

CHRONICLES AS HISTORIOGRAPHY:  
AN INVESTIGATION IN SCRIPTURE'S USE OF SCRIPTURE

A Thesis  
submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Department of Biblical Studies  
Faculty of Arts  
The University of Sheffield

By Tomotoshi Sugimoto  
March 1989

**BEST COPY**

**AVAILABLE**

Variable print quality



**PAGE  
NUMBERS  
CUT OFF  
IN THE  
ORIGINAL**

## SUMMARY

### CHRONICLES AS HISTORIOGRAPHY: AN INVESTIGATION IN SCRIPTURE'S USE OF SCRIPTURE

TOMOTOSHI SUGIMOTO

The aim of this thesis is to define the literary genre of Chronicles, especially focusing on the issues of how the Chronicler's theological purpose and historical interest relate to each other and how his major source Samuel-Kings is used to produce the kind of work intended.

In the first three chapters we examine three aspects of the Chronicler's literary techniques; his use of Samuel-Kings, his use of additional materials, and his overall presentation. We find seven ways in which the text of Chronicles disagrees with that of Samuel-Kings in the first chapter. These are mostly employed to make the text more intelligible and not to alter the original meaning or the historical reportage. His theological interpretation is introduced either by additional comments or typological alterations. In chapter two we see that some additional materials most likely reflect real historical events or older traditions, whereas no new account is preposterous and historically impossible. Although theological comments, speeches, and typological alterations are again used for theological purpose, the Chronicler intends to base his writing on the real historical events. In chapter three we confirm that the structure of Chronicles is organized around its own themes and not controlled by Samuel-Kings.

In chapter four the Chronicler's literary characteristics, found in chapters one to three, are compared with four Scripture-based Jewish literatures; Targum Pseudo-Jonathan,

Jubilees, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus' Antiquities. Chronicles is most similar to Antiquities in having an independent literary structure and concern for historical truth. The Chronicler seems to be conscious of his prophetic status and this is also comparable to Josephus.

We conclude that, though the Chronicler has a theological purpose in writing his work, he attempts to show theological lessons from examples and principles in history and his work must be seen as historiography.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS .....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	xii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
 CHAPTER ONE	
The Chronicler's Use of Samuel-Kings .....	16
Textual .....	18
Clarification .....	27
Adaptation .....	54
Harmonization .....	60
Theological Stress .....	66
Typological Alterations .....	82
Summary .....	98
 CHAPTER TWO	
The Chronicler's Use of Additional Materials .....	101
Blessings .....	102
a. Building Activities .....	102
b. Army Organization .....	112
c. Large Family .....	118
d. Wealth .....	122
e. War (Victory) .....	125
Curses .....	142
a. War (Defeat) .....	142
b. Illness and Death .....	154
Religious Attitude .....	157
a. Reforms .....	157
b. Apostasies .....	178
Theological Comments .....	181
a. Comments .....	181
b. Speeches .....	182
Summary .....	187
 CHAPTER THREE	
The Chronicler's Presentation of his Work .....	191
1 Chr 10: Saul's Death .....	192
1 Chr 11-12: David's Coronation .....	195
1 Chr 13-16: The Transfer of the Ark .....	200
1 Chr 17-20: The Establishment of the Kingdom .....	206
1 Chr 21: The Purchase of the Temple Site .....	209
1 Chr 22-29: David's Charge to Solomon and the People .....	212

2 Chr 1-9: Solomon's Temple Building	218
2 Chr 10-16: The Division of the Kingdom	227
2 Chr 17-20: Jehoshaphat	234
2 Chr 21-23: Jehoram, Ahaziah, Athaliah	238
2 Chr 24-26: Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah	243
2 Chr 27-28: Jotham, Ahaz	249
2 Chr 29-32: Hezekiah	253
2 Chr 33-35: Manasseh, Amon, Josiah	263
2 Chr 36: The Destruction of the Kingdom	269
Summary	272
<b>EXCURSUS</b>	
Summary of Chapters One to Three	274
1 Chronicles 1-9	275
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>	
Chronicles and Other Jewish Literatures	277
Targum Pseudo-Jonathan	277
Jubilees	285
Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum	296
Jewish Antiquities	303
Chronicles and Other Jewish Literatures	317
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	326
<b>NOTES</b>	328
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	375

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would, first of all, like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Philip Davies for being so generous of his time and for his encouraging and insightful supervision. I am also thankful to Prof. John Rogerson, Prof. David Clines, and all the fellow students in the Department of Biblical Studies in Sheffield for the stimulating atmosphere in which I could pursue my research. In addition, Dr. Mark Throntveit and Dr. Philip Alexander have kindly shown me their manuscripts before publication.

Substantial financial support was provided by Mikage Shin'ai Church, Japan and the Tyndale Fellowship. Without it this thesis would not have been possible and I am deeply grateful to them.

Personally, I must thank Reiko, my wife, who gladly shared a stressful time and turned it into an enjoyable and memorable experience. My parents, Rev. and Mrs. Shunsuke Sugimoto, have been praying and supporting me throughout my long post-graduate study, and to them I would like to dedicate this thesis.

## INTRODUCTION

The curious literary character of the books of Chronicles has fascinated many serious students of the Old Testament. A cursory reading of Chronicles gives the impression that it is a history of Israel, but soon we realize that it is dominated by strong theological motives. Chronicles is, moreover, already preceded by Samuel-Kings, and one must naturally question why a second history of Israel was necessary within the Hebrew canon and what the relationship is between the two. These questions have significant implications for the understanding of how the history of Israel led scholars to reappreciate Chronicles as a Old Testament writers viewed the history of Israel, and how some of Scripture used earlier parts of Scripture during the formation of the Old Testament. The aim of the present study is, thus, to define the literary genre of Chronicles, bearing these questions in mind.

We would like to begin our study by examining the way in which previous scholars have seen the nature of Chronicles.<sup>1</sup> Since the medieval period there have always been some people sceptical about its historical nature, but it was de Wette in the beginning of the nineteenth century who first argued that Chronicles is historically totally unreliable.<sup>2</sup> De Wette attempted to undermine the traditional view that the Law was given in the beginning of Israel's history and that it

examination of the materials, but he argued that to reject the constituted Israel's life thereafter. He rejected the historical worth of any part of Chronicles out of hand as "both subjective and unorthodox".<sup>3</sup> He rejected the historical reliability of Chronicles completely, because it depicts Israel's history more in the line of the Pentateuch, in comparison to the Former Prophets. Wellhausen basically accepted de Wette's approach and refined it.<sup>3</sup> He argued for the close relationship between Chronicles and P rather than the whole Pentateuch, and used the tendentiousness of Chronicles to prove the late dating of P.

By the first half of the twentieth century, however, accumulating archaeological data and a growing interest in the history of Israel led scholars to reappraise Chronicles as a historical source. Historical elements are severally found in Chronicles by such scholars as Winckler, Benzinger, Kittel and Curtis.<sup>4</sup> But the most influential figure in this direction was W.F. Albright. In his article in 1921, he first accepted E. Meyer's conclusion that the Aramaic documents in Ezra-Nehemiah are authentic and defended the reliability of Ezra-Nehemiah.<sup>5</sup> Although he was still unconvinced about the historical nature of Chronicles *per se* in 1921, in his second article "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat" in 1950 he could exhibit an increasing amount of evidence to support the historical trustworthiness of Chronicles (e.g., drachmas, the royal potteries in 1 Chr 4:23, fortified cities of Rehoboam, the Siloam Tunnel, etc.).<sup>6</sup> Albright, of course, did not deny the tendentiousness of Chronicles and called for careful



examination of the materials, but he argued that to reject the historical worth of any part of Chronicles out of hand is "both subjective and uncritical".<sup>7</sup>

Meantime in Germany and Scandinavia the tradition-critical approach to the Old Testament was developed, and the literary nature of Chronicles ceased to be evaluated in terms of historical truth. This approach distinguishes between scientifically reconstructed history and theologically pictured biblical history, and sees the specific theological standpoint of the biblical writers as being more important than historical information in their works. Von Rad argued in his *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (1930) that Chronicles was written as "Programmschrift für das nachexilische Israel" and was meant to replace the older history of the Former Prophets with its new theological understanding.<sup>8</sup> He regarded Chronicles as a history written for this specific theological purpose, and focused his study on the distinct "historical picture" of the Chronicler. The tradition-critical approach made it possible to study Chronicles in its own right, because it views the composition of biblical books as a development in successive generations, which freed Chronicles from the burden of demonstrating the lateness of the Pentateuch. G. von Rad showed that Chronicles is relying not only on P but also significantly on D.

M. Noth took a similar tradition-critical approach in his *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943), but he claimed that Chronicles was a re-worked form of Israel's history, written to present Israel's historical tradition in a relevant way to later generations.<sup>9</sup> He defended the Chronicler's intention of writing history, supporting his essential faithfulness to the historical report of Samuel-Kings and availability of extra-canonical sources.<sup>10</sup> However, according to Noth, the aim of the Chronicler is not simply to inform about the past but "to give teaching about various specific consequences which could be drawn from past history and which were relevant to the present."<sup>11</sup> It was important for the Chronicler to show how the institutions of the post-exilic community developed historically.<sup>12</sup> Noth suggested that the Chronicler intended to write a true history of Israel, but his work was inevitably conditioned and controlled by the special concern of his day and often used to give historical justification for the post-exilic institutions.<sup>13</sup>

This line of approach is followed by most subsequent works on Chronicles. However, given that Chronicles is a "theological history", there is still a great diversity of opinion concerning how the Chronicler's description of history relates to his theology.

T. Willi has identified Chronicles as "exegesis (Auslegung)" of Samuel-Kings and suggested its similarities

with Rabbinic interpretations.<sup>14</sup> He claims that its purpose was to help later readers to understand the text and that "exegesis" of the prophetic history is the historiographical activity in the late post-exilic community. Already as early as the end of the last century W.E. Barnes pointed out the presence of midrashic elements in Chronicles and called it "Targum".<sup>15</sup> Midrashic elements were also found by A.-M. Brunet and J. Weingreen.<sup>16</sup> R. Bloch argued in her influential article entitled "Midrash" for a continuous development from interpretation within the Bible to later Rabbinic exposition, and categorized Chronicles as a primitive form of Rabbinic midrash.<sup>17</sup> Such a view shares a common ground with Noth in seeing Chronicles as a reworking of Israel's historical tradition from the post-exilic standpoint, but differs from him in minimizing the Chronicler's historical interest and denying his role as an independent narrator.<sup>18</sup>

Others have maintained that Chronicles is an independent theological expression, though the author may have used midrashic interpretation to achieve this purpose. B. Childs and M.P. Miller argued that "midrashic" exegetical method/activity can be traced back to Chronicles and intertestamental Rewritten Bibles, and that all these must be called "midrash" even if they are employed in different literary forms from Targum or Rabbinic Midrash.<sup>19</sup> Childs suggested that there are "enough similarities" between the Chronicler's method and the Rabbinic



midrash, because the Chronicler was interested in the interpretation of the sacred text beginning interpretation with his situation and connecting it with the text. However, Childs did not see Chronicles as a mere commentary or homily on the text, for the text was reorganized around new distinct theological themes.<sup>20</sup> He offered three phenomena to support his view. First, the Scriptural texts are cited as such for his new purpose, regardless of their function in the original setting. Second, the Chronicler's harmonization between texts assumes the status of Samuel-Kings as canonical Scripture. Third, the text is not altered, but a new framework is provided to assign a new role to it.

R. Mosis devoted his entire monograph, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (1973), to the analysis of the Chronicler's own structure.<sup>21</sup> He emphasized the "paradigmatic" description of Israel, rather than midrashic interpretation, as the key to the Chronicler's presentation. The Chronicler had the reigns of Saul, David, and Solomon respectively represent the time of judgement, restoration, and final glorification, and ascribed the Babylonian exile to the sins of the post-Solomonic kings who followed Saul's example. He encouraged the post-exilic community to take David's example in restoring proper worship so that they could look forward to the future reestablishment of a glorious Israel just as in Solomon's period. Williamson and Throntveit followed

Mosis in finding a distinct structure of Chronicles, though they suggested some modification to the scheme.<sup>22</sup>

Mosis did not discuss the historical issues in Chronicles but evaluated it only from its theological purpose. Such exclusively theological understanding of Chronicles is typically represented by P. Welten's *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern* (1973).<sup>23</sup> Welten studied the Chronicler's additional materials, category by category, and concluded that mostly they are not based on reliable historical traditions but created from his hellenistic background. Chronicles is labeled as "freie parabolische Geschichtsdarstellung", and compared to "historical fiction" such as the book of Judith, written for edification.<sup>24</sup> These studies by Childs, Mosis, and Welten share two common features: finding (1) an independent structure from the canonical text in Chronicles; (2) little historical concern in the Chronicler's handling of the material.

The third way of looking at Chronicles' literary nature is not only to take it as an independent literary work but also as historiography. Writing against the tendency to call Chronicles "midrash", A. Wright stressed the importance of separating literary genre from exegetical method.<sup>25</sup> He claimed that the literary genre of Chronicles cannot be "midrash", because the primary objective of Chronicles is not to make a clearer, more relevant version of Samuel-King, but to write an

independent history. Though it uses the techniques similar to the Rabbinic exegetical methods, they can be used by writers of various literary forms. He pointed out that the Chronicler structured his work not on Samuel-Kings but according to his own themes, and he used "these books as sources and not as an object of interpretation".<sup>26</sup> Further, he noted that the Chronicler is concerned with the interpretation of the events, whereas narrative midrash is concerned with the interpretation of the text, especially how events are related in a given text.<sup>27</sup> M. Fishbane likewise distinguishes haggadic exegesis within historiography and historiographical techniques *per se*.<sup>28</sup>

E. Bickerman claimed that, though some scholars blamed the Chronicler for his distortion of facts, the way the Chronicler wrote his work is compatible with the historiographies in his cultural milieu.<sup>29</sup> Exaggerations in numbers, correction of the source according to his law of historical probability, and providing the clue to the meaning and direction of history all parallel Assyrian and/or Greek historiography of his time. Commentaries by Myers, Williamson and Dillard have supplied much evidence for the Chronicler's use of extra-canonical sources in his rewritings and additions.<sup>30</sup>

It is now clear that, though the time of judging Chronicles solely by its historical reliability has past, there are at least three ways of understanding the relationship

between theology and history and that there is still no consensus on this issue among scholars. In the present writer's opinion, this is largely due to the fact that previous works did not cover all aspects of the Chronicler's literary techniques and defined its literary genre prematurely, though these were necessary studies and greatly contributed to our understanding of Chronicles. For example, Willi's work was mostly on the Chronicler's use of Samuel-Kings, Welten concentrated on his use of additional materials, and Mosis on his structuring. Defence of the Chronicler's historical nature has also been argued only in general terms or in commentaries, and they need to be reexamined to see if the claim can stand systematic scrutiny. In this study, therefore, we would like to review all three aspects of the Chronicler's literary composition: his use of Samuel-Kings, his use of additional materials, and his overall presentation, chapter by chapter, and to define what kind of literature Chronicles is. In the final chapter we will further compare the results of the first three chapters with various Jewish literatures in order to define Chronicles by the literary convention of its day.

Our discussion, however, does not aim to establish what sort of interpreter, theologian, or historian the Chronicler might be. We are simply interested in what was the purpose of writing for the Chronicler: whether to interpret the sacred text, to write an independent theological treatise, or to

Ezra is a device which became necessary when Ezra-Nehemiah was express his theological view based on historical events. His interpretation may not always be "sound" from our viewpoint, but it does not necessarily deny his interpretative intention. His account of historical events may not always seem to be "accurate" by modern standard, but this does not suggest that Chronicles is not intended to be a history writing. The point is which of the above three models best describe the way the Chronicler related his theological expression and historical account.

In carrying out our research we assume that Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah are separate works and limit our study to Chronicles only. It has been long accepted that these two works originally formed one book since L. Zunz first claimed it in 1832, but the situation has been overturned in the last two decades.<sup>31</sup> The discussions have centred around four points, which Sara Japhet conveniently summarized as follows:

1. The presence of the first verses of Ezra at the end of Chronicles.
2. 1 Esdras begins with 2 Chr 35-36 and continues through Ezra.
3. The linguistic resemblance between the books as revealed by common vocabulary, syntactic phenomena and stylistic peculiarities.
4. The alleged uniformity of theological conceptions expressed both in the material and in its selection.<sup>32</sup>

The first argument for the "single work" hypothesis is that the overlap of the end of Chronicles and the beginning of



Ezra is a device which became necessary when Ezra-Nehemiah was separated and became canonical before Chronicles. However, this argument is ill-founded, because this is not the only possible explanation of the phenomenon. As P.R. Ackroyd writes, "Two separate works might equally be provided with a link designed to point the reader to where further information could be found".<sup>33</sup> There is, moreover, no adequate ground for the supposition that Ezra-Nehemiah was canonized earlier than Chronicles. The presence of Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles in LXX shows both works were separately accepted in the canon at least as early as the middle of the second century.<sup>34</sup>

The second argument for original unity is drawn from 1 Esdras, where 2 Chr 35-36 are followed by the whole account of Ezra, but this is again not compelling. The structure of 1 Esdras suggests that it is a secondary work of compilation and cannot reflect the original form of the Chronicler's history.<sup>35</sup> The story of the three young bodyguards (1 Esdras 3:1-5:6) and the additional activity of Ezra (1 Esdras 9:37-55) are introduced into the Ezra account from elsewhere, and the whole work begins and ends rather abruptly. F.M. Cross and R. Klein not only argued for the priority of the Hebrew text underlying the Greek of 1 Esdras, but also developed the theory of three successive editions of the Chronicler's work based on the evidence of 1 Esdras:

Chr 1 = 1 Chr 10 - 2 Chr 34 + the Vorlage of 1 Esdras 1:1 - 5:65

Chr 2 = 1 Chr 10 - 2 Chr 34 + the Vorlage of 1 Esdras

Chr 3 = 1 Chr 1 - 9 + 1 Chr 10 - 2 Chr 36 + (Heb) Ezra - Nehemiah<sup>36</sup>

That the Nehemiah memoirs were supplied at the last stage (Chr 3) may be supported by 1 Esdras, but there is no evidence that the original Chronicles (Chr 1) included the *Vorlage* of 1 Esdras 1:1-5:65 (or Ezr 1:1-3:13).<sup>37</sup> For Chr 1 Cross simply followed Freedman's argument: "The parallel between the first building of the temple under the direction of David (and Solomon), and the second building under Zerubbabel is too striking to be accidental, and must have formed part of the original structure of the work."<sup>38</sup> Unfortunately neither Freedman nor Cross gave any concrete examples of the parallels. On the contrary, the genealogy of Zerubbabel is not even traced back to the house of David, and that Zerubbabel was acting as the expected Davidide is far from obvious.

Thirdly, the linguistic affinity between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah was invoked to indicate their continuity by Driver, Torrey, Brown, and Curtis-Madsen.<sup>39</sup> But Japhet, Williamson, and Throntveit have reexamined the linguistic features of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah and found differences as well as similarities between them.<sup>40</sup> Japhet, acknowledging their "common linguistic basis", demonstrated the differences in three areas: (1) Linguistic opposition, (2) Technical terms, and (3) Stylistic peculiarities. Although her first

be found in other documents of the post-exilic period as point is challenged by Polzin and Throntveit, Williamson refined her work and supplemented especially on (3) the peculiarities of style.<sup>41</sup> He argued that more rigid criteria are necessary to distinguish between the general similarities of the language and the particular peculiarities shared only by Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, and proposed the following:

- (1) A substantial number of peculiarities must be produced.
- (2) These peculiarities must come from both Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.
- (3) The evidence must be confined to Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.
- (4) Peculiarities should, if possible, be expressed differently in other LBH works.
- (5) Peculiarities must be used with the same meaning in both Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.<sup>42</sup>

When Williamson applied these criteria to Driver's list of similarities, the majority did not satisfy them and most of the remaining entries were in favour of diverse authorship.<sup>43</sup> R. Polzin studied grammatical/syntactical aspects of the language and found "amazing linguistic similarities" among Chronicles, Ezra and the Nehemiah memoir, but the aim of this study was not to establish common authorship but the typology of Late Biblical Hebrew in general.<sup>44</sup> Throntveit thus applied Williamson's five criteria to Polzin's work and proved that in this respect also most of the alleged similarities between Chronicles and Ezra are not limited to these two works but can



be found in other documents of the post-exilic period as well.<sup>45</sup>

The last argument usually presented for the "single work" hypothesis is the similarity in theological outlook: interest in the Temple and its cultus; emphasis on the role of the Levites; inclusion of many genealogical and other lists; concern for the fate of the Temple treasures.<sup>46</sup> However, these are common interests of post-exilic society and can hardly be signs of distinct theological thought.<sup>47</sup> On the other hand, there are a number of differences in key theological issues at that time, and they make it difficult to suppose that the same author wrote the two works:

- (1) Whereas the Davidic covenant plays a key role in Chronicles, especially for the hope of future restoration, such an idea cannot be found in Ezra-Nehemiah (cf. Zerubbabel).<sup>48</sup>
- (2) In Chronicles "Jacob" is constantly called "Israel" and focused as the forefather of the post-exilic community, but Ezra-Nehemiah understands the resettlement more in the tradition of Exodus and Abraham (Neh. 9).<sup>49</sup>
- (3) Ezra-Nehemiah does not describe events with an immediate retribution, as is so prevalent in Chronicles.<sup>50</sup>
- (4) Ezra-Nehemiah expresses the author's theological view with prayers (cf. Ezra 9, Neh. 9) instead of the Levitical sermons as in Chronicles.
- (5) Although Ezra-Nehemiah is completely hostile toward the North (Ezra 4-6; Neh 2-6), as R. Braun suggested, Chronicles includes incidents more positive to the inhabitants of the North.<sup>51</sup>

Although the objections to the first three arguments only suggest their inconclusiveness, the difference in theological viewpoint indicates diversity of authorship and we adopt it in our study to the extent that we discuss the literary characteristics of 1 and 2 Chronicles as a complete work and do not consider Ezra-Nehemiah as a product of the Chronicler.

# I

## The Chronicler's Use of Samuel-Kings

Since the major source of Chronicles is generally agreed to be the canonical books of Samuel-Kings, the first step is to compare these two texts in order to examine the Chronicler's attitude to his source and the relationship between the source and his own work. The minor changes which the Chronicler introduces into his *Vorlage* may create new effects in his presentation of Israel's history and in his theology. We shall categorize them as follows.

#### TEXTUAL

1. The Chronicler's *Vorlage* is different from MT Samuel-Kings.
2. Samuel-Kings text is corrupted.
3. Chronicles text is corrupted.
4. Textual problem but difficult to decide which text is corrupted.

#### CLARIFICATION

1. Rewriting
  - a. Use of more normal lexical and grammatical form
  - b. Use of equivalent words or phrases
  - c. Change of word order
  - d. Use of more definite expression
2. Omission and Abridgement
  - a. Omission of redundant expression
  - b. Omission of self-evident expression
  - c. Use of more general expression
3. Addition
  - a. Repetition of similar expression
  - b. Addition of self-evident expression
  - c. Use of more exact expression
4. Explaining difficult passages
  - a. Textual correction
  - b. Explication of the implied thought
5. Additional historical information
  - a. Historical identification
  - b. Historical information

#### ADAPTATION

1. Change into Late Biblical Hebrew
  - a. Lexical
  - b. Grammatical
2. Use of equivalent for unintelligible terms

#### HARMONIZATION

1. With near context
2. With Chronicles' general structure

#### THEOLOGICAL STRESS

1. God as a real king
2. Choice of David and Solomon
3. All Israel
4. People
5. Proper worship
6. Retribution

#### TYPOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS

1. Type scene
2. Typology
3. Contemporization

It is true that some changes may have been made unconsciously, but we are not seeking to find out the exact rules which the Chronicler had in his mind but to categorize the effects of the changes in the text. Some discrepancies can be also listed in more than one effect, but the aim of our study is only to see the general principles in the Chronicler's alterations and some overlaps do not greatly change the result of our study. In this chapter analyses of more extensive changes are not included, because in such passages it is impossible to determine the effects of minor alterations without relating them to the larger contexts. In such cases we must consider other sources as a possible reason for changes as well. We shall therefore deal with these cases in chapter III.

#### TEXTUAL

The first thing we notice in an exhaustive study of the differences between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings is the Chronicler's basic faithfulness to the source text. Where he reproduces his *Vorlage*, he follows it almost word for word, and many of the minor discrepancies can be explained in text-critical terms. These textual problems happened simply for mechanical reasons and have nothing to do with the Chronicler's attitude to the source or his interpretation. Excluding these textual corruptions there are not as many differences between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings as we might suppose.



1. The Chronicler's *Vorlage* is different from MT Samuel-Kings. F. M. Cross and his students have most clearly shown that there are cases where the Chronicler conveys his *Vorlage* faithfully but his *Vorlage* was already different from MT Samuel-Kings.<sup>1</sup> This phenomenon is attested by the fact that the reading of Chronicles often agrees with the Samuel text of LXX and 4QSam (4Q hereafter) against MT Sam. Although Cross' theory of local text types has been recently challenged by S. Talmon and E. Tov, the agreement of Chronicles with LXX Sam and 4QSam is so remarkable that it still seems plausible to see the Chronicler's *Vorlage* in the same textual family as LXX Sam and 4QSam.<sup>2</sup> other hand, the Chronicler's *Vorlage* of Kings seems

For reasons of space we list only representative examples of this kind of discrepancy, but for further discussions one can consult the textual studies of Cross' students, Lemke, Klein, Ulrich, and McKenzie.<sup>3</sup> 1 Chr 11:8 has וִבֵן הָעִיר for וִבֵן דָּוִד in 2 Sam 5:9. Although the words are wrongly divided, Chronicles reflects the same reading as 4Q וִבְנָה עִיר and LXX- και οικοδομησεν την πολιν . דָּוִד in MT Sam is a corruption of King עִיר.<sup>4</sup> 1 Chr 11:9, likewise, gives וְהָיָה צְבָאוֹת against וְהָיָה צְבָאוֹת אֵלָּהּ in 2 Sam 5:10, because 4Q and LXX have only וְהָיָה צְבָאוֹת .<sup>5</sup> Wenham and Payne have shown that the number of David's chariots and horsemen in 1 Chr 18:4 is the "fullest and most coherent" report among variants; 2 Sam 8:4-5 // 1 Chr 18:4 and 2 Sam 10:18 // 1 Chr 19:18.<sup>6</sup> Since LXX

Sam agrees with Chronicles and  $\text{לכב}$  is attested by 4Q, the change is not one made to magnify David's resources and victory. The plus of  $\text{בה עשה שלמה את-ים הנחשת ואת-}$   $\text{העמודים ואת כלי הנחשת}$  "with it Solomon made the bronze sea and the pillars and the vessels of bronze" in 1 Chr 18:8 (& 2 Sam 8:8) is often taken as the Chronicler's composition, because it accords with his theological interest, i.e., the seized bronze was used to make Temple articles.<sup>6</sup> However, as Rudolph and Lemke correctly point out, LXX Sam and Josephus (*Ant.* VII. 106) suggest this text was already in the Chronicler's *Vorlage*.<sup>7</sup>

On the other hand, the Chronicler's *Vorlage* of Kings seems to be of the same type as the MT. While Lemke's earlier work automatically assumes the same situation as in the Samuel *Vorlage* for the Kings *Vorlage*, we have much less evidence from Qumran and LXX<sup>8</sup> on Kings and it is difficult to establish the case.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, McKenzie has shown that the Chronicles' text is in close affinity with MT Kings over against the Greek text, even where MT may be secondary, and this suggests that the Chronicler's Kings *Vorlage* is closer to MT Kings.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, where MT Chronicles differs from MT Kings we cannot suppose that the Chronicler's *Vorlage* was of a different text type and we must look for other reasons for discrepancies.

2. Samuel-Kings text is corrupted.

The second sub-category of textual issues is the case where the Chronicler copied his *Vorlage* correctly but later the text of Samuel itself became corrupted. These discrepancies may not be supported by LXX<sup>4</sup> or 4Q but can be explained by common causes of textual mistakes. Again they do not reflect the Chronicler's view of history or interpretation at all. The following are typical cases.

The difference between שְׁבֹטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in 2 Sam 7:7 and שְׁפֹטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in 1 Chr 17:6 seems to be due to graphic confusion, and the context clearly indicates Chronicles is correct. הַגְּלִיכִים in 2 Sam 11:1 is also corrupted, for הַגְּלִיכִים (1 Chr 20:1) is sustained not only by its context but also by many mss., LXX, and many versions. 2 Chr 10:12 gives וַיִּבֹא instead of וַיִּבֹּא of Kings, and as the Kethib-Qere of the latter indicates, the Chronicler's text is undoubtedly correct. 2 Chr 18:23 correctly supplies הַדָּרֶךְ after אִזָּה because without it the phrase is grammatically difficult.<sup>10</sup> In 2 Chr 25:23 the Hiphil verb וַיִּבְרָא stands against Qal וַיִּבְרָא in 2 Kgs 14:13 and the context again indicates Chronicles' superiority. In 2 Chr 28:3 וַיִּבְעֵר differs from הָעֵבֶר (2 Kgs 16:3). Since the latter is euphemistic for the former, Chronicles seems to preserve the original form.

### 3. Chronicles text is corrupted

Just as Samuel-Kings text sometimes became degenerated during the course of scribal transmission, our text of Chronicles may have also suffered from similar textual problems. Most of these errors can be explained as common textual corruptions and they do not reflect the Chronicler's intentional alterations.

For example,  $\text{וְגַ$  in front of  $\text{בְּהִ'וֹת}$  in 1 Chr 11:2 must be dittography, because  $\text{וְגַ$  occurs twice before in this verse both in MT Samuel and MT Chronicles (cf. 2 Sam 5:2). In the same verse  $\text{עַל עַמֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  is in a like manner changed to  $\text{עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  since the same expression is already used here. In 1 Chr 11:13 the whole account of the heroic deed of Eleazar the son of Dodo (2 Sam 23:9b-11a) is dropped because of haplography between  $\text{וַיֹּאסְפוּ הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים לְהִיהָ$  and  $\text{וַיֹּאסְפוּ שֵׁם לְמַלְחָמָה וְהַפְּלִשְׁתִּים}$ . In 1 Chr 18:6 is accidentally omitted from 2 Sam 8:6, for this is necessary as the object of  $\text{וַיִּשָּׂם}$ .

Some textual corruptions are likely to be due to graphic confusion of similar words. In 2 Chr 18:19 original  $\text{בְּכָה}$  is changed to  $\text{כָּה}$  twice and in 25:4  $\text{וַיִּזְוֶה}$  (twice) and  $\text{וַיִּזְוֶה}$  are inaccurately copied as  $\text{וַיִּזְוֶה}$ . The personal name "Micaiah (  $\text{מִיכָיָהוּ}$  )" of 2 Chr 13:2 is probably a scribal variant of "Maacha (  $\text{מַעַכָּה}$  )" and the personal name "Achbor (  $\text{עַכְבֹּר}$  )" is altered to "Abdon (  $\text{עַבְדֹּן}$  )" in 2 Chr 34:20. The difference between 'hear (  $\text{שָׁמַע}$  ) the word' (2 Kgs 22:13) and 'keep (  $\text{שָׁמַר}$  )

the word' (2 Chr 34:21) is also because of graphic confusion and the difference between 'Shaphan the scribe came to the king' (2 Kgs 22:9) and 'Shaphan brought the book' (2 Chr 34:16) is due to Chronicler's inferior way of vocalization. 'And in Benjamin' in 2 Chr 34:32 seems to be a corruption of 'in the covenant ( לברית )' of the *Vorlage*.

The change from וישלח ידו הגלאך to וישלח האלהים מלאך in 1 Chr 21:15 (// 2 Sam 24:16) appears to be an attempt to solve the difficulty of God's repentance, but the next sentence explicitly says "[the Lord] repented ( יהוה ו'נחם )" and so obviously the Chronicler does not feel any change to be necessary. CM instead proposes a textual mechanism which led to the Chronicler's reading: הגלאך was first misread as יהוה מלאך, and it was then changed as usual to האלהים מלאך.<sup>12</sup>

The last phrase of 2 Chr 18:27 "and he said, 'hear, all you peoples'" is suspected as originally a marginal gloss inserted from Mic 1:2 by a scribe who identified Micaiah with the canonical prophet Micah. The Chronicler's plus "and ten days" to Jehoiachim's reigning period "three months" (2 Chr 36:9) may also be a marginal gloss which has crept into the text, as commentators suggest. But Ackroyd's view seems to be more convincing; the numerical sign of ten for the king's age ("eighteen" in Kings and "eight" in Chronicles) is misplaced to his reigning period.

Many other textual corruptions are indicated by LXX and other versions. 1 Chr 11:12 gives  $\text{׳ל׳ל׳ל׳}$  for  $\text{׳ל׳ל׳}$  in 2 Sam 23:9, but as LXX Chr 11:12  $\delta\omega\delta\alpha\lambda$  and the Hebrew text of 1 Chr 27:4  $\text{׳ל׳ל׳}$  suggest Samuel text is more original. In 2 Chr 22:2 the accession age of Ahaziah is given as "forty two years old" against "twenty two years old" in 2 Kgs 8:26. Chronicles' age is not only impossible because his father died at about forty years old (2 Chr 21:5, 20) but also probably not original as LXX<sup>1</sup> and Syr of Chronicles also support the Kings text.

#### 4. Textual but difficult to decide which text is corrupted

The instances where it is difficult to decide which text is more original, or where both texts seem to be corrupted are classified here. A number of personal names in the list of David's mighty men in 1 Chr 11 are confused with similar letters and now it is impossible to decide the original spellings. Such confusion occurs quite frequently and in some cases both spellings in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles seem to be corrupted (e.g.,  $\text{׳פ׳}$  1 Chr 20:4,  $\text{׳}$  in 2 Sam 21:18; cf.  $\text{׳ל׳}$  in 2 Sam 21:18; 27:11; 1 Chr 11:29; 27:11)).<sup>10</sup> There are also instances where it is hard to decide whether the differences are due to the Chronicler's improvement of poor expressions in MT Kings or subsequent textual corruption on the side of MT Kings. For instance, in 2 Chr 10:2  $\text{ד׳ל׳ל׳}$  is changed to more suitable  $\text{ד׳ל׳ל׳}$  and in 2 Chr 10:8  $\text{ל׳ל׳}$  which

is placed unnecessarily before הלאהם by DtH is omitted. The second and the third of these scribal exchanges are is written as הל הנג in 2 Chr 25:26, but we cannot certainly tell which the original is, for the Chronicler uses both forms.<sup>14</sup> The Chronicler uses the singular participle עֲשֵׂה for "workmen" in 2 Chr 34:10 against the plural form in 2 Kgs 22:5. While the context suggests the Kings reading, 1 Chr 23:24 employs the same expression עֲשֵׂה הַמְּלָאכָה for apparently multiple people, and it is difficult to be certain about the original text.

Besides such instances, there are three common scribal exchanges. Firstly, it is known that theophoric names are often spelled differently in Chronicles. Japhet argues that, while Ezra-Nehemiah constantly uses short spellings of theophoric names, Chronicles tends to lengthen them, and she ascribes such inconsistency to the Chronicler's personal style.<sup>15</sup> However, Cross and Throntveit have convincingly shown from Qumran examples that this in fact is due to scribal practices and not the Chronicler himself.<sup>16</sup> Japhet lists fourteen instances of lengthening of short theophoric names, but the opposite can be found in the following.<sup>17</sup> 1 Chr 11:22 and 31 (בְּנֵיהָ → בְּנֵיהוּ), 2 Chr 18:4 and 34:20 (צִיכִיהוּ → צִיכִיהוּ) and in 2 Chr 26:3 (יְכִלִּיהוּ → יְכִלִּיהוּ). Theophoric elements at the beginning of the word are also changed in 2 Chr 22:4 (הוֹרֵם → יוֹרֵם [lengthening]), in 1 Chr 11:34 (יְהוֹנָתָן → יוֹנָתָן [shortening]) and in 2 Chr 24:1 (יְהוֹאָשׁ → יוֹאָשׁ [shortening]).



The second and the third of these scribal exchanges are related to expressions for the divine name. Von Rad observes the Chronicler's preference for אלהים over יהוה, and gives as his explanation that in the later period "Yahweh is increasingly detached from contact with the human world."<sup>19</sup> But Japhet correctly points out that יהוה is still used about five hundred times in Chronicles and that יהוה and אלהים are actually in many cases synonymous.<sup>20</sup> Thus she concludes that the changes of יהוה and אלהים should not be attributed to the Chronicler but to later scribal practice.<sup>20</sup> This change occurs in 1 Chr 13:8, 12(2x), 14; 14:10, 11, 15, 16; 16:1; 17:2, 3; 21:8; 2 Chr 10:15; 11:2; 15:18; 18:5; 22:12; 23:3; 25:24; 28:1; 34:9, 27. The elements in the combined expressions of the divine name are also exchanged quite freely and they tend to be shorter. There seems to be no particular preference among the elements, and they are probably due to omission, or more likely expansion, during textual transmission. They can be found in 1 Chr 11:9; 16:2; 17:16, 17 (2x), 23, 24, 25, 28, 29; 21:3, 24; 2 Chr 18:3.

The Chronicler is not responsible for these "textual" disagreements and we cannot draw any conclusion about his alterations of the source from them. Rather, we conclude that so many discrepancies are in fact of a textual nature and that the Chronicler otherwise faithfully followed his *Vorlage*,



showing his high respect for his source. We must be careful not to judge Chronicles as a tendentious writing too quickly.

#### CLARIFICATION

The second category of discrepancy is the change by which the Chronicler attempts to clarify the meaning of his source for his readers. These rewritings do not alter the basic meaning of the text. The changes can be very subtle and made for both directions of elaboration and abridgement. In such cases it is not always easy to see the consistent rules, but the Chronicler may use other wordings. If additional information or interpretation is given by rewriting, it is dealt with in 5. Additional historical information section, and rewritings of a theological nature will be discussed under the headings of the Theological Stress.

#### 1. Rewriting

##### a. Use of more normal lexical and grammatical form.

One of the conspicuous features of the Chronicler's rewriting is the change to more normal or clearer expressions. The enclitic is generally avoided: e.g., 1 Chr 10:11, 12 < יבשה → יבש >; 11:2 < אתגול → תגול >. The longer and clearer personal pronoun and pronominal suffix is preferred by the Chronicler: e.g., 1 Chr 10:9 < ויפשיטו → ויפשיטהו >; 17:9

< וְנִטְעִיתִיו → וְנִטְעִיתִי >; 21:10 < מֵהֶם → מֵהֵנָּה >; 2 Chr 12:10  
< שִׁנְאַתִּיהוּ → שִׁנְאַתִּיו > 18:7 < בָּהֶם → בָּנֵם > 16:6 < תַּחְתִּיהֶם → תַּחְתָּם >

The direction is more clearly indicated by prepositions

directives: e.g., 1 Chr 11:16 < בֵּית לַחֶם > , מִן , אֶל , עַד and הֵ :  
→ < מֵעִיר דָּוִד → עִיר דָּוִד > 15:29 < מִבֵּית לַחֶם → בֵּית לַחֶם > 26 < בְּבֵית לַחֶם >  
2 Chr 10:1 < מִשְׁכָּנִי → שְׁכֵנִי > 23:15 < מִדֶּרֶךְ מִבּוֹא > 20  
< מִדֶּרֶךְ-שַׁעַר → דֶּרֶךְ-שַׁעַר > . The object of the verb is more  
clearly marked with אֶת and לֵ : e.g., 1 Chr 14:15 < לַחֲכוֹת >  
וַיֹּשַׁע יְהוָה → וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה אֶת-דָּוִד < 18:6 > לַחֲכוֹת אֶת-מִצְחָה → בְּמִצְחָה  
< 21:12 > . Similarly the ambiguous  
expression "to fight with < לְמִלְחָמָה עִמָּם >" is changed to the  
more specific "to fight against < לְמִלְחָמָה עָלָם >" in 2 Chr 22:5.

Grammar and syntax are also corrected to a more normal usage. As we have already seen in the Textual section, the omission of the grammatically unnecessary אֲשֶׁר in 2 Chr 10:8 may be categorized here. In 1 Chr 18:13 singular verb וַיְהִי is altered to plural וַיְהִי'ן for the subject is עֲבָדָיִם (pl.), and in 1 Chr 20:2 the grammatically necessary וַיְבִיחֵ is supplied before אֶבְרָם . The Chronicler also changes אֶל to עַל for this purpose. Though CM argue that it "may be due to the influence of Aramaic which does not use אֶל", the Chronicler still uses אֶל quite often and we cannot see any tendency to avoid אֶל.<sup>22</sup> It must be rather understood as the Chronicler's correction to more normal usage, since, as BDB suggests, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel have a tendency to use אֶל

in the sense of עָל interchangeably (1 Chr 10:3; 11:15, 25; 13:7; 14:10; 17:17; 18:7; 19:2; 21:3, 15; 2 Chr 23:13).<sup>23</sup>

There are instances where the Chronicler simply substitutes better known words or more common idioms for his *Vorlage*. For example, the hapax legomenon קָבַהּ is changed to נִסְבָּה in 2 Chr 10:15, and הַשְּׂמִיעַ אֵין נְקִי, an expression used only once in OT, is altered to simple לָקַהּ in 2 Chr 16:6.<sup>24</sup> Although קָבַהּ in 2 Kgs 8:29 is permissible, the Chronicler changes it to the more natural form הִקְבֵּהוּ.<sup>25</sup> The Chronicler also seems to add final ך to the obviously feminine name יְהוֹשָׁפָט in 2 Chr 22:11.<sup>26</sup> The change from

מִפּוֹז וּמִכִּרְכַר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה "leaping and dancing before the Lord" to מִלְקָד וּמִשְׂחָק "dancing and making merry" in 1 Chr 15:29 is often ascribed to the Chronicler's desire to dignify David's dancing, but, as Willi suggests, he probably substitutes the unusual pilpil form of כָּרַךְ with a better known word.<sup>27</sup> This view is more likely because in 15:27 מִכִּרְכַר is omitted. Many commentators believe that כַּהֲנִים הֵיוּ "were priests" in 2 Sam 8:18 is changed to הָרָאשִׁים לִיד מִלְכָּךְ "the chief officials in the service of the king" in 1 Chr 18:17, because the Chronicler cannot accept that non-Levitic sons of David were priests. However, Wenham has argued convincingly that it was rather the Chronicler's attempt to clarify the text.<sup>28</sup> He states that the first view is unlikely because the Chronicler describes David and Solomon performing priestly roles (1 Chr

15:27; 16:2-3, 43; 21:26; 2 Chr 6:3, 13) and in 1 Chr 18:16 // 2 Sam 8:17 priests are already listed and it is strange that the same list contains two different groups of priests. Chr 19:5 Probably the text of MT Samuel is confused and the original text read  $\text{ד'נ'ש}$  "administrators of the royal state" or at least "some sort of palace official" not "priests". Yet since  $\text{ד'נ'ש}$  is a rare word, the Chronicler gives a reasonable paraphrase.

phrases, slightly different expressions are used with the same

b. Use of equivalent words or phrases  $\text{ד'נ'ש}$  and  $\text{ד'נ'ש}$

The next class of rewriting is the Chronicler's substitution of a word or phrase for its equivalent. Probably the latter sounds better to his mind, but again it is hard to find any particular emphasis or interest in this alteration.

Personal names are sometimes spelled slightly differently in Chronicles.  $\text{ד'נ'ש}$  is written as  $\text{ד'נ'ש}$  in 2 Chr 10:18.<sup>29</sup>

The spelling of "Hezekiah" is frequently changed from  $\text{חזקיהו}$  to  $\text{חזקיהו}$  (cf. 2 Chr 28:27; 29:1 etc.) and the latter form is used thirty seven times.<sup>30</sup> But, since in 1 Chr 3:13; 2 Chr

29:18, 27; 30:24; 32:15  $\text{חזקיהו}$  is retained and in 2 Kgs 20:10  $\text{חזקיהו}$  is already used, they are probably simple orthographical

variants.<sup>31</sup> The Chronicler consistently uses the form  $\text{שישק}$

for the Egyptian Pharaoh Shishak in 2 Chr 12, whereas in Kings

both  $\text{שישק}$  (2 Kgs 11:40) and  $\text{שושק}$  (2 Kgs 14:25) are used.<sup>32</sup>

Common nouns are also spelled differently (e.g.,  $\text{אררה}$  in 1 Chr

sense of  $\text{אררה}$  in 2 Chr 25:4 is not uncommon usage<sup>33</sup>

11:22 // אר' in 2 Sam 23:20), and lexical variants can be used (e.g., לישועה in 1 Chr 19:12 // לתשועה in 2 Sam 10:11).

Similarly synonymous expressions are employed. 1 Chr 19:5 gives עך-אשר for עך as its equivalent, and 1 Chr 19:17 omits את in the *Vorlage*, because the object of עך does not necessarily take את. In 2 Chr 33:3 אבך "to destroy" is altered to נתץ "to break down". Even in the case of phrases, slightly different expressions are used with the same meaning. The exchange of אשר בלדי הרפא and מילדי הרפאים in 1 Chr 20:4 // 2 Sam 21:18, or that of ודבר יהוה and

ידבר יהוה in 1 Chr 21:9 // 2 Sam 24:11 does not alter their original meaning. The expressions "I shall put my name (אש'ם את שמי)" and "there will be my name (יהיה שמי)" are also used interchangeably, for while in 2 Chr 6:20 היה is changed to ש'ד, in 2 Chr 7:16 and 33:4 the alteration is *vice versa*, and in 2 Chr 6:5, 6 היה is kept.<sup>33</sup> Often the exchange of prepositions or conjunctions does not alter the meaning of the text, and both expressions are perfectly possible. The changes in 1 Chr 11:2; 18:2, 6, and 2 Chr 21:6 suggest that ל of the predicate noun after היה can be omitted in Chronicles, while it is kept in 2 Chr 18:21. מפני and מלפני is interchangeable in 1 Chr 19:18; 21:12, 2 Chr 34:27. While the subordinate clause in 2 Chr 22:6 is introduced by ל' instead of מן of Kings, both conjunctions are possible. Likewise כ' in the sense of אך in 2 Chr 25:4 is not uncommon usage.<sup>34</sup>



### c. Change of word order

The Chronicler sometimes changes the order of the two or three elements in a sentence. Since they do not change the meaning of the sentence, the variation is totally stylistic.<sup>35</sup> For example, in 1 Chr 16:1 לפני אלהים is shifted from the end of the phrase to between עולות and ושלמים, but the meaning is still the same "they offered burned offerings and peace offerings before the Lord". The order of "when he goes out, and when he comes in" is reversed in 2 Chr 23:7, and "the book, the law of Moses (בספר תורה משה)" is changed to "the law, the book of Moses (בתורה בספר משה)" in 2 Chr 25:4. The alteration of 1 Chr 10:9 "And they stripped him and took his head and armour (ויפשיטוהו וישאו את־ראשו ואת כליו)" from "And they cut off his head, and stripped off his armour (וכרת את ראשו ויפשיטו את כליו)" in 1 Sam 31:9 is more complex but can be included here.

### d. Use of a more definite expression

The Chronicler seems to prefer more straightforward or sometimes more dramatic expressions. The simplest way is the addition of definite articles to nouns: e.g., 1 Chr 11:23 (האיש המצרי → איש מצרי); 2 Chr 18:30 (הקטן, גדול → קטן).<sup>36</sup> The Chronicler also changes a rhetorical question into an affirmative statement. In 1 Chr 11:21 the Samuel text "Was he not held in greater honour than the Three?" is replaced by "He

was doubly honoured above the Three" (NIV). 2 Sam 7:5 "Would you build me a house to dwell in?" is also changed to an outright rejection "You shall not build me a house to dwell in" in 1 Chr 17:4. The Chronicler's interpretation is undoubtedly correct for as vv. 6 ff suggest in Samuel also God does not wish David to build a temple for Him. It is true, as commentators suggest, that the Chronicler's stress is more on "not you, but Solomon", but such a nuance is recognized only when we read this verse with other changes and concerning this verse his main purpose is to make God's rejection clearer. Likewise the interrogative  $\alpha\lambda\eta$  in the source citation formula is replaced by the more positive  $\eta\eta$  (2 Chr 16:11; 20:34; 32:32; 33:18; 35:27; 36:8) in all but two occurrences (2 Chr 9:29; 12:15), and  $\eta\eta$  is used in the Chronicler's own 1 Chr 29:29.<sup>37</sup> Its definiteness is further enhanced by his occasional addition of "first and last". For the same reason, the Chronicler often prefers a more dynamic form of the verb. For example, 2 Sam 6:9 "how can it [the ark] come (Qal) to me?" is changed to "how can I bring (Hiphil) it to me?" in 1 Chr 13:12. In 2 Chr 23:13, "she was killed ( $\text{וַתָּמוּת}$ )" is altered to "they killed her ( $\text{וַיַּמְוֹתוּהָ}$ )", and the Niphal form of  $\text{הִכְבִּיד}$  "to be honoured" is changed to Hiphil  $\text{לְהַכְבִּיד}$  "to display honour" in 2 Chr 25:19.<sup>38</sup>

The Chronicler also makes the style more dramatic. In 1 Chr 17:19, 20, and 21:17 he adds the vocative "O Lord (my God)"



to make David's prayer more personal and impressive. Similarly 1 Sam 31:11 "what the Philistines had done to Saul" is stressed with  $\text{ל}$  in 1 Chr 10:11 "all that the Philistines had done to Saul". The sinful nature of apostasy is heightened by plural forms of idols and sacrificed children (2 Chr 28:3; 33:3 (2x), 6, 22). Child sacrifice is more directly expressed in 2 Chr 28:3, changing from "And [Ahaz] made his son pass through the fire" to "and he burnt his children". Verbs are also changed to more vivid ones: e.g., 2 Chr 16:2  $\langle \text{לָקַח} \text{"to take"} \rightarrow \text{אָצַח} \text{"to bring out"} \rangle$ ; 23:17  $\langle \text{עָשָׂה} \text{"to do well [with idols]"} \rightarrow \text{שָׁבַט} \text{"to break into pieces"} \rangle$ ; 25:3  $\langle \text{כָּרַע} \text{"to smite"} \rightarrow \text{הָרַג} \text{"to kill"} \rangle$ .

As we have seen above, these rewritings are not meant to give a different picture from the source but to improve the style. Even in the "more definite expression" category the dominant motive seems to be to make the phraseology more direct and positive, and not to change the historical facts of the source, though his straightforward style will help to clarify his theological emphasis.

## 2. Omission and Abridgement

The Chronicler also clarifies his source by omitting some letters, words, and phrases. Obviously the parts omitted are less interesting or important to the Chronicler, but he does not seem to change the content of the source or to eliminate

the inconvenient section intentionally. He rather omits the redundant words, self evident contents, or unnecessary details for the plot, so that his style becomes more crisp and tight.

a. Omission of redundant expression

Many of the Chronicler's omissions are of expressions already mentioned in their near contexts and which is unnecessary to repeat. Since there are numerous such cases, the following are merely examples. The same contents are often given in the same verse. The subject  $\text{טִי־ט}$  is skipped in 1 Chr 13:13 for the third time in the verse and in 1 Chr 18:1 and 14 for the second time. Since the subject  $\text{הַיְהוָה}$  is already introduced by the addition before, it is not mentioned in 1 Chr 21:15. In 2 Chr 10:11, 14 the Chronicler writes, "My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" without the second verb "will chastise you" repeated, because the same verb is clearly expected from the parallelism. He does not write that Shishak took "all" the golden shields,  $\langle \text{אֶת כָּל מַגְנֵי} \rangle$  in 2 Chr 12:9, for it is already said that "he took away everything  $\langle \text{אֶת הַכֹּל לָקַח} \rangle$ " just before it. In vs. 16, the Chronicler omits "with his fathers" from Rehoboam's burial notice. While concluding formulae are generally regarded as his theological evaluation of the king's reign, this particular case is a simple omission,

because he is said to be buried "with his father" in the beginning of the verse.

In like manner the similar phrase in a near context is also sometimes felt to be redundant by the Chronicler. In 2 Chr 10:10 הַזֶּה of לְעַם הַזֶּה is skipped, because already appears in v.9 and from the context it is evident which people they are talking about. Also in 2 Chr 12:16 the name of Rehoboam's mother is not included since it is already mentioned in vs. 13. Some expressions are redundant by themselves. בְּמִקּוּמָו in 1 Chr 16:1 is abridged to בְּתֵךְ הָאֱהוּל and לְכָל־הָעָם לְכָל־הַגּוֹי־יִשְׂרָאֵל in 16:3 to לְכָל־אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל. Obviously both wordings mean the same and Chronicles is more succinct. The idiom "with one accord" (2 Chr 18:12) is shortened from כְּדָבָר אֶחָד to כְּאַחַד, and in 2 Chr 25:17, the last two elements of וַתִּרְאוּ אִתְּכֶם אֶת־פְּנֵי "let us look one another in the face" is abridged to וַתִּרְאוּ אִתְּכֶם

b. Omission of self-evident expression

The second group of omissions of statements are those which are self-evident, even when not referred to elsewhere. Again, this kind of omission is done to make the style more crisp, but not to contradict the Samuel-Kings' report. The clearest example is the Chronicler's change from noun to pronoun. In 2 Chr 10:13 the indirect object of "the king answered" is changed from "the people (אֶת־הָעָם)" to the pronominal suffix "them (וְאֵלֵיהֶם)", because to whom the

king is speaking is clearly known from the context. In the next verse "I will add to your yoke ( < אַסִּיף עַל-עַלְכֶם > )" is simply written as "I will add to it ( < אַסִּיף עָלָיו > )", because it immediately follows "my father made your yoke heavy". The Chronicler also tends to avoid using two verbs together to express a single idea.<sup>39</sup> In 1 Chr 10:12 "and they took their bones and buried them" ( < וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת עַצְמוֹתֵיהֶם וַיִּקְבְּרוּ > ) is written simply as "and they buried their bones" ( < וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֶת-עַצְמוֹתֵיהֶם > ) and in 2 Chr 10:16 "replied and said ( < וַיִּשְׁבַּר.....דָּבָר > )" is shortened to "replied ( < וַיִּשְׁבַּר > )".

Other abridgements are also obvious from the context. For example, in 2 Chr 10:13 "the counsel which the old men had given him ( < וְעֵצַת הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר יַעֲצֶהוּ > )" is changed to "the counsel of the old men ( < עֵצַת הַזְּקֵנִים > )". Similarly the Chronicler omits "to battle" from Ahab's request to Jehoshaphat "Will you go with me to Ramoth-gilead" (2 Chr 18:3), for it is evident from Ahab's intention in vs. 2 and Jehoshaphat's answer in vs. 3b. In 2 Chr 35:19 the qualification of Josiah's Passover לַיהוָה "to the Lord in Jerusalem" is skipped over because it is clearly understood from his description of the Passover (cf. esp. vv. 16, 18)

c. Use of more general expression

Another kind of self-evident abridgement is the one which sums up or totally omits the unnecessary details of the text.

By doing this the Chronicler's writing is more focused on the major historical events and theological points, but this shortening itself does not change the course of events reported in his *Vorlage*. For example, 1 Chr 10:12 omits the description that the mighty men of Jabesh Gilead went to Beth Shean "walking through the night", but this does not affect the general course of the events nor by this is the Chronicler trying to omit an unpleasant detail. In 2 Chr 16:2 four elements of Asa's gifts to Ben-hadad are abridged: (1) the gifts given are shortened from "all the silver and gold that were left" to "silver and gold", (2) the way Asa sent them "giving to his servants' hands" is passed over, (3) the line of descent of Ben-hadad is excluded, and (4) "the treasure house" of the temple and the palace is unmentioned. In this case probably the Chronicler does not want to stress this incident because it is a reminder of Shishak's plundering of the temple which he has already rewritten as less devastating and because he does not wish to give the impression that the faithful Asa completely emptied the remaining Temple treasures.<sup>40</sup> Thus while his lighter treatment of the incident fits with his interpretation and whole presentation, yet even here factual elements in the story are not affected.

In 1 Chr 18:2 more than half of the verse, וימדדו בהכל השקב וימדדו אותם ארצה וימדדו שני הבלים להטית ומלא החבל להחיות them with a line, making them lie down on the ground; two lines

he measured to be put to death, and one full line to be spared" is omitted. While CM suggest that the Chronicler "omitted because it did not fit his idealized picture of David", McKenzie correctly retorts that 1 Chr 22:28 and 28:3 admit that David shed much blood and that it is not a problem to the Chronicler.<sup>41</sup> 1 Chr 21, especially the Chronicler's stress on David's sin, also makes it difficult to suppose that he systematically omits the dark side of David in order to idealize him (Cf. chap. III also). Thus this particular description is probably omitted because the Chronicler does not want the unnecessary detail. This interpretation is further supported by the abridgement in 1 Chr 19:4 from וַיִּגְלַח אֶת-צִיְצִי קָדְמָא to וַיִּגְלַח. Here again the disgusting action of shaving off half of the beard by the Ammonite, not by David (!), is avoided.

Just as with his rewritings, by his omissions the Chronicler does not attempt to change the historical report of Samuel-Kings, but to make the text simpler to understand. Most of the omissions are mere stylistic abridgements of redundant or self-evident expressions. His generalizations are all minor parts of the plot and replace unnecessary repetition of the full details. Though his more crisp and terse style may help to clarify his version of historical pictures and his theology, it does not convey a different historical reality.

### 3. Addition

Another means of clarification is supplying a small note or a "help" in the text. Many of the minor additions are again merely stylistic and quite in agreement with his source.<sup>42</sup> In fact, they are mostly self-evident or known from near contexts. Though giving a more specific description sometimes requires more sophisticated interpretation and emphasizes certain aspects of the events, the Chronicler's main aim is to present a clearer picture of the text.

#### a. Repetition of similar expression

This section lists those additions which only repeat the same expressions nearby. 1 Chr 19:2 explains that David's men came to Hanun "to express sympathy to him", for the same verse writes, "David sent a delegation to express his sympathy to Hanun". In 1 Chr 19:15 Abishai is called Joab's brother as he is clearly identified so in vs. 11. In 2 Chr 18:2 and 3 "the king of Israel" is identified with "Ahab", because he is so called in 1 Kgs 22:20 // 2 Chr 18:19. 1 Kgs 22:20 itself has only "Ahab", but, as is certain from vs. 17 and common knowledge, the Chronicler adds "the king of Israel" to it. As repeated frequently in the near context "the king" is specified as "the king of Israel" in vs. 34 to contrast with Jehoshaphat. Similarly in 2 Chr 34:28 the object of the wrath of the Lord is expanded from "this place" to "this place and its inhabitants".



Since in vv. 24 and 27 the wrath is said to be poured upon "this place and its inhabitants", here the Chronicler repeats the same idiom.

b. Addition of self-evident expression

While the Chronicler often supplies the subject or other elements of the sentence, these are certainly implied in the context. 1 Chr 11:5 adds "inhabitants of Jebus" as a subject of the verb "said to David". Now David is attacking Jebus, and who else can say "You will not get in *here*"? 1 Chr 11:18 also supplies a subject  $\text{וְיָדָו}$  to "refused to drink", for David's three men had just brought back water to David in vs. 17. Likewise in 2 Chr 23:9 and 11, the subjects of the verbs "delivered" and "anointed" are named as "Jehoiada the priest" and "Jehoiada and his sons" respectively. While the Chronicler may want to stress the prominence of a priestly figure here, these identifications are quite natural from the context (see vv. 1, 8, 14, 16 etc.).<sup>43</sup> In vs. 9 the Chronicler only adds "Jehoiada" to "the priest" in 2 Kgs 11:10, and in the beginning of 2 Kgs 11:12 // vs. 11 Jehoiada (in Chr "they") is already mentioned as the subject of the following actions. In 1 Chr 11:7 he clarifies the causal relationship by adding  $\text{וְעַל־כֵּן}$ , and in 11:20 he adds copula, as evident from the context. In 2 Chr 18:7 the identification of the prophet Ahab hated with Micaiah is clarified by insertion of  $\text{וְיָדָו}$ .

The Chronicler also gives more details of actions and information, which are easily understood from the context. 2 Chr 15:16 correctly changes "his mother" to "the mother of king Asa", for this section is dealing with Asa's purification of the cult. The Chronicler also adds "thus ( וְאֵת )" to "[Hilkiah] said to her [Huldah]" (2 Chr 34:22) to suggest that Hilkiah's message was the king's order in vs. 21. Since Hilkiah went out to Huldah to fulfill the king's order, this is again evident.

c. More exact expression

There are instances where the Chronicler uses more exact wording, though essentially the same contents. Often they are self-evident, but sometimes he deduces the most probable picture from the situation and from common sense. In 1 Chr 11:15 the Philistines are said to have "pitched tent ( וּמַחֲנֶה )" in the valley instead of simply they "were ( וַהֲיָה )" in the valley. Probably this change is not based on any other source, but by his general knowledge this was the most natural way for troops then. 1 Chr 17:1 relates that the ark was "under the tent ( תַּחַת רִיעוֹת )", not "in the tent ( בְּתוֹךְ הַרְיָעָה )". Although Chronicles is more specific, there is no other possible way the ark can be in the tent. In 2 Chr 12:11 the Chronicler's addition "the guard *came and* bore them [the shields]" is logical, because the guard did this when the king went into the

temple. Also in 28:3 the Chronicler adds "moreover he burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom" before his description of child sacrifice. As D. Plataroti has pointed out this phrase is deduced from his knowledge of child sacrifice.<sup>44</sup> In 33:9 the people that Manasseh seduced with idolatry is specified from "them" to "Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem", which is most natural for the king of Judah. These specifications are quite logical from the contexts or common sense, and it seems that the Chronicler intends to give a more vivid or accurate historical picture through them but not to make any factual changes.

#### 4. Explaining difficult passages

The Chronicler clarifies the text not simply by rewriting, omitting and adding small parts, but also by providing better readings to textually corrupted sections or by explicating the implied thoughts in his *Vorlage*. Such seriousness in attaining correct understanding of the text well exhibits his respect for the source.

##### a. Textual correction

There are several cases where the Chronicler attempts to understand textually unintelligible verses. For example 1 Chr 11:22 gives  $\text{בן־אִישׁ־חַיִל}$  for  $\text{בן־אִישׁ־חַי}$ . While Samuel does not make sense, Chronicles is certainly appropriate for the

description of David's mighty men. 2 Chr 11:4 changes  
 "according to the word of the Lord" (ללכם כדבר יהוה) to "did  
 not go against Jeroboam" (צלחת אל ירבעם). Kings repeats a  
 similar phrase immediately before and seems to be corrupted,  
 and therefore the Chronicler substitutes it with the most  
 natural phrase from the context. Similarly he prefixes *waw* to  
 the impossible לבני in 2 Kgs 8:19 to provide a smoother  
 reading in 2 Chr 21:7, "promised to give a lamp to him and to  
 his sons". As 1 Kgs 11:36 suggests, the original Kings text  
 was probably לפני, and should be read "promised to give a  
 lamp before him".<sup>45</sup> In 2 Chr 18:9, since the adverbial clause  
 "at the threshing floor at the entrance of the gate of Samaria"  
 is too remote from the noun to modify "their thrones", the verb  
 "they were sitting" (1°) (שבו), (2°) (שבו)) is repeated  
 before it. "The gate Sur (סור)" is changed to "the Gate of  
 the Foundation (סור)" in 2 Chr 23:5. While vs. 15 suggests  
 that probably the original reading was "the horse gate (סוס  
 )", the Chronicler tries to understand the incorrect text. In  
 this verse Jehoiada's arrangement of the priests and the  
 Levites is slightly different from that of Kings. It may also  
 be due to the textual difficulties in his *Vorlage*, though it  
 can be simply a part of his extensive rewriting according to  
 his understanding of the nature of the *coup*.

Whereas את לחמי אחי גלית "Lahmi the brother of Goliath" in 1 Chr 20:5 is often ascribed to the Chronicler's desire to harmonize his source 2 Sam 21:19 ארגים בית הלחמי את גלית ". . . oregim, the Bethlehemite [slew] Goliath" with 1 Sam 17, Williamson and others correctly suggest that this verse is another example of his attempt to understand the corrupted text.<sup>46</sup> As the present text of Samuel has difficulties in ארגים (dittography) and 'ער', his *Vorlage* was probably also corrupt. He tries to correct it by changing בית to את as in 10:9, and את to אח . Thus "the Bethlehemite ( בית הלחמי )" becomes "Lahmi (את-לחמי)" and "brother of Goliath ( אחי גלית )" "Goliath (אחי גלית)". Therefore this discrepancy was caused by the Chronicler's "desire to make the Samuel text intelligible to his readers than to a deliberate harmonization by falsification".<sup>47</sup>

b. Explication of the implied thought

Another group of clarifications of difficult passages is the one in which the Chronicler makes implicit thought more explicit. The last phrase of Jehoshaphat's answer to Ahaz's request to ally is changed from "my horses as your horses" to "We will be with you in the war" (2 Chr 18:3). The Chronicler states it clearly because he wishes to draw out the theological lesson of danger in alliance with a foreign power, but from the rest of his answer "I am as you are, my people as your people"

and the subsequent narrative we know that Jehoshaphat accepted Ahaz' offer and there is no factual change. In 2 Chr 34:21 "the words of the Lord" replaces the second "the words of the book". As is evident from vs. 14 the book at issue is "the book of the law of the Lord given through Moses" and it can be called "the words of the Lord". However, the Chronicler deliberately chose this expression here, to clarify that the wrath of the Lord is poured upon Israel because they did not keep the words of the book, which is no other than the law of the Lord.

