

## THE SPEECHES IN CHRONICLES.

IN an article on the "Critical Study of the Old Testament" in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1890 (p. 216), I happened to make a remark to the effect that in the Books of Chronicles there are speeches attributed to David, Solomon, and different prophets, which can only be the composition of the Chronicler himself, the idioms used in them being constantly of a distinctively late character, and often without precedent in the pre-exilic literature, if not peculiar to the compiler of Chronicles himself. I supposed, in making this statement, that I was merely saying what, though no doubt usually kept back from the ordinary Bible-reader, was nevertheless perfectly well known to every serious Hebrew student. True, however, as my remark was, it has had the misfortune to incur the displeasure of the Rev. Valpy French, who—though not, I believe, previously known either as a Biblical scholar or as a Hebraist—has in these latter days come forward as a doughty antagonist of the "Higher Criticism," and in the volume called *Lex Mosaica*, of which he is the editor, has done me the honour of devoting a special Excursus to its refutation.<sup>1</sup> The confidence with which Mr. French announces his conclusions, the seeming completeness of his data, and the pretensions of Hebrew learning with which he exhibits them, are well calculated to mislead the ordinary reader; and accordingly we find the *Tablet* complimenting him upon his success "on a point"—the writer naively adds—"which admits of comparatively easy verification." The point does indeed admit of easy verification; and I propose to verify it. In doing this, I may succeed, incidentally,

<sup>1</sup> P. 192 ff. (cf. p. 164 f.).

in placing before students of Hebrew some facts which may interest them.

In support of my position, I remarked in a note: "See 1 Chr. 29; 2 Chr. 13, 5-12; 15, 2-7; 20, 5-12, etc.; and contrast, for instance, the speeches in 2 Chr. 10, which are excerpted nearly verbatim from 1 Ki. 12."

Upon this, Mr. French observes: "The issue is clear. Dr. Driver says in so many words: 'I give you four instances in which you can see for yourself that where the Chronicler relates speeches which are not recorded in the parallel books, the language and thought are both exilic [rather *post-exilic*];<sup>1</sup> whilst in the one instance nearly verbatim quoted, the diversity of style is not apparent.'"

Mr. French objects, however, that I "derive proof of my contention" from 2 Chr. 10, which contains a speech of only seven verses; and declares that he is able to "adduce in evidence to the contrary lengthy speeches which are also nearly verbatim excerpted from Samuel or Kings, and which have quite as many marks of exilic language and thought as those with no parallel references, which Dr. Driver pronounces to be invented." And he proceeds accordingly to take two speeches of about twelve verses each in 1 Chr. 17, derived from 2 Sam. 7, the differences between which he exhibits—or professes to exhibit (for there are several omissions)—in parallel columns. I am of course perfectly prepared to follow him in this. There is not much in the Chronicles with which I am unacquainted: years ago I collated the text, word for word, with that of Samuel and Kings; and Mr. French is greatly mistaken if he imagines that I rest my contention upon seven verses in a single chapter. I merely took 2 Chr. 10 as an example: any other speech would have served as an illustration equally well.

<sup>1</sup> No one imagines the Chronicles to have been written *during* the Exile even Ezra did not come to Palestine till eighty years afterwards.

For the purpose of refuting Mr. French the two speeches selected by himself will answer admirably.

The result of Mr. French's researches in the Chronicles may be stated in his own words (p. 165). It is to show that "the speeches for which there are parallels in Samuel or Kings"—as, for instance, those in 1 Chr. 17—"exhibit the compiler's hand as much as those for which there is no voucher, while the latter"—as, for instance, David's speeches in 1 Chr. 29—"bear no stronger impress of his individuality than the former."

This representation is altogether false. The changes introduced by the Chronicler into the text of 2 Sam. 7, in incorporating it into his own work, are virtually *imperceptible*: they consist on an average of two or three words in a verse; in some of them a very keen eye can detect the Chronicler's hand, but they do not affect the general style or texture of the verse in the least. Let me transcribe a few verses, in parallel columns, to show this:—

