

We may express the hope that Dr. Hort's "Judaistic Christianity" will stimulate many in England to a fresh study of the facts of apostolic and sub-apostolic history. The appeal to the "Primitive Church" will become much more real and decisive when we know more precisely what the actual conditions were. At the beginning of the inquiry no one can afford to slight the final words of the late Bishop of Durham, in his *Epistle to the Galatians* (p. 374): "However great may be the theological differences and religious animosities of our own time, they are far surpassed in magnitude by the destructions of an age which, closing our eyes to facts, we are apt to invest with an ideal excellence."

W. F. SLATER.

### THE SPEECHES IN CHRONICLES.

#### A REPLY.

THE article upon "The Speeches in Chronicles," from the pen of Professor Driver, which appeared in the April number of the EXPOSITOR, demands from me some words of reply, (1) because he has misrepresented or misunderstood my meaning, and based most of his argument—indeed (p. 255) he challenges me upon—such misrepresentation; (2) because I venture to differ from some of his pronouncings upon the idiomatic character of certain speeches; (3) because I wish to refute the unworthy charge of *suppressio veri*. In so doing, I hope that I "may succeed, incidentally, in placing before students some facts that may interest them."

I. For the sake of clearness, let me put in parallel columns my own words and Dr. Driver's quotation from them.

LEX MOSAICA (p. 195).

"Those speeches which Dr. Driver has pronounced fictitious contain no more traces of exilic language than those whose genuineness is vouched for by parallels; indeed, some of those exilic words are omitted in LXX., especially הַבִּירָה, while otherwise the language is the same as in Samuel and Kings."

EXPOSITOR, April, 1895 (p. 253).

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

Dr. Driver interprets my term "otherwise" as excluding the single word הַבִּירָה, whereas it was, of course, intended to exclude the "traces of exilic language" spoken of two lines before. The misconception is the more remarkable, as I had previously expressed the very same thought on p. 165, in words which are quoted by Dr. Driver himself on p. 243, words which are the target for his critical arrows. But I have observed that not infrequently critics who know exactly what a Hebrew writer intended to say many centuries ago, misunderstand the plain English of to-day. How can I be supposed to maintain, as Dr. Driver would represent, that the language of the Chronicler is, with the exception of one word, the language of Samuel and Kings, when I had distinctly admitted (p. 165) the fact that the speeches, whether with or without a tally, equally exhibit the Chronicler's hand?

Dr. Driver politely complains that, wisely or unwisely, I abstained from examining the literary character of the Chronicler's speeches for which there is no tally, while I had done so to some extent in the vouched-for speeches. He regards this as a "singular omission" on my part. But, surely, the point of the argument did not demand such examination, even had space permitted. The point was—that genuine speeches can exhibit marks of lateness,

whether due to the hand of Chronicler or copyist, and that therefore no argument can be adduced for the spuriousness of the unvouched-for speeches on the ground of similar or any other indications of lateness.

For instance, in the question before us—whether a speech put into the mouth of King David be genuine or not—it can make no difference whether the language of the recorded speech be exilic or *post-exilic*; in neither case can the record be precisely the original form. Chaucer could not anticipate the diction of either Shakespeare or Browning. In employing the term *exilic*, I did so advisedly, in contradistinction to *pre-exilic*, and as a generic term comprising later stages of the language. It is beside the mark on the part of Dr. Driver to alter for me the term *exilic* to *post-exilic*, and then to base upon the alteration a laboured disquisition on the nice distinctions between *late* and *very late* idiom, both impossible in the mouth of David; and yet there are speeches of the former class which, by reason of their tally, must be genuine.

But Dr. Driver may say—for this I infer to be his contention, after a careful study of his words in the *Contemporary* and now in the EXPOSITOR—“You do not meet my objection. I contend that the following characteristics are observable and constant—wherever there is a tally in Samuel the Chronicler’s idiom is classical; where there is no tally it is exilic or post-exilic. The facts read somewhat differently, namely, that whether with or without tally the idiom of the Chronicler is at one time mainly classical, at another time exilic or even post-exilic; and this, whether in narrative or speeches.

Dr. Driver selected in the *Contemporary* (p. 216) five untallied speeches. Of these, the three former are *post-exilic* in language; the two latter, like the rest of the untallied speeches in Chronicles, are in the main rendered in good Hebrew; whereas the speeches for which there is

a tally (*e.g.*, 1 Chron. xvii. and xxi.) display upon the whole as much linguistic deterioration as the untallied.

