

hastily: 2 Chr 3:14 is a late addition made by "a second Chronicler";<sup>36</sup> and 2 Chr 4:22 is a late addition based on the verse in 1 Kings 7.<sup>37</sup>

**20.11** In 1 Chr 18:1, the Chronicler altered the difficult passage in 2 Sam 8:1–2, "David took Metheg-ammah out of the hand of the Philistines" to read "[David] took Gath and its villages from the Philistines." This alteration contradicts 1 Kgs 2:39–41, which states that during Solomon's time two slaves "ran away to King Achish, son of Maacah, of Gath."<sup>38</sup>

### *B. Deviations and Contradictions between Chronicles and Torah Legislation*

Occasionally, the Chronicler explained that a certain action was taken "as it was written" or "as Moses instructed," and so on, apparently in order to give the step constitutional-religious authority. A detailed examination shows, however, that sometimes there are deviations and contradictions between a passage in Chronicles and the laws of the Torah.<sup>39</sup> Several scholars have concluded from this that the Torah used by the Chronicler differed from the Torah in our hands.<sup>40</sup> However, that "Torah" undoubtedly would also have been attributed to Moses, and it is difficult to assume that two different, contradictory Torahs coexisted in the Chronicler's day, each attributed to Moses. Furthermore, it is likely that the Torah text had already been finalized by that time and probably had also been canonized (see Neh 8:1–3, 8–9, 13–14, 18). The difference between some passages in Chronicles and their counterparts in the Pentateuch, therefore, apparently stems from differences between the Chronicler and modern scholars in interpreting—in understanding—the Torah.<sup>41</sup>

## *3. Historical Mistakes*

Several historical differences between the text of the early books and the book of Chronicles apparently stem from the Chronicler's lack of awareness of the use of certain technical idioms and unchanging linguistic structures and his lack of awareness of the real historical and

36. Thus Galling, *Chronik*, 83.

37. See, e.g., Benzinger, *Chronik*, 89; Rudolph, *Chronik*, 3, 205; Mosis, *Untersuchungen*, 137 n. 38.

38. For a detailed discussion of this, see example 6.3 (p. 112).

39. Compare Japhet, *Ideology*, 239, and see the examples on pp. 240–44 and the earlier literature on the subject given there.

40. See von Rad, *Geschichtsbild*, 63 and n. 106; Rudolph, *Chronik*, xv; Japhet, *Ideology*, 244 n. 149.

41. For a different opinion, see Shaver, *Torah and the Chronicler*, 128.

geographical facts of the period of the Monarchy. These are some of the signs of the time gap separating the later historian, who lived in the Persian period, and the early sources at his disposal in his book on the history of the First Temple period. In other words, despite the Chronicler's many literary and historiographical talents, his work is not free of errors and misunderstandings.

This phenomenon is also observable in other historiographical sources—for example, in the historiography of the Hasmonean revolt:

(a) In 1 Macc 1:29 we are told: "Two years later the king sent a minister of taxation (ἄρχοντα φρονολογίας) to the cities of Judah." This is apparently a reference to Appollonius, who was called "captain of the Mysians" in 2 Macc 5:24 because he was in command of the mercenary force from the land of Mysia (Μυσία), in northwest Asia Minor. The Greek translator of 1 Maccabees was apparently unfamiliar with this geographical term and with the military title derived from it, so he paraphrased it, explaining: מוסיים 'Mysians' = מסים 'taxes'.<sup>42</sup>

(b) In 1 Macc 3:13, Seron is termed "commander of the army of Syria" (ἄρχων τῆς δυνάμεως Συρίας). However, it is clear from v. 14 that Seron was not the head of the Seleucid army: "He [Seron] said: 'I will make a name for myself and become a noble of the kingdom, for I will wage war against Judas and his companions, who ridicule the word of the king.'" Only the Seleucid king himself was the commander-in-chief of the army, and the commanding officers of the various expeditions were determined by him. Later, when Josephus made use of this source (*Ant.* 12.288), he paraphrased it erroneously, apparently using the term accepted in his day for "commander of the army of Syria" and describing Seron as "commander of the armies of Coele-Syria" (στρατηγός τῆς κοίλης Συρίας).<sup>43</sup>

The following are a number of examples of historical mistakes made in the book of Chronicles:

