

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES  
FROM  
THE HISTORICAL STANDPOINT.

by  
EDWARD L. ISRAEL

A thesis written for the degree of  
Rabbi.

Cincinnati O. 1919.  
Hebrew Union College.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Chapter One

- A. Introduction.
1. The task and method
  2. The unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah
  3. The text of Chronicles

## Chapter Two

- B. Historical Value of Chronicles.
1. Introduction and various opinions
  2. The Chronicler's importance for post-exilic history
  3. The Chronicler's distortion of comparatively objective fact
  4. The objective value of Chronicles
    - a. The genealogies
    - b. The use of older sources

## Chapter Three

- C. The Chronicler's Conception of History and the Importance.
1. God as the supreme guide of destinies
  2. The selection of Israel
  3. Sin the sole explanation of misfortune

## Chapter Four

- D. The Genealogies of Chronicles.
1. Introduction and various views
  2. A sketch of the early genealogies and their purposes
  3. Types of genealogies found and their explanation
    - a. Biblical sources
    - b. Extra-Biblical sources and traditions
    - c. Inventions of the Chronicler
    - d. Post-exilic family genealogies
    - e. Post-Chronicler interpolations

## Chapter Five

- E. Sources Used By the Chronicler.
1. The erroneous conclusions sometimes advanced
  2. The nature of the additions
  3. The real sources
    - a. Works included in our canon
    - b. Old folk tales and genealogies
    - c. A possible Dibre Hayyamim L'malke Jehuda
    - d. The Dibre Hozim

## Chapter Six

- F. The Chronicler and David.
1. The general tendency of the Chronicler toward David
  2. The reasons for that tendency and their manifestations
  3. The methods by which David is exalted

## Chapter Seven

- G. The Attitude of the Chronicler Toward the Northern Kingdom.
1. The reason for the attitude
  2. The exemplifications

## Chapter Eight

- H. The Chronicler's Connexion with P
1. The evident P standpoint of Chronicles
  2. The sanctuary
  3. The Chronicler and Ps
  4. His subsequent activity

Chapter Nine

I. The Date of the Chronicler.

1. The original internal evidence to be gained
2. A criticism of their opinions

Chapter Ten

J. The Chronicler as Levite.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baentsch, Bruno; Numeri. In Handkommentar z. A.T. ed Nowack.  
Goettingen 1903
- Batten, Loring W., The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah in International  
Critical Commentary. N.Y.1913
- Benziger, I., Die Buecher der Chronik, in Kurzer Hand-Kommentar,  
ed. Marti. Leipzig 1901.
- Bertholet, Alfred, Leviticus. In Kurzen Hand-Kommentar, ed. Marti  
Leipzig 1901.
- Brown, Driver, Briggs; A Hebrew and English Lexicon. Boston 1906.
- Curtis, Edward Lewis; The Books of Chronicles. In International  
Critical Commentary, N.Y.1910.
- Carpenter-Battersby; The Hexateuch. 2 vols. London 1900.
- E.B. i.e. Encyclopedia Biblica, ed. T.K.Cheyne.4 vols. N.Y.1899.
- Gesenius; Hebrew and English Lexicon. Boston 1882.
- I.C.C. i.e. International Critical Commentary (see Curtis or Batten)
- Josephus Antiquities
- Hebrew Bible, English Translation, Jewish Publ. Society. Phil.1917.
- Hebrew Bible, ed. Kittel. Leipzig 1909
- Ki. i.e. Kittel. (see Hebrew Bible, ed. Kittel) 1901
- Holzinger, Dr. H.; Exodus. In Kurzen Hand-Kommentar, ed. Marti. Leipzig
- Holzinger, Dr. H.; Numeri. In Kurzen Hand-Kommentar, ed. Marti "
- J.E. i.e. Jewish Encyclopedia. N.Y. 1905.
- Meyer, Eduard; Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Hall A.S.1896
- Rashi, Commentary to Chronicles.
- Wellhausen, Geschichte Israels. Berlin 1878.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Benj.---Benjamin or Benjaminite  
 Bn.---Benziger's Commentary to Chronicles. See Bibliography.  
 Ch.---The Chronicles  
 Chr.---The Chronicler/  
 D---The Deuteronomic code.  
 EB---Encyclopædia Biblica. See Bibliography.  
 Ezer.---The book of Ezra  
 Gen.---The book of Genesis  
 gen.---genealogy  
 gens.---genealogies  
 Hez.---Hezekiah  
 Ju.---The book of Judges  
 K---The books of Kings.  
 Neh.---The book of Nehemiah  
 P---The priestly code.  
 Pent.---The Pentateuch  
 post-ex.---post-exilic  
 pre-ex.---pre-exilic  
 LXX---The Septuagint  
 S---The books of Samuel  
 Sol.---Solomon  
 v.---Verse  
 vv.---Verses.  
 p.---Page  
 pp.---Pages

Note- An almost complete list of biblical sources for the writings of the Chr. is to be found in I.C.C. to Chronicles, pp. 17-19. This list is so complete that it has been deemed unnecessary to repeat it here. Very few corrections or emendations would have to be given, if any.  
 Any omissions from the list of abbreviation follow the usual and accepted form.

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES  
FROM  
THE HISTORICAL STANDPOINT.

# A. Introduction.

1. The task and method.
2. The unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah
3. The text of Chronicles

So little has been done, especially by Jewish scholars towards developing the critical understanding of the Chr's work, that in most instances, the proper understanding of the religious bias of the Chr. leads along paths yet untrodden. This has meant a necessary differing with many of the accepted views. It has meant the undertaking of study along the lines of which I have had no guide whatsoever. Such a subject as the detailed connexion of the Chr. with the P <sup>code</sup> has been touched upon, but has never been adequately considered. I need not here state how important I have found the work of the Chr. to be, much more important than is usually thought. That sort of statement is usually platitudinous for a thesis, and furthermore, the thesis, of itself alone can show the truth of such an assertion.

I have sought condensation as much as possible. In almost every case, where I have quoted a Biblical passage, I have not gone into the usual laborious and doleful repetition of what the passage states. The only cases where I do elaborate is when elaboration has been absolutely necessary. As I review the work, my fault seems rather to be a surfeit of brevity. I have given due credit when I have presented the views of another. But there will be found very few verbose presentations of opposing views. The reference to them is sufficient. He who will can examine in detail. All that I do is to synopsise when necessary. Where no authority is given, I am advancing what I feel to be the truth as a result of my own investigation. The unsatisfactory and superficial nature of most of the work on the historical nature of Ch. has caused a multiplicity of original attitudes on my part. Inadequate as they may be, they attempt to handle the problem with greater detailed

consideration than has been done heretofore.

This thesis, though limited in its direct considerations to the books of Ch. takes into account the other works of the Chr., namely Ezer. and Neh. It is therefore necessary that a short paragraph be devoted to the establishing of the unity of these. With a short subsequent remark or two as to the textual conditions, I may enter upon the real matter at hand.

It is generally conceded that Ezer. and Neh. form an harmonious continuation of Ch. Every modern scholar has held this view. There seems no reason to dispute it. There is no evidence which can contradict all that has been said in favor of this unity. As will be seen in the course of our paper, the Chr. wrote long after the time of Ezra. The religious and national standpoint of the group of books <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ the same throughout. The Hebrew diction is very similar. So chronologically, stylistically and religiously, the arguments which I have merely suggested as to the unity of Ch.-Ezer-Neh are entirely borne out. The clumsy hint of the redactor of a later date in leaving the first paragraph of Ezra in its proper place at the end of Ch. (2Ch.36) clinches the argument. Very few of the conclusions of this paper will draw much evidence from Ezer-Neh. but such as do will accept the universally accepted critical view that the books are a unity. The problem of various strata in the work of the Chr. will have consideration later.

I have found little need to do much emending with the text of Ch. True, there are many variant readings, there are many Mss. which contain better renditions than our Massoretic text. In most cases the LXX has retained a better text. In two cases I have accepted the LXX text in the promulgation of a theory, although in neither case does the theory rest upon the unreliable basis of an emended text. When there are Biblical sources, the state of preservation of Ch. is often striking. In quite a few instances,



Ch. has preserved the better text, and when Ch. has become corrupt the types of corruption are usually the simple ones, well known among textual critics.

B. Historical Value of Ch.

1. Introduction and Various Opinions
2. The Chr's. importance for post-exilic history
3. The Chr's. distortion of comparatively objective facts.
4. The objective value of Ch.
  - a. The genealogies.
  - b. The use of older sources.

Rashi opens his commentary to the books of Ch. with the traditional view that they were written by Ezra according to the data gained from S., K., Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. The purpose of the book, says our commentator is to show the Temple institutions as prescribed by David. Now, our view of the historical value of Ch. will differ widely from this. One kernel of the truth has the ancient exegete discovered, a tendency on the part of the Chr. to trace religious institutions to David. But there is much more to be said before the historical value of the books is determined. Modern scholars have adopted various attitudes. Let me give only one or two representative views. Bn. maintains that Ch. are valuable only for the time of the Chr.; that the Chr. received his history built by ages into legend; that he is not an historian but a Midrashist-- all of which is true but only partially so. Bn. further states that by comparing Ch. with K. we see plainly that Ch. is not an objective history of the kingdoms but a Church history. David's whole life is merely a preparation for the Temple. The entire history of Israel is merely a history of cultus. All other facts are not worthy of mention. Everything previous to David and Solomon were merely to prepare for the Temple. Everything that follows has the Temple as its center. Kings are judged according to their allegiance to the cultus. Piety brings material greatness; a king's soldiers are proportionate in number to his pious acts. So speaks Bn. Again I say- true but only partially so.

The entire question of the historical value of Ch. cannot be settled in this chapter, for in a sense, this whole thesis revolves about this subject. Let us take Bn. as typical of the critical view and by discussing him, perhaps map out a general course of discussion.

11.  
Bn. is right in maintaining that the Chr. has a definite object in view in his history. The exegete might emphasize a bit more firmly the important connexion of this definite object with post-ex. conditions. Everything that has been stated with reference to the Temple and cultus is true. But there is one phase of the subject I desire to mention here as a problem to be taken up later. Is the work of the Chr. merely a Tendenzschrift? Does the Chr. merely reconstruct <sup>pre-</sup>~~post-~~ex. history according to post-ex. conditions? True it is that there is much of that. The gens. of the later chapters have probably only one big purpose, to give antiquity to prominent post-ex. families. Curtis very aptly remarks that such a passage as I Ch. 12;2 stresses Benj. probably to remove the odium from Benj. because of Benj.'s importance in post-ex. Israel. The members of the post-ex. Benj. families must have felt ashamed that their ancestors were reported to have followed Saul in preference to <sup>David</sup>. Curtis' statement seems all the more true, I have found because the names of such gen. purporting to be pre-ex. often repeat the names of contemporary gens. of Ezra's time. Thus we see the Chr. giving us an insight into post-ex. conditions.