1 CHR. 17.	2 SAM. 7.
ואהיה עמך בכל אשר הלכת <sup>8</sup>	ואהיה עמך בכל אשר הלכת <sup>9</sup>
ואכרית את כל אויבך מפניך ועשיתי	ואכריתיה את כל אויבך מפניך ועשיתי
לך שם כשם הגדולים אשר	לך שם גדול כשם הגדולים אשר
בארץ: <sup>9</sup> ושמתי מקום לעמי ישראל	בארץ: <sup>10</sup> ושמתי מקום לעמי לישראל
ונטעתיהו ושכן תחתיו ולא ירנז עוד	ונטעתיו ושכן תחתיו ולא ירנז עוד
ולא יוסיפו בני עולה לבלותו כאשר	ולא יסיפו בני עולה לענותו כאשר
בראשונה: <sup>10</sup> ולמימים אשר צויתי	בראשונה: <sup>11</sup> ולמן היום אשר צויתי
שפטים על עמי ישראל והכנעתי את	שפטים על עמי ישראל והניחתי לך
כל אויבך ואניד לך	מכל אויבך והניד לך יהוה כי בית
ובית	יעשה לך יהוה:
יבנה לך יהוה:	

The two texts are virtually identical: the variations do not affect the general style at all; and the one text is just as idiomatic and flowing as the other. The only word in which the Chronicler's own hand might be traced is *מלכותו* for *ממלכתו* (my *Introd.*, p. 503).<sup>1</sup> Mr. French cites indeed

<sup>1</sup> It might have been suspected also in *הכנעתי*, *humble* (v. 10), had this word been used here in a *moral* acceptation (*Introd.*, p. 504): but, as it is, it is used exactly as in Judg. 3, 30. 4, 23. 8, 28. 11, 33.

למימים as a "modern" expression; but how he knows this he does not state: it does not occur elsewhere; and as למימים is a classical idiom, it is difficult to understand why the plural למימים should not be classical likewise.<sup>1</sup> In parts of the subsequent verses the differences are somewhat greater: thus—

<p>אלך           מה יוסיף עוד דויד<sup>18</sup>  לכבוד את עבדך ואתה את עבדך  ידעת:           <sup>19</sup> יהוה בעבור עבדך  ובלבך עשית את כל הגדולה הזאת  להדיע את       כל הגדלות: <sup>20</sup> יהוה  אין כמוך ואין אלהים  זולתך בכל אשר שמענו באזנינו:</p>	<p><sup>20</sup> ומה יוסיף דוד עוד לדבר אליך  ואתה ידעת את  עבדך אדני יהוה: <sup>21</sup> בעבור דברך  ובלבך עשית את כל הגדולה הזאת  להודיע את עבדך: <sup>22</sup> על כן גִּדַּלְתָּ יהוה  אלהים כי אין כמוך ואין אלהים  זולתך בכל אשר שמענו באזנינו:</p>
---	--

But Mr. French himself describes them throughout as "similar"; and the character of the language remains still the same.<sup>2</sup> Four passages (*vs.* 5, 10, 17, 18), in which the text of Chronicles reads harshly, are owned by Mr. French to be corrupt: there are consequently no grounds for concluding that they also read harshly in the form in which the Chronicler left them.<sup>3</sup> In the whole of the two speeches, as given in Chronicles, comprising nearly 350 words, there is not a single trace of the cumbrous and laboured syntax of the Chronicler, not one of his mannerisms or peculiar idioms, and at most five expressions in which a keen-sighted and attentive reader might succeed in detecting the Chronicler's own hand.<sup>4</sup> I say "keen-sighted and atten-

<sup>1</sup> On נמעתיהו in *v.* 9 Mr. French informs his readers that it is a "poetic form." Is it to be inferred then that 1 Sam. 16, 1 (מאסתיו) is prose, while 1 Sam. 16, 7 (מאסתיהו) is poetry? And what account has Mr. French to give of Judg. 4, 7 (נתתיהו), 11, 31 (העליתיהו), 13, 6 (שאלתיהו), which, as they occur in the book on which he writes, he may be presumed to have seen?

<sup>2</sup> The plural גִּדַּלְתָּ (*v.* 19) is treated by Mr. French as a "modern" form. But in what material respect does it differ from גִּבְרֹת, which, as it occurs in Deuteronomy, Mr. French would, I imagine, be the last man to pronounce modern?

<sup>3</sup> Comp. also the passages cited below, p. 245, note 1.

<sup>4</sup> *God* for *Jehovah* (see my *Introduction*, p. 20), *vs.* 2, 3, 17; מן אחרי, *v.* 7 (before a word without the art. מן as a separate word occurs more frequently in the Chronicles (about fifty times) than in all the rest of the O.T. together);

tive," for the expressions in question are by no means so strongly marked as many which the Chronicler employs. But it would not embarrass me if they had this character; for they stand quite isolated; and in general the style of both speeches (except in the passages admitted to be corrupt) is pure, lucid, and flowing.