Clearly these examples are the Chronicler's attempts to make difficult passages in the source easier to understand. Together with simpler cases discussed in previous sections, his eagerness to present a clearer text and to solve difficulties shows how important it is for him to understand his source correctly.

## 5. Additional Historical Information

### a. Historical identification

Historical identification occurs when either the Chronicler gives a different name for the person or place mentioned in Samuel-Kings, or he adds more identifying information not obvious at once from the context.<sup>48</sup> Up to this point in our classification, all the clarifications of the Chronicler have been intended to make the text easier to read,

but historical identification requires more than that. The Chronicler needs to study what the historical events were really like, and how two or more different pieces of information can fit together.

In 1 Chr 13:6 the Chronicler changes בעלתהּ מגבעלי יהודה, identifying Baalah with Kiriath Jearim. He needs this identification because he writes that the ark was in Kiriath Jearim in 13:5 (his own writing), while the rest of the narrative (following the source) says it was in Baalah. Probably he learned the idea from 1 Sam 7:1. His identification is certainly correct, for בעלהּ literally means "the city of Baal" and Kiriath Jearim was one of the most important of these and identification of these two is explicit in Josh 15:9.<sup>43</sup> Yet it is not simply a literal harmonization, reflects his historical interest, for otherwise he does not need to introduce Kiriath Jearim in 13:5 from the beginning. In like manner, 1 Chr 18:3 writes that David fought with Hadadezer, "advancing to Hamath". Though Samuel does not mention Hamath, this is a very reasonable interpretation. David's war took place "when Hadadezer went to establish his control along the Euphrates River" (18:3 immediately before) and Hadadezer was at war with Tou the king of Hamath (18:10). Certainly David helped Tou to prevent Hadadezer come down to the south of the Euphrates. If the Chronicler were interested



in only literal harmonization, the addition of Hamath would be unnecessary.

The Chronicler also specifies the destination to which Hiram sent his wood for Solomon as "Joppa" in 2 Chr 2:16. This is probably the most natural deduction, because Joppa was the nearest major port to Jerusalem throughout OT times (cf. Ezr 3:7; Jon 1:3; cf. Josh 19:46), and the Chronicler thus provides a clearer picture of the route.<sup>50</sup> In 2 Chr 36:4 Jehoiakim is called "the brother of Jehoahaz" instead of "the son of Josiah" (2 Kgs 23:34). This change is probably because the Kings' expression seems to neglect the previous reign of Jehoahaz, and is intended to clarify his relationship with his two predecessors. It is hard to find any theological bias here and this identification is correct, because both Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim were sons of Josiah.

The case of 2 Chr 22:11, the identification of "Jehosheba, the daughter of King Joram, sister of Ahaziah" (2 Kgs 11:2) with "wife of Jehoiada the priest" is not so clear cut.<sup>51</sup> M. Noth argues that this was to justify her presence in the temple, but as Williamson correctly remarks, women were not admitted in any case and such a supposition is unnecessary.<sup>52</sup> It is also possible that this identification was introduced to enhance Jehoiada's prominence in the story and to equate his position with that of the Davidic kings together with his burial notice (2 Chr 24:15-16). But since he was not a

Davidide himself but remained a protector of the Davidic prince, and since he received honours not because of his descent but because of what he did for God and the Temple as a priest (2 Chr 24:16), his association with the king's daughter does not necessarily support the Chronicler's point. Whether the Chronicler sees in Jehoiada the model of the post-exilic theocratic priest who also played the role of Davidic king is a matter of debate. In any case we cannot exclude the possibility that this short note was introduced for historical interest.

The Chronicler also replaces obscure place names with better known names in the same area. The unintelligible Philistine cities which David took  $\text{לְיָמֵי דָוִד}$  in 2 Sam 8:1 are replaced by  $\text{גַּת וְכִפְתֹּרֶיהָ}$  "Gath and its surrounding villages" in 1 Chr 18:1. Some commentators believe Chronicles is correct, interpreting Samuel as "the capital and the satellites."<sup>53</sup> Whether their interpretation is correct or not, the Chronicler prefers a clear place name in the area rather than an obscure name. 1 Chr 19:6 identifies little known  $\text{אֲרָם נְהָרִים}$  with  $\text{בֵּית־רָחוֹב}$  and an Aramean country in the south of Damascus,  $\text{אֲרָם גְּעֵזָה}$ . The context suggests the war was to the southwest of Damascus, and the Chronicler's identification is legitimate. Again 'Gob' appears only in 2 Sam 21:18 and 19 in OT, and it is replaced by Gezer in 1 Chr 20:4 and omitted in 20:5. According to Eissfeldt's topographical study, Gezer is a better known city

in the area. Likewise the prince of Hamath  $\text{דורם}$  is called  $\text{דורם}$  in 1 Chr 18:10. As many commentators agree, Hadoram is the real name and Joram (Yahweh is high) is the name given by the Hebrews.<sup>54</sup> These efforts in historical identification clearly show how the Chronicler is interested in historical reality. He does not wish to keep an incomprehensible text and searches for the most probable identification.

#### b. Historical information

While the major additions to the narrative will be dealt with in the next chapter, the Chronicler sometimes supplies the parallel sections with brief notes of information which cannot be explained by other scriptural passages. They are meant to give a clearer historical picture and also testify to the Chronicler's strong interest in history.

Although 1 Chr 11:6 has been understood as the Chronicler's misreading of his source, many commentators today hold that the Chronicler omits the reference to the blind and the lame because of its obscurity, and supplies the information about Joab from a different source.<sup>55</sup> The argument to support the first position that "Joab the son of Zeruah"  $\text{בן-צרויה}$  might come from "in the aquaduct"  $\text{בוצר}$  is not enough to explain all the difference. On the other hand, it is highly unlikely that his information about Joab is total fabrication. First of all, it does not help to support any of the commonly claimed



interests of the Chronicler, and secondly, if he simply wants to replace the obscure passage, he can omit it completely as he does in vs. 5. Furthermore, Williamson suggests that "some such event may be necessary to explain how Joab came to be a chief and commander, a position which he undoubtedly held soon after, but which we might not have expected him to hold after he had incurred David's displeasure". (cf. 2 Sam 3:29, 39; 1 Kgs 2:5f, 32)<sup>56</sup> Similarly 1 Chr 11:8 gives another piece of information about Joab, "Joab restored the rest of the city". Again this is not theologically significant, and probably the Chronicler supplies it from his stock of information about Joab because of his historical interest.

1 Chr 19:6 and 7 have two additions as well. One is that the Ammonites bought the mercenaries for "a thousand talents of silver" and another is the report "who came and camped before Medeba. And the Ammonites were mustered from their cities and came to battle." As McKenzie suggests, since 4Q supports them, they may be already in his *Vorlage*.<sup>57</sup> But LXX Sam does not have these readings and 4Q has something different in the second place. If they are not from his *Vorlage*, probably they come from another source. While "a thousand talents of silver" may help to express the desperation of the Ammonites, the second addition cannot be explained without the Chronicler's interest in the historical event.

In 2 Chr 28:2 "molten images for the Baals" is added to the list of Ahaz' idolatry. While this additional item helps to emphasize Ahaz' unfaithfulness, his use of images is perhaps known (it is recorded in Isa 2:8-18 and 20) and the Chronicler may be giving more historical information from elsewhere.<sup>58</sup> Ahaz' erection of an altar like the one in Damascus (2 Kgs 16:10-12) is changed to his sacrifice to the gods of Damascus in 2 Chr 28:23. As McKay has pointed out, the Chronicler's reasoning that Ahaz built an altar in order to be helped by Aramean gods is "hardly a logical deduction from 2 Kgs 16:10ff., for there the gods of Damascus were shown by their defeat to have been ineffectual against the power of Assyria" (2 Kgs 16:9).<sup>59</sup> Yet the Chronicler's interpretation of the altar as that of an Aramean god rather than an Assyrian one erected by the army of occupation seems to be correct because Ahaz built it as the centre-piece of the Temple cult and the Assyrians did not have altars for animal sacrifices.<sup>60</sup> Thus it seems that the Chronicler attempts to understand the real historical situation of the already confusing Kings report with additional historical information.

In 2 Chr 33:6 the place of child sacrifice is specified as "in the valley of Ben Hinnom ( בְּנֵי־הִינּוֹם | בְּאֵר־צֶלְהַרְהָעֵלִים)". Since this addition does not reflect any theological motivation and the information is amply testified (e.g., Jer. 7:31), the Chronicler probably only wishes to give a more vivid and

accurate historical picture. In 2 Chr 34:8 two more officials, Maaseiah the governor of the city and Joah the son of Joahaz the recorder, are added to Josiah's messenger Shaphan. They are scarcely the Chronicler's invention, for not only can no theological reason be found for them but also they are well-attested names and titles in the pre-exilic period.<sup>61</sup> Though it is not impossible to suppose with Williamson that they stood in the Chronicler's *Vorlage* and later became corrupted, there is no textual support for it. It is more likely that he supplied extra historical details from another source. Similarly in 2 Chr 36:10 Jehoiachin's exile is more specifically dated as "in the spring of the year (lit. "at the turn of the year")" instead of "at that time" (2 Kgs 24:10). The use of this expression elsewhere suggests a military campaign and its dating in March 597 is attested by the Babylonian Chronicle.<sup>62</sup> The Chronicler supplies a clearer chronology, while he abridges the detailed accounts of the exile recorded in Kings.

The above examples clearly indicate that the Chronicler's additions at times go beyond mere literary refinement. He studies the historical situation and attempts to supply a more informed picture, even if there is no theological need for it.



## ADAPTATION

The third category of the Chronicler's quotation techniques is to adapt his source for later readers. Since the language of the post-exilic period, Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH hereafter), was a little different from that of the pre-exilic period, he needs to up-date some vocabulary and expressions. He also changes some nomenclatures which were no longer used in his generation. These changes are only to help later readers to understand the text and factual changes are not intended. Such activities are necessary for any kind of writing which uses a source. While they may suggest respect for his source, these features are not confined to exegetical literature.

There are also places where the Chronicler systematically portrays former religious activities from his contemporary perspective. But since they are based on a typologically idealized picture of worship and intended for legitimation of a particular system, they cannot be categorized here (cf. *Typological Alterations*).

### 1. Late Biblical Hebrew

#### a. Lexical

The Chronicler changes words which were no longer used in the post-exilic period. Those words are listed by Driver, CM, and Williamson.<sup>63</sup> This kind of adaptation serves simply to

therefore, if the Chronicler's change is toward LBH, we can make the source easier to understand for the readers of his age, like his clarification techniques, and he does not intend to change the historical report of his source. For instance, 1

Chr 10:12 changes the rare word  $\text{לְאִיִּם}$  to LBH or Aramaic  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  plural verbs (Polzin's no. 4; P-4 hereafter). For example, in 1 Chr 11:16  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  is altered to  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$ . They mean different things in Samuel,  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  "garrison" and  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  "prefect, deputy", but in Chronicles  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  cannot be found and  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  in Chronicles and LBH acquires a wider meaning range to signify not only "prefect" as original but also "garrison" (1 Chr 11:16; 2 Chr 17:2; Eccles 46:18).<sup>54</sup> 1 Chr 13:12 uses an Aramaic form  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  for  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$ . 1 Chr 14:2 replaces  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  with  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$ . While  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  appears almost exclusively in post-exilic writing in the sense of "kingdom",  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  or  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  are usually used in the earlier writings.<sup>55</sup> In 1 Chr 18:5, 6 and 2 Chr 16:2 the spelling of "Damascus" is changed from  $\text{דַּמַּשְׁק}$  to  $\text{דַּמַּשְׁק}$ , a common LBH spelling. In 2 Chr 23:10 the word for "his weapon" is changed from  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$  to a late word  $\text{לְאִיִּים}$ . The latter is found elsewhere only in 2 Chr 32:5; Neh 4:11, 17; Job 33:18; 36:12; Joel 2:8.<sup>56</sup>

#### b. Grammatical

Since LBH changed not only in vocabulary but also in some grammatical usages, the Chronicler needs to change them as well. This aspect of LBH has been carefully studied by Kropat, Japhet and Polzin.<sup>57</sup> Their analyses are based on non-parallel

sections of Chronicles and other post-exilic writings, and, therefore, if the Chronicler's change is toward LBH, we can safely conclude his changes in parallel sections also serve to adjust to contemporary usage.

As in LBH the Chronicler makes collective nouns take plural verbs (Polzin's no.4; P-4 hereafter). For example, in 1 Chr 11:13 **והעם נס** is altered to **והעם נסו**. In 2 Chr 10:1 **בא** is changed to **באו**, for its subject is **לִי־יִשְׂרָאֵל** and in 2 Chr 16:4 **וְיָ** is pluralized to **וְיָו** corresponding to its subject **שָׂרִי** "commanders". Similar cases can be found in 1 Chr 18:2; 19:11, 16(3x); 2 Chr 18:25, 26, 29; 33:25. Another tendency of LBH is that the first person singular imperfect with -ah (cohortative) is rarely used (P-10). For instance, the cohortative ending of **הִפְרָה** is shortened to **הִפְרָ** in 2 Chr 16:3 and **לְכָה** to **לֵךְ** in 2 Chr 25:17 (cf. also 1 Chr 21:13 and 2 Chr 18:8).

As Polzin and Willi have pointed out (P-1), the construction of **לָא** with pronominal suffix is replaced with a verbal form. For example, in 2 Chr 25:28 **וְאִשָּׁא אֲתָו** is changed to **וְאִשָּׁאוּ** (cf. also 2 Chr 22:11; 23:14; 24:25; 36:1). Also in LBH **ל** is frequently used as a mark of accusative and the Chronicler rewrites his text thus (P-15). In 2 Chr 10:6 **אֵת הָעַם הַזֶּה** is altered to **לְעַם הַזֶּה**, in vs. 16 **אֱלֹהֵם** is changed to **לָהֶם**, and in 18:17 **לְרַע** to **רָע**. In LBH the use of the infinitive absolute with a finite verb for emphasis is less often used (P-



6), and 1 Chr 14:10 avoids  $\text{נָטַן אֶתֶּן}$ , changing it to  $\text{וַיִּנְתֵּן}$ .  
 The use of the infinitive absolute is generally reduced:  $\text{הִרְבָּה}$   
 is changed to the adjective  $\text{רַב}$  in 1 Chr 18:8, and  $\text{הִלֹּךְ}$  is  
 transformed to the imperative  $\text{לֵךְ}$  in 1 Chr 21:10.<sup>69</sup> Moreover,  
 in LBH the final nun of  $\text{מִן}$  is frequently not assimilated  
 before a noun without an article (P-16). The Chronicler  
 changes  $\text{מִן הַמְּיֹרִים}$  to  $\text{מִן הַיְּרִים}$  (1 Chr 10:3),  $\text{מִן הַשְּׁלִשִׁים}$  to  
 $\text{מִן קַבְצָאֵל}$  (1 Chr 11:22),  
 $\text{מִן הַשְּׁלִשִׁים}$  (1 Chr 11:15),  $\text{מִן קַבְצָאֵל}$  to  $\text{מִן קַבְצָאֵל}$  (1 Chr 11:22),  
 and  $\text{מִן אַחֲרָיִם}$  to  $\text{מִן אַחֲרֵי}$  (1 Chr 17:7), though 1 Chr 17:10  
 and  $\text{מִן הַיְּרִים}$  (1 Chr 17:10) is exceptional.

There are four other alterations where the Chronicler  
 adjusts to LBH, not listed by Polzin. Firstly, since in LBH  
 the distinction between masculine and feminine nouns became  
 blurred, he often uses a masculine form for an originally  
 feminine noun. For instance,  $\text{וַיִּקְרָא לָהּ}$  is changed to  $\text{וַיִּקְרָא לָו}$   
 (1 Chr 11:7), taking Jerusalem as masculine. In 1 Chr 11:11  $\text{בְּפֶעַם}$

$\text{אֶחָד}$  "in one stroke", or "at one time" is changed to the  
 masculine  $\text{אֶחָד}$ . While the people's name is usually followed  
 by feminine verbal form, in 1 Chr 18:2, 5, 6; 21:5 it is  
 followed by masculine. Secondly, as Japhet points out,  
 imperfect consecutive is written with a shorter form.<sup>70</sup>

$\text{אֶחָד}$  is written as  $\text{אֶחָד}$  in 1 Chr 17:8. Thirdly, as BDB  
 shows, the shorter first person singular form  $\text{אֶנִּי}$  is preferred  
 over  $\text{אֲנִי}$  in 1 Chr 17:16; 21:10; 17; 2 Chr 34:27, though 1  
 Chr 17:1  $\text{אֲנִי}$  is exceptional.<sup>71</sup> Lastly, in LBH final  $\text{ה}$

and  $\chi$  are interchangeable, as we can see in 1 Chr 20:6; 2 Chr 16:2; 18:7; 27:1.

## 2. Use of equivalent for unintelligible term

There are some technical terms or place names no longer understood by the people of the Chronicler's time, and he substitutes them with his contemporary equivalents. For example, the names of the musical instruments used for the transfer of the ark are different between Samuel and Chronicles. As CM suggest, while Samuel is original, probably the Chronicler "introduced instruments better known or more in use in his day".<sup>72</sup> אַנְטֹנִים is used only here but

אַצְלִים is mentioned 12 times in OT, and צִלְצִים is used only here and in Ps 150:5, but הצְצֹרוֹת is used by the Chronicler often (1 Chr 15:24, 28; 16:4, 42, etc.).<sup>73</sup> In like manner the name of Araunah (הַאִירְנָה) is changed to Ornan (אֶרְנָן) in 1 Chr 21:15. Williamson points out that, though linguistically Chronicles is secondary, Ornan seems to have become the customary form in post-exilic times as LXX Sam and Josephus suggest.

The post-exilic community could no longer understand some pre-exilic locations. In the Identification section we have already dealt with the problem of obscure place names, but some obscurity is also caused by the passage of time. In 1 Chr 10:7

בְּעֵינַי וְאִשׁר נֶעְבַר הַיַּרְדֵּן is abridged to בְּעֵינַי. While McCarter suggests that the Samuel text has been expanded, LXX Sam supports MT Sam.<sup>74</sup> If it is not a simple omission of the unnecessary detail, the Chronicler was probably not certain exactly which area the text was referring to.<sup>75</sup> In 1 Chr 18:8 וְצִרְתַּי is changed to וְצִיִּן, because, as Williamson following Simons suggests, "'Cun' was in Chronicler's day a better known town than 'Berothai', which was in the same area."<sup>76</sup> In 1 Chr 19:16 הַיְלָם is omitted and in v. 17 הַלְּאֵמָה is changed to the people staying there אֱלֵהֶם. He seems to avoid the unknown name Helam.

In 2 Chr 16:4 "Abel-beth-maacha, and all Chinneroth, with all the land of Naphtali" is changed to "Abel-maim, and all the store-cities of Naphtali". Apparently the Chronicler understands the area correctly, but the people probably commonly called it as latter because of its fertility and the Chronicler prefers it.<sup>77</sup> In 2 Chr 24:25 the place of Joash's death is changed from "the House of Millo" to "on his bed". As the modern interpreters are not certain about the former, perhaps the Chronicler did not understand it either and replaced it with the most natural deduction from the context.<sup>78</sup> Also in 2 Chr 24:5, 6, 12; 34:10 a technical building term בֵּית is constantly omitted (cf. 2 Chr 34:15, 18); probably because the word was no longer used or understood.

## HARMONIZATION

As the Chronicler quotes his source, he tries to harmonize expressions of his source with their near context and with the overall structure of his own work. While coherent presentation of information is essential for any history or theology, the way he adjusts his source to his new structure indicates that his work is intended to be a new work, independent of his source. It is noteworthy that midrash, in contrast, often exploits contradictions for theological development rather than harmonizes them.

### 1. With near context

Harmonization with near context is either merely stylistic or arises from his minor changes, and there is no factual conflict. For example, the title to the list of mighty men in 1 Chr 11:26 is changed from "עשה-אל אחי יואב בשלשים" . . . in the Thirty" to "וגבורים החלים עשה-אל אחי יואב" "The Mighty men are . . . " because in Samuel there are thirty seven men in the list (cf. 2 Sam 23:39), and in Chronicles even more people are added at the end of the list. While probably "the Thirty" was not a true number of mighty men but a title or nickname for this group of people, the Chronicler avoids the possible confusion. In 1 Chr 17:10 "והגיד לך יהוה" is converted to "ואגיד לך". Since vv. 4-14 is a speech of God to Nathan (and David) and the



subject is constantly "I" (God), "The Lord tells you" is also harmonized with the subject of the other sentences in this section. Again in 1 Chr 17:10 *י' ב'ית י'עשה-לך יהוה* is changed to *וב'ית'בנה-לך יהוה*. As in this chapter "to build" a temple or dynasty is usually expressed with *בנה*, he harmonizes *עשה*. The Chronicler obviously takes them synonymously and does not see a theological difference between them as is sometimes argued. In 2 Chr 18:16 *להם* is changed to the feminine form to agree with *צאן*. Though *להם* already agrees with *ישראל* and makes good sense, the Chronicler harmonizes it with its more immediate antecedent.<sup>79</sup> Also in vs. 26 'בא' of the king's order "Put this fellow in prison . . . until I come in peace" is changed to *שוב'* to connect it more clearly with the prophet's following reply "If you return ( *תשוב* ) in peace, the Lord has not spoken by me." In 2 Chr 22:12 Joash is said to be hidden "with them ( *אתם* )" instead of "with her ( *אתה* )", because in the previous verse Jehoiada the priest is introduced as the husband of Jehoshabeath. *caused by original*

Differences in spelling of personal names are also adjusted to the near context.<sup>80</sup> The king Azariah/Uzziah is constantly called Uzziah in Chronicles, while Kings uses both names.<sup>81</sup> The Chronicler chooses Uzziah probably because Uzziah was more widely used in OT and to avoid confusion with Azariah the high priest introduced in 2 Chr 26:17-20.<sup>82</sup> Likewise in 2 Chr 24:26 the name *יוגב'* is shortened to *וגב'* not to be

confused with the following יהוידג. The name of the Egyptian Pharaoh Shishak is constantly spelled ש'ש, while in Kings both ש'ש and שש are used. The alteration of the king's name 'Abijam' to 'Abijah' in Chronicles is probably due to a difference in evaluation of the king by means of extra materials (cf. next chapter). While in Kings he is criticised and an element of his name is formed from the Canaanite god Yam, here he is pictured more favourably and his name is compounded with Yahweh.<sup>33</sup>

## 2. With Chronicles' general structure

Sometimes the Chronicler introduces new episodes or omits sections of narrative from his *Vorlage*, and this leads him to harmonize small parts of his source to fit with his overall presentation. Here it is clear that the Chronicler "cuts and pastes" his *Vorlage* and uses it as a source for his own work rather than following it totally (for more on it, cf. chapter III). Though possible historical problems caused by original changes must be discussed in appropriate sections, harmonizations themselves do not bring new historical problems.

In 1 Chr 19:19 וישלמו את ישראל "[the Arameans] made peace with Israel" is transformed to וישלמו עם דוד "made peace with David", and ויעבדום "became subject to them" to ויעבדהו "became subject to him", because in chaps. 18-20 he is stressing David's victory rather than Israel's victory. In 1 Chr 20:4

"there was again" ( ותהי עוד ) is changed to "occurred" ( ותעגד ) , for while in Samuel this verse immediately follows the account of another war against the Philistines ( 2 Sam 21:15-17 ) , in Chronicles this is the first episode. Likewise in 1 Chr 20:8 the number of sons of Rapha, four, is dropped since there are only three stories of the fight against sons of Rapha included in Chronicles. In 1 Chr 21:4 אל-יואב ועל שרי החיל is abridged to על יואב , for in 21:2 before he has changed the subject "Joab" to "Joab and the leaders of the people" and the latter does not fit with the present verse. In 1 Chr 21:18-19 כזב-גם כאשר , להקים , יעלה דוידס , עלה is rewritten to צוה יהוה , because while in Samuel Gad speaks to David, in Chronicles God speaks to Gad. These are the Chronicler's attempts to make his new structure coherent.

Likewise to harmonize with the overall account of Solomon the Chronicler reverses the story that Solomon turned over some cities to Hiram of Tyre ( 1 Kgs 4:12 ) , making Hiram ( i.e., Hiram ) give them to Solomon ( 2 Chr 8:2 ) . Since the Chronicler presents the building of Solomon's Temple as the establishment of ideal worship, he cannot accept that Solomon did not pay sufficiently for it. It is, however, not necessary to regard it as falsification of historical reports or lack of historical interest on the Chronicler's side, because, as Dillard suggests, it is easily deduced from Hiram's displeasure with the cities ( 1 Kgs 9:13 ) that he returned them to Solomon.



Thus the Chronicler saves his portrayal of Solomon by introducing what he believes to be a sequel to Kings' report.

2 Chr 10:2 omits "still" from "[Jeroboam] was in Egypt", because first he does not include the story of Jeroboam's flight to Egypt (1 Kgs 11 esp. vs. 40). He also leaves out a notice in 1 Kgs 15:12 "He [Asa] put away the male cult prostitutes out of the land, and removed all the idols that his father made" (cf. 2 Chr 14:1). Since the Chronicler evaluates his father Abijah's reign more positively with extra materials, such a statement may weaken that evaluation.

The qualifying clause "nevertheless the high places were not taken away; etc." is omitted from the first good reigns of Joash, Amaziah and Uzziah (2 Chr 24:1-2; 25:3; 26:4; cf. 27:2). This is not simply to enhance their goodness, but rather to harmonize with the Chronicler's schematization of two-part reigns of Joash, Amaziah and Uzziah. Since the Chronicler makes their first good reigns to be followed by more evil reigns with extra materials, it is no longer appropriate to summarize them as "good reigns" with only a little qualifications, and he excludes these.

In 2 Chr 27:2 the Chronicler adds "only he [Jotham] did not invade the temple of the Lord" to "he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord according to all that his father Uzziah had done", because he had included this incident in Uzziah's reign. At the end of Jotham's reign, 2 Kgs 15:37 "In those

days the Lord began to send Rezin the king of Syria and Pekah the son the Remaliah against Judah" is omitted. The Chronicler sees his reign totally positively and this statement might weaken his evaluation.<sup>36</sup>

2 Chr 33:3 also passes over "as Ahab king of Israel had done" in the note of Manasseh's idolatry, because the Chronicler did not narrate the idolatry of Ahab before. In vs. 22 the Chronicler replaces the original introductory comment "He [Ammon] walked in all the way in which his father [Manasseh] walked, and served the idols that his father served, and worshipped them" with a more general description of idolatry and refers to Manasseh's repentance in the following verse. In the previous chapter he adds the account of Manasseh's repentance and could not retain Kings' completely negative judgement on him.<sup>37</sup>

The Chronicler supplies a linking verse with Josiah's repairs of the Temple and the discovery of the book (34:14), because he has inserted a note on the roles of the the Levites in between (vv. 12-13). Also because of this insertion, Shaphan's answer to the king in vv 16-17 is rewritten to take account of the parts the Levites took. In 2 Chr 35:19  $\Delta X ' \textcircled{2}$  is omitted, since the Chronicler earlier included Hezekiah's Passover, and hence the uniqueness of Josiah's passover is undermined.

## THEOLOGICAL STRESS

As the Chronicler copies Samuel-Kings' historical reports he highlights some actions to point to his theological emphases and introduces his theological evaluation of the events. We can categorize these theological inclinations under six headings: God as the real king, Choice of David and Solomon, All Israel, People, Proper worship, and Retribution. Usually they are indicated by minor modifications of the *Vorlage* or the Chronicler's comments in the middle of the narrative or in the introduction or conclusion. The comment may take the form of a speech. But these changes and comments are generally small and only affect the theological significance of the incidents; they do not affect factual elements.

### 1. God as the real king

The Chronicler understands the idea of divine kingship literally and believes that Israel is the kingdom of God, and David or any other king is simply a human leader who exercises His rule on earth. Such a view is most typically expressed by a series of small changes in terminology in the Dynastic Promise. In 1 Chr 17:1-2  $\text{האלהים}$  is changed to  $\text{יהוה}$  three times to clarify the relationship between God the real ruler and David whose House is established only by God. Similarly



2. Choice of David and Solomon  
 הגילך in 1 Chr 18:8 and הגילך in 1 Chr 21:2 are  
 changed to ג'ל, and in 1 Chr 21:3 אל-הגילך is omitted. In  
 God's speech in 1 Chr 17:14 "your House, your kingdom" is  
 unmistakable divine choice of David's line  
 changed to "my House, my kingdom" to present the Davidic  
 promise from this perspective. Although, as McKenzie suggests,  
 textual corruption is possible here, it is not necessary.  
 Rather in view of the changes in 17:1-2 and the omission of לפרנ  
 later in v. 14, it is more likely that this change is  
 intentional.<sup>28</sup> The same point is also made by the repetition  
 of "my people" 'עם in 11:2, if it is not a dittography. In  
 2 Chr 22:10 "of the house of Judah" is correctly added to  
 "[Athaliah] destroyed all the royal family".<sup>29</sup> Willi and  
 Williamson suggest this clumsy addition may imply that she "may  
 have struck a blow at the 'earthly manifestation' of the  
 kingdom, but not the true kingdom, which is God's alone".<sup>30</sup>  
 The following story of Joash underlines the irony that God is  
 in control of the situation and preserves the crown prince. In  
 2 Chr 25:3 the Chronicler also avoids the expression "the royal  
 power became strong by his [Amaziah's] hand ( 17'2 )" and  
 substituted it with "upon him ( עליו )". Since he  
 believes that the kingdom is established only by the Lord, he  
 does not wish to give the impression of ascribing it to  
 Amaziah's ability.<sup>31</sup>

## 2. Choice of David and Solomon

Since God is the real king of Israel, it must be ruled only by the one commissioned by God himself and the unmistakable divine choice of David is emphasized. God's hand is clearly pointed out behind David's coronation in 1 Chr 11. The verb in 11:1 is changed from  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$  to  $\text{וַיִּקְבֹּץ}$ , suggesting the religious nature of his coronation (cf. 10:4 as well), and the close relationship between God and David is highlighted by the addition of  $\text{אֱלֹהֵיךָ}$  in 11:2. 11:3 also adds  $\text{לְדַבֵּר יְהוָה בֵּית שִׁיאוּל}$  to interpret David's coronation as the fulfilment of Samuel's word that God chose David to be king. The addition of  $\text{לְמַעַל}$  in 1 Chr 14:2 again underlines the idea that it was God who established David's kingdom for the people of Israel. The eternal nature of the Davidic promise is likewise made definite. In 1 Chr 17:13 the Qal expression of  $\text{לֹא־יִסוּר מִמֶּנּוּ}$  is changed to Hiphil  $\text{לֹא־אִסִּיר מֵעַיִן}$ , and in vs. 27  $\text{וְהָיָה וְיָבֵר}$  is transformed to  $\text{וְהָיָה לְבָרֵךְ}$  to make the expression more positive.

David's victories in 1 Chr 18-20 are placed immediately after God's promise of blessing and establishment to David and the victories witness the beginning of its fulfilment. Thus in 19:15 the passage which might weaken his victory ("Joab returned from fighting the Ammonites") is omitted, though this omission of detail does not change the historical picture of his victory. In 19:17 the subject ( $\text{אֲרָם}$ ) and the object ( $\text{דָּוִד}$ )

) of the sentence are exchanged to make David more positively involved in the war. In 20:4 the Chronicler's characteristic word ו'כנעו "and they were subjugated" is added as a conclusion to the war account.

However, the Davidic covenant is peculiarly interpreted by the Chronicler to emphasize the importance of Solomon in its establishment. According to him, the perfect rest was first given to Solomon and not yet given to David.<sup>92</sup> In 1 Chr 17:1 the reference to rest is omitted and in 17:10 "I will give you rest from all your enemies" is changed to "I will subjugate all your enemies". While God's military help is the same, the concept of "rest" is avoided for David. From Deut 12:10f. the Chronicler cannot see that David had perfect rest, because he did not build the Temple. Temple building and complete establishment of the kingdom are clearly assigned to Solomon. In 17:4 the rhetorical question האתה is changed to the more direct prohibition "You shall not build" לא אתה, and the article is added to בית so that the verse can be interpreted as speaking about the Temple which is built not by David but by Solomon. In 17:14 the establishment of the kingdom is promised in terms of Solomon's throne not of David's throne. The personal suffixes of ואצנן ביתך ונצלכתך are altered to והעצדתיהו בביתי ובצלכותי, and ונסאך to ונסאו. The Chronicler interprets that, while the Davidic promise is originally spoken to David, it was not completely fulfilled

until Solomon. Though he does not change any historical facts, his interpretation of the Davidic Promise is distinct from 2 Sam 7: "in Jerusalem" and in "the city of David", but the Chronicler

The Chronicler's extensive addition of David's speech in 1 Chr 22, 28, 29 and his Solomon narrative show the covenant was successfully established by Solomon's obedience, and after their reigns he stresses the eternal nature of this covenant. In 2 Chr 21:7 the Chronicler changes "the Lord would not destroy Judah, for the sake of David his servant" to "the Lord would not destroy the House of David, because of the covenant he had made with David". He explicitly points to the unconditional promise to the Davidic dynasty, though it is already implied in the Kings text. Similarly in the additional speech in 2 Chr 23:3 Jehoiada the priest explains the coup d'etat as "Let him reign, as the Lord spoke concerning the sons of David".

Each king is evaluated as to suitability for a Davidic king in a burial notice. They are judged in terms of whether they were buried "in the city of David", "with his fathers" or "in the tombs of the king". Though the Chronicler makes little change in the parallel sections, with additional materials from outside the judgment on the overall reign may be changed from that of Kings. While in Kings the evil kings were also buried "in the city of David", the Chronicler variously qualifies the statement. Jehoram was buried in the city of David, "but not

in the tombs of the king" (the Chronicler's addition) (2 Chr 21:20). Ahaziah was originally said to be buried in "Jerusalem" and in "the city of David", but the Chronicler simply writes "They buried him, for they said, "He is the grandson of Jehoshaphat, who sought the Lord with all his heart (2 Chr 2:9)". Ahaz's burial place is changed from "the city of David" to "the city of Jerusalem", avoiding the term "David", though the city of David is a part of Jerusalem (2 Chr 28:27). It is further qualified with the clause "for they did not bring him into the tombs of the kings of Israel". Joash, Amaziah, and Uzziah are relatively good kings in Kings, but with the extra materials the Chronicler reports their failures in the second half of their reigns. Thus Joash was buried "in the city of David" as in Kings but not "in the tombs of the kings" (2 Chr 24:25). Amaziah's burial place "Jerusalem" is changed to "the city of Judah" and "the city of David" is kept unmentioned (2 Chr 25:28). In the case of Uzziah "in the city of David" is altered to "in the burial field which belonged to the kings" (2 Chr 26:23). The tendency to avoid "in the city of David" for evil kings and to specify "not in the tombs of the kings" is evident.

On the other hand the burial notices of good kings not only mention "the city of David" but are more elaborated with eulogies (?) as in the case of Asa (2 Chr 16:14). Hezekiah was buried "with his fathers" especially "in the ascent of the



tombs of the sons of David" (32:33). Josiah was buried not the simply "in his tomb" but "in the tomb of his fathers". In 1:5, Manasseh's burial notice "in the garden of his house, in the garden of Uzza" is shortened to "in his house". Since the Chronicler has added the account of "Manasseh's repentance" and portrayed his reign more favourably, he avoids the term with pagan connotations.<sup>35</sup> In this way the Chronicler supplies theological evaluation of the king by the standard of David at the conclusion of each reign,<sup>36</sup> Williamson has shown how the Chronicler's calculation of the number of all Israel's fighting

3. All Israel from the Samuel passage, and probably he does not. One of the most distinctive theological stances the Chronicler takes against his source is his definition of "Israel". In the account of the united monarchy he stresses Israel as one people of God and it consists of all twelve tribes, and after the division he does not assume the existence of the northern kingdom. In David's reign he calls the people assembled from the twelve tribes simply "Israel" or "all Israel" instead of שבטי ישראל (1 Chr 11:1; 21:2), בני ישראל (1 Chr 17:5, 6), or בית ישראל (1 Chr 13:8; 15:28), for he does not need to distinguish it from Northern Israel. Since these expressions signify all Israel in the original contexts as well, his rewriting does not cause any historical conflict. In 1 Chr 21:1 את־ישראל ויהודה is in like manner altered to mere את־ישראל. The



Chronicler's stress on the unity of Israel is expressed by the changes from  $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  to  $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  in 1 Chr 14:8 and 1 Chr 21:5, though the interpretation of 21:5 is not completely agreed among scholars. Williamson and CM suggest that Chronicles gives the numbers of the fighting men of all Israel and Judah within it, while Samuel reports the numbers of those of Northern Israel and Judah.<sup>37</sup> Probably, as CM comments, the Chronicler does not want to count the soldiers of Northern Israel and Judah separately.<sup>38</sup> Williamson has shown how the Chronicler's calculation of the number of all Israel's fighting men is possible from the Samuel passage, and probably he does not intend to falsify the number of the people for theological reasons.<sup>39</sup>

In the account of the divided monarchy, the Chronicler on the one hand does not acknowledge the political existence of the Northern kingdom, since Israel is seen as the kingdom of God on earth and it must centre round the divinely chosen Temple and be ruled by a Davidic king. On the other hand, however, the people living in the North are still regarded as a part of "Israel" and expected to return to the only legitimate Davidic ruler and Jerusalem Temple. While such a view is most clearly expressed in his radical rewritings with additional materials in Abijah (2 Chr 13), Ahaz (2 Chr 28) and Hezekiah (2 Chr 29-32) (cf. chaps II and III), it is also reflected in minor changes of the parallel materials.

The first point is clearly seen by his systematic omission of the history of the Northern Kingdom where it has no relevance to the Southern Kingdom. This principle is so thoroughly carried out that even where he records the joint campaign by Ahab and Jehoshaphat, the description of Ahab's fate is skipped over (2 Chr 18:34). In like manner from the accession formulae of the Southern kings the synchronisms with the contemporary Northern king are regularly dropped (2 Chr 13:23; 20:31; 21:1; 22:1; 24:1; 25:1; 26:3; 27:1; 28:1; 29:1; cf. 25:25). The continuity of the legitimate kingdom of "Israel" in Judah is stressed by the modification of the source citation formulae. Though the Chronicler limits his account to the history of the Southern kingdom, he always called the title of his source 'The Book of the Kings of Israel' or ' . . . of Israel and Judah' and not once called it with 'Judah' alone. On several occasions (16:11; 25:26; 28:26; 33:18-19) he adds "Israel" to his *Vorlage*, suggesting that Judah is still Israel even when the Northern Israel is *de facto* existing. Likewise in 35:18 the southern king Josiah is called simply "the king of Israel" instead of the original "the king of Israel and Judah".

Nevertheless, the Chronicler believes that there is always a faithful remnant in the North who never completely lose their opportunity for repentance or their status as the people of God.<sup>100</sup> In the account of the division of the monarchy, "All the house of Judah and Benjamin, and . . . the rest of the

people" is changed to "all Israel in Judah and Benjamin" (2 Chr 11:3 // 1 Kgs 12:23). Though von Rad argues from this change that the Chronicler believes after the division only the south may be legitimately called 'Israel', Japhet correctly replies that 'Judah and Benjamin' is mere geographical qualification and it presupposes some part of Israel outside this boundary.<sup>101</sup> The northern Israel is in fact still called Israel several times in this section. Just as in 11:3 only the south is called "all Israel" in 10:16 the designation of the northern tribes is changed from *ישראל* to *כל-ישראל*, and in 10:18 the people in north is called *בני ישראל* in 10:3 and *ל'ל* in 11:1 are omitted from before *ישראל*, for it might be confused with northern "Israel" as a political entity as elsewhere in the Bible.<sup>102</sup> While these changes in terminology reflect the Chronicler's definition of "Israel", they actually refer to the same group of people and there are no factual changes.

Moreover with slight modification of the *Vorlage*, he emphasizes that the division of the monarchy was God's will and not to blame the Northerners.<sup>103</sup> In the beginning of 2 Chr 10:16 MT has only *ישראל* in place of *ל'ל ישראל* (1 Kgs 12:16). Commentators ascribe its loss to haplography, but Williamson argues that "the presence of the *ל* before the *ישראל* precludes" such explanation and it was the Chronicler's intentional omission to soften the image of the Northerners as

a positive driving force for the division. He translates MT 15b-16a as "for it was a turn of affairs brought about by God that the Lord might fulfill his word, which he spoke by Ahijah the Shilohite to Jeroboam the son of Nabat and all Israel, because the king did not hearken to them. And the people answered the king . . ." and suggests that the Chronicler emphasizes that the division was God's will.<sup>194</sup> Though the change is admittedly subtle, this understanding well accords with his retention of the *Vorlage* "it was a turn of affairs brought about by God" in 2 Chr 10:15 and "this thing is from me [the Lord]" in 2 Chr 11:4.

The Northerners' status as "Israel" was not forfeited even after their rejection of Abijah's call to return and their condemnation as rebellious (2 Chr 13).<sup>195</sup> The Chronicler still calls them "children of Israel" (e.g., 13:12) and through major additions he indicates that some people from the North were present at the reforming activities of Asa (2 Chr 15:8), Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17:2; 19:4) and reunited with the south under Hezekiah (2 Chr 30:5, 11) after the destruction of the kingdom (cf. chap. III).<sup>196</sup> While he follows the Kings account in Josiah's reform, by small changes he stresses that Josiah's power was extended to the North (which is probably historically true). In 2 Chr 34:9 those who participated in the religious reform is altered from "the people" to "Manasseh and Ephraim and from all the remnant of Israel and from all Judah and



Benjamin and from the inhabitants of Jerusalem" and in 2 Chr 34:21 "for the people, and for all Judah" is changed to "for those who are left in Israel and in Judah" to include the whole presentation of north and south.<sup>167</sup>

#### 4. People

The Chronicler also emphasizes the role of the people in major historical events. He makes them actively involved with the transfer of the ark, changing the subject of the verbs from David to the people. In 1 Chr 14:16 the verb is changed from singular  $\text{וַיָּבֵן}$  to plural  $\text{וַיִּבְנוּ}$ , and in 1 Chr 15:25  $\text{וַיִּלֶךְ דָּוִד}$  is elaborated to  $\text{וַיְהִי דָוִד וּזְקֵנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְשָׂרֵי הָאֲלָפִים הַהֲלָכִים}$ . In vs. 25 the destination of the ark, the "city of David", is omitted, for the ark was moved not only for David but to prepare for the Temple of all Israel. In 1 Chr 15:28 the subject of bringing up the ark and praising the Lord is again altered from  $\text{וַיִּזְדֹּד וְכָל-בֵּית-יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  to  $\text{וְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ . In 1 Chr 16:1 it is not David who offers sacrifice ( $\text{וַיַּעַל דָּוִד}$ ), but the people ( $\text{וַיִּקְרִיבוּ}$ ). The war with the Philistines is also written as an activity of the people ( $\text{וַיַּעַל}$ ) rather than that of David ( $\text{וַיִּבַּא דָּוִד}$ ) in 1 Chr 14:11. Since all these activities are not carried out by David alone but naturally with the people, the Chronicler's stress on them does not conflict with the report of his source.

In 1 Chr 21:2 David orders not only Joab (אל-יואב שר-החיל אשר אתו) but the leaders of the people (אל-יואב ואל-שרי העם) to conduct the census. While McKenzie argues that this change is already in his *Vorlage* because LXX<sup>108</sup> conflates Samuel's  $\psi$  and Chronicles'  $\omega$  (העם) שרי, this is not necessarily the case.<sup>109</sup> LXX's reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\psi\ \delta\omicron\nu\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\omega\upsilon$  = ואל שרי החיל is more likely a corrupt form of the original as we find it in 2 Sam 24:4. If this interpretation is correct, the Chronicler is making a theological point referring to שרי החיל as שרי העם. The Chronicler also has more people participate in Joash's coronation (2 Chr 23) and repairing the Temple (2 Chr 24). But since they are introduced by the pattern of David's coronation and the building of the tabernacle respectively, they will be discussed in the Typology section. The Chronicler's stress on the people may reflect his desire that his contemporary people behave as responsible for their nation Israel.<sup>109</sup>

## 5. Proper Worship

The Chronicler stresses worship and attempts to describe worship scenes as properly as possible. Together with his typological description of various religious events, these changes express the Chronicler's enthusiasm for proper worship. In 1 Chr 11:18 David's offering of water is intensified by the



unusual Piel stem of נסך, and in the following verse the wording is strengthened ( יהוה מעשתי to געלהי מעשות, and הלהללים to the more active האלה אשתה). In 1 Chr 15:27 David's linen ephod is changed to a (priestly) robe of fine linen, and the Levites are introduced. As the second element suggests, this change is not really meant to eliminate unpleasant materials but more positively reflects his desire to describe it as proper worship.<sup>110</sup> In 1 Chr 15:28 more musical instruments are added to elaborate the celebration for the safe transfer of the ark.<sup>111</sup>

In 2 Chr 33:4 the Chronicler adds "for ever ( לעולם )" to "there will be my name" to point to the eternal choice of the Jerusalem Temple. The condemnation of idolatry is intensified by making idols plural forms in 2 Chr 33 (cf. 28:3 also). In vs. 3 the Baal and Asherah that Manasseh built and in vs. 6 his son given for child sacrifice are pluralized to magnify his apostasy. As we have seen that the burial notices are used for the evaluation of Davidic kings, the names of heathen mothers of Judean kings are dropped from the accession formulae; the mothers of Manasseh, Amon and Josiah (2 Chr 33:1, 21; 34:1; 36:2).<sup>112</sup> Presumably, the Chronicler believes their religion will have influenced Judah and thinks it improper to mention them with Davidic kings. In the same way Maacha, the mother of Asa, is omitted from 2 Chr 14:1, for she also introduced foreign cults (cf. 2 Chr 15:16).<sup>113</sup>

priest" suggests that Joash was assassinated because he killed the prophet Zechariah.<sup>112</sup> Likewise his explanatory comment in

## 6. Retribution

2 Chr 25:20 connects Amaziah's disastrous challenge to northern Israel (2 Chr 25:17-28) with his killing Zechariah (2 Chr 25:14-16). The Chronicler's summary of Amaziah's evil reign with schematization and additional materials, juxtaposition of his characteristic vocabulary "did not humble himself" and faithful acts with blessings and disobedience with judgment "incurred guilt more and more" (2 Chr 33:23) correlates it with the conspiracy against him. Clearly the Chronicler's notes supplies introductory or concluding comments to the quoted events to suggest their immediate causes or consequences. These comments are meant only to point out their theological significance and causal relationships and not to alter the course of events.

While the Chronicler closely follows the account of the death of Saul, he ascribes Saul's downfall to his "unfaithfulness" in his own conclusion (1 Chr 10:13-14).<sup>114</sup> When Jehoshaphat was attacked by the Aramean army and cried out, the Chronicler adds "and the Lord helped him. God drew them away from him" (2 Chr 18:31). As Kings reports "they turned back from pursuing him" (1 Kgs 22:33 // 2 Chr 18:32) the Chronicler does not change facts, but with his note he underlines God's immediate response to the prayer. Edom and Ribnah's rebellions (2 Kgs 8:20-22 // 2 Chr 21:8-10) are connected with Jehoram's idolatry (2 Kgs 8:18-19 // 2 Chr 21:6-7) by his concluding comments: "because he had forsaken the Lord, the God of his fathers" (10b).<sup>115</sup> The Chronicler's short note in 2 Chr 24:25 "for the blood of the son of Jehoiada the

priest" suggests that Joash was assassinated because he killed the prophet Zechariah.<sup>116</sup> Likewise his explanatory comment in

#### TYPOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS

There are three kinds of alterations in which the Chronicler is concerned not only to report historical facts but also to express their typological significance: type scene, typology, and contemporization. They all display their theological meaning by focusing on the commonality of various historical events, but each relates events in a different way. Type scenes present a number of incidents with a characteristic literary form to show the recurring patterns in history, whereas typology portrays a historical event after a certain past event in order to interpret the significance of the later event in light of the previous one and to suggest the continuation between them. Contemporization describes a typical past event from a contemporary perspective to signify what it means to his contemporary readers. These alterations interrelate with each other and the boundary is not necessarily clear, but these three categories can also be found in the rationale of additional materials (cf. chap. II) and they must play a significant role in the Chronicler's theological thinking. Here we would like to list the alterations which employ such techniques according to these three headings.

We have seen how the Chronicler emphasizes his six theological themes in the parallel sections, though they are more clearly pointed out by his extensive additions and schematizations. Here he only supplies interpretative comments and small changes in wordings, leaving factual reports essentially unaltered.

## TYPOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS

There are three kinds of alterations in which the Chronicler is concerned not only to report historical facts but also to express their typological significance: type scene, typology, and contemporization. They all display their theological meaning by focusing on the commonality of various historical events, but each relates events in a different way. Type scenes present a number of incidents with a characteristic literary form to show the recurring patterns in history, whereas typology portrays a historical event after a certain past event in order to interpret the significance of the later event in light of the previous one and to suggest the continuation between them. Contemporization describes a typical past event from a contemporary perspective to signify what it means to his contemporary readers. These alterations interrelate with each other and the boundary is not necessarily clear, but these three categories can also be found in the rationale of additional materials (cf. chap. II) and they must play a significant role in the Chronicler's theological thinking. Here we would like to list the alterations which employ such techniques according to these three headings.



## 1. Type Scenes

The readers are also invited to understand Saul's death. 1 Sam 31 tells of the end of king Saul, but with a few minor changes it is remodeled to a typical story of the tragic end of a sinful king in 1 Chr 10. Vs. 10 is changed from וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֶת כְּלָיו בֵּית עֶשְׂתֵּרוֹת וְאֶת־גִּוִּיתוֹ תָּקְעוּ בְּחֹמַת בַּיִת שֵׁן to וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֶת־כְּלָיו בֵּית אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְאֶת גִּלְגָּלְתוֹ, and the typical nature of this alteration has been convincingly shown by Mosis, Ackroyd, and Williamson.<sup>117</sup> The one noticeable difference is that the thing hung up is not Saul's body but his head.<sup>118</sup> Probably "body" was changed to "head" because the Chronicler wishes to point out a contrast between this scene and 1 Sam 5:1-6, where the head of the Philistine deity Dagon was cut off because of the ark. As 1 Chr 13:3 and 15:29 show that the Chronicler regards Saul's sin as his neglect of the ark, he describes Saul's decapitation as an appropriate punishment. This "head" theme also contrasts 1 Chr 10 and David's victory against Goliath in 1 Sam 17. David brought Goliath's head back to Jerusalem, but Saul's head was brought to the Philistine temple. Our interpretation can be confirmed by the other rewritings. The Chronicler removes the reference to the Israelite city Beth Shean and the Canaanite goddess Ashtaroth and introduces the temple of Dagon so that the reader could read that Saul's head was brought to the land of the Philistines, especially to Dagon's temple.<sup>119</sup> Since Saul did not seek the Lord, he and his House completely perished by the

heathen.<sup>120</sup> The readers are also invited to understand Saul's death not simply as an historical happening but as a type scene of anger of the Lord, and it is not certain why David had to repent. The whole incident is within God's hand since at the end it leads to the establishment of the worship place, yet God emphasizes that Saul was killed because he did not seek the Lord.<sup>121</sup>

1 Chr 10 is further compared to David's victory over the Philistines in 14:9-17.<sup>122</sup> David's attitude in seeking the Lord is again stressed by the addition of  $\text{לַיהוָה}$  in 14:14, "David inquired of God again" and the contrast with Saul's attitude is obvious. As Williamson suggests, David's victory is also typologized and read, like Isa 28:21, as a typical "example of God's marvelous interventions in the battle on behalf of his people". While Mount Perazim in Isaiah and Baal Perazim in Samuel correspond, the Chronicler has to change one of the locations of battle from the Valley of Rephaim to that of Gibeon.

David's repentance of taking the census in 1 Chr 21 is also rewritten with type scenes and typology in order to emphasize God's choice of Jerusalem as a place for permanent

worship and repentance of sins, but here we deal with alterations due to type scenes only and typological changes will be discussed in the following section. Firstly, as Willi and Williamson point out, the Chronicler introduces Satan in order to stress that taking the census was David's sin.<sup>123</sup>



According to 2 Sam 24 the cause of taking the census was "the anger of the Lord", and it is not certain why David had to repent. The whole incident is within God's hand since at the end it leads to the establishment of the worship place, yet God punishes David's sin. The Chronicler solves this crux by alluding to Satan, who in Job 1-2 incites people to sin (Job 1:8, 11, 22) within God's permission. Thus in Chronicles David's census is taken as a type scene of sin induced by Satan, while Job offers a case of overcoming sin. David's sin is further underlined by several rewritings. In vs. 3 Joab's courtesy הגלך ראות ואדני הגלך "while the eyes of my lord the king still see it" is changed to objection הלא אדני המלך "Are they not, my lord the king, all of them my lord's servant?", and the verb הפץ "desire" is changed to the stronger בקש, "Why do you demand it?" At the end of the verse he adds a new phrase, "Why should he bring guilt on Israel?" In vs. 7 "David was conscience-stricken" ויך לבידוד אתו is altered to the clearer "This command was also evil in the sight of God; so he punished Israel" וירע בעיני האלהים עם הדבר הזה ויך את ישראל.

On the other hand, his prayer of repentance is so arranged that this can be a type for the penitential prayer which will be given in the Temple. The wording of David's confession is strengthened by the additions of הוא אשר, הלא אני אמרתי "Was it not I who gave command to number the people?", the vocative

carry him out of the battle and to have him propped up in his chariot. Whereas 2 Kgs 23:29 states that Josiah died in

"יהוה אלוקי" "O Lord my God", and by the change of "ואנכי העויתי" "I have sinned" into the infinitive absolute "זהרע הרעותי" "It is I who have sinned". His wish to fall into God's punishment rather than man's is clarified by the Chronicler and God's grace is also stressed with "אל" in vs. 13. In vs. 17 his prayer is changed to intercession adding "do not let this plague remain on your people" "ולא יבא לארץ". The parallel of this prayer and Solomon's prayer to ask God to listen to Israel's repentance prayed in the temple (2 Chr 6:21, 29, 36ff) is striking, and such prayer of repentance is actually offered over and again in the later narrative of the divided kingdom. Thus David's sin and repentance is presented as a type scene for the desired attitude in the later generations, and especially for the post-exilic community by the Chronicler.

In 2 Chr 15:16 the Chronicler adds the word "crushed it [or broke into pieces]" to the report of Asa's destruction of an image of Asherah. Since the same word is used for Josiah's purge of Asherah in 2 Kgs 23:6, 15 // 2 Chr 34:4, 7, probably it is used here as a *Leitwort* for the typical religious reformation. Similarly the death of Josiah (2 Chr 35:22-24) is deliberately likened to that of Ahaz (1 Kgs 22:29-40) to portray it as a typical end of the king who did not listen to the word of the Lord.<sup>124</sup> Like Ahab Josiah went to the battle disguised and was shot by archers. Josiah's order to move him from his battle chariot to another one parallels Ahaz' order to

carry him out of the battle and to have him propped up in his chariot. Whereas 2 Kgs 23:29 states that Josiah died in Megiddo, the vague expression of 2 Chr 35:24 might hint that he died on the way back to Jerusalem, as Ahaz died before he arrived at his capital Samaria (1 Kgs 22:37). The Chronicler also omits the proper name "Tiglath Pileser" from "the king of Assyria" in 2 Chr 28:16 and changes "Pharaoh Necho" to "the king of Egypt" in 2 Chr 36:13. He is probably more concerned with the pattern that unfaithfulness brings disaster by the foreign power than the specificities of the event.<sup>125</sup> Moreover, as we shall see in the following chapter, many of the battle reports are set in the conventional literary form of "holy war" to present them as God's intervention on behalf of his people.

## 2. Typology

We have seen that the first half of 1 Chr 21 is presented as a type scene of the repentance of sins, but in its second half the Chronicler employs three typologies to interpret the event as clear divine choice of a place of worship. Firstly, the appearance of the angel is rewritten after Num 22 to show that the angel is giving an inescapable divine command, as Baalam was forced to obey God's will given by the angel with the sword (Num 22:35).<sup>126</sup> The drawn sword is introduced from Num 22:23, and in vv. 18ff a command to build an altar in

and 24 he adds the phrase "at its full price", which is used only in Gen 23:9 elsewhere in OT. 3. Against the Vorlage David

Ornan's threshing floor is given by the angel to Gad, not by Gad to David.

Similarly, David's meeting with Ornan is written after Gideon's building of the long lasting altar in Ophrah in Judg 6:11-24. Willi points out six analogies between them besides the general similarity of the angel meeting with the farmer in the threshing floor.<sup>127</sup> 1. The angel (  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  ) is introduced while in Samuel only the king (  $\text{דָּוִד}$  ) is mentioned. 2. The phrase Ornan "was threshing wheat"  $\text{וְהָיָה שֹׂרֵף הַשֵּׂבִיל}$  is added as om Judg 6:21. 3. Ornan and his sons hide themselves as Gideon did in Judg 6:11b. 4. Ornan turns (  $\text{וַיִּשָׁב}$  ) instead of looking (  $\text{וַיִּשְׁקֹף}$  ) as in Judg 6:18. 5. Both Ornan and Gideon see the angel (Judg 6:22). 6. Both Ornan and Gideon are willing to give (vs. 23 // Judg 6:18, 19). Some correspondences cannot be stressed too much, but as a whole the relation between them is convincing. Williamson also notes that God's acceptance of the offering by the supernatural fire is common in both passages (v. 26, Judg 6:21).<sup>128</sup> The Chronicler, thus, seems to interpret David's building of the altar with Judg 6:24 as the establishment of a permanent worship place.

David's negotiation to purchase Ornan's threshing floor is also paralleled with Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah. Williamson lists six parallels as following.<sup>129</sup>

1. The Chronicler changes his Vorlage to use  $\text{בָּיָה$  in the sense of "to buy" twice in vs. 22 as Gen. 23:4 and 9. 2. In vv. 22



and 24 he adds the phrase "at its full price", which is used only in Gen 23:9 elsewhere in OT. 3. Against the *Vorlage* David starts the negotiation as in Gen 23:3f. 4. Ornan's willingness to give is stressed by changing impf.  $\eta\eta'$  to impr.  $\eta\eta'$  (cf. Gen 23:11). 5. The area purchased is extended from the threshing floor to the whole site (vs. 25) as in the case of Abraham. 6. Both places are regarded as holy (vs. 20). Evidently the significance of the event is emphasized, as with Gen 23, as the purchase of a sacred site. Furthermore, two other occasions are adjusted to this typology. Related to Ornan's willingness to give everything (4), v. 23 adds ". . . the wheat for the grain offering, I will give everything". While Rudolph and CM claim this addition is due to the Chronicler's harmonization with Exod 29:38ff and Num 15:1f, as McKenzie and Williamson correctly point out, grain offering is not "wheat" but "fine flour", and this addition simply emphasizes Ornan's wish to give everything he has. Similarly in connection with (5) the price David paid is increased from fifty shekels of silver to six hundred of gold in vs. 25. Though there is a textual difficulty in this verse, probably as commentators suggest, the amount is increased to meet with the whole place rather than only the threshing floor. Therefore 1 Chr 21 is interpreted with three previous events as the establishment of the divinely appointed worship place.

Similarly Solomon's Temple building (2 Chr 2-8:16) is described after the manner of the construction of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, to indicate the continuation of true worship between these two institutions.<sup>131</sup> This typology is already presupposed in the Chronicler's major addition of David's charge to Solomon to build the Temple (1 Chr 28, 29), but here they are related by a number of minor modifications.

In the beginning of the Solomon account, as Dillard suggests, Solomon and Hiram-abi are compared with the tabernacle constructors Bezalel and Oholiab respectively.<sup>132</sup> As the Chronicler's additions in 1 Chr 22 and 28-29 emphasize, Solomon is singled out for the building work just as Bezalel (Exod 31:1-11; 35:30-36:2; 38:22-23), and both are of the tribe of Judah (Exod 31:2; 35:30; 38:22). Also the new literary structure of 2 Chr 1 suggests that the wisdom Solomon received was specifically for the construction of the Temple, like the earlier example of Bezalel (Exod 31:1-3; 35:30-35).<sup>133</sup> On the other hand, the details about Hiram-abi in 2 Chr 2 are changed to parallel him with Oholiab, the helper of Bezalel (Exod. 31:6). His name is different from "Hiram" in Kings, and the additional -abi seems to be taken from the last part of Oholiab. His mother is said to be one of the daughters of Dan rather than of Naphtali as in 1 Kgs 7:14, to correspond with the tribal ancestry of Oholiab (Exod 31:6; 35:34; 38:23). Moreover, in Kings Hiram is credited specifically with casting



bronze items after the completion of the Temple itself (1 Kgs 7:13-47), but in Chronicles Hiram-abi is in charge of the Temple building from the beginning. Accordingly his skill is also extended from bronze casting (1 Kgs 7:14) to other kinds of craftsmanship related to the construction of the Temple (2 Chr 2:13 [14]) as in the case of Bezalel and Oholiab (Exod 31:1-6; 35:30-36:2; 38:22-23). Although Mosis and Williamson argue that Hiram-abi reflects the characteristics of both Bezalel and Oholiab, there is no strong connection between Hiram-abi and Bezalel alone and Bezalel is rather paralleled by Solomon.<sup>134</sup>

The account of the building of the Temple itself (2 Chr 3:1-5:1) also corresponds to that of the tabernacle in Exod 36:8-39:32. The Chronicler repeats the word וַיַּעַשׂ "and he made" consistently in this section, replacing similar expressions in the *Vorlage* (2 Chr 3:8, 10, 14, 15; 4:1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 19), because וַיַּעַשׂ is used almost forty times when the tabernacle was built according to the pattern shown by the Lord.<sup>135</sup> 2 Chr 3:9 also adds a reference to gold nails used in the holy of holies, which probably parallel the golden hooks used for the holy of holies of the tabernacle (Exod 26:32, 37).<sup>136</sup> Similarly, although 1 Kgs 6:31-32 speaks of doors at the entrance of the holy of holies, 2 Chr 3:14 mentions the veil, as in the case of the tabernacle (Exod 26:31-33).<sup>137</sup> 2 Chr 4:2-6 also supplies an explanatory note on

the bronze sea in order to equate its function with the laver in the tabernacle: ritual cleansing of the priests and the offering utensils (Exod 30:17-21). The "prescription" according to which the lampstands were made may refer to Exod 25:31-40; 37-24; though this may also speak of the prescription for this Temple in 1 Chr 28:11-19; or 2 Chr 2:4. The pots, the shovels, the basins (2 Chr 4:11), the golden altar, and the table (2 Chr 4:19) all correspond to the tabernacle equipment, and the spoils taken by David were dedicated to the Temple (2 Chr 5:1) as the spoils from Egypt were offered to the tabernacle (Exod 35:4-36:7), although they are already mentioned in 1 Kgs 8:40-51.