But our evidence is going to show us later that the Chr. is not only doing this. He is also establishing customs for his day or lending strength to customs newly established. Many examples will be given of this. Here take such a passage as 2 Ch. 19; 1 ff. Isn't it more than likely that the picture here of a judicial system based on the clergy is not so much a projection of his day into Jehoshaphat's reign, but an attempt at founding a post-ex. judicial system according to the hierarchical ideas of the Chr. In this particular instance he ultimately failed as we know from subsequent Mishnaic history. Wellhausen ingeniously attempts to attribute this invention of the Chr. to a play on the king's name, Jehoshaphat, God judges. This clever remark may explain why Ch. picks upon this particular king but it does not explain the underlying purpose. Again with reference to the Lev. <sup>priests</sup> courses of ~~Ex. 29; 30-32; 33-34; 35-36; 37-38; 39-40; 41-42; 43-44; 45-46; 47-48; 49-50; 51-52; 53-54; 55-56; 57-58; 59-60; 61-62; 63-64; 65-66; 67-68; 69-70; 71-72; 73-74; 75-76; 77-78; 79-80; 81-82; 83-84; 85-86; 87-88; 89-90; 91-92; 93-94; 95-96; 97-98; 99-100; 101-102; 103-104; 105-106; 107-108; 109-110; 111-112; 113-114; 115-116; 117-118; 119-120; 121-122; 123-124; 125-126; 127-128; 129-130; 131-132; 133-134; 135-136; 137-138; 139-140; 141-142; 143-144; 145-146; 147-148; 149-150; 151-152; 153-154; 155-156; 157-158; 159-160; 161-162; 163-164; 165-166; 167-168; 169-170; 171-172; 173-174; 175-176; 177-178; 179-180; 181-182; 183-184; 185-186; 187-188; 189-190; 191-192; 193-194; 195-196; 197-198; 199-200; 201-202; 203-204; 205-206; 207-208; 209-210; 211-212; 213-214; 215-216; 217-218; 219-220; 221-222; 223-224; 225-226; 227-228; 229-230; 231-232; 233-234; 235-236; 237-238; 239-240; 241-242; 243-244; 245-246; 247-248; 249-250; 251-252; 253-254; 255-256; 257-258; 259-260; 261-262; 263-264; 265-266; 267-268; 269-270; 271-272; 273-274; 275-276; 277-278; 279-280; 281-282; 283-284; 285-286; 287-288; 289-290; 291-292; 293-294; 295-296; 297-298; 299-300; 301-302; 303-304; 305-306; 307-308; 309-310; 311-312; 313-314; 315-316; 317-318; 319-320; 321-322; 323-324; 325-326; 327-328; 329-330; 331-332; 333-334; 335-336; 337-338; 339-340; 341-342; 343-344; 345-346; 347-348; 349-350; 351-352; 353-354; 355-356; 357-358; 359-360; 361-362; 363-364; 365-366; 367-368; 369-370; 371-372; 373-374; 375-376; 377-378; 379-380; 381-382; 383-384; 385-386; 387-388; 389-390; 391-392; 393-394; 395-396; 397-398; 399-400; 401-402; 403-404; 405-406; 407-408; 409-410; 411-412; 413-414; 415-416; 417-418; 419-420; 421-422; 423-424; 425-426; 427-428; 429-430; 431-432; 433-434; 435-436; 437-438; 439-440; 441-442; 443-444; 445-446; 447-448; 449-450; 451-452; 453-454; 455-456; 457-458; 459-460; 461-462; 463-464; 465-466; 467-468; 469-470; 471-472; 473-474; 475-476; 477-478; 479-480; 481-482; 483-484; 485-486; 487-488; 489-490; 491-492; 493-494; 495-496; 497-498; 499-500; 501-502; 503-504; 505-506; 507-508; 509-510; 511-512; 513-514; 515-516; 517-518; 519-520; 521-522; 523-524; 525-526; 527-528; 529-530; 531-532; 533-534; 535-536; 537-538; 539-540; 541-542; 543-544; 545-546; 547-548; 549-550; 551-552; 553-554; 555-556; 557-558; 559-560; 561-562; 563-564; 565-566; 567-568; 569-570; 571-572; 573-574; 575-576; 577-578; 579-580; 581-582; 583-584; 585-586; 587-588; 589-590; 591-592; 593-594; 595-596; 597-598; 599-600; 601-602; 603-604; 605-606; 607-608; 609-610; 611-612; 613-614; 615-616; 617-618; 619-620; 621-622; 623-624; 625-626; 627-628; 629-630; 631-632; 633-634; 635-636; 637-638; 639-640; 641-642; 643-644; 645-646; 647-648; 649-650; 651-652; 653-654; 655-656; 657-658; 659-660; 661-662; 663-664; 665-666; 667-668; 669-670; 671-672; 673-674; 675-676; 677-678; 679-680; 681-682; 683-684; 685-686; 687-688; 689-690; 691-692; 693-694; 695-696; 697-698; 699-700; 701-702; 703-704; 705-706; 707-708; 709-710; 711-712; 713-714; 715-716; 717-718; 719-720; 721-722; 723-724; 725-726; 727-728; 729-730; 731-732; 733-734; 735-736; 737-738; 739-740; 741-742; 743-744; 745-746; 747-748; 749-750; 751-752; 753-754; 755-756; 757-758; 759-760; 761-762; 763-764; 765-766; 767-768; 769-770; 771-772; 773-774; 775-776; 777-778; 779-780; 781-782; 783-784; 785-786; 787-788; 789-790; 791-792; 793-794; 795-796; 797-798; 799-800; 801-802; 803-804; 805-806; 807-808; 809-810; 811-812; 813-814; 815-816; 817-818; 819-820; 821-822; 823-824; 825-826; 827-828; 829-830; 831-832; 833-834; 835-836; 837-838; 839-840; 841-842; 843-844; 845-846; 847-848; 849-850; 851-852; 853-854; 855-856; 857-858; 859-860; 861-862; 863-864; 865-866; 867-868; 869-870; 871-872; 873-874; 875-876; 877-878; 879-880; 881-882; 883-884; 885-886; 887-888; 889-890; 891-892; 893-894; 895-896; 897-898; 899-900; 901-902; 903-904; 905-906; 907-908; 909-910; 911-912; 913-914; 915-916; 917-918; 919-920; 921-922; 923-924; 925-926; 927-928; 929-930; 931-932; 933-934; 935-936; 937-938; 939-940; 941-942; 943-944; 945-946; 947-948; 949-950; 951-952; 953-954; 955-956; 957-958; 959-960; 961-962; 963-964; 965-966; 967-968; 969-970; 971-972; 973-974; 975-976; 977-978; 979-980; 981-982; 983-984; 985-986; 987-988; 989-990; 991-992; 993-994; 995-996; 997-998; 999-1000; 1001-1002; 1003-1004; 1005-1006; 1007-1008; 1009-1010; 1011-1012; 1013-1014; 1015-1016; 1017-1018; 1019-1020; 1021-1022; 1023-1024; 1025-1026; 1027-1028; 1029-1030; 1031-1032; 1033-1034; 1035-1036; 1037-1038; 1039-1040; 1041-1042; 1043-1044; 1045-1046; 1047-1048; 1049-1050; 1051-1052; 1053-1054; 1055-1056; 1057-1058; 1059-1060; 1061-1062; 1063-1064; 1065-1066; 1067-1068; 1069-1070; 1071-1072; 1073-1074; 1075-1076; 1077-1078; 1079-1080; 1081-1082; 1083-1084; 1085-1086; 1087-1088; 1089-1090; 1091-1092; 1093-1094; 1095-1096; 1097-1098; 1099-1100; 1101-1102; 1103-1104; 1105-1106; 1107-1108; 1109-1110; 1111-1112; 1113-1114; 1115-1116; 1117-1118; 1119-1120; 1121-1122; 1123-1124; 1125-1126; 1127-1128; 1129-1130; 1131-1132; 1133-1134; 1135-1136; 1137-1138; 1139-1140; 1141-1142; 1143-1144; 1145-1146; 1147-1148; 1149-1150; 1151-1152; 1153-1154; 1155-1156; 1157-1158; 1159-1160; 1161-1162; 1163-1164; 1165-1166; 1167-1168; 1169-1170; 1171-1172; 1173-1174; 1175-1176; 1177-1178; 1179-1180; 1181-1182; 1183-1184; 1185-1186; 1187-1188; 1189-1190; 1191-1192; 1193-1194; 1195-1196; 1197-1198; 1199-1200; 1201-1202; 1203-1204; 1205-1206; 1207-1208; 1209-1210; 1211-1212; 1213-1214; 1215-1216; 1217-1218; 1219-1220; 1221-1222; 1223-1224; 1225-1226; 1227-1228; 1229-1230; 1231-1232; 1233-1234; 1235-1236; 1237-1238; 1239-1240; 1241-1242; 1243-1244; 1245-1246; 1247-1248; 1249-1250; 1251-1252; 1253-1254; 1255-1256; 1257-1258; 1259-1260; 1261-1262; 1263-1264; 1265-1266; 1267-1268; 1269-1270; 1271-1272; 1273-1274; 1275-1276; 1277-1278; 1279-1280; 1281-1282; 1283-1284; 1285-1286; 1287-1288; 1289-1290; 1291-1292; 1293-1294; 1295-1296; 1297-1298; 1299-1300; 1301-1302; 1303-1304; 1305-1306; 1307-1308; 1309-1310; 1311-1312; 1313-1314; 1315-1316; 1317-1318; 1319-1320; 1321-1322; 1323-1324; 1325-1326; 1327-1328; 1329-1330; 1331-1332; 1333-1334; 1335-1336; 1337-1338; 1339-1340; 1341-1342; 1343-1344; 1345-1346; 1347-1348; 1349-1350; 1351-1352; 1353-1354; 1355-1356; 1357-1358; 1359-1360; 1361-1362; 1363-1364; 1365-1366; 1367-1368; 1369-1370; 1371-1372; 1373-1374; 1375-1376; 1377-1378; 1379-1380; 1381-1382; 1383-1384; 1385-1386; 1387-1388; 1389-1390; 1391-1392; 1393-1394; 1395-1396; 1397-1398; 1399-1400; 1401-1402; 1403-1404; 1405-1406; 1407-1408; 1409-1410; 1411-1412; 1413-1414; 1415-1416; 1417-1418; 1419-1420; 1421-1422; 1423-1424; 1425-1426; 1427-1428; 1429-1430; 1431-1432; 1433-1434; 1435-1436; 1437-1438; 1439-1440; 1441-1442; 1443-1444; 1445-1446; 1447-1448; 1449-1450; 1451-1452; 1453-1454; 1455-1456; 1457-1458; 1459-1460; 1461-1462; 1463-1464; 1465-1466; 1467-1468; 1469-1470; 1471-1472; 1473-1474; 1475-1476; 1477-1478; 1479-1480; 1481-1482; 1483-1484; 1485-1486; 1487-1488; 1489-1490; 1491-1492; 1493-1494; 1495-1496; 1497-1498; 1499-1500; 1501-1502; 1503-1504; 1505-1506; 1507-1508; 1509-1510; 1511-1512; 1513-1514; 1515-1516; 1517-1518; 1519-1520; 1521-1522; 1523-1524; 1525-1526; 1527-1528; 1529-1530; 1531-1532; 1533-1534; 1535-1536; 1537-1538; 1539-1540; 1541-1542; 1543-1544; 1545-1546; 1547-1548; 1549-1550; 1551-1552; 1553-1554; 1555-1556; 1557-1558; 1559-1560; 1561-1562; 1563-1564; 1565-1566; 1567-1568; 1569-1570; 1571-1572; 1573-1574; 1575-1576; 1577-1578; 1579-1580; 1581-1582; 1583-1584; 1585-1586; 1587-1588; 1589-1590; 1591-1592; 1593-1594; 1595-1596; 1597-1598; 1599-1600; 1601-1602; 1603-1604; 1605-1606; 1607-1608; 1609-1610; 1611-1612; 1613-1614; 1615-1616; 1617-1618; 1619-1620; 1621-1622; 1623-1624; 1625-1626; 1627-1628; 1629-1630; 1631-1632; 1633-1634; 1635-1636; 1637-1638; 1639-1640; 1641-1642; 1643-1644; 1645-1646; 1647-1648; 1649-1650; 1651-1652; 1653-1654; 1655-1656; 1657-1658; 1659-1660; 1661-1662; 1663-1664; 1665-1666; 1667-1668; 1669-1670; 1671-1672; 1673-1674; 1675-1676; 1677-1678; 1679-1680; 1681-1682; 1683-1684; 1685-1686; 1687-1688; 1689-1690; 1691-1692; 1693-1694; 1695-1696; 1697-1698; 1699-1700; 1701-1702; 1703-1704; 1705-1706; 1707-1708; 1709-1710; 1711-1712; 1713-1714; 1715-1716; 1717-1718; 1719-1720; 1721-1722; 1723-1724; 1725-1726; 1727-1728; 1729-1730; 1731-1732; 1733-1734; 1735-1736; 1737-1738; 1739-1740; 1741-1742; 1743-1744; 1745-1746; 1747-1748; 1749-1750; 1751-1752; 1753-1754; 1755-1756; 1757-1758; 1759-1760; 1761-1762; 1763-1764; 1765-1766; 1767-1768; 1769-1770; 1771-1772; 1773-1774; 1775-1776; 1777-1778; 1779-1780; 1781-1782; 1783-1784; 1785-1786; 1787-1788; 1789-1790; 1791-1792; 1793-1794; 1795-1796; 1797-1798; 1799-1800; 1801-1802; 1803-1804; 1805-1806; 1807-1808; 1809-1810; 1811-1812; 1813-1814; 1815-1816; 1817-1818; 1819-1820; 1821-1822; 1823-1824; 1825-1826; 1827-1828; 1829-1830; 1831-1832; 1833-1834; 1835-1836; 1837-1838; 1839-1840; 1841-1842; 1843-1844; 1845-1846; 1847-1848; 1849-1850; 1851-1852; 1853-1854; 1855-1856; 1857-1858; 1859-1860; 1861-1862; 1863-1864; 1865-1866; 1867-1868; 1869-1870; 1871-1872; 1873-1874; 1875-1876; 1877-1878; 1879-1880; 1881-1882; 1883-1884; 1885-1886; 1887-1888; 1889-1890; 1891-1892; 1893-1894; 1895-1896; 1897-1898; 1899-1900; 1901-1902; 1903-1904; 1905-1906; 1907-1908; 1909-1910; 1911-1912; 1913-1914; 1915-1916; 1917-1918; 1919-1920; 1921-1922; 1923-1924; 1925-1926; 1927-1928; 1929-1930; 1931-1932; 1933-1934; 1935-1936; 1937-1938; 1939-1940; 1941-1942; 1943-1944; 1945-1946; 1947-1948; 1949-1950; 1951-1952; 1953-1954; 1955-1956; 1957-1958; 1959-1960; 1961-1962; 1963-1964; 1965-1966; 1967-1968; 1969-1970; 1971-1972; 1973-1974; 1975-1976; 1977-1978; 1979-1980; 1981-1982; 1983-1984; 1985-1986; 1987-1988; 1989-1990; 1991-1992; 1993-1994; 1995-1996; 1997-1998; 1999-2000; 2001-2002; 2003-2004; 2005-2006; 2007-2008; 2009-2010; 2011-2012; 2013-2014; 2015-2016; 2017-2018; 2019-2020; 2021-2022; 2023-2024; 2025-2026; 2027-2028; 2029-2030; 2031-2032; 2033-2034; 2035-2036; 2037-2038; 2039-2040; 2041-2042; 2043-2044; 2045-2046; 2047-2048; 2049-2050; 2051-2052; 2053-2054; 2055-2056; 2057-2058; 2059-2060; 2061-2062; 2063-2064; 2065-2066; 2067-2068; 2069-2070; 2071-2072; 2073-2074; 2075-2076; 2077-2078; 2079-2080; 2081-2082; 2083-2084; 2085-2086; 2087-2088; 2089-2090; 2091-2092; 2093-2094; 2095-2096; 2097-2098; 2099-2100; 2101-2102; 2103-2104; 2105-2106; 2107-2108; 2109-2110; 2111-2112; 2113-2114; 2115-2116; 2117-2118; 2119-2120; 2121-2122; 2123-2124; 2125-2126; 2127-2128; 2129-2130; 2131-2132; 2133-2134; 2135-2136; 2137-2138; 2139-2140; 2141-2142; 2143-2144; 2145-2146; 2147-2148; 2149-2150; 2151-2152; 2153-2154; 2155-2156; 2157-2158; 2159-2160; 2161-2162; 2163-2164; 2165-2166; 2167-2168; 2169-2170; 2171-2172; 2173-2174; 2175-2176; 2177-2178; 2179-2180; 2181-2182; 2183-2184; 2185-2186; 2187-2188; 2189-2190; 2191-2192; 2193-2194; 2195-2196; 2197-2198; 2199-2200; 2201-2202; 2203-2204; 2205-2206; 2207-2208; 2209-2210; 2211-2212; 2213-2214; 2215-2216; 2217-2218; 2219-2220; 2221-2222; 2223-2224; 2225-2226; 2227-2228; 2229-2230; 2231-2232; 2233-2234; 2235-2236; 2237-2238; 2239-2240; 2241-2242; 2243-2244; 2245-2246; 2247-2248; 2249-2250; 2251-2252; 2253-2254; 2255-2256; 2257-2258; 2259-2260; 2261-2262; 2263-2264; 2265-2266; 2267-2268; 2269-2270; 2271-2272; 2273-2274; 2275-2276; 2277-2278; 2279-2280; 2281-2282; 2283-2284; 2285-2286; 2287-2288; 2289-2290; 2291-2292; 2293-2294; 2295-2296; 2297-2298; 2299-2300; 2301-2302; 2303-2304; 2305-2306; 2307-2308; 2309-2310; 2311-2312; 2313-2314; 2315-2316; 2317-2318; 2319-2320; 2321-2322; 2323-2324; 2325-2326; 2327-2328; 2329-2330; 2331-2332; 2333-2334; 2335-2336; 2337-2338; 2339-2340; 2341-2342; 2343-2344; 2345-2346; 2347-2348; 2349-2350; 2351-2352; 2353-2354; 2355-2356; 2357-2358; 2359-2360; 2361-2362; 2363-2364; 2365-2366; 2367~~

