, § 13; Da. § 41.

shall not have been,’ future perfect; or more strictly, ‘was not (ever),’ upon any occasion that can be specified.

So that there shall not have been any like thee among kings [all thy days].’ Here ו אם makes no sense, and the sentence is quite complete without it. Vulg. attempts to explain, cunctis retro diebus, but doubtless LXX, Luc. are right in their omission of the phrase. It arose probably from an erroneous repetition of והלך.

LXX καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ παραγόνται εἰς, Luc. καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ σιγήλθην, i.e. מי ועב עב; possibly genuine.

LXX, Luc. κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον (ῥήμ) κυβηροῦ, i.e. ו ה ירוא אל עלים ומעים ומעים. Th., Klo. think that this represents the original text, and that the recurrence of והל occasioned the omission in MT. More probably the additional words are an insertion of the translator who wished to remove the impression that Solomon passed into the immediate presence of the Ark.
8. 16–28. A notable example of Solomon’s exercise of wisdom.

16. דובא א] The use of מ to introduce a fresh detail or narrative is very frequent in Kings. The other instances are ch. 8. 1, 12; 9. 11b, 24b; 11. 7; 16. 21; 22. 5a; II. 8. 22b; 12. 18; 14. 8; 15. 16; 16. 41. Doubtless this was one of the methods by which R pieced together his various sources, and was employed when he wished to show that an event was more or less contemporaneous with the preceding narrative. When greater definiteness seemed desirable, he employed the phrases ביסון וניה ch. 16. 34; א novità הנחתשה ch. 14. 1 (see note on each passage).

[The use of the Imperf. after מ introducing a past event is very usual. So in nine of the cases enumerated above, and also Ex. 15. 1; Num. 21. 17; al. The event is pictured as growing out of the previous circumstances indicated by מ; a form of idea which has become stereotyped in the ordinary construction of the Imperf. with י consec. See Dri. Tenses, §§ 67, 68. Probably in Kings R sometimes substitutedمام with Imperf. for an Imperf. with י consec. standing in his source; cf. ch. 8. 1 where we actually meet with a shortened form of the Imperf., מְלָל. When, as in ch. 8. 12; 9. 24b; al., the Perfect is employed with מ, the mere occurrence of the fact seems to be dwelt upon, without special stress upon its time relationship. G-K. § 107, 1, Rem. 1.

17. י] Properly ‘supplication,’ and then ‘oh’ or ‘pray.’ The word seems to be from י in, Ar. יָשָׂר ‘to supplicate.’ Others derive from יָשָׂר = Aram. יָשָׂר ‘to ask,’ and make the word a contraction of יָשָׂר; like לַעֲר for לַעֲר, יָשָׂר for יָשָׂר. Cf. Targ. rendering בּוּב, Pesh. חָסְר , here and elsewhere.

רֵעָה ‘With her,’ i.e. ‘in her company’; Lev. 25. 39 יָשָׂר דָּוִד ‘if thy brother be waxen poor near thee’; Ex. 22. 24; Gen. 31. 38. When used of proximity to several persons ‘among’ is a fair equivalent; Judg. 18. 25 יָשָׂר דָּוִד יָשָׂר יָשָׂר ‘make not thy voice to be heard among us.’ This use of יָשָׂר with persons is closely similar to that with places noticed on ch. 1. 9.
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18. יִֽשָּׁרֶד אֶֽלֶֽלֶּם כֵּּֽלֵֽל with back reference to the point of departure, 'after my deliverance.' Cf. Gen. 7. 10; Deut. 1. 36; al., but, with a looser connexion with what precedes, 'but only.' So Deut. 4. 12; and it came to pass after seven days'; 2 Sam. 13. 23.

[19.] LXX, Not 'except,' as usually (ch. 12. 20; Deut. 1. 36; al.), but, with a looser connexion with what precedes, 'but only.' So Deut. 4. 12; and it came to pass after seven days'; 2 Sam. 13. 23.


19. LXX, 'Because'; ch. 8. 33 ✉ µή τρία ἄγαθα; 15. 5; Gen. 30. 18; 31. 49; al. More precise are ✉ µὴ οἶδα 2 Sam. 12. 6; ✉ µὴ οἶδα Ex. 19. 18; ✉ µὴ οἶδα 1 Sam. 28. 18; ✉ µὴ οἶδα &c.

21. ἀν ὑποκάμην] 'I looked carefully at.' So Isa. 14. 16 + ἀν ὑποκάμην

22. ἀπόσπασμα] The participle lends pictorial effect; 'was saying.'

23. ἀπόσπασμα LXX, Luc. σὺ λέγεται, i.e. τῷ λέγεται; scarcely so good as MT., where the participle nearly represents the true English present; 'this one says,' 2 Sam. 18. 27. Dri. Tenses, § 135, 2 end.

24. ἀπόσπασμα ... ἀπόσπασμα] 'This one ... and the other'; ch. 22. 20 ἀν ὑποκάμην ✉ µή τρία ἄγαθα 'and one said on this wise and another on that.' Da. § 5.

25. ψυχή] 'Cut in twain.' So with the substantive, Ps. 136. 13 ἀρνῶν 'into two parts'; Gen. 15. 17.

At end of verse Luc. adds καὶ τὸ τάφρος ὑπὸνει διηλετε, καὶ δότε εὑμφορίαν. So Jos. This appears to be a translator's addition, derived, as Kio. notices, from the law in Ex. 21. 35.

26. דָּבָר] So Gen. 43. 30; Hos. 11. 8 (with ✉ µὴ ὡς as subject).

The ground idea is 'to be hot'; cf. Lam. 5. 10 ὁ λόγος ἐννέα ὡς ἐν τῇ ἀνθρώπου.

27. הָסִיָּהּ] Here, as elsewhere, constantly in the plural, representing the seat of compassion or affection.

28. לע אֲלֵיהּ] 'Over her son,' applied appropriately to the infant, but in Gen. 43 ὡς 'towards,' with reference to grown men.

29. מַוְּלָה] So v. 27; 1 Chr. 14. 4 מַוְּלָה; but elsewhere only in the expression מַוְּלָה three times in Job. In Syr. מֵאָלָה is a common form.
Since the woman who spoke last was the one who desired the division of the child, we must suppose that the king, in uttering the words שָׁנַה וְאָמַר, made a gesture to indicate that he referred to the other woman. Luc. (so LXX, omitting וְאָמַר) removes the ambiguity by reading דָּאָר וְעָבַר וְאָמַר; a mere exegetical paraphrase. Th., following Bö., supposes that the original may have been שָׁנַה וְאָמַר, and that thus אתל מארה may have fallen out by homoioteleuton. But if the LXX translator had had these words before him, why should he have transposed אתל מארה?

Wisdom sent by or proceeding from God. Cf. הָקַח Gen. 35. 5; וְעָבַר 2 Chr. 20. 29.

is here used in the special sense of shrewdness and keen insight into human nature. Cf. the bearing of the term wise as applied to the woman of Tekoa 2 Sam. 14. 2 ff.; and the woman of Abel-Meholah 2 Sam. 20. 16. Upon the later development of the term as seen in the 'Hokhma literature' of the Old Testament, cf. Dri. LOT, pp. 368 ff.

Solomon's officers of state. His prosperity and wisdom.

Ch. 5. 11 = 2 Chr. 9. 26. Ch. 5. 6 = 2 Chr. 9. 25a.

The circumlocution has the effect of retaining the greater definiteness which would have been sacrificed if וְעָבַר had been written. Cf. note on ch. 1. 8, and Da. § 28, Rem. 5a.

must refer to יָזִיר יַעֲקֹב וּכְרַמְי יַעֲקֹב, and not to יָזִיר יַעֲקֹב וּכְרַמְי יַעֲקֹב, just as elsewhere in the list, the title of the office refers to the man first specified, and not to his father. Hence Vulg., filius Sadoc sacerdosis, interprets wrongly. LXX, Luc. omit וְעָבַר, as also וְעָבַר in v. 5, apparently under the impression that its usage is not to be reconciled with v. 4. Pesh., Targ. follow MT. The Chronicler, 1. 5. 36, mentions an Azariah as וְעָבַר וְעָבַר מְאֹרֶה דָּבֶר, a statement apparently misplaced from v. 35 (see Bertheau, ad loc.), where it will refer to our Azariah who is
mentioned as son of Ahimaaz son of Zadok. Probably Azariah succeeded to Zadok, and exercised the office of high-priest at the consecration of the new Temple at Jerusalem, and during far the longer portion of Solomon's reign. We know that the statement of v. 4, as regards Abiathar, only holds good for a very short period during this reign (ch. 2. 26/), and very possibly this is also true of Zadok, whose son Ahimaaz was a man of some experience at the time of Absalom's rebellion (2 Sam. 15. 35, 36), and who therefore must have been well advanced in years at the time of Solomon's accession.

3. The only occurrence of this name. LXX 'Ελαδόφ, Luc.'Ελάδα seem to substitute the more ordinary בַּבֶּלֶעַ.  

נָשָׁי The only occurrence of this name. LXX סבָּה, Luc. סָבָּה. In 1 Chr. 18. 16 the same man is called נָשָׁי, LXX 'יִשָּׁוּי, Luc. יָוָא.  

In 2 Sam. 8. 17 apparently the same person appears as נָשָׁי, LXX 'אָסָי, Luc. זָפָלָא; 2 Sam. 20. 25 קִזּ, Q'te קֶז, LXX 'יִשָּׁוּי, Luc. יָוָא.  

Hence—(i) The form נָשָׁי has only weak attestation. It is supported by Luc. once, by LXX never.  

(ii) The form יִשָּׁוּי occurring twice in LXX cannot be original, since it is most improbable that so ordinary a name as נָשָׁי should have suffered corruption. On the other hand, it is very likely that יָוָא has become corrupted into the well-known יִשָּׁוּי.  

(iii) The form נָשָׁי is supported—  

(a) By נָשָׁי in 1 Ki. 4. 3, the interchange of י and י being of constant occurrence.  

(b) By יָוָא twice in Luc.  

1 It is true that this is the form adopted in three places by Pesh., and in two by Vulg.; but in the case of proper names we cannot attach much importance to the testimony of Vulg., Pesh., Targ., since either the lists in the Heb. texts used by these translators appeared in a later form resembling that of MT., or else some sort of arbitrary uniformity with MT. has been produced by later hands. In the cases to which allusion is here made, correction for the sake of uniformity with 2 Sam. 8. 17 appears to have taken place.
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(γ) In some degree by ἵππος twice in LXX, and, as regards the second ἴππ, by Ἀσά in a third passage.

Hence ἰππός has by far the best attestation, and may be adopted.

4. LXX om. through oversight.

[Verse 4] No part of the register in its original form as an official state document. This naturally headed the list with the name of the high-priest of the time, Ἰωάννης ἃν τρίχα. The insertion was made by R or by some one still earlier who wished, as a matter of historical interest, to notice that Zadok and Abiathar were priests at the commencement of the reign.

5. LXX ὁριστώ, Luc. ὀριστό seem to presuppose with corruption of ι into ρ. This officer is apparently not elsewhere mentioned under either name.

[Verse 5] Only here. Luc. ταχυόν, i.e. probably ἰαμάλ, a name of frequent occurrence. Pesh. ἴαμα in part supports this reading.

[Verse 6] A peculiar use of the term to denote some high official whose functions we cannot precisely determine. Cf. 2 Sam. 8. 18 ἡρασθεῖται, paraphrased by the Chronicler, I. 18. 17 ἡρασθεῖται, ἤστω ὁ ἐξοδήμῳ ἢ τὸ ἄνθρωπον. Dri. (Sam., ad loc.) argues from the uniform use of ἤστω in Heb. that the office, if possibly semi-secular and at times extended to non-priestly men of good family, must have belonged in the first place to the priestly class.

[Verse 7] This anomalous punctuation of the st. constr. is found again in 2 Sam. 15. 37 ἤστω ἤστω, and, according to Norzi, in 16. 16 in the best MSS. Klo. omits, as an exegetical gloss to explain the difficult ἤστω; but all Verss. reproduce the word.

6. This is the only important official named, vv. 2-7, whose father is not mentioned. Hence there is probably some corruption of text.

LXX seem to have a triple, and Luc. a double rendering.

LXX καὶ ἄξιος ἡν οἴκουμεν i.e. ὁ οἴκουμεν καὶ ἀξίων ἡν οἴκουμεν καὶ ἀξίων ἡν οἴκουμεν καὶ ἀξίων ἡν οἴκουμεν τὴν πατρίδα

1 Verse 4b is no exception: see note.
The name which occurs in three renderings (γ is a mistake for δ in βαβιλ) appears to be the genuine form. Probably also the two letters ρς, which appear to occur in LXX 1, 2, Luc. 1, and in LXX 3 under the form ξαφ, are a remnant of the father’s name. Hence we may conjecture

The supposes that LXX 3 (Luc. 2) are a translation of some words which have fallen out of MT., and hence after Th. would restore θεν, supposing that LXX παραβόλαι read τιμήδευσαι for τιμήσαι. So Ew.

Prefect of the palace, discharging the king’s domestic affairs. This office existed subsequently both in the Northern (ch. 16. 9; 18. 3; II. 10. 5) and Southern (II. 18. 18; al.) kingdoms, and was a position of the highest dignity, being held by Jotham the heir to the throne of Judah after his father Azariah had been smitten with leprosy II. 15. 5; cf. also the exalted language used of Eliakim upon his promotion Isa. 22. 21, 22. The palace prefect was also called יְבוּם Isa. 22. 15; see note on ch. 1. 2.

So LXX, Luc. This form of the name, which occurs also in ch. 5. 28, is doubtless correct. The form מַעְלָן (2 Sam. 20. 24; ch. 12. 18; || 2 Chr. 10. 18 מַעְלָן) is either a contraction or a corruption.

The forced labour exacted by Solomon for his building operations, according to ch. 9. 15-22 only from the Canaanite nations, but according to ch. 5. 27 from all Israel. That the latter statement is correct is proved by the unpopularity of Adoniram, who was stoned by men of the ten tribes; ch. 12. 18. The מַעְלָן is mentioned as existing at the end of David’s reign, 2 Sam. 20. 24, and is also spoken of as enforced upon the Canaanites at the conquest of the land; Jos. 17. 13 (JE); Judg. 1. 28; al.

‘It was incumbent upon’: Ezek. 45. 17 ואִתָּה יְבֹה"לעַעָל.
IV. 7-10

The Imperf. expresses the periodical nature of the duty.

Read דומע הלוע with Q're; LXX, Luc. ה‧ הנון דוה. The article is necessary to express the idea of distribution.

8. רוה [ב] Correct. LXX, Luc. באו, a corruption. All twelve officers are mentioned either by their patronymic only, or by their particular name with the addition of the patronymic, which is in no case omitted.

9. רוה [ב] LXX vide 'Ῥωξα, Luc. vide 'Ῥωξαβ. The name occurs nowhere else, unless רבקה II. 9. 25 represents a contraction of it. Luc.'s בִּרְשָׁת is at least as probable.

Not elsewhere mentioned. LXX מְאָסְיוּס, i.e. apparently מַיִשָׁס (cf. 1 Sam. 13. 2, 5; 14. 31 מְאָסְיוּס), cannot be right, since it is clear that the place must have lain, with the others belonging to the same officer, in or about the district originally assigned to Dan, and in the west borders of Judah. Luc. מְאָסְיוּס, and other Verss. support MT.

Judg. 1. 35+. שֶׁפֶלֶל Josh. 19. 42+. One of David's heroes is described in 2 Sam. 23. 32 as מַשֵּׁל הַשָּׁם.

The modern 'Ain Shems, a village about four miles west-south-west of Jerusalem. Rob. BR. ii. 223f.

LXX kal 'אלוֹמְו יָס וּטָנָם, Luc. kal אלוֹמְו יז נֶט ונֶט, read as the names of two places, doubtless correctly. In Josh. 19. 43 אלָשְׁנָי is mentioned as a town of Dan, and נֶט ונֶט appears to have been discovered under the modern name Beit-Handin, a short distance east-north-east of Gaza. Rob. BR. ii. 35; Baed. 154. We may, therefore, read מֵעַבְדָם יָאָפֵי; cf. v. 12 מֵעַבְדָם יָאָפֵי. So Klo., Kamp.

LXX vide 'Esad, Βερναμαλουσαμηχά καὶ Ῥησαφαραχίν. This, when transliterated, upon the whole supports MT.

The place מַשֵּׁל is not mentioned elsewhere, but may possibly be the same as מַשֵּׁל Josh. 15. 52, a city near Hebron. The ס of
LXX may easily be a corruption of Ἴδι of MT., and ἰδιαί certainly does not point to any known place of a different name. Since נֶּורִים (probably the modern Farmuk) is mentioned with יִבְּשָׁם in Josh. 15. 35, it has been thought, with some plausibility, that this place lies concealed under נֶּרִים. So Th.

The correctness of נֶּרִים, which has been identified with Shaveikeh close to Beit Nettif, is not to be doubted. Rob. BR. ii. 16, 21; Baed. 161. LXX reads Ἰ for Ἱ, Ἴ for Ἴ, and inserts Ἴ, perhaps a corruption of Ἴ erroneously repeated. LXX, Ἰμ is merely a transposition of Ἴμ, which latter seems to be correct, Josh. 12. 17.

Luc. Μαχαι υδὲ ἑκατομαιὸν καὶ ἀμενα καὶ τῆς Ἐφραίμουαράδας is clearly a further corruption of LXX through an attempt to resolve it into sense. ἑκατομαι ἤπι- has become ἑκατομαι, then ἤπι- is repeated under the form ἤπιθ-, ἐκατομαια is divided into ἐκ (ἐυ) ἀμενα, ἤπι- becomes τῆς, and finally Ἐφραίμου with the Ἐφραίμ of the next verse appears as Ἐφραίμουαράδας.

11. [ב נב] 'Ben-Abinadab—all the high country of Dor'; correct. For ראו תמא, cf. Josh. 12. 23 רָאָי תמא; 11. 2 רָאָי תמא.

The meaning of the root שֵׁם is illustrated by Ps. 48. 3 נִלְגֵּי, 'beautiful in elevation,' of Mount Zion.

LXX Ἰδὼ Δάβ is a corruption of Ἰβαναδάβ, and Ἰδὼ Θαβιθι of Ναάβ. The words ἵππος Θαβιθι represent הָאֵד מָר read as מָלַי. Probably נָאָד was at first attached to הָאֵד by the translator, the whole being transliterated נאֵדָאכ, which afterwards came to be divided.

With the old f. termination. So with other personal names, both f.:—רַבְּרוֹן v. 15; Gen. 26. 34; חֶלֶב Gen. 28. 9; 2 Chr. 11. 18; or, more strangely, m.:—רָיִל ch. 11. 20; יֵל ch. 16. 21; חֶלֶב Sam. 9. 1; יֵל 1 Sam. 17. 4 ff.; חֵלֶב Gen. 26. 26. It is noticeable that most of these names are non-Israelitish: חֵלֶב, חֹל Palestinian; זבָּב probably Edomite or a Semiticized Egyptian name like קֵקָן Gen. 41. 45; חָלָה Ishmaelite; and מַסְמֵה, מַסְמִה, if daughters of Solomon's foreign wives, probably Canaanite; נָאָד, נָאָד Gen. 26. 34 being specified as Hittite. נָאָד, mentioned Judg. 3. 31; 5. 6 as the parent of נָאָד, is the name of the Canaanite goddess,
traces of whose cult appears in the localities ḫubni¹ in Judg. 1. 33; ḡnab ha Judg. 15. 59; ḡnab⁰ Jer. 1. 1; al.

Similarly, we find a number of place-names with this termination, these being clearly Canaanite in origin:—nbsp (perhaps a segholate termination) Josh. 13. 18; sin fJosh. 15. 59; sin⁰ Josh. 15. 39; II. 22. 1; sin¹ Josh. 16. 6; sinf (text obscure) Josh. 18. 28; sinf Josh. 19. 12; sin¹ Josh. 21. 28; sin Josh. 19. 15; sinf Josh. 19. 25; sin¹ Josh. 21. 31; sin¹ Josh. 19. 26; sin¹ Josh. 19. 35; sin¹ Josh. 19. 44; ch. 9. 18; sin¹ Judg. 1. 17; sin¹ Judg. 7. 22; sin¹ Ob. 20; ch. 17. 9, 10; and perhaps sin¹ Sam. 19. 18 (on vocalization, cf. Dri. ad loc.)¹. Outside Palestine we have ḥnîš in Deut. 2. 8; al.; and ḥnîš in Moab, Mesha, l. 14.

Comparing the inscriptions of neighbouring countries, it may be noticed that both Phoenician and Aramaic afford many examples of f. proper names in -ath, this being the regular f. termination in Phoen. as in Moabitic: Phoen. (CIS.) ḥna Kābdath, 372, al.; ḥna 'Arīshath, 307, al.; ḥna 'Elišath, 481, al., &c.;—Aram. Nabatean (Euting, Nabatiäische Inschriften) ḥna Bun̄ayath, 13; ḥna Ḥusātath, 15; ḥna Ḥmāth, 26, &c.; while Aramaic alone yields instances of m. names with this termination:—Nabatean (Euting) ḥna Harīlah (Aretas); ḥna Ḥmālath, 18; ḥna Ḥmālah, 7, &c.;—Aram. Mun̄āth, 6, 19; ḥna 'Obādath, 23, 24; ḥna 'Amīrath, 19;—Palmyrene (De Vogüé, Syrie Centrale) ḥna 'Odainath, 21, al.;—Babylon (CIS.) ḥna 'Um̄madath, 66;—Assyria, ḥna 'Artādath, 100. Phoenician, on the other hand, only exhibits m. names in -ath compounded with the f. name of the goddess ḥna Milkath, just as Aramaic abounds in m. compounds of the f. name 'Allath.

12. [חנעטמ] Mentioned together as the scene of the great battle of Deborah and Barak with the Canaanites; Judg. 5. 19. ḥna now appears as Tu'annāk, not far to the south-west of Zer'ṭān, i.e. ḥnîš. ḥna is conjectured by Rob. to be the modern Lejjān,

¹ No attempt has been made to include or classify proper names in Chr.
the Legio of Jos. and Eusebius, said by them to be three or four Roman miles from Taanach. This place lies north-west of Ta'an-nâk, and due west of Zer'în. BR. ii. 316, 328; Baed. 227; Smith, Hist. Geogr. 386 ff.
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Also הָיָה 1 Sam. 31. 10, 12; or הָיָה 2 Sam. 21. 12; the Scythopolis of later times, and now, by a rather strange contraction, Beisan to the west of the other cities, and near the Jordan. Baed. 222; Smith, Hist. Geogr. 357 ff.

[100x587]This place lies north-west of Ta'an;[119x590] due west of Zer'în.

BR. ii. 316, 328; Baed. 227; Smith, Hist. Geogr. 386 ff.

[100x587]Also הָיָה 1 Sam. 31. 10, 12; or הָיָה 2 Sam. 21. 12; the Scythopolis of later times, and now, by a rather strange contraction, Beisan to the west of the other cities, and near the Jordan. Baed. 222; Smith, Hist. Geogr. 357 ff.

[110x587]The identification of the two places seems, however, to be doubtful.

[110x587]Jeroboam in the hill-country of Ephraim. The identification of the two places seems, however, to be doubtful.

[100x587]Also מִסְכָּן Ch. 7. 46 mentioned with צֵיבָן (see note); Josh. 3. 16 said to be near בֶּן, i.e. probably the modern ford of ed-Dâmieh close to Qarn Sarfâbeh, with which, however, מִסְכָּן cannot be identified (Van de Velde, &c.) without violence to philology. 2 Chr. 4. 17 reads מִסְכָּן for מֵאָס of ch. 7. 46; מֵאָס being mentioned, ch. 11. 26, as the home of Jeroboam in the hill-country of Ephraim.

The identification of the two places seems, however, to be doubtful.

[100x587]As far as the other side of; not as RV. marg. 'as far as over against,' i.e. on this side of. The former is the universal sense of the phrase used from the point of view of the speaker or writer. Thus מִסְכָּן, מֵאָס can denote either the country to the east of Jordan, Num. 22. 1; Deut. 1. 1; Josh. 17. 5; or that to the west of Jordan, Deut. 3. 20, 25; 11. 30; Josh. 5. 1; 9. 1; 12. 7; according to the position or point of view of the user of the phrase. In Num. 32. 19 the double מִסְכָּן does not violate the rule, but is employed by way of contrast, the first being spoken from the actual position of the speaker east of Jordan, and the second from the new point of view pictured by the calling up before the mind of the country west of Jordan. So in Josh. 22. 7, the phrase is used with reference to the position of the other half-tribe on the east. See Dri. Deul. xlii. f.

[100x587]A place of this name is mentioned, 1 Chr. 6. 53f., as a Levitical city in the hill-country of Ephraim. In Josh. 21. 22 (|| 1 Chr.) the name is given as מִסְכָּן, identified by Col. Conder (Handbook, 417) with Tel el-Kabâs near Bethel. This locality is much too far south of the cities previously named to suit the present mention, and, besides this, the מִסְכָּן אֲשֶׁר has already been
assigned (v. 8) to Ṭov. This therefore cannot be the Ṭov of 1 Chr., unless Conder’s identification is wrong, and the city lay quite in the north of the Ṭov realm. Rob. *BR.* iii. 115 follows AV. in regarding the name as a corruption of Ṭov, Josh. 21. 34, *al*., which he finds as *Tell Qaimun,* south-east of Carmel. Baed. 228.


After the first ᵒ, LXX, Luc. omit ᵒ . . . Ṭov by homoioteleuton. Ṭov] ‘the tent-villages’; Ar. ṫuş ‘collect together,’ ṫuş a group of tents near together.

. . . Ṭov] So Num. 32. 40, 41; Judg. 10. 4, rightly. Deut. 3. 14; Josh. 13. 30 (D) locate the villages in Bashan. See Dri. *Deut., ad loc.,* who explains the origin of the mistake.

. . . Ṭov] Targ. אָלֶּרָת אֲרָבָא ‘the region of Trachonitis,’ i.e. the modern El-Leja, a district to the south of Damascus, forming a great lava-bed of about 350 square miles in extent. This identification seems, however, to be improbable. See Dri. on Deut. 3. 4, 5; and in *DB. Edinb.* s. v. Argob.

‘Uriyy Ṭov Ṭov; or, as we should say, ‘with walls, &c.’ The extension Ṭov, in loose apposition to Ṭov, serves in part to describe the cities, in part to characterize their greatness. Cf. Deut. 3. 5; 2 Chr. 8. 5. Dri. *Tenses,* § 188, i.

14. Salirim] LXX Ṭov . . . Ṭov, Luc. Ṭov Melto, perhaps read Ṭov; but, as Klo. says, the *loc.* can be justified by supposing the implication of some such expression as ‘appointed to Ṭov.’


16. Salirim] JXX, Luc. om.; but allusion to this district follows naturally after Ṭov in previous verse.

No such place as Ṭov is mentioned elsewhere, and Ṭov of ch. 9. 18 is apparently the same as the Ṭov of Josh. 19. 44 mentioned among the cities assigned to Dan, and so unsuitable, since this district has already been dealt with in v. 9. LXX Ṭov Μαλά, Cod. A καὶ Μαλά. This suggests Ṭov or Ṭov, and accordingly Th. thinks that the country round about Accho and Achzib may have been known as ‘the steps’ or ‘ascents,’ even
if the original reading of the Heb. text was not \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \); cf. Josh. 10. 10 \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \). Against this, we have no trace elsewhere of the use of the term in this district. Luc. \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) seems to be merely an alteration of LXX. Gilead is dealt with in vv. 13, 19. Klo. suggests \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \), and since this tribe would naturally be mentioned in connexion with \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \), the emendation is probably correct.

19. \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) LXX, Luc. \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \). Probably a mistake. The land of Gad is rather too precise, part of the kingdoms of Sihon and Og having been assigned to Reuben and the half-tribe of Manasseh; Josh. 13. 21, 30. On the other hand, from the wider term \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) we conclude that Geber ben-Uri had supervision of all the country east of Jordan not assigned in v. 13.

RV. ‘and he was the only officer which was in the land.’ This is usually interpreted thus: As the district was a very large one, more than one officer might have been expected to superintend it; but as a matter of fact this was not the case, probably because the country was rugged and thinly populated. But this translation, together with its explanation, would at least require \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \), \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \), \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \), and there are no signs of the text ever having existed in this form. LXX \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \). Luc. Naorion \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) make the reference to be to yet one more officer who has supervision over Judah, thus restoring the number twelve which these Verss. would otherwise have lost through the corrupt rendering in v. 11a. But it is strange that this officer should be thus vaguely mentioned without record of his name, nor does Luc. appear to be correct in viewing \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) as a proper name; and besides this, having adopted the obviously original \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) of v. 11b, we have now thirteen officers in contradiction to the statement of v. 7.

Klo. ingeniously suggests \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) ‘and one officer was over all the officers who were in the land,’ the allusion being to \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \) who is mentioned in v. 5 as \( \text{ךָּטַלְּל} \). Such a second passing notice of this official at the end of the list would be most appropriate. The emendation is to some extent
supported by Vulg., *super omnia quae erant in illa terra*, and may be worthily adopted.\(^1\)

**Verse 20—chapter 5. 14.**

This section appears in LXX, Luc. in a form somewhat different to MT. 4. 20; 5. 1, 5, 6, and part of v. 4 (חֲשַׁמֵּשׁ) do not appear, but are to be found in the addition at the end of ch. 2. 46. At the close of v. 19 of ch. 4 the text continues with ch. 5 in the following order: vv. 7, 8, 2–4, 9–14, after which follow ch. 3. 1; ch. 9. 16, 17.\(^6\) Thus the commencement of v. 7 which enumerates the נִבְנֵי הָאֲדָמָה and their respective districts. This explains נִבְנֵי of ch. 5. 7, which is otherwise anomalous. There can be no question that the text of the section, as preserved by LXX, is complete in itself, and bears the stamp of originality rather than the somewhat confused account of MT. The disturbing factors in MT. appear to have been 4. 20; 5. 1, 5.\(^7\) These, which contain no very precise information, were added probably not from a written source but from oral tradition, by an exilic or post-exilic\(^8\) scribe, who desired reference to the happy times under Solomon’s golden age. The insertion led to the dislocation of vv. 7, 8, causing them to be placed after vv. 2, 3, 4. Probably the same hand excerpted the notice about Pharaoh’s daughter and her dowry from its true position after v. 14, dividing it and placing part at the beginning of ch. 3 (for the reason given on 3. 2, 3 *note ad fin.*) and part as a sequel to the mention of רֹא in ch. 9. 15.

20. [כֶּלֶל] A common simile for a very large multitude; so exactly 2 Sam. 17. 11; cf. 1 Sam. 13. 5; Josh. 11. 4; Judg. 7. 12.

5. 1. [מַעְרֵשׂ הַיְשָׁר] The participle with the substantive verb en-

---

1 Cf. Jos. (*Ant. viliii, 2, § 3*) ἵνα δὲ τοῦτον ἐλπίς ψυχῶν ἰδονὶ ἀποδιδόντω.
2 Verse 6 belongs properly to ch. 10 where it occurs in LXX, Luc. in connexion with v. 26.
3 Necessarily so; for exilic hands had already been at work upon ch. 5. 4 (*note*) in the part which is common both to LXX and MT.
phasizing the idea of duration—'was ruling'; so  v. 24 'was giving,' continuously for some long period; ch. 12. 6; al. Dri. Tenses, § 135, 5.

[The ideal limits of Israel's dominion; cf. Gen. 15. 18; Ex. 23. 31; Deut. 1. 7; 11. 24; Josh. 1. 4. 'the river' always denotes הֵרְבֵּשָׁן, the Euphrates; hence Vulg. a flumine terrae Ph., Pesh. סִי סְעַ, which make 'מִן an accus. of place, are quite wrong. 'מִן is an accus. of motion towards, 'to the land of the Ph.;' cf. Gen. 45. 25. 26 reads יָדָּא אָרָם 'the land of the Aram.' Da. § 67b. 2 Chr. 9. 26 reads יָדָּא אָרָם 'the land of the Aram.'

'Even to the boundary of Egypt.' The נֶבֶל מִצְיוֹנָה... oases... 'They brought &c.;' impersonal. Cf. Gen. 39. 22 וַיְנַחֵם אֶת עָשָׂה שֶם הַגֵּרְשִׁים שָׂדֶם אֶת עָשָׂה 'whatsoever was done (lit. they did) there, he was the doer of it.' This use of the participle with the indefinite subject unexpressed is somewhat uncommon. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 135, 6.

מעה] 'Tribute'; so II. 17. 3; Judg. 3. 15, 17; 2 Sam. 8. 2, 6. Elsewhere the word has the more general sense of a present brought voluntarily to gain favour in the eyes of the recipient; II. 8. 8; 20. 12; Gen. 32. 14. As a sacrificial term the word in P denotes the meal-offering. Cf. further, ch. 18. 29 note.

3. גִּרְבָּא 'Pasture'; a דְּנַּאַכְּאַלְּיָא. The common word is מְגִץ. According to the vocalization of מְגִּית st. abs., מְגִּית stands in apposition, defining the class under which these cattle fall; 'meadow-fed cattle.' Dri. Tenses, § 188, 1.

לְקָדָם] LXX, Luc. om.

בְּעַרְבֵּי אֲבָנִים 'is a דְּנַּאַכְּאַלְּיָא. The root בְּעַרְבֵּי is seen again in Prov. 15. 17, בְּעַרְבֵּי אֲבָנִים 'a stalled ox,' the substantives אֲבָנִים 'stall,' Isa. 1. 3; Prov. 14. 4; Job 39. 9; and אֲבָנִים 'granary,' Jer. 50. 26f. All Verss. give the sense of fatted or selected fowls, without specifying the kind; Kimhi capons, Ges. geese (from בְּעַרְבֵּי,
to be pure or white), Th. *guinea-fowls* (an onomatop. from the cry of these birds).

4. "The other side of the river"; referring to Solomon’s dominions to the west of the Euphrates. The phrase, as in Ezra 4. 10, 11, 16, 17, 20; 5. 3, 6; 6. 6, 8, 13; 7. 21, 25; 8. 36; Neh. 2. 7, 9; 3. 7, implies an *exilic* standpoint. The passage, therefore, is an insertion later than the redaction of the book by the pre-exilic R\(^{D}\); but not so late as the dislocation caused by the insertion of 4. 20; &c. See *note ad loc.* On the other hand, the phrase as used in ch. 14. 15 (R\(^{D}\)); Josh. 24. 2, 3, 14, 15; 2 Sam. 10. 16; || 1 Chr. 19. 16t; cf. Isa. 7. 20 (ךCodeAt) denotes the country *east* of Euphrates, from a *western* standpoint.

5. The omission in LXX, Luc., though perhaps marking the words as an insertion later than the main part of the v., and by the same hand as 4. 20; &c., may, on the other hand, be merely due to homoioteleuton, the scribe’s eye passing from the first to the second.

5. ‘Upon all sides of him.’ So Jer. 49. 32 (ךCodeAt) לְפָנָיו נִמְטַבְּשָׁה לְפָנָיו נַסָּע. The text of Van der Hooght reads , a scriptural error unconfirmed by any Cod. or Vers.

5. An idiom expressive of pastoral prosperity; Mic. 4. 4; cf. Zech. 3. 10; II. 18. 31.

6. The standing phrase to express all the territory of Israel between the north and south limits; Judg. 20. 1; 1 Sam. 3. 20; 2 Sam. 3. 10; 17. 11; 24. 2, 15t. מָכָא שָׁבוּר וּרְעַר occurs in 1 Chr. 21. 2; 2 Chr. 30. 5t.

6. [ךCodeAt] So Vulg., Pesh., Targ.; and Luc. in 10. 26. LXX in 10. 26 *τιςαρχοκ* κακοβαίνει, and so 2 Chr. 9. 25 אֲרָבִיבָה וְאֶלֶמְס. The smaller number is adopted by Ew., Th., and others, and is perhaps more likely to be correct.

7. אַרְבֵּי (ךCodeAt) || 2 Chr. 9. 25; corre. אַרְבֵּי || 2 Chr. 32. 28t. The expression אַרְבֵּי לֶצְבֵי רָבָה אָרָיッシュ, corresponding e.g. to סְבִּיא to *Ar. לְבָא* and *Ar. סְבִּיא*; Aram. סְבִּיא, to *S. Luke 2. 7.
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missing,' six times. In Ar. קְטַנֶּךָ is used of a sheep lagging behind the rest of the flock.

8. And the barley, &c., they used to bring unto the place to which it might pertain. The subject of היה is naturally thought of collectively. Each officer had in his month to supply the different אֲרֹן which, to which allusion is made in ch. 10. 26. So Klo., RV. marg. 2; &c. LXX, Luc., Vulg. supply נְדֹר as subject of היה, and this is followed by RV. marg. 1. It seems clear, however, that the word supplied is merely a wrong explanatory gloss on the part of the translator. The business of the בעלה can scarcely have been to follow the king from place to place with fodder for the limited number of horses which he might have with him.

For the nuance of the imperf. היה cf. Dri. Tenses, § 38 β.

보ְרָה] RV. 'swift steeds.' From the contrast to דְּתָא the word seems to denote some special kind of horse, whether used for riding, Est. 8. 10, 14, or for chariots, Mic. 1. 13+ In Pesh. מֵחַל is the constant equivalent of מַכָּה when used as a collective sing., or in the pl.

9. בַּל הָבְר] 'Breadth of heart.' בָּל here is used as the seat of the intellect; cf. Job 12. 3 מַשָּׁהוּ אַל מְדַל אֵין מַכָּה, and 24; Jer. 4. 9; the expression מֵחַל בָּל 'devoid of intelligence;' peculiar to Prov., where it occurs eleven times, 7. 7; al. (_mask הַבָּל once as a variation 28. 16); and the common phrase מֵחַל יַבְשָׁב in Ex. 31. 6; al.

With our phrase cf. Ps. 119. 32 מִרְדָּא אָדָם יִעְרָה וּבַל יַבְשָׁב בּוֹ.

חַטָּא] Here the figure is suggested not, as in ch. 4. 20, by the innumerable grains, but by the vastness of the level expanse.

10. יִבְרָעֵב In Gen. 29. 1 this expression is used of Mesopotamia, but elsewhere, Judg. 6. 3, 33; 7. 12 (coupled with חָבוּ בַּקְשָׁם); Isa. 11. 14; Jer. 49. 28 (חֶבֶר); Ezek. 25. 4, 10 (שֵׁר הָיוֹדָד 'their tents,' mentioned v. 4); Job 1. 3+, the phrase denotes the Arabian tribes to the east of Israel, and spreading as far as the Euphrates. So also, while רַבּוּ הָיוֹדָד Num. 23. 7 (חֶבֶר) are the mountains of Mesopotamia, ראָשָׁא רַבּוּ היִבְרָעֵב Gen. 25. 6 is the land into which Abraham sent the ראָשָׁא יִבְרָעֵב previously enumerated as Arab
V. 8-II

tribes, and Gen. 10. 30 seems to be the Arabian hill-country called en-Nejd stretching eastward from Hadramaut. Thus Solomon's wisdom seems to be compared, not with the wisdom of the Chaldeans, who were chiefly known as astrologers, but with that of the Arabs, whose country, as Ke. points out, is the fatherland of proverbial wisdom. Agreeable to this is the mention, 1 Ch. 10, of the visit of the queen of Sheba in south-west Arabia, who came to test Solomon's wisdom with hard enigmas. So Ke., Ew., Th.

[The wisdom of the מנהיגים, men of the priestly class who employed themselves in the study of hieroglyphics, astronomy, and magic; Gen. 41. 8; Ex. 8. 3, 14; al.: Ebers, Aegyplen, p. 344 f. Cf. also Isa. 19. 11; Acts 7. 22.

11. 'הנהיא] The four (לו for ליוו; but Codd., Luc., Pesh., Targ. agree with Kings) are mentioned with הער in 2 Chr. 6. 6 as sons of הר the son of Judah by Tamar, Gen. 38. 30. So Targ. interprets וירא as וירא. In 1 Chr. 15. 17, 19 a Heman and an Ethan appear with Asaph as appointed by the Levites to be precentors in the temple, the three representing the families of Kohath (1 Chr. 6. 18), Merari (1 Chr. 6. 29), and Gershom (6. 24-28) respectively. In 1 Chr. 25. 1 וס and וס (cf. 1 Chr. 16. 41, 42; 2 Chr. 5. 12; 35. 15; apparently the same as וס) are mentioned as וס וס וס וס, and in v. 5 וס is called וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס וס. Hence the chronicler distinguishes Ethan and Heman, the sages of the tribe of Judah, from Ethan and Heman the musicians, who were Levites; and further, his statement that they were sons of Zerah need not conflict with that of Kings, 'sons of Mahol,' since Zerah, as is suggested by the title ירחא, may have been the remoter ancestor, Mahol the immediate father. On the other hand, the author of the Psalm titles, in naming his men Ezrahites, seems to be introducing a confusion between the Levites and the Judeans.

[His name,' i.e. his fame; cf. the phrases ב ילחש a Sam. 7. 9; al.; ב ילחש Isa. 55. 13; ב ילחש Gen. 6. 4; cf. Num. 16. 2; ילחש Job 30. 8.
12. לְשׁוֹןָה is never elsewhere used as a collective. Hence Klo. reads לְשׁוֹןָהַים, supposing that the scribe's eye was caught by the similar לְשׁוֹנָה in the previous line.

[This latter, as a round number, seems preferable.]

13. As a general rule the sing. collective denotes growing trees, the pl. pieces of wood, logs, or timber, as e.g. in v. 22; ch. 15. 22. When in classical Hebrew the pl. is used of living trees, there seems to be some emphasis, however slight, upon the different varieties. So here, Judg. 9. 8 ff. (Jotham's parable), and perhaps Isa. 7. 2.

Elsewhere the pl. use appears to be late or poetical; Isa. 44. 14; Ezek. eight times; Joel 1. 12, 19; Song of Sol. 2. 3; 4. 14; Ps. 96. 12; Ps. 106. 16.

14. לְשׁוֹןָה [Deputed by all the kings, &c.'; so exactly 2 Sam. 15. 3 RV.'there is no man deputed of the king to hear thee.' Ew. makes לְשׁוֹןָה a closer definition of מְלַאכָה מָרְגָלֵה, &c.'specially some from among all kings, &c.' For this sense it would be more natural to read מְלַאכָה simply without מָרְגָלֵה, and even so the expression would be rather strange.

Luc. inserts καὶ διάμαθεν δαπανήμενον before מְלַאכָה, and similarly Pesh. מְלַאכָה יָמוֹנְשָׂא, i.e. מְלַאכָה יָמוֹנְשָׂא, adopted by Klo., Hoo., and very probably correct. The reception of rich presents would be one mark of the prosperity of an ideal eastern monarch; cf. e.g. Ps. 72. 10.

5. 15—7. 51. Solomon's building operations; chiefly, the construction of the Temple and its furniture.

Ch. 5. 15—7. 51 supply the basis of 2 Chr. 1. 18—5. 1.

15. יְרוֹם The name is contracted from יְרָם 'brother of the

1 Josh. 10. 26, 27 'השָׂטָן יִשְׂרָאֵל' is probably no exception. The meaning seems to be 'five gibbets,' and, in addition, the numeral influences the use of the pl.

2 רָם 'from proximity with' (see Heb. Lex., Oxf., p. 86) is too closely specific of locality to be used in such a sense as this.
lofty One,' a form which occurs as a Heb. name, Num. 26. 38. The same contraction in Phoenician is seen in the names Himilcat, for חימילכ "brother of Milcat'; Hothmilcat, for חותמילכ "sister of Milcat." So in Heb. ליה for ליהא, ch. 16. 34. The form ליהא occurs in 2 Chr. 2. 2, 10, 11; al.: cf. the variants ליהא 1 Sam. 25. 3, al., ביטי אתכ Kt. v. 18; ליהא in 1 Sam. 31, 24. 18; ליהא Gen. 32. 31, בה ויד v. 32; ליהא ch. 16. 34, Assy. Abu-ra-mu, COT. ii. 479.

LXX (Luc. ου) χρίσαν ρως ε. merely represents a corruption of MT., which latter is supported by other Verss.

Emphatic by position: 'they had anointed him'; perhaps with reference to the events of ch. 1.

LXX, Luc. divi David ρως παραδός ανθρώπων, correct, as being more circumstantial. The immediate mention of the name רח in the next sentence favours its inclusion here also.

Cf. ch. 2. 39 note.

'All the days,' with the implication 'all his days.' So very frequently in preference to the use of the suffix ל concatenated, &c.; ch. 12. 7; 14. 30; II. 13. 3; Gen. 43. 9; 44. 32; 2 Sam. 13. 37b; al. In 1 Sam. 1. 28 we have the expanded phrase כל ימי אישו used absolutely (Deuteronomistic) in the sense 'continually,' cf. ch. 9. 3 note.

16-19. These verses have, in their present form, been amplified by R0 upon the lines of 2 Sam. 7. On v. 17 'לאגוג ביצים' cf. ch. 3. 2 note; v. 19 ' множת granitas' 2 Sam. 7. 13; v. 18 'ות.ForegroundColor' 2 Sam. 7. 1, 11; cf. Deut. 12. 10; 25. 19; Josh. 21. 42; 23. 1 (D6), and also Deut. 3. 20; Josh. 1. 13, 15; 22. 4 (both D5).

LXX, Luc. ρως θεός μου, an error.

The speaker, in using the state of warfare, has implicit in his mind מѧא the enemies, who were its cause, and so immediately passes into the pl. מѧא, and is able to continue מѧא מѧא מѧא. Cf. Judg. 5. 7 (government for governors). This manner of thought is illustrated by the less
extreme case Isa. 25. 3 (where the thought of the sing. is lost in the idea of the mult. who inhabit it), and by the common use of a sing. collective for a pl. Cf. Ew. § 317; Da. § 17.

LXX, Vulg., Pesh. render "ה/place" by a pl. 'wars'; Luc. τῶν πολεμίων, Targ. "נהב" paraphrase 'enemies.' From this latter Klo. would emend מלחים; but this is unnecessary, and also out of accord with Heb. idiom, the phrase always denoting members of Israel's standing army, never their foes. The expression is different 2 Sam. 8. 10 ([1 Chr. 18. 10] is different.

18. [ם] Illustrated by ch. 11. 14, 23, 25; 1 Sam. 29. 4.

[ם] 'Evil chance'; Eccl. 9. 11 time and chance encounters all of them.' is something which meets one; cf. the use of the verb, 1 Sam. 10. 5; Am. 5. 19; al.

19. [ם] 'I purpose to build.' So Ex. 2. 14 הולגרי את; 1 Sam. 30. 6; 2 Sam. 21. 16; Ezr. 20. 8; Ps. 106. 23. Similarly in the sense 'promise to;' ch. 8. 12 אמר לשב; II. 8. 19.

With the meaning 'command to' the phrase occurs 2 Sam. 1. 18; 2. 26; and very frequently in late Heb., 1 Chr. 13. 4; 15. 16; Est. 1. 10; Dan. 1. 3, 18; 2. 2; al.; and in the Aramaic of Dan. 2. 12, 46; 3. 13, 19; 5. 2.

20. [ם] 'Command and let them hew,' i.e. 'command that they hew'; the voluntative with weak expressing regularly the purpose of the previous act. Dri. Tenses, § 62.

[ם] LXX, Luc. ἔξωθα, i.e. ἐξωθεί, probably a correction in view of the fact that (v. 22) Hiram supplied Solomon not merely with but also with Cedar wood, as the most important necessity, may very well be specially mentioned.

21. [ם] Luc. κύρος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ. So [2 Chr. 2. 11; Klo., Hoo. As Klo. remarks, the expression is more

1 Joel 4. 9 is the only passage where the phrase is used of foreign armies; and here too the 'ם שחק are spoken of, not as Israel's foes, but from the point of view of the שחק themselves.
appropriate in the mouth of Hiram than מַחוּ only. Vulg. *Dominus Deus* preserves part of the original text.

22. [רָז-נֶח] So v. 23; and of doing one's own pleasure, Isa. 46. 10; 48. 14; 58. 13†.

23. [זָרָק לַעֲנֵי] LXX, Luc. *σωπεῦσα*, Pesh. מַקָּדֶשׁ, Targ. יִרְפּוֹ, תַּרְגּוֹ; ‘rafts’ or ‘floats.’ This meaning agrees with the following: ‘I will break them up;’ cf. Ps. 2. 9; Jer. 48. 12. Vulg. in *ratisbus* is a guess from the context.

In || 2 Chr. 2. 15 מָחַת, a זָרָק לַעֲנֵי of doubtful derivation, is used.

24. [אֲדֹנֵי] Cf. v. 1 note.

25. [רָז-נֶח] The subject is intentionally emphasized so as to throw the sentence into antithesis with v. 24 זָרָק לַעֲנֵי. Cf. ch. 10. 10, 13 וַיַּלְמַלְמוּ ... וַיֵּשֹּׁמָהּ וּבָנָהָ וּשְׁלַם וּנְתִן; 12. 29 והָאְסָר וַיִּלַּח לָשׁוֹן וּבָנָהָ וּשְׁלַם וּנְתִן בָּנָהָ וּשְׁלַם; 18. 42 וַיִּשַׁלְּכוּ לָשֹׁן וּבָנָהָ וּשְׁלַם וּנְתִן בָּנָהָ וּשְׁלַם; 22. 20b וַיִּשַׁלְּכוּ לָשֹׁן וּבָנָהָ וּשְׁלַם וּנְתִן בָּנָהָ וּשְׁלַם; 29. 1a וַיֵּשֹּׁמָהּ וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשָּׁמַע וַיָּהָוֵה וַיִּשָּׁמַע וַיִּשָּׁמַע וַיִּשָּׁמַע וַיִּשָּׁמַע וַיִּשָּׁמַע.

For יִשָּׁמַע Is. 9. 4, 18†, with assimilation of the weak cons. נ. Sta. § 112, 1, *Rem. 2* quotes as parallels מַאֶשְׁמָא for מַאֶשְׁמָא Is. 27. 8; מַאֶשְׁמָא for מַאֶשְׁמָא from מַאֶשְׁמָא (or a redup. of the syll. מַאֶשְׁמָא) Is. 38. 15; מַאֶשְׁמָא for מַאֶשְׁמָא Ezek. 39. 2. More frequent is the dropping of the quiescent נ with a lengthening of the preceding vowel; so מַאֶשְׁמָא Ezek. 20. 37; מַאֶשְׁמָא for מַאֶשְׁמָא Job 32. 11; al. G-K. § 24, 3; § 68, 2, *Rem. 1*; Sta. § 112, 1.

For יַשֵּׁב רָע רָע מַשְׁבֵּיהַ The רָע was a dry measure, and the quantity specified is much too small. We must follow LXX, Luc. (and Pesh. for the numeral), and read מַשֵּׁבָה מַשֵּׁבָה; cf. 2 Chr. 2. 9.

So Jos., Th., Klo., Kamp.

For יַשֵּׁב מַשֵּׁבָּה ‘Beaten oil,’ obtained by the pounding of the olives in a mortar. This is specified for the lamp of the Tabernacle, Ex. 27. 20; Lev. 24. 2; and to form part of the מַשָּׁבָה and מַשָּׁבָה, Ex. 29. 40; Num. 28. 51†.

For יַשֵּׁב מַשָּׁבָה So Lev. 25. 53; Deut. 15. 20; al. ‘Year by year,’ properly, ‘year for year,’ the meaning being that what was done in one year exactly corresponded to that which was done in others.
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Cf. ch. 10. 25, compares Heb. Lex., Oxf., p. 90\textsuperscript{a}, compares in very late Heb., Neh. 8. 18; 1 Chr. 12. 23; \textit{al.}; 1 Sam. 18. 10\textsuperscript{+}; Judg. 16. 20; \textit{al.}; \textit{ךָּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּ
bearing burdens.' 2 Chr. 2. 1, 17, based upon this verse, omits שְׂרָפָה and reads בְּרִית שְׁתֵּי נַפָּרִים, בְּרִית.

The relationship of this 70,000 + 80,000 to the 30,000 of vv. 27, 28, is obscure. According to 2 Chr. 2. 16, 17 the former consisted of 'the strangers that were in the land of Israel.' Probably vv. 29–32 are from a different source to vv. 27, 28. So Ew., Sta.; the latter noticing that המָלַךְ of v. 28 is in v. 29 called רְשֵׁי.

30. המָלַךְ וְהַגּוֹיִם "מצעלות פְּרָשֵׁת הַגּוֹיִם," in agreement with 2 Chr. 2. 1, 17, and probably genuine. So Th., Klo. Th.'s attempt to divide the 3,600 into the 70,000 + 80,000 = 150,000 of v. 29, + 30,000 of v. 28 = 180,000, thus assigning fifty workmen to each overseer, seems to be unlawful; since it places the 30,000 Israelites upon the same footing as the 150,000 strangers, and, in supposing that the overseers had charge of the work of the former, is neither consonant with the statement of 2 Chr. 2, nor with the view that v. 28, vv. 29ff. are portions of different documents.

Luc. for the second number gives ἐπιτεκτάσῃς, Cod. A περιτεκτάσῃς.

31. מִשְׁלֶה דְּאָרָי לXX om., probably owing to the transposition noticed below. Luc. καὶ ἐπιτεκτάρο  ὤ τῶν ἀρχοντῶν, i.e. μαζί, scarcely improves MT., and is probably merely an exegetical addition.

In LXX, Luc. vv. 31, 32a are placed after v. 32b, ch. 6. 1. Sta. points out that this gives a bad succession, because the command to prepare the stone in the fourth year follows the statement in 5. 17 (LXX) that the hewing of stones and timber had been going on for three years. He also notices that in vv. 31, 32a, 32b MT. מִשְׁלֶה, מִשְׁלֶה, מִשְׁלֶה naturally follow one another in appropriate order.

32. מִשְׁלֶה] Difficult. As the word stands it has been taken in two senses—

(i) 'The stone-squarers.' So apparently Targ. מְבָנָה, Pesh. מְבָנָה, and hence AV. However, the word is not used else-

1 The derivation is doubtful. Levy thinks the word a transposition from the Gk. ἐπιτεκτάτων, while Jensen, ZA. vii. 218, explains by the Assyr. ongulu.
where in Heb. with such a meaning, and if it be adopted we must suppose that the 1 is employed for closer specification, 'namely,' which is improbable.

(ii) 'The Gebalites.' So Vulg. Giblīi, RV., Ges., Ke., Ew., Kamp. The 1 must then mean 'and especially;' the men of Gebal being particularly singled out from among the servants of Hīram. But, as Th. remarks, no one has as yet succeeded in explaining why they should receive such special notice.

Hence it seems probable that we have here a corruption, and that we must look for some verb following upon the preceding לֵבַד. So LXX kal ἰβαλαν αὐτοῖς, Luc. kal ἰβαλαν αὐτοῖς. Th. restores ἰβαλαν 'and they bordered them with grooved edges,' and so substantially Klo. ἰβαλαν. Th.'s emendation is favoured by Sig., u. Sta.; Heb. Lex., Oxf., and may be adopted.

Luke 1:1 LXX omits and reads instead τριά ἄμμυ. Luc. τριῳ ἀμμῳς ἐκ τῆς ὀχυδομην τοῦ οἶκου. This addition is favoured by Th., who thinks that without it v. 32b is pointless, and supposes that three years' preparation of stone and timber preceded the commencement of the building, ch. 6. 1, in order that the work might go on without interruption. On the other hand, Sta., Klo. regard the words as a false inference from 6. 1. The former points out that even supposing that a very short time elapsed between the commencement of Solomon's reign and his intercourse with Hīram, yet, notwithstanding, a longer time than three years is needed for the hewing of the timber in Lebanon and its conveyance to Jerusalem. Sta. thinks also that the long duration of the work of building is not to be understood, if at the commencement stone and timber were already prepared. On these grounds MT. seems to be preferable.

6. 1. As has been noticed above, LXX inserts this verse before vv. 31, 32a of ch. 5. In its place we now have ch. 6. vv. 37, 38a which give the dates of laying the foundation of the Temple and of its completion. Wellh. (C. 267) remarks that these latter verses in MT. break the continuity between 6. 36 and 7. 1-12, while in the position which they occupy in LXX they completely supersede
v. 1 MT. which holds the 'very unfortunate position' above mentioned. Hence he concludes that v. 1 is the work of a later editor who relegated vv. 37, 38a to their present place in MT. to make room for his addition, and that LXX represents the original text. This will account for the position of v. 1 in LXX, the late addition having been first written in the margin of a MS., and afterwards incorporated in the text as best it could be. As a mark of the different authorship of v. 1 Wellh. notices that it uses וְיָדָהוּ where vv. 37, 38a have וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ; וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ standing in place of וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ.

Another consideration favours the lateness of this verse. The number 480 appears to be not strictly historical, but to be a round number obtained, as recognized by Bertheau and Nöldeke, from 40 × 12, forty years being regarded as the approximate length of a generation, and frequently occurring in Judges in descriptions of the duration of periods of peace or oppression. Attempts have been made so to arrange previous chronological notices that they may together correspond to this given period; but no scheme has been entirely successful.

Now it is at least conceivable that the author of our verse may have been influenced by that fondness for the construction of artificial periods of similar length exhibited by the chrono-

---

1 Sta. agrees with Wellh. that v. 1 is a late insertion, but refuses to regard the position of vv. 37, 38a in LXX as original, on the ground that a notice as to the completion of the building is out of place at the commencement, the expressions וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ וְיָדָהוּ pointing backward to a previous description. This argument scarcely seems to carry conviction.

2 So in S. Matt. 1. 17 ἀνά τῇ μετακιστείᾳ Βαβυλώνι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεῖ μετακιστείαι, 40 × 14 = 560, approximates very fairly to the real length of the period—586 years.

3 So of the peace enjoyed after the victories of Othniel (3. 11), Deborah (5. 31), Gideon (8. 28), Ehud (3. 30) eighty years, i.e. 40 × 2; and of the Philistine oppression (13. 1). Samson's judgeship (16. 31) twenty years, is half a generation. Cf. the periods assigned for Eli's judgeship (1 Sam. 4. 18), and for the reigns of David (2 Sam. 5. 4) and Solomon (1 Ki. 11. 42).

4 Cf. Wellh. Prolegomena, 230 f. Jos. states the number of years to have been 492.
logist in S. Matt. 1. 17, and may thus have purposely approxi-
mated the length of the little-known period from the Exodus
to the building of the Temple to the chronology of some sub-
sequent period for the knowledge of which he possessed available
sources.

If then we start from the commencement of Solomon’s Temple,
and add together the years of the reigns of the kings of Judah
as given by R", we obtain the following result:—

| Solomon (40 - 3 years before the com-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mence ment of the Temple)</th>
<th>.</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>I. 11. 42.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijam</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athaliah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoash</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zedekiah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To this 430 add the fifty years of the Babylonian exile, and
we have from the commencement of the Temple down to the
return from Babylon a second period of 480 years\(^1\) which may be fairly considered as having determined the duration assigned to the former period. Thus v. 1 appears to be the work of a post-exilic editor, the same no doubt as will later on come into prominence through the insertions made by him under the influence of the Priestly Code\(^2\).

The reading of LXX, ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ τετρακοσιῳτῷ ἔτει, is a mistake, but cannot be explained with Th., following Winer, ii. 327, note 2, as arising from a confusion of \(\Delta = 80\) with \(\Delta = 40\). In ancient Hebrew writing the method of expressing numeration, in cases where the number was not fully written in words, was most probably a system of strokes and similar signs, such as we find in Phoenician inscriptions. We have not the slightest evidence to prove that the comparatively late system of expressing numbers by means of letters was ever adopted in Hebrew MSS. of OT.

Luc. agrees with LXX as to the position assigned to vv. 37, 38 in place of v. 1, but continues καὶ φιδώθησαν αὐτῷ ἐν ἑκατά τὰ ἔτει, καὶ φιδώθη τῶν οἴκων τῷ κυρίῳ, i.e. vv. 38b, 1b. This has obviously been added to Luc. by a later hand, both sentences in MT. belonging to the author of v. 1\(^a\).

2. \[v. 1\]
So Vulg., Pesh., Targ., and 2 Chr. 3. 3 (MT. and all Verss.). LXX, Luc. τεσσαρακοστὰ μήνοι αἰῶνοι, the translator apparently fancying erroneously that the reference is to the ἱερόν or Holy Place, exclusive of the ναός, and so altering the text from v. 17.

3. \[v. 1\]
Read ὠφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν with LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh.

4. \[v. 1\]
So Vulg., Pesh., Targ.; but LXX, Luc. καὶ πάντα καὶ ἔλεησεν ἐν πάσης τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν. In 2 Chr. 3. 3, and in the description of the dimensions of Ezekiel’s Temple (41. 2), there is no record of the height.

5. \[v. 1\]
Upon the face of the breadth,’ i.e. corresponding to it; but PRI means simply ‘before the house.’

---

\(^1\) This has been already noticed by Sta., Ges. i. 88 ff.; Kau., Abriss, 172.

\(^2\) And therefore elsewhere cited as RP.
LXX omits through oversight. After v. 3, LXX, Luc. insert v. 14 and ἐκείνην τὸν οίκον καὶ συντάξεις αὐτῶν. In spite of what Klo. says to the contrary, it seems to be clearly inconsistent to mention the completion of the house before the details as to its roofing, side-chambers, &c, LXX order is therefore to be rejected.

4. רֶםֶשׁ (only again in 7. 4) probably means 'frames,' the reference being to the beams or stones which were fitted together to form the outline of the window. לְעָקָב (7. 5) doubtless signifies 'square in framework'; לְעָקָב denoting the beams or stones which formed the sides and lintel of the doorway; לְעָקָב (Ex. 12. 22, 23) is the lintel or portal; and the Talmudic לְעָקָב has the same meaning 'lintel.' Ar. לְעָקָב means to roof a building with a vaulted roof, לְעָקָב an arched or vaulted roof; the original signification probably being that assigned by Ges., to bend down, incline, then, to place upon, especially applied to beams, and so, to joist or construct with beams. לְעָקָב is again applied to windows Ezek. 40. 16; 41. 16, 26; and is used in the expression לְעָקָב 'stopping his ear,' Prov. 21. 13; Isa. 33. 15: Ar. לְעָקְב 1. to cover, hide, be contracted, iv. to close (a door): Syr. לְעָקְב compressed, contracted, then, thick, solid, and even hard, stubborn (of a disposition and of anger).

Thus our phrase may be rendered either (i) 'Windows with frames closed in,' possibly by gratings (this being implied merely and not stated), or more probably (ii) 'Windows with narrowed frames,' i.e. wide on the inner side of the thick wall, and gradually sloping so as to form a mere slit on the outer side, like the windows of ancient western fortresses. So probably Vulg. fenestras obliquas, and certainly Pesh. מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל 'windows oblique and narrowed' (cf. Ezek. 40. 16 מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל 'windows oblique within and small without'); Targ. מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל 'windows oblique and narrowed';

1 אָבָב is restored by Cornill in Ezek. 41. 16 מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל מַעַלְמַעַל.

2 In Ar. the term מַעַלְמַעַל is used of the flexible neck of the ostrich. Lane, Lex. 1283.
VI. 4-5

windows opened within and closed without'; Jesu bar-Ali who explains that 'windows opened within and closed without'.

windows which are not cut through straightly (i.e. squarely), but narrowed upon one side obliquely'; Kamp.; and Cornill on Ezekiel, so far as regards 'schråg einfallende Fenster'.

The Greek Verss. generally connect ἄνθρωπος with ἀνεβάειν 'to look or lean out of a window':—LXX θυρίδας παρακυττυμένας κρύπτας, al. exempl. διακυττυμένας κρύπτας, and so Θ.; Σ. θυρίδας καὶ ἐκθένας ἑπισκέπτοντος; 'A. ἐπιβλέπουσας βεβαιωμένας; Luc. θυρίδας διεκτυσμένας κρύπτας. Perhaps LXX, Θ, 'A. mean 'with prospects obstructed,' whether by grating or otherwise. So Vet. Lat. prospicientes abscessas. Luc. debuer. is probably a corruption of διακυττυ. in view of the explanation noticed below.

RV., Ke., Th., Ew., Sta., Kamp. (and Cornill in Ezek. 41. 16) give to λαμψίς the sense of lattices, gratings, or transverse beams; but this seems to rest upon pure conjecture; and, besides bearing no resemblance to the meaning of other Hebrew words from the same root, is unsuitable to the use of the same word by the same writer in 7. 4 (see note). The rendering of לַמְבָא by RV., Ke., Th., Sta. 'fixed,' 'festgemachte,' appears to be an accommodation to the meaning given to לַמְבָא, and fails of justification.

5. [בָא] LXX ἑδόκειν, i.e. [环卫]; possible (cf. הָב, v. 6), but not superior to MT. Luc. καὶ ἐν χώραν, i.e. ἕνωμι, is influenced by the recurrence of this word in vv. 4, 5b.

[בָא] The meaning seems to be something spread upon or applied to the wall of a house, so 'side-buildings' or 'wings.' So approximately Pesh. [בָא] lit. 'surroundings,' Targ. [בָא] probably 'projecting buildings.' The word denotes the whole wing, not the single stories: see notes on the other occurrences vv. 6, 10f. Hence LXX, Luc. μελαβρα, Vulg. tabulata, whence RV. 'stories,' are not quite correct.

1 These Verss., however, appear to derive their rendering 'open (oblique), closed (narrowed)' from the whole phrase לַמְבָא לַמְבָא; and so apparently RV. marg.
Q‘re שנית, probably aims at distinction from שינה, ‘bed,’ Gen. 49. 4; al.

[םNeill] LXX, Luc. om. As Sta. points out, the words appear to be merely a gloss upon שינה. So Kamp. The strange accentuation, which places the zaqef in each case upon שינה, cannot be correct.

[םNeill] LXX om., but merely through oversight. The words are found in Luc. and the other Verss., and are, as Sta. remarks, indispensable. שינה, properly a rib, is thought to be used distinctively of a side-chamber here and in the description of Ezekiel’s Temple, but seems to be employed of chambers more generally in 7. 3. Cf. note on 7. 2 ad fin.

6. [םNeill] (the whole wing, v. 5) is here unsuitable, and is also a masc. word. LXX, Luc. שינתה, Targ. "rebate", point to שינה as the original reading, doubtless correctly. Cf. v. 8 שינה ותנכות. So Th., Sta.; and Klo. doubtfully.

[םNeill] ‘Rebateaments’; מַעֲנָא לֶרֶא. The meaning is clear from the context, and from the common sense of גיב ‘take away’ or ‘diminish.’ So perhaps LXX, Luc. חטאת. Pesh., Targ., guessing from context, ממעה ‘ledges’; Vulg. irabes.

[םNeill] ‘That (the beams) should not have hold in the walls of the house.’ The absence of the subject, not previously mentioned, is very harsh; and we may reasonably suppose that ממעה has fallen out before ממעה, owing to the similarity of the two words. Cf. the confusion of these words in v. 15. Targ. rightly supplies a subject ממעה ‘the ends of the beams.’

7. This verse intrudes itself very awkwardly into the midst of the account of the construction of the side-chambers, and, if forming a part of the original description, must at any rate be out of place. Kamp. assigns the notice to ר, and Sta., following Ew., regards it as a gloss from the margin, and so presumably by a later hand,—perhaps the post-exilic author of v. 1, &c. The tradition of the building of the Temple without the use of tools and of previously prepared material is doubtless...
VI. 6–8

derived from or connected with the command of Ex. 20. 25 (J); Deut. 27. 5, 6 (cf. especially the phrase בְּבֵית זָרָה) with regard to an altar of stone, and so can have been written by the pre-exilic R', as is suggested by the occurrence of the verse in the same position in LXX, Luc.

On the other hand, the notice is not in the spirit of R'—whose insertions, as a rule, subserve a definitely religious purpose—and rather answers to the desire for curious details characteristic of a later (post-exilic) age; while the awkward position of the verse is strange to the really skilful handling by R' of his materials, and more nearly resembles the work of the later editor who has complicated the descriptions of chh. 6, 7 throughout.

We may therefore assign the insertion to the post-exilic editor (R'), and suppose that in LXX the verse was added by a copyist from a Hebrew MS.

[Stone rough-hewn in (as regards) quarrying.] מָקוֹם, in loose apposition (Dri. Tenses, § 188, 1; Da. § 290), defines the sense in which the stone could be described as מָקוֹם.

[Whole.] גָּם מָקוֹם, as hewn from the quarry, without any further preparation by sawing or otherwise. The term, as employed of the stones of an altar, Deut. 27. 6; Josh. 8. 31, probably denotes stones in their natural condition. מִבְּנָה, in this sense a הָקַךְ מַאֲם, is the ‘action of removal,’ from Hiph'il הָקַךְ הַיָּקְעֵל, ‘pluck up,’ used of moving stones from the quarry in 5. 31. The whole expression is an accus. of material; and with an active verb הָקַךְ מַאֲם would have formed the second or remoter accus., as in Deut. 27. 6; 7. 15. Dri. Tenses, § 195. Cf. Ew. § 284°; Da. § 80.

[For at the close of a category asyndetos summarizing all possibilities of the class cf. ch. 8. 37.] נַעֲשָׂה הַמָּקוֹם, the verb agreeing, not with the whole list, but with the nearest subs. נַעֲשָׂה הַמָּקוֹם, not in sing. Cf. Deut. 8. 13 נַעֲשָׂה הַמָּקוֹם; Hos. 4. 11 נַעֲשָׂה הַמָּקוֹם; Da. § 114°.

8. [LXX, Luc. τῇ ἐνοπλώθειν, Targ. ἀρχαῖα presuppose ἀρχαῖα, which is doubtless correct. So Th., Ew., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.]

A "winding stair," the meaning of which is not quite clear. RV. 'winding stairs' is derived from LXX, Luc. διώρυγα (διώρυγα) δώρυγα, 'A. (καὶ ἐν) κοσκίνα, Vulg. cochlæa, Targ. תַּקְלָם; soo Ke., Th., Ew., Klo., Kamp. Pesh., however, renders נֶחֶל 'through a trap-door,' and Sta. thinks that this is nearly correct. In Rabb. Hebrew דְּלֵית can mean a falling shaft covered by a trap-door; Middoth 4, 5 may have חֻלַּת בְּבַלָּא לְכָּלִי קָדָשָׁת שׁבָּח וָא. Mes. אַל אֵשֶׁת בְּבַלָּא כָּל שָּׁלֹא שֶׁלְׁא יִוָּנֵה מָכָּה קְרִי קְרִי קְרִי מְדַמָּם 'There were דלתים in the loft opening into the Holy of Holies through which they used to let down the workmen in boxes that they might not feast their eyes within the most Holy Place.' We also have the word used to denote a hollow room covered above; Pesachim 34b, 77b, al.; and afterwards it comes to mean a hen-roost; Shabbath 102b, 122b, al. Hence Sta. understands by דלתים hollow chambers covered above with trap-doors, through which one might ascend by means of a ladder or steps like those of hen-roosts.

Adopting this explanation we may render 'trap-door covered ascents.'

9. This verse is obviously out of place, breaking the connexion between vv. 8 and 10; and, accordingly, with Sta. it shares the fate of v. 7 as being a late gloss. Against this it should be noticed (i) that the verse contains the only allusion to the roofing of the house, a detail not likely to be omitted; and (ii) that mention of the completion of the house ought fitly to come into a description of the building, and may reasonably do so immediately after the details as to the construction of the house proper, and before those which concern its inward embellishments. Thus we may regard the verse as original, excepting the words not found in LXX, Luc., and place it after v. 10, from which position it has been transposed by a very early error of transcription.

---

1 Cf. Levy, s. v.
2 Verse 15 immediately continues with a description נָבט הַנֵּבֶת. הַנֵּבֶת.
3 This conclusion is confirmed by the repetition (v. 14) of 9b by the author of the interpolation vv. 11–14. See note.
Thus the sequence in description—walls, porch, windows, wings, roofing—is perfect, the last detail aptly rounding off the account of the outside building of the house.

A rather strange expression. If we adopt RV. 'beams and planks of cedar,' we must suppose that the is a variety of the essentiae; consisting of cedar.' LXX, Luc. κεκολουθημεν ἐν ὀπλοὶ ἐν κέδρους, Pesh. seem to have read simply ἡ ἰδία, which was probably the original form of the sentence. The words are then a later gloss added to explain more precisely the use to which the cedar beams were put.

elsewhere means 'pits' or 'cisterns'; II. 3. 16; while elsewhere in its other occurrences, II. 11. 8, 15; || 2 Chr. 23. 14†, denotes 'ranks' of men. Ew., taking to mean lit. 'cavities,' explains that the roof consisted 'of an ornamental ceiling in squares, with small pieces of cedar wood as dividing beams.' This agrees with LXX insertion φανερώμεν καὶ διατίθεν ἐν κέδρους, 'panels and cedar boards in rows;' Vulg. laquearibus, 'with panelled roofs.' Adopting this explanation we may render, 'panels and parallel beams.' Targ. explains אֶלִישָׁל יִהְיֶשׁ הָנָטוּ כְּתוֹּבָה, 'And he roofed the house with rafters, and above them were a series of cedar boards joined together.' Lagarde (Armenische Studien, § 499; Mittheil. i. 211) for reads which he connects with Persian , Armen. γυμβδ, 'vaulted roofs.'

Somewhat obscure. MT. is adopted by Ke., Th., Kamp., Klo.; the last explaining:—'He built it (each story) evenly against the wall of the whole house, until it was five cubits high, and then the connexion with the house and the roof of the side-chambers was formed by the cedar beams and planks, which rested upon the rebatements of the house.' Of course this process is conceived to have taken place three times, so that the three stories when

But not, as stated by Ew., with LXX κεκολουθημεν, 'made with vaulted roof,' which, as above noticed, is a translation of κεκολουθημεν merely. Cf. Hag. I. 4, in olous ὑμῶν κεκολουθήσατε.
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built and roofed must have had a height of fifteen cubits. Against this it should be noticed that קֹדֶשׁ in v. 5 denotes not a single story (called לְזֵקֶן v. 8), but the whole wing consisting of three stories; hence Sta. is probably correct in reading וְהָיָה הַקֹּדֶשׁ תֶּבֶן שֵׁם for וְהָיָה שֵׁם חָצֵי of MT. So Kit.

The subject of וֹאֶל, rightly divined by RV., Ke., Sta., Klo., Benz., is וֹאֶל; 'It rested on the house with beams of cedar.' Sta. compares וֹאֶל יִהְיֶה of v. 6. On the contrary, Verss., RV. marg., Th., Kamp., Kit. make the subject to be the same as that of בֵּית; Vulg. operuit domum, Targ. אֶלְנִי 'he roofed the house,' giving a wrong sense to וֹאֶל. LXX καὶ συνέχει στὸν συνδέσμον (Luc. τοιού συνδέσμον) appear to have read וֹאֶל וֹאֶל וֹאֶל for וֹאֶל וֹאֶל וֹאֶל, and Sta. is probably right. This reading is favoured by Ew., but is probably merely a mistranslation, due to the mistake in the subject of וֹאֶל noticed above.

11-14. Omitted by LXX, Luc. Verses 11-13 are assigned by Kue., Wellh., Kamp., Benz., Kit. to RP; but this is certainly incorrect. The section, it is true, contains some D phrases, such as could and did pass from D into P; but other expressions belong solely to P or to H, and thus mark the verses as the work of RP. This conclusion is rendered certain by the LXX omission. Verse 14 is by the same hand as vv. 11-13; v. 9a being repeated in order to round off the interpolation and attach it to the preceding narrative.

The following are marks of authorship which require notice:—

12. וֹאֶל וֹאֶל וֹאֶל [This phrase, which never occurs in Deut., is found twice in Jer. 44. 10, 23. On the other hand, it is distinctively characteristic of H, occurring Lev. 26. 3 (cf. 18. 4), and constantly in Ezekiel, whose connexion with P, and especially with H, is well ascertained; 5. 6, 7; 11. 20; 18. 9, 17; 20. 13, 16, 19, 21.] Cf. the phrase בֵּית הָעַשָׁה Lev. 18. 3; 20. 23 (H).

וֹאֶל וֹאֶל וֹאֶל [The exact phrase (with וֹאֶל as spokesman; בֵּית הָעַשָׁה) belongs to H; Lev. 18. 4; Ezek. 5. 7; 11. 12; 18. 17; 20. 24; 1 Chr. 28. 7. In ch. 11. 33 וֹאֶל וֹאֶל וֹאֶל בֵּית הָעַשָׁה בֵּית הָעַשָׁה בֵּית הָעַשָׁה]

1 Cf. Dri. LOT., pp. 45 ff.
VI. 11-12
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... the passage belongs to RD, but the words 'from' are an insertion by RD, as is shown by their omission in LXX, Luc.

Even with RD, the phrase is not specially characteristic of Deut. 1:16; 26:15; 33:29 (Blessing of Moses in Appendix); Elsewhere, Neh. 10. 30.

Similar H phrases are found in Lev. 18. 5; Ezek. 20. 17, 18; Deut. 5. 10, and is then very frequent in Deut.; passing on to RD in Kings, I. 2. 3; 9. 6; 11. 34; al.; and to P, which shows several occurrences.

The expression 'with you' as subj. is found once in Deut. 9. 5, and twice in RD, ch. 2. 4; 12. 1; ch. 2. 15; II Chr. 10. 15; but is also more general; I Sam. 1. 23; Jer. 33. 14; Dan. 9. 12; cf. Is. 44. 26.

... Referring, like RD in 2. 4, to Nathan's prophecy, 2 Sam. 7. 12-16.

... Very distinctive of P; Ex. 25. 8; 29. 45; Num. 6. 3; 35. 34; Ezek. 43. 9. No occurrences in D.

With the whole verse cf. Lev. 26. 11, 12 (H) and the parallel passages in Deut. 28. 11-12 (H).

A casus pendens, 'As for this house,' &c., imperfectly reinforced, after the long protasis, by the clause 'take judgements to do them'; see ch. 13, where we should strictly expect 'will teach (some one else) judgements to do them'; Num. 5. 1, 5. 14; 6. 1.

1 D's usual phrases are מִלַּמְדוּ 'observe judgements to do them'; 6. 1; 7. 11; 11. 32; 12. 1; 2 Ki. 17. 37; Ezek. 20. 21 (cf. 18. 9): נִלְּמָלַּם 'teach (some one else) judgements to do them'; 4. 1, 5, 14; 6. 1.
suppose that before certain words have fallen out, such as או יִשְׂכַל הָאָדָם 'mine eyes shall be open toward,' as in ch. 8. 29.

15. והיה] Omitted by LXX, Luc.; but scarcely to be dispensed with.

16. יְבָעָל] Read יהב עָלֶה 'the rafters of the ceiling,' with the former part of the doublet in LXX, Luc. ἐστίν ὄνα κεφαλάρι, Vulg. laquearia, Pesh. מַעַלְתָּה. So Bö., Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

16b. יְבָעָל] Rejected by Sta. as a summary of the contents of the verse which has come into the text from the margin, and by Klo., Benz., Kit. as a later gloss added to guard the expression וי... עָלֶה against misunderstanding. The words, however, appear in all Versa., and may very well form with the previous וְשָׁכַר a circumstantial clause; 'And he built the walls of the house within with boards of cedar, over-laying with wood within from the floor of the house to the rafters of the ceiling.' Cf. Dri. Tentes, § 163, who quotes ch. 7. 51 יְבָעָל... וַיִּבְאָה, and he brought in the vessels... placing them,' &c.

16. יְבָעָל] 'And he built off the twenty cubits from the innermost part of the house with boards of cedar.' יְבָעָל means 'the furthest extremity,' and may be applied to the most secret recesses of a house or cave employed as a place of hiding, Am. 6. 10; 1 Sam. 24. 4; or as women's apartments, Ps. 128. 3; or again in the phrase יְבָעָל יֶדֶת, to the most inaccessible limits of the earth, Jer. 31. 7; al.; cf. Ezek. 38. 6; al.; Ezek. 32. 23. יְבָעָל means 'the point of departure in measurement, as e.g. 1 Sam. 20. 37 מַעַלְתָּה וַיִּבְאִהל 'on beyond thee.'

16b. יְבָעָל] Read יהב עָלֶה with LXX, Luc. ἐστίν ὄνα κεφαλάρι, Vulg. superiora, Pesh. מַעַלְתָּה. So the authorities cited for the same emendation in v. 15.

16b. יְבָעָל] is the reading of 1 Cod., LXX, Luc. 0., Vulg. So Th.

[5] Datius commodi, as in 1. 28; lit. 'he built for himself'; so Kamp. 'baute er sich's.' Th., RV. 'he even built (them) for it,' i.e. for the house, are incorrect.

[6] For an adytum. The word יְבָעָל, which only occurs
in this section of Kings, chs. 6–8, in the parallel account in
a Chr. 3–5, and in Ps. 28. 2 1, is connected with Ar. מַחֲרָה, to be behind,
whence מַחֲרָה, מַחֲרָה hindmost or back part, and so doubtless denotes the 
back or innermost room of the Temple. 'A., Z. χρυσαυτησιον, 
Vulg. oraculi, whence AV., RV. 'oracle,' connect מַחֲרָה incorrectly 
with רְבָּעָה 'to speak.'

So ch. 7. 50; 8. 6. The phrase occurs four times 
in P of the innermost sanctuary, Ex. 26. 33, 34; Num. 4. 4, 19;
in Num. 18. 9, 10 it refers to the offerings of the b'ne Israel
לַבֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל Lev. 21. 22 is the portion of the 
sons of Aaron; מַחֲרָה מְזִכֶר, seventeen times in P, is applied to 
the brazen altar, the altar of incense, the twelve cakes of shew-
bread, and the portions of various sacrifices which fell to the priests.
These are all occurrences of the phrase in P. Elsewhere it is 
found only in late books influenced by P; Ezek., Chr., Ezra, Neb., 
Dan.; and in the three passages noticed in Kings. Thus the 
phrase in Kings is clearly a gloss made by a post-exilic interpolator 
under the influence of P, to explain the possibly obsolete term 
מַחֲרָה in 6. 16; 8. 6; and הבאר in 7. 50.

The inclusion of the phrase in LXX, Luc. in each passage 
suggests that it is not due to the post-exilic editor R, whose 
glosses and changes are usually absent from the Greek Vers., or 
obviously inserted later from the margin, but to earlier post-exilic 
interpolators upon a smaller scale. 2

17–20a. ותوري . . . . מַחֲרָה . . . . . . The passage as it stands is 
remarkably involved, and appears to exhibit a double stratum 
of glosses. LXX reads καὶ τεσσαράκοντα πέντε ἐν διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας 
τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ οἴκου ἠσθενεῖ, δούναι ἕκατο τῶν 
μυθησεων Κυρίου. εἰς την πέντε μαραθία, καὶ εἰς την 
πέντε πέλατος, καὶ εἰς την πέντε τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, i.e. εἰς τὴν 
τρεῖς μαραθίαν τῆς πέντε πέλατος, καὶ τὸ τρίτην τῆς πέντε 
τῆς πέντε (v. 17) ἔπεμψε, ἀνθίζοντας τῆς πέντε μαραθίας τῆς 
πέντε πέλατος, καὶ ἀντειποντας τὴν τρισάρσεως, μαραθίαν πέντε 
πέλατος, μαραθίαν τρεῖς πέλατος τῆς τρισάρσεως (v. 19)

1 The word should probably be restored in II. 10. 35; see note.
2 These seem to have been mere scriva or copyists, not to be dignified 
by the title 'editor,' working under the influence of P, and thus their small insertions 
may be cited as belonging to SS. 2.
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(v. 20). So substantially Luc.

Here we notice the omission of לְעַבָּל also lacking in Vulg., explanatory of וּרְבָּה in v. 17; and the entire absence of v. 18, which contains details of the wood-carving of the house. These are clearly insertions made by RP. By their removal the monstrous לְעַבָּל at the close of v. 17, together with לְעַבָּל at the commencement of v. 20, is explained as arising out of the original לְעַבָּל at the close of v. 17, through the confusion incident upon the introduction of v. 18.

But the account, even as simplified by LXX, cannot stand in its original form. The mention (v. 19) of the situation of the וּרְבָּה is superfluous after v. 16, and the expression לְעַבָּל belongs to D; see note on 3.15. Thus v. 19 is also an insertion, though of earlier date than those first noticed, and possibly even due to RP. The description originally ran as follows:

(ו. 20) הפֶּרֶךְ וְלַעֲבָל הֵמוֹת לְעָבָּרֵי: ... וְלַעֲבָּרֵי וְלַעֲבָּרֵי אֲנָא

And forty cubits was the house before the adytum. And the adytum was twenty cubits long, and twenty cubits broad, and twenty cubits high.' So Sta., except for the retention of יָשַׁב וֹאָל (`situated') against LXX, Luc., Vulg.

18. וּרְבָּה לָל The preposition לָל is not used in a loose way for יָשַׁב, RV. 'on the house,' i.e. on its walls; but rather expresses presence in or at the building as pictured from a distance; 'in the house.' Cf. II. 10.14 'They slew them at the pit of Beth-Eqed'; Ezek. 31.7 ְשָׁמַשׁ אֶת מְשָׁר יְרֵם 'its root was by many waters'; 47.7 ְשָׂמַח אֵלֶּל נְחָלְתֵי יְרֵם 'behold, at the edge of the ravine there were many trees.'

[Carving]; only again vv. 29, 32; ch. 7.31; while the verb לָל לָל v. 29, 32, 35+ is also peculiar to this one interpolator.

[Goards]; 7.24+. הפֶּרֶךְ II. 4.39+ means wild gourds gathered from a_staff. According to Tristram, DB. 1244, the Colocynthis agri is denoted.

[Open flowers]; vv. 29, 32, 35+.
This anomalous form of the infinitive construction occurs once again, *ch. 17. 14* Kt., where *Q’re* is ָּ. König’s view (*Lehrg. I.* i. p. 305) that the double occurrence precludes the theory of textual corruption, and that the final ת is a parasitical addition due to the fact that vulgarly the recollection of the connexion of ת with ת was totally obliterated, is very forced and unnatural.

20. Sta. argues at length against the originality of all passages which speak of the use of gold plating in Solomon’s Temple, making in brief the following points:—

(i) If for the manufacture of brazen vessels a Syrian workman had to be imported (*7. 13* ff.), it is highly improbable that sufficiently skilful workers in gold were to be found among the men of Israel.

(ii) Later notices in Kings which mention the treasures of the Temple make no allusion to the gold-plating. Thus, *14. 26,* Shishak carries off only the מַרְאָה וּבְיִשׁי as such as would presumably be stored in the side-chambers, and the golden shields of Solomon; *II. 14. 14,* Joash king of Israel makes booty of the מַרְאָה מַמְאָה בְיִשׁי; *II. 16. 17,* Ahaz in his need uses merely the great *bronze* vessels found in the Temple; *II. 18. 16,* Hezekiah overlays the doors of the מַרְאָה וּבְיִשׁי with gold-plating, but afterwards cuts it off and sends it to the king of Assyria.

(iii) Verses 21 ff., 30 stand in wrong position; *v. 21,* so far as it refers to the gold-plating of the house, is wanting in LXX; and *v. 22, 30* are otherwise rendered suspicious by their contents.

(iv) Ezekiel, in his description of the future Temple, knows of no such gold-plating.

Thus in this connexion *v. 20b* (in part, מַמְאָה בְיִשׁי), *21* (all but מַמְאָה בְיִשׁי), *22, 28, 30, 32b* are omitted by Sta.

These arguments, though weighty, are not entirely convincing. מַרְאָה may denote not necessarily a heavy gold-plating as in II. 18. 16, but a thin gilding with *liquid* gold, such as called for no very

---

1 In Prov. 26. 23 מַמְאָה מַמְאָה מַמְאָה מַמְאָה, one thinks of a potsherd silvered over, not coated with *plates* of silver.
special skill in preparation and application to the wood, and also
need not imply so prodigious a supply of the metal, nor have
been calculated to attract the cupidity of a foreign foe bent upon
hastily pillaging the treasures of the Temple. Again, the fact
that certain notices are absent from LXX rather favours than
otherwise the originality of the remainder. Quite probably the
narrative has here, as elsewhere, been subject to later glosses;
but the total denial to the original account of all references to
the employment of gold in Solomon's Temple must be deemed
extremely precarious.

Apparently 'choice' or 'precious gold' (cf. the alter-
native מְבֹד of 2 Chr. 3. 8); though how the word gains this
sense is quite uncertain. A subs. יָדָע occurs Job 28. 15.

But if the altar was merely overlaid with cedar
boards, what was its inner material? As Sta. remarks, an altar
if of stone or earth could scarcely be covered outside with boards.
LXX, Luc. kal ἐπιθέμενον ὡς i.e. προτέρος ἱερόν, is doubtless
correct as regards the verb, but the mention of the material יָדָע
is indispensable, and must have fallen out through oversight. So
Bo., Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

21. LXX, Luc. have only the last four words of this verse
which they refer to the altar. This seems to be correct. The
remainder of the verse is a gloss inserted later, and breaking the
connexion. The whole sentence ought to run יִשָּׂרֶי יָדָע
וֹאָרְשָׁעָבִים יִשָּׂרֶי כְּרִיתָא בְּשֵׁלָה.

This can only mean 'he drew golden
chains across,' lit. 'he made a crossing with,' &c.; but this is very
harsh.

In 2 Chr. 3. 14 mention is made of יָדָע the veil; and, in
accordance with Th.'s suggestion, it is at least conceivable that
in our passage R' may have written, or intended to write, יָדָע
'and he drew the veil across with chains of gold.'

Pfell is only so used in this passage. The sing. יָדָע occurs
in Ezek. 7. 23 (but disappears under Cornill's emendation), and
a pl. יָדָע Is. 40. 19. Klo. makes the very conjectural emenda-
tion of its four horns were of gold, referring to the altar.

But we have already been informed about the overlaying of the altar with gold in the previous verse. This passage, omitted by LXX, Luc., is doubtless a gloss, and owes its existence to the gloss in the previous v. 21 which, by breaking the connexion, destroyed the original statement with reference to the gold-plating of the altar, and so caused the necessity for an additional clause to that effect.

So Vulg., Targ. LXX omits. Luc. εἰ δέκαν νυμα-

As the verse stands the reference of the suffix is obscure. RV. 'each' is an unsatisfactory escape from the difficulty, and no real translation. LXX, Luc. μέγεθος ἐστάθμωσιν, for which Th. suggests ἔστήθησεν; but Sta. points out that this cannot mean 'upright stature,' since ἔστη only signifies 'to adjust.' ἐστάθη appears to be merely a translator's flourish. Sta. most cleverly removes all difficulty by placing v. 26 between v. 23a and v. 23b. This is doubtless correct. The suffix of συνέρχεται is satisfied by reference to υπάρχειν ταύτην in v. 26b, and the account of the measurements of the ναός closes very appropriately with the summary v. 25

All Verss. follow the wrong order of MT.

So Klo., who notices that the fact that the were brought into the has already been stated in v. 23a. Th., Sta. adopt as more precise, but retain of MT. This latter, as introducing the statement that when so placed their wings touched the wall on either side, can scarcely be considered redundant.

One MS. Possible, but not preferable to MT.

