

THE DATE AND PERSONALITY OF THE CHRONICLER

W. F. ALBRIGHT

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH, JERUSALEM

DURING the past generation the attention of Old Testament scholars has been drawn more and more to the problems connected with the Chronicler's great work—I and II Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. While Hexateuchal criticism remained the focus of interest, it was not to be expected that students would spend their time over a work generally regarded as a late mid-rashic compilation, with independent historical value only for the postexilic period.¹ But the advance of the school of Wellhausen to its final triumph over rival critical groups at last began to attract men to renewed study of the historical situation at the time of the introduction of the Priest Code and the definitive redaction of the Law. This led to a careful investigation of the sources for our knowledge of this period, contained mainly in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The complexity of the textual problems involved has been increasingly recognized, while the equally intricate chronological and historical questions have received every conceivable solution . . . except the right one, to judge from the unsatisfactory results hitherto obtained. To be

¹ Up to the present, no archaeological discoveries have confirmed the facts added by the Chronicler to his liberal excerpts from the canonical books of the Old Testament. Some of his statements, especially his lists of towns and clans, have doubtless historical value, though their exact source remains unknown. The rest is of the most problematical character, like the campaign of Zerah the Cushite against Asa. It is still, however, too early for a categorical denial of historical nuclei in these fantastic stories, obviously concocted *ad majorem dei gloriam*.

sure, the matter was relatively simple for the older scholar, who assumed without hesitation that Ezra compiled the work, to which he appended his own memoirs, along with those of his friend and associate, Nehemiah; there remained only the question of a possible rearrangement and of the disposal of certain passages which were thought by some to be interpolations. Can it be that the complexity of the problem is in part only apparent, and that the traditional view has an important grain of truth which has been disregarded of late?

Owing to the disorder in which the books of Ezra and Nehemiah have been left by later editors, the Persian kings are no longer mentioned in correct sequence. Moreover, there have been a number of interpolations, in part very late, designed to harmonize apparent contradictions and elucidate obscure allusions. Modern scholars have tried in many ways to reconstruct the original order. The Artaxerxes of Ezra's memoirs has thus been identified with Artaxerxes Mnemon,² or even with Ochus;³ the date of Zerubbabel has been depressed to the reign of Darius Nothus,⁴ and so on.

The question of the Chronicler's date is naturally of the greatest importance for the postexilic history of the Jews. Since he shows a total lack of historical sense in dealing with the preëxilic age, he may be trusted with equal unreliability for the century after the Captivity, in case he lived in the third century B. C., where the great majority of scholars, including Curtis, Batten, and Torrey, place him. On the other hand, since practically the whole of the old Jewish literature perished in 586, we can understand how a writer of the early fourth century might be worthless for preëxilic conditions, and yet reliable for the century preceding his own time. The two problems of the

² De Saulcy, *Étude chronologique des livres d'Esdras et de Néhémie*, Paris, 1868; Van Hoonacker, *Néhémie et Esdras*, Louvain, 1890; Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah* (ICC), New York, 1913.

³ Bellangé, *Le judaïsme et l'histoire du peuple juif*, Paris, 1889, pp. 178 ff.

⁴ Havet and Imbert, quoted by Kuenen, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (ed. Budde), p. 213. Havet and Imbert also followed De Saulcy in placing Ezra under Artaxerxes Mnemon.

date and of the veracity of Ezra-Nehemiah are therefore indissolubly connected, a fact which makes it of the greatest historical importance to fix the date of their composition or compilation.

At present there is a singular unanimity among critics regarding the approximate date of the Chronicler, and at the same time a surprising divergence as to the historical value of his work. The arbitrary attacks of the erratic Maurice Vernes⁵ on the veracity of his account in general were followed by the much more serious criticism of Kosters,⁶ who denied that there was a real return from the exile under Zerubbabel, and rejected practically the whole first part of Ezra, including the Aramaic documents, as a forgery, designed to enhance the glory of the priesthood. Wellhausen attacked Kosters' innovations with vigor, though granting his contention so far as the letters were concerned.⁷ Kosters, however, soon received an auxiliary of unusual skill in the person of Torrey, whose *Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (Giessen, 1896) presented a wholly novel theory of great significance, later defended with vigor and success in his *Ezra Studies* (Chicago, 1910).⁸ Torrey's textual work is perhaps unsurpassed for brilliancy in the whole domain of Old Testament science, but has been neglected by others because of the apparently concomitant necessity of adopting his iconoclastic views, involving the theory of Kosters as well as the rejection of the Ezra memoirs as a worthless fabrication of the Chronicler. However, there is, I believe, a way out of the dilemma, as will be shown below.

We should be in a sad pass if it were not for the extraordinary skill and success with which Eduard Meyer has demonstrated the general historic reasonableness of the two books in question. His epochmaking *Entstehung des Judentums*,

⁵ Cf. his *Précis d'histoire juive*, Paris, 1889, pp. 562 ff. 589 ff.

⁶ *Die Wiederherstellung Israels in der persischen Periode* (trans. Basedow) published in 1895, two years after the Dutch edition.

⁷ *Die Rückkehr der Juden aus dem babylonischen Exil*, Nach. Gütt. Ges. Wiss. 1895, 166 ff.

