
a ***Grace Notes*** course

First Chronicles

From Commentary on the Old Testament

C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch

adapted for Grace Notes training by Warren Doud

Grace Notes

Web Site: <http://www.gracenotes.info>

E-mail: wdoud@gracenotes.info

1 Chronicles - Keil and Delitzsch

Contents

Introduction	4
1 Chronicles 1.....	27
1 Chronicles 2.....	32
1 Chronicles 3.....	44
1 Chronicles 4.....	49
1 Chronicles 5.....	58
1 Chronicles 6.....	68
1 Chronicles 7.....	75
1 Chronicles 8.....	82
1 Chronicles 9.....	87
1 Chronicles 10.....	97
1 Chronicles 11.....	100
1 Chronicles 12.....	105
1 Chronicles 13.....	113
1 Chronicles 14.....	115
1 Chronicles 15.....	116
1 Chronicles 16.....	121
1 Chronicles 17.....	129
1 Chronicles 18-20	133
1 Chronicles 21.....	136
1 Chronicles 22.....	142
1 Chronicles 23.....	146
1 Chronicles 24.....	153
1 Chronicles 25.....	157
1 Chronicles 26.....	160
1 Chronicles 27.....	166
1 Chronicles 28.....	170
1 Chronicles 29.....	174

The Authors

Carl Friedrich Keil (26 February 1807 – 5 May 1888) was a conservative German Lutheran Old Testament commentator. He was born at Lauterbach near Oelsnitz, Kingdom of Saxony, and died at Rätz, Saxony.

Franz Delitzsch (Leipzig, February 23, 1813 – Leipzig, March 4, 1890) was a German Lutheran theologian and Hebraist. Born in Leipzig, he held the professorship of theology at the University of Rostock from 1846 to 1850, at the University of Erlangen until 1867, and after that at the University of Leipzig until his death. Delitzsch wrote many commentaries on books of the Bible, Jewish antiquities, biblical psychology, a history of Jewish poetry, and Christian apologetics.

Grace Notes

Grace Notes is a Bible study ministry which began in 1994 using the Internet to distribute lessons and articles to people who are interested in God's Word. Thousands of Christians, in more than 110 countries around the world, have received Grace Notes lessons on the Internet, by E-mail and the World Wide Web. All courses and materials are distributed free of charge, and the work is supported by believers who want to see the ministry continue and grow. Grace Notes studies are also distributed on diskette and CD-ROM in order to reach those who do not have Internet access.

Verse-by-verse (expositional) courses are available in 50 books of the Bible. Some of the courses include word studies (categorical doctrine) or historical articles (isagogics) that are relevant to the passages being discussed. Other courses offered are Bible character studies, comprehensive studies of the Christian Life and Basics of the Christian Life, an extensive series on the Person and Word of Jesus Christ, and a thorough study of the Attributes of God. You are invited to write to the address below, or write by e-mail, to inquire about Grace Notes materials.

Warren Doud, Director
1705 Aggie Lane, Austin, Texas 78757

E-Mail: [**wdoud@gracenotes.info**](mailto:wdoud@gracenotes.info)

Web Site: [**http://www.gracenotes.info**](http://www.gracenotes.info)

1 Chronicles

Introduction

Introduction to the Hagiographic Historical Books of the Old Testament

Besides the prophetic-historic writings—Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings—which describe from a prophetic point of view the development of the kingdom of God established by means of the mediatorial office of Moses, from the time of the bringing of the tribes of Israel into the land promised to the fathers till the Babylonian exile, the Old Testament contains five historical books,—Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. These latter stand in the Hebrew canon among the *כתובים*, i.e., in the hagiography, and are at once distinguished from the above-mentioned prophetic-historic writings by this characteristic, that they treat only of single parts of the history of the covenant people from individual points of view. The book of Ruth gives a charming historical picture from the life of the ancestors of King David. The Chronicles, indeed, extend over a very long period of the historical development of the Israelite kingdom of God, embrace the history from the death of King Saul till the Babylonian exile, and go back in the genealogies which precede the narrative of the history to Adam, the father of the human race; yet neither in the genealogical part do they give a perfect review of the genealogical ramifications of the twelve tribes of the covenant people, nor in their historical portion contain the history of the whole people from the death of Saul till the exile. Besides the tables of the first progenitors of humanity and the tribal ancestors of the people of Israel, borrowed from Genesis, the genealogical part contains only a collection of genealogical and topographical fragments differing in plan, execution, and extent, relating to the chief families of the most prominent tribes and their dwelling-places. The historical part contains, certainly, historical sketches from the history of all Israel during the reigns of the kings David and Solomon; but from the division of the

kingdom, after the death of Solomon, they contain only the history of the kingdom of Judah, with special reference to the Levitical worship, to the exclusion of the history of the kingdom of the ten tribes. From a comparison of the manner of representing the history in the Chronicles with that in the books of Samuel and the Kings, we can clearly see that the chronicler did not purpose to portray the development of the Israelitic theocracy in general, nor the facts and events which conditioned and constituted that development objectively, according to their general course. He has, on the contrary, so connected the historical facts with the attitude of the kings and the people to the Lord, and to His law, that they teach how the Lord rewarded fidelity to His covenant with blessing and success both to people and kingdom, but punished with calamity and judgments every faithless revolt from His covenant ordinances. Now since Israel, as the people and congregation of Jahve, could openly show its adherence to the covenant only by faithful observance of the covenant laws, particularly of the ordinances for worship, the author of the Chronicles has kept this side of the life of the people especially in view, in order that he might hold up before his contemporaries as a mirror the attitude of the fathers to the God-appointed dwelling-place of His gracious presence in the holy place of the congregation. He does this, that they might behold how the faithful maintenance of communion with the covenant God in His temple would assure to them the fulfilment of the gracious promises of the covenant, and how falling away into idolatry, on the contrary, would bring misfortune and destruction. This special reference to the worship meets us also in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which describe the deliverance of the Jews from exile, and their restoration as the covenant people in the land of their fathers. The book of Ezra narrates, on the one hand, the return out of the Babylonian exile into the land of their fathers of a great part of the Jews who had been led away by Nebuchadnezzar,—partly in the first year of the reign of Cyrus over Babylon, with Zerubbabel, a prince of the royal

race of David, and Joshua the high priest as leaders; partly at a later period with the scribe Ezra, under Artaxerxes. On the other hand, it relates the restoration of the altar of burnt-offering, and of the divine service; together with the re-erection of the temple, and the effort of Ezra to regulate the affairs of the community according to the precepts of the Mosaic law, by doing away with the illegal marriages with heathen women. And Nehemiah describes in his book what he had accomplished in the direction of giving a firm foundation to the civil welfare of the newly-founded community in Judah: in the first place, by building the walls of Jerusalem so as to defend the city and holy place against the attacks and surprises of the hostile peoples in the neighbourhood; and secondly, by various measures for the strengthening of the capital by increasing the number of its inhabitants, and for the more exact modelling of the civil, moral, and religious life of the community on the precepts of the law of Moses, in order to lay enduring foundations for the prosperous development of the covenant people. In the book of Esther, finally, it is recounted how the Jewish inhabitants of the various parts of the great Persian kingdom were delivered by the Jewess Esther (who had been raised to the position of queen by a peculiar concatenation of circumstances) from the destruction which the Grand Vizier Haman, in the reign of King Ahashverosh (i.e., Xerxes), had determined upon, on account of the refusal of adoration by the Jew Mordecai.

Now, if we look somewhat more narrowly at the relation of these five historical books to the prophetic-historic writings, more especially in the first place in reference to their contents, we see that the books of Ruth and the Chronicles furnish us with not unimportant additions to the books of Samuel and Kings. The book of Ruth introduces us into the family life of the ancestors of King David, and shows the life-spring from which proceeded the man after God's own heart, whom God called from being a shepherd of sheep to be the shepherd of His people, that He might deliver Israel out of the

power of his enemies, and found a kingdom, which received the promise of eternal duration, and which was to be established to all eternity through Christ the Son of David and the Son of God. The Chronicles supplement the history of the covenant people, principally during the period of the kings, by detailed accounts of the *form* of the public worship of the congregation; from which we see how, in spite of the continual inclination of the people to idolatry, and to the worship of heathen gods, the service in the temple, according to the law, was the spiritual centre about which the pious in Israel crowded, to worship the Lord their God, and to serve Him by sacrifice. We see, too, how this holy place formed throughout a lengthened period a mighty bulwark, which prevented moral and religious decay from gaining the upper hand, until at length, through the godless conduct of the kings Asa and Manasseh, the holy place itself was profaned by the idolatrous abomination, and judgment broke in upon the incorrigible race in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and the driving out of Judah from the presence of the Lord. But the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther are the only historical writings we possess concerning the times of the restoration of the covenant people after their emancipation from the captivity, and their return into the promised land; and even in this respect they are very valuable component parts of the Old Testament canon. The first two show how God the Lord fulfilled His promise, that He would again receive His people into favour, and collect them out of their dispersion among the heathen, if they should, in their misery under the oppression of the heathen, come to a knowledge of their sins, and turn unto Him; and how, after the expiry of the seventy years of the Babylonian exile which had been prophesied, He opened up to them, through Cyrus the king of Persia, their return into the land of their fathers, and restored Jerusalem and the temple, that He might preserve inviolate, and thereafter perfect, by the appearance of the promised David who was to come, that gracious covenant which He had entered into with their fathers. But the

providence of God ruled also over the members of the covenant people who had remained behind in heathen lands, to preserve them from the ruin which had been prepared for them by the heathen, in order that from among them also a remnant might be saved, and become partakers of the salvation promised in Christ. To show this by a great historical example is the aim of the book of Esther, and the meaning of its reception into the canon of the Holy Scriptures of the old covenant.

If, finally, we consider the style of historical writing found in these five books, we can scarcely characterize it in its relation to the prophetic books by a fitting word. The manner of writing history which is prevalent in the hagiography has been, it is true, called the national (*volksthümlich*) or annalistic, but by this name the peculiarity of it has in no respect been correctly expressed. The narrative bears a national impress only in the book of Esther, and relatively also in the book of Ruth; but even between these two writings a great difference exists. The narrative in Ruth ends with the genealogy of the ancestors of King David; whereas in the book of Esther all reference to the theocratic relation, any, even the religious contemplation of the events, is wholly wanting. But the books of the Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, have no national impress; in them, on the contrary, the Levitico-priestly manner of viewing history prevails. Still less can the hagiographic histories be called annalistic. The books of Ruth and Esther follow definite aims, which clearly appear towards the end. Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah contain, it is true, in the genealogical, geographical, and historical registers, a mass of annalistic material; but we find this also in the prophetic-historic works, and even in the books of Moses. The only thing which is common to and characteristic of the whole of the hagiographic historical books, is that the prophetic contemplation of the course of history according to the divine plan of salvation which unfolds itself in the events, either falls into the background or is wanting altogether; while in its place individual points of view

appear which show themselves in the pursuit of paraenetic-didactic aims, which have acted as a determining influence on the selection and treatment of the historical facts, as the introduction to the individual writings will show.

Name, Contents, Plan, and Aim of the Chronicles.

The two books of the Chronicles originally formed one work, as their plan at once makes manifest, and were received into the Hebrew canon as such. Not only were they reckoned as one in the enumeration of the books of the Old Testament (cf. Joseph. c. Apion, i. 8; Origen, in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 25; and Hieronym. *Prolog. galeat.*), but they were also regarded by the Masorites as one single work, as we learn from a remark of the Masora at the end of the Chronicle, that the verse 1 Chronicles 27:25 is the middle of the book. The division into two books originated with the Alexandrian translators (LXX), and has been transmitted by the Latin translation of Hieronymus (Vulgata) not only to all the later translations of the Bible, but also, along with the division into chapters, into our versions of the Hebrew Bible. The first book closes, 1 Chronicles 29:29f., with the end of the reign of David, which formed a fitting epoch for the division of the work into two books. The Hebrew name of this book in our Bible, by which it was known even by Hieronymus, is דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים, *verba*, or more correctly *res gestae dierum*, events of the days, before which סִפְרָא is to be supplied (cf. e.g., 1 Kings 14:19, 29; 15:7, 23).

Its full title therefore is, Book of the Events of the Time (*Zeitereignisse*), corresponding to the annalistic work so often quoted in our canonical books of Kings and Chronicles, the Book of the Events of the Time (Chronicle) of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Instead of this the LXX have chosen the name Παραλειπόμενα, in order to mark more exactly the relation of our work to the earlier historical books of the Old Testament, as containing much historical information which is not to be found in them. But the name is not used in the sense of

supplementa,—“fragments of other historical works,” as Movers, *die Bibl. Chronicles* S. 95, interprets it,—but in the signification “praetermissa;” because, according to the explanation in the *Synopsis script. sacr.* in Athanasii *Opera*, ii. p. 84, παραλειφθέντα πολλά ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις (i.e., in the books of Samuel and Kings) περιέχεται ἐν τούτοις, “many things passed over in the Kings are contained in these.” Likewise Isidorus, lib. vi. *Origin*. c. i. p. 45: *Paralipomenon graece dicitur, quod praetermissorum vel reliquorum nos dicere possumus, quia ea quae in lege vel in Regum libris vel omissa vel non plene relata sunt, in isto summam et breviter explicantur*. This interpretation of the word παραλειπόμενα is confirmed by Hieronymus, who, in his *Epist. ad Paulin.* (Opp. ti. i. ed. Vallars, p. 279), says: *Paralipomenon liber, id est instrumenti veteris epitome tantus et talis est, ut absque illo, si quis scientiam scripturarum sibi voluerit arrogare, seipsum irrideat; per singula quippe nomina juncturasque verborum et praetermissae in Regum libris tanguntur historiae et innumerabiles explicantur Evangelii quaestiones*. He himself, however, suggested the name Chronicon, in order more clearly to characterize both the contents of the work and at the same its relation to the historical books from Gen. 1 to 2 Kings 25; as he says in *Prolog. galeat.*: דברי הימים, i.e., *verba dierum, quod significantius chronicon totius divinae historiae possumus appellare, qui liber apud nos Paralipomenon primus et secundus inscribitur*. Through Hieronymus the name Chronicles came into use, and became the prevailing title.

Contents.—The Chronicles begin with genealogical registers of primeval times, and of the tribes of Israel (1 Chronicles 1–9); then follow the history of the reign of King David (1 Chronicles 10–29) and of King Solomon (2 Chronicles 1–9); the narrative of the revolt of the ten tribes from the kingdom of the house of David (1 Chronicles 10); the history of the kingdom of Judah from Rehoboam to the ruin of the kingdom, its inhabitants being led away into exile to Babylon (1 Chronicles 11–36:21); and

at the close we find the edict of Cyrus, which allowed the Jews to return into their country (1 Chronicles 36:22, 23). Each of the two books, therefore, falls into two, and the whole work into four divisions. If we examine these divisions more minutely, six groups can be without difficulty recognised in the genealogical part (1 Chronicles 1–9). These are: (1) The families of primeval and ancient times, from Adam to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and his sons Edom and Israel, together with the posterity of Edom (1 Chronicles 1); (2) the sons of Israel and the families of Judah, with the sons and posterity of David (2–4:23); (3) the families of the tribe of Simeon, whose inheritance lay within the tribal domain of Judah, and those of the trans-Jordanic tribes Reuben and Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (1 Chronicles 4:24–5:26); (4) the families of Levi, or of the priests and Levites, with an account of the dwelling-places assigned to them (1 Chronicles 5:27–6:66); (5) the families of the remaining tribes, viz., Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, the half-tribe of Manasseh, Ephraim, and Asher (only Dan and Zebulun being omitted), with the genealogy of the house of Saul (7, 8); and (6) a register of the former inhabitants of Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 9:1–34), and a second enumeration of the family of Saul, preparing us for the transition to the history of the kingdom of Israel (1 Chronicles 9:35–44). The history of David’s kingship which follows is introduced by an account of the ruin of Saul and his house (1 Chronicles 10), and then the narrative falls into two sections. (1) In the first we have David’s election to be king over all Israel, and the taking of the Jebusite fort in Jerusalem, which was built upon Mount Zion (1 Chronicles 11:1–9); then a list of David’s heroes, and the valiant men out of all the tribes who made him king (1 Chronicles 11:10–12:40); the removal of the ark to Jerusalem, the founding of his house, and the establishment of the Levitical worship before the ark in Zion (13–16); David’s design to build a temple to the Lord (17); then his wars (18–20); the numbering of the people, the pestilence which followed, and the fixing of the place for the future temple (21). (2) In the

second section are related David's preparations for the building of the temple (22); the numbering of the Levites, and the arrangement of their service (23–26); the arrangement of the military service (27); David's surrender of the kingdom to his son, and the close of his life (28 and 29). The history of the reign of Solomon begins with his solemn sacrifice at Gibeon, and some remarks on his wealth (2 Chronicles 1); then follows the building of the temple, with the consecration of the completed holy place (1 Chronicles 2–7). To these are added short aphoristic accounts of the cities which Solomon built, the statute labour which he exacted, the arrangement of the public worship, the voyage to Ophir, the visit of the queen of Sheba, and of the might and glory of his kingdom, closing with remarks on the length of his reign, and an account of his death (8–9). The history of the kingdom of Judah begins with the narrative of the revolt of the ten tribes from Rehoboam (1 Chronicles 10), and then in 1 Chronicles 11–36 it flows on according to the succession of the kings of Judah from Rehoboam to Zedekiah, the reigns of the individual kings forming the sections of the narrative.

Plan and Aim.—From this general sketch of the contents of our history, it will be already apparent that the author had not in view a general history of the covenant people from the time of David to the Babylonian exile, but purposed only to give an outline of the history of the kingship of David and his successors, Solomon and the kings of the kingdom of *Judah* to its fall. If, whoever, in order to define more clearly the plan and purpose of the historical parts of our book in the first place, we compare them with the representation given us of the history of Israel in those times in the books of Samuel and Kings, we can see that the chronicler has passed over much of the history. (a) He has omitted, in the history of David, not only his seven years' reign at Hebron over the tribe of Judah, and his conduct to the fallen King Saul and to his house, especially towards Ishbosheth, Saul's son, who had been set up as rival king by Abner (2 Sam. 1–4 and 9), but in general has passed over all the events referring

to and connected with David's family relations. He makes no mention, for instance, of the scene between David and Michal (2 Sam. 6:20–23); the adultery with Bathsheba, with its immediate and more distant results (2 Sam. 11:2–12); Amnon's outrage upon Tamar, the slaying of Amnon by Absalom and his flight to the king of Geshur, his return to Jerusalem, his rising against David, with its issues, and the tumult of Sheba (2 Sam. 13–20); and, finally, also omits the thanksgiving psalm and the last words of David (2 Sam. 22:1–23:7). Then (b) in the history of Solomon there have been left unrecorded the attempt of Adonijah to usurp the throne, with the anointing of Solomon at Gihon, which it brought about; David's last command in reference to Joab and Shimei; the punishment of these men and of Adonijah; Solomon's marriage with Pharaoh's daughter (1 Kings 1:1–3:3); his wise judgment, the catalogue of his officials, the description of his royal magnificence and glory, and of his wisdom (1 Kings 3:16–5:14); the building of the royal palace (1 Kings 7:1–12); and Solomon's polygamy and idolatry, with their immediate results (1 Kings 11:1–40). Finally, (c) there is no reference to the history of the kingdom of Israel founded by Jeroboam, or to the lives of the prophets Elijah and Elisha, which are related in such detail in the books of Kings, while mention is made of the kings of the kingdom of the ten tribes only in so far as they came into hostile struggle or friendly union with the kingdom of Judah. But, in compensation for these omissions, the author of the Chronicle has brought together in his work a considerable number of facts and events which are omitted in the books of Samuel and the Kings.

For example, in the history of David, he gives us the list of the valiant men out of all the tribes who, partly before and partly after the death of Saul, went over to David to help him in his struggle with Saul and his house, and to bring the royal honour to him (1 Chronicles 12); the detailed account of the participation of the Levites in the transfer of the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem, and of the arrangements made by

David for worship around this sanctuary (1 Chronicles 15 and 16); and the whole section concerning David's preparations for the building of the temple, his arrangements for public worship, the regulation of the army, and his last commands (1 Chronicles 22-29). Further, the history of the kingdom of Judah from Rehoboam to Joram is narrated throughout at greater length than in the books of Kings, and is considerably supplemented by detailed accounts, not only of the work of the prophets in Judah, of Shemaiah under Rehoboam (1 Chronicles 12:5-8), of Azariah and Hanani under Asa (1 Chronicles 15:1-8; 16:7-9), of Jehu son of Hanani, Jehaziel, and Ebenezer son of Dodava, under Jehoshaphat (1 Chronicles 19:1-3; 20:14-20 and 37), and concerning Elijah's letter under Joram (1 Chronicles 21:12-15); but also of the efforts of Rehoboam (1 Chronicles 11:5-17), Asa (1 Chronicles 14:5-7), and Jehoshaphat (1 Chronicles 17:2, 12-19) to fortify the kingdom of Asa to raise and vivify the Jahve-worship (1 Chronicles 15:9-15), of Jehoshaphat to purify the administration of justice and increase the knowledge of the law (1 Chronicles 17:7-9 and 19:5-11), of the wars of Abijah against Jeroboam, and his victories (1 Chronicles 13:3-20), of Asa's war against the Cushite Zerah (1 Chronicles 14:8-14), of Jehoshaphat's conquest of the Ammonites and Moabites (1 Chronicles 20:1-30), and, finally, also of the family relations of Rehoboam (1 Chronicles 11:18-22), the wives and children of Abijah (1 Chronicles 13:21), and Joram's brothers and his sickness (1 Chronicles 21:2-4 and 18f.). Of the succeeding kings also various undertakings are reported which are not found in the books of Kings. In this way we are informed of Joash's defection from the Lord, and his fall into idolatry after the death of the high priest Jehoiada (1 Chronicles 24:15-22); how Amaziah increased his military power (1 Chronicles 25:5-10), and worshipped idols (1 Chronicles 25:14-16); of Uzziah's victorious wars against the Philistines and Arabs, and his fortress-building, etc. (1 Chronicles 26:6-15); of Jotham's fortress-building, and his victory

over the Ammonites (1 Chronicles 27:4-6); of the increase of Hezekiah's riches (1 Chronicles 32:27-30); of Manasseh's capture and removal to Babylon, and his return out of captivity (1 Chronicles 33:11-17). But the history of Hezekiah and Josiah more especially is rendered more complete by special accounts of reforms in worship, and of celebrations of the passover (29:3-31, 21, and 35:2-15); while we have only summary notices of the godless conduct of Ahaz (1 Chronicles 28) and Manasseh (1 Chronicles 33:3-10), of the campaign of Sennacherib against Jerusalem and Judah, of Hezekiah's sickness and the reception of the Babylonian embassy in Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 32, cf. 2 Kings 28:13-20, 19); as also of the reigns of the last kings, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. From all this, it is clear that the author of the Chronicle, as Bertheau expresses it, "has turned his attention to *those times* especially in which Israel's religion had showed itself to be a power dominating the people and their leaders, and bringing them prosperity; and to *those men* who had endeavoured to give a more enduring form to the arrangements for the service of God, and to restore the true worship of Jahve; and to *those events* in the history of the worship so intimately bound up with Jerusalem, which had important bearings."

This purpose appears much more clearly when we take into consideration the narratives which are common to the Chronicle and the books of Samuel and Kings, and observe the difference which is perceptible in the mode of conception and representation in those parallel sections. For our present purpose, however, those narratives in which the chronicler supplements and completes the accounts given in the books of Samuel and Kings by more exact and detailed information, or shortens them by the omission of unimportant details, come less into consideration.¹ For both additions and abridgments show only that the chronicler has not drawn his information from the canonical books of Samuel and Kings, but from other more circumstantial original documents which he had at his command, and has used these

sources independently. Much more important for a knowledge of the plan of the Chronicle are the variations in the parallel places between it and the other narrative; for in them the point of view from which the chronicler regarded, and has described, the events clearly appears. In the number of such passages is to be reckoned the narrative of the transfer of the ark (1 Chronicles 13 and 15, cf. 2 Sam. 6), where the chronicler presents the fact in its religious import as the beginning of the restoration of the worship of Jahve according to the law, which had fallen into decay; while the author of the books of Samuel describes it only in its political import, in its bearing on the Davidic kingship. Of this character also is the narrative of the raising of Joash to the throne (2 Chronicles 23, cf. 2 Kings 11), where the share of the Levites in the completion of the work begun by the high priest Jehoiada is prominently brought forward, while in Kings it is not expressly mentioned. The whole account also of the reign of Hezekiah, as well as other passages, belong to this category. Now from these and other descriptions of the part the Levites played in events, and the share they took in assisting the efforts of the pious kings to revivify and maintain the temple worship, the conclusion has been rightly drawn that the chronicler describes with special interest the fostering of the Levitic worship according to the precepts of the law of Moses, and hold it up to his contemporaries for earnest imitation; yet this has been too often done in such a way as to cause this one element in the plans of the Chronicle to be looked upon as its main object, which has led to a very onesided conception of the character of the book. The chronicler does not desire to bring honour to the Levites and to the temple worship: his object is rather to draw from the history of the kingship in Israel a proof that faithful adherence to the covenant which the Lord had made with Israel brings happiness and blessing; the forsaking of it, on the contrary, ensures ruin and a curse. But Israel could show its faithfulness to the covenant only by walking according to the ordinances of the law given by Moses, and in worshipping Jahve,

the God of their fathers, in His holy place in that way which He had established by the ceremonial ordinances. The author of the Chronicle attaches importance to the Levitic worship only because the fidelity of Israel to the covenant manifested itself in the careful maintenance of it.

This point of view appears clearly in the selection and treatment of the material drawn by our historian from older histories and prophetic writings. His history begins with the death of Saul and the anointing of David to be king over the whole of Israel, and confines itself, after the division of the kingdom, to the history of the kingdom of Judah. In the time of the judges especially, the Levitic worship had fallen more and more into decay; and even Samuel had done nothing for it, or perhaps *could* do nothing, and the ark remained during that whole period at a distance from the tabernacle. Still less was done under Saul for the restoration of the worship in the tabernacle; for "Saul died," as we read in 1 Chronicles 10:13f., "for his transgression which he had transgressed against the Lord; ... and because he inquired not of the Lord, therefore He slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse." After the death of Saul the elders of all Israel came to David with the confession, "Jahve thy God said unto thee, Thou shalt feed my people Israel; and thou shalt be ruler over my people Israel" (1 Chronicles 11:2). David's first care, after he had as king over all Israel conquered the Jebusite hold on Mount Zion, and made Jerusalem the capital of the kingdom, was to bring the ark from its obscurity into the city of David, and to establish the sacrificial worship according to the law near that sanctuary (1 Chronicles 13:15, 16). Shortly afterwards he formed the resolution of building for the Lord a permanent house (a temple), that He might dwell among His people, for which he received from the Lord the promise of the establishment of his kingdom for ever, although the execution of his design was denied to him, and was committed to his son (1 Chronicles 17). Only *after* all this has been related do we find narratives of David's wars

and his victories over all hostile peoples (1 Chronicles 18–20), of the numbering of the people, and the pestilence, which, in consequence of the repentant resignation of David to the will of the Lord, gave occasion to the determination of the place for the erection of the temple (1 Chronicles 21). The second section of the history of the Davidic kingship contains the preparations for the building of the temple, and the laying down of more permanent regulations for the ordering of the worship; and that which David had prepared for, and so earnestly impressed upon his son Solomon at the transfer of the crown, Solomon carried out. Immediately after the throne had been secured to him, he took in hand the building of the temple; and the account of this work fills the greater part of the history of his reign, while the description of his kingly power and splendour and wisdom, and of all the other undertakings which he carried out, is of the shortest. When ten tribes revolted from the house of David after his death, Rehoboam's design of bringing the rebellious people again under his dominion by force of arms was checked by the prophet Shemaiah with the words, "Thus saith the Lord, Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren, for this thing is done of me" (2 Chronicles 11:4). But in their revolt from the house of David, which Jeroboam sought to perpetuate by the establishment of an idolatrous national worship, Israel of the ten tribes had departed from the covenant communion with Jahve; and on this ground, and on this account, the history of that kingdom is no further noticed by the chronicler. The priests and Levites came out of the whole Israelite dominion to Judah and Jerusalem, because Jeroboam and his sons expelled them from the priesthood. After them, from all the tribes of Israel came those who gave their hearts to seek Jahve the God of Israel to Jerusalem to sacrifice to Jahve the God of their fathers (2 Chronicles 11:13–16), for "Jerusalem is the city which Jahve has chosen out of all the tribes of Israel to put His name there" (1 Chronicles 12:13). The priests, Levites, and pious people who went over from Israel made

the kingdom of Judah strong, and confirmed Rehoboam's power, for they walked in the ways of David and Solomon (1 Chronicles 11:17).

But when the kingdom of Rehoboam had been firmly established, he forsook the law of Jahve, and all Israel with him (1 Chronicles 12:1). Then the Egyptian king Shishak came up against Jerusalem, "because they had transgressed against the Lord" (1 Chronicles 12:2). The prophet Shemaiah proclaimed the word of the Lord: "Ye have forsaken me, and therefore have I also left you in the hand of Shishak" (1 Chronicles 12:5). Yet when Rehoboam and the princes of Israel humbled themselves, the anger of the Lord turned from him, that He would not destroy him altogether (1 Chronicles 12:6, 12). King Abijah reproaches Jeroboam in his speech with his defection from Jahve, and concludes with the words, "O children of Israel, fight not ye against the Lord God of your fathers, for ye shall not prosper" (1 Chronicles 13:12); and when the men of Judah cried unto the Lord in the battle, and the priests blew the trumpets, then did God smite Jeroboam and all Israel (1 Chronicles 13:15). "Thus the children of Israel were brought under at that time, and the children of Judah prevailed, because they relied upon the Lord God of their fathers" (1 Chronicles 13:18). King Asa commanded his subjects to seek Jahve the God of their fathers, and to do the law and the commandments (1 Chronicles 14:3). In the war against the Cushites, he cried unto Jahve his God, "Help us, for we rest on Thee;" and Jahve smote the Cushites before Judah (1 Chronicles 14:10). After this victory Asa and Judah sacrificed unto the Lord of their spoil, and entered into a covenant to seek Jahve the God of their fathers with all their heart, and with all their soul. And the Lord was found of them, and the Lord gave them rest round about (1 Chronicles 15:11ff.). But when Asa afterwards, in the war against Baasha of Israel, made an alliance with the Syrian king Benhadad, the prophet Hanani censured this act in the words, "Because thou hast relied on the king of Syria, and hast not relied on Jahve thy God, therefore has the host of the king of Syria escaped out of

thy hand ... Herein thou hast done foolishly," etc. (1 Chronicles 16:7-9). Jehoshaphat became mighty against Israel, and Jahve was with him; for he walked in the ways of his father David, and sought not unto the Baals, but sought the God of his father, and walked in His commandments, and not after the doings of Israel. And Jahve established his kingdom in his hand, and he attained to riches and great splendour (1 Chronicles 17:1-5).

After this fashion does the chronicler show how God blessed the reigns and prospered all the undertakings of all the kings of Judah who sought the Lord and walked in His commandments; but at the same time also, how every defection from the Lord brought with it misfortune and chastisement. Under Joram of Judah, Edom and Libnah freed themselves from the supremacy of Judah, "because Joram had forsaken Jahve the God of his fathers" (1 Chronicles 21:10). Because Joram had walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, and had seduced the inhabitants of Jerusalem to whoredom (i.e., idolatry), and had slain his brothers, God punished him in the invasion of Judah by the Philistines and Arabs, who stormed Jerusalem, took away with them all the furniture of the royal palace, and took captive his sons and wives, while He smote him besides with incurable disease (1 Chronicles 21:11ff., 16-18). Because of the visit which Ahaziah made to Joram of Israel, when he lay sick of his wound at Jezreel, the judgment was (1 Chronicles 22:7) pronounced: "The destruction of Ahaziah was of God by his coming to Joram." When Amaziah, after his victory over the Edomites, brought back the gods of Seir and set them up for himself as gods, before whom he worshipped, the anger of Jahve was kindled against him. In spite of the warning of the prophets, he sought a quarrel with King Joash of Israel, who likewise advised him to abandon his design. "But Amaziah would not hear; for it was of God, that He might deliver them over, because they had sought the gods of Edom" (1 Chronicles 25:20). With this compare v. 27: "After the time that Amaziah turned away from the following Jahve, they made a conspiracy

against him in Jerusalem." Of Uzziah it is said (1 Chronicles 26:5), so long as he sought the Lord, God made him to prosper, so that he conquered his enemies and became very mighty. But when he was strong his heart was lifted up, so that he transgressed against Jahve his God, by forcing his way into the temple to offer incense; and for this he was smitten with leprosy. Of Jotham it is said, in 27:6, "He became mighty, because he established his ways before Jahve his God."

From these and similar passages, which might easily be multiplied, we clearly see that the chronicler had in view not only the Levitic worship, but also and mainly the attitude of the people and their princes to the Lord and to His law; and that it is from this point of view that he has regarded and written the history of his people before the exile. But it is also not less clear, from the quotations we have made, in so far as they contain practical remarks of the historian, that it was his purpose to hold up to his contemporaries as a mirror the history of the past, in which they might see the consequences of their own conduct towards the God of their fathers. He does not wish, as the author of the books of Kings does, to narrate the events and facts objectively, according to the course of history; but he connects the facts and events with the conduct of the kings and people towards the Lord, and strives to put the historical facts in such a light as to teach that God rewards fidelity to His covenant with happiness and blessing, and avenges faithless defection from it with punitive judgments. Owing to this peculiarity, the historical narrative acquires a hortative character, which gives occasion for the employment of a highly rhetorical style. The hortative-rhetorical character impressed upon his narrative shows itself not only in many of the speeches of the actors in the history which are interwoven with it, but also in many of the historical parts. For example, the account given in 2 Chronicles 21:16 of the punitive judgments which broke in upon Joram for his wickedness is rhetorically arranged, so that the judgments correspond to the threatenings contained in the letter of Elijah, vv. 12-15. But this may be much more

plainly seen in the description of the impious conduct of King Ahaz, and of the punishments which were inflicted upon him and the kingdom of Judah (1 Chronicles 28); as also in the descriptions of the crime of Manasseh (1 Chronicles 33:3-13; cf. especially vv. 7 and 8), and of the reign of Zedekiah, and the ruin of the kingdom of Judah (1 Chronicles 36:12-21). Now the greater part of the differences between the chronicler's account and the parallel narrative in the books of Samuel and Kings, together with the omission of unimportant circumstances, and the careful manner in which the descriptions of the arrangements for worship and the celebration of feasts are wrought out, can be accounted for by this hortatory tendency so manifest in his writings, and by his subjective, reflective manner of regarding history. For all these peculiarities clearly have it for their object to raise in the souls of the readers pleasure and delight in the splendid worship of the Lord, and to confirm their hearts in fidelity to the Lord and to His law.

With this plan and object, the first part of our history (1 Chronicles 1-9), which contains genealogies, with geographical sketches and isolated historical remarks, is in perfect harmony. The genealogies are intended to exhibit, on the one hand, the connection of the people of Israel with the whole human race; on the other, the descent and genealogical ramifications of the tribes and families of Israel, with the extent to which they had spread themselves abroad in the land received as a heritage from the Lord. In both of these respects they are the necessary foundation for the following history of the chosen people, which the author designed to trace from the time of the foundation of the promised kingdom till the people were driven away into exile because of their revolt from their God. And it is not to be considered as a result of the custom prevalent among the later Arabian historians, of beginning their histories and chronicles *ab ovo* with Adam, that our author goes back in this introduction to Adam and the beginnings of the human race; for not only is this custom far too

modern to allow of any inference being drawn from it with reference to the Chronicle, but it has itself originated, beyond a doubt, in an imitation of our history. The reason for going back to the beginnings of the human race is to be sought in the importance for the history of the world of the people of Israel, whose progenitor Abraham had been chosen and separated from all the peoples of the earth by God, that his posterity might become a blessing to all the families of the earth. But in order to see more perfectly the plan and object of the historian in his selection and treatment of the historical material at his command, we must still keep in view the age in which he lived, and for which he wrote. In respect to this, so much in general is admitted, viz., that the Chronicle was composed after the Babylonian exile. With their release from exile, and their return into the land of their fathers, Israel did not receive again its former political importance. That part of the nation which had returned remained under Persian supremacy, and was ruled by Persian governors; and the descendants of the royal race of David remained subject to this governor, or at least to the kings of Persia. They were only allowed to restore the temple, and to arrange the divine service according to the precepts of the Mosaic law; and in this they were favoured by Cyrus and his successors. In such circumstances, the efforts and struggles of the returned Jews must have been mainly directed to the reestablishment and permanent ordering of the worship, in order to maintain communion with the Lord their God, and by that means to prove their fidelity to the God of their fathers, so that the Lord might fulfil His covenant promises to them, and complete the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem. By this fact, therefore, may we account for the setting forth in our history of the religious and ecclesiastical side of the life of the Israelitish community in such relief, and for the author's supposed "fondness" for the Levitic worship. If the author of the Chronicle wished to strengthen his contemporaries in their fidelity to Jahve, and to encourage them to fulfil their covenant duties by a description of the earlier history of the

covenant people, he could not hope to accomplish his purpose more effectively than by so presenting the history as to bring accurately before them the ordinances and arrangements of the worship, the blessings of fidelity to the covenant, and the fatal fruits of defection from the Lord.

The chronicler's supposed predilection for genealogical lists arose also from the circumstances of his time. From Ezra 2:60ff. we learn that some of the sons of priests who returned with Zerubbabel sought their family registers, but could not find them, and were consequently removed from the priesthood; besides this, the inheritance of the land was bound up with the families of Israel. On this account the family registers had, for those who had returned from the exile, an increased importance, as the means of again obtaining possession of the heritage of their fathers; and perhaps it was the value thus given to the genealogical lists which induced the author of the Chronicle to include in his book all the old registers of this sort which had been received from antiquity.

Age and Author of the Chronicles.

The Chronicle cannot have been composed before the time of Ezra, for it closes with the intelligence that Cyrus, by an edict in the first year of his reign, allowed the Jews to return to their country (2 Chronicles 36:22f.), and it brings down the genealogical tree of Zerubbabel to his grandchildren (1 Chronicles 3:19-21). The opinion brought into acceptance by de Wette and Ewald, that the genealogy (1 Chronicles 3:19-24) enumerates six or seven other generations after Zerubbabel, and so reaches down to the times of Alexander the Great or yet later, is founded on the undemonstrable assumption that the twenty-one names which in this passage (v. 21b) follow בני רפיה are the names of direct descendants of Zerubbabel. But no exegetical justification can be found for this assumption; since the list of names, "the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah," etc. (vv. 21b24), is

connected neither in form nor in subject-matter with the grandsons of Zerubbabel, who have been already enumerated, but forms a genealogical fragment, the connection of which with Zerubbabel's grandchildren is merely asserted, but can neither be proved nor even rendered probable. (*Vide* the commentary on these verses.) Other grounds for the acceptance of so late a date for the composition of the Chronicle are entirely wanting; for the orthography and language of the book point only in general to the post-exilic age, and the mention of the Daric, a Persian coin, in 1 Chronicles 29:7, does not bring us further down than the period of the Persian rule over Judaea. On the other hand, the use of the name בִּיָּה (1 Chronicles 29:1, 19) for the temple can scarcely be reconciled with the composition of the book in the Macedonian or even the Seleucidian age, since an author who lived after Nehemiah, when Jerusalem, like other Persian cities, had received in the fortress built by him (Neh. 2:8; 7:2), and afterwards called βάρτις and *Arx Antonia*, its own בִּיָּה, would scarcely have given this name to the temple.

In reference to the question of the authorship of our book, the matter which most demands consideration is the identity of the end of the Chronicle with the beginning of the book of Ezra. The Chronicle closes with the edict of Cyrus which summons the Jews to return to Jerusalem to build the temple; the book of Ezra begins with this same edict, but gives it more completely than the Chronicle, which stops somewhat abruptly with the word וַיַּעַל, "and let him go up," although in this וַיַּעַל everything is contained that we find in the remaining part of the edict communicated in the book of Ezra. From this relation of the Chronicle to the book of Ezra, many Rabbins, Fathers of the church, and older exegetes, have drawn the conclusion that Ezra is also the author of the Chronicle. But of course it is not a very strong proof, since it can be accounted for on the supposition that the author of the book of Ezra has taken over the conclusion of the Chronicle into his work,

and set it at the commencement so as to attach his book to the Chronicle as a continuation. In support of this supposition, moreover, the further fact may be adduced, that it was just as important for the Chronicle to communicate the terms of Cyrus' edict as it was for the book of Ezra. It was a fitting conclusion of the former, to show that the destruction of Jerusalem and the leading away of the inhabitants of Judah to Babylon, was not the final destiny of Judah and Jerusalem, but that, after the dark night of exile, the day of the restoration of the people of God had dawned under Cyrus; and for the latter it was an indispensable foundation and point of departure for the history of the new immigration of the exiles into Jerusalem and Judah. Yet it still remains more probable that one author produced both writings, yet not as a single book, which has been divided at some later time by another hand. For no reason can be perceived for any such later division, especially such a division as would make it necessary to repeat the edict of Cyrus.² The introduction of this edict with the words, "And it came to pass in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, *that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished,*" connects it so closely with the end of the account of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the carrying away into Babylon, contained in the words, "And they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia, *to fulfil the word of the Lord spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah, ... to fulfil the seventy years*" (v. 20f.), that it cannot be separated from what precedes. Rather it is clear, that the author who wrote verses 20 and 21, representing the seventy years' exile as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jeremiah, must be the same who mentions the edict of Cyrus, and sets it forth in its connection with the utterances of the same prophet. This connecting of the edict with the prophecy gives us an irrefragable proof that the verses which contain the edict form an integral part of the Chronicle. But, at the same time, the way in which the edict is broken off in the Chronicle with וַיַּעַל, makes it likely that the author of the Chronicle did not give the contents of the edict

in their entirety, only because he intended to treat further of the edict, and the fulfilment of it by the return of the Jews from Babylon, in a second work. A later editor would certainly have given the entire edict in both writings (the Chronicle and the book of Ezra), and would, moreover, hardly have altered בְּפִי (Chron.) into מִפִּי (Ezra), and יְהִי אֱלֹהֵינוּ עִמּוֹ into יְהִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ עִמּוֹ.

The remaining grounds which are usually urged for the original unity of the two writings, prove nothing more than the possibility or probability that both originated with one author; certainly they do not prove that they originally formed one work. The long list of phenomena in Bertheau's Commentary, pp. xvi.-xx., by which a certainty is supposed to be arrived at that the Chronicle and Ezra originally was one great historical work, compiled from various sources, greatly requires the help of critical bias. 1. "The predilection of the author for genealogical lists, for detailed descriptions of great feasts, which occurred at the most various times, for exact representations of the arrangement of the public worship, and the business of the Levites and priests, which their classifications and ranks," cannot be proved to exist in the book of Ezra. That book contains only one very much abridged genealogy, that of Ezra (Ezra 7:1-5); only two lists,—those, namely, of the families who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel and Ezra (Ezra 2 and 8); only one account of the celebration of a feast, the by no means detailed description of the consecration of the temple (Ezra 6:16); short remarks on the building of the altar, the celebration of the feast of tabernacles, and the laying of the foundation-stone of the temple, in Ezra 3; and it contains nothing whatever as to the divisions and ranks of the priests and Levites. That in these lists and descriptions some expressions should recur, is to be expected from the nature of the case. Yet all that is common to both books is the word הַתְּיָחָשׁ, the use of בְּמִשְׁפָּט in the signification, "according to the Mosaic law" (1 Chronicles 23:31, 2 Chronicles 35:13, Ezra 3:4, and Neh. 8:18), and the liturgical formulae הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה,

which occurs also in Isa. 12:4 and Ps. 33:2, and לַיהוָה with the addition, "Jahve is God, and His mercy endureth for ever" (1 Chronicles 16:34, 41; 2 Chronicles 7:6; Ezra 3:11). The other expressions enumerated by Bertheau are met with also in other writings: נִקְבוּ בְשֵׁמוֹת in Num. 1:17; רָאִשֵׁי אֲבוֹת and רָאִשֵׁי בֵּית־אֲבוֹת, Ex. 6:14ff.; and the formula בְּתוֹרַת (בְּכַתוּב בְּתוֹרַת) לְכֹל־הַכְּתוּב (יהוה) (1 Chronicles 16:40; 2 Chronicles 35:12, 26; Ezra 3:2, 4) is just as common in other writings: cf. Josh. 1:8; 8:31, 34; 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Kings 14:6; 22:13; 23:21. Bertheau further remarks: "In those sections in which the regulation of the public worship, the duties, classification, and offices of the priests and Levites are spoken of, the author seizes every opportunity to tell of the musicians and doorkeepers, their duties at the celebration of the great festivals, and their classification. He speaks of the musicians, 1 Chronicles 6:16ff., 9:14-16, 33; 15:16-22, 27f., 16:4-42; 23:5, 25; 2 Chronicles 5:12f., 7:6; 8:14f., 20:19, 21; 23:13, 18; 29:25-28, 30; 30:21f., 31:2, 11-18; 34:12; 35:15; Ezra 3:10f.; Neh. 11:17; 12:8, 24, 27-29, 45-47; 13:5. The doorkeepers are mentioned nearly as often, and not seldom in company with the singers: 1 Chronicles 9:17-29; 15:18, 23, 24; 16:38; 23:5; 26:1, 12-19; 2 Chronicles 8:14; 23:4, 19; 31:14; 34:13; 35:15; Ezra 2:42, 70; 7:7; 10:24; Neh. 7:1, 45; 10:29; 11:19; 12:25, 45, 47; 13:5. Now if these passages be compared, not only are the same expressions met with (e.g., מְצַלְתִּים only in Chron., Ezra, and Neh.; הַמְשַׁרְרִים and הַמְשַׁרְרִים likewise only in these books, but here very frequently, some twenty-eight times), and also very often in different places the same names (cf. 1 Chronicles 9:17 with Neh. 12:25); but everywhere also we can easily trace the same view as to the importance of the musicians and doorkeepers for the public worship, and see that all information respecting them rests upon a very well-defined view of their duties and their position." But does it follow from this "well-defined view" of the business of the musicians and doorkeepers, that the Chronicle, Ezra, and Nehemiah form a

single book? Is this view an idea peculiar to the author of this book? In all the historical books of the Old Testament, from Exodus and Leviticus to Nehemiah, we find the idea that the laying of the sacrifice upon the altar is the business of the priest; but does it follow from that, that all those books were written by one man? But besides this, the representation given by Bertheau is very one-sided. The fact is, that in the Chronicle, and in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, mention is made of the priests just as often as of the Levitical musicians, and oftener than the doorkeepers are spoken of, as will be seen from the proofs brought forward in the following remarks; nor can any trace be discovered of a "fondness" on the part of the chronicler for the musicians and porters. They are mentioned only when the subject demanded that they should be mentioned.

2. As to the language.—Bertheau himself admits, after the enumeration of a long list of linguistic peculiarities of the Chronicle and the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, that all these phenomena are to be met with separately in other books of the Old Testament, especially the later ones; only their frequent use can be set down as the linguistic peculiarity of *one* author. But does the mere numbering of the places where a word or a grammatical construction occurs in this or that book really serve as a valid proof for the unity of the authorship? When, for example, the form בָּזָה, 2 Chronicles 14:13; 28:14, Ezra 9:7, Neh. 3:36, occurs elsewhere only in Esther and Daniel, or קָבַל in 1 Chronicles 12:18; 21:11, 2 Chronicles 29:16, 22, and Ezra 8:30, is elsewhere found only in Proverbs once, in Job once, and thrice in Esther, does it follow that the Chronicle and the book of Ezra are the work of one author? The greater number of the linguistic phenomena enumerated by Bertheau, such as the use of הַאֲלֵהִים for יהוה; the frequent use of לְ, partly before the infinitive to express shall or must, partly for subordinating or introducing a word; the multiplication of prepositions,—e.g., in עַד לְאֵין, 2 Chronicles 36:16; עַד לְמֵאד, 2 Chronicles

16:14; עַד לְמַעְלָה, 2 Chronicles 16:12; 17:12; 36:8,—are characteristics not arising from a peculiar use of language by our chronicler, but belonging to the later or post-exilic Hebrew in general. The only words and phrases which are characteristic of and common to the Chronicle and the book of Ezra are: כַּפּוֹר (bowl), 1 Chronicles 28:17, Ezra 1:10; 8:27; the infinitive Hophal הוּסַד, used of the foundation of the temple, 2 Chronicles 3:3, Ezra 3:11; פְּלִגָּה, of the divisions of the Levites, 2 Chronicles 35:5 and Ezra 6:18; הַתְּנִידָב, of offerings, 1 Chronicles 29:5, 6, 9, 14, 17, Ezra 1:6; 2:68; 3:5; עַד לְמַרְחֹק (with three prepositions), 2 Chronicles 26:15, Ezra 3:13; and הִכִּין לְבָבוֹ לְדָרֵשׁ, 2 Chronicles 12:14; 19:3; 30:19, and Ezra 7:10. These few words and constructions would *per se* not prove much; but in connection with the fact that neither in the language nor in the ideas are any considerable differences or variations to be observed, they may serve to strengthen the probability, arising from the relation of the end of the Chronicle to the beginning of the book of Ezra, that both writings were composed by the priest and scribe Ezra.³

The genealogical list in 1 Chronicles 1, which gives us the origin of the human race and of the nations, and that which contains the names of the sons of Jacob (1 Chronicles 2:1 and 2), are to be found in and have been without doubt extracted from Genesis, to be placed together here. For it is scarcely probable that genealogical lists belonging to primeval time and the early days of Israel should have been preserved till the post-exilic period. But all the genealogical registers which follow, together with the geographical and historical remarks interwoven with them (1 Chronicles 2:3–8:40), have not been derived from the older historical books of the Old Testament: for they contain for the most part merely the names of the originators of those genealogical lines, of the grandsons and some of the great-grandsons of Jacob, and of the ancestors, brothers, and sons of David; but nowhere do they contain the

whole lines. Moreover, in the parallel places the names often differ greatly, so that all the variations cannot be ascribed to errors of transcription. Compare the comparative table of these parallel places in my *apolog. Versuch über die Chronicles* S. 159ff., and in the *Handbook of Introduction*, § 139, 1. All these catalogues, together with that of the cities of the Levites (1 Chronicles 6:39–66), have been derived from other, extra-biblical sources. But as Bertheau, S. xxxi., rightly remarks: “We cannot hold the lists to be the result of historical investigation on the part of the author of the Chronicle, in the sense of his having culled the individual names carefully either out of historical works or from traditions of the families, and then brought them into order: for in reference to Gad (1 Chronicles 5:12) we are referred to a genealogical register prepared in the time of Jotham king of Judah and Jeroboam king of Israel; while as to Issachar (1 Chronicles 7:2) the reference is to the numbering of the people which took place in the time of David; and it is incidentally (?) stated (1 Chronicles 9:1) that registers had been prepared of all Israelites (i.e., the northern tribes).” Besides this, in 1 Chronicles 23:3, 27, and 26:31, numberings of the Levites, and in 1 Chronicles 27:24 the numbering of the people undertaken by Joab at David’s command, are mentioned. With regard to the latter, however, it is expressly stated that its results were not incorporated in the דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים, i.e., in the book of the chronicles of King David, while it is said that the results of the genealogical registration of the northern tribes of Israel were written in the book of the kings of Israel. According to this, then, it might be thought that the author had taken his genealogical lists from the great historical work made use of by him, and often cited, in the history of the kings of Judah—“the *national* annals of Israel and Judah.” But this can be accepted only with regard to the short lists of the tribes of the northern kingdom in 1 Chronicles 5 and 7, which contain nothing further than the names of families and fathers’-houses, with a statement of the number of males in these fathers’-houses. It is possible

that these names and numbers were contained in the national annals; but it is not likely that these registers, which are of a purely genealogical nature, giving the descent of families or famous men in longer or shorter lines of ancestors, were received into the national annals (*Reichsannalen*), and it does not at all appear from the references to the annals that this was the case. These genealogical lists were most probably in the possession of the heads of the tribes and families and households, from whom the author of the Chronicle would appear to have collected all he could find, and preserved them from destruction by incorporating them in his work.

In the historical part (1 Chronicles 10–2 Chronicles 36), at the death of almost every king, the author refers to writings in which the events and acts of his reign are described. Only in the case of Joram, Ahaziah, Athaliah, and the later kings Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, are such references omitted. The books which are thus named are: (1) For David's reign, Dibre of Samuel the seer, of the prophet Nathan, and of Gad the seer (1 Chronicles 29:29); (2) as to Solomon, the Dibre of the prophet Nathan, the prophecy (נְבוֹאָת) of Abijah the Shilonite, and the visions (חֲזוֹת) of the seer Iddo against Jeroboam the son of Nebat (2 Chronicles 9:29); (3) for Rehoboam, Dibre of the prophet Shemaiah and the seer Iddo (2 Chronicles 13:22); (5) for Asa, the book of the kings of Judah and Israel (2 Chronicles 16:11); (6) as to Jehoshaphat, Dibre of Jehu the son of Hanani, which had been incorporated with the book of the kings of Israel (2 Chronicles 20:34); (7) for the reign of Joash, Midrash-Sepher of the kings (2 Chronicles 24:27); (8) for the reign of Amaziah, the book of the kings of Judah and Israel (2 Chronicles 25:26); (9) in reference to Uzziah, a writing (כְּתָב) of the prophet Isaiah (2 Chronicles 26:22); (10) as to Jotham, the book of the kings of Israel and Judah (2 Chronicles 27:7); (11) for the reign of Ahaz, the book of the kings of Judah and Israel (2 Chronicles 28:26); (12) for Hezekiah, the vision (חֲזוֹן) of the

prophet Isaiah, in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel (2 Chronicles 32:32); (13) as to Manasseh, Dibre of the kings of Israel, and Dibre of Hozai (2 Chronicles 33:18 and 19); (14) for the reign of Josiah, the book of the kings of Israel and Judah (2 Chronicles 35:27); and (15) for Jehoiakim, the book of the kings of Israel and Judah (2 Chronicles 36:8).

From this summary, it appears that two classes of writings, of historical and prophetic contents respectively, are quoted. The book of the kings of Judah and Israel (No. 5, 8, 11), the book of the kings of Israel and Judah (10, 14, 15), the histories (דְּבָרִי) of the kings of Israel (13), and the Midrash-book of kings (7), are all historical. The first three titles are, as is now generally admitted, only variations in the designation of one and the same work, whose complete title, "Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel" (or Israel and Judah), is here and there altered into "Book of the Events (or History) of the Kings of Israel," i.e., of the whole Israelitish people. This work contained the history of the kings of both kingdoms, and must have been essentially the same as to contents with the two annalistic writings cited in the canonical books of Kings: the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel, and the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah. This conclusion is forced upon us by the fact that the extracts from them contained in our canonical books of Kings, coincide with the extracts from the books of the kings of Israel and Judah contained in our Chronicle where they narrate the same events, either verbally, or at least in so far that the identity of the sources from which they have been derived cannot but be recognised. The only difference is, that the author of the Chronicle had the two writings which the author of the book of Kings quotes as two separate works, before him as one work, narrating the history of both kingdoms in a single composition. For he cites the book of the Kings of Israel even for the history of those kings of Judah who, like Jotham and Hezekiah, had nothing to do with the kingdom of Israel (i.e., the ten tribes), and even after the kingdom of the ten tribes had been already destroyed,

for the reigns of Manasseh, Josiah, and Jehoiakim. But we are entirely without any means of answering with certainty the question, in how far the merging of the annals of the two kingdoms into *one* book of the kings of Israel was accompanied by remoulding and revision. The reasons which Bertheau, in his commentary on Chronicles, p. 41ff., brings forward, after the example of Thenius and Ewald, for thinking that it underwent so thorough a revision as to become a different book, are without force. The difference in the title is not sufficient, since it is quite plain, from the different names under which the chronicler quotes the work which is used by him, that he did not give much attention to literal accuracy. The character of the parallel places in our books of Kings and the Chronicle, as Bertheau himself admits, forms no decisive criterion for an accurate determination of the relation of the chronicler to his original documents, which is now in question, since neither the author of the books of Samuel and Kings nor the author of the Chronicle intended to copy with verbal exactness: they all, on the contrary, treated the historical material which they had before them with a certain freedom, and wrought it up in their own writings in accordance with their various aims.

It is questionable if the work quoted for the reign of Joash, מְדַרְשׁ סֵפֶר הַמְּלָכִים (No. 7), is identical with the book of the kings of Israel and Judah, or whether it be not a commentary on it, or perhaps a revision of that book, or of a section of the history of the kings for purposes of edification. The narrative in the Chronicle of the chief events in the reign of Joash, his accession, with the fall of Athaliah, and the repairing of the temple (2 Chronicles 23 and 24), agrees with the account of these events in 2 Kings 11 and 12 where the annals of the kings of Judah are quoted, to such an extent, that both the authors seem to have derived their accounts from the same source, each making extracts according to his peculiar point of view. But the Chronicle recounts, besides this, the fall of Joash into idolatry, the censure of this

defection by the prophet Zechariah, and the defeat of the numerous army of the Jews by a small Syrian host (1 Chronicles 24:15–25); from which, in Bertheau's opinion, we may come, without much hesitation, to the conclusion that the connection of these events had been already very clearly brought forward in a Midrash of that book of Israel and Judah which is quoted elsewhere. This is certainly possible, but it cannot be shown to be more than a possibility; for the further remark of Bertheau, that in the references which occur elsewhere it is not so exactly stated as in 2 Chronicles 24:27 what the contents of the book referred to are, is shown to be erroneous by the citation in 1 Chronicles 33:18 and 19. It cannot, moreover, be denied that the title מְדַרְשׁ סֵפֶר instead of the simple סֵפֶר is surprising, even if, with Ewald, we take מְדַרְשׁ in the sense of "composition" or "writing," and translate it "writing-book" (*Schriftbuch*), which gives ground for supposing that an expository writing is here meant. Even taking the title in this sense, it does not follow with any certainty that the Midrash extended over the whole history of the kings, and still less is it proved that this expository writing may have been used by the chronicler here and there in places where it is not quoted.

So much, however, is certain, that we must not, with Jahn, Movers, Staehelin, and others, hold these annals of the kings of Israel and Judah, which are quoted in the canonical books of Kings and the Chronicle, to be the official records of the acts and undertakings of the kings prepared by the מְזַכְּרִים.⁴ They are rather annalistic national histories composed by prophets, partly from the archives of the kingdom and other public documents, partly from prophetic monographs containing prophecy and history, either composed and continued by various prophets in succession during the existence of both kingdoms, or brought together in a connected form shortly before the ruin of the kingdom out of the then existing contemporary historical documents

and prophetic records. Two circumstances are strongly in favour of the latter supposition. On the one hand, the references to these annals in both kingdoms do not extend to the last kings, but end in the kingdom of Israel with Pekah (2 Kings 15:31), in the kingdom of Judah with Jehoiakim (2 Kings 24:5 and 2 Chronicles 36:8). On the other hand, the formula "until this day" occurs in reference to various events; and since it for the most part refers not to the time of the exile, but to times when the kingdom still existed (cf. 1 Kings 8:8 with 2 Chronicles 5:9; 1 Kings 9:13, 21, with 2 Chronicles 8:8; 1 Kings 12:19 with 2 Chronicles 10:19; 2 Kings 8:22 with 2 Chronicles 21:10, 2 Kings 2:22; 10:27; 14:7, and 16:6), it cannot be from the hand of the authors of our canonical books of Kings and Chronicles, but must have come down to us from the original documents, and is in them possible only if they were written at some shorter or longer period after the events. When Bähr, in the place already quoted, says, on the contrary, that the time shortly before the fall of the kingdom, the time of complete uprooting, would appear to be the time least of all suited for the collection and editing of national year-books, this arises from his not having fully weighed the fact, that at that very time prophets like Jeremiah lived and worked, and, as is clear from the prophecies of Jeremiah, gave much time to the accurate study of the older holy writings.

The book composed by the prophet Isaiah concerning the reign of King Uzziah (9) was a historical work; as was also probably the Midrash of the prophet Iddo (4). But, on the other hand, we cannot believe, as do Ewald, Bertheau, Bähr, and others, that the other prophetic writings enumerated under 1, 2, 3, 6, 12, and 13, were merely parts of the books of the kings of Israel and Judah; for the grounds which are brought forward in support of this view do not appear to us to be tenable, or rather, tend to show that those writings were independent books of prophecy, to which some historical information was appended. 1. The circumstance that it is said of two of those

writings, the Dibre of Jehu and the זִכְרוֹן of Isaiah (6 and 12), that they were incorporated or received into the books of the Kings, does not justify the conclusion "that, since two of the above-named writings are expressly said to be parts of the larger historical work, probably by the others also only parts of this work are meant" (Ew., Berth. S. 34). For in the citations, those writings are not called parts of the book of Kings, but are only said to have been received into it as component parts; and from that it by no means follows that the others, whose reception is not mentioned, were parts of that work. The admission of one writing into another book can only then be spoken of when the book is different from the writing which is received into it. 2. Since some of the writings are denominated דְּבָרֵי of a prophet, from the double meaning of the word דְּבָרִים , *verba* and *res*, this title might be taken in the sense of "events of the prophets," to denote historical writings. But it is much more natural to think, after the analogy of the superscriptions in Amos 1:1, Jer. 1:1, of books of prophecies like the books of Amos and Jeremiah, which contained prophecies and prophetic speeches along with historical information, just as the sections Amos 7:10–17, Jer. 40–45 do, and which differed from our canonical books of prophecies, in which the historical relations are mentioned only in exceptional cases, only by containing more detailed and minute accounts of the historical events which gave occasion to the prophetic utterances. On account of this fulness of historical detail, such prophetic writings, without being properly histories, would yet be for many periods of the history of the kings very abundant sources of history. The above-mentioned difference between our canonical books of prophecy and the books now under discussion is very closely connected with the historical development of a theocracy, which showed itself in general in this, that the action of the older prophets was specially directed to the present, and to *vivâ voce* speaking, while that of those of a later time was more turned towards the future, and the consummation of

the kingdom of God by the Messiah (cf. Küper, *das Prophetenthum des A. Bundes*, 1870, S. 93ff.). This signification of the word דְּבָרִי is, in the present case, placed beyond all doubt by the fact that the writings of other prophets which are mentioned along with these are called נְבוּאָה, חֲזוֹן, and חֲזוֹן, — words which never denote historical writings, but always only prophecies and visions of the prophets. In accordance with this, the חֲזוֹן of Isaiah (12) is clearly distinguished from the writings of the same prophet concerning Uzziah, for which כְּתָב is used; while in the reign of Manasseh, the speeches of Hozai are named along with the events, i.e., the history of the kings of Israel (2 Chronicles 33:18, 19), and a more exact account of what was related about Manasseh in each of these two books is given. From this we learn that the historical book of Kings contained the words which prophets had spoken against Manasseh; while in the writing of the prophet Hozai, of whom we know nothing further, information as to the places where his idolatry was practised, and the images which were the objects of it, was to be found. After all these facts, which speak decidedly against the identification of the prophetic writings cited in the book of Kings with that book itself, the enigmatic לְהַתִּיחֵשׁ, after the formula of quotation, “They are written in the words (speeches) of the prophet Shemaiah and of the seer Iddo” (2 Chronicles 12:15), can naturally not be looked upon as a proof that here prophetic writings are denominated parts of a larger historical work. 3. Nor can we consider it, with Bertheau, decisive, “that for the whole history of David (דְּבָרֵי דָוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ הַרְאִשֵׁנִים) (וְהָאֲחֵרִים), Solomon, Rehoboam, and Jehoshaphat, prophetic writings are referred to; while for the whole history of Asa, Amaziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Josiah, the references are to the book of the kings of Israel and Judah.” From this fact no further conclusion can be drawn than that, in reference to the reigns of some kings the prophetic writings, and in reference to those of others the history of the kingdom,

contained all that was important, and that the history of the kingdom contained also information as to the work of the prophets in the kingdom, while the prophetic writings contained likewise information as to the undertakings of the kings. The latter might contain more detailed accounts in reference to some kings, the former in reference to others; and this very circumstance, or some other reason which cannot now be ascertained by us, may have caused the writer of the Chronicle to refer to the former in reference to one king, and to the latter in reference to another.

Finally, 4. Bähr remarks, S. viii.f.: “Quite a number of sections of our books (of Kings) are found in the Chronicle, where the words are identical, and yet the reference there is to the writings of single definite persons, and not to the three original documents from which the Kings is compiled. Thus, in the first place, in the history of Solomon, in which the sections 2 Chronicles 6:1–40 and 1 Kings 8:12–50, 2 Chronicles 7:7–22 and 1 Kings 8:64–9:9, 2 Chronicles 8:2–10:17 and 1 Kings 9:17–23:26, 2 Chronicles 9:1–28 and 1 Kings 10:1–28, etc., are identical, the Chronicle refers not to the book of the history of Solomon (as 1 Kings 11:41), but to the דְּבָרֵי of the prophet Nathan, etc. (2 Chronicles 9:29); consequently the book of the history of Solomon must either have been compiled from those three prophetic writings, or at least have contained considerable portions of them. The case is identical with the second of the original documents, the book of the history of the kings of Judah (1 Kings 14:29 and elsewhere). The narrative as to Rehoboam is identical in 2 Chronicles 10:1–19 and 1 Kings 12:1–19, as also in 2 Chronicles 1:1–4 and 1 Kings 12:20–24; further, in 2 Chronicles 12:13f. as compared with 1 Kings 14:21f.; but the history of the kings of Judah is not mentioned as an authority, as is the case in 1 Kings 14:29, but the דְּבָרֵי of the prophet Shemaiah and the seer Iddo (2 Chronicles 12:15). In the history of King Abijah we are referred, in the very short account, 1 Kings 15:1–8, for further information to the book of the history of the kings of Judah;

while the Chronicle, on the contrary, which gives further information, quotes from the מְדַרְשׁ of the prophet Iddo (2 Chronicles 13:22). The case is similar in the history of the kings Uzziah and Manasseh: our author refers in reference to both to the book of the kings of Judah (2 Kings 15:6; 20:17); the chronicler quotes, for the first the כְּתָב of the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz (2 Chronicles 26:22), for the latter דְּבַרֵי חוֹזֵי (2 Chronicles 33:19). By all these quotations it is satisfactorily shown that the book of the kings of Judah is compiled from the historical writings of various prophets or seers." But this conclusion is neither valid nor necessary. It is not valid, for this reason, that the Chronicle, besides the narratives concerning the reigns of Rehoboam, Abijah, Uzziah, and Manasseh, which it has in common with the books of Kings, and which are in some cases identical, contains a whole series of narratives peculiar to itself, which perhaps were not contained at all in the larger historical work on the kings of Judah, or at least were not there so complete as in the special prophetic writings cited by the chronicler. As to Solomon also, the Chronicle has something peculiar to itself which is not found in the book of Kings. Nor is the conclusion necessary; for from a number of identical passages in our canonical books of Kings and Chronicles, the only certain conclusion which can be drawn is, that these narratives were contained in the authorities quoted by both writers, but not that the variously named authorities form one and the same work.

By all this we are justified in maintaining the view, that the writings quoted by the author of the Chronicle under the titles, Words, Prophecy, Visions of this and that prophet, with the exception of the two whose incorporation with the book of Kings is specially mentioned, lay before him as writings separate and distinct from the "Books of the Kings of Israel and Judah," that these writings were also in the hands of many of his contemporaries, and that he could refer his readers to them. On this supposition, we can comprehend the change in

the titles of the works quoted; while on the contrary supposition, that the special prophetic writings quoted were parts of the larger history of the kings of Israel and Judah, it remains inexplicable. But the references of the chronicler are not to be understood as if all he relates, for example, of the reign of David was contained in the words of the seer Samuel, of the prophet Nathan, and of the seer Gad, the writings he quotes for that reign. He may, as Berth. S. xxxviii. has already remarked, "have made use also of authorities which he did not feel called upon to name,"—as, for example, the lists of David's heroes, 1 Chronicles 11:10–47, and of those who gave in their adherence to David before the death of Saul, and who anointed him king in Hebron, 1 Chronicles 12. Such also are the catalogues of the leaders of the host, of the princes of the tribes, and the stewards of the royal domains, 1 Chronicles 27; of the fathers'-houses of the Levites, and the divisions of the priests, Levites, and singers, etc., 1 Chronicles 23–26. These lists contain records to whose sources he did not need to refer, even if he had extracted them from the public annals of the kingdom during the reign of David, because he has embodied them in their integrity in his book.

But our canonical books of Samuel and Kings are by no means to be reckoned among the sources possibly used besides the writings which are quoted. It cannot well be denied that the author of the Chronicle knew these books; but that he has used them as authorities, as de Wette, Movers, Ewald, and others think, we must, with Bertheau and Dillmann, deny. The single plausible ground which is usually brought forward to prove the use of these writings, is the circumstance that the Chronicle contains many narratives corresponding to those found in the books of Samuel and Kings, and often verbally identical with them. But that is fully accounted for by the fact that the chronicler used the same more detailed writings as the authors of the books of Samuel and Kings, and has extracted the narratives in question, partly with verbal accuracy, partly with some small alterations, from them. Against

the supposition that the above-named canonical books were used by the chronicler, we may adduce the facts that the chronicle, even in those corresponding passages, differs in many ways as to names and events from the account in those books, and that it contains, on an average, more than they do, as will be readily seen on an exact comparison of the parallel sections. Other and much weaker grounds for believing that the books of Samuel and Kings were used by the chronicler, are refuted in my *Handbook of Introduction*, § 141, 2; and in it, at § 139, is to be found a synoptical arrangement of the parallel sections.

The Historical Character of the Chronicles.

The historic truth or credibility of the books of the Chronicle, which de Wette, in the *Beitr. zur Einleit.* 1806, violently attacked, in order to get rid of the evidence of the Chronicle for the Mosaic origin of the Sinaitic legislation, is now again in the main generally recognised.⁵ The care with which the chronicler has used his authorities may be seen, on a comparison of the narratives common to the Chronicle with the books of Samuel and Kings, not only from the fact that in these parallel sections the story of the chronicler agrees in all essential points with the accounts of these books, but also from the variations which are to be met with. For these variations, in respect to their matter, give us in many ways more accurate and fuller information, and in every other respect are of a purely formal kind, in great part affecting only the language and style of expression, or arising from the hortatory-didactic aim of the narrative. But this hortatory aim has nowhere had a prejudicial effect on the objective truth of the statement of historical facts, as appears on every hand on deeper and more attentive observation, but has only imparted to the history a more subjective impress, as compared with the objective style of the books of Kings.

Now, since the parallel places are of such a character, we are, as Bertheau and Dillmann frankly acknowledge, justified in believing that the author of the Chronicle, in the

communication of narratives not elsewhere to be found in the Old Testament, has followed his authorities very closely, and that not only the many registers which we find in his work—the lists in 1 Chronicles 12, 23–26, 27; the catalogue of cities fortified by Rehoboam, 2 Chronicles 11:6–12; the family intelligence, 1 Chronicles 11:18–23; 21:2, and such matters—have been communicated in exact accordance with his authorities, but also the accounts of the wars of Rehoboam, Abijah, Jehoshaphat (1 Chronicles 20), Amaziah, etc. Only here and there, Bertheau thinks, has he used the opportunity offered to him to treat the history in a freer way, so as to represent the course of the more weighty events, and such as specially attracted his attention, according to his own view. This appears especially, he says (1) in the account of the speeches of David, 1 Chronicles 13:2f., 15:12f., 28:2–10, 20f., 29:1–5 and 10–19, where, too, there occur statements of the value of the precious metals destined for the building of the temple (1 Chronicles 29:4, 7), which clearly do not rest upon truthful historical recollection, and can by no means have been derived from a trustworthy source; as also in the reports of those of Abijah (2 Chronicles 13:5–10) and of Asa (1 Chronicles 14:10, etc.); then (2) in the description of the religious ceremonies and feasts (1 Chronicles 15 and 16; 2 Chronicles 5:1–7:10, 1 Chronicles 29–31, 1 Chronicles 35): for in both speeches and descriptions expressions and phrases constantly recur which may be called current expressions with the chronicler. Yet these speeches stand quite on a level with those of Solomon, 2 Chronicles 1:8–10, 1 Chronicles 6:4–11, 12–42, which are also to be found in the books of Kings (1 Chronicles 3:6–9, 1 Chronicles 8:14–53), from which it is to be inferred that the author here has not acted quite independently, but that in this respect also older histories may have served him as a model. But even in these descriptions information is not lacking which must rest upon a more accurate historical recollection, e.g., the names in 1 Chronicles 15:5–11, 17–24; the statement as to the small number of priests,

and the help given to them by the Levites, in 2 Chronicles 29:14f., 30:17. Yet we must, beyond doubt, believe that the author of the Chronicle “has in these descriptions transferred that which had become established custom in his own time, and which according to general tradition rested upon ancient ordinance, without hesitation, to an earlier period.”

Of these two objections so much is certainly correct, that in the speeches of the persons acting in the history, and in the descriptions of the religious feasts, the freer handling of the authorities appears most strongly; but no alterations of the historical circumstances, nor additions in which the circumstances of the older time have been unhistorically represented according to the ideas or the taste of the post-exilic age, can, even here, be anywhere pointed out. With regard, first of all, to the speeches in the Chronicle, they are certainly not given according to the sketches or written reports of the hearers, but sketched and composed by the historian according to a truthful tradition of the fundamental thoughts. For although, in all the speeches of the Chronicle, certain current and characteristic expressions and phrases of the author of this book plainly occur, yet it is just as little doubtful that the speeches of the various persons are essentially different from one another in their thoughts, and characteristic images and words. By this fact it is placed beyond doubt that they have not been put into the mouths of the historical persons either by the chronicler or by the authors of the original documents upon which he relies, but have been composed according to the reports or written records of the ear-witnesses. For if we leave out of consideration the short sayings or words of the various persons, such as 1 Chronicles 11:1f., 12:12f., 15:12f., etc., which contain nothing characteristic, there are in the Chronicle only three longer speeches of King David (1 Chronicles 22:7–16; 28:2–10, 12–22, and 29:1–5), all of which have reference to the transfer of the kingdom to his son Solomon, and in great part treat, on the basis of the divine promise (2 Sam. 7 and 1 Chronicles 17), of the building of

the temple, and the preparations for this work. In these speeches the peculiarities of the chronicler come so strongly into view, in contents and form, in thought and language, that we must believe them to be free representations of the thoughts which in those days moved the soul of the grey-haired king. But if we compare with these David’s prayer (1 Chronicles 29:10–19), we find in it not only that multiplication of the predicates of God which is so characteristic of David (cf. Ps. 18), but also, in vv. 11 and 15, definite echoes of the Davidic psalms. The speech of Abijah, again, against the apostate Israel (2 Chronicles 13:4–12), moves, on the whole, within the circle of thought usual with the chronicler, but contains in v. 7 expressions such as *בְּנֵי בְּלִיעַל* and *אֲנָשִׁים רָקִים*, which are quite foreign to the language of the Chronicle, and belong to the times of David and Solomon, and consequently point to sources contemporaneous with the events. The same thing is true of Hezekiah’s speech (2 Chronicles 32:7, 8), in which the expression *זְרוֹעַ בְּשָׂר*, “the arm of flesh,” recalls the intimacy of this king with the prophet Isaiah (cf. Isa. 31:3). The sayings and speeches of the prophets, on the contrary, are related much more in their original form. Take, for instance, the remarkable speech of Azariah ben Oded to King Asa (2 Chronicles 15:1–7), which, on account of its obscurity, has been very variously explained, and which, as is well known, is the foundation of the announcement made by Christ of the destruction of Jerusalem and the last judgment (Matt. 24:6, 7; Luke 21:19). As C. P. Caspari (*der syrisch-ephraimit. Krieg.*, Christiania 1849, S. 54) has already remarked, it is so peculiar, and bears so little of the impress of the Chronicle, that it is impossible that it can have been produced by the chronicler himself: it must have been taken over by him from his authorities almost without alteration. From this one speech, whose contents he could hardly have reproduced accurately in his own words, and which he has consequently left almost unaltered, we can see clearly enough that the chronicler has taken over the speeches he

communicates with fidelity, so far as their contents are concerned, and has only clothed them formally, more or less, in his own language. This treatment of the speeches in the Chronicle is, however, not a thing peculiar and confined to the author of this book, but is, as Delitzsch has shown (*Isaiah*, p. 17ff. tr.), common to all the biblical historians; for even in the prophecies in the books of Samuel and Kings distinct traces are observable throughout of the influence of the narrator, and they bear more or less visibly upon them in impress of the writer who reproduces them, without their historical kernel being thereby affected.

Now the historical truth of the events is just as little interfered with by the circumstance that the author of the Chronicle works out rhetorically the descriptions of the celebration of the holy feasts, represents in detail the offering of the sacrifices, and has spoken in almost all of these descriptions of the musical performances of the Levites and priests. The conclusion which has been drawn from this, that he has here without hesitation transferred to an earlier time that which had become established custom in his own time, would only then be correct if the restoration of the sacrificial worship according to the ordinance of Leviticus, or the introduction of instrumental music and the singing of psalms, dated only from the time of the exile, as de Wette, Gramberg, and others have maintained. If, on the contrary, these arrangements and regulations be of Mosaic, and in a secondary sense of Davidic origin, then the chronicler has not transferred the customs and usages of his own time to the times of David, Asa, Hezekiah, and others, but has related what actually occurred under these circumstances, only giving to the description an individual colouring. Take, for example, the hymn (1 Chronicles 16:8–36) which David caused to be sung by Asaph and his brethren in praise of the Lord, after the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem into the tabernacle prepared for it (1 Chronicles 16:7). If it was not composed by David for this ceremony, but has been substituted by the chronicler, in his endeavour to represent the

matter in a vivid way, from among the psalms sung in his own time on such solemn occasions, for the psalm which was then sung, but which was not communicated by his authority, nothing would be altered in the historical fact that then for the first time, by Asaph and his brethren, God was praised in psalms; for the psalm given adequately expresses the sentiments and feelings which animated the king and the assembled congregation at that solemn festival. To give another example: the historical details of the last assembly of princes which David held (1 Chronicles 28) are not altered if David did not go over with his son Solomon, one by one, all the matters regarding the temple enumerated in 1 Chronicles 28:11–19.

There now remains, therefore, only some records of numbers in the Chronicle which are decidedly too large to be considered either accurate or credible. Such are the sums of gold mentioned in 1 Chronicles 22:14 and 29:4, 7, which David had collected for the building of the temple, and which the princes of the tribes expended for this purpose; the statements as to the greatness of the armies of Abijah and Jeroboam, of the number of the Israelites who fell in battle (2 Chronicles 13:3, 17), of the number of King Asa's army and that of the Cushites (2 Chronicles 14:7f.), of the military force of Jehoshaphat (2 Chronicles 17:14–18), and of the women and children who were led away captive under Ahaz (2 Chronicles 28:8). But these numbers cannot shake the historical credibility of the Chronicle in general, because they are too isolated, and differ too greatly from statements of the Chronicle in other places which are in accordance with fact. To estimate provisionally and in general these surprising statements, the more exact discussion of which belongs to the Commentary, we must consider, (1) that they all contain round numbers, in which thousands only are taken into account, and are consequently not founded upon any exact enumeration, but only upon an approximate estimate of contemporaries, and attest nothing more than that the greatness of the armies, and the multitude of those who had

fallen in battle or were taken prisoner, was estimated at so high a number; (2) that the actual amount of the mass of gold and silver which had been collected by David for the building of the temple cannot with certainty be reckoned, because we are ignorant of the weight of the shekel of that time; and (3) that the correctness of the numbers given is very doubtful, since it is indubitably shown, by a great number of passages of the Old Testament, that the Hebrews have from the earliest times expressed their numbers not by words, but by letters, and consequently omissions might very easily occur, or errors arise, in copying or writing out in words the sums originally written in letters. Such textual errors are so manifest in not a few places, that their existence cannot be doubted; and that not merely in the books of the Chronicle, but in all the historical books of the Old Testament. The Philistines, according to 1 Sam. 13:5, for example, brought 30,000 chariots and 6000 horsemen into the field; and according to 1 Sam. 6:19, God smote of the people at Beth-shemesh 50,070 men. With respect to these statements, all commentators are now agreed that the numbers 30,000 and 50,000 are incorrect, and have come into the text by errors of the copyists; and that instead of 30,000 chariots there were originally only 1000, or at most 3000, spoken of, and that the 50,000 in the second passage is an ancient gloss. There is, moreover, at present no doubt among investigators of Scripture, that in 1 Kings 5:6 (in English version, 4:26) the number 40,000 (stalls) is incorrect, and that instead of it, according to 2 Chronicles 9:25, 4000 should be read; and further, that the statement of the age of King Ahaziah at 42 years (2 Chronicles 22:22), instead of 22 years (2 Kings 8:26), has arisen by an interchange of the numeral signs ד and ב . A similar case is to be found in Ezra 2:69, compared with Neh. 7:70–72, where, according to Ezra, the chiefs of the people gave 61,000 darics for the restoration of the temple, and according to Nehemiah only 41,000 (viz., 1000 + 20,000 + 20,000). In both of these chapters a

multitude of differences is to be found in reference to the number of the exiled families who returned from Babylon, which can only be explained on the supposition of the numeral letters having been confounded. But almost all these different statements of numbers are to be found in the oldest translation of the Old Testament, that of the LXX, from which it appears that they had made their way into the MSS before the settlement of the Hebrew text by the Masoretes, and that consequently the use of letters as numeral signs was customary in the pre-Masoretic times. This use of the letters is attested and presupposed as generally known by both Hieronymus and the rabbins, and is confirmed by the Maccabean coins. That it is a primeval custom, and reaches back into the times of the composition of the biblical books, is clear from this fact, that the employment of the alphabet as numeral signs among the Greeks coincides with the Hebrew alphabet. This presupposes that the Greeks received, along with the alphabet, at the same time the use of the letters as numeral signs from the Semites (Phoenicians or Hebrews). The custom of writing the numbers in words, which prevails in the Masoretic text of the Bible, was probably first introduced by the Masoretes in settling the rules for the writing of the sacred books of the canon, or at least then became law.

