

of death that the voice of Jeremiah is heard uttering its most lyrical word and its most musical note—a word and a note in which is contained the magic of all revelation. For the God of the Bible is neither the God of nature, nor the God of Israel, nor the God of morality—though He is all these—but He is, above and beyond everything else, the God of salvation. “O the Hope of Israel, the Saviour thereof in time of trouble”—this is Jeremiah’s formula for this truth; but one of the psalmists has given it perfect expression: “He that is our God is the God of salvation.”¹

JAMES STALKER.

THE SPEECHES IN THE CHRONICLES.

THE article of Dr. French² in the August number of the EXPOSITOR seems to call for some notice on my part. He has, it is true, neither substantiated his own position nor shaken mine; but in a cumulative proof, consisting of a large number of independent arguments, there are naturally some which are less forcible than others, and of these he has made the most. His paper is essentially an attempt to invalidate the conclusions reached by me in my previous article,³ by arguing that I have exaggerated the marks of the Chronicler’s style in 1 Chr. 29, and unduly minimized those in 1 Chr. 17. As there may be some readers to whom it may not be apparent why this attempt fails, I have thought it proper to examine his article in some detail, and to consider *seriatim* the principal objections raised in it. My reply will at the same time afford me the opportunity of stating more distinctly some of the points noticed by me

¹ Ps. lxxviii. 20.

² Whom I regret in my previous article to have inadvertently neglected to designate by his legitimate title.

³ EXPOSITOR, April, 1895, p. 241 ff.

before, as well as of adducing fresh evidence in support of my general position.

1. On p. 141, Dr. French complains that I represent him as maintaining that "the language of the Chronicles is, with the exception of one word, the language of Samuel and Kings." If I have done this, it is due solely to a literary inaccuracy of his own; for in the sentence quoted by him from *Lex Mosaica*, p. 195, the clause "while otherwise," etc., I submit, can grammatically qualify only "are omitted in LXX.;" had it been intended to qualify "contain no more traces," etc., it surely ought to have immediately followed "parallels." But I do not think I have misrepresented him in reality. The passage quoted by him at the top of the page in support of his complaint is intended to apply only to the two speeches in 1 Chr. 29, as the opening words ("These then are two of the speeches of which the Rev. Valpy French, etc.")—omitted by Dr. French in his quotation—sufficiently shew. Strictly, to be sure, I ought to have written "These then are two speeches, of which, etc.;" but the context surely makes it clear that I have no other speeches in view, and that I have no desire to impute to Dr. French the belief that with the exception of one word (הַבִּיָּרָה) the language of the Chronicles is *uniformly* the same as that of Samuel and Kings.

2. Dr. French next finds fault with me for correcting his description of the Chronicles as "exilic" into "post-exilic," and basing upon the alteration "a laboured disquisition on the nice distinctions between *late* and *very late* idiom." I corrected it because, whatever may have been Dr. French's intentions in using it, it was an inaccuracy, calculated to perpetuate confused ideas respecting the later ages of Jewish history, and to ante-date seriously an important transition period in the history of the Hebrew language. The exile is a well-defined period, closing B.C. 536; and while the Chronicles (which upon no view were written

earlier than c. B.C. 450) cannot evidently, upon any natural interpretation of the word, be designated as "exilic," to use *exilic* "as a generic term comprising later stages of the language," and therefore its *post-exilic* stages, is at once objectionable logically, and misleading historically. I was not aware that I had indulged in any "laboured disquisition" on the "nice distinctions between *late* and *very late* idiom"—though since such distinctions certainly do exist, it surely is not out of place for a student of language to notice them; but I cannot consent to place, linguistically, even the latest parts of Kings, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah in the same category with Chronicles, Ezra, and Esther. I readily grant, however, that for the purposes of my argument with Dr. French, very little, if anything, turns upon the distinction, and that my position would be equally strong, were the Chronicles a work of (strictly) the exilic period.

3. Dr. French states (p. 142) my contention to be 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." This statement of my position is not sufficiently exact, and might be interpreted in a sense which I could not accept; it might suggest, viz., that in the speeches to which there is a tally in Samuel or Kings the idiom was *throughout* classical, and while in the others it was *throughout* non-classical. This I have nowhere maintained; all that the words quoted from me¹ by Dr. French imply is that there are untalied speeches which display peculiarities of thought or expression, sufficient to show that they belong to the post-exilic age, not that such peculiarities appear in every single sentence or clause, or even, to the same degree, in every individual speech.² Dr. French continues: "The

¹ *Introduction*, p. 84; *Contemporary Review*, Feb., 1890, p. 216.

² Nor, I may add here, have I maintained that it was possible, from *idiom*

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." A description apparently plain, but in reality involved; for it is true only if "at one time" and "at another time" be understood, respectively, in a different sense according as the reference is to the speeches (or narrative) with tally, or to the speeches (or narrative) without tally; in the former case, namely, the idiom is nearly always classical, in the latter a post-exilic complexion prevails. By the use of two ambiguous terms, Dr. French has thus concealed a real and important distinction. What I maintain (stated in my own words) is that in the speeches (as in the narratives) to which there are parallels in Samuel or Kings, though there may be occasional post-exilic touches, the greatly predominant character of the idioms (as of the ideas) is pre-exilic; while in the speeches found only in the Chronicles, though particular sentences may be classically expressed, post-exilic idioms are of frequent occurrence, and there are numerous affinities either in thought or expression with the post-exilic narratives peculiar to the Chronicles. And the differences between the two cases are considerable, and, at least in many instances, are so marked and significant as to amount to differences of kind. The question is thus not quite as Dr. French puts it at the bottom of p. 141: it is not sufficient for him to show that tallied speeches "can exhibit marks of lateness"; he must show that these marks of lateness are similar in number and character to those in the untallied speeches. For this purpose a study of *both*

alone, to demonstrate the post-exilic origin of every particular speech peculiar to the Chronicles. In forming a judgment on the authorship of these speeches, it is, however, impossible not to take account at the same time of their contents, as also of their intimate connection with the *post-exilic* narratives, in which they are embedded, and from which it is in most cases inconceivable that they were ever separate.

the speeches selected for comparison is essential. It was as far as possible from my intention to impute to Dr. French any conscious *suppressio veri*; all that I supposed was that he had not examined the language of the speeches in 1 Chr. 29 with any particular care, and that he took it for granted that it did not differ materially from that of the speeches with parallels in Samuel or Kings. And I thought that his omission in this respect was one which led him into serious error.

