

The Name of the Book¹

In the Hebrew Bible, Chronicles is called ספר דברי הימים “The Book of the Events² of the Days,” reflecting rabbinic tradition. This title indicates one understanding of Chronicles, namely, that the book³ deals with past events.⁴ These words without an additional modifier are not found in the text of Chronicles itself⁵ but may be related to lost works cited in Kings, such as ספר דברי ישראל “The Book of the Events of the Days of the Kings of Israel” or ספר דברי יהודה “The Book of the Events of the Days of the Kings of Judah.”⁶ These source citations are renamed “The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel,” or “The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah,” in Chronicles.⁷ The reference to the kings of Israel and Judah may have been dropped from “The Book of the Events of the Days” in the title of Chronicles since it would not apply to 1 Chronicles 1-9.

The Septuagint’s name for Chronicles is παραλειπομενων⁸ α and β. The title *Paraleipomena*, “Things Omitted” or “Things Left Behind,” indicates a second understanding of the book’s purpose, to record events left out by earlier histories, such as Samuel and Kings.⁹ In Codex Alexandrinus the title is slightly longer: “The Things Omitted regarding the Kings of

¹For a comprehensive discussion of the history of the names ascribed to Chronicles, see Knoppers and Harvey, “Omitted and Remaining Matters,” 227-243.

²Literally, “Words.”

³In Jewish tradition 1 and 2 Chronicles were considered one book with the *masorah finalis* appearing only at the end of what we call 2 Chronicles. A marginal note at 1 Chr 27:25, חצי הספר בפסוקים “half of the book in verses,” indicates the midpoint of this one book. The division of the book into two by LXX eventually found its way into Hebrew Bibles, but that is not attested before 1448 (Rudolph, III).

⁴Knoppers and Harvey, “Omitted and Remaining Matters,” 230.

⁵The only places where this phrase occurs in the biblical text itself are at Neh 12:23 and Esth 2:23.

⁶E.g. in 1 Kgs 14:19 and 1 Kgs 14:29 respectively.

⁷See “Sources in Chronicles” below.

⁸The title is genitive plural. Apparently one is to translate “[The book of] the Things Omitted.”

⁹This name is also used in the Ethiopic translation. Werner H. Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 160, points to a second possible understanding of this name. Since Chronicles was largely parallel to Samuel-Kings, he conjectures that it might at first have been left out of the Greek translation and only later included in it. Cf. Kim Strübind, *Tradition als Interpretation*, 10, who suggests that the books of Chronicles were first left out of the canon [!] and only later included in it.

Judah.” Cf. some manuscripts of the Peshitta.¹⁰ This is a third understanding of the purpose of Chronicles, which reflects the fact that Chronicles primarily focuses its narrative on Judah and only includes the history of the Northern Kingdom when it affects Judah. In many ways the name *Paraleipomena* is inappropriate since Chronicles not only includes “things that have been omitted” but it also “takes over” or “includes” a large amount of material from Samuel-Kings.

In the “prologus galeatus,” Jerome called the book “*Paralipomenon One and Two*” and noted that it touched on historical events omitted in the books of Kings and explained innumerable questions pertinent to the Gospel.¹¹ In the same work Jerome also called it a “Chronicle [*Chronicon* = χρονικόν] of All Divine History,” a fourth understanding of the purpose of Chronicles. Jerome identified it with a genre of historiography of his time, which gave a summary of past history arranged according to a chronological outline.¹² Chronicles begins with Adam, the first human according to Genesis, and continues until the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE. Unlike the *chronica* of Eusebius and Jerome himself, which synchronized sacred and secular history, the biblical “Chronicon” tells the story *coram deo*, as the relationship between God and God’s people. In the Vulgate translation the book is called *Liber I and II Paralipomenon*.

In his translation of the historical books, published in 1524, Martin Luther showed his indebtedness to Jerome’s Preface to his translation of Samuel and Kings by giving Chronicles the title Die Chronika.¹³ In 1535 Miles Coverdale, one of the early translators of the Bible into

¹⁰“The book of Chronicles, namely, the book remembering the days of the kings of Judah.” See the apparatus in Robert P. Gordon, *The Old Testament in Syriac: Chronicles*, 1.

¹¹*Prologus in libro Regum and Epist.* 53.8, as cited in Knoppers and Harvey, “Omitted and Remaining Matters,” 227, 232. Jerome, *Prologus in libro Regum in Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. B. Fischer et al. (3d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984), 365. **check.**

¹²Knoppers and Harvey, “Omitted and Remaining Matters,” 237.

¹³*Das erste Buch der Chronika; das andere Buch der Chronika.* Cf. Rudolph, III. Knoppers and Harvey, “Omitted and Remaining Matters,” 242. In modern German Bibles Chronicles is called *Das erste Buch der Chronik* and *Das zweite Buch der Chronik*. Strübind, *Tradition als Interpretation*, 10, says Luther called it “Chronica.”

English, followed Luther's lead and gave this book the name Chronicles for the first time in English.

Canonicity and Place in the Canon

The canonicity of Chronicles was apparently never disputed. According to the Talmud (Baba Bathra 14b), the order of books in the last part of the Kethubim is Daniel, Esther, Ezra (=Ezra-Nehemiah), Chronicles.¹⁴ This location is also reflected in Matt 23:35//Luke 11:51.¹⁵ Kalimi suggests that the Talmudic Sages may have wanted to contrast the climax of the Hebrew Canon (reporting the return to Zion and Jerusalem) with the Christian canon of the Old Testament, which put Malachi's prophecy (3:23-24 [4:5-6]) about the coming of Elijah the prophet as the preparation for the birth of Jesus at the climax of its canon. Roger Beckwith suggests that Chronicles was put at the end of the Bible because it recapitulates the whole biblical story.¹⁶ In Codex Leningradensis and the Aleppo Codex,¹⁷ however, Chronicles is the *first* book in the Writings. This location may represent chronological calculations since Chronicles begins with Adam, the first human being. McIvor, on the other hand, suggests that Chronicles was put before Psalms in these manuscripts since Chronicles, in which David plays such a major role, was considered an appropriate introduction to the Psalter, which was attributed to Davidic authorship.¹⁸ In the Septuagint the *Paraleipomena* appear after the four books of Reigns (= Samuel-Kings) and before 1 Esdras (εσδρας α) and the Greek translation of Ezra-Nehemiah (εσδρας β).

¹⁴See Isaac Kalimi, "History of Interpretation," 23-25.

¹⁵This passage refers to martyrs from Abel to Zechariah son of Barachiah. The first of these is a reference to Genesis 4; the second, apparently, to 2 Chr 24:20-21 although the patronymic "son of Barachiah" belongs to the later prophet Zechariah (Zech 1:1) rather than to Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. Thus these martyrs appear in the first and last books of the Bible. Cf. Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 115, 123, 127, and 220. But see also Lee McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon* (rev. ed.), 46-47, and James Sanders and Lee McDonald, *The Canon Debate*.

¹⁶Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*, 158.

¹⁷Curtis and Madsen, 2, note that this is the order followed in general also by Spanish codices.

¹⁸J. D. McIvor, *The Targum of Chronicles*, 13.

The Language of Chronicles

Older studies of the language of Chronicles provided lists of characteristic words that were common in Chronicles, with the occurrences of these terms in Ezra and Nehemiah also included in the listing,¹⁹ or they alleged significant Aramaic influence on the language of Chronicles.²⁰ S. R. Driver, for example, provided a list of forty-six words, syntactical usages, and prepositions that characterized the author's style, and that list was expanded to one hundred thirty-six by Curtis and Madsen.²¹ These lists remain valuable indices of the author's vocabulary and style, but their relevance to the question of the unity of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah is vigorously contested. The strong Aramaic influence on the language of Chronicles detected by Kropat had convinced him that Aramaic was the chief commercial and literary language of the time when Chronicles was written.²² Robert Polzin's Harvard dissertation effectively reversed this last judgment and found only three of nineteen grammatical/syntactical features of Chronicles to be the result of direct Aramaic influence.²³ Even in vocabulary, Polzin only found that fourteen of sixty-four words identified as Late Biblical Hebrew showed clear Aramaic influence.²⁴ Polzin

¹⁹S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913), 535-540; Curtis and Madsen, 27-36. The latter also make a harsh judgment about the language of the Chronicler, 27, speaking of his "slovenly and careless composition."

²⁰Arno Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik* (BZAW 16; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1909); cf. Curtis and Madsen, 27.

²¹They remark (p. 27): "The following list contains the more marked peculiarities of the Chronicler's writings, including new words and phrases, old ones with a new or unusual sense, and syntactical usages peculiar to him, and also all of these found frequently in other late books as well as occasionally in earlier writings, but which are particular favourites with the Chronicler, hence characteristic of his style."

²²As summarized in Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 14.

²³Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 69. This is in tension with pp. 61-69, where he lists six features under this category, and 159, where he mentions that five words meet this criterion. Apparently he concluded that only three of these features had been *directly* influenced by Aramaic usage.

²⁴*Late Biblical Hebrew*, 123-150, 160.

also presented a careful description of “Late Biblical Hebrew” which he divided into two main categories: a) the language of Chronicles, Ezra, and the non-Nehemiah Memoir parts of Nehemiah,²⁵ which is relatively free of archaisms; and b) the language of the Nehemiah Memoir,²⁶ Esther, and the Hebrew parts of Daniel, which is replete with deliberate archaisms.²⁷

In 1968, Sara Japhet noted that earlier scholars had not only concluded that Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah belonged to the same linguistic stratum, but they also believed that the language of these books bore the personal stamp of one author.²⁸ As they highlighted the similarity of the language in these books, these scholars tended to overlook or neglect the differences between them. Japhet’s article then presented cases of linguistic opposition, divergent use of specific technical terms, and divergent styles in the books of Chronicles on the one hand and Ezra-Nehemiah on the other. She concluded: “Our investigation of the differences between the two books...has proven that the books could not have been written or compiled by the same author.”²⁹ She added that study of other features of the books would support these conclusions.

The findings of this seminal study, which was the first blow in what would lead to a widespread rejection of the notion that the Chronicler’s History included Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, have now been called into question. David Talshir observed that there is no necessary linguistic opposition between the two books and the affinity between them in fact is extremely high.³⁰ Talshir noted that all of Japhet’s examples of the full and short imperfect consecutive forms in the first person from Ezra-Nehemiah³¹ occur only in the Nehemiah

²⁵Identified by him as Neh 7:6-12:26.

²⁶Identified by him as Neh 1:1-7:5 and 12:27-13:21.

²⁷Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 159.

²⁸“The Supposed Common Authorship,” 330-71. She mentions L. Zunz, “Dibre-Hayamin oder die Bücher der Chronik” in *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch Entwickelt* (Berlin: A. Asher, 1832), 13-36, and F. C. Movers, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die biblische Chronik* (Bonn: T. Habicht, 1834).

²⁹Japhet, “The Supposed Common Authorship,” 371.

³⁰David Talshir, “A Reinvestigation of the Linguistic Relationship,” 165-193.

³¹Chronicles regularly uses the full imperfect consecutive form in the first person and the short imperfect consecutive form in the second and third persons. Japhet, “The Supposed Common

Memoir, which everyone admits is of separate authorship. After a complete review of the evidence, Talshir concluded that there is complete symmetry between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah in all forms of the imperfect consecutive. Some of the differences in first person forms between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah detected by Japhet are only orthographic and should be attributed to different copyists instead of different authors.³² Japhet also noticed a difference in theophoric names, with Ezra-Nehemiah uniformly spelling these names with a final *-yā* while Chronicles prefers *-yāhū* but it also uses the shorter form *-yā*. Ezra-Nehemiah, however, is dealing with post-exilic history, where the short form of names was normal, while Chronicles tries to use the classical long form when dealing with pre-exilic history.

Talshir also criticizes Japhet's arguments about technical terms.³³ Chronicles uses קדש in the *hitpa el* more than טהר in the *hitpa el*, but קדש as a verb is not used at all in Ezra-Nehemiah and טהר only once (Ezra 6:20).³⁴ Hence there is almost nothing for comparison in Ezra-Nehemiah. In the terms for high priest, Chronicles prefers כהן הראש over הכהן הגדול, but הכהן הגדול does not appear at all in Ezra-Nehemiah (outside of the Nehemiah Memoir) and הכהן הראש does appear in Ezra 7:5. Talshir also sees no opposition between מהלקת (a division of the cultic personnel) and משמרת (a word connoting the fulfilment of a certain cultic role or the appointment to such a role). Word pairs, consequently, do not constitute proof for different authors.³⁵ The rest of Talshir's article attempts to show similarity in syntax (nine items; pp. 179-181), idioms and other expressions (thirty-two items; pp. 182-185), and vocabulary (twenty-one items; pp. 185-188) between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. While admitting that lack of linguistic

Authorship," 334-336, argued that the author of Ezra-Nehemiah used the full and short forms haphazardly in all three persons.

³²So already Frank Moore Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," 14.

³³"A Reinvestigation of the Linguistic Relationship," 176-179.

³⁴Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship," 342, refers also to Neh 12:30 and 13:22, but both are from the Nehemiah Memoir.

³⁵"A Reinvestigation of the Linguistic Relationship," 177. He dismisses the rest of the examples offered by Japhet because they do not show lexical opposition, but only reveal linguistic characteristics of the respective books. This criticism would also apply to the twenty-eight cases that Williamson discussed that supposedly show diversity of authorship (see below).

opposition is not proof of identical authorship, Talshir believes that the theory of single authorship would seem to deserve serious consideration in the future (193). Talshir's findings do much more to undercut Japhet's criticisms of the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, in my judgment, than to establish or prove unity of authorship. We will return to the question of the supposed unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah below.

H. G. M. Williamson addressed the question of similarities in style between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah in his doctoral dissertation.³⁶ Williamson identified criteria for determining unity of authorship on the basis of the lists in Driver and Curtis and Madsen. These criteria are:

1. A substantial number of words or stylistic peculiarities must be identified before common authorship can be supported.
2. These peculiarities must be identified from both Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. On the basis of this criterion, Williamson excludes forty-seven entries from the lists.
3. Any distribution of these peculiarities outside of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah suggests we are dealing with features of Late Biblical Hebrew and not with common authorship. On the basis of this criterion, Williamson excludes another twenty-seven entries from the list.
4. The words or expressions in question should be expressed in other literature of this same period in a different way.
5. Words that meet the above criteria should be checked to see if they are used with the same meaning in Chronicles and in Ezra-Nehemiah. Williamson finds that thirty-two of the words are inconclusive to the debate about unity³⁷ and that twenty-eight point to diversity of authorship.³⁸ That leaves six words that suggest unity of authorship and the best of these in his judgment is עַד לִּפְנֵי before a substantive³⁹ and the expression שְׂמֵחָה גְדוֹלָה "great joy." Williamson attempted to put the burden of the linguistic argument about the unity of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah on those who support this hypothesis (contrast Talshir above).

³⁶H. G. M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 39-59. Williamson brackets out the Nehemiah Memoir in this comparison.

³⁷*Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 45-52.

³⁸*Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 52-58.

³⁹Cf. also Talshir, "A Reinvestigation of the Linguistic Relationship," 184, and Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 69.

Polzin identified the following grammatical and/or syntactic features of the language of Chronicles:⁴⁰

A. Features not attributable to Aramaic influence

1. Radically reduced use of ׀ with pronominal suffix to express the direct object. Instead the Chronicler primarily uses object suffixes on verbs.
2. Increased use of ׀ before nouns in the nominative case (׀ emphatic; 1 Chr 2:9; 16:39).
3. Expression of possession by prospective pronominal suffix with a following noun (1 Chr 7:9), or ׀ plus a noun (2 Chr 31:18), or ׀ plus a noun.⁴¹
4. Collectives are construed as plurals almost without exception (1 Chr 13:4; 29:9).
5. The Chronicler exhibits a preference for plural forms of words and phrases which the earlier language uses in the singular (1 Chr 5:24; 12:30).
6. The infinitive absolute in immediate connection with a finite verb of the same stem is almost completely lacking (except for 1 Chr 4:10 and 2 Chr 28:19); the infinitive absolute used as a command is not found at all.
7. Less frequent use of ׀ and ׀ with the infinitive construct, and when one of these prepositions is used, it is often without some form of the verb ׀.
8. Repetition of a singular word for emphasis (1 Chr 28:14, 15).
9. The Chronicler shows a merging of the third feminine plural suffix with the third masculine plural suffix (1 Chr 23:22; 28:15).
10. The first person singular imperfect with final ׀ (lengthened imperfect or cohortative) is found only once in Chronicles (1 Chr 22:5).
11. The verb form ׀ greatly recedes in usage.⁴²

⁴⁰*Late Biblical Hebrew*, 28-69. The examples cited in parentheses are illustrative, not exhaustive.

⁴¹Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 39, cites only Song 3:7 ׀ ׀ ׀ “the litter of Solomon.” I do not believe this usage appears in Chronicles, but see 1 Chr 5:20 and 27:27 for ׀ used as a relative pronoun.

⁴²Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 56-58.

12. With cardinal numbers, the Chronicler prefers to place the substantive before the numeral and almost always puts the substantive in the plural (2 Chr 3:15; 4:6).

13. The Chronicler shows an increased use of the infinitive construct with לָ.

B. Features caused by Aramaic influence⁴³

1. The Chronicler often mentions the material that is being weighed followed by its weight or measure (1 Chr 22:14); older Hebrew has an appositional order: the weight or measure is followed by the material weighed or measured (2 Kgs 5:23).

2. *Lāmed* is used very often as the sign of the accusative (1 Chr 5:26).

3. With the preposition מִן, the final *nûn* is often not assimilated before a noun without an article.⁴⁴

4. The Chronicler uses the emphatic *lāmed* before the last element of a list (1 Chr 28:1; 29:6).

5. רַבִּים used attributively is placed twice in Chronicles before the substantive (1 Chr 28:5).⁴⁵

6. Use of עַד לִי before a substantive (1 Chr 4:39).

Polzin shows that items A. 2-9 and 11-13 and B. 1-2 are also true of the language of Ezra. In addition, Chronicles and Ezra have three additional linguistic features in common:⁴⁶

1. Reduced occurrence of the periphrastic conjugation (הִיהָ plus the active participle)

2. Reduced use of אֲנִי, the particle of entreaty.

3. Neither Chronicles or Ezra use the word מְדַרְעֵי.

Because of these fifteen features in common between the language of Chronicles and Ezra,

Polzin speaks of “an extremely strong case for similarity in authorship of Chr and Ezzr.”⁴⁷

Throntveit admits that Polzin has shown that Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah belong to

⁴³Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 61-69, seems to attribute only numbers 1, 2, and 3 to *direct* Aramaic influence. Number 5 is attested in Syriac, a dialect of Aramaic.

⁴⁴Fifty-one of the ninety-eight occurrences of this phenomenon in the Old Testament are in Chronicles.

⁴⁵Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 68, apparently construes Neh 9:28 as part of Chronicles, or at least of the Chronicler’s History.

⁴⁶*Late Biblical Hebrew*, 71.

⁴⁷*Late Biblical Hebrew*, 71.

the same literary stratum.⁴⁸ But on the basis of Williamson's criteria for determining common authorship,⁴⁹ he concludes that only two of the fifteen points of comparison Polzin makes between Chronicles and Ezra can be used to show identity of authorship. These are the lack of the infinitive absolute to articulate a command (A. 6) and the reduced use of the periphrastic conjugation. The first of these, of course, is an argument from silence. Throntveit suggests changing Polzin's conclusion to "an extremely strong case for similarity in *language*."

The result of this discussion about the language of Chronicles is that it is inconclusive in deciding whether Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah are one work or two.⁵⁰ But there is a general consensus that in syntax, grammar, and vocabulary the Books of Chronicles are fully a part of Late Biblical Hebrew. Willi⁵¹ and Welten⁵² have concluded that Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles are two works by the same author. If so, his later work (Chronicles) seems much less troubled by issues like intermarriage. While I consider this conclusion doubtful, both they and I are agreed that Chronicles is to be interpreted as a literary work in its own right and not part of a longer work consisting of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah.

Extent of the Chronicler's Work

Since the time of Zunz and Movers in the early nineteenth century (see note 28 above) and until quite recently, the overwhelming majority of scholars have believed that the Chronicler's History consisted of 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.⁵³ Within this consensus, of course, there were many scholars who held large parts of Chronicles to be secondary (see the

⁴⁸Mark A. Throntveit, "Linguistic Analysis and the Question of Authorship in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah," *VT* 32 (1982), 215.

⁴⁹*Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 39-40.

⁵⁰This is conceded by Gunneweg, *Ezra*, 26, in his own defense of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah as one work.

⁵¹*Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 180.

⁵²*Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern*, 199.

⁵³A notable exception was Adam C. Welch, *Post-exilic Judaism*, 186, and *The Work of the Chronicler*, 1. See also W. A. L. Elmslie, *The First and Second Book of Chronicles*, 345, 547 (1954). This reverses the position Elmslie had taken in *The Books of Chronicles*, xvi-xvii (1916). In his first commentary Elmslie dated Chronicles to the first half of the third century; in his second commentary he dated it to the latter half of the fifth century or a little later.

discussion of Unity below), and also many who believed that the Nehemiah Memoir and/or other parts of Ezra-Nehemiah were also secondary. Four kinds of evidence lay behind this consensus.

