

Judah and the Judeans
in the
Fourth Century B.C.E.

edited by

ODED LIPSCHITS, GARY N. KNOPPERS,
and RAINER ALBERTZ

Winona Lake, Indiana
EISENBRAUNS
2007

© Copyright 2007 by Eisenbrauns.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

www.eisenbrauns.com

Cataloging in Publication Data

Judah and the Judeans in the fourth century B.C.E. / edited by Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-1-57506-130-6 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Judaea (Region)—History—Congresses. 2. Yehud (Persian province)—Congresses. 3. Jews—History—586 B.C.–70 A.D.—Congresses. 4. Judaism—History—Post-exilic period, 586 B.C.–210 A.D.—Congresses. 5. Bible. O.T.—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—Congresses. I. Lipschits, Oded. II. Knoppers, Gary N., 1956– III. Albertz, Rainer, 1943–

DS110.J78J82 2007

933—dc22

2007028004

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.®™



EISENBRAUNS

Offprint from:
Lipschits, Knoppers, and Albertz, ed., *Judah and the
Judaens in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*
© Copyright 2007 Eisenbrauns. All rights reserved.

Who Knew What? *The Construction of the Monarchic Past in Chronicles and Implications for the Intellectual Setting of Chronicles*

EHUD BEN ZVI
University of Alberta

Introduction

The starting point of this essay is the portrayal of major characters in Chronicles or a section thereof as people who (a) know a variety of texts, including texts that are explicitly set in a time later than the putative time of the speaker in Chronicles, or (b) exhibit knowledge about future events. These particular attributes of the characters are for the most part conveyed to the intended and primary rereaders of the book through the direct speech of the relevant character and, therefore, cannot be explained away as the interpretive comments of a narrator whose perspective stretches to centuries after the narrated events. Moreover, these crucial utterances by the speakers tend to appear in unexpected contexts in the narrative of the book. Thus the tension between the contents of the utterances and the explicit narrative setting in the book serves to draw special attention to the utterances and their meanings. This tension suggests to the intended readers that something of importance that is far beyond the basic narrative thrust of the book is being communicated through these utterances. Two main examples will be discussed below and their implications elaborated.

The Case of David

The intended and primary readers of the book are informed that David's fame spread into all lands and that YHWH brought the fear of him on all nations (1 Chr 14:17). They also learn that David's kingship was exalted for the sake of his people (1 Chr 14:2). Against this background, they vicariously learn and vicariously experienced through their reading a central point in their story about themselves. David has

just brought the ark inside the tent he has pitched for it, offered burnt and peace offerings in the midst of a great celebration (1 Chr 16:1–3), and organized the service of the ark (1 Chr 16:4–7). David, through Asaph, appropriately sings YHWH's praises, as the song concludes. Asaph (that is, David)¹ asks or, better, commands the community that (in the world of the book) is participating in the event to implore YHWH (along with him, of course) with the following words:

הוֹשִׁיעֵנו אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְקַבְּצֵנוּ וְהַצִּילֵנוּ מִן־הַגּוֹיִם

Save us, O God of our salvation, and *gather and rescue us from among the nations*. (1 Chr 16:35)

The intended and primary readers of the book are unlikely to imagine that the implied author and communicator of the book (that is, the Chronicler) is asking them either to (a) imagine David as delusional or (b) to wonder who has been exiled and must be gathered from among the nations at this particular time in the narrative. There has been no reference to any exile of Israel at this time or previously and, even if one were to argue that some people were exiled among the Philistines after the Philistines' victory over Saul—something the text does not claim—David had already defeated the Philistines (1 Chr 14:6–16) within Chronicles' chronology. Instead, it seems highly likely that, from the perspective of the intended and primary readers of Chronicles, David is praying and asking the community of his days to pray for the return of exiles that have not *yet been exiled*. Given the historical circumstances of these readers and their discourses, it also seems highly likely that, from their perspective, this exile would have been associated with (though not necessarily limited to) the Babylonian Exile.