**20.12** The phrase אני/אניות תרשיש 'fleet/ships of Tarshish' serves as a technical idiom in the Bible, with a fixed linguistic structure, to denote a type of ship having specific dimensions, shape, strength, and carrying capacity. These ships served in the merchant fleets of Tyre and Israel and sailed the Mediterranean and the Red Sea (1 Kgs 10:22; 22:49; Isa 2:16; 23:1, 14; Ezek 27:25; Ps 48:8).<sup>44</sup>

42. Cf. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 211–12; idem, *II Maccabees*, 265.

43. See Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 246; Bar-Kochva, "Seron and Cestius Gallus," 15–16.

44. Cf. Elat, "Tarshish," 944. However, Elat was not aware that Don Isaac Abarbanel already felt this, as he notes in his commentary on 1 Kgs 10:22: "They were called 'ships of Tarshish' by virtue of their structure: they were built like the ships

1 Kgs 10:22, speaking of Solomon, relates “that the king had ships of Tarshish at sea. . . . Once every three years the ships of Tarshish would come, bearing gold and silver.” Similarly, we are told that Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, built “ships of Tarshish to sail to Ophir for gold. But he did not sail, for the ships broke up at Ezion-geber” (1 Kgs 22:49).

These narratives are related in the parallel texts in Chronicles but with a change in the language: “fleet/ships of Tarshish” becomes “ships sailing to Tarshish”:

2 Chr 9:21	כי אניות למלך הלכות תרשיש . . .	For the king had <b>ships</b> sailing to <b>Tarshish</b> .
2 Chr 20:36–37	ויחברו עמו לעשות אניות ללכת תרשיש ויעשו אניות בעציון גבר . . . וישברו אניות ולא עצרו ללכת אל תרשיש	Then he joined him in building <b>ships to sail to</b> <b>Tarshish</b> and made the ships in Ezion-geber. . . . And the ships broke up, so that they were not able to sail to Tarshish.

Täckholm believes that here the Chronicler preserved an early, more accurate tradition. He claims that “Tarshish” is the name of a place in Africa on the coast of the Red Sea, where precious stones—“Tarshish” stones (Exod 28:20; 39:13)—were found. The name “Tarshish” was given to the ships because of their destination and their cargo (Tarshish stones and tropical goods).<sup>45</sup> However, there is no supporting evidence for the claim that Solomon and Hiram imported “Tarshish” in vessels of

---

made in Tarshish, and all ships constructed anywhere following the same pattern were called ‘ships of Tarshish.’” Scholars have proposed various explanations for the term “Tarshish,” its derivation, and the reason for its application to the noun “ships.” For a review of these proposals, see Elat, *ibid.*, pp. 944–45; *idem*, *Economic Relations*, 147–48, 181–82; *idem*, “Tarshish and Phoenician,” 56–59; Hoenig, “Tarshish,” 181–82; The Egyptian “ships of Byblos” (*kbn.t/kpn.t*) that sailed to Punt, in the vicinity of Ophir (for its location on the northern coast of Somali, see Malamat, “Kingdom of David and Solomon,” 169–70; or “either in Sudan or, farther south, along the Eritrian-Somalian coast,” as carefully expressed by Markoe, *Phoenicians*, 33), can serve as a typical example of the idiom “ships of Tarshish.” In the first quarter of the fifteenth century B.C.E., “ships of Byblos” served Queen Hatshepsut by importing goods from Punt, goods identical to those that Solomon and Hiram imported from Ophir in “ships of Tarshish”; see Breasted, *Records of Egypt*, 2.109, §265; Naville, *Temple of Deir el-Bahari*, part 3, pls. 69–79; Kitchen, “Punt,” 1198–1201. For the Egyptian term “ships of Byblos,” see Horn, “Byblos,” 53. Another example, taken from the Semitic world, is *anyt.miḥd* (‘ships of Maḥid’), mentioned in Ugaritic documents; see Dietrich-Loretz-Sanmartín, *Texte aus Ugarit*, 202, §4.81. It is likely, as Alt says, that these were boats constructed the same way as boats were built in Maḥid (Ugarit’s harbor) and for similar purposes; see Alt, “Ägyptisch-Ugaritisches,” 69 n. 3.

45. See Täckholm, “Tarsis,” 151 n. 6, 145, 151–53, 166; *idem*, “Tarsis-Tartessos-problem,” 46ff.

Tarshish. See further below, especially in connection with the location of Tarshish. There is also no justification for Elat's assumption that the reading תרשיש in 2 Chr 9:21; 20:36–37 "is an error made by a scribe or a copyist."<sup>46</sup> Elat does not explain just how this error came about, and there is no support for his claim in the various witnesses to the text. Furthermore, it is difficult to assume that one "scribe or copyist" made the same mistake in two verses that are connected with the reigns of two different kings.

