



# Computer-Assisted Analysis of Parallel Texts in the Bible. The Case of 2 Kings xviii-xix and Its Parallels in Isaiah and Chronicles

Wido van Peursen and Eep Talstra  
*Leiden and Amsterdam*

---

## Abstract

In literary-critical and text historical studies of the Bible the comparison of parallel texts plays an important role. Starting from the description of the proximity of parallel texts as a continuum from very close to very loose, this article discusses the way in which the computer can facilitate a comparison of various types of parallel texts. 2 Kings 18-19 and Isaiah 37-38 are taken as an example of two closely related texts. The Kings chapters and their parallels in 2 Chronicles 32 occupy a position at the other side of the continuum. These chapters differ so much, that it is sometimes impossible to establish which verses should be considered parallel. The computer-assisted analysis brings to light some striking correspondences, that disappear in traditional synopses, such as Ben David's Parallels in the Bible. These observations have an impact on our evaluation of the Chronicler's user of his sources and his literary taste.

## Keywords

computer-based comparison, parallel texts

## 1. Introduction: Comparison of Parallel Texts

### 1.1. *Introduction*

In biblical studies the comparison of texts plays an important role.<sup>1</sup> The extant biblical sources are the result of a long literary and textual history. To the products of the composition and redaction history of the Bible belong multiple inner-biblical parallels, such as the Chronistic history and its

---

<sup>1</sup>) Transliteration alphabet: >BGDXHXZVJKLMNS<PYQRCT.

sources, parallels between the Psalms and historical books (e.g. 2 Sam. xxii and Ps. xviii), parallels within the book of Psalms (e.g. Pss. xiv and liii) and parallels in different parts of the Pentateuch. The process of textual transmission has engendered multiple textual witnesses, which also can be studied as parallel versions of the same composition. Some sources have the same language (e.g. the MT and biblical scrolls from Qumran); others have different languages (e.g. MT and LXX). The reading and interpretation history of the Bible also has produced many documents that can be studied as parallels to the Bible, in which biblical stories have been retold, biblical rules have been reformulated or biblical poetry has been reshaped for liturgical purposes. To these sources belongs the literature that has been labelled 'Rewritten Bible' which is 'literature that is very closely related to the biblical texts, expanding and paraphrasing them and implicitly commenting on them.'<sup>2</sup>

A very useful tool for studying parallel texts is a synopsis in which these texts are presented together to facilitate their comparison.<sup>3</sup> In the present article we will discuss the way in which the computer can help with the analysis of parallel texts. Questions that will be addressed are: Can we create a synopsis with the help of the computer? Is there any advantage in doing so? Are there other ways in which the computer can be used to analyse parallel texts?

## 1.2. *Philological Approaches to 'Parallel Texts'*

The notion of 'parallel texts' is applicable to a heterogeneous group of sources. Variation in this group concerns the proximity of the texts, their language and their genetic relationship. The proximity may range from very close with almost verbatim similarities, to very loose. The parallel texts may be in the same

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, 'The Bible Rewritten and Expanded', in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRI 2; Assen, 1984), pp. 89-156, esp. 156.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. Lasserre, *Synopse des lois du Pentateuque* (SVT 59; Leiden, 1994), p. xi: 'je propose de définir comme synopse une présentation conjoint de textes parallèles pour en faciliter la comparaison.' The first attestation of this use of the word 'synopsis' is from J. J. Griesbach in 1774; see Lasserre, *Les synopses: élaboration et usage* (SubBi 19; Rome, 1996), p. 2. Publications containing a synoptic arrangement of parallel texts from the Old Testament include Lasserre, *Synopse des lois du Pentateuque*; O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse: die Erzählung der fünf Bücher Mose und des Buches Josua mit dem Anfange des Richterbuches in ihre vier Quellen zerlegt und in deutscher Übersetzung dargeboten, samt einer in Einleitung und Anmerkungen gegebenen Begründung* (Leipzig, 1922); P. Vannutelli, *Libri synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum loci paralleli quos Hebraice, Graece et Latine critice* (2 vols.; Rome, 1931-1934); A. Bendavid, *Parallels in the Bible* (Jerusalem, 1972).

language, in two related languages, or in two languages with a completely different structure. When they are in 'the same language' there may still be considerable differences in the written representation of that language.<sup>4</sup> In some cases parallel texts have a relationship of dependency in that one text has been used as a source for revision, re-use or translation in the other; in other cases neither text has clear priority.

Not only are there many different types of parallel texts. The very processes that have led to the existence of parallel texts also display the same kind of diversity: copying, tradition history, textual transmission, literary re-use of sources, redaction and translation. In most cases the relation between two parallel texts is due to a combination of these processes. In the case of translations, for example, the question of textual transmission is involved as well. Thus in the case of the Ancient Versions the question of the translator's Hebrew source text plays an important role, as well as the textual transmission of the translation itself. In the case of internal biblical parallels the question of textual transmission is involved as well.<sup>5</sup>

### 1.3. *Systematic Descriptive Comparison of Parallel Texts*

In the philological study of parallel texts the explanation of agreements and differences plays a prominent role. Which of the factors mentioned in the preceding paragraph have contributed to the present state of the sources available? The issues addressed are, for example, the decision on what differences between the MT and the Ancient Versions should be ascribed to textual transmission, and what to the translator's interpretation. However, because of the complex interrelatedness of factors that account for agreements and disagreements in parallel texts, it is our conviction that an analysis of parallel texts should not start with the explanation of agreements and differences in terms of redaction, transmission, translation and the like, but with a systematic description of the elements that do and do not correspond and the nature of the correspondences. In other words, we give the formal and systematic registration of the data priority over their interpretation.

The extent to which two texts agree can be described in terms of a continuum. As M. O. Wise puts it in an important study on the Temple Scroll:

---

<sup>4</sup>) Thus the Isaiah text in the Leningrad Codex and in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> are in 'the same language' (i.e. Hebrew), but display considerable linguistic differences.

<sup>5</sup>) Cf. below, § 3.1.

When analyzing any text, which is heavily dependent on a known source or group of sources, it is possible to construct a continuum which describes the relationship of any part of the text to its source(s). The continuum ranges from the extreme of extensive verbatim quotation, on the one hand, to the point where no relationship is discernible, on the other.<sup>6</sup>

The systematic description concerns the extent to which multiple texts run parallel and the complexity of the relationship between them. A formal registration can be made, for example, of the linguistic level of correspondences: Do they occur at the level of words, phrases or clauses? Or is the situation more complex and does a single clause in one text correspond with two or more clauses in the other? The philological explanations of the differences between parallel texts do not represent fixed positions in Wise's continuum. Redaction, transmission and translation, for example, do not have an increasing degree of complexity.

Since we give the registration of the data priority over their explanation and interpretation, we think that the computer can play a crucial role in the analysis of parallel texts, because it is an instrument that supports a formal and systematic registration of data. In the present article we will take two samples of Hebrew parallel texts that occupy very different positions in the continuum of agreement. On the one hand we will take 2 Kings xviii 13-xix 37 and Isaiah xxxvi 1-xxxvii 38, two texts that greatly resemble each other; on the other hand we will compare the Kings passage with 2 Chronicles xxxii 1-32, two texts where the relationship is very complex.

#### 1.4. *How to Instruct a Computer Program to Generate a Synopsis*

Producing a synopsis is basically the process of placing together what belongs together. It does not concern the creation of new texts, but the arrangement of existing texts in a meaningful way. The human researcher who produces a synopsis makes numerous diverse observations on the basis of which he or she establishes which belong together. These observations may be lexical, syntactical, structural, literary or thematic. If we wish to create a synopsis with the help of a computer, we have to make explicit which observations should be taken into account in order to establish which parts of the texts belong together.

---

<sup>6</sup> M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49; Chicago/Illinois, 1990), p. 207.

An important parameter concerns lexical correspondences. Text fragments that share a large number of lexemes are likely to belong together. However, some complications are involved. If we give the computer the instruction to count identical lexemes, some lexemes that occur very often, like the conjunction ו, may distort the process of deciding which clauses are the best to put together. Moreover, counting identical lexemes does not cover the replacement by synonyms. Thus לקח and קבל are very apt to function as lexical equivalents, but they are not identical lexemes.