⁸ The problem of Ezra is now at the front again: see Bewer, *AJSL* 1919, 18-26, and Torrey's reply, *AJSL* 1921, 81-100.

which appeared in the same year as Torrey's first work, defends the essential historicity of our material, with remarkable success, especially in the case of the Aramaic documents preserved in Ezra. For the first time the archaeological discoveries of the nineteenth century were drawn upon. The Aramaic language was the official tongue of Persian bureaucracy, a fact which might have been inferred before Meyer wrote, from Pahlavi, which is written in Aramaic characters, employing regularly Aramaic words as pseudo-ideograms with Persian readings (writing מלכא, but reading *shah*). What Meyer concluded on the basis of a few inscriptions and a single papyrus fragment is now certain, thanks to the Elephantine Papyri, as he has had the unusual pleasure of pointing out himself in his *Papyrusfund von Elephantine* (Leipzig, 1912). Many additional Persian inscriptions in Aramaic have come to light from the remotest corners of the Achaemenian Empire, even from places so far removed as Sardes in Lydia and Taxila in the Punjab, once the capital of the Persian province of India. The official letters found at Elephantine prove not only that Meyer was right in considering that the Aramaic letters in Ezra follow correct Achaemenian usage, but also in maintaining that the Persian court did take an active and effective interest in furthering the Jewish ecclesiastical polity of Ezra's school. Since denial of the latter point has been the main argument advanced against the authenticity of the letters, it is easy to see the importance of the Arsames correspondence, especially the letter regarding Passover observance. From Elephantine there has come, in fact, a perfect flood of material bearing directly or indirectly upon our problem; we are, accordingly, justified in examining it anew, in the light of the accumulating evidence. The tendency of the latter being in favor of the conservative position, let us reconsider, first of all, the date of the Chronicler.

The principal arguments adduced to prove that the Chronicler wrote in the first century of the Greek period are: (1) the genealogy of Jeconiah, I Chr. 3 17-24; (2) the list of high-priests, Neh. 12 10-11, 22; (3) the supposed Greek loan-words; (4) the language of the Aramaic letters. Let us, then, take up these points one by one, and consider their validity.

The genealogy of Jeconiah is really not nearly so difficult a problem as frequently assumed.⁹ It is true that the versions differ from *M* in v. 21 so as to apparently swell the six generations of the latter to eleven, but a little reflection will show the impossibility of that. The text of *G* now offers us three detailed generations, followed by five where only the bare lineage is given, and finally three more appear in detail again; in *M* no generation is slighted. *M* begins (v. 17) with the sons of Jeconiah, born while he was a captive (יָבֹנִן) in Babylon. Seven sons are named: Še'alti'el, Malkiram, Pedayah, Šn'šr, Yeḳamyah, Hošama', and Nedabyah. Pedayah (v. 19) had two sons, Zerubbabel and Šim'i. A number of scholars, following *G*, have altered *Pedayah* to *Še'alti'el*, but *G* was obviously indulging in some superfluous emendation on its own account. Nothing is more natural than to find two cousins bearing the same name, especially when the name is so natural for children of the Captivity as *Zēr-Babel*, a common formation in Babylonian, meaning "Offspring of Babylon". It is furthermore all but certain that the young Zerubbabel of Judah perished without children; as is well known, he planned rebellion against Darius, and probably was punished with death. Had he really left descendants, they certainly would have figured in similar attempts later. We speak of the "young Zerubbabel" advisedly; in the reign of Cyrus he was still so young that his uncle "*Ššbšr*" acted as regent and head of the Jewish community. Now, as Meyer has shown, *Šn'šr* and *Ššbšr* are not to be separated, though his suggestion for the original name, *Šin-bal-ušur*,¹⁰ seems to be wrong. Torrey's remark in

⁹ The genealogy has been made the subject of a special monograph of over a hundred pages by Rothstein, *Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin*, Berlin, 1902. It is difficult to see how a scholar of reputation could have gathered more nonsense into one work. Rothstein, along with many hazardous speculations, endeavors to reconstruct the history of the family from the proper names, which he thinks were given because of their bearing upon the fortunes of the house of Jeconiah. Now we know that proper names were nearly always given in antiquity because of their popularity or association with individuals, just as in modern times.

¹⁰ The form is wrong. The word for "heir", not merely "son", is *aplu*, construct *apał*; the writing with *b* is not a Babylonian dialecticism, as used to be thought, but simply an orthographic peculiarity of the

AJSL 37, 93, n. 1 that "the two Babylonian names are correctly transmitted and perfectly distinct" is rather hasty, since neither name can be explained as it stands. The name *Šin-PAP* does occur in neo-Babylonian texts, but is to be read *Šin-nâsir* (i. e. Šin protects, as a general statement; with *ušur*, in the imperative, an object is required). "Sheshbazzar" is absolute nonsense; I Esdras (Cod. A, etc.)¹¹ offers *Σαβαβαρραπος*, abbreviated by Josephus to *Αβαρραπος*. The original Hebrew שְׁנַאֲבַר * may very easily have been corrupted to שְׁשַׁבַּר, since a ligature of נב in cursive Aramaic looks very much like a cursive ש.¹² Now *Šin-ab-ušur* (Šin, protect the father) is a common neo-Babylonian name, found not only in the cuneiform tablets, but also in an Aramaic papyrus from Saḫkârah as

