
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

SOME FACTORS IN EARLY HEBREW HISTORY

HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN
BARRISTER-AT-LAW

II.

ONCE seated on the throne of all Israel, David reverted to the policy of Moses. He realized the ideal of a religious capital, and strengthened it by making it identical with the capital of a powerful and well-organized kingdom. The actual choice made was exceptionally happy. David captured a fortress that lay in the territory of Benjamin, Saul's tribe, but had apparently never passed into Israelite possession.[1] Historically David's capital was unencumbered by any inconvenient traditions of any former Israelite rule. As it had never been national territory, no troublesome questions could arise in connection with the expropriation of unwilling Israelite land owners, as happened with another site in the case of Naboth. What it was in Israel's affections, and what it was thereafter to become, it owed solely to David and his house. Politically it had many advantages. It was sufficiently central. By giving the tribe of Benjamin the prestige and solid advantages of having the national capital situate on its territory, it did much to conciliate the portion of the nation that would most resent the change of dynasty. And yet tribalism could have no sway in it, for it had never been incorporated in any tribal organization. If other tribes might feel jealous that the dynasty came from Judah, they could have no corresponding prejudice against the capital. The principle embodied in its choice was similar to that which often leads to the selection of a new capital in territory that is federalized when a number of existing states voluntarily combine in a new federal union. By its situation on the main mountain range of the country, between the two great rival tribes of Ephraim and Judah, near the

[1] See BS, Oct. 1919, pp. 470 f.

highway between them, Jerusalem became to some extent a connecting link, even as it had previously been part of the hostile barrier that separated South from North. Here again we see Benjamin, in the choice of the capital, enjoying the benefit of the mediating position given to it by geography and its inherent weakness, just as a generation before this had given it the crown. The military strength of the new capital was enormous. Not merely was the site easily defensible; the city had the striking advantage of possessing a natural spring in the midst of an arid region, so that any besieging army had to fight against thirst, while the defenders were relieved of anxiety as to their water supply. Moreover, it lies within easy reach of the head of a valley leading from the sea along which runs the modern railway from the coast. On the other hand, one disadvantage was connected with some of its most striking advantages. The native population naturally did not share in the historical and religious reminiscences and ideals of Israel, and the prophet Ezekiel declares in no uncertain language that this ultimately led to even worse religious abuses than those that prevailed in Samaria and Sodom (xvi; esp. ver. 44 ff.).

By bringing up the Ark with due ceremonial and solemnity, David made Jerusalem the religious capital to the same extent as Shiloh had been. The policy of giving it a magnificent temple which, while not carried into execution till the next reign, had its inception with this monarch, lent additional importance to the position of religious capital. David's conquests removed all danger from hostile enclaves or foreign oppressors, and his building and military operations necessarily imply the existence or construction of good roads (2 Ś v 9–12).[1] The creation of a considerable empire, of which Jerusalem was the capital,

[1] It must not be forgotten that in that age the king was the roadmaking authority (see Nu xx 17, xxi 22, and Mesha's statement, "I made the highway by the Arnon," on the Moabite stone). The Hebrew monarchy did much to improve the means of communication. At the time of the invasion the Israelites conquered the

still further raised the importance and prestige of the city. His military organization, moreover, included a bodyguard, which to a great extent insured the safety and stability of the monarchy.

David, then, gave Israel a hereditary national dynasty, a stable central government, a great religious center, a permanent political capital, the heritage of an imperial age, and, apparently, a considerable administrative organization. We are given lists of officials holding various offices, though our information does not explain the particular duties attached to each. They are, however, sufficient to prove the broad fact, though they give us no knowledge of the details. No previous statesman since Moses had rendered any service at all comparable to his in the struggle against centrifugalism; and he seems to have come within a very little of winning the fight and making a strong national unity for all time.

But centrifugalism was scotched, not killed; and when the scandals of his private life and the unhallowed ambition of Absalom led to a seditious outbreak, the old wounds began to bleed again. The feeling in favor of the house of Saul was not extinct in Benjamin (2 S xvi 5–8). Nor does David seem to have been entirely satisfied as to the loyalty of Saul's son, for he deprived him of half of his property (xix 25–31 (24–30)). In addition to this hostile feeling of the partisans of the fallen dynasty, the national unity was badly jarred by the emphasis laid on the feud between Judah and Israel. The narrative gives us an impression both of the rivalry between the two and of the king's personal hold on Israel, and claims through blood on Judah (xix 9b–16 (8b–15)). The progress of the quarrel is also vividly depicted (41–44 (40–43)). It was at this point that the two currents seem to have coalesced. The

hill country, but not plains, where chariots could manoeuver; but in the time of Solomon the roads had been so improved that one at least of his cities for chariots was Zeredah in Mount Ephraim (see also 2 S xv 1). The importance of this in the struggle for unity must not be overlooked.

feeling of Benjamin poisoned the weapon that the rivalry of Judah and Israel had forged. "We have no portion in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: every man to his tents, O Israel" (see xx 1 f.). The rebellion was suppressed, but not before David had realized that it contained the seeds of greater trouble than Absalom's revolt (xx 6).