LXX, Luc. τὰ πτερυγαὶ αὐτῶν, i.e. στήκοντες, doubtless correct. So Bo., Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

LXX seems to convey the idea that each had four
wings: — καὶ ἡστερὸς πτέρυξ μὴ τοῦ οἰκοῦ, καὶ πτέρυξ ἡστερὸς τοῦ οἰκοῦ τοῦ δευτέρου καὶ αἷς πτέρυγις αὐτοῦ αἱ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ οἴκου ἡστερὸς πτέρυξ πτέρυγος. This is very inferior to the plain statement of MT supported by Luc. and the other Vers.

29, 30. These verses, though both appearing in LXX, Luc., appear to form no part of the original account. Verse 29 is obviously by the same hand as v. 18, assigned to R², and v. 30 is redundant after v. 22, and also out of place.

29. Probably to be emended בָּאָרָא with Klo. The reference of 'within and without' is rather ambiguous, a remark which also applies to the similar words in v. 30. Klo.'s emendation, נַעֲרוּ יָשְׁבַּת יָשְׁבַּת 'both of the inner and of the outer house,' is probably correct; cf. Ezek. 41. 17. The expression יָשְׁבַּת יָשְׁבַּת is used of the יָשְׁבַּת v. 27; ch. 7. 50.

31. LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ. seem to presuppose דָּרָא; and so Klo. This may be original, but is quite as likely to be a paraphrase of the somewhat difficult MT. The latter, as Sta. notices, is quite possible, and may be paralleled; cf. Ex. 26. 1 דָּרוּ דָּדוֹת תַּקְוֹו דָּדוֹת; Dri. Tenses, § 195, i. Th., in retaining MT., cites Ew. § 284 for the usage.

Vulg. et in ingressu oraculi, takes יָשְׁבַּת דָּרָא to be an accus. of place as in ch. 7. 40 דָּרוֹי תִּבְרֵי in templo domini.

Of doubtful meaning. Neither Sta. 'door-opening,' nor RV., &c. 'lintel,' seems to be correct; for according to either of these renderings the breadth of the יָשְׁבַּת ought to be commensurate with that of the doorway, whereas in Ezek. 41. 3 the former is said to be two cubits (broad), the latter six cubits; cf. Ezek. 40. 9 — the porch eight cubits, the יָשְׁבַּת two cubits. Again, the יָשְׁבַּת is spoken of as something standing in equal proportions upon either side of an entrance or porch; Ezek. 40. 48 יָשְׁבַּת יָשְׁבַּת שֵׁרְפָּה יָשְׁבַּת שֵׁרְפָּה יָשְׁבַּת שֵׁרְפָּה יָשְׁבַּת שֵׁרְפָּה (on 48b see Cornill's emendation); cf. 41. 1. Thus the explanation of Bo. (Proben alttest. Schriftklärung: 302 ff.), pilasters or projections in a wall upon either side of an entrance, appears to be near to the truth. So Pesh. יָשְׁבַּת יָשְׁבַּת 'its
rapaorádetes,' Cornill 'Wandpfeiler,' Kit. 'Einfassung,' and apparently RV. marg. 'posts.' Somewhat similar is the suggestion 'crepidines,' of Ges., who quotes the passages where the word occurs, and the ancient interpretations.

חָצֶבָה] So Baer. Less accurate texts חָצֶבָה. Upon the analogy of 7. 5 פֶּן אֹהְלְךָ חַסִּינַן, and the necessary and obvious emendation at the close of v. 33 חַסִּינַן חָצֶבָה, חָצֶבָה ought to mean 'a pentagonal' □. So Vulg. postesque angulorum quinque, B6., Th., Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit. Pesh. חָצֶבָה suggests the possibility of an original חָצֶבָה exactly analogous to חָצִינַן of 7. 5. The explanation 'a fifth part' of the entire wall, adopted by Ges., Ke., Klo., is alien to the context, the breadth of the wall not having been mentioned since v. 20.

חָצֶבָה חָצֶבָה חָצֶבָה] It is impossible to regard חָצֶבָה as a case of apposition, 'the pilasters were doorposts,' &c., because חָצֶבָה is not identical with חָצֶבָה. Hence it is best to adopt Sta.'s emendation חָצֶבָה חָצֶבָה חָצֶבָה, rendering 'the pilasters and doorposts were (i.e. formed) a pentagonal.' It is, however, conceivable that the text may have originally read חָצֶבָה חָצֶבָה, and that חָצֶבָה is a gloss from the margin as an (incorrect) explanation of the difficult חָצֶבָה.

32, 35. By the same hand as vv. 18, 29.

32. 'נ חָצֶבָה לֵבֶן יִשָּׂעָה] A casus pendens; 'as for the two doors,' &c. חָצֶבָה] The perf. with weak חָצֶבָה here and in v. 35, if part of the original text, would be 'an isolated irregularity' (Dri. Tenses, § 133, 2), but the construction marks the style of the post-exilic interpolator. Klo. חָצֶבָה; but this, if possible in v. 32, is scarcely so in v. 35.

דְּבָה] From דְּבָה; 'and he spread out the gold upon the cherubim,' &c. The word is that which is used in Targ. Onk. as an equivalent of וַיַּשְׁמֵשַׁן; Ex. 39. 3; Num. 17. 4; and its use thus forms another

1 Unless this represent wpapaoráde, 'vestibule.' The other Vers. give no help; Targ. יָשָׁמֶשׁ 'but' misunderstands; LXX, Luc., Vulg. omit.
post-exilic indication. Luc. kal κατασκευαζω, i.e. ἀποτελόμενος; Pesh. ἀποτελέσματι, i.e. ἀποτελέσματος; Targ. טמון, apparently פֵּלֶן or וָלֶנֶן; Vulg. et operuit, a guess. Klo.'s reading וָלֶנֶן is unnecessary.

33. חוּרֵשׁ נַחֲמַא] LXX στοά (Luc. στοάς) τερπομένη, i.e. מֵתוֹפָּר ‘doorposts standing foursquare,’ is doubtless correct. Cf. ch. 7. 5. So Th., Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit. The verse, all but the last two words, is with v. 32 omitted by LXX through homoioteleuton with the end of v. 31.

34b. כֶּלֶל כֶּלֶל] All Verss. rightly presuppose מֵתוֹפָּר as in v. 34a. So Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp.

35. חָלָק] ‘Revolving,’ or ‘turning on hinges,’ so ‘folding.’ Thus only here. In Ezek. 41. 24 the doors are called חָלָק מֵתוֹפָּר מֵתוֹפָּר חָלָק.

36. בְּקָצָר] Cf. v. 32 note on מֵתוֹפָּר.

בַּשְׁלָשָׁה יִמְשָׁלָה ‘Applied evenly to the carving.’ יִמְשָׁלָה Pu'al only here; פָּל ‘make straight or even,’ of a way, &c.

36. בָּקָצָר] Surrounding the Temple, and innermost as contrasted with the חַגֹּבֵי בְּקָצָר 7. 8, containing the King's palace, both courts lying inside the חַגֹּבֵי בְּקָצָר which enclosed the whole group of buildings. See note on 7. 12b, and plan in Sta. Ge. i. 314.

At the end of this verse LXX, Luc. continue with the words מַעֲלָה יֵשָׁה, kal φθοραίμαι κ.τ.λ. This seems to represent MT. ch. 7. 12b, where it receives discussion.

7. 1-12a appear in LXX, Luc. at the close of the ch., being apparently so placed by some scribe who thought it better to give the account of the Temple furniture in immediate sequence to that of the Temple itself, and not separated by the description of Solomon's other buildings. This is shown to be a late dislocation by the fact that v. 12b has been accidentally left behind in making the alteration, and now follows immediately after the close of ch. 6, instead of after v. 12a to which it clearly belongs. MT., which describes all the buildings first and then the furniture of the Temple, is correct.

2. מַעֲלָה יֵשָׁה] LXX, Luc. τρύπω. Hence Sta. adopts מַעֲלָה יֵשָׁה as in agreement with the statement in v. 3.
This, he contends, must refer to the רַעֲשָׁנִים, and not to the רִובִּים (Th.) a fem. noun; Ezek. 41. 8. So Kamp., Benz., Kit.

Sta. takes the following view of the construction of the house:— 'It was a house of which the back and sides upon the ground-floor were formed of walls, while the front of the bottom story was formed by the fifteen pillars of the first row. The pillars of the second and third rows stood within the building, exactly corresponding to the pillars of the first row. The second story was formed by a number of chambers lying in three rows or flights' (ZATW. 1883, p. 150). A further description, together with excellent plans of the building, may be seen in Ges. i. 318 ff. It may be doubted, however, whether Sta. is correct in his arrangement of the chambers which he assigns to one single story above the pillars. The expressions of vv. 4, 5 seem to suggest three stories of chambers (so Kit.), and this is agreeable to the height of the building, thirty cubits, even supposing these stories to have been higher than those of the Temple wings (6. 6)—perhaps six cubits each, with the pillars below the first floor of some twelve cubits in height. The house seems to have obtained its name from the fact that the pillars, open to view from the outside, gave to the spectator the idea of a forest of trees. The rooms, if in three stories, may have run right through the breadth of the building, having a window or windows at either end, i.e. at the front and back of the house. This explains v. 4 'and window was over against window three times.' The doors, on the other hand, opening from one room into another, ran lengthways down the centre of the building. Thus each room had two doors opposite to one another and communicating directly with the rooms on either side. This seems to satisfy the expression 'and door was over against door three times,' which we shall adopt in v. 5 at the suggestion of LXX, Luc.

We have no information as to staircase or number of chambers. The kind of rooms above described are not strictly the same as those described in 6. 5 ff., supposing the term רַעֲשָׁנִים to really denote
'side-chambers.' But the use of יָלֶל 'a rib' to describe a chamber is very obscure, and we can scarcely say for certain what sort of room could be so called, and what not. יָלֶל may perhaps refer to the main beams 1 , which, resting on the pillars and running from wall to wall, formed the basis of the partitions between the different chambers, and were, so to speak, the ribs of the building.

LXX, Luc. αὐλοι, i.e. ἄλτρα 'shoulder-pieces' at the top of the pillars, forming a support for the beams. Cf. the use of the word in v. 30. This is adopted by Klo., Benz., Kit., but is scarcely superior to MT.

3. After LXX, Luc. insert καὶ ἀποθέμενος τῶν στύλων, i.e. ἄλτρα. By this addition the verse is relieved, and the precise reference of the number made perfectly clear.

4. Explained by Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz. as the main beams supporting the floors and ceilings of the chambers; a meaning possibly agreeable to the Ar. חַלַּשׁ quoted on 6. 4. It should be noticed, however, that ν. 4 seems obviously to refer back to the preceding statement, as though הָיוּ and כָּסָּר were closely connected in meaning. Hence it seems preferable to assign to כָּסָּר here as in 6. 4, the meaning 'window-frames.' So RV. 'prospects.' Kit. 'Fenster (?).


6. Cf. 6. 4 note.

LXX καὶ ἄνω θυράματος (Luc. ἄνω θύρας) ἄνα θύρας τρισάσων, i.e. πρεσβύτερης, probably standing for οἱ θύραι οἱ θυράρχοι, which may be adopted. Sta. reads τρισάσων, regarding οἱ θύραι as a gloss arising from a marginal note τρισάσων οἱ θύραι.


1 Cf. the use of the term to denote the beams or boards which went to form the inner walls of the house, and the partition-wall of the adytum; cf. 6. 15, 16a.
After בָּשָׁה and before סַלְגָּא לָאֹס LXX inserts ἰὑρωπία, Luc. ἰὑρωπίαν. This appears to be a mere gloss by which it was sought to explain the relationship between the second סַלְגָּא לָאֹס and the זְלֹא וְסַלְגָּא מָיִסִּימָה. Or possibly the word may form a doublet of בָּשָׁה, the letters being transposed and read as some part of רְבָּה, perhaps רְבָּה.

The meaning is very obscure, and can only be guessed. LXX, Luc. render lit. ἐπιστήλια, Vulg. epistylia, 'cross-beams,' Pesh. 'entrance hall,' Targ. 'threshold.' The word occurs again Ezek. 41. 25 נִבְלָא סִפְרָה סַלְגָּא מָיִסִּימָה. Here Cornill hazards 'Vordach,' and this is perhaps what is intended by Vulg. in Kings—the front part of the roof of the porch, possibly forming a kind of projecting cornice. Sieg. u. Sta. also suggests 'Vordach, Schutzdach.' Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp. doubtfully follow the suggestion of Targ., and suppose the word to mean an entrance with steps.

7. רָאָשָׁה רָאָשָׁה] 'Where he should or might judge'; Dri. Tenses, § 39 b.

The usual construction would be מְשָׁבֶת עַשָּׁה, 'he made the porch covered,' &c.; cf. Dri. Tenses, § 161. 2. It is rare for the participle to be preceded by 'when thus introducing a subordinate idea as a secondary predicate. See instances under Obs. 1 of Dri. § cited.

Vulg. usque ad summilatem, Pesh. reads πρὸς τὸν πάραλλον, which is to be adopted. So Ew., Th., Sta., Kamp., Benz.; and Klo. doubtfully. Kit. retains MT. The second half of the verse has fallen out in LXX, Luc.; but, according to Field, Hex., the Complutensian reads ἀπὸ ἱδάφους ἐως ἐπιφονίαν.

8. רָאָשָׁה רָאָשָׁה] The same nuance as in v. 7. רָאָשָׁה.

Also called רָאָשָׁה נֵבֶל גָּרֶה; see notes on v. 12 b; ch. 6. 36.

It is unusual in classical Hebrew (though customary in post-biblical Hebrew) to omit the article with a subs. when its adj. is so defined according to rule. Cf. הָרוֹצִיא דַּעַי v. 12. Dri. (Tenses, § 209. 1) collects instances of the usage which 'appears
to have arisen in connexion with familiar words, which were felt to be sufficiently definite in themselves without the addition of the article.'

LXX renders curiously ἐξ ἀπεριβλήτων τούτων, Luc. ἐξ ἄπειρος τούτων, apparently a misreading ἐκ τοῦ ... τοῦ, the former word being some Pu'al or Hoph'al participle. MT. correct.

The tense is quite anomalous, and cannot be explained, the perfect alone being suitable to describe a single fact in so prosaic a connexion. It is at least possible that some scribe, intending to copy τοῦτο τούτων, wrote by mistake τοῦτο τούτων through confusion with τοῦτο τούτων at the beginning of the verse, and that this τοῦτο τούτων was subsequently interpreted as τοῦτο τοῦτων. The omission of the τοῦτο in LXX suggests as a second hypothesis that the word may be a later gloss carelessly inserted.

9. 'According to measurements,' i.e. of regular dimensions, and not of various sizes. So v. 11.

'Sawn'; only here. A denom. from ἄπειρος which is derived from δραμ 'drag.' Both subs. מָסָא and denom. verb in Qal and Niphal occur in post-biblical Hebrew.

'Foundation'; a ἀποθεομ. from ἄπειρος, the ' being assimilated according to the small class of contracted verbs v'μ; G-K. § 71. Other contracted forms from this root are מַסָא Isa. 28. 16; מַסָא וּמַסָא a Chr. 31. 7.

RV, 'unto the coping'; so LXX, Luc. ἐπὶ τῶν κτίσεων (with a Schol. στεφανωμάτων κτίσεων), and approximately 2. (ἐπὶ) τῶν διαπροσδοκημάτων, Vulg. usque ad summilatem parietum, Pesh. דָּא שלז; Th., Klo., Sieg. u. Sta. Sta., Kamp., Kit. follow Ges. in rendering mutules or projecting stones (Kragsteine) upon which the ends of the beams rested. The word, which occurs only here in this sense, elsewhere means a 'handbreadth'; v. 26; al. So Targ. אבשראב, 'א. (בש) תֹּהֶלֶת מַסָא. The first מַסָא, which is indispensable, has fallen out in LXX,

1 Ko., however (Lehrb. I. ii. § 368 b), classes the use with ch. 20. 33a רַחֲשָׁי as an Inceptive.
VII. 9-14

Luc. through oversight. The second is very difficult. As Sta. remarks, it forms no contrast to . Sta.'s emendation is, however, not quite correct. We ought rather to read , a correction which accords with v. 12, and accounts for the letters in MT.

10. LXX, Luc. , Pesh. , apply this specially to the great court. It seems better to regard it as having a vague general application to at the beginning of v. 9; all the buildings. Sta. 'und fundamentirt (war alles).’ So Th., Kamp., Benz.

12b, [as has before been noticed, LXX, Luc. at the close of ch. 6. 36 contain the words , i.e. probably . This seems to represent MT. ch. 7. 12b c certainly cannot be original, the phrase being absurd. The word is probably therefore a corruption of repeated from the preceding, and is clearly a gloss formed through repetition of v. 6. 36, to explain the connexion of with the previous sentence. The first is genuine, and should be restored before in place of the 1 of MT. LXX is also correct in reading (this referring to of v. 8), but has omitted through the homoioteleuton. Possibly, as Sta. thinks, is a gloss from 6. 36, and redundant after . Finally, the sentence is a gloss from 6. 3, through a wrong identification of the here mentioned.

We may therefore read v. 12b (自媒体ר ויתית (‘round about the (inner) court of the House of Yahwe, and the court of the porch of the palace.’

13, 14. In 2 Chr. 2. 12, 13 the workman is called , and he is . According to Giesebruch (ZA TW. i. 239 ff.) the text of Chr. is the more original, the name (misunderstood as by LXX in Chr.) having undergone correction.
in Kings, and being an insertion to suggest that this builder of Solomon's Temple was purely Israelitish, and not half Phoenician.

15–22. This very mutilated and obscure account may be compared with the summary in vv. 41, 42; || 2 Chr. 4. 12, 13, and with the description in II. 25. 17, of which a better and fuller form exists in Jer. 52. 21–23.

15a. [LXX, Luc. καὶ ἐκάθεν, i.e. Πρωτό, probably correct. So Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.]

LXX omits by oversight. Luc. reads all but ἀποστάσεως, which is scarcely necessary after the precise statement of v. 14, and so may be a gloss, but on comparison with vv. 16, 27, 30, 38 is more likely to be original

This is accepted by Sta, on the ground that the expression ἡ δύο στήλες 'the two pillars,' requires some such specification of their destined position to justify the use of the article. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Kit.

15b. [LXX δεσδώ καὶ διὰ πέρα ἐν εἴπος τοῦ στύλου καὶ περίμετρον τῆς σαρκος καὶ διὰ πέρα ἐν εἴπος ἐκείνου αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ χώρο τοῦ στύλου τῆς σαρκος ἐν εἴπος τοῦ δεινος, i.e. ἡ δύο στήλες ἡ ἑνενήκοντα χιλιάδες ἕξακοσιόκοσια ἕνα φούτα, ἐν οἷς ἐστιν ἀρχαῖοι καὶ ἑξάκοσια ἑκάστην εἴπος ἑνενήκοντα χιλιάδες ἕνα φούτα, ἐν οἷς ἐστιν ἀρχαῖοι καὶ ἑξάκοσια ἑκάστην εἴπος. 'eighteen cubits was the height of the (one) pillar, and a thread of twelve cubits compassed it about; the thickness of the pillar was four fingers; it was hollow: and the second pillar was similar.' This description corresponds accurately with that which is given in Jer. 52. 21, and is doubtless correct, except that ἐν ἑκάστην is to be retained with MT. after the first ἑκάστην.

LXX text is confirmed substantially by Luc., and in part by Pesh. ἡ δύο στήλες τῆς ἑνενήκοντα χιλιάδες ἕνα φούτα. 'the height of the one pillar was eighteen cubits, and a thread of twelve cubits compassed

---

1 On the other hand, v. 23 omits πρωτό in MT. and Versa.
VII. 15-17

it about; and the second pillar was similar.' So Ew., Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz, Kit.

'Could or might encompass'; so v. 23 "encompass," v. 26 'could contain' (or in this instance perhaps 'contained,' as a customary state). Dri. Tenses, § 37 B. Da. (§ 44, Rem. 2) is scarcely correct when he renders 'encompassed' or 'ran round,' in describing the course of an ornamentation,' as if this were or the of v. 23 were part of the ornamentation, and not rather an imaginary line of measurement.

... adopted in the emendation, occurs, besides the passage cited in Jer., Ex. 27. 8; 38. 7 'hollow, with boarded sides,' of the altar of burnt offering, and figuratively Job 11. 12+ 'a hollow' or 'empty-headed man.'

16. 'Chapter'; only used in the description of these pillars, here and in II. 25, 2 Chr., Jer. Connected with the root 'surround,' Piel, Judg. 20. 43; Ps. 22. 13, from which comes the late word 'diadem,' three times in Est.+, and in new Hebrew.

'Tt has fallen out of LXX, but is found in Luc. and the other Verss., and, as in the previous verse, is to be retained. LXX is also wrong in its omission of ... LXX.

17. LXX, Luc. καὶ στήλαι δύο διαρασμένα, i.e. καὶ στήλαι δύο διαρασμένα, are correct, the words στήλαι ... being certainly a gloss. στήλαι δύο διαρασμένα (στήλαι δύο διαρασμένα) occurs in all the other descriptions, but the expressions στήλαι δύο διαρασμένα, καὶ στήλαι δύο διαρασμένα, καὶ στήλαι δύο διαρασμένα, are not so found. LXX is followed by Th., Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit.; and Klo. as regards the addition of ... LXX.

With pl. ì—only here; elsewhere ì from sing. ì. The word is derived from Ar. ἑνεκοιτίζειν, whence εἰς ἑνεκοιτίζειν.
net (for catching fish, birds, &c.), and in biblical Hebrew, outside
the description of these pillars, it occurs only in II. 1. 2 of the
lattice of a window, and in Job 18. 8, where the parallel word is
' net ' Thus the meaning in this description is clearly
' network ' or ' trellis. ' 

ם"למ הידקיא "Festoons'; Deut. 22. 12 of the fringes of a garment.
Ar. סדרון a bridle of plaited thongs. Syr. very commonly
means to plait or interweave; e.g. S. Matt. 27. 29, of plaiting
the crown of thorns.

ער"א 'Chains'; a Chr. 3. 5, 16; so in Ex. 28. 14; 39. 15, of the
ornaments or fastenings of the breastplate. ל"א Ex. 28. 22
is a corruption of the same. The word is a Pilpel (intensive) form
from רשת 'wist.'

[1] LXX περικαλύφθης περί ἑπεθέμα τῶν
στολῶν, Luc. περικαλύφθης περί ἑπεθέμα τῶν στολῶν, i.e. περί

Here א is quite incomprehensible, and we may follow Pesh. and emend
agreeably to v. 41b. This sentence of v. 18 is not to be found
in LXX, Luc., and thus Th., Sta. are doubtless correct in supposing
that, after having fallen out of v. 17 in MT., it was first written
in again on the margin, and then inserted in the text in a wrong
position, viz. in v. 18. So Kamp., Benz., Kit.

[2] LXX, Luc. διέρων ... καὶ διέρων, i.e.

Thus v. 17, as restored, will run:—'And he made two trellises to cover the chapter which
were upon the top of the pillars; a trellis for the one chapter,
and a trellis for the second chapter.'

1 The root רכס, which ought properly to be רכש, occurs Nah. 1. 10; Job
8. 17 with the meaning 'intertwine.' Hence come רכש, רכש 'thicket.'
18. [Obviously incorrect. At this stage of the description the statement ‘he made the pillars’ is out of place. Two MSS. read כְּפֶרֶתַּיִם, ‘the pomegranates,’ and this is to be adopted with Bo., Th., Sta., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. Vulg., Pesh., Targ. follow MT.; LXX, Luc. καὶ ἐπιγραφή κρεμαστῶν, i.e. ἐπιγραφή ἐνιπτή, a misreading of ἐπιγραφή λειψάνων.

LXX, Luc. δῖος στίχος χαλάσσων ἔδεικται, i.e. [ἐπιγραφή] ἐνιπτή, is thought by Kio. to be a corruption of διατύπωσις ἐνιπτή, which is possible (cf. v. 42 τῷ διατύπωσις ἐνιπτή), but not really necessary. LXX reading is correct, and is adopted by Sta., Kamp. So Th., with addition of ביב.

LXX, Luc. continue with ἐπιγραφή κρεμαστῶν, στίχος ἐνιπτή στίχου. This appears to be merely a doublet of the previous καὶ ἐπιγραφή κρεμαστῶν, δῖος στίχου.

The sentence ἐν ἑαυτῷ having been adopted into its proper position in v. 17, v. 18 now ends abruptly with θον ἑιδή λαβαρά, no special reference being previously made to λαβαρά. Th. therefore inserts, before the closing sentence, v. 20b in the form in which it appears in Pesh. MT. being improved by the addition of σῆ, and the emendation ἑαυτῷ for ἑαυτῶν. This is satisfactory; and it is worthy of notice that Pesh. continues this sentence with "ץב ש"ככ, precisely the same words with which it is finished off when placed in v. 18. The transposition is adopted by Sta., Benz. with omission of the words ש"ככ מיר מיו on the ground that they have already occurred in the earlier part of the verse—a scarcely justifiable belief in the writer’s extreme precision in avoiding even the smallest repetition. Kamp., Kit. also follow Th., reading מיר as in MT. for ש"ככ מיו; and Kio., while taking v. 20b into v. 18,
expands and alters the whole verse thus formed to a quite unnecessary extent.

Thus the probably original form of v. 18 is:

"And he made the pomegranates; and two rows of pomegranates in brass were upon the one trellis, and the pomegranates were two hundred, two rows round about upon the one chapiter; and so did he to the second chapiter."

19, 20a, 22. The vv. 19, 20 appear in LXX, Luc. after v. 21, while v. 22 is altogether missing. Now v. 21, which relates the erection and naming of the pillars, ought obviously to come at the close of the description; and this consideration, together with the state of LXX text, goes, as Sta. has seen, to point to the probability of vv. 19, 20a, 22 being merely a gloss.

This is still further borne out if we compare the contents of these verses with the description of the chapiters given in the original text. In vv. 16-18 all that we gather with regard to the chapiters relates to their size, and to the trellises and pomegranates with which they were ornamented. The description of their appearance seems to come naturally to an end with the sentence "at the close of v. 18, and then v. 21, containing the account of their erection in their destined position, might fitly be expected to follow as the conclusion of the reference. But instead of this we have fresh details with regard to the "i.e. apparently the lily-like form of the chapiters, and the chapiters properly so called seem to be distinguished from a part of the pillar immediately beneath them which is known as "Now it is reasonable to suppose that in a consistent description the account of the actual form and appearance of the chapiters would precede rather than follow the reference to such

1 In view of the precise statement of the number of the pomegranates as 100 in Jer. 52. 23, it may be questioned whether we ought not in this passage also to read יַאוּ for יָאוּ.
appendages as the pomegranates and trellises. But, assuming for the moment that the additional details are genuine, let us turn to vv. 41, 42, where a summary of Hiram's work at the pillars is given. Here we have mention of the מְדָמָס themselves, the מַחְבֶּבֶת which surmounted them, the מִשְׁלֹשָׁה, and the מִשְׁלֹשָׁה; but there is not the slightest reference to any מִשְׁלֹשָׁה of the chapiters, nor to a part called מִשְׁלֹשָׁה connected with them. Hence we may confidently regard vv. 19, 20 as a gloss added to the text by a later hand. The interpolator's idea of the form of the chapiters appears to have resembled the accompanying illustration. Judging from the expression מִשְׁלֹשָׁה in v. 42, he supposed the existence of a bowl-shaped portion of the pillar underneath the actual chapiter, which looked at, as Th. says, 'nach der Profilansicht,' might be described as מִשְׁלֹשָׁה. This led him to add the account of the shape of the actual chapiters, which he describes as מִשְׁלֹשָׁה. The original narrator, however, in speaking of מַחְבֶּבֶת, appears to mean the actual chapiters, which from their rounded form might be thus described.

19. מַחְבֶּבֶת So Vulg., Pesh., Targ. Probably correct, and an awkward intimation of the position occupied by the pillars 'in the porch.' Cf. the notice which we derive from Luc. in v. 15 מַחְבֶּבֶת, and v. 21. LXX, Luc. מַחְבֶּבֶת וְאֶדְמָא, i.e. מַחְבֶּבֶת, seems to be an easy correction of this, and scarcely increases the lucidity of the expression.

20. מַחְבֶּבֶת In connexion with: cf. Ex. 25. 27 מַחְבֶּבֶת מִשְׁלֹשָׁה מְדָמָס מֹשֶׁל; 28. 27; al. מִשְׁלֹשָׁה in the Hexateuch is peculiar to P. With מִשְׁלֹשָׁה only in this passage. LXX מַחְבֶּבֶת מִשְׁלֹשָׁה points to a misreading מְדָמָס. For the other peculiarities of this verse in LXX cf. notes on corruptions and doublets in Introduction.
The First Book of Kings

‘Over against’ or ‘at the side of’; RV. ‘beside.’ Cf. the use of רָבָא illustrated § 4 note.


אֵלָה] LXX ἐπίθετος (Luc. ἐπιθετος) τοῦ ἐπίθετος through a mistaken repetition of סליסים as סליסים. The measure given is the circumference answering to the diameter of the sea (1 Kings 7:23).

24. רָתִים] Q’re אֵל is the usual word. Kt. אֵל only occurs elsewhere Jer. 31. 38; Zech. 1. 16, with Q’re אֵל in each place. אֵל is a case of apposition; ‘a line—thirty cubits.’ So Ex. 27. 16 ἡ λίθος ἡ ἑξήκοντα κυκλώματα; Dri. Tenses, § 192. 1.

25. שִׁבְעָה] See v. 15 note.

26. רָתִים] This can only be translated as it is by Vulg., Pesh., Targ. ‘for ten cubits.’ The rendering of RV. marg. ‘ten (sc. יָדָם) in a cubit,’ besides supposing, as Sta. remarks, the mistake of רָתִים for דֹּה לָעַת, is quite contrary to the universal usage of the expression. We find the same words occurring in 2 Chr. 4. 3, and the most obvious explanation is to suppose that an early scribe, perhaps רָתִים himself, through lapse of memory confused the circumference of the sea with its diameter, when all the while he was intending to write דֹּה לָעַת. Sta. omits.

27. רָתִים] Omitted by LXX, but contained in Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ. Sta. regards the sentence as a gloss on the ground that the author never elsewhere uses the word דֹּה לָעַת, and has already said דֹּה לָעַת. So Kamp., Benz., Kit.


29. לְסַלְסָלָה] Not found in LXX, Luc.; but the similar reference to the contents of the lavers in v. 38, אִצְרֵיפֵי בֶּן כֵּי יִבְשָׂע, speaks for the genuineness of the notice in this case also. On the tense לְסַלְסָלָה, cf. v. 15 note on יִבְשָׂע.
Fig. 1.
BRONZE STAND FROM LARNACA.
VII. 23-27

27-37. This difficult section, which was formerly regarded as involved in almost hopeless obscurity, has received considerable elucidation through recent discoveries in Cyprus. Two bronze stands of late Mycenaean workmanship have been unearthed, the one from Larnaka and the other from Enkomi. The light which these bronzes were capable of throwing upon the ten metres of Solomon's Temple was first noticed by A. S. Murray with reference to the stand from Enkomi: Journal of Royal Inst. of Brit. Architects, 1899, vii. pp. 20 ff. The subject was worked out at length by A. Furtwängler in an article in the Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. und der histor. Classe der kgl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, 1899, Bd. 2, Heft 3. This was followed by a detailed examination by Stade of the section in Kings in the light of the new discoveries (ZATW. 1901, pp. 145 ff.), in which he largely modified his earlier views upon the subject, as expressed in the article on Solomon's buildings (ZATW. 1883), and illustrated by a figure in his Geo. i. p. 341. Figures of the Cyprus bronzes are here given. That from Larnaka measures 39 cm. in height, 23 cm. in width of side, 12 cm. in diameter of wheels; that from Enkomi is 16 cm. in height, and about 13 cm. in width.

It is clear that we have two divergent accounts of the combined in vv. 27-37. This was first noticed by Klo., who distinguished vv. 34-36 as belonging to a second account. His view was accepted in the main by Benz. Furtwängler regards vv. 32-36 as the remains of an ancient doublet; while Sta. supposes that the two accounts have been not simply placed side by side, but to a large extent interwoven. Sta. notices the following double descriptions:—1. Decoration of the...

1 Furtwängler places the date of the Necropolis at Enkomi cir. B.C. 1200-1000. Cf. Antike Gemmen, Bd. iii. 440.
2 The upper figure in Plate 1 I have been kindly allowed by Dr. Furtwängler to reproduce from his article; the under figure I owe to Mr. J. L. Myres, of Christ Church, Oxford, who obtained the photograph for me through the British Commissioner at Cyprus. The two reproductions in Plate 2 are from photographs taken by the University Press.
with figures in v. 29 and v. 36. The two verses exhibit discrepancies (a) in description of the figures—v. 29 mentions lions, oxen, and cherubim, v. 36 cherubim, lions, and palm trees; (b) in naming the part of the temple so decorated—v. 29 and v. 36 תֵּלֶּשׁ, 살ְמִים. 2. The Wheels. These are described briefly in v. 30, and in detail in vv. 32, 33. 3. The bases of the corner pillars in v. 30 and v. 34. Obviously the indefinite וַיָּבֹא of v. 34 belongs to an account in which the parts so named have not been previously mentioned. 4. The part at the top of the המנוחות which held the laver. This is called מַעַל in v. 31, while in v. 35 the name has fallen out. 5. The double statement that the part of the wheels were of one part with the המנוחות; v. 32 and v. 35.

While, however, it is certain that vv. 34–36 cannot, from their contents, belong to the preceding account, this is not necessarily the case with vv. 33, 34, since there is nothing in the contents of these verses to prevent us from regarding them as a description of the wheels in detail, after their brief mention in v. 30.

27. LXX, Luc. give the length of the bases as five cubits, the breadth as four cubits, and the height as six cubits. Sta. remarks that from this difference between length and breadth the inference might be drawn that the lavers standing upon the המנוחה were not round but elliptical; but that this is opposed to v. 28, where the 'four cubits' can only be taken as the diameter of a round laver. The המנוחה of Figs. 1 and 2 are square, and have round cylinders to hold the lavers. Thus the measurements of MT., four x four, are to be accepted. It seems not improbable that the six cubits of LXX, Luc. represent the total height of the המנוחה three cubits + the המ disadv 1⁷⁄₈ cubits (v. 32) + the המ disadv 1⁷⁄₈ cubits (v. 31).

28. המ уровне The question as to whether this word means 'borders' (RV.) or 'panels' (RV. marg.) is not at all elucidated by the Verss. LXX, Luc. συγκελιστώ translate according to the sense of the root, and perhaps vocalize מֱקַעַס פּוֹלְס; Vulg. interrasile + sculpturae appears to be merely guessing; Pesh., Targ. מַעַל is the word used by Pesh. to translate מַעַל in ch. 6. 6, with the meaning 'ledges.' The only other connexion in which המעו...
FIG. 2
BRONZE STAND FROM ENKOJI
in a similar sense occurs, viz. as a part of the table of shewbread, Ex. 25. 25, 27; 37. 12, 14, is greatly in favour of the meaning 'border' (i.e. what we now call the frame of the table), whether immediately below the top of the table, as in our modern tables, or connecting the ends of the legs; cf. especially מְסֹמֵחַ 'a border of a handbreadth,' scarcely 'a panel of a handbreadth.'

The Pu'al participle of a verb שלב occurs Ex. 26. 17; 36. 21, 'there shall be two tenons to each board, morticed one to another.' In Talmudic שלב denotes the rung of a ladder; so Maccot יב הד שעה מסמל שלב והיה הוא והיה 'he was mounting a ladder when a rung gave way beneath him.' Hence we may understand by שלב the corner uprights of the 모ֹסֶר, and possibly also uprights at regular intervals between the corners (cf. Fig. 2). The מָסָר then ran horizontally, forming a connexion or framework to the corner uprights. Cf. the four horizontal bars in Fig. 2. Perhaps the best rendering of שלב is 'supports.' Vulg., Pesh. seem to approximate to the right meaning with their renderings juncturas, 'connexions'; Targ. אשבלוי, LXX, Luc. יָשַׁלְמוּשׁ.

Are the second מָסָר different from the first? i.e. ought we to render מָסָר 'and also border-frames'? or, if the two are identical, why do we not read מָסָר 'and the border-frames,' already mentioned? Again, why מָסָר 'the supports,' when these have not been previously mentioned? Klo., observing these difficulties, emendsORLD?ORLD?ORLD! 'they had border-frames and supports, and the border-frames were between the supports.' It is preferable to suppose that the first מָסָר has been written by mistake for מָסָר which would naturally be first mentioned; מָסָר מְסֹמֵחַ 'they had supports, and there were border-frames between the supports.'

29. And upon the supports Likewise.' The rendering of Furtwängler, 'And upon the supports there was a pedestal,'
is unsuitable, because this part of the הָעַלְמָה is described below in v. 31 not as a הָעַלְמָה but as a הָעַל.

\[\text{Follow LXX, Luc. הָעַלְמָה 'and above and below &c.'} \]

Doubtless a corruption of הָעַלְמָה, which is desiderated after הָעַל. The corruption is due to the influence of v. 30 end.

\[\text{LXX, Luc. appear to explain rightly הָעַלְמָה, 'step-work,' or, as we should say, 'bevelled work;' i.e. probably the edges of the הָעַלְמָה were bevelled in the form of steps:—} \]

\[\text{or a section viewed from the end would have appeared thus:—} \]

The ornamental borders in Fig. 1, above and below the winged figures, have something of this character.

\[\text{A הָעַלְמָה ley.; but in Syr. הָעַלְמָה 'axle' is common. Probably the axles were similar in form to those of Fig. 1.} \]

\[\text{RV. 'and the four feet thereof had undersetters.' If הָעַלְמָה (lit. 'shoulders') could mean 'undersetters,' we might identify them with the diagonal stays which strengthen the legs in Figs. 1 and 2. But these stays would scarcely be described as 'shoulder-pieces,' and in fact they seem to be denoted by a more suitable term תָּוָּעַלְמָה in v. 32. Moreover, they could scarcely be described as הָעַלְמָה, i.e. immediately under the laver. The position of these הָעַלְמָה should rather be that of the four birds (doves?), at the four upper corners of the הָעַלְמָה in Fig. 1, which might aptly be described as 'shoulder-pieces.' So Hommel, Furtwängler, Sta. But then הָעַלְמָה (rather הָעַלְמָה with reference to their lower ends could very well be described as the הָעַלְמָה of the הָעַלְמָה.' When we are speaking of the shoulder-pieces we are thinking of the upper ends of the} \]
corner pillars, and besides, these corner pillars or supports have already been described as פֶּלַלְכ. In the second account, v. 34, four מָנוֹת are said to have been פִּינוֹד at the four קְוֹרָנִים of the base.' A more suitable term to describe the position of the shoulder-pieces could not be selected, and we may follow Kamp. in emending מָנוֹת פִּינוֹד 'and its four corners had shoulder-pieces.' LXX, Luc. μόνη αἰθων appears to be an alteration of the difficult מִשְׁבַּע into מִשְׁבַּע; cf. Ex. 25. 26, where והָאֳפֶּח פִּינוֹד is rendered וַיָּהָהְ וְרֶנְשַׁף וַנִּמְנַמֶּה.

[תִּלְעֵן (תִּלְעֵן)] appears to denote 'wreaths' or 'spiral work,' such as forms the principal ornamentation in Fig. 2, and appears round the cylinder in Fig. 1. מֹעֲבֶר is properly 'beyond or at the side of each.' Cf. the phrase מִכְלֶב הַנוֹר 'at all sides of him,' ch. 5. 4 note. We may render 'with spirals at the side of each.' The spirals may have run between the shoulder-pieces along the top edges of the מֵלָכ.

31. Read מְנַח, 'and its mouth,' the suffix referring to the מֵלָכ. The מ is clearly the mouth or opening of the cylinder, seen in Figs. 1 and 2, to contain the laver. So Furtwängler, Sta.

[תִּלְעֵן (תִּלְעֵן)] R. V. 'within the chapter.' But מִשְׁבַּע, elsewhere always the crown or chapiter of a column, scarcely seems a suitable term to describe the part of the מֵלָכ which contained the מ; and the fact that the word is defined by the article rather indicates that it refers to something already mentioned. We may therefore follow Ew.'s emendation (adopted by Klo., Sta., and others), and read מְנַח מְנַח 'within the shoulder-pieces,' just described.

A number must have fallen out before מְנַח, and this was probably רָאִי (Kamp., Sta.). But מְנַח, which qualifies the statement as to the height, ought naturally to follow after it. We may therefore read מְנַח מְנַח 'was one cubit and upwards.' The statement which comes later in the verse, מְנַח מְנַח, is merely a repetition of the same fact in more exact terms, and ought probably, therefore (with Sta.), to be regarded as a marginal gloss.

[תִּלְעֵן (תִּלְעֵן)] 'After the structure (form) of a pedestal.' מ is used of the pedestal of the מ in Ex. 30. 28; 31. 9; al.
If this sentence is in place, the statement ought naturally to refer to the מַסָּה. But then we should expect מִצָּה, i.e., in contrast to the round opening itself, ‘its borders were foursquare, not round,’ thus forming a pedestal which corresponded in shape to the square מַסָּה beneath. If this be the meaning of the passage, the pedestal differed from those in Figs. 1 and 2, which are round outside as well as inside. Sta. considers the statement to be out of place, and, reading מֵן מַסָּה, refers it to the border-frames of the מְשָׁנִים proper.

32. [And the stays of the wheels were in the base]; i.e. of one casting with it. מַכְלָה seems to denote the diagonal stays, which are seen under the מַסָּה in Figs. 1 and 2.

33. [Their felloes]; i.e. the rounded portion of the wheel, from בּ to be curved.’ So, in this sense, Ezek. 1. 18.

Both מַכְלָה and מַכְלָה. Ges. connects the former word with מַכְלָה ‘cleave to’ or ‘join,’ so מַכְלָה ‘those which join’ sc. the felloe to the nave, i.e. the spokes; but his derivation of the latter word from Ar. הַמֵּרָע congregavit, so מַכְלָה ‘place in which the spokes come together,’ i.e. the box or nave, seems more than doubtful, since, apart from the dubious meaning, a wrong interchange of consonants is implied.

34. [Of one casting with the base were its shoulder-pieces.’ The same meaning is to be attached to מַסָּה in v. 35. Cf. Ex. 27. 2. Sta. regards v. 34b as a gloss, mainly on the ground of the masc. pl. form מַסָּה in place of מַסָּה.

35. [The subject of the sentence has fallen out. In accordance with v. 31 it should be מַסָּה, or some similar term.

The words יָדָה יִשָּׁבֶת must have been read, if this account originally agreed with that of v. 31.

The קְנָה on the top of the מַסָּה cannot be identified; the קְנָה are probably those described in v. 31b.

36. [He carved.’ The subject is Hiram.

The קְנָה ‘The panels’ are peculiar to this second account. Judging by the reference to the figures carved upon them, we may suppose that they answer to the קְנָה of vv. 28, 29.
VII. 32-40

[Text content not shown]
41. Cf. note on vv. 19, 20, 22.

42. ‘Two rows—pomegranates’; cf. Dri. Tenses, § 194. It would be more natural to read either as in v. 18a above emended, or else ‘pomegranates in two rows,’ for them being then an accus. of manner: Da. § 70.


Q’re certainly correct. Thus Targ. translates according to the structure of the vessels of the Tabernacle which Moses made.’ LXX, Luc., Vulg. omit the word. Pesh. , probably a paraphrase of Kt. Sta., in adopting Q’re, points out that the before must (as in Vulg.) be omitted, since otherwise is unnecessary.

After the sentence , LXX, Luc. add , i.e. , . It is to be noticed that vv. 41-45a sum up the work of Hirain, which is described in detail in vv. 15-40; vv. 41, 42 corresponding to vv. 15-22, v. 43 to vv. 27-39, v. 44 to vv. 23-26, and v. 45a to v. 40. If, however, the LXX addition be regarded as genuine, we have here a matter of great importance mentioned for the first time in the summary without previous detailed description of any kind. And not only so, but a work so considerable as the casting of these forty-eight pillars is mentioned last of all, even subsequently to the notice of the making of articles so comparatively unimportant as the brazen pots, &c. We may therefore regard the passage as a gloss, of uncertain source. So Sta.; but Bo., Th., Benz., and to some extent Klo., adopt as genuine.

‘Burnished brass.’ The verb is used again in the participle , for Ezek. 21. 15, 16, and Qal passive Ezek. 21. 14, 33, of a burnished sword; and in Isa. 18. 2, 7 for (for ) describes the polished appearance
of the skin of the Ethiopians. Elsewhere the word is used of plucking out hair, and this is the first meaning in Ar. and Syr. The Verss. merely guess at the sense of מִיפָד. Targ. מִיפָד, Vulg. de aurichalc., Pesh. מִיפָד, LXX χαλκὴ αἵμην; Luc. simply χαλκὴ ἤν.

46–50. This section as it stands can scarcely exhibit its original form.

(i) רָאָה . . . עָלָיו v. 47 is very obscure and awkward. It can only mean, 'And Solomon left all the vessels because of their very great number.' This we have to interpret, 'He left them unweighed,' a forced and unparalleled explanation.

(ii) It is unnatural to say that the brass could not be weighed because the vessels were so numerous. We have just had a description of the great vessels, &c., which were made by Hiram, the sea, the bases and lavers, and the two pillars, the casting of which must have taken an enormous quantity of brass; and in comparison with this the brass used for the pots, shovels, &c., however numerous they may have been, must have been comparatively trivial in quantity. Hence, the reason why the brass went unweighed was not the number of the vessels, most of which were small, but the great quantity of brass which was used, chiefly for the comparatively few large vessels.

(iii) After the very lengthy description of the brazen vessels made by Hiram, it is surely strange that so short a summary (vv. 48–50) of the golden vessels, &c., should be given, without any account of their appearance or mention of their maker. We are justified in regarding an allusion of such brevity, in the midst of a document which seems to aim at peculiar minuteness in description, as the work of a later hand who desiderated some reference to the golden vessels of the Temple.

1 This is simply a paraphrase derived from the context, and cannot represent מֵעָלָיו of Th.; still less Klo.'s עַלְיוֹן בֵּית or עַלְיוֹן, supposed to mean 'consecrated (?) brass,' according to the (free) rendering of Mal. 3. 14 מֵעָלָיו בֵּית מִשְׁכָּב אֲשֵׁר מֵעָלָיו בֵּית יָבֵשׁ, מִי לֹא מֵעָלָיו בֵּית יָבֵשׁ מֵעָלָיו בֵּית יָבֵשׁ. 2 These verses are omitted by Sta., together with v. 47.
Turning to the Verses, we find that LXX, Luc. presuppose a considerably divergent text. In both v. 47 precedes v. 46, and vv. 47, 48 exhibit striking variation from MT.

LXX, v. 47, οὐκ ὤν σταθὼς τοῦ χαλκοῦ ὁ ἐποίησεν πάντα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα ἐκ πλήθους σφόδρα: οὐκ ἦν τέρμα τῶν σταθμῶν τοῦ χαλκοῦ.

v. 46. As in MT., omitting ἔστιν.

v. 48a. καὶ Ἐλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλομών τὰ σκεῖα ἐποίησεν ἐν οἴκῃ.

vv. 48b–50. Substantially as in MT.

This may be re-translated:

v. 47. ὁ Σαλομών ἐποίησεν πάντα τὰ σκεῖα ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ χαλκῷ.

v. 46. As in MT., omitting ἔστιν.

v. 48a. [ἡλιοφάνεια] τῆς ἐποίησεν ἐν ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους σφόδρα: οὐκ ἦν τέρμα τῶν σταθμῶν τοῦ χαλκοῦ.

Luc. is slightly different:

v. 47. οὐκ ὤν σταθὼς τοῦ χαλκοῦ ὁ ἐποίησεν ἐποίησεν πάντα τὰ σκεῖα ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους σφόδρα: οὐκ ἦν τέρμα τῶν σταθμῶν τοῦ χαλκοῦ.

v. 46. As in MT., omitting ἔστιν.

v. 48a. καὶ Ἐλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλομών τὰ σκεῖα ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ουρανοῦ.

vv. 48b–50. Substantially as in MT.

Translate:

v. 47. ἔστιν ἐποίησεν πάντα τὰ σκεῖα ἐποίησεν [ἡλιοφάνεια] τῆς ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ χαλκῷ.

v. 46. As in MT., omitting ἔστιν.

v. 48a. [ἡλιοφάνεια] τῆς ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ χαλκῷ.

In v. 47 Luc.'s rendering can scarcely be original. The repetition of ἐποίησεν, and the construction of ἐκ τοῦ χαλκοῦ in apposition to τοῦ χαλκοῦ, are very awkward. On the other hand, LXX text is here very clear and good, completely disposing of difficulty (i) by the substitution of 'ἴστιν ἐποίησεν' for ἐποίησεν, and of (ii) by the reference of back to τοῦ χαλκοῦ instead of to τοῦ χαλκοῦ. Luc.'s text of this verse probably arose through the insertion of ἔστιν as a doublet of ἐποίησεν, this breaking the sentence and causing the repetition of ἐποίησεν.
By the transposition of v. 47 and v. 46 we gain a better sequence, the great quantity of brass being naturally mentioned before the locality in which the vessels, &c., were cast.

In v. 48a Luc. is to be preferred to LXX. The המל יר of the commencement of v. 47 MT. is here referred to its proper place, and its position in MT. is perhaps explained by the transposition of vv. 46 and 47. The writer, having wrongly written v. 46 first, was proceeding to write v. 48 which properly followed it, when he noticed that he had omitted v. 47, and so added it then and there. Thus the first two words of v. 48 came to be placed at the beginning of v. 47.

According to Luc., v. 48a describes the destination of the golden vessels; it ought, however, properly to refer to the brazen vessels, and to conclude the account of them. This should naturally lead the way to v. 51, the conclusion of the whole notice. The alteration of v. 48a in MT. וני for יר, and in LXX καὶ τὸ ἱδρυμα for καὶ τὸ ἱδρυμα, is most probably due to the gloss vv. 48b-50 which mentions the golden vessels.

Upon these grounds the following may plausibly be considered the original text of these vv. 46-51:

v. 47. קָסָ֣אָה יְהֹוָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה הָעָ֔לֶה לְאָכְלָ֖ה יְהוָ֣ה יְהוָ֣ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֣ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֣ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֣ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ה יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה לְאָכְלָ֔ל יְהוָ֥ה יְהוָ֥ה LXX יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא יא YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH YHWH

v. 46. As in MT., omitting מִשְׁמָרָה.

which David his father had dedicated, even the silver and the gold and the vessels, placing them in the treasuries of the house of Yahwe.

46. [ובכר יהודא] ‘The circle of the Jordan’; || 2 Chr. 4. 17; Gen. 13. 10, 11.; called also 'המין 'the circle,' Gen. 13. 12; 19. 17; Deut. 34. 3; 2 Sam. 18. 23; al. The term, a Pilpel form (מעב) from רד 'move in a circle,' is used of the depressed region which forms the lower stage of the Jordan valley by which the river flows into the Dead Sea; but may in the earliest times have been exclusively applied to the fertile region occupied by the circle of cities forming the נין; Gen. 13. 12; 19. 29. See Stanley, SP. 284.

[כממעב התומרות] RV. ‘In the clay ground’; so Vulg. in terra argillosa. מעב, root עב ‘to be thick, dense’ (ch. 12. 10), only occurs here, || 2 Chr. 4. 17 having מעב. Moore (on Judg. 7. 22) emends מעב תומרות ‘at the crossing (ford) of Adamah,’ regarding Adamah as identical with נין. Mo (on Josh. 3. 16 (ed-Damieh) which is there said to be near צור حت.

[כממעב] The identification of Rob. (BR., iii. 309 ff.) with סלק (‘Ain es-Sdqdt) on the west bank of Jordan some nine miles south of Beisan, though suiting the connexion with זרעא, which is mentioned (ch. 4. 12) together with עב התומרות, is improbable as being philologically unsound. Moore, in accordance with his emendation above noticed, thinks מעב to be the place named in Genesis and Joshua east of Jordan. This, according to the Talmud (Shebith i.x. 2, Gemara), was in later times called דר' אלא, i.e. probably ‘the present Tell Deir Alla, a high mound in the Jordan valley, about one mile north of the Jabbok.’ G. A. Smith, Historical Geography, 585; Buhl, Geogr. 259 f.

[ולת] The perf. asyndelos as a circumstantial clause; ‘he placed,’ &c., so ‘placing,’ &c. Cf. ch. 13. 18 ותר; Dri. Tenses, § 163.

13–51. Wellh. comments upon the absence of any allusion to the making of the brased altar in this description of the Temple
furniture, assuming that, in accordance with the mention of an altar in ch. 8. 64; II. 16. 14, 15, such a reference must have originally existed, and has therefore been purposely removed by the post-exilic editor, upon the supposition that the brazen altar of Moses mentioned by P was, like the Ark, still in existence. Now, as we have seen, the glosses of R² are for the most part either absent in LXX, Luc., or can at any rate be easily detected and separated from the original text into which they have come from the margin; and the method of treating the LXX text as representing upon the whole a recension untouched by R² has, through the results, justified itself as reasonable. Thus, if mention of the casting of the brazen altar had existed in the original description, some trace of it would certainly have remained in LXX; but this is not the case. And not only so, but there are no other traces of the rejection by R² of the statements of the original¹, such a proceeding being quite contrary to his method, which was to interpolate without excision.

Again, as will be seen, the section ch. 8. 1-11 has been largely interpolated by R², and in v. 4 there is mention of the carrying up to the Temple of the ark of the covenant, מִשְׂכָּל מְעֹר, מִשְׂכָּל מְעֹר חֹסֵל מִשְׂכָּל מְעֹר. If, therefore, this editor had only just previously excised from ch. 7 the mention of the making of the brazen altar for the reason above noticed, he would surely have expressly named it in ch. 8. 4 among the furniture of the ark מִשְׂכָּל מְעֹר which was taken up to the Temple.

Thus we may confidently conclude that mention of the brazen altar was, for whatever reasons, not contained in the original recension of 7. 13-51. The allusion in 2 Chr. 4. 1 וְיִשְׂכָּל מְעֹר חֹסֵל מְעֹר is marked as a late addition by the absence of all detail in the description.

¹ The addition of LXX, Luc. in v. 45, with reference to the forty-eight pillars, is to be regarded as a gloss, for reasons above given.
8. Dedication of Solomon's Temple.

Ch. 8 = 2 Chr. 5. 2—7. 10.

8. 1. [LXX prefaces these words with the sentence καὶ ἕγινε ὡς συντελέσας Σαλομῶν τοῦ ολοκληρωμένος τὸν οίκον Κυρίου καὶ τὸν οίκον έαυτοῦ μετά ἔλεος ἔτη. So Luc., with the variation ἐν τῇ συντελέσας Σαλομῶντα. This is regarded by Bo., Th. as part of the original text. But more probably the words are an addition of the translator, who objected to the use of έτε without 'any definite point of attachment in the preceding narrative.' This peculiar use of the particle is, however, characteristic of R (see collected instances in 3. 16 note; and cf. Dri. LOT. 192), and it is very noticeable that in no single case does έτε occur as introduction to the apodosis of a sentence, after the protasis has contained a definite notice of the point of departure. In such a case the usual construction would certainly be ἔτε ... ἔτη (cf. 9. 1, 2), and there is no reason why this should have been relinquished in favour of έτε ... ἔτη. The form of the gloss was determined by 9. 1, and the time-notice μετὰ ἔλεος ἔτη derived from the addition of μετὰ ἔλεος 6. 38, and τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς 7. 1.

1-11. This section has clearly received considerable interpolation by post-exilic hands under the influence of P. In LXX vv. 1-5 appear in a considerably shorter form, which reads smoothly and without trace of abridgement:—τοῖς ἐξεκεχισάσοις ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλομῶν πάντας τοῦ προσβεντύρου Ἰσραήλ ἐν Σειων τοῦ ἐνεχείσι τῆς κυβρών διαβίβασε Κυρίου ἐκ πόλεως Δαυεὶδ, αὐτή ἐστὶν Σειων, (2) ἐν μνῆ Ἀμαλαίν. (3) καὶ ἰδον τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς κυβρών (4) καὶ τὸ σπῆμα τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ τὴ σκέψει τὰ δόμα τὰ ἐν τῷ σπείραν τοῦ μαρτυρίου (5) καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραήλ ἵπποισθεν τῆς κυβρών δώσαις πρόβατα, βόσκο, ἀναρίθμητα. So substantially Luc. Here we notice the following omissions:

1. [LXX καὶ ἵπποισθεν τῆς κυβρών δώσαις πρόβατα, βόσκο, ἀναρίθμητα] ἰδον τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς κυβρών (4) καὶ τὸ σπῆμα τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ τὴ σκέψει τὰ δόμα τὰ ἐν τῷ σπείραν τοῦ μαρτυρίου (5) καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραήλ ἵπποισθεν τῆς κυβρών δώσαις πρόβατα, βόσκο, ἀναρίθμητα. So substantially Luc. Here we notice the following omissions:

Here ἰδον τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς κυβρών belongs distinctively to P. Cf. ἰδον τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς κυβρών || 2 Chr. 5. 2; Num. 30. 24. ἰδον τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς κυβρών Num. 32. 28; Josh. 14. 14. ἰδον τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς κυβρών Josh. 19. 54. ἰδον τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς κυβρών Ex. 6. 25; Num. 31. 26; 36. 1; Josh.
21. 1, and very frequently in Chr., Ezra, Neh. (34 times)†.

Ex. 6. 14; Num. 7. 2, and four times in Chr.† נָשָׁי in the Hexateuch occurs but once outside P, Ex. 22. 27 (J); in P 82 times, Ezek. 37 times, Chr. six times†.

Probably original. The reading of LXX, Luc. seems to be a scriptural error due to the occurrence of וְיָשָׁת at the end of the verse.

2. An addition rendered almost necessary to introduce the date after the weighting of the previous verse with the long insertion above noticed. Niph. נָשָׁי occurs most often in P, Lev. 8. 4; Num. 16. 3; 17. 7; 20. 2; Josh. 18. 1; 22. 12, and in books influenced by P (Ezek. 38. 7; Chr., Ezra, seven times); though not unknown in earlier writings, Ex. 32. 1 (JE), Judg. 20. 1; 2 Sam. 20. 14; Jer. 26. 9†. Notice the phrase נְשָׁי and the following here and in the additions of vv. 1, 5 contrasted with נְשָׁי נְשָׁי in v. 5, of the original narrative.

The reference in the verses being drawn from v. 65, נָשָׁי נְשָׁי, the editor plausibly assumes from the mention of its duration that this was the Feast, i.e. the Feast of Tabernacles, and so adds the statement נָשָׁי as in Lev. 23. 34 (H). In Dt. 16. 13 the date is more vaguely defined as נָשָׁי נָשָׁי נָשָׁי.

3. A resumption from v. 1*, due to the number of additions intervening.

4. In vv. 3, 5, 7 (twice), 9 simply נָשָׁי. The distinction drawn between priests and Levites implies the standpoint of P. Cf. Dri. Deut. 219:—'The term Levite, it must always be remembered, has in Deuteronomy a different meaning from "Levite" in P. In P it denotes the members of the tribe, cf. note ad loc.

1 On the rejection of נָשָׁי אֲוֹרָת שֵׁר, cf. note ad loc.
exclusive of the priests, the descendants of Aaron; in Deuteronomy it denotes all members of the tribe, without distinction. The “Levites” of P are inferior members of the tribe, who are assigned various subordinate duties in connexion with the Tabernacle (Num. 3–4; 18. 1–7), but are peremptorily forbidden to intrude upon the office of priest. In Deuteronomy this sharp distinction between priests and the common Levites is not recognized; it is implied (18. 1a) that all members of the tribe are qualified to exercise priestly functions; 18. 1b, 2b assign to the whole tribe the altar-dues reserved in Num. 18. 20 for the priests alone; and 18. 6–8, relating to the “Levite” coming from the country to reside at the central sanctuary, describes his services there in terms which elsewhere, when used in ritual connexion, denote regular priestly duties.

In contrast to this distinction of v. 4b, cf. vv. 3, 6, 10, 11 where Levites alone are mentioned; and ch. 12. 31 where all Levites seem to be regarded as fit to exercise priestly functions:

5. [Inserted for the sake of accordance with the title used in vv. 1b, 2.

The phrase הָנַחַל is of constant occurrence in P, outside which it never occurs but here and in || 2 Chr. 5. 6.

רַעְשָׁו means to appoint or define a place or time, and Niph'al has the sense set oneself at the appointed place. This latter occurs very constantly in a ceremonial connexion, and so used is characteristic of P; || 2 Chr. 5. 6; [הָנַחֲלוּ] נַחֲלֵיהֶם [Num. 14. 35; 16. 11; 27. 3; Num. 10. 3, 4; and, with ' as subject, נַחַלְתֵּיהֶם Ex. 25. 22; 29. 42, 43; 30. 6, 36; Num. 17. 19. Cf. the phrase מַעֲלִית נַחֲלֵי (see below) 'the tent of meeting,' i.e. of Yahwe and His people in the person of their representative. Elsewhere Niph'al is only used without ceremonial connotation; Josh. 11. 5 (JE); Am. 3. 3; Ps. 48. 5; Job 2. 11; Neh. 6. 2, 10f.
LXX, Luc. ἀναπηδήσαντα for the whole sentence appears at first sight to omit the last three words. But a comparison of ch. 3.8, where the same phrase is rendered by LXX ἀν ἀπῆλθεν, suggests that the translator’s single word is intended to satisfy the whole expression in the Hebrew.

Further omissions of LXX in this section (vv. 1–11) are:

6. [הנה ויהי] Omitted by LXX only, but contained in Luc. The phrase is properly Deuteronomic (cf. 3.14 note).

8. [יהוה ויהי ויהי] Quite different in character from the other omissions. The phrase implies a pre-exilic standpoint, and is thus original, and has been removed by the LXX translator (or by a later copyist) because in his time its purport had ceased to be true. It occurs again 9.13, 21; 10.12; 12.19; 11.22; 8.22; 10.27 (יוהו והוה והוה); 14.7; 16.6; 17.23, 34, 41. The phrase is in most cases the addition of R², and thus has important bearing upon the date of compilation of Kings. See Introduction.

10, 11. [היהי ויהי ויהי] LXX omits ויהי ויהי and reads ויהי. Luc. in both cases רוח קנים קやすく.

Thus it is clear that the omissions in LXX (vv. 1–5) are later additions to the text from the hand of R². But beyond these additions, in the text which is common to LXX and MT. there are a few phrases which exhibit unmistakeably the influence of P. These must be prior to the separation of the recensions represented by MT. and LXX, and therefore prior also to R²; and are to be assigned to late exilic or early post-exilic scribes influenced by P, mentioned above (ch. 6.16) under the symbol SS². The phrases in question are as follow:

4a. [ספיט] This phrase occurs a few times in JE; Ex. 33.7; Num. 11.16; 12.4; Deut. 31.14; but is chiefly characteristic of P, in which it occurs some 132 times. Outside the Hexateuch, it is found only in 1 Sam. 2.22; ch. 8.4a; and in Chr. In 1 Sam, the last member of the verse, containing the expression, is wanting in LXX, and seems to be of the
character of an interpolation. So Wellh., Kamp., Budde.Probably also in our passage (the tent of Moses) has been substituted for an original קֶרֶן (the tent of David; ch. 1. 39). LXX, Luc. οὐ μακρύς after בַּאֲשָׁלָם in this verse is probably added for the sake of uniformity with the previous רָשָׁת.

6. [Ex. 33 note] Cf. ch. 6. 16 note.

8. 10. קֶרֶן קֶרֶן is ‘the holy place,’ i.e. the outer room of the Temple, called בְּנֶקֶל in 6. 17, 33; 7. 21. The term is obviously used in relation to the name given to the inner room קֶרֶן קֶרֶן, as is the case in Ex. 26. 33 הבידול have been substituted for an original קֶרֶן קֶרֶן, to guard against the supposition that the staves were exposed to the public gaze.

Thus the original form of the section vv. 1–11, as it left the hand of ר' פ, was probably as follows:—

1. וַיְכַלָּהּ תֹּלְדֹתָהּ אַתָּה כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל לְחַלְוַתָהּ אֵת אֲרוֹם בְּרֵיהּ

2. וַיִּשְׁתְּבִיל הַשָּׁמַע וַיִּשְׁתְּבִיל הַשָּׁמַע וַיִּשְׁתְּבִיל הַשָּׁמַע

3. וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל

4. וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל

5. וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל

6. וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן

7. וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן

8. וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן

9. וַיִּשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן אֶל כְּלֵי יְשוּעַת יִשָּׁתֵן

The words overlined are the work of ר' פ; those marked by the dotted line may perhaps be due to him.

1, 6. [Ex. 33 note] Cf. 3. 15 note. Probably站立 והם stood in the original narrative, as in vv. 3, 5, 7, 9.

8. [Ex. 33 note] Discussed above.
The idea of the covenant between Yahwe and Israel appears first in JE; Ex. 19. 5; 24. 7, 8; 34. 10, 27; but is brought into special prominence through the emphasis laid upon it in Deuteronomy; cf. 5. 2f. Doubless RD was thinking of the idea of the covenant implied by these, and so made his insertion in its existing form. So vague a relationship of relative to antecedent would scarcely be possible if the whole verse were by one hand. LXX, Luc. insert after לָאָלְמָה אֲשֶׁר מָעָן בוֹ בִּית בָּאוּר, an addition which brings the sentence into close accord with Deut. 9. 9. Probably this is a gloss inserted to smooth away the roughness in connexion. The explanation of 'אָלְמָה אֲשֶׁר מָעָן 'where Yahwe made,' &c., with an ellipse of בִּית בָּאוּר as in 1 Sam. 20. 16; 22. 8, is possible but scarcely necessary.

Possibly לָאָלְמָה אֲשֶׁר מָעָן may also belong to RD, in continuation of the preceding. If, however, it belong to the first narrative, it probably originally ran 'בָּאָלְמָה בִּית בָּאוּר.'

See ch. 3. 16 note.

'C hath promised to dwell'; RV. 'Hath said that He will dwell'; 1 Chr. 27. 23 אֲשֶׁר לָאָלְמָה אֲשֶׁר; 2 Chr. 21. 7; Est. 4. 7. With ל of the person to whom the promise is made, II. 8. 19. Cf. ch. 5. 19 note.

The word is frequently mentioned as the sign of Yahwe’s theophany:—|| 2 Chr. 6. 1; Ex. 20. 21; Dt. 4. 11; 5. 19; 2 Sam. 22. 10; ||Ps. 18. 10; Ps. 97. 2; Job 22. 13. The word is connected seven times with לָאָלְמָה, twice with לָאָלְמָה אֲשֶׁר, once with לָאָלְמָה אֲשֶׁר אֵלֶּה, and once with לָאָלְמָה רֵעֲלָה. לָאָלְמָה had the appearance of the dark lowering storm-cloud, as is clear from 2 Sam. 22. 10ff. and Ex. 20. 21; cf. 19. 16.
13. [Possibly ‘a house of elevation,’ or ‘lofty house.’] For the meaning of ‘elevation’ or ‘height,’ Schrader (COT. i. 175) quotes Assyr. 'bē sabal = הבנווה; Cheyne (Isa. ii. 172 f.) cites M. Stanislas Guyard as stating that Assyr. possesses the root 'sabdlu = nasū (נenance) in the sense of ‘bearing,’ and hence (but by inference merely) of ‘elevating.’ This interpretation suits all the Biblical occurrences of הבנווה as well as, or better than, the old unphilological explanation ‘habitation’; || 2 Chr. 6. 2; Isa. 63. 15; Hab. 3. 11; Ps. 49. 15 (Cheyne הכננה). The verb occurs once, Gen. 30. 20 ‘This time will my husband extol me.’ In New Heb. הבווה = ‘temple’; Berachoth ix. 13b ‘those (heathen) who stretched out their hands against the temple.’

[So Ex. 15. 17 ‘there is no house which can endure in all time.’] So Ex. 39, 43, 49, cf. Ps. 33. 14. This gives prominence to the idea of the fixed security of Yahwe’s dwelling-place. So Ps. 89. 15; Ps. 97. 2; Ps. 98. 3.

[Used adverbially, ‘for ever,’ in place of the more prosaic מַלְאֹת.] So only || 1 Chr. 6. 2; Ps. 61. 5.

The two vv. 12, 13 occur in LXX after the section vv. 14–53, and exhibit considerable divergence from MT. γινώσκειν, κωρίς; καὶ κατοικεῖν ἐκ γνώσεως, ὁλοκληρωμένως ὁλοκληρωμένως μου, ὁλοκληρωμένως σαφῶς, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κατοικεῖν.

Here the words ἐκ... αὐτῶν are clearly a gloss, due to the fact that when the section vv. 14–53 is made to precede v. 12 the reference of Solomon’s words in this latter verse is not immediately obvious. The remainder, however, as is shown by Wellh. (C. 271), presupposes, after the easy correction of a few translator’s errors, a text
substantially superior to MT. ἐνυάπωσν perhaps represents שַׂעַר, an error for שָׂעַר which Luc. renders rightly ظًئٍظٍ ظتٍ ظتٍ ظتٍ. We thus may retranslate:

'Ve then said Solomon,
The sun hath Yahwe set in the heavens,
But hath promised to dwell in thick darkness;
—Build my house, a house of habitation for me,
That I may dwell therein for ever.

Is it not written in the Book of the Upright?'

Here in v. 12, in place of the single clause of MT., we have two antithetically parallel distichs, setting in pointed contrast the sun brightly shining in the sky above and the thick black cloud which fills and overhangs the House of Yahwe. The substance of Yahwe's command and promise is appropriately introduced in v. 13a, while v. 13b, as in Josh. 10. 13 (Joshua at the battle of Beth-Horon), 2 Sam. 1. 18 (David's lament over Saul and Jonathan), bears the stamp of genuineness and ensures the antiquity of the short extract. Klo. follows LXX in v. 12, supposing that ἐνυάπωσν translates דְּרוֹנ, a mistaken reading of דְּרוֹנ—'The sun is manifest in the heavens.' In v. 13a, however, he abides by MT., with

1 But שַׂעַר is never elsewhere in LXX rendered by מָשַׂר.
2 So Kamp. Wellh. reads שָׂעַר for מָשַׂר, שָׂעַר for מָשַׂר, but in both cases Luc. indicates the more accurate reading.
3 But more probably the expressions הֶזְּר, עַשְׂר exhibit traces of a later phase of thought as to Yahwe's dwelling-place. See above as to usage and occurrence of these phrases.
the small alteration for ψηφιά from 2 Chr. 6. 2, while v. 13c LXX is bracketed as doubtful. Jos.'s somewhat lengthy reproduction of Solomon's words (Ant. viii. 4, § 2) depends upon a combination of Kings and Chronicles freely wrought up and expanded. Thus καὶ ἐκ δυναμινει ἐργασία γεγονούτα τῶν οὗτων οὖν αυτῶν k. r. l. represents ἧλιον ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος of 1 Kings, while Τοιόν θέλεις κατασκευάσας τὸν ναὸν ἐπώνυμον is drawn from καὶ ἔγγον εἰσελθείη ἐκεῖν ἀπὸ ἀυτοῦ σου, 2 Chr. 6. 2.

Vulg. agrees closely with MT. Pesh. אָלַיָּב לִשְׁתַּחַם אַל הַשָּׁמַיִם 'Lord, thou hast promised to dwell in thick darkness,' is probably an arbitrary alteration from 3rd to 2nd pers. in view of the use of the 2nd pers. in the following verse. Targ. יָהָ֛והַ שֶּכֶ֖ינוֹת שָׁלֵֽהַ עַ֣ל יְרוּשָׁלָֽאָם 'Yahwe hath been pleased to establish his Shechinah in Jerusalem' is obviously a paraphrase in the translator's usual style. Nevertheless, Th., finding difficulty in the use of בַּשָּׁמַיִם 'black darkness' to describe the appearance of the בָּלָק or בְּנֵי הָלָּא by inference a bright cloud, obtains by combination of Pesh. and Targ. the emendation בַּשָּׁמַיִם לְאִלּוֹנָה פְּוּ שְׁלָמָה 'Yahwe, thou hast promised to dwell in Jerusalem,' a somewhat prosaic statement which is partially anticipated by Bo.'s suggestion בַּשָּׁמַיִם לְאִלּוֹנָה פְּוּ שְׁלָמָה.

14–66. This long section, containing Solomon's address to the people (vv. 14–21), the dedication prayer (vv. 22–53), the blessing (vv. 54–61), and the short account of the festival (vv. 62–66), presents throughout clear indications that it owes its present form to the hand of R². The final portion (vv. 62–66) may perhaps exhibit an older narrative into which Deuteronomic additions have been incorporated, but the remainder, and especially the central prayer of dedication, has been so thoroughly amplified by the editor that it is impossible to discover any older kernel upon which he may have based his work. The choice of subjects in the successive divisions of the prayer seems for the most part to have been suggested by the catalogue of curses contained in Deut. 28. 15–68.
VIII. 14-66

I Kings 8.

Deut. 28.

31 תְּנַכָּה  יְנַחַל אֲבָכָה

25 וְעַתָּה יְנַחַל אֲבָכָה

33 רֹבּוֹגֵעָה עָמָךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל יְנַחַל אֲבָכָה

23, 24 יְנַחַל אֲבָכָה

35 וּמְטַמְּעַת הָאָדָם וּמְטַמְּעַת הָאָדָם

אֲבָכָה

37 וְרָבָּה הָאָדָם

בְּשֹׁרַת חַיָּה

אֲבָכָה

38 וּמְטַמְּעַת הָאָדָם וּמְטַמְּעַת הָאָדָם

אֲבָכָה

Cf. also vv. 39, 42.

52 וְהָעָשָׂה לְבָּכָל שִׂמְעִי

Cf. vv. 49 ff.


44 וְיִנָּהֲפֶּה לַהֲלָהָה

46 וְאֶלֶּה יִהְיוּ לָכֶם... וְתִהְיוּ

vv. 36, 37, 64-68.

דְּלֵי אֲבָכָה שְׁבוֹנוֹת הָאָדָם,

Deuteronomic phraseology is noticed below verse by verse.

It is more difficult to decide whether the section has suffered interpolation at the hands of later Redactors.

(i) The division of the prayer vv. 46-49, which brings forward the possibility of a general captivity of Israel in punishment for sins, is considered by Wellh. (C. 270), Sta. (Gen. i. 74), Kamp., Benz., Kit. to be marked by its contents as not earlier than the Exile, and therefore later than D.¹

Against this view may justly be cited the vagueness of the terms of vv. 46 וָכָּה שָׁבַתָּה לָא אֲרָמִים עָבְדוּ הָדָּהָה, and the fact that the writer (v. 48) appears to regard the Temple as still standing during the period of the Exile, ... וַתְּלַחֲלוּ הָאֲלָמָיִי וַיָּאַרְצָה רֹבּוֹד אֲבָכָה וְרָבָּה הָאָדָם. But the chief argument for the pre-exilic date of the passage is to be derived from comparison of Deut. 28, which, as we have seen above, forms to some extent the model of the dedication prayer. This ch. 28 is regarded by all critics as

¹ Wellh., Sta. seem to regard these verses as determining the exilic date of the whole section vv. 14-66. Kamp. assigns vv. 44-53 to D; Benz., Kit. vv. 44-51.
being, if not an integral portion of D (chs. 5–26), at least closely akin to D in standpoint and date, and thus certainly pre-exilic; yet notwithstanding, vv. 36, 37, 64–68 threaten a captivity of the nation in language decidedly more definite than that of the passage of the prayer which has been called in question. We may therefore be content to regard these verses as containing nothing necessarily opposed to the supposition of a pre-exilic authorship, and so, as of one piece with the whole, vv. 22–53.

(ii) Sta. (Ger. ii. 248 note) regards הַיְשָׁמָנוּ v. 30, and the local accusative הַיִּשְׁמָנוּ v. 32, 34, 36, 39, 43, 45, 49 as later insertions made upon the view that Yahwe’s habitation was not the Temple, as is suggested by the old narrative, vv. 11–13, but the heavens, out of which he exercised a supervision over the Temple. Accordingly, portions of vv. 22, 54 מָשָׁמָנוּ מְצוֹנֵי הַמֶּשֶׁם; מָשָׁמָנוּ מְצוֹנֵי הַמֶּשֶׁם, and v. 27 which questions the possibility of God’s dwelling upon the earth, are also assigned to the same hand.

This opinion of Sta. is decidedly favoured by syntactical considerations. The local accusative מָשָׁמָנוּ ‘in heaven,’ following upon מָשָׁמָנוּ נָא, v. 32 al., can scarcely be paralleled. Th. compares מְצוֹנֵי ch. 7. 8. Da. § 69, Rem. 1 places it among words subordinated in the accusative more freely ‘in elevated speech and poetry.’ מָשָׁמָנוּ, again, at the commencement of v. 28 hinges very imperfectly on to the end of v. 27, and much more readily follows upon v. 26.

If this view be adopted, מָשָׁמָנוּ v. 30 will refer originally not to the heavens but to the Temple, agreeably to the idea not only of the old narrative, but of the framer of the prayer (R); cf. v. 38 מָשָׁמָנוּ מְצוֹנֵי הַמֶּשֶׁם where the House seems to be regarded as Yahwe’s abode; vv. 35, 42, al. So also מָשָׁמָנוּ מְצוֹנֵי v. 39, 43, 49, where, upon the removal of מָשָׁמָנוּ, מְצוֹנֵי must be restored.

1 Kne. Hex. § 7, 21; Drl. Deuteronomy, 303 f.
3 II 2 Chr. 6, 21, 23, 25, 30, 33, 35, 39 reads מִשָּׁמָנוּ, מְצוֹנֵי, מָשָׁמָנוּ, מְצוֹנֵי, but in v. 27 מָשָׁמָנוּ as in Kings.
The view that heaven, not the Temple, is Yahwe’s proper abode, belongs to exilic times, and doubtless owed its origin to the destruction of the first Temple. Cf. Isa. 66. 1 On the other hand, according to Ezekiel the newly constructed Temple and city are to be specially dignified by Yahwe’s Presence, though doubtless according to a more heightened and spiritual conception; 48. 35

15. שָׂדָה לְשׁוֹנָה] A phrase very characteristic of RĐ. Cf. vv. 17, 20, 23, 25, (26 om.’); 11. 9, 31; 14. 7, 13; 15. 30; 16. 13, 26, 33; 22. 54; II. 10. 31; 14. 25; 21. 12; 22. 15, 18. Elsewhere in Kings the phrase is found only in I. 1. 30, 48; II. 9. 6; 19. 15, 20, and in I. 17. 1, 14 where the text is doubtful (see note). After לְשׁוֹנָה יָשָׂר LXX, Luc. insert οὐ πάντως, i.e. חיהו. This is natural, and probably original; cf. ch. 5. 21

20. בְּשֹׁם רֹאֶה] So v. 24; Jer. 44. 25. The special reference of ‘יתוּר is to 2 Sam. 7. 5 ff.: cf. v. 16a with 2Sam. 7. 6a; v. 16b with 2 Sam. 7. 8–11; v. 19 with 2 Sam. 7. 13a.

16. בֵּית בְּרִית] Cf. Deut. 12. 5, 11, 18, 21, 26; al. So in vv. 44, 48; 11. 13, 32, 36; 14. 21; II. 21. 7; 23. 27; all RĐ or RĐ'.

17. יִתֶּה יִתֵּה יִתֶּה יִתֵּh
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23. [Deut. 4. 39] Owing to the influence of the following verse this has become altered in LXX into τὸ δοῦλόν σου τῷ πορευόμενῳ ἐν χώρᾳ σου ἐν δόξῃ τῷ κατδίκ αὐτοῦ, while in Luc. we have further the paraphrase τῷ πατρὶ μου ὑπὲρ τὸ δοῦλόν σου. Doubtless MT. is correct. The verse enunciates Yahwe’s character as shown in His dealings with His servants in general.

24. [Ch. 2. 4 note.]

25. [Ch. 2. 3, 4 note.]

26. [As in Gen. 42. 20 ; 2 Chr. 1. 9.]

27. [Elsewhere only || 2 Chr. 6. 18 ; Num. 22. 37 (JE); Ps. 58. 2 ; 1 Kings 18 Gen. 18. 13 (J).]

28. [Serves to point the question very forcibly, ‘Is it indeed the case that.’ On the other hand, the form יָדוּ, which occurs nine times, seems, with the single possible exception Job 19. 5, to be reserved for non-interrogative asseverations.

29. ‘Can God dwell.’ So לְבוּלָתָה and cannot contain Thee;’ Dri. Tenses, § 37. a.

So LXX, Luc. here add περὶ ὀλίγων, Targ. אֵלָה וְנָא. This is probably genuine, and is adopted as such by Th., Klo., Benz.
Lit. Indeed (or strictly, adding) that this house (cannot contain Thee); so, with reference to the preceding sentence, 'how much less this house.' Cf. 2 Chr. 32. 15; Prov. 17. 7; Job 4. 19 (without יב); 9. 14; 15. 16; 25. 6, where, as here, the preceding sentence states a negation. When preceded by a positive statement יב naturally gains the sense 'how much more'; so Deut. 31. 27; 2 Sam. 16. 11; Prov. 11. 31; al.

28. 'So turn Thou'; so הָעַשֶּנֶת v. 30. Cf. note on הָעַשֶּנֶת ch. 2. 2.

ןַע הָעַשֶּנֶת מִתְכֻּרָה אָלַי] LXX, Luc. כָּלֵי תְּוֹעָרְתִּי you appear to have passed, through oversight, from הָעַשֶּנֶת to וָעַשֶּנֶת, and then not unnaturally to have read the suffix of 1st pers. instead of 1.

ןַע הָעַשֶּנֶת] LXX, Luc. אוֹתָה 'יִשְׁמַךְ. The more personal reference of MT. agrees better with the preceding ii:וֹ. Possibly LXX 'יִשְׁמַךְ arose from a mistaken repetition of the last letter of וָעַשֶּנֶת and the first of יִשְׁמַךְ, כָּל being regarded as a contraction of יִשְׁמַךְ.

ןַע הָעַשֶּנֶת] LXX omits. The words are, however, found in Luc. and the other Verss., and are demanded by the following מְשֹׁמְרָה which cannot refer merely to הָעַשֶּנֶת.

29. כָּלֵי תְּוֹעָרְתִּי] || 2 Chr. 6. 20; v. 52; 2 Chr. 6. 40; 7. 15; Neh. 1. 6.

ןַע הָעַשֶּנֶת] So Vulg., Targ.; but LXX, Luc., Pesh., || 2 Chr. 6. 20 הָעַשֶּנֶת, probably an arbitrary alteration to the more usual order. At the close of the verse LXX, Luc. add ἡμέρας καὶ χρόνωσις.

30. כָּלֵי תְּוֹעָרְתִּי] 'At Thy dwelling-place, even at heaven.' Cf. ch. 6. 18 note.

30b. כָּלֵי תְּוֹעָרְתִּי] LXX, Luc. καὶ ποιήσεως, i.e. ἡμέρας. This, though adopted by Klo., appears to be merely a correction of the translator, who took offence at the repetition of the verb בְּשָׁמֶנֶת, and so made the alteration in order to produce an outward harmony with vv. 32, 43. But these two cases are different from our passage. It is only appropriate that תְּוֹעָרְתִּי should be used of punishing the wicked and vindicating the righteous (v. 32), or of bringing about
the request of the stranger (v. 43), but here, where the question is simply of forgiveness which would not need to be manifested in any outward action, ḫūṣḥ would be less apposite. On the other hand, ḫūṣḥ, as a resumption from the commencement of the verse after the lengthy intervening sentence, is quite in accordance with Hebrew usage. Cf. ch. 2. 4 note.

31. ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt] Rather difficult. ḫūṣḥ ḫāt seems to be used in the same way as ḫāt alone, which occurs here and there in the sense 'in case' or when; cf. v. 33 ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt; Lev. 4. 22 ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt; Deut. 11. 27; 18. 22; Josh. 4. 21; Isa. 31. 4. Just possibly ḫūṣḥ ḫāt was intended in the first instance for a kind of accusatives pendens which should have owed subordination to ḫūṣḥ ḫāt v. 32, ‘That which &c. . . . do thou hear,’ but owing to the length of the intervening sentence the connexion was imperfectly effected. LXX, Luc. ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt, Vulg. Si peccaverit, Pesh. ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt paraphrase slightly to overcome the difficulty; Targ. ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt literal. || 2 Chr. 6. 22 ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt. So Lev. 4. 3, 13, 27 compared with v. 22 above cited.

vārā' ḫūṣḥ] ‘Against,’ or strictly, ‘with reference to his neighbour.’ So most commonly; Gen. 20. 6; 40. 1; 1 Sam. 7. 6; al.

vārā' ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt] The phrase only here and || 2 Chr. 6. 22. ḫāt ḫāt ‘take up,’ i.e. ḫāt ḫāt Ps. 50. 16, or ḫūṣḥ ḫāt Ps. 16. 4.

vārā' ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt] Scarcely correct. If the sense intended were ‘and the oath come,’ we should expect ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt. LXX, Luc. ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt, Pesh. ḫūṣḥ ḫāṣḥ ḫūṣḥ, Targ. ḫūṣḥ ḫūṣḥ all presuppose ḫūṣḥ, and Vulg. et venerit proper juramentum seems to be a slightly paraphrastic rendering of the same text. Thus, with Klo., Kamp., Benz., we may emend ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt ‘and he come and swear,’ in preference to the suggestion of Bo, followed by Th., ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt ‘and he come swearing,’ and the alternative of Kamp., adopted by Kit., ḫūṣḥ ḫāt ḫāt ḫāt ‘and he enter into an oath’ (cf. Neh. 10. 30).

32. ḫūṣḥ ḫāt] ‘And shalt do.’ An absolute use of ḫūṣḥ, the implied object being ‘that which is meet to be done,’ as is shown by the following ḫūṣḥ ḫūṣḥ. Such a pregnant use of this verb with ḫūṣḥ as subject is not infrequent in lofty or poetic style; Ps. 119. 126
VIII. 31-34

[Text continues as in the original document]
The form of the 3rd and 2nd pers. pl. of the imperf. with the so-called Nfin paragogicum is not uncommon in Hebrew. Cf. this same verb, Isa. 35. 10; 51. 11; Jer. 44. 28; al.; Gen. 3. 3, 4; Deut. 33. 11; 2 Sam. 22. 39; al. This form is usual in Aram. and in class. Ar.; negilún, yaqtuluna. See Wright, Compar. Sem. Gramm. pp. 184, 145, for the origin of the termination. In Hebrew the form is rather an affected than a real archaism, and is most common in elevated poetical style, or in pause as being heavier and more impressive.

According to vocalization the only possible rendering is 'when thou shalt answer them,' Pesh. ṣ̂ ma'ajma', Targ. ṣ̂ ma'ajma'; but this is unsuitable. Hence it is better to follow LXX, Luc. éwv raraíwov aivonoè, Vulg. propter afflictionem suam, and to vocalize ṣ̂ ma'ajma, when thou shalt humble them.' So Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit. Klo.'s emendation ʔ̂ ma'ajma, after 2 Chr. 7. 14, is unnecessary.

In which they are to walk' or 'should walk.' For this nuance of the imperf. cf. Ex. 10. 26 ṣ̂ ma'ajma; We do not know how we are to serve Yahwe until we come thither.' Dri. Tenses, § 39 a.

Gavest...for an inheritance'; so 2 Chr. 6. 27; Deut. 29. 7; Josh. 11. 23 (D²); 14. 13 (E recast by D¹); Ps. 136. 21; Num. 18. 21, 24 (P; in these verses the reference is to tithe, not to the land); So ṣ̂ ma'ajma ṣ̂ ma'ajma Josh. 14. 9, 14 (E recast by D²); 24. 32 (E); Ezek. 36. 12; 44. 28+ The usual phrase of Deuteronomy is ṣ̂ ma'ajma ṣ̂ ma'ajma Deut. 4. 21; 15. 4; 19. 10; 20. 16; 21. 23; 24. 4; 25. 19; 26. 1; Ps. 135. 12+. The usual phrase occurs Num. 36. 2 (P); ṣ̂ ma'ajma ṣ̂ ma'ajma Num. 26. 53 (P); Josh. 13. 7 (D²); ṣ̂ ma'ajma ṣ̂ ma'ajma Josh. 13. 6; 23. 4 (D²); Num. 34. 2 (P); Judg. 18. 1; Ezek. 45. 1; 47. 14, 22+.

This order—subject, conjunction, verb—serving to give slight emphasis to the subject, is common in P; Lev. 1. 2;
2.1; 4.2; 5.1, 4, 15, 21; 7.21; al.; Num. 5.12; cf. Ezek. 3.19; 14.9, 13; 18.5, 18, 21; 33.6. So Isa. 28.18; Mic. 5.4; Ps. 62.11.

A kind of locust; || 2 Chr. 6.28; Ps. 78.46; Joel 1.4; 2.25; Isa. 33.4†. This and the other words used to denote the locust, קָרָם, קָרָא קָרֵב, and the ordinary הָלְכָה, cannot with any degree of certainty be distinguished as describing different species or stages of growth. A verb מִתְכַּנֶּס occurs once; מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס. 'the locusts shall consume it,' Deut. 28.38. In Aram. מִתְכַּנֶּס means 'bring to an end'; so Targ., Jer. מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס = Heb. מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס; but most frequently, as in Syr., has gained the more special secondary sense 'wean.' LXX, Luc., connecting מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס as one expression, render מִתְכַּנֶּס 'red blight.'

A kind of locust; So || 2 Chr. 6.28. The expression is very forced and unnatural, even if it can be regarded as giving any sense at all. LXX, Luc. מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס furnish the correct text, מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס. 'in any of his gates,' a regular phrase of D; Deut. 15.7; 16.5; 17.2; 23.17; cf. 18.6†. So Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort. Th. emends מִתְכַּנֶּס; but this is not the usual phrase, nor is it postulated by the renderings of LXX, Luc., which very commonly represent מִתְכַּנֶּס by מִתְכַּנֶּס; cf. Deut. 12.17, 18, 21; 15.7; 17.2; al. מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס. Cf. ch. 6.7 note.

38. מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס. The construction is somewhat involved, since מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס can scarcely be regarded as part of the category formed by the plagues mentioned in v. 37. Thus v. 37 must be regarded as breaking off with an apophasis, and the apodosis מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס as answering to the protasis formed by the second and different category מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס. 'Whatsoever prayer, &c., there be, or, If there be any prayer, &c. . . . , then hear thou,' &c.

LXX, Luc. omit correctly. The words are a gloss upon מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס, to explain that this refers to Israel in contrast to מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס of v. 41. So Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. מִתְכַּנֶּס מִתְכַּנֶּס. So v. 43. Cf. v. 35 note.

A rather obscure expression. The idea seems to be that each man will recognize in the case of his particular plague,
be it famine, pestilence, or some other above enumerated, that it is
sent by God as a punishment for his sin. So || 2 Chr. 6. 29 נֶּעַבּ הֵבֵן
Klo., however, interprets וַיָּשֶׁר, not as 'plague,' but as
'Berühmung,' 'the touching of his heart';—'Because God will through
the misfortune awaken the humiliating consciousness of sin.' So
apparently LXX, Luc. ἀθηνοθ ομήθων αὐτοῦ. Cf. 1 Sam. 10. 26.