The account of the dedication of the Temple (2 Chr 5:2-7:11) is also paralleled with that of the tabernacle (Exod 40:34-35) and the feast of Tabernacles (Lev 23:33-43). The dedication ceremony was held a week before the feast of Tabernacles and the two-week festivals were celebrated together (2 Chr 5:2-3; 7-8:10). Whereas this description is based on 1Kgs 8:1-2 and 65-66, 2 Chr 7:9-10 elaborates the procedure of the festival and refers to the solemn assembly to focus on its relation to the feast of Tabernacles. God's response to the dedication (5:13b-14; 7:1-3) is also portrayed after the manner of the divine acceptance of the tabernacle in the wilderness (Exod 40:34-35). Both Solomon's Temple and the tabernacle were filled with the glory cloud and neither Solomon nor Moses could

enter the sanctuary because of the presence of the glory of the Lord. Thus, although the Chronicler's account of Solomon's Temple is essentially based on Kings text, with minor alterations and additions it is presented as the reactualization of the tabernacle, the worship place built according to the divinely-given plan and accepted by God of himself. In like manner Joash's coronation in 2 Chr 23 is deliberately paralleled with David's coronation in 1 Chr 11. Whereas in 2 Kgs 11 the incident was merely a "private compact of Jehoiada with the captains of the guards", in Chronicles the guards bring the Levites and "heads of the fathers' houses of Israel" and it becomes a formal state affair, as in the case of David.<sup>140</sup> "Heads of the father's house of Israel" not only appears in 1 Chr 11:3 but also implies that Joash was enthroned by all twelve tribes of Israel (cf. 1 Chr 11:1 and 12:23-37).<sup>141</sup> The role of the people is further highlighted by the introduction of "all the congregation ( כל הקהל )" in vs. 3 and "all the people" in vv. 6, 10, 16, 17.<sup>142</sup> As the Chronicler's addition in vs. 3 suggests here he wishes to emphasize that Israel must be ruled by a Davidic king, and he pictures Joash's coronation after the pattern of David's. Jehoiada's restoration of the Temple is also modeled after the construction of the tabernacle and the building of the Temple by David and Solomon, for the latter is itself



typologically presented after the tabernacle. In 2 Chr 24:9 the Chronicler identifies the collection of the box in the Temple with "the tax that Moses the servant of God laid upon Israel in the wilderness" for the tabernacle (Exod 30:11-16, 38:25f). In vs. 10 he writes "The people rejoiced" in giving and responded well as in the time of the original building of the Temple (1 Chr 29:9) and that of the tabernacle (Exod 25:1-7; 35:4-9, 20-29). Vs. 14 states that the temple vessels were made with the surplus silver and gold, whereas in 2 Kgs 12:13 explicitly mentions that no vessels were made out of it.<sup>143</sup> Here again the Chronicler rewrites the text to point out the correspondence with the Mosaic tax, with which furnishings of the tabernacle were made (cf. Exod 35:10ff; 1 Chr.28:11b; 2 Chr 4).<sup>144</sup> With these typological alterations he suggests that Jehoiada properly restored the Temple as originally built by David and Solomon and stresses his faithfulness to the right by worship of the Lord. Vs. 6 states that Jehoiada's arrangement of the Levitical guards "foreign  
 3. Contemporization vs. 4-5 was to keep anyone but the priests  
 and Just as the Chronicler suggests the typological vs. 7  
 significance of some events by connection with previous events in Scripture, he at times describes some historical events from his contemporary situation to present them as type for his day. Again the Chronicler's intention was not to change the "to  
 "by the pillar at the entrance", after the plan of the second

historical details of incidents, but to indicate their theological significance for his contemporary readers.

In 2 Chr 23 the coronation of Joash is described as if it was carried out according to the post-exilic religious customs to show its properness, but in turn it also sets the model for the post-exilic community. Whereas in Kings Joash was enthroned by the foreign royal guards, in Chronicles all the indications of foreign elements are disregarded and the Levites are introduced as the major participants (vs. 2). Activities that the foreign guards originally took part in are now transferred to the Levites (e.g., vv. 4ff, 8). As commentators suggest, the changes are probably because foreigners were not admitted to the Temple in his time and "he could not conceive that the high priest could have called upon the royal foreign body-guard for services in the Temple".<sup>145</sup> The Chronicler's concern for the sanctity of the Temple is further underlined by his addition of vs. 6 and an alteration in vs. 7. Vs. 6 states that Jehoiada's arrangement of the Levitical guards ("foreign guards" in Kings) in vv. 4-5 was to keep anyone but the priests and the Levites away from the sanctuary. Similarly vs. 7 changes their roles from protecting "the ranks" encircling the prince to protecting "the house".<sup>146</sup> Since the king himself was not allowed to be in the sanctuary, vs. 13 changes "[the king was standing] by the pillar according to his custom" to "by the pillar at the entrance", after the plan of the second



temple. The Chronicler avoids mentioning "guards" changing "through the gate of guards" to "through the upper gate" in vs. 20 and points to its locality by its connection with the Temple, for in his time the palace no longer existed.<sup>147</sup>

The Chronicler's introduction of the Levites also reflects their prominent role in the post-exilic Temple cult. He assumes Levitical divisions first developed in the post-exilic period in his explanatory addition in vs. 8 "for Jehoiada the priest did not dismiss the divisions".<sup>148</sup> In vs. 13 he adds "and the singers with their musical instruments leading in the celebration," for in his time the praise must be led by the Levitical musicians. Vv. 18-19 includes Jehoiada's appointment of "watchmen of the house of the Lord under the direction of the priests and the Levites whom David had organized to be in charge of the house of the Lord". While it is a part of the Chronicler's design to describe the event as the complete restoration of Davidic worship, the details of the Levites' functions are from his own time.

The Levites are also added to the accounts of Jehoiada's restoration of the Temple (2 Chr 24), because from the post-exilic perspective it was unthinkable that they did not participate in such religious activities. In 24:5 the Chronicler introduces a new role for the Levites to collect money for the restoration from all Israel and in vs. 11 they are made responsible for the collection box. In 34:9 again

collection of money for the cleansing of the Temple is assigned to the Levites and in vv. 12-14 their supervision of the work and music accompanying it are delineated. The change of "the prophets" to "the Levites" in 34:30 seems to reflect his view that the Levites are in his day in the tradition of the earlier prophets (cf. 2 Chr 20:14-17 as well).<sup>149</sup> In 35:18 the prominent role of the Levites in Josiah's Passover is again underlined with his addition "the priests, and the Levites, and all Judah and Israel who were present, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem".

Probably these changes reflect the Chronicler's contemporary situation, but it may not be a simple adaptation of the earlier cultic system to the contemporary one. Rather, typological rewriting in Joash's reform suggests that the Chronicler sees the theological significance of the reform as the return to proper worship and presents the details as the ideal for his contemporary readers. Thus his introduction of the Levites is also probably a part of his view of what proper worship means. It is not certain if the Chronicler is simply legitimizing their role in the cult or advocating his position against some opposing group in his time.<sup>150</sup> But his frequent additions of the Levites in the description of proper worship strongly suggests that he offers more than simple contemporary equivalents and tries to include the Levites in his typical picture of the proper worship.

## SUMMARY

From the analyses of the parallel sections with Samuel-Kings above, we can point out seven characteristics in the Chronicler's use of his basic source. Although these are by no means applied consistently, we can still discern the general directions in his rewritings.

1. Many of the apparent contradictions between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles are simply due to textual corruptions. Where the Chronicler quotes his source, basically he copies it word for word and does not paraphrase it (cf. Textual).

2. Frequently the Chronicler changes his *Vorlage* stylistically to make it easier to understand. When his *Vorlage* is textually difficult, either he omits that part or attempts to reconstruct it (cf. Clarification).

3. He changes archaic expressions or old names to their equivalents in his time or LBH to make them more comprehensible to his contemporary readers (cf. Adaptation).

4. When there is obscurity or diversity in the historical report of the source, he studies it carefully in order to attain a clearer historical picture (cf. Clarification---), though Additional Historical Information).

5. He attempts to present his source as coherent within a block of material and within his new presentation as a whole (cf. Harmonization).

6. He stresses particular aspects of actions and introduces his theological evaluation of the events to point to his theological themes (cf. Theological Stress).

7. He sometimes rewrites historical events typologically to show their theological significance. Some events are portrayed as type scenes in a set literary pattern and others are paralleled with previous Scriptural events to indicate their theological significance. Still other events are seen as a "type" for the contemporary religious practice and their significance for the later period is reflected in the description of events themselves (cf. Typology).

The first four characteristics are concerned with presenting the text intelligibly and do not change its content substantially. Whereas this suggests the Chronicler's respect for his source, this technique is not limited to interpretative literatures but theological and historical literatures also must interpret sources which provide information. In fact, his interpretation of the event is frequently different from that of Samuel-Kings and a theological significance which was originally foreign to his source is read into it (6, 7), though such behaviour is not unusual for midrashic literature. The Chronicler's harmonizations (5) suggests that he organizes his account according to his own scheme and Samuel-Kings are used as a source for a new work rather than as a text to comment on, as we shall see more closely in chap. III.

Another noteworthy characteristic is the Chronicler's interest in historical reality. He supplies additional information and reconstructs confusing historical reports to show how the events really happened (4). He also does not change the factual elements even when he changes the wording of the text for harmonization or theological stress. Only occasionally he may change historical details where he indicates the typological significance of events (7). While he is concerned with history, his ultimate interest is what the historical events mean for his contemporary readers and as a rule he presents them within "patterns" in history.



## II

### The Chronicler's Use of Additional Materials

In the first chapter we have seen that the Chronicler respects the account of Samuel-Kings and that his theological points are not made by changing the events themselves but by supplying new interpretation of the significance of the events. But what about more extensive additions and rewritings? Where are they derived from? How are they used? Are they midrashic elaborations of the text, the Chronicler's free theological writings, or additional historical information? Though all three can be used to express the Chronicler's theological views, the way in which he adds extra materials has a serious bearing on what kind of literature Chronicles is. Since it is generally agreed that the Chronicler had a theological purpose in supplying additions, in this chapter we would like to pay special attention to whether he had any historical concern as well as theological interest to add new elements. Here we do not mean historicity of accounts or even use of sources by the Chronicler's "historical concern", though we shall deal with them as a part of our discussion. Our interest is rather to find out whether his intention is to interpret the significance of what he believed really happened in history, not

interpretation of the stories recorded in the sacred text or pure imagination.

There are four categories of additional materials. The first one is used to describe the positive aspects of the king's reign, or God's blessings. This includes building activities, large family, wealth, army organization, and war, especially victory. The second, on the other hand, concerns the negative side or God's judgment, and includes war (defeat), and disease or death. Thirdly, there are materials dealing with the religious activities of the kings: positively on reform, and negatively on apostasy. The fourth kind of addition expresses the Chronicler's evaluation or view of the significance of the events. Now we would like to start analysing these additions category by category.

## 1. Blessings

### a. Building Activities

It has been pointed out that the Chronicler set the accounts of the extensive building activities after the faithful acts of 'good' kings, so as to suggest that the kings and Judah was constantly receiving the blessings as rewards for their faithfulness to the Lord. Since they create a repeated pattern, some of the accounts have been seen as the Chronicler's fabrication underlining his theological evaluation of the king's reign and his historical interest has been questioned.

also However, at least in three cases the reliable nature of the historical information is generally accepted. For example, as a description of the establishment of Rehoboam's rule (cf. 12:1), the Chronicler supplies an additional section (11:5-12:1) and introduces his construction of fortresses in its first part (11:5-12). While vv. 5 and 10b-12 are the Chronicler's own introductory and concluding summaries, the list of the fortresses in the core (vv. 6-10a) is almost unanimously accepted as being based on an older source.<sup>3</sup> Since the list is so detailed and the locations of the fortresses cannot be harmonized with any other lists in the Scripture, it is reckoned to have been taken over from an extra-canonical document.<sup>3</sup> G. Beyer has also convincingly demonstrated that these fortified cities are placed in the most strategic points for the defence of Judah and unlikely to be simply fictitious.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, this defence system suits well the situation we know in Rehoboam's reign. For example, while at least in the following reign of Abijah the conflict with the North over the territory of Benjamin had started (1 Kgs. 15:6, 2 Chr. 13:2) and Judah was constantly threatened from the North, the list completely lacks defence on that side. This is possible only because Rehoboam had not yet felt threatened from that direction and still desired to reunify the kingdom.<sup>5</sup> The exclusion of Arad, a major fortress of the later period, from the southern line indicates an earlier date as well.<sup>6</sup> It has

also long been recognized that the western and southern defence lines are placed deep inside the Judean territory and that this may reflect the weakened political situation of Rehoboam.<sup>7</sup>

This consensus has been challenged, to my view unsuccessfully, by Junge and more recently by Volkmar Fritz who dates the list to Josiah's time.<sup>8</sup> Fritz argues against the early dating on archaeological grounds. He shows that, while archaeological evidence for fortifications in Rehoboam's time is questionable, Lachish, Beth-zur, Azekah and Mareshah all existed in the seventh century. Moreover, he suggests Gath should be identified with 'Philistine' Gath and not with Moresbeth-gath as Aharoni does, since 'Philistine' Gath had not been conquered until the time of Uzziah (2 Chr. 26:6). However, though recent archaeological excavations at Lachish suggest the city was not yet fortified in Rehoboam's time, this dating is still open to discussion and from the settlement during David and Solomon's reigns some fortification in the city may be assumed despite the lack of positive verification.<sup>9</sup> The eleventh century settlement in Beth-zur also appears to be abandoned in Rehoboam's time, but the scale of the excavation is rather limited and hardly conclusive.<sup>10</sup> Fritz does not give any positive evidence to prefer 'Philistine' Gath to Moresbeth-gath, but merely writes "Aharoni's suggestions would not fit the strategic concept of security of the access routes".<sup>11</sup> 'Philistine' Gath can function as an outpost for the route from



the coastal plain, but that route is already defended by Azekah and Socoh and the location of Moresheth-gath can also make good strategic sense for the western defence line. For other cities little archaeological data is available. Since archaeological information is rather limited and its interpretation is not settled yet, it is unwise to rely on it too heavily.

Fritz also does not accept the argument for Rehoboam's date from the distribution of defence cities, because these cities are not identical with the actual boundaries. However, granted his point, the situation which necessitated building fortified cities around the capital seems to point to Rehoboam's date, whether they indicate boundaries or not. Such a tight defence system around the capital may suggest that the territory is shrinking and a more direct threat to Jerusalem is expected. This situation can be ascribed to the result of Shishak's invasion, as Aharoni suggests.<sup>12</sup> But even before his attack Judah must have lost considerable territory during the dispute over Rehoboam's succession in view of the growing power of the Philistines and Edomites (cf. 1 Kgs. 11:14-22, 25) and Rehoboam must have noticed Shishak's aim.<sup>13</sup> Miller has also pointed out that these defence cities function not only against invaders from outside but also to secure loyalty to the royal family within the territory after the separation of the Northern kingdom.<sup>14</sup>



Fritz believes that the construction of defence cities under Rehoboam is unlikely because his predecessor Solomon had already set up numerous fortresses in the Negev. In particular, if we assume that their building occurred after Shishak's campaign, it was not necessary to fortify cities in the hill country because Shishak's raid was from the north-west and he did not destroy that area of Judah. Fritz argues that this defence system fits better in Josiah's time, for Josiah knew Sennacherib would attack from the coastal plain, and he was attempting to gain independence from Assyria. However, from Shishak's topographical list from Karnak we know that he destroyed the fortresses in the Negev as well as in the north.<sup>15</sup> If that is the case, Rehoboam could no longer rely on them and it is not surprising that he built defence cities in the inner areas even if that part was not devastated. Moreover, Solomon's fortresses are mostly at frontiers and even before Shishak's campaign it is not certain if they were sufficient defence for his reduced territory and his unstable power. Josiah's reign admittedly also provides a plausible setting for building defence cities in the western and southern boundaries and probably he really did reestablish some cities.<sup>16</sup> But since the list fits marvelously well with the original position in Rehoboam's reign, there is no need to look for another context for it.

(vs. 9) Once we accept Rehoboam's date we can see this defence by line working effectively a couple of generations after him.<sup>17</sup> Asa stopped the invasion of Zerah the Cushites at *Mareshah* (2 Chr. 14:8-14) and Jehoshaphat beat the alliance of the Moabites and Ammonites in the field of *Tekoa* (2 Chr. 20:1-28).<sup>18</sup> Therefore, though the Chronicler uses these details of building activities to illustrate his positive evaluation of Rehoboam's reign, they are based on an older document and reflect reliable historical information.

A second case where we can confidently suppose an underlying source is Uzziah's rebuilding of defence structures in Jerusalem and his agricultural development (2 Chr. 26:9-10). Again this is one of the Chronicler's additions, which describes the reward for his faithfulness in the first half of his reign. Uzziah's towers, cisterns and even drainage tunnels for agricultural use (vs. 10a) are impressively attested by archaeological discoveries in Gibeah, Qumran, and several sites around Beersheba.<sup>19</sup> Their dating to Uzziah's time is confirmed by a seal bearing his name found in a cistern at Tell Beit Mirsim.<sup>20</sup> The existence of considerable crown lands besides the property of free Israelites (vs. 10b) is supported by many other texts (1 Sam. 8:12-14; 22:7; 1 Kgs. 21; 2 Kgs. 8:3-6; 1 Chr. 27:25-31) and there the poor people worked as vinedressers and laborers (2 Kgs 24:14; 25:12; Jer 40:9-10; 52:16).<sup>21</sup> That Uzziah restored the city wall of Jerusalem

(vs 9) is also most naturally expected after the damage done by Joash of Israel in the previous reign (25:23). It is especially probable under the king whose extensive building activities are well-known. Welten doubts an underlying source for this part, because the use of the term "towers (  $\text{מִגְדָּלוֹת}$  )" for the city wall is chiefly known from the post-exilic period, especially in Neh. 3, and the names "the Corner Gate", "the Valley Gate" and "the Angle" are attested either only or mostly in the book of Nehemiah.<sup>21</sup> But  $\text{מִגְדָּלוֹת}$  is widely used as a general term for various towers (cf. Judg. 8:17; 9:46, 47, 49; 2 Kgs 9:17; 17:9; 18:8; Song 4:4; 7:5) and must be an appropriate word here. Moreover, the details of the Jerusalem city wall are rarely given except in Neh 3 and lack of any previous occurrence of the words does not necessarily mean the gates did not exist or the words were not in use.<sup>22</sup> If we consider the reliable nature of the Chronicler's addition in this section, such as vs. 10 seen above or vv 6-8 on war (see below), it is rather unlikely that he made up this verse simply from 25:23 and from his knowledge in the post-exilic period.

Thirdly, Manasseh's reinforcement of fortifications (2 Chr 33:14) is also probably based on authentic information, though it is meant to show divine blessing as a result of his repentance. As Noth writes, the passage is too "straightforward and detailed" to be fictitious, and historically it is quite likely that Manasseh undertook activity like this.<sup>23</sup> If the



Chronicler is reversing the order of the events here, as some have suggested, Manasseh may have strengthened his defence before he joined the revolt against Assyria.<sup>24</sup> But more probably, as the text suggests, his reinforcement was made after his return from Babylon to fulfill the Assyrian desire to make Judah a buffer-state against the Egyptian border.<sup>25</sup> The growing population in the city at this time may have also contributed to his building activity, as Broshi suggests.<sup>26</sup>

On the other hand, one must be more cautious in postulating sources for the building activity reports of Asa (2 Chr 14:6-7) and Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17:12-13a). They are not only expressed in general terms and lacking details but also couched in the Chronicler's highly theological language. 14:4-7 gives the background for Asa's speech and articulates the condition for the building; "The land was at peace", "for the Lord gave him rest", "because we have sought the Lord our God," and "So they built and prospered". 17:10 also sets the theological tone for the rest of the paragraph with "the fear of the Lord" and "they made no war". Clearly the Chronicler inserts them not so much to give historical information about their buildings as to present them as patterns of the blessings the faithful can receive. Indeed the concept of "rest" indicates the parallel between these building activities and the direct consequences of Solomon's Temple building.<sup>27</sup> Having completed the Temple, Solomon had rest, and the first thing he

did was to build cities and fortifications (2 Chr 8:1-6).<sup>28</sup>

The Chronicler also uses the passages we have seen above (11:5-12; 26:9-10; 33:14) as a sign of blessings, though their theological significance is known only from the context, and he seems to present this building theme as a pattern we can find in the life of the faithful kings.

However, his keen interest in theological patterns or the general character of his expressions does not necessarily mean they are created only to support his positive evaluation of the kings. In fact 1 Kgs 15:23 and Jer 41:9 report Asa's constructions, and the unsettled political situation in his time (cf. 2 Chr 14:9 ff; 16) makes it highly probable.<sup>29</sup>

Similarly it is natural that a wealthy king such as Jehoshaphat built fortifications and cities, and the trustworthy information about the tribute in 17:11 (see below) may suggest the following report of Jehoshaphat's building (17:12) is also reliable.<sup>30</sup> Considering these together with the more certain cases above, it is more likely that, though the Chronicler is interested in a building theme in the reigns of faithful kings, he does not make up these sections to support his theological ideas but looks for the available patterns in history. Their theological significance is expressed either by his evaluative comments or by their position in the literary context.

The account of Jotham's building activities (2 Chr 27:3-4) seems somewhat different from other cases: (1) the addition



continues from the original notice in Kings, (2) the rather generalized wordings are used, and (3) it is paralleled with Uzziah's building project. All these suggest the Chronicler's hand here.<sup>31</sup> As in other cases, the account fulfills a faithfulness-blessings pattern, but the Chronicler may have also changed or added minor expressions in order to suggest a typological correspondence with Uzziah's activities. In using Samuel-Kings he does change expressions for that purpose, though he always has historical events to work on (see the previous chapter). Since he compares Jotham's reign with Uzziah's (2 Kgs 15:34 // 2 Chr 27:2), he may have allowed himself to extend the parallel to building activity. As Uzziah's rebuilding of the Tower on the Corner Gate, the Valley Gate and the Angle already corresponds with Jotham's building of the Upper Gate (2 Kgs 15:35 // 2 Chr 27:3), he may have added "the wall of Ophel" to Jotham's work to match it with more items in Uzziah's list, and for Uzziah's towers and cisterns in the wilderness, "fortifications and towers in forested areas" are compared. With or without an additional source, his additions are simply meant to suggest the typological relationship between Uzziah's building activities and Jotham's activities rather than to testify to an otherwise unreported event.

b. Army Organization

Another group of additions used to support the Chronicler's positive evaluation of "good" kings is a notice of army organizations. Although the Chronicler mostly uses the parallel materials in presenting the establishment of David and Solomon's reigns, in 1 Chr 11-12 he employs extra-biblical lists of David's mighty men to emphasize the unanimous support David received. The Chronicler transposes the list at the appendix of David's history in 2 Sam 23:8-35 to 1 Chr 11:10-41a at the beginning of David's reign to start off his more extensive list. The list is supplemented with additional names in vv. 41b-47, and in chap. 12 five more materials of David's supporters are included. As the Chronicler repeatedly comments (1 Chr 11:10; 12:1, 9, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 39), they are collected and joined together here in order to show how David gained cumulative support from the army, and finally from all Israel, to be a king.

However such theological motivation to create an impressive list of David's supporters does not necessarily mean they are unhistorical fabrications. M. Noth regards the additional names in 11:41b-47 as fictitious, suggesting that some post-exilic families wished to trace their ancestry back to one of David's thirty heroes.<sup>22</sup> However, as Williamson correctly points out, their places of origin are mostly either unknown or Transjordan which is then seen with suspicion (cf.

Reuben [vs. 42], Ashtaroth, Aroer [vs. 44], Moab, Mahanaim [vs. 46], Zoba[?] [vs. 47] and it is unlikely to be forged in the post-exilic community.<sup>33</sup> The four more lists of David's mighty men in 12:1-21 [20] also seem to be based on some earlier sources. Whereas the framework combines them to form one extensive section of David's supporters, the way the lists enroll mighty men differs significantly among them (cf. vv. 3-5 with 5-8 [7], 10-14 [9-13], and 21 [20]), indicating that the Chronicler uses various lists for his own purpose and he does not compose them by himself.<sup>34</sup> Williamson also identifies the poetic fragment in vs. 19 as composed of short sayings of loyalty to David from the early days of the monarchy.<sup>35</sup> The list of armed troops from the twelve tribes in 12:24-38 is also unlikely to be invented by the Chronicler. Not only do the snippets of tradition qualifying the troops not contribute to the Chronicler's purpose in these chapters, but also the numbers of the Northern tribes are considerably higher than those of Benjamin, Judah, and Levi, on which he focuses attention throughout his work.<sup>36</sup> It is thus evident that the Chronicler uses various earlier sources to show how David was unanimously supported.

In the history of the post-Solomonic kings (2 Chr 14:8; 17:14-19; and 26:11-15), large army organization constantly follows notice of the kings' faithful acts, together with building activities, to form positive descriptions. It is

noteworthy that after the completion of the Temple Solomon's army details are recorded with his building activities (2 Chr 8:7-10). Welten thus argues that these army details were simply fabricated from the Hellenistic army of his day to illustrate the kind of blessings that good kings enjoyed.<sup>37</sup>

However, that they are used as recurring motifs of the blessed reign does not necessarily mean that they do not reflect real historical information (cf. the building theme above). For example, the note on Asa's army in 2 Chr 14:8 follows his reform and subsequent building activities, but Williamson and Junge defend its historicity.<sup>38</sup> Whereas Welten argues that the list does not include the number of chariots, the most common weapon, Williamson correctly points out that the information given here is not of a standing army but of a conscript army, and the absence of chariots is not strange. The verse clearly concerns the conscript army, because the divisions are given according to tribes, the numbers of soldiers are larger than what we expect for a standing army, and the expressions used for troops are different from those of a professional army. It is acknowledged by many writers that the Chronicler has access to such a military census list organized on a tribal basis.<sup>39</sup> Besides Williamson's argument we can also note that Welten's point is an "argument from silence" and it is questionable whether only one verse should give every detail of the army. Welten also objects to the



historicity of the precise correspondence between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin and the weapons they use. But Williamson again points out that 'Judah' and 'Benjamin' as technical terms in the army context had ceased to be mere tribal names and had come to mean the "heavy" and "light" regiments. Junge also detects an authentic source here in its "concise, clear and matter of fact style."<sup>40</sup> The Chronicler's theological interests cannot be found in the verse itself, and follow only from its placement in the context.

Additionally the large numbers ascribed to the army are probably not meant to magnify the king's strength. As we shall see below, in the case of Amaziah the numbers of soldiers are counted not to show their strength but to suggest their weakness, yet they are still enormous. Myers and J. Wenham suggest that they are not exaggerations but  $\text{qly}$  in the army context does not mean "thousand" but "unit" or "the professional soldier".<sup>41</sup> If they are correct, this verse gives more realistic numbers, and there is no reason to doubt its basic historical trustworthiness.

Similarly, although the record of Jehoshaphat's army (2 Chr 17:13b-19) follows the regular pattern of faithful acts and blessings, it seems to reflect an older source. Just as in the case of Asa's army, the reportage style of the section, especially the inclusion of details such as many personal names, makes it difficult to suppose that it is totally



fictitious.<sup>42</sup> The remark in 16a "who volunteered himself for the service of the Lord" (NIV) is also suggestive that this part was taken from a longer record of heroes.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, if we follow Williamson's view, there is a confusion between the standing army and the conscript army in this list.<sup>44</sup> The names of commanders, that they were in Jerusalem (13b), and that they "were in the service of the king" suggest that the list concerns the standing army. On the other hand, the introduction to the list, "muster of them by father's houses" (14a) and their division according to tribes indicate a conscript army. Although it is no longer possible to reconstruct the original source, such confusion again points to underlying sources behind the list.

There are less positive indications of an older source for Uzziah's army (2 Chr 26:11-15), but objections to its historicity are, again, not compelling. Firstly, the large numbers involved can be explained by a different understanding of  $\text{אלפים}$ . If we follow Myers, there are only six hundred chiefs ( $\text{אלפים}$ ) instead of two thousand and six hundred (vs. 12), and three hundred units ( $\text{אלפים}$ ) of seven thousand and five hundred men (vs. 13).<sup>45</sup> Secondly, though Welten argues that "catapults" were not invented in Uzziah's time and are an anachronism from the Chronicler's own day, the expression ( $\text{חַשְׁבֵּנֹת נִיחָשְׁבֵּת חֹשֶׁב}$ ) is not necessarily to be translated as "catapults".<sup>46</sup> Since  $\text{חַשְׁבֵּנֹת}$  is derived from the

root  $\text{לשן}$  "to think", it literally means "contrivances",  
 "the invention of inventive men", and probably refers to  
 "protective or shielding devices from which the defenders could  
 shoot arrows and hurl stones at the attackers".<sup>47</sup> As such a  
 device is illustrated in the Assyrian relief of the siege of  
 Lachish, only some forty years later, we do not need to find an  
 anachronism here.<sup>48</sup> Thirdly, though Williamson suggests that  
 the Chronicler's characteristic use of the phrase "to help the  
 king" in vs. 13 might indicate his own composition here, this  
 does not necessarily mean the content is also from himself. As  
 we saw in the examples of building activities, the Chronicler  
 sometimes rewrites inherited material with his own vocabulary.  
 Rather, the details such as the names of scribes in vs 11, which  
 are not necessary for his theological points, may indicate an  
 underlying source. Therefore, while positive evidence for  
 historical sources is not as strong as elsewhere, objections  
 against its historical validity are not convincing, either.  
 Moreover, the view that the Chronicler fabricates the army  
 materials to support his pattern of blessings is challenged by  
 another piece of army information in 2 Chr 25:5, where it is  
 not used to enhance the picture of Amaziah,<sup>49</sup> but is rather  
 meant to suggest that Amaziah's army was not sufficient, as  
 clearly shown in the following verse where he hires mercenaries  
 from northern Israel. The ambiguous evaluation of his reign

before this verse (vv 2-4) and the Lord's disapproval of his acts in vs. 6 (vv 7-10) also indicate that the context does not provide a pattern of faithful king and blessings. The verse belongs to the following narrative of Amaziah's war against Edom, and as we shall see below the narrative itself is probably based on a reliable source. The numbers of the soldiers also suggest the realistic nature of the verse. While Asa had five hundred and eighty thousand and Jehoshaphat a million and a hundred and sixty thousand, Amaziah had only three hundred thousand men, and this reflects the lowering of the military power then. If we are correct in seeing that 2 Chr 25:5 is used negatively, the army notices are not decisive signs of blessings. Although in the above three passages they are used in positive patterns, we must be careful not to assume immediately that the Chronicler believes they are by themselves sufficient to support his point and thus made them up. Rather, it is easier to suppose that the Chronicler had some historical information, and sometimes interprets them positively, and at other times negatively, in order to use them for the appropriate theological message.

#### c. Large Family

Reports of many wives and children are also added by the Chronicler as signs of blessings received by faithful kings. Rehoboam's eighteen wives, sixty concubines, twenty eight sons



and sixty daughters (2 Chr 11:18-23) clearly indicate the establishment of the kingdom in reward for his faithfulness, not for they are mentioned immediately after vs. 17: "They probably strengthened the kingdom of Judah, and for these years they it made Rehoboam the son of Solomon secure, for they walked for three years in the way of David and Solomon". Abijah's large family (2 Chr 13:21) likewise portrays the reward for his reliance upon the Lord, because it follows his victory (vs. 17 "[Abijah and Judah] prevailed, because they relied upon the Lord, the God of their fathers") and vs. 21a "But Abijah grew mighty". Joash's family details (2 Chr 24:3) function in the same way, as vs. 2 states "And Joash did what was right in the eyes of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest", and indicates that the threat to the Davidic line described in chapters 21-23 is now finally evaded.<sup>99</sup> The parallel can be further drawn from David's family details 1 Chr 14:3-7, though here the Chronicler clearly uses 2 Sam 5:13-16 as his source. They suggest the establishment of his power (cf. vs. 2) following his care for the ark.

The As with building activities and army organization, however, theological use of family details does not necessarily suggest their fictitiousness. Apart from 1 Chr 14:3-7, there are enough indications of underlying sources in other passages. Many of the names given in Rehoboam's family (2 Chr 11:18-23) are unknown elsewhere and it is difficult to believe that the

Chronicler makes up such a problematic list without any historical tradition.<sup>51</sup> For example, Jerimoth in vs. 18 is not mentioned in any other genealogy of David's sons and probably his mother was a concubine.<sup>52</sup> If the list were fabrication, it would be highly unlikely that the Chronicler would introduce Jerimoth, especially calling him David's son. The names of his sons in vv. 19-20 are unique here and cannot be derived from any other Scriptural passages. In vs. 20, Rehoboam's beloved wife is called "Maacha the daughter of Absalom", while in 13:2 she is introduced as "Micaiah the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah". Although 1 Kgs 15:2 gives "Maacha the daughter of Abisalom" and she is probably Absalom's granddaughter and Uriel's daughter, it is improbable that the Chronicler uses two different names and parentages if he does not have a source to draw on.<sup>53</sup> As a whole the account is written in a matter-of-fact style and circumstantial details such as Rehoboam's action in vs. 23 suggest some older source about Rehoboam's family life.

Joash's family details in 2 Chr 24:3 are more general and much shorter, but most likely reflect a reliable tradition. The number of Joash's wives here, two, is very modest against Rehoboam's eighteen and Abijah's fourteen, and this suggests that theological interest does not surmount factual report. If the Chronicler created this freely, he would probably have introduced more wives.

the disastrous defeat and horrible death through disease.



Altho The report of Abijah's family structure in 2 Chr 13:21 is also short and here it is difficult to find any positive ~~warns~~ indications of an underlying source. It in fact sets the climax of the Chronicler's positive description of Abijah's ~~gard~~ reign.<sup>54</sup> But we have already seen that many passages which the Chronicler uses for his theological purpose are still based on an older source. CM suggests that his three year reign is too short for a large harem, but when Abijah became a king, most likely he had already reached manhood and this objection is not convincing.<sup>55</sup> CM's further suggestion that Abijah had no son, because he was succeeded by his *brother* Asa is also not strong. Although the argument is based on 1 Kgs 15:10, where Abijah's mother Maacha is called Asa's mother, usually she is understood as "grandmother" of Asa and probably she was still acting as "queen mother" in the beginning of Asa's reign.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore this view clashes with 1 Kgs 15:8, where Asa is explicitly called Abijah's son. Therefore, though we can provide no positive evidence for a source, the arguments against it are not compelling, either.

Furthermore, the addition of Jehoshaphat's many sons (2 Chr 21:2-4) is not used to establish a faithfulness-blessings pattern, but to illustrate the wickedness of his son Jehoram. Jehoram killed all his brothers (vs. 4), and this together with his idolatry (vs. 6), set the tone of his reign and drew down the disastrous defeat and horrible death through disease.


Although a "large family" is often used as a sign of blessing, here it is used for a completely opposite purpose. This warns us not to be too quick to see the "large family" as a sufficient element in a pattern of blessings and thus to regard it as a fabrication by the Chronicler to support his positive theological evaluation of the reign. As for this particular notice, again it is probably based on a historical source. The killing of all the possible rivals in the king's family could be developed from vs. 7 // 2 Kgs 8:19 with similar events in Judg 9:5; 2 Kgs 10:11; 11:1, but not necessarily so.<sup>57</sup> Such an event is not uncommon in history. The names of Jehoshaphat's sons in vs. 2 and details which have little to do with the theme in vs. 3, suggest its authentic nature.<sup>58</sup> The account as a whole is written in reportage style and the Chronicler's characteristic expressions cannot be found. Though "large family" may not be a decisive element for blessings, it is rather unlikely that the Chronicler turns Jehoshaphat's large family into a negative story against his usual pattern without any historical basis.

Other precious metals or treasures (1 Chr 29:2-4; 2 Chr 3:17-9:28; 32:27-30). Wealth reserved expression "sons of the Philistines" also point to the blessing that the faithful king received is also underlined by a description of his wealth. This may be compared with the great wealth Solomon received after his faithful completion of the Temple (2 Chr 8:17-9:28). The

report of tributes brought to Jehoshaphat in 2 Chr 17:11 follows that of his religious reform and the rest given to him (vs. 10), thus setting the pattern of faithfulness-blessing. The tributes are accounted together with his building activities (vv. 12-13a) and his army organization (13b-19). Hezekiah's wealth (2 Chr 32:27-29) points to the reward he received, for the Chronicler evaluates his reign as a whole very positively; notably, the verse before it (vs. 26) describes Hezekiah's humility before the Lord. We could also include Uzziah's agricultural wealth in 2 Chr 26:10 here, but we have dealt with it earlier.

The theological function of these notices, nevertheless, does not of itself guarantee their fictitious nature. Uzziah's emphasis on agriculture and his cisterns and towers are convincingly supported by archaeological discoveries. Although historical bases for other notices cannot be shown conclusively, there are some indications. The tributes to Jehoshaphat are too modest to create an impression of wealth, for they are only flocks and silver and do not include any other precious metals or treasures (cf. 2 Chr 8:17-9:28; 32:27-30).<sup>59</sup> The reserved expression "some of the Philistines" also points to a possible historical source. The Philistines and the Arabs (if they lived near the Philistines) are likely to have paid tribute to Jehoshaphat, because his father Asa "smote all the cities near Gerar" (2 Chr 14:14).<sup>60</sup> The identification

The last item used for a description of blessings received of Zerah the Cushite, whether Ethiopian or Bedouin, does not have much bearing on this issue, for Asa devastated this area and such accounts are at times of a negative description of kings' reigns (cf. next section).<sup>61</sup> Jehoshaphat's relatively prosperous reign is also implied by his establishment of a stable relationship with the northern Israel for the first time (2 Kgs 22:44).<sup>62</sup> Thus the theological dimension of the report does not necessarily deny its basic historicity.

Hezekiah's great wealth and his building of storehouses are also likely to be historical. His victory over the Philistines (2 Kgs 18:8, no parallel in Chr) and less pressure from the Assyrians before his revolt probably made him more prosperous.<sup>63</sup> The building of storehouses is also quite probably a measure to tighten up the tax-collecting procedures to prepare for the revolt against the Assyrians. Hezekiah's careful preparation is known from the construction of an aqueduct (2 Chr 32:2ff), rebuilding of the city wall (vs. 5) and strengthening of the military (vs. 6).<sup>64</sup> Indeed the change of royal steward from Shebna to Eliakim (Isa 22; 2 Kgs 18:18) may point to restructuring of the royal administrative system.<sup>65</sup> Reorganization of administrative districts can be reflected by  seal impressions on storage jars found in Judea, and four place names appearing on them may represent newly established administrative centres.<sup>66</sup>



e. War (Victory), (d) cultic purity of the Lord's army

(13:1) The last item used for a description of blessings received by "good" kings is an account of war. War can be disastrous and such accounts are at times used for negative description of kings' reigns (cf. next section), but the following seven cases are clearly meant to be signs of divine blessings.

Although Abijah's campaign against the North (2 Chr 13:2b-20) does not follow faithful acts by the king or the people, Abijah's speech (vv 4b-12) and the Chronicler's comment in vs. 18 suggest that within the account itself Judah's victory is seen as reward for Judah's trust in the Lord and judgment on Israel's rebellion. Vs. 18 states "Thus the men of Israel were subdued at that time, and the men of Judah help prevailed, because they relied upon the Lord, God of their fathers". Judah's cry to the Lord (vs. 14) reminds us of Solomon's prayer that the Lord would hear his people's prayer at time of battle (6:34-35). Besides these theological Exod comments and speeches attached to the narrative, the event itself is presented in a standardized fashion of a holy war type scene and the fight is clearly seen as a display of the power of the Lord on behalf of his people. Dillard lists the following holy war motifs: (a) much larger size of the foe (13:3; cf. Deut 20:2; 2 Chr 14:8-9; 20:2), (b) a speech before the battle to assure that the Lord will give victory (13:5-13; cf. Deut 20:1-4; 2 Chr 20:5-17), (c) an offer of peace (13:5-



13; cf. Deut 20:10), (d) cultic purity of the Lord's army (13:10-11; cf. 1 Sam 21:4-5, Josh 5:1-8; 7-13; 2 Chr 20:3-4), and (e) the battle cry and the trumpets (13:12-15; cf. Num 10:8-9; 31:6; Josh 6; 2 Chr 20:18-22).<sup>67</sup> Although the form of holy war is not strictly fixed, the above motifs are all characteristic elements.

30) Asa's defence against Zerah the Cushite (2 Chr 14:9-15) also constitutes a part of the account of blessings he received. Contextually, it follows Asa's religious reforms (14:1-5), his building activities, and his army (14:6-8). Asa's prayer before the fight (vs. 11) parallels Solomon's request. The characteristic holy war style of the battle report also emphasizes the initiative the Lord takes to help his people: cf. fighting against a numerically greater army (14:8-9), a prayer before the battle (14:11), the Lord's initiative and total passivity of the army (14:12-13), and the fear of the Lord prevailing upon the enemies (14:14; cf. Exod 23:28, Deut 7:20, 23).

Jehoshaphat's war against the Moabites, Ammonites and their allies in 2 Chr 20 fits this pattern again. It is preceded by the account of his judicial reform (19:4-11) and his reliance on the Lord is expressed by his long prayer (20:5-13). The Lord's response to it is clearly shown by the prophecy of Jahaziel (vv. 14-17) and the battle is described with holy war motifs: a much larger number of enemies (vv. 2,

12, 15), the pre-battle prayer (vv. 3-13), the Lord's active involvement in fighting (vv. 15-17, 22), the exhortation not to fear (vv. 15, 17, 20), the role of music (vv. 19-21, 28), the employment of an ambush (vs. 22; cf. 2 Chr 13:13), self-destruction of the enemies (vv. 23, cf. Judg 7:22; 1 Sam 14:20), and the fear of the Lord among the nations (vv. 29-30).

The account of Hezekiah's victory over Sennacherib (2 Chr 32:1-23) is started with "after these things and these acts of faithfulness" (vs. 1a) and is apparently intended to be the direct consequence of his extensive religious reformation (2 Chr 29-31). The negotiations between Hezekiah and Sennacherib's envoys go around the question whether the Lord is really reliable and powerful (cf. esp. vs. 10) and the Chronicler inserts Hezekiah's pre-battle speech to express his complete faith in the Lord (vv. 7-8). Although most of the other holy war motifs are already in Kings text, it is noteworthy that the Chronicler retains them to form a more straightforward holy war account: the numerically superior and more powerful foe (vv. 7, 13-15), pre-battle speech and exhortation not to fear (vv. 7-8), prayer to the Lord (vs. 20), the Lord's initiative in fighting and the passivity of the king (vs. 21), complete destruction of the foe (v. 21), and the rest given to the king (vv. 22-23).

tribe The case of Amaziah's campaign against Edom (2 Chr 25:5-13) is more subtle, for "he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, yet not with a blameless heart" (vs. 2). To prepare for the war, he hires mercenaries from Israel and is accused of lack of faith in the Lord by a prophet (vv. 6-8). Nevertheless, Amaziah accepts the prophet's word and dismisses the mercenaries. Since the prophet's message focuses on the importance of relying solely on the Lord and His sovereign power to decide the outcome of the battle, Amaziah's victory is seen as the reward for his obedience to the Lord. Although it is not written in a typical holy war pattern, indifference to the number of the army (cf. 13:3-18; 14:8-15; 1 Kgs 20:27; 1 Sam 14:6; Judg 7), stress on the Lord's "power to help" (vs. 8) and overwhelming victory parallel it.

Uzziah's conquest of the Philistines and his reception of tribute (2 Chr 26:6-8) is written in a summary fashion and not as a full holy war account.<sup>71</sup> But it is immediately preceded by the statement in vs. 5b: "as long as he sought the Lord, God made him prosper", and is followed by the descriptions of his building activities, wealth and army (vv. 9-15), and apparently it forms a part of the blessings Uzziah enjoyed because he sought the Lord. A short comment concerning his victory against the Philistines and others, "God helped him", (vs. 7) also suggests that his successful war is God's gift. The summary of Jotham's victory over the Ammonites and the



tributes he received from them (2 Chr 27:5) is likewise a sign of his positive reign. It is placed beside his building activities (vv. 3-4) and flanked by the evaluative statements "And he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord according to all that his father had done" (vs. 2a) and "So Jotham became mighty, because he ordered his ways before the Lord his God" (vs. 6). Therefore victories are also used to describe the positive reigns of "good" kings, though unlike other elements they are not always seen as the results of the previous faithful actions and their faith is often tested within the war account itself.

The theological function of these war accounts, however, does not suggest that they are created without consideration of their historical probabilities. In fact at least for two passages a strong case for their historical character could be established.

It is true that Amaziah's war in 2 Chr 25:5-13 betrays the Chronicler's style and CM even called it "wholly a product of Midrashic fancy" on 2 Kgs. 14:7, but a number of details indicate the use of some other source.<sup>72</sup> As commentators have pointed out, the raid of the Ephraimite mercenaries in vs. 13 conflicts with the promise of vs. 9, which guarantees God's help for Amaziah if he discharges the mercenaries.<sup>73</sup> Here the Chronicler does not supply any retributational rationale why obedient Amaziah had to suffer from such a trouble. Unless he

is writing under the constraint of an older source, it can be hardly explained why he develops the story like that. Likewise the cities the Ephraimites plundered, "from Samaria to Beth Horon", (vs. 13) are least expected if the account was freely fabricated. Whereas vs. 10 writes they were dismissed and "returned home in fierce anger", the direction of the plunder from north to south suggests that this plundering did not take place on the return journey but at some later time.<sup>74</sup> Samaria is situated inside the northern territory and can hardly be considered a Judean town that the Ephraimites would attack.<sup>75</sup> Yet, as Keil and CM suggest, probably Samaria was meant to be simply the starting point of the raid, and historically it is possible that they waited for the opportunity until Amaziah left for his campaign against Edom. Thus, though the Chronicler's description of the situation makes sense, it is not the most natural or obvious area or timing which the Chronicler would have chosen if it were a free composition. J.R. Bartlett also suggests that Amaziah's dismissal of the Ephraimite mercenaries is historically probable, though in the narrative it is theologically interpreted.<sup>76</sup> Since Israel and Edom had a good relationship then, it is possible that they "were not thought to be reliable against the Edomites".

It is also difficult to accept the view that the destruction of ten thousand Edomites at the rock in vs. 12 (or even the whole account) is a theological elaboration of 2 Kgs



14:7: "[Amaziah] took Sela by storm, and called it Jokteel."<sup>77</sup> Sela in Kings is often understood as a proper name and be Negev identified with Petra, the story being developed from to his "Jokteel", which means "God kills". However, the the fortress identification of Sela is by no means certain. Sela can mean "rock" even in Kings, and it is not necessarily to be military understood as a proper name. It is indeed unlikely that his Amaziah captured the Edomite capital, since he could not take even Eilat (cf. 2 Chr 26:2).<sup>78</sup> The tradition of calling Petra Jokteel is not anywhere preserved, despite its relatively prominent position. Therefore it is possible that the Kings text itself alludes to the same incident, but the Chronicler has access to a fuller account and preserves it. If we take all indications together, the account of Amaziah's campaign is much more likely to be the Chronicler's composition based on an additional source than a midrashic expansion of 2 Kgs 14:7.

Uzziah's conquest of the Philistines and other people in 2 Chr 26:6-8 also seems to be historical. As commentators have pointed out, his move toward the west and south is quite Holy probable, given the political situation of his rule.<sup>79</sup> Expansion to the north was impossible because of Jeroboam's strong reign in Israel.<sup>80</sup> But the campaign against the been Philistines makes excellent strategic sense to control the international trade route the "Via Maris". Uzziah's Province restoration of the port of Eilat (vs. 2) and his subsequent

fame which "spread even to the border of Egypt" (vs. 8) thus underline his policy. Besides Uzziah's fortresses in the Negev and other southern areas, already mentioned in relation to his agricultural activities, Myers has suggested that the fortress at Tel Mor near Ashdod may be identified as Uzziah's work (vs. 6).<sup>81</sup> The Chronicler also reports Uzziah's extensive military activities in an itemized fashion with specific names, and his characteristic expressions or stylized "holy war" pattern are not prominent. Especially the reference to Jabneh, which is not found anywhere else in OT, makes it difficult to suppose the report a pure fabrication.<sup>82</sup> For the rest of the victory accounts it is not easy to show conclusive evidence for their historicity or underlying sources, but besides the theologically oriented description of the events there are no strong objections which make it necessary to doubt their basic trustworthiness. Few people would deny that the Chronicler's account of Abijah's campaign against the North (2 Chr 13) serves his theological purpose, for it is written in the set form of Holy War and includes a highly theological speech by Abijah. However, the question of a historical kernel to the war report itself has not been conclusively settled. The issue has been discussed around the geographical details in 2 Chr 13:4 and 19. F.M. Cross and G.E. Wright relate them with the Judean Province List in Josh 18:21-24 and identify the latter as the

administrative list of the area conquered by Abijah and thus defend its historicity.<sup>83</sup> But their interpretation and dating of the list have been seriously challenged by Y. Aharoni.<sup>84</sup> Peter Welten, who denies the historical bases of most of the additional materials, also argues that the cities mentioned here are well-known cities from the post-exilic period and that they do not suggest an older source.<sup>85</sup> Yet his argument is correctly criticised by R. Klein.<sup>86</sup> Since at least two out of three cities, Bethel and Ophrah, are attested in the earlier period of Israel's history and, if textual restoration is allowed, Jeshnah is also found in 1 Sam 7:12 and Josh 18:22, they do not necessarily reflect a later situation.<sup>87</sup> Klein himself suggests that the Chronicler uses Josh 18:21-24 to write up the geographical specificity of Abijah's expansion to the Benjamite cities. Josh 18:21-24 includes Zemaraim (2 Chr 13:4) and Bethel and Ophrah (2 Chr 13:19), and Jeshanah could be textually restored. But Klein's view is in turn questioned by Dillard:

it is hardly surprising that two sources reporting the events within the borders of Benjamin would mention some of the same cities. There is a high probability that some of the same cities would be mentioned, and this vitiates the value of these city names as evidence that the Chronicler borrowed them from Josh 18 to provide concreteness for an otherwise spurious story.<sup>88</sup>

Thus it is quite insecure to base our argument for or against the historicity of the account on these city names.



Welten and Klein also see in the Chronicler's intention to see the first four kings of Judah in a favourable light the motivation for the radical change of Abijah's character from the "evil" king in 1Kgs 15 (see especially vs. 3). However, that the Chronicler wanted to see Rehoboam's reign thoroughly positively is quite doubtful and thus there is no reason to suppose that he should have felt obliged to present Abijah positively.<sup>89</sup> Therefore, despite little evidence for its historicity, the arguments against it are not compelling, either. The present writer would rather agree with Williamson, who writes; "it is still questionable whether he [the Chronicler] would have arrived at it [the favourable judgment] in the first place had he not had in addition to Kings some account of a victory by Abijah over the north, from which in his usual way he would then have deduced Abijah's faithfulness".<sup>90</sup> The historicity of Asa's victory over Zerah the Cushite (2 Chr 14:9-15) is also rejected by Welten because of the Chronicler's characteristic style in the narrative.<sup>91</sup> But most other commentators suggest possible historical reconstructions. Albright postulates that Egypt established a buffer state of Nubian mercenaries at Gerar, and the incident at issue is their invasion of Judah.<sup>92</sup> This view, however, is no longer well accepted, because there is no evidence of the existence of such a buffer state and Asa's pursuit of Zerah to Gerar (vs. 13)

does not suggest that the latter came from that area.<sup>93</sup> Many other scholars believe that the Cushites were a nomadic tribe living in the south of Judah and the invasion was historically on a much smaller scale than the Chronicler's account.<sup>94</sup> This is supported by the reference to herdsmen, sheep, and camels in vs. 15 and the parallelism between Cush and Midian in Hab. 3:7. The identity of Moses' wife may further support the relationship between them, if a daughter of a priest of Midian (Exod 2:16-21; 3:1) is the same woman as a Cushite woman in Num 12:1. Nevertheless, this proposal is also not without its difficulties. The mere allusion to camels etc. does not make the invaders bedouins, for "even a sedentary population engaged in caravan trade".<sup>95</sup> The apparent reference to this incident in 16:8 mentions the Libyans as well as the Cushite and this cannot be explained if it was only a local skirmish. (cf. 12:3 as well). The significance of the battle is also deduced from 17:10-11, which states Asa's son Jehoshaphat received tributes from the area he conquered. If "Ammonites" should be read The most literal view, and to me the most plausible view, is proposed by K.A. Kitchen: the Egyptian Pharaoh Osorkon I was already old and sent a Nubian (i.e., Cushite) general to lead a force to Palestine to follow his father's (Shishak) example.<sup>96</sup> Since Zerah is not called a king but simply a Cushite and Osorkon I was of Libyan origin, this view satisfies the statement of 16:8. The Cushites are also involved in an



Egyptian force in 12:3 and are better understood as the people from the upper Nile region. This understanding does not exclude the possibility of the participation of bedouins, but the major force was Egyptian and thus Asa could extend his territory to the southwest (cf. 17:10-11).<sup>97</sup> Moreover, Mareshah (vv. 9-10) is one of the cities fortified by Rehoboam to defend the south west and the pursuit to Gerar (vv. 13-14) is quite natural for an attack from that direction. Although concrete evidence for the historical reconstruction cannot be presented, the incident clearly makes excellent sense in its political situation and the geographical details indicate some underlying source.

On the short notice of Jotham's war with the Ammonites (2 Chr 27:5) little can be said with certainty, but again historically the incident is not improbable.<sup>98</sup> Commentators have pointed out that "Ammonites" here can be a textual confusion of "Meunites" so that Jotham simply followed his father's policy (Cf 26:7f).<sup>99</sup> If "Ammonites" should be retained in the text, on the other hand, Judah's war with them is still possible, though they do not share a common boundary. After the death of the powerful king Jeroboam II, Israel was rapidly losing influence in the Transjordan, and it is quite likely that both Judah and the Ammonites were interested in it.<sup>100</sup> Jotham's power in this area seems to be reflected in 1 Chr 5:17.<sup>101</sup> This increasing influence of Judah is probably

the background of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition against it, and ceasing of the tributes by the Ammonites after the third year may indicate the ascendancy of the rival Aram in the region.<sup>102</sup>

The battle of Jehoshaphat against Moabites, Ammonites, and Meunites (2 Chr 20) was regarded as a midrash on 2 Kgs 3 by older commentators.<sup>103</sup> But this view is mostly discarded by more recent studies (with the notable exception of P. Welten), because its points of contact with 2 Kgs 3 are rather limited and geographical details can be better understood with some other source.<sup>104</sup> The most commonly accepted view today is Rudolph's modification of Noth's proposal.<sup>105</sup> Noth argues that since the otherwise uncommon place-names in the text set up an intelligible route for the invasion, the account must reflect precise local knowledge, probably a tradition of a Nabatean attack in the third century. Accepting the basic point, Rudolph maintains that the Meunites are not necessarily associated with the Nabateans and the tradition is not to be dated so late. He also points out that the expression "Hazazon-tamar (that is Eingedi)" (vs. 2) is the Chronicler's editorial note and supports an earlier written source for the Chronicler's account. Williamson also suggests that another note "to this day" on the name "Valley of Beracah" is a confirmation of a received tradition by an editor and further points to the Chronicler's reworking of the source.

In vs. 1 he changes "in the fourteenth year of

Hezekiah's deliverance from Sennacherib (2 Chr 32:1-23) is also defined as "midrash" by B.S. Childs, for it aims to solve the difficulties arising from the sacred text and to assign contemporary theological significance to the text.<sup>106</sup> The problem in the Kings text is that there are three rather different sets of Assyrian threat and resolution in one literary section (<A> 2 Kgs 18:13-16; <B1> 18:17-19:9a, 36-37; <B2> 19:9b-35) and it is hard to decide how to interpret them. Although the final form of the text apparently suggests a two-stage Assyrian invasion, the widely held opinion is that they represent three distinct phases in the theological development of one tradition; B1 account is a theological interpretation of the historical report in A account and B2 is a further development of the B1 account.<sup>107</sup> If it is true that literary tradition can grow independently of historical events, it is not hard to see 2 Chr 32 as midrash on the Kings text.<sup>108</sup>

However, here our primary interest is not whether Kings' multiple accounts are historically independent reports or products of successive theological reflection. Rather we are concerned with whether *the Chronicler reads Kings* as a historical source or as a sacred text to exegete. It is true that the Chronicler recasts the three reports into one Assyrian threat and the Lord's deliverance, and that many modifications serve not only for abridgement but to create his theological picture. In vs. 1 he changes "in the fourteenth year of

Hezekiah" to "after these things" to directly connect Hezekiah's deliverance with his reforms in previous chapters, and this weakens the historical character of the account.<sup>109</sup> He also omits the details which might give the impression that the Assyrian invasion was really devastating, because his emphasis is on the Lord's deliverance.<sup>110</sup> Thus he does not include Hezekiah's paying tribute (A account; 2 Kgs 18:14-16) or the great size of the Assyrian army (cf. 2 Kgs 18:17; 19:35-37). The Chronicler also inserts Hezekiah's speech in the form of a Levitical sermon (vv. 7-8) to clarify that the king is trusting in the Lord and that this is a holy war.<sup>111</sup> At the same time he abridges the Rabshakeh's speech to omit the accusation that Hezekiah was relying on Egypt (2 Chr 18:23-25). At the end of the account he retains Hezekiah's prayer and the Lord's miraculous mighty act and supplies his own conclusion, focusing on the rest which he received.

Despite these theological changes, nevertheless, it is still doubtful that the Chronicler has no concern for historical facts. As D.N. Fewell has demonstrated, whatever the origin of materials may be, 2 Kgs 18-19 can be read as a cohesive account of Assyrian threat and the Lord's deliverance.<sup>112</sup> Most probably the Chronicler did not recognize the modern distinction between A, B1, and B2 and took the account as a whole to be a report of what happened in history. Thus, though his version is certainly theologically coloured,



the basic course of events is kept as described in Kings. Although he does not include Hezekiah's surrender (A; 2 Kgs 18:14-16), in Kings it is already reported in a summary form and the focus of the event is clearly on the deliverance.<sup>113</sup> Whether the Assyrian demand to surrender happened once or twice (cf. B1 and B2), the historian can summarize them into one general picture. Indeed in 2 Chr 32:16 he admits his abridgement. The Levitical sermon is his usual technique to give theological comment to the event, and we have already seen that the Chronicler often uses it in his historical report. Hezekiah's prayer, the Lord's miraculous act, even the death of Sennacherib are all in the Kings text. If the Chronicler takes the text as a whole as his historical source, it is very natural that he should understand this to be the final outcome of the event. Therefore his theological presentation does not conflict with the historical picture presented in the final form of Kings and there is no evidence that the Chronicler is only interested in theological interpretation of the tradition but not in the historical event.

Moreover, the Chronicler's historical interest can be underlined by his additional information on Hezekiah's preparations for the siege (vv. 2-5). As other similar examples, these building activities and the construction of Hezekiah's tunnel most probably reflect a real historical picture. Isa. 22:8-11 refers to the same point and is almost



unanimously supported by archaeological research.<sup>114</sup> Though these activities can be signs of blessings, unless the Chronicler has some historical interest it is hard to see why he introduces additional historical data in a purely theological exegesis of the text.

From the discussion above, it has become clear that despite the Chronicler's use of building activities, army, large family, wealth and victory accounts as recurrent motifs of blessing, most of them are likely to be based on some historical sources, Samuel-Kings or extra-biblical. Where he expands Samuel-Kings, new elements are limited to theological evaluations of the events and the basic course of events is retained as reported in the source. Where he adds new historical facts, the character of the materials, archaeological data, and their geo-political setting often strongly suggest that the Chronicler carefully uses historical information to present theological patterns he sees in Israel's history. Even where we do not have enough data to judge their reliability, the accounts are not improbable and they do not indicate the Chronicler's lack of historical interest. The Chronicler supplies bare information and the theological significance is indicated by the contexts and his editorial comments. Sometimes he also presents the accounts as type scenes or typologies, though we do not know how extensively he remodels them. However, even in the last two cases the

Chronicler's reports are not entirely divorced from historical traditions and the standardization of events does not deprive them of their historical nucleus or their individuality.

Therefore, the Chronicler does not seem to create convenient stories for his theological purposes, whether for interpretation or for a new work, but to demonstrate his theological interpretation of the historical events with extra materials..

## 2. Curses

### a. War (Defeat)

Just as a positive outcome in warfare is seen as a sign of blessing, a defeat is judged as a curse or punishment for unfaithfulness. Shishak's invasion of Judah during Rehoboam's reign (2 Chr 12:1-12) is presented as the result of Rehoboam's disobedience to the Lord, though in the middle he repents and the Lord shows him mercy. Already in Kings Rehoboam's idolatry (1 Kgs 14:22-24 // 2 Chr 12:1-2) and Shishak's invasion (1 Kgs 14:25-28 // 2 Chr 12:3-12) are set side by side, but the Chronicler explicates the retributinal relationship between them with his comments and new materials.<sup>115</sup> He sums up Rehoboam's sin with his characteristic vocabulary such as "forsook (  $\text{לָּוַן}$  ) the laws of the Lord" (vs. 1) and gives the reason for the invasion as "because they had been unfaithful (

אֲנִי אֶעֱזֹב) to the Lord" (vs. 2). His interpretation is underlined by the word play in the inserted speech (vs. 5); "You [Judah] abandoned ( אֶעֱזֹב ) me, so I [the Lord] have abandoned ( אֶעֱזֹב ) you." The use of אֶעֱזֹב also points to the parallel with the destruction of Saul in 1 Chr 10:13-14. The idea that destruction follows unfaithfulness is explicitly stated in God's response to Solomon's prayer in 2 Chr 7:19-22 and the Chronicler seems to interpret the events according to this pattern.

Jehoram's evil doings (2 Chr 21:5-7) and Edom's rebellion against him (2 Chr 21:8-10) also form a negative retributitional pattern, though the Chronicler is basically following the Kings text here. The Chronicler stresses their interconnection with the explanatory comment, "because he had forsaken the Lord, the God of his fathers (vs. 10b)". The same retributitional pattern is found in the additional account of Jehoram's unfaithfulness with Elijah's accusations (2 Chr 21:11-15) and the attacks of the Philistines and Arabs (2 Chr 21:16-17). These materials are completely new in Chronicles, and his positioning of the sequence, plus Elijah's prediction (vs. 14 cf. vs. 17) suggest that the raid was the result of Jehoram's idolatry.

The Aramean invasion during the reign of Joash (2 Chr 24:23-25a) is radically rewritten and set in a new literary context to be understood as the fulfilment of the curse for Joash's disobedience to the Lord. Whereas in Kings Joash's



reign is presented thoroughly positively, the Chronicler and includes the account of Joash's idolatry and killing of a true prophet (vv. 17-22) immediately before the invasion. Clearly the Chronicler sees the Aramean attack as a punishment, for he includes a speech of the prophet with characteristic language, "because you have forsaken the Lord, he has forsaken you" (vs. 20). The Chronicler writes that it was the Lord who delivered the people of Judah into the hands of the Arameans and adds a comment on the invasion "because they have forsaken the Lord, the God of their fathers" (vs. 24). Interestingly, the comment that the small Aramean army defeats "a very great army" of Joash is an exact reversal of the holy war motif.

The account of the Syro-Ephraimite war (2 Chr 28:5-7, 16-21) is completely rewritten from Kings (2 Kgs 16:5-7), and in Chronicles it is presented as God's judgment upon wicked Ahaz. While it follows the report of Ahaz' apostasy in both Kings and Chronicles (2 Kgs 16:2b-4 // 2 Chr 28:1b-4), Kings emphasizes the inability of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition to conquer Jerusalem while Chronicles focuses on the harm Judah suffered from the attack. Clearly the Chronicler intends to point out the retributinal relationship between them: God punishes apostasy with military defeat. The point is also reflected in his interpretation, which attributes the defeat to the Lord's plan (vs. 5a), and in his explanatory comment, "because they had forsaken the Lord, the God of their fathers" (vs. 6b). The

Chronicler adds more details of the damage Judah suffered and the deportation of the population of Judah (vv. 6-8). In the second half of the Kings account Tiglath-pileser accepts Ahaz' appeal for help by attacking Damascus, but the Chronicler passes over Tiglath-pileser's action completely and judges Ahaz' appeal to be of no use (vv. 20-21). For the Chronicler this appeal is seen as another act of unfaithfulness, for he regards reliance on other nations as a sign of lack of faith in the Lord. Instead he introduces two more invasions by the Edomites and the Philistines to Judah (vv. 17-18) and comments "For the Lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz king of Israel, for he had dealt wantonly in Judah and had been faithless ( *וַיִּעַל אֶל־יְהוָה* ) to the Lord" (vs. 19). Williamson has convincingly demonstrated that this whole account is meant to be a complete reversal of Abijah's holy war against the North (2 Chr 13) and suggests that Judah became as sinful as the North and was brought into exile. "

Josiah's death in battle (2 Chr 35:20-24) does not follow any other unfaithful acts, but within the account itself the Chronicler presents his misfortune as the result of his neglect of God's message. He puts into the mouth of Pharaoh Necho the view that his campaign is according to the divine order and consequently implies that Josiah's interference is against God's will. Thus the Chronicler explains why an otherwise very pious king died in such a tragic way.



Asa's war with Baasha (2 Chr 16:1-9) is also not preceded by his apostasy, but it sets a stage for his failure and his further involvement with continuous conflicts. Asa sought help from the Aramean king Benhadad and is accused by Hanani the prophet as lacking faith in the Lord (vv. 7-9). His prophetic speech underlines the retributitional relationship between Asa's foreign alliance and his wars (9b). Although the Chronicler's account of the warfare itself (vv. 1-6) is paralleled with Kings (1 Kgs 15:17-22), he introduces chronological notices (14:1; 15:10, 19; 16:1, 12, 13) to place the account within a retributitional framework.<sup>118</sup> Since he would have had a problem with Kings' account of a faithful king such as Asa suffering from continuous wars and disease, he divides Asa's reign into periods of obedience and disobedience. While 1 Kgs 15:16 states "there was war between Asa and Baasha king of Israel all their days", the Chronicler assigns peaceful years after Asa's reform and records the first conflict with Baasha as late as in his thirty-sixth year. Through this device, the Chronicler manages to change the problematic Kings text into clear examples of retributitional patterns.

