

Son of man" and the "in many" stand accidental juxtaposition. The one term denotes a person who stands in common and collective relations; the other term denotes those to whom He is related as the "multitude," the "many," not as opposed to the few, but as distinguished from "the One." This One has the distinction of the unique: He stands alone, and does what He alone can do. Of the "many" no one "can by any means redeem his brother nor give to God a ransom for him";<sup>1</sup> but "the One" can do what is impossible to any of the "many." His pre-eminence, therefore, is the secret of His worth; He does what is possible to no other, for He transcends all others, and His personality equals as it were the personality of collective man. Hence He is able to "give Himself a ransom for many."

E. "For many." ἀντὶ πολλῶν = "in room of many." His death is not a common death, and Jesus does not here conceive it simply as suffered "for conscience' sake," but as "for many." In it He endures the tragedy of His pre-eminence. Though once He has suffered, His grace concedes to those who follow Him fellowship in His sufferings, yet in the article and moment of Sacrifice He is without a fellow. It is "a cup" which He alone can drink; "a baptism" which none can share. And it is so because He stands where no one can stand beside Him, in a death which is "a ransom for many."

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

### *THE MIDRASHIC ELEMENT IN CHRONICLES.*

MIDRASH means "Enquiry, Seeking." The Darshan ("Enquirer") fixes on turns of expression and on details in the work which lies before him, in order to draw out from them (usually for purposes of edification) some side fact or

<sup>1</sup> Ps. xlix. 7.

side teaching which may be gained with more or less certainty or justification.

The Midrashic element in Chronicles may be seen in its simplest form in 1 Chronicles x. 13, 14. The parallel account of the death of Saul (1 Sam. xxxi.) is simple history, giving its circumstances without comment. The Darshan, however, seeks out the reason of the death of the Lord's Anointed in fighting against uncircumcised foes; *he fell because he offered a presumptuous burnt offering* (1 Sam. xiii. 9), *and because he consulted a witch* (1 Sam. xxviii. 8).

Another simple form of Midrash is the *deduction of facts by parallelism or analogy*. Thus from 1 Kings xviii. 24, 38 the principle might be deduced that *when the Lord answers, He answers by fire*. Two instances in which this principle is followed may be cited from Chronicles.

(a) 1 Chronicles xxi. 26: "[the Lord] answered him (*i.e.* David at Ornan's threshing-floor) from heaven *by fire upon the altar* of burnt offering."

2 Samuel xxiv. 25 has simply, "And the Lord was intreated for the land."

(b) 2 Chronicles vii. 1: "Now when Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices."

1 Kings viii. contains no parallel statement.

More careful consideration is due to the apparent presence of Haggadah in Chronicles. Every Midrash contains a Haggadic element, consisting of stories introduced for a didactic purpose. Such stories, like parables, need not necessarily be true. In Chronicles several accounts which have no parallel in Kings have been pronounced to be Haggadah. We have to ask, To what extent is this verdict justified?

The first story to be considered is the account of Abijah's victory over Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii. 3-20).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "2 Chronicles 15 (misprint for '13') ist späterer Midrash," Kittel, *Geschichte*, ii. 212, note.

There are several difficulties in accepting the story as it stands.

(a) There is no parallel in Kings beyond the bare words, "There was war between Abijam (Abijah) and Jeroboam."

(b) Ver. 3 seems to state that the forces present were short by 100,000 only of the whole total of men that drew sword in Israel as numbered by David (2 Sam. xxiv. 9, "Israel 800,000, Judah 500,000").

(c) The speech put into Abijah's mouth describes his father Rehoboam as "young and tender-hearted" at his accession. Rehoboam's age was forty-one (1 Kings xiv. 21).

(d) Ver. 11 seems to refer to Exodus xl. 23-29, a passage which can hardly have been written till long after the days of Abijah, being by some ascribed to "a secondary and posterior stratum of P" (Driver, *Introduction*, last paragraph of the section on Exodus).

(e) The slaughter of 500,000 of the men of Israel should have brought about the downfall of the Northern Kingdom.