After all these facts, we may conclude the Introduction to the books of the Chronicle, feeling assured of our result, that the books, in regard to their historical contents, notwithstanding the hortatory-didactic aim of the author in bringing the history before us, have been composed with care and fidelity according to the authorities, and are fully deserving of belief.

As to the exegetical literature, see my *Handbook of Introduction*, § 138.

1 Chronicles 1**Genealogies, with Historical and Topographical Notes.—Ch. 1–9.**

1 Chronicles 1–9. In order to show the connection of the tribal ancestors of Israel with the peoples of the earth, in 1 Chronicles 1 are enumerated the generations of the primeval world, from Adam till the Flood, and those of the post-diluvians to Abraham and his sons, according to the accounts in Genesis; in 1 Chronicles 2–8, the twelve tribal ancestors of the people of Israel, and the most important families of the twelve tribes, are set down; and finally, in 1 Chronicles 9, we have a list of the former inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the genealogical table of King Saul. The enumeration of the tribes and families of Israel forms, accordingly, the chief part of the contents of this first part of the Chronicle, to which the review of the families and tribes of the primeval time and the early days of Israel form the introduction, and the information as to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the family of King Saul the conclusion and the transition, to the following historical narrative. Now, if we glance at the order in which the genealogies of the tribes of Israel are ranged,—*Viz.* (*a*) those of the families of Judah and of the house of David, 1 Chronicles 2:1–4:23; (*b*) those of the tribe of Simeon, with an account of their dwelling-place, 1 Chronicles 4:24–43; (*c*) those of the trans-Jordanic tribes, Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, 1 Chronicles 5:1–26; (*d*) of the tribe of Levi, or the priests and Levites, 1 Chronicles 5:27–6:66; (*e*) of the remaining tribes, *viz.*, Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, cis-Jordanic Manasseh, Ephraim, and Asher, 1 Chronicles 7; and of some still remaining families of Benjamin, with the family of Saul, 1 Chronicles 8, —it is at once seen that this arrangement is the result of regarding the tribes from two points of view, which are closely connected with each other. On the one hand, regard is had to the historical position which the tribes took up, according to the order of birth of their tribal ancestors, and which they obtained by divine promise and guidance; on

the other hand, the geographical position of their inheritance has been also taken into account. That regard to the historical position and importance of the tribes was mainly determinative, is plain from the introductory remarks to the genealogies of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chronicles 5:1, 2, to the effect that Reuben was the first-born of Israel, but that, because of his offence against his father's bed, his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph, although they are not specified as possessors of it in the family registers; while it is narrated that Judah, on the contrary, came to power among his brethren, and that out of Judah had come forth the prince over Israel. Judah is therefore placed at the head of the tribes, as that one out of which God chose the king over His people; and Simeon comes next in order, because they had received their inheritance within the tribal domain of Judah. Then follows Reuben as the first-born, and after him are placed Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh, because they had received their inheritance along with Reuben on the other side of the Jordan. After Reuben, according to age, only Levi could follow, and then after Levi come in order the other tribes. The arrangement of them, however—Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Asher, and again Benjamin—is determined from neither the historical nor by the geographical point of view, but probably lay ready to the hand of the chronicler in the document used by him, as we are justified in concluding from the character of all these geographical and topographical lists. For if we consider the character of these lists somewhat more carefully, we find that they are throughout imperfect in their contents, and fragmentary in their plan and execution. The imperfection in the contents shows itself in this, that no genealogies of the tribes of Dan and Zebulun are given at all, only the sons of Naphtali being mentioned (1 Chronicles 7:13); of the half tribe of Manasseh beyond Jordan we have only the names of some heads of fathers'-houses⁶ (1 Chronicles 5:24); and even in the relatively copious lists of the tribes of Judah, Levi, and Benjamin, only the genealogies of

single prominent families of these tribes are enumerated. In Judah, little more is given than the families descended from Pharez, 1 Chronicles 2:5–4:20, and a few notices of the family of Shelah; of Levi, none are noticed but the succession of generations in the high-priestly line of Aaron, some descendants of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, and the three Levites, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, set over the service of song; while of Benjamin we have only the genealogies of three families, and of the family of Saul, which dwelt at Gibeon. But the incompleteness of these registers comes still more prominently into view when we turn our attention to the extent of the genealogical lists, and see that only in the cases of the royal house of David and the high-priestly line of Eleazar do the genealogies reach to the Babylonian exile, and a few generations beyond that point; while all the others contain the succession of generations for only short periods. Then, again, in regard to their plan and execution, these genealogies are not only unsymmetrical in the highest degree, but they are in many cases fragmentary. In the tribe of Judah, besides the descendants of David, 1 Chronicles 3, two quite independent genealogies of the families of Judah are given, in 1 Chronicles 2 and 4:1–23. The same is the case with the two genealogies of the Levites, the lists in 1 Chronicles 6 differing from those in 1 Chronicles 5:27–41 surprisingly, in 6:1, 28, 47, 56, Levi's eldest son being called Gershom, while in 1 Chronicles 5:27 and 1 Chronicles 23:61, and in the Pentateuch, he is called Gershon. Besides this, there is in 1 Chronicles 6:35–38 a fragment containing the names of some of Aaron's descendants, who had been already completely enumerated till the Babylonian exile in 1 Chronicles 5:29–41. In the genealogies of Benjamin, too, the family of Saul is twice entered, viz., in 1 Chronicles 8:29–40 and in 1 Chronicles 9:35–44. The genealogies of the remaining tribes are throughout defective in the highest degree. Some consist merely of an enumeration of a number of heads of houses or families, with mention of their dwelling-place: as, for instance, the genealogies of Simeon, 1

Chronicles 4:24–43; of Reuben, Gad, half Manasseh, 1 Chronicles 5:1–24; and Ephraim, 1 Chronicles 7:28, 29. Others give only the number of men capable of bearing arms belonging to the individual fathers' houses, as those of Issachar, Benjamin, and Asher, 1 Chronicles 7:2–5, 7–11, 40; and finally, of the longer genealogical lists of Judah and Benjamin, those in 1 Chronicles 4:1–20 and in 1 Chronicles 8 consist only of fragments, loosely ranged one after the other, giving us the names of a few of the posterity of individual men, whose genealogical connection with the larger divisions of these tribes is not stated.

By all this, it is satisfactorily proved that all these registers and lists have not been derived from one larger genealogical historical work, but have been drawn together from various old genealogical lists which single races and families had saved and carried with them into exile, and preserved until their return into the land of their fathers; and that the author of the Chronicle has received into his work all of these that he could obtain, whether complete or imperfect, just as he found them. Nowhere is any trace of artificial arrangement or an amalgamation of the various lists to be found.

Now, when we recollect that the Chronicle was composed in the time of Ezra, and that up to that time, of the whole people, for the most part only households and families of the tribes of Judah, Levi, and Benjamin had returned to Canaan, we will not find it wonderful that the Chronicle contains somewhat more copious registers of these three tribes, and gives us only fragments bearing on the circumstances of prae-exilic times in the case of the remaining tribes.

The Families of Primeval Time, and of the Antiquity of Israel.

1 Chronicles 1:1–4. *The patriarchs from Adam to Noah and his sons.*—The names of the ten patriarchs of the primeval world, from the Creation to the Flood, and the three sons of Noah, are given according to Gen. 5, and grouped together without any link of

connection whatever: it is assumed as known from Genesis, that the first ten names denote generations succeeding one another, and that the last three, on the contrary, are the names of brethren.

1 Chronicles 1:5–23. *The peoples and races descended from the sons of Noah.*—These are enumerated according to the table in Gen. 10; but our author has omitted not only the introductory and concluding remarks (Ge. 10:1, 21, 32), but also the historical notices of the founding of a kingdom in Babel by Nimrod, and the distribution of the Japhetites and Shemites in their dwelling-places (Gen. 10:5, 9–12, 18b20, and 30 and 31). The remaining divergences are partly orthographic,—such as תַּבְּת, v. 5, for תּוֹבֵל, Gen. 10:2, and רַעְמָא, v. 9, for רַעְמָה, Gen. 10:7; and partly arising from errors of transcription,—as, for example, דִּיפַת, v. 6, for רִיפַת, Gen. 10:3, and conversely, רוֹדְנִים, v. 7, for דְּדִנִים, Gen. 10:4, where it cannot with certainty be determined which form is the original and correct one; and finally, are partly due to a different pronunciation or form of the same name,—as תַּרְשִׁישָׁה, v. 7, for תַּרְשִׁישַׁי, Gen. 10:4, the *ā* of motion having been gradually fused into one word with the name, לוֹדִיִּים, v. 11, for לוֹדִים, Gen. 10:13, just as in Amos 9:7 we have כּוּשִׁים for כּוּשִׁיִּים; in v. 22, עֹבֵל for עֵיבֵל, Gen. 10:28, where the LXX have also Εὐάλ, and מִשְׁדָּה, v. 17, for מִשָּׁה, Gen. 10:23, which last has not yet been satisfactorily explained, since מִשְׁדָּה is used in Ps. 120:5 with קְדָר of an Arabian tribe.

Finally, there is wanting in v. 17 וּבְנֵי אָרַם before עֹזַי, Gen. 10:23, because, as in the case of Noah's sons, v. 4, where their relationship is not mentioned, so also in reference to the peoples descended from Shem, the relationship subsisting between the names Uz, Hul, etc., and Aram, is supposed to be already known from Genesis. Other suppositions as to the omission of the words וּבְנֵי אָרַם are improbable. That this

register of seventy-one persons and tribes, descended from Shem, Ham, and Japhet, has been taken from Gen. 10, is placed beyond doubt, by the fact that not only the names of our register exactly correspond with the table in Gen. 10, with the exception of the few variations above mentioned, but also the plan and form of both registers is quite the same. In vv. 5–9 the sections of the register are connected, as in Gen. 10:2–7, by וּבְנֵי; from v. 10 onwards by יָלַד, as in Gen. v. 8; in v. 17, again, by וּבְנֵי, as in Gen. v. 22; and in v. 18 by יָלַד, and v. 19 by יָלַד, as in Gen. vv. 24 and 25. The historical and geographical explanation of the names has been given in the commentary to Gen. 10. According to Bertheau, the peoples descended from the sons of Noah amount to seventy, and fourteen of these are enumerated as descendants of Japhet, thirty of Ham, and twenty-six of Shem. These numbers he arrives at by omitting Nimrod, or not enumerating him among the sons of Ham; while, on the contrary, he takes Arphaxad, Shelah, Eber, Peleg, and Joktan, all of which are the names of persons, for names of people, in contradiction to Genesis, according to which the five names indicate persons, viz., the tribal ancestors of the Terahites and Joktanites, peoples descended from Eber by Peleg and Joktan.

1 Chronicles 1:24–27. *The patriarchs from Shem to Abraham.*—The names of these, again, are simply ranged in order according to Gen. 11:10–26, while the record of their ages before the begetting and after the birth of sons is omitted. Of the sons of Terah only Abram is named, without his brothers; with the remark that Abram is Abraham, in order to point out to the reader that he was the progenitor of the chosen people so well known from Genesis (cf. Gen. 17).

1 Chronicles 1:28–34. *The sons of Abraham.*—In v. 28 only Isaac and Ishmael are so called; Isaac first, as the son of the promise. Then, in vv. 29–31, follow the posterity of Ishmael, with the remark that Ishmael was the first-born; in

vv. 32 and 33, the sons of Keturah; and finally in v. 34, the two sons of Isaac.

1 Chronicles 1:29ff. The names of the generations (תולדות) of Ishmael (Hebr. Yishma'el) correspond to those in Gen. 25:12–15, and have been there explained. In v. 32f. also, the names of the thirteen descendants of Abraham by Keturah, six sons and seven grandsons, agree with Gen. 25:1–4 (see commentary on that passage); only the tribes mentioned in Gen. 25:3, which were descended from Dedan the grandson of Keturah, are omitted. From this Bertheau wrongly concludes that the chronicler probably did not find these names in his copy of the Pentateuch. The reason of the omission is rather this, that in Genesis the great-grandchildren are not themselves mentioned, but only the tribes descended from the grandchildren, while the chronicler wished to enumerate only the sons and grandsons. Keturah is called פִּילְגֶשֶׁת after Gen. 25:6, where Keturah and Hagar are so named.

1 Chronicles 1:34. The two sons of Isaac. Isaac has been already mentioned as a son of Abram, along with Ishmael, in v. 28. But here the continuation of the genealogy of Abraham is prefaced by the remark that Abraham begat Isaac, just as in Gen. 25:19, where the begetting of Isaac the son of Abraham is introduced with the same remark. Hence the supposition that the registers of the posterity of Abraham by Hagar and Keturah (vv. 28–33) have been derived from Gen. 25, already in itself so probable, becomes a certainty.

1 Chronicles 1:35–42. *The posterity of Esau and Seir.*—An extract from Gen. 36:1–30. V. 35. The five sons of Esau are the same who, according to Gen. 36:4f., were born to him of his three wives in the land of Canaan. יְעִישׁ is another form of יַעֲשָׂב, Gen. v. 5 (Kethibh).

1 Chronicles 1:36, 37. The grandchildren of Esau. In v. 36 there are first enumerated five sons of his son Eliphaz, as in Gen. 36:11, for צָפִי is only another form of צָפֹו (Gen.). Next to these five names are ranged in addition וְתַמְנֵעַ וְעַמְלִיק,

“Timna and Amalek,” while we learn from Gen. 36:12 that Timna was a concubine of Eliphaz, who bore to him Amalek. The addition of the two names *Timna* and *Amalek* in the Chronicle thus appears to be merely an abbreviation, which the author might well allow himself, as the posterity of Esau were known to his readers from Genesis. The name Timna, too, by its form (a feminine formation), must have guarded against the idea of some modern exegetes that Timna was also a son of Eliphaz. Thus, then, Esau had through Eliphaz six grandchildren, who in Gen. 36:12 are all set down as sons of Adah, the wife of Esau and the mother of Eliphaz. (*Vide* com. to Gen. 36:12, where the change of Timna into a son of Eliphaz is rejected as a misinterpretation.)

1 Chronicles 1:37. To Reuel, the son of Esau by Bashemath, four sons were born, whose names correspond to those in Gen. 36:13. These ten (6 + 4) grandsons of Esau were, with his three sons by Aholibamah (Jeush, Jaalam, and Korah, v. 35), the founders of the thirteen tribes of the posterity of Esau. They are called in Gen. 36:15 אֲלֹפִי בְנֵי עֵשָׂו, heads of tribes (φύλαρχοι) of the children of Esau, i.e., of the Edomites, but are all again enumerated, vv. 15–19, singly.⁷

1 Chronicles 1:38–42. When Esau with his descendants had settled in Mount Seir, they subdued by degrees the aboriginal inhabitants of the land, and became fused with them into one people. For this reason, in Gen. 36:20–30 the tribal princes of the Seirite inhabitants of the land are noticed; and in our chapter also, v. 38, the names of these seven בְּנֵי שְׂעִיר, and in vv. 39–42 of their sons (eighteen men and one woman, Timna), are enumerated, where only Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, also mentioned in Gen. 36:25, is omitted. The names correspond, except in a few unimportant points, which have been already discussed in the Commentary on Genesis. The inhabitants of Mount Seir consisted, then, after the immigration of Esau and his descendants, of twenty tribes under a like number of phylarchs, thirteen of whom were Edomite, of the family of Esau, and seven Seirite, who are called in the

Chronicle **בְּנֵי שְׂעִיר**, and in Genesis **חַרִי**, Troglodytes, inhabitants of the land, that is, aborigines.

If we glance over the whole posterity of Abraham as they are enumerated in vv. 28–42, we see that it embraces *9a*) his sons Ishmael and Isaac, and Isaac's sons Israel and Esau (together 4 persons); *(b)* the sons of Ishmael, or the tribes descended from Ishmael (12 names); *(c)* the sons and grandsons of Keturah (13 persons or chiefs); *(d)* the thirteen phylarchs descended from Esau; *(e)* the seven Seirite phylarchs, and eighteen grandsons and a granddaughter of Seir (26 persons). We have thus in all the names of sixty-eight persons, and to them we must add Keturah, and Timna the concubine of Eliphaz, before we get seventy persons. But these seventy must not by any means be reckoned as seventy tribes, which is the result Bertheau arrives at by means of strange calculations and errors in numbers.⁸ Upon this conclusion he founds his hypothesis, that as the three branches of the family of Noah are divided into seventy peoples (which, as we have seen at p. 402f., is not the case), so also the three branches of the family of Abraham are divided into seventy tribes; and in this again he finds a remarkable indication “that even in the time of the chronicler, men sought by means of numbers to bring order and consistency into the lists of names handed down by tradition from the ancient times.”

1 Chronicles 1:43–50. *The kings of Edom* before the introduction of the kingship into Israel.—This is a verbally exact repetition of Gen. 36:31–39, except that the introductory formula, Gen. v. 32, “and there reigned in Edom,” which is superfluous after the heading, and the addition “ben Achbor” (Gen. v. 39) in the account of the death of Baal-hanan in v. 50, are omitted; the latter because even in Genesis, where mention is made of the death of other kings, the name of the father of the deceased king is not repeated. Besides this, the king called Hadad (v. 46f.), and the city **פְּטִי** (v. 50), are in Genesis Hadar (v. 35f.) and **פְּעוּ** (v. 39).

The first of these variations has arisen from a transcriber's error, the other from a different pronunciation of the name. A somewhat more important divergence, however, appears, when in Gen. v. 39 the death of the king last named is not mentioned, because he was still alive in the time of Moses; while in the Chronicle, on the contrary, not only of him also is it added, **וַיָּמָת הַדָּד**, because at the time of the writing of the Chronicle he had long been dead, but the list of the names of the territories of the phylarchs, which in Genesis follows the introductory formula **וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת**, is here connected with the enumeration of the kings by **וַיָּהִי**, “Hadad died, and there were chiefs of Edom.” This may mean that, in the view of the chronicler, the reign of the phylarchs took the place of the kingship after the death of the last king, but that interpretation is by no means necessary. The **וַיָּהִי** consec. may also merely express the succession of thought, only connecting logically the mention of the princes with the enumeration of the kings; or it may signify that, besides the kings, there were also tribal princes who could rule the land and people. The contents of the register which follows require that **וַיָּהִי** should be so understood.

1 Chronicles 1:51–54. *The princes of Edom.*—The names correspond to those in Gen. 36:40–43, but the heading and the subscription in Genesis are quite different from those in the Chronicle. Here the heading is, “and the Allufim of Edom were,” and the subscription, “these are the Allufim of Edom,” from which it would be the natural conclusion that the eleven names given are proper names of the phylarchs. But the occurrence of two female names, Timna and Aholibamah, as also of names which are unquestionably those of races, e.g., Aliah, Pinon, Teman, and Mibzar, is irreconcilable with this interpretation. If we compare the heading and subscription of the register in Genesis, we find that the former speaks of the names “of the Allufim of Edom according to their habitations,⁹ according to their places in their names,” and the latter of “the Allufim of Edom according to

their habitations in the land of their possession." It is there unambiguously declared that the names enumerated are not the names of persons, but the names of the dwelling-places of the Allufim, after whom they were wont to be named. We must therefore translate, "the Alluf of Timna, the Alluf of Aliah," etc., when of course the female names need not cause any surprise, as places can just as well receive their names from women as their possessors as from men. Nor is there any greater difficulty in this, that only eleven dwelling-places are mentioned, while, on the contrary, the thirteen sons and grandsons of Esau are called Allufim. For in the course of time the number of phylarchs might have decreased, or in the larger districts two phylarchs may have dwelt together. Since the author of the Chronicle has taken this register also from Genesis, as the identity of the names clearly shows he did, he might safely assume that the matter was already known from that book, and so might allow himself to abridge the heading without fearing any misunderstanding; seeing, too, that he does not enumerate אֱלוֹפֵי of Esau, but אֱלוֹפֵי אֲדוֹם, and Edom had become the name of a country and a people.

1 Chronicles 2

Ch. 2–4:23.—The Twelve Sons of Israel and the Families of Judah.

1 Chronicles 2:1–4:23. The list of the twelve sons of Israel (1 Chronicles 2:1, 2) serves as foundation and starting-point for the genealogies of the tribes of Israel which follow, 1 Chronicles 2:3–8. The enumeration of the families of the tribe of Judah commences in v. 3 with the naming of Judah's sons, and extends to 1 Chronicles 4:23. The tribe of Judah has issued from the posterity of only three of the five sons of Judah, viz., from Shelah, Pharez, and Zerah; but it was subdivided into five great families, as Hezron and Hamul, the two sons of Pharez, also founded families. The lists of our three chapters give us: (1) from the family of Zerah only the names of some famous men (1 Chronicles 2:6–

8); (2) the descendants of Hezron in the three branches corresponding to the three sons of Hezron, into which they divided themselves (1 Chronicles 2:9), viz., the descendants of Ram to David (1 Chronicles 2:10–17), of Caleb (1 Chronicles 2:18–24), and of Jerahmeel (1 Chronicles 2:25–41). Then there follow in 1 Chronicles 2:42–55 four other lists of descendants of Caleb, who peopled a great number of the cities of Judah; and then in 1 Chronicles 3 we have a list of the sons of David and the line of kings of the house of David, down to the grandsons of Zerubbabel; and finally, in 1 Chronicles 4:1–23, other genealogical fragments as to the posterity of Pharez and Shelah. Of Hamul, consequently, no descendants are noticed, unless perhaps some of the groups ranged together in 1 Chronicles 4:8–22, whose connection with the heads of the families of Judah is not given, are of his lineage. The lists collected in 1 Chronicles 4:1–20 are clearly only supplements to the genealogies of the great families contained in 1 Chronicles 2 and 3, which the author of the Chronicle found in the same fragmentary state in which they are communicated to us.

1 Chronicles 2:1, 2. *The twelve sons of Israel*, arranged as follows: first, the six sons of Leah; then Dan, the son of Rachel's handmaid; next, the sons of Rachel; and finally, the remaining sons of the handmaids. That a different place is assigned to Dan, viz., before the sons of Rachel, from that which he holds in the list in Gen. 35:23ff., is perhaps to be accounted for by Rachel's wishing the son of her maid Bilhah to be accounted her own (*vide* Gen. 30:3–6).

1 Chronicles 2:3–5. *The sons of Judah and of Pharez*, v. 3.f.—The five sons of Judah are given according to Gen. 38, as the remark on Er which is quoted from v. 7 of that chapter shows, while the names of the five sons are to be found also in Gen. 46:12. The two sons of Pharez are according to Gen. 46:12, cf. Num. 26:21.

1 Chronicles 2:6–8. *Sons and descendants of Zerah*.—In v. 6, five names are grouped together as בְּנֵי of Zerah, which are found nowhere else so united. The first, Zimri, may be

strictly a son; but זַמְרִי may perhaps be a mistake for זַבְדִּי, for Achan, who is in v. 7 the son of Carmi, is in Josh. 7:1 called the son of Carmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zerah. But זַבְדִּי (Josh.) may also be an error for זַמְרִי, or he may have been a son of Zimri, since in genealogical lists an intermediate member of the family is often passed over. Nothing certain can, however, be ascertained; both names are found elsewhere, but of persons belonging to other tribes: Zimri as prince of the Simeonites, Num. 25:14; as Benjamite, 1 Chronicles 8:36; 9:42; and as king of Israel, 1 Kings 16:9; Zabdi, 1 Chronicles 8:19 (as Benjamite), and 27:27, Neh. 11:17. The four succeeding names, Ethan, Heman, Calcol, and Dara, are met with again in 1 Kings 5:11, where it is said of Solomon he was wiser than the Ezrahite Ethan, and Heman, and Calcol, and Darda, the sons of Machol, with the unimportant variation of דַרְדַע for דַרַע. On this account, Movers and Bertheau, following Clericus on 1 Kings 4:31 (1 Chronicles 5:11), hold the identity of the wise men mentioned in 1 Kings 5:11 with the sons (descendants) of Zerah to be beyond doubt. But the main reason which Clericus produces in support of this supposition, the *consensus quatuor nominum et quidem unius patris filiorum*, and the difficulty of believing that in *alia familia Hebraea* there should have been *quatuor fratres cognomines quatuor filiis Zerachi Judae filii*, loses all its force from the fact that the supposition that the four wise men in 1 Kings 5:11 are brothers by blood, is a groundless and erroneous assumption. Since Ethan is called the Ezrahite, while the last two are said to be the sons of Machol, it is clear that the four were not brothers. The mention of them as men famous for their wisdom, does not at all require that we should think the men contemporary with each other. Even the enumeration of these four along with Zimri as זַמְרִי בְנֵי זֶרַח in our verse does not necessarily involve that the five names denote brothers by blood; for it is plain from vv. 7 and 8 that in this genealogy only single famous names of the family of Zerah the son of Judah and Tamar are

grouped together. But, on the other hand, the reasons which go to disprove the identity of the persons in our verse with those named in 1 Kings 5:11 are not of very great weight. The difference in the names דַרַע and דַרְדַע is obviously the result of an error of transcription, and the form הַאֶזְרָחִי (1 Kings 5:11) is most probably a patronymic from זֶרַח, notwithstanding that in Num. 26:20 it appears as זֶרַחִי, for even the appellative אֶזְרָח, *indigena*, is formed from זֶרַח. We therefore hold that the persons who bear the same names in our verse and in 1 Kings 5:11 are most probably identical, in spite of the addition בְנֵי מַחֹל to Calcol and Darda (1 Kings 5:11). For that this addition belongs merely to these two names, and not to Ezrah, appears from Ps. 88:1 and 89:1, which, according to the superscription, were composed by the Ezrahites Heman and Ethan. The authors of these psalms are unquestionably the Heman and Ethan who were famed for their wisdom (1 Kings 5:11), and therefore most probably the same as those spoken of in our verse as sons of Zerah. It is true that the authors of these psalms have been held by many commentators to be Levites, nay, to be the musicians mentioned in 1 Chronicles 15:17 and 19; but sufficient support for this view, which I myself, on 1 Kings 5:11, after the example of Hengstenberg, *Beitrr.* ii. S. 61, and on Ps. 88 defended, cannot be found. The statement of the superscription of Ps. 88:1—"a psalm of the sons of Korah"—from which it is inferred that the Ezrahite Heman was of Levitic origin, does not justify such a conclusion.¹⁰ For though the musician Heman the son of Joel was Korahite of the race of Kohath (1 Chronicles 6:18–23), yet the musician Ethan the son of Kishi, or Kushaiah, was neither Korahite nor Kohathite, but a Merarite (1 Chronicles 6:29ff.). Moreover, the Levites Heman and Ethan could not be enumerated among the Ezrahites, that is, the descendants of Zerah, a man of Judah. The passages which are quoted in support of the view that the Levites were numbered with the tribes in the midst of whom they dwelt, and

that, consequently, there were Judaeen and Ephraimite Levites,—as, for example, 1 Sam. 1:1, where the father of the Levite Samuel is called an Ephrathite because he dwelt in Mount Ephraim; and Judg. 17:7, where a Levite is numbered with the family of Judah because he dwelt as sojourner (גַּר) in Bethlehem, a city of Judah,—certainly prove that the Levites were reckoned, as regards citizenship, according to the tribes or cities in which they dwelt, but certainly do not show that they were incorporated genealogically with those tribes because of their place of residence.¹¹ The Levites Heman and Ethan, therefore, cannot be brought forward in our verse “as adopted sons of Zerah, who brought more honour to their father than his proper sons” (Hengstb.). This view is completely excluded by the fact that in our verse not only Ethan and Heman, but also Zimri, Calcol, and Dara are called sons of Zerah, yet these latter were not adopted sons, but true descendants of Zerah. Besides, in v. 8, there is an actual son or descendant of Ethan mentioned, and consequently זִמְרִי and דָּרָא cannot possibly be understood in some cases as implying only an adoptive relationship, and in the others actual descent. But the similarity of the names is not of itself sufficient to justify us in identifying the persons. As the name Zerah again appears in 1 Chronicles 6:26 in the genealogy of the Levite Asaph, so also the name Ethan occurs in the same genealogy, plainly showing that more than one Israelite bore this name. The author of the Chronicle, too, has sufficiently guarded against the opinion that Zerah’s sons Ethan and Heman are identical with the Levitical musicians who bear the same names, by tracing back in 1 Chronicles 6 the family of those musicians to Levi, without calling them Ezrahites.¹² But to hold, with Movers, S. 237, that the recurrences of the same names in various races are contradictions, which are to be explained only on the supposition of genealogical combinations by various authors, will enter into the head of no sensible critic. We therefore believe the five persons mentioned in our verse to be actual

descendants of the Judaeen Zerah; but whether they were sons or grandsons, or still more distant descendants, cannot be determined. It is certainly very probable that Zimri was a son, if he be identical with the Zabdi of Josh. 7:1; Ethan and Heman may have been later descendants of Zerah, if they were the wise men mentioned in 1 Kings 5:11; but as to Calcol and Dara no further information is to be obtained. From vv. 7 and 8, where of the sons (בְּנֵי) of Zimri and Ethan only one man in each case is named, it is perfectly clear that in our genealogy only individuals, men who have become famous, are grouped together out of the whole posterity of Zerah. The plural בְּנֵי in vv. 7 and 8, etc., even where only one son is mentioned, is used probably only in those cases where, out of a number of sons or descendants, one has gained for himself by some means a memorable name. This is true at least of Achan, v. 7, who, by laying hands on the accursed spoils of Jericho, had become notorious (Josh. 7). Because Achan had thus troubled Israel (עָרַר), he is called here at once Achar. As to Carmi, *vide* on 4:1.

1 Chronicles 2:9. The only name given here as that of a descendant of Ethan is Azariah, of whom nothing further is known, while the name recurs frequently. Nothing more is said of the remaining sons of Zerah; they are merely set down as famous men of antiquity (Berth.). There follows in

1 Chronicles 2:9–41. *The family of Hezron*, the first-born son of Pharez, which branches off in three lines, originating with his three sons respectively. The three sons of Hezron are Jerahmeel, and Ram, and Chelubai; but the families springing from them are enumerated in a different order. First (vv. 10–17) we have the family of Ram, because King David is descended from him; then (vv. 18–24) the family of Chelubai or Caleb, from whose lineage came the illustrious Bezaleel; and finally (vv. 25–41), the posterity of the first-born, Jerahmeel.

1 Chronicles 2:9. אֲשֶׁר נִלְדָּד לוֹ, what was born to him. The passive stands impersonally instead of the more definite active, “to whom one bore,” so that the following names are subordinated to it with אֵת. The third person singular Niph. occurs thus also in 3:4 and 26:6; the construction of Niph. with אֵת frequently (Gen. 4:18; 21:5, and elsewhere). Ram is called, in the genealogy in Matt. 1:3, 4, Aram; comp. רָם, Job 32:2, with אָרָם, Gen. 22:21. כְּלוּבִי is called afterwards כְּלָב; cf. on v. 18.

1 Chronicles 2:10–17. *The family of Ram* (vv. 10–12), traced down through six members of Jesse.—This genealogy is also to be found in Ruth. 4:19–21; but only here is Nahshon made more prominent than the others, by the addition, “prince of the sons of Judah.” Nahshon was a prince of Judah at the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt (Num. 1:7; 2:3; 7:12). Now between him, a contemporary of Moses, and Pharez, who at the immigration of Jacob into Egypt was about fifteen years old, lies a period of 430 years, during which the Israelites remained in Egypt. For that time only three names—Hezron, Ram, and Amminidab—are mentioned, from which it is clear that several links must have been passed over. So also, from Nahshon to David, for a period of over 400 years, four generations—Salma, Boaz, Obed, and Jesse—are too few; and consequently here also the less famous ancestors of David are omitted. שְׁלֵמָא is called in Ruth 4:20, 21, שְׁלֵמָה and שְׁלֵמוֹן. In vv. 13–15, seven sons and two daughters of Jesse, with those of their sons who became famous (vv. 16, 17), are enumerated. According to 1 Sam. 17:12, Jesse had eight sons. This account, which agrees with that in 1 Sam. 16:8–12, may be reconciled with the enumeration in our verse, on the supposition that one of the sons died without posterity. In 1 Sam. 16:6ff. and 17:13, the names of the eldest three—Eliab, Abinadab, and Shammah—occur. Besides יֵשׁוּ, we meet with the form אֵישׁוּ (v. 13); and the name שְׁמָה is only another form of

שְׁמָה, which is found in 2 Sam. 13:3 and in 1 Chronicles 20:7, and is repeated in 2 Sam. 13:32 and 21:21 in the Kethibh (שְׁמָה). The names of the other three sons here mentioned (vv. 14 and 15) are met with nowhere else.

1 Chronicles 2:16f. The sisters of David have become known through their heroic sons. Zeruiah is the mother of the heroes of the Davidic history, Abishai, Joab, and Asahel (cf. 1 Sam. 26:6; 2 Sam. 2:18; 3:39; 8:16, and elsewhere). Their father is nowhere mentioned, “because their more famous mother challenged the greater attention” (Berth.). Abigail was, according to 2 Sam. 17:25, the daughter of Nahash, a sister of Zeruiah, and so was only a half-sister of David, and was the mother of Amasa the captain of the host, so well known on account of his share in the conspiracy of Absalom; cf. 2 Sam. 17:25; 19:14, and 20:10. His father was Jether, or Jithra, the Ishmaelite, who in the Masoretic text of 2 Sam. 17:25 is called, through a copyist’s error, הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִי instead of הַיִּשְׁמְעֵאֵלִי; see comm. on passage.

1 Chronicles 2:18–24. *The family of Caleb.*—That כְּלָב is merely a shortened form of כְּלוּבִי, or a form of that word resulting from the friction of constant use, is so clear from the context, that all exegetes recognise it. We have first (vv. 18–20) a list of the descendants of Caleb by two wives, then descendants which the daughter of the Gileadite Machir bore to his father Hezron (vv. 21–23), and finally the sons whom Hezron’s wife bore him after his death (v. 24). The grouping of these descendants of Hezron with the family of Caleb can only be accounted for by supposing that they had, through circumstances unknown to us, come into a more intimate connection with the family of Caleb than with the families of his brothers Ram and Jerahmeel. In vv. 42–55 follow some other lists of descendants of Caleb, which will be more fully considered when we come to these verses. The first half of the 18th verse is obscure, and the text is probably corrupt. As the words stand at present, we must translate, “Caleb the son of Hezron begat with Azubah, a

woman, and with Jerioth, and these are her (the one wife's) sons, Jeshur," etc. בְּנֵיהָ, *fili ejus*, suggests that only one wife of Caleb had been before mentioned; and, as appears from the "and Azubah died" of v. 19, Azubah is certainly meant. The construction הוֹלִיד אֶת, "he begat with," is, it is true, unusual, but is analogous to הוֹלִיד כֵּן, 8:9, and is explained by the fact that הוֹלִיד may mean to cause to bear, to bring to bearing; cf. Isa. 66:9: therefore properly it is, "he brought Azubah to bearing." The difficulty of the verse lies in the וְאִתְּ-יִרְיעוֹת אִשָּׁה, for, according to the usual phraseology, we would have expected אִשְׁתּוֹ instead of אִשָּׁה. But אִשָּׁה may be, under the circumstances, to some extent justified by the supposition that Azubah is called indefinitely "woman," because Caleb had several wives. וְאִתְּ-יִרְיעוֹת gives no suitable meaning. The explanation of Kimchi, "with Azubah a woman, and with Jerioth," cannot be accepted, for only the sons of Azubah are hereafter mentioned; and the idea that the children of the other wives are not enumerated here because the list used by the chronicler was defective, is untenable: for after two wives had been named in the enumeration of the children of one of them, the mother must necessarily have been mentioned; and so, instead of בְּנֵיהָ, we should have had בְּנֵי עֲזוּבָה. Hiller and J. H. Michaelis take וְאִתְּ as explicative, "with Azubah a woman, viz., with Jerioth;" but this is manifestly only the product of exegetical embarrassment. The text is plainly at fault, and the easiest conjecture is to read, with the Peschito and the Vulgate, אִשְׁתּוֹ אֶת instead of וְאִתְּ אִשָּׁה, "he begat with Azubah his wife, Jerioth (a daughter); and these are her sons." In that case אִשָּׁה would be added to עֲזוּבָה, to guard against עֲזוּבָה being taken for acc. obj. The names of the sons of Azubah, or of her daughter Jerioth, do not occur elsewhere.

1 Chronicles 2:19. When Azubah died, Caleb took Ephrath to wife, who bore him Hur. For

אֶפְרָתָה we find in v. 50 the lengthened feminine form אֶפְרָתָה; cf. also 4:4. From Hur descended, by Uri, the famous Bezaleel, the skilful architect of the tabernacle (Ex. 31:2; 35:30).

1 Chronicles 2:21-24. The descendants of Hezron numbered with the stock of Caleb: (a) those begotten by Hezron with the daughter of Machir, vv. 21-23; (b) those born to Hezron after his death, v. 24.

1 Chronicles 2:21. Afterwards (אַחֵר), i.e., after the birth of the sons mentioned in v. 9, whose mother is not mentioned, when he was sixty years old, Hezron took to wife the daughter of Machir the father of Gilead, who bore him Segub. Machir was the first-born of Manasseh (Gen. 50:23; Num. 26:29). But Machir is not called in vv. 21 and 23 the father of Gilead because he was the originator of the Israelite population of Gilead, but אָב has here its proper signification. Machir begot a son of the name of Gilead (Num. 26:29); and it is clear from the genealogy of the daughters of Zelophehad, communicated in Num. 27:1, that this expression is to be understood in its literal sense. Machir is distinguished from other men of the same name (cf. 2 Sam. 9:4; 17:27) by the addition, father of Gilead. Segub the son of Hezron and the daughter of Machir begat Jair. This Jair, belonging on his mother's side to the tribe of Manasseh, is set down in Num. 32:40f., Deut. 3:14, as a descendant of Manasseh. After Moses' victory over Og king of Bashan, Jair's family conquered the district of Argob in Bashan, i.e., in the plain of Jaulan and Hauran; and to the conquered cities, when they were bestowed upon him for a possession by Moses, the name Havvoth-Jair, i.e., Jair's-life, was given. Cf. Num. 32:41 and Deut. 3:14, where this name is explained. These are the twenty-three cities in the land of Gilead, i.e., Peräa.

1 Chronicles 2:23. These cities named Jair's-life were taken away from the Jairites by Geshur and Aram, i.e., by the Arameans of Geshur and of other places. Geshur denotes the inhabitants of a district of Aram, or Syria, on the north-western frontier of Bashan, in the

neighbourhood of Hermon, on the east side of the upper Jordan, which had still its own kings in the time of David (2 Sam. 3:3; 13:37; 14:23; 15:8), but which had been assigned to the Manassites by Moses; cf. Josh. 13:13. The following *אֶת־קִנְתָּ וְגו'* must not be taken as an explanatory apposition to *אֶת־חַוֹת יַאֲרִי*: "Jair's-life, Kenath and her daughters, sixty cities" (Berth.). For since *מֵאֵתָם* refers to the collective name Jair, Geshur and Aram could not take away from Jair sixty cities, for Jair only possessed twenty-three cities. But besides this, according to Num. 32:42, Kenath with her daughters had been conquered by Nobah, who gave his own name to the conquered cities; and according to Deut. 3:4, the kingdom of Og in Bashan had sixty fenced cities. But this kingdom was, according to Num. 32:41, and 42, conquered by two families of Manasseh, by Jair and Nobah, and was divided between them; and as appears from our passage, twenty-three cities were bestowed upon Jair, and all the rest of the land, viz., Kenath with her daughters, fell to Nobah. These two domains together included sixty fenced cities, which in Deut. 3:14 are called Jair's-life; while here, in our verse, only twenty-three cities are so called, and the remaining thirty-seven are comprehended under the name of Kenath had her daughters. WE must therefore either supply a ו copul. before *אֶת־קִנְתָּ*, or we must take *אֶת־קִי* in the signification "with Kenath," and refer *שְׁשִׁים עִיר* to both Jair's-life and Kenath. Cf. herewith the discussion on Deut. 3:12–14; and for Kenath, the ruins of which still exist under the name Kanuat on the western slope of the Jebel Hauran, see the remarks on Num. 32:42. The time when these cities were taken away by the Arameans is not known. From Judg. 10:4 we only learn that the Jair who was judge at a later time again had possession of thirty of these cities, and renewed the name Jair's-life. *כָּל־אֲלֵה* is not all these sixty cities, but the before-mentioned descendants of Hezron, who are called sons, that is offspring, of Machir, because they were begotten with the daughter of

Machir. Only two names, it is true, Segub and Jair, are enumerated; but from these two issue the numerous families which took Jair's-life. To these, therefore, must we refer the *כָּל־אֲלֵה*.

1 Chronicles 2:24. After the death of Hezron there was born to him by his wife Abiah (the third wife, cf. vv. 9 and 21) another son, Ashur, the father of Tekoa, whose descendants are enumerated in 1 Chronicles 4:5–7. Hezron's death took place *בְּכָל־בְּרָתָהּ*, "in Caleb Ephrathah." This expression is obscure. According to 1 Sam. 30:14, a part of the Negeb (south country) of Judah was called Negeb Caleb, as it belonged to the family of Caleb. According to this analogy, the town or village in which Caleb dwelt with his wife Ephrath may have been called Caleb of Ephrathah, if Ephrath had brought this place as a dower to Caleb, as in the case mentioned in Josh. 15:18f. Ephrathah, or Ephrath, was the ancient name of Bethlehem (Gen. 33:19; 48:1), and with it the name of Caleb's wife Ephrath (v. 19) is unquestionably connected; probably she was so called after her birthplace. If this supposition be well founded, then Caleb of Ephrathah would be the little town of Bethlehem. Ashur is called father (*אָבִי*) of Tekoa, i.e., lord and prince, as the chief of the inhabitants of Tekoa, now Tekua, two hours south of Bethlehem (*vide* on Josh. 15:59).

1 Chronicles 2:25–41. *The family of Jerahmeel*, the first-born of Hezron, which inhabited a part of the Negeb of Judah called after him the south of the Jerahmeelites (1 Sam. 27:10; 30:29).

1 Chronicles 2:25. Four sons were born to Jerahmeel by his first wife. Five names indeed follow; but as the last, *אֶחָזִיהָ*, although met with elsewhere as a man's name, is not ranged with the others by ו copul., as those that precede are with each other, it appears to be the name of a woman, and probably a ם has fallen out after the immediately preceding ם. So Cler., J. H. Mich., Berth. This conjecture gains in probability from the mention in v. 26 of another wife, whence we might expect that in v. 25 the first wife would be named.

1 Chronicles 2:26. Only one son of the second wife is given, Onam, whose posterity follows in vv. 28–33; for in v. 27 the three sons of Ram, the first-born of Jerahmeel, are enumerated.

1 Chronicles 2:28. Onam had two sons, Shammai and Jada; the second of these, again, two sons, Nadab and Abishur.

1 Chronicles 2:29. To Abishur his wife Abihail bore likewise two sons, with whom his race terminates.—In vv. 30, 31, Nadab's posterity follow, in four members, ending with Ahlai, in the fourth generation. But Ahlai cannot well have been a son, but must have been a daughter, the heiress of Sheshan; for, according to v. 34, Sheshan had no sons, but only daughters, and gave his daughter to an Egyptian slave whom he possessed, to wife, by whom she became the mother of a numerous posterity. The שֶׁשָׁן בְּנֵי אֶחָי is not irreconcilable with this, for בְּנֵי denotes in genealogies only descendants in general, and has been here correctly so explained by Hiller in *Onomast.* p. 736: *quicquid habuit liberorum, sive nepotum, sustulit ex unica filia Achlai.*

1 Chronicles 2:32, 33. The descendants of Jada, the brother of Shammai, in two generations, after which this genealogy closes with the subscription, "these were the sons of Jerahmeel."¹³—In vv. 34–41 there follows the family of Sheshan, which was originated by the marriage of his daughter with his Egyptian slave, and which is continued through thirteen generations. The name of this daughter is in v. 25f. not mentioned, but she is without doubt the Ahlai mentioned in v. 31. But since this Ahlai is the tenth in descent from Judah through Pharez, she was probably born in Egypt; and the Egyptian slave Jarha was most likely a slave whom Sheshan had in Egypt, and whom he adopted as his son for the propagation of his race, by giving him his daughter and heir to wife. If this be the case, the race begotten by Jarha with the daughter of Sheshan is traced down till towards the end of the period of the judges. The Egyptian slave Jarha is not elsewhere met with; and though the names which his posterity bore are found again in

various parts of the Old Testament, of none of them can it be proved that they belonged to men of this family, so as to show that one of these person had become famous in history.

1 Chronicles 2:42–55. *Other renowned descendants of Caleb.*—First of all there are enumerated, in vv. 42–49, three lines of descendants of Caleb, of which the two latter, vv. 46–49, are the issue of concubines.—The first series, vv. 42–45, contains some things which are very obscure. In v. 42 there are mentioned, as sons of Caleb the brother of Jerahmeel, Mesha his first-born, with the addition, "this is the father of Ziph; and the sons of Mareshah, the father of Hebron," as it reads according to the traditional Masoretic text. Now it is here not only very surprising that the sons of Mareshah stand parallel with Mesha, but it is still more strange to find such a collocation as "sons of Mareshah the father of Hebron." The last-mentioned difficulty would certainly be greatly lessened if we might take Hebron to be the city of that name, and translate the phrase "father of Hebron," lord of the city of Hebron, according to the analogy of "father of Ziph," "father of Tekoa" (v. 24), and other names of that sort. But the continuation of the genealogy, "and the sons of Hebron were Korah, and Tappuah, Rekem, and Shema" (v. 43), is irreconcilable with such an interpretation. For of these names, Tappuah, i.e., apple, is indeed met with several times as the name of a city (Josh. 12:17; 15:34; 16:8); and Rekem is the name of a city of Benjamin (Josh. 18:27), but occurs also twice as the name of a person—once of a Midianite prince (Num. 31:8), and once of a Manassite (1 Chronicles 7:16); but the other two, Korah and Shema, only occur as the names of persons. In v. 44f., moreover, the descendants of Shema and Rekem are spoken of, and that, too, in connection with the word הוֹלִיד, "he begat," which demonstrably can only denote the propagation of a race. We must therefore take Hebron as the name of a person, as in 5:28 and Ex. 6:18. But if Hebron be the name of a man, then Mareshah also must be interpreted in the same manner. This is also

required by the mention of the sons of Mareshah parallel with Mesha the first-born; but still more so by the circumstance that the interpretation of Mareshah and Hebron, as names of cities, is irreconcilable with the position of these two cities, and with their historical relations. Bertheau, indeed, imagines that as Mareshah is called the father of Hebron, the famous capital of the tribe of Judah, we must therefore make the attempt, however inadmissible it may seem at first sight, to take Mareshah, in the connection of our verse, as the name of a city, which appears as father of Hebron, and that we must also conclude that the ancient city Hebron (Num. 13:23) stood in some sort of dependent relationship to Mareshah, perhaps only in later time, although we cannot at all determine to what time the representation of our verse applies. But at the foundation of this argument there lies an error as to the position of the city Mareshah. Mareshah lay in the Shephelah (Josh. 15:44), and exists at present as the ruin Marasch, twenty-four minutes south of Beit-Jibrin: *vide* on Josh. 15:44; and Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, § 129 and 142f. Ziph, therefore, which is mentioned in 2 Chronicles 11:8 along with Mareshah, and which is consequently the Ziph mentioned in our verse, cannot be, as Bertheau believes, the Ziph situated in the hill country of Judah, in the wilderness of that name, whose ruins are still to be seen on the hill Zif, about four miles south-east from Hebron (Josh. 15:55). It can only be the Ziph in the Shephelah (Josh. 15:24), the position of which has not indeed been discovered, but which is to be sought in the Shephelah at no great distance from Marasch, and thus far distant from Hebron. Since, then, Mareshah and Ziph were in the Shephelah, no relation of dependence between the capital, Hebron, situated in the mountains of Judah, and Mareshah can be thought of, neither in more ancient nor in later time. The supposition of such a dependence is not made probable by the remark that we cannot determine to what time the representation of our verse applies; it only serves to cover the difficulty which renders it

impossible. That the verse does not treat of post-exilic times is clear, although even after the exile, and in the time of the Maccabees and the Romans, Hebron was not in a position of dependence on Marissa. Bertheau himself holds Caleb, of whose son our verses treat, for a contemporary of Moses and Joshua, because in v. 49 Achsa is mentioned as daughter of Caleb (Josh. 15:16; Judg. 1:12). The contents of our verse would therefore have reference to the first part of the period of the judges. But since Hebron was never dependent on Mareshah in the manner supposed, the attempt, which even at first sight appeared so inadmissible, to interpret Mareshah as the name of a city, loses all its support. For this reason, therefore, the city of Hebron, and the other cities named in v. 43ff., which perhaps belonged to the district of Mareshah, cannot be the sons of Mareshah here spoken of; and the fact that, of the names mentioned in vv. 43 and 44, at most two may denote cities, while the others are undoubtedly the names of persons, points still more clearly to the same conclusion. We must, then, hold Hebron and Mareshah also to be the names of persons.

Now, if the Masoretic text be correct, the use of the phrase, "and the sons of Mareshah the father of Hebron," instead of "and Mareshah, the sons of the father of Hebron," can only have arisen from a desire to point out, that besides Hebron there were also other sons of Mareshah who were of Caleb's lineage. But the mention of the sons of Mareshah, instead of Mareshah, and the calling him the father of Hebron in this connection, make the correctness of the traditional text very questionable. Kimchi has, on account of the harshness of placing the sons of Mareshah on a parallel with Mesha the first-born of Caleb, supposed an ellipse in the expression, and construes *וּבְנֵי מַרְשָׁה*, *et ex filiis Ziph Mareshah*. But this addition cannot be justified. If we may venture a conjecture in so obscure a matter, it would more readily suggest itself that *מַרְשָׁה* is an error for *מִיֶּשֶׁעַ*, and that *אֲבֵי חֶבְרוֹן* is to be taken as a *nomen compos.*, when the meaning would be, "and the sons of Mesha

were Abi-Hebron." The probability of the existence of such a name as Abihebron along with the simple Hebron has many analogies in its favour: cf. Dan and Abidan, Num. 1:11; Ezer, 12:9, Neh. 3:19, with Abi-ezer; Nadab, Ex. 6:23, and Abinadab. In the same family even we have Abiner, or Abner, the son of Ner (1 Sam. 14:50f.; 2 Sam. 2:8; cf. Ew. § 273, S. 666, 7th edition). Abihebron would then be repeated in v. 43, in the shortened form Hebron, just as we have in Josh. 16:8 Tappuah, instead of En-Tappuah, Josh. 17:7. The four names introduced as sons of Hebron denote persons, not localities: cf. for Korah, 1:35, and concerning Tappuah and Rekem the above remark (p. 68). In v. 44 are mentioned the sons of Rekem and of Shema, the latter a frequently recurring man's name (cf. 5:8; 8:13; 11:44; Neh. 8:4). Shema begat Raham, the father of Jorkam. The name יִרְקָעַם is quite unknown elsewhere. The LXX have rendered it Ἰεκλάν, and Bertheau therefore holds Jorkam to be the name of a place, and conjectures that originally קְדָעַם (Josh. 15:56) stood here also. But the LXX give also Ἰεκλάν for the following name רְקָם, from which it is clear that we cannot rely much on their authority. The LXX have overlooked the fact that רְקָם, v. 44, is the son of the Hebron mentioned in v. 43, whose descendants are further enumerated. Shammai occurs as a man's name also in v. 28, and is again met with in 4:17. His son is called in v. 45 Maon, and Maon is the father of Bethzur. בֵּית-צוּר is certainly the city in the mountains of Judah which Rehoboam fortified (2 Chronicles 11:7), and which still exists in the ruin Bet-sur, lying south of Jerusalem in the direction of Hebron. Maon also was a city in the mountains of Judah, now Main (Josh. 15:55); but we cannot allow that this city is meant by the name מְעוֹן, because Maon is called on the one hand the son of Shammai, and on the other is father of Bethzur, and there are no well-ascertained examples of a city being represented as son (בֶּן) of a man, its founder or lord, nor of one city being called the father of another. Dependent cities and villages are called daughters (not sons) of the mother

city. The word מְעוֹן, "dwelling," does not *per se* point to a village or town, and in Judg. 10:12 denotes a tribe of non-Israelites.

1 Chronicles 2:46–49. *Descendants of Caleb by two concubines.*—The name עֵיפָה occurs in v. 47 and 1:33 as a man's name. Caleb's concubine of this name bore three sons: Haran, of whom nothing further is known; Moza, which, though in Josh. 18:26 it is the name of a Benjamite town, is not necessarily on that account the name of a town here; and Gazez, unknown, perhaps a grandson of Caleb, especially if the clause "Haran begat Gazez" be merely an explanatory addition. But Haran may also have given to his son the name of his younger brother, so that a son and grandson of Caleb may have borne the same name.

1 Chronicles 2:47. The genealogical connection of the names in this verse is entirely wanting; for Jahdai, of whom six sons are enumerated, appears quite abruptly. Hiller, in *Onomast.*, supposes, but without sufficient ground, that יְהִדָּי is another name of Moza. Of his sons' names, Jotham occurs frequently of different persons; Ephah, as has been already remarked, is in 1:33 the name of a chief of a Midianite tribe; and lastly, Shaaph is used in v. 49 of another person.

1 Chronicles 2:48f. Another concubine of Caleb was called Maachah, a not uncommon woman's name; cf. 3:2; 7:16; 8:29; 11:43, etc. She bore Sheber and Tirhanah, names quite unknown. The masc. מְלִדָּה instead of the fem. מְלִדָּה, v. 46, is to be explained by the supposition that the father who begat was present to the mind of the writer. V. 49. Then she bore also Shaaph (different from the Shaaph in v. 47), the father of Madmannah, a city in the south of Judah, perhaps identical with Miniay or Minieh, southwards from Gaza (see on Josh. 15:31). Sheva (David's Sopher [scribe] is so called in the Keri of 2 Sam. 20:25), the father of Machbenah, a village of Judah not further mentioned, and of Gibeah, perhaps the Gibeah mentioned in Josh. 15:57, in the mountains of Judah, or the village Jeba mentioned by

Robinson, *Palest.* ii. p. 327, and Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, S. 157f., on a hill in the Wady Musurr (*vide* on Josh. 15:57). This list closes with the abrupt remark, "and Caleb's daughter was Achsah." This notice can only refer to the Achsah so well known in the history of the conquest of the tribal domain of Judah, whom Caleb had promised, and gave as a reward to the conqueror of Debir (Josh. 15:16ff.; Judg. 1:12); otherwise in its abrupt form it would have no meaning. Women occur in the genealogies only when they have played an important part in history. Since, however, the father of this Achsah was Caleb the son of Jephunneh, who was about forty years old when the Israelites left Egypt, while our Caleb, on the contrary, is called in v. 42 the brother of Jerahmeel, and is at the same time designated son of Hezron, the son of Pharez (v. 9), these two Calebs cannot be one person: the son of Hezron must have been a much older Caleb than the son of Jephunneh. The older commentators have consequently with one voice distinguished the Achsah mentioned in our verse from the Achsah in Josh. 15:16; while Movers, on the contrary (*Chronicles* S. 83), would eliminate from the text, as a later interpolation, the notice of the daughter of Caleb. Bertheau, however, attempts to prove the identity of Caleb the son of Hezron with Caleb the son of Jephunneh. The assertion of Movers is so manifestly a critical *tour de force*, that it requires no refutation; but neither can we subscribe to Bertheau's view. He is, indeed, right in rejecting Ewald's expedient of holding that vv. 18–20 and 45–50 are to be referred to Chelubai, and vv. 42–49 to a Caleb to be carefully distinguished from him; for it contradicts the plain sense of the words, according to which both Chelubai, v. 9, and Caleb, vv. 18 and 42, is the son of Hezron and the brother of Jerahmeel. But what he brings forward against distinguishing Caleb the father of Achsah, v. 49, from Caleb the brother of Jerahmeel, v. 42, is entirely wanting in force. The reasons adduced reduce themselves to these: that Caleb the son of Jephunneh, the conqueror and possessor of Hebron, might well

be called in the genealogical language, which sometimes expresses geographical relations, the son of Hezron, along with Ram and Jerahmeel, as the names Ram and Jerahmeel certainly denote families in Judah, who, originally at least, dwelt in other domains than that of Caleb; and again, that the individual families as well as the towns and villages in these various domains may be conceived of as sons and descendants of those who represent the great families of the tribe, and the divisions of the tribal territory. But we must deny the geographical signification of the genealogies when pressed so far as this: for valid proofs are entirely wanting that towns are represented as sons and brothers of other towns; and the section vv. 42–49 does not treat merely, or principally, of the geographical relations of the families of Judah, but in the first place, and in the main, deals with the genealogical ramifications of the descendants and families of the sons of Judah. It by no means follows, because some of these descendants are brought forward as fathers of cities, that in vv. 42–49 towns and their mutual connection are spoken of; and the names Caleb, Ram, and Jerahmeel do not here denote families, but are the names of the fathers and chiefs of the families which descended from them, and dwelt in the towns just named. We accordingly distinguish Caleb, whose daughter was called Achsah, and whose father was Jephunneh (Josh. 15:16ff.), from Caleb the brother of Jerahmeel and the son of Hezron. but we explain the mention of Achsah as daughter of Caleb, at the end of the genealogical lists of the persons and families descended by concubines from Caleb, by the supposition that the Caleb who lived in the time of Moses, the son of Jephunneh, was a descendant of an older Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel. But it is probable that the Caleb in v. 49 is the same who is called in v. 42 the brother of Jerahmeel, and whose descendants are specified vv. 42–49; and we take the word בַּת, "daughter," in its wider sense, as signifying a later female descendant, because the father of the Achsah so well known from Josh. 15:16ff. is

also called son of Jephunneh in the genealogy, 1 Chronicles 4:15.

1 Chronicles 2:50–55. *The families descended from Caleb through his son Hur.*—V. 50. The superscription, “These are the sons (descendants) of Caleb,” is more accurately defined by the addition, “the son of Hur, the first-born of Ephratah;” and by this definition the following lists of Caleb’s descendants are limited to the families descended from his son Hur. That the words בְּנֵי-חֹר וְגוֹ are to be so understood, and not as apposition to בְּלָב, “Caleb the son of Hur,” is shown by v. 19, according to which Hur is a son of Caleb and Ephrath. On that account, too, the relationship of Hur to Caleb is not given here; it is presupposed as known from v. 19. A famous descendant of Hur has already been mentioned in v. 20, viz., Bezaleel the son of Uri. Here, in vv. 50 and 51, three sons of Hur are named, Shobal, Salma, and Hareph, with the families descended from the first two. All information is wanting as to whether these sons of Hur were brothers of Uri, or his cousins in nearer or remoter degree, as indeed is every means of a more accurate determination of the degrees of relationship. Both בְּנֵי and הוֹלִיד in genealogies mark only descent in a straight line, while intermediate members of a family are often omitted in the lists. Instead of בְּנֵי-חֹר, בְּנֵי-חֹר might have been expected, as two sons are mentioned. The singular בֶּן shows that the words are not to be fused with the following into one sentence, but, as the Masoretic punctuation also shows, are meant for a superscription, after which the names to be enumerated are ranged without any more intimate logical connection. For the three names are not connected by the ו copul. They stand thus: “sons of Hur, the first-born of Ephratah; Shobal ... Salma ... Hareph.” Shobal is called father of Kirjath-jearim, now Kureyet el Enab (see on Josh. 9:17). Salma, father of Bethlehem, the birth-place of David and Christ. This Salma is, however, not the same person as Salma mentioned in v. 11 and Ruth 4:20 among the ancestors of David; for the latter belonged

to the family of Ram, the former to the family of Caleb. Hareph is called the father of Beth-Geder, which is certainly not the same place as Gedera, Josh. 15:36, which lay in the Shephelah, but is probably identical with Gedor in the hill country, Josh. 15:58, west of the road which leads from Hebron to Jerusalem (*vide* on 1 Chronicles 12:4). Nothing further is told of Hareph, but in the following verses further descendants of both the other sons of Hur are enumerated.

1 Chronicles 2:52, 53. Shobal had sons, הָרְאָה. These words, which are translated in the Vulgate, *qui videbat dimidium requietionum*, give, so interpreted, no fitting sense, but must contain proper names. The LXX have made from them three names, Ἀραὰ καὶ Αἰοὶ καὶ Ἀμμωνῖθ on mere conjecture. Most commentators take הָרְאָה for the name of the man who, in 1 Chronicles 4:2, is called under the name Reaiah, רְאִיָּה, the son of Shobal. This is doubtless correct; but we must not take הָרְאָה for another name of Reaiah, but, with Bertheau, must hold it to be a corruption of רְאִיָּה, or a conjecture arising from a false interpretation of הָרְאִיָּה by a transcriber or reader, who did not take Hazi-Hammenuhoth for a proper name, but understood it appellatively, and attempted to bring some sense out of the words by changing רְאִיָּה into the participle רְאָה. The הָרְאִיָּה in v. 54 corresponds to our חֲצִי הַמְּנַחֲתִי in v. 53, as one half of a race or district corresponds to the other, for the connection between the substantive הַמְּנַחֲתִי and the adjective הַמְּנַחֲתִי cannot but be acknowledged. Now, although מְנוּחָה signifies resting-place (Num. 10:33; Judg. 20:43), and the words “the half of the resting-place,” or “of the resting-places,” point in the first instance to a district, yet not only does the context require that Hazi-Hammenuhoth should signify a family sprung from Shobal, but it is demanded also by a comparison of our phrase with חֲצִי הַמְּנַחֲתִי in v.

54, which unquestionably denotes a family. It does not, however, seem necessary to alter the *הַמְּנַחֲוֹת* into *הַמְּנַחְתִּי*; for as in v. 54 Bethlehem stands for the family in Bethlehem descended from Salma, so the district Hazi-Hammenuhoth may be used in v. 52 to denote the family residing there. As to the geographical position of this district, see on v. 54.

1 Chronicles 2:53. Besides the families mentioned in v. 52, the families of Kirjath-jearim, which in v. 53 are enumerated by name, came of Shobal also. *וּמִשְׁפְּחוֹת ק'* is simply a continuation of the families already mentioned, and the remark of Berth., that "the families of Kirjath-jearim are moreover distinguished from the sons of Shobal," is as incorrect as the supplying of *ו* cop. before *הַצִּי הֵם* in v. 52 is unnecessary. The meaning is simply this: Shobal had sons Reaiah, Hazi-Hammenuhoth, and the families of Kirjath-jearim, viz., the family of Jether, etc. David's heroes, Ira and Gareb, 11:40, 2 Sam. 23:38, belonged to the family of Jether (*הַיְתָרִי*). The other three families are not met with elsewhere. *מֵאַלָּה*, of these, the four families of Kirjath-jearim just mentioned, came the Zoreathites and the Eshtaulites, the inhabitants of the town of Zoreah, the home of Samson, now the ruin Sura, and of Eshtaol, which perhaps may be identified with Um Eshteyeh (see in Josh. 15:33).

1 Chronicles 2:54, 55. The descendants of Salma: Bethlehem, i.e., the family of Bethlehem (see on v. 52), the Netophathites, i.e., the inhabitants of the town of Netophah, which, according to our verse and Ezra 2:22, and especially Neh. 7:26, is to be looked for in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem (cf. 9:16); a family which produced at various times renowned men (cf. 2 Sam. 23:28f.; 2 Kings 25:23; Ezra 2:22). The following words, *עֲטָרוֹת ב' י'*, i.e., "crowns of the house of Joab," can only be the name of a place which is mentioned instead of its inhabitants; for *עֲטָרוֹת* occurs elsewhere, sometimes alone, and sometimes in conjunction with a proper name, as the name of places: cf.

Num. 32:34f.; Josh. 16:2, 5, 7; 18:13. Hazi-Hammanahath is certainly to be sought in the neighbourhood of Manahath, 8:6, whose position has, however, not yet been ascertained. *הַצְרְעִי* is only another form of *הַצְרְעָתִי*, and is derived from the masculine of the word. The Zorites here spoken of formed a second division of the inhabitants of Zoreah and the neighbourhood, along with the Zoreathites descended from Shobal, v. 53.

1 Chronicles 2:55. "And the families of the writers (scribes) who inhabited Jabez." The position of the town Jabez, which is mentioned only here, and which derived its name from a descendant of Judah, has not yet been discovered, but is to be sought somewhere in the neighbourhood of Zoreah. This may be inferred from the fact that of the six *שְׁלֵמָא* בְנֵי, two are always more closely connected with each other by *ו* cop.: (1) Bethlehem and Netophathite, (2) Ataroth-beth-Joab and Hazi-Hammanahath, (3) the Zoreites and the families of the Sopherim inhabiting Jabez. These last were divided into three branches, *תְּרַעְתִּים*, *שְׁמֵעָתִים*, *שׁוֹכְתִים*, i.e., those descended from Tira, Shimea, and Suchah. The Vulgate has taken these words in an appellative sense of the occupations of these three classes, and translates *canentes et resonantes et in tabernaculis commemorantes*. But this interpretation is not made even probable by all that Bertheau has brought forward in support of it. Even if *שׁוֹכְתִים* might perhaps be connected with *סֻכָּה*, and interpreted "dwellers in tabernacles," yet no tenable reason can be found for translating *תְּרַעְתִּים* and *שְׁמֵעָתִים* by *canentes et resonantes*. *שְׁמֵעָתִי*, from *שָׁמְעָה*, "that which is heard," cannot signify those who repeat in words and song that which has been heard; and *תְּרַעְתִּי* no more means *canentes* than it is connected (as Bertheau tries to show) with *שְׁעָרִים*, "doorkeepers" (the Chaldee *תְּרַע* being equivalent to the Hebrew *שַׁעַר*); and the

addition, “These are the Kenites who came of Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab” (בּוֹאֵי חֶמַת, to issue from any one, to be descended from any one), gives no proof of this, for the phrase itself is to us so very obscure. קִינִיִּים are not inhabitants of the city Kain (Josh. 15:57) in the tribal domain of Judah (Kimchi), but, judging from the succeeding relative sentence, were descendants of Keni the father-in-law of Moses (Judg. 1:16), who had come with Israel to Canaan, and dwelt there among the Israelites (Judg. 4:11, 17; 5:24; 1 Sam. 15:6; 27:10; 30:29); and Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab, i.e., of the Rechabites (Jer. 35:6), is probably the grandfather of Jonadab the son of Rechab, with whom Jehu entered into alliance (2 Kings 10:15, 23). But how can the families of Sopherim inhabiting Jabez, which are here enumerated, be called descendants of Salma, who is descended from Hur the son of Caleb, a man of Judah, if they were Kenites, who issued from or were descendant of the grandfather of the family of the Rechabites? From lack of information, this question cannot be answered with certainty. In general, however, we may explain the incorporation of the Kenites in the Judaeian family of the Calebite Salma, on the supposition that one of these Kenites of the family of Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses, married an heiress of the race of Caleb. On this account the children and descendants sprung of this marriage would be incorporated in the family of Caleb, although they were on their father’s side Kenites, and where they followed the manner of life of their fathers, might continue to be regarded as such, and to bear the name.

1 Chronicles 3

1 Chronicles 3. *The sons and descendants of David.*—After the enumeration of the chief families of the two sons of Hezron, Caleb and Jerahmeel, in 1 Chronicles 2:18–55, the genealogy of Ram the second son of Hezron, which in 1 Chronicles 2:10–17 was only traced down to Jesse, the father of the royal race of David, is in 1 Chronicles 3 again taken up and

further followed out. In vv. 1–9 all the sons of David are enumerated; in vv. 10–16, the line of kings of the house of David from Solomon to Jeconiah and Zedekiah; in 17–21, the descendants of Jeconiah to the grandsons of Zerubbabel; and finally, in vv. 22–24, other descendants of Shechaniah to the fourth generation.

1 Chronicles 3:1–9. The sons of David: (a) Those born in Hebron; (b) those born in Jerusalem.—Vv. 1–4. The six sons born in Hebron are enumerated also in 2 Sam. 3:2–5, with mention of their mother as here: but there the second is called כַּלְאֵב; here, on the contrary, דָּגְיָאֵל,—a difference which cannot well have arisen through an error of a copyist, but is probably to be explained on the supposition that this son had two different names. In reference to the others, see on 2 Sam. 3. The sing. אֶשֶׁר נִוְלַד לוֹ after a preceding plural subject is to be explained as in 2:9. שְׁנֵי, without the article, for מְשֻׁנָּהוּ, 2 Sam. 3:3, or הַמְשֻׁנָּה, 1 Chronicles 5:12, is surprising, as all the other numbers have the article; but the enumeration, the first-born, a second, the third, etc., may be justified without any alteration of the text being necessary. But the difference between our text and that of 2 Sam. in regard to the second son, shows that the chronicler did not take the register from 2 Sam. 3. The preposition לְ before אֶבְשָׁלוֹם seems to have come into the text only through a mistake occasioned by the preceding לְאֶבְיָהוּ, for no reason is apparent for any strong emphasis which might be implied in the לְ being placed on the name of Absalom. The addition of אֶשְׁתּוֹ to עֵגְלָה (v. 3) seems introduced only to conclude the enumeration in a fitting way, as the descent of Eglah had not been communicated; just as, for a similar reason, the additional clause “the wife of David” is inserted in 2 Sam. 3:5, without Eglah being thereby distinguished above the other wives as the most honoured. The concluding formula, “six were born to him in Hebron” (v. 4), is followed

by a notice of how long David reigned in Hebron and in Jerusalem (cf. 2 Sam. 2:11 and 55), which is intended to form a fitting transition to the following list of the sons who were born to him in Jerusalem.

1 Chronicles 3:5–8. In Jerusalem thirteen other sons were born to him, of whom four were the children of Bathsheba. The thirteen names are again enumerated in the history of David, in 1 Chronicles 14:7–11, which in the parallel passage, 2 Sam. 5:14–16, only eleven are mentioned, the two last being omitted (see on the passage). Some of the names are somewhat differently given in these passages, owing the differences of pronunciation and form: אֶלִישָׁמָע; שְׁמוּעָה; אֶלִישָׁמָע; שְׁמוּעָה, between Ibhar and Eliphalet, is in 1 Chronicles 14 more correctly written אֶלִישָׁמָע. Elishama is clearly a transcriber's error, occasioned by one of the following sons bearing this name. אֶלִישָׁמָע, shortened in 14:6 into אֶלִישָׁמָע, and נוּגָה, are wanting in 2 Sam. 5:15, probably because they died early. אֶלִישָׁמָע, v. 8, 2 Sam. 5:16, appears in 1 Chronicles 14:7 as בְּעִלְיָדָע; the mother also of the four first named, בְּתֶשֶׁבַע, the daughter of Ammiel, is elsewhere always בְּתֶשֶׁבַע, e.g., 2 Sam. 11:3, and 1 Kings 1:11, 15, etc.; and her father, Eliam (2 Sam. 11:3). בְּתֶשֶׁבַע has been derived from בְּתֶשֶׁבַע, and בְּתֶשֶׁבַע is softened from בְּתֶשֶׁבַע; but אֶלִישָׁמָע has arisen by transposition of the two parts of the name עַמְיָאֵל, or Ammiel has been altered to Eliam. Besides these, David had also sons by concubines, whose names, however, are nowhere met with. Of David's daughters only Tamar is mentioned as "their sister," i.e., sister of the before-mentioned sons, because she had become known in history through Amnon's crime (2 Sam. 13).

1 Chronicles 3:10–16. The kings of the house of David from Solomon till the exile.—Until Josiah the individual kings are mentioned in their order, each with the addition בְּנֵי, son of the preceding, vv. 10–14; the only omission

being that of the usurper Athaliah, because she did not belong to the posterity of David. But in v. 15 four sons of Josiah are mentioned, not "in order to allow of a halt in the long line of David's descendants after Josiah the great reformer" (Berth.), but because with Josiah the regular succession to the throne in the house of David ceased. For the younger son Jehoahaz, who was made king after his father's death by the people, was soon dethroned by Pharaoh-Necho, and led away captive to Egypt; and of the other sons Jehoiakim was set up by Pharaoh, and Zedekiah by Nebuchadnezzar, so that both were only vassals of heathen lords of the land, and the independent kingship of David came properly to an end with the death of Josiah. Johanan, the first-born of the sons of Josiah, is not to be identified with Jehoahaz, whom the people raised to the throne. For, in the first place, it appears from the statement as to the ages of Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim in 2 Kings 23:31, 36, 2 Chronicles 36:2, 5, that Jehoahaz was two years younger than Jehoiakim, and consequently was not the first-born. In Jer. 22:11 it is expressly declared that Shallum, the fourth son of Josiah, was king of Judah instead of his father, and was led away into captivity, and never saw his native land again, as history narrates of Jehoahaz. From this it would appear that Shallum took, as king, the name Jehoahaz. Johanan, the first-born, is not met with again in history, either because he died early, or because nothing remarkable could be told of him. Jehoiakim was called Eliakim before he was raised to the throne (2 Kings 23:24). Zedekiah was at first Mattaniah (2 Kings 24:17). Zedekiah, on his ascending the throne, was younger than Shallum, and that event occurred eleven years after the accession of Shallum = Jehoahaz. Zedekiah was only twenty-one years old, while Jehoahaz had become king in his twenty-third year. But in our genealogy Zedekiah is introduced after Jehoiakim, and before Shallum, because, on the one hand, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah had occupied the throne for a longer period, each having been eleven years king; and on the other, Zedekiah and Shallum were sons of

Hamutal (2 Kings 23:31; 24:18), while Jehoiakim was the son of Zebudah (2 Kings 23:36). According to age, they should have followed each other in this order—Johanan, Jehoiakim, Shallum, and Zedekiah; and in respect to their kingship, Shallum should have stood before Jehoiakim. But in both cases those born of the same mother, Hamutal, would have been separated. To avoid this, apparently, Shallum has been enumerated in the fourth place, along with his full brother Zedekiah. In v. 6 it is remarkable that a son of Jehoiakim's son Jeconiah is mentioned, named Zedekiah, while the sons of Jeconiah follow only in vv. 17 and 18. Jeconiah (cf. Jer. 24:1; shortened Coniah, Jer. 22:24, 28, and 37:1) is called, as kings, in 2 Kings 24:8ff. and 2 Chronicles 36:9, Jehoiachin, another form of the name, but having the same signification, "Jahve founds or establishes." Zedekiah can only be a son of Jeconiah, for the בְּנוֹ which is added constantly denotes that the person so called is the son of his predecessor. Many commentators, certainly, were of opinion that Zedekiah was the same person as the brother of Jehoiakim mentioned in v. 15 under the name Zidkijahu, and who is here introduced as son of Jeconiah, because he was the successor of Jeconiah on the throne. For this view support was sought in a reference to v. 10ff., in which all Solomon's successors in the kingship are enumerated in order with בְּנוֹ. But all the kings who succeeded each other from Solomon to Josiah were also, without exception, sons of their predecessors; so that there בְּנוֹ throughout denotes a proper son, while King Zedekiah, on the contrary, was not the son, but an uncle of Jeconiah (Jehoiachin). We must therefore hold צִדְקִיָּה for a literal son of Jeconiah, and that so much the more, because the name צִדְקִיָּה differs also from צִדְקִיָּהוּ, as the name of the king is constantly written in 2 Kings 24:17ff. and in 2 Chronicles 36:10. But mention is made of this Zedekiah in v. 16 apart from the other sons of Jeconiah (vv. 17 and 18), perhaps because he was not led away captive

into exile with the others, but died in Judah before the breaking up of the kingdom.

1 Chronicles 3:17–24. The descendants of the captive and exiled Jeconiah, and other families.—V. 17. In the list of the son of Jeconiah it is doubtful if אֶסֶר be the name of a son, or should be considered, as it is by Luther and others, an appellative, "prisoner," in apposition to יְבָנִיָּה, "the sons of Jeconiah, the captive, is Shealtiel" (A. V. Salathiel). The reasons which have been advanced in favour of this latter interpretation are: the lack of the conjunction with שְׂאֵלְתִיָּאֵל; the position of בְּנוֹ after שְׂאֵלְתִיָּאֵל, not after אֶסֶר; and the circumstance that Assir is nowhere to be met with, either in Matt. 1:12 or in *Seder olam zuta*, as an intervening member of the family between Jeconiah and Shealtiel (Berth.). But none of these reasons is decisive. The want of the conjunction proves absolutely nothing, for in v. 18 also, the last three names are grouped together without a conjunction; and the position of בְּנוֹ after שְׂאֵלְתִיָּאֵל is just as strange, whether Shealtiel be the first named son or the second, for in v. 18 other sons of Jeconiah follow, and the peculiarity of it can only be accounted for on the supposition that the case of Shealtiel differs from that of the remaining sons. The omission of Assir in the genealogies in Matthew and the *Seder olam* also proves nothing, for in the genealogies intermediate members are often passed over. Against the appellative interpretation of the word, on the contrary, the want of the article is decisive; as apposition to יְבָנִיָּה, it should have the article. But besides this, according to the genealogy of Jesus in Luke 3:27, Shealtiel is a son of Neri, a descendant of David, of the lineage of Nathan, not of Solomon; and according to Hagg. 1:1, 12, Ezra 3:2; 5:2, and Matt. 1:12, Zerubbabel is son of Shealtiel; while, according to vv. 18 and 19 of our chapter, he is a son of Pedaiah, a brother of Shealtiel. These divergent statements may be reconciled by the following combination. The discrepancy in regard to the enumeration of Shealtiel among the sons of Jeconiah, a

descendant of Solomon, and the statement that he was descended from Neri, a descendant of Nathan, Solomon's brother, is removed by the supposition that Jeconiah, besides the Zedekiah mentioned in v. 16, who died childless, had another son, viz., Assir, who left only a daughter, who then, according to the law as to heiresses (Num. 27:8; 36:8f.), married a man belonging to a family of her paternal tribe, viz., Neri, of the family of David, in the line of Nathan, and that from this marriage sprang Shealtiel, Malchiram, and the other sons (properly grandsons) of Jeconiah mentioned in v. 18. If we suppose the eldest of these, Shealtiel, to come into the inheritance of his maternal grandfather, he would be legally regarded as his legitimate son. In our genealogy, therefore, along with the childless Assir, Shealtiel is introduced as a descendant of Jeconiah, while in Luke he is called, according to his actual descent, a son of Neri. The other discrepancy in respect to the descendants of Zerubbabel is to be explained, as has been already shown on Hagg. 1:1, by the law of Levirate marriage, and by the supposition that Shealtiel died without any male descendants, leaving his wife a widow. In such a case, according to the law (Deut. 25:5–10, cf. Matt. 22:24–28), it became the duty of one of the brothers of the deceased to marry his brother's widow, that he might raise up seed, i.e., posterity, to the deceased brother; and the first son born of this marriage would be legally incorporated with the family of the deceased, and registered as his son. After Shealtiel's death, his second brother Pedaiah fulfilled this Levirate duty, and begat, in his marriage with his sister-in-law, Zerubbabel, who was now regarded, in all that related to laws of heritage, as Shealtiel's son, and propagated his race as his heir. According to this right of heritage, Zerubbabel is called in the passages quoted from Haggai and Ezra, as also in the genealogy in Matthew, the son of Shealtiel. The **גַּנָּה** seems to hint at this peculiar position of Shealtiel with reference to the proper descendants of Jeconiah, helping to remind us that he was son of Jeconiah not by natural birth, but only

because of his right of heritage only, on his mother's side. As to the orthography of the name **שְׁאַלְתִּיאל**, see on Hagg. 1:1. The six persons named in v. 18 are not sons of Shealtiel, as Kimchi, Hiller, and others, and latterly Hitzig also, on Hagg. 1:1, believe, but his brothers, as the cop. **ו** before **מְלִכִּירָם** requires. The supposition just mentioned is only an attempt, irreconcilable with the words of the text, to form a series, thus: Shealtiel, Pedaiah his son, Zerubbabel his son,—so as to get rid of the differences between our verse and Hagg. 1:1, Ezra 3:2. In vv. 19 and 20, sons and grandsons of Pedaiah are registered. Nothing further is known of the Bne Jeconiah mentioned in v. 18. Pedaiah's son Zerubbabel is unquestionably the prince of Judah who returned to Jerusalem in the reign of Cyrus in the year 536, at the head of a great host of exiles, and superintended their settlement anew in the land of their fathers (Ezra 1–6). Of Shimei nothing further is known. In vv. 19b and 20, the sons of Zerubbabel are mentioned, and in v. 21a two grandsons are named. Instead of the singular **וְבֶן** some MSS have **וְבָנֵי**, and the old versions also have the plural. This is correct according to the sense, although **וְבֶן** cannot be objected to on critical grounds, and may be explained by the writer's having had mainly in view the one son who continued the line of descendants. By the mention of their sister after the first two names, the sons of Zerubbabel are divided into two groups, probably as the descendants of different mothers. How Shelomith had gained such fame as to be received into the family register, we do not know. Those mentioned in v. 20 are brought together in one group by the number "five." **וַיֵּשֶׁב הַחֶסֶד**, "grace is restored," is one name. The grandsons of Zerubbabel, Pelatiah and Jesaiah, were without doubt contemporaries of Ezra, who returned to Jerusalem from Babylon seventy-eight years after Zerubbabel.