The situation becomes more complicated when we are dealing with a translation. This has been a major concern in the CALAP project. Sometimes a Hebrew word corresponds to a cognate form in the Syriac text, such as נס // נככ, but sometimes not, such as נמה // נחמ. In CALAP we solved this problem by creating an electronic lexicon. When in the interactive analysis נמה נחמ and are put together as correspondences, this will be stored in the electronic lexicon. When these words occur the next time, the program that calculates what belongs together will attach some importance to נמה and נחמ as correspondences.<sup>7</sup> With this procedure we do not claim that the Hebrew and the Syriac words in question have an identical meaning, but that it is plausible that words that correspond in the source text and the translation in one place may do the same in other contexts.

If the computer looks for lexical parallels, it has to be instructed where to look. Usually two parallel texts will run more or less parallel as far as the order of the rhetorical units is concerned. Correspondences that occur in the same position in a text are more likely to indicate that two elements are parallel than those that occur in different places. The program we used for creating a synopsis (see below, § 2.2) takes one text as the point of departure. It starts with the first line of this text and looks for parallels in the other text. If a parallel has been accepted between verse A in Text 1 and verse A' in Text 2, it will look for parallels to the verse following A in the verses following A'. It is possible, however, that in Text 2 the material has been reorganised in such a way that elements occur in different places. As long as this happens within

<sup>7</sup> For further details see E. Talstra, K. D. Jenner and W. Th. van Peursen, 'How to Transfer the Research Questions into Linguistic Data Types and Analytical Instruments?', in: *Corpus Linguistics and Textual History. A Computer-Assisted Interdisciplinary Approach to the Peshitta* (ed. P. S. F. van Keulen and W. Th. van Peursen; SSN 48; Assen, 2006), pp. 45-83; and in the same volume J. W. Dyk, 'Lexical Correspondence and Translation Equivalents: Building an Electronic Concordance' (pp. 311-326).

one verse, the program can handle it, but if the reordering of the elements runs across verse boundaries, human intervention is needed. This demonstrates exactly the nature of our dilemma: the order of elements cannot be ignored as a parameter in establishing parallels between texts, but the possibility that parallel elements occur in a different order should be taken into account as well.

The preparation of a synopsis involves a large variety of observations, many of which remain implicit if a synopsis is made manually by a human researcher. But they have to be made explicit and described precisely before they can be used as input for programs creating a synopsis. This requires much calculation, even if the relationships between the two texts are obvious to the human eye. Much effort is required to reach the level where the computer can imitate what many human researchers have done before, namely matching those parts of multiple texts that can be regarded as parallel. From the viewpoint of computer technology, even the question of whether it is possible to imitate and formalise what has been done before is in itself most interesting. Exegetes and textual critics, however, have different interests. For them the question will be whether it is possible to go beyond this imitation. Can a computer-generated synopsis go beyond human-made presentations of parallel texts? Can the computer, when dealing with an increasing level of complexity, go beyond this imitation?

## **2. A Comparison of 2 Kings xviii 13-xix 37 and Isaiah xxxvi 1-xxxvii 38**

### *2.1. General Remarks*

In three places in the Old Testament Sennacherib's campaign against Judah is narrated: in Kings, Isaiah and Chronicles. The reports in 2 Kings xviii-xx and Isaiah xxxvi-xxxix are very similar. Differences are the plus in 2 Kgs. xviii 14-16, which is probably secondary because it does not fit the context, and the plus in Isa. xxxvi 9-20, containing Hezekiah's prayer. It is generally assumed that Isaiah xxxvi-xxxix is a borrowing from 2 Kings xviii-xx. A compiler or redactor inserted the chapters from Kings at the end of the First Isaiah as a historical appendix to the prophetic book, comparable to the way in which the historical chapter about the fall of Jerusalem has been added to the book of Jeremiah; he augmented it with Hezekiah's prayer. Although this is the majority view, other scholars think that Kings borrowed these chapters from Isaiah. They consider these chapters as a section that is highly integrated in the book of Isaiah,

displaying both backward references to First Isaiah (especially to Isaiah vii, the story of king Achaz, Hezekiah's counterpart) and remarkable parallels to Deutero-Isaiah (especially in the story of the Babylonian envoys).<sup>8</sup>

The purpose of the present paper is not to settle the debate about which version has priority but to show how agreements and disagreements can be registered prior to and independently of their explanation in terms of literary criticism and redaction history.

## 2.2. *Preparing a Synopsis*

In the CALAP project programs have been developed for the creation of a synopsis containing a parallel alignment of texts and for a detailed analysis of the relation between the parallel texts on the basis of the synopsis. The present article is the report of an experiment to apply these programs to parallel texts in the Hebrew Bible. The preparation of a synopsis includes the following steps.

### *Syntactical Analysis*

The first step in the preparation of a synopsis is the syntactical analysis of the texts. This involves the segmentation of words into morphemes, the combination of words into phrases, the combination of phrases into clauses, the syntactical parsing of the phrases, and the establishing of the relationships between clauses in the text hierarchical structure. The result of the final stage of the syntactical analysis is twofold: a xxx.PX file (e.g. 1Kings18.PX) and a xxx.ct4.p file. The first contains the complete syntactical analysis, the second relates the syntactical information to the surface text.

### *Selection of Texts*

The completely analysed texts have to be collected from a database. In our database each chapter is stored in a separate file, which means that for a larger section chapters have to be concatenated. Moreover, adaptations have to be made if the verse numbers in the two chapters do not run parallel (thus in the case

---

<sup>8</sup>) Thus, e.g., K. A. D. Smelik, 'Distortion of Old Testament Prophecy: The Purpose of Isaiah xxxvi and xxxvii', in: *Crises and Perspectives. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Polytheism, Biblical Theology, Palestinian Archaeology and Intertestamental Literature*. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Cambridge, UK, 1985 (ed. J. C. de Moor *et al.*; OTS 34; Leiden, 1986), pp. 70-93, esp. 71-74.

of Kings and Isaiah, 2 Kgs. xviii 13-xix 37 is parallel to Isa. xxxvi 1-xxxvii 38). For this purpose we use the program *Select*, which selects a section from a larger text file and, if needed, changes temporarily the order of verses into a strict numerical order. The output of this program is a file with a proper order of verses throughout the file, which may contain more than one chapter, e.g. 1Kings 1819.PX or 1Kings1819.ct4.p.

### *Reformatting*

The program *Prepare* is used to reformat the text files into files according to the relevant categories: surface text, lexemes, parts of speech, division into phrases and clause parsing. Each of the two text files has to be prepared. The input is the xxx.PX and xxx.ct4.p files. The output is a file called xxx.Paral-Data, which serves as the input for the program *Synopsis*.

### *Generating a Synopsis*

The preceding steps are needed to run the program *Synopsis*. The program takes one of the two texts as basic text. For each clause, running from the first line till the last, it proposes a match with a clause from the other text on the basis of the number of lexical correspondences. If the human researcher rejects the proposal, it will look for other matches. If the proposal is accepted, the program searches for new matches in the subsequent lines. The input of this program is the ParalData files; the output is a document in which the two texts appear in parallel alignment. See the sample in Table 1.

### *Analysing the Parallel Texts*

The output of the program *Synopsis* contains more than a surface text in parallel alignment. It includes information about the parallels between verses, clauses, phrases and lexemes. On the basis of this information the program *Compare* can register corresponding patterns on the level of lexemes, phrases and clauses. It can produce, for example, lists of lexical correspondences or corresponding phrase patterns.

## **3. A Comparison of 2 Kings xviii 13-xix 37 and 2 Chronicles xxxii 9-19**

### *3.1. Introduction*

If we locate the stories of Sennacherib's campaign in Kings and Isaiah to the left of the 'continuum of parallel texts' (§ 1.3), 2 Kings xviii-xix and

2 Chronicles xxxii should be placed much more to the right. The parallel texts in Kings and Chronicles have most often been studied from the perspective of the Chronicler's re-use of his sources. Many differences between the two texts are indeed due to the fact that in Chronicles the text occurs in a new literary context. The Chronicler thoroughly reworked the text by adding or omitting larger and smaller parts of texts and by adapting the text to his ideological and theological views. However, other factors may also account for the differences between Kings and Chronicles, such as the Chronicler's language<sup>9</sup> and that of the textual transmission of Kings. It cannot be taken for granted that the Chronicler's text of Kings was identical to the text of Kings preserved in the MT.<sup>10</sup>

2 Chronicles xxxii is a thorough reworking of the parallel chapters in Kings. Not only have many details been omitted or added, but also the overall structure of the story has been changed.<sup>11</sup> If we look at the approach of Sennacherib's servants, which is described in 2 Kgs. xviii 17-37 and 2 Chr. xxxii 9-16, we see that in Kings this approach follows several stages:

1. Delegation sent from Lakish (xviii 17-18).
2. Hezekiah's representatives hear the Rabshakeh's words (xviii 19-25).
3. Interruption by an argument regarding the language (xviii 26-27).
4. Second address of the Rabshakeh and the people's reaction (xviii 28-36).
5. The officers return to Hezekiah (xviii 37).