(f) The tone of Abijah's speech in Chronicles does not at all suit the man of whom we are told (1 Kings xv. 3) that "he walked in all the sins of his father [Rehoboam]." Those sins certainly included some toleration of idolatry (1 Kings xiv. 22-24).

On the other hand, there is nothing incredible in the story of a victory of some kind being gained by Abijah over Jeroboam.

(a) There was a war between the two kings (1 Kings xv. 7).

(b) If the victory were fictitious, it would probably not have been attributed to Abijah (Abijam), of whom it is said in Kings (uncontradicted by Chronicles) that "his heart was not perfect with the Lord" (1 Kings xv. 3).

(c) The story is circumstantial and consistent; Beth-el and two other cities were the prize of victory.

(d) Abijah's early death—he reigned three years only—is perhaps a sufficient explanation of the fact that no further

fruits of the victory were gathered. Hence the battle might remain unrecorded in Kings.

(e) Abijah's victory answers a question, which demands an answer, viz., In the long warfare which followed the disruption, why were not the Two Tribes overwhelmed by the Ten?

A final judgment on the credibility of the story as a whole must depend on the estimate formed of the general trustworthiness of the chronicler. The tentative result meanwhile to which we are led seems to be that the victory is credible, but the speech of Abijah, and the numbers given of the combatants and of the slain, must be pronounced unhistorical.

Another story which might be Haggadic rather than historical, is Asa's victory (2 Chron. xiv. 9-15).<sup>1</sup> "Zerah the Cushite invaded Judah" with 1,000,000 men and 300 chariots. Asa prayed for victory, pleading his faith in the Lord. The Cushites were routed, and Asa returned to Jerusalem with much spoil.

Against this story might be urged,—

(a) The silence of 1 Kings xv., in which fifteen verses are devoted to Asa's reign;

(b) The number assigned to Zerah's army;

(c) The description of the invader as "Zerah the Cushite." If "Zerah" = Osorkon II., the person meant was a native Egyptian.

On the other hand it may be said,—

(a) that in Kings down to the fall of the Northern Kingdom only *such* events relating to the Southern Kingdom are narrated as also concern the Northern Kingdom. The invasion of the South by the Cushites and their repulse at Mareshah in the Shephelah was no concern of the North.

(b) That the reckoning of the Cushite host at 1,000,000 is

<sup>1</sup> "Vielleicht liegt die Erinnerung zu Grunde, dass Asa das Glück hatte, einen gefährlichen Raubzug zurückzuweisen." Kittel, *Geschichte*, ii. p. 213.

probably only another way of saying that the host seemed too great to number.

(c) That the identification of Zerah with Osorkon II. is doubtful. The Cushim of 2 Chronicles xiv. 12 and xvi. 8 may very well be the Cushim of 2 Chronicles xxi. 16, *i.e.* inhabitants of Arabia.

A story similar in its outline with the story of the Cushite invasion is found half a dozen chapters later. In 2 Chronicles xx.<sup>1</sup> we are told that a great multitude of Moabites, Ammonites, and men of Mount Seir invaded Judah from the S.E.; that Jehoshaphat went out to the wilderness of Tekoa against them with an army whose vanguard consisted of praising singers (probably Levites); that scared by ambushments (set by the Lord) the invaders feared treachery in their ranks, and turned their arms against each other with such effect that "none escaped."

In this account the military details are so vague and the religious and liturgical so clear and prominent that the whole might easily pass as an Haggadic tale to illustrate the theme, "The Lord is with you while ye be with Him; and if ye seek Him, He will be found of you" (2 Chron. xv. 2). Apart however from this consideration, there is no just reason for doubting the story in its outline. We may ascribe the prayer of Jehoshaphat to the pen of the Chronicler because of the apparent allusions to Isaiah xli. 8 (ver. 7, "Abraham thy friend") and to Deuteronomy ii. 5, 9, 19 (the command not to meddle with Seir, Moab, and Ammon, cf. ver. 10). We may think that a soldier-author would have said more of the ambushments (ver. 22), and less perhaps of the prayer (ver. 6), the praise (ver. 21), and the thanksgiving (ver. 26). Yet the account as a whole is consistent and not improbable.