It seems to me that this alteration was made deliberately by the Chronicler in order to clarify the meaning of the phrase אֲנִיּוֹת תְּרִשִׁישׁ. As a late historian, he was no longer aware of the use of the technical idiom "ships of Tarshish" to denote a type of boat. He altered the fixed linguistic construction and turned the name "Tarshish" into the name of a place on the Red Sea coast. This was an early attempt to explain the term אֲנִיּוֹת תְּרִשִׁישׁ, similar to the attempts made in later Jewish literature. For instance:

- a. In the Septuagint of 1 Kgs 10:22, the translator wrote  $\nu\alpha\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \Theta\alpha\rho\sigma\iota\varsigma$  'ships from Tarshish' in place of the words "ships of Tarshish." That is, "ships of Tarshish" were merely "ships coming from Tarshish."
- b. In *Ant.* 8.181, Josephus wrote: "for the king [Solomon] had many ships stationed in the *Sea of Tarshish* (Ταρσικὴ θάλασσα), as it was called." In other words, "ships of Tarshish" were merely ships that set sail in the Sea of Tarshish.
- c. In *Tg. Jonathan* on Isa 2:16 (ועל כל נחתי וועל כל אַנְיֹוֹת תְּרִשִׁישׁ), we find ועל כל נחתי וועל כל אַנְיֹוֹת תְּרִשִׁישׁ. The translator seems to have understood 'Tarshish' to be related to  $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$  'sea'; the Septuagint had already translated the phrase  $\pi\lambda\omicron\iota\omicron\nu \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$  'ships of the sea'.<sup>47</sup>
- d. The Aramaic translation of 2 Chr 20:36 uses the name טורסוס (in place of תרשיש) and alongside it gives the explanation לִימָא רַבָּא 'to the great sea'.

These translators apparently attempted to explain the word "Tarshish" itself with reference to the most similar-sounding Greek word. Evidently, these explanations are far from being straightforward interpretations of the word.<sup>48</sup>

The inaccuracy of the explanation proposed in Chronicles stands out prominently in light of the clear narrative of the earlier text: "Jehosha-

46. Elat, "Tarshish," 942.

47. And later also Jerome, in his commentary, ad loc.; see Ginzberg, "Hieronymus zu Jesaja," 280–81.

48. Against Hoenig, who adopts the explanation that "Tarshish" = sea ("Tarshish," 181–82).

phat built ships of Tarshish to sail to *Ophir* for gold" (1 Kgs 22:49)—"to Ophir," not "to Tarshish"! Moreover, according to this text, the objective of the ships of Tarshish built by Jehoshaphat was to import *gold*. That gold was imported from Ophir is also clear from the narrative about the naval expeditions in the days of Solomon (1 Kgs 9:26–28 // 2 Chr 8:17–18; 1 Kgs 10:11 // 2 Chr 9:10).<sup>49</sup> On the other hand, from Tarshish, they used to import primarily silver but also iron, tin, and lead (Jer 10:9; Ezek 27:12).

The Chronicler's explanation does not fit the historical and geographical facts of the First Temple period either. The fact is that there was a port (or ports) named Tarshish in the Mediterranean basin, not on the Red Sea coast, where Ezion-geber was located (near modern Elat), from which Jehoshaphat wanted to set sail to Tarshish, according to the Chronicler. That Tarshish was on the Mediterranean coast is clear from the words of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria:

*šarrāni*<sup>meš</sup> *ša qabal tamtim kalīšunu ultu māt Iadanana māt Iaman adi māt Tarsisi ana šēpeya iknušu*

all the kings living on the sea, from Iadanan [= Cyprus] and Greece to Tarshish, surrendered at my feet.<sup>50</sup>

The narrative about the prophet Jonah, who fled from the Lord, also says, "Then he went down to Jaffa and found a boat sailing for Tarshish" (Jonah 1:3). The Table of Nations in Gen 10:4–5 (which the Chronicler copied into his work: 1 Chr 1:7!) lists Tarshish with the other descendants of Javan, who were Elishah (= Cyprus), Kittim, and Dodanim.<sup>51</sup>

**20.13** 2 Kgs 15:5 speaks of Jotham, bearer of the title *על הבית* 'over the house', who became ruler over Judah after his father, King Uzziah,<sup>52</sup> was afflicted with leprosy:

וינגע ה' את מלך      The Lord struck the king,  
ויהי מצרע עד יום מותו      so that he remained leprous until the day

49. Hence the term "Ophir gold" in Isa 12:12; Ps 45:10; Job 28:16; 1 Chr 29:4 and also on an ostracon (no. 2) from Tel Qasile; see Maisler (= Mazar), "Tell Qasile," 67.