Unlike the accounts of victories, most of the additional accounts of defeat are somehow based on Kings text. However, since they are substantially rewritten and new information is given, we must ask if the Chronicler has historical interest in introducing expansions to his *Vorlage*.

28) New materials in the Chronicler's account of Shishak's invasion (2 Chr 12:1-12) include the components of Shishak's army (vs. 3), their invasion route (vs. 4), Shemaiah's prophecy (vv. 5-8) and the Chronicler's evaluative comments (vv. 2b and 12). Though we shall discuss such comments and speeches in a later section, as for additional details of the Egyptian invasion (vv. 3-4) they seem to be based on reliable historical information. The reference to the Libyans is not surprising, for Shishak is the founder of the Libyan twenty-second dynasty and their association with the Cushites (Nubians) is known from the invasion of Zerah the Cushites during the reign of likely Shishak's son Osorkon I (cf. 2 Chr 14:8). The inclusion of the Sukkiim among the troops firmly establishes the Chronicler's reliance on an ancient source, because Sukkiim (Egyptian *Tjukten*) are attested as Libyan forces from the Egyptian record of the thirteenth-twelfth centuries B.C., while the Greek translators of Chronicles already did not understand the term.<sup>113</sup> Whereas vs. 4 states "[Shishak] took the fortified cities of Judah and came as far as Jerusalem", city names mentioned in Shishak's topographical list at the temple of Karnak do not include Jerusalem and indicate that the campaign was primarily aimed at the Northern kingdom and the Negev.<sup>114</sup> However, among the fortified cities Aijalon is mentioned, and both Chronicles and Kings report that Jerusalem was spared because Rehoboam paid the tribute ( vv. 9-11 // 1 Kgs 14:26-

28). The damage to Judah was probably minimal, owing either to the prompt tribute or the effectiveness of Rehoboam's fortification.<sup>121</sup> Therefore, though the Chronicler writes from a Judean perspective, historical details of vv. 3-4 seem to reflect authentic information.<sup>122</sup> (Sixty thousand Egyptian horsemen may be a hyperbole.) This suggests that the Chronicler does not freely elaborate the source for his theological needs but carefully bases his expansions on reliable historical data.

The additional report of the rebellion against Jehoram by the Philistines and the Arabs (2 Chr 21:16-17) is also likely to be based on an ancient source.<sup>123</sup> The plunder of the king's house may imply entrance into Jerusalem, but the Chronicler does not specify so and probably means to refer to a royal household in an outlying city. According to 2 Chr 17:11 the Philistines and the Arabs were under the control of his father Jehoshaphat. Since Jehoram failed to suppress the rebellions of the Edomites and Libnah in the neighbouring areas, it is not hard to imagine that it further encouraged other peoples to rebel against him.<sup>124</sup> Moreover, the use of the name "Jehoahaz" in vs. 17 contrasts with his normal usage "Ahaziah" (cf. 2 Chr. 22) and indicates the Chronicler's use of a source here.<sup>125</sup> Thus, although the Chronicler employs the relatively minor incident for a sign of divine judgement, he again bases his theological additions on independent historical information.



The Chronicler's substantial rewriting of the account of the Syro-Ephraimite war (2 Chr 28:5-7, 16-21) seems to reflect his historical interest. Whereas Kings focuses on the fact that Aram and Israel could not capture Jerusalem (1 Kgs 16:5), there are a number of indications that the considerable damage reported in Chronicles (vv.5-8) is historical. Since 1 Kgs 16:5-6 states that the invaders advanced as far as besieging Jerusalem and Elath was taken, it must have been a serious blow on Judah.<sup>126</sup> Isa 7:2,4 suggests that Ahaz and the people of Judah became fearful of them and that it was a serious threat for them.<sup>127</sup> The details such as titles and names in vs. 7 are also indications of the underlying source. Although the number of people killed (120,000) and deported (200,000) may be exaggerations, the Chronicler seems to base his elaborations on historical sources.<sup>128</sup> That he retains the historical information of Kings despite its totally opposite interpretation strongly suggests that he uses the Kings text as a historical source rather than a text to exegete and that he prefers to rely on historical reports rather than fabricating a totally new story.

The Chronicler's connection of Ahaz's appeal to Tiglath-pileser with invasions of the Edomites and the Philistines (2 Chr 28:1-4) again seems to reflect the true historical picture.<sup>129</sup> Although 2 Kgs 16:7 explicitly relates Ahaz' appeal to the Aramean invasions, 16:6 indicates that the

Edomites took part in this conflict. Since Edom was becoming stronger and showing its interest in the Negev at that time, to such an attack is hardly surprising, especially when Judah was preoccupied with the problem from the north.<sup>130</sup> It is also probable that the Philistines took advantage of the occasion, and specific details in the information in vs. 18 may point to some other source for their invasion. Assyrian texts, but discovered at Nimrud have shed light on the movements of the Assyrians at the time and a number of specialists agree that the Chronicler's account reflects an accurate picture of the situation.<sup>131</sup> an interpretation of one of the Arad inscriptions which On the precise nature of the Chronicler's source for Josiah's battle with Pharaoh Necho (2 Chr 35:20-27) there is a serious debate between Williamson and Begg, but few would doubt the basic historical authenticity of his account.<sup>132</sup> Details of its historical setting betray the Chronicler's accurate knowledge of the situation, although as we have already seen the portrayal of Josiah's death is paralleled with Ahab's death in order to present them as type scenes. He modifies the purpose of Necho's campaign from the misleading "against (ל) the king of Assyria" to the more accurate, though general expression "to fight at Carchemish". From the Babylonian Chronicles now we know that the Babylonians had driven Ashur-uballit, the Assyrian king, to Carchemish in 610 BC, half a year before the battle at Megiddo, and the Egyptians went up to



message. The Chronicler's retention of such an account clearly support the Assyrians in 609 BC.<sup>133</sup> Thus the Egyptians in fact allied with the Assyrians, though their ultimate aim was not to save the Assyrians but to stop the growth of Babylonian strength.<sup>134</sup> Such rewriting is hardly possible unless the Chronicler knows the precise movements of the major powers.

It is true that Necho's letter supplies a reason why an otherwise very faithful king suffered such a tragic death, but that Necho sent a letter to Josiah beforehand is not improbable. Necho clearly wished to go to Carchemish as swiftly as possible and not to have any trouble with Judah. Y. Yadin offers an interpretation of one of the Arad inscriptions which indicates that Ashurballit also requested Necho's safe passage for Josiah.<sup>135</sup> Even the theological reasoning of Necho's letter (vs. 21) is not completely impossible, for Sennacherib's envoys also presented their case in terms of the will of the Lord (2 Kgs 18:25).<sup>136</sup> Jeremiah's lamentation for Josiah also need not be questioned, because, though it is no longer preserved, Jeremiah's high esteem for Josiah is known from Jer 22:15-16.<sup>137</sup> Of course, Jer 22 is not sufficient to prove that Jeremiah really composed such a lament, but at least it is not difficult to imagine that the Chronicler believes that it occurred as a fact. A terrible defeat of a righteous king is hardly reconcilable with the Chronicler's theme and here he has to offer last resort reasoning: to accept the word of a heathen king literally, so as to take it as divine

message. The Chronicler's retention of such an account clearly suggests that he is writing his account under historical constraint.

As for the Aramean invasion at the end of Joash's reign (2 Chr 24:23-25) positive indications of the historical trustworthiness of the Chronicler's expansions are difficult to find. Its major differences from Kings are; (1) the king of Damascus is *not* named as Hazael, (2) the Aramean king does not seem to be with his army and the primary object of the invasion is shifted from Gath to Jerusalem, and (3) the princes of Judah are said to be "destroyed" and "judgment was executed" (NIV) on Joash. The killing of the princes may well have been seen as the judgement upon their conspiracy against the prophet Zechariah (vs. 21) and judgement upon Joash corresponds with Zechariah's final word "May the Lord see and revenge".<sup>138</sup> However, other elements of modifications have little to do with his theological purposes, and there is no reason why he had to change them unless there was some historical tradition. Since in other passages the Chronicler bases his theological reports on an historical basis, despite the theological nature of his additions, we must be open to the possibility of their underlying source.

The historical character of the chronological notes on Asa is also hard to determine. The problem here is twofold; (1) against the chronological note dating the war between Baasha

and Asa in Asa's thirty sixth year (2 Chr 16:1, cf. 15:19),<sup>139</sup> Baasha was already dead and succeeded by Elah in the twenty-sixth year of Asa's reign (1 Kgs 16:8, cf. 1 Kgs 5:33).<sup>140</sup> (2) of these notes provide a retribitional framework to Asa's reign and solve the difficulties that Asa, a good king, suffered: a life-long wars (1 Kgs 15:16) and illness; hence their suspect historicity. One approach to the issue is to see the twenty chronological notes as entirely fabrication for theological purposes.<sup>139</sup> According to this view, setting Asa's reform and first conflict with Baasha in the fifteenth and thirty sixth year respectively creates twenty years of peace after the reform; and introducing the incident of Asa's anger against the prophet also provides the reason for his foot disease.<sup>140</sup> However, it is doubtful that the Chronicler needs to fabricate a whole precise chronology simply in order to create a long peace period after the reform, so as to fit a retribitional pattern. That he is probably using extra sources elsewhere in Asa's reign may also suggest the possibility of some source here.<sup>140</sup> Another approach to the problem is to assume some underlying source for the chronological notices and somehow to identify the "thirty fifth" (15:19) and "thirty sixth" (16:1) year with Asa's fifteenth and sixteenth years. E. Thiele and some commentators suggest that in these two places the years are counted from the division of the kingdom rather than from the beginning of Asa's reign.<sup>141</sup> It is possible that here the



Chronicler uses a source which reckons the dates on a different system, but these are the only occasions where such dating is used and such reading does not fit with the literal meaning of the text. Alternatively they may be simply scribal errors due to the confusion of alphabetical representations of numbers; more likely "that the Chronicler wrote up the prophecy on the (10) and (30).<sup>142</sup> If we take this approach, whichever version, Asa was punished by disease and died more than twenty years after (thirty-ninth year) his sin against the prophet (sixteenth year), though elsewhere the Chronicler relates Sennacherib's death to his offence against the Lord some twenty years before (2 Chr 32:21). Also, since the Chronicler reports the reform in the fifteenth year (15:10) and the subsequent rest (vs. 15), it is hardly possible that the Chronicler really means "there was no more war until the *fifteenth* year" in 15:19. It is possible that the Chronicler uses some historical source and changes the datings of these two places in order to suit his retributational pattern, but this again does not go beyond speculation. Thus currently we have no satisfactory view on the nature of these chronological notes and we must be open-minded to any other possibilities.

#### b. Illness and Death

The second recurrent motif used for judgment is disease and terrible death. Jehoram's illness (2 Chr 21:18-19) has no parallel in Kings, but the commentators tend to see in this



some historical tradition.<sup>143</sup> Since the text gives so much detail of the disease, it is difficult to regard it as pure invention. Moreover, the illness corresponds with the prophecy of judgment in vv. 14-15 and, as Williamson points out, it is more likely "that the Chronicler wrote up the prophecy on the basis of the account found in his source rather than inventing both *de novo*".<sup>144</sup>

There are three more accounts of illness, which have parallels in Kings but are considerably expanded by the Chronicler. We have already seen that Josiah's death (32:24-26) is pictured typologically after Ahab's death. The description of Uzziah's leprosy (2 Chr 26:20a) is also patterned after that of Miriam (Num 12:10): judgment against the pride of coveting cultic authority. To this the Chronicler adds the explanatory comment "for he was excluded from the house of the Lord " (vs. 21) from Lev. 13:46. The connection of his leprosy with his sin in burning incense (vv. 16-19) is often regarded as a retrojection of the post-exilic rules on Uzziah and a creation by the Chronicler, since the incense offering is regarded as a priestly prerogative only in the P section of the Pentateuch.<sup>145</sup> However, an historical tradition need not be ruled out. A growing number of scholars date at least a core of P regulations to an earlier time and it is difficult to believe that regulations for such an important element for the cult had not developed until the post-exilic

period.<sup>146</sup> Asa's foot disease is linked with his putting the seer in the stocks (2 Chr 16:10). Again this seems to be

Since divine blessings and curses are the direct patterned after the example of Jeremiah (Jer 20:2-3). Nevertheless, since all the other typologies are not pure fabrications but developed from existing reports, it is presented in his highly characteristic way. The Kings text is questionable if the Chronicler creates the incident without any frequently expanded and new materials are added, so that the basis here.

The discussion in this section has shown that we do not always have enough indications from the text and extra biblical information to evaluate the Chronicler's additional materials. Nevertheless, where they are available, the Chronicler seems to have used some historical tradition to expand the text, and even where we have no positive evidence for such a tradition, objections against their historical reliability are not compelling. These historical additions are of course not used for their own sake but in order to present theological views on the pattern of history. The Chronicler rewrites data with the

techniques of typology, hyperbole, and theological comments for this purpose. It seems that the Chronicler does not freely create edifying stories, but rather is interested in the theological significance of historical events and he bases his additional materials on what he sees as reliable information, whether or not it may be verified by modern scholarship.

### 3. Religious Attitude

Since divine blessings and curses are the direct consequences of the king's religious attitude in Chronicles, it is not surprising that religious reforms and apostasies are presented in his highly characteristic way. The Kings text is frequently expanded and new materials are added, so that the Chronicler's version of reforms and apostasies may give quite different impressions. With the techniques of typology, contemporalization, dischronologization, etc., they are given in patterns of faithfulness and faithlessness. Yet, as in the cases of blessings and cursings, theological colouring of the accounts does not necessarily preclude that they are based on a historical nucleus. Now we would like to study how the Chronicler's theological views are introduced and whether he had any historical as well as theological concern in writing the individual accounts.

#### a. Reforms

After David established the kingdom, he brought up the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem to rectify improper worship in Saul's period (cf. 1 Chr 13:3). Although this account (1 Chr 13, 15-16) is essentially based on 2 Sam 6:2-20, the significant role of the Levites in the transfer of the ark is inserted in 2 Chr 15:1-24. 15:1-3 and 11-15 are the Chronicler's expansions of his *Vorlage* with the Pentateuchal



regulations and describe the second attempt of the transfer: and in 15:1-3 David orders that the ark must be carried by the Levites alone, based on Deuteronomic law (cf. Deut. 10:8, etc.), and in vv. 11-15 the proper way of carrying the ark is suggested according to Exod. 19; 25:13-15 and Num. 7:9.<sup>147</sup> 15:4-10 and 16-24, on the other hand, list the names and duties of the Levites and the Levitical musicians and appear to be based on the post-exilic situation. These lists are sometimes argued to be later additions to the Chronicler's work, since they seem to reflect more developed organization of the Levitical singers than usually assigned to the Chronicler's stage.<sup>148</sup> However, where to locate the Chronicler in the development of singers depends on one's view how much and where are the secondary materials, and ultimately on one's literary analysis of the text.<sup>149</sup> Repetitive resumption in vs. 11 indicates that the list in vv. 4-10 was originally there, and the list in vv. 16-24 cannot be inserted later because vs. 25 is not directly continued from vs. 15.<sup>150</sup> Nevertheless, this does not suggest that the Chronicler ignores historical facts so as to advocate the post-exilic organization of the Levites. Whereas the transfer of the ark is portrayed as an ideal religious act with Pentateuchal regulations, there is a good reason to believe that the Chronicler sincerely thinks that the Levites were actually there. There are ancient traditions that David was interested



in the music of the cult (e.g., 2 Sam 6:5; 23:1; Amos 6:5), and the existence of guilds of cult singers are known from ancient near eastern cultures.<sup>151</sup> Recent scholarship also supports the Davidic origin of the Levitical singers.<sup>152</sup> Thus in all likelihood the Chronicler believes the involvement of the Levites in the transfer is historical. Only he does not present it as a mere historical incident but as a type of a proper religious act and draws out its implication for the later generations with contemporization. He supports the importance of the Levites in the post-exilic cult, focusing on the fact that David respected their duties, and defines their roles in the post-exilic cult showing how David's original organization developed in his day. It is not his fabrication to defend the position of the Levites, but using what he thinks to be historical fact as a basis for his theological point clarifying the direct link between them.

Similarly in 1 Chr 23-27 the Chronicler introduces an extensive list of Levitical organization as a part of David's preparation for the Temple building. Whereas it is unanimously agreed that the list reflects the post-exilic situation, it is still debated whether the whole list is a secondary addition to the Chronicler's work or at least part of it comes from himself.<sup>153</sup> One may suspect a different hand because of a conflicting picture of the Levites in these chapters from elsewhere in the Chronicles (e.g., the role of Obed-Edom, or

twenty four courses of the Levitical organization), but, as generally accepted, these chapters themselves are composite and inclusion of these aspects itself cannot be an evidence for secondary nature of the whole material. Williamson has demonstrated that chaps. 23-27 basically consist of two distinct layers: the primary layer classifies the Levites genealogically into four duties according to David's organization as the heading to the list (23:3-6a) suggests, whereas the secondary layer divides the Levites into twenty four courses by lot-casting against the explicit intent of the list.<sup>154</sup> Since all the "contradicting" elements belong to the secondary layer, there is no reason why the primary layer cannot come from the Chronicler, and in fact "the reconstructed lists of the primary layer fit in well with the stage of development in the Levitical orders . . . reflected in other parts of Chronicles".<sup>155</sup> The secondary nature of the passage is also claimed to be indicated by the apparent interruption of the narrative sequence between 23:2 and 28:1.<sup>156</sup> However, these two verses share so little vocabulary in common as to suggest the original continuity of the narrative, and they may probably be better understood as "repetitive resumption".<sup>157</sup> On the other hand, the inclusion of the Levites at this point is expected from the Chronicler's overall interest. 1 Chr 15-16 above and the reform passages in 2 Chronicles indicate the Chronicler's concern to show the role of the Levites in proper

worship, and it is difficult to imagine that he misses the opportunity to explicate this in David's establishment of an ideal cult through the Temple building. Moreover, later passages such as 1 Chr 29:8; 2 Chr 8:14; 23:18; and 35:4 explicitly refer to David's organization of the Levites and cannot be understood without at least the primary layer of 1 Chr 23-27.<sup>150</sup>

However, the Chronicler's theological concern behind the inclusion of the Levites does not point to lack of historical interest, because, as in the case of 1 Chr 15, it is based on the tradition that David himself was responsible for the Levitical organization.<sup>151</sup> Since the Chronicler tries to show that David and Solomon established the ideal worship (cf. tabernacle typology and later reform accounts), he wants to include the Levitical organization here to stress that it was first ordered by David and must be a significant part of proper worship. Yet the summary of David's preparation for the Temple building is only a part of his charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22-29 and does not have enough room for the detailed list of the Levites. Thus the Chronicler has to insert it in a small narrative part with "repetitive resumption".

The list reflects the organization and duties of Levites not in David's time but in the post-exilic time, for he is not only interested in its Davidic origin but also in its significance for his contemporary cult. The Chronicler



believes that the Levites were historically first organized by David, but he sidetracks to explicate how the original organization has developed and is functioning in his day. This contemporization is a literary technique to introduce the author's view of the implication of historical events to the historical narrative.<sup>160</sup> The first readers would not have taken it as historical distortion but have understood what he is doing here, for the organization reflects their own day and they have even revised the text to update the material. That it is the immigration of the northern priests and Levites to the south during Rehoboam's reign (2 Chr 11:13-17) is not in a strict sense an account of a reform, but it is used to show that the orthodox Jerusalem cult was continued in Rehoboam's reign. It is taken from 2 Kgs 12:26-33 with only a few factual changes, though recast from a completely new perspective. It does not include the details of Jeroboam's apostasy and is considerably shorter than the Kings text. The Chronicler's main purpose here is not to attack the northern kingdom, for he does not see the division of the kingdom as all Jeroboam's fault.<sup>161</sup> Rather he focuses on the orthodox religious practice in the south and the immigration of the levitical priests to the south. Whereas Jeroboam's rejection of the levitical priests and their coming to the south are not explicitly stated in Kings, they are easily deduced from 2 Kgs 12:31 "[Jeroboam] appointed priests from among all the people, who were not of



the Levites".<sup>162</sup> Once the levitical priests were rejected, (2 Chr 14:3, 5a). The Chronicler does not hesitate over this they could go nowhere but Jerusalem, where the cult they were deduction, probably because idols most likely included these affiliated with was continued. Though the united worship of items. At the same time they are mentioned in Hezekiah's (2 Kgs 18:4) and Josiah's (23:8, 14) reforms as well, and the the Lord in the Jerusalem Temple is the ideal the Chronicler represents, he probably sincerely believes that this is what happened. The same material is again used in Abijah's speech (2 Chr 13:8-11) this time to criticize the continuous rebellion in the north after the succession of the true Davidide. That it is used in a completely different literary context reflects the Chronicler's entirely different understanding of the significance of the schism from the original setting. Yet he nevertheless bases his description of the religious situation of both kingdoms on the firm historical tradition of 2 Kgs 12:26-33.

There are few indications of extra sources for the first half of the account of Asa's reform (2 Chr 14:1-5), though the real contact with the Kings text is only a general description of the reform in vs. 1 (cf. 1 Kgs 15:11). The removal of the sacred prostitutes (1 Kgs 15:12) is not mentioned, because the Chronicler presented the previous reign of Abijah more favourably and sacred prostitution was no longer a serious problem in the post-exilic period.<sup>163</sup> Instead, he expands the destruction of "the idols" to include "the foreign altars, the high places, the pillars, the Asherim, and the incense altars"

(2 Chr 14:3, 5a). The Chronicler does not hesitate over this deduction, probably because idols most likely included these items. At the same time they are mentioned in Hezekiah's (2 Kgs 18:4) and Josiah's (23:8, 14) reforms as well, and the Chronicler may have pictured Asa's reform as a type scene. Since these specifications have little to do with the Chronicler's audience, presumably he believes this was what the reform was like. Likewise the further expansions in vs. 4 "to seek the Lord" and "to keep the law and the commandment" may also be elements of a type scene of reform: cf. Jehoshaphat (17:9, cf. 19:4ff) and Josiah (23:2-3). But these are his characteristic definitions of the proper worship and it is not surprising that the Chronicler understands these as the purposes of the reform. Thus the account is essentially based on the Kings text and the expansions can be most naturally deduced from it, especially if one assumes a standardized picture of a type scene.

On the other hand, the additional elements in the second account of Asa's reform (2 Chr 15:8-19) may have been derived from some additional source. The reference to "the cities which he [Asa] had taken in the hill country of Ephraim" (vs. 8) is difficult to understand unless the Chronicler has some extra information. As Williamson has shown, this cannot be identified with Abijah's conquest in 13:19 nor Asa's later (thirty-sixth year) campaign in 16:6 without textual

problems.<sup>164</sup> It is also very unlikely that the Chronicler has written up this passage by himself because he takes the trouble to show that the reign is peaceful until Asa's thirty-fifth year (15:19). Historically, on the other hand, Abijah's victory (13:19) did not last long and the conflict with the north continued during the early reign of Asa (cf. 1 Kgs 15:16 and 32). Thus, though this text betrays the Chronicler's interest in the southern king's religious influence on the north, most probably it is based on knowledge of Asa's minor victory at one stage of the conflict.<sup>165</sup> The specific allusion to the repair work of "the altar of the Lord that was in the vestibule of the house of the Lord" (8b) does not reflect any theological bias but suggests some additional information.

Although the nature of the chronological notices in Asa's reign is uncertain, the dating of the ceremony of covenant making in the third month of the fifteenth year is not improbable. Both in Kings and Chronicles his reform appears to have started early in his reign (1 Kgs 15:11-12; 2 Chr 14:2-3), but Asa probably succeeded very young and his mother had brought strong influence of pagan worship (2 Chr 15:16) at the beginning of his rule.<sup>166</sup> It is quite possible that the reform started later and was not completed until the fifteenth year in his reign. "The third month" is not necessarily a retrojection of a later tradition to equate the festival in the third month, the Feast of Weeks, with the giving of the law at Sinai (cf. 2



Chr 15:3, 12, 13).<sup>167</sup> There are some parallels between the description of the ceremony here and the covenant renewal ceremony of Josiah (2 Kgs 23) and Nehemiah (Neh 10), and characteristic phraseology of the Chronicler can be found (seek the Lord, joy, rest; vv. 12, 15). However, unlike the Kings and Nehemiah passages there is no explicit connection of this ceremony with the covenant renewal of the Mosaic law in the text (cf. 2 Kgs 23:3, 25, Neh 10:9) even if obeying the law is implied. Probably the connection between the Feast of the Weeks and the law-giving had not been established even in the Chronicler's time, and there is no necessary reason why this covenant ceremony had to be the Feast of Weeks, or the ceremony in the third month had to be retrojected as the covenant renewal unless there is some historical information about the ceremony itself and its dating. Though there is no positive evidence for a source, it is easier to postulate such than to assume both the ceremony itself and its dating are fabricated out of nothing.

As with Asa's reform, the Chronicler presents Jehoshaphat's reform in two parts (2 Chr 17:7-9; 19:4-11), and both of them are in all likelihood based on additional sources. While it is possible that they are doublets of the same reform written from different viewpoints, there is no inherent difficulty in taking the texts literally as two different stages (cf. 2 Chr 19:4, "again"), because the contents of the



reform are slightly different and the reform must have taken a long time.<sup>168</sup> The first part of the reform (17:7-9) focuses on the teaching mission. The teaching of the law in this early history of Judah is not improbable. Though we cannot be certain about the contents of "the book of the law of the Lord" (17:9) here, as in most ancient Near Eastern countries, some form of law code most likely had existed in Judah from early time on.<sup>169</sup> The instruction of the law was also commonly regarded as a royal responsibility.<sup>170</sup> Jehoshaphat's appointment of five lay officials for this task (vs. 7) is unexpected in view of the Chronicler's concern for the status of the priests and the Levites, and may point to an earlier source.<sup>171</sup> In this account the Levites are listed before the priests, against his usual practice, and this also suggests an underlying source.

The second part of Jehoshaphat's reform (19:4-11) has been a focal point of discussion about the historical reliability of the Chronicler's additional materials. Whereas Wellhausen regards it as an etiological development from Jehoshaphat's name ("Yahweh judges") and denies any authentic information, Albright defends it from parallels to an Egyptian judicial reform.<sup>172</sup> Though Albright's argument cannot establish any direct Egyptian influence on the story of Jehoshaphat, it suggests that this kind of reform was possible as early as Jehoshaphat's time.<sup>173</sup> It is generally accepted that the

earlier tribally-based judicial system must have changed at some point in Israel's history to a more centralized organization under the crown as described here.<sup>174</sup> Such a change must have happened before the eighth century, for the royal administrators are already referred to by Isaiah (1:21-26; 3:2) and Micah (3:1-2, 9-11), and Jehoshaphat's reign is a reasonable period for it. Some suggest that his alliance with the northern kingdom could have influenced the introduction of reorganization for judicial administration.<sup>175</sup>

There are also some indications of the earlier source in the text itself. Whereas the summary statement in vs. 4 employs the Chronicler's characteristic expressions such as "from Beershaba to Ephraim" and "the God of their fathers", the Chronicler's typical style cannot be found in the rest of the account (vv. 5-11).<sup>176</sup> There is also tension between the religious interest in vs. 4 (cf. "brought them back to the Lord") and the mainly practical description of the new administrative organization in the remainder.<sup>177</sup> These phenomena may be ascribed to the Chronicler's use of some official record of Jehoshaphat's religious policy for a different purpose. The possibility of an underlying source is also supported by the mentioning of the Levites before the priests in vs. 8. The close correspondence between this passage and Deut 16:18-17:13 has often been pointed out, but, as Williamson demonstrates, there are some noticeable

differences, and the Chronicler's source seems to reflect an earlier phase of the judicial system than the present form of Deuteronomy.<sup>178</sup> Clearly the Chronicler uses the accounts of Jehoshaphat's reforms as illustrations of his faithful reign, but most likely they are based on an historically reliable source.

The Chronicler's account of Joash's restoration of the Temple (2 Chr 24:4-14) is rather different from that in Kings (2 Kgs 12:4-16). Yet most of the differences can be explained by modifications effected by his own perspective, contemporization and typology, and he does not seem to exercise complete freedom in his rewriting of the historical source. Firstly, as we saw in the previous chapter, the Chronicler describes Joash's restoration of the Temple after the tabernacle account and that of Solomon's temple building, and introduces important roles for the Levites in order to present it as a return to the ideal worship and as a model for his contemporary readers. Although these typological and contemporizing changes give a considerably different impression of the reform from that in Kings, modifications are made only to point out the meaning of the incident from the Chronicler's viewpoint and the account is essentially based on the historical report of 2 Kgs 12.

Secondly, there is a major disagreement concerning how the money for the restoration was collected. According to Kings



the king originally ordered the use of the offerings the priests received for the restoration, but the priests rejected this. Eventually they were rebuked and lost their privilege of collecting money but were freed from this duty and the collection box was made for it instead. On the other hand, in Chronicles, since the priests and the Levites did not collect money swiftly enough, the king made a collection box for a more effective result. Commonly it is suggested that the Chronicler cannot accept the king's position as superior to the priest, the demeaning of the priestly privilege or the blaming of Jehoiada. However, there are good reasons to believe that the rebuke of the slowness of the Levites (vv. 5b-6) was not part of the original text of Chronicles. Williamson lists seven reasons: (1) Vs. 7 does not follow vs. 6 smoothly and there must be some kind of intrusion before vs. 7. (2) The final outcome of the original order in vs. 5 is not mentioned. (3) The expression "the tent of testimony" ( אֶהָל־הָעֵדוּת ) occurs only here. (4) The chief priest is called simply "the chief ( שֹׁרֵט )" against the usage elsewhere. (5) In vv. 5b-6 the priests are not rebuked whereas in vs. 5a they are summoned with the Levites. (6) The rebuke of the Levites stands at odds with the Chronicler's concern to defend their position. (7) The expression "year to year" is in conflict with the Chronicler's presentation of the incident as a single act of restoration. While Dillard supplies possible counter-arguments for each one



of these points, he fails to establish a case, and Williamson's arguments as a whole have cumulative force.<sup>180</sup> If Williamson is correct, the Chronicler starts his version straight from the making of the collection box and the previous negotiations are simply skipped and not rewritten. This view seems to be more in line with the overall presentation of the incident, because the Chronicler focuses on the enthusiasm for, and success in, temple restoration (cf. vs. 10) and these background incidents might weaken his portrayal. It is of interest that in the account of the deliverance from Sennacherib he also passes over the minor incidents so that his account focuses solely on the final outcome and its theological meaning. Thus the Chronicler does not change the course of the event but omits its prehistory in order to concentrate on the main point, whereas the later revisers attempted to bring the account closer to the parallel account in Kings and to soften the criticism of the priesthood.

In Chronicles, Hezekiah's reform (2 Kgs 18:3-6) is extensively elaborated (2 Chr 29-31). Though the general summaries in Kings are repeated (2 Chr 29:2; 31:1, 20-21), the Chronicler details three major events, restoration of the Temple, Passover, and provisions for the Temple cult, which are not mentioned in Kings. Despite his obvious theological interest in stressing the unification of worship and in

portraying him as a second David and Solomon, it is unlikely that these new accounts are totally his free compositions.<sup>181</sup>

Hezekiah's Passover has been often regarded as the Chronicler's retrojection of Josiah's Passover in Kings to elevate Hezekiah's status as a reformer. Those who hold this view argue that Hezekiah's Passover is only the Chronicler's fancy, because Kings does not include the parallel account and claims that no such Passover had been kept until Josiah's time (2 Kgs 23:22). They also find it difficult to see the observance of Passover at the central sanctuary and the association of Passover with the Feast of Unleavened Bread taking place before the deuteronomic code or Josiah's reign.

However, there are some irregularities in the Chronicler's description of Hezekiah's Passover and it is very unlikely that a writer who is always concerned with the proper observance of the cult would create such details without any historical source. The feast was delayed one month, ceremonially unclean people participated in the meal, and the celebration was extended for an additional week.<sup>182</sup> While S. Talmon's suggestion that Hezekiah accommodated with the northern religious calendar which was a month behind that of the south may be too ingenious, as Moriarty and recent commentators suggest, these anomalies must be based on some trustworthy tradition. The centralization of Passover does not necessarily entail the newly registered cultic system of the time of

Josiah. Few scholars would deny that older materials are contained in Deuteronomy and there are some previous attempts at reform by the central royal government (cf, Asa, the feast Jehoshaphat, Joash).<sup>183</sup> Whereas Hezekiah's inclusion of the northern population in the united worship accords with the Chronicler's interest, Hezekiah's involvement with the north is politically probable after the fall of Samaria and withdrawal of the Assyrians from Palestine.<sup>184</sup> His expansion to the north is further indicated by 2 Chr 31:1 and the naming of his son Manasseh after one of the leading tribes of the north.<sup>185</sup> Thus it is more likely that Kings downplays the historical report on Hezekiah's reform in his source to highlight the uniqueness of Josiah than that the Chronicler writes up Hezekiah's reform according to Josiah's example later on.<sup>186</sup> The late dating of the connection between Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread is based on the view that they are presented as independent feasts in J materials, whereas in Deuteronomy they are associated and in P the united feast takes further development. However, such a traditional understanding of the development of the Pentateuchal documents has been seriously challenged. J. McConville argues that this association can be found in all strata of pentateuchal law.<sup>187</sup> If the latter is the case, there is no real problem for the celebration together of Passover and Unleavened Bread in the pre-Josianic period. Even if we accept the traditional view of



Passover development, Williamson has shown that the core of the report of Hezekiah's Passover is limited to the account of the feast of Unleavened Bread.<sup>133</sup> Since irregularity of the feast cannot be explained as the Chronicler's creation, the report is still probably based on a historical tradition of Hezekiah's feast of Unleavened Bread and rewritten from the Chronicler's viewpoint.

For other aspects of Hezekiah's reform, the restoration of the Temple (2 Chr 29) and the provisions for the Temple cult (2 Chr 31), there is little positive evidence for historical sources. Yet in view of the historical probability of such a reformation before Josiah and of the source for Hezekiah's Passover, it is not unlikely that the Chronicler has rather extensive historical information about it. The Chronicler may assume that the Levites played a significant role historically in the reform, since they had assumed religious duties since David's time, but their prominence throughout the narrative and other reform activities suggests that they are introduced as a part of the typology with David's and Solomon's ideal worship.<sup>134</sup> The Chronicler seems to view the reform as a return to David's and Solomon's worship, as he describes the building of the Temple and worship by David and Solomon in an idealized picture and judges the subsequent kings according to that standard. Yet, as the Levites are portrayed after the post-exilic situation in David's original organization (1 Chr



23-27), here again their roles reflect the Chronicler's contemporary picture of them in the post-exilic cult. Therefore, the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform is probably based on extra historical information, but he uses typology and contemporization to make his theological points. Also Manasseh's reforming activities (2 Chr 33:15-17) after his repentance are supported neither in Kings nor in extra-biblical information. Whereas the Chronicler's addition may reflect his attempts to justify a long reign for an evil king and to correspond Manasseh's repentance with Israel's exile and restoration, its absence from Kings may also be due to theological purposes. Kings exalts Josiah highly and presents Manasseh's sin as having brought inevitable exile and the untimely death of Josiah (2 Kgs 23:26; cf. 21:12-15), and thus it is perfectly possible that the account excludes any positive elements of Manasseh. Jer 15:4 betrays a similar idea, but the closeness of the book of Jeremiah to the Deuteronomistic historian is well known.<sup>120</sup> Kings sees Manasseh's change as insignificant, whereas the Chronicler emphasizes its importance, though even the latter admits the incompleteness of Manasseh's reform (vv. 17, 22).<sup>121</sup> The difference between the two accounts is due to different theological stances and it cannot have any historical bearings. Although it is not possible to present any evidence for an historical source, the Chronicler's exile and restoration typology has already been

presented in the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah and it seems rather unlikely that the Chronicler would create such a completely opposite picture of Manasseh without any support.

The Chronicler's account of Josiah's religious reform (2 Chr 34-35) somewhat abridges the report of 2 Kgs 22-23, but it also rearranges the materials and adds some more details. Whereas Kings uses the cleansing of the Temple only as background for the finding of the book of the law, 2 Chr 34 presents it as a part of Josiah's series of reform activities; destruction of pagan cults, repair of the Temple, and covenant renewal. To form this series the Chronicler narrates the repair work of the Temple (2 Chr 34:8-13) not in terms of the king's command (as in Kings) but as carried out. In Kings the discovery of the law book is told first and the other elements seem to be derived from it, but in Chronicles destruction of pagan cults (vv. 3-7) has already started when the Temple cleansing is done (vv. 8-28). Moreover, the Chronicler supplies chronological notes to these two elements and to the Passover in the next chapter.

The change from imperative to narrative does not present a serious historical problem, for it only assumes that the king's command was exactly carried out as Kings itself implies. But does the Chronicler have any historical basis for his chronological notes and his new order of events? Some regard the change as a reflection of the Chronicler's desire to show

the king's piety from an early period, but theological interest does not necessarily indicate historical inauthenticity.<sup>192</sup> The extension of the reform from the removal of Canaanite pagan idols, restoration of the Temple, and inclusion of the northern population in the Passover seems to coincide with the decline of the Assyrian threat, though they may not correspond so neatly to particular events in Assyrian history as Cross and Freedman suggest.<sup>193</sup> The Kings' report that the law book was found during the restoration also implies that some reform was already started. Furthermore, the Kings' account itself seems to show the theological bias of the author in attributing Josiah's reform to the discovery of the law book. Dillard suggests that the structure of 2 Kgs 23 "proceeds in concentric circles from the discovery of the book (2 Kgs 23:2) through the temple (2 Kgs 23:4), through the city of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 23:5-7), through Judah (2 Kgs 23:8-9), and into territories in the North (2 Kgs 23:15-20)".<sup>194</sup> Therefore, there is no need to assume that the Chronicler's chronological notes or new order of events are unhistorical inventions conceived for theological purposes, though we cannot present decisive evidence for an underlying source for these notes.

In Chronicles the account of Josiah's Passover (2 Chr 35:1-19) is considerably expanded from 2 Kgs 23:21-23. Whereas we cannot be certain about a possible underlying source, most of the portrayal is directed towards stressing the prominent



role of the Levites and describing the feast according to Pentateuchal teachings. As in the cases of previous reforms, the presence of the Levites is seen as a sign of return to the Davidic ideal of worship (typology), and their portrayal from the contemporary perspective is in turn used for legitimation of their role in the post-exilic cult (contemporization). The ritual is described mostly from Deut 16, Exod 12 and from his knowledge of the post-exilic practice, and he presents it as an ideal worship and an example for his contemporaries. But at the same time this is his attempt to reconstruct the ritual "as described in the book of the law" (2 Kgs 23:21) and probably he believes this is how the ritual was performed.

#### b. Apostasies

The Chronicler's accounts of apostasy mostly parallel Kings and there are only three places where he provides additional materials: 2 Chr 24:17-27; 25:14-16; 26:16-21. They all show sinfulness of kings and set up an unfaithfulness-judgement pattern; thus their historicity is often questioned, but there is no compelling reason to negate it. (Uzziah's improper act of incense burning in 2 Chr 26:16-19 we have already dealt with it in the section on Illness and Death.) 2 Chr 24:17-22 recounts Joash's abandonment of Temple worship, idolatry, and killing of Zechariah the prophet in the second half of his reign. The Chronicler's theological



interest is evident in several aspects: it supplies a rationale for the subsequent Aramean invasion (vv. 23-25), it uses characteristic vocabulary (e.g., "abandon" [vv. 18, 20], "wrath" [vs. 18], the language of vs. 19 [cf. 2 Chr 36:15f], "prosper" [vs. 20]) and it contrasts the second half of Joash's reign with the first, focusing on the murder of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada.<sup>196</sup> Nevertheless, historically it is not difficult to imagine that when Jehoiada died a group of people who were unhappy about the reform approached Joash and won his favour to reverse religious policy.<sup>197</sup> If so, it is only to be expected that the son of Jehoiada, now the priest and the prominent figure in the pro-reform group, stood up against Joash and was killed. Admittedly such a reconstruction alone is not sufficient to prove its historicity, but the Chronicler probably uses a source in rewriting the following account of Aramean invasion, and it is easier to suppose a historical source behind this account as well.<sup>198</sup>

Similarly, Amaziah's worship of the gods of the Edomites (2 Chr 25:14-16) suggests the reason for his defeat in vv. 17-24. They are retributionally connected by the narrative sequence as well as by the Chronicler's explicit theological comment in vs. 20. The word-play on the root  $\sqrt{\text{V}}$  in vv. 16-17 also contrasts Amaziah's rejection of God's counsel through his prophet and his acceptance of human counsel. Thus it is no surprise that commentators take such worship of the gods of a

defeated nation as "historically improbable," and ascribe it to the Chronicler's composition.<sup>199</sup> However, it is also improbable that the Chronicler creates such an utterly nonsense event without any historical basis to sustain his theological point.<sup>200</sup> In fact Cogan has shown a more intelligible interpretation of this passage from his study on the Assyrian religious practice at the time of war.<sup>201</sup> The spoliation of a defeated people's deities is not only widely attested in the ancient Near Eastern literatures, but also these deities are frequently described as abandoning their people and joining the conquering side in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions.<sup>202</sup> In the OT itself the motif that the Lord abandons his people and fights against them with the foreign nation occurs repeatedly (e.g., 2 Chr 12:5; 15:2; 21:16; 22:7; 24:20; 28:5; 29:8; 33:11; 36:17).<sup>203</sup> In such a cultural context, as Cogan concludes, 2 Chr 25:14-16 probably reflects Amaziah's salutation to the gods of Edom for their help to Judah by abandoning their adherents, but the Chronicler interprets such recognition of foreign gods as abandonment of the Lord and uses it for his negative schematization.<sup>204</sup>

From the analysis of the Chronicler's accounts of the kings' religious activities, it becomes once again clear that the Chronicler's theological points are not expressed at the expense of his historical concern. He uses various techniques

typology, contemporization, and dischronologization to suggest the theological meaning of the events, but, where it is possible to draw conclusions, the events themselves seem to be deduced from Kings text or taken from extra biblical sources. Underlying sources may not always be ascertained, but from clearer examples we can see the Chronicler's tendency to elaborate the information from historical sources rather than invent, and there is no additions which we must doubt whether the Chronicler sincerely believes historical.

#### 4. Theological Comments

##### a. Comments

Most of the Chronicler's additions are new historical data which support his theological interpretation of the history. But there are some independent theological comments which evaluate the significance of a king's reign or certain actions (13:1-2; 22-23; 17:1-5; 24:15-16, 25-27; 27:6; 33:10; 36:13-17). Though these are not directly attached to the Samuel-Kings text, they belong to the same kind as the modifications for theological stress (see the previous chapter). They are a significant means of expressing the Chronicler's theological views directly, but they do not introduce any new historical information and there is no need to discuss his historical concern in these additions.



b. Speeches prophets' message itself, and the prophets demand the Chronicer's theological interpretation of historical events is also expressed through the mouths of prophets and kings. Besides mere passing references to the prophets and cited prophetic sources, he often adds new prophetic speeches to events and rewrites some parallel speeches substantially. These speeches appear at the turn of events and betray the Chronicer's characteristic theological expressions. Such new prophetic speeches are as follows:

Shemaiah	2 Chr 11-12	logical nature of the messages,
Azariah	2 Chr 15:1-7	they
Hanani	2 Chr 16:7-9	historical prophets. At the attack
Jehu	2 Chr 19:2-3 (cf. 20:34)	of
Jahaziel	2 Chr 20:14-17	gives
Eliezer	2 Chr 20:37	retr
Elijah	2 Chr 21:12-15	tioned as (the Lord), so I have
Zechariah	2 Chr 24:20	aban
man of God	2 Chr 25:8	le this prophecy is unique to
prophet	2 Chr 25:15f	Chron
Oded	2 Chr 28:9-11	rites it to Shemaiah apparently

It is noteworthy that all of them appear between the schism of the northern and southern kingdoms and the exile of the north and the reunification of the kingdom under Hezekiah.<sup>205</sup> Throntveit has convincingly shown that they all suggest how retributational justice is carried out in various situations and thus they locate the kings' actions and their consequences in his theological scheme.<sup>206</sup> At the same time, however, the Lord's judgment does not ultimately depend on the kings' faithfulness or apostasy but on whether they accept or



reject the prophets' message itself, and the prophets demand the decision. The message that cultic unfaithfulness brings disaster and return to proper worship brings restoration and glory back seems to be that of the Chronicler himself to the community just returned from the exile. Since he is concerned to legitimate the status of the Levites so systematically and to identify them as prophets (cf. 2 Chr 20:14-17; 34:30), it is possible that he himself was a Levite and sees his role and message as in the line of the inspired prophet to lead the community at the turn of events.<sup>207</sup>

Despite the highly theological nature of the messages, they are put on the lips of historical prophets. At the attack of Shishak Shemaiah the prophet gives Rehoboam the clearly retribitional message, "You abandoned me [the Lord], so I have abandoned you" (12:5). While this prophecy is unique to Chronicles, the Chronicler attributes it to Shemaiah apparently because his earlier prophecy to Rehoboam is known from 1 Kgs 12:22-24 // 2 Chr 11:2-4 and he is evidently a representative prophet at that period. Hanani in the reign of Asa (2 Chr 16:7-9) and Jehu in the reign of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 19:2-3) are also the most probable prophets of the respective times, as deduced from Kings.<sup>208</sup> Jehu the son of Hanani is associated with Jehoshaphat, because he was active in the reign of the northern king Baasha which overlaps Jehoshaphat's reign (2 Kgs 16:1, 7) and no prophet is connected with Jehoshaphat himself.

Jehu's father Hanani is further related to Jehoshaphat's father Asa.

Elijah is associated with Jehoram, who followed the sinful way of his father-in-law, Ahab. Some argue that this connection reflects Elijah's severe criticism of Ahab in Kings and suspect its historicity.<sup>209</sup> In Kings Elijah's ascension (chap. 2) precedes the start of Elisha's ministry during Jehoshaphat's reign, and this implies Elijah was no longer active in Jehoram's reign. Kings also does not include any literary activity of Elijah, and his deeds are generally confined to the Northern Kingdom. However, the Elijah narrative and Elisha narrative form independent sections in Kings and the sequence of 2 Kgs 2-3 is not necessarily strictly chronological.<sup>210</sup> Elisha seems to be already ministering as a prophet before he succeeded Elijah (cf. 2:2-3, 5) and he could have prophesied to Jehoshaphat (2 Kgs 3). Elijah also seemed to be alive at least in the beginning of Jehoram's reign, for in 2 Kgs 1:16 he prophesied the northern king Ahaziah's death in the second year of Jehoram. Literary activity of a prophet is not unknown in the ancient Near East and a letter is a probable means of indirect ministry by the northern prophet to the south.<sup>211</sup> Therefore, given the sources the Chronicler has and apparent theological connection between Elijah and Ahab, it is not difficult to imagine that the Chronicler sincerely believes that Elijah sent a letter to Jehoram.

that It is possible that the Chronicler has some historical information about the prophets besides Kings. Noth suggests such knowledge for Eliezer the son of Dodavahu (2 Chr 20:37), because his name is 'not particularly common' and details such as his place of origin, Mareshah are included.<sup>212</sup> The long genealogy of Jahaziel the Levite (2 Chr 20:14) may also indicate some tradition behind it, though the Chronicler might simply have wished to trace Levitical parentage back to the time of David.<sup>213</sup> The prophecy of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest, and his death (2 Chr 24:20-22) are probably based on some extra source, although this material serves to contrast the second half of Joash's reign with the first half. It is less likely that the Chronicler creates such an incident without any basis and he seems to have access to extra information for the latter half of Joash's reign (cf. vv. 23-27).<sup>214</sup> Azariah the son of Oded ( אֲזַרְיָהוּ ) in 2 Chr 15:1-7 and Oded ( אֲדֵד ) in 2 Chr 28:9-11 may be taken from some other sources. Since the Chronicler seems to call the unnamed prophet in 1 Kgs 13 Iddo ( אִדּוֹ ) in 2 Chr 9:29, he may have called anonymous prophets in extra-biblical tradition from the root ( אִדּוֹ/אִדָּו ) "to bear witness".<sup>215</sup> There are other unnamed prophet/s who is/are not called Oded or Iddo in 2 Chr 25:8 and 15f. The Chronicler does not give a specious name in these cases and this is probably another example of a genuinely anonymous prophet, though we cannot exclude the possibility

that the Chronicler does not know any prophetic tradition for this period (Amaziah's reign) and supposes that some prophet must be functioning.<sup>216</sup>

Clearly these prophetic speeches are the Chronicler's device for introducing his interpretation of the events and retributational scheme and to challenge the final response to them. Though the evidence is not sufficient, they seem to be spoken by the most probable historical persons who would speak such messages, either deduced from Kings or based on extra-biblical sources.

Like prophetic speeches, the Chronicler also uses royal speeches and prayers to explain the theological significance of events. Throntveit has analysed the function of royal speeches and prayers and determines 22 royal speeches and 4 prayers with the following conditions:

1. The speech is on the lips of a king.
2. The speech is not part of a conversation or dialogue (a direct discourse for prayer).
3. The speech, though paralleled in the *Vorlage*, has been significantly altered.
4. The speech is unique to the Chronicler.<sup>217</sup>

He classifies royal speeches into three categories. (1) Edicts order the action "immediately described in the narrative as carried out by the audience": 1 Chr 15:11-15; 22:5; 29:20; 2 Chr 29:31; 35:3-6.<sup>218</sup> (2) Orations also call for subsequent actions but with historical retrospects either to the distant past or the immediate situation: 1 Chr 13:2-3; 29:1-5; 2 Chr



2:2-9 [Eng 3-7]; 13:4-12; 14:6 [Eng 7]; 29:3-11; 30:4-9 and 2 Chr 32:6-8; 1 Chr 22:7-19; 1 Chr 28:2-21; 2 Chr 19:4-11; 2 Chr 20:20.<sup>219</sup> (3) Rationales provide "some rationale for a cultic action": 1 Chr 15:2; 22:1; 23:25-26, 28-32; 2 Chr 8:11; 28:22-23.<sup>220</sup> Throntveit has demonstrated that all of these appear "at turning points in the narrative" and are used to determine the structural framework of the Chronicler's work.<sup>221</sup> When the addressee is God instead of a human, royal speeches turn to royal prayer, but in form and content they are similar to royal speeches (1 Chr 29:10-19; 2 Chr 14:10 [Eng 11]; 20:5-12; 30:13-22a).<sup>222</sup> It is clear that royal speeches and prayers relate why certain actions are taken from the Chronicler's perspective, but they are naturally spoken by historical kings who would most probably have made such speeches, whether they are based on historical tradition or simply ascribed to them by the Chronicler.

#### SUMMARY

From the discussions above we can conclude:

1. The Chronicler's rewritten and additional events are all recurring motifs of retributational patterns and emphasize his theological themes. His comments and additional speeches explicate these patterns and themes more clearly and challenge his readers as well as the kings and the people in the narrative.

Most probably the Chronicler does not write for their own sake but in order to demonstrate the theological meaning of the past and lessons learnt from the past in history. This way of understanding the nature of Chronicler fits well with his high respect for the factual reports of events which we saw in the previous chapter. The Chronicler must be seen as a history with a distinct interpretive and theological message rather than a reinterpretation of past events.

- a. type scenes (to point out recurring patterns in history)
- b. Typologies (to indicate reactualization of past scenes or events, especially that of the ideal worship set forth by David and Solomon)
- c. contemporization (to stress the continuous link between the historical events and his contemporary practice; e.g., the role of the Levites)
- d. hyperbole (for emphasis)
- e. dischronologization (for theological schematization)

3. Nevertheless the Chronicler, as far as we can ascertain, is careful to base his new materials on historical facts or probabilities. In many cases there are indications of their historical trustworthiness or of underlying sources. Even where no positive evidence is available, they are not preposterous and there are no firm reasons to suppose that unhistorical stories are consciously created by the Chronicler. It is possible that he is inconsistent and the principle of analogy cannot be always applied, but it is hard to believe that his interest is purely theological because he collects much extra information and uses a source even where its content does not completely match with his theological purpose.<sup>229</sup>

Most probably the Chronicler uses facts not for their own sake but in order to demonstrate the theological meaning of the past and lessons learnt from the patterns in history. This way of understanding the nature of Chronicles fits well with his high respect for the factual reports in Samuel-Kings which we saw in the previous chapter. Thus Chronicles must be seen as a history with a distinct interpretation and theological message rather than a reinterpretation of previous historical literature or a theological writing without historical concern.

One of the most conspicuous features of the Chronicler's emphases is the role of the Levites. He systematically introduces them in worship scenes and portrays them according to the post-exilic practice. His emphasis on their Davidic origin and their extensive role in worship may suggest that he is defending the status of the Levites in the post-exilic cult and that he himself is a Levite. In 2 Chr 34:30 he exchanges the word "the prophets" with "the Levites" and in 2 Chr 20:14 the Levitical parentage of the prophet Jahaziel is stressed. The Levitical musicians (cf. 1 Chr 15-16; 23-27, etc.) are said to have "prophesied" with musical instruments. It seems that the Chronicler identifies the Levites, and thus himself, with the inspired prophets. The Chronicler is urging his audience in the post-exilic community to return to the proper worship to receive divine blessings and restoration. He is not interpreting Scripture and the authority of his messages does

not come from Scripture. Rather the authority seems to come from his prophetic status to preach a new message to particular situations. Interestingly enough, his distinct message of retribution is repeated again and again through the mouths of prophets as if he is suggesting that that is the recurring pattern in history and the audience must learn from the responses of previous generations.



### III

#### The Chronicler's Presentation of his Work

In the previous two chapters we have seen that the Chronicler's use of the Samuel-Kings text and of additional materials is controlled by his interest in the theological significance of historical events. His concern for historical matters as well as theological views makes it difficult to suppose that Chronicles is purely theological writing employing the historical narrative style. In the present chapter, therefore, we would like to address to another aspect of the issue, whether it is meant to be an interpretation of Samuel-Kings or independent writing, analysing how the Chronicler presents his work as a whole.

If Chronicles is an interpretation of Samuel-Kings, it must be essentially based on the text of Samuel-Kings.' Where the original text is retained we must question if it is repeated to be a basis for exegesis and theological development or to be a part of new literary context and to function differently. Where the texts are omitted we must examine if it is simply due to their conflict with the Chronicler's overall interpretation as often claimed or his conscious selection of useful materials for his own literary structure. Where new materials are added the question is if they are elaboration of

Samuel-Kings text or additions supplied for his distinct purposes regardless of their relation to the Samuel-Kings text.<sup>2</sup> The basic issue here is whether Chronicles is an elaboration of the text of Samuel-Kings and constrained by it or if it has a new distinct literary structure of its own to be read as an independent work.

To defend the exegetical nature of Chronicles another incidental argument is often presented; the Chronicler assumes the readers' knowledge of the unrepeated sections of Samuel-Kings. Whether this argument can be justified will be also considered in the following discussion. Now we would like to turn to the examination of the Chronicler's presentation of the materials.

#### 1. 1 Chr 10: Saul's death

Although the Chronicler's account of Saul's death closely follows the text of Samuel-Kings, with a few minor rewritings it is remodeled to a type scene of the tragic end of a sinful king in 1 Chr 10.<sup>3</sup> Vs. 10 is changed from

וַיִּשְׂאוּ אֶת־לִיָּוִן

וַיִּשְׂאוּ to בֵּית עֶשְׂתֵּרֹת וְאֶת־גִּוִּיָּתוֹ תָּקְעוּ בַּחֹצֵת בֵּית שֵׁן

and the typological nature of this alteration has been convincingly shown by Mosis, Ackroyd, and Williamson.<sup>4</sup> The one noticeable difference is that the thing hung up is not Saul's body but his head. Probably with this change the Chronicler wishes to point out

the contrast between this scene and 1 Sam 5:1-6, where the head of the Philistine deity Dagon was cut off because of the ark.<sup>5</sup> As 1 Chr 13:3 and 15:29 show, the Chronicler regards one of Saul's sins as his neglect of the ark. This head theme also relates 1 Chr 10 to David's victory against Goliath in 1 Sam 17. David brought Goliath's head back to Jerusalem, whereas Saul's head was brought to the Philistine temple. The other rewritings confirm our interpretation. The Chronicler removes the reference to the Israelite city Beth Shean and the Canaanite goddess Ashtaroth and introduces the temple of Dagon so that the reader can read that Saul's head was brought to the land of the Philistines, especially to Dagon's temple.<sup>6</sup> Since Saul did not seek the Lord, he and his House completely perished by the heathen. Also in 1 Chr 10:12 יִשְׂרָאֵל is changed to יִשְׂרָאֵל, and יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיָמָיו is omitted to adjust to his typological rewriting, for Saul's body is not on the wall of Beth Shean but in the temple, and these phrases are no longer appropriate.

The readers are also invited to see Saul's death not simply as an historical happening but as a type of divine rejection by the Chronicler's own conclusion to the episode (vv. 13-4). Vs. 13 ascribes the cause of his death to his neglect of the Lord, and vs. 14 contrasts the Lord's rejection of Saul with his choice of David writing "So the Lord put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David son of Jesse".

Though both Saul and David were chosen by the Lord, Saul proved himself unworthy to be Israel's king by not seeking the Lord, and David proved himself suitable by seeking Him. This motif of rejection of those who do not seek the Lord and the recognition of those who do so is repeated several times later in the narrative (e.g., 1 Chr 13; 15). His conclusion also identifies Saul's death with the exilic situation, attributing the reason for both the exile (1 Chr 9:1) and his death (10:13) to their unfaithfulness ( [ ]לעלם ) to the Lord. Both Judah and Saul were completely destroyed by the heathen because they did not seek the Lord. The Chronicler's first readers, the returnees from the exile (9:2f), are thus compared with Israel's situation after Saul's death and they are questioned whether they take Saul's way or David's way. With the Chronicler's conclusion 1 Chr 10 cannot be a mere report of an historical event but it functions as a paradigm for the fate of those who do not seek the Lord.

The omission of most of David's Rise (1 Sam 16-30) suggests the same point. The Chronicler does not omit this in order to idealize David and to ignore David's struggle with Saul, since the events during this period are referred to in 1 Chr 9:35-40 and 12:1. It is rather because his interest was not the psychological or political tension between Saul and David, but only the fate of Saul as a type of those who do not seek the Lord. Thus he reproduces only his tragic death and



adds comments on its cause. The omission of 2 Sam 1-4 and 9 and the rewriting of 1 Chr 10:6 is also due to the Chronicler's own scheme of history. He writes as if the whole House of Saul died out at Mt. Gilboa. However, since David's reign in Hebron is admitted in 1 Chr 29:26, this omission is not in order to deny the conflict between David and Saul's House before David finally became king over all Israel, but it is meant to present God's turning the kingship from Saul to David (v. 14) more straightforwardly. It is actually doubtful if he thinks it possible to conceal the well-known facts reported in Samuel-Kings and to supercede it. The Chronicler is interested only in God's hands behind the perishing of Saul's House and the establishment of David's. His simplified picture leaves out minor incidents during the transitional period and helps his readers to appreciate the theological implication behind the change of the dynasties more clearly. Thus the repeated section of Saul's life functions completely differently in the new literary context of Chronicles, and the section is not merely left out after omitting the dark side of David's life but deliberately selected for a new literary composition.

## 2. 1 Chr 11-12: David's Coronation

David's coronation scene (1 Chr 11-12) is also presented with a new literary structure by the Chronicler, but this time by changing the order of the quoted sources and by adding his

own materials. Chap. 11 starts with David's anointing taken from 2 Sam 5:1-10 and is followed by the lists of his mighty men of 2 Sam 23:8-39. Chap. 12 continues with five other materials on the mighty men and finishes with the Chronicler's own conclusion. While the list in 11:10-47 is moved here from the originally separate literary setting in 2 Samuel, those in chap. 12 seem to be adopted from various sources.<sup>7</sup> The Chronicler does not swop and add materials arbitrarily but he carefully constructs a new literary structure according to his own scheme. In fact, narratives, lists, prophetic saying etc. are all put together to make 1 Chr 11-12 one literary unit. Williamson has pointed out that 1 Chr 11-12 forms a chiasm, as follows.<sup>8</sup>

David's coronation at Hebron	11:1-9	a
Support for David at Hebron	11:10-47	b
Support for David at Ziklag	12:1-8	c
Support for David at the stronghold	12:9-16	d
Support for David at the stronghold	12:17-19	d'
Support for David at Ziklag	12:20-23	c'
Support for David at Hebron	12:24-38	b'
David's coronation at Hebron	12:39-41	a'

Clearly the first section taken from 2 Sam 5:1-10 (1 Chr 11:1-9) sets the scene of David's coronation for these two chapters and the Chronicler's own conclusion makes other materials in between to be understood as somehow related to the significance of David's accession to the throne. The titles of these early supporters of David suggest that they are used to show how David was increasingly recognized and supported by the

people and finally became the king over all Israel.<sup>9</sup> Though in the original literary context these lists were independent from the narrative of the coronation scene (2 Sam 5:1-10), they were all David's men and it is perfectly adequate to see them as representatives of David's supporters. 11:10-47 lists David's "Three" and "Thirty" selected mighty men, and many of them were with David from the early period, as the narrative of 1 Samuel suggests. 12:1-23 are the names of those who joined David during the Ziklag and the stronghold periods, and four minor sections within it also form a chiasm to recall the past support. 12:24-38 finally lists all those who assembled to make David king at Hebron according to the twelve tribes. Thus 11:10-12:38 as a whole "illustrates the accumulating support for David during the period before his elevation to the throne".<sup>10</sup> The centre of the chiasm consists of the prophecy of Amasai (12:17-19) and focuses on divine "help" for David from the earliest day.<sup>11</sup> The Chronicler's arrangement of the lists, therefore, stresses the idea that David became king supported by both all Israel and God. Israel's support is explicitly stated later in his conclusion (vs. 39) "All the rest of the Israelites were also of one mind to make David king", and God's choice of David is also mentioned in 10:14; 11:1, 3, 9; 12:23 etc. The reason why the Chronicler forms a long impressive list of David's supporters by changing orders and adding new materials was to articulate this theme and in

this way he manages to present a totally different picture of his coronation without changing historical facts. <sup>also</sup> The same theological points are further noted by the Chronicler's slight changes in the introduction and conclusion of each paragraph. Between David's coronation (1 Chr 11:1-3) and his capture of Jerusalem (1 Chr 11:4-9) the summary formula of David's reign is dropped and a new phrase "as the Lord had promised through Samuel" is added. The omission seems to be due to the different function of "the capture of Jerusalem" in the present context. In 2 Samuel because the coronation scene ends with vs. 3 and David's capture of Jerusalem is told independently, the summary of David's reign can be placed after the coronation. Especially 2 Sam 5 is the climax of the long narrative of David's Rise and it is appropriate to give a summary of his reign at this point. But in Chronicles chap. 11 is the beginning of David's story and chaps. 11-12 form one literary unit of David's coronation. The capture of Jerusalem is mentioned within this context and the relationship between his coronation and the capture of Jerusalem is better not interrupted by the formula.

The Chronicler's addition in vs. 3 also gives a new nuance to David's coronation. With this concluding comment he interprets the fulfilment of Samuel's word and points to God's choice behind it.<sup>12</sup> The rewriting of the first verb in vs. 1 from <sup>1X2'1</sup> "they came" to <sup>1X27'1</sup> "they assembled" also



stresses the religious significance of the coronation and suggests David's accession was according to God's plan (cf. also 1 Chr 10:14).

In 1 Chr 11:10 the Chronicler adds another introduction to the list taken from 2 Sam 23. It reads, "Now these are the chiefs of David's mighty men, who gave him strong support in his kingdom, to make him king, according to the word of the Lord concerning Israel." While in 2 Samuel the list has no connection with the coronation scene, with this introduction the Chronicler presents it from the viewpoint that they worked ultimately to establish David's kingdom and it was the Lord's will.

The beginning and the end of the list of "the Thirty" (1 Chr 11:26ff // 2 Sam 23:24ff) are also modified. In vs. 26 the title of the list "the Thirty" is changed to the simpler "the mighty men" and in vs. 41 the concluding comment "there are thirty seven altogether" is skipped and other names are added. "The Thirty" seems to be avoided because there are more than thirty names in the list even in the original form in 2 Samuel, though probably "the Thirty" is an official title and not denoting the exact number of the member.<sup>13</sup> Since the function of the list here is to illustrate the unanimous support of David, it is not necessary for the Chronicler to confine himself to "the Thirty" and it is perfectly possible to increase the names of his supporters.<sup>14</sup>

1 Chr 11 and 12 are, therefore, completely reorganized by the Chronicler to express how David was unanimously supported by the people and God. The parallel materials are changed into parts of the Chronicler's new literary structure with the transposition and new introductions and conclusions. The additional material is also used to contribute to a distinct purpose rather than merely to elaborate the Samuel text.