Moreover, there is one other aspect of his policy that perhaps has a bearing on our subject. We have seen that the rise of Israel had been made possible by the eclipse of the great powers. David's conquests had now created, in regions over which Egypt had once exercised sovereignty, a monarchy of considerable strength. If ever the Southern kingdom should again seek to pursue a policy of expansion, or even of aggression, in Asia, it would inevitably become hostile to the Hebrew power and would gladly embrace any chance of weakening it by internal divisions.

Solomon continued his father's centralizing policy and increased and perfected the civil and religious organization of the kingdom. For the purposes of this study certain aspects only of his policy claim attention. Substantially the keynote appears to have been magnificence. He was unwarlike, and sought to maintain peace by matrimonial alliances, the upkeep of a powerful and well-equipped force (1 K x 26, 2 Ch i 14, ix 25) and fortifications (1 K ix 15, 17 ff.). He stimulated trade to bring in money; and the peace and wealth he obtained by these means were utilized to carry out a huge building program, and to support an enormous royal establishment. For these ends, too, he levied immense exactions in labor[1] and in kind from his Israelite subjects as well as from the Canaanites (1 K ix 21). The improved organization of which we read in 1 K iv was designed for the same end.

[1] The statement of 1 K ix 22, 2 Ch viii 9, that no forced levy was made from the Israelites conflicts with 1 K v 13 ff., xii 4, and with the fact that Jeroboam was over the levy of the house of Joseph (xi 28).

As it departed in some respects from the purely tribal division, it may have had a slight tendency to counteract tribalism; and the improvements in the means of communication, the stimulus given to pilgrimages by the splendor of the Temple and capital, and the enforced traveling of the labor levies, with their consequent acquaintance with other districts than their own, all tended towards strengthening the national unity. But these were much more than outweighed by the oppressive nature of Solomon's exactions. He imposed on the people greater burdens than they could tolerate. The contributions of revenue and service which were the inevitable price of the monarchy had formed the burden of the objection raised to its institution. Whether or not we regard 1 S viii 11–18 as colored by later experience, there can be no doubt whatever that any form of national organization and provision for safety could only be obtained by paying the cost, and that many minds would object to it on that ground. Solomon, however, went far beyond what was necessary or reasonable, and by his magnificence seems to have laden the people too heavily. This is made the ground of complaint in the next reign. The narrative of 1 K xi lays stress on two other factors: first, that Solomon loved many strange women; and, secondly, that he was unfaithful. But the first of these is an objection of later times, for the Law never prohibits unions with Egyptians, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, or Zidonians. Intermarriage with the Hittites of Canaan is prohibited by Dt vii. As we have seen,[1] the Mosaic provisions were strictly limited to what was necessary. It appears further that Jeroboam had married an Egyptian wife.[2] Nevertheless, his candidature in the next reign enjoyed some prophetic support. We may therefore take this objection to be the work of a later age. Again, while Solomon's religious infidelity may have alienated some support, it does not seem to have had much in-

[1] *Supra*, p. 209.

[2] For proofs of this and other statements that are not supported by the Hebrew, see Appendix.

fluence in causing the schism; and certainly the breaking off of the northern tribes led to permanent religious deterioration.

A more dangerous result of the policy was, however, the accumulation of great treasure in Jerusalem. We have already noted the fact that the creation of a fairly powerful state in Palestine constituted a barrier against an Egyptian irruption into Asia. That would be a reason for Egypt to try to weaken it; and if this could be effected, a plundering raid promised to be a lucrative undertaking. During Solomon's reign there was a change of dynasty [1]

[1] Attempts have been made to identify Shishak I. with the Pharaoh who gave Solomon his daughter and captured Gezer. It is *primâ facie* improbable that Shishak, the brother-in-law of Solomon's younger contemporary, Jeroboam, should have been the father-in-law of the older king, and the chronological difficulties disprove the theory. From 1 K xiv 25 we know that Shishak invaded in the 5th year of Rehoboam. In the Silsileh quarry is a stele containing an inscription from which it appears that, in the 21st year of his reign, Shishak gave instructions for the erection of the Karnak monument on which his record of the event appears. At the very outside, therefore, he cannot have been reigning contemporaneously with Solomon for more than 16 years, and the period may well have been much less. H. R. Hall (Ancient History of the Near East, 4th ed [1919], p. 439) thinks it was about 12 years.

The length of Solomon's reign is unknown, for the 40 years of 1 K xi 42 is not an arithmetical number. The building of the Temple began in his 4th year, the completion of that and his own palace occupied rather more than 20 years (20 years according to 1 K ix 10), but the building of the Temple really occupied 7½ years (vi 1, 37 f.), and his own house 13 years (vii 1). The building of Millo was subsequent (ix 24), and apparently also the other building activities with which Jeroboam is associated. Some considerable time must therefore be allowed between the completion of the house built for Pharaoh's daughter (ix 24) and the end of the reign. She, however, had been accommodated in the city of David (iii 1) for some previous period, while the great buildings were being completed; and her own house cannot even have been planned before the alliance was contracted. Moreover, the building of Gezer was necessarily subsequent to this (ix 16). We know that the first four items of the list of Solomon's build-

in Egypt, and the new Pharaoh, Sheshonk I. (the Biblical Shishak or Shushak), was an enterprising Libyan soldier. It will appear in the sequel that he did not fail to utilize the opportunities presented to him by the weak points in Solomon's policy and the personal factors that came into play after his death.