This being so, one has to conclude that these readers most likely imagined David as one who knew the future (even the far future, like Moses; see Deut 4:25–28, 31:16–18). Significantly, the reference to the future Exile is not advanced by David as new knowledge or as knowl-

1. The words are uttered by Asaph, the Levite. The context and David's central role in arranging the entire service make it abundantly clear to the intended, primary readers of the book that the main person to be associated with the song is not Asaph but David. (Significantly, none of the psalms included or alluded to in this song [see below] are characterized as "Psalms/Songs of Asaph" in the book of Psalms). As is well known, the term *discourse* can carry many different meanings. Without entering into the contested field of defining this concept, in this essay I do not use *discourse* in the sense of conversation, discussion, or the like but in the general sense of a system or cluster of interrelated ideas, ways of thinking, images, linguistic, or extralinguistic expressions that govern the ways in which particular sets of issues may (or may not) be thought, imagined, stated, or generally dealt with in some social group.

edge that is not widely shared by the community or that needs to be repeated as a warning² or as a contingent future development (cf. 1 Kgs 8:46–50, 2 Chr 6:36–40) that requires explanation; it is presented as a matter of fact. It bears noting that David's primary distinction is not so much related to the fact that the text requires the readers to imagine him as a person who knows of a turning point in the future of Israel. In fact, the text suggests that the readers should imagine the entire assembly in the story as knowing this event as well. David's main characterizing stroke at the conclusion of his psalm of thanksgiving is that he brings to the attention of the Israel of his time an awareness of a future exile. Thus, David in this depiction of a crucial, formative, celebratory event (the bringing of the ark) is portrayed as someone who identifies himself with, reflects, and reinforces the identification of the Israel of his time with postmonarchic Israel (notice the "gather and rescue us").

Conversely, from the perspective of these readers, the reference allows them to identify with David closely, especially with David's Israel and, accordingly, to participate vicariously and rejoice with the Israelites at the time of bringing the ark. The gap between the Israel for whom Chronicles was composed and the Israel of David's time is thus bridged. The two become closely interrelated, and for this to happen, exiled Israel *must* share some of their discourse and world of knowledge with preexilic Israel. Similarly, a turning point in the establishment of the proper cult becomes linked with both its destruction (the Exile) and the hope for its full restoration in terms of YHWH's gathering and rescuing Israel from among the nations. This restoration process from the perspective of the intended and primary readers of the book has begun in some way but has not yet been completely fulfilled (2 Chr 36:22–23).³

To be sure, the authors and target readers of Chronicles know very well that the David of 1 Chr 16:8–36 is essentially uttering a slightly modified version of Psalm 96 that is framed by an extensive selection from Psalm 105 (again with slight modifications) and a short concluding selection from Psalm 106.⁴ Shaping new texts and meanings by

2. Contrast with Deut 4:25–28, 31:15–21. The image of a great figure of the past who is informed of the future judgment of Israel is a common *topos* in late Second Temple literature (e.g., 1Q22 [= 1QDM] col. 1; *T. Levi* 14–25; *Jub.* 1:7–14).

3. See E. Ben Zvi, *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles* (London: Equinox, 2006) chap. 10.

4. To be more precise, 1 Chr 16:8–36 is based on Ps 105:1–15, 96:1–13, 106:1 (?), and 106:47–48. Of course, as a literary unit, it conveys a message of its own, which is shaped partly by the "intertextual" references in the repertoire of psalms accepted in the

citing portions of other texts in the accepted repertoire of the late Persian period is certainly a well-known device among the Yehudite literati—a device that is raised to quasi-burlesque proportions in Jonah 2:3–10. While it is certainly true that, on one level the newly crafted text carries a message of its own and is most often anchored in the surrounding narrative,⁵ explicit references to other texts known by the community are also integral to the communication and creation of meaning through the reading and rereading of the new text. In the present case, the key phrase “Save us, O God of our salvation, and gather and rescue us from among the nations” points to the text of Ps 106:47. Psalm 106 is a postmonarchic psalm that explains exile, recalls the history of Israel, and provides hope for the future. This psalm was certainly understood by the readers as speaking to the postmonarchic situation, including the situation of the primary readerships of Chronicles. In other words, David is portrayed here not only as aware of and properly responding to the future Exile but as someone whose speech speaks to both (a) the formative circumstances in the world portrayed in the book and present in the social memory of the readers of Chronicles and (b) these readers’ own times; and this is accomplished by using the readers’ psalms.⁶

Keeping this in mind, we should note that the intended and primary readerships of Chronicles (and the implied author they construed) are also asked to imagine David as choosing to cite a slightly modified version of Psalm 96 on the very same occasion. Although less obvious than Psalm 106, Psalm 96 was most likely understood by these readers as speaking to their postmonarchic situation.⁷ In fact, unlike the MT, the LXX attests a tradition of interpretation that associates

discourse of the readership of Chronicles. See G. N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10–29* (AB 12A; New York: Doubleday, 2004) 644–61.