1 Ch. 9:18 ff. there may be some reflection of a ceremony of his day, but as we shall see, in the light of even the latest portions of P, the Chr. is most likely inventing a new law. So we shall see the Chr. not only as giving the post-ex. conditions but his historical value is even more far reaching and trenchant.

There is hardly any of the Chr's work which can be taken as objective history. Having certain objects in view, he distorts his sources frightfully/ Things he approves, he exaggerates; the facts to which he is opposed, he neither ignores or deprecates. Hez. is a king of whom the Chr. is highly fond and so, to avoid embarrassing the memory of such a king, the Chr. abridges the K account and leaves out entirely the distasteful events of Hez's reign, the loss of the Temple treasures, Isaiah's rebuke etc. The good features of this reign he exaggerates by his midrash method. So too, of Asa in 2Ch.14, Asa is made a reformer of much greater latitude than K has it. The Chr., could not perceive how Asa could permit ~~idol~~ and strange altars to remain. Jehoshaphat too is glorified because the Chr. likes the description in 1K.22;43. A pious king like this would not have been idolatrous as 1K.22;44 truthfully has it, so the Chr. changes this line. In fact, so acute are the Chr's sensibilities on the pre-Josiah violations of D that in almost every case he omits the recurrent K expression <sup>(כ)</sup>ה' עמו <sup>(ל)</sup>אשר נתן להם. This gives us some appreciation of how far the Chr. is removed in time from K.

On the other side, the Chr. distorts the comparatively objective facts of K by ~~making this~~ exaggerating the misdeeds of his aversions. K is quite considerate towards Jehoram but 2 Ch.21;11ff. varies absolutely. Jehoram's idolatry forces the Chr. to condemn his whole reign. So drastic is his revision of K that he changes the passage where K mentions Jehoram's burial with his fathers. Thus we see, that in treating Ch. as an historical document, we must beware of these historical perversions and forced harmonizations as 1Ch.24;3 where to harmonize

the priestly line Abimelech becomes a descendant of Itamar.

There is a final aspect of this subject of the historical value of Ch. to which the critics pay little heed. There are very often occasional traces of real objective pre-ex. history preserved by the Chr. and not found in K. Often it is distorted; sometimes we see it plainly. Eg. many of the earlier gens. (1-9) are not what critics usually say, the invention of the Chr. There is every reason to believe (see chap. on gen.) that some of them are very old records reflecting historical conditions and incorporated by the Chr. for definite reasons. Such a section as 1Ch.5;22 clearly indicates the early struggles of Israel for a foothold in the E. Jordan country. 1Ch4;34 is clearly not invented but represents a tribal movement. The importance of 1Ch.2;55 both concerning Jabez and the Kenite-Rechabite problem is well known to Biblical students. And not only in the gens but also in many portions especially of 2Ch. not found in K we have reflections of objective History taken from earlier sources. The detailed discussion of this comes later. Here we have given merely a perspective of the hist. value of Chr.



C. The Chr's. Conception of History and Its Importance.

1. God as the supreme guide of destinies
2. The selection of Israel
3. Sin the sole explanation of misfortune

True to the style of almost every writer of Biblical narrative the Chr. possesses a definite conception of history. The general prophetic notions have influenced him greatly. The universalism of prophetic idealism finds little or no response in his soul but that one conception, the belief in God as the supreme guide of the universe finds expression again and again. We note this not only as an interesting fact, not only as a definite characteristic of the Chr. It is important for the proper understanding of post-ex. Judaism; for the comprehension of how far pre-ex. prophetic ideals impressed themselves upon post-ex. orthodoxy. In 1Ch.11;10, prefacing a long list of David's heroes and their exploits, Ch. goes aside from K to insert the idea that it is God more than the king who is the final arbiter in Israel's destinies. Significantly in 2Ch.22;7 is the place of God as the immediate controller of all man's impulses portrayed. Even in sickness it is God and not the physician who heals.(2Ch.16;11f.) In the prayer of Jehoshophat, 2Ch.20;7ff. we find the pronounced perseverance of the prophetic notions of older Pent. codes. God orders the ways of all the nations of the earth.(v.10)

But the prayer of Jehosh. contains even a further emphasis, the emphasis on the eternal choice of Israel. It would not be particularly noticeable were these ideas merely to occur frequently for their appearance in documents much earlier than Ch. is well known. But the significant feature of the Chr's. inclusion of these ideas is that they occur for the greater part, not as repetitions from the source. They either form part of the Chr's. invented narrative or more strikingly, in cases where almost literal parallels are drawn from K, the Chr. inserts these ideas on his conception of hist. not found in the K text. This makes it significant for it throws much light upon his times. But let us go on for a bit, with concrete instances.