39. [|| 2 Chr. 6. 30; Jer. 17. 10; 32. 19; Ezek. 7. 9.

40. [|| 2 Chr. 6. 31; Deut. 4. 10; 12. 1;

41. [Note on v. 34.

42. [Note on v. 34.

LXX, Luc. in || 2 Chr. 6. 32 read μᾶς ἀθηνοθ, and Klo.
accordingly emends יִהְיֶהוֹ 'jeder Fremdling.'

Vulg. et alienigena, Targ. and Klo. seem to take the expression
as a kind of casus pendens, 'as for the stranger,' a use of מִי scarcely
to be justified. Pesh. מִי seems to mean 'on behalf of the
stranger,' and supposes the ellipse of some such expression as
יִהְיֶהוֹ 'I pray.'

LXX, Luc. in || 2 Chr. 6. 32 read μᾶς ἀθηνοθ, and Klo.
accordingly emends יִהְיֶהוֹ 'jeder Fremdling.'

These fifteen words have fallen out
in LXX, Luc. through homoiooteleuton. For the second מִי
reinforcing the first after the intervening words cf. ch. 2. 4 note.

The two phrases occur in
combination || 2 Chr. 6. 32; Deut. 4. 34; 5. 15; 7. 19; 11. 2; 26. 8;
Jer. 21. 5 (different order); 32. 21 (חַרְצִי); Ezek. 20. 33, 34; Ps.
136. 12. They alone, Deut. 3. 24; 6. 21; 7. 8; 9. 26; 34. 12;
Ex. 3. 19; 6. 1; 32. 11 (all JE); 13. 9 (E); Num. 20. 20 (JE;
referring to Edom); Neh. 1. 10; Dan. 9. 14. Cf. Josh. 4. 24 (D').
They alone, Deut. 9. 29; II. 17. 36; Jer. 27. 5; 32. 17;
Ex. 6. 6 (P').

43. [|| 2 Chr. 6. 33; vv. 53, 60; Deut. 28. 10; Josh.
4. 24 (D'); Ezek. 31. 12; Zeph. 3. 20 are the only occurrences of the exact phrase. LXX, Luc. omit ידלא.

לֵאמו א] || 2 Chr. 6. 33. A common phrase in Deut.; 4. 10; 5. 26; 6. 24; 8. 6; 10. 12; 14. 23; 17. 19; 28. 58; 31. 13; Jer. 32. 39; Neh. 1. 11; Ps. 86. 11.

יהו רכש נימא על ידך יד} That thy name is called over this house,' i.e. in token of ownership. The phrase is most clearly elucidated by 2 Sam. 12. 26, 28, where Joab, having taken Rabbath-Ammon, sends to David that he may come and complete the capture, that אָדָם אנא הוּא נַעַר נַעַר יֶשׁ עָלָיו, 'lest I take the city, and my name be called over it,' as having the credit of its conquest.

The phrase occurs besides:—as here, of the Temple || 2 Chr. 6. 33; Jer. 7. 10, 11, 14, 30; 32. 34; 34. 15; of the chosen people Deut. 28. 10; Jer. 14. 9; Isa. 63. 19; 2 Chr. 7. 14; of Jerusalem Jer. 25. 29; of Jerusalem and the chosen people Dan. 9. 18, 19; of Jeremiah Jer. 15. 16; of the nations Am. 9. 12.

44. יד הָאָדָם] So Targ. יד הָאָדָם. The other Verss. are different; LXX, Luc. εἰς ὅριον Κουφίου, Vulg. υπὲρ, Mede. חטש כמש', || 2 Chr. 6. 34 (MT. and Verss.) יד לָאָדָם. Probably יד לָאָדָם is original, and the MT. reading due to this having been read יד לָאָדָם. LXX seems to have had the reading of MT., and to have paraphrased in order to explain the transition from the second to the third person.

יד לָאָדָם] 'In the direction of the city.' So v. 48; || 2 Chr. 6. 34, 38; ch. 18. 43 מְכָנַּה רֹדֵה 'look toward the sea,' Ezek. 8. 5; 41. 12; al.

נְפֻיָה אֵשׁ בַּצְתָר הָב} Note on v. 16.

'נְפֻיָה אֵשׁ בַּצְתָר הָב] Ch. 3. 2 note.

45. יד לָאָדָם יָשֶׁם יָשֶׁם] 'And wilt execute their right.' The exact phrase (יָשֶׁם יָשֶׁם הָאָדָם, with הוּא as subject) occurs only besides in v. 49; || 2 Chr. 6. 35, 39; v. 59; Deut. 10. 18; Mic. 7. 9; Ps. 9. 5.

בַּצְתָר אֵשׁ בַּצְתָר הָאָדָם] Cf. Eccl. 7. 20 בַּצְתָר אֵשׁ בַּצְתָר הָאָדָם. The latter may perhaps be explained by supposing an ellipse of יָשֶׁם יָשֶׁם. Cf. Ps. 7. 12, where יָשֶׁם is rendered
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Similarly LXX may be a corruption of ἐκάθισεν ἀφρός, the alteration being due to some one who supposed the sense intended by the Greek to be 'lead them away and deliver them up,' &c. In LXX of || 2 Chr. 6. 36 there is a further alteration—καὶ παράγει ἀφρός. Luc., however, renders καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄμην ἀφρός.

[And thou set them before the foe, i.e. deliver them over to his power and disposal. The other occurrences of the phrase in this sense are || 2 Chr. 6. 36; Deut. 1. 8, 21; 2. 31, 33, 36; 7. 2, 23; 23. 15; 28. 7, 25; 31. 5; Josh. 10. 12; 11. 6 (both Deut.); Judg. 11. 9; Isa. 41. 2.]

47. [And shall bring back to their heart,' or as we should say, 'their mind.' So RV. 'shall bethink themselves.' || 2 Chr. 6. 37; Deut. 4. 39; 30. 1; Isa. 44. 19; 46. 8 (τῷ λόγῳ); Lam. 3. 21+ The verse is a reminiscence of Deut. 30. 1 ff.

[But LXX ἐν τῷ μετοχίᾳ ἀφρός, Luc. ἐν τῷ γάρ τις μετοχίᾳ ἀφρός agree with || 2 Chr. 6. 37 in reading ἀφρός, which is probably correct. Cf. Jer. 30. 10; 46. 27.]

'Cf. Ps. 106. 6; Dan. 9. 15, both reminiscences of this passage.

Weak, co-ordinating two synonymous ideas. Cf. Isa. 1. 2 ἀπέκρυψεν ἀπήκρυψεν; 1 Sam. 12. 2; Deut. 2. 30; al.; Dri. Tenses, §§ 131, 132. ἀπάτη, like ἀπαφράτω, means literally to 'miss the mark'; so Job 5. 24 ἀναυώκας γνώσασθαι 'And thou shalt visit thy pasture and shalt miss nothing'; and in Hiph'il, Judg. 20. 16. ὁπλόν = Ar. ὑφήραν; so Hiph. ὑπῆραν make crooked (with obj. ὑπήρα) Job 3. 21, i.e. act perversely. ἀρνώ, a more general word, act wickedly, perhaps has its origin in the notion of raising a tumult; Job 34. 29 ἀκρωτίζω ἢ δὲ ἀκρωτίζω; cf. Job 3. 17. ἀσύνδετος after the two previous verbs connected by ἥν it is a little harsh, and, following the suggestion of Ps. 106. 6, it seems preferable to reject the 1 before ἥν, and to read οἷς γενεαῖς ὑπωκύουσιν. So LXX, Vulg., Targ. Pesh., on the other hand, inserts o before the last verb, cf. Job 3. 17. Luc., omitting ἥν, inserts ὑπωκύουσιν, ὑπωκύουσιν. || 2 Chr. 6. 37.
48. cwm  Deut. 30. 10; II. 23. 25; cf. Jer. 3. 10. On 'י with cf. v. 33 note; on כב Deut. 9. 25, cf. ch. 2. 3, 4 note.

47. LXX, Luc. cf. μετέφαγεν above possibly read לְשׁוֹנָם, but more probably render somewhat freely, as is the case with Vulg. ad quam captivi ducli fuerint.

Note on v. 44.

Note on v. 34.

Note on v. 16.

Note on ch. 3. 2.

49. LXX, Luc. omit. The words are very probably a gloss from v. 45. In this former verse the phrase לְשׁוֹנָם, of vindicating Israel's right against the encroachments of their foes, is highly appropriate; but in v. 49, where the captivity is regarded as a just penalty for sins committed, the force of the expression is scarcely so immediately apparent, the idea of a right and of concession granted through forgiveness (מלvio) being somewhat incompatible.

50. LXX, Luc. omit. The following words down to the close of v. 51 are not found in || 2 Chr. 6. 39.

Neh. 1. 11; Ps. 106. 46; the latter being probably a reminiscence of our passage: cf. v. 47 note on 'םז.

51. יכ צָרַךְ וָנוּלַתָה מְסַרְרוֹר... cf. Deut. 9. 26, 29. In application to the chosen people BY and נַפְסִי appear as parallel terms;—Deut. 32. 9; Isa. 47. 6; Joel 2. 17; 4. 2; Ps. 28. 9; 78. 62, 71; 94. 5, 14; 106. 4, 5, 40. Cf. Mic. 7. 14.

בר כב Deut. 4. 20; Jer. 11. 4. The meaning of the phrase may be illustrated by Isa. 48. 10, 'I have tested thee in the furnace of affliction.'

52. לְשׁוֹנָם Deut. 6. 40 and Ps. 39. 8. In our passage insert καὶ τὰ ἀρά σου, i.e. αἰτήμας, after רעך. This is probably a gloss due to the idea of the unsuitability of eyes only being open to a supplication. The words of 2 Chr. are probably no older than the Chronicler, if we may judge by the use of בְּעִינָי.
which appears to be a late form; 2 Chr. 7. 15; Ps. 130. 2; Neh. 1. 6, 11.

For the constr. cf. Gen. 30. 41; 1 Chr. 23. 31. Neb. 1. 6, 11.

53. 'Cf. Lev. 20. 24, 26 (H); Jer. 12. 7, 8, 9; Mic. 7. 18; Isa. 19. 25; see further the cases given on v. 51.

The land of Israel is named the "land of Yahwe in Jer. 2. 7; 16. 18; 50. 11; Ps. 68. 10; 79. 1; cf. 2 Sam. 20. 19; 21. 3; Ex. 15. 17 (both D); E.

By the hand of Moses,' i.e. by his agency. The idiom is very frequent of a word of Yahwe delivered through the agency of a prophet;—ch. 12. 15; 14. 18; 15. 29; 16. 7, 12, 34; 17. 16; II. 9. 36; 10. 10; 14. 25; 17. 13, 23; 21. 10; 24. 2; 1 Sam. 28. 15, 17; al.

54. 'With his hands spread forth &c.'; a circumstantial clause, giving further detail as to Solomon's attitude whilst kneeling. Cf. v. 22.

55. ' Accus. of closer specification, defining the manner of the action described by רד (though of Yahwe's words) 1 Sam. 3. 19; Est. 6. 10.

56. Accus. of closer specification, defining the manner of the action described by רד: Ps. 95. 11. cf. Ch. 5. 26 note.

The use of the Hiph'il is similar: 'suffer to fall' (though not of Yahwe's words) 1 Sam. 3. 19; Est. 6. 10.
frequent), are very characteristic of Deuteronomy, occurring more than three hundred times. In D of Joshua there are four occurrences of and twenty-seven occurrences of . Elsewhere in Hexateuch:—J, E, JE nine times, viz. Ex. 3. 18; 5. 3; 8. 22, 23; 10. 25, 26; Jos. 18. 6; 24. 17, 24; of twelve times, viz. Gen. 27. 20; Ex. 15. 26 (D?); 20. 2, 5, 7, 10, 12; 23. 19; 32. 4, 8; 34. 24, 26; of six times, viz. Ex. 8. 24; 10. 8, 16, 17; 23. 25; Josh. 4. 5: of three times, viz. Ex. 8. 6; Jos. 22. 19, 29; of seven times, viz. Num. 10. 9, and in the phrase (twice): H twice, viz. Lev. 23. 28, 40; of twenty-one times, viz. Lev. 18. 2, 4, 30; 19. 2, 3, 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36; 20. 7, 24; 23. 22, 43; 24. 22; 25. 17, 38, 55; 26. 1, 13. In other books the phrases occur here and there, but not times in all. Cf. Dri. Deut. lxxix.

Cf. Josh. 24. 23b (perhaps added to E by D).

Ch. 2. 3, 4 note.

LXX, Luc. omit, probably through oversight. With MT. cf. Deut. 26. 17; 30. 16, where precisely the same enumeration is made.

Contrast Ps. 22. 2 note.

So Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ. LXX omits through oversight.

Lit. ‘matter of a day in its day’; so RV. ‘as every day shall require.’ The idiom is not infrequent, being used e.g. of the daily allowance of Jehoiachin at the court of the king of Babylon, II. 25. 30 (|| Jer. 52. 34); and of that of Daniel and his friends, Dan. 1. 5; of the manna gathered by the people, Ex. 16. 4; or again of the daily burden imposed by the Egyptian task-masters, Ex. 5. 13, 19.

Cf. Josh. 4. 24 (D). On cf. v. 43 note.

Deut. 4. 35, 39. Cf. also the exclamation
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of the populace upon the issue of the trial between Elijah and the false prophets, ch. 18. 39.

61. 'ו התלבה' Cf. ch. 11. 4; 15. 3, 14 (all Rö). LXX, Luc., Vulg. suggest מפיב for התלבה; probably an alteration suggested by the following הלאו.

Note on v. 57.

Ch. 2. 3, 4 note.

Ch. 3. 6 note.

62. מפיב] Luc. ορνών Κυπλου του Θεοῦ, perhaps under the influence of הלאו 'v. 57.

63. ו] LXX omits.

64. מפיב] 'The fat or choice portions of the peace-offerings.' So Lev. 6. 5; 2 Chr. 29. 35; cf. Gen. 4. 4 mבכרצת קאמנ רהמבל שלמה 'of the firstlings of his flock and of their fat pieces.' The slight variations of LXX, Luc. in the enumeration of the sacrifices are due to error in transmission of the Greek text.

65. מפיב] The phrase is that of Rö. Cf. ch. 14. 1 note. In Deuteronomy מפיב is of frequent occurrence in the retrospects, when events more or less contemporaneous are co-ordinated by the writer; 1. 9, 16, 18; 2. 34; 3. 4, 8, 12, 18, 21, 23; 4. 14; 5. 5; 9. 20; 10. 1, 8. Possibly also מפיב מנה פותח v. 64a may mark the hand of Rö, though this phrase is not so characteristic. In ch. 13. 3; 16. 16; 22. 35; II. 3. 6 the expression is quite as likely to be part of the old narrative. On מנה פותח Rö cf. II. 10. 32.

66. מפיב] 'The Feast'; i.e. probably the Feast of Tabernacles as the most important festival of the year; cf. Neh. 8. 14; v. 2 note.

מלכה] The whole kingdom from extreme north to extreme south. Jeroboam II is said to have restored the kingdom of Israel מלכה תחת יד רוחב II. 14. 25; cf. Am. 6. 14. מפיב lit. 'at the entry of'; Num. 13. 21; 34. 8; Josh. 13. 5; Judg. 3. 3; 1 Chr. 13. 5; Ezek. 47. 20; 48. 1; Mal. 3. 17; 2 Chr. 5. 9; Mal. 2 Chr. 26. 8; Ezk. 47. 15. On מפיב, the Wady el-Arta, cf. ch. 5. 1 note.

Note on v. 57. After this LXX, Luc. have the words מפיב ל unordered, מפיב רע and מפיב ו unordered (Luc. adds...
LXX has here simply ἐπὶ τὰ ἡμέρας, i.e. the remaining words ... being omitted. The manner in which the next verse continues, '_while the ... LXX, Luc., cai in τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κ.α., establishes the genuineness of the shorter sentence, and points to the conclusion that the remainder of the sentence is an insertion in accordance with 2 Chr. 7. 9, probably due to R\textsuperscript{p}. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort.

The omission of the \textit{i} was made when the gloss was added at the end of the previous verse.

LXX καὶ εἰδογγέας αὐτῶν, 'and they blessed him,' i.e. the king, as in MT. The plural verb with ἔδωκας as subj. is rendered in LXX by sing., as e.g. in ch. 1. 39, 40; 12. 30; al. Luc., however, taking καὶ εἰδογγέας αὐτῶν in the sense 'and he blessed \textit{it},' i.e. the people, makes the addition καὶ εἰδογγέας καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν βασιλείας, and thus exhibits a double rendering.

So Est. 5. 9. מברך has the meaning cheerful or merry; Prov. 15. 15 מברך has the meaning cheerful or merry; the merry-hearted has a continual feast.' Cf. Judg. 16. 25 Q're מברך; Eccl. 9. 7 מברך; and the verbal phrase 'one's heart is cheerful,' ch. 21. 7; Judg. 18. 20; 19. 6, 9; Ruth 3. 7. מברך 'cheerfulness of heart,' Deut. 28. 47; Isa. 65. 14.

\section*{9. 1–9. Solomon's Second Vision.}

Ch. 9. 1–9=2 Chr. 7. 12–22.

1–9. This account is coloured throughout by the spirit of Deuteronomy, and, owing to the terms in which it speaks of the exile of Israel and the destruction of the Temple (vv. 7–9; cf. emendation in v. 8), is regarded by Kue., Wellh., Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit. as the work of R\textsuperscript{p} in exilic times.

Such a conclusion, however, is by no means inevitable. The
expression of v. 3 'ו וְּלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה' goes quite as far to prove a pre-exilic position, as do the words of vv. 6–9 to argue a post-exilic point of view; nor are the terms of these latter verses so definite as to forbid the opinion that they were penned by R Priest in the reign of Josiah; cf. note on ch. 8. 46–49 under vv. 14–66 note. If vv. 7–9 do imply an exilic standpoint, vv. 6–9 (and not the whole section) will belong to R Priest, vv. 1–5 to R Priest.

1. 'ו וְּלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה' 'All the pleasure of Solomon which he wished to do.' The substantive מָלָאַה only occurs again Isa. 21. 4 'ְלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה, 'the twilight of my pleasure,' and in v. 19, § 2 Chr. 8. 6, with the cognate verb, וְּלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה מַמָּרָה, Pesh., Targ., which render in v. 1 'ְלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה מַמָּרָה, and similarly in v. 19, appear therefore in the former verse, as in the latter, to have read מָלָאַה for מָלָאַה, probably correctly. LXX, Luc. καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν προσευχήν σου, Vulg. paraphrastically, et omne quod oportuerat et voluerat facere.

3. 'ו וְּלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה' The expressions of R Priest in ch. 8; cf. vv. 33, 38, 54; al. LXX τὴν φωνὴν τῆς προσευχῆς σου κ.τ.λ., i.e. 'ו וְּלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה; but Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ. as MT.

After מָלָאַה LXX, Luc. add (Luc. ἰδοὺ) προσευχή (LXX σου) καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν προσευχήν σου, i.e. 'ו וְּלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה; so Th., Kio., Oort. The words are probably genuine; cf. ch. 3. 12 מָלָאַה, מָלָאַה נוּת.

'ו וְּלֵאָשֶׁם שוש יְשִׁמְךָּ וּרְעַע עֹֽשֶׁה' 'I have hallowed,' referring to the previous manifestation of Yahwe's glory in the house, ch. 8. 10; or else a perfect of certitude referring to time really future, as in English we might say 'I hallow.' For this latter explanation cf. Dri. Tenses, § 13.

'Sh'ma Yisrael' So ch. 11. 36; 14. 21; II. 21. 4, 7 (referring to I. 9. 3) all R Priest. Cf. Sm. שְׂמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמָע שָׁמָו שָׁמָו
IX. i-6

The phrase is very characteristic of Deut., occurring 4. 40; 5. 26; 6. 24; 11. 1; 14. 23; 18. 5; 19. 9; 28. 29, 33; cf. also Josh. 4. 24 (D');
1 Sam. 2. 32, 35 (Deut. redactor); Jer. 31. 35; 32. 39; 33. 18; 35. 19. Thus the expression used absolutely appears to be purely Deuteronomic. In Deut. 4. 10; 12. 1; 31. 13; ch. 8. 40 it is defined and to some extent limited by the added words used in a strictly limited sense of the lifetime of an individual (non-Deut.) cf. ch. 5. 15 note.

1. So ch. 11. 36, 39; II. 8. 19; 17. 37 (all R').

2. "As I spake concerning David." So ch. 2. 4

3. Several Codd., however, read מִצְבָּת וּבְדָיִן instead of מִצְבָּת וּבְדָיִן, and this is also suggested by LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ.

4. Ch. 2. 3, 4 note.

5. Cf. Num. 14. 43; 32. 15 (both JE); Josh. 22. 16, 18, 23, 29 (P?); 1 Sam. 15. 11; Jer. 3. 19.

6. Ch. 2. 3, 4 note.

7. So exactly || 2 Chr. 7. 19; Josh. 23. 16 (D'); cf. Deut. 11. 16; 17. 3. The phrase occurs also Deut. 7. 4; 13. 7, 14; 28. 36, 64; Jer. 16. 13; Judg. 10. 13 (Deut. compiler); Josh. 24. 2, 16 (E); 1 Sam. 8. 8; 26. 19; cf. Jer. 44. 3.
II. 17. 35; Deut. 8. 19; 13. 3; 28. 14; 30. 17; 31. 20; Jer. 11. 10; 13. 10; 16. 11; 22. 9; 25. 6; 35. 15; Judg. 2. 19 (Deut. compiler).

Deut. 8. 19; 13. 3; 28. 1-4; 30. 17; Jer. 11. 10; 13. 10; 16. 11; 22. 9; 25. 6; 35. 15; Judg. 2. 19 (Deut. compiler).


8. This can only mean 'And this house shall be most high,' and we cannot, with R.V., force the language and render 'And though this house be so high.'

Ps. 44. 15; 69. 12; Ezek. 14. 8 (Cf. Jer. 15. 1). Such a text, however, would imply that the Chronicler copied Deut. 34. 25 from Kings before textual corruption set in; and in this case, why did he not also transcribe Deut. 34. 25? Or are we to suppose that he did copy these words, and that
IX. 7-10

subsequently through coincidence this reference to נ触发 disappeared both from Kings and Chronicles?

Vulg. *Et domus haece erit in exemplum* is a paraphrase of which it is impossible to determine the precise original.

[כָּלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה (ל)] Cf. Jer. 18. 16 (reference to the land of Israel); 19. 8 (Jerusalem); 49. 17 (Edom); 50. 13 (Babylon); Zeph. 2. 15 (Nineveh). Similar also is Lam. 2. 15.

[כַּמִּי] For this question put by the heathen from outside, together with its answer in v. 9, cf. Deut. 29. 23-27; Jer. 22. 8f.

[כִּתְבָּה] The phrase occurs only here and in [2 Chr. 7. 22. Deut. above quoted has לֹא יִתְנוּבָה אֶלֶּהָ מְאֻוּרִים; Jer. כִּתְבָּה אֶלֶּהָ מְאֻוּרִים לַחֲדָּו; כִּתְבָּה יְהוֹ הַגֶּזֶרֶת לִמְדִידָו.

9. 10—10. 29. Further details of Solomon's magnificence and wisdom.

Chhh. 9. 10—10. 29 = 2 Chr. 8. 1—9. 24, 27, 28. 2 Chr. 1. 14—17.

Mainly a series of short notices drawn from the same sources as chhh. 4—5. 14. The originals appear to have been cut up and pieced together with no great skill; but whether the arrangement throughout is due to Rⁿ, or later hands have employed themselves in altering the sequence of the account, it is impossible to determine. In LXX, Luc. the arrangement is somewhat different, but scarcely superior, to that of MT.; v. 24a (יְהוֹ for וה; add שָׁמָּהּ מִצְבָּה after יְהוֹ), vv. 10–14 (om. מְאֻוּרִים v. 10a), vv. 26–28 (v. 26a being connected on to v. 14 by addition of the words מֵעֲפָר אוּלַיְּהוֹ—a later device), ch. 10. 1—22; ch. 9. 15, 17b—22; ch. 10. 23—25; v. 26 combined with ch. 5. 6; ch. 5. 13; ch. 10. 27—29.

One single original document appears to be represented by ch. 9. 10, 17, 18, 19, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, and these verses may very well have originally taken this order, the completion of Solomon's building operations being first narrated, and then followed by an account of the forced levy raised to carry out these works. After v. 23 there probably followed in the original a list of the names of the אֲדֹנָיָא. The statement of v. 24b, connected by Rⁿ to v. 24a by נ (ch. 3. 16 note), is probably from the same document.
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Next to the account of the king’s building activity—his most important work, there would naturally follow mention of his achievement next in importance—the provision of an efficient shipping for the increase of his wealth from external sources. This succeeds in ch. 9. 26-28; ch. 10. 11. But reference to the ships naturally leads up to mention of the imports introduced by their means, as we see in ch. 9. 28; ch. 10. 11, and the use to which these rare and valuable materials were put. Thus there follows ch. 10. 12, 14-22. The general subject of imports suggests allusion to a specially important item—horses from Egypt (or Muṣri), apparently first introduced into the kingdom of Solomon in any considerable numbers:—ch. 10. 26 (with ch. 5. 6; see note on 4. 20—5. 14), 28, 29.

Thus the disturbing factors introduced into this main account are seen to be ch. 9. 11-13, 14, 16, 24, 25; ch. 10. 1-10, 13, 23-25, 27. Notice in ch. 9. 11, 16, 24 the awkward pluperfects pointed by the order—subj., verb, obj., מַאֲשָׁר הָאָדָם וְיָדָיו וְעֵינָיו חָיוֹת וָעָרָיִן וְעֵינָיו וָעָרָיִן, and marking the passages as mere excerpts from sources which in describing a regular sequence of events must have read יָדָיו וְעֵינָיו חָיוֹת וָעָרָיִן וְכֵן, and together with ch. 10. 2-3 has been seen to fall into its proper position after v. 14 of ch. 5. From the same source would seem to be derived v. 24 and v. 25, though clearly alien to its immediate context, cannot definitely be assigned to any special source. Ch. 10. 1-10, 13 is an ancient narrative introduced at this point to illustrate Solomon’s wealth and wisdom, much in the same way as ch. 3. 16-28 serves to depict his discernment in judgement; and the two stories may very possibly be derived from the same source. Finally, vv. 23-25, 27 of ch. 10, couched in vague and generalizing statement, are probably relatively late.
in origin, and are here introduced to give the finishing touch to the picture of Solomon's prosperity.


12. [כִּי] On the use of נָחַל as employed by R D cf. ch. 3. 16 note. In place of this notice we find in the parallel account 2 Chr. 8. 1, 2 the statement that Hiram gave Solomon certain cities, and that Solomon built these and settled Israelite inhabitants in them; an explanation of the transaction probably grounded upon objection to the idea that Solomon parted with any portion of his territory. Jos. (Ant. viii. 5, § 3) states that when Hiram had inspected the cities and found them displeasing, he sent word to Solomon that he did not need them.

'Land of the circuit' or 'district,' the title applied to a region in Naphtali on the north border of the kingdom of Israel, and adjoining Hiram's dominions. Cf. Josh. 20. 7; 21. 32; 1 Chr. 6. 61, where שֵׁם is mentioned as belonging to this district. In Isa. 8. 23 the phrase מַעַל 'district of the nations' is applied to the land of Zebulon and Naphtali, and would seem to imply that the population was for the most part non-Israelite. Ezek. 47. 8; Josh. 13. 2 (נָהָר נַחֲלָת); 18. 17; 22. 10, 11 (נָהָר נַח); Joel 4. 4, are used more generally as geographical terms.

13. [נַחֲלָת] The name is obviously regarded as employed to express Hiram's dissatisfaction with the cities. Thus Ew.'s explanation is probably correct, that the name is connected with בַּעַל 'like nothing;' so 'good for nothing;' 'worthless.' This does not embody a true etymology, but is intended for a witty play of words suggested by similarity of sound; cf. Gen. 11. 9 בַּעַל connected with בַּעַל as if for בַּעַל; Mic. 1. 10—15 נְתֵנִי לְךָ נֵבֶן play upon רֶנֶב, נב, נַבֶּה, נַבֶּה נַבֶּה, נַבֶּה נַבֶּה נַבֶּה — נַבֶּה, נַבֶּה — נַבֶּה, נַבֶּה — נַבֶּה, נַבֶּה — נַבֶּה; al. Jos. (Ant. viii. 5, § 3) explains μεθερμηνευόμενον γὰρ τὸ Χαβαλῶν κατὰ Φασίκας γλῶσσαν, 'οὐκ ἀρίστον' σημαίνει, a statement which seems to have no further foundation than the inference to be drawn from v. 1a. LXX, Luc. in interpreting 'Orów, must have read לָבָא. Talm., Shabbath, 54b,
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gives the fanciful derivation 'a land in which men dwelt who were bound with silver and gold (fetters).’ No modern interpretation commends itself.

is mentioned, Josh. 19. 37, as one of the towns assigned to Asher; and Jos. (Vit. 43-44) speaks of קבא in the district of Ptolemais forty stadia west of Jotaparta. The town is identified by Rob. (BR. iii. 88) with the modern Kabal. Thus it may be supposed that the name of one of the twenty cities was given by Hiram to the whole district.

 Cf. ch. 8. 8 note.

Part of the fortifications of the city of David, existing in the old Jebusite city (2 Sam. 5. 9; || 1 Chr. 11. 8), and mentioned, as here, in connexion with the walling up of the breaches of the city (ch. 11. 27), and the repair of the wall and towers by Hezekiah (2 Chr. 32. 5). Joash is said to have been murdered at מָלֹֽלַת (II. 12. 21), but it is not clear whether this was at Jerusalem; and in Judg. 9. 6, 20 a מָלֹֽלַת is mentioned in connexion with the city of Shechem.

The word is usually connected with the root מָלֹֽלַת be filled, and interpreted as meaning something which fills or banks up (a Piel form causat. of Qal), and thus an earthwork. So Targ. renders מָלֹֽלַת, this word being elsewhere used to translate Hebrew מָלֹֽלַת; 2 Sam. 20. 15 מָלֹֽלַת נִמְלַת אֵלֶֽה - then מָלֹֽלַת נִמְלַת עֲלֵי הָרָאשָׁה; 19. 32; Jer. 32. 24; al. Cf. also Talm. מָלֹֽלַת 'filled-up ground or mound,' Baba bathra, 54a שֵׁן מָלֹֽלַת אָדָם בּוֹנֶה 'If one takes earth from the mound and throws it on the low ground.' This derivation cannot, however, be regarded as certain. The word may, as Moore (Judg. 9. 6) suggests, be Canaanite in origin; and it seems reasonable to suppose that the Millo was not a simple earthwork, but rather a massive fortress or tower built into that part of the city wall where such a protection was specially needed. So LXX, Luc. render מָלֹֽלַת, מָלֹֽלַת מְלַג, Judg. 9. 46, may thus perhaps be identical with מָלֹֽלַת of 9. 6, 20.

A chief city of North Canaan belonging to King Jabin, and
captured and burnt by Joshua (Josh. 11. 10; al.). The city was not far from the waters of Merom, the modern lake of Hülleh (Josh. 11. 5), and was afterwards assigned to the tribe of Naphtali (Josh. 19. 36). In Judg. 4 a second Jabin king of Hazor is mentioned as oppressing Israel, and as conquered by Deborah and Barak. The site is not well ascertained. Buhl (Geogr. 236) finds the name preserved in the modern name of the valley Merj-el-Hadtre, S.S.W. of Kedes (Josh. 19. 37), on the N. side of the Wadi 'Auba which runs into the lake of Hülleh. Cf. also Baed. 297.

[2] A town on the border of Ephraim assigned by Joshua as a Levitical city (Josh. 16. 3; 21. 21). Horam king of Gezer came to the assistance of Lachish against Joshua, but was defeated and his army utterly destroyed by the Israelites (Josh. 10. 33). The city of Gezer, however, held out against the invader, and seems to have remained in the hands of its Canaanite (and Perizzite, LXX) inhabitants until the days of Solomon (Josh. 16. 10). The site of Gezer has been discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau in the modern Till-jeur about eighteen miles W.N.W. of Jerusalem. On this and on the inscription רִיצֹת, i.e. probably 'the boundary of Gezer,' which confirms the authenticity of the site, cf. PEF. 1873, 78 f.; 1875, 74 f.; Hastings, BD. s.v.; Smith, Hist. Geogr. 215 ff.

16. רִיצֹת 'A dowry' given when the wife is 'sent away' from the home of her parents; cf. Mic. 1. 14, and the use of the verb כָּרַע Gen. 24. 59.

17. רִיצֹת Also in distinction from רִיצֹת (1 Chr. 7. 24; al.) without closer specification also occurs: Josh. 10. 10, 11; 18. 14; al. In Josh. 10. 10, 11, LXX reads 'אִירָבָא, i.e. לְךָרַע 'the two Horons'; so 2 Sam. 13. 34 and elsewhere (Isa. 15. 5; al.) is a Moabite city. The two Beth-horons were upon the boundary line of Ephraim (Josh. 16. 3, 5), and the pass running between them was the scene of Joshua's pursuit of
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the five Amorite kings who made a combined attack upon Gibeon ( Josh. 10. 10)^11). In modern times they have been with certainty identified, the lower with Beit 'Ur et-lahla, the upper with Beit 'Ur el-faqa, the former being about one mile north-west of the latter, which is some three or four miles north-west of Gibeon,—el-faqa. See Rob. BR. iii. 250 f., PEF. Mem. iii. 86.

18. תַּעֲבוּן || 2 Chr. 8. 6. Mentioned Josh. 19. 44 as a city assigned to Dan. The conjectural site is Bel'ah about two and a-half miles north of Beit 'Ur et-lahla. PEF. Mem. ii. 256. Q're el-faqa, i.e. Palmyra the modern Tadmur, is supported by all Verss. 1, and by || 2 Chr. 8. 4 (so all Verss.). The other towns, however, mentioned vv. 17, 18 are all in South Palestine, and in Ezek. 47. 19; 48. 28 we have a בִּלְעֶן cited as being in the extreme south of the land—בְּלִעֵן דְּבָא. Thus in spite of || 2 Chr., which connects Solomon's building of Tadmor with a successful campaign against Hamath-zobah, Kit. in our passage seems to deserve the preference. So Bo., Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit.; Smith, Hist. Geogr. 270 note 2, 580 note 2.

19. תֶּן נֶאֶה שְׁמוֹאֵל || 2 Chr. 8. 4. 'In the wilderness in the land'; a vague and pointless statement. שְׁמוֹאֵל cannot be intended to distinguish the city from another of the same name outside the land, for in such a case a closer definition of the locality would be expected. Vulg. in terra solitudinis, Pesh. תָּבָא הָכָּה יִסְדָּה אָשֶׁר, 'in the desert country.' The phrase תֶּן נֶאֶה שְׁמוֹאֵל occurs only in the poetical passage Deut. 32. 10 and in Prov. 21. 19, but might reasonably be used in plain prose. Targ. follows MT., while LXX, Luc. ( ch. 10. 23) omit. Very probably שְׁמוֹאֵל is the corruption of some place-name. So Bo. נֶאֵל שְׁמוֹאֵל; plausible, but rather far towards the south. Kit. סְגִ'א יָדָיו. Perles (Analekten zur Textkritik des A.T., 22), following Eichhorn, regards שְׁמוֹאֵל as a contraction של הנא, upon the view that Q're תֶּן נֶאֶה שְׁמוֹאֵל is correct, and comparing 2 Chr. 8. 3, 4.

1. LXX οὖσι τῆς γῆς, i.e. χώρα τῆς γῆς, 1 being misread τ. The passage in LXX occurs ch. 10. 23.
This form of *casus pendens*, where a substantive is reinforced by the pronominal suffix of a following substantive, is idiomatic and frequent. 1 Sam. 2.10; Gen. 17.15; Josh. 34.8. Cf. other instances in Dri. Tenses, § 197, 2.

The predicate introduced by a *consecutive* after the preceding *accusativus pendens* is a rather uncommon construction. Cf. ch. 12.17; ch. 15.13; Dri. Tenses, § 127 a.

Cf. ch. 8.8 note. But cf. the statement of ch. 5.27, and see ch. 4.6 note.

A word of unknown meaning and derivation. LXX which here omits (Cod. A, Luc. τρισάρως) elsewhere usually renders τρισάρων, a term to which Origen on Ex. 14.7 gives as one explanation among others the meaning, *one of three warriors in a chariot*; ἐκ τῶν πολίμων ἄρματα ἐνοίκον μεγάλα, ὡς καὶ τριῶν χωρίν· ὥστε μὴ εἰς ἤνωσιν, οἱ δὲ δύο πολεμῶσιν. So Greg. Nyss.; cf. the more precise rendering of LXX in Ex. 15.4 διοδόσις τρισάρων. This explanation, which appears to depend upon the context of Ex. 14.7, has been adopted by some moderns, but is purely conjectural, and is rightly opposed by Dillmann, who points out that the ancient chariot as figured on the monuments has usually but two occupants—the driver and the fighting man, and that only kings and the highest officers would have had in addition a third man as shield-bearer. It may be added that in accordance with Ex. 14.7 third man could not describe a spare man acting as armour-bearer, but would denote the most important occupant of the chariot, viz. the combatant. This meaning, however, is opposed to the use of the word of an officer immediately attendant upon a king, whether in a chariot (II.9.25) or elsewhere (II.7.2, 17, 19; 15.25).
Derivation thus failing, the most that can be said is that, judging from the context of our passage (נִצְכָּרָה בְּרֵבוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל) II. 9. 25; 10. 25 (ֹלְמַע לָמִּי_coupled with רְשָׁם 'foot-runners’ as though in contra-distinction); Ex. 14. 7, וַיֶּלֶשֵׁת may have been a class of warriors usually connected with chariots; but it is with wisdom that AV., RV. 'captains’ agree with Vulg. duces, Pesh. —Targ. in rendering by a very general term.

23. יַּדֶּשֶׁת יְהֹוָה תָּבוֹא [LXX (section following ch. 2. 35) gives the number as τρεῖς χιλιάδες καὶ ἓκατάκοσον, Luc. τρεῖς χιλιάδες καὶ ἓκατάκοσον—probably an arbitrary alteration of the translator with the view of bringing the number into correspondence with that of ch. 5. 30 with which our verse is closely parallel in wording. The other Verss. support MT. 550.

Possibly after the completion of the Temple and Palace the number of the מִשְׁאֵֽלִים מַעֲרָה may have been greatly diminished, and in any case it is easier to believe that the exact parallelism of the Greek translator is a change for the sake of conformity, than that vice versa the alteration was made in MT. for no apparent reason. II 2 Chr. 8. 10 gives the number as מְשִׁלֵּים מַעֲרָה, a variation explained by Kennicott as a misreading ז for י; but such a method of notation in early OT. MSS. is highly improbable. Cf. ch. 6. 1 note.

24. יָכַּח] Very difficult. Th. explains 'As soon as . . . then he built, &c.’ יָכַּח has here a restrictive sense only or scarcely, and the meaning as soon as is determined by the following יַחֲצֵּא which marks the point of time immediately following that denoted by יָכַּח. But the case is scarcely parallel to the only two examples which can be compared, Gen. 27. 30 יָכַּח . . , וַיַּחֲצֵּא יָכַּח יָכַּח, and Judg. 7. 19 יָכַּח יָכַּח אַחֲצָא אֵל יָכַּח, for in both these passages great stress is laid upon the very immediate sequence in time of the two events described, and to suppose the existence of a similar stress in our passage would be absurd. Moreover, the back reference of יַחֲצֵּא to יָכַּח is opposed to the characteristic usage of this former particle in Kings—its employment with merely vague reference to the period which is being described, and without
distinct attachment to any definite point of time (ch. 3. 16 note). And further, the change of subject implied in וְהָבֹא, without mention of the new subject וֹאֵל, is very strange. Thus some slight corruption of the text may reasonably be supposed.

Vulg., Pesh., Targ. seem to agree with MT., except for the addition of וֹאֵל after וְהָבֹא in Vulg., Pesh.—probably a translator's addition made for the sake of lucidity. LXX, Luc. offer two renderings—the first in the insertion following ch. 2. 35, the second in immediate sequence to ch. 9. 9. The former translation exactly follows MT., except for reading אוֹרְס, i.e. probably א, in place of יָאֵל. The latter rendering is somewhat different:—

This agrees closely with the MT. of 2 Chr. 8. 11: and supposing the LXX translator to have inserted אוֹרְס upon his own responsibility or through a misreading א for יא, and also to have read יא for יא, א, we may believe the original text of our passage to have been This emendation removes all difficulties above noticed. The יא of MT. will thus be a scribe's error for יא due to the occurrence of the same two letters in יא the word immediately preceding; and further, it is possible that יא may have been copied by mistake for יא and that later on a second scribe, perceiving that יא must thus refer to יא may have altered it into the feminine יא.

25. יא יא 'Used to offer;' frequentative.

יא יא 'Scarcely original. The curious יא cannot be used in place of יא and refer to the altar (Pesh., Targ., Ges.), nor can we believe (Ew., Th.) that it refers to Solomon;—

'He would offer incense by himself' (without the intervention of another) 1. LXX, Luc. (after ch. 2. 35) altogether omit the words יא יא, and seem simply to have read יא יא. So Oort.

1 Th. cites Gen. 39. 6; Isa. 44. 24 for this use of יא, and regards יא as a mistaken insertion.
Klo. ingeniously suggests "and would burn his fire-offering before Yahwe"—a very plausible emendation.

RV. 'So he finished the house,' and so all Verss.;—LXX, Luc. καὶ συνετέλεσεν τὸν οἶκον, Vulg. perfectumque est templum, Pesh. מִלְפָּה יֵשׁ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל. It is impossible, however, to explain why the perfect with 1 consecutive should be thus used, as though the fact narrated were in due sequence to the preceding frequentatives רָכַּב...חַלָּה; and moreover such a statement is out of place in this connexion, where events are being recorded which must have taken place only after the completion and consecration of the building. Hence Ew. renders 'and he would take leave of (say farewell to) the house'; Th. 'and he would completely furnish the house,' i.e. provide upon each occasion of his visits that all the requirements of the Temple and its services should be fully met. Neither of these translations can be justified by analogy; and it seems not improbable that the letters כֵּכַּב are a mistaken repetition of כָּכַּב in the earlier part of the verse, and that a later addition to form a complete sentence intended to convey the meaning given by the Verss.

26. 'Which is near Eloth'; an idiomatic use of the preposition in definition of locality. Cf. II. 9. 27 רָכַּב יָדָיוֹ, רָכַּב יָדָיוֹ, רָכַּב יָדָיוֹ, Judges 3. 19; 4. 14; Ezek. 43. 8. For the similar use of ב see ch. 1. 9 note.

28. LXX τοῦ περί τῶν Εύαρσίων is unsupported by Luc. and the other Verss., all of which agree with MT.

10. 1. 'Through the name of Yahwe'; lit. 'at the name.' The meaning is that the fame of Yahwe's name led to the diffusion of a report concerning the wise and prosperous king who enjoyed His favour and protection; and this is in full accordance with the prominence which the queen in this story assigns to Yahwe as the chooser and supporter of Solomon (v. 9). The phrase 'בֵּית בְּשׁומָה occurs elsewhere Josh. 9. 9; Isa. 60. 9; Jer. 3. 17, and the nuance of the preposition is closely similar to that in the expression בְּשׁוֹם 'at the sound of'; Jer. 10. 13 מִי בְּשׁוֹם בְּשׁוֹם; 11. 16; 51. 16; Ezek. 27. 28; Hab. 3. 16; Ps. 42. 8; Job 21. 12. Cf. also
Ps. 18. 45; 'At the hearing of the ear they shall obey me'; Job 42. 5.

There is thus no need to have recourse to the emendation of Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., "and the report of the house which he had built to the name of Yahwe." LXX, Luc. καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ χατάνθον. Pesh. <...> are probably merely loose renderings, and do not presuppose יֵלָד, in place of which, as Th. points out, we should rightly expect יֵלָד.

RV. 'hard questions' is perhaps the best rendering; cf. Prov. 1. 6. The word here denotes something less trivial than the mere riddle of Samson, Judg. 14. 12 ff., but, on the other hand, has not advanced to the later sense of a perplexing question of ethics or morals, Ps. 49. 5; 78. 2.

2. [Ch. 8. 17 note.] 'The sitting of his servants and the attendance of his ministers.' For מִיתָב in this sense cf. the phrase מַעְרְא לְפַן used of service; ch. 1. 2 note. This explanation alone suits the context. The whole of v. 5 down to דַּעְשׁ refers to Solomon's magnificent display at his banquets. לְפַן are his courtiers and מִיתָב his waiters, and naturally in this connexion their gorgeous robes call for special notice. On the other hand, Th.'s explanation of מִיתָב as substantives of place, denoting the dwellings or quarters of Solomon's servants, is quite alien to the context. It is impossible to think that the mere dwellings of the king's servants should be singled out either for their magnificence or number as exciting the queen's admiration, while no special mention is made of the impression left upon her by the sight of the Palace, the Temple, and the Lebanon house. The mention also of the garments and the cup-bearers is upon this interpretation deprived of significance.

There is no difficulty in assigning to these substantives with מִיתָב preformative a signification other than that of place. The Arabic nouns of this form (nomina vasis) are used of place or time, and e.g. לְפַן 'the place where, or time when, several persons sit, room, assembly, party' (Wright, i. 221) may aptly be quoted in this special
connexion. So in Hebrew we may cf. e.g. מֵאֶנְתָּן, מָסַר, where, as with מְתוֹךְ, מְתוֹךְ, the idea of time or place of action seems to have passed further into definition of the action itself.

Pesh. adds זָמָן זָמָן i.e. a repetition of the previous זָמָן; an unnecessary redundancy.

[And his burnt-offering which he used to offer at the house of Yahwe.] Here it is still the large scale of the king's doings, rather than his buildings, which forms the writer's theme. So all Verss. both here and in 2 Chr. 9. 4, RV. marg., Th., Klo., Kamp., Kit. 2 Chr. reads כי לה, doubtless intending to convey the sense 'the ascent by which he used to go up to the house of Yahwe'; and this rendering is adopted by RV., Ke., Ew.

[There was no more spirit in her.] i.e. Solomon's display of wisdom and magnificence deprived her of all courage to attempt further to compete with him. The nuance of מַר is like that in the English expression 'a woman of spirit,' and may be partly paralleled by the use of the term in ch. 21. 5; Gen. 45. 27 and the phrases אֶל-יָהוֹPs. 34. 19.

The common explanation following LXX, Luc. οἱ ἐποιήσαν ἑγκέντρω, 'she was beside herself (with astonishment),' misses the precise meaning.

6. [Truth was the saying.] The abstract substantive, used in place of an adjective; cf. ch. 2. 13 note, and Dri. Tenses, § 189, a. The order of words is highly emphatic; Tenses, § 208.

7. [And he did not let his heart.] LXX οὐκ εἰσίν (Luc. οὐκ εἰσίν kiart) τὸ ζῷον καθός ἑπτάχρονον μοι, merely a somewhat paraphrastic rendering of the same text. In place of מי, 2 Chr. 9. 6 has מִמְזוֹבֶל וֹעֵבָר מִמְזוֹבֶל. Probably correct.

[and he did not let his heart.] LXX, Luc. προστίθεναι ἐγκέντρω πρὸς (LXX αὐτὰ ἐν) πᾶσαν τὴν ἁστυν ἡ ζευγαρία ἐν τῷ γάμῳ μοι, i.e. ὡς αὐτὲς τῆς ἐποιήσης τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ τῆς ζωῆς. Probably correct.

The common seems to be the addition of a later precisionist, and is really covered by מי which includes everything which makes for prosperity. The repetition of מי (from v. 6) is not out of place.
LXX ὁδὸς αὐτὰ ἐνὶ πᾶσαν κ.τ.λ. probably arises from repetition of ἀν read first as ἀνύλη.
|| 2 Chr. ὀδὴ ἀνύλη ἄνετως ἀνέπνεον. LXX, Luc., Pesh. presuppose ἄνύλη, 'thy wives'; so in || 2 Chr. 9. 7 Luc. (Pesh. omits). Adopted by Bö., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort. correctly. ἄνύλη by the side of ὀδὴ is redundant, and, as Klo. suggests, may be a later alteration in view of the facts of ch. 11. 1-3.

8. ἄνετως] LXX, Luc., Pesh. presuppose ἄνύλη, 'thy wives'; so in || 2 Chr. 9. 7 Luc. (Pesh. omits). Adopted by Bö., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort. correctly. ἄνύλη by the side of ὀδὴ is redundant, and, as Klo. suggests, may be a later alteration in view of the facts of ch. 11. 1-3.

9. ὀδὴ] LXX ὀδὴν ἔις τὸν ἀλόξα, Luc. τὸν ὀδὴν αὐτῶν ἔις τὸν ἀλόξα agree with || 2 Chr. 9. 8 ἄνύλην ἀνύλην. This addition, which is almost indispensable, may be adopted. Klo.'s emendation ἄνετως is not to be preferred.

10. ἀνά] So v. 12+. ἀνά ἄνετως 2 Chr. 2. 7; 9. 10, 11+. The tree is usually thought to be the red sandal-wood (Pterocarpus santalinus) which is very heavy, fine grained, and of a brilliant red colour, and is said still to be highly esteemed in the east for the construction of lyres and other musical instruments. The meaning and derivation of the word are, however, quite uncertain: Hastings, BD. i. 63; Tristram, 332. LXX ἔιλα πελεκτρά (Luc. ἀπελεκτρά), Vulg. ligna thyina, Pesh. מְלֶאכָּה (explained by lex. as a scented and variegated wood, sandal-wood), Targ. מְלֶאכָּה (explained by lex. as a scented and variegated wood, sandal-wood).

11. ἀνά] 'A support' or 'supports,' i.e. upon the easiest interpretation, pilasters or light buttresses; so LXX, Luc. οἰστορητικόμαρα, Vulg. fulcra. The substantive only occurs here, and || 2 Chr. 9. 11 reads ἀνά, perhaps 'terraces' or 'verandahs,' an explanation which Th. seeks to fit also to ἀνύλη. This rendering, however, like that of Pesh. מְלֶאכָּה, 'ornamentation,' Ke., Ew. 'balusters' or 'balustrade,' Bö., Klo. 'furniture,' depends merely upon conjecture.

12. מָלֵאכָּה] 'There came not thus (i.e. in such quantity and of such excellence) almug trees,' and so, by accommodation to Eng. idiom, 'there came not such almug trees.' Cf. Ex. 10. 14 מִלְּבָדֶד לֹא דְעָלִים with a tenth or twelfth century.'

1 The latest discussion is that by Cheyne (Expository Times, July, 1898, pp. 470 ff.), who cites Assy. ḫammāku, a tree used by Sennacherib in building his palaces.
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After מַלְשִׁנָה in v. 12b LXX, Luc. add τινὶ ὡς γινώσκει, i.e. מִצְרָיִם, perhaps correctly. Cf. 2 Chr. 9. 11 מַלְשִׁנָה אֲשֶׁר בָּא הָיוּ וְלָצְבוּ אֶל. 12. מַלְשִׁנָה. Ch. 8. 8 note.

13. מַלְשִׁנָה] Upon the emphatic position of the subject, in antithesis to v. 10a, cf. ch. 5. 25 note.

14. רַבָּה] ‘According to the king’s hand,’ i.e. his ‘bounty.’ So Est. 1. 7; 2. 18t. 12 Chr. 9. 12 reads בָּא הָיוּ אֲשֶׁר בָּא הָיוּ וְלָצְבוּ אֶל, for which Ber. emends מַלְשִׁנָה.

15. מַלְשִׁנָה] Very difficult. Supposing מַלְשִׁנָה to denote ‘men of the merchants’ (though רַבָּה spy out, investigate has nowhere else the sense of trading, and the phrase מַלְשִׁנָה is peculiar); we still seek allusion, not to the traders themselves, but to the revenue which they produced. Thus RV., going further than MT. warrants, renders ‘Beside that which the chapmen brought’; LXX, Luc. ἄριστος τῶν φορων τῶν ἰντεραγγείου, Targ. ב וַיָּקְרָא מַלְשִׁנָה אֲשֶׁר בָּא הָיוּ וְלָצְבוּ אֶל ‘beside the duties &c.’; cf. II. 23. 33 where וַיָּקְרָא is rendered φοραὶ by Luc.; 2 Chr. 36. 3 שָׁנַח LXX, Luc. καὶ ἀνεῖβαλεν φοραὶ. So Bo. לַבּוּר מַלְשִׁנָה, Th. לְבוּר מַלְשִׁנָה φοר TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR; but מַלְשִׁנָה ‘the subject people’ is not to be paralleled. The best and easiest emendation, though independent of any Vers., is that suggested by Kamp. for the whole half-verse לַבּוּר מַלְשִׁנָה ‘beside that which came from the traffic of the merchants.’

15. מַלְשִׁנָה] RV. ‘all the kings of the mingled people.’ LXX, Luc. πάνω τῶν βασιλέων τού (Luc. τῶν ἐν τῷ) πιπαρ, i.e. מַלְשִׁנָה; Vulg. omnes reges Arabiae; Pesh. אֲשֶׁר מַלְשִׁנָה. So 2 Chr. 9. 14 מַלְשִׁנָה a בְּכַל אֲשֶׁר מַלְשִׁנָה וְלָצְבוּ אֶל ‘and all the kings of the allied peoples.’ These מַלְשִׁנָה are mentioned Jer. 25. 24 as מַלְשִׁנָה וְלָצְבוּ אֶל ‘the kings of Arabia.’ In Jer. 25. 20 מַלְשִׁנָה are cited together with מַלְשִׁנָה אֲשֶׁר בָּא הָיוּ וְלָצְבוּ אֶל, and in Ezek. 30. 5 מַלְשִׁנָה אֲשֶׁר בָּא הָיוּ וְלָצְבוּ אֶל.

1. Verse 12 must have originally followed immediately upon v. 10; cf. note on ch. 9. 10—ch. 10. 29.

2. Perhaps Vulg. is a paraphrase of the same: Excepto eo, quod afferent viri, qui super vectigaliam erant.
In Jer. 50. 37 they appear as the mercenaries of the king of Babylon. Hence it may be inferred that these were kings or sheiks of the mixed nomad tribes of SE. Arabia who came more or less under Solomon's power and so were subject to tribute.

In Ex. 12. 38 לְגֹּלֶפֶת 'a great mixed multitude' is mentioned as coming up out of Egypt with Israel, and in Neh. 13. 3 לְגֹּלֶפֶת 'all the mixed multitude' is separated from the returned exiles by Nehemiah; but the connexion of these with לְגֹּלֶפֶת is not clear.

The view that these are identical with the גולָּים of ch. 4. 7-19 (Th.; Ber. on ||2 Chr. 9. 14) is opposed by the close connexion with the גולָּים. More probably the reference is to petty vassal-princes who were allowed to retain a nominal suzerainty at the price of an annual tribute: cf. the inscription (l. 12) in which Panammu is termed גולָּיא 'viceroy and neighbour-king of Ya'di,' appointed by 'his lord the king of Asshur' (Lidzbarski, Nordmml. Epigr. 443). Elsewhere in OT, the title is used of military commanders under the Aramaean Hadadezer ch. 20. 24 note, and the Assyrian Sennacherib II. 18. 24 note, || Isa. 36. 9, of governors under the Babylonian king, Jer. 51. 23, 57, the king of Media, Jer. 51. 28, and the Assyrian (and Chaldean) Ezek. 23. 6, 12, 23; but with far the greatest frequency of governors of provinces appointed by the Persian monarchs, e.g. of Zerubbabel, Hag. 1. 1, 14; 2. 2, 21; Nehemiah, Neh. 5. 14, 18; 12. 26; the governors generally 'beyond the River,' Neh. 2. 7, 9, &c.

Many critics, regarding גולָּים as a Persian word connected with Sanskrit paksha or pakkha, friend or ally, are obliged therefore to consider the occurrences in Kings as late interpolations (cf. especially Giesebrecht, ZATW. i. 233). Against this Schrader argues with force, citing the use of the term in Assyr. pahat, pl. pahdi, viceroy, and abstract pihat, satrapy in the Khorsabad inscription of the time of Sargon (b.c. 722-705), two centuries before the Persian era, and maintaining the purely Semitic character of the word: COT. i. 175 f.

The feminine termination of גולָּה pl. גולָּים is perhaps to be
explained as used with a term denoting office, as in Ar. הֵסֵּף, 'viceroy,' לְאָדוֹן, 'creator,' al.; cf. G-K. § 122.1.


Only in this connexion; v. 17 || 2 Chr. 9. 15, 16†. 'Beaten gold,' RV., Bo., Ke., Th., Ber., Klo., Kamp., מָאָטֶה meaning stroke or beat down. So LXX, Luc. χρυσάδες. The other Verss. give the sense 'fine or pure gold;'—Vulg. de auro purissimo, Pesh. וָּיֶה תָּוָּיֶה, Targ. שֶׁשֶׁה. The explanation 'alloyed gold,' Ges., Winer, obtained from Ar. מָאָטֶה—dilute wine with water, cannot be maintained.

Lit. 'went up upon,' describing the laying of the gold plating upon the (wooden) framework or foundation. The Imperf. describes the norm which characterized each shield of the class.

18. [םָּאֵתֶּה] Probably, as RV., al. 'finest or purest gold.' So LXX, Luc. χρυσοὶ δοξῆς, Targ. מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה, || 2 Chr. 9. 17 מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה. The verb occurs only here, but the substantive מָאָטֶה nine times. Identification with Ar. מָאָטֶה break, separate, on the view that this may be used of separating the gold from the ore (Ges.), seems to be precarious. Pesh., Arab. presuppose מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה, 'gold from Ophir'; so Pesh., Targ. in Jer. 10. 9 מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה, and many moderns in Dan. 10. 5 מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה מָאָטֶה. Vulg. auro fulvo nimis.

21. [מָאָטֶה] 'Drink;' so Lev. 11. 34.

Scarcely, as the accents suggest, and as rendered by LXX, Luc., Vulg. 'There was no silver, it was not accounted of;' but rather a negation strengthened by duplication of the negative, 'silver was not accounted of at all.' Such a duplication is found in Zeph. 2. 2 before there

1 The meaning and use of the term מָאָטֶה is too uncertain to permit of its being cited as a parallel.

* In Jer. 9. 7 KL שֶׁה שֶׁה אֵדֵּה 'a destroying arrow' is to be preferred; see Graf, ad loc.
come upon you,' and in the phrase תושב, Ex. 14. 11. Cf. Ew. § 323. Pesh. יָבִא, 1 Chr. 9. 20 omits one negative, thus agreeing with II Chr. 9. 20 which is without כ.  

22. יָבִא מֵאָרֶץ [A fleet of Tarshish]; i.e. a fleet consisting of ships such as were used by the Phoenicians for communication with their distant colony at Tartessus in Spain. II Chr. 9. 21 makes Tarshish the destination of the ships, מֵאָרֶץ תָּרָשִׁישׁ מִנָּהוּ לְהַלְוַת, but that this is incorrect is shown by mention of the cargo of the ships—products of the East, and by the reference in ch. 22. 49 to Jehoshaphat's fleet or ship (see note ad loc.) of Tarshish which was stationed at Ezion Geber on the Aelanitic gulf in order to go to Ophir. Cf. ch. 9. 26-28 where the allusion is doubtless to one and the same fleet of Solomon.

Cod. A, Vulg., Targ., and in II Chr. 9. 21, LXX, Luc. render 'elephants' teeth'; Pesh. in both places יָבֵא 'elephants'; Vulg. in Chr. ebur. Elsewhere 'ivory' is always כ alone, or with the generic art. מיסק; and it is generally thought that some foreign word meaning 'elephants' is here represented by מיסק. So Ges., Ber. regard the word as a contraction of מיסק כ, and compare Sanskrit ibha = 'elephant.' Or מיסק is thought to be a corruption of מיסק כ, pši being the Persian name for the elephant which has thence passed into Ar. and Aram. Assy. sin-ni pi-ri denotes 'teeth of elephants.' In Ezek. 27. 15 there is mention of מיסק כ כ (םיסק כ = Egypt. heben, Gk. ἰβένος, Lat. hebenum), and Bö., Th., following Rödiger and reading in our passage מיסק כ כ as two words, explain 'ivory (and) ebony,' regarding מיסק כ כ as a contraction or corruption of מיסק כ כ.כ

Pesh., Targ. transliterate; Cod. A, and in 2 Chr. LXX, Luc. מיסק כ כ, Vulg. simias. The word is doubtless foreign, and the rendering 'apes' is generally adopted, upon comparison of

---

1 Sayce (Expository Times, Jan. 1902, p. 179) argues for identification of מיסק כ כ with Tarsus in Cilicia.

2 The rendering of LXX, Luc. מְלָאשׁ תַורְשִׁישׁ מִנָּהוּ (Luc. דְּאֶלֶכְהָּּּּ), for the whole מְלָאשׁ תַורְשִׁישׁ, is obscure.
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Sanskrit and Malabar kapi, from whence comes the Greek κάπης, καπις, καπος, a species of long-tailed monkey.

Cod. A ταύνος, Vulg. pavos, Pesh. ḫaṭag, Targ. ḱēməm, i.e. 'peacocks'; || 2 Chr. Luc. ῥεχεια, LXX omits. Another foreign word. The Tamil or Malabar name for the peacock is ḫaṭgai or ḫaṭgai, and ḫaṭ may represent this, with interchange of the back-palatals g, k. So most moderns.


24. למלנסא and ] LXX, Luc., Pesh. presuppose למלנסא יפרא; so || 2 Chr. 9. 23 probably rightly.

25. למלנסא and ] LXX, Luc. omit, perhaps in view of v. 21b.

Elsewhere (eight times) the word always denotes 'arms' or 'armour,' and this is the meaning here given by Vulg., Pesh., Targ. So RV., Bo., Th., Klo., Kamp., Kit. The mention of armour follows not inappropriately after רוחלים 'raiment.' LXX, Luc. render σταυρήν, 'oil of myrrh or cinnamon,' and this is favoured by Ew., Ber. who compare Ar. כִּפְיָּשׁ 'breathe in an odour through the nostrils.' For this, however, regular interchange of consonants would require פֶּשֶׁח. Possibly LXX was influenced in its rendering by the following by the following word בְּשֵׂרָם.

26. בְּשֵׂרָם ... ולמריא ] In place of this statement LXX reads καὶ ἤσον τῷ Σαλομώνι τὸσαρεθ χοιλίας θηλεῖας ἐπὶον εἰς δραμα, Luc. καὶ ἦσον τῷ Σαλομώνι τοσαράκστα χοιλίας ἐπὶον θηλεῖας εἰς ομάτα τοῦ τίτερου, i.e. ch. 5. 6a with mistaken rendering of the rare word תורא. The following words of ch. 10. 26 and ch. 5. 6b are identical; מֵאָו תָּם יָבָשׂ מַשׂיָּשׁ. 2 Chr. 9. 25a = ch. 5. 6; 2 Chr. 1. 14a = ch. 10. 36a; 2 Chr. 9. 25b = 2 Chr. 1. 14b = ch. 10. 26b. Thus (as is testified by the partial combination of the two Kings' passages in LXX, Luc., and 2 Chr. 9. 25) the original account, which was properly incorporated in ch. 10 (see note on ch. 9. 10—ch. 10. 29), probably ran as follows:—בְּשֵׂרָם נָכַּב בֵּית יִשְׁרָאֵל נֶאֶסָדוֹנָה כְּפֶרֶף יִשְׁרָאֵל נֶאֶסָדוֹנָה כְּפֶרֶף יִשְׁרָאֵל. The smaller number 4,000 is adopted in accordance with LXX and || 2 Chr. 9. 25. The mention of the number of chariots is not found in LXX, Luc.,
X. 23-28

but is agreeable to the reference to the which follows. of [2 Chr. in place of has the support of all Verses.

27. Before these words LXX, Luc. insert —a later and unwarranted insertion.

Always (except Josh. 11. 16 with suff.) with def. art. 'the Lowland,' i.e. the tract of low hills or 'downs' lying between the maritime plain of Philistia and the mountain-country of Judah, and separated from the latter 'by a series of valleys, both wide and narrow, which run all the way from Ajalon to Beer-sheba.' Cf. Smith, Geogr. ch. x.

It may be regarded as certain that a place-name underlies the obscure. So LXX, Luc. for which Field cites a variant. Eusebius (Onom.) is rendered by Jerome Coa, quae est juxta Aegyptum, and so Vulg. translates de Coa. Lenormant (Les origines de l'histoire, iii. 9) was the first to make identification with , i.e. the plain of Cilicia. The same discovery was independently arrived at by Winckler (Alltest. Untersuchungen, 168 ff.; cf. Alteroriental. Forschungen, i. 28) together with its complement, viz. that does not in our passage denote Egypt, but the North Syrian land of Muṣri, south of the Taurus, which often figures in Assyrian inscriptions. The horse, which was unknown in Egypt before B.C. 1700-1500, can scarcely ever have been bred in sufficient numbers for wholesale exportation, while the pastures of N. Syria and Cilicia must have been eminently suited for breeding upon a large scale. With this agrees the statement of Ezek. 27. 14 that Israel derived horses, chargers, and mules not from Egypt but from Togarmah, i.e. N. Syria and Asia Minor. We may therefore render: 'And Solomon's import of horses was from Muṣri (perhaps or ) and from Kuē ( ); the king's traders received them from Kuē at a price.' So Hommel (Gesch. Babyl. 610), Benz., Kit. On Muṣri see further, II. 7. 6. König (Fünf neue arab. Landschaftsnamen im A. T. 25) agrees as to Kuē, but thinks that the fact that Solomon supplied horses for the Hittites and Aramaeans is inexplicable if they were obtained
from North Syria, but natural if they came from Egypt. It must be noticed also that Deut. 17. 16 connects the supply of horses with Egypt. Cf. Isa. 31. 1.

|| 2 Chr. 9. 28 connects the supply of horses with Egypt. It must be noticed also that Deut. 17. 16 connects the supply of horses with Egypt. 

29. In || 2 Chr. 1. 17 LXX, Luc. agree with MT. inferior to M. T.


This section in its present form is coloured by the hand of R^p. His phrases are as follow:

2. אֶרֶץ אֱרָב The reference is to Deut. 7. 1-4; Ex. 34. 12-16 (J). Cf. Josh. 23. 7 (D^p).

The same phrase is used with reference to the אל הסנה Cf. II. 3. 3 (R^p). With reference to Yahwe it occurs in Deut. 4. 4 (adj. מִלְכָּה); 10. 20; 11. 22; 13. 5; 30. 20; Josh. 22. 5; 23. 8 (both D^p); II. 18. 6 (R^p).

3. נֵרִי נֵרִי The same phrase is used with reference to the לְשׁוֹן צְבָא Owen. So of following a false god, v. 10; ch. 21. 26; II. 17. 15 (all R^p); ch. 18. 18, 21; Deut. 4. 3; 6. 14; 8. 19; 11. 28; 13. 3; 28. 14; Judg. 2. 12, 19 (Deut. compiler); Jer. 2. 5, 23; 7. 9; 11. 10; 13. 10; 16. 11; 25. 6; 35. 15; Ezek. 20. 16; cf. Hos. 2. 7, 15. Of following Yahwe ch. 14. 8 (R^p); 18. 21; Deut. 13. 5; 2 Chr. 34. 31; Hos. 11. 10.

4. נָחַל נָחַל so of following a false god, v. 10; ch. 21. 26; II. 17. 15 (all R^p); ch. 18. 18, 21; Deut. 4. 3; 6. 14; 8. 19; 11. 28; 13. 3; 28. 14; Judg. 2. 12, 19 (Deut. compiler); Jer. 2. 5, 23; 7. 9; 11. 10; 13. 10; 16. 11; 25. 6; 35. 15; Ezek. 20. 16; cf. Hos. 2. 7, 15. Of following Yahwe ch. 14. 8 (R^p); 18. 21; Deut. 13. 5; 2 Chr. 34. 31; Hos. 11. 10.

5. נֵרִי נֵרִי So of following a false god, v. 10; ch. 21. 26; II. 17. 15 (all R^p); ch. 18. 18, 21; Deut. 4. 3; 6. 14; 8. 19; 11. 28; 13. 3; 28. 14; Judg. 2. 12, 19 (Deut. compiler); Jer. 2. 5, 23; 7. 9; 11. 10; 13. 10; 16. 11; 25. 6; 35. 15; Ezek. 20. 16; cf. Hos. 2. 7, 15. Of following Yahwe ch. 14. 8 (R^p); 18. 21; Deut. 13. 5; 2 Chr. 34. 31; Hos. 11. 10.
The view that the latter portion of this section is not earlier than the exile (RP; so Kue. vv. 9–13, Kamp., Benz., Kit. vv. 9, 10) is based upon the words of v. 9, and presupposes that the narrative of the second vision, ch. 9. 1–9, comes from the hand of RP; but upon this opinion see note ad loc. On the other hand, the fact that vv. 11–13 speak of a division of the kingdom but make no mention of an exile, favours their pre-exilic authorship.

1–8. LXX, Luc. arrange differently. After the first four words of v. 1 there follows v. 3a; then the remainder of v. 1 in the form 'אבה שמש נכחשו וגו, and with the addition אסパス התחפשו אפרסי אפרסי, kal 'Apoppalais ἀφορίζων ἀφορίζων, and omission of והוהי; v. 2; v. 4a 'אנה לשה נחמה וגו, followed by v. 4b 'אנה לשה נחמה וגו, so Luc. v. 3b, 4b represented by אנה לשה נחמה נחמה נחמה, kal נחמה נחמה נחמה, and omission of והוהי; v. 7 with אָמַל, i.e.стал, אָמַל, for שִׁכֵּן in both cases and omitting הלך erhalten על מלי נְעָר, followed by v. 5a in the form נְﬠָר נְﬠָר נְﬠָר, kal נְﬠָר נְﬠָר נְﬠָר, v. 8 where for נָלָם, נָלָם, LXX נָלָם, kal נָלָם, i.e. נָלָם, נָלָם; v. 6.

This arrangement is, in the main, correct. The general allusion to Solomon’s love of women leads on to the fact that many of his wives belonged to the neighbouring nations with whom intercourse was strictly forbidden, and that these wives turned away his heart after their strange gods. After mention in some detail of the concessions which the king made to their religious rites, the writer sums up by saying that Solomon did evil in the sight of Yahwe, and did not walk after Yahwe like David his father. This forms a natural and appropriate transition to v. 9 צאנה וגו.
The following points call for special notice:—

The mention of the number of wives and concubines v. 3a is no part of the original account, but is an addition from the margin which has come into MT. and LXX in a different position, and thus to some extent accounts for their variation in arrangement.

The words שותס ה ve. 1 have been omitted in MT. through homoioteleuton.

וֹסֵת ה וְהָלַיָּה of ve. 1 have been added from the margin which has come into MT. and LXX in a different position, and thus to some extent accounts for their variation in arrangement.

The words שותס ה ve. 1 have been omitted in MT. through homoioteleuton.

In the category of foreign wives v. 1b, LXX ἱππας is merely a doublet of ἱππας, since there is no special reason for its insertion unless it be a third representation of ἱππας. The reading ἵππας is original, but the opposite change in v. 5, ἵππας, is probably a later alteration; cf. note on v. 33.

In v. 8b Luc. supplies the original text. Solomon himself burnt incense and offered sacrifice to the strange gods, but this fact has been toned down by some later hand into the statement of MT. Syntax, however, has suffered in the process (we should expect at least ἵππας). On the other hand, the original שותס ה ve...
XI. 1, 2

determining the subject of קָנִית, is perfectly regular in construction; cf. e.g. Jer. 2. 26, 27; 17. 25.

Accordingly, the original narrative of רז probably ran as follows:

Now King Solomon was a lover of women; and he took many strange wives, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, Hittites [and Amorites]; of the nations whereof Yahwe said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go among them, neither shall they come among you; for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods: Solomon clave unto these in love. And it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his heart was not perfect with Yahwe his God like the heart of David his father; but his wives turned away his heart after other gods. Then did Solomon build a high place for Chemosh the god of Moab, and for Milcom the god of the children of Ammon, and for Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians. And so did he for all his wives, burning incense and offering sacrifice to their gods. And Solomon did that which was evil in the sight of Yahwe, and went not fully after Yahwe, as did David his father.'

1. וְכָנִית From masc. sing. יְנוּרָה Ezek. 32. 30; Judg. 3. 3, pl. יְנוּרִים v. 5; אִלּוֹ, would naturally be formed fem. sing. יְנוּרַית, pl. יְנוּרִית; and doubtless this last was the original pronunciation in our passage. For the Massoretic punctuation cf. Q’re in Neh. 13. 23 יְנוּרַית, where Kt. is יְנוּרִית, וְכָנִית, יְנוּרָה, Targ. אֶלֶף יְרָה suggest יָרִית (so Klo.), but this rendering is...
merely an accommodation to the context, and weakens the force of the statement.

[1] of reference defining the manner of the verb כַּלֶּה

3. 무( is the substantive, not the Infinitive construct.

The verb coming at the beginning of the sentence takes the 3rd masc. sing. as the simplest form, although really predicate to the pl. fem. subj. מַשְׁלָה. This constr. is not infrequent; cf. Gen. 1. 14 מַשְׁלָה הִנְךָ, but following the subj. once named מַשְׁלָה. So in v. 3b מַשְׁלָה דִּבְרֵי מַשְׁלָה masc. pl. predicate precedes fem. pl. subj. Cf. Ew. § 316b; Da. § 113b.

5. מַשְׁלָה מַשְׁלָה רַבָּא מַשְׁלָה] So v. 33. For this application of the term מַשְׁלָה to a godhead cf. Phoen. מַשְׁלָה תְיוֹרַת רַבָּא 'deo suo Astartae' CIS. I. i. 4; Baethgen, Semit. Relig. p. 71.

7. מַשְׁלָה מַשְׁלָה] Cf. ch. 3. 16 note.

9. מַשְׁלָה Intended by the punctuators to represent a 3rd sing. perfect Niph. with the article used with relatifial force; cf. Isa. 56. 3 מַשְׁלָה. This construction of art. with perf. is well known in late Hebrew; e.g. I Chr. 26. 28 מַשְׁלָה; 29. 17 מַשְׁלָה; al.; but it is very noticeable that in classical Hebrew the only occurrences depend upon the vocalization or accentuation, and if this be altered we obtain the common construction of the participle with the article. So here מַשְׁלָה (as in Gen. 12. 7; 35. 1), Isa. 56. 3 מַשְׁלָה; and with forms of מַשְׁלָה verbs accented as 3rd fem. perf., Gen. 18. 21; 46. 27 מַשְׁלָה, Isa. 51. 10 מַשְׁלָה, al., where change of accentuation gives מַשְׁלָה, מַשְׁלָה, 3rd fem. participle with article. We never meet with pl. forms מַשְׁלָה, מַשְׁלָה, where the constr. depends upon the consonants, except in the single instance Josh. 10. 24 מַשְׁלָה which may well be a corruption of מַשְׁלָה. Hence it is reasonable to think that this construction of perf. with art. was unknown to early Hebrew, and that all supposed occurrences rest merely upon a theory of the punctuators.

The solitary instance of the article used as relative with a preposition, מַשָּׁלֶה 'that which was on it,' I Sam. 9. 24, is probably a textual error. See Da. § 22 Rem. 4; Ew. § 331b, 1; and especially Dri. Sam. I. 9. 24.
The use of the perfect with waw *simplex* is an irregularity which cannot here be justified. In view of the vocalization of נַעַר in the participle in the previous verse as a perfect (see note), it seems possible that here also a change to the perfect may have been effected later, and that we should restore נַעַר in continuation of נַעַר. So Klo.

LXX καὶ φυλάξασθαι ποιήσαι, Luc. καὶ φυλάξαν καὶ ποιήσαι, i.e. τὸ στόμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου—correct; cf. II. 17. 37; 21. 8. MT. is an easy alteration under the influence of ἀκροατὴς αὐτοῦ v. 11.

LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. appear to presuppose נַעַר 'had commanded him,' but the addition of the suffix pronoun is not really necessary, and may be regarded as a natural translator's addition.

LXX, Luc. add to the end of the verse οὐδ' (Luc. οὐδέ) ἄν η ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεῖα μετ' Κυρίου κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν Δαοῦδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, a gloss from v. 4.

'With thee,' i.e. 'in thy thought,' or, more fully, as referring to an action carried into effect, 'to be taken into reckoning in estimating thy character.' Cf. Job 10. 13 καὶ ἀνέπεμψε παράλληλο to τὸ βάλλων; 23. 14; 27. 11; cf. Num. 14. 24.

LXX, Luc. τὰς ἐντολὰς μου καὶ τα προστάγματα μου, i.e. γρηγορόντως; Cod. A. τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς μου, Pesh. חֲצֹם, i.e., supposing חֲצֹם to be an error for בֵּית חֵשָׁם, חֲצֹם, חֲצֹם. These variations in order seem to indicate that חֲצֹם was a later addition made first upon the margin as being a word often coupled with חֲצֹם.

LXX, Luc. λήμψομαι αὐτήν, i.e. מַקְלָּבָה; so v. 13 מַקְלָּבָה. LXX, Luc. λαβεῖ, Vulg. auferam, i.e. מַקְלָּבָה. This reading, as agreeing better with the phrase בֵּין רֹאֶם v. 12 (v. 11 רֹאֶם מַעְלֶה ... מַעְלָה), and according with vv. 34, 35, is to be adopted.

Solomon's adversaries; Hadad the Edomite and Reson the Syrian.

14–22. The narrative in its present form seems to be somewhat confused. Hadad, though but 'a little lad' at the time of his
flight into Egypt, at once finds favour with Pharaoh, and receives from him a house, an allowance, and land. He then, in spite of his extreme youth, marries the sister of Pharaoh’s queen Tahpenes, and his son Genubath is brought up in the palace together with Pharaoh’s sons. The form רואי v. 17, as a variation of רוא, creates further suspicion as to the integrity of the narrative.

Winckler (Altest. Untersuchungen, i ff.) believes that two accounts have here been interwoven, and attempts the task of unravelling the skein by the aid of a discriminating use of LXX. Winckler’s two narratives run as follows:—

The First Book of Kings
'And Yahwe raised up an adversary unto Solomon, Hadad the Edomite, of the royal seed in Edom. And it came to pass, when David cut off Edom, and smote every male in Edom, that Hadad was a little lad. [And one] of his father's servants [took him, and brought him into Egypt unto Pharaoh]. And Hadad found great favour in the sight of Pharaoh, and he gave him to Tahpenes his chief wife, and she brought him up in Pharaoh's house among the sons of Pharaoh. And Hadad heard in Egypt that David slept with his fathers, and he said to Pharaoh, Let me depart, that I may go to my own country. And Pharaoh said to him, What hast thou lacked with me, that, behold, thou seekest to go to thine own country? And he said to him, Let me in anywise depart. So Hadad returned to his own land.'

In the first narrative the Edomite Hadad is carried into Egypt by his father's servant, and brought up by Pharaoh's queen. The second account seems to make Adad a Midianite prince, who flees with his adherents into Egypt, taking with him certain Edomites.

1 סַמִּים וְסַמְיָם. Had Adad and his followers been Edomites, such a specification would here have been unnecessary.
from Paran, and is well received by Pharaoh, who gives him for wife Anoth the sister of his queen. A son, Genubath, is born to him, but of his fate we are not informed. Winckler conjectures that just as the two accounts exhibit similarity in their commencement with David's campaign against Edom and in the allied names Hadad, Adad, so the conclusion of the second may have resembled that of the first in relating the journeying of Genubath from Egypt into Midian the land of his father, and his there establishing himself as an adversary to Solomon.

In the two accounts the following portions of MT. are rejected as glosses:

(i.) v. 20\( ^{b} \) וַיְהִי מִתְיַחֵד וְשָׂר אַתֶּה הָעַדְסָה, v. 21\( ^{b} \) וּכְבֻּדֶת לְפָנָיו (introduced in accordance with v. 15 by the welder of the two narratives), v. 21\( ^{b} \) רָדָה.

(ii.) v. 18\( ^{b} \) וְיָשָׂר עֵין מַלְּכֵּנוּ.

The sentences enclosed in square brackets are supplied by conjecture.

Words overlined are emendations dependent upon LXX, as follow:


v. 15. \[ וַיְהִי \] LXX ἐν τῷ ἐξολοθρεύσει = καὶ ἐποίησεν. So Klo., Kamp. Pesh. אֶמַּו = הָלֵכָה adopted by Bo., Th., Benz., Oort.

v. 20\( ^{a} \) וַיְהִי מִתְיַחֵד LXX καὶ ἐξολοθρεύσεις αὐτῶν = καὶ ἐποίησεν. So Klo., Benz.

v. 22 end] LXX adds καὶ ἐνίστρεψεν Ἀδηρ εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ = ἐποίησεν ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῷ.

v. 19\( ^{b} \) הַנָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל \[ הַנָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל \] Here שָׂרִי הַנָּה is restored by conjecture in (i.). The name שָׂרִי in (ii.) is derived from LXX, Luc. ch. 12. 24\( ^{a} \) καὶ Σουσακίμ Ἰδων τῷ Ἰεροβαμ ὑπὸ ἀδελφήν θεσσαλίας τὴν πρεσβυτήραν (Luc. adds ἀδελφήν) τῆς γυναῖκας αὐτοῦ εἰς γυναῖκα (Luc. καὶ) αὐτὴ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν δυνατῶν τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἔτεκεν τῷ Ἰεροβαμ τὸν Ἀβίδα ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ, a statement which occurs in the midst of the account of Jeroboam. Winckler considers the question whether this passage (obviously correspondent to MT.
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ch. 11. 19\(^b\), 20\(^a\)\(^1\) belongs properly to the Hadad or to the Jeroboam narrative, and concludes that the recurrence of the name 'A\(\text{m}o\) in ch. 12. 24 \(8, 9\)\(^1\) (MT. ch. 14. 2, 8, 9) makes for the latter view, but may be due to interpolation in accordance with ch. 12. 24\(^c\); while, on the other hand, the obviously incorrect position\(^9\) of the account in LXX, and the supposition that Pharaoh would more reasonably have given his queen's sister as wife to a Midianite prince than to an Israelite rebel, are conclusively in favour of the former.

14. \[\text{ Cf. ch. 5. 18 note.}\]
16. \[\text{ Cf. II. 3. 25 note on \text{neshi\(\text{a} \text{neshi\(\text{a}\).}\}}\]
18. \[\text{ Cf. II. 3. 25 note on \text{\text{neshi\(\text{a} \text{neshi\(\text{a}\).} }}\]

19. \[\text{ Cf. ch. 5. 18 note.}\]

1 Jeroboam hears of Solomon's death, and asks leave to return to Ephraim (v. 34 or 24\(^b\)); but Pharaoh, instead of granting his request, marries him to Anoth, by whom he has a son (vv. 35-37 or 24\(^b\)\(^a\)). After this Jeroboam makes a fresh effort to depart, and, in spite of the delay, returns in time to be created king of Israel at the rebellion upon Rehoboam's accession.
probably correct in assuming that this position would be usually occupied by the queen-mother, but, in the event of her death or removal, by the chief wife or queen. Cf. also Benz. There is no reason for thinking, with Klo., Kamp., Kit., that must always mean 'queen-mother,' and therefore emending after LXX, Luc. ch. 12. 24* ταν προσβοτευμαν. In ch. 11. 19, LXX της μειτω, Luc. της μειτω, i.e. μητρος, is also inferior to MT.

20. [הנה] On the form of the name cf. note on חם ch. 4. 11.

21. 'ג גבכ' So Gen. 47. 30; 2 Sam. 7. 12. Elsewhere (23 times in Kings and 10 times in || 2 Chr.) the phrase forms part of the formula of R in concluding his notice of a reign.

22. 'ג גבכ' Not as RV. 'But what hast thou lacked,' &c. יב, as in the second half of the verse יש לשהלעת, simply introduces the direct oration. See ch. 1. 13 note.

[ה] Read Q're יל. יל cannot mean 'nothing,' RV., and 'Nay but,' &c., is inappropriate as an answer to the question.

23-25. LXX, Luc. omit vv. 23-25* (down to נמה), and then, in place of the impossible MT., continue after entsprechend 'Adip' και Ἰσραήλ ἡ Ἰταραία, και Ἰσραήλ εὔ τῇ (Luc. γς) Ἠλαμ, i.e. τῷ κάλλιστο τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ τῷ τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τ着力打造 ‘This is the evil which Hadad did; and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Edom.' This is correct both in reading and position, referring as it does the latter part of v. 25 to Hadad, and adding the necessary summary as to his relationship to Solomon. So Klo., Benz., Kit., Oort. The definiteness of the statement יראה יאה suggests that in the original narrative some explicit account of Hadad's aggressions must have intervened after v. 22.

The short reference to Rezon, thus omitted by LXX, Luc., has been inserted between vv. 14* and 14b, but clearly by a later hand. So placed, it breaks the connexion of the Hadad story, and necessitates the resumption καὶ ὁδήμος ὁ Ἰδονίας 14b, repeated

1 Vulg. agrees with LXX in reading et hoc est malum Adad, but with MT. in the position of the notice concerning Rezon, and in reading הלא for הלא.
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from 14\textsuperscript{a}. The notice is ancient and genuine\textsuperscript{1}, but its original position cannot now be accurately determined.

23. הָאָדָם] See note on הָאָדָם ch. 15. 18.

24. הָאָדָם] Generally a marauding band; II. 5. 2; 6. 23; 13. 20, 21; 24. 2; 1 Sam. 30. 8, 15, 23; al. So, of the foray made by such a band, 2 Sam. 3. 22. The word is perhaps used of more regular detachments of an army 2 Sam. 4. 2; but this use seems generally to be late—1 Chr. 7. 4; 2 Chr. 25. 9, 10, 13; 26. 11.

LXX, Luc. omit. The statement is probably a gloss from the margin, referring to v. 23\textsuperscript{b}. So Klo., Winckler (Altest. Untersuchungen, p. 60), Benz. In place of הָאָדָם read נְצָרָם with Klo., Benz.

25. הַיָּדוּ לֹא] So, of racial hostility, Ex. 1. 12; Num. 22. 3, followed in both places by רָע, expressing dislike.


Ch. 11. 26–43 properly belongs to the section of 1 Kings, chh. 3. 1—11. 43, which deals with the reign of Solomon. See summary at head of ch. 3. Since, however, the history of Jeroboam commences with v. 26, it is convenient at this point to consider the structure of the narrative. The arrangement of events in LXX, Luc. presents a striking variation from that of MT., as may be best seen by a parallel summary of the two accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT.</th>
<th>LXX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. 29. He is marked out as future king of the ten tribes by the prophet Aḥijah.</td>
<td>11. 29. He is marked out as future king of the ten tribes by the prophet Aḥijah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 40. Solomon seeks to kill Jeroboam, who takes flight into Egypt, where he stays until the death of Solomon.</td>
<td>11. 40. Solomon seeks to kill Jeroboam, who takes flight into Egypt, where he stays until the death of Solomon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 41. Death and burial of Solomon.</td>
<td>11. 41. Death and burial of Solomon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} A notice so straightforward and unembellished can scarcely be thought (Kit. Hist. Heb. ii. 53) merely to have grown up out of the lapsus calami יִתְנָה for יִתְנָה.
11. As. Jeroboam returns so soon as he hears of Solomon's death, and sets up in Zeredah.
Repeted notice of Solomon's death.
Rehoboam succeeds him.

12. 1. Rehoboam goes to Shechem to be crowned by all Israel.

12. 2. Jeroboam returns from Egypt upon the news of Rehoboam's accession.

12. 3. The people of Israel summon him, and he and all Israel come and lay their grievances and lay their grievances before Rehoboam.

12. 5. Rehoboam, after making a delay of three days, decides to answer the people harshly and to add to their burdens.

12. 12. Jeroboam and all the people come to Rehoboam upon the third day to receive his answer.

12. 13. Rehoboam's answer results in the revolt of all Israel except the tribe of Judah and Benjamin.

12. 10. All Israel, when they hear of Jeroboam's return, send for him and make him their king.

12. 21. Rehoboam goes to Jerusalem, and assembles all Judah and Benjamin to fight against Jeroboam, but is restrained by the word of God through the prophet Shemaiah.

His age at accession, length of his reign, and his mother's name. Verdict as to his character.

MT. 11.
12. 24. Solomon seeks to kill Jeroboam, who flees into Egypt, where he remains until the death of Solomon.
12. 24. Jeroboam hears of Solomon’s death, and asks leave of Pharaoh to return to his own country. Pharaoh, instead of granting the request, gives him his daughter Athah as wife. She bears him Abijah.
12. 24. Jeroboam renews his request to return to Ephraim, and leaving Egypt arrives at Zeredah, where he gathers all the tribes of Ephraim, and builds a fort.
12. 24. Jeroboam’s son falls sick at Zeredah. He sends his wife to inquire as to the issue of the sickness. Abijah prophesies the death of the child and the utter extermination of Jeroboam’s posterity (but without assigning any cause).
12. 24. Jeroboam goes to Shechem, and gathers the tribes of Israel against the arrival of Rehoboam.
12. 24. Shemaiah the prophet marks out Jeroboam as future king of the ten tribes.
12. 24. The people lay their grievances before Rehoboam, who, after asking a delay of three days, decides to answer the people roughly and to add to their burdens.
12. 24. Revolt of all Israel except the tribes of Judah and Benjamin.
12. 24. Rehoboam assembles all Judah and Benjamin to fight against Jeroboam, but is restrained by the
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MT. LXX.

12. 26. His calf-worship at Bethel and Dan a measure to prevent the return of Israel to the house of David.

13. 1. The narrative concerning the prophet who came from Judah to rebuke Jeroboam.
13. 33. In spite of this Jeroboam maintains his worship, and thus seals the doom of his house.

14. 1. Jeroboam's son falls sick at Tirzah. He causes his wife to disguise herself, and sends her to inquire of Ahijah as to the issue of the sickness. She is at once recognized by Ahijah, who prophesies the death of the child and the utter extirpation of Jeroboam's posterity, because of 'the sins of Jeroboam,' i.e. his idolatrous calf-worship.

14. 19. Death of Jeroboam; record of the length of his reign, and mention of his successor.

Here the following points are to be noticed:

1. The superiority of LXX to MT. in 11. 43—12. 24. Jeroboam would naturally return from Egypt upon the news of the death of Solomon (LXX), and would scarcely delay until he had received information of Rehoboam's accession (MT.; read in 12. 2b בָּאוּ יְהֹוָה לֵּא יְהוּ֣דָה לָנָּתַ֑י with || 2 Chr. 10. 2). This point, however, cannot be pressed, since MT. may not be intended to represent the logical order of events. The variations in vv. 3a, 12a are more important. From v. 20 in both MT. and LXX it is certainly to be gathered that Jeroboam had taken no part in the previous negotiations, but that news of his return first reached the people when they were looking around for a new leader after their rejection of the house
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of David. This agrees with the previous narrative in LXX, but
conflicts with the statements of MT. in vv. 3a, 12a. LXX is
therefore to be preferred.