The Chronicler has reworked the story in the following respects:

1. All the secondary figures—the Rabshakeh and his entourage on the one side, Hezekiah's princes and officers on the other—are removed from the scene.

<sup>9</sup> See A. Kropat's classic study *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen* (BZAW 16; Giessen, 1909); another important study on the language of Chronicles is R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew. Toward a Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula, 1976). While Kropat's main focus is on those passages that have parallels in Samuel and Kings, Polzin is mainly interested in the unique material of Chronicles.

<sup>10</sup> Compare the discussion about the Chronicler's text of Samuel, for which Ulrich has argued that it stood closer to the Samuel text from Qumran (4QSam<sup>a</sup>) than to the MT; E. C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, 1978).

<sup>11</sup> For the following summary see also Japhet, *Chronicles*, p. 985.

2. Two speeches of the Rabshakeh are combined into one.
3. The intermediate negotiation regarding language is omitted.<sup>12</sup>

The result is a much shorter version of the same account: In Chronicles the account takes eight verses, as opposed to twenty-one verses in Kings!

*Table 1.* Synopsis of 2 Kings 18-19 and Isaiah 36-37 (sample)

CPLE	L	TextLine	V	
{ 1 }	-1	[ ]	13	
{ 2 }	1	[ 1 ]		IIKGS18,01 [W-<Cj>] [B->RB< <FRH CNH [L—MLK [XZQJH <sp><ap><Tt"
{ 3 }	2	[ 2 ]		IIKGS18,01 [W-<Cj>] [JTPFM <PO>] *
CPLE	L	TextLine	V	17
{ 1 }	1	[ 3 ]		IIKGS18,02 [W-<Cj>] [JCLX <Pr>] [MLK >CWR <Co>] [>T TRTN W->T RB "
{ 2 }	2	[ 4 ]		IIKGS18,02 [W-<Cj>] [J<LW <Pr>] *
{ 3 }	3	[ 5 ]		IIKGS18,02 [W-<Cj>] [JB>W <Pr>] [JRWCLM <Co>] *
{ 4 }	4	[ 6 ]		IIKGS18,02 [W-<Cj>] [J<LW <Pr>] *
{ 5 }	5	[ 7 ]		IIKGS18,02 [W-<Cj>] [JB>W <Pr>] *
{ 6 }	6	[ 8 ]		IIKGS18,02 [W-<Cj>] [J<MDW <Pr>] [B-T<LT H-BRKH H-<LJWNH <Co>] *
{ 7 }	7	[ 9 ]		IIKGS18,02 [>CR <Re>] [B-MSLT FDH KWBS <PC>] *
CPLE	L	TextLine	V	18
{ 1 }	1	[ 10 ]		IIKGS18,03 [W-<Cj>] [JQR>W <Pr>] [>L H-MLK <Co>] *
{ 2 }	2	[ 11 ]		IIKGS18,03 [W-<Cj>] [JY> <Pr>] [>LHM <Co>] [>LJQJM [BN XLQJHW <ap"
{ 3 }	3	[ 12 ]		IIKGS18,03 [>CR <Re>] [<L H-BJT <PC>] *
{ 4 }	4	[ 13 ]		IIKGS18,03 [W-[CBNH [H-SPR <PA><ap><Su>] [W-[JW>X [BN >SP [H-MZK"
CPLE	L	TextLine	V	19
{ 1 }	1	[ 14 ]		IIKGS18,04 [W-<Cj>] [J>MR <Pr>] [>LHM <Co>] [RB_CQH <Su>] *
{ 2 }	2	[ 15 ]		IIKGS18,04 [>MRW <Pr>] [N> <Ij>] [>L XZQJHW <Co>] *
{ 3 }	3	[ 16 ]		IIKGS18,04 [KH <Mo>] [>MR <Pr>] [H-MLK H-GDWL [MLK >CWR <ap><Su"
{ 4 }	4	[ 17 ]		IIKGS18,04 [MH <Qp>] [H-BVXWN H-ZH <Su>] *
{ 5 }	5	[ 18 ]		IIKGS18,04 [>CR <Re>] [BVXT <PC>] *
CPLE	L	TextLine	V	20
{ 1 }	1	[ 19 ]		IIKGS18,05 [>MRT <Pr>] *
{ 2 }	2	[ 20 ]		IIKGS18,05 [>K <Mo>] [DBR FPTJM <Su>] [<YH W-GBWRH [L—MLXMH <sp>"
{ 3 }	3	[ 21 ]		IIKGS18,05 [<TH <Mo>] *
{ 4 }	4	[ 22 ]		IIKGS18,05 [<L MJ <Co>] [BVXT <Pr>] *
{ 5 }	5	[ 23 ]		IIKGS18,05 [KJ <Cj>] [MRDT <Pr>] [BJ <Co>] *
CPLE	L	TextLine	V	21
{ 1 }	1	[ 24 ]		IIKGS18,06 [<TH <Mo>] *
{ 2 }	2	[ 25 ]		IIKGS18,06 [HNH <Ij>] [BVXT <Pr>] [LK <sc>] [<L MC<NT H-QNH H-RYW"
{ 3 }	3	[ 26 ]		IIKGS18,06 [>CR <Re>] [JSMK <Pr>] [>JC <Su>] [<LJW <Co>] *
{ 4 }	4	[ 27 ]		IIKGS18,06 [W-<Cj>] [B> <PC>] [B-KPW <Co>] *
{ 5 }	5	[ 28 ]		IIKGS18,06 [W-<Cj>] [NQBH <PO>] *
{ 6 }	6	[ 29 ]		IIKGS18,06 [KN <Mo>] [PR<H [MLK MYRJM <ap><Su>] [L-KL <Co>] *
{ 7 }	7	[ 30 ]		IIKGS18,06 [H-<Re>] [BVXJM <PC>] [<LJW <Co>] *

<sup>12)</sup> But it is hinted at in xxxii 18.

Table 1 (cont.)

CPLE	L	TextLine	V	22
{ 1 }	1	[ 31 ]	IIKGS18,07	[W-<Cj>] [K] <Cj> [T>MRWN <Pr>] [>LJ <Co>] *
{ 2 }	2	[ 32 ]	IIKGS18,07	>L JHWH [>LHJNW <ap>]<Co> [BVXNW <Pr>] *
{ 3 }	3	[ 33 ]	IIKGS18,07	[H-<Qu>] [LW> <Ng>] [HW> <Su>] *
{ 4 }	4	[ 34 ]	IIKGS18,07	>CR <Re> [HSJR <Pr>] [XZQJHW <Su>] [>T BMTJW W->T MZ"]
{ 5 }	5	[ 35 ]	IIKGS18,07	[W-<Cj>] [J>MR <Pr>] [L-JHWDH W-L-JRWCLM <Co>] *
{ 6 }	6	[ 36 ]	IIKGS18,07	[L-PNJ H-MZBX H-ZH <Co>] [TCTXWW <Pr>] [B-JRWCLM <Lo>"]
L TextLine V 1				
	1	[ 1 ]	ISA 36,01	[W-<Cj>] [JHJ <Pr>] *
	2	[ 2 ]	ISA 36,01	[B->RB< <FRH CNH [L—MLK [XZQJHW <sp>]<ap>]<Ti>] [<LH "
	3	[ 3 ]	ISA 36,01	[W-<Cj>] [JTPFM <PO>] *
L TextLine V 2				
	1	[ 4 ]	ISA 36,02	[W-<Cj>] [JCLX <Pr>] [MLK >CWR <Su>] [>T RB_CQH <Ob>"]
	-1	[ ]		
	-1	[ ]		
	-1	[ ]		
	-1	[ ]		
	2	[ 5 ]	ISA 36,02	[W-<Cj>] [J<MD <Pr>] [B-T<LT H-BRKH H-<LJWNH [B-MSLT F"
	-1	[ ]		
L TextLine V 3				
	-1	[ ]		
	1	[ 6 ]	ISA 36,03	[W-<Cj>] [JY> <Pr>] [>LJW <Co>] [>LJQJM [BN XLQJHW <ap>"]
	2	[ 7 ]	ISA 36,03	>CR <Re> [<L H-BJT <PC>] *
	3	[ 8 ]	ISA 36,03	[W-<Cj>] [CBN> [H-SPR <ap>]<Su>] [W-<Cj>] [JW>X [BN >S"
L TextLine V 4				
	1	[ 9 ]	ISA 36,04	[W-<Cj>] [J>MR <Pr>] [>LJHM <Co>] [RB_CQH <Su>] *
	2	[ 10 ]	ISA 36,04	>MRW <Pr> [N> <Ij>] [>L XZQJHW <Co>] *
	3	[ 11 ]	ISA 36,04	[KH <Mo>] [>MR <Pr>] [H-MLK H-GDWL [MLK >CWR <ap>]<Su>"]
	4	[ 12 ]	ISA 36,04	[MH <PC>] [H-BVXWN H-ZH <Su>] *
	5	[ 13 ]	ISA 36,04	>CR <Re> [BVXT <PC>] *
L TextLine V 5				
	1	[ 14 ]	ISA 36,05	[MRT] <Pr>] *
	2	[ 15 ]	ISA 36,05	>K <Mo> [DBR FPTJM <Su>] [<YH W-GBWRH [L—MLXMH <sp>"]
	3	[ 16 ]	ISA 36,05	<TH <Mo>] *
	4	[ 17 ]	ISA 36,05	<L MJ <Co>] [BVXT <PC>] *
	5	[ 18 ]	ISA 36,05	[KJ <Cj>] [MRDT <Pr>] [BJ <Co>] *
L TextLine V 6				
	-1	[ ]		
	1	[ 19 ]	ISA 36,06	[HNH <Ij>] [BVXT <PC>] [<L MC<NT H-QNH H-RYWY H-ZH [<L"
	2	[ 20 ]	ISA 36,06	>CR <Re> [JSMK <Pr>] [>JC <Su>] [<LJW <Co>] *
	3	[ 21 ]	ISA 36,06	[W-<Cj>] [B> <PC>] [B-KPW <Co>] *
	4	[ 22 ]	ISA 36,06	[W-<Cj>] [NQBH <PO>] *
	5	[ 23 ]	ISA 36,06	[KN <Mo>] [PR<H [MLK MYRJM <ap>]<Su>] [L-KL <Aj>] *
	6	[ 24 ]	ISA 36,06	[H-<Re>] [BVXJM <PC>] [<LJW <Co>] *