Our books of Kings have been much edited, and Greek translations seem to have been made of successive Hebrew editions. Side by side with a narrative of the schism that substantially agrees with our present Hebrew text, some of our Greek authorities have preserved a portion of an older translation. This gives a widely different account of the material events, and enables us to see where the truth lies. A rendering of it and a discussion of the main points of difference will be found in the Appendix. The historical results that flow from that discussion are here assumed.

ings in ix 15, 17, are in chronological order, and this raises the presumption that the others may be. As Shishak was a usurper, he will hardly have been in a position to attack Gezer immediately after his seizure of power. These considerations, taken together, show that the time is insufficient to allow of all the activities that must be placed between Solomon's marriage and death. The fair inference from the Hebrew narrative is that Solomon married the Egyptian princess in the earlier portion of his reign, not in the later.

Whether Shishak attacked Israel as well as Judah is uncertain. It is not so stated in 1 K; but his Karnak inscription gives a list of towns and localities he is said to have plundered, and this includes a number of Israelite items. The trustworthiness of this list in this respect is upheld by some, but impugned by others. No decisive argument can be adduced, but personally I lean towards the view of those who accept the invasion as historical, and connect the removal of Jeroboam's capital from Shechem to Penuel (1 K xii 25) with the Egyptian danger. It must be remembered that the notice of 1 K xiv 25 f. is a portion of the narrative that is based on the chronicles of the kings of Judah, and consequently would not naturally deal with the non-Judæan portion of a Pharaoh's campaign. On the other hand, Jeroboam's reign is treated almost entirely from the point of view of religion. Hence the silence of Kings appears to be no argument for questioning the reality of the invasion.

The schism was the result of the conjunction of four factors: (1) the old centrifugalism, flowering in the attitude of Ephraim, Joshua's tribe, which even in the period of the Judges had considered the lead its birthright; (2) the oppressive policy of Solomon, with its unreasonable demands for forced service and excessive taxation; (3) the personal equation, a half-foreign boy in his teens being pitted against the ripe maturity of the ablest Israelite of his age, who, while of the lowest birth, was yet the son of an Ephraimite mother; and (4) the support of Egypt cunningly given to a blow directed against the weakest point in the national armor.

Jeroboam was the son of an Ephraimite woman of loose character. By sheer force of ability he had risen to a high post under Solomon. He had been in charge of the Ephraimite *corvée,* and had fortified Zeredah in Mount Ephraim and also executed other important works for the king. He had abused his position to aim at the kingdom. Solomon therefore sought to slay him; but Jeroboam escaped to Egypt, where Shishak received him into favor, and gave him an Egyptian princess of preëminent rank to wife. On Solomon's death he returned. While we are not expressly informed that Shishak gave him material assistance, that seems to follow necessarily from the facts. The husband of an important Egyptian princess would doubtless go provided with sufficient means to enable him to accomplish his purpose. He threw himself into Zeredah, gathered his own tribe of Ephraim, and constructed a fortification. Subsequently he summoned the other tribes to Shechem, whither Rehoboam, a boy of 16, also repaired. The people made representations to the king as to the intolerable nature of the burdens imposed by Solomon, and promised their allegiance conditionally on his giving them relief. The elders of the people advised acceptance, but the king's playmates suggested an insolent answer that accorded better with his childish disposition. That provoked the old retort of Sheba: "We have *no* share in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse; to

thy tents, O Israel, for this man is not fit for a ruler or a leader." Judah and Benjamin alone remained true to the dynasty. "Is fecit cui profuit"—the leader of the rebellion became king of the ten tribes, the Pharaoh who had aided him gained rich plunder some four years later by invading the southern and probably also the northern kingdom, and his country was permanently relieved of the danger of a powerful state near its Asiatic frontier.

Was the schism inevitable, or could it have been prevented? The theory of 1 K xii 15 that it was a thing brought about by God is not sustained by the earlier text, and our judgment must be formed on an estimate of the historical factors at work. There are four reasons for holding that with a little more wisdom the calamity could have been prevented: (1) While the centrifugal force was always very strong, a wise policy had succeeded in so conciliating Benjamin that, though it had lost the *kingship*, and had at one time been far from loyal (2 S xx, *etc.*), *it* remained faithful to the house of David at this supreme hour. It is true that the same steps could not have been taken in dealing with Ephraim; but had the king had an Ephraimite consort, and had his mother come from some powerful family of that tribe, instead of being a granddaughter of Nahash, the feeling of the Ephraimites might well have been different. (2) At the time of the schism the bulk of the Israelites hardly seem to have desired it. They were driven to it by the policy of Solomon and the immaturity of his successor. There is no reason to suppose that their promise to serve Rehoboam if he would lighten their burden was not made in good faith; and the elders, who were in the best position to judge, advised acceptance. (3) According to xii 24y (LXX)=xii 23, Rehoboam retained a remnant of the people in addition to the two tribes. This points to the existence of a loyal element in Israel outside these tribes, even after the crowning blunder. (4) Jeroboam's apprehensions (1 K xii 26) as to a return to the house of David witness to the strength of the national feeling.