5. See, for instance, A. E. Hill, “Patchwork Poetry or Reasoned Verse? Connective Structure in 1 Chronicles XVI,” *VT* 33 (1983) 97–100; T. C. Eskenazi, “A Literary Approach to the Chronicler’s Ark Narrative in I Chronicles 13–16,” in *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. A. B. Beck; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995) 258–74; H. N. Wallace, “What Chronicles Has to Say about Psalms,” in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (ed. M. P. Graham and S. L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 267–91. Incidentally, the same holds true even when the text exhibits some hyperbole in the use of citations for rhetorical purposes (see Jonah 2:3–10).

6. Cf. T. C. Butler, “A Forgotten Passage from a Forgotten Era (1 Chr. XVI 8–36),” *VT* 28 (1978) 142–50.

7. On Psalm 96, see E. S. Gerstenberger, *Psalms, Part 2 and Lamentations* (FOTL 15; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001) 187–91.

Psalms 96 both with the rebuilding of the temple after the Exile and with David.⁸ Although it is impossible to know whether this tradition goes back to the time of the primary readerships of Chronicles or whether it is a tradition that derives from Chronicles,⁹ it proves that ancient communities of readers could and did understand not only the text of Ps 106:47–48 (as demonstrated above) but also the idea that Psalm 96 pertained to both David and the Second Temple period.

It is exactly this fluidity of meanings that allows the target readership to engage deeply with the text and to negotiate their identity through the intertwining of the converging and mutually identifying tendencies communicated by the text without negating the differences between them, their leaders, and their circumstances on the one hand; and David, his people, and the circumstances around the transporting of the ark on the other hand. In fact, it was this fluidity of meanings that made the text powerful for the mentioned readerships.¹⁰

A related ambiguity enhances further the fluidity of these (complementary) meanings conveyed by the text. The target readerships could have imagined that David knew, cited, and slightly rephrased Psalm 96 and the portions of the other psalms (e.g., Ps 106:47–48), but if they read Chronicles with the grain rather than against the grain, they could have also imagined that the authors of the relevant psalms were aware of David's utterances. In either case, a sense of association between the authorship of the relevant Psalms and David would have been affirmed.

Significantly, not only associations but also differences are conveyed and stressed, because the minor differences between the words of David in 1 Chr 16:8–36 and the relevant texts in the Psalms suggest an authorship and readership mindful of differences. Certainly some of the variants are grounded in the different settings of the relevant texts. For

8. The superscription to the psalm in the LXX reads: "When the house was being rebuilt after the captivity. An Ode. Pertaining to David." See A. Pietersma, *The Psalms* (NETS; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000) 95.

9. The tradition is to be differentiated from the actual writing of the superscription itself, which is a different issue—an issue that also defies precise dating.

10. G. Knoppers (*1 Chronicles 10–29*, 648) writes, "if the superscription had been part of the Chronicler's source, it is unlikely that he would have quoted this psalm in the context of the presentation of David's life." Setting aside the fact that I prefer to talk about the implied author of Chronicles as understood by its intended and primary readerships than about the actual author/s of the book, I disagree with this statement. These readerships had to construe the authorial voice of the book as a voice that has no problem with portraying characters as being aware of later events and texts, and in fact, uses double understandings (such as in this case) to advance rhetorical and ideological aims.

instance, whereas Ps 96:6 reads *במקדשו*, David says *במקומו* in 1 Chr 16:27. After all, there was not temple at the time of David's utterances. Similarly, the absence of the long history of sin in Psalm 106 may be understood as reflecting a different rhetorical setting for David's words. It is precisely against this affirmation of difference between (a) the communities explicitly addressed in these psalms and the related literati for whom Chronicles was composed and (b) the people addressed by David when he brought the ark both in the world of the book and the social memory of the literati that the rhetorical power of "Save us, O God of our salvation, and *gather and rescue us from among the nations*" is far more salient, and along with it the mentioned fluidity of meanings that serves the readers to negotiate their identities in terms of convergence and divergence from David's Israel at its time of glory, of likeness and of lack thereof.