Nevertheless Mr. French closes his synopsis of parallels with these brave words: "We have here two speeches of about twelve verses each, excerpted nearly verbatim from Samuel. Were it not for the parallel in the earlier book, Dr. Driver would no doubt have triumphantly pointed to this chapter as the acme of clumsy invention, for the language throughout is obscure and redundant, the syntax is heavy and awkward; the Chronicler moreover employs modern words and forms," etc. It is difficult indeed to treat Mr. French's lucubrations otherwise than as a comedy: nevertheless, I have a right to protest against an imputation which may be taken by some readers seriously. No doubt, *if* my knowledge of Hebrew idiom were as superficial as his is, and *if* I were equally deficient in the desire to ascertain the facts, or to state them correctly, I might have done what he suggests: it is unnecessary for me to say more. But all that a critic (who was also a Hebrew scholar) would have to say on the speeches in 1 Chr. 17, supposing the parallel in 2 Sam. 7 not to exist, would be that their style was entirely unlike the usual style of the Chronicler, and was in some respects allied to that of Deuteronomy; that there was reason therefore to suppose that the Chronicler had taken them from some earlier source; that in certain places<sup>1</sup> the text seemed to be corrupt;

מלכות, *vs.* 11, 14 (*ib.* p. 503); העמיד, *v.* 14 (*ib.*: contrast 2 Chr. 33, 8 with 2 Ki. 21, 8); the indirect narration לו בית לבנות, *v.* 25 (Ewald, § 338*a*: Sam. has לאמר בית אבנה לך; comp. 21, 18 with 2 Sam. 24, 18). If the speech had been the Chronicler's own composition, the marks of his style would certainly have been both more distinctive and much more frequent.

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the four noted by Mr. French, *v.* 19 הנדקות להודיע את כל הנדקות,

and that in a few isolated instances—those cited, p. 244, note 4—he had not impossibly altered the expression originally used. But “the language throughout obscure and redundant”! It is obscure only where, as Mr. French himself owns in four cases, it is corrupt; while, as to redundancies, the only one that I can discover is in *v.* 24 (יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים לישראל): in general, the text of Chr. is *shorter* than that of Sam. (343 words as against 389). And “the syntax heavy and awkward”! Only, as before, where the text is corrupt. Mr. French is fastidious. Will he re-write for us Deuteronomy in lucid and elegant Hebrew? His refined and delicate scholarship will surely be equal to the task.

The speeches in 2 Sam. 7, then, in the form in which they are excerpted in 1 Chr. 17, retain their original character virtually unimpaired: they are clear and flowing; they have none of the very peculiar idioms which mark the style of the Chronicler; the signs of the Chronicler’s hand are slight and few; they stand by themselves, and do not affect the general style even of the particular sentences in which they occur. Let us now pass to the speeches in Chronicles, to which there is no parallel in the earlier books, with the view of ascertaining whether or not they exhibit the same characteristics. It is a singular omission on Mr. French’s part that he has himself given the reader no help in doing this—for clearly, if two objects are to be properly compared, they ought both to be similarly exhibited, or described, to the person who is to judge of them. But the literary character of these speeches Mr. French has—wisely or unwisely—abstained from examining. I must therefore be

though easy enough to construe, yields a poor sense; *v.* 21 קשום לך נשם גְדִלוֹת is a strange expression, for which (see my *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, p. 214) there should no doubt be restored (partly with Sam.) לשום לו (cf. Deut. 10, 21),—the following לגרש in Chr. is however evidently correct, as against לארצך in Sam.; *v.* 27 ומברך לעולם, ויהיה may have fallen out at the end (comp., however, Ew. § 303b).

allowed to do this for him, and to impart to the reader that information which he has deemed it unnecessary to give him. I will select the speeches in the chapter which I named first, the two speeches of David in 1 Chr. 29. I shall analyse the language of these speeches in some detail: it will speedily appear that it abounds with examples of the late and peculiar usages characteristic of the Hebrew of the Chronicler, which are *absolutely* wanting in the speeches in 1 Chr. 17, excerpted from 2 Sam. 7.

1. שלמה בני אחד בחר בו אלהים נער ורך. "Solomon my son—as a single one<sup>1</sup> did God choose him—is young and tender." An involved and cumbrous sentence, quite out of harmony with the earlier usage of the language, which would have distributed the ideas to be expressed into two (or three) independent clauses. Note that the words שלמה בני נער ורך are repeated from *ch.* 22, 5, in a sentence placed in David's mouth, the late origin of which is sufficiently evidenced by the clause which follows, והבית לבנות ליהוה להגדיל למעלה לשם ולתפארת לכל הארצות.