50. See Berger, *Asarhaddon*, p. 86 no. 57:10–11.

51. "Dodanim" in the MT; "Rodanim" in several ancient versions and in 1 Chr 1:7 (interchange of ד and ר; compare, among many other examples, Gen 36:26 חמרן with 1 Chr 1:41 חמרן; and see above, p. 16), followed by the RSV. Scholars differ regarding the precise location of biblical "Tarshish." For the various opinions on the subject, see Elat, *Economic Relations*, 148–53; idem, "Tarshish," 942–44; idem, "Tarshish and Phoenician," 55–69; Hoening, "Tarshish," 181–82; Markoe, *Phoenicians*, 34, 211.

52. Uzziah seems to have officially kept the title "king." The title was given to Jotham only after his father's death; see 2 Kgs 15:7b // 2 Chr 26:23b; 2 Kgs 15:32 // 2 Chr 27:1.

	of his death,
<sup>53</sup> וישב בבית החפשיית	and he lived in Beth ha-ḥophshith.
<sup>54</sup> ויותם בן המלך על הבית שפט	Jotham, the king's son, was <i>over</i>
<sup>55</sup> את עם הארץ	<i>the household</i> , ruling the people of the land.

In 2 Chr 26:21, the Chronicler wrote: "Jotham, his son, [was] *over the house of the king*," instead of the title "over the household" in the early text.

Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, apart from this text, the title "over the household" appears in Solomon's list of officials in 1 Kgs 4:6: "Ahi-sar, over the household."<sup>56</sup> The common, full form of the title, אשר על הבית, appears in early biblical historical writing (1 Kgs 16:9; 18:3; 2 Kgs 18:18); in classical prophecy (Isa 22:15; compare with 36:3); in a burial inscription from the village of Shiloah: [את קברת . . . ] יהו אשר על הבית;<sup>57</sup> in the impression of a seal found at Lachish: [אשר על הבית] / לגדליהו 'To Gedaliahu / [w]ho was over the house[hold]' which, based on its orthography, dates to approximately 600 B.C.E.;<sup>58</sup> on a seal [ל]ידו אשר [ע]ל הבית [ע] [to] Ydw who is [ov]er the household', which Avigad dates to the seventh

53. For the phrase בית החפשיית, see the detailed discussion in example 6.4 (pp. 112–114).

54. The title שפט is used here in the sense of "ruler" (rather than "judge"). Such a meaning of the title is found in verses in which it appears parallel to the title מלך 'king' (e.g., Isa 33:22; Hos 7:7; Ps 2:10) or שר 'prince, chief' (e.g., Amos 2:3; Mic 7:3; Prov 8:16; see also 1 Sam 8:5–6, 20; Mic 4:14; Dan 9:12). This sense of the title שפט can also be found in other Semitic languages, for example, *tpt* in Ugaritic, used parallel to מלך / זבל; and *špātu* in Akkadian. See also Ehrlich, *Mikrâ ki-Pheschutô*, 366. Against Katzenstein, who interprets the verb לשפט here in the sense of לדון 'to judge' ("The Royal Steward," 152).

55. The phrase עם הארץ 'people of the land' seems to mean all of the subjects of the kingdom of Judah (cf. 2 Kgs 25:3 // Jer 52:6; Lev 4:27; 20:2, 4; Ezek 33:2; 39:13) and is not to be linked with the political-technical term in 2 Kgs 11:14–20; 21:24; 23:30, 35; 25:19 (against Cogan-Tadmor, *II Kings*, 167).

56. It is also possible that this is a mistaken separation of the letters into two words, the early version being אשר על הבית 'Ahi is prince over the household'. In fact, the LXX<sup>B</sup> has καὶ Ἀχει ἡν οἰκονόμος 'Ahi is prince over the household', whereas the Lucianic (LXX<sup>L</sup>) version has καὶ Ἀχιήλ οἰκονόμος 'Ahiel is prince over the household'. It can also be read: [אשר על הבית] [ואחי] 'Ahi[ ] [w]ho is over the household'. The name *Ahi* may be a shortened form of Aḥijah, Aḥiel, Aḥimelek, and so on. The term οἰκονόμος served as the title of a district governor in Ptolemaic Egypt, and this may be a translator's archaic usage; see Mettinger, *State Officials*, 72–73.