1. The linguistic identity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, but as we noted in the previous section, this argument has proved to be inconclusive one way or the other. 2. The overlap between 2 Chr 36:22-23 and Ezra 1:1-3a; 3. The witness of 1 Esdras; and 4. Agreement of the books in theology, purpose, and perspective. We shall review the last three arguments in the following paragraphs.

The overlap between 2 Chr 36:22-23 and Ezra 1:1-3a. These passages are nearly identical, with Chronicles breaking off abruptly after the words “and let him come up.” Ezra 1:3 continues: “to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and let him build the house of Yahweh the God of Israel. He is the God who is in Jerusalem.” This overlap implies that the story told in 1 and 2 Chronicles is continued in Ezra-Nehemiah. More important for our discussion, however, is whether this overlap indicates that at one time these books were part of a unified Chronicler’s History that included Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, as recently maintained in articles by Menahem Haran.⁵⁴ Haran argued that Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah were separated because they were too long for one scroll and that these overlapping verses served as catch-lines to indicate to the reader where the narrative continued. He adduced parallels to this procedure from Mesopotamia and the Greco-Roman world. While this conclusion is possible, it is not necessary, and the overlap could be understood in a more neutral sense, namely, that the history of Judah/Israel continues in Ezra-Nehemiah, without requiring unity of authorship between the works.

The content of 1 Esdras. This work, preserved only in Greek and daughter translations, is a valuable resource for the textual criticism of 2 Chronicles 35-36, as noted under Textual Criticism below. But its content has also been used to support the idea that Chronicles, Ezra, and at least part of Nehemiah were once a unity. 1 Esdras is a somewhat periphrastic translation of 2

⁵⁴Menahem Haran, “Book-Size and the Device of Catch-Lines in the biblical Canon,” *JJS* 36 (1985):1-11, and “Explaining the Identical Lines at the End of Chronicles and the Beginning of Ezra,” *BibRev* 2 (1986):18-20.

Chronicles 35-36; Ezra 1-10; and Neh 8:1-13a. Almost all scholars admit that the text of the book is fragmentary, at least at the end, since it breaks off in the middle of a sentence.⁵⁵ Is it also fragmentary at the beginning, since the narrative begins mid-course in the reign of Josiah, the account of whose reign begins in 2 Chr 34:1-33 in Chronicles? Or did the translation known as 1 Esdras once include (most of) the rest of 1 and 2 Chronicles? If that is so, and if Ezra 10 is followed directly by Nehemiah 8, the account of Ezra's reading of the law, does 1 Esdras represent a fragment of the translation of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah before the Nehemiah Memoir had been added to it?

Two issues tend to undercut this interpretation. An addition in 1 Esd 1:21-22 (23-24), following its translation of 2 Chr 35:19, warmly praises Josiah and perhaps hints that the author began his book with Josiah.⁵⁶ The second verse of this addition⁵⁷ seems to allude to 2 Kgs 23:15-20, the fulfilment of the prophecy about Josiah in 1 Kgs 13:1-3, with this consequence according to Talshir: "Josiah's actions were foretold long ago, in the early days, in the book that told the history of the sinners against the Lord (the sins of Jeroboam); and God's word had come true in Josiah's day."⁵⁸ The Chronicler himself thought that Josiah himself was responsible for his actions, not some ancient prophecy, and the contrast in 1 Esd 1:22 (23) between the piety of Josiah and his subjects also contrasts with 2 Chr 34:33.⁵⁹ The Chronicler also would not have delayed the consequence of the sinners' deeds to some later time, such as the time of Josiah, but these sins would have demanded an immediate impact on Judah's fate. Clearly 1 Esd 1: 22 (23) was not written by the Chronicler. While v. 22 (23) refers to the sins of others, it does not

⁵⁵This opinion, however, has been challenged by Arie van der Kooij, "On the Ending of the Book of 1 Esdras" in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Leuven, 1989* (SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 37-49.

⁵⁶Zipora Talshir, *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation*, 15-21. Talshir believes that this addition was first made in a Hebrew text of Chronicles and was not added by the translator himself.

⁵⁷"In ancient times the events of his reign have been recorded--concerning those who sinned and acted wickedly toward the Lord beyond any other people or kingdom, and how they grieved the Lord deeply, so that the words of the Lord fell upon Israel." NRSV

⁵⁸Talshir, *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation*, 17.

⁵⁹Zipora Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, 38.

connect these sins to the reign of Manasseh, as one might have expected from the account of 2 Kings. An addition in Chr LXX at this same point is a translation of 2 Kgs 23:24-27, a passage not included in Chronicles MT. This addition explains the continued anger of Yahweh during the time of Josiah as something provoked by the sins of Manasseh. Reflection on 1 Esd 1:21-22 (22-23) led Williamson, like Talshir, to conclude that 1 Esdras never included anything before the reign of Josiah,⁶⁰ although one might guess that 1 Esdras once started with the beginning of Josiah's reign in 2 Chronicles 34.⁶¹

Much more crucial to the whole argument is the probability that 1 Esd 9:37 is a translation of Neh 7:72 (73) and 1 Esd 9:38 is a translation of Neh 8:1a.⁶² Nehemiah 7:72b (73b) is usually construed as the introduction to Ezra's reading of the law in Nehemiah 8, while Neh 7:72a is taken as the conclusion of the list of returnees in Neh 7:5b-72a (73a). The verses preceding the list of returnees, Neh 7:1-5a, are from the Nehemiah Memoir and report Nehemiah's observations about the insufficient population of Jerusalem. Williamson concludes that the list of returnees was included in the Nehemiah Memoir and that Neh 7:72a (73a) forms a transition to the continuation of this document in Nehemiah 11, where lots are cast to bring ten percent of the people to Jerusalem.⁶³ The presence of a translation for Neh 7:72a in 1 Esdras indicates that the translator knew the present shape of Nehemiah 7 and 8 and that therefore one cannot conclude that he knew a text of Ezra-Nehemiah to which the Nehemiah Memoir had not yet been added. Talshir, who accepts the original unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, at least agrees with Williamson that one cannot conclude from 1 Esdras that Nehemiah 8 once followed directly after Ezra 10.⁶⁴ She believes that 1 Esdras omitted the story of Nehemiah in order to build the history of the restoration about the figures of Zerubbabel and Ezra. Williamson and

⁶⁰*Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 20.

⁶¹Arie van der Kooij, "Zur Frage des Anfangs des 1. Esrabuches," *ZAW* 103 (1991):239-252, argues that the present beginning of the book was also the original beginning.

⁶²See the comparison of the Greek of 1 Esdras with a Hebrew retroversion and the text of Neh 7:72 MT in Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, 484.

⁶³*Ezra, Nehemiah*, 267-269.

⁶⁴*1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation*, 34, 57.

Talshir have disproved that the text of 1 Esdras presupposes a Chronicler's History that still lacked the Nehemiah Memoir, and they have made it unlikely that 1 Esdras ever included any history before Josiah. For Williamson this takes 1 Esdras out of the proofs for an original history consisting of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah; for Talshir it does not.

Agreement in Theology, Purpose and Perspective between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah?⁶⁵ While no one would deny similarity in language and a focus on the cult in the two books, as well as a time of composition in the post-exilic period, Japhet, Williamson, and Braun have also pointed to theological or ideological distinctions between the two books that make common authorship unlikely. The principal pieces of evidence are the following:

A. Attitude toward mixed marriages. Ezra-Nehemiah is extremely critical of those who have intermarried. Ezra 9 refers to intermarriage with the peoples of the land (vv. 1-2), whose abhorrent practices are like those of the Hittites, Perizzites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians, and Amorites.⁶⁶ The peoples of the land are those who are not considered to be full members of the community, perhaps referring to those who had not been in exile and those who had not been fully accepted into the Golah community for other reasons.⁶⁷ The accusation of abhorrent practices might include the worship of other gods, sexual immorality, or following a detestable diet.⁶⁸ As a result of the criticism of intermarriage, more than one hundred men divorced their wives and sent their children away (Ezra 10:18-44). The problem of mixed marriages came up again during the tenure of Nehemiah, this time involving marriages with

⁶⁵This section is based on J. D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and his Purposes," *JBL* 94 (1975):201-217; Williamson, *Israel in the Book of Chronicles*, 60-70, and "Did the Author of Chronicles also Write the books of Ezra and Nehemiah?" *BibRev* 3 (1987):56-59; Roddy L. Braun, "Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah: theology and literary history" in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 52-64; Tamara Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 14-36; Japhet, "The Relationship between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah" in *Congress Volume: Leuven, 1989* (VTSup 43; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 298-313; De Vries, 8-10.

⁶⁶I follow the translation of JPS (cf. NIV). According to NRSV, these intermarriages were with the Hittites and other foreigners in the list of pre-Israelite inhabitants.

⁶⁷See Ralph W. Klein, "Ezra & Nehemiah," 733.

⁶⁸See Bezalel Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 249.

women of Ashdod, many of whose children spoke the language of Ashdod but not the language of Judah (Neh 13:23).⁶⁹ Nehemiah violently confronted those who had intermarried and forced them to take an oath not to give their daughters to the Ashdodite sons or take their daughters for their own sons (Neh 13:24-25). In Neh 13:26 Nehemiah refers to Solomon's sin on account of such women. Chronicles nowhere condemns mixed marriages and in fact does not include the indictment against Solomon's many marriages with foreign women in 1 Kings 11. Even more remarkably, the Chronicler reports a number of other marriages of Israelites with foreigners without ever issuing a word of rebuke: 1 Chr 2:3 Judah marries a Canaanite Bath-shua; 1 Chr 2:17 David's sister Abigail bore a son to Jether the Ishmaelite; 1 Chr 2:34-35 the Judahite Sheshan gave his daughter to his Egyptian slave; 1 Chr 4:17 the Judahite Mered married Bithiah daughter of Pharaoh; 1 Chr 7:14 Manasseh had a Aramean concubine; 1 Chr 8:8 the Benjaminite Shaharaim had sons in the country of Moab, presumably through a Moabite wife; 2 Chr 2:13 (14) Hiram sends Hiram-abi, the son of a Danite woman and a Tyrian father to work on the temple; 2 Sol 8:11 Solomon was married to Pharaoh's daughter; and 2 Chr 12:13 Rehoboam's mother was Naamah the Ammonite (she was the wife of Solomon). The hostile attitude toward intermarriage in Ezra-Nehemiah contrasts strikingly with the non-defensive attitude in Chronicles to such marriages. Ezra-Nehemiah seems to be dealing with a controversial contemporary issue; Chronicles is reporting events that happened more than five centuries earlier.

B. The early history of Israel. Chronicles focuses on the patriarch Jacob, whom it always refers to by the name Israel.⁷⁰ The name Israel is substituted for Abraham in 1 Chr 16:13a, and in the genealogy of at the beginning of the book, the beginning of the people as the elect of God seems not to occur with Abraham, but with Israel (1 Chr 2:1-2; chs. 2-8 give details of the descendants

⁶⁹I believe the mention of Ammon and Moab in this verse is secondary. See Klein, "Ezra & Nehemiah," 848. The references from Nehemiah are all from the Nehemiah Memoir and therefore are to be distinguished from the other parts of the Ezra-Nehemiah book.

⁷⁰There are two exceptions, in 1 Chr 16:13, 17, where the Chronicler is quoting from the Psalter (Ps 105:6, 10).

of the sons of Israel). In the Vorlage at 1 Kgs 3:8, the people are referred to as an entity that cannot be numbered or counted, using an expression that describes the descendants of Ishmael in Gen 16:10. When the Kings passage is incorporated in Chronicles (2 Chr 1:9), the people are said to be as numerous as the dust of the earth. The latter expression is used of Jacob/Israel in Gen 28:14. In Chronicles the Exodus tends to be downplayed or deemphasized. In Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple in the Chronicler's Vorlage, the king refers to the Exodus in 1 Kgs 8:21 and 53. In 1 Kgs 8:21, the king mentions the covenant Yahweh made with the ancestors when he brought them out of the land of Egypt. That becomes the covenant Yahweh made with the Israelites in 2 Chr 6:11. The Chronicler does not include 1 Kgs 8:53, but in 2 Chr 6:41-42 he includes a quotation from Psa 132:8-10 and 132:1, which contains a dynastic promise to David and report his efforts on behalf of the ark. The high role of Jacob/Israel does not occur in Ezra. Nehemiah bases his appeal to Yahweh on the basis of the Exodus (Neh 1:10), and the confession in Nehemiah 9 refers to the election of Abraham (vv. 7-8) and the Exodus and related events, included the conquest, are central to vv. 9-25.

C. The fall of the northern kingdom. Chronicles does not include the fall of the northern kingdom from 2 Kings 17 and presupposes that the north is inhabited by genuine Israelites after the Assyrian conquest (2 Chr 30:5-11, 18, 25). The only reference to the exile of northern tribes mentions only the two and one half Transjordanian tribes in 1 Chr 5:26 at the time of Tiglath-pileser. In Ezra, on the other hand, we find references to the resettlement of the land in the time of Esarhaddon (v. 2) and the time of Osnappar (v. 10; apparently a reference to Ashurbanipal). Zerubbabel sharply rejects the offer of the northerners connected to Esarhaddon to participate in the temple project (v. 3). The Chronicler, on the other hand, has a genuinely positive attitude toward the north. Six Judean kings have military and religious activities in the north: 2 Chr 15:8 Asa; 2 Chr 19:4 Jehoshaphat; 2 Chr 30:10-11 Hezekiah; 2 Chr 34:6, 21 (contrast 2 Kgs 22:13); 2 Chr 21:4 Jehoram; 2 Chr 28 Ahaz. After the division of the kingdom, priests and Levites from the north side with Rehoboam in Jerusalem, joined by representatives of all the tribes (2 Chr 11:16). Asa and Hezekiah make covenants with the people of the north (2 Chr 15:9-15; 31).

Northerners released Judean captives, whom they described as their kin (2 Chr 28:8, 11).

Monies for Josiah came from Ephraim, Manasseh, and the remnant of Israel (2 Chr 34:9).⁷¹

D. Immediate retribution. Chronicles is noted for its doctrine of retribution (see also below), in which a king, for example, is rewarded or punished for good deeds or errors within his own lifetime. There is virtually no trace of this doctrine in Ezra-Nehemiah, except in Ezra 9 (vv. 8, 9, and 15) and Nehemiah 9 (vv. 31, 33, and 36), where we have references to God's righteousness in inflicting punishment, punishment understood as servitude, and talk of a remnant. Gunneweg tries to downplay this difference by stating that while Chronicles uses retribution to support the fall of the northern kingdom and Judah, that justification was no longer necessary to repeat in the post-exilic community.⁷² In his opinion, Chronicles had used retribution to explain the fall of Jerusalem, but in Ezra-Nehemiah retribution only functions as a warning.⁷³ Japhet has noted, however, that retribution in Chronicles is not simply a response to the fall of Jerusalem, but that each and every event in Israel's history has to be explained in terms of the Chronicler's belief system, and that the Chronicler feels compelled to explain good as well as evil.⁷⁴

E. The Nethinim and the sons of Solomon's servants. These groups are mentioned throughout Ezra-Nehemiah, but they are absent in Chronicles except for an incidental mention of the Nethinim in 1 Chr 9:2, which is borrowed from Neh 11:3. The Chronicler considered the gatekeepers (1 Chr 9:17-18) and the singers (2 Chr 5:12) Levites while they have not attained this status in Ezra-Nehemiah (Neh 11:19; Ezra 7:24; 13:10).⁷⁵

F. Israel. In Chronicles Israel is described as made up of the twelve tribes and the Chronicler uses the term remnant to refer to those in the north, or in both kingdoms, after the fall of Samaria

⁷¹See Braun, "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude Toward the North," 59-62.

⁷²*Ezra*, 26.

⁷³A future falling away from God would lead to the destruction of the ransomed remnant as well (Ezra 9:14).

⁷⁴*Ideology*, 154-155, and see in general her discussion of guiding principles for divine action and retribution, 150-176.

⁷⁵See Sara Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship," 351-354. Nehemiah 11 is later than Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 since the singers are included among the Levites (vv. 15-17) although the gatekeepers have not yet attained Levitical status in this document (v. 19).

(cf. 2 Chr 30:6; 34:9, 21).⁷⁶ Ezra on the other hand distinguishes sharply between the “holy seed” and the other peoples of the lands (Ezra 9:2; cf. Ezra 3:3; 4:1-5), and Israel consists of Judah and Benjamin, the post-exilic community.⁷⁷

G. Greater emphasis on the Davidic monarchy in Chronicles. Chronicles is dominated by David and the covenant Yahweh made with him,⁷⁸ while David plays a minor role in Ezra-Nehemiah and no mention is made of the covenant with him.⁷⁹ Abijah’s sermon in 2 Chronicles 13 stresses the eternal character of the Davidic rule (cf. 1 Chr 12:39-40; 17:13-14; 22:9-10; and 28:6-7). Ezra-Nehemiah, on the other hand, insists on the importance of the Sinai covenant and the promise to Israel’s ancestors, and makes no reference to the Davidic ancestry of Zerubbabel (cf. 1 Chr 3:19; Hag 2:23). Scholars are divided on whether there is a messianic hope in Chronicles; there surely is not one in Ezra-Nehemiah.

These substantive differences in theology, purpose, and perspective have convinced me that Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah are separate works, each of which needs to be interpreted in its own right.

Unity of the Book of Chronicles

In the commentary on 1 Chronicles in this volume I have ascribed very few passages to a second hand, a trend already evident in the commentaries by Williamson, 12-15,⁸⁰ De Vries, 13,⁸¹ Japhet, 7, and Johnstone (1:22).⁸² This contrasts with the majority of commentators in the

⁷⁶See Williamson, *Israel in the Book of Chronicles*, 125-126.

⁷⁷Von Rad, *Geschichtsbild*, 24.

⁷⁸1 Chr 17:1-15; 2; 2 Chr 7:18; 13:5; 21:7; 23:3.

⁷⁹In Ezra 3:10 and Neh 12:24 reference is made to David’s liturgical instructions.

⁸⁰Williamson ascribes a few passages in chs. 15-16 (15:4, 11, 14; 16:6) ; 23:13b-14, 25-32; 24:1-19, 20-32; 25:7-31; 26:4-8, 12-18; 27:1-34, and a few isolated other passages to a pro-priestly redactor, who worked about a generation after the Chronicler himself. See H. G. M. Williamson, “The Origins of the Twenty-four Priestly Courses,” 251-268.

⁸¹De Vries provides a list of thirteen minor glosses and the following substantive expansions: 1 Chr 2:34-41, 42-50aa, 52-55; 6:35-38 [50-53]; 15:23-24; 23:24b-32; 24:1-19, 20-31; 25:7-31; 26:4-8, 12-18; 27:1-34; 2 Chr 24:5b-6; 29:25; 34:6-9, 11-16.

⁸²See already Myers, *I Chronicles*, lxiii.

twentieth century and with a number of recent European monographs as well. My approach is based in part on the general trend in much current scholarship, particularly in North America, to focus on the final form of the text in a synchronic fashion. It also results from my belief that the reasons given for considering passages secondary are often weak and ambivalent or flow from circular reasoning. Noth, for example, argued that the Chronicler did not put much emphasis on the Levites only after he had deleted most of the passages from 1 Chronicles that emphasize the Levites. Noth also deleted most of the genealogical information in chs. 2-8 because of his opinion that the Chronicler only included the material corresponding to Numbers 26 (and Genesis 46) in his genealogy of the twelve tribes. My reticence to identify secondary passages can be contrasted with a number of alternate conclusions outlined in the following paragraphs.

The commentary on 1 Chronicles by Rothstein and Hänel identified a number of redactions in Chronicles. The oldest redaction, Ch^P, was completed soon after 432 BCE, and reflected the fact that the Chronicler still used P as a separate literary entity. The person responsible for this redaction used the Vorlage of Samuel-Kings⁸³ and also the canonical Samuel-Kings. The redaction they called Ch^R was written about 400 BCE and relied on the completed version of the Hexateuch and the canonical version of Samuel-Kings. Rothstein and Hänel also referred to an earlier redaction of 1 Chr 15:1-16:3, which they called Ch^G and dated it to the time of Ezra. Between Ch^P (432 BCE) and Ch^R (400 BCE), they find a redaction Ch^M in chs. 15 and 22-27. In their opinion, there were numerous isolated additions after Ch^R.

In *Post-Exilic Judaism and The Work of the Chronicler*, Adam C. Welch posited two editions of Chronicles. The first author, who worked during the exile, about the time of Ezekiel, based his work on the Pentateuchal source D. This author may never have been in exile. Welch considered 1 Chronicles 1-9 as a later addition, as was any passage which shows influence from

⁸³Throughout this commentary I will be referring to the text of Samuel-Kings used by the Chronicler as his Vorlage (the manuscript of Samuel-Kings that lay before him). Rothstein and Hänel in this case are using this term to refer to an earlier historical account which was used by the author of Samuel-Kings in composing his work.

the Priestly source.⁸⁴ The reviser, who was active shortly after the exile, based his revisions on P and focused on questions about temple, personnel, and cult.

