

Community Identity in Judean Historiography

Biblical and Comparative Perspectives

Edited by

GARY N. KNOPPERS and KENNETH A. RISTAU

Winona Lake, Indiana
EISENBRAUNS
2009

© Copyright 2009 by Eisenbrauns.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

www.eisenbrauns.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Community identity in Judean historiography : biblical and comparative perspectives / edited by Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau
p. cm.

"This volume is largely the outcome of presentations made in the Ancient Historiography Seminar of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies/Société canadienne des études bibliques at its 2007 annual meeting in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan"—Introduction.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-1-57506-165-8 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Jews—History—To A.D. 70.—Historiography—Congresses.
2. Jews—Identity—History—Congresses. 3. Jews—Identity—Historiography—Congresses. 4. Ethnicity in the Bible—Congresses.
5. Bible. O.T.—Historiography—Congresses. 6. Bible. O.T.—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—Congresses. I. Knoppers, Gary N., 1956—
- II. Ristau, Kenneth A.

DS115.5.C655 2009

933.0072—dc22

2009010552

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.®™

Contents

Contributors to <i>Community Identity in Judean Historiography</i>	ix
Introduction	1
Israel and the Nomads of Ancient Palestine	9
KENTON L. SPARKS	
David: Messianic King or Mercenary Ruler?	27
JOHN VAN SETERS	
A Comparative Study of the Exilic Gap in Ancient Israelite, Messenian, and Zionist Collective Memory	41
KATHERINE M. STOTT	
Are There Any Bridges Out There? How Wide Was the Conceptual Gap between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles?	59
EHUD BEN ZVI	
Characters in Stone: Royal Ideology and Yehudite Identity in the Behistun Inscription and the Book of Haggai	87
JAMES BOWICK	
The Diaspora in Zechariah 1–8 and Ezra–Nehemiah: The Role of History, Social Location, and Tradition in the Formulation of Identity	119
JOHN KESSLER	
Ethnicity, Genealogy, Geography, and Change: The Judean Communities of Babylon and Jerusalem in the Story of Ezra	147
GARY N. KNOPPERS	
Ezra’s Mission and the Levites of Casiphia	173
MARK LEUCHTER	
Textual Identities in the Books of Chronicles: The Case of Jehoram’s History	197
LOUIS JONKER	

Reading and Rereading Josiah: The Chronicler's Representation of Josiah for the Postexilic Community	219
KENNETH A. RISTAU	
Identity and Empire, Reality and Hope in the Chronicler's Perspective	249
MARK J. BODA	
Indexes	273
Index of Authors	273
Index of Scripture	279



Are There Any Bridges Out There? How Wide Was the Conceptual Gap between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles?

EHUD BEN ZVI
University of Alberta

Introduction

There is no doubt that there is a substantial difference between the (hi)stories (hereafter, “history” or “histories”) constructed and narrated in the book of Chronicles and those in the Deuteronomistic Historical Collection, that is, the collection of books usually referred to as the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH).¹ For instance, the two histories begin and reach their explicit narrative conclusion at different places.² Many episodes, even central episodes, in one do not appear in the other, and vice versa.³ Even when they include reports about the same period, they often construe it in substantially different ways.⁴ Moreover, the

Author's note: A note about the background that led to the choice of the question that opens this contribution: this work originated in an oral presentation at the 2007 meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies that took place at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon. Near the university campus, where the talk was delivered, stands a very prominent bridge that marks the city landscape and that most participants in the meeting had to cross daily to arrive at or leave the campus area.

1. In referring to the Deuteronomistic History as a collection of books, I wish to stress that I view this corpus as a multivocal and complex corpus rather than as a tightly written, univocal, coherent unity.

2. The same holds true for the Primary History or, as it might also be called, the Primary Historical Collection. In speaking of the Primary History as a collection, I mean to say that this work is not a tightly-knit and well-integrated unity but, rather, a collection of books or writings. The Primary History is a work to which Chronicles is more comparable than the DtrH, from the viewpoint of the general temporal span with which it deals and which it construes for the intended and primary readerships.