1Ch.17;27 again pronounces the eternal choice of Israel. 1Ch.28;1 ff the picture of David's last assembly gives us a further step. It is not Israel in general but Judah in particular which is the recipient of God's eternal heritage, (v.4). God, to this end, has chosen David and exercises a divine choice over each succeeding king. By following JHWH all Israel will come to an eternal heritage (v.8). Here, if anywhere, is a clear insight into the use to which the Chr. puts this prophetic idea of history. Judah, the nucleus of the post-ex. Jewish community was, in the Chr's eyes the predestined nucleus from early times. The prophetic notion that God uses all nations becomes the Chr's message of comfort in the strenuous post-ex. days. God will not let Israel perish for he has chosen Israel and since he has power over all nations, he will use them for the benefit of his chosen one. We cannot here go into any detailed description of what must have been the life of the post-ex. community down to the year 300. But from the pictures in Ezra and Neh. and from other evidence, we know that the people must have needed such a message of hope as the Chr. tried to bring. Herein lies the reason for this emphasis.

The Chr. has in addition a corollary or supplement to these conceptions. God guides history. God is just. He is just even in the misfortunes that have come to Israel. The Chr, now becomes even more of a preacher and develops his conception as to the cause of misfortune among his people. He re-interprets the past and when necessary he invents. Though his sources as K relate the pre-ex. distresses of Israel comparatively objectively; the Chr. sees the opportunity to use these adversities homeletically. He invents and inserts. The invasion of Shishak and all following disasters which are told as matters of fact in K become in Ch. the result of sin (2Ch.12;1). Amaziah is made to sin to explain his defeat (2Ch.25;14ff). Bn. has noted this fact. Apostasy causes the Syrian invasion (2Ch.24;21ff). A sin is the direct cause of the king's leprosy (2Ch.26;16). Even the righteous king Hez. was known to have suffered. This was explicable

only  
to the Chr./as due to the fact that Hez. must have sinned. So a sin  
is invented against him in 2Ch.32;24. And not only are insertions  
made but in cases as 2Ch.15;19 the Chr. absolutely contradicts and  
changes his source (1K.15;16). The war must have been the result of  
evil. Yet Asa as depicted in K is entirely good. So the Chr. splits  
Asa's reign into an early good period and a later bad one to give  
some basis for the misfortune of war. And notice that all the sins  
which bring misfortune are of a ritualistic nature. The Chr. is  
demonstrating how all misfortune is the immediate result of sin.  
His people have suffered. They must have sinned. Only by acceptance  
of ritualistic institutions such as the Chr. presents will true piety  
and good fortune be assured. Here we see the Chr. supporting his  
religious propaganda. Ritualism and the unswerving observance of  
all that the Chr. depicts as the proper worship of God- these alone  
will keep Israel free from misfortune and adversity.



17

D. The Genealogies of Chronicles.

1. Introduction and various views
2. A sketch of the early genealogies and their purposes
3. Types of genealogies found and their explanation.
  - a. Biblical sources
  - b. Extra-Biblical sources and traditions
  - c. Inventions of the Chr.
  - d. Post-ex. family gens.
  - e. Post-Chr. interpolations

No portion of the work of the Chr. has received greater examination at the hands of scholars than the gens. Not only in the first few chapters of the books, but throughout are inserted list after list of genealogical character. Some students have shown a tendency toward a superficial estimate of these lists. They have said that they are based on Gen. or other Biblical sources in some cases and in others are simply the invention of the Chr. But this far from states the truth. The question as to the purpose, if any, of this genealogical data is important. The real sources of the lists are also of paramount interest. And the historical value of what is given there cannot be cast aside lightly. Rashi tries to solve the problem of purpose. He says that the lists begin at creation to bring in Abraham, even as the Toledot lists of Gen., and that the main line followed is from ~~Abraham~~ Seth through Abraham to David. This is true. There is a definite object in establishing the line of kingship. But this is only a small part of the story. Bn. too hits upon some of the truth when he sees some connexion between the Ch. lists and the Toledot of P. But the reason for that connexion is deeper than Bn. states. He is correct also in dividing the lists into personal and geographical but he errs in giving the personal lists too little credence and perhaps too much to the geographical. Fantastic theories have tried to find in some of the later lists of singers hidden psalms (vid. I.C.C. Ch. p.281). None of the scholars seem to give a clear presentation of this genealogical problem in its entirety.

Let us take a hasty glance through the first nine chapters of Ch.; for here we find types of every sort of gen. included in the

books. The opening verses of 1Ch. are taken plainly from Gen.5, a P document. By his great condensation the Chr. shows that his interest is in a line of descent and not in ages. 1Ch.1;5-23 are based on the P document of Gen.10. The minor textual differences are easily explicable as corruptions and the omissions of certain remarks of Gen. shows us the Chr's steadfastness to his set purpose, the line of descent. 1Ch.1;24-27 is also based on P(Gen.11;10-32) and by his omission of Nahor and Haran, Rashi's point is proved. The first step of the Chr. was to Abraham.

1Ch.1;28-33 again depends on P (Gen.25;13-17) but significantly, for the first time a collateral branch is given, that of Ishmael So on through v.54. A probably general interest in royalty and kingship may account for the incorporation of vv.43-54. But there is no doubt but that this is directly based on P. (Gen.36) The second chapter opens with the twelve sons of Jacob. The main course thus far is plainly discernible, the twelve tribes are reached thru P gens.

It is with 1Ch.2;6 that the divergence from the Biblical sources begins. It is noteworthy that the first divergence occurs just at the point where Ethan and Heman, two men in whom he is particularly interested, enter the account. For we see here one of the definite purposes of the Chr., to establish the lines of Ethan, Heman and Asaph the three heads of the families of levitical singers. A source like 1K.5;11 is used by the Chr. anachronistically, showing the general unreliability of the redactions. With this point, the Chr. breaks the bounds of P. That document no longer serves his purpose. But he resorts to other sources for his next step.

This appears in 1Ch.2;9ff. It is to establish the line of David We shall see that this interest in the line of David is merely because of the fashion in which the Chr. has centered the ritual about the reign of David. Ruth 4;18ff is his source together with a misinterpretation of 2S.2;18 and 17;25. From the treatment of these last

15  
mentioned passages we receive new light upon the Chr's methods. He does not confine himself to written fact. If documents stand in the way of his set purpose, woe to the documents. He changes them as he wills.

We now enter upon a secondary Calebite list 1Ch.2;18-54;.  
There is absolutely no Biblical parallel to this lengthy list. There is not even a connexion of names. Even Rashi goes to the radical extent of calling this either an unreliable folk gen. or the work of the Chr. We cannot settle this question here. At present we only note that we have come upon a list of apparently no purpose, having no known source, yet included by the Chr. That most interesting verse 1Ch.2;55, already mentioned, may represent still another type. If it is, as Meyer says, a reference to post-ex. scribal divisions (Entsteh. Jud. p.118) it is highly significant. It represents, at any rate a new type in these conglomerate gens.

1Ch.3 follows out what I have stated as the second purpose (in point of development, not importance), of these lists. The line of kingship is developed into post-ex. times. The pre-ex. tabulations are fairly accurate. The minor differences throw no light on our thesis. But the concluding list, vv.17-24 presents an interesting problem. This list of the post-ex. descendant of David cannot be discarded as mere invention on the ground that none of the main line except Shehaniah and Shmayah are mentioned later (Ezra 8;5 and Neh.12;34). The occurrence of the name Hatush among the Bene Shehaniah (Ezra 8;6) is enough to give this list more than artificial significance. Though in parts it may be untrustworthy, it has an undoubted post-ex. importance. 17

Confusing in the problem of purpose is the occurrence of parallel after parallel in these gens. There are the Calebite parallels, all different. There are two lists of Judah, entirely different, as well as others. Such a list opens 1Ch.4. v. Vv.7ff. seem to have more than passing significance, though absolutely no conceivable connexion

with any purpose. The abrupt transition such as the delving again into P(Ex.6;15) in 1Ch.4;24 and the radical change in style beginning with vv.25-27 throw further light upon the complexity of sources from which the Chr. probably assembled verbatim. And not only this, but the use of the sources is unskillful. Again using P(Jos.19;2-8) the Chr. entirely misunderstands his source in his redaction (1Ch.4;28-33)<sup>2</sup>. Vv.34-43 offer interesting reading. K has no reference to this episode<sup>of</sup> the Simeonite migration. But K would hardly regard this as important enough for mention. To the Chr. with such an attitude toward gens as we shall later describe him to be possessed of, this list was well worth mentioning.

So we continue through lists of the tribes with here and there a cross reference to P or here and there a valuable historical reference. Such a reference as that to set censuses (1Ch.5;17) gives us a clue to the origin of some of these lists. Censuses must have been taken by order of each king from time to time. This too may explain the presence of contradictory lists of the same tribe. The lists may have been labeled as here, "the list of such a tribe in the reign of so-and-so". If the name<sup>#</sup> of the king was lost from the list, it is easy to see how we would have difficulty in solving the problem of two parallel lists, yet conflicting. They ~~are~~<sup>would be</sup> in reality, two lists ~~xxx~~ of the same tribe but from different periods.

And now, in 1Ch.5;27 we enter upon a third and very important purpose of the Chr. in his gens. In vv.27-41 the line of the high priest is given. We can state here the well-known bias of Ch. The high priesthood was the direct line of Aaron through Zadok in the time of David down to Jehozadak at the time of the captivity. It is part of the Chr's task to connect Jehozadak with Aaron through Zadok. And here the Chr. becomes plainly inventive. Practically every name he gives after leaving the solid ground of Elazar and Pinhas (Ju.20;28) is fictitious; found nowhere except in the writings of the Chr. Coming



to David's time, he does his best to straighten out Zadok's line. But the fancifulness of his efforts is obvious. Intimately connected with P. the Chr. desires to validate the P tradition of a high priesthood of Zadokite priests going back to Aaron. The futility of his task lies in the fact that no such line ever existed. The condition of the priesthood before the exile was so promiscuous as to permit of no definite gen. history.

The fourth purpose of the gens. links itself up with the first. He is interested, vitally interested in the levitical group. And in his gens. he firmly establishes a levitical group having complete charge over Temple work.(1Ch.6). As I mentioned, this is linked up with the first purpose, the line of levitical singers, for here he turns to Asaph. 1Ch.6;14<sup>6</sup>ff establishes these lines. This is but another bit of fancy by the Chr. Just as he was anxious to trace the highpriesthood to Aaron, he wants to trace to David's time the establishment of these three great levitical families as singers. His especial interest in the purity of levitical descent is here obvious and will become more so as we look farther. Samuel is made a Levite for everyone who was in the Temple must have been a Levite. The list of levitical cities furthers our conviction of this especial levitical interest. This will all be mentioned later. So too shall we have occasion to refer to the Benj. document of 1Ch.8;1ff. The descendants of Saul to the exile are next given. Particularly of interest as an entirely new type in this genealogical crazy-quilt is the passage 1Ch.9;3 ff according to Bn's. explanation.(See below)

Having scanned these various lists, we have discerned a four-fold purpose. I now give them in the order of their real importance in the estimation of the Chr. First, the purity of the levitical family, its clear title to certain possessions and rights. Second, the pure line of singers according to the three families which are made to be instituted by David. Third, the purity of the line of the high

priest back to Aaron. Fourth, the clear and uninterrupted descent of Davidites far into post-ex. times, together with David's pure line from Judah. The chief interest in all cases is the purity of descent. And now, is it not this same general interest which leads him to incorporate apparently inconsequential selections from P and other sources with regard to the tribes of Israel. In post-ex. times all families were interested in being of pure Israelitish descent. This was the spirit of Ezra, the spirit of all succeeding Judaism. So to the Chr. every Israelitish gen. was of importance and deserved a place in his book. I feel that this is the purpose of including so many collateral gens. aside from his main purposes.