2. The inconsistency of LXX 12. 24±±x with LXX 11. 43—
12. 24, and its inferiority to MT.

(a) The section is inconsistent with the previous section in LXX.
Many of its notices are mere duplications of what has been pre­
viously recorded in 11. 43—12. 24. Thus the notice of Solomon's
death and Rehoboam's accession, 12. 24a, repeats 11. 41, 43; the
introduction to Jeroboam, 12. 24b, is superfluous after 11. 26;
Solomon's attempt to kill Jeroboam is a repetition of 11. 40, and
comes in very awkwardly without any narrative preceding to
explain the king's action; 12. 24c is merely a variation of the
story of 11. 29 ff., and cannot exist side by side with it; 12. 24d±
answers to 12. 3—24, while the whole account in its second form
is inconsistent with the first account, in representing Jeroboam
as having gathered the tribes to Shechem to meet Rehoboam
12. 24a, and so presumably as present during the negotiations, and
taking part in them.

(b) The section is inferior to the narrative of MT. On LXX
12. 24±±x as compared with MT. 11. 19b ff. see note on ch. 11. 14—
22. The relative value of the two forms of the story of the sickness
of Jeroboam's son admits of some difference of opinion. See, for
ii. 206 f. The variation between the two narratives is clearly too
considerable to admit of the supposition that the one was derived
from the other; and it seems necessary to suppose that each was
drawn independently from some earlier source. Thus regarded,
LXX may represent the more original form of the story, since
it is easier to believe that vv. 7—9, 14—16 MT. are a later addition
than that in LXX they were purposely cut out in order to place
the story at the commencement of Jeroboam's career (Kit.). It is

1 The work of Rö. His hand, however, is also to be traced in v. 10, which
appears in LXX. See notes ad loc.
certain, however, that from the point of view of Ῥδ the story in MT. occupies the right position, and, as intended to exemplify God's visitation upon Jeroboam on account of the idolatry of his calf-worship, aptly closes the history of his life, and is followed, vv. 19, 20, by the short notice as to his death. In LXX all reference to the death of Jeroboam is lacking, a point which further argues the inferiority of the section.

The inference to be drawn from the foregoing points is that the history of Jeroboam, as it left the hand of Ῥδ, is represented, as nearly as can be determined, by MT., LXX 11. 26-42; LXX 11. 43—12. 24; MT. 12. 25—14. 20. LXX 12. 24𝑒 onslaught, as both inconsistent with the previous section in LXX and inferior to MT., must be considered to be a history of Jeroboam which came independently into the hands of some copyist of the LXX, and was inserted after ch. 12. 24 at the expense of the omission of the original text.

The origin of the section LXX 12. 24𝑒 onslaught is not clear. It may have been, and probably was, drawn in part from our Book of Kings (the recension of Ῥδ). But, as has been noticed above, the story 12. 24𝑒 onslaught appears to come from some independent source; and 12. 24𝑒 onslaught, composed, like the LXX insertions in ch. 2 after vv. 35, 46, of fragments which in the main can be paralleled in MT., contains a few independent statements. Thus v. 24b, Φυσοδόμησεν Σαλομών (Luc. Ἰεροβαμ ὁ Σαλομώντος) τὴν Σαριφά τὴν ἐν ἐρεί 'Εφραίμ, καὶ ἦταν σύνε ἄρματα τρικόσια ἑπτῶν, and καὶ ἦν ἑπαρθόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν, v. 24f, καὶ ἔζηλθεν Ἰεροβαμ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἤλθεν εἰς γῆν Σαριφᾶ τὴν ἐν ἐρεί 'Εφραίμ' καὶ ἐφοδώρησεν Ἰεροβαμ ἵκει χάρακα. Further, the narrative of vv. 24d—f, though ultimately identical with MT. 11. 19 ġ (see note), must certainly have been derived from some other source than Kings.

The view of Kue. (Ond. § 26. 10) is that we have in this section a version of the history of Jeroboam undertaken in his interest, and thus representing him as marrying the daughter of Pharaoh, and purposely omitting a large portion of Ahijah's prophecy against him. But, as Kit. points out, the fact that his mother is represented
as a harlot, and the revolt laid at his door, is entirely alien to such a purpose.


11. 26. מחרabbage] Only here in MT. LXX, Luc. ξαρευά, here and in v. 43; 12. 24b, f, k, l, n. In 11. 43; 12. 24b ξαρευά is said to be δύνα ἐφράω, perhaps an inference from v. 26. The view that מחרabbage is the same as מחרabbage (ch. 4. 12 note; 7. 46, where || 2 Chr. 4. 17 has רְשֵׁי), is by no means certain.

In Judg. 7. 22 מחרabbage (with יְך loc.) mentioned as the scene of the flight of the Midianites, is usually thought to be miswritten for מחרabbage, but nothing definite as to locality can be gathered from this passage, which seems to embody a confusion of sources (see Moore, ad loc.). Conder suggests as the site of מחרabbage Surda, a small village four kilometres north-west of Bethel; Memoirs, ii. 295.

11. 26. מחרabbage LXX, Luc. omit, probably owing to the translator's eye passing from מחרabbage to מחרabbage.

[11. 26. מחרabbage] The י consec. is here employed to introduce the predicate with some little emphasis after the words intervening between it and the subject: 'And Jeroboam, &c., he lifted up &c.' Cf. Gen. 30. 30; 1 Sam. 14. 19; Dri. Tenses, § 127 a. These words are omitted in LXX, Luc. through confusion with v. 27a.

11. 27. מחרabbage why &c.] 'And this is the reason why &c.' So Josh. 5. 4 מחרabbage why the wars why מחרabbage why. פלוי Ch. 9. 15 note.

11. 28. מחרabbage why &c.] 'A mighty man of skill,' i.e. 'a man of great ability.' So 1 Chr. 9. 13; cf. 1 Chr. 26. 8. So in Ruth 2. 1 (and perhaps 1 Sam. 9. 1) the phrase is used not in the special sense of great valour in battle, but of marked moral or material worth. Cf. note on לתי ch. 1. 42.

1 Ranke takes the view that LXX 12. 24-4 is of superior historical value to the previous section in LXX, and to MT.; see Weltgeschichte, iii. 2, pp. 4-12.
29. Ἱδιω... ὁ άλλος ἦν ὁ θεός

LXX, Luc. add καὶ ἀνεπαρατέρως αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀδιόν, i.e. ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ. The words, which are necessary in view of the following statement, have fallen out of MT. through homoioteleuton. The motive of the action, to insure privacy, may be compared with I Sam. 9. 27, where Samuel causes Saul's servant to pass on before, and with II. 9. 2, where the young prophet is directed to take Jehu into the bath.

Cf. ch. 14. 1 note.

The words, which are necessary in view of the following statement, have fallen out of MT. through homoioteleuton. The motive of the action, to insure privacy, may be compared with I Sam. 9. 27, where Samuel causes Saul's servant to pass on before, and with II. 9. 2, where the young prophet is directed to take Jehu into the bath.

LXX, Luc., Pesh. probably original. In any case the reference is to Abijah (Th., Klo.) and not to Jeroboam (Ew.), the garment being assumed for the special purpose described in v. 30; cf. Jer. 13. 1 ff.; Isa. 20. 2.

LXX omits ἐκ τῆς ἀδιόν; Luc. reads ἐκ τῆς ἀδιόν for ἔκ τῆς ἀδιόν. MT. correct.

31-39. Abijah's speech has taken its present form at the hands of R⁰. Notice the following phrases:

31. οἱ ἅγιοι ἑαυτοῦ ἤταν

Cf. ch. 8. 15 note.

32. ἡ μέμνην ὁ υἱός του οὐρανοῦ

So v. 34; cf. v. 12 note.

33. ἡ ἀθάνατος τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ ἀθάνατος τῆς ἀληθείας

So v. 36; cf. ch. 8. 16 note.

34. ἢ καὶ οἱ ἀποκαλυφθέντες τοὺς οὐρανοὺς

So v. 38; cf. ch. 2. 3 note.

Elsewhere only Ex. 15. 26 (JE or D?) ; Jer. 34. 15. For the contrary phrase of R⁰ cf. v. 6 note.

35. ἐστὶν λόγος τῶν θεῶν τῆς θείας πλατφυλίας

Cf. ch. 3. 14 note on ἐστὶν λόγος τῶν θεῶν τῆς θείας πλατφυλίας.

36. ἡ αὐτοκράτορική ἡ ἁγιοίτατη ἡ ἁγιοίτατη

Cf. Deut. 17. 15. For the contrary phrase of R⁰ cf. v. 15 note.

37. ἡ καταφράσων τῆς ἀλήθείας τοῦ θεοῦ

Cf. Ps. 132. 17. The figure of the unquenched lamp represents a lasting posterity; cf. Prov. 13. 9; Job 18. 6.

38. ἡ ἀληθινὴ ἡ ἀληθινὴ

So v. 39; cf. ch. 9. 3 note.
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38. So Deut. 28. 1, 15; with pl. 11. 13; cf. 15. 5.

11. 28. In the same way (obedience the condition of a promise) Deut. 13. 19; 28. 2, 13; 30. 10; cf. Deut. 11. 27.

39. Cf. ch. 2. 3 note.

40. Cf. ch. 3. 14 note.

[Note] Cf. the promise in 2 Sam. 7. 11, 16, 27 Nathan’s prophecy referred to elsewhere by R. Deut. 13. 19; 28. 2, 13; 30. 10; 11.

For the phrase cf. 1 Sam. 2. 35 and (בנש for הבנ) 25. 28.

Not improbably the speech has received some few later additions. In v. 33 הָדַר הָדַר וְהָדַר is wanting in LXX, and the use of these terms after הָדַר rather than הָדַר being characteristic of P or H (see ch. 6. 13 note), the two words may reasonably be suspected as an insertion due to R. LXX also omits הָדַר שֹׁאֵל רְאוּף at the end of v. 34, and though the phrase is Deuteronomistic, yet the repeated הָדַר has something of the awkward ring of an insertion, and the words may be due to the same interpolator. The omission of the close of the speech by LXX וּבַנָּהּ מַגָּרְשׂ הָאָבִי: המַגָּרְשׂ מַגָּרְשׂ וּבַנָּהּ מַגָּרְשׂ, taken in connexion with the reference of v. 39—the affliction of the seed of David, but not for ever—suggests that this also may be an addition of exilic or post-exilic times; though, as Kue. points out, the statement of v. 39 need not imply an exilic standpoint: cf. 2 Sam. 7. 14b. The use of the imperf. with weak וְ, for the perf. with וְ, as agreeing with the sing. וְ of vv. 31, 32, and the sing. וְ of v. 34, is to be adopted.

32. וַהֲשׁוּבֵן וַהֲשׁוּבֵן] LXX, Luc. καὶ δύο σκεύη, an alteration in view of v. 30b: ch. 12. 23. So v. 36. Cf. the addition καὶ Βεναχεί in ch. 12. 20. The inconsistency in MT. between the ‘12 pieces’ of v. 30 and the 10+1 of vv. 31, 32 perhaps points to a modification of the original narrative only partially effected.

33. וַהֲשׁוֹבֵן וַהֲשׁוֹבֵן] LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. presuppose the sing. verb throughout the verse; וַהֲשׁוֹבֵן וַהֲשׁוֹבֵן וְהָאָבִי. This, and the sing. וַהֲשׁוֹבֵן of vv. 31, 32, and the sing. וַהֲשׁוֹבֵן of v. 34, is to be adopted.
The plural termination ה, used in Aramaic and upon the Moabite stone, occurs in Hebrew some twenty-five times, chiefly in late Books. In earlier Books the form, if not dialectical (so perhaps Judg. 5. 10), is due to error in transcription under the influence of Aramaic. For the occurrences cf. G-K. § 87 e; Sta. § 323a.

34. נַשֵּׁנָה נַשֵּׁנָה [LXX, Luc. ἀντιστροφήματος ἀντίστροφἀντῷ appear to have read בַּשֶּׁנֶּה בַּשֶּׁנֶּה, or better בַּשֶּׁנֶּה בַּשֶּׁנֶּה, interpreting בַּשֶּׁנֶּה incorrectly in a reflexive sense 'lift myself up against'; cf. LXX rendering of Hos. 1. 6 יִשָּׁנֶה יִשָּׁנֶה יִשָּׁנֶה. Given the text of LXX, we might render 'for I will surely forgive him during his life-time &c.;' but this is inferior to MT.

37. שָׁלוֹם ... יִשְׂרָאֵל [So exactly 2 Sam. 3. 21. Cf. Deut. 14. 26; 1 Sam. 2. 16. נָשַׁל נָשַׁל and subs. נָשַׁל are used almost exclusively in connexion with שֵׁנָה.


41 ff. 'ה יִשְׂרָאֵל' [For this summarizing formula of R see Introd.

42. 8f. יִשָּׁנֶה יִשָּׁנֶה] LXX, Luc. ἀντιστροφήματος ἀντίστροφἀντῷ, adopted by Th. upon the ground that ch. 5. 9–14 merely gives a summary account of this wisdom.

'וּבַשֶּׁנֶּה יִשָּׁנֶה' [Luc. εν βιβλίῳ λόγων ἡμερῶν 2., Vulg. in libro verborum dierum S., i.e. 'in the book of the days,' probably a correction in accordance with the phrase used in the records of the

1 In LXX προσάνατσιμα usually = בַּשֶּׁנֶּה, but never = בַּשֶּׁנֶּה; בִּלְעָנֶהוּ often = בַּשֶּׁנֶּה, בַּשֶּׁנֶּה, but more than twice as frequently = בַּשֶּׁנֶּה. In Deut. 7. 26 we get the two words in juxtaposition, בַּשֶּׁנֶּה בַּשֶּׁנֶּה בַּשֶּׁנֶּה, προσάνατσιμα προσ­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­�
kings of Israel and Judah. 2 Chr. 9. 29

and

v 17-30, and names them at the close, and adds a

43. The notice with reference to the return of Jeroboam from Egypt, inserted correctly (see note on 11. 26—14. 20) by LXX, Luc. between v. 43a and v. 43b, must have run in the original:—

The notice with reference to the return of Jeroboam from Egypt, inserted correctly (see note on 11. 26—14. 20) by LXX, Luc. between v. 43a and v. 43b, must have run in the original:

represents καὶ καταβαίνειν, Luc. more correctly καὶ καταβαίνειν,

In LXX τὴν Σαψατήν the word γῆν appears to be a corrupt repetition of τῆς: cf. LXX ch. 12. 24, where LXX γῆν = Luc. τῆς.


Ch. 12. 1-24 = 2 Chr. 10. 1—11. 4.

In this narrative vv. 15, 17, 21-24 appear to be additions of a later hand. v. 15, with its reference to the prediction of Ahijah, probably presupposes ch. 11. 31 ff. in its present form, and must in this case be due to RH. vv. 21-24, standing in close connexion with v. 15 (cf. v. 15 v. 16 ff.; v. 24), give a Judaic turn to the originally impartial narrative of vv. 1-20, and are scarcely consistent with the statement of ch. 14. 30 מְלֻשָּׁהוּ מִזְכָּרָה, וְיִנְּתֹן, a genuine excerpt from the ancient annals. Notice further that, while v. 20 speaks only of the tribe of Judah, vv. 21, 23 are careful to make reference also to the tribe of Benjamin. v. 17, which stands in an awkward position, and is absent from LXX, is probably a later gloss, though not by the same hand as vv. 15, 21-24, since it makes no reference to Benjamin.

1. נְלֻשָּׁהוּ The Roman Flavia Neapolis and modern Nablus, lying under the north-east base of Mount Gerizim. See Rob. BR. ii. 275, 287 ff.; Baed. 252 ff.

2. מְלֻשָּׁהוּ Vulg., II 2 Chr. 10. 2 νείπις, correctly. Cf. note on ch. 11. 43 LXX.

4. יָעַף as a figure of hard bondage is very frequent, though always elsewhere of that imposed by a foreign nation:—Gen. 27. 40 (Israel's subjection of Edom); Lev. 26. 13; Hos. 11. 4; Jer. 2. 20 (Egypt); Isa. 9. 3; 10. 27; 14. 25 (Assyria); Jer. 27. 8, 11, 12; 28. 2, 4, 11, 14; 30. 8; Isa. 47. 6; Ezek. 34. 27 (Babylon); Deut. 28. 48 (general); of the moral restraints of religion Jer. 5. 5, cf. Lam. 3. 27; of the bonds of sin (late) Lam. 1. 14.

5. לִשֵׁה] LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ. presuppose לִשֵׁה 'Depart until three days (sc. have elapsed), i.e. 'until the third day.' This is doubtless correct. יָעַף of MT. would rather suggest that a previous postponement had taken place.

6. לִשֵׁה] So with pathah always in this form (11 times). According to König, Lehrg. I. i. 419, the emphatic pronunciation of the י is better served by the broader 'Pathah gadol in place of Pathah qaton' (=Seghol).

7. דְּרֵי מְוֻבָּרִים] 'Favourable words'; Zech. 1. 13.

8. דְּרֵי מְוֻבָּרִים] 'Who were those who stood before him'; but this is harsh unless we read 'דְּרֵי מְוֻבָּרִים תַּקְנַי,' i.e. 'my littleness,' so, no doubt rightly, 'my little finger,' Vulg., Pesh. LXX, Luc. μυκτηρος μου. Targ. paraphrases μυκτηρος μου, 'my weakness.'

9. From st. abs. יָעַף For vocalization cf. יָעַף, Ezek. 26. 9. Doubtless the original and correct form was יָעַף with half-open syllable, and a later stage of pronunciation first raised the hatuf gamec to the position of a full short vowel, and then proceeded in consequence to place it in a closed syllable by doubling the 5. So דְּרֵי מְוֻבָּרִים.

10. דְּרֵי מְוֻבָּרִים, only here and in דְּרֵי מְוֻבָּרִים תַּקְנַי, 'my littleness,' so, no doubt rightly, 'my little finger,' Vulg., Pesh. LXX, Luc. μυκτηρος μου. Targ. paraphrases μυκτηρος μου, 'my weakness.'

11. דְּרֵי מְוֻבָּרִים] Explained by Pesh. מְוֻבָּרִים, Targ. מְוֻבָּרִים, i.e. מְדָרָיָה, 'scourges,' probably so named from being loaded with metal or
XII. 4-16

12. [Read Q’re מַלְשָׁנַת.] The sing. verb agrees, as is frequently the case, with the nearest member of the compound subject. Cf. Da. § 114b. On this verse in LXX, Luc. cf. note on chh. 11. 26—14. 20.

13. [And the king returned the people a harsh response.] For מִלְשָׁנַת ‘something harsh’ cf. || 2 Chr. 10. 13; 1 Sam. 20. 10; ch. 14. 6; Ps. 60. 5; plur. מַלְשָׁנַת Gen. 42. 7, 30t.

15. [בֵּית כַּרְשַׁד]; something turning or bringing about, ‘fate’ or ‘providence.’ So LXX, Luc. מְצַוְּרָפָה, Pesh. מְצַוְּיָר ‘instigation’; Targ. מְצַוְּרָפָה, passive, ‘fated lot,’ so || 2 Chr. 10. 15 מַלְשָׁנַת. The verb appears to be used with a similar sense in 1 Sam. 22. 22 ‘I have brought about (sc. death) upon every member of thy father’s house.’ This, however, with ellipse of the direct object מִלְשָׁנַת, is extremely harsh, and Th., Wellh., Dri., Budde emend מַלְשָׁנַת to מִלְשָׁנַת ‘I am guilty in respect of &c.’ In late Rabbinic Hebrew מִלְשָׁנַת = ‘cause.’

 Cf. ch. 8. 53 note.

16. [The words of Sheba son of Bichri are nearly identical; 2 Sam. 20. 1.]

[There is not a portion to us]; practically equivalent to מִלְשָׁנַת but מִלְשָׁנַת, originally interrogative = num, gives more emphatic point to the negation. ‘This use of מִלְשָׁנַת, though very usual in Arabic, is rare in Hebrew; Cant. 8. 4 מִלְשָׁנַת מְצַוְּרָפָה answers to 2. 7; 3. 5 מִלְשָׁנַת מְצַוְּרָפָה; cf. also Job 31. 1 מִלְשָׁנַת מְצַוְּרָפָה ‘and how shall I gaze &c.’ = ‘and I will not gaze’; 9. 2; 16. 6; Prov. 20. 24. Ew. § 325b.

With full long vowel in the antepenult upon which there dwells a counter/one, thus facilitating the due pronunciation of the two weak letters מְצַוְּרָפָה. So מַלְשָׁנַת, מְצַוְּרָפָה. Cf. Sta. § 109.

[The point of the taunt appears to be in the suffix of מַלְשָׁנַת ‘look to thy house’ (so Th.), emphasizing the old division (2 Sam. 2. 4, 8-11) and jealous hostility (2 Sam. 2. 16; 19. 42-44)
existing between the tribe of Judah and the northern tribes. For the nuance of ἄνευ 'look after' cf. Gen. 39. 23. LXX, Luc. ἄνευ τὸν οἶκον σου, i.e. [17].

17. [i.e. תּוֹפָא] Luc. קָאָה מִזְאָה קָאָה מִזְאָה מִזְאָה. The additional words represent a marginal correction afterwards inserted in the text.

Cf. ch. 9. 21 note.

18. After יִשְׁלָחֵּנִי Pesh. adds יָשִּׁם מִי חָיָה, i.e. קְרֵבָּה יִשְׁלָחֵנִי.

Cf. ch. 4. 6 note.

19. גָּדִים Luc., Pesh. read מִזְאָה לְבַּעַל; cf. ch. 4. 6 note.

Cf. ch. 8. 8 note.

20. לִפְסֹמָה LXX, Luc. add קַנְּבָאָס, for conformity with v. 23. Cf. ch. 11. 32, 36.

Cf. ch. 1. 27.

12. 26–33. Jeroboam’s institution of the calf-worship.

Judging by the stress which R reports constantly lays upon Jeroboam’s cult as the cause of all subsequent deflexion of Israel from the pure worship of Yahwe (cf. Introduction), it is probable that this narrative has obtained its present casting at his hands, though there is no reason hence to infer that any detail of fact is underven from the older source. Kue. (On. § 25. 4) observes justly, ‘Jeroboam’s measures with reference to the worship must already have been related in older narratives, but it is only natural that the redactor, when dealing with a matter which so specially excited his interest, should not fail to set before us his own
construction and his own verdict.' vv. 32, 33 serve to introduce the story of ch. 13. No special phrases of R² are to be noticed.

28. וָלֵב וּבְנֵיהֶם [Not, as RV. text, 'It is too much for you to go up' (this would be בָּנֵיכֶם אֲרֵב; cf. ch. 19. 7), but, as marg., 'Ye have gone up long enough.' The וּבְנֵיהֶם before וָלֵב is logically redundant, as in Ezek. 44. 6 'Enough of all your abominations,' and the normal construction is that of Deut. 1. 6 וָלֵב אֲרֵב בְּנֵיהֶם]

29. [For contrasted order of words cf. ch. 5. 25 note.]

30. בֵּיתַן [The modern Beit‘an, a short distance to the north of Michmash (Mukhmdz) of Benjamin, and so upon the southern frontier of Jeroboam’s kingdom. For the substitution of Ar. -tn for Heb. אֶת cf. Zer‘tn=ֶתֶרִים. See Rob. B.R. i. 448 ff.; Baed. 249.]

31. [Read, with Luc., פְּדָה, מַעֲשֹׁת, which, as more definite and agreeing with the frequent phrase of R² אֲשֶׁר נְשִׁיעֳנִים, may be deemed correct.

Obviously incomplete in making mention only of the worship at Dan. We should probably restore רִבְּעַי אֲלֵיהֶם לְפָנֵי בֵּית יַעֲקֹב אֲרֵב וּבְנֵיהֶם, 'for the people used to go before the one to Bethel and before the other unto Dan.' The words supplied may be thought to have fallen out through homoioteleuton, and in אֲלֵיהֶם לְפָנֵי נֶרֶךְ we have a case of the confusion between כ and נ seen elsewhere in ch. 22. 37 תּוֹרָה, LXX are ἀναδιοματική, i.e. ὠς ἐπὶ ἐσθήσεσθαι; Isa. 39. 1 ἀναλθῇ for ἀναλήθη; Jer. 37. 16 ἀναλθῇ for ἀναλήθη; 1 Sam. 2. 21 ἀναλθῇ for ἀναλήθη. Luc., which adds καὶ πρὸ ἀπόκοπτες τῆς ἀλλὰς εἰς Βαβδῆσα ἀναλθῇ, after the reference to Dan, probably exhibits a later restoration of the text, since, if this be regarded as the original order, it is not clear why the words should have fallen out. Vulg. ita enim populus ad adorandum vitulum usque in Dan paraphrases in order to overcome the difficulty of the single אֲשֶׁר נְשִׁיעֳנִים. LXX, Pesh., Targ. as MT.

32. [Read, with Luc., נְשִׁיעֳנִים אֲרֵב וּבְנֵיהֶם וּבְנֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר נְשִׁיעֳנִים.]
And Jeroboam made houses of high places,' i.e. temples erected upon the high places. בָּנָיָהּ of the temples of the various cults at Samaria. Ch. 13. 32; II. 23. 19, plur. מַעֲשֶׂה. The use of נָא before the indefinite בָּנָיָהּ is collective, as in II. 17. 29, 32 מַעֲשֶׂה; of the temples of the various cults at Samaria.

Ch. 13. 32; II. 23. 19, plur. מַעֲשֶׂה. The use of נָא before the indefinite בָּנָיָהּ is anomalous; the case being different to ch. 16. 18 'and he burnt the king's house over him,' where like בָּנָיָהּ מַעֲשֶׂה is really definite; cf. Da. § 22, Rem. 3; Ew. § 277c. Cases like 1 Sam. 24. 6 (cf. LXX); 2 Sam. 5. 24 (cf. || 1 Chr. 14. 15); 18. 18, where נָא appears to be used before an indefinite object, are probably textual errors.

וַיַּכְתַּב מִי 'From among the whole of the people'; lit. 'from the end of:' So ch. 13. 33; II. 17. 32; Gen. 19. 4 מְדִינָה and 'all the people, one and all'; Jer. 51. 31 מְדִינָה 'his city is taken throughout'; Isa. 56. 14 מְדִינָה 'all of them have turned to their own way, each to his gain, one and all'; Ezek. 25. 9 מְדִינָה 'from his cities in every quarter'; 33. 2 מְדִינָה מְדִינָה 'one man from among the whole of them.' The phrase may be illustrated e.g. by Num. 22. 41 מְדִינָה 'and he saw thence the utmost part of the people,' and so, by implied inclusion, מְדִינָה מְדִינָה מְדִינָה 'the whole of them.'

Pesh. [חֵסָל] here and in v. 33, i.e. 'upon the full moon'; cf. Heb. הַנִּחַ עַל Ps. 81. 4.

וַיִּכְכַּר מִי 'Like the feast,' i.e. the feast of Tabernacles; cf. ch. 8. 2, 65. This, however, was on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, Lev. 23. 34; hence the statement of v. 33א.

כְּכַר מִי ' Cf. ch. 1. 53 note.

וַיַּכְכַּר מִי There can be little doubt that this latter portion of v. 32, together with the first three words of v. 33 כְּכַר מִי repeated from the previous verse, represents a very early gloss inserted on account of the omission in v. 30. After the loss of the words to be supplied in this latter verse, it is clear that the reference to the institution of the priests and the

1 Da.'s explanation of כְּכַר מִי as 'a known kind of divine rustling' is inadequate; § 72, Rem. 4.
festival, vv. 31, 32, might be taken to refer only to the sanctuary at Dan, and so give rise to this explanatory insertion. Notice the awkwardness of the οὕτως οὖν ἀσυνδετο, and the perf. with weak 1.

33. οὕτως ... ὑπεράντη] Pesh. omits.

Which he had invented out of his own heart.' occurs only once beside in OT.; Neh. 6. 8 'out of thine own heart art thou inventing them' (for בָּלָא). In Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic the verb has the same meaning, always with a bad nuance. Q're פָּלַב, with the sense 'at his own initiative,' is correct; cf. Num. 16. 28; 24. 13; Ezek. 13. 2, 17.

18. i–32. The prophecy against the altar at Bethel.

The style of the language shows traces of decadence:—cf. וְנָה הָיוֹת perf. with weak 1 v. 3, apparently first written as מַלְאוֹן אֲשֶׁר הָיוֹת v. 23 (but cf. note ad loc.), and perhaps מַלְאוֹן v. 7—and this fact, together with the anachronism in v. 32 (cf. II. 17. 24, 26; 23. 19), and the non-mention of the names of the principal actors, marks the narrative as being of comparatively late origin. It may be thought to have been a story previously current in the form of oral tradition, and to have assumed a literary form very shortly after the event predicted—the destruction of the altar at Bethel—had come about. Notice the precision of the statement, v. 2. The style is about contemporary with that of the annals of Josiah's reformation, II. 23. 1–15, 19–24, where the perf. with weak 1 is used with some frequency:—v. 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15. It is, however, by no means to be hence inferred that the story is of the character of a valentinum post eventum. Such a view presupposes that it, together with the notice of II. 23. 16–18, was inserted into Kings subsequently to the redaction of R* (Wellh. C. 280; Kue. Ond. § 25. 4); whereas on the contrary ch. 12. 26 ff. appears to have been carefully edited by R so as to lead up to the story, and the resumption of the main narrative in ch. 13. 33, 34, forming the link to ch. 14. 1–20, constructs of the history a harmonious whole. If the story be
merely a very late Judaean fiction, the point of the details as to
the disobedience and punishment of the Judaean prophet seems
to be quite inexplicable.

1. So vv. 2, 5, 9, 17, 18, 32. Elsewhere in this sense
ch. 20. 35; i Sam. 3. 21; 2 Chr. 30. 12‡. Cf. ch. 1. 53 note.
2. Pesh. prefixes 'Hear the word of the Lord.'
3. 'A wonder' or 'miracle,' as a proof of the divine com­
mission; so Ex. 4. 21; 7. 9; 1 Chr. 32. 24, 31; cf. Deut. 13. 2, 3.
6. 'Entreat the favour of Yahwe'; lit. 'Make sweet the face &c.' Ar. יָשָׁן, חָסֵן, Aram. יָשָׁן, מִשְׁקָל = to be sweet or pleasant.

7. So Jer. 22. 20, נְאָה י. II. 7. 18. Elsewhere we
find hatef-pathah with a sibilant after the -sound:—םָּצָה  ch. 14. 21,
לְבָנָה II. 9. 17, לְבָנָה II. 19. 16§, Gen. 2. 12, לְבָנָה 27. 26,
לְבָנָה Lev. 25. 34, לְבָנָה Judg. 5. 12, Dan. 9. 18. According to
G-K. (§ 10 g) the hatef-games in the former cases arises under the
influence both of the preceding ה and the following guttural; but
probably König (Lehrg. I. i. 262) is correct in regarding the slightly
fuller sound of this half-vowel as due to the more emphatic
sibilants  כ, כ.

8. Cf. the words of Balaam, Num. 22. 18; 24. 13 (JE). On
the form of the conditional sentence, expressing the merest
(hyperbolical) possibility, cf. Dri. Tenses, § 143.
9. 'For so one commanded me,' the implied subject
being the voice of Yahwe, or, as in v. 18, the divine messenger.
For other instances of this semi-impersonal construction, employed
where the intervention of divine agency (or agencies) is implied,
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cf. Zech. 9. 12 וַיָּשָׁב; and in plur. Job 7. 3 וַיְבָא; Ezek. 32. 25 וַיַּשֶּׁר. So in Aramaic Dan. 4. 22 וַיֶּשָּׁר; 4. 28 וַיַּשֶּׁר; al. It seems, however, to be not improbable that וַיָּשָׁר represents the alteration of an original וַיְבָא 'I was commanded.' Cf. Wellh. C. 280; Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. See on יְבָא v. 17.

11. וַיָּשָׁר וַיְבָא [A certain old prophet.] For this use of וַיָּשָׁר, mainly characteristic of northern Palestinian narrative and of the later style, cf. instances cited p. 209. The usage is common in Rabbinic Hebrew. Luc. προφήτης ἀλλος, i.e. παλαιός ἄλλος; 'and another prophet, an old man, was dwelling in Bethel.' וַיָּשֶׁר, where the name of neither prophet is mentioned, is most apposite, and may well be original.

'הָעֵד כְּנֵי הָעֵד וַיָּשָׁר' [LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. presuppose וַיָּשֶׁר and יְבָא respectively, in accordance with plur. וַיָּשָׁר v. 11ב, וַיְבָא v. 12.

והיה] 'That day.' So only here. The writer seems to lapse into the point of view of the sons, to whom it was וַיָּשֶׁר 'to-day.' Luc. לֹא יָשֶׁר יְבָא suggests the more usual וַיְכָא, but is more likely to be an alteration of LXX לֹא יָשֶׁר.

'לֹא יָשֶׁר וַיָּשָׁר' [Resuming the previous וַיָּשָׁר; cf. ch. 2. 4 note.] LXX, Luc. strangely so εἰσικρατήσας τὸν προφήτην τοῦ παρόντος αὐτῶν, apparently reading through corruption לְמִדֶּשֶׁה קָצֵם לְפִירָה יִסְמַכְתּוּוּ, i.e. εἰσικρατήσας an alteration of εἰσικρατήσας.

12. וַיְבָא וַיְבָא [וַיָּשֶׁר אֲלִימָה וְאֲבָיִם] LXX, Luc. add λέγοντες; so Klo. וַיְבָא וַיְבָא. But the word is similarly absent in MT., and supplied by LXX, Luc. in vv. 17, 22.

וַיְבָא וַיִּשֶּׁר מִן [Where is the way?] so 'Which way?' So II. 3. 8; 2 Chr. 18. 23; Job 38. 19, 24, always, as here, with omission of relative מִן before the following verb. On the enclitic מִן, strongly pointing the question, cf. note on מִן יִנָּת ch. 14. 6.

וַיְבָא וַיָּשֶׁר [Now his sons had seen &c.] LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. are greatly superior in presupposing מִן 'and his sons showed (him).' So Benz., Kit. וַיָּשְׁבוּ, Klo., Kamp. וַיָּשֶׁר; cf. Ex. 15. 25.

14. וַיָּשָׁר] 'The terebinth,' which the writer's vivid imagination pictures as the tree under which the prophet was sitting. So ch. 18. 4 וַיָּשָׁר, ... וַיָּשָׁר וַיָּשֶׁר 'and hid them in the cave,' marked
as having thus afforded an asylum; 2 Sam. 17. 17 having thus afforded an asylum;‘and a wench used to go &c.,’ pictured by the writer as ‘the wench’ simply as being the agent thus employed; 1 Sam. 9. 9 saw her and the wench used to go &c.,’ pictured by the writer as ‘the wench’ simply as being the agent thus employed; 1 Sam. 9. 9

 thus spake the man;’ who, as a matter of fact, did so speak; but according to English idiom, ‘thus spake a man’; 2 Sam. 15. 13; Gen. 14. 13; al. This method of thought may be most clearly understood in such a case as 1 Sam. 17. 34 ‘and if a lion came,’ where the speaker has had active experience of the coming of the lions which he thus recalls to his mind. Cf. Da. § 21. e. This use of the article is a very idiomatic extension of the usage noticed in ch. 1. 1.

16. [LXX, Luc. omit. Pesh. מַלְּאֵךְ, i.e. מִשְׁפָּט לָנוּ, LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. omit מַלְּאֵךְ, but Pesh. supplies the word after the previous מַלְּאֵךְ, LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ. suggest מַלְּאֵךְ על לְאֵךְ, ‘for it was said unto me.’ So Wellh., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. Cf. note on v. 9.

18. מַלְּאֵךְ As in ch. 19. 5; Zech. 1. 9, 14; al.

19. מַלְּאֵךְ The perfect thus used anastemos forms a circumstantial clause,—‘lying unto him’; cf. ch. 7. 51 מַלְּאֵךְ, 18. 6 מַלְּאֵךְ מַלְּאֵךְ, ‘Ahab going one way &c.’ Dri. Tenses, § 163.

20. מַלְּאֵךְ ‘And it came to pass—they were sitting at the table—and there came &c.;’ so, ‘And it came to pass, as they were sitting at the table, that there came &c.’ The circumstantial clause מַלְּאֵךְ מַלְּאֵךְ מַלְּאֵךְ, elevated to so striking a position in advance of the principal sentence, lays great stress upon the moment of time at which the event described by the latter took place. Cf. II. 2. 11 מַלְּאֵךְ מַלְּאֵךְ מַלְּאֵךְ מַלְּאֵךְ, ‘And it came to pass, while they were going on and talking as they went, that behold a chariot of fire &c.;’ II. 8. 5. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 165, who terms the participle thus used the participle absolute.
In Neh. 5. 17 we have 'above or over my table'; 1 Sam. 20. 34 Jonathan gets up 'from proximity with the table.' When the idea of eating at the table is prominent, it is natural and accurate to use 'upon'; so 2 Sam. 9. 7, 10, 13, cf. Ezek. 39. 20. In ch. 2. 7; 18. 19; 2 Sam. 19. 29, however, we have the simple st. constr. employed;—ךלפנש שולחנ קינא.

21. 'יטי הער] So ch. 21. 29; Num. 11. 20; Isa. 3. 16; 7. 5; 8. 6; 29. 13. The more usual expression is 'ратא נ"ע; ch. 3. 11; 8. 18; al. נ"ע appears to be originally a substantive = 'response,' contracted from הער from verb הער. So with הער in the phrase 'on account of,' 'in order (that).' Cf. הער 'recompense' used in the sense 'in return for,' 'because'; Deut. 7. 12; al.

22. 'יטי הער אל יא] Illustrated by the dying injunction of Jacob, Gen. 47. 30, and of Joseph, 50. 25.

23. LXX, Luc., Pesh. add 'סינ in accordance with vv. 8, 16, 18, 19.

Very awkward. The sentence would most obviously mean 'for the prophet who had brought him back' (cf. vv. 20, 26), but in accordance with the context can only be rendered 'for the prophet whom he had brought back,' the suffix of recompense referring back to the antecedent נב, as in Aram.; cf. Duval, Gramm. Syr. § 399 b. LXX, Luc., in place of these words and the י"ע of v. 24a, read קא לiaeµασµαι קא ליאך, i.e. ליאך הער 'and he once more departed'; probably the original text. Pesh. ליאך ליאך קא ליאך, i.e. ליאך ליאך 'and he once more departed' suggests that MT. arose from the incorporation into the text of the words ליאך ליאך, a marginal note explanatory of the previous אב. LXX, Luc., Pesh. add 'סינ in accordance with vv. 8, 16, 18, 19.

24. Cf. ch. 5. 1 note on משל שלש... לוחה. 26b, 27. LXX omits.

26. 'יטי הער] The phrase 'came near' occurs frequently in Kings to call attention to the fulfilment of a prophecy. So ch. 22. 38. Most often mention of the prophetic agent is added in the form-
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18. 33, 34. A brief resumption by Ῥ of the main thread of the history from the end of chapter 12.

33. ἄνα τετελεῖται ὁ στόχος τοῦ χρόνου. The phrase occurs only here, the more usual (and less precise) expression being ἐν τῇ τετελεσθέντι ἡμέρα ch. 17. 17; 21. 1; Gen. 15. 1; 22. 1; 40. 1; Ezr. 7. 1; Est. 2. 1; 3. 1; Ezr. 2. 1; 3. 1; Gen. 22. 20; 48. 1; Josh. 24. 29; 2 Chr. 32. 11.

36. 3, 7; Jon. 3. 8, 10; Ezek. 13. 22 (documents); and with pl.
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II. 17. 13 (R'); 2 Chr. 7. 14; Zech. 1. 4. Cf. Jer. 23. 22; Ezek. 3. 19; 33. 11.

[Commentary] Cf. ch. 12. 31 note.

יַעֲנוּר וַעֲנוּר יְהֹוָה (Ex. 29. 22-25; Lev. 8. 25-28, these being called יָאָבָק Lev. 8. 28. The phrase is used of the consecration of the priest at Micah's sanctuary Judg. 17. 5, 12, but is elsewhere characteristic of P and of later Books.

יָאָבָק Impossible. LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. יָאָבָק 'and he became priest to the high-places'; so Kamp. Klo. prefers to follow Targ. and emend יָאָבָק.


בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל מְסַלֶּק וְנָאָבָק] So Deut. 6. 15; Am. 9. 8; cf. Josh. 23. 15 (D'). 장. 32. 187 is very frequent in Deut. (27 times); cf. Dri. Deut. 1. 27.


Upon the LXX Version of this narrative in its relationship to MT. see note on chh. 11. 26—14. 20. The story exhibits very clear traces of the hand of R' in Abijah's prophecy vv. 7—16, with which should be compared the prophecies of Jehu son of Hanani against Ba'asha ch. 16. 1-4, of Elijah against Ahab ch. 21. 20—24, and of the young prophet against the house of Ahab II. 9. 6—10. The following phrases are to be noticed:

7. [So v. 13. Cf. ch. 8. 15 note.]
8. [So exactly ch. 16. 2s.]
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9. As used of Jeroboam the expression מָּמַל is somewhat mechanical.

10. Not, as RV., 'to provoke me to anger,' but, 'to vex me' by treatment wholly undeserved. So subs. וָּשָּׁהשׁ='vexation' or 'chagrin,' the rendering 'grief' being too general, and 'anger' incorrect; cf. Ps. 10. 14; 1 Sam. 1. 16; Job 6. 2.

The verb (Hiph'il) is very characteristic of רֹד הוא:—v. 15; 15. 30; 16. 2, 7, 13, 26, 33; 21. 22; 22. 54; II. 17. 11, 17; 21. 6 (|| 2 Chr. 33. 6), 15; 22. 17 (|| 2 Chr. 34. 25); 23. 19, 26; cf. 2 Chr. 28. 25; Deut. 4. 25; 9. 18; 31. 29; 32. 16; Jer. 7. 18, 19; 8. 19; 11. 17; 25. 6, 7; 32. 29, 30, 32; 44. 3, 8. Elsewhere, with הָו as obj., only six times. פֶּל, Deut. 32. 21.

11. Cf. ch. 21. 21; II. 22. 16 (|| 2 Chr. 34. 24 לְך; cf. v. 20 || 2 Chr. 34. 28) both רֹד; Jer. 6. 19; 11. 11 (cf. v. 23); cf. 19. 15; 35. 17. With לְך II. 21. 12 רֹד; Jer. 19. 3; 45. 5; cf. Jer. 17. 18; 23. 12; 36. 31; 49. 37; 51. 64.

12. Cf. Ch. 16. 11; 21. 21; II. 9. 8 רֹד. Only besides 1 Sam. 25. 22, 34.

13. Cf. Ch. 21. 21; II. 9. 8; 14. 26 (all רֹד); Deut. 32. 36. The phrase means 'restrained and let loose' (לָיָי as in Ex. 23. 5 'release'; Job 10. 1), i.e. 'all,' every one being supposed to fall under one of the two categories. Cf. the expressions of Deut. 29. 18 רֹד תְּמוֹן: Isa. 2. 9 וְאִשָּׁה יָשָׁתָ�
Dri. Deut. 32. 36. Other suggestions are:—'bond and free,'
Ges.; cf. II. 17. 4; Jer. 33. 1; al.: 'married and
celebrate,' De Dieu, Ke.; Ar. ʿaṣalu = 'celibate,'
\textit{aṣalu}, explained wrongly (cf. Roediger, \textit{Thes. Append. 104})
as 'paterfamilias': 'under and over age,' Th., Kamp.,
following Schmidt, 'pue, qui domi adhuc \textit{detinetur}, et qui
\textit{emancipatus} est.' For the alliteration of the phrase Dri.
(loc. cit.) cites
\textit{Isa. 14. 22; Gen. 21. 23; Job 18. 19;}
\textit{Mal. 2. 12; Isa. 59. 7; 60. 18; Jer. 48. 3;}
\textit{Ecclus. 40. 9; Isa. 5. 6; al. (7 times). Add}
\textit{Gen. 4. 12, 14; Ezek. 2. 10; Ecclus.}
\textit{40. 4; Deut. 28. 22; Ecclus. 40. 9;}
\textit{Ezek. 5. 17; cf. 38. 22.}

\[\text{XIV. 1, 2}\]

\[\text{187}\]

\[\text{Dri. Deut. 32. 36. Other suggestions are:—'bond and free,'}
\text{Ges.; cf. II. 17. 4; Jer. 33. 1; al.: 'married and}
\text{celebrate,' De Dieu, Ke.; Ar. ʿaṣalu = 'celibate,'}
\textit{aṣalu}, explained wrongly (cf. Roediger, \textit{Thes. Append. 104})
as 'paterfamilias': 'under and over age,' Th., Kamp.,
following Schmidt, 'pue, qui domi adhuc \textit{detinetur}, et qui
\textit{emancipatus} est.' For the alliteration of the phrase Dri.
(loc. cit.) cites
\textit{Isa. 14. 22; Gen. 21. 23; Job 18. 19;}
\textit{Mal. 2. 12; Isa. 59. 7; 60. 18; Jer. 48. 3;}
\textit{Ecclus. 40. 9; Isa. 5. 6; al. (7 times). Add}
\textit{Gen. 4. 12, 14; Ezek. 2. 10; Ecclus.}
\textit{40. 4; Deut. 28. 22; Ecclus. 40. 9;}
\textit{Ezek. 5. 17; cf. 38. 22.}\

\[\text{11. \text{ Cf. ch. 21. 21; both RP.}}\]

\[\text{21. 4; 21. 24\text{ R\textsuperscript{P}; cf. II. 9. 10, 36; ch. 21.}
\text{19, 23; 22. 38.}}\]

\[\text{15. So exactly Josh. 23. 13, 15 (D\textsuperscript{P}).}
\text{The usual phrase in Deut. of the land of Canaan is}
\textit{Deut. lxxxi.}}\]

\[\text{\textbf{AESCHYLOS} \text{ Cf. ch. 8. 34 note.}}\]

\[\text{16. \text{ Cf. ch. 18. 30. Reference to the sins of}
\text{Jeroboam in these terms is very constant in R\textsuperscript{P}. See \textit{Intro.}}\]

\[\text{1. \textit{Biblia} \text{ Cf. ch. 8. 65; 11. 29; II. 8. 22. For similar expressions thus}
\text{used cf. note on ch. 3. 16.}}\]

\[\text{2. \textit{Hithpael} only here: 'and thou shalt \textit{change thyself};'
\textit{Ethpeel} of \textit{man}, here and in ch. 22. 30; 1 Sam.
\textit{10. 6; al.}}\]

\[\text{i. e. 'change thy clothes,' 'disguise thyself.' So in Syr. \textit{hukhluh}}
\text{for \textit{man}, here and in ch. 22. 30; 1 Sam.
\textit{10. 6; al.}}\]

\[\text{\textit{hukhluh}}\]

\[\text{\textit{hukhluh} Impers., 'that (men) may not know,' so RV. 'that}
\text{thou be not known.'}}\]

\[\text{1 The vocalization \textit{hukhluh} 'drought,' in preference to \textit{hukhluh}, is adopted by most}
\text{moderns. Cf. Dri. \textit{Deuteronomy, ad loc.}}\]
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Kt. יֵּשָׁנ as in II. 4. 16, 23; 8. 1; Judg. 17. 2; Jer. 4. 30; Ezek. 36. 13; Q're always יֵּשָׁנ. יֵּשָׁנ is the more ancient form of the pron. 2nd pers. fem. sing., and appears to be a dialectical survival. Cf. Ar. אֶל, Eth. אֶלִית; Assy. אָלִית; Syr. אָלִית,で, where ω, though written, is not pronounced.

Also written יֵּשָׁנ, יֵּשָׁנ; probably originally יֵּשָׁנ, and so הֵק Josh. 15. 51; 2 Sam. 15. 12 originally יֵּשָׁנ, as forming adjectives יֵּשָׁנ ch. 11. 29; al.; יֵּשָׁנ 2 Sam. 15. 12; 23. 34. Wright, however (Compar. Gramm. 138 ff.), suggests the possibility of an original שַׁעִידע, Gaild' u with termination like Ar. —. The site of Shiloh is described in Judg. 21. 19 as 'N. of Beth-el, E. of the highway which goes up from Beth-el to Shechem, S. of Lebanon,' and this accurately corresponds to the modern Seil'dun; cf. Rob. BR. ii. 268 ff.; Baed. 250.

בַּל יֵּשׁ] 'He spoke of me as (lit. for) king,' i.e. predicted that I should be king; a use of יֵּשׁ common in such phrases as יֵּשׁ וַתְּנַב, יֵּשֶׁנ, יֵּשׁ וַתְּנַב, but somewhat strange after רָב. Cod. A וַתְּנַב, Vulg. quod regnaturus esset, Pesh. וַתְּנַב, Targ. וַתְּנַב suggest יֵּשׁ 'that I should reign,' probably correctly. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

בַּל יֵּשׁ] Only elsewhere Josh. 9. 5, 12, where the word denotes dry fragments of old bread. Here probably some kind of cakes or dry biscuits; so LXX, Luc. κολλόρα, Vulg. crustulam, Pesh. וְנַב, Targ. וְנַב (cf. Levy s. v.).

בַּל יֵּשׁ] 'Now Yahwe had said'; pluperfect. The writer, wishing to narrate an event anterior to that described in the previous verse יֵּשׁ וַתְּנַב, cuts the thread of continuous narrative formed by the succession of imperfects with הָיִם. By interposing the subject between the conjunction and the verb, and thus starts afresh from a new standpoint. Cf. ch. 22. 31 יֵּשׁ וַתְּנַב 'had commanded,' prior to the commencement of the battle; II. 7. 17; 9. 16b; Gen. 31. 34; al.; Dri. § 76 γ Obs.

בַּל יֵּשׁ] 'To seek an oracle.' Cf. II. 1. 16 יֵּשׁ וַתְּנַב. The more usual phrase is יֵּשׁ וַתְּנַב יֵּשׁ וַתְּנַב 'To seek, or inquire of Yahwe'; ch. 22. 8; II. 22. 18; Gen. 26. 22; al.
XIV. 3-12

So Judg. 18. 4; 2 Sam. 11. 25. On ת cf. II. 6. 19 note.

[ו ת ה ב נ ה] Read, with Cod. A, Vulg. ו ת ה ב נ ה ‘And it came to pass that, as she came in, she was dissembling herself.’

The sentence belongs to the narrator’s description, and not, as the MT. vocalization is intended to indicate, to the words of Yahwe. So, if vocalization be correct, Ps. 69. 4 יג כ יג פ ו יג ‘mine eyes consume as I wait &c.’ Cf. note on ch. 1. 41.

[ו ת ה ב נ ה] ‘Why, now?’ or, with emphasis, ‘Why?’ The enclitic נ, with something of adverbal force, gives point and colour to the query. So often:—Gen. 18. 13; 25. 22; al. Cf. ה יבש ch. 21. 5; al.; ה ת ש 1 Sam. 17. 55, 56; al.; ה ת ש ch. 13. 12 note; with מ internally. ה ת ש ch. 18. 7 note; ה ת ש ch. 19. 5 note; ה ת ש ch. 17. 24; II. 5. 22. In Ar. נ is used in the same way:—מַגְּדוּנָי, מַגְּדוּנָי; cf. Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, i. 355 f.

[ו ת ה ב נ ה] ‘Seeing that I am sent unto thee with something harsh.’ נ is direct accusative after הנל, ‘given in commission something harsh,’ and with an active verb would form the remoter accusative,—ה יבש ל ת ש ‘he has commissioned me (with) something harsh.’ For this use of הנל with double accusative cf. Ex. 4. 28 ל ת ש ש ל ת ש ב ל ת ש ב; so with ל ת ש 1 Sam. 21. 3 ל ת ש ש ל ת ש א; Ex. 34. 32; al. For הנל cf. ch. 12. 13 note.

7. הנל [ Cf. ch. 1. 35 note.


10. מ ר י ל [ See note on vv. 1 ff.

12. מ ר י ל [ Cf. ch. 1. 6 note.

12. מ ר י ל [ If not an error for מ ר י ל, an isolated instance of the feminine termination with infin. constr. of a verb י. The explanation of Ew. § 309°, that the termination is suff. 3 fem. sing. (with omission of Mappiq from מ as in II. 8. 6; al.), and refers by anticipation to מ ר י ל, is very unnatural.
13. וירש חנמ רכז] 'Something good.'

14. והיה זה] 'To-day!' or 'this very day!' If the text be correct (cf. note following), ה is used בָּאֵרָה, and adds point to והיה which in English can scarcely be brought out but by emphasis in pronunciation. Occurrences of the pronoun thus preceding the subs. to which it is in apposition are rare and in most cases poetical. Cf., however, II. 6. 31 יאש נבג; Isa. 23. 13 יאש נבג; Josh. 9. 12 יאש נבג.

15. יאש נבג] Most obscure, and probably corrupt. The only possible rendering seems to be 'But what? (sc. do I say?') יאש used asynotos as in Prov. 31. 2), so with emphasis 'Nay, even now!' The words thus form a climax to והיה הכ, as though this expression did not sufficiently depict the instant imminence of the destruction of Jeroboam's house.

16. יאש נבג] 'Their Asherim.' The יאש נבג was made of wood Judg. 6. 26, probably in most cases of a whole tree-trunk, Deut. 16. 21 יאש נבג in appos. 'an Ashera—any kind of tree'), and was planted (עָשָׂר Деּוֹד. l.c.) or set on end (יֶשֶׁר 2 Chr. 33. 19) in the ground. When destroyed it is said to be cut down (יֶשֶׁר Judg. 6. 25; II. 18. 4; 23. 14), chopped down (יֶשֶׁר Deut. 7. 5; 2 Chr. 14. 2; 31. 1), plucked up (עָשָׂר Mic. 5. 13), pulled down (יָכָר 2 Chr. 34. 7), or burnt (Deut. 12. 3; II. 23. 15). Thus יאש נבג is thought to designate a pole set up as a symbol or substitute for the sacred tree venerated by the ancient Semites as the abode of the deity. This pole appears to have usually stood beside the altar at the Bāmōth of the Canaanites, and to have been adopted from them by the Israelites in their perverted worship of Yahwe, or definitely extraneous worship; cf. Deut. 16. 21; Judg. 6. 25 ff. See R. Sm. Rel. Sem. 187 ff.

1 יאש נבג יאש נבג 'broke in pieces and beat small,' 2 Chr. 34. 4, probably applies chiefly to the graven and molten images, and only by zeugma to the (wooden) Asherim. LXX, Luc., making a different division of the verse, read καὶ (Luc. εἰς) λαοὺς ἢ αἵκη, i.e. יאש נבג יאש נבג.

2 F. B. Jevons, Introduction to History of Religion, pp. 134 ff., collects instances of the use of symbolic poles among non-Semitic races:—'This ἀσηρά appears again amongst people which differ as widely as possible from one another in race and place and time: it is presupposed by the ἀσηρά of the
It is a moot question whether the name Ashera is also used to designate a particular Canaanite goddess. Mention is made of an image of the Ashera placed by Manasseh in the Temple, II. 21. 7, cf. ch. 15. 13 note; II. 23. 7 perhaps speaks of the making of 'shrines' for the Ashera (cf. note ad loc.); and the Ba'al and the Ashera are coupled together as the objects of idolatrous worship, ch. 18. 19 (but see note); II. 23. 4; cf. Judg. 3. 7. In the Tell-el-Amarna inscriptions we find a name Abd-Alratu = 'servant of Ashera' (cf. Schrader, ZA. iii. 363 f.; KAT. i. 276), and the name occurs twice with doubtful significance in Phoenician inscriptions. Cf. Dri. Deut. pp. 201 ff.

Verss.:—LXX always ἀποτόμη, pl. ἀπότομα, except 2 Chr. 15. 16 τῇ Ἀστάρτῃ (so Luc.); 24. 18 τῷ Ἀστάρτῃ (Luc. τῇ Ἀστάρτῃ); Isa. 17. 8; 27. 9 τῇ διάδρα; Luc. in II. 23. 4 τῇ Ἀσταρθῇ. Vulg. always lucus, except Judg. 6. 25, 26, 30 nemus, 3. 7 Astaroth. Pesh. 19 times ḥā‘em, pl. ḥā‘em, 'object of reverence'; Judg. 3. 7; 6. 25, 26, 28, 30 ḥā‘em, pl. ḥā‘em, 'Astarte'; Deut. 16. 21; Mic. 5. 13 ḥā‘em ‘trees’; Deut. 7. 5; 12. 4 ḥā‘em ‘molten images’(?); 2 Chr. 15. 6; 24. 18 ḥā‘em, pl. ḥā‘em ‘image’; 2 Chr. 34. 3; Isa. 17. 8 ḥā‘em ‘idols’; 2 Chr. 14. 2 ḥā‘em ὀμολογεῖται; 2 Chr. 17. 6 ḥā‘em ‘high-places’; 1 Chr. 31. 1; 33. 3; 34. 3 ḥā‘em ‘nemora’(?) Targ. transliterates.

מַעְלֶהוּ The participle determines the subject, forming the secondary predicate; 'because they have made &c., vexing Yahwe.' Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 161, 2.

16. וְיַעַשׂ 'Shall give up.' Cf. the phrase וַיִּנְטַק הָאֲרֵי ch. 8. 46 note.

17. וְיַעַשׂ 'This for thee: grant me a blessing.'

Greeks; it is found among the Ainos; the gods of the Brazilian tribes were represented by poles stuck upright in the ground, at the foot of which offerings were laid; the Hurd Islanders "in their houses had several stocks or small pillars of wood, four or five feet high, as the representatives of household gods, and on these they poured oil [which takes the place of fat or blood], and laid before them offerings of coco-nuts and fish"; the Kureks at irregular times slaughter a reindeer or a dog, put its head on a pole facing east, and mentioning no name, say, "This for thee: grant me a blessing."

R[. Cf. Introduction.

19. ‘Acts of the days,’ i.e. ‘daily record of events,’ and so ‘annals.’


Ch. 14. 26–28, 31 = 2 Chr. 12. 9–11, 16. Beside the introductory and summarizing formulae vv. 21, 22, 29–31 (see Introdr.), the hand of R is to be noticed in vv. 22–24:

21. ‘And they moved him to jealousy’; cf. Deut. 4. 24; 6. 15. ‘Pillars.’ נזב is ‘something set up,’ i.e. a stone pillar or obelisk, doubtless representing the sacred stone which in primitive times was thought to be the abode of the deity. Cf. R. Sm. Rel.
Thus Jacob sets up a rough stone as a Maacaba to mark the scene of a Theophany, and anoints it with oil, calling it the house of God, Gen. 28. 18, 22; 31. 13 (E); and Maacaboth are raised by him and by Moses to indicate that Yahwe is witness or party to a covenant or agreement, Gen. 31. 44, 45, 51 ff. (E); Ex. 24. 3, 4 (JE); cf. also Isa. 19. 19, 20. The Maacaba played a prominent part in the worship of the Canaanites, standing, like the Asherah, beside the altar at the Bama. Its destruction is strictly enjoined in the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 23. 24, and in Deut. 7. 5; 12. 3, this latter code also forbidding its use for the worship of Yahwe, 16. 22. Jehu destroyed the Maacaboth at the Temple of the Canaanite Ba'al, II. 10. 26 f., while Maacaboth of all kinds were demolished with the destruction of the Bamioth at the reformations under Hezekiah and Josiah. Cf. further, for the use of the term in Phoenician to denote a commemorative obelisk, Dii. Deut. p. 204.

Cf. v. 15 note.

Prob. 'spreading,' i.e. with branches hanging down and affording shelter for such worship. Cf. Verss.:—LXX, Luc. πυρόθια, Vulg. frondosam, Pesh. דירק 'thick,' Targ. נוב 'shady.' Etym. doubtful.

24. אשה] 'Temple prostitutes.' The word is here collective as in ch. 22. 47, and includes persons of both sexes, נשים and נשים, who were 'set apart' for the immoral rites of the Canaanites, carried on within the precincts of their sanctuaries. A law against the introduction of these practices into Israel is found in Deut. 23. 18. Asa, ch. 15. 12, and Jehoshaphat, ch. 22. 47, effected a banishment of נשים from Judah, and Josiah destroyed the houses of the נשים which, during Manasseh's reign, had been established even at the Temple of Yahwe, II. 23. 7.

LXX, Luc. σύνεσαμος erroneously read מְכַל for אשה.

25. ובש הכבא Cf. ch. 11. 40 note. This invasion of Palestine by Sheshonk is recorded in an inscription upon the walls of the temple of Amon at Karnak. From the list of cities subjugated it appears that the expedition was directed not only against Judah.
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but also against the N. kingdom. The name of Jerusalem cannot be identified in the list. Cf. Dri. Authority, 87 f.; Sta. Ges. i. 353 f.

26. After LXX, Luc. have the insertion καὶ τὰ δόρατα τὰ χρυσά ὁ λαβὼν Δαυίδ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν παιδῶν Ἀθαράζου βασιλέως Σουδα καὶ εὐρηγεῖν αὐτὰ ὡς Ἱερουσαλήμ. The reference is to 2 Sam. 8. 7, where also LXX, Luc. contain an addition stating that Shishak made booty of these shields in his expedition against Jerusalem recorded in our passage. Th., noticing that LXX in Samuel renders παρῆκα by χειρός, while in Kings addition the word used is δόρατα, infers thence that while Samuel addition is certainly a gloss (so Wellh.), Kings addition must be based upon an authentic text. Possibly, however, both additions are later cross-references derived from some independent source. If original, the sentence of LXX in our passage represents ἡ παράδοσις τοῦ κεραυνοῦ τοῦ δοράτου ἀπὸ τῶν παιδῶν Ἀθαράζου βασιλέως Σουδα, and εὐρηγεῖν αὐτὰ ὡς Ἱερουσαλήμ. LXX, Luc. omit ὡς Ἱερουσαλήμ. In Pesh. the whole is wanting.

27. דְּפַרְחוּ] We should expect רָפָהִן in continuation of שָׁעֵר, since the shields appear to have been given permanently into the charge of the שֶׁשֶּׁשֹּׁשׁוֹן שִׁישָׁן. Possibly, however, דְּפַרְחוּ is intended as a frequentative, like שָׁנִיתֵם שְׁנָהָם v. 28 which are used of the recurrent occasions upon which the שֶׁשֶּׁשֹּׁשׁוֹן שִׁישָׁן carried the shields.

רָפָהִן] 'Upon the hand,' i.e. 'into the possession or care of.' So with τὰν Gen. 42. 37, יָדָיו אַחַת עֵלָי יְצָא, 'Give him into my care.' Cf. the phrase דָּנַרְךָ לְפֶרֶת, 'deliver into the power of the sword,' Jer. 18. 21; Ezek. 35. 5; Ps. 63. 11.

דְּפַרְחוּ] Cf. ch. 1. 5 note.

28. רְמָה] Lit. 'out of the sufficiency of,' and so, 'as often as.' Followed thus by Infin. || 2 Chr. 12. 11; 1 Sam. 1. 7; 18. 30; II. 4. 8; Isa. 28. 19; Jer. 31. 19f.

הָרָה] Prob. 'guard room'; Vulg. armamentarium. The word is only elsewhere used in Ezek. 40. 7 ff., where it denotes the small guard chambers at the gates of the outer court of Ezekiel's Temple.

30. דְּפַרְחוּ] Cf. note on ch. 12. 1-24. For this summary statement by R of warfare recorded with some detail in the
Annals cf. ch. 15. 6, 16, 32, and v. 19, ch. 22. 46; II. 13. 12; 14. 15, 28.

Cf. ch. 5. 15 note.

31. The mention of the name of the queen-mother, repeated from v. 21, occurs only here in the summary of a reign, and is rightly omitted by LXX, Luc., Pesh., |2 Chr.

Cf. ch. 15. 1, 7 (twice), 8+ In every case, Luc. 'אבדה, Pesh.حم presuppose מַעֲכֶה as in MT. 1 Chr. 3. 10; 2 Chr. 12. 16; 13. 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23; LXX 'אבדה, מַעֲכֶה as in MT. 2 Chr. 13. 20, 21. We may therefore conclude that this latter name, either in its longer or shorter form, stood originally in the text of Kings, and was altered by a later hand into מַעֲכֶה, perhaps for the sake of making a distinction from מַעֲכֶה of ch. 14. 1.


The whole account is framed by R^. For vv. 1–3, 7, 8 cf. Introd.; v. 4 cf. ch. 11. 36; v. 5 cf. ch. 11. 33, and generally for reference to David ch. 3. 14.

1. אַלּוֹ[ו] Luc. adds vhos 'Ῥωθοῦμ, LXX vhos 'Ῥωθοῦμ.

2. וֹש אַלּוֹ מַעֲכֶה תֶּבֶן חוֹדָלָם Precisely the same statement is made concerning Asa the son of Abijah v. 10; cf. v. 13. Hence Ew., Ke., Ber. suggest that the mother of Abijah continued to hold the position of מַעֲכֶה or 'chief lady' during the reign of her grandson Asa. More probably there has occurred a very early confusion between the mothers of the two kings which cannot now be elucidated. Kit. (Ges.) supposes that both were named Ma'acha, and that the addition בָּנָי מַעֲכֶה in v. 10 is an erroneous insertion from v. 2. LXX, Luc. v. 2 Μααχά, θυγάτηρ 'Φθεσσαλόν, v. 10 'Ἀνί, θυγάτηρ 'Αθεσσαλόν, so v. 10 'Ἀνί; probably an alteration made to remove the difficulty, the repetition of the name 'Αθεσσαλόν being against the originality of the reading. 2 Chr. 11. 20–22, which gives the name of Abijah's mother as מַעֲכֶה and names her other sons, appears to be derived from an ancient source. In 2 Chr. 13. 2 she is called מַעֲכֶה, and so Vulg. Michaia, Jos. Ant. viii. 11, § 3 Ἔλεκαλα;
but LXX, Luc., Pesh. presuppose מטבנה rightly, \( \text{ך} \) being elsewhere a male name. So Ew., Ber., Kamp., Kit., Sieg. u. Sta.

2 Chr. 11. 20 מטבנה

Doubtless the son of David is here meant, and Jos. (Ant. viii. 10, § 1) is probably correct in saying that Ma'acha was really his granddaughter, her mother being Tamar the daughter of Absalom (2 Sam. 14. 27):—

Thus Ma'acha bore the same name as her great-grandmother 2 Sam. 3. 3. The statement of 2 Chr. 13. 2 that she was the daughter of מטבנה perhaps implies (Ke., Ber.) that this Uriel married Tamar, Absalom's daughter.

4a. מטבנה

4b. מטבנה

So Klo., Kamp.

5. מטבנה

LXX omits. The words may perhaps be a qualification inserted by a later hand.

6. מטבנה

LXX, Luc. omit. The words are an erroneous insertion from ch. 14. 30. Pesh. reads חָּטֵא חָּטֵא 'Abijah son of R.' for מַעְרָא, and omits the similar statement in v. 7.


Ch. 15. 13–22 = 2 Chr. 15. 16–16. 6.

R²—introduction and summary; v. 14 (cf. ch. 3. 2, 3); casting of v. 12 (cf. note on מַעְרָא below) and of v. 16 (cf. ch. 14. 30) from information derived from the Annals. From this source all further particulars of the reign are drawn.

12. מטבנה


זכֵר מַעְרָא 'The idol-blocks'; a term of opprobrium. Probably lit. 'logs' or 'rolling things,' from מַעְרָא 'to roll'; so Ges., &c. Ew. (Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott, ii. 264) prefers to render 'doll-images,' as rolled or wrapped up in clothes, dressed up. Smend's proposal to connect the word with מַעְרָא, מַעְרָא 'dung' (Ezek. 6. 4), as is done

1 Luc. מַעְרָא is clearly a correction in accordance with 11. 20.
by the Rabbinic interpreters, is improbable. The word occurs elsewhere in Kings, ch. 21. 26; II. 17. 12; 21. 11, 21; 23. 24 (all R\(^0\)); and besides, Deut. 29. 16; Lev. 26. 30 (H), and thirty-nine times in Ezekiel. 13. הָדוֹד] The 1 \textit{consec.} introduces the predicate after the accūs. \textit{pends., as in ch. 9. 21 (cf. note).} 14. מְשַׁמָּשׁ] Cf. ch. 11. 19 \textit{note.} מְשַׁמָּשׁ לְאַשֵּׁרַה ‘A horrible thing for an ashera’ (or ‘for Ashera,’ supposing the word here to denote a Canaanite goddess; cf. \textit{note} on ch. 14. 15). מְשַׁמָּשׁ only occurs again in ] || 2 Chr. 15. 16, and its meaning, ‘an object causing shuddering or horror,’ must be determined from the use of the verb מַּשֵּׁשׁ, prob. ‘tremble,’ Job 9. 6\(\star\), and the substantive מַּשַּׁשׂ ‘trembling’ or ‘horror,’ Isa. 21. 4; Ezek. 7. 18; Ps. 55. 6; Job 21. 6\(\star\). The nature of this ‘horrible thing’ is not clear. It must have been some kind of idol or idolatrous symbol, and Vulg., Kings \textit{in sacris Priapi, v. 13\textsuperscript{b} simulacrum turpissimum 1, Chr. simulacrum Priapi, finds reference to a phallus cult. This explanation is adopted by Ew., Th., Ber., Kit.; Ew., citing the somewhat obscure מַּשַּׁשׂ, perhaps ‘Oh, thy wantonness!’ Jer. 49. 16. LXX, Luc., Pesh. misunderstand, and Targ. offers no elucidation. 15. רֶזֶחְנָא] Read רֶזֶחְנָא with || 2 Chr. 15. 18 and LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ. ‘And he brought the votive gifts of his father and his own votive gifts into the house of Yahwe—silver and gold and vessels.’ 17. רֶזֶחְנָא] Er-Rd\(\textsuperscript{m}, two hours north of Jerusalem, and a short distance to the west of Geba (Jeb\(\textsuperscript{a}'). \) Rob. \textit{BR.} i. 576; Smith, \textit{Hist. Geogr.} 251. רֶזֶחְנָא] Cf. Josh. 6. 1. רֶזֶחְנָא] Three Aramaean kings of this name are generally

---

\(1\) The rendering \textit{ne esset princeps in sacris Priapi, et in luco eius quam consecraverat seems to presuppose a wrong rearrangement of words in some such form as \textit{in luco eius quem consecraverat} \textit{et spectum eius, et confregit simulacrum turpissimum, is probably merely a paraphrastic expansion of} רֶזֶחְנָא.
supposed to be mentioned in these books; cf. ch. 20. 1 ff.; II. 13.
24. Winckler, however, regards the Ben-hadad of this passage
as one with the Ben-hadad of ch. 20; an identification which
postulates a reign of not much more than forty years in length.
Cf. Alittest. Untersuchungen, pp. 60 ff. [ד"ני], the Aram. weather-god,
is the same as י Asheville (II. 5. 18 note); cf. the compound name

plausibly suggest the identification of י Asheville with חון of ch. 11. 23,
whose name appears in LXX (11. 14) as 'Eespów, Luc. 'Eespów, Pesh.
(ד"ני). Klo. regards י Asheville as the original form of the name.

19. 'There is a covenant between me and thee,' &c.'
LXX [ד"ני] is self-condemned.

20. י Asheville Mentioned again in connexion with י Asheville and
other cities of the north, as taken by Tiglath-Pileser in the reign
of Pekah (II. 15. 29). Rob. suggests as the site of י Asheville the modern
הרי עופר 'the plain of 'Ayun,' a fertile basin lying to the north
of the plain of the Hátel, and south-west of the ancient Dan.
To the south of מיר 'Ayun lies 'Abil, probably the site of י Asheville
שנתנה. BR. ii. 438; iii. 372 f.

Th. is right in noticing that the reference, thus
phrased, is to a district, and not to a city. So, as here in plural,
Josh. 11. 2, and singular י Asheville Deut. 3. 17. In Josh. 19. 35 the
allusion seems to be to a city י Asheville in the land of Naphtali, while
in Num. 34. 11; Josh. 13. 27 we find mention of the Sea of
Cinnereth י Asheville, Joel 12. 3 י Asheville י Asheville. Targ., except Josh. 19. 35
where it preserves י Asheville, renders י Asheville, &c., this being the name
adopted in later times; cf. I Macc. 11. 67 י Asheville, S. Matt. 14. 34;
S. Mark 6. 53; S. Luke 5. 1 י Asheville. The region of Gennesaret
is described by Josephus (BJ. iii. 10, § 8) as being of marvellous
beauty and fertility, and accordingly is generally identified with
the level plain El-Ghawdir on the north-west shore of the lake
of Galilee; Sta. SP. 374 f.; Rob. BR. iii. 348 f.; Smith, Hist.
Geogr. 443. A city י Asheville may have lain in this district, but its
site is unknown.
RV., Kamp. ‘with all the land of Naphtali,’ taking in the sense ‘in addition to,’ as in Gen. 32. 12; Ex. 35. 22; Job 38. 32. But such a use of the preposition is here very unnatural, and LXX, Luc. ἐκ, i.e. ὧν ‘even unto the whole land of Naphtali,’ preserve a superior reading.

[2 Chr. 16. 4 b reads, in place of v. 20 b, ἐκ τῆς ἐπανάπτυξεν ἡ ὑπό θέατος, LXX, Luc., Vulg. ἐκ, incorrectly.

22. לָטַע ‘Summoned.’ In this special sense only again in Jer. 50. 29; 51. 27; Piel 1 Sam. 15. 4; 23. 84.

[20] ‘Without exemption’; lit. ‘none was exempted,’ a circumstantial clause; Dri. Tenses, § 164. For ‘free’ from obligation, cf. Num. 32. 22.

[21] Now called Jebo’a; south of Mukhmās (Michmash) from which it is separated by the steep ravine called the Wady es-Suweinet, the scene of Jonathan’s adventure I Sam. 14. 1 ff. Rob. BR. i. 440.

[22] Also called הָעַץ Josh. 18. 26. No modern equivalent of the name has been discovered, but Nebi Samw (Ma‘āl), about five miles NNW. of Jerusalem, and visible therefrom, is plausibly regarded by Rob. (BR. i. 459 ff.) and others as the site of the ancient city. Mizpah was well known in connexion with Samuel, 1 Sam. 7. 5 ff., 16; 10. 17, and is described in 1 Mace. 3. 46 as being καταμαρτυρία Ισπρονάλη.

23. רֹתְבַּנ הָעָל ‘He was diseased in his feet.’ The accusative, as in Greek, specifies the part affected; cf. Gen. 3. 15 ἄγαν ish באת; Deut. 33. 11; al. Da. § 71; Ew. § 281, c. 3. Luc. after the words ἀρετὴν ἀναστασίαν adds ἵπονεαν Αράχ απὸ τὸ ποιητῶν, καὶ—a gloss inserted to assign a cause for his disease, and perhaps with reference to the events described in 2 Chr. 16. 7–12.

15. 25–32. Nadab, king of Israel.

25–32. Nadab, king of Israel.
The First Book of Kings

28. LXX rou 'Aσρ uivou 'Αβιων. LXX omits.
29. LXX omits. 'Anything breathing'; lit. 'any breath.' So Deut. 20. 16; Josh. 10. 40; 11. 11, 14 (D'); Ps. 150. 6f.

30. LXX omits. 'A repetition of v. 16, rightly omitted by LXX, Luc.

15. 33—16. 7. Ba'asha, king of Israel.

The whole is framed by R^D.


7. Pesh. 'Both because of all the evil, &c., and because he smote him.' The repeated 'both ... and,' is, however, rare (poetical); Job 34. 29; Ps. 76. 7; except in the rather different class of instances cited v. 11. רעה refers to Jeroboam as personifying his house, and Vulg. is incorrect in paraphrasing ob hanc causam occidit eum, hoc est, Ichu filium Hanani, prophelam.

16. 8–14. Elah, king of Israel.

Framed throughout by R^D, with short notices from the Annals v. 9, 12^a, b, 11a.

9. So ch. 20. 16. 'Drinking to excess'; lit. 'drinking, drunk,' the two words being in apposition, and the second making closer definition of the first. Cf. ch. 1. 2 note on הערת בחלה.
XV. 28—XVI. 16

[11a, 12a. LXX, Luc. omit, through homoioteleuton, the mention of the name of an idol;—R. Cp. ch. 4. 6 note. Targ. strangely explains אנהניא as the name of an idol;—R. Cp. ch. 4. 6 note.]

Neither kinsmen nor friends.' The repeated 'neither...nor,' or without preceding negative, 'both...and,' is used idiomatically in connecting an exhaustive category on to a previous more general statement, of which it is epexegetical. So Num. 9. 14 אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר לְךָ נֶבֶר . LXX, Luc. omit, through homoioteleuton, the mention of the name of an idol;—R. Cp. ch. 4. 6 note. The sins of Bā'asaḥ and his son are here spoken of in the terms usually applied by R to the sins of Jeroboam. See Introduction.

11. אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר . LXX kal πρὸς Elo as in v. 1; MT kal לְךָ נֶבֶר , where, however, LXX reads ἐν χειρὶ E.

12. אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר . LXX kal πρὸς Elo as in v. 1; MT kal לְךָ נֶבֶר , where, however, LXX reads ἐν χειρὶ E.

13. אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר . LXX kal πρὸς Elo as in v. 1; MT kal לְךָ נֶבֶר , where, however, LXX reads ἐν χειρὶ E.

The use of אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר with a subj. of an army or military detachment: cf. Vulg. porro exercitus obsidebat.

15. אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר . LXX, Luc. cal יִפְרָעָבָא יִפְרָעָב . אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר , if not a direct paraphrase, probably arose from omission of י, which gave the reading יִפְרָעָב, or יִפְרָעָב . אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר , to which the translator added the explanatory יִפְרָעָב. אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר is used here, as in ch. 20. 15; 1 Sam. 14. 26; 30. 21; 2 Sam. 15. 17, of an army or military detachment: cf. Vulg. porro exercitus obsidebat.

The use of אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר with a subj. of an army or military detachment: cf. Vulg. porro exercitus obsidebat.

14. אנהניא אנהניא לְךָ נֶבֶר . LXX kal πρὸς Elo as in v. 1; MT kal לְךָ נֶבֶר , where, however, LXX reads ἐν χειρὶ E.
different from that of the preceding clause is idiomatic after the verb שמע. Cf. II. 19. 9; [Isa. 37. 9; Deut. 13. 13; 1 Sam. 13. 4; 2 Sam. 19. 3. The new subj. is really the implied obj. of the preceding clause, e.g. מִיִּתְנָה יָדִים, 'the report,' or מֵאָדָם, 'someone's words.' This is apparent from Gen. 31. 1 וַיֶּאֶסֶּר אֶת-רַבִּי בִּי, 1 Sam. 24. 10 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲבֹהַי אֲבֹהַי, and, after a verb other than שמע, II. 5. 6 וַיְהִי הַמִּכְסֶר אֲלֵּם יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאָבָר; so perhaps 2 Sam. 13. 33; Jer. 7. 4.

More peculiar and not to be classed are the cases in which the subj. of שמע is quite indefinite, and lies in a loose sense of the connexion with the preceding clause;—2 Sam. 7. 26 וַיֹּאמֶר וּלְעַל אֱמוֹר; Deut. 30. 12, 13 וְאָדָם מְסָמְרֵה אֶל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיָּעָל סֵפֶר; Ex. 5. 19.

Quite a distinct class, however, is formed by cases in which a passive verb is employed in the clause preceding שמע, and the substitution of an active gives the subj. of שמע ch. 1. 51; II. 6. 13; 8. 7; Gen. 22. 20; 38. 13, 24; Josh. 10. 17; 1 Sam. 15. 12; 19. 19; 2 Sam. 6. 12; Isa. 7. 24; Ex. 5. 14 וַיְהִי בָּא לְמוֹסֵר לְאֵל הִשְׂרָאֵל... וְשָׁרֵר בִּנְיָמִין לְאֵל הִשָּׂרָאֵל; Isa. 29. 12 וַיָּלְכוּ לְמָהֵר... וַיִּמְסֹר לְאֵל הִשָּׂרָאֵל. The short notice comes from the Annals.

LXX καὶ ἀσαίλευσαν ὕπερ τῶν, LXX καὶ ἀσαίλευσαν ἐν Ἰρας. MT. is favoured by v. 17a.

18. The keep of the king's palace; cf. II. 15. 25. יֹבֶל. Pesh. אֶשְׁיָר, i.e. יֹבֶל, 'they (the besiegers) burnt &c.' תָּנָה. Cf. note on ch. 12. 31.

16. 21, 22. Civil war between the parties of rival aspirants to the throne of Israel, Tibni and Omri.

The short notice comes from the Annals.

21. קֹלֶל [c. ch. 3. 16 note. קֹלֶל יַיָּה אֵל הִשְׂרָאֵל] 'The people Israel'; a case of apposition exactly like כֹּל הַיָּה אֵל הִשָּׂרָאֵל. So Josh. 8. 33t; cf. Judg. 20. 22 מְסַרְסָר אֵל הִשָּׂרָאֵל.

לֹא. LXX, Luc. omit, and Klo., Kamp., Kit. regard as an erroneous dittography of the final letter of לֹא and the following ו. וְז.
XVI. 18-23
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On form of name cf. note on הָאָרֶץ ch. 4. 11.

'And the half,' i.e. 'the other half,' in sharply defined opposition to the previously mentioned הָאָרֶץ. LXX καὶ τὸ ἡμερὸν τοῦ λαός γίνεται ὁλοίρως Ζαμβρέα (Luc. Ἀμβρι, τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν) is probably due to desire for uniformity with the preceding clause.

22. מְנַעְתָּהוּ...פַרְנָס] פַרְנָס thus followed by accusative only here; 'were strong as regards the people,' so prevailed over them. Cf. the similar (but poetic) use of accus. in הִנִּית, 'I have prevailed over him,' Ps. 13. 5. The construction is, however, somewhat harsh in prose, and the connexion almost demands (Kamp.) the emendation דִּבְרֵי or דִּבְרֵיה. LXX for v. 22a καὶ ἡττήθη ὁ λαὸς ὁ δὲ ὁλόκληρος θαυμάζω νῦν ὁμολόγη, a reading probably due in the first place to omission of ישׁר יומא...פַרְנָס through homoioteleuton with v. 21 end.

LXX, Luc. add καὶ Ἰωρᾶ ὁ διδασκάλος αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἔκτιμη, and then, after ἀληθεύεται, μετὰ Θαυμάζω (Luc. τῶν Θαυματ). i.e. v. 22b καὶ Ἰωρᾶ ὁ διδασκάλος αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἔκτιμη, ἐπειδὴ ὁ θαυμάζω ἐπεί τὸν τραχύν ἑαυτῷ ἐπιμένων ἔστιν. 'And Tibni died and his brother Joram at that time, and Omri reigned after Tibni.' The genuineness of this text is favoured by the fact that the additional words supply a detail unessential to the narrative, and thus not to be explained as a later invention. So Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Maspero.


The work of Rö, with short details from the Annals, vv. 23b, 24.

But Zimri, who reigned but seven days, is said, v. 15, to have come to the throne in the twenty-seventh year of Asa. It might therefore be supposed that the civil war, vv. 21, 22, lasted some three or four years; but this is precluded by the synchronism in the case of Ahab's accession, v. 29 'the thirty-eighth year of Asa,' which harmonizes with v. 15, supposing the interregnum to have been merely a matter of a few days or months—as might be inferred from the absence of special detail—and the length of Omri's reign to be correctly stated as twelve years. It must therefore be concluded that in the synchronism
for Omri’s accession thirty-first is an error for twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth.

[176x589]Mentioned in Mesha’s inscription, II. 4 f., as king of Israel who ‘afflicted Moab for many days’ (Append. 1). In the Cuneiform inscriptions Jehu is called ‘son of Omri’ (Append. 4), and the northern kingdom named mdI Ḫu-um-ri-i, ‘Omri-land,’ or mdI Blt-Ḫu-um-ri-a, ‘Beth-Omri-land.’ Cf. COT, i. 179 f.

24. הָרָּשֶׁם] Sta. (ZATW, v. 165 f.) argues very plausibly for an original vocalization הֲרָשֶׁם or הֲרָשֶׁה, upon the following grounds:—

i. The form of the name from which הָרָּשֶׁם is said to be derived.

First stating that הֲרָשֶׁה cannot come from הֲרָשֶׁה but only from הֲרָשֶׁה, he goes on to prove the genuineness of the form הֲרָשֶׁה against הֲרָשֶׁה, and its actual existence, together with the kindred הֲרָשֶׁה 1 Chr. 8. 21; הֲרָשֶׁה Gen. 46. 13; Num. 26. 24; 1 Chr. 7. 1, as a clan name. הֲרָשֶׁה Josh. 19. 15; 11. 1 is also the name of a city, and this transference of a clan-name to a city has its analogy in הֲרָשֶׁה ( descargar clan name 1 Chr. 8. 17), הֲרָשֶׁה, וְרָשֶׁה, &c.

ii. Ancient evidence for vocalization of הָרָּשֶׁם.

(a) Cuneiform inscriptions. Three forms of the name occur: Sa-mir-i-na, Sa-mrl-ri-na, Sa-m(-ur-na. These presuppose הָרָּשֶׁה or הָרָּשֶׁה or הָרָּשֶׁה.

(b) LXX ὅμαρτων. τι may represent Hebrew ai or ʾ or ʾ. So הָרָּשֶׁה or הָרָּשֶׁה or הָרָּשֶׁה.

(c) Aramaic forms וּרְשָׁדָה, וּרְשָׁדָה (Ezra 4. 10, 17).

That הָרָּשֶׁה is preferable to הָרָּשֶׁה in the two cases where the latter form occurs in MT. appears from the following facts. הָרָּשֶׁה is found 1 Chr. 7. 32 as a proper name, probably of a clan, but in v. 34 the name appears as הָרָּשֶׁה (הָרָּשֶׁה in pause). Further, one of the murderers of Joash, II. 12. 22, is named הָרָּשֶׁה רְשָׁד; but that this vocalization does not rest upon ancient tradition is clear from 2 Chr. 24. 26, where the same man is said to be son of הָרָּשֶׁה, a form presupposing הָרָּשֶׁה and not הָרָּשֶׁה. And moreover, while LXX in 11. 12. 22 reads וַאֲמַרְתָּ, Luc. has the form וַאֲמַרְתָּ, as in ch. 16. 24, LXX, Luc. וַאֲמַרְתָּ, וַאֲמַרְתָּ, וַאֲמַרְתָּ.
(d) Testimony of LXX in ch. 16. 24. To mark derivation from שמע, שמע, נזעם is represented, not as usually by ישמעא, but by ישמעא, ישמעא, of which ישמעא (Luc., Cod. A) is a correction in accordance with MT.

Supposing therefore ישמעא, ישמעא to be the original form, the termination ה is illustrated by ה in Gen. 37. 17 (דנ锃), and answers to the more usual ד which appears in the place-names דנ锃, דנ锃. ישמעא may stand together with ישמעא, just as we find the two names דנ锃 (ר) and דנ锃.

The reason why the name should have been altered in later times into ישמעא Sta. is not prepared to explain. He suggests the possibility of an erroneous explanation of the Aramaic form with ד, but admits that this merely postpones the question, since one must next inquire how the Aramaic form with Qames is to be explained. That the form ישמעא is, however, very young, appears from the LXX rendering in ch. 16. 24.

If, as seems to be the case, ישמעא was a clan-name, the hill upon which Omri built his city was probably already named Samaria, and bore this name as being the possession and residence of the clan ישמעא. But that this fact need not invalidate the statement that Omri bought the hill from a man named ישמעא may be argued from the many occurrences of clan-names used as personal names. Thus ישמעא, David's foe, bears a clan-name Num. 3. 21; al., and the same is the case with ישמעא the Kenite; Saul's son 'Esh-baal has the name of the Benjamite clan ישמעא Gen. 46. 21; al.; ישמעא, the name of Ba'asha's son, and also of the father of Hosea, is found as a clan-name Gen. 36. 41; ישמעא the tribal-name is borne by a prophet in David's time; &c.

28. At the close of Omri's reign LXX, Luc. insert the account of Jehoshaphat's reign=MT. ch. 22. 41-51 with certain variations, in accordance with the different system of synchronism which appears in Luc. See Introduction.
16. 29–34. 22. 39, 40. Ahab, king of Israel.

RD embodies short notices from the Annals (substance of v. 31b, v. 32, v. 34 to מַעַל). 32. יֵשָׁבָה] Mentioned once on the monolith of Shalmaneser II as A-ḥa-ab-bu md’tu Sîr-‘la-ai; 'Ahab of Israel'; cf. Append. 3, and ch. 20. 34 note. 30b, 'וָלָכְי לְךָ] LXX, Luc. prefix (Luc. καί) ἑπαξείσαρο, i.e. ἔπληξεν, probably correctly. Cf. v. 25; ch. 14. 9 note. 31. 'וַיָּלְכַּה הַיָּמִּים] 'And it came to pass—was it a light thing his walking in the sins of Jeroboam?—and (that) he took &c.' so RV. 'And it came to pass, as if it had been a light thing &c., that he took &c.' For similar use of interrogative with הִי, expressing surprise at the lengths to which any one can go in sinning, cf. Ezek. 8. 17 כִּי וְזָכָה בִּלְבָּד לַפְרָג בְּכִלָּו בְּכֵי יָמִים יָשָׁבוּ בְּכֵי יָמִים זַכָּה לַפְרָג וְזָכָה בִּלְבָּד בְּכֵי יָמִים יָשָׁבוּ בְּכֵי יָמִים יָשָׁבוּ. 33. 'וַיִּשָּׁא הָאָרֶץ] LXX, Luc. ἄνασται ἑπαξείσαρο, i.e. ἐπανείσαρο, (Luc. ἠρεισάρων ὑπερ πάντας κ.τ.λ.), i.e. apparently ἐπανείσαρο 'Ishšu保证金' (LXX ἐπανείσαρο). Scarcely superior to MT. Elsewhere 'וַיְבָא הָאָרֶץ' II. 23. 26, occur ch. 15. 30; 21. 22 form the direct obj. of וַיִּשָּׁא; and omission of חֲלָק אִישָׁר יָשָׁב (RD; cf. ch. 8. 15 note) is unfavourable.
34. Luc. omits.

A phrase of \textit{R}\textsuperscript{p} used in synchronizing an event with the preceding narrative. So II. 8. 20; 23. 29; 24. 1; and 15. 19 (emend after LXX). For similar phrases thus employed cf. \textit{ch.} 3. 16 \textit{note} on \textit{fn.}

\textit{[אוחל]} LXX \textit{ארוית, i.e. \textsuperscript{בכית}}\textsuperscript{א}, \textit{ Cf. note on \textit{ch.} 5. 15.}

\textit{[ביבי]} \textit{בו נין ויריעי \textit{ch.} 2. 8.}

\textit{[רמאיתו ...}} \textit{ב = 'at the cost of'; \textit{ב pretii. Cf. note on \textit{בנוש ch.} 2. 23. The statement suggests the possibility that the builder \textit{sacrificed} his sons, perhaps by enclosing them alive in the foundation and wall, in order by this costly blood-offering to secure the prosperity of his city. Or, the tradition may have been that, through failure to perform such a rite, his eldest and youngest born were claimed by the offended deity at the initiatory and final stages of the building. For instances from various sources of the wide-spread primitive custom of human sacrifice 'in order to furnish blood at the foundations of a house or of a public structure,' cf. H. C. Trumbull, \textit{The Threshold Covenant}, pp. 46 ff.}

\textit{[ברב] Josh. 6. 26.}

\textit{Narratives of the Northern Kingdom.}

I. 17-19; 20; 21; 22. 1-38. II. 1. 2-17\textsuperscript{a}; 2. 1-18, 19-22, 23-25; 3. 4-27; 4. 1-7, 8-37, 38-41, 42-44; 5; 6. 1-7, 8-23, 24-33; 7; 8. 1-6, 7-15; 9. 1-10. 28; 13. 14-19, 20, 21; (14. 8-14).