Table 1 (cont.)

L	TextLine	V	7
1	[ 25]	ISA 36,07	[W-<Cj>] [KJ <Cj>] [T>MR <Pr>] [>LJ <Co>] *
2	[ 26]	ISA 36,07	[>L JHWH [>LHJNW <ap>]<Co>] [BVXNW <Pr>] *
3	[ 27]	ISA 36,07	[H-<Qu>] [LW> <Ng>] [HW> <Su>] *
4	[ 28]	ISA 36,07	[>CR <Re>] [HSJR <Pr>] [XZQJHW <Su>] [>T BMTJW W->T MZ"]
5	[ 29]	ISA 36,07	[W-<Cj>] [J>MR <Pr>] [L-JHWDH W-L-JRWCLM <Co>] *
6	[ 30]	ISA 36,07	[L-PNJ H-MZBX H-ZH <Co>] [TCTXWW <Pr>] *

### 3.2. *Synoptic Approaches*

In Bendavid's *Parallels in the Bible* (see above, note 3) the following verses of 2 Kings xviii 13-xix 37 and 2 Chronicles xxxii 1-23 are aligned as parallels. (See Table 2.)

Table 2. Bendavid's arrangement of 2 Kings xviii 13-xix 37 and 2 Chronicles xxxii 1-23

2 Kings	2 Chronicles	2 Kings	2 Chronicles
xviii 13	xxxii 1	xviii 35	xxxii 14
xviii 14-16	–	–	xxxii 15-16
–	xxxii 2-8	xviii 36-37	–
xviii 17	xxxii 9	xix 1-9	–
xviii 18	–	–	xxxii 17
xviii 19	xxxii 10	xix 10-13	–
xviii 20-21	–	[xviii 28]	xxxii 18
xviii 22	xxxii 11-12	[xviii 29]	[xxxii 15]
xviii 23-27	–	–	xxxii 19
xviii 28	[xxxii 18]	xix 14	–
xviii 29	[xxxii 15]	xix 15	xxxii 20
xviii 30-32	–	xix 16-34	–
xviii 33	xxxii 13	xix 35-37	xxxii 21
xviii 34	–	–	xxxii 22-23

In Table 3 we have taken Chronicles as the basic text and omitted references to parts of Kings that have no parallel in Chronicles. To Bendavid's synopsis, which is presented on the left, we have added the synopsis of Sara Japhet in her commentary on Chronicles.

Table 3. Parallels to 2 Chronicles xxxii according to Bendavid and Japhet

A. Bendavid		S. Japhet	
2 Chronicles	2 Kings	2 Chronicles	2 Kings
xxxii 1	xviii 13	xxxii 1	xviii 13
xxxii 2-8	–	xxxii 2-8	–
xxxii 9	xviii 17	xxxii 9	xviii 17-18
xxxii 10	xviii 19	xxxii 10-15	xviii 19-25, 28-35
xxxii 11-12	xviii 22		
xxxii 13	xviii 33		
xxxii 14	xviii 35		
xxxii 15	(xviii 29)		
xxxii 16	–	xxxii 16-17	–
xxxii 17	–	xxxii 17, 19	xix 1-4, 14-19
xxxii 18	[xviii 28]	xxxii 18	xviii 26-27, 36
xxxii 19	–		
xxxii 20	xix 15	xxxii 20	xix 9b-13
xxxii 21	xix 35-37		
xxxii 22-23	–		

Already at first glance it will be evident that the relation between Kings and Chronicles is much more complicated than that between Kings and Isaiah. Three factors contribute to the complexity of the relationship between the two versions: (a) both texts have passages that have no counterpart in the other text, e.g. 2 Kgs. xviii 14-16, 2 Chr. xxxii 2-8; (b) because the Chronicler merges two speeches into one, the order in the two texts differs sometimes;<sup>13</sup> (c) there are also correspondences that are not covered by the synopsis. For this third factor compare, for example, 2 Chr. xxxii 17-19.

17 וספרים כתב לחרף ליהוה אלהי ישראל ולאמר עליו לאמר כאלהי נוי  
הארצות אשר לא הצילו עמם מידי כן לא יציל אלהי יחזקיהו עמו מידי  
18 ויקראו בקול גדול יהודית על עם ירושלים אשר על החומה ליראם  
ולבהלם למען ילכדו את העיר  
19 וידברו אל אלהי ירושלים כעל אלהי עמי הארץ מעשה ידי האדם

The relation between these verses and the story of Sennacherib's campaign in 2 Kings xviii and xix is difficult to grasp with a parallel alignment of the texts.

<sup>13</sup> Compare the parallels indicated in square brackets in Table 2.

In Bendauid's synopsis 2 Chr. xxxii 17 and 19 have no parallel in Kings, while xxxii 18 has a parallel in 2 Kgs. xviii 28, which he adds in square brackets between 2 Kgs. xviii 13 and xviii 14. However, 2 Chr. xxxii 17-19 has some parallels with the chapters in Kings that are not covered by the synopsis. (see Table 4).<sup>14</sup>

Table 4. 2 Chronicles xxxii 17-18 and its parallels in 2 Kings xviii-xix

2 Chronicles xxxii 17-18		Parallel in 2 Kings xviii-xix	
xxxii 17a $\alpha$	וספרים כחב	xix 14	ויקח הזקיהו את הספרים
xxxii 17 a $\beta$	לחרף ליהוה אלהי ישראל	xix 4, 16	לחרף אלהים חי (cf. xix 22, 23)
xxxii 17 a $\alpha$	לחרף ליהוה אלהי ישראל	xix 15	יהוה אלהי ישראל
xxxii 17b	כאלהי נגי הארצות	xviii 35	אלהי הארצות
		xix 12	אלהי הנגים
xxxii 18a	ויקראו בקול גדול יהודית	xviii 28	ויקראו בקול גדול יהודית
xxxii 18b	על עם ירושלים אשר על החומה	xviii 27	על האנשים הישבים על החמ
xxxii 19	וידברו אל אלהי ירושלים	xix 18	ונתנו את אלהיהם באש כי לא אלהים
	כעל אלהי עמי הארץ מעשה ידי האדם		המה כי אם מעשה ידי אדם עץ ואבן ואבנים

2 Chr. xxxii 17 refers back to 2 Kgs. xix 9-14, which deals with a letter sent to Hezekiah. The precise phrasing of the summary statement about the content of this letter has been influenced by Hezekiah's words that Sennacherib sent his messengers 'to mock the living God', which occurs in Hezekiah's address to Isaiah in 2 Kgs xix 4 and in his prayer in 2 Kgs. xix 16. In this prayer we also find the phrase 'the Lord, the God of Israel' (2 Kgs. xix 15), which returns in 2 Chr. xxxii 17a. 2 Chr. xxxii 17b combines 'the gods of the peoples' (2 Kgs. xix 12) and 'the gods of the lands' (2 Kgs. xviii 35) to make 'the gods of the peoples of the lands'. 2 Chr. xxxii 18a is parallel to 2 Kgs. xviii 28 and 2 Chr. xxxii 18b to 2 Kgs. xviii 27. A summary statement follows in 2 Chr. xxxii 18c. The next verse, 2 Chr. xxxii 19, is another concluding summary. It contains phrases taken from Hezekiah's prayer in 2 Kgs. xix 18.