Let us now consider the various types of gens. we have discovered. There are those taken over from Biblical sources, either in a literal or redacted fashion. Except in cases where the attempt is to establish a late line, as the line of David, these are generally the P tribal gens. Then there are the old non-biblical yet unmanufactured lists. Among these are such as 1Ch.2;18ff, the Calebite document; 1Ch.4;9ff, the Jabetz list of 1Ch.4;34 ff. the Simeonite document. These lists are generally of a geographical nature, containing names of places rather than of persons. The Chr. gathered and incorporated them because of his general genealogical interest. There is no outstanding purpose. But they are valuable to us because they represent old folk documents and convince us that there were many old genealogical lists not included in our canon. Thirdly are those lists which are the plain invention of the Chr. Such a gen. as that of the high priesthood; the line of Saul, the families of the singers and above all, practically every gen. outside of the first nine chapters is of this type. It would be a thesis in itself to consider each gen. in detail. I can only state here the general truths I have found. The Chr. has two reasons for inventing gens.; either to establish the antiquity of an institution or the purity of a family. He shows the first purpose in tracing the priesthood or the singers (see above).

An excellent demonstration of the second purpose is 1Ch.23. The Chr. desires to establish the claims of descent of certain families of Post-ex. times. So it is plain that he here uses the post-ex. names in these gens. purporting to be of earlier times. He does the same thing often to establish the claims of Levites. More of this later. However, in 1Ch.23 this much is plain. The antiquity of certain post-ex. families with pre-ex. claims is established by the use of post-ex. names. Jehiel of v.8 is an important post-ex. family (Ezr.8;9 etc) Ladan of v.8 occurs again in Esd.5;37. Shimi of v.10 is in Ezr.10;38. So constantly we find this process going on. Post-ex. families are being given an invented gen. in order that their post-ex. prominence may be justified by antiquity. In the case of the Levites too this is pronounced. Adnah of 2Ch.18;14 is found again as a post-ex. name in Ezr.10;30 and Neh.12;5. So in 2Ch.31;11ff. There is nothing which could lead us to believe, as many say, that the Chr. is copying old Temple records.

These two reasons for invented gens. sometimes overlap as eg. the Chr. gives the gen. of the singers to show that the levitical singer was an institution even from David's time yet at the same time by the use of names of post-ex. levitical families, the Chr. establishes the claims of these families to the position of singer.

Fourth among the types of gens. found in Ch# is the bonafide post-ex. document. It may be that the gen. is made to appear pre-ex. but the document is a valid bit of history. 1Ch.6;37<sup>0</sup>ff is probably the list of the post-ex. levitical cities. More conclusive is the gen. of 1Ch.8 which Curtis rightly takes as a list of Post-ex. Benj. families. 2Ch.15;7 is also of this type.

The final type of gen. is that which is an interpolation by a hand later than the Chr. The interpolation is usually in an erroneous context. 1Ch.2;55 may be of this type. But more positively of this nature is 1Ch.9;3 ff as Bn. points out. Meyer (E.J.) regards this gen.

as fanciful ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ despite its affinity to Neh.  
11;3-19. Bn. however, holds a more plausible view that this was not  
inserted here by the Chr. but was erroneously interpolated by a writer  
who believed it to refer to pre-ex. times.

So we find the five heads under which we may group the types  
of gens. From the characteristics which I have laid down of each  
group, it is a <sup>much</sup> ~~more~~ more definite matter now to determine the nature of  
any gen. found in the works of the Chr.



E. Sources Used by the Chronicler.

1. The erroneous conclusions sometimes advanced
2. The nature of the additions
3. The real sources
  - a. Works included in our canon
  - b. Old folk tales and genealogies
  - c. A possible Dibre Hayamim Lemalke Jehuda
  - d. The Dibre Hozim

There is no doubt that the Chr. had other sources than our canon in his reconstruction of history. So many matters in which he differs from known sources or else in which he contains works found absolutely nowhere convince us by their nature that they cannot be the simple invention of the Chr. Nor can we say with Bn. that the main sources are merely S and K and their Midrashic commentaries. We have too much which seems to be objective in its nature, which we shall discuss later. Nor can we with Curtis accept each and every statement of source as a separate book. The Chr. now and then puts in such a reference (1Ch.11;3etc). Some exegetes infer from this a distinct book. But it is plainly only a reference to 1S.15;28-16;1,3 and is given in this form by the Chr. merely to strengthen the 'divine choice of David' as a doctrine of theology. This is not the basis of a new source. Then there are the many references in the second book of Ch., such references as 2Ch.12;15 or 13;22 or 15;1 etc. Curtis and others infer that each and every reference found herein means a separate book. I am going to attempt to establish what I regard as the truth, that all of these references refer to only one book. There has been a wealth of sources claimed for the Chr. but we shall see that the actual units in his possession were very few.

If we examine the nature of the divergences and additions which the Chr. contains over and above the material found in S and K, we soon discover a simple principle. Whenever he takes a canonical source and diverges from it, it is with the express purpose of establishing one of his principles along which he reconstructs the

20

history of the period before the exile. The story of the removal of the ark, we shall see, is taken over with S as its only source yet is changed vitally to harmonize with the P code. There is always a purpose in the Chr's divergences. Now as to the additions not found in the Chr's canonical sources. There are but two lines which are followed. In the first place, the second book abounds with a great mass of prophetic additions. Just as the first book contained genealogical additions, so if we turn to almost every addition of book II, we find it of a prophetic nature. Take such passages as 2Ch.12;15 or 13;22 Or 15;1 or 16;7 or 21;12 etc. And with regard to passages added not of a prophetic nature, as 2Ch.27;4 there is always a difference of opinion among scholars. In this particular instance K1. accepts and Bn. rejects. There is no unanimity that such passages are from an outside source. So we see that the divergences from S or K are usually invented by the Chr for a purpose and the additions over S and K when not obviously invented or doubtful, are usually genealogical in the first book and prophetic in the second. One more remark is to be made before we finally determine our sources. We must call attention to such cross references as 2Ch.27;7 with 2K.15;36 in which the Chr. refers to a source, למלכי ישראל והודא and K refers to a דבר הימים למלכי יהודה. Also in 2Ch.25;26 and 2K.14;18 the same cross reference made. There are many other occurrences of this. We must take these references into account when considering the various sources of the Chr.

Let us now tabulate and describe the sources which the Chr must have had in his possession while writing his book. There are first of all, the indisputable canonical sources. We have seen from the Toledot gens. that he had the P code. In a following chapter, the legal similarity with P will be discussed and we shall see

that the Chr. was in possession of the entire P code. We have seen him to quote verbatim from S and K. We know by such references as 2Ch.26;22 that he had certain of the literary prophets. And we may feel certain, absolutely certain, that he had D in his possession. Indeed he may have been one of those P writers who assisted in the combination of P and D into one code. His constant omission of the K passages such as 2K.15;4 אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יָבוֹא וְיִשְׁמָר וְיִשְׁלָם וְיִשְׁכַּח וְיִשְׁכַּח וְיִשְׁכַּח occurring again and again shows a plain D bias. In 2Ch.15;8 we have a very important document which may be the basis of the D covenant (the B'rith of v.12) but since our purpose here is merely to establish D as a source for the Chr. and not to discuss D, we cannot give time here to this interesting point. The constant recurrence of D expressions as 2Ch.15;4 לֵב יִשְׂרָאֵל or the stress with which he has pre-D pious kings remove Bamoth contrary to K, as eg.2Ch.17;6 or the mention of מִן הַמִּלְחָמָה in 2Ch.19;10 or the striking D vocabulary of 2Ch.33;4,7, all point to a strong D influence. To call attention to two other evidences of this same influence in opinions solely by the Chr. In 1Ch.10;13f. Saul is condemned in accordance with D for inquiry of spirits. So too, in the story of Solomon in 2Ch.1;6ff. there is a remarkable change from the source 1K.3;4-15. It is not in a dream but by direct vision that God appears to Sol. The D aversion to dreams as a means of divination comes strongly to the fore. It is striking that these changes should be made over K which has a certain D bias throughout. We shall see later that it is most likely that the Chr. had before him as a completed document JEDP, indeed, he may have been one of the compilers.

Besides the canonical sources, the Chr. had extra-biblical documents. We may dismiss merely with mention the old folk legends and gens. to which we made reference in the preceding chapter. We may hazard the suggestion here also, although we can bring no real ~~proof~~

28

and final evidence, that there was an old groundwork called דבר יחידה  
הימים למלכי יהודה. This old work was probably one of the  
sources used by the writers of K. We cannot however determine whe-  
ther it was in the possession of the Chr. At any rate, the refer-  
ences in K to דבר הימים למלכי יהודה absolutely do not refer to  
our Ch. It is positively to a collection older than K. It is my  
belief that the Chr. did not have in his possession this old *source*.  
All his direct references are to K. He knew, however of this older  
collection, if only from K, and is possibly calling his own work by  
the same name to give it apparent antiquity and thus more credence,  
a well known process of literary fiction among Biblical writers.

By far the most important extra-biblical source and that one  
most substantiated by evidence is the lost book Dibre Hozim. It  
is striking that scholars have not seen this and given expression  
to the evident facts I now present. Let us scan the references and  
evidence. 2Ch.9;29ff begins the story with reference to prophetic  
sources. Then follows 2Ch.12;4-8 with the account of the prophet  
Shemayah where the emphasis and moral of the story is on a well-  
known prophetic truth. 2Ch.12-15 has the words הלא הם כתובים  
In 2Ch.13;22 there is a reference to a  
Midrash of the prophet Iddo. 2Ch.15;8 has another prophetic ad-  
dition, the prophecy of Oded. A great prophetic truth of the reli-  
ance upon God alone is brought to Asa in the passage of 2Ch.16;7 ff.  
All of these passages have no parallel in K or elsewhere. Bn. would  
throw out many of these passages, eg. the last mentioned, but I  
find them fraught with important historical value. I find them to  
breathe unerring facts of an objective nature. Hanani the Roeh is  
clearly a forerunner of the great prophets and his words are true  
to the spirit of all of the literary prophets. Then 2Ch.21;12  
has a reference to Elijah found nowhere in canonical sources. There



is no reason to regard this specific reference as unfounded although the redaction of the passage may be artificial. Breathing the prophetic with direct reference to an אלהים 2Ch.25;5ff. This seems to be something more than Curtis would have it, merely a Midrashic expansion of K. Oded's connexion with Ahaz is plainly along the lines of the prophetic spirit of the great prophets.

All of these additions are of ~~one~~ nature, asort of parallel to the ideals of the great prophets in a minor scale, as in his activities Elijah is a small great prophet. They seem to be a continuous group, parts of a large collection of individuals extending over many years and dominated by the same prophetic ideals which in a more sweeping and universalistic fashion, dominated the great prophets. The chief prophetic ideal which is the emphasis of almost every one of these men is the divine guidance of Israel's national life and the religious responsibilities which that divine guidance entails. The Chr. with his conception of history (see above) would naturally find much inspiration in such a source and quote it often. But how are we certain that this is one source?