Centrifugalism was the old enemy; and it was inevitable that, sooner or later, a large tribe like Ephraim should throw up a leader who would be incomparably abler than the contemporary head of the Davidic dynasty. That such a man should aspire to the throne was not unnatural, but it was by no means inevitable that there should be a conjuncture of all the other circumstances. No such serious consequences would have ensued had the foreign pressure been as strong as it usually was, and had it followed the customary channel. Whether Shishak would have undertaken his campaign if the kingdom had remained undivided we cannot now say; and accordingly not too much can be built on the probability that if the schism had been averted for a few years the Egyptian danger would have prevented it. But in the north Aram was a rising power, and a collision with Israel was inevitable sooner or later. Once the Syrian wars had begun, the northern tribes would have had the strongest reason for maintaining the union, while every year would have tightened the bonds of national and religious unity. At the worst there would have been a change of dynasty.

It was perhaps inevitable in those days that a king succeeding to the throne at 16 should be free of all control. This is a matter in which experience has taught wisdom, and few modern communities would so order their constitutions as to leave their fate in the hands of a headstrong boy. And in the absence of modern constitutional devices it was not easy to give Ephraim a sufficient share in the government to avoid all danger of friction. But the matrimonial policy of Solomon was directed to the satisfaction of every power except his own subjects, and the pressure of his levies and taxes far exceeded what would have been imposed by a wise and patriotic statesmanship. Judged even by contemporary standards, it would seem that the errors of Solomon's policy must be held largely responsible for the untoward issue of the long conflict and the final though partial triumph of centrifugalism.

APPENDIX

In the following discussion, M stands for the Massoretic (or Received) Hebrew text; S, for the LXX. Immediately after 1 K xii 24 in M, B and some other authorities of S have a long passage that does not occur in M in its present form. It comes from a Greek translation of an earlier edition of Kings. The rendering below follows the text of B (except where otherwise stated) and the numbering of the Cambridge editions. Where M has a similar statement, the reference is added in brackets: in a number of cases square brackets [] denote that the corresponding passage in M contains something material that is not found in S: passages found in S only are in parentheses (): substantial differences in statements of fact are italicized. No notice is taken of some small variations of reading that are not material from the historical point of view. But this system is not carried through with absolute uniformity, owing to the difficulty in some passages where the rewriting makes it impracticable.

In regard to the names the familiar forms of the English Bible are substituted. S presents varieties due to three causes: (*a*) differences of transliteration; (*b*) differences in the pronunciation of the unpunctuated Hebrew consonantal text; and (*c*) differences in the consonantal reading. Of these classes, (c) alone represents true textual differences. Thus the name of a place is Zeredah in EV, but Sareira in S. Allowing for (a) and (b), the only case of (c) is the difference between ר and ד. Similarly the variation in the name of Jeroboam's mother is at bottom the difference between י and ו. Even if we were able to prove which of these forms are right, it would not help us in judging the comparative historical value of S and M; for, obviously, an account that was superior in substance might have suffered corruption in small matters of this kind. But in point of fact we have no means of ascertaining the correct forms. In these circumstances the easiest plan appears to be to adhere to the forms with which the

reader is familiar, and not to distract his attention from the important historical questions involved by introducing these minute points of discrepancy.

24a And (king) Solomon slept with his fathers, and was buried (with his fathers) in the city of David []: and Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead (in Jerusalem) [xi 43]. He was *sixteen* years old when he began to reign, and he reigned *twelve* years in Jerusalem []: and his mother's name was Naamah (daughter of Hanun, son of Nahash, king of) *Ammon* [xiv 21]; (and he did that which was evil before the Lord, and walked not in the way of David his father).

24b *And there was a man from Mount* Ephraim a servant of Solomon, *and his name was* Jeroboam [], and his mother's name was Zeruah, a *harlot* [xi 26a], and Solomon made him tally-master [perhaps=M's "gave him charge"] over [] the levies [EV "labour"] of the house of Joseph [xi 28b]. (And Solomon built [or "he built for Solomon," which is clearly the reading of other S texts,] Zeredah which is in Mount Ephraim, and he had three hundred chariots of horses;) *he* [οὗτος emphatic] built Millo (with the levies of the house of Ephraim); (*he* [οὗτος emphatic]) inclosed [] the city of David [] [xi 27b], and *he was exalting himself over the kingdom* [xi 26b].

24c Solomon sought therefore to kill him: but *he took fright* and fled [] unto Shishak, king of Egypt, and was *with him* until the death of Solomon [xi 40].

24d And Jeroboam [] heard in Egypt [xii 2a] (that Solomon was dead, and he spake in the ears of Shishak king of Egypt, saying), Let me depart, that I may go to mine own country [xi 21b]; (And Shishak said to him, Ask what thou wilt, and I will give it to thee).

24e (Now Shishak had given to Jeroboam Ano [1] the sister of Tahpenes [S here, and in xi 20 f., "Thekemeina"], the elder of his wife to him to wife [1]; she was the great one [2] among the daughters of the king, and she bare to Jeroboam Abijah his son) [contrast xi 20].

[1] I have preserved the confused order of the original, and the doublets "to Jeroboam . . . to him," which show that the text had been glossed. [Duplicate superior figures indicate limits.—EDITOR.]