archaizing texts of Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus. Where *bal* is found in foreign transcriptions, partial assimilation has been at work. With a *Šin-apal-ušur*, *Ššbr* has hardly anything in common. The view often expressed that the name is compounded with *Šamaš*, pronounced *Šawaš*, is very improbable; the loss of the *w* would then have to be explained. Moreover, names formed with *Šamaš* are rare at this period. On the other hand, it is certain that *Šnʿr* begins with the element *Šin*. It is extraordinary to note the confusion prevailing among scholars regarding the orthography of this name. The transcriptions of Assyrian names in the Old Testament prove conclusively that the Assyrian form was *Šin*, and since the Assyrians inverted the Babylonian values of the sibilants *s* and *š*, it becomes clear that the Babylonians must have pronounced the name with *š*. That this was, in fact, the case is proved by many Aramaic transcriptions of Babylonian names beginning with *Šin*, where we always find the name written שן. When in the Elephantine copy of the *Ahikar Romance* we find the name of Sennacherib written both שְׁנַחֲרִיב and שְׁנַחֲרִיב, it merely follows that the more common Babylonian pronunciation was sometimes used by mistake. The new Aramaic letter published by Lidzbarski was written by Babylonians, which explains the Babylonian forms of the sibilants. It may be added that the name of the moon-god is Semitic, being found in South Arabia and Canaan as well as in Babylonia; the stem is Ar. *sânâ*, "to shine", primarily "flood with water or light" (like Eg. *wbn* = Ar. *wâbala*), whence we have *sânâ*, "irrigate" = Akkad. *šanû*. As is well known, the Babylonian values of the sibilants are etymologically more original than the Assyrian.

¹¹ A careful account of the textual history of the name is given by Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 136—8.

¹² The tail of the *nun* then touches the lower end of the shaft of the *alef*.

[שְׁנֵי אֲחָיו],¹³ which gives the etymologically correct writing with all the alefs, as in the orthography employed in the *Aḥikar* Romance for the Assyrian royal names, written *defective* in the Old Testament. The *plene* writing may have been used also in I Chr. 3 18, in which case שְׁנֵי אֲחָיו* was changed to שְׁנֵי אֲחָיו by haplography.

The text goes on to name the two sons of Zerubbabel,¹⁴ Mešullam and Ḥananyah, as well as a daughter, Šelômit. The following verse (20) names five sons of somebody, who is probably Mešullam, as has been suggested, since v. 21 gives the names of seven sons of the younger brother, Ḥananyah. The text of 21 is somewhat corrupt, but there can be no doubt that the seven names are all those of Ḥananyah's family; the interpretation of the versions has been disposed of above. The last name in 21 is Šekanyah, whose six sons are given in v. 22,¹⁵ as Šemāyah, Haṭṭûš, Yig'al (6 Yô'el), Bariaḥ, Ne'aryah, and Šafat. In v. 23 we find the names of the three sons of Ne'aryah: Elyo'enai, Hizkiyah, and 'Azriqam. Finally, in 24, we have the seven sons of Elyo'enai.

The following table will elucidate the chronological situation more clearly than can otherwise be done. The ancient Oriental lists of kings prove that the average generation in the case of kings and nobles was between twenty and twenty-five years.

| Name | Earliest date of birth | Latest date of birth | Probable mean |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| Pedāyah . . . | 590 | 560 | c. 580 |
| Zerubbabel . . . | 570 | 530 | c. 550 |

¹³ For the name see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, III, 128. Torrey's suggestion, *Sin-šar-ušur*, following שְׁנֵי אֲחָיו, Lidzbarski, *Handbuch*, p. 380, is quite unnecessary. This orthography, by the way, is Assyrian, not Babylonian; for the dissimilation, changing the first *s* into *š* (as in Arab. *šams* for **sams*), cf. שלמנר for Assyr. *Šulmānu-ašarid*, pronounced *Sulmanasarid*. It may be added in this connection that the Nêrâb name שְׁנֵי אֲחָיו, *Sin-zêr-ibnî* (not *Sin-zer-ban*, which is nonsense) is Babylonian, not Assyrian, and that the Nêrâb inscriptions date from the reign of Nabonidus, when the cult of Bêl-Ḥarrân was revived, this god being, of course, Šin.

¹⁴ The cousin of Zerubbabel, son of Še'alti'el (see above).

¹⁵ The phrase וּבְנֵי שְׁמַעְיָה is proved by the rest of the verse to be an error of a copyist, which he inadvertently allowed to stand in the text.

| Name | Earliest date of birth | Latest date of birth | Probable mean |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| Hananyah | 550 | 500 | c. 525 |
| Šekanyah | 520 | 460 | c. 500 |
| Ne ^c aryah | 495 | 430 | c. 475 |
| Elyo ^c enai | 475 | 400 | c. 450 |
| Seven sons of Elyo ^c enai | 455—440 | 370—350 | c. 425—410 |

The mean dates given in the table agree perfectly with the synchronisms otherwise determinable. Šema'yah, son of Šekanyah, was an adult in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. 3 29), whom he assisted B. C. 444 with the construction of the wall, so could not have been born later than 470; according to our table his father was born about 500, but may have been born in 520. A later date than 500 is excluded, a fact which at once raises the lowest limit for the birth of Elyo^cenai's sons to about 400—380. But the evidence of nomenclature points to the preceding generation for the time of their birth, in strict accord with our mean estimate, since four of the sons bear names belonging to some of the most prominent members of the Jewish nobility between 425 and 400: Elyāšib, Yôhanan (high-priests), 'Ananî (brother of Ostanēs),¹⁶ and Delayah (son of Sin-uballit).¹⁷ Since the studies of Cook, and the discovery of the Elephantine Papyri and the ostraca from Samaria, we know that the proper names of the Jews followed the same laws of popularity as those of other peoples, so this agreement is convincing testimony against a later date than the beginning of the fourth century for the birth of Elyo^cenai's sons. From the evidence of the genealogy,

¹⁶ Meyer, *Papyrusfund*, p. 73, n. 3, has attempted to identify this 'Ananî with his Biblical namesake, but he is surely wrong.