4. I may proceed now to consider Dr. French's strictures upon my remarks on the speeches in 1 Chr. 29 and 1 Chr. 17 (= 2 Sam. 7). Dr. French begins by disputing my supposition that the words שלמה בני נער ורך in 29, are borrowed from 22, 5. No doubt, in the abstract, the opposite supposition is a tenable one, though it may be doubted whether any one would have thought of it, *εἰ μὴ θέσω διαφυλάσσω*: the natural place for the remark to be first made is surely when David is *commencing* his preparations, rather than when they are *completed*. Dr. French also urges that *said* in 22, 5 means *said mentally*, so that the following words need not be those actually used by David. Does not the context, however, imply that אמר is used because the intention was one which was expressed openly? Even, however, if both these contentions of Dr. French be correct, my literary estimate of the speeches in chap. 29 remains unaffected: a particular subsidiary argument for the late date of the chapter falls through, and 22, 5 must be excluded from the list of speeches with late idioms placed by the Chronicler in the mouth of pre-exilic characters.

For the antithesis towards the end of the same verse, I compared 2 Chr. 19, 6 (in the speech of Jehoshaphat) as a slight indication that both were the work of one hand: I might have added 2 Chr. 20, 15 (speech of Jachaziel) כי לא לכם המלחמה כי לאלהים. It is possible, of course, that the thought of 2 Chr. 19, 6 may have been suggested by

sions;¹ but if the present verse contains reminiscences of a Psalm which Dr. French appears willing to ascribe to the 8th or 9th century B.C., and of Job (which he will hardly contend to have been written as early as the reign of David), its *Davidic* authorship falls through of itself. The remark (on *v.* 18) as to the source of יצר מחשבות לבב had no polemical purpose, and was intended merely to remind the reader of a fact which he might not recall.

Dr. French passes next to the idioms used in the two speeches in 1 Chr. 29. *V.* 1 he frees speedily of two marks of the Chronicler's age and style by correcting the text with the help of the LXX. No doubt אשר for אחד greatly improves the first clause of the verse, and produces a smooth and classical sentence; but no previous commentator (so far as I am aware) had felt the correction to be necessary, and the very severe terms in which Dr. French rebukes another scholar² for presuming to follow the LXX. naturally discouraged me from venturing to innovate here. In being so ready to take a liberty himself which he refuses to allow another, Dr. French can hardly be said to be very consistent. In a comparison such as the present the fair method appears to me to be not to correct the text except upon grounds independent of the question in dispute, *i.e.*, except where it is either manifestly defective or altogether untranslatable; and the only passage in the present chapter where one of these grounds appears to me certainly to hold is *v.* 16, וכי כי (noted in my previous article).³ Nevertheless, the sentence before us is, no doubt,

¹ The only critical conclusions which I assumed in it were the late date of Ecclesiastes, and of Psalms 37 and 103. I did not assume the critical date of Deuteronomy. Of course, for those who accept this, the non-authentic character of at least many of the speeches assigned by the Chronicler to David, and other persons living before the 7th century B.C., follows without further argument; for they contain numerous and unmistakable reminiscences of that book.

² *Lex M.*, p. 134.

³ *v.* 11, כי might be *yea* (Keil); but it seems to me more likely that either

more abrupt than is usual even with the Chronicler; and hence, though (as I said) previous commentators have felt no difficulty, I am ready to give Dr. French the benefit of the doubt, and to allow that the true reading may be אשר.

I cannot, however, make the same concession in the case of הַבַּיִת for הַבִּירָה: there is no internal or syntactical ground in support of this alteration; it is prompted solely by the desire to clear the text of an inconvenient word.¹ Dr. French endeavours indeed to find an internal ground: but when it is remembered that "the house of Jehovah" is a standing designation of the Temple, what ambiguity could there have been in the sentences, "the house is not for man, but for Jehovah God," and (in the same context) "to build the house which I have prepared," to lead, as he supposes, to the substitution of הַבִּירָה?²

v. 2. Every one, surely, must feel that the thought of this verse might have been more briefly, and yet not less completely, expressed. Isa. 28, 13 ("Line upon (to) line, precept upon (to) precept," etc.), compared by Dr. French, is not in the least degree parallel.

v. 11, מִתְנַשֵּׂא. I followed the best modern authorities in explaining this word as an anomalous Aramaizing infinitive. Let it however be granted that this view is incorrect, and that it is intended as a participle; the passage is then another example of a sentence without a subject expressed, which is characteristic of the Chronicler (*Intr.*, p. 504, No.

לך has dropped out after כִּי, or לך הוּא after וּבִאֲרִיץ (before לֵךְ יְהוּדָה).—נֶצְהָה, splendour, glory, in the same verse is characterized by Keil as an Aramaism; I did not, however, cite it, on account of its occurrence in 1 Sam. 15, 29 (cf. my note, *ad loc.*).

¹ It has thus less justification than Wellhausen's omission (with the LXX.) of 1 Samuel 2, 22b; for in the case of this clause there are internal grounds, *entirely unconnected with his critical theory*, which make it doubtful whether it is an original part of the text, and it is treated accordingly as a gloss by both Klostermann and Kittel.