*The Case of Azariah, the Son of Oded,
and of References to Prophetic Literature*

More than 70 years ago, von Rad published his famous essay on the Levitical sermon in Chronicles.¹¹ One of the things he discussed there was the references to prophetic books in Chronicles. About 30 years ago, Japhet wrote that "the many verses of classical prophecy quoted by the Chronicler particularly in his speeches prove his familiarity with this corpus." She referred to von Rad's essay and considered 2 Chr 16:9 (cf. Zech 4:10), 15:6 (cf. Zech 11:6), 15:7 (cf. Jer 31:16), and 20:20 (cf. Isa 7:9) to be "the most obvious" examples.¹² This trend has been noticed and discussed by more-recent scholars as well.¹³ Although at times the obvious "anachronistic" character of these quotations is mentioned,¹⁴ the focus of these studies has not been on the effect that these quotations have on the characterization of the relevant speakers or by implication the effect they have on the constructions of the past that

11. G. von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London: SCM, 1984) 267–80 (first published in German as "Die levitische Predigt in den Büchern der Chronik," in *Festschrift für Otto Procksch* [Leipzig, 1934] 113–24).

12. S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (2nd ed.; BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997) 183.

13. See particularly P. Beentjes, "Prophets in the Book of Chronicles," in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (ed. J. C. de Moor; OtSt 45; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 45–53; idem, "Tradition and Transformation: Aspects of Innerbiblical Interpretation in 2 Chronicles 20," *Bib* 74 (1993) 258–68.

14. So, for example, *ibid.*, 266.

confront the intended and primary rereaders of Chronicles and their ideological implications.¹⁵

Azariah's speech in 2 Chr 15:3–7 provides an excellent illustration of the possible contributions to be gained by shifting the focus of the inquiry. The speech attracts the attention of the readers by defamiliarizing the expectations created by the narrative. Following Asa's glorious victory over Zerah—which is described in superlative terms in Chronicles—and the celebrated peaceful period that immediately preceded it, the reader does not expect to hear: *וַיְמִים רַבִּים לִישְׂרָאֵל לֹא אֱלֹהֵי אֲמֹת*: 'For many days Israel was without the true God and without a teaching priest and without divine teaching' (v. 3), or *וּבְעֵתֵיהֶם הָיָה אֵין שְׁלוֹם לְיוֹצֵא וּלְבָא כִּי מְהוּמַת רַבּוֹת עַל כָּל־יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרְצוֹת* ('In those times, there was no peace for people coming and going, for many disturbances affected all the inhabitants of the lands' (v. 5), or *וַיִּכְרַתוּ גוֹיִם* 'Nation crushed nation and city crushed city, for God caused confusion among them by every kind of distress' (v. 6).¹⁶ To be sure, v. 7, *וְאַתָּם חֲזָקוּ וְאַל־יִרְפוּ יְדֵיכֶם כִּי יֵשׁ שִׂכָר לְפַעֲלֹתְכֶם* ('But as for you, be strong and do not let your hands be weak, for there is reward for your work'), serves to attenuate the discrepancy between the wording of the speech up to this point and the circumstances in which it is uttered, but by doing so v. 7 confirms the odd contextual situation in which the words are set to begin with and further draws the attention of the intended and primary readers to the message/s conveyed by the speech of Azariah, the son of Oded.