3. So, for example, the period of the “Judges,” as construed in the book of Judges, has no parallel in the temporal account of Chronicles.

4. See, for instance, the characterization of the reigns of Abijah and Manasseh.

characterization of shared central personages in these histories is at times clearly dissimilar.⁵

None of this is the result of chance. One of the most fundamental social and ideological roles of Chronicles, as most likely understood by its intended and primary readers was to shape, communicate, and encourage its readers to visit and vicariously relive through their reading a somewhat different past than the one shaped, communicated by, and relived through the reading of the Deuteronomistic History, and for that matter, the Primary History.⁶ A related social and ideological role of Chronicles was to create a set of complementary histories in such a way that the readers of each would approach their relevant text in a way informed by the other. Certainly, ancient (re)readers (hereafter, readers) who internalized Chronicles would have approached the Deuteronomistic History and the Primary History in ways different from readers without knowledge of Chronicles.⁷ In other words, Chronicles was meant to influence the reading and interpretation of already existing authoritative works,⁸ while at the same time being influenced by

5. Perhaps the most obvious case is David—that is, the David of Samuel compared with the David of Chronicles. There are also substantial differences in the characterizations of Solomon, Abijah, Asa, and Manasseh, to mention just a few kings in Kings and Chronicles.

6. In referring to the readers of Chronicles, the Primary History, and the Deuteronomistic History, I want to stress that I am referring to the intended and primary rereaderships of these different literary works.

7. The Deuteronomistic History served as a source for Chronicles. See, among many others, S. L. McKenzie, "The Chronicler as a Redactor," 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) 70–90; I. Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005); J. Van Seters, "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible," *Studies in Religion* 29 (2000) 395–409. For a different position, see A. G. Auld, "What If the Chronicler Did Use the Deuteronomistic History?" in *Virtual History and the Bible* (ed. J. C. Exum; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 137–50; idem, "What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles?" in *The Chronicler as Author*, 91–99; idem, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994). Notice also his recent clarification that he does not (and did not) claim that the individuals responsible for the present form of the book of Chronicles did not know the book of Samuel.

8. Simply, for the sake of illustration, Chronicles identifies Mt. Moriah as the site of the Jerusalemite temple (2 Chr 3:1). Ancient readers who accepted this identification would have their own readings of the patriarchal narratives in Genesis strongly colored by such an understanding. On Mt. Moriah in Chronicles, see I. Kalimi, *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place and Writing* (*Studia semitica neerlandica* 46; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005) 129–31. It is worth noting that, even if Chronicles is not an innovator here but reflects a position common to Jerusalemite-centered discourses of the Persian period, it still presents itself as literature meant to convey the "actual" meaning

them. Thus multiple constructions of (and virtual visitations of) the past became interwoven in a web of meanings that not only represented better as a whole the horizon of thought of Persian-period Jerusalem but also, because of its relative openness, allowed its literati to use and reuse the past in manifold ways, according to different circumstances. Thus, Chronicles was both a self-standing work, as any other authoritative book in the repertoire of Yehud, and was asking its readers to approach it as such. At the very same time and at a different interpretive level, Chronicles was a work whose (hi)story clearly evoked, interacted with, and was written, read, and reread in ancient Israel in ways strongly informed by the “classical” version in the social memory, a memory shaped by books such as Genesis, Samuel, and Kings that were considered authoritative also from the perspective of the readers of Chronicles.⁹

This being so, Chronicles, by logical and social necessity, consistently presented itself to its readers as both similar and dissimilar, continuous and discontinuous with existing memories of the past and with their accepted renderings in narratives that were included in the

of older pentateuchal texts. See my “Revisiting ‘Boiling in Fire’ in 2 Chron. 35.13 and Related Passover Questions: Text, Exegetical Needs, Concerns, and General Implications,” in *Biblical Interpretation in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Isaac Kalimi and Peter J. Haas; Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 439; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006) 238–50. On the general issue, see Gary N. Knoppers, who writes, “[a]fter reading the Chronicler’s composition and its selective incorporation of earlier writings, ancient readers may have understood those earlier writings differently” (*1 Chronicles 1–9* [AB 12; New York: Doubleday, 2004] 133).