Martin Noth, who held to a single Chronicler as the author of the book, considered the following passages in 1 Chronicles⁸⁵ secondary: 1 Chr 12:1-23;⁸⁶ 12:24-41; 15:4-10, 16-24; 16:5-38,⁸⁷ 41-42; 22:17-19;⁸⁸ 23:3-27:34.⁸⁹ From the genealogies in 1 Chronicles 1-9 Noth retained *only* 1 Chr 1:1-2:5; 2:9-15;⁹⁰ 4:24; 5:3; 6:1-4 (16-19); 6:34-48 (49-53); 7:1, 12-13,⁹¹ 14-19 (in part); 7:20, 30; 8:1. His criterion for originality in chs. 2-8 was that the Chronicler originally included only such genealogical material as is found in Numbers 26 (paralleled in part in Genesis 46). He judged 1 Chr 9:1-34, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, secondary since Jerusalem is only captured later in the narrative. On the list of Gibeonites in 1 Chr 8:29-32//9:35-38, he remarked that the Chronicler had no reason to introduce this. He admits that part of the genealogy of Saul in 1 Chr 8:33-40//9:39-44 might have been included, but decides that the genealogy is traced down much too far and, besides, 1 Chr 7:12 shows that the Chronicler would only include the genealogy of Benjamin from Numbers 26.⁹²

⁸⁴It will be noted that this is directly opposite to the hypothesis of Rothstein and Hänel.

⁸⁵Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 36, found few additions in 2 Chronicles: 2 Chr 5:11bβ, and the mention of the singers in 2 Chr 5:12a and 13a, and perhaps in 2 Chr 8:14-15. He also found small additions in 2 Chr 23:18 and 35:15. The list of additions in Rudolph, 1-5, is remarkably similar to Noth for 1 Chronicles, but he finds significantly more secondary passages in 2 Chronicles. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 194-204, largely follows Noth and Rudolph in identifying secondary passages in 1 Chronicles, but he finds many more secondary cultically-oriented passages in 2 Chronicles. While he denies these passages came from a single "second Chronicler," he notes that many of them deal with cultic organization and were probably made at the turn from the third to the second century BCE.

⁸⁶This passage was added later than 1 Chr 12:24-41.

⁸⁷The psalm materials in vv. 7-36 were a more recent element within this addition.

⁸⁸Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 149, n. 2, was uncertain about 1 Chr 22:14-16.

⁸⁹Noth also believed the words "priests and Levites" in 1 Chr 23:2 were part of this expansion.

⁹⁰1 Chr 2:16-17 were an addition based on 2 Sam 2:18 and 17:25.

⁹¹Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 37, conjecturally reconstructed this text and then used the reconstruction as a template to determine which parts of the rest of the genealogies were original. See the discussion in the commentary.

⁹²Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerks*, 44, follows Noth on 1 Chr 23:(2b)-27:34 and also identifies some secondary passages in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29.

Galling identified two Chroniclers in his commentary in 1954, who had similar outlooks, but differed in their attitude toward their sources. The first Chronicler, ChrG, was anti-Samaritan and did his work around 300 BCE. The second Chronicler, about 200 BCE, included the Nehemiah Memoir in the Chronicler's history and interwove the careers of Ezra and Nehemiah. This second Chronicler added the lists of priests and Levites in chs. 23-27 and many other passages.⁹³

Frank Moore Cross⁹⁴ identified three stages in the redaction of Chronicles: Chr¹ includes a genealogical introduction, much of 1 Chronicles 10-2 Chronicles 34 and the Vorlage of 1 Esd 1:1-2:15; 5:1-62 (2 Chronicles 35-36; Ezra 1:1-3:13) and was designed to support the restoration of the kingdom under Zerubbabel during the late sixth century; Chr² includes a short version of the genealogical lore in 1 Chronicles 1-9 plus 1 Chronicles 10-2 Chronicles 34 and the Vorlage of 1 Esdras (2 Chronicles 35-36; Ezra 1-10; and Nehemiah 8) and was written after Ezra's mission in 458 BCE;⁹⁵ and Chr³ is the final form of the Chronicler's History, encompassing all of 1 and 2 Chronicles and Hebrew Ezra-Nehemiah, and was dated by Cross to ca. 400 BCE or shortly thereafter. Cross deals with large units and does not deal with redactional issues about individual passages. The ending for his Chr¹ is determined by his very early date for the Chronicler, and his identification of the passages in Chr² is the result of his decision that 1

⁹³For a critique of this position, see Welten, *Geschichte and Geschichtsdarstellungen*, 189-191. Many of the "topoi" studied by Welten in 2 Chronicles had been assigned to the second Chronicler by Galling. On 1 Chronicles, Galling assigned to the second Chronicler passages that Noth also considered secondary, but Galling assigned them to one revision while Noth interpreted them as independent additions at various times.

⁹⁴"A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," 11-14. Cf. Newsome, *JBL* 94 (1975):201-217 and David Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy* (SBLMS 23; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977), 57-60. His position is slightly revised to include some of the genealogical introduction in all three editions, as noted above, in *From Epic to Canon*, 165-169.

⁹⁵Cross believes that this recension included the story of the three pages (1 Esd 3:1-5:6), but that this story was later suppressed by the redactor responsible for Chr³. A number of recent studies, however, have indicated that 1 Esdras is a literary work in its own right and was built around the story of the three pages. See Steven L. McKenzie, "The Chronicler as Redactor" in *The Chronicler as Author*, 72-78; Talshir, *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation*, 3-109; and H. G. M. Williamson, "The Problem with 1 Esdras" in *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Mason* (ed. J. Barton and D. J. Reimer; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996), 201-216.

Esdras is a fragment of the original arrangement of the Chronicler's History that from the start included (parts of) Ezra, with Nehemiah following immediately after Ezra 10.⁹⁶

Date of Chronicles

Kai Peltonen⁹⁷ and Isaac Kalimi⁹⁸ have published recent articles on the date of the books of Chronicles, and the following discussion is dependent on their research. Decisions about the unity or lack of unity of Chronicles with Ezra-Nehemiah are crucial in this discussion, as are the questions about secondary passages in Chronicles itself.⁹⁹ During the time I have been working on Chronicles, scholars have proposed a wide array of dates for the composition of this work, from 520-515 BCE to the Maccabean era, ca. 160 BCE, thus ranging over three and one half centuries.¹⁰⁰ The narrative sections of Chronicles tell the story of the death of Saul, Israel's first king, and the subsequent history of the United and Judean monarchies, until the exile in 586 BCE. The last events reported in Chronicles are the seventy-year sabbath rest of the land (2 Chr 36:21)¹⁰¹ and the decree of Cyrus permitting Jews to return home from Mesopotamia and rebuild the temple in 539 BCE (2 Chr 36:22-23).¹⁰² There is unanimous agreement among recent

⁹⁶Cross's Chr¹ is dependent in part on an article by David Noel Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961):436-442.

⁹⁷Kai Peltonen, "The Date of Chronicles," 225-271. Peltonen also reviews the proposals of Joel Weinberg and Rainer Albertz, who attempted to connect the emphases in Chronicles to specific chronological settings (late fifth century and between 330 and 250 BCE respectively). But they offer no more clear evidence than will be surveyed below, and their recreation of the issues allegedly addressed by the Chronicler are equally unsure.

⁹⁸Isaac Kalimi, "Die Abfassungszeit der Chronik," 223-233. See also Isaac Kalimi, "Könnte die aramäische Grabinschrift aus Ägypten als Indikation für die Datierung der Chronikbücher fungieren?" *ZAW* 110 (1998):79-82. This inscription of Akabiah the son of Elioenai dates to the early third century. Akkub the son of Elioenai is mentioned in 1 Chr 3:24, but his brother Anani is mentioned in an Elephantine papyrus from the late 5th century.

⁹⁹These questions concern especially the genealogies and lists in 1 Chronicles 1-9, 12:1-23 (22); 23-27, and parts of chs. 15-16. See discussion of the unity of Chronicles in this introduction. If the genealogy of the descendants of Jehoiachin is part of the original edition, a date no earlier than ca. 400 BCE is possible.

¹⁰⁰Somewhat earlier, A. C. Welch, *The Work of the Chronicler*, 156, even made the time of the Chronicler contemporary with the programs of Ezekiel in the first half of the sixth century.

¹⁰¹The exile in fact lasted only from 586 to 538, or forty-eight years.

¹⁰²Zerubbabel, a leader in the early post-exilic community, is mentioned in 1 Chr 3:19.

scholars, therefore, that this is a post-exilic work, but the evidence for a more specific date within that period is thin and ambiguous. The author of Chronicles mentions no historical events after the genealogical reference to Zerubbabel (except for his descendants in 1 Chr 3:20-24),¹⁰³ and which religious, social, economic, or political conditions he is addressing with this massive book must be inferred indirectly from the issues emphasized in the book.

The description of David in the apocryphal book of Sirach (usually dated 200-180 BCE) seems to presuppose the Chronicler's depiction of David: "He [David] placed singers before the altar, to make sweet melody with their voices. He gave beauty to the festivals, and arranged their times throughout the year...." (47:9-10). Eupolemos, a Jewish historian who flourished about 150 BCE in Judea, seems to have known Chronicles in a Greek translation.¹⁰⁴ These witnesses set a *terminus ante quem* in the early second century BCE.

The earliest date in the current discussion, the late sixth century, is associated with Braun, xxix, Cross (Chr¹),¹⁰⁵ Dillard, xix, Freedman (515 BCE),¹⁰⁶ McKenzie,¹⁰⁷ Newsome (525-515 BCE),¹⁰⁸ Petersen,¹⁰⁹ Throntveit (527-527 BCE),¹¹⁰ and Willoughby.¹¹¹ Advocates of a third century date include Noth (300-200 BCE),¹¹² Pfeiffer (350-300),¹¹³ Smend,¹¹⁴ Strübind,¹¹⁵

¹⁰³This makes Chronicles distinctly different from Ezra-Nehemiah, which records the work of Ezra and Nehemiah in the fifth century. Some, who date Ezra to Artaxerxes II, would extend that date into the fourth century.

¹⁰⁴See Kalimi, "History of Interpretation," 14-17, and Ben Zvi, "The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period," *JSP* 3 (1988), 72-73, and notes 73-74, p. 84. The relevance of Sirach and Eupolemos has been recently challenged by Georg Steins, *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen*, 491-493. McKenzie, 15, claims that Chronicles is also cited or alluded to in 1 Maccabees (90 BCE), Daniel (ca. 165 BCE), and certain of the Dead Sea Scrolls (ca. 200 BCE).

¹⁰⁵Frank Moore Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," 4-18. The second and third editions identified by Cross were composed in 450 and 400 or a little later.

¹⁰⁶David Noel Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961):436-442.

¹⁰⁷Steven L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, 25-26.

¹⁰⁸J. D. Newsome, "Towards a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes," *JBL* 94 (1975):201-217.

¹⁰⁹David L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy*, 58.

¹¹⁰Mark A. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak*, 97-107.

¹¹¹B. E. Willoughby, "I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah" in *The Books of the Bible* (ed. B. W. Anderson; New York: Scribner's, 1989), 1:155-159.

¹¹²*The Chronicler's History*, 73., 83-87. Noth thought that Chronicles was written in reaction

Torrey (250 or a little later),¹¹⁶ and Welten (300-250 BCE),¹¹⁷ and a second century date is supported by Spinoza¹¹⁸ and Steins.¹¹⁹ Driver (shortly after 333 BCE)¹²⁰ and Wellhausen¹²¹ dated the book after the fall of Persia, and Willi placed it either toward the end of the Persian empire or at the beginning of the Hellenistic period.¹²² The date of 400 or a little later is chosen by Albright,¹²³ Myers, Rudolph (first decades of 4th century BCE), x, and Rothstein-Hänel.¹²⁴ Perhaps a majority of scholars, including myself, argue for a fourth century date: Allen, 301, first half of fourth century; Curtis and Madsen (close of the 4th century, ca. 300 BCE), 6; DeVries, 16, fourth century; Japhet, 23-28, Kleinig,¹²⁵ Oeming,¹²⁶ Rudolph, x, and Williamson, 16.

to the schism with the Samaritans although the decisive break with that community is now dated much later, to the last years of the second century BCE. See Frank Moore Cross, "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," *HTR* 59 (1966):201-211.

¹¹³Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper, 1948),

¹¹⁴Rudolph Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (ThW 1; 3rd ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984), 228.

¹¹⁵Kim Strübind, *Tradition als Interpretation*, 23-25, 200.

¹¹⁶*Ezra Studies*, 30, 35.

¹¹⁷Peter Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung*, 199-200.

¹¹⁸He dated it after the restoration of the temple by Judah the Maccabee; hence after 166 BCE. Spinoza thought that some pseudepigraphical books were better than Chronicles. See Isaac Kalimi, "History of Interpretation," 39.

¹¹⁹Georg Steins, *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen*, 491-499. Steins mentions an article by Ulrich Kellermann, "Anmerkungen zum Verständnis der Tora in den chronistischen Schriften," *BN* 42 (1988):49-92, which identifies striking agreements between the picture of cultic irregularities and cultic reforms in 1-2 Chronicles on the one hand and 1-2 Maccabees on the other. The only substantive difference between Chronicles and the later period is in the abolition of circumcision in 1 and 2 Maccabees. Kellermann himself dates Chronicles to the early third century. Steins argues that the Chronicler did not just anticipate the threat that became reality in the second century, but he was reacting to the challenges of the Maccabean period itself.

¹²⁰*An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 518.

¹²¹*Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 171.

¹²²See Kalimi, "Die Abfassungszeit der Chronik," 227. Galling dated the first edition of Chronicles to 300 and the second to 200.

¹²³William Foxwell Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," *JBL* 40 (1921), 119-121.

¹²⁴Rothstein-Hänel, lxi, date the original composition to 432 BCE, with the final form achieved by about 400.

¹²⁵J. W. Kleinig, *The Lord's Song*, 22.

¹²⁶Manfred Oeming, *Das wahre Israel*, 44-47.

The following evidence in Chronicles itself is usually brought into the discussion:

- The genealogy of the sons of Jehoiachin (1 Chr 3:17-24). The MT extends the genealogy after Zerubbabel, who flourished about 520 and may have been born about 575, for six generations, but the LXX extends his descendants to a full eleven generations. If one calculates twenty years to a generation,¹²⁷ the MT would imply a date in the late fifth century at the earliest; the LXX would extend the date to the early third century (see textual notes 33-37 to ch. 3 and the commentary to 1 Chronicles 3).¹²⁸ Supporters of a sixth century date argue that this genealogy was not part of the original edition of Chronicles.
- The reference to Persian coins, ten thousand darics, in 1 Chr 29:7. This coin was first minted by Darius I (522-486 BCE). This coin is back dated by the Chronicler to the reign of David, and it is felt that some time would have had to pass since its first appearance for the author to commit such an anachronism. Hence a date late in the fifth century for Chronicles would seem to be the earliest possible moment.¹²⁹
- The connection between Tadmor and Hamath-zobah in 2 Chr 8:3-4 seems to reflect the Persian provincial administration and would put the Chronicler in the Persian period (539-333 BCE).¹³⁰
- The Chronicler writes that the laments spoken about Josiah can be found in “the Lamentations” (הקִינֹת; 2 Chr 35:25)¹³¹ Japhet, 27, mentions that Lamentations had an influence on Chronicles and suggests, on p. 1040, that the reference to lamentations in 2 Chr 35:25 points to the biblical

¹²⁷The number twenty is only a very approximate round number and perhaps should be considerably higher. Kalimi, “Die Abfassungszeit der Chronik,” 230, lists proposals ranging from twenty to thirty years per generation. Kalimi himself chooses twenty-three or twenty-four, and dates the end of the genealogy to 382-376 BCE. The date of Zerubbabel’s birth is only an educated guess.

¹²⁸A papyrus from Elephantine in 407 BCE was sent to Bagohi, the governor of Yehud, Jehohanan the high priest, and Ostanes the brother of Anani, asking for permission to rebuild their destroyed temple in Egypt. Is this Anani the same as the last person named in 1 Chr 3:24?

¹²⁹Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*, 105-106, and Throntveit, *When Kings Speak*, 97-107, believe that this reference is part of a secondary addition to Chronicles.

¹³⁰See Williamson, 229-230.

¹³¹Japhet, 27, mentions the influence on Chronicles of the whole Pentateuch and of Zechariah and Lamentations. On p. 1043 she suggests that the book referred to as Laments is the biblical book by the same name.

book by the same name. But the biblical book is usually known by its first word אִיכָה. The word קִינָה does not appear in Lamentations.

- The seer Hanani seems to quote Zech 4:10 in his address to Asa (2 Chr 16:9). Zechariah flourished in the last quarter of the sixth century, and sufficient time would again need to pass for his work to be cited as an authoritative source.¹³²
- Two passages in Chronicles have been borrowed from Ezra-Nehemiah, namely, 1 Chr 9:2-17 (from Neh 11:3-19) and 2 Chr 36:22-23 (from Ezr 1:1-3a).¹³³ If Ezra-Nehemiah is dated to about 400 BCE, Chronicles would be somewhat later. While I believe that the first of these passages at least is a part of the original book of Chronicles, that is by no means a unanimous position, and the originality of 2 Chr 36:22-23 is also much debated. Japhet, 26-27, notes in general that the development of cultic institutions and personnel in Chronicles seems to be later than Ezra-Nehemiah. The singers in Chronicles are considered Levites, but that is not yet the case in Ezra 2:41//Neh 7:44. The gatekeepers are Levites in 1 Chr 9:18, but this is not yet the case in Ezra 2:42//Neh 7:45, nor even in Neh 11:19. Nehemiah 8 reports Ezra reading the book of the law of Moses as if it were a novel event, but Chronicles implies that this same book has always been at hand (De Vries, 17). The organization of the twenty-four priestly courses in 1 Chronicles 24¹³⁴ would again suggest a date (considerably) later than Ezra-Nehemiah, but the originality of this chapter in Chronicles itself is hotly debated.
- If the war machines mentioned in 2 Chr 26:15 are catapults, it might suggest a Hellenistic date for Chronicles since the catapult was first used about 400 BCE in Syracuse, but the Persians may have had a device for hurling large stones almost a century earlier than that.¹³⁵

¹³²Cf. also Zech 1:2-4 and 2 Chr 30:6-7, and Zech 8:10 and 2 Chr 15:5-6. McKenzie, 18, refers to allusions to Malachi in 2 Chr 30:6-9 and the influence of Lamentations on 2 Chronicles 30.

¹³³Allen, 300, believes that Ezra 9-10 is also reflected in 2 Chr 24:26. The conspirators who killed Joash according to the latter verse are made sons of Ammonite and Moabite women due to an association with names in Ezra 10:22-23, 27, 33, 43. See also M. P. Graham, "A Connection Proposed Between II Chr 24, 26 and Ezra 9-10," *ZAW* 97 (1985):256-258.

¹³⁴Cf. also the organization into twenty-four of the Levites, singers, and gatekeepers in chs. 23, 25, 26, but the originality of these chapters is also contested.

¹³⁵See especially Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung*, 98-114, for the argument based

▪ Linguistic evidence discussed earlier in this introduction supports a post-exilic date for Chronicles since the language of Chronicles is part of Late Biblical Hebrew.¹³⁶ But the present state of typological linguistic investigation does not allow a more specific identification of time within the post-exilic period. The lack of evidence for Greek influence or terminology might suggest a date before the time of Alexander.¹³⁷ The introduction to Daniel 2-6, composed some time before the Maccabean period, presupposes knowledge of 2 Chr 36:6b-7, not included in 2 Kgs 24:1. Daniel (1:1-2) refers to the vessels of the house of God that were taken by the Babylonians during the reign of Jehoiakim.¹³⁸ As noted above, the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach (= Ecclesiasticus), in 47:8-10, at the beginning of the second century BCE, hails David as the one who established singers and musical groups in the Jerusalem temple.¹³⁹

Other, external evidence is equally ambiguous. If the author of Chronicles was Ezra, as affirmed by the Talmud and supported in the twentieth century by W. F. Albright,¹⁴⁰ a more precise date might be achieved. But the date of Ezra himself is uncertain (did he come to Jerusalem in 458 BCE or 398 BCE?), and my discussion of the extent of the Chronicler's history has argued that Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah are quite separate works, and that Chronicles is

on the late invention of the catapult, and Williamson, 337-338, for the earlier evidence for the Persians hurling stones.

¹³⁶See especially Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*.

¹³⁷Cf. Peter R. Ackroyd, *The Age of the Chronicler* (Auckland: Commercial, 1970), 7-8. As Peltonen, "The Date of Chronicles," 238, admits, the degree of Persian impact on Chronicles is also quite meager. Japhet, 26, notes the small number of Persian words: גִּזְרֵי (1 Chr 28:11); פֶּרֶבֶר (1 Chr 26:18); and אֲדָרְכָן (1 Chr 29:7). She suggests that this might place the date of authorship just after the Persian period and before major Hellenistic influence. That is, in the last part of the fourth century. Gary N. Knoppers, "Classical Historiography and the Chronicler's History: A Reexamination," *JBL* (200?), believes that a number of features of the Chronicler's use of genealogies can best be explained by analogy to Greek historiography.

¹³⁸See Isaac Kalimi, "History of Interpretation," 9-10. For other citations in late Second Temple period literature, see Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period," *JTS* 3 (1988):59-88. Both authors note the relative inattention to Chronicles in Jewish sources. See the disparaging rabbinic references in Ben Zvi, 85, n. 86.

¹³⁹Cf. 1 Chr 15:16-21; 16:4-42; 25:1-31. See Kalimi, "History of Interpretation," 12, and Ben Zvi, "The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles," who claims, however, that this was a widespread tradition concerning David and therefore the dependence in this case is not conclusive.