### 3. 1 Chr 13-16: The Transfer of the Ark on David's sincere

1 Chr 13-16 also form a new literary structure of "the transfer of the ark" by changing the order of materials and adding new sections.<sup>15</sup> 2 Sam 6 is divided into two sections (1 Chr 13 and 16) and its first half is exchanged with 2 Sam 5. 1 Chr 15 and 16:4-42 are constructed by new materials; the former is based on another source and the latter is from excerpts of the psalms.<sup>16</sup> As a result, while in 2 Samuel the blessing of David and his victory over the Philistines are narrated independently between the coronation (2 Sam 5:1-10) and the ark narrative (2 Sam 6), in Chronicles they are located between the two divided sections of the ark narrative together with David's organization of the Levites. The psalms are added at the final celebration of the ark transfer. In the structure of Samuel there is no relationship between David's transfer of the ark and his blessings or his victory over the Philistines, but in Chronicles the causal relationship between them is evident. In

fact according to the Chronicler the transfer of the ark is the first major activity of David since he became king. This pattern, seeking of the Lord leading to blessings and victory, is clearly intended as the reversal of Saul's death and the exile.

The Chronicler's introductions in 13:3 and 14:17 state this contrast. As Saul was a type of destruction, David is here presented as a type of victor/deliverer.<sup>17</sup> For the Chronicler, all the differences are based on David's sincere attitude to the Lord, and therefore "the Lord also gave him victory everywhere". David's victory starts with Jerusalem (1 Chr 11), the Philistines (1 Chr 14), and culminates with the neighbouring countries (1 Chr 18-20). David's kingdom was also recognized by Israel (1 Chr 11), by Tyre (1 Chr 14) and finally by the Lord Himself (1 Chr 17) with the dynastic promise that his kingdom is established. Before the Chronicler goes to the account of the full establishment of the kingdom (1 Chr 17-20), here he clarifies why David was blessed and he arranges the materials taken from the various sections of the Scripture and outside for this scheme.

The Chronicler is interested in not only David's seeking of the Lord but also his seeking Him in a proper way, as we already saw in chapter one. In 1 Chr 15 he introduces the Levites as carriers of the ark and their organization, because

he believes the ark must be carried by them as the Deuteronomic law suggests (Deut 10:8 etc.). He writes in vs. 13:

It was because you, the Levites, did not bring it up the first time that the Lord our God broke out in anger against us. We did not seek it in the proper way.

15:1-3 and 11-15 are the Chronicler's description of the second transfer of the ark and it is basically an expansion of his *Vorlage* by the Pentateuchal regulations. In vv. 1-3 David orders that only the Levites can carry the ark and in vv. 12, 14, and 15 the proper way of carrying the ark is suggested according to Exod 12; 25:13-15 and Num. 7:9. 1 Chr 15:4-10, 16-24 are occupied by the lists of the Levites and their duties. Since David's religious activities are presented as types of proper worship and these musicians are viewed as the direct continuation of David's enterprise (cf. chap. 2), the Chronicler jumps to his contemporary situation to link the theological significance of David's worship and what the proper worship in his day should be like.

Another addition in 16:4-42 is basically taken from three different psalms. This again stresses David's permanent installment of the Levitical musicians and the importance of their role in the cult. In vv. 4-7 probably based on the reference to music in his *Vorlage* (2 Sam 6:5), the Chronicler connects the appointment of the temple musicians with a specific historical occasion; the completion of the transfer of the ark. The following psalms are adopted from the canonical



psalms almost verbatim, but three different ones are combined according to his purpose: vv. 8-22 are taken from Ps 105:1-15, vv. 23-33 from Ps 96:1-13, vs. 34 from Ps 106:1 and vv. 35-36 from Ps 106:47-48. Besides the general praise of God's almighty sovereignty (vv. 8-13 // Ps 105:1-6, and vv. 23-33 // Ps 96), it focuses on God's covenant with the patriarch to give the land and on His protection of the patriarchs who were yet small and weak (vv. 14-22 // Ps 105:7-15). The psalm ends with a petition for deliverance from the nations (vv. 34-36 // Ps 106). The content of the psalm fits much better with the post-exilic situation than the glorious Davidic period. Since many of the psalms are connected with David from the early time, they are used here to illustrate the kind of music the Levitical musicians might have sung. But to contemporize the portrayal of worship, the Chronicler shows the exemplary psalms which should be also sung among the post-exilic community.

The Chronicler also supplies introductions and conclusions to the quoted materials in order to adjust them to a new literary context and to interpret them from his perspective. At the beginning of the whole ark narrative he expands the original introduction of 2 Sam 6:1 into 1 Chr 13:1-5. The first noticeable stress is that David summons "all Israel" for the transfer of the ark. Clearly it is seen not only as David's individual work but as an event of national religious significance. It suggests that the people are also responsible

implication of this victory, emphasizing David's establishment of the kingdom and the Lord's support. The contrast with Saul, especially with his concluding words, is for their religious matters and it might also imply his assumption that Jerusalem is the place of worship for "all Israel". Reference to neglect of the ark in Saul's day in vs. 3 suggests that its contrast with David's care for the ark and consequent victory over the Philistines is intended in these chapters. The Chronicler's expanded introduction thus makes his readers see not only the course of the events but also the theological implication of the transfer of the ark with him.

In 14:3 the Chronicler omits the phrase "after they came from Hebron" from the introductory part of David's sons and daughters. While Rudolph believes it is due to his stress on David as king of all Israel, his coronation took place in Hebron (1 Chr 11-12) and this phrase does not necessarily imply his seven and a half year reign of Judah in this context.<sup>18</sup> 1 Chr 29:27, moreover, admits his reign in Hebron so that it is unlikely that the Chronicler avoids it because of his desire to present David as king over all Israel. The change was rather intended to adjust this section about David's sons and daughters to a new literary context. In Samuel it is recorded immediately after the coronation at Hebron and it is important to suggest his movement, but in Chronicles by swapping the materials he has already started to narrate David in Jerusalem in 13:1 and the reference to Hebron is not necessary.

In 14:17 the Chronicler again adds a conclusion to David's victory over the Philistines. In it he clarifies the

implication of this victory, emphasizing David's establishment of the kingdom and the Lord's support. The contrast with Saul, especially with his concluding comment in 1 Chr 10:13-14 is obvious. He does not see this victory as one of many victories David won, but he interprets it as a sign of the Lord's establishment of David's kingdom and as a contrast with Saul's defeat by the Philistines.

The beginning and the end of the concluding part of the ark narrative (1 Chr 15:25ff) is also modified by the Chronicler to fit with a new literary context and to show another theological implication of the event. He does not include the first clause in 2 Sam 6:12 "Now the king David was told, 'The Lord has blessed the household of Obed-Edom and everything he has, because of the ark of God'" before "So David went to bring up the ark of the covenant . . ." In Samuel this phrase comes immediately after the first failure of the transfer and explains why David tried it again. But in Chronicles there are other stories inserted between the two parts and David has already started to prepare for the second transfer in 15:1, appointing the Levites. In order to read this preparation together with the transfer *per se* this phrase is out of place. Moreover, despite the first failure, the whole structure of 1 Chr 13-16 suggests that David was blessed because he sought the ark, and therefore the verse which might

suggest that David forgot all about the ark until he heard about Obed-Edom is not appropriate for his scheme.

The ending of the transfer account reports that Michal, a daughter of Saul, despised David dancing, but its reason (2 Sam 6:17ff) is excluded. It is possible that the Chronicler does not want to include a possibly unpleasant description (his exposure) and describes David's worship as a type for proper worship. But Mosis has convincingly shown that this omission highlights the theme of these chapters, the contrast between Saul and David again, because Michal, Saul's daughter, despised David being pleased with the ark.<sup>19</sup> While Samuel simply records Michal's irony on David's exposure, the Chronicler interprets it as she was not happy about David's excitement about the ark from the beginning. With these changes, the contrast between David and Saul becomes clearer and David's seeking of the ark and the Lord's blessing is more stressed.

Again in these chapters parallel materials are read from a new perspective with his introductions and conclusions. They are also transposed and with additional materials they form a new literary structure.

#### 4. 1 Chr 17-20: The Establishment of David's Rule

After David completed the transfer of the ark, the Lord promised to establish his kingdom. In these chapters the Chronicler reports the dynastic promise and David's victories



collection of David's victories and stress on God's establishment of David's kingship strongly suggest that they were omitted simply because they had little to do with his narrative invites us to see the establishment of the kingdom as the culmination of David's seeking of the Lord. L. Allen

The omission of the Nephibosheth episode (2 Sam 9) should not be understood as the Chronicler's denial of David's conflict with Saul's House. As we have seen, the events during David's Rise are related in 2 Sam 1-10 and 20:1-4, and the Chronicler's exclusion of this episode is structural. The significance of the dynasty's bloodshed and his not having "rest", in 1 Chr 17 he follows his *Vorlage* so faithfully that his minor changes cannot assert any particular interpretation by themselves and David's wars here are only an advance hint of what will be more clearly stated in 1 Chr 22ff. The main function of these chapters is rather to show how the promise of the establishment of the kingdom begins to be fulfilled. 1 Chr 18:6, 13 "The Lord gave him victory everywhere" clearly states the purpose of these chapters, though it is based on his *Vorlage*.

1 Chr 18-20 consists of nothing but the reports of David's victory and that the Chronicler consciously collects them is evident. 1 Chr 18 is based on 2 Sam 8; 19:1-20:1 is taken from 2 Sam 10:1-11:1; 20:1-3 is from 2 Sam 12:26-31, and 20:4-8 is from 2 Sam 21:18-22. Omissions between these sections have been often attributed to the Chronicler's unwillingness to include an account unfavourable to David. But his deliberate

collection of David's victories and stress on God's establishment of David's kingship strongly suggest that they were omitted simply because they had little to do with his theme and no place to fill.

The omission of the Mephibosheth episode (2 Sam 9) should not be understood as the Chronicler's denial of David's conflict with Saul's House. As we have seen above, the events during David's Rise are referred to in 1 Chr 9:35f and 12:1 and their exclusion is structurally aimed at highlighting the significance of the dynastic change. In this episode, moreover, David treats Mephibosheth with kindness and, if the Chronicler is simply idealizing David, it is questionable whether Mephibosheth's being one of Saul's descendants made the Chronicler shy away from using such a positive portrayal of David. Similarly, the Bath Sheba episode (2 Sam 11-12) is not excluded to conceal the dark side of David. In these chapters the Chronicler deals with David's victories and he is not interested in David's personal matters. In fact not only here, but in the whole account of David, his personal life, whether good or bad, is excluded. 2 Sam 13-21, Absalom's rebellion, is also skipped because it is irrelevant to his theme. As his interpretation of the Davidic promise suggests, he is interested only in the theological significance of the blessed reign of David and Solomon and their establishment of "rest". For him the minor problems between these two figures are

negligible and he does not intend to reproduce the whole course of the events. Since he hints at least at Adonijah's rebellion in 1 Chr 23:1 and 29:24, he does not intend to hide the strife over the David's throne by his sons (see below).

Even within the quoted episode the material which does not directly contribute to the theme is passed over. Because of the exclusion of the Bath Sheba episode in between, the first part and the second part of the war against the Ammonites are directly connected by the Chronicler. Yet he does not include the first three verses of the second half (2 Sam 12:12-26-28), because they attribute the victory to Joab but not to David. Since these chapters are dealing with David as a victor and Joab fought for David anyway, only the part directly related to David is adopted. Likewise, the first of the four episodes of the war against the Philistines (2 Sam 21:15-17) is excluded, and accordingly in 20:8 the number "four [Philistines]" is omitted. Though the Israelites won the war, vs. 15 says "David was tired" and in vs. 17 David's men ask him not fight any more. These expressions can weaken his point that David won victory overwhelmingly and they are eliminated.

##### 5. 1 Chr 21: The Purchase of the Temple Site

Before 1 Chr 21 is taken from 2 Sam 24, David's song (2 Sam 22) and his last word (2 Sam 23) are passed over in Chronicles. These omissions again show the Chronicler's

conscious selection of the materials for his scheme. Both David's song and his last word give a positive picture of David and, if the Chronicler were only interpreting his *Vorlage*, there is no reason why these texts should be omitted. Though 2 Sam 22 is the song sung when David was delivered from Saul, in the song itself there is nothing related to the Saul-David conflict (Cf. Mephibosheth episode). Probably as the Chronicler wishes to make certain theological points in his own extensive additions of David's last moment (1 Chr 22-29), David's song and last word in the *Vorlage* have become somewhat redundant. On the other hand, the Chronicler does not hesitate to include the account of David's sin in taking a census in this chapter (see below) or his failure in the Ark transfer in 1 Chr 13. These phenomena clearly indicate that the Chronicler is not simply omitting the problematic passages from the text, but consciously selecting materials according to his own direction.

1 Chr 21 itself is essentially adopted from 2 Sam 24, but the significance of the event is considerably changed by the Chronicler's introduction and conclusion. As we saw in the typological rewriting section, the cause of David's census was changed from "the anger of the Lord" to "Satan's instigation" (vs. 1). It is true that this is an attempt at explaining theological difficulties: why did David have to repent of his census, if it was led by "anger of the Lord"?<sup>21</sup>



However, in vs. 3 the verb "desire"  $\gamma\delta\eta$  is changed to the stronger "demand"  $\psi\eta\eta$ , Joab's courtesy is transformed to his open objection to David's order, and a phrase "why should he [David] bring guilt on Israel?" is added. This verse has nothing to do with "the anger of the Lord" and the Chronicler does not need to explain any problem here. Vs. 7 also rewrites "David was conscious stricken" to "This command was also evil in the sight of God; so he punished Israel". These changes clearly emphasize that the census is David's sin and probably the change in vs. 1 must be also seen as a part of the stress on David's sin.

The stress on his sin in the beginning of the narrative leads us to read vs. 8 as a type of "repentance of sins" In later chapters "repentance of sins" is viewed as a major function of the temple (2 Chr 6:20ff; 7:12ff) and clearly here a sequence - David's sin, his repentance, building of the altar, and God's forgiveness - is seen as a type. The Chronicler's conclusion 21:26b-22:1 adds further significance to this account by identifying Ornan's threshing floor which David purchased with the later temple site. We can no longer read this story as one of the incidents of David's life but it must be understood as the account of the divine choice of the temple site. Formerly Gibeon was the place of worship, but the Chronicler suggests that now everyone must worship in Jerusalem because the Lord Himself forced David to worship there.<sup>22</sup>

6. 1 Chr 22-29: David's Charge to Solomon and the People

The last section of 1 Chronicles is essentially the Chronicler's new composition, though it deals with the transition between David's reign and Solomon's reign as 1 Kgs 1-2.<sup>23</sup> The proposal to regard it as interpretation of the Kings text seems difficult to accept, because there is little literal contact with 1 Kgs 1-2 and the material is carefully structured by the Chronicler himself. Moreover, it plays a different yet significant role in the overall theological schematization of his work.

The completely new structure of 1 Chr 22-29 suggests its independence from 1 Kgs 1-2. Although the last section (1 Chr 29:20-25) sums up the general course of events in 1 Kgs 1-2, the remainder of the material is not a historical narrative as Kings but it concentrates on David's charges and his organization of the Levites. David's two speeches to Solomon and the leaders of Israel (1 Chr 22 and 28, 29) sandwich his Levitical organization (1 Chr 23-27) and they are consciously paralleled as follows:

(22:2-5)	David's preparation for Temple building	28:2
22:(6)7-10	Divine Choice of Solomon	28:3-8
22:11-13	Charge to Solomon to build the Temple (I)	28:9-10
22:14-16a	Practical Assignment	28:11-19
22:16b	Charge to Solomon to build the Temple (II)	28:20-21
22:17-19	Charge to the People	29:1-9

The narrative of David's preparation of building materials for the Temple (22:2-5) sets up the context for his charges to Solomon to complete the building work and his charge ends with the encouragement to the people (29:1-9) to offer more building materials as he himself did.<sup>24</sup> This inclusion clearly suggests that all of the charges are based on David's preparation of the Temple materials, and thus his participation in the establishment of the Temple cult is emphasized.<sup>25</sup> The organization of the Levites in between (1 Chr 23-27) is also David's arrangement for the Temple personnel.<sup>26</sup> However, in contrast to the Chronicler's conscious effort to give David a place for the institution of the Temple cult along with Solomon, 1 Kgs 1-2 does not mention David's preparation at all and it is first referred to in 1 Kgs 7:51. Thus 1 Chr 22-29 is more likely a statement of David's and Solomon's roles in Temple building than mere interpretation of the text of 1 Kgs 1-2.

The Chronicler models David's charge to Solomon on Moses' charge to Joshua (Josh 1), suggesting David and Solomon worked together for the Temple building and Solomon was chosen by the Lord to fulfill the building work started by David.<sup>27</sup> N. Lohfink and R. Braun have shown that 1 Chr 22:11-13, 16b and 28:9-10, 20-21 are constructed with three basic structural elements in Joshua's commissioning: the formula of encouragement, the description of the task, and the formula of



accompaniment.<sup>28</sup> They also share a number of phrases with Josh 1: the concern for the keeping of the law (1 Chr 22:12, 13; 28:7, 9), the thought of prosperity (1 Chr 22:11, 13), the fourfold division of the formula of encouragement, "Be strong, be courageous, do not be afraid and do not be terrified" (1 Chr 22:13), and the formula "May the Lord be with you/ the Lord is with you".<sup>29</sup> The twofold commissioning of Solomon (1 Chr 22 and 28) also parallels that of Joshua (Deut 31:14-15, Josh 1:2-9). This typological device clearly points to the Chronicler's conscious effort to describe David's and Solomon's reign as a unified reign to accomplish one major task of the Lord, the Temple building.<sup>30</sup> Solomon was equally chosen by the Lord for this task as David and his succession to David's throne is told exclusively in terms of the Temple building. Although David's charge in 1 Kgs 2:2-4 already shows some influence from Josh 1, the Chronicler explicates their typological relationship and uses it for his own theological purpose: to delineate his understanding of the relationship of David and Solomon in the establishment of the Temple worship.<sup>31</sup>

However, it is in the "Divine Choice of Solomon" section (1 Chr 22:7-10; 28:3-8) where the Chronicler most clearly explicates his view of the David-Solomon relationship from his peculiar interpretation of the Davidic Promise (2 Sam 7). That it was not David but Solomon who built the Temple is not



understood as historical chance by the Chronicler but as the Lord's deliberate choice.<sup>32</sup> 22:8 states that David was disqualified from this task because of his engagement in war and bloodshed, but vs. 9 contrasts Solomon as a man of peace (i.e., "rest") and he is appointed as the Temple builder (vs. 10a). The idea comes from 1 Kgs 5:17-19 [Eng 3-5] where "rest" is taken as the prerequisite for the construction of the Temple. The Chronicler relates the name Solomon with peace, and this expansion makes the pronoun  $\chi\iota\tau$  in "He shall build a house for my name" (vs. 10a) refer directly to Solomon rather than to unnamed seed as in the original Davidic Promise in 2 Sam 7.<sup>33</sup> The reference to the Davidic Promise in David's charge to Solomon in 1 Kgs 2:2-4 does not mention "rest" or the Temple building, but here the Chronicler sees Solomon as chosen not only as David's successor but as the Temple builder. From this perspective the Chronicler removes the reference of "rest" to David in the Davidic Promise itself (1 Chr 17:1, 10) and makes the prohibition of the Temple building more definite (vs. 4). The deuteronomic historian already connects "rest" with the erection of a central sanctuary and has David not plan the Temple building until he received "rest", but the Chronicler cannot see "rest" in a strict sense during his reign, because he could not build it anyway.<sup>34</sup>

Just as in 1 Chr 22, in 1 Chr 28:2-8 the disqualification of David (vs. 3) and the explicit choice of Solomon (vs. 6) as

the Temple builder is evident. The reference to the ark in vs. 2 further underlines the relationship between "rest" and the Temple. Here the Chronicler parallels the tradition found in Ps 132 and Num 10:33-36: when the Lord gives his people "rest", his ark "rests" in the Temple.<sup>35</sup> The Chronicler's unique application of  $\text{בחר}$  "to choose", the word not used of any king after David elsewhere, to Solomon again suggests divine choice of Solomon for the particular work.<sup>36</sup> *expansive commentary on 1 Kgs* The Chronicler also interprets the significance of the Temple building for the establishment of the dynasty differently from the deuteronomic historian. In 2 Sam 7 the Davidic Promise is offered to David unconditionally and Solomon makes no particular contribution for its fulfilment, but later in the Deuteronomistic History Solomon and later kings are judged according to the condition of the promise.<sup>37</sup> The Chronicler solves this tension by making the original dynastic oracle conditional upon Solomon's obedience, especially to his completion of the Temple building, and he writes David's charge accordingly (1 Chr 28:7). For the establishment of the dynasty both God's promise to David and Solomon's obedience are necessary and in this sense their reigns are seen as united in Chronicles.<sup>38</sup> Their roles are complimentary, for David could not build the Temple (1 Chr 22:8; 28:3) and Solomon could not prepare for it by himself (1 Chr 22:5; 29:1). Thus after the dedication of the Temple the Chronicler consistently sees the

dynasty as eternally established and bases his future hope on it (cf. 2 Chr 6:41-42; 7:12-22; 13:5-8; 21:7; 23:3). The Chronicler believes David's charge to Solomon is more than the election of his successor but the divine choice of the one who completes the Temple building and establishes the dynasty eternally.

It is not difficult to imagine why these chapters are sometimes seen as reinterpretation or "expansive commentary" on 1 Kgs 1-2, especially David's charge to Solomon and its reference to the Davidic Promise.<sup>39</sup> However, from the discussions above it is clear that the Chronicler composes these chapters for his own purpose. It is noteworthy that the account of Solomon's accession in Chronicles concentrates on the establishment of the cult and he arranges his materials with his own parallel structures, typologies, and inclusio. David's charge parallels only four verses in Kings (1 Kgs 1:30, 2:2-4) and the rest of the Kings' historical narrative is completely ignored, while Chronicles contains extensive new materials. Not only has he a new structure but also he has a completely new perspective to interpret the Davidic Promise and it is used to present his understanding of the roles of David and Solomon. He is concerned to show that Solomon was chosen to complete the Temple building begun by David and thus to fulfil the Davidic Promise. Such a view conflicts with the interpretation of the deuteromistic historian, but in 2 Chr

## 7. 2 Chr 1-9: Solomon's Temple Building

The Chronicler's version of Solomon's reign itself shares 22:1-29:9 he sets up this basic theme and develops the rest of his narrative on it. Clearly the few parallel materials do not control the structure or content of the Chronicler's writing, and he is using them solely to express his highly theological view of the David-Solomon relationship.

The remainder of 1 Chr 29 also points to the Chronicler's conscious literary creation. The last prayer of David (29:10-19) is expressed with typical psalm-like phrases. Williamson has demonstrated that three major themes here (the sojourning patriarchs, the kingship of the Lord, and petition) correspond with the psalm anthology in 1 Chr 16:8-36, and together form a framework round David's preparation for the Temple (1 Chr 17-29).<sup>40</sup> In the concluding section (29:20-30) the Chronicler sums up Solomon's accession and David's death, based on 1 Kgs 1-2.<sup>41</sup> Yet the historical situation of Solomon's accession is given surprisingly little space, especially considering the long theological excursus of David's charges, and against his *Vorlage* the charges are not placed in their historical context but within David's preparation for the Temple. Even the structure of this small section agrees with the Chronicler's overall picture of the united David-Solomon reigns. Excluding Adonijah's rebellion, he puts David's death after Solomon's accession, against his *Vorlage* (1 Kgs 2:10-12), to further reinforce their unity.<sup>42</sup>



## 7. 2 Chr 1-9: Solomon's Temple Building

The Chronicler's version of Solomon's reign itself shares much of the material with 1 Kgs 3:1-11:43, but the overall image of Solomon is considerably different between the two accounts. Although there are no major additions in Chronicles, a number of events are omitted or transposed to create a new literary structure, and the parallel materials are given new functions in new contexts with additions of small theological introductory or concluding comments.

The most striking omissions are those of the beginning and concluding chapters of Solomon's reign. Since 1 Kgs 1-2 reports Solomon's struggle with Adonijah for the succession of David's throne and 1 Kgs 11 reveals his sins and the prophecy of judgment against him, they are often ascribed to the Chronicler's desire to remove Solomon's negative side from his *Vorlage* (cf. also the omission of 1 Kgs 9:15-16). However, we have already seen that, though the Chronicler excludes most of the negative aspects of David's reign, he does not mind retaining his sin (1 Chr 21) or failure (1 Chr 13), and it is doubtful whether the Chronicler systematically suppresses the unfavourable side of David's or Solomon. Rather these omissions seem to be designed to present David and Solomon's reign as a "united reign" for the establishment of the Temple cult and to portray the transition of power as smoothly as possible.<sup>43</sup>

In the previous section we have seen that the Chronicler's peculiar interpretation of the Davidic Promise and concept of "rest", his unique use of the term  $\gamma\eta\lambda$ , the typology of the commissioning of Joshua, and the parallelism of the people's immediate support of Solomon, all contribute to this purpose. Here again the first act of Solomon after his accession, the summoning of "all Israel" to seek the Lord, parallels David's example (cf. 1 Chr 13).<sup>44</sup> In Solomon's consecration of the Temple the divine blessing is ascribed not only to "David his servant" (1 Kgs 8:66) alone but to "David and Solomon" (2 Chr 7:10), and the people come all over "from Lebo-Hamath to the Brook of Egypt" as in the case of his modified account of David's celebration (2 Sam 6:1 // 1 Chr 13:5).<sup>54</sup>

The Chronicler's account of Solomon's reign is dominated by the Temple building and establishment of ideal worship and the omission of these chapters must be seen as a part of his careful selection of materials for his presentation. As B. Porten has shown, the deuteronomic historian presents his reign as a series of fulfilments of the Davidic promise: wisdom (1 Kgs 3:4-4:19), building (4:20-9:23), wealth (9:26-10:29), and its partial abrogation (11:1-40), but as we shall see in the following discussion for the Chronicler both wisdom and wealth are seen as means for the Temple building and there is no room for the account of his sins.<sup>46</sup> From 1 Chr 21 on the

Chronicler's sole concern is Solomon's building of the Temple.<sup>47</sup> establishment of his rule, especially that

The overall structure of the remaining materials also suggests the Chronicler's conscious structuring around the theme of the Temple building. R. Dillard has demonstrated that 2 Chr 1-9 forms a great chiasm as follows:

- A. Solomon's wealth and wisdom (1:1-17)  
(Trade in horses, 1:14-17)
- B. Recognition by Gentiles/ dealings with Hiram (2:1-16)  
(Yahweh's love for Israel, 2:11)
- C. Temple construction/gentile labour (2:17-5:1)  
(Gentile labor, 2:17-18)  
(Completion of temple, 5:1)
- D. Dedication of temple (5:2-7:10)
  - 1. a. Summons
  - b. Sacrifice
  - c. Music
  - d. Glory cloud
  - 2. Solomon speaks to the people (6:1-11)
    - a. Exodus (6:5)
    - b. Choice of Jerusalem (6:6-11)
  - 2'. Solomon speaks to God (6:12-42)
    - a. Promises to David (6:16-17)
    - b. Eyes open; hear and forgive (6:18-42)
  - 1''. d'. Glory cloud
  - c'. Music
  - b'. Sacrifice
  - a'. Dismissal
- D'. Divine response (7:11-22)
  - 2''. God speaks' to Solomon (7:12-18)
    - b. Eyes open; hear and forgive (7:13-16)
    - a. Promises to David (7:17-18)
  - 2'''. God speaks to the people (7:19-22)
    - b. Choice of Jerusalem (7:19-21)
    - a. Exodus (7:22)
- C'. Other construction/gentile labour (8:1-16)  
(Gentile labor, 8:7-10)  
(Completion of temple, 8:16)
- B'. Recognition by Gentiles/  
dealings with Hiram (8:17-9:12)  
(Yahweh's love for Israel, 9:8)
- A'. Solomon's wealth and wisdom (9:13-28)  
(Trade in horses, 9:25-28)<sup>48</sup>



Both A (1:1-14) and A' (9:13-28) sections deal with Solomon's establishment of his rule, especially that illustrated by his wealth and wisdom. Although A focuses on those recognized within his kingdom (cf. 1:12) and A' in a more international context (cf. 9:22), the Chronicler seems to present them in a parallel structure intentionally. The Chronicler constructs 1:1-14 as a separate section of Solomon's consolidation of his reign with his new introductory and concluding comments (1:1 and 13b), whereas in Kings the kingdom was already established before the Gibeon event through the court politics (cf. 1 Kgs 2:46) and this section represents a beginning of a series of realization of Solomon's wisdom.

He also shifts its focus from Solomon's wisdom itself to his wisdom and wealth as signs of the establishment of his reign, to parallel 1:1-14 with 9:13-28. The omission of the Succession Narrative and his introductory comment "Solomon the son of David established himself in his kingdom" (2 Chr 1:1) make the story of Solomon's wisdom a part of the establishment of Solomon's rule, which is a prerequisite for the Temple building. In 2 Chr 1:9 Solomon's request for wisdom is related to the fulfilment of the Davidic Promise (without parallel) which is in his view dependent on Solomon's completion of the Temple.<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, the references to Solomon's being "a little child" (1 Kgs 3:7) and "discerning between good and evil" (3:9) are abridged. The Chronicler further leaves out



the illustrations of Solomon's wisdom lest wisdom alone is focused upon: wisdom in any case is to be understood in more general terms: the story of two harlots (1 Kgs 3:16-28), the commercial trade in 1 Kgs 5, the Chronicler changes them to an list of the officers (1 Kgs 4:1-5:8 [Eng 4:28]), the summary of example of the recognition of Solomon's glory by gentiles as in his wisdom (1 Kgs 5:9-14 [Eng 4:29-34]).<sup>50</sup> These are other examples of omissions of Solomon's positive aspects, and the Chronicler's structural intent is evident. Later Hiram also praises the Lord for Solomon's wisdom to "build a temple for the Lord, and to connect the trade explicitly with his preparation for Temple building."<sup>51</sup> In 2 Chr 2:10 Solomon decides the amount of payment in advance and it is implied that it is a single rather than an annual provision. In the conclusion (2 Chr 2:16) the Chronicler omits Hiram's request for faithful

The Chronicler introduces Solomon's wealth as the Lord's initial provision for the Temple building in 2 Chr 1:14-17. The details of his wealth (1 Kgs 10:26-29 // 2 Chr 9:25-28) are substituted by Hiram's returning (giving) them to maintain Solomon's superior position.<sup>52</sup> The tie between the Hiram and wealth and the beginning of the building work.<sup>52</sup> The almost verbatim repetition of trade in horses and comparison between cedar and sycamore and silver and stone strongly suggests the Chronicler's conscious effort in corresponding A and A'.<sup>53</sup> Clearly with these changes the original story of Solomon's request for wisdom is transformed into the counterpart of A', especially that of 9:22; "Thus King Solomon excelled all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom".

In like manner the Chronicler couples B (2:1-16) with B' (8:17-9:12). Whereas the dealings with Hiram are seen as a commercial trade in 1 Kgs 5, the Chronicler changes them to an example of the recognition of Solomon's glory by gentiles as in the case of the visit of the queen of Sheba (2 Chr 8:17-9:12). He replaces the original introduction (1 Kgs 5:1) with his own (2 Chr 2:1-2), so as to have Solomon take the initiative, not Hiram, and to connect the trade explicitly with his preparation for Temple building.<sup>54</sup> In 2 Chr 2:10 Solomon decides the amount of payment in advance and it is implied that it is a single rather than an annual provision. In the conclusion (2 Chr 2:16) the Chronicler omits Hiram's request for faithful payment to suggest Hiram's subordinate position. In 2 Chr 8:1-2 Hiram's displeasure with the cities Solomon gave is substituted by Hiram's returning (giving) them to maintain Solomon's superior position.<sup>55</sup> The tie between the Hiram narrative and that of the queen of Sheba is reinforced by the additional praise in Hiram's letter: "Because the Lord loves his people, he has made you king over them" (2:11).<sup>56</sup> The identical expression is used by the queen of Sheba (9:8), but it is found only there in the Deuteronomistic History (1 Kgs 10:9). The account of the visit of the queen (8:17-9:12) is also related to Hiram, for it is bracketed by Solomon's maritime venture with him (8:17-18; 9-10-11).<sup>57</sup>

Solomon's Temple building (C: 2:17-5:1) and his other construction activities (C': 8:1-16) are also paired by the Chronicler. The conscription of gentile labour is included in both sections (2:17-18 // 1 Kgs 5:13-16; 8:7-10 // 1 Kgs 9:20-23).<sup>58</sup> Both C and C' are somehow associated with the construction of the Temple, though the accounts in Kings include various building activities. The Chronicler removes the report of the building of the royal palace (1 Kgs 7:1-12) from the first account (C) to concentrate on the Temple building, suggesting his careful choice of the materials relevant to his own theme. Noncultic constructions in 8:1-10 (C') are related to the Temple with an extensive expansion of Solomon's ceremonial provisions for the Temple cult (8:12-15 // 1 Kgs 9:25), for the construction of the Temple itself is already over.<sup>59</sup> It is especially difficult to see why the Chronicler concludes C' with a note on the completion of the Temple building and the treasures in 8:16 unless it is linked to the ending of the first section (C; 5:1).

Dedication of the Temple (D) in 5:2-7:10 is again structured in a chiasmic fashion. Whereas the cloud of glory appears only in the beginning of the dedication in Kings (1 Kgs 8:1-11 // 2 Chr 5:2-14), the Chronicler repeats it after Solomon's dedicatory prayer in 2 Chr 7:1-10. The repetition includes details such as the priests overcome by the glory, sacrifices, and musical accompaniment. Although it has been



often explained in redaction critical terms, there is no compelling reason to regard it as a later insertion. Rather, judging from the overall intention of the Chronicler, it is more plausible to attribute it to his conscious parallelism.<sup>60</sup> Because of this, an immediate divine response to Solomon's blessing of the people (1 Kgs 8:54b-61) becomes unnecessary and is thus omitted.<sup>61</sup> Solomon's dedicatory speech (D) and the divine answer (D': 7:11-22) also correspond. Just as Solomon's speech is divided into two parts, one to the people (6:1-11 // 1Kgs 8:14-21) and another to God (6:12-42 // 1 Kgs 8:22-53), God responds first to Solomon (7:12-18 // 1 Kgs 9:2-5) and then to the people (7:19-22 // 1 Kgs 9:6-9)<sup>62</sup> Dillard has also pointed out that four themes of Solomon's speech, Exodus, choice of Jerusalem, Promise to David, and request to hear and forgive, have respective counterparts in the divine response, in a chiastic order.<sup>63</sup>

The centre of the chiasm is, therefore, not the building of the Temple itself but Solomon's dedicatory speech and divine response. The report of the construction is actually curtailed through a number of substantial omissions: Temple details (1 Kgs 6:4-19, 22, 26, 29-38; 7:15, 17b-20, 22), Temple furnishing (1 Kgs 7:27-38), and the construction of the palace (1 Kgs 7:1-12). For the Chronicler's contemporaries the Temple building is not as splendid as Solomon's, but what matters most is continuity with the Temple in Jerusalem.<sup>64</sup> He thus clearly



expresses his view of the God-Israel relationship in his additions in Solomon's speech and divine response. He exchanges the basis of Solomon's petition to listen to the people's prayer from the Exodus experience (1 Kgs 8:51-53) to the Davidic Promise (2 Chr 6:40-42 taken from Ps 132:1, 8-10) and in 2 Chr 7:14 he sets (without *Vorlage*) a principle of forgiveness, which is realized again and again in the following history of Israel and still challenges his readers.<sup>65</sup> The Chronicler's account of Solomon has such a well-crafted structure and such distinct themes that it is hard to perceive it as an interpretation of 1 Kgs 3-11. The Chronicler seems to believe that there are 'good reasons' for 2 Chr 10-16: The Division of the Kingdom and he retains 'God' The Chronicler's account of the division of the monarchy is again reported completely from his own perspective, though Samuel-Kings is used as a main historical source. He manages to give a new interpretation of the division and to set a retributitional pattern which dominates the subsequent history of Israel by selecting materials, adding his own, and supplying theological comments. The Chronicler ascribes the cause of the initial division of the kingdom to God's will, but he does not elaborate its relationship with Solomon's sin (2 Chr 10:15; cf. 11:4). He omits the account of Solomon's apostasy and Shemaiah's prophecy (1 Kgs 11), because he wants to show that the Davidic Promise

was established by Solomon's obedience. Consequently Rehoboam's unwise treatment of the northerners becomes more significant for the division, despite little rewriting in the account itself.<sup>66</sup> The Chronicler also sees Jeroboam being actively against Judah from an early stage, though whether he is following his *Vorlage* at this point is debated.<sup>67</sup> However, neither of the two characters are seen as totally responsible for the division, as the negative evaluation of Rehoboam's reign is qualified by some positive aspects (cf. 2 Chr 12:12-14) and the detail of Jeroboam's apostasy is not introduced until Abijah's reign. As Welch and Williamson argue, the Chronicler seems to believe that there are 'good reasons' for Israel to refuse Rehoboam's unfaithful reign and he retains "God's will" as the ultimate cause of the division (2 Chr 10:15; 11:4).<sup>68</sup> Thus Judah's attempt to force Israel to return is rejected by Shemaiah and the northerners are still called "brethren" (2 Chr 11:1-4).<sup>69</sup>

The rebellion of the North becomes evident at the accession of the godly Abijah. The Chronicler forms a two stage division by replacing a negative evaluation of Abijah's reign (1 Kgs 15:3) with his own materials. Abijah calls Israel to return, insisting that God has eternally chosen the Davidic house, that the reign of the unworthy Rehoboam is over, and that now a true Davidide has become king (2 Chr 13:5, 8).<sup>70</sup> The apostasy of Jeroboam is shifted from an earlier position in

Rehoboam's reign to here and it is strongly condemned (2 Chr 11:14f // 1 Kgs 12:26-33). Abijah's war against the North is portrayed as a 'holy war' in contrast to Shemaiah's prohibition against fighting in Rehoboam's day. The Chronicler bases the rest of his account of the divided monarchy on this understanding of the status of the North. He does not accept the legitimacy of the northern kingdom for it rebels against the divinely chosen Davidic house.<sup>71</sup> Yet he still believes the people in the North are part of Israel and leaves the possibility of repentance open. He uses the term 'Israel' not only for the southern but also the northern kingdom and includes instances of their returning to true worship (cf. 2 Chr 15:2, 9; 19:2f etc.).<sup>72</sup> Thus, in his narrative after Abijah, the account concerning the northern Israel is systematically deleted, but all the contacts with the South, including some unparalleled incidents, are present.<sup>73</sup> The Chronicler also sets the narrative of the first kings of Judah in a retributational framework, as promised in the divine response to Solomon's dedicatory prayer (2 Chr 7:12-22). Williamson has found four patterns in Rehoboam's reign: failure (10:1-11:14), success through obedience (11:5-23), disaster by pride (12:1-4), restoration through self-humbling (12:5-12).<sup>74</sup> Although his account of the division (10:1-11:4) follows 1 Kgs 12:1-24 closely, it functions differently in its larger context. Already in Kings the division is related to

Rehoboam's neglect of wisdom in ruling the people properly, but with the omission of Solomon's sin and the transposing of Jeroboam's apostasy, it has become the major cause of the initial division.

The negative retribitional pattern of Rehoboam's failure is followed by the positive pattern of the blessings he received through obedience (11:5-23). Details about his extensive building activities (vv. 5-12) and large family (vv. 18-23) are newly added as signs of blessings, and the report on Jeroboam's apostasy (1 Kgs 12:26-33) is reworked from the southern perspective into the participation of faithful northerners to the Jerusalem cult (11:13-17). Since they are unique in Chronicles and they follow the explicit reference to Judah's obedience to the word of the Lord in vs. 4, the section seems to be intentionally schematized.

Both positive and negative retribitional patterns are repeated in one incident of Shishak's invasion (2 Chr 12:1-12). Although the core of the historical report (12:2a, 9-11) parallels 1 Kgs 14:25-28, it is set within the Chronicler's structure. The Chronicler supplies an introduction (vs. 1) to the incident to connect it to Rehoboam's abandonment of the law, while Kings simply juxtaposes the two accounts. After narrating Shishak's invasion (2a // 1 Kgs 14:22), he adds the theological interpretation "because they had been unfaithful to the Lord" (2b). In vv. 3-4 he gives further information about



the disaster and in vs. 5 he again emphasizes the retribution theme through the mouth of the prophet Shemaiah, "You abandoned me, so I have abandoned you". In the second half of the account the self-humbling of the king and the princes of Israel is introduced without any basis in the *Vorlage* (vs. 6) and it is followed by God's promise through the prophet not to destroy them completely (vv. 7-8). Vv. 9-11 reproduces the description of the Egyptian raid (1 Kgs 14:25-28), but the Chronicler concludes the section by repeating a second retribitional point; "when he humbled himself the wrath of the Lord turned from him, so as not to make a complete destruction; there were some good in Judah" (latter half my translation) (vs. 12).

At the end of Rehoboam's reign the Chronicler rewrites the concluding remarks with his characteristic vocabulary (2 Chr 12:13-16 // 1 Kgs 14:21-22, 29-31). Whereas in Kings the conclusion is interrupted by the account of Shishak's invasion, the Chronicler combines the two parts. In vs. 14 the sin of the people of Judah (cf. 1 Kgs 14:22) is attributed solely to Rehoboam and the totally negative evaluation is softened to "he did not set his heart to seek the Lord" to accord with the overall presentation.

The Chronicler's distinct schematization of history and theological themes are most clearly seen in rewritings in Abijah's reign (2 Chr 13). The first few verses (vv. 1-2a) parallel 1 Kgs 15:1-2, but he replaces the account of the rest

of Abijah's unfaithfulness with a long theological speech and a note of the victory and blessings he received. Its motive, as we saw above, is to show that the division was finalized by the rebellion of the North against the true Davidides, but also to cast this point in a retribitional framework. Abijah emphasizes in his speech the eternal choice of the House of David (vv. 5, 8) and cultic faithfulness in the South in contrast to apostasy in the North (vv. 10-12). The war between them is narrated in "holy war" type and it suggests that the Lord was with Judah and helped her (cf. vv. 12, 14-16). Apostate Israel was punished and faithful Judah was rewarded with victory. The retribitional theme is explicated in conclusion in vs. 18 "Thus the men of Israel were subdued at that time, and the men of Judah prevailed, because they relied upon the Lord, the God of their fathers." The Chronicler further underlines the retribitional pattern by referring to Abijah's large family and the establishment of his reign (vs. 21).

The reign of Asa is arranged around two sets of retribitional pattern (2 Chr 14:1-15:19; 16:1-14). Although the Chronicler apparently builds his account on 1 Kgs 15:9-24, he succeeds in giving a new structure, adding considerable materials including two theological speeches and a new chronological framework. In 14:2-5a he expands Asa's reform, narrated in 1 Kgs 15:11-12, and he suggests that the reform

resulted in divinely given peace, in his own introduction (1b) and conclusion (5b). Immediately following the reform his building activities and army organization (vv. 6-8) are introduced as signs of peace (cf. vs. 6b) and his victory over Zerah the Cushite (vv. 9-15) is recounted in a "holy war" style (without parallel). Moreover, in 15:1-7 the unparalleled speech of the prophet Azariah repeats the retributitional theme and encourages the people to continue to be faithful. The obedience of the people and the completion of Asa's reform is reported in vv. 8-19, based on 1 Kgs 15:12-15 but with substantial new elements (cf. vv. 8-15). The first section ends with the Chronicler's own chronological note that no war took place until the thirty fifth year of Asa (15:19). Whereas the precise nature of these chronological notes is debated, its implication of a long period of peace in Asa's first faithful reign contrasts with the view of the deuteronomistic historian (cf. 1 Kgs 15:8).<sup>75</sup>

In 16:1-6 the Chronicler reproduces the account of Asa's war with Baasha in 1 Kgs 15:17-22, but he interprets Asa's alliance with Benhadad as a lack of complete faith in the Lord and denounces him through the mouth of the prophet Hanani (16:7-10, without parallel). Whereas Kings writes "there was war between Asa and Baasha king of Israel all their days" (1 Kgs 15:16), the Chronicler supplies the chronological note "in the thirty sixth year of Asa" (16:1) to the war in order to

distinguish his disobedient second period from the first. Hanani's speech contrasts Asa's attitude here with his first period (vs. 8) and prophesies wars due to his foolish act (vs. 9). His foot disease (vs. 12 // 1 Kgs 15:23) is also retributively explained by his harsh treatment of the prophet (vs. 10). The Chronicler structures Asa's reign in a twofold retributivational framework supplying necessary elements and theological comments in prophetic sermons, and this clearly indicates his creative use of the materials in Kings. L. Allen has recently pointed out that the motif of "reliance (  $\text{לְיְהוָה}$  ) on the Lord" recurs at the turn of the events in Abijah's reign, Asa's first period and second period, and this again points to the Chronicler's intentional structuring.<sup>76</sup>

#### 9. 2 Chr 17-20: Jehoshaphat

In Kings Jehoshaphat appears only in relation to the northern kings, but the Chronicler turns him into a major pious king with extensive additions.<sup>77</sup> Whereas the implication of his alliance with Ahab in 1 Kgs 22 is a negative one and the Chronicler appears to hold the same view (cf. 2 Chr 19:1-3), his extra materials give a more positive picture of Jehoshaphat and his overall evaluation is very high (2 Chr 20:30, 32; cf. 21:12; 22:9 also).

Before the Chronicler goes into reproduction of 1 Kgs 22, he inserts a general summary of Jehoshaphat's reign in chap.



17. The introductory statements in 17:1-6 set out the positive retribitional pattern. It summarizes the characteristics of his reign as "seeking the God of his father" and "walking in his commandments" (vs. 4) and relates them to the divine establishment of his kingdom (vv. 3a, 5) and riches and honour (vs. 5). In the next paragraph Jehoshaphat's teaching mission (vv. 7-9, without parallel) elaborates his religious devotion (vv. 3, 6), and it is followed by the signs of blessing; wealth and honour (vv. 10-13a) and army and fortifications (vv. 13b-19) which are mentioned in the introduction (vs. 5 and vs. 2. respectively).<sup>78</sup> The blessings are connected with the teaching mission by 'ל' -clause and the Chronicler explains them with his idiosyncratic vocabulary "the fear of the Lord fell upon all the kingdoms of the land" in vs. 10. The Chronicler's positive retribitional pattern sharply contrasts with the picture given in Kings and it is difficult to question his own purpose in introducing new materials.

2 Chr 18 repeats Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab in their war against Aram in 2 Kgs 22, but as Dillard correctly observes, "[the Chronicler] has taken a previous unit of tradition into the service of his own interest".<sup>79</sup> Kings concludes the account by stressing the fulfilment of the prophecy in the death of Ahab (1 Kgs 22:36-39), but the Chronicler replaces this notice with his own (2 Chr 19:1-3) which condemns Jehoshaphat's foreign alliance.<sup>80</sup> 19:1-3 also

makes difficult the commonly held view which ascribes the inclusion of this account to the Chronicler's desire to portray Jehoshaphat positively in contrast to Ahab (cf. 18:4). The Chronicler's aim is, rather, to point out that foreign alliance and the lack of faith bring the wrath of the Lord. Although Jehoshaphat's faithful actions in the next two chapters demonstrate that the wrath can be, at least, partially averted, the judgment on his action in this chapter is negative and it prepares the way for the recovery from failure.<sup>21</sup> The Chronicler also modifies the introductory verses to suit his structure. Whereas 1 Kgs 22:1 reports the incident as a war between Israel and Aram, 2 Chr 18:1 rewrites it from the perspective of Jehoshaphat and 18:2 gives more prominence to Jehoshaphat than 1 Kgs 22:3.

The materials in 2 Chr 19-20 are unique to Chronicles and portray Jehoshaphat in a typical retributitional fashion. 19:4-11 details the second stage of Jehoshaphat's religious reform as his introduction in vs. 4 states "he went out again among the people, . . . and brought them back to the Lord, the God of their fathers". However, the remainder of the chapter contains no religious flavour, and, as we saw in the previous chapter, the Chronicler is probably here using a secular administrative document to show the piety of Jehoshaphat. We have also seen that Jehoshaphat's war against the Moabites in 2 Chr 20 is not a midrash on 2 Kgs 3 but based on an earlier source. The

king's faithfulness is emphasized with the Chronicler's peculiar phrase "seeking the Lord" (vv. 3, 4), the lament ritual (vv. 5-12) and the worship before the battle (vv. 18-21). Their utter trust in the Lord is answered by the salvation oracle through Jahaziel (vv. 14-17), and their victory is described in holy war style (vv. 22-29). Jehoshaphat's attitude clearly contrasts with his previous war and this reverses his fate from wrath to peace (vs. 30). Such positive retribution has no basis in Kings' account nor can it be theological elaboration of the disastrous war in 1 Kgs 22 (cf. 2 Chr 19:1-3). Clearly these new materials are employed to give a thoroughly new picture of Jehoshaphat and they are set in a new literary structure.

The account of Jehoshaphat's venture at the end of his reign (2 Chr 20:35-37) is also probably not theological interpretation of 1 Kgs 22:47-49 but a report of another phase of the incident.<sup>82</sup> This again provides the negative retribitional pattern in which foreign alliance leads to disaster. However, one wonders why it must replace the Kings account of Jehoshaphat's rejection of a foreign alliance which fits much better his generally good reign. The answer may lie in the parallelism between the Asa's reign and Jehoshaphat's reign in Chronicles. Despite an overall positive evaluation of Asa (cf. 15:17; 16:14) his death notice is combined with an



accusation of sin just as here. Dillard has suggested the following common elements in these outlines:

reform I, building programs, and large armies;	14:2-8	17:1-19
battle report I;	14:9-15	18:1-19:3
reform II;	15:1-19	19:4-11
battle report II;	16:1-9	20:1-30
transgression and death;	16:10-14	20:31-21:1

Though not all the correspondences Dillard lists are specific enough to carry such a thesis, the following two points are at least remarkable. His first battle report does not follow smoothly from his reform nor is its negative result reported immediately after it: thus it is doubtful if the first battle report would ever have been placed in that context if the Chronicler is not following the pattern of Asa's reign. Admittedly the successful battle and failure reverses the order in Jehoshaphat's reign, but it can be attributed to his desire to end his reign with a positive note. The division of the reform in two phases is also a conspicuous feature of these reigns. If such parallelism is at work here, this also underlines the Chronicler's intentional structuring of the material.

#### 10. 2 Chr 21-23: Jehoram, Ahaziah, Athaliah

The reign of Jehoram (2 Chr 21:1-20), that of Ahaziah (2 Chr 22:1-9), and the interregnum of Athaliah (2 Chr 22:10-23:21) all start with the murder of possible successors to the Davidic throne, and they are apparently intended to be one unit



which show how the threat to the Davidic dynasty was averted.<sup>64</sup> At the same time the House of Ahab is repeatedly contrasted with the House of David as the symbol of idolatry throughout these sections, and the retributational justice is dramatically illustrated by the judgment upon it.

Jehoram's reign (2 Chr 21:1-20) is much expanded from 2 Kgs 8:16-24 to emphasize that his sinful acts invited rebellions in the territory and personal tragedy. In the beginning of the account (21:1-4) the Chronicler adds his killing of the brothers to introduce the theme of threat to the Davidic House and to depict his evil reign. His unfaithfulness is identified with the way of the house of Ahab in vs. 6 (// 2 Kgs 8:18) and in vs. 13 (the Chronicler's addition). On the other hand, the eternity of the Davidic covenant is reiterated as the reason why Jehoram was not completely destroyed; "for the sake of David" in 2 Kgs 8:19 is changed to "because of the covenant which he had made with David" (vs. 7) and "Judah" to "the house of David" (vs. 7). David is once more mentioned in the letter of Elijah in vs. 12. The report on the rebellion of Edom and Ribnah (vv. 8-10) parallels 2 Kgs 8:20-22, but in this context it is clearly seen as the punishment for his evildoings and a theological comment is given after it "because he had forsaken the Lord, the God of his fathers" (vs. 10b).

The Chronicler extends the description of his unfaithfulness making reference to his erection of high places

(vs. 11) and supplies theological reasons for further punishments in Elijah's letters (vv. 12-15). In vv. 16-17 the raid by Philistines and Arabs is added and all the royal princes but his last son are killed. As Dillard observes, the Chronicler seems to present "the reign of Jehoram as the undoing of the accomplishments of Asa and Jehoshaphat".<sup>25</sup> The high places these two kings suppressed (14:2-5; 17:6) are reerected by Jehoram (21:11), the victory in the east and south (14:9-15; 20) is no longer effective (21:8-10) and Philistines and Arabs do not pay tribute as before (17:11) and attack Jehoram (21:16). In 21:12 the Chronicler expressly contrasts Jehoram with Asa and Jehoshaphat. In vv. 18-19 another element of judgment, a disease of his bowels, is added, as predicted by Elijah (vs. 15). The concluding note (vv. 19b-20) specifically mentions that no fire was made in his honour and he was not buried in the tombs of the kings. The Chronicler clearly portrays in Jehoram's reign how even a Davidide must be punished if he is not faithful to the Lord with considerable new materials and a new schematization.

The reign of Ahaziah (2 Chr 22:1-9) is, in contrast, incorporated into the themes of judgment upon the unfaithful and protection of the Davidic house by drastic abridgment of the Kings material (2 Kgs 8:24b-10:14). Since the deuteronomistic historian details Jehu's coup and destruction of Ahab's house from the viewpoint of the northern kingdom, the

Chronicler selects only the materials relevant to the reign of the southern king. In the first verse he repeats the killing of all the sons of Jehoram by Arabs (cf. 21:17) to start Ahaziah's reign with the recurring theme of the threat to the Davidic dynasty. Whereas 22:2-6 parallels 2 Kgs 8:26-29, it focuses on how Ahaziah followed the way of the House of Ahab and listened to its advice. 22:7-9 summarizes the destruction of the House of Ahab reported in 2 Kgs 9:1-28 and 10:12-14 from the perspective of how Ahaziah was involved in it and killed. The Chronicler is not interested in recording Jehu's coup, but does not assume the incident either, for he supplies the minimum necessary information about Jehu (vs. 7b) and about the context in which Ahaziah was killed (vv. 7-8).<sup>36</sup>

The death of Ahaziah in vs. 9 contrasts greatly with Kings' version, and the differences are clearly motivated by theological reasons. The killing of the princes and officers of Judah is shifted from after the murder of Ahaziah to before it because of the Chronicler's new structure: these events are not told as parts of a long narrative of Jehu's coup but as an account of Ahaziah's reign and it suits the Chronicler to end with the death of the king. Mosis may be correct in pointing out the conscious paralleling with the end of Saul.<sup>37</sup> In Chronicles Ahaziah's flight before his death (2 Kgs 9:27) is also changed and his burial in Jerusalem and the City of David (2 Kgs 9:28) is omitted. Although historical harmonization is

not impossible, the information that Ahaziah was found in Samaria and executed highlights the consequence of his association with the House of Ahab.<sup>23</sup> Silence on his burial place does not necessarily imply he was buried in the North, but it indicates the Chronicler's disapproval of his reign.<sup>24</sup>

The overthrowing of Athaliah's rule in 2 Chr 22:10-23:21 basically follows 2 Kgs 11:1-20, but with a number of minor modifications; especially in the beginning and the end of chap. 23, it is transformed into a conclusion to the themes of the last three chapters: the threat to the Davidic House and the evil influence of Ahab's house. 22:10-12, though following 2 Kgs 11:1-3, narrates Athaliah's slaughter of the royal family so as to repeat the theme of threat to the Davidic House for the third time. Athaliah is the last remaining member of Ahab's family (21:6) and retained power even after the destruction of her father's house in the North.

The coup against Athaliah by Jehoiada the high priest is carefully compared with the accession of David to portray it not only as palace intrigue but as the restoration of proper Davidic rule and final judgment upon Ahab's house. Whereas in Kings only the soldiers are present at Joash's coronation (2 Kgs 11:4), the Chronicler makes it a "religious assembly",<sup>25</sup> like David's coronation. The inclusion of "heads of father's house of Israel" (23:2) also parallels David's coronation and the Chronicler explicates his view through



Johoiada's mouth, "Let him reign, as the Lord spoke concerning the sons of David" (23:3b, without parallel). In the conclusion again "the nobles, the governors of the people" are substituted for "the Carites, the guards" (vs. 20). Moreover, the major participants of the coup are changed from foreign body guards (2 Kgs 11:4, 9, 19) to the priests and the Levites (2 Chr 23:1, 8, 18-20) and the sanctity of the Temple is carefully protected (23:5b-6, 19) to present it a restoration of proper worship. Especially the roles of the Levitical musicians (23:13, 18) and gatekeepers (vs. 19) are elaborated in line with David's original organization as recorded in 1 Chr 23-27.<sup>30</sup> The ending of the account "the city was quiet, after Athaliah had been slain with the sword" is an irony for the conclusion of the section which started with the threat to the Davidic House and the dominance of the idolatrous House of Ahab.

It is thus evident that, while using Kings as a major source, the Chronicler has carefully constructed a narrative of these three periods around his own twin themes of divine protection of the Davidic House and the tragic fate of those who rebel against the Lord.

#### 11. 2 Chr 24-26: Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah

The following reigns of Joash (2 Chr 24:1-27), Amaziah (25:1-28), and Uzziah (26:1-23) all start with obedience to the

Lord, but once their rules are established they become unfaithful and they die in tragedy.<sup>21</sup> Commendatory notices are given at the beginning of their reigns but they are qualified by their imperfect nature (24:2 // 2 Kgs 12:3 [2]; 25:2; 26:4-5), and for Amaziah and Uzziah "pride" is given as the cause of their falling away from faith (25:19 // 2 Kgs 14:10; 26:16). This pattern seems to suggest that the Chronicler is preaching to his contemporary readers the importance of unchanging reliance on the Lord.

The Chronicler basically follows 2 Kgs 12 for Joash's reign proper, but with his additional materials and theological comments he transforms Kings' completely positive picture into two contrasting periods of initial obedience and subsequent failure. He limits the period the first commendatory notice covers from "all his days, because Jehoiada the priest instructed him" (2 Kgs 12:2) to "all the days of Jehoiada the priest" to suit his twofold pattern (2 Chr 24:2). The first half of this reign is portrayed more positively by the Chronicler. He presents a more enthusiastic and successful picture of the Temple restoration, omitting the minor conflict between the king and the temple personnel about its financial source, as we saw in the previous chapter.<sup>22</sup> The role of the Levites is stressed (vv. 5, 6, 11) and the restoration is patterned after the tabernacle (Exod 35, 36; vv. 9-10, 14) to suggest that the worship was properly restored as in the line

of his concern in 2 Chr 23.<sup>33</sup> The account of Joash's first good period ends with the Chronicler's additional death notice of his mentor Jehoiada, which emphasizes his longevity and good deeds to God and the Temple (vv. 15-16).

However, after this the Chronicler adds Joash's apostasy and rejection of prophets' warnings (vv. 17-19) to clearly mark the beginning of his second bad period. He especially elaborates his theological points through the prophecy of Zechariah with his characteristic retributitional expressions: "to prosper (  $\text{לָצַח}$  )" and "Because you have forsaken (  $\text{אָבַדְתָּ}$  ) the Lord, he has forsaken you" (vs. 20, without parallel). A great contrast with the first period is made by the irony of the murder of Zachariah, the son of Jehoiada (vv. 21-22). In the following account of an Aramean invasion (vv. 23-24), he rejoins 2 Kgs 12:17-18, but a new context invites us to read it as a judgment upon his sins. Whereas in Kings the battle is reported without any theological comment, here the Chronicler supplies "because they had forsaken the Lord, the God of their fathers" (v. 24). He also rewrites the account itself to stress the casualties which Judah suffered more and to suggest it as a reversal of the usual holy war: the great Judean army is delivered to the smaller Aramean forces by the Lord (vs. 24a).<sup>34</sup> The theological evaluation in the conspiracy against Joash is not given in 2 Kgs 12:20-21, but here he writes "because of the blood of the son of Jehoiada the priest" (vs.

25). The burial notice of Joash is changed from "with his fathers in the city of David" to "in the city of David, but they did not bury him in the tombs of the kings" to indicate the disapproval of his reign.

For Amaziah's reign the Chronicler reproduces 2 Kgs 14:1-20, but he inserts a long addition in the middle to make a clear two-tier structure. The general summary of his reign in 2 Kgs 14:3 runs "he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, yet not like David his father, but did all things as Joash his father had done", and it is essentially positive because nothing negative is reported about Joash in Kings. However, the Chronicler interprets tragedies for Joash and Amaziah as due to their sins, and changes the qualifying clause to "yet not with a blameless heart" (2 Chr 25:2) in order to balance the two sides of their reigns. The first positive period is shared by the expansion on Amaziah's victory over the Edomites (2 Kgs 14:7) in 2 Chr 25:5-13. Whereas in Kings it only gives the background for his proud challenge to Jehoash, here it is expanded to a full account and the victory is described as the reward for Amaziah's obedience to the prophetic warning. The Chronicler emphasizes the need to rely solely on the Lord not the foreign army and the Lord's power "to help" those who rely on him.

However, immediately after that, the Chronicler also reports that Amaziah brought back gods of the people he



conquered and worshipped them (vv. 14-16, without parallel). Again a prophet accuses him, but this time he does not listen to him and threatens to kill him. Even in the first half of his reign, he showed some hesitation to obey the Lord, but now the negative side of his indeterminate attitude overruled. The folly of Amaziah's decision is stressed by the word-play Amaziah did not listen to the prophet's "counsel" (vs. 16) but took human counsel (vs. 17).<sup>94</sup> In vv. 17-24 his defeat by Jehoash the king of the northern kingdom is repeated from 2 Kgs 14:8-14, but in the context of Chronicles it is clearly seen as judgment upon Amaziah's apostasy and rejection of the prophet. Jehoash's speech aptly points to Amaziah's pride behind his challenge, though it is paralleled in 2 Kgs 14:10. The death of Amaziah by conspiracy (2 Chr 25:27-28) is likewise repeated from 2 Kgs 14:19-20, but the Chronicler adds the theological comment "when he turned away from the Lord" (vs. 27a) and couches it in a retributational framework.

The reign of Uzziah is again changed from a positive account in Kings (2 Kgs 14:21-23; 15:2-7) to two distinct periods of obedience and failure in Chronicles.<sup>95</sup> The parallel materials are used in the introductory (2 Chr 16:1-4 // 2 Kgs 14:21-23, 15:2-3) and concluding sections (26:21-23 // 2 Kgs 15:4-7) but his long addition in the middle demarcates his positive and negative periods theologically and adds illustrative materials for both. In vs. 4 the Chronicler

provides a new structure for the text of the  
theological lesson.

follows the general summary of his reign in 2 Kgs 15:3, but he adds his own qualification in vs. 5: "He set himself to seek God in the days of Zechariah, who instructed him in the fear of God; and as long as he sought the Lord, God made him prosper". That the death of the king's spiritual mentor changes his attitude to the Lord parallels the case of Joash. Though 2 Kgs 15:3 writes, "[Uzziah] did what was right in the eyes of the Lord", Kings does not give any concrete incident of his better period. So the Chronicler supplies his characteristic repertoire of signs of blessings such as victory, the large army, wealth, fame, and extensive building activities (26:6-15), to create the account of the first good period.

The beginning of his second bad period is also marked by the Chronicler's own theological introduction "But when he was strong, he grew proud, to his destruction" (vs. 16). The leprosy Uzziah suffered is reported in Kings without any theological explanations, but here it is explicitly ascribed to his cultic sin and how it happened is related in a narrative form (vv. 17-20). His sin is specifically called twice as למא (vv. 16, 18), just like the sin of Saul and the Babylonian exile (cf. 1 Chr 9:1; 10:13). His burial notice (vs. 23) is accordingly altered to stress that he was buried separately from other kings (cf., "for they said, 'he is a leper.'")<sup>27</sup> In Uzziah's reign just as Joash and Amaziah's, the Chronicler does not simply interpret the Kings report on his reign but, again

provides a new structure for the text to point out a new theological lesson.