9. Concerning the claim that Samuel and Kings were treated as “classical” texts from the perspective of the readers of Chronicles, see Van Seters, “Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible.” Of course, texts can bear authority within a particular community of readers even if their literal story is not taken as the only possible representation of a social memory (compare the Gospels). The case is particularly clear in ancient Israelite historiography in which rhetorical and didactic needs trumped what today we may consider “the reconstruction of the most likely historical event.” For this reason, even within the same book there exist reports that would be construed as logical contradictions within a literal, full, and only mimetic mode of reading (e.g., Josh 11:23 and 13:1; 1 Sam 14:47–48, 52; 17:54; and 2 Sam 5:6–9; 2 Chr 17:6, and 20:33).

Because of their common use, I referred above to “literal” and “literally.” It should be noted, however, that the terms are a bit of a misnomer for the phenomenon I described. A more precise term would be “letteral.” The letteral meaning of a text—that is, the “literal-as-written” meaning of the text, is only one of the possible “literal” meanings that communities of readers may associate with a text. See G. Loughling, “Using Scripture: Community and Letterality,” in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honor of John F. A. Sawyer* (ed. J. Davies et al.; JSOTSup 195; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 321–39 (esp. pp. 324–25).

repertoire of authoritative texts held by the literati, among whom one is to find both the authorship and primary readership of Chronicles. This characterization of Chronicles as both continuous and discontinuous with other literati's memories and, above all, with their written, authoritative texts shaped much of Chronicles and was communicated to the latter's readers, again, through multiple ways. Among them, one may mention the choice of a language that is both saliently and unmistakably evocative of Samuel and Kings—after all, Chronicles repeats much of these texts. However, Chronicles is also written in Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) and is therefore clearly unlike Samuel and Kings. One may mention also the manner in which Chronicles conforms, as expected, to a shared basic outline of Israel's past, while simultaneously reshaping substantially many of the narratives and their main characters, and all within the limits of the allowable (hi)stori- cal malleability of the community of literati for which the work was written.

Because some of these matters have been discussed elsewhere,¹⁰ I focus here on another component of the crucial and careful interplay in Chronicles between continuity and discontinuity, between resemblance to historical traditions and the kind of creative discontinuity that enabled its readers to (vicariously) experience slightly different pasts and, therefore, allowed them to shape additional "sites of memory" and images of the past. As is well-known, the general tendency in contemporary research has been to highlight the differences between Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History in terms of basic world view.¹¹ The position advanced here serves to bring some balance into

10. See Van Seters, "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible"; and my *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles* (London: Equinox, 2006).

11. The tendency to emphasize differences between Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History so as to widen as much as possible the gap between them has a very long history of interpretation, which in part is entangled with that of the dating of the pentateuchal sources and particularly the Priestly work (P). Thus, for instance, a postexilic date of P was associated with an evaluation of the picture of the monarchic period that Chronicles portrays as carrying essentially no historical value for the historical reconstruction of the period. A Josianic date for the Deuteronomistic work (D), however, tended to be associated with a positive evaluation of the historicity of Kings in particular (and not only with respect to its account of Josiah's reign). Thus a strong tendency to stress the difference between the two historical narratives developed. Other factors contributed to this trend. For instance, in the case of Julius Wellhausen—who was a child of his own times—his negative evaluation of what he construed to be Judaism and which he associated with Chronicles played a major role. The more negative his appreciation of Chronicles, the more he tended to show that Kings, Samuel, and Judges were different at least in the main. (To be sure, according to him, these books were at a late ["Judaic"] stage "tampered" with.) Had Wellhausen not stressed the difference between these books and