After these grandsons of Zerubbabel, there are ranged in v. 21b, without any copula whatever, four families, the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of

Arnan, etc.; and of the last named of these, the sons of Shecaniah, four generations of descendants are enumerated in vv. 22–24, without any hint as to the genealogical connection of Shecaniah with the grandsons of Zerubbabel. The assertion of more modern critics, Ewald, Bertheau, and others, that Shecaniah was a brother or a son of Pelatiah or Jesaiah, and that Zerubbabel's family is traced down through six generations, owes its origin to the wish to gain support for the opinion that the Chronicle was composed long after Ezra, and is without any foundation. The argument of Bertheau, that "since the sons of Rephaiah, etc., run parallel with the preceding names Pelatiah and Jesaiah, and since the continuation of the list in v. 22 is connected with the last mentioned Shecaniah, we cannot but believe that Pelatiah, Jesaiah, Rephaiah, Arnan, Obadiah, and Shecaniah are, without exception, sons of Hananiah," would be well founded if, and only if, the names Rephaiah, Arnan, etc., stood in our verse, instead of the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, etc., for Pelatiah and Jesaiah are not parallel with the *sons* of Arnan. Pelatiah and Jesaiah may perhaps be sons of Hananiah, but not the sons of Rephaiah, Arnan, etc. These would be grandsons of Hananiah, on the assumption that Rephaiah, Arnan, etc., were brothers of Pelatiah and Jesaiah, and sons of Hananiah. But for this assumption there is no tenable ground; it would be justified only if our present Masoretic text could lay claim to infallibility. Only on the ground of a belief in this infallibility of the traditional text could we explain to ourselves, as Bertheau does, the ranging of the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, etc., along with Pelatiah and Jesaiah, called sons of Hananiah, by supposing that Rephaiah, Arnan, Obadiah, and Shecaniah are not named as individuals, but are mentioned together with their families, because they were the progenitors of famous races, while Pelatiah and Jesaiah either had no descendants at all, or none at least who were at all renowned. The text, as we have it, in which the sons of Rephaiah, etc., follow the names of the grandsons of Zerubbabel without a

conjunction, and in which the words וּבְנֵי שְׁכַנְיָהּ, and a statement of the names of one of these בְּנֵי and his further descendants, follow the immediately preceding וּבְנֵי שְׁכַנְיָהּ, has no meaning, and is clearly corrupt, as has been recognised by Heidegger, Vitranga, Carpzov, and others. Owing, however, to want of information from other sources regarding these families and their connection with the descendants of Zerubbabel, we have no means whatever of restoring the original text. The sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, etc., were, it may be supposed, branches of the family of David, whose descent or connection with Zerubbabel is for us unascertainable. The list from בְּנֵי רְפָיָהּ, v. 21*b*, to the end of the chapter, is a genealogical fragment, which has perhaps come into the text of the Chronicle at a later time.¹⁴ Many of the names which this fragment contains are met with singly in genealogies of other tribes, but nowhere in a connection from which we might draw conclusions as to the origin of the families here enumerated, and the age in which they lived. Bertheau, indeed, thinks "we may in any case hold Hattush, v. 22, for the descendant of David of the same name mentioned in Ezra 8:2, who lived at the time of Ezra," but he has apparently forgotten that, according to his interpretation of our verse, Hattush would be a great-grandson of Zerubbabel, who, even if he were then born, could not possibly have been a man and the head of a family at the time of his supposed return from Babylon with Ezra, seventy-eight years after the return of his great-grandfather to Palestine. Other men too, even priests, have borne the name Hattush; cf. Neh. 3:10; 10:5; 12:2. There returned, moreover, from Babylon with Ezra sons of Shecaniah (Ezra 8:3), who may as justly be identified with the sons of Shecaniah mentioned in v. 22 of our chapter as forefathers or ancestors of Hattush, as the Hattush here is identified with the Hattush of Ezra 8:2. But from the fact that, in the genealogy of Jesus, Matt. 1, not a single one of the names of descendants of Zerubbabel there enumerated coincides with the names given in

our verses, we may conclude that the descendants of Shecaniah enumerated in vv. 22–24 did not descend from Zerubbabel in a direct line. Intermediate members are, it is true, often omitted in genealogical lists; but who would maintain that in Matthew seven, or, according to the other interpretation of our verse, nine, consecutive members have been at one bound overleapt? This weighty consideration, which has been brought forward by Clericus, is passed over in silence by the defenders of the opinion that our verses contain a continuation of the genealogy of Zerubbabel. The only other remark to be made about this fragment is, that in v. 22 the number of the sons of Shecaniah is given as six, while only five names are mentioned, and that consequently a name must have fallen out by mistake in transcribing. Nothing further can be said of these families, as they are otherwise quite unknown.

1 Chronicles 4

Ch. 4:1–23.—Fragments of the Genealogies of Descendants and Families of Judah.

1 Chronicles 4:1. V. 1 is evidently intended to be a superscription to the genealogical fragments which follow. Five names are mentioned as sons of Judah, of whom only Pharez was his son (1 Chronicles 2:4); the others are grandchildren or still more distant descendants. Nothing is said as to the genealogical relationship in which they stood to each other; that is supposed to be already known from the genealogies in 1 Chronicles 2. Hezron is the son of Pharez, and consequently grandson of Judah, 2:8. Carmi, a descendant of Zerach, the brother of Pharez, see on 2:6, 7. Hur is a son of Caleb, the son of Hezron, by Ephratah (see on 2:19 and 50); and Shobal is the son of Hur, who has just been mentioned (1 Chronicles 2:50). These five names do not denote here, any more than in 1 Chronicles 2, “families of the tribe of Judah” (Berth.), but signify persons who originated or were heads of families. The only conceivable ground for these five being called “sons of Judah,” is that

the families registered in the following lists traced their origin to them, although in the enumeration which follows the genealogical connection of the various groups is not clearly brought out. The enumeration begins,

1 Chronicles 4:2. V. 2, with *the descendants of Shobal*. As to Reaiah the son of Shobal, see 2:52. He begat Jahath, a name often occurring in Levite families, cf. 6:5, 28; 23:10ff., 24:22, 2 Chronicles 34:12; but of the descendant of David who bore this name nothing further is known. His sons Ahumai and Lahad founded the families of the Zorathites, i.e., the inhabitants of Zora, who also, according to 2:53, were descended from sons of Shobal. Our verse therefore gives more detailed information regarding the lineage of these families.

1 Chronicles 4:3, 4. Vv. 3 and 4 contain notices of the descendants of Hur. The first words of the third verse, “these, father of Etam, Jezreel,” have no meaning; but the last sentence of the second verse suggests that *מְשֻׁפָּחוֹת* should be supplied, when we read, “and these are the families of (from) Abi-Etam.” The LXX and Vulgate have *אלה בני עיטם*, which is also to be found in several codices, while other codices read *אלה בני אבי עיטם*. Both readings are probably only conjectures. Whether *אבי עיטם* is to be taken as the name of a person, or appellatively, father = lord of Etam, cannot be decided. *עיטם* is in v. 32, and probably also in Judg. 15:8, 11, the name of a town of the Simeonites; and in 2 Chronicles 11:6, the name of a little town in the highlands of Judah, south of Jerusalem. If *עיטם* be the name of a place, only the lest named can be here meant. The names Jezreel, Ishma, and Idbash denote persons as progenitors and head of families or branches of families. For *יִזְרְעֵאל* as the name of a person, cf. Hos. 1:4. That these names should be those of persons is required by the succeeding remark, “and their sister Hazelel-poni.” The formation of this name, with the derivative termination *i*, seems to express a relationship of race; but the

word may also be an adjective, and as such may be a proper name: cf. Ew. § 273, *e*.

1 Chronicles 4:4. Penuel, in Gen. 22:31f., Judg. 8:8, name of a place in the East-Jordan land, as here, and in 8:25 the name of a man. Gedor is, we may suppose, the town of that name in the mountains of Judah, which is still to be found in the ruin Jedur (see on Josh. 15:58). Penuel is here called father of Bedor, while in v. 18 one Jered is so called, whence we must conclude that the inhabitants of Gedor were descended from both. Ezer (Help) occurs in 7:21; 12:9, Neh. 3:19, of other men; father of Hushah, i.e., according to the analogy of Abi-Gedor, also the name of a place not elsewhere mentioned, where the hero Sibbecai had his birth, 11:29, 2 Sam. 23:27. Those thus named in vv. 3 and 4 are sons of Hur, the first-born of Ephratah (1 Chronicles 2:19), the father of Bethlehem. The inhabitants of Bethlehem then, according to this, were descended from Hur through his son Salma, who is called in 2:51 father of Bethlehem. The circumstance, too, that in our verses (3 and 4) other names of persons are enumerated as descendants of Hur than those given in 2:50–55 gives rise to no discrepancy, for there is no ground for the supposition that in 2:50–55 *all* the descendants of Hur have been mentioned.

1 Chronicles 4:5–7. *Sons of Ashur*, the father of Tekoa, who, according to 2:24, was a posthumous son of Hezron. Ashur had two wives, Helah and Naarah. Of the latter came four sons and as many families: Ahuzam, of whom nothing further is known; Hephher, also unknown, but to be distinguished from the Gileadite of the same name in 1 Chronicles 11:36 and Num. 26:32f. The conjecture that the name is connected with the land of Hephher (1 Kings 4:10), the territory of a king conquered by Joshua (Josh. 12:17) (Berth.), is not very well supported. Temani (man of the south) may be simply the name of a person, but it is probably, like the following, the name of a family. Haahashtari, descended from Ahashtar, is quite unknown.

1 Chronicles 4:7. The first wife, Helah, bore three sons, Zereth, Jezoar, and Ethnan, who are not elsewhere met with. For the Kethibh יצחר there is in the Keri יצחר, the name of a son of Simeon (Gen. 46:10), and of a Hittite chief in the time of the patriarchs (Gen. 23:8), with whom the son of Helah has nothing to do.

1 Chronicles 4:8–10. Vv. 8–10 contain a fragment, the connection of which with the sons of Judah mentioned in 1 Chronicles 2 is not clear. Coz begat Anub, etc. The name קוז occurs only here; elsewhere only קוזי is found, of a Levite, 24:10, cf. Ezra 2:61 and Neh. 3:4, —in the latter passage without any statement as to the tribe to which the sons of Hakkoz belonged. The names of the sons begotten by Coz, v. 8, do not occur elsewhere. The same is to be said of Jabez, of whom we know nothing beyond what is communicated in vv. 9 and 10. The word יעבץ denotes in 2:55 a town or village which is quite unknown to us; but whether our Jabez were father (lord) of this town cannot be determined. If there be any genealogical connection between the man Jabez and the locality of this name or its inhabitants (1 Chronicles 2:55), then the persons named in v. 8 would belong to the descendants of Shobal. For although the connection of Jabez with Coz and his sons is not clearly set forth, yet it may be conjectured from the statements as to Jabez being connected with the preceding by the words, “Jabez was more honoured than his brethren.” The older commentators have thence drawn the conclusion that Jabez was a son or brother of Coz. Bertheau also rightly remarks: “The statements that he was more honoured than his brethren (cf. Gen. 34:19), that his mother called him Jabez because she had borne him with sorrow; the use of the similarly sounding word יעבץ along with the name יעבץ (cf. Gen. 4:25; 19:37f., 29:32, 33, 35; 30:6, 8, etc.); and the statement that Jabez vowed to the God of Israel (cf. Gen. 33:20) in a prayer (cf. Gen. 28:20),—all bring to our recollection similar statements of Genesis, and doubtless rest upon primeval

tradition." In the terms of the vow, לְבִלְתִּי עֲצָבִי, "so that sorrow may not be to me," there is a play upon the name Jabez. But of the vow itself only the conditions proposed by the maker of the vow are communicated: "If Thou wilt bless me, and enlarge my coast, and Thy hand shall be with me, and Thou wilt keep evil far off, not to bring sorrow to me,"—without the conclusion, Then I vow to do this or that (cf. Gen. 28:20f.), but with the remark that God granted him that which he requested. The reason of this is probably that the vow had acquired importance sufficient to make it worthy of being handed down only from God's having so fulfilled his wish, that his life became a contradiction of his name; the son of sorrow having been free from pain in life, and having attained to greater happiness and reputation than his brothers.

1 Chronicles 4:11, 12. The genealogy of the men of Rechah.—As to their connection with the larger families of Judah, nothing has been handed down to us. Chelub, another form of the name Caleb or Chelubai (see 2:9 and 18), is distinguished from the better known Caleb son of Hezron (1 Chronicles 2:18 and 42), and from the son of Jephunneh (v. 15), by the additional clause, "the son of Shuah." Shuah is not met with elsewhere, but is without reason identified with Hushah, v. 4, by the older commentators. Mehir the father of Eshton is likewise unknown. Eshton begat the house (the family) of Rapha, of whom also nothing further is said; for they can be connected neither with the Benjamite Rapha (1 Chronicles 8:2) nor with the children of Rapha (1 Chronicles 20:4, 6, 8). Paseah and Tehinnah are also unknown, for it is uncertain whether the sons of Paseah mentioned among the Nethinim, Ezra 2:49, Neh. 7:51, have any connection with our Paseah. Tehinnah is called "father of the city of Nahash." The latter name is probably not properly the name of a town, but rather the name of a person Nahash, not unlikely the same as the father of Abigail (2 Sam. 17:25), the step-sister of David (cf. 2:16). The men (or people) of Rechah are unknown.

1 Chronicles 4:13–15. *Descendants of Kenaz.*— קְנָז is a descendant of Hezron the son of Pharez, as may be inferred from the fact that Caleb the son of Jephunneh, a descendant of Hezron's son Caleb, is called in Num. 32:12 and Josh. 14:6 קְנָזִי, and consequently was also a descendant of Kenaz. Othniel and Seraiah, introduced here as בְּנֵי קְנָז, are not sons (in the narrower sense of the word), but more distant descendants of Kenaz; for Othniel and Caleb the son of Jephunneh were, according to Josh. 15:17 and Judg. 1:13, brothers.¹⁵ Kenaz, therefore, can neither have been the father of Othniel nor father of Caleb (in the proper sense of the word), but must at least have been the grandfather or great-grandfather of both. Othniel is the famous first judge of Israel, Judg. 3:9ff. Of Seraiah nothing further is known, although the name is often met with of different persons.

The sons of Othniel are Hathath. The plural בְּנֵי, even when only one name follows, is met with elsewhere (*vide* on 2:7); but the continuation is somewhat strange, "and Meonothai begat Ophrah," for as Meonothai is not before mentioned, his connection with Othniel is not given. There is evidently a hiatus in the text, which may most easily be filled up by repeating וּמְעֹנָתַי at the end of v. 13. According to this conjecture two sons of Othniel would be named, Hathath and Meonothai, and then the posterity of the latter is given. The name מְעֹנָתַי (my dwellings) is not met with elsewhere. It is not at all probable that it is connected with the town Maon, and still less that it is so in any way with the Mehunim, Ezra 2:50. Ophrah is unknown, for of course we must not think of the towns called Ophrah, in the territory of Benjamin, Josh. 18:23, and in that of Manasseh, Judg. 6:11, 24. Seraiah, who is mentioned in v. 13, begat Joab the father (founder) of the valley of the craftsmen, "for they (i.e., the inhabitants of this valley, who were descended from Joab) were craftsmen." The valley of the חַרְשֵׁים (craftsmen) is again mentioned in Neh. 11:35,

whence we may conclude that it lay at no great distance from Jerusalem, in a northern direction.

1 Chronicles 4:15. Of Iru, Elah, and Naam, the sons of Caleb the son of Jephunneh (cf. on v. 13), nothing more is known. To connect Elah with the Edomite chief of that name (1 Chronicles 1:52) is arbitrary. Of Elah's sons only "and Kenaz" is mentioned; the ו copul.

before קָנַז shows clearly that a name has been dropped out before it.

1 Chronicles 4:16–20. *Descendants of various men*, whose genealogical connection with the sons and grandsons of Judah, mentioned in v. 1, is not given in the text as it has come to us.

1 Chronicles 4:16. Sons of Jehaleleel, a man not elsewhere mentioned. Ziph, Ziphah, etc., are met with only here. There is no strong reason for connecting the name זִיפִי with the towns of that name, Josh. 15:24, 55.

1 Chronicles 4:17. Ezra, whose four sons are enumerated, is likewise unknown. The singular זָרָא is peculiar, but has analogies in 3:19, 21, and 23. Of the names of his sons, Jether and Epher again occur, the former in 2:53, and the latter in 1:33 and 5:24, but in other families. Jalon, on the contrary, is found only here. The children of two wives of Mered are enumerated in vv. 17b and 18, but in a fashion which is quite unintelligible, and shows clear traces of a corruption in the text. For (1) the name of a woman as subject of וַתֵּהָרֵג, "and she conceived (bare)," is wanting; and (2) in v. 18 the names of two women occur, Jehudijah and Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh. But the sons of Jehudijah are first given, and there follows thereupon the formula, "and these are the sons of Bithiah," without any mention of the names of these sons. This manifest confusion Bertheau has sought to remove by a happy transposition of the words. He suggests that the words, "and these are the sons of Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh, whom Mered had taken," should be placed immediately after וַיִּלֹּן. "By this means we obtain (1) the missing subject of וַתֵּהָרֵג; (2)

the definite statement that Mered had two wives, with whom he begat sons; and (3) an arrangement by which the sons are enumerated after the names of their respective mothers." After this transposition the 17th verse would read thus: "And the sons of Ezra are Jether, Mered, ... and Jalon; and these are the sons of Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh, whom Mered took; and she conceived (and bare) Miriam, and Shammai, and Ishbah, the father of Eshtemoa (v. 18), and his wife Jehudijah bore Jered the father of Gedor, etc." This conjecture commends itself by its simplicity, and by the clearness which it brings into the words. From them we then learn that two families, who dwelt in a number of the cities of Judah, were descended from Mered the son of Ezra by his two wives. We certainly know no more details concerning them, as neither Mered nor his children are met with elsewhere. From the circumstance, however, that the one wife was a daughter of Pharaoh, we may conclude that Mered lived before the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt. The name Miriam, which Moses' sister bore, is here a man's name. The names introduced by זָרָא are the names of towns. Ishbah is father (lord) of the town Eshtemoa, in the mountains of Judah, now Semua, a village to the south of Hebron, with considerable ruins dating from ancient times (cf. on Josh. 15:50). הַיְהוּדִיָּה means properly "the Jewess," as distinguished from the Egyptian woman, Pharaoh's daughter. Gedor is a town in the high lands of Judah (cf. on v. 4). Socho, in the low land of Judah, now Shuweikeh, in Wady Sumt (cf. on Josh. 15:35). Zanoah is the name of a town in the high lands of Judah, Josh. 15:56 (which has not yet been discovered), and of a town in the low land, now Zanuah, not far from Zoreah, in an easterly direction (cf. on Josh. 15:34). Perhaps the latter is here meant. In v. 19, "the sons of the wife of Hodiah, the sister of Naham, are the father of Keilah the Garmite, and Eshtemoa the Maachathite." The *stat. contr.* אִשָּׁת before הַיְהוּדִיָּה shows that Hodiah is a man's name. Levites of this name are mentioned in Neh. 8:7; 9:5; 10:11. The relationship of Hodiah and Naham

to the persons formerly named is not given. קַעֲלֵה is a locality in the low land of Judah not yet discovered (see on Josh. 15:44). The origin of the Epithet הַגְּרָמִי we do not know. Before אֲשֶׁת־מַעַי, אָבִי with ו copul. is probably to be repeated; and the Maachathite, the chief of a part of the inhabitants of Eshtemoa, is perhaps a descendant of Caleb by Maachah (1 Chronicles 2:48).

1 Chronicles 4:20. Of Shimon and his four sons, also, nothing is known. בְּנֵי־חִנָּן is one name. Ishi is often met with, e.g., v. 42 and 2:31, but nowhere in connection with Zoheth (not further noticed). The names of the sons are wanting after בְּנֵי־זוּחַת.

1 Chronicles 4:21–23. *Descendants of Shelah*, the third son of Judah, 2:3, and Gen. 38:5.—All the families of Judah enumerated in vv. 2–20 are connected together by the conjunction ו, and so are grouped as descendants of the sons and grandsons of Judah named in v. 1. The conjunction is omitted, however, before בְּנֵי שֶׁלָה, as also before בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה in v. 3, to show that the descendants of Shelah form a second line of descendants of Judah, co-ordinate with the sons of Judah enumerated in vv. 1–19, concerning whom only a little obscure but not unimportant information has been preserved. Those mentioned as sons are Er (which also was the name of the first-born of Judah, 2:3f.), father of Lecah, and Laadan, the father of Mareshah. The latter name denotes, beyond question, a town which still exists as the ruin Marash in the Shephelah, Josh. 15:44 (see on 2:42), and consequently Lecah (לֶכָה) also is the name of a locality not elsewhere mentioned. The further descendants of Shelah were, “the families of the Byssus-work of the house of Ashbea,” i.e., the families of Ashbea, a man of whom nothing further is known. Of these families some were connected with a famous weaving-house or linen (Byssus) manufactory, probably in Egypt; and then further, in v. 22, “Jokim, and the man of Chozeba, and Joash, and Saraph, which ruled

over Moab, and Jashubi-lehem.” Kimchi conjectured that כְּזִיב was the place called כְּזִיב in Gen. 38:5 = אֶבְזִיב, Josh. 15:44, in the low land, where Shelah was born. יִשְׁבִי לְחָם is a strange name, “which the punctuators would hardly have pronounced in the way they have done if it had not come down to them by tradition” (Berth.). The other names denote heads of families or branches of families, the branches and families being included in them.¹⁶ Nothing is told us of them beyond what is found in our verses, according to which the four first named ruled over Moab during a period in the primeval time; fir, as the historian himself remarks, “these things are old.”

1 Chronicles 4:23. “These are the potters and the inhabitants of Netaim and Gedera.” It is doubtful whether הַמָּה refers to all the descendants of Shelah, or only to those named in v. 22. Bertheau holds the latter to be the more probable reference; “for as those named in v. 21 have already been denominated Byssus-workers, it appears fitting that those in v. 22 should be regarded as the potters, etc.” But all those mentioned in v. 22 are by no means called Byssus-weavers, but only the families of Ashbea. What the descendants of Er and Laadan were is not said. The הַמָּה may consequently very probably refer to all the sons of Shelah enumerated in vv. 21 and 22, with the exception of the families designated Byssus-weavers, who are, of course, understood to be excepted. נִטְעִים signifies “plantings;” but since גְּדֵרָה is probably the name of a city Gedera in the lowlands of Judah (cf. Josh. 15:36; and for the situation, see on 1 Chronicles 12:4), Netaim also will most likely denote a village where there were royal plantations, and about which these descendants of Shelah were employed, as the words “with the king in his business to dwell there” expressly state. הַמֶּלֶךְ is not an individual king of Judah, for we know not merely “of King Uzziah that he had country lands, 2 Chronicles 26:10” (Berth.); but we learn from 1 Chronicles 27:25–31 that David

also possessed great estates and country lands, which were managed by regularly appointed officers.

We may therefore with certainty assume that all the kings of Judah had domains on which not only agriculture and the rearing of cattle, but also trades, were carried on.¹⁷

Ch. 4:24–43.—The Families and the Dwelling-places of the Tribe of Simeon.

1 Chronicles 4:25–27. In 25–27 we have, traced down through several generations, the genealogy of only one of all the families of the tribe of Simeon. There follows thereupon, in vv. 28–33, an enumeration of the ancient dwelling-places of this tribe; and finally, in vv. 34–43, information it given concerning the emigrations of Simeonite families into other neighbourhoods.

1 Chronicles 4:24–27. *The families of Simeon.*—Of the six sons of Simeon, Gen. 46:10 and Ex. 6:15, only the five are here named who, according to Num. 26:12–14, founded the families of this tribe. The third son, Ohad, is omitted even in Num. 26:12 in the list of the families of Simeon, at the numbering of the people in the fortieth year of the journey through the wilderness, clearly only because the posterity of Ohad had either died out, or had so dwindled away that it could form no independent family. The names of the five sons agree with the names in Num. 26:12–14, except in the case of Jarib, who in Num. 26:12, which coincides here with Gen. 46:10 and Ex. 6:15, is called Jachin; יַרִיב, consequently, must be looked upon as a transcriber's error for יַכִּיָן. Nemuel and Zerah (זֶרַח, the rising of the sun) are called in Genesis and Exodus Jemuel (a different form of the same name) and Zohar (צֹהַר, i.e., *candor*), another name of similar meaning, which, at first used only as a by-name, afterwards supplanted the original name.

1 Chronicles 4:25. "Shallum (was) his son;" without doubt the son of the last named Shaul, who in Genesis and Exodus is called the son of a Canaanitish woman, and is thereby

distinguished from the other sons. His family is traced down, in vv. 25 and 26, through six generations to one Shimei. But this list is divided into two groups by the words "and the sons of Mishma," inserted at the beginning of v. 26, but the reasons for the division are unknown. The plural, sons of Mishma, refers to Hammuel and his descendants Zacchur and Shimei. Perhaps these two together form, with the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons mentioned in v. 25, a single larger family.

1 Chronicles 4:27. Shimei had sixteen sons and six daughters, by whom he became the father of a numerous race. "His brothers," i.e., the other Simeonites, on the contrary, had not many sons. Hence it happens that they made not their whole race, i.e., the whole race of the Simeonites, numerous unto the sons of Judah, i.e., that the Simeonites were not so numerous as the descendants of Judah. This account is corroborated by the statement made at the numberings of the people under Moses; see on Num. 1–4 (1 Chronicles 1:2, S. 192).

1 Chronicles 4:28–33. *The ancient dwelling-places of the Simeonites,* which they received within the tribal domain of Judah at the division of the land by Joshua; cf. Josh. 19:1ff.—There are in all eighteen cities, divided into two groups, numbering thirteen and five respectively, as in Josh. 19:2–6, where these same cities are enumerated in the same order. The only difference is, that in Joshua thirteen cities are reckoned in the first group and four in the second, although the first group contains fourteen names. Between Beersheba and Moladah there stands there a שֶׁבַע which is not found in our list, and which might be considered to be a repetition of the second part of בְּאֵר-שֶׁבַע, if it were not that in the list of the cities, Josh. 15:26, the name שֶׁמֶע before Moladah corresponds to it. The other differences between the two passages arise partly from different forms of the same name being used,—as, for example, בְּלָהָה for בְּלָהָה (Josh.), אֶלְתוֹלַד for תוֹלַד, אֶלְתוֹלַד for בְּתוֹאֵל, and partly from different names being used of the

same city,—e.g., בֵּית־בְּרָאִי (v. 31) instead of בֵּית־לְבָאוֹת, “the house of lions” (Josh.), שְׁעָרִים instead of שְׁרוּחָן (Josh.). All these cities lie in the south land of Judah, and have therefore been named in Josh. 15:26–32 among the cities of that district. As to Beersheba, now Bir es Seba, see on Gen. 21:31; and for Moladah, which is to be identified with the ruin el Milh to the south of Hebron, on the road to Ailah, see on Josh. 15:26. Bilhah (in Josh. 15:29, בַּעֲלָה), Ezem, Tolad, and Bethuel (for which in Josh. 15:31 בְּסִיל is found), have not yet been discovered; cf. on Josh. 15:29 and 30. Hormah, formerly Sephat, is now the ruin Sepata, on the western slope of the Rakhma table-land, 2 1/2 hours south of Khalasa (Elusa); cf. on Josh. 12:14. Ziklag is most probably to be sought in the ancient village Aschludsch or Kasludsch, to the east of Sepata; cf. on Josh. 15:31. Beth-Marcaboth, i.e., “carriage-house,” and Hazar-Susim (or Susa), i.e., horse-village, both evidently by-names, are called in Josh. 15:31 Madmannah and Sansannah. Their position has not yet been discovered. Beth-Birei, or Beth-Lebaath, is also as yet undiscovered; cf. on Josh. 15:32. Shaaraim, called in Josh. 15:32 Shilhim, is supposed to be the same as Tell Sheriah, between Gaza and Beersheba; cf. Van de Velde, *Reise*, ii. S. 154. The enumeration of these thirteen cities concludes in v. 31 with the strange subscription, “These (were) their cities until the reign of David, and their villages.” וְחֻצְרֵיהֶם, which, according to the Masoretic division of the verses, stands at the beginning of v. 32, should certainly be taken with v. 31; for the places mentioned in v. 32 are expressly called cities, and in Josh. 19:6, cities and their villages, חֻצְרֵיהֶם, are spoken of. This subscription can hardly “only be intended to remind us, that of the first-mentioned cities, one (viz., Ziklag, 1 Sam. 27:6), or several, in the time of David, no longer belonged to the tribe of Simeon;” nor can it only be meant to state that “till the time of David the cities named were in possession of the tribe of Simeon, though they did not all continue to be possessed by this

tribe at a later time” (Berth.). Ziklag had been, even before the reign of David, taken away from the Simeonites by the Philistines, and had become the property of King Achish, who in the reign of Saul presented it to David, and through him it became the property of the kings of Judah (1 Sam. 27:6). The subscription can only mean that till the reign of David these cities rightfully belonged to the Simeonites, but that during and after David’s reign this rightful possession of the Simeonites was trenched upon; and of this curtailing of their rights, the transfer of the city of Ziklag to the kings of Judah gives one historically attested proof. This, however, might not have been the only instance of the sort; it may have brought with it other alterations in the possessions of the Simeonites as to which we have no information. The remark of R. Salomo and Kimchi, that the men of Judah, when they had attained to greater power under David’s rule, drove the Simeonites out of their domains, and compelled them to seek out other dwelling-places, is easily seen to be an inference drawn from the notices in vv. 33–43 of emigrations of the Simeonites into other districts; but it may not be quite incorrect, as these emigrations under Hezekiah presuppose a pressure upon or diminution of their territory. We would indeed expect this remark to occur after v. 33, but it may have been placed between the first and second groups of cities, for the reason that the alterations in the dwelling-places of the Simeonites which took place in the time of David affected merely the first group, while the cities named in v. 32f., with their villages, remained at a later time even the untouched possession of the Simeonites.

1 Chronicles 4:32. Instead of the five cities, Etam, Ain, Rimmon, Tochen, and Ashan, only four are mentioned in Josh. 19:7, viz., Ain, Rimmon, Ether, and Ashan; עֵתָר is written instead of תּוֹכָן, and עֵיטָם is wanting. According to Movers, p. 73, and Berth. in his commentary on the passage, the list of these cities must have been at first as follows: עֵיז רְמוֹן (one city), עֵתָר,

תּוֹכָן, and עֵשָׂן; in Joshua תּוֹכָן must have fallen out by mistake, in our text עֵתָר has been erroneously exchanged for the better known city עֵיטָם in the tribe of Judah, while by reckoning both עֵין and רִמּוֹן the number four has become five. These conjectures are shown to be groundless by the order of the names in our text. For had עֵתָר been exchanged for עֵיטָם, עֵיטָם would not stand in the first place, at the head of the four or five cities, but would have occupied the place of עֵתָר, which is connected with עֵשָׂן in Josh. 19:7 and 15:43. Then again, the fact that in Josh. 15:32 רִמּוֹן is separated from עֵין by the ו cop., and in Josh. 19:7 is reckoned by itself as one city as in our verse, is decisive against taking עֵין and רִמּוֹן together as one name. The want of the conjunction, moreover, between the two names here and in Josh. 19:7, and the uniting of the two words into one name, עֵין־רִמּוֹן, Neh. 11:29, is explained by the supposition that the towns lay in the immediate neighbourhood of each other, so that they were at a later time united, or at least might be regarded as one city. Rimmon is perhaps the same as the ruin Rum er Rummanim, four hours to the north of Beersheba; and Ain is probably to be identified with a large half-ruined and very ancient well which lies at from thirty to thirty-five minutes distance, cf. on Josh. 15:32. Finally, the assertion that the name עֵיטָם has come into our text by an exchange of the unknown עֵתָר for the name of this better known city of Judah, is founded upon a double geographical error. It rests (1) upon the erroneous assumption that besides the Etam in the high lands of Judah to the south of Bethlehem, there was no other city of this name, and that the Etam mentioned in Judg. 15:8, 11 is identical with that in the high lands of Judah; and (2) on the mistaken idea that Ether was also situated in the high lands of Judah, whereas it was, according to Josh. 15:42, one of the cities of the Shephelah; and the Simeonites, moreover, had no cities in the high lands of Judah, but had their dwelling-places

assigned to them in the Negeb and the Shephelah. The existence of a second Etam, besides that in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem, is placed beyond doubt by Judg. 15:8 and 11; for mention is there made of an Etam in the plain of Judah, which is to be sought in the neighbourhood of Khuweilfe, on the border of the Negeb and the mountainous district: cf. on Judg. 15:8. It is this Etam which is spoken of in our verse, and it is rightly grouped with Ain and Rimmon, which were situated in the Negeb, while Tochen and Ashan were in the Shephelah. The statement of Josh. 19:7 and 15:42 leaves no doubt as to the fact that the תּוֹכָן of our verse is only another name for עֵתָר. Etam must therefore have come into the possession of the Simeonites after Joshua's time, but as to when, or under what circumstances, we have no information.

1 Chronicles 4:33. Concerning the villages belonging to these cities, cf. on Josh. 19:8, where for בְּעַל we have the more accurate בְּעַלְתָּ בְּאֵרָא, and Ramah of the south. The position of these places has not yet been certainly ascertained. "These are their dwelling-places, and their family register was to them;" i.e., although they were only a small tribe and dwelt in the midst of Judah, they yet had their own family register (Berth.). הִתְיַחֵשׁ infin. is used substantively, "the entering in the family register."

1 Chronicles 4:34–43. *Emigrations of Simeonite families into other districts.*—Vv. 34–41 record an expedition of the Simeonites, in the time of Hezekiah, undertaken for purposes of conquest. In vv. 34–36, thirteen princes of the tribe of Simeon are enumerated who undertook this expedition. The families of some of them are traced through several generations, but in no case are they traced down so far as to show their connection with the families named in vv. 24–26.

1 Chronicles 4:38. "These mentioned by their names were princes in their families; whose fathers'-houses had increased to a multitude.

And they went," etc. הַבָּאִים בְּשֵׁמוֹת, properly "those who have come with their names," i.e., those who have been mentioned by name; for בּוֹא with בָּ = to come with, is to bring something in, to introduce: cf. Ps. 71:16. This formula is synonymous with הַבָּתוּבִים בְּשֵׁמוֹת, v. 41; but we cannot consider it, as J. H. Mich., Berth., and others do, identical in meaning with אֲשֶׁר נָקְבוּ בְּשֵׁמוֹת, 12:31, Num. 1:17, etc. The predicate to אֵלֶּה is וְשֵׁיִאִים, and הַבָּאִים is a relative sentence, more accurately defining the subject אֵלֶּה.

Princes in their families are not heads of families, but heads of fathers'-houses, into which the families had divided themselves. בֵּית־אָבוֹת is not construed with the plural, as being collective (Berth.), but as the plural of the word בֵּית־אָב: cf. Ew. § 270, c.

1 Chronicles 4:39. The princes named "went westward from Gedor to the east side of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks." מְבוֹא גְדוֹר does not mean the entrance of Gedor (Mich., Berth., and others); but is, as the corresponding מְזֶרַח, "rising" of the sun, i.e., east, requires, a designation of the west, and is abridged from מְבוֹא הַשְּׁמֶשׁ, as in statements with reference to places מְזֶרַח is used instead of מְזֶרַח הַשְּׁמֶשׁ. The locality itself, however, is to us at present unknown. So much is clear, that by Gedor, the Gedor mentioned in Josh. 15:58, situated in the high lands of Judah, north of Hebron, cannot be intended, for in that district there is no open valley stretching out on either hand; and the Simeonites, moreover, could not have carried on a war of conquest in the territory of the tribe of Judah in the reign of Hezekiah. But where this Gedor is to be sought cannot be more accurately determined; for הַגֵּיא is certainly not "the valley in which the Dead Sea lies, and the southern continuation of that valley," as Ewald and Berth. think: that valley has, in the Old Testament, always the name הַעֲרֵבָה. From the use of the article, "the valley," no further conclusion can be drawn, than that a definite

valley in the neighbourhood of Gedor is meant.¹⁸ Even the further statements in v. 30, with regard to the district, that they found there fat and good pasture, and that the land extended on both sides (i.e., was wide), and at rest and secure, because formerly the Hamites dwelt there, and the statement of v. 41, that the Simeonites found the Meunim there, and smote them, give us no firm foothold for the ascertainment of the district referred to. The whole Negeb of Judah has been as yet too little travelled over and explored by modern travellers, to allow of our forming any probable conjecture as to Gedor and the wide valley stretching out on both sides. The description of the Hamite inhabitants, שְׁקֵטָה וְשִׁלְוָה, reminds us of the inhabitants of the ancient Laish (Judg. 18:7, 27). Those מִן חָם are people from Ham, i.e., Hamites, and they may have been Egyptians, Cushites, or even Canaanites (1 Chronicles 1:8). This only is certain, that they were a peaceful shepherd people, who dwelt in tents, and were therefore nomads. לְפָנַי, "formerly," before the Simeonites took possession of the land.

1 Chronicles 4:41. The above-mentioned Simeonite princes, with their people, fell upon the peaceful little people of the Hamites in the days of Hezekiah, and smote, i.e., destroyed, their tents, and also the Meunites whom they found there. The Meunites were strangers in this place, and were probably connected with the city Maan in the neighbourhood of Petra, to the east of Wady Musa (cf. on 2 Chronicles 20:1 and 26:7), who dwelt in tents as nomads, with the Hamites in their richly pastured valley. וַיַּחֲרִימֵם, and they destroyed them utterly, as the Vulgate rightly renders it, *et deleverunt*; and J. H. Mich., *ad internecionem usque eos exciderunt*. The word הַחֲרִיִּים, to smite with the curse, having gradually lost its original religious signification, came to be used in a wider sense, to denote complete extirpation, because all accursed persons were slain. Undoubted examples are 2 Chronicles 20:23; 32:14, 2 Kings 19:11, Isa. 37:11; and it is to be so understood here also.¹⁹ "Until this day," i.e., till the composition of the

historical work used by the author of the Chronicle, i.e., till the time before the exile.

1 Chronicles 4:42, 43. A part of the Simeonites undertook a second war of conquest against Mount Seir. Led by four chiefs of the sons of Shimei (cf. v. 27), 500 men marched thither, smote the remainder of the Amalekites who had escaped, and they dwell there to this day (as in v. 41). מְהָם is more accurately defined by מְבַנֵּי שׁ, and is therefore to be referred to the Simeonites in general, and not to that part of them only mentioned in v. 33 (Berth.). From the circumstance that the leaders were sons of Shimei, we may conclude that the whole troop belonged to this family. The escaped of Amalek are those who had escaped destruction in the victories of Saul and David over this hereditary enemy of Israel (1 Sam. 14:48; 15:7; 2 Sam. 8:12). A remnant of them had been driven into the mountain land of Idumea, where they were smitten, i.e., extirpated, by the Simeonites. It is not said at what time this was done, but it occurred most probably in the second half of Hezekiah's reign.

1 Chronicles 5

Ch. 5:1–26.—The Families of Reuben, Gad, and the Half Tribe of Manasseh beyond Jordan.

1 Chronicles 5:1–10. *The families of the tribe of Reuben.*—Vv. 1, 2. Reuben is called the first-born of Israel, because he was the first-born of Jacob, although, owing to his having defiled his father's bed (Gen. 49:4), his birthright, i.e., its privileges, were transferred to the sons of Joseph, who were not, however, entered in the family register of the house of Israel according to the birthright, i.e., as first-born sons. The inf. הַתְּיַחֵשׁ with לֵּ expresses "shall" or "must," cf. Ew. § 237, e., "he was not to register," i.e., "he was not to be registered." The subject is Joseph, as the Rabbins, e.g., Kimchi, have perceived. The clauses after כִּי הוּא form a parenthesis, containing the reason of Reuben's being called בְּכוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is still further established by its being shown (in v. 2) how it happened that

Joseph, although the birthright was given to him, according to the disposition made by the patriarch (Gen. 48:5ff.), yet was not entered in the family registers as first-born. The reason of this was, "for Judah was strong among his brethren, and (one) from him became the Prince;" *scil.* on the strength of the patriarchal blessing (Gen. 49:8–12), and by means of the historic fulfilment of this blessing. The "prevailing" of Judah among his brethren showed itself even under Moses at the numbering of the people, when the tribe of Judah considerably outnumbered all the other tribes (cf. t. i. 2, S. 192). Then, again, it appeared after the division of the land of Canaan among the tribes of Israel, Judah being called by a declaration of the divine will to be the vanguard of the army in the war against the Canaanites (Judg. 1:1f.); and it was finally made manifest by the נָגִיד over Israel being chosen by God from the tribe of Judah, in the person of David (cf. 28:4 with 1 Sam. 13:14; 25:30). From this we gather that the short, and from its brevity obscure, sentence וְלִנְגִיד מִמֶּנּוּ bears the signification we have given it. "But the birthright was Joseph's;" i.e., the rights of the progenitor were transferred to or remained with him, for two tribal domains were assigned to his two sons Ephraim and Manasseh, according to the law of the first-born (Deut. 21:15–17).

After this parenthetic explanation, the words "the sons of Reuben, the first-born of Israel," v. 1, are again taken up in v. 3, and the sons are enumerated. The names of the four sons correspond to those given in Gen. 46:9, Ex. 6:14, and Num. 26:5–7.

1 Chronicles 5:4–6. From one of these sons descended Joel, whose family is traced down through seven generations, to the time of the Assyrian deportation of the Israelites. But we are neither informed here, nor can we ascertain from any information elsewhere given in the Old Testament, from which of the four sons Joel was descended. For although many of the names in vv. 4–6 frequently occur, yet they are nowhere met with in connection with the

family whose members are here registered. The last-named, Beerah, was לְרֵאשִׁי לְרֵאשִׁי, a prince of the Reubenites, not a prince of the tribe of Reuben, but a prince of a family of the Reubenites. This is expressed by לְ being used instead of the *stat. constr.*; cf. Ew. § 292, a. In reference to the leading away of the trans-Jordanic tribes into captivity by Tiglath-pileser, cf. on 2 Kings 15:29. The name of this king as it appears in the Chronicles is always Tiglath-pileser, but its meaning has not yet been certainly ascertained. According to Oppert's interpretation, it = תְּגִלְת־פְּלִא־סַחֵר, i.e., "worship of the son of the Zodiac" (i.e., the Assyrian Hercules); vid., Delitzsch on Isaiah, Introd.

1 Chronicles 5:7-9. "And his brothers, (each according to his families in the registration, according to their descent (properly their generations; *vice* for תּוֹלְדוֹת on Gen. 2:4), are (were) the head (the first) Jeiel and Zechariah, and Bela, ... the son of Joel," probably the Joel already mentioned in v. 4. "His (i.e., Beerah's) brothers" are the families related to the family of Beerah, which were descended from the brothers of Joel. That they were not, however, properly "brothers," is clear from the fact that Bela's descent is traced back to Joel as the third of the preceding members of his family; and the conclusion would be the same, even if this Joel be another than the one mentioned in v. 4. The singular suffix with לְמִשְׁפַּחָתוֹ is to be taken distributively or שֵׁנִי may be supplied before it in thought; cf. Num. 2:34; 11:10. The word ראש, "head," for the first-born, stands here before the name, as in 12:3; 23:8; elsewhere it stands after the name, e.g., v. 12 and 9:17. The dwelling-places of Bela and his family are then given in vv. 8b and 9. "He dwelt in Aroer," on the banks of the brook Arnon (Josh. 13:9; 12:2), now the ruin Araayr on the northern bank of the Mojob (*vide* on Num. 32:34). "Until Nebo and Baal-meon" westward. Nebo, a village on the hill of the same name in the mountains of Abarim, opposite Jericho (cf. on Num. 32:38). Baal-meon

is probably identical with the ruin Myun, three-quarters of an hour south-east from Heshbon.

1 Chronicles 5:9. "Eastward to the coming to the desert (i.e., till towards the desert) from the river Euphrates," i.e., to the great Arabico-Syrian desert, which stretches from the Euphrates to the eastern frontier of Perea, or from Gilead to the Euphrates. Bela's family had spread themselves so far abroad, "for their herds were numerous in the land of Gilead," i.e., Perea, the whole trans-Jordanic domain of the Israelites.

1 Chronicles 5:10. "In the days of Saul they made war upon the Hagarites, and they fell into their hands, and they dwelt in their tents over the whole east side of Gilead." The subject is not determined, so that the words may be referred either to the whole tribe of Reuben or to the family of Bela (v. 8). The circumstance that in vv. 8 and 9 Bela is spoken of in the singular (הוא וישב and יָשַׁב), while here the plural is used in reference to the war, is not sufficient to show that the words do not refer to Bela's family, for the narrative has already fallen into the plural in the last clause of v. 9. We therefore think it better to refer v. 10 to the family of Bela, seeing that the wide spread of this family, which is mentioned in v. 9, as far as the desert to the east of the inhabited land, presupposes the driving out of the Hagarites dwelling on the eastern plain of Gilead. The notice of this war, moreover, is clearly inserted here for the purpose of explaining the wide spread of the Belaites even to the Euphrates desert, and there is nothing which can be adduced against that reference. The אָרְזוֹ in v. 7 does not, as Bertheau thinks probable, denote that Bela was a contemporary of Beerah, even if the circumstance that from Bela to Joel only three generations are enumerated, could be reconciled with this supposition. The spread of Bela's family over the whole of the Reubenite Gilead, which has just been narrated, proves decisively that they were not contemporaries. If Bela lived at the time of the invasion of Gilead by Tiglath-pileser, when the prince Beerah was

carried away into exile, it is certainly possible that he might have escaped the Assyrians; but he could neither have had at that time a family “which inhabited all the east land,” nor could he himself have extended his domain from “Aroer and Nebo towards the wilderness,” as the words יהוא יושב, v. 8, distinctly state. We therefore hold that Bela was much older than Beerah, for he is introduced as a great-grandson of Joel, so that his family might have been as widely distributed as vv. 8, 9 state, and have undertaken and carried out the war of conquest against the Hagarites, referred to in v. 10, as early as the time of Saul. Thus, too, we can most easily explain the fact that Bela and his brothers Jeiel and Zechariah are not mentioned. As to הגראים, cf. on v. 19.

1 Chronicles 5:11–17. *The families of the tribe of Gad, and their dwelling-places.*—V. 11. In connection with the preceding statement as to the dwelling-places of the Reubenites, the enumeration of the families of Gad begins with a statement as to their dwelling-places: “Over against them (the Reubenites) dwelt the Gadites in Bashan unto Salcah.” Bashan is used here in its wider signification of the dominion of King Og, which embraced the northern half of Gilead, i.e., the part of that district which lay on the north side of the Jabbok, and the whole district of Bashan; cf. on Deut. 3:10. Salcah formed the boundary towards the east, and is now Szalchad, about six hours eastward from Bosra (see on Deut. 3:10).

1 Chronicles 5:12. The sons of Gad (Gen. 46:16) are not named here, because the enumeration of the families of Gad had been already introduced by v. 11, and the genealogical connection of the families enumerated in v. 12ff., with the sons of the tribal ancestor, had not been handed down. In v. 12 four names are mentioned, which are clearly those of heads of families or fathers’-houses, with the addition “in Bashan,” i.e., dwelling, for יָשָׁבוּ is to be repeated or supplied from the preceding verse.—In v. 13 seven other names occur, the bearers of which are

introduced as brothers of those mentioned (v. 12), according to their fathers’-houses. They are therefore heads of fathers’-houses, but the district in which they dwelt is not given; whence Bertheau concludes, but wrongly, that the place where they dwelt is not given in the text. The statement which is here omitted follows in v. 16 at a fitting place; for in vv. 14 and 15 their genealogy, which rightly goes before the mention of their dwelling-place, is given. אֵלֶּה, v. 14, is not to be referred, as Bertheau thinks, to the four Gadites mentioned in vv. 12 and 13, but only to those mentioned in v. 13. Nothing more was known of those four (v. 12) but that they dwelt in Bashan, while the genealogy of the seven is traced up through eight generations to a certain Buz, of whom nothing further is known, as the name בּוּז occurs nowhere else, except in Gen. 22:21 as that of a son of Nahor. The names of his ancestors also are not found elsewhere among the Gadites.

1 Chronicles 5:15. The head of their fathers’-houses (i.e., of those mentioned in v. 13) as Ahi the son of Abdiel, the son of Guni, who is conjectured to have lived in the time of King Jotham of Judah, or of Jeroboam II of Israel, when, according to v. 17, genealogical registers of the Gadites were made up.

1 Chronicles 5:16. The families descended from Buz “dwelt in Gilead,” in the part of that district lying to the south of the Jabbok, which Moses had given to the Gadites and Reubenites (Deut. 3:12); “In Bashan and her daughters,” that is, in the villages belonging to the cities of Bashan and Gilead inhabited by them (for the suffix in בְּבִנוֹתֶיהָ is to be referred distributively to both districts, or the cities in them). “And in all the pasture grounds (מִגְרָשׁ, cf. on Num. 35:2) of Sharon unto their outgoings.” שָׂרוֹן, Sharon, lay not in Perea, but is a great plain on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea, extending from Carmel to near Joppa, famed for its great fertility and its rich growth of flowers (Song 2:1; Isa. 33:9; 35:2; 55:10). *“A Caesarea Palaestinae usque ad oppidum Joppe omnis*

terra, quae cernitur, dicitur Saronas." Jerome in *Onom.*; cf. v. Raumer, *Pal.* S. 50, and Robins. *Phys. Geog.* S. 123. It is this plain which is here meant, and the supposition of the older commentators that there was a second Sharon in the east-Jordan land is without foundation, as Reland, *Palestina illustr.* p. 370f., has correctly remarked. For it is not said that the Gadites possessed cities in Sharon, but only pastures of Sharon are spoken of, which the Gadites may have sought out for their herds even on the coast of the Mediterranean; more especially as the domain of the cis-Jordanic half-tribe of Manasseh stretched into the plain of Sharon, and it is probable that at all times there was intercourse between the cis- and trans-Jordanic Manassites, in which the Gadites may also have taken part. תּוֹצְאוֹת are the outgoings of the pastures to the sea, cf. Josh. 17:9.

1 Chronicles 5:17. "And these (בְּלִים, all the families of Gad, not merely those mentioned in v. 13ff.) were registered in the days of Jotham king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam king of Israel." These two kings did not reign contemporaneously, for Jotham ascended the throne in Judah twenty-five years after the death of Jeroboam of Israel. Here, therefore, two different registrations must be referred to, and that carried on under Jotham is mentioned first, because Judah had the legitimate kingship. That set on foot by Jeroboam was probably undertaken after that king had restored all the ancient boundaries of the kingdom of Israel, 2 Kings 14:25ff. King Jotham of Judah could prepare a register of the Gadites only if a part of the trans-Jordanic tribes had come temporarily under his dominion. As to any such event, indeed, we have no accurate information, but the thing in itself is not unlikely. For as the death of Jeroboam II was followed by complete anarchy in the kingdom of the ten tribes, and one ruler overthrew the other, until at last Pekah succeeded in holding the crown for ten years, while in Judah until Pekah ascended the throne of Israel Uzziah reigned, and raised his kingdom to greater power and prosperity, the southern part of the trans-Jordanic land might

very well have come for a time under the sway of Judah. At such a time Jotham may have carried out an assessment and registration of the Gadites, until his contemporary Pekah succeeded, with the help of the Syrian king Rezin, in taking from the king of Judah the dominion over Gilead, and in humbling the kingdom of Judah in the reign of Ahaz.

1 Chronicles 5:18–22. *War of the trans-Jordanic tribes of Israel with Arabic tribes.*—As the half-tribe of Manasseh also took part in this war, we should have expected the account of it after v. 24. Bertheau regards its position here as a result of striving after a symmetrical distribution of the historical information. "In the case of Reuben," he says, "the historical information is in v. 10; in the case of the half-tribe of Manasseh, in vv. 25 and 26; as to Gad, we have our record in vv. 18–22, which, together with the account in vv. 25 and 26, refers to all the trans-Jordanic Israelites." But it is much more likely that the reason of it will be found in the character of the authorities which the author of the Chronicle made use of, in which, probably, the notes regarding this war were contained in the genealogical register of the Gadites.

1 Chronicles 5:18. מִן־בְּנֵי הַיֵּל belongs to the predicate of the sentence, "They were the sons of Valour," i.e., they belonged to the valiant warriors, "men bearing shield and sword (weapons of offence and defence), and those treading (or bending) the bow," i.e., skilful bowmen. לְמוֹדֵי מִלְחָמָה, people practised in war; cf. the portrayal of the warlike valour of Gad and Manasseh, 1 Chronicles 12:8, 21. "The number 44,760 must be founded upon an accurate reckoning" (Berth.); but in comparison with the number of men capable of bearing arms in those tribes in the time of Moses, it is somewhat inconsiderable: for at the first numbering under him Reuben alone had 46,500 and Gad 45,650, and at the second numbering Reuben had 43,730 and Gad 40,500 men; see on Num. 1–4 (1 Chronicles 1:2, S. 192).

1 Chronicles 5:19. "They made war with the Hagarites and Jethur, Nephish and Nodab." So

early as the time of Saul the Reubenites had victoriously made war upon the Hagarites (see v. 10); but the war here mentioned was certainly at a later time, and has no further connection with that in v. 10 except that both arose from similar causes. The time of the second is not given, and all we know from v. 22*b* is that it had broken out before the trans-Jordanic Israelites were led captive by the Assyrians. הַגְּרִיטִים, in Ps. 83:7 contracted into הַגְּרִיטִים, are the Ἀγραῖτοι, whom Strabo, xvi. p. 767, introduces, on the authority of Eratosthenes, as leading a nomadic life in the great Arabico-Syrian desert, along with the Nabataeans and Chaulotaeans. Jetur, from whom the Itureans are descended, and Nephish, are Ishmaelites; cf. on Gen. 25:15. Nodab, mentioned only here, is a Bedouin tribe of whom nothing more is known.

1 Chronicles 5:20. The Israelites, with God's help, gained the victory. יִעֲזְרוּ, "it was helped to them," i.e., by God "against them"—the Hagarites and their allies. שָׁעַמְקָהָם contracted from אֲשֶׁר עָמְקָהָם. אֲשֶׁר נִגְתָּוֹר is not an uncommon form of the perf. Niph., which would not be suitable in a continuous sentence, but the inf. absol. Niph. used instead of the third pers. perf. (cf. Gesen. *Heb. Gramm.* § 131, 4): "and (God) was entreated of them, because they trusted in Him." From these words we may conclude that the war was a very serious one, in which the possession of the land was at stake. As the trans-Jordanic tribes lived mainly by cattle-breeding, and the Arabian tribes on the eastern frontier of their land were also a shepherd people, quarrels could easily arise as to the possession of the pasture grounds, which might lead to a war of extermination.

1 Chronicles 5:21. The conquerors captured a great booty in herds, 50,000 camels, 250,000 head of small cattle (sheep and goats), 2000 asses, and 100,000 persons—all round numbers; cf. the rich booty obtained in the war against the Midianites, Num. 31:11, 32ff.

1 Chronicles 5:22. This rich booty should not surprise us, "for there fell many slain," i.e., the enemy had suffered a very bloody defeat. "For

the war was from God," i.e., conducted to this result: cf. 2 Chronicles 25:20; 1 Sam. 17:47. "And they dwelt in their stead," i.e., they took possession of the pasture grounds, which up to that time had belonged to the Arabs, and held them until they were carried away captive by the Assyrians; see v. 26.

1 Chronicles 5:23–26. *The families of the half-tribe of Manasseh in Bashan, and the leading away of the East-Jordan Israelites into the Assyrian exile.*—V. 23. The half-tribe of Manasseh in Bashan was very numerous (הַמָּהָה (רְבוּ), "and they dwelt in the land of Bashan (i.e., the Bashan inhabited by Gad, v. 12) (northwards) to Baal Hermon,"—i.e., according to the more accurate designation of the place in Josh. 12:7 and 13:5, in the valley of Lebanon under Mount Hermon, probably the present *Bânjas*, at the foot of Hermon (see on Num. 34:8),—"and Senir and Mount Hermon." שְׁנִיר, which according to Deut. 3:9 was the name of Hermon or Antilibanus in use among the Amorites, is here and in Ezek. 27:5 the name of a part of those mountains (*vide* on Deut. 3:9), just as "mount Hermon" is the name of another part of this range.

1 Chronicles 5:24. Seven heads of fathers'-houses of the half-tribe of Manasseh are enumerated, and characterized as valiant heroes and famous men. The enumeration of the names begins strangely with וְיִעֲקֹב (וְיִעֲקֹב); perhaps a name has fallen out before it. Nothing has been handed down as to any of these names.

1 Chronicles 5:25, 26. Vv. 25 and 26 form the conclusion of the register of the two and a half trans-Jordanic tribes. The sons of Manasseh are not the subject to וְיִמְעָלוּ, but the Reubenites and Manassites, as is clear from v. 26. These fell away faithlessly from the God of their fathers, and went a whoring after the gods of the people of the land, whom God had destroyed before them, i.e., the Amorites or Canaanites. "And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of the Assyrian kings Pul and Tiglath-pilneser, and he (this latter) led them away captives to Halah

and Habor," etc. לַיְעָר אֶת־רוּחַ, Lavater has rightly rendered, "in mentem illis dedit, movit eos, ut expeditionem facerent contra illos;" cf. 2 Chronicles 21:16. Pul is mentioned as being the first Assyrian king who attacked the land of Israel, cf. 2 Kings 15:19f. The deportation began, however, only with Tiglath-pileser, who led the East-Jordan tribes into exile, 2 Kings 15:29. To him לְיָגֹלִים sing. refers. The suffix is defined by the following acc., לְיָגֹלִים: לְיָגֹלִים is, according to the later usage, *nota acc.*; cf. Ew. § 277, e. So also before the name הָלָה, "to Halah," i.e., probably the district Καλαγχήνη (in Strabo) on the east side of the Tigris near Adiabene, to the north of Nineveh, on the frontier of Armenia (cf. on 2 Kings 17:6). In the second book of Kings (2 Kings 15:29) the district to which the two and a half tribes were sent as exiles is not accurately determined, being only called in general Asshur (Assyria). The names in our verse are there (2 Kings 17:6) the names of the districts to which Shalmaneser sent the remainder of the ten tribes after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel. It is therefore questionable whether the author of the Chronicle took his account from an authority used by him, or if he names these districts only according to general recollection, in which the times of Shalmaneser and of Tiglath-pileser are not very accurately distinguished (Berth.). We consider the first supposition the more probable, not merely because he inverts the order of the names, but mainly because he gives the name הָרָא instead of "the cities of Media," as it is in Kings, and that name he could only have obtained from his authorities. הָבֹר is not the river Chaboras in Mesopotamia, which falls into the Euphrates near Circesium, for that river is called in Ezekiel כְּבַר, but is a district in northern Assyria, where Jakut mentions that there is both a mountain Χαβώρας on the frontier of Assyria and Media (Ptolem. vi. 1), and a river Khabur Chasaniae, which still bears the old name *Khâbur*, rising in the neighbourhood of the upper Zab, near Amadijeh, and falling into the Tigris below

Jezirah. This *Khâbur* is the river of Gozan (*vide* on 2 Kings 17:6). The word הָרָא appears to be the Aramaic form of the Hebrew הָר, mountains, and the vernacular designation usual in the mouths of the people of the mountain land of Media, which is called also in Arabic el *Jebâl* (the mountains). This name can therefore only have been handed down from the exiles who dwelt there.

Ch. 5:27–6:66.—The Families of Levi, and Their Cities.

1 Chronicles 5:27–6:66. As to the tribe of Levi, we have several communications: (1.) the genealogy of the high-priestly family of Aaron, down to Jehozadak, who was led away into exile by Nebuchadnezzar (1 Chronicles 5:27–41); (2.) a short register of the families of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, which does not extend far into later times (1 Chronicles 6:1–15); (3.) the genealogies of the musicians Heman, Asaph, and Ethan (1 Chronicles 6:16–32), with remarks on the service of the other Levites (vv. 33, 34); (4.) a register of the high priests from Eleazar to Ahimaaz the son of Zadok (1 Chronicles 6:35–38), with a register of the cities of the Levites (1 Chronicles 6:39–66). If we look into these genealogies and registers, we see, both from a repetition of a part of the genealogy of the high priest (1 Chronicles 6:35–38), and also from the name of the eldest son of Levi appearing in two different forms—in 5:27ff. Gershon; in 6:1, 2, 5, etc., Gershom—that the register in 5:27–41 is drawn from another source than the registers in 1 Chronicles 6, which, with the exception of the genealogies of David's chief musicians, are throughout fragmentary, and in parts corrupt, and were most probably found by the author of the Chronicle in this defective state.

1 Chronicles 5:27–41. *The family of Aaron, or the high-priestly line of Aaron, to the time of the Babylonian exile.*—Vv. 27–29. In order to exhibit the connection of Aharon (or Aaron) with the patriarch Levi, the enumeration begins with the three sons of Levi, who are given in v. 27 as in Gen. 46:11, Ex. 6:16, and in other

passages. Of Levi's grandchildren, only the four sons of Kohath (v. 28) are noticed; and of these, again, Amram is the only one whose descendants—Aaron, Moses, and Miriam—are named (v. 29); and thereafter only Aaron's sons are introduced, in order that the enumeration of his family in the high-priestly line of Eleazar might follow. With v. 28 cf. Ex. 1:18, and on v. 19 see the commentary on Ex. 6:20. With the sons of Aaron (29b) compare besides Ex. 6:23, also Num. 3:2–4, and 1 Chronicles 24:1, 2. As Nadab and Abihu were slain when they offered strange fire before Jahve (Lev. 10:1ff.), Aaron's race was continued only by his sons Eleazar and Ithamar. After Aaron's death, his eldest son Eleazar was chosen by God to be his successor in the high priest's office, and thus the line of Eleazar came into possession of the high-priestly dignity.

1 Chronicles 5:30–41. In vv. 30–41 the descendants of Eleazar are enumerated in twenty-two generations; the word הוֹלִיד, "he begat," being repeated with every name. The son so begotten was, when he lived after his father, the heir of the high-priestly dignity. Thus Phinehas the son of Eleazar (Ex. 6:25) is found in possession of it in Judg. 20:28. From this the older commentators have rightly drawn the inference that the purpose of the enumeration in vv. 30–40 was to communicate the succession of high priests from Eleazar, who died shortly after Joshua (Josh. 24:33), to Jehozadak, whom Nebuchadnezzar caused to be carried away into Babylon. From the death of Aaron in the fortieth year after Israel came forth from Egypt, till the building of the temple in the fourth year of the reign of Solomon, 400 years elapsed (480–40 = 440, 1 Kings 6:1). From the building of the temple to the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple by the Chaldaeans there was an interval of 423 years (36 years under Solomon, and 387 years during which the kingdom of Judah existed; see the chronological table to 1 Kings 12). Between the death of Aaron, therefore, and the time when Jehozadak was led away into captivity, supposing that that event occurred only under

Zedekiah, lay a period of 440 + 423 = 863 years. For this period twenty-two generations appear too few, for then the average duration of each life would be 39 1/4 years. Such an estimate would certainly appear a very high one, but it does not pass the bounds of possibility, as cases may have occurred in which the son died before the father, when consequently the grandson would succeed the grandfather in the office of high priest, and the son would be omitted in our register. The ever-recurring הוֹלִיד cannot be brought forward in opposition to this supposition, because הוֹלִיד in the genealogical lists may express mediate procreation, and the grandson may be introduced as begotten by the grandfather. On the supposition of the existence of such cases, we should have to regard the average above mentioned as the average time during which each of the high priests held the office. But against such an interpretation of this list of the posterity of Eleazar two somewhat serious difficulties are raised. The less serious of these consists in this, that in the view of the author of our register, the line of Eleazar remained an uninterrupted possession of the high-priestly dignity; but in the historical books of the Old Testament another line of high priests, beginning with Eli, is mentioned, which, according to 1 Chronicles 24:5, and Joseph. *Antt.* v. 11. 5, belonged to the family of Ithamar. The list is as follows: Eli (1 Sam. 2:20); his son Phinehas, who, however, died before Eli (1 Sam. 4:110; his son Ahitub (1 Sam. 14:3); his son Ahijah, who was also called Ahimelech (1 Sam. 14:3; 22:9, 11, 20); his son Abiathar (1 Sam. 22:20), from whom Solomon took away the high-priesthood (1 Kings 2:26f.), and set Zadok in his place (1 Kings 2:35). According to Josephus, *loc. cit.*, the high-priestly dignity remained with the line of Eleazar, from Eleazar to Ozi (עֲזִי, v. 31f.); it then fell to Eli and his descendants, until with Zadok it returned to the line of Eleazar. These statements manifestly rest upon truthful historical tradition; for the supposition that at the death of Ozi the high-priesthood was transferred from the line of Eleazar to the line of Ithamar through Eli, is

supported by the circumstance that from the beginning of the judgeship of Eli to the beginning of the reign of Solomon a period of 139 years elapsed, which is filled up in both lines by five names,—Eli, Phinehas, Ahitub, Ahijah, and Abiathar in the passages above quoted; and Zerariah, Meraioth, Amariah, Ahitub, and Zadok in vv. 32–34 of our chapter. But the further opinion expressed by Joseph. Antt. viii. 1. 3, that the descendants of Eleazar, during the time in which Eli and his descendants were in possession of the priesthood, lived as private persons, plainly rests on a conjecture, the incorrectness of which is made manifest by some distinct statements of the Old Testament: for, according to 2 Sam. 8:17 and 20:25, Zadok of Eleazar's line, and Abiathar of the line of Ithamar, were high priests in the time of David; cf. 1 Chronicles 24:5f. The transfer of the high-priestly dignity, or rather of the official exercise of the high-priesthood, to Eli, one of Ithamar's line, after Ozi's death, was, as we have already remarked on 1 Sam. 2:27ff., probably brought about by circumstances or relations which are not now known to us, but without an extinction of the right of Ozi's descendants to the succession in dignity. But when the wave of judgment broke over the house of Eli, the ark was taken by the Philistines; and after it had been sent back into the land of Israel, it was not again placed beside the tabernacle, but remained during seventy years in the house of Abinadab (1 Sam. 4:4–7:2). Years afterwards David caused it to be brought to Jerusalem, and erected a separate tent for it on Zion, while the tabernacle had meanwhile been transferred to Gibeon, where it continued to be the place where sacrifices were offered till the building of the temple.

Thus there arose two places of worship, and in connection with them separate spheres of action for the high priests of both lines,—Zadok performing the duties of the priestly office at Gibeon (1 Chronicles 16:39; cf. 1 Kings 3:4ff.), while Abiathar discharged its functions in Jerusalem. But without doubt not only Zadok, but also his father Ahitub before him, had

discharged the duties of high priest in the tabernacle at Gibeon, while the connection of Eli's sons with the office came to an end with the slaughter of Ahijah (Ahimelech) and all the priesthood at Nob (1 Sam. 22); for Abiathar, the only son of Ahimelech, and the single survivor of that massacre, fled to David, and accompanied him continuously in his flight before Saul (1 Sam. 22:20–23). But, not content with the slaughter of the priests in Nob, Saul also smote the city itself with the edge of the sword; whence it is probable, although all definite information to that effect is wanting, that it was in consequence of this catastrophe that the tabernacle was removed to Gibeon and the high-priesthood entrusted to Zadok's father, a man of the line of Eleazar, because the only son of Ahimelech, and the only representative of Ithamar's line, had fled to David. If this view be correct, of the ancestors of Ahitub, only Amariah, Meraioth, and Zerariah did not hold the office of high priest. But if these had neither been supplanted by Eli nor had rendered themselves unworthy of the office by criminal conduct; if the only reason why the possession of the high-priesthood was transferred to Eli was, that Ozi's son Zerariah was not equal to the discharge of the duties of the office under the difficult circumstances of the time; and if Eli's grandson Ahitub succeeded his grandfather in the office at a time when God had already announced to Eli by prophets the approaching ruin of his house, then Zerariah, Meraioth, and Amariah, although not *de facto* in possession of the high-priesthood, might still be looked upon as *de jure* holders of the dignity, and so be introduced in the genealogies of Eleazar as such. In this way the difficulty is completely overcome.

But it is somewhat more difficult to explain the other fact, that our register on the one hand gives too many names for the earlier period and too few for the later time, and on the other hand is contradicted by some definite statements of the historical books. We find too few names for the time from the death of Aaron to the death of Uzzi (Ozi), when Eli became high priest,—a period of 299 years (*vide* the

Chronological View of the Period of the Judges, ii. 1, S. 217). Five high priests—Eleazar, Phinehas, Abishua, Bukki, and Uzzi—are too few; for in that case each one of them must have discharged the office for 60 years, and have begotten the son who succeeded him in the office only in his 60th year, or the grandson must have regularly succeeded the grandfather in the office,—all of which suppositions appear somewhat incredible. Clearly, therefore, intermediate names must have been omitted in our register. To the period from Eli till the deposition of Abiathar, in the beginning of Solomon's reign—which, according to the chronological survey, was a period of 139 years—the last five names from Zerariah to Zadok correspond; and as 24 years are thus assigned to each, and Zadok held the office for a number of years more under Solomon, we may reckon an average of 30 years to each generation. For the following period of about 417 years from Solomon, or the completion of the temple, till the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, the twelve names from Ahimaaz the son of Zadok to Jehozadak, who was led away into captivity, give the not incredible average of from 34 to 35 years for each generation, so that in this part of our register not many breaks need be supposed. But if we examine the names enumerated, we find (1) that no mention is made of the high priest Jehoiada, who raised the youthful Joash to the throne, and was his adviser during the first years of his reign (2 Kings 11, and 2 Chronicles 22:10; 24:2), and that under Ahaz, Urijah, who indeed is called only יהויה, but who was certainly high priest (2 Kings 16:10ff.), is omitted; and (2) we find that the name Azariah occurs three times (vv. 35, 36, and 40), on which Berth. remarks: "Azariah is the name of the high priest in the time of Solomon (1 Kings 4:2), in the time of Uzziah (2 Chronicles 26:17), and in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 31:10)." Besides this, we meet with an Amariah, the fifth after Zadok, whom Lightf., Oehler, and others consider to be the high priest of that name under Jehoshaphat, 2 Chronicles 19:11. And finally, (3) in the historical account in 2

Kings 22:4ff., Hilkiyah is mentioned as high priest under Josiah, while according to our register (v. 39) Hilkiyah begat Azariah; whence we must conclude either that Hilkiyah is not the high priest of that name under Josiah, or Azariah is not the person of that name who lived in the time of Hezekiah. As regards the omission of the names Urijah and Jehoiada in our register, Urijah may have been passed over as an unimportant man; but Jehoiada had exerted far too important an influence on the fate of the kingdom of Judah to allow of his being so overlooked. The only possibilities in his case are, either that he occurs in our register under another name, owing to his having had, like so many others, two different names, or that the name יהויה has fallen out through an old error in the transcription of the genealogical list. The latter supposition, viz., that Jehoiada has fallen out before Johanan, is the more probable. Judging from 2 Kings 12:3 and 2 Chronicles 24:2, Jehoiada died under Joash, at least five or ten years before the king, and consequently from 127 to 132 years after Solomon, at the advanced age of 130 years (2 Chronicles 24:15). He was therefore born shortly before or after the death of Solomon, being a great-grandson of Zadok, who may have died a considerable time before Solomon, as he had filled the office of high priest at Gibeon under David for a period of 30 years. Then, if we turn our attention to the thrice recurring name Azariah, we see that the Azariah mentioned in 1 Kings 4:2 cannot be regarded as the high priest; for the word כהן in this passage does not denote the high priest, but the viceroy of the kingdom (*vide* on the passage). But besides, this Azariah cannot be the same person as the Azariah in v. 35 of our genealogy, because he is called a son of Zadok, while our Azariah is introduced as the son of Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok, and consequently as a grandson of Zadok; and the grandson of Zadok who is mentioned as being high priest along with Abiathar, 1 Kings 4:4, could not have occupied in this grandfather's time the first place among the highest public officials of

Solomon. The Azariah mentioned in 1 Kings 4:2 as the son of Zadok must not be considered to be a brother of the Ahimaaz of our register, for we very seldom find a nephew and uncle called by the same name. As to the Azariah of v. 36, the son of Johanan, it is remarked, "This is he who was priest (or who held the priest's office; אֲזַרְיָהוּ, cf. Ex. 40:13, Lev. 16:32) in the house (temple) which Solomon had built in Jerusalem." R. Sal. and Kimchi have connected this remark with the events narrated in 2 Chronicles 26:17, referring it to the special jealousy of King Uzziah's encroachments on the priest's office, in arrogating to himself in the temple the priestly function of offering incense in the holy place. Against this, indeed, J. H. Mich. has raised the objection, *quod tamen chronologiae rationes vix admittunt*; and it is true that this encroachment of Uzziah's happened 200 years after Solomon's death, while the Azariah mentioned in our register is the fourth after Zadok. But if the name Jehoiada has been dropped out before Johanan, and the Jehoiada held the high priest's office for a considerable time under Joash, the high-priesthood of his grandson Azariah would coincide with Uzziah's reign, when of course the chronological objection to the above-mentioned explanation of the words הוּא אֲזַרְיָהוּ בֶּהֱוֹן וְגו' is removed.²⁰

But lastly, the difficulty connected with the fact that in our passage Azariah follows Hilkiyah, while in 2 Kings 22:4ff. and 2 Chronicles 31:10, 13, Azariah occurs as high priest under King Hezekiah, and Hilkiyah in the time of his great-grandson Josiah, cannot be cleared away by merely changing the order of the names Hilkiyah and Azariah. For, apart altogether from the improbability of such a transposition having taken place in a register formed as this is, "Shallum begat Hilkiyah, and Hilkiyah begat Azariah, and Azariah begat," the main objection to it is the fact that between Azariah, v. 26, who lived under Uzziah, and Hilkiyah four names are introduced; so that on this supposition, during the time which elapsed between Uzziah's forcing his way into the temple till the passover

under Hezekiah, i.e., during a period of from 55 to 60 years, four generations must have followed one another, which is quite impossible. In addition to this, between Hezekiah and Josiah came the reigns of Manasseh and Amon, who reigned 55 years and 2 years respectively; and from the passover of Hezekiah to the finding of the book of the law by the high priest Hilkiyah in the eighteenth year of Josiah, about 90 years had elapsed, whence it is clear that on chronological grounds Hilkiyah cannot well have been the successor of Azariah in the high-priesthood. The Azariah of v. 39f., therefore, cannot be identified with the Azariah who was high priest under Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 31:10); and no explanation seems possible, other than the supposition that between Ahitub and Zadok the begetting of Azariah has been dropped out. On this assumption the Hilkiyah mentioned in v. 39 may be the high priest in the time of Josiah, although between him and the time when Jehozadak was led away into exile three names, including that of Jehozadak, are mentioned, while from the eighteenth year of Josiah till the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans only 30 years elapsed. For Hilkiyah may have been in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign very old; and at the destruction of Jerusalem, not Jehozadak, but his father Seraiah the grandson of Hilkiyah, was high priest, and was executed at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 25:18, 21), from which we may conclude that Jehozadak was led away captive in his early years. The order in which the names occur in our register, moreover, is confirmed by Ezra 7:1-5, where, in the statement as to the family of Ezra, the names from Seraiah onwards to Amariah ben-Azariah occur in the same order. The correspondence would seem to exclude any alterations of the order, either by transposition of names or by the insertion of some which had been dropped; but yet it only proves that both these genealogies have been derived from the same authority, and does not at all remove the possibility of this authority itself having had some defects. The probability of such breaks as we suppose in the case of Jehoiada and Azariah,

who lived under Hezekiah, is shown, apart altogether from the reasons which have been already brought forward in support of it, by the fact that our register has only eleven generations from Zadok, the contemporary of Solomon, to Seraiah, who was slain at the destruction of Jerusalem; while the royal house of David shows seventeen generations, viz., the twenty kings of Judah, omitting Athaliah, and Jehoahaz and Zedekiah, the last two as being brothers of Jehoiakim (1 Chronicles 3:10–27). Even supposing that the king's sons were, as a rule, earlier married, and begat children earlier than the priests, yet the difference between eleven and seventeen generations for the same period is too great, and is of itself sufficient to suggest that in our register of the high priests names are wanting, and that the three or four high priests known to us from the historical books who are wanting—Amariah under Jehoshaphat, Jehoiada under Joash, (Urijah under Ahaz,) and Azariah under Hezekiah—were either passed over or had fallen out of the list made use of by the author of the Chronicle.²¹

1 Chronicles 5:41. Jehozadak is the father of Joshua who returned from exile with Zerubbabel, and was the first high priest in the restored community (Ezra 3:2; 5:2; Hagg. 1:1). After הָלַךְ, “he went forth,” בָּגָדוֹלָה is to be supplied from בָּהֲגִלוֹת וְגוֹ, “he went into exile” to Babylon; cf. Jer. 49:3.

1 Chronicles 6

1 Chronicles 6. *The families and cities of the Levites.*—Vv. 1–34. *Register of the families of the Levites.*—This is introduced by an enumeration of the sons and grandsons of Levi (vv. 1–4), which is followed by lists of families in six lines of descent: (a) the descendants of Gershon (vv. 5–7), of Kohath (vv. 1–13), and of Merari (vv. 14 and 15); and (b) the genealogies of David's chief musicians (vv. 16 and 17), of Heman the Kohathite (vv. 18–23), of Asaph the Gershonite (vv. 24–28), and of Ethan the Merarite (vv. 29–32); and in vv. 33, 34, some notes as to the

service performed by the other Levites and the priests are added.

1 Chronicles 6:1–4. The sons of Levi are in v. 1 again enumerated as in 5:27; then in vv. 2–4a the sons of these three sons, i.e., the grandsons of Levi, are introduced, while in 1 Chronicles 5:28 only the sons of Kohath are mentioned. The only object of this enumeration is to make quite clear the descent of the Levitic families which follow. The name of the first son of Levi is in vv. 1, 2, 4, etc. of this chapter גֵּרְשֹׁם, which was the name of Moses' son, cf. 23:15f.; whereas in 5:27 and in the Pentateuch we find a different pronunciation, viz., גֵּרְשֹׁן. The names of Levi's grandsons in vv. 2–4a coincide with the statements of the Pentateuch, Ex. 6:17–19, and Num. 3:17–20, cf. 26:57f. Bertheau and other commentators consider the words in 4b, “and these are the families of Levi according to their fathers,” to be a “concluding subscription” to the statements of vv. 1–4a, and would remove י before אֶלֶה, as not compatible with this supposition. But in this he is wrong: for although the similar statement in Ex. 6:20 is a superscription, yet it is in Num. 3:20 a superscription, and must in our verse also be so understood; for otherwise the enumeration of the descendants of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, which follows, would be brought in very abruptly, without any connecting particle, and the י before אֶלֶה points to the same conclusion.

1 Chronicles 6:5–15. The three lists of *the descendants of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari* are similar to one another in plan, and in all, each name is connected with the preceding by בְּנוֹ, “his son,” but they differ greatly in the number of the names.

1 Chronicles 6:5, 6. The לְ before גֵּרְשֹׁם is introductory: “as to Gershom.” Those of his descendants who are here enumerated belong to the family of his oldest son Libni, which is traced down through seven generations to Jeaterai, a name not elsewhere met with. Of the intermediate names, Johath, Zimmah, and Zerach occur also among the descendants of Asaph,

who is descended from the line of Shimei, vv. 24–28.

1 Chronicles 6:7–13. The genealogy of the descendants of Kohath consists of three lists of names, each of which commences afresh with כִּנְיָ, vv. 7, 10, and 13; yet we learn nothing from it as to the genealogical connection of these three lines. The very beginning, “The sons of Kohath, Amminidab his son, Korah his son, Assir his son,” is somewhat strange. For, according to Ex. 6:18, 21, and 24, Kohath’s second son is called Izhar, whose son was Korah, whose sons were Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph. Amminidab is nowhere met with as a son of Kohath; but among the descendants of Uzziel, a prince of a father’s-house is met with in the time of David who bore this name. The name Amminidab occurs also in the time of Moses, in the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chronicles 2:10, Num. 1:7, Ruth 1:19, as that of the father of the prince Nahshon, and of Elisheba, whom Aaron took to wife, Ex. 6:23. But since the names Korah and Assir point to the family of Izhar, the older commentators supposed the Amminidab of our verse to be only another name for Izhar; while Bertheau, on the contrary, conjectures “that as an Amminidab occurs in the lists of the descendants of Kohath as father-in-law of Aaron, Amminidab has been substituted for Izhar by an ancient error, which might very easily slip into an abridgment of more detailed lists.” But we have here no trace of an abridgment of more detailed lists. According to Ex. 6:21 and 24, Korah was a son of Izhar, and Assir a son of Korah; and consequently in our genealogies only the name Izhar is wanting between Korah and Kohath, while instead of him we have Amminidab. An exchange or confusion of the names of Izhar and Amminidab the father-in-law of Aaron, is as improbable as the supposition that Amminidab is another name for Izhar, since the genealogies of the Pentateuch give only the name Izhar. Yet no third course is open, and we must decide to accept either one or the other of these suppositions. For that our verses contain a

genealogy, or fragments of genealogies, of the Kohathite line of Izhar there can be no doubt, when we compare them with the genealogy (vv. 18–23) of the musician Heman, a descendant of Kohath, which also gives us the means of explaining the other obscurities in our register. In vv. 7 and 8 the names of Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph, and again Assir, follow that of Korah, with כִּנְיָ after each. This כִּנְיָ cannot be taken otherwise than as denoting that the names designate so many consecutive generations; and the only peculiarity in the list is, that the conjunction ו is found before Abiasaph and the second Assir, while the other names do not have it. But if we compare the genealogy in Ex. 6 with this enumeration, we find that there, in v. 24, the same three names, Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph, which are here enumerated as those of the son, grandson, and great-grandson of Korah, were said to be the names of the sons of the Izharite Korah. Further, from Heman’s genealogy in v. 22, we learn that the second Assir of our list is a son of Abiasaph, and, according to v. 22 and v. 8, had a son Tahath. Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph must consequently be held to have been brothers, and the following Assir a son of the last-named Abiasaph, whose family is in v. 9 further traced through four generations (Tahath, Uriel, Uziah, and Shaul). Instead of these four, we find in vv. 22 and 21 the names Tahath, Zephaniah, Azariah, and Joel. Now although the occurrence of Uziah and Azariah as names of the same king immediately suggests that in our register also Uziah and Azariah are two names of the same person, yet the divergence in the other names, on the one hand Zephaniah for Joel, and on the other Uriel for Shaul, is strongly opposed to this conjecture. The discrepancy can scarcely be naturally explained in any other way, than by supposing that after Tahath the two genealogies diverge,—ours introducing his son Uriel and his descendants; the other, in v. 21f., mentioning a second son of Tohath, Zephaniah, of whose race Heman came.