Admitting for the sake of argument that Dr. Driver has not overstated the diversity of treatment by the Chronicler of 1 Chronicles xvii. and xxix. ; to what does it all amount, when we remember that the Chronicler treats his sources, in respect of idiom, in most diversified ways; for, sometimes he quotes verbatim whole chapters with scarcely an alteration; sometimes he recasts narrative, as well as embedded speeches, using post-exilic phraseology even in the speeches (1 Chron. 21, 2 Chron. 9); sometimes he modifies, abbreviates, expands, omits, explains, and replaces, even in speeches, the original terms by late ones. All that Dr. Driver could legitimately urge is, that this marked difference might suggest the question whether the Chronicler was in such cases trusting to memory. There are no dates whatever for the suggestion that he was a writer of fiction or romance. Herodotus promises to outlive the imputation of invention; possibly the same good fortune awaits the Chronicler.

Still, the question presses—If the Chronicler had before him in classical Hebrew the original of chapter xxix., why did he not allow it to remain in its own idiom? Why did he give it the dress of his own times? And why in this instance should he be inconsistent with his more general practice? Surely, it is sufficient to reply that the inconsistency is one of degree, not of kind. Instances have been cited above of *some post-exilic* modifications of classical speeches. And the same principle is at work when the Chronicler adopts exilic language, *e.g.*, 1 Chron. 17, where *post-exilic* expressions happen not to occur.

Again, it must be borne in mind that whereas we have not all the tallies, there is strong presumption that they were in evidence to the contemporaries of the Chronicler, who were as fully competent to judge of the genuineness

of the (to us) untallied speeches as of those for which we possess parallels.

But, the preceding remarks have assumed that Dr. Driver had not overstated the Chronicler's peculiarities of treatment. To this question let us now address ourselves. The Professor (EXPOSITOR, pp. 247 ff.) gives a list of crucial examples of the Chronicler's hand in 1 Chronicles 29. In this list are included five instances of borrowing from books or reminiscences of phrases to which exception may be taken. Dr. Driver urges that "the words שלמה בני נער ורך are repeated from 22, 5 in a sentence placed in David's mouth, the late *origin* of which is sufficiently evidenced by the clause which follows." The italics are mine. For why *origin* and not *setting*? But, to pass this by, 22, 5 is a soliloquy, not a set speech. It is appended by the Chronicler to vv. 1-4, as intended to account for the activity of David. The Chronicler there reports what David had in his mind (cf. Gen. 18, 17. 32, 21; Job 1, 5, where אמר means to "say to oneself").

And the very ground of the particular thought and wording of 22, 5 is taken from the speech 29, 1 f. It is noticeable that in chapter 29, the precise occasion on which, as well as the persons to whom the speech was delivered, are given, whilst we have no indication of date or circumstance for the soliloquy 22, 5. Regarded in this light, the fact that the Chronicler made anticipatory use of the phraseology of the speech in chapter 29 is a strong proof of its authenticity.

Dr. Driver proceeds to condemn the antithesis contained in 29, 1 on the ground of a similar antithesis in a speech of Jehoshaphat reported later on in Chronicles. Is it so improbable that two persons should adopt the same line of thought and expression, the expression being limited to five words? Besides, Jehoshaphat's argument is (*pace* some critics) taken from Deuteronomy 1, 17, and similar anti-

theses abound : cf. 1 Sam. 15, 29. 16, 7. Neither the language nor the thought are peculiar to the Chronicler ; both are classical.

On p. 250 Dr. Driver compares *וְאֵתָהּ מוֹשֵׁל בְּכָל* with Psalm 103, 19. As to the question of borrowing—for the question of idiom will be treated separately—there is no ground to assume that because the two phrases resemble each other they are borrowed the one from the other ; still less is there reason to infer that they belong to the same age. And even if one were a reminiscence of the other, it remains to be proved which is the earlier.

Again (p. 251), what mark of lateness (29, 15) is deducible from reminiscences of Psalm 39, 13 and Job 8, 9? Ewald cannot determine whether to assign the former to the 8th or 9th century, and cannot quite decide whether the Psalmist or Job is the original authority.

What force is there in the observation (p. 253) that *יָצַר לְבַב מַחֲשָׁבוֹת לְבַב* is borrowed from Genesis 6, 5? Do not pre-exilic authors borrow from the Pentateuch? The Chronicler uses the phrase twice, it is true ; but on the same occasion, and not again. The Almighty does the same on the occasion of the flood. There is nothing remarkable in this.