Our conclusive proof comes from 2Ch.33;11ff. There we have just such a passage as the additions found above. And it says, v.18.19.  
ויתר דברי חנניה ותפלתו אל אלהי ישראל ודברי החוזים הסדברים אליו בשם ה' אלהי ישראל הנה על דברי מלכי ישראל ותפלתו... לסג  
הכנעו הנה כתובים על דברי חנני:

Now, in the light of the words of the preceding verse, the mention there of חנני and in accordance with the reading of another Ms. (see Kittel) and possibly the LXX, as well as according to the consensus of opinion among modern exegetes, the last two words of v.19 must be read דברי חנני, the doings of the seers. That the word Hozei to the Chr. had a real religious significance is shown by his use of the word applied to Asaph (2Ch.29;30) or again to

levitical singers (2Ch.35;15)/ The word had its prophetic significance long before the days of the Chr. as we see by its occurrence in the books of the literary prophets.(Is.29;10). To the Chr. everything connected with the Temple partook of the spirit of prophecy. In the writings of these prophets he found much religious inspiration. Now, it is most certain that there were many 'prophets' who did not leave written ~~works~~ but who were active along prophetic lines throughout their lives. They constituted the חז"ל and were the minor personalities, the satellites of the leaders of the movement. It is only natural to see that their doings would be collected in some minor collection. It is likewise easy to see that such a collection would be left out of the canon. Its heroes were too insignificant. But there is no doubt from our evidence that such a book existed in the days of the Chr. and the additions that he gives, not found in K, are excerpts from this ספר חז"ל. K lacks these passages either from intention or what is more likely, that this book was not in the possession of the writers of K.

More space cannot be given to the development<sup>ment</sup> of this idea. But I find in it a very plausible explanation to the addition of all these prophetic passages. In most cases the Chr. gives the quotation under the head of the particular prophet's name. Thus it is that many scholars mistook these for references to separate sources. But in 2Ch.33;19 there is no particular name to be mentioned so the exact title of the source book is given. The theory seems absolutely valid in all respects. In this ספר חז"ל, I find the last big definite source of the Chr.

21

F. The Chronicler and David.

1. The general tendency of the Chr. toward David
2. The reasons for that tendency and their manifestations
3. The methods by which David is exalted

Beginning his gens. as he does with Adam, the Chr. might be construed as aiming at any point. But we have seen several definite purposes in those gens.; one of them being to arrive at the Davidic line and follow it. We have further evidences of the Chr's purpose. He begins his narrative portion with Saul's death and David's formation of the kingdom. All previous history is foreign to his purpose. He is not even interested in the kingdom as such; if so, he would have given some account of Saul's reign. No! his interest begins where Saul dies and David assumes the crown. The entire set of relations between Saul and David, even between Jonathan and David, are omitted. It is as if the Chr. conceived of Israel's real history as beginning when David became king. We cannot help but notice the aggrandizement of David. Our further remarks will mention specifically the various ways in which the Chr sets up David as the chief hero of Israel's history.

There are many definite reasons for the Chr's proceeding in this fashion. We have seen him fasten upon David's reign the origin of many religious institutions. The gens. have shown the singing families to date from David's reign. But there is more than that. David's whole life is made merely a preparation for the Temple. Everything that is usually given to Sol. in K is, in Ch. placed to David's credit. The entire plans for the Temple and everything but the mechanical act of building the structure becomes Davids. Then too, the order of the Levites, the entire ritual and the whole cultus as a definite affair, find their concrete expression in David's reign. Of course, the laws are held to date from Moses-- although, let it here be noted as worthy of much in-

tense study, there is no mention of Moses in the Ch.-- yet it is from David's Temple (not Sol's.) that the real institutions date. The only way in which I can at present explain this entire absence of reference to Moses in a book which deals with the institutions of Mosaic law in part, is that under the last and extremest P influence Moses had dwindled into still further insignificance than by that into which he had been put comparatively ~~with~~ the earlier P writers. The institutions and not the law was the interest.

But to go on with our subject. It is only natural that the Chr upon searching into the past to find some glorious figure upon whom to attach these post-ex. institutions, should select David. We can well imagine that in the days of 400-300 B.C.E. David's name had already most of that glowing historical halo. And despite the fact that the Temple was built in Sol's time and according to K, was for the almost entire part the work of Sol, still according to the Chr. it was not right to fasten all this upon such a man as Sol. In the first place it was David who was the founder of the dynasty. He was actually and divinely anointed by Samuel. He was the prime recipient of the divine choice. And his was the real work of building up the kingdom. Furthermore his misdeeds were only those due to man's naturally frail nature. His sin with Bathsheba, his senile weakness for Abishag, his frailty in dealing with his rebellious sons, were all weaknesses inherent in the human frame. But Solomon was of a type of oriental cosmopolite who must have been extremely distasteful to the pan-Judean mind of the Chr. The multiplication of non-Jewish wives, the sumptuous orientalism of the palace, the heavy taxes and the general free and easy contact with the world outside of Judea; these were features of Solomon's character which would be far ~~from~~ more reprehensible in the eyes of the Chr. than the human frailties of



David. The Chr. lived in the very heart of that post-ex. spirit which saw the only possible salvation of the Jew to be in a binding and ornate ritualism centering about the Temple and making the Jew distinct, separate and separated from all the world round about. His was the spirit which demanded the refusal to the Samaritans when they wanted to join with the new Temple. He may have been one of the leaders in the final schism. He was a logical successor in spirit to Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah. Sol's whole life represented this opposite spirit of cosmopolitanism. To the Chr. David was a much better Jew than Sol. And so ~~Sol~~<sup>David's reign</sup> becomes the center about which all institutionalism and ritual is built.

And how is this exaltation of David accomplished. Sol. is stripped of all connexion with the Temple except, as we have said, the technical and mechanical duty of carrying out all orders which David has left. 1Ch.22 shifts from Sol. to David the work assigned to Sol<sup>1</sup> by 1K.8. Every problem relating to the Temple is anticipated by David and handed over personally to Sol. Those incidents which are too favorable to Sol. in K are omitted by the Chr. (Vid.I.C.C.<sup>Chronicles</sup> Ch. pp.313-315) for the Chr's omission in almost all cases are as important as his additions. 2Ch.1;12 minimizes its source in K so that Sol. will not appear too prominently. David's character<sup>#</sup> is sanctified much over what it is in K. Even in ritual matters. In K, David builds his house first and then attends to the ark. The Chr. cannot have his pious king so negligent of holy things. So in #Ch. the order is reversed. The tradition of David as a psalmist, which doubtless~~##~~ also influenced the Chr to center the singers about David's reign, is given credence by the Chr. in 1Ch.16;27,29. A quotation from the Psalms is given as David's prayer after the ark is brought up- the necessary changes of course being made in the psalm to make it appear that the Temple is not yet built.

(Some enterprising scholar might be able to work out a theory on the basis of this that the Chr. by placing the singers in David's time and by such a prayer as the one mentioned is the founder of the tradition that David is the writer of the psalms and the the headings of the psalms mentioning David are either by the Chr. or post-Chr. This would avoid the syntactical contortions usually used in explaining so many of these psalm headings).

Not only in the ritual is the work of Sol. minimized and David's part exaggerated over K but even in the more secular affairs. The selection of an army which by 1K.4;7 belonged to Sol. is given by 1Ch.27 to David, although according to our sources, David is dead by this time. 1Ch.28;7ff. halts Sol's. reign and David's death again to give David time to order everything worth while that was done in Sol's reign. The entire historic conception is perverted by the Chr. The national idea is emphasized even more strongly than in the greater part of S and all of K. All, army and priests and levites and singers, temple preparations and national life, ~~is~~ made to be organized by David. David's removal of the ark, exaggerated enough in S, becomes a national affair in Chr all the more. All these are examples of the Chr's midrashic method, the exaggeration of the incidents and numerical facts of the source in order to fulfill his definite purpose. The S source of David's army is also subjected to this midrash method. In 2S.22 David's company is truthfully given as composed of roustabouts. Under the idealization of the Chr. they become the choicest of the tribesmen, and of all tribes, and possessed of real discipline. (1Ch.20;30ff.) Such a list of names as that of 1Ch.12 is a type of that gen. by which post-ex. families are given proud antiquity. Eg. Beth Azamoth receives mention again in Neh.7;28, Ezr.2;21 and Neh.12;29. Gibeon is known to have been important in post-ex. times as was Benjamin, both of

whom become prominent in this invented and pragmatic gen.

And so, throughout his narrative, the Chr emphasises David's virtues and omits his vices. Even in the days of Josiah, this good king worships 'the God of David, his father' (2Ch.34;3). There is a constant harking back to David as the ~~founder~~ one in whose reign the ritual was founded (2Ch.23;18f). In 1Ch.20;4ff the two conflicting Goliath stories of S which imperil David's clear claim to the heroic, are harmonized by the Chr. thus saving David's glory unsuspected.

Throughout is the natural cruelty of David omitted from mention. 18;18;1ff and 20;38ff illustrate this. The distasteful Bathsheba episode is entirely omitted as is the indelicate and pathetically human Abishag story. In the census story, taken from 2S.24, 1Ch.21;1-10 abridges all that is to David's discredit and expands the following seven vv. to David's glory. Mention has already been made of the last assembly and death scene of 1Ch.28. True, it is based on K, but how different. How much more prominent is David! How the numbers are wildly exaggerated! Clumsy and typical of the Chr's unskillfulness in assembling and redacting sources is the way in which the Michal incident slips into 1 Ch.15;29 where David is upbraided by his wife. This is but one example of unskillful redaction by the Chr. But this is the main slip in the whole scheme. The is the overwhelming evidence given above which shows the main theme, the glorification of David and the surrounding of his reign with the real origin of the cultus, temple and nation.

G. The attitude of the Chronicler toward the Northern Kingdom.

1. The reason for the attitude
2. The exemplifications

That the Chr. should have no sympathy at all with the northern element in the Israelitish schism is to be expected. That he should treat the north as apostates in his <sup>net</sup>interpretation of the history of Israel and Judah is also not to be marvelled at. In the first place, our preceding chapter prepares us for this. The Chr. is wrapped up in David and would naturally favor the Davidic line. He would naturally regard all separation from the divinely consecrated line as not only political but religious rebellion. And furthermore, the insurmountable basis of hatred! The North had no part whatsoever in the cultus at Jerusalem, the only real shrine in the eyes of the Chr. The worship of the North was at Bamoth and was often further traduced by the introduction of foreign elements. Furthermore, the Chr. is a Judean, or as we shall see, a Levite with all interests centering about Jerusalem. God has shown that the North were apostates. He has destroyed them for their sins. If there are any of the northern tribes who have repented, they may return, but only uncompromisingly to a kingdom led by the Jerusalem cultus and the house of David. The post-ex. attitude is nowhere more forcible.

And how does the Chr. evidence this attitude. First, by ignoring the North whenever possible. In taking 1K.12 as his source for the time of Rehoboam, he omits all such verses as v.20 which mention the defection of the North or the origin of Jeroboam's reign. He is primarily interested in tracing a history of the cultus, and because, as he orders it, and as history did bear out, this cultus is bound up only with the house of David among royalty, he adopts almost throughout, the negative attitude of the omission of everything in his sources which refers to the North.