1 Chronicles 6:10. “And the sons of Elkanah, Amasai and Ahimoth.” As it is clear that with

בְּנֵי אֶלְקָנָה a new list begins, and that the preceding enumeration is that of the descendants of Abiasaph, it is at once suggested that this Elkanah was the brother of the Abiasaph mentioned in v. 8. If, however, we compare the genealogy of Heman, we find there (vv. 21 and 20) a list of the descendants of Joel in an ascending line, thus,—Elkanah, Amasai, Mahath, Elkanah, Zuph; from which it would seem to follow that our Elkanah is the son of Moel mentioned in v. 21, for Ahimoth may be without difficulty considered to be another form of the name Mahath. This conclusion would be assured if only the beginning of v. 11 were in harmony with it. In this verse, indeed, אֶלְקָנָה בְּנֵי, as we read in the Kethibh, may be without difficulty taken to mean that Elkanah was the son of Ahimoth, just as in v. 20 Elkanah is introduced as son of Mahath. But in this way no meaning can be assigned to the אֶלְקָנָה which follows בְּנֵי, and Bertheau accordingly is of opinion that this אֶלְקָנָה has come into the text by an error. The Masoretes also felt the difficulty, and have substituted for the Kethibh בְּנֵי הַכֶּרִי the Keri בְּנֵי הַכֶּרִי, but then nothing can be made of the first אֶלְקָנָה in v. 11. Beyond doubt the traditional text is here corrupt, and from a comparison of vv. 20 and 19 the only conclusion we can draw with any certainty is that the list from צוּפִי onwards contains the names of descendants of Elkanah the son of Mahath, which is so far favourable to the Keri בְּנֵי אֶלְקָנָה. The name Elkanah, on the contrary, which immediately precedes בְּנֵי, seems to point to a hiatus in the text, and gives room for the conjecture that in v. 10 the sons of Elkanah, the brother of Abiasaph and Assir, were named, and that there followed thereupon an enumeration of the sons or descendants of the Elkanah whom we meet with in v. 21 as son of Joel, after which came the names Elkanah בְּנֵי, Zophai בְּנֵי, etc. אֶלְיָאָב and נַחֲתָה we consider to be other forms of אֶלְיָאָל and תוֹחַ, v. 19, and צוּפִי is

only another form of צוּרִי. The succeeding names, Jeroham and Elkanah (v. 12), agree with those in v. 19; but between the clauses “Elkanah his son” (v. 12), and “and the sons of Samuel” (v. 13), the connecting link שְׁמוּאֵל בְּנֵי, cf. v. 18, is again wanting, as is also, before or after הַבְּכֹר (v. 13), the name of the first-born, viz., Joel; cf. v. 18 with 1 Sam. 8:2. Now, although the two last-mentioned omissions can be supplied, they yet show that the enumeration in vv. 7–13 is not a continuous list of one Kohathite family, but contains only fragments of several Kohathite genealogies.—In vv. 14 and 15, descendants of Merari follow; sons of Mahli in six generations, who are not mentioned elsewhere. Bertheau compares this list of names, Mahli, Libni, Shimei, Uzza, Shimea, Haggiah, and Asaiah, with the list contained in vv. 29–32, Mushi, Mahli, Shamer, Bani, Amzi, Hilkiah, and Amaziah, and attempts to maintain, notwithstanding the great difference in the names, that the two lists were originally identical, in order to find support for the hypothesis “that the three lists in vv. 5–15 have not found a place in the Chronicle from their own intrinsic value, or, in other words, have not been introduced there in order to give a register of the ancestors of Jeaterai, the sons of Samuel and Asaiah, but have been received only because they bring us to Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, vv. 19, 24, 29, in another fashion than the lists of names in vv. 18–32.” But this hypothesis is shown to be false, apart altogether from the other objections which might be raised against it, by the single fact of the total discrepancy between the names of the Merarites in vv. 14 and 15 and those found in vv. 29–32. Of all the six names only Mahli is found in both cases, and he is carefully distinguished in both—in the genealogy of Ethan as the son of Mushi and grandson of Merari; in our list as the son of Merari. When we remember that Merari had two sons, Mahli and Mushi, after whom the father’s-houses into which his descendants divided themselves were named (Num. 3:20; 26:58), and that the same names very frequently occur in different families, it would never suggest itself to any

reader of our register to identify the line of Mushi with the line of Mahli, seeing that, except the name of Mahli the son of Mushi, which is the same as that of his uncle, all the other names are different. Vv. 14 and 15 contain a register of the family of Mahli, while the ancestors of Ethan, vv. 29–32, belonged to the family of Mushi. Our list then absolutely cannot be intended to form a transition to Ethan or Ethan's ancestors. The same may be said of the two other lists vv. 5–7 and vv. 8–13, and this transition hypothesis is consequently a mere airspun fancy. The three lists are certainly not embodied in the Chronicle on account of the persons with whose names they end—Jeaterai, the sons of Samuel, and Asaiah; but the author of the Chronicle has thought them worthy of being received into his work as registers of ancient families of the three sons of Levi which had been transmitted from ancient times.

1 Chronicles 6:16–34. *The genealogies of the Levite musicians—Heman, Asaph, and Ethan.*—These registers are introduced by an account of the service of the Levites about the sanctuary (vv. 16, 17), and conclude with remarks on the service of the remaining Levites (vv. 33, 34).

1 Chronicles 6:16. “These are they whom David set for the leading of the song in the house of Jahve, after the resting of the ark,” cf. 15, 17. על יְדֵי “upon the hands,” “to the hands;” that is, both for leading, and, according to arrangement. To the hands of the song, i.e., to manage the singing, to carry it on, to conduct it. מִמְנוּחַ הָאָרוֹן, “from the resting of the ark,” i.e., from the time that the ark of the covenant, which in the prae-Davidic time had been carried about from one place to another, had received a permanent resting-place on Zion, and had become the centre of the worship instituted by David, 2 Sam. 6:17. “And they served before the dwelling of the tabernacle with song.” לְפָנֵי מִשְׁכָּן, “before the dwelling,” for the sacrificial worship, with which the singing of psalms was connected, was performed in the court before the dwelling. The genitive אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד is to be taken as explanatory: “The dwelling (of

Jahve), which was the tent of the meeting (of God with His people).” אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד was the usual designation of the tabernacle built by Moses, which was at first set up in Shiloh, then in the time of Saul at Nob, and after the destruction of that city by Saul (1 Sam. 22) in Gibeon (1 Chronicles 21:29). It denotes here the tent which David had erected upon Mount Zion for the ark of the covenant, because from its containing the ark, and by the institution of a settled worship in it (cf. 16:1–4ff.), it thenceforth took the place of the Mosaic tabernacle, although the Mosaic sanctuary at Gibeon continued to be a place of worship till the completion of the temple (1 Kings 3:4; 2 Chronicles 1:3),—“till Solomon built the house of Jahve in Jerusalem,” into which the ark was removed, and to which the whole of the religious services were transferred. In their services they stood בְּמִשְׁפָּטָם, according to their right, i.e., according to the order prescribed for them by David; cf. 16:37ff.

1 Chronicles 6:18–23. “These (following three men, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan) are they who stood (in service) with their sons.” The three were the heads of the three Levitic families, to whom the execution of the liturgic singing was entrusted. The names of their sons, *vide* 1 Chronicles 25:1–6. The object of the following genealogies is to show their descent from Levi. “Of the sons of the Kohathite family (is) Heman the singer.” הַמְשֹׁרֵר, ὁ ψαλτῳδός LXX. Heman is named first as being the head of the choir of singers who stood in the centre, while Asaph and his choir stood on his right hand, and on the left Ethan and his choir, so that when they sang in concert the conducting of the whole fell to Heman. His family is traced back in vv. 18–23 through twenty members to “Kohath the son of Levi, then son of Israel” (Jacob).

1 Chronicles 6:24–28. “His brother Asaph,” who is Heman's brother only in the more general sense of being closely connected with him, partly by their common descent from Levi, partly by their common calling, was a descendant of Gershon from his younger son

Shimei. His genealogy contains only fifteen names to Gershon, five less than that of his contemporary Heman, probably because here and there intermediate names are omitted.

1 Chronicles 6:29–32. “And the sons of Merari their brethren (i.e., the brethren of the choirs of Heman and Asaph) on the left (i.e., forming the choir which stood on the left hand) were Ethan and his sons.” As in the case of Asaph, so also in that of Ethan, וּבְנֵיהֶם (v. 18) is omitted, but is to be supplied; when the introductory clause “and the sons of Merari” is at once explained. Ethan is a Merarite of the younger line of Mushi (see above). The name of his father is here קִישִׁי, and in 1 Chronicles 15:17 it is קוּשִׁיָּהוּ, which latter is clearly the original form, which has been shortened into Kishi. Instead of the name Ethan (אֵתָן) as here and in 1 Chronicles 15:19, we find in other passage a Jeduthun mentioned as third chief-musician, along with Heman and Asaph (cf. 25:1; 2 Chronicles 35:15; Neh. 11:17, cf. 1 Chronicles 6:41); from which we see that Jeduthun was another name for Ethan, probably a by-name—יְדוּתָן, “praiseman”—which he had received from his calling, although nothing is said in the Old Testament as to the origin of this name. His genealogy contains only twelve names to Merari, being thus still more abridged than that of Asaph.

1 Chronicles 6:33, 34. “And their brethren the Levites,” i.e., the other Levites besides the singers just mentioned, “were נְתוּנִים given for every service of the dwelling of the house of God,” i.e., given to Aaron and his sons (the priests) for the performance of service in the carrying on of the worship; cf. Num. 3:9; 8:16–19; 18:6. But Aaron and his sons had three duties to perform: (1) they burnt the offerings on the altar of burnt-offering and on the altar of incense, cf. Num. 18:1–7; (2) they looked after all the service of the holy place; (3) they had to atone for Israel by offering the atoning-sacrifices, and performing the cleansings according to all that Moses commanded. This last clause refers to all the three above-

mentioned duties of the priests. Moses is called the servant of God, as in Deut. 34:5, Josh. 1:1, 13.

1 Chronicles 6:35–38. The remarks as to the service of the priests are followed by a catalogue of the high priests, which runs from Eleazar to Ahimaaz the son of Zadok (cf. 2 Sam. 15:27), who probably succeeded his father in the high-priesthood even in the time of Solomon. This genealogy is similar in form to the genealogies given in vv. 5–15, and has therefore most probably been derived from the same source as this, and has been drawn in here to form a transition to the enumeration of the cities of the Levites; for it begins in v. 39 with the dwelling-places of the sons of Aaron, and the וְאֵלֶּה מוֹשְׁבוֹתָם ... וּלְבְנֵי אַהֲרֹן of v. 39

corresponds to the וְאֵלֶּה בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן of v. 35. The order of the names coincides exactly with that of the longer register in 1 Chronicles 5:30–34.

1 Chronicles 6:39–66. *Register of the cities of the Levites*, which agrees on the whole with the register in Josh. 21, if we except different forms of some names of cities, and many corruptions of the text, but differing in many ways from it in form; whence we gather that it is not derived from the book of Joshua, but from some other ancient authority.

1 Chronicles 6:39. V. 39 contains the superscription, “These are their dwelling-places according to their districts, in their boundaries.” So far the superscription belongs to the whole catalogue of cities. The suffixes point back to the בְּנֵי לֵוִי, v. 1. טִירָה, from טוּר, to surround in a circle, signifies in the older language a “nomad village” (cf. Gen. 25:16; Num. 31:10); here, on the contrary, it is used in a derivative sense for “district,” to denote the circle of dwellings which were granted to the Levites in the cities of the other tribes. The following words, “For the sons of Aaron of the family of Kohath,” etc., are the superscription to vv. 42–45, and together with the confirmatory clause, “for to him the (first) lot had fallen,” are a repetition of Josh. 21:10, where, however,

רַאשֵׁנָה is found after הַגּוֹרֵל, and has perhaps been here dropped out.

1 Chronicles 6:40, 41. Vv. 40 and 41 correspond almost verbally with Josh. 21:11 and 12, as vv. 42–45 also do with Josh. 21:13–19. As we have already in our remarks on Joshua commented upon the whole catalogue, it will not be necessary to do more here than to group together the errors and defects of our text.

1 Chronicles 6:42. The plural עָרֵי הַמְּקֻלָּט is incorrect, for only one of the cities thereafter named, viz., Hebron, was a city of refuge for homicides, and in Josh. 21:13 it is correctly written עִיר מְקֻלָּט. After יִתֵּיר the usual addition וְאֶת־מִגְרָשֶׁיהָ is omitted, v. 44f. Before Bethshemesh the name Juttah has been lost, and before Geba (v. 45) the name Gibeon, so that only eleven cities are mentioned, but the sum is rightly given as thirteen. Instead of the name הַיְלֵן, v. 43, there is found in Josh. 21:15 and 15:51 חֶלְזָן; instead of עֵינָן, Josh. 21:16, we have in v. 44 the more correct name עֵשָׂן; and the name עֶלְמוֹן, v. 45, is in Josh. 21:18 עֶלְמוֹן.

1 Chronicles 6:46–48. Summary statements of the number of cities which the remaining Kohathites, the Gershonites, and the Merarites received in the domains of the various tribes, corresponding to vv. 5–7 in Josh. 21. In v. 46 occurs a hiatus; between הַמְּטָה and מִמְּחֻצֵיּהָ the words “Ephraim and of the tribe of Dan and” have been omitted. In v. 48 the words “of the tribe of Manasseh in Bashan” are quite intelligible without הַצִּי, which is found in Joshua.

1 Chronicles 6:49, 50. Vv. 49 and 50 are not here in their proper place; for their contents show that they should be in the middle of the thirty-ninth verse, after the general superscription, and before the words “for the sons of Aaron.” They are found also in Josh. 21:8, 9, as a superscription before the enumeration by name of the cities assigned to the priests; but how the confusion has arisen in

our text cannot be certainly ascertained. Bertheau thinks “the wish to make mention of the cities of the high-priestly family at the beginning of the enumeration, has induced the author of the Chronicle to communicate the introductory remarks belonging to the lists of cities with other statements as to the tribal domains, only after the enumeration of the cities of the sons of Aaron.” By that supposition the position of vv. 46–48 is certainly explained, but not that of vv. 49 and 50; for even with the supposed desire, vv. 49 and 50 should have been placed before vv. 46–48. But besides, this, the clause לְבָנֵי אֶהֱרָן וְגו' in v. 39 neither has anything to connect it with the preceding superscription nor a verb; and the subject of וַיִּתְּנוּ, v. 40, is also wanting. That which was missed before v. 39b and in v. 40 is contained in vv. 49 and 50; whence it is manifest that vv. 49 and 50 ought to stand before v. 39b, and have by some inexplicable accident fallen out of their proper place, and have come into an unsuitable position after v. 48. The plurals יִקְרְאוּ and שְׂמוֹת, instead of the singulars יִקְרָא and שֵׁם, as in Josh. 21:9b, bring the words into more manifest correspondence with the circumstances, since the subject of יִקְרְאוּ, “the sons of Israel,” may be easily supplied from v. 48, and many names of cities are mentioned. The masc. אֶתְהֶם instead of the fem. אֶתְהֶן is probably only an oversight. With v. 51 begins the enumeration of the cities of the other Levitic families only summarily given in vv. 46–48, which forms a very suitable continuation of v. 48.

1 Chronicles 6:51–55. *The cities of the remaining Kohathites; cf. Josh. 21:20–26.* For וּמִמְּשִׁפּוֹחֹת we must read וּלְמִשְׁפְּחוֹת, for the preposition מִן gives no suitable sense: it is never used to introduce a subject. The sense is, “as regards the families of the sons of Kohath, the cities of their dominion in the tribe of Ephraim were (the following). They gave them.” The plur. עָרֵי הַמְּקֻלָּט instead of the sing., as in v. 42. As to the four cities of the tribe of Ephraim,

vv. 52, 53, see on Josh. 21:21, 22, where instead of *יְקַמְעַם* we find the name *קִבְצַיִם*. Before v. 54 a whole verse has been lost, which was as follows: "And of the tribe of Dan, Eltekeh and her pastures, Gibbethon and her pastures;" cf. Josh. 21:23. Then follows v. 54, which contains the names of the two other cities of the tribe of Dan. In v. 55 we have the names of the cities of half Manasseh, Aner and Bileam, i.e., Ibleam (Josh. 17:11), correctly given; but the names Taanach and Gath-rimmon in Josh. 21:25 are incorrect, and have been inserted through a transcriber's error, arising from the copyist's eye having wandered to the preceding verse. The singular *לְמִשְׁפַּחַת*, v. 55, is incorrect; and the plural *לְמִשְׁפָּחוֹת* is to be substituted (as in v. 51). The words *וּגְוֵי וְגַיִם* are a subscription, which corresponds to *וַיִּתְּנוּ לָהֶם* in v. 52.

1 Chronicles 6:56–61. *The cities of the Gershonites*; cf. Josh. 21:27–33. "To the sons of Gershon (they gave) out of the family of the half-tribe of Manasseh, Golan and Ashtaroth;" see on Josh. 21:27. In v. 57, *קִדְשׁ* is a mistake for *קִשְׁיוֹן*, Josh. 21:28 (see on Josh. 19:20); in v. 58, *רָאמוֹת* for the more correct *רָמוֹת*, Josh. 21:29, a city which was also called *רָמָת*, Josh. 19:21, or had been so called originally; and *עֵיִן-גִּנָּיִם* for *עֵיִן-גִּנָּיִם* (Josh.), as the city is called also in Josh. 19:21. It cannot be determined whether *עֵיִן-גִּנָּיִם* is a transcriber's error, or another name for *עֵיִן-גִּנָּיִם*. In v. 59, *מִשְׁלַל* (which should perhaps be pointed *מִשְׁלָל*) is a contracted form of *מִשְׁאָל*, Josh. 31:30; 19:26; and in v. 60, *חֹזֶקֶק* is probably an error for *חֹזֶקֶת*, Josh. 21:31; 19:25, occasioned by its being confounded with *חֹזֶקֶק* in the tribe of Naphtali, Josh. 19:34. In v. 61 the fact that Kadesh was a city of refuge is not mentioned, as it is in Josh. 21:32. *חֶמּוֹן* is a shortened form of *חֶמּוֹת-דִּדְאָר*, Josh. 21:32; for this city is called in Josh. 19:35 *חֶמַת*, from the warm springs in the

neighbourhood. Finally, Kirjathaim is contracted in Josh. 21:32 into *קִרְתָּיִם*.

1 Chronicles 6:62–66. *The cities of the Merarites*; cf. Josh. 21:34–37. "To the sons of Merari the remaining," sc. Levites. In Josh. 21:34 it is more clearly put *הַלְוִיִּים הַנּוֹתָרִים*, for the remaining Merarites are not spoken of. What is intended to be said is, that the Merarites, alone of the Levites, are still to be mentioned. In the tribe of Zebulun, in v. 62, only two cities are named, Rimmon and Tabor, instead of the four—Jokneam, Karthah, Dimnah, and Nahalal—in Josh. 21:34. The first two names have been dropped out of our text, while *רָמוֹנוֹ* corresponds to the *דְּמָנָה* of Joshua, but is a more correct reading, since *רָמוֹן* occurs in Josh. 19:13 among the cities of Zebulun, while *דְּמָנָה* is not mentioned; and *הַבְּבוֹר* must consequently correspond to the *נְהַלֵּל* in Joshua. Nahalal occurs in Josh. 19:15 and in Judg. 1:30, in the form Nahalol, among the cities of Zebulun, and consequently seems to be the more correct name, but has not yet been pointed out with certainty, since its identification with *Mâlul* (Arabic *m{lûl}*), south-west from Nazareth, rests upon very slender foundation. Bertheau's conjecture that the name of the city has been dropped out, and that of a more exact description of its position, perhaps *עַל גְּבוּל כְּסֵלֶת*, Josh. 19:12, only the last word has remained, is no more probable than that of Movers, that instead of the name of the city, only the neighbourhood in which the city lay, viz., Mount Tabor, is mentioned.

1 Chronicles 6:63, 64. Vv. 63 and 64 are wanting in some editions of the book of Joshua, but are found in many MSS and in the oldest printed copies, and have been omitted only by an oversight; see on Josh. 21:30f., note 2. As to the city Bezer, see on Deut. 4:43; and concerning Jahzah, Kedemoth, Mephaath, *vide* on Josh. 13:18.

1 Chronicles 6:65f. For Ramoth in Gilead, a city of refuge (Josh. 21:36), and Mahanaim, see

on Josh. 13:26; and for Heshbon and Jazer, on Num. 21:28, 32.

1 Chronicles 7

Families of Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, Half Manasseh, Ephraim, and Asher.

1 Chronicles 7:1-5. *Sons and families of Issachar.*—V. 1. Instead of וְלִבְנֵי, we must certainly read בְּנֵי, as in vv. 14, 30, or וּבְנֵי, as in v. 20, 1 Chronicles 5:11, and elsewhere. The לְבָנֵי has come into the text only by the recollection of the copyist having dwelt on the so frequently recurring לְבָנֵי in 6:42, 46, 47, cf. vv. 48, 56, 62, for it is not possible to take לְ as the לְ of introduction, because the names of the sons follow immediately. The names of the four sons are given as in Num. 26:23f., while in Gen. 46:13 the second is written פְּנִיָּה, and the third יִזְבֵּן; *vide* on Gen. *loc. cit.*

1 Chronicles 7:2. The six sons of Tola are not elsewhere met with in the Old Testament. They were “heads of their fathers’-houses of Tola.” לְתוֹלָעַ after לְבֵית אֲבוֹתָם (with the suffix) is somewhat peculiar; the meaning can only be, “of their fathers’-houses which are descended from Tola.” It is also surprising, or rather not permissible, that לְתוֹלְדוֹתָם should be connected with גְּבוּרֵי חַיִּל. גְּבוּרֵי חַיִּל לְתוֹלְדוֹתָם belongs to the following: “(registered) according to their births, they numbered in the days of David 22,600.” The suffixes םֶ- do not refer to רְאִשִּׁים, but to the בְּיַת־אֲבוֹת, the fathers’-houses, the males in which amounted to 22,600 souls. As David caused the people to be numbered by Joab (2 Sam. 24; 1 Chronicles 21), this statement probably rests on the results of that census.

1 Chronicles 7:3. From Uzzi, the first-born of Tola, are descended through Izrahiah five men, all heads of groups of related households (v. 4); “and to them (i.e., besides these) according to their generations, according to their fathers’-houses, bands of the war host, 36,000 (men), for they (these chiefs) had many wives and

sons.” From the fact that Izrahiah is introduced as grandson of Tola, Bertheau would infer that vv. 3, 4 refer to times later than David. But this is an erroneous inference, for Tola’s sons did not live in David’s time at all, and consequently it is not necessary that his grandson should be assigned to a later time. The only assertion made is, that the descendants of Tola’s sons had increased to the number mentioned in v. 2 in the time of David. By that time the descendants of his grandson Izrahiah might have increased to the number given in v. 4. That the number, 36,000, of the descendants of the grandson Izrahiah was greater than the number of those descended from the sons of Tola (22,600), is explained in the clause, “for they had many wives and sons.” That the two numbers (in vv. 2, 4) refer to the same time, i.e., to the days of David, is manifest from v. 5, “and their brethren of all the families of Issachar, valiant heroes; 87,000 their register, as regards everything,” i.e., the sum of those registered of all the families of Issachar. Whence we gather that in the 87,000 both the 22,600 (v. 2) and the 36,000 (v. 4) are included, and their brethren consequently must have amounted to 28,400 (22,600 + 36,000 + 28,400 = 87,000). In the time of Moses, Issachar numbered, according to Num. 1:29, 54,400; and at a later time, according to Num. 26:25, already numbered 64,300 men.

1 Chronicles 7:6-11. *Sons and families of Benjamin.*—In v. 6 only three sons of Benjamin—Bela, Becher, and Jediahel—are mentioned; and in vv. 7-11 their families are registered. Besides these, there are five sons of Benjamin spoken of in 1 Chronicles 8:1, 2, —Bela the first, Ashbel the second, Aharah the third, Nohah the fourth, and Rapha the fifth; while in vv. 3-5 five other בְּנֵים are enumerated, viz., אֲדָר, גֵּרָא (twice), נַעֲמָן, שְׁפֹפֶן, and חֹזַי. If we compare here the statements of the Pentateuch as to the genealogy of Benjamin, we find in Gen. 46:21 the following sons of Benjamin: Bela, Becher, Ashbel, Gera, Naaman, Ehi (אֶחִי) and Rosh, Mupim and Hupim and Ard (אֲרִד); and

in Num. 26:38–40 seven families, of which five are descended from his sons Bela, Ashbel, Ahiram, Shephupham, and Hupham (חופם); and two from his grandsons, the sons of Bela, Ard and Naaman. From this we learn, not only that of the בָּנִים mentioned in Gen. 46:21 at least two were grandsons, but also that the names אַחִי and אַחִירָם (Gen.) are only other forms of אַחִירָם and שְׁפוּפָם (Num.). It is, however, somewhat strange that among the families (in Num.) the names בְּכָר, גֵּרָא, and רֹאשׁ are wanting. The explanation which at once suggests itself, that their descendants were not numerous enough to form separate families, and that they on that account were received into the families of the other sons, though it may be accepted in the case of Gera and Rosh, of whom it is nowhere recorded that they had numerous descendants, cannot meet the case of Becher, for in vv. 8 and 9 of our chapter mention is made of nine sons of his, with a posterity of 20,200 men. The supposition that the name of Becher and his family has been dropped from the genealogical register of the families in Num. 26, will not appear in the slightest degree probable, when we consider the accuracy of this register in other respects. The only remaining explanation therefore is, that the descendants of Becher were in reality not numerous enough to form a מְשֻׁפָּחָה by themselves, but had afterwards so increased that they numbered nine fathers'-houses, with a total of 20,200 valiant warriors. The numbers in our register point unquestionably to post-Mosaic times; for at the second numbering by Moses, all the families of Benjamin together numbered only 45,600 men (Num. 26:41), while the three families mentioned in our verses number together 59,434 (22,034 + 20,200 + 17,200). The tribe of Benjamin, which moreover was entirely destroyed, with the exception of 600 men, in the war which it waged against the other tribes in the earlier part of the period of the judges (Judg. 20:47), could not have increased to such an extent before the times of David and Solomon. The name of the third son of

Benjamin, Jediel, occurs only here, and is considered by the older commentators to be another name of Ashbel (Gen. 46:21 and Num. 26:38), which cannot indeed be accepted as a certainty, but is very probable.

1 Chronicles 7:7. The five heads of fathers'-houses called sons of Bela are not sons in the proper sense of the word, but more distant descendants, who, at the time when this register was made up, were heads of the five groups of related households of the race of Bela. גְּבוּרֵי חֵילִים is synonymous with חֵילִי, v. 9, and is a plural, formed as if from a *nomen compositum*, which arose after the frequent use of the words as they are bound together in the *status constructus* had obscured the consciousness of the relation between them.

1 Chronicles 7:8. Becher's descendants. Of these nine names there are two, עֲנַתוֹת and עֲלָמֶת, which occur elsewhere as names of cities (cf. for עֲלָמֶת in the form עֲלָמָת, 6:45; and for עֲנַתוֹת, Josh. 21:18, Isa. 10:30, Jer. 1:1). We may, without doubt, accept the supposition that in these cases the cities received their names from the heads of the families which inhabited them. In v. 9, אֲבוֹתָם בֵּית רֹאשֵׁי בֵּית אֲבוֹתָם, stands in apposition to, and is explanatory of, לְתוֹלְדוֹתָם: "And their register, according to their generations," viz., according to the generations, that is, the birth-lists, "of the heads of their fathers'-houses, is (amounts to) in valiant heroes 20,200 men."

1 Chronicles 7:10f. Among the descendants of Jediel we find Benjamin and Ehud, the first of whom is named after the patriarch; but the second is not the judge Ehud (Judg. 3:15), who was indeed a Benjamite, but of the family of Gera. Chenaanah does not necessarily indicate a Canaanite family. Tharshish, which is elsewhere a precious stone, is here the name of a person; Ahishahar, that is, Brother of the Dawn, perhaps so named because *sub auroram natur.*—In v. 11 the expression is contracted, as often happens in formulae which frequently recur; and the meaning is, "All these are sons of Jediel (for as sons of Bilhan the son of Jediel, they are at the same time sons of the latter),

(registered) according to the heads of their fathers'-houses, valiant heroes 17,200, going forth in the host to war." ראשי האבות is contracted from ראשי בית־אבות, vide on Ex. 6:25; and the ה before ראשי, which Bertheau from a misinterpretation wishes to remove, depends upon the התיקשם (v. 9) to be supplied in thought.

1 Chronicles 7:12. V. 12 is unintelligible to us. The first half, "And Shuppim and Huppim, sons of Ir," would seem, if we may judge from the ו cop., to enumerate some other descendants of Benjamin. And besides, (1) the names מפים and וּהֹפִים occur in Gen. 46:21 among those of the sons of Benjamin, and in Num. 26:39, among the families of Benjamin, one called שופמי from שופם, and another חופמי from חופם, are introduced; we must consequently hold מפים to be an error for שפם or שופם. And (2) the name עיר is most probably identical with עירי in v. 7. The peculiar forms of those names, viz., שפם and וּהֹפִים, seem to have arisen from an improper comparison of them with לְהַפִּים וּלְשַׁפִּים in v. 15, in which the fact was overlooked that the Huppim and Shuppim of v. 15 belong to the Manassites. Here, therefore, two other families descended from the Benjamite Ir or Iri would seem to be mentioned, which may easily be reconciled with the purpose (v. 6) to mention none of the Benjamites but the descendants of Bela, Becher, and Jediel. The further statement, "Hushim, sons of Aher," is utterly enigmatical. The name חשים is found in Gen. 46:23 as that of Dan's only son, who, however, is called in Num. 26:42 שוחם, and who founded the family of the Shuhami. But as the names חושים and חשים are again met with in 1 Chronicles 8:8, 11 among the Benjamites, there is no need to imagine any connection between our חשם and that family.

The word אָהֵר, *aher*, is not indeed found elsewhere as a *nomen proprium*, but may notwithstanding be so here; when we might, notwithstanding the want of the conjunction ו, take the Hushim sons of Aher to be another Benjamite family. In that case, certainly, the tribe of Dan would be omitted from our chapter; but we must not allow that to lead us into arbitrary hypotheses, as not only Dan but also Zebulun is omitted.²²

1 Chronicles 7:13. *The sons of Naphtali.*—Only the sons of Naphtali are named, the families descended from them being passed over. The names correspond to those in Gen. 46:24 and Num. 25:48f., except that there the first is יַחְצִיאל, and the last שלם instead of שלום.

1 Chronicles 7:14–19. *Families of the half-tribe of Manasseh.*—The families of Manasseh which dwelt in Gilead and Bashan have already been mentioned in 1 Chronicles 5:23, 14. Our verses deal with the families of this tribe which received their inheritance in Canaan, on this side Jordan. These were, according to Num. 26:30, 34, and Josh. 17:2, six families, of which, however, only two are here spoken of—Ashriel, v. 14, and Shemidah, v. 19; or perhaps three, if Abiezer, v. 18, be the same person as Jeezer (Num. 26:30), who is called Abiezer in Josh. 17:2. The statements of vv. 14 and 15 are very obscure. At the head of the register of the Manassites stands Ashriel, who, according to Num. 26:31, belonged to the sons of Gilead the son of Manasseh and the grandson of Joseph (cf. Gen. 50:23), and founded one of the six families of the cis-Jordanic Manassites. But the words which follow are obscure; the words are אָשֶׁר יָלְדָהּ וּגִי, "whom his Aramaic concubine bore; she bore Machir the father of Gilead." But since Ashriel, according to this, was the great-grandson of Manasseh, while Machir was his son, the relative clause can refer only to Manasseh, to whom his concubine bore Machir. Movers and Berth. would therefore erase אָשֶׁר יָלְדָהּ, as a gloss arising out of a doubling of the following אָשֶׁר יָלְדָהּ. By this expedient the

difficultly as to the connection of the relative clause is certainly got rid of, but the obscurities of the following verse (15) are not thereby removed. The analogy of the other registers in our chapter requires, rather, that immediately after **בְּנֵי מְנַשֶּׁה** there should stand the name of a descendant,—a fact which speaks strongly in favour of the authenticity of **אַשְׂרִיאֵל**. It is therefore a much more probable suggestion, that after the name **אַשְׂרִיאֵל**, some additional clause, such as **בְּזֶן מְנַשֶּׁה**, has been dropped, or regarded as superfluous by a copyist, and so omitted. To such an omitted **בֶּן מְנַשֶּׁה**, the relative sentence, which gives more details as to the descent of Ashriel, would be attacked in a simple and natural manner, since it was known from Num. 26:30f. that Ashriel was descended from Manasseh through Gilead.

1 Chronicles 7:15. V. 15 is literally, “And Machir took a wife to Huppim and Shuppim, and the name of his sister was Maachah, and the name of the second Zelophehad.” According to v. 16, on the contrary, Maachah is the wife of Machir, and we should consequently expect to find in v. 15 only the simple statement, “And Machir took a wife whose name was Maachah.” From the words **לְחַפִּים וְלִשְׂפִים אַחַתוּ מַעֲבָה** no meaning which harmonizes with the context can be obtained. Since **לָקַח אִשָּׁה לְ** signifies “to take a wife for one” (cf. Judg. 14:2), we can only suppose that by the names Huppim and Shuppim Machir’s sons are meant, to whom he, as their father, gave wives. But we cannot suppose that the sons of Machir are referred to, for the birth of the sons is first mentioned in v. 16. But we have found the names **שַׁפִּים** and **חַפִּים** spoken of as descendants of Benjamin; and Bertheau consequently conjectures that these names have been brought thence into our verse by some gloss, and that the beginning of our verse originally stood thus: **וּמִכִּיר לָקַח אִשָּׁה וְשֵׁמָּה** “And Machir took a wife whose name is Maachah, and the name of his sister if Hammoleketh” (the last according to v.

18). By this means we certainly bring some meaning into the words; but we cannot venture to maintain that this conjecture corresponds to the original text, but rather incline to doubt it. For, in the first place, the following words, “And the name of the second (is) Zelophehad,” do not suit the proposed reading. Berth. must here alter **הַשְּׁנִי** into **אָחִיו** (the name of his brother).

But even after this alteration, the mention of the brother of Machir is not suitable to the context; and moreover Zelophehad was not a true brother, but only a nephew of Machir, the son of his brother Hephher; cf. Num. 26:33; 27:1. And besides this, according to the concluding formula, “These are the sons of Gilead, the son of Machir, the son of Manasseh” (v. 17), we should expect to find in vv. 15, 16, not merely sons or descendants of Machir, but rather descendants of Gilead. We therefore hold the statement of v. 15b, “And the name of the second if Zelophehad, and Zelophehad had (only) daughters,” to be correct and beyond criticism, and the first part of v. 15 to be corrupt and defective; and conjecture that a son of Gilead’s was mentioned in it, to whose name the words, “And the name of the second,” etc., belonged. This son who was mentioned in the text, which has been handed down to us only in a defective state, was probably the Ashriel mentioned in v. 14, a son of Gilead, whose descent from Machir was given more in detail in the corrupt and consequently meaningless first half of v. 15. In vv. 15, 17, other descendants of Machir by his wife Maachah are enumerated, which favours the probable conjecture that the wife whom Machir took, according to v. 15, was different from Maachah, that Machir had two wives, and that in v. 15 originally the sons of the first were enumerated, and in vv. 16, 17, the sons of the second. Peresh and Shelesh are mentioned only here. **בְּנָיו**, “his sons” (that is, the sons of the last-named, Shelesh), were Ulam and Rakem, names which are also met with only here. The name **בְּדָן** is found in our Masoretic text, 1 Sam. 12:11, as the name of a judge, but probably **בְּרָק** should be read instead.

1 Chronicles 7:18. A third branch of the descendants of Gilead were descended from Machir's sister Hammoleketh, a name which the Vulgate has taken in an appellative sense. Of her sons, Ishod, i.e., "man of splendour," is not elsewhere mentioned. The name Abiezer occurs, Josh. 17:2, as that of the head of one of the families of Manasseh. In Num. 26:30, however, he is called Jeezer, which is probably the original reading, and consequently our Abiezer is different from that in Josh. 17:2. Another circumstance which speaks strongly against the identification of the two men is, that the family descended from Jeezer holds the first place among the families of Manasseh, which is not at all consonant with the position of the son of Machir's sister here mentioned. Of the family of Abiezer came the judge Gideon, Judg. 11:15. A daughter of Zelophehad is called Mahlah in Num. 26:33; 27:1, but she is not the person here mentioned.

1 Chronicles 7:19. The sons of Shemida, the founder of the fourth family of the Manassites, Num. 26:32. His four sons are nowhere else referred to, for שָׁכָם, the founder of a family of the Manassites (Num. 26:31 and Josh. 17:2), is to be distinguished from the Shechem of our verse; nor is there any greater reason to identify Likhi with Helek, Num. 26:30 (Berth.), than there is for connecting אֲנִיעָם with נָעָם, the daughter of Zelophehad, Num. 26:33, Josh. 17:3.

1 Chronicles 7:20–29. *The families of Ephraim.*—V. 20f. Among the Ephraimites, the descendants of Shuthelah, the founder of one of the chief families of this tribe, Num. 26:35, are traced down through six generations to a later Shuthelah. The names וְעֹזֶר וְאֶלְעָד which follow שׁוּתֵלָח בְּנֵי, "And his son Shuthelah," after which בְּנֵי is wanting, are not to be considered descendants of the second Shuthelah, but are heads of a family co-ordinate with that of Shuthelah, or of two fathers'-houses intimately connected with each other. These names are to be taken as a continuation of the list of the sons of Ephraim, which commenced with שׁוּתֵלָח. The

suffix in וְהָרְגוּם refers to both these names: "The men of Gath, that were born in the land, smote Ezer and Elead." These "men born in the land" Ewald and Bertheau take to be the Avvites, the aboriginal inhabitants of that district of country, who had been extirpated by the Philistines emigrating from Caphtor (Deut. 2:23). But there is no sufficient ground for this supposition; for no proof can be brought forward that the Avvaeans (Avvites) had ever spread so far as Gath; and the Philistines had taken possession of the south-west part of Canaan as early as the time of Abraham, and consequently long before Ephraim's birth. "The men of Gath who were born in the land" are rather the Canaanite or Philistine inhabitants of Gath, as distinguished from the Israelites, who had settled in Canaan only under Joshua. "For they (Ezer and Elead) had come down to take away their cattle" (to plunder). The older commentators assign this event to the time that Israel dwelt in Egypt (Ewald, *Gesch.* i. S. 490), or even to the pre-Egyptian time. But Bertheau has, in opposition to this, justly remarked that the narratives of Genesis know nothing of a stay of the progenitors of the tribe of Ephraim in the land of Palestine before the migration of Israel into Egypt, for Ephraim was born in Egypt (Gen. 46:20). It would be more feasible to refer it to the time of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, as it is not impossible that the Israelites may have undertaken predatory expeditions against Canaan from Goshen; but even this supposition is not at all probable. Certainly, if in vv. 23–27 it were said, as Ewald thinks, that Ephraim, after the mourning over the sons thus slain, became by his wife the father of three other sons, from the last named of whom Joshua was descended in the seventh generation, we should be compelled to refer the expedition to the pre-Egyptian period. But the opinion that Reophah and Resheph, v. 25, were begotten only after that misfortune has no foundation. Moreover, the statement that Ephraim, after he was comforted for the loss of his slain sons, went in unto his wife and begat a son, to whom he gave the name Beriah, because he was born in misfortune in his house, does

not at all presuppose that the patriarch Ephraim was still alive when Ezer and Elead were slain. Were that the case, the necessary result would of course be, that this event could only be referred to the time when the Israelites dwelt in Egypt. In opposition to this, Bertheau's remark that the event in that case would be *per se* enigmatical, as we would rightly have great hesitation in accepting the supposition of a war, or rather a plundering expedition to seize upon cattle carried out by the Ephraimites whilst they dwelt in Egypt, against the inhabitants of the Philistine city of Gath, is certainly not all decisive, for we know far too little about those times to be able to judge of the possibility or probability of such an expedition.

The decision to which we must come as to this obscure matter depends, in the first place, on how the words **כִּי יָרְדוּ וְגו'** are to be understood; whether we are to translate "for they had gone," or "when they had gone down to fetch their cattle," i.e., to plunder. If we take the **כִּי** *par partic. ration.*, for, because, we can only take the sons of Ephraim, Ezer and Elead, for the subject of **יָרְדוּ**, and we must understand the words to mean that they had gone down to carry off the cattle of the Gathites. In that case, the event would fall in the time when the Ephraimites dwelt in Canaan, and went down from Mount Ephraim into the low-lying Gath, for a march out of Egypt into Canaan is irreconcilable with the verb **יָרַד**. If, on the contrary, we translate **כִּי יָרְדוּ** "when they had gone down," we might then gather from the words that men of Gath went down to Goshen, there to drive away the cattle of the Ephraimites, in which case the Gathites may have slain the sons of Ephraim when they were feeding their cattle and defending them against the robbers. Many of the old commentators have so understood the words; but we cannot hold this to be the correct interpretation, for it deprives the words "those born in the land," which stand in apposition to **אֲנָשֵׁי הָאָרֶץ**, of all meaning, since there can be absolutely no thought of men of Gath born in Egypt. We therefore take the words to mean,

that the sons of Ephraim who are named in our verse attempted to drive away the cattle of the Gathites, and were by them slain in the attempt. But how can the statement that Ephraim after this unfortunate event begat another son, Beriah, be reconciled with such a supposition, since the patriarch Ephraim was dead long before the Israelites came forth out of Egypt. Bertheau understands the begetting figuratively, of the whole of the tribe of Ephraim, or of a small Ephraimite family, which at first was not numbered with the others, into the number of the famous families of this tribe. But this straining of the words by an allegorical interpretation is not worthy of serious refutation, since it is manifestly only a makeshift to get rid of the difficulty. The words, "And Ephraim went in unto his wife, and she conceived and bare a son," are not to be interpreted allegorically, but must be taken in their proper sense; and the solution of the enigma will be found in the name Ephraim. If this be taken to denote the actual son of Joseph, then the event is incomprehensible; but just as a descendant of Shuthelah in the sixth generation was also called Shuthelah, so also might a descendant of the patriarch Ephraim, living at a much later time, have received the name of the progenitor of the tribe; and if we accept this supposition, the event, with all its issues, is easily explained. If Ezer and Elead went down from Mount Ephraim to Gath, they were not actual sons of Ephraim, but merely later descendants; and their father, who mourned for their death, was not Ephraim the son of Joseph, who was born in Egypt, but an Ephraimite who lived after the Israelites had taken possession of the land of Canaan, and who bore Ephraim's name. *He* may have mourned for the death of his sons, and after he had been comforted for their loss, may have gone in unto his wife, and have begotten a son with her, to whom he gave the name Beriah, "because it was in misfortune in his house," i.e., because this son was born when misfortune was in his house.

1 Chronicles 7:24. "And his daughter Sherah," the daughter of the above-mentioned Ephraim,

“built Beth-horon the nether and the upper,” the present Beit-Ur-Fok and Tachta (see on Josh. 10:10), “and Uzzen-sherah,” a place not elsewhere referred to, which she probably founded, and which was called after her. The building of the two Beth-horons is merely an enlarging and fortifying of these towns. Sherah was probably an heiress, who had received these places as her inheritance, and caused them to be enlarged by her family. In vv. 25–27 the ancestors of Joshua the son of Nun, who brought Israel into the land of Canaan, are enumerated. As the word בְּנֵי is wanting after רְשָׁף, we must hold Rephah and Resheph to be brothers, but we are not informed from which of the four Ephraimite stocks enumerated in Num. 26:35f. they were descended. “Telah his son,” Bertheau holds to be a son of Rephah. The name Tahan occurs in Num. 26:35 as that of the founder of one of the families of Ephraim; but he can hardly be identical with our Tahan, who was probably a son of that Tahan from whom an Ephraimite family descended. If this conjecture be correct, Joshua would be of the family of Tahan.

1 Chronicles 7:26. Elishama the son of Ammihud was a contemporary of Moses, Num. 1:10, and prince of the tribe of Ephraim, Num. 7:48; 10:22. נֹנ (Non) is so pronounced only in this place; in the Pentateuch and in the book of Joshua it is נֹן (Nun).

1 Chronicles 7:28, 29. In vv. 28 and 29 the possessions and dwelling-places of the tribe of Ephraim (and as we learn from the superscription, v. 29), also those of West Jordan Manasseh, are given, but in a very general way; only the chief places on the four sides being mentioned. Bethel, now Beitin, on the frontier of the tribal domains of Benjamin and Ephraim (Josh. 16:2; 18:13), and assigned to the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. 18:22), is here mentioned as an Ephraimite city on the southern frontier of the Ephraimite territory, as it belonged to the kingdom of the ten tribes; whence we gather that this register was prepared after that kingdom had come into existence. As to its

position, see on Josh. 7:2. Her daughters are the smaller villages which belonged to Bethel. Naaran, without doubt the same place which is called in Josh. 16:17 נְעָרְתָּה (with ה *loc.*), is the eastern frontier city lying to the north-east of Jericho; see on Josh. 16:7. “And westward Gezer,” according to Josh. 16:13, lying between Beth-horon and the sea (see on Josh. 10:33), is the frontier city on the south-west; and Shechem and Avvah (עָוָה), with their daughters, are places which mark the boundary on the north-west. As to שְׂכֶם, Shechem, the present Nabulus, see on Josh. 17:7. Instead of עָוָה, most of the editions of the Bible agree with LXX and Vulg. and Chald. in having עָזָה, but not the Philistine Gaza: it is only an error of the transcribers and printers, as all the more accurate MSS and the better printed copies have עוּה; see De Rossi, *Variae Lectt. ad h. l.* The locality עָוָה or עָיָה is certainly met with nowhere else, but, if we may judge by Josh. 16:6 and 17:17, is to be sought not far from Shechem in a north-western direction, perhaps on the site of the there mentioned Michmethah, the position of which has, however, not yet been ascertained.

1 Chronicles 7:29. According to Josh. 17:11, the Manassites had received the four cities here named, lying within the territory of Issachar and Asher. This is attested also by עַל-יְדֵי בְנֵי מַנַּשֶׁה, to the hands, i.e., in possession of the sons of Manasseh. As to its position, see Josh. 17:11. These cities formed the boundaries on the extreme north, of the dwellings “of the sons of Joseph,” i.e., of the two tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh.

1 Chronicles 7:30–40. *The sons and several families of Asher.*—V. 30. The names of the four sons of Asher and that of their sister coincide with the statement of Gen. 46:17; but in Num. 26:44–47, on the contrary, the name Ishuai does not occur among the families of Asher.

1 Chronicles 7:31. The sons of Beriah, Heber and Malchiel, are also to be found in Gen. 46:17 and Num. 26:45 as the heads of two families;

but the further statement, “he (i.e., Malchiel) the father of Birzavith,” is found only here. How ברזות, the Kethibh, is to be pronounced, cannot be with certainty determined. Gesen. in *Thes.* p. 239 makes it ברזות, and considers the word to be the name of a woman; Bertheau, on the contrary conjectures that it is a compound of בר = באר and זית, “well of the olive-tree,” and so the name of a place. In vv. 32–34 the descendants of Heber are enumerated in three generations, which are mentioned nowhere else. In v. 32 we have four sons and one daughter. The name יפלט is not to be connected with יפלט, Josh. 16:3, “because a family of Asher is not to be sought for in the neighbourhood there referred to” (Berth.). In v. 33 we have four sons of Japhlet, and in v. 34 the sons of his brother Shemer. It is somewhat remarkable that שומר, v. 32, is called here שְׁמֵר אָחִי. שְׁמֵר is not an appellative, but a proper name, as the ו before the following name shows; cf. another Ahi in 5:15. For יחבה we should read וּחְבָה.

1 Chronicles 7:35–39. Descendants of Helem—in v. 35 sons, in vv. 36–38 grandsons. As Helem is called אָחִי, “his brother” (i.e., the brother of the Shemer mentioned in v. 34), הֶלֶם would seem to be the third son of Heber, who is called in v. 32 חוּתָם. If so, one of the two names must have resulted from an error in transcription; but it is now impossible to determine which is the original and correct form of the name. Eleven names are introduced as those of the sons of Zophah (vv. 36, 37); and in v. 38 we have, besides, three sons of Jether (יֶתֶר), who is called in v. 38 יֶתֶרֶן. In v. 39 there follow three names, those of the sons of Ulla; on which Bertheau rightly remarks, the whole character of our enumeration would lead us to conjecture that עֲלָא had already occurred among the preceding names, although we find neither this name nor any similar one, with which it might be identified, in the preceding list.

1 Chronicles 7:40. V. 40 contains a comprehensive concluding statement as to the descendants of Asher: “All these (those just mentioned by name) were heads of fathers’-houses, chosen valiant heroes (חַיִּלִּים, as in v. 5), chief of the princes,” Vulg. *duces ducum*, i.e., probably leaders of the larger divisions of the army, under whom were other נְשִׂאִים. “And their genealogical register is for service of the host in war,” i.e., was prepared with reference to the men capable of bearing arms, and had not, like other registers, reference to the number of inhabitants of the various localities; cf. 9:22. It amounted to 26,000 men. According to Num. 1:41, Asher numbered 41,500, and according to Num. 26:47, 53,000 men. But we must observe that the number given in our verse is only that of the men capable of bearing arms belonging to one of the greater families of Asher, the family of Heber, of which alone a register had been preserved till the time of the chronicler.

1 Chronicles 8

Families of Benjamin, and Genealogy of the House of Saul.

1 Chronicles 8. The families of Benjamin enumerated in this chapter were probably separated from those in 1 Chronicles 7:6–11, merely on the ground that all the registers which are grouped together in 1 Chronicles 7 were taken from another genealogical document than that from which the registers in our chapter, which form a supplement to the short fragments in 1 Chronicles 7:6–11, have been derived.

1 Chronicles 8:1–5. *The sons of Benjamin and Bela.*—The manner in which the five sons begotten by Benjamin are enumerated is remarkable, “Bela his first-born, Ashbel the second,” etc., since, according to Gen. 46:21, after the first-born Bela, Becher follows as the second son, and Ashbel is the third; while Aharah, Nohah, and Rapha are not met with there, quite other names occupying their place. In אַחֲרָר we can easily recognise the אַחֲרָר of

Num. 26:38, whence the enumeration in v. 1f. harmonizes with the order in Num. 26:38. It is therefore clear, that in our genealogy only those sons are mentioned who founded the families of Benjamin. The names נֹחָה and רָפָא are nowhere else met with among the sons of Benjamin; but we may conclude, partly from the agreement of the first three names with the heads of the families of Benjamin enumerated in Num. 26:38, and partly from the agreement as to the number, which is five in both passages, that נֹחָה and רָפָא are intended to correspond to the שְׁפוּפָם and חוּפָם of Num. 26:39. The only question which then remains is, whether the variation in the names arises from these two sons of Benjamin having had different names, or from the families which issued from Shephupham and Hupham having afterwards perhaps received new names from famous chiefs, instead of the original designations, so that Nohah and Rapha would be later descendants of Shephupham and Hupham. Even this second supposition seems possible, since הוּלִיד in such genealogical registers may denote mediate procreation. If, e.g., Nohah were a grandson or great-grandson of Shephupham the son of Benjamin, he might well be introduced in the genealogical lists of the families as begotten by Benjamin.

1 Chronicles 8:3–5. The sons of Bela. Of the six names borne by these sons, גֵּרָא is twice met with; נַעֲמָן is found in Gen. 46:21 as the son, and in Num. 26:40 as grandson of Benjamin; שְׁפוּפָן is another form of שְׁפוּפָם, Num. 26:39; and חוּרָם may be a transcriber's error for חוּפָם, Num. 26:39, just as אֲדָר probably stands for אֲרָד, Gen. 46:21. The occurrence of the name Gera would be incomprehensible only if בְּנִים denoted sons in the narrower sense of the word; but if בְּנִים are sons in the wider sense, i.e., descendants who founded fathers'-houses (groups of related households), two cousins might have the same name. In that case, Addar, Shephuphan, and Huram also may be different persons from Ard,

Shephupham, and Hupham. Abihud and Abishua are met with as descendants of Benjamin only here, and אֲחֻזָּה may be connected with אֲחֻזָּיָה, v. 7.

1 Chronicles 8:6, 7. *Sons of Ehud.*—The descent of Ehud from the sons, grandsons, and descendants of Benjamin, enumerated in vv. 1–5, is not given. The names of Ehud's sons follow only at the end of the 7th verse, "And he begat Uzza and Ahihud," while the intermediate clauses contain historical remarks. These sons were "heads of fathers'-houses of the inhabitants of Geba," i.e., Geba of Benjamin (1 Sam. 13:16), the Levite city, 6:45, which still remains as the half-ruinous village Jeba, about three leagues to the north of Jerusalem; see on Josh. 18:24. "And they led them captive to Manahath, viz., Naaman and Ahiah and Gera, this man led them captive." The subject to וַיִּגְלוּם are the men mentioned in the following verse, while the הוּא which follows shows that, of the three above mentioned, the last, Gera, was the author of their captivity. The place Manahath is not known, but is conjectured to be connected with Hazi-Hammanahiti and Hazi-Hammenuhoth, 2:54 and 52; but we cannot ascertain with certainty whether the name denotes a city or a district, and the situation of it has not yet been discovered. Of the hostile collision of these Benjamite families also, no more detailed accounts have come down to us.

1 Chronicles 8:8–12. *The descendants of Shazaraim.*—The descent of Shazaraim from the sons and grandsons named in vv. 1–3 is obscure, and the conjecture which connects him with Ahishahar of 1 Chronicles 7:10 is unsupported. He was the father of a considerable number of heads of fathers'-houses, whom his two or three wives bore to him. According to v. 8, he begat "in the country of Moab after he had sent them, Hushim and Baara his wives, away; (v. 9) there begat he with Hodesh his wife, Jobab," etc. When and how Shazaraim, a Benjamite, came into the country of Moab, is not known; all that can be gathered from our verse is that he must have

lived there for a considerable time. שְׁלֵחוֹ is *infin. Pi.*, the “i” being retained, and the Daghesh forte omitted with Sheva (cf. as to this formation, Ew. § 238, *d.*). אֹתָם, accus. of the pronoun, which, as it precedes its noun, is in *gen. masc.*, although the names of women follow (cf. for this use of the pronoun, Ew. § 309, *c.*). חֻשִׁים and בְּעָרָה are women, as we learn from the following נְשָׁיו. By this parenthesis, the beginning of the main sentence has been lost sight of, and the הוֹלִיד is taken up again in וַיֹּלֶד. As to הוֹלִיד with מִן, cf. the remark on 2:8. הַדְּשִׁי is the third wife, which he took instead of those he had sent away. The seven names in vv. 9, 10 are grouped together as sons or descendants of the last-named wife, by the concluding remark, “These his sons are heads of fathers’-houses.” Then, further, in vv. 11, 12, the sons and grandsons of the first (divorced) wives, one of whom built the cities Ono and Lydda, are enumerated; but we have no means of determining whether the הוּא בְּנָה refers to Shemer, the last mentioned, or to Elpaal the father of the three sons, Eber, and Misham, and Shemer. It would, however, naturally suggest itself, that the words referred to the first. לֹד (Lod) is without doubt the city Lydda, where Peter healed the paralytic (Acts 9:32ff.). It belonged in the Syrian age to Samaria, but it was added to Judea by the King Demetrius Soter, and given to Jonathan for a possession (1 Macc. 11:34, cf. with 10:30, 38). In the Jewish was it was destroyed by the Roman general Cestius (Joseph. *de Bell. Jud.* ii. 19. 1), but was rebuilt at a later time, and became the site of a toparchy of Judea. In still later times it was called Diospolis, but is now a considerable Mohammedan village, lying between Jafa and Jerusalem to the north of Ramleh, which bears the old name Ludd, by the Arabs pronounced also Lidd. See v. Raumer, *Pal.* S. 10; Robins. *Pal. sub voce*; and Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, S. 69f. Ono is mentioned elsewhere only in Ezra 2:33, Neh. 7:37 and 11:35, along with Lod, and must have been a place in the neighbourhood of Lydda.

1 Chronicles 8:13–28. *Heads of fathers’-houses of the tribe of Benjamin, who dwelt partly in Aijalon (v. 13) and partly in Jerusalem.—*Their connection with the heads of fathers’-houses already mentioned is not clear. The names וְשִׁמְעֵה בְּרִיעָה וְשִׁמְעֵה might be taken fore a fuller enumeration of the sons of Elpaal (v. 12), were it not that the names enumerated from v. 14 or 15 onwards, are at the end of v. 16 said to be those of sons of Beriah; whence we must conclude that with וְבְרִיעָה, v. 13, a new list of heads of Benjamite fathers’-houses begins. This view is supported by the fact that the names from v. 14 or 15 to v. 27 are divided into five groups of families: the sons of Beriah (v. 16), of Elpaal (v. 18), of Shimhi (v. 21), of Shashak (v. 25), and of Jeroham (v. 27). But as two of these, Beriah and Shashak, occur in vv. 13, 14, and שְׁמַעִי is probably another form of שְׁמַעִי, Bertheau conjectures that the last two names, Shashak and Jeroham, are represented by אֶחָיו and יְרֵמוֹת (v. 14). יְרֵחוֹ and יְרֵמוֹת may be explained by the supposition of a transcriber’s error, or by one person having two names; but the word אֶחָיו is rendered by the LXX by ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ (= אֶחָיו); and the view that אֶחָיו is a *nom. prop.* is opposed, as in v. 31, by the fact that the ὁ cop. is not found before the following שְׁשָׁק, for here, throughout, the names are all connected with each other by the ὁ cop. Bertheau therefore conjectures that the text originally ran thus, וְאֶלְפַּעַל אֶחָיו וְשְׁשָׁק, and that the name Elpaal was dropped out; and that in consequence of that, אֶחָיו had been punctuated as a *nom. prop.* These conjectures seem satisfactory, especially as it may be adduced in their favour that אֶחָיו has been added to the name Elpaal to connect the names in v. 15 with the enumeration (v. 13) interrupted by the parenthetical remarks. No certainty, however, can be attained in a matter so obscure. If a new series of groups of families begins with v. 13, we should expect an introductory formula, as in v. 6. Beriah and Shema are called heads of the fathers’-houses of

the inhabitants of Aijalon, i.e., heads of the groups of related households inhabiting Aijalon, the present Jalo to the west of Gibeon (see on Josh. 19:42). It is quite consistent with this that their sons or descendants dwelt in Jerusalem. Next a heroic deed of theirs is related, viz., that they (in some war or other) turned to flight the inhabitants of Gath (without doubt Philistines). This remark reminds us of the statement in 1 Chronicles 7:21, that sons of Ephraim were slain by those born in Gath, because they had gone down to drive away the herds of the inhabitants. But Bertheau draws an erroneous conclusion from this fact, when he says that because in both passages the name Beriah occurs, both refer to the same event, and thereafter attempts by various hypotheses to make the Benjamites mentioned in our verse into Ephraimites. For the name Beriah is not at all so rare as to allow of our inferring from that alone that the various persons so called are identical, for Jacob's son Asher also named one of his sons Beriah; cf. 7:30 with Gen. 46:17. The notion that the Benjamites Beriah and Shema defeated those inhabitants of Gath who had slain the sons of Ephraim (1 Chronicles 7:21) is quite unsupported, as the Philistines lived at war and in feud with the Israelites for hundreds of years.

1 Chronicles 8:15, 16. Several of the names of these six sons of Beriah who are mentioned in our verse occur elsewhere, but nowhere else are they met with as sons of Beriah.

1 Chronicles 8:17, 18. Bertheau would identify three of the sons of Elpaal—Meshullam, Heber, and Ishmerai—with Misham, Eber, and Shemer, v. 12, but without any sufficient reason; for it is questionable if even the Elpaal whose sons are named in our verses be the same person as the Elpaal mentioned in v. 12. Of these descendants of Elpaal, also, nothing further is known, and the same may be said of the nine sons of Shimhi, vv. 19–21; of the eleven sons of Shashak, vv. 22–25; and of the six sons of Jeroham, vv. 26, 27, although some of these names are met with elsewhere singly. The concluding remark, v. 28, “These are heads of

fathers'-houses,” refers, without doubt, to all the names from v. 15 or 14 to v. 27. “According to their generations—heads” is in apposition to the preceding, as in 9:24, but the meaning of the apposition is doubtful. The word ראשי can hardly be repeated merely for emphasis, as the old commentators understood it, in harmony with the Vulgate *principes inquam*, for why should this word be so emphasized? Bertheau thinks that “according to their births—heads” is to be taken to mean that those who are enumerated by name are not the heads living at the time of the preparation of this register, but the individual families, with the name of their progenitor after whom they were named in the genealogical lists. But how this meaning can be found in the words in question, I at least cannot understand. Can the individual families be called ראשי אבות, “heads of fathers'-houses”?

The families are the fathers'-houses themselves, i.e., they are made up of the groups of related households comprehended under the name fathers'-houses. These groups of related households have, it is true, each of them either head, but cannot possibly be themselves called heads. The meaning seems rather to be that the persons named in the family registers, or registers of births, are introduced as heads (of fathers'-houses); and the reason why this is remarked would seem to be, to prevent those who are enumerated as the sons of this or that man from being regarded simply as members of fathers'-houses. The further remark, “these dwelt in Jerusalem,” is manifestly not to be taken to mean that the heads alone dwelt there, while the households that were subordinated to them lived elsewhere; for it signifies that they dwelt in Jerusalem with the households which composed their respective fathers'-houses. That the households dwelt there also is not stated, merely because the register contains only the names of the heads.

1 Chronicles 8:29–40. *The genealogy of Saul.*—Vv. 29–38 recur in 9:35–44 (see on that passage).

1 Chronicles 8:29–32. The ancestors of Saul. They dwelt mainly in Gibeon, but a branch of

them were settled in Jerusalem, v. 32.f. In Gibeon, now El Jib, two hours north-west from Jerusalem (see on Josh. 9:3), dwelt the father of Gibeon, with his wife and his sons. The plural יְשָׁבוּ is used because there dwelt there, besides the father of Gibeon, also his wife and his sons. The father, i.e., the lord and possessor of Gibeon, was called, according to 9:35, Jehiel (יְעִיֶאל, Keth. יַעֲוֹאֵל), and his wife Maachah, a not uncommon female name (see on 2:48). The descent of Jehiel from Benjamin is not given. In v. 30 eight names are given as those of his sons, while in 9:36f. ten are mentioned, the latter statement being correct; for a comparison of the two passages shows that in our verse two names have been dropped out,—Ner between Baal and Nadab, and Mikloth at the end, which must have originally stood in our register also,—for in vv. 32, 33 their descendants are mentioned. זְבַרְיָה is called in 9:37 זְבַרְיָהּ. These names are evidently those of actual sons of Jehiel who were progenitors of fathers'-houses (groups of related households), but in the case of only two is the race descended from these further noticed. In v. 32 we have that of the youngest Mikloth, who begat Shimeah, called in 9:38 Shimeam. These also (viz., Shimeah and his family) dwelt in Jerusalem אֶחְיֵיהֶם, "before their brethren," i.e., over against them, and עִמָּם אֶחְיֵיהֶם, "with their brethren." The brethren are the other Benjamites in the first clause, those dwelling outside of Jerusalem and inhabiting the neighbouring country as far as Gibeon (v. 30); in the second, those dwelling in Jerusalem (v. 28). From this it is clear that of the descendants of Abi-Gibeon only that branch which was descended from Mikloth went to Jerusalem.

1 Chronicles 8:33. The family of Ner. Ner begat Kish, and Kish Saul. According to 1 Sam. 9:1 and 14:51, Kish was a son of Abiel. this statement, on account of which Bertheau proposes to make alterations in the text, may be reconciled with that in our verses, by the simple supposition that in our verse intermediate names mentioned in 1 Sam. 9:1, and probably

others besides, are passed over, and Ner the son of Abi-Gibeon is named only because he was the progenitor of the line by which Saul was descended from him. Saul (שָׁאוּל) is King Saul. Only three of his four sons, 1 Sam. 14:49, are mentioned,—those, namely, who fell with him in the battle against the Philistines, 1 Sam. 31:2. The second is called, in 1 Sam. 14:49, Ishui, but in 31:2 Abinadab, as in our register, whence we gather that Ishui is another name for Abinadab. The fourth, Eshbaal, is the same who is called in 2 Sam. 2:8, and elsewhere, Ishbosheth, who was set up as king in opposition to David by Abner (see on 2 Sam. 2:8).

1 Chronicles 8:34. Jonathan's sons and grandsons. His son is called here and in 9:40 Meribbaal, while in 2 Sam. 4:4; 9:6; 16:1ff., 19:25, he is called Mephibosheth, because the name "striver with Baal" has been changed into מְפִיבֹשֶׁת, *exterminans idolum*. This Meribbaal, who was lame in his feet (cf. 2 Sam. 4:4), had a son Micha (מִיכָה, in 2 Sam. 9:12 written מִיכָא), of whom came a numerous race. He had four sons (v. 35), and the family of the last-named of these (Ahaz) is traced down, in vv. 36–40, through ten generations to the great-grandson of Eshek. First it is traced from Ahaz to Alemeth (v. 36); then through Zimri, brother of this latter, to Binea, by הוּלִיד; then further by בְּנוֹ (hisson) to Azel, of whom in v. 38 six sons are enumerated; and finally, in v. 39, the sons of his brother Eshek are named, and the sons and grandsons of the first-born of this latter are then enumerated. The last two verses are wanting after 9:44. The names in the two registers correspond, except at one point, where we cannot get rid of the discrepancy that for יְהוֹעָדָה (v. 36) there stands in 9:42 יַעֲרָה both times, probably through an error of transcription, by which out of the shortened form יַעֲרָה there arose יַעֲרָה, ד and ר being interchanged. Besides this, instead of the תִּאֲרָע of v. 35, we have in 9:41, according to the harder pronunciation of the gutturals, תִּתְרָע;

and for רָפָה, v. 37, we have in 9:41 the longer original form רָפָיָה. Now since Ahaz, whose posterity is traced down to the tenth generation, was descended from Jonathan in the third generation, and his grandfather Mephibosheth was a boy of five years of age at the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 4:4), the grandsons of Ulam, mentioned in v. 40, will be the thirteenth generation of Jonathan's descendants. Now Jonathan fell along with Saul in the year 1055 B.C. (see the chronological table of the period of the judges, p. 217), and consequently this thirteenth generation of Jonathan's descendants lived probably about 700 B.C., i.e., about 100 years before the Babylonian exile; for, according to the analogy of the royal race of David, we cannot reckon more than twenty-five years on an average for each generation.²³

1 Chronicles 8:40. The sons of Ulam are called valiant heroes and archers, and must have shown the same capability for war by which the tribe of Benjamin had been distinguished at an earlier time; cf. Judg. 20:16, and for דְרִכֵי קִשְׁתׁוֹ, cf. 1 Chronicles 5:16. The subscription כָּל־אֲלֵהֶם׃ refers back to the superscription in v. 1, and binds all the names in our chapter together.

1 Chronicles 9

The Former Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the Family of Saul.

1 Chronicles 9:1-3. Vv. 1-3 form the transition from the genealogies to the enumeration of the former inhabitants of Jerusalem in vv. 4-34.

1 Chronicles 9:1. "And all the Israelites were registered; and, behold, they were written in the book of the kings of Israel, and Judah was led away to Babylon for her transgressions." The LXX and Vulg. have erroneously connected וַיְהוּדָה with the preceding words, and render, "in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah," and then have translated the following words הַגְּלוּ אַרְבָּיבָרָה arbitrarily. Not less incorrect is Bertheau's opinion, that Israel here denotes only the tribes

of the northern kingdom, because Israel is contrasted with Judah, and kings of Israel are spoken of, for both reasons are quite worthless. "The book of the kings of Israel" is cited in 2 Chronicles 20:34 (cf. 2 Chronicles 33:18), and is declared by Bertheau himself to be identical with the historical work cited as the "book of the kings of Israel and Judah" (2 Chronicles 27:7; 35:27; 36:8), or as the "book of the kings of Judah and Israel" (2 Chronicles 16:11; 25:26, and elsewhere). How then can it be inferred from the shortened title, "book of the kings of Israel," that kings of the northern kingdom are spoken of? Then, as to the contrast between Israel and Judah, it might, when looked at by itself, be adduced in favour of taking the name in its narrower sense; but when we consider the grouping together in v. 10 of "Israel, the priests, the Levites, and the Nethinim," we see clearly that Israel in v. 2 incontrovertibly denotes the whole Israel of the twelve tribes. In v. 1, Israel is used in the same sense as in v. 2; and the contrast between Israel and Judah, therefore, is analogous to the contrast "Judah and Jerusalem," i.e., Israel is a designation of the whole covenant people, Judah that of one section of it. The position of our verse also at the end of the genealogies of all the tribes of Israel, and not merely of the ten tribes of the northern kingdom, requires that the name Israel should be understood to denote the whole covenant people. That v. 1 forms the transition from the genealogies to the enumeration of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and so is properly the conclusion of the genealogies in 1 Chronicles 2-8, is so manifest that Bertheau cannot adduce a single tenable ground for his assertion to the contrary, that "the verse forms clearly quite a new beginning." For the assertion, "We recognise in it a short introduction to the historical statements regarding the tribe of Judah or the Israelites after the exile," cannot be adduced in support of his view, since it not only contradicts his former assertion that Israel here denotes the northern kingdom, but is also irreconcilable with the words of the verse.²⁴

The statement, "Judah was led captive to Babylon for her transgressions," corresponds to the statement 1 Chronicles 5:25f, 41. But when, after this statement, our writer continues, "And the former inhabitants which (lived) in their possessions in their cities were Israel, the priests, the Levites, and the Nethinim; and in Jerusalem there dwelt of the sons of Judah," etc., the "former inhabitants" can only be those who dwelt in their possessions before Judah was led captive into Babylon. This could hardly be misunderstood by any commentator, if the right interpretation of our passage were not obscured by the similarity of the register of the inhabitants of Jerusalem which follows to that contained in Neh. 11, —a similarity which has led some to believe that both registers treat of the post-exilic inhabitants of Jerusalem. Bertheau, e.g., comes to the following decision as to the relation of our register, vv. 2–34, to that in Neh. 11:3–24: "As the result of the comparison, we have found that both registers correspond exactly in their plan, and agree as to all the main points in their contents." The first point in this result has some foundation; for if we turn our attention only to the enumeration of chiefs dwelling in Jerusalem, then the registers in vv. 4–17 of our chapter and in Neh. 11:3–19 are identical in plan. But if we consider the whole of the registers, as found in 1 Chronicles 9:2–34 and Neh. 11:3–24, we see that they do differ in plan; for in ours, the enumeration of the inhabitants of Jerusalem is introduced by the remark, v. 2, "The former inhabitants in their possessions in their cities, were Israel, the priests," etc., according to which the following words, v. 3, "And in Jerusalem there dwelt of the sons of Judah," etc., can only be understood of the pre-exilic inhabitants. When Bertheau refers, in opposition to this, to Neh. 5:15, where the time between Zerubbabel and Ezra is called the time of the former governors (הַפְּחוֹת הָרִאשֹׁנִים), with whom Nehemiah contrasts himself, the later governor, to prove that according to that the former inhabitants in our passage may very well denote the inhabitants of the land in the first century of the restored community, he

forgets that the governors were changed within short periods, so that Nehemiah might readily call his predecessors in the office "former governors;" while the inhabitants of the cities of Judah, on the contrary, had not changed during the period from Zerubbabel to Ezra, so as to allow of earlier and later inhabitants being distinguished. From the fact that the inhabitants "of their cities" are not contrasted as the earlier, with the inhabitants of Jerusalem as the later, but that both are placed together in such a way as to exclude such a contrast, it is manifest that the conclusion drawn by Movers and Bertheau from Neh. 11:1, that the "former inhabitants in their possessions in their cities" are those who dwelt in Jerusalem before it was peopled by the inhabitants of the surrounding district, is not tenable. In Neh. 11, on the contrary, the register is introduced by the remark, v. 3, "These are the heads of the province who dwelt in Jerusalem; and they dwelt in the cities of Judah, each in his possession in their cities, Israel, the priests," etc. This introduction, therefore, announces a register of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and of the other cities of Judah, at that time, i.e., at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. To this corresponds the manner in which the register has been made out, as in vv. 3–24 the inhabitants of Jerusalem are enumerated, and in vv. 25–36 the inhabitants of the other cities. The register in our chapter, on the contrary, deals only with the inhabitants of Jerusalem (vv. 3–19a), while in vv. 19b–34 there follow remarks as to the duties devolving upon the Levites. No mention is made in the register of the inhabitants of other cities, or of Israelites, priests, and Levites, who dwelt in their cities outside of Jerusalem (v. 2), because all that was necessary had been already communicated in the preceding genealogies (1 Chronicles 2–8).

1 Chronicles 9:3. V. 3, too, is not, as Bertheau and others think, "the superscription of the register of those dwelling in Jerusalem;" for were it that, mention must have been made in it of the priests and Levites, the enumeration of whom fills up the greater part of the following register, vv. 10–33. V. 3 corresponds rather to v.

35, and serves to introduce the contents of the whole chapter, and with it commences the enumeration itself. In Neh. 11, consequently, we have a register of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, while our chapter contains only a register of the former inhabitants of Jerusalem. Only in so far as it treats of the inhabitants of Jerusalem does Nehemiah's register resemble ours in plan; that is, to this extent, that the sons of Judah, the sons of Benjamin, priests and Levites, are enumerated *seriatim* as dwelling in Jerusalem, that is, that heads of the fathers'-houses of these inhabitants, as is stated by Nehemiah in the superscription 11:3, and in our chapter, at the end of the respective paragraphs, vv. 9, 13, and in the subscription, vv. 33 and 34.

But if we examine the contents of the two catalogues more minutely, their agreement is shown by the identity of several of the names of these heads. On this point Bertheau thus speaks: "Of the three heads of Judah, Uthai, Asaiah, and Jeuel, vv. 4-6, we recognise the first two in Athaiah and Maaseiah, Neh. 11:4, 5; only the third name, Jeuel, is omitted. Of the five heads of Benjamin, vv. 5-7, it is true, we meet with only two, Sallu and Hodaviah, in Neh. 11:7-9; but it is manifest that there was no intention to communicate in that place a complete enumeration of the hereditary chiefs of Benjamin. The names of the six heads of the divisions of the priests, Jedaiah and Jehoiarib, Jachin, Azariah (Seriah occupies his place in the book of Nehemiah), Adaiah and Maasiai (represented in Nehemiah by Amashai), are enumerated in both places in the same order. Among the Levites there occur the names of Shemaiah and Mattaniah as representatives of the great Levitic divisions of Merari and Gershon-Asaph, and we easily recognise our עֲבָדָי in the עֲבָדָא of the book of Nehemiah. Only the two first of the four chiefs of the doorkeepers, Shallum, Akkub, Talmon, and Ahiman, are named in the abridged enumeration of the book of Nehemiah, while the two others are only referred to in the added וְאַחֵיהֶם." Now, even according to this statement

of the matter, the difference is seen to be almost as great as the agreement; but in reality, as a more exact comparison of the catalogues shows, the true state of the case is very different. According to v. 3, there dwelt in Jerusalem also sons of Ephraim and Manasseh; but the catalogue from v. 4 onwards contains only sons of Judah and Benjamin, and not a single Ephraimite or Manassite. The reason of that is probably this, that only single families and individuals from among the latter dwelt there, while the register only makes mention of the heads of the larger family groups in the population of Jerusalem.

1 Chronicles 9:4-6. In the same place there dwelt, of the sons of Judah, three chiefs of the three most important families of Judah, that of Pharez, that of Shelah, and that of Zerah; cf. 2:3, 4. Of the family of Pharez was Uthai, whose descent is traced back in v. 4 to Bani, of the children of Pharez. The Kethibh כְּוֹ-בְנֵימוֹן-בְּנֵי is clearly to be read according to the Keri כְּוֹ-בְנֵי בְנֵי. The name Bani occurs, 6:31, among the Merarites; while in the genealogies of Judah, 1 Chronicles 2-4, neither Bani nor Uthai, nor any one of his ancestors who are here named, is mentioned. In Neh. 11:4, on the contrary, there is named of the sons of Pharez, Athaiah (עֲתָיָהּ, perhaps only another form of עֲוֵתָי), with quite other ancestors; while not a single one of the five names of the persons through whom his race is traced back to Mahalaleel, of the sons of Pharez, coincides with the ancestors of Uthai.

1 Chronicles 9:5. Of the family of Shelah, Asaiah the first-born, and his other) sons. בְּנֵי, after הַבְּכוֹר, can only be understood of the other sons or descendants. But the epithet give to Asaiah, הַשִּׁלּוֹנִי, is surprising, for it is a formation from שִׁילוֹה or שִׁילֹן, and appears to denote a native of Shiloh, a well-known city of Ephraim. This derivation, however, is not suitable, since here the sons (descendants) of Judah are enumerated; and no connection between the inhabitants of Judah and the Ephraimite city

Shiloh can either be proved or is at all likely. The older commentators, therefore, have suggested the reading הַשְּׁלֹנִי, as in Num. 26:20, where the family of Shelah, the third sons of Judah, is so called. This suggestion is doubtless correct, and the erroneous punctuation הַשְּׁלֹנִי has probably arisen only from the *scriptio plena* of the word שִׁלָּה instead of שְׁלָה. This supposition is confirmed by the fact that the form הַשְּׁלֹנִי is found in Neh. 11:5, although it also is pointed הַשְּׁלֹנִי. In Neh. *loc. cit.*, instead of Asaiah, Maaseiah is introduced as בְּנֵי הַשְּׁלֹנִי in the seventh generation, while no ancestors whatever of our Asaiah are mentioned. The name מַעֲשִׂיָה, moreover, is not unfrequent, and occurs in 4:36 among the Simeonites; in 6:15; 15:6, 11, among the Levites; in 2 Kings 22:12, 14 and 2 Chronicles 34:20, as עֲבָד of the King Josiah. מַעֲשִׂיָה is the name of many persons, e.g., in 15:18, 20, and likewise in 2 Chronicles 23:1, Jer. 21:1; 29:21; 35:4; and elsewhere it is used of men of other tribes: so that even should Maaseiah have been written instead of Asaiah merely by an error of transcription, we are not warranted in identifying our Asaiah with the Maaseiah of Nehemiah.

1 Chronicles 9:6. "Of the sons of Zerah, Jeuel;" also the name of various persons; cf. 5:7, 2 Chronicles 26:11: the register in Neh. 11 notices no descendants of Zerah. "And their brethren, 690 (men)." The plural suffix in אֶחְיָהֶם cannot be referred, as Bertheau thinks, to Jeuel, for that name, as being that of the head of a father's-house, cannot be a collective. The suffix most consequently refer to the three heads mentioned in vv. 4–6, Uthai, Asaiah, and Jeuel, whose brethren are the other heads of fathers'-houses of the three families descended from Judah; cf. v. 9, where the number of the אֶחְיָהֶם mentioned refers to all the heads who had formerly been spoken of.

1 Chronicles 9:7–9. Of the sons of Benjamin, i.e., of the Benjamites, four heads are named, Sallu, Ibneiah, Elah, and Meshullam; and of the

first and fourth of these, three generations of ancestors are mentioned, of the second only the father, of the third the father and grandfather. "And their brethren according to their generations, 956;" cf. on v. 6. "All these men" are not the brethren whose number is given, but the heads who have been mentioned by name. Now, if we compare this with Neh. 11, we meet in vv. 7–9 with only one of the four heads of Benjamin, Sallu, and that too, as in the Chronicle, as a son of Meshullam, while the ancestors of both are different. Instead of the three others in v. 8, we have גְּבִי סָלִי, 928; and in v. 9, as overseer (prefect), and Jehudah as ruler over the city.

1 Chronicles 9:10–13. *The priests.*—The three names Jedaiah, Jehoiarib, and Jachin (v. 10) denote three classes of priests (cf. 24:7, 17), who accordingly dwelt in Jerusalem. There also dwelt there (v. 11) Azariah the son of Hilkiah, etc., the prince of the house of God; cf. 2 Chronicles 31:13. This is the Azariah mentioned in 1 Chronicles 5:40, the son of Hilkiah, etc., the grandfather of the Jehozadak who was led captive into Babylon. then in v. 12 we have two other heads of the priestly fathers'-houses, with an enumeration of their ancestors, through whom they are traced back to the classes of priests to which they belonged respectively, viz., Adaiah to the class Malchijah (1 Chronicles 24:9), and Maasiai to the class Immer (1 Chronicles 24:14). According to this, therefore, there dwelt at Jerusalem, of the priesthood, the three classes Jedaiah, Jehoiarib, and Jachin, Azariah the prince of the temple, and of the classes Malchijah and Immer, the fathers'-houses Adaiah and Maasiai. In v. 13 the whole number is estimated at 1760. A difficulty is raised by the first words of this verse, "And their brethren, heads of their fathers'-houses, 1760," which can hardly be taken in any other sense than as denoting that the number of the heads of the fathers'-houses amounted to 1760. This, however, is not conceivable, as "fathers'-houses" are not single households, but larger groups of related families. Moreover, אֶחְיָהֶם, which is co-ordinate with the heads of the

fathers'-houses, can only denote, as in vv. 6, 9, the heads of the families which belonged to or constituted the fathers'-houses. To arrive at this meaning, however, we must transpose the words *וְאֶחָיִהֶם* and *לְבֵית־אֲבוֹתָם*, connecting *וְאֶחָיִהֶם* with v. 12, and *לְבֵית־אֲבוֹתָם* with the number, thus: heads of fathers'-houses, etc., were those mentioned in v. 12, and their brethren 1760 (men), valiant heroes in the work of the service of the house of God. Before *מְלֹאכֶת* one would expect the word *עָשִׂי*, as in 1 Chronicles 23:24 and Neh. 11:12, but its presence is not so absolutely necessary as to warrant us in supposing that it has been dropped out, and in inserting it. *מְלֹאכֶת* may be also taken as an accusative of relation, "valiant heroes in reference to the work;" or at most a *ל* may be supplied before *מְלֹאכֶת*, as it might easily have been omitted by a clerical error after the immediately preceding *הָיָה*. On comparing our passage with Neh. 11:10-14, we find there, if *בְּנֵי־יְהוֹרִיב* in v. 10 be altered into *יְהוֹרִיב*, the same three classes of priests; but instead of Azariah, Seraiah is prince of the house of God, v. 11: thereafter we have 822 brethren, performing the work of the house (of God). Then follows Adaiah of the class Malchijah (as in the Chronicles), but with the addition, "his brethren 242;" and then Amashai of the class Immer, but with other ancestors than those of the Maasai of the Chronicles, and with the addition, "and their brethren, valiant heroes, 128;" and finally, Zabdiel Ben Hagdolim as overseer (president over them). The sum of the three numbers is 1192, as contrasted with the 1760 of the Chronicle.