This great group consists of narratives dealing with the affairs of the kingdom of Israel. The stories are in most cases of some length, their high descriptive power and sympathetic feeling indicating that they have their origin in the kingdom to which they relate; and this conclusion is substantiated by such touches as I. 19. 3 \textit{בביח שמע ארש לוהרי \textit{לוהרי}}; II. 14. 11 \textit{ברא שבי ארש לוהרי \textit{לוהרי}}. No blame is anywhere attached to the calf-worship of Bethel and Dan, the efforts of Elijah and his successor being wholly directed to the rooting out of the foreign cult of the Tyrian Ba'al.
Certain peculiarities of diction probably belong to the dialect of North Palestine. The following may be noticed:—

Suff. 2 f. sing. בְּ, pl. בְּ,—Kt. Ⅱ. 4. 2 לֹא, 3 לֹא, 7 לֹא, לֹא. Elsewhere, sing. Cant. 2. 3; Ps. 103. 3, 4; Jer. 11. 15 (text corrupt), pl. Ps. 103. 3, 4, 5; 116. 7. Cf. Syr. suff. 2 f. sing. בְּ, pl. בְּ.

Pers. pron. 2 f. sing. Kt. בּ:—Ⅱ. 4. 16, 23; 8. 1. Elsewhere ch. 14. 2 (cf. note); Judg. 17. 2; Jer. 4. 30; Ezek. 36. 13†. Cf. Syr. בּ. So probably Kt. בּ II. 4. 23 stands for בּ, as in Syr. תּ for תּ; Duval, Gramm. Syr. pp. 174 f.


Rel. ב in בּ in II. 6. 11. So Judg. 5. 7 (North Palestine); 6. 17; 7. 12; 8. 26 (prob. Ephraimitic), and uniformly in Cant. (exc. title 1. 1). Elsewhere only in exilic or post-exilic writings. In Phoenician rel. is ב with prosthetic ב.

1 The particle ב of is thought by some to occur upon a haematite weight from Samaria, bearing an inscription upon either side which was at first read as ב ב ב ב (the fourth part of the fourth part of a נֶגֶד?), and dated 8th century B.C. Careful examination of the original weight convinces the writer that Prof. Robertson Smith (Academy, Nov. 18, 1893, pp. 443 ff.) is correct in his view (based upon a close study of the original) that the much worn ב upon the one side is of earlier date than the clearly cut ב upon the other, this fact being especially marked in the different workmanship of the two inscriptions. To add one point to others already noticed by the Professor—in the older inscription the ב (which in the old character usually takes the shape of a circle) is formed by four straight cuts, which give the letter nearly the appearance of a quadrilateral. In the newer inscription, upon the other hand, attempt has been made to render the rounded form of the letter, at the cost of more than one slip of the graving tool.

It is also extremely doubtful whether the first letter of the supposed ב is really מ. If, however, this be the true reading, and Prof. Smith be correct in regarding ב as an abbreviation of בּ, the word is most simply to be regarded as an adjective in agreement with ב, and the inscription denotes
Preservation of ר of art. after prep. — II. 7. 12 והנהו. 
Kt. הָרוּם = where? II. 6. 13. Elsewhere only Cant. 1. 7 bis.
Constr. with suff. pron. anticipating obj. (akin to Syr.):
I. 19. 21 שֶׁנְָהַנְָהוּ; 21. 13 רֶבֶנְָהוּוּ... יְהָיוּ.
Indefinite use of יוֹם a certain.—I. 19. 4, 5; 20. 13, 35; 22. 9
(cf. v. 8); II. 4. 1; 7. 8; 8. 6: add I. 21. 1, LXX, Luc. Elsewhere I. 13. 11 (perhaps for יוֹם); II. 12. 10;
Judg. 9. 53; 13. 2; 1 Sam. 1. 1; 7. 9, 12; 2 Sam. 18. 10,
and late Ezek. 1. 15; 8. 7, 8; 9. 2; 17. 7; 33. 2; Zech. 5. 7; Dan. 8. 13, 3; 10. 5.
To these may be added a few roots which betray the influence
of Aram.—גֵּרִּי I. 20. 10; חָנָּה 20. 14. 15. 17, 19 (elsewhere
only very late); יִהְוָה 21. 8, 11; תַּנֶּה II. 4. 28. There is also
a fair number of דָּרָךְ leyv, some of which take the place of
ordinary words and thus may be dialectical; e.g. גֶּרֶד gird,
I. 18. 46 (for רָה, רָע), יְהָלוּפֵל food, 19. 8 (for גָּלֵל, גָּלֵפַן,
 وغير); but of others nothing can be affirmed.

The narratives are clearly not all by one author.
(i) Some are histories of Elijah and Elisha, or of movements
which they instituted in the direction of religious reform. (ii) In
others the fate of the kingdom is regarded from a political stand-
point, and this as determined mainly by the action of the king,
though here also prophets play an important part as advisers and
announcers of the oracle of Yahwe. Thus both classes have
a religious colouring or motive, and may equally be regarded as

1 a full (i.e. complete or accurate; cf. Dent. 25. 15, Prov. 11. 1) quarter.
In this case the difficult ה of the obverse may be a Niph'al participle ה, 'set'
or 'appointed'; so 25. 19 'a standard quarter'.
Prof. Smith's article, together with other correspondence upon the subject of
the inscription, is collected in PEF. Ay. St., July, 1894, pp. 220-231; October,
1894, pp. 284-287.
1 הָרוּם II. 25. 19 appears to have a certain force; 'One Eunuch and five
men, &c.' Cf. 1 Sam. 8. 7.
the work of men of prophetic training, perhaps members of the
guilds which we see coming into prominence in some of the Elisha
stories.

(i) To the former class belong I. 17-19; 21; II. 1. 2-17a;
2. 1-18, 19-22, 23-25; 4. 1-7, 8-37, 38-41, 42-44; 5; 6. 1-7;

Of these, I. 17-19 forms a continuous narrative. From the
abruptness of v. 1, no reason being assigned for Elijah's threat, and
no point of connexion existing for הָלַּע v. 3, it may be inferred that
the commencement of the story has been omitted or abbreviated
by R0, and the specification of אֶלְיָהֵה הָעָדָד מָחָשָׂב יֹתֵרָה thus represents
his summary introduction. The sequel also, in strict accordance
with 19. 15, 16, is lacking, only one part of Yahwe's commission
being fulfilled, vv. 19-21.

I. 21 is clearly out of place in MT., breaking the connexion
between ch. 20 and its sequel ch. 22, and LXX, Luc. are no doubt
correct in placing this narrative immediately after ch. 19. The
dislocation may have been due to the desire to bring the prophecy
of Ahab's death (21. 19) nearer to the account of its occurrence
(22. 35ff.), and perhaps in a minor degree to the description of the
king's mood as שַׁם יִשְׁמָע in 20. 43 as in 21. 4.

Most critics (Wellh., Dri., Kamp., Benz., Kit.; but Kue. is uncertain:
Ond. § 25. 7) assign I. 21 to the same author as I. 17-19. Thus
Wellh. cites as points of contact the central position occupied by
Elijah, his eagle-like swoop upon Ahab at the right moment, and
the formulae הָלַּע הָעָדָד מָחָשָׂב in 21. 1 (but cf. note ad loc.)
as 17. 17, 18 as הָלַּע הָעָדָד מָחָשָׂב in 21. 17 as מָחָשָׂב in 18. 1.

On the other hand, it may be maintained that Elijah is not really
the central figure as in I. 17-19. He does not appear upon the
scene until v. 17, and then takes scarcely a more conspicuous
position than Micaiah in 22. 8ff. The king and his action form
the centre of interest both at the beginning and end of the narrative.
Further, Kue. notices the absence of any reference in 21 to 17-19
and vice versa, the murder of Naboth forming the single crime
of Ahab and Jezebel in the one story, while in the other the sole
pivot is the struggle between Yahwe and Ba' äl. This, however, is a point of slight moment, and no definite conclusion can be reached as to the relative authorship of the two sections.

Of far greater interest and importance is the question of the connexion of I. 21 with its natural sequel II. 9. 1—10. 28. Critics generally argue or assume that the latter section is by a different author to the former, and most (Wellh., Dri., Kamp., Kit.) assign II. 9 ff. to the writer of I. 20. 22; II. 3. 4—27, &c. (see below). The argument against identity of authorship of I. 21 and II. 9 ff., as stated by Wellh., is based upon supposed discrepancy in detail. While in I. 21 it is the vineyard of Naboth which is mentioned, and this is described as נבуть נב , i.e. his portion or estate, which lay outside the city. Again, I. 21. 13 records only the death of Naboth, while II. 9. 26 speaks also of the blood of his sons as calling for vengeance.

On the other hand, the following considerations clearly make for the unity of the two narratives:—

II. 9. 21b, the meeting of Joram ben-Ahab with Jehu actually upon the estate of Naboth, is a touch of high dramatic power which demands that the writer should not only have known the story of Naboth (proved by vv. 25, 26), but should actually have written it down himself as an introduction to the sequel II. 9 ff.

Thus a presumption is created in favour of our Naboth narrative being the story thus written.

The parallels between the prediction I. 21. 19, 23 and the fulfilment II. 9. 25, 26, 36 cannot be insisted upon, because I. 21. 19 ff. has been largely amplified by R^2 (see notes ad loc.), and it is not now possible certainly to determine the original kernel of Elijah’s prediction. It should, however, be noticed that the usual method of R^2 is to expand rather than to excise, and, if this plan has here prevailed, the original speech must be contained in vv. 19, 20, 23b. The disagreement in points of fact between I. 21 and II. 9 proves upon examination to be non-existent. Ahab’s dispute with Naboth arose in the first instance about a vineyard
adjoining the palace, but this was only a portion of Naboth's estate (נַבֹּת), the whole of which would lapse to the king supposing that the family of Naboth became extinct. And I. 21. 15, where Jezebel tells Ahab to go down and take possession of the vineyard, clearly implies the extirpation of the whole family: in the statement יְהַבֹּת יִשָּׂא נַבֹּת וּלְךָ מִת the name נַבֹּת means Naboth and his sons, just as much as in v. 19 דְּרָם מִי אֲנָה הָיָה means the blood of Ahab and his son (cf. v. 29b).

Most decisive, however, is the question of the supposed unity of II. 9. 1—10. 28 with I. 20. 22; II. 3. 4—27; 6. 8—7. 20. If this be granted, the diverse authorship of I. 21 and II. 9 is seems necessarily to follow, since I. 21 can scarcely be regarded as of one piece with I. 20. 22. The place where the dogs lick the blood of Ahab, 22. 38, is discordant with the prediction of 21. 19, and in general the interest of the writer of 20. 22—mainly, if not wholly, political—and his sympathetic feeling for the king of Israel, preclude the supposition that he is also the author of the Naboth story.

Wellh. cites the following coincidences in phraseology of II. 9f. with I. 20. 22, &c.:—הַרְוַר הַבָּהוֹרִים II. 9. 2; I. 20. 30; 22. 25; הַשָּׁמֶךְ יְהַבֹּת II. 9. 3; 7. 9; רֶכֶב הָעָם 9. 18; 7. 14; I. 22. 34; 20. 18; אָרְאֵה יִשָּׂא II. 10. 14; 7. 12; I. 20. 18; אָרְאֵה יִשָּׂא II. 10. 27; 6. 25. The importance of this collection is, however, open to doubt, since it contains no striking phrase, but such only as might be expected to occur in narratives nearly contemporaneous, and having, in the main, the same subjects in common.

On the other hand, a point of phraseology, apparently hitherto overlooked, sharply separates between II. 9f. and I. 20. 22, &c., and seems absolutely to preclude the theory of a common authorship. This is the title which is ordinarily applied to the king in the course of the narrative.

I. 20. 22; II. 3. 4—27; 6. 8—7. 20 are, as might be expected, bound together by the use of a common title. In all the writer's phrase is מִלְּלֵי יִשָּׁעַי, and the proper name of the king, if it occurs at all, is in nearly every case reserved for the necessary
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specification at the commencement of a section. The facts are as follow:


I. 22 ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש כלל נופל שאר תונש, viz. vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 18, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38, 39 bis; ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש כלל נופל שאר תונש, viz. vv. 15, 16, 35, 37, 38, 39 bis.

II. 3. 4-27 ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש כלל נופל שאר תונש, viz. vv. 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 bis; ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש כלל נופל שאר תונש, viz. v. 5 (probably from another source); ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש כלל נופל שאר תונש, viz. v. 6.

II. 6. 8—7. 20 ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש, seven times, viz. 6. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 21, 26; ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש, ten times, viz. 6. 28, 30; 7. 2, 6, 12, 14, 15, 17 bis, 18.

On the other hand, in II. 9 the king of Israel is called ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש, simply nine times, viz. vv. 14 bis, 16 bis, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24; ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש, simply, nine times (omitting the prophecy vv. 21-26), viz. vv. 2, 3, 4, 8, 15, 16, 20, 27, 29.

Now though this agreement in form of reference to the king cannot be pressed to prove identity of authorship for I. 21 and II. 9, any more than the fact that I. 17-19 always speaks of ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש, simply can be used to connect this section with I. 21, because different writers may easily have employed the same so obvious citation of the proper name; yet the fact of disagreement in form of reference between I. 21 and I. 20. 22, &c., ought to be emphasized as demonstrating diversity of authorship.

It is true that in I. 20. 22, &c., the general use of ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש may be explained as prompted to a large extent by contrast to ג'קק קפנשת ת'לעשת תונש, simply; but this does not sufficiently account for the almost total omission of the king’s proper name, which would certainly have occurred far more frequently had the author of II. 9 been the writer of these narratives. Contrast especially I. 22, II. 3. 4-27, where (excepting 3. 6) the
names of Ahab and Joram are never mentioned in spite of the close connexion with the usual form of citation is simply. And, again, notice the use of simply five times in I. 22, ten times in II. 6. 8—7. 20, where the desire for distinction from simply cannot have been in the writer’s mind, and the occasion might have been suitable for the use of the king’s proper name.

By this point, therefore, the diverse authorship of I. 20. 22, &c., and II. 9 seems to be proved, and this dissociation adds weight to the arguments which have above been put forward in favour of the unity of II. 9. 1—10. 27 with I. 21.

II. 1. 2—17** is from a different source to the preceding Elijah narratives. This fact is marked by the form of the name peculiar to this section, and generally by the inferior literary merit of the composition. The story is probably much later than I. 17—19, I. 21 and sequel.

II. 2. 1—18, Elijah’s translation, links itself closely on to some of the longer Elisha narratives which follow, as their introduction; but also might have formed a suitable close to the Elijah history, of which we possess a fragment in I. 17—19, if this can be thought to have gone on to embody also a history of Elisha. The following coincidences between the narratives are worthy of notice, and suggest that I. 17—19; II. 2. 1-18; 4. 1—37, to which we may add II. 5, may be the work of one author. In the case of II. 8. 7—15; 13. 14—19 the evidence is too slight to build upon.

**Elijah.**

I. 17. 8—24. Miraculous provision for the widow of Zarephath during famine, and the raising of her son from death.

I. 18. 26. לְתָן אַלּ הִמָּה לְתָן אַלּ הִמָּה.

29. לְתָן אַלּ הִמָּה לְתָן אַלּ הִמָּה.

**Elisha.**

II. 4. 1—7. Miraculous provision for the wife of one of the sons of the prophets.

II. 4. 8—37. Raising to life of the son of the Shunammite woman.

II. 4. 31. בֵּיתוֹ הַיָּעָה בֵּיתוֹ הַיָּעָה.
The short Elisha stories are probably popular tales handed down orally at first, and not put into writing till some considerable time after the longer narratives.

(ii) The second class includes I. 20; 22. 1-38; II. 3. 4-29; 6. 8-23, 24-33; 7; (14. 8-14). All these, with the exception of 14. 8-14, deal in the same style with the same subject—Israel’s relations with Aram, and may not improbably flow from one hand. Notice especially the close bond of connexion between I. 22. 4, 7 and II. 3, 7, 11.

II. 14. 8-14, which stands apart from the other narratives, is marked as probably North Palestinian in origin by its tone, and especially by the reference v. 11 וַיהֵרֵד לֶמְנֶה לְגֵילָּא. Cf. I. 19. 3.

17. Elijah the prophet predicts three years of famine. He is supported at the brook Kerith by ravens, and afterwards at Zarephath by a widow, whose means of subsistence he miraculously maintains. He raises the widow’s son from death.

17. וַיַּעַבְרָה So ch. 21. 17, 28; II. 9. 36; 1. 3, 8. On the place Tishbe see below.

רְוֵצֵק R.V. ‘Of the sojourners of Gilead.’ יַעַבְרָה occurs thirteen times elsewhere—eleven times in the Pentateuch exclusively in P and H, and in 1 Chr. 29. 15; Ps. 39. 13. The word may
thus, but for this occurrence in Kings, be judged to be late. 

Therefore is found eight times || יא, viz. Gen. 23. 4; Lev. 25. 23, 35, 47 bis; Num. 35. 15; 1 Chr. 29. 15; Ps. 39. 13; || יא four times, viz. Ex. 12. 45; Lev. 22. 10; 25. 6, 40; while the participle יא refers to Lev. 25. 45. Thus יא has much the same meaning as יא—a foreigner dwelling in the midst of Israel, and, if it can be in any way distinguished from this latter, seems to denote residence of a more fortuitous or transitory character; cf. Gen. 23. 4; Ps. 39. 13; 1 Chr. 29. 15. Elijah is thus said to have been a foreigner who had been sojourning, probably for a short time merely, in the region east of Jordan—a statement which ill accords with his zeal in extirpating the foreign Ba'al cult, and confirming the worship of Yahwe in the kingdom of Israel.

It should be noticed further that the scriptio defectiva of the Holom in יא is not found elsewhere among the thirteen other occurrences of the word, and is unusual in the case of יא arising out of the diphthong אוי.

The difficulty thus apparent is met by the rendering of LXX εκ θεσιπον τῆς Γαλαάδ, Luc. ῦ εκ θεσιπον τῆς Γαλαάδ, i.e. יא יא (ירדנש) 'of Tishbe in Gilead.' Thus the gentilic יא is further elucidated, and the native city or village of the prophet is named, as might have been expected; cf. ch. 19. 16; II. 14. 25; al. So Jos. (Ant. viii. 13, § 2) εκ πόλεως θεσιπον τῆς Γαλαάδιδος χώρας, and among moderns Ew., Th., Wellh., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Sta. u. Sieg., &c. Klo., who reads 'aus Thisbe Gileads' in his text, suggests in the notes that LXX ῦ προφήτης (θεσιπος) ῦ εκ θ᾽ stands for יא יא תישב עשת, and that this is a corruption of יא יא יא 'the Jabeshite of Jabesh Gilead.' This, however, must presuppose that יא is a corruption in all its six occurrences.

A place named Tishbe in Naphtali is mentioned Tobit 1. 2:—

δε ἡμαλλοτέτηθη ἐν ἡμέραις Ἠκματισίαρ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων ἐκ Θεσβίς (Cod. A Θεβίς), ἢ ἠστίν ἐκ δεξιῶν Κυδών τῆς Νεφθαλίας ἐν τῇ

1 According to Field, in some texts ῦ προφήτης stands alone without θεσιπος. His note is:—'Sic Ald., Codd. III, XI, 44, 55, 64, 71, alli (inter quos 247), Syro-hex. (cum לֶאַכְשָׁנְו in marg.), Arm. 1.'
Thus the statement 'Tishbe of Gilead' may be intended to make distinction from this other place of the same name.

Van Kasteren (Zeitschr. d. deutsch. Pal. Vereins XIII, 207 ff.) identifies הַנְבוֹת with El-istiib upon the Jebel Ajlun, some ten miles north of the Jabok, and supports the metathesis (st for ts) by comparison of Ar. Tell semak = Sycaminos. To the south-east of Istib lie the ruins of a quadrangular chapel now bearing the name of Mar Elyas, and near to this is an insignificant grave which is said to be the grave of the prophet.

\[\text{ Cf. ch. 18. 15; II. 3. 14; 5. 16.}\]

\[\text{LXX} \quad \text{Kύρος ὅ Θεός τῶν δυνάμεων, ὁ Θεός Ἰσραήλ.}\]

Luc. omits. In v. 14 LXX, Luc. κύρος. Elijah's expression elsewhere ch. 18. 15; 19. 10, 14 is מַעְנָב לְיָלָה 'א, and this, taken in connexion with the fact that מַעְנָב is most generally a redactional phrase (cf. ch. 8. 15 note), favours the reading in v. 1 מַעְנָב לְיָלָה 'א, and in v. 14 hath merely.

\[\text{Before whom I stand,' i.e. whose servant I am, the phrase being employed in the idiomatic sense noticed ch. 1. 2 note. The perfect is here used of an action commencing at some point of time indefinitely anterior, and continuing into the present.}\]

\[\text{According to Jos. (Ant. viii. 13, § 2) this drought is mentioned by Menander the historian among the events of the reign of Ittoba'al of Tyre, and its duration is stated as one full year:—μετήμεντα δὲ τῆς ἀνομβρίας ταύτης καὶ Μεικάρδου ἐν τούτῳ Ἰθαβάλῳ τῶν Τυρίων βασιλείως πράξεως λέγων αὐτῶν: 'ἀφροδία τὴν ἀυτοῦ ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπερβρατικοῦ μικρὸς ὅς τοῦ ἐχομένου ἐντὸς ὑπερβρατικοῦ, λεπτίναι δ' ἀυτοῦ ποιησαμένου κεραυνός λευκαίς βαθύκινως, κ.τ.λ.'}\]

\[\text{LXX, Luc. here and in v. 8 πρὸς Ἡλειοῦ (Ἡλέων), if not paraphrastic, seems to be an easy error Ἡλέων (Ἡλίων) for Ἡλέων. Cf. v. 11 where Ἡλέων ἡ τῆς ἡττοῦ is rendered καὶ ἐβδομεῖν ὅπως αὐτῆς Ἡλειοῦ. For MT. cf. ch. 19. 9.}\]

\[\text{The substantive verb merely serves loosely to}\]
introduce what follows. Dri. Tenses, § 121 Obs. 1, quotes also Ex. 4. 16; Ezek. 47. 10, 22.

6. מְכָבָא הָיוּ בָנוּ "Were bringing." The stress is on the continuity of their action during a period of some length.

‘וכ’ LXX, Luc. ἀπροφ ὀς πρατε καὶ πρεια τὸ δῶας, favoured by Klo., Kamp., Kit. upon the ground (Klo.) of a supposed reference to Ex. 16. 8, 12.


וּקָנָה יָבָאֵה שֶׁזֶּה LXX, Luc. omit.

10. מַגְ'אֵר ] LXX, Luc. omit.


11. מַגְ'אֵר ] The first radical is thus preserved only again in imperat.

12. מַגְ'אֵר ] ‘A cake’; only again in the doubtful passage Ps. 35. 16. The more usual word is מַפָּע v. 13; al., possibly so named from its rounded or twisted shape, if we may suppose a connexion with Ar. אוֹלֶקֶךְ ‘to be curved or distorted.’ Pesh. רֶשֶׁי קִדְמָה, Targ. רְשָׁהוּ לְרָדִידֵךְ. LXX, Luc. presuppose ἡ καθισμή σου ἡ παιδία μου ‘I have nothing,’ a reading which, as Th. notices, agrees better than MT. with the following יָבָא יֵבָא, and is therefore preferable. So Klo.

14. מַגְ'אֵר ] ‘and for my children;’ and so v. 13 יָבָא לְאָבָא for יָבָא לְאָבָא. So Th., upon the ground that the pl. agrees better with יָבָא יֵבָא her household, v. 15, and that MT. vocalization may be due to vv. 17 ff. These latter verses, however, certainly convey the impression that the boy was the widow’s only son, and this perhaps gains confirmation from the parallel story of Elisha, II. 4. 8 ff.

15. מַגְ'אֵר ] The final syllable anomalously vocalized after the
analogy of verbs מַלְלֶה; cf. אֶלֶל, Dan. 10. 14. For cases of the converse change—true מַלְלֶה vocalized as מָלָל, cf. אֶלֶל ch. 9. 11; אֲלָל Eccl. 8. 12; 9. 18; הָלָל Ps. 119. 101; G-K. § 75 00; Sta. § 143 4, Rem. 1 8.

15. [אָחָתוֹל רַקֲנָא] Q’re, which is postulated by the fem. verb, has the support of LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ.

16. [רַקֲנָא] The predicate agrees with מַלְלֶה, the principal number of the compound subj., and not with מַלְלֶה as in v. 14. Naturally it is the oil and not the cruse which is thought of as not failing. Cf. § 35 00; Sta. § 143 6; Rem. 2.

17. [בַּעַל הָוְעָלָא] ‘The mistress of the house.’ Similarly בַּעַלְיָוְעָלָא Ex. 22. 7 (E); Judg. 19. 22, 23. Klo.’s ingenious suggestion to emend בַּעַלְיָוְעָלָא as in the upper chamber of the house,’ regarding this as a gloss from v. 19, is in fact refuted by the statement of that verse, מַלְלֶה.

18. [לָלָא לָא] Luc. מַלְלֶה כַּנָּא suggests מַלְלֶה כַּנָּא as in Gen. 2. 7. For MT., supported by LXX, Vulg., Pesh., Targ., cf. Dan. 10. 17.

19. [לָא לָא] ‘What have I and thou (in common)?’ i.e. ‘What concern hast thou with my affairs?’ The phrase occurs again in II. 3. 13; Judg. 11. 12; 2 Chr. 35. 21; 2 Sam. 16. 19; 19. 23, and in each case deprecates outside interference. This is further illustrated by NT.; S. Matt. 8. 29 Τι ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, οὐ τοῦ Θεοῦ; οὗτος ἐστὶν πρὸ καρποῦ ματαίως ἡμᾶς; S. Jo. 2. 4 Τι ἣμων καὶ σοί, γενέω; οὗτος οὖν ἡ ἄρα μοι. Cf. also S. Matt. 27. 19 μηδέν σοι καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ. By מַלְלֶה לָא לָא the woman seems to mean that the man of God, by living in her house, has directed God’s attention to her, and that some secret sin, perhaps unknown to her and which might otherwise have escaped detection, has been the cause of her son’s death.

[Here, however, the vocalisation may have been determined by מַלְלֶה of Gen. 49. 1, which seems to have suggested the words of Daniel. Cf. Bevan, ad loc.]
20. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης 

21. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

22. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

23. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

24. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

18. Elijah’s meeting with Ahab in the third year of the famine.

18. 1. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

18. 2. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

18. 3. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

18. 4. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης

18. 5. Ἡσθη α'ς ἕξης
Impossible. Even a forced translation can merely give the sense that Ahab feared to lose *some* only of the beasts, while the context clearly demands expression of the apprehension lest the whole should perish. The true text is given by Luc. Kal *vos ἐξομολογήσως ἐφ' ἡμῖν κτῆμα, i.e. וּבָשָׂר, ‘that cattle be not cut off from us.’ So Wellh.

6. [א] LXX, Luc., Pesh. suggest שְׁכִינָה; inferior to MT.

7. [א] LXX, Luc. omit in reference to Ahab.

8. [א] LXX, Luc. kal *Ἰωνέαρ*, i.e. פשחת, preferred by Th., Klo. MT., however, agrees well with the fact that Obadiah had not before seen Elijah (cf. his question in this verse, and his statements as to himself vv. 12b, 13), and must therefore have recognized him from popular description of his appearance.

9. [א] The enclitic *nū* gives point and vivacity to the interrogation. So v. 17; 2 Sam. 2. 20, and in an indirect question Gen. 27. 21†. With omission of *nū*, etc. Gen. 27. 24†. Cf. note on ch. 14. 6.

10. [א] Luc. omits.

11. [א] ‘And when they said, He is not (here), he would take an oath of &c.’ LXX, Luc. render ἐπικράτησαν by kal *ἐπικράτησαν*, rightly recognized by Klo. as a corruption of kal *ἐπικράτησαν*, i.e. ספתנה.

12. [א] ‘That he *could* not find thee.’ Dri. *Tenses*, § 37 b. Unless *by* be merely used in place of *ל* (ch. 1. 38 note), the constr. is pregnant: ‘carry thee off (up) and set thee down upon.’ Cf. II. 2. 16 פָּשֲׂבָתָה יָאַבְרָה מַעְבֶּרֶתְךָ וּלְיַבֵּשְׂךָ עָלֶיךָ וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וּרְאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה וְרָאָבְךָ עָלָה V.

13. [א] For impers. passive governing the accus., cf. ch. 2. 21 note.

14. [א] And when I hid &c.’ Cf. ch. 2. 5 note.

15. [א] Cf. ch. 17. 1 note.
16. [LXX, Luc. καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀνείπη]. Th. notices that such haste is wholly conformable to the statement of v. 10.

18. [The Ba'als]. Some contempt is conveyed by the use of the plural as contrasted with the one Yahwe. Cf. 1 Sam. 7. 4 'And the children of Israel put away the Ba'als and the Astartes, and served Yahwe alone.' The plural has reference to the various local forms under which the Canaanite Ba'al was worshipped; cf.עֲבַדוּ, בֵּית בֶּהָל, בֵּית בֶּהָל, and the place-names (local sanctuaries) בֵּית בֶּהָל, בֵּית בֶּהָל, בֵּית בֶּהָל, al. For instances from CIS. of Phoenician titles of special Ba'als, cf. Dri. Sam., pp. 49 f.

19. [LXX, Luc. τῆς αἰοχάμης, and so v. 25; i.e. παρ' ἑαυτῷ 'the shameful thing' substituted by a later hand, as in Hos. 9. 10στῆς αἰοχάμης ἡ μοιραία ὑπολογίζεται; Jer. 3. 24; 11. 13. Cf. also the same alteration in the proper names נֵצֶר 2 Sam. 11. 21 for נֵצֶר; Judg. 6. 32; נֵצֶר 2 Sam. 2. 8 for נֵצֶר 1 Chr. 8. 33; נֵצֶר 2 Sam. 4. 4 for נֵצֶר 1 Chr. 8. 34; 9. 40a or נֵצֶר 1 Chr. 9. 40b. In these latter cases נֵצֶר appears to have been used as a title of Yahwe, an ancient practice which was afterwards discouraged by the prophets (cf. Hos. 2. 18), and finally disappeared. Cf. Dri. Sam., p. 95.

Wellh. (so Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit.), calling attention to the absence of נֵצֶר before בְּנֵבֶן and to the omission of any mention in vv. 22, 40, regards these words as a gloss, upon the ground that נֵצֶר was not confused with the goddess נֵצֶר until much later times. Cf. ch. 14. 15 note. Pesh. gives the number as 450.

20. [LXX, Luc. are preferable in omission of בְּנֵבֶן; εἰς πᾶσα Ἰσραήλ].

22. [LXX, Luc. πάρασ ρώσ ρωπῃας. Pesh. יַמָּ֑ת,] 'and gathered the men' may perhaps point to a reading מָכַבְּנִים, with suffix of indefinite reference.

1 EloBetha is the reading of Cod. 93 Holmes and of אביגל, i. e. 'A., X., Θ.

2 LXX, Luc. make the addition in v. 22 καὶ ρωπῃας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Luc. τὸν Ἰσραήλ) τεθρεπτεῖν.
21. ‘How long are ye limping upon the two different opinions?’ The attempt to combine two religions so incompatible as Yahwe-worship and Ba’al-worship is compared to the laboured gait of a man walking upon legs of different length. דואות appears to mean divisions, as rendered by Pesh. (סRGBA תַּנִּית, Targ. partes1; cf. פֶּשֶׁן ‘cleft’ or ‘fissure’ of a rock, Judg. 15. 8, 11; Isa. 2. 21; 57. 5; ‘branch’ Isa. 17. 6; 27. 10; מ’רין ‘thoughts’ (as dividing or distracting the mind, Ges.) Job 4. 13; 20. 21 may be the same word. LXX, Luc. render by ὀρείς ἤπειρος, and this is followed by Ew., Th., Benz., who explain מ’רין as ‘knee-cavities (Kniekehlen), the place where the bone is divided,’ and regard the saying as a proverb of Elijah’s time.

22. [Pesh. omits. Targ. תֶּחֶר יִתְרָה נְבֶן נְבֶן.]

23. [So let them give.] The ל is, however, not expressed in the Verss., excepting Targ.

24. [LXX, Luc., Pesh. presuppose additional מ’רין, probably an easy gloss in antithesis to the preceding דואות.]

‘He is the God,’ i.e. the true God. Cf. v. 39.

25. [LXX, Luc. add מ’רין לָעַדְבָּה; but for MT. cf. ch. 2. 38, 42.]

26. [Pesh. omits.]

27. [The repetition of LXX, Luc. ἐνάκυσαν ἡμῶν, ὁ Βα’אל, ἐνάκυσαν ἡμῶν is probably an imitation of v. 37.]

‘And they limped around the altar.’ ἵνα μετὰ τὰ ὑπαναχθῆναι, the intensive of the word used in v. 21, describes with some scorn the pantomimic dance (Ke., Th.) of the priests. LXX, Luc. καὶ διερχόμενις, Vulg. transitilhantique, Pesh. תַּנִּית, תַּנִּית ‘exerted themselves,’ Targ. מִשְׁמְרָה מ’רין ‘leapt madly.’ Klo.’s suggestion וּנְרָה ‘and they danced’ (2 Sam. 6. 16) is unnecessary. Baethgen (Semit. Relig. 25) compares a Greek inscription from the neighbourhood of Berytus (CIG. 4536) Εἰσαβί μοι, Βαλμαρίας, κολλαντι κάμων. Here Βαλμαρίας must represent רֵעֵב ‘Ba’al of the dance,’ or רֵעֵב ‘causing to dance,’ i.e. ‘worshipped in the dance.’

1 coloured, perhaps a corruption of aמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָמָm, ‘doubtful (opinions).’
LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. presuppose ἦσσ' πρέπει 'which they had made,' correctly.


G-K. § 67 y; Kō. Lehrg. I. i, p. 352, explain as imperf. Hiph. of הָנָה with doubling of first radical (Aramatizing form) as in לֶשֶׁב, and without elision of ה as in the forms לֶשֶׁב Job 13. 9, לֶשֶׁב, Jer. 9. 4. Sta., in adopting the former view, considers that these latter forms ought properly to be vocalized לֶשֶׁב, מִן.


So Luc. v. 29.

' النبي' מִן] 'Surely meditation, or surely going aside occupies him, or surely a journey occupies him!' מִן 'meditation,' as producing a condition of abstraction (Pesh. לֶשֶׁב), is preferable here to 'conversation' (LXX, Luc., Vulg., Targ.). מִן (for מִן from מִן 'turn back'; cf. לֶשֶׁב 2 Sam. 1. 22 for לֶשֶׁב) is usually explained, after Jarchi, as an euphemism. But omission of מִן מִן מִן in LXX, Luc., suggests that these words may be an erroneous repetition of the former. So Klo. The meaning of מִן מִן מִן is brought out by paraphrase of LXX, Luc. כִּי מִן מִן מִן מִן, 'perhaps he has business to transact!'

29. מִן מִן מִן מִן] The nuance is 'must (or should) be awakened.'

28. מִן מִן מִן מִן] LXX omits; but Luc. מִן
XVIII. 27-30b

In the time of the offering of the oblation; but v. 36, 'at the offering' (exc. Josh. 13. 5 = Judg. 3. 3) is elsewhere very late, being confined to Chr., Ezra, Neh. The occurrences are cited Dri. LOT., p. 506. In the earlier language יֵד alone is usual, as in Gen. 32. 25; 19. 22; Judg. 6. 18; al. The phrase 'about (the time of) the offering,' is also found in II. 3. 20, of the early morning, and not, as here, of the afternoon. The reference can scarcely be to anything else than the morning and evening offering at the Temple at Jerusalem; nor need this, as coming from a writer of the northern kingdom, cause difficulty, in view of the statement of v. 31b; see note.

יתמר in P always denotes a meal-offering, and this, according to the regulations of Ex. 29. 38-42; Num. 28. 3-8, was the regular accompaniment of the lamb which was to be offered morning and evening. But our passage clearly refers to the offering generally, of whatever it consisted at that time, and not to such a special portion of it as the term denotes in P. From 1 Sam. 26. 19 'let him smell an offering,' smell i.e. the sweet smoke from the burning (cf. Gen. 8. 21), Gen. 4. 4; 1 Sam. 2. 17 (cf. vv. 15, 16), it appears that יֵד in early times could denote even an animal sacrifice, and was thus a general term for an offering, like יֵד in P. The use of the word with the meaning present (ch. 5. 1 note) is closely allied. Cf. Wellh. Prolagomena, pp. 61 f. Upon the difficult passage II. 16. 15 cf. note ad loc.

30b 'וֶה נָשָׁת [And he repaired &c.': a use of נָשָׁת heal peculiar to this passage. In LXX, Luc. these words do not stand in this position, but appear between 32a and 32b, 32b being somewhat abbreviated; καὶ ἐνατέρον τῶν λίθων (LXX ἐν ἐνατέρον Κυρίου), καὶ ἐνατέρον τῶ ἰουδαστήμαιν (Luc. κυρίου) τῶ κατασκαμμένων, κ.τ.λ. This is a superficial rearrangement made because the altar could not be said to be repaired until the stones had been built up. But in MT., v. 30b states summarily what is re-stated in detail in vv. 31, 32, according to the diffuse but picturesque style of the writer. Gen. 27. 23, followed by the details of vv. 24-29, is similar.
Thus the spot selected on Carmel by Elijah was the site of a הַנַּעְט הַנְטָל or local sanctuary which had been destroyed at the idolatrous reaction which had been brought about by Jezebel. Cf. ch. 19. 10. These passages show incidentally the wide diffusion of such high-places for the (unmixed) worship of Yahwe throughout the northern kingdom. Cf. ch. 19. 18.

Th. cites Tac. Hist. ii. 78; Suet. Vespas. 5 as stating that down to Vespasian's time an altar existed on Carmel without temple or statues.

This notice goes to show that the absence of any polemic on the part of Elijah against the calf-worship of the kingdom of Israel does not imply his tacit approval, but rather that while (so far as we know) tolerating it in face of the far more serious deflection caused by the introduction of the Phoenician Baal worship, he had in view as an ideal the ultimate union of the two kingdoms in the pure worship of Yahwe. Cf. v. 29 note; ch. 22. 7 note.

The precise words, מַס הַנַּעְט הַנְטָל, occur in Gen. 35. 10 (P), and this has caused Kue. and others to regard this half-verse as an addition under the influence of P. Kamp. goes further, taking the whole of vv. 31, 32a as a later gloss, and finding in them a contradiction to v. 30b (the mere repair of the altar; but see note; and it is most probable that, if the narrative
has received any addition, this is the correct view. But the fact recorded in v. 31 is also in Gen. 32. 28, 29 (LXX), and too much stress must not be laid upon such a very easy coincidence with the words of P.

32. נחלת ‘A channel.’ Cf. II. 18. 17; 20. 20, where the word means a ‘conduit’ or ‘aqueduct.’

תויב ‘(Of) about the capacity of.’

33. After v. 33b, LXX, Luc. add ἐπὶ τὰ σκοιατήριαν καὶ ἐπικεφάλης, and at the close of the verse, καὶ ἐπικεφαλής ἐπὶ τὰ σκοιατήρια.

34. שחל ‘Do it a third time.’ Elsewhere this denom. Piel means Do on the third day; Sam. 20. 19; Divide into three parts; Deut. 19. 31.

‘35. לְלִי LXX ἀλήθεια, under the influence of the plural verbs in the preceding verse.

36. After לאשה פֶּרֶס זָרָה הֲדָבָר LXX, Luc. add the gloss ἐκάκωσθος μου, κύριέ, ἐκάκωσθος μου σήμερον ἐν πυρί, and then continue καὶ γνώσεσθαι πᾶσα καὶ λαβεῖν οἴκος (cf. v. 37) in place of ויהיו עמה.

37a. Luc. omits.

37b. לְלִי LXX, Luc. τῆς καρδιάς τοῦ λαὸς τοῦτον.

38. אֲאָדַם)]. LXX, Luc. πορεὶ πόρον ἑπεραστήκει, Targ. ‘it suggests ἐφαρμόζεσθαι, and this is adopted by Th., Klo., Kamp., on the supposition that ἅρμος has been lost through proximity to the similar ןאם. After ‘ LXX, Luc. add ἐν τοῦ εὐφαντοῖ, as in Gen. 19. 24 מֹרִיחו מַגְּלָה יִהְיֶה and ‘.

יתא] The different order of LXX, Luc., אֲאָדָם מְאָה מֵאָדָם הַתַּנְחִית, is certainly wrong, since לחה must refer to לחה תַּנְחִית.

39. לְלִי LXX, Luc. πρὸς τὸν λαὸν.

40. לְלִי LXX, Luc. πρὸς τὸν λαὸν.

41. ‘There is a sound of the roar of rain.’ מַגְּלָה means the loud rushing noise of a heavy downpour, as heard by Elijah’s ‘prophetically sharpened ear’ (Klo.). So Pesh. קַפַּר צַעְמָה, Targ. יְבַעַר. Cf. Jer. 10. 13; 51. 16 מַגְּלָה.

42. אלע[ך] On the contrasted order cf. ch. 5. 25 note.

רונע ‘And he crouched.’ The meaning, here and in the only
other occurrence II. 4. 34, 35, must be determined by the context.
So Verss. in both passages.

43b. LXX καὶ σὺ ἐπιστρέψεις ἐπιτάκει, καὶ ἐπιστρέψεις ἐπίτακε. καὶ ἐπιστρέψεις τὸ παιδάριον ἐπιτάκε. Luc. Ἐπιστρέψεις καὶ ἐπιστρέψεις τὸ παιδάριον ἐπιτάκει. καὶ ἐπιστρέψεις τὸ παιδάριον ἐπιτάκε. Here the first sentence of LXX appears to contain a doublet, while in Luc. the text has been worked over, and the verb of the second member altered into ἐπιστρέψεις, in accordance with v. 43a. The emphatic καὶ σὺ of LXX has the appearance of originality, and supposing (with Klo.) ἰσιά to be a corruption of ἰσιά, we may restore:—Now return seven times.' And the lad returned seven times.'

44. LXX, Luc. αὐγουστ αὐλο a mistaken reading μή με.

45. In a very short while.' The repetition expresses both the brevity of the interval and its indeterminateness. Vulg. explains differently Cumque se vereret hoc aique illuc, and so Pesh. ἤ ἔρχετο ἐκεῖ ἀπὸ ἐκείνου. Similar Targ. paraphrases ὅπως ὄνειρον 'while he was harnessing.'

46. So Ezek. 33. 22; but לָע instead of לָע is usual.—II. 3. 15; Ezek. 1. 3; 3. 22; 37. 1; 40. 1. The phrase describes the powerful access of prophetic inspiration. Cf. also Ezek. 8. 1 'And the hand of the Lord Yahwe fell upon me there'; Ezek. 3. 14 'וּם חָדַךְ יְהֹוָה, 'And the hand of Yahwe was strong upon me'; Isa. 8. 11 'Thus said Yahwe unto me with strength of hand.'

The word is otherwise quite unknown. All Verss. give the meaning 'gird.'

19. Jezebel seeks to take vengeance upon Elijah for the death of her prophets. Elijah flees into the wilderness of Judah, and then journeys on to Horeb, where he receives Yahwe's further commission for the extermination of Ba' al worship from Israel.

19. LXX adds תָּלְאַר גוּן, i.e. תָּלְאַר, which may have fallen out before the following מִן.
‘And all the details of his slaying’; lit. ‘and all that he had slain.’ This, however, is extremely forced, and, since לָא is omitted by all Verss. except Targ., it may be supposed to be an erroneous insertion from the first half of the verse. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

2. LXX, Luc. preface Jezebel’s speech with the words Εἴς οὖς ἐπὶ ‘As surely as you are Elijah and I am Jezebel!’ The force and character of the words speak for their genuineness. So Th.

3. Read ‘And he was afraid,’ with all Verss. except Targ. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

4. ‘A broom.’ This shrub, which bears in Ar. the same name רָמִים, is the Retama roetam of modern botanists, the Genista roetam of older authors. It occurs with great frequency near Sinai and Petra, abundantly round the Dead Sea and in the ravines leading down to the Jordan valley, and occasionally in the wilderness of Judaea. The flower, a delicate white or purplish-pink blossom, appears in February in advance of the tiny foliage, and the shrub reaches a height of ten to twelve feet, affording a grateful shade. Tristram, pp. 359f.; cf. Stanley, Sin. Pal., p. 80.

Rightly explained by Th.:—‘As human I must one day die, and now it is death that I desire.’
Here the variation in order, and the fact that "הרי מ" in the previous verse is simply transliterated, LXX 'Paβην, Luc. παβην, suggest that the original text read "הרי" alone, and that the remaining words are a later insertion after MT. In MT, the indefinite מ" מ" is strange after the shrub has been already mentioned, and the words have the character of a gloss taken directly from v. 4 to explain מ" of the original text. We may therefore restore מ" מ" 'And he lay and slept there.'

[Isa. 21. 9; Song of Sol. 2. 8, 9t. Cf. ch. 14. 6 note.]

The word means 'the places or parts near his head,' and, used as an adverbial accusative, should be rendered 'At his head.' So 1 Sam. 19. 13; 26. 7; al.

'A cake of (i.e. baked on) hot stones.' Ar. מ" means a stone heated in the fire, to be dropped into milk for the purpose of making it boil. מ" יס. 6. 6 denotes a glowing ember.

8th ff.] The writer appears to know, and to be influenced by, the narrative of JE relating to Moses at Ḥoreb. Thus, with the forty days' fast cf. Ex. 34. 28; with the Theophany cf. Ex. 33. 18—34. 8, and especially v. 11 'עֹז בָּעַר' with Ex. 34. 6 הָעֹז. The name מ" לֶלְבָנ in the Hexateuch is peculiar to E, Ex. 3. 1; 17. 6; 33. 6, and to Deut., while the expression מ" מ" מ" מ" מ" מ" always with reference to Ḥoreb, occurs elsewhere only in Ex. 3. 1; 18. 5; 24. 13 (E); 4. 27 (JE).

Perhaps, however, he was dependent, not upon the written source, but upon oral tradition. Contrast the מ" מ" מ" מ" of Elijah with the מ" מ" מ" in which Moses was placed, Ex. 33. 22. Our writer's tradition may have spoken of this latter as a מ" מ" מ" מ" מ" מ" מ" unless merely an example of the use of the definite article noticed ch. 13. 14, may mean 'the cave' thus rendered famous in former times.

[Isa. 21. 9; Song of Sol. 2. 8, 9t. Cf. ch. 14. 6 note.]

What hast thou here?' (to concern thee), so 'What doest thou here?' Cf. Judg. 18. 3; Isa. 22. 16; 52. 5t.
XIX. 5-20

10. [LXX, Luc. ἐναρκτήσας σε, and so v. 14, where, however, in LXX τὴν διαθήκην σου has been added by a later hand.

11. ] The participle picturesquely describes the Theophany as in course of occurrence, and is not, with LXX, Luc., to be rendered as a fut. instans, 'Behold Yahwe shall pass by,' as if the words formed part of the preceding speech.

The second adjective, as more remote from its subject, lapses into the masculine, and is then followed by masculine participles. So Jer. 20. 9 τὸν ἔσχαταν ὑποκάτωτε; cf. Ezek. 2. 9 ἔν τηρεῖν ἐν τῇ ἀπεργώσει. i Sam. 15. 9, quoted by G-K. § 132 d; Da. § 32, Rem. 4, is certainly corrupt; cf. Dri. ad loc.

12. ] The sound of a light whisper.' LXX, Luc. φωνή ἄλπης λεπτῆς, and so Vulg. sibilus aurae tenuis, have excellently grasped the sense both of substantive and adjective. νους is a gentle breeze Ps. 107. 29, or a murmur which can be compared with such a breeze Job 4. 16. ἄνενθε thin, fine, and small, is only here used of a sound, but cf. the similar application of λεπτός. RV. marg. 'a sound of gentle stillness' is unsatisfactory, stillness being incompatible both with ἄνενθε and ἀλπης, and with κλίμακα of the following verse.

At the close of the verse, Cod. A adds the weak gloss κλίμακα Κόρον.

13. ] Hiph. only here. Qal particip. pass. 1 Sam. 21. 10; Isa. 25. 7. Cf. the similar action of Moses Ex. 3. 6 (E).

15. ] Cf. note on II. 8. 15.

18. ] 'And I will spare in Israel seven thousand, even all the knees &c.'

19. ] The kiss of homage offered to idols may be illustrated by Hos. 13. 2 ἐκ τῶν ἱδών ἐκ τῆς ποταμίου kiss calves of Bethel and Dan. Cf. Job 31. 27, which speaks of kissing the hand in worship of the heavenly bodies.


With ḫatef-qameṣ under the doubled sibilant. So with the emphatic letters p, ṣ; cf. Ruth 2. 2, 7; ḫatef (for ḫatef)
Elijah disclaims any special significance for his action, unless the call correspond with Elisha's own free impulse. The words do not merely grant Elisha's request, but give permission to return, if he will, to his ordinary pursuits.

21. He boiled them, the (pieces of) flesh.' The pronom. suffix anticipates the object, as commonly in Syriac. Cf. also ch. 21. 13 ... ἱεράν ... τῶν εὐαγγελίων; II. 16. 15 Kt. ἵκτορς polypr. ἡσαύρων ... οὗτος. Cf. Da. § 29, Rem. 7, where a number of instances are cited from other books. LXX, Luc., however, omit יבשא, and it is thus possible that it may have come in as an explanatory gloss from the margin.

20. Narrative of two campaigns of Ben-hadad II (Hadadezer) against Israel in successive years. In the first the Aramaeans besiege Samaria, and are beaten off by an unexpected sortie. In the second a pitched battle takes place at Aphek, the Aramaeans are defeated, and Ben-hadad falls into the hands of Ahab, who concludes a truce with him.

1. The second Aramaean king of this name mentioned in Kings. Cf. ch. 15. 18 note. This Ben-hadad appears in the Cuneiform inscriptions under the name Dad-'id-ri, Dad-id-ri, i. e. בֶּן־חָדָד. Cf. further v. 34 note; COT. i. 190 ff.

2. Luc., Pesh. omit.

3. LXX omits.

5. יב יבשא introduces the direct oration: cf. ch. 1. 13 note.

LXX, Luc. omit.

6. LXX, Luc., Pesh., Vulg. presuppose בֶּן־חָדָד, correctly. The Aramaeans were to take whatever seemed worth taking to them. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.
7. ἡμᾶς ἄλλοις] So Ἀ. καὶ εἰς οὓς μου. LXX καὶ περὶ τῶν υἱῶν μου καὶ περὶ τῶν θυγατέρων μου, Luc. καὶ περὶ τῶν τεκνῶν μου.

8. οἱ ἰδιωταὶ ἐμὴν ἱστορίαν] ‘Obey not, nor consent.’ Continuation by μή with imperf. secures an even flow to the sentence, which would have been broken by reinforcement by the more energetic μήν, μήν μετάλλομαι ἐμὲ μὴν ἀφάνιζῃ, μήν ἄλογος ἕρεμος ἔσται. Cf. Ew. § 350a.

10. τὸν ὑπὸ τὸν δήμον] With pl. verb in the mouth of a polytheist, as in ch. 19. 2.

71] ‘Shall suffice.’ The only occurrence of the verb. Subs. ἐπεβαίνω, ‘his sufficiency,’ Job 20. 22. The root is common in Aram. in the same sense.

11] ‘For handfusa.’ Ezek. 13. 19; Isa. 40. 12. The boast implies that Samaria is unworthy of the prowess of a power like Aram, and at the same time promises its utter obliteration:—‘So innumerable are my followers that they will be unable to secure even a handful each of the dust of the ruined city.’ Jos. (Ant. viii. 14, § 2) explains strangely:—ἐπειλῶν υψηλότερον τῶν τεκνῶν σε καταφρονεῖ χάμα τούτους επεγείρισε αυτού τὴν στρατιὰν κατὰ δράκα λαμβάνουσαν.

70] ‘At my feet,’ i.e. following me. So II. 3. 9; 1 Sam. 25. 27; 2 Sam. 15. 16. 17; Judg. 4. 10; Ex. 11. 8 (J); Deut. 11. 6.

11. ἐβραίς] LXX, Luc. ἰκανοίσθω (Luc. ὑμῖν) must have read ἐβραίς; cf. ch. 19. 4; 12. 28.

71] ‘Let not him who is girding boast himself as he who is ungirding’; i.e. as Targ. rightly paraphrases את יקרא ומשה ‘Let not him who is girding himself and going down into the battle boast himself as the man who has conquered and is coming up from it.’ כְּכַל יכין ‘and the loins of kings will I ungird,’ i.e. render them defenceless. LXX, Luc. μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ κυρίος ὦ κύριε ὁ ἡρῴς interpret רוח from Rabb. Heb. רוח lāme, and then guess at גזע as expressing the antithesis.
12. [8131] Clearly an order for the renewal of the hostilities which had been suspended during the negotiations previously described. Render, ‘Set yourselves in array, and they set themselves in array against the city.’ So Ges., Ke., Kit., Sieg. u. Sta., RV. text. The expression covers every device which could be used to secure the downfall of the city, and it is therefore incorrect to postulate the ellipse of any special object after the verb, as is done by LXX, Luc. ὀκενομοργατε χώρας, and similarly Klo., Benz. ‘build battering rams,’ Th., Kamp., RV. marg. ‘place the engines’: cf. Ezek. 4. 2; 21. 27. For שׁו used, as in our passage, to denote military mobilization generally (and so without expressed obj.) cf. Ezek. 23. 24 ביבי יכשין; 1 Sam. 15. 2 שׁו.


‘בְּנֵי’ Cf. v. 28 with pl. verb יָשָׁם. The phrase is specially characteristic of Ezekiel (some sixty occurrences), and appears also six times in P. Elsewhere it is found only in Ex. 10. 2 (JE); Isa. 49. 23, and + יַשְׁמַע Joel 4. 17.

14. [8131] ‘By the young men of the princes of the provinces.’ These פְּרָיוֹנִיםрест שבְּנֵי (‘Landvögte;’ Ew., Th., Klo., Kamp., Kit.) were probably appointed to the prefecture of special districts, perhaps in the same way as the הִשָּׁם under Solomon ch. 4. 7 ff., and bound, as a condition of their tenure, in times of emergency to provide the king with a certain number of warriors

---

1 So Jos. (Ant. viii. 14, § 2) rightly expands the king’s brief command:— δ’ εὐθύς τούτο προστάξας καὶ περιχρομανόν τῷ πόλιν καὶ χώρας βαλλεσθαι καὶ μηθίαν τρόπον ἐνελεύθερον πολεμίσαι.

2 In Ezek. the cases are:— מַעַת, 25. 7; 35. 4; מַעַת, 16. 62; 22. 16; מַעַת 6. 7, 13; 7. 4; 11. 10, 12; 12. 20; 13. 14; 14. 8; 15. 7; 20. 38, 42, 44; 25. 5; 35. 9; 36. 11; 37. 6, 13; 13. 9; 28. 49; 24. 24 (¶ 7. 9); 7. 9 (+ מַעַת); מַעַת 13. 21, 23; מַעַת 6. 10, 14; 7. 27; 12. 15, 16; 24. 27; 25. 11, 17; 26. 6, 28. 22, 23; 29. 6, 9, 21; 30. 8, 19, 25, 26; 32. 15; 33. 29; 34. 27; 35. 15; 36. 23, 38; 38. 23; 39. 6; 28. 24; 29. 16 (¶ 7. 9); 28. 26; 34. 30; 39. 22, 28 (+ מַעַת); מַעַת 9 (+ מַעַת אלְמַה). In P:— מַעַת Ex. 6. 7; 16. 12 (+ מַעַת); מַעַת 7. 5; 14. 4, 18; 29. 46 (+ מַעַת).

out of their own retinues. In contrast to these ἐκ οίκου of v. 15 denotes the standing army; cf. ch. 16. 15 note. LXX in v. 14 ἔν τοῖς παιδαρίων τῶν ἀρχῶν τῶν χρῶν (Luc. χαρών), but v. 15 τοῖς ἀρχονταῖς, τὰ παιδάρια τῶν χί, and similarly v. 17 ἀρχοντα παιδαρία τῶν χί, v. 19 ἀρχοντα τὰ παιδαρία ἀρχοντα τῶν χί, as though ὡς were a suspended st. constr. (cf. 1 Sam. 28. 7; Isa. 23. 12; al.; Da. § 28, Rem. 6) and the phrase meant 'the young men, the princes of the provinces,' i.e. 'the young princes &c.' Luc. in v. 19 renders as in v. 14, but vv. 15, 17 show signs of having first exhibited the same rendering as LXX and then undergone emendation:—τοὺς ἁρχοντας (οἰ ἁρχοντας) καὶ τὰ παιδάρια τῶν ἁρχῶν τῶν χρῶν. 'A. v. 14 ὦν παῖς ἁρχῶν τῶν ἐπαρχῶν, v. 15 τοὺς παιδας ἁρχῶν τῶν ἐπ., v. 17 παιδες ἁρχων ... , v. 19 deest.

χασεάλατο ἔρρεια ἐν ψαλμοῖς] 'Who shall join battle?' i.e. make the first advance. So 2 Chr. 13. 3.

15. μεγέθυνις ἡμῖν] LXX omits ἡμῖν.

[ἀνασώκησα ἐν] LXX, Luc. rightly presuppose ἐκ τοῦ ἀνασώκητος, 'all the mighty men,' the phrase being explanatory of ἐκ τοῦ ἔμμεν ἐν.

[εἶδον χρῆ] LXX εἶδον χρῆ, Luc. εἶδον χρῆδας.

16. μετὰ τῆς ἐρα] LXX καὶ εἴδολοι μεσημβριάς, Luc. καὶ εἴδολον ὁ βασιλεὺς μετ' αὐτῶν μεσημβριάς, an expansion explanatory of the sing. verb.

[σοφήμα] Ch. 16. 9.

17. ὥστε μαθεῖν] LXX, Luc. καὶ ἀποστέλλοντος, the implied subj. being the outposts of the Aramaean host who observed the sortie, while the king was engaged at his carouse. The orig. text, if not μαθεῖν, was perhaps imper. μαθῇ, 'and one sent,' rendered correctly by LXX, and with subj. erroneously supplied in MT.

20. ὑπερθύμιν] 'And they smote each his man.' LXX, Luc. add καὶ ἑξενεργοῦσιν ἐκατός τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ, and so Ew. restores ὑπερθύμιν 'and they repeated &c.,' the whole passage meaning 'and they slew each his man repeatedly.' The repetition of ὑπερθύμιν is, however, extremely awkward, and the addition is certainly a later gloss. Had the original writer wished to lay stress upon the fact that each man slew more than one of the
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opposing Aramaeans he would have added simply רָחָב or else רָחָב
and אָשָׁר. But the point of the narrative is that the first onslaught
was such that it immediately put the enemy to flight.

20b. 'וַיַּעַל הָמוֹסָר הַמִּצָּה.' The sense of the last three words is obscure.
The best rendering is that of RV. text, 'And Ben-hadad king
of Aram escaped on a horse with (lit. and) horsemen.'
must be thought to be loosely connected on to רָחָב by the רָחָב
as forming a concomitant factor to the king's escape. Cf. Cod. A
חַפַּר חֲפַר וְהָרָתָא, Vulg. in equo cum equilibus suis. But
the text would be greatly improved by the addition of רָחָב
after רָחָב, as is suggested by Targ. The sense is: 'Upon horses, two horsemen being with him.' Klo. emends רָחָב
upon horses, two horsemen being with him.'

21. [LXX, Luc. καὶ ἀλάβων, i.e. πλῆθος.] The king and his
reserve availed themselves of the horses and chariots which had
been abandoned by the Aramaeans in their panic, and were thus
(Th.) able to effect the 'great slaughter' which the main body
of the army, following the fugitives on foot, might have failed to
accomplish. MT. describes a senseless waste of energy.

22. [LXX πάντας τοὺς πάντους.] Apparently an irregular abandonment of the constr. of imperfect. with 1 consec. in favour of 1 simplex with perf. Possibly, however, the vocalization is at fault, and the writer intended to use the infinitive absol.; cf. ch. 9. 25; Judg. 7. 19; al. Da. § 88.

23. [LXX, Luc., with omission of ὁ, Κραναοῦ. In Ἐν Προδρόμῳ, the original pathah of the last syllable of the Hithpael is preserved; cf. G-K. § 54 k.

24. 'At the return of the year'; i.e. when spring
comes round again after the winter, and warfare becomes prac-
ticable. So v. 26. Cf. 2 Sam. 11. 1 where the phrase is explained
‘at the time when kings go forth (on campaign)’; 2 Chr. 36. 10.

25. 'Gods of hills are their gods, therefore were
they (the gods) too strong for us.' RV., in rendering אֱלֹהִים as a
sing. and making subj. of מָלַךְ to be the Israelites themselves, is
incorrect. The Aramaeans, in accordance with their own ideas, ascribe a plurality of deities to Israel, and it is these gods, as well as their worshippers, against whom they are fighting, and whom they hope to conquer if they can decoy them from their fastnesses. LXX ὸς Ἰσραήλ followed by sing. verb ἐκπαραλαῖαν is an intentional alteration in order to avoid the use of phraseology offensive to the unity of God. So in v. 28 the Israelitish prophet, in quoting the words of the Aramaeans, naturally substitutes a singular:—Ἀλλὰ ὦ ἀνθρώπος ὁ Ἰσραήλ 'A God of hills is Yahwe.'

[191x589] 225] LXX, Luc. add καὶ οὐ θεὸς κοιλίδως (Luc. κοιλίδων), a gloss made for the sake of strict conformity with v. 28. In v. 23, however, the words are certainly out of place, μὴ ἄπαλλακτο ἀλὰ ἀλώμενος, but however, introducing the idea that the gods may not be gods of the plain as a suggestion not previously mentioned except by implied antithesis in ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑλθεῖν 'A God of hills is Yahwe.'

[197x589] 228] 'Surely we shall be stronger than they.' So v. 25. The same form of asseveration is found in Josh. 14. 9; Isa. 5. 9; 14. 24; Job 1. 11, and with perf. II. 9. 26; Jer. 15. 11; Job 22. 20; Ps. 131. 2. Cf. note on ch. 2. 23.

[222x589] 229] 'From his place'; i.e. his appointed position in the line of battle. LXX, Luc. εἰς τὸν τόπον αὑτῶν (Luc. αὑτῶν), and so Jos. (Ant. viii. 14, § 3) ἐσοχθεύη πρὸς τὰ ολίγα, is inferior, and probably arose from the common confusion of μ with β. But neither ἐν τῇ ὅπερ (Th.) nor ἐν τῇ ὅπερ (Klo.) could correctly stand with this signification, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑλθεῖν being the required phrase.

[225x589] 231] 'Commanders' or 'vicegerents.' These appear to be the same as the ἄρχοντες ἐν οἴκοις Ἰωνίων ch. 22. 31; cf. 20. 1. Giesebrecht, taking the term ἄρχοντα as Persian in origin, is obliged to regard this verse as an interpolation, and considers that it breaks the connexion, ἦν πάντα of v. 25 forming the right continuation to v. 23, and ἐν τῇ ὅπερ, v. 25 end, being satisfied by v. 26 (a doubtful contention). But cf. note on ch. 10. 15.

[233x589] 235] This form of the particle for the usual ἐν τῇ ὅπερ, occurs repeatedly in these N. Pal. narratives up to II. ch. 8;—ch. 22. 7, 8, 24; II. 1. 15; 3. 11, 12, 25; 6. 16; 8. 8;
but can scarcely be counted dialectical, depending as it does upon vocalization and scriprio plena, and standing also beside the more ordinary form; cf. ch. 20. 23; 22. 4, 24; II. 3. 7; 6. 16, 32. The form תֹּלְדֵּי is found several times in Jer. and Ezek., but appears elsewhere only rarely.

26. נֵסָן] Several cities of this name are mentioned in O. T.; but this one, which occurs again in II. 13. 17, is doubtless the same as is mentioned in Josh. 12. 18; 1 Sam. 29. 1, in the neighbourhood of Jezreel. Assyr. Ap-šu; COT. i. 194.

27. מַעֹרֶן] The same form occurs Num. 1. 47; 2. 33; 26. 62, and is intended as passive of מַעֹרֶן; Judg. 20. 15, 17; 21. 9. Both forms, however, have precisely the same reflexive sense, 'set themselves for muster,' 'were mustered,' and probably Wright (Compar. Gramm. 208 n.) is correct in thinking the pronunciation as a passive מַעֹרֶן to be due to a misunderstanding of the Massoretes. מַעֹרֶן, without doubling of the 2nd rad., stands alone in Heb., and appears to be a relic of the reflexive of the simple stem מָעַרְן, corresponding to Aram. מַעֹרֶן, נֹמַל, Aeth. tqalla, Ar. viii with transposition of 1st rad. and preform. מַעֹרֶן 'iqatatula for 'ithqatala, and so on the Moabite stone, II. 11, 15, 19, 32 מַעֹרֶן from root מָעַרְן. Cf. Wright, loc. cit.; G-K. § 54 l; Sta. § 162; and, for other views as to the form, König, Lehrg. I. i. p. 198.

28. מָעַרְן] 'And were provisioned'; passive of the Pilpel which is found in ch. 17. 4, 9; 18. 13; al. So Vulg. et acceptis cibaritis, LXX, Luc. omit. 1 simplex co-ordinates the two facts. Dri. Tenses, § 132.

29. נָאָס וַניָן הָאָמָּנִי יָמִים] The subs. נָאָס is elsewhere quite unknown. LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ. give the meaning 'like two small flocks of goats,' and this is generally adopted. נָאָס = 'strip off,' and thus נָאָס 'that which is stripped off' may possibly denote segregatum (Heb. Lex. Oxf.), but the inference is precarious. Klo. emends נָאָס מַעֹרֶן 'upon the bare height, after the manner of goats.'

30. רָמָה] The repetition of דָּבַּא is certainly superfluous. Pesh. omits the first occurrence, thus making the
passage to agree with vv. 13, 22; while LXX, Luc., Vulg. are without the second. This latter omission is correct, the addition in MT. being probably due, as is suggested by Pesh., to an attempt to gain agreement with the preceding passages.

LXX καὶ γράψῃ, Luc. γράφει, as in v. 13.

Pesh. حمام مستعملاً [حمام مستعملاً, 25,000.

A chamber within a chamber,' i.e. 'an innermost chamber'; here, as in ch. 22. 25 (|| 2 Chr. 18. 24); II. 9. 27, selected as most remote and private. Jos. (Ant. viii. 14, § 4) explains as an underground house;—παρ’ οδόν τοῦ οἰκίου.

LXX, Luc. puts the suggestion into the mouth of Ben-hadad, reading καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισίοις αὐτοῦ οἶδα κ.τ.λ. τὰς γυναῖκας ημῶν. So Luc., with the different χόριος. That this, however, is incorrect is shown by vv. 32, 33, where the servants without the king form the embassy.

For the second יở resumptive of the first, cf. ch. 1. 30 note.

Vulg., Pesh., though agreeing with MT. in placing the speech in the mouth of the servants, yet like LXX, Luc., presuppose pl. מגדלי. This is an easy alteration induced by the preceding pls. וַיֶשֶם, but inferior to MT. in which the saving of the king's life is rightly made the object of the proposed plan.

Vulg. excellently, quod accepterunt viri pro omine; i.e. they divined the successful issue of their mission from the favourable response זיו התש客戶. Cf. Sta. Ges. i. 445 f. For this use of the verb cf. Gen. 30. 27 'I have observed the omens, and Yahwe hath blessed me for thy sake.' The only explanation that can be placed upon the imperfect is that it emphasizes pictorially the coming into being of their consciousness of the king's mood;—'and the men began to divine'; cf. Dri. Tenses, § 27. 7. The emendation of Gra. ישבסיים joined with ויהי, is unnecessary.

The verb occurs nowhere else, and is untranslateable, RV. 'whether it were his mind' (marg. Heb. 'from
him') being indefensible. The Verss.—LXX καὶ ἀνέλεξεν τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶ (Luc. καὶ ἀνέλεξεν τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐκ) τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, Vulg. rapuerunt verbum ex ore ejus, Pesh. מִבְּרֵךְ פֶּן מְשֹּׁרֶת, Targ. מִבְּרֵךְ פֶּן מְשֹּׁרֶת—are unanimous both in presupposing a different division of the words וְֶָּהָ יָָָֹו תְלֹּּות, and in supplying a plausible meaning for the verb;—'and they caught it from him,' i.e. they at once took up and repeated the title of brother which he had conferred upon Ben-hadad. מִבְּרֵךְ פֶּן מְשֹּׁרֶת being isolated, and its meaning purely conjectural, it is futile to dogmatize as to its being Qal (Sta. § 529a) or shortened Hiph'il form like מִבְּרֵךְ פֶּן מְשֹּׁרֶת (G-K. § 53 n, Ko., Lehrg. I. i. p. 251).

לֹּּות] LXX, Luc. καὶ ἀναβίβασαν αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτῶν. Here the subj. of the verb being wrongly conceived as pl. מִבְּרֵךְ פֶּן מְשֹּׁרֶת, πρὸς αὐτῶν appears to be the translator's explan. addit. 'unto him' (Ahab) which is thus rendered desirable to complete the sense. The view that LXX presupposes an orig. מִבְּרֵךְ פֶּן מְשֹּׁרֶת (Th., Kamp.) is therefore improbable.

בּ] 'Streets,' i.e. doubtless, as explained by Ke., Th., Ges., Heb. Lex. Oxf., &c., basaars where trade might be freely carried on. Ew. 'fortified quarters' is strangely alien to the term employed.

הָָו] The change of speaker is regarded as sufficiently marked by the content of his speech as a response to the preceding: cf. II. 10. 15.

בּ] RV. 'with this covenant,' i.e. at the price of it; בּ prelil; cf. ch. 2. 23 note on ובנ. The fact of this alliance between Ahab and Hadadezer is strikingly confirmed by the monolith of Shalmaneser II, where the two kings are mentioned as leagued against the Assyrian at the battle of Qarqar: cf. Append. 3.

בּ] Luc. adds בּ תְָָות וְָָו כְָָו הָָו וְָָו כְָָו הָָו.

בּ] Cf. p. 209. The identification by Jos. (Ant. viii. 14, § 5) of this prophet with Micaiah of ch. 22 is by no means improbable: cf. vv. 42, 43 with ch. 22. 8.

בּ] 'Sons of the prophets' was the title of members of the prophetical guilds or schools which existed at Bethel, II. 2. 3;
Jericho, vv. 5, 15; Gilgal, 4. 38, and probably elsewhere, and were in some sense presided over by Elijah and Elisha; cf. II. 2. 15–18; 4. 1, 38 ff.; 6. 1 ff.; 9. 1. Such guilds seem to have flourished under Samuel, 1 Sam. 19. 20 (Naioth), cf. 10. 5, 10 (Gibeah), and may, perhaps, have been founded by him; cf. 7. 15–17 where Bethel and Gilgal are included with Mizpah among the cities visited by Samuel in his yearly round from his centre, Ramah. The force of the term נֵבָה is well illustrated by Am. 7. 14, where Amos tells Amaziah of Bethel, לֹא נֵבָה אֲדֹנִי אֲלֵהֶנָּה נֶבַע. ‘I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son,’ i.e. I had not the advantage of any special training for the calling.

6. הָאָרֶץ] ‘The lion,’ singled out for the part which he is to play, and already conjured up before the speaker’s prophetic vision. Cf. especially ch. 22. 21 מְחַלִּית, and see note on ch. 13. 14.

13. מַעֲשֶׂה] ‘And the man smote him, so as to wound him.’ Here the act denoted by פָּתַח sharply limits the duration of that described by מה להו, as forming its end or result. So exactly Jer. 12. 17 תֹּנֵשֶׂה אֵת נוֹתֵנַי נוֹתֵנַי אֵבָר, ‘I will pluck up that nation, so as to destroy it.’ The case cannot be classed, as by Da. (§ 86c; Jer. 12. 17 is made to fall under § 87), among cases where ‘the inf. abs. after its verb suggests an indefinitely prolonged state of the action, and therefore expresses continuance, prevalence, &c.;’ this being precisely what in the present instance it does not do. Cases where the second infin. expresses concomitance of indefinite duration, Judg. 14. 9; II. 2. 11, or simple addition of an event in due sequence (but not as the result aimed at by the previous action), Isa. 19. 22, are different in character.

38. לְּאָלָם] LXX, Luc. τῷ βασαλτὶ Ἰσραήλ.

רָחֵם] The word רָחֵם occurs only here and in v. 41, but the meaning ‘covering’ or ‘bandage,’ given by LXX, Luc. ἄλαμων, Targ. בַּשָּׂךְ, has the support of Assyr. in which aparu = ‘to attire,’ especially with a head-covering; ἀπαρίτης = ‘garment.’ See Friedr. Delitzsch, Assyrisches Handwörterbuch, s.v. I. רָחֵם, and Prolegomena, 54; Zimmern, Babylonische Busspsalmen, 95; Barth,
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40. They are the same word as in II. 2. 8, 14; Josh. 8. 20†; an impossibly harsh construction. Vocalization יָתְנְי st. abs. gives the rendering 'was busy hither and thither'; but that a man posing as having been set to guard a captive should represent himself as deliberately engaged in other matters seems scarcely probable. LXX περα­βιστεῖται, Luc. περαβιστεῖται, Vulg. me verlem, Pesh. סכתנה, Targ. יבשנה, point to an orig. יָתְנְי 'was turning (looking) hither and thither,' and are followed by Th., Klo., Heb. Lex. Oxf. Cf. Ex. 2. 12 הָזָה הָיָה וּלְעֲבוֹד. 'Such (lit. so) is thy verdict; thou thyself hast decided.' For sense of verb בּנָה cf. esp. Niph. participle in the phrase בּנָה יָתְנְי 'a consumption and a strict decision,' i.e. a consumption finally decided; Isa. 10. 23; 28. 22; Dan. 9. 27.

42. יָתְנְי 'The man of my ban'; i.e. the man devoted by me to destruction. Cf. Isa. 34. 5 יָתֶנְי עִי referring to Edom.

43. יָתְנְי LXX, Luc., Vulg. suggest יָתֶנְי, and so Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.; but MT. is supported by 1 Sam. 19. 9; 26. 23; 2 Chr. 25. 20; Isa. 28. 2; Ezek. 12. 7, where יָתֶנְי occurs without specific suffix 1. An expression first used, as in Prov. 6. 5 יָתֶנְי הָיָה הָיָה, with vague and general reference, may then come to be employed where closer specification might be expected. Cf. colloquial Eng. in hand, out of hand.

43. יָתֶנְי So ch. 1. 38 note on בּנָה יָתְנְי.

44. יָתְנְי So ch. 21. 4. 'Chafing and sullen.' יָתֶנְי, used again in fem. ch. 21. 5 הָיָה רַע הָיָה, is connected with רַע 'be refractory.' The meaning of the adj. יָתֶנְי is well illustrated by the use of the participle יָתְנְי which in Gen. 40. 6 denotes an appearance dejected and gloomy as produced by perplexing thoughts (cf. Joseph's

---

1 Cf. the renderings of LXX, Vulg. in 1 Sam. 19. 9 γι' ξειπα αδρεν, μανοι suae; 26. 23 εις ξειπας μου, in manum meam; 2 Chr. 25. 20 Luc. εις ξειπα τοις, in manus hostium; where, as in our passage, the translators are at pains to make the reference precise, but presuppose no different original to MT.
question in v. 7 a countenance haggard through spare and coarse diet. The phrase is further elucidated by the description of the king's conduct in ch. 21. 4b.

21. Ahab covets the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite, and obtains it by the judicial murder of the owner, planned and executed by Jezebel. The prophet Elijah announces Yahwe's sentence upon Ahab and his house because of the deed.

18. LXX καὶ ὁμολογῶν εἰς ἑν τῷ Ναβουσαλ τῷ Ἰσραήλ, i.e. possibly: probably original. The introductory formula of MT., copied from ch. 17. 17 but here somewhat ill-fitting, was probably added by the scribe who interposed this ch. between chh. 20 and 22; cf. p. 210. The words are found in Luc., but that they are there a later addition is shown by the presence also of καὶ before ὁμολογῶν, as in LXX. On ὁρείχατι cf. p. 209.

1b. LXX παρὰ τῷ Ἀχαβ, i.e. ἁτὰ τὰ ἁτὰ ἐνάρθοντο, is to some extent favoured by v. 2 ἀνέλαβεν ἤλεξι, MT.

2a. 'The money-value of this one'; lit. 'the money of the price of this.' πάρει, is st. constr. before μεταίηθαπταλομᾶν, and is not, with RV., to be taken as an accus. of limitation, 'the worth of it in money.' LXX, Luc., expanding μεταίηθαπταλομᾶν into (Luc. τοῦ) ὁμολογῶν σου ροιόντων, then repeat καὶ ὅστε μαύλος ἐλεῖς κῆφον λαχάνων.

3. ἀνάλογα] So 1 Sam. 24. 7; 26. 11; and 2 Sam. 23. 17 Luc., Pesh., Targ. (cf. 1 Chr. 11. 19 μὴ Ἀχαβ ἐλθίτω). In Luc., MT. and LXX παρὰ θεοῦ μου. Luc. καὶ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ μου a combination of MT. and LXX.

4. χρημάτων ...[ἔνω] LXX καὶ ἐγένετο τῷ πνεύμα Ἀχαβ, probably an alteration for exact agreement with v. 5. Luc. embodies the two readings, following MT. in v. 4a, and placing LXX reading at the beginning of v. 4b. On ὁρείχατ] cf. ch. 20. 43 note.

Cf. II. 20. 2a. Vulg., as in this passage, makes
The addition ad parietem. LXX, Luc. καὶ συνεκάθισεν seem to have read סכן for סכן.

5. חָא מָה Ch. 14. 6 note.

6. יַכְרָבֵי לֶב Not, as RV. 'Because I spake,' but simply 'I spake,' introducing the direct narration. Cf. ch. 1. 13 note. The use of the imperf. is here somewhat strange, but may perhaps be explained as laying pictorial stress upon the commencement of the king's overtures, a usage resembling the Eng. historical present; 'I speak' or 'begin to speak,' when immediately negotiations are cut short by a definite refusal. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 27 γ; Da. § 45, Rem. 2, quoting Hitzig. The suggestion of a frequentative force for the imperf. (Dri. loc. cit.) is less probable, there being no hint of this in the preceding narrative.

7. תֵּרָם LXX, Luc. ἐνθορμείων παρίσταντας, an alteration after v. 3.

7. דָּוִדְתּוּ 'Dost thou now govern Israel?' On the interrogative force of the sentence cf. ch. 1. 24 note.

8. מֶלְכָּה 'And let thy heart be cheerful.' Cf. note on ch. 1. 66.

8. קָדֵנְתִּים is correct; 'the letters' already mentioned, v. 8a.

'The nobles,' lit. 'freeborn'; Ar. גי, Aram. גי. The word doubtless belongs to the N. Pal. dialect (cf. p. 209), other occurrences in O. T. being late;—seven times in Neh. of the magnates of Judah, and so in Jer. 27. 20; 39. 6 (both passages omitted in LXX, and probably later interpolations; cf. Dri. Introd. pp. 248, 254.), of Edomite nobles Isa. 34. 12 (exilic); מַעַה as in Aram., Eccl. 10. 17t.

'Who were in his city, who presided with Naboth.' So v. 11 'who were those who presided in his city.' Naboth himself was one of the elders and nobles in whose hands the civil government of the city lay. That הביש here has the sense of presiding, especially as judges, is rightly recognized by Th., and by Klo. who renders 'Beisitzer.' For this use of the verb, cf. Isa. 28. 6 מַעַה 'for him who sits (presides) over the judgement'; Am. 6. 3 מַעַה 'the seat of violence (i.e.
of unjust judgement'); and of Yahwe Ps. 9. 8 where the clause answering to מָצַּם used absolutely is מַעֲשָׂי; cf. Ps. 29. 10; Joel 4. 12. RV. 'and that dwelt with Naboth' makes the sentence simply a repetition of the statement wrongly omit this former clause, while Pesh. combines with the following: נַפְּהָמָה חוֹמָל חַם חָמֵל 'who dwelt in the city with Naboth.'

9. שֵׁם מָצַּם An extraordinary day of humiliation to avert the wrath of Yahwe which for some cause (supposed to be as yet unascertained) was assumed to be threatening the community. Such a special fast is mentioned as proclaimed by Jehoshaphat, 2 Chr. 20. 1-4. Cf. Th., Sta. Ges. i. 527.

'והישע' Not as the suspected culprit, but as a man of marked position and piety who would naturally take the lead upon such an occasion; so Jos. (Ant. viii. 13, § 8) καὶ πανομοίων ἔκκλησιῶν προκαθέσαν μὲν αὐτῶν Ναβωθίων, ἵνα γὰρ αὐτῶν γίνοιτο ἱπποφάνεις. The prominence of his position would thus the more excite the popular indignation (Th.), when the crime had been fastened upon him.

10. שֵׁם מָצַּם 'Two men,' as at least necessary to secure a conviction; cf. Deut. 17. 6; 19. 15; Num. 35. 30; S. Matt. 26. 60 ff.

'Villains.' The derivation and exact meaning of מָצַּם are highly obscure. There are two rival explanations, both of which regard the word, according to its Masoretic vocalization, as a compound. (i) מָצַּם not+לֵילָה which is supposed to mean worth or use (cf. Hiph'il מָצַּם). Thus מָצַּם = 'worthlessness,' מָצַּם = 'base fellows' (cf. Heb. Lex. Oxf., s. v.). (ii) מָצַּם not+לֵילָה for מָצַּם that which comes up;—'not coming up,' and so 'unsuccessful' or 'ne'er-do-well' (Kimhi מָצַּם, followed by Hupfeld among moderns). It is no objection to either of these explanations that the use of the term proves the conception to be not negative but positive—malignity or dangerous wickedness (Cheyne, as cited below), since instances can be quoted from all languages in which terms originally negative have gained later a very definite positive significance; cf. e. g. θανάσις, Germ. 'Unheil,' Old Eng. 'naughty.'
But a real difficulty in the way of the acceptance of either is the fact that the use of such a compound term in ordinary phraseology is without a parallel; expressions such as הַשָּׁנָּה 'nothingness,' Job 26. 7; הַשָּׁנָּה ב' 30. 8; הַשָּׁנָּה א' 38. 2 being late poetical creations, and therefore not to the point. הַשָּׁנָּה, then, is probably to be classed with הַשָּׁנָּה (for הַשָּׁנָּה) as exhibiting merely a fancy vocalization based upon relatively late tradition.

The view of Cheyne is that לֵשָׁנָה is to be identified with the Babylono-Assyrian goddess Belili, as representing the underworld, and that in later times the word may have been popularly associated with the derivation לֵשָׁנָה in the sense 'the depth which lets no man return.' The chief passage cited in favour of this explanation is Ps. 18. 5b לֵשָׁנָה, rendered 'streams of the underworld,' in juxtaposition to לֹזְנֵי כָּבָד v. 5a, לָשָׁנָה v. 6a (Expositor, June 1895, pp. 435-439; Expository Times, June 1897, pp. 423f.; Nov. 1897, pp. 91 ff.; Apr. 1898, p. 332). The identification of לֵשָׁנָה with Belili is, however, denied by Baudissin and Jensen, on the grounds that there is no evidence to show that the earth-goddess Belili was ever regarded as a deity ruling the underworld; that there is no O.T. passage in which the meaning 'underworld' for לֵשָׁנָה is clearly present; and that there is no analogous O.T. expression in which men are brought into connexion with the underworld in order to mark them out as destructive or wicked (Expository Times, Oct. 1897, pp. 40-45; March 1898, pp. 283f.).

If לֵשָׁנָה be not a compound term, it is natural to refer it to the root לֹזְנָה 'swallow up, engulf,' and to regard the ל as a formative, cases of which are seen in לֹזְנָה, לֹזְנָה, לֹזְנָה, and perhaps לֹזְנָה. The ל may then conceivably mark the word as a diminutive, according to the common Ar. usage (Wright, Ar. Gramm. i. § 269), to be traced also in Syr. in the words לֹזְנָה, לֹזָד, לֹזָד (Duval, Gramm. Syr. § 235), and in Heb. לֹזָה, and perhaps also in לֹזָה and לֹזָה 2 Sam. 13. 20 (cf. Dri. ad loc.). Thus an original בולסאֹד might become לֵשָׁנָה, a form resembling לֵשָׁנָה, לֵשָׁנָה, which may be thought to stand for shuafa'ah, 'umainan, upon the analogy of vulgar Ar. k'ifah, 'little basket,' for k'ifah
XXI. 11, 12

(Wright, *Compar. Gramm.* p. 89). "will then denote 'engulfin9 rain' or 'perdition,' the diminutive marking the word as used in contempt and antipathy. Such a significance attached to the root לול may be seen in Ps. 52. 6, and the phrase לב תיב may be paralleled by ὅ ὄν χρόνος ἠθανασίας S. John 17. 12; 2 Thess. 2. 3.

After רח إلي LXX omits all that follows in MT. down to רח إلي of v. 13, apparently through homoioteleuton.

‘Thou hast cursed;' lit. 'blessed,' and so v. 13; Job 1. 5, 11; 2. 5, 9; Ps. 10. 3.†. A sense so strangely opposed to the usual meaning of the verb is scarcely to be regarded as obtained from the idea 'greet at departing' (ch. 8. 66; Gen. 47. 10). so 'say farewell,' and then 'renounce' (Ges. *Thes.*, Ke., Dillmann on Job, &c., and so RV. marg.), there being no particle of evidence for such a transition in meaning; nor does it seem probable that the notion is that of 'a blessing overdone and so really a curse as in vulgar English as well as in the Semitic cognates' (*Heb. Lex. Oxf.*). Rather, the word is an euphemism deliberately substituted for its direct antithesis, viz. the most fearful form of curse such as it were a sin even to mention in direct terms. Cf. among the Greeks the title Εὐερίδης, 'the gracious goddesses,' applied euphemistically to the Ἐπερίδες or Furies, and the name Ῥ Ῥημιδρος given to the Black sea as being Ἦ τος inhospitable;—'Dicitus ab antquis Aremus ille fuil,' Ovid, *Trist.* 4. 4, 56.

The cursing of God and the king is prohibited in the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 22. 27. אֲדֹנֵי אֶלֹהִים אֵין וּמָזָא וּבְעָרָם אֵין אָנוּ.

The same penalty (verb תנ) is imposed for blasphemy in Lev. 24. 10–16 (H).

11b. לֹא וְאָזָה רְבֵה וּלְאָזָח רְבֵה מַעְרָה. Luc. omits. The words are redundant after the statement immediately preceding, and may therefore be a gloss.

12. יָרָהוֹי] Not to be explained as a perf. with 1 *consec.,* nor can any reason be assigned for the use of 1 *simplex.* The form is an unintentional lapse into the imperat. form used in v. 9, and
we may correct יז. That the passage is not a mere gloss (Klo.) appears from the suffix of רעש v. 13, which points back to the name תבש of this verse.

13. LXX, Luc. omit מְבֹשׁ הִבִּישָׁ. But the last two words at least give a touch to the narrative not to be dispensed with.

15. [ Cf. ch. 19. 21 note on יבשָׁ.]

16. After v. 16 LXX adds כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּשָּׁר הָאָדָם וַיִּמָּכֶר פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי בָּאָדָם וַיִּמָּכֶר פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי רָמָהֵי. So Luc. This, however, is scarcely consistent with v. 27 MT.; since it is improbable that Ahab first made a show of mourning at Naboth's death, then proceeded to take possession of his estate, and finally, upon Elijah's rebuke, secured a remand of the threatened vengeance through a repetition of the same tokens of remorse, this time, it must be supposed, sincere. Hence LXX varies from MT. in v. 27, making this statement to refer back to the former show of repentance narrated by the Version in v. 16:—כַּאֲשֶׁר נִשְׂרֵה בְּזַמֵּשׁ הָאָדָם וַיִּמָּכֶר פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי בְּזַמֵּשׁ הָאָדָם וַיִּמָּכֶר פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי נֶסֶת רָמָהֵי נֶסֶת פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי נֶסֶת בְּזַמֵּשׁ הָאָדָם וַיִּמָּכֶר פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי נֶסֶת רָמָהֵי נֶסֶת פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי נֶסֶת בְּזַמֵּשׁ הָאָדָם וַיִּמָּכֶר פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי נֶסֶת רָמָהֵי נֶסֶת פַּרְשָׁלָהֵי נֶסֶת בְּזַמֵּשׁ הָאָדָם. So substantially Luc. But all this stands self-condemned. It is impossible that Ahab's remand should have been granted as an afterthought on account of his first exhibition of repentance (v. 16 LXX), which was clearly insincere and had not in the first place served in any way to qualify the penalty pronounced by Elijah. MT., therefore, in making the king display no sign of remorse, real or assumed, until after the prophet's threatenings, is certainly correct; and the fact that LXX text is here spurious and late is recognized by Th., who points out that
Jos. (Ant. viii. 13, § 8) was acquainted with a narrative in no way different from MT.


19 ff. The account of this interview has been amplified by R.

Cf. Abijah's prophecy against Jeroboam, ch. 14. 7–16 notes, and, beside the phrases there enumerated as characteristic, notice vv. 20, 25, and cf. II. 17. 17 R^+; v. 26 תֵּמֶל, cf. ch. 15. 12 note; 'לְהִשָּׁתָה וְרָחִית, cf. ch. 14. 24 note. The original elements of the narrative, so far as they can be distinguished, are to be found in v. 19^a, v. 20 to וַתָּקַח, vv. 27–29, and probably also v. 19^b. Less certain is the somewhat awkwardly placed statement as to Jezebel v. 23, which would follow more easily after v. 24, since v. 24 clearly forms the direct continuation to v. 22.

19. [Jos. viii. 16] In the first place LXX, Luc. read al δὲ καὶ αἰὼν (so ch. 22. 38), but that the addition is of the nature of a gloss is rendered most probable by its omission in the second place: αἰὼν simply, as in MT.