[2] Perhaps a translation of some title; *v.l.* ἡ μεγαλη, "was great," for ἡ μεγαλη.

24f (And Jeroboam said to Shishak, Let me depart in any wise that I may go. And Jeroboam went out from Egypt, and came to Zeredah [1] which is in Mount Ephraim; and all the tribe of Ephraim gathered together there; and Jeroboam built there a rampart.)

24g And [ ] his *child* fell sick [xiv 1] (with a very grievous sickness; and Jeroboam went to inquire about the child), and he said to (Ano) his wife, Arise, (go) [ ]; (inquire of God concerning the child, whether he shall recover from his sickness) [xiv 2a].

24h (Now there was a man in) Shiloh (and his name was) Ahijah (, and he was sixty years old, and the word of the Lord was with him) [ ] [xiv 2b]. (And Jeroboam said to his wife, Rise) and take with thee (for the man of God) [ ] loaves, and cracknels (for his children and a bunch of grapes), and a cruse of honey [] [xiv 3].

24i And the woman arose [] (and took [2] with her loaves, and two cracknels, and a bunch of grapes, and a cruse of honey for Ahijah [2]). *Now the man was old, and his eyes were dim so that he could not see* [xiv 4a].

24k (And she rose up from Zeredah, and went; and it came to pass as she entered the city to Ahijah the Shilonite that Ahijah said to his servant, Go out, I pray thee, to meet Ano the wife of Jeroboam, and thou shalt say unto her, Come in and tarry not, for thus saith the Lord, Evil do I send on thee.)

24l (And Ano went in to the man of God, and Ahijah said to her, Why hast thou brought me loaves, and a bunch of grapes, and cracknels, and a cruse of honey? Thus saith the Lord, Behold thou shalt depart from me, and it shall be that as thou enterest the gate into Zeredah, thy maidens shall come out to meet thee, and shall say to thee, The child is dead.) [Contrast xiv 12.]

24m (For) thus saith the Lord [], Behold I will cut off from Jeroboam every man child [] [xiv 7–10]; and (it shall be that) him that dieth of Jeroboam in the city shall the dogs eat, and him that dieth in the field shall the fowls of the air eat [] [xiv 11]. [3]*And the child shall be mourned* [3] (Alas, Lord!) [] because in him there was found some good thing toward the Lord [] [xiv 13].

24n And *the woman* [] departed (when she heard this)

[1] B The land of, ΓΗΝ for ΤΗΝ.

[2] HP 71 omits these words.

[3] Or "and the children shall mourn."

[]; (and it came to pass) as *she entered Zeredah* that the child died [xiv 17] (and the sound of mourning came forth to meet her).

(And Jeroboam went to Shechem, which is in Mount Ephraim, and gathered together there the tribes of Israel) and Rehoboam (son of Solomon) went up thither [] [xii 1].

24o *And the word of the Lord came unto Shemaiah, the Enlamite, saying, Take for thyself a new garment which has not been dipped in water, and rend it into twelve pieces; and thou shalt give to Jeroboam, and say to him, Thus saith the Lord,* Take for thyself ten[1] pieces [] (to clothe thyself. And Jeroboam took them; and Shemaiah said, Thus saith the Lord, Over the ten tribes of Israel [Lucian adds "thou shalt reign"]) [cp. xi 29–39].

24p *And the people said* unto Rehoboam (son of Solomon), Thy father made our yoke grievous (and made grievous the food for his table): now therefore make (it) [] lighter (upon us), and we will serve thee [xii 3 f.]. And (Rehoboam) said to *the people* [], Yet three days [] (and I will return you answer) [] [xii 5].

24q *And Rehoboam said, Bring in to me the elders* [] *that I may take counsel with them what answer I shall return to the people* (on the third day. And Rehoboam spake in their ears according as the people's message to him was). *And the elders of the people said,* [2] *Thus hath the people spoken unto thee* [2] [cp. xii 6 f.].

24r But Rehoboam forsook *their* counsel [], (and it was not pleasing in his sight); and *he sent* and brought [] them that were grown up with him [ ], and said to them, [3] *Thus and thus was the people's message to me.* And [] they that were grown up with him said [ ], Thus shalt thou speak to the people (saying), My little finger is thicker than my father's loins: [] my father chastised you with whips, but I will *rule*[4] you with scorpions [cp. xii 8–11].

24s (And the thing was pleasing in the sight of Rehoboam), and he answered the people [] as they (that were

[1] B, "twelve."

[2] There are several variants, but it is useless to attempt to restore the exact text till the materials of the larger Cambridge LXX are available.

[3] B, τα αὐτα, "the same things," for ταυτα.

[4] Or "strike"; unlike M, S does not repeat "chastise."

grown up with him,) the boys, counselled him [] [cp. xii 12–15].

24t *And all the people spoke like one man each to his neighbour, and all shouted aloud, saying,* We have *no* portion in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: to *thy* tents, O Israel; (for this man is not fit for a ruler or a leader) [] [cp. xii 16, 2 S xx 1].

24u (And the people dispersed from Shechem) and departed (each) to his tent [cp. xiii 6b]. But [] Rehoboam *persisted and departed and* got him up to his chariot and *entered* Jerusalem [ ]; (and the whole tribe of Judah and the whole tribe of Benjamin followed him) [cp. xii 17–20].