The readers for whom this speech was crafted were literati of late Yehud. They would have easily recognized another "odd," salient feature of this speech. The words set in the mouth of Azariah strongly echoed prophetic texts set in periods later than Azariah and Asa. For instance, v. 3 (*... ללא ... ללא ... ללא*) contains an echo of Hos 3:4 (*... אינ ... אינ ... אינ*); v. 5 (*אֵין שְׁלוֹם לְיוֹצֵא וּלְבָא*) contains an echo of both Zech 8:10 (*וְלִיוֹצֵא וּלְבָא אֵין־שְׁלוֹם*) and Amos 3:9 (the only two instances of *מְהוּמַת רַבּוֹת* in the Hebrew Bible; compare with Zech 14:13);

15. Lack of interest in these matters is partially due to a common tendency to focus on the world view, world of knowledge, and literary techniques of the proposed *actual* author or authors of the book. This tendency has contributed to a better understanding of the social and intellectual history in late-Persian Yehud. But, as this essay shows, a complementary approach that focuses on the ideological worlds implied, created, reinforced, and communicated through the social process of reading and rereading Chronicles by the literati for whom it was primarily intended sheds additional important, unique light on the social and intellectual history of late-Persian Yehud.

16. The text may have also connoted a sense of "nation will crush nation and city will crush city, for God caused confusion among them by every kind of distress." See below.

v. 7 (וְאֶל-יָרְפוּ יְדִיכֶם) contains an echo of Zeph 3:16 (אֶל-יָרְפוּ יְדִיךְ) and of Jer 31:16 (compare *כִּי יֵשׁ שָׂכָר לְפַעֲלֹתְכֶם* in Chronicles with *כִּי יֵשׁ שָׂכָר לְפַעֲלֹתָיִךְ* in Jeremiah);¹⁷ to which one may add (with Japhet) a close textual tie between v. 4 and Hos 5:15.¹⁸ Although each of these can perhaps be dismissed as a simple coincidence, the cumulative rhetorical power of all these occurrences within the range of a few verses most likely carried considerable significance to the primary and intended readerships of the book.

An illustration of the interpretive influence of this observation is in order. Verse 4 suggests to the intended and primary readers that the negative circumstances portrayed in vv. 3–6 belong to an undefined past. At the same time, the clout of the explicit reference to the past in v. 4 for these readers' understanding of these verses is not negated but rhetorically balanced by the difficulty that they face if they try to associate the text with a particular time in the past.¹⁹ To be sure, some aspects of the text may have suggested to the readers that Azariah referred to the period of the Judges (see v. 4) and that this is what the Chronicler wanted to convey. But other aspects (for example, the lack of reference to the period of the Judges in Chronicles) pointed in a different direction. Among these other aspects, the most noticeable is the explicit, repeated use of words that link this text to other texts in the repertoire of the reading communities, as mentioned above. For instance, as these readers ponder about the possible referents in their discourse of the circumstances portrayed in these verses, the seemingly at best connoted reference to the (eschatological?) future created by the reference to Zech 8:10 in v. 5 becomes far more salient. This is because the other references to prophetic books led the readers to assume that the Chronicler at least at one level of meaning asked them to approach the speech of Azariah from an intertextual perspective that by necessity goes beyond the surface meanings carried by the narrative about Asa's days. Significantly, some of the other references to

17. On these matters, see Beentjes, "Prophets in the Book of Chronicles," 51–52.

18. S. Japhet, *1 & 2 Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993) 20.

19. For instance, should they understand the Chronicler as asking them to skip all the reported periods that precede the utterance (for example, the relevant portion of the reign of Asa, Abijah, and so on) in the story narrated by the Chronicler and recall the background of the period of the Judges, which is not even reported in the book? (See S. S. Tuell, *First and Second Chronicles* [Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001] 169–70.) Or should they understand the Chronicler as asking them to associate this particular review of the past with Northern Israel only, even if this is nowhere stated by the Chronicler? (See W. Johnstone, *1 & 2 Chronicles, Vol. 2: 2 Chronicles 10–36: Guilt and Atonement* [JSOTSup 254; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997] 65–66.)

prophetic texts also reinforce associations between the circumstances described here and historical contexts in the speaker's future. This is certainly true of the reference to Hos 3:4 in v 3.²⁰

Of course, from the perspective of the intended readership, the intertextuality of the speech of Azariah cuts both ways. References to Hos 3:4 and Zech 8:10 contribute to the readers' association of the circumstances portrayed in the speech with future events; conversely, the speech of Azariah provides an intertextual viewpoint from which the primary readership may reread and reinterpret the meanings conveyed by Hos 3:4. As Seligman already noted, whereas Hosea speaks of king, officers, sacrifice, pillar, ephod, and teraphim, Azariah refers to the true deity, priests who teach, and divine teaching/torah.