¹⁴⁰William Foxwell Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," *JBL* 40 (1921):104-124.

likely written later than Ezra-Nehemiah. The author of Chronicles also knew the Pentateuch¹⁴¹ and the Deuteronomistic History in their more or less final form. The final form of the Deuteronomistic History is no earlier than 550 BCE, and the textual differences between the text of Samuel-Kings used by the Chronicler and the MT (see the discussion of textual criticism below) suggests that some time had passed since that mid sixth century date.¹⁴² The date of the composition of the Pentateuch is also highly contested, with a common opinion placing that date at about 400 BCE.

The working hypothesis which I follow is that Chronicles was composed in the first half of the fourth century 350 BCE, before the end of the Persian period and the arrival of Alexander the Great.

Author and Place

The author of Chronicles is anonymous, and his identity can only be clarified by his interests: the Davidic dynasty and especially its support of the temple in Jerusalem, its clergy, and its cult. His emphasis on the Levites has sometimes been taken as an indication of his own Levitical identity although that only seems to me only a possibility rather than a probability. But his deep knowledge of the temple, its ritual, and its clergy does suggest he was numbered among the temple personnel. He was certainly a resident of the post-exilic province of Yehud and probably of Jerusalem itself.

The Nature of the Work

Form criticism in biblical studies has often fared better with shorter genres, such as laments, miracle stories, prophetic oracles, or proverbs than with larger compositions, such as the Pentateuch or the New Testament Gospels. Attempts to define these larger works builds largely

¹⁴¹See William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition*, 133, n. 11; 194, n. 16. In both notes Schniedewind criticizes Judson R. Shaver, *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work* (BJS 196; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), who had argued that the Chronicler's law book was not the Pentateuch in its present form.

¹⁴²Steven L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, proposed that the first edition of Chronicles only used the first edition of Dtr (=Dtr¹, purportedly composed in pre-exilic times). But see the discussion and criticism of this theory under "Textual Criticism."

on deductions made from the texts themselves, from comparison with biblical works, or known extrabiblical documents.

In trying to understand the nature of the writing in 1 and 2 Chronicles a number of hypotheses have been put forth.¹⁴³ Wellhausen considered Chronicles “midrash,” a Jewish type of exegesis operating with far different presuppositions than modern critical exegesis. For Wellhausen, whose views here are tinged with an anti-Judaic spirit, the free way in which the Chronicler reinterpreted and reworked his sources destroyed the credibility of the work as a historical source for the pre-exilic period.

Thomas Willi, who is writing a major commentary on Chronicles in the *Biblischer Kommentar* series, classifies Chronicles as “interpretation” or “exegesis,” that is, it is an interpretation of significant parts of the Deuteronomistic History, which he believed was considered canonical at the time of the Chronicler. Kalimi raises seven criticisms of this point of view: 1. The books of Samuel and Kings were not considered canonical or at least not as immutable by the Chronicler; 2. the exegetical methods used by the rabbinic sages in their interpretation of the Pentateuch were not known by the Chronicler and attempts to find them in Chronicles are anachronistic; 3. The Chronicler’s main purpose was not exegesis--the Chronicler often included texts from Samuel-Kings without comment even though they bristled with difficulties, and about half of the material comes from no biblical source; 4. There are hundreds of literary, stylistic, and linguistic differences between Chronicles and its Vorlage that do not fall under the category of commentary; 5. The Chronicler omitted many texts from Samuel and Kings and rearranged others--the genre commentary does not explain this; 6. Most of the changes in Chronicles stem from his usage of earlier works, in which he saw difficulties or contradictions with other biblical passages, or he attempted to provide evaluations of his sources; and 7. The category of commentary totally negates the value of Chronicles as a source for the

¹⁴³I am especially indebted for the following discussion to Isaac Kalimi, “Was the Chronicler a Historian?” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 73-89. See also Kenneth G. Hoglund, “The Chronicler as Historian: A Comparativist Perspective” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 19-29.

pre-exilic period. Although much information in Chronicles is historically unreliable, the Chronicler also included texts with indispensable historical information.¹⁴⁴

Kalimi dismisses those who consider the Chronicler as a theologian although one might argue whether theologians necessarily write in the genre of contemporary systematic theologians or whether the Yahwist or Second Isaiah were not also theologians. The trouble with the classification of the Chronicler as theologian or his work as theological is that it does not clarify a great deal about how the Chronicler went about his task. The theological emphases underlined by Ackroyd in his brief commentary and in numerous other publications indicates the importance of theology in the agenda of the Chronicler.¹⁴⁵

Kalimi insists, finally, that the Chronicler is a historian: “The author deals with the past; he collects material from the earlier books and perhaps additional sources; he selects from the sources, evaluates, and interprets them; he makes connections between the sources; and above all, his work as a whole is imprinted with a unique ‘philosophy of history.’”¹⁴⁶ As a narrator of past events he deserves the title historian although what he writes is sacred rather than secular history. He articulates his view in the guise of speeches and prayers by leading figures. Kalimi considers the Chronicler a creative artist, who selects material suitable to his purposes from earlier sources and presents his account in a fresh style, in a new literary mode. The Chronicler is a different kind of historian than the Deuteronomistic Historian or nearly contemporary Greek historians, and dramatically different from post-Enlightenment historians as well. Every generation has its own kind of historian.

Hoglund attempts to explain some of the ways in which the Chronicler differs from the Deuteronomistic History by comparing him to ancient Greek works of historiography. He

¹⁴⁴Should Chronicles be considered under the category of “rewritten Bible”? Cf. Qumran and Josephus. Such works retell some portion of the Bible while interpreting it through paraphrase, elaboration, allusion to other texts, expansion, conflation, rearrangement, and other techniques.

¹⁴⁵See *Exile and Restoration* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968) and *The Chronicler in his Age* (JSOTSup 101; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

¹⁴⁶“Was the Chronicler a Historian?” 83.

compares the opening nine chapters of genealogy to the style of Acusilaus of Argo (early fifth century BCE), but one might suppose that the Chronicler and his audience were directly familiar with the sociological function of genealogies and so came independently to using them in a literary work.¹⁴⁷ Hoglund compares the role of the prophets in Chronicles to the “wise counsellors” in Greek histories, but there is a much more direct source for this point of view in the roles of prophets in the Deuteronomistic History or in the traditions of the so-called writing prophets. One of the most interesting parallels between Chronicles and Greek histories proposed by Hoglund is the use of large numbers to render military accounts credible, but while this is a possible source for this stylistic feature, it is hardly the only one conceivable. Hoglund finds a parallel to Greek histories in the way the Chronicler cites sources, but as we will see below, almost all of these citations are merely renaming of sources cited already in the Deuteronomistic History. The Chronicler and the Greek historians use speeches composed by the author, but that technique was employed already in the Deuteronomistic History. Hoglund also notes that both the Chronicler and the Greek historians borrowed earlier narratives without attribution. Every historian, without doubt, is indebted to the cultural influences of his or her day, and the Chronicler’s method of writing history reflects consciously and unconsciously literary and cultural conventions of the time, but I do not find the parallels with Greek histories distinctive enough to conclude that the Chronicler was actually acquainted with any of these histories.

Van Seters calls Chronicles revisionist historiography that functions as legitimation for the contemporary Jerusalem community and its institutions.¹⁴⁸ I would prefer to call Chronicles a work of historiography and of theology. While the primary biblical parallel is the Book of Kings, Chronicles also departs from that model and its theology especially in his incorporation

¹⁴⁷See Yigal Levin, “Who Was the Chronicler’s Audience? A Hint from his Genealogies,” *JBL* 122 (2003):229-245.

¹⁴⁸“The Chronicler’s Account of Solomon’s Temple-Building: A Continuity Theme” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 300.

of genealogies and other lists and in his efforts to legitimate the Jerusalem temple, its clergy, and its rituals. In his recent commentary, McKenzie calls it “a theological rewriting of Bible history for instructional purposes.”

Regardless of how we assess the genre of the work as a whole, the Chronicler used many smaller genres that can be more easily classified. These include narratives, speeches and prayers, lists, and genealogies.¹⁴⁹ The speeches and prayers incorporated by and presumably composed by the Chronicler include:¹⁵⁰ See also McKenzie 31-32.

For lists, see Japhet 40, Kegler-Augustin, 233-241, and McKenzie 32.

Speeches and Prayers¹⁵¹

A. By kings. Royal speeches appear with the following kings: David (1 Chr 13:2-3; 15:2, 12-13; 22:6-16; 22:17-19; 28:2-10; 28:20-21; and 29:1-5, 20; all without Vorlage in Dtr); Abijah 2 Chr 13:4-12; Asa 2 Chr 14:7; Jehoshaphat 2 Chr 19:6-7, 9-11; 20:20; Hezekiah 2 Chr 29:5-11, 31; 30:6-9; 32:7-8; Josiah 2 Chr 35:3-6. Mason has classified 1 Chr 13:2-3 as an “overture”; 2 Chr 13:4-12 and 30:6-9 as “calls to repentance”; 2 Chr 20:20 and 35:3-6 as “exhortations”; all the rest are seen as “encouragements for a task.”¹⁵² Throntveit has pointed out the structural role of 2 Chr 13:4-12 and 30:6-9 as an *inclusio* at the beginning of the divided monarchy (Abijah) and the resumption of the united monarchy under Hezekiah. He also notes that another *inclusio* involves the speeches dealing with the ark in 1 Chr 13:2-3 (David) and 2

¹⁴⁹See especially the commentary of De Vries who concentrates on form critical questions and Jürgen Kegler and Matthias Augustin, *Deutsche Synopse zum Chronistischen Geschichtswerk*, 22-63.

¹⁵⁰Nathan’s oracle in 1 Chronicles 17 is taken from 2 Samuel 7 and Solomon’s prayer in 2 Chronicles 6 from 1 Kings 8. For study of the Chronicler’s speeches, see Mark A. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak* and “The Chronicler’s Speeches and Historical Reconstruction” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 225-245; Rex Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, and Ehud Ben Zvi, “When the Foreign Monarch Speaks” in *The Chronicler as Author*, 209-228.

¹⁵¹See Mark A. Throntveit, “The Chronicler’s Speeches and Historical Reconstruction” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 225-245, and *When Kings Speak*; Otto Plöger, “Reden und Gebete im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk” in *Aus der Spätzeit des Alten Testaments: Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 50-66; R. Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*.

¹⁵²What about 1 Chr 29:1-5, 20? See Mason.

Chr 35:3-6 (Josiah). These speeches are only spoken by kings whom the Chronicler views favorably, or in the pious portion of the king's reign if the Chronicler has both positive and critical things to say about that king.

There are also six royal prayers: David 1 Chr 17:16-24//2 Sam 17:17-29; 1 Chr 29:10-19; Solomon 2 Chr 6:12-40//1 Kgs 8:22=53; Asa 2 Chr 14:10 (11); Jehoshaphat 20:5-12; Hezekiah 30:18-19. Hence two of the prayers are taken over from Dtr with some modification and four others are attributable to the Chronicler's hand. The prayers in 1 Chronicles 17 and 29 provide a frame around David's preparations for the building of the temple while the prayers of Asa and Jehoshaphat are prayers before a battle, with some ties to 2 Chr 6:34-35//1 Kgs 8. Hezekiah's intercessory prayer also shows a connection with 2 Chr 6:20.

B. Speeches by prophets. The Chronicler incorporated with some changes five prophetic speeches from the Dtr: Nathan 1 Chr 17:1-15//2 Sam 7:1-17; Gad 1 Chr 21:9-12//18; 2 Sam 24:11-13, 18; Shemaiah 2 Chr 11:2-4//1 Kgs 12:22-24; Micaiah 2 Chr 18:12-27//1 Kgs 22:13-28; and Huldah 2 Chr 34:22-28//2 Kgs 22:14-20. In addition, he included speeches for the following prophets that lack a Vorlage: Shemaiah the prophet¹⁵³ 2 Chr 12:5-8; Azariah (has Spirit of God)¹⁵⁴ 15:1-7; Hanani the seer (הַרְאֵה) 16:7-9; Jehu ben Hanani the seer (הַחִזֵּק) 19:2-3; Eliezer who acted as a prophet (הַתְּנַבֵּא) 20:37; a letter from Elijah the prophet, employing the messenger formula 21:12-15; Zechariah 24:20-22; the man of God 25:7-9; an anonymous prophet 25:15-16; Oded the prophet 28:9-11. Elijah is known from the book of Kings as a prophet to the Northern Kingdom and was taken to heaven before the reign of Jehoram. A Jehu ben Hanani was also active in the Northern Kingdom (1 Kgs 16:1, 7) about fifty years earlier

¹⁵³He uses the messenger formula (2 Chr 12:5), the word of Yahweh came to him (2 Chr 12:7).

¹⁵⁴The Spirit of God is connected also with Amasai (speeches by others below), Jahaziel (listed with the speeches by clergy below), and Zechariah (see later in this paragraph). Neco says that God, who was with him, commanded (אָמַר) him to hurry (speeches by others below). William M. Schniedewind, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Books of Chronicles" in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 222, suggests that these inspired messengers are the forerunners of the inspired text interpreters of Second Temple Judaism and that the Chronicler saw himself as such an inspired messenger who exhorts the people. The inspired messengers spoke primarily to the people while those designated as prophets spoke to the king.

than his namesake in Chronicles. The figure Shemiah gave one speech that was taken over from Dtr and one that was added by the Chronicler. The ten additional prophetic speeches all support the doctrine of retribution that is central to the Chronicler's message, and they all appear in the period of the Divided Monarchy (from Rehoboam to Ahaz). They promise blessing and reward for those who seek God and judgment and disaster for those who do not. They also issue calls for repentance and warnings¹⁵⁵ before judgment is imposed.

C. Speeches by clergy. There are only three¹⁵⁶ of these in Chronicles, all without Vorlage in DTR: Jahaziel the Levite¹⁵⁷ 2 Chr 20:14-17; Azariah the priest (2 Chr 26:17-18); and Azariah the high priest (2 Chr 31:10). Jahaziel offers an oracle of salvation in response to a national lament; Azariah and his priestly colleagues criticize Uzziah for taking over their prerogative with regard to incense; and Azariah pronounces a blessing on all who support the temple.

D. Speeches by others. These include: an address by Amasai, an army officer 1 Chr 12:19 (18); an address by Ephraimite leaders supporting Oded's prophecy 2 Chr 28:12-13; a speech by Neco, the Egyptian king, criticizing Josiah 2 Chr 35:21; and a decree by Cyrus the Persian king relating to the rebuilding of the temple and the return of the Jewish exiles 2 Chr 36:23.

¹⁵⁵For example the anonymous prophet and the man of God in 2 Chr 25:7-9, 15-16; Zechariah in 2 Chr 24:20-22.

¹⁵⁶We have classified Zechariah's speech in 2 Chr 24:20-22 as prophetic; it could also be included among the priestly speeches.

¹⁵⁷This is the only speech delivered by a Levite in the book of Chronicles. This fact alone would call into question the genre called "Levitical sermon" by Gerhard von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon in I & II Chronicles" in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 267-280. Von Rad included in this category: 1 Chr 28:2-10; 2 Chr 15:2-7; 16:7-9; 19:6ff; 20:15-17, 20; 25:7ff; 29:5-11; 30:6-9; 32;7-8a. In addition to the speech by the Levite Jehaziel, there are six speeches delivered by kings and three by prophets. Von Rad identified three parts in these sermons: a quotation of an ancient source, its application to a situation in the past, and an exhortation to faith and action. In fact, these speeches are neither levitical nor are they sermons. He believed that these sermons reflected standard levitical practices. See D. Mathias, "'Levitisches Predigt' und Deuteronomismus," *ZAW* 96 (1984):23-49; Braun, xxiv-xxv; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 257-259. check.

With the exception only of the last verse (2 Chr 36:23) all of the speeches and prayers in chronicles, that are not taken from the vorlage, are to be assigned to the Chronicler himself.

Chronicles and History

One of the most controversial aspects of the study of Chronicles since de Wette has been the question of the historical value of the Chronicler's account of the pre-exilic period. Two dissertations have explored this question at length.¹⁵⁸ There were two nineteenth-century challenges to the credibility of Chronicles as a source for reconstructing the history of the pre-exilic period: 1. the use of historical criticism by Wilhelm de Wette¹⁵⁹ and others, which emphasized the differences between the picture of pre-exilic history in Chronicles and Samuel-Kings; and 2. the hypothesis of an exilic or post-exilic date for P, which was brought to its classic expression by Julius Wellhausen.¹⁶⁰

Prior to de Wette, Chronicles was regarded as a reliable source for the pre-exilic history of Israel. De Wette rejected Chronicles for reconstruction of the pre-exilic period and denied that the Chronicler had been able to use non-canonical, lost sources. The history in Samuel-Kings was older and more original than that in Chronicles. The Chronicler had drastically altered the account in Samuel-Kings in a careless and even ignorant manner; his own biases were in favor of the Levites and the Judean cult. The Chronicler in fact favored Judah and hated Israel. Chronicles therefore had no use as a historical source. De Wette's position was supported by Wilhelm Gesenius¹⁶¹ and C. P. W. Gramberg.¹⁶² Many nineteenth century

¹⁵⁸Matt Patrick Graham, *The Utilization of 1 and 2 Chronicles in the Reconstruction of Israelite History*, and Kai Peltonen, *History Debated*. Peltonen's survey begins in the pre-critical period and continues until the present day. The following summary is dependent on the findings of Graham and Peltonen. See also Sara Japhet, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles: The History of the Problem and its Place in Biblical Research," *JSOT* 3 (1985):83-107.

¹⁵⁹W. M. L. de Wette, *Kritischer Versuch über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher der Chronik mit Hinsicht auf die Geschichte der Mosaischen Bücher und Gesetzgebung* (vol. 1 of *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1806).

¹⁶⁰Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*.

¹⁶¹*Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*. Leipzig: Friedrich Christian Wilhelm Vogel, 1815).

¹⁶²Carl Peter Wilhelm Gramberg, *Die Chronik nach ihrem geschichtlichen Charakter und ihrer Glaubwürdigkeit neu geprüft* (Halle: Eduard Anton, 1823).

scholars concluded on the basis of their research that Chronicles was dominated by theological biases and filled with inaccurate information. Those who replied to this challenge tried to vindicate the historical testimony of Chronicles and feared that the challenge to the historicity of Chronicles was at the same time a challenge to the Christian faith and the authority of Scripture. They attempted to show that adequate and accurate sources lay behind the narrative. F. K. Movers, for example, argued that the author of Chronicles used as sources the canonical books of Samuel-Kings and the royal annals of the two kingdoms, which, after undergoing two editions, were known as the “Midrash on the Book of Kings.” He concluded that these two sources were in essential agreement. Movers talked about the didactic and parenetic character of Chronicles, but was not willing to relativize its historical value.¹⁶³ C. F. Keil, a proponent of confessional orthodoxy, denied that the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings but proposed that he was dependent instead on a source called “The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah.”¹⁶⁴ Other scholars, such as J. G. Dahler, tried to harmonize the accounts of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles and thought Chronicles was completely historical.¹⁶⁵ In his *History of Israel*,¹⁶⁶ Heinrich Ewald represented a mediating position, a compromise between the positions of de Wette and Keil.¹⁶⁷

In the mid-nineteenth century a number of scholars¹⁶⁸ argued that the source document P in the Pentateuch dated from exilic or post-exilic times, replacing the former idea that P was one of the earliest sources, and this was accompanied by a rejection of the historical accuracy of P.

¹⁶³Franz Karl Movers, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die biblische Chronik* (Bonn: T. Habicht, 1834).

¹⁶⁴*Apologetischer Versuch über die Bücher der Chronik and über die Integrität des Buches Esra* (Berlin: Ludwig Oehmigke, 1833). See also his commentary.

¹⁶⁵*De librorum Paralipomenon auctoritate atque fide historica disputat* (Argentorati: Johannis Henrici Heitz, 1819). Argentorati = Leipzig?

¹⁶⁶*Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus* (7 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1843-1852).

¹⁶⁷Ernst Bertheau, who was a student of Ewald, published the first historical critical commentary on Chronicles in 1854. He felt it was possible to find in Chronicles a wealth of reliable historical information about ancient Israel.

¹⁶⁸Eduard Reuss, Wilhelm Vatke, K. H. Graf, Abraham Kuenen, John William Colenso, and Julius Wellhausen.

When the similarities between P and Chronicles were noted, it was also concluded that Chronicles did not offer a reliable witness to Israel's pre-exilic history. Wellhausen believed that Chronicles was composed three hundred years after Samuel-Kings, and that the additional materials in Chronicles were in accord with P and presupposed the completed Pentateuch. He traced the alterations and additions of Chronicles to the same fountain-head--the Judaizing of the past, a rewriting of history so that it became congruent with the Priestly Code.¹⁶⁹ The only historical value of Chronicles was thought to stem from an analysis of its theological agenda, which would help reconstruct the beliefs and institutions for the post-exilic Jewish community. Wellhausen thus emphatically rejected the mediating position of his teacher Ewald. Attempts by Archibald H. Sayce¹⁷⁰ and others to bolster the credibility of Chronicles and its sources by an appeal to archaeology were met with sharp criticism by S. R. Driver.¹⁷¹ The most prominent advocate in the twentieth century for the historicity of Chronicles on the basis of archaeology was William Foxwell Albright. In his judgment archaeology had confirmed numerous details in the genealogies, the Davidic origin of the guilds of temple singers, data relating to military campaigns and building projects, and the report of Jehoshaphat's judicial reform.¹⁷² Albright's position was followed by John Bright in writing the history of Israel.¹⁷³ A diametrically opposite

¹⁶⁹Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 223.