כי לא לאדם הבירה כי ליהוה אלהים. Cf. (for the antithesis) 2 Chr. 19, 6 (speech of Jehoshaphat) כי לא לאדם תשפטו כי ליהוה.

הבירה: *so v.* 19. A notoriously late word, the Persian *bāru*, found otherwise only in Neh., Est., and Dan. (8, 2), of the *fortress*, or *castle*, in which the Persian kings resided, or of the *castle* near the Temple (Neh. 2, 8. 7, 2). It is used here, no doubt (as Mr. Ball<sup>2</sup> observes), for the purpose of "conveying to the minds of the Chronicler's contemporaries some idea of the magnificence of the Temple of Solomon as he imagined it." Its occurrence, however, does not suit Mr. French's theory of the Chronicler's literary methods: so, adopting an expedient which, when resorted to by another, he severely censures,<sup>3</sup> he proceeds, with the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Is. 51, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Commentary on the O.T. for English Readers*, edited by Bp. Ellicott. So Prof. W. H. Bennett in the *Expositor's Bible*, p. 319

<sup>3</sup> Page 134 *top*.

help of the LXX., to expel it from the text. But why, in *v.* 1, the unusual הַבִּירָה should have been introduced arbitrarily into the text, or why, in *v.* 19, an ordinary word, like הַבֵּית, should have been, as he supposes, corrupted into it, he does not stop to explain.

2. "Gold for gold (*i.e.* for vessels of gold), and silver for silver, and bronze for bronze, iron for iron, and timber for timber." A genuine example of that "redundant" style which Mr. French affects to discover in the speeches in 1 Chr. 17, but which is not there to be found; cf. similar—not the same—redundancies in *ch.* 28, 14–17 (narrative). For the peculiar mode of expression comp. also 28, 14, "Gold by weight for gold": there is a passage something like it in Jer. 52, 19 (= 2 Ki. 25, 15).

לָרַב. A favourite expression of the Chronicler (35 times): cf. *v.* 21, 12, 40, 22, 3 (*bis*), 4, 5, 8, 14, 15; 2 Chr. 2, 8, 9, 1, etc. In the older language, restricted chiefly to stating the *tertium comparationis* (as Dt. 1, 10; 1 Ki. 4, 20); so 11 times in the books from Gen. to Kings; otherwise in the same books only (with a verb) Gen. 30, 30, 48, 16; and, as here, 1 Ki. 1, 19, 25.<sup>1</sup> Classical Hebrew expresses usually the same idea by הִרְבֵּה מְאֹד (as 1 Ki. 10, 10, *changed* in 2 Chr. 9, 9 into לָרַב).

3. ועוד ברצותי בבית אלהי יש לי סגלה זהב וכסף. The words here are all ancient; but is the sentence a classically constructed one?

למעלה מכל-הכינותי לבית הקדש. Two of the Chronicler's solecisms occur in this short clause. למעלה in early Hebrew is used only in the literal sense of *upwards*; its weakened use as a mere intensive (= *exceedingly*) is found solely in the Chronicles, where it is very common, in the author's own narrative (1 Chr. 14, 2, 23, 17, 29, 25; 2 Chr.

<sup>1</sup> It is a characteristic of the later Hebrew that it uses *constantly* words, or constructions, which are rare and exceptional in classical Hebrew.

1, 1. 16, 12. 17, 12. 20, 19. 26, 8), and, as here, in David's mouth, 1 Chr. 22, 5 (cited above, on *v.* 1).

מְכַלְהֵכִינוֹתֵי. The omission of the relative in *prose* is in early Hebrew exceedingly rare: <sup>1</sup> in the Chronicles it is very frequent; 17 cases are cited in my *Introduction*, p. 505, —amongst them 1 Chr. 15, 12, where the extraordinary construction is placed in David's mouth, וְהֵעֲלִיתֶם אֶת אֲרוֹן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכִינוֹתַי לוֹ — an expression which is the twin-brother of the Chronicler's own לֹא דָוִד בְּהֶכֶן לוֹ דָּוִד, 2 Chr. 1, 4; add Ezr. 1, 6, לְבַר עַל כְּלֵהתְנַדֵּב (cf. Ryle's note); comp. other anomalous instances (in speeches) 2 Chr. 16, 9. 30, 18–19 (בְּעַד כָּל לִבְבוֹ הַכִּיֹּן).