¹⁷ The pronunciation *Sin-uballit*, suggested long ago, has been proved by the Elephantine Papyri, which write *סנאבלית*. There can be little doubt that he was a native of Beth-horon, whence he is called the Horonite modern 'Ūrî, from *Bêt-Ūr*. Like the family of the Tobiads, sprung from Nehemiah's foe, Sin-uballit left a "name for himself in the land," for we can trace his line through his sons to Sin-uballit II, a contemporary of Alexander, with whom Josephus confuses Sin-uballit I. The Assyrian pronunciation of the name shows that he cannot have been a "Cuthean" himself, but probably sprang from the Assyrian officials who governed Samaria from 722 until after 625.

then, the compiler of *Chronicles* lived between 400 and 350, certainly not in the Greek period.

This brings us to the second point; the names of the high-priests in *Neh.* 12 10f., 22f. Since the discovery of the Elephantine Papyrus, No. 1, this question should afford no more trouble, and yet it seems to be misunderstood even yet. Verse 23, which states that the names of the Levites were recorded down to the time of Yôhanan, son of Yôyada^c, proves that the Chronicler finished his work during the priesthood of Yôhanan, which began before 410, and lasted (see below) until after 398, presumably until about 390—380. The mention of Yaddûa^c, son of Yôhanan, in 11 merely means that Yaddûa^c I (who must not be confused with Yaddûa^c II, son or grandson of Yaddûa^c I)¹⁸ was the recognized heir to the high-priesthood when the Chronicler wrote. An argument for the late date of the Chronicler has been drawn from v. 22, which says that the records then in Jerusalem extended to the reign of Darius the Persian, who is identified with Codomannus. But since there was no Greek Darius, it is obviously absurd to speak of Darius III as "the Persian". The appellation "Persian", may, however, have been applied naturally to Darius Hystaspes, to distinguish him from Darius the Mede.¹⁹ This enables us to reach a solution of the

¹⁸ It is barely possible that Yaddûa^c actually did hold the high-priesthood for more than fifty years (cf. the table below), and that there is no Yaddûa^c II. Under the circumstances, however, it is safest to distinguish between them. There is no difficulty in assuming that the name was repeated, since this becomes the rule in the third century with the Oniads.

¹⁹ Torrey's view that Darius the Mede is a confused reminiscence of Darius Hystaspes (*Ezra Studies*, p. 38, note) is possible, but not likely. Darius I was a Persian of the Persians, of the purest Achaemenian stock, and his victory over Pseudo-Smerdis was also a triumph over the growing Median influence at court, which the Medes resented by appeals to arms, under the leadership of nobles of the old Median line. On the other hand, Gobryas, who, as we know from cuneiform sources, was appointed governor of Babylonia by Cyrus, had been governor of Gordyene (Gutium), and was almost certainly a Mede, since earlier in his career he was a general of Nebuchadrezzar, the ally of the Medes. The statements of Daniel and the *Cyropaedia* regarding the advanced age of the first Iranian ruler of Babylonia are thus confirmed by the cuneiform records. It seems to me highly probable that Gobryas did actually assume the royal dignity,

problem; we must read in Neh. 12 22, מעל מלכות דריוש הפרסי, "from the reign of Darius the Persian" (to the time of Johanan, next verse). The **ב** has been lost by haplography, since the preceding word closed with a **ב**; the emendation **ע**, generally adopted, now becomes gratuitous. The preposition **מעל** is used because past time is considered psychologically as higher than present time. Our passage therefore means simply that the records available in Jerusalem extended from the time of Darius Hystaspes (about 520) down to the priesthood of Yôhanan (about 380), and furnishes us with another important, in fact irrefutable argument for placing the Chronicler during the latter part of Yôhanan's priesthood.

We now come to the problem of the supposed Greek loan-words in the Chronicler's work, which have been defended most elaborately by Torrey.²⁰ The words in question are דרכמונים (which occurs several times in Ezra-Nehemiah instead of the usual אדרכונים), אפרסכיא (Ezra 5 6 6 6), אפתם (Ezra 4 13), פתגם (Ezra 4 17, etc.) The view that דרכמון is a loan from Gr. *δραχμή* is an unproved assumption; in Phoenician both forms, דרכנם and דרכמנם, occur as the names of metallic weights, so Eduard Meyer (*Entstehung*, pp. 296 f.) is probably right in maintaining that *δραχμή* is a loan from the Phoenician, instead of the reverse. Nor is it at all unlikely that our form is a late error of the copyist for the archaic אדרכונים, "darics". It is, at all events, clear that this form alone offers no effective argument unless supported by strong corroborative material.

along with the name "Darius", perhaps an old Iranian royal title, while Cyrus was absent on an Eastern campaign. At all events Gobryas presently disappears, and is followed in the vicerealty of Babylon by Cambyses, so we may suppose that he died suddenly, before Cyrus had arrived on the scene. After the cuneiform elucidation of the Belshazzar mystery, showing that the latter was long coregent with his father, the vindication of Darius the Mede for history was to be expected. If I am correct in placing the composition of the first half of Daniel (see below) during the early part of the third century, not over two hundred and fifty years later than the Persian conquest, we may safely expect the Babylonian Jewish author to be acquainted with the main facts of neo-Babylonian history.

²⁰ See his *Ezra Studies*, pp. 174 ff.