24x And (it came to pass when the year set in that) [] Rehoboam collected all the *men* of Judah and Benjamin [] (and went up) to fight against *Jeroboam* (to Shechem) [contrast xii 21].

24y But the word of *the Lord* came unto Shemaiah the man of God, Speak unto Rehoboam [] the king of Jodah, and unto all the house of Judah and Benjamin, and to the rest of the people, saying, Thus saith the Lord, Ye shall not go up nor fight against your brethren the children of Israel; return every man to his house, for this thing is of me [xii 23 f.].

24z So they hearkened to the word of the Lord, and *desisted from going* according to the word of the Lord [xii 24b].

It will be seen that the above represents not a supplement to M, but an alternative to large portions of its narrative.

Of the discussions I have examined, the best are those of L. von Ranke, "Weltgeschichte" (ed. 1883), dritter Theil zweite Abtheilung, pp. 4–12; G. W. Wade, "Old Testament History" (6th ed., 1909); and A. T. Olmstead, *American Journal of Semitic Languages* (Oct. 1913, pp. 15 ff., and April, 1915, pp. 169 ff.); and I am indebted to these writers for a few of the points that follow. Professor Olmstead's articles in particular should be read, as he deals with the passage from a textual standpoint; whereas, in the following observations, interest is necessarily concentrated on the historical.

1. The first discrepancy is as to Rehoboam's age on accession — 16 according to S, 41 according to M. Here

S is demonstrably right. In xii 8, 10 (cp. 14), M speaks of "the boys that were grown up with him." "Young men" is a mistranslation. The Hebrew ילדים means "boys," and could not be applied to men of 40. Again, the answer about the whips and scorpions breathes the spirit of children in their teens, and would never have been given by middle-aged men. Lastly, 2 Ch xiii 7 calls him a lad. Here, therefore, M is inferior. The reason for its change is not apparent at first sight, but may possibly be discovered when fuller materials are available.

2. The length of Rehoboam's reign is variously given in different texts of S, and does not agree with M. Now M's chronology of the kingdom is not consistent. No judgment can therefore be formed on our present materials.

3. S makes Rehoboam a great-grandson of Nahash. It is easy to see how repugnant this would be to later Jewish feeling, in view of 1 S xi and 2 S x 6. That would be a reason for cancelling the notice. On the other hand, no Jewish editor would have inserted a statement so hurtful to the national pride. Politically it is entirely in keeping with the matrimonial policy of Solomon, who sought to consolidate his position by such unions. If, as both M and S agree, he made an Ammonitess his wife and the mother of his successor, the presumption is that she was of the royal blood of Ammon, and not a member of some less eminent house. Consequently S should be accepted.

4. S makes Jeroboam's mother a harlot; M, a widow. In accordance with this, there is no father in S. Jephthah, too, was the son of a harlot (Jgs xi 1). Later interpretation may possibly have understood the ממזר of Dt xxiii 3 (2) as a person not born in wedlock (see LXX and Vulg *ad loc.*), though this is not correct. If so, an editor who was dominated by such ideas, obviously could not believe that the man to whom a prophet promised the kingdom should be one of a class that could not come into the congregation of the Lord unto the tenth generation. But I think it unlikely that this view of Dt xxiii prevailed

in Jewish circles. In any case, however, later Judaism would take exception to the elevation of the son of a harlot. Hence the substitution of widow. Here, again, Jewish feeling would have made it impossible for anybody finding "widow" to alter it into "harlot," in view of the prophetic attitude. The reading of S is therefore original.

5. With regard to the utilization of Jeroboam and the Ephraimite levy to build Millo and inclose Jerusalem, S and M are substantially at one, for the present position of xi 27b would be unintelligible unless Jeroboam was employed on this work. But while M fails to make the connection plain, the narrative of S is clear and perspicuous, and deserves the preference.

6. There is a most material discrepancy as to the reason why Solomon sought to kill Jeroboam. According to S, the latter had acquired a position of considerable power in the king's service, and had fortified Zeredah and garrisoned it for the king. He was now using this and his position with his tribesmen to aim at the throne. There is nothing improbable in such a story, for there are thousands of instances in history of a powerful subordinate seeking the kingdom. M's story is very different. Jeroboam was met by a prophet Ahijah of Shiloh (who, as we know from the story of the sick child, detested his action) and promised the kingdom. The prophecy of the ten pieces is assigned to this period. Although "they two were alone in the field" (xi 29), this is the ground for Solomon's trying to kill Jeroboam; and the prophet, who, curiously enough, does not incur the king's wrath by his action, is so far from gauging the character of the man he is inciting to treason that he promises "a sure house, as I built for David" (xi 33), conditionally on good religious conduct. In plain English such conduct would have been high treason, and nothing else. That is the first great objection to this narrative. In a time of profound national tranquillity — so runs the story — the prophet incites a subject to conspire against the national government and unity. Surely such things are not to be believed of a