5. לִזְהַב לִזְהַב וּלְכַסֵּף לְכַסֵּף. The first ל, in each of these pairs, is very anomalous: it is probably (Bertheau) an example of that peculiar use of ל to introduce pleonastically a new term, of which there is an isolated instance in Dt. 24, 5, but which is otherwise all but confined to the Chronicles: 1 Chr. 5, 2 (Bertheau). 28, 1<sup>b</sup> (וּלְכָל גְּבוּרָה). 21 (לְכָל נְדִיב). 29, 6 (וּלְשָׂרֵי מְלֹאכֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ). 2 Chr. 7, 21 (לְכָל־עוֹבֵר), altered from 1 Ki. 9, 8, כָּל עוֹבֵר. 26, 14<sup>b</sup>. Ezr. 7, 28. Otherwise the sentence is another example of the peculiar type noticed on *v.* 2.

מִתְנַדֵּב. In old Hebrew this word occurs twice in poetry, Jud. 5, 2. 9, of warriors *showing themselves ready or forward* to fight in the cause of their country: here it is used exactly as in the prose parts of Chronicles, Ezr., Neh. (and nowhere else) as a *terminus technicus* for *showing oneself ready or liberal* in offering gifts (*v.* 6. 9. Ezr. 1, 6. 2, 68. 3, 5. 7, 15. 16), or otherwise coming forward with sacred offices (2 Chr. 17, 16. Ezr. 7, 13. Neh. 11, 2): so in the following prayer of David, *v.* 14. 17.

I pass to this prayer of David, *vv.* 10–19.

<sup>1</sup> See my *Notes on Samuel*, on 1 Sam. 14, 21.

<sup>2</sup> This and 2 Chr. 26, 14<sup>b</sup> might also be explained as instances of the usage noticed on *v.* 12 (cf. 2 Chr. 24, 12<sup>b</sup>).

11. כל בשמים ובארץ. In ordinary Hebrew, כל אשר בשמים ובארץ would be said. The construction of the clause is, however, very difficult; for there is apparently no predicate: the reader must choose for himself between the suggestions offered by Bertheau, Keil, Ball, and Oettli.

והמתנשא ללל לראש "and the being lifted up over all as head" (Ew. § 160<sup>e</sup>, Bertheau, Keil, Oettli),—המתנשא being a strange Aramaizing inf., and the sentence itself a characteristic example of the Chronicler's uncouth style.

12. *Riches and honour* (or *glory*). The words are ordinary ones (1 Ki. 3, 13); but it is, at least, a curious coincidence that the combination is one frequently used by the Chronicler himself, in his descriptions of the wealth and state of kings, *v.* 28. 2 Chr. 17, 5. 18, 1 (in a verse *added* to the narrative of Kings). 32, 27.

מלפניך, "from *before* thee." A singular usage. "From before Jehovah" means commonly from Jehovah's presence, whether at the sanctuary (Lev. 9, 24. Num. 17, 11. 24. 1 Sam. 21, 7), or more generally (1 Ki. 8, 25. Ps. 51, 13). In such a connexion as this (with *riches and honour*) the usage can hardly be anything but an example of that late pleonastic use of *from before* for *from*, which had already begun in Aramaic, and afterwards became very prevalent. So König (*Lehrgeb. der Heb. Sprache*, ii. 1. p. 320), who compares 2 Chr. 19, 2. Est. 1, 19. 4, 8 ("to ask *from before*" a king). Eccl. 10, 5 ("an error proceeding—not *from*, but—*from before* a ruler"). Cf. in Aramaic מן קדם, Ezr. 7, 14 ("to be sent *from before* the king"). Dan. 2, 6 ("to receive *from before* me gifts and rewards"). 5, 24; and constantly in the Targums.<sup>1</sup>

ואתה מושל בכל. Cf. (in a Psalm shewn to be late by its Aramaisms) Ps. 103, 19, ומלכותו בכל משלה.

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* Gen. 47, 22. 2 Sam. 15, 3. Jer. 51, 53. Mic. 5, 6—all for the Heb. קִדְמָה; Is. 29, 6. 1 Sam. 1, 17. 27. 1 Ki. 2, 33 for קִדְמָה; Jud. 14, 4. 1 Sam. 1, 20. Job 20, 29 for מִן. It is significant of deference towards a superior.