57. See Donner-Röllig, *KAI*, 35, no. 191B, line 1; Avigad, "Royal Steward," 66–72; idem, *Early Ancient Monuments*, 9–17; Ussishkin, "Short Inscription," 297–303.

58. See Moscati, *L'epigrafia ebraica*, 62, no. 30. Some identify the "Gedaliahu" on this seal with Gedaliah ben Ahikam ben Shaphan (though the Bible does not say that Gedaliah bore the title "[who] is over the household"), who was appointed governor of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar II, king of Babylon, after the destruction of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 25:22; Jer 40:7); see, for example, de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 130.

century B.C.E. based on orthography and the form of the decorative pattern;<sup>59</sup> and in three other seal impressions: *אשר על הבית* / *לאדניהו* 'to Adoniahu / who is over the household' (this prince used two different seals) and *אשר* / *ל[ע] בית לנתן* 'to Nathan, who is / [ov]er [the] household' (in this one, the definite article preceding the word *בית* was erroneously omitted).<sup>60</sup>

The phrase *על הבית* (*אשר*) '(who is) over the household' was thus an administrative technical phrase, a title having a fixed linguistic pattern, borne by someone in an administrative position who served in the royal bureaucracy during the First Temple period. The function was not limited to matters of the royal palace alone. Rather, the person who was 'over the household' was the chief minister in the kingdom. His authority spread to all important matters of the kingdom. We can see this in several biblical verses, especially in Isaiah, which refers to Eliakim ben-Hilkiah, who was to take the title *אשר על הבית* from Shebna:

I will give your government into his hand, and he will be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. I will place the key of the house of David on his shoulder. He will open and none will shut, and he will shut and none will open. (Isa 22:21–22).

"Eliakim ben-Hilkiah, who was over the household," headed the list of officials who went out to the Rabshakeh (Isa 36:3 // 2 Kgs 18:18). Elah, king of Israel, drank too much in the home of "Arza, who was over the household," in Tirza (1 Kgs 16:9). "Obadiah, who was over the household," was given the same task as King Ahab himself (to search the parched countryside for water for the animals, 1 Kgs 18:3, 6). And the very fact that the crown prince, Jotham, held this position even after he began to rule in place of his father, who had been struck with leprosy (2 Kgs 15:5), indicates the importance of the position.<sup>61</sup>

The change from the technical administrative term "over the household" that appears in the earlier text to "over the king's house" in Chronicles apparently stems from the Chronicler's mistaken interpretation of the term. As a late historian, he was no longer aware of the

59. See Avigad, "Hebrew Seals," 123–24.

60. See idem, *Hebrew Bullae*, 21–23. According to Avigad, Adonijah and Nathan could have served the kings of Judah from Josiah to Zedekiah (just like contemporaries of Baruch ben-Neriah, the scribe).

61. See de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 129–31; Katzenstein, "The Royal Steward," 150. Against Mettinger (*State Officials*, 73–79), who limits the authority of "(who is) over the household" to responsibility for the king's property, while comparing it with the Egyptian title *mr pr wr* 'the supreme supervisor over the household (= the property)'. From a typological perspective, *אשר על הבית* can apparently best be compared with a parallel title from the Semitic world, the Akkadian title *ša pān ekalli* (see CAD E 62a) as well as *ša elī bitī* / *ša elī bitanu/i*; see Ebeling-Meissner, "Beamter," 464–65.

phrase's original meaning and of its fixed linguistic structure as a royal title, so he paraphrased it<sup>62</sup> but by doing so limited the authority of the official to "the king's house" only.

**20.14** The word בְּרֵק appears in the Bible in the sense of "crack, fissure" in a structure or in a boat. This is the meaning of the word in closely-related Semitic languages as well; for example, *bdqt* in Ugaritic;<sup>63</sup> *batqu* in Akkadian;<sup>64</sup> and one sense of the Aramaic word ברקא.