1 Chronicles 9:14-17. *The Levites.*—Of these there dwelt in Jerusalem, Shemaiah the son of Hasshub, the son of, etc., a Merarite; and (v. 15) Bakbakkar, Heresh, and Galal; and Mattaniah the son of Micah, a descendant of Asaph, and consequently a Gershonite (v. 16); and Obadiah the son of Shemaiah, as descendant of Jeduthun, consequently also a Merarite; and Berechiah the son of Asa, the son of Elkanah, who dwelt in

the villages of the Netophathite, i.e., of the lord or possessor of Netopha, a locality in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem; cf. Neh. 7:26. This remark does not refer to Shemaiah, who cannot have dwelt at the same time in Jerusalem and in the village of the Netophathite, but to his grandfather or ancestor Elkanah, who is thereby to be distinguished from the other men who bore this name, which often occurs in the family of Kohath. All these men are, according to the analogy of the other names in our register, and according to the express statement of the superscription, v. 34, to be regarded as heads of Levitic fathers'-houses, and were probably leaders of the music, since those mentioned in vv. 15, 16 were descendants of Asaph and Jeduthun, and may therefore with certainty be assumed to have belonged to the Levitic musicians. A confirmation of this supposition is found in the superscription, v. 33, inasmuch as the mention of the singers in the first line goes to show that the enumeration of the Levites began with the singers. If we compare Neh. 11:15-18 with our passage, we find that these two, Shemaiah and Mattaniah, are mentioned, and on the whole their forefathers have the same names, vv. 15 and 17; but between the two we find Shabbethai and Jozabad of the chief of the Levites set over the external service of the house of God. After Mattaniah, who is chief of the Asaphites there also, mention is made of Bakbukiah as the second among his brethren, and Abda the son of Shammua, a descendant of Jeduthun (v. 17); according to which, even if we identify Bakbakkar with Bakbukiah, and Abda with Obadiah, the Heresh, Galal, and Berechiah of the Chronicles are wanting in Nehemiah, and instead of these three, only Jozabad is mentioned.

1 Chronicles 9:17. "The doorkeepers, Shallum, Akkub, Talmon, Ahiman, and their brethren: Shallum the chief." The service was so divided among the four just named, that each along with his brethren performed the duty of watching by one of the four sides and chief entrances of the temple (cf. vv. 24 and 26), and these four were consequently heads of those

divisions of the Levites to whom was committed the duty of the watch. In Neh. 11:20, on the contrary, the doorkeepers mentioned are Akkub, Talmon, and their brethren, 172 (men); but the other two chiefs named in the Chronicle are there omitted, while in the Chronicle no number is given. Here the agreement between the two registers ceases. In the Chronicle there follows first of all, in vv. 18–26a, some remarks on the service of the doorkeepers; and then in 26b32 the duties of the Levites in general are spoken of; and finally, in vv. 32 and 34 we have subscriptions. In Nehemiah, on the other hand, we find in v. 20 the statement that the remaining Israelites, priests, and Levites dwelt in their cities; and after some statements as to the service of the Levites, the enumeration of these cities is introduced.

In glancing back over the two catalogues, it is seen that the differences are at least as great as the coincidences. But what conclusions are we to deduce from that fact? Bertheau thinks “from this it is certain that both catalogues cannot have been drawn up independently of each other,” and “that both have been derived from one and the same source, which must have been much more complete, and much richer in names, than our present catalogues; cf. Movers, S. 234.” We, however, judge otherwise. The discrepancies are much too great to allow us to refer them to free handling by epitomizers of some hypothetical more detailed catalogue, or to the negligence of copyists. The coincidence, in so far as it actually exists, does not justify us in accepting such far-fetched suppositions, but may be satisfactorily explained in another way. It consists indeed only in this, that in both registers, 91) sons of Judah and Benjamin, priests and Levites, are enumerated; (2) that in each of these four classes of the inhabitants of Jerusalem some names are identical. The first of these coincidences clearly does not in the least prove that the two catalogues are derived from the same source, and treat of the same time; for the four classes enumerated constituted, both before and after the exile, the population of Jerusalem. But neither does the identity of

some of the names prove in the slightest degree the identity of the two catalogues, because the names denote, partly classes of inhabitants, and partly heads of fathers’-houses, i.e., of groups of related households, which did not change with each generation, but sometimes continued to exist for centuries; and because, *à priori*, we should expect that those who returned from exile would, as far as it was possible, seek out again the dwelling-places of their pre-exilic ancestors; and that consequently after the exile, on the whole, the same families who had dwelt at Jerusalem before it would again take up their abode there. In this way the identity of the names Jedaiah, Jehoiarib, and Jachin in the two catalogues may be accounted for, as these names do not denote persons, but classes of priests, which existed both before and after the exile. A similar explanation would also apply to the names of the doorkeepers Akkub and Talmon (v. 17; Neh. v. 19), as not merely the priests, but also the other Levites, were divided for the service according to their fathers’-houses into classes which had permanent names (cf. 1 Chronicles 25 and 26). Of the other names in our register only the following are identical: of the Benjamites, Sallu the son of Meshullam (v. 7; Neh. v. 7); of the priests, Adaiah (v. 12; Neh. v. 12), with almost the same ancestors; and of the Levites, Shemaiah and Mattaniah (v. 10f.; Neh. vv. 15, 17). All the other names are different; and even if among the priests Maasai (v. 12) should be identical with Amashai (Neh. v. 13), and among the Levites Bakbakkar and Obadiah (vv. 16 and 15) with Bakbukiah and Abda (Neh. v. 17), we cannot identify the sons of Judah, Uthai and Azaiah (v. 4f.), with Athaiah and Maaseiah (Neh. v. 4f.), for their ancestors are quite different. The similarity or even the identity of names, were it in two or three generations, cannot of itself prove the identity of the persons, as we have already seen, in the genealogy of the line of Aaron 5:29ff.), that, e.g., the series Amariah, Ahitub, and Zadok recurs at various times; cf. v. 33f. and v. 37f. Everywhere in the genealogical lines the same names very often recur, as it was the custom to give the children the names of

their ancestors; cf. Tob. 1:9, Luke 1:59. Win. *bibl. R. W.* ii. S. 133; Hävern. *Einl.* ii. 1, S. 179f. But if, on the one hand, the identity of these names in the two catalogues is not at all a valid proof of the identity of the catalogues, and by no means justifies us in identifying similarly-sounding names by supposing errors of transcription, on the other hand we must hold that the register refers to the pre-exilic population of Jerusalem, both because of the wide discrepancies in all points, and in accordance with the introductory statements in v. 2f. This interpretation is also demanded by the succeeding remarks in reference to the service of the Levites, since they throughout refer to the pre-exilic time.

1 Chronicles 9:18–34. *The duties of the Levites.*—V. 18. The first half of this verse, “And until now (is he) in the king’s gate eastward,” must be referred to Shallum (Berth.). To imagine a reference to all the doorkeepers, “until now are they,” does not suit vv. 24–26, according to which the doorkeepers kept guard upon all the four sides. The eastern gate of the temple was called the king’s gate, because by this gate the king went in and out to the temple; cf. Ezek. 46:1, 2; 41:3. The remark, “until now is Shallum watcher,” etc., presupposes the existence of the temple at the time of the preparation of this register, and points to the pre-exilic time. Against this Bertheau has raised the objection that the name king’s gate may have been retained even in the post-exilic times for the eastern gate. This must of course be in general admitted, but could only be accepted if it were proved that Shallum lived after the exile. This proof Bertheau obtains by taking the words, “until now is Shallum in the king’s gate,” to mean, “that, according to the ancient arrangement, Shallum, the chief of all the doorkeepers, had still to guard the eastern entrance; according to which Shallum would be the collective designation of the whole series of the chiefs of the doorkeepers who lived from David’s time till after the exile;” but the words cannot be thus interpreted. Such an interpretation cannot be made plausible by identifying the name Shallum with

Meshelemiah or Shelemiah, to whose lot it fell in the time of David to be doorkeeper to the eastward (1 Chronicles 26:1, 14); for in doing so, we would overlook the fact that in v. 21 of our chapter also he bears the name Meshelemiah. The circumstance that both Shallum and Meshelemiah are called Ben-Kore, of the sons of Abiasaph, by no means justifies the identification of these two quite different names; for it is neither necessary nor probable that כֹּרֵי should here be taken in its narrower sense, and Kore regarded as the immediate father of both. The name כֹּרֵי is repeated in the family of the east doorkeepers, as we learn from 2 Chronicles 31:14, where it is stated that this office was held by a Kore ben Jimna. “These (who are named in v. 17) are the doorkeepers for the camp of the sons of Levi” (of the Levites),—an antiquated expression, bringing to remembrance the time of Moses, when the Levites, on the journey through the wilderness, were encamped about the tabernacle (Num. 3:21ff.).

1 Chronicles 9:19. V. 19 gives more exact information as to Shallum’s person and his official position. He, the descendant of Kore, the son (descendant) of Abiasaph, a Korahite, and his brethren according to his father’s-house (i.e., called brethren because they, like him, belonged to the father’s-house of Korah), were over the work of the service, viz., keepers of the thresholds of the tent, i.e., of the house of God, of the temple, which, according to the ancient custom, was called tent, because God’s house was formerly a tent—the tabernacle. “And his fathers (the ancestors of Shallum) were by the encampment of Jahve, guardians of the entrance.” With these words the author of this register goes back into the ancient time; and we learn that Shallum’s ancestors, of the father’s-house of the Korahite Abiasaph, had held the office of guardian of the entrance to the house of God from the time of the conquest of Canaan and the setting up of the tabernacle in Shiloh. The remark in v. 20, that Phinehas the son of Eleazar was prince over them in time past, points to the same period. In the book of Joshua

and the older books there is no record of the matter; but since the Korahites were descended through Ishhar from Kohath, and the Kohathites held, according to Num. 4:4ff., the first place among the servants of the holy place, and were responsible for the holiest vessels, we cannot doubt that the statement here rests upon accurate historical tradition. The “encampment of Jahve” is the holy place of the tabernacle, the dwelling of Jahve in the midst of His people. This designation also is derived from the circumstances of the Israelites in their wandering in the Arabian desert, and is likewise employed in 2 Chronicles 31:2 in reference to Solomon’s temple; but in our verse the tabernacle is intended. It had only one entrance, מַבְוֵא, the guarding of which was entrusted to the above-mentioned Korahites.

1 Chronicles 9:20. Phinehas was prince over them, not as high priest, but during the high-priesthood of his father Eleazar, i.e., in the time of Joshua, just as Eleazar, under the high-priesthood of Aaron in the time of Moses, had the oversight of the keepers of the holy place, as prince of the princes of Levi (Num. 3:32). The words יהוה עִמּוֹ do not contain a historical remark, “Jahve was with him,” for then the conjunction ו would stand before it, as in 11:9; they are a blessing—“Jahve be with him”—in reference, probably, to the covenant of peace entered into with him and his descendants by Jahve (Num. 25:11–13).

1 Chronicles 9:21. V. 21 is quite unconnected with the preceding context, the conjunction ו being omitted, and its contents also present considerable difficulties. Zechariah, the son of Meshelemiah, can only be the Zechariah who is mentioned in 26:2 as the first-born of Meshelemiah, and who lived in the time of David; for at the time when David divided the porters into classes, there fell to him the lot towards midnight, i.e., the duty of waiting at the door on the north side of the holy place (1 Chronicles 26:14). With this, indeed, the general statement of our verse, “he was porter of the door (or the entrance) of the tent of the

covenant,” is not inconsistent. But what purpose does this general statement serve? With what design is Zechariah, and he alone, mentioned? We have no means of giving a definite answer to this question; but he may perhaps be named as being the person who, before David’s division of the Levites into classes was carried out, had charge of the porters’ service in the tabernacle. But even if this conjecture be accepted as well grounded, the abrupt way in which it is mentioned still remains enigmatical.

1 Chronicles 9:22. With v. 22 the narrative seems to return to the enumeration begun in vv. 17–19a, so that the reflections on the earlier times, vv. 19b–21, are to be regarded as a parenthesis. V. 22 runs: “They all who were chosen for doorkeepers for the thresholds, 212 (men): they, in their villages were they registered; they were ordained by David and Samuel the seer on their fidelity.” The infinitive הִתְיַחַשׁ is used substantively, “in reference to them, in their villages as their genealogical registration accomplished.” If v. 22 be the continuation of vv. 17–21a, then the number given (212) will refer to the doorkeepers in active service at the time of the preparation of the register. With this hypothesis, however, the last clause of the verse, which states that David and Samuel had appointed them, does not seem to harmonize. But if we consider that the four men mentioned in v. 17 are heads of fathers’-houses, and that their fathers’-houses were not extinguished at the death of their temporary heads, and performed the same service from generation to generation, it might well be said of the generation performing the service at the time of the preparation of our register, that David had appointed them to their office. The case would of course be similar, if, as we have above supposed, the four names in v. 17 are designations of the classes of doorkeepers, for these classes also performed the same service continually. The statements of our 22nd verse cannot be referred to the time of David, for in 1 Chronicles 26:8–10 the number of the doorkeepers appointed by David amounted

only to eighty, viz., sixty-two of the sons of Obed-Edom, and eighteen of the sons of Meshelemiah, which, with the addition of thirteen Merarites (1 Chronicles 26:10, 11), gives a total of ninety-three, while in our verse the number is 212. According to Ezra 2:42, the number of doorkeepers who returned with Zerubbabel was 139 men; and in the register, Neh. 11:19, the number is stated to be 172. From the remark that they were registered in their villages (חֲצֵרֵיהֶם, as in 6:41, Josh. 13:23, and elsewhere), we learn that the doorkeepers dwelt in villages near Jerusalem, whence they came to the city so often as their service required, as the singers also did in the post-exilic time, Neh. 12:29f. יָסַד, to found, set, ordain, and so appoint to an office. "David and Samuel the seer:" הִרְאָה, the ancient designation of the prophets, for which at a later time נָבִיא was the more usual word; cf. 1 Sam. 9:9. Nowhere else do we find any record of Samuel's having taken any part in David's arrangement of the service of the Levites in the holy place. Samuel, moreover, was no longer living when David began to arrange the worship at the time when the ark was brought to Jerusalem, for he died before Saul, and consequently before the beginning of David's reign; cf. 1 Sam. 25:1 with 28:3. Bertheau is consequently of opinion that this statement of our historian rests merely upon the general recollection, according to which the worship was organized afresh, and established in its newer form, in the time of David and Samuel. This is of course possible, but there is no cogent reason against accepting the much less remote supposition that the chronicler took this remark from his authority. The mention of Samuel after David has not a chronological signification, but David is named first on account of his connection with the matter in hand; for the thorough re-organization of the worship, and the classification of the persons engaged in carrying it on, originated with David. For these arrangements of David, however, Samuel had prepared the way in his struggle for the restoration of the theocracy, and of the worship

which had fallen into desuetude under Eli and his profligate sons. To do this in any measure, he must have, without doubt, ordained trustworthy men to the individual offices, and thus have prepared the way for King David. בְּאֵמוּנָתָם is found in vv. 26, 31 without the suffix, with the meaning "in good faith" (cf. 2 Kings 12:16; 22:7, 2 Chronicles 31:12), and accordingly is here upon their fidelity, i.e., because they had been recognised to be faithful.

1 Chronicles 9:23f. They (those ordained by David) and their sons (descendants) were at the doors of the house of Jahve—of the tent-house (בֵּית־יהוָה is added to בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים, in order that the latter might not be confined to Solomon's temple); for the watch (מִשְׁמָרוֹת) of persons, as in Neh. 12:9; 4:3, 16), according to the four winds (quarters) were they, i.e., the doorkeepers stood so, in accordance with the arrangement made by David; cf. 26:14ff.

1 Chronicles 9:25. "And their brethren in their villages (cf. v. 22) were bound to come the seventh day, from time to time, with these." The infinitive בּוֹא with לֵי expresses duty, as in 5:1.

The seventh day is the Sabbath of the week, on which each class in order had to take charge of the services. אֱלֵהֶם are the chiefs mentioned in v. 17 who dwelt in Jerusalem, and of whom it is said in v. 26, "for they are on their fidelity, the four mighty of the doorkeepers." In explanation of the גִּבּוֹרֵי, Bertheau very fittingly compares σταρτηγοῖ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, Luke 22:52. The words הֵם הַלְוִיִּים, which may be translated, "they are the Levites," or "they (viz., the Levites)," are somewhat surprising. The Masoretic punctuation demands the latter translation, when the words would be an emphatic elucidation of the preceding הֵמָּה. Were they a subscription, we should expect אֱלֵהֶם instead of הֵם; while, on the other hand, the circumstance noticed by Bertheau, that in the following verses the duties not merely of the doorkeepers, but of the Levites in general, are enumerated, would seem to favour that sense.

Even in the second half of the 22nd verse it is not the doorkeepers who are spoken of, but the Levites in general. May we not suppose that the text originally stood וְהָיוּ הַלְוִיִּים הָיוּ (cf. v. 14)

instead of וְהָיוּ הַלְוִיִּים וְהָיוּ, and that the reading of our present text, having originated in a transcriber's error, found acceptance from the circumstance that v. 27 apparently still treats of, or returns to, the service of the doorkeepers? So much is certain, that from v. 26b onward the duties of the Levites in general, no longer those of the doorkeepers, are spoken of, and that consequently we must regard the Levites (הַלְוִיִּים), and not the before-mentioned four doorkeepers, as the subject of וְהָיוּ: "and the Levites were over the cells of the storehouses of the house of God." The cells in the outbuildings of the temple served as treasure-chambers and storehouses for the temple furniture. הָאֻצְרוֹת with the article in the *stat. constr.* (Ew. § 290, *d.*), because of the looser connection, since the genitive בֵּית־הָאֵל also belongs to הַלְשָׁכוֹת.

1 Chronicles 9:27. V. 27 refers again to the doorkeepers. They passed the night around the house of God, because the care of or watch over it was committed to them, and "they were over the key, and that every morning," i.e., they had to open the door every morning. מִפְתָּח occurs again in Judg. 3:25 and Isa. 22:22, in the signification key, which is suitable here also.

1 Chronicles 9:28. And of them (the Levites), some were over the vessels of the service, by which we are probably to understand the costly vessels, e.g., the golden cups for the libations, etc., which were brought from the treasure-chamber only for a short time for use in the service. They were brought, according to the number, into the place where the service took place, and after being again numbered, were again carried forth; and according to v. 29, other Levites were set over הַבָּלִים and over כְּלֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ.

1 Chronicles 9:29. And of them, others were set over the vessels (in general), and over all

the holy vessels which were used for the daily sacrificial service, and over the fine flour (סֹלֶת, *vide* on Lev. 2:1), wine, oil, and incense which was required therein for the meat and drink offerings, and the בְּשָׂמִים, spicery, for the holy perfumes (frankincense, cf. Ex. 25:6).

1 Chronicles 9:30. And of the priests' sons were preparers of the ointments for the spices. It is the preparation from various spices of the holy anointing oil, Ex. 30:23–25, which is meant, and which consequently was part of the priest's duty.

1 Chronicles 9:31. Mattithiah, the first-born of the Korahite Shallum (*vide* v. 19), was on good faith over the panbakings (pastry) for the meat-offerings, over the preparation of which he was to watch. To the name Mattithiah מִן־הַלְוִיִּים is added, in contrast to the מִן־בְּנֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים in v. 30. The word הַחֲבֻתִים (pastry, panbaking) occurs here only; cf. מַחְבֵּת, pan of sheet iron, Ex. 4:3.

1 Chronicles 9:32. Finally, to some of the Kohathites was committed the preparation of the shew-bread, which required to be laid on the table fresh every Sabbath; cf. Lev. 24:5–8. The suffix אֲחֵיהֶם refers back to the Levites of the father's-house of Korah in v. 32.

1 Chronicles 9:33, 34. Vv. 33, 34 contain subscriptions to the section 14–32. Since the enumeration of the Levites dwelling in Jerusalem in vv. 14–16 began with the Levitic singer families, so here we find that the singers are mentioned in the first subscription, "these are the singers, heads of fathers'-houses of the Levites," with an additional remark as to their service: "In the cells free, for day and night it is incumbent upon them to be in service," which is somewhat obscure. פָּטוּרִים, from פָּטַר, in later Hebrew, let loose, set free. Rashi and Kimchi have already translated it, *immunes ab aliis nempe ministeriis*, or *ab omni alio officio*. Adopting this linguistically assured translation, we must supply with בְּלִשְׁכָּתָה, dwelling or waiting in the cells of the courts of the temple, freed from every other business in order that

they may apply themselves wholly to their service, for they are wholly busied therewith day and night. Day and night is not to be pressed, but signifies perpetually, continually. Bertheau translates *בְּמִלְאָכָהּ*, “they were over them in the service,” i.e., had to take the oversight of the singers subordinate to them. but this can hardly be correct; and the passage quoted to justify this translation, 2 Chronicles 34:12, proves nothing, because there *מִפְקֹד* is used along with it. We therefore prefer to take *עָלֵיהֶם* in the signification “it is incumbent upon them,” although we should then expect *הַמְלֹאכָה* instead of *בְּמִלְאָכָהּ*; cf. v. 27. Yet *בְּמִלְאָכָהּ* can in this connection quite well be used elliptically or concisely for “to be in service,” i.e., to carry on their musical duties. The second subscription (v. 34) refers to all the Levites, and is similar in contents and form to that in 1 Chronicles 8:28.

1 Chronicles 9:35–44. *The family of King Saul.*—This register has already occurred in 1 Chronicles 8:29–38, along with those of other families of the tribe of Benjamin, and is repeated here only to connect the following history of the kingship with the preceding genealogical lists. It forms here the introduction to the narrative of Saul’s death in 1 Chronicles 10, which in turn forms the transition to the kingship of David. The deviations of this register from that in 1 Chronicles 8:29–38, show that it has been derived from another document in more complete preservation than that in 1 Chronicles 8, which had been handed down in connection with other genealogies of the Benjamite families, and had suffered considerably in its text. See the commentary on 8:29–38.

1 Chronicles 10

The History of David’s Kingship.—Ch. 10–29.

1 Chronicles 10–29. The account of the ruin of Saul and his house in 1 Chronicles 10, cf. 1 Sam. 31, forms the introduction to the history of the kingship of David, which is narrated in two sections. In the first, 1 Chronicles 11–21, we

have a consecutive narrative of the most important events of David’s life, and his attempts to settle the kingship of Israel on a firmer basis, from the time of his being anointed king over all Israel to the numbering of the people in the latter years of his reign. The second, 1 Chronicles 22–29, contains an account of the preparations made towards the end of his reign for the building of the temple, of the arrangement of the service of the Levites and the army, and the last commands of the grey-haired king as to the succession of his son Solomon to the kingdom, and matters connected with it. The first section runs parallel to the account of the reign of David in 2 Samuel; the second is peculiar to the Chronicle, and has no parallel in the earlier historical books, Samuel and Kings. Now, if we compare the first section with the parallel narrative in 2 Samuel, it is manifest that, apart from that omission of David’s seven years’ reign over the tribe of Judah in Hebron, and of all the events having reference to and connection with his family relationships, of which we have already spoken in p. 377, in the Chronicle the same incidents are recounted as in the second book of Samuel, and with few exceptions the order is the same. The main alterations in the order of the narrative are: (a) that the catalogues of David’s heroes who helped him to establish his kingdom (1 Chronicles 11:10–47), and of the valiant men of all the tribes, who even in Saul’s lifetime had joined themselves to David (1 Chronicles 12), follow immediately upon the account of the choosing of Jerusalem to be the capital of the kingdom, after the conquest of the fortress Jebus (1 Chronicles 11:1–9), while in 2 Samuel the former of these catalogues is found in 2 Sam. 23:8–39, in connection with the history of his reign, and the latter is entirely omitted; and (b) the account of his palace-building, his wives and children, and of some battles with the Philistines, which in 2 Sam. 5:11–25 follows immediately after the account of the conquest of the citadel of Zion, is inserted in the fourteenth chapter of Chronicles, in the account of the bringing of the ark of the covenant from Kirjath-jearim (1 Chronicles 13),

and its transfer to Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 15f.). Both these transpositions and the before-mentioned omissions are connected with the peculiar plan of the Chronicle. In the second book of Samuel the reign of David is so described as to bring out, in the first place, the splendidly victorious development of his kingship, and then its humiliation through great transgression on David's part; the author of the Chronicle, on the other hand, designed to portray to his contemporaries the glories of the Davidic kingship, so that the divine election of David to be ruler over the people of Israel might be manifest. In accordance with this purpose he shows, firstly, how after the death of Saul Jahve bestowed the kingship upon David, all Israel coming to Hebron and anointing him king, with the confession, "Jahve thy God hath said to thee, Thou shalt be ruler over my people Israel;" how the heroes of the whole nation helped him in the establishing of his kingdom (1 Chronicles 11); and how, even before the death of Saul, the most valiant men of all the tribes had gone over to him, and had helped him in the struggle (1 Chronicles 12). In the second place, he narrates how David immediately determined to bring the ark into the capital of his kingdom (1 Chronicles 15); how, notwithstanding the misfortunes caused by a transgression of the law (1 Chronicles 13:7, 9ff.), so soon as he had learned that the ark would bring a blessing (1 Chronicles 13, 14), and that God would bless him in his reign (1 Chronicles 14), he carried out his purpose, and not only brought the ark to Jerusalem, but organized the public worship around this sanctuary (1 Chronicles 15 and 16); and how he formed a resolution to build a temple to the Lord, receiving from God, because of this, a promise that his kingdom should endure for ever (1 Chronicles 17). Then, in the third place, we have an account of how he, so favoured by the Lord, extended the power of his kingdom by victorious wars over all the enemies of Israel (1 Chronicles 18-20); and how even the ungodly enterprise of the numbering of the people, to which Satan had tempted him, David, had by the grace of God, and through his penitent

submission to the will of the Lord, such an issue, that the place where the Lord should be thereafter worshipped in Israel was determined by the appearance of the angel and by the word of the prophet Gad (1 Chronicles 21). And so the grey-haired king was able to spend the latter part of his reign in making preparations for the building of the temple, and in establishing permanent ordinances for the public worship, and the protection of the kingdom: gave over to his son Solomon, his divinely chosen successor on the throne, a kingdom externally and internally well ordered and firmly established, and closed his life at a good old age, after a reign of forty years (1 Chronicles 22-29).

Ch. 10—The Ruin of Saul and of His House. (Cf. 1 Sam. Ch. 31)

1 Chronicles 10. The account of Saul's struggle with the Philistines, in which he fell together with his sons, vv. 1-7, exactly coincides with the narrative in 1 Sam. 31:1-7; and the statements as to the fate of the fallen king, vv. 8-12, differ from 1 Sam. 31:8-13 only to this extent, that both narratives make mention only of the main points, and mutually supplement each other. In vv. 13 and 14 there follow reflections on the ruin of the unfortunate king, which show that the account of the death of Saul is only intended to form an introduction to the history of David.

1 Chronicles 10:1-7. In 1 Sam. 31 this narrative forms the conclusion of Saul's last war with the Philistines. The battle was fought on the plain of Jezreel; and when the Israelites were compelled to retire, they fell back upon Mount Gilboa, but were hard pressed by the Philistines, so that many fell upon the mountain. The Philistines pressed furiously after Saul and his sons, and slew the latter (as to Saul's sons, see on 8:33); and when the archers came upon Saul he trembled before them (חֹלַל from יָהָל), and ordered his armour-bearer to thrust him through. Between הַמִּזְרִים and בְּקֶשֶׁת the superfluous אֲנָשִׁים is introduced

in Samuel, and in the last clause **מֵאֵד** is omitted; and instead of **מִהַמְּוֹרִים** we have the unusual form **מִזֵּהֵיזִרִים** (cf. 2 Chronicles 35:23). In Saul's request to his armour-bearer that he would thrust him through with the sword, **וַיִּדְקֶרְנֵי** (1 Sam. v. 4) is omitted in the phrase which gives the reason for his request; and Bertheau thinks it did not originally stand in the text, and has been repeated merely by an oversight, since the only motive for the command, "Draw thy sword, and thrust me through therewith," was that the Philistines might not insult Saul when alive, and consequently the words, "that they may not thrust me through," cannot express the reason. But that is scarcely a conclusive reason for this belief; for although the Philistines might seek out Saul after he had been slain by his armour-bearer, and dishonour his dead body, yet the anxiety lest they should seek out his corpse to wreak their vengeance upon it could not press so heavily upon him as the fear that they would take vengeance upon him if he fell alive into their hands. It is therefore a more probable supposition that the author of the Chronicle has omitted the word **וַיִּדְקֶרְנֵי** only as not being necessary to the sense of the passage, just as **עָמוּ** is omitted at the end of v. 5. In v. 6 we have **וְנִשְׂא כָלֵיו גַּם וְכָל־בֵּיתוֹ** instead of the **וְנִשְׂא כָלֵיו גַּם** of Samuel, and in v. 7 **אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל** is omitted after the words **כִּי נָסוּ** (Samuel). From this Bertheau concludes that the author of the Chronicle has designedly avoided speaking of the men of Saul's army or of the Israelites who took part in the battle, because it was not his purpose to describe the whole course of the conflict, but only to narrate the death of Saul and of his sons, in order to point out how the supreme power came to David. Thenius, on the contrary, deduces the variation between the sixth verse of the Chronicles and the corresponding verse in Samuel from "a text which had become illegible." Both are incorrect; for **כָּל־אֲנָשָׁיו** are not all the men of war who went with him into the battle (Then.), or all the Israelites who took part in the battle (Berth.),

but only all those who were about the king, i.e., the whole of the king's attendants who had followed him to the war. **כָּל־בֵּיתוֹ** is only another expression for **כָּל־אֲנָשָׁיו**, in which the **כָּלֵיו** is included. The author of the Chronicle has merely abridged the account, confining himself to a statement of the main points, and has consequently both omitted **אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל** in v. 7, because he had already spoken of the flight of the warriors of Israel in v. 1, and it was here sufficient to mention only the flight and death of Saul and of his sons, and has also shortened the more exact statement as to the inhabitants of that district, "those on the other side of the valley and on the other side of Jordan" (Samuel), into **אֲשֶׁר בְּעַמְקָא**. In this abridgement also Thenius scents a "defective text." As the inhabitants of the district around Gilboa abandoned their cities, they were taken possession of by the Philistines.

1 Chronicles 10:8-13. On the following day the Philistines, in their search among the fallen, found and plundered the bodies of Saul and of his sons, and sent the head and the armour of Saul round about the land of the Philistines, to proclaim the news of their victory to their people and their gods. That for this purpose they cut off Saul's head from the trunk, is, as being a matter of course, not specially mentioned. In regard to the other discrepancies between the two texts, both in vv. 8-10 and in the account of the burial of Saul and of his sons by valiant men of Jabesh, vv. 11, 12, cf. the commentary on 1 Sam. 31:8-13. In the reflection on Saul's death, vv. 13 and 14, a double transgression against the Lord on Saul's part is mentioned: first, the **מַעַל** (on the meaning of this word, *vide* on Lev. 5:15) of not observing the word of Jahve, which refers to the transgression of the divine command made known to him by the prophet Samuel, 1 Sam. 13:8ff. (cf. with 10:8), and 15:2, 3, 11, cf. 28:18; and second, his inquiring of the **אוֹב**, the summoner of the dead (*vide* on Lev. 19:31),

לְדַרוֹשׁ, i.e., to receive an oracle (cf. in reference to both word and thing, 1 Sam. 28:7).

1 Chronicles 10:14. And because he inquired not of the Lord, therefore He slew him.

According to 1 Sam. 28:6, Saul did indeed inquire of Jahve, but received no answer, because Jahve had departed from him (1 Chronicles 28:15); but instead of seeking with all earnestness for the grace of Jahve, that he might receive an answer, Saul turned to the sorceress of Endor, and received his death-sentence through her from the mouth of Samuel, 1 Sam. 28:19.

1 Chronicles 11

The Anointing of David to Be King in Hebron, and the Conquest of Jerusalem. A List of David's Heroes.

1 Chronicles 11. In the second book of Samuel there are passages parallel to both sections of this chapter; vv. 1–9 corresponding to the narrative in 2 Sam. 5:1–10, and vv. 10–47 to the register in 2 Sam. 23:8–39.

1 Chronicles 11:1–3. *The anointing of David to be king over the whole of Israel in Hebron; cf. 2 Sam. 5:1–3.*—After Saul's death, in obedience to a divine intimation, David left Ziklag, whither he had withdrawn himself before the decisive battle between the Philistines and the Israelites, and betook himself with his wives and his warriors to Hebron, and was there anointed by the men of Judah to be king over their tribe (2 Sam. 2:1–4). But Abner, the captain of Saul's host, led Ishbosheth, Saul's son, with the remainder of the defeated army of the Israelites, to Mahanaim in Gilead, and there made him king over Gilead, and gradually also, as he reconquered it from the Philistines, over the land of Israel, over Jezreel, Ephraim, Benjamin, and all (the remainder of) Israel, with the exception of the tribal domain of Judah. Ishbosheth's kingship did not last longer than two years, while David reigned over Judah in Hebron for seven years and a half (2 Sam. 2:10 and 11). When Abner advanced with Ishbosheth's army from Mahanaim against

Gibeon, he was defeated by Joab, David's captain, so that he was obliged again to withdraw beyond Jordan (2 Sam. 2:12–32); and although the struggle between the house of Saul and the house of David still continued, yet the house of Saul waxed ever weaker, while David's power increased. At length, when Ishbosheth reproached the powerful Abner because of a concubine of his father's, he threatened that he would transfer the crown of Israel to David, and carried his threat into execution without delay. He imparted his design to the elders of Israel and Benjamin; and when they had given their consent, he made his way to Hebron, and announced to David the submission of all Israel to his sway (2 Sam. 3:1–21). Abner, indeed, did not fully carry out the undertaking; for on his return journey he was assassinated by Joab, without David's knowledge, and against his will. Immediately afterwards, Ishbosheth, who had become powerless and spiritless through terror at Abner's death, was murdered in his own house by two of the leaders of his army. There now remained of Saul's family only Jonathan's son Mephibosheth (2 Sam. 4), then not more than twelve years old, and lame in both his feet, and all the tribes of Israel determined to anoint David to be their king. The carrying out of this resolution is narrated in vv. 1–3, in complete agreement as to the facts with 2 Sam. 5:1–3, where the matter has been already commented upon. In 1 Chronicles 12:23–40 there follows a more detailed account of the assembly of the tribes of Israel in Hebron. The last words in v. 3, כְּדָבַר יְהוָה וְגַר, are a didactic addition of the author of the Chronicle, which has been derived from 1 Sam. 16:13 and 1 Sam. 15:28. In 2 Sam. 5:4, 5, in accordance with the custom of the author of the books of Samuel and Kings to state the age and duration of the reign of each of the kings immediately after the announcement of their entry upon their office, there follows after the preceding a statement of the duration of David's reign; cf. 1 Sam. 13:1, 2 Sam. 2:10f., 1 Kings 14:21; 15:2, etc. This remark is to be found in the Chronicle only at the close of David's reign; see 29:29, which shows that Thenius' opinion that this verse has

been omitted from the Chronicle by a mistake is not tenable.

1 Chronicles 11:4–9. *The capture of the citadel of Zion, and Jerusalem chosen to be the royal residence under the name of the city of David; cf. 2 Sam. 5:6–10, and the commentary on this section at that place.*—יָחִיָּהּ, v. 8, to make alive, is used here, as in Neh. 3:34, of the rebuilding of ruins. The general remark, v. 9, “and David increased continually in might,” etc., opens the way for the transition to the history of David’s reign which follows. As a proof of his increasing greatness, there follows in

1 Chronicles 11:10–47. *A register of the heroes who stood by him in the establishment of his kingdom. The greater part of this register is found in 2 Sam. 23:8–39 also, though there are many divergences in the names, which for the most part have found their way into one or other of the texts by errors of transcription. The conclusion (vv. 41–47 of the Chronicle) is not found in 2 Sam. 23, either because the author of the Chronicle followed another and older register than that used by the author of the book of Samuel, or because the latter has not communicated all the names contained in his authority. The former of these is the more probable supposition. In the Chronicle the superscription of the register is enlarged by the insertion in v. 10, before the simple superscription in v. 11a, cf. 2 Sam. 23:8a, of a further superscription informing us of the design which the chronicler had in introducing the register at this place. “These are the chiefs of David’s heroes who stood by him strongly (הַתְּחִיָּהּ עִם), as Dan. 10:21) in his kingdom, with the whole of Israel to make him king, according to the word of Jahve, over Israel.” The collocation רָאשֵׁי הַגִּבּוֹרִים is accounted for by the fact that הַגִּבּוֹר is a designation of a valiant or heroic man in general, without reference to his position, whether co-ordinate with or subordinate to others. Among David’s גִּבּוֹרִים who helped to establish his kingdom, are not merely those who are mentioned by name in the following register, but also, as we learn*

from 1 Chronicles 12, the great number of valiant men of all the tribes, who, even during his persecution by Saul, crowded round him, and immediately after Saul’s death came to him in Hebron to hail him king. The enumeration in our passage contains only the chiefs, רָאשֵׁים, of those valiant men, i.e., those who held the first rank among them, and who were in great part leaders in the army of David, or became so. לְהַמְלִיכוֹ is not to be confined to the mere appointment to the kingship, but includes also his establishment in it; for there follows an account of the heroic deeds which the men enumerated by name performed in the wars which David waged against his enemies in order to maintain and increase his kingly power. דְּבַר יְהוָה concerning Israel is the word of the Lord, the import of which is recorded in v. 3, that David should feed His people Israel, and be ruler over them. The *ipsissima verba* are not found in the earlier history of David, but the substance of them has been deduced from 1 Sam. 16:13 and 15:28; cf. herewith the remarks on 2 Sam. 3:18. The enumeration of these heroes is introduced in v. 11 by a short supplementary superscription, “these the number of the heroes.” That מִסְפַּר should be used instead of the שְׁמוֹת of Samuel is surprising, but is explained by the fact that these heroes at first constituted a corps whose designation was derived from their number. They originally amounted to thirty, whence they are still called the thirty, הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים; cf. v. 12, and the discussion on 2 Sam. 23:8ff. In both narratives three classes are distinguished. Jashobeam, Eleazar, and Shammah hold the first place, and specially bold and heroic deeds performed by them are recorded, vv. 11–14, and 2 Sam. 23:8–12. For details as to themselves and their deeds, see on the last cited passage. There we have already remarked, that in v. 13 of the text of the Chronicle, the three lines which in Samuel come between וַיֵּאסְפוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים (Sam. v. 9) and וַיֵּאסְפוּ שָׁם, v. 11, have been, through wandering of the

copyist's eye, omitted; and with them the name of the third hero, שָׁמָה, has also been dropped, so that the heroic deed done by him, vv. 13b, 14, appears, according to our present text, to have been performed by Eleazar. In place of the words, "And the Philistines had gathered themselves together there to battle, and there was a parcel of ground full of barley," v. 13, the text, according to the narrative in 2 Sam. 23:11, must have stood originally thus: "The Philistines had gathered themselves together there to battle, and the men of Israel went up (sc., retreating from the Philistines up the mountain); he, however, stood firm, and smote the Philistines till his hand was wearied, and cleaved unto the sword (i.e., clung crampedly to his sword through fatigue): there wrought Jahve a great deliverance on that day, and the people returned (from their flight) behind him only to spoil. And after him was Shammah the son of Aga the Hararite, and the Philistines had gathered themselves together to battle," etc. In v. 14 the plural forms וַיִּצְלִיחֵהּ, וַיִּתְּצֵבּוּ, are incorrect, and should be changed into singulars, as in Sam. vv. 12 and 70, since only the deed of the hero Shammah is here spoken of. The plurals were probably introduced into the text after the missing lines had been dropped out by a reader or copyist, who, on account of the הוּא הָיָה עִם דָּוִד (v. 13), understood the three clauses of v. 14 to refer to Eleazar and David. וַיִּשַׁע, on the contrary, is here perfectly appropriate, and is not to be altered to suit the וַיַּעַשׂ of Samuel, v. 14, for the καὶ ἐποίησε of the LXX is not of itself a sufficient reason for doing so.

1 Chronicles 11:15–19. In vv. 15–19 (cf. 2 Sam. 23:13–17) there follows an exploit of three others of the thirty, whose names have not been handed down. הַשְּׁלוֹשִׁים רֵאשִׁי, the thirty chiefs (not, as Thenius wrongly interprets the words, these three knights the chief parts, i.e., these three chief knights), are David's heroes hereafter mentioned, the thirty-two heroes of the third class named in vv. 26–40 (or vv. 24–39 of Samuel). That three others, different from

the before-mentioned Jashobeam, Eleazar, and Shammah are intended, is plain from the omission of the article with שְׁלוֹשָׁה; for if these three were spoken of, we would have הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה, as in v. 18. For further remarks on this exploit, which was probably performed in the war treated of in 1 Chronicles 14:8ff., and in 2 Sam. 5:17ff., see on 2 Sam. 23:13–17. The words הָדָם וּגְוֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים, v. 19, are to be translated, "The blood of these men shall I drink in their souls? for for their souls (i.e., for the price of their souls, at the risk of their life) have they brought it." The expression "blood in their souls" is to be understood according to Gen. 9:4 and Lev. 17:14 (דָּמּוֹ בְּנַפְשׁוֹ הוּא, "his blood is in the soul," is that which constitutes his soul). As there blood and soul are used synonymously (the blood as seat of and container of the soul, and the soul as floating in the blood), so here David, according to our account of his words, compares the water, which those heroes had brought for the price of their souls, to the souls of the men, and the drinking of the water to the drinking of their souls, and finally the souls to the blood, in order to express his abhorrence of such a draught. The meaning therefore may be thus expressed: "Shall I drink in this water the souls, and so the blood, of these men; for they have brought the water even for the price of their souls?"

1 Chronicles 11:20–25. In vv. 20–25 the second class of heroes, to which Abshai (Abishai) and Benaiah belonged, cf. 2 Sam. 23:18–23, is spoken of. They were not equal to the preceding three in heroic deeds, but yet stood higher than the list of heroes which follows in v. 26 and onwards. אַבְּשָׁי, as 2:16 and 2 Sam. 10:10, while in 2 Sam. 23:18 and elsewhere he is called אַבְּיָשָׁי, was one of the three sons of Zeruah (1 Chronicles 2:16). It is difficult to explain הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה רֵאשִׁי, "he was the chief of the three," instead of which we find in Sam. v. 18 הַשְּׁלִישִׁי, i.e., הַשְּׁלִישִׁי, "chief of the body-guard" (knights). But owing to the succeeding

שָׁם (וְלֹא בְּשָׁלוֹשָׁה וְלֹא) שָׁם, where Samuel also has בְּשָׁלוֹשָׁה, and to the recurrence of הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה on two occasions in v. 21 (cf. Sam. v. 19), it does not seem possible to alter the text with Thenius. Bertheau proposes to get rid of the difficulty by taking the word שְׁלוֹשָׁה in two different significations,—on the one hand as denoting the numeral three, and on the other as being an abstract substantive, “the totality of the thirty.” He justifies the latter signification by comparison of v. 21 with v. 25, and of 2 Sam. 23:19 with v. 23, from which he deduces that שְׁלוֹשָׁה and שְׁלוֹשִׁים denote a larger company, in which both Abishai and Benaiah held a prominent place. But this signification cannot be made good from these passages. In both clauses of v. 25 (and v. 23 in Sam.) הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה and הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה are contrasted, which would rather go to prove the contrary of Bertheau’s proposition, viz., that הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה, the three, cannot at the same time denote the whole of the thirty, הַשְּׁלוֹשִׁים. The truth of the matter may be gathered from a comparison of v. 18 with v. 15. In v. 18 הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה is synonymous with מִן הַשְּׁלוֹשִׁים, v. 15; i.e., the three in v. 18 are the same men who in v. 15, where they are first met with, are called three of the thirty; and consequently הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה, the three (triad), vv. 21 and 25, can only denote the triad of heroes previously named. This is placed beyond doubt by a comparison of v. 24 with v. 25, since the שְׁלוֹשָׁה הַגִּבּוֹרִים, the triad of heroes, v. 24, corresponds to the simple הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה of v. 25. The only remaining question is, whether by this triad of heroes we are to understand those spoken of in vv. 11–14, — Jashobeam, Eleazar, and Shammah,—or the three whose names are not given, but whose exploit is narrated in vv. 15–19. But the circumstance that the names of the three latter are not mentioned goes decidedly to show that הַשְּׁלוֹשָׁה in vv. 20–25 does not denote that nameless triad, whose exploit is manifestly adduced incidentally only as a similar case, but

the three most valiant, who held the first rank among David’s heroes. Bertheau’s opinion, that in vv. 20–25 one triad of heroes is distinguished from another, cannot be regarded as well-founded, for the three of whom Abishai was chief are not distinguished, and are not different from the three to whom, according to v. 21, he did not attain. Nor is there greater reason to believe that the triad of vv. 20 and 21 is different from that in vv. 24 and 25, among whom Benaiah made himself a name, and to whom he did not attain. The fact of being chief or prince over the three is not irreconcilably contradictory to the statement that he did not attain to them, i.e., did not come up to them in heroic strength, as is shown by the two classes being connected in v. 21*b*. As to the rank which the triad held in the regular forces of David, we know nothing further than that Jashobeam was, according to 1 Chronicles 27:2, leader of that part of the army which was on duty during the first month. Eleazar the son of Dodo, and the Hararite Shammah the son of Aga, are not mentioned anywhere but in our list. Abishai, on the contrary, who had already distinguished himself by his audacious courage in David’s struggle with Saul (1 Sam. 26:6ff.), conducted together with Joab the war against Abner (2 Sam. 2:24–3:30). Afterwards, in David’s war with the Ammonites, he was under Joab in command of the second half of the host (2 Sam. 10:10ff.); in the war against Absalom he commanded a third part of the host (1 Chronicles 18:2ff.); and in the struggle with the rebel Sheba he commanded the vanguard of the royal troops sent against the rebel (1 Chronicles 20:6ff.); and in general held, along with Joab the commander-in-chief, the first place among David’s captains. In this position he was chief of the three heroes before mentioned, and their leader (שָׂר), and among them had made himself a name. וְלֹא, v. 20, is an orthographical error for וְלֹא, as in fifteen other passages, according to the Masora. See on Ex. 21:10 and Isa. 63:9.

1 Chronicles 11:21a. V. 21*a* should be translated: honoured before the three as two;

i.e., doubly honoured—he became to them prince, leader. With regard to בְּשָׂנִים, which, as meaningless, Bertheau would alter so as to make it correspond with הָכִי (Sam.), cf. Ew. *Lehrb.* § 269, b. For Benaiah and his exploits, vv. 22–25, see the commentary on 2 Sam. 23:20–23.

No special deeds of the heroes enumerated in vv. 26–47 are related, so that we may regard them as a third class, who are not equal to the first triad, and to the second pair, Abishai and Benaiah, and consequently occupied a subordinate place in the collective body of the royal body-guards. In 2 Sam. 23 thirty-two names are mentioned, which, with the above-mentioned three and two of the first and second classes, amount in all to thirty-seven men, as is expressly remarked in 2 Sam. 23:39 at the conclusion. In the text of the Chronicle no number is mentioned, and the register is increased by sixteen names (vv. 41–47), which have been added in the course of time to the earlier number. The words וְגִבּוֹרֵי הַחַיִּלִּים, v. 26, are to be regarded as a superscription: And valiant heroes were, etc.; equivalent to, But besides there, there remain still the following valiant heroes. The words גִּבּוֹרֵי הַחַיִּלִּים are not synonymous with שָׂרֵי הַחַיִּלִּים, leaders of the host, 1 Kings 15:20, Jer. 40:7, (Berth.), but signify heroes in warlike strength, i.e., heroic warriors, like גִּבּוֹרֵי הַיָּלִים (1 Chronicles 7:5, 7, 11, 40). That חַיִּלִּים has here the article, while it is not found in the passages quoted from the seventh chapter, does not make any difference in the meaning of the words. The article is used, here, as with הַגִּבּוֹרִים, vv. 10, 11, because the heroes of David are spoken of, and אֲשֶׁר לְדָוִד is to be mentally supplied from v. 10f. As to the names in vv. 26–41, which are also found in the register in the book of Samuel, see the commentary to 2 Sam. 23:24–39. This list, which is common to both books, begins with Asahel, a brother of Joab, who was slain by Abner in the war which he waged against David (2 Sam. 2:19–23), and concludes in the book of

Samuel with Uriah the Hittite, so well known from 2 Sam. 11:3ff. (Chronicles v. 41a), with whose wife David committed adultery. But to the continuation of the register which is found in vv. 41b47 of our text, there is no parallel in the other writings of the Old Testament by which we might form an idea as to the correctness of the names. The individual names are indeed to be met with, for the most part, in other parts of the Old Testament, but denote other men of an earlier or later time. The names וְדִיעָאֵל, v. 45, and אֶלְיָאֵל, v. 46f., are found also in 1 Chronicles 12:20, 11, among those of the valiant men who before Saul's death went over to David, but we cannot with any certainty ascertain whether the persons meant were the same. The expression וְעָלְיוֹ שְׁלֹשִׁים (v. 42) is also obscure,—“and to him in addition,” i.e., together with him, thirty,—since the thought that with Adina the chief of the Reubenites, or besides him, there were thirty (men), has no meaning in this register. The LXX and the Vulgate read עָלְיוֹ, while the Syriac, on the contrary, makes use of the periphrasis, “And even he was a ruler over thirty heroes;” and Bertheau accordingly recommends the emendation עַל הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים, and thence concludes that the tribe of Reuben had thirty leaders in its army,—a conjecture as bold as it is improbable. Were עַל הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים to be read, we could not but refer the words to the thirty heroes of v. 11, and hold Adina to be their leader, which could not be easily reconciled with v. 11. See on 12:4.

1 Chronicles 11:43. בְּזִמְעָהּ is perhaps the same as הַמְעַבְתִּי, 2 Sam. 23:34.

1 Chronicles 11:44. הַעֲשֵׂתָרְתִּי, he of the city Ashtaroth (1 Chronicles 6:56), in the trans-Jordanic domain of Manasseh. הַעֲרֵעֵרִי, he of Aroer, or Reuben or Gad (Josh. 13:16, 25).

1 Chronicles 11:46. Bertheau conjectures that the somewhat strange הַמַּחֲנִימִים (LXX ó Μαώι, Vulg. Mahumites) denotes הַמַּחֲנֵימִי, he of Mahanaim, in the East-Jordan land; see Josh. 13:26.

1 Chronicles 11:47. הַמְצַבִּיָּה, which, so far as the form is concerned, is not a *nomen gentil.*, Reland (*Palaest. ill.* p. 899) holds for a contraction of מִגְדַל צְבֻעִיָּא, Migdal Zebujah,—a place which, according to the rabbins, is said to have been somewhere in the neighbourhood of Hebron. Bertheau's opinion is, that the article has come into the text by mistake; and when it has been struck out, the remaining consonants, מִצְבִּיָּה, recall the מְצַבָּה of 2 Sam. 23:36 (?).

1 Chronicles 12

Registers of the Valiant Men Who Helped David to the Kingdom.

1 Chronicles 12. This chapter contains two somewhat long registers, viz.: (1) a register of the valiant men who before Saul's death went over to David, vv. 1–22; and (2) a register of the fighting men who anointed him king in Hebron. The first is divided into three smaller registers: (a) that of the valiant Benjamites who came to David during his stay in Ziklag (vv. 1–7); (b) that of the Gadites and the men of Judah and Benjamin who went over to him while he remained in the mountain fastnesses; and (c) that of the Manassites who, on his return to Ziklag before Saul's last battle with the Philistines, joined themselves to him (vv. 19–22).

1 Chronicles 12:1–7. *The Benjamites who came to David to Ziklag.*—V. 1. Ziklag was originally allotted to the Simeonites by Joshua (Josh. 19:5; 1 Chronicles 4:30), but at a later time came into possession of the Philistines, and was assigned and presented by king Achish to David, who had fled for refuge to him, as a dwelling-place for himself and his followers; see 1 Sam. 27:1–7. As to its situation, which has not yet been with certainty ascertained, see the discussion on Josh. 15:31. In it David dwelt for a year and four months, until he went to Hebron on the death of Saul. During this time it was that the warriors of the tribe of Benjamin mentioned in the succeeding register went over to him, as we learn from the words עוֹד עֲצוּר, “he was still held

back before Saul,” a concise expression for “while he was still held back before Saul.” This last expression, however, does not signify, “hindered from coming before Saul” (Berth.), but *inter Israelitas publice versari prohibitus* (J. H. Mich.), or rather, “before Saul, imprisoned as it were, without being able to appear in a manner corresponding to his divine election to be ruler over Israel.” וְהָמָּה בְּגֹב', and they were among the heroes, i.e., belonged to the heroes, the helpers of the war, i.e., to those who helped him in his former wars; cf. vv. 17f., 21f.

1 Chronicles 12:2. וְנֹשְׂקֵי קֶשֶׁת, “those preparing bows,” i.e., those armed with bows, synonymous with דֹרְכֵי קֶשֶׁת (1 Chronicles 8:40); cf. 2 Chronicles 17:17, Ps. 78:9. “With the right and left hand practised upon stones,” i.e., to hurl stones, cf. Judg. 20:16; “and in arrows on the bow,” i.e., to shoot therewith. מֵאַחֵי שָׂאוּל, of Saul's brethren, i.e., of the men of the tribe, not “of his nearer relatives,” and consequently of Benjamin, has been added as an explanation; cf. v. 29, where בְּנֵי בְנִימִן and אֲחֵי שָׂאוּל are synonyms.—In vv. 3ff. we have the names. הָרֵאשִׁי, the head, i.e., the leader of this host of warriors; compare 1 Chronicles 5:7, 12. הַגְּבַעְתִּי, cf. Gibeah of Saul or Benjamin, cf. 11:31; and for its situation, see on Josh. 18:28. הָעֵנְוֹתָי, from the priests' city Anathoth, now Anata; see on Josh. 18:24. In v. 4 the Gibeonite Ismaiah is called “hero among the thirty, and over the thirty,”—words which can hardly have any other sense than that Ismaiah belonged also to David's corps of thirty heroes (1 Chronicles 11), and was (temporarily) their leader, although his name does not occur in 1 Chronicles 11. It is probable that the reason of the omission was, that at the time when the list was prepared he was no longer alive. הַגְּדֵרָתִי, of Gedera, a city of the tribe of Judah in the Shephelah, which, according to Van de Velde (*Reise*, ii. S. 166), was probably identical with the village Ghedera, which lies to the left of the road Tel-es-Safieh to Akir, about an hour to the south-west of Jabne. In any case, it corresponds well with the

statements of the *Onom.* As to Gedrus, or Gaedur, see on Josh. 15:36. Immediately afterwards in v. 7 Gedor is mentioned, a city in the mountains of Judah, to the westward of the road which leads from Hebron to Jerusalem (see on Josh. 15:58); and from that fact Bertheau imagines we must conclude that the men of Judah are enumerated as well as the Benjamites. But this conclusion is not valid; for from the very beginning, when the domains and cities were assigned to the individual tribes under Joshua, they were not the exclusive possession of the individual tribes, and at a later period they were still less so. In course of time the respective tribal domains underwent (in consequence of wars and other events) many alterations, not only in extent, but also in regard to their inhabitants, so that in Saul's time single Benjamite families may quite well have had their home in the cities of Judah.

1 Chronicles 12:5. הַחֲרִיפִי (Keri הַחֲרִיפִי) is a patronymic, which denotes either one descended from Haruph, or belonging to the בְּנֵי חֲרִיף mentioned in Neh. 7:34 along with the Gibeonites. The קְרָחִים, Korahites, in v. 6 are, without doubt (cf. Delitzsch, *Ps.* S. 300), descendants of the Levite Korah, one division of whom David made guardian of the thresholds of the tent erected for the ark of the covenant on Zion, because their fathers had been watchers of the entrance of the camp of Jahve, i.e., had in that earlier time held the office of watchers by the tabernacle; see on 9:18f. The names Elkanah and Azareel are thoroughly Levitic names, and their service in the porter's office in the holy place may have roused in them the desire to fight for David, the chosen of the Lord. But there is no reason why we should, with Bertheau, interpret the words as denoting descendants of the almost unknown Korah of the tribe of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:43), or, with the older commentators, refer it to some other unmentioned Benjamite who bore this name. The explanation of the connection existing between these Levitic Korahites and the Benjamites, which is presupposed by the

mention of them among the Benjamites, may be found in the fact that the Levites received no tribal domain of their own, and possessed only cities for dwelling in in the domains of the other tribes, with whom they were consequently civilly incorporated, so that those who dwelt in the cities of Benjamin were properly reckoned among the Benjamites. At the partition of the land under Joshua, it is true, only the priests received their cities in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin; while, on the contrary, the Kohathites, who were not priests, among whom the Korahites were, received their cities in the tribal domain of Ephraim, Dan, and half-Manasseh (Josh. 21:9–26). But when the tabernacle was transferred from Shiloh to Nob, and afterwards to Gibeon, the Korahite doorkeepers must, without doubt, have migrated to one of the Levitic cities of Benjamin, probably for the most part to Gibeon, and who were reckoned among the Benjamites. As to הַגִּדּוֹר, *vide* v. 4. If this be so, there remains no cogent reason for supposing that in our register, besides the Benjamites, men out of other tribes are also introduced. With that there falls away at once Bertheau's further conclusion, that the author of the Chronicle has considerably abridged the register, and that from v. 4*b* onwards men of Judah also are named, the list of whom must certainly (?) have been originally introduced by special superscription similar to those in vv. 8, 16, 19. His further reason for his conjecture—namely, that our register makes use of the qualificative epithets, “the Gibeathite,” “the Anathothite,” etc., only in a few special cases—is of no force whatever; for we are not justified in assuming that we may expect to find here, as in the register in 1 Chronicles 11:26–47, such qualificatives after every individual name. The character of our register cannot be arrived at by a comparison with the list of David's heroes in 1 Chronicles 11; it should rather be sought for by comparing it with the succeeding list, whose contents are of a similar kind with its own. David's chosen corps of thirty heroes was much more important for the history of his reign, than the lists of the men who joined

themselves to him and fought on his behalf before he ascended the throne. For that reason the thirty heroes are not only mentioned by name, but their descent also is told us, while that more detailed information is not given with regard to the others just mentioned. Only the names of the Gadites and Manassites are mentioned; of the Benjamites and men of Judah, who came to him in the mountain fastness (vv. 16–18), the name of only one, Amasai, is given; while of the Benjamites who came to Ziklag, vv. 3–7, such qualificative statements are made in reference to only a few individuals, and in these cases the object probably was to distinguish them from other well-known persons of the same name.

1 Chronicles 12:8–18. *The Gadites, Benjamites, and men of Judah who joined themselves to David during his sojourn in the mountain fastness.*—V. 8. David's sojourn in the mountain hold falls in the first years of his flight from Saul, 1 Sam. 22ff. מָצַד, pointed with Pathach instead of with Kamets (מָצַד, cf. v. 16), on account of its intimate connection with מְדַבְּרָה, is synonymous with מְצוּדָה (1 Sam. 24:23, etc.). The addition מְדַבְּרָה, "towards the wilderness," shows that מָצַד denotes a mountain-top or mountain-fortress in the wilderness of Judah. If we compare the account in 1 Sam. 22–24, we learn that David at that time did not hide himself in one single definite mountain-fortress, but sought and found resting-places, now here, now there, in the wilderness, on the summits of the hills (cf. בְּמַדְבָּר בְּמַצְדוֹת, 1 Sam. 23:14; 24:1); so that מָצַד here is to be understood, as הַמְצוּדָה, 1 Sam. 24:3, also is, generally of the fastnesses in the mountains of Judah. At that time there gathered round David a great company of discontented and oppressed men, to the number of about 400,—men dissatisfied with Saul's rule, whose leader he became, and who soon amounted to 600 men (1 Sam. 22:2 and 23:13). To these belong the Gadites, and the men out of Benjamin and Judah, whose adhesion to David is noticed in

our verses. נִבְדְּלוּ, they separated themselves from the other Gadites who were on Saul's side, "strong heroes," as in Josh. 8:3; cf. גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִל, 5:24; 7:2, 9, etc. אֲנָשֵׁי צָבָא לְמַלְחָמָה, men for service in the host for the war, i.e., combatants practised in war. עֵרְכֵי צֶנֶה וְרֶמַח, preparing shield and spear, i.e., wielding shield and spear, practised in their use: the preparing of these weapons includes the handling of them. Instead of וְרֶמַח, Veneta and many of the older copies have וּמִגָּן; but it is not supported by MS

authority, and moreover is not congruous with the passage. Lions' faces their faces, i.e., lion-like in appearance, thoroughly warlike figures; cf. 2 Sam. 1:23. "As roes running swiftly on the mountains;" cf. 2 Sam. 2:18. This description of the strength and swiftness of these warriors recalls, as Bertheau remarks, the similar expressions used in the historical books concerning heroes of David's time. It has manifestly been drawn from the original documents, not added by the chronicler. In vv. 9–13 the names are enumerated individually. עֲשֹׁתֵי עָשָׂר, at the end of a series of ordinal numbers, denotes the eleventh; cf. 24:12.

1 Chronicles 12:14. רָאִשֵׁי הָעֶבֶא, heads of the war-host, i.e., chief warriors, not leaders of the host. אֶחָד לְמֵאָה וְגו', "one for a hundred, (viz.) the small and the greater for a thousand," i.e., the smaller (weaker) could cope with a hundred, the stronger with a thousand men; cf. Lev. 26:8. This, which is the only correct interpretation, is that received by Bertheau and the older Jewish commentators. The Vulgate, on the contrary, translates, *novissimus centum militibus praeerat et maximus mille*, which is inadmissible, for in that case עַל must have been used instead of ל.

The אחד belongs to both the clauses which it precedes, to הַקָּטָן and to הַגָּדוֹל, and is placed immediately before לְמֵאָה to emphasize the contrast between one and a hundred. In v. 15 we have a proof of their valour, in an account of a bold exploit performed by them. In the first

month of the year, that is, in spring, when the Jordan overflows all its banks, they crossed the river and put to flight all the dwellers in the valleys towards the east and towards the west. This happened, probably, when they separated themselves from their brethren and went over to David, when they must have had to cut their way through the adherents of Saul (Berth.). The Piel מלא with על denotes to make full, to make to run over, in the signification to overflow. The Kethibh גדיתי comes from גדיה elsewhere only the plural גדיתי, so also here in the Keri. In the dry summer season the Jordan may be crossed by wading at various points (fords); while in spring, on the contrary, when it is so swollen by the melting snows of Lebanon, that in some parts it overflows its banks, it is very dangerous to attempt to cross. See on Josh. 3:15. העמקים, "the valleys," for the inhabitants of the valleys.

1 Chronicles 12:16–18. There came to David in the mountain-fastness also men of Benjamin and Judah (cf. v. 8). Their names are not in the lists, possibly because they were not handed down in the historical works made use of by the chronicler. At their head, as we learn from v. 18, stood Amasai, chief of the thirty, i.e., of the corps formed of the thirty heroes (see 11:11), although his name does not occur in the catalogue, 1 Chronicles 11. According to this, Amasai must have occupied a very important position under David; but since the name עמשי is not elsewhere mentioned in the history of David, the older commentators have conjectured that עמשי may have been the same person as עמשא, son of Abigail (1 Chronicles 2:17), whom Absalom made captain in Joab's place, and whom David, after the victory over the rebels, wished to make commander-in-chief in the room of Joab, and whom for that reason Joab afterwards murdered (2 Sam. 17:25; 19:14; 20:4, 8ff.); or identical with אבשי the son of Zeruah, 2:16 and 11:20. Of these conjectures the first is much more probable than the second. To meet these men, David went forth from his fastness, and asked them with what

purpose they came to him. "If for peace," to stand by him, "then shall there be to me towards you a heart for union," i.e., I will be with you of one heart, be true to you. לִבְבִּי לְיָחַד is plainer than לִבְ אָחָד, v. 38. "But if לְרִמּוֹתַי, to practise deceit against me (to be guilty of a מְרִמָּה) for mine enemies (to deliver me to them), although there be no wrong in my hands, the God of our fathers look thereon and punish;" cf. 2 Chronicles 24:22. The God of our fathers, i.e., of the patriarchs (cf. Ezra 7:27, 2 Chronicles 20:6, and Ex. 3:13f.), who rules in and over Israel, who shields the innocent and punishes the guilty.

1 Chronicles 12:18. Then came the Spirit upon Amasai, so that he proclaimed himself enthusiastic for David and his cause. With רוּחַ לְבָבִי cf. Judg. 6:34. Usually אֱלֹהִים or יהוה is found with this expression (2 Chronicles 24:20), and here also the Spirit of God is meant; and אֱלֹהִים is omitted only because all that was of importance here was to show that the resolution announced by Amasai was an effect of higher spiritual influence. לְךָ, to thee, David (do we belong), thine are we. עִמָּךְ, "with thee," sc. will we remain and fight. "Peace be to thee, and peace be to thy helpers; for thy God helpeth thee." עֲזָרְךָ, He has helped thee in the fortunate combats in which you have heretofore been engaged (1 Sam. 18:12ff.), and He will help still further. David thereupon received them and made them captains of his band. הַגִּדּוֹד, the warrior-band, which had gathered round David, and were still gathering round him, 1 Sam. 22:2; 27:8, cf. also v. 21; 1 Sam. 30:8, 15, 23, etc.

1 Chronicles 12:19–22. *The Manassites who went over to David before the last battle of the Philistines against Saul.*—נָפַל עַל, to fall to one, is used specially of deserters in war who desert their lord and go over to the enemy: cf. 2 Kings 25:11; 1 Sam. 29:3. יָפוּל אֶל, in the last clause of the verse, is a synonymous expression. The Manassites went over "when David went with

the Philistines against Israel to the war, and (yet) helped them not; for upon advisement (בְּעֵצָה, cf. Prov. 20:18), the lords of the Philistines had sent him away, saying, 'For our heads, he will fall away to his master Saul.' " 1 Sam. 29:2–11 contains the historical commentary on this event. When the lords of the Philistines collected their forces to march against Saul, David, who had found refuge with King Achish, was compelled to join the host of that prince with his band. But when the other Philistine princes saw the Hebrews, they demanded that they should be sent out of the army, as they feared that David might turn upon them during the battle, and so win favour by his treachery with Saul his lord. See the commentary on 1 Sam. 29. בְּרֵאשֵׁינוּ, for our heads, i.e., for the price of them, giving them as a price to obtain a friendly reception from Saul (cf. 1 Sam. 29:4). In consequence of this remonstrance, Achish requested David to return with his warriors to Ziklag. On this return march ("as he went to Ziklag," cf. with בְּלָכְתָּהּ the לָלַכְתָּהּ of 1 Sam. 29:11), and consequently before the battle in which Saul lost his life (Berth.), and not after Saul's great misfortune, as Ewald thinks, the Manassites whose names follow went over to David. The seven named in v. 20 were "heads of the thousands of Manasseh," i.e., of the great families into which the tribe of Manasseh was divided, and as such were leaders of the Manassite forces in war: cf. Num. 31:14 with Ex. 18:25, and the commentary on the latter passage.

1 Chronicles 12:21. These²⁵ helped David עַל הַגָּדוּד, against the detachment of Amalekites, who during David's absence had surprised and burnt Ziklag, and led captive the women and children (1 Sam. 30:1–10). This interpretation, which Rashi also has (*contra turmam Amalekitarum*), and which the Vulgate hints at in its *adversus latrunculos*, rests upon the fact that in 1 Sam. 30:8, 15, the word הַגָּדוּד, which in general only denotes single detachments or predatory bands, is used of the Amalekite band;

whence the word can only refer to the march of David against the Amalekites, of which we have an account in 1 Sam. 30:9ff, and not to the combats which he had with Saul. "For they were all valiant heroes, and were שָׂרִים, captains in the army," sc. which gathered round David.

1 Chronicles 12:22. "For every day" (לְעֵת יוֹם בְּיָוֶם, at the time of each day) "came (people) to David to help him, until to a great host, like a host of God," i.e., until his band grew to a camp like to a host of God. מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים, a host which God has formed, and in which the power of God shows itself; cf. hills and cedars of God, Ps. 36:7; 80:11. In these concluding remarks to the enumeration by name of the valiant men who during Saul's lifetime went over to David, there is no exaggeration which would betray an idealizing historian (Movers, S. 270). The greatness of a host of God is to be estimated according to the power and the spirit, not according to the number, of the warriors, so that we need not take the words to mean a host of thousands and tens of thousands. David had at first 400, afterwards 600, valiant warriors, against whom Saul with his thousands could accomplish nothing. The increase in their number from 400 to 600 shows that the host increased from day to day, especially when we keep in mind the fact that after Saul's defeat considerable bands of fugitives must certainly have gone over to David before he was anointed in Hebron to be king over Judah. The expression is only rhetorical, not idealizing or exaggerating.

1 Chronicles 12:23–40. *List of the warriors who made David king in Hebron.*—The superscription (v. 23) runs: "These are the numbers of the bands of the men equipped for war, who came," etc. הַחֲלוּץ is a collective noun, denoting the equipped manhood. רָאשֵׁי signifies here, not *principes exercitus*, as the Vulgate renders it, heads, i.e., leaders of the army (Berth.), but literally denotes sums, i.e., companies, bands of soldiers, as in Judg. 7:16, 20; 9:34, 37, 44, 1 Sam. 11:1; or it may perhaps

also be heads for individuals, as ראש in Judg. 5:30. Both these meanings are linguistically certain; so that we cannot say, with Bertheau, that ראשי before הַקְּהִלִּים denotes, according to the well-ascertained use of language, leaders of the army, and that גְּלִילָת would have been used had it been wished to express the number by heads, e.g., 23:3–24. That use of the word is indeed also found, but it cannot be proved to be the only proper one. If we take ראשי here to denote leaders, we bring the superscription into irreconcilable contradiction with the contents of the following catalogue, which gives the names of the heads and the number of the warriors (v. 27f.) only in the case of the families of Aaron, and in that of Issachar the number of the princes; while in the case of the other tribes we have only the numbers of the bands or detachments. This contradiction cannot be got rid of, as Bertheau imagines, by the hypothesis that the superscription referred originally to a catalogue which was throughout similar in plan to that which we find in vv. 26–28, and that the author of the Chronicle has very considerably abridged the more detailed statements of the original documents which he used. This hypothesis is a mere makeshift, in which we have the less need “to take refuge,” as the catalogue has neither the appearance of having been abridged or revised by the author of our Chronicle. It is shown to be a faithful copy of a more ancient authority, both by the characteristic remarks which it contains on the individual tribes, and by the inequality in the numbers. Bertheau, indeed, derives support for his hypothesis “from the inequality of the statements of number, and their relation to each other,” and upon that ground throws doubt upon the accuracy and correctness of the numbers, but in both cases without sufficient warrant.

The total is not objected to by Bertheau, and its correctness is placed beyond a doubt by the recollection that we have here to do not with the representation of the various estates of the kingdom, but with a declaration of the will of

the whole nation, who wished to make David their king. We must, if we are to estimate these statements, endeavour to go back in imagination to the circumstances of that time when Israel, although settled in the land, had not quite laid aside the character of a nation of warriors, in which every man capable of bearing arms marched to battle with, and for, his king. Now if the total number of fighting men in Israel was 600,000 in the time of Moses, and if, when the people were numbered in the last year of David’s reign, there were in Israel 800,000, and in Judah 500,000 (2 Sam. 24:9)—the Levites being excluded in both cases—the 340,000 men of all the tribes, except Issachar, in reference to which no number is given, or after subtracting Judah and Levi, the 324,500 men out of the remaining tribes, is not much more than a half of the men capable of bearing arms in Moses’ time, and about a fourth part of the fighting population towards the end of David’s reign. But the relation of the numbers in the respective tribes, on the contrary, is somewhat surprising, and calls forth from Bertheau the following remarks: “To Judah, David’s tribe, which from the earliest time had been famous for its numbers and its powers, 6800 are assigned; to Zebulun, on the contrary, 50,000; to Naphtali, 1000 princes at the head of 37,000 warriors; to the two and a half East-Jordanic tribes, 120,000 men, etc. How does it happen that Zebulun and Naphtali, for example, two tribes that play no great part in Israel’s history, are so strongly represented, while Judah sends only a relatively small number of warriors?” To this question we answer, that Judah’s being represented by a number of warriors relatively so small, is accounted for simply by the fact that David had already been king over Judah for seven years, and consequently that tribe did not need to make him king by coming with the whole of its warriors, or the majority of them, when the other tribes were doing homage to David, but sent only a small number of its male population to this solemn act, who were witnesses in the name of the whole tribe to the homage proffered by the others. The same remark

applies to the tribe of Simeon, whose domain was enclosed by that of Judah, and which had consequently recognised David as king at the same time as the larger tribe. In regard to the numbers of the other tribes, Levi had in the last year of David's reign 38,000 men from thirty years old and upwards (1 Chronicles 23:3); and when here only 4600 Levites, besides the priestly families, are spoken of, the question arises, whether this number is to be understood to refer to the Levites in all the tribes, or only to those dwelling outside of Judah and Simeon, in the cities assigned to them by Moses and Joshua. The smallness of the number (3000) from the tribe of Benjamin is explained by the remark that the majority of this tribe still held to the house of Saul (v. 29). The only thing which is at all remarkable about the other numbers is, that the Ephraimites are so few (20,800 men) in contrast to the 180,000 men brought into the field by the half-tribe of Manasseh. But if we consider that Ephraim, which at the first census under Moses at Sinai had 40,500 men, had decreased to 32,500 at the second census in the wilderness of Moab, it is not improbable that at the time now treated of that tribe may not have been very strong in fighting men. For in Saul's last war with the Philistines, when they had pressed forward so far as Mount Gilboa, and also in Abner's struggle on behalf of King Ishbosheth for the reconquest of the territory occupied by them, it probably suffered more, and was more weakened, than any of the other tribes. Perhaps also we may add that Ephraim, owing to its jealousy of Judah, which dates from the time of the judges, was not very much disposed to make David king over all Israel. That Zebulun and Naphtali are here so numerous represented, although they do not otherwise play an important part, is no reason for suspecting that the numbers given are incorrect. Since Zebulun under Moses numbered 57,400 men, and at a later time 60,500, and Naphtali 53,400 and 45,400 men capable of bearing arms respectively on the same occasions (see t. i. 2, S. 192); the first named tribe may easily have sent 50,000, the

other 37,000 men to David, as the tribes dwelling in the north had been least affected by the wars which Israel carried on in the second half of the period of the judges and under Saul. Both of these tribes, too, are praised in the song of Deborah as a people ready to risk their lives for their fatherland (Judg. 5:18), and may have very much increased in the succeeding time. And besides all this, the tribes Asher, Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh are indeed more feebly represented than Zebulun, but more strongly than Naphtali. There therefore remains no reason for doubting the historical accuracy of the numbers given; but it is of course to be understood that the numbers, which are stated only in hundreds, are not the result of an enumeration of the individual persons, but only of an estimate of the various detachments according to the military partition of the tribes.

In regard to לְהִסָּבֵם, cf. 10:14; and as to כָּפְּי יְהוּה, see the remark on כְּדַבֵּר יְהוּה, 11:3, 10.

1 Chronicles 12:24f. For נִשְׂאֵי צִנְהָ וְרִמְחָ, cf. v. 8, 5:18. גְּבוּרֵי חַיִל לְצָבָא, valiant men for the war service.

1 Chronicles 12:26. Jehoiada is thought by Rashi, Kimchi, and others, to be the father of Benaiah, 11:22. He was נָגִיד for Aaron, i.e., prince of the house of Aaron, head of the family of the Aaronites, not *princeps sacerdotum*, which was a title appertaining to the high-priesthood, an office held at that time by Abiathar (1 Sam. 23:9).

1 Chronicles 12:28. Zadok, a youth, i.e., then still a youth, may be the same who was made high priest in place of Abiathar (1 Kings 2:26, but see on 5:34). "And his father's-house, twenty-two princes." The father's-house of Zadok is the Aaronite family descended from Eleazar, which was at that time so numerous that it could muster twenty-two שָׂרִים, family chiefs, who went with Zadok to Hebron.

1 Chronicles 12:29. From the tribe of Benjamin, to which Saul belonged (אַחֵי שָׂאוּל), see

on v. 2), only 3000 men came, for until that time (וְעַד הַנְּהִיָּה, cf. 9:18) the greater number of them were keeping the guard of the house of Saul, i.e., were devoted to the interests of the fallen house. For שָׁמַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת, see on Gen. 26:5 and Lev. 8:35. From this we learn that the attachment of the Benjamites to Saul continued even after the death of his son Ishbosheth, and that it was with difficulty that they could bring themselves to recognise David as king.

1 Chronicles 12:30. Of Ephraim 20,800 famous men (אֲנָשֵׁי שְׁמוֹת, see on Gen. 6:4); לְבֵית־אָב, "in their fathers'-houses."

1 Chronicles 12:31. Of half Manasseh, this side Jordan (cf. v. 37), 18,000, who were appointed by name, i.e., chosen as famous men to go thither and make David king. נִקְבְּוּ בְּשֵׁמוֹת, as in Num. 1:17, *vide* on Lev. 24:16. The tribe of Manasseh had consequently held a general consultation on the matter, and determined upon sending their representatives.

1 Chronicles 12:32. From Issachar came "men of understanding in reference to the times, to know (i.e., who knew) what Israel should do." יוֹדְעֵי בִינָה, knowing in insight (cf. 2 Chronicles 2:12), i.e., experienced in a thing, having understanding of it. From this remark some of the older commentators (Chald., various Rabbins, and Cleric.) concluded that the tribe of Issachar had distinguished itself beyond the other tribes by astronomical and physical knowledge, by which it was qualified to ascertain and make choice of proper times for political action. But the words do not suggest astronomical or astrological knowledge, but merely state, as Salomo ben-Melech in the *Miclol Yophi* long ago interpreted them, *noverant tempora ad omnem rem et quodque negotium, sicut sapiens dixit: Suum cuique tempus est et opportunitas cuique rei*, Koh. iii. 1. The words refer not to the whole tribe, but only to the two hundred heads, who, as Lavater expresses it, are designated *prudentes viri*, as being men *qui quid, quando et quomodo agendum esset, varia lectione et usu rerum cognoscebant*. The only thing to be objected to

in his statement is the *varia lectione*, since a sound and correct judgment in political matters does not necessarily presuppose scientific training and a wide acquaintance with books. The statement in question, therefore, affirms nothing more than that the tribe of Issachar (in deciding to raise David to the throne) followed the judgment of its princes, who rightly estimated the circumstances of the time. For all their brethren, i.e., all the men of this tribe, went with the two hundred chiefs. עַל־פִּיהֶם, according to their mouth, i.e., followed their judgment; cf. Num. 4:27, Deut. 21:5.

1 Chronicles 12:33. עֲרָכֵי מִלְחָמָה, preparing war with all manner of warlike weapons, i.e., practice in the use of all kinds of weapons for war; cf. v. 8. The infinitive לְעִדֹּר is substantially a continuation of the preceding participles, but grammatically is dependent on בָּאוּ understood (cf. vv. 23, 38). Cf. as to this free use of the infinitive with לְ, Ew. § 351, c. The signification of the verb עִדֹּר, which occurs only here (vv. 33, 38), is doubtful. According to the LXX and the Vulg. (βοηθησαι, *venerunt in auxilium*), and nine MSS, which read לְעִזֹּר, we would be inclined to take עִדֹּר for the Aramaic form of the Hebrew עִזָּר (cf. Arabic 'dr), to help; but that meaning does not suit מְעַרְכָּה, v. 38. Its connection there demands that עִדֹּר should signify "to close up together," to set in order the battle array; and so here, closing up together with not double heart, i.e., with whole or steadfast heart (בְּלֵבָב שְׁלֵם, v. 38), *animo integro et firmo atque concordi*; cf. Ps. 12:3 (Mich.).—In v. 38 we have a comprehensive statement; כָּל־אֵלֶּה, which refers to all the bodies of men enumerated in vv. 24–37. שְׂרִית is שְׂאֲרִית defectively written; and as it occurs only here, it may be perhaps a mere orthographical error. The whole of the remainder of Israel who did not go to Hebron were לֵב אֶחָד, of one, i.e., of united heart (2 Chronicles 30:12): they had a unanimous wish to make David king.

1 Chronicles 12:39. Those gathered together were there three days eating and drinking, holding festive meals (cf. 1 Sam. 30:16, 1 Kings 1:45, etc.), for their brethren had prepared them for them. The object of **הָכִינוּ**, sc. the eating and drinking, may easily be supplied from the context. **אֲחֵיהֶם** are the inhabitants of Hebron and the neighbourhood; the tribe of Judah in general, who had already recognised David as king.

1 Chronicles 12:40. But it was not only these who performed this service, but also those of the remaining tribes dwelling near them; and indeed the men of Issachar, Zebulun, and Naphtali, those on the northern frontier of Canaan as well as those who bordered upon Judah, had sent provisions upon beasts of burden, "for joy was in Israel." This joy moved those who remained at home to show their sympathy with the national festival solemnized at Hebron by sending the provisions. For **דְּבָלִים**, masses of dried figs, and **צִמוּקִים**, masses of raisins or cakes, see on 1 Sam. 25:18.

1 Chronicles 13

Ch. 13–16. The Removal of the Ark from Kirjath-jearim. David's Building, His Wives and Children, and His Victories over the Philistines. The Bringing of the Ark into the City of David, and the Arrangement of the Worship in Mount Zion.