20. [Jos. viii. 20] 'Thy blood, even thine, or 'thy blood also.' For this re-enforcement of the suff. by the pers. pron., cf. the exactly similar case 2 Sam. 17. 5 אִישׁ וַתֶּשֶׁם מִתֶּבֶנ ה אָם וה לָמָּה 'and let us hear what is in his mouth also.' Cf. ch. 1. 26 note with references. At the end of the verse LXX, Luc. add kal αἰῶνα κοινωνίας εἰς τῷ αἰῶνι αὐτοῦ, adopted by Th. as presupposing מִשְׂרָה. The reference, however, implies not the vineyard of Jezreel but the pool of Samaria, and is therefore doubtless a gloss derived from ch. 22. 38.

20. [Jos. viii. 22] Luc. δὲ δὲν πέφρασεν πάρνη, LXX δὲν πέφρασεν, i.e. δὲν πέφρασεν 'because thou hast sold thyself to no purpose'; a pointed addition in view of what follows. For מִשְׂרָה cf. Jer. 2. 30; 4. 30; 46. 11. The suggestion of Th., מִשְׂרָה, is less probable, since this would rather signify 'for nought,' i.e. without expecting a return.

'A...[Jos. viii. 23] LXX, Luc. add (Luc. τοῦ) παροργίας αὐτῶν, i.e. תֵּמֶל, correctly. Cf. II. 17. 17; 2 Chr. 33. 6; Deut. 4. 25; 9. 18.

22. Continuation of ch. 20. After seven years of peace between Israel and Aram, Ahab, with the help of Jehoshaphat of Judah, determines to recover Rama of Gilead from the Aramaeans. He falls in the battle which takes place.

Ch. 22. 2-37* = 2 Chr. 18. 2-34.

1. After the ‘covenant’ described as concluded ch. 20. 34. The disastrous issue to which this led at Qarqar, where the confederate kings were defeated with great loss by
Shalmaneser (Append. 3), must have weakened the bonds of alliance, and led to a *rapprochement* between Israel and Judah. This new alliance made feasible the scheme to recover by force from the Aramaeans one of the most important cities which Ben-hadad had failed to cede according to compact. Cf. COT. i. 189f.

3. [always with *script. defect.* except 2 Chr. 22. 5 'ו וחוזו. Luc. in all occurrences transliterates 'Pəmuḏ r, while LXX varies between 'Pəmuḏ r and 'Pəmuḏ r. Thus there is some presumption in favour of a vocalization רָמָא הָרָא 'Rama of Gilead,' the city being so called in distinction from other places of the same name west of Jordan; and in II. 8. 29 ([| 2 Chr. 22. 6] רָא) actually occurs. So Sta., Wellh. The form Rmoth, however, is substantiated as an existing form by the occurrence of the *st. absol.* רָמָא bLb Josh. 21. 36; רָמָא (רָמָא) fLXX Deut. 4. 43; Josh. 20. 8; i Chr. 6. 65. The site of this Rama is doubtful. By most identification is sought with the modern Es-Salt, which would have formed a convenient point of vantage for an advance upon Samaria from an E.S.E. position. Dillmann (after Hitzig, Langer) on Gen. 31. 54 prefers the site El-Jaffā, six miles north of Es-Salt.

6. [always with *script. defecet.* Chr. 'י הה רָמָא. Cf. ch. 1. 38 note.

[**י**] LXX, Luc. καὶ (Luc. ὅτε) διδοῦν δῶσας, i.e. [**י**] תַחַל. Cf. Num. 21. 2; Judg. 11. 30; 2 Sam. 5. 19.

[**י**] || 2 Chr. 18. 5 [**י**]. According to Th. many Codd. read [**י**], and this probably represents the original text, as in vv. 11, 12. The alteration probably arose (Th.) from the supposition suggested by Jehoshaphat’s question v. 7, that the 400 were prophets of Ba’al.

7. 'י אֱלֹהָי] Render with AV. 'Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides?' i.e. yet one more prophet of Yahwe in addition to these His (professed) prophets. The reason for Jehoshaphat’s distrust of the 400 prophets can only be inferred. Jos. (Ant. viii. 15, § 4) συνει ἐκ τῶν λόγων Ἰωσάφατος, ἐτί γενομόσπορο- φήτων γυναικών, and similarly Ber., 'He shrewdly conjectured that Aliab had only interrogated the prophets who were prepared to
give him a favourable answer.' RV. 'Is there not here besides a prophet of the Lord?' is an unwarrantable dislocation of יִנָּה, intended apparently to imply that the speaker regarded the 400 not as prophets of Yahwe but of a strange god. This sense, not to be obtained from MT., is, with omission of יִנָּה, given by LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., 'Is there not here a prophet of Yahwe?' But against this is Ahab's reply (v. 8) which presupposes that the 400 prophesied in the name of Yahwe, as is stated in vv. 11, 12.

This passage again points the inference (already drawn ch. 18. 31* note) that there were two forms of Yahwe-worship existent in the northern kingdom—that represented by the cult of the calves, and that of which such prophets as Elijah, Elisha, and Micaiah were the exponents; and that the view that the former was a perversion of the true religion was not merely the opinion of later (Deuteronomistic) times, but was shared by the contemporary adherents of the purer form of religion. The 400 prophets cannot be thought to have belonged to the class which Jezebel used rigorous measures to extirpate (ch. 18. 4; 19. 10, 14; II. 9. 7), but must have been representatives of a form of Yahwe-religion which for some reason escaped attack during her persecution; and the reason for this escape may be assumed to have been that this professed Yahwe-worship could tolerate¹ the existence side by side with it of a definitely extraneous cult, even if it had not itself assimilated certain Canaanite elements ².

On the other hand, the reason for Jezebel's vindictiveness against a certain section of Yahwe-worshippers must have been that these, by emphasis of Yahwe's exclusive claim (Ex. 20. 3), came into sharp collision with the form of religion which she desired to...

---

¹ Cf. the indifferent attitude of the populace gathered at Mt. Carmel to the two diverse cults; ch. 18. 21.

² It may accordingly be conjectured that in II. 8. 13 Elisha's words to Joram כִּלָּה יִנָּה מַעֹרְכַּי מִדָּי מֶלֶךְ יַבֵּאל describe as the prophets of Ahab, and the prophets of the Phoenician Ba'al who were under the special patronage of Jezebel; the former, as the latter, being really opposed to the pure religion of Yahwe.
naturalize. Such were those mentioned in ch. 19. 18—not merely an isolated prophet here and there, but a considerable body of the people whose number is reckoned as 7,000.

8. [杞 since כָּל, 'probably more correct etymologically'; Th. מִלְבֶּשׁ בְּנֵיהוּ; 'Clad in robes,' i.e. in robes of state. Cf. v. 30 'put thou on thy robes,' in contrast to the preceding הַנָּשָׁרָה.

[כְּּנֶּבֶּדֶם, 'In a threshing-floor.' Chr. מִלְבֶּשׁ בְּנֵיהוּ with explan. ref. of previous מִלְבֶּשׁ. Scarcely possible. RV. paraph. 'in an open place' is impermissible, there being no ground for assigning this general signification to מַעְמָר; and the same remark applies to the renderings of Vulg. in area; Luc. in ָּדָּפַת 1; LXX, Luc. in מִלְבֶּשׁ מְלַשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים. In LXX (Kgs.) מִלַּשְׁנִים answers to the whole מִלְבֶּשׁ מְלַשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים, i.e. מַעְמָר is unrepresented, and may thus be regarded as mere dittography of מַעְמָר. The emendations of Ew. מַעְמָר, 'in armour,' Th., Ber. מַעְמָר, 'embroidered'(!) have nothing to recommend them.

11. [杞 רָכָּה, 'Yahwe shall give (it),' with obj. understood as in vv. 6, 15. LXX, Luc. wrongly supply as obj. מִלַּשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים.

12. [杞 רָכָּה, 'Yahwe shall give (it),' with obj. understood as in vv. 6, 15. LXX, Luc. wrongly supply as obj. מִלַּשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים. אֲרוֹרִים הַנָּשָׁרָה So Josh. 9. 2. An accus. defining the manner of מִלַּשְׁנִים.

13. [杞 רָכָּה, 'Yahwe shall give (it),' with obj. understood as in vv. 6, 15. LXX, Luc. wrongly supply as obj. מִלַּשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים. יְבַמְּשָׁם So Josh. 9. 2. An accus. defining the manner of מִלַּשְׁנִים.

17. [杞 רָכָּה, 'Yahwe shall give (it),' with obj. understood as in vv. 6, 15. LXX, Luc. wrongly supply as obj. מִלַּשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים מְלַשְׁנִים. יְבַמְּשָׁם So Josh. 9. 2. An accus. defining the manner of מִלַּשְׁנִים.

But perhaps this is a corruption of מִלַּשְׁנִים. In Pesh. (Kgs. and Chr.) מִלַּשְׁנִים is clearly an error for מִלַּשְׁנִים, which answers to MT.
The First Book of Kings

Luc. in place of אִל reads אִנ, i.e. כָּל or אֲלָל, and this is followed by Klop., 'If these had any master, they would return, &c.,' a reading incomparably poor by the side of MT. LXX ὁ Κύριος τῶν Θεῶν; presupposes a false repetition of מִלָּה as מִלָּה מֵלָה.

19. אֲלָל מִלָּה] The strange rendering of LXX, Luc. ὁ Κύριος θεῶν, ὁ Κύριος ἡκένιπ χριστοῦ Κύριος θεῶν ἐκεῖνου αὐτοῦ, represents at the beginning a doublet of מִלָּה, first read as מִלָּה מִלָּה, and then explained by the gloss ὁ Κύριος ἡκένιπ, 'Not I' (am responsible, but Yahwe). The second ὁ Κύριος θεῶν, which should not be followed by a stop, is an imitation of מִלָּה מֵלָּה, v. 17.

אֲלָל מִלָּה] Chr. וַתִּשְׁקַ, and so here Cod. Kenn. וַתִּשְׁקַ לְאָדָם מַהוּץ] 'The host of heaven'; an expression not used elsewhere in pre-exilic writings in the special sense of spiritual beings or angels. Cf., however, Josh. 5. 13ff. (JE) where the 'man' who appears to Joshua describes himself as מַהוּץ. In Isa. 34. 4 (prob. exilic) the phrase seems to describe the angels corresponding to or acting as guardians of 'all the nations' (v. 2), this being clearly the case in 24. 21 with the expression דָּנוּר וַתַּשְׁקֵן 1. Elsewhere generally מַהוּץ denotes the stars;—II. 17. 16; 21. 3, 5 (|| 2 Chr. 33. 3, 5); 23. 4, 5; Deut. 4. 19; 17. 3; Jer. 8. 2; 19. 13; Zeph. 1. 5; cf. Gen. 2. 1; Ps. 33. 6; Isa. 40. 26; 45. 12. It is a late usage in which the term is used indefinitely to denote visible heavenly bodies and invisible agencies; Neh. 9. 6; Dan. 8. 10; cf. Ps. 102. 21; 148. 2.

20. אֲלָל מַהוּץ] For the doctrine that Yahwe, in His displeasure, incites men to their own ruin or injury, cf. Ex. 4. 21b; 10. 1, 20, 27; 11. 9, 10 (J, E, or JE); 7. 3; 9. 12 (P); Deut. 2. 30 hardening of the heart ascribed to Yahwe (cf. Isa. 6. 10); Judg. 9. 23 Yahwe sends an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem; 2 Sam. 24. 1 incites David to a pernicious action; Isa. 19. 2, 14 stirs up Egypt against Egypt and mingles a spirit of perverseness

1 Cf. for this doctrine Dan. 10. 13, 20, 21; 12. 1; Exclus. 17. 17; and Deut. 82. 8 LXX (reading הַיָּע for הָעֲשֻׁר).
XXII. 19-26

in the midst of her; Ezek. 14. 9 deceives the false prophet to his own ruin (the same verb as in our passage יָנוּשֶׁה).

LXX, Luc., Vulg. presuppose יָנוּשֶׁה מִלֵּךְ יָהֳウェ, and so Chr.

On the contrasted order cf. ch. 5. 25 note.

'The spirit,' vividly pictured in the speaker's imagination through the part which he fulfilled. Cf. ch. 20. 36 note.

The variation of Luc. after v. 22א נִפְנְדָהוּ אֵינוּת. קא נִפְנְדָהוּ אֵינוּת is probably due merely to the dislocation of אֵינוּת in the Greek text. LXX as MT. קא נִפְנְדָהוּ אֵינוּת נִפְנְדָהוּ אֵינוּת.

The interrog. מַה הַיָּא is never elsewhere used with a verb, and Chr., in supplying before רָעִים, conforms to the usual constr. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. On the contrasted order cf. ch. 13. 12 note. LXX פְּנִיָּה קְרִיָּה לֹא שָׁלוֹם חֲסִידָן אֵינוּת מַגְּלֵה, i.e. not as rendered, 'What kind of spirit &c.? but 'where is the spirit of Yahwe that speaketh in thee?' a direct challenge to Micaiah to avenge the insult, implying that, if he fails to do so, the spirit by which he speaks is a מַרְעֹן מַר. To this Micaiah replies, 'Behold thou shalt see (where it is; i.e. the challenge shall be accepted; not now, but) in that day &c.' This is superior to the obscure sentence of MT., and probably represents the original text. Luc. exhibits a combination of LXX and MT.

The interrog. מַה הַיָּא is never elsewhere used with a verb, and Chr., in supplying before רָעִים, conforms to the usual constr. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. On the contrasted order cf. ch. 13. 12 note. LXX פְּנִיָּה קְרִיָּה לֹא שָׁלוֹם חֲסִידָן אֵינוּת מַגְּלֵה, i.e. not as rendered, 'What kind of spirit &c.? but 'where is the spirit of Yahwe that speaketh in thee?' a direct challenge to Micaiah to avenge the insult, implying that, if he fails to do so, the spirit by which he speaks is a מַרְעֹן מַר. To this Micaiah replies, 'Behold thou shalt see (where it is; i.e. the challenge shall be accepted; not now, but) in that day &c.' This is superior to the obscure sentence of MT., and probably represents the original text. Luc. exhibits a combination of LXX and MT.

The substitution of pl. for sing. may be explained as due to the influence of pl. imperat. v. 27 יָנוּשֶׁהוּ אֵינוּת. This refer to two persons מַר and מַר, but the address of v. 26 is probably to the רֹאשׁ מַרְעֹן of vv. 9 ff. ZATW. V. 173 ff.

LXX πρὸς Εὔμηρος, Luc. πρὸς Εὔμηρος. Chr. LXX πρὸς 'Εὔμηρος, Cod. A, Luc. πρὸς Εὔμηρος. The forms with 2 probably

1 Adopted by Sta. Ges. i. 533: 'Was für ein Geist Jahwes hat denn aus dir gesprochen?'
exhibit a repetition of the last letter of ρφρ, and LXX Chr. represents the original form in the Greek. Accordingly Sta. favours the reading ραμ, 'Εμμων being the LXX form for MT. גמל in Jer. 20. 1; Ezr. 2. 37, 59; 10. 20; Neh. 3. 29; 7. 40; 11. 13; 1 Chr. 9. 12; 24. 14.

27. [ז] LXX, Luc. omit.

With great contempt:—‘This fellow.’ So exactly, with זאא, 1 Sam. 21. 16; 2 Sam. 13. 17 (מאו זאא); cf. ch. 20. 7; II. 5. 7; 1 Sam. 10. 27; 25. 21; Ex. 10. 7. 'ו יאא לוהי 'Bread in scant measure and water in scant measure'; lit. 'bread—affliction and water—affliction,' a case of apposition. So Isa. 30. 20. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 189 r.

28. [ז] LXX, Luc. omit. The words are clearly a gloss derived from Mic. 1. 2, and inserted for the purpose of identifying Micaiah with Micah the Morashtite. The names הָּיוֹנָה and הָּיוֹנָה are really identical, and the prophet of the later century bears the longer name הָּיוֹנָה in Jer. 26. 18 Kt. The pl. occurs many scores of times with the signification of foreign nations, seldom or never of Israel.

30. [ז] 'Let me disguise myself and enter the battle!' The infin. absol. presents the bare idea of the verb in exclamatory and excited speech. Cf. II. 4. 43 דַּעֲמָה וְאֵלְכָה 'Thus saith Yahwe, Ye shall eat and leave over!' II. 3. 16; Hos. 4. 2; alt.; Da. § 88b; Ew. § 328c.

[ז] LXX, Luc. וְיוֹנָה לֹא יְהַנְּקִינוּ, an easy (but false) correction deduced from the fact that Ahab himself was disguised.

31. [ז] 'Now the king of Aram had commanded.' On order of sentence cf. ch. 14. 5 note.

[ז] The military commanders who filled the place previously occupied by the thirty-two vassal princes. Cf. ch. 20. 24 note.

32. [ז] 'They turned aside against him'; somewhat

1 Supposed cases are Deut. 33. 3 where the better reading seems to be מק LXX; Gen. 28. 3; 48. 4 the promise to Jacob. With suffix Judg. 5. 14; Hos. 10. 14. Cf. Dri. on Deut. loc. cit.
harsh. LXX, Luc. καὶ ἐκκατοστάν αἰσθών agree with Chr. θεῖαν τὴν ἀναπτύχθηκεν αὐτοῦ agree with Chr. 'they surrounded him;' a reading certainly to be preferred. So Th., Klo. ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐμὸς as in Job 16. 13.

34. ἀλλά [Lit. 'in his simplicity' (o of norm), i.e. without being able to assign a reason for the selection of his mark. So AV., RV. suitably 'at a venture'; Luc. ἀφικνότα, 'artlessly.' That this is the meaning of the phrase is rendered clear by the context of its only other occurrence, 2 Sam. 15. 11 καὶ ἔκκατακτώσαν ἄνω τῶν συνήθεων ἡλίκίων, 'straight in front of him;' seem to have imagined that the phrase denoted the letting fly of an aimless shaft. LXX, guessing, σωστοχαστά.

'אלה המרכות ד "Between the attachments and between the coat of mail.' The subs. מך only elsewhere occurs in Isa. 41. 7, where it means joining or soldering. So Heb. Lxx. Oxf., following Th., Ber. al., explains 'the jointed attachment or appendage to the rigid breast-armour, which covered the abdomen.' Other explanations have merely the nature of guesses:—LXX, Luc. διὰ μίσου τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ διὰ μίσου τοῦ δόρατος: Vulg. inter pulmonem et stomachum; Ew. the soft parts which connect the chest with the bottom of the back, so, 'between the groin and breast-bone'; Ges. Thes. 'arm-pits,' lit. joints of shoulder; Klo. 'helmet-appendages'.

'יהו'י ו "So II. 9. 23 with pl. ויו as Kt.

המשננים [The army 'in action, as in Judg. 4. 15, 16.

חכתי רְבִּי [RV. 'For I am sore wounded.' So 2 Chr. 35. 23.

35. וַיַּהְנוּ 'And the battle waxed hotter;' lit. went up or increased, the figure being perhaps drawn from a river which gathers force as it rises (Ke., Th., Ber.); cf. Isa. 8. 7; Jer. 46. 7, 8.

'וַיְזָהֵן 'Was propped up.' The participle with subs. verb s
expresses the duration of the action; Dri. Tenses, § 135. 5. Chr. act. רֵיָּשׁ יָהוּ 'kept himself standing.'

After v. 35a LXX, Luc. add εἰς τὸν θανάτον, i.e. οὗτος ἀπέκτεινεν, and this is partially supported by Chr. דָּעֲךָ וְהוּב. In v. 35b LXX, Luc., which place after וְחָלָב, are superior.

Chr. וַיַּפְרֹץ אָנוּ לְתֹחֲנוֹן, either a summary conclusion formed by combining Kgs. v. 36a וְחָלָב, or else the writer's eye passed to וִיהי of v. 37, and וְחָלָב represents a corrupt reading of וְחָלָב אָנוּ.

[Page 259] 'And the blood of the wound flowed &c.' This intrans. sense occurs only once besides, Job 38. 38 מָצַח לְפִיקָהוּ 'when dust flowed into the mass.' Imperf. Qal always elsewhere takes the form יָקָם.

36. `

37. 'And there passed the cry.' The verb, if not an error for רְבָעֲו, is masc. as coming first in the sentence; cf. ch. 11. 3 note on מִטְפֶּה לְנַע. LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ. interpret רְבָעֲו as the herald.

38. 'And the harlots washed themselves (there),' sc. in the pool into which the blood had drained. LXX, Luc. add εὐρισκόμεν (Luc. obruic). This is the only meaning of which the sentence is capable. The other Verss., probably for the sake of avoiding an objectionable statement, give to וְחָלָב another interpretation and make it the obj. of וַיִּתְנַשֶּׁר;—Vulg. et habenas laterum, Pesh. וַיָּבְרוּ (transposed with וַיִּתְנַשֶּׁר), and so Targ. וַיִּתְנַשֶּׁר.
'and they washed the (Pesh. his) armour.' But 'weapon or military equipment' of Rabb. Heb. and Aram. never occurs in Bib. Heb.; and verb מַחְפֵל is used exclusively of washing the body, whether one's own person (without obj.) or some part of it (obj. מַחְפֵל, מַחְפֵּל, al.) or some one else (Ex. 29. 4; 40. 12; Lev. 8. 6 P; Ezek. 16. 9†), or of washing the flesh portions of a sacrifice (Ex. 29. 17; Lev. 1. 9, 13; 8. 21; 9. 14 P†), never of washing any kind of inanimate object.

Cf. ch. 13. 26 note.

22. 39, 40. Summary of Ahab's reign.

39. וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲצְוּ [The house of ivory.' The קִבְּלָה of Am. 3. 15 perhaps contains an allusion to this. Cf. Ps. 45. 9 נִבְּלָה 'palaces of ivory.' Jer. 22. 15 speaks of Ahab's fame as a builder, upon the reading of Cod. A 'אחָב for Ḥאָב, יֹטְלֵל וּפָאְטָם וּפָאְטָם אלַחָבָה,' 'Shalt thou reign because thou competest with Ahab?' (in magnificence of palace architecture; cf. vv. 13, 14).

22. 41-51. Jehoshaphat, king of Judah.

Ch. 22. 41-51 forms part of the material of 2 Chr. 20. 31-37.

44. וַיֹּאמֶר [ Cf. ch. 3. 2, 3 note.

47. וַיֹּאמֶר [ Cf. ch. 14. 24 note.

48, 49. וַיָּשָׁהוּ [Highly obscure as the text stands. RV. 'And there was no king in Edom: a deputy was king,' agrees with Targ. and so Ke., Th., Kamp. But that a mere deputy, ostensibly appointed by Jehoshaphat, should be dignified with the title of king is incredible. Vulg. nec erat tunc rex constititus in Edom, Pesh. פַּלְאֹת פַּלְאֹת נַשִּׁים בְּדַיָּדוֹן give an intelligible sense: 'And there was no king in Edom appointed as king,' i.e. regularly constituted as such; but against this it may be urged (Sta.) that

1 Strictly speaking, Targ. גַּלְגָּל הָבָה מַעַדְּדִים אִשָּׁה יַעֲשֶׂהוּ מֵעָלָיו, 'And there was no king in Edom appointed, but a general was king,' exhibits a double rendering of יָשָׁהוּ, the former 'appointed' agreeing with Vulg., Pesh.
of the appointment of a king is unparalleled. LXX, Luc. simply transliterate בֵּית, and fail to afford any elucidation.

Probably, therefore, the text has suffered some corruption; and this inference is confirmed by the condition of v. 49a, where נֹשֶׁע must be corrected נֹשֶׁע upon the authority of Q're, several Codd., and all Verss., and the reference of נֹשֶׁע אל is, at best, highly obscure.

Sta. (ZATW. 1885, p. 178) by clever emendation obtains for the two verses a text which is at once lucid and but little divergent from MT. Connecting v. 48 with v. 49 he reads: כִּי לֹא נֹשֶׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוֹשָׁפָת בִּתְרָשִׁיסְ וַיֵּצַר שׁוֹפֶר מִילֵךְ לְעֹיֵב יְהוָה לְלַעֲבָדֶד יְהוָה וַיְקָרֵב כִּי לֹא נֹשֶׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוֹשָׁפָת בִּתְרָשִׁיסְidy.

Now there was no king in Edom. And the deputy of king Jehoshaphat made a ship of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold; but it went not, for the ship (his ship) was wrecked at Ezion-geber.’ For the constr. כִּי לֹא נֹשֶׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ cf. 2 Sam. 16. 6; 19. 17; ch. 1. 38; 5. 7; 10. 13; II. 19. 5, and so כִּי לֹא נֹשֶׁع הַמֶּלֶךְ cf. 1 Sam. 13. 3. So Benz., Kit. Klo. agrees with Sta. as far as regards v. 48 and its connexion with v. 49, while in this latter verse he combines Q're and Kt. ‘made ten ships,’ and finds the reference of נֹשֶׁע to be to the projector of the expedition.

Upon cf. ch. 10. 22 note.

22. 52–54. Ahabiah, king of Israel.

54. לָ֯יְהוֹ יְהוֹיָדָע LXX, Luc. pl. τοῦ βασιλέα.

This verse clearly belongs to the series of short notices referring to the reign of Ahabiah immediately preceding, I. 22. 52–54. The division of the Hebrew text of Kings into two books
is not found in the MSS. nor in the early printed editions. It first occurs in the great Rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg, published at Venice 1516-17, where an asterisk between I. 22. 54 and II. 1. 1 calls attention to a marginal note: מחוזב הלוחמים סמבפלבר אבריע; 'Here the non-Jews (i.e. Christians) begin the fourth book of Kings.' A similar note is found between 1 and 2 Sam. Cf. Ginsburg, *Introdc. to the Massoretico-critical ed. of the Heb. Bible*, pp. 45, 930 ff. Thus the division in MT. appears to have been an innovation from LXX, Vulg. While in LXX no known MS. presents an undivided text of 1, 2 Kgs.; 3, 4 Kgs.; Chr.; it is noticeable that in Cod. B the first verse of each second book appears also at the close of each first book, a fact which shows that the divider of the books was desirous of indicating the inner connexion existing between the first and second divisions in each case. Cf. the manner in which in MT. Ezr. 1. 1-3* (to יעה) repeats 2 Chr. 36. 22, 23, of which it originally formed the unbroken continuation.

'ותשש מאב

According to the inscription of Mesha' king of Moab (*Append. 1*) the rebellion took place during the reign of Omri's son. Ahab is, however, nowhere mentioned by name in the inscription.

1. 2-18. *Ahaziah, after an accidental fall through a lattice, appeals to the oracle of Ba'al-zebub, the god of Ekron, in order to learn whether he will recover. Elijah predicts his death, on account of his unfaithfulness to Yahwe.*

2. *'Out through (lů, away from) the lattice.' So LXX διὰ τοῦ δανυνῶν, 'A. ἐπὶ τῶν κιγκαλεων, Vulg. per cancellos, Targ. מניינןמן נמ. For the other uses of מַב ה ל cf. I. 7. 17 note. Luc. presents a slightly different form of v. 2*: καὶ ἠμηθ ὁ Χ. εἰς τὸ δανυνῶν ὑπερήφανον αὐτοῦ τῷ ἐν Σαμαιρίᾳ καὶ ἑστηκε καὶ ἤπεισε—inferior to MT.*

'ות

Cf. ch. 8. 8, 9.

The constr. וַיַּלְעָה (for the normal וַיָּלָה) is regular in Rabbinic Heb., but extremely uncommon in Bib. Heb. Other
occurrences, cited by Kö. Syntax, § 334 b, are ἀλλὰ ἔνθα Mic. 7. 12
(text doubtful), ὡς ἐπὶ Ps. 80. 15. LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ. presuppose a reading ὅ ἡ ἁμάρτησίς 'this my sickness,' both here and in ch. 8. 8, 9. This constr., in which the demonstr. pronoun without the article follows a subs. with possessive suffix, is perfectly regular; cf. v. 13 τό ἡ ἁμάρτησίς; I. 8. 59; 10. 8; 22. 23; al.; Da. § 32 (2), Rem. 3; Ew. § 293; G-K. § 126 y.

At the end of the verse LXX, Luc. add καὶ ἐπαραθῆκαν ἐπαραθῆκαν (LXX δ' αὐτῶν), i.e. ἐπαραθῆκαν τοῦ δοῦναι, an addition which forms a suitable introduction to v. 3a, and which may be compared with v. 4b.

3. Ἠλία LXX ἐκδέχεται . . . λέγων, Luc. ἐλάλησε . . . λέγων. Probably LXX is a corruption of Luc. The latter presupposes the reading of MT., λέγων being merely the translator's addition: cf. I. 13. 12 note.


5. ἵνα ἐδέχθη] Upon the enclitic ἵνα, cf. I. 14. 6 note.

6. ἐλέησεν Ἰσραήλ] LXX, Luc. presuppose ὑπεκάλεσε; cf. v. 3. MT., as the easier reading, appears to be a correction. A correction in the Greek would probably have run ὑμεῖς πορεύεσθε, i.e. ἀπεκάλεσεν, in strict agreement with v. 3.

6b. ἐκδέχεται LXX, Luc. add τάδε λέγει Κύριος as in v. 4. At the end of the verse Luc. has a gloss, derived, in the main, from I. 21. (20) 21.

7. ἔννοια 'Description,' i.e. the summary of distinctive characteristics. Cf. Judg. 13. 12 μὴ ἱππαρχήσῃ ἢ ἱππαρχὴ 'What shall be the description of the child?'

9b. τί λέγει . . . ἦν] The text is somewhat expanded in Luc.: καὶ ἐπαραθῆκεν πρὸς αὐτῶν. αὐτῶν δὲ ἐκάθηκε ἐπὶ τῆς καρφῆς τοῦ δρόμου. καὶ ἀνείπη ὁ ἡγούμενος καὶ οἱ πεντηκοσία αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡλθοῦν ὡς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐλάλησε πρὸς αὐτῶν ὁ πεντηκοσίαρχος καὶ εἶπεν κ. κ. κ.

בשֵׁן הנהו] Omission of the pronominal subject of the participle is not infrequent after מִן, which calls pointed attention to a
subject closely preceding. Cf. Gen. 24. 30; 37. 15; al.; Dri. Tenses, § 135 (6); Da. § 100 a. Such a use of מַלְכָּה without expression of suffix of reference is idiomatic in other cases also; cf. e.g. ch. 6. 13; I. 2. 29; 21. 18.

[ןבמצ] LXX ἐπέκτεν ἵνα, probably an alteration of ἀπέκτεν; cf. v. 3 note. Luc. ῆπεκτεν, in accordance with v. 11 ἔπεκτεν ἵνα.

10. [ו] 'And if.' The ' by emphasis of 'if,' imparts a grim sarcasm to the prophet's words; the implication being, 'You glibly term me "man of God," while overlooking my power to withstand the king's command.' Cf. I. 2. 22 note. In v. 121 is omitted.

11. [ט] Luc., Cod. A are correct in reading כָּל וֹשֶׁב, i.e. כָּל as in vv. 9, 13. So Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit.


[ט] Luc., Vulg., Targ. מַלְכָּה, the reference being (as in clause b) to the captain; cf. מַלְכָּה 'another' (second) v. 11. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. MT. מַלְכָּה has arisen by attraction to מַלְכָּה 'a third fifty'; pl. as in 1 Sam. 19. 21 מַלְכָּה מַלְכָּה מַלְכָּה 'a third set of messengers.' LXX omits; Pesh. רָאשׁ לַחֲמָנֶה 'for the third time.'

[ט] LXX, Luc. כָּל וֹשֶׁב, Vulg. qui cum omisisset, omit the former verb, while Pesh. מַלְכָּה is without the latter. The subj. כָּל וֹשֶׁב, following upon the second verb, occupies an awkward though not impossible position (cf. I. 10. 29 a), and is omitted by Vulg. So Klo., Kamp., Benz.

[ט] LXX, Vulg. omit the somewhat redundant מָשָׁא.


16. [ט] 'Forasmuch as' is answered by קָם 'therefore,' and the interjected question רֹאשׁ וֹשֶׁב... וֹשֶׁב.. וֹשֶׁב... כָּל... כָּל... כָּל... Kio., Kamp., Benz., Kit. The words are a gloss from vv. 3, 6.

17. [ט] Add וֹשֶׁב with Luc., Th. אֲדַלְדַּל אֲדַלְדַּל, a specification presupposed by the statement of clause b. So Klo., Kamp., Kit.

[ט] This synchronism breaks the connexion between
the statements preceding and following, and also conflicts with the synchronism of ch. 3. 1, which occupies the regular position in R's framework. As standing in MT. it is an erroneous insertion, and forms part of a distinct synchronistic system, which appears in Luc., but of which this notice and that of I. 16. 23 are the only traces in MT. See Introduction.

2. 1-18. The translation of Elijah to heaven, and the gift of a double portion of his spirit to Elisha, his disciple and successor.

1. הָלַאַף הָגִּמֶכ The hatef-gamec facilitates the pronunciation of the emphatic sibilant s. Cf. Kö. Lchrg. I. i. 262; and notes on I. 13. 7; 19. 20.

גִּילָגְלָגְלָג It is the merit of Th. to have first noticed that this Gilgal, from which Elijah and Elisha went down (יָצִיא v. 2) to Bethel, cannot have been the Gilgal between Jericho and the Jordan, Josh. 4. 19; al.; and to have identified the place with Gilgal, south-west of Seilam, and 'near the high road between Bethel and Shechem'; cf. Smith, Hist. Geogr. 494. Rob. (BR. ii. 265.) describes the locality of Gilgal, but fails to perceive the Biblical identification.

2. הָלַאַף הָגִּמֶכ The vocalization קמ is adopted by the punctuators for the sake of drawing artificial distinction between the sacred oath קמ and the non-sacred. Cf. vv. 4, 6; 4. 30; 1 Sam. 20. 3; 25. 26; 1. 26; 17. 55; 2 Sam. 11. 11; 14. 19; קמ Gen. 42. 15, 16; קמ 2 Sam. 15. 21; קמ Am. 8. 14.

3. הָלַאַף הָגִּמֶכ 'Who were at Bethel.' The accusative of place, in answer to the question where can thus be used in the case of proper names compounded with קמ; so exactly 2 Sam. 2. 22 רָש אֶרְפָּא מִל-תְּנַב; cf. Hos. 12. 5; Da. § 69a. In contrast we have רָשׁוֹי רָשׁוֹי 'in Jericho,' v. 5.

According to norm we should expect קמ. Another instance of the imperat. of a verb קמ gutt. vocalized after the analogy of the perf. is found in Jer. 49. 8, 30 קמ, קמ; so infin. constr. קמ in Jer. 31. 31.
II. 1-14

8. יֹלְדוּתָה ‘And rolled (it) up.’ The verb, which only occurs here in Bibl. Heb., is found in Rabbinic Heb. with the same significance. Other occurrences of the root in Bibl. Heb. are found in Ezek. 27. 24 וַיִּשַׁלַּח הַדְּשָׁם ‘wrappings of blue’ (so Aram. עָלְמִית, עָלְמִית); Ps. 139. 16 שֵׁל הַנֶּפֶשׁ ‘my unformed substance’ (embryo; so New Heb. id.; Aram. עָלְמִית).

9. ‘ות אני יד ‘‘Let there be now a share of two in thy spirit upon me!’ Elisha claims the right of a first born son among the disciples of Elijah. בֵּית הַנֶּפֶשׁ, as in Deut. 21. 17, lit. ‘mouth (mouthful) of two,’ is a share twice as large as that which is given to any one of the later-born sons. The explanation of Ew. ‘two-thirds’ is quite unwarranted. In Zech. 13. 8 the expression has this meaning only through being brought into relationship with מִנֵה יָד ‘the third part.’

10. יִתְנָה With dropping of ב preformative, for מִנֵה. So בֵּית Ex. 3. 2; יִתְנָה Judg. 13. 8; יִתְנָה מִנֵה Isa. 18. 2, 7; יִתְנָה Ezek. 26. 17 (accent יִתְנָה). Ew. § 617b; G-K. § 525.


12. יִתְנָה So ch. 13. 14, the words of king Joash to Elisha upon his death-bed. The expression seems to mean that Elijah, as after him Elisha, stands for Yahwe’s invisible forces which should be Israel’s true safeguard (cf. ch. 6. 16f.), and to convey the apprehension lest this safeguard should be lost to the nation with the removal of the prophet. In the present case the use of the words naturally connects itself with the vision.

14. After the statement יִתְנָה יִתְנָה in the first half-verse, Luc. inserts καὶ οὗ ἐνσήπητον, Vulg. et non sunt divisae—regarded by Hoo. as part of the original text, but more probably a gloss to explain

¹ Ew.’s words are (Hist. iv. p. 81), ‘But although he had inherited Elijah’s mantle, and many might esteem him equally great, yet it was always an essential feature of the representation of him that he had only received two-thirds of Elijah’s spirit, and had indeed with difficulty obtained even that. In fact, in this sharp expression tradition expressed the most correct and striking judgement of his value, taken as a whole.’ In contrast to this deprecatory estimate, cf. the words and action of the prophets, v. 15.
the repeated mention of the striking of the water which follows in clause 6. Such a repeated reference to a single event, after an intervening clause or clauses, may be paralleled by Gen. 27. 23b-27a. The accentuation connects closely with 'and he also (like Elijah in v. 8) smote the waters, &c.' Had this meaning, however, been intended, we should certainly have read either מַפְרוּנָה מַפְרוּנָה (cf. Deut. 2. 11, 20; Lev. 26. 24, 28), or מַפְרוּנָה מַפְרוּנָה (cf. Lev. 26. 16, 41). As the text stands we must therefore (with Ke.) alter the accentuation, and, placing the principal break after מַפְרוּנָה, render, 'Where is Yahwee, the God of Elijah, even he?' But this explanation is, as Th. notices, open to the objections that such an emphasis appears to be superfluous, and that מַפְרוּנָה (denoting properly 'addition') cannot be shown to have simply the force of a strengthened ד. While Pesh., Targ. support MT., Vulg. etiam nunc, ס. καὶ νῦν, and perhaps LXX translit. ἀπέφω (cf. ch. 10. 10), suggest מַפְרוּנָה, connecting with the preceding interrogation, 'Where is Yahwee, the God of Israel, now?' This reading is followed by Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit., and some older commentators. It is true that מַפְרוּנָה, when used elsewhere with the interrog. מַפְרוּנָה (Judg. 9. 38; Isa. 19. 12; Job 17. 15), immediately follows this particle, but cases can be cited in which the word, when used after other interrog. particles, occurs further on in the sentence; cf. Ex. 33. 16 'וַיָּמָּשׁ כִּי בִרְעֹת, מַפְרוּנָה; Hos. 13. 10 מַפְרוּנָה מַפְרוּנָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל.'

If this emendation be not accepted, the only alternative seems to be to omit מַפְרוּנָה with Luc., regarding the letters as an erroneous repetition of the preceding מַפְרוּנָה.

15. Klo., followed by Kamp., Benz., Kit., omits מַפְרוּנָה as an erroneous insertion after the pattern of vv. 3, 5. מַפְרוּנָה implies that the prophets were not in Jericho, but were standing near at hand as spectators of the scene—a fact which is clear from this verse and v. 7.
16. After אָשֶׁר he ָלָשֶׁל, LXX adds εν πάπῃ ַּיִּפְדָם i.e. אֲנִי, 'and hath cast him into the Jordan, or upon one of the mountains, &c.' So Th., Klo. In view of the scene of Elijah's disappearance, the suggestion is very natural, and appropriately comes first.

19-25. Elisha 'heals' the unwholesome water of Jericho (19-22), and vindicates his prophetic authority against the insults of children at Bethel (23-25).

19. אֶת הַגָּזֶה אֶת הַגָּזֶה as in Ezek. 6. 3, and in suff. form אֶלְקָנָה Ezek. 35. 8. Q're אֵלֶקַנָּה as in Ezek. 7. 16; 32. 5; 36. 4, 6. LXX, Luc. רָכַב הָוֹיַם, i.e. לשון, inferior to MT.


23. אוֹמִּיתָהוּ] ‘Nor any that casts her young.’ It is more natural to take אֶת הַגָּזֶה as a participle (as in v. 19) than to regard it, with Ges., Ke., Klo., Kamp., RV., as a subs. ‘miscarriage.’

24. בִּקְרָא] 'And reviled him.' The incident perhaps illustrates the unpopularity of Yahwe's true prophets in the chief centre of the calf-worship; cf. Am. 7. 10 ff. Luc. καὶ εἰδὼλον αἰερον, i.e. ἱδωλοκοπῶν.

25. אֶת הַגָּזֶה] 'And rent'; lit. 'clef' or 'loose open,' as in ch. 8. 12; 15. 16.
The Second Book of Kings

3. Jehoram, king of Israel. His campaign against Moab in alliance with the kings of Judah and Edom.

2. LXX, Luc. τὰς στάσεις, Vulg. statuas understand as pl. צבת, and so Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. In the passage with reference to Jehoram (vv. 1-3) which follows in LXX, Luc. after ch. 1. 18 there is the addition καὶ συνετήρησεν αὑτός, i.e. בריכת. As Th. notices, the pillar (sing.) of MT. is probably intended to be brought into connexion with the statement of I. 16. 32. From the narrative of ch. 10. 18 ff. it is clear that Jehoram made no organized attempt to root out the worship of Ba'al-Melqart, such as is suggested by the reading of the pl. צבת, nor is such an attempt to be thought probable while Jezebel was still living and in possession of power.

3. הָעָנָמָה] Read sing. הָעָנָמָה, in agreement with the suffix of הנַעַמְתּוֹ following. So in ch. 13. 2, 6, 11; 17. 22. So Klo.


הַעַנָּמָה] So, with reference to the sins of Jeroboam, ch. 13. 2, 6, 11; 14. 24; 15. 9, 24, 28; 17. 22; with יַעֲמָה 10. 29; with לַעָמָה 10. 31; 15. 18. The phrase occurs in a favourable reference 1. 15. 5; 22. 43 (יַעֲמָה); ch. 18. 6 (יַעֲמָה).

4. חָבָשׁ 'A sheep-master,' or breeder of the kind of sheep called in Ar. מְטִיר, a breed of small size and ugly appearance 1, but highly esteemed on account of its wool. Amos, before his prophetic call, was one of the מְטִיר at Tekoa'.

בָּרָשׁ 'And he used to render;' frequentative. So Targ. adds an explanatory הוּא כַּאֲנָשִׁים 'year by year.' LXX adds the gloss εἰ ζήσαντον, regarding the tribute as the single payment of an indemnity after the rebellion.

דְּרָשׁ An accusative more closely defining the manner in which Mesha' paid the rams, viz. 'in wool,' i.e. the fleeces of 100,000 rams. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 194.

5. הָעֲמִיתָה] Cf. ch. 1. 1, with note.

1 Lane (Lex. 2836) quotes the saying מְטִיר מַחְסִיד, 'more abject than the sheep called nagad.'
7. 7. [Luc., here and in v. 9 'Oxias, i.e. שְׁמוֹשָׁה, in accordance with the different system of synchronism which appears in this Version. See Intro. In vv. 11, 12 bis, 14, the title בָּשָׁלֵש 'ויָשָׁה takes the place of the proper name.

8. [Cf. I. 13. 12 note.


10. [Add היה, and with LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., 2 Codd.

11. [Cf. I. 17. 18 note.

12. [Cf. I. 22. 7 footnote. LXX wrongly omits וַיֵּלֶד. LXX wrongly omits נָא לִבְגַלַּי. 'Nay!' לא is thus used absolutely in deprecation, ch. 4. 16; Judg. 19. 23; Gen. 19. 18; Ruth 1. 13; 2 Sam. 13. 16 (following Luc. יַיֵּלֶד, idelphil, i.e. יַיֵּלֶד לא; cf. Dri. ad loc.).

13. [Cf. I. 17. 1 note.

14. [As the text stands, יהוה introduces the statement of a single event in the past, and cannot be explained as a perf. with או consec. On the other hand, the occurrence in our narrative of the perf. with weak או, in place of the normal יָבֹא, is inconceivable. Thus Klo. is probably correct in conjecturing that יהוה 'and it shall come to pass' is the continuation of Elisha's speech, and that all that originally followed has fallen out through the scribe's eye confusing יָבֹא with יָאָב, which introduced the statement יָבֹא ... of clause b. The view that an omission has taken place is favoured (apart from the difficulty of יהוה) by the fact that in MT. there is no mention of the bringing of a minstrel—an almost indispensable detail which is found in Luc. after clause a. כל מונס אַדֶּלֶט פְּזָלָלָה. Klo. suggests the following restoration: 'And it shall come to pass, when the hand of Yahwe comes upon me, that I will declare unto thee that which Yahwe saith. And they brought him a minstrel; and it came to pass, &c.; i. e. יהוה לא יָבֹא יִבָּלְשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה יָאָב רַע יָאָב מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה, &c."

15. [Cf. I. 17. 1 note.

16. [Every depression, deep or shallow, in the dry bed of the Wady is to suddenly become a receptacle for water. The infin. absol. יָבֹא takes the place of the finite verb (יֵרֵבָה יָבֹא) in the sudden
rush of the oracle upon the prophet, 'when the speaker is too full of his subject to mention the action in any other than an ejaculatory manner, and as briefly as possible' (Ew. § 328a). So exactly, in another oracle by Elisha, ch. 4. 43 'Thus saith Yahwe, Eating and leaving over!' i.e. 'There shall be eating &c.,' or 'Ye shall eat &c.;' cf. I. 22. 30 note. This explanation of the infin. abs. הָשַׁעֲק יָסַף אֶלֶף רִים, Targ. דַּמְיָם סֶלֶךְ, So exactly, in another oracle by Elisha, cf. I. 22. 30 note. This explanation of the infin. abs. הָשַׁעֲק יָסַף אֶלֶף רִים is implied by Pesh. יָשַׁעֲק כְּסָרְךָ, Targ. יָשַׁעֲק כְּסָרְךָ, This torrent bed shall be made &c.; so Ew. § 328c end; Hist. iv. p. 88.

On the other hand, LXX, Luc. ποιήσας, Vulg. Facile regard נִעַשְׂעֲק as equivalent to an imperative: 'Make this torrent-bed full of cisterns!' So RV., and most moderns. This explanation is, however, less in accord with v. 17b, which seems to preclude the necessity of human intervention; and is also opposed by vv. 22, 23, where the phenomenon described must have been produced by the sun shining upon natural and so irregular and wide-spreading pools of water, and not upon artificial and so (presumably) symmetrically shaped trenches. For the repetition נִמְלַב נְבִית cf. Gen. 14. 10; G-K. § 123 e; Ew. 313a.

17. דַּמְיָם [וֹסֶה] Luc. καὶ al πορευομαι ὑμῶν, i.e. פָּשַׁעֲק יָסַף, is certainly correct; cf. v. 9b. So Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

18. יָשַׁעֲק ... [ותָּכֵל] ‘And this shall be a light thing, &c., and he shall give &c.,' i.e. 'And this being a light thing, &c., he shall (further) give &c.' Cf. Isa. 49. 6.

19. נַעֲשַׂעֲק LXX, Luc. omit, and the words are regarded by Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. as a variant of the preceding נִעַשְׂעֲק. רַכְבַּב LXX ἐργασάς, and so RV. 'ye shall marry.' הֵבַב, however, has always elsewhere the meaning "to be in pain," Hiph'il to pain, and the use of the verb in this passage is unparalleled. Klo. emends רַכְבַּב as רַכְבַּב 'ye shall destroy.'


21. נִעֲשַׂעֲק [יָשַׁעֲק כְּסָרְךָ] 'Now all Moab had heard.' So v. 22 and the sun had risen.' For the order, expressing the pluperfect, cf. note of I. 14. 5.

23. נִעֲשַׂעֲק Render, with RV. marg., 'The kings have surely fought together.' So Verss. כָּפֵר infin. abs.Pu'al
should probably be vocalized as Nipḥʿal. The verb והָלָךְ ślay, occurs again in Qal, Jer. 50. 21, 27†, and is frequent in Syr. (in Pesh. generally as a rendering of נָבָא; so e.g. v. 24 his). Ar. חֵרְבָּה III. Klo. regards Targ. נַשֵׁעַת נָבָא and Luc. ἔπιτο λόγον γὰς ἡμᾶς (cf. ch. 14. 10) as presupposing an original רֶשֶׁת הַרְבָּה; but this emendation, though adopted by Kamp., Benz., is scarcely necessary.

24. בָּדָא הַכָּבָם בַּעֲשֵׁי] In place of the impossible MT., LXX, Luc. read καὶ εὐθύς ἔστεραν καὶ τέμπῃτε, i.e. εὐθύς καὶ τέμπῃτε 'and they went forward smiting Moab as they went,' an emendation certainly to be adopted with Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. נָבָא appears to be a rare case of the infin. absol. with the termination נ as in the infin. constr.; so תָּמֹּּם Isa. 22. 13; תָּמֹּּם Hos. 10. 4; תָּמֹּּם Hab. 3. 13; and perhaps תָּמֹּּם 2 Sam. 6. 20. Cf. Kö. Letharg. I. i. p. 536. Cases of the infin. constr. used in place of the infin. absol. are quoted by Da. § 86, Rem. 3.

25. לבַּרְכָּה] 'They kept on overthrowing,' i.e. one after another. The imperfects are frequentative; cf. Dri. Tenses, § 113 β: 'a graphic picture of the way in which the people occupied themselves during their sojourn in Moab.'

'לַא מְיָדָה יִשָּׂאַר רַע] RV. 'until in Kir-ḥareseth (only) they left the stones thereof.' Had this meaning, however, been intended, the indispensable בְּכִי תָּשָׁר, and the statement would naturally have followed immediately after the first clause of the verse, תָּשָׁר וַתְּרַע, to which it must be referred. LXX, Vulg., Pesh. presuppose the same text as MT., while in Luc., Targ. the addition of a negative before Ḥיָאָשָר 'until there was not left, &c.,' is clearly an attempt at emendation, and limits to one city the thorough demolition which the context suggests to have been carried out in the case of all. Luc., however, has an additional statement preceding וַתְּרַע יִשָּׂאַר רַע, viz. כַּא מְפַּצְתָּשָׁר וַתְּרַע Moab, i.e. probably, as Klo. suggests, אַבָּא נְעַרְיָא. This seems

¹ The Hithpaʿel of רָדְתָה, דָּרַתָה, is rendered by LXX σῳθήσεται in Isa. 24. 30. For the use of רָדְתָה in our passage, cf. Qal wander about or flee away, Gen. 4. 12, 14; Jer. 49. 30; 50. 3, 8; Hiph'il drive about or scare, ch. 21. 8; Ps. 86. 12.
to make plain the reference of יִלַּשְׁנּוּ כָּל. That which was left in קִרְיָה-רֶאֶסְתָּה after the ruthless expulsion of the Moabites from their territory, which is expressed by the strong term אֵלָיוֹשָׁא, was not the stones of the city, but, as is clear from vv. 26 f., the king of Moab and his immediate followers. We may thus restore: וַיַּחְלִילוּוּ יְהוֹיָשָׁע-רֶאֶסְתָּה, 'and they harried Moab until her sons were left in Kir-hareseth, and the slingers encompassed and smote it.'

ירַשְׁנְאָה, as in ch. 10. 11; Num. 21. 35; Deut. 3. 3; Josh. 8. 22; 10. 33; 11. 8 after יִלַּשְׁנּוּ כָּל, and in Deut. 28. 55 after יַחְלִילוּ כָּל, may be regarded either as an impersonal perfect (understand subj. יִלַּשְׁנְאָה; cf. note on יִלַּשְׁנִי I. 1. 6), or as an infin. constr. vocalized with הִירֶק in place of פַּתָּח. Elsewhere in Kgs. we find רַיָּיָה כָּל I. 11. 16; יִלַּשְׁנְאָה כָּל I. 15. 29; ch. 10. 17. In this latter case the suffix indicates that the Massoretes recognized an infin. constr. form with הִירֶק under the preformative כָּל; and this is substantiated by the occurrence elsewhere of such forms as רַיָּיָה כָּל Deut. 7. 24; 28. 48; Josh. 11. 14; רַיָּיָה כָּל Lev. 14. 43. Dri. (Deut. pp. 48, 105) rejects the hypothesis of Kö. (Lehrg. I. i. p. 212) that such a form can have really existed after the analogy of the perfect, and thinks it probable that the punctuation does not represent an original and true tradition, and that — כָּל should therefore be throughout restored for — כָּל.

הָרֵע סְלֶשָׁא The stronghold of Moab, mentioned again under the same name, Isa. 16. 7, and called סְלֶשָׁא סוּפָך 16. 11; Jer. 48. 31, 36; בְּשַׂמָּה סוּפָך Isa. 15. 1. Targ. in Isa. and Jer. renders by אֲשֵׁר בֵּית כָּל, i.e. the modern El-Karak ('the fortress'), which gives its name to the surrounding district south-east of the Dead Sea. Cf. Rob. BR. ii. 166.

ב. יִלַּשְׁנָא ‘Who was to reign.’ Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 39 b.

ב. יַחְלִילוּוּ ‘And there came great wrath against Israel.’ The ‘great wrath’ is that of Chemosh the Moabite deity, whom the writer supposes to have been induced by means of the costly offering to succour his worshipper and repulse the foe. Cf. Sta. Ges. i. p. 430; Wellh. Prolegomena, p. 23 note; Montefiore, Hibbert
Lectures, p. 35. Cf. the inscription of the Moabite stone, ii. 5 ff., where Mesha' traces the affliction of Moab at the hand of Israel to the fact that 'Chemosh was angry with his land,' while so soon as the god overcomes his inertia the fortunes of his country change, and Moab is successful against Israel (Append. 1).


4. 1–7. Elisha makes miraculous provision for the wife of one of the sons of the prophets.

1. 'וְזָרַע [כֻּלּוּ] Targ. expands the verse for the purpose of identifying the woman's husband with Obadiah of I. 18. 3 ff., the ground of connexion probably being the resemblance of the statement 'תָּא מָא אָשֹׁי הָאָרֶץ' to I. 18. 3b, 12b.


3. הם is rendered by Pesh. וְנָשָׁבָא, Targ. וְנָשָׁבָא, and so RV. 'pot.' Th.'s explanation, 'unctio, i.e. quantum ad unctionem sufficit,' is more probably correct, as 'תָּשְׁבָּא' may thus, in accordance with its vocalization, be regarded as stat. absol. in apposition to 'חָפַשׁ, an anointing measure—oil,' i.e. 'enough oil for an anointing.' Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 194.

LXX δέλ' εἶ ὀλιφόμας δολιον, and probably Vulg. parum olei, quo ungar, regard וָנָשָׁבָא as 1st sing. imperf. Qal of כָּשַׁב, as though the sentence could be equivalent to יִשָּׁבֵץ שְׁבֵץ וָאֵשׁ. Luc. δέλ' εἶ ὀλίφαν δολιον ... δ ολιφόμαν exhibits a double rendering.

4. ובש בֵּית ⚫ 'And shalt pour into.' For this use of יָשַׁב (lit. upon, from above) cf. Nah. 3. 12 יָשָּׁב לָעֲשָׁה יָשָּׁב לָעֲשָׁה 'shall fall into the mouth of the eater.'

After v. 4a Luc. adds כִּי אוֹרְדָא אוֹרְדָא אָפְרַתָא, i.e. 'and it (the oil) shall not stay.' Cf. v. 6b 'וַיְקָרְבֻּהּ חֵפָא וַיִּבְדַּל שֶׁ רָפָא יִהְיוּ שָׁלֵם 'and the oil stayed,' only when the vessels were exhausted.

4. יבש ⚫ So, of removing heavy objects, I. 5. 31; Eccles. 10. 9 (stones).
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5. [הָאָמָה לְָעֵינֵי] Luc. adds יִשָּׂאֵף אוֹרֵר, i.e. יֵשָׂאֵף, adopted by Klo, Kamp, Benz.


Kt. should probably be vocalized יָשָׂאֵף Hiph'īl, there being no occurrence of a Piel יָשָׂאֵף.

6. [לְָוָט] LXX, Luc. pl. פָּדַּס רְוָטָם שְׁרָבָּה, 'Raphare s.v. l., probably a correction after v. 5.

7. [שָׁכַב נְבֵית צְיֶרֶת] All Vers. supply the needful copula before כָּלִכְת. Instances of the verb, when following a compound subj., agreeing with the principal member of the subj. are collected by Ew. § 340c. Cf. e.g. Ex. 21. 4. As Klo. notices, the consonants of MT. can be vocalized יָשָׂאֵף 'and do thou keep thy sons alive &c.'

4. 8–37. Elisha restores to life the son of the Shunammite woman.

8. [וַיְהִי לָט] 'And there came a day when Elisha passed over &c.' Lit. 'and the day was,' day being defined on account of the events which happened upon it, according to the idiom noticed, I. 13. 14 note. The phrase occurs elsewhere, vv. 11, 18; 1 Sam. 1. 4; 14. 1; Job 1. 6, 13; 2. 1.

The other explanation, which regards לָט as used adverbially, 'and it came to pass, on a day, that &c.,' is less probably correct. Cf. Dri. on 1 Sam. 1. 4.

[שָׁכַב נְבֵית צְיֶרֶת] Cf. I. 1. 3 note.


13. [לָט] 'What (is one) to do for thee?' and so, 'What is to be done for thee?' The idiom occurs again Isa. 5. 4; 2 Chr. 25. 9; Est. 1. 15; 6. 6.

[שָׁכַב נְבֵית צְיֶרֶת] Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 202 (x).

[שָׁכַב נְבֵית צְיֶרֶת] An assertion of independence. She has no need of patronage, being 'a great woman' (v. 8) within her own clan.


15. [בְּאָמָה] LXX omits.

16. [לָט] 'At this season, next spring.' יָשָׂאֵף means
IV. 5–28

lit. 'about the time (when it is) reviving.' The phrase occurs again Gen. 18. 10, 14 (J), in the latter verse in conjunction with רָבָּעַת. Cf. Gen. 17. 21 (P) רָבָּעַת הָעָדָה הָעָדָה רָבָּעַת 'at this time, next year.'

יִזְאֵג Cf. p. 208.


20. בָּשְׁרוּ ] LXX καὶ θεωρήθη, i.e. וְשָׁם. כְּסָף.


18. רָבָּעַת] 'Not a new moon nor a Sabbath,' i.e. not a festive day. Cf. Am. 8. 5 and 1 Sam. 20. 5 with Dri.'s note. The universality of the festival of the new moon is illustrated by Dillmann on Lev. 23 (p. 578).

25. מָרָּבָּעַת] LXX δεύοι καὶ πορεύοι καὶ σαββάτο, inferior to MT. Luc. exhibits a combination of the two readings.

18. מָרָּבָּעַת] Identical in form with Ar. relative מִן, just as the fuller form נָבִין answers to Ar. דָּלֵי. נָבָּע is equivalent to מִן or מְבִין, with the additional demonstrative element מְבִין. The form is used only here with a fem. subs., but occurs elsewhere with a masc. subs. ch. 23. 17; Judg. 6. 20; 1 Sam. 14. 1; 17. 26; Zech. 2. 8. It should doubtless be restored with LXX מְבִין בְּנֵי in 1 Sam. 20. 19 (cf. Dri. ad loc.). Without a subs. Dan. 8. 16.

26. After v. 26a Luc. adds καὶ θρομμένοις αὐτοῖς καὶ σοιν


28. מָרָּבָּעַת] 'Deceive' (lit. 'mislead'). מָרָּבָּעַת is frequent in Aram. in the sense 'go astray' or 'act in error,' occurring in Targ. as the equivalent of Heb. מָלֵא or מָרֵא. Cf. Aph'el,
Ps. 119. 10 ‘Cause me not to go astray from thy commandments.’ The only other occurrence of the verb in Bib. Heb. is late, 2 Chr. 29. 11, and in our passage so marked an Aramaism must be regarded as dialectical (cf. pp. 208 f. and note on ch. 6. 11). In 2 Sam. 6. 7 a subs. ווש occurs, which has been explained as equivalent to Aram. עתה, ‘error,’ but here the text is probably at fault. Cf. Dri. ad loc.


30. וַיֵּבֶן Cf. ch. 2. 2 note.

34. וַיַּכְלֵם וּלְשׁוֹן ‘And crouched upon him.’ So v. 35; cf. I. 18. 42†. The verb appears to describe the drawing up of the prophet’s limbs that they might coincide with the short limbs of the child. Cf. I. 17. 21a.

35. וַיַּזְזַר נַפְשָׁהוּ ‘Backwards and forwards’; lit. ‘once here and once there.’ For חזה fem. ‘once’ (for חָזָה Josh. 6. 3, 11, 14) cf. ch. 6. 10; Ps. 89. 36; al.

36. וַיַּסְחָר וַיַּתְמֹא A סכף λέγεται, rendered ‘sneezed,’ in accordance with Targ. Job 41. 10, where it represents Heb. וֹסָחַר ‘his sneezings.’ So apparently Targ. in our passage פַּקְתִּים (cf. Job 41. 10 Ed. Regia תקף). Vulg. et oscilavit, Pesh. מַסָחֲר give the meaning ‘yawned.’ LXX omits וֹסָחַר together with the letters ו of the preceding וָלַעַי, thus reading וָלַעַי דְּבֵה הָלָהָל חָלֵּפָה וַתְּצַקָּרָנָה וְלַעֲבַר וַתְּצַקָּרָנָה. Thus Grä. is probably correct in regarding וֹסָחַר as having arisen through dittography from וָלַעַי.

In the text of Luc. וַיַּסְחָר וַיַּתְמֹא seems to represent a marginal variant for LXX rendering of וָלַעַי דְּבֵה, while וַיַּסְחָר וַיַּתְמֹא occurring also as a various rendering of וָלַעַי in v. 34. Cf. Field.
4. 38-44. Elisha makes wholesome a pot of poisoned broth (38-41), and miraculously increases a small supply of provisions (42-44).

38. חַלָּלוֹן] Cf. ch. 2. 1 note.
חללו] LXX omits.

39. יָדְו] Probably 'herbs'; Vulg. herbas agrestes, Targ. דְּגֵדְו. So several authorities in Isa. 26. 19. There is a root יָדְו = 'pluck' which occurs Song 5. 1; Ps. 80. 13, and as Th. and Klo. notice, the translit. ἁραδ of LXX, Luc. suggests the form חַלָּלְו which might be derived from this root.

40. לִי] Luc., Vulg., Pesh. sing. לִי, probably correctly.

41. שֵׁי] 'Then take.' Cf. Ps. 4. 4.
shall] LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ. שְׁלֵי 'and cast.'

42. מַעֲלָה] LXX, Luc. מַעֲלָה, i.e. נַעֲלֵי, according to Eusebius (Βασσαρίων) fifteen Roman miles north of Diospolis (Lydda). The modern ruin Kafir Tilt (יוֹדֵל = sollen) seems to correspond with this situation. Cf. Buhl, p. 214.

43. כַּרְס] Probably 'garden-fruit.' So Lev. 2. 14; 23. 14, in each case in the enumeration of firstfruits. כַּרְס generally means 'garden-land.' RV. 'fresh ears of corn' follows Vulg. frumentum novum, Pesh. נָחַמ, Targ. זָרִית.

44. זַכָּאֲלֶס] The word is a זַכָּאֲלֶס key. RV. 'in his sack' agrees with Vulg. in pæra sua in giving a meaning demanded by the context. Pesh. כַּרְס, Targ. כַּרְס interpret 'garment.' LXX, Luc. omit, but Cod. A transliterates βασσαλισθ, and hence Lagarde (Armen. Stud. § 333) infers that, in place of בְּסֶלָב, we should read בְּסֶלָב = מַעֲלָה being explained by Ar. נְנִיעַנ sack, used for provisions, &c. Halévy, however (Revue des Études Juives, xi. 68), takes βασσαλισθ to have been a marginal note transcribing the Aram. term מַעֲלָה 'in his basket.'---'אכילה is a very frequent word in the Rabbinic literature; its Arabic equivalent אכילה is still at the
The Second Book of Kings

present day very popular in the sense of jar, a large measure of capacity, which probably takes its origin from the Greek σκλάβος.

43. Cf. ch. 3. 16; I. 22. 30 notes.
44. LXX, Luc. omit.

5. Elisha heals Na'aman, the Aramaean, of his leprosy.

It is an open question who is the nameless king of Israel to whom reference is made in vv. 5-8; and the same difficulty arises in connexion with the sections 6. 8-23; 6. 24—7. 20; 8. 1-6. Probably Rə, to judge by the position in which he has incorporated the narratives in Kings, assumed that the king in question was in every case Jehoram; but, since Elisha's death did not take place until the reign of Joash (ch. 13. 14 ff.), we have, after the reign of Jehoram, a period of 28 (Jehu) + 17 (Jehoahaz) + x (Joash) years during which he may be supposed to have been active.

There is not, however, any evidence sufficient to determine the question. Kue. (§ 25. 12) cites the expression רָפָא מִיוֹרָה in 6. 32 as an indication that the king thus characterized by Elisha is not Jehoram but Jehoahaz, the 'murderer' being Jehu, the father of the latter (cf. chh. 9, 10; Hos. 1. 4); but it is scarcely possible that Elisha would so stigmatize Jehu on account of a course of action of which he was himself the instigator (ch. 9. 1 ff.). Supposing רָפָא מִיוֹרָה to contain literally a reference to the father of the king in question, the reference is more naturally to Ahab (cf. the use of רֶפֶא in I. 21. 19); but, as a matter of fact, the title explains itself as called forth by the hostile menace of the king himself against Elisha (6. 31; cf. note on רָפָא מִיוֹרָה in 6. 32).

Thus, failing direct evidence, all that can be said is that in the single case of the narrative 6. 1-23 the friendly terms upon which Elisha stands to the king (cf. vv. 9, 21 f.) create a slight presumption against identification with Jehoram, to whom, in 3. 13, 14, he openly expresses his hostility, and in favour of some member of the dynasty which the prophet had been instrumental in placing upon the throne of Israel.

1. בֵּיתָנִי [So Isa. 3. 3; 9. 14; Job 22. 8.]

2. מִּלְּחָרָה [Luc. simply וַיֵּאָסְפוּ וְנַחֲרָה, omitting הָעַלְוָה, which is probably to be regarded, with Benz., as a marginal gloss upon the preceding הָעַלְוָה קָשָׁה.

3. בְּהַלֶּךְ [ Cf. Dri. Theses, § 161 (3).

4. 'תִּדְרַשְׁתּוּ [Only again Ps. 119. 5, with vocalization יְדָרַשׁ. In our passage the punctuators seem to have regarded the word as a subs. plur. constr., and this view is taken by Pesh. מָרֹם מְרֹם יְדָרַשׁ, Targ. רָצָה רָצָה יְדָרַשׁ, קָשָׁה קָשָׁה יְדָרַשׁ. 'Oh, the benefits of my lord if he would go to the prophet!' Cf. the vocalization יְדָרַשׁ]

5. בְּרִית [LXX εἰς τόν προφήτην τοῦ θεοῦ.

6. בְּרִית [After v. 3b Luc. adds καὶ διέβαλεν τοῦ προφήτου αὐτοῦ, i.e. προφήτου. Cf. I. 13. 6 note.

7. בּוֹרַת [And he went in, &c.' The subject, as Vulg. rightly divines, is Na'aman (RV. marg.), and not some one unnamed, 'and one went in' (RV. text, Pesh.). LXX, Luc., Targ., against gender, take Na'aman's wife as subject: 'And she went in and told her lord,' and this necessitates in Luc. the addition καὶ ἀνεγγειλεν τῷ βασιλείῳ, which is duplicated at the commencement of v. 5 in the form καὶ ἀνεγγειλεν τῷ βασιλείῳ.

8. יֵשָׁנָה [ Cf. I. 14. 5 note.


10. יֵשָׁנָה [ 'And now.' The main point of the letter, to which that which precedes leads up, is all that is quoted. Cf. note on I. 1. 20.

11. יֵשָׁנָה [ Cf. I. 22. 27 note.


13. יֵשָׁנָה [ 'Seeks occasion against.' So Versa. Lit. 'causes himself to meet.'

14. יֵשָׁנָה [ LXX omits יֵשָׁנָה, while Luc. omits יֵשָׁנָה.
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11. LXX, Luc. omit.

12. LXX, Luc. omit.

13. Probably to be regarded, with Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort, as a corruption of ἐν, which is scarcely to be dispensed with. Klo. emends ἐν as ἐν. LXX omits.

14. The order—object, subject, verb—is very rare. Cf. ch. 6. 22; Dri. Tenses, 208 (2).

15. Cf. I. 17. 1 note.


17. The request is made upon the view that Yahwe, the national God of Israel, can only be worshipped aright upon the soil of Israel's land. Cf. the writer's Outlines of O. T. Theology, p. 35.


19. The Assyrian Rammānu, 'the Thunderer,' the storm- or weather-god, apparently identical with צלע; cf. I. 15. 18 note; Schrader, COT. i. p. 196; Baethgen, Semit. Relig. p. 75.

On the form cf. p. 208. LXX, Luc. ἐν τῷ προσευμινο as θέλω, Vulg. adorante eo, i.e. θεοπροσευτάτος (θεοπροσευτάτος), ought probably to be followed, with Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

RV. 'a little way'; marg. 'some way.' The expression occurs again Gen. 35. 16; 48. 7; RV. 'some way.'
The distance denoted by "10 - 3000 (or 10 - 2000) is quite indeterminate. Pesh. in all passages "הمستشفى 'a parasang'; LXX, Luc. as one rendering in Gen. 48. 7 ἑκατόμποιος, an expression perhaps equivalent to the Ar. שַׁעַח אֹפֶרְשִׁי, i.e. as far as a horse can gallop; Targ. כַּדִּב, explained as a piece of land of about an acre's extent (Aram. עָם, Ar. כָּר = 'to plough'), a rendering apparently obtained by transposition of ד and פ. In Assyrian, קְבָּרֶד denotes a region of the earth or heaven; cf. e.g. Lars kibrat arba'-i, 'king of the four regions' (quarters of the earth); Delitzsch, Assy. Hand­wörterbuch, 315. קּוֹבֶרֶד also occurs in a Phoenician inscription from Ma'sūb, apparently with the same significance as in Assyri., in the expression 'region of the sunrise'; cf. Halévy, Revue des Études Juives, xii (1886), p. 109; Lidzbarski, Nordsemit. Epigraphik, p. 419. E. Hoffmann, however (Abhand­lungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, xxxvi (1890), pp. 24 f.), explains the word in Phoen. and Heb. as meaning the tract of country which lies between the eye and the horizon; as much as one can see, rather than the direction in which one sees ('Sehweite, nicht Schrichtung').

20. יָפָא יִשְׂרָאֵל 'I will surely run.' יָפָא is a perfect of certitude; cf. Jer. 51. 14 הִשָּׁמֵעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִקְשָׁב לֹא יִשָּׁנָה יִשָּׁרְאֵל 'Yahwe Holocaust hath sworn by himself, Surely I will fill thee with men, &c.'; Judg. 15. 7 אָשֹׁהַ יִשָּׂרָאֵל אָשֹׁה הֵם אֱלֹהִים יִשָּׁרְאֵל 'If ye act thus, I will surely be avenged of you.' The particles אִם יֵ בְּאֶרֶץ are connected closely together with a strong asseverative force, as is clear from the two passages above cited, and also from 1 Sam. 26. 10; 2 Sam. 15. 21 Kt. (in both cases after the oath אֶל 'ו); Ruth 3. 12 Kt. (after אֶל אֶל); 1 Sam. 21. 6. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 139, note 1;EW. § 356 b; Ko. Syntax, § 391 f. The view which takes י בְּאֶרֶץ separately, as introducing the terms of the oath (cf. note on I. 2. 23), overlooks the fact that א only following could only, in such a case, introduce a negation, and not an assertion (אֶל אֶל).

21. יִאָשַׁר הָעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל 'And he lighted down from the chariot. Cf. Gen. 24. 64 הָעַל יִשָּׁרְאֵל.
22. Vulg. *Recte ne sunt omnia?* or, understanding *omnia* as in I. 2. 13, 'Is it well?' i.e. 'Does thy coming portend no evil tidings?' Cf. ch. 9. 11, 17, 22, 31.

23. *Consent, take two talents,* or, as we should say, *Consent to take &c.* Cf. ch. 6. 3; Judg. 19. 6; 2 Sam. 7. 29. When the verb is used of an action undertaken at one's own instance, and not at the suggestion of another, *Resolve* is a suitable rendering: cf. Gen. 18. 27, 31; Deut. 1. 5.

24. *Bags.* The word only occurs again in Heb. Isa. 3. 22, where it is mentioned as an article of feminine adornment. In Ar. *denotes a bag or pouch made of leather, rag, or other material.*

25. Probably *the citadel.* The universal explanation, however, among modern interpreters, seems to be 'the hill' or 'mound.' The verb *means to swell,* and occurs twice in Heb., once in Pu'al *'is puffed up,'* Hab. 2. 4, and once in Hiph'il *'and acted arrogantly' (internal Hiph'il). The subs. *is used to denote a swelling, i.e. tumour,* i.e. tumour, i Sam. 5. 6; al. (so in Ar.). When used in a topographical sense, the inference is generally drawn that *denotes a natural swelling of the earth's surface,* i.e. conceivably, a low conical hill. But the connexion in which the term appears points with much greater probability to an artificial 'swelling,' i.e. a bulging, or rounded keep, or enceinte.

An *is mentioned as existing in three different localities:—(i) at Jerusalem; (ii) presumably at Samaria (here only); (iii) in the territory of Mesha', king of Moab (Moabite stone, II. 21/). In each case reference is made to *the 'ophel,* well known as
such, and so on a *prima facie* view not a hill marked out merely by its unimportant physical characteristics. Accordingly, the *ophel* at Jerusalem is a fortified place with walls, 2 Chr. 27. 3; Neh. 3. 27; is mentioned in close connexion with the great projecting tower, Neh. 3. 27; and in parallelism with *tower of the flock,* Mic. 4. 8. In the same way Mesha says And I built the wall of the *ophel,* and I built its gates, and I built its towers.'

25. [1 Tremp, Ad] 'And stood by his lord.' Cf. ch. 11. 14 *And stood in his sight.*

[2] Kt. [cocc occurs again i Sam. 10. 14 and 27. 10 according to Pesh., Targ. (in place of ס), and in the expression [כנ Job 8. 2.

26. [3 LXX, Luc. add μετὰ σοῦ, i.e. מְעָלָה. The meaning of the expression is, 'Was not I present in spirit?' Ew.'s explanation, which makes מְעָלָה an affectionate designation of Gehazi, is strangely forced.

[4] 'וַיְרַב כָּהָה 'Was it a time to take silver, &c.?' The miracle had served to emphasize before a representative of the rival nation the unique power of Israel's God (cf. vv. 15, 18), and the dignity of His prophet (cf. vv. 8b, 10, 16); Gehazi's rapacity, representing itself as directed by Elisha, must have tended to weaken the impression. Kio., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort follow LXX καὶ νῦν ἔλαβες τὸ ἀργύριον, καὶ νῦν ἔλαβες τὰ ἱματα, ε.π.λ., Luc. καὶ νῦν ἔλαβες τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὰ ἱματα καὶ λήφη ἐν αὐτῷ, ε.π.λ.; Vulg. nunc igitur acceptisti argentum, et acceptisti, &c., and read כנה חכמה נאמנה מְפָלֵה נְעָלָה. 'וַיְרַב כָּהָה 'And now thou hast taken the silver, and wilt take

---

1 The kind of hill which מְעָלָה might be expected to describe, upon the supposition that the term was so used, would scarcely be outstanding and conspicuous, but rather with a low and rounded top, the less likely to attract attention as מְעָלָה if covered, wholly or partly, by buildings. And, again upon such a supposition, it is somewhat strange that the term is not more frequently employed, and that of hills not in towns but in the open country.

2 The position of καὶ τὰ ἱματα has clearly been ignorantly altered in Luc. in order to agree with vv. 22, 25.
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garments, &c.; describing the use to which Gehazi was already planning to put the money. This emendation, though yielding a good sequence, is scarcely superior to MT.

6. 1-7. Elisha causes iron to float.

2. סנ נ LXX, Luc. שפ י, owing to the influence of the following רוח הרוח. So Pesh.

3. רוזנא ] 'The one' who, as a matter of fact, did so speak, but according to Eng. idiom simply 'one.' Cf. note on I. 13. 14 with the instance 1 Sam. 9. 9 there quoted.

 Cf. ch. 5. 23 note.

4. סניע ו 'The timber,' in its natural condition, destined to become the מות (prepared) 'beams' of v. 2.

5. רוזנא ] As Kamp. remarks, a man cuts down tree-trunks (brit v. 4) and not beams. Klo.'s emendation סרגן, favoured by Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort, is worthy of notice. Render, 'as one was swinging his axe.' This use of נט cannot, however, be paralleled, while that implied by the reading of MT. has the support of ch. 3. 19.

 קוזה ] The use of נט to introduce a new subject is sporadic, most of the certified instances belonging to the later and inferior style. Cf. Jer. 36. 22 רזנא ... . Other cases are cited by G-K. § 117 m; Ew. § 277d. G-K., however, considers that in our passage 'the נט is probably derived from a text which read the Hiph'il instead of נט.' Klo. regards נט as a substantive 'axe-head,' a suggestion which is favoured by Kamp., Benz., Kit., Kô. Syntax, § 270 a.

6. נט שמה ] Luc. ממסיפא יא לאָ סמאפ.

6. 8-23. Elisha blinds and captures an Aramaean army.

8. סנ נפ סלְל אמא וט ] 'Place of so and so,' i.e. 'such and such a place.' So exactly 1 Sam. 21. 3, and, in addressing a person

1 נט might in this sense be very idiomatically retained: 'and art for taking.' Cf. Gen. 30. 15; Dri. Tenses, § 204.
unnamed, Ruth 4. 1.  lệnh, upon comparison of Ar.  הָלְלָכָה, Aram. הָלָכָה, is usually connected with the verb הָלָל in the sense distinct, specific; with הָלֹא 'to be dumb,' as meaning one whose name is withheld. In Dan. 8. 13 the contraction הָלְלָכָה occurs, and this form appears to be presupposed by Luc. הָלָלָמָמ in our passage.

[The rest of the text follows, discussing the comparison of Aramaic and Hebrew texts, and the implications of specific names and the verb הָלָל in the context of the passage.]
traitor in the camp, 'one of ours.' But this is sufficiently implied
byolib, i.e. substantially, 'One of you must know.'

12. LXX, Luc., Vulg. מַרְעָא יִשְׂרֵעַ.
For the expression cf. Eccles. 10. 20.


It is idiomatic to omit expression of the subject with
when it may be readily inferred from the context. Cf. v. 20;
I. 21. 18; Dri. Tenses, § 135 (5), note 4. So, with participle,
6. 25 note.

LXX, Luc. Διβίης, i.e. שִׂיָּה; cf. וְלָלָל by the side of
Dothan is the modern Tell Dothan, a green hill with a few
ruins about ten miles north of Samaria. Cf. Eusebius, Onom.;
Baed. 261; Buhl, 24 f., 102.

15. מַרְעָא] MT. is somewhat confused. The subj. of מַרְעָא,
in accordance with 15b, must be Elisha, but following as it does
upon what precedes, it can scarcely be different from that of מַשְׂרָא
viz. in accordance with MT., מַשְׂרָא. Again, the servant is called
מַשְׂרָא in 15a, מַרְעָא in 15b, and the expression מַשְׂרָא . . .
'and he got up early to arise,' is at best extremely harsh. Klo.
happily restores order by emending מַשְׂרָא for מַרְעָא (cf. Ex. 32. 6; Judg.
6. 38; 1 Sam. 5. 3), and substituting מַשְׂרָא for מַרְעָא after Luc.
Vulg. diluculo:—'And the man of God arose early on the
morning in the morning, and went forth, &c.' So Kamp., Benz.,
and substantially Kit.

17. וְרָאָה] LXX, Luc. ρέθαιμονδιανομονότοιν. 5
'They came down' from the hills surrounding the small valley
in the midst of which Tell Dödan lies.

'Blindness.' Only again Gen. 19. 11. The word is
perhaps a Shaph'el formation from מָעָר, samara,' make blind' (lit.

19. מַעָר] So again for מָעָר Ezek. 40. 45; Eccl. 2. 2, 24; 5. 15, 18;

\[\text{\footnotesize 1} \] Luc. has also וְרָאָה, clearly as a gloss derived from LXX.
\[\text{\footnotesize 2} \] Kit. reads וְלָלָל מַרְעָא, a reading which he apparently refers to Klo.
7. 23; 9. 13, and in the phrase מָנוּגִּי הַיּוֹם I. 14. 5; Judg. 18. 4; 2 Sam. 11. 25. The form resembles Aram. מְנֻה, and may be dialectical. Cf. p. 208.


21. דַּק עָבַד] Cf., for the repetition, Ezek. 14. 3b, which should perhaps be vocalized יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלֹשֶׁת. Most critics, however, restore an infin. absol. שְׁלֹשֶׁת, and so in our passage LXX El παράκες παράκες, Pesh. מַעֲשֶׁה מַעֲשֶׁה suggest the reading מַעֲשֶׁה מַעֲשֶׁה.

22. 'ע תיבש רֶשֶׁת] Klo. inserts a negative אֲנָה after Luc. וְאֵ֣שׁ עֲמַלֹּתֵהוּ אֵ֣ת אָבִ֑ד רוּת וּלְשׁוֹנָךְ אָכְלָה: Wilt thou slay those whom thou hast not captured with thy sword and with thy bow? ’ So Benz., Kit. This is probably correct rather than MT. which is scarcely consonant with the frequent practice of the וַיּוֹנָה, sanctioned and even enforced by members of the prophetic school; cf. e.g. I. 20. 42; 1 Sam. 15. 3, 33. Kamp. favours MT.

23. 'ע תיבש אִיב] The context demands the meaning ‘And he made them a great feast’; and so Vulg., Pesh., Targ.; but יָשַׂר with this meaning is not elsewhere found in Heb. Perhaps the root is the same as Assyr. κατά, ‘bring,’ κύριθο, ‘feast’ (to which guests are brought or invited). So in the Balawat inscription, κι-τε-τισκόν, ‘he made a feast’; Delitzsch, Assyr. Handwörterbuch, p. 352. Klo. emends מִשְׁפֶּר דְּבָרָה ‘And he laid a spread,’ after LXX, Luc. καὶ σαπέθηκεν αὐτῷ σαπέθηκεν, but this expression so used is unparalleled in Heb. More probably the Greek represents a free guess at the unknown words.

6. 24—7. 20. Samaria is besieged by the Aramaeans, and reduced to great straits through famine. The city is relieved through a panic which seizes the besieging army.

24. דַּק עָבַד] Cf. note on I. 15. 18. If this narrative be wrongly assigned to the reign of Jehoram (cf. p. 278), the reference will be to the successor of Hazael (cf. ch. 13. 24).

1 The regular phrase is מַעֲשֶׁה מַעֲשֶׁה. Cf. Is. 21. 5; Ps. 28. 5; 78. 19; Prov. 9. 2.
25. ~,,l

It is not quite clear whether the writer regards the famine as simply due to the rigour of the siege, or as in a measure independent of it. The fact that the king of Israel considers Elisha as the main cause of the calamity (v. 31) favours the latter supposition, and the same inference is perhaps to be drawn from the reference to the opening of 'the windows of heaven,' ch. 7. 2. In this case the famine is probably the same as that mentioned in ch. 8. 1–6, which lasted seven years (v. 2). Ch. 8. 1–6 represents Gehazi as still holding the position of Elisha's favoured servant; therefore 8. 1–6; 6. 24–7. 20 are presumably earlier than 5. 1–27 which relates the smiting of Gehazi with leprosy.

Expression of the subject is omitted in accordance with idiom. See cases cited by Dri. Tenses, § 135 (6), and cf. note on v. 13.

Th. quotes a parallel from Plutarch, Artaxerx. 24: οὐκ ὁποδομα μόνον κατείχατον, ὅτε οὖν κεφαλὴν μὸλις δραχμὰν ἐξεκοντα ἰδόνων εἶναι.

The kab is only here mentioned in the OT., but occurs in New Heb. both as a dry and fluid measure. Josephus represents by εἰρήνη, a measure which is known to be equivalent to the Heb. קב. The fourth part of a kab was therefore about a pint. Cf. Benz. Archäologie, 182; Nowack, Archäologie, i. 202 ff.

The Verss. follow Kt., and, reading as two words "doves' dung." Q're סְלִילָיִים is of unknown derivation. The strangeness of such an article as used for food has aroused suspicion. Thus Ges. Thes. cites the view of Bochart that 'doves' dung' may have been the popular name for some vegetable product (roasted chick peas) just as in Ar. the name 'sparrows' dung' is applied to the herb καλύς, and in German assafeldida is named Teufeldreck. Klo. emends סְלִילָיִים 'sour wine' (?Num. 6. 4), Cheyne (Expositor, 1899, p. 32) סְלִילָיִם 'carob pods,' a word well known in New Heb. and Syriac, and restored by the
same writer also in ch. 18. 27 = Isa. 36. 12 (מְלָכֵי בֵּית יְהוָה for המלך בֵּית יְהוָה), Isa. 1. 20 (מַעֲשֵׂי יְהוָה for מַעֲשֵׂי בֵּית יְהוָה); cf. S. Luke 15. 16.

It is, however, by no means certain that MT., Kt., in its literal acceptation, is incorrect. A parallel in Jos. Bell. Jud. v. 13, § 7 depicts the extremities to which men may be brought by a prolonged siege:—μετὰ ταύτα δὲ ὡς οὖν παγηγέων θαλανθῇ ἑκάστου ἁπέρ τοῖς πόλεσιν, προσέλθων τιμάς εἰς τοσοῦτον ἄγκυρα, διότι τὰς ἀμάρας ἐρευνῶσας καὶ παλαιὸν δόθων δεδομένα προσφέρεται τὰ ἑκ ταύτων σκέπαλα, καὶ τὸ μηδὲ δεξιὰ φορτών πάλαι τότε γενέσθαι τροφήν. Again, Post (in Hastings, B.D. i. 629) quotes, on the authority of Houghton, a statement from a Spanish author that in the year 1316 so great a famine distressed the English that ‘men ate their own children, dogs, mice, and pigeons’ dung.’

26. [‘א יָשָׁר] Cf. 2 Sam. 14. 4b. Similarly v. 28a is exactly paralleled by 2 Sam. 14. 5a.

27. [‘א נָשָׁי הָא] Difficult. As the text stands, it is best to render, ‘If Yahwe help thee not, whence shall I help thee?’ lit. ‘Let not Yahwe help thee, whence &c.?’ a case of the jussive used in the protasis of a hypothetical sentence. So Dri. Tenses, § 152(3); G-K. § 109 h. The alternative is to regard הב as used absolutely in deprecation: ‘Nay I let Yahwe help thee.’ Cf. note on ch. 3. 13.

Pesh. is noticeable as suggesting the reading יָשָׁר for יָשָׁר. ‘And he said to her, Let Yahwe deliver thee!’ Is it, however, possible (in view of the dialectical peculiarities of these narratives; pp. 208f.) that we should find in יָשָׁר the Aram. יָשָׁר ‘except’?

29. [הָבֵב וָאָמָרָה] Luc. adds כָּל וַחָנַק אֲבוֹתֵנוּ כִּי פָאָגְמוּ כָּל אָבָנוּ.

30. [עָלֵי אָמָרָה] Luc. כָּל אֲבוֹתֵנוּ אָלֵיָבָה, i.e. יָשָׁר אָמָרָה, probably correct. So Klo, Kamp., Benz., Kit.

31. [תִּשָּׂחֵץ הָבֵב] Cf. 1. 2. 23 note.


33. [רָבָּא שָׁלֵש הָבֵב] RV. ‘And [the king] sent a man from before
him.' So Luc. inserts בֵּית הַשֵּׁם. The sentence is probably a clumsy interpolation to explain the following reference והַשֵּׁם יִשָּׁב. Wellh. (C. 360) drastically removes all reference to the messenger by excision both of this sentence and of והַשֵּׁם יִשָּׁב, and emendation of והַשֵּׁם יִשָּׁב in its first occurrence to והַשֵּׁם יִשָּׁב, as also in v. 33.

[Read Heb. with Luc., Vulg., Pesh.

[As is remarked by Klo., Benz., Kit., the expression does not refer literally to the king's father (Ahab? cf. p. 278), but characterizes the king himself. ‘Mördersohn’ = 'Mordbube.' Cf. 1 Sam. 20. 30 (reading הנברתּ וְנָבֶּר; cf. Dri. ad loc.); Isa. 57. 3. ‘לָעַב יָהָעַב גּוֹרְכֵנוּ’

[And press him with the door,' i.e., as we should say, 'Shut the door in his face.'

[Read Heb. with Ew., Wellh., Gra., Klo., Kamp., Kit., Benz., Oort. Mention of the king's arrival is presupposed by ch. 7. 2 (cf. v. 17 יַעַב יָהָעַב תְּפִלְבּוּ), and the words of v. 33b are only explicable if placed in the king's mouth.


[7. 1. הבּ] A seah contained about a peck, and was equivalent to six measures of the kab (ch. 6. 25), and twenty-four of the log. Cf. Benz. Archäologie, 181 ff.

[יִתְאֲרֵיתָּם וְעָמָד בְּשָׁם LXX omits through homoioteleuton.

[ Cf. I. 9. 22 note.

[Read Heb. with several Codd., all Versa. and modern authorities.

[ Cf. ch. 5. 18.

[Windows or sluices (LXX, Luc. καταπάρσας) in the heavens,' through which the rain was thought to be poured down; Gen. 7. 11; 8. 2; Mal. 3. 10; cf. Isa. 24. 18. The point of the speech seems to be that, even if Yahwe were at once to send rain, it would be impossible for such a state of plenty to come about by to-morrow.

[ The kings of the Hittites are mentioned again in I. 10. 29 as providing themselves with horses from Muṣri (cf.
The Hittite kingdom lay in north Syria, having its capital at Kadesh on the Orontes. In 2 Sam. 24. 6 David's northern boundary is said to have extended as far as 'the land of the Hittites to Kadesh'. The land of the Hittites is also mentioned in Judg. 1. 26, and in Judg. 3. 3 ought probably to be substituted for וֹתוֹ: 'the Hittites who inhabit the hill-country of the Lebanon' (cf. Moore, ad loc.).

Josh. 1. 4 is perhaps a later gloss, identifying the Hittites with the Canaanites. On the Hittites as they figure in the Egyptian and cuneiform inscriptions, cf. Sayce in Hastings, DB. ii. 390 ff.; Dri. Authority, 83 ff.

Probably we should vocalize מֵתָניָ הַלֲעַנָּ or מִסְרָן נִ, and render, 'and the kings of Muṣri.' An alliance of the Hittites with Egypt would have been highly improbable, and could scarcely have suggested itself to the Aramaeans, while an alliance of the two north Syrian kingdoms for the purpose of turning their flank was a danger well calculated to cause a panic. On Muṣri, cf. I. 10. 28 note.

7. אִמַּה הַבָּשָׁב מֶלַׁזְאָר [RV. 'even the camp as it was.'] But is always elsewhere masc. We may read רֵאֵשׁ, רֵאֵשׁ, with Luc. ἕν πολιτείαν ὁ παραπόλεμος: cf. v. 10b. The reading מַעַה is also presupposed by LXX, Vulg., Pesh.

8. [Cf. I. 19. 3 note.]

9. מַעַה לָמַעַה נִ [Cf. LXX omits.]

10. מַעַה לָמַעַה נִ [Cf. Dri. Authority, 83 ff.]