² "The house" alone occurs similarly elsewhere; e.g., 1 Kings 6, 1, "built the house for Jehovah" (not *house of*, A.V.); 2 Kings 12, 7, 22, 9.

27), and which would be even more marked, if the pronoun to be supplied were the second person, than it is when it is the third. Dr. French seeks again to remove the difficulty by correcting the text, but the omission of אַתָּה after ׀ in אֲנִי מִתְנַשֵּׂא cannot be said to be very probable. I prefer not to press what may be doubtful: the Massoretic text, however explained, is anomalous; and though the commentators have acquiesced in it, it would be hazardous to insist upon its integrity. Whether, however, the original text differed as much from what we now read as it must have done if the LXX. translated at all literally,¹ is more than I am prepared to maintain.

v. 12. "Riches and honour are *from before* thee." My note here, I should have thought, was sufficiently explicit; and yet Dr. French has misunderstood it. Of course, there are many contexts in which there would be nothing strange in the use of *before*, or even of *from before*; the peculiarity lies, as I explained, in the use of the combination "from before" in this particular context.

v. 13. מוֹדִים...וּמְהַלְלִים. Certainly, this phrase is not "proof" of the Chronicler's composition; but in view of the fact that the combination is a common one in the Chronicles, it deserves a place in a cumulative argument. The single items in such an argument are not supposed to be individually "proofs." In the present instance, however, the inference which I base upon the phrase gains in probability by the fact that the construction of הִלֵּל with ל is not found elsewhere, except in the Chronicles (1 Chr. 16, 36 [*altered* from Ps. 106, 48]. 23, 5; 2 Chr. 5, 13. 20, 19. 29, 30. 30, 21; Ezr. 3, 11 *b* [also, in the phrase, הַדְּוִת הַהִלֵּל, 1 Chr. 16, 4. 23, 30. 25, 3]). The case of the same words occurring in Hezekiah's Song, as quoted by Isaiah (38, 18), is in no respect parallel; for Isaiah never uses the combination.

¹ ἀπὸ προσώπου σου ταράσσεται πᾶς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἔθνος.

v. 15. **מקוה** occurs 5 times in the O.T., 3 times in Jeremiah (14, 8. 17, 13. 50, 7) in the sense, harmonizing with its form, of “*object of hope*,” here and Ezra 10, 2, in the weakened sense of “*hope*” in the abstract. **תקוה** occurs 32 times in the O.T., once in Hosea (2, 17 [A.V. 15]), twice in Jeremiah (29, 11. 31, 17), twice in Ezekiel (19, 5. 37, 11), Ruth 1, 12, Lamentations 3, 29, 13 times in Job, 8 times in Proverbs (10, 28. 11, 7. 23. 19, 18, etc.), Psalms 9, 19. 62, 6. 71, 5. Zechariah 9, 12. I cannot allow that the two words are “*co-eval*,” in the sense in which Dr. French understands the term. **תקוה** is guaranteed as an early Hebrew word by Hosea; it is used by Jeremiah and Ezra at the beginning of the exile; nor am I committed to the post-exilic date of Ruth and Prov. 10, 1—22, 16. **מקוה** is used by Jeremiah in its proper sense of “*object of hope*”: as a synonym of **תקוה** it is found only here and Ezra 10, 2.¹ **תקוה** may have *continued* in use in post-exilic times; but **מקוה**, as its synonym, *first appears then*.

v. 17. **ומישרים תרצה**. It may be true that this clause has a poetical colouring: if so, however, the fact will agree excellently with my view of its authorship; for the Chronicler affects elsewhere poetic phraseology.²

v. 18. The rendering “*bear this in mind for*,” etc., is one for which Dr. French will hardly find support. Bertheau, Keil, Ball, and Oettli all construe as I did.³

¹ Contrast **לִי מְקוֹה** here with **לִי תְקוּוָה** Prov. 19, 18. Ruth 1, 12. Jer. 31, 17. Lam. 3, 29. Job 11, 18. 14, 7.

² Comp. 1 Chr. 2, 30. 32 (**לֵא בָנִים**); 2 Chr. 14, 10 (**בֵּין רַב לְאִין כַּח**); see Isa. 40, 29b; Job 26, 2. 3); 15, 3 (**לֵלֵא אֱלֹהֵי אֲמַת וְג'**); 20, 15 and 33, 10 (**הַקְּשִׁיב**). The present passage is indeed not improbably generalised from Ps. 9, 9. 17, 2. 75, 3. 96, 10. 98, 9. 99, 4. Is. 45, 19 (where God is said to see, judge, etc., **בְּמִישְׁרִים** or **מִישְׁרִים**).

³ On v. 19 I might have added in my previous article that **לִבְבֵי שְׁלָם** is a favourite expression of the Chronicler's: see v. 9. 12, 38. 28, 9. 29, 9. 2 Chr. 16, 9. 19, 9. 25, 2; otherwise only 1 Ki. 8, 61. 11, 4. 15, 3. 14 (= 2 Chr. 15, 17); 2 Ki. 20, 3 (= Isa. 38, 3)—mostly, if not entirely, passages belonging to the compiler of Kings. The whole of the first part of the verse is no doubt a reminiscence of 1 Ki. 8, 61.

The deduction from my list of the very few instances which, upon textual or other grounds, may be allowed to be doubtful does not weaken or impair my argument. The great majority of words or constructions adduced by me as characteristic of the post-exilic age, Dr. French has not ventured to dispute. His confident assertions (*Lex Mosaica*, p. 165) that my "linguistic arguments go for nothing," and that "in all the speeches adduced in the *Contemporary Review*, in proof that the language is [*post-*] *exilic*, there are only two (!) expressions which can certainly be referred to that date," he has signally failed to substantiate.¹ In addition, moreover, to individual words and constructions, there are also to be noted the conformation of sentences, and the type of thought, neither of which can readily be tabulated, but both of which, as well in the speeches in 1 Chr. 29 as in the others, for which there are no parallels in Samuel or Kings, are often of a character appreciably different from that observable in pre-exilic writers, while they constantly display affinities with the narratives, found likewise in the Chronicles alone.