1 Chronicles 13–16. All these facts are described in the second book of Samuel, for the most part in the same words. There, however, the contents of our chapter 14, David's building, wives and children, and victories over the Philistines, immediately follow, in 2 Sam. 5:11–25, the account of the conquest of the citadel of Zion (1 Chronicles 11:4–8); and then in 2 Sam. 6 the removal of the ark from Kirjath-jearim, and the bringing of it, after an interval of three months, to Jerusalem, are narrated consecutively, but much more shortly than in the Chronicle. The author of the books of Samuel confined himself to a mere narration of the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem, as one of

the first acts of David tending to the raising of the Israelitish kingship, and has consequently, in his estimation of the matter, only taken account of its importance politically to David as king. The author of our Chronicle, on the contrary, has had mainly in view the religious significance of this design of David to restore the Levitic *cultus* prescribed in the Mosaic law; and in order to impress that upon the reader, he not only gives a detailed account of the part which the Levites took in the solemn transfer of the ark of God (1 Chronicles 15), but he sets forth minutely the arrangements which David made, after the ark had been brought into the capital of the kingdom, for the restoration of a permanent worship about that sanctuary (1 Chronicles 16). Both the narratives are taken from an original document which related the matter more at length; and from it the author of 2 Samuel has excerpted only what was important for his purpose, while the author of the Chronicle gives a more detailed account. The opinion held by de Wette and others, that the narrative in the Chronicle is merely an expansion by the author of the Chronicle, or by the author of the original document followed by our chronicler, of the account in 2 Sam. 6, for the purpose of glorifying the Levitic *cultus*, is shown to be incorrect and untenable by the multitude of historical statements peculiar to 1 Chronicles 15 and 16, which could not possibly have been invented.

1 Chronicles 13. *The removal of the ark from Kirjath-jearim.* Cf. 2 Sam. 6:1–11, with the commentary on the substance of the narrative there given.

1 Chronicles 13:1–5. The introduction to this event is in 2 Sam. 6:1 and 2 very brief; but according to our narrative, David consulted with the chief men over thousands and hundreds (1 Chronicles 15:25), viz., with all the princes. The preposition **לְ** before **כָּל-נְגִידֵי** groups together the individual chiefs of the people just named. He laid his purpose before "all the congregation of Israel," i.e., before the above-mentioned princes as representatives of the whole people. "If it seem good to you, and if it

come from Jahve our God," i.e., if the matter be willed of and approved by God, we will send as speedily as possible. The words **נִפְרָצָה נִשְׁלַחָה** without the conjunction are so connected that **נִשְׁלַחָה** defines the idea expressed by **נִפְרָצָה**, "we will break through, will send," for "we will, breaking through," i.e., acting quickly and energetically, "send thither." The construction of **שְׁלַח** with **עַל** is accounted for by the fact that the sending thither includes the notion of commanding (**עַל** צִוָּה). **כָּל-אֲרָצוֹת** (צִוָּה עַל), all the provinces of the various tribal domains, is used for **כָּל-הָאָרֶץ**, 1 Sam. 13:19, here, and 2 Chronicles 11:23 and 34:33; in all which places the idea of the division of the land into a number of territories is prominent. This usage is founded upon Gen. 26:3 and 4, where the plural points to the number of small tribes which possessed Canaan. After **וְעַמָּהֶם עַל** or **לֹא דִרְשָׁנָהּ עַל** is to be repeated. The words **וְעַמָּהֶם עַל** in v. 3, we have not sought it, nor asked after it, are meant to include all.

1 Chronicles 13:4f. As the whole assembly approved of David's design (**לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּנֵן**, it is to do so = so much we do), David collected the whole of Israel to carry it out. "The whole of Israel," from the southern frontier of Canaan to the northern; but of course all are not said to have been present, but there were numerous representatives from every part,—according to 2 Sam. 6:1, a chosen number of 30,000 men. The **מִצְרַיִם**, which is named as the southern frontier, is not the Nile, although it also is called **שַׁחַר** (Isa. 23:3 and Jer. 2:18), and the name "the black river" also suits it (see Del. on Isaiah, *loc. cit.*); but is the **שַׁחַר** before, i.e., eastward from Egypt (**אֲשֶׁר עַל-פְּנֵי מִצְרַיִם**), i.e., the brook of Egypt, **נַחַל מִצְרַיִם**, now el Arish, which in all accurate statements of the frontiers is spoken of as the southern, in contrast to the neighbourhood of Hamath, which was the northern boundary: see on Num. 34:5. For the designation of the northern

frontier, **לְבוֹא חֲמַת**, see on Num. 34:8. Kirjath-jearim, the Canaanitish Baalah, was known among the Israelites by the name Baale Jehudah or Kirjath-baal, as distinguished from other cities named after Baal, and is now the still considerable village Kureyeh el Enab; see on Josh. 9:17. In this fact we find the explanation of **בְּעֵלְתָּהּ אֶל ק' "** v. 6: to Baalah, to Kirjath-jearim of Judah. The ark had been brought thither when the Philistines sent it back to Beth-Shemesh, and had been set down in the house of Abinadab, where it remained for about seventy years; see 1 Sam. 6 and 7:1, 2, and the remarks on 2 Sam. 6:3f. **אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא שֵׁם** is not to be translated "which is named name," which gives no proper sense. Translating it so, Bertheau would alter **שֵׁם** into **שָׁם**, according to an arbitrary conjecture of Thenius on 2 Sam. 6:2, "who there (by the ark) is invoked." But were **שָׁם** the true reading, it could not refer to the ark, but only to the preceding **מִשָּׁם**, since in the whole Old Testament the idea that by or at the resting-place of the ark Jahve was invoked (which **אֲשֶׁר שָׁם** would signify) nowhere occurs, since no one could venture to approach the ark. If **שָׁם** referred to **מִשָּׁם**, it would signify that Jahve was invoked at Kirjath-baal, that there a place of worship had been erected by the ark; but of that the history says nothing, and it would, moreover, be contrary to the statement that the ark was not visited in the days of Saul. We must consequently reject the proposal to alter **שֵׁם** into **שָׁם** as useless and unsuitable, and seek for another explanation: we must take **אֲשֶׁר** in the sense of **ὡς**, which it sometimes has; cf. Ew. § 333, *a.*: "as he is called by name," where **שֵׁם** does not refer only to יהוה, but also to the additional clause **יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים**, and the meaning is that Jahve is invoked as He who is enthroned above the cherubim; cf. Ps. 80:2, Isa. 37:16.—On the following vv. 7–14, cf. the commentary on 2 Sam. 6:3–11.

1 Chronicles 14

1 Chronicles 14. *David's palace-building, wives and children*, vv. 1-7; cf. 2 Sam. 5:11-16. *Two victories over the Philistines*, vv. 8-17; cf. 2 Sam. 5:17-25.—The position in which the narrative of these events stands, between the removal of the ark from Kirjath-jearim and its being brought to Jerusalem, is not to be supposed to indicate that they happened in the interval of three months, during which the ark was left in the house of Obed-edom. The explanation of it rather is, that the author of our Chronicle, for the reasons given in page 170, desired to represent David's design to bring the ark into the capital city of his kingdom as his first undertaking after he had won Jerusalem, and was consequently compelled to bring in the events of our chapter at a later period, and for that purpose this interval of three months seemed to offer him the fittest opportunity. The whole contents of our chapter have already been commented upon in 2 Sam. 5:1, so that we need not here do more than refer to a few subordinate points.

1 Chronicles 14:2. Instead of כִּי נִשָּׂא, that He (Jahve) had lifted up (נִשָּׂא, perf. Pi.), as in Sam. v. 2, in the Chronicle we read כִּי נִשְׂאת לְמַעַל, that his kingdom had been lifted up on high. The unusual form נִשְׂאת may be, according to the context, the third pers. fem. perf. Niph., נִשְׂאת having first been changed into נִשְׂאת, and thus contracted into נִשְׂאת; cf. Ew. § 194, b. In 2 Sam. 19:43 the same form is the infin. abs. Niph. לְמַעַל is here, as frequently in the Chronicles, used to intensify the expression: cf. 22:5; 23:17; 29:3, 25; 2 Chronicles 1:1; 17:12. With regard to the sons of David, see on 3:5-8.

In the account of the victories over the Philistines, the statement (Sam. v. 17) that David went down to the mountain-hold, which has no important connection with the main fact, and would have been for the readers of the Chronicle somewhat obscure, is exchanged in v. 8 for the more general expression וַיֵּצֵא לְפָנֵיהֶם,

“he went forth against them.” In v. 14, the divine answer to David's question, whether he should march against the Philistines, runs thus: לֹא תַעֲלֶה אַחֲרֵיהֶם הָסֵב מֵעֲלֵיהֶם, Thou shalt not go up after them; turn away from them, and come upon them over against the baca-bushes;—while in Sam. v. 23, on the contrary, we read: לֹא תַעֲלֶה אֶל־אַחֲרֵיהֶם, Thou shalt not go up (i.e., advance against the enemy to attack them in front); turn thee behind them (i.e., to their rear), and come upon them over against the baca-bushes. Bertheau endeavours to get rid of the discrepancy, by supposing that into both texts corruptions have crept through transcribers' errors. He conjectures that the text of Samuel was originally לֹא תַעֲלֶה אַחֲרֵיהֶם, while in the Chronicle a transposition of the words עֲלֵיהֶם and אַחֲרֵיהֶם was occasioned by a copyist's error, which in turn resulted in the alteration of עֲלֵיהֶם into מֵעֲלֵיהֶם. This supposition, however, stands or falls with the presumption that by לֹא תַעֲלֶה (Sam.) an attack is forbidden; but for that presumption no tenable grounds exist: it would rather involve a contradiction between the first part of the divine answer and the second. The last clause, “Come upon them from over against the baca-bushes,” shows that the attack was not forbidden; all that was forbidden was the making of the attack by advancing straight forward: instead of that, they were to try to fall upon them in the rear, by making a circuit. The chronicler consequently gives us an explanation of the ambiguous words of 2 Samuel, which might easily be misunderstood. As David's question was doubtless expressed as it is in v. 10, הֲאֵפְעֶלָה עַל הַפְּלִי, the answer לֹא תַעֲלֶה might be understood to mean, “Go not up against them, attack them not, but go away behind them;” but with that the following וּבָאתָ לָהֶם וּגו', “Come upon them from the baca-bushes,” did not seem to harmonize. The chronicler consequently explains the first clauses of the answer thus: “Go not up straight behind them,” i.e., advance not against them so as to attack them openly,

“but turn thyself away from them,” i.e., strike off in such a direction as to turn their flank, and come upon them from the front of the bacabuses. In this way the apparently contradictory texts are reconciled without the alteration of a word. In v. 17, which is wanting in Samuel, the author concludes the account of these victories by the remark that they tended greatly to exalt the name of David among the nations. For similar reflections, cf. 2 Chronicles 17:10; 20:29; 14:13; and for **וַיִּצְאָה שָׁמָּה**, 2 Chronicles 26:15.

1 Chronicles 15

1 Chronicles 15:1–16:3. *The bringing of the ark into Jerusalem.*—In the parallel account, 2 Sam. 6:11–23, only the main facts as to the transfer of the holy ark to Jerusalem, and the setting of it up in a tent erected for its reception on Mount Zion, are shortly narrated; but the author of the Chronicle elaborately portrays the religious side of this solemn act, tells of the preparations which David had made for it, and gives a special enumeration of the Levites, who at the call of the king laboured with him to carry it out according to the precepts of the law. For this purpose he first gives an account of the preparations (1 Chronicles 15:1–24), viz., of the erection of a tent for the ark in the city of David (v. 1), of the consultation of the king with the priests and Levites (vv. 2–13), and of the accomplishment of that which they had determined upon (vv. 14–29).

1 Chronicles 15:1. In 2 Sam. 6:12a the whole matter is introduced by a statement that the motive which had determined the king to bring the ark to Jerusalem, was his having heard of the blessing which the ark had brought upon the house of Obed-edom. In our narrative (v. 1), the remark that David, while building his house in Jerusalem, prepared a place for the ark of God, and erected a tent for it, forms the transition from the account of his palace-building (1 Chronicles 14:1ff.) to the bringing in of the ark. The words, “he made unto himself houses,” do not denote, as Bertheau thinks, the building of other houses besides the palaces

built with the help of King Hiram (1 Chronicles 14:1). For **עָשָׂה** is not synonymous with **בָּנָה**, but expresses the preparation of the building for a dwelling, and the words refer to the completion of the palace as a dwelling-place for the king and his wives and children. In thus making the palace which had been built fit for a habitation, David prepared a place for the ark, which, together with its tent, was to be placed in his palace. As to the reasons which influenced David in determining to erect a new tabernacle for the ark, instead of causing the old and sacred tabernacle to be brought from Gibeon to Jerusalem for the purpose, see the remarks introductory to 2 Sam. 6.

1 Chronicles 15:2ff. The reason for the preparations made on this occasion for the solemn progress is assigned in the statement that David had resolved to cause the ark to be carried by the Levites alone, because God had chosen them thereto; cf. Num. 1:50; 4:15; 7:9; 10:17. **וְאָז**, “at that time,” i.e., at the end of the three months, 13:14. **לֹא לְשָׂאתָ**, “there is not to bear,” i.e., no other shall bear the ark than the Levites. “By this arrangement, it is expressly acknowledged that it was contrary to the law to place it upon a cart; 1 Chronicles 13:17” (Berth.). For this purpose, the king assembled “the whole of Israel” in Jerusalem, i.e., the elders, the rulers over thousands, the heads of families; cf. 2 Sam. 6:15, where it is stated that **יְשָׁרְאֵל בְּלִבְיָתָא** took part in the solemn march.

1 Chronicles 15:4. From among assembled Israel David then specially gathered together the heads of the priests and Levites, to determine upon the details of this solemn procession. “The sons of Aaron” are the high priests Zadok and Abiathar, v. 11; and the “Levites” are the six princes named in vv. 5–10, with their brethren, viz., (vv. 5–7) the three heads of the families into which the tribe of Levi was divided, and which corresponded to the three sons of Levi, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, respectively (Ex. 6:16): Uriel head of the Kohathites, Asaiah of the Merarites, and Joel head of the Gershonites, with their brethren.

Kohath is first enumerated, because Aaron the chief of the priests was descended from Kohath, and because to the Kohathites there fell, on account of their nearer relationship to the priests, the duty of serving in that which is most holy, the bearing of the holiest vessels of the tabernacle. See Num. 4:4, 15; 7:9; as to Uriel, see on 6:9; for Asaiah, see 6:15; and as to Joel, see 6:21. Then in vv. 8, 9 we have the heads of three other Kohathite families: Shemaiah, chief of the sons of Elizaphan, i.e., Elizaphan son of the Kohathite Uzziel (Ex. 6:22); Eliel, chief of the sons of Hebron the Kohathite (Ex. 6:18); and Amminadab, chief of the sons of Uzziel. The sons of Uzziel, consequently, were divided into two fathers'-houses: the one founded by Uzziel's son Elizaphan, and named after him (v. 8); the other founded by his other sons, and called by his name. Of the fathers'-houses here enumerated, four belong to Kohath, and one each to Merari and Gershon; and the Kohathites were called to take part in the solemn act in greater numbers than the Merarites and Gershonites, since the transport of the ark was the Kohathites' special duty.

1 Chronicles 15:11. Zadok of the line of Eleazar (1 Chronicles 5:27–41), and Abiathar of the line of Ithamar, were the heads of the two priestly lines, and at that time both held the office of high priest (1 Chronicles 24:3; cf. 2 Sam. 15:24ff., 20:25). These priests and the six princes of the Levites just enumerated were charged by David to consecrate themselves with their brethren, and to bring up the ark of God to the place prepared for it. הִתְקַדְּשׁ, to consecrate oneself by removal of all that is unclean, washing of the body and of the clothes (Gen. 35:2), and careful keeping aloof from every defilement, avoiding coition and the touching of unclean things; cf. Ex. 19:10, 15. אֶל־הַכִּינּוֹתַי לֹא, to (the place) which I have prepared for it. הַכִּינּוֹתַי לֹא is a relative clause with אֶשֶׁר, construed with a preposition as though it were a substantive: cf. similar constructions, 29:3, 2 Chronicles 16:9; 30:18, Neh. 8:10; and Ew. § 33, *b*.

1 Chronicles 15:13. “For because in the beginning (i.e., when the ark was removed from the house of Amminadab, 1 Chronicles 13) it was not you (sc., who brought it up), did Jahve our God make a breach upon us,” sc. by the slaying of Uzza, 13:11. In the first clause the predicate is wanting, but it may easily be supplied from the context. The contracted form לְמַבְרַשׁוֹנָה, made up of לָמָּה and בְּרַאשׁוֹנָה, is unique, since מָּה is so united only with small words, as in מָּזָה, Ex. 4:2, מְלָכִים, Isa. 3:15; but we find מֵהִתְלַאֵחַ for מֵהִתְלַאֵחַ, Mal. 1:13; cf. Ew. § 91, *d*. לָמָּה here signifies: on account of this which = because; cf. Ew. § 222, *a*, and 353, *a*. “This was done, because we did not seek Him according to the right,” which required that the ark, upon which Jehovah sits enthroned, should be carried by Levites, and touched by no unholy person, or one who is not a priest (Num. 4:15).

1 Chronicles 15:14f. The Levites consecrated themselves, and bare—as v. 15 anticipatively remarks—the ark of God upon their shoulders, according to the prescription in Num. 7:9, בְּמוֹטוֹת עֲלֵיהֶם, by means of poles upon them (the shoulders). מוֹטָה, the flexible pole used for carrying burdens, Num. 13:23. Those used to carry the ark are called בָּדִים in the Pentateuch, Ex. 25:13ff.

1 Chronicles 15:16–24. David gave the princes of the Levites a further charge to appoint singers with musical instruments for the solemn procession, which they accordingly did. כְּלֵי שִׁיר, instruments to accompany the song. In v. 16 three kinds of these are named: נַבְלִים, *nablia*, ψαλτήρια, which Luther has translated by psalter, corresponds to the Arabic santir, which is an oblong box with a broad bottom and a somewhat convex sounding-board, over which strings of wire are stretched; an instrument something like the *cithara*. כַּנְּרוֹת, harps, more properly lutes, as this instrument more resembled our lute than the harp, and corresponded to the Arabic catgut instrument *el 'ûd* (ל-*ûd*); cf. Wetzstein in Delitzsch, *Isaiah*,

S. 702, der 2 Aufl., where, however, the statement that the santir is essentially the same as the old German cymbal, *vulgo* Hackebrett, is incorrect, and calculated to bring confusion into the matter, for the cymbal was an instrument provided with a small bell. מְצֻלְתִּים, the later word for צֻלְצָלִים, cymbals, castanets; see on 2 Sam. 6:5. מְשָׁמֵיעִים does not belong to the three before-mentioned instruments (Berth.), but, as is clear from vv. 19, 28, 16:5, 42, undoubtedly only to מְצֻלְתִּים (Böttcher, *Neue krit. Aehrenlese*, iii. S. 223); but the meaning is not “modulating,” but “sounding clear or loud,”—according to the proper meaning of the word, to make to hear. The infinitive clause לְהַרְרִים וגו' belongs to the preceding sentence: “in order to heighten the sound (both of the song and of the instrumental music) to joy,” i.e., to the expression of joy. לְשִׂמְחָה is frequently used to express festive joy: cf. v. 25, 2 Chronicles 23:18; 29:30; but also as early as in 2 Sam. 6:12, 1 Sam. 18:6; Judg. 16:23, etc.—In vv. 17, 18 the names of the singers and players are introduced; then in vv. 19–21 they are named in connection with the instruments they played; and finally, in vv. 22–24, the other Levites and priests who took part in the celebration are mentioned. The three chief singers, the Kohathite Heman, the Gershonite Asaph, and the Merarite Ethan, form the first class. See on 6:18, 24, and 29. To the second class (הַמְשִׁנִּים, cf. הַמְשִׁנָּה, 2 Kings 23:4) belonged thirteen or fourteen persons, for in v. 21 an Azaziah is named in the last series who is omitted in v. 18; and it is more probable that his name has been dropped out of v. 18 than that it came into our text, v. 21, by an error. In v. 18 בֶּן comes in after זְכַרְיָהוּ by an error or transcription, as we learn from the ו before the following name, and from a comparison of vv. 20 and 25. The name יְעִזְיָאֵל is in v. 20 written יְעִזְיָאֵל, *Yodh* being rejected; and in 16:5 it is יְעִזְיָאֵל, which is probably only a transcriber’s error, since יְעִזְיָאֵל occurs along with it both in v. 18 and in 16:5. The names Benaiah and Maaseiah,

which are repeated in v. 20, have been there transposed. All the other names in vv. 18 and 20 coincide.

1 Chronicles 15:19–21. These singers formed three choirs, according to the instruments they played. Heman, Asaph, and Ethan played brazen cymbals לְהַשְׁמִיעַ (v. 19); Benaiah and the seven who follow played *nablia* (*psalteria*) עַל עֲלָמוֹת (v. 20); while the last six played lutes (harps) עַל הַשְּׁמִינִית לְנִצָּחַ (v. 21). These three Hebrew words plainly denote different keys in singing, but are, owing to our small acquaintance with the music of the Hebrews, obscure, and cannot be interpreted with certainty. נִצָּחַ, going over from the fundamental signification glitter, shine, into the idea of outshining and superior capacity, overwhelming ability, might also, as a musical term, denote the conducting of the playing and singing as well as the leading of them. The signification to direct is here, however, excluded by the context, for the conductors were without doubt the three chief musicians or bandmasters (*Capellenmeister*), Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, with the cymbals, not the psalteries and lute players belonging to the second rank. The conducting must therefore be expressed by לְהַשְׁמִיעַ, and this word must mean “in order to give a clear tone,” i.e., to regulate the tune and the tone of the singing, while לְנִצָּחַ signifies “to take the lead in playing;” cf. Del. on Ps. 4:1. This word, moreover, is probably not to be restricted to the singers with the lutes, the third choir, but must be held to refer also to the second choir. The meaning then will be, that Heman, Asaph, and Ethan had cymbals to direct the song, while the other singers had partly psalteries, partly lutes, in order to play the accompaniment to the singing. The song of these two choirs is moreover distinguished and defined by עַל עֲלָמוֹת and עַל הַשְּׁמִינִית. These words specify the kind of voices; עַל עֲלָמוֹת after the manner of virgins, i.e., in the soprano; עַל הַשְּׁמִינִית, after the octave, i.e., in bass—*al ottava bassa*. See Del. on Ps. 6:1; 46:1. In vv. 22–24 the

still remaining priests who were engaged in the solemn procession are enumerated.

1 Chronicles 15:22. "Chenaniah, the prince of the Levites, for the bearing, teacher in bearing; for he was instructed in it." Since Chenaniah does not occur among the six princes of the Levites in vv. 5–10, and is called in v. 27 הַשֵּׁר הַמְּשָׂא, we must here also join בְּמִשְׂאָ (as most editions punctuate the first בַּמִּשְׂאָ, while according to Norzi בְּמִשְׂאָ is the right reading even in the first case) closely with שֵׁר־הַלְוִיִּים, with the meaning that Chenaniah was captain of the Levites who had charge of the bearing of the ark, a chief of the Levites who bore it. The word מִשְׂאָ is, however, very variously interpreted. The LXX have ἄρχων τῶν ᾠδῶν, and the Vulgate, *prophetiae praeerat ad praecinendam melodiam*; whence Luther translates: the master in song to teach them to sing. This translation cannot, however, be linguistically upheld; the word מִשְׂאָ means only the bearing of the burden (Num. 4:19, 27, etc.; 2 Chronicles 35:3), and a prophetic utterance of an oppressive or threatening character (Isa. 13:1, and 15:1, etc.). But from this second signification neither the general meaning *propheta*, nor, if we wish to go back upon the נִשְׂא קוֹל, to raise the voice, the signification master of song, *supremus musicus* (Lavati.), or *qui principatum tenebat in cantu illo sublimiore* (Vatabl.), can be derived. The meaning *propheta*, moreover, does not suit the context, and we must consequently, with Bertheau and others, hold fast the signification of bearing. We are determined in favour of this, (1) by the context, which here treats of the bearing of the ark, for which מִשְׂאָ is the usual word; and (2) by the circumstance that in 26:29 Chenaniah is mentioned as the chief of the Levites for the external business, which goes to show, if the persons are identical, that he here had the oversight of the external business of the transport. יָסַר is not the inf. absol., which cannot stand directly for the *verb. finit.*; nor is it the

imperf. of סָרַר in the signification of שָׁרַר (Bertheau and others), but a nominal formation from יָסַר (cf. on this formation as the most proper designation of the actor, Ew. § 152, b), in the signification teacher, which is shown by Isa. 28:26 certainly to belong to יָסַר. The clause יָסַר בְּמִשְׂאָ gives the explanation of the preceding בְּמִשְׂאָ, or it specifies what Chenaniah had to do in the procession. He had to take the lead in the bearing because he was מְבִיֵן in it, i.e., was instructed in that which was to be observed in it.—In v. 23 two doorkeepers for the ark are named; and in v. 24, at the end of the enumeration of the Levites who were busied about the transport, two additional names are mentioned as those of men who had the same duty. The business of these doorkeepers was, as Seb. Schmidt has already remarked on 2 Sam. 6, *non tam introitum aperire arcae, quam custodire, ne ad eam irrumperetur*. Between these two pairs of doorkeepers in v. 24, the priests, seven in number, who blew the trumpets, are named. The Kethibh מְחַצְצְרִים is to be read מְחַצְצָרִים, a denom. from חֲצָצְרָה; the Keri מְחַצְצָרִים is Hiph. of חָצַר, as in 2 Chronicles 7:6; 13:14, and 29:28. In 2 Chronicles 5:12 and 13, on the contrary, מְחַצְצָרִים is partic. Pi. The blowing of the silver trumpets by the priests in this solemn procession rests on the prescription in Num. 10:1–10, which see. The place assigned to these trumpet-blowing priests was either immediately before the ark, like the priestly trumpeters in the march round Jericho (Josh. 6:4, 6), or immediately after it. For, that these priests entered in the immediate vicinity of the ark, may be inferred from the fact that before and behind them were doorkeepers of the ark. The procession, then, was probably arranged in this way: (1) the singers and players in front, in three division; (2) Chenaniah, the captain of the bearers; (3) two doorkeepers; (4) the priests with the trumpets immediately before or after the ark; (5) two doorkeepers; (6) the king with the elders and captains of thousands (v. 25). The two

doorkeepers Obededom and Jehiah (יְהִיָּה), Rashi, Berth., and others consider to be the same persons as the singers Obededom and Jeiel (יְעִיָּאל), supposing that the latter name is wrongly written in one of the passages. This, however, is incorrect, for the identity of the name Obededom is no sufficient ground for supposing the persons to be the same, since in 16:38 the singer Obededom and the doorkeeper Obededom the son of Jeduthun seem to be distinguished. And besides that, Obededom and his colleagues could not possibly at the same time as porters precede, and as singers come after, the priests and the ark, and there is consequently no reason to doubt that the name יְהִיָּה is correct.

1 Chronicles 15:25–16:3. narrate the further proceedings connected with the bring of the ark to Jerusalem; cf. 2 Sam. 6:12–19. By the words וַיְהִי דָוִד וּגְרָם the account of the execution of the design is connected with the statements as to the preparations (vv. 2–24): “And so were David ... who went to bring up the ark.”

1 Chronicles 15:26. When God had helped the Levites who bare the ark of the covenant of Jahve, they offered seven bullocks and seven rams, i.e., after the journey had been happily accomplished. Instead of this, in 2 Sam. 6:13, the offering which was made at the commencement of the journey to consecrate it is mentioned; see on the passage.

1 Chronicles 15:27. The discrepancy between v. 27 and 2 Sam. 6:14 is more difficult of explanation. Instead of the words דָּוִד מְכַרְכֵּר יהוה, David danced with all his might before Jahve, we read in the Chronicle דָּוִד מְכַרְבֵּל בְּמַעֲלֵי בּוּץ, David was clothed with a robe of byssus. But since מכרכר differs from מכרבבל only in the last two letters, and כר might be easily exchanged for בל, we may suppose that מכרבבל has arisen out of מכרכר. Bertheau accordingly says: “Any one who remembered that in this verse David’s clothing was spoken of

might write מכרכר as מכרבבל, while the words עז בכל, which were probably illegible, were conjecture to be במעיל בּוּץ.” This opinion would be worthy of consideration, if only the other discrepancies between the Chronicle and Samuel were thereby made more comprehensible. That, besides David, the bearers of the ark, the singers, and Chenaniah are mentioned, Bertheau thinks can be easily explained by what precedes; but how can that explain the absence of the לפני יהוה of Samuel from our text? Bertheau passes this over in silence; and yet it is just the absence of these words in our text which shows that מכרבבל במעיל עז cannot have arisen from an orthographical error and the illegibility of עז בכל, since לפני יהוה must have been purposely omitted. Böttcher’s opinion (*N. kr. Aehrenl.* iii. S. 224), that the Chaldaizing מכרבבל can scarcely have been written by the chronicler, because it is not at all like his pure Hebrew style, and that consequently a later reader, who considered it objectionable that a Levite should dance, and perhaps impossible that the bearers should (forgetting that they were released in turn from performing their office), while holding as closely to the letter of the text as possible, corrected עז בכל מכרכר into בּוּץ במעיל מכרבבל, and that the same person, or perhaps a later, added besides וְהַמְשֻׁרְרִים וְכַנְנִיָּהּ, is still less probable. In that way, indeed, we get no explanation of the main difficulty, viz., how the words from הַלְלוּם to וְהַמְשֻׁרְרִים came into the text of the Chronicle, instead of the לפני יהוה of Samuel. The supposition that originally the words from וְהַמְשֻׁרְרִים וְכַנְנִיָּהּ stood in the text, when of course the statement would be, not only that David danced with all his might, but also that all the Levites who bore the ark danced, is in the highest degree unsatisfactory; for this reason, if for no other, that we cannot conceive how the singers could play the *nebel* and the *kinnor* and dance at the same time,

since it is not alternations between singing and playing, and dancing and leaping that are spoken of.

The discrepancy can only be got rid of by supposing that both narratives are abridged extracts from a more detailed statement, which contained, besides David's dancing, a completer account of the clothing of the king, and of the Levites who took part in the procession. Of these the author of the books of Samuel has communicated only the two characteristic facts, that David danced with all his might before the Lord, and wore an ephod of white; while the author of the Chronicle gives us an account of David's clothing and that of the Levites, while he omits David's dancing. This he does, not because he was scandalized thereby, for he not only gives a hint of it in v. 29, but mentions it in 13:8, which is parallel to 2 Sam. 6:5; but because the account of the king's clothing, and of that of the Levites, in so far as the religious meaning of the solemn progress was thereby brought out, appeared to him more important for his design of depicting at length the religious side of the procession. For the clothing of the king had a priestly character; and not only the ephod of white (see on 2 Sam. 6:14), but also the *me'il* of בּוּיָג, white byssus, distinguished the king as head of a priestly people. The *me'il* as such was, it is true, an outer garment which every Israelite might wear, but it was worn usually only by persons of rank and distinction (cf. 1 Sam. 2:19; 15:27; 18:4; 24:5; Ezra 9:3; Job 29:14), and white byssus was the material for the priests' garments. Among the articles of clothing which the law prescribed for the official dress of the simple priest (Ex. 28:40) the *me'il* was not included, but only the כְּתוֹנֶת, a tight close-fitting coat; but the priests were not thereby prevented from wearing a *me'il* of byssus on special festive occasions, and we are informed in 2 Chronicles 5:12 that even the Levites and singers were on such occasions clad in byssus. In this way the statement of our verse, that David and all the Levites and bearers of the ark, the singers, and the captain Chenaniah, had put on *me'ilim* of byssus, is

justified and shown to be in accordance with the circumstances. The words therefore are to be so understood. The words from וְכָל-הַלְוִיִּם to הַמְּשָׁא are co-ordinate with הַשָּׂר הַמְּשָׁא, and may translate the verse thus: "David was clothed in a *me'il* of byssus, as also were all the Levites," etc. No objection can be taken to the הַשָּׂר הַמְּשָׁא when we have the article with a *nomen regens*, for cases of this kind frequently occur where the article, as here, has a strong retrospective force; cf. Ew. § 290, *d*. On the contrary, הַמְּשָׁרִים after הַמְּשָׁא is meaningless, and can only have come into the text, like בֵּן in v. 18, by an error of the transcriber, although it was so read as early as the time of the LXX. For the last clause, cf. 2 Sam. 6:14.

1 Chronicles 15:28. V. 28 is, as compared with 2 Sam. 6:5, somewhat enlarged by the enumeration of the individual instruments.

1 Chronicles 16

1 Chronicles 15:29–16:3. V. 29 and 1 Chronicles 16:1–3 agree in substance with 2 Sam. 6:15–19a, only some few words being explained: e.g., מְרַקֵּד וּמְשַׁחֵק, v. 29, instead of מְפַיֵּז (Sam.), and אֶרֶז בְּרִית יְהוָה instead of אֶרֶז (Sam.); see the commentary on 2 Sam. *l.c.*

1 Chronicles 16:4–42. *The religious festival, and the arrangement of the sacred service before the ark of the covenant in the city of David.*—

This section is not found in 2nd Samuel, where the Conclusion of this whole description (v.43, Chron.) follows immediately upon the feasting of the people by the king, vv. 19b and 20.

1 Chronicles 16:46. When the solemnity of the transfer of the ark, the sacrificial meal, and the dismissal of the people with a blessing, and a distribution of food, were ended, David set in order the service of the Levites in the holy tent on Zion. He appointed before the ark, from among the Levites, servants to praise and celebrate God, i.e., singers and players to sing psalms as a part of the regular worship. לְהַזְכִּיר, literally, "in order to bring into remembrance,"

is not to praise in general, but is to be interpreted according to the לְהַזְבִּיר in the superscription of Ps. 38 and 70, by which these psalms are designated as the appointed prayers at the presentation of the Azcarah of the meat-offering (Lev. 2:2). הַזְבִּיר accordingly is a *denom.* from אֶזְבָּרָה, to present the Azcarah (cf. Del. on Ps. 38:1), and is in our verse to be understood of the recital of these prayer-songs with musical accompaniment. הוֹדוֹת, to confess, refers to the psalms in which invocation and acknowledgment of the name of the Lord predominates, and הַלֵּל to those in which praise (Hallelujah) is the prominent feature. In vv. 5 and 6 there follow the names of the Levites appointed for this purpose, who have all been already mentioned in 15:19–21 as accompanying the ark in its transmission; but all who are there spoken of are not included in our list here. Of the chief singers only Asaph is mentioned, Heman and Ethan being omitted; of the singers and players of the second rank, only nine; six of the eight nebel-players (1 Chronicles 15:20. יַעֲזִיאֵל is a transcriber's error for יַעֲזִיאֵל, 15:18), and only three of the six kinnor-players; while instead of seven trumpet-blowing priests only two are named, viz., Benaiah, one of those seven, and Jehaziel, whose name does not occur in 15:24.

1 Chronicles 16:7. On that day David first committed it to Asaph and his sons to give thanks to Jahve. נָתַן is to be connected with בָּיַד, which is separated from it by several words, and denotes to hand over to, here to commit to, to enjoin upon, since that which David committed to Asaph was the carrying out of a business which he enjoined, not an object which may be given into the hand. בְּיָוִם הַהוּא is accented by אֶזְ, בְּרֵאשִׁית, “at the beginning,” “at first,” to bring out the fact that liturgical singing was then first introduced. אֶחָיו, the brethren of Asaph, are the Levites appointed to the same duty, whose names are given in vv. 5, 6. But in order to give a more exact description of the

הוֹדוֹת לַיהוָה committed to Asaph in vv. 8–36, a song of thanks and praise is given, which the Levites were to sing as part of the service with instrumental accompaniment. It is not expressly said that this song was composed by David for this purpose; but if Asaph with his singers was to perform the service committed to him, he must have been provided with the songs of praise (psalms) which were necessary for this purpose; and if David were in any way the founder of the liturgical psalmody, he, as a richly endowed psalm-singer, would doubtless compose the necessary liturgical psalms. These considerations render it very probable that the following psalm was a hymn composed by David for the liturgical song in the public worship. The psalm is as follows:—

- 8 Give thanks unto Jahve; preach His name;
Make known His deeds among the peoples:
- 9 Sing to Him, play to Him;
Meditate upon all His wondrous works.
- 10 Glory ye in His holy name:
Let the heart of them rejoice that seek the Lord.
- 11 Seek ye the Lord, and His strength;
Seek His face continually.
- 12 Remember His wonders which He has done;
His wondrous works, and the judgments of His mouth;
- 13 O seed of Israel, His servants,
Sons of Jacob, His chosen.
- 14 He, Jahve, is our God;
His judgments go forth over all the earth.
- 15 Remember eternally His covenant,
The word which He commanded to a thousand generations:
- 16 Which He made with Abraham,
And His oath to Isaac;
- 17 And caused it to stand to Jacob for a law,
To Israel as an everlasting covenant;
- 18 Saying, “To thee I give the land Canaan,
As the heritage meted out to you.”

19 When ye were still a people to be numbered,
 Very few, and strangers therein,
 20 And they wandered from nation to nation,
 From one kingdom to another people,
 21 He suffered no man to oppress them,
 And reprov'd kings for their sake:
 22 "Touch not mine anointed ones,
 And do my prophets no harm."
 23 Sing unto Jahve, all the lands;
 Show forth from day to day His salvation.
 24 Declare His glory among the heathen,
 Among all people His wondrous works.
 25 For great is Jahve, and greatly to be praised;
 And to be feared is He above all the gods.
 26 For all the gods of the people are idols;
 And Jahve has made the heavens.
 27 Majesty and splendour is before Him;
 Strength and joy are in His place.
 28 Give unto Jahve, ye kindreds of the people,
 Give unto Jahve glory and strength.
 29 Give unto Jahve the honour of His name:
 Bring an offering, and come before His presence;
 Worship the Lord in the holy ornaments.
 30 Tremble before Him, all the lands;
 Then will the earth stand fast unshaking.
 31 Let the heavens be glad, and the earth rejoice;
 And they will say among the heathen, Jahve is King.
 32 Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof;
 Let the field exult, and all that is thereon.
 33 Then shall the trees of the wood rejoice
 Before the Lord; for He comes to judge the earth.
 34 Give thanks unto Jahve, for He is good;
 For His mercy endureth for ever.
 35 And say, "Save us, God of our salvation:"

And gather us together, and deliver us from the heathen,

To give thanks to Thy holy name,

To glory in Thy praise.

36 Blessed be Jahve, the God of Israel,

From everlasting to everlasting.

And all the people said Amen, and praised Jahve.

1 Chronicles 16:8-36. This hymn forms a connected and uniform whole. Beginning with a summons to praise the Lord, and to seek His face (vv. 8-11), the singer exhorts his people to remember the wondrous works of the Lord (vv. 12-14), and the covenant which He made with the patriarchs to give them the land of Canaan (vv. 15-18), and confirms his exhortation by pointing out how the Lord, in fulfilment of His promise, had mightily and gloriously defended the patriarchs (vv. 19-22). But all the world also are to praise Him as the only true and almighty God (vv. 23-27), and all peoples do homage to Him with sacrificial gifts (vv. 28-30); and that His kingdom may be acknowledged among the heathen, even inanimate nature will rejoice at His coming to judgment (vv. 31-33). In conclusion, we have again the summons to thankfulness, combined with a prayer that God would further vouchsafe salvation; and a doxology rounds off the whole (vv. 34-36). When we consider the contents of the whole hymn, it is manifest that it contains nothing which would be at all inconsistent with the belief that it was composed by David for the above-mentioned religious service. There is nowhere any reference to the condition of the people in exile, nor yet to the circumstances after the exile. The subject of the praise to which Israel is summoned is the covenant which God made with Abraham, and the wonderful way in which the patriarchs were led. The summons to the heathen to acknowledge Jahve as alone God and King of the world, and to come before His presence with sacrificial offerings, together with the thought that Jahve will come to judge the earth, belong to the Messianic hopes. These had formed

themselves upon the foundation of the promises given to the patriarchs, and the view they had of Jahve as Judge of the heathen, when He led His people out of Egypt, so early, that even in the song of Moses at the Red Sea (Ex. 15), and the song of the pious Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1–10), we meet with the first germs of them; and what we find in David and the prophets after him are only further development of these.

Yet all the later commentators, with the exception of Hitzig, *die Psalmen*, ii. S. ix.f., judge otherwise as to the origin of this festal hymn. Because the first half of it (vv. 8–22) recurs in Ps. 105:1–15, the second (vv. 23–33) in Ps. 96, and the conclusion (vv. 34–36) in Ps. 106:1, 47, 48, it is concluded that the author of the Chronicle compounded the hymn from these three psalms, in order to reproduce the festive songs which were heard after the ark had been brought in, in the same free way in which the speeches in Thucydides and Livy reproduce what was spoken at various times. Besides the later commentators, Aug. Koehler (in the *Luth. Ztschr.* 1867, S. 289ff.) and C. Ehrst (*Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters*, Leipz. 1869, S. 41ff.) are of the same opinion. The possibility that our hymn may have arisen in this way cannot be denied; for such a supposition would be in so far consistent with the character of the Chronicle, as we find in it speeches which have not been reported *verbatim* by the hearers, but are given in substance or in freer outline by the author of our Chronicle, or, as is more probable, by the author of the original documents made use of by the chronicler. But this view can only be shown to be correct if it corresponds to the relation in which our hymn may be ascertained to stand to the three psalms just mentioned. Besides the fact that its different sections are again met with scattered about in different psalms, the grounds for supposing that our hymn is not an original poem are mainly the want of connection in the transition from v. 22 to v. 23, and from v. 33 to v. 34; the fact that in v. 35 we have a verse referring to the Babylonian exile borrowed from Ps. 106; and

that v. 36 is even the doxology of the fourth book of Psalms, taken to be a component part of the psalm. These two latter grounds would be decisive, if the facts on which they rest were well authenticated. If v. 36 really contained only the doxology of the fourth book of Psalms—which, like the doxologies of the first, second, and third books (Ps. 41:14; 72:18, 19, and 89:53), was merely formally connected with the psalm, without being a component part of it,—there could be no doubt that the author of the Chronicle had taken the conclusion of his hymn from our collection of psalms, as these doxologies only date from the originators of our collection. But this is not the state of the case. The 48th verse of the 106th Psalm does, it is true, occupy in our Psalter the place of the doxology to the fourth book, but belonged, as Bertheau also acknowledges, originally to the psalm itself. For not only is it different in form from the doxologies of the first three books, not having the double אָמֵן וְאָמֵן with which these books close, but it concludes with the simple אָמֵן הַלְלוּ־יְיָ. If the אָמֵן וְאָמֵן connected by ו is, in the Old Testament language, exclusively confined to these doxologies, which thus approach the language of the liturgical Beracha of the second temple, as Del. *Ps.* p. 15 rightly remarks, while in Num. 5:22 and Neh. 8:6 only אָמֵן אָמֵן without copulative ו occurs, it is just this peculiarity of the liturgical Beracha which is wanting, both in the concluding verse of the 106th Psalm and in v. 36 of our festal hymn. Moreover, the remainder of the verse in question,—the last clause of it, “And let all the people say Amen, Halleluiah,”—does not suit the hypothesis that the verse is the doxology appended to the conclusion of the fourth book by the collector of the Psalms, since, as Hengstenberg in his commentary on the psalm rightly remarks, “it is inconceivable that the people should join in that which, as mere closing doxology of a book, would have no religious character;” and “the praise in the conclusion of the psalm beautifully coincides with its commencement, and the

Halleluiah of the end is shown to be an original part of the psalm by its correspondence with the beginning."²⁶ The last verse of our hymn does not therefore presuppose the existence of the collection of psalms, nor in v. 35 is there any indubitable reference to the exilic time. The words, "Say, 'Save us, Thou God of our salvation; gather us together, and deliver us from among the heathen,'" do not presuppose that the people had been previously led away into the Chaldean exile, but only the dispersion of prisoners of war, led away captive into an enemy's land after a defeat. This usually occurred after each defeat of Israel by their enemies, and it was just such cases Solomon had in view in his prayer, 1 Kings 8:46–50.

The decision as to the origin of this festal hymn, therefore, depends upon its internal characteristics, and the result of a comparison of the respective texts. The song in itself forms, as Hitz. *l.c.* S. 19 rightly judges, "a thoroughly coherent and organic whole. The worshippers of Jahve are to sing His praise in memory of His covenant which He made with their fathers, and because of which He protected them (vv. 18–22). But all the world also are to praise Him, the only true God (vv. 23–27); the peoples are to come before Him with gifts; yea, even inanimate nature is to pay the King and Judge its homage (vv. 28–33). Israel—and with this the end returns to the beginning—is to thank Jahve, and invoke His help against the heathen (vv. 34 and 35)." This exposition of the symmetrical disposition of the psalm is not rendered questionable by the objections raised by Koehler, *l.c.*; nor can the recurrence of the individual parts of it in three different psalms of itself at all prove that in the Chronicle we have not the original form of the hymn. "There is nothing to hinder us from supposing that the author of Ps. 96 may be the same as the author of Ps. 105 and 106; but even another might be induced by example to appropriate the first half of 1 Chronicles 16:8ff., as his predecessor had appropriated the second, and it would naturally occur to him to supply from his own resources the continuation which had been already taken away and made use of" (Hitz. *l.c.*). A similar

phenomenon is the recurrence of the second half of Ps. 40:17ff. as an independent psalm, Ps. 70. "But it is also readily seen," continues Hitzig, "how easily the psalmist might separate the last three verses from each other (vv. 34 to 36 of the Chronicle), and set them as a frame round Ps. 106. V. 34 is not less suitable in the Chronicle for the commencement of a paragraph than in Ps. 107, which v. 6 would admit of no continuation, but was the proper end. On the other hand, we can scarcely believe that the chronicler compiled his song first from Ps. 105, then from Ps. 96, and lastly from Ps. 106, striking off from this latter only the beginning and the end."

Finally, if we compare the text of our hymn with the text of these psalms, the divergences are of such a sort that we cannot decide with certainty which of the two texts is the original. To pass over such critically indifferent variations as פִּיהוּ, Chronicles v. 12, for פִּי, Ps. 105:5; the omission of the *nota acc.* אַת, Chronicles v. 18, compared with Ps. 105:10, and *vice versa* in Ps. 96:3 and Chronicles v. 24; עֲצֵי הַיַּעַר, Chronicles v. 33, instead of כֵּל-עֲצֵי הַיַּעַר, Ps. 96:12, —the chronicler has in יִצְחָק, v. 16, instead of יִשְׁחָק, Ps. 105:9, and יַעֲלֶז, v. 32, instead of יַעֲלֹז, Ps. 96:12, the earlier and more primitive form; in בְּנֵי-אֵי, v. 22, instead of לְנֵי-אֵי אֵל תִּרְעוּ, Ps. 105:15, a quite unusual construction; and in מִיּוֹם אֵל יוֹם, v. 23, the older form (cf. Num. 30:15), instead of מִיּוֹם לְיוֹם, Ps. 96:2, as in Esth. 3:7; while, on the other hand, instead of the unexampled phrase הַגִּיחַ אֲדָם לְעֶשְׂקָם, Ps. 105:14, there stands in the Chronicle the usual phrase הַגִּיחַ לְאִישׁ, and שְׂדֵי in Ps. 96:12 is the poetical form for the הַשְׂדֵה of Chronicles v. 32. More important are the wider divergences: not so much זָרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל, Chronicles v. 13, for זָרַע אַבְרָהָם, Ps. 105:6, in which latter case it is doubtful whether the עֲבָדוֹ refers to the patriarchs or to the people, and consequently, as the *parallelismus membrorum* demands the latter

references, **ישראל** is clearly the more correct and intelligible; but rather than the others, viz., **זָכְרוּ**, Chronicles v. 15, for **זָכַר**, Ps. 105:8; since **זָכְרוּ** not only corresponds to the **זָכְרוּ** of v. 11, but also to the use made of the song for the purposes stated in the Chronicle; while, on the contrary, **זָכַר** of the psalm corresponds to the object of the psalm, viz., to exalt the covenant grace shown to the patriarchs. Connected with this also is the reading **בְּהִיּוֹתְכֶם**, “when ye (sons of Jacob) were” (v. 19), instead of **בְּהִיּוֹתֵם**, Ps. 105:12, “when they (the patriarchs) were,” since the narrative of what the Lord had done demanded **בְּהִיּוֹתֵם**. Now the more likely the reference of the words to the patriarchs was to suggest itself, the more unlikely is the hypothesis of an alteration into **בְּהִיּוֹתְכֶם**; and the text of the Chronicle being the more difficult, is consequently to be regarded as the earlier. Moreover, the divergences of vv. 23 to 33 of our hymn from Ps. 96 are such as would result from its having been prepared for the above-mentioned solemn festival. The omission of the two strophes, “Sing unto Jahve a new song, sing unto Jahve, bless His name” (Ps. 96:1a and 2a), in v. 23 of the Chronicle might be accounted for by regarding that part of our hymn as an abridgment by the chronicler of the original song, when connecting it with the preceding praise of God, were it certain on other grounds that Ps. 96 was the original; but if the chronicler’s hymn be the original, we may just as well believe that this section was amplified when it was made into an independent psalm. A comparison of v. 33 (Chron.) with the end of the 96th Psalm favours this last hypothesis, for in the Chronicle the repetition of **כִּי בָּא** is wanting, as well as the second hemistich of Ps. 96:13. The whole of the 13th verse recurs, with a single **כִּי בָּא**, at the end of the 98th Psalm (v. 9), and the thought is borrowed from the Davidic Psalm 9:9. The strophes in the beginning of Ps. 96, which are omitted from Chronicles v.16, often recur. The phrase, “Sing unto Jahve a new song,” is met within Ps. 33:3; 98:1, and 149:1,

and **שִׁיר הַדָּשׁ** in Ps. 40:4, a Davidic psalm. **בָּרְכוּ אֶת־שְׁמוֹ** is also met with in Ps. 100:4; and still more frequently **אֶת־יְהוָה בָּרְכוּ**, in Ps. 103:02, 22; 134:1, and elsewhere, even as early as Deborah’s song, Judg. 5:2, 9; while **שִׁירוֹ לַיהוָה** occurs in the song of Moses, Ex. 15:1. Since, then, the strophes of the 96th Psalm are only reminiscences of, and phrases which we find in, the oldest religious songs of the Israelites, it is clear that Ps. 96 is not an original poem. It is rather the re-grouping of the well-known and current thoughts; and the fact that it is so, favours the belief that all which this psalm contains at the beginning and end, which the Chronicle does not contain, is merely an addition made by the poet who transformed this part of the chronicler’s hymn into an independent psalm for liturgical purposes. This purpose clearly appears in such variations as **וְחָדָוָה בְּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ**, Ps. 96:6, instead of **בְּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ**, Chronicles v. 27, and **וּבָאוּ לְחַצְרוֹתָיו**, Ps. 96:8, instead of **וּבָאוּ לְפָנָיו**, Chronicles v. 29. Neither the word **מִקְדָּשׁ** nor the mention of “courts” is suitable in a hymn sung at the consecration of the holy tent in Zion, for at that time the old national sanctuary with the altar in the court (the tabernacle) still stood in Gibeon. Here, therefore, the text of the Chronicle corresponds to the circumstances of David’s time, while the mention of **מִקְדָּשׁ** and of courts in the psalm presupposes the existence of the temple with its courts as the sanctuary of the people of Israel. Now a post-exilic poet would scarcely have paid so much attention to this delicate distinction between times and circumstances as to alter, in the already existing psalms, out of which he compounded this festal hymn, the expressions which were not suitable to the Davidic time. Against this, the use of the unusual word **חֵדוּן**, joy, which occurs elsewhere only in Neh. 10:8, 10, and in Chaldee in Ezra 6:18, is no valid objection, for the use of the verb **חָדָה** as early as Ex. 18:9 and Job 3:6 shows that the word does not belong to the later

Hebrew. The discrepancy also between vv. 30 and 31 and Ps. 96:9–11, namely, the omission in the Chronicle of the strophe **יְדִין עַמִּים בְּמִשְׁפָּרִים** (Ps. v. 10), and the placing of the clause **וַיֹּאמְרוּ** **יְהוָה מְלִיךְ** after **וַתִּגַּל הָאָרֶץ** (Chronicles v. 31, cf. Ps. 96:10), does not really prove anything as to the priority of Ps. 96. Hitzig, indeed, thinks that since by the omission of the one member the parallelism of the verses is disturbed, and a triple verse appears where all the others are double merely, and because by this alteration the clause, “Say among the people, Jahve is King,” has come into an apparently unsuitable position, between an exhortation to the heaven and earth to rejoice, and the roaring of the sea and its fulness, this clause must have been unsuitably placed by a copyist’s error. But the transposition cannot be so explained; for not only is that one member of the verse misplaced, but also the **אָמְרוּ** of the psalm is altered into **וַיֹּאמְרוּ**, and moreover, we get no explanation of the omission of the strophe **וְיִדִין וְגוֹ**. If we consider **וַיֹּאמְרוּ** (with **ו** consecutive), “then will they say,” we see clearly that it corresponds to **אָז יִרְנְנוּ וְגוֹ** in v. 33; and in v. 30 the recognition of Jahve’s kingship over the peoples is represented as the issue and effect of the joyful exultation of the heaven and earth, just as in vv. 32 and 33 the joyful shouting of the trees of the field before Jahve as He comes to judge the earth, is regarded as the result of the roaring of the sea and the gladness of the fields. The **אָמְרוּ** of the psalm, on the other hand, the summons to the Israelites to proclaim that Jahve is King among the peoples, is, after the call, “Let the whole earth tremble before Him,” a somewhat tame expression; and after it, again, we should not expect the much stronger **אָף תִּבְזֹן וְגוֹ**. When we further consider that the clause which follows in the Chronicle, “He will judge the people in uprightness,” is a reminiscence of Ps. 9:9, we must hold the text of the Chronicle to be here also the original, and the divergences in Ps. 96 for alterations, which were occasioned by the changing of a part of our hymn into an

independent psalm. Finally, there can be no doubt as to the priority of the chronicler’s hymn in vv. 34–36. The author of the Chronicle did not require to borrow the liturgical formula **וְגוֹ הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה כִּי טוֹב וְגוֹ** from Ps. 106:1, for it occurs in as complete a form in Ps. 97:1; 118:1, 29; 136:1, and, not to mention 2 Chronicles 5:13; 7:3; 20:21, is a current phrase with Jeremiah (Jer. 33:11), and is without doubt an ancient liturgical form. Vv. 35 and 36, too, contain such divergences from Ps. 106:47 and 48, that it is in the highest degree improbable that they were borrowed from that psalm. Not only is the prayer **וְגוֹ הוֹשִׁיעֵנו וְגוֹ** introduced by **אָמְרוּ**, but also, instead of **יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ** of the psalm, we have **אֱלֹהֵי אֲלֹהֵינוּ**; and to **וְהַצִּילֵנוּ וְקַבְּצֵנוּ** is added,—a change which causes the words to lose the reference to the Chaldean exile contained in the text of the Psalms. The post-exilic author of the Chronicle would scarcely have obliterated this reference, and certainly would not have done so in such a delicate fashion, had he taken the verse from Ps. 106. A much more probable supposition is, that the post-exilic author of the 106th Psalm appropriated the concluding verse of David’s to him well-known hymn, and modified it to make it fit into his poem. Indubitable instances of such alterations are to be found in the conclusion, where the statement of the chronicler, that all the people said Amen and praised Jahve, is made to conform to the psalm, beginning as it does with Halleluiah, by altering **וַיֹּאמְרוּ** into **וַאֲמַר**, “and let them say,” and of **וְהִלֵּל** into **לְלֹלֵי יְהוָה**.

On the whole, therefore, we must regard the opinion that David composed our psalm for the above-mentioned festival as by far the most probable. The psalm itself needs no further commentary; but compare Delitzsch on the parallel psalms and parts of psalms.

1 Chronicles 16:37–43. *Division of the Levites for the management of the public worship.*—At the same time as he set up the ark in the tent erected for it on Mount Zion, David had prepared a new locality for the public worship.

The Mosaic tabernacle had continued, with its altar of burnt-offering, to be the general place of worship for the congregation of Israel even during the long period when the ark was separated from it, and it was even yet to be so; and it became necessary, in order to carry on the religious service in both of these sanctuaries, to divide the staff of religious officials: and this David now undertook.

1 Chronicles 16:37. Before the ark he left Asaph with his brethren (לְ before the *accus. obj.*, according to the later usage), to serve, to minister there continually. לְדַבְרֵי-יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ, “according to the matter of the day on its day,” i.e., according to the service necessary for each day; cf. for this expression, Ex. 5:13, 19; 16:4, etc. “And Obed-edom and their brethren.” In these words there is a textual error: the plural suffix in אֲחֵיהֶם shows that after אֲדוֹם at least one name has been dropped out. But besides that, the relation in which the words, “and Obed-edom the son of Jeduthun, and Hosah, to be porters,” stand to the preceding clause, “and Obed-edom and their brethren,” is obscure. Against the somewhat general idea, that the words are to be taken in an explicative sense, “and Obed-edom indeed,” etc., the objection suggests itself, that Obed-edom is here defined to be the son of Jeduthun, and would seem to be thereby distinguished from the preceding Obed-edom. In addition to that, in 15:21 and Obed-edom is mentioned among the singers, and in v. 24 one of the doorkeepers bears that name, and they are clearly distinguished as being different persons (see p. 509). On the other hand, however, the identity of the two Obed-edoms in our verse is supported by the fact that in 1 Chronicles 26:4–8 the doorkeepers Obed-edom with his sons and brethren number sixty-two, which comes pretty nearly up to the number mentioned in our verse, viz., sixty-eight. Yet we cannot regard this circumstance as sufficient to identify the two, and must leave the question undecided, because the text of our verse is defective. Jeduthun the father of Obed-edom is different from the chief musician Jeduthun (= Ethan); for

the chief musician is a descendant of Merari, while the doorkeeper Jeduthun belongs to the Korahites (i.e., Kohathites): see on 26:4.

1 Chronicles 16:39. וְאֵת צְדוֹק is still dependent on the וַיַּעֲזֹב in v. 37. The priest Zadok with his brethren he left before the tent of Jahve, i.e., the tabernacle at the Bamah in Gibeon. For בָּמָה see on 2 Chronicles 1:13, and for Zadok on 5:38. It is surprising here that no priest is named as superintendent or overseer of the sacrificial worship in the tent of the ark of the covenant. But the omission is accounted for by the fact that our chapter treats properly only of the arrangement of the sacred music connected with the worship, and Zadok is mentioned as overseer of the sanctuary of the tabernacle at Gibeon only in order to introduce the statement as to the Levitic singers and players assigned to that sanctuary. Without doubt Abiathar as high priest had the oversight of the sacrificial worship in the sanctuary of the tabernacle: see on 18:16; with v. 40 cf. Ex. 29:38, Num. 28:3, 6. לְהַעֲלוֹת לְכָל-הַכְּתוּב corresponds to לְהַעֲלוֹת: and in reference to all, i.e., to look after all, which was written. This refers not only to the bringing of the sacrifices prescribed, in addition to the daily burnt-offering, but in general to everything that it was the priests' duty to do in the sanctuary.

1 Chronicles 16:41. וְעִמָּהֶם, and with them (with Zadok and his brethren) were Heman and Jeduthun, i.e., (the two other chief musicians, 15:19), with the other chosen famous, sc. singers (וְנִקְבוּ בְשֵׁמוֹת, see on 12:31). To these belonged those of the number named in 15:18–21, 24, who are not mentioned among those assigned to Asaph in 16:5 and 6, and probably also a number of others whose names have not been handed down. In v. 42, if the text be correct, הֵימָן וַיְדוּתוֹן can only be in apposition to עִמָּהֶם: “and with them, viz., with Heman and Jeduthun, were trumpets,” etc. But, not to mention the difficulty that passages analogous and parallel to this statement are not to be found, the mention of these two chief musicians

in the connection is surprising; for the musical instruments mentioned are not merely the **מְצִלְתִּים** (s. 15:19) played by them, but also the **קְצָצֹרוֹת** which the priests blew, and other instruments. Moreover, the names Heman and Jeduthun are not found here in the LXX, and have probably been inserted in our verse by some copyist from v. 41, which likewise begins with **וְעִמָּהֶם**. If we omit these names, then, the verse contains no other difficulty worthy of consideration, or any which would occasion or necessitate such violent alterations of the text as Berth. has proposed. The suffix in **עִמָּהֶם** refers to the persons mentioned in v. 41, Heman, Jeduthun, and the other chosen ones. "With them were," i.e., they had by them, trumpets, cymbals, etc. The **לְ** before **מְשָׁמְעִים** is strange, since **מְשָׁמְעִים** is in 15:16 connected with **מְצִלְתִּים** as an adjective, and in 15:19 we have **לְהַשְׁמִיעַ**. But if we compare v. 5 of our chapter, where **מְשָׁמְעִיעַ** is predicate to Asaph, "Asaph gave forth clear notes with cymbals," then here also **לְמְשָׁמְעִים** in connection with **מְצִלְתִּים** is thoroughly justified in the signification, "and cymbals for those who gave forth the notes or the melody," i.e., for Heman and Jeduthun. **כָּלֵי שִׁיר הָאֵל** are the other instruments used in the service of the song, viz., the *nablia* and *kinnoroth*. "The sons of Jeduthun for the gate," i.e., as doorkeepers. As Obed-edom, who was doorkeeper by the ark, according to v. 38, was likewise a son of Jeduthun, here other sons of the same Jeduthun, brothers of Obed-edom, must be meant, the number of whom, if we may judge from 26:8, was very considerable; so that the members of this family were able to attend to the doorkeeping both by the ark and in the tabernacle at Gibeon.

1 Chronicles 16:43. V. 43 brings the account of the transfer of the ark to a conclusion, and coincides in substance with 2 Sam. 6:19 and 20a, where, however, there follows in addition a narrative of the scene which David had with

his wife Michal. This, as *res domestica*, the author of the Chronicle has omitted, since the reference to it in 15:29 seemed sufficient for the design of his work. **לְבָרֵךְ** is not to greet, but to bless his house, just as in v. 2 he had already pronounced a blessing on his people in the name of God.

1 Chronicles 17

David's Design to Build a Temple, and the Confirmation of His Kingdom.

1 Chronicles 17. In the Chronicle, as in the second book of Samuel 2 Sam. 7, the account of the removal of the ark to the city of David is immediately followed by the narrative of David's design to build a temple to the Lord; and this arrangement is adopted on account of the connection between the subjects, though the events must have been separated by a period of several years. Our account of this design of David's, with its results for him and for his kingdom, is in all essential points identical with the parallel account, so that we may refer to the commentary on 2 Sam. 7 for any necessary explanation of the matter. The difference between the two narratives are in great part of a merely formal kind; the author of the Chronicle having sought to make the narrative more intelligible to his contemporaries, partly by using later phrases current in his own time, such as **יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים** for יהוה, **מִלְכוּת** for מַמְלָכָה, partly by simplifying and explaining the bolder and more obscure expressions. Very seldom do we find divergences in the subject-matter which alter the meaning or make it appear to be different. To supplement and complete the commentary already given in 2nd Samuel, we will now shortly treat of these divergences. In v. 1, the statement that David communicated his purpose to build a temple to the Lord to the prophet Nathan, "when Jahve had given him rest from all his enemies round about," is wanting. This clause, which fixes the time, has been omitted by the chronicler to avoid the apparent contradiction which would have

arisen in case the narrative were taken chronologically, seeing that the greatest of David's wars, those against the Philistines, Syrians, and Ammonites, are narrated only in the succeeding chapter. As to this, cf. the discussion on 2 Sam. 7:1-3.

1 Chronicles 17:10. In v. 10, וְלִמְיָמַי, like וְלִמְנֵי-הַיּוֹם (Sam. v. 11), is to be connected with the preceding בְּרֵאשִׁיטָה in this sense: "As in the beginning (i.e., during the sojourn in Egypt), and onward from the days when I appointed judges," i.e., during the time of the judges. לְמָן is only a more emphatic expression for מָן, to mark off the time from the beginning as it were (cf. Ew. § 218, b), and is wrongly translated by Berth. "until the days." In the same verse, וְהִכְנַעְתִּי, "I bow, humble all thine enemies," substantially the same as the וְהִנֵּחֹתִי, "I give thee peace from all thine enemies" (Sam.); and the suffix in אוֹיְבֶיךָ is not to be altered, as Berth. proposes, into that of the third person אוֹיְבָיו, either in the Chronicle or in Samuel, for it is quite correct; the divine promise returning at the conclusion to David direct, as in the beginning, vv. 7 and 8, while that which is said of the people of Israel in vv. 9 and 10a is only an extension of the words, "I will destroy all *thine* enemies before thee" (v. 8).

1 Chronicles 17:11. In v. 11, לָלֶכֶת עִם-אֲבוֹתֶיךָ, "to go with thy fathers," used of going the way of death, is similar to "to go the way of all the world" (1 Kings 2:2), and is more primitive than the more usual שָׁכַב עִם אֲבוֹת (Sam. v. 12). עָשָׂר יְהִיָּה מִבְּנֵיךָ, too, is neither to be altered to suit יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֶיךָ of Samuel; nor can we consider it, with Berth., an alteration made by the author of the Chronicle to get rid of the difficulty, that here the birth of Solomon is only promised, while Nathan's speech was made at a time when David had rest from all his enemies round about (2 Sam. 8:1), i.e., as is usually supposed, in the latest years of his life, and consequently after Solomon's birth. For the difficulty had

already been got rid of by the omission of those words in v. 1; and the word, "I have cut off all thine enemies from before thee" (v. 8), does not necessarily involve the destruction of all the enemies who ever rose against David, but refers, as the connection shows, only to the enemies who up till that time had attacked him. Had the author of the Chronicle only wished to get rid of this supposed difficulty, he would simply have omitted the clause, since "they seed" included the sons of David, and needed no explanation if nothing further was meant than that one of his sons would ascend the throne after him. And moreover, the thought, "thy seed, which shall be among thy sons," which Berthieu finds in the words, would be expressed in Hebrew by אֲשֶׁר מִבְּנֵיךָ, while אֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה מִבְּנֵיךָ signifies, "who will come out of (from) thy sons;" for יְהִיָּה מָן does not denote to be of one, i.e., to belong to him, but to arise, be born, or go forth, from one: cf. Ben. 17:16; Eccles. 3:20. According to this, the linguistically correct translation, the words cannot be referred to Solomon at all, because Solomon was not a descendant of David's sons, but of David himself.²⁷ The author of the Chronicle has interpreted אֶת-יְרֵעָךְ אֶתְרִיךָ theologically, or rather set forth the Messianic contents of this conception more clearly than it was expressed in אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֶיךָ. The seed after David, which will arise from his sons, is the Messiah, whom the prophets announced as the Son of David, whose throne God will establish for ever (v. 12). This Messianic interpretation of David's יְרֵעָךְ explains the divergence of the chronicler's text in vv. 13 and 14 from 2 Sam. 7:14-16. For instance, the omission of the words after בָּן in v. 13, "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men" (Sam. v. 14), is the result of the Messianic interpretation of יְרֵעָךְ, since the reference to the chastisement would of course be important for the earthly sons of David and the kings of Judah, but could not well find place in the case of the Messiah. The only thing said

of this son of David is, that God will not withdraw His grace from him.

The case is exactly similar, with the difference between v. 14 and Sam. v. 16. Instead of the words, "And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever" (Sam.), the promise runs thus in the Chronicle: "And I will settle (הֶעֱמִיד) cause to stand, maintain, 1 Kings 15:4; 2 Chronicles 9:8) him (the seed arising from thy sons) in my house and in my kingdom for ever, and his throne shall be established for evermore." While these concluding words of the promise are, in the narrative in Samuel, spoken to David, promising to him the eternal establishment of his house, his kingdom, and his throne, in the Chronicle they are referred to the seed of David, i.e., the Messiah, and promise to Him His establishment for ever in the house and kingdom of God, and the duration of His throne for ever. That בְּיָתִי here does not signify the congregation of the Lord, the people of Israel, as Berth. thinks it must be translated, is clear as the sun; for בַּיִת, immediately preceding, denotes the temple of Jahve, and בְּיָתִי manifestly refers back to לִי בַיִת (v. 12), while such a designation of the congregation of Israel or of the people as "house of Jahve" is unheard of in the Old Testament. The house of Jahve stands in the same relation to the kingdom of Jahve as a king's palace to his kingdom. The house which David's seed will build to the Lord is the house of the Lord in his kingdom: in this house and kingdom the Lord will establish Him for ever; His kingdom shall never cease; His rule shall never be extinguished; and He himself, consequently, shall live for ever. It scarcely need be said that such things can be spoken only of the Messiah. The words are therefore merely a further development of the saying, "I will be to him a Father, and I will not take my mercy away from him, and will establish his kingdom for ever," and tell us clearly and definitely what is implicitly contained in the promise, that David's house, kingdom, and throne will endure for ever (Sam.), viz., that the

house and kingdom of David will be established for ever only under the Messiah. That this interpretation is correct is proved by the fact that the divergences of the text of the chronicler from the parallel narrative cannot otherwise be explained; Thenius and Berth. not having made even an attempt to show how וְהֶעֱמַדְתִּיהוּ בְּבֵיתִי could have arisen out of וְנִצַּחְתָּ בְּיָתֶךָ. The other differences between the texts in the verses in question, לִי (Chron.) for לְשָׁמִי, אֶת-כֶּסֶף for אֶת-כֶּסֶף (Chronicles v. 12, cf. Sam. v. 13), and מֵעַם שְׂאוֹל אֲשֶׁר וּגְוֹ מֵאֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְפָנָיִךָ (Chronicles v. 13, cf. Sam. v. 15), are only variations in expression which do not affect the sense. With reference to the last of them, indeed, Berth. has declared against Thenius, that the chronicler's text is thoroughly natural, and bears marks of being more authentic than that of 2 Sam. 7.

In the prayer of thanksgiving contained in vv. 16 to 27 we meet with the following divergences from the parallel text, which are of importance for their effect on the sense.

1 Chronicles 17:17b. Instead of the words וְזָאת וְרָאִיתָנִי (Sam. v. 19), the Chronicle has וְרָאִיתָנִי וְרָאִיתָנִי, and sawest me (or, that thou sawest me) after the manner of men; תּוֹר being a contraction of תּוֹרָה = תּוֹרָה, רָאָה, to see, may denote to visit (cf. 2 Sam. 13:5; 2 Kings 8:29), or look upon in the sense of regard, *respicere*. But the word רָאִיתָנִי remains obscure in any case, for elsewhere it occurs only as a substantive, in the significations, "the act of going up" (or drawing up) (Ezra 7:9), "that which goes up" (Ezek. 11:5), "the step;" while for the signification "height" (*locus superior*) only this passage is adduced by Gesenius in *Thes*. But even had the word this signification, the word רָאִיתָנִי could not signify *in loco excelso = in coelis* in its present connection; and further, even were this possible, the translation *et me intuitus es more hominum in coelis* gives no tolerable sense. But neither can רָאִיתָנִי be the vocative of

address, and a predicate of God, “Thou height, Jahve God,” as Hgstb. *Christol.* i. p. 378 trans., takes it, with many older commentators. The passage Ps. 92:9, “Thou art מְרוֹם, height, sublimity for ever, Jahve,” is not sufficient to prove that in our verse הַמַּעֲלָה is predicated of God. Without doubt, הַמַּעֲלָה should go with רְאִיתִי וְגוֹ, and appears to correspond to the לְמַרְחֹק of the preceding clause, in the signification: as regards the elevation, in reference to the going upwards, i.e., the exaltation of my race (seed) on high. The thought would then be this: After the manner of men, so condescendingly and graciously, as men have intercourse with each other, hast Thou looked upon or visited me in reference to the elevation of myself or my race,—the text of the Chronicle giving an explanation of the parallel narrative.²⁸ The divergence in v. 18, לְדַבֵּר אֵלַי instead of לְכַבֹּד אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ (Sam. v. 20), which cannot be an explanation or interpretation of Samuel’s text, is less difficult of explanation. The words in Samuel, “What can David say more unto Thee?” have in this connection the very easily understood signification, What more can I say of the promise given me? and needed no explanation. When, instead of this, we read in the Chronicle, “What more can Thy servant add to Thee in regard to the honour to Thy servant?” an unprejudiced criticism must hold this text for the original, because it is the more difficult. It is the more difficult, not only on account of the omission of לְדַבֵּר, which indeed is not absolutely necessary, though serving to explain יוֹסִיף, but mainly on account of the unusual construction of the *nomen* כְּבוֹד with אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ, honour towards Thy servant. The construction דַּעַה אֶת is not quite analogous, for כְּבוֹד is not a *nomen actionis* like דַּעַה; כְּבוֹד אֶת is rather connected with the practice which begins to obtain in the later language of employing אֶת as a general *casus obliquus*, instead of any more definite preposition (Ew. § 277, d, S. 683f., der 7

Aufl.), and is to be translated: “honour concerning Thy servant.” The assertion that אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ is to be erased as a later gloss which has crept into the text, cuts the knots, but does not untie them. That the LXX have not these words, only proves that these translators did not know what to make of them, and so just omitted them, as they have omitted the first clause of v. 19. In v. 19 also there is no valid ground for altering the בַּעֲבוּר עַבְדְּךָ of the Chronicle to make it correspond to בַּעֲבוּר דְּבָרְךָ in Samuel; for the words, “for Thy servant’s sake,” i.e., because Thou hast chosen Thy servant, give a quite suitable sense; cf. the discussion on 2 Sam. 7:21. In the second half of the verse, however, the more extended phrases of 2nd Samuel are greatly contracted.

1 Chronicles 17:21. The combining of גְּדֻלוֹת וְנוֹרָאוֹת with לְשׁוֹם לְךָ שֵׁם as one sentence, “to make Thee a name with great and fearful deeds,” is made clearer in 2nd Samuel by the interpolation of וְלַעֲשׂוֹת לָכֶם, “and for you doing great and fearful things.” This explanation, however, does not justify us in supposing that וְלַעֲשׂוֹת has been dropped out of the Chronicle. The words וְנוֹרָאוֹת וְגְדֻלוֹת are either to be subordinated in a loose connection to the clause, to define the way in which God has made Himself a name (cf. Ew. § 283), or connected with שׁוֹם in a pregnant sense: “to make Thee a name, (doing) great and fearful things.” But, on the other hand, the converse expression in Samuel, “fearful things for Thy land, before Thy people which Thou redeemedst to Thee from Egypt (from) the nations and their gods,” is explained in Chronicles by the interpolation of לְגַרֵּשׁ: “fearful things, to drive out before Thy people, which ... nations.” The divergences cannot be explained by the hypothesis that both texts are mutilated, as is sufficiently shown by the contradictions into which Thenius and Bertheau have fallen in their attempts so to explain them.

All the remaining divergences of one text from the other are only variations of the expression, such as involuntarily arise in the endeavour to give a clear and intelligible narrative, without making a literal copy of the authority made use of. Among these we include even מִצָּא עֲבָדָךָ לְהִתְפַּלֵּל, “Thy servant hath found to pray” (Chronicles v. 25), as compared with מִצָּא עֲבָדָךָ אֶת־לְבָבוֹ לְהִתְפַּלֵּל, “Thy servant hath found his heart,” i.e., found courage, to pray (Sam. v. 28); where it is impossible to decide whether the author of the books of Samuel has added אֶת־לְבָבוֹ as an explanation, or the author of the Chronicle has omitted it because the phrase “to find his heart” occurs only in this single passage of the Old Testament. מִצָּא עֲבָדָךָ לְהִתְפַּלֵּל signifies, Thy servant has reached the point of directing this prayer to Thee.

1 Chronicles 18-20

Ch. 18–20.—David’s Wars and Victories; His Public Officials; Some Heroic Deeds Done in the Philistine Wars.

1 Chronicles 18–20. The events recorded in these three chapters are all narrated in the second book of Samuel also, and in the same order. First, there are grouped together in our 18th chapter, and in 2 Sam. 8, in such a manner as to afford a general view of the whole, all the wars which David carried on victoriously against all his enemies round about in the establishment of the Israelitish rule, with a short statement of the results, followed by a catalogue of David’s chief public officials. In 1 Chronicles 19 and in 2 Sam. 10 we have a more detailed account of the arduous war against the Ammonites and Syrians, and in 1 Chronicles 20:1–3 and 2 Sam. 12:26–31 the conclusion of the war with the capture of Rabbah, the capital of the Ammonites; and finally, in 1 Chronicles 20:4–8, we have a few short accounts of the victories of the Israelitish heroes over giants from the land of the Philistines, which are inserted in 2 Sam. 21:18–22 as a supplement to the last section of David’s history. Apart from

this last section, which is to be regarded even in the Chronicle as an appendix, we find the arrangement and succession of the events to be the same in both books, since the sections which in 2 Sam. 9 and 11:1–12, 25, stand between the histories of the wars, contain sketches of David’s family life, which the author of the Chronicle has, in accordance with his plan, omitted. Even as to individual details the two narratives are perfectly agreed, the divergences being inconsiderable; and even these, in so far as they are original, and are not results of careless copying,—as, for instance, the omission of the word נְצִיבִים, 18:6, as compared with v. 13 and 2 Sam. 8:6, and the difference in the numbers and names in 1 Chronicles 18:4, 8, as compared with 2 Sam. 4:4, 8, are,—partly mere explanations of obscure expressions, partly small additions or abridgments. For the commentary, therefore, we may refer to the remarks on 2nd Samuel, where the divergences of the Chronicle from the record in Samuel are also dealt with. With 1 Chronicles 18:1–13 cf. 2 Sam. 8:1–14; and with the register of public officials, 1 Chronicles 18:14–17, cf. 2 Sam. 8:15–18.

Examples of paraphrastic explanation are found in 1 Chronicles 18:1, where the figurative expression, David took the bridle of the mother out of the hands of the Philistines, i.e., deprived them of the hegemony, is explained by the phrase, David took Gath and her cities out of the hands of the Philistines, i.e., took from the Philistines the capital with her daughter cities; and in v. 17, בְּהָגִים is rendered by, the first at the king’s hand. Among the abridgments, the omission of David’s harsh treatment of the Moabites who were taken prisoners is surprising, no reason for it being discoverable; for the assertion that the chronicler has purposely omitted it in order to free David from the charge of such barbarous conduct, is disposed of by the fact that he does not pass over in silence the similar treatment of the conquered inhabitants of Rabbah in 1 Chronicles 20:3. Instead of this, the chronicler has several historical notes peculiar to himself,

which are wanting in the text of Samuel, and which prove that the author of the Chronicle has not derived his account from the second book of Samuel. Such, e.g., is the statement in 1 Chronicles 18:8, that Solomon caused the brazen sea and the pillars and vessels of the court of the temple to be made of the brass taken as booty in the war against Hadadezer; in v. 11, the word **מֵאֲדוֹם**, which is wanting in Samuel, as **מֵאֲרָם**, which in v. 11 of that book is used in place of it, probably stood originally in the Chronicle also. Such also are the more accurate statements in v. 12 as to the victory over the Edomites in the Valley of Salt (see on 2 Sam. 8:13).

The same phenomena are met with in the detailed account of the Ammonite-Syriac war, 1 Chronicles 19:1, 2; 20:3, as compared with 2 Sam. 10:1–11:1, and 12:26–31. In 19:1 the omission of the name **חֲנוּן** after **בְּנֵי** is merely an oversight, as the omission of the name **נָחַשׁ** in 2 Sam. 10:1a also is. In v. 3 there is no need to alter **וְגַרְוֵי וְלִהְפֹּךְ וְגַרְוֵי** into **וְגַרְוֵי וְלִהְפֹּךְ וְגַרְוֵי**, 2 Sam. 10:3, although the expression in Samuel is more precise. If the actual words of the original document are given in Samuel, the author of the Chronicle has made the thought more general: “to search and to overthrow, and to spy out the land.” Perhaps, however, the terms made use of in the original document were not so exact and precise as those of the book of Samuel. In vv. 6, 7, at least, the divergence from 2 Sam. 10:16 cannot be explained otherwise than by supposing that in neither of the narratives is the text of the original document exactly and perfectly reproduced. For a further discussion of the differences, see on 2 Sam. 10:6. The special statement as to the place where the mercenaries encamped, and the Ammonites gathered themselves together from out their cities (v. 7), is wanting in 2nd Samuel. The city Medeba, which, according to Josh. 13:16, was assigned to the tribe of Reuben, lay about two hours southeast from Heshbon, and still exists as ruins, which retain the ancient name Medaba

(see on Num. 21:30). In v. 9, **פְּתַח הָעִיר**, “outside the city” (i.e., the capital Rabbah), more correct or exact than **פְּתַח הַשָּׂעַר** (Sam. v. 8). On **וַיָּבֵא** **אֶלֵיהֶם**, as compared with **וַיָּבֵא חֲלָאֲמָה** (Sam. v. 17), cf. the discussion on 2 Sam. 10:16, 17.

The account of the siege of Rabbah, the capital, in the following year, 1 Chronicles 20:1–3, is much abridged as compared with that in 2 Sam. 11:1; 12:26–31. After the clause, “but David sat (remained) in Jerusalem,” in 2 Sam. 11, from v. 2 onwards, we have the story of David’s adultery with Bathsheba, and the events connected with it (2 Sam. 11:3–12:25), which the author of the Chronicle has omitted, in accordance with the plan of his book.