Another parallel that is not covered by a synopsis is the reference to Sennacherib's predecessors in 2 Chr. xxxii 13, which has no parallel in 2 Kgs. xviii 33, but in 2 Kgs. xix 12:

<sup>14</sup>) We have not included correspondences that occur also elsewhere in 2 Chronicles xxxii like the lexemes  $\text{נצל}$  Hifil and  $\text{ירא}$ .

2 Kgs. xix 12  
2 Chr. xxxii 13

הִצִּילוּ אִתְּכֶם אֱלֹהֵי הַנְּגִיִּים אֲשֶׁר שָׁחַתוּ אֲבוֹתַי  
הֲלֹא תִדְעוּ מִה עֲשִׂיתִי אֵינִי וְאֲבוֹתַי לְכֹל עַמֵּי הָאָרְצוֹת  
הַיְכוּל יִכְלוּ אֱלֹהֵי נַגְי הָאָרְצוֹת לְהִצִּיל אֶת אֶרְצָם מִיָּדִי

Other examples could be added to demonstrate that the parallels between 2 Kings xviii-xix and 2 Chronicles xxxii can only partly be covered by a synopsis. Somewhere in the 'continuum of parallel texts' there is an area in which there is not enough analogy to create a synopsis. The passages under discussion are on the borderline of this area: to make a synopsis becomes very difficult. And if we try to make one, we observe parallels in the text that are not covered by it.

### 3.3. *Making a Computer-Assisted Comparison with the Help of Frequency Lists*

It appears from our observations made in the preceding paragraph that a number of lexical equivalents between Kings and Chronicles are not covered by a synopsis. The Chronicler's text is a thorough reworking of the section in Kings and his activities cover more than copying (→ in the synopsis both columns are filled), omitting (→ in the synopsis the column of Chronicles is empty) and adding (→ the column of Kings is empty). He rephrases and epitomises large parts of Kings in such a way that there are parallels that are hard to convey with a synopsis.<sup>15</sup>

This state of affairs encouraged us to look for other ways of analysing the relationship between the two passages. Therefore we made a concordance of the passages in Kings and Chronicles and generated some frequency lists from it. A sample of the result is given in Table 5.

Table 5. Sample of the frequency list

	Total	2Kgs 18-19	Isa 36-37	2Chr32
>B/	5	1	1	3
>BD [	2	1	1	0
>BN/	2	1	1	0
>DWN/	12	6	6	0
>DM/	3	1	1	1
>DNJ//	2	1	1	0

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Japhet, *Chronicles*, p. 976: 2 Chronicles xxxiii is an 'extensive reworking through omissions, additions, rephrasing and epitomization' of 2 Kings xviii-xix.

Table 5 (cont.)

	Total	2Kgs 18-19	Isa 36-37	2Chr32
>DRMLK=//	2	1	1	0
>WLJ	2	1	1	0
>WYR/	1	1	0	0
>WT/	2	1	1	0
>ZN/	6	3	3	0
>XD/	3	1	1	1
>XR/	5	1	1	3
>XR=/	1	0	0	1
>J	1	1	0	0
>JH	5	2	3	0
>JK	2	1	1	0
>JN/	2	1	1	0
>JC/	12	6	6	0
>K	2	1	1	0
>KL [	8	4	4	0
>L	75	35	36	4
>L=	18	7	6	5
>LH	5	1	2	2
>LHJM/	50	19	18	13
>LWH/	1	0	0	1
>LJQJM//	8	4	4	0
>LP=/	4	2	2	0
>M	4	2	2	0
>MWY//	5	2	2	1
>MN [	1	0	0	1
>MNH/	1	1	0	0
>MNM	2	1	1	0
>MY [	1	0	0	1
>MR [	71	31	30	10
>MT/	1	0	0	1
>NXNW	2	1	1	0
>NJ	5	2	2	1
>SP//	4	2	2	0
>SRXDN//	2	1	1	0
>P	1	0	0	1
>P/	2	1	1	0
>RB</	2	1	1	0
>RZ/	2	1	1	0
>RMJ=//	2	1	1	0

Table 5 (cont.)

>RPD//	4	2	2	0
>RY/	42	17	18	7
>RRV//	2	1	1	0
>C/	2	1	1	0
>CWR//	47	21	18	8
>CR	52	24	21	7
>T	106	47	41	18
>TH	12	6	6	0
>TM	1	0	0	1
B	88	40	36	12
BGD/	4	2	2	0
BD/	4	2	2	0
BHL [	1	0	0	1
BW> [	34	15	13	6
BWZ [	2	1	1	0
BWR/	2	1	1	0
BWC [	2	1	1	0
BVX [	17	8	8	1

Apart from the relative frequency of words occurring in both sources, we have three groups of lexemes to be examined.

1. Words unique in Kings. In most cases they reflect elements in the story that the Chronicler omitted. This group may assist in answering the question of what the Chronicler deemed not important enough to be retained in his own text.
2. Words common to both Kings and Chronicles. This group may assist us in answering the question of what the Chronicler considered important enough in his source to be retained in his own text.
3. Words unique in Chronicles. This group may indicate how the Chronicler added his own accents to the story and what he found missing in his source text.

If we generate these lists with the help of the computer, in categories 1 and 3 words may appear which the computer has labelled as unique, but which to our understanding are lexically equivalent. Thus the computer-generated list of words that are unique in Chronicles included the proper noun יהוֹקִידוֹ, because this form of the king's name does not occur in Kings. Therefore we had to make some adaptations for the program's establishing lexical correspondences.

The total number of lexemes in 2 Kings xviii 13-xix 37 is 352. The parallel chapters in Isaiah xxxvi-xxxvii have 326 lexemes, while Chronicles has 162 lexemes. 108 lexemes occur both in Kings and in Chronicles. This is only 30% of the total number of lexemes in Kings and 66% of the vocabulary of Chronicles. If we disregard common words like prepositions, the article and the conjunction ׀ (see above), the percentage of words that recur in Chronicles becomes even lower. These statistics demonstrate that 'the Chronicler's version of Sennacherib's campaign is much simpler, with all the unclear features, mostly of a political nature, omitted, and its course is straightforward, with no deviations.'<sup>16</sup>

About the three groups that we distinguished above the following remarks can be made.

1. Words unique in Kings. This concerns 244 lexemes of all different kinds. That the number of lexemes not attested in Chronicles is so high, indicates that the Chronicler shortened the text greatly. The number of 33 proper nouns not occurring in Chronicles is significant. Apparently the Chronicler was not so interested in 'unclear features, mostly of a political nature',<sup>17</sup> and deemed proper nouns and other details unimportant.
2. Words common to both Kings and Chronicles. This concerns 108 lexemes. The observation that the Chronicler omits so much from his sources makes the lexemes that he did not omit significant. They reflect not a slightly reworked source, but a selection that the Chronicler wanted to give a place to in his own account. Even more noteworthy are those lexemes from Kings that are retained in Chronicles but do not occur in a parallel verse, like those given in Table 6.
3. Words unique in Chronicles. This concerns 54 lexemes, some of which are given below.
  - a. Some words related to the building and defence activities reported in xxxii 2-6, such as חוץ, מנדל, מנדנות, מלוא, נחל, סתם, סתם, נחל, מלוא, מנדנות, מנדל, חוץ.
  - b. Words that reflect ideological or theological accents that the Chronicler added in his description of Hezekiah and his proper

<sup>16</sup> Japhet, *Chronicles*, p. 977.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. the quotation from Japhet's commentary given above.

attitude to the threat of the Assyrian armies, such as אַמְזָה (xxxii 1), אַמְזִן (xxxii 7), חֹזֶק (xxxii 7, 8)<sup>18</sup> and עֹזֶר (xxxii 3, 8).