this question by taking into serious account the multivocality of both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles. This study points to a number of observations that converge to show strong continuity (and at times even overlap) between at least some “voices” within the Deuteronomistic History and voices that are either usually associated with or considered “distinctive” of Chronicles. Moreover, most of these observations directly relate to ideologically central issues in Chronicles. In most of these instances, Chronicles highlighted or further developed some viewpoints already existing in the Deuteronomistic History, implicitly or explicitly. Needless to say, because the approach in Chronicles to these matters points to strong elements of continuity, it cannot but also point at an accompanying sense of discontinuity. This is the case because Chronicles, by necessity, echoes particular voices of the Deuteronomistic History in a very different literary and ideological setting and, therefore, makes these voices interact and inform a different set of voices from those with which their “partners” in the Deuteronomistic History informed and interacted. After all, meanings in these books are always both contextual and cotextual.¹²

Observations: Converging Lines

Deferred and Non-deferred Judgment and Related Issues of Agency

As is well known, according to 2 Kgs 24:3 the destruction of monarchic Judah was due to Manasseh’s sin (see also 2 Kgs 21:11–14; 23:26–27; Jer 15:4). But, to be sure, this is not the only “voice” in the Deuteronomistic

Chronicles, he would have remained without any “worthy” biblical historiographical narrative, historically or theologically. Likewise, the (later) widespread perception of Chronicles as a very problematic source for the reconstruction of the history of monarchic Judah led in some circles to a tendency to stress that Kings is different, for the alternative would have left historians of the monarchic period with very few reliable sources with which to write a detailed history of the period. A study of these matters demands a separate discussion and, in any event, stands well beyond the scope of the present paper. For Wellhausen’s position on Chronicles, which in various ways continues to exert a strong influence in Chronicles research, see J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Cleveland: Meridian, 1957; orig. publication, 1883) 171–227. For research on Chronicles in the 19th century, see M. P. Graham, *The Utilization of 1 and 2 Chronicles in the Reconstruction of Israelite History in the Nineteenth Century* (SBLDS 116; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

12. Of course, a similar argument may be advanced about Josephus and biblical traditions (see below). This interaction between discontinuity and continuity is a systemic feature of successful attempts at renarrating and reshaping a past that is in the main agreed upon within a community.

History or in Kings for that matter. The far more common voice relating the fall of monarchic Judah, Jerusalem, and the temple to a long history of cumulative sin that goes back to the very beginnings of the nation appears also in the very same report on Manasseh's reign in Kings (see 2 Kgs 21:15; cf. Lev 26:14–43; Deut 31:15–22; Hosea, *passim*). This voice echoes in Huldah's prophecy (2 Kgs 22:14–20) and is embedded in the inner logic of the ubiquitous construction of the fall of northern Israel (both in the Deuteronomistic History and in the prophetic literature). It is the latter's sins—certainly not Manasseh's—that resulted eventually in its fall.¹³ Yet, the fall of northern Israel is ubiquitously presented as an interpretive key through which the readers of Kings were supposed to understand the fall of monarchic Judah. There is also a less salient, third voice in Kings. This voice creates an association between the Babylonian Exile and Hezekiah (see 2 Kgs 20:14–19). Despite their differences, all of these voices share a world view in which (a) the usual complementary dyad of king-people plays an important role, and (b) punishment might be deferred and sin may accumulate.¹⁴

There has been a common misperception that Chronicles is all about immediate and individual retribution and that there is neither “accumulated sin (n) or merit as in the book of Kings.”¹⁵ Similarly, Chronicles supposedly contains no reference to deferred or even to transgenerational punishment. In fact, Chronicles contains numerous examples

13. The idea that the sin that leads to the destruction of the monarchic polities is conceived as *only* monarchic in the Deuteronomistic History and is later “democratized” *only* in Chronicles is incorrect. There are clear voices in Kings that point to a “democratized” sin (see 2 Kgs 17:7–17; 21:8, 14; at times characterized as a DTR-N voice), and Chronicles is not immune to the idea that the king may lead the people astray. Note, for instance, the immediate reversal of the people as soon as Ahaz dies. See my *History, Literature and Theology*, 167–68, 220–22.