Thereafter, in 2 Sam. 12:26, the further progress of the siege of Rabbah is again taken up with the words, “And Joab warred against Rabbah of the sons of Ammon;” and in vv. 27–29 the capture of that city is circumstantially narrated, viz., how Joab, after he had taken the water-city, i.e., the city lying on both banks of the upper Jabbok (the Wady *Ammân*), with the exception of the Acropolis built on a hill on the north side of the city, sent messages to David, and called upon him to gather together the remainder of the people, i.e., all those capable of bearing arms who had remained in the land; and how David, having done this, took the citadel. Instead of this, we have in the Chronicle only the short statement, “And Joab smote Rabbah, and destroyed it” (1 Chronicles 20:1, at the end). After this, both narratives (Chronicles vv. 2, 3, and Sam. vv. 30, 31) coincide in narrating how David set the heavy golden crown of the king of the Ammonites on his head, brought much booty out of the city, caused the prisoners of war taken in Rabbah and the other fenced cities of the Ammonites to be slain in the cruellest way, and then returned with all the people, i.e., with the whole of his army, to Jerusalem. Thus we see that, according to the record in the Chronicle also, David was present at the capture of the Acropolis of Rabbah, then put on the crown of the Ammonite king, and commanded the slaughter of the prisoners; but no mention is made of his

having gone to take part in the war. By the omission of this circumstance the narrative of the Chronicle becomes defective; but no reason can be given for this abridgment of the record, for the contents of 2 Sam. 12:26–39 must have been contained in the original documents made use of by the chronicler. On the differences between v. 31 (Sam.) and v. 3 of the Chronicle, see on 2 Sam. 12:31. וַיִּשֶׂר, “he sawed asunder,” is the correct reading, and וַיִּשֶׂם in Samuel is an orthographical error; while, on the contrary, בַּמְּגֵרוֹת in the Chronicle is a mistake for בַּמְּגֵרוֹת in Samuel. The omission of וַיִּשֶׂר אֹתָם בַּמְּלִיכָן is probably explained by the desire to abridge; for if the author of the Chronicle does not scruple to tell of the sawing asunder of the prisoners with saws, and the cutting of them to pieces under threshing instruments and scythes, it would never occur to him to endeavour to soften David’s harsh treatment of them by passing over in silence the burning of them in brick-kilns.

The passages parallel to the short appendix-like accounts of the valiant deeds of the Israelitish leaders in 1 Chronicles 20:4–8 are to be found, as has already been remarked, in 2 Sam. 21:18–24. There, however, besides the three exploits of which we are informed by the chronicler in vv. 15–17, a fourth is recorded, and that in the first place too, viz., the narrative of David’s fight with the giant Jishbi-Benob, who was slain by Abishai the son of Zeruiah. The reason why our historian has not recounted this along with the others is clear from the position which he assigns to these short narratives in his book. In the second book of Samuel they are recounted in the last section of the history of David’s reign, as palpable proofs of the divine grace of which David had had experience during his whole life, and for which he there praises the Lord in a psalm of thanksgiving (2 Sam. 22). In this connection, David’s deliverance by the heroic act of Abishai from the danger into which he had fallen by the fierce attack which the Philistine giant Jishbi-Benob made upon him when he was faint, is very suitably narrated, as

being a visible proof of the divine grace which watched over the pious king. For the concluding remark in 2 Sam. 21:17, that in consequence of this event his captains adjured David not to go any more into battle along with them, that the light of Israel might not be extinguished, shows in how great danger he was of being slain by this giant. For this reason the author of the book of Samuel has placed this event at the head of the exploits of the Israelite captains which he was about to relate, although it happened somewhat later in time than the three exploits which succeed. The author of the Chronicle, on the contrary, has made the account of these exploits an appendix to the account of the victorious wars by which David obtained dominion over all the neighbouring peoples, and made his name to be feared among the heathen, as a further example of the greatness of the power given to the prince chosen by the Lord to be over His people. For this purpose the story of the slaughter of the Philistine giant, who had all but slain the weary David, was less suitable, and is therefore passed over by the chronicler, although it was contained in his authority,²⁹ as is clear from the almost verbal coincidence of the stories which follow with 2 Sam. 21:18ff. The very first is introduced by the formula, “It happened after this,” which in 2nd Samuel naturally connects the preceding narrative with this; while the chronicler has retained אַחֲרֵי־כֵן as a general formula of transition,—omitting, however, עוֹד (Sam.) in the following clause, and writing וַתֵּעָמֹד, “there arose,” instead of וַתֵּהִי עָמֵד in the later Hebrew is the same as קוּם. The hypothesis that וַתֵּעָמֵד has arisen out of וַתֵּהִי עוֹד (in Samuel) is not at all probable, although עָמֵד is not elsewhere used of the origin of a war. Even קוּם is only once (Gen. 41:30) used of the coming, or coming in, of a time. On בָּגְגוּר and סָפִי instead of בָּנוֹב and סָף, see on 2 Sam. 21:18. וַיִּכְבְּעוּ at the end of the fourth verse is worthy of remark, “And they (the Philistines) were humbled,” which is omitted from Samuel, and “yet can scarcely

have been arbitrarily added by our historian" (Berth.). This remark, however, correct as it is, does not explain the omission of the word from 2nd Samuel. The reason for that can scarcely be other than that it did not seem necessary for the purpose which the author of the book of Samuel had in the first place in view. As to the two other exploits (vv. 6–8), see the commentary on 2 Sam. 21:19–22. לֹא for אֱלֹהִים in the closing remark (v. 8) is archaic, but the omission of the article (לֹא instead of הָאֱלֹהִים, as we find it in Gen. 19:8, 25, and in other passages in the Pentateuch) cannot be elsewhere paralleled. In the last clause, "And they fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants," that David should be named is surprising, because none of those here mentioned as begotten of Rapha, i.e., descendants of the ancient Raphaite race, had fallen by the hand of David, but all by the hand of his servants. Bertheau therefore thinks that this clause has been copied *verbatim* into our passage, and also into 2 Sam. 21:22, from the original document, where this enumeration formed the conclusion of a long section, in which the acts of David and of his heroes, in their battles with the giants in the land of the Philistines, were described. But since the author of the second book of Samuel expressly says, "These four were born to Rapha, and they fell" (v. 22), he can have referred in the words, "And they fell by the hand of David," only to the four above mentioned, whether he took the verse in question unaltered from his authority, or himself added אֶת־אֲרֵבֶעַת אֱלֹהִים. In the latter case he cannot have added the בְּיַד־דָּוִד without some purpose; in the former, the reference of the בְּיַד־דָּוִד in the "longer section," from which the excerpt is taken, to others than the four giants mentioned, to Goliath perhaps in addition, whom David slew, is rendered impossible by אֶת־אֲרֵבֶעַת אֱלֹהִים. The statement, "they fell by the hand of David," does not presuppose that David had slain all of them, or even one of them, with his own *hand*; for בְּיַד frequently signifies only through, i.e., by means

of, and denotes here that those giants fell in wars which David had waged with the Philistines—that David had been the main cause of their fall, had brought about their death by his servants through the wars he waged.

1 Chronicles 21

The Numbering of the People, the Pestilence, and the Determination of the Site for the Temple (cf. 2 Sam. 24).

1 Chronicles 21. The motive which influenced the king, in causing a census of the men capable of bearing arms throughout the kingdom to be taken in the last year of his reign, has already been discussed in the remarks on 2 Sam. 24, where we have also pointed out what it was which was so sinful and displeasing to God in the undertaking. We have, too, in the same place commented upon the various stages of its progress, taking not of the differences which exist between the numbers given in 2 Sam. 24:9, 13, 24, and those in our record, vv. 5, 12, 25; so that here we need only compare the two accounts somewhat more minutely. They correspond not merely in the main points of their narrative of the event, but in many places make use of the same terms, which shows that they have both been derived from the same source; but, as the same time, very considerable divergences are found in the conception and representation of the matter. In the very first verse, David's purpose is said in 2nd Samuel to be the effect of the divine anger; in the Chronicle it is the result of the influence of Satan on David. Then, in 2 Sam. 24:4–9, the numbering of the people is narrated at length, while in the Chronicle, vv. 4–6, only the results are recorded, with the remark that Joab did not complete the numbering, Levi and Benjamin not being included, because the king's command was an abomination to him. On the other hand, the Chronicle, in vv. 19–27, narrates the purchase of Araunah's threshing-floor for a place of sacrifice, and gives not merely a more circumstantial account of David's offering than we find in Samuel (vv. 19–

25), but also states, in conclusion (vv. 28–30), the circumstances which induced David to offer sacrifice even afterwards, on the altar which he had built at the divine command, on the threshing-floor bought of Araunah. The purpose which the author of the Chronicle had in view in making this concluding remark is manifest from v. 1 of 1 Chronicles 22, which should properly be connected with 1 Chronicles 21: “And David said, Here is the house of Jahve God, and here the altar for the burnt-offering of Israel.” Only in this verse, as Bertheau has correctly remarked, do we find the proper conclusion of the account of the numbering of the people, the pestilence, and the appearance of the angel, and yet it is omitted in the book of Samuel; “although it is manifest from the while connection, and the way in which the history of David and Solomon is presented in the books of Samuel and Kings, that the account is given there also only to point out the holiness of the place where Solomon built the temple even in the time of David, and to answer the question why that particular place was chosen for the site of the sanctuary.” This remark is perfectly just, if it be not understood to mean that the author of our book of Samuel has given a hint of this purpose in his narrative; for the conclusion of 2 Sam. 24:25, “And Jahve was entreated for the land, and the plague was stayed,” is irreconcilable with any such idea. This concluding sentence, and the omission of any reference to the temple, or to the appointment of the altar built on the threshing-floor of Araunah to be a place of sacrifice for Israel, and of the introductory words of the narrative, “And again the wrath of Jahve was kindled against Israel, and moved David against them,” (2 Sam. 24:1), plainly show that the author of the book of Samuel regarded, and has here narrated, the event as a chastisement of the people of Israel for their rebellion against the divinely chosen king, in the revolts of Absalom and Sheba (cf. the remarks on 2 Sam. 24:1). The author of the Chronicle, again, has without doubt informed us of the numbering of the people, and the pestilence, with its results, with the design of showing how God Himself had chosen and

consecrated this spot to be the future place of worship for Israel, by the appearance of the angel, the command given to David through the prophet Gad to build an altar where the angel had appeared, and to sacrifice thereon, and by the gracious acceptance of this offering, fire having come down from heaven to devour it. For this purpose he did not require to give any lengthened account of the numbering of the people, since it was of importance to him only as being the occasion of David’s humiliation.

1 Chronicles 21:1–7. “And Satan stood up against Israel, and incited David to number Israel.” The mention of Satan as the seducer of David is not to be explained merely by the fact that the Israelites in later times traced up everything contrary to God’s will to this evil spirit, but in the present case arises from the author’s design to characterize David’s purpose from the very beginning as an ungodly thing.

1 Chronicles 21:2. The naming of the שָׂרֵי הָעָם along with Joab is in accordance with the circumstances, for we learn from 2 Sam. 24:4 that Joab did not carry out the numbering of the people alone, but was assisted by the captains of the host. The object of וְהִבִּיאוּ אֵלַי, which is not expressed, the result of the numbering, may be supplied from the context. No objection need be taken to the simple כָּהֶם of v. 3, instead of the double וְכָהֶם וְכָהֶם in Samuel. The repetition of the same word, “there are so and so many of them,” is a peculiarity of the author of the book of Samuel (cf. 2 Sam. 12:8), while the expression in the Chronicle corresponds to that in Deut. 1:11. With the words הֲלֹא אֲדֹנָי וְגוֹ, “Are they not, my lord king, all my lord’s servants,” i.e., subject to him? Joab allays the suspicion that he grudged the king the joy of reigning over a very numerous people. In Sam. v. 3 the thought takes another turn; and the last clause, “Why should it (the thing or the numbering) become a trespass for Israel?” is wanting. אֲשָׁמָה denotes here a trespass which must be atoned for, not one which one commits. The meaning is therefore, Why should Israel expiate thy sin, in

seeking thy glory in the power and greatness of thy kingdom? On the numbers, v. 5, see on 2 Sam. 24:9. In commenting on v. 6, which is not to be found in Samuel, Berth. defends the statement that Joab did not make any muster of the tribes Levi and Benjamin, against the objections of de Wette and Gramberg, as it is done in my *apologet. Versuche*, Sa. 349ff., by showing that the tribe of Levi was by law (cf. Num. 1:47–54) exempted from the censuses of the people taken for political purposes; and the tribe of Benjamin was not numbered, because David, having become conscious of his sin, stopped the numbering before it was completed (cf. also the remarks on 2 Sam. 24:9). The reason given, “for the king’s word was an abomination unto Joab,” is certainly the subjective opinion of the historian, but is shown to be well founded by the circumstances, for Joab disapproved of the king’s design from the beginning; cf. v. 3 (Samuel and Chronicles).—In v. 7, the author of the Chronicle, instead of ascribing the confession of sin on David’s part which follows to the purely subjective motive stated in the words, “and David’s heart smote him,” i.e., his conscience (Sam. v. 10a), has ascribed the turn matters took to objective causes: the thing displeased God; and anticipating the course of events, he remarks straightway, “and He (God) smote Israel.” This, however, is no reason for thinking, with Berth., that the words have arisen out of a misinterpretation or alteration of 2 Sam. 24:10a; for such anticipatory remarks, embracing the contents of the succeeding verses, not unfrequently occur in the historical books (cf. e.g., 1 Kings 6:14; 7:2).—In reference to vv. 8–10, see on 2 Sam. 24:10–16.—In v. 12, *נִסְפָּה* has not come into the text by mistake or by misreading *נָסַף* (Sam. v. 13), but is original, the author of the Chronicle describing the two latter evils more at length than Samuel does. The word is not a participle, but a noun formed from the participle, with the signification “perishing” (the being snatched away). The second parallel clause, “the sword of thine enemies to attaining” (so that it reach thee),

serves to intensify. So also in reference to the third evil, the *הָרַב יְהוּה* which precedes *דָּבַר בְּאַרְצָךְ*, and the parallel clause added to both: “and the angel of the Lord destroying in the whole domain of Israel.”

1 Chronicles 21:15. *וַיִּשְׁלַח הָאֱלֹהִים מַלְאָךְ לִירֹ.* “And God sent an angel towards Jerusalem,” gives no suitable sense. Not because of the improbability that God sent the angel with the commission to destroy Jerusalem, and at the same moment gives the contrary command, “Stay now,” etc. (Berth.); for the reason of this change is given in the intermediate clause, “and at the time of the destroying the Lord repented it,” and command and prohibition are not given “at the same moment;” but the difficulty lies in the indefinite *מַלְאָךְ* (without the article). For since the angel of Jahve is mentioned in v. 12 as the bringer of the pestilence, in our verse, if it treats of the sending of this angel to execute the judgment spoken of, *הַמַּלְאָךְ* must necessarily be used, or *אֵת הַמַּלְאָךְ*, as in v. 16; the indefinite *מַלְאָךְ* can by no means be used for it. In 2 Sam. 24:16 we read, instead of the words in question, *וַיִּשְׁלַח יְדוֹ הַמַּלְאָךְ יֵרֹ*, “and the angel stretched out his hand towards Jerusalem;” and Bertheau thinks that the reading *הָאֱלֹהִים* (in the Chron.) has arisen out of that, by the letters *יְדוֹ ה* being exchanged for *יְהוּה*, and *אֱלֹהִים* being substituted for this divine name, as is often the case in the Chronicle; while Movers, S. 91, on the contrary, considers the reading of the Chronicle to be original, and would read *יִשְׁלַח יְהוּה* in Samuel. But in that way Movers leaves the omission of the article before *מַלְאָךְ* in the Chronicle unexplained; and Bertheau’s conjecture is opposed by the improbability of such a misunderstanding of a phrase so frequent and so unmistakeable as *יְדוֹ יִשְׁלַח*, as would lead to the exchange supposed, ever occurring. But besides that, in Samuel the simple *הַמַּלְאָךְ* is strange, for the angel has not

been spoken of there at all before, and the LXX have consequently explained the somewhat obscure מַלְאָךְ by ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ. This explanation suggests the way in which the reading of our text arose. The author of the Chronicle, although he had already made mention of the יהוה מַלְאָךְ in v. 12, wrote in v. 15 מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים וַיִּשְׁלַח מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים instead of יהוה—, as, for example, in Judg. 6:20, 22; 13:6, 9, and 13, 15, 17. מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים alternates with יהוה מַלְאָךְ, and omitting יְדוּ with וַיִּשְׁלַח, as is often done, e.g., 2 Sam. 6:6, Ps. 18:17, etc. By a copyist מַלְאָךְ and הָאֱלֹהִים have been transposed, and מַלְאָךְ was then taken by the Masoretes for an accusative, and pointed accordingly. The expression is made clearer by וַיִּכְרַתְהוּת, “And as he destroyed, Jahve saw, and it repented Him of the evil.” The idea is: Just as the angel had begun to destroy Jerusalem, it repented God. רַב, adverb, “enough,” as in 1 Kings 19:4, etc., with a *dativ commodi*, Deut. 1:6, etc. Bertheau has incorrectly denied this meaning of the word, connecting רַב with בָּעָם in 2 Sam. 24:16, and desiring to alter our text to make it conform to that. In 2nd Samuel also רַב is an adverb, as Thenius also acknowledges.

1 Chronicles 21:16–26. The account of David’s repentant beseeching of the Lord to turn away the primitive judgment, and the word of the Lord proclaimed to him by the prophet, commanding him to build an altar to the Lord in the place where the destroying angel visibly appeared, together with the carrying out of this divine command by the purchase of Araunah’s threshing-floor, the erection of an altar, and the offering of burnt-offering, is given more at length in the Chronicle than in 2 Sam. 24:17–25, where only David’s negotiation with Araunah is more circumstantially narrated than in the Chronicle. In substance both accounts perfectly correspond, except that in the Chronicle several subordinate circumstances are preserved,

which, as being minor points, are passed over in Samuel. In v. 16, the description of the angel’s appearance, that he had a drawn sword in his hand stretched out over Jerusalem, and the statement that David and the elders, clad in sackcloth (garments indicating repentance), fell down before the Lord; in v. 20, the mention of Ornan’s (Araunah’s) sons, who hid themselves on beholding the angel, and of the fact that Ornan was engaged in threshing wheat when David came to him; and the statement in v. 26, that fire came down from heaven upon the altar,—are examples of such minor points. We have already commented on this section in our remarks on 2 Sam. 24:17–25, and the account in the Chronicle is throughout correct and easily understood. Notwithstanding this, however, Bertheau, following Thenius and Böttcher, conjectures that the text is in several verses corrupt, and wishes to correct them by 2nd Samuel. But these critics are misled by the erroneous presumption with which they entered upon the interpretation of the Chronicle, that the author of it used as his authority, and revised, our Masoretic text of the second book of Samuel. Under the influence of this prejudice, emendations are proposed which are stamped with their own unlikelihood, and rest in part even on misunderstandings of the narrative in the book of Samuel. Of this one or two illustrations will be sufficient. Any one who compares v. 17 (Sam.) with vv. 16 and 17 of the Chronicle, without any pre-formed opinions, will see that what is there (Sam.) concisely expressed is more clearly narrated in the Chronicle. The beginning of v. 17, “And David spake unto Jahve,” is entirely without connection, as the thought which forms the transition from v. 16 to v. 17, viz., that David was moved by the sight of the destroying angel to pray to God that the destruction might be turned away, is only brought in afterwards in the subordinate clause, “on seeing the angel.” This abrupt form of expression is got rid of in the Chronicle by the clause: “And David lifted up his eyes, and saw the angel ... and fell ... upon his face; and David spake to God.” That which in Samuel is

crushed away into an infinitive clause subordinate to the principle sentence, precedes in the Chronicle, and is circumstantially narrated. Under these circumstances, of course, the author of the Chronicle could not afterwards in v. 17 make use of the clause, "on seeing the angel who smote the people," without tautology. Berth., on the contrary, maintains that v. 16 is an interpolation of the chronicler, and proposes then to cull out from the words and letters *בְּעַם המכה את המלאך* (Sam.), the words *בראתו אמרתי למנותי בְּעַם* (Chronicles v. 17), great use being made in the process of the ever ready auxiliaries, mistakes, and a text which has become obscure. This is one example out of many. V. 16 of the Chronicle is not an addition which the Chronicle has interpolated between vv. 16 and 17 of Samuel, but a more detailed representation of the historical course of things. No mention is made in 2nd Samuel of the drawn sword in the angel's hand, because there the whole story is very concisely narrated. This detail need not have been borrowed from Num. 22:23, for the drawn sword is a sensible sign that the angle's mission is punitive; and the angel, who is said to have visibly appeared in 2nd Samuel also, could be recognised as the bearer of the judicial pestilence only by this emblem, such recognition being plainly the object of his appearance. The mention of the elders along with David as falling on their faces in prayer, clad in sackcloth, will not surprise any reader or critic who considers that in the case of so fearful a pestilence the king would not be alone in praying God to turn away the judgment. Besides, from the mention of the *עֲבָדָיו* of the king who went with David to Ornan (Sam. v. 20), we learn that the king did not by himself take steps to turn away the plague, but did so along with his servants. In the narrative in 2nd Samuel, which confines itself to the main point, the elders are not mentioned, because only of David was it recorded that his confession of sin brought about the removal of the plague. Just as little can we be surprised that David calls his command to number the people the *delictum* by

which he had brought the judgment of the plague upon himself.—To alter *בְּדָבָר*, v. 19, into *בְּדָבָר*, as Berth. wishes, would show little intelligence. *בְּדָבָר*, at Gad's word David went up, is proved by Num. 31:16 to be good Hebrew, and is perfectly suitable.

1 Chronicles 21:20. *וַיִּשָׁב אֲרָנָן*, "and Ornan turned him about," is translated by Berth. incorrectly, "then Ornan turned back," who then builds on this erroneous interpretation, which is contrary to the context, a whole nest of conjectures. *וַיִּשָׁב* is said to have arisen out of *וַיִּשְׁקֶף*, the succeeding *הַמִּלְאָךְ* out of *הַמִּלְךְ* *אֲרָבֶעַת* out of *עָבְדָיו עֲבָרִים עָלָיו* (Sam. v. 20), "by mistake and further alteration." In saying this, however, he himself has not perceived that v. 20 (Sam.) does not correspond to the 20th verse of the Chronicle at all, but to the 21st verse, where the words, "and Araunah looked out (*יִשְׁקֶף*) and saw the king," as parallel to the words, "and Ornan looked (*יִבֵּט*) and saw David."

The 20th verse of the Chronicle contains a statement which is not found in Samuel, that Ornan (Araunah), while threshing with his four sons, turned and saw the angel, and being terrified at the sight, hid himself with his sons. After that, David with his train came from Zion to the threshing-floor in Mouth Moriah, and Araunah looking out saw the king, and came out of the threshing-floor to meet him, with deep obeisance. This narrative contains nothing improbable, nothing to justify us in having recourse to critical conjecture.

1 Chronicles 21:24. The infinitive *הַעֲלוֹת* is very frequently used in Hebrew as the continuation of the *verb. fin.*, and is found in all the books of the Old Testament (cf. the collection of passages illustrative of this peculiar form of brief expression, which We. gives, § 351, c), and that not only with regard to the *infin. absol.*, but the *infin. constr.* also. David's answer to Ornan's offer to give him the place for the altar, and the cattle, plough, and wheat for the burnt-offering, was therefore: "no, I will buy it for full price; I

will not take what belongs to thee for Jahve, and bring burnt-offerings without cost," i.e., without having paid the price for them.

1 Chronicles 21:25. As to the different statements of the price, cf. on 2 Sam. 24:24.

1 Chronicles 21:26–30. In 2 Sam. 24:25 the conclusion of this event is shortly narrated thus: David offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and Jahve was entreated for the land, and the plague was stayed from Israel. In the Chronicle we have a fuller statement of the **יָעָרָה** **יְהוָה** in v. 26*b*. David called upon Jahve, and He answered with fire from heaven upon the altar of burnt-offering (v. 27); and Jahve spake to the angel, and he returned the sword into its sheath. The returning of the sword into its sheath is a figurative expression for the stopping of the pestilence; and the fire which came down from heaven upon the altar of burnt-offering was the visible sign by which the Lord assured the king that his prayer had been heard, and his offering graciously accepted. The reality of this sign of the gracious acceptance of an offering is placed beyond doubt by the analogous cases, Lev. 9:24, 1 Kings 18:24, 38, and 2 Chronicles 7:1. It was only by this sign of the divine complacency that David learnt that the altar built upon the threshing-floor of Araunah had been chosen by the Lord as the place where Israel should always thereafter offer their burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as is further recorded in vv. 28–30. and in 22:1. From the cessation of the pestilence in consequence of his prayer and sacrifice, David could only draw the conclusion that God had forgiven him his transgression, but could not have known that God had chosen the place where he had built the altar for the offering demanded by God as a permanent place of sacrifice. This certainly he obtained only by the divine answer, and this answer was the fire which came down upon the altar of burnt-offering and devoured the sacrifice. This v. 28 states: "At the time when he saw that Jahve had answered him at the threshing-floor of Ornan, he offered sacrifice there," i.e., from that time forward; so that we may with Berth. translate

וַיִּזְבַּח שָׁם, "then he was wont to offer sacrifice there." In vv. 29 and 30 we have still further reasons given for David's continuing to offer sacrifices at the threshing-floor of Ornan. The legally sanctioned place of sacrifice for Israel was still at that time the tabernacle, the Mosaic sanctuary with its altar of burnt-offering, which then stood on the high place at Gibeon (cf. 16:39). Now David had indeed brought the ark of the covenant, which had been separated from the tabernacle from the time of Samuel, to Zion, and had there not only erected a tent for it, but had also built an altar and established a settled worship there (1 Chronicles 17), yet without having received any express command of God regarding it; so that this place of worship was merely provisional, intended to continue only until the Lord Himself should make known His will in the matter in some definite way. When therefore David, after the conquest of his enemies, had obtained rest round about, he had formed the resolution to make an end of this provisional separation of the ark from the tabernacle, and the existence of two sacrificial altars, by building a temple; but the Lord had declared to him by the prophet Nathan, that not he, but his son and successor on the throne, should build Him a temple. The altar by the ark in Zion, therefore, continued to co-exist along with the altar of burnt-offering at the tabernacle in Gibeon, without being sanctioned by God as the place of sacrifice for the congregation of Israel. Then when David, by ordering the numbering of the people, had brought guilt upon the nation, which the Lord so heavily avenged upon them by the pestilence, he should properly, as king, have offered a sin-offering and a burnt-offering in the national sanctuary at Gibeon, and there have sought the divine favour for himself and for the whole people. But the Lord said unto him by the prophet Gad, that he should bring his offering neither in Gibeon, nor before the ark on Zion, but in the threshing-floor of Ornan (Araunah), on the altar which he was there to erect. This command, however, did not settle the place where he was afterwards to sacrifice. But David—so it runs, v. 29*f*.—sacrificed

thenceforward in the threshing-floor of Ornan, not at Gibeon in the still existent national sanctuary, because he (according to v. 30) “could not go before it (לִפְנֵי) to seek God, for he was terrified before the sword of the angel of Jahve.” This statement does not, however, mean, *ex terrore visionis angelicae infirmitatem corporis contraxerat* (J. H. Mich.), nor yet, “because he, being struck and overwhelmed by the appearance of the angel, did not venture to offer sacrifices elsewhere” (Berth.), nor, “because the journey to Gibeon was too long for him” (O. v. Gerl.). None of these interpretations suit either the words or the context. נִבְעַת מִפָּנָי הַחֶרֶב, terrified before the sword, does indeed signify that the sword of the angel, or the angel with the sword, hindered him from going to Gibeon, but not during the pestilence, when the angel stood between heaven and earth by the threshing-floor of Araunah with the drawn sword, but—according to the context—afterwards, when the angelophany had ceased, as it doubtless did simultaneously with the pestilence. The words כִּי נִבְעַת וגו' can therefore have no other meaning, than that David's terror before the sword of the angel caused him to determine to sacrifice thereafter, not at Gibeon, but at the threshing-floor of Araunah; or that, since during the pestilence the angel's sword had prevented him from going to Gibeon, he did not venture ever afterwards to go. But the fear before the sword of the angel is in substance the terror of the pestilence; and the pestilence had hindered him from sacrificing at Gibeon, because Gibeon, notwithstanding the presence of the sanctuary there, with the Mosaic altar, had not been spared by the pestilence. David considered this circumstance as normative ever for the future, and he always afterwards offered his sacrifices in the place pointed out to him, and said, as we further read in 1 Chronicles 22:1, “Here (זֶה הוּא, properly this, mas. or neut.) is the house of Jahve God, and here is the altar for the burnt-offering of Israel.” He calls the site of the altar in the threshing-floor of Araunah

בְּיַת יְהוָה, because there Jahve had manifested to him His gracious presence; cf. Gen. 28:17.

1 Chronicles 22

Ch. 22:2–19.—David's Preparations for the Building of the Temple.

1 Chronicles 22. With this chapter commences the second section of the history of David's kingship, viz., the account of the preparations, dispositions, and arrangements which he made in the last years of his reign for the establishment of his kingdom in the future under his successors (see above, p. 482ff.). All these preparations and dispositions had reference to the firm establishment of the public worship of the Lord, in which Israel, as the people and congregation of Jahve, might show its faithfulness to the covenant, so as to become partakers of the divine protection, and the blessing which was promised. To build the temple—this desire the Lord had not indeed granted the fulfilment of to David, but He had given him the promise that his son should carry out that work. The grey-haired king accordingly made preparations, after the site of the house of God which should be built had been pointed out to him, such as would facilitate the execution of the work by his successor. Of these preparations our chapter treats, and in it we have an account how David provided the necessary labour and materials for the building of the temple (vv. 2–5), committed the execution of the work in a solemn way to his son Solomon (vv. 6–16), and called upon the chiefs of the people to give him their support in the work (vv. 17–19).

1 Chronicles 22:2–5. Workmen and materials for the building of the temple.—V. 2. In order to procure the necessary workmen, David commanded that the strangers in the land of Israel should be gathered together, and, as we learn from 2 Chronicles 2:16, also numbered. הַגֵּרִים, the strangers, are the descendants of the Canaanites whom the Israelites had not destroyed when they took possession of the land, but had reduced to bondage (2 Chronicles

8:7-9; 1 Kings 9:20-22). This number was so considerable, that Solomon was able to employ 150,000 of them as labourers and stone-cutters (1 Kings 5:29; 2 Chronicles 2:16f.). These strangers David appointed to be stone-cutters, to hew squared stones, אֲבָנֵי גֹזֵית (see on 1 Kings 5:31).

1 Chronicles 22:3. Iron and brass he prepared in abundance: the iron for the nails of the doors, i.e., for the folding-doors of the gates, i.e., partly for the pivots (*Zapfen*) on which the folding-doors turned, partly to strengthen the boards of which doors were made; as also for the קַח־בְּרוֹת, literally, things to connect, i.e., properly iron cramps.

1 Chronicles 22:4. The Tyrians sent him cedar trees or beams in abundance, probably in exchange for grain, wine, and fruit of various sorts, which the Phoenicians obtained from the Israelites; cf. Movers, *Phönizier*, iii. 1, S. 88ff. Sidonians and Tyrians are named to denote the Phoenicians generally, as in Ezra 3:7. When Solomon began to build the temple, he made a regular treaty with Hiram king of Tyre about the delivery of the necessary cedar wood, 1 Kings 5:15ff.

1 Chronicles 22:5. V. 5 gives in substance the reason of what precedes, although it is connected with it only by ו consec. Because his son Solomon was still in tender youth, and the building to be executed was an exceedingly great work, David determined to make considerable preparation before his death. נֶעַר נֶרְדִּי, *puer et tener*, repeated in 29:1, indicates a very early age. Solomon could not then be quite twenty years old, as he was born only after the Syro-Ammonite war (see on 2 Sam. 12:24), and calls himself at the commencement of his reign still נֶעַר קָטָן (1 Kings 3:7). The word נֶעַר may of itself denote not merely a boy, but also a grown youth; but here it is limited to the boyish age by the addition of נֶרְדִּי. Berth. wrongly compares Ex. 33:11, where נֶעַר denotes not a boy, but a lad, i.e., a servant. In the succeeding clause לְבָנוֹת

is to be taken relatively: and the house which is to be built to the Lord is to be made great exceedingly (לְמַעַלָּה, see on 14:2), for a name and glory for all lands, i.e., that it might be to the Lord for whom it should be built for an honour and glory in all lands. אֲכַיִנָּה נָא לוֹ, I will (= therefore will I) prepare for him (Solomon), *scil.* whatever I can prepare to forward this great work.

1 Chronicles 22:6-16. *Solomon commissioned to build the temple.*—V. 6. Before his death (v. 5) David called his son Solomon, in order to commit to him the building of the temple, and to press it strongly upon him, vv. 7-10. With this design, he informs him that it had been his intention to build a temple to the Lord, but the Lord had not permitted him to carry out this resolve, but had committed it to his son. The Keri בְּנִי (v. 7) is, notwithstanding the general worthlessness of the corrections in the Keri, probably to be preferred here to the Keth. בְּנוֹ, for בְּנוֹ might have easily arisen by the copyist's eye having wandered to לְשָׁלְמָה בְּנוֹ, v. 6. David's addressing him as בְּנִי is very fitting, nay, even necessary, and not contrary to the following אֲנִי לְבָבִי, it was with my heart, i.e., I had intended, occurs indeed very often in the Chronicle, e.g., 28:2, 2 Chronicles 1:11; 6:7f., 9:1; 24:4; 29:10, but is also found in other books where the sense demands it, e.g., Josh. 14:7, 1 Kings 8:17f., 10:2. In וַיְהִי עָלַי, There came to me the word of Jahve (v. 8), it is implied that the divine word was given to him as a command. The reason which David gives why the Lord did not allow him to build the temple is not stated in 1 Chronicles 17 (2 Sam. 7), to which David here refers; instead of the reason, only the promise is there communicated, that the Lord would first build him a house, and enduringly establish his throne. This promise does not exclude the reason stated here and in 1 Chronicles 28:3, but rather implies it. As the temple was only to be built when God had enduringly established the throne of David,

David could not execute this work, for he still had to conduct wars—wars, too, of the Lord—for the establishment of his kingdom, as Solomon also states it in his embassy to Hiram. Wars and bloodshed, however, are unavoidable and necessary in this earth for the establishment of the kingdom of God in opposition to its enemies, but are not consonant with its nature, as it was to receive a visible embodiment and expression in the temple. For the kingdom of God is in its essence a kingdom of peace; and battle, or war, or struggle, are only means for the restoration of peace, the reconciliation of mankind with God after the conquest of sin and all that is hostile to God in this world. See on 2 Sam. 7:11. David, therefore, the man of war, is not to build the temple, but (v. 9f.) his son; and to him the Lord will give peace from all his enemies, so that he shall be *איש מנוחה*, a man of rest, and shall rightly bear the name Shelomo (Solomon), i.e., Friederich (rich in peace, Eng. Frederick), for God would give to Israel in his days, i.e., in his reign, peace and rest (*שקט*). The participle *נוֹלֵד* after *הַיָּה* has the signification of the future, shall be born; cf. 1 Kings 13:2. *איש מנוחה*, not a man who procures peace (Jer. 51:59), but one who enjoys peace, as the following *וַהֲנִיחוּתִי לוֹ* shows. As to the name *שְׁלֹמֹה*, see on 2 Sam. 12:24. Into v. 10 David compresses the promise contained in 1 Chronicles 17:12 and 13.

1 Chronicles 22:11. After David had so committed to his son Solomon the building of the temple, as task reserved and destined for him by the divine counsel, he wishes him, in v. 11, the help of the Lord to carry out the work. *וַהֲצַלַחְתָּ*, *ut prospere agas et felici successu utaris* (J. M. Mich.), cf. Josh. 1:8. *עַל דְּבַר עַל* of a command from on high; cf. *עָלַי*, v. 8. Above all, however, he wishes (v. 12) him right understanding and insight from God (*שָׂכַל וּבִינָה*), so connected in 2 Chronicles 2:11 also), and that God may establish him over Israel, i.e., furnish him with might and wisdom to rule over the people

Israel; cf. 2 Sam. 7:11. *וְלִשְׁמֹר*, “to observe” = and mayest thou observe the law of Jahve; not thou must keep (Berth.), for *וְלִשְׁמֹר* is to be regarded as a continuation of the *verb. finit.*; cf. Ew. § 351, c, S. 840.

1 Chronicles 22:13. The condition of obtaining the result is the faithful observing of the commands of the Lord. The speech is filled with reminiscences of the law, cf. Deut. 7:11; 11:32; and for the exhortation to be strong and of good courage, cf. Deut. 31:6, Josh. 1:7, 9, etc.

1 Chronicles 22:14–16. In conclusion (vv. 14–16), David mentions what materials he has prepared for the building of the temple. *בְּעֵנָי*, not, in my poverty (LXX, Vulg., Luth.), but, by my painful labour (*magna molestia et labore*, Lavat.); cf. Gen. 31:42, and the corresponding *בְּכֶל-כוֹחִי*, 1 Chronicles 29:2. Gold 100,000 talents, and silver 1,000,000 talents. As the talent was 3000 shekels, and the silver shekel coined by the Maccabees, according to the Mosaic weight, was worth about 2s. 6d., the talent of silver would be about £375, and 1,000,000 talents £375,000,000. If we suppose the relative value of the gold and silver to be as 10 to 1, 100,000 talents of gold will be about the same amount, or even more, viz., about £450,000,000, i.e., if we take the gold shekel at thirty shillings, according to Thenius’ calculation. Such sums as eight hundred or eight hundred and twenty-five millions of pounds are incredible. The statements, indeed, are not founded upon exact calculation or weighing, but, as the round numbers show, only upon a general valuation of those masses of the precious metals, which we must not think of as bars of silver and gold, or as coined money; for they were in great part vessels of gold and silver, partly booty captured in war, partly tribute derived from the subject peoples. Making all these allowances, however, the sums mentioned are incredibly great, since we must suppose that even a valuation in round numbers will have more or less correspondence to the actual weight, and a subtraction of some thousands of talents from

the sums mentioned would make no very considerable diminution. On the other hand, it is a much more important circumstance that the above estimate of the value in our money of these talents of silver rests upon a presumption, the correctness of which is open to well-founded doubts. For in that calculation the weight of the Mosaic or holy shekel is taken as the standard, and it is presumed that the talents weighed 3000 Mosaic shekels. But we find in 2 Sam. 14:26 mention made in David's time of another shekel, "according to the king's weight," whence we may with certainty conclude that in common life another shekel than the Mosaic or holy shekel was in use. This shekel according to the king's weight was in all probability only half as heavy as the shekel of the sanctuary, i.e., was equal in weight to a Mosaic beka or half-shekel. This is proved by a comparison of 1 Kings 10:17 with 2 Chronicles 9:16, for here three golden minae are reckoned equal to 300 shekels,—a mina containing 100 shekels, while it contained only 50 holy or Mosaic shekels. With this view, too, the statements of the Rabbins agree, e.g., R. Mosis Maimonidis *constitutiones de Siclis, quas—illustravit Joa. Esgers.*, Lugd. Bat. 1718, p. 19, according to which the שקל שלחול or שקל המדינה, i.e., the common or civil shekel, is the half of the שקל הקדש. That this is the true relation, is confirmed by the fact that, according to Ex. 38:26, in the time of Moses there existed silver coins weighing ten gera (half a holy shekel) called beka, while the name beka is found only in the Pentateuch, and disappears at a later time, probably because it was mainly such silver coins of ten gera which were in circulation, and to them the name shekel, which denotes no definite weight, was transferred. Now, if the amounts stated in our verse are reckoned in such common shekels (as in 2 Chronicles 9:16), the mass of gold and silver collected by David for the building of the temple would only be worth half the amount above calculated, i.e., about £375,000,000 or £400,000,000. But even this sum seems enormously large, for it is five times the annual

expenditure of the greatest European states in our day.³⁰

Yet the calculation of the income or expenditure of modern states is no proper standard for judging of the correctness of probability of the statements here made, for we cannot estimate the accumulation of gold and silver in the states and chief cities of Asia in antiquity by the budgets of the modern European nations. In the capitals of the Asiatic kingdoms of antiquity, enormous quantities of the precious metals were accumulated. Not to mention the accounts of Ktesias, Diodor. Sic., and others, which sound so fabulous to us now, as to the immense booty in gold and silver vessels which was accumulated in Nineveh and Babylon (see the table in Movers, *die Phönizier*, ii. 3, S. 40ff.), according to Varro, in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxii. 15, Cyrus obtained by the conquest of Asia a booty of 34,000 pounds of gold, besides that which was wrought into vessels and ornaments, and 500,000 talents of silver; and in this statement, as Movers rightly remarks, it does not seem probable that there is any exaggeration. In Susa, Alexander plundered the royal treasury of 40,000, according to other accounts 50,000 talents, or, as it is more accurately stated, 40,000 talents of uncoined gold and silver, and 9000 talents in coined darics. These he caused to be brought to Ecbatana, where he accumulated in all 180,000 talents. In Persepolis he captured a booty of 120,000 talents, and in Pasargada 6000 talents (see *Mov. loc cit.* S. 43). Now David, it is true, had not conquered Asia, but only the tribes and kingdoms bordering on Canaan, including the kingdom of Syria, and made them tributary, and had consecrated all the gold and silver taken as booty from the conquered peoples, from the Syrians, Moabites, Ammonites, Philistines, Amalekites, and Hadadezer the king of Zobah (2 Sam. 8:11f.), to Jahve. Now, in consequence of the ancient connection between Syria and the rich commercial countries of the neighbourhood, great treasures of silver and gold had very early flowed in thither. According to 2 Sam. 8:7, the servants (i.e., generals) of King Hadadezer had golden shields, which

David captured; and the ambassadors of King Toi of Hamath brought him vessels of silver, gold, and copper, to purchase his friendship.³¹ The other peoples whom David overcame are not to be regarded as poor in the precious metals. For the Israelites under Moses had captured so large a booty in gold rings, bracelets, and other ornaments from the nomadic Midianites, that the commanders of the army alone were able to give 16,750 shekels (i.e., over 5 1/2 talents of gold, according to the Mosaic weight) to the sanctuary as a consecrating offering (Num. 31:48ff.).

We cannot therefore regard the sums mentioned in our verse either as incredible or very much exaggerated,³² nor hold the round sums which correspond to the rhetorical character of the passage with certainty to be mistakes.³³ Brass and iron were not weighed for abundance; cf. v. 3. Beams of timber also, and stones—that is, stones hewed and squared—David had prepared; and to this store Solomon was to add. That he did so is narrated in 2 Chronicles 2.

1 Chronicles 22:15. David then turns to the workmen, the carpenters and stone-cutters, whom he had appointed (v. 2) for the building. חֲצֹבִים, properly hewers, in v. 2 limited to stone-hewers, is here, with the addition אֲבָנֵי וְעֵץ, used of the workers in stone and wood, stonemasons and carpenters. כָּל-הַקָּמָה ב', all manner of understanding persons in each work, in contradistinction to עֹשֵׂי מְלָאכָה, includes the idea of thorough mastery and skill in the kind of labour. These workmen, whom David had levied for the building of the temple, are mentioned by Solomon, 2 Chronicles 2:6f.—In v. 16 all the metals, as being the main thing, are again grouped together, in order that the exhortation to proceed with the erection of the building may be introduced. The ה' before each word serves to bring the thing once more into prominence; cf. Ew. § 310, a. "As for the gold, it cannot be numbered." "Arise and be doing! and Jahve be with thee" (vv. 17–19).

1 Chronicles 22:17–19. Exhortation to the princes of Israel to assist in the building of the temple.—David supports his exhortation by calling to remembrance the proofs of his favour which the Lord had showed His people. The speech in v. 18 is introduced without לְאָמַר, because it is clear from the preceding וַיִּצַו דָּוִד that the words are spoken by David: "The Lord has given you peace round about; for He has given the inhabitants of the land into my hands, and the land is subdued before Jahve and before His people." The subdued land is Canaan: the inhabitants of the land are, however, not the Israelites over whom the Lord had set David as king, for the words נָתַן בְּיָדִי cannot apply to them, cf. 14:10f., Josh. 2:24; it is the Canaanites still left in the land in the time of David, and other enemies, who, like the Philistines, possessed parts of the land, and had been subdued by David. On נִכְבְּשָׁה הָאָרֶץ, cf. Josh. 18:1, Num. 32:22, 29. This safety which the Lord had granted them binds them in duty to seek Him with all their heart, and to build the sanctuary, that the ark and the sacred vessels may be brought into it. The ה' in לְבֵית ה' is not a sign of the accusative (Berth.), for הַבַּיִת is not construed with *accus. loci*, but generally with אֶל, for which, however, so early as Josh. 4:5, ה' is used, or it is construed with the *acc.* and ה *locale*—הַבְּיָתָה, Gen. 19:10; 43:47.

1 Chronicles 23

Ch. 23–26.—Enumeration and Arrangement of the Levites according to Their Divisions and Employments.

1 Chronicles 23–26. These four chapters give a connected view of the condition of the Levites towards the end, i.e., in the fortieth year, of David's reign (cf. 23:1 and 26:31), and of the sections into which they were divided according to their various services. This review begins with a statement of the total number belonging to the tribe of Levi according to the census then undertaken, and their divisions

according to the duties devolving upon (1 Chronicles 23:2–5); which is followed by an enumeration of the heads of the fathers'-houses into which the four families of Levites had branched out (1 Chronicles 23:6–23), together with a short review of their duties (1 Chronicles 23:24–32). Thereafter we have: 1. In 1 Chronicles 24, a catalogue of the Aaronites, i.e., of the priests, who were divided into twenty-four classes, corresponding to the sons of Eleazar and Ithamar, and were appointed to perform the service in succession, according as it was determined by lot, special mention being made of the heads of these twenty-four classes; and a catalogue of the heads of the fathers'-houses of the other descendants of Levi, in an order of succession, which was likewise settled by lot (1 Chronicles 24:20–31). Then, 2. In 1 Chronicles 25 we have a catalogue of the twenty-four orders of Levitic musicians, in an order fixed by lot. And, 3. In 1 Chronicles 26 the classes of doorkeepers (vv. 1–19), the administrators of the treasures of the sanctuary (vv. 20–28), and the officials who performed the external services (vv. 29–32).

1 Chronicles 23. *Number, duties, and fathers'-houses of the Levites.*—This clear account of the state and the order of service of the tribe of Levi is introduced by the words, v. 1, "David was old, and life weary; then he made his son Solomon king over Israel." זָקֵן, generally an adjective, is here *third pers. perf.* of the verb, as in Gen. 18:12, as שָׁבַע also is, to which יָמִים is subordinated in the accusative. Generally elsewhere שָׁבַע יָמִים is used, cf. Gen. 35:29, Job 42:17, and also שָׁבַע alone, with the same signification, Gen. 25:8. These words are indeed, as Berth. correctly remarks, not a mere passing remark which is taken up again at a later stage, say 1 Chronicles 29:28, but an independent statement complete in itself, with which here the enumeration of the arrangements which David made in the last period of his life begins. But notwithstanding that, it serves here only as an introduction to the arrangements which follow, and is not to be

taken to mean that David undertook the numbering of the Levites and the arrangement of their service only after he had given over the government to his son Solomon, but signified that the arrangement of this matter immediately preceded Solomon's elevation to the throne, or was contemporaneous with it. Our verse therefore does not contain, in its few words, a "summary of the contents of the narrative 1 Kings 1," as Berth. thinks, for in 1 Kings 1 we have an account of the actual anointing of Solomon and his accession to the throne in consequence of Adonijah's attempt to usurp it. By that indeed Solomon certainly was made king; but the chronicler, in accordance with the plan of his book, has withdrawn his attention from this event, connected as it was with David's domestic relations, and has used הִמְלִיךָ in its more general signification, to denote not merely the actual elevation to the throne, but also his nomination as king. Here the nomination of Solomon to be king, which preceded the anointing narrated in 1 Kings 1, that taking place at a time when David had already become bed-ridden through old age, is spoken of. This was the first step towards the transfer of the kingdom to Solomon; and David's ordering of the Levitical service, and of the other branches of public administration, so as to give over a well-ordered kingdom to his successor, were also steps in the same process. Of the various branches of the public administration, our historian notices in detail on the Levites and their service, compressing everything else into the account of the army arrangements and the chief public officials, 1 Chronicles 27.

1 Chronicles 23:2–5. *Numbering of the Levites, and partition of their duties.*—V. 2. For this purpose David collected "all the princes of Israel, and the priests and Levites." The princes of Israel, because the numbering of the Levites and the determination of their duties was a matter of national importance. "The meaning is, that David, in a solemn assembly of the princes, i.e., of the representatives of the lay tribes, and of the priests and Levites, fixed the

arrangements of which an account is to be given" (Berth.).

1 Chronicles 23:3. The Levites were numbered from thirty years old and upwards. This statement agrees with that in Num. 4:3, 23, 30, 39ff., where Moses caused those from thirty to fifty years of age to be numbered, and appointed them for service about the tabernacle during the journey through the wilderness. But Moses himself, at a later time, determined that their period of service should be from twenty-five to fifty; Num. 8:23–26. It is consequently not probable that David confined the numbering to those of thirty and upwards. But besides that, we have a distinct statement in v. 24 that they were numbered from twenty years of age, the change being grounded by David upon the nature of their service; and that this was the proper age is confirmed by 2 Chronicles 31:17 and Ezra 3:8, according to which the Levites under Hezekiah, and afterwards, had to take part in the service from their twentieth year. We must therefore regard שְׁלֵשִׁים in v. 3 as having crept into the text through the error of copyists, who were thinking of the Mosaic census in Num. 4, and must read עֶשְׂרִים instead of it. The various attempts of commentators to get rid of the discrepancy between v. 3 and v. 24 are mere makeshifts; and the hypothesis that David took two censuses is as little supported by the text, as that other, that our chapter contains divergent accounts drawn from two different sources; see on v. 24. The number amounted to 38,000, according to their heads in men. לְגַבְרִים serves for a nearer definition of לְגִלְגֻלְתָּם, and explains that only men were numbered, women not being included.

1 Chronicles 23:4, 5. Vv. 4 and 5 contain words of David, as we learn from אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי (v. 5, end), so that we must supply וַיֹּאמֶר before v. 4. מֵאַלֶּה, of these (38,000) 24,000 shall be לְנִצָּח וְגו', to superintend the business, i.e., to conduct and carry on the business (the work) of the house of Jahve. This business is in

vv. 28–32 more nearly defined, and embraces all the business that was to be carried on about the sanctuary, except the specifically priestly functions, the keeping of the doors, and the performance of the sacred music. For these two latter offices special sections were appointed, 4000 for the porters' services, and the same number for the sacred music (v. 5). Besides these, 5000 men were appointed Shoterim and judges. "The instruments which I have made to sing praise" are the stringed instruments which David had introduced into the service to accompany the singing of the psalms; cf. 2 Chronicles 29:26, Neh. 12:36.

1 Chronicles 23:6–23. *The fathers'-houses of the Levites.*—V. 6. "And David divided them into courses according to the sons of Levi, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari;" see on 5:27. The form וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם which recurs in 24:3 with the same pointing, is in more accurate MSS in that place pointed וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם. There are also found in MSS and editions וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם, and the rare form of the Kal וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם (for וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם); cf. J. H. Mich. *Notae crit.* This last pronunciation is attested for, 24:3, by D. Kimchi, who expressly remarks that the regular form וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם corresponds to it; cf. Norzi on this passage. Gesen. (in *Thes.* p. 483) and Ew. (§ 83, c) regard וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם as a variety of the Piel (וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם), to which, however, Berth. rightly remarks that it would be worth a thought only if the punctuation וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם were confirmed by good MSS, which is not the case, though we find the Piel in the Chronicle in 15:3, and then with the signification to distribute. Berth. therefore holds—and certainly this is the more correct opinion—that the form וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם, attested by Kimchi for 24:3, was the original reading in our verse also, and considers it a rare form of the impf. Kal derived from וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם (cf. 24:4, 5), by Kamets coming into the pretonic syllable, after the analogy of וַיִּשְׁחָטוּם for וַיִּשְׁחָטוּם, 2 Kings 10:14, and by the passing of an *ā* (Pathach) into *ē* (Seghol) before the Kamets, according to well-known euphonic rules. מַחֲלֻקוֹת is a second

accusative: "in divisions." The tribe of Levi had been divided from ancient times into the three great families of Gershonites, Kohathites, and Merarites, corresponding to the three sons of Levi; cf. 5:27–6:15, 28:32.—From v. 7 onwards we have an enumeration of the fathers'-houses into which these three families were divided: vv. 7–11, the fathers'-houses of the Gershonites; vv. 12–20, those of the Kohathites; and vv. 21–23, those of the Merarites. Berth., on the other hand, thinks that in these verses only the fathers'-houses of those Levites who performed the service of the house of Jahve, i.e., the 24,000 in v. 4, and not the divisions of all the Levites, are enumerated. But this opinion is incorrect, and certainly is not proved to be true by the circumstance that the singers, porters, and the scribes and judges, are only spoken of afterwards; nor by the remark that, in great part, the names here enumerated appear again in the sections 1 Chronicles 24:20–31 and 26:20–28, while in the enumeration of the twenty-four classes of musicians (1 Chronicles 25:1–31), of the doorkeepers (1 Chronicles 26:1–19), and of the scribes and judges (1 Chronicles 26:29–32), quite other names are met with. The recurrence of many of the names here enumerated in the sections 1 Chronicles 24:20–31 and 26:20–28 is easily explained by the fact that these sections treat of the divisions of the Levites, according to the service they performed, and of course many heads of fathers'-houses must again be named. The occurrence of quite other names in the lists of musicians and doorkeepers, again, is simply the result of the fact that only single branches of fathers'-houses, not whole fathers'-houses, were appointed musicians and doorkeepers. Finally, Bertheau's statement, that in the catalogue of the scribes and judges quite other names occur than those in our verses, is based upon an oversight; cf. 26:31 with 23:19.

1 Chronicles 23:7–11. *The fathers'-houses of the Gershonites.*—According to the natural development of the people of Israel, the twelve sons of Jacob founded the twelve tribes of Israel; his grandsons, or the sons of the twelve

patriarchs, founded the families (מִשְׁפָּחוֹת); and their sons, i.e., the great-grandsons of Jacob, founded the fathers'-houses (בְּיַתְאָבוֹת). But this natural division or ramification of the people into tribes, families, and fathers'-houses (groups of related households), was not consistently carried out. Even the formation of the tribes suffered a modification, when the two sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, who were born before Jacob's arrival in Egypt, were adopted by him as his sons, and so made founders of tribes (Gen. 48:5). The formation of the families and fathers'-houses was also interfered with, partly by the descendants of many grandsons or great-grandsons of Jacob not being numerous enough to form independent families and fathers'-houses, and partly by individual fathers'-houses (or groups of related households) having so much decreased that they could no longer form independent groups, and so were attached to other fathers'-houses, or by families which had originally formed a בְּיַתְאָב becoming so numerous as to be divided into several fathers'-houses. In the tribe of Levi there came into operation this special cause, that Aaron and his sons were chosen to be priests, and so his family was raised above the other Levites. From these causes, in the use of the words מִשְׁפָּחָה and בְּיַתְאָב many fluctuations occur; cf. my *bibl.*

Archäol. ii. § 140. Among the Levites, the fathers'-houses were founded not by the grandsons, but by the great-grandsons of the patriarch.

1 Chronicles 23:7. "Of the Gershonites, Laadan and Shimei," i.e., these were heads of groups of related families, since, according to v. 9, their sons and descendants formed six fathers'-houses. The sons of Gershon, from whom all branches of the family of Gershon come, are called in 6:2, as in Ex. 6:17 and Num. 13:18, Libni and Shimei; while in our verse, on the contrary, we find only the second name Shimei, whose sons are enumerated in vv. 10, 11; and instead of Libni we have the name Laadan, which recurs in 26:21. Laadan seemingly

cannot be regarded as a surname of Libni; for not only are the sons of Shimei named along with the sons of Laadan in vv. 8 and 9 as heads of the fathers'-houses of Laadan, without any hint being given of the genealogical connection of this Shimei with Laadan, but mainly because of לְגֵרְשֹׁנִי in v. 7. In the case of Kohath and Merari, the enumeration of the fathers'-houses descended from them is introduced by the mention of their sons, בני קהת and בני מררי (vv. 12, 21), while in the case of Gershon it is not so;—in his case, instead of בני גרשון, we find the Gentilic designation גֵרְשֹׁנִי, to point out that Laadan and Shimei are not named as being sons of Gershon, but as founders of the two chief lines of Gershonites, of which only the second was named after Gershon's son Shimei, while the second derived their name from Laadan, whose family was divided in David's time into two branches, the sons of Laadan and the sons of Shimei, the latter a descendant of Libni, not elsewhere mentioned. That the Shimei of v. 9 is not the same person as Shimei the son of Gershon mentioned in v. 7, is manifest from the fact that the sons of the latter are enumerated only in v. 10. Each of these two lines numbered at that time three fathers'-houses, the heads of which are named in vv. 8 and 9. הָרֵאשִׁי in v. 8 belongs to יְהִיאֵל: "the sons of Laadan were: the head (also the first; cf. vv. 11, 16) Jehiel, Zetham, and Joel, three."

1 Chronicles 23:9. The sons of Shimei: Shelomoth or Shelomith (both forms are found in 26:35 of another Shelomith), Haziël, and Haran, three. These (three and three) are the heads of the fathers'-houses of Laadan.—In vv. 10 and 11 there follow the fathers'-houses of the Shimei mentioned in v. 7 along with Laadan: they are likewise three, derived from the four sons of Shimei, Jahath, Zina, Jeush, and Beriah; for the last two, as they had not many sons, were included in one father's-house, one פְּקֻדָּה, i.e., one official class (1 Chronicles 24:3; 2 Chronicles 17:14). The Gershonites at that time,

therefore, numbered nine father's-houses—six named after Laadan, and three after Shimei.

1 Chronicles 23:12–20. *The fathers'-houses of the Kohathites.*—The four sons of Kohath who are named in v. 12, as in 5:28; 6:3, and Ex. 6:18, founded the four families of Kohath, Num. 3:27. From Amram came Aaron and Moses; see on Ex. 6:20. Of these, Aaron with his sons was set apart "to sanctify him to be a most holy one; he and his sons for ever to offer incense before Jahve, to serve Him, and to bless in His name for ever." לְהַקְדִּישׁוּ קֹדֶשׁ ק' signifies neither, *ut ministraret in sancto sanctorum* (Vulg., Syr.), nor, *ut res sanctissimas, sacrificia, vasa sacra etc. consecrarent* (Cler.). Against this interpretation we adduce not only the objection advanced by Hgstb. *Christol.* iii. p. 119, trans., that the office assigned by it to the Levites is far too subordinate to be mentioned here in the first place, but also the circumstance that the suffix in הַקְדִּישׁוּ, after the analogy of שָׂרְתוּ, must denote the object of the sanctifying; and this view is confirmed by the subject, who offers incense and blesses, not being expressed with לְהַקְטִיר and לְבָרֵךְ. The Vulgate translation cannot be accepted, for קֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים cannot be the ablative, and the most holy place in the temple is always called הַקְדִּישִׁים with the article.

קֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים, without the article, is only used of the most holy things, e.g., of the vessels connected with the worship, the sacrificial gifts, and other things which no lay person might touch or appropriate. See on Ex. 30:10, Lev. 2:3, and Dan. 9:24. Here it is committed to Aaron, who, by being chosen for the priest's service and anointed to the office, was made a most holy person, to discharge along with his sons all the priestly functions in the sanctuary. Specimens of such functions are then adduced: הַקְטִיר לְפָנַי יי, the offering of the sacrifice of incense upon the altar of the inner sanctuary, as in 2 Chronicles 2:3, 5, Ex. 30:7f.; לְשָׂרְתוֹ, "to serve Him," Jahve,—a general expression, including all the other services in the sanctuary, which were reserved for the priests; and לְבָרֵךְ בְּשֵׁמוֹ, to

bless in His name, i.e., to pronounce the blessing in the name of the Lord over the people, according to the command in Num. 6:23, cf. 16:2, Deut. 21:5; not “to bless His name” (Ges., Berth.). To call upon or praise the name of God is *בָּרַךְ שְׁמוֹ*, Ps. 96:2; 100:4; and the assertion that *בָּרַךְ בְּשֵׁם* is a somewhat later phrase formed on the model of *קָרָא בְּשֵׁם*, for “to call upon God” (Ges. in *Lex. sub voce* *ברך*), is quite groundless. Our phrase occurs as early as in Deut. 10:8 and 21:5; and the latter passage in connection with *לְשֵׁרְתוֹ* of the priests; in the former, of the tribe of Levi, but so used that it can refer only to the priests, not to the Levites also.

1 Chronicles 23:14. “But as to Moses the man of God” (cf. Deut. 33:1), “his sons were called after the tribe of Levi,” i.e., were reckoned in the ranks of the Levites, not of the priests. On *נִקְרָא* *עַל*, cf. Gen. 48:6, Ezra 2:61, Neh. 7:63.

1 Chronicles 23:15–17. Each of his two sons Gershon and Eliezer (see Ex. 2:22 and 18:3f.) founded a father’s-house; Gershon through his son Shebuel (*שְׁבוּאֵל*, in 24:20 *שְׁבוּאֵל*), Eliezer through Rehabiah. The plurals *בְּנֵי א’*, *בְּנֵי ג’* are used, although in both cases only one son, he who was head (*הָרֵאשִׁית*) of the father’s-house, is mentioned, either because they had other sons, or those named had in their turn sons, who together formed a father’s-house. From the remark in v. 17, that Eliezer had no other sons than Rehabiah, while Rehabiah had very many, we may conclude that Gershon had other sons besides Shebuel, who are not mentioned because their descendants were numbered with Shebuel’s father’s-house.

1 Chronicles 23:18. Only one son of Jizhar, the brother of Amram, is mentioned, Shelomith as head, after whom the Jizharite father’s-house is named.

1 Chronicles 23:19. Amram’s next brother Hebron had four sons, and the youngest brother Uzziel two, who founded fathers’-houses; so that, besides the priests, nine

Levitical fathers’-houses are descended from Kohath, and their chiefs who served in the sanctuary are enumerated in 1 Chronicles 24:20–25.

1 Chronicles 23:21–23. *The fathers’-houses of the Merarites.*—V. 21f. As in 6:4, Ex. 6:19, and Num. 3:33, two sons of Merari are mentioned—Mahli and Mushi—who founded the two families of Merari which existed in the time of Moses. Mahli had two sons, Eleazar and Kish; the first of whom, however, left behind him at his death only daughters, who were married to the sons of Kish (*אֶחָיִהֶם*, i.e., their cousins), according to the law as to daughters who were heiresses (Num. 26:6–9). The descendants of Mahli, therefore, were comprehended in the one father’s-house of Kish, whose head at that time (1 Chronicles 24:29) was Jerahmeel.

1 Chronicles 23:23. Of the sons of Mushi, three founded fathers’-houses, so that the Merarites formed only four fathers’-houses in all. If we compare the enumeration of the Merarites in 1 Chronicles 24:26–30, we find there in v. 30 Eleazar and Kish called sons of Mahli, with the remark that Eleazar had no sons. In v. 26, however, of the same passage we read, “sons of Merari (were) Mahli and Mushi, sons of Jaaziah his son;” and v. 27, “sons of Merari by Jaaziah his son; and Shoham, and Zaccur, and Ibri.” From this Bertheau concludes that Merari had really three sons, and that the name of the third has been dropped out of 1 Chronicles 23; but in this he is incorrect, for vv. 26 and 27 of the 24th chapter are at once, from their whole character, recognisable as arbitrary interpolations. Not only is it strange that *בְּנֵי יַעֲזִיָּהוּ בְּנֵי* should follow the before-mentioned sons of Merari in this unconnected way (*Vav* being omitted before *בְּנֵי*), but the form of the expression also is peculiar. If *יַעֲזִיָּהוּ* be a third son of Merari, or the founder of a third family of Merarites, coordinate with the families of Mahli and Mushi, as we must conclude from the additional word *בְּנֵי*, we should expect, after the preceding, simply the name with the conjunction, i.e.,

וַיַּעֲזִיָּהוּ. The בְּנֵי יַעֲזִיָּהוּ is all the more surprising that the names of the sons of Jaaziah follow in v. 27, and there the name of the first son שֶׁהָם is introduced by the *Vav* copulative. This misled the older commentators, so that they took בְּנוֹ for a proper name. The repetition of מְרָרִי, too, at the beginning of the second verse is strange, and without parallel in the preceding enumeration of the fathers'-houses founded by Amram's sons (1 Chronicles 24:20–25). We must, then, as the result of all this, since the Pentateuch knows only two descendants of Merari who founded families of fathers'-houses,³⁴ regard the additions in 24:26, 27 as later glosses, although we are not in a position to explain the origin or the meaning of the interpolation. This inability arises from the fact that, of the names Jaaziah, Shoham, Zaccur, and Ibri, only Zaccur again occurs among the Asaphites (1 Chronicles 25:2), and elsewhere of other persons, while the others are nowhere else to be met with. The three families of Levi numbered therefore 9 + 9 + 4 = 22 fathers'-houses, exclusive of the priests.

1 Chronicles 23:24–32. *Concluding remarks.*—V. 24. "These (the just enumerated) are the sons of Levi according to their fathers'-houses, according to those who were counted (Num. 1:21f.; Ex. 30:14) in the enumeration by name (Num. 1:18; 3:43), by the head, performing the work for the service of the house of Jahve, from the men of twenty years and upwards." עֲשֵׂה הַמְלָאכָה is not singular, but plural, as in 2 Chronicles 24:12; 34:10, 13, Ex. 3:9, Neh. 2:16, cf. 2 Chronicles 11:1. It occurs along with עָשָׂה, with a similar meaning and in a like position, 2 Chronicles 24:13; 34:17, Neh. 11:12; 13:10. It is only another way of writing עָשָׂה, and the same form is found here and there in other words; cf. Ew. § 16, *b*. The statement that the Levites were numbered from twenty years old and upwards is accounted for in v. 25 thus: David said, The Lord has given His people rest, and He dwells in Jerusalem; and the Levites also have no longer to bear the dwelling (tabernacle) with all its

vessels. From this, of course, it results that they had not any longer to do such heavy work as during the march through the wilderness, and so might enter upon their service even at the age of twenty. In v. 27 a still further reason is given: "For by the last words of David was this, (viz.) the numbering of the sons of Levi from twenty years old and upwards." There is a difference of opinion as to how בְּדִבְרֵי דָוִד are to be understood. Bertheau translates, with Kimchi, "in the later histories of David are the number = the numbered," and adduces in support of his translation 1 Chronicles 29:29, whence it is clear that by "the later histories of David" a part of a historical work is meant. But the passage quoted does not prove this. In the formula וְהָאֲחֵרִים דְּבָרֵי הָרִאשׁוֹנִים וְהָאֲחֵרִים ... (1 Chronicles 29:29; 2 Chronicles 9:29; 12:15; 16:11, etc.), which recurs at the end of each king's reign, דְּבָרֵי דָוִד denotes not *historiae*, in the sense of a history, but *res gestae*, which are recorded in the writings named. In accordance with this, therefore, דְּבָרֵי דָוִד cannot denote writings of David, but only words or things (= deeds); but the Levites who were numbered could not be in the acts of David. We must rather translate according to 2 Chronicles 29:30 and 2 Sam. 23:1. In the latter passage דְּבָרֵי דָוִד are the last words (utterances) of David, and in the former בְּדִבְרֵי דָוִד, "by the words of David," i.e., according to the commands or directions of David. In this way, Cler. and Mich., with the Vulg. *juxta praecepta*, have already correctly translated the words: "according to the last commands of David." הַמָּוָה is nowhere found in the signification *sunt* as the mere copula of the subject and verb, but is everywhere an independent predicate, and is here to be taken, according to later linguistic usage, as *neutr. sing.* (cf. Ew. § 318, *b*): "According to the last commands of David, this," i.e., this was done, viz., the numbering of the Levites from twenty years and upwards. From this statement, from twenty years and upwards, which is so often repeated, and for which the reasons are so

given, it cannot be doubtful that the statement in v. 3, “from thirty years and upwards,” is incorrect, and that, as has been already remarked on v. 3, שְׁלִשִּׁים has crept into the text by an error of the copyist, who was thinking of the Mosaic census.³⁵ In vv. 28–32 we have, in the enumeration of the duties which the Levites had to perform, another ground for the employment of those from twenty years old and upwards in actual service.

1 Chronicles 23:28. Their appointed place or post was at the hand of the sons of Aaron, i.e., they were ready to the priest’s hand, to aid him in carrying on the service of the house of God. “Over the courts and the cells (of the courts; cf. 9:26), and the purifying of every holy thing,” i.e., of the temple rooms and the temple vessels. On לְ before כָּל־קֹדֶשׁ, used for mediate connection after the *stat. const.*, cf. Ew. § 289, *b*. וּמַעֲשֵׂה עֲבֹדָה, and for the performance of the service of the house of God. Before מַעֲשֵׂה, עַל is to be supplied from the preceding. The individual services connected with the worship are specialized in vv. 29–31, and introduced by the preposition לְ. For the bread of the pile, i.e., the shew-bread (see on Lev. 24:8f.), viz., to prepare it; for the laying of the bread upon the table was the priest’s business. For fine meal (סֶלֶת, see on Lev. 2:1) for the meat-offering and unleavened cakes (רִקְיָקִי הַמְּצוֹת, see on Lev. 2:4), and for the pans, i.e., that which was baked in pans (see on Lev. 2:5), and for that which was roasted (מִרְבֶּכֶת, see on Lev. 6:14), and for all measures of capacity and measures of length which were kept by the Levites, because meal, oil, and wine were offered along with the sacrifices in certain fixed quantities (cf. e.g., Ex. 29:40; 30:24), and the Levites had probably to watch over the weights and measures in general (Lev. 19:35).

1 Chronicles 23:30. “On each morning and evening to praise the Lord with song and instruments.” These words refer to the duties of the singers and musicians, whose classes and orders are enumerated in 1 Chronicles 25. The

referring of them to the Levites who assisted the priests in the sacrificial worship (Berth.) needs no serious refutation, for הַזֹּדוֹת וְהַלֵּל is the standing phrase for the sacred temple music; and we can hardly believe that the Levites sang psalms or played on harps or lutes while the beasts for sacrifices were slaughtered and skinned, or the meat-offerings baked, or such duties performed.

1 Chronicles 23:31. “And for all the bringing of offerings to Jahve on sabbaths, the new moons, and the feasts, in the number according to the law concerning them (i.e., according to the regulations that existed for this matter), continually before Jahve.” It was the duty of the Levites to procure the necessary number of beasts for sacrifice, to see to their suitability, to slaughter and skin them, etc. תְּמִיד refers to עֹלוֹת, the burnt-offerings for Jahve, which are תְּמִיד, because they must always be offered anew on the appointed days.

1 Chronicles 23:32. In conclusion, the whole duties of the Levites are summed up in three clauses: they were to keep the charge of the tabernacle, the charge of the sacred things, i.e., of all the sacred things of the worship, and the charge of the sons of Aaron, i.e., of all that the priests committed to them to be done; cf. Num. 18:3ff., where these functions are more exactly fixed.

1 Chronicles 24

1 Chronicles 24. *The division of the priests and Levites into classes.*—Vv. 1–19. *The twenty-four classes of priests.* After the statement as to the fathers’-houses of the Levites (1 Chronicles 23), we have next the arrangements of the priests for the performance of the service in the sanctuary; the priestly families descended from Aaron’s sons Eleazar and Ithamar being divided into twenty-four classes, the order of whose service was settled by lot.

1 Chronicles 24:1a. V. 1a contains the superscription, “As for the sons of Aaron, their divisions (were these).” To make the division clear, we have an introductory notice of Aaron’s

descendants, to the effect that of his four sons, the two elder, Nadab and Abihu, died before their father, leaving no sons, so that only Eleazar and Ithamar became priests (יִכְהֲנֹוּ), i.e., entered upon the priesthood. The four sons of Aaron, v. 1, as in 5:29, Ex. 6:23.

1 Chronicles 24:2. cf. Lev. 10:1f., Num. 3:4. These priestly families David caused (v. 3) to be divided, along with the two high priests (see on 13:16), “according to their service.” פְּקֻדָּה, office, official class, as in 23:11.

1 Chronicles 24:4. As the sons of Eleazar proved to be more numerous in respect of the heads of the men than the sons of Ithamar, they (David, Zadok, and Ahimelech) divided them thus: “For the sons of Eleazar, heads of fathers’-houses, sixteen; and for the sons of Ithamar, (heads) of fathers’-houses, eight.” לְרֹאשֵׁי הַגְּבָרִים means neither in respect to the number of the men by the head (cf. 23:3), nor with respect to the chiefs of the men, divided according to their fathers’-houses (Berth.). The supplying of the words, “divided according to their fathers’-houses,” is perfectly arbitrary. The expression רֹאשֵׁי הַגְּבָרִים is rather to be explained by the fact that, according to the natural articulations of the people, the fathers’-houses, i.e., the groups of related families comprehended under the name בְּיַתְאָבוֹת, divided themselves further into individual households, whose heads were called גְּבָרִים, as is clear from Josh. 7:16–18, because each household had in the man, הַגְּבָר, its natural head. רֹאשֵׁי הַגְּבָרִים are therefore the heads, not of the fathers’-houses, but of the individual households, considered in their relation to the men as heads of households. Just as בְּיַתְאָב is a technical designation of the larger groups of households into which the great families fell, so הַגְּבָר is the technical expression for the individual households into which the fathers’-houses fell.

1 Chronicles 24:5. They divided them by lot, אֶלֶּה עִם־אֶלֶּה, these with these, i.e., the one as the other (cf. 25:8), so that the classes of both were

determined by lot, as both drew lots mutually. “For holy princes and princes of God were of the sons of Eleazar, and among the sons of Ithamar;” i.e., of both lines of priests holy princes had come, men who had held the highest priestly dignity. The high-priesthood, as is well known, went over entirely to Eleazar and his descendants, but had been held for a considerable period in the time of the judges by the descendants of Ithamar; see above, pp. 444f. In the settlement of the classes of priests for the service, therefore, neither of the lines was to have an advantage, but the order was to be determined by lot for both. שְׂרֵי קֹדֶשׁ, cf. Isa.

43:28, = שְׂרֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים, 2 Chronicles 36:14, are the high priests and the heads of the priestly families, the highest officers among the priests, but can hardly be the same as the ἀρχιερείς of the gospel history; for the view that these ἀρχιερείς were the heads of the twenty-four classes of priests cannot be made good: cf. Wichelhaus, *Comment. zur Leidensgesch.* (Halle, 1855), S. 32ff. שְׂרֵי הָאֱלֹהִים would seem to denote the same, and to be added as synonymous; but if there be a distinction between the two designations, we would take the princes of God to denote only the regular high priests, who could enter in before God into the most holy place.

1 Chronicles 24:6. “He set them down,” viz., the classes, as the lot had determined them. מִן־הַלֵּוִי, of the tribe of Levi. וְלִזְבֻּלֵי הַלֵּוִי, heads of the fathers’-houses of the priests and of the Levites. The second hemistich of v. 6 gives a more detailed account of the drawing of the lots: “One father’s-house was drawn for Eleazar, and drawn for Ithamar.” The last words are obscure. אָחַז, to lay hold of, to draw forth (Num. 31:30, 47), here used of drawing lots, signifies plucked forth or drawn from the urn. The father’s-house was plucked forth from the urn, the lot bearing its name being drawn. וְאֵתֵּן זָאוּ, which is the only well-attested reading, only some few MSS containing the reading וְאֵתֵּן אֵתֵּן, is very difficult. Although

this various reading is a mere conjecture, yet Gesen. (*Thes.* p. 68), with Cappell and Grotius, prefers it. The repetition of the same word expresses sometimes totality, multitude, sometimes a distributive division; and here can only be taken in this last signification: one father's-house drawn for Eleazar, and then always drawn (or always one drawn) for Ithamar. So much at least is clear, that the lots of the two priestly families were not placed in one urn, but were kept apart in different urns, so that the lots might be drawn alternately for Eleazar and Ithamar. Had the lot for Eleazar been first drawn, and thereafter that for Ithamar, since Eleazar's family was the more numerous, they would have had an advantage over the Ithamarites. But it was not to be allowed that one family should have an advantage over the other, and the lots were consequently drawn alternately, one for the one, and another for the other. But as the Eleazarites were divided into sixteen fathers'-houses, and the Ithamarites into eight, Bertheau thinks that it was settled, in order to bring about an equality in the numbers sixteen and eight, in so far as the drawing of the lots was concerned, that each house of Ithamar should represent two lots, or, which is the same thing, that after every two houses of Eleazarites one house of Ithamarites should follow, and that the order of succession of the single houses was fixed according to this arrangement. To this or some similar conception of the manner of settling the order of succession we are brought, he says, by the relation of the number eight to sixteen, and by the words אָחִיז and אָחִיז אָחִיז. But even though this conception be readily suggested by the relation of the number sixteen to eight, yet we cannot see how the words אָחִיז and אָחִיז אָחִיז indicate it. These words would much rather suggest that a lot for Eleazar alternated with the drawing of one for Ithamar, until the eight heads of Ithamar's family had been drawn, when, of course, the remaining eight lots of Eleazar must be drawn one after the other. We cannot, however, come to any certain judgment on the matter, for the words

are so obscure as to be unintelligible even to the old translators. In vv. 7–18 we have the names of the fathers'-houses in the order of succession which had been determined by the lot. יִצְאָ, of the lot coming forth from the urn, as in Josh. 16:1; 19:1. The names Jehoiarib and Jedaiah occur together also in 9:10; and Jedaiah is met with, besides, in Ezra 2:36 and Neh. 7:39. The priest Mattathias, 1 Macc. 2:1, came of the class of Jehoiarib. Of the succeeding names, שְׁעָרִים (v. 8), יִשְׁבָּבֶב (v. 13), and הַפְּצִץ (v. 15) do not elsewhere occur; others, such as הַפָּה (v. 13), גָּמֹל (v. 17), do not recur among the names of priests. The sixteenth class, Immer, on the contrary, and the twenty-first, Jachin, are often mentioned; cf. 9:10, 12. Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, belonged to the eighth, Abiah (Luke 1:5).

1 Chronicles 24:19. These are their official classes for their service (cf. v. 3), לְבוּא, so that they came (according to the arrangement thus determined) into the house of Jahve, according to their law, through Aaron their father (ancestor), i.e., according to the lawful arrangement which was made by Aaron for their official service, as Jahve the God of Israel had commanded. This last clause refers to the fact that the priestly service in all its parts was prescribed by Jahve in the law.³⁶

1 Chronicles 24:20–31. *The classes of the Levites.*—The superscription, "As to the other Levites" (v. 20), when compared with the subscription, "And they also cast lots, like to their brethren the sons of Aaron" (v. 31), leads us to expect a catalogue of these classes of Levites, which performed the service in the house of God at the hand of, i.e., as assistants to, the priests. הַגִּזְתָּרִים are the Levites still remaining after the enumeration of the priests. We might certainly regard the expression as including all the Levites except the Aaronites (or priests); but the statement of the subscription that they cast lots like the sons of Aaron, and the circumstance that in 1 Chronicles 25 the twenty-four orders of singers

and musicians, in 1 Chronicles 26:1–19 the class of the doorkeepers, and in 26:20–32 the overseers of the treasures, and the scribes and judges, are specially enumerated, prove that our passage treats only of the classes of the Levites who were employed about the worship. Bertheau has overlooked these circumstances, and, misled by false ideas as to the catalogue in 1 Chronicles 23:6–23, has moreover drawn the false conclusion that the catalogue in our verses is imperfect, from the circumstance that a part of the names of the fathers'-houses named in 23:6–23 recur here in vv. 20–29, and that we find a considerable number of the names which are contained in 1 Chronicles 23:6–23 to be omitted from them. In vv. 20–25, for example, we find only names of Kohathites, and in vv. 26–29 of Merarites, and no Gershonites. But it by no means follows from that, that the classes of the Gershonites have been dropped out, or even omitted by the author of the Chronicle as an unnecessary repetition. This conclusion would only be warrantable if it were otherwise demonstrated, or demonstrable, that the Levites who were at the hand of the priests in carrying on the worship had been taken from all the three Levite families, and that consequently Gershonites also must have been included. But no such thing can be proved. Several fathers'-houses of the Gershonites were, according to 26:20ff., entrusted with the oversight of the treasures of the sanctuary. We have indeed no further accounts as to the employment of the other Gershonites; but the statements about the management of the treasures, and the scribes and judges, in 1 Chronicles 26:20–32, are everywhere imperfect. David had appointed 6000 men to be scribes and judges: those mentioned in 1 Chronicles 26:29–32 amounted to only 1700 and 2700, consequently only 4400 persons in all; so that it is quite possible the remaining 1600 were taken from among the Gershonites. Thus, therefore, from the fact that the Gershonites are omitted from our section, we cannot conclude that our catalogue is mutilated. In it all the chief branches of the Kohathites are named, viz., the two lines descended from

Moses' sons (vv. 20, 21); then the Izharites, Hebronites, and Uzzielites (vv. 22–25), and the main branches of the Merarites (vv. 26–30).

1 Chronicles 24:20b. V. 20*b* is to be taken thus: Of the sons of Amram, i.e., of the Kohathite Amram, from whom Moses descended (1 Chronicles 23:13), that is, of the chief Shubael, descended from Moses' son Gershon (1 Chronicles 23:16), his son Jehdeiah, who as head and representative of the class made up of his sons, and perhaps also of his brothers, is alone mentioned.

1 Chronicles 24:21. Of the father's-house Rehabiah, connected with Eliezer the second son of Moses (1 Chronicles 23:16); of the sons of this Rehabiah, Isshiah was the head.

1 Chronicles 24:22. Of the Izharites, namely of the father's-house Shelomoth (1 Chronicles 23:18), his sons were under the head Jahath. The heads of the class formed by David mentioned in vv. 20–22, Jehdeiah, Isshiah, and Jahath, are not met with in 1 Chronicles 23, — a clear proof that 1 Chronicles 23 treats of the fathers'-houses; our section, on the contrary, of the official classes of the Levites.

1 Chronicles 24:23. V. 23 treats of the Hebronites, as is clear from 23:19; but here the text is imperfect. Instead of enumerating the names of the chiefs of the classes into which David divided the four fathers'-houses into which Hebron's descendants fell for the temple service, we find only the four names of the heads of the fathers'-houses repeated, just as in 23:19, — introduced, too, by וּבְנֵי as sons of ... Bertheau would therefore interpolate the name וְהַבְרֹנִי after וּבְנֵי (according to 23:19). This interpolation is probably correct, but is not quite beyond doubt, for possibly only the וּבְנֵי of the four sons of Hebron named could be mentioned as being busied about the service of the sanctuary according to their divisions. In any case, the names of the heads of the classes formed by the Hebronites are wanting; but it is impossible to ascertain whether they have been dropped out only by a later copyist, or were not

contained in the authority made use of by our historian, for even the LXX had our text.