Three tribes (or parts of tribes) of kindred origin, impelled by hunger perhaps or by the straitness of their country, determine to settle in Western Palestine (ver. 11). Two

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kittel, *Geschichte*, ii. pp. 241, 242.

roads are open to them, one round the Northern end of the Dead Sea passing by Jericho, the other by the Southern end passing through the wilderness of Tekoa. The former offered perhaps the more hospitable country to traverse, but it was blocked by Jericho, a fortress which was probably in the hands of the kings of Israel (1 Kings xvi. 34; 2 Chron. xxviii. 15<sup>1</sup>). If so, the confederates, wishing to attack the Southern kingdom, would pass (as we are told they did pass, ver. 2—read “from beyond the Sea, from *Edom*”) round the Southern end of the Dead Sea. In their advance through the South of Judah, a land of cliffs, ravines, hills and caves, they would doubtless be harassed by the sturdy shepherd population of that region, and in the course of a difficult march dissensions are very likely to have broken out among them. The care taken by Jehoshaphat to invest the advance of his army from Jerusalem with the character of a religious act is quite of a piece with his anxiety (1 Kings xxii. 5, 7) to consult a prophet of the Lord before advancing against Ramoth-Gilead. The greatness of the spoil, which took three days to gather (ver. 25) is consistent with the representation of ver. 11 that the three tribes came to stay. They brought all their property with them. (Cf. G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 272 f.).

The fact that the whole story is absent from Kings forms no objection against its truth. Like Asa's victory over the Cushites, Jehoshaphat's deliverance from the confederates concerned only the south of the Southern kingdom. The business of the author of Kings was primarily with the Northern kingdom.

In this story we see perhaps Midrash at its best. It is gain, not loss, that the victory of faith has in this case been set in a setting in which the secondary causes of the deliverance have all but vanished from sight.

It is difficult to form any satisfactory judgment on another story which may seem to some Haggadic, viz., the account

<sup>1</sup> Not “unto” but “to the side (vicinity) of their brethren.”

of the cause of Uzziah's leprosy. We are reminded of the narrative told by the Priestly Writer of the Hexateuch of the destruction by fire of Korah and the 250 Levites, who though not of the seed of Aaron insisted on offering incense (Num. xvi. 16-18, 35). It would be easy to conjecture that both stories originated only a short time before the introduction of the Priestly Legislation under Ezra. But such a conjecture is as a matter of fact in mid air without direct means of support. Other considerations must be taken into account.

The account in Kings of Azariah (= Uzziah) is (a) that he recovered the hold on the Red Sea which had been lost to Judah, (b) that his religious conduct reached the level of that of his father Amaziah and of his grandfather Joash, (c) that the Lord smote (plagued, וינגע) him, and he became a leper. Speaking generally, it must be confessed that the more detailed account given by the Chronicler agrees with the outline given in Kings. The Chronicler says (a) that Uzziah's military prowess was great, (b) that for a time he sought God and prospered, (c) that his successes turned his head, and his leprosy was a judgment on his pride.

But the Chronicler is more definite still. The particular manifestation of pride which brought down instantaneous punishment was, we are told, Uzziah's wilful assumption of the priestly function of offering incense upon the altar of incense. This altar was "most holy" (קדש קדשים); Aaron himself was to burn incense on it every morning and evening, and once a year on the Day of Atonement the blood of the sin offering was to be put upon its horns (Exod. xxx. 1-10).

But this section, dealing with the altar of incense, is attributed to a "secondary and posterior stratum"<sup>1</sup> of P (the work of the Priestly Writer of the Hexateuch). If the late date thus reached for the law of the peculiar sanctity of the altar of incense be accepted, it is difficult to accept

<sup>1</sup> See Driver, *Introduction*, p. 35.

the Chronicler's statement that it was just the violation of the sanctity of the altar of incense which brought down the punishment of leprosy on Uzziah.