בָּבֵל. The use of הָבֵל (again at the end of the *v.* and in *v.* 14. 16), in the absolute sense of *all*, is almost confined to the later language: isolated instances occur in the earlier books, as Gen. 16, 12, יָדוּ בָּבֵל וַיֵּד כָּל בּוֹ; but the real parallels are such examples as Jer. 10, 16 (= 51, 19) כִּי יוֹצֵר הָבֵל הוּא. Ps. 119, 91 הָבֵל עֲבָדֶיךָ. 145, 9 מִטּוֹב יְהוָה לְכֹל. Dan. 11, 2. 37. 2 Chr. 32, 22, and often in Eccl., as 1, 2. 14. 3, 1. 11. 19. 20. 9, 1. 2. 3. 10, 3 etc. In the earlier language the sense of הָבֵל is usually limited by the context to things that have been just mentioned, as Lev. 1, 9. 13. 8, 27. 1 Sam. 30, 19. 1 Ki. 6, 18. 7, 33 (16 such cases in Gen.—Kings), cf. Gen. 24, 1. 2 Sam. 23, 5 (בָּבֵל).

לְחֹזֶק לֵב. The ל in לְכֹל is the *nota accusativi*, which, though it occurs here and there in early Hebrew (cf. p. 248, *note*), is much more common (through Aramaic influence) in late Hebrew: in the Chronicles, for instance, *v.* 20. 22 (*bis*). 4, 22. 16, 37. 18, 5. 21, 17. 22, 17. 19. 25, 1. 26, 27 (with חֹזֶק, as here). 2 Chr. 5, 11. 15, 13. 17, 3. 4. 7. 19, 2. 20, 3. 26, 13. 27. 28, 16. 31, 21. 32, 17. 34, 3. Ezr. 4, 2.

13. מוֹדִים . . . וּמַהֲלִים. A common combination in the Chronicles: 1 Chr. 16, 4. 25, 3. 23, 30. 2 Chr. 5, 13. 31, 2. Ezr. 3, 11. Neh. 12, 24; otherwise only Is. 38, 18 (Hezekiah's Song), and in the Psalms. Both words (as here used) derive their force from their liturgical associations, and presuppose a long-established liturgical use.

14. וְכִי מִי. וְכִי is (here) untranslatable; either וּ or כִּי must, it seems, have come into the text by error.

עָצַר כַּח, *to hold in* (or *retain*) *strength*. Exclusively a late idiom,—with an inf. following=*to be able*: found elsewhere only 2 Chr. 2, 5. 13, 20. 22, 9. Dan. 10, 8. 16. 11, 6; and with omission of כַּח, 2 Chr. 14, 10. 20, 37.

15. The Hebrew of this verse is smooth and flowing; but it consists simply of two reminiscences, with unessential variations, of Ps. 39, 13 (כִּי גַר אֲנֹכִי עִמָּךְ תּוֹשֵׁב כָּכֵל אֲבוֹתַי), and Job 8, 9 (צֵל יָמֵינוּ עָלֵינוּ אֲרִץ), followed by a clause introduced

by ואין, such as occurs at all periods of the language. The only parallel for מְקוּדָה *hope* (in this application) is, however, Ezr. 10, 2 יש מקוה לישראל (rather differently, in poetry, Jer. 14, 8. 17, 13. 50, 7, of Jehovah). מְקוּדָה does not occur elsewhere: the earlier language would prefer תְּקוּדָה.

16. כל ההמון הזה. המון is properly a *humming* or *confused noise*, such as that of a throng of people (Is. 17, 12), or of the sea (Jer. 51, 42); it is then used often of a *throng* or *crowd* itself (as 2 Sam. 6, 19): in the weakened sense of a collection of *noiseless* inanimate things, it is exclusively a late usage; see 2 Chr. 31, 10 (of tithes and offerings), Eccl. 5, 9 (of wealth), Ps. 37, 16 ("the *abundance* of many wicked"). There seems to be an approximation to this sense in Is. 60, 5 (כי יִהְיֶה עֲלֵיד הַמּוֹן יָם).

17. מִישְׂרִים. Except here and Dan. 11, 6, exclusively a poetical word (Pss., Pr., Is., Cant.).

17. התנרב and התנרבתי: cf. on v. 5.

ועתה עמך הנמצאו פה ראיתי להתנרב לך. The subordination of an inf. with ל after ראה (in place of כי with a finite verb) is almost without parallel in the O.T.: an example with ירע occurs however in the late passage, Eccl. 4, 17; 2 Sam. 18, 29 (compared by Ewald, § 336*b*), is in all probability to be differently construed (see Kirkpatrick's note; and Ges.-Kautzsch, § 114. 2 *note*).