- c. Words that describe Sennacherib's vast, but nevertheless powerless army, such as בִּשְׂר (xxxii 8), זְרוּעַ (xxxii 8), גְּבוּרַ (xxxii 3, 21), הַבּוּן (xxxii 7) referring to Sennacherib and his armies.

*Table 6.* Words shared by 2 Kings xviii-xix and 2 Chronicles xxxii, but in different contexts

<p>אֵב (2K xix 12; 2C xxxii 13, 14, 15; the reference to Sennacherib's predecessors occurs three times in Chronicles, but not in a direct parallel to 2K xix 12)</p> <p>אֱלֹהֵי נְיֵי הָאֲרָצוֹת (2K xviii 5) and אֱלֹהֵי הַנְּגִיבִים (2K xix 12) // אֱלֹהֵי נְיֵי הָאֲרָצוֹת (2C xxxii 17) and אֱלֹהֵי עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ (2C xxxii 19).</p> <p>אֲשֶׁר עַל הַחִמָּה (2K xviii 26; 2C xxxii 18)</p> <p>חֶרֶם Hifl (2K xix 11; 2C xxxii 14)</p> <p>חֶרֶף Piel + אֱלֹהִים (2K xix 4, 16);</p> <p>יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ // יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךְ (2K xix 4; 2C xxxii 11)</p> <p>יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (2K xix 15, 20; 2C xxxii 17)</p> <p>יֹשְׁבֵימ (2K xviii 27; 2C xxxii 10).</p> <p>יִשַׁע Hifl (2K xix 19, 34 [Hezekiah's prayer]; 2C xxxii 22 [narrated text])</p> <p>יִשְׁעִיהוּ (הַנְּבִיאַ and/or בֶּן אַמְזִין +) (2K xix 2, 5, 6, 20; 2C xxxii 20)</p> <p>מַעֲשֵׂי יַדֵּי אָדָם (2K xix 18; 2C xxxii 19)</p> <p>נִפְלַ Hifl (2K xix 7 [Isaiah's prophecy]; 2C xxxii 31 [narrated text])</p> <p>עַבְדּוּ (2K xix 34 [epithet of David]; 2C xxxii 16 [epithet of Hezekiah])</p> <p>סִפְרַ (2K xix 14; 2C xxxii 17)</p>
---

### 3.4. *Using Frequency Lists to Create a Synopsis*

The statistical analysis can be used for the comparison of texts that have such a complex relationship that a synoptic presentation does not cover all the data. However, it can function not only as an alternative for, but also as a contribution to a synoptic analysis. It may help to establish what verses in a text contain corresponding elements and hence are more likely to be parallel. Thus for each verse in 2 Chronicles xxxii the number of lexemes corresponding to each verse of 2 Kings xviii-xix can be calculated. The result is a list of

<sup>18</sup>) Note the wordplay on the proper noun יְהוֹזָכִידוּ and compare Sir xlvi 17 (MS B) חֹזֶק עָרֵי יְהוֹזָכִידוּ.

Table 7. Matches between verses based on lexeme frequencies

Chapter: 32

verse:	1: //	18:14[9x]	18:13[7x]	19:10[7x]	18:19[6x]	19: 6[6x]					
verse:	2: //	18:17[4x]	18:22[3x]								
verse:	3: //										
verse:	4: //	18:14[7x]	18:32[7x]	18:19[6x]	19:10[6x]	18:17[5x]	19: 6[5x]	18:13[4x]	18:28[4x]	18:31[4x]	19: 4[4x]
verse:	5: //	18:13[3x]	19:11[4x]	19:15[4x]	19:20[4x]	19:32[4x]					
verse:	6: //	18:26[4x]	19:10[4x]	18:19[3x]	18:30[3x]	19: 6[3x]					
verse:	7: //	18:14[6x]	18:13[4x]	19: 6[4x]	18:16[3x]	18:17[3x]	18:19[3x]	18:28[3x]			
verse:	8: //	19: 4[3x]	19:10[3x]	19:11[3x]	19:13[3x]						
verse:	9: //	19: 4[8x]	18:14[6x]								
verse:	9: //	18:14[11x]	19:10[8x]								
verse:	10: //	19:10[8x]	18:14[7x]	18:19[7x]	18:17[5x]	18:22[5x]	19: 6[5x]	19:20[5x]			
verse:	11: //	18:14[8x]	18:30[8x]	19:10[8x]	19: 4[7x]	18:19[6x]	19: 6[6x]	18:32[5x]	18:16[5x]	18:32[5x]	19:15[5x]
verse:	12: //	18:22[11x]									
verse:	13: //	18:35[8x]	18:32[6x]	18:33[6x]	19:15[6x]	19:19[6x]					
verse:	14: //	18:35[6x]	18:33[5x]	18:34[4x]	19: 4[4x]	19:19[4x]	18:29[3x]	18:30[3x]	19:11[3x]	19:12[3x]	
verse:	15: //	19:15[3x]	19:18[3x]								
verse:	15: //	18:35[6x]	18:29[5x]	18:33[5x]	19:15[5x]	19:19[5x]	18:30[4x]	18:34[4x]	19: 4[4x]	19:10[4x]	18:32[3x]
verse:	16: //	19: 4[5x]	19:14[3x]	19:18[3x]							
verse:	16: //	19: 4[5x]	19:15[4x]	19:19[4x]	18:26[3x]	19:16[3x]					
verse:	17: //	18:32[8x]	18:35[8x]	19:15[8x]	18:30[6x]	18:33[6x]	19: 4[6x]	19:19[6x]	19:10[5x]	19:20[5x]	
verse:	18: //	18:28[5x]	18:26[3x]								
verse:	19: //	18:35[6x]	18:32[5x]	19:18[5x]	19:15[4x]	19:19[4x]	18:22[3x]	18:26[3x]	18:33[3x]	18:34[3x]	
verse:	20: //	19:20[5x]	19:10[3x]								
verse:	20: //	19:20[5x]	18:14[4x]	19: 2[4x]	18:18[3x]	19:13[3x]	19:19[6x]				
verse:	21: //	19: 4[9x]	18:14[8x]	19:15[8x]	18:17[7x]	18:32[7x]					
verse:	22: //	18:14[6x]	18:13[5x]	18:17[5x]	18:30[5x]	18:35[5x]					
verse:	19: 4[5x]	19:10[5x]	19:17[5x]	18:16[4x]	19:15[4x]	19:15[4x]	19:20[4x]	18:15[3x]	18:19[3x]	18:22[3x]	18:28[3x]
verse:	18:33[3x]	19: 6[3x]	19:11[3x]	19:13[3x]	19:14[3x]						
verse:	19:16[3x]	19:17[3x]	19:32[3x]	19:35[3x]							
verse:	23: //	18:14[7x]	18:17[6x]	19: 4[5x]	18:13[4x]	18:16[4x]	18:22[4x]	19:10[4x]			

matches as in Table 7. Thus 2 Chr. xxxii 1 has nine lexical matches with 2 Kgs. xviii 14, seven matches with xviii 13, seven matches with xix 10 and six matches with xix 6. This can be calculated for each verse in Chronicles.<sup>19</sup>

When we compare this list with Bendavid's synopsis, we can observe that Bendavid presents as parallel some verses that have very few lexical correspondences, such as 2 Chr. xxxii 7 // 2 Kgs. xviii 17; 2 Chr. xxxii 11 // 2 Kgs. xviii 22; 2 Chr. xxxii 20 // 2 Kgs. xviii 15 and 2 Chr. xxxii 35-37 // 2 Kgs. xviii 21. It seems that in these cases the synopsis has been adapted to the desire to give both versions the same plot and to retain more or less the order of the verses in both versions.

The list of matches can be used in a new effort to create a synopsis that is completely based on lexical correspondences. This implies that the order of the verses and other parameters related to the narrative structure of the text are not taken into account. The computer-assisted interactive procedure to generate a synopsis is represented in Table 8.