Thus far exception has been taken to five of Dr. Driver's examples of the Chronicler's habit of borrowing, a habit which, he conceives, supports his contention that "the speeches in chapter 29 can be nothing but the composition of the Chronicler himself." These five may at once be struck out of his searching count of thirty-five items. Let us now proceed to scrutinize the remaining counts which are chiefly of an idiomatic nature ; then examine the tallied chapter (1 Chron. 17) which Dr. Driver attempts to prove mainly classical, and by an exhibition of what we conceive to be its marks of lateness endeavour to make good our contention that those "speeches for which there are parallels exhibit the compiler's hand as much as those for which there is no

voucher, while the latter bear no stronger impress of his individuality than the former. (*Lex Mosaiica*, p. 165, and cf. p. 195, cited above).

1 Chronicles 29, 1, אָדָר is most probably a copyist's error for אֲשֶׁר; so read LXX. This is alike good sense and classic Hebrew. One only wonders that this word should have been adduced.

v. 1. הַבֵּיִרָה, used again v. 19, = "a royal residence." A post-exilic word, but LXX. does not read it in this chapter. In v. 1 it omits it, while in v. 19 it read, "thy house." It was natural to substitute הַבֵּיִרָה for the ambiguous term.

v. 2. "Redundant style"! There is not one superfluous word. David is recounting how he has been careful to supply each several exigency with its appropriate provision. For similar phraseology cf. Isaiah 28, 10, 13.

v. 5. The alleged redundance comes under the same category as v. 2. The anomaly of the לֵב complained of is doubtful.

v. 11. כַּתְנַשָּׂא. An Aramaic infinitive? If so, by the showing of Dr. Driver, it is an anomaly. But why not supply אַתָּה? Perhaps this would be too classical. Bertheau (cited by Dr. Driver) must have changed his grammar with his views, for Keil quotes his earlier edition for the rendering here proposed. But no argument can be drawn from this passage; LXX. had a different text.

v. 12. "Riches and honour." The words accurately befit the occasion. The combination of these ordinary words is no more strongly marked here than in Proverbs.

v. 12. The expression, "before thee." Where is the "strongly marked character"? לִפְנֵי is used in 1 Samuel 20, 1, in profane connection, "said before Jonathan."

v. 13. מוֹרִים . . . וּמְהַלְלִים. A phrase as little proof of the Chronicler's composition as it is that of Isaiah in quoting Hezekiah (38, 18).

v. 15. If it were a fact that תְּקוּהָה and מְקוּהָה were used

frequently and exclusively, the former in *pre-exilic*, the latter in *exilic* and *post-exilic* books, Dr. Driver would be correct in assigning the latter to a *post-exilic* age; but תְּקוּהָה occurs only once in the books admitted by the critics to be *pre-exilic* (Hosea), unless *Ruth* be so accounted, where also it occurs once; whereas it is mainly used in books said to be late, viz., in Psalms 3 times, in Proverbs 8 times, in Job 13, in Ezekiel twice, in Zechariah once. In Jeremiah the instances are equi-balanced. מִקְוֶה however occurs in *post-exilic* books only twice, so that the two words are apparently co-eval. No linguistic inference can be drawn.

v. 17. מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל. Daniel 11, 6 is the only place where this word is not poetical. Here the clause in which it occurs is structurally poetical.

v. 18. A difficult passage. Too much is made of the ל, since it is not certain that we have here a *definite* interpreting the *indefinite*. The idea may be "bear this in mind for" (=in judging of) the imagination of the thoughts, etc.

Pass we now to chapter 17, to ascertain if *exilic* phrases are as conspicuous by their absence as Dr. Driver represents.

v. 2. The change of "God" for "Jehovah" is several times made in this chapter, but pointedly here.

v. 5. Unintelligible; probably corrupt. vv. 5-14 might, on Dr. Driver's principles, be alleged to have been borrowed from Psalm 89, v. 20 ff.; or Jeremiah 7, vv. 7, 22-25, but for the tally.

v. 7. בֵּן אַחֲרָי, admitted by Dr. Driver to be characteristic of the Chronicler.

v. 8. The sudden change from past to future here and in v. 10 is inelegant.