14. The two obvious cases are Hezekiah and Josiah. It may be noticed also that both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles assume that the divine decision to divide the Davidic/Solomonic kingdom was made during Solomon's life but implemented only after his death. In the case of the Deuteronomistic History, the divine decision is explicitly construed as punishment for wrongdoing (1 Kgs 11:33). Chronicles construes the decision differently. For its take on the matter, see my *History, Literature and Theology*, 117–43.

15. Citation from R. W. Klein, *1 Chronicles* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006) 46. Of course, he is not the only scholar who advanced this position. See, for instance, the highly influential words of S. Japhet, “the deeds of one generation are not ‘visited on’ another: any ideology of ‘the sins of the fathers’ or ancestral merit . . . has no place in the book,” *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum 9; rev. ed.; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997) 162.

that belie this claim.¹⁶ For the present purposes, it is worth stressing that not only does Chronicles contain the crucial prophecy of Huldah (2 Chr 34:22–28; cf. 2 Kgs 22:14–20),¹⁷ which implies deferred punishment and cumulative sin (see also 2 Chr 36:21 and cf. 2 Kgs 22:13), but its Huldah prophecy is more salient in Chronicles than in Kings, because there is no voice in Chronicles ascribing the destruction to Manasseh, and there is only a vague allusion to Hezekiah's (mis)deed (2 Chr 32:25–26). Thus, the concept of deferred judgment is communicated to the ancient readers of both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles.

To be sure, unlike Kings, Chronicles does not refer to the tradition about Manasseh's responsibility for the fall of Judah; but, interestingly enough, it may reflect one of the major inconsistencies between the main literary and ideological *topos* of deferred judgment and the way in which it was textualized and brought to bear into the memory of the literati in the case of the Manasseh of Kings. When judgment or the materialization of any divinely appointed catastrophe is deferred, the deferral is often conceived as a divine reward for the good deeds of an individual who is spared the experience of such a tragedy. Ancient readers of Kings who were aware of this *topos* would probably have wondered about the picture of Manasseh in Kings. Why would punishment have been deferred until after his death? Did he do something to deserve it?¹⁸ Significantly, Chronicles constructs his image as a king who also did much good, and in fact, it shifts the crucial moment of the declaration of YHWH's irrevocable punishment that seals the fate of Judah completely to the account of Josiah, a very pious king, for rhetorical and ideological purposes.¹⁹ In any case, this section of Chronicles

16. See my *History, Literature and Theology*, passim.

17. There are no substantial differences between the two pericopes.

18. Of course, Chronicles did not *have* to answer these questions. After all, Chronicles conveys also to its intended and primary (re)readers that at times YHWH's actions are impossible to explain (e.g., YHWH's decision to divide the Solomonic kingdom in two, which significantly took place during Solomon's days but was divinely implemented later—because of the piety of Solomon?).

19. I discussed the rhetorical and ideological purposes in "Observations on Josiah's Account in Chronicles and Implications for Reconstructing the Worldview of the Chronicler," in *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na'aman* (ed. Y. Amit et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006) 89–106. The usual explanation for the positive characterization of Manasseh in Chronicles relates it to his longevity. Long life is a blessing; his (later) actions were the reason for such a blessing. This explanation does not contradict but complements the suggestion that another impetus for the positive characterization of the king may have come from considerations related to the *topos* of deferred judgment/catastrophe. The argument that, because Chronicles avoids the references in

rather than rejecting the use of the motif of deferred punishment in Kings manifests it in a way that is more consistent with the topos.²⁰