Torrey (*op. laud.*, p. 174) explains אפרסכיא as Gr. *ἐπαρχος* with the Aramaic plural ending. It must be granted that the word can hardly be a gentilic, "Persians", as Meyer maintains at length (*Entstehung*, pp. 38 ff.), but evidently refers to Persian officials of some kind. But Torrey's suggestion is opposed by the fact that *ἐπαρχος* appears in later Aramaic as אִיפֶרְכָּא, with the meaning *praefectus*, which *ἐπαρχος* had under the Romans, while *ἐπαρχία* appears as אִפְרִיָּא. Were our word in reality so common a Greek term, how could the LXX have failed to recognize it? Since the word occurs in two passages with the same spelling, it is probably transmitted correctly, a fact in itself a fatal objection to Torrey's identification. Without doubt it is Persian, though the speculative etymologies of Scheffelowitz and others may safely be neglected. But since Torrey wrote in 1910 the Sachau papyri have been edited, providing us with a mass of Perso-Aramaean official names, so we must, perforce, be more modest in our assertions regarding the possibilities in this direction. In Pap. El. 4, 5, we read, וּכְנוּתָא אִזְכְּרִיָּא, exactly paralleling Ezra 5 6, וּכְנוּתָא אִפְרִסְכִּיָּא. The term אִזְכְּרָא means approximately "secretary" (*azd + kar*, adjectival suffix), so אִפְרִסְכִּיָּא(ר) ought to mean something similar, probably with the same termination *kar*, as in פֶּרְמַנְכְּרִיָּא, "commanders" (*farman + kar*) etc. While I have no definite solution of the question, it may be worth while to make the following suggestion. In Pap. El. 10, 3, etc. we have the Persian word פתִּיפֶרְסָא or פתִּפֶרְסָא, of uncertain meaning. Now, Persian *pât* is "lord, master, chief", as in *nôpât* (נִּפְתָּא) Pap. El. 8, 2, "naval captain". We therefore are left with the element פֶּרְס or פֶּרְס, which may then be found with the suffix *kar* in אִפְרִסְכִּיָּא(ר). In the Talmud פֶּרְסָא is "salary". Our term may mean "officials", or "secretaries"; perhaps some Iranian specialist may be able to explain it more exactly.

Torrey further combines אִפְתָּס with Gr. *ἐπίθεσις*, "impost" (*op. laud.* p. 175). In Ezra 4 13, where the word appears, we must render: Let it now be known to the king that if this city be built and the walls be completed, (the Jews) will not pay tribute, taxes or imposts (Assyr. *mandattu, bitlu, ilku*) and the royal *aftom* (the better attested reading) will suffer loss.

"Impost" is here an impossible rendering, and "revenue", which Torrey suggests, is too general a term, besides being a very inexact translation of Gr. *ἐπιθεσις*. The most natural rendering is "treasury", which is precisely what Scheftelowitz has suggested, on the basis of Avestan *pathma*, "storehouse" (*Arisches im Alten Testament*, p. 79).

The last Greek loan-word proposed by Torrey is מַלְמַל, which he equates with Gr. *φθέγμα* (*op. laud.* p. 177). Our word has the same meaning as later Aram. מַלְמַל, "message, command, word, thing". Now Gr. *φθέγμα* was already a poetic archaism in the Hellenistic period; it is not found once in the New Testament, and only once in the Old, Job, 6 26, where it renders מַלְמַל (!); the occurrence of the word in the book of Wisdom is without significance, since this author prides himself on his poetic phraseology. That an archaic Greek word meaning "sound, voice", should be borrowed in Aramaic to mean "message", etc., is unthinkable. Moreover, we have a perfectly good Persian etymology; as pointed out long ago Pers. *paigam*, "message", and Armenian *patgam*, "word", go back to Old Persian *patigama*, which combined the two meanings.

From the foregoing discussion it appears that we do not find a single probable Greek loan-word in the whole of the Chronicler's work, and only one even possible one. Let us then consider Torrey's argument for the late date of the Chronicler on the ground of the Aramaic idiom employed in the Aramaic sections of Ezra.²¹ As a result of his comparisons he concludes that Ezra and Daniel are more closely related in their phonological and morphological peculiarities to Jewish Aramaic than to the Aramaic inscriptions of 900—500, and must be placed considerably later than the Elephantine Papyri. A similar, but much more elaborate study of the Aramaic of Daniel by Wilson, of Princeton, comes to opposite conclusions. Wilson's study is a very accurate, and, in general, judicious study of the available material, though his anxiety to prove that Daniel might have been written in the sixth century B. C. (!) leads to some queer deductions from his own evidence. The trouble with the

²¹ *Ezra Studies*, pp. 161 ff.

arguments from Daniel is that Daniel is obviously a composite work, from two different periods. Dan. 1—7 28 a, begun in Hebrew, but relapsing at the first convenient opportunity into Aramaic, is entirely different in character from the rest of the book, composed throughout in Hebrew, and dating without question from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the latter part the predictions are explicit, down to the desecration of the Temple; there is a full angelology, Gabriel and Michael being mentioned by name. In the first part the prophecies are so vague that interpreters have never reached an agreement on their meaning, and the attempts to refer them to Antiochus Epiphanes leave one skeptical; moreover, angels are alluded to in vague terms, but no names are given. More important still is the Babylonian atmosphere that enshrouds the first part, disappearing entirely in the latter half of the book. The former is of value for neo-Babylonian history, thanks to the interesting legendary details regarding Nebuchadrezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede, which could hardly have been common property in the second century B. C.; the latter is worthless for this purpose. While the visions in ch. 4 and 7 are full of Babylonian imagery, with the sacred tree whose top reaches heaven,²² winged lions and panthers, etc., the visions in the latter part, with their rams and goats, their kings of the south and north, etc., are wholly un-Babylonian.²³ The visions of the first half of Daniel are impregnated with Babylonian magical and eschatological conceptions, such as the succession of kingdoms

²² Eduard Meyer's view (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Vol. II, pp. 189 ff.) that this tree is a reflection of the Iranian Gaokerena (Gokart) is entirely unnecessary, since we find the same ideas appearing throughout cuneiform literature; see my remarks AJSL 35, 198 ff.