On the other hand we may conclude (a) that the Chronicler in regarding the leprosy as a judgment has the support of the expression *גנני* used in Kings, (b) that the statement that Uzziah's heart was lifted up by success is confirmed to this extent that he is described in Kings as having won at least one great military and political triumph, (c) that therefore there is nothing incredible in the Chronicler's account that Uzziah's leprosy was the punishment of Uzziah's pride. This pride may very likely have manifested itself in some encroachment on the domain customarily assigned to the priests; but, on the other hand, to accept the Chronicler's story as it stands is to charge Uzziah with the breach of a law which we cannot prove to have existed in his day.

One more story remains to be discussed, viz., the story of the Repentance of Manasseh (2 Chron. xxxiii. 12, 13). The account of this king in Kings is condemnatory without qualification. He did "wickedly above all that the Amorites did, who were before him." The punishment which his sins should bring upon the land, would *make the ears of those that heard it tingle*. Manasseh "filled Jerusalem with innocent blood from one end to the other" (2 Kings xxi. 11, 12, 16). Similarly Jeremiah (ch. xv. 4) directly attributes the dispersion of Judah to the guilt of Manasseh.

The Chronicler begins by drawing an equally dark picture of the reign of Manasseh. He adds that the Lord spoke to the king and that he would not hearken. But a complete change follows the coming of the Assyrian captains. Manasseh is bound and carried to Babylon; there he humbles himself before the Lord, and God hears and brings him back to Jerusalem to his kingdom; restored to his throne, he puts down the idolatry which he had set up in the city, and commands the people to worship the Lord.



Even the soberest of critics have been inclined to regard this sequel told by the Chronicler as a Haggadic tale. No real difficulty is now felt in the statement that under an Assyrian king Manasseh was carried to Babylon (and not to Nineveh). But with regard to his repentance it is said, *e.g.*, by Driver (Appendix to Ed. v. of the Introduction, p. 541) that the accuracy of the Chronicler "can only be maintained at the cost of the justice of the earlier, and nearly contemporary, compiler of Kings." Yet it seems to me possible to accept the verdict passed in Kings on Manasseh's reign without rejecting the assertion of a personal repentance on the part of Manasseh himself. If the repentance came late in the king's life, if fifty years were spent in corrupting the nation, and less than five in trying to stay the corrupting influences, the compiler of Kings was right in omitting Manasseh's belated reformation from a hasty sketch of the downfall of the Jewish state.

On the other hand, the Chronicler of the kings of the house of David was bound to notice any good, however belated, in a descendant of the man whom God had chosen. It should however be noticed that it is *not* stated in Chronicles that Manasseh succeeded in completely putting down idolatry among the people. Ver. 17, which does indeed make a sweeping statement (the high places were now used for the worship of Jehovah only), says much less than this. The two years of Amon and the first eight or twelve of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 3) gave ample time for a recovery of idolatry after a merely superficial reformation such as Manasseh's probably was.

A serious warning against hastily pronouncing narratives in Chronicles to be merely Midrashic and in no practical sense historical, may be drawn from 2 Chronicles xxiii., which contains the story of Jehoiada's revolution. If we ignore for the present the fact that 2 Kings xi. contains a parallel narrative, and if we judge 2 Chronicles xxiii. simply by the criteria which have been applied by critics of great

name to other parts of Chronicles which have no parallel in Samuel or Kings, we shall be driven to the conclusion that it contains a Midrashic story which rests on no pre-exilic tradition.

Applying therefore experimentally these criteria to 2 Chronicles xxiii., we find :

(1) That the story in its general outline falls in with the "Tendenz" of the Chronicler. It is the victory of the Lord's high-priest over a wicked queen whose "sons" (? "adherents," ch. xxiv. 7) had committed sacrilege in the Temple. Such a story in Chronicles arouses suspicion at once.