## 12. 2 Chr 27-28: Jotham, Ahaz

Whereas in the last three reigns the good period is turned over to the bad period within one reign, Jotham's reign in chap. 27 is portrayed thoroughly positively and it is followed by the absolutely sinful reign of Ahaz (chap. 28). Jotham's reign is paralleled with the first good half of Uzziah's reign as 27:2a (// 2 Kgs 15:34) notes, and his building projects (vv. 3-4) and other blessings (vv. 5-6) are rewritten to correspond to his father's.<sup>99</sup> The Chronicler reproduces 2 Kgs 15:32-38 for Jotham's reign to support its positive picture, but he omits the note on the threat by Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel in 2 Kgs 15:37 and adds details on Jotham's building activities (vv. 3-4) and victory (vv. 5-6).<sup>99</sup> The whole reign of Jotham is portrayed positively to contrast with Ahaz' totally sinful reign and to highlight the inevitable nature of judgment.<sup>100</sup> As L. Allen points out, the general summary of Jotham's reign

ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה

(27:2 // 2 Kgs 15:34) sets an antithesis with that of Ahaz

ולא עשה הישר בעיני יהוה

(28:1 // 2 Kgs 16:2), and the notices that both kings reigned sixteen years (27:1, 8 // 2 Kgs 15:33; 28:1 // 2 Kgs 16:2) emphasizes their "essential dissimilarity".<sup>101</sup> Thus the reign of Jotham seems



to be carefully rewritten to prepare for Ahaz' grave sin according to the Chronicler's intentional schematization.

The basic account of Ahaz' reign in chap. 28 follows 2 Kgs 16:1-20, but there are considerable differences in details. These differences are probably based on his interpretation of the *Vorlage* with some other source, but his theological purpose is also evident.<sup>102</sup> In 28:1-4 (// 2 Kgs 16:2-4) the apostasy of Ahaz is enhanced with minor modifications. In the following section (28:5-15) the account of the Syro-Ephraimite invasion (2 Kgs 16:5-6) is largely expanded and the threat to Jerusalem and defeat of Judah are heightened to present it as a judgment upon his sins. Whereas 2 Kgs 16:5 relates the inability of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition to conquer Ahaz, the Chronicler reports the great disaster Ahaz suffered in the invasion (vv. 5-8). Especially he emphasizes the extent of trouble including the large number of the people slaughtered and brought into captivity.<sup>103</sup> The invasions of Aram and Israel are recounted separately in Chronicles, and this may also be intended to enhance the impression of the devastated state of Judah. The Chronicler explains the incident in terms of the theology of immediate retribution in vs. 6, "because they had forsaken the Lord, the God of their fathers".

In contrast to the problems in Judah, the northern kingdom is portrayed in a more favourable light. In vs. 10 the northerners repent of their sins, not only of this war but also



of their disobedience to the Lord in general (cf. 2 Chr 13), resulting in opening the possibility of reconciliation with the Lord and unification with the southern kingdom.<sup>104</sup> In vs. 10 the Lord is called "their God" and in vs. 11 the people of Judah are called "brethren". Ahaz' appeal to Tiglath-pileser in 28:16-25 (// 2 Kgs 16:7-9) is reported as a further disaster in Chronicles (cf. especially vs. 20 "it did not help him"; vs. 21 "distress"), whereas 2 Kgs 16:7-9 suggests it was at least temporarily effective. In Kings the appeal is made in the context of the Syro-Ephraimite war, but here it is related to another raid by the Edomites and Philistines and it is again explained as the judgment upon his sins in vs. 19.<sup>105</sup> In 28:22-23 Ahaz is said to have committed the idolatry of worshipping the gods of Damascus, though in 2 Kgs 16:10-13 he only copied an Aramean altar to make sacrifices presumably to the Lord. Vv. 24-25 also suggests the closure of the Temple and the halt of true worship, though Kings reports the continuation of worship. The Chronicler ends the account of Ahaz with his burial notice that he was not buried in the tombs of the kings against the apparent implication of 2 Kgs 16:20.

The systematic enhancement of Ahaz' sin and introduction of the repentance of the northerners give a distinct picture to Ahaz' reign in Chronicles and it cannot be understood as interpretation of the deuteronomistic history. Indeed, as Williamson correctly points out, it is intended to be a

"complete reversal in the relationship between north and south" in 2 Chr 13.<sup>106</sup> The apostasy of Ahaz is so increased to show that the religious orthodoxy of Judah claimed by Abijah has been nullified, and with the repentance of the northerners the reconciliation with the Lord and the South become possible.

The military fortunes of the two kingdoms are also reversed, and the Lord is now with the North, to give them victory over the South. Moreover, the king of Israel is no longer mentioned here and the language of 28:12 (cf. 30:6) implies the fall of the northern kingdom (though it is not explicitly recounted). All these prepare the way for the reunification of Israel under Hezekiah, as 2 Chr 29-32 emphasizes.

Moreover, the two kingdoms are portrayed as being in a similar situation at the end of Ahaz' reign.<sup>107</sup> Both stand under the anger of the Lord (2 Chr 28:9, 11, 13, 25; 29:8, 10; 30:8) and much of their populations are taken into captivity. The Chronicler suggests not only the North but also the South suffered exile at this time, repeating that their population was taken out of Judah (28:5, 8, 17, 18).<sup>108</sup> The sin of Ahaz is called לַיָּדָיִם like Saul's and like that which led to exile (1 Chr 9:1; 10:13), and in the beginning of the next reign Hezekiah describes their situation with clearly exilic language (2 Chr 29:6-9). The faithful kings after Hezekiah are rewarded by the postponement of the final exile but this exile seems to be an already unavoidable fate (32:26; 34:23-28).<sup>109</sup>

Hezekiah's speech in 30:6ff and Manasseh's return concern how they can be restored from the exilic situation and this directly addresses the major issue in the post-exilic community.

The Chronicler's presentation of Israel's history is carefully structured to show that the sins of Judean kings, especially those of Ahaz, fixed their judgment of the exile together with the northern kingdom, and to suggest the way of restoration in the reign of Hezekiah and thereafter. Although the threat to the Davidic House is once averted by Jehoiada, it is followed by three successive failures (cf. <sup>לעז</sup> in 2 Chr 26:18), and even in the perfectly good reign of Jotham "the people still followed the corrupt practices" (27:2). Ahaz' sin is foiled by Jotham and greatly heightened by modifications to be responsible to finalize the judgment. Ahaz' reign is thus rewritten in relation to the Chronicler's overall schematization and it clearly contrasts with the deuteronomic history which blames Manasseh's sins for the exile (2 Kgs 23:26; 24:3-4).

### 13. 2 Chr 29-32: Hezekiah

The account of Hezekiah in Chronicles gives a rather distinct impression from that in Kings, because its focus is shifted from the Assyrian invasion and the envoys from Babylon to Hezekiah's religious reform. The invasion of Sennacherib (2

Kgs 18:8-19:37) and the envoys from Merodach-Baladan (2 Kgs 20:1-19) are substantially shortened (2 Chr 32:1-23; and 2 Chr 32:24-26, 31, respectively) and a brief reference to Hezekiah's reform (2 Kgs 18:3-7) is expanded to as many as three chapters in Chronicles (2 Chr 29-31). Although the deuteronomistic historian, who is concerned with Josiah's reform, may have played down the significance of earlier reforms, the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform is far longer than any other (except David and Solomon's dedication of the Temple) and he has without doubt special interest in it. The account of the reform consists of three sections; cleansing of the Temple (2 Chr 29), Passover (2 Chr 30), and restoration of proper worship (2 Chr 31), and throughout them repentance is stressed as the way for restoration after the judgment in Ahaz' reign and the North and the South are seen as reunited after the fall of Samaria. Hezekiah thus brings back Israel to the ideal relationship with the Lord and he is consciously modeled after the image of David and Solomon.

In Chronicles Hezekiah's religious reform starts with the cleansing of the Temple (2 Chr 29) which has no parallel account in Kings. Historically it deals with the overthrowing of Ahaz' apostasy, but typologically it shows the way of restoration from an "exilic situation" through acknowledgment of sins and repentance. In vv. 5-11 Hezekiah's speech outlines the sinfulness of the people in terms of "exilic" language, and



and God's reestablishment (vs. 12) of the relationship with the Lord. Whereas "the filth (  $\text{הַתְּהוֹמָה}$  )" in vs. 5 is the word particularly used for ritual impurity in the priestly literature and indicates Ahaz' apostasy (cf. 28:23f), the following qualification relates it with the more general "exilic" theme with the terms such as "unfaithfulness (  $\text{אִשְׁמוּנָה}$  )" and "forsake (  $\text{אָבַד}$  )".<sup>110</sup> The cessation of the Temple worship in vs. 7 points to Ahaz' work (cf. 2 Chr 28:24), but the Chronicler interprets that it brought Judah to the same situation as the northern kingdom and invited the "wrath of the Lord" (vs. 8a). Its result is recounted in vv. 8-9 using the language of Jeremiah's prophecy of the Babylonian exile (Jer 29:18);

he has made them an object of horror, of astonishment, and of hissing, as you see with your own eyes. For lo, our fathers have fallen by the sword and our sons and our daughters and our wives are in captivity for this.

In vv. 10-11 Hezekiah encourages the people "to make a covenant with the Lord", which actually means, to "take a solemn oath before God to put right what is wrong".<sup>111</sup> In vv. 12-36 the people put their repentance into practice and cleanse the Temple and rededicate it.<sup>112</sup> At the beginning of the rededication (vv. 20-24) sin offerings are offered for the kingdom, the sanctuary, and for the nation, all three involved in the apostasy of Ahaz.<sup>113</sup> And the rededication concludes with the restoration (  $\text{שׁוּבָה}$  ) of the Temple worship (vs. 35)

and God's reestablishment (  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ}$  ) of the people (vs. 36).<sup>114</sup>

The theme of restoration through repentance is continued in the account of Hezekiah's Passover in 2 Chr 30 (without parallel), for Passover itself is, as Dillard puts it, "a commemoration of redemption and release from bondage to a foreign power".<sup>115</sup> In his letter of invitation to the Passover (vv. 6-9) Hezekiah describes the situation which he and the people are in with characteristically "exile" terminology such as "the remnant" (vs. 6), "faithless (  $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$  )" (vs. 7), "desolation" (vs. 7), "his [the Lord's] fierce anger" (vs. 8), "Captors" (vs. 9), and "return to this land" (vs. 9). Hezekiah also eagerly encourages the people to repent, calling them to "return to the Lord" three times in his letter (vv. 6, 9a, 9b).<sup>116</sup> Especially the language of vs. 9 and the peoples' response in vs. 11 "humbled themselves" remind us of the programmatic statement of God's forgiveness of those who repent in 2 Chr 7:14. In vv. 18-19 Hezekiah also prays for those who could not follow the "prescribed" manner of Passover and the Lord "heard" and "healed" (v. 20) them as promised in 2 Chr 7:14. Hezekiah's passover is concluded with the remark "their voice was heard, and their prayer came to his holy habitation in heaven" (vs. 27). In 2 Chr 31 their repentance is further put into practice by destroying pagan objects (vs. 1, cf. 2 Kgs 18:4) and by reinstating the continuous proper worship (vv.

2-19, cf. 2 Kgs 18:5-7a). Since Hezekiah successfully restored the right relationship with the Lord, the introductory notice "he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord" (29:2) is repeated at the end of his religious reform (31:20, without parallel), and his reform is seen as "an exemplar of loyalty" to the Lord.<sup>117</sup>

The second theme in Hezekiah's religious reform is reunification of Israel under one Davidic king. Since there is no king in the North and its people repented, it became now possible for them to be joined for the restoration of the proper relationship with the Lord under Hezekiah (cf. 29:35-36). Although the cleansing and rededication of the Temple is mainly carried out by the priests, the Levites, and the officials of Jerusalem, atonement was made for all Israel (29:24) "without regard for the former political division".<sup>118</sup> In chap. 30 Hezekiah more clearly expresses his intention of including the inhabitants of the north in his religious reform, calling them to participate in his Passover. He not only sends messengers to "all Israel and Judah" but also writes letters specifically to "Ephraim and Manasseh" (30:1). In vs. 5 a proclamation is sent "throughout all Israel, from Beersheba to Dan, that the people should come and keep the passover . . . at Jerusalem". "Couriers went throughout all Israel and Judah with letters" (vs. 6), but it is particularly mentioned that they went "from city to city through the country of Ephraim and

Manasseh, and as far as Zebulun" (vs. 10). The response was not good, but "some men from Asher, Manasseh, and Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem" (vs. 11, my translation). The people from the north ("Ephraim, Manasseh, Issachar, and Zebulun") "had not cleansed themselves and ate the passover otherwise than as prescribed" (vs. 18), but Hezekiah prayed for their forgiveness. The joy of the Passover is shared by "all the people" including "the whole assembly came out of the land of Israel" (vs. 25).<sup>119</sup> After the Passover the people went out to destroy pagan objects not only "throughout all Judah and Benjamin" but also "in Ephraim and Manasseh" (31:1). Even in the restoration of the regular worship some people from the north seemed to participate according to 2 Chr 31:6, though its precise meaning is debated.<sup>120</sup> This careful inclusion of the northerners clearly suggests the Chronicler's desire to show that the people of the North and the South are united in repentance and worship properly restored by Hezekiah.

While the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform consists mostly of additional materials (except 2 Kgs 18:3-7 which somewhat parallels 2 Chr 31) and has its own distinct themes, the following reports of the Assyrian invasion (2 Kgs 18:8-19:37) and the Babylonian envoys (2 Kgs 20:1-19) are radically reduced and incorporated into the framework of the reward Hezekiah received (2 Chr 32). The introductory verse (2



Chr 32:1) is rewritten from "in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah" to "after these things and these acts of faithfulness", to indicate that the following narrative is not given as an independent historical account as in Kings but as an example of blessings resulted from his faithfulness. 2 Chr 32 is further connected with the previous section with the word-play between this verse and the final summary in 32:30b and the conclusion to Hezekiah's religious reform in 31:20-21.<sup>121</sup>

The narrative of the Assyrian invasion is, as we saw in the previous chapter, abridged to give the main outline of the historical event, but Hezekiah is described as not suffering as much as in Kings and the questionable acts of Hezekiah during the siege (2 Kgs 18:14-16; 2 Kgs 18:17b-34, 36-19:34) are all passed over.<sup>122</sup> A Levitical sermon is put in the mouth of Hezekiah (vv. 7-8, without parallel) to stress his total reliance on the Lord and to describe the battle as a holy war. As a result, the account is essentially presented as that of Hezekiah's trust in the Lord and the final deliverance from Sennacherib. At the beginning of the account the Chronicler also elaborates Hezekiah's preparation for the siege with a number of building activities (vv. 2-5, without parallel) and at the end he adds notes on the rest Hezekiah enjoyed from enemies, on his wealth, and on his fame (vv. 22-23, without parallel). Clearly the Chronicler's version of the Assyrian

invasion is not given as theological interpretation of 2 Kgs 18-19, but is used for an illustration of blessings Hezekiah received after his religious reform.

The second half of 2 Chr 32 (vv. 24-31) is similarly employed to show the blessings Hezekiah received. His illness in 2 Kgs 20:1-11 and the visits of the Babylonian envoys in 2 Kgs 20:12-19 are so integrated and drastically shortened (2 Chr 32:24-26, 31) that without the knowledge of Kings it is difficult to know the concrete events these verses are speaking of. However, the Chronicler is not interested in reproducing the historical events in full details but only to list another example of Hezekiah's blessings (vv. 27-30, without parallel).<sup>123</sup> He seems to interpret Hezekiah's word in 2 Kgs 20:19a as repentance and sandwiches the references to his wealth, fame, and building projects with these notices (vv. 24-26, 31). His new structure suggests that Hezekiah's repentance resulted not only in the aversion of judgment (v. 26 // 2 Kgs 20:19) but also in blessings.

With restoration of the proper worship, reunification of Israel and the blessings he received Hezekiah returned to the ideal reign of David and Solomon. Indeed the Chronicler carefully presents him as a second David and Solomon pointing out the parallel between them. Although there has been a debate whether he is modeled after David or Solomon, it seems best to see that he is portrayed as both a second David and a

second Solomon.<sup>124</sup> According to the Chronicler the "ideal" period with the proper Temple worship and unity of the people is established by a cooperative work of David and Solomon, and their reigns are seen as unity.<sup>125</sup> Hezekiah's reign itself contains a number of references to both David's reign and Solomon's reign, and it cannot be compared exclusively with either one.

Throntveit has examined the alleged allusions to David and Solomon based on two criteria: (1) if they are unique to the Chronicler, and (2) if they are applicable to David and Hezekiah or Solomon and Hezekiah *alone*.<sup>125</sup> He concludes that the following items can be safely seen as the Chronicler's conscious comparison between David and Hezekiah:

- 2 Chr 30:6 // 1 Chr 29:18 (appellation "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and *Israel*")
- 2 Chr 30:12 // 1 Chr 12:39 (People's support in "one accord")
- 2 Chr 30:24ff; 31:4-12 // 1 Chr 22:3-5, 11-16; 29:21 etc. (provision of wealth)
- 2 Chr 31:11-14 // 1 Chr 9:26; 23:28; 26:22; 28:12 (provisions for storerooms, and the Levites)
- 2 Chr 32:5b // 1 Chr 11:8 ("Millo")
- 2 Chr 32:6 // 1 Chr 23-27 (Appointment of military officers)
- 2 Chr 32:7 // 1 Chr 22:13 (words of encouragement, in the style of Josh 1:7)
- 2 Chr 32:21 // 1 Chr 21 (destroying angel)
- 2 Chr 32:22 // 1 Chr 18:6, 13 (the Lord's protection from around)
- 2 Chr 32:23a // 1 Chr 18:2-18 (great tributes received)

Likewise there is clear parallelism between Solomon's reign and Hezekiah's reign:

- 2 Chr 29:3 // 2 Chr 1 (concern with the Temple from the start of their reigns)

- 2 Chr 29:35b-36a // 2 Chr 8:16 (summary of the accomplishment of the Temple work)
- 2 Chr 30:6-19 // 2 Chr 7:14 (four verbs of repentance)
- 2 Chr 30:9 // 1 Kgs 8:50 (prayer for compassion for the captives)
- 2 Chr 30:23 // 2 Chr 7:8, 9 (an additional seven days of feast for the Temple dedication)
- 2 Chr 30:26 // 2 Chr 7:10 etc ("great joy" comparable to the "time of Solomon")
- 2 Chr 32:27 // 2 Chr 9:16; 12:9 ("shields")

Moreover, some of Hezekiah's actions can be compared with both David and Solomon, but no one else:

- 2 Chr 30:1ff // 1 Chr 11:3, 4; 23:1; 28:1 (David) // 2 Chr 1:2; 5:2 (Solomon), (assembling of all the people)
- 2 Chr 31:3 // 1 Chr 16:37-40 (David) // 2 Chr 2:4; 8:12-13 (Solomon), (provision for regular worship)
- 2 Chr 31:8 // 1 Chr 16:2 (David) // 2 Chr 6:3 (Solomon), (Blessing of the people).

With these unambiguous allusions to David and Solomon, it is evident that the Chronicler intentionally portrays Hezekiah after them.

The above discussion once again leads us to conclude that the Chronicler has a full control of materials in his presentation of Hezekiah's reign. In his account of Hezekiah's reform plenty of new materials are introduced and in the section on Hezekiah's blessings Kings' accounts are greatly shortened, but they are not meant to be theological elaboration of the text or omission of unpleasant details. Rather they are structured according to his dominant themes of restoration through repentance, reunification of Israel, and the blessings he received as reward for his faithfulness. The Chronicler portrays Hezekiah as a second David and Solomon, because



through these acts Hezekiah brought Israel back to the glorious period of these kings. The way he presents Hezekiah's reign points to his overall schematization of history as well as the selection of materials for his themes.

#### 14. 2 Chr 33-35: Manasseh, Amon, Josiah

The accounts of the next three reigns are structured into two sets of the "restoration through repentance" pattern, in order to reinforce the theme put forward in Hezekiah's reign. Manasseh is pictured thoroughly negatively in Kings (2 Kgs 21:1-18), and the responsibility for the exile is directly ascribed to his sin (2 Kgs 23:26; 24:3-4). The Chronicler, however, adds his repentance and reform (2 Chr 33:11-17) after the reiteration of his apostasy (2 Chr 33:1-9 // 2 Kgs 21:1-9) and transforms his reign into an example of the efficacy of repentance. Although it is possible that his evil character and long reign may pose a problem for the Chronicler's retribitional theology, it is hardly likely that the explanation of the difficulty in the text is the major motivation for the change.<sup>127</sup> As Mosis points out, no theological point is made of his long reign, and his interest seems to be more in creating a typological pattern of exile and restoration.<sup>128</sup>

After the account of the apostasy (33:1-9 // 2 Kgs 21:1-9), the Chronicler summarizes the warning of the prophets (2

Kgs 21:10-16) in one verse (vs. 10) and explicates Manasseh's rejection of their message. Vs. 11 reports that Manasseh was taken captive to Babylon (without parallel), so as to supply the immediate judgment upon his sin and to remind the reader that Judah is in the exilic situation now (cf. 32:25-26). Although Babylon is not historically impossible as the destination of his exile, the reference seems to be consciously included to indicate its typological significance with the Babylonian exile.<sup>129</sup> Manasseh's repentance and God's forgiveness is recorded in vv.12-13 with the language related to 2 Chr 7:14 such as "entreated the favour of", "humbled himself", "prayed to him", and "God . . . heard his supplication". The setting "When he was in distress" may contrast his repentance with Ahaz' increase in apostasy in the similar circumstances (cf. 28:22).<sup>130</sup> His repentance is followed by the regular retribitional blessings, building activities and a large army, and undoing of his previous idolatry (vv. 14-17). As Williamson points out, his reform may also reflect God's promise in 2 Chr 7:14 to "heal the land".<sup>131</sup> The Chronicler elaborates the concluding formula (33:18-20 // 2 Kgs 21:17-18) and ends Manasseh's reign repeating the theme of "restoration through repentance" with his characteristic vocabulary: "faithlessness", "his prayer", "humbled himself" and "God received his entreaty".

but this time his continued apostasy is contrasted with

The second set of the "restoration through repentance" pattern is split into two reigns. Whereas Amon's reign is described as totally apostate, Josiah repents and restores the proper worship. The Chronicler's account of Amon (33:21-25) follows 2 Kgs 21:19-26 quite closely, and his negative picture is essentially based on the Kings account. However, in the context of Chronicles, it now functions as "a necessary prelude of renewed apostasy before the reform of Josiah".<sup>132</sup> Although the omission of the final notice (2 Kgs 21:25-26) may be due to homoioteleuton, as Mosis suggests it may be the Chronicler's device to couple Amon's reign with Josiah's.<sup>133</sup> Amon's reign is, moreover, paralleled with the first half of Manasseh's reign, and the second half of Manasseh's reign corresponds to Josiah's reign. 2 Chr 33:22, though based on the Kings text, gives the same general summary of Amon's reign as that of Manasseh's (33:2): "He did what was evil in the sight of the Lord", and adds, "as Manasseh his father had done" (// 2 Kgs 21:20). The description of his apostasy is specified with the word used in Manasseh's apostasy (33:19) "the images ( 𐤏𐤃𐤕𐤓 )" (vs. 22, without parallel) and it is qualified as "that Manasseh his father had made" (without parallel). Both kings are reported to have "served ( 𐤇𐤒𐤅 )" the idols (2 Chr 33:22 // 2 Kgs 21:21; cf. 2 Chr 33:3 // 2 Kgs 21:4). In vs. 23 he is for the third time compared to Manasseh (once in Kings), but this time his continued apostasy is contrasted with



Manasseh's repentance and expects the repentance of Josiah in the following. *Kgs 23:6-7*, here it is turned into an independent episode. The Chronicler's account of Josiah's reign contains the same elements as Kings, but they are reordered and some elements are summarized and others are expanded to suit his own structure. In Kings his religious reform stems from the discovery of the book of the law, and it is carried through the Temple (*2 Kgs 23:4*), through Jerusalem (*2 Kgs 23:5-7*), through Judah (*2 Kgs 23:8-9*) and as far as the territories in the North (*2 Kgs 23:15-20*). On the other hand, in Chronicles the discovery becomes only one episode in a series of reforming activities and they are designed to culminate in Huldah's prophecy of God's forgiveness.<sup>134</sup> The Chronicler starts his reform account with a note of Josiah's piety from early days: "in the eighth year of his reign, while he was yet a boy, he began to seek the God of David, his father" (*2 Chr 34:3*, without parallel). He then summarizes the removal of high places and images from Jerusalem, Judah, and Israel (*2 Chr 34:3-13 // 2 Kgs 23:4-20*) and shifts it from its position after the discovery of the law book to before it. He dates it in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign (without parallel) and suggests that the cleansing of the land was already underway even before the discovery of the law book (the discovery is in the eighteenth year (cf. vs. 8)). In vv. 8-13 the Chronicler narrates the repair work on the Temple. Whereas in Kings it is



given as a king's command and only provides a setting for the discovery (2 Kgs 22:3-7), here it is turned into an independent episode and the significance of the discovery is thus relatively weakened.

The account of the discovery of the law book and the prophecy of Huldah (34:14-33) itself follows 2 Kgs 22:8-23:8 quite closely. Already in Kings Huldah's prophecy focuses on Josiah's repentance and God's forgiveness using such terms as "forsake" (  $\text{לָּוַי}$  : 34:25 // 2 Kgs 22:17), "humbled yourself" (  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּבַּח}$  : 34:27 // 2 Kgs 22:19) and "[God] heard" (  $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע}$  : 34:27 // 2 Kgs 22:19). These agree so well with the theme of 2 Chr 7:14 and the second half of Manasseh's reign (cf. 33:12, 19, 23 (  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּבַּח}$  )); and 33:13 (  $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע}$  )), that the Chronicler repeats the word  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּבַּח}$  to put further accent on this theme. In his conclusion to the reform account (vs. 33), he states that Josiah made the people "serve the Lord" also to correspond to Manasseh's action (33:16). Since the Chronicler has already recounted Josiah's reform activities, Huldah's prophecy is now seen as the reward for his faithfulness and becomes the climax of his reform.

The account of Josiah's Passover (2 Chr 35:1-19) is substantially expanded from 2 Kgs 23:21-23, providing the details of rituals and the prominent role for the Levites. However, this emphasis in the Passover seems to underline the theme of "restoration through repentance" again. Passover is

celebrated as commemoration for redemption from foreign bondage. Although Israel is already in the exilic situation, just as Hezekiah and Manasseh, Josiah is restored from it through repentance. As Huldah's prophecy clearly expresses, the judgment has been already irreversibly determined for the fate of Israel (2 Chr 34:24, 25, 28; cf. 2 Chr 32:26) and the restoration in Josiah's reign has to take the form of probation, but the principle of immediate retribution is still at work and the Chronicler seems to preach to his contemporaries that even from the exilic situation restoration is possible (cf. 2 Chr 7).<sup>136</sup>

A short note on Josiah's death in 2 Kgs 23:29-30 is also expanded into a fully-fledged account in Chronicles (2 Chr 35:20-27).<sup>137</sup> The additional details include an unusual prophetic warning through the heathen Pharaoh Necho and Josiah's rejection (vv. 21-22). It is commonly ascribed to the Chronicler's desire to explain why an otherwise pious king has to meet with tragic death, but it seems to serve as more than explanation of the difficulty in the text<sup>138</sup>. Vs. 22 "He did not listen to the words of Necho from the mouth of God" contrasts with Josiah's 'listening to' the prophecy of Huldah and the subsequent blessings (34:26-27).<sup>139</sup> In vv. 22-24 the details of Josiah's battle and death are described in typology with the death of Ahab, who also rejected the prophetic warning.<sup>140</sup> Clearly the Chronicler intends to present Josiah's

death as a negative example and to show the disastrous consequences of rejecting the prophetic word. The Chronicler sees himself in the line of the prophets (cf. 2 Chr 24:30) and he has shown the way of restoration through the reigns of Hezekiah to Josiah. He now concludes his sermon with the warning that, though the post-exilic community has been restored from the exile, if they do not listen to his prophetic word, they will invite the same tragedy as Josiah.

#### 15. 2 Chr 36: The Destruction of the Kingdom

There is a discussion whether the Chronicler's account of the last four kings is dependent on 2 Kgs 23:36-25:30. S. McKenzie argues that the text of Kings which the Chronicler uses is the earlier edition of the Deuteronomistic History (DH<sup>1</sup>) and it does not include these chapters, because 2 Chr 36 deviates from the Kings text more than we would normally expect.<sup>141</sup> However, as we shall see below, the differences can be accounted for by the Chronicler's deliberate shaping of the material around his themes, and it is not necessary to presuppose that DH<sup>2</sup> was not available to him. Especially the details such as the ones found in Jehoahaz' reign (36:2-5) seem to be based on 2 Kgs 23:31-36.<sup>142</sup>

The Chronicler drastically abbreviates the reigns of the last four kings to present them as a single unit. Their reigns are no longer separated by their death notices, and all the



details except spoliation of the temple and exile are omitted to emphasize their common fate.<sup>143</sup> The Chronicler is apparently not interested in a comprehensive account of their reigns but only in the fact that their apostasy brought them to the exile. In the very last reign of Zedekiah, he quickly summarizes the destruction of the temple (2 Chr 36:18-19) and the deportation of the people (36:20), and instead theologially explains why they had to go into exile with his characteristic vocabulary (36:12-17, without parallel). Vv. 12-13 speak in particular of Zedekiah that he rejected the prophet Jeremiah and did not turn to the Lord ("did not humble himself"). However, in vv. 14-17 the scope is widened to the sins of all the people throughout the apostate history of Israel.<sup>144</sup> "All the leading priests and the people" are accused of their "extreme unfaithfulness ( הִרְבּוּ לַעֲוֹל גִּיעוּל )" and "defilement of the temple ( וְאִשְׁמָאוּ אֶת בַּיִת יְהוָה )" in vs. 14 and their mocking of "the prophets (pl)" and "the messengers (pl) of God" is pointed out in vv. 15-16. Although the final judgment of the exile has been averted by the timely repentance of Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Josiah, the Chronicler sees now that Israel's sin has reached the degree that "there is no remedy" (vs. 16b) and the exile inevitably takes place. The exile is unambiguously ascribed to God's judgment in vs. 17, and it is quickly reported in vv. 18-20.



The Chronicler, however, concludes his history of Israel with a note of hope for the future (without parallel). Although vv. 22-23 may be secondary, in vs. 21 he refers to the prophecy of Jeremiah and suggests that the judgment is only for a limited period (cf. Jer 25:11-12; 29:10).<sup>154</sup> He interprets the significance of the Babylonian exile with the allusion to Lev. 26:34-35 as rest for the land, and implies that God has not forgotten his covenant and restoration is possible after they have paid for their sins (cf. Lev. 26:40-45).<sup>155</sup> Israel thus returns to the same situation as the beginning of the Chronicler's history in 1 Chr 9-10. The Chronicler's first readers, the returnees from the exile, have gone through the judgment, and are now looking for the restoration, and he challenges them to take the way of David and Solomon in order to reestablish their glorious period. The Chronicler's thematic schematization of history is evident in this concluding chapter, probably more so than ever; apparently he selects materials from 2 Kgs 23:36-25:30 and uses them for his distinct message. That were the case, it would not be more than a supplement or interpretation of the earlier work. It is true that he refers to the earlier history for further information or confirmation and he most likely does not intend to supersede it. Knowledge of Samuel's life is also helpful in reconstructing the historical events the Chronicler is

## SUMMARY

It is now obvious that the Chronicler arranges his materials around his own distinct themes and that Chronicles is structurally independent from Samuel-Kings. Where he reproduces the Samuel-Kings text, he does not do so to interpret it but to use it for his own purpose. The texts are set in new literary contexts - by his introduction, conclusion, transposition, combination with other materials - and given new roles to play. The texts are sometimes omitted, but not to conceal unpleasant sections rather to select the materials which contribute to his overall purpose. Additions are likewise not meant to be interpretation or elaboration of the Samuel-Kings text but to be components of his new structure together with the materials taken from the scriptural source and to show his theological message.

In defence of our conclusion, it must be pointed out that the Chronicler does not assume the reader's knowledge of Samuel-Kings to such a degree that without it Chronicles cannot be understood. If that were the case, it could not be more than a supplement or interpretation of the earlier work. It is true that he refers to the earlier history for further information or confirmation and he most likely does not intend to supercede it. Knowledge of Samuel-Kings is also helpful in reconstructing the historical events the Chronicler is

referring to, but he provides enough information for his work to be complete by itself. For example, although the Chronicler does not relate the earlier life of Saul, he is concerned only with the disastrous fate of unfaithfulness in 1 Chr 10 and the knowledge of his whole life is not necessary (cf. 1 Chr 10:13-14). Likewise 2 Chr 10:15 refers to the prophecy of Ahijah omitted earlier in Chronicles, but it only suggests that the course of the events in 2 Chr 10 was already promised beforehand and its detail is not required. 2 Chr 22:7-8 recounts the killing of Ahaziah by Jehu. Although the revolt of Jehu is not included in Chronicles, vs. 7b quickly introduces who Jehu is and for the account of the death of Ahaziah it is enough. In 32:24-31 "signs" given to Hezekiah and his "pride" are mentioned, but without knowledge of 2 Kgs 20 it is difficult to know which historical events he is referring to. However, here the Chronicler is abstracting the change of Hezekiah's attitude to the Lord and it is doubtful if he expects his readers to know the exact course of events.

demonstrated that the Chronicler... structure around his theological... from Samuel-Kings, adding extra... contexts for parallel material...

It is now evident that... a new message and they are... events, not an explanation...

EXCURSUS

Summary of Chapters One to Three

In chapters I-III, we have analysed three aspects of the Chronicler's literary techniques. The first chapter has found seven possible causes of disagreements in his quotation of Samuel-Kings: Textual; Clarification; Adaptation; Harmonization; Theological Stress; and Typological Alterations. These are mostly employed to make the text more intelligible and not to alter the original meaning or the historical reportage. His theological interpretation is introduced either by evaluative comments or typological alterations. The Second chapter has shown that, although he introduces additional materials to make his theological points, they are unlikely to be pure fabrications. The Chronicler intends to show theological lessons from the pattern of factual history and claims prophetic status to interpret it. The Third chapter has demonstrated that the Chronicler creates a distinct literary structure around his theological themes, selecting materials from Samuel-Kings, adding extra materials, and giving new contexts for parallel materials.

It is now evident that Chronicles has a new structure and a new message and they are intended to be read as an account of events, not an explanation of an existing text. The Chronicler



attempts to show the importance of total reliance on the Lord and cultic fidelity for the restoration of David and Solomon's glorious days from the pattern of the country's past. What he has written is *historiography* presented from this particular perspective, and it is difficult to identify it with interpretative literatures which are essentially dependent on the texts of earlier works, or with theological works which do not concern historical facts. of the entire work 2 Chr 36:21-22, where Israel is again in exile but challenged with the hope of restoration.

Secondly, 1 Chr 1-9 1 Chronicles 1-9 *Chronicles* has its own *Chronicles* Although we have not included the first nine chapters of 1 Chronicles in our discussion, because they do not parallel Samuel-Kings, they also support the conclusion that *Chronicles* is *historiography*. God's listening to the prayer of the people Firstly, as Van Seters has demonstrated, genealogy is a standard ancient historiographical technique to connect the people in the past with more recent times, and it is appropriate for the Chronicler to use it as a historian.<sup>1</sup> 1 Chr 1-9 is structured as a segmented genealogy of all twelve sons of Israel up to the post-exilic period, and this indicates that the post-exilic community is a successor of God's promise to Israel.<sup>2</sup> Within the genealogy special attention is given to the sons of Judah (2:3-4:23), because the promise to the Davidic dynasty shares a significant place as the basis for the

future hope in the remainder of the work.<sup>3</sup> Sons of Levites are also focused upon, for the proper worship is the key to the fulfilment of the promise. The genealogy ends with the Chronicler's contemporaries, the returnees from the exile, and this ushers the readers into the following history which narrates how the exilic situation at the end of Saul's reign is turned into the glorious period of David and Solomon. 1 Chr 9 also parallels the conclusion of the entire work 2 Chr 36:21-22, where Israel is again in exile but challenged with the hope of restoration.

Secondly, 1 Chr 1-9 suggests that Chronicles has its own overarching themes and prepares the readers to pay attention to them. Besides the focus on the House of David and the Levites, occasional comments within the genealogy point to the retribitional theology. God's listening to the prayer of the people is repeated in 4:10 and 5:18-22 and the faithlessness (  $\text{לֹא אָמֵן}$  ) of the people is judged by exile in 5:23-26.

Thirdly, 1 Chr 1-9 indicates that Chronicles has its own literary structure. Although it is not completely certain if the genealogy is a part of the original work of the Chronicler, if it is so, Chronicles cannot be interpretation of Samuel-kings.<sup>4</sup> It is mainly based on the Pentateuchal materials and this clearly indicates that the author intends to start the work of history from the beginning of mankind (1 Chr 1).

#### IV

### Chronicles and Other Jewish Literatures

As the foregoing study of the Chronicler's literary techniques indicates that Chronicles is historiography, in the present chapter we would like to compare these techniques with other Jewish literatures and to place Chronicles in a broader context of literary activities. We have chosen typical passages from Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Jubilees and Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus, which respectively represent exegetical literature, "Rewritten Bible", and historiography. The differences and similarities between these literatures and Chronicles will help us to define more precisely what kind of literature Chronicles is.

#### 1. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 22 the "Akedah" and MT Gen 22 exhibits some of the literary techniques we have already found in the Chronicler's use of his source, but there are some marked differences as well.

One of the literary techniques employed by both works is clarification of the text.<sup>1</sup> For example, in Gen. 22:5 Ps. Jon. supplies the object "the Lord of the universe" to "we [Abraham and Isaac] will worship", and in vs. 11 it adds "to him" to



"the angel of the Lord . . . said". In vs. 13 it qualifies "the thicket" with "of a tree". These do not betray any particular theological interest and serve to clarify the obvious in the text.

However, the Targumist also supplies guidelines to interpret difficulties inherent in the text. Whereas the Chronicler's explanatory expansions are meant to explicate the implied thoughts or to add some historical information, in Ps. Jon's guidelines we can find little concern for the original meaning of the text or historical reality. In vs. 3 the missing names of Abraham's two young men are given as Eliezer and Ishmael. The identification of the unspecified two young men with these two names is frequently found in Rabbinic literature, but there is nothing to suggest or imply such names in the text nor it is likely that the Targumist has access to a reliable historical source. Likewise, he writes in vs. 4, without firm basis, that Abraham saw "the cloud of glory smoking on the mountain [Moriah], and he recognized it", in order to avoid the question "how did Abraham know it was the right place?"<sup>2</sup> Also, perhaps from traditional legend, vs. 13 qualifies the ram Abraham found as that "which was created in the evening of the completion of the world".

Moreover, whereas the Chronicler often corrects the textual problems to restore the most probable reading, Ps. Jon. develops its theological teaching from its peculiar way of



reading the Hebrew text. Where Abraham said to his young men, "I and the lad will go yonder", Ps. Jon. adds "to find if what I was assured - 'so shall thy seed be' - will be established". "So ( ׀ )" in the promise of Gen 15:5 is connected with "yonder ( ׀ )" in this verse. Thus in the Targum Abraham "went to discover what ׀ in the promise could mean when his son was about to be taken from him".<sup>3</sup> This interpretation must be traditional, as it is recorded in Ber. R. 41:2 as well. In like manner, with a slight change of punctuation, Ps. Jon. interprets vs. 8 as Abraham telling Isaac that he would be the offering, and Isaac understanding it and the two going together "with a single heart".<sup>4</sup> While "my son" in the Genesis text seems to be a vocative, Ps. Jon. takes it as apposition to a burnt offering; "God will provide himself the lamb for a burnt offering: my son". This change implies the self-offering of Isaac, and the same interpretation can be found in Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, 4 Maccabees and elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> With these expansions Ps. Jon. explains the text, like the Chronicler, but is more interested in showing a "deeper" meaning of the text according to the tradition than clarifying the literal meaning of the text itself or giving a historical picture of the events reported.

Another interpretative technique common to Ps. Jon. and Chronicles is adaptation. In vs. 21 Kemuel is called "the master of the Aramean diviners" instead of "the father of

Aram", probably because of the later concept of the Arameans. On the other hand, Ps. Jon. does not harmonize the text, because it essentially takes the form of translation (see below) and there is no need to adjust the text to a new structure.

Just as in Chronicles, there are expansions not only to help the readers to understand the text but also to make theological points on it. Vs. 18 "through your sons all the nations on earth will be blessed" is theologially interpreted as "because of the merit of your sons, etc.". Since it was popularly believed that "the deed and faith of just men (particularly of the fathers) would carry over and assist others", this idea of imputed merit is read into the more general statement of the Genesis text by Ps. Jon. The same point is repeated in the extension of the next verse, where Milcha, Abraham's sister-in-law, is said to be "granted easement through the merit of her sister [Sarah] to bear sons".

The Targumist also uses typological interpretation to present certain scenes in the text. In vs. 2 "the region of Moriah" is changed to "the land of worship". Alteration is made not because the explanation is necessary but because the continuity of worship is to be stressed. The identification of Mount Moriah and the Temple mount can be often found in Jewish tradition, as already in Chronicles and probably in the final form of Genesis itself. In vs. 9 the same line of thought is

further extended to connect the altar Abraham built with the one Adam built and Noah rebuilt, though there is no Scriptural basis. The sacrifice of Isaac is not only seen as a type of ideal worship but also presented properly from the contemporary perspective. The wood Abraham brought for a burnt offering (vs. 3) is specified as "of olive and the fig and the palm which are proper for burnt offering" in order to picture the scene in harmony with the later halakah.

Besides these changes and expansions of the Scriptural text, Ps. Jon. also introduces totally new incidents and speeches. For instance, when Abraham is about to slaughter Isaac (vs. 10), the speeches of Isaac and the angels are added. They are not only concerned to show their deep faith in God that Abraham was even ready to kill his dearest or Isaac to be killed but also to identify them with a rabbinic technical term *yehidim* "unique ones". There is also a halakic concern to show that the binding conforms to ritual requirements. After the Lord provided a ram for Isaac, the prayer of Abraham is added to interpret His mercy. Abraham confesses that he did not hesitate to perform His decree, and prays for Isaac's descendants to be also delivered in the hour of distress.

With these speeches, just as the Chronicler, Ps. Jon. suggests the theological meaning of the reported event for his contemporaries.



However, where it introduces new incidents, as in the case of the clarifications mentioned above, it is difficult to detect any historical interest in them. In vs. 1 the non-biblical story of the dispute between Isaac and Ishmael is introduced in order to give reasons for the sacrifice of Isaac and for the testing of Abraham.<sup>11</sup> Each claims that he is more righteous than the other because he is more willing to offer his body for the Lord. Although it may be developed from the rivalry between them in Gen. 21, in the canonical text they are too young for such a dispute over their righteousness (cf. 21:8) and Ishmael has already been sent off from Abraham's household before Isaac's sacrifice. The additional story in vs. 19 also does not have any biblical parallel; the angel brought Isaac to the school of Shem after the Akedah. As Bowker comments, "the text of Genesis does not say that both Abraham and Isaac returned to the young men, so the Targum suggests where Isaac was."<sup>12</sup> Again the story may be developed from the question arising from the text; it is historically unwarranted. Similarly in the next verse, since the Genesis text has no record of Abraham meeting Sarah after the sacrifice of Isaac, Ps. Jon. tells that Sarah died because of the shock at the news of the incident.

The overall structure of Ps. Jon. consists of two elements; reproduction (translation) of the sacred text and explanatory expansion on it, and such control of the structure by the text



sharply contrasts with the distinct structure of Chronicles. The Genesis text is translated word by word to provide a basic text and very little, if any, is omitted. The Targum provides running commentary on the text and no expansions are unrelated to the text. Explanations and speeches derive from various spheres such as literary context, peculiar reading of the text, later theology and traditional legend, but all contribute to give a deeper meaning to the text for the later community. They are, moreover, not systematically introduced to stress a particular message throughout, nor organized around a new theme of the work. Expressions are essentially secondary to the sacred text, and later theological teachings are only suggested for the interpretation of the individual parts of the text.

These literary characteristics of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan can be summarized as below:

Clarification of the Canonical Text	○
Adaptation of the Canonical Text	○
Harmonization of the Canonical Text	×
Theological Changes of the Canonical Text	○
Typological Changes of the Canonical Text	○
Historical Concern in the Use of the Canonical Text	×
Historical Concern in the Additional Materials	×
Distinct Structure to the entire work	×

The results of this table accord naturally with the Targum's function as translation of the Scripture from Hebrew to Aramaic (Targum means "translation"). After the return from the exile Hebrew was increasingly replaced by Aramaic as the common language, and in the synagogue service the reading of the Hebrew Scripture was followed by Aramaic translation and some interpretation and homily were added. Thus, structurally, the sacred text provides the basic framework of Targum and explanatory phrases are added to clarify the meaning of the text. It is essentially an annotated translation and, unlike Chronicles, it does not have its own structure or theme. Expansions teach the meaning of the text and edify the contemporary community from a particular tradition, and again unlike Chronicles, there is no interest in the historical reality behind the text. The Targum and Chronicles share some interpretative techniques (basic clarification, adaptation, theological stress, typological changes), because both attempt to present the text as intelligible to the later readers. But the Targum's lack of its own structure and historical interest suggests a rather different relationship to the text than with Chronicles.

2. Jubilees 23-25. 19:1-24: 25

Jubilees, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus' Antiquities are customarily categorized as "Rewritten Bible" with some other works. While it has been suggested that the development of midrashic interpretation can be traced back to these "Rewritten Bibles" and the Bible itself, there are some differences between "Rewritten Bible" and Rabbinic Targum or Midrash and it is difficult to identify them simply. Even within the "Rewritten Bibles" the purposes of writing are so diverse that there is much disagreement on which literature should be included in "Rewritten Bible".<sup>13</sup> While Jubilees is written as direct revelation from the angel, Pseudo-Philo does not claim such, and Antiquities explicitly states it is history writing. The presence of midrashic interpretation in the works cannot be a sign of a particular literary genre, because such interpretation must have been so widespread that any writer who used the Bible could have employed it. Probably, as Harrington suggests, "Rewritten Bible" should be seen as a kind of activity rather than one literary genre.<sup>14</sup> Therefore here we would like to study the relationship between the text and the new work, and the interpretative method of the text, in each individual case before we attempt to draw any general conclusion about this type of literature.

Chapters 19-22 of Jubilees narrate Abraham's return to Hebron, Isaac's marriage, and the birth of Esau and Jacob,

based on Gen. 23-25. 19:1-24; 20:1, 11-13 parallel the biblical text and, as with Chronicles and Ps. Jon., the text is often clarified by the author of Jubilees. For instance, "Mamre" in 19:5 is qualified with "i.e., Hebron" as easily deduced from the context of Gen. 25. The following verse similarly writes that Abraham bowed down "twice" because he did so in Gen 25:7 and 12. In 19:12 the writer adds that Keturah bore "six sons" for Abraham before the six names of her sons are listed. He also explicates that Abraham paid the price for the cave of Machpelah "in full silver" (19:6), which is only implied in Genesis 23.

Another common technique Jubilees uses is adaptation of the Genesis text. In 20:12 the geographical area where the sons of Ishmael dwelt is described in terms more easily understood by the later readers: "From Havilah to Shur, which is opposite Egypt in the direction of Assyria" is changed to "from Paran to the entrance to Babylon in all the land which faces the east opposite the desert".<sup>15</sup> In the next verse Ishmaelites are further identified with the Arabs of later times.<sup>16</sup> The concept of evil is also personified as "the spirit of Mastema" following common practice in the later post-exilic period.<sup>17</sup> Although this figure appears here only in the author's original composition of Abraham's speech (19:28), elsewhere it is used in the parallel sections as well (e.g., 17:16). The rendering of the cave of Machpelah as "the double



cave" (in the Ethiopic text) follows LXX translation and may also be adaptation, but two fragments of the Hebrew text from Qumran (3Q5, F3 and 2Q19) indicate that the original text has "Machpelah".<sup>18</sup>

The author of Jubilees also harmonizes the Genesis text within itself and with his overall structuring. For instance, the order of Abraham's actions in Gen 25:5 is altered in order to remove an apparent difficulty from the story: after Abraham gave "all he had" to Isaac, he still gave gifts to the sons of his concubines.<sup>19</sup> In Jubilees 20:11 Abraham first gave gifts to Ishmael and to his other sons and then he gave "everything" to Isaac. The author takes such a liberty because, unlike translations such as Targumim, he does not need to keep the exact wordings of the text. Also, in 19:10 Rebekah is introduced with a long genealogy taken from various places in Gen 24 (cf. vv. 15, 24, 29, 47). Since the narrative of Gen 24 is quickly summarized here all the information which the author is interested in has to be put together.

Certain aspects of the story are also highlighted and its theological significance is interpreted by the author of Jubilees. Where he works on the story of the death and burial of Sarah (Jub. 19:4-7, cf. Gen 23:1-16), he adds his own introduction and conclusion (vv. 1-3, 8-9) so that its new theological meaning is given by angels: the death of Sarah is the tenth trial for Abraham and he succeeds in it through his

patience and faithfulness. However, in contrast to the practice of Ps. Jon. the theological significance of the burial of Sarah is given according to an overall theological theme, because in Jubilees various incidents in the latter half of Abraham's life are presented as his testings and faithfulness (cf. 17:15-18). In 19:14 the difference in the characters of Jacob and Esau (Gen 25:27) is theologically interpreted to contrast Jacob's learning writing and Esau's learning war and fierce deeds. Again, the positive portrayal of Jacob and hostility to Esau is a recurring theme in Jubilees (e.g., 19:17-25; 35-38 etc.), probably because Jacob is identified as the forefather of Israel (e.g., 23:23; 31:15) and Esau as that of the Edomites, its arch-enemy.<sup>20</sup>

Some scenes in Genesis are also presented from the contemporary perspective of Jubilees, though it does not employ theological exegesis of typology much. The patriarchs are often described as if they obeyed the religious teachings of a later period in order to make them exemplary for its contemporary readers. Jubilees 19:11 says Abraham took his third wife Keturah "from among the daughters of his household servants", while its parallel text Gen 25:1-2 gives no information about her. That she was not a foreigner is stressed so as to eliminate the possibility of Abraham's marriage to a non-Jewish wife, which was a major issue in the Hasmonean period.<sup>21</sup> In the same verse the author also adds "for Hagar died before

Sarah", to defend Abraham from the charge of bigamy.<sup>22</sup>

Similarly in 20:11 he replaces the term "concubines" with the names of Abraham's descendants.<sup>23</sup> Jubilees also interprets "Jacob dwelt in tents" (Jub 19:13 // Gen 25:27) as "learned to write". Endres explains it thus: "In the targumic tradition the 'tents' were academies, so this author's aim was that Jacob be 'represented as a lifelong student of Torah'."<sup>24</sup>

Besides these changes to the canonical text, Jubilees introduces a substantial amount of additional material, mainly in the form of speech. After the account of Jacob and Esau's birth (19:13-14 // Gen 25:21-26), it inserts Abraham's blessings for Jacob (19:15-31). Whereas Genesis merely states that Isaac loved Esau and Rebekah loved Jacob (vs. 28), Jubilees writes that Abraham loved Jacob and instructed Rebekah to watch over Jacob and blessed him. It clearly serves the theological emphasis of Jubilees on the election of Jacob and his descendants, including its audience, and Abraham's blessings upon them. However, the addition is without an historical basis, because in Genesis Abraham's death is narrated beforehand and he does not appear in this scene. Admittedly the narrative sequence of Genesis may be dischronologized and Abraham may have lived until then, but still it is doubtful whether the author of Jubilees had access to an historical source of Abraham's preference of Jacob and command to Rebekah. Moreover, although it is possible that



here the significance of Rebekah's love is interpreted as having the support of Abraham, it is better to understand that Rebekah's love provides only a setting for the freely created theological sermon: Abraham's blessings. The content of the speech focusses on Abraham's love for Jacob and the election of Jacob, and nothing is said of the role of Rebekah. The direct contradiction with the presentation of Genesis also makes it difficult to see this addition merely as interpretation of Rebekah's love.<sup>25</sup>

Similarly Abraham's "Testaments" to his sons and grandsons, particularly to Isaac (Jub 20:1-11) have no counterparts in Scripture. These speeches are only assumed from Abraham's giving gifts to Isaac and his other sons (Gen 25:5-6 // Jub 20:11). Although the Chronicler often puts his theological interpretation of events in the mouths of historical figures, it is again questionable if these "Testaments" in any way function as an interpretation of Abraham's giving gifts. The speeches are basically halakic teachings of ethical and cultic purity to Abraham's descendants and contemporizing elements suggest that they address the readers of Jubilees. The speeches do not comment on the incident in the text and they seem to be connected with Abraham only for authorization.

Such use of additional materials is more clearly seen in Abraham's last words to Jacob (Jub 22), because here the author



creates afresh the setting of the speech (22:1-9) as well as the speech itself (22:10-30). He writes that Abraham blessed Jacob when all the children of Abraham gathered for the celebration of the feast of firstfruits, but this event is neither recorded in Scripture nor somehow connected with the text, as was the previous example of Rebekah's love. It also presents the problems of shifting Abraham's death to after Jacob's boyhood and of the patriarchs' celebrating the later festival. The creation of such an event strongly suggests the author's lack of historical interest. The account is also not intended to be an interpretation of the Genesis text, because there is no text to comment on. Rather the message is addressed to the readers of Jubilees in the Hasmonean period, because Abraham's charge that Jacob and his descendants must be separated from the Gentiles was one of the most significant issues at that time.

The above discussions suggest that Jubilees is not meant to be an up-to-date version or interpretation of the canonical text, but a new work with a distinct structure and theme. Stories are retold often only in outline form to supply a basis for theological comments, though there are some verbatim quotations as well.<sup>26</sup> The theological meaning of the death and burial of Sarah is expressed by angels in Jub 19:1-3 and 8-9, but the event itself (Gen 23:1-16) is condensed into four verses in Jubilees (19:4-7). The story of Isaac's marriage

with Rebekah (Gen 24:1-67) is more radically reduced to only one verse in Jubilees (19:10). It is reported not for its own sake but simply to supply necessary background for the birth of their sons Esau and Jacob (19:13ff). Similarly, Abraham's marriage with Keturah (Gen 25:1-4) is reduced to one verse (19:11) only to provide the background for Abraham's last words to Isaac, Ishmael, and the sons of Keturah in 20:1-11.

The writer omits the details of the descendants of Keturah (Gen 25:3-4) and transfers that of Ishmael's sons (Gen 25:12-18) to after Abraham's speech, reducing it to two verses (20:12-13).<sup>27</sup> He also moves the account of Abraham's death (Gen 25:1-11) to Jub 23:1-18 in order to make it possible for Abraham to bless his grandson Jacob (22:10-30). The birth account of Esau and Jacob itself (Gen 25:21-27) is also condensed to two verses (19:12-13), without mentioning Isaac's prayer for a child or the struggle between the twins, though they are followed by Abraham's long command to Rebekah. Clearly the author reports the narrative in an outline form to provide the context for his theological exhortation and he is not dependent on the text.

While As we have seen above, the additional materials in Jubilees do not always directly interpret the theological significance of the events in the text but often freely express typological relationships between past events and present situations.<sup>28</sup> He rewriting the text and sets up imaginative

theological ideas with minimal or no connection with the Genesis text. Endres who has studied the interpretative method of Jubilees writes:

peculiar dating of events. . . .  
Rewriting often prepared for homiletical exhortations (compositions) which the author inserted into the sacred history. This writer believed that narrative history provided the basic context for halakic prescription. Put differently, this author considered Haggadah and Halakah as inextricably bound together.<sup>29</sup>

Jubilees' composed speeches are not meant to be interpretation of the text, but *vice versa*: the narrative is embellished with haggadah to give "the basic context for halakic prescriptions". The patriarchal narratives are employed only as setting and authorization for those speeches, and even a new story which has no basis in the text is created for this purpose.<sup>30</sup>

The teaching itself is unrelated to its literary setting, as Endres again agrees with us:

Jubilees' author often utilized a technique called *Applied Exegesis* in order to address problems or situations not envisioned by biblical authors. This presumes that past events can address to contemporary situation, but it adds an important qualification: the past can address the present even in situations never envisioned in those texts. Rewriting and free composition enable the author to bridge that gap.<sup>31</sup>

While Endres describes what the author of Jubilees does correctly, it may not be adequate to call it Applied Exegesis, because the author does not interpret the text nor suggest typological relationships between past events and present situations.<sup>31</sup> He rewrites the text and sets up imaginative



events so that he can address totally new issues in the speeches.

The distinct structure of Jubilees is supported by its peculiar dating of events. The exact dating of an event according to the later religious calendar is also found in the Targum.<sup>32</sup> But in Jubilees the dating of the major events is almost always supplied at the beginning, and it punctuates the narrative, giving a new framework to it. In our text of Jubilees 19-22 such datings are given to Abraham's return to Hebron (19:1), Isaac's marriage (19:10), the birth of Esau and Jacob (19:13), Abraham's admonition to his sons (20:1), Abraham's last words to Isaac (21:1), and their celebration of the feast of first fruits (22:1). These events are not simply reported, but carefully placed within the religious calendar so that they become foundations for later generations.

The author of Jubilees thus uses the text of Genesis and Exodus, and composes his work, as follows:

Clarification of the Canonical Text	○
Adaptation of the Canonical Text	○
Harmonization of the Canonical Text	○
Theological Stress of the Canonical Text	○
Typological Change of the Canonical Text	○
Historical Concern in the Use of the Canonical Text	×
Historical Concern in the Additional Materials	×
Distinct Structure to the entire work	○



### 3. Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum

In using Genesis-Exodus, Jubilees clarifies, adapts, and harmonizes the text to help his readers towards its better understanding, and stresses certain aspects of the events and narrative (chap. 38) and Jephthah narrative (chaps. 39-40). Where Pseudo-Philo follows the canonical text (chs. 39-40) (Judg 10:9-11:40), he frequently clarifies the meaning of the text just as Targum Ps. Jon. and Jubilees do. In fact, he explains the text with words obvious from the context (e.g., "you have driven me out of my land" (39:6) and "and came" (39:6)). Thoughts implied in the text are made clear: cf., "whoever rears me first of the day shall be a holocaust" (39:10, 11), and "he did everything he had vowed and offered the holocausts" (40:8).

These characteristics are quite in harmony with the author's revelatory claim in the beginning of the work (cf. chap. 1). He suggests its content was dictated to Moses on Mt. Sinai by the angel of the presence and this is constantly recalled by the frequent appearances of the angel in the first person throughout the work. Since it is direct revelation, it does not need to be confined to Scripture or historical events. Philo offers an explanation why the Lord (the Lord) have shut up the tongue of the wise men of this generation so that they cannot repeat the words of Jephthah, etc." (40:47).<sup>33</sup> Names of events are also introduced. The king of the Ammonites (39:8), the daughter of Jephthah is called (39:11) and the mountain where she went to weep over her virginity is called (40:3).

### 3. Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum

Another example of "Rewritten Bible", Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, will be represented by its Jair narrative (chap. 38) and Jephthah narrative (chaps. 39-40).

Where Pseudo-Philo follows the canonical text (LAB 39-40 // Judg 10:9-11:40), he frequently clarifies the meaning of the text just as Targum Ps. Jon. and Jubilees. For example, he explains the text with words obvious from the context: e.g., "you have driven me *out of my land*" (39:4), or "Jephthah *arose and came*" (39:6). Thoughts implied in the story are made clear: cf., "whoever meets me *first* on the way will be a *holocaust*" (39:10, 11), and "he did everything he had vowed *and offered the holocausts*" (40:8).

However, Pseudo-Philo also explains difficulties arising from the text without historical warrant, just as Targum Ps. Jon. Since a rabbinic tradition says that Jephthah's vow was invalid and his daughter need not have been sacrificed, Pseudo-Philo offers an explanation why the Lord allowed it: "I [the Lord] have shut up he tongue of the wise men of my people for this generation so that they cannot respond to the daughter of Jephthah, etc." (40:4).<sup>34</sup> Names of unnamed characters are also introduced. The king of the Ammonites is called Getal (39:8), the daughter of Jephthah is Seila (40:1), and the mountain where she went to weep over her virginity is Stelac (40:5).

Harrington suggests that the name "Seila" comes from Hebrew root  $\text{לָשַׁא}$  "to ask", for she is the one "asked for" or "requested", and "Stalac" may be connected with the Hebrew  $\text{לָשַׁא}$  "snow" or the Aramaic  $\text{לָשַׁא}$  "snow".<sup>35</sup> Such naming activity is very common in the midrashic literatures, but indicates Pseudo-Philo's lack of historical concern in expansion of the text.

There is no clear example of Pseudo-Philo's adaptation of the text in the Jephthah narrative, but this does not mean he does not update the text at all. Elsewhere such instances can be found: for example, in LAB 44:2 the amount of the money Micah had is given in the equivalent in the contemporary currency.<sup>36</sup>

The text is sometimes harmonized with the new arrangement of LAB. In the beginning of the Jephthah narrative the background of Israel's apostasy under the Ammonites (Judg 10:6-18) is condensed into one sentence (39:1), because Pseudo-Philo has rewritten the Jair narrative in chap. 38 as an account of apostasy and it has become redundant. Yet because of this abridgement he has to add the necessary information of the Ammonites' domination of Israel before Jephthah's challenge to them (39:6). Similarly the empowering of Jephthah by the spirit is mentioned before his sending letters to the king of the Ammonites (39:8), instead of before his vow to the Lord



(Judg 11:29-31), since Pseudo-Philo writes that "God was very angry" at his vow (39:10).

Pseudo-Philo also suggests the theological significance of the events with comments and speeches. For example, when Jephthah becomes the leader of the people, he adds Jephthah's address which encourages the people to turn to the law of the Lord and to pray that God will deliver them in spite of their previous iniquities (39:6). As P.S. Alexander suggests, this speech is developed in typical midrashic fashion from Judg 11:11 "Jephthah spoke *all these words* before the Lord in Mizpah", for it is not clear what these words are in Judges.<sup>27</sup> But the content of the speech emphasizes the importance of repentance and trust in God's deliverance. The speech is followed by the people's prayer of repentance which has no parallel (39:7) and Pseudo-Philo's comment "and God repented of his wrath" (39:8a). All these show the meaning of the battle in terms of God's deliverance of those who repent.

Immediately after Jephthah's vow, the reaction of God and His speech are added to explain the nature of his vow (39:11). Whereas Judges only reports the tragic consequence of the vow, Pseudo-Philo suggests why Jephthah's vow was not right and his daughter must have suffered from it. Likewise after the victory of Jephthah and his meeting of his daughter Seila, another speech of God is added to show the theological significance of Seila's sacrifice (40:4). It contrasts the



foolishness of Jephthah's vow with the preciousness of Seila's death, and stresses God's acceptance of her sacrifice.

Lastly, Pseudo-Philo rewrites the events in the scriptural text to show their typological significance. The death of Seila is commented on in a divine speech as: "her death will be precious before me always" according to Ps. 116:15, and is presented as a type scene of the death valued by God (40:4).

A. Anderson writes on the Psalm passage that "the untimely death of the saints, or of Yahweh's loyal dependents, is not a matter of indifference to him".<sup>36</sup> When the leaders of Gilead try to persuade Jephthah to be their leader, his outcast position is typologically interpreted with the role of Esther who was also set aside for a certain purpose beforehand by God (39:4). Pseudo-Philo inserts the expression reminiscent of Esth 4:14 in the speech of the leaders: "For who knows if you have been kept safe to these days or freed from the hands of your brothers in order that you may rule your people in this time?" Similarly the sacrifice of Seila is interpreted after that of Isaac in her own speech (40:2):

And who is there who would be sad in death, seeing the people freed? Or do you not remember what happened in the days of our fathers when the father placed the son as a holocaust, and he did not refuse him but gladly gave consent to him, and the one being offered was ready and the one who was offering was rejoicing?

Some other events reflect the contemporary ideas or situation of Pseudo-Philo and are presented as types for his

audience. The leaders of Gilead compare their petition to Jephthah with a metaphor of a dove for Israel (39:5), which is found in 4 Ezra 5:26 and several rabbinic texts (cf. Ps. 74:19).<sup>39</sup> Since the metaphor prays for the deliverance of the dove (Israel) from the enemies, its use for the petition of God's deliverance through Jephthah makes it a type for later generations. The Aramean king is similarly identified with Getal, who is according to Harrington "Cotylas" the ruler of the city of Philadelphia.<sup>40</sup> If this identification is correct, the oppressor of Israel and her deliverance through Jephthah is seen as the model for his contemporary readers.

Pseudo-Philo also includes extensive additional materials in his work, such as the Jair narrative (LAB 38). Though Jair can be found in Judges 10:3-5, apart from his name the story is completely different between LAB and Judges. It is changed so much that the original good judge becomes responsible for the apostate situation in the following chapter at the time of Jephthah's appearance (Judg 10:6).<sup>41</sup> The Jair story is used to present the whole narrative as well as individual stories according to Pseudo-Philo's theological scheme.<sup>42</sup> Admittedly, LAB's version may be derived from the original text of Judges. As Ginzberg and Bauckham suggest, the word |'גךך in Judges 10:5 "When Jair died, he was buried in Kamon" was probably read as |'גךך "in the furnace", and a new story was composed on the analogies of Dan 3 and the story of Abraham in the

furnace.<sup>43</sup> Reliance on the details of the text and the creation of a new story according to the corresponding part of the Scripture is typical midrashic interpretation. However, though Jair in LAB is remotely related to the text of Judges, the way Pseudo-Philo develops his new story suggests that his aim is not to clarify the theological significance of the biblical incidents. He uses the sacred text for his theological purpose and he has no historical concern in doing so.