²³ The symbolism of rams and goats, while un-Babylonian, is rather characteristic of Egyptian culture. Note also that the lamb of Bochoris is one of the most popular mediums of apocalypse among the later Egyptians. The conflict between the kings of the south and the north is also an Egyptian motive found constantly in the religious and apocalyptic literature. While direct Egyptian influence upon the writer of Daniel II is possible, it is more likely that the motives were borrowed from the common Palestinian stock, quite largely, as we know now, of Egyptian origin.

of gold, (silver),²⁴ bronze, and iron, and cannot be forced into accord with any sequence of historical empires; such predictions, based on astrological and magical foundations, became more and more common in the last centuries before the Christian era, as we know from the papyri and from Berossus, etc. The three, perhaps four Greek loan-words in Daniel preclude a date earlier than 300 B. C.; 2 43 obviously refers to the vain efforts of Alexander, Seleucus Nicator and Antiochus Soter to amalgamate the Hellenes and the Orientals, which failed—even as iron is not mixed with clay. We may therefore place the Aramaic section of Daniel somewhere in the first half of the third century, a century or a little more after the composition of Ezra, as shown above. In the third century literary Aramaic was still the *lingua franca* of the Achaemenian Empire, and the question of local dialects plays little rôle. It is practically certain that the first part was written in Babylonia, since, if it were known in Palestine when the author of Daniel II wrote, his work could not have been successful.

A number of indications that Ezra is older than Daniel I are present. In 402 lines (Marti's ed.) Daniel has 14 Persian loan-words, while in only 136 lines of Ezra there are 11. Persian loans would fall in popularity under Greek rule as rapidly as Turkish words are disappearing from Palestine under the British mandate. The fact that Daniel has proportionately less than half as many Persian words as Ezra has is therefore very significant. On the other hand, there are three or four Greek loans in Daniel—none in Ezra (see above). Grammatically, the differences are very slight; the language is the *lingua franca*. Yet the following evolution may be pointed out. In the Aramaic papyri of the fifth century the causative in *h* (*hafel*) is always employed, and in Ezra the same is true. In Daniel there is one *afel* form, and two or three reflexive forms in *š* instead of *š*. In Jewish Aramaic we always have *afel*, except in a very few archaic forms, probably from the Maccabaeian period, which show that Daniel is not written in Jewish Aramaic of the second century B. C., but in the older *lingua franca*.

²⁴ The silver element is explicitly mentioned in v. 32.

So far as the supposed evidence for the modernity of Biblical Aramaic is concerned, the following will suffice. The main argument is orthographical. When the Aramaeans adopted the Phoenician script, they employed **𐤀** to represent their *d*, following analogy, and **𐤁** to indicate their *d*, pronounced actually'.²⁵ This is still the usual orthography of the papyri, but in Biblical Aramaic the more recent orthography is consistently used. It is hard to see how an argument from orthography can be used here at all. As is well known, the *matres lectionis* were introduced into Hebrew after the Exile—but they were put in almost everywhere in the Old Testament, even in the earliest portions. The classical Greek and Latin authors automatically underwent the same process, found before them in Egypt and Babylonia, and since then in numberless instances. The King James' Version, for example, is not published now in its original spelling, nor is the *Don Quijote* of Cervantes.

The grammatical differences between the papyri and the books of Ezra and Daniel are almost negligible, but, slight as they are, they show that Biblical Aramaic is a little more recent, just as we maintain. The similarity in vocabulary is very great, as great as the gulf between Biblical Aramaic and the Targums. The verb **𐤏𐤃**, for instance, is found thirteen times in the Elephantine Papyri, sixteen times in Ezra, ten in Daniel (with three times the extent), once out of some two hundred possible cases in Onkelos, and never in Jonathan. Here we may bring the philological discussion to a close, secure in the confidence that we have found nothing to cast doubt upon our

²⁵ Since all the *ps* which stood for an etymological *d* became later *v*, it is certain that the *p* is simply a conventional orthography. The cerebral (not emphatic) *d* seems to have become a glottal catch in Aramaic, just as the cerebral *g* has in the city dialects of Egypt and Palestine. There is an intimate phonetic and auditory association between *p* and *κ*, which leads to their being confused very easily. Now as we know from Aramaean morphology the true consonantal *κ* was lost very early, and the *κ* became a vowel-letter. Hence, in order to indicate the glottal catch, *p* was the only available letter. Later on the *v* lost its true value as the voiceless consonant corresponding to unpointed *ha*, and became pronounced as a kind of glottal catch, or *alef*. Accordingly the *ḏad* and the *'ayin* fell together, and the letter *v* was used for both.

approximate date for Ezra, c. 400—350, and Daniel, shortly before 250.