The consistent shift from the original singular to plural in v. 7's citations of Zeph 3:16 and Jer 31:16 suggests an interpretive approach to these verses.²¹ Moreover, the setting described in Zeph 3:16 and Jer 31:6 concerns a great future that will be manifested following the Exile and that in many ways could not have been considered fulfilled in the days of the primary readership of Chronicles. The text thus creates a multiple interpretive, cross-temporal links between the Israel of Asa's days and the future Israel; between the words of Azariah, son of Oded, and the words YHWH's diverse promises of restoration; between Azariah and the later voice that will be heard according to Zech 3:16; and between the intended and primary readerships that identify with and vicariously experience their own events through their reading as well as the events they are reading about.

As in the previous case of David's psalm, the text of Azariah's speech as experienced and understood through the reading and rereading of the literati for whom the book of Chronicles was composed carries a fluidity of meanings that allows them to engage with it deeply on multiple levels. They also can negotiate their identity through the intertwining of the converging and mutually identifying tendencies communicated by the text without negating the differences between them. After all, they identify on one level with the community addressed by Azariah in the world of the book of Chronicles, and they identify with all the other communities—including those in the future—to which this text clearly alludes and whose images it evokes. At the same time,

20. Compare Japhet, *1 & 2 Chronicles*, 719; and I. L. Seligman, "The Beginning of Midrash in Chronicles," *Tarbiz* 49 (1979–80) 21 [Hebrew].

21. The feminine singular in Zeph 3:15 refers to Jerusalem; the fem. sing. in Jer 31:16 refers to Rachel.

they certainly cannot ignore the difference in their location. Of course, for the text to carry all these meanings, Azariah has to be imagined as bearing the voices of multiple texts set later than his putative time. The obvious “chronism” on the narrative level that is implied in any historiographical work is not negated but is, by discursive and ideological necessity, counterbalanced with claims for cross-temporal connections.²² The latter are supported by, and expressed, among others, in terms of worlds of knowledge (including precise wording of texts, awareness of exile, and of what constitutes a proper response to it) that are at times shared by communities and individuals that exist in different eras. This basic conceptual approach allows for cross-temporal identification as well as for intertextuality within a repertoire of works set in or associated with different periods. It also allows the Chronicler to take a stance as an interpreter of previous texts and to advance claims about their meanings.²³

Given the precedent of David, it is reasonable to assume that the primary and intended readerships of Chronicles imagined Azariah as being aware of the texts he was quoting—that is, he was knowingly quoting them.²⁴ If this was the case, then texts that were explicitly associated with later periods (for example, Zechariah, Hosea, Jeremiah, Zephaniah) had to be conceived at some point or on some level as being known to a prophet before they were written. Significantly, this

22. I discussed elsewhere the central and ubiquitous role of balancing claims in Chronicles; see *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, passim.

23. See, for instance, G. N. Knoppers, “Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood,” *JBL* 118 (1999) 49–72; E. Ben Zvi, “Revisiting ‘Boiling in Fire’ in 2 Chr 35:13 and Related Passover Questions: Text, Exegetical Needs and Concerns, and General Implications,” *Biblical Interpretation in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. I. Kalimi and P. J. Haas; LHBOTS 439; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006) 238–50; and idem, *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, chap. 7.

24. It goes without saying that any study of Chronicles’ understanding of temporal dimensions and fluctuations in the (proper) knowledge of the divine teaching associated with Moses among Israelites raises a number of issues that are substantially different from the issues involved in the case of Azariah, the son of Oded (for one thing, Moses was set in a time period in the story of Israel that was construed as prior to rather than later than the time of any Israelite speaker in the monarchic period) and therefore are beyond the scope of this essay. These matters must be addressed at length in a separate essay. There is not doubt, however, that Chronicles contains allusions and references to pentateuchal texts and that many of the considerations advanced here about identity, fluidity of meanings, intertextuality, the late Persian, Yehudite social background of the authorship and primary readership of Chronicles and its/their interpretive approaches are relevant to the study of the world views shaped and reflected by references to pentateuchal texts in Chronicles, from the viewpoint of the latter’s intended and primary readerships.

line of thought is present in other works within the authoritative repertoire of the Yehudite literati. The most obvious example is Gen 26:5b, which asks the intended and primary readerships of Genesis to associate Abraham with Mosaic Torah (and compare Gen 26:5b with Deut 11:1), even though, obviously, Abraham preceded Moses.²⁵ The appearance of similar ideological approaches to the construction of the past and to the cross-temporal character of some texts in works other than Chronicles, within the general setting of the Persian period, is only to be expected. Chronicles is simply part and parcel of a range of ideological discourses that informed and shaped the world of the literati of the time.