To be sure, although Chronicles knows of deferred punishment/catastrophe, there is no doubt that it communicates numerous examples in which there is no deferral. By doing so, Chronicles presents itself as a whole to its readers as a work in which seemingly contradictory positions are advanced, so as to balance and inform each other. Significantly, the same holds true for the Deuteronomistic History. For instance, David is punished with the death of his first son born to Bathsheba, Jezebel is killed and the dogs eat her flesh, the punishment of the people of Gibeah (and Benjamin) is certainly not deferred to later generations, and the system of apostasy and punishment that characterizes much of the book of Judges is predicated on non-deferred punishment.²¹ At the same time, the reference to Manasseh points to an obvious case of deferred punishment. In other words, both Chronicles

Kings to Manasseh's sins as being responsible for YHWH's decision to destroy Judah, the topos of deferred judgment could not have served as an impetus for the characterization of Manasseh does not hold water. The communities within which and for which Chronicles was written were well aware of this claim (after all, they knew the Deuteronomistic History). Moreover, on other occasions Chronicles develops its story in a way that interacts with, responds to, and balances sections of the Deuteronomistic History that were not included in Chronicles. See, for instance, the story of Rehoboam's building activities (only) in Chronicles and the activities of Jeroboam (only) in Kings.

20. The relevant section of Kings uses Manasseh as the main person responsible for the destruction so as to develop its lionized image of Josiah. This is part of a pattern: Ahaz-Hezekiah; Manasseh-Josiah. The tendency toward the occurrence of the topos of deferred punishment in a way that is more consistent with its usual attributes in narrowly construed pericopes in Chronicles is congruent with its general (though certainly not absolute) tendency toward higher consistency between ideological expectations and narrative within narrowly construed pericopes (as opposed to the book as a whole). This holds true for "Deuteronomistic" expectations as well as many others. See G. N. Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings," *CBQ* 63 (2001) 393–415 (esp. pp. 395–96) and my *History, Literature and Theology*, 210–42. For typical examples of the topos of deferred judgment for the righteous in biblical literature, see the example associated with Hezekiah in 2 Kgs 20:17–18 // Isa 39:6–8; with Josiah, 2 Kgs 22:14–20 // 2 Chr 34:22–28. An interesting twist in this motif is the case of an individual subjected to a premature, divinely caused death so that he will not undergo a punishment that cannot be deferred much more. See the case of Abijah, son of Jeroboam, in 1 Kgs 14:13. The text there reinforces the principle while at the same time conveying that the best a pious Jeroboamite can expect is to die before an impending disaster, not to become king and defer it for awhile, something that only Davidides may do. On this matter, see below. For another twist in the deferred-judgment motif, see 1 Kgs 11:34, in which the merit of the father saves the son from experiencing a deserved punishment.

21. I have deliberately chosen examples for which there is no parallel in Chronicles.

and the Deuteronomistic History maintain that both deferred and non-deferred divine judgment/calamity were at work in Israel's past (and likely future) and shape a balanced ideological approach on the matter in the readers. Their position on this issue is to a large extent anticipated and consistent with the position of the discourse of the Persian-period literati in general, and appears in pentateuchal traditions and in prophetic literature as well as other places.²² It is also worth noting that the same holds true in historical works such as Herodotus, Xenophon, and of course Josephus.²³ In other words, there is nothing unexpected about the coexistence of the two approaches in the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles.²⁴

Non-deferred judgment inevitably raises the matter of the relationship between divinely caused disaster and agency. Both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles assume that, at times, later generations may pay for the sins of preceding generations.²⁵ Although at times there is not much that the people populating the world portrayed in either one of these ancient Israelite histories can do about these matters,²⁶ both histories communicate that the fulfillment of a deferred

22. For examples of non-deferred judgment/calamity, see instances such as Onan in Gen 38:9–10, Miriam in Numbers 12, and Zimri son of Salu and the Midianite woman in Numbers 25. Deferred punishment is implied in the case of Moses and, above all, in the references to Israel's future exile. Note that the omen-nomen traditions in prophetic literature suggest an idea of a predetermined punishment that is deferred to the time of the deity's choice.