Now we are ready to take up the question of the authorship of the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Who was the Chronicler? The way to a solution of this interesting, but at first sight insoluble question is furnished, I believe, by Torrey's brilliant analysis of Ezra and Nehemiah. Torrey has demonstrated in the most convincing way that "there is no portion of the whole work Chron.-Ezra-Neh. in which the Chronicler's literary peculiarities are more strongly marked, more abundant, more evenly and continuously distributed, and more easily recognizable, than in the Hebrew narrative of Ezra 7—10 and Neh. 8—10".²⁶ It is hard to see how anyone can oppose this conclusion, after a careful study of the impressive list of words and expressions common to the Chronicler and to the Ezra memoirs given by Torrey, *Composition*, pp. 16—28. In his *Ezra Studies*, pp. 238—248, he has adduced a great many additional facts and considerations, the cumulative momentum of which is enormous. As Torrey observes, Ezra "was a man precisely like the Chronicler himself: interested very noticeably in the Levites, and especially the class of singers; deeply concerned at all times with the details of the cult and with the ecclesiastical organization in Jerusalem; armed with lists of names giving the genealogy and official standing of those who constituted the true church; — — — zealous for — — — the preservation of the pure blood of Israel! There is not a garment in all Ezra's wardrobe that does not fit the Chronicler exactly".²⁷ Having with rare logical consistency reached this result, Torrey's attitude on the other evidence forces him to the conclusion that the memoirs of Ezra

²⁶ *Ezra Studies*, p. 241.

²⁷ Batten's objection (*op. laud.*, p. 51) to Torrey's statement is based upon his elimination from the Ezra memoirs of everything that to him suggests the Chronicler, though an impartial critic can hardly see less characteristic marks of the Chronicler in the portions he retains. Batten says "there is no genealogical or other list of names" in the Ezra memoirs, but his own very arbitrary delimitation of the latter on p. 16 includes the list of eleven names in 8 16 and the genealogy in 8 18. Despite his correct solution of the Ezra problem, Batten's treatment of the documents is most unsatisfactory—nor could it be otherwise, with his point of view.

are a forgery of the Chronicler, and that Ezra himself is probably a mythical figure imagined by the Chronicler in order to give authority to his peculiar point of view. As a result recent writers, unable to accept Torrey's radical revision of the historical situation in the fifth century, have rejected his critical theory, though admitting that the Ezra memoirs are colored by a drastic revision at the hands of the Chronicler. But if this is the case, why do we not find the same thorough-going redaction in Nehemiah? The Chronicler's method in redacting the Book of Kings was to supplement, not to rewrite, so we may safely assume that he followed the same course with the Ezra memoirs—unless we cut the Gordian knot of the difficulty by supposing that he wrote them himself—that, in other words, the Chronicler was Ezra.

This may seem absurd, since critical scholarship has for generations rejected the tradition that Ezra was the Chronicler. This skepticism has served its purpose in freeing the minds of scholars from predispositions as to the nature of the work, but now the cycle is completed, and we may return to a traditional theory without being regarded as slaves of tradition. But here there looms an apparently unsurmountable obstacle to our suggestion. Ezra is placed by the consensus of opinion in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, over fifty years before the date fixed above for the composition of the Chronicler's work. Of late, however, there is an increasing tendency to place Ezra after Nehemiah, in the reign of Artaxerxes II, Mnemon, a theory first presented with all Van Hoonacker's ability in a brochure entitled *Néhémie et Esdras. Nouvelle hypothèse sur la chronologie de l'époque de la restauration* (Louvain, 1890). Kuenen immediately replied to Van Hoonacker,²⁸ but his answer, representing all that the ripest scholarship could say in defense of the standard view, is very unconvincing. The Belgian scholar made one mistake which seriously weakened his position, suggesting that Ezra was in fact an associate of Nehemiah, but later went back to Babylonia, only returning decades later in 397 (398), an almost inconceivable hypothesis. For years no one

²⁸ See his *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, edited by Budde, pp. 235—251.

ventured to take up arms for its defense, though Torrey removed one of the chief difficulties by showing convincingly that the references to Nehemiah in the Ezra memoirs were late glosses,²⁹ so that Ezra might have lived after Nehemiah—if he existed at all—; Torrey suggested that the Chronicler meant to place Ezra under Artaxerxes Mnemon. Finally, in 1913 Batten, in his commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah (ICC), made the obvious change in Van Hoonacker's theory. It is this theory which we adopt, after reaching it independently.

By placing Ezra before Nehemiah we encounter a large number of most perplexing difficulties (Batten, pp. 28—30). The reforms of Nehemiah would be very strange and even inexplicable if Ezra's career had fallen shortly before, nor could the Levites well be brought to such a pass as that described Neh. 13 10 f. during Ezra's ascendancy. Ezra nowhere in his memoirs describes the Holy City as ruined, while Nehemiah's picture is gloomy in the extreme. The most conclusive passage is Neh. 12 26, which names in succession the outstanding figures in Jewish ecclesiastical history from the reign of Darius Hystaspes (see above) to that of Artaxerxes Mnemon; they are: Yôyaqim, son of Yešûa'; Nehemiah, the Governor (*pehah*); and finally Ezra "the priest, the scribe". Another valuable hint is given by Ezra 10 6, where Ezra mentions the fact that during a fast he occupied the *liškah* (attached to the temple) of Yôhanan, son of Elyášib. The latter was almost certainly the high-priest, who is called "son of Elyášib" because his father, Yôyada', was high-priest only a few years, if at all, which may well have been the case. Yôhanan, who naturally had his own mansion elsewhere, surrendered his chamber in the temple to the temporary head of the Jewish community, by virtue of the royal *firman*. Ezra can only have felt contempt for Yôhanan, the fratricide³⁰ and transgressor

²⁹ See especially *Ezra Studies*, pp. 282 f.

³⁰ The fratricide is described by Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 7. The Persian strategos of Artaxerxes, named Bagoses (or Bagoas), plotted with Jesus (Yešûa') to depose his brother Joannes (Yehohanan), the actual high-priest, and to instal the former in his place. The two brothers then quarreled in the temple, and Joannes slew his brother. In revenge Bagoses profaned the temple by entering the Holy of Holies, and laid on

of the law, which would account for his failure to call him "high-priest". The following table will indicate the chronological relationship of the high-priests during the Persian period.