Punishment.' So Gen. 4. 13. Cf. Num. 14. 34; Isa. 53. 11; al.

Pl. is demanded by the following מִשְׁפַּט, and by מִשְׁפַּט v. 11. So Th., Kamp., Kit., Oort.

LXX, Luc. al ἀκαται αὐτῶν, i.e. μὴ ἀκαται, correctly. So Klo., Kamp., Benz. Kit. מִשְׁפַּט.

1 Reading מַעַה נִ instead of מַעַה מַעַה, after Luc. eis τῶν XuRετευ ᾿Ιαβάτ, for the senseless מַעַה מַעַה מַעַה of MT. Cf. Dri. ad loc.
11. א לך] Read א לך! with LXX, Luc., Targ. Vulg. lerunt ergo, Pesh. also presuppose a plural.

12. המשבב] Cases in which the ה of the article remains unsyncopated after an inseparable preposition are cited by G-K. § 35 ה. The occurrences are ‘almost exclusively in the later Books.’

13. ה-

14. ל תב] LXX intabaras intaw, Luc. intabaras intaw, i.e. כבש נשים במשעיס, ‘mounted men’; cf. ch. 9. 18. Scouts would naturally be sent out on horseback rather than in chariots.

15. קי. is correct. The Niph'al is used elsewhere, 1 Sam. 23. 26; Ps. 48. 6; 104. 7.

16. ד] Luc. adds bv śahēn ‘אֱלַישׁוֹת.’

17. קי.Scarce original. Probably we have a combination of two different readings—בּוּ בֶּשׁ simply, and בּוּ בֶּשׁ בּוּ בֶּשׁ. The former has the support of Vulg., Pesh., and is probably correct.
VII. II—VIII. II

8. 1–6. Elisha again assists the Shunammite woman.

1. [from ch. 4. 8–37]

Dri. on Deut. 1. 46 calls the mode of expression the *idem per idem* idiom, often employed in the Semitic languages, when a writer is either unable or has no occasion to speak explicitly. Cf. also Dri. on 1 Sam. 23. 13, where instances in Ar. are quoted from Lagarde, *Psalterium Hieronymi* (1874), 156 f.; Dri. *Tenses*, § 38 β note.

2. Luc. omits נַעֲמָה, and adds, after יִשְׁרִיָּמִים נֵרָא, יַנִּיטָא אֱלֹהִי דְּבֹרֶאָה תַּאֱוֶּה.

3. [from ch. 5]

Dri. on 1 Sam. 23. 13, where instances in Ar. are quoted from Lagarde, *Psalltri'um Hieronymi* (1874), 156 f.; Dri. *Tenses*, § 38 β note.

4. [from ch. 1. 2 note]

5. [from ch. 1. 2 note]

6. [from ch. 1. 2 note]

7. [from ch. 1. 2 note]

8. [from ch. 1. 2 note]

10. [from ch. 1. 2 note]

11. [from ch. 1. 2 note]

A variety of explanations of the passage have been suggested. LXX (vocalizing יֵּשָׁרִיָּמִים) καὶ παρίστη τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀφέναι ἕως ἀλχίσθη, expanded by Luc. καὶ ἠττή Ἀλαυ πρὸς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρίστην Ἐνδίκιον αὐτοῦ καὶ βάσα ἐν ἰχίλεντῳ. Vulg. *Sefitique cum eo, et conturbatus est* (i.e. *Marvels*) usque ad suffusionem vultus. Targ.
And he turned away his face and delayed a very long time. Pesh. omits. Benz., Kit., reading פַּלְפָל or פִּפְלָל (cf. Vulg.), explain, 'And he stared immovable before him, and became horrified in the extreme,' understanding the first statement as referring to the setting in of the prophetic ecstasy, while the second depicts the effect produced upon the prophet by his vision. But the sense given to 'aufs äusserste' (ch. 2. 17; Judg. 3. 25) is improbable, since the naming of the subject in the following sentence פַּלְפָל a נָא seems to be intended to contrast with the implied different subject of בֵּית (viz. Hazael), and is out of place if the subject of בֵּית be the same as that of וּכְפַר, וּכְפַר, וּכְפַר. Græ. emends בֵּית for בֵּית (cf. Targ.) and בֵּית for בֵּית, 'And he hid his face and was silent, &c.' Klo.'s explanation is strangely impossible.

13. 'What is thy servant, the dog, that he should do this great thing?' LXX, Luc. גִּנְיֶה גִּנְיֶה גִּנְיֶה, as in 2 Sam. 9. 8; cf. 1 Sam. 24. 15; 2 Sam. 16. 9. So Klo., Oort, Winckler.

15. RV.'coverlet.' Cf. קֵלָדָה קֵלָדָה קֵלָדָה 1 Sam. 19. 13, 16, spread by Michal over the head of Teraphim in David's bed. The word is a פָּרָךְ לָךְ, and seems to denote something of intertwined or woven workmanship. פָּרָךְ Am. 9. 9, 'sieve.'

חָיָה הָאָרָא Shalmaneser II mentions two campaigns against 'Ha-za'-ilu of Damascus'; in the eighteenth year of his reign (b.c. 842; cf. Append. 4), and again in the twenty-first year (b.c. 839).


Ch. 8. 17-23=2 Chr. 21. 5-10a. Rv vv. 16-19, 23.

16a. Rightly omitted by LXX. The words have come in through error from the latter half of the verse.

17. Q're corrects to פְּלַע, in accordance with the almost invariable rule that numerals from 2 to 10 take the object numbered in the pl. Other exceptions, cited by G-K. § 134 a, are ch. 22. 1 (םַלְפַּל uncorrected); 25. 17 (Q're pl.); Ex. 16. 22; Ezek. 45. 1. LXX פַּלְפָל פְּלַע פְּלַע.
19. So (without prep.) ch. 13. 23; Deut. 10. 10.

But the lamp was not given for the sons, since the sons are themselves the lamp. || 2 Chr. 21. 7, Luc., Vulg., Targ., feeling the difficulty, read יְלַעֲמָה; but this does not really effect any improvement. LXX omits. No doubt Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort are right in emending יְאֶשֶׁת; 'to give him a lamp before Him all the days.' Cf. I. 11. 36 כְּלֶלֶת נַחֲלֵי.


21. The place is unknown. Ew. would read יָרִיב 'to Zo'ar,' but against this it is to be noticed with Buhl (Edomiter, p. 64 f.) that LXX, Luc. in our passage transliterate סְדֵבֶר, סְדֵבֶר, while יָרִיב is always represented by סְדֵבֶר, סְדֵבֶר; the inference being that י in יָרִיב = ע, while in יָרִיב it = ע. Th. suggests יָרִיב 'to Se'ir.' || 2 Chr. יָרִיב.

21b. The half-verse seems to be seriously corrupt.

(1) The constr. 'מִּבֵּית יָרִיב is inexplicable. Accents connect יָרִיב closely with מִבֵּית (cf. || 2 Chr. 21. 9 מִבֵּית וָיוֹד); but the idea of duration usually conveyed by the constr. of participle with substantive verb (Dri. Tenses, § 135. 5) is out of harmony with the sense of the passage. The alternative, adopted by LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ., is to make a break after יָרִיב, and to treat יָרִיב מִבֵּית as a circumstantial clause, מִבֵּית being a perfect. Upon this view, however, the analogy of the cases cited by Dri. Tenses, § 165, demands a change of subject in the (presumed) principal sentence which follows:—'And it came to pass, whilst he arose by night [some one else acted in such a way].'

(2) As the text stands, the statement is made that Joram, the subject of מֵית, smote פֶּלֶס מִבֵּית. These, however, as is clear from v. 21a, belonged to his own forces. The least correction, therefore, that can be made is to follow Kit. in reading פֶּלֶס מֵית בֹּקֶר; 'And the captains of the chariots were with him.'

(3) Verse 22 makes it plain that Joram's attempt to re-subjugate Edom was futile. What we therefore desiderate in v. 21b is probably an account of the falling of Joram and his army into
an ambush laid by the Edomites, from which escape was only made by cutting a way through the surrounding enemy and beating a hurried retreat. As to the precise wording of such a narrative the passage in its present state affords no sufficient clue.

22. [Cf. I. 8. 8 note.]

[ Cf. I. 3. 16 note.

As to the precise wording of such a narrative the passage in its present state affords no sufficient clue.


Ch. 8. 26–29 forms the basis of 2 Chr. 22. 2–6. R⁰ vv. 25–27.

25. [Cf. Ch. 9. 29 הִשְׂרָה שָׁאוּל. So in the present passage, Luc., Pesh.]

26. [Cf. II. 22. 2 note.

We should naturally expect לַאֲשֹׁרִים, which LXX, Luc. represent by לַאֲשֹׁרוֹן, i.e. 'the archers'; cf. 1 Sam. 31. 3; 2 Sam. 11. 24. This reading is very probably original. So Klo.

29. [Cf. II. 22. 3 note.

We should naturally expect לַאֲשֹׁרִים. || 2 Chr. has the strange לַאֲשֹׁרִים, which LXX, Luc. represent by of רַוְעָם, i.e. רַוְעָם 'the archers'; cf. 1 Sam. 31. 3; 2 Sam. 11. 24. This reading is very probably original. So Klo.

29. [Cf. II. 22. 3 note.]

We should naturally expect לַאֲשֹׁרִים. || 2 Chr. has the strange לַאֲשֹׁרִים, which LXX, Luc. represent by of רַוְעָם, i.e. רַוְעָם 'the archers'; cf. 1 Sam. 31. 3; 2 Sam. 11. 24. This reading is very probably original. So Klo.

29. [Cf. II. 22. 3 note.]

We should naturally expect לַאֲשֹׁרִים. || 2 Chr. has the strange לַאֲשֹׁרִים, which LXX, Luc. represent by of רַוְעָם, i.e. רַוְעָם 'the archers'; cf. 1 Sam. 31. 3; 2 Sam. 11. 24. This reading is very probably original. So Klo.

8. 1–10. 28. Jehu, an officer of the host of Israel, is anointed king at the command of Elisha. He destroys the whole house of Ahab, and extirpates Ba'al-worship from Israel.

8. 2. [Ja-u-a apal Hu-um-ri-i, i.e. 'Jehu son of Omri' (cf. I. 16. 23 note), is twice mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions of Shalmaneser II, as bringing tribute to the Assyrian king. The
first inscription is found upon the obelisk, above a representation of the embassy presenting the tribute before Shalmaneser. In the second inscription (Annals, III, Rawlinson 5, no. 6, 40-65), after an account of the conquest of Hazacl of Damascus, Shalmaneser states that ‘at that time I received the tribute of the Tyrians, Sidonians, of Jehu son of Omri.’ Cf. Append. 4. It may be inferred, therefore, that the aid of Assyria had been solicited by Jehu to meet the encroachments of Hazacl, to which brief reference is made in ch. 10. 32, 33, just as in later times it was solicited by Ahaz of Judah against the alliance of Israel and Aram; ch. 16. 6 ff.; cf. Isa. 7. 1-9.


12. [Luc. יִתְנֶה יָדֶה יְהוָה יְאוֹתָה. Cf. v. 6.]

13. [The meaning is very uncertain. Ges., Ew., Ke., upon the analogy of the use of דָּשֶׁא, suppose that the expression may mean 'upon the steps themselves,' i.e. 'upon the bare steps.' Grä. emends יָדֶה יְאוֹתָה 'upon the elevation of the steps.']

14b. [Very probably Grä. is correct in substituting יָדֶה for יָדֶה:—'Now Jehu was keeping Ramoth Gilead ... but Jehoram had returned to be healed &c.']

15. [If it be your mind,' i.e. If ye are desirous of making me king. LXX, Luc. add μὴ ἐκατον, but this is unnecessary. Many Codd. read דָּשֶׁא דָּשֶׁא, as in Gen. 23. 8.]

16. [In place of these words LXX, Luc. present a second rendering of v. 15—clearly a marginal gloss which has usurped the place of the true reading. Notice ἐπιτατμένης for ἐπιτατμένης ... ἐπιτατμένης—and τῶν ταφοῦματων δὲ κατατέφωσαν αὐτόν for ἐν τῶν πληγῶν δὲ ἐκσωμαν αὐτόν—οἱ Ἀραμεῖοι for οἱ Σιρίοι. LXX rounds off the gloss with ἐρ χορὸς καὶ ἄρη δυνάμεως.

17. [On the order of sentence expressing the pluperfect cf. note on I. 14. 5.]

18. [טֹּלָה] Cf. ch. 5. 21 note.

'א הֵבֶן [What hast thou (as an emissary of Ahab's son)
IX. 12-24

to do with peace?—the implication (cf. v. 22) being ‘How can peace exist so long as the house of Ahab exists?’ Cf. the phrase תֵּל ה יָאֵב מִן I. 17. 18 note.

[We ought probably to read מֵלָּעַר.] Cf. Job 32. 12 מֵלָּעַר. 20. מֵלָּעַר עַל נְעָר Cf. the phrase מַלְטַל יִפְי I. 18. 29 note.

[The phrase מַלְטַל עַל נְעָר] ‘Madly,’ or, as RV., ‘furiously.’ So A. אֶל נְפֹלָמֶּל, 7. עַדְעָם, Vulg. praeceps, Pesh. הַכֹּלֶּל, and probably LXX, Luc. אֶל נְפֹלָמֶּל. In contrast, Targ. renders רְחַפָּן ‘quietly,’ and this interpretation is adopted by Jos. (Ant. ix. 6, § 3):—συχαλαίτερον δι' εαυτέρ μετ' εἰσαζομαι ἵππος Ιρών.'

[Probably describing Jehu’s habit:—‘he is wont to drive.’ In description of a (single) present event we should of course expect וַיַּלְטֶל.]

22. מֵלָּעַר נְעָר] For the sense ‘What peace?’ (RV.) we should expect מֵלָּעַר נְעָר, and this is adopted by Klop., Kit., who suppose that the נ before מֵלָּעַר has come in by dittography. Benz., following Targ., vocalizes מֵלָּעַר נְעָר, explaining ‘Jehu answers: Between us there can be no’ ‘How do you fare?’ so long as &c.’ But the sense assigned to מֵלָּעַר נְעָר is not that which it possesses in this connexion. Cf. note on ch. 5. 21.

[The sense of רַע is ‘at’ or ‘during.’ Cf. Judg. 3. 26 מֵלָּעַר נְעָר ‘During their delay’; Jon. 4. 2 מֵלָּעַר נְעָר ‘Whilst I was (during my being) in my country.’ Grä.’s emendation מֵלָּעַר נְעָר for רַע is unnecessary. LXX ἀπειρομένῳ, i.e. ἀπειρομένῳ (so Klop.), is greatly inferior to MT.]

23. מֵלָּעַר נְעָר] Cf. I. 22. 34.

24. מֵלָּעַר נְעָר אֶל מַלְתָּל] ‘Armed (lit. filled) his hand with the bow.’ Cf. 2 Sam. 23. מֵלָּעַר נְעָר אֶל מַלְתָּל ‘arms himself with iron and a spear’s shaft’—‘lit. falls himself,’ viz. in so far as the hand using the weapon is concerned’ (Dri. ad loc.)

1 The sub. occurs again in A.’s rendering of Job 4. 13 אֶל נְפֹלָמֶּל יִמַּכֵּס מִן מִי מֵלָּעַר אַדְּוָד תַּבְּרָאִים, i.e. probably ‘In trances of visions of the night.’ Cf. 41. אֶל נְפֹלָמֶּל יִמַּכֵּס מִן מֵלָּעַר אַדְּוָד תַּבְּרָאִים.

* It should, however, be remembered that the context of this passage is very dubious, and that מֵלָּעַר disappears under Budde’s emendation.
The Second Book of Kings


27. It is necessary to follow Pesh. and add אשת, which has fallen out through similarity to the preceding word. So most moderns. Vulg. makes the insertion after גבריה, and LXX, Luc. supply it in place of מנה.


30. ‘And set her eyes in stibium.’ אביזר is the kohl of the Arabs (cf. the verb לעובד Ezek. 23. 40), i.e. sulphide of antimony reduced to a black powder which is mixed with oil and used for painting the eye-lashes and brows, in order to make the eyes appear large and dark. Cf. Jer. 4. 30 והָיָה לְאֵבִּיָּר כְּפָרִי יָרוּץ ‘though thou enlargeth thine eyes with stibium.’ Benz. Archäologie, 110.

31. RV. rightly, ‘Is it peace, thou Zimri, thy master’s murderer?’ It is idiomatic in Heb. to change to the 3rd pers. after an opening vocative. Cf. cases cited by Dri. Tenses, § 198, Obs. 2, and add Isa. 51. 7 and Job 18. 4 (with inverted order).
IX. 25—X. 1

... as Th. rightly emphasizes, must have the same sense as in vv. 17, 18, 19, 22. Jezebel reminds Jehu of the speedy fate of Zimri (I. 16. 9–18), and gives him the opportunity of making peace with her, the hitherto all-powerful mistress of the kingdom. To give to תְּלַעְפֵּשׁ the meaning ‘How fare you?’ deprives the queen of her policy.

32. יִמְנָא רָאָה שָׁם ‘Who is with me, who?’ i.e. on my side. For this use of מָא cf. ch. 6. 16; Isa. 43. 5; 63. 3; Jer. 1. 19; Ps. 12. 5. The reading of LXX, Luc. τις εις σου; κατάβας μεν έσω (Luc. πρὸς μου) probably has its origin in a double rendering of מָא, vocalized in the first place as מַא, while κατάβας may answer to the second מָא read as מַא. Klo. makes κατάβας the equivalent of וַיְרַז, a corrupt reading of וַיְרַז, and so emends מָא מַא פָּרָה שָׁם ‘Who art thou, that thou wouldest contend with me?’—a reading in no way comparable to MT.

'תִּשְׁפָּל שְׁנֵה שֶׁיָּם 'Two or three.' Cf. Isa. 17. 6 ... שְׁנֵה שֶׁיָּם מַחֲרַח שָׁם 'Two or three berries ... four or five.' LXX, Luc. omit שׁנֵה.

33. תְּבִיסָה וָרְמָא וָרְמָא, rightly making the horses the subject.

36. לְדוּ LXX omits.

37. וָרְמָא Kt. should probably be vocalized וָרָמָא, the older form of the 3rd fem. sing. perf. of verbs וַיִּזְרָה which occurs in a few other cases: — בָּרָמָא Lev. 25. 21; וָרְמָא Lev. 26. 34; וָרְמָא Ezek. 24. 12; וָרְמָא Jer. 13. 19.

'וַיְרַז שָׁם וַיְרַז וָרְמָא Vulg., by omission of the negative, ulla ut praeterentes dicant: Haecine est ulla Isabiel? Luc. adds eal oba ἵνα τοσσαὶ ὅ λεγον ὁλοιν.

10. 1. בָּשָׂתא According to the contents of Jehu’s letter, vv. 2, 3, the seventy princes are sons of Jehoram rather than of Ahab. Cf. the phrases מֵאָה בָּשָּׂתא and לָשָּׂתא אַשְׁנָתָה. Thus Sta. (ZATW., 1885, pp. 279 ff.) regards v. 1a as a later and erroneous gloss. It is not, however, unreasonable to suppose that בָּשָּׂתא is here used not in the strictly literal sense, but of descendants of Ahab in any degree (cf. בָּשָּׂתא עַל v. 3), any one of whom might have been
set up to resist the usurper. Cf. note following on the use of the number seventy. Jehu's commission (ch. 9. 7) is explicitly not against Jehoram but against the house of Ahab, and to describe the members of this house no other term could have been chosen by the writer than בֶּן-יָהוֹ. It is remarkable that seventy is the number of the sons of Gideon-Jerubba'al, Judg. 8. 30ff., and of the relations of Bar-Côr of Ya'di (Panammu inscription, l. 3: D. H. Müller, Die altsemit. Inschr. von Sendschirli), who, in each case as here, are massacred to secure succession to the throne. Possibly, therefore, as Müller (op. cit., p. 9) suggests, seventy is a round number to denote the whole of the royal kin.

Luc. πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῆς πόλεως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβύτερους, Vulg. ad optimates civilisatis, et ad maiores nati, i.e. בֶּן-יָהוֹ—certainly correct: cf. v. 5 MT. בֶּן-יָהוֹ of MT. has arisen from a mistaken combination of the letters בֶּן-יָהוֹ. Jehu was himself at Jezreel, and would scarcely have sent a letter to the authorities of that city with regard to the royal princes who were in Samaria. So Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.


Cf. I. 4. 6 note. בֶּן-יָהוֹ. LXX, Luc. παράγομεν.

Several Codd., and LXX, Luc. בֶּן-יָהוֹ—a second letter.' As the text stands, the first sl. constr. is in apposition to the second (suspended construct state)—'The men, the sons of your master.' Cf. Da. § 28, Rem. 6. Possibly בֶּן-יָהוֹ is

In Judg. 12. 13 f. the descendants of Abdon are seventy; forty sons and thirty grandsons, riding upon seventy asses.

LXX agrees with Luc., except in the substitution of ξαμαπελας for τῆς πόλεως, an alteration made for the sake of precision.
merely a doublet of וְשָׁם. Kamp., Oort omit the word. Sta. emends "אֲבִי חָלָה לָה. Luc. λαμήτρια εἰκόσι τιν ἑκατέρῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ θνίου τούτου ἐκείνου, i.e. probably יָפָרָה לְשָׁם שָׁם הָאָרֶץ; adopted by Benz., Kit. as far as regards the use of שָׁם.

[See] LXX, Luc., Pesh. מָלַשׁ, 'and bring (them).' So Th., Sta., Klo.

7. [See] LXX, Luc., Pesh. מַלְשׁוֹן, correctly:—'slew them, even seventy men.'

8. [See] LXX, Luc., Pesh. רֵעַ, 'In baskets': so all Verss. On the use of the article cf. I. 1. 1 note on שָׂרֶה.


10. [See] LXX "יִתְנַשְּׁא—probably an easy alteration of MT.

11. [See] LXX kal πάντας τοῖς ἀγγέλοις ἐδοξασμένοντας αὐτῷ, i.e. "even all his kinsmen":—probably correct; cf. I. 16. 11 note. So Klo.

12. [See] Cf. ch. 3. 25, note 2.

13. [See] By the side of יִשָּׂע, אָבִי is redundant; at least we should expect it to follow יִשָּׂע and immediately precede וְשָׁם, as in Pesh. LXX, Luc., Vulg. omit אָבִי, probably correctly. Perhaps the word is a corruption of אָבִי. So Klo., Benz., Kit.

14. [See] The rendering of RV. 'shearing house,' marg. 'house of gathering' (Targ. ישיבת נביאים), is merely conjectural. The verb יִשָּׂע, Gen. 22. 9, means, as in New Heb., Ar., and Aram., to bind.

15. [See] Read שִׁבֹּל, with Dri. Tenses, § 169, Obs. 2. The events described by v. 12b and v. 13a are thus pointedly synchronized in accordance with the idiom of the language:—'He was at Beth­−eqed of the shepherds by the way, when he found &c.' Cf. 1 Sam. 9. 11; Judg. 18. 3; Gen. 38. 25. It is noticeable that
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Luc., Vulg. omit the proper name, and may thus be regarded as supporting the emendation.

The expression which ordinarily has the meaning ‘to enquire after’ is 

Luc. 11. 7; 1 Sam. 10. 4; 17. 22; al. If this phrase in full was originally written in our passage, the omission of יְשַׁלָּח is earlier than the Verss., all of which agree with MT.

14. רָאוּ הָיוּם יְהָיָה LXX omits; Luc., Pesh. apparently read simply.

15. [וְ] רָאִי LXX, Luc. omit ד.נ מְכַוֶּשׁ (if not a doublet of בַּכַּר) may be original: הָשַׁמָּן, like מִי, מָי of Pesh., is due to the translator.

Doubtless we ought to follow LXX, Luc. in reading וְיִתְנוּ, thus securing a perfect parallelism with the following clause. So Th., Klo., Benz., Oort. Kamp., Kit. adopt the less probable order וְיִתָנוּ מְכַוֶּשׁ, like מִי, מָי of Pesh., is due to the translator.

If it be (said he).’ The writer regards it as sufficiently evident that מְכַוֶּשׁ is the response to the preceding מְכַוֶּשׁ. Cf. I. 20, 17.

With מְכַוֶּשׁ cf. בַּכַּר ch. 5. 17 note.


18. [וְ] רָאִי Read מְכַוֶּשׁ מְכַוֶּשׁ, Vulg. ego autem colam eum;—inferior to MT.

19. [וְ] רָאִי Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. cut out the two words as an erroneous insertion from v. 21. Jehu summons the prophets

It is certain that Vulg., reading מְכַוֶּשׁ מְכַוֶּשׁ, would have left the pronoun unexpressed, and rendered, as is actually the case, invemit. Cf. in Vulg. the other cases of the idiom cited. That the same course may have been followed in the Greek may be inferred from the rendering of Gen. 38. 25.
and priests of Ba‘al, who are commanded to proclaim a solemn assembly, to which the worshippers in general are summoned (v. 20 f.). It is noticeable that in Luc. καὶ πάντες τοὺς δοῦλους αὐτοῦ follow καὶ τοὺς λείπεις αὐτοῦ, as though inserted from the margin.

21. LXX erroneously expands the verse from v. 19.

Ch 21, 16†.


23. ‘... ἐποίησε’ Luc. adds καὶ ἐξαρπασμένου αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐστὶν ὁ θεός ἡ ζωή κ.κ.α.; adopted by Klo.


26. [Hebrew] As בְּשָׂר, is vocalized, the sentence is extremely difficult. Read בְּשָׂר, with Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. —‘The man who suffers to escape any of the men, &c., his life shall be for his life.’

27. [Hebrew] ‘Into (lit. upon) your hands.’ So, after נני, Gen. 42. 37; after ויהי, Jer. 18. 21; Ezek. 35. 5; Ps. 63. 11.

28. [Hebrew] Pesh. מַעֲבְדָה, i.e. מַעֲבְדָה.

29. [Hebrew] Cf. I. 1. 5 note.


31. [Hebrew] The object is missing. RV., ‘cast them out,’ finds the reference to be to the corpses of the slain; but it is reasonable to expect this to be more precisely indicated. Klo. is right in finding the object of מַעֲבְדָה to lie concealed under מָעַבְדָה, the repetition in detail of the subject of the verb in MT. being scarcely less strange than the omission of the object. He ingeniously suggests מַעֲבָדָה מַעֲבָדָה מַעֲבָדָה ‘and they cast the Asherim down to the ground.’ This restoration, however, is not very likely to
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represent the original if the emendation adopted in v. 26 be correct, which thus makes reference to the (single) Ashera of the temple.

'To the city of the house of Ba'al' can hardly be correct. Klo.'s emendation 'ה יריעה יד to the adytum, &c.' (cf. I. 6. 16 note), is very suitable to the context, though it is illegitimate to cite the rendering of Luc. ἡς τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ Baal in support of the emendation. The other Verss. agree with MT.

26. The Verss. presuppose a sing. מזרה, in accordance with the suffix of נבש. But, as Sta. (ZATW., 1885, p. 278) remarks, the stone Maʿāseba cannot have been burnt, and it is therefore probable that we ought to substitute מgetPropertyl 'the Ashera of the house of Ba'al,' in accordance with I. 16. 33, הבנותו ותְיָהוּ הבנותו: cf. ch. 23. 6. So Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort. On the character of the Ashera cf. I. 14. 15 note.

27. Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit. emend מזרה, the first comparing I. 16. 32, and, for the expression מזרה מזון, Ex. 34. 13; Deut. 7. 5; 12. 3; Judg. 2. 2; 6. 28 ff. Mention of the destruction of the altar is to be expected, supposing the clause to be not merely a doublet of that which follows (Klo.), which it resembles somewhat suspiciously.

10. 29-36. Summary of Jehu's reign: his character and his foreign relations.

Rō vv. 28-31, 34-36; vv. 32, 33 summarized from the Annals.

29. 'Namely) the golden calves,' in apposition to מזרה. Vulg., with a view to make the connexion more clear, inserts nec dereliquit, Targ. יבשותנה רברברך.

32. The same phrase is used by Rō in ch. 15. 37; 20. 1. Cf. note on I. 3. 16.

1 The כַּעֲרֵם in I. 6. 5, 16, 19, 21, 23, 31; 7. 49; 8. 8 appears as בָּבֶל; and, assuming that νοῦς could answer to יריעה, as in Ps. 28 (LXX 27). 2, יריעה remains unrepresented, and simply is scarcely likely to have been read by the translator.
‘To cut Israel short,’ lit. ‘to cut off in Israel.’

The expression is strange, though Hab. 2. 10 סָכָה לְעַמָּי affection affords an instance of the use of the verb סָכָה in this sense. The original reading is probably preserved by Vulg. taedere super Israel, i.e. לְעַמָּי, ‘to loathe Israel’; cf. Gen. 27. 46 לְעַמָּי. So Klo. Targ. Hosea and other Targums seem to have read לְעַמָּי, ‘to be angry with,’ and this is adopted by Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

The double mention of רַע הָעָד introduces confusion, and Grä., Buhl. (Geogr. 70) simplify the description by cutting out the first רַע הָעָד, and also the רַע before the second. The fact that, at the time of the fall of Omri’s dynasty, Rama of Gilead appears to have been the most northern point of Israel’s dominions east of Jordan causes some critics (cf. Sta. ZATW., 1885, p. 279; Benz., Kit.) to regard the verse, either as a whole or in part, as a later addition.

The same description of the position of רַע הָעָד, with the addition of רַע before רַע, is found in Deut. 2. 36; 3. 12; 4. 48; Josh. 12. 2; 13. 9, 16. The site of ‘Aro’er is found in a heap of ruins called ’Ar’âdir, south of Dibba, and standing on a hill on the northern side of the ravine of Arnon. Buhl, 269.

Luc. adds וַיַּבְשָׁה. LXX, Luc. add וַיַּבְשָׁה (Luc. al) ἐν σύνφυσι ἐστὶ σύνφυσι, i.e. מַעַּבִּישׁ נֵסִים. Cf. I. 16. 20; ch. 15. 15.

36. At the end of the verse Luc. adds ἐν τῷ διανόμῳ τῆς Γασδιαίας βασιλείας κόρας τὸν ἱων ὀλίν Ναμεία, and then continues with a summary account of Ahaziah’s reign, derived in the main from ch. 8. 25 ff., with a brief mention of the events of ch. 9 in so far as they concern the death of Ahaziah.

11. Athaliah the queen-mother usurps the throne of Judah. At the end of six years Jehoiada the priest effects a revolution, and sets Jehoash, the rightful heir, upon the throne.

Ch. 11 forms the basis of 2 Chr. 22. 10—23. 21.

This chapter and its sequel, ch. 12. 5–17, form, with chh. 16.
10-16; 22. 3—23. 25, a series of Judaean narratives which reflect prominently the influence of the priests as conservators of the religion of Yahwe, and in which the interest centres to a great extent round the Temple at Jerusalem. Probably therefore, as Sta. suggests, the source from which the narratives were drawn may have been the Temple-archives.

Sta. (ZATW., 1885, pp. 280 ff.) has pointed out that ch. 11 is probably a combination of two narratives. The first, vv. 4-12, 18b-20, is a continuous whole; the second, vv. 13-18a, merely a fragment. According to the first, Jehoiada effects the revolution by the aid of the royal bodyguard (יוו); in the second, it is the people (יהו) who are prominent. The insertion of היו in v. 13 in apposition to יהו is clearly a redactional device, and traces of the redactor's hand are also to be found in v. 15 (see ad loc.).

The recognition of this composite character of the narrative explains certain difficulties which are patent if it be read as a continuous whole. Thus, it cannot be thought that the destruction of the temple of Ba'al (v. 18a) took place between the anointing and enthronement of Jehoash. It would naturally occur after the measures taken against Athaliah, and not as an episode in their course. Again, it is difficult to understand why the setting of a guard over the Temple (v. 18b) should have been necessary after the death of Athaliah (vv. 15, 16). The purpose of such a guard can only have been to protect the Temple against the danger of an attack by the queen and her adherents. It is strange, also, if the narrative be a whole, that there should be two accounts of the death of Athaliah; vv. 15, 16 and v. 20b.

The main difference between the two narratives seems to be that while the fragment emphasizes the religious importance of the revolution, the continuous narrative regards it purely as an event of civil importance. This difference does not set the two accounts at variance; the religious revolution may well have followed in the train of the civil.

The parallel narrative of 2 Chr. has been considerably expanded in parts by the editor, the priests and Levites being introduced
and made to take the place which is occupied in Kings by the royal bodyguard.

11. 1. הָנָּ֣ה יִרְאוּתְךָ || 2 Chr. 20:1, a scribal error.
2. הָנָּ֣ה יִרְאוּתְךָ || 2 Chr. 20:1, She is there stated to have been thereunto.

קָרַ֥בָּה וּלְאִוֶּ֣בַּרְשָׁהָ֑י || 2 Chr. 20:11. She is there stated to have been thereunto.

לֵֽאָ֣ה וּלְאִוֶּ֣בַּרְשָׁהָ֑י LXX ὠβριακόν ἀνθρώπιν, i.e. ἀνθρώπιν. Luc. combines the two readings.

2. הָנָּ֣ה יִרְאוּתְךָ || 2 Chr. prefixes והר, which is indispensable. So Ew., Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

קָרַ֥בָּה וּלְאִוֶּ֣בַּרְשָׁהָ֑י LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. והר והר. So || 2 Chr. והר והר.

4. הָנָּ֣ה יִרְאוּתְךָ Luc. adds ὁ ἱερός, i.e. ἱερός, as in vv. 9 ff. The specification is necessary unless it be supposed that the narrative originally contained an earlier reference to Jehoiada, such as that of || 2 Chr. noticed on v. 2.

קָרַ֥בָּה וּלְאִוֶּ֣בַּרְשָׁהָ֑י Kt. only again vv. 9, 10, 15. Kt. discusses the form and concludes that the ' is merely euphonic, מֵדִיבָּה for מֵדִיבָּה, representing the pronunciation adopted for the avoidance of hiatus, as in Aramaic. Lehrg. I, i. p. 217; cf. p. 481.

קָרַ֥בָּה וּלְאִוֶּ֣בַּרְשָׁהָ֑י So v. 19 and 2 Sam. 20. 23 Kt. Probably the Carians are denoted. Cf. R. Sm. OTJC.3, p. 262 note.

קָרַ֥בָּה וּלְאִוֶּ֣בַּרְשָׁהָ֑י Cf. I. 1. 5 note.

קָרַ֥בָּה וּלְאִוֶּ֣בַּרְשָׁהָ֑י LXX καλ διήθεσα αὐτῷ διαφέρειν ἀνόητον καὶ ἰδιάρισον, i.e. ἰδιάρισον. Kt. probably correct. "This at the end is superfluous, while ' was may be paralleled from 1 Sam. 20. 8. So Klo.

5-7. As Wellh. (C. 361) points out, v. 6 is clearly a gloss, the יִרְאוּתְךָ יִרְאוּתְךָ of v. 7 answering to יִרְאוּתְךָ יִרְאוּתְךָ of v. 5. By removal of this insertion, and reading יִרְאוּתְךָ (as in v. 5) for יִרְאוּתְךָ in v. 7, we obtain an intelligible text in vv. 5, 7, 8:—'And he commanded them, saying, This is the thing which ye shall do; the third part of you who go in on the Sabbath and keep the guard of the king's house, and the two divisions of you, even all who go forth on the Sabbath and keep the guard of the House of Yahwe about the king,
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ye shall compass the king round about, &c.' The point is obviously that all the bodyguard is to be concentrated at the Temple, no part of it being at Athaliah's disposal at the palace: cf. v. 9.

5. At the end LXX adds τὰ τοὺς ἱερεῖς. || 2 Chr. φυλάσσετε τὸν βασιλέα διὰ τούτοις. The unintelligible φοράμενος is omitted by LXX, and by || 2 Chr. in the free explanation, וגו תחתיו. LXX. Field cites a Schol. which states the existence of a reading דמשקאי, i.e. חbases, adopted by Kit.

6. תחתיו [The unintelligible תחתיו is omitted by LXX, and by || 2 Chr. in the free explanation, וגו תחתיו. Field cites a Schol. which states the existence of a reading דמשקאי, i.e. חbases, adopted by Kit.]

8. תחתיו [Up to the ranks,' i.e. the lines of men surrounding the king, suggested by the previous 'τοὺς ἱερεῖς. The word is the same as New Heb. דמשק, Aram. שמשק, J ו. Vulg., septum templi; misunderstands. || 2 Chr. יַשְׁוֶל].

10. תחתיו [|| 2 Chr. יַשְׁוֶל. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.]

RV., here as in the other occurrences of the word, 'the shields.' This rendering seems to be demanded by Song 4. 4, where יַשְׁוֶל stands in explanatory apposition to יַשְׁוֶל ו. Th. on 2 Sam. 8. 7 favours the more general meaning 'armour;' and the same view is taken by W. E. Barnes, who classifies the ancient renderings of the word: Expos. Times, Oct. 1898, pp. 43 ff. The fact, however, that יַשְׁוֶל (here and in Jer. 51. 11) occurs in connexion with other specified items of military equipment is against the view that the term is used in a general and not a special sense. According to LXX, Luc. in 1. 14. 26, the יַשְׁוֶל which David took from the servants of Hadadezer, king of Zoba, were carried off by Shishak, king of Egypt, during the reign of Rehoboam. Cf. note ad loc.

11. תחתיו [RV. 'along by the altar and the house.' The meaning seems to be that the guards formed a semicircle extending from the south to the north corner of the Temple, and surrounding the brazen altar which stood before the Temple. Thus all the space between the porch and the altar would be enclosed. It is, however, highly doubtful whether י can bear the sense 'along by,' and whether, granted this sense, the writer would have chosen
to convey the explanation given above in so obscure a manner. Pesh. represents לְחָמִים by מָנוֹלָה... If we may regard מָנוֹלָה as due to an erroneous explanation of תֵּיבָה 'the house' (i.e. the Temple) as 'the king's house,' we obtain the good sense, חֲבִיא פֶּרֶי לְחָמִים round about the altar and the Temple. בְּגֵזָה seems to have been wrongly placed in MT., and then explained by the addition הַשָּׁמֶשׁ, a statement which at this stage of the proceedings is incorrect.

12. תְרֵיָדָה] RV., following Verss., 'the testimony,' i.e., apparently, a written law-book, committed to the young king as head over the theocratic state; cf. Deut. 17. 18 ff. There is not, however, anywhere else allusion to such a custom as the laying of a book (?) upon (sc. the head of) a king at his coronation; the term תְרֵיָדָה is a late one; and, if it represented the law of the kingdom embodied in a concrete form, it would be natural to expect that this fact would be more precisely indicated (e.g. מָנוֹלָה תְרֵיָדָה). Thus it is reasonable to suspect the text of corruption. Wellh. (C. 361) makes the happy emendation פֶּרֶי הַלְּבָנָה, 'the bracelets,' which formed, with הַשָּׁמֶשׁ 'the diadem,' the royal insignia. Cf. 2 Sam. 1. 10.

13. פָּאֵל פְּרֶי] Obviously the two terms cannot stand together כְּפִלֹאָא. פָּאֵל is a gloss, roughly inserted for the purpose of connecting the narrative with that which precedes. Cf. note on the composition of the narrative. פָּאֵל is probably used in a military sense. Cf. I. 16. 15 note.

14. פֵּתֵר פְּרֶי 'By the king.' For this sense of פֵּתֵר cf. note on I. 6. 18.

15. פְּרֶי פְּרֶי] LXX ἐμοσανώματα, i.e. ἔρημος, adopted by Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit., is doubtless correct. MT. can only mean 'those of the army who were mustered.' פְּרֶי פְּרֶי is superfluous by the side of פְּרֶי פְּרֶי, and must be regarded as a gloss from ספ. 4, 9, 10, of the same character as

1 Reading מָנוֹלָה for מָנוֹלָה, with Wellh., Dri., Budde, &c.
that noticed in v. 13. The same is probably the case with the words מִבְּנֵי, which seem to conflict with v. 15. The queen is to be taken outside the Temple, and therefore not inside the ranks which, according to v. 8, surround the king within the Temple.

16. רְמָאָה אֵלְיִישוֹז 'And they laid hands on her.' So LXX, Luc., Vulg., Kamp., Benz., Kit. The rendering, 'And they made way (lit. place) for her,' Pesh., Targ., adopted among moderms by Ke., Th., Klo., AV., RV., is not to be paralleled 1.

19. רְמָאָה LXX, Luc. καὶ εὐαίσθανεν αἰσθῶν. So || 2 Chr. בִּיהוֹדֵד.

12. 1–4. Introduction by R0 to the reign of Jehoash.

Ch. 12. 1–3 = 2 Chr. 24. 1, 2.

12. 1, 2. Luc. reads הָאָדָם הָשָׁם in the synchronism of v. 2, and inserts v. 1, the statement of the king's age at accession, after the synchronism, thus conforming to the order which is constant elsewhere in the introductory formula. See Introduction.

3. רְמָאָה 'And Jehoash did that which was right in the sight of Yahwe all his days, forasmuch as Jehoiada the priest instructed him.' So Ew., Th., Kamp. The antecedent of יהוה is found in יהוה; lit. 'he who Jehoiada instructed.' Cf. e.g. Gen. 42. 21 רְמָאָה 'we who saw' (or, 'in that we saw'); Heb. Lex. Oxf., s.v. יהוה, 8 c. AV., RV., Kit., following LXX, Luc., Vulg., render 'all his days wherein Jehoiada the priest instructed him,' thus limiting the period of the king's good living to the life-time of Jehoiada, in accordance with || 2 Chr. 24. 2, יהוה וְיָשָׁרֵי, and the narrative of 2 Chr. 24. 17–22 which relates the defection of Jehoash from the religion of Yahwe and his murder of the son of Jehoiada. But the normal method of expressing such a sense

---

1 מִבְּנֵי in Josh. 8. 20 does not mean place or room (Gen. Thes.), but power, as in Ps. 76. 6; singular מִבְּנֵי. Dent. 82. 36. Cf. Dillmann, ad loc.; Heb. Lex. Oxf.
2 Pesh., Targ. are ambiguous in meaning, and cannot be cited, as by Th., in favour of this rendering. The accentuation of MT., however, in placing the principal break upon יהוה, is certainly intended to convey the meaning adopted.
would have been יְהַעַר, as e.g. in 1 Sam. 1. 28. כֵּן is elsewhere in every occurrence used absolutely, without further definition, in the sense 'all his life long':—I. 15. 14; 2 Chr. 15. 17; ch. 15. 18; 2 Chr. 18. 17; 34. 33; Deut. 22. 19, 29; Eccl. 2. 23; 5. 16†. Moreover, as Ew. points out, it seems to be clear that Rô was unacquainted with any narrative of the king's defection, for 'had this been so, then the older historical work must have told us how Joash showed himself faithless afterwards; but so far is this from being the case, that the piety of his successor is afterwards compared with his own, and that of both regarded as inferior to David's alone, 2 Ki. 14. 3 (the Chronicles omit this passage); even Uzziah is only treated as their equal, 2 Ki. 15. 3; 2 Chr. 26. 4.'

It is, of course, possible that the statement יְהַעַר may be an early marginal note intended to qualify the absolute כֵּן, in accordance with the narrative of Chr. This supposition is perhaps favoured by the reading of 2 Chr. 18. 17, which looks like a limited explanation of כֵּן simply.

4. יְהַעַר כֹּהֵן [ Cf. I. 3. 2, 3 note.]


2 Chr. 24. 4–14 gives a different narrative of the same events.

5. יְהַעַר כֹּהֵן [ Very difficult. As the text stands, must mean 'current money' (RV.). Cf. Gen. 23. 16. Then the four following words are rendered by RV. 'the money of the persons for whom each man is rated'; marg. Heb. 'each man the money of the souls of his estimation.' The construction is here similar to that of Gen. 9. 5 וַיִּשָּׁם 'each man his brother,' i.e. 'each man's brother'; Gen. 15. 10 וַיִּשָּׁם 'each its half,' i.e. 'the half of each.'

Luc. represents רֹבֶר by ἀργόνιον συντιμήσεως ἀξίως, ἀργόνιον συντιμήσεως πρόκειται, i.e. 'very rich man.' It is certainly a great simplification of the text if we suppose, with Sta., Kamp., Benz., Kit., that these first three words, 'the money of each man's
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assessment' (cf. Lev. 27. 2 ff.), represent the original text, and that is an explanatory gloss which has come into the text as a doublet.

It is necessary to insert ' before בֵּן, 'and all the money &c.' The freewill offering of money which a man's heart prompts him to make is clearly distinct from the sum which is assessed by tariff.

6. Apparently, 'each from his acquaintance,' RV. The scope with which בֵּן (only again v. 8) is employed is highly obscure, and the word is justly regarded with suspicion by Kamp., Benz. LXX ἀνὰ τῆς πρᾶξεως αὐτοῦ (Luc. αὐτοῦ) vocalizes ἀνὰ τῆς πρᾶξεως αὐτοῦ; Vulg. juxta ordinem suum (f).

[ב] 'Dilapidation.' Cf. ch. 22. 5; Ezek. 27. 9, 27.

[ב] 'For everything,' i.e. 'wherever.'

9. [This form, in place of the ordinary נַעֲרָה, appears here only. Ko. (Lehrg. II. i. 490) cites the similar segholate st. constr. forms רָעֲרָה, עִנְרָה, שָׁנְרָה, רְעָרָה. Cf. G-K. § 93 h.

10. [Though vocalized as st. constr., can only be regarded as st. abs.; Kimhi's explanation, 'the chest of (belonging to) some one,' being excluded by 2 Chr. 24. 8 רַעֲרָה וּלְשֹׁנָה, and the statement of Ew., § 286d, that 'the numeral רַעֲרָה one, though mostly used as an adjective, may nevertheless be subordinated to its noun, put in the construct state,' being in the present case inconceivable. Cf. Ko. Syntax, § 310 d. Probably the vocalization here and in Lev. 24. 22, רַעֲרָה וּלְשֹׁנָה, is merely an error of the punctuators.

The statement that the chest was placed beside the altar seems scarcely to accord with the fact that it was given into the charge of the keepers of the threshold, who placed in it the money which they received from persons entering the House of Yahwe. Hence Sta., following the suggestion of the LXX transliteration in Cod. A, οὐτως ἦν, emends רַעֲרָה וּלְשֹׁנָה, a suggestion favoured by Kamp., Kit., Oort. The fact that Macpēḇēth existed subsequently in the Temple appears from chh. 18. 4; 23. 4 ff. Klo. emends רַעֲרָה וּלְשֹׁנָה 'beside the doorpost,' and this agrees well with
XII. 6—XIII. 5

the following כְּסִיָּה Kt., and is favoured by Benz., who objects to the former suggestion on the ground that מַכְּפֶּסְבוֹתָה usually stood in Semitic sanctuaries near the altar and not near the entrance.

|| 2 Chr. 24. 8 וַתִּשְׁפָּן יִֽתְנָא תִּנְפֹּלָה.

Frequentative, 'used to place.' So v. 12. Cf. the imperf. of vv. 14-17. For the reversion to the imperf. with 1 consec. in vv. 11, 12 cf. Dri. Tenses, § 114.

[אשת] LXX, Luc. vó eispeíon, as in v. 11.

11. וַיִּשְׁפָּן Luc. omits, while Pesh. places after וַיֵּעָז.

13. ובַּנְתָּהוּ So ch. 22. 6.

הָלָּכָה 'And for all for which outlay should be made upon the house.' אֶזְרָה יִשְׁרָאֵל, lit. 'for which it (i.e. הבנת v. 12*) should go forth.'

הָלָּכָה 'For repair.' Probably the vocalization should be סְפִּיָּה 'to repair it'; cf. Luc., Pesh., Targ. So Klo., Benz.

17. וַיִּשְׁפָּן וַיִּשְׁפָּן Luc. omits, while Pesh. places after וַיֵּעָז.

The reference appears to be to fines in money. Cf. Wellh. Prolegomena, 73.

12. 18–22. Closing events of the reign of Jehoash, summarised by R⁰.

Ch. 12. 18–22 forms the substance of 2 Chr. 24. 23–27.

18. וַיֹּאמְרוּ Cf. I. 3. 16 note.


22. וַיִּשְׁפָּן || 2 Chr. 24. תְּרוּמָה וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם לְמָהָרַת וְשֵׁם LXX, Luc. add 22. וַיִּשְׁפָּן וַיִּשְׁפָּן suitcase. So Klo., Benz.


R⁰ frames short notices from the Annals.

18. 3. וַיֹּאמְרוּ לכָּל 'All the days,' viz. of Jehoahaz. Cf. note on I. 5. 15. The statement is made rather loosely if the events of v. 5 belong to this reign.

4. וַיֹּאמְרוּ For the expression cf. I. 13. 6 note.

5. וַיָּשֶׁר Luc.cai εἶχον αὐτῶν, i.e. בַּנְתָּהוּ.

6. וַיֹּאמְרוּ Luc. add εἶχον τὴν ῥήματα ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ αὐτῶν.

7. וַיֹּאמְרוּ Not strictly 'in their tents,' but 'in their homes.' Cf. I. 8. 66; Judg. 19. 9, and the phrase of I. 12. 16; 2 Sam. 20. 1.
7. The reference of יי is to v. 4b, and the subject of רפא is not Yahwe (Th., Kamp., Kit.) nor Hazael (Benz.), but is indefinite (יָשֹׁעַ; cf. I. 1. 6 note on יָשֹׁעַ):—'For there was not left to Jehoahaz &c.' So LXX, Luc. οὐχ ὄντες δερελίθησιν, Vulg. non sunt dediticii, Pesh. [א"א] כְּהַמָּה {א"א}.

ןו"ל] 'For treading.' Klo. emends פְּלִלָּא .after Luc. εἰς τοῦ λευκοῦ, and so Kamp., Benz., Oort. The change is unnecessary.

After v. 7 Luc. inserts v. 23 of MT. Probably this is correct. The mention of Jehoash's successes against Aram would form a reason for transferring the verse from its position in Luc. to that which it occupies in MT., whilst no reason can be cited for the converse change. Again, it is clear that the position assigned by Luc. to vv. 12, 13 MT. is correct; and this creates a strong presumption in favour of the position of v. 23 in Luc.


R P vv. 10-13; two Elisha-narratives from North Palestinian sources, vv. 14-19, 20, 21; short notices from the Annals framed by R P vv. 22-25.


10. [בְּשֵׁנָה שֶלָּשִׁים יָעֹד] This synchronism disagrees with the statement of v. 1, that Jehoahaz, who reigned seventeen years, came to the throne in the twenty-third year of Jehoash. We should therefore expect the synchronism to be בְּשֵׁנָה שֶלָּשִׁים יָעֹד in the thirty-ninth year'; and this alteration agrees with ch. 14. 1, where the second year of Jehoash of Israel synchronizes with the accession of Amaziah.


12, 13. These two verses appear in Luc. at the close of the chapter, a position which, in accordance with the scheme of R P, is clearly correct. Luc. also replaces the unusual formula יָשֹׁעַ in v. 13 by the regular εἰς ἔβασιν αὐτοῦ in v. 13b by the regular καὶ ἔβασιν αὐτοῦ ἕως αὐτοῦ at the end of v. 13b.
The formula for the close of this reign is repeated in ch. 14. 15, 16, where it is due to the preceding account of Jehoash in relationship to Amaziah. As this narrative, however, forms part of the history of the reign of Amaziah, the introduction of vv. 15, 16 breaks the connexion, and is probably the work of a later hand. The repetition is not found in Luc.

14. Not, as RV., 'whereof he died,' but, 'whereof he was to die.' Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 39 B.

17. Cf. Gen. 50. 1 'whereof he died.' LXX omits through oversight.

18. Luc. λαβον ἀπὸ βραχήν. Probably, 'kept on coming.'

19. Δ'ουρουκνούμιον. Winckler (Alltest. Untersuchungen, 66) gives reasons for identifying this king with Mari', king of Damascus, who was brought into subjection by the Assyrian king Ramman-nirari III in his campaign against the nations of the West, between b.c. 806-803. Cf. KB. i. 191; Winckler, Keilinschrift. Textbuch, 12 f.

21. 'when the (new) year came.' Cf. the phrase of I. 20. 22, 26 as though for νῦν ἀπὸ ἕτος, an Aramaic construction. Benz. emends νῦν 'yearly' (?)


Ch. 14. 1-14, 17-22 = 2 Chr. 25. 1-4, 11, 17-28; 26. 1, 2.

RD embodies short notices from the Annals, together with a complete narrative (vv. 8-14; cf. p. 215) from an unknown source.


3. 4. וּתְנַתָּה | | 2 Chr. 25. 2b sums up the limitations to the favourable verdict in the terse statement נִבְּלָה הָאָדָמן וּמָלַת כָּלָה.

4. וְתָתֹן יָמוֹם | | Cf. I. 3. 2, 3 note.

5. וְכִ֣י וּמָלַ֑ת כָּלָ֔ה | LXX, Luc. omit.

6. וְכִ֣י וּמָלַ֑ת כָּלָ֔ה Citation is made by RD directly from Deut. 24. 16. For וְכִ֣י קַֽמִּי Q're, Deut. reads יָמִּים. || 2 Chr. 25. 4 וַיֵּלֶד.

7. וְכִ֣י וּמָלַ֑ת הַמּוֹרָ֔ה The emphatic וּמָלַת (almost 'It was he who smote &c.') occurs again vv. 22, 25; 15. 35b; 18. 4, 8, and may be regarded as a mark of the style of RD in connecting together detached notices relating to one particular king.

8. וּמָלַ֥ת כָּלָ֖ה Kt. is supported by || 2 Chr. 25. 11; 1 Chr. 18. 12; Q're יִתְנַתָּה יִתְנַתָּה by 2 Sam. 8. 13; Ps. 60. 2.

9. וְכִ֣י וּמָלַ֑ת הָאָדָ֔מן Perfect with weak ו, a mark of decadence in style, due not to RD, but to his source. So elsewhere in later extracts from the Annals, ch. 18. 4; 21. 4, 6. The style of RD is always, like that of Deuteronomy his model, of the best (cf. e.g. ch. 17); the style of the extracts is on a level with that of the lengthy narrative ch. 22. 3-23. 25, and may be taken as representing the popular style (as distinct from the prophetic or literary style) of the closing years of the kingdom of Judah.

10. וְכִ֣י וּמָלַ֑ת הָאָדָ֔מן Cf. Judg. 1. 36; Isa. 16. 1; 42. 11 (יִתְנַתָּה without article). The usual identification with Petra (cf. Baed. 206) is denied by Buhl, Edomites, 34 ff. || 2 Chr. 25. 11 finds reference to 'the crag' from which ten thousand captive Edomites were thrown headlong. The name יִתְנַתָּה (LXX, Luc. קֵבָֹּדוֹ) as an Edomite city does not appear elsewhere.

11. וְכִ֣י וּמָלַ֑ת הָאָדָ֔מן Cf. I. 3. 16 note.

12. וְכִ֣י וּמָלַ֑ת הָאָדָ֔מן Probably perf. with weak ו and thy heart hath lifted
Another occurrence is found in v. 14 הָעַל. Cf. note on this up. ıv. 7.

'Enjoy your honour' ('let yourself be honoured').

The force of ἐπιστεύειν is sarcastic: 'Pray, why?' Cf. I. 2. 22 note.

Luc., Vulg. presuppose as in || 2 Chr. 25. 23, probably correctly.

Read מֵא רָשָׁפֶנוּ with Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ., || 2 Chr.

The word רָשָׁפֶנוּ Cf. 2 Chr. 26. 9; Jer. 31. 38. A חָפַשי is mentioned in Zech. 14. 10.

is omitted in || 2 Chr. 25. 24, and it is therefore possible that the word may be a later insertion made to supply the missing verb, which may have been רָשָׁפֶנוּ, or מֵא following after מֵא רָשָׁפֶנוּ. Cf., however, מֵא רָשָׁפֶנוּ v. 10 note.


After מֵא רָשָׁפֶנוּ, LXX adds kal πάρα ἀν καὶ (Luc. δόμα) ἐνυλογεῖδ'.

An old Amorite city, several times named in the Tell el-Amarna inscriptions; probably the modern Tell el-Ḥasi some distance east of Gaza, and close to the south of 'Ajlūn, i.e. Eglon. Cf. Smith, Geogr. 234; Baed. 140; Buhl, 191 ff.

Luc. adds פָּנָיו. Pesh. [כֵּן] conforms to || 2 Chr. 26. 1 פָּנָיו.

 Cf. note on מֵא רָשָׁפֶנוּ v. 7.


Rv frames short notices from the Annals.

The usual phrase is מַלְאָל חֶסְדֵּיהֶם מָשָּׂרָה, and this appears in LXX, Targ., while Luc. combines the two readings.

Luc. καὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕν ἑταρχήσαντα καὶ ἐν Σαμερίᾳ. ıv. 8. 65 note.

Mentioned again in the description of the territory assigned to the tribe of Zebulun, Josh. 19. 13. Tradition, both
Christian and Mohammedan, places the tomb of Jonah at *el-Meshhed*, about three miles to the north-east of Nazareth, and this village is therefore usually regarded as the site of Gath Hepher. Rob. *BR.* ii. 350; *Baed.* 285; Buhl, 219.

26. [As vocalized דלע 'rebellious' gives no sense. The Verss. render 'bitter,' which is doubtless the meaning intended, but fem. דלע is out of agreement with masc. דלע. Hence Kamp. would emend הא דא יד, a suggestion favoured by Benz., Kit. It is simpler to transpose the י of הא, and to read דא 'the very bitter affliction of Israel.'


28. [Certainly corrupt. The rendering of RV., Kamp., 'How he recovered Damascus, and Hamath, (which had belonged) to Judah, for Israel,' cannot be obtained from the text; reference in such terms to the state of affairs under David is impossible, since David's kingdom is never designated as 'Judah'; and, even if such reference could be substantiated, it would be untrue, since Hamath never formed part of David's kingdom (cf. *2 Sam.* 8. 9 ff.). LXX, Luc., Vulg., Targ. present the same text as MT., but Pesh. reads נינא ממסכלמל מוסכלמל יבשה וכשת, i.e. by substitution of נינא for נינא 'and restored Damascus and Hamath to Israel.' This text is adopted by Ew., Th., Kit., Oort, but is directly contradictory, as regards Hamath, to the statement of v. 25a. Winckler (*Ger.* i. 147 f.) takes בִּשֵּׁף in the sense 'drove back' (cf. *Isa.* 36. 9; the שֵׁף in *Isa.* 28. 6), and supposes that some words have fallen out after נינא which would have explained the connexion with נינא; while Klo. disposes of the reference to Hamath, boldly emending בִּשֵּׁף נינא 'the very bitter suffering of Israel.'

If it might be supposed that נינא had been misplaced from the preceding sentence, very slight alteration would give the text נינא נינא נינא נינא נינא נינא 'and

---

1 Schrader (*COT.* ad loc.) reads similarly נינא נינא.
how he fought with Damascus, and how he turned away the wrath of Yahwe from Israel.' Cf. ch. 10. 32.

29. Before מַעַרְסֶל מִלְּכָּא שָׁלֹּם the words מַעַרְסֶל מִלְּכָּא שָׁלֹּם, in accordance with the usual formula, have probably fallen out. So Luc. οὐκ ἐπέστρεψ εἰς Σαμαρεία, and, in part, Pesh. מָלֵא חַמֶּם חַמֶּם.


Ch. 15. 2, 3, 5–7 = 2 Chr. 26. 3, 4, 21–23.

Rn frames short notices from the Annals.

15. 1. מַעַרְסֶל This name appears in ch. 14. 21; 15. 1, 7, 17, 23, 27; and in the form מַעַרְסֶל in ch. 15. 6, 8. מַעַרְסֶל is used in ch. 15. 13, 30; מַעַרְסֶל in ch. 15. 32, 34. מַעַרְסֶל is read in place of מַעַרְסֶל in v. 13 by LXX, Luc., Vulg., Targ., and by LXX, Luc. in v. 32. In v. 30, LXX Αχάς, Luc. omits. מַעַרְסֶל is uniformly substituted for מַעַרְסֶל by Pesh. The form מַעַרְסֶל occurs in ch. 21. 18; cf. note ad loc.

Outside Kings, with the exception of 1 Chr. 3. 12 מַעַרְסֶל, מַעַרְסֶל is used in 2 Chr. 26. 1–27. 2 (13 times), and in Isa. 1. 1; 6. 1; 7. 1; מַעַרְסֶל in Hos. 1. 1; Am. 1. 1; Zech. 14. 5.

The supposed reference to this king in the Assyrian inscriptions under the name As-rî-ya-a-u (COT. i. 208 ff.) is denied by Winckler (Allorient. Forschungen, i. 1 ff.): cf. also Maspero, iii. p. 150, note 3.

4. מַעַרְסֶל This meaning is obscure. RV. 'a several house,' i.e. lit. 'a house of separateness.' So Targ. paraphrases מַעַרְסֶל 'and he dwelt outside of Jerusalem'; Pesh. מַעַרְסֶל, however, according to the root-meaning, should denote not separateness but freedom. Klo.'s suggestion is noteworthy: מַעַרְסֶל 'in his house at freedom,' i.e. not under restraint. מַעַרְסֶל is thus used adverbially, like מַעַרְסֶל Gen. 9. 23. Stade (ZATW. vi. 156 ff.) emends מַעַרְסֶל מַעַרְסֶל 'in the winter-house.'

 Cf. 1. 4. 6 note.

15. 8–12. Zechariah, king of Israel.

Rn frames short notices from the Annals.

10. מַעַרְסֶל Senseless; the rendering 'before the people,'
adopted by RV. after Pesh., Targ., Vulg., being out of the question. We should, doubtless, follow Luc. in 'מְדָאִים, and emend יִבְנְיַסֶּה in Ibleam.' On the situation of Ibleam cf. ch. 9. 27 note.

12. 'וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה]' Cf. ch. 10. 30.


R^0 frames short notices from the Annals.

16. תַּמְשִׁית] Clearly not the יָשָׁב of I. 5. 4 on the Euphrates. Th. emends מָאָב, a town which lay in the territory of Ephraim near to the border of Manasseh; Josh. 16. 8; 17. 7, 8. This suggestion, which is borne out by Luc. Talm., is adopted by Buhl (Geogr. 178), Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

'וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה] Slightly corrupt. Read, after LXX, Pesh., as יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְיַסֶּה יִבְנְy יִבְנְy יִb


R^0 frames short notices from the Annals.

17. תַּמְשִׁית] Mentioned by Tiglath-Pileser III as Mi-ni-hi-im-mi of Samaria in a list of tributary kings, B.C. 738; COT. i. 215; Dri. Authority, 98.

18. לֹא מֲשָׁל] LXX ὅπερ μακαρίω, i.e. לֹא מֲשָׁל—correct.

18, 19. 'וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה] Read, with LXX, Luc., וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה 'In his days came up Pul &c.' So moderns. 'וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה at the end of v. 18 is an unusual addition; and v. 19 in MT. commences abruptly, and needs the mark of connexion which is supplied by וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה as used elsewhere by R^0 (cf. I. 16. 34 note).


'וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה] LXX omits.

20. 'וֹ לֹא אָבְרֵי אֲסָרָה] 'And Menahem imposed (lit. brought forth) the money upon Israel'; so RV. 'exacted ... from.' Such a use of the Hiph'il of מֶשֶׁר is, however, without a parallel; and probably Klo. is correct in emending מֶשֶׁר מֶשֶׁר מֶשֶׁר מֶשֶׁר מֶשֶׁr מֶשֶׁר מֶשֶׁr M;
XV. 12-27

So Benz., Kit. may then be supposed to have been introduced in imitation of ch. 12. 12, 13, after the corruption of ווש into ווש.


Rφ frames a short notice (v. 25) from the Annals.

23. וושנש] Luc. Địaא דינ.


Rφ frames notices from the Annals (vv. 29-30).

27. והש לארשי] The Assyrian inscriptions do not admit of a reign of such a length. Tiglath-Pileser mentions Menahem as his tributary in b.c. 738 (cf. note on v. 17), and also refers to the de-thronement and execution of Pekah in b.c. 734-732 (cf. v. 30 note).

Thus, even supposing b.c. 738 to have been the last year of Menahem, we have at most six years for the reigns of Pekahiah and Pekah. If Pekahiah reigned two years (i.e. possibly a little more than one year), Pekah may have reigned from four to five years.

Hommel (Hastings, BD. i. 186) comments on the fact that exactly the same things are related of Pekahiah as of Pekah,
and that the names are virtually the same, and deduces the infer­ence that there really existed only one king Pekah (or Pekahiah), who reigned two years, between Menahem and Hoshea.

29. The account of this campaign is contained, in a somewhat mutilated condition, in the Annals of Tiglath-Pileser. Cf. Rost, 78 ff.; Dri. Authority, 98 ff.

The site is uncertain. Conder (Lists, 38; and in Hastings, BD., s. v.) cites Yarnu near Tyre, but Buhl (Geogr. 229) maintains that this situation is too far west of the other places named. Guérin's identification with Hunin, west of the Upper Jordan, is mentioned by Buhl (Geogr. 237). The place of the same name mentioned in Josh. 16. 6, 7 on the border of Ephraim is too far south to be identical.


The statement of Tiglath-Pileser (cf. Rost, 80 ff.), 'Pa-ka-ḥa (Pekah) their king they slew, A-u-si' (Hoshea) to reign over them I appointed,' makes it clear that the revolution was effected under the auspices of Assyria.

Clearly an erroneous statement. Pekah's operations against Judah, in alliance with Rezin, which appear to have been begun during Jotham's reign (v. 37), were carried on into the reign of Ahaz; ch. 16. 5 ff.; Isa. 7. 1 ff.


Ch. 15. 33, 34, 35b, 36, 38 = 2 Chr. 27. 1–3 a, 7–9. The whole account is cast by R.

32. At the end of the verse Luc. adds εἰς Ἰσραήλ.

35. Cf. I. 3. 2, 3 note.

37. Cf. ch. 10. 32 note.

Frequently mentioned by Tiglath-Pileser as Ra-būm-nu.
His predecessor upon the throne of Damascus was perhaps הַלּוֹדֶךְ, or more correctly הָלַךְ, to whom allusion is made in Isa. 7. 6. Cf. Winckler, *Altest. Untersuchungen*, 74.


Ch. 16. 2–4, 19, 20 = 2 Chr. 28. 1–4, 26, 27.

Verses 1–9, 17–20 contain notices from the Annals, framed by R.P. Verses 10–16 form a continuous narrative, probably derived from the same source as ch. 11; 12. 5–17. See p. 307.

16. i. יָנָשָה Tiglath-Pileser mentions, in a list of tributaries, *Ya-u-ḥa-si* of Judah, i.e. יָהוּ-בַּשְׁמִי, the full form of the name יהוּ. The date is b.c. 728, the last year but one of Tiglath-Pileser. *KB*. ii. 20 f.; Rost, 72 f.; *COT*. i. 225; *Dri. Authority*, 100.

2. There is clearly some discrepancy between the statements of this verse and ch. 18. 2. If Ahaz died at the age of thirty-six (20 + 16), and Hezekiah was twenty-five years old at his accession, then Ahaz must have become a father at the age of eleven!

3. [Cf. I. 14. 24 note.]

4. [Cf. I. 14. 23 note.]

5. [Cf. I. 3. 16 note.]

6. [Cf. I. 14. 1 note.]

It is quite clear that the Massoretes are correct in reading [כִּי]. and that this correction carries with it the correction of the preceding יִשָּׁר into יִשָּׁר (cf. I. 9. 26; 22. 48 f.; II. 14. 7, 22). So Th., Sta., Kamp., Oort. Probability is also in favour of Klo.'s emendation יֵשָּׁר in place of יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר. So Benz., Kit. It is far more likely that the king of Edom should have seized the opportunity of Ahaz's engagement with the northern confederacy in order to once more gain possession of his seaport town, than that the king of Aram should have despatched a purposeless expedition against the remote eastern point of Ahaz's dominions.

[Cf. I. 8. 8 note.]

1 The reference of 'the son of Tab'el' is most naturally to Rezin. The name Tab'el ('El is wise') is Aramaic, and identical in form with Tabrimmon, I. 16. 18.


9. ריז LXX omits; Luc. ליע הדות (יא רן). Benz., Kit., Oort, on the ground of the omission, suppose that the name is a later insertion derived from Am. 1. 5. The situation of ריז is unknown. According to Am. 9. 7 the district was the original home of the Aramaeans.

10. Probably an error for the form יִשְׁלְמָש, which appears in Chr., and is regular in Syriac, and in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan.

11. LXX omits from down to מְרַשָׁמַש in v. 12, probably through homoioteleuton, though the narrative runs quite smoothly without the words omitted. Luc. agrees with MT. except for the omission of the first מְרַשָׁמַש before רַשָׁמַש.

12. קִירְבּ LXX omits.


The original text must have read simply, and is a gloss from v. 15b, correctly distinguishing the old altar from the new. LXX omits מְרַשָׁמַש thus, causing it to appear that the ritual described in v. 13 was still carried on upon the old (brazen) altar. This is adopted by R. Sm. (Relig. Sem. 3, note L), who further reads מְרַשָׁמַש, as in v. 12, for מְרַשָׁמַש, thus making the verse from that point to be ‘an elaborate description of the new ritual introduced by the king.’ The context, however, desiderates the precise statement of MT. as to the new position of the brazen altar, which was clearly supplanted by the new altar (v. 15a), and devoted only to a special purpose (v. 15b). The LXX omission may thus be regarded as merely due to homoioteleuton.

15. קִירְבּ Kt. with pronoun-suffix anticipating the object, as in Syriac. Cf. I. 19. 21 note. Possibly, however, the words מְרַשָׁמַש may be a later explanatory insertion.
The distinction appears to coincide with the ritual of Ezek. 46. 13–15, where there is only mention of a morning εὐλογία. In ch. 3. 20 the term εὐλογία is applied to the morning sacrifice, and in I. 18. 29, 36 to the evening sacrifice. In the time of P the εὐλογία has become both a morning and evening institution; Num. 28. 1 ff. Jer. 14. 12 draws a distinction, as in our passage, between τὰυτά and ἡμερήσιμα; but it is by no means to be hence inferred (R.V.) that εὐλογία therefore possesses the restricted sense of 'meal-offering,' as in P. Cf. note on εὐλογία I. 18. 29; Wellh. Prolegomena, 79, note 1.

[The significance is obscure. ἀνακάθαρσις means to examine (lit. divide, and so presumably look at in detail; cf. Ar. ἀνακαλύπτω, cleave, slit). This meaning is clear for most of the occurrences in Bib. Heb.:—Lev. 13. 36 'The priest shall not examine (the suspected leper) for the yellow hair'; Lev. 27. 33 'he shall not examine (the tithe of the herd and flock) whether it be good or bad'; Ezek. 34. 11, 12 'will look after (or look for, i.e. search out) my flock'; Prov. 20. 25, probably 'after vowing, he begins to make inquiry,' i.e. to examine his financial position (cf. Toy ad loc.). Ps. 27. 4 ἄνακαθάρσεως is involved in the same ambiguity as our passage; 'to look at his Temple,' or 'to make inquiry in his Temple.' In Rabb. Heb. ἀνακάθαρσις is used of examining sacrificial animals for blemishes.

Accordingly, the explanation of our passage least open to objection is that of AV., R.V., R. Sm. (Relig. Sem.¹, note L), 'and the brazen altar shall be for me to inquire by'; i.e. lit. to investigate, sc. the oracle, perhaps by examination of portions of the sacrifice. Cf. the action ascribed to the king of Babylon, Ezek. 21. 26 Ἀνακάθαρσις. So approximately Pesh. ἀνακάθαρσις 'shall be for me to make request by.' Less probable is the explanation of Klo., 'for me to look at'; the idea of close scrutiny which is implied in the verb being inconsistent as applied to the altar, which must
have been long familiar to the king, and which was (on this explanation) about to undergo degradation. Least probable, and without support from usage elsewhere, is the explanation of Kamp., Benz., Kit., 'shall be for me to think of,' i.e. 'I must decide at my leisure what is to become of it.' Cf. Vulg. *erit paratum ad voluntatem meam.*

17. The construction is impossible. Probably we should read *mēmetithnim* with Verss., or else emend *mēmetithnim* to *mēmetithnim.* Cf. Kamp. Klo., Benz. suppose that ו תAREA ה should be read מַעֲלֵהַמִּים. On *mēmetithnim* cf. I. 7. 28 note.

וְיָרוּ We should expect ינִּירוּ. Cf. I. 7. 38 ff.

The construction is probably, as in v. 14, a later addition.

' A pediment.' Cf. the use of קֹדֶשׁ 'pavement,' 2 Chr. 7. 3; al.; and the participle קְדֶשׁ 'pavement.' Song 3. 10.

18. Highly obscure. Q're קְדֶשׁ, if correct, should denote something *covered in;* hence RV. 'the covered way (marg. covered place) for the Sabbath.' LXX, however, reads *ῥήμα θείου* τῆς καβιδπας, i.e. קֹדֶשׁ שָׁם לִי; cf. I. 10. 19. Pesh. explains קֹדֶשׁ לַחֹל; Targ. אֶת הַקָּדֶשׁ *רֹפֶס* (T•ixos) סְלֹם.

17. 1-6. Hoshea, king of Israel. Fall of the kingdom.

Winckler (*Alltest. Untersuchungen,* 15 ff.) argues with much cogency that in vv. 3-6 we have a combination of two narratives. Supposing the narrative to be single, the course of events can only have been as follows. Hoshea comes to the throne as the vassal of Tiglath-Pileser (ch. 15. 30 note); he revolts against Shalmaneser, and is again reduced to vassalage (ch. 17. 3); he again revolts, and is deposed and made prisoner (ch. 17. 4); the king of Assyria (Shalmaneser) besieges Samaria for three years (ch. 17. 5); at the end of three years (in the first year of Sargon; v. 6 note) Samaria falls, and the population is deported to Assyria. It is, however, highly improbable that Israel remained for three years without a king, after the deposition of Hoshea, and, as a matter of fact, v. 6 states that the fall of the capital took place 'in the ninth year of Hoshea,' i.e. in his ninth reigning year. Ch. 18. 9b-11 describes
only one campaign of Assyria against Israel and the fall of Samaria after a three years' siege, and it is noticeable that this account is nearly verbally identical with ch. 17. 5, 6. Probably therefore ch. 17. 3, 4 represents another and independent account drawn from a different source to ch. 17. 5, 6=18. 9b-11 (Annals). The form of the statements of v. 3 suggests that the writer was ignorant of the true state of affairs, viz. that Hoshea was from the first a vassal of Assyria, and supposed that his dependence was the direct result of a campaign (יִלְּטֶל הָלֶחלק) distinct from that in which he lost his throne (v. 4). Winckler meets the difficulty by the supposition that רד read in his source רד inasmuch as Hoshea was (already) his vassal, &c.; but such a construction is impossible.

17. 1. 'ו מֵעַשְׂא] The synchronism is inconsistent with the preceding synchronisms of ch. 16, 17, but agrees, as Benz. notices, with the statement of Luc. in ch. 16. 23 as to the length of the reign of Pekahiah.

2. 'ו מֵעַשְׂא] Luc. παμα χωτος τως γενομένως λεπροθεν αὐτού, i.e. לְמֵעַשְׂא; cf. I. 14. 9; 16. 25, 30, 33. The reason why רד should make exception in favour of Hoshea is not apparent from his narrative; while, on the other hand, it is eminently suitable to his scheme that the last king of Israel should be painted in the blackest colours of all. Cf. vv. 7 ff.


100. Sargon (KB. ii. 54 f.) mentions סיבע general (turban) of Egypt as defeated by him, together with Hanunu, king of Gaza, at Raphia (c. 720), but he expressly distinguishes him from Pharaoh (Pir'u), king of Egypt. If, therefore, with Schrader, we vocalize מַשְׂא and identify with סיבע, it is clear that the title מַשְׂא is at any rate inapplicable at the time when Hoshea's overtures were made. See, however, Winckler's note, Keilschrift. Sargon, p. 101.

Luc., in place of 'ו מֵעַשְׂא מֵע, reads πτόσε ἀδραμήλεξ τῶν Ἀλβίων τῶν
only one campaign of Assyria against Israel and the fall of Samaria after a three years' siege, and it is noticeable that this account is nearly verbally identical with ch. 17. 5, 6. Probably therefore ch. 17. 3, 4 represents another and independent account drawn from a different source to ch. 17. 5, 6 = 18. 9b-11 (Annals). The form of the statements of v. 3 suggests that the writer was ignorant of the true state of affairs, viz. that Hoshea was from the first a vassal of Assyria, and supposed that his dependence was the direct result of a campaign (נִלְתָּן לָעַנד) distinct from that in which he lost his throne (v. 4). Winckler meets the difficulty by the supposition that רד read in his source רד (frequentative?) in place of רד—'inasmuch as Hoshea was (already) his vassal, &c.'; but such a construction is impossible.

17. 1. [11 הַשָּׁם] The synchronism is inconsistent with the preceding synchronisms of chs. 16, 17, but agrees, as Benz. notices, with the statement of Luc. in ch. 16. 23 as to the length of the reign of Pekahiah.

2. [11 כִּי] Luc. παμπ πάντας τοῦς γενομένους ζημποSOY τηντυ, i.e. כִּי阴影 ימי; cf. I. 14. 9; 16. 25, 30, 33. The reason why רד should make exception in favour of Hoshea is not apparent from his narrative; while, on the other hand, it is eminently suitable to his scheme that the last king of Israel should be painted in the blackest colours of all. Cf. vv. 7ff.

4. [גִּל] LXX ἀδίκων, i.e. ἰη, adopted by Th., Kamp., Benz., Kit.

[11 כְּ] Generally identified with Šabatu, who founded the twenty-fifth (Ethiopian) dynasty. Cf. COT. ad loc.; Dri. Authority, 100. Sargon (KB. ii. 54f.) mentions Siš'ū general (turan) of Egypt as defeated by him, together with Hanunu, king of Gaza, at Raphiah (a.c. 720), but he expressly distinguishes him from Pharaoh (Pir'u), king of Egypt. If, therefore, with Schrader, we vocalize קִז and identify with Siš'ū, it is clear that the title יְרָשׁ is at any rate inapplicable at the time when Hoshea's overtures were made. See, however, Winckler's note, Keilschrift. Sargons, p. 101.

Luc., in place of כְּ מִד֫ לֶנְ, reads πρὸς 'adelphia τῶν Ἀλσώνα τῶν
6. 'Not Shalmaneser, as in v. 3, but Sargon; cf. the great triumphal inscription ll. 23 ff.:—'Samaria I besieged and conquered; 27,290 of its inhabitants I carried into captivity, fifty chariots I seized from them; the rest of them I allowed to retain their possessions(?); I set my officers over them; the tribute of the former king I laid upon them.' KB. ii. 54 f.; Dri. Authority, 101. Schrader (COT. ad loc.) quotes evidence to show that the conquest of Samaria must have taken place in the year of Sargon's accession, i.e. b.c. 722.

'Ha-bur, a tributary of the Euphrates; Gu-za-na, which is assigned to the district of Mesopotamia. It is doubtful, but may be Halaḫahu in Mesopotamia. Cf. COT. ad loc.

17. 7–23. Commentary by R^D upon the causes which brought about the downfall of the Northern Kingdom.

The phraseology of R^D is very marked throughout the section. Notice v. 7 (I. 9. 6 note); v. 8 (I. 14. 24 note); v. 10 (I. 14. 23 note); v. 11, 17 (I. 14. 9 note); v. 12 (I. 15. 12 note); v. 13 (I. 13. 33 note); v. 19 (I. 2. 3 note); v. 23 (as in I. 9. 7; 21. 10; 24. 2); v. 14 note; v. 15 (I. 11. 5 note); v. 15 (I. 16. 2 note); v. 17 (I. 21. 20, 25); v. 17 (I. 11. 6 note); v. 18 (I. 11. 9 note); v. 19, 20 (ch. 3. 3 note).

Verses 19, 20 are certainly a later insertion, subsequent to the commencement of the Judaean exile, and due to R^D. The opening of v. 21, 'For he rent &c.,' clearly refers immediately to the statement of v. 18, 'was very angry &c.' but the sequence is destroyed by the interpolation, v. 21 being deprived of all point. The whole reference of the section is to the causes which brought about
the rejection of the kingdom of Israel, no reference being elsewhere made to Judah except in v. 13, where it is probably by the same hand as vv. 19, 20.

Stade (ZATW. vi. 163 f.) regards vv. 7–17 as an exilic addition, later than R^D, upon the grounds that the writer of these verses ascribes Molech-worship (v. 17a) and Assyrian star-worship (v. 16b) to the Northern Kingdom—the abuses which later on were rife in the Southern Kingdom under Manasseh (chs. 21. 3, 6), and also because certain phrases appear to exhibit the influence of Jeremiah; cf. v. 13 with Jer. 18. 11; 25. 5; 35. 15; 36. 3, 7; ‘ライ with Jer. 7. 25 f.; 11. 7 f.; v. 15b with Jer. 2. 5. The reflections embodied in these verses are, however, in strict accordance with R^D’s plan which runs throughout his work, as the number of phrases above cited as characteristic of his hand sufficiently show, nor is it at all unnatural that the editor, who worked not many years after Josiah had removed from Judah the foreign abuses of Manasseh’s reign, should ascribe the same kind of religious abuses to the kingdom of Israel, side by side with the worship of Yahwe under the form of a calf. Nor, again, need the phrases above mentioned imply dependence upon the written prophecies of Jeremiah, any more than need other phrases used by R^D elsewhere, in common with Jeremiah^1, go to prove that R^D and Jeremiah were one and the same person. All that clearly emerges from the fact of such resemblances is that the two writers were members of one prophetic school of thought, i.e. the Deuteronomic. Cf. Dri. LOT^s p. 203 at end.

7. [Now it (viz. the foregoing) came to pass because &c.,] Luc. καὶ ἑξένειτο ἐργῇ κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ, δὲ ὁ ὁμαρτιων κτ.λ., i.e. προσεγγίστηκεν—superior to MT.

1 Cf. J 1. 8. 43 note; 1. 9. 7 note; עָבַר יִשְׂרָאֵל יִרְאוּ וְגוֹ 1. 9. 8 note; also 1. 13. 33 note; אַל יָדַע מִשְּׁכִיתוֹ 1. 14. 10 note; הָרָו נֶפֶשׁ רֵעָה אָל (תֵּל יִשְׂרָאֵל) ch. 9. 7; 17. 13, 23; 21. 10; 24. 2; Jer. 7. 25; 25. 4; 26. 5; 29. 19; 35. 15; 44. 4. Other resemblances, from the later chh. of 2 Kings, are cited by Dri. LOT^s p. 203.
8. senseless. Cf. RV's attempt at a rendering. No doubt is a corruption of , a doublet of the preceding three words; and 'who performed (them, sc. the statutes of the nations) is probably a marginal gloss made subsequently to the corruption to explain the occurrence of 'the kings of Israel' in this connexion.

9. V HV. The rendering of RV. 'did secretly' can scarcely be maintained, and LXX ὑπελεγαν, 'clad themselves in,' in accordance with the use of ἀνάρτας 'overlay' in 2 Chr., is preferable, if the text be genuine. Pesh., Targ. render vaguely ויאכז, וומכ; and Vulg. offenderunt seems only to be guessing. Klo. emends וירוי 'devised'; cf. Job 13. 4 הָיָה וַיִּשְׁמַר probably 'contrivers of nought' (дробныя думы). So Benz., Kit.

10. So ch. 7. 9.

11. So ch. 18. 8. The expression, as here used, describes the smallest and largest of communities.

12. and suggest קְלָלָה מֵעְרִישָם. This is preferable to the supposition that the text originally read קְלָלָה מֵעְרִישָם simply, and קְלָלָה מֵעְרִישָם came in later as a gloss.

13. So Deut. 10. 16; Jer. 7. 26; 17. 23; 19. 15; Neh. 9. 16, 17, 29; 2 Chr. 30. 8t. Cf. the expressions קְלָלָה מֵעְרִישָם Deut. 31. 27; קְלָלָה מֵעְרִישָם Deut. 9. 6, 13; Ex. 32. 9; 33. 3, 5; 34. 9 [JE].

14. So Deut. 10. 16; Jer. 7. 26; 17. 23; 19. 15; Neh. 9. 16, 17, 29; 2 Chr. 30. 8t. Cf. the expressions קְלָלָה מֵעְרִישָם Deut. 31. 27; קְלָלָה מֵעְרִישָם Deut. 9. 6, 13; Ex. 32. 9; 33. 3, 5; 34. 9 [JE].

15. So LXX, Luc. ὑπερ τῶν νόμων, Pesh. מְדַעַכְו read מְדַעָכְו.

16. On the meaning of the terms used in Hebrew to describe various kinds of divination cf. Dri. on Deut. 18. 10. ספ is uncertain (probably applied in the case of Joseph's cup, Gen. 44. 5, 15, to hydromancy, but also used more generally): ספ=Ar. to divide, x. to get a part allotted to oneself, to draw lots, especially with headless arrows, as is described, in the case of the king of Babylon, in Ezek. 21. 26f. After v. 17b Luc. adds καὶ ἐνιαυτῷ ἑξοφόλον καὶ ἐπεραιφύμαι.

17. For the construction of מ with the negative,
'not...except,' cf. I. 8. 9 מִטֹּבַתָּהוּ כֶּלֶל נֹּאַר וְלָּשׁוּנָּהוּ. The negative is really redundant. Cf., with the same verb, Ex. 8. 5, 7; Deut. 3. 11; 1 Sam. 5. 4.

20. מְסָמֵר] Luc. presupposes יַעֲשֶׂה בְּעַיִם הָעָלָמִים וּלְשָׁנָהוּ מְסָמֵר וְלָּשָׁנָהוּ. The negative is really redundant. 

21. מְסָמֵר] Q're מְסָמֵר is probably correct. 


23. מְסָמֵר] Cf. i. 8. 8 note.

17. 24–41. The foreign settlers in the district of Samaria.

The narrative is certainly composite. Verses 32, 33, 41, in speaking of the races which were settled by the king of Assyria in the cities of Samaria, say that they 'feared Yahwe,' while retaining the worship of their own national deities. In v. 34, on the contrary, it is stated with great emphasis that they 'feared not Yahwe.' Again, while vv. 24–34a refer exclusively to the foreign settlers, and only mention the introduction into their midst of a single priest of Israelitish nationality (v. 28 מִזְמוֹר אֶלֶף), to whom was due their instruction in the worship of Yahwe, vv. 34b–40 are couched in such terms as can only refer to Israelites as such, of however mixed and renegade a strain. Notice especially vv. 35, 38, the reference to the Deuteronomic covenant; v. 36 'Yahwe, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt.'

Thus this latter section must be regarded as a later addition to the narrative of Kings1, referring probably to the Samaritans of post-exilic times. Verse 40b rounds off the interpolation by the repetition of v. 34b—the statement of the older narrative to which the later writer attaches his addition. Verses 24–34a, 41, on the other hand, form, in part at least, an ancient narrative embodied by Rd. Stade (ZATW. vi. 167 ff.) regards vv. 24–28, 41 as the original kernel which has received the later extension, vv. 29–34a. Possibly

---

1 Rd; cf._stage 'ית את וּלְשָׁנָהוּ v. 37 (I. 9. 3 note); וּלְשָׁנָהוּ v. 36 (I. 8. 43 note); v. 36 (I. 9. 3 note); וּלְשָׁנָהוּ v. 35, 37 (I. 9. 6 note).
this latter may be assigned to R\(^{D}\) himself:—v. 32\(^{b}\) resembles I. 12. 31, and in v. 34\(^{a}\) הָעָרִיָּה לֶבַע is an expression commonly employed by R\(^{D}\) (cf. I. 8. 8 note).

24. הָעָרִיָּה] The fact that Sargon imported foreign prisoners of war into Samaria is attested by his inscriptions, though the peoples mentioned are not those of our passage. A mutilated passage, however, in his annals refers to a campaign in his first year (subsequent to the conquest of Samaria) which (as read by Winckler, Alltest. Untersuchungen, 105) was directed against the tribe of Tu'muna, which had apparently allied itself 'with Merodach-Baladan, king of Kaldu, who against the will of the gods had usurped the sovereignty of Babylon.' This was followed by a deportation of prisoners into 'the land Ḫatti,' a term which may include Samaria. In another passage he states that he settled in Samaria 'men of Tamud, Ibādīd, Marsîman, Ḫayāpā, the remote Arbāi inhabiting the desert.' This took place in his seventh year, i.e. b.c. 715. Cf. Delitzsch, Paradies, 304; COT. i. ad loc.; Winckler, Keilschriftexte Sargons, i. 20 f.; KB. ii. 42 f.

טきっと is Kūtit of the inscriptions, the modern Tell-Ibrāhīm, north-east of Babylon. לִבְנַי probably denotes the two Sippars, Sippar son of Šamaš (the sun-god), and Sippar of Anunītu(m), between Bagdad and Babylon. For this identification a form לִבְנַי might have been expected, and this is perhaps to be found in v. 31\(^{b}\) Kt. Some critics, however, have been led by the reference to Sepharvaim in ch. 18. 34=Isa. 36. 19, in close connexion with Ḥamath, Arpad, and Samaria, to infer that its situation is to be sought in the west; and לִבְנַי Ezek. 47. 16 is cited as possibly identical. Cf. Dillmann on Isaiah ad loc. The unknown לִבְנַי is doubtless the same as לִבְנַי of ch. 18. 34—by inference a western state.

Winckler (Alltest. Untersuchungen, 95–107) conjectures that confusion has been introduced into the text between Sargon’s importation and that of Assurbanipal, to which allusion is made in Ezra 4. 8–10. Sargon makes no mention of the capture of
prisoners of war from Babylon and Kutha. Babylon was not besieged by him until B.C. 710, and then he came not as enemy to the Babylonians, but as deliverer from the Chaldean yoke of Merodach-Baladan. His successor, Sennacherib, cannot have formed such a settlement of Babylonian captives, and the same is the case with Esarhaddon, the reference to this king in Ezra 4.2 being clearly an error for Assurbanipal (אֲשֻׂרְבְּנִיָּ֣ל as in Ezra 4.10). Assurbanipal, however, carried out a successful campaign against Sippar, Kutha, and Babylon, all of which are mentioned in ch. 17. 24, supposing מִרְבָּד to be an erroneous alteration of an original מִיָּד. Winckler regards the inclusion of Ḥamath and Awwa as of a piece with this alteration, the reason being that the two names stand together with Sepharvaim (the Syrian city) in the speech of the Rabshakeh, ch. 18. 34. For 'no Assyrian king would have introduced settlers from Ḥamath into Samaria, since such a measure would have failed of its object, viz. the placing of unruly elements at a distance from their native soil. Ḥamathites would not have remained long in Samaria, but would soon have made their escape back to their home which lay so near.' Thus, according to Winckler, the narrative of Kings affords us no authentic account as to the nationality of the peoples introduced into Samaria by Sargon. These arguments are accepted by Benz. It may be doubted, however, whether there is evidence sufficient to substantiate Winckler's theory. For example, in default of precise information as to the reasons which may have influenced Sargon in the disposal of his prisoners of war, the argument by which Winckler rejects the mention of Ḥamath and Awwa appears to be highly arbitrary. Again, Assurbanipal, so far from mentioning any transportation of the people of Sippar, Kutha, and Babylon, definitely states that he allowed the remnant of them to remain in Babylonia (KB. ii. 192 f.). Kit. accepts Winckler's argument with regard to Ḥamath and Awwa, but demurs to his main theory as without basis, either in the Old Testament or in the inscriptions.