It is worth noting, however, that if carried to its logical conclusion, this line of thought leads beyond the “moderate” approach mentioned above to the concept of preexisting texts, whether written or unwritten. The latter is actually attested in the literature of the late Second Temple and its aftermath (see *Jubilees* and *2 Bar.* 57:1–2) and may be compared with later concepts of a preexisting Torah, such as the concepts reflected in the beginning of *Genesis Rabbah*.

In any event, the attribution of knowledge of things or utterances that have not yet taken places to pious figures in Israel’s past (For example, David and Israel when David transported the ark; the prophet Azariah) shades them with a bit of godly character (cf. Isa 46:10). Certainly, these attributions contribute to the later characterization of David as a prophet.²⁶

This said, at least in some of their rereadings of the text, the primary and intended readerships of Chronicles could have also imagined Azariah as being unaware that his speech referred to texts that would later be included in the repertoire of Persian Yehud. If so, within these readings they had to imagine a providential hand guiding Azariah and making him utter the very precise words that would allow and shape the true and full meaning of his speech, as understood by these readerships. This line of thought, if carried to its logical conclusion, leads to

25. On this matter, see J. D. Levenson, “The Conversion of Abraham to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. H. Najman and J. H. Newman; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 3–40 (esp. pp. 20–21).

26. See the well-known case of Acts 2:30–31. Of course, the characterization of David as a prophet did not begin with the book of Acts. See 11Q5 (= 11QPs^a) col. xxvii line 11. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 6.166 (cf. *Ant.* 8.109). On these matters, see J. A. Fitzmyer, “David, ‘Being Therefore a Prophet’ (Acts 2:30),” *CBQ* 34 (1972) 332–39; and recently, P. W. Flint, “The Prophet David at Qumran,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005) 158–67.

the concept of prophets who were unaware of and, in fact, essentially unable to understand the full meaning of what they were prophesying (compare Qumran pesharim, New Testament exegesis, and the use of biblical references in, for instance, 1 Macc 14:9, 12; and compare Zech 8:4–5 and Mic 4:4). Significantly, the text of Chronicles leaves all these interpretive paths open.

Conclusions

Rather than dismissing references to speakers who know later texts or events as anachronistic mistakes that a good historian should have avoided, I strongly suggest in this essay that these references served important purposes and for this reason were highlighted in the text. These references created a fluidity of meanings that was essential to the didactic, socializing function of the text and, above all, essential to the reading and rereading of the text by the communities for whom it was composed. This fluidity of meanings allowed the primary readers to shape their identity in terms of convergences and identification with other communities of Israel across time without negating differences among them. These references also allowed for the development of a substantial degree of intertextuality. To some extent they permitted the development of integration through interaction with diverse authoritative texts in the repertoire of the primary readership—including interaction with Chronicles. This discursive interaction is, of course, related to and somewhat a reflection of the actual social situation of the literati who constituted the primary readership of Chronicles and who read and reread other books in their authoritative repertoire besides Chronicles. Their interpretive viewpoint was strongly informed by the knowledge they used as they read and reread Chronicles. Finally, I suggest in this essay that Chronicles stood ambiguously before interpretive approaches to “Scripture” (including prophetic texts) that played major roles in the late Second Temple period; in fact, it was already pointing to them.

In this essay, I point out the potential for understanding the intellectual and ideological setting of the literati in (Jerusalem-centered) late Persian Yehud. This understanding can be clarified by studying the intellectual milieu of the monarchic past in Chronicles from the perspective of the late Persian period’s ideological world, which was implied, created, reinforced, and communicated to the primary readers through the social process of reading and rereading Chronicles. Much more work on these matters awaits us.