¹⁷⁰See *The "Higher Criticism" and the Verdict of the Monuments* (London: SPCK, 1894); "Archaeology v. Old Testament Criticism," *The Contemporary Review* 68 (1895):477-484; *The Early History of the Hebrews* (New York: Macmillan, 1897); *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies* (3rd ed.; New York: , 1904).

¹⁷¹"Hebrew Authority" in *Authority and Archeology* (ed. D. G. Hogarth; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), 1-152. Peltonen, *History Debated*, 2:479, remarks: "Sayce and those who accepted his position were guilty of neglecting the methodological questions concerning the applicability of archaeology to the study of the literary remains of ancient Israel, of underestimating the problems raised by 'higher criticism', and of playing down or even completely obscuring the new questions evoked by archeology."

¹⁷²See "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat" in *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 61-82; *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (4th ed.; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), 125-129; and "A Votive Stele Erected by Ben Hadad I of Damascus to the God Melcarth," *BASOR* 87 (1942):23-29. Albright reaffirmed this position at many points throughout his writings. In "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," *JBL* 40 (1921), 105, however, Albright had concluded that the Chronicler "shows a total lack of historical sense in dealing with the pre-exilic age."

¹⁷³John Bright, *A History of Israel* (3d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 229-230 and note

position was taken by Robert North.¹⁷⁴

C. C. Torrey believed that Chronicles was nothing but religious fiction and that as a historian, the Chronicler is completely untrustworthy. The source citations in Chronicles were only literary adornments to give the work authority. It needs to be added, however, that Torrey's primary focus was on the book of Ezra.¹⁷⁵ Gerhard von Rad conceded that the Chronicler wrote history according to his own biases and the religious circumstances of his day, but Von Rad was primarily interested in the theological view of history in Chronicles.¹⁷⁶ While most scholars followed Wellhausen in saying that the Chronicler based himself on the Priestly source, Von Rad believed that the Chronicler used the completed Pentateuch and there was more evidence for him being influenced by Deuteronomic rather than Priestly theology. The Chronicler's Levitical ark theology, in Von Rad's opinion, was in considerable tension with the Aaronic tabernacle theology of P.

In 1943, Martin Noth¹⁷⁷ dated the Chronicler to Ptolemaic times and believed that what determined the outlook and theology of Chronicles was its critical attitude toward the Samaritan cult community. Because he considered most of the genealogies and lists to be secondary, Noth did not believe the Chronicler had a primary interest in promoting Levitical claims. In citing sources, the Chronicler was merely imitating his Vorlage in the Deuteronomistic History and hence these citations had no historical value. Noth admitted that on at least two occasions Chronicles contained information that must have come from pre-exilic sources: 2 Chr 32:30, report of Hezekiah's water tunnel, and 2 Chr 35:20-24, the last battle and death of Josiah. Note the reference to Carchemish in v. 20, where Neco was going to try to prop up the remnant of the

3. Cf. also the commentaries by Myers and H. Neil Richardson, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles," *JBR* 26 (1958):9-12.

¹⁷⁴"Does Archaeology Prove Chronicles Sources?" in *A Light Unto my Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973), 375-401.

¹⁷⁵*The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (BZAW 2; Giessen, 1896). See also his collected essays, *Ezra Studies* (New York: KTAV, 1970 [1910]).

¹⁷⁶See *Das Geschichtsbild*.

¹⁷⁷*The Chronicler's History*.

Assyrian Empire as a buffer against the Babylonians. Noth also placed historical value in the reports of fortification projects¹⁷⁸ and some of his war accounts.¹⁷⁹ Noth devoted more space in his monograph to the form of the Chronicler's work, its traditio-historical nature, and its theological ideas than to its use as a historical source.¹⁸⁰

Peter Welten also found only a few notices from pre-exilic times in Chronicles.¹⁸¹ But Welten concluded, on the other hand, that the so-called *topoi* dealing with fortresses and buildings,¹⁸² makeup of the army,¹⁸³ and war reports¹⁸⁴ were creations of the Chronicler and reflected the circumstances of his own time and place. They were fictitious except for the few passages listed in note 174. In 2 Chronicles 10-36, to which Welten's study was restricted, old material in addition to Samuel-Kings plays a subordinate role. The net result of the work of Noth and Welten is that Chronicles is considered by them as an essentially useless work in reconstructing Israel's pre-exilic history.¹⁸⁵

Some of the most controversial questions about pre-exilic history are in 2 Chronicles, and so we will need to address this issue again in the second volume of this commentary. The issues regarding history in 1 Chronicles are themselves less controverted.

Recent commentators (e.g. Williamson, Johnstone, Japhet) have recognized that in the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 2-8 there is much authentic information about the various tribes of Israel, though this information is fragmentary, sometimes broken, of unequal extent for the tribes, and often almost impossible to date to a given century. Passages like 1 Chronicles 9 and

¹⁷⁸2 Chr 11:5b-10a, 26:9; 26:15a; and 33:14a.

¹⁷⁹2 Chr 13:3-20; 14:8-14; 26:6-8a; 27:5; and 28:18. In the first two cases the Chronicler had extensively rewritten his source materials.

¹⁸⁰Peltonen, *History Debated*, 2:652.

¹⁸¹*Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung*. He considered historical 2 Chr 11:5b, 6a-10a, 26:6a and 10; 32:30a. He also found notions from pre-exilic times in 2 Chr 11:22-23 and 21:1-4.

¹⁸²2 Chr 11:5-12; 14:5-6; 17:12-13; 26:9-10; 27:3-4; 32:5-6a; 33:14. Cf. 1 Chr 11:8-9 and 2 Chr 8:1-6.

¹⁸³2 Chr 14:7; 17:14-19; 26:11-15; 2 Chr 25:5; 1 Chr 27:1-15.

¹⁸⁴2 Chr 13:3-20; 14:8-14; 20:1-30; 26:6-8; 27:5-6.

¹⁸⁵Cf. Peltonen, *History Debated*, 2:662.

11 are in part borrowed from or dependent upon earlier passages such as Neh 11:1-19 and 2 Sam 23.

It is also recognized today that the Chronicler sometimes rearranged the order of his material for theological or ideological reasons. David's first action, after his coronation in Chronicles, is an attempt to bring the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chr 13:1-14//2 Sam 6:1-3, 5-11) and this account is followed by notices about Hiram's support (1 Chr 14:1-2//2 Sam 5:11-12), David's wives and children (1 Chr 14:3-7//2 Sam 5:13-16), and his wars with the Philistines (1 Chr 14:8-16//2 Sam 5:17-25). The Chronicler's literary purposes, not different information about history, led to this shifting of events.

The listing of the various ranks of clergy in chs. 23-26, regardless of whether these chapters are original or secondary to the book, represents authentic, but post-exilic data. Almost all scholars would recognize that crediting David with these appointments is anachronistic. The enormous numbers dealing with David's donations for the temple are recognized as hyperbole,¹⁸⁶ and the report of the extensive temple preparations done by David is also seen as part of the Chronicler's theological emphasis rather than historical fact. The list of twelve supervisors over the king's property in 1 Chr 27:25-31 and the seven advisors to David in 1 Chr 27:32-34 may be authentic material from the time of David.¹⁸⁷ Perhaps the materials in ch. 12, not paralleled in the Deuteronomistic History, have some authentic historical information, but the large numbers, indicating that the most distant tribes were the most loyal to David, seems clearly to have arisen as part of the Chronicler's message. The identification of Gibeon as the place where the tabernacle was located until the time of Solomon is probably related to the Chronicler's attempt to explain why Solomon went to worship at the Gibeonite high place and not to historical memory. Other items from 1 Chronicles with potential implications for reconstruction of the history of Israel will be examined in the commentary itself.

¹⁸⁶See Ralph W. Klein, "How Many in a Thousand?" 270-282.

¹⁸⁷For 1 Chr 27:16-22, see the commentary.

Textual Criticism¹⁸⁸

Two aspects of the discipline of textual criticism have importance for a commentator on Chronicles. The first is the establishment of the best text of 1 and 2 Chronicles itself, based on the ancient versions, especially the LXX, ancient Hebrew manuscripts, and, rarely, conjectural emendation of the text. The text of no book of the Bible is preserved perfectly, and all books must be corrected. In general, Chr MT is fairly well preserved,¹⁸⁹ surely in a way much superior to the books of Samuel, but our translations for every chapter are annotated with multiple textual notes that attempt to apply standard text critical principles to the Hebrew text of Chronicles. But a second aspect of textual criticism is of equal or even greater importance in Chronicles since it has become clear that the Vorlage used by the Chronicler, especially in the Books of Samuel,¹⁹⁰ was often different from the Masoretic Text. Hence before one ascribes a change noted in Chronicles to the Chronicler, one needs to determine as far as possible whether a reading now in Chronicles may once have been in the Samuel textual tradition, as witnessed by LXX, LXX^L, Qumran manuscripts, Josephus, or other witnesses.¹⁹¹ If the reading of Chronicles is found in one of the Samuel textual traditions, it is obviously not a change made by the Chronicler. Present resources and methodologies, of course, do not allow us to reconstruct perfectly the Vorlage of the Chronicler, that is, the text of Samuel and Kings that lay before the Chronicler. Commentators on the books of Samuel and Kings, in turn, often have to evaluate the readings in

¹⁸⁸On the present state of Old Testament textual criticism, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

¹⁸⁹Curtis and Madsen, 36; Rudolph, iv. On the spelling of the numerous names in Chronicles, there is much uncertainty both in MT and in the versions.

¹⁹⁰I restrict the discussion primarily to Samuel since Kings does not serve as a Vorlage in 1 Chronicles except for a couple verses in 1 Chronicles 29. I plan to address the text critical relationship of the Kings Vorlage in the second volume of this commentary. Steven L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, 155, concluded that observations about the Chronicler's Vorlage in Samuel do not apply to his Vorlage in Kings.

¹⁹¹In 1 Chr 8:33-34 and 9:39-40, without Vorlage in the Dtr, the Chronicler retains the older forms of the names Esh-baal and Meri(b)-baal, a son and a grandson of Saul, whose names when they do appear in Samuel MT are spelled polemically as Ish-bosheth (2 Sam 2:8) and Mephibosheth (2 Sam 4:4-21:7).

Chronicles as they study the textual history of Samuel and Kings.¹⁹²

A. The Witnesses to the text of Chronicles

1. The Dead Sea Scrolls

Only two small fragments of the Books of Chronicles (4Q118) were discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, containing portions of the text of 2 Chr 28:27-29:3.¹⁹³ The fact that Chronicles was included in the “library” of the biblical books of the Qumran community is important in its own right. The fragments have been dated for paleographic reasons to 50-25 BCE. The first fragment only has one complete word in it, which does not correspond to any reading in Chr MT or LXX. The second fragment has three minor variants: בן אהז for בנו in 2 Chr 28:17; איבה for אביה in 2 Chr 29:1; and ויהוא for יהוא in 2 Chr 29:3. They will be discussed in the translations to those passages. Because of the brevity of these fragments, they contribute little to the understanding of the text of Chronicles.

2. The Septuagint

While I will refer to the Greek translation of Chronicles in the commentary as LXX or Chr LXX, this work is called *παραλειπομενων* “Paraleipomena” in Greek manuscripts and in scholarly literature.¹⁹⁴ As with most books in the Old Testament, the LXX is the most significant of the ancient versions for the textual criticism of Chronicles. Leslie Allen has made a thorough study of this translation in his dissertation and his findings will be followed in this introductory

¹⁹²See for example, S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* and P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *I Samuel and II Samuel*.

¹⁹³Julio Trebolle Barrera, “4QChr” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI. Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD 16; ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 295-297.

¹⁹⁴The Vulgate, as noted above, calls these books *Paralipomenon I and II*.

material.¹⁹⁵ Allen concluded that Chr LXX was translated in Egypt, probably in the second century BCE.¹⁹⁶ This decision was made in explicit criticism of C. C. Torrey, who had earlier argued that the translator of Chronicles was Theodotion from the second century CE.¹⁹⁷ Allen considered Chr LXX and the translation of Ezra and Nehemiah called *Esdras β* as separate translations, and he recognized the vast difference between Chr LXX and those parts of Chronicles, 2 Chronicles 35-36, that are included in the Greek translation known as *I Esdras* (*Esdras α*).

Allen identified four groups of manuscripts among the forty-six manuscripts of Chr LXX that were available to him. These groups are:

L or Lucianic manuscripts: b and e₂. These manuscripts are sometimes matched by minuscules fjk, giny¹⁹⁸, and 350, and sporadically by other manuscripts and the Armenian daughter translation. The Bohairic and Ethiopic have close affinity with L, and this group has close links with Theodoret. L exhibits the usual characteristics of the Lucianic recension¹⁹⁹ and gives the impression of being most carefully corrected to MT.²⁰⁰ Manuscripts of the G group (see below) provide the type of text which underlies this revision.

¹⁹⁵Leslie C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles*. Allen insists (1:26-31, 175-218) that Chr LXX and the translator's Hebrew Vorlage have absorbed contamination from parallel texts in Samuel-Kings. In this he follows in part Gillis Gerleman (*Studies in the Septuagint II. Chronicles* [Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946] and *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament* [Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1948]) and differs from Martin Rehm (*Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* [ATA 13, 3; 1937]) and James Donald Shenkel ("A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I-II Reigns," *HTR* 62 [1969]:63-85), who argued that the translator of Chronicles had used and thus revised the Greek text of Samuel and Kings in making his own translation.

¹⁹⁶*The Greek Chronicles*, 1:23. See also Isaac Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten*, 12-13, n. 44. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 3-45, also argued for a second century date because of its use by Eupolemos.

¹⁹⁷Torrey's views can be found conveniently in his collected essays, Charles C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 66-81. Cf. Curtis and Madsen, 38-40.

¹⁹⁸"y" is a member of this group until 1 Chr 11:4. At v. 5 it joins group O.

¹⁹⁹It adds names and replaces pronouns by names; substitutes synonyms, indulges in neo-Atticisms. Cf. *The Greek Chronicles*, 1:67.

²⁰⁰Allen, *The Greek Chronicles*, 1:73, identifies seventeen cases where Josephus cites a text that must be called proto-Lucian.

R: Manuscripts d p q t z. Sometimes allied to this group are manuscripts 44, 68, 74, 122, 125, 144, 236, 246, 314, 321, 346, 610, and manuscript j in 1 Chronicles. Also allied to this group from time to time are manuscripts f i m n y and c₂. L and R have been corrected independently to MT.

O or Hexaplaric manuscripts: AN aceghn Armenian, and the Syro Hexaplaric recension. Cf. also from time to time mss b f i j m o y 46, 381, 728. This group attempts to improve the rugged style of the Greek and make corrections toward the MT.²⁰¹ This group is ultimately based on the text type known as G.

G: B and c₂, except for the last six chapters of 2 Chronicles, where c₂ is allied with R. At times MSS A N f g h i j and m join this group. O, L, and R are revisions of a Greek Vorlage most like G. The Old Latin depends on another revised text form, like L and R, but the basic text form seems again to be group G.²⁰²

Allen notes that the translator of Chr LXX sometimes borrowed vocabulary and cultic details from the LXX of the Pentateuch. He also concluded that Chr LXX is not to be identified with the *kaige* recension since it violates ten of the nineteen characteristics of that recension, complies with only four of those characteristics, and has a nodding acquaintance with four more. Therefore it has nothing in common with a systematic revision like *kaige*. Allen rejects Shenkel's proposal that the translator used an earlier recension of the LXX of Samuel and Kings in making his translation of Chronicles.²⁰³ Allen is convinced that Chr LXX and the translator's Hebrew text have absorbed varying amount of contamination from parallel texts in Samuel and Kings.²⁰⁴ Behind the intensive Greek corruption and the idiosyncracies of the translation lies a

²⁰¹Torrey had claimed that A and related MSS had the oldest form of the text. See *The Greek Chronicles*, 1:87.

²⁰²*The Greek Chronicles*, 1:107. On p. 108, Allen lists verses where the Old Latin throws valuable light on the history of the Greek text. For the text of the Old Latin of 2 Chronicles, see R. Weber, *Les anciennes versions Latines du deuxième livre des Paralipomène* (Rome: 1945). Old Latin readings are also supplied in the apparatus to the Cambridge Septuagint. Does the Old Latin for 1 Chronicles exist?

²⁰³*The Greek Chronicles*, 2:182.

²⁰⁴*The Greek Chronicles*, 1:217.

Hebrew text which may in very many cases be easily related to MT, or, rather, it is a valuable witness to the state of the text of Chronicles in second century BCE Egypt.²⁰⁵ The translation shows thirty-six alignments with the Qere and sixteen with the Kethib. Vowel letters were much less frequent in the Vorlage of the LXX than in MT.²⁰⁶ The second volume of Allen's work is dedicated to identifying and analyzing Chr LXX's differences from Chr MT.

3. 1 Esdras

1 Esdras is a Greek translation of 2 Chronicles 35-36, Ezra 1-10, and Nehemiah 8, and incorporates the story of the three pages (1 Esd 3:1-5:6), which lacks a canonical parallel.²⁰⁷ The translation is much less formally equivalent than Chronicles LXX, and Zipora Talshir has recently published two monographs that discuss the relationship of this translation to MT.²⁰⁸ The document was known by Josephus and may go back as far as the second century BCE. This document will play a significant role in this commentary only in the textual criticism of 2 Chronicles 35-36 in the second volume.²⁰⁹

4. Syriac, Targum, and other witnesses

Study of the Syriac translation of Chronicles has been greatly enhanced by the splendid critical edition of R. P. Gordon.²¹⁰ Gordon collated twenty-nine manuscripts in preparing this edition and the text is based principally on MS *B. 21 Inferiore* of the Ambrosian Library in Milan (7th century CE). The text of the Peshitta was often harmonized with the text of Samuel-

²⁰⁵Allen, *The Greek Chronicles*, 2:168.

²⁰⁶*The Greek Chronicles*, 2:167.

²⁰⁷The equivalent of Ezra 4:7-24 is placed after Ezra 1:11 and before the account of the three pages, and the equivalent of Ezra 2:1-4:5 is put after that account. This apocryphal work is to be evaluated as a piece of literature in its own right and not a fragment of a translation of the so-called Chronicler's History.

²⁰⁸Zipora Talshir, *I Esdras: From Origin to Translation* and *I Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*. See also my own earlier study of this text, *Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler* (unpublished Harvard dissertation, 1966).

²⁰⁹For the text of 1 Esdras, see Robert Hanhart, *Esdrae liber I* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 8, 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

²¹⁰R. P. Gordon, *The Old Testament in Syriac: Chronicles*.

Kings, which considerably lessens its value for the textual critic.

The Targum rarely has importance for textual criticism in Chronicles, but its exegetical comments or interpretations are often quite enlightening.²¹¹

The Vulgate too is of secondary importance, but occasionally confirms variant readings discovered in the LXX or other versions.

B. The Textual Characteristics of the Chronicler's Vorlage in Samuel

One of the early fruits of research on the Dead Sea Scrolls was the discovery that the text of Samuel (and perhaps Kings) used by the Chronicler was at times different from the MT and that this variant text of Samuel could be discovered through 4QSam^a, Sam LXX, and Sam LXX^L.²¹² 4QSam^a is a manuscript from the first century BCE, 4QSam^{b and c} are from the third century BCE, Sam LXX was presumably translated from a Hebrew text in Egypt in the second century BCE, and behind Sam LXX^L, the Lucianic text of Samuel, usually dated to the early fourth century CE,²¹³ one can recover a proto-Lucianic recension of Samuel made in the first century BCE, probably in Palestine. This proto-Lucianic revision was based on the Old Greek translation.

Unfortunately, the LXX of Samuel and Kings offers further complexities. In terminology used since the time of Henry St. John Thackeray, the Greek translation of Samuel and Kings (called "Reigns" or "Kingdoms") needs to be divided into five sections:

α 1 Samuel

ββ 2 Sam 1:1-9:13

²¹¹See J. Stanley McIvor, *The Targum of Chronicles*, and R. Le Deaut and J. Robert, *Targum des Chroniques. 1: Introduction et Traduction; 2. Texte et Glossaire* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971). The latter authors (1:27) date its final redaction to the eighth or ninth century CE. See also A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic. vol. IV A: The Hagiographa* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).

²¹²See the pioneering studies of Frank Moore Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964): 281-299; "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," *1972 Proceedings of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 2; ed. R. A. Kraft; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 108-126. See my earlier discussion of these insights in *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 70-73. The Lucianic manuscripts in Samuel-Kings are boc₂e₂.

²¹³Lucian died in 311 or 312 CE.