prophet if there is a reasonable probable alternative account. Nor do the minor discrepancies to which attention has been drawn make it more credible. Yet such action might be possible if genuine religious necessities called for it. But it could only be regarded as the work of a true prophet if it in fact resulted in religious improvements of sufficient magnitude to justify it. Assuming that all the facts were as stated in M, what were the religious fruits of the prophetic action? The seer had done all in his power to destroy the nation. Did he save the religion? Did he hand over the north to one who rescued the true faith, and imprinted on his people a religious character which would enable it to withstand the buffets of the world? On the contrary, history has justified the bitter epithet which rings through the narrative books — Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin! The south which the prophet attacked succeeded in ultimately purifying the religion, and creating a nation that in nearly three thousand years of a history of unparalleled tragedy and strain never proved wholly false to its God. The king he instituted wrecked the purity of the people's religion for good and all, and began the long chain of impiety that ultimately led to a sad and unhonored end, not merely for the nation but also for the faith. The royal house he rejected gave its people the benefit of a stable and untroubled succession: the monarch he set up proved to be but the first of a series of conspirators who could dethrone their masters, but invariably failed to give the country a settled dynasty. From the point of view of national strength the act was a crime. He bequeathed to the Hebrews a civil war, and delivered a weakened Judah, and probably also Israel, to the tender mercies of the Egyptian invader, while leaving both kingdoms too powerless to play any great rôle in the world or to give their peoples the security that the united monarchy could have afforded. And, as we have seen, the treason was not relieved by any religious benefit resulting from the elevation of Jeroboam, who, on the contrary, made Israel to sin.

These considerations appear to be conclusive against M's form of the narrative. With regard to the difference in the name of the prophet, see 11 *infra*. In S, on the other hand, not merely are the minor discrepancies entirely wanting, but the prophet (Shemaiah) is not the author of the trouble, and his intervention does not take place till the popular discontent and the progress of the rebellion had advanced so far that a schism could have been prevented only by concessions on the part of the king which anybody who knew his character could see to be out of the question. Nor is there any suggestion of an expectation of religious benefit. S is here to be preferred.

7. S shows internal signs of glossing in 24e, which will not read, as well as in many other passages. Tahpenes was apparently an earlier queen. According to xi 19 f., Hadad of Edom had married her sister before the death of David. For the chronological reasons given (*supra*, p. 381, *note*), it is impossible that the same person should still have been the Egyptian queen and the wife of a totally different Pharaoh. We must either hold that Tahpanes has been erroneously introduced into the text of 1 K xi 19 f. or else that S has here been glossed from the earlier passage. The latter view is supported by the incoherence of the text. There is, of course, no improbability in supposing that in two different generations Egyptian policy favored matrimonial alliances with claimants to Palestinian thrones.

8. With regard to the statement of S that Jeroboam married an Egyptian princess, like Solomon, we must remember that, according to the true meaning of the Law, which was still comprehended, there was no objection to this. It was only from the time of Ezra that the Mosaic provisions were misinterpreted. Now it will be seen that an editor who blamed Solomon for his foreign marriages (xi 1 ff.) could not possibly tolerate a narrative which elevated the husband of an Egyptian princess to a throne with the approval or at the instance of a prophet, just as he could not tolerate his birth out of wedlock. But, polit-

ically, it is very probable that Shishak did make a matrimonial alliance with Jeroboam, gave him the necessary funds for his attempt, and subsequently recouped himself with interest at the expense of the two wealthy and disunited kingdoms left at his mercy by the schism. Nor is there any ground for suspecting the name given by S to Jeroboam's wife, though, for the reason given, the editor of M would necessarily delete the name of the Egyptian princess. Here, again, it is possible to derive M from the original of S, but not to perform the converse process.

9. According to S, Jeroboam returns after Solomon's death and starts a secession of his own tribe, fortifying himself in his own city. After an interval he is strong enough to go to Shechem and gather the other tribes there. Rehoboam comes to the assembly after the people's discontent has been thoroughly organized under Jeroboam's leadership. That gives a reason for the gathering at Shechem. According to M, this was held to make Rehoboam king (xii 1). He was of course king already, but presumably the idea intended is that of a formal inauguration ceremony. There is no precedent for the choice of this town for the purpose. Further, M gives no intelligible account of Jeroboam's return. The statements of xi 2, 3a, cannot stand: for (*a*) this passage is wanting in the LXX, which inserts a similar notice of his return (but to his city Zeredah in Mount Ephraim) in the middle of xi 43, and then repeats the statement that King Solomon slept with his fathers; (*b*) the narrative hesitates between attributing Jeroboam's return to his receipt of the news or to a message from the people; (*c*) his presence in ver. 3 is incompatible with xi 20; (*d*) as we have seen that the prophecy of the ten pieces cannot stand where M places it, the present narrative leaves no room or occasion for it. In this matter, therefore, M appears inferior to S.

This story passed through several stages. We may note, in passing, that the Greek xi 43 still recognizes a return to Zeredah, and xii 20 harmonizes with this. See further Olmstead's articles.