(2) The details as recorded confirm the first doubts. Such details are :

- (a) The prominent part played by the Levites, who are here co-ordinated with the Priests. (Cp. Wellhausen, *Proleg.*, p. 199).
- (b) The delivery of the *Testimony* to the young king at his coronation. ("Testimony" = Book of the Law.)
- (c) The openness and boldness of the conspirators (ver. 2).
- (d) The priest's anxiety not to kill Athaliah *in the House of the Lord*.
- (e) The establishment of porters (no doubt an anachronism).
- (f) Jehoiada's covenant between himself and the people, the king being mentioned last.

(3) Lastly, with some countenance from Canon Driver (*Introduction*, p. 541; Additional Note to p. 498), we may conclude that in view of the late style of 2 Chronicles xxiii. the hypothesis that it is extracted from a pre-exilic source is an ill-considered one. Among the marks of this late style we may reckon :

- (a) "strengthened himself" (Driver, p. 503, 8). Ver. 1.
- (b) The use of the preposition  $\text{ב}$  to mark the object, Ver. 1.

- (c) "the chief of the fathers" ראשי האבות (found in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and in one or two *Priestly* passages of the Hexateuch). Ver. 2.
- (d) "House of God" (Driver, p. 503, 5). Ver. 3.
- (e) "porters" (Driver, p. 506, 46). Ver. 4.
- (f) "courses" (Driver, *ib.*). Ver. 8.
- (g) "singers" (Driver, *ib.*). Ver. 13.
- (h) "he set" (Driver, p. 503, 4). Ver. 19.
- (i) "unclean in anything," לכל (Driver, p. 506, 45).  
Ibid.

What is it then which prevents us from rejecting the whole story of Jehoiada's revolution as for all practical purposes a post-exilic fiction? We are saved from such a mistake by our possession in Kings of a parallel form of the narrative. It seems almost like an accident that we have this Judæan story breaking the thread of the history of Israel, but it exists and puts to flight the doubts which would otherwise have passed on from the details of the story to the story itself.

(1) Thus we find that, though the style militates against the hypothesis of extraction from an early source, *2 Chron. xxiii. does as a matter of fact come from 2 Kings xi., a pre-exilic document.*

(2) Secondly, we find that the details which cause difficulty are due :

(a) to false readings. Ver. 11 (cp. W. R. Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, p. 311, *note*), ver. 16 (cp. parallel in 2 Kings xi. 17).

(b) to additions made by the Chronicler in accordance with his Tendenz. Ver. 2, 6, 19.

(3) Lastly, we find that the story *as a whole* is the story given in 2 Kings xi. If 2 Kings xi. were lost, and we proceeded on the principle, "Die Chronik keine Quelle" (Stade), we should miss a very important event in the history of the Southern Kingdom.

We get, in short, a double lesson from a consideration of

2 Chronicles xxiii. (= 2 Kings xi.). We get on the one side a warning against rejecting narratives in Chronicles merely on the ground that they fall in with the Chronicler's Tendenz, and that they exhibit marks characteristic not of an early style, but of the Chronicler's own peculiar style. On the other side we see that the Chronicler did consider himself justified in modifying details of some importance in accordance with his own Tendenz.

We will now briefly reconsider the five [Haggadic?] stories discussed above. With the double warning supplied by a consideration of 2 Chronicles xxiii. before us, we shall be inclined neither to reject any one of the five stories altogether, nor on the other hand to accept any one in all its details. Moreover we are led to draw a distinction between some of the stories and the rest. In three cases (the Repentance of Manasseh, the Leprosy of Uzziah, and the Victory of Abijah) the Chronicler's Tendenz is seen not merely in the details, but also in the substance of the stories. Yet even these three narratives are not thereby necessarily discredited. Events do sometimes happen in accordance with men's theories. The Tower in Siloam, no one doubts, did fall and slay some sinners, and Uzziah's leprosy may have followed some overbearing act connected with the service of the Temple. That the suffering of the body is sometimes the punishment of the sin of the soul is a doctrine stated in the Old Testament (Amos iv. 8, 10; cp. Deut. xxviii. 35), accepted in the New (1 Cor. xi. 30-32), and adopted as true in the Prayer-Book (Exhortation in the Visitation of the Sick). On the other hand the details which are expressed in the Chronicler's own phraseology ought probably to be given up.