In early Biblical Hebrew, repairing a fissure in a certain structure was expressed by a fixed idiom: X חזק ברק, literally, 'strengthen a crack in X'. It appears six times in the book of Kings, חזק (את) ברק הבית/בית ה' in connection with the restoration of the Temple in the days of Joash and Josiah, kings of Judah (2 Kgs 12:6–9, 13; 22:5). It is also found twice more in "transition-period" Hebrew, though with changed word order. These examples are found in Ezekiel's prophecy about Tyre, in connection with the repairing of a boat: מחזיקי ברקך (Ezek 27:9, 27). And there is a parallel expression in Akkadian: *batqu ša . . . šabātu*.<sup>65</sup>

The Chronicler, on the other hand, instead of using the fixed idiom לחזק ברק הבית 'repairing a crack in the Temple', which had been used in the narrative of the restoration of the Temple in 2 Kgs 22:5, wrote לברוק לבדוק ולחזק הבית 'examining and repairing the Temple' (2 Chr 34:10), a phrase unparalleled in the entire Bible. He may not have been aware of the meaning of the word ברק or of the fixed technical idiom חזק (את) ברק הבית / בית ה' and therefore confused the noun ברק ('crack, fissure') with the verb בְּרֵק ('examine, search') derived from it.

This may also be why the Chronicler did not use the word or the technical phrase in the narrative of the restoration of the Temple in the days of Joash. A comparison of 2 Chronicles 24 with 2 Kings 12 shows that, instead of וְהֵם יְחַזְּקוּ אֶת בְּרֵק הַבַּיִת לְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִמְצָא שָׁם בְּרֵק 'they will repair the

62. On the other hand, the words בן המלך 'the son of the king' in this passage were understood by the Chronicler in a genealogical sense (he wrote בנו 'his son' in order to shorten the text; cf. 1 Chr 3:3, לעגלה אשתו 'by Eglah, his wife', instead of 'by Eglah, the wife of David', in 2 Sam 3:5). Even if we adopt the opinion that "the son of the king" was the title of a person holding a position in the royal bureaucracy in Israel (see Brin, "Son of the King," 5–20, 85–90, 240 and earlier literature given there), it is difficult to assume that Jotham also held the title "the son of the king" along with the more prominent position of "(who is) over the household." (Jotham apparently played a lesser role, policing and imprisoning [Jer 36:26; 38:6], or, in any case, was not one of the leading officials [in 1 Kgs 22:26 // 2 Chr 18:25, he is listed after "the governor of the city"]; see also Yeivin, "Son of the King," 160; idem, "Administration," 117.)

63. See Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, 51:17–19, VII, *wyph bdqt 'rpt* 'and opened a crack, a fissure, in the clouds'.

64. See CAD B 167b.

65. See Greenfield, "Lexicographical Notes," 221 n. 24; see the example given by Hurowitz, "Fiscal Practice," 293.

cracks in the Temple wherever one is found' (2 Kgs 12:6), the Chronicler wrote *לחזק את בית אלהיכם* 'collect money from all Israel to repair the Temple of your God' (2 Chr 24:5a); and instead of *לחזק את בית ה'* 'to repair the cracks in the House of the Lord' (2 Kgs 12:13), he wrote *לחזק את בית ה'* 'to repair the House of the Lord' (2 Chr 24:12). More changes of this sort can be found in a comparison of the following passages:

2 Kgs 12:7–9	2 Chr 24:5b–6
7. לא חזקו הכהנים את בדיק הבית . . .	5b. ולא מהרו הלויים
8. מדוע אינכם מחזקים את בדיק הבית ועתה אל תקחו כסף מאת מכריכם כי לבדיק הבית תתנהו	6. מדוע לא דרשת על הלויים להביא מיהודה ומירושלם את משאת משה עבד ה' . . .
9. ויאתו הכהנים . . . ולבלתי חזק את בדיק הבית	
7. the priests <i>had not repaired the cracks in the Temple</i> . . . .	5b. the Levites <i>did not act quickly</i> . . . .
8. "Why are you not <i>repairing the cracks in the Temple</i> ?" Now therefore do not accept any more money from your donors but set it aside for <i>the cracks in the Temple</i> ."	6. "Why have you <i>not demanded</i> that <i>the Levites bring in</i> from Judah and Jerusalem the tax levied by Moses, the servant of the Lord?"
9. Then the priests agreed . . . not to <i>repair the cracks in the Temple</i> .	

It is also possible that the Chronicler was interpreting the word *בדיק* in the sense of 'reinforce, repair'. A verb derived from this root is found in Ben Sira (ca. 200 B.C.E.): "In whose generation the Temple was *repaired* (*נבדק*) / and in whose days the Temple was *reinforced* (*חזק*)" (Sir 50:1);<sup>66</sup> in Rabbinic Hebrew: "of the fund for the repairing of the Temple" (*m. Šeqal.* 4:2); "the funds dedicated to the repairing of the Temple do not free other suitable funds dedicated to the altar sacrifices" (5:4); and "all the altar sacrifices are for the altar, and those dedicated to the repairing of the Temple are for the repairing of the Temple" (*m. Me'il.* 9:2).<sup>67</sup> Based on these examples, the words *לחזק ולחזק* in 2 Chr 34:10 were used as a hendiadys.