There are, however, certain places where the North had to be mentioned. There the Chr. adopts one of two attitudes, either he reverses the spirit of his source where even K puts the North sometimes superior to the South or he blackens the North even more than does K. Eg. 1K.14;21-24. In this passage the Chr. purposely omits mention of the paganism of Rehoboam, so as not to embarrass the memory of the South at the very moment when the North broke away (2Ch.12). He exaggerates the number of Rehoboam's host to glorify a weak ruler of David's line. The entire reign of Rehoboam is changed from its description in K. The Chr.'s decree is that it was a very good reign, entirely contrary to K. It would not do for a man whose interest is to defend David's line and to treat the North as apostate, to blacken the memory of the very Davidic king under whom the revolution took place. So in the case of Abijah (Abijam). Although 1K.15 makes him of no good or importance, yet just because he wages war against the North, he is glorified by the Chr. (2Ch.13;1-22), and given three times the amount of attention given him by K. Here again the midrash method of the Chr. is exemplified as a fanciful elaboration of his source to glorify his hero. Especially to be noted is the mention in 2Ch.13;9 whereby the Aaronitic priesthood is absolved from all connexion with the apostate North.

Again, in taking over an account from K, the Chr. in order to discountenance the North, will sometimes invent two or three introductory verses to serve his purpose. And excellent example of this is the Ahab-Jehoshaphat story of 1K22 which is taken over by the Chr. in 2Ch.18 with three introductory vv. added to whitewash Jehoshaphat and throw the entire blame on Ahab.

All connexion of the South with the North is sin, on the part of the South. Any Davidic king who enters into any amicable

relations with the North, the <sup>נורא</sup> 'א<sup>ל</sup> as they are called, (2Ch.19), is ipse fact~~us~~ a sinner. Jehoshophat is thus guilty and only because of his previous merit is he forgiven. Contact with the North at any time results in evil results to the South. (See 2Ch.22) The North was an unforgiveable apostate because it broke away, not so much from David, as from Jerusalem, the center of the only <sup>holy</sup> ~~holy~~ cultus and set up instead Bamoth. The North are scoffers at the truth (2Ch.30;10ff) and deserve no mention except for disgrace. Thus from his standpoint of a post-ex. Judean or one connected with Judea and as a Jerusalemite Levite and one intimately connected with P, the Chr. takes the expected attitude toward the North. In a subsequent chapter, I shall have occasion to mention what effect the Samaritan problem of his day may have had upon this stand of the Chr.

- H. The Chronicler's connexion with P.  
1. The evident P standpoint of Ch.  
2. The sanctuary  
3. The Chr. and Ps  
4. His subsequent activity

The subject to which we now turn is the most important and profound of this entire bit of work. A wealth of material exists; much information which has never before been brought to light lies hidden in this subject. Far be it from me to suppose that I can solve the problem. So thorough is the grasp one must have not only of the biblical codes in their exactness but also of the historical reconstruction of post-ex. history, of the Samaritan pentateuch and of Josephus that I feel timid in my approach to this matter. I shall endeavor, though, to indicate the problem and the difficulties it presents with perhaps here and there a hint at conclusions, with the hope that some day, I shall be better able to cope with this great fund of material.

Let me first establish the evident P standpoint of the Chr. Not only in his conception of history but in all his ritualism, theology and diction, the Chr. stands closely in relation, if not identical with P. The idea pointed out in an early chapter of this work, that piety brings material greatness and sin brings physical punishment is a <sup>P</sup> doctrine. There has been mentioned also that to Chr. most sins are of a ritual nature. Uzziah, for the disobedience of a <sup>P</sup> law is stricken with leprosy (2Ch.26;18ff). The story of the bringing up of the ark by David abounds with P references not to be found in the S source. The use of the word <sup>P</sup> in connexion with the ark 1Ch.5;1, the fact that only Levites are allowed to approach the ark, v.12, the differentiation of Aaronitic priests and Levites, the carrying of the ark by Mattoth on the shoulders are all P viewpoints. The mark the account of Ch. to be written by one who has the ~~xx~~ P religious notions. The sacrifice after the ark is moved is not according to the source S, but to P. The text

is further changed, 1Ch.15;27. David cannot wear an Ephod as he does in S. That, according to the P notions of the Chr. belongs solely to the priest. The sons of David, according to the P view of the Chr. could not possibly act as priests; so 2S.8;18 is changed by the Chr. to the reading we find in 1Ch.18;16f. We remember that S is much more nearly the truth in every one of these matters. In the building of the temple, which will be taken in more detail later, it is very natural that the most pronounced P influence should be shown by the Chr. To mention a few superficial P traces of 2Ch.3;18ff. We can see the P fondness for exact numbers, the mention of the P festivals in 2Ch.4;3. The references in 2 Ch.11;13 are important, eg. the levitical Ahuzah (cf. Lev.25;29-34, Nu.35;2-5etd). The entire tendency to shield the levitical family from the contaminating influence of the Northern apostasy in this passage shows also a definite P bias on the part of the Chr. So ~~also~~ in 2Ch.13;9. The P theology finds expression in the passages by the Chr. (See 2Ch.20.) Here the P references are Jos.2;11, Dt.4;39, Nu.20;14ff and Jos.7;7. The Athaliah story interest the Chr. deeply because of its priestly aspects. The account is based on K but there are significant changes. The priest and levite ~~are~~ exalted and are made the leading factors of the whole revolution. In his legalistic nations, the Chr. follows P. A leper cannot be buried in the common burial ground (2Ch.26;23). Especially in the account of the reign of Hez. is the source amplified with P additions by the Chr. In 2Ch. 29, there are the Niddah, v.5., the P offerings, v.6., the P covenant, v.9, the levitical conclave, v.12f., and the P atonement offerings, v.20f. There is a plain reflection of the P law of the sabbatical year in 2Ch.36;21. And too, the story of 2K.12;1-11 is changed completely when it is taken over by the Chr. in 2Ch. 24;. The reason for the change is evident. The Chr. does not wish to implicate the priests. And too, even in the diction there



41

is the P influence. To mention only two, the terms used in the description of the sacrifice wherever sacrifice is detailed in Ch. and the occurrence of such expressions as  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1Ch.11;4 which is entirely P. (Cf. Jos.15;8 or 18;5 etc.).

The description of the sanctuary as repeated in Ch#. from K presents striking difficulties. There are so many features in which Ch. does not follow K and yet in the changed portion is still in opposition to P. With such conflicting circumstances one can hardly make a sweeping statement that Ch. reworks the temple building in accordance with P. There is very strong evidence too, that if K was not actually reworked in part by the Chr., it was touched up a bit by some P writer. There are very few absolute contradictions between the temple account of K and Chr. One or two of the dimensions found in K are not to be found in Ch#. (eg. the third dimension of the temple building or the conflicting dimensions of the porch) but there is no set contradiction. The main hardship here comes in the lack of parallel structure between the accounts, since they assemble details in a greatly varying order.

So too, when compared with P, the sanctuary of the wilderness, Ch. shows some decidedly P elements not found in K but it shows by no means a complete accord with P. The veil prescribed in Ch. and not found in K appears in Ex.26;21. There is a multiplicity of detail in Ch. which seems much more definite than either K or P. The exact prescriptions concerning the ~~inner~~ <sup>inner</sup> layers, the details regarding the tables, the two courts ~~etc.~~, all are but a few instances where Ch. seems to reach a degree of exactitude and definiteness not approached by either K or P. There is a P bias to the Chr's temple account, a bias which the Chr. plainly possesses over K. This is splendidly demonstrated by Carpenter-Battersby *(The Sanctuary)*

on page 131. The dedication of the temple, according to K coincides with the great autumn festival (1K.8;2#65). K is confused by the addition of seven days, v.65, by a later writer. Ch. follows the P calendar according to which (Lev.23;34-36), the autumn festival began on the fifteenth day of the seventh month and lasted seven days. The holy convocation or solemn assembly is on the twenty-second and as 2Ch.7;10 has it, the people are dismissed on the twenty-third. So Ch. by recognizing an altar dedication lasting seven days and running synchronously with the feast of Booths, adopts the P calendar and ignores the confusion brought on in K by the clumsy gloss of a later redactor.

The question to be decided, however, is how this conflict of the three accounts of a sanctuary, K, P and Ch. can be harmonized. Omitting the natural exaggerations of the K writers and the obvious additions of a later hand, we are safe in asserting that the foundation of the K account is really the temple of Solomon. But P and Ch. are not. Their conflict is more vital and of deeper significance. The P account of the tabernacle in Ex.25ff is given as the earlier P portion (Holzinger). It is with this first P account that the greatest divergence with Ch. is found. The similarities of the veil etc. are found in the Ps account of Ex.35ff. And now, too, significantly, in these affinities on the part of Ch. to the Ps, are found also, the Chr's greatest divergences from K. So my explanation solves itself into this. The Chr. is either a contemporary or follower of Ps. He is describing actual temple conditions which Pg gives in an earlier, and necessarily more theoretical fashion. This is very harmonious with the view now held in some circles giving the building of the second temple a comparatively late date. The mention of the two courts, a priest's court and a big court by the Chr. <sup>is</sup> ~~xxx~~ convincing for this is a known feature in which the second temple differed from Sol's. The Chr.

has the second temple before him. He changes the K account on the basis of an actual structure and gives us the Ch. version. He represents the latest development of the P code.

Let us turn to the laws of the Chr. and see whether our conclusions are verified. Let us see if the similarity between Chr and P contains enough elements of what is generally conceded to be Ps to warrant a close connexion. The injunction to the priests and levites in 1Ch.15;11ff finds its P counterpart in Nu.1;50 and 4;15 and 7;9 and 10;17. Of these passages all but the last are Ps. The law of <sup>0</sup>1Ch.16;41ff, the Tamid sacrifice, is found in Nu.28;3,6, a Ps document. The reference to the levitical cities of 2Ch.11;13ff is Ps. The parallel between 2Ch.31;3 and Nu.28 and 29 gives us another Ps basis in Ch. The tithe references of 1Ch.31;5,6 has its Ps origin in Lev.27;31-33. The Pesach injunction of Ps in Nu.9;9-12 has its parallel in 2Ch.30;2-4. There is no time to compare Ch. and Ps in all details. There is no need. This array of facts is sufficient. There can be no doubt that the Chr. was not only intimately connected with Ps but he must also have been in ~~entire~~ possession of the entire P code. Whether he was a writer or one of the codifiers of this code or not will be answered later. But we have established this much, which has never been undertaken by any writer on this subject, that the Chr. has ~~the~~ P as a whole/ I have no doubt but that a <sup>more</sup> detailed study of Ps as compared with Ch. when the two are parallel~~s~~ will but strengthen my proof.

There can be no doubt of another important fact. The Chr. is more than a describer of existing institutions. We mentioned this far back in our theses when our steps had not permitted us to verify and explain what we meant. But we are now ready. The Chr. is not only describing. He is giving credence by law. We have seen him try to establish customs and ceremonies by giving them

44

Davidic antiquity. He has given families antiquity by tracing them in invented gens. He also, we may now see, tries to ~~give~~ institute definite laws concerning institutions not found in the Pentateuch. He tries to do this by his same methods. This is a radical theory, that the Chr. is working as a lawgiver, but I feel that there is strong evidence. Let us see.