Let us now turn to 1 Chr. 17, which is excerpted from 2 Sam. 7. A re-examination of the speeches contained in this chapter will merely confirm the results reached in my previous article. I will treat the speeches, as Dr. French claims that they should be treated, on their own merits, without reference to the parallels in 2 Samuel. As before, in estimating their literary character, I assume textual error only where grammar or sense imperatively requires it: as the four most important passages (*vv.* 5,² 10,³

¹ Indeed, he admits now, though somewhat indirectly (p. 142, l. 4 from bottom), that the two speeches in 1 Chr. 29 "are *post-exilic* in language."

² "And I was from tent to tent, and from dwelling-place": evidently *dwelling-place* has fallen out at the end, and probably also *going about* (בְּמַחֲלָה) after *was*.

³ Lit. "And I have told thee, and Jehovah will build thee an house." A. V., R. V., translate (illegitimately) as if בָּ stood for י (as it actually does in Sam.).

17,¹ 18²) are already allowed by Dr. French in *Lex Mosaica* (p. 193) to be corrupt, there need be no dispute between us on this score. Excluding these passages then from the comparison, we have in *vv.* 4-9 a continuous passage, comprising (in the Hebrew) 100 consecutive words, classical alike in syntax and vocabulary, the only expression even remotely suggestive of the Chronicler's authorship being the solitary מִן־אַחֲרַי (*v.* 7), for אַחֲרַי, which, it must be remembered, is not unprecedented in classical Hebrew,³ and is, moreover, of a character too readily explicable as an alteration introduced by himself⁴ to justify us in assigning to his hand the entire passage. Dr. French, it is true, finds the transition from the past to the future in *v.* 8, "inelegant"; but I can see nothing in it deserving this epithet. There are similar transitions in Genesis 26, 22. 44, 29. 1 Samuel 17, 36. 2 Samuel 14, 7. 1 Kings 2, 44, and frequently.

v. 10*a.* Here there occurs the expression לְמִיָּמַי, my remark on which Dr. French has misunderstood, as I also (it now seems) had misunderstood the objection raised by him in *Lex Mosaica*. But in the *plural*, which I now see is the source of his difficulty, there is nothing remarkable: the meaning is, of course, not (as he renders), "from the *day*," but "from the *days* when I appointed judges over Israel," *i.e.* (as Keil rightly explains), from the period when the judges ruled over Israel. What, can there be "unclassical," or "modern," in this use of the word "days"?

v. 10*b.* One of the corrupt passages, referred to above.

¹ וְרֵאִיתָנִי כְּתוּר הָאָדָם הַמַּעֲלָה

² Lit. "And what can David yet add unto thee for honour thy servant (accus.)?" The paraphrase of A.V., R.V. is quite indefensible. The omission, with LXX., of "thy servant" (which may have been faultily anticipated by a scribe from clause *b*) would yield a tolerable sense; but the parallel in 2 Sam. makes it probable that the real corruption lies deeper.

³ See *e.g.* Judg. 7, 23 (twice); 10, 11 (twice); 19, 16.

⁴ As it is actually so introduced in 1 Chr. 11, 22. 15, 25; 2 Chr. 8, 9. 26, 3 (see 2 Sam. 23, 20. 6, 12; 1 Ki. 9, 22; 2 Ki. 15, 2, respectively).

vs. 11-14. In this passage, comprising 83 consecutive words, all is classical, both in thought, construction, and vocabulary, except (at most) four words—מלכות twice, העמיד in the figurative sense of *establish*, and העולם with the article—each of which can be naturally explained as due to an alteration made by the Chronicler himself. On *v.* 11, ללכת עם אבותיך, “to walk”—rather, to go—“with thy fathers,” Dr. French remarks indeed, “unclassical in thought and expression”: but this judgment cannot be sustained; the *words* are classical and correctly construed; the *phrase*, in the sense in which it is here used—a synonym of the more usual “lie with thy fathers”—does not occur besides; and a phrase which is merely unusual cannot, if the words and syntax are correct, be stigmatized as unclassical. For הלך, used in connection with death, and having nearly the force of *go away, depart*, cf. Gen. 15, 2. 1 Ki. 2, 2. Ps. 39, 14. מלכות “kingdom” (*ibid.*, and *v.* 14), is not exclusively post-exilic, as I have said (by implication) in my *Introduction* (p. 503); see Numb. 24, 7. 1 Sam. 20, 31. 1 Ki. 2, 12, and (I suppose Dr. French will allow me to add) Ps. 45, 7; hence the occurrence of the word, when not supported by concurrent marks of a later style, is not decisive in a question of date. But even if it be granted to be a clear mark of the Chronicler’s hand, it still does not carry with it the surrounding (classical) context: for it is admittedly the custom of the Chronicler to introduce verbal alterations in the passages excerpted by him; it is thus perfectly reasonable to suppose that he has substituted it for ממלכה, exactly as he has done in 1 Chr. 14, 2 (= 2 Sam. 5, 12), and in 2 Chr. 7, 18 (= 1 Ki. 9, 5).¹ The same remark applies to העמדתיו in *v.* 14; this occurs similarly in 2 Chr. 33, 8 (being substituted for נתתי of 2 Kings 21, 8), in a context which otherwise is worded quite classically, and does not differ materially from the parallel in Kings.

¹ A reference to 2 Sam. 7, 12. 16 shows that this is what he has actually done.