הנמצאו: the art., with the finite verb, with the force of a relative! Every competent Hebrew scholar knows the cases in which this construction is found in the O.T. In classical Hebrew, its occurrence is so rare and so much against analogy, that it is beyond question no true element in the language:<sup>1</sup> the cases being confined to (1) the isolated הִהְלִכּוּא in Jos. 10, 24 (read הִהְלִיכּוּ); and (2) the

<sup>1</sup> See Ges.-Kautzsch (ed. 25), § 138, 3*b*; my note on 1 Sam. 9, 24; or A. B. Davidson, *Heb. Syntax* (1894)—an excellent work which I am glad to have this opportunity of commending to such English Hebraists as may still be unacquainted with it—§ 22 R. 4.

cases in which by the change of a point (1 Ki. 11, 9 הַנְּרָאָה for הִנְרָאָה) or of an accent (Gen. 18, 21 הַבָּאָה for הִבָּאָה), the ordinary and regular construction with a participle can be restored. On the other hand, it is a genuine element in the idiom of the Chronicler, the cases (cited in my *Introd.*, p. 505) being 1 Chr. 26, 28, 29, 8, 17. 2 Chr. 1, 4, 29, 36. Ezra 8, 25 (הַהֲרִימוּ). 10, 14 (הַהֲשִׁיבוּ). 17 (הַהֲשִׁיבוּ).

18. שמרה זאת לעולם ליצר מחשבות לבב עמך. "preserve this for ever, *namely*, the imagination of the thoughts of the heart of thy people" (*i.e.* may this mind continue in them perpetually: see with what simple grace an early writer expresses the same thought, Dt. 5, 26 [A.V. 29]). Another case of the ל as the *nota accusativi*, introducing the *definite* object, after the *indefinite*: exactly so 2 Chr. 2, 12 ועתה יועתי, "And now I send a wise man, *namely* Hiram my father" (see 4, 16); 23, 1; Ps. 135, 11. 136, 19. 20 (who slew mighty kings,—לְסִיחוֹן מֶלֶךְ הָאֲמֹרִי וְנֹ): cf. after a suffix—in Syriac fashion—1 Chr. 5, 26. 23, 6. 2 Chr. 25, 5. 10. 26, 14<sup>a</sup>. 28, 15. Neh. 9, 32. The earlier language uses in such cases regularly את: Gen. 26, 34 ויקח אשה את יהודית בת בארי החתי; Jud. 3, 15 ויקם יהוה בירדן את בן טבאל; Is. 7, 6 להם מושיע את אהור; 8, 2. יצר מחשבות לבב is of course borrowed from Gen. 6, 5.

19. לשמור מצותיך עדותיך וחקיך: the phraseology being Deuteronomic, the verse naturally flows. But immediately afterwards we have an inelegancy in לעשות הכל—an earlier writer would have here *specified* in what הכל consisted—and the unfortunate בירה, which Mr. French so sadly desires to see extruded from the text (see on *v.* 1).

These, then, are two of the speeches of which the Rev. Valpy French has the boldness to say (p. 195) that they "contain no more traces of exilic [rather *post-exilic*] language than those whose genuineness is vouched for by parallels in Sam. or Kings," and that, with the exception of הַבִּירָה (above, on *v.* 1), "the language is the same as in

Samuel and Kings"! This lofty superiority to the facts, though, of course, in a "critic" it would occasion no surprise, is startling in the Editor of *Lex Mosaica*. As the preceding pages have shewn, the language is *not* "the same as in Samuel and Kings": on the contrary, it teems with post-exilic idioms and uses; nor do these resemble the rare and slight touches which just shew the Chronicler's hand in 1 Chr. 17 (p. 244), but which leave the pre-exilic character of the speech as a whole entirely unimpaired; they have, in nearly every case, a strongly marked character; and they are such, moreover, as to affect the *entire texture* of the sentences in which they occur. Of course particular clauses are to be found (as 1 Chr. 29, 10 ברוך אתה יהוה אלהי ישראל (אבינו)), which are quite classical in style: but this is a characteristic of the later Hebrew:<sup>1</sup> the language is not an *entirely* new one; and so combinations of words sometimes occur, which are not different from what would be used by an earlier writer. But the two speeches in 1 Chr. 29 hold exactly the same relation to the two in 1 Chr. 17 (= 2 Sam. 7) that the narrative of (say) 2 Chr. 19 (without parallel in Kings) holds to 2 Chr. 18 (= 1 Ki. 22); the former (in each case) bearing as distinctly the post-exilic stamp, as the latter (in spite of *slight* and *occasional* traces of the Chronicler's hand) bear the pre-exilic stamp.