This is one general example of erroneous use of an expression/word or explanation based on a late interpretation.<sup>68</sup> Whatever the cause, it

66. See Segal, *Ben-Sira*, 342–43.

67. For additional examples, see Kasowski, *A Thesaurus of Talmudic Hebrew*, 7.34–36.

68. Against Willi, who believes that the substitution of *לחזק ולחזק הבית* for *בדיק* was intended to create a stronger effect in Chronicles (*Chronik*, 89).

is clear that the verse has a meaning different from the sense intended by the earlier author.

**20.15** According to 1 Kgs 9:26–28, Solomon built ships at Ezion-geber, near Elath<sup>69</sup> on the shore of the Red Sea, and Hiram, king of Tyre, sent “his servants, sailors who were familiar with the sea”<sup>70</sup> to Solomon. Hiram’s servants sailed to Ophir with Solomon’s servants to import gold.

In 2 Chr 8:17–18 the Chronicler apparently wanted to show that Solomon initiated this expedition. He wrote that Solomon went “to Ezion-geber and to Elath on the seacoast” (instead of “Ezion-geber, near Elath” in Kings!); and Hiram sent him not only Tyrian sailors but also ships: “Hiram sent him, with his servants, *ships and servants familiar with the sea*. They went to Ophir with Solomon’s servants and imported gold . . . from there.” This does not seem to be a textual error, as Rudolph claims. He emends the text to read, “And for the ships he sent him servants who know well the sea.”<sup>71</sup> At any rate, there is no textual support for either the supposed error or for the proposed emendation. The Chronicler’s citation is a paraphrase of the earlier text<sup>72</sup> that ignored the vast geographical and technological problems prohibiting the dispatch of ships from Tyre on the Phoenician coast to Ezion-geber on the Red Sea—either by land<sup>73</sup> or by sea. It is unreasonable to assume that Hiram’s ships sailed from Tyre around the African continent to reach Ezion-geber. Neither is there any evidence of a canal linking the Nile and the Red Sea during the Solomonic era.<sup>74</sup> However, these possibilities existed in the Chronicler’s day, as we read in Herodotus 2.158 and 4.42 and on steles set up by Darius I (522–486 B.C.E.) along the route of the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea. On one of the steles, Darius said, “I ordered this canal to be dug to link the river flowing throughout Egypt with the sea coming from Persia . . .

69. The LXX translates it Αἰλαθ (= Elath), as in 2 Kgs 14:22. This verse in 1 Kings contradicts the claim made by Glueck that Ezion-geber and Elath are two names for the same location (“Elath, Eloth,” 268, 272). It is reasonable “to locate Ezion-geber on the coast of the Sinai Peninsula, opposite the island of Jezirat Far’an, or on the island itself, but the name Elath must be connected with the later Elat (‘Aqaba)” (Ahituv, “Ezion-geber,” 332–33).

70. “Sailors” and “who were familiar with the sea” are an example of hendiadys.

71. Rudolph, *Chronik*, 220.

72. Cf. Curtis-Madsen, *Chronicles*, 355; Elmslie, *Chronicles* (1916), 202.

73. No reference is made here to transporting materials or parts to build ships in Ezion-geber but only to “ships” themselves.

74. See Butzer, “Kanal,” 312–13.

and ships sail from Egypt along this canal to Persia.”<sup>75</sup> But the sources available to us do not indicate that this canal existed during the period of the United Monarchy.

**20.16** 2 Sam 10:6 does not say where the Aramean and the other armies that the Ammonites hired to help them camped. In 1 Chr 19:7 the Chronicler added the name of the location to the earlier text: “They came *and camped before Medaba*.”<sup>76</sup> In contrast, in vv. 16–17, he omitted the place-name Helam, where the armies of Hadadezer assembled; this name does appear in 2 Sam 10:16–17. The omission may have stemmed from the fact that the Chronicler was not familiar with the place. As a result, he may have read אלהם ‘to them’ instead of חלאמה ‘Helam’ in 2 Sam 10:17.<sup>77</sup>

*2 Sam 10:16–17*

וישלח הדדעזר ויצא את ארם  
אשר מעבר הנהר ויבאו חילם . . .  
ויגד לדוד ויאסף את כל ישראל  
ויעבר את הירדן ויבא חלאמה  
Hadadezer sent and brought the  
Arameans who were beyond the  
Euphrates, *and they came to  
Helam*. . . . When they told  
David, he gathered together all  
Israel, crossed the Jordan, and  
came *to Helam*.