βγ 2 Sam 10:1-1 Kgs 2:11

γγ 1 Kgs 2:12-21:43

γδ 1 Kings 22-2 Kings

In sections α, ββ, and γγ, the text contained in LXX^B, the text presented at the top of the page in the Cambridge Septuagint, is a copy of the Old Greek translation, made in Egypt in the second century BCE on the basis of a Hebrew text, that is related to but an offshoot of the text of Samuel preserved in Palestine. In sections βγ and γδ, however, the text contained in LXX^B is part of the *kaige* recension, a revision of the Old Greek toward the proto-MT in the first century CE. The Old Greek in these sections is lost, but the proto-Lucianic recension is retained in readings from the sixth column of Origen's Hexapla (usually identified as Theodotion). This means that we have a series of windows that offer indirect and direct access to the history of the text of Samuel in Palestine:

- a. Chronicles, when it incorporates Samuel texts: first half of the fourth century BCE
- b. 4QSam^{b and c} third century BCE (Unfortunately, the fragments of these scrolls do not contain parts of the books of Samuel used by the Chronicler).
- c. The Old Greek translation of LXX in the second century BCE (sections α, ββ, γγ), based on a manuscript that is a descendant of the Palestinian tradition.²¹⁴
- d. 4QSam^a first century BCE
- e. The proto-Lucianic recension of the LXX made in the first century BCE²¹⁵
- f. The *kaige* recension, a first century CE revision of the Old Greek toward the proto-MT
- g. Josephus, end of the first century CE, who used a Greek Bible of the proto-Lucianic tradition in writing his narrative based on the books of Samuel in his *Jewish Antiquities* (see discussion of Ulrich below).

A number of dissertations at Harvard University by Werner Lemke,²¹⁶ Eugene Charles

²¹⁴Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text," 295, believes this Hebrew text separated from the Old Palestinian textual tradition no later than the fourth century BCE.

²¹⁵Proto-Lucianic readings are occasionally supported by readings in the Old Latin.

Ulrich, Jr.²¹⁷ and Steven L. McKenzie²¹⁸ explored aspects of this divergent text of Samuel and Kings that helps us understand more precisely the text of the Vorlage that lay before the Chronicler. Lemke protested against excessively tendentious interpretations of Chronicles that tried to explain ideologically every departure of Chronicles from the MT text of Samuel and Kings. In 1 Chronicles 10-21, Lemke counted nearly one hundred instances in which the LXX of Samuel agreed with Chronicles against Samuel MT.²¹⁹ His insightful observations about the divergent text of the Vorlage at times downplays the significant ways that the Chronicler did in fact alter the text of his Vorlage.

Ulrich, now one of the chief editors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, was one of the first scholars to have full access to the text of 4QSam^a.²²⁰ He combined a careful analysis of this text and the MT and LXX of Samuel with a judicious investigation of the text presupposed by Josephus in the *Antiquities* and was able to show in many cases that Josephus utilized a non Masoretic form of Samuel now known from the LXX, LXX^L or 4QSam^a. He developed in detail the discovery by Adam Mez of the relationship between Josephus and the Lucianic, that is, proto-Lucianic version of the LXX.

While McKenzie made very helpful observations on dozens of the non Masoretic readings in Samuel, his principal aim in his dissertation was to use text critical insights in support of redaction critical research. He adopted the redactional theories of his advisor, Frank M. Cross, on the Deuteronomistic History and on Chronicles. Cross had proposed that there was

²¹⁶*Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History* (1964). Part of his findings were published in "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," (1965).

²¹⁷*The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (1978).

²¹⁸*The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (1984).

²¹⁹"The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," 362, n. 41.

²²⁰As of this writing, the full scholarly edition of 4QSam^a has not been published. The readings are largely accessible through the works of Ulrich and McKenzie and the textual notes of P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *I Samuel* and *II Samuel*. McCarter's textual notes are indispensable for understanding the textual history of Samuel and also for understanding the relationship of this text to Chronicles. For provisional access to the text of 4QSam^a see now also Edward D. Herbert, *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls*, and Andrew Fincke, *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran*.

a pre-exilic edition of the Deuteronomistic History,²²¹ written during the reign of Josiah, which he called Dtr¹. The history was then revised in the exile into its final form, which he called Dtr².²²² Cross also had identified three stages in the redaction of Chronicles as well: Chr¹ (late 6th c BCE), Chr² (ca. 450 BCE), and Chr³ (400 BCE or a little later).²²³ McKenzie argued that the author of Chr¹ used as his Vorlage in Samuel-Kings Dtr¹. But the theories of Cross on the redactional history of Chronicles have not found wide acceptance, and McKenzie came to a series of redactional judgments that are unlikely, including the idea that the account of the exile and repentance of Manasseh in 2 Chr 33:10-13 originally stood in Dtr¹. When passages he understands as Dtr 2 have parallels in Chronicles, he assigns these passages in Chronicles to (Cross's) Chr² or Chr³. McKenzie also argued, as mentioned above, that the Chronicler's Hebrew text of Kings was quite different in character from his text of Samuel.

The text of Chr LXX is conveniently available through the splendid edition in the Cambridge Septuagint.²²⁴ Many of the variants in Chr LXX and other ancient versions are reported accurately in the apparatus to *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, which was edited by Wilhelm Rudolph, the author of a German commentary on Chronicles which is frequently cited throughout my own commentary. Rudolph's textual notes in his commentary offer important explanations for his suggestions in *BHS*. In the first textual footnote to the translation of those chapters that have a Vorlage in the books of Samuel--1 Chronicles 10, 11, 13-21--I list the number of the footnotes containing readings in that chapter that presuppose a text of Samuel other than Samuel MT. Those readings number more than **one hundred twenty-five**. Frequent references in the commentary itself underscore the significance of some of these non MT

²²¹Deuteronomy 1-4; Joshua; Judges; 1 and 2 Samuel; 1 and 2 Kings.

²²²Frank Moore Cross, "The Themes of the book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History" in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 274-289.

²²³Cf. the discussion of this theory above under The Unity of Chronicles.

²²⁴*The Old Testament in Greek. Volume II. The Later Historical Books. Part III. I and II Chronicles* (ed. Alan England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray; London: Cambridge University Press, 1932). The Hebrew and Greek texts of Samuel-Kings are also printed in Vannutelli, *Libri Synoptici*.

readings for understanding the methodology of the Chronicler. Other textual notes, of course, address textual difficulties in Chronicles itself regardless of the reading in the Vorlage of the Deuteronomistic History.

The Sources Used by the Chronicler

1. The sources from Samuel, Kings, and Psalms

The primary source used by the Chronicler is the books of Samuel and Kings, but the copy of these books, the Chronicler's Vorlage, was not identical with the Masoretic Text of these books (see the discussion of Textual Criticism above and the textual notes to the translation).

In the nineteenth century and again in the late twentieth century, there have been scholars who proposed that Chronicles did not use Samuel and Kings, but that Chronicles and Samuel-Kings independently had access to a common source now lost to us. C. F. Keil can stand for many conservative scholars in the nineteenth century who posited a common source behind Samuel-Kings and Chronicles as a defense against the attack on the historicity of Chronicles in the wake of the work of W. M. L. de Wette.²²⁵ This source theory constituted an indispensable link between Keil's historical conservatism and his confessional presuppositions,²²⁶ and ran the risk of arguing in a vicious circle: The historical reliability of Chronicles was justified by his use of reliable sources, and the reliability of his sources was justified by the reliability of Chronicles itself. Hence historical criticism was basically excluded.

²²⁵C. F. Keil, *Apologetischer Versuch über die Bücher der Chronik und über die Integrität des Buches Esra* (Berlin: Ludwig Oehmigke, 1833). See the thorough discussion of Kai Peltonen, "Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena: Aspects of Source Criticism as Theory and Method in the History of Chronicles Research" in *The Chronicler as Author*, 18-69, and especially 24-27. Keil's approach was anticipated earlier in the work of J. G. Eichhorn, who argued that the author of Chronicles knew the accounts of David and Solomon from 2 Samuel and 1 Kings, but did not use them as sources. Chronicles, in his view, used trustworthy, non-canonical source material, which had also been used by the author of Samuel and Kings. For de Wette, see *Kritischer Versuch über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher der Chronik mit Hinsicht auf die Geschichte der Mosaischen Bücher und Gesetzgebung* (Halle: Schimmelpfennig & Compagnie, 1806).

²²⁶See Peltonen, "Source Criticism as Theory," 26. Aspects of this conservative attitude toward the Chronicler's sources and the idea that the Chronicler and Deuteronomistic Historian shared a common source show up in H. R. Macy, "The Sources of the Books of Chronicles: A Reassessment" (PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1975), 117, 125, 127, 170, and *passim*.

Recently A. G. Auld has returned to the notion of a common source for Samuel-Kings and Chronicles with results dramatically different from the work of C. F. Keil.²²⁷ This common source was for Auld a history of the Judahite monarchy. Auld argued that where one history, Samuel-Kings or Chronicles, lacks an account it was lacking in the common source. Hence the history of the northern kingdom, largely lacking in Chronicles, was also largely lacking in the common source and in the first draft of Samuel-Kings. This makes the history of the northern kingdom as reported in 1 Kings 12-2 Kings 17 a very late composition and of very little historical value. But, as McKenzie asks about the source proposed by Auld, why would a history of the Judahite monarchy begin with Saul?²²⁸ Does not 1 Chr 10:13-14 presuppose knowledge of at least 1 Samuel 18 and probably of 1 Samuel 13 and 15?²²⁹ My commentary will show numerous places where the Chronicler alludes to or presupposes knowledge of passages in the books of Samuel which he did not include in his own narration of history.²³⁰ To exclude them from the common source and from the earlier version of Samuel-Kings seems arbitrary to me.

²²⁷See A. G. Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), and "What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles" in *The Chronicler as Author*, 91-99. Cf. C. Y. S. Ho, "Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXX 1-13 Really the Source of 1 Chronicles X 1-12?" *VT* 45 (1995), 82-106. Ho was a student of Auld. For my evaluation of his article, see the commentary on 1 Chronicles 10.

²²⁸Auld, "What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles?" in *The Chronicler as Author*, 92, responds by calling the common source "The Book of Two Houses," dealing with Jerusalem's royal and divine houses.

²²⁹Steven L. McKenzie, "The Chronicler as Redactor" in *The Chronicler as Author*, 81. Auld, "What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles," suggests the Chronicler only had on his desk the Book of the Two Houses, but he knew of the additional stories about Saul that were included in the Former Prophets by ear or by repute, or he knew about Saul's resort to a consultation with a medium but only in a preliminary, non elaborated form. He also tries to reply to McKenzie's other difficulties with his hypothesis, mentioned in the next note, with equally little success, in my judgment.

²³⁰See also McKenzie, "The Chronicler as Redactor," 82-85, who notes the mention of Michal in 1 Chr 15:29, which presupposes knowledge of the stories about Michal in 1 and 2 Samuel. The Chronicler changed 2 Sam 21:19 so that Elhanan killed not Goliath, but the brother of Goliath, but that presupposes he knew the conflict between 2 Sam 21:19 and the story of David killing Goliath in 1 Samuel 17. The Chronicler refers to Ahab in 2 Chronicles 18, 21, and 22, but never introduces him, thus assuming that the reader would know about Ahab from 1 and 2 Kings. In 2 Chr 32:24, the Chronicler summarized Hezekiah's prayer and the accompanying sign from 2 Kgs 20:1-11. The verse in Chronicles is too short to have been the source from which the longer story developed.

Rather, I believe that the Chronicler used the nearly final form of Samuel-Kings although from a copy of the text of those books that is often variant from the MT of Samuel and Kings.

The relationship between 1 Chronicles and its source in Samuel-Kings and Psalms can be outlined as follows.²³¹ Passages printed in italics have a different order in Chronicles than they do in the Vorlage.

1 Chronicles	1 Samuel
10:1-12 death of Saul	31:1-13
10:13-14 evaluation of Saul	
	2 Samuel
	1:1-4:12 interregnum
11:1-3 anointing of David	5:1-3
	5:4-5 chronology of David
11:4-9 David captures Jerusalem	5:6-10
11:10 chiefs supporting David	
<i>11:10-41a David's warriors</i>	<i>23:8-39</i>
11:41b-47 more warriors	
12:1-22 (21) leaders who rallied to David at Ziklag	
12:23-40 (22-39) soldiers who rallied to David at Hebron	
13:1-4 invitation to bring the ark to Jerusalem	
13:5-7 the ark's journey begins	6:1-3
	6:4 note about Ahio
13:8-14 Uzzah killed for touching the ark	6:5-11
<i>14:1-2 Hiram's support; David's kingdom</i>	<i>5:11-12</i>

²³¹When no passage is listed in the Samuel-Kings column, we can assume an addition by the Chronicler. When no passages is listed in the Chronicles column, we have an omission by the Chronicler. This list is only an approximation since on some occasions the Chronicler copies his source word for word while at other times he recasts his Vorlage, paraphrases it, omits parts of verses, and the like.

established

14:3-7 David's wives and children in Jerusalem	5:13-16
14:8-16 Philistines defeated	5:17-25
15:1-3 preparations for moving the ark	
15:4-10 six Levite chiefs	
15:11-15 clergy ordered to carry ark	
15:16-24 installation of Levitical musicians	
	6:12a house of Obed-Edom blessed
15:25-16:3 ark brought to Jerusalem	6:12b-19a
16:4-7 David appoints Levites to thank and praise	
16:8-22 Israel's praise	Ps 105:1-15
16:23-33 international and cosmic praise	Ps 96:1b-13a
16:34-36 thanksgiving and petition	Ps 106:1b, 47-48
16:37-42 regular worship established	
16:43 David's blessing	2 Sam 6:19b-20a
	6:20b-23 David rebuked by Michal
17:1-15 oracle of Nathan	7:1-17
17:16-27 prayer of David	7:18-29
18:1-13 defeat of the Philistines	8:1-14
18:14-17 officers of David	8:15-18
	9:1-13 story of Mephibosheth
19:1-19 defeat of Ammonites and Arameans	10:1-19
20:1a spring as time of war	11:1a
	11:1b-12:25 David and Bathsheba
20:1b Joab attacked Rabbah of the Ammonites	12:26
	12:27-29 David summoned to Rabbah

20:2-3 David seized Ammonite crown and returned to Jerusalem	12:30-31
	13:1-20:6 crimes and rebellions ²³²
	21:1-17 dismemberment of Saul's descendants; exploits of David's warriors
20:4-8 Elhanan killed Lahmi the brother of Goliath	21:18-22
	22:1-51 (= Ps 18:1-50)
	23:1-7 last words of David
21:1-4a David incited to take a census	24:1-4a
	24:4b-7 Joab's census
21:4b-15 report of census	24:8-16
21:16 angel with drawn sword	
21:17-25 purchase of threshing floor of Ornan; altar erected	24:17-25
21:18-22:1 tabernacle and altar of burnt offering at Gibeon	
22:2-5 David provides materials for temple	
22:6-16 David's private speech to Solomon	
22:17-19 leaders commanded to build temple	
23:1-2 Solomon made king by David	
23:3-32 families of Levites and their functions	
24:1-31 twenty-four priestly courses; more Levites	
25:1-31 Levitical singers	

²³²These include the rape of Tamar and the murder of Amnon; the revolt and death of Absalom; negotiations for David's restoration to the throne; rebellion of Sheba; and a listing of the officers of David.

26:1-32 Levitical gatekeepers; other Levites	
27:1-34 commanders of monthly divisions; tribal leaders; David's administrators	
28:1-10 David's public speech to Solomon	
28:11-21 David's instructions for building the temple	
29:1-9 David's contributions to the temple	
29:10-22a David's praise of God; sacrifices by assembly	1 Kings
29:22b anointing of Solomon and Zadok	Cf. 1:39
29:23a Solomon sat on the throne	1:46 (cf. 2:12)
29:23b-25 Yahweh magnified Solomon	
29:26 summary of David's reign	
<i>29:27 length of David's reign</i>	<i>1 Kgs 2:11</i>
29:28 death of David	1 Kgs 1:1-2:10 death of David ²³³
29:29-30 sources: words of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad	
2 Chronicles	1 Kings
1:1-13 Solomon granted wisdom at Gibeon	2:12-46 rivals exiled or killed]
	3:1-15 + marriage to Pharaoh's daughter
	3:16-28 judgment of prostitutes
	4:1-20 Solomon's officials
	5:1-14 (4:21-34) Magnificence; wisdom
<i>1:14-17 chariots and horses</i>	<i>10:26-29</i>
1:18-2:1-15 (16) Treaty with Hiram	5:15-22 (5:1-8); 7:13-14; 5:23-26 (9-12)

²³³An aged David is warmed by Abishag on his deathbed; revolt of David's son Adonijah; intervention of Bathsheba and Nathan on behalf of Solomon; anointing of Solomon; death of David.

2:16-17 (2:17-18) census	5:27-32 (13-18) forced labor
3:1-14 Solomon builds the temple	6:1-38
	7:1-12 Solomon's other buildings
3:15-4:9 Hiram's work in temple	7:15-39a
4:10-22 the Sea, pillars, etc.	7:39b-50
5:1-14 ark into temple	7:51-8:11
6:1-40 Solomon's speech and prayer at dedication	8:12-53
6:41-42 Quotation from Psalms	Psa 132:8-10, 1
7:1a Solomon finishes prayer	8:54a
7:1b-3 fire from heaven	8:54b-61 Solomon blesses assembly
7:4-10 Sacrifices and dismissal of people	8:62-66
7:11-22 Yahweh appears again to Solomon	9:1-9
8:1-2 Hiram gives cities to Solomon	9:10-14 Solomon gives cities to Hiram
	9:15-16 corvee; Gezer as dowry
8:3-16 further activities	9:17-25
8:17-18 fleet at Ezion-geber	9:26-28
9:1-25 Queen of Sheba, wisdom, wealth	10:1-26
9:26 extent of rule	5:1
9:27-28 silver, cedar, horses	10:27-28a
	10:28b-11:40 apostasy and enemies
9:29-31 death of Solomon	11:41-43
10:1-11:4 Rehoboam becomes king	12:1-24
11:5-23 Rehoboam's fortifications	
	12:25-14:20 Jeroboam I
12:1-16 Shishak invasion; Abijah king	14:25-31, 21-24, 29-31 Abijam
13:1-2 war with Jeroboam	15:1-6 + evaluation

13:3-21 Abijah's sermon to the north	
13:22-23 (13:22-14:1) death of Abijah; Asa king	15:7-10 + synchronism
14:1-2 (2-3) evaluation of Asa	15:11-12
14:3-14 (4-15) war with Cushites	
15:1-15 Azariah's sermon; covenant to seek Yahweh	
15:16-19 cultic measures; war	15:13-16
16:1-6 alliance with Ben-hadad	15:17-22
16:7-10 Hanani rebukes Asa	
16:11-14 regnal resumé	15:23-24a
17:1 Jehoshaphat becomes king	15:24b
	15:25-21:29 ²³⁴
17:2-19 religious instruction; military might	
18:1-34 Micaiah prophesies defeat	22:1-40
19:1-11 Jehu the seer; judicial reform	
20:1-30 victory over Moab and Ammon	
20:31-21:1 death of Jehoshaphat	22:41-51
	22:52-2 Kgs 8:15 ²³⁵
21:2-10a reign of Jehoram	8:16-22
21:10b-19 apostasy, letter from Elijah, punishment	
21:20 regnal resumé	8:23 source reference
22:1-6 reign of Ahaziah	8:24-29
	9:1-26 Jehu's revolution
22:7-9 Jehu kills Ahaziah	9:27-29
	9:30-10:36 Jehu continued

²³⁴Reigns of Nadab, Baasha, Elah, Zimri, Omri, Ahab; Elijah cycle.

²³⁵Reigns of Ahaziah and Joram; Elijah and Elisha stories.

22:10-12-23:21 Athaliah rules, overthrown	11:1-20
24:1-27 reign of Joash	12:1-22
	13:1-25 Jehoahaz, Jehoash; death of Elisha
25:1-28 Reign of Amaziah	14:1-22
	14:23-29 Jeroboam II
26:1-2 Uzziah becomes king	
26:3-4 regnal resumé	15:1-4
26:5-20 success; sin and punishment	
26:21-23 regnal resumé	15:5-7
	15:8-31 ²³⁶
27:1-9 reign of Jotham	15:32-38
28:1-5 King Ahaz defeated by Arameans and Israel	16:1-6
28:6-15 Judahites captured by north	
28:16 Ahaz and king of Assyria	16:7-18
28:17-25 further defeats; evil of Ahaz	
28:26-27 regnal resumé	16:19-20
	17:1-41 Hoshea king; fall of north
29:1-2 Hezekiah becomes king	18:1-3
29:3-26 Hezekiah's reform	
30:1-27 Hezekiah's passover	
31:1 pillars, asherim destroyed	18:4-8 Hezekiah's reform
	18:9-12 fall of Samaria
31:2-21 provision for priests and Levites	
32:1-23 battle against Sennacherib ²³⁷	18:13-19:31

²³⁶Reigns of Zechariah, Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah, Pekah.

²³⁷The Chronicler has completely rewritten the long report in 2 Kings 18-19.