The case is similar with other speeches ascribed to David in the Chronicles. Where in the earlier books are such sentences to be found as יהיה־לִי לֵבָב לְיָחִיד (1 Chr. 12, 18); אִם עֲלֵיכֶם<sup>2</sup> מִיּוֹב וּמִן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ נִפְרָצָה נִשְׁלַחָה עַל אֲחֵינוּ כִּי לְמִבְרָאשׁוֹנָה לֹא אַתֶּם<sup>3</sup>; (13, 2); הַנְּשֹׂאִים בְּכָל אֲרָצוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל (15, 13<sup>4</sup>); וְעַמְדָּ לְרֹב עָשִׂי מְלֹאכָה (22, 15); וְעַמְדָּ בְּכָל מְלֹאכָה

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction*, p. 473 note.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> So only in Neh. (2, 5, 7), and Est. (1, 19, 8, 9, 5, 4, 8, 7, 3, 8, 5, 9, 13).

<sup>3</sup> *Introduction*, p. 504, No. 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 504, No. 27 (on the peculiar type of sentence): לְמִי as 2 Chr. 30, 8 only.

הכל נדיב בהכמה לכל עבדה (28, 21). But, if the Rev. Valpy French's contention is true, they are to be found "in Samuel and Kings." I challenge him to produce them.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, lest, in spite of all that I have adduced, the reader should still be of opinion that I am maintaining a paradox of my own, I append two corroborative judgments. The first shall be from an unexceptionable quarter, viz. from *Lex Mosaiica* itself. On p. 305, Mr. Watson writes:—

"It must be considered probable that the speeches he puts into the mouth of speakers are *expansions* of the accounts which came down to him, *in his own spirit and with his own colouring*" (the italics are mine).

That is exactly my own view. The second shall be from a Commentary issued under the editorship of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and therefore presumably possessing his sanction. Vol. iii. p. 203, the Rev. C. J. Ball writes:—

"Moreover he does not hesitate, nor would any writer of the time have hesitated, to put appropriate speeches into the mouths of leading personages, some of which betray their ideal character by a close similarity in form and matter."

The most recent English commentator on the Chronicles, Prof. W. H. Bennett, in his suggestive and interesting volume in the *Expositor's Bible*, takes substantially the same view of the aims and methods of the Chronicler that I have done in my *Introduction*. Thus in a chapter headed "Teaching by Anachronism," he writes (p. 117):—

"Israel had always been the Israel of his own experience, and it never occurred to him that its institutions under the kings had been other than those with which he was familiar.

<sup>1</sup> Above, on 29, 5.

<sup>2</sup> It would have been interesting to point out how the speeches peculiar to the Chronicles reflect, in almost every case, the interests and point of view of the Chronicler himself: but space has obliged me to confine myself to the linguistic argument.

He had no more hesitation in filling up the gaps in the Books of Kings from what he saw round about him, than a painter would have in putting the white clouds and blue waters of to-day into a picture of skies and seas a thousand years ago. He attributes to the pious kings of Judah the observance of the ritual of his own day. Their prophets use phrases taken from post-exilic writings."

The closing days of David's life are filled with thoughts about the Temple (1 Chr. 22-29): "This is how the Chronicler would have wished to die if he had been David, and how, therefore, he conceives that God honoured the last hours of the man after His own heart" (p. 156). His last prayer (1 Chr. 29, 10-19) "states some of the leading principles which govern the Chronicler in his interpretation of the history of Israel" (p. 314). Of course, there is no occasion to doubt either the general fact that David made preparations for the erection of the Temple, or that some particulars respecting them were accessible to the Chronicler: but the representation as a whole is both the Chronicler's conception, and the Chronicler's composition.<sup>1</sup>

S. R. DRIVER.

<sup>1</sup> May I be allowed to mention, for the benefit of such readers of the EXPOSITOR as may be interested in Aramaic studies, G. Dalman's valuable *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, which has recently appeared? This grammar—which embraces in particular the idioms of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash, the Targum of Onkelos, and the Jerusalem Targums of the Pentateuch—is distinguished for its careful discrimination of the various Aramaic dialects, for its abundant quotations, and for its philological completeness,—Onkelos, for instance, being cited always with the superlinear punctuation, and the Aramaic of the Inscriptions being frequently compared, —and completely supersedes all previous works on the same subject.