עַד הָעוֹלָם, with the article (= εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) is next noted by Dr. French as post-exilic. It is true, the usage occurs principally in passages which are late,¹ but it is surely of a kind to which the smallest possible weight can be attached. I suppose that the word was felt to be more emphatic with the article; but if Jeremiah so construed it, I do not understand why another pre-exilic writer might not do the same. It is *not*, however, a usage characteristic of the Chronicler, for he elsewhere regularly² prefers the ordinary עַד עוֹלָם (*vv.* 12, 14*b*, 22, 23, 24, in this very chapter, and nine times besides; also two or three times עַד לְעוֹלָם).

vv. 16*b*, 17*a*. All classical.

vv. 17*b* and 18*a* are two more of the corrupt passages.

vv. 18*b*, 19. In *Lex Mosaica*, p. 194, there occurs, under the heading of "Modern Words and Forms," the note, "*v.* 19, הַגְּדֻלוֹת, the greatness (pl.)." From the form of this note, I naturally inferred that it was the *plural* which Dr. French objected to as "modern"; and upon this supposition my appeal to the plural גְּבוּרֹת in Deuteronomy 3, 24 was perfectly reasonable and fair. It now appears, however, that it is the word itself (whether singular or plural) which Dr. French regards as modern. The other occurrences of it are *vv.* 19*a*, 21. 2 Sam. 7, 21. 23. Ps. 71, 21. 145, 3. 6. 1 Chr. 29, 11. Esth. 1, 4. 6, 3. 10, 2; hence it is true that (the date of Ps. 71 being uncertain), were it not for the parallel in 2 Samuel 7, it would not be possible to show that it was in early use. But there is nothing in the *form* of the word indicative of lateness; nor is it a word like עֵתִיק, or בִּירָה, or גִּנוּךְ, or צֶרֶךְ, or קִבֵּל, etc.; hence it cannot outweigh the numerous and clear marks of pre-exilic date afforded by the context. *v.* 19*b* (as was remarked in my

¹ Viz: Jer. 28, 8. Joel 2, 2. Ps. 28, 9. 41, 14. 106, 48 (whence 1 Chr. 16, 36). 133, 3. Neh. 9, 5. Dan. 12, 7, and here. (Ecc. 3, 11 cannot be compared, the application of the word being there different.)

² Except in the emphatic liturgical formula (= ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) 1 Chr. 16, 36 (in a citation from Ps. 106, 48): cf. Ps. 41, 14. Neh. 9, 5.

previous article) yields an indifferent sense, and is open consequently to the suspicion of being corrupt.¹

v. 20-24, comprising seventy-nine consecutive words, are throughout classically worded, except in two or three passages, open (upon independent grounds) to the suspicion of being textually corrupt. In v. 20 ככל would be expected for בכל, and ought perhaps to be read for it; but even if the text be correct, the use of כ for כ in such a connection is not a characteristic of later Hebrew. In v. 21 לעם would be more elegant than עם; but the omission of ל is no peculiarity of the Chronicler's style² (see v. 22), and is probably (as Dr. French himself suggests) due merely to textual error. שם גדלות ונראות is a strange phrase; but it would be a grave mistake to suppose that every such phrase in a Hebrew writer was evidence of a post-exilic date. There are strange phrases in 1 Sam. 14 or 20, for instance, which, however, even by those who attribute them to the original author, have never been interpreted as marks of late authorship. The present phrase wears the appearance of corruption: the LXX. express שם גדול ונורא.³ In לגרש מפני עמך אשר פדית ממצרים ניום, the ending in Samuel ואלהיו ניום), yields, no doubt, a better balanced sentence; but the place of the object at the end is correct,⁴ and there is nothing in the conformation of the clause which betrays, or suggests, the Chronicler's hand.

v. 25. The rest of this verse being classical, the oblique לבנות is merely an indication that the Chronicler (as in 1 Chr. 21, 1. 2 Chr. 6, 20, compared with 2 Sam. 24, 1. 1 Ki. 8, 29) has altered the construction employed in the

¹ 2 Sam. 7, 22 shows that this suspicion is well founded.

² His tendency is rather to use ל freely, and to employ it where in classical Hebrew it would not be required.

³ 2 Sam. 7, 23, however, appears to show that in fact the corruption is a different one. See EXPOSITIO, April, p. 246, note.

⁴ See Am. 6, 14. Jer. 13, 13. 15, 11b. Ex. 32, 32. 2 Sam. 3, 20b, etc.; and comp. my note on 2 Sam. 14, 12.

source which he is excerpting. On מצא להתפלל Dr. French observes that an object such as את לבו (2 Sam. 7, 27) is required in classical Hebrew; but if I am not to make any use of the parallel in 2 Samuel, he must not do so either, and as מצא את לבו does not occur elsewhere, he would not, but for the parallel, know that this was the case. The statement itself is, however, a doubtful one; for in Judges 9, 33. 17, 9. 10 מצא has no object, except, I suppose, לעשות and לגור, understood from the preceding clause. Cannot מצא להתפלל be explained on the analogy of this usage? *Found* (it) *to pray* is at least no stranger expression than *found his heart* [not, as A.V., R.V., “found (it) in his heart”] *to pray*, which occurs in 2 Samuel.

vv. 26, 27. All classical, except ומברך לעולם at the end, where the hand of the Chronicler is most probably responsible for the absence of the subject (*Introd.*, p. 504). The description of להיות in *v.* 27 as “oblique narration” is incorrect.