23. On Herodotus, see the defeat of Persia during the days of Xerxes, which is explained in terms of both the long-term imperial hubris of the empire and the individual hubris of Xerxes. On Xenophon, see J. Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (New York: Routledge, 1995); F. Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious in Xenophon's *Hellenica*," *HTR* 91 (1998) 251–77. For a clear instance of deferred judgment, see Josephus's account of the episode about Hezekiah's dealings with the messengers of the king of Babylon (*Ant.* 10.33–34), and for non-deferred judgment, the death of the combatants at Massada. It is worth noting that the absence of a note explaining the fall of monarchic Judah in terms of Manasseh's deeds here (just as in Chronicles) does not point to a rejection of the idea of deferred punishment. On the interesting characterization of Manasseh in Josephus, which in turn was influenced by that in Chronicles, see L. H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal of Manasseh," *JSP* 9 (1991) 3–20.

24. Neither in ancient Israel nor in Greece did historiographical writers and their readers think that such a combination was logically impossible.

25. No one doubts that this is the case in Kings. As for Chronicles, see not only the case of Josiah's generation but also of people who had to live in exile because the land had to make up for its Sabbaths, a total of 70 years (2 Chr 36:21). See also 2 Chr 29:9.

26. David's people fall because of the census in both Chronicles and Samuel. For further examples in Chronicles, see, for instance, the case of people living in forced exile (2 Chr 36:21). Moreover, one cannot assume full agency for Judahites under the spell, as it were, of bad kings, or kings under a "divine spell," as was the case with Rehoboam

calamity does not necessarily imply that those who will experience its full impact *must* be deprived of agency. For instance, Zedekiah remains a bad king in Chronicles, even if the destruction of monarchic Judah was unavoidable already by Josiah's time. Similarly, the calamity that fell upon the House of David following his actions toward Bathsheba and Uriah the Hittite did not remove any agency (or culpability) from Amnon and later from Absalom for their deeds. The Chronicler and the Deuteronomist do not stand on opposite ideological sides; in both Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History, the idea of (a) an already sealed and absolutely irrevocable future known to YHWH and at times to particular individuals²⁷ is not construed as necessarily inconsistent with the notion of (b) personal free choice and agency.²⁸

Prophets and Prophecy

Prophets in Chronicles are often and correctly portrayed as serving a number of roles. Among other roles, they serve to warn addressees before divine punishment (and thus fulfill the relatively common motif of giving a warning before divine punishment),²⁹ to explain to individuals the significance of their actions and the future consequences, to communicate godly world views, and to write history.

All of these features find clear counterparts in the Deuteronomistic History. To begin with, one of the roles of the generic prophets in Kings, a role that is essential to the construction of the image of "the prophets of old" in the DtrH, is to warn people of the calamity to which their actions may lead.³⁰ The idea that YHWH sent warnings to the people about the impending destruction and that these were ignored is present in Kings (e.g., 2 Kgs 17:13–15, 22–23), Jeremiah (see Jer 7:25; 25:4; 26:9; 35:15; 44:4), Zech 1:3–5, and, particularly relevant to this es-

during the secession of the north. I have discussed these matters elsewhere (*History, Literature and Theology*, passim).

27. See Moses in Deut 30:1–6, Joshua in Josh 24:19, "YHWH's servants, the prophets" in 2 Kgs 21:10–15, Josiah (and Huldah) in both Kings and Chronicles, or David in 1 Chr 16:35. On the latter, see my "Who Knew What? The Construction of the Monarchic Past in Chronicles and Implications for the Intellectual Setting of Chronicles," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (ed. O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007) 349–