26. [Impersonal; ‘And it was told.’]

27. [Luc. אָשֶׁר מְלֹא שֵׁר—certainly correct.]

28. [Luc., Vulg., Pesh. אָשֶׁר מְלֹא שֵׁר, correctly.]

30. [Uncertain. The interpretation of Delitzsch (Paradies, 215) Sakkut-binîtu, ‘supreme judge of the Universe,’ is rejected by Schrader (COT. ad loc.), who suggests identification with Zir-bônî or Zar-pa-ni-tuv, the consort of Marduk. Jensen (ZA. iv. 352) regards ṥâlû as equivalent to banîtu, an epithet of Ishtar. Cheyne (Expos. Times, x. 429) proposes to emend מִלְהַת הָעָלָה, the two names which denote the Babylonian Saturn.

31. [Nergal appears in the inscriptions as the god of Kutha. He is the lord of hell, and the god of war and pestilence. As a destructive agency his symbol is the lion. Jensen (Kosmologie, 476 ff.) explains the name as compounded of Ni+uru+gal= Ni+unu+gal= ‘Lord of the great city,’ or rather ‘dwelling,’ i.e. the Underworld. Cf. also COT. ad loc.

32. [Probably ‘Adar is king’ (or ‘counsellor’). Adar appears as a west Semitic god in the name רַומָה ‘Adar has given’ (Baethgen, Semit. Religionsgeschichte, 54), but is best known as an Assyrian god, the name, according to Schrader, being Akkadian in origin, and originally pronounced A-tar, ‘father of decision.’ Ṣumâ occurs as the name of a son of Sennacherib in ch. 19. 37, a fact which favours the view that we have here the name of an Assyrian deity, and so lends weight to the view (above noticed) that כָנָא denotes Sippar rather than a western city.

33. [Perhaps equivalent to מִלְהַת הָעָלָה, i.e. ‘Anu is king’ (or ‘counsellor’). Anu is the god of heaven, supreme among the deities of Assyria and Babylon.

Kt. (according to Ginsburg, בַּשֵּׁר מֶלָה רַומָּה) seems to make reference to one deity only, and similarly Luc. omits מִלְהַת הָעָלָה, and reads ἀνδρομέλεξ Θεῷ ἐνεφορεῖμυ.

34. [‘From among the whole of them.’ Cf. I. 12. 31 note. LXX, Luc. offer a double version of this verse, the second
corresponding to MT, while the first runs καὶ ἐπικοινώνει τὸν κύριον, καὶ κατάφηλεν τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν υψηλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν Σαμαρεία, ἵνα ἔθνες ἐν πόλει ἐν ᾗ κατάφηλεν ἐν αὐτῷ, i.e. probably ἀναδιόρθωσεν τὸν Ἰς πέλαν (or ἀναδοξάσθη ὁ πάπας τῆς Ἰουδαίας) so that in ἀναδιόρθωσεν it seems to have been ἀναδιόρθωσεν ὁ Ἰς πέλας. This reading bears the stamp of superiority, MT. probably representing the restoration of an imperfect text upon the lines of I. 12. 31.


Ch. 18. 1–8 is mainly the work of RD, based upon the notices of vv. 4, 7b, 8. The substance of vv. 7b, 8 is probably drawn from the Annals. With regard to v. 4 this is not so clear. The verse shows marks of a late style (perfect with weak τ, as in 21. 4, 6; 23. 4ff.), and sketches the outline of a religious reformation which appears in all essentials to have resembled and anticipated the reformation of Josiah. Hence some critics regard the notice as a late and unhistorical interpolation (cf. Stade, Ges. i. 607ff.; ZATW. iii. 8ff.; vi. 170ff.; Wellh., C. 291).

The occurrence of a reformation under Hezekiah is supported by 18. 22 (which must, with the rejection of 18. 4, be likewise branded as a later misconception), and perhaps also by the statement of Jer. 26. 17–19a, which speaks of the influence exercised upon Hezekiah and all Judah by the preaching of Micah the Morashtite. Mic. 1. 5b MT. mentions the ἱλασθήτησα of Jerusalem for reparation; but this passage must not be pressed, because LXX, Pesh., Targ. presuppose a different reading. Certainly Isaiah does not seem to have had in view any centralization of Yahwe's cultus, such as was prominent in Josiah's reformation; but his attacks upon the idol-worship (Isa. 2. 8, 18, 20; 31. 7; cf. 10. 10, 11), tree-worship (1. 29), and necromancy (8. 19), which seem to have been rife in the kingdom of Judah, are in agreement with

1 ἁμαρτία 'sin,' parallel to ἀμαρτία 'transgression,' as in v. 4°. The reading of MT. is, however, accepted by Kit. (Hist. ii. 357), who regards the rendering of the Versions as merely a simplification.
such a movement in the direction of the pure worship of Yahwe. Probably, therefore, as is allowed by Sta. (Gen., loc. cit.), the statement of v. 4b is based upon authentic information as to such a reform, and this has been later on expanded in v. 4a, under the influence of the accomplished fact of Josiah's reformation.

18. 2. [Shortened form of הֶבְלָקִים 2 Chr. 29. 1.]


[Vocalization connects the name with הֶבָּלָקִים, with a formative termination 'brazen one.' It seems certain, however, that the word is connected with הַךְָלָפִים; and, unless there is intended a play upon the similarity in name of the thing 'serpent,' and its material 'brass,' it is possible that the vocalization is incorrect. Cf. Luc. Neobio. For conjectures as to the form and its meaning cf. Heb. Lex. Oxf., s. v.]

5. [Scarce or original. The clumsily connected sentence וַיַּלְמֹלְהוּ וַיְסֻרֵם introduces a statement which we should have expected to occupy the first place (cf. I. 3. 12); and the statement וַיָּשָׁר is in direct contradiction to ch. 23. 25, where Josiah is regarded, from the standpoint of R0, as the ideal of a religious king. Probably therefore we should omit וַיָּשָׁר and the ַלְּלֹא before וַיְסֻרֵם, and read וַיָּשָׁר וַיְסֻרֵם וּלְלֹא וַיָּשָׁר וַיְסֻרֵם וּלְלֹא.]

6. [On the use of וַיְסֻרֵם by R0 cf. note on I. 11. 2.]

[ Cf. ch. 3. 3 note.]

[Luc. וַיָּשָׁר וַיְסֻרֵם וּלְלֹא.]

7. [Probably frequentative, in reference to the repeated occasions depicted by וַיָּשָׁר.] 9-12. A notice from the Annals, introduced by the synchronism of R0, v. 9a, and closed by his comment v. 12. The notice is identical with ch. 17. 5, 6.


Ch. 18. 13, 17—20. 19 = Isa. 36. 1—38. 8; 38. 21—39. 8.

The section vv. 14—16, which is not found in Isaiah, is dis-
tonguished from 18. 13, 17 ff. by the form of the name ריבי (instead of רִיבִי) which occurs also in vv. 1, 10 (Annals). The notice appears to be in strict agreement with the Assyrian record (cf. Append. 5, col. iii. 11 ff.), and is probably a genuine excerpt from the Annals.

It is generally agreed that the narrative of Isa. 36. 1—39. 8 cannot be traced to Isaiah himself, but must be of a considerably later date. Notice the mention of Sennacherib’s death (Isa. 37. 38 || ch. 19. 37), which did not happen until B.C. 681, twenty years after the campaign against Jerusalem, and certainly later than the death of Isaiah. Again, it seems to be clear that the Isaiah section (except 38. 9–20, from another source) must have been extracted from our Book of Kings by the editor of Isa. 1—39. For certain phrases which are due to ר in the Kings-narrative appear also in Isaiah:—cf. לֵיתָן רוֹדָעְבִי ch. 19. 34 || Isa. 37. 35; אֶת אֶשֶר וַרְוָלִים ch. 20. 3 || Isa. 38. 3; and the redactional phrases בָּעָשׁוּ אֱלֹהִים ch. 20. 1 || Isa. 38. 1; בְּעָשׁוּ אֱלֹהִים ch. 20. 12 || Isa. 39. 1. Kings is also superior to Isaiah in the account of Ḥezekiah’s sickness. Isa. 38. 4–8 has been abbreviated; 38. 21, 22 is misplaced.

The Kings-narrative 18. 13, 17–20. 19 seems to represent a combination of three sources. Sta. (ZATW. vi. 174) notices that Isaiah’s threat against Sennacherib occurs three times in similar terms: 19. 7; 19. 28b; 19. 33. The contents of Sennacherib’s letter (19. 10–13) merely repeat in brief that which has already been said by the Rabshakeh (18. 28–35). Again, it is highly improbable that Sennacherib, after hearing the news with regard to Tirḥakāh (19. 9a), should have imagined that the mere dispatch of a letter would be likely to compel Ḥezekiah’s submission, after the failure of previous verbal negotiations. The true sequel to 19. 9a seems to be 19. 36 f.; upon receiving information of Tirḥakāh’s hostile movement, Sennacherib raises the siege of Jerusalem and returns to Assyria. We have, then, two separate accounts of the Assyrian campaign, 18. 13, 17—19. 9a, 36 f., and 19. 9b–35; 19. 9b having probably been slightly modified
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by the redactor. Further, the section 19. 9b–35 itself appears to be composite in character. The taunt-song vv. 21–28, with its accompanying sign vv. 29–31, stands apart from the prosaic statement vv. 32–34. יְם therefore' of v. 32 answers, not to anything in the prophecy preceding, but to v. 20b, שָׁמֹרַת לְאֵל יְשֹׁעַ 'Whereas thou hast prayed ... I have heard'; and, as has been noticed above, vv. 28b, 33 are duplicates of the same statement. Thus vv. 21–31, generally regarded by critics as an authentic prophecy of Isaiah, appear to have been inserted into the midst of the prophetic history 19. 9b–20, 32–34, v. 21a representing the redactor's link.

The narrative of 20. 1–19 probably belongs to the author of one of the two preceding narrative sections. Cheyne, following Duhm, selects the second narrative, 19. 9b ff. Notice, as a point of connexion, the occurrence of a prayer of Hezekiah in each section, 19. 15 ff.; 20. 2 ff. Very possibly the chronological notice at the beginning of 18. 13, 'In the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah,' properly refers to the events of 20. 1–19, and occupies its present position upon the false assumption that Sennacherib's invasion took place in the same year as Hezekiah's sickness and recovery. This arrangement is probably due to R₀, who removed the note of time from its true position at the head of the narrative of 20. 1 ff., replacing it by his synchronistic phrase, 'In those days.' Notice the reference to Assyria in 20. 6. The whole verse, from יִנָּס יְהֹוָה 'and from the hand &c.,' must be due to the author of the mistaken synchronism. Cf. the latter half with 19. 34.

13. The sixth year of Hezekiah for the fall of Samaria, b.c. 722 (v. 10), cannot be reconciled with the fourteenth year for Sennacherib's campaign, b.c. 701, and it seems the best course to regard this latter date as true for the sickness of Hezekiah and the embassy of Merodach-Baladan (ch. 20), which will then fall cir. b.c. 714. Thus Hezekiah's reign may

---

1 Cf. note on ch. 18. 13.
be supposed to have closed B.C. 699, i.e. some fifteen years after B.C. 714 (ch. 20. 6).

'תלנה יבנ' [According to the inscription of the Taylor cylinder, col. iii. l. 13 (cf. *Append. g*), Sennacherib captured forty-six fortified towns, besides innumerable fortresses and small places.

14. וַיֹּשָׁב LXX, Luc., Vulg. supply an object וַיֹּשָׁב.

[ Cf. ch. 14. 19 note.]

The sum is given in the inscription (col. iii. l. 34) as thirty talents of gold and 800 talents of silver. Schrader quotes Brandis for the view that the difference in the statement of the amount of the silver is due to the difference in weight between the Babylonian light and the Palestinian heavy talent.

16. 'ו תמא וַיֹּשָׁב[ Cf. I. 14. 1 note.]

17. התנ Assyrian *tartānu* or *tartānu*, title of the commander-in-chief of the Assyrian army. || Isa. 36. 2 omits this official and the one following.

18. וַיֹּשָׁב Probably the Hebrew perversion ('chief of the eunuchs') of an Assyrian title which is unknown to us.

19. התנ[ Probably in Assyrian *rāb-lāšē*, i.e. 'high officer.' Cf. *lūd-lāšā* or *lūd-lāsā*, 'high-lord, chieftain.' Delitzsch, *Assyr. HWB*. 685.]

20. התנ Righlly omitted in the second place by LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh.

'ג וַיֹּשָׁב Cf. Isa. 7. 3. The site is unknown. For the conjectures which have been offered cf. Dillmann on Isa. 7. 3.

21. התנ Cf. I. 4. 6 note.

22. התנ Possibly the addition may be due to corruption of *וַיֶּאֶב*, i.e. *רָאוֹב*, which is missing in Luc., at the beginning of the following verse. LXX *אֶב*. || Isa. 36. 7 omits.

23. התנ 'One satrap of the least of my lord's servants.' must be regarded as attracted into the construct state of its adjective חֶלֶח, as is the case in the expression חֵלֶחְךָ חָסַדְךָ, Deut.
21. 11. The general verdict is for the excision of מָתָא as a corrupt insertion, but the construction, though harsh, can scarcely be asserted to be impossible, in view of our limited knowledge of the possibilities of Hebrew syntax. Cf. KB. Syntax, §§ 277 o, 337 o. On the meaning and use of נָשַׁב cf. note on I. 10. 15.

25. לַעַל LXX, Luc. דַּעַת.

27. מָתָא מָתָא) Notice the confusion between יָעַל and יָעַשׁ: — יָעַשׁ על... יָעַשׁ. || Isa. 36. 12 reads יָעַשׁ אֶת נָשַׁב יָעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל. On this confusion between the prepositions cf. note on מָתָא על I. 1. 38, and the full list of instances given in Heb. Lex. Oxf., s. v. על § 7 c.


31. לֻכָּא] RV., following Targ., 'Make your peace with me.' This use of יָעַשׁ 'blessing,' in the sense of a mutual well wishing taking the form of a treaty, is unique.

32. לֻכָּא] On the idiomatic use of the imperative in place of the cohortative cf. I. 1. 12 note.

34. מָתָא מָתָא] The allusion is perhaps to Sargon's defeat of Ya'u-bi'di king of Êamath, who had induced the Assyrian provinces of Arpad, Êimirra, Damascus, and Samaria to join with him in revolt. This coalition was crushed at Qarqar in B.C. 720. Cf. KB. ii. 56 f. ים the modern Tell-Erfedd, to the north of Aleppo, had been conquered by Tiglath-Pileser III, in B.C. 743-740. KB. i. 212 f. Upon מָתָא cf. ch. 17. 24 note. מָתָא and מָתָא (omitted in || Isa. 36. 19) are unknown 1. The latter is doubtless the same as מָתָא of ch. 17. 24.

The second half of the verse runs in Luc. וַיֵּאָכֵל וְלִבְּנָי חֲרוֹן סָמאֶרֵא; יִהְיֶה כִּנְכָרָא וַיַּמְלָכֵי וְלִבְּנָי ווֹ לָא הָעָלְיָה. The insertion is indispensable, the subject presupposed by מָתָא being obviously 'the gods of Samaria.' So Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort.

1 Targ. אַבְיָנֵל פְּלִיטִים ווֹ לָא 'Has he not dispersed them and carried them captive?' takes the forms as verbs, Hiph'il of יָעַשׁ and Piel of יָעַל. Similarly X. in Isa. 37. 13 δισταρσός καὶ δισταρσός.
36. "תַּחֲפֹרָה" [|| Isa. 36. 21 תַּחֲפֹרָה, correctly.

דְּעוּ] LXX, Luc. omit.

37. מִזְרַח [Lit. 'rent as to garment.' Cf. note on 1. 15. 23.

10. 2. After καὶ ζωόν τοῦ γράμματος Luc. has the curious insertion καὶ τὸν Σαουή καὶ τὸν Ζωοάνουμαι καὶ τὸν Μακρατηρ τὸν γέροντα. Possibly Σαουή and Ζωόμα represent marginal notes of three various spellings of the name מָלֵשֶׁה; the second perhaps Ζωοּמָי ἡ Ζωοόμα by transposition of the letters of Ζωοόμα.

3. דּוֹלְלַם] LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh. presuppose דּוֹלְלַם 'to her who is in travail,' probably correctly. So Klo. Cf. Mic. 4. 9, 10; Hos. 13. 13; Jer. 49. 24. The form דּוֹלְלַם as infin. constr. for the normal דּוֹלְלַם occurs elsewhere Hos. 9. 11; Jer. 13. 21.

4. מְבֶּנְבֶּן] RV. 'And will rebuke the words which Yahwe thy God hath heard.' So Pesh., Targ. נְבֶn as the subject.

8. חַלֶּב] Cf. ch. 8. 22 note.

9. 'וַיֵּאָנָּה הַיְשָׁרָה'] || Isa. 37. 9 reads בִּלְאָנָּה for לְאָנָּה.

הָנָּרָית] Mentioned by Sennacherib not by name but as 'the king of Miluhhi,' Taylor cylinder, col. ii. ll. 69 ff. (cf. Append. 5). The name is given by Assurbanipal as Tar-ku-u, Egyptian T-h-r-k.

הָנָּרָית] || Isa. 37. 9 ההָנָּרָית יִשְׁפַּר 'and when he had heard, he sent.' נָשָׁר was doubtless written by the hand which connected the following narrative with the preceding, i.e. presumably the hand of R (cf. p. 339): hence נָשָׁר may be judged to be a corruption of נָשָׁר. LXX in Isaiah combines the two readings: καὶ ἀνδρὸν ἀνέπτρεψεν καὶ ἀνέπτειλεν.

10. LXX omits the introductory sentence down to the first ἀνάλωμα, probably through homoioteleuton with the end of v. 9.

11. מִזְרַח] 'As regards devoting them to destruction.'

12. מִזְרַח] Luc. ὀδοὶ διάφθειρας οἱ παρίποις μου αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς χώρας αὐτῶν. The reading of LXX has arisen through corruption of ὀδοὶ into ὅδοι.
tions. Charrae of the Romans, in north-west Mesopotamia, situated on the Belias, a tributary of the Euphrates. יֶבֶּן, mentioned in the inscriptions as Ra-ṣa-ṣa-pa or Ra-ṣa-pa-pa, is the ḫēṣāf of Ptolemaeus (v. 15), and the modern ṭuḏaṣa, on the route from Sura to Palmyra in the Euphrates valley Ez-Zbr (cf. Delitzsch, Paradies, 297). The יֶבֶּן belonged to the Aramaean state Bīl-Adīnī, situated between the Euphrates and the Belias, which offered stubborn resistance to Assur-nāṣir-pal, and was conquered by his successor Shalmaneser II in B.C. 856 (Hommel, Assyria in Hastings, BD. i. 183 b, 184 b; Maspero, iii. 30 f., 66). The site of ṣ̄alān (|| Isa. 37. 12 ṣ̄alān) must naturally be sought for in the same neighbourhood, and is probably to be identified with Til-ṣarūr̄i in the land of the Hītītītes (cf. Winckler, Geschichte Babyloniens, 269, 335 f.).

Luc. separates ṣ̄alān from necessary connexion with יֶבֶּן by the insertion of קָאָל, i.e. יֶבֶּן קָאָל ṣ̄alān.

13. יֶבֶּן נשא] ‘Where is he, (viz.) the king of Hamath?’ So Isa. 19. 12 יֶבֶּן קָאָל מָאֶה יָשָׁה; Mic. 7. 10 יֶבֶּן קָאָל מָאֶה יָשָׁה. || Isa. 37. 13 reads יֶבֶּן.

‘וַיְגַּלֶּחֶנֶה יֹבֵד’ Cf. ch. 18. 34 note.

15. יֶבֶּן נשא] LXX omits.

לִבְּרַּּדְּיָה יְבַנְּיָה] Luc. קָוָרַּּדְּיָה יְבַנְּיָה, Pesh. צֵרַּדְּיָה יְבַנְּיָה : יְבַנְּיָה יָבַּדְּיָה presuppose the insertion of יֶבֶּן after יְבַנְּיָה, as in || Isa. 37. 16.

יְבַנְּיָה נשא] Cf. 1 Sam. 4. 4; 2 Sam. 6. 2. || 1 Chr. 13. 6; Ps. 80. 2; 99. 1. The reference is primarily to the presence of the יְבָּשָׁא above the יְבָּשָׁא in the innermost sanctuary of the Temple.

בָּשָׁא נשא] So 2 Sam. 7. 28. Probably ‘Thou (with emphasis; lit. ‘Thou-He’) art the God’; or else ‘Thou art He, (namely) the God.’ Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 200.


יְבָּשָׁא נשא] Read יְבָּשָׁא יְבָּשָׁא with LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., and
II. Isa. 37. 17; i.e. probably 'which he hath sent' (LXX, Luc.), or possibly 'who hath sent' (Vulg.).

17. Probably we should read ὃν ὦτητο, in agreement with v. 11. So Benz., Kit., and (on Isa.) Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, and doubtfully Dillmann.

17. || Isa. 37. 18 erroneously ὅτι ὠτητον ἢν μένῳ 
LXX omits. Luc. καὶ πᾶσιν τοὺς γῆς αἰώνας. Vulg. et terras omnium.

18. || Isa. 37. 18 erroneously ὅτι ὠτητον ἢν μένῳ 
Irregular usage of the perfect with weak 1. || Isa. 37. 19 is correct in reading infinit. abs. ἐν, in accordance with idiom. Da. § 88a.

19. || Isa. 37. 20 omits ἢν μένῳ erroneously.
20. LXX, Luc. Κύριος (LXX adds βασιλεὺς) τῶν δύναμεων Θεὸς Ἰσραήλ.

22. A gesture of mockery. Cf. Ps. 22. 8; 109. 25; Lam. 2. 15; Job 16. 4.

23. Q're בהל in agreement with the text of many Codd., all Verss. and || Isa. 37. 24.

24. LXX, Luc., Vulg. are probably correct in reading ἢν μένῳ, and similarly אביהי, and v. 24 ביבי, v. 25 (except Vulg.) ἡ ἡ. So most moderns.

25. 'His farthest lodging-place'; lit. 'the lodging-place of his end.' as in Isa. 10. 29. LXX μὴσω, Cod. A, Luc. μέσω are doubtless emendations of a transliteration μὴσω. Q're ἡ ἡ appears in the text of many Codd.

24. || Isa. 37. 24 offers the inferior reading ἡ ἡ σω.
Winckler (Allt. Untersuchungen, 170) supposes that the original vocalization was מַיִּז-כָּרִי or מַיִּז-כָּרִי, on the ground that the form Mi-is-car-ı occurs twice on the Amarna tablets. The Massoretic vocalization will then be due to identification of the name with the Hebrew word meaning 'fortification.'

25. 'תְּנֻּכָּרִי' Render as in RV., with the alteration הָיוּךְ 'that thou becamest,' in place of הָיוּךְ, rendered 'that thou shouldest be,' and the addition of 'and' before 'now.' The thought of the verse is that of Isa. 10. 5 ff.

The first part of the verse down to the is omitted by LXX.

§§ 23f., 75 qq. Participle Niphal of מַיִּז-כָּרִי. The only other occurrence of the verb is in Jer. 4. 7, where נֵעַכְרוּנָה should probably be restored for Qal נֵעַכְרוּן.

26. 'סְלָמָה' Short of hand,' i.e. unequal to the task of saving themselves. So, with the verb, Isa. 50. 2 אַחֲרֵיהֶנָּה יִרְבְּצֵת. So, the participle is used in Jer. 37. 26.

Such a sense, however, cannot be extracted from the original as it stands; and, if we are to retain it, the least alteration will be in נֵעַכְרוּן, referring back to נֵעַכְרוּן of the following verse: 'Before me is thy rising up and thy lying down.' This supersedes the emendation of Th. מַיִּז-כָּרִי before the east wind.' Possibly, then, תְּנֻּכָּרִי may stand by itself in the sense 'blasted' (sc. corn); and this is preferable to || Isa. 37. 27 תְּנֻּכָּרִי, which seems to give no sense in this connexion. Klo.'s emenda-
XIX. 25-37

tion דִּשְׂנָה is worthy of notice: ‘grass of the house tops and of the downs.’ So Cheyne. For דִּשְׂנָה as barren uplands, cf. Isa. 41. 18; Jer. 12. 12.

28. רָאָשָׁה] RV. text, ‘thine arrogance,’ in agreement with LXX, Luc. ἀρετὴ σου, Vulg. superbia tua, a rendering perhaps to be justified by Ps. 123. 4. RV. marg., ‘thy careless ease,’ is the more usual meaning. This latter rendering, however, is unsuitable to the context and parallelism; and the same remark applies, in a less degree, to the former rendering. Probably the emendation רָאָשָׁה, ‘thy tumult,’ adopted by Benz., Kit., Budde, Grätz, Cheyne, is correct.

‘וֹ זֵרֶשָׁה] The figure is that of a savage beast led captive by a ring in its nose. Cf. Ezek. 19. 4, and the similar figure of Ezek. 29. 4; 38. 4.

29. רָאָשָׁה] ‘That which groweth of itself’; from unused root equivalent to Ar. אֵשָׁה pour out, and so, the produce of grain spliced or self-sown. שָׁנָה (|| Isa. 37. 30 שָׁנָה) is by inference the self-sown produce of this natural crop in the second year.’ So Verss.

31. Q’re תַּתָּא is supported by the text of many Codd., all Verss., and || Isa. 37. 32.

33. לְכָּבָשׁ] Read מִלָּה with || Isa. 37. 34.

34. וַנִּשְׁבַּה] LXX omits. In Luc. the whole of v. 34* has fallen out.


35. The catastrophe, as might have been expected, is passed over in silence in the Assyrian inscriptions; but the fact that Sennacherib does not make claim to have captured Jerusalem is in agreement with our narrative. Herodotus (ii. 141) records an Egyptian tradition, according to which Sennacherib’s army was easily routed at Pelusium because innumerable field-mice had during the night gnawed through its bow-strings and the thongs of its shields.

36. לְכָּבָּשׁ] Luc. omits.

37. לְכָּבָּשׁ] No such god is known in the Assyrian inscriptions.
Halévy (Mélanges de crit. 177) plausibly conjectures that the name should be נֵסֵכַל, i.e. Nusku, a solar deity.


According to Schrader (COT. ad loc.) the name is shortened from Nergal-lar-usur (cf. Jer. 39. 3, 13). He refers to Abydenus, as quoted by Eusebius, who states that Sennacherib was assassinated by Adramelus, and succeeded by Nergilus, and that this latter was put to death by Aderdis. If, as seems obvious, Adramelus corresponds to אֲדַרְמֵלִי and Aderdis to אָדוֹרְדִּי, then Nergilus may be thought to answer to נְרֶגִילוּשׁ.

Q're has the support of many Codd., all Verss., and || Isa. 37. 38.

Assyr. Urartu, the land of Armenia.

Cf. ch. 10. 32 note.

Cf. I. 2. 1 note.

'For thou art about to die'; the participle denoting the futurum instans. The same idiomatic expression occurs Gen. 20. 3; 48. 21; 50. 5, 24; Deut. 4. 22; Jer. 28. 16. Cf. also Deut. 17. 6 פָּשַׁב 'the doomed man.'


On the construction cf. Dri. Tenses, § 165. || Isa. 38. 4 is much abbreviated.

Read יָדִי with the text of several Codd., and all Verss. On יָדִי used definitely without the article cf. I. 7. 8 note. The middle court was the courtyard of the palace, called יָדִי I. 7. 8 in contrast to the Temple (innermost) court. Cf. note on I. 6. 36.

Cf. I. 1. 35 note.

6. יָדִי || Isa. 38. 6 omits.

7. יָדִי LXX, Luc., Pesh. presuppose the reading יָדִי, יָדִי, יָדִי יָדִי יָדִי יָדִי 'Let them take ... and place ... that he may recover.' This is probably original, Hezekiah's request for the sign in v. 8 naturally presupposing that recovery is only as yet promised and not accomplished. יָדִי v. 7b must have been
inserted after 'ה יִנַּחְתָה had been taken as describing a completed sequence of events.

|| Isa. 38. 21 (which, with v. 22, is misplaced) reads ... **ןִּתְנָה** ... וַיִּשָּׁמֵר. The verb זָרַע, a **שָׁרַע** wy. in Heb., is explained from the Ar. **שָׁרַע** anoint, smear.

8. 'ו יִנַּחְתָה [|| Isa. 38. 22] וַיִּשָּׁמֵר אֶל הַמֶּשֶׁר מְאֹד.

9. 'ו יִנַּחְתָה The only possible rendering is that of RV. marg. 'The shadow is gone forward &c.' But it is evident from Hezekiah's reply, v. 10, that an alternative is offered to him. We must therefore emend יִנַּחְתָה, which is expressed by Targ. **ו יִנַּחְתָה**, and presupposed by the other Verss. So Th. (doubtfully), Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort.

11b. As the text stands, **בַּשָּׁמֵר** can only refer to the **מֶשֶׁר**. The true subj. of the verb is, however, preserved by Pesh., Targ., viz. **טָשָׁמֵר**, which should be inserted after **מֶשֶׁר**, or after **מֶשֶׁר** as in Isaiah (see below). 'The statement then runs:—'And he brought back the shadow on the steps by which the sun had gone down on the step-clock of Ahaz, ten steps.' This slight correction (Th., Oort) is more obvious than the supposition that **ו יִנַּחְתָה** is an erroneous insertion from || Isa. 38. 8.

The Isaianic account omits the offer of an alternative sign; v. 8 with the emendations **לָיִן** for **לָיָן**, **טָשָׁמֵר** for **טָשָׁמֵר** (Kautzsch and others) reading as follows:—'Behold I will bring back the shadow so many steps as the sun has gone down upon the step-clock of Ahaz, even ten steps. And the sun returned ten steps upon the steps by which it had gone down.'

The character of the sun-clock called **טָשָׁמֵר** can only be conjectured. Most probably it was 'a pointed pillar (obelisk) upon a (round or square) plinth, to which a flight of steps led up. This pillar cast the shadow of its point at midday upon the highest, and at morning and evening upon the lowest step (west or east), and thus indicated the time of day.' Cf. Dillmann on Isaiah *ad loc.* The clock may have been introduced by Ahaz from Assyria.
The Second Book of Kings

(cf. ch. 16. 10 ff.). According to Herodotus (ii. 109) the Babylonians were the inventors of the ἁλς or concave sun-dial upon which the shadow was cast by the γυμνος, and of the division of the day into twelve hours.

12. מַלְאָךְ [Cf. I. 14. 1 note.]

Read מַלְאָךְ with several Codd., LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ., and || Isa. 39. 1. The Assyrian form is Мардук-абал-идинна. Merodach-Baladan appears at first as king of the Kaldû. His kingdom is called Bilt-yakin, 'by the salt waters,' i.e. the Persian Gulf. He paid homage and tribute to Tiglath-Pileser in B.c. 729 (Rost, 60 f.), but seems to have seized the opportunity of the death of Shalmaneser and the accession of Sargon to constitute himself king of Babylon. His principal ally was Humbanigal king of Elam. Sargon directed an expedition against the allies (B.c. 721); but little is known about it, and it seems to have met with ill success. Humbanigal of Elam died in B.c. 717, and was succeeded by his less able son Šuher-naḫundi. Merodach-Baladan retained the sovereignty of Babylon for twelve years, until Sargon, having settled his affairs in the west and north, was able to direct his arms against him. After a campaign which occupied B.c. 710–709, Sargon entered Babylon in triumph. He claims to have taken Merodach-Baladan prisoner (Winckler, Sargon, 84 f., 122 f., 150 f.), but elsewhere (Winckler, Sargon, 58 f.) seems to state that he fled away and could not be found. The latter alternative seems to be the more probable, since a Merodach-Baladan appears some years later as king of Babylon for nine months, until conquered and driven out by Sennacherib (B.c. 704: cf. Tiele, Bab. Gesch. i. 246). Cf. Winckler, Sargon, pp. xv f., xvii, xxxi–xxxix; Maspero, iii. 222 ff., 254 ff.

There can be no doubt that Merodach-Baladan's embassy to Hezekiah took place some time prior to B.c. 710, whilst he was forming alliances in order to meet the advance of Sargon, which he must have foreseen as inevitable so soon as the latter should find himself free to operate against him. According to the chronology of Kings, Hezekiah's sickness happened in B.c. 714
(cf. ch. 18. 13 note), and the embassy arrived shortly afterwards, i.e. probably any time between the end of B.C. 714 and the beginning of B.C. 712.

In the inscriptions he appears as ‘son of Yakin,’ doubtless a dynastic title. Cf. the title ‘son of Omri,’ applied by Shalmaneser II to Jehu, as king of the land which was known to Assyria as Biš-Hū-um-ri-a. Cf. notes on ch. 9. 2; I. 16. 23.

Duhm, Cheyne, Marti emend מִּשָּׁם ‘eunuchs,’ a correction which is suitable to the suffix objects in v. 13 מִשָּׁם ‘from.


13. מִשָּׁם ‘From’ Read מִשָּׁם ‘And Hezekiah was glad because of them,’ with several Codd., LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., and || Isa. 39. 2. So moderns.

is omitted by many Codd., Vulg., Pesh., and || Isaiah. The meaning of מִשָּׁם can only be guessed from the context; so Luc. רֹוֹ וֹלֶּכְו וֹתַי יְבֵרָהוֹ, Pesh. מַּהוּ, Targ. מַּהוּ, ‘his treasure-house’; Vulg. domum aromatum, and so ἡ, in || Isa. μα ων οἰκετεῖν οὔ χθων. In Assyr. biš nakanti denotes ‘treasure-house,’ nakantu or nakamtu, plural nakamtdli, meaning ‘treasure,’ and nakamu, ‘to heap up.’ Cf. Delitzsch, Assyr. HWE. 462. Hence some authorities (cf. Heb. Lex. Oxf.) propose to read מִשָּׁם, making the word equivalent to nakamtdli.

Luc. καὶ εἰς παρθήνα θεσαυροῦ αἰτέων. Luc.

14. מִשָּׁם ‘And from whence may they come?’ A more polite form of question than the categorical מִן אֵיךְ. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 39 γ.

15. מִן אֵיךְ ‘And from whence may they come?’ LXX, Luc., Pesh. add וַיִּפְלֹעַ, וַיִּפְלֹעַ, LXX, Luc. וַיִּפְלֹעַ, וַיִּפְלֹעַ. LXX, Luc.

16–18. No kind of allusion is found elsewhere in the known prophecies of Isaiah to a Babylonian captivity, the prophet’s

1 Also Targ., according to de Rossi, in one MS. and in Edit. Venet.
political horizon being bounded by the great powers of his times, Assyria and Egypt. Thus it is probable that these verses have been worked over by R² in exilic or post-exilic times.

16. ἐν ἐλλείπου Τζούλιον ἐποτικόνοπος.

17. Ἐν ἐλλείπου Τζούλιον ἐποτικόνοπος, ἢ λ. ἐν ἐλλείπου Τζούλιον ἐποτικόνοπος; cf. e.g. ch. 19. 33; 22. 19 in Luc.

18. ἡσσλατ] Sta. emends ἡσσλατ ἀπὸ τοῦ κέρατον, after Gen. 15. 4; 2 Sam. 7. 12, and regards the following χειρὶστὰ ὡς σαυρα ἀπὸ τοῦ κέρατον as a gloss which owes its origin to the corruption ἐπίστροφος.

19b. ἡσσλατ] LXX omits. Pesh. ἡσσλατ ... ἐκκεῖνος, Luc. ἐκκεῖνος, Vulg. sūl, agree with || Isa. 39. 8 ἡσσλατ ἐκκεῖνος, properly ἐκκεῖνος. 'There shall be &c.'

20. ἡσσλατ ἐκκεῖνος] 2 Chr. 32. 30 describes the method adopted by Ἰζηζεκία in order to provide a water-supply for Jerusalem: Ἰζηζεκία ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοῦ ἐν αὑτῷ ἐκκεῖνος ἀνατέλλειν τοῦ ἐπιτέλεσθαι τοῦ тo

21. After v. 21b Luc. adds καὶ ἐκάθη ἀνεῖς τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ἐν πόλει Δαβίδ.


Ch. 21. 1–9, 18 = 2 Chr. 33. 1–9, 20.

The narrative throughout is the work of R², based upon very brief notices (vv. 3, 4a, 5, 6a, 7a, 16a), derived, presumably, from the Annals. The section vv. 10–15 appears to presuppose the
captivity of Judah, and must therefore, in its present form, be assigned to \( R^\Theta \). The following phrases of \( R^\Theta \) have in most cases already been noticed:

2. \[ Note. \]

4. 7. \[ Note. \]

7. \[ Note. \]

8. \[ Note. \]

So I. 11. 10 (note); ch. 17. 37; 2 Chr. 33. 8; 1 Chr. 22. 12; Deut. 5. 1, 29; 6. 3, 25; 7. 11; 8. 1; 11. 22, 32; 12. 1; 13. 1; 15. 5; 17. 10; 19. 9; 24. 8; 28. 1, 15. 58; 31. 12; 32. 46; Josh. 1. 7, 8; 22. 5 (\( D^\eta \)).

10. \[ Cf. ch. 9. 7; 17. 13, 23; 24. 2; Jer. 7. 25; 25. 4; 26. 5; 29. 19; 35. 15; 44. 4. Elsewhere Am. 3. 7; Zech. 1. 6; Ezra 9. 11; Dan. 9. 10. \]

11. \[ Note. \]

11, 21. \[ Note. \]

12. \[ Note. \]

Both Esar-haddon and Assurbanipal refer to this king as \( M\-n\-a\-s\-i\-f \) or \( M\-i\-n\-s\-i\-f \), king of Judah, in a list of twenty-two kings of the land of \( H\)atti. Cf. \( COT. \) \textit{ad loc.}

2. \[ Note. \]

3. \[ Note. \]

The worship of the heavenly bodies was indigenous in Babylon in the earliest times, and was no doubt introduced into Judah through intercourse with Assyria. Whether this Babylonian cult was known and practised in the Northern Kingdom also before its fall, as is affirmed in \( ch. 17. 16^b \), has been questioned. Cf. p. 331.

4. \[ Note. \]

The use of perfect with weak \( \text{\textit{v}} \), here and in \( v. 6 \), must be ascribed to the decadent style of the Annalist. Cf. \textit{note} on \( ch. 14. 7 \).

5. \[ Note. \]

The House of Yahwe seems to have had only one courtyard; cf. I. 6. 36 \textit{note}; \( ch. 20. 4 \). Possibly the reference may include the \( T\) or \( T\) properly.
the Palace-courtyard, which, as Kit. remarks, passed over in the
time of the second Temple into a wider Temple-courtyard.


םרא ידועי) [‘Necromancers and wizards.’ בוש seems to denote,
in the first place, the ghost itself, which was said to dwell in
the medium (Lev. 20. 27). Similarly, the witch of Endor is a
גנ· נב ‘possession of a ghost’ (1 Sam. 28. 7), and Saul’s request
to her is בוש ‘Divine for me, I pray thee, through
the ghost’ (v. 8). In Deut. 18. 11 the diviner is called בוש ‘one who consults a ghost.’ The voice of the בוש is low and
thin, and appears to come from the ground (Isa. 29. 4).

The transference of the term from the ghost to the medium,
as in our passage, || 2 Chr. 33. 6; 1 Sam. 28. 3, 9, appears to be
a secondary usage. According to Schwally, the reverse process
took place in the case of נפש, the prime meaning being ‘wizard,’
and hence, as with Aram. נב, a secondary application being
made to the ghost. Cf. Das Leben nach dem Tode, 69 ff. If,
however, the meaning of נפש be either ‘knowing one’ or ‘familiar,’
it is more natural to find first reference to the ghost, as in the
can only be remotely conjectured, and the distinction between
בוש and נפש is unknown.


השא] LXX, Luc. omit.

... רשא נב ... והשא בוש ... והשא בוש רשא] LXX, Luc. ἐν τῷ ὅσαρ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ
... ἐκεῖνοῦν ... καὶ θησον (Luc. θείαν), omitting רֹאשׁ before הָאָדָם,
and reading מַתָּחֵן or שָׁמַע for שָׁמַע.

8. [דבוש] Luc. כָּעָה, i.e. דבוש.

9. [דח נמא] LXX adds ἐν ἀδελφοῖς Κυρίου, Luc. εἰνὶ ἀδελφοῖς
Κυρίου.


[םלת] Luc. κατὰ πάντα, i.e. כלל.

12. [דל] Cf. 1 Sam. 3. 11; Jer. 19. 3.

13. [דם] For the figure cf. Isa. 34. 11; Lam. 2. 8.

Pesh., in place of this simile, reads מִכָּר רְעָה.
'and will destroy it, on account of all the evil which Manasseh wrought in Judah.'

Read, with most moderns, מָשַׁחְתָּו 'wiping and turning (it).' The second infin. stands in simple sequence to the first, as e.g. in Isa. 19. 22, noticed under I. 20. 37 note.

Sta. (Ges. i. 569) quotes Wellh. for the suggestion that מִשָּׁחְתָּו (cf. 2 Sam. 6. 3) is a contracted form of מְשָׁחָת, which was in later times confused with the name מְשָׁחָה, so that this latter was written in place of the contraction. Cf. ch. 15. 1, note on מְשָׁחָה.

On the narrative of 2 Chr. 33. 11-13, which relates the captivity, repentance, and restoration of Manasseh, cf. Dri. Authority, 114 ff.


Ch. 21. 19-24 = 2 Chr. 33. 21-25.

Rö frames brief notices from the Annals.

Cf. ch. 16. 15 note.

Luc. εἰ τῷ τάφῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.


Ch. 22. 1—23. 3 = 2 Chr. 34. 1, 2, 8-32.

Ch. 23. 4-20 is the probable source of the summary 2 Chr. 34. 3-7.

Ch. 23. 30b = 2 Chr. 36. 1.

The lengthy narratives of the Chronicler which relate the keeping of the passover, 2 Chr. 35. 1-19 (cf. ch. 23. 21-23), and Josiah's defeat and death at the hands of Necho, king of Egypt, 2 Chr. 35. 20-27 (cf. ch. 23. 29, 30), appear to be based upon extraneous sources.

Ch. 22. 3—23. 25 is a continuous narrative, probably drawn from the Temple-archives (cf. note on ch. 11, pp. 307f.). Deuteronomic phrases are found in 23. 3, 19, 25', and in the speech of Huldah,
22. 15-20, which seems to show signs of revision by Rd in exilic times. Certainly this later editor is responsible for the addition 23. 26, 27, at the close of the narrative, which strikes a note strangely alien to the enthusiasm of the pre-exilic author in view of Josiah's reformation (cf. especially 23. 22, 25).

Ch. 23. 29, 30 is probably drawn from the Annals.

22. 3. RV. 'that he may sum the money'; lit. 'may bring to an end,' and so, by inference, 'return the full amount of.' No parallel, however, can be cited for such a use of the verb. Comparison of v. 9, קָחוּם, suggests the emendation קָחִית, 'that he may pour out,' a reading which seems to be presupposed by Luc. καὶ κρατεισάει, Vulg. ut conferetur, and which is adopted by Ginsburg, Grä., Kit., Oort. LXX καὶ σφραγίσεως, i.e. סְפֹּר, is favoured by Th., Kamp., Benz., but appears less suitable. Klo. קָחוּה, 'that he may weigh'; cf. לָשׂון ch. 12. 12. [2 Chr. 34. 9 עַלְנוּ].

5. RV. 'And let them place it upon the hand &c.' So exactly Gen. 42. 37. Lit. 'that he may weigh'; cf. ch. 12. 12.

7. RV. Apparently a special title, 'the servant of the king' par excellence. The title has been found in ancient Heb. character upon a seal. Cf. Benz. Archäologie, 310 f.

13. LXX, Luc. ἐν ἀνφόρῳ, i.e. לִקְנָה, the reading of two Codd., is probably correct. Cf. || 2 Chr. 34. 21 לִקְנָה. So Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort.

---

1 'lit. 'that he may sum the money' v. 16 (I. 14. 10 note); so also LXX, cf. 10 (I. 9. 6 note); cf. 17 (I. 14. 9 note).

2 cf. 26 (I. 14. 9 note); so LXX, see LXX v. 27, cf. ch. 17. 18, 23, 24. 3; Jer. 32. 31; so with רֶפֶעָה 'I. 9. 7; Jer. 15. 1; with לָשׂון ch. 13. 23; 17. 20 (םֶשׁ in place of מָשָׂה); cf. 27 (I. 8. 16 note).
14. "In the second (district)." Cf. Zeph. 1. 10, and, according to the probable interpretation, Neh. 11. 9. The precise significance with which the term is employed is unknown. According to Neh. 3. 9, 13 we find Jerusalem divided into two districts in post-exilic times for administrative purposes. Possibly the נוֹשֶׁה may have been the new as distinct from the old city. So Ges.-Buhl.

18. "Then he added," Luc., however, offers the reading 'in evolvas vosis λέγων μου, καὶ ἡμαλήνῃ ἡ καπδα εου, Vulg. Pro eo quod audisti verba voluminis, et &c., i.e. 'As regards the words which thou hast heard.' Luc. omits.

20. "(As regards) the words which thou hast heard." Add διὰ τῶν λόγων ὑδρον, as in 2 Chr. 34. 28. So Klo. Oort υδρον.

28. 1. "LXX, Luc. presuppose sing. לְבָנָה, as in 2 Chr. 34. 29.

2. "(And) the nobles." Six Codd. agree with 2 Chr. 34. 30 in reading מִלְחַת. The mention of מִלְחַת is somewhat unexpected, in view of the fact that no mention is made of prophets in ch. 22, but only of Huldah the prophetess. On the other hand, the fact that מִלְחַת is the more obvious reading creates the suspicion that it is a correction, since no reason can be assigned for the substitution of מִלְחַת for מִלְחַת.

4. "In the fields of Kidron." RV, 'the priests of the second order.' In ch. 25. 18 a single מְנַשֶּׁה, 'second (i.e. vice) priest,' is mentioned, in contrast to מְנִשֶּׁה, and Targ. מְנֶשֶׁה is probably correct in making reference in the present passage also to a single individual.


5. "In the fields of Kidron." Elsewhere הרוח is peculiar to poetry. Luc. או יֵצֵר הָרוֹחֵם, i.e. הָרוֹחֵם, adopted by Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., and interpreted as (līm-)hīlīm. Cf. Isa. 33. 12.

Note. Here and elsewhere in the narrative the use of the perfect
with weak is a mark of decadence in style. Cf. note on שָׁעִי
ch. 14. 7.

suggest מַעֲרָא, but may equally be supposed to be reproducing
in their renderings the idea of purpose implied in מַעֲרָא.

תְלֵוֳהוּ ‘And for the heavenly mansions.’ In Ar. המַנָּסַד
denotes a lodging-place or mansion; and the pl. המַנָּסַדָּי
is used of the twenty-eight mansions of the moon. In Assyr. (Delitzsch,
Assyr. Handwörterbuch) mansazu denotes ‘a place of standing,’
from the root nasazu, ‘to stand.’ This word occurs on the fifth
of the Babylonian Creation series, which begins, ‘He made
the mansions (mansazi) of the great gods’ (Jensen, Kosmologie,
288 ff.; Schrader, COT. i. 15). Further, there is a fem. form of
mansazu, viz. mansalzu (=
mansazu), masallu. For this Delitzsch
quotes III Rawlinson, 59, 35*: ‘The gods in heaven in their
mansions (man-sal-ti-su-nu) set me.’ Jensen (Kosmologie, 347 f.)
mentions the same facts. While, however, Delitzsch identifies
these mansalzu with the zodiacal stations (Prolegomena, 54), Jensen
thinks that they were perhaps fifty in number, corresponding
to the number of the great gods, and thus can scarcely denote
merely the signs of the zodiac, but rather certain fixed stars and
planets, lists of which are to be found in the inscriptions, but
of which the identification seems to be possible in a few cases
alone (Kosmologie, 146 ff.).

In Rabbinic Heb. המַנָּסַד is used to denote the twelve zodiacal
signs (Berachoth, 32b; Shabbath, 75a), but also the planets,
regarded as stars of good or ill fortune (Bereshith rabba, 10,
106; al.). In agreement with this latter signification, we have,
according to the restoration of de Vogüé, the dedication
לַזְּלַזְּל הָעָם,

1 The number of the mansazi appears to have originally existed on the
Creation tablet.

2 Jensen finds allusion to the zodiacal signs in the malš stars of l. 2 of the
Creation tablet above cited. The word miṣrāta (not miṣrāta) or Ṗirāta, which
occurs in l. 3, cannot, with Sayce (Religion of Bab., 389), be identified with
חיים.
answering to the Greek 'Αγαθή τις in a Phoenician inscription from Larnaka of about the fourth century B.C. (CIS. 95).

It is doubtful whether ἀναφέρεται of Job 38. 32 is identical with ἀναφέρεται. LXX in both passages transliterates μακούραθ, while Targ., in accordance with Kings, uses in Job the rendering שֵׁם חֵלֶק, שֵׁם.

6. [The common burial-place of those who were without name and memorial. Cf. Jer. 26. 23.]

7. [Cf. I. 14. 24 note.]

[Scarcely explicable in connexion with שֵׁם. RV. 'hangings' is unjustifiable; and 'tent-shrines' might have been called שָׁמִית, but scarcely שֵׁם. The transliteration of LXX קָטָנִים suggests to Klo. an original קָטָנִים for קָטָנִים 'tunics,' a reading which is supported by Luc. στοιχεῖον, and may well be original. So Benz.]

8. [Cf. I. 15. 22 note.]

[Emend, with most moderns after Hoffmann, ZATW. ii. 175, מָלַשׁנָה (LXX, Luc. εἴρον) 'The high-places (or house) of the Satyrs.' Cf. 2 Chr. 11. 15; Lev. 17. 7.]

[Luc. adds πολὺς ἐκκεντρικῶν, and according to Field, Quinta τὴν πολύν τῶν τετραμένων (or τετραμεταμένων), i.e. perhaps Πολύσις ἐπὶ 'the fish-gate'; cf. the rendering of LXX in Zeph. 1. 10, ἐπὶ πολύν ἀποκεντροῦσαν.]

9. [Did not go up'; frequentative. The regulation of Deut. 18. 6 ff. seems to have been intended to place the provincial priesthood upon a level with the priesthood of the central sanctuary, as regards service as well as maintenance. This regulation, so far as it concerned equality of service, appears from our passage to have remained a dead letter, doubtless owing to the exclusiveness of the Jerusalem priesthood. The provincial appears to have sunk at once into the subordinate position of the 'Levite,' as defined in the Priestly Code (I. 8. 4 note). Cf. also Ezek. 44. 10-16.]

10. [R. Sm. (Rel. Sem. 3, 377) conjectures that נַחַן is properly the Aram. name for a fireplace, upon the assumption of a variant אֲדֹל, אֵנוֹל, for the Syr. אֵנוֹל. Cf. the use made of the]
name in Isa. 30. 33. The vocalization מַשָּׁה, like that of שָׁם, אַשָּׁה, probably points to a later approximation to the vocalization of מַשָּׁה 'shameful thing.' Cf. the substitution of מַשָּׁה for מַשָּׁה in the text of Hos. 9. 10; Jer. 3. 24; 11. 13.

Elsewhere always מַשָּׁה or abbreviated מַשָּׁה. Q're is supported by many Codd., and by LXX, Luc., Vulg., Pesh., Targ.

occurs only here. Cod. 304 de Rossi, LXX, Pesh. omit מַשָּׁה, taking מַשָּׁה instead, to express the purpose of the existence of the מַשָּׁה: 'that a man might offer &c.' Thus it is possible that מַשָּׁה is a later insertion, made by a scribe who understood the clause as explaining the purpose of מַשָּׁה.

RV. 'in the precincts.' יִשָּׁר in Chr. 26. 18, doubtless the same, is stated to have been on the west of the Temple. New Heb. יָרֶה, Aram. יְרֵה denote a suburb. Ges. Thes. 1123 finds the origin of the term in Persian מַשָּׁה, a summer-house, or open kiosk (lit. light-possessing). Dri. (s. v. Parbar, Hastings, BD. iii) remarks that, if the term is to be traced to the Persian, its occurrence in Kings must be regarded as a mark of post-exilic revision.

Luc. adds יִשָּׁר עֲרַבָּה יִשָּׁר. כּוֹדֵר מָיֵי מַשָּׁה מַשָּׁה יִשָּׁר בֵּיתֵי אֲרָם, יָרֶה יִשָּׁר מַשָּׁה מַשָּׁה יִשָּׁר בֵּיתֵי אֲרָם.

clearly refers to the roof of the Temple, and נֶסֶף נֶשֶׁף, in apposition, must have come into the text as a gloss. Benz., Kit. conjecture that Ahaz may have erected a shelter for the altars upon the Temple roof; cf. the יִשָּׁר הָאֲרָם of ch. 4. 10.

As the text stands, RV. 'and beat them down,' making the verb Imperf. Qal of מָרָת, must be adopted. So Luc. מָרָת—apparently a third rendering of the word. Th., Oort follow Kimhi in vocalizing מָרָת (Imperf. Hiph'il of מָר), 'and banished them,' in agreement with Targ. Klo. cites the second rendering of Luc., מָרָת מָרָת מָרָת מָרָת מָרָת, for the emendation מָרָת, a suggestion favoured by Benz., Kit.
13. [תֵּרוּ הָרָה] ‘The hill of the destroyer.’ Only mentioned here. Klo. suggests that the name, if genuine, may have reference to 2 Sam. 24. 16. Targ. אָרְדָּא וַיִּשָּׁו ‘mount of olives’ suggests מַסְדֵּק יִשָּׁו ‘mount of oil,’ as occasionally in the Talmuds according to Neubauer, Geographie du Talmud, 147. So Hoffmann, ZATW. ii. 175; Perles, Analekten, 31f.

15. [תֵּרוּ הָרָה] Impossible. The mention itself, i.e. the situation of the altar, could not be burnt; nor can it be supposed that the term is used vaguely in place of מַסְדֵּק יִשָּׁו. LXX, Luc. read καὶ συνετρίψαν τοὺς λίθους αὐτοῦ, i.e. מַסְדֵּק יִשָּׁו—doubtless the original text. So Klo., Benz., Kit., Oort.

‘ו זַעַת’ ‘Crushing (them) to dust’; lit. ‘he crushed &c.’, perf. used asyndetos in a circumstantial clause. Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 163.

16. [תֵּרוּ הָרָה] We ought probably to read כְּתַלְתָּל, or מַסְדֵּק יִשָּׁו.

16b. [תֵּרוּ הָרָה] After ἱεροσόλυμα Σαλώματι LXX, Luc. add ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐπὶ τῷ θυσιαστήριον. καὶ ἐπιστρέψας (Luc. ἐσωσάς) ἔρεν τῶν ἑβδόμων αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν τάφων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, i.e. ἐπὶ τῇ βρέχου τῷ ὑπάρχου ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας ἡ ἤλωσε. These words must have fallen out of the text through homoioteleuton. As MT. stands, the repeated ו אָרְדָּא is awkward and redundant, while the details supplied by the missing words are felt to be wanting to the narrative. So Th. (בְּפִסְךָ for καὶ ἐπιστρέψας), Klo., Benz., Oort.

17. [תֵּרוּ הָרָה] ‘Yonder tomb-stone.’ מָשָׁא occurs again in Ezek. 39. 15 to denote a stone set up to mark the locality of an unburied body, and in pl. in Jer. 31. 21 of stones placed as way-marks. The word is used in the same sense in New Heb., together with a verb לָּקֶם to mark, e.g. the site of sepulchres as being unclean.

On מָשָׁא cf. ch. 4. 25 note.

[תֵּרוּ הָרָה] If the text be correct, can only be taken as an instance of the article with the st. constr. Benz., Kit. emend יִשָּׁו לָּקֶם ‘This is the grave &c.’ for יִשָּׁו; Klo., Da. (§ 20, Rem. b) יִשָּׁו לָּקֶם—a suggestion which is open to the objection that אָרְדָּא would more naturally fall after יִשָּׁו.

[תֵּרוּ הָרָה] The vocalization of MT., with the rendering
of RV. 'the altar of Bethel,' is to be rejected. The correct vocalization is רְאָיָן st. absol., and אוּ לֶב is to be regarded as an accusative (cf. ch. 2. 3; 10. 29) defining the place of the event described by 'וִיקָרִים':—'and proclaimed these things which thou hast done against the altar at Bethel.' Cf. Dri. Tenses, § 191, Obs. 2.

18. רְאָיָן] Luc. καὶ διαόδη γὰ καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφητῆρου τοῦ προφητηρίου τοῦ κατακτητοῦ τοῦ Βαβylon πρὸς παρὰ τ. ε. τ. α. i.e. ἀντίθετος τὰς λειτουργίας τοῦ παρελθόντος—probably original. Cf I. 13. 31c.


20. 'וַיְנַדֶה] Pesh., כנְפָס שֶׁאָסָמְךָו וַיִּתְנַדְסָא וַיִּתְנַדְסָא בְּמַךְ שֶׁאָסָמְךָו 'who placed sweet savours upon the altars,' appears to have read שְׁלֵךְ for שְׁלֵךְ, a use of the verb which is justified by Deut. 33. 10b.

21. At the end of the v. Luc. adds καὶ ἔφηγον εἰς αὐτός.

22. רְאָיָן] RV. 'Surely there was not kept &c.' It seems, however, preferable, in view of 'וַיְנַדֶה of v. 23, to render 'For there had not been kept &c.'

23. רְאָיָן] 'Such a passover as this,' referring to 'וַיְנַדֶה of v. 21. LXX τὸ πάσχα τοῦ ὥραν, i.e. πέντε ἄνωθεν, seems to state that the passover was not kept at all during the period named.


םֹאֵיר] A kind of idol, as is proved by the designation הַנַּמָא, Gen. 31. 30, 32; apparently of human form and size (1 Sam. 19. 13ff.), though sometimes much smaller (Gen. 31. 34). Like הַנַּמָא, the plural לְשׂוּרֵי may denote one image (cf. Sam. l.c.), or more than one (Gen. l.c.; al.). מֹאֵיר are found as household gods in the possession of the Aramaean Laban (Gen. 31. 19ff.), the Ephraimite Micah (Judg. 17ff.), and Michal, David's wife (1 Sam. 19. 13ff.). Ezekiel pictures them as consulted by the king of Babylon (21. 26). It is clear that מֹאֵיר were employed as oracular-givers. In Judg. 17ff.; Hos. 3. 4 they are mentioned in connexion with the oracular מָשָׁא; in 1 Sam. 15. 23; Zech. 10. 2; Ezek. 21. 26, 27 with the form of divination called בבִּא (cf. ch. 17. 17 note). Their association in our passage with מַעֲחַת מַעֲחַת מַעֲחַת (cf. ch. 21. 6 note) appears to connect them with the
practice of necromancy. The wide-spread character of the cult among the Semitic races (as attested by the Biblical references above cited) has led Schwally (Das Leben nach dem Tode, 36) to identify it with ancestor-worship; cf. also Sta. Ges. i. 467; Nowack, Archäologie, ii. 23. A strange Jewish tradition explains ד'אלמ as the pickled head of a first-born son, which was fastened on the wall of a house, and worshipped as an oracle; cf. Pirgê de R. Eliezer, ch. 36 (eighth century A.D.); Jerus. Targ. on Gen. 31. 19; cited by Buxtorf, s. v. ד'אלמ.

 Cf. I. 15. 12 note.


 נזכ[ה] Necho II, son of Psammaticus I, was second king of the twenty-sixth dynasty, and reigned 610–595. Cf. Hastings, BD. iii. 504. The strange rendering of Pesh. תמר המלך "Pharaoh the lame," connects בֵּינָא בְּלֵי מַלְכּ with נזכ[ה].

 Cf. I. 4. 12 note. Herodotus (ii. 159) places the encounter at מַיְהָא, i.e. בֶּלֶן, probably the place of that name on the N. E. border of Egypt; Ex. 14. 2; Num. 33. 7; Jer. 44. 1; al.

 After the Pesh. adds 'to fight with him; and Pharaoh said to him, I am not come against thee; turn aside from me. And he hearkened not unto Pharaoh, and Pharaoh smote him.' This is probably a reminiscence of 2 Chr. 35. 21 ff.

 'When he saw him,' i.e. when they joined battle. On the analogy of the use of the Hithpa'el in ch. 14. 8, Benz., following Winckler, proposes to read the Nipb'al בָּלַה—scarcely a necessary emendation.

 Cf. ch. 16. 15 note.

 30. Cf. ch. 16. 15 note.

 Ch. 23. 31–34 forms the source of 2 Chr. 36. 2–4. Short notices, probably from the Annals, are framed by ר"פ (R"p).


 Ch. 24. 31–34 forms the source of 2 Chr. 36. 2–4. Short notices, probably from the Annals, are framed by ר"פ (R"p).
the name is given in our passage also by LXX 'Αμουδαίος, Cod. A, Luc. 'Αμουδαίος, Vulg. 'Αμιλαι.

Cf. ch. 8. 22 note.

33. [לעב לועה קספנ] LXX, Luc. eti περιεκαταρτων ανω... του μη βεβαιωτες (Luc. ανωτών), i.e. 'και... οὐδεν. Cf. || 2 Chr. 36. 3. So Oort. It is, however, scarcely possible to suppose that 'ו התלעב originally followed שִׂמְךָ, and does not properly belong to MT. שִׂמְךָ. Thus the passage seems to be involved by the combination of two readings:—'bound him in Ribla in the land of Ḥamath,' and, 'removed him from reigning in Jerusalem.' Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit. retain MT. שִׂמְךָ, and regard כָּלַת as a gloss introduced from 2 Chr. 36. 3.

34. [לעב לועה קספנ] LXX, Luc., Vulg. מֵעַ.

35. [לעב לועה קספנ] The sentence is awkward in the extreme if these words be regarded as in apposition to מֵעַ... כָּלַת; and the alternative suggested by Benz., 'With (i.e. by the help of) the people of the land' (cf. LXX, Luc. μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς γῆς), is out of the question. Doubtless Klo. is right in regarding מֵעַ... כָּלַת as a gloss explanatory of מֵעַ... כָּלַת of the first half of the verse.


Ch. 23. 36—24. 6 are summarized in 2 Chr. 36. 5-8. RD (RD²) frames short notices, probably drawn from the Annals.


After הביאו את הנחלות מַעְרֵה מָעֲשֵׂים Luc. adds את הכנף יירא, while Pesh. adds 'יג יילא תוכ רכ חירב, 'against Jerusalem' after בּית בְּנֵי מֵעַ... כָּלַת.

Nebuchadnezzar's campaign against Egypt (cf. v. 7) took place, according to Berossus, in the last year of his father Nabopolassar, i.e. B.C. 605. The news of Nabopolassar's death caused him to hasten back to Babylon, after he had brought his campaign to a successful issue. According to Jer. 46. 2 the defeat of the Egyptian army at Carchemish took place in Jehoiakim's fourth
year (B.C. 604), and Jer. 25. 1 co-ordinates the fourth year of Jehoiakim with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar.

That Jehoiakim became 'servant' to Nebuchadnezzar through this campaign seems to follow both from the fragmentary account of Kings and also from the fact that Berossus speaks of ῥόδες ἀλκαλάτειρος τῶν Ιουδαίων among other prisoners of war. Thus, if the 'three years' of ch. 24. 1 be correct, and if the length of Jehoiakim's reign extended to eleven years (ch. 23. 36), Jehoiakim must have remained in rebellion against Nebuchadnezzar for four years.

The reference to Egypt's loss of Syria in v. 7 demands that in the original narrative an account of Nebuchadnezzar's victory at Carchemish must have followed v. 1a. Cf. Winckler, Alltest. Untersuchungen, 81 ff.

2. [Rather than] is to be expected in connexion with and , and this emendation is favoured by Grä., Klo., Benz.

After Luc. adds καὶ εἰς τὴν Συμάπειαν, i.e. possibly original, though not (with Klo.) to be substituted for שָׂרָה.

3. [LXX, Luc., Pesh., Targ. seem to have read 'on account of the anger of Yahweh,' as in v. 20. The introductory appears to be characteristic of this editor; cf. ch. 23. 26, 35.

4. [And also (because of) the innocent blood which he shed.] If the text is correct, the force of the ב of תֹם הָאִדָּם (v. 3) must be carried over into this clause.

6. [These words are omitted in 2 Chr. 36. 8 MT., but appear in the LXX text, with the addition καὶ εἰσῆγεν εἰς γενομενήν μυῖα τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, i.e. μ[…] β] (cf. ch. 21. 26). Sta. Ges. i. 679 note conjectures that this reference to the burial-place originally stood in Kings, and was derived thence by the Chronicler, but that the notice was subsequently struck out in view of the prediction of Jer. 22. 19. So Wellh. (C. 359), Benz.

7. [Cf. note on נְבֵל מֵאָרִים I. 5. 1.]
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Ch. 24. 8–17 is briefly summarized in 2 Chr. 36. 9, 10. No reference is made to the Annals, and it is possible that 
may be writing from personal knowledge of events, independently of a written source. Sta. (ZATW. iv. 271 ff.) regards vv. 13, 14 as a later insertion, properly referring to the events of 586 B.C. It is difficult to reconcile the 10,000 of v. 14 with the numbers given in v. 16; in v. 13 has no antecedent to which to refer back, whilst in v. 15 refers directly to v. 12. The chief objection, however, to the reference of these verses to 597 B.C. is to be found in their contents. Verse 13 speaks of all the treasures of the City and Temple as carried off by Nebuchadnezzar, and the golden vessels as melted down. But from ch. 25 (Jer. 52) and Jer. 27. 18–20, the inference is that only a part of the City and Temple treasures were carried off on this occasion, and that the greater part was seized by the Chaldeans in 586 B.C. Thus the contents of v. 13 are suitable as a description of the events of 586 B.C., but not of those of 597 B.C. The same inference is to be drawn from the contents of v. 14. All Jerusalem was first deported in 586, and a characteristic of this deportation was that only the remained (25. 12). On the other hand, as appears from Jer., the deportation at the close of Jehoiachin’s reign consisted only of the higher classes (cf. e.g. Jer. 27. 20 that and the men who bore arms, i.e. practically the same category as is named in v. 16.

8. [2 Chr. 36. 9 adds אשה ושביתות.]


12. [Jer. 25 is the event in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar.]

13. Luc. prefixes the statement καὶ εἰσῆλθε βασιλεὺς Βασιλέου eis τὴν πόλιν, i.e. εἰσὶν ἐν ἐν—addition desiderated by in the following sentence.

1 But cf. note on v. 13.
14. The participle singular is used of a single exile 2 Sam. 15. 19; fem. Isa. 49. 21. It is clear, however, from vv. 15, 16 that we should vocalize a collective, 'captives.'

[Remarque] Probably 'the lock-smiths.' So v. 16; Jer. 24. 1; 29. 2; in each case collective sing., and in connexion with שׁלון, by inference 'the workers in wood.' Elsewhere (Isa. 24. 22; 42. 7; Ps. 142. 8) שׁלון denotes 'place of locking,' i.e. 'dungeon.'


15. RV. 'and the chief men of the land.' Q're_pool, as in Ezek. 17. 13. The word is perhaps from a root הָיָה 'to be foremost'; but it is possible that the insertion of the 1 or 1 is an intentional alteration to distinguish from the divine title הוה'. Cf. Heb. Lex. Oxf., s. v. קָר § 1.


Ch. 24. 18—25. 7 = Jer. 52. 1-11.

18. Cf. ch. 23. 31 note.

20. Cf. note on יִשְׁמַעְלֵה ch. 3. 25.

25. 1. אֲנִיָּהוּ כִּבְשֵׁר רָכִּב] LXX, Luc. omit.

3..states] It is impossible that mention should be made of the day of the month when the month itself has not been specified. Pesh. חָסַמְחֲלָה חָסַמְחֲלָה חָסַמְחֲלָה, i.e. חָסַמְחֲלָה חָסַמְחֲלָה חָסַמְחֲלָה, חָסַמְחֲלָה חָסַמְחֲלָה, חָסַמְחֲלָה חָסַמְחֲלָה. This, however, conflicts with the earlier date given in v. 8 for a subsequent event. Th., Klo., Kamp., Benz., Kit., Oort supply יִשְׁחָר כִּבְשֵׁר רָכִּב after Jer. 39. 2; 52. 6.

4. ' ונַחֲמָה] The missing verb is supplied by ||Jer. 52. 7 הָעִישׁ אֲנִיָּהוּ כִּבְשֵׁר רָכִּב; cf. Jer. 39. 4. So exactly Pesh. חָסַמְחֲלָה חָסַמְחֲלָה, while LXX, εἰς ἄλλον, supplies the latter verb, Vulg., sugerunt, the former. We are still, however, confronted by the difficulty of the sing. הָעִישׁ in v. 4b, without specified subj. This appears as plur. הָעִישׁ in ||Jer. 52. 7, and Pesh. in our passage is again in agreement. This is scarcely satisfactory, because the
king is only mentioned for the first time in v. 5 as having left the city with the men of war. The solution of the difficulty is probably to be found in Luc., which supplies in v. 4 a before 'יהלע נו אמן ו יסוי kal Ἰωάννης ὁ βασιλεὺς. We may thus read in v. 4a "ויהי נו אמן ו יסוי נואו תגרוס" retaining sing. 'יהי in v. 4b as referring to the principal actor. The plur. of Luc. kal Ἰωάννης ὁ βασιλεὺς is probably the translator's alteration.

Many Codd., all Verss., and || Jer. 52. 9 read sing. הרים. The phrase מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס מ תגרוס (as in || Jer. 52. 9) is the reading of several Codd. in our passage.


[Jer. 52. 11 adds ויהי, as in ch. 23. 33.]

368

The Second Book of Kings


Gedaliah, governor of Judah.

Ch. 25. 8-21 — Jer. 52. 12-27.

Ch. 25. 22-26 is a much abbreviated account of the events described in Jer. 40. 7—43. 6, to which source R D clearly owes his information. Jer. 52, on the other hand, seems to be a later addition to the prophet's book excerpted from Kings, naturally with omission of 25. 22-26, as having been already related in fuller detail.

Three Codd., Luc., Pesh. ויהי; || Jer. 52. 12 ויהי Kloe, Benz. make the erroneous statement that Luc. agrees with || Jer.

9. [Jer. 52. 11 adds ויהי, as in ch. 23. 33.]

'And every house of a great one.' So Pesh., Targ. The statement is superfluous after the preceding מ תגרוס מ תגרוס, and is regarded by Benz., Kit. as an explanatory gloss.

Notice the closing words of Jer. 51, 'Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.'
XXV. 6-23

10. Read אַרְשָׁר בֶּן בְּרֶבֶנְכִּיתָּן, with || Jer. 52. 14. Luc. omits בֶּן בְּרֶבֶנְכִּיתָּן, while the whole v. is wanting in LXX.

11. The remnant of the multitude is indistinguishable from 'the remnant of the people' mentioned just previously. || Jer. is doubtless correct in reading מָשָׁמְךָ 'the artificers,' or 'master-workmen.' Cf. ch. 24. 14.

At the end of the v. Pesh. adds הָעַלּוֹ 'and brought them to Babylon.'

12. Q're יַנְבִּיא, as in || Jer. 52. 16, is supposed to mean 'husbandmen.' Kt. סֵבִי 'ploughmen' (lit. 'diggers') is preferred by K6., Lehrg. I. ii. 105. Q're is to some extent supported by Jer. 39. 10b יָנָבִי יֵכֹהֶה יְבֵא יְבֵא; though here also it is possible that יָנָבֵי, of uncertain meaning (RV. 'fields'), is an alteration of יֵכֹהֶה 'cisterns' (ch. 3. 16; Jer. 14. 3).

13-17. Cf. notes on I. 7. 15 ff.

15. רֹחֲמֹן רֹחֲמַי 'That which was of gold he took in gold, and that which was of silver in silver'; i.e. all the vessels &c. of these precious metals, as so much gold and silver.

18. Cf. ch. 23. 4 note.

19. רֹחֲמֹן רֹחֲמַי || Jer. 52. 25 reads יְבֵא for יָנָבִי.


'_that which was of the multitude' Read st. constr. יְבֵא, with || Jer. 52. 25. Luc., קַל יִבְּרֵי חֶפֶר, takes the word as a proper name חֶפֶר (or חֶפֶר), and this is adopted by Klo. But the statement יְבֵא וְנַעֲמָה, 'who mustered the people of the land,' makes it clear that the reference is not to the מַעֲמָה himself, but to an official who had charge of the conscription, and so appropriately יְבֵא.

23. קַנָּה | Read רָאָם עֲשָׂר, with LXX, Pesh., Targ., as in vv. 23b, 24. So || Jer. 40. 7.


Ch. 25. 27-30 = Jer. 52. 31-34.

b b
27. [beshan melah] b.c. 561.

LXX, Luc., Pesh. are probably correct in reading נֶאֶה, as in || Jer.

28. [mesul cema] || Jer. אָמֵץ is preferable.

30. [rahot] 'His allowance' (&c. of food). So Jer. 40. 5; cf. Prov. 15. 17. In Assyr. itara hu denotes a portion of corn.

 Cf. I. 8. 59 note.
APPENDIX

Inscription of Mesha', king of Moab.

1. I am Mesha', son of Chemosh[?], king of Moab, the Daibonite.

2. My father reigned over Moab for thirty years, and I reigned

3. after my father, and I made this high-place to Chemosh in

4. . . . because he had saved me from all the . . . , and

5. king of Israel afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was

6. land; and his son succeeded him, and he also said, I will afflict

7. but I saw (my desire) upon him and upon his house, and

8. of Mehedeba, and one (i.e. Israel) dwelt therein during his
days and half his son's days, even forty years; but

9. Chemosh restored it in my days. And I built Ba'al-Me'on, and

I made therein the reservoir (?) , and I built
10. Qiryathēn. And the men of Gad had dwelt in the land of ‘Ataroth from of old; and the king of Israel had built for himself

11. ‘Ataroth. And I fought against the city and took it, and I slew the whole of it, [the people of ??]

12. the city, a gazingstock (?) to Chemosh, and to Moab. And I took captive thence the altar-hearth of Dawdoh (?), and I dragged

13. it before Chemosh in Qeriyyoth. And I settled therein the men of sān and the men of

14. MHR. And Chemosh said to me, Go, take Nebo against Israel, and I

15. went by night and fought against it from break of dawn until noon, and I took

16. it, and I slew the whole of it, 7,000 men, and male strangers, and [female strangers],

17. and female slaves; for to ‘Ashtar-Chemosh had I devoted it, and I took thence the

18. vessels of Yahwe, and I dragged them before Chemosh. Now the king of Israel had built

19. Yahāq, and he abode therein when he fought with me. But Chemosh drove him out from before me; and

20. I took from Moab 200 men, even all its chiefs, and I took them up against Yahāq, and took it,

21. to add (it) unto Daibon. I built qāḥ, the wall of Ye‘ārin, and the wall of

22. the keep. And I built its gates, and I built its towers, and

23. I built the king’s house, and I made the sluices of the reservoir for water in the midst of

24. the city. Now there was no cistern in the midst of the city in qāḥ. And I said to all the people, Make

25. yourselves every man a cistern in his house; and I cut out the cutting for qāḥ by means of the

26. prisoners of Israel. I built ‘Aro‘er, and I made the highway by the Arnon.
27. I built Beth-Bamoth; for it was pulled down. I built Beṣer, for ruins
28. . . . . . . of Daibon (were) fifty, for all Daibon was obedient.
And I ruled
29. over . . . 100 in the cities which I had added to the land.
And I built
30. Mēhēdēba, and Beth-Diblahēn, and Beth-Ba'al-Me'on, and
I took thither the nāqad-keepers,
31. . . . . . . sheep of the land. And as for Ḫoronēn, there
dwelt therein . . . .
32. . . . . . . and Chemosh said to me, Go down, fight against Ḫoronēn. So I went down . .
33. . . . . . . and Chemosh restored it in my days, and . .
thence . .
34. . . . . . . . And I . . .

2.

The Siloam Inscription.

1. [Behold] the piercing through! And this was the manner of
the piercing through. Whilst yet [the miners were lifting
up]
2. the pick each towards his fellow, and whilst yet there were
three cubits to be [cut through, there was heard] the voice
of each call-

1 Text as in Lidzbarski, *Nordsemit. Epigr.* p. 439. Translation, with con-
jectural supplement, from Dri. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, p. xvi.
3. ing to his fellow, for there was a fissure (?) in the rock on the right-hand . . . . . . . And on the day of the
4. piercing through, the miners (lit. hewers) smote each so as to meet his fellow, pick against pick; and there flowed
5. the water from the source to the pool, 1,200 cubits; and one hun-
6. dred cubits was the height of the rock over the head of the miners.

3.

Inscription of the Monolith of Shalmaneser II, ll. 78–102

78 In the Eponym-year of Daian-Asshur (b. c. 854), in the month Airu, on the 14th day, I left Nineveh, crossed the Tigris, advanced against the cities 79 of Giammu on the Balih. Before the terror of my lordship, the panic of my mighty weapons, they were afraid, and with their own weapons Giammu their lord 80 they slew. Into Kitlala and Til-ša-apli-aḫḫ I advanced, my gods in his palaces I set up, revelling in his palaces I instituted. 81 His treasure-house I opened, his treasure I found, of his goods (and) possessions I made spoil, to my city Asshur I brought (them). From Kitlala I departed; to Kar-Šulman-ašārid 82 I drew nigh; on boats of sheep-skin for the second time the Euphrates at high water I crossed. The tribute of the kings on that side of the Euphrates, (namely) of Sangar of 83 Gargamiš (Carchemish), of Kundašīpi of Qummuḫ, of Arami son of Gūši, of Lalli of Milida, of Ḥaiāni son of Gabar, 84 of Kalparuda of Patin, of Kalparuda of Gurgum, silver, gold, lead, copper, copper vessels,— 85 at Asshur-utir-āšbat on that side of the Euphrates, which is above (the river) Sagur, (and) which the Hittites Pitru (Pethor?) 86 name, (even) there I received. From the Euphrates I departed; to Ḥalman (Aleppo) I drew nigh. Battle with me they dreaded; my feet they embraced. 87 Silver

1 Nos. 3, 4, and 5 are based upon the text and translation of KB., and Winckler, Keilschrift. Textbuch, and upon Delitzsch, Assyrisches Hand- worterbuch.
(and) gold as their tribute I received; offerings before Rammân of Ḫalman I brought.

From Ḫalman I departed; to the two cities of Irḫulini of Ḫamath I drew nigh. Adinnu, Mašgâ, Ḩaranâ, the city of his kingship, I conquered. His spoil, his goods, the possessions of his palaces I brought forth; to his palaces I set fire. From Ḩaranâ I departed; to Qarqar I drew nigh; Qarqar, the city of his kingship, I laid waste, I destroyed, with fire I burned. 1,200 chariots, 1,200 horsemen, 20,000 men of Hadadezer of Damascus; 700 chariots, 700 horsemen, 10,000 men of Irḫulini of Ḫamath; 2,000 chariots, 10,000 men of Aḥab of Israel; 500 men of Guai (Coa); 1,000 men of (the land) Muṣri; 10 chariots, 10,000 men of (the land) Irqanat; 200 men of Matinu-baʿli (Mattan-baʿal) of Armada (Arvad); 200 men of (the land) Usanata; 30 chariots, 10,000 men of Adunu-baʿli (Adoni-baʿal) of Šiana; 1,000 camels of Gindibu of Arba ....... 1,000 men of Baʿṣa, son of Ruḥubi (Reḥob), of Ammon;—these twelve kings to his assistance he took; for battle and combat against me they advanced. With the exalted succour which Asshur, the lord, rendered, with the mighty power which Nergal, who marched before me, bestowed, with them I fought; from Qarqar unto Gilzân their defeat I accomplished; 14,000 of their troops with weapons I laid low; like Rammân upon them a flood I rained down; I scattered their corpses; the surface of the wilderness I filled with their numerous troops; with weapons I caused their blood to flow ... the river Orontes ... I dammed (?)}. In the midst of that battle their chariots, their horsemen, their horses, their teams I captured.

4.

Fragment of the Annals of Shalmaneser II.

In the eighteenth year of my reign for the sixteenth time the Euphrates I crossed. Ḫazael of Damascus in the multitude of his troops placed confidence, and his troops without number assembled. Senir, a mountain-peak in the neighbourhood of
Sennacherib's Third Campaign

Lebanon, his stronghold he made. With him I fought, his siege I conducted. 6,000 of his men of war with weapons I laid low; 1,121 of his chariots, 470 of his war-horses, together with his baggage, I took from him. For the saving of his life he betook himself off. In Damascus, the city of his kingship, I besieged him; his plantations I cut down. To the mountains of Hauran I went; cities without number I destroyed, I laid waste, with fire I burned; their prisoners without number I carried off. Unto the mountains of the range Bāli-ra'ī, a promontory, I went; the image of my kingship there did I set up. At that time the tribute of the Tyrians, of the Zidonians, of Ja-u-a (Jehu) the son of Omri I received.

Descriptive Inscription from the Obelisk of Shalmaneser.

Tribute of Ja-u-a (Jehu) son of Omri; silver, gold, a bowl (šaplu) of gold, goblets (zuqāl) of gold, a ladle (qabuli) of gold, pitchers (dalānī) of gold, bars of lead, a staff (hutaru) for the hand of the king, spear-shafts (budilādi) I received of him.

Narrative of Sennacherib's Third Campaign (B.C. 701), from the Taylor Cylinder, Col. II. I. 34–Col. III. 1. 41.

In my third campaign to the land Hatti (Hittite land) I went. Luli (Elulaeus), king of Zidon—the dread of the majesty of my lordship overwhelmed him, and to a far-off spot in the midst of the sea he fled, and his land I reduced to subjection. Great Zidon, Little Zidon, Beth-Zitti, Zarepta, Maḥallība, Usū, Akzib, Akko, his strong cities, the fortresses, the spots for pasture and for watering, his intrenchments, were overwhelmed by the might of the arms of Asshur, my lord, and submitted themselves under my feet. Tuba'lu (Iitoba'al) upon the royal throne over them I seated, and the payment of the tribute of my lordship, yearly without intermission, I laid upon him. Minḥimmu

1 Heb. יָנֵי. 2 Heb. יָנֵי. 3 Heb. יָנֵי. 4 Heb. יָנֵי.
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(Menahem) of Samsimuruna, Tuba’lu of Zidon, Abdil‘iti of Arvad (Arados), Urumilk of Gebal (Byblos), Mitinti of Ashdod, Buduilu of Beth-Ammon, Kammušunadbi (Chemosh-nadab) of Moab, Malikrammu (Malkiram) of Edom, all the kings of the West country (Martu), rich presents, weighty tribute, moveable (?) possessions before me brought, and kissed my feet. But Zidqā, king of Ashqelon, who had not bowed himself under my yoke—the gods of his father’s house, himself, his wife, his sons, his daughters, his brothers, the seed of his father’s house I dragged forth, and to Assyria I conveyed them.

Šarruludāri, son of Rukibi, their former king, over the people of Ashqelon I placed, and the tribute-offering of subjectio to my lordship I imposed upon him, and he became subject (?) to me. In the course of my campaign Beth-Dagon, Joppa, Bene-baraq, Azuru, the cities of Zidqā, which under my feet had not speedily submitted, I besieged, conquered, carried off their spoil. The leaders, nobles, and people of Amqarruna (Eqron), who had cast Pād (their king by virtue of a sworn covenant with Assyria) into fetters of iron, and to Ḥazaqiyau (Hezekiah) of Judah had delivered him with hostile intent, (he shut him up in darkness;)—their heart trembled. The kings of Egypt—-the archers, the chariots, the horses of the king of Miluhhi, forces innumerable they summoned together, and came to their aid. Before Altaqu (Elteqeh) the battle-array was set against me; they lifted up (?) their weapons. In reliance upon Asshur, my lord, I fought with them, and effected their defeat; the commander of the chariots and the sons of the king of Egypt, together with the commander of the chariots of the king of Miluhhi, alive in the midst of the battle my hand took prisoners. Altaqu (and) Tamnā (Timnath) I attacked, conquered, and carried forth their booty.

Col. III. Against Amqarruna (Eqron) I advanced, and the chief officers, the magnates who had offended, I slew; and on stakes around the city I impaled their corpses. The inhabitants of the town, who had practised wickedness and mischief, as prisoners
I counted; the rest of them, who had not practised wickedness and misdeed, who in their transgression had not shared, their amnesty I proclaimed. Padi, their king, from Jerusalem I brought, and on the throne of lordship over them I installed him, and the tribute of my lordship I imposed upon him. But Hezekiah of Judah, who had not bowed himself under my yoke, of his fortified towns, fortresses, and small cities in their neighbourhood innumerable, with casting down of battering-rams and assault of siege-engines, with attack of infantry, of mines, I besieged, I captured. 200,150 souls, young, old, male, and female, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep, without number, from the midst of them I brought forth, and as spoil I counted them. Himself, like a bird in a cage, in the midst of Jerusalem, the city of his kingship, I shut up. Fortifications against him I erected, and those coming forth from the gates of his city I turned back. His cities, which I had plundered, from his territory I severed, and to Mitinti king of Ashdod, Padf king of Amqarruna (Eqrn), and Zilbel king of Haziti (Gaza) I gave them, and diminished his territory. To the former payment—their yearly tribute—the tribute of subjection to my lordship I added, and I laid it upon them. Himself, Hezekiah, terror of the glory of my lordship overwhelmed him; and the Urbi and his trusty soldiers, which for the defence of Jerusalem, the city of his kingship, he had introduced, laid down their arms. Together with 30 talents of gold (and) 800 talents of silver, precious stones (?), sparkling ...-stones, great lapislazuli-stones (?), couches of ivory, thrones of state of elephant-skins (and) ivory, ...-wood, ...-wood, everything available, an enormous treasure, and his daughters, the women of his palace, his male and female servants (?), to Nineveh, the city of my lordship, after me I caused to be brought; and for the payment of tribute and the rendering of homage he despatched his envoy.
In favour of the view as to the site taken in the note ad loc., and against the rival identification with Bfr Eyāb, cf. J. F. Stenning, art. En-Rogel in Hastings, BD. i. 711.

For further authorities for finding the site upon the south-east hill, cf. G. A. Smith, art. Jerusalem in Encyc. Bibl. ii. 2417f.

Further arguments for the view that Solomon’s supply of horses was drawn, not from Egypt, but from the North-Syrian Muṣri are given by T. K. Cheyne, Encyc. Bibl. iii. 3162.

This looks like a doublet, introduced into the text with the gloss et aperuit fenestram secundam. That this is the case cannot, however, be affirmed with certainty, in view of the repetition of the second symbolic action which is desiderated by Elisha in v. 19. If the addition be genuine, we must suppose [או] for ים to have fallen out after ימי.
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— as relative, 156.
— omitted with demonstr. pronoun, 262.
— omitted with subs. when used with adj., 81.
Casus pendens, 69.
Circumscription of genitive, 5, 8, 26.
Circumstantial clause, 6, 11, 12, 70, 102, 126, 182, 189, 199, 295.
Construct state, suspended, 302.
Co-ordination in time, 6.
Dialect of North Palestine, 208.
Diminutives, 246.
Geographical sites:—
Abel-beth-ma'achah, 198.
Amana, 280.
Anathoth, 22.
Aphek, 238.
Argob, 45.
Aro'er, 307.
Arpad, 342.
Avva, 334.
Ba'alath, 138.
Ba'al-shalishah, 277.
Bethel, 177.
Beth-Ḥanan, 41.
Beth-Ḥoron, 137.
Beth-Shan, 44.
Beth-Shemesh, 41.
Cabul, 135.
Cinnereth, 198.
Coa, 151.
Cuthah, 334.
David, city of, 17, 380.
Dothan, 286.
Eden, 344.
En-Rogel, 5.
Gath-Ḥepher, 319.
Geba, 199.
Gezer, 137.
Gihon, 8.
Gilgal, 264.
Gozan, 330.
Habor, 330.
Halah, 330.
Haran, 343.
Hazor, 136.
Ible'am, 300.
Ijon, 198.
Januaḥ, 324.
Jarmuth, 42.
Jokme'am, 44.
Jordan, circuit of, 102.
Kir-ḥareseth, 272.
Lachish, 319.
Libnah, 296.
Megiddo, 43.
Millo, the, 136.
Mizpah, 199.
Müri, 151, 291.
Pharpar, 280.
Ramah, 197.
Ramoth-Gilead, 251.
Reshef, 344.
Sela, 318.
Sepharvaim, 334.
Shechem, 173.
Shephelah, the, 151.
Shiloh, 188.
Shunem, 3.
Socoh, 42.
Succoth, 102.
Tappuah, 322.
Telasshur, 344.
Tishbeh, 217.
Zarephath, 218.
Zarethan, 44.
Zeredah, 169.
Zion, 17.

Hatef-shewa with a sibilant, 180, 231, 264, 344.
Hebrew words and phrases:—

ם, 11.
ם, 354.
ם for ב, 237.
ם, 35.
ם as indefinite article, 209.
ם, 255.
ם used absolutely, 289.
ם, peculiar use of, 72, 182, 311.
ם for ב, 72, 184, 201, 228, 297.
ם in single direct questions, 7.
ם, 116.
ם = assign, 161.
ם, 54.
ם, 117.
ם י, 31.
ם, 190.
ם, 5, 8.
ם, sign of accusative, before indef. obj., 178.
— sign of accusative, marking new subj., 284.
ם = with, 142.
ם prettii, 22, 207, 240.
ם, 245.
םך, 16.
ם, 50.
ם, 327.
ם = curse, 247.
ם, 201.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Josh</th>
<th>Lev</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Deut</th>
<th>Josh</th>
<th>Lev</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Deut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>275.</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>169.</td>
<td>189.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>360.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1consecutive epexegetical, 15.</td>
<td>— consecutive introducing predicate, 169.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>354.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introducing direct narration, 244.</td>
<td>— introducing oath, 21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formative, 246.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idem per idem idiom, 293.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperative with 1 in place of cohortative, 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect, with frequentative force, 1, 32, 194, 268, 338, 359.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pictorial, 239.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impersonal construction, 4, 20, 48, 180, 187.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infinitive absol., use of, 241, 256, 269.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in מ, 271.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infinitive constr., use of, 317.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiph'il with Hireq under pre-formative מ, 272.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index

Negative duplicated, 148.
Nomen unitatis, 12.

Oath, 12, 21, 281.
Omission of pronom. subject of participle, 262.
Order of sentence, 4, 18, 55, 120, 280.

Participle, agreement of, with suffix of antecedent subject, 189.
— force of, 3, 47, 218, 257.
Perfect with article prefixed, 156.
— with t consecutive as imperative, 13.

Personal pronoun reinforcing suffix pronoun, 7, 249.
Pluperfect, 188, 270.
Question indicated by tone of voice, 7.
Relative omitted, 33.
Resumption, 8, 14, 118, 239.
Termination in proper names, 42.
Vocative continued by third person, 300.