When we start to make a synopsis of 2 Kings xviii-xix and 2 Chronicles xxxii, and take the Chronicles chapter as our point of departure, the first verse of this chapter appears on the screen together with three possible parallels to this verse. Below each parallel the corresponding lexemes are listed. Thus 2 Kgs. xviii 14 shares with 2 Chr. xxxii 4 the lexemes אָמַר (in both verses one occurrence) אָשׁוּר (two occurrences), יְהוּדָה (two occurrences) and מֶלֶךְ (four times). Together these shared lexemes make up nine matches. Similarly the correspondences with two other possible parallels, 2 Kgs. xviii 13 and 2 Kgs. xix 10, are listed. At the bottom of the screen there appears the question of whether the human researcher accepts one of these parallels (1, 2, 3) or not (= 0). The computer program suggests which the best parallel is. As can be seen in the table, the program did not suggest 2 Kgs. xviii 14 as parallel to 2 Chr. xxxii 1, even though this verse has the highest number of correspondences. In its calculations it gave additional weight to כְּצֹרַר in 2 Kgs. xviii 13, which is an infrequent word in these chapters (twice in 2 Kings xviii-xix and once in 2 Chronicles xxxii). The underlying assumption is that the less frequent a lexeme is in the corpus, the more significant it is for establishing parallels.

<sup>19</sup> If we use all words identified by the computer as lexemes, common words like prepositions, the article and the conjunction ׀ may distort the statistics. These words are so common that it cannot be regarded as significant if they occur in both texts. They are not taken into account in the calculations that resulted in Table 7.

Table 8. Procedure of interactive creation of a synopsis based on lexeme frequencies

IICHR32,01	[>XRJ H-DBRJM W-H->MT H->LH <Ti>] [B->Pr>] [SNXR]B / MLK >CWR <ap><Su>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[W-<Cj>] [JB->PC>] [B-]JHWDH <Co>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[W-<Cj>] [JXN <Pr>] [<L H-<RJM H-BYRWT <Co>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[W-<Cj>] [J>MR <Pr>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[L-BQ<M <PO>] [>LJW <Co>] * 1 *
PAR	1 text:iiKings89.cr4.p starts with line: 3
IIKGS18,14	[W-<Cj>] [JCLX <Pr>] [XZQ JH / MLK]JHWDH <ap><Co>] [>L.MLK >CWR <Co>] [LKJCH <Co>]
IIKGS18,14	[L->MR <Pr>]
IIKGS18,14	[XV>TJ <Pr>]
IIKGS18,14	[CWB <PC>] [M-<LJ <Co>]
IIKGS18,14	[>T >CR <Re>] [TTN <Pr>] [<LJ <Co>]
IIKGS18,14	[>F> <Pr>]
IIKGS18,14	[W-<Cj>] [JFM <Pr>] [MLK >CWR <Su>] [<L.XZQ JH / MLK JHWDH <ap><Co>] [CLCM>WT KKR KSP W-CLCJM KKR ZHB <Ob>]
lexemes, part of the relation:	
>MR[	(1X) iiKings89 31X iiChronicles32 10X
>CWR//	(2X) iiKings89 21X iiChronicles32 8X
JHWDH//	(2X) iiKings89 7X iiChronicles32 6X
MLK/	(4X) iiKings89 39X iiChronicles32 12X
PAR	2 text:iiKings89.cr4.p starts with line: 1
IIKGS18,13	[W-<Cj>] [B->RB <FRH CNH / L—MLK / XZQ JH <sp><ap><Ti>] [<LH <Pr>] [SNXR]B / >CWR <ap><Su>] [<L KL <R]JHWDH H-BYRWT <Co>]
MLK	IIKGS18,13 [W-<Cj>] [JTFM <PO>]

Table 8 (cont.)

lexemes, part of the relation:

>CWR// (1X) iiKings89 21X iiChronicles32 8X  
 BYWR/ (1X) iiKings89 2X iiChronicles32 1X \*†  
 JHWDH// (1X) iiKings89 7X iiChronicles32 6X  
 MLK/ (2X) iiKings89 39X iiChronicles32 12X  
 SNXRJB// (1X) iiKings89 4X iiChronicles32 5X  
 <JR/ (1X) iiKings89 7X iiChronicles32 5X  
 [6] (spec.:1)

PAR 3 text:iiKings89.cr4.p starts with line: 163

IIKGS19,10 [KH <Mo>] [T>MRWN <Pr>] [>L XZQ JHW / MLK JHWDH <ap><Co>]  
 IIKGS19,10 [L->MR <Pr>]  
 IIKGS19,10 [>L <Ng>] [JC>K <PO>] [>LHJK <Su>]  
 IIKGS19,10 [>CR <Re>] [>TH <Su>] [BVX <PC>] [BW <Co>]  
 IIKGS19,10 [L->MR <Pr>]  
 IIKGS19,10 [L> <Ng>] [TNTN <Pr>] [JRWCLM <Su>] [B-JD MLK >CWR <Co>]

lexemes, part of the relation:

>MR[ (3X) iiKings89 31X iiChronicles32 10X  
 >CWR// (1X) iiKings89 21X iiChronicles32 8X  
 JHWDH// (1X) iiKings89 7X iiChronicles32 6X  
 MLK/ (2X) iiKings89 39X iiChronicles32 12X  
 [4]

which one is the best parallel? [ 0 1 2 3 ]

I suggest number: 2 = verse number 1 18:13

Table 9. Synopsis of 2 Chronicles 32 // 2 Kings 18-19

IICHR32,01	[>XRJ H-DBRJ M W-H->MT H->LH <Ti>] [B->Pr>] [SNXRJ B / MLK >CWR <ap><Su>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[W-<Cj>] [JB->PC>] [B-JHWDH <Co>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[W-<Cj>] [JXN <Pr>] [<L H-<RJM H-BYRWT <Co>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[W-<Cj>] [J>MR <Pr>] * 1 *
IICHR32,01	[L-BQ<M <PO>] [>LJW <Co>] * 1 *
IIKGS18,13	[W-<Cj>] [B->RB<< FRH CNH / L—MLK / XZQ JH <sp><ap><Ti>] [<LH <Pr>] [SNXRJ B / MLK >CWR <ap><Su>] * 1 *
	<ap><Su>] [<L KL <R>JHWDH H-BYRWT <Co>]
IIKGS18,13	[W-<Cj>] [JTPFM <PO>]
IICHR32,02	[W-<Cj>] [JR> <Pr>] [JXZQ JHW <Su>] * 2 *
IICHR32,02	[K] <Cj> [B->Pr>] [SNXRJ B <Su>] * 2 *
IICHR32,02	[W-<Cj>] [PNJW <Su>] [L—MLXMH <PC>] [<LJRWCLM <A>] * 2 *
IICHR32,03	[W-<Cj>] [JW<Y <Pr>] [<M FRJW W-GBRJW <Co>] * 3 *
IICHR32,03	[L-STWM <Pr>] [>T MJM] H-<JNWT <Ob>] * 3 *
IICHR32,03	[>CR <Re>] [M-XWYL—<JR <PC>] * 3 *
IICHR32,03	[W-<Cj>] [J<ZRWHW <PO>] * 3 *
IICHR32,04	[W-<Cj>] [JQBYW <Pr>] [<M RB <Su>] * 4 *
IICHR32,04	[W-<Cj>] [JSTMW <Pr>] [>T KL H-M<JNWT W->T H-NXL <Ob>] * 4 *
IICHR32,04	[H-<Re>] [CWVP <PC>] [B-TWK H->RY <Co>] * 4 *
IICHR32,04	[L->MR <Pr>] * 4 *
IICHR32,04	[LMH <Qu>] [JBW>W <Pr>] [MLK] >CWR <Su>] * 4 *
IICHR32,04	[W-<Cj>] [MY>W <Pr>] [MJM RB] M <Ob>] * 4 *
IICHR32,05	[W-<Cj>] [JTXZQ <Pr>] * 5 *
IICHR32,05	[W-<Cj>] [JBN <Pr>] [>T KL H-XWMH H-PRWYH <Ob>] * 5 *
IICHR32,05	[W-<Cj>] [J<L <Pr>] [<L H-MGDLWT / W-/ L—XWYH <ej><PA><Co>] [H-XWMH >XRT <Ob>] * 5 *

Table 9 (cont.)