Dr. French remarks further on the “redundance” of *v.* 14, as compared with *vv.* 11, 12, and of much of *vv.* 22–27; but this “redundance” (or “diffuseness”) is only of that *rhetorical* kind, of which there are many perfectly classical examples in Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and elsewhere, and which is very different from the *statistical* redundance observable in 1 Chr. 29, 2. The statement (p. 150, bottom) that the syntax of 1 Chr. 17 is “heavy” I must dispute altogether:¹ indeed, Dr. French betrays unconsciously his inability to substantiate it by instancing, in his notes on the chapter (pp. 147–9), only passages which he had before (in *Lex Mosaiica*) owned himself to be corrupt! With what reason can a judgment upon authorship be founded upon a text for which it is admitted that the author is not responsible?

¹ Except, certainly, in the corrupt passages; but the syntax of a corrupt passage cannot properly be spoken of at all.

Surveying now the two speeches in this chapter as a whole, we find that, disregarding the corrupt passages, the (possible) marks of lateness are confined to single words, sometimes even to single letters.¹ In all other respects, the speeches are throughout pre-exilic in thought and classical in expression. Dr. French, in declaring (*Lex Mosaica*, p. 194), that "the language throughout is obscure and redundant, the syntax is heavy and awkward," is guilty of an almost incredible exaggeration of the facts. In spite of his contradiction (*EXPOSITOR*, p. 151), I must still insist that in the speeches in 1 Chr. 17 the marks of the Chronicler's hand are "few and slight," not affecting at all the general tone and style, while in those in 1 Chr. 29 they are strongly marked and numerous, and embrace not only single words, but also the syntax and conformation of sentences, as well as the ideas (in so far as these are of a distinctive character). Hence it is impossible not to form a different judgment on the authorship of the speeches in the two chapters. In 1 Chr. 17 classical idiom preponderates almost exclusively: sentence after sentence (except where the text is corrupt) is clear and flowing;² hence the few non-classical expressions which it contains are properly and naturally explained as changes introduced by the Chronicler: in 1 Chr. 29, on the contrary, the marks of post-exilic style and thought are so continuous that the whole can only reasonably be concluded to be the composition of a post-exilic hand.³

¹ *v.* 7, מִן־אַחֲרַי for מֵאַחֲרַי; *sv.* 11, 14, מִמְּלַכְתּוֹ (ו) for מַלְכוּתוֹ (ו); *v.* 14, הָעַמִּיר; *v.* 14, עוֹלָם for הָעוֹלָם; *sv.* 19, 20, נִדְרָה; *v.* 25, לְבָנוֹת לוֹ for לְבָנוֹת; *v.* 27 end, the omission of the subject: also *God* in *sv.* 2, 3 (introduction), 16, 17. But, as we have seen, very few of these can be treated as pointing necessarily and unreservedly to the Chronicler's hand.

² I deliberately repeat these two epithets, in spite of Dr. French's assertion (p. 150) that they are a "misrepresentation of fact": at most, the last two words of *v.* 27 might be described as not "flowing." I presume that, in forming this judgment, he accidentally omitted to leave out of account the corrupt passages.

³ Or (an alternative which here, as in other cases, I have no desire to ex-

The literary character of the speeches in 1 Chr. 17 is precisely similar to that of the narrative in 2 Chr. 18. The style of this chapter, as a whole, is classical and pure; but here and there we notice late or peculiar expressions which remind us of the style of the Chronicler, and suggest that they are due to his hand (*v.* 1, עֶשֶׂר וּכְבוֹד and לָרֵב;¹ *v.* 2, לִקְצֵן שָׁנִים² and לְשִׁמְרוֹן;³ *v.* 2, לָרֵב again; *v.* 3*b*, וְעִמְךָ בַּמְלָחָה;⁴ *v.* 5, *God*; *v.* 31*b*, "And Jehovah helped⁵ him, and *God* enticed them from him").

A reference to 1 Kings 22 proves this to be the case, and shows that the expressions in question have been introduced by the Chronicler.⁶ The chapter, as a whole, is pre-exilic, and in all other respects retains its pre-exilic character unimpaired.

Of course it cannot be expected that such traces of the Chronicler's style will occur everywhere in precisely the same proportion: in 1 Chr. 19 (=2 Sam. 10), or 2 Chr. 10, 1-11, 4 (=1 Ki. 12), for instance, they are less numerous than in the chapter just noticed; in 1 Chr. 21 (=2 Sam. 24) they are more so; in 2 Chr. 5 (=1 Ki. 8, 1-11 [A.V. 7, 51-8, 10]), while the chapter as a whole is free from them, they abound, in a very marked form, in *vv.* 11*b*-13*a*, which a reference to the parallel in Kings shows to be an insertion in the original text. But, in the case of the passages,

clude) a very considerable expansion of the elements handed down by tradition or mentioned in written sources.

¹ *Introduction*, p. 502 ff.; Nos. 2 and 24.

² Cf. Dan. 11, 6. 13. 12, 13; Neh. 13, 6. Classical Hebrew says מִקְצֵן; and for יָמִים (indef.) would use שָׁנִים.

³ In classical Hebrew שִׁמְרוֹן. The use of ל to denote the goal, after a verb of motion, is greatly more common in Chr. than in early Hebrew. In early Hebrew it is chiefly confined to certain special phrases (לְרִכְבּוֹ, לְבִיתוֹ).

⁴ *Introduction*, *ibid.*, No. 27.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 10. *Entice*, in a good sense, is also peculiar.

⁶ The Chronicler has also made other slight alterations in excerpting the chapter, adding, or omitting, for instance, such words as *King of Judah* and *to battle*, *v.* 4; *unto me*, *v.* 17; *thirty and two*, *v.* 30; but these are evidently not traceable by their literary style.

whether narrative or speeches, which have parallels in Samuel or Kings, these peculiarities never preponderate to the same extent that they do in the passages which are without parallel; the *general* and *predominant* character of the language remains in those cases early and classical.

Let me in conclusion cite two or three instances of rather a different kind, illustrating the literary affinities of the speeches peculiar to the Chronicles, partly with one another or with the narrative in which they are embedded, partly with post-exilic idiom.