32:24 Hezekiah's sickness	20:1-11
32:25-30 further acts of Hezekiah	
32:31 visit by Babylonian officials	20:12-19
32:32-33 regnal resumé	20:20-21
33:1-10 reign of Manasseh	21:1-10
	21:11-16 rebuke of Manasseh
33:11-17 captivity and repentance	
33:18-20 regnal resumé	21:17-18
33:21-25 reign of Amon	21:19-26
34:1-2 Josiah becomes king	22:1-2
34:3-7 reform of Josiah	
34:8-33 book of law; Huldah; covenant	22:3-23:3
	23:4-20 Josiah's reforms
35:1-19 passover	23:21 -23
	23:24-27 judgment because of Mansasseh
<i>35:20-27 death of Josiah</i>	<i>23:29, 30a, 28</i>
36:1-4 Jehoahaz deposed; Jehoiakim becomes king	23:30b-35
36:5-8 reign of Jehoiakim	23:36-24:7
36:9-10 reign of Jehoiachin	24:8-17
36:11-17 reign of Zedekiah	24:18-20
36:18-20 vessels taken; temple burned; exile	25:1-21 destruction of Jerusalem
36:21 Jeremiah's prophecy; sabbath for the land	
36:22-23 Yahweh stirs up spirit of Cyrus	Ezra 1:1-3a

We will see in this commentary that the Chronicler assumes his readers' familiarity with events he omits from Samuel and Kings, that he omits things that do not fit with his purposes, that he rearranges items in retelling Israel's story, and that he even changes the evaluation of

certain kings. Of course there are also hundreds of changes in detail, sometimes for theological or ideological reasons, but others apparently because of literary or linguistic sensitivities.²³⁸

2. Other biblical sources

In the genealogies in particular, one can find parallel information in the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua although the form of the genealogy in Chronicles often differs from that in the Vorlage.²³⁹ In many cases the Chronicler himself may have recast the genealogy; at other times, he *may* have had an alternate version of the genealogy that just happened to overlap with canonical information. Noth and other scholars have used the distinction between genealogical information contained in the Bible and other genealogical information to separate between primary and secondary materials.

1 Chronicles ²⁴⁰	Genesis
1:1-4 Adam to Shem, Ham, and Japheth	5:1-32; 10:1
1:5-23 descendants of Shem, Ham, and Japheth	10:2-4, 6-8, 13-18a, 22-29
1:24-27 Shem to Abraham	11:10-26; cf. Gen 17:5
1:28-34 descendants of Ishmael and Isaac	25:12-16a, 2-4, 19-26 ²⁴¹ ; cf. 16:15; 21:2-3
1:35-54 descendants of Esau and Seir; kings and chiefs of Edom	36:4-5a, 11-12a, 20-28, 31-43
2:1-2 descendants of Israel	Gen 35:22b-26; cf. Exod 1:2-5
2:3-8 descendants of Judah	ch. 38; 46:12; Num 26:19-22; Josh 7:1; 1 Kgs 5:11 (4:31)
2:10-12 from Ram to Jesse	Ruth 4:18-22; cf. 1 Sam 16:6-9; 2

²³⁸Isaac Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten*, has compiled a comprehensive list of such literary changes.

²³⁹In 1 Chr 1:1-4, the genealogy of the pre flood patriarchs is merely a list of names without stating that Adam became the father of Seth, etc.

²⁴⁰Chronicles did not include the genealogy of Cain (Gen 4:17-26); Terah (Gen 11:27-32); and Nahor (Gen 22:21-24).

²⁴¹not in Myers.

	Sam 2:18
2:13 David and his brothers	1 Sam 16:6-9; 17:13
2:16-17 Zeruah and Abigail	2 Sam 17:25; 19:14
2:20 Hur-Uzi-Bezalel	Exod 31:2; 35:30; 38:22
2:49 Achsah the daughter of Caleb	Josh 15:16-17; Judg 1:12-23
3:1-4 descendants of David born at Hebron	2 Sam 3:2-5; 5:5, 14-16; cf. 13:1
3:5-9 children of David born at Jerusalem ²⁴²	2 Sam 5:13-16
3:10-16 descendants of Solomon who served as kings	1 and 2 Kings
4:24 sons of Simeon	Num 26:12-14 (cf. also Gen 46:10; Exod 6:15)
4:28-33ba places associated with Simeon	Josh 19:1-9
5:1 Reuben's incest	Gen 35:22
5:3 sons of Reuben	Exod 6:14; cf. Gen 46:9; Num 26:5-7
5:11 Gad	Gen 30:10-11
5:25-26 exile of Transjordanian tribes	Cf. 2 Kgs 15:19-20, 29; 17:6; 18:11
5:29-41 (6:3-15) ²⁴³	Ezra 7:1-5; Neh 11:10-11; 1 Chr 9:10-11; 2 Esd 1:1-3
6:39-66 (54-81) the cities of the priests and Levites	Josh 21:1-40 ²⁴⁴
7:1 descendants of Issachar	Num 26:23-24 (cf. Gen 46:13)
7:6 descendants of Benjamin (cf. 1 Chr 8:1-2)	Gen 46:21; Num 26:38-41
7:13 descendants of Naphtali	Gen 46:24; Num 26:48-49

²⁴²Cf. also 1 Chr 14:3-7.

²⁴³Cf. 1 Chr 6:35-38 (6:50-53). Curtis: 5:27-29 (6:1-3). Exod 6:16, 18, 20, 23; Num 3:17, 19, 6:1-4, 7 (16-19, 22) Exod 6:16-24; 6:7-13 (22-28) Exod 6:24; 1 Sam 1:1; 8:2.

²⁴⁴10-39 in Japhet. Chronicles cites these verses in the following order: 21:10-19, 5-9, 20-39.

7:14-19 Manasseh	cf. Num 26:29-33 ²⁴⁵
7:20 descendants of Ephraim ²⁴⁶	Num 26:35-36
7:30 descendants of Asher	Gen 46:17; cf. Num 26:44-46
8:1-2 descendants of Benjamin (cf. 1 Chr 7:6)	Gen 46:21 ²⁴⁷ ; Num 26:38-41
8:33-34//9:39-40 some ancestors and descendants of Saul ²⁴⁸	1 Sam 9:1-2; 14:49-51; 31:2 ²⁴⁹
9:2-17a list of those who lived in the land and in Jerusalem	Neh 11:3-19

2 Chronicles

28:16-22	Isaiah
30:6-9	Malachi
36:9	Zechariah
36:21	Jeremiah

The Chronicler also shows wide acquaintance with the legal and cultic materials in the Pentateuch and patterns some of his accounts of the temple building on the earlier account of the tabernacle. These matters are taken up in the commentary itself.

3. Source citations given in Chronicles

Chronicles also contains fourteen source citations which can be compared with parallel references in the book of Kings. The following list refers to the name of the sources themselves; other differences in these paragraphs will be treated in the commentary.

Chronicles

Kings

²⁴⁵check.

²⁴⁶Japhet, 16: 7:29 cities of Manasseh; Josh 17:11-12; 13:5 land that remained; Josh 13:2-5;

²⁴⁷This includes in this case the text preserved in LXX.

²⁴⁸See also under "Other presumed sources" below.

²⁴⁹Cf. 1 Chr 10:2.

1. David

1 Chr 29:29 in the acts²⁵⁰ of Samuel²⁵¹ the seer,²⁵² and in the acts of Nathan the prophet, and in the acts of Gad who saw visions.²⁵³

2. Solomon

2 Chr 9:29 in the acts of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and in the visions of Iddo, who saw visions about Jeroboam, the son of Nebat

1 Kgs 11:41 in the book of the acts of Solomon

3. Rehoboam

2 Chr 12:15 in the acts of Shemaiah the prophet and Iddo who saw visions

1 Kgs 14:29 in the book of the chronicles²⁵⁴ of the kings of Judah

4. Abijah/Abijam

2 Chr 13:22 in the history²⁵⁵ of the prophet Iddo

1 Kgs 15:7 in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah

5. Asa

2 Chr 16:11 in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel

1 Kgs 15:23 in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah

6. Jehoshaphat

2 Chr 20:34 in the acts of Jehu the son of Hanani,

1 Kgs 22:6 (45) in the book of the

²⁵⁰This word represents דברי in these source citations.

²⁵¹Samuel died, of course, before David ever became king. The Chronicler is here apparently acknowledging Samuel’s role in recording the early days of David as reported in 1 Samuel. The Chronicler did not include any parts of the book of Samuel before the prophet’s death.

²⁵²הראה.

²⁵³החזה. This could also be translated as “the seer,” but I have chosen this alternate translation to distinguish this title from הראה.

²⁵⁴דברי הימים.

²⁵⁵מדרש. Cf. 2 Chr 24:27.

which are recorded in the book of the kings of Israel

chronicles of the kings of Judah

7. Jehoram

2 Kgs 8:23 in the book of the
chronicles of the kings of Judah

8. Joash

2 Chr 24:27 in the history of the book of the kings²⁵⁶

2 Kgs 12:20 (19) in the book of the
chronicles of the kings of Judah

9. Amaziah

2 Chr 25:26 in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel

2 Kgs 14:18 in the book of the
chronicles of the kings of Judah

10. Uzziah/Azariah

2 Chr 26:22 Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz wrote

2 Kgs 15:6 in the book of the
chronicles of the kings of Judah

11. Jotham

2 Chr 27:7 in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah

2 Kgs 15:36 in the book of the
chronicles of the kings of Judah

12. Ahaz

2 Chr 28:26 in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel

2 Kgs 16:19 in the book of the
chronicles of the kings of Judah

13. Hezekiah

2 Chr 32:32 in the vision of Isaiah the prophet the son of
Amoz, in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel

2 Kgs 20:20 in the book of the
chronicles of the kings of Judah

14. Manasseh

2 Chr 33:18-19 in the acts of the kings of Israel...

2 Kgs 21:17 in the book of the

²⁵⁶This is the only source reference for the kings after Solomon that does not contain the name Israel.

in the chronicles of his visionaries²⁵⁷

chronicles of the kings of Judah

15. Amon

²⁵⁸

2 Kgs 21:25 in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah

16. Josiah

2 Chr 35:27 in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah

2 Kgs 23:28 in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah

17. Jehoiakim

2 Chr 36:8 in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah

2 Kgs 24:5 in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah

Kings lacks a source citation for David, and the source citation for Solomon in Chronicles is unique. The other fifteen source citations in Kings are all to the same document: “the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah.” Mordechai Cogan believes that this book, like its parallel for the northern kingdom,²⁵⁹ surveyed and summarized the monarchic period, and was based on source materials, such as records of war, tribute payments, royal projects, etc. The books for the northern and southern kingdoms were both commonly known, in his opinion, and were held to be authoritative.²⁶⁰ No source citation in Kings and Chronicles is given for Ahaziah, Athaliah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. In addition, Chronicles MT lacks a source citation for Jehoram (#7) and Amon (#15). With the single exception of #16,²⁶¹ all of the source citations appear at the same place within the narrative in Chronicles as in Kings, even when, as in #5, 6, and 9, important parts of the king’s reign are reported after the source citation.

²⁵⁷הוֹזַי. MT הוֹזַי ”Hozai.” LXX presupposes הַחֹזִיִּים “the visionaries.”

²⁵⁸Benzinger, 129, suggests that the equivalent of 2 Kgs 21:25-26 was lost in Chronicles by haplography (homoioteleuton). Cf. *BHS*.

²⁵⁹“The book of the kings of Israel.”

²⁶⁰Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings* (AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 89-91.

²⁶¹And the addition of a source citation #1.

Chronicles refers to one source by at least five different names: 1. the book of the kings of Israel and Judah (#11, 16, 17); 2. the book of the kings of Judah and Israel (#5, 9, 12, 13)²⁶²; 3. the book of the kings of Israel (#6); 4. the acts of the kings of Israel (#14); and 5. the history of the book of the kings (#8). Despite the variation between “book,” “acts,” and “history,” and the variations among the names of the nations,²⁶³ I assume that the author is referring to the same document.

Note also that the Chronicler refers eight times to prophets or prophetic figures in these source citations: 1. Samuel, Nathan, and Gad (#1 David); 2. Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo (#2 Solomon); 3. Shemaiah and Iddo (#3 Rehoboam); 4. Iddo (#4 Abijah); 5. Jehu (#6 Jehoshaphat); 6. Isaiah (#10 Uzziah); 7. Isaiah (#13 Hezekiah); and 8. his seers (#14 Manasseh). Jehu’s words are said to be recorded in the book of the kings of Israel, and “the book of the kings of Judah and Israel” is in apposition to “the vision of Isaiah” in #13.²⁶⁴ Thus the Chronicler relates the prophetic writings to the book of the kings mentioned in the previous paragraph. All of the prophetic source references occur with kings whom the Chronicler views favorably.²⁶⁵

What is the meaning of these prophetic references and the reference to a source called the book of the kings? Five proposals may be considered.

1. The Chronicler is following a literary convention based on the parallel source citations in the canonical book of Kings²⁶⁶ or, more radically, these citations are “mere show.”²⁶⁷ But if the Chronicler were only following a literary convention or merely arbitrarily claiming authority for

²⁶²The first of these is written מלכי יהודה and the last three מלכי יהודה.

²⁶³Williamson, 19, notes that Judah is never used alone in these titles, but Israel always appears before or after it, with the exception of 2 Chr 24:27 where no nation is mentioned. In 2 Chr 20:34 and 33:18 “Israel” by itself refers to the southern kingdom.

²⁶⁴There is variety again, both in the references to the document (acts, chronicles, history, prophecy, visions and the reference to the writing of Isaiah) and to the prophetic titles (prophet, seer, [the one] who saw visions, visionaries).

²⁶⁵Rehoboam, Uzziah?

²⁶⁶Martin Noth, *The Chronicler’s History*, 53.

²⁶⁷C. C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 223. On p. 230 Torrey refers to the supposedly midrashic version of the book of Kings (see # 3 below) as a phantom “source.”

his work, why would he not add source citations for the kings' reigns where these citations were missing in the book of Kings?

2. Both the Deuteronomistic Historian and the Chronicler had access to a compilation known as "the chronicles of the kings of Judah" or a similar title. That is, both the Deuteronomistic Historian and the Chronicler used the same source. The Deuteronomistic Historian chose not to use certain passages, while the Chronicler chose to include them.²⁶⁸ This would explain how the Chronicler got the additional information he includes about various kings. But we have already noted above the unlikelihood that Samuel-Kings and Chronicles independently used a common source. This explanation does not really account for the prophetic references that show up in Chronicles, nor does it account for the fact that the Chronicler does not add this kind of citation for those reigns where it is omitted in Kings.

3. The Chronicler is referring to an elaborated version of the canonical book of Kings, perhaps called "the midrash on the book of kings" (2 Chr 24:27; cf. #8 above and 2 Chr 13:22).²⁶⁹

Positing this hypothetical source, of course, does little to clarify the real origin of the Chronicler's additional information, but substitutes one unknown for another, and it also does not explain why the Chronicler only claims to have used this source when the Deuteronomistic Historian also had inserted a source citation.

4. The Chronicler repeated *and* reworded the source citations found in the Deuteronomistic History, but understood them now as references to the Deuteronomistic History itself rather than

²⁶⁸Anson F. Rainey, "The Chronicler and his Sources--Historical and Geographical" in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 43.

²⁶⁹Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 527-32; Curtis, 23-24, and Rudolph, xi. Japhet, 21-22, affirms this position, but on p. 23 she admits uncertainty about what the source citations are referring to. Already F. C. Movers, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die biblische Chronik: Ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in das alte Testament* (Bonn: T. Habicht, 1834), posited such a source. He felt that this source was a revision of the book of Kings in a post-exilic spirit. Movers also believed that the Chronicler used the books of Samuel and Kings as a source. See Peltonen, "Aspects of Source Criticism," 29-31. Among the four sources posited by I. Benzinger in his commentary were: a. Samuel-Kings; b. midrashic writings; c. source material from a historical work of post-exilic origin; and d. defective and fragmentary lists. See Peltonen, 56-57.

to some other kind of source document.²⁷⁰ Note that in his narrative about Solomon, the Chronicler does not in fact use sources other than the account in 2 Kings.²⁷¹ This interpretation fits well with the (later) understanding of Samuel and Kings as part of the Former Prophets, but it does not fit so well with the many reigns in which Chronicles presents additional information.

5. By these source citations, the Chronicler was explaining his understanding of the tradition history of the book of Kings.²⁷² That is, the Chronicler believed that the prophets had recorded contemporary events²⁷³ and that these prophetic works had been gathered together into a “book of the kings,”²⁷⁴ probably for both the northern and the southern kingdom. The Chronicler also thought that the Deuteronomistic History was an epitome of that book of the kings. By repeating and rewording the source citations found in his Vorlage, the Chronicler was explaining why he considered that Vorlage to have prophetic authority--because it was based ultimately on prophetic accounts of contemporary events that had been gathered into a book of the kings. These source citations in this understanding do not clarify the origin of the additional material Chronicles reports for many reigns. The same can be said for interpretation #4 as well. I believe either this explanation or the previous one offers a plausible understanding for the use of these source citations in Chronicles.

As Japhet, 23, has noted, however, the question of the source citations, and the questions about the sources available to the Chronicler are quite separate issues in any case. Hence the Chronicler’s use of sources and the value of these sources need to be evaluated independently of these source citation references.

4. Other allusions to sources

²⁷⁰Cf. Williamson, 18. Do I want to change the order of these last two references?

²⁷¹Cf. Noth, *The Chronicler’s History*, 53, though he adds in n. 12, p. 157, one needs to calculate in a few allusions to the Pentateuch in the Chronicler’s account of Solomon.

²⁷²Thomas Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 231-241.

²⁷³See especially 2 Chr 26:22.

²⁷⁴See especially 2 Chr 20:34.

In addition to the source citations for kings' reigns, Chronicles contains a series of other allusions to sources:

1 Chr 9:1 "the book of the kings of Israel." This same title is given as a source for the reign of Jehoshaphat in 2 Chr 20:34 above and is similar to a number of the other source citations. With this title at 1 Chr 9:1 the Chronicler seems to be referring to the source for some or all of the genealogies provided in chs. 2-8. None of the five explanations for the royal source citations really helps here unless we assume that the hypothetical elaborated book of Kings (#3) also contained a genealogical preface. That preface, of course, is what seems unique about the book of Chronicles itself. There can be no question, see the next section, that the Chronicler indeed did have access to genealogical sources, but exactly how this "book of the kings of Israel" relates to the royal source citations is not clear to me.

2. 1 Chr 16:40 "all that is written in the law of Yahweh."²⁷⁵ A reference to (a part of) the Pentateuch.

2. 1 Chr 23:27 "For according to the last words of David these were the number of the Levites from twenty years old and upward." In the commentary I assign this verse to a secondary hand. This reference ascribes Davidic authority to the change in age for the beginning of Levitical service described in 1 Chr 23:24. The Chronicler would probably have considered all the speeches of David from chs. 22-29 as David's last words.

3. 1 Chr 24:6 "The scribe Shemaiah the son of Nethanel, from the Levites, wrote them [= the divisions of the sons of Aaron] down." This seems to refer to a source document that recorded the twenty-four priestly courses now attested in 1 Chr 24:7-19.

4. 1 Chr 27:24 "the book of the chronicles of king David." 1 Chr 27:23-24 was added by someone other than the Chronicler in an attempt to exonerate David for the census he took in 1 Chronicles 21. We believe that this source reference is actually an allusion to ch. 21.

²⁷⁵Cf. the references to the law in 1 Chr 22:12 and seventeen times in 2 Chronicles. In 2 Chr 23:18 and elsewhere this source is ascribed to Moses.

5. 2 Chr 29:30 “the words of David and of the seer Asaph.” This is probably an allusion to the psalter.

6. 2 Chr 35:4 “the written directions of King David of Israel and the written directions of his son Solomon.” The written directions of David refer to (parts of) 1 Chronicles 23-27; the written directions of Solomon seem to refer back to 2 Chr 8:14.

7. 2 Chr 35:25 “they [= the laments for Josiah] are recorded in the lamentations.” The book of Lamentations in the Bible does not contain any references to Josiah, and its title in Hebrew, אֵיכָה, is different from the word laments (הַקִּינּוֹת) here. The Chronicler thus refers to an otherwise unknown collection of laments.²⁷⁶

5. Other presumed non biblical sources

The Chronicler had access to other oral or written sources for at least some of his information even though he does not specify where this information comes from. We refer especially to the genealogical materials in 1 Chronicles 2-8, which he took from genealogical collections or even in some cases from living memory. For the tribe of Naphtali, he seems only to have had the information supplied by the Bible itself, but for the other tribes he had voluminous additional information. While many commentators have said the Chronicler used both biblical and extra biblical genealogical information in constructing his genealogies for the tribes, information parallel to the biblical data may already have been recorded in his non biblical source. The genealogical information is diverse in genre and may have come from a wide variety of sources. The fact that the Chronicler had much more information for some tribes than for others also strongly suggests that he was dependent on whatever genealogical sources were available and that he did not manufacture these data. Williamson, 46, has called attention to what appears to be information from a military census list in 1 Chr 5:23-24; 7:2, 4-5, 7, 9, 11, 40.

Another document taken from a source is 1 Chr 27:25-34, the twelve supervisors over

²⁷⁶For a contrary opinion, see Japhet, 1043, and the discussion of this passage under the Date of Chronicles above.

David's property and the list of seven advisors or associates of David.²⁷⁷ Noth, however, has argued that the Chronicler had nothing but the books of Samuel in their present form as his Vorlage for the history of David.²⁷⁸

In general, most scholars contend that the availability of source documents to the Chronicler should be evaluated on a case to case basis. Noth contended that we can assume that the Chronicler made use of ancient sources only where allowance for the overall character of Chronicles has been made and where cogent arguments can be advanced in favor of such a claim.²⁷⁹ Noth suspected that the Chronicler used only one source document besides Dtr for the period of the monarchy.²⁸⁰ Source documents for 2 Chronicles will be discussed in the introduction to that volume.²⁸¹

6. Post-exilic sources

Finally, the Chronicler also used documents containing information from post-exilic times and sometimes ascribed those to an earlier period, such as the time of David.

- 1 Chr 3:17-24 the descendants of Jeconiah [=Jehoiachin]. Two of these names, Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, are known in other biblical materials.²⁸²
- 1 Chr 5:27-41 (6:1-15) The list of high priests. In the commentary I understand this as the "master list" of the high priests, from which other lists have been excerpted in 1 Chr 6:35-38 (50-53); Ezra 7:1-5; 2 Esd 1:1-3; Nh 11:10-11; 1 Chr 9:10-11.