v. 10. וְלִמְיָמַי. I called it a "modern" expression (*Lex Mosaica*, p. 244). It is an unclassical one. Dr. Driver writes:—"As לְמִיּוֹם is a classical idiom it is difficult to



understand why the plural should not be classical likewise." The uses of the singular and plural are quite different and peculiar. Whereas מיום can stand for "from *the* day," and therefore be followed by אשר (which in poetry is suppressed); מים absolute, and without determining suffix, either means "a twelvemonth," as in the set phrase מימים ימימה "from year to year" (probably so in 2 Chron. 19), or it conveys, like עולם, the sense of an indefinite time: it is specially so used in *Judges* (11, 4. 14, 8. 15, 1). Its use here for "from the day" is clearly unclassical.

v. 10. Style inelegant, meaning obscure. Even if 10a is (with LXX.) joined to 9, the sudden change of tense is hard.

v. 11. "To walk with thy fathers." Unclassical in thought and expression.

ib. "Thy seed that shall be of your sons." A pointless tautology. The Chronicler has departed from the original. Did he do so purposely to avoid anachronism, as Solomon was already born? But to do this he need not have altered the text, but read יצא for יצא.

v. 14. מלכות, exilic. Cf. Dr. Driver's *Introd.*, 474, 503.

ib. והעמדתיהו, *ib.*, 503.

ib. עולם, with prefix ה post-exilic.<sup>1</sup>

ib. Both parts of this verse seem a repetition from v. 11, 12.

Is this not a redundancy?

v. 17. וראיתני ff. Not only obscure, but the syntax heavy.

v. 18. לכבוד את, יוסף . . . אליך. Obscure and awkward syntax; for the latter expression, cf. 2 Chronicles 26, 18; 1 Samuel 2, 12.

v. 19. גדלות and גדולה, exilic.

The pre-exilic word is גדל, and Dr. Driver's sneer in his

<sup>1</sup> It occurs 11 times, and only after ער or מן against an overwhelming use of the word without ה. For Joel 2, 2, cf. *EXPOSITOR*, p. 248 n.

note on p. 244 of EXPOSITOR at my quoting the former as a "modern" word is gratuitous.

v. 21. עַם reads awkwardly: perhaps the right reading was לְעַם.

ib. שֵׁם גְּדֹלוֹת. An abnormal phrase, as Dr. Driver (EXPOSITOR, 246 n.) admits. Cf. also supra.

ib. נִיִּים placed at the end of the verse after an inserted clause sounds weak without some addition. It is not strong enough to be severed from the verb and stand by itself.

vv. 22-27. Much is diffuse and tautologous. A genuine example of redundance.

v. 25. לְבָנוֹת. Oblique narration.

ib. After the verb מִצָּא, classical Hebrew requires an object such as לֵב (cf. Sam. *in loc.*).

v. 27. לְהִיִּית. Oblique narration.

ib. וּמִבְּרַךְ. A sentence expressed peculiarly without a subject (cf. Driver, *Introd.*, 504).

We have now examined the two chapters which Dr. Driver selected for contrast, viz. 1 Chronicles 29 and 17, and have found occasion to modify considerably the results of his comparison in respect of (a) borrowing; (b) redundance; (c) late idiom.

In noting late idiom in chapters 29 and 17 (EXPOSITOR, 244 ff.) Dr. Driver manifests a tendency to stock the former (untallied) chapter with every item, however slight, many of which to our less keen eye present no force at all, as, e.g., his alleged reminiscences, etc., while he endeavours (EXPOSITOR, p. 244 and n. 4) to minimize the aspect of lateness in the (tallied) chapter 17 by discarding as quite unimportant sound evidence of lateness, evidence that he himself adduces in his *Introd.*, e.g., מִלְכּוֹת, הָעֵמִיד, clauses without a subject, etc. Only by such devices can he arrive at the extraordinary statement (EXPOSITOR, 244): "In the whole of the two speeches . . . there is not a single

trace of the cumbrous and laboured syntax of the Chronicler, not one of his mannerisms or peculiar idioms," etc.

Without for one moment accepting the compliment repeatedly proffered, of possessing a keen eye for detecting marks of lateness, I venture to demur to Dr. Driver's omission of such marked exilic expressions as העילם and גרלה, and reject such flimsy evidence as במקודה and מלפניך, pp. 250, 252.