דרש, *to seek*, with reference to God, is rare in Samuel and Kings, and is always there used of seeking God on a particular occasion, and especially of consulting Him by a prophet.¹ In the Chronicles it is a much more common word, and is used more generally of seeking God in the various exercises and offices of religion: it is found thus, in narratives, 1 Chr. 21, 30. 2 Chr. 1, 5 (the altar). 12, 14 (Rehoboam "set not his heart to seek Jehovah"). 14, 4 ("commanded Judah to seek Jehovah"). 15, 12 ("entered into a covenant to seek Jehovah"). 13. (16, 12). 17, 4. 20, 3. 24, 14 (of serving foreign gods,—in a passage *inserted* in the text of 2 Ki. 14, 11). 26, 5 (twice). 31, 21. 34, 3. Ezr. 6, 21 (cf. 7, 10). But it also occurs in exactly the same application in speeches: viz. 1 Chr. 13, 3 (David), "We sought not unto it (the ark) in the days of Saul," 15, 13, "We sought him not according to the ordinance," 22, 19; 2 Chr. 14, 7 (Asa), "We have sought Jehovah our God, we have sought Him, and He hath given us rest on every side"; 15, 2 (Azariah); 19, 3 (Jehu, son of Hanani), "Thou hast set thy heart to seek God"; 22, 9; 25, 15 (of foreign gods, in the address of a prophet to King Amaziah); 30, 19 (Hezekiah), "Every one that setteth his heart to seek God"; Ezr. 4, 2.

¹ 1 Sam. 9, 9. 1 Ki. 14, 5. 22, 5. 7. 8 (= 2 Chr. 18, 4. 6. 7). 2 Ki. 1, 16. 3, 11. 22, 13. 18 (= 2 Chr. 34, 21. 26): similarly of consulting false gods, 2 Ki. 1, 3. 6. 16. Isa. 8, 19. 19, 3. Dt. 18, 11.

Is there not a strong presumption that all these passages, whether in narrative or speeches, are the work of one and the same hand?

This is not all, however. Most of the speeches just quoted display also features tending *independently* to show partly that they are the work of one and the same hand, partly that this hand is that of the Chronicler. Thus, in four of the passages cited, we observe, twice in narrative (2 Chr. 12, 14. Ezr. 7, 10; see also 2 Chr. 20, 33), and twice in speeches (2 Chr. 19, 3. 30, 19), the same expression, *to set* (or *direct*) *the heart* (הִכִּין לְבוֹ),¹ connecting the speeches with each other, and also with the narrative. In 1 Chr. 13, 3. 15, 13. 2 Chr. 30, 19 we observe the peculiarities noted in my previous paper, pp. 249, 254. The speech of Azariah (2 Chr. 15, 2-7) affords more numerous points of contact with the style or thought of the Chronicler. Thus in *v. 2a* notice the opening address, *Hear ye me* (שְׁמַעֲנִי), *Asa and all Judah and Benjamin*, observing (1) the great similarity in form with the opening words of 1 Chr. 28, 1 (David), 2 Chr. 13, 4 (Abijah), 20, 20 (Jehoshaphat), 29, 5 (Hezekiah), and remembering (2) that *no other* speech in the Old Testament opens in this manner; in *v. 2b* note the similarity in both thought and expression partly with 1 Chr. 28, 9 (David), "If thou seekest him, he will be found of thee, and if thou forsakest him, he will reject² thee for ever"; partly with 2 Chr. 12, 5 (Shemaiah), "Ye have forsaken me; I also have forsaken you in the hand of Shishak"; 24, 20 (Zechariah), "Ye have forsaken Jehovah, and He hath forsaken you"; *v. 3* the syntax of וַיִּמָּצְאוּ רַבִּים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֵלֵא אֱלֹהֵי אֲמַת וְגו'; *v. 5a*, כִּי מֵהוֹמוֹת רַבּוֹת עַל כָּל יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ; *v. 5b*, כִּי מֵהוֹמוֹת רַבּוֹת עַל כָּל יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ; as well as the general tone and manner of the

¹ Occurring otherwise only 1 Sam. 7, 3. Ps. 78, 8. Job 11, 13; and (with God as subject) 1 Chr. 29, 18. Ps. 10, 17.

² For the unusual word here rendered "reject," cf. 2 Chr. 11, 14 (narrative); 29, 19 (speech).

whole address, so different from those in Samuel or Kings, and so analogous to what is observable elsewhere in the parts peculiar to the Chronicles.

Let us take another example. אִשְׁמָה, *guilt*, is a rare word in ordinary Hebrew (the usual synonyms being עֵוֹן, חַטָּאת, פֶּשַׁע), but occurs several times in Chr.-Ezr., viz., in narratives, 2 Chr. 24, 18. 33, 23. Ezr. 10, 19; and in speeches, viz. Joab's, 1 Chr. 21, 3 (in an *insertion* in 2 Sam. 24, 3); Oded's, 28, 10. 13 (three times); and Ezra's, Ezr. 9, 6. 7. 13. 15. 10, 10. Otherwise it is found only in the laws, Lev. 4, 3. 5, 24. 26 [in these two passages more probably an *infinitive*]; Am. 8, 14; and Ps. 69, 6. The speeches of Oded in 2 Chr. 28, 9-11 and 13, now, have other marks of late style: notice, for instance, the heavy syntax of v. 10, הֲלֹא רַק אַתָּם כִּי לְאַשְׁמַת יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם אֲשַׁמּוּת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם; of v. 13, אַתָּם אֹמְרִים לְהוֹסִיף עַל חַטָּאתֵנוּ וְעַל אֲשַׁמְתָּנוּ זֶעַף, v. 9, זֶעַף [cf. 16, 10. 26, 19: otherwise rare and poetic], עַד לְ [Intro., p. 506]: v. 9b, וְתַהַרְנוּ בָּם בְּזַעַף עַד לְשָׁמַיִם הַגֵּיַע, and v. 13b, כִּי רַבָּה אֲשַׁמָּה לָנוּ וְחָרוֹן אַף עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל, also, are surely not worded as a pre-exilic writer would have worded them.