We have proved that the Chr. is at least contemporary with Ps. If we can now show that there are elements in Ch. which are of a ritual nature and not included in P, and if we can show that these rituals were part of the worship of later Judaism, will we not have proved that the Chr. is either the initiator of subsequently accepted legislation or is giving even post-Ps institutions a tradition. Either conclusion will prove my point. Take such a passage as 2Ch.35;2ff. Follow the Pesach as carried out there. It does not tally with P. The part given the levites is much greater than in P. And especially, the introduction of the singers into the service is entirely unknown to P. This very item of the 2 or levitical singers is my strongest argument. There is no doubt that singers existed in the worship at the time of P's codification. But they had not the religious sanction of a legal code, they had not the antiquity to give them religious sanction. Now notice the treatment of singer by Ch. They are made Levites; their gens is carried back to David. They are brought in before the ark when it is brought up (1Ch.16;4ff). In 1Ch.25; an order of singers is established and as we have mentioned before, the singers are made to chant the psalms. None of this is found in P. Can I not rightly maintain then that the Chr. is not only fancifully raising the singer to the dignity of antiquity, but is making a religious law of the singer by establishing his tradition. And the fact that these singers were a feature of the <sup>post-P</sup> temple worship to the



145

time of the destruction shows conclusively that the Chr ~~is~~, writing at the time of or immediately following Ps, ~~is~~ either including what the more orthodox code rejects or ~~instituting~~ in event of his following Ps, which ~~is~~ the more likely, is instituting a law by traditionalizing an institution which had no authoritative basis. Inevitably though, this much is true; that the Chr. is part of a body interested not only in describing but instituting. He may well form one of the pre-Tanaitic lawgivers. The priestly division forecasted in a gen. in 2Ch.31;1ff, in 2Ch.35;3 and in 1Ch.24;7-18 <sup>is</sup> ~~xxx~~ but another instance of this same activity on the part of the Chr. A succeeding chapter will contain another suggestion as to the time and definite assignment of his work. Sufficient here to give as a conclusion that the Chr. had JEDP as a unit and even supplemented this code. :



I. The Date of the Chronicler.

1. The original evidence to be gained from the Chr's work.
2. A criticism of other opinions.

It is unwise even to hazard a date from the Chr. without making a detailed study of Ezz. and Neh. The information there is vital and important. But solely upon the basis of the two books of Ch. with the admission on a fact or two from Ezz. and Neh. have I secured enough data to show enlightening results. I have already demonstrated by comparing legislation that Chr. had in his hands Ps; it is very certain that Ps represents the latest strata of pentateuchal development and that the writers of Ps were probably the redactors of JEDP, and possibly too, the canonizers of the Pentateuch. Now, the Samaritan Pentateuch is enough like ours to convince us that the Pentateuch was canonized before the Samaritan schism. Josephus affords us practically the only historical basis for dating the schism, or the final step, the building of the Samaritan temple. <sup>(Jos. Ant. 11:147 and Jewish Encyclopedia, Samaritan)</sup> It was at the time of Alexander the Great, 332 B.C.E. The Pentateuch must have been canonized by that time, for it is natural to insist that the Samaritans would not take over any holy literature except that which was canonized. We may then assign c. 350 B.C.E. as the time of the canonization of the Pentateuch and the time of Ps.

But there are passages in Ch. which we have seen to be later than JEDP, at least as laws. The conservative in arriving at conclusions might say that the institution of the courses of priests and levites existed before this, as did the detailed ritual prepared for the singers; that they merely did not have the authority to get into the law code which was at that time canonized. In this way it might be argued that the Chr. is no later than Ps. I may grant that the Chr. had a hand in the canonization of JEDP, but I feel certain that his real date as a writer of Ch. is the time of the absolute break with Samaria,

Indeed, somewhat subsequent to the building of the Samaritan temple. First of all, I see the Chr. as the first stage in the development of the oral law. The legal canon was closed and when he wanted to institute as law certain already mentioned changes which had been going on as customs, he invented instead of

חוקי משה which was not yet a principle of oral law, a sort of חוקי דוד, a law since David's time. So the Chr. forms one of that important body, whether they were Anshe Keneseth Haggedolah or Soferim or both, who regulated the course of oral law till the coming of the Tanaim. This group must have followed the canonization of the Pentateuch as well as had hand init. They must be later than 350 B.C.E. Then, the second step. My date is further verified by another fact. The attitude toward the Northern kingdom which I have brought out thus far only as the result of opposition to pre-ex. sinfulness according to the Chr. on the part of the North, may have had a deeper significance. K is nearer the sinfulness of the North and yet is not nearly so bitter. But Chr. who is at the very least three centuries removed from the mean date of the northern kings, is intensely bitter. This bitterness might well have been expected to heal under ordinary circumstances, especially since the North was destroyed and many of the pre-ex. families of distinction traced their descent from northern tribes. (See chapter on gens.) But the wound was a much fresher one in the spirit of the Chr. It was the present bitterness of the Samaritan schism and the unholy Samaritan temple. This well known and bitter hatred between Samaritan and Judean coming to its climax with the Samaritan temple in imitation of Jerusalem, when to the Chr. the Samaritan was pagan, a perverter of true faith; all this explains the Chr's attitude toward the North and the emphasis on their apostasy, the damning influence of any sort of contact with this hybrid

people having its origin in the first schism in Israel. It is natural too, that with the other temple on Gerizim now standing the Chr should endeavor to crystallize into law these# features of the Jerusalem worship which had been only custom. A certain religious revolution would take place, a closer defining of ritual and a deepening of ceremony, even as in the days of Ezra. Thus we arrive at our explanation of the additional# ritualism of the Chr. over JEDP. And these became part of the Temple worship.

There are certain other minor factors which I have come upon and which may be of more or less importance with regard to the date of the Chr. In 1Ch.21;1. the story of the census of David, we have Satan introduced as a definite character. It is no longer

as in Job but plain <sup>יוס</sup>, a proper name not needing the article. The point need not be discussed but since Job and one of the psalms have the only other mentions of Satan in the Bible and since this reference in Ch. by its lack of the definite article, makes it the latest development in the idea, much may be inferred. We cannot merely say that it is the work of a later hand. Then, the detailed angelology of the same chapter is to be noted. Late diction, such words as <sup>מלאך</sup> and <sup>מלאך</sup> have often been pointed out by exegetes. The Chr's attitude toward Edom (2Ch.25;12ff, Job and 28;12ff) is significant, but it can afford us no definite conclusions since the antipathy against Edom extends from Ezekiel through Jesus B. Sirach in post-ex times. Finally, aiding us to place this work of the Chr. not before ~~325~~ 325-300 is the pronounced tendency of the Chr. to bring forward the growing tendency of strife between priest and royalty. Such a difficulty is known to have existed about the year 300 B.C.E., <sup>the high priesthood having attained secular power</sup> (Graetz). And so, in the work of the Chr. we find 2Ch.19;11, the priest is put above the secular authorities in justice. 2Ch.22;10ff traces

Davidic blood in the veins of the high priest. The priest Jehoiada is buried with the royalty (2Ch.24;15). When priestly influence is removed, the royalty deteriorate (2Ch.24;15ff). Jehoash's life constitutes a Midrash on the fact that ingratitude to priests brings a violent end. This directly contradicts all facts in K.

Thus, from my own observation, I would place the Chr. as having written Ch. 325-300 B.C.E. There is no perceptible Greek influence which would entitle it to an <sup>later</sup> ~~earlier~~ date, despite the apparent testimony of the gen. of 1Ch.3;19-24 when read with the LXX. On the basis of gens. which cannot be verified, Curtis gives 390 as the date. Despite his approximate correctness, he does not bring the necessary critical evidence to defend his view. By our omission of a critical view of Neh. we lack an analysis of the Jaddua gen. which is always quoted, but this merely supports our view as to the date. On the same ground as Curtis, Bn. give  $\pm$  300 as the Chr's date. To base so important a point, entailing as we now see, much of importance for later Judaism, the ground of a gen. is too little. Yet neither of these scholars exert the methods of internal criticism and evidence, to the extent which the text affords. Upon their reasoning it might be urged that the only part of the Chr. that can be assigned to the date 300 B.C.E. is the gens. EB also gives the same date and with the same lack of convincing argument.



J. The Chronicler a Levite.

As a final chapter of this work, let me hazard a minor yet most interesting point. The importance which may attach to such a theory as I now advance, I must confess, works rather in a circle. I explain the Chr. to be a Levite, thus showing his interest in the Levites, exemplified by texts which I have quoted to determine his levitical identity. Yet as facts, my notations of the Chr's tendency in favor of the Levites may be of value. I present them now.

The Chr. establishes the institution of levitical singers. There may have been ritual singers before, but it is the Chr. who first insists on their levitical origin. Perhaps under his influence, P took over that idea with which he stocks his work, that all of the sanctuary tasks must be done by Levites. Even Samuel and Eli, the former plainly an Ephraimite, become Levites in Ch. because of their connexion with the Temple. A further interest in the Levites is shown in the detailed repetition of their possessions from Jos. 21 in 1Ch.6;39ff. And not only the singers, but even the gate-keepers must be Levites (1Ch.15;17ff). Obed Edom at whose house the ark stopped when David brought it up is made a Levite when really it is doubtful whether he was a Hebrew. Note the prominent place given the Levite in 1Ch.23;24. Even the Sofer of David must be a Levite. This is significant for the Chr., as we have pointed out, may have been one of the later Soferim. And now, by contrasting with K, we find the following. Compare the Ch. account of the revolution of Joash in 2Ch.23 with its source in 2K.11 and you cannot but notice the unduly big part given the Levites by the Chr. 2Ch.20;14ff exalts the Levites. This is the Chr's own passage. The Levites are arbitrarily inserted again in the Jehoash story (2Ch.24;5) In 2Ch.29;11ff. the place of the Levite is again unduly emphasized. The story of the finding of the Book in Josiah's reign is taken



Almost verbatim from K except for the place given the Levites.

In 2Ch.30;22 the Levites are again given special privilege.

Yes, you might argue, but this is all on the basis of Pg or Ps and is a reconstruction of history to fit the levitical attitude of the P dode. Granted that this might explain this undue levitical influence, which it does not, how are you going to explain instances like the Pesachim of Hez, and Josiah. In the later reign, 2Ch.35, the priest's role as the chief actor is endangered by the part given the Levite, a part greater than any basis in P. And the account of Hez's Pesach in 2Ch.29;34, has the Levites still more extolled; there is too much sacrificing for the priests to handle and the Levite is sanctified to the priesthood so that he serves as a priest.

All of these items may be of importance or of no importance, but to me, it seems that only one conclusion can be drawn. The Chr. is a Levite interested in advancing levitical claims as far as he can and a watchdog over the newly granted levitical ~~rights~~ privileges of P. In some cases he succeeds in his advance of new claims. He did succeed in handing over every bit of Temple service to the Levite. But that tendency of which we find some hint in the Chr., the tendency to narrow the sharp cleavage finally drawn between priest and levite, did not succeed. The Chr. was a loyal upholder of P with its Aaronitic priesthood. But because of his levitic descent, there are those inevitable symptoms of levitical interestedness.

This, though, is merely hypothesis. I present it as a fact worthy of consideration on the basis of the evidence. It is but indicative of the nature of the task I have undertaken; there is so much that is new which can be found, so great a wealth of important historical material lying unexplained and unused in the works of the Chr. No ~~scholar~~ <sup>scholar</sup> who has written on Ch. has com-

prehended the scope of his task. I have but tried to indicate the deeper problems, the underlying purposes of the Chr., his historical conception, and the value of all these to us from an historical standpoint. I have tried to indicate with some effort at solution the interesting problem of sources, the Chr's intricate connexion with the P code and finally, the Chr's extremely great importance as the door through which one may enter upon the study of the Judaism of the late Persian and early Greek periods. My task is far from accomplished and I leave it with the hope that I may turn to it again at some other time with richer maturity and profounder judgment.