*1 Chr 19:16–17*

וישלחו מלאכים ויוציאו את ארם  
אשר מעבר הנהר . . . . .  
ויגד לדוד ויאסף את כל ישראל  
ויעבר הירדן ויבא אלהם  
They sent messengers to bring the  
Arameans who were beyond the  
Euphrates . . . . .  
When David was told, he  
gathered together all Israel,  
crossed the Jordan, and  
came *to them*.

Indeed, the precise location of Helam is disputed to this day.<sup>78</sup>

**20.17** This phenomenon of mistaken, late interpretations is even more significant when we consider a comment made by the Chronicler at the end of the genealogical list of the tribes on the east bank of the Jordan River. 2 Kings 15 describes two Assyrian expeditions to the land of Israel. One was during the days of Menahem ben-Gadi, king of Israel:

75. See Weissbach, *Keilinschriften*, 102–5, and especially §3 on pp. 104–5 (Gewicht-Inschriften, Dar. Pond. 9); and also Tsafir, “Suez Region,” 94–95. For a comprehensive discussion of the four steles that were erected by Darius I, and on the Greek as well as other sources, see Redmount, “Canals of the Pharaohs,” 127–35.

76. For this, see example 3.24 (p. 84).

77. Against Curtis-Madsen, *Chronicles*, 241 and others, who emend here in accordance with the verse in 2 Samuel: ויבא חלאמה ‘and he came to Helam’.

78. See Kallai, “Helam,” 114; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 273.

*Pul, king of Assyria*, came against the land. Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver to support him in maintaining his hold on the kingdom. (v. 19)

The other expedition was during the reign of Pekah, king of Israel:

*Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria*, came and captured Ijon, Abel-beth-maacah, Janoah, Kedesh, Hazor, Gilead, Galilee, and all the land of Naphtali and exiled them to Assyria. (v. 29)<sup>79</sup>

These expeditions took place during the reigns of two kings of Israel, with a time interval between them. The expedition against Menahem apparently took place in 738 B.C.E.,<sup>80</sup> whereas the expedition against Pekah apparently occurred at the end of 733 or the beginning of 732 B.C.E. The two expeditions were undertaken by a single Assyrian king with two names: "Pul" (this is the Pūlu mentioned in Neo-Babylonian sources)<sup>81</sup> and "Tiglath-pileser" (this is the Tukultī-apil-Ešarra<sup>82</sup> who appears in Assyrian documents).

In 1 Chr 5:26 the Chronicler closed the genealogical lists of the Transjordanian tribes with a comment about the end of the tribes during the period of the Assyrian Empire. This comment indicates that he was not aware that the names "Pul" and "Tiglath-pileser/Tilgath-pilneser" mentioned in Kings were two different names for a single Assyrian king; as a result, he listed them as though they were two Assyrian kings:

The God of Israel stirred up *the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser*,<sup>83</sup> king of Assyria, to exile Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh and bring them to Halah, Habor, Hara,<sup>84</sup> and the river Gozan, to this day.<sup>85</sup>

79. Compare this verse with the Annals of Tiglath-pileser III; see Luckenbill, *ARAB*, vol. 1, §772, §§815–19; Pritchard, *ANET*, 283–84.

80. See Tadmor, "Azariah in Assyrian Inscriptions," 180–87.

81. See idem, "Pul," 443; Cogan-Tadmor, *II Kings*, 171–72, and the earlier literature cited there.

82. For this name, see Tadmor, "Tiglat-Pileser," 415; Cogan-Tadmor, *II Kings*, 187.

83. In 1 Chr 5:6; 2 Chr 28:20: תלגת־פלנאסר. These are late forms of the name תלגת־פלנאסר, apparently resulting from dissimilation.

84. The name *Hara* is not mentioned in 2 Kgs 17:6 and 18:11, on the basis of which the Chronicler compiled his list; nor does it appear anywhere else in the Bible or extrabiblical literature. It may be the result of dittography with the following word, ונהר. If this is indeed the case, the correct reading is וחבור נהר גוזן, that is, in the jurisdiction of Habor, which is the river in the Assyrian district of Gozan.

85. On this phenomenon, see also example 15.9 n. 27 (p. 335).