Dr. French suggests (p. 150) that the instances of unclassical idiom collected by me in my previous article (p. 245) are "probably the only ones to be found in speeches"; but can it be pretended that the sentences just quoted from the speeches of Azariah and Oded are classically constructed? or that 2 Chr. 14, 10 (Asa) אִין עַמֶּךָ לְעוֹר בֵּין רַב לְאִין כַּח (Asa), and the second part of 16, 9 (Hanani), אֵל יַעֲצֵר עַמֶּךָ אֲנוֹשׁ לְהַתְּחֹק עִם לְבַבְּךָ שְׁלֵם אֱלֹהִים נִסְכַּלְתָּ עַל זֹאת² כִּי מַעַתָּה יֵשׁ עִמָּךָ הַלְרֹשַׁע לְעוֹר וּלְשֹׁנָיִם יְהוָה תֹּאחֵב וּבֹזֵאת, or 19, 2, מִלְּחָמוֹת עִמָּכֶם בְּדַבֵּר, or 19, 6b (Jehoshaphat), עַלֶּיךָ קִצַּף מִלְּפָנַי יְהוָה³

¹ Note here the omission of the relative; and see also above, p. 295, *note*.

² In prose אֵל עַל זֹאת is a late idiom: v. 10. 29, 9 (speech). 32, 20. Ezr. 8, 23. 9, 15. 10, 2. Neh. 13, 14.

³ Note here (a) בְּזֹאת (as here employed, a late usage: only so besides 20, 17. 1 Chr. 27, 24: see the classical use of בְּזֹאת in Gen. 42, 15. 33. 1 Sam. 11, 2 *al.*);

כִּי אִין עִם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ עוֹלָה וּמוֹשָׁא פְּנִים וּמִקַּח, כַּשְׁבַּט
 כִּי מַעֲלַת וְלֹא לֶךְ לִכְבוֹד, שׁוּד, or 26, 18 (priests to Uzziah),
 מִיְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ, are sentences such as would be penned by the
 writers of Samuel or Kings?

I might continue: but I have perhaps written enough for my purpose.² Dr. French has taken a position which he will find it impossible to maintain. He disputes, be it observed, not only my *inference* from the style of the speeches peculiar to the Chronicles, that they are the composition of a much later hand than those in Samuel or Kings, but the *facts* upon which that inference is based: he denies that there are *any differences whatever* between the two classes of speeches: "the alleged differences are non-existent. The 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."³ Even Keil, however, owns frankly that this is not the case. Of the four speeches in 1 Chr. 22, 7-16, 28, 2-10, 12-22 [*sic*: ? 19-21], 29, 1-5 he remarks that "in contents and form, in thought and language, the individuality of the Chronicler is so prominent in them that we must regard them as free expansions of the thoughts which at the time stirred the soul of the aged king."⁴ Delitzsch speaks yet more distinctly. "The speeches which the Chronicles have in common with the Kings read almost

(b) the resemblance in expression (עַל קִצְּרָה) with v. 10, 24, 18, 29, 8 (speech). 32, 25, 25, and especially 1 Chr. 27, 24.

¹ With clause *a*, comp. 14, 13, 17, 10, 20, 29. In this speech, consisting of two verses, *each* clause has thus a noticeable point of contact, with either the style or the thought of the Chronicler (on v. 6*a*, see above, p. 290). To prevent misunderstanding, I should explain that this and the preceding notes are not intended to comment upon all the peculiarities of the Chronicler's style occurring in the passages quoted.

² I had noted, for instance, some suggestive instances of dependence upon Deuteronomy, but I have no space for developing them. Perhaps I may revert to the subject on a future occasion.

³ *Lex. M.*, p. 165; repeated, *EXPOSITOR*, p. 145 sq.

⁴ *Comm. on Chron.*, p. 28.

verbally the same; the others have an *entirely different physiognomy*." ¹ According to Dr. French the physiognomy is *entirely the same!* ² The alleged differences are "non-existent"! And when we come to the further question, and ask how Delitzsch supposes this different physiognomy to have arisen, we find that he adopts the same explanation that I do: the speeches peculiar to the Chronicles display, namely, similarities of thought and expression, which are evidence that they cannot be referred to the original authors, but that they are imbued with the individuality of a later compiler. ³ Whether the form of these speeches is due entirely to the Chronicler himself, or whether it had in part, or even principally, been already assumed in the Chronicler's main authority, the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, ⁴ which (in Delitzsch's words) "must in tone and style have resembled his own," does not affect the present question: the differences are there, and it is extraordinary that any one capable of forming literary judgments should be found to deny them. For my own part I have propounded no novel or precarious theory, and nothing which does not rest upon a wide and secure induction of facts. In my former article I simply exemplified, by concrete instances, that "entirely different physiognomy" of which Delitzsch speaks; while in the inferences which I based upon it I have maintained nothing which is not abundantly warranted by the facts, and at the same time supported by the best and most independent authorities who have written on the subject.

S. R. DRIVER.

¹ *Comm. on Isaiah*, p. xvi. (ed. 3), p. 11 (ed. 4).

² I presume that this is no unjust paraphrase of the judgment quoted a few lines above from *Lex Mosaiica*.

³ Similarly Dillmann, in Herzog's *Encyclopädie*, s.v. *Chronik* (p. 224, ed. 2).

⁴ The latter alternative is preferred by Bertheau (p. xxxvii.): comp. *Introd.*, pp. 498, 499.