Pseudo-Philo has a literary structure independent from its canonical source, just as the book of Jubilees. He is not interested in simply repeating the text with annotation, although he frequently clarifies the text. Rather he outlines the narrative in order to set up the basis for his theological comments and speeches. His more extensive additions (e.g., Jair) may be prompted by the text, but they are introduced in order to be parts of his new overall structure and not to be mere interpretation of the particular texts. He omits many biblical incidents and is even more selective than Jubilees. Although it covers the content of Genesis to the beginning of 2 Samuel, a third of the material comes from the book of Judges, which is relatively neglected elsewhere in the Haggadah.<sup>44</sup> The Judges cycle (sin, divine punishment, repentance, salvation) appears frequently in the interpolated speeches, and this indicates his conscious structuring of the material around the



readers, and organizes his work as a whole according to the theme of divine deliverance of Israel from her enemies through distinct themes and structure. The rest of the history is also related around the great Israelite leaders, rather than following the biblical text.<sup>45</sup> The Genesis account is centred around Abraham and he appears even in the building of the Tower of Babel, whereas little attention is paid to other patriarchs. The rest of the Pentateuch is retold around the figure of Moses and little legal teaching is included.

The literary characteristics of LAB are, therefore, very similar to those of Jubilees:

Clarification of the Canonical Text	○
Adaptation of the Canonical Text	○
Harmonization of the Canonical Text	○
Theological Stress of the Canonical Text	○
Typological Change of the Canonical Text	○
Historical Concern in the Use of the Canonical Text	×
Historical Concern in the Additional Materials	×
Distinct Structure to the entire work	○

Although various techniques are used to explain the canonical text, these explanatory notes and additional materials often do not reflect the literary meaning of the text and are historically groundless. Pseudo-Philo uses the canonical narrative as a setting for his sermons to his contemporary



readers, and organizes his work as a whole according to his distinct theme and structure. The only difference from Jubilees is that he does not claim revelation for his work and additional materials are somehow developed from the text. Unlike Jubilees, he does not create a story which does not have even a hint in the text, or introduce halakic teachings unrelated to the narrative itself. LAB is nevertheless essentially Pseudo-Philo's theological teaching for his contemporaries, but he introduces it via midrashic interpretation of selected texts rather than imposing completely foreign ideas on the text.

#### 4. Jewish Antiquities

While Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* is commonly included in the category "Rewritten Bible", he claims in the preface that he is writing history (I. 26). He aims to inform the Greek-speaking world about the ancient history and political constitution of the Jews (I. 5), and apologetically, to show that the Jews have been a law-abiding people since antiquity (I. 15-18). Therefore, unlike Jubilees and LAB, it is important for him to report what really happened as well as to interpret the sacred text.<sup>47</sup> Josephus also states in the preface that he uses "the sacred writings" as a source for his historical account and he does not add or omit anything from it (I. 5, 13, 17). Such a claim of fidelity to his source is not

only derived from his belief in divine inspiration but is also a common hellenistic historiographic technique.<sup>43</sup> Yet in practice he modifies the text frequently and there seems to be some inconsistency. In order to understand Josephus' real attitude to his source and his work, how faithful he is to the text, and how he uses it to write history, we would like to examine his Exodus narrative (II. 315-349 // Exod 12:37-15:21) as an example.

Most of Josephus' minor changes of the canonical text can be classified as clarifications. Although he paraphrases the text extensively, probably he is simply following the hellenistic idea that historians should rewrite their sources in their own words, and he does not intend to change the meaning of the text. There are many places where he employs synonyms only to avoid using the same words as his source. For example, II. 318 reads "Moses had already reached his eightieth year; his brother Aaron was three years older", whereas Exod 7:7 is "Moses was eighty years old and Aaron eighty three". Direct speech conversations are usually summed up by indirect speech. The song of Moses after the miraculous deliverance (Exod 15:1-21) is summed up in one sentence: "Moses himself composing in hexameter verse a song to God to enshrine His praises and their thankfulness for His gracious favour."<sup>43</sup> Some changes are introduced more positively for clarification of the text. Obvious details are added such as "his brother"

to "Aaron" in II. 318 and the subjects of verbs are frequently supplied. God's  $\pi\rho\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\lambda$  and to point out that God has already mirac Josephus sometimes adapts the text to his contemporary readers. The Jewish month name Nisan is equated with the Macedonian name for April "Xanthicus" (II. 318). The song of Moses is said to be composed in hexameters. The text is also harmonized with other parts of the Scripture and the flow of the narrative is improved. Although there is no clear example in our passage, later in the invasion account divine speech in Josh 1:1b-9 is omitted because it overlaps with the material already included from the end of Deuteronomy.<sup>50</sup> The apparent discrepancies over what Joshua captured and what he did not are also reconciled by leaving out some materials (cf. Josh 11:21-23 with 13:2; Judg 1:8 with Josh 15:63, etc.). These are all basic changes to help the readers to appreciate the text better and no factual changes are intended.

Josephus also comments on the events to show their theological significance and to stress certain themes. Describing God's miraculous deliverance of the Israelites at the Reed Sea (II. 329 ff), Josephus emphasizes the necessity to trust in God's providence (  $\pi\rho\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\lambda$  ) and that God really saves those who trust in Him. He comments that Moses was relaxed and trusted in God's  $\pi\rho\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\lambda$  when the Israelites panicked facing the Egyptians and the Reed Sea (II. 329). He also expands Moses' speech to the dismayed Israelites (Exod

14:13-14 // II. 330-333) in order to encourage them also to trust in God's *προνοια* and to point out that God has already miraculously delivered them from Egyptian bondage and is trustworthy. He further adds Moses' prayer, without Scriptural basis (II. 334-337), which asks God to manifest His power and expresses Moses' faith in God's *προνοια*, using the term for the third time. Josephus does not write history for its own sake but to draw out certain moral lessons from it. But his comments are theological interpretations of historical events and he does not create highly imaginative details simply for his theological points, as some other Jewish literatures do.<sup>51</sup>

Typological changes are also employed to point out in Josephus' theological theme. The accounts of the passage of the Reed Sea and the destruction of the Egyptians are recast to stress that the Israelites were confident in God's deliverance and that the miracles were brought about by God Himself. Josephus adds rain and thunderbolts to dramatize the scene. Such spectacular divine deliverance of the righteous from a hopeless situation is repeatedly stressed throughout his work: e.g., the Akedah (I. 222-236), the Joseph story (II. 39-167), etc. The wicked are also duly punished, as in the cases of revolts against Moses by Korah (IV. 14-66) and by Zambias (IV. 131-155). Certainly, these events are presented as "type scenes" of God's providence at work, and function as more than the second month" a month after leaving Egypt on the fifteenth



mere historical reports; it is a means to highlight recurring patterns in history.<sup>52</sup>

Josephus adds the origin of the unleavened bread to the account of the hurried departure from Egypt to suggest the later religious significance of the historical events.<sup>53</sup> Although the account itself is not presented from a later perspective, it ties the historical event to the contemporary situation. Josephus writes that the feast lasted eight days, against the original seven day celebration, because diaspora Jews added one more day to their principal feasts.

Josephus' additional materials are often supplied for extra historical or geographical information. For example, in the account of the departure from Egypt he adds "They took the road for Letopolis, at that time desert, afterwards the site of Babylon, founded by Cambyses when he subjugated Egypt" (II. 315). This statement suggests Josephus' historical research into the most likely Exodus route based on contemporary geographical knowledge.<sup>54</sup> Egyptian Babylon is mentioned as a stronghold in or near "the Letopolite nome" founded by certain Babylonian emigrants by Strabo (xvii. 807). Josephus also writes that the Israelites lived with the dough they brought from Egypt "for thirty days". The length of the term is probably calculated from Exod 16:1, which suggests the Israelites first began to eat manna "on the fifteenth day of the second month" a month after leaving Egypt on the fifteenth

Nisan. This is not simple harmonization of scripture but an attempt to find out more about the historical event, for the period is not originally mentioned here, and there is no problem to reconcile. While identifications of placenames and dates with religiously significant sites or with the religious calendar are also found in exegetical literatures, the examples here are not related to any theological system and purely reflect Josephus' historical interest.<sup>55</sup> Josephus similarly gives a more detailed dating of the exodus, 215 years after Jacob's imigration, probably based on the Jewish historian Demetrius.<sup>56</sup> Though he does not study the reliability of his secondary source, still his interest in historical information is evident.

In II. 320-325, Josephus gives three reasons for the longer route taken by Moses, in order to defend its historical probability against possible objections. He gives the expected Egyptian pursuit, the Philistines, and God's plan for Mt. Sinai as reasons for the southern route, from his general knowledge of Israel's history. Also in 349 he relies on Demetrius and introduces another historical incident, that the Israelites collected the arms from the defeated Egyptians. He may be answering the question why they took that route or where the unarmed Israelites, according to Josephus, got arms, as the Targumist does. But his answers are genuinely historical

answers, and Josephus' effort to collect every piece of information for historical reconstruction is obvious.

Josephus' historical interest is also reflected in his omission of miraculous elements from the story and his supplying of more logical explanations. His attitude toward miracle is most clearly seen in his concluding comment on the crossing of the Reed Sea (II. 347-348). He is very reserved, saying "everyone is welcome to his opinion" whether the event was by God's will or accident, though he supports the historical possibility of the event citing the parallel event of Alexander the Great.<sup>57</sup> It seems that he reduces miraculous elements because he wants to write history more credibly, and in this sense he is not simply repeating the Scriptural text.

The analysis of the exodus narrative suggests that Josephus adds to, and omits from, Scripture according to his purpose of writing, just as Jubilees and LAB do. He passes over the Passover restrictions (Exod 12:43ff) and the order of consecration of the first born (Exod 13), since these details of legal matters digress from his main purpose of writing history to a non-Jewish audience and since he plans to write a separate work on the Jewish creed (I. 25).<sup>58</sup> As we have seen above, he minimizes miraculous accounts and tries to describe such events more rationally. Before the Israelites cross the Reed Sea, the Lord's command to Moses to divide the Sea (Exod 14:15-18) and the miraculous shift of the pillar of cloud to

confuse the Egyptians (Exod 14:19-20) are omitted. Instead in Antiquities Moses encourages the Israelites to trust in the Lord (II. 329-333). Describing the perishing of the Egyptians in the water (II. 340-344), Josephus also leaves out the Lord's order to Moses to stretch out his hand over the sea and His presence in the pillar of fire and cloud.

In this passage Josephus adds a prayer of Moses (334-337), comments on the miracle (347-348), and an explanation for how the Hebrews got their arms (349). Although the prayer of Moses may explain the theological significance of the event, the other two cannot be seen as haggadic or halakic expansions of the text. They historically assess the plausibility of the events with additional information and are unusual in ancient Jewish commentaries.

Josephus also sometimes transposes materials in order to present the narrative in his scheme. Describing the departure of the Israelites from Egypt (II. 315-317 // Exod 12:37-39), the name of the place where they arrived first, Beelsephon, is introduced from the later part of the narrative (Exod 14:2). The number of the people at the departure (Exod 13:37) is also moved to after the account of unleavened bread (Exod 13:38-39). The ages of Moses and Aaron (Exod 7:7) are given later with the discussion of the date of Exodus (II. 318-319 // Exod 12:40). Besides these minor cases, Josephus, for instance, shifts the whole story of the Levite of Ephraim from the end of



Judges to its beginning. Such major transpositions cannot be explained unless Josephus intends to produce a new coherent narrative.<sup>53</sup> It is thus clear that, though the Antiquities heavily relies on one source, Scripture, its literary structure is not determined by the Scripture but is essentially its own.

The results of our analysis of Antiquities, therefore, can be summarized as follows:

Clarification of the Canonical Text	○
Adaptation of the Canonical Text	○
Harmonization of the Canonical Text	○
Theological Stress of the Canonical Text	○
Typological Change of the Canonical Text	○
Historical Concern in the Use of the Canonical Text	○
Historical Concern in the Additional Materials	○
Distinct Structure to the entire work	○

Just as Jubilees and LAB, structurally Antiquities is independent from its scriptural source and organized according to its own purpose. But it sharply contrasts with the other two works in its careful preservation of historical reports of the text and in its introduction of additional historical data.

The literary nature of Josephus' composition parallels other hellenistic historiographies and is in harmony with his claim that he is writing history. It has been pointed out that

Dionysius, mentioning his main source in the preface and other sources some fifty-five times throughout the work, though he Josephus consciously modelled his work on the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>60</sup> Not only the title of the work and the division into twenty books indicate his indebtedness, but also, as some scholars suggest, certain "rationalistic" phrases and the structuring of certain scenes may have been composed after him.<sup>61</sup> Josephus, moreover, defines his subject matter and the aim of writing in the preface according to standard historiographical technique. The subject of the *Antiquities* is the "ancient history and political constitution of the Jews" (I. 5) and he writes it in order to remove ignorance about the Jews (I. 3) and to teach some moral lessons (I. 14, 20). These clearly reflect Dionysius, who writes *Roman Antiquities* "to dispel ignorance and remove erroneous impressions about Romans among Greeks" and to teach morality through examples of virtuous men.<sup>62</sup>

Josephus' reference to the source of information, i.e., Scripture, is also modelled after Dionysius' preface. In 1 6-7 Dionysius introduces preceding works on Roman antiquities and claims that he uses the proper documentation.<sup>63</sup> While secondary sources are rarely named by Greek historians, who are sceptical about the reliability of tradition and stress the importance of eyewitness, Dionysius believes that careful use of written sources is a proper activity of historians.<sup>64</sup> Josephus himself also writes the *Jewish War* which deals with his contemporary affairs, but in *Antiquities* he follows

Dionysius, mentioning his main source in the preface and other sources some fifty-five times throughout his work, though he does not always reveal his most important sources.<sup>65</sup> Evidently Josephus' *Antiquities* is written in the style of "archaeological" historiography and is not meant to be theological or interpretative literature.

Josephus' reliance on only one major source (Scripture) throughout the first half of *Antiquities* does not necessarily suggest that he is commenting on it (i.e., is doing midrash). It is an accepted historiographical method in his time: he is dependent on Nicolaus of Damascus in the earlier part of his *Jewish War* as Plutarch's *Life of Coriolanus* is fundamentally based on the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>66</sup> Josephus insists on several occasions on "the faithful reproduction as the responsibility of the historians".<sup>67</sup> He writes in VIII. 56 "because I wish my readers to know that we have said nothing more than what is true, and have not, by inserting into the history various plausible and seductive passage meant to deceive and entertain". As P.S. Alexander suggests, though Josephus paraphrases and modifies his source regularly, he still seems to believe in his essential faithfulness to the text.<sup>68</sup> Josephus clearly intends to use Scripture as a historical source and not as the text to comment on.



full of promise, but he ends his years...  
his evil deeds.<sup>70</sup> Whereas the...  
interpretation of the significance of historical events is a  
historical event is the historical...  
common hellenistic historiographical technique. Interpretation  
most likely interpretation of the...  
of the text is not exclusive to interpretative literatures, but  
hellenistic historian, Joseph...  
historians also need to interpret their sources to construct a  
learn some lessons from the...  
historical picture. Although Josephus points out what the  
It is interesting that...  
historical events mean, unlike Ps. Jon., Jubilees, and LAB, he  
prophet and thus implies he is...  
does not create events without some historical tradition.<sup>70</sup>  
He suggests that the prophets were...  
Certainly hellenistic historians, including Josephus, gave  
history, because they learned...  
speeches to the leading characters in order to review the  
certain way, divine inspiration...  
situation and to comment on it, though the authenticity of the  
not call himself...  
content of these speeches varies.<sup>70</sup> But, as Walbank suggests,  
the authoritative writings of...  
the criterion for judging speeches in hellenistic  
believes that "God still...  
historiography is not their accuracy but their  
instruments for revealing the...  
appropriateness.<sup>71</sup>  
the destinies of his people"

Similarly, describing an historical event as a "type  
called for this mission and...  
scene" is a frequently used technique. Walbank writes in  
interpreter of dreams and...  
another place, "for history like poetry was normally read  
ambiguous utterances of the...  
aloud, on a common emphasis on moral purpose shared by both,  
priestly descent, he was not...  
and on an identical background in the school of rhetoric, which  
III, 352).  
exploited both historical and tragic exempla for their own  
That his prophetic gift...  
end".<sup>72</sup> While Polybius is strongly against writing history  
skill is obvious from his...  
emotionally and tragically, he still describes the last year of  
Antiquities. However, his...  
Philip V of Macedon as a "moral type". He defines the sequence  
inspired interpretation of the...  
of cause and effect clearly: when Philip was young, he was so



full of promise, but he ends his years in bitterness because of his evil deeds.<sup>73</sup> Whereas the causal chain found behind the historical event is the historian's interpretation, it is the most likely interpretation of the situation for him. As a hellenistic historian, Josephus simply believes that he can learn some lessons from the patterns and principles in history.

It is interesting that Josephus claims himself as a prophet and thus implies he is suitable for writing history. He suggests that the prophets were entrusted to write canonical history, because they learned about the past by the most certain way, divine inspiration (Ap. I. 37). Although he does not call himself *προφητης* and distinguishes his works from the authoritative writings of the canonical prophets, he believes that "God still [makes] use of certain individuals as instruments for revealing the course of the future and guiding the destinies of his people".<sup>74</sup> Josephus sees himself being called for this mission and describes his ability as "an interpreter of dreams and skilled in divining the meaning of ambiguous utterances of the deity; a priest himself and of priestly descent, he was not ignorant of the sacred books" (War III. 352).

That his prophetic gift partially rests on exegetical skill is obvious from his extensive use of Scripture in Antiquities. However, his prophetic role cannot be reduced to inspired interpretation of the Biblical text only, since he

which may include the prediction of futura events without claims to receive direct revelation through dreams and divine utterances. He relates that the future course of events and his mission are revealed through a dream, not by studying of Scripture, when he was captured by the Romans (War III. 383-391). He attempts to persuade the besieged Jews to turn themselves over to the Romans, because he has realized that that is God's will (War VI. 107-108). On the other hand, he sees himself in a position to obtain favours from the rulers for his people, as he constantly compares himself with Joseph, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Esther-Mordecai in his works.<sup>77</sup> As we have seen above, Antiquities is not meant to be interpretation of the Biblical text but historiography with a distinct purpose: to defend the reputation of Jews in the Roman Empire (I. 15-18).<sup>77</sup> This mission comes from outside Scripture, and his exegetical skill is used to fulfill it.

Moreover, the claim to priestly status suggests that Josephus' interpretation is meant to be more than inspired biblical exegesis. He writes that he was descended on his mother's side from the priestly line of the Hasmoneans (Life, 2-6). By the time of the Maccabees canonical prophecy is seen as the thing of a normative past, but the Maccabean revolution was encouraged by direct revelation.<sup>77</sup> (The instances recorded in 2 Macc 11:8 and 15:11-16 are visions and not based on any Scriptural passages.) Blenkinsopp suggests that *bath qol* and Urim and Tummim reflect the prophetic function of the priests

which may include the prediction of future events without the Scriptural basis.<sup>78</sup> Josephus also knows certain prophetic Pharisees who communicate future events through extraordinary experiences (Ant XVII. 41-43). Although Josephus understands that the age of normative prophecy is over and that he does not belong to the canonical prophets, he still believes that God uses special people to reveal future events and to guide his people in particular situations.

### 5. Chronicles and Other Jewish Literatures

In this chapter we have discussed the similarities and differences between the literary techniques of Chronicles and of four other examples of Jewish literature. Our analysis can be summarized as follows:

	Ps, Jon,	Jubilees	LAB	Antiquities
Clarification of the Canonical Text	○	○	○	○
Adaptation of the Canonical Text	○	○	○	○
Harmonization of the Canonical Text	×	○	○	○
Theological Stress of the Canonical Text	○	○	○	○
Typological Change of the Canonical Text	○	○	○	○
Historical Concern in the Use of the Canonical Text	×	×	×	○
Historical Concern in the Additional Materials	×	×	×	○
Distinct Structure	×	○	○	○



A clear difference can be found between commentary on the text, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, and independent literary works, all three "Rewritten Bibles" and Chronicles. The Chronicler, unlike the Targumist, consciously selects the appropriate materials for his theme from his major source, and he transposes and adds materials in order to present history according to his scheme. As the above list shows, all "Rewritten Bibles" have independent literary structures. Thus Chronicles and "Rewritten Bibles" can be grouped together, whereas the Targum is contrasted to them in not having a distinct writing purpose and its own structuring of materials.

The further distinction can be made within independent recreation of the Bible, between those with a *theological* purpose (Jubilees and LAB) and those with a *historical* purpose (Antiquities and Chronicles). In the present chapter, we have seen that Rewritten Bible is not a homogeneous literary genre but includes various types of literatures. They differ in their use of the text according to their purpose of writing, and the Chronicler's use of the text is closest to Josephus.<sup>78</sup>

Firstly, the Chronicler's historical interest is indicated by his additions of extra historical information to his source. In the account of the transfer of the Ark, he identifies Baalah with Kiriath Jearim from his knowledge of Palestinian geography and Scripture. He attempts to answer a historical question: where the Ark was between Samuel's time (1 Sam 7:1) and the



transfer here. The Chronicler's addition "advancing to Hamath" (1 Chr 18:3) clarifies the route of David's manoeuvre in his war with Hadadezer. The Targum, Jubilees, and LAB may identify the place or date of an event with a religiously significant site or later religious calendar, but they are never interested in what really happened. The Chronicler's more extensive additions, such as the building activities of Rehoboam and Uzziah or the army organization of David, Asa, and Jehoshaphat, are almost certainly based on some other historical sources, and there are no historically implausible additions. Such historical interest sharply contrasts with the occasionally fantastically imaginative additions of interpretative literatures, and can be a mark of historiography.

Secondly, the Chronicler's general faithfulness to the text and the methods of his minor changes are parallel to ancient historiographical conventions. Most of the Chronicler's minor modifications are clarifications, harmonizations, and adaptations, to make his source more intelligible. This conservative attitude toward his source seems to reflect not so much his belief in the inspiration of the text as his respect for the text as a historical source. Though Josephus paraphrases his source regularly, following hellenistic practice, he still claims to reproduce it faithfully and his modifications do not change the content substantially. Such interpretation of the source is necessary

for any history, but especially for ancient historiography which does not have footnotes or quotation marks, and where such notations are proper activities of the historian.<sup>79</sup> On the other hand, the modifications of Jubilees and LAB are more radical. The text is much abridged, as if the outline of the stories are used for the sake of theological embellishment and reporting the event itself is not important. Events are sometimes changed into completely different stories and unrealistic new events are added. Chronicles, which reports a full account of the incident in more or less its original form, is clearly interested in reporting historical events and is not using the text only for the basis of theological comments or interpretation.

Thirdly, the Chronicler also draws out theological lessons from history as an ancient historian, but he is interested in the principles behind the historical events rather than mere interpretation of the source text. He often interprets the significance of the events by supplying comments and speeches. For example, in David's charges to Solomon in 1 Chr 28-29 he expresses his interpretation of the Temple building and the succession of Solomon. While these speeches are independent of the text, they comment on real historical incidents. Such speeches are a standard historiographical technique in his time. On the other hand, halakic speeches in Jubilees are simply put into the patriarch's mouth and they exhort later

theological teachings regardless of their historical settings. Sometimes even haggadic expansions are used to prepare a setting for such speeches. Whereas the Chronicler is concerned with what the event means, Jubilees simply uses the sacred tradition as the basis for his teaching.

The Chronicler also teaches lessons depicting historical events from their later theological significance. He describes the organization of the Levites according to his contemporary situation, to show what David's original act means to his generation. He suggests the direct consequence of what David did but he does not create a new event, without an historical basis, to legitimate later practice. In this sense Chronicles is different from Jubilees, which writes that Abraham observed the feast of Shabuoth and offered sacrifice properly. Such events have no Scriptural basis nor did Abraham do anything from which these teachings later develop. What the Chronicler is doing is more like Josephus when he adds the excursus on the feast of the unleavened bread as he quotes the text that the Israelites ate only unleavened bread in the beginning of the Exodus.

The Chronicler also stresses some theological themes by suggesting typological interconnections between events. The Chronicler's version of Saul's death is reported as a type scene of the tragic end of those who neglect the Lord. Israel's situation after Saul's death is further identified

with that of the post-exilic community, since both were defeated by the heathen because of their unfaithfulness. This tendency to point out recurring patterns in history is also a common ancient historiographical technique. As we saw above, Josephus repeatedly stresses the *προνοια* theme and illustrates this pattern by dramatizing God's deliverance from a hopeless situation. While LAB also frequently interprets Scripture from other parts of Scripture, it develops a totally new story or radically different story (haggadah) based on the similarities of small parts between them. The Chronicler, on the other hand, keeps the basic course of events and changes only small parts of the text to suggest interconnections with other texts. He clearly wishes to report historical events faithfully and points out patterns behind them.

Fourthly, the Chronicler's frequent reference to his source is a formal characteristic of historiography. He refers to previous historical works as his source and for further reference after his account of each king. Since the titles of the works differ from those of Samuel-Kings, it is unlikely that he simply imitates the previous history: they are probably genuine references. Ancient interpretative or theological works do not usually mention their sources of the account, since their fundamental reliance on the Bible is assumed, and do not need to be stated.<sup>80</sup> On the other hand, historians' sources are not necessarily Scripture and they have to support



the truthfulness of their accounts by referring to their sources. Such references are found in hellenistic "archaeological" historiographies such as Josephus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>31</sup> The author of 2 Maccabees also mentions the work of Jason of Cyrene as the basis of his epitome and Samuel-Kings have source references before Chronicles. It seems that source reference is very basic to historiographies which deal with previous traditions and which must base their authenticity on reliable sources. The source references of Chronicles suggest that it was concerned with the truthfulness of its historical account and was meant to be a historiography.

Lastly, the Chronicler seems to regard himself as a prophet just as Josephus, though it is not explicitly stated. The prophetic role of the Levites is emphasized in his description of the Levitical musicians (1 Chr 15-16; 23-27, etc.) and Jahaziel (2 Chr 20:14), and the word "the prophets" is exchanged with "the Levites" in 2 Chr 34:30. Since he stresses and supports the status of the Levites throughout his work, probably he himself is a Levite and thus sees himself having a prophetic task. Actually the sermon he consistently puts in the mouth of prophets is a message of retribution, and this seems to be his own message to his readers as well. Ancient historiography is often composed by prophets or priests (cf. DtH, Josephus, Manetho, Berossos), and it may have been a

cultic task to interpret history and to give teaching for a particular situation. Although Josephus' inspiration is not as normative as the canonical prophecies, such a distinction is foreign to the Chronicler. It is not necessary to identify the Levitical prophets with pre-exilic cultic prophets and to deny transmission of direct revelation in their ministry.<sup>82</sup> As D. L. Petersen points out, not only is our knowledge about pre-exilic cultic prophecy uncertain, but also the prophetic terminology is used for the Levitical singers only in the later stages of its tradition-history and it is unlikely that the Levitical prophets were developed from already existing cultic prophets.<sup>83</sup> Moreover, the Chronicler does not hesitate to use the terms such as אֲבִיבֵי , אֲמָרִים , אֲמָרִים for the Levitical prophets, as does Josephus, and the prophecy of Jahaziel seems to involve direct revelation. The Chronicler is, therefore, probably very conscious of his prophetic task to reveal a new message for his generation, and tries to perform it from the examples of history.

It is true that there are several noticeable differences between Chronicles and Josephus. Josephus paraphrases his source more regularly, he has a typical hellenistic preface, and he expresses God's miraculous work less straightforwardly. But these are characteristics of *hellenistic* historiographies and not applicable to a non-hellenistic historiography like

Chronicles. Despite these minor differences, the Chronicler shares an interest in historical facts and principles behind history with Josephus and these are fundamental to historiography in general.

## CONCLUSION

Our analysis of the Chronicler's literary techniques and comparison with other Jewish literatures have suggested that Chronicles is written as historiography and is not to be seen as commentary or theological reinterpretation of the Samuel-Kings text. This, however, does not mean that Chronicles is only a report of objective facts of Israel's history, as positivistic historians would argue. Recent philosophers of history, especially those in the analytical tradition, have shown that historical discourse is not "only a vehicle for the transmission of information about an extrinsic referent" but also "an apparatus for the *production of meaning*" (italic his).<sup>1</sup> Historical narrative produces a quite different meaning from mere historical facts, because it explains why they happened, putting them into literary "plots" and drawing out principles in it. H. White writes, "the narrative figurates the body of events that serves as its primary referent and transforms these "events" into intimations of patterns of meaning that any *literary* representation of them as 'facts' could never produce".<sup>2</sup> The only distinction between history and other kinds of literature, therefore, must lie in the author's intention to present this pattern of meaning from factual events.<sup>3</sup>

This is indeed what the Chronicler is doing, as a prophet and a historian. As a prophet, he attempts to show what the



Lord is going to do in the future of Israel and to guide His people accordingly. This comes as a new revelation and not from the study of the Scripture. However, since he believes that God rules over history and works on the same principles in it, he presents his teaching through patterns in the past history as a historian. He structures factual past events according to his own understanding of the principles in history and tries to communicate his theological message to his generation.

The implication of such an understanding of Chronicles is that the tradition building process of the Old Testament is not a successive line of reinterpretation of the sacred text by "revisors" but an accumulation of new inspired teachings for new generations. At least the Chronicler believes that he is writing a new historiography, with a new inspired theology, and not a commentary or an imaginative interpretation of the text. The historical reports and the theological teachings of the previous history are respected, but his work is not in any way confined to the already existing text. This stance of direct revelation and independence from the text draws a line between Chronicles and later interpreters who only expand the authoritative text, no matter how much help of the Holy Spirit they may have, and makes it difficult to trace back radical reinterpretation of the text to the practice of Chronicles.

## NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. For general research history, see S. Japhet, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles," *JSOT* 33 (1985), 83-107; T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung* (FRALNT 106; Göttingen, 1972), 9-47; H.G.M. Williamson, "Introduction," to M. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, (Sheffield, 1987), 11-26.
2. W. de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament, vol. 1. Kritischen Versuch über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher Chronik, mit Hinsicht auf die Geschichte der Mosaischen Bücher und Gesetzgebung; Ein Nachtrag zu den Vaterschen Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, (Halle, 1806). (He also first suggested that the major source for Chronicles is the canonical books of Samuel-Kings.) The most typical example of earlier scepticism is B. Spinoza: cf. *Theologico-Political Treatise* (1670), tr. by R.H.M. Elwes, in *The Chief Works of Benedict de Spinoza* (New York, 1951).
3. J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, tr. by S. Black and A. Menzies, (Edinburgh, 1885), 171-227. In contrast, K.H. Graf ("Das Buch der Chronik als Geschichtsquelle," *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testament* (Leipzig, 1866), 114-247) is more positive about the historical reliability of Chronicles.
4. H. Winckler, "Bemerkungen zur Chronik als Geschichtsquelle," *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, (Leipzig, 1892), 157-67; I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Chronik* (KHAT; Tübingen, 1901), x-xiii; R. Kittel, *Die Bücher der Chronik* (HAT; Göttingen, 1902), x-xvi; E.L. Curtis and A.A. Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh, 1910), 14-16.
5. W.F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," *JBL* 40 (1921), 104-24. Albright followed the study of E. Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judentums* (Halle, 1896), 8-71.
6. W.F. Albright, "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat," *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, (New York, 1950), 61-82.
7. Albright, "Judicial Reform," 74.
8. G. von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, (BWANT 54; Stuttgart, 1930), 121-33. Von Rad himself does not explicitly affirm the Chronicler's intention to replace older history, but see the description of von Rad's view in Willi (*Auslegung*), 49-50.

9. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, (Tübingen, 1943, 1957). The second half of the work is recently translated by H.G.M. Williamson as *The Chronicler's History*, (hereafter Noth) (Sheffield, 1987), whereas the first half has already been published in English under the title of *The Deuteronomistic History*, (Sheffield, 1981).

10. Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, ET, 97-98. For the Chronicler's use of extra-canonical sources, see ET, 51-61, especially 58; for his attitude to Samuel-Kings, consult ET, 89-90.

11. Noth, ET, 80.

12. Noth, ET, 97-98.

13. Noth, ET, 83; cf. 80, 98 as well.

14. For the reference see note 1 above.

15. W.E. Barnes, "Chronicles a Targum," *ExpT* 8 (1896-7), 316-19; "The Midrashic Elements in Chronicles," *The Expositor*, 5th series 4 (1896), 426-39.

16. A.-M. Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses Sources," RB 60 (1953), 481-508; 61 (1954), 349-86. J. Weingreen, "Exposition in the Old Testament and In Rabbinic Literature," *Promise and Fulfillment* (Edinburgh, 1963) 187-201; "The Rabbinic Approach to the Study of the Old Testament," *BJRL*, (1952), 166-190.

17. R. Bloch, "Midrash," *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, vol. V, cols. 1263-80; ET by M. Callaway in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice* (Missoula, 1978), 31-34. Her thesis was supported by the recognition that many haggadic interpretations are derived from the pre-Tannaitic period as figured in Jubilees, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Dead Sea Scrolls, etc., and that the Palestinian (midrashic) Targum reflects a stratum of targumic tradition older than the official translation of Targum Onkelos. Cf. also G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden, 1961), 1-10; "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," *Cambridge History of the Bible*, I (1970), 199-231.

18. For the view of the Chronicler as an independent narrator, see Noth, ET, 80.

19. M.P. Miller, "Midrash," *IDB Supp* (Nashville, 1976), 593-97. B.S. Childs, "Midrash and the Old Testament," *Understanding the Sacred Text*, 47-59. I.L. Seeligmann calls

this "Denkstill" in "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegeese," *VTSupp* 1 (1953), 151.

20. B.S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, (Philadelphia, 1979), 654.

21. R. Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*, (Freiburg, 1973).

22. H.G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, (Cambridge, 1977), 119-125. M. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak: Royal Speeches and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, 121-24; "Hezekiah in the Books of Chronicles," *1988 SBL Seminar Papers*.

23. P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern*, (WMANT 42; Neukirchen, 1973).

24. P. Welten, 206.

25. A. Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash," *CBQ* 28 (1966), 105-38; 417-57.

26. A. Wright, 428-29.

27. A. Wright, 429.

28. M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in ancient Israel*, (Oxford, 1985).

29. E. Bickerman, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees*, (New York, 1962), 21-26.

30. J.M. Myers, *I Chronicles and II Chronicles*, AB (Garden City, 1965); H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB (London, 1982); R.B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, WBC (Waco, 1987).

31. L. Zunz, "Dibre Hajamim oder die Bücher der Chronik," in *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt. Ein Beitrag zur Altertumskunde und biblischen Kritik, zur Literatur- und Religionsgeschichte*, (Berlin, 1832).

32. S. Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," *VT* 18 (1968), 331-32.

33. P.R. Ackroyd, "Chronicles, I and II," *IDB Supp* (Nashville, 1976), 157; although he himself holds the "single work" hypothesis. D.N. Freedman also writes, "the verses are repeated to bind together two originally separated works," in his "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961), 436.



34. Williamson, 5.
35. Williamson, *Israel*, 13-37; N. Turner, "Esdras, Book of," *IDB* vol. 2, 141.
36. F.M. Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," *JBL* 94 (1975), 4-18. R. Klein, "Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler," (Cambridge MA, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1966). A summary of the dissertations is published in *HTR* 59 (1966), 449; cf. also *HTR* 62 (1969), 99-107.
37. Chr 3 is supported by the fact that in 1 Esdras Ezra's reading of the law (Neh 7:72b-8:12) follows the Ezra narrative and consequently the entire Ezra narrative is completely separated from Nehemiah memoirs. This structure seems to be reflected in Josephus as well. Cross also suggests that Neh 12:23 corresponds to his reconstruction of the High Priests' genealogy, because it suggests that the Chronicler's work before Nehemiah memoirs was attached (i.e., Chr 2) ended in the days of Yohanan son of Elyashib, the contemporary of Ezra, and did not reach to the era of Elyashib II, the contemporary of Nehemiah (cf. F.M. Cross, "Notes on the Ammonite Inscription from Tell Siran," *BASOR* 212 (1973), 12-15). However, the last point is based on two uncertain assumptions: (1) there was a practice of papponymy in the High Priest's house of this period, (2) the repetition of the names due to papponymy dropped out through haplography.
38. Freedman, "Purpose," 439-40.
39. S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, (Edinburgh, 1891), 535-40; C.C. Torrey, *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*, (BZAW 2; Giessen, 1896); F. Brown, "Chronicles, I and II," in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. by Hastings, vol. 1, (Edinburgh, 1900); Curtis-Madsen, 27-36.
40. Japhet, "Common Authorship" (cf. note 34 above); Williamson, *Israel*, 37-59; M. Throntveit, "Linguistic Analysis and the Question of Authorship in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah," *VT* 32 (1982), 201-216.
41. For the references for Japhet and Williamson, see note 42 above. Japhet's study is criticised in R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward An Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, (Missoula, 1976), 54-55; and Throntveit, "Linguistic Analysis."
42. Williamson, *Israel*, 39-41.

43. Williamson, *Israel*, 37-59.

44. Polzin's primary purpose is "to 'take the first steps toward a typology of Biblical Hebrew' so that the early portion of P may be distinguished from the later with the resultant gains made in the history of Israel's religion (Polzin, 60)." His examination of Chronicles is, thus, merely preparatory for his work in P and does not require him to decide on the issue of authorship in Chronicles.

45. Throntveit, "Linguistic Analysis," 210-15.

46. For example, see O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, An Introduction*, tr. P.R. Ackroyd, (Oxford, 1965), 530-31; C-M, 4-5; W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, (HAT 21; Tübingen, 1955), 1-2; Rudolph, "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," *VT* 4 (1954), 404.

47. Williamson, 9. Cf. also S. Japhet, "Chronicles, book of," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 5, 518-34.

48. Williamson, 9-10.

49. Williamson, 10; his *Israel*, 61-66.

50. Cf. R. Braun, "Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History," *VTSupp* 30 (1979), 55.

51. R. Braun, "Theology and Literary History," 57-58; and his "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude toward the North," *JBL* 96 (1977), 59-62.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. F.M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964), 281-89; "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ* 16 (1966) 81-95; and "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, (Cambridge MA, 1975), 306-15.
2. S. Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," *The Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginning to Jerome* (Cambridge, 1970), 159-99. Cf. also E. Tov, "Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues," *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Proceedings IOSCS-Vienna* (Jerusalem: Academion, 1980), 45-68.
3. W.E. Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," *HTR* 58 (1965), 349-63, and his unpublished Th.D. Thesis "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," (Harvard, 1963). R.W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) and his unpublished Th.D. Thesis "Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler," (Harvard, 1966). E.C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, HSM 19. (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978) and "The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran," *The Hebrew and Greek Text of Samuel* (Jerusalem, 1980). S.L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
4. McKenzie, 44-45.
5. J.B. Payne, "Validity of Numbers in Chronicles," Part 1, *BSac* 136 (1979) 119-19. J.W. Wenham, "Large Numbers in the Old Testament," *TynB* 18 (1967), 22.
6. H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB, (London, 1982), 139; P.R. Ackroyd, *I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*, TBC, (London, 1973), 70; R. Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*, (Freiburg, 1973), 104. A.-M. Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses Sources," *RB* 60 (1953), 506.
7. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, (Tübingen, 1955), 135; Lemke, "Synoptic Problem," 354-554; McKenzie, 64-65.
8. Lemke, 362-63. McKenzie, 83.
9. McKenzie, 119-58.

10. E.L. Curtis and A.A. Madsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1910), 400.
11. CM, p.497.
12. CM, p.251.
13. Cf.  $\text{קו}$  in 2 Sam 21:18 and  $\text{קוֹדֶשׁ}$  in 2 Sam 21:18; 27:11; 1 Chr 11:29; 27:11.
14. CM 446-47
15. S. Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," *VT* 18 (1968), 338-41.
16. F.M. Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," *JBL* 94 (1975), 4-18. M. Throntveit, "Linguistic Analysis and the Question of Authorship in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah," *VT* 32 (1982), 202-3.
17. The list is found in Japhet, 339, n.5.
18. G. von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, (Stuttgart, 1930), 3-8, and ET is quoted from Williamson, 115.
19. S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (Hebrew), (Jerusalem, 1977), 33-39.
20. L.C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles. The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text, Part 2* *VTSupp* 27, (Leiden, 1974), 146-48.
21. Other examples are 1 Chr 16:12 and 17:9. Cf. Willi, 85
22. CM, 183.
23. BDB, 41.
24. Willi, 87. Cf also CM, 364.
25. CM, 420.
26. McKenzie, 116, n.27.
27. Willi, 140.
28. G.J. Wenham, "Were David's Sons Priests?" *ZAW* 87 (1975), 79-82.



29. He may be identified with Adniram in 1 Kgs 4:6 (CM, 364).
30. CM, 462.
31. See also Isa 1:1; Jer 15:4; Hos 1:1; Mic 1:1.
32. Vv.2,5,7,9. Cf. Willi, 82.
33. Willi, 145.
34. Cf. GKC §163a.
35. Since the changes of the word order in 2 Chr 10:15; 23:12; and 34:17 also cause the changes of the meaning, they must have other purposes and are not included in this section.
36. In 1 Chr 10:1, 8 the articles are removed and provide exceptions to this rule.
37. 2 Chr 25:26 uses a mixed form
38. For other examples, see, 2 Chr 18:15; 25:28; 28:27.
39. The exception in 2 Chr 34:15 is probably because of idiomatic nature of the expression. See Rewritings - use of equivalent words or phrases section.
40. Williamson, 273.
41. CM, 232-33; McKenzie, 64.
44. Cf. Willi, 102
43. The priest is naturally expected here, also because anointing was regarded as priestly function.
44. VT 28 (1978), 293-98. Cf. Williamson, 345.
45. Cf. Willi, 107; CM, 414-15.
46. Williamson, 142; Cf. also Willi, 138f.
47. Williamson, 142.
48. Thus it is different from, for example, the identification of "his mother" with "Asa's mother" (2 Chr 15:16) or "Ahab" with "the king of Israel" (2 Chr 18:2). Cf. 3. Addition b. Self-evident expression.
49. Cf. BDB, 128.

50. Cf. Williamson, 201.
51. N. Avigad, "The King's Daughter and the Lyre," *IEJ* 28 (1978), 146-51.
52. Noth, ET 91. Williamson, 314-15.
53. Myers, *1 Chronicles*, 135; R. Braun, *2 Chronicles*, WBC (Waco, 1986), 203; cf. Rudolph, 134.
54. Cf. Williamson, 136, which includes more extensive bibliography.
55. Williamson, 99.
56. *ibid.*
57. McKenzie, 54-55.
58. Cf. CM, 456; Williamson, 344.
59. J.W. McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians*, (London, 1973), 6.
60. McKay, 6. Cf. also R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: its Life and Institutions*, (ET London, 1965), 410.
61. Williamson, p.400. See N. Avigad, "The Governor of the City," *IEJ* 26 (1976), 178-82; T.N.D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials. A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy*, (Lund, 1971), 51-62.
62. Cf. Ackroyd, 207-208; Myers; 220. The expression is used elsewhere in 1 Chr 20:1; 2 Sam 11:1; and 1 Kgs 20:26. For the Babylonian Chronicles see D.J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings*, (London, 1956), 34-73.
63. S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, 1913), 535-40. CM, 27-36. H.G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, (Cambridge, 1977), 37-59.
64. BDB, 1662.
65. CM, 31.
66. BDB, 1019. Cf. Williamson, 316. Willi, 104, sees this a specification.

67. A. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen*, BZAW 16, (Giessen, 1909). Japhet, "Common Authorship." R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, (Missoula, 1976).
68. Cf. Willi, .86.
69. Polzin, 44.
70. Japhet, "Common Authorship," 334.
71. BDB, 59.
72. CM, 207.
73. *ibid.*
74. P.K. McCarter, *I Samuel*, AB, (Garden City NY, Doubleday, 1980), 422.
75. Cf. Willi, 119.
76. Williamson, 139.
77. Cf. CM, 388-89 and Willi, 121. Textual corruption is unlikely here, because Abel-beth-maacha is well-known (2 Sam 20:8-13, 1 Kgs 15:20 (Cf 1 Chr 5:26)) and the Chronicler apparently understood the area. There is no textual support for such corruption.
78. Willi, 122.
79. Cf. CM, 399.
80. The spelling of Hezekiah is also frequently changed, but harmonization does not seem to play a major role there. Cf. Clarification - Rewriting - use of equivalent words or phrases section.
81. Except 1 Chr 3:12.
82. Cf. CM, 447-48; Williamson, 333-34.
83. Williamson, 249-50
84. It is seen as deliberate falsification for the Chronicler's various theological purposes by Wellhausen, (*Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, ET by Menzies and Black, (New York, Meridian Books, 1957), p.187); Galling,

(*Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemiah, ATD 12*, (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954), p.97); CM, p. 352; Coggins, (*The First and Second Books of the Chronicles*, (London, Cambridge Univ Press, 1976), p.174). But Dillard (p.63) defends the historical plausibility of this harmonization. Josephus also introduces a similar interpretation in *Ant.8:142*.

85. Actually, in the good reigns of Asa and Jehoshaphat not only are the statements of non-removal of high places retained but also the Chronicler adds his own statement of removal of high places to make an apparent contradiction in itself (2 Chr 14:3; 17:6; Cf. 2 Chr 15:17; 20:33). Though Rudolph (pp.241, 263) and McKenzie (pp. 100-102) try to solve contradiction claiming 15:17 and 20:33 as secondary insertions from the Kings text, the scribes are as unlikely as the Chronicler himself to add such directly opposing comments. It is also difficult to understand why they did not supply the same statement in Joash, Amaziah, and Uzziah's reigns where no contradiction will happen. Willi (pp.61-62) and Williamson (p.302) presume that the Chronicler wishes to keep his *Vorlage* intact as far as possible and adjusts the tension by changing the expression of the rest of the verse. But the Chronicler does not retain the statement in Joash and others' reigns, and as we shall see in the third chapter it is doubtful if the Chronicler even wants to retain his *Vorlage* despite the tension. Others might suggest that the destruction of high places was a temporary reform activity and not completely effected but there are no positive indications from the text and there still remains the question why the Chronicler keeps flatly contradicting statement.

The best solution seems to be that of Goettsberger (*Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon*, (Bonn, 1939), p.292) and Ringgren's (*Israelite Religion*): the Chronicler finds no contradiction between these verses. The high places removed by the reform are pagan and the ones mentioned in the summary statements are Yahwistic. In 2 Chr 14:3 and 17:6 the reform is clearly depicted as destruction of the heathen cult objects associating high places with foreign altars, pillars and Asherim. On the other hand, the original "non-removal" statement in DtH seems to be against local Yahwistic high places and to reflect the centralization of the cult in Josiah's reign. The use of high place for Yahweh worship is amply attested by both Scripture (1 Sam 9:12, 13; 10:5-13; 1 Kgs 3:3,4; 2 Kgs 23:5,9,20; 1Chr 16:39; 21:29; 33:11, 17; 2 Chr 28:4; Isa 15:2; 16:2; 56:7; Jer 48:35; Ezek 6:3,6) and archaeological discoveries (e.g., Arad proves the existence of worship place for Yahweh outside Jerusalem). If they were illegitimate before Josiah, it is hard to understand why otherwise faithful kings before him did not remove only high places and why they were still regarded as faithful. (Even if



98. CX, 250.  
the Deuteronomic law was earlier than the Josianic reform, it does not exclude the possibility of local shrines for Yahweh, because as J.G. McConville (*Law and Theology in Deuteronomy* (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1984), pp.21-38) points out, Deuteronomy only suggests the need for a central sanctuary but not necessarily the sole sanctuary.) Thus the Chronicler must understand the difference between them and so he used them: Asa and Jehoshaphat removed only pagan high places as a part of their reform, and their non-removal of Yahwistic high places is mentioned to qualify their good reigns from a later perspective.

86. Cf. Williamson, 390.

87. Cf. CM, 501.

88. McKenzie, 64. Cf. Rudolph, 135; Williamson, 136, for the theological change.

89. Cf. 2 Chr 9:8

90. Quoted from Williamson, 314. Willi, 131.

91. Besides the rewriting of Samuel-Kings materials, the theme is explicitly mentioned in his own inserted speeches within additional stories. For example, in the speech of Abijah to the North (2 Chr 13:8) the southern kingdom is called "the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David," as already called in David's speech added by the Chronicler (1 Chr 28:5; 29:23).

92. See chap.3, the Chronicler's Presentation of his Work, as well. Cf. R. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles," *JBL* 92 (1973), 502-14; "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: the Significance of I Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles," *JBL* 95 (1976), 59-62.

93. See also the Chronicler's own 2 Chr 13:5.

94. Williamson, 315-16, and his article, "Eschatology in Chronicles," *TynB* 28 (1977), 148f.

95. McKay, 24f, though Dillard does not accept this view (2 *Chronicles*, WBC (Waco, 1988), 269.

96. For the omission of the burial notice of Amon (2 Chr 33:25) see the third chapter.

97. CM, 250; Williamson, 145.

98. CM, 250.
99. Williamson, 145.
100. Williamson, *Israel*, 107-110. More on this issue in chaps. 2 and 3 below. Cf. also R. Braun, "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude toward the North," *JBL* 96 (1977), 59-62.
101. Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, (Stuttgart, 1930), 18-37. Japhet, *Ideology*, 233f. Cf. Williamson, 239-40. The similar phrase "Israel who dwelt in the cities of Judah" is also retained in 10:17.
102. In 2 Chr 11:4 the title "brethren" for the Northerners is retained.
103. So Williamson, *Israel*, 110-114; and A.C. Welch, *Post-Exilic Judaism*, (Edinburgh and London, 1935), 189-91. Some claimed on the basis of 3 *Reigns* that the present text of 1 Kgs 10:3 is the result of secondary influence from the Chronicles to make Jeroboam more responsible for the division. But D.W. Gooding has seriously challenged such hypothesis, and it is not sufficient to argue against the present view from such insecure ground. J.A. Montgomery and H.S. Gehman, *Kings*, 248ff. Gray, *I & II Kings, OTL*, (London, SCM Press, 1977<sup>3</sup>), 299ff. Rudolph, 227. R.W. Klein, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *JBL* 89 (1970), 217-18, and "Once More: 'Jeroboam's Rise to Power,'" *JBL* 92 (1973), 582-4.
104. Williamson, *Israel*, 108.
105. Williamson, *Israel*, 102.
106. With the Chronicler's radical rewritings of Ahaz' reign (2 Chr 28), he records the repentance of the Northerners and their reunion under Hezekiah's reign.
107. While this certainly reflects the Chronicler's interpretation, that some northern people joined Judah is most likely historically true. Josiah's expansion toward north is archaeologically attested. Cf. Aharoni and Avi-Yonah, *The MacMillan Bible Atlas*, (New York, McMillan, 1968), 102.
108. McKenzie, 67-68.
109. The Chronicler's theological comment in 2 Chr 36 explicitly states that the people are as much responsible for the exile as the kings.

110. The omission of "dancing" here is probably because of the difficulty of the word (Cf. Use of equivalent words or phrases section) and not for theological reasons, for "dancing" is expressed by a different word in vs. 29.

111. Since these instruments appear in 1 Chr 13:8 ;15:19-21, and 2 Sam 6:5 writes music is accompanied, the Chronicler's addition is historically quite acceptable.

112. McKay, 23-5; Williamson, 143.

113. Williamson, 390.

114. Compare also with the Chronicler's presentation of David's history. David's faithfulness to the ark of the Lord is followed by Dynastic Promise and victories (cf. 1 Chr 14:16, 28:9).

115. Vs. 11 may be included.

116. The story is the Chronicler's addition and its historicity must be discussed. But this note itself only connects already reported incidents and does not change facts.

117. R. Mosis, 17-43; P.R. Ackroyd, "The Chronicler as Exegete," *JSOT* 2 (1977), 2-32, esp. 3-9; Williamson, 92-96.

118. While Botterweck ("Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte," *TQ* 136 (1956) pp. 402-35) claims that the change owes to the Chronicler's harmonization with Deut 21:22-23, the code against leaving the body of hung man overnight, McKenzie correctly refutes it. McKenzie (p. 59) argues, firstly, the deuteronomic law is discussing criminals but Saul is not; secondly, Saul was not hung because his head was cut off from his body; and lastly, it was the Philistines who hung Saul and we cannot expect them to behave according to Deuteronomy.

119. Ackroyd, "Exegete," 5-6.

120. Also in 1 Chr 10:12 **וְיָקָחוּ** is changed to **וְיָשְׂאוּ**, and **מִחוּמַת בַּיָּשֵׁן** is omitted to adjust to his typological rewriting, for Saul's body is not on the wall of Beth Shean but in the temple, and these phrases are no longer appropriate.

121. In a word he defines Saul's sin as "unfaithfulness ( **צַעַל** ) to the Lord" in vs. 13. The same word appears in the beginning of the genealogy of the returnee from the exile in 9:1. It reads "The people of Judah were taken captive to



- Babylon because of their unfaithfulness ( <sup>על</sup> ). The sin and the cause of their destruction is thus identified with Saul's, and Saul's death is narrated as a paradigm for the exilic situation.
122. Three small words are changed to equivalents to stress close correspondence between God's command and David's obedience, and God's promise and his faithfulness.
123. Willi, 155-56; Williamson, 143.
124. Cf. Dillard, 292.
125. Willi, 164.
126. The description of the angel standing between earth and heaven may be based on the conventional pattern also used in Daniel, although the expression in 1 Chr 21:16 may have been already in the Chronicler's *Vorlage*.
127. Willi, 157.
128. Williamson, 150.
129. Williamson, 149.
130. McKenzie, 70; Williamson, 149-50.
131. Mosis, 138-39.
132. Dillard, 4.
133. As we shall see in the third chapter the wisdom which Solomon receives in 2 Chr 1 is changed from general wisdom to more specific wisdom for the Temple construction.
134. Mosis, 136-38; Williamson, 200-201.
135. Mosis, 140-41; Williamson, 208. Cf. Exod 25:9.
136. Williamson, 209; Dillard, 29. Six hundred talents of gold may correspond to the amount David paid for the Temple site (1 Chr 21:25) in order to match David and Solomon. Fifty shekels of gold for nails may also come from 2 Sam 24:24, but it may well reflect fifty loops and clasps used for the tabernacles in Exod 26.
137. CM, 327; Williamson, 209. Yet Dillard (pp.29-30) still sees it possible that the Chronicles account is historically accurate.



138. Dillard (p.36) and Williamson (p.211) suggest 1 Chr 28 and 2 Chr 2 respectively. The contrast between ten lampstands here and one lampstand in the tabernacle makes the parallel difficult, but it may not be necessary that the indications of typology correspond perfectly. (Cf. 2 Chr 13:1 has only one lampstand). *Velten, Geschichte, 9-73.*

139. Williamson, 223; Dillard, 41, 57. *Territorialgeschichte von Südwestpalästina im Altertum, I. Das Festungssystem*

140. CM, 425-26. *54 (1931), 113-34; Jung, Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia, 248ff. 25 (Stuttgart)*

141. McKenzie (p.115 n.14) argues that "'Israel' here reflects a belief that there were actually representatives of all the tribes living in Judah" against Williamson who takes the "heads of the father's house of Israel" title only.

142. It seems that the Chronicler identifies עַם הָאָרֶץ with "all the people."

143. Williamson (pp.319-20) suggests that this change is also due to different understanding of the nature of the task, in Kings it is for continuous cult, while in Chronicles it is once for all. Cf. vv.4,7. contrasts with "fortified cities" in his own framework (vv.10b,11, 12a) and the designation of "Judah"

144. Williamson, 322. as "Judah and Benjamin" in vv.10b and 12.

145. CM, 425. CM suggests that Kings is, nevertheless, probably historically more true, for Ezek 44:6 indicates that foreigners were admitted to the sanctuary in earlier time.

146. Williamson, 316. Willi's view (p.116) that the Chronicler no longer understands the word "the ranks" is unlikely.

147. CM, 432-33.

148. Williamson, 316. *S. Herrmann, A History of Israel in Old Testament Times, 1903, pp. 100-101; Miller and J. H. Hayes, A History of Ancient Israel, 1960, London, SCM*

149. Cf. D.L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*, (Missoula, 1977), 85. Von Rad, 114. For a different understanding, see Williamson, 402.

150. Petersen (cf pp.97-102) strongly argues for the latter view. *261 (1936), pp. 3-5; 262-263, pp. 3-5; 264-265, pp. 3-5*

151. Note that this chapter does not include more radical changes (cf. chap.2). *The Deuteronomistic History of Israel and the Dating of the Royal History (1 Kings 1-2 Kings 23)* (1977) 23-57. However, *American Journal of Archaeology* 81 (1977) 1-14. *Investigations at Lachish. The Excavations and the Excavation Report (Lachish V)*, (Tel Aviv, 1973), 14.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. The most systematic account from this viewpoint can be found in P. Welten, *Geschichte*, 9-78.
2. For example, Beyer, "Beiträge zur Territorialgeschichte von Südwestpalästina im Altertum, I. Das Festungssystem Rehabeams" *ZDPV* 54 (1931), 113-34; Junge, *Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia*, BWANT 75 (Stuttgart, 1937) 73-80; A. Alt, "Festungen und Levitenorte im Lande Juda," *Kleine Schriften II*, 306-15; M. Noth, *ET* 58; *CM*, *Chronicles*, 365-66; Williamson, 240-43; and Aharoni, *Land*, 290-94, and even Welten accepts it, (pp.11-15.) There is a debate over whether vs.5b is a part of the list. V. Fritz, ("The 'List of Rehoboam's Fortresses' in 2 Chr 11:5-12 - a Document from the Time of Josiah," *EI* 15 (1981), p.46\*) sees it as from the Chronicler's own hand, because vs.6 has another introductory "12" and the expression "cities for defence in Judah" is found only in post-exilic period. On the other hand, Noth and Welten take it a part of the source, for "cities for defence in Judah" (5b) contrasts with "fortified cities" in his own framework (vv.10b,11, 12a) and the designation of "Judah" alone in vs.5b compares "Judah and Benjamin" in vv.10b and 12.
3. Fritz, "Fortresses," 46\*.
4. Beyer, "Festungssystem" 113-34.
5. Aharoni, *Land*, 292; Williamson, 241.
6. Williamson, 241.
7. S. Herrmann, *A History of Israel in Old Testament Times*, rev. ed., (London, SCM Press, 1983), 197; and J.M. Miller and J.H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah*, (London, SCM Press, 1986), pp. 237-41.
8. Junge, *Wiederaufbau*, 73-80; Fritz, "Fortresses," 46\*-53\*; Alt (*Kleine Schriften, II*, pp.306-15) also prefers a Josianic date, though he thinks Rehoboam's time is possible. N. Na'aman, ("Hezekiah's Fortified Cities and the LMLK Stamps," *BASOR* 261 (1986), pp.5-21), suggests Hezekiah's reign for the date of this list.
9. D. Ussishkin, "The Destruction of Lachish by Sennacherib and the Dating of the Royal Judean Storage Jars," *Tel Aviv* 4 (1977) 28-57. However, Aharoni gives a later dating in his *Investigations at Lachish. The Sanctuary and the Residency (Lachish V)*, (Tel Aviv, 1975), 14.

10. O.R. Sellers, R.W. Funk, J.L. McKenzie, P. and N. Lapp, *The 1957 Excavation at Beth-zur (AASOR 38)*, (Cambridge, 1968). But see Sellers' preliminary report in *BA* 21 (1958), 71-76.
11. V. Fritz, "Fortresses," 47\*.
12. Aharoni, *Land*, 290.
13. Williamson, 241; Herrmann, 97-98.
14. Miller-Hayes, 238-40.
15. B. Mazar, "The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine," *VTSupp* 4 (1957), 57-66; K.A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (TIPE hereafter)*, (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1973), 432-47, etc.
16. Cf. Lachish, Beth-zur, En-gedi, Tell Qasile, Mesad Hashavyahu, and Khirbet el-Meshash.
17. Aharoni, *Land*, 293.
18. Cf. R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1973), 94; N. Glueck, *Rivers in the Desert*, (1959), 168-80. For more extensive bibliographical data, see Myers, *II Chronicles*, 152; Williamson, 336-37; Aharoni, *Land*, 314; Welten, 24-27.
19. *AASOR* 21-22 (1943), 63f and 70.
20. Dillard, 209. Cf. Graham, *BA* 48 (1955), 55-58; Rainey, *BASOR* 245 (1982), 55-58.
21. Welten, 63-66.
22. The exact location of the city wall in the pre-exilic period is still debated.
23. Noth, *ET* 59.
24. Dillard, 269; Williamson, 394.
25. Rudolph, 316-17; Dillard, 269.
26. M. Broshi, "The Expansion of Jerusalem in the Reigns of Hezekiah and Manasseh," *IEJ* 24 (1974), 21-6 ; Williamson, 394..
27. Cf. 1 Chr 22:9. See for the detailed discussion, R. Braun, "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of



43. Cf. 1 Chr 11:11f. This suggestion is made by Williamson, 284.
- 1 Chr 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles," *JBL* 95 (1976), 581-90, especially, 82-86.
28. In the Chronicler's presentation it is told as if they are parts of the Temple building (Cf. 2 Chr 8:16). See Williamson, 227.
29. Cf. CM, 382. If we consider the Chronicler's dischronologization technique, the placement of his building activities in a peace time does not present a problem. See Williamson, 260-61.
30. F.M. Cross and J.T. Milik ("Explorations in Judean Buqeah" *BASOR* 142 (1956), pp.5-17) claim that they found one such example in the Buqeah, but its identification is uncertain.
31. Williamson, 342.
32. Noth, ET 158 n.27. It is possible that the last part of the original list dropped from Samuel so as to end with Uriah the Hittite and to create irony with 2 Sam 11. But since vv. 41b-47 are stylistically different from the foregoing section and the phrase "and with him thirty" (vs. 42) contradicts the purpose of the list, it is more likely to have been added later.
33. Williamson, 104. Cf. Braun, 160 as well.
34. Braun, 164.
35. Williamson, "'We are yours, O David': the Setting and Purpose of 1 Chronicles xii 1-23," *OTS* 21 (1981), 164-76, esp. 174-75.
36. Williamson, 110, 112.
37. Welten, 79-114.
38. Junge, 37-45; Williamson, 261-62.
39. Williamson, 262; M.D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies* (Cambridge, 1969), 62-8.
40. Junge, 37-45; Williamson, 261-62. The quotation is from Williamson.
41. Myers, *II Chronicles*, 78; J.W. Wenham, "Large Numbers in the Old Testament," *TynB* 18, (1967), 51.
42. Myers, 100.



43. Cf. 1 Chr 11:11f. This suggestion is made by Williamson, 284.
44. Williamson, 284.
45. Myers, 150. For another possible way of interpreting these numbers, see Williamson, 337.
46. Welten, 150.
47. The translation of the word is taken from BDB, 364. Cf. also Y. Skenik, "Engines Invented by Cunning Man," *BJPES* 13 (1946/47), 19-24; Myers, 150.
48. For the possibility of the earlier invention of catapults, see Myers, 150 and Williamson, 338.
49. Cf. Williamson, 328. Welten himself acknowledges the problem in 90-94.
50. Williamson, 319.
51. Williamson, 244.
52. Cf. 1 Chr 3:1-9; 14:3-7, 2 Sam 3:2-5; 5:14-16. The point is suggested by Myers, 70; Williamson, 244.
53. Williamson, 244. The Chronicler may have got "Maacha the daughter of Abshalom" from 1 Kgs 15:2, and changed 2 Chr 13:2 with an extra source, but this implies the Chronicler had more information about Rehoboam's wife at any rate.
54. CM, 378.
55. Cf. 2 Chr 12:13 and 13:1.
56. Williamson, 245.
57. Cf. Williamson, 304.
58. The similar details as vs. 3 can be found in 2 Chr 11:23, but Judg 9:5, 2 Kgs 10:11, or 11:1 have no such details.
59. Williamson, 283.
60. Dillard, 135.
61. For the view to see him an Ethiopian, see Kitchen, *TIFE*, par 269, n.372; Dillard, 119. For his identification with a

78. Cf. Dillard, 200.

79. Myers, 151-52; Williamson, 324; Dillard, 203.

Bedouin, see, S. Hidal, *SEA* 41-42 (1976-7), 100-1, and Williamson, 263-65.

62. Aharoni, 352.

63. Miller-Hayes, 353.

64. Miller-Hayes, 354.

65. B. Oded, "Judah and Exile" in *Israelite and Judean History* ed. by J.H. Hayes and J.M. Miller, (London: SCM Press, 1977).