1 Chronicles 24:26–28. The classes of the Merarites. As to Jaaziah and his sons, see the remarks on 23:31. As Mahli's son Eleazar had no sons, only Jerahmeel from his second son Kish, as head of the class formed by Mahli's sons, is named. Of Mushi's sons only the names of the four fathers'-houses into which they fell are mentioned, the chiefs of the classes not being noticed. The heads mentioned in our section are fifteen in all; and supposing that in the cases of the fathers'-houses of the Hebronites and of the Merarite branch of the Muses, where the heads of the classes are not named, each father's-house formed only one class, we would have only fifteen classes. It is, however, quite conceivable that many of the fathers'-houses of the Hebronites and Muses were so numerous as to form more than one class; and so out of the Levite families mentioned in vv. 20–29 twenty-four classes could be formed. The subscription, that they cast the lot like their brethren, makes this probable; and the analogy of the division of the musicians into twenty-four classes (1 Chronicles 25) turns the probability that the Levites who were appointed to perform service for the priests, were divided into the same number of classes, into a certainty, although we have no express statement to that effect, and in the whole Old Testament no information as to the order of succession of the Levites is anywhere to be found.

1 Chronicles 24:31. לַפְּנֵי דָוִד וּגֵר, as in v. 6. In the last clause אָבוֹת is used for בֵּית-אָבוֹת, as רֵאשִׁי בֵּית-אָבוֹת stands frequently for בֵּית-אָבוֹת in these catalogues. הָרֵאשִׁי stands in apposition to בֵּית-אָבוֹת, the father's-house; the head even as his younger brother, i.e., he who was the head of the father's-house as etc., i.e., the oldest among the brethren as his younger brethren. The Vulgate gives the meaning correctly: *tam majores quam minores; omnes sors aequaliter dividebat.*

1 Chronicles 25

1 Chronicles 25. *The twenty-four classes of musicians.*—V. 1. "David and the princes of the host separated for the service the sons of Asaph," etc. שְׂרֵי הַצָּבָא are not princes of the Levite host; for although the service of the Levites is called צָבָא צָבָא in Num. 4:23, yet the princes of the Levites are nowhere called שְׂרֵי הַצָּבָא. This expression rather denotes either the leaders of the army of the chiefs of Israel, as the host of Jahve, Ex. 12:17, 41, etc. Here it is used in the last signification, as synonymous with princes of Israel (1 Chronicles 23:2); in 24:6 we have simply the princes, along with whom the heads of the fathers'-houses of the priests and the Levites are mentioned. הַבְּדִיל לְעִבְדָּה, separate for the service; cf. Num. 16:9. The לְ in לְבָנֵי אָסָף is *nota acc.* Since Asaph was, according to 6:24–28, a descendant of Gershon, Heman, according to 6:18–23, a descendant of Kohath, and Jeduthun (= Ethan) a descendant of Merari (1 Chronicles 6:29–32), all the chief families of Levi had representatives among the singers. The Kethibh הַנְּבִיאִים is an orthographical error for הַנְּבָאִים (Keri), *partic. Niph.*, corresponding to the singular הַנְּבָא, vv. 2 and 3. נְבִיא, *prophetae*, is here used in its wider signification of the singing and playing to the praise of God performed in the power of the Divine Spirit. In reference to the instruments of these chief musicians, cf. 15:16. The suffix in מְסַפְּרִים refers to the following noun, which is subordinated to the word מְסַפֵּר as genitive; cf. the similar construction נַפְשׁוֹ עָצַל, his, the sluggard's, soul, Prov. 13:4, and Ew. § 309, *e.* "Their number (the number) of the workmen for the service, i.e., of those who performed the work of the service, was (as follows)."

1 Chronicles 25:2. With לְבָנֵי אָסָף the enumeration beings: "Of Asaph's sons were, or to Asaph's sons belonged, Zacchur," etc. Four are here named, but the number is not stated, while it is given in the case of the sons of

Jeduthun and Heman, vv. 3 and 5. עַל־יָד, at the hand, alternates with עַל־יָדִי (vv. 3 and 6), and עַל יָד אֶסָפִי does not of itself express a different relationship to Asaph than that expressed by עַל יָדֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ with reference to the king. It signifies only “under (according to) the direction of;” and in v. 6 the king, Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman are co-ordinated, inasmuch as the musical part of the worship was arranged by David and the three chief musicians in common, although only the latter were concerned in its performance. In v. 3 לִידוּתוֹן is placed at the beginning, because the choir of singers led by him bore his name; and so also in the case of Heman, v. 4. “As to Jeduthun, were sons of Jeduthun.” The word sons in these catalogues denotes not merely actual sons, but those intellectually sons, i.e., scholars taught by the master. This is clear from the fact that the twenty-four classes, each of which numbered twelve men, consist of sons and brothers of the leaders. The names given as those of the sons of Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, in vv. 2–5, do not represent the whole number of the scholars of these masters, but only the presidents of the twenty-four classes of Levites who were engaged under their leadership in performing the sacred music. Only five sons of Jeduthun are named in our text, while according to the number given there should be six. A comparison of the names in vv. 9–31 shows that in v. 3 the name שְׁמַעִי (v. 17) has been dropped out. בְּכִנּוֹר belongs to יְדוּתוֹן: under the direction of their father Jeduthun (the master), upon the kinnor (see on 15:16), who was inspired to sing praise, i.e., who played inspiredly to bring praise and honour to the Lord; cf. 16:4; 23:30, etc.

1 Chronicles 25:4f. Fourteen sons of Heman are enumerated. רַמְמָתִי עֶזְרָא is one name, cf. 31, although עֶזְרָא is without doubt to be supplied also after גְּדַלְתָּי. Probably also מְחֻזְאוֹת is to be supplied in thought after the names. מְלוֹתֵי, I

made full, and הוֹתִיר, increased.³⁷ Heman is called in v. 5 the seer of the king in the words of God, because he, along with his gift of song, was endowed also with the prophetic gift, and as seer made known to the king revelations of God. In 2 Chronicles 35:15 the same thing is predicated also of Jeduthun, and in the same sense the prophet Gad is called in 21:9 David’s seer. לְהַרְיִם קָרָן the Masoretes have connected with the preceding, by placing Athnach under the קָרָן, and the phrase has been wholly misunderstood by the Rabbins and Christian commentators. Berth., e.g., connects it with בְּדַבְּרֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, and translates, “to sound loud upon horns, according to the divine command,” referring to 2 Chronicles 29:15, where, however, both meaning and accentuation forbid us to connect בְּדַבְּרֵי יְהוָה with what follows. This interpretation of the words is thoroughly wrong, not only because the Levites under Heman’s direction did not blow horns, the horn not being one of the instruments played by the Levites in connection with the worship, but also because on linguistic grounds it is objectionable. קָרָן הַרְיִם never has the signification to blow the horn; for to elevate the horn signifies everywhere to heighten the power of any one, or unfold, show power; cf. 1 Sam. 2:10; Lam 2:17; Ps. 148:14; 89:18; 92:11, etc. That is the meaning of the phrase here, and the words are to be connected, according to their sense, with what follows: “to elevate the horn,” i.e., to give power, God gave Heman fourteen sons and three daughters; i.e., to make Heman’s race mighty for the praise of God, God gave him so many sons and daughters.

1 Chronicles 25:6. V. 6 is the subscription to the enumeration, vv. 2–5. כָּל־אֲלֹהִים are not the fourteen sons of Heman, but all the sons of Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman. All these were under the direction of their fathers for song in the house of Jahve, with cymbals ... for the service in the house of God under the direction of the king, etc. אֶבְיָהֶם is used distributively of each father of the sons named. Bertheau

supplies after אֲבִיהֶם the name Heman, and thereby the first half of the verse contradicts the second, which he correctly understands to refer to the twenty-four persons enumerated.— In v. 7 the total number is given. Their number (the number) of the sons of Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman (i.e., of the twenty-four [4 + 6 + 14] mentioned by name), with their brethren, was 288 (×); whence we learn that each of those named had eleven אָחִים, all of them מְלַמְדֵי שִׁיר, learned, practised in song for Jahve. In כָּל־הַמְבִינִין the sons and the brothers are both included, in order to give the total number. מְבִיֵן, having understanding, knowledge of a thing, denotes here those who by education and practice were skilled in song—the accomplished musicians. Their number was 288, and these were divided into twenty-four choirs (classes). David had, according to 23:5, appointed 4000 Levites for the performance of the music. Of these, 288 were מְבִינִים skilled in song; the others were scholars (תְּלָמִידִים), as v. 8 shows, where מְבִיֵן and תְּלָמִיד are the two categories into which the musicians are divided.

1 Chronicles 25:8. They cast lots, גּוֹרְלוֹת, מִשְׁמֶרֶת, מִשְׁמֶרֶת, κληρονομία ἐφημερίων (LXX), by which the waiting upon the service, was fixed, that is, the order of their succession in the official service. לְעֵמֶת is variously translated. As no name follows, R. Shel. and Kimchi would repeat the preceding מִשְׁמֶרֶת: one class as the other; and this is supported by 26:16 and Neh. 12:24, and by the fact that in 17:5, after מִמִּשְׁכָּן, the words אֶל מִשְׁכָּן have been dropped out. But according to the accentuation מִשְׁמֶרֶת belongs to גּוֹרְלוֹת, and so the proposed completion is at once disposed of. Besides this, however, the thought “class like class” does not appear quite suitable, as the classes were only formed by the lots, and so were not in existence so as to be able to cast lots. We therefore, with Ewald, § 360, a, and Berth., hold the clause בְּקִטּוֹן בְּגִדוֹל to

be the genitive belonging to לְעֵמֶת, since עֵמֶת is in Eccles. 5:15 also connected with a clause: “in the manner of, as the small, so the great,” i.e., the small and the great, the older as the younger. This is further defined by “the skilled as the scholars.” From these words it is manifest that not merely the 288 cast lots, for these were כָּל־מְבִיֵן (v. 7), but also the other 3712 Levites appointed for the service of the singers; whence it further follows that only the 288 who were divided by lot into twenty-four classes, each numbering twelve persons, were thoroughly skilled in singing and playing, and the scholars were so distributed to them that each class received an equal number of them, whom they had to educate and train. These, then, were probably trained up for and employed in the temple music according to their progress in their education, so that the ἐφημερία which had at any time charge of the service consisted not only of the twelve skilled musicians, but also of a number of scholars who assisted in singing and playing under their direction.

1 Chronicles 25:9–31. The order of succession was so determined by lot, that the four sons of Asaph (v. 3) received the first, third, fifth, and seventh places; the six sons of Jeduthun, the second, fourth, eighth, twelfth, and fourteenth; and finally, the four sons of Heman (first mentioned in v. 4), the sixth, ninth, eleventh, and thirteenth places; while the remaining places, 15–24, fell to the other sons of Heman. From this we learn that the lots of the sons of the three chief musicians were not placed in separate urns, and one lot drawn from each alternately; but that, on the contrary, all the lots were placed in one urn, and in drawing the lots of Asaph and Jeduthun came out so, that after the fourteenth drawing only sons of Heman remained.³⁸ As to the details in v. 9, after Joseph we miss the statement, “he and his sons and his brothers, twelve;” which, with the exception of the הוּא, used only of the second lot, and omitted for the sake of brevity in all the other cases, is repeated with all the 23 numbers, and so can have been dropped here only by an error. The

words **לְיוֹסֵף לְאַסָּף** are to be understood thus: The first lot drawn was for Asaph, viz., for his son Joseph. In the succeeding verses the names are enumerated, sometimes with and sometimes without **לְ**. Some of the names diverge somewhat in form. Izri, v. 11, stands for Zeri, v. 3; Jesharelah, v. 14, for Asarelah, v. 2; Azarel, v. 18, for Uzziel, v. 4 (like the king's names Uzziah and Azariah, 3:12, and 2 Chronicles 26:1); Shubael, v. 20, for Shebuel, v. 4 (cf. 23:16 with 24:20); Jeremoth, v. 22, for Jerimoth, v. 4; Eliyathah, v. 27, for Eliathah, v. 4. Besides these, the fuller forms Nethanyahu (v. 12), Hashabyahu (v. 3), Hananyahu (v. 23), are used instead of the shorter Nethaniah, etc. (vv. 2, 19, 4). Of the 24 names which are here enumerated, besides those of Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, only Mattithiah recurs (1 Chronicles 15:18, 21) in the description of the solemnities connected with the bringing in of the ark; "but we are not justified in seeking there the names of our twenty-four classes" (Berth.).

1 Chronicles 26

1 Chronicles 26. *The classes of the doorkeepers, the stewards of the treasures of the sanctuary, and the officers for the external business.*—Vv. 1–19. *The classes of the doorkeepers.* V. 1. The superscription runs shortly thus: "As to (**לְ**) the divisions of the doorkeepers." The enumeration begins with **לְקַרְחִים**: to the Korahites (belongs) Meshelemiah (in v. 14, Shelemiah). Instead of **מִן־בְּנֵי אֶסָּף** we should read, according to 9:19, **מִן־בְּנֵי אֶבְיָסָף**, for the Korahites are descended from Kohath (Ex. 6:21; 18:16), but Asaph is a descendant of Gershon (1 Chronicles 6:24f.).—In vv. 2, 3, seven sons of Meshelemiah are enumerated; the first-born Zechariah is mentioned also in 9:21, and was entrusted, according to v. 14, with the guarding of the north side.

1 Chronicles 26:4–8. Obed-edom's family. Obed-edom has been already mentioned in 1 Chronicles 16:38 and 15:24 as doorkeeper; see the commentary on the passage. From our

passage we learn that Obed-edom belonged to the Kohathite family of the Korahites. According to v. 19, the doorkeepers were Korahites and Merarites. The Merarites, however, are only treated of from v. 10 and onwards. **וְלַעֲבָד אָדָם** (v. 4) corresponds to **וְהָיָה שְׂמֵרֵי שְׂמֵרֵי** (v. 2), and is consequently thereby brought under **לְקַרְחִים** (v. 1). Here, vv. 4, 5, eight sons with whom God had blessed him (cf. 13:14), and in 6 and 7 his grandchildren, are enumerated. The verb **נִגְלַד** is used in the singular, with a subject following in the plural, as frequently (cf. Ew. § 316, a). The grandchildren of Obed-edom by his first-born son Shemaiah are characterized as **הַמְּשָׁלִים**, the dominions, i.e., the lords (rulers) of the house of their fathers (**מְשָׁל**, the abstract dominion, for the concrete **מִשָּׁל**; cf. Ew. § 160, b), because they were **גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִל**, valiant heroes, and so qualified for the office of doorkeepers. In the enumeration in v. 7, the omission of the **ו** cop. with **אֶלְזָבָד אֶחָיו** is strange; probably we must supply **ו** before both words, and take them thus: And Elzabad and his brethren, valiant men, (viz.) Elihu and Semachiah. For the conjecture that the names of the **אֶחָיו** are not given (Berth.) is not a very probable one.

1 Chronicles 26:8. The whole number of doorkeepers of Obed-edom's family, his sons and brethren, was sixty-two; able men with strength for the service. The singular **אִישׁ חַיִל**, after the preceding plural, is most simply explained by taking it to be in apposition to the **כֹּל** at the beginning of the verse, by repeating **כֹּל** mentally before **אִישׁ**.—In v. 9 the number of Meshelemiah's sons and brothers is brought in in a supplementary way.

1 Chronicles 26:10, 11. The Merarites. Hosah's sons and brothers. **חֹסָה** has been already mentioned (1 Chronicles 16:38) along with Obed-edom as doorkeeper. Hosah made Shimri head of the Merarites, who served as

doorkeepers, because there was no first-born, i.e., because his first-born son had died without leaving any descendant, so that none of the families descended from Hosah had the natural claim to the birthright. All the sons and brothers of Hosah were thirteen. Meshelemiah had eighteen (cf. v. 9), and Obed-edom sixty-two (v. 8); and all taken together they make ninety-three, whom we are (according to v. 12f.) to regard as the heads of the 4000 doorkeepers. In 9:22 the number of the doorkeepers appointed by David is stated to be 212, but that number most probably refers to a different time (see on 9:22). Bertheau further remarks: "According to 16:38, sixty-eight are reckoned to Obed-edom and Hosah, in our passage seventy-five; and the small difference between the numbers is explained by the fact that in the first passage only the doorkeepers before the ark are referred to." Against this we have already shown, in our remarks on 16:38, that the number there mentioned cannot be held with certainty to refer to the doorkeepers.

1 Chronicles 26:12–19. The division of the doorkeepers according to their posts of service. V. 12. "To these classes of doorkeepers, viz., to the heads of the men, (were committed) the watches, in common with their brethren, to serve in the house of Jahve." By לְאֵלֶּה מַחְלְקוֹתֵי הַשָּׁמַרִים it is placed beyond doubt that the above-mentioned names and numbers give us the classes of the doorkeepers. By the apposition לְרֵאשֵׁי הַגְּבָרִים, the meaning of which is discussed in the commentary on 24:4, מַחְלְקוֹתֵי הַשָּׁמַרִים is so defined as to show that properly the heads of the households are meant, only these having been enumerated in the preceding section, and not the classes.

1 Chronicles 26:13. The distribution of the stations by lot followed (cf. 25:8), the small as the great; i.e., the younger as the older cast lots, according to their fathers'-houses, "for door and door," i.e., for each door of the four sides of the temple, which was built so that its sides corresponded to the points of the compass.

1 Chronicles 26:14. The lot towards the east, i.e., for the guarding of the east side, fell to Shelemiah (cf. vv. 1, 2); while that towards the north fell to his first-born Zechariah. Before יוֹעֵץ לְזַכְרְיָהוּ לְ, is to be repeated. To him the title הַפִּילֹוּ בְּשֶׁקֶל is given, for reasons unknown to us. גַּר, (for him) they threw lots.

1 Chronicles 26:15. To Obed-edom (fell the lot) towards the south, and to his sons it fell (to guard) the house Asuppim. As to בֵּית־הָאֶסְפִּים, called for brevity אֶסְפִּים in v. 17, i.e., house of collections or provisions (cf. Neh. 12:25), we can say nothing further than that it was a building used for the storing of the temple goods, situated in the neighbourhood of the southern door of the temple in the external court, and that it probably had two entrances, since in v. 19 it is stated that two guard-stations were assigned to it.

1 Chronicles 26:16. The word לְשָׁפִים is unintelligible, and probably has come into the text merely by a repetition of the two last syllables of the preceding word, since the name שָׁפִים (1 Chronicles 7:12) has no connection with this passage. To Hosah fell the lot towards the west, by the door Shallecheth on the ascending highway. הַמְסָלָה הָעוֹלָה is the way which led from the lower city up to the more lofty temple site. Instead of the door on this highway, in v. 18, in the statement as to the distribution of the guard-stations, Parbar is named, and the highway distinguished from it, four doorkeepers being appointed for the מְסָלָה, and two for פְּרָבָר. פְּרָבָר, probably identical with פְּרוֹרִים, 2 Kings 23:11, a word of uncertain meaning, was the name of an out-building on the western side, the back of the outer court of the temple by the door Shallecheth, which contained cells for the laying up of temple goods and furniture. שְׁלֶכֶת, Böttcher translates, *Proben*, S. 347, "refuse-door;" see on 2 Kings 23:11. Nothing more definite can be said of it, unless we hold, with Thenius on 2 Kings 23:11,

that Ezekiel's temple is in all its details a copy of the Solomonic temple, and use it, in an unjustifiable way, as a source of information as to the prae-exilic temple. מִשְׁמָר לְעִמָּת מִשְׁמָר (as in Neh. 12:24), guard with (over against?) guard, or one guard as the other (cf. on לְעִמָּת, v. 12 and 25:8), Bertheau connects with Hosah, according to the Masoretic punctuation, and explains it thus: "Because it was Hosah's duty to set guards before the western gate of the temple, and also before the gate Shallecheth, which lay over against it." Clericus, on the contrary, refers the words to all the guard-stations: *cum ad omnes januas essent custodiae, sibi ex adverso respondebant*. This reference, according to which the words belong to what follows, and introduce the statement as to the number of guards at the individual posts which follows in v. 17ff., seems to deserve the preference. So much is certain in any case, that there is no ground in the text for distinguishing the gate Shallecheth from the western gate of the temple, for the two gates are not distinguished either in v. 16 or in v. 18.

1 Chronicles 26:17f. Settlement of the number of guard-stations at the various sides and places. Towards morning (on the east side) were six of the Levites (six kept guard); towards the north by day (i.e., daily, on each day), four; towards the south daily, four; and at the storehouse two and two, consequently four also; at Parbar towards the west, four on the highway and two at Parbar, i.e., six. In all, therefore, there were twenty-four guard-stations to be occupied daily; but more than twenty-four persons were required, because, even supposing that one man at a time was sufficient for each post, one man could not stand the whole day at it: he must have been relieved from time to time. Probably, however, there were always more than one person on guard at each post. It further suggests itself that the number twenty-four may be in some way connected with the divisions or classes of doorkeepers; but there is only a deceptive appearance of a connection. The division of the priests and musicians each into twenty-four

classes respectively is no sufficient analogy in the case, for these classes had to perform the service in succession each for a week at a time, while the twenty-four doorkeepers' stations had to be all occupied simultaneously every day.—In vv. 2–11, then, twenty-eight heads in all are enumerated by name (Meshelemiah with seven sons, Obed-edom with eight sons and six grandsons, and Hosah with four sons); but the total number in all the three families of doorkeepers is stated at ninety-three, and neither the one nor the other of these numbers bears any relation to twenty-four. Finally, the posts are so distributed that Meshelemiah with his eighteen sons and brothers kept guard on the east and north sides with six posts; Obed-edom with his sixty-two sons and brothers on the south side with four and ×, that is, eight posts; and Hosah with his thirteen sons and brothers on the western side with four and two, that is, six; so that even here no symmetrical distribution of the service can be discovered.

1 Chronicles 26:19. Subscription, in which it is again stated that the classes of doorkeepers were taken from among the Korahites and Merarites.

1 Chronicles 26:20–28. *The stewards of the treasures of the sanctuary.*—V. 20 appears to contain the superscription of the succeeding section. For here the treasures of the house of God and the treasures of the consecrated things are grouped together, while in vv. 22 and 26 they are separated, and placed under the oversight of two Levite families: the treasures of the house of Jahve under the sons of the Gershonite Laadan (vv. 21, 22); the treasures of the consecrated things under the charge of the Amramites. But with this the words הַלְוִיִּם אֲחִיָּהּ cannot be made to harmonize. According to the Masoretic accentuation, הַלְוִיִּם alone would be the superscription; but הַלְוִיִּם alone gives no suitable sense, for the Levites have been treated of already from 1 Chronicles 23 onwards. Moreover, it appears somewhat strange that there is no further characterization of אֲחִיָּהּ, for the name is a very common one, but has not

before occurred in our chapter, whence we would expect a statement of his descent and his family, such as we find in the case of the succeeding chief overseers. All these things tend to throw doubt upon the correctness of the Masoretic reading, while the LXX, on the contrary, in καὶ οἱ Δευῖται ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν θησαυρῶν κ.τ.λ., give a perfectly suitable superscription, which involves the reading אַחֲזִיקָא instead of אַחֲזִיקָה. This reading we, with J. D. Mich. and Berth., hold to be the original. On אַחֲזִיקָא אַחֲזִיקָה, cf. 6:29, 2 Chronicles 29:34.

1 Chronicles 26:21, 22. Vv. 21 and 22 to together: "The sons of Laadan, (namely) the sons of the Gershonite family which belong to Laadan, (namely) the heads of the fathers'-houses of Laadan of the Gershonite family: Jehieli, (namely) the sons of Jehieli, Zetham and his brother Joel (see 23:7), were over the treasures of the house of Jahve." The meaning is this: "Over the treasures of the house of Jahve were Zetham and Joel, the heads of the father's-house of Jehieli, which belonged to the Laadan branch of the Gershonites." Light is thrown upon these words, so obscure through their brevity, by 1 Chronicles 23:7, 8, according to which the sons of Jehiel, or the Jehielites, are descended from Laadan, the older branch of the Gershonites. This descent is briefly but fully stated in the three clauses of the 21st verse, each of which contains a more definite characterization of the father's-house Jehieli, whose two heads Zetham and Joel were entrusted with the oversight of the treasures of the house of God.

1 Chronicles 26:23, 24. Vv. 23 and 24 also go together: "As to the Amramites, Jisharites, Hebronites, and Uzzielites (the four chief branches of the Kohathite family of Levites, 1 Chronicles 23:15–20), Shebuel the son of Gershon, the son of Moses, was prince over the treasures" (ו before Shebuel introduces the apodosis, cf. Ew. § 348, a, and = Germ. "so war").

1 Chronicles 26:25. "And his (Shebuel's) brethren of Eliezer were Rehabiah his

(Eliezer's) son, and Jeshaiiah his son, ... and Shelomoth his son." These descendants of Eliezer were called brethren of Shebuel, because they were descended through Eliezer from Moses, as Shebuel was through his father Gershon.

1 Chronicles 26:26. This Shelomoth (a descendant of Eliezer, and so to be distinguished both from the Jisharite Shelomith [23:18 and 24:22], and the Gershonite of the same name [23:9]), and his brethren were over the treasures of the consecrated things which David the king had consecrated, and the heads of the fathers'-houses, etc. Instead of לְשָׂרֵי we must read וְשָׂרֵי, according to 29:6. The princes over the thousands and hundreds are the war captains, and the שָׂרֵי הַצֶּבֶא are the commanders-in-chief, e.g., Abner, Joab, 27:34, 2 Sam. 8:16, 1 Chronicles 18:15.—The 27th verse is an explanatory parenthesis: "from the wars and from the booty," i.e., from the booty taken in war had they consecrated. לְחֹזֶק, to make strong, i.e., to preserve in strength and good condition the house of Jahve. חֹזֶק elsewhere of the renovation of old buildings, 2 Kings 12:8ff., Neh. 3:2ff., here in a somewhat general signification.—In v. 28 the enumeration of those who had consecrated, thus interrupted, is resumed, but in the form of a new sentence, which concludes with a predicate of its own. In וַיִּשָׂא the article represents אֲשֶׁר, as in 29:17, 2 Chronicles 29:36, and elsewhere; cf. Ew. § 331, b. With כָּל הַמְקַדְּשֵׁי, all who had consecrated, the enumeration is concluded, and the predicate, "was at the hand of Shelomith and his brethren," is then brought in. עַל-יַד, laid upon the hand, i.e., entrusted to them for preservation; Germ. *unter der Hand* (under the hand).

If we glance back at the statements as to the stewards of the treasures (vv. 20–28), we find that the treasures of the house of Jahve were under the oversight of the Jehielites Zetham and Joel, with their brethren, a branch of the Gershonites (v. 22); and the treasures of the

consecrated things under the oversight of the Kohathite Shelomith, who was of the family of Moses' second son Eliezer, with his brethren (v. 28). But in what relation does the statement in v. 24, that Shebuel, the descendant of Moses through Gershon, was נְגִיד עַל־הָאֲצֻרוֹת, stand to this? Bertheau thinks "that three kinds of treasures are distinguished, the guarding of which was committed to different officials: (1) The sons of Jehieli, Zetham and Joel, had the oversight of the treasures of the house of God, which, as we may conclude from 29:8, had been collected by voluntary gifts: (2) Shebuel was prince over the treasures, perhaps over the sums which resulted from regular assessment for the temple (Ex. 30:11–16), from redemption-money, e.g., for the first-born (Num. 18:16ff.), or for vows (Lev. 27); consequently over a part of the sums which are designated in 2 Kings 12:5 by the name כֶּסֶף הַקִּדְשִׁים: (3) Shelomith and his brothers had the oversight of all the אוֹצְרוֹת הַקִּדְשִׁים, i.e., of the consecrated gifts which are called in 2 Kings 12:19 קִדְשִׁים, and distinguished from the כֶּסֶף קִדְשִׁים in v. 5." But this view has no support in the text. Both in the superscription (v. 20) and in the enumeration (vv. 22, 26) only two kinds of treasures—treasures of the house of God (of Jahve), and treasures of the קִדְשִׁים—are mentioned. Neither by the facts nor by the language used are we justified in supposing that there was a third kind of treasures, viz., the sums resulting from the regular assessment for the holy place. For it is thoroughly arbitrary to confine the treasures of the house of God to the voluntary contributions and the consecrated gifts given from the war-booty; and it is still more arbitrary to limit the treasures over which Shebuel was prince to the sums flowing into the temple treasures from the regular assessment; for the reference to 2 Kings 12:19 and 5 is no proof of this, because, though two kinds of קִדְשִׁים are there distinguished, yet both are further defined. The quite general expression הָאֲצֻרוֹת, the treasures, can naturally

be referred only to the two different kinds of treasures distinguished in v. 22. This reference is also demanded by the words שְׂבוּאֵל ... נְגִיד (v. 24). Heads of fathers'-houses, with their brethren (אֲחֵיהֶם), are mentioned as guardians of the two kinds of treasures spoken of in v. 20; while here, on the contrary, we have Shebuel alone, without assistants. Further, the other guardians are not called נְגִיד, as Shebuel is. The word נְגִיד denotes not an overseer or steward, but only princes of kingdoms (kings), princes of tribes (1 Chronicles 12:27; 13:1; 27:16; 2 Chronicles 32:21), ministers of the palace and the temple, and commanders-in-chief (2 Chronicles 11:11; 28:7), and is consequently used in our section neither of Zetham and Joel, nor of Shelomith. The calling of Shebuel נְגִיד consequently shows that he was the chief guardian of the sacred treasures, under whose oversight the guardians of the two different kinds of treasures were placed. This is stated in vv. 23, 24; and the statement would not have been misunderstood if it had been placed at the beginning or the end of the enumeration; and its position in the middle between the Gershonites and the Kohathites is explained by the fact that this prince was, according to 23:16, the head of the four Levite families descended from Kohath.

1 Chronicles 26:29–32. *The officials for the external business.*—V. 29. "As to the Izharites, Chenaniah (see on 15:22) with his sons was for the outward business over Israel for scribes and judges." According to this, the external business of the Levites consisted of service as scribes and judges, for which David had set apart 6000 Levites (1 Chronicles 23:4). Without sufficient reason, Bertheau would refer the external business to the exaction of the dues for the temple, because in Neh. 11:16 הַמְלֵאכָה הַהִיצֵגָה for the temple is spoken of. But it does not at all follow that in our verse the external work had any reference to the temple, and that the scribes and judges had only this narrow sphere of action, since here, instead of the

house of God, **עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל** is mentioned as the object with which the external service was connected.

1 Chronicles 26:30. Of Hebronites, Hashabiah and his brethren, 1700 valiant men, were **עַל פְּקֻדַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל**, for the oversight (inspection) of Israel this side Jordan, for all the business of Jahve and the service of the king. Bertheau takes **פְּקֻדָּה** to mean “due,” “fixed tribute,” a meaning which the word cannot be shown to have. The LXX have translated correctly, *ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπισκέψεως τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*, *ad inspectionem Israelis*, i.e., *praefecti erant* (J. H. Mich.). For **עַל פְּקֻדַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל** is in v. 32 rendered by **מִמְעַבְרַת לְיַרְדֵּן**. **יִפְקִיד עַל** is shown by the addition **מִמְעַבְרַת** to refer to the land of Canaan, as in Josh. 5:1; 22:7, since Israel, both under Joshua and also after the exile, had come from the eastward over Jordan into Canaan. The words **מְלֶאכֶת** and **עֲבֹדָת** are synonymous, and are consequently both represented in v. 32 by **דָּבַר**.

1 Chronicles 26:31f. David set another branch of the Hebronites, under the head Jeriah (cf. 23:9), over the East-Jordan tribes. Between the words “Jeriah the head,” v. 31, and **וְיֶחֱזִי**, v. 32, a parenthesis is inserted, which gives the reason why David made these Hebronites scribes and judges among the East-Jordan tribes. The parenthesis runs thus: “As to the Hebronites, according to their generations, according to fathers, they were sought out in the fortieth year of David’s rule, and valiant heroes were found among them in Jazer of Gilead.” Jazer was a Levite city in the tribal domain of Gad, assigned, according to Josh. 21:39, to the Merarites (see on 6:66). The number of these Hebronites was 2700 valiant men (v. 32). The additional **רָאשֵׁי הָאֲבוֹת** is obscure, for if we take **אֲבוֹת** to be, as it often is in the genealogies, a contraction for **בֵּית-אֲבוֹת**, the number given does not suit; for a branch of the Hebronites cannot possibly have numbered 2700 fathers’-houses (*πατριά*, groups of related households): they

must be only 2700 men (**גְּבֻרִים**), or heads of families, i.e., households. Not only the large number demands this signification, but also the comparison of this statement with that in v. 30. The 1700 **בְּנֵי חַיִל** of which the Hebronite branch, Hashabiah with his brethren, consisted, were not so many *πατριά*, but only so many men of this *πατριά*. In the same way, the Hebronite branch of which Jeriah was head, with his brethren, 2700 **בְּנֵי חַיִל**, were also not 2700 *πατριά*, but only so many men, that is, fathers of families. It is thus placed beyond doubt that **אֲבוֹת רָאשֵׁי** cannot here denote the heads of fathers’-houses, but only heads of households. And accordingly we must not understand **אֲבוֹת רָאשֵׁי** (v. 31) of fathers’-houses, as the LXX and all commentators do, but only of heads of households. The use of the verb **נִדְרָשׁוּ** also favours this view, for this verb is not elsewhere used of the legal census of the people, i.e., the numbering and entering of them in the public lists, according to the great families and fathers’-houses. There may therefore be in **נִדְרָשׁוּ** a hint that it was not a genealogical census which was undertaken, but only a numbering of the heads of households, in order to ascertain the number of scribes and judges to be appointed. There yet remain in this section three things which are somewhat strange: 1. Only 1700 scribes and judges were set over the cis-Jordanic land, inhabited as it was by ten and a half tribes, while 2700 were set over the trans-Jordanic land with its two and a half tribes. 2. Both numbers taken together amount to only 4400 men, while David appointed 6000 Levites to be scribes and judges. 3. The scribes and judges were taken only from two fathers’-houses of the Kohathites, while most of the other Levitical offices were filled by men of all the families of the tribe of Levi. On all these grounds, it is probable that our catalogue of the Levites appointed to be scribes and judges, i.e., for the external business, is imperfect.

1 Chronicles 27**Division of the Army. Tribal Princes, Administrators of the Domains, and Councillors of State.**

1 Chronicles 27. This chapter treats of the organization of the army (vv. 1–15) and the public administration; in vv. 16–24, the princes of the twelve tribes being enumerated; in vv. 25–31, the managers of the royal possessions and domains; and in vv. 32–34, the chief councillors of the king. The information on these points immediately succeeds the arrangement of the service of the Levites, because, as we learn from v. 23f., David attempted in the last year of his reign to give a more stable form to the political constitution of the kingdom also. In the enumeration of the twelve divisions of the army, with their leaders (vv. 1–15), it is not indeed said when David organized the men capable of bearing arms for the alternating monthly service; but the reference in v. 23f. of our chapter to the numbering of the people, spoken of in 1 Chronicles 21, leaves no doubt of the fact that this division of the people stands in intimate connection with that numbering of the people, and that David caused the people to be numbered in order to perfect the military constitution of the kingdom, and to leave his kingdom to his son strong within and mighty without.

1 Chronicles 27:1–15. *The twelve divisions of the army.*—V. 1. The lengthy superscription, “And the sons of Israel according to their number, the heads of the fathers’-houses, and the princes over the thousands and the hundreds, and their scribes, who swerved the king in regard to every matter of the divisions; which month for month of all months of the year went and came, one division 24,000 men,” is towards the end so intimately interwoven with the divisions of the army, that it can only refer to this, i.e., only to the catalogue, vv. 2–15. Since, then, we find in this catalogue only the twelve classes, the number of the men belonging to each, and their leaders, and since

for this the short superscription, “the Israelites according to their number, and the princes of the divisions which served the king,” would be amply sufficient, Bertheau thinks that the superscription originally belonged to a more complete description of the classes and their different officers, of which only a short extract is here communicated. This hypothesis is indeed possible, but is not at all certain; for it is questionable whether, according to the above superscription, we have a right to expect an enumeration by name of the various officials who served the king in the classes of the army. The answer to this question depends upon our view of the relation of the words, “the heads of the fathers’-houses, and the princes,” to the first clause, “the sons of Israel according to their number.” Had these words been connected by the conjunction ו (וְ) with this clause, and thereby made co-ordinate with it, we should be justified in having such an expectation. But the want of the conjunction shows that these words form an apposition, which as to signification is subordinate to the main idea. If we take this appositional explanation to mean something like this, “the sons of Israel, according to their number, with the heads of the fathers’-houses and the princes,” the emphasis of the superscription falls upon לְמִסְפָּרָם, and the number of the sons of Israel, who with their heads and princes were divided into classes, is announced to be the important thing in the following catalogue. That this is the meaning and object of the words may be gathered from this, that in the second half of the verse, the number of the men fit for service, who from month to month came and went as one class, is stated הָאֶחָד, one at a time (distributive), as in Judg. 8:18, Num. 17:18, etc.; cf. Ew. § 313, a, note 1. בּוֹא וְיֵצֵא, used of entering upon and leaving the service (cf. 2 Chronicles 23:4, 8; 2 Kings 11:5, 7, 9). But the words are hardly to be understood to mean that the classes which were in service each month were ordered from various parts of the kingdom to the capital, and there remained under arms; but rather, as Clericus, that they *paratae essent ducum*

imperii parere, si quid contigisset, dum ceterae copiae, si necesse essent, convenirent.

1 Chronicles 27:2ff. Over the first division was Jashobeam, *scil.* commander. The second על מְחֻלְקָתוֹ is to be rendered, “in his division were 24,000 men,” i.e., they were reckoned to it. As to Jashobeam, see on 11:11 and 2 Sam. 23:8.

1 Chronicles 27:3. V. 3 further relates of him that he was of the sons (descendants) of Perez, and the head of all the army chiefs in the first month (i.e., in the division for the first month).

1 Chronicles 27:4. Before דוֹדֵי, according to 11:12, אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן has been dropped out (see on 2 Sam. 23:9). The words וּמְחֻלְקָתוֹ וּמִקְלוֹת הַנְּגִיד are obscure. At the end of the sixth verse similar words occur, and hence Bertheau concludes that ו before מְחֻלְקָתוֹ is to be struck out, and translated, “and his divisions, Mikloth the prince,” which might denote, perhaps, “and his division is that over which Mikloth was prince.” Older commentators have already translated the word in a similar manner, as signifying that Mikloth was prince or chief of this division under the Ahohite Eleazar. All that is certain is, that מְחֻלְקָתוֹ is a name which occurred in 8:32 and 9:37 among the Benjamites.

1 Chronicles 27:5. Here the form of expression is changed; שֵׁר הַעֲצָבָא, the chief of the third host, begins the sentence. As to Benaiah, see 11:22 and the commentary on 2 Sam. 23:20. רֹאשׁ does not belong to הַבְּהֵן, but is the predicate of Benaiah: “the prince of the ... was Benaiah ... as head,” *sc.* of the division for the third month. This is added, because in v. 6 still a third military office held by Benaiah is mentioned. He was hero of the (among the) thirty, and over the thirty, i.e., more honoured than they (cf. 11:25 and 2 Sam. 23:23).—With v. 6b cf. what is said on the similar words, v. 4.

1 Chronicles 27:7. From here onwards the mode of expression is very much compressed: the fourth of the fourth month, instead of the chief of the fourth host of the fourth month.

Asahel (see 11:26 and on 2 Sam. 23:24) was slain by Abner (2 Sam. 2:18–23) in the beginning of David’s reign, and consequently long before the division of the army here recorded. The words, “and Zebadiah his son after him,” point to his death, as they mention his son as his successor in the command of the fourth division of the army. When Asahel, therefore, is called commander of the fourth division of the host, it is done merely *honoris causâ*, since the division over which his son was named, *de patris defuncti nomine* (Cler.).

1 Chronicles 27:8. Shamhuth is called in 11:27 Shammoth, and in 2 Sam. 23:25 Shamma. He was born in Harod; here he is called הַיִּזְרָחִי the Jizrahite, = הַזֵּרָחִי, v. 13, of the family of Zerah the son of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:4, 6).

1 Chronicles 27:9. Ira; see 11:28, 2 Sam. 23:26.

1 Chronicles 27:10. Helez: 11:27; 2 Sam. 23:26.

1 Chronicles 27:11. Sibbecai; see 11:29, 2 Sam. 23:27.

1 Chronicles 27:12. Abiezer; see 11:28, 2 Sam. 23:27; he was of Anathoth in the tribe of Benjamin (Jer. 1:1).

1 Chronicles 27:13. Maharai (see 11:30, 2 Sam. 23:28) belonged also to the family of Zerah; see vv. 11, 8.

1 Chronicles 27:14. Benaiah of Pirathon; see 11:31, 2 Sam. 23:30.

1 Chronicles 27:15. Heldai, in 11:30 Heled, in 2 Sam. 23:29 erroneously called Heleb, belonging to Othniel’s family (Josh. 15:17).

1 Chronicles 27:16–24. *The princes of the twelve tribes.*—The enumeration of the tribal princes, commencing with the words, “and over the tribes of Israel,” immediately follows the catalogue of the divisions of the army with their commanders, because the subjects are in so far connected as the chief management of the internal business of the people, divided as they were into tribes, was deposited in their hands. In the catalogue the tribes Gad and Asher are omitted for reasons unknown to us, just as in 1 Chronicles 4–7, in the genealogies of the tribes,

Dan and Zebulun are. In reference to Levi, on the contrary, the *Nagid* of Aaron, i.e., the head of the priesthood, is named, viz., Zadok, the high priest of the family of Eleazar.

1 Chronicles 27:18. Elihu, of the brethren of David, is only another form of the name Eliab, 2:13, David's eldest brother, who, as Jesse's first-born, had become tribal prince of Judah.

1 Chronicles 27:20f. Of Manasseh two tribal princes are named, because the one half of this tribe had received its inheritance on this side Jordan, the other beyond Jordan. גִּלְעָדָה, towards Gilead, to designate the East-Jordan Manassites.

1 Chronicles 27:23, 24. Vv. 23 and 24 contain a concluding remark on the catalogue of the twelve detachments into which the men capable of bearing arms in Israel were divided, contained in vv. 2–15. David had not taken their number from the men of twenty years and under, i.e., he had only caused those to be numbered who were over twenty years old. The word מִסְפָּרָם points back to לְמִסְפָּרָם, v. 1. נִשְׂא מִסְפָּר as in Num. 3:40 = נִשְׂא רֹאשׁ, Ex. 30:12, Num. 1:49, to take up the sum or total. The reason of this is given in the clause, "for Jahve had said (promised) to increase Israel like to the stars of heaven" (Gen. 22:17), which cannot mean: For it was impossible for David to number all, because they were as numerous as the stars of heaven, which of course cannot be numbered (Berth.). The thought is rather that David never intended to number the whole people from the youngest to the eldest, for he did not desire *in fidem divinarum promissionum inquirere aut eam labefactare* (J. H. Mich.); and he accordingly caused only the men capable of bearing arms to be numbered, in order to organize the military constitution of the kingdom in the manner recorded in vv. 2–15. But even this numbering which Joab had begun was not completed, because wrath came on Israel because of it, as is narrated in 1 Chronicles 21. For this reason also the number, i.e., the result of the numbering begun by Joab, but not completed, is not included in the number of the chronicle of King David, i.e., in

the official number which was usually inserted in the public annals. מִסְפָּר neither stands for בְּסֻפָּר (according to 2 Chronicles 20:34), nor does it denote, "in the section which treats of the numberings" (Berth.). דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים is a shorter expression for סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים, book of the events of the day.

1 Chronicles 27:25–31. *The managers of David's possessions and domains.*—The property and the income of the king were (v. 25) divided into treasures of the king, and treasures in the country, in the cities, the villages, and the castles. By the "treasures of the king" we must therefore understand those which were in Jerusalem, i.e., the treasures of the royal palace. These were managed by Azmaveth. The remaining treasures are specified in v. 26ff. They consisted in fields which were cultivated by labourers (v. 26); in vineyards (v. 27); plantations of olive trees and sycamores in the Shephelah, the fruitful plain on the Mediterranean Sea (v. 28); in cattle, which pastured partly in the plain of Sharon between Caesarea Palestina and Joppa (see p. 440f.), partly in various valleys of the country (v. 29); and in camels, asses, and sheep (v. 30f.). All these possessions are called רְכוּשׁ, and the overseers of them שְׂרֵי הָרְכוּשׁ. They consisted in the produce of agriculture and cattle-breeding, the two main branches of Israelitish industry.

1 Chronicles 27:27. Special officers were set over the vineyards and the stores of wine. The שׁ in שְׂבִבְרָמִים is a contraction of אֶשֶׁר: "over that which was in the vineyards of treasures (stores) of wine." The officer over the vineyards, Shimei, was of Ramah in Benjamin (cf. Josh. 18:25); he who was over the stores of wine, Zabdi, is called הַשִּׁבְמִי, probably not from שִׁבְמָה on the northern frontier of Canaan, Num. 34:10, the situation of which has not yet been discovered, but from the equally unknown שְׂבִמָּה in the Negeb of Judah, 1 Sam. 30:28. For since the vineyards, in which the stores of wine were laid up, must certainly have lain in the

tribal domain of Judah, so rich in wine (Num. 13:23ff.; Gen. 49:11), probably the overseers of it were born in the same district.

1 Chronicles 27:28. As to the שֹׁפֵלָה, see on Josh. 15:33. הַגְּדֵרִי, he who was born in Geder, not Gedera, for which we should expect הַגְּדֵרְתִי (1 Chronicles 12:4), although the situation of Gedera, south-east from Jabne (see on 12:4), appears to suit better than that of גְּדֵר or גְּדוֹר in the hill country of Judah; see Josh. 12:13 and 15:58.

1 Chronicles 27:30. The name of the Ishmaelite who was set over the camels, Obil (אוֹבִיל), reminds us of the Arab. *abila, multos possedit vel acquisivit camelos*. הַמְרֹנְתִי, he of Meronoth (v. 30 and Neh. 3:17). The situation of this place is unknown. According to Neh. 3:7, it is perhaps to be sought in the neighbourhood of Mizpah. Over the smaller cattle (sheep and goats) Jaziz the Hagarite, of the people Hagar (cf. 5:10), was set. The oversight, consequently, of the camels and sheep was committed to a Hagarite and an Ishmaelite, probably because they pastured in the neighbourhood where the Ishmaelites and Hagarites had nomadized from early times, they having been brought under the dominion of Israel by David. The total number of these officials amounted to twelve, of whom we may conjecture that the ten overseers over the agricultural and cattle-breeding affairs of the king had to deliver over the annual proceeds of the property committed to them to the chief manager of the treasures in the field, in the cities, and villages, and towns.

1 Chronicles 27:32–34. *David's councillors.* This catalogue of the king's officials forms a supplementary companion piece to the catalogues of the public officials, 1 Chronicles 18:15–17, and 2 Sam. 8:15–18 and 20:25, 26. Besides Joab, who is met with in all catalogues as prince of the host, i.e., commander-in-chief, we find in our catalogue partly other men introduced, partly other duties of the men formerly named, than are mentioned in these three catalogues. From this it is clear that it is

not the chief public officials who are enumerated, but only the first councillors of the king, who formed as it were his senate, and that the catalogue probably is derived from the same source as the preceding catalogues.

Jonathan, the דוֹד of David. The word דוֹד generally denotes a father's brother; but since a Jonathan, son of Shimea, the brother of David, occurs 20:7 and 2 Sam. 21:21, Schmidt and Bertheau hold him to be the same as our Jonathan, when דוֹד would be used in the general signification of "relative," here of a nephew. Nothing certain can be ascertained in reference to it. He was יוֹעֵץ, councillor, and, as is added, a wise and learned man. סוֹפֵר is here not an official designation, but signifies *litteratus*, learned, scholarly, as in Ezra 7:6. Jehiel, the son of Hachmon, was with the children of the king, i.e., was governor of the royal princes.

1 Chronicles 27:33. Ahithophel was also, according to 2 Sam. 15:31; 16:23, David's confidential adviser, and took his own life when Absalom, in his conspiracy against David, did not regard his counsel (2 Sam. 17). Hushai the Archite was also a friend and adviser of David (2 Sam. 15:37 and 16:16), who caused Absalom to reject Ahithophel's counsel (2 Sam. 17).

1 Chronicles 27:34. After Ahithophel, i.e., after his death, was Jehoiada the son of Benaiah (*scil.* counsellor of the king), and Abiathar. As Benaiah the son of Jehoiada is elsewhere, when named among the public officials of David, called chief of the royal body-guard (cf. 18:17), Bertheau does not scruple to transpose the names here. But the hypothesis of such a transposition is neither necessary nor probable in the case of a name which, like Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, so frequently occurs (e.g., in v. 5). Since sons not unfrequently received the name of the grandfather, Jehoiada the son of the hero Benaiah may have been named after his grandfather Jehoiada. Abiathar is without doubt the high priest of this name of Ithamar's family) 15:11, etc.; see on 5:27–31), and is here mentioned as being also a friend and adviser of David. As to Joab, see on 18:15.

1 Chronicles 28**Ch. 28 and 29.—David's Last Directions, and His Death.**

1 Chronicles 28–29. In order to give over the throne before his death to his son Solomon, and so secure to him the succession, and facilitate his accomplishment of the great work of his reign, the building of the temple, David summoned the estates of his kingdom, the court officials, and the heroes of the people in Jerusalem. In a solemn address he designated Solomon as his divinely chosen successor on the throne, and exhorted him to keep the commandments of God, to serve the Lord with devoted heart, and to build Him a house for a sanctuary (1 Chronicles 28:1–10). He then committed to Solomon the sketches and plans for the sacred buildings and sacred objects of various sorts, with the confident promise that he, by the help of God, and with the co-operation of the priests and of the people, would complete the work (vv. 11–21). Finally, he announced, in the presence of the whole assembly, that he gave over his treasures of gold and silver to this building, and called upon the chiefs of the people and kingdom for a voluntary contribution for the same purpose; and on their freely answering this call, concluded with a solemn prayer of thanks, to which the whole assembly responded, bowing low before God and the king (1 Chronicles 29:1–20). This reverence they confirmed by numerous burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and by the repeated anointing of Solomon to be king (vv. 21 and 22).

1 Chronicles 28:1–10. David summoned the estates of the kingdom, and presented Solomon to them as his divinely chosen successor on the throne.

1 Chronicles 28:1. “All the princes of Israel” is the general designation, which is then specialized. In it are included the princes of the tribes who are enumerated in 1 Chronicles 27:16–22, and the princes of the divisions which served the king, who are enumerated in 27:1–15; the princes of thousands and

hundreds are the chiefs and captains of the twelve army corps (1 Chronicles 27:1), who are subordinate to the princes of the host: the princes of all the substance and possessions of the king are the managers of the domains enumerated in 27:25–31. **לְמֶלֶךְ וְלְבָנָיו** is added to **לְבָנָיו**, “of the king and of his sons,” because the possession of the king as a property belonging to the house (*domanium*) belonged also to his sons. The Vulg. incorrectly translates **לְבָנָיו** *filiosque suos*, for in this connection **לְ** cannot be *nota accus.* **עַם הַסְּרִיסִים**, with (together with) the court officials. **סְרִיסִים** are not eunuchs, but royal chamberlains, as in 1 Sam. 8:15; see on Gen. 37:36. **הַגִּבּוֹרִים** has been well translated by the LXX **τοὺς δυνάστας**, for here the word does not denote properly or merely war heroes, but powerful influential men in general, who did not occupy any special public or court office. In **וְלִכְל־גִּבּוֹר הָיִל** all the others who were present in the assembly are comprehended.

1 Chronicles 28:2. The king rose to his feet, in order to speak to the assembly standing; till then he had, on account of his age and feebleness, sat, not lain in bed, as Kimchi and others infer from 1 Kings 1.

1 Chronicles 28:3. The address, “My brethren and my people,” is expressive of condescending goodwill; cf. on **אָחֵי** on 1 Sam. 30:23, 2 Sam. 19:13. What David here says (vv. 3–7) of the temple building, he had in substance already (1 Chronicles 22:7–13) said to his son Solomon: I, it was with my heart, i.e., I purposed (cf. 22:7) to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of Jahve, and the footstool of the feet of our God, i.e., for the ark and for the capporeth upon it, which is called “footstool of the feet of our God,” because God was enthroned above the cherubim upon the capporeth. “And I have prepared to build,” i.e., prepared labour and materials, 22:2–4 and 14ff.; on v. 3, cf. 22:8.—In v. 4 David states how his election to be king was of God, who had chosen Judah to be ruler (cf. 5:2); and just so (vv. 5, 6) had God chosen Solomon from among

all his many sons to be heir to the throne, and committed to him the building of the temple; cf. 22:10. The expression, “throne of the kingdom of Jahve,” and more briefly, “throne of Jahve” (1 Chronicles 29:23, or מְלִכּוּתָי, 17:14), denotes that Jahve is the true King of Israel, and had chosen Solomon as He had chosen David to be holder and administrator of His kingdom dominion.—On vv. 6b and 7, cf. 22:10 and 17:11f.; and with the condition אִם יִחְזַק וגו', cf. 1 Kings 3:14; 9:4, where God imposes an exactly similar condition on Solomon. בְּיָוֶם הַזֶּה, as is done at this time; cf. 1 Kings 8:61, and the commentary on Deut. 2:30. On this speech J. H. Mich. well remarks: “*tota haec narratio aptata est ad propositum Davidis: vult enim Salomoni auctoritatem apud principes et fratres conciliare, ostendendo, non humana, sed divina voluntate electum esse,*” To this David adds an exhortation to the whole assembly (v. 8), and to his son Solomon (v. 9), to hold fast their faithfulness to God.

1 Chronicles 28:8. “And now before the eyes of all Israel, of the congregation of Jahve (collected in their representatives), and into the ears of our God (so that God should hear as witness), (*scil.* I exhort you), observe and seek ... that ye may possess (that is, keep as possession) the good land (cf. Deut. 4:21f.), and leave it to your sons after you for an inheritance” (cf. Lev. 25:46).—In v. 9 he turns to his son Solomon in particular with the fatherly exhortation, “My son, know thou the God of thy father (i.e., of David, who has ever helped him, Ps. 18:3), and serve Him with whole (undivided) heart (1 Chronicles 29:9, 19; 1 Kings 8:61) and willing soul.” To strengthen this exhortation, David reminds him of the omniscience of God. Jahve seeks, i.e., searches, all hearts and knows all the imagination of the thoughts; cf. Ps. 7:10, 1 Sam. 16:7, Jer. 11:20, Ps. 139:1ff. יִצֹר מִחֻשְׁבוֹת as in Gen. 6:5. With the last clauses cf. Deut. 4:29, Isa. 55:6, etc. יָדָנָה, only here and 2 Chronicles 11:14; 29:19.—With v. 10 the discourse turns to the building of the temple. The exhortation חֲזַק וְעָשָׂה is interrupted by the giving over of the

sketches and plans of the temple, and is taken up again only in v. 20.

1 Chronicles 28:11–19. *The sketches and plans of the sacred buildings and vessels.*—The enumeration begins in v. 11 with the temple house, progressing from outside to inside, and in v. 12 goes on to the courts and the buildings in them, and in v. 13ff. to the vessels, etc. תְּבִנִית, model, pattern; cf. Ex. 25:9; here the sketches and drawings of the individual things. וְאֶת־בְּתֵינֵי is a contraction for וְאֶת־תְּבִנֵי בְּתֵינֵי, and the suffix refers, as the succeeding words show, not to הָאוֹלָם, but to הַבַּיִת, which may be easily supplied from the context (v. 10). In the porch there were no houses. The בָּתִּים are the buildings of the temple house, viz., the holy place and the most holy, with the three-storeyed side-building, which are specified in the following words. גִּנְזָבוֹי occurs only here, but is related to גִּנְזוּיִם, Esth. 3:9; 4:7, Ezra 27:24, and to the Chald. גִּנְזוּן, Ezra 7:20, and signifies store and treasure chambers, for which the chambers of the three-storeyed side-building served. עֲלִיּוֹת are the upper chambers over the most holy place, 2 Chronicles 3:9; הַפְּנִימִים הַחֲדָרָיו are the inner rooms of the porch and of the holy place, since בַּיִת הַכַּפֹּרֶת, the house of the ark with the mercy-seat, i.e., the most holy place, is mentioned immediately after.

1 Chronicles 28:12. And the pattern, i.e., the description of all that was in the spirit with him, i.e., what his spirit had designed, לְחָצְרוֹת, as to the courts. לְכָל־הַלְשָׁכוֹת סָבִיב, in reference to all the chambers round about, i.e., to all the rooms on the four sides of the courts. לְאֶצְרוֹת, for the treasures of the house of God; see on 26:20.

1 Chronicles 28:13. וְלִמְחֻלְקוֹת הַדָּר (continuation of לְאֶצְרוֹת), “and for the divisions of the priests and Levites, and for all the work of the service, and for all vessels,”—for for all these purposes, viz., for the sojourn of the priests and Levites in the service, as well as for the performance of

the necessary works, e.g., preparation of the shew-bread, cooking of the sacrificial flesh, holding of the sacrificial meals, and for the storing of the vessels necessary for these purposes, the cells and building of the courts were set apart.—With v. 14 begins the enumeration of the vessels. לְיָהוָה is co-ordinate with לְחֻצְרוֹת ... לְכֶל־הַלְשָׁכוֹת, v. 12: he gave him the description of that which he had in mind “with regard to the golden (i.e., to the golden vessels, cf. 29:2), according to the weight of the golden, for all vessels of every service,” in regard to all silver vessels according to the weight.—With v. 15 the construction hitherto employed is dropped. According to the usual supposition, the verb וַיִּתֵּן is to be supplied from v. 11 after וַיִּמְשָׁקֵל: “and gave him the weight for the golden candlesticks and their golden lamps,” זָהָב being in a state of free subordination to the word וַיִּגְרִיתֵיהֶם (J. H. Mich., Berth., and others). But apart from the fact that no analogous case can be found for such a subordination (for in 2 Chronicles 9:15, which Berth. cites as such, there is no subordination, for there the first זָהָב שְׁחוֹט is the accusative of the material dependent upon וַיַּעַשׂ), the supplying of וַיִּתֵּן gives no suitable sense; for David here does not give Solomon the metal for the vessels, but, according to vv. 11, 12, 19, only a תַּבְּנִיט, pattern or model for them. If וַיִּתֵּן be supplied, נָתַן must be “he appointed,” and so have a different sense here from that which it has in v. 11. This appears very questionable, and it is simpler to take מִשְׁקָל without the article, as an accusative of nearer definition, and to connect the verse thus: “and (what he had in mind) as weight for the golden candlesticks and their lamps, in gold, according to the weight of each candlestick and its lamps, and for the silver candlesticks, in weight—כַּעֲבוּדָת, according to the service of each candlestick” (as it corresponded to the service of each).—In v. 16 the enumeration is continued in very loose connection: “And as to

the gold (אֶת, *quoad*; cf. Ew. § 277, *d*) by weight (מִשְׁקָל, acc. of free subordination) for the tables of the spreading out, i.e., of the shew-bread (מִמְעַרְכָתָא = מִמְעַרְכָתָא לְחָם, 2 Chronicles 13:11); see on Lev. 24:6), for each table, and silver for the silver tables.” Silver tables, i.e., tables overlaid with silver-lamin, and silver candlesticks (v. 15), are not elsewhere expressly mentioned among the temple vessels, since the whole of the vessels are nowhere individually registered even in the description of the building of the temple. Yet, when the temple was repaired under Joash, 2 Kings 12:14, 2 Chronicles 24:14, and when it was destroyed by the Chaldeans, 2 Kings 25:15, vessels of gold and silver are spoken of. The silver candlesticks were probably, as Kimchi has conjectured, intended for the priests engaged in the service, and the tables for reception of the sacrificial flesh after it had been prepared for burning upon the altar.

1 Chronicles 28:17. Before וְהַמְזֻלְגוֹת וְגו' we should probably supply from v. 11: “he gave him the pattern of the forks ... וְלִכְפֹּרִי, and for the golden tankards, according to the weight of each tankard.” For מְזֻלְגוֹת and מְזֻרְקוֹת, see on 2 Chronicles 4:22. קְשׁוֹת, *σπονδαῖα*, cups for the libations, occur only in Ex. 25:29; 37:16, and Num. 4:7. זָהָב טָהוֹר, in free subordination: of pure gold. כְּפֹרִים from כָּפַר, to cover, are vessels provided with covers, tankards; only mentioned here and in Ezra 1:10; 8:27.

1 Chronicles 28:18. And (the pattern) for the altar of incense of pure gold by weight. In the second member of the verse, at the close of the enumeration, תַּבְּנִיט, from vv. 11, 12, is again taken up, but with לְ, which Berth. rightly takes to be *nota accus.*: and (gave him) “the model of the chariot of the cherubim of gold, as spreading out (wings), and sheltering over the ark of the covenant of Jahve.” הַכְּרוּבִים is not subordinated in the genitive to הַמְרַכְבָּה, but is in explanatory apposition to it. The cherubim, not the ark, are the chariot upon which God enters

or is throned; cf. Ps. 18:11; 99:1, Ex. 25:22. The conception of the cherubim set upon the golden cover of the ark as מְרַכְבֵּה is derived from the idea על־כְּרוּב, Ps. 18:11. Ezekiel, it is true, saw wheels on the throne of God under the cherubim (Ezek. 1:15ff., 26), and in accordance with this the LXX and Vulg. have made a cherubim-chariot out of the words (ἄρμα τῶν Χερουβίμ, *quadriga cherubim*); but as against this Berth. rightly remarks, that the idea of a chariot of the cherubim does not at all appear in the two sculptured cherubim upon the ark, nor yet in our passage. לְפָרְשִׁים (without the article, and with ל) Berth. thinks quite unintelligible, and would alter the text, reading הַפָּרְשִׁים וְהַסִּבְכִּים, because the two participles should be in apposition to הַכְּרוּבִים. But this is an error; for neither by the meaning of the words, nor by the passages, 2 Chronicles 5:8, Ex. 25:20, 1 Kings 8:7, are we compelled to make this alteration. The two first-mentioned passages prove the opposite, viz., that these participles state for what purpose the cherubim are to serve. לְפָרְשִׁים וְהָיָה הַכְּרוּבִים פָּרְשִׁי וְהָיָה הַכְּרוּבִים פָּרְשִׁי וְהָיָה הַכְּרוּבִים פָּרְשִׁי וְהָיָה הַכְּרוּבִים פָּרְשִׁי, “that the cherubim might be spreading wings and protecting” (Ex. 25:20), as J. H. Mich. has rightly seen. This use of ל, where in ל even without a verb the idea of “becoming something” lies, but which Berth. does not understand, has been already discussed, Ew. § 217, *d*, and illustrated by passages, among which 1 Chronicles 28:18 is one. The reference to Ex. 25:20 explains also the use of פָּרַשׁ without כְּנָפִים, the author of the Chronicle not thinking it necessary to give the object of פָּרַשׁ, as he might assume that that passage would be known to readers of his book.

1 Chronicles 28:19. In giving over to Solomon the model of all the parts and vessels of the temple enumerated in vv. 11–18, David said: “All this, viz., all the works of the pattern, has He taught by writing from the hand of Jahve which came upon me.” הַכָּל is more closely

defined by the apposition מִלְאָכּוֹת הַתּ. That the verse contains words of David is clear from עָלַי. The subject of הַשְּׂכִיל is Jahve, which is easily supplied from מִיַּד יְהוָה. It is, however, a question with what we should connect עָלַי. Its position before the verb, and the circumstance that הַשְּׂכִיל construed with עָלַי *pers.* does not elsewhere, occur, are against its being taken with הַשְּׂכִיל; and there remains, therefore, only the choice between connecting it with מִיַּד יְהוָה and with בְּכֶתֶב. In favour of the last, Ps. 40:8, כְּתוּב עָלַי, prescribed to me, may be compared; and according to that, כְּתֹב עָלַי can only mean, “what is prescribed to me;” cf. for the use of כְּתֹב for written prescription, the command in 2 Chronicles 35:4. Bertheau accordingly translates מִיַּד יְהוָה עָלַי, “by a writing given to me for a rule from Jahve’s hand,” and understands the law of Moses to be meant, because the description of the holy things in Ex. 25ff. is manifestly the basis of that in our verses. But had David wished to say nothing further than that he had taken the law in the Scriptures for the basis of his pattern for the holy things, the expression which he employs would be exceedingly forced and wilfully obscure. And, moreover, the position of the words would scarcely allow us to connect בְּכֶתֶב with עָלַי, for in that case we should rather have expected מִיַּד יְהוָה עָלַי. We must there take עָלַי along with מִיַּד יְהוָה: “writing from the hand of Jahve came upon me,” i.e., according to the analogy of the phrase יָד יְהוָה עָלַי (2 Kings 3:15, Ezek. 1:3; 3:14, etc.), a writing coming by divine revelation, or a writing composed in consequence of divine revelation, and founded upon divine inspiration. David therefore says that he had been instructed by a writing resting upon divine inspiration as to all the works of the pattern of the temple. This need not, however, be understood to mean that David had received *exemplar vel ideam templi et*

vasorum sacrorum immediately from Jahve, either by a prophet or by vision, as the model of the tabernacle was shown to Moses on the mount (Ex. 25:40; 27:8); for it signifies only that he had not himself invented the pattern which he had committed to writings, i.e., the sketches and descriptions of the temple and its furniture and vessels, but had drawn them up under the influence of divine inspiration.

1 Chronicles 28:20, 21. In conclusion, David encourages his son to go forward to the work with good courage, for his God would not forsake him; and the priests and Levites, cunning workmen, and the princes, together with the whole people, would willingly support him. With the encouragement, v. 20a, cf. 22:13; and with the promise, v. 20b, cf. Deut. 31:6, 8, Josh. 1:5. אֱלֹהֵי, my God, says David, *ut in mentem ei revocet, quomodo multis in periculis servatus sit* (Lav.). כָּל-מְלָאכֶת עֲבוּדָה, all the work-business, i.e., all the labour necessary for the building of the house of God.

1 Chronicles 28:21. וְהִנֵּה is fittingly translated by Clericus, "*en habes.*" The reference which lies in the וְהִנֵּה to the classes of the priests and Levites, i.e., the priests and Levites divided into classes, does not presuppose their presence in the assembly. With the וְהִנֵּה corresponds וְעִמָּךְ, with thee, i.e., for assistance to thee, in the second half of the verse. The לְ before לְכָל-נְדִיבִים, "are all freely willing with wisdom," in the middle of the sentence introducing the subject is strange; Bertheau would therefore strike it out, thinking that, as לְכָל goes immediately before, and follows immediately afterwards twice, לְכָל here may easily be an error for בְּכָל.

This is certainly possible; but since this לְ is very frequently used in the Chronicle, it is a question whether it should not be regarded as authentic, "serving to bring into emphatic prominence the idea of the נְדִיבִים: with thee is for each business, what regards each willing person, for also all willing persons;" cf. Ew. § 310, a. נְדִיבִים =

נְדִיבִים לְבָב, 2 Chronicles 29:31, Ex. 35:5, 22, usually denotes him who brings voluntary gifts, but here, him who voluntarily brings wisdom to every service, who willingly employs his wisdom and knowledge in a service. Cunning, intelligent workmen and artists are meant, 22:15, 2 Chronicles 2:6. לְכָל-דְּבַר־יְהוָה, "towards all thy words," i.e., as thou sayest or commandest them, the princes and the people, or callest upon them for assistance in the work.

1 Chronicles 29

1 Chronicles 29:1–9. *Contributions of the collected princes for the building of the temple.*—David then turns to the assembled princes to press upon them the furthering of the building of the temple. After referring to the youth of his son, and to the greatness of the work to be accomplished (v. 1), he mentions what materials he has prepared for the building of the temple (v. 2); then further states what he has resolved to give in addition from his private resources (v. 4); and finally, after this introduction, calls upon those present to make a voluntary collection for this great work (v. 5). The words, "as only one hath God chosen him," form a parenthesis, which is to be translated as a relative sentence for "my son, whom alone God hath chosen." וְנָעַר יְהוָה as in 22:5. The work is great, because not for man the palace, *scil.* is intended, i.e., shall be built, but for Jahve God. הַבֵּיטָרָה, the citadel, the palace; a later word, generally used of the residence of the Persian king (Esth. 1:2, 5; 2:3; Neh. 1:1), only in Neh. 2:8 of the citadel by the temple; here transferred to the temple as the glorious palace of Jahve, the God-king of Israel. With v. 2a, cf. 22:14. הַזָּהָב, the gold for the golden, etc., i.e., for the vessels and ornaments of gold, cf. 28:14. אֲבָנֵי שָׁהָם וּמְלוֹאִים as in Ex. 25:7; 35:9, precious stones for the ephod and choshen. שָׁהָם, probably beryl. אֲבָנֵי מְלוֹאִים, stones of filling, that is, precious stones which are put in settings. אֲבָנֵי פֹדֶד, stones of pigment, i.e., ornament,

conjecturally precious stones which, from their black colour, were in appearance like פֹּדֶם, *stibium*, a common eye pigment (see 2 Kings 9:30). אֲבִנֵי רִקְמָה, stones of variegated colour, i.e., with veins of different colours. אֲבֵן יָקָרָה, precious stones, according to 2 Chronicles 3:6, for ornamenting the walls. אֲבִנֵי שֵׁשׁ, white marble stones.

1 Chronicles 29:3. “And moreover, because I have pleasure in the house of my God, there is to me a treasure of gold and silver; it have I appointed for the house of my God over and above all that ...” הַכִּינֹותַי with לֹא without the relative, cf. 15:12.

1 Chronicles 29:4. Gold 3000 talents, i.e., about 13 1/2, or, reckoning according to the royal shekel, 6 3/4 millions of pounds; 7000 talents of silver, *circa* 2 1/2 or 1 1/4 millions of pounds: see on 22:14. Gold of Ophir, i.e., the finest, best gold, corresponding to the pure silver. לְטַוֵּחַ, to overlay the inner walls of the houses with gold and silver leaf. הַבָּתִּים as in 28:11, the different buildings of the temple. The walls of the holy place and of the most holy, of the porch and of the upper chambers, were overlaid with gold (cf. 2 Chronicles 3:4–6, 8, 9), and probably only the inner walls of the side buildings.

1 Chronicles 29:5. לְזָהָב לְזָהָב, for every golden thing, etc., cf. v. 2. וּלְכָל־מְלָאכָה, and in general for every work to be wrought by the hands of the artificer. וְיָמִי, who then is willing (וְיָמִי expressing it as the consequence). To fill one’s hand to the Lord, means to provide oneself with something which one brings to the Lord; see on Ex. 32:29. The infinitive מְלָאכָה occurs also in Ex. 31:5 and Dan. 9:4, and along with מְלָא, 2 Chronicles 13:9.

1 Chronicles 29:6f. The princes follow the example, and willingly respond to David’s call. וּלְשָׂרֵי הָאֲבוֹת = שָׂרֵי הָאֲבוֹת, 24:31; 27:1, etc. מְלָאכָתָם, and as regards the princes of the work of the king. שָׂרֵי רְכוּשׁ וּמְקַנְהָ לְמֶלֶךְ, 28:1,

the officials enumerated in 27:25–31 are meant; on לְ see on 28:21. They gave 5000 talents of gold (22 1/2 or 11 1/2 millions of pounds), and 1000 arics = 11 1/2 millions of pounds. אֲדָרְכֹון, with אֲ *prosth.* here and in Ezra 8:27, and דְּרַכְמוֹן, Ezra 2:69, Neh. 7:70ff., does not correspond to the Greek δραχμή, Arab. *dirhem*, but to the Greek δαρεικός, as the Syrian translation *d’erikônā*, Ezra 8:27, shows; a Persian gold coin worth about 22s. 6d. See the description of these coins, of which several specimens still exist, in Cavedoni *bibl. Numismatik*, übers. von A. Werlhof, S. 84ff.; J. Brandis, *das Münz-Mass und Gewishtssystem in Vorderasien* (1866), S. 244; and my *bibl. Archäol.* § 127, 3. “Our historian uses the words used in his time to designate the current gold coins, without intending to assume that there were darics in use in the time of David, to state in a way intelligible to his readers the amount of the sum contributed by the princes” (Bertheau). This perfectly correct remark does not, however, explain why the author of the Chronicle has stated the contribution in gold and that in silver in different values, in talents and in darics, since the second cannot be an explanation of the first, the two sums being different. Probably the sum in darics is the amount which they contributed in gold pieces received as coins; the talents, on the other hand, probably represent the weight of the vessels and other articles of gold which they brought as offerings for the building. The amount contributed in silver is not large when compared with that in gold: 10,000 talents = £3,500,000, or one half that amount. The contribution in copper also, 18,000 talents, is not very large. Besides these, those who had stones, i.e., precious stones, also brought them. הַנִּמְצָא אִתּוֹ, that was found with him, for: that which he (each one) had of stones they gave. The sing. אִתּוֹ is to be taken distributively, and is consequently carried on in the plural, נָתַנוּ; cf. Ew. § 319, *a.* אֲבָנִים is *accus.* of subordination. נָתַן, to give over for administration (Ew. § 282,

b). יְהִיאֵל, the Levite family of this name which had the oversight of the treasures of the house of God (1 Chronicles 26:21f.).

1 Chronicles 29:9. The people and the king rejoiced over this willingness to give. בְּלֵב שְׂלֵם, as in 28:9.

1 Chronicles 29:10–19. *David's thanksgiving prayer.*—David gives fitting expression to his joy on the success of the deepest wish of his heart, in a prayer with which he closes the last parliament of his reign. Since according to the divine decree, not he, the man of war, but his son, the peace-king Solomon, was to build a temple to the Lord, David had taken it upon himself to prepare as far as possible for the carrying out of the work. He had also found the princes and chiefs of the people willing to further it, and to assist his son Solomon in it. In this the pious and grey-haired servant of the Lord saw a special proof of the divine favour, for which he must thank God the Lord before the whole congregation. He praises Jahve, “the God of Israel our father,” v. 10, or, as it is in v. 18, “the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, our fathers.” Jahve had clearly revealed himself to David and his people as the God of Israel and of the patriarchs, by fulfilling in so glorious a manner to the people of Israel, by David, the promises made to the patriarchs. God the Lord had not only by David made His people great and powerful, and secured to them the peaceful possession of the good land, by humbling all their enemies round about, but He had also awakened in the heart of the people such love to and trust in their God, that the assembled dignitaries of the kingdom showed themselves perfectly willing to assist in furthering the building of the house of God. In this God had revealed His greatness, power, glory, etc., as David (in vv. 11, 12) acknowledges with praise: “Thine, Jahve, is the greatness,” etc. הַנְּצַח, according to the Aramaic usage, *gloria*, splendour, honour. כִּי כָל, yea all, still dependent on לְךָ at the commencement of the sentence, so that we do not need to supply לְךָ after כִּי. “Thine

is the dominion, and the raising of oneself to be head over all.” In His מְמַלְכָה God reveals His greatness, might, glory, etc. מִתְנַשֵּׂא is not a participle requiring אַתָּה, “thou art,” to be supplied (Berth.), but an appellative, an Aramaic infinitive,—the raising oneself (Ew. § 160, e).

1 Chronicles 29:12. “From Thee came the riches and the glory ..., and in Thy hand is it (it lies) to make all things great and strong.”

1 Chronicles 29:13. For this we must thank God, and sing praise to His holy name. By the partic. מוֹדִים, from הוֹדָה, confess, praise, the praising of God is characterized as an enduring praise, always rising anew.

1 Chronicles 29:14. For man of himself can give nothing: “What am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to show ourselves so liberal?” עֲצַר כּוֹחַ, to hold strength together; both to have power to do anything (here and 2 Chronicles 2:5; 22:9), and also to retain strength (2 Chronicles 13:20; Dan. 10:8, 16; 11:6), only found in Daniel and in the Chronicle. הִתְנַדָּב, to show oneself willing, especially in giving. כְּזָאת refers to the contribution to the building of the temple (vv. 3–8). From Thy hand, i.e., that which is received from Thee, have we given.

1 Chronicles 29:15. For we are strangers (as Ps. 39:13), i.e., in this connection we have no property, no enduring possession, since God had only given them the usufruct of the land; and as of the land, so also of all the property of man, it is only a gift committed to us by God in usufruct. The truth that our life is a pilgrimage (Heb. 11:12, 13, 14), is presented to us by the brevity of life. As a shadow, so swiftly passing away, are our days upon the earth (cf. Job 8:9, Ps. 90:9f., 102:12; 144:4). וְאֵין מְקוֹה, and there is no trust, *scil.* in the continuance of life (cf. Jer. 148).

1 Chronicles 29:16. All the riches which we have prepared for the building of the temple

come from the hand of God. The Keth. הִיא is neuter, the Keri הוּא corresponds to הַהֲמוֹן.

1 Chronicles 29:17. Before God, who searches the heart and loves uprightness, David can declare that he has willingly given in uprightness of heart, and that the people also have, to his joy, shown equal willingness. כָּל-אֲלֵהּ, all the treasures enumerated (vv. 3–8).

The plural הַנְּמֻצָאוֹ refers to עֲמָדָה, and the demonstrative הֵ stands for אֲשֶׁר as in 26:28.

1 Chronicles 29:18. He prays that God may enable the people ever to retain this frame of heart. זֹאת is more closely defined by לִיצֵר מִחַד, viz., the frame of the thoughts of the heart of Thy people. “And direct their heart (the people’s heart) to Thee,” cf. 1 Sam. 7:3.

1 Chronicles 29:19. And to Solomon may God give a whole (undivided) heart, that he may keep all the divine commands and do them, and build the temple. לְעֲשׂוֹת הַכֹּל. as in v. 9. לְעֲשׂוֹת הַכֹּל, that he may do all, *scil.* that the commands, testimonies, and statutes require. For הַבְּיָרָה, see v. 1.

1 Chronicles 29:20–22. *Close of the public assembly.*—V. 20. At the conclusion of the prayer, David calls upon the whole assembly to praise God; which they do, bowing before God and the king, and worshipping. וַיִּקְדּוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ, connected as in Ex. 4:31, Gen. 43:28, etc.

1 Chronicles 29:21. To seal their confession, thus made in word and deed, the assembled dignitaries prepared a great sacrificial feast to the Lord on the following day. They sacrificed to the Lord sacrifices, viz., 1000 bullocks, 1000 rams, and 1000 lambs as burnt-offering, with drink-offerings to correspond, and sacrifices, i.e., thank-offerings (שְׁלָמִים), in multitude for all Israel, i.e., so that all those present could take part in the sacrificial meal prepared from these sacrifices. While זִבְחֵיהֶם in the first clause is the general designation of the bloody offerings as distinguished from the meat-offerings, in the last clause it is restricted by the contrast with

עֲלוֹת and the שְׁלָמִים, from which joyous sacrificial meals were prepared.

1 Chronicles 29:22. On this day they made Solomon king a second time, anointing him king to the Lord, and Zadok to be priest, i.e., high priest. The שָׁנִיתָ refers back to 1 Chronicles 23:1, and the first anointing of Solomon narrated in 1 Kings 1:32ff. לִיהִיָּה, not: before Jahve, which לֵ cannot signify, but: “to Jahve,” in accordance with His will expressed in His choice of Solomon (1 Chronicles 28:4). The לֵ before צָדוֹק is *nota accus.*, as in לְשִׁלְמָה. From the last words we learn that Zadok received the high-priesthood with the consent of the estates of the kingdom.

1 Chronicles 29:23–30. *Solomon’s accession and David’s death*, with a statement as to the length of his reign and the sources of the history.—Vv. 23–25. The remarks on Solomon’s accession and reign contained in these verses are necessary to the complete conclusion of a history of David’s reign, for they show how David’s wishes for his son Solomon, whom Jahve chose to be his successor, were fulfilled. On עַל-כִּפְסָא יהוה see the commentary on 28:5.

וַיִּצְלַח, he was prosperous, corresponds to the hope expressed by David (1 Chronicles 22:13), which was also fulfilled by the submission of all princes and heroes, and also of all the king’s sons, to King Solomon (v. 24). There can hardly, however, be in these last words a reference to the frustrating of Adonijah’s attempted usurpation of the throne (cf. 1 Kings 1:15ff.). נָתַן וַיִּתְחַתֵּן = to submit. But this meaning is not derived (Rashi) from the custom of taking oaths of fidelity by clasping of hands, for this custom cannot be certainly proved to have existed among the Israelites; still less can it have arisen from the ancient custom mentioned in Gen. 24:2, 9; 47:29, of laying the hand under the thigh of the person to whom one swore in making promises with oath. The hand, as the instrument of all activity, is here simply a symbol of power.

1 Chronicles 29:25. Jahve made Solomon very great, by giving him the glory of the kingdom, as no king before him had had it. לֹל is to be taken along with לֹא, *nullus*, and does not presuppose a number of kings before Solomon; it involves only more than one. Before him, Saul, Ishbosheth, and David had been kings, and the kingship of the latter had been covered with glory.

1 Chronicles 29:26–30. עַל כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל (as in 11:1; 12:38), referring to the fact that David had been for a time king only over Judah, but had been recognised at a later time by all the tribes of Israel as king. The length of his reign as in 1 Kings 2:11. In Hebron seven years; according to 2 Sam. 5:5, more exactly seven years and six months.

1 Chronicles 29:28. On עֲשֶׂה וְכָבוֹד cf. 1 Kings 3:13, 2 Chronicles 17:5.

1 Chronicles 29:29. On the authorities cited see the Introduction, p. 30ff. עַם כָּל־מְלָכוֹתוֹ וְגו'. הַנְּזָם כְּתוּבִים: the acts of David ... are written ... together with his whole reign and his power, and the times which went over him. הַקְּעָתִים, the times, with their joys and sorrows, as in Ps. 31:16, Job 24:1. The kingdoms of the lands (cf. 2 Chronicles 12:8; 17:10; 20:29) are the kingdoms with which the Israelites under David came into contact,—Philistia, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Aram.