²⁷⁷For 1 Chr 27:16-22, see the commentary.

²⁷⁸*The Chronicler's History*, 56. But see 1 Chr 11:41b-47 and (at least parts of) 1 Chronicles 12. See the commentary.

²⁷⁹*The Chronicler's History*, 53.

²⁸⁰*The Chronicler's History*, 60.

²⁸¹Noth, 57-61, believed the following items in 2 Chronicles may have come from a source document: 11:5b-10a (Rehoboam's fortresses); 13:3-20 (aspects of Abijah's war against Jeroboam); 14:8-14 (aspects of Asa's campaign against the Cushites); 26:6-8a (Uzziah's wars with the Philistines); 26:9 (Uzziah's building of fortifications in Jerusalem); 26:15 (Uzziah's catapults); 27:5 (Jotham's Ammonite campaign); 28:18 (cities captured by Philistines from Ahaz); 32:30 (Hezekiah's tunnel); 33:14a (Manasseh's building projects); 35:20-24 (some details of Josiah's last battle and death).

²⁸²The identity of Zerubbabel's father is unclear. See the commentary on 1 Chr 3:19.

- 1 Chr 6:1-15 (16-30) The genealogy of the regular Levites
- 1 Chr 6:16-34 (31-49) The linear pedigrees of the Levitical singers

Williamson, 23, concluded his own study of the Chronicler's sources with these words: "Overall the Chronicler shows himself as the master, not the servant, of his sources." We can see in many cases exactly how he has accepted, rearranged, or reworded his biblical source in Samuel-Kings and the Psalter. One can propose that he used similar methods on his extra-biblical sources, but, lacking the original copies of those sources, it is hard to get more specific. It is difficult for me to understand how Williamson concludes on the same page that "he [the Chronicler] has handled his biblical sources more conservatively than others." That may be true, but how would one know, except one would expect him to show respect toward what was surely by his time an authoritative text.

Central Themes in Chronicles

While a full statement on the Chronicler's theology must wait for the publication of the second volume in this commentary, a number of primary themes and emphases need to be mentioned already here.

Kingship

The Davidic kingship in Israel is identified in Chronicles with the kingdom of Yahweh (1 Chr 10:14; 17:1-15; 28:5; 29:23), and the kingship of the Northern Kingdom is considered illegitimate (2 Chr 13:8). This divine commitment to the Davidic dynasty decreases the attention given to the events of Exodus and Sinai in the book.²⁸³ The two kings of the United Monarchy, David and Solomon, are presented in an idealized fashion, with a far greater emphasis on their public actions than on their private lives. The Chronicler omits David's

²⁸³In my judgment Japhet, 47, overstates this issue and concludes that Israel has had a virtually undisturbed continuity in the land. As Williamson, 24, has pointed out, the Chronicler assumes knowledge of themes like Exodus and Sinai. The Chronicler's notion of the land enjoying its sabbaths during the exile also runs counter to Japhet's conclusion about a virtually unbroken existence in the land.

controversial struggles with Saul, his adultery with Bathsheba, the murder of Uriah, and the revolt of Absalom. Nothing is said of the weakness of his final days, the vain efforts of Abishag to warm him, or his vengeful advice to Solomon in 1 Kings 1-2. It is an overstatement, however, to say that David is presented as perfect. His sins are noted in 1 Chr 15:13 (improper care for the ark) and 1 Chr 21:1, 3, and 8 (the census), and he was barred from building the temple because he was a shedder of blood (1 Chr 22:8) and a man of war (1 Chr 28:3). The Chronicler offers a radically revised picture of Solomon as well. Solomon's rise to power did not come through the conniving of Nathan and Bathsheba, who took advantage of David's weakness during his final illness, nor is there any mention of the attempt by Solomon's brother Adonijah, supported by the king's sons and all his royal officials, to usurp the throne. Rather, David, presumably in full command of his powers, designates Solomon as king in fulfilment of the oracle of Nathan (1 Chr 17:15; 22:9-10), and he cites a divine oracle designating Solomon as the king chosen by Yahweh (1 Chr 28:6-7, 10). The people, including all the sons of king David, made Solomon king before the death of his father (1 Chr 29:22-25). Solomon's idolatry and apostasy, induced by his many foreign wives, is omitted completely (1 Kgs 10:28b-11:40).²⁸⁴ Even his journey to sacrifice at the "high place" at Gibeon (1 Kgs 3:2-6) is cast in a different light since according to the Chronicler the tent of meeting/the tabernacle was located there (2 Chr 1:3-6). The chief contribution of David was his preparation for the building of the temple and his establishment of several classes of lesser clergy; the chief contribution of Solomon was the erection of the temple itself. In several studies, Braun has noted how the Chronicler treats David and Solomon in parallel and complementary ways (1 Chr 22:12 and 2 Chr 1:10; 1 Chr 29:12 and 2 Chr 1:11-12; 1 Chr 22:3-4 and 2 Chr 2:1-2; cf. also 2 Chr 7:10; 11:17; 35:4).²⁸⁵

²⁸⁴The Nehemiah Memoir, on the other hand, emphasizes these charges: "Did not King Solomon of Israel sin on account of such women? Among the many nations there was no king like him, and he was beloved by his God, and God made him king over Israel; nevertheless, foreign women made even him to sin (Neh 13:26).

²⁸⁵Roddy L. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles," *JBL* 92 (1972):503-516; "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles," *JBL* 96 (1976):581-590;

Temple and Cult

The temple and its worship life are central in Chronicles. Jerusalem even plays a role in the opening genealogies (1 Chr 3:4-5; 5:36, 41; 6:17 [6:10, 15, 32]; 8:28, 32; 9:3, 34, 38). The temple is mentioned in 1 Chr 5:36 (6:10), and the high priests and lists of Levites are at the center of the genealogical unit that opens the book (1 Chr 5:27-6:66 [6:1-81]). David appointed Levites to the service of song at the tabernacle, and they continued this service in the temple after it had been built by Solomon (1 Chr 6:16-17 [31-32]). Among the post-exilic inhabitants of Jerusalem are priests, Levites, gatekeepers, and singers (1 Chr 9:10-34). David's first action after his anointing (1 Chr 11:1-3) is the capture of Jerusalem (1 Chr 11:4-9). After we are told about all those who rallied to David at Hebron from all Israel (1 Chr 11:10-12:41 [40]), David assembled all Israel to bring the ark from Kiriath-jearim to Jerusalem (ch. 13). That effort was foiled because the Levites had not been asked to carry the ark (1 Chr 15:13), but the second attempt to bring the ark to Jerusalem was completely successful. David took the occasion to appoint Levites to invoke, thank, and praise, both at the ark in Jerusalem and at the tabernacle in Gibeon (ch. 16). The oracle of Nathan promises David a dynasty and authorizes his son to build the temple (1 Chr 17:1-15). David's wars in chs. 18-20 provide the opportunity to acquire vast quantities of bronze, which Solomon used in the temple construction. After the nearly disastrous census in ch. 21, David acquired the site for the altar of burnt offering and the temple itself (1 Chr 22:1). The speeches of David in chs. 22, 28, and 29 endorse Solomon as temple builder and reveal David's own generous provision of raw materials for the temple. In the midst of these speeches, David appointed a number of Levites, including those charged to be officers and judges, gatekeepers, and singers.²⁸⁶ From 2 Chr 1:18 (2:1) to 8:16 Solomon is involved with the building and dedication of the temple. Abijah criticizes the Northern Kingdom severely for having an alternate worship site and an alternate clergy and maintains that Yahweh is with those who maintain the temple in Jerusalem (2 Chr 13:8-12). Five later kings initiate cultic reforms

²⁸⁶Cite appropriate original verses.

(Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Hezekiah, and Josiah), and faithfulness in maintaining proper worship becomes the criterion by which kings are judged. Hezekiah, the first king after the fall of the north, is a second Solomon, who cleanses the temple (2 Chr 29:12-36), celebrates a passover to which he also invites northerners (ch. 30), and re-orders the Levites and arranges for their support (2 Chr 31:12-19). When the king of the Chaldeans burned down the temple, this action was seen as fulfilment of the word of Jeremiah (2 Chr 36:19-20).

The Chronicler gives surprising little attention to the high priests, who are often thought to have displaced the king in importance in the post-exilic period. The chief priest Azariah, however, does severely criticize Uzziah for cultic encroachment (2 Chr 26:16-21), and the Chronicler does provide a master list of the high priests in 1 Chr 5:27-41 (6:1-15). The high priest Jehoiada also deposed Athaliah and put Joash on the throne. After Jehoiada's death, Joash listened to advisors, initiated syncretistic practices, and gave orders to kill Zechariah, Jehoiada's son (2 Chr 24:15-22).

Israel²⁸⁷

A number of earlier scholars felt that the advocacy for the Jerusalem temple and its worship was also a polemic against the Samaritan community.²⁸⁸ That has changed in recent times both because the Samaritan schism is now dated considerably after the time of the Chronicler,²⁸⁹ and because a different, more inclusive attitude has been detected within Chronicles after it was recognized that it is not part of a Chronicler's History that included Ezra and Nehemiah.

While the northern kingdom is considered politically and religiously illegitimate, the residents of that territory are considered part of Israel. The genealogy of the tribes in chs. 2-8 includes the northern tribes, all of whom are descendants of "Israel," the Chronicler's consistent

²⁸⁷Roddy L. Braun, "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude Toward the North," *JBL* 96 (1997):59-62 and H. G. M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 87-140.

²⁸⁸Among many, C. C. Torrey, Martin Noth, Wilhelm Rudolph.

²⁸⁹See Frank Moore Cross, "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," *HTR* 59 (1966):202-211, and R. J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975).

way of designating the patriarch Jacob. While prominence is given to the tribes of Judah, Levi, and Benjamin in these genealogies, all of whom were members of the Chronicler's community, they only form a framework that includes the other tribes. All Israel was involved in the coronation of David (1 Chr 11:1//2 Sam 5:1) and of Solomon (1 Chr 29:20-22), and all of Israel's officials were present when David addressed Solomon (1 Chronicles 28). All Israel was involved in the conquest of Jerusalem (1 Chr 11:4-9)²⁹⁰ and the transfer of the ark (1 Chr 13:4; 15:3), and in the building and dedication of the temple (2 Chr 7:8//1 Kgs 8:55). When the northern tribes broke away from the south, they did not give up their position as children of Israel. Those from all the tribes of Israel who had decided to seek Yahweh came to Jerusalem to sacrifice to Yahweh (2 Chr 11:16). Even at the conclusion of his sermon that is sharply critical of the north, Abijah calls the northerners "Israelites" (2 Chr 13:12). Great numbers of people from the north deserted to Asa because they perceived that Yahweh was with him (2 Chr 15:9). At the time of Ahaz, the north took captive two hundred thousand of their "brothers" (מֵאֲחֵיהֶם; 2 Chr 28:8; cf. vv. 11, 15) from the south. Admonished by the prophet Oded, the northerners repented and sent the captives back, with clothing and food, to Jericho (2 Chr 28:8-15). The Chronicler uses the term "remnant" for those left in the north (2 Chr 34:9) or those in both kingdoms (2 Chr 34:21) after the fall of Samaria. Hezekiah invited all Israel and Judah, including especially Ephraim and Manasseh, to his passover (2 Chr 30:1, 11, 18, 21, 25-26; 31:1). Repentance included a recognition of the temple in Jerusalem. Josiah's reforms extended to the towns of Manasseh, Ephraim, and Naphtali (2 Chr 34:6, 9), and Hilkiah is told to inquire of Yahweh about those who are left in Israel and Judah (2 Chr 34:21). The unity of Israel, in the Chronicler's view, is based on the worship of Yahweh at his temple in Jerusalem. Japhet, 46, writes, "According to the Chronicler's portrayal, there are no Gentiles in the land of Israel; all its dwellers are 'Israel', either through their affiliation with the tribes or as the attached 'sojourners.'"

²⁹⁰The Vorlage at 2 Sam 5:6 has the king and his men conquering Jerusalem.

Reward and Retribution²⁹¹

The doctrine of rewards and punishments takes on a special form in Chronicles. While throughout the Bible it is expected that faithfulness is followed by reward and unfaithfulness by punishment, in Chronicles these rewards/punishments are more immediate and individual, normally taking place within a person's lifetime. There is no accumulated sin or merit.²⁹² For Saul the consequences of his unfaithfulness were his death and the loss of his kingdom (1 Chr 10:13-14). In a speech constructed by the Chronicler, David outlines both the positive and negative possibilities of behavior: "If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you abandon him, he will cast you off forever" (1 Chr 28:9). But warnings are often issued by prophets between the sin and the resultant punishment, and God responds positively to those who repent.²⁹³ In a passage not contained in the Vorlage, Yahweh announces to Solomon: "If my people who are called by my name humble themselves, pray, seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land" (2 Chr 7:14). Kelly has argued that the Chronicler is less concerned to demonstrate strict relationships between acts and consequences than to emphasize Yahweh's benevolence and mercy toward the people (cf. 1 Chr 22:12; 29:18; 2 Chr 30:18). This is in criticism of Japhet who believes that retribution takes place in relationship to a principle of absolute divine justice.²⁹⁴ Kelly believes that Yahweh's covenant mercy (1 Chr 17:13) is the fundamental conviction against which the Chronicler's doctrine of retribution must be assessed. For a number of kings Chronicles divides

²⁹¹For a fresh study of this concept and a review of previous research, see Brian E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*. Cf. Japhet, *Ideology*, 150-198.

²⁹²Japhet, *Ideology*, 166-167 identifies five changes introduced by the Chronicler to his Vorlage: in the case of any transgression, an appropriate punishment is introduced by the Chronicler; whenever piety is displayed with no mention of recompense, the Chronicler adds a fitting reward; when any incident which might be a punishment remains unexplained, the Chronicler adds a suitable sin; whenever a possible reward is mentioned without the appropriate causes for it, the Chronicler provides the source of merit; if two occurrences, one a possible sin, the other an apparent punishment, are described independently, the Chronicler makes a causal connection between the two.

²⁹³2 Chr 12:7; 15:2-7; 30:6-9, 18-19.

²⁹⁴*Ideology*, 153. check.

their life into a period of faithfulness followed by reward, and unfaithfulness followed by judgment: Asa (2 Chronicles 14-15 vs. 2 Chronicles 16); Jehoram (2 Chr 21:1-7 vs. 21:8-20);²⁹⁵ Joash (2 Chr 23:11-2 Chr 24:14 vs. 2 Chr 24:15-27); Amaziah (2 Chr 25:1-13 vs. 2 Chr 25:14-28); Uzziah (2 Chr 26:1-15 vs. 2 Chr 26:16-23), or of unfaithfulness followed by judgment, and faithfulness followed by reward: Manasseh (2 Chr 33:1-11 vs. 2 Chr 33:12-20). Characteristic rewards in Chronicles are rest and quit, building projects, military victories, a large family, wealth, international reputation, and respect from citizens. The verb “to succeed” or “to prosper” (צִלַּח) expresses the reward for righteous actions.²⁹⁶

Attitude toward the Persians

The present book of Chronicles ends with words that announce that the decision of Cyrus to build the temple of Jerusalem and to let the exiles to return to the land is the fulfilment of the word of Jeremiah and the result of Yahweh’s stirring up the spirit of Cyrus (2 Chr 36:22-33). While there is a question whether these words are original to Chronicles, but were only added from Ezra 1:1-4 to show the connection between the two works, it is remarkable that the Chronicler utters no critique of the Persians elsewhere and seems content with the implicit permission of the Persians for worship connected with the Jerusalem temple. For all of his focus on David and his descendants and the everlasting promise made by God to David, the Chronicler nowhere advocates the reestablishment of the Davidic monarchy, let alone a rebellion against Babylon. He seems relatively content with life under Persian suzerainty, provided that the worship at the temple in Jerusalem is able to continue without restraint. Ezra and Nehemiah express a similar attitude although there is the plaintive note in Neh 9:37, that complains that the rich yield of the land goes to kings whom God has sent over them because of their sins and “we are in great distress.”

Personal piety

²⁹⁵Convincing?

²⁹⁶1 Chr 22:11, 13; 29:23; 2 Chr 7:11; 14:6; 20:20; 24:20; 26:5; 31:21; 32:30. Cf. 2 Chr 13:12.

The focus on the worship of the temple and the rights of its clergy might suggest that the Chronicler had a very wooden idea of piety and the religious life. But we need to note how much the word joy is used in his history²⁹⁷ and how warmly he can speak of faith: “Believe in Yahweh your God, and you will be established; believe his prophets and you will succeed” (2 Chr 20:20). The cult must be performed with a whole heart,²⁹⁸ and the cultic counterpart of that is the temple’s music. Hezekiah prayed for northerners who had set their hearts to seek God even though they had not followed the sanctuaries rules on cleanliness (2 Chr 30:18-20). Humbling oneself is always viewed as appropriate action (2 Chr 7:14; 12:6-12; 30:6-11; 32:26; 33:12-14). Prayer too is effective (2 Chr 32:20, 24; cf. Manasseh at 2 Chr 33:13).

Hope or eschatology?

While the Chronicler provides justification for the worshipping community as he knew it, there are also indications that he hoped for a different, better future. The genealogies in chs. 2-8, for example, portray an ideal Israel, composed of all twelve tribes and spread out over a far wider territory than the post-exilic province of Yehud. Oeming believes that the geographical notes in the opening genealogies are programmatic, outlining a land of Israel which is modelled in the past and still expected for the future.²⁹⁹ Chronicles offers an implicit appeal to people in the north to support the temple and its worship in Jerusalem, and 1 Chr 9:3 notes that the new Jerusalem already includes people from Ephraim and Manasseh. During Hezekiah’s reform, in 2 Chr 30:6-9, it is promised that repentance by those who are in the land will lead to the return of the exiles in Mesopotamia. This can also be taken as a call for the Chronicler’s audience to turn to Yahweh with the expectation of a subsequent return to the land from the growing diaspora. In the psalm placed in the mouth of the singers we read: “Save us, O God of our salvation, and gather us and deliver us from the nations” (1 Chr 16:35). Kelly concludes: “The Chronicler

²⁹⁷1 Chr 12:39-41 (38-40). Note the emphasis there on singleness of mind. Cf. also 1 Chr 15:25; 29:7 and 17 (generous giving), 22; 2 Chr 7:8-10; 20:28; 23:16-18; 29:30; 30:21-26. In 2 Chr 31:4-10 the citizens of Judah bring their tithes and generous donations.

²⁹⁸David orders Solomon to serve Yahweh with a whole heart and a willing spirit (1 Chr 28:9).

²⁹⁹Oeming, *Das Wahre Israel*, 209-210.

indicates how Israel may continue to possess its inheritance...and he holds out the possibility of a more extensive fulfilment.”³⁰⁰ Did the Chronicler expect a restoration of the Davidic monarchy? The covenant God made with David is viewed as everlasting (2 Chr 13:5; 21:7; 23:3). Riley has concluded that the Davidic kingship was primarily cultic in its mission and only provisional. He writes: “The Davidic covenant persisted for the Chronicler and his audience in the task (which the people had from the days of David himself) to worship at the Temple and to provide for its needs and the needs of the cultus.”³⁰¹ Williamson, 221, admits that Chronicles is not messianic, but believes it does see an abiding validity for the Davidic line, and that the building of the temple has confirmed, but not absorbed, this hope.³⁰² The genealogy of Davidic descendants after the exile, 1 Chr 3:17-24, probably extending down to the time of the Chronicler himself, may have been preserved by heirs of David who hoped for some kind of restoration of the monarchy. What is not clear is whether the Chronicler’s inclusion of this genealogy means that he shared that hope.

Outline of 1 Chronicles

Pick up headings from commentary itself.

- I. Genealogies (1 Chronicles 1-9)
- II. The Reign of David (1 Chronicles 10-29)³⁰³
 - A. David becomes king (1 Chronicles 10-12)
 - B. David’s efforts to establish the worship of Yahweh in Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 13-17)
 - C. David’s wars (1 Chronicles 18-20)

³⁰⁰*Retribution and Eschatology*, 182.

³⁰¹William Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 201.

³⁰²See also his “Eschatology in Chronicles,” *TynBul* 28 (1977):115-154, and “The Dynastic Oracle in the Books of Chronicles” in *Essays on the bible and the Ancient World. Festschrift I. L. Seeligmann* (ed. A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch; Jerusalem: Rubenstein, 1983), 3:305-318. check. For a non-messianic understanding of Chronicles, see Donald F. Murray, “Dynasty, People, and the Future :The Message of Chronicles,” *JSOT* 58 (1993):71-92.

³⁰³The reference to Yahweh handing over the kingdom to David (1 Chr 10:14) and the summary of David’s reign in 1 Chr 29:26-29 bracket the beginning and ending of David’s reign.

D. David's preparations for the construction of the temple and the transfer of kingship to Solomon (1 Chronicles 21-29)

III. The Reign of Solomon (2 Chronicles 1-9)

II and III could be a united section

IV. The Reigns of the Kings of Judah from Rehoboam to Zedekiah (2 Chronicles 10-36)

2 Chronicles 10:1-28:17 The Divided Kingdom

2 Chronicles 29:1-36:23 The Reunited Kingdom.

Bibliography

List of Commentaries