It is a misrepresentation of fact to say that the speeches contained in 1 Chronicles 17 are "clear and flowing" (p. 246). Thus, of the three verses given (p. 243) *in extenso* in proof of his contention, only the middle one can be translated into "lucid and flowing" English without violation of the text. True, the chapter is virtually the same as 2 Samuel 7, but the text of Samuel itself often reads awkwardly, while such expressions as גרולה and "the Lord God" should caution a critic against pronouncing the text even of Samuel to be pure. The well-known tendency of the Chronicler to abbreviate his sources has been at work in this chapter to such an extent that without the omission of a single verse of the original the text in Chronicles is 46 words shorter than that in Samuel. This circumstance naturally renders the style cumbrous.

But, is not any reference to the tally in Samuel unfair? Surely, the two chapters ought to be treated each on its own merits, as if neither had a tally. It is gratuitous on Dr. Driver's part to challenge me (p. 255) to find in chapter 17 just such passages as he has there collected. I never maintained that any particular kind of idiom is a mark of lateness. Moreover, Dr. Driver's instances are probably the only ones to be found in speeches.

In chapter 17 we have found every kind of late idiom alleged by Dr. Driver for chapter 29; save that in the latter there is a preponderance of single words that are late, while in chapter 17 the lateness manifests itself in heavy syntax.

It is a misrepresentation of the facts to maintain (pp. 243, 246, 254) that chapter 17 can be restored to lucid and flowing Hebrew by removing "a few and slight" touches of the Chronicler's hand, whereas the late idiom in chapter 29 affects whole classes. The very reverse would be true. Nearly all the items of late idiom in chapter 29 consist of single words which might be exchanged for old ones without touching their setting; whereas the task of reconstructing chapter 17 in "clear and flowing" Hebrew is difficult throughout, even with the help of the text in Samuel.

The unwary reader will gain the impression from Dr. Driver's words that the untallied speeches in Chronicles are full of the late idiom that is so abundant in chapter 29, and of such phases as he adduces on p. 255. Thus, Dr. Driver remarks (p. 245 n.) that if chapter 17 "had been the Chronicler's own composition, the marks of his style would certainly have been both more distinctive and much more frequent"; but Dr. Driver maintains in the *Contemporary Review*, cited EXPOSITOR, p. 242, on grounds other than idiomatic, that 2 Chronicles 15, 2-7, and 20, 5-12 are inventions of the Chronicler. What if he had chosen these speeches for comparison with chapter 17? They are, except four exilic touches, couched in classic Hebrew, and read both lucid and flowing.

In the other speeches cited by Dr. Driver as fictitious, viz. 1 Chronicles 29, and 2 Chronicles 13, 5-12, there occur 26 late words in 47 lines, or one word in every second line. In all the rest of the untallied speeches in Chronicles there are found 34 late words in 191 lines, or about one word in six lines.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Instances could be given in which Dr. Driver invalidates his own witnesses, inasmuch as he adduces both in the EXPOSITOR and *Introduction* instances where the Chronicler has changed classic for late expressions in excerpting from Samuel and Kings, e.g., כִּאֲוֹר into לָרֹב (EXPOSITOR, 248); cf. also 2 Chronicles

It may be asked, If the Chronicler was so astute as to hide his identity in the other speeches by employing classic Hebrew, how is it that he forgot his cunning in chapter 29 and 2 Chronicles 2?

The answer lies in the fact observable throughout, that the Chronicler has no one consistent method of dealing with his sources, and that therefore inferences drawn from his style and idiom are at best equivocal.

VALPY FRENCH.

### ST. PAUL'S LAST VISIT TO JERUSALEM.

THE account of this visit in Acts xxi.-xxiii. presents certain well-known difficulties, which have been used as serious arguments against its authenticity. We read, for instance, (i.) that St. Paul consented to share personally in an elaborate Levitical purification in the temple; (ii.) that he did this in order to show "that there was no truth" in the current report that he taught "all Jews that were among the Gentiles to forsake Moses;"<sup>1</sup> (iii.) that before the Sanhedrim he claimed to be himself a Pharisee, who was persecuted for holding the Pharisees' faith "touching the hope and resurrection of the dead." When we recollect that the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans had been written not many months before, such an attitude on the part of their author appears unnatural and inconsistent, not to say disingenuous. And yet there are some neglected elements in the situation, which, I submit, go

33, 8 (*Intro.*, 503, No. 4; 504, No. 18; 505, No. 27). On the grounds of changes like this, it is impossible to assert of any late expression in the Chronicles that it has not an historic basis.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hatch (in *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th edition, article "Paul") has curiously overstated this point. He describes the report about St. Paul as that "he had told the *Gentiles* not to circumcise their children," and naturally adds that the Apostle's repudiation of this "seems hardly credible."