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| Yešûa' | Zerubbabel (son of Še'alti'el) | | | |
| c. 560—490 | c. 550—515 (?) | | | |
| | | | | |
| Yôyakîm | | | | |
| c. 530—460 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Elyāšîb | Nehemiah | | | |
| c. 500—425 | gov. 444—c. 425 | | | |
| | | | | |
| Yôyada' | | Sin-uballiṭ I | | |
| c. 470—420 | | c. 480—410 | | |
| ----- ----- ----- ----- | | | | |
| Yehoḥanan | Yešûa' | Manasseh—Nikaso | Delāyah | Šelamyah |
| c. 450—390 | c. 450—410 | c. 445— | | |
| | | | | |
| Yaddûa' I | | | | |
| c. 430—360 | | | | |
| (Yaddûa' II) | | | | Sin-uballiṭ II |
| (c. 330) | | | | c. 330 |
| | | | | |
| Honnai I (Onias) | | | | |

the Jews for seven years (!) a fine of 50 drachmas for every sacrificial sheep. The former identification of this Bagoas with the famous vizier of Artaxerxes Ochus has been discarded since the Elephantine Papyri have showed that Bagoses (Bagoth) was governor of Judaea in 410—7, contemporaneously with Yehoḥanan. It is hardly probable that Bagoses held his office long; Josephus's source evidently confused him with his distinguished namesake, the great general and minister of the name, connecting him accordingly with an Artaxerxes, instead of placing him correctly under Darius Nothus. Since the death of Yešûa' presumably occurred early in the rule of his brother, we may safely place it about 410, more than ten years before Ezra's mission. Who the Tirshatha was in Ezra's time we cannot say; at all events he was friendly to the party of Ezra, which stood for the rule of the Law, against both patriotic hotheads and priestly aristocrats, enjoying in consequence the active patronage of the Persian government.

The best attack on the theory of Van Hoonacker is that of Kuenen (see above). Most of his arguments are no longer valid, after the Elephantine discoveries and Torrey's work on the text and arrangement of Ezra's and Nehemiah's memoirs. One point is important. Kuenen points out that two men who took part in the construction of the wall under Nehemiah may reappear in the Ezra memoirs: Malkiyah, son of Harim, and the priest Meremôt, son of Uriyah. But in Ezra 10³¹ Malkiyah is named among the members of the *benê Harim*, the family of Harim, and so was probably another member of the family. On the other hand, Meremôt is probably identical with the Meremôt who was a contemporary of Nehemiah. A little reflection will show the possibility of this. The young priest who aided in the building of the wall in 444 need not have been over seventy forty-six years later, in 398, when he was the chief of the committee which received the gifts brought by Ezra from Babylon. As a matter of fact, if Ezra and Nehemiah were really contemporaries, it would be occasion for astonishment that, out of all the prominent men who are named in connection with each, only one should be mentioned with certainty by both.

The objection has been raised that in the Chronicler's work Ezra precedes Nehemiah. The reply is that Ezra probably affixed Nehemiah's memoirs to his own fragmentary compilation. The lack of a history of the postexilic period is no more difficult to explain than the similar lack of a history of the pre-Davidic age; Ezra was not interested in historical researches, but only in ecclesiastical succession (i. e., priestly and related genealogies) and theological orthodoxy. Hence Nehemiah's memoirs, since they deranged his scheme, were affixed rather than inserted in chronological order. It is interesting to follow the harmonizing attempts of later editors, which led to the rearrangement of the text in various ways; a good discussion of the subject, with emphasis on the importance of the oldest extant recension, I Esdras, is found in Torrey's *Ezra Studies*, pp. 1—114.

One clear result of the transposition of Ezra and Nehemiah in history is that Ezra's supposed importance in connection with the introduction of the Priest Code vanishes. It is impossible to place the publication of the complete Pentateuch as late as

400 B. C., for many reasons. Its official introduction certainly preceded the "Passover letter" written by Hananyah to the heads of the colony at Elephantine in 419, shortly after the close of Nehemiah's career in Palestine. Some years before, about 425, Nehemiah had expelled Manasseh, grandson of the old high-priest Elyasib, because of his marriage to Nikaso, daughter of Sin-uballit, as we learn from Neh. 13 28 f. and Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 7, 2, who gives an independent tradition, according to which Manasseh was nephew instead of brother of Yôhanan, a very natural mistake. Since this Manasseh was made by the old Sin-uballit high-priest of the temple on Mount Gerizim, to which he transferred the Jewish Pentateuch, still written in the archaic Hebrew script, it is clear that the Pentateuch had been published some time before 425. The most probable theory by far is that the Pentateuch had been completed in Babylonia during the latter part of the Exile, and published before the time of Haggai and Zechariah. During the fifth century the priesthood, with the assistance of the imperial government, gradually imposed it on Judaea, as well as upon the communities of the Diaspora. Finally, in 398, Ezra was able to gather up the scattered threads and bind Judaism into a solid and exclusive ecclesiastical structure. The Jews long maintained a clear tradition of Ezra's rôle, which they not unnaturally exaggerated. While he was not a gifted thinker or writer in any sense, and his soul was circumscribed by the narrow limits of a conventional orthodoxy, he must have been an organizer of remarkable ability. To Ezra's organizing talent Judaism owes, in large measure, the rigid system which preserved it, unbroken, through centuries of fierce struggle with Hellenism.