10. There are several points about the prophecy of the sick child. B omits xiv 1–20, and we have to decide the true date of the incident and the better form of the narrative. The following points stand out in M: (*a*) Jeroboam's wife disguises herself, but this is hardly of a piece with the fact that Ahijah was blind (xiv 4), a trait that is common to both texts. It looks as if an editor finding the story in an earlier form, and removing it to a period when Jeroboam's wife was a queen, had overlooked this point, and consequently made her disguise herself to hide her rank. (*b*) The expression "I am sent to thee" (xiv 6) is not in keeping with the situation. It is the woman who has come to him. (*c*) "Thou hast done evil above all that were before thee" (xiv 9) is not appropriate to Jeroboam. (*d*) The difference between the Zeredah of S and the Tirzah of M (xiv 17) is merely due to the different location of the passage and gives no clue to the original position. (*e*) The elaboration of Ahijah's prophecy tells against M, the simpler form of S being clearly the more original. (*f*) It is objected that 24m foretells the punishment before Jeroboam has committed the sin. That is a mistake based on the theory of M, which regards his religious offenses as his worst sin. That is the view of later Judaism; but to the inhabitants of Judah in his own age, and for long after, by far his worst offense must have been the successful schism. So long as Judah retained national independence, the fall to a small power, the civil war, Shishak's invasion and spoliation, and the other evils that resulted from the schism must have created far more bitterness against Jeroboam and his memory than any of his religious actions. An early writer would assign weight to these — especially when contrasted with the national position under David and Solomon rather than to any ritual irregularities. If S be read with a mind cleared of M's presuppositions, there is no improbability whatever in this language being used by an early historian in dealing with the period in which Jeroboam was actively and successfully engaged in the rebellion that culminated in his ele-

vation to the throne. On the other hand, it is impossible to suggest any reason why an editor finding this incident where it is placed by M, should transfer it to its position in S.

11. S attributes the prophecy of the pieces to Shemaiah, not Ahijah. This harmonizes with the former's rôle in both texts (xi 22 f. and 24y). M seems to have changed the name for dramatic effect (see 1 K xiv 2).

12. The dialogue with the people presents several minor touches. (*a*) 24p, "And made grievous the food for his table," is supported by v 7–27. (*b*) The elders of the people are the advisers in S; the elders that had stood before Solomon, in M. It has been argued that S is here the better; and, on the whole, perhaps the elders of the people, who played an important part on great occasions (2 S v 1–3, 1 K viii 1), deserve the preference. But the argument is not very cogent. Rehoboam may well have had in his suite both ministers of experience and friends of his own age. (*c*) S recognizes that the people spoke to Jeroboam through representatives. This is more original than the conception of the people speaking. (*d*) In the celebrated reply S is greatly superior through the forcible change of verb — "My father [merely] chastised you [when you needed it and that only] with whips, but I will [normally and regularly] rule you [whatever your conduct] with scorpions." That seems to be the implication. (*e*) "We have no portion" agrees with the earlier passage (2 S xx 1). (*f*) "For this man is not fit for a ruler or a leader" (24t) looks original enough, though it might easily have been omitted in days when the editors laid no emphasis on anything but religious merits or demerits.

13. M's notice of the killing of Adoniram (xii 18a) is wanting in S, but is intrinsically probable and supported by v 13 ff. This officer would be particularly unpopular as the instrument of the odious policy. The notice comes in awkwardly after Israel's departure (xii 16), even if 17 be regarded as a gloss. Apparently it comes from a different source from that rendered by S, which forms the

staple of M, and consequently has no bearing on our problem.

14. (*a*) The dating "at the setting in of the year" in 24x is an original constituent of the narrative, for that was the campaigning season for which Rehoboam had, perforce, to wait (cp. 2 S xi 1). (*b*) The 180,000 chosen men of xii 21 is, of course, an impossible number and should be omitted. (*c*) Shemaiah's prophecy is inconsistent with the view that the Judæans had already gone up to Shechem (24x), which, however, is shown by M to be due to glosses in the text of S.

15. M is inconsistent, for Rehoboam sometimes retains one tribe (xi 13, 32, 36; xii 17, 20b), at others two (xii 21, 23). S only knows the retention of two, and is self-consistent. The kingdom was known as Judah from the preponderant tribe, and later editors seem to have thought that it included nothing else.[1] That the view which makes two tribes follow Rehoboam is the earlier follows from the symbolical action of the prophet who retains two of the twelve pieces — representing Judah and Benjamin.

The results of this survey of the main points of historical interest can easily be summarized. The view that one text represents the northern and the other the southern kingdom does not fit the facts. That S is not specially in sympathy with the north may be seen from 4 *supra* and 24m, nor with the south from 3 *supra* and 12d and the prominence given to Jeroboam in building Millo, etc. Historically M is full of self-contradictions and impossible statements, from which S is free. S represents a far earlier text, on the whole, though it too has suffered in transmission and has been heavily glossed, as may be seen from the very first verse, where, e.g., "with his fathers" is impossible, or from the tautology of 24g–i, or other instances, some of which have been discussed. M, on the other hand, shows a good deal of the midrashic tendency — the system of making historical narrative the vehicle of impressing religious truths. The chronological sequence of

[1] Cp. BS, Oct. 1919, p. 470.

events is subordinated to the homiletic interest; facts that were unwelcome to the religious views of a later age are softened or suppressed, and political and national interests are everywhere overlooked; while the prophetic share in events is constantly magnified and conformed to a strictly literal interpretation of the words of Amos, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets" (iii 7). With the immense importance of these considerations for the textual and higher criticism of the historical books we are not now concerned, but it is submitted that they abundantly justify the historical reconstruction adopted in this study.