Our resolution not to reject the substance of the story of Uzziah's leprosy is confirmed by the fact that if we omit doubtful details and all marks of a late style and phraseology from 2 Chronicles xxvi. 16-20 we still have a consistent story left, in which one word only (underlined below) has been

changed. The following may serve as a rough restoration of the pre-exilic text which probably lay before the Chronicler :

## 2 CHRON. XXVI.

16*b*. And he went in to the Temple of the Lord to burn incense. . . . 17*a*. And Azariah the priest went in after him and with him . . . eighty *men*, sons of valour. 18*a*. And they stood by Uzziah the king and said to him, It is not for thee, Uzziah, to burn incense to the Lord, but for the priests. . . . 19. And Uzziah was wroth, and in his hand was a censer to burn incense, and as he was wroth with the priests. . . . 20. Azariah looked upon him . . . and behold he was leprous in his forehead . . . for the Lord had smitten him.

In the passage as restored above we have a piece of Hebrew which might have been written in the golden age of Hebrew literature.

The story of Manasseh's Captivity and Repentance (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11-13) is briefly told and offers few opportunities for detailed criticism. It must be allowed however that its phraseology is quite as much that of the earlier books as that of the Chronicler himself, so that judging by 2 Chronicles xxiii. it may come from a pre-exilic source.

The story of Abijah's victory (2 Chron. xiii.), on the contrary, is written in the Chronicler's most characteristic style. There is practically nothing in it which directly suggests that a pre-exilic document was used as the source. The weight of evidence is against accepting anything beyond the bare foundation of the story as history. It may have been written by a Darshan, who wished to demonstrate the superiority of Judah over Israel from the earliest times, but owing to 1 Kings xii. 24 (Shemaiah's prohibition of war against Israel) shrank from ascribing invasion of the North (2 Chron. xiii. 4) to Rehoboam, who had received the prohibition.<sup>1</sup>

The two remaining stories (the Victory of Asa, and the

<sup>1</sup> Yet cp. pp. 427, 428.

Victory of Jehoshaphat) exhibit the Tendenz of the Chronicler in their details only, unless indeed it be seriously maintained that every martial deed of Judah recorded in Chronicles is recorded through Tendenz. Both stories are deeply marked by the Chronicler's phraseology and style, yet after our study of 2 Chronicles xxiii. we shall be slow to conclude that therefore they cannot come from a source considerably older than the Chronicler himself.

In the case of the victory over the Cushites (2 Chron. xiv. 9 ff.) the statement of the number of the enemy and the insertion of Asa's prayer may be due to the Chronicler, but it should be noticed that if the story be a Tendenz-fiction the writer has not used his opportunity well. There is no proclamation of a fast (as in 2 Chron. xx. 3), no assembly in the Temple (*ibid.* ver. 5), no promise by a prophet of victory (*ibid.* ver. 15), no advance of the army with religious ceremonial (*ibid.* ver. 21). In short, there is nothing to throw doubt on the story except only the numbers ascribed to the Cushites.

Lastly, with regard to Jehoshaphat's victory (2 Chron. xx.) it must be confessed that the religious and ritual details just mentioned, though they fall in with the Tendenz of the Chronicler, are not, *when slightly modified*, improbable in themselves, for they fall in also with what we know of the character of Jehoshaphat. But if the details do not throw doubt on the story, nothing else does, and the most critical course seems to be to accept the story, while allowing that the Chronicler may have given to a certain extent his own colour to the details of it.

On the whole it seems that, though the presence of Haggadah in Chronicles cannot be denied, the amount of it to which we can point with any confidence is small. The Chronicler may have been the first Darshan whose works have been preserved, but Chronicles has too many points of contact with history to be lightly called a Midrash "as one of the Midrashim."

W. E. BARNES.