66. Aharoni, 394-400, esp. 398. Cf. also Oded, 447; Miller-Hayes, 354f.

67. Dillard, 105. Cf. G. von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, (Zürich, 1951), 79f. For the view that Holy War is a later standardization of historical tradition by a redactor, see G.H. Jones, "'Holy War' or 'Yahweh War'?" *VT* 25, 642-58. On type scenes, R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, (New York, 1981), chap.3 "Biblical Type-Scenes and the Uses of Convention" is helpful. Other examples of patterning can be found in D.M. Gunn, "Narrative Patterns and Oral Tradition in Judges and Samuel," *VT* 24 (1974) 286-317; B.O. Long, "Historical Narrative and the Fictionalizing Imagination," *VT* 35 (1985), 405-416; J. Blenkinsopp, "Biographical Patterns in Biblical Narrative," *JSOT* 20 (1981) 27-46.

68. Dillard, 119. Cf. also Welten, 119-22; Williamson, 254.

69. Williamson, 291; Dillard, 154-55, and 157-58.

70. Cf. Dillard, 256.

71. Yet the expression in vs.7 "God helped him" parallels holy war motif.

72. CM, 442. Cf. also Noth, ET 59.

73. Rudolph, 281; Williamson 327-29; Dillard, 197.

74. Dillard, 200.

75. Hence Rudolph (pp.278-79) suspects a textual error for some orthographically similar Judean town such as Migron.

76. J.R. Bartlett, "The Land of Seir and the Brotherhood of Edom," *JTS* ns. 20 (1969), 1-20, especially, 14.

77. Cf. CM, 443.
78. Cf. Dillard, 200.
79. Myers, 151-52; Williamson, 324; Dillard, 208.
80. H. Tadmor, "Azriyau of Yaudi," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961) 232-71.
81. Myers, 152. Cf. also the reports on Tell Mor in *IEJ* 9 (1959) 271; 10 (1960) 124; and *RB* 67 (1960), 397.
82. Williamson, 334-35. Jabneel in Josh 15:11 is probably the same name.
83. F.M. Cross and G.E. Wright, "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah," *JBL* 75 (1956), 202-226.
84. Aharoni, 347-56. See also his "The Province List of Judah," *VT* 9 (1959), 225-46.
85. Welten, 116-129.
86. R. Klein, "Abijah's Campaign against the North (II Chr 13) - What were the Chronicler's Sources?" *ZAW* 95 (1983), 212-13.
87. Klein, 215-16.
88. Dillard, 106.
89. Cf. Williamson, 254.
90. Williamson, 250. The similar view is held by Noth (p.142).
91. Welten, 129-40.
92. W.F. Albright, "Egypt and the Early History of the Negev," *JPOS* 4 (1924), 146-47.
93. Williamson, 264; Dillard, 119.
94. S. Hidal, *SEA*, 41-42, 100-101; Williamson, 263-65.
95. Dillard, 119.
96. Kitchen, *TIFE*, 309; Dillard, 119-120. The older view identifying Zerah with Osorkon I is difficult, because the names do not correspond. Cf. Kitchen, 309.



97. The size of the force can be exaggerated.
98. Against Welten, 163-66.
99. CM, 454; Williamson, 342.
100. H. Tadmor, "Azriyau," 248.
101. Rudolph, 288.
102. Isa 7 and 2 Chr 28. Dillard, 215. Cf. also Myers, 157; and Noth, 142, n. 2.
103. I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Chronik*, KHAT (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901), 107; CM, 404-5.
104. P. Welten, 140-53. For more common view, see Williamson, 292; Petersen, 71; Dillard, 154.
105. M. Noth, "Eine palästinische Lokalüberlieferung in 2 Chr. 20," *ZDPV* 67 (1945), 45-71; Rudolph, 259. Rudolph's view is accepted by Myers, 114-15; Petersen, 70-71; Williamson, 292-3; Dillard, 154.
106. B.S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis*, (1967) 104-11, followed by Williamson, 378-80. Childs' view is criticized by James Reese in his review in *CBQ* 30, 84-85.
107. It was originally proposed by B. Stade, "Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö 15-21" *ZAW* 6 (1886), 156-89, especially, 172-83. Cf. also R.E. Clements, *Isaiah and the Deliverance of Jerusalem*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).
108. However, there are at least two issues to be answered before making this assumption: whether theological explanation is always a later development, and whether there is no repetition of similar events. Recent studies suggest the probability of two Assyrian campaigns against Judah. See W.H. Shea, "Sennacherib's Second Palestinian Campaign," *JBL* 104 (1985), 401-18, and C.T. Begg, "Sennacherib's Second Palestinian Campaign: An Additional Indication," *JBL* 106 (1987), 685-692.
109. Cf. Williamson, 380.
110. Cf. Williamson, 378-80.
111. Cf. Williamson, 382.



112. D.N. Fewell, "Sennacherib's Defeat: Words at War in 2 Kings 18:13-19:37," *JSOT* 34 (1986), 79-90.
113. Cf. Fewell, 80.
114. Reference to Isaiah is made by Williamson (p.380). On the historicity of Hezekiah's building activities, see M. Broshi, "Expansion," 21-24; D. Cole, "How Water Tunnels Worked," *BAR* 6/2 (1980), 8-29; and T. Shilo, "Jerusalem's Water Supply during Siege - The Rediscovery of Warren's Shaft," *BAR* 7/4 (1981), 24-39, etc. The notable exception is R. North, "Does Archaeology Prove Chronicles Sources?" in *Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M Myers*, ed. by H.N. Bream et al. (Philadelphia: Temple Univ Press, 1974) 375-79.
115. Cf. Williamson, 245.
116. For the account of his sickness, see next sub-section.
117. Williamson, 343-49, and his *Israel*, 114-18.
118. Cf. Dillard, 122-124.
119. Kitchen, *TIPE*, 295; L. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles. The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. Part I: The Translator's Craft*, *VTSupp* 27, (Leiden, 1974), 23.
120. Kitchen, *TIPE*, 432-37.
121. Dillard, 100.
122. Williamson (p.247) suggests that sixty thousand might be a possible scribal error for six thousand, which is in better proportion to the number of chariots.
123. CM, 416-17; Williamson, 307-8.
124. Dillard, 167.
125. Williamson, 308.
126. Williamson, 345.
127. J.W. McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians*, (London, 1973), 78.
128. Dillard, 222.
129. Cf. Williamson, 347-48.

133. D.J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings*, (London: 1956).
130. Cf. J.R. Bartlett, *FEQ* 104 (1972), 33.
131. J. Gray, "The Period and Office of the Prophet Isaiah in the Light of a New Assyrian Tablet" *ExpT* 63 (1952), 263-65; H.G.F. Saggs, *Iraq* 17 (1955), 133, 152; and H. Tadmor, "Philistia under Assyrian Rule" *BA* 29 (1966), 88.
132. Williamson ("The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History," *VT* 32 (1982) 242-48, and "Reliving the Death of Josiah: A Reply to C.T. Begg," *VT*, 37 (1987), 9-15) suggests that the Chronicler's additional details concerning Josiah's death were already in his Kings *Vorlage*, which was further developed from the canonical shape of DtH. He lists four reasons for such supposition:
- The Chronicler always places his source citation formulae in the same position as Kings except here in 2 Chr 35:26-27. Thus it is probable that here also he is following his source which has the source citation after the death of Josiah, against the canonical form of Kings.
  - Necho's speech indicates earlier tradition, because the Chronicler usually puts theological explanation of the event in the mouths of prophets and it is difficult to believe he himself ascribed a speech to a pagan king.
  - The Chronicler's characteristic expression of immediate retribution is completely lacking.
  - Despite the "until today" formula, it is unlikely that the regular lamentations for Josiah continued until the Chronicler's own day.

On the other hand, without denying the possibility of additional source, C.T. Begg (*The Death of Josiah in Chronicles: Another View*, *VT* 37 (1987), 1-8) challenges Williamson's supposition of an intermediate stage in the literary development from Kings to Chronicles. He attempts to refute Williamson's arguments and suggests that all the Chronicler's elaborations can be explained by his theological interest in retribution and pattern. Though Begg's refutations may not be always strong enough, it seems that Williamson has not established the necessity of presupposing an intermediate stage. As Dillard comments (p. 289), his usual placement of source citations at the same point do not necessary suggest that this is a "high priority compositional principle for the author." In fact the source citation formula for Joash is relocated from before his assassination account (2 Kgs 12:19-21) to after it (2 Chr 24:25-27). Once this argument loses its force, the rest of Williamson's points simply argue for a prior tradition which is not generally disputed and we do not need to assume literary development of the Kings text.

133. D.J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings*, (London: British Museum, 1956), 17-19. See also A. Malamat, "Josiah's Bid for Armageddon," *JANES* 5 (1973) 274; A.K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, (Locust Valley, NY, 1975) 96.
134. Cf. Dillard, 292. *Psalms in Israel's Worship*, vol. 2, ET by D.R. Ap-Thomas, (Oxford, Blackwell, 1962), 79-81.
135. Y. Yadin, "The Historical Significance of Inscription 88 from Arad: A Suggestion" *IEJ* 26 (1976), 9-14.
136. Dillard, 292.
137. Cf. Williamson, 411.
138. Williamson (pp.324-25) suggests an echo of Exod 5:21 "May the Lord see and judge" here.
139. For example, see Rudolph, 239; M. Cogan, "The Chronicler's Use of Chronology as Illuminated by Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. Tigay (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 197-210.
140. 2 Chr 14:9-15 and 15:8-15. Cf. Williamson, 257.
141. E. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1951); Williamson, 256-53.
142. CM, 387; Dillard, 124.
143. Rudolph, 267; Williamson, 308.
144. Williamson, 308.
145. The sin of burning incense may be influenced by 2 Kgs 15:4 immediately before, where incense burning is referred to, but the subject is the people, not a king.
146. M. Haran, "The Use of Incense in Ancient Israelite Ritual," *VT* 10 (1960) 113-25, and his *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 230-45. Cf. also Dillard, 210. Note especially the importance of incense in cult and trade in ancient Near East from as early as the second millennium onward.
147. Cf. Williamson, 122-125.
148. Cf. H. Gese, "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am zweiten Tempel," in *Vom Sinai zum Zion. Alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie*, (München, 1974), 147-58.



149. Williamson, 121.
150. Williamson, 121.
151. S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, vol.2, ET by D.R. Ap-Thomas, (Oxford, Blackwell, 1962), 79-81
152. For example, see McConville, "Priests and Levites in Ezekiel: a crux in the interpretation of Israel's history," *TynB* 34 (1983), 3-31; Hauer, "David and the Levites," *JSOT* 23 (1982), 33-54; Nielsen, "The Levites in Ancient Israel," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* vol.3 (1964), 16-27.
153. Williamson, ("The Origins of the Twenty-Four Priestly Courses: a Study of 1 Chronicles xxiii-xxvii," *VTSupp* 30 (1979), pp.251-68), suggests that the primary layer belongs to the Chronicler himself. On the other hand, Rudolph, 152; Willi, 196f; Braun, 231 see the whole section as secondary.
154. Since the primary layer includes all the necessary elements the heading requires, it provides the sufficient content for the list.
155. Williamson, 262.
156. Rudolph, 152; Willi, 196f; Braun, 231. However, if we follow Williamson's reconstruction of the primary layer (for even Braun seems to accept it), the original interruption is considerably smaller than chaps. 23-27 and it is questionable if the author cannot allow such digression.
157. Williamson, 264-65.
158. Williamson, 262.
159. Cf. Braun, 228.
160. Williamson, "Priestly Courses," 265.
161. Cf. 2 Chr 10:15; 11:4; 13:7, and Williamson's treatment on this period in *Israel*, 97-110.
162. Once the levitical priests are rejected, they can go nowhere but Jerusalem.
163. P.E. Dion, "Did Cultic Prostitution Fall into Oblivion in the Postexilic Era? Some Evidence from Chronicles and the Septuagint," *CBQ* 43 (1981), 41-48.
164. Williamson, 269-70.



165. The expression "and he gathered [the representatives of the people]" parallels David's act in 1 Chr 13:1-5.
166. Williamson, 269.
167. Williamson, 270.
168. Dillard, 134, whereas other commentators tend to take them as doublets, e.g., Williamson, 282.
169. Cf. S. Yeivin, *VT* 3 (1953), 149-66.
170. G. Widengren, *JSS* 2 (1957), 16f; K. Whitelam, *Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979), 207-18.
171. Williamson, 282.
172. J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, ET (Edinburgh, 1885), 191; W.F. Albright, "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat," in *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, (New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1950), 61-82.
173. Dillard, 147-48.
174. Williamson, 289; R. Knierim, "Exodus 18 and die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit," *ZAW* 73 (1961), 146-71; A. Phillips, *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), 18ff; Whitelam, *The Just King*, 185-206.
175. CM, 393.
176. Dillard, 147.
177. Williamson, 288.
178. Williamson, 288-89. Cf. CM, 402-3; Junge, *Wiederaufbau* 81-92.
179. Williamson, 319-20. Cf. also A. Welch, *The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Date*, (London: British Academy, 1939), 78-80.
180. Dillard, 189-90.
181. For the portrayal of Hezekiah as a second David and Solomon, see M. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 121-25; and P.R. Ackroyd, 179-89. Mosis (p.189) has proposed Hezekiah as a second David, and Williamson (*Israel*, 119-25)

196. In Kings there is no theological explanation of Josiah's misfortune.

identifies him as a second Solomon, but in the Chronicler's presentation of Hezekiah's reign characteristics of both David's and Solomon's reign are found and earlier in the narrative their reigns are given as one literary unit.

182. F. Moriarty, "The Chronicler's Account of Hezekiah's Reform," *CBQ* 27 (1965), 309-406; A. Phillips, *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law*, 167-79; Dillard, 240. Cf. also S. Talmon, "Divergencies in Calendar Reckoning in Ephraim and Judah," *VT* 8 (1958), 48-74.

183. For the examples of previous attempts, see Moriarty, 402-3.

184. Cf. H.W.F. Saggs, "Assyrians" in *Peoples of Old Testament Times*, ed. by D.J. Wiseman, (1973), 62.

185. Williamson, 360-65.

186. Dillard, 241. Cf. also J. Rosenbaum, "Hezekiah's Reform and Deuteronomic Tradition," *HTR* 72 (1979), 23-43; McKenzie, 170-72.

187. J. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 99-123.

188. Williamson, 360-65.

189. I take the Levites in chapter 29 as original in the Chronicler's work, against Petersen, 79-83. Cf. Rudolph, 293-94; Williamson, 352-56.

190 Cf. Williamson, 394-95.

191. 2 Chr 33:22 speaks about Manasseh's evildoings, but vs. 23 neutralizes it with the rest of the Chronicler's position.

192. M. Cogan (*Chronology*, pp.203-5) suggests theological motivation for the introduction of chronological notes, but Dillard (pp.276-77) correctly points out that this does not negate their historicity.

193. F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, "Josiah's Revolt against Assyria," *JNES* 12 (1953), 56-58.

194. Dillard, 277.

195. Besides the sinfulness of Ahaz (2 Chr 28) and Manasseh (2 Chr 33) is enhanced by minor changes.

196. In Kings there is no theological explanation of Joash's misfortune.
197. Myers, *II Chronicles*, 138. Cf. CM, 437 as well.
198. Williamson, 323-4.
199. Williamson, 330.
200. If he wished, he could create a more believable picture.
201. M. Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.*, (Missoula, Scholars Press, 1974), 116-17.
202. Cogan, *Imperialism*, 22-41.
203. Dillard, 201.
204. Cogan, *Imperialism*, 117.
205. In 1 Chronicles there are long speeches on the Davidic covenant by Nathan and on the choice of the Temple site by Gad, but these are essentially paralleled by Samuel-Kings. Ahijah's speech to Jeroboam reveals the divine will concerning the division of the kingdom (1 Kgs 11:29-39) and is mentioned in 2 Chr 10:15, but its content is not recorded in Chronicles. After the fall of the North Isaiah's speech (2 Chr 32:20) and Huldah's speech (2 Chr 34:23-28) are repeated from Samuel-Kings. They speak about the temporary deliverance of the kings from disaster, but they seem to presuppose inevitable exile (cf. 2 Chr 32:26; 34:24, 28) and individual retribution is no longer strictly working. In 2 Chr 36 Jeremiah's prophecy about the exile and restoration is referred to, but again the content is not recorded.
206. Throntveit, 127-29.
207. Petersen, 85-87.
208. Cf. Noth, 156-57.
209. CM, 415; Rudolph, 267; Myers, 122.
210. Williamson, 307; Dillard, 167-68.
211. Cf. Williamson, 306-7; H.B. Huffmon, "Prophecy in the Mari Letters," *BA* 31 (1968), 101-24, for examples from Mari.
212. Noth, ET 168.

213. Cf. Williamson, 298.
214. Williamson, 324.
215. Noth, ET 156-57.
216. Cf. Dillard, 197. For the latter view see Williamson, 328.
217. Throntveit, 11, 51-52.
218. Throntveit, 21.
219. Throntveit, 32.
220. Throntveit, 26.
221. Throntveit, 50.
222. Throntveit, 74-75.
223. Klein, "Abijah's Campaign," 211.



## NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

13. R. Braun, 160.

1. Those who regard Chronicles as an interpretative literature include, R. Bloch, "Midrash"; W.E. Barnes, "Midrashic Element"; T. Willi, *Auslegung*.
2. Since we have already discussed possible source of additions in the previous chapter, here we concentrate on how these new elements function in the overall structure of Chronicles. Expansions themselves can be employed for either exegetical, theological, or historical literature.
3. We use the terms "type scene," "typology," and "contemporization" as we defined in the previous chapters. "Type scene" refers to a device to describe events or persons in a fixed form to emphasize their commonalities, whereas "typology" indicates the perspective to see significance of certain events prefigured in previous experience. "Adaptation" is a method to portray past events in contemporary terms and often it implies their continuity.
4. Mosis, 17-43; Ackroyd, "The Chronicler as Exegete," *JSOT* 2 (1977), 3-9; Williamson, 92-96.
5. While Botterweck ("Eigenart", pp. 406-7) claims that the change owes to the Chronicler's harmonization with Deut 21:22-23, the code against leaving the body of hung man overnight, McKenzie (*Use*, p. 59) successfully refutes it. The Deuteronomic law is discussing about criminals but Saul was not, and Saul was not hung because his head was cut off from his body. Moreover, it was the Philistines who hung Saul and we cannot expect the to behave according to Deuteronomy.
6. Ackroyd, "Exegete," 5.
7. Cf. CM, 194; Williamson, 106.
8. Williamson, "'We are yours, O David': The Setting and Purpose of 1 Chronicles 12.1-23," *OTS* 21 (1981), 164-76; his commentary, 96-97, 105-106.
9. Williamson, "'We are Yours,'" 170; his commentary, 106-107. Cf. Braun, 225.
10. *ibid.*
11. Williamson, "'We are yours,'" 166-67.
12. Cf. Williamson, 97.

13. R. Braun, 160. Temple Builder," 531-90; "Solomonic Apologetic" 503-16; Williamson, "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of
14. As Williamson (pp. 103-4) suggests, the additions in vv. 41b-47 cannot be an original part of the list, whether it was omitted by the Deuteronomic Historian or it was later dropped from it. The style of vv. 41b-47 is different from that of vv. 26-40 and vs. 42 "and with him thirty" does not fit with the list of "the Thirty." Temple Builder," 556-83; 1 Chronicles, 272-73. J. McCarthy ("An Installation Genre?" JBL 90 (1971),
15. L. Allen, ("Kerygmatic Units in 1 & 2 Chronicles," JSOT 41 (1988), 27-28.) also suggests the Chronicler's conscious structuring of these chapters. He sees that this consists of four episodes and the key word  $\chi\tau\omicron$  occurs in each of them.
16. See chap. 2 for the source of 1 Chr 15.
17. Williamson (p. 119) suggests David's victory is also typologized and read with Isa 28:21 as "example of God's marvellous interventions in the battle on behalf of his people." While Mount Perazim in Isaiah and Baal Perazim in Samuel correspond, the Chronicler changes one of the locations on battle from the Valley of Rephaim to that of Gibeon.
18. Rudolph, 113. Temple Builder," 533-34.
19. Mosis, 26. Temple Builder," 533-34.
20. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 24-25.
21. Willi, 155-56. Cf. Williamson, 143-44 also. "Accession," 355.
22. Especially pay attention to the command of the angel of the Lord in vs. 18 (Cf. vv. 15, 16, and 27). JBL 96 (1977) 141.
23. The term "composition" is used in historically neutral sense. The Chronicler may have some historical basis for these compositions, but they are at least completely integrated into his own writing. if he succeeds, there is no doubt, and in any case the phrase is meaningless in the context.
24. 22:5 and 29:1 also point out Solomon's inability to complete it alone.
25. Cf. Braun, 225. JBL 96 (1977) 141; and L. Allen ("Kerygmatic Units," p. 27).
26. As we saw in the previous chapter, at least some layer of chs. 23-27 is the Chronicler's own writing. Cf. Williamson, 153.
27. Williamson, 188.
28. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic," 504-16.

27. R. Braun, "Temple Builder," 581-90; "Solomonic Apologetic" 503-16; Williamson, "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles," *VT* 26 (1976) 351-61.
28. N. Lohfink, "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentliche Theologie des Amtes," *Scholastic* 37 (1962) 32-44; R. Braun, "Temple Builder," 586-88; *1 Chronicles*, 272-73. J. McCarthy ("An Installation Genre?" *JBL* 90 (1971), pp. 31-41) questions if Joshua's commissioning can be properly called *Gattung* as Lohfink suggests, but it is evident that at least 1 Chr 22 and 28 are modeled after Joshua 1 (Cf. Braun, p. 222). *1 Chr* 22/29, *2 Chr* 6:17. Also see *Joshua*, 130-31.
29. Braun, "Temple Builder," 587-88.
30. As we saw in chap. 2, tabernacle typology is used here.
31. Cf. Braun, "Temple Builder," 587, n.17; Williamson, "Accession," 359-60.
32. Braun, 224.
33. Braun, "Temple Builder," 585-86.
34. Braun, "Temple Builder," 583-84.
35. Braun, 270
36. Braun, "Temple Builder," 588-90; Williamson, "Accession," 355.
37. Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles," *TynB* 28 (1977) 141.
38. Thus 2 Sam 7:14b is omitted in 1 Chr 17. If Solomon fails to obey, he will not be punished but his kingdom will not be established, and if he succeeds, there is no punishment, and in any case the phrase is meaningless in Chronicles.
39. Ackroyd, 78.
40. Williamson, 185-86. Braun (p. 285) and L. Allen ("Kerygmatic Units," p.22) accept it.
41. For its dependence on 1 Kgs 1-2, see Braun, 289.
42. Williamson, 188.
43. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic," 509-11.



44. Cf. Mosis, 126-28; Dillard, 11.
45. Dillard, 57.
46. "The Structure and Theme of the Solomon Narrative (1 Kgs 3-11)," *HUCA* 38 (1967), 93-128.
47. Cf. Dillard, 9-11.
48. R. Dillard, "The Literary Structure of the Chronicler's Solomon Narrative," *JSOT* 30 (1984), 85-93; *2 Chronicles*, 5-7.
49. Cf. 1 Chr 22, 29, 2 Chr 6:17. Also see Mosis, 130-31.
50. Mosis, 132-33.
51. Mosis, 130.
52. Mosis, 156-57.
53. Dillard, "Literary Structure," 88; *2 Chronicles*, 6.
54. Cf. Williamson, 197-200.
55. Cf. Dillard, 61-62.
56. Dillard, 6.
57. Dillard, 6. Already in 1 Kgs 9:26-10:13 the account of Sheba is connected with Hiram's trade.
58. Dillard, 6.
59. Dillard, 6.
60. Dillard, 40-41, 56.
61. Ackroyd, 114; Dillard, 57.
62. It is indicated by the change of the second person pronoun from singular to plural form. Cf. Dillard, 57.
63. Dillard, 7.
64. Williamson, 203; Dillard, 31. It is doubtful if the Chronicler assumed such detailed knowledge of the readers.
65. Dillard, 7, 51.
66. Williamson, *Israel*, 110-14; and his commentary, 238.



54. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 31-32.

67. For the textual issue, see the discussions between D. Gooding ("The Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise to Power." *VT* 17 (1967), 173-89; "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969), 1-29; "Jeroboam's Rise to Power: A Rejoinder," *JBL* 91 (1972), 529-33) and R. Klein ("Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *JBL* 89 (1970), 217-18; "Once More: Jeroboam's Rise to Power," *JBL* 92 (1973), 582-84).

55. For historical harmonization, see Dillard, 132.

68. Williamson, *Israel*, 98; A.C. Welch, *Post-Exilic Judaism*, Edinburgh and London (1935), 189-91.

69. Williamson, *Israel*, 110.

70. Williamson, *Israel*, 111-114.

71. Cf. also the omission of 2 Kgs 12:20, "and made him [Jeroboam] king over all Israel."

72. Williamson, *Israel*, 113-114. The northerners are still called as "children of Israel" in 13:12.

56. Cf. Dillard, 132.

73. Williamson, *Israel*, 114.

57. Cf. Williamson, 330.

74. Williamson, 238.

58. 2 Kgs 14:23-15:1 is omitted because it does not fit with the

75. Williamson, 255-58; Dillard, 122-25. For the source of chronological notes see chap. 2.

59. Cf. Williamson, 330.

76. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 29.

60. 2 Kgs 22:26-27 is omitted because it does not fit with the second

77. He appears in Ahab narrative in 1 Kgs 22:1-40, and in relation to his maritime venture with Ahaziah in 22:41-50. Cf. Williamson, 277-78.

78. Williamson, 280; Dillard, 132.

79. Dillard, 140.

80. Cf. Dillard, 139.

81. Williamson, 279.

82. It is commonly ascribed to the Chronicler's desire to explain why otherwise good king Jehoshaphat could not succeed, but Dillard sees it based on extra source (p. 160). Willi, (p. 219) and Williamson (p. 303) argue they are developed from Kings text to provide retribitional explanation.

83. Dillard, 129-30.

84. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 31-32.
85. Dillard, 164.
86. *Contra* Dillard, 172-73.
87. Mosis, 179.
88. For historical harmonization, see Dillard, 173.
89. Dillard, 173.
90. Williamson, 317-18.
91. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 33.
92. I take vv. 5b-6 are secondary, as demonstrated by Williamson (p. 320).
93. Williamson, 319.
94. Cf. Dillard, 193.
95. Cf. Williamson, 330.
96. 2 Kgs 14:23-15:1 is omitted because it deals with the northern kingdom.
97. Cf. Williamson, 340.
98. 27:2b carefully distinguish Jotham's reign with the second half of Uzziah's reign.
99. Williamson, 341.
100. *ibid.*
101. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 34.
102. See the previous chapter.
103. The number involved may be hyperbole, cf. Dillard, 222.
104. Williamson, *Israel*, 116.
105. For the discussion on its historicity, see the previous chapter; see also 2 Kgs 16:6.
106. 343. Cf. also *Israel*, 114-18.

107. Williamson, *Israel*, 118. by Ackroyd (pp. 179-180), and more in detail, by N. Throntveit (*When Kings Speak: Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, Atlanta, 1987), 121-124; and "Hezekiah in the Books of Chronicles," in 1988 SBL.
108. Dillard, 220.
109. A break in the narrative after the reign of Hezekiah has been noted, for example, by B. Halpern ("Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure - Indications of an Earlier Source," in *The Creation of Sacred Literature, Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text*, ed. R. Friedman, (Berkeley CA, 1981), pp. 35-54) and S. McKenzie, (*Use*, pp. 159-176).
110. Williamson, 353.
111. Williamson, 354; cf. Japhet, *Ideology*, 101-3 as well. This is unusual usage of the word "covenant."
112. See particularly vs. 19, which contrasts faithlessness of Ahaz and cleansing.
113. Williamson, 356.
114. Cf. Williamson, 359.
115. Dillard, 245.
116. See also "yield yourselves to the Lord (vs. 8)," and "serve the Lord (vs. 8)."
117. Together they form an *inclusio*, cf. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 26.
118. Williamson, 357-58.
119. Since the latter is mentioned along side "the whole assembly of Judah," it clearly points to the northern kingdom.
120. Cf. Dillard, 250; Williamson, 375; *Israel*, 129-130.
121. Cf. Williamson, 378; Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 25-26.
122. However, it is not to omit unpleasant materials, but more positively to portray Hezekiah as to suit to the Chronicler's overall presentation.
123. Williamson, 386-87.
124. The comparison with David is suggested by Mosis (pp. 189-92), whereas Williamson argued for a second Solomon in *Israel*, 119-125. The view to take Hezekiah as both a second David and

144. Cf. Dillard, 300-1.  
a second Solomon is presented by Ackroyd (pp. 179-189), and more in detail, by M. Throntveit (*When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, (Atlanta, 1987), 121-124; and "Hezekiah in the Books of Chronicles," in *1988 SBL Seminar Papers* (forthcoming).

125. Braun, "Temple Builder," etc.

126. Throntveit, "Hezekiah," 2.

127. This view is most recently claimed by Dillard (267).

128. Mosis, 194; Williamson, 389, 90.

129. Cf. previous chapter and Williamson, 390.

130. Cf. Williamson, 393.

131. 394.

132. Williamson, 396.

133. Mosis, 195.

134. Dillard, 277.

135. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 32.

136. Cf. Mosis, 198; Williamson, 402.

137. We saw in the previous chapter that it is not necessary to suppose intermediate stage in textual development for the Chronicler's source as Williamson claims. It also needs not be the Chronicler's free composition as McKenzie suggests; cf. below.

138. For example, Dillard, 292.

139. Williamson, 409.

140. Cf. Dillard, 292.

141. McKenzie, *Use*, 181-88.

142. Cf. Dillard, 297.

143. Mosis suggests this purpose of elimination of death notices in *Untersuchungen*, 205-8. For the two themes see Williamson, 412.



144. Cf. Dillard, 300-1.

145. For the secondary nature of vv. 22-23, see Williamson, 419; his *Israel*, 7-10.

146. Cf. Dillard, 301.

1. Cf. Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*, (New Haven: Yale Univ Press, 1983), 3, 29, 31, 38, 47-48, 388.

2. Cf. M.D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies*, (Cambridge, 1989), 77-82. Johnson (p. 80) defines one of the purposes of genealogy as to exhibit "a sense of movement within history toward a divine goal."

3. Cf. J.G. McConville, *Chronicles*, (Edinburgh, 1984) 9-10.

4. For the summary of various views, see Bruch, 11. Recent works are generally in favour of unity (e.g., Williamson, Japhet, Johnson, V.E. Osborne, *The Genealogies of I Chronicles 1-9*, Dissertation: Dropsie University, (1979)).

## NOTES TO EXCURSUS

1. J. Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*, (New Haven: Yale Univ Press, 1983), 3, 29, 31, 38, 47-48, 356.
2. Cf. M.D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies*, (Cambridge, 1969), 77-82. Johnson (p. 80) defines one of the purposes of genealogy as to exhibit "a sense of movement within history toward a divine goal."
3. Cf. J.G. McConville, *Chronicles*, (Edinburgh, 1984) 9-10.
4. For the summary of various views, see Braun, 11. Recent works are generally in favour of unity (e.g., Williamson, Japhet, Johnson, W.E. Osborne, *The Genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9*, Dissertation: Dropsie University, (1979)).

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. Although Ps. Jon. also shares some discrepancies due to textual problems, they do not reflect the Targumist's interpretative method or relationship between his work and the text and here we shall not discuss on them.
2. John Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, (Cambridge, 1969), 231.
3. *ibid.*
4. We must remember that the Hebrew text did not have punctuations originally.
5. Bowker, *Targums*, 231-33, especially, 231.
6. *Ant.* I. 228-32; LAB 18.5; 32.1-4; 40.2; 4 Macc 7.14; 8.1-17; 16.16-23; 18.11.
7. Bowker, *Targums*, 202-3.
8. The Chronicler may well have taken this tradition as historically true. However, its extension to Adam and Noah in Ps. Jon. exhibits the Targumist's lack of historical interest.
9. Bowker, *Targums*, 233.
10. Bowker, *Targums*, 233-34.
11. Bowker, *Targums*, 228. This story is also found in Rabbinic tradition as well; cf. Ber. R. 40.4, B. San. 89b.
12. Bowker, *Targums*, 234.
13. For example, books listed as "Rewritten Bible" in G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden, 1961) differ much from those classified by G.W.E. Nickelsburg in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple period* (Philadelphia, 1984).
14. D.J. Harrington, "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies," *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*, (Philadelphia, 1986), 243.
15. J.C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, (Washington D.C., 1987), 30.

16. This agrees with the result of modern historical criticism.
17. Endres, *Jubilees*, 27. Cf. T.H. Gaster, "Demon," in *IDB* 1: 822; and "Satan," *IDB* 4: 224-28.
18. O.S. Wintermute, "Jubilees," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. by J.H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 (London, 1985), 92 n.19a; 100 n.23c.
19. Endres, *Jubilees*, 29.
20. Cf. Wintermute, "Jubilees," 36.
21. Endres, *Jubilees*, 21. A Hasmonean date is claimed for the composition of Jubilees by J.C. VanderKam (*Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, (Missoula, 1977), 283), and generally accepted.
22. Endres, *Jubilees*, 21.
23. Endres, *Jubilees*, 29.
24. Endres, *Jubilees*, 24.
25. For example, Gen 25:7-18 is placed after 25:19-28 in order to make Abraham meet with Jacob, though in Jubilees transpositions are less common than other Rewritten Bibles.
26. The verbatim quotation can be found, for instance, in Jub 17.
27. There are more extensive omissions as well: e.g., Abraham's presentation of Sarah to foreign rulers as his sister, Gen 12:10-20; 20:2-7.
28. Endres, *Jubilees*, 223.
29. This is significant, even though complete creation of the narrative setting is only one out of twenty five speeches.
30. Endres, *Jubilees*, 223.
31. This weakness of Endres' work is also pointed out by M. Fishbane in his book review in *JBL* 1988, 527-28.
32. D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Missoula, 1975), 62; Bowker, *Targums*, 167-68.



33. Jub 6:2. Cf. P.S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (Cambridge, Cambridge Univ Press, 1988) 100-101.
34. i.e., "the scholars forgot that his vow was invalid" as D.J. Harrington explains ("Pseudo Philo", in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol.2 (London, 1985), 353 n. 40g. Cf. Ber. R. 60:3; Vay. R. 37:4.
35. Cf. Harrington, "Pseudo Philo," 353, n. 40c for Seila, and n. 40h for Stelac.
36. R. Bauckham, "The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as 'Midrash'" *Gospel Perspectives* vol. 3 (Sheffield, 1983), 40.
37. Alexander, "Retelling," 109.
38. A.A. Anderson, *Psalms*, vol. 2, (London, 1972), 794.
39. Harrington, "Pseudo Philo," 352, n. 39c. L.H. Feldman, "Prolegomenon," to M.R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*, (New York, 1971), CXXII.
40. Harrington, "Pseudo Philo," 352, n. 39e.
41. Bauckham, "Liber Antiquitatum," 52.
42. A similar technique is also used in LAB 34, where the unscriptural Aod is created to explain Israel's subjugation to the Midianites.
43. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, (Philadelphia, 1911-38), vol. 6, 202, n. 104; Bauckham, "Liber Antiquitatum," 52.
44. Alexander, "Retelling," 108.
45. L. Cohn, "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria," *JQR* 10 (1898), 322. Cf. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Writings*, 107-8; Bauckham, "Liber Antiquitatum," 40.
46. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Writings*, 108.
47. Antiquities' full account of biblical stories is not only because it was written for non-Jewish readers but also because of the nature of historiography.
48. Cf. Ap. I. 28ff. Cf. Alexander, "Retelling," 15.

50. Similarly, the exchange between the Israelites and Moses when they saw the Egyptian troops approaching (II. 326-328) is changed to a narrative form.
51. F.G. Downing, "Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels (I)," *JSNT* 8 (1980), 50.
52. H.W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*, (Missoula, 1976), 56; Alexander, 111.
53. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 71ff.
54. H.J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London, 1958), 170.
55. H.ST.J. Thackeray, et al, *Josephus. With an English Translation* (Loeb Classic Library), (Cambridge MA, 1926-65), vol. , 302-303.
56. Cf. Patte, *Hermeneutics*, 68.
57. Thackeray, 305.
58. Cf. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 18.
59. Items Josephus regularly omits are listed in S.J.D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*, (Leiden, 1979), 37.
60. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 133-34; Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*, 40.
61. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 43.
62. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 44.
63. *Roman Antiquities* I. 5.1.; 5.3. Cf. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 53.
64. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 59.
65. Cf. Thucydides, I. 20-21; Polybius, III. 4.13. L.C.A. Alexander, unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, pp.30-31. Cadbury, *Luke-Acts*, 158-59.
66. B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, (Berlin, 1895, rpt. 1955), 87. See also L.H. Feldman, *Josephus and modern scholarship: (1937-1980)* (Berlin, 1984).
67. Cadbury, *Luke-Acts*, 159.

68. Attridge, *Interpretation*, 57.
69. Alexander, "Retelling," 113.
70. Downing, who analysed the redaction techniques of Josephus reached the similar conclusion ("Redaction Criticism," p.17).
71. Cadbury, *Luke-Acts*, 184.
72. F.W. Walbank, "Speeches in Greek Historians," (1965), 246; 260.
73. F.W. Walbank, *Polybius*, (Berkeley, 1972), 38.
74. F.W. Walbank, "ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ : A Polybian Experiment," *JHS* 58 (1938), 61-63. See also R. Doran, "The Jewish Hellenistic Historians Before Josephus," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, (Berlin, 1987), 292.
75. The quotation is from J. Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus," *JJS* 25 (1974), 256. For the distinction Josephus makes between himself and the canonical prophets, see *Ap*, I. 41; and Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 246-50.
76. Cf. D. Daube, "Typology in Josephus," *JJS*, 31 (1980), 18-36; G.L. Johnson, "Josephus: Heir Apparent to the Prophetic Tradition?" *SBL 1983 Seminar Papers*, 337-46.
77. Blenkinsopp ("Prophecy," 247, 258) sees the parallel with Josephus in the twofold aspects (fortelling of the future and exegetical activity) in the Essene concept of prophecy. However, from the study of Qumran pesher we cannot conclude that Josephus' prophecy is also heavily dependent on Biblical exegesis. Since Qumran pesher is exegetical literature, its dependence on the exegesis is only expected, whereas Antiquities is a historiography and prophecy can take other forms as well.
78. 1 Macc 4:46; 9:27; 14:41.
79. Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 251-54.
80. J. Licht, "Biblical Historicism," *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, (Jerusalem, 1984), 107-8.
81. Though they may refer to the sources of particular interpretation for authorization; new revelation (Jubilees), or Rabbi So-and-so (Midrash), they are not the sources of historical accounts nor written documents.

82. Hellenistic historians who deal with their contemporary events do not usually refer to their sources, for they are basically based on eyewitness or firsthand experiences.

83. The identification of the Levitical prophets with pre-exilic cultic prophets is suggested by G. von Rad, *Geschichtsbild*, 113-14; and H. Gese, "Kultsänger," 223.

84. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy*, 62-64.



## NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. H. White, "The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory," *History and Theory* (1984) XXIII, 19.
2. White, "Narrative," 22.
3. A. Momigliano, "The Rhetoric of history and the history of rhetoric: On Hayden White's tropes," in Shaffer, E.S. (ed.) *Comparative Criticism Year Book*, (Cambridge, 1981), 259-68; M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, (Bloomington, 1985), 23-35.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , *1, 2 Chronicles, The Communicator's Commentary* (Waco: Word Books, 1987)
- Ackroyd, P.R., "History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler" *CTM* 38 (1967) 501-15.
- , *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968).
- , "Historian and Prophets" *SEA* 33 (1968) 18-54.
- , "The Temple Vessels - a continuity theme" *VTSupp* 23 (1972) 166-81.
- , *I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*, TBC (London: SCM Press, 1973)
- , "The Theology of the Chronicler" *LTQ* 8 (1973) 101-16.
- , "The Chronicler as Exegete" *JSOT* 2 (1977) 2-32.
- Aharoni, Y., *The Land of the Bible* tr. A. Rainey, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979).
- , "The Province List of Judah" *VT* 9 (1959) 225-46.
- Aharoni, Y. and Avi-Yonah, M., *The MacMillan Bible Atlas*, (New York: MacMillan, 1968).
- Albright, W.F., "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler" *JBL* 40 (1921) 104-24.
- , "Egypt and the Early History of the Negev" *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 4 (1924) 146-47.
- , *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1946).
- , "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat" *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume* (New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1950)
- Alexander, P.S., (ed.) *Textual Sources for the Study of Judaism* (Manchester: Manchester Univ Press, 1984).
- , "Retelling the Old Testament" in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* eds. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1988) 99-120.
- Allen, L., *The Greek Chronicles* 2 vols. *VTSupp* 25, 27 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974).
- Beyer, G., "Beiträge zur Septuaginta-Exegese"

- Südwestpalästina im Altertum. I. Das Festungssystem  
Rehabeams" ZDPV 54 (1931) 113-70
- , *1, 2 Chronicles*, The Communicator's Commentary (Waco: Word Books, 1987)
- , *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees* (New York: Schocken, 1963)
- , "Kerygmatic Units in 1 & 2 Chronicles" *JSOT* 41 (1988) 21-36.
- B. S. P., "Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and Judah" *VT* 18 (1968) 414-32
- Alt, A., "Festungen und Levitenorte im Lande Juda" *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels* vol. 2 (München: C.H. Beck, 1953) 306-15.
- Alter, R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981).
- Anderson, A.A., *Psalms*, NCB, 2 vols (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1972).
- Attridge, H.W., *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaecae of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula: Scholar Press, 1976).
- Bar-Efrat, S., *Narrative Art in the Bible*, ET (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).
- Barnes, W.E., "The Midrashic Element in Chronicles" *The Expositor* 5th series 4 (1896) 426-39.
- , "Chronicles: a Targum" *Expt* 3 (1896-97) 316-19.
- Barton, J., *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1984).
- Bauckham, R., "The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as 'Midrash'" *Gospel Perspectives* vol. 3 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983)
- Begg, C., "The Death of Josiah in Chronicles: Another View" *VT* 37 (1987) 1-8.
- , "Sennacherib's Second Palestinian Campaign: An Additional Indication" *JBL* 106 (1987) 685-92.
- Ben David, A. *Parallels in the Bible* (Jerusalem: Carta, 1972)
- Benzinger, I. *Die Bücher der Chronik*, KHAT 20 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1901).
- Berlin, A., *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983).
- Beyer, G., "Beiträge zur Territorialgeschichte von

- Südwestpalästina im Altertum. I. Das Festungssystem Rehabeams" *ZDPV* 54 (1931) 113-70.
- Bickerman, E.J., *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees* (New York: Schocken, 1962).
- Bin-Nun, S.P., "Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and Judah" *VT* 18 (1968) 414-32.
- Blenkinsopp, J., "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus" *JJS* 25 (1974) 239-62.
- , "Biographical Patterns in Biblical Narrative" *JSOT* 20 (1981) 27-46.
- Bloch, R. "Midrash" in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*, Brown Judaic Studies 1 (Missoula: Scholars press, 1978).
- Botterweck, G.J., "Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte" *TQ* 136 (1956) 402-35.
- Bowker, J., *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1969).
- Braun, R.L., "The Message of Chronicles: Rally 'Round the Temple" *CTM* 42 (1971) 502-14.
- , "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles" *JBL* 92 (1973) 503-16.
- , "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chr 22,28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles" *JBL* 95 (1976) 581-90.
- , "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude toward the North" *JBL* 96 (1977) 59-62.
- , "Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History" *VTSupp* 30 (1979) 52-64.
- , *1 Chronicles* WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1986).
- Brett, M.G., "Literacy and Dominion: G.A. Herion's Sociology of History Writing" *JSOT* 37 (1987) 15-40.
- Bright, J., *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972).
- Brooke, G.J., *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish*



- Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).
- Discoveries in the Judean Desert" *JTS* 57 (1964) 281-89.
- Brownlee, W.H., *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).
- of the Biblical Text" *JTS* 16 (1965) 81-95.
- Brueggemann, W. and Wolff, H.W., *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985).
- in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* eds. F.M. Cross and E. Tov.
- Brunet, A.M., "Le Chroniste et ses sources" *RB* 60 (1953) 481-508.
- , "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration" *JTS* 12 (1961) 1-17.
- Cadbury, H.J., *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: 1958).
- Childs, B. *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (London: SCM Press, 1967).
- , "Midrash and the Old Testament" in *Understanding the Sacred Text* 47-59.
- , *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).
- Clements, R.E., "Messianic Prophecy or Messianic History?" *Horizons in Biblical Theology* vol. 1 (1979) 87-104.
- T. Clark, 1910).
- , *Isaiah and the Deliverance of Jerusalem* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).
- and Gunn, D.M., (eds.), "A History of Ancient Israel and Judah: A Discussion of Miller's *Isaiah*" *JTS* 31 (1980) 1-17.
- Cogan, M., *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.*, SBLMS 19 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974).
- Josephus" *JTS* 31 (1980) 1-17.
- Coggins, R.J., *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1976).
- , "The Reign of Ahas" *JTS* 31 (1980) 1-17.
- Cohn, L., "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria" *JQR* 10 (1898) 277-332.
- , "The Literary Structure of the Chronicle of Jeroboam" *ZAW* 97 (1983) 97-125.
- , "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Case of Jeroboam" *JTS* 31 (1980) 1-17.
- Cohen, S.J.D., *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (Leiden, 1979).
- , "David's Census: Perspectives on the Chronicler's Account" *JTS* 31 (1980) 1-17.
- Cole, D., "How Water Tunnels Worked" *BAR* 6/2 (1980) 8-29.
- J. Boyd (Phillipsburg, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977).
- Cook, A., "'Fiction' and History in Samuel and Kings" *JSOT* 36 (1986) 27-48.
- , "The Chronicler's Jehoshaphat" *JTS* 31 (1980) 1-17.
- Cross, F.M., "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Dion. P.S., "Did Cultic Practices Persist into Oblivion in the

- Discoveries in the Judean Desert" *HTR* 57 (1964) 281-89.
- , "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text" *IEJ* 16 (1966) 81-95.
- , "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts" in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* eds. F.M. Cross and E. Tov (Cambridge, MA; Harvard Univ Press 1975) 306-15.
- , "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration" *JBL* 94 (1975) 4-18.
- Cross, F.M., and Freedman, D.N., "Josiah's Revolt against Assyria" *JNES* 12 (1953) 56-58.
- Cross, F.M., and Milik, J.T., "Explorations in Judean Beqeah" *BASOR* 142 (1956) 5-17.
- Cross, F.M., and Wright, G.E., "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah" *JBL* 75 (1956) 202-226.
- Curtis, E.L. and A.A. Madsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910).
- Davies, P.R., and Gunn, D.M., (eds.) "A History of Ancient Israel and Judah: A Discussion of Miller-Hayes (1986)" *JSOT* 39 (1987) 3-63.
- Daube, D., "Typology in Josephus" *JJS* 31 (1980) 18-36.
- Dillard, R.B., "The Chronicler's Solomon" *WTJ* 43 (1980) 289-300
- , "The Reign of Asa (2 Chr 14-16): An Example of the Chronicler's Theological Method" *JETS* 23 (1980) 207-18.
- , "The Literary Structure of the Chronicler's Solomon Narrative" *JSOT* 30 (1984) 85-93.
- , "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retiribution" *WTJ* 46 (1984) 164-72.
- , "David's Census: Perspectives on 2 Samuel 24 and 1 Chronicles 21" in *Through Christ's Word*, eds. R. Godfrey and J. Boyd (Philipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1985) 94-107.
- , "The Chronicler's Jehoshaphat" *TJ* 7 (1986) 17-22.
- Dion, P.E., "Did Cultic Prostitution Fall into Oblivion in the

- Postexilic Era? Some Evidence from Chronicles and the Septuagint" *CBQ* 43 (1981) 41-48.
- Doran, R., "The Jewish Hellenistic Historians Before Josephus" *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* (Berlin, 1987) 246-97.
- , "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Maccabees and 'Tragic History'" *HUCA* 50 (197 ) 107-14.
- Downing, F.G. "Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels" *JSNT* 8 (1980) 46-65.
- Endres, J.C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (Washington, D.C., 1987).
- Eshkenazi, T., "The Chronicler and the Composition of 1 Esdras" *CBQ* 48 (1986) 39-61.
- Grayson, A.K., *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Leuven, 1975).
- Feldman, L.H., "Prolegomenon" to M.R. James *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (New York, 1971).
- Gunn, D.M., "Narrative Patterns and Oral Tradition in Judges" *Josephus and modern scholarship: (1937-1980)* (Berlin, 1984).
- , *The Story of King David* (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1973).
- Fishbane, M., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).
- Freedman, D.N., "The Chronicler's Purpose" *CBQ* 23 (1961) 436-42.
- Fritz, V., "The 'List of Rehoboam's Fortress' in 2 Chr 11:5-12 - A Document from the Time of Josiah" *EI* 15 (1981) 46\*-53\*.
- Galling, K., *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemiah*, ATD (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954).
- Haran, M., *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Leuven, 1978).
- Gaster, T.H., "Demon" *IDB* vol. 1, 822.
- , "Satan" *IDB* vol. 4, 224-28.
- Gese, H., "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am zweiten Tempel" in *Von Sinai zum Zion: alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblische Theologie* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1974) 147-58.
- Ginzberg, L., *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1911-38).
- Goettsberger, J. *Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1939).



- Goldingay, J., "The Chronicler as Theologian" *BTB* 5 (1975) 99-126.
- Gooding, D., "The Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise to Power" *VT* 17 (1967) 173-89.
- , "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns" *Textus* 7 (1969) 1-29.
- , "Jeroboam's Rise to Power: A Rejoinder" *JBL* 91 (1972) 529-33.
- Graf, K.H., "Das Buch der Chronik als Geschichtsquelle" in *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testament* (Leipzig, 1866).
- Gray, J., *I and II Kings*, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1970).
- Grayson, A.K., *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley, NY, 1975).
- Gunn, D.M., "Narrative Patterns and Oral Tradition in Judges and Samuel," *VT* 24 (1974) 286-317.
- , *The Story of King David* (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1978).
- , *The Fate of King Saul* (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1980).
- , "New Directions in the Study of Biblical Hebrew Narrative" *JSOT* 39 (1987) 65-75.
- Halpern, B. "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure - Indications of an Earlier Source" in *The Creation of Sacred Literature, Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text*, ed. R. Friedman, (Berkeley: Univ of California, 1981) 31-54.
- Haran, M., *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).
- , "The Use of Incense in Ancient Israelite Ritual" *VT* 10 (1960) 113-25.
- Harrington, D.J. "Pseudo Philo" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* ed. J.H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 (London: Darton, Lonman, & Todd, 1985).
- , *The "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies" in Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 239-55.



Junge, E., *Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia*, BWANT (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937).

Hauer, C., "David and the Levites" *JSOT* 23 (1982) 33-54.

Hayes, J.H. and Miller, J.M., (eds.) *Israelite and Judean History* (London: SCM Press, 1977).

Herion, G.A., "The Role of Historical Narrative in Biblical Thought: The Tendencies Underlying Old Testament Historiography" *JSOT* 21 (1981) 25-57.

-----, "The Impact of Modern and Social Science Assumptions on the Reconstruction of Israelite History" *JSOT* 34 (1986) 3-33.

Herrmann, S., *A History of Israel in Old Testament Times*, rev. ed. (London: SCM Press, 1983).

Hobbs, T., *2 Kings*, WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1985).

Japhet, S., "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew" *VT* 18 (1968) 330-71.

-----, "Chronicles, Book of" *EncJud* vol. 5 (1971) 517-34.

-----, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1977).

-----, "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles" *JBL* 98 (1979) 205-18.

-----, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles" *JSOT* 33 (1985) 83-107.

Jobling, D., "Sociological and Literary Approaches to the Bible: How Shall the Twain Meet?" *JSOT* 38 (1987) 85-93.

Johnson, G.L., "Josephus: Heir Apparent to Prophetic Tradition?" *SBL 1983 Seminar Papers*, 337-46.

Johnson, M.D., *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies* (Cambridge, Cambridge Univ Press, 1969).

Johnstone, W. "Guilt and Atonement: The Theme of 1 and 2 Chronicles" in *A Word in Season*, eds. J. Martin and P. Davies (Sheffield: JSOT press, 1986) 113-38.

Jones, G.H., "'Holy War' or 'Yahwen War'?" *VT* 25 (1975) 642-58.

-----, *1 and 2 Kings*, NCB 2 vols. (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1984).

- Junge, E., *Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia*, BWANT (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937).
- Long, B. O., "Historical Narrative and the Fictionalizing Process" *JBL* 88 (1969) 31-41.
- Keil, C.F., *The Books of the Chronicles* tr. A. Harper (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966).
- McIntire, C.T., *God, History, and Historians: Modern Christian History*, K.A., *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (Warminster: Aris and Philips, 1973).
- Malamat, A., "Josiah's Bid for Armageddon" *JANES* 5 (1973) 267-274.
- Kittel, R., *Die Bücher der Chronik HKAT* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902).
- Mazar, B., "The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine" *VTS* 4 (1967) 1-10.
- Klein, R., "Jeroboam's Rise to Power" *JBL* 89 (1970) 217-18.
- , "Once More: Jeroboam's Rise to Power" *JBL* 92 (1973) 582-84.
- , *II Samuel AB* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984).
- , *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).
- , "Abijah's Campaign against the North (II Chr 13) - What were the Chronicler's Sources?" *ZAW* 95 (1983) 210-17.
- Knierim, R., "Exodus 18 und die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit" *ZAW* 73 (1961) 146-71.
- Knight, D., *Rediscovering the Tradition of Israel: The Development of the Tradition-Historical Research of the Old Testament, with Special Consideration of Scandinavian Contributions* SBLDS 9 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973).
- , (ed.) *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1977).
- Kropat, A., *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen*, BZAW (Giessen, 1909).
- (1958) 52-56
- Lemke, W.F., "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History" *HTR* 58 (1965) 349-63.
- Licht, J., *Storytelling in the Bible*, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1978).
- , "Biblical Historicism" *History, Historiography and Interpretation* (Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1984)
- Miller, J.M., and Hayes, J.H., *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).
- Lohfink, N., "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentliche Theologie des Amtes" *Scholastic* 37 (1962) 32-44.
- Momigliano, A., "The Rhetoric of History and the History of

- Long, B.O., "Historical Narrative and the Fictionalizing Imagination" *VT* 35 (1985) 405-16.
- McIntire, C.T., *God, History, and Historians: Modern Christian Views of History* (New York: Oxford Univ Press, 1977).
- Malamat, A., "Josiah's Bid for Armageddon" *JANES* 5 (1973) 267-78.
- Mazar, B. "The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine" *VTS* 4 (1957) 57-66.
- McCarter, P.K. Jr., *I Samuel* AB (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980).  
 -----, *II Samuel* AB (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984).
- McCarthy, J., "An Installation Genre?" *JBL* 90 (1971) 31-41.
- McConville, J., "Priests and Levites in Ezekiel: A Crux in the Interpretation of Israel's History" *TynB* 34 (1983) 3-31.  
 -----, *I and II Chronicles*, Daily Study Bible (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1984)  
 -----, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).
- McKay, J., *Religion in Judah under Assyrians* (London: SCM Press, 1973).
- McKenzie, S. *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
- Mendenhall, G.E., "The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26" *JBL* 77 (1958) 52-66.
- Mettinger, T.N.D., *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (Lund, 1971).
- Michaeli, F., *Les livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie*, CAT (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1967).
- Miller, J.M., and Hayes, J.H., *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (London, SCM Press, 1986).
- Miller, M.P., "Midrash" *IDBSupp* 593-97.
- Momigliano, A., "The Rhetoric of history and the history of



- rhetoric: On Haden White's tropes" in *Comparative Criticism Year Book* ed. E.S. Shaffer (Cambridge, 1981) 259-68.
- Montgomery, J., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, ICC (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1951).
- Mosis, R. *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973).
- Mowinkel, S., *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, vol. 2 tr. Ap-Thomas, D.R., (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962).
- Myers, J.M., *I Chronicles*, AB (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965).
- , *II Chronicles*, AB (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965).
- , "The Kerygma of the Chronicler: History and Theology in the Service of Religion" *Int* 20 (1966) 259-73.
- Na'aman, N., "Hezekiah's Fortified Cities and the LMLK Stamps" *BASOR* 261 (1986) 5-21.
- Newsome, J.D.Jr., "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His purposes" *JBL* 94 (1975) 204-17.
- Nielsburg, G.E.W., (ed.) *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Niese, B., *Flavii Iosephi Opera* (Berlin, 1895, rpt. 1955).
- Nielsen, E., "The Levites in Ancient Israel" *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 3 (1964) 16-27.
- North, R., "The Theology of the Chronicler" *JBL* 82 (1963) 369-81.
- , "Does Archaeology Prove Chronicles Sources?" in *Old Testament Studies in Honour of Jacob M Meyers*, ed. H.N. Bream et al (Philadelphia: Temple Univ Press, 1974).
- Noth, M., *Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), ET of the first half of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle, 1943).
- , "Eine palästinische Lokalüberlieferung in 2 Chr 20" *ZDPV* 67 (1945) 45-71.
- , *The Chronicler's History*, (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1987), ET of the second half of the above mentioned work.



- Rudolph, W., "Problems of the Books of Chronicles" VT 4 (1954)
- Osborne, W. *The Genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9* Dissertation, Dropsie University, 1979.
- , *Chronikbücher*, KAT (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953).
- Patte, D., *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975). in *Chronicles? Some Remarks to the Old Testament Background of the New Testament Christology*
- Payne, J.B., "The Validity of Numbers in Chronicles" *BSac* 136 (1979) 109-28, 206-20.
- , "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegeese" *VTSupp* 1
- Petersen, D.L., *Late Israelite Prophecy*, SBLMS 23 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).
- , "Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der
- Phillips, A., *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970). *Inaug. Exkurs über das Buch Jeremia*" *VTSupp* 29 (1973) 264-84
- Plöger, O. *Theocracy and Eschatology*, ET (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968). *J.R., Funk, J.L. McKenzie, P. and N. Lapp, The 1957 Excavation at Beth-sur*, *BAR* 38 (Cambridge, 1968).
- Polzin, R., *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. HSM 12 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976). *World and the Origin of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale Univ Press, 1983).
- Popper, K., *The Poverty of Historicism* (London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957). *1 Palestinian Campaign*" *JBL* 104 (1985) 201-13.
- Porten, B. "The Structure and Theme of the Solomon Narrative (1 Kgs 3-11)" *HUCA* 38 (1967) 93-128. *durig Siege - The Rediscovery of Warren's Shaft*" *BAR* 7/4 (1981) 24-30
- Rad, G. von., *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, BWANT (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930). *ed. tr. J. Bowden* (London: SCM Press, 1955).
- , *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* (Zürich, 1951).
- Spinoza, B., *Theologico-Political Treatise* (Chicago, 1977)
- , "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles" *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* tr. E. Dicken (London: SCM Press, 1966) 267-80.
- Stade, B., "Anmerkungen zu 2 Ks 15-21" *ZAW* 6 (1884) 109-117
- , "The Beginning of Historical Writing in Ancient Israel" *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London: SCM Press, 1966) 166-185. 1987
- Rast, W.E., *Tradition History and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972).
- Reventlow, H.G., *Problems of Old Testament Theology in the Twentieth Century*, ET. (London: SCM Press, 1985).
- Rothstein, J.W., and Hänel, J., *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, KAT (Leipzig, A. Deichert, 1927). *Society* 13 (1946/7) 29-32

- Rudolph, W., "Problems of the Books of Chronicles" *VT* 4 (1954) 401-9.
- , *Chronikbücher*, HAT (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955).
- Saeboe, M., "Messianism in Chronicles? Some Remarks to the Old Testament Background of the New Testament Christology" *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 2 (1980) 85-109.
- Seeligman, I.L., "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegeese" *VTSupp* 1 (1953) 150-81.
- , "Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung (mit einem Exkurs über das Buch Jeremias)" *VTSupp* 29 (1978) 254-84.
- Sellers, O.R., Funk, J.L. McKenzie, P. and N. Lapp, *The 1957 Excavation at Beth-zur*, AASOR 38 (Cambridge, 1968).
- Seters, J. van, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale Univ Press, 1983).
- Shea, W.H., "Sennacherib's Second Palestinian Campaign" *JBL* 104 (1985) 401-18.
- Shilo, T. "Jerusalem's Water Supply during Siege - The Rediscovery of Warren's Shaft" *BAR* 7/4 (1981) 24-39.
- Soggin, J.A., *A History of Ancient Israel* tr. J. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1985).
- Spinoza, B., *Theologico-Political Treatise* (Hamburg[?], 1670) tr. by R.H.M. Elwes in *The Chief Works of Benedict de Spinoza* (New York, 1951).
- Stade, B., "Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö 15-21" *ZAW* 6 (1886) 156-89.
- Sternberg, M., *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ Press, 1987).
- Stinespring, W.F., "Eschatology in Chronicles" *JBL* 80 (1961) 209-19.
- Strack, H.L., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Philadelphia, 1931).
- Sukenik, Y., "Engines Invented by Cunning Men" *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* 13 (1946/7) 19-24.

- Tadmor, H., "Aziriyau of Yaudi" *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961) 232-271.
- Talmon, S., "Divergencies in Calendar Reckoning in Ephraim and Judah" *VT* 8 (1958) 48-74.
- , "The Old Testament Text" in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1970).
- Thiele, E. R., *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983).
- Throntveit, M., "Linguistic Analysis and the Question of Authorship in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah" *VT* 32 (1982) 201-216.
- , *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles* SBLDS 93 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).
- , "Hezekiah in the Book of Chronicles" *1988 SBL Seminar Papers* (forthcoming).
- Torrey, C. C., "The Chronicler as Editor and Independent Narrator" *AJSL* 25 (1908-9) 157-73, 188-217.
- , *The Chronicler's History of Israel* (New Haven: Yale Univ Press, 1954).
- Tov, E., "Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues" *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS- Vienna* (Jerusalem: Academon, 1980).
- Ulrich, E. C., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, HSM 19 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978).
- , "The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran" *The Hebrew and Greek Text of Samuel* (Jerusalem, 1980).
- Ussishkin, D. "The Destruction of Lachish by Sennacherib and the Dating of the Royal Judean Storage Jars" *Tel Aviv* 4 (1977) 28-57.
- VanderKam, J. C., *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).
- Vaux, R. de, *Ancient Israel: its Life and Institutions*, ET (London, 1965).



- , *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford Univ Press, 1973).
- Vermes, G., *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961).
- , "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis" *Cambridge History of the Bible* vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1970).
- , *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975).
- Walbank, F.W., "ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ : A Polybian Experiment" *JHS* 58 (1938) 61-63.
- , "Speeches in Greek Historians" (Third Myers Memorial Lecture: Oxford, 1965).
- , *Polybius* (Berkeley: Univ of California Press, 1972).
- Welch, A.C., *The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Date* (London: British Academy, 1939).
- , *Post-Exilic Judaism* (Edinburgh and London, 1935).
- Wellhausen, J. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* tr. Menzies and Black (Edinburgh: 1885).
- Welten, P. *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern*, WMANT (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973)
- Wenham, G.J., "Were David's Sons Priests?" *ZAW* 87 (1975) 79-82.
- Wenham, J.W., "Large Numbers in the Old Testament" *TynB* 18 (1967) 19-53.
- Wette, W. de, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Halle, 1806).
- White, H., "The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory" *History and Theory* 23 (1984)
- Whitelam, K., *The Just King* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979).
- , "Recreating the History of Israel" *JSOT* 35 (1986) 45-70.
- Willi, T. *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, FRLANT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1972).



- Williamson, H.G.M., "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles," *VT* 26 (1976) 351-61.
- , "Eschatology in Chronicles" *TynB* 28 (1977) 115-54.
- , *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1977).
- , "The Origin of the Twenty-Four Priestly Courses: a Study of 1 Chronicles xxiii-xxvii" *VTSupp* 30 (1979) 251-68.
- , "Sources and Redaction in the Chronicler's Genealogy of Judah" *JBL* 98 (1979) 351-9.
- , *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB (London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1982).
- , "The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History" *VT* 32 (1982) 242-48.
- , "Reliving the Death of Josiah: A Reply to C.T. Begg" *VT* 37 (1987) 9-15.
- Wintermute, O.S., "Jubilees" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* ed. J.H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985) 297-377.
- Wiseman, D., *Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings* (London: British Museum, 1956).
- Wright, A.G., "The Literary Genre Midrash" *CBQ* 28 (1966) 105-38, 417-57.
- Zunz, L., *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt* (Berlin, 1832).