IICHR32,05 [W-<Cj>] [JXZQ <Pr>] [>T H-MLW< <Jr DWJD <Ob>] * 5*
IICHR32,05 [W-<Cj>] [J<F/ CLX/ L-RB / W-/ MGNJM <PA> <sp> <cj> <PA> <??>] * 5*
IICHR32,06 [W-<Cj>] [JTN <Pr>] [FRJ MLXMT <Ob>] [<L H-<M <Co>] * 6*
IICHR32,06 [W-<Cj>] [JQBYM <PO>] [>LjW< <Co>] [>L RXXWB C<R H-<Jr <Lo>] * 6*
IICHR32,06 [W-<Cj>] [JDBR <Pr>] [<L LBBM <Co>] * 6*
IICHR32,06 [L->MR <Pr>] * 6*
IICHR32,07 [XZQW <Pr>] * 7*
IICHR32,07 [W-<Cj>] [>MYW <Pr>] * 7*
IICHR32,07 [>L <Ng>] [TJR>W <Pr>] * 7*
IICHR32,07 [W-<Cj>] [>L <Ng>] [TXTW< <Pr>] [M-PNJ MLK >CWR / W-/ M-L-PNJ KL H-HMWN <cj> <PA> <Co>] * 7*
IICHR32,07 [>CR <Re>] [<MW <PC>] * 7*
IICHR32,07 [Kj <Cj>] [<MNV <PC>] [RB <Su>] [M-<MW <Co>] * 7*
IIKGS19,06 [W-<Cj>] [J>MR <Pr>] [LHM <Co>] [JC<JHW <Su>]
IIKGS19,06 [KH <Mo>] [T>MRWN <Pr>] [>L >DN]KM <Co>]
IIKGS19,06 [KH <Mo>] [>MR <Pr>] [JHWH <Su>]
IIKGS19,06 [>L <Ng>] [TJR> <Pr>] [M-PNJ H-DBR]M <Co>]
IIKGS19,06 [>CR <Cj>] [CM<T <Pr>]
IIKGS19,06 [>CR <Re>] [GDPW <Pr>] [N<R] MLK >CWR <Su>] [>Tj <Ob>]

The result of the interactive creation of a synopsis is given in Table 9. Special attention should be paid to those parallels that do not occur in traditional synopses. An example of this occurs in 2 Chr. xxxii 7 // 2 Kgs. xix 6. Hezekiah's words in Chronicles are clearly reminiscent of Isaiah's words to Hezekiah in Kings, but since Isaiah's address to Hezekiah has been omitted from Chronicles, this parallel is not registered in traditional synopses. These parallels support our earlier observation about the way in which the Chronicler used his source: Even from those sections that he omitted (in this case: Isaiah's prophecy) he took words and phrases and reused them in different contexts. This means that some passages from Chronicles that in traditional synopses are labelled as 'without parallel', on closer inspection attest to a reuse of the material from Kings.

Likewise, as already appears from this example, sometimes the Chronicler has used passages from Kings that in traditional synopses have no counterpart in Chronicles. If we follow the plot of the story, 2 Chr. xxxii 20, which tells that Hezekiah prayed to God, is parallel to 2 Kgs. xix 15. However, if we count the lexical correspondences, 2 Kgs. xxxii 20 is a better candidate, because not only the lexeme *הִתְפַּלֵּל*, but also the names of Hezekiah and Isaiah, the son of Amos, appear there.

Our observations have consequences for the question of the Chronicler's sources. Regarding the material in Chronicles without parallel in Kings, it is a debated issue whether the Chronicler had other sources at his disposal. However, as soon as we can establish that a certain verse is incorrectly labelled 'without parallel', then we will probably not need to resort to another source to classify it correctly.

Our observations have an impact not only on the source criticism and redaction history of Chronicles. They also contribute to the study of narrative art in the Bible. R. Alter has argued that in biblical narrative much information is conveyed in direct speech.<sup>20</sup> Our analysis demonstrates that in later texts the narrator's role increases, because several times we have seen that words or phrases that appear in direct speech in Kings have become narrated text in Chronicles.

<sup>20</sup> R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York, 1981), pp. 63-87 (= Chapter 4: Between Narration and Dialogue).

Table 10. Direct speech in 2 Kings xviii-xix becomes narrated text in 2 Chronicles xxxii

2 Kings xviii-xix (direct speech)	2 Chronicles xxxii (narrator)
xviii 26 וְאֵל תְּדַבֵּר עִמָּנוּ יְהוָה בְּאָזְנֵי הַעַמְּךָ עַל הַחֲמָה (Hezekiah's servants)	xxxii 18 וַיִּקְרְאוּ בְּקוֹל גָּדוֹל יְהוּדִית עַל עַם יְרוּשָׁלַם אֲשֶׁר עַל הַחֲמָה
xviii 27 עַל הָאֲנָשִׁים הַיֹּשְׁבִים עַל הַחֲמָה (Rabshakeh)	
xix 4 לְחֶזְקִיָּהוּ אֱלֹהִים חַי	xxxii 17 וּסְפָרִים כָּתַב לְחֶזְקִיָּה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
xix 16 לְחֶזְקִיָּהוּ אֱלֹהִים חַי	
xix 22 אֵת מִי חֲרַפְתָּ (Isaiah)	
xix 23 בִּיד מִלְּאֲכִיךָ חֲרַפְתָּ אֲדֹנָי (Isaiah)	
xix 7 וְהִפְלַתִּי בְּחָרֵב בְּאֶרֶץ צוּר (Isaiah)	xxxii 21 שֶׁם הִפְלִיתוּ בְּחָרֵב
xix 15 לְחֶזְקִיָּהוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל חַי	וּסְפָרִים כָּתַב לְחֶזְקִיָּהוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
xix 18 כִּי לֹא אֱלֹהִים הֵמָּה כִּי אִם מַעֲשֵׂה יָדַי	וַיִּדְבְּרוּ אֶל אֱלֹהֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם כַּעַל אֱלֹהֵי עַמִּי
xix 19 וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוֹשִׁיעֵנו נָא מִיַּד (Hezekiah)	הָאֲרִיץ מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי הָאָדָם xxxii 22 וַיֹּשַׁע יְהוָה אֶת יְהוֹקִיָּה וְאֶת יִשְׁבִי יְרוּשָׁלַם מִיַּד סַנְחַרְיָב מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר וּמִיַּד כָּל
xix 34 וּנְגוּתִי אֶל הָעִיר הַזֹּאת לְהוֹשִׁיעָהּ (Isaiah)	וּתְפַלֵּל יְהוֹקִיָּהוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ
xix 20 יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר תִּתְפַּלֵּל אֵלָי (Isaiah)	

#### 4. Conclusion

The ways in which two parallel texts are related can be very diverse and complex. In the present article we have argued that any analysis of parallel texts should start with a systematic description of the elements that do and do not correspond and the nature of the correspondences rather than with an explanation of agreements and differences in terms of redaction, transmission, translation and the like. The computer can be very useful in the formal and systematic registration of the data.

In the case of two closely related texts, like 2 Kings xviii-xix and Isaiah xxxvi-xxxvii, it is possible to create a synopsis with the help of the computer. Although the result does not differ much from traditional synopses that have been published in the course of the centuries, the very fact that it is possible with the computer to reach the same result, is noteworthy. It challenges us to follow the same procedure to arrange texts in parallel alignment where traditional synopses fail, or at least differ. Moreover, the added value of the use of the computer lies in the need to make explicit the parameters that are taken into account. Some remarkable differences between synopses or other studies on parallel texts in the Bible go back to the points of departure and the parameters chosen. In many cases these parameters are far from obvious. Nevertheless, more than once they have not been made explicit.

In the case of 2 Kings xviii-xix and 2 Chronicles xxxii we had to follow a different procedure to compare the two texts. The use of concordances, frequency lists and lists of matches between verses was helpful to establish the relationship between the two texts. This approach leads to results that differ from traditional presentations of parallel texts as in, for example, Bendavid's *Parallels in the Bible*. On the one hand there are cases which Bendavid presents as parallel verses that on closer inspection appear to have few lexical correspondences. Although Bendavid does not make his criteria explicit, it seems that in these cases his decisions were motivated by literary considerations, like the desire to retain the same narrative structure in the two texts concerned. On the other hand there are correspondences between verses that are not covered by traditional synopses because they do not appear in the same literary framework of, for example, the direct speech of one of the participants. This includes cases where elements of the direct speech of one participant in Kings (Isaiah) become the words of another person in Chronicles (Hezekiah) and cases where direct speech in Kings becomes narrated text in Chronicles.

Our observations are relevant to the reconstruction of the Chronicler's interpretation and reworking of Kings, to developments in Classical Hebrew narrative as far as the relationship between direct speech and narrated text is concerned, and to the question of whether the Chronicler has used other sources besides Kings.

The application of the computer-assisted research strategy to parallel texts is still in its infancy. Much work remains to be done. The small study which has been generated for the present article indicates that it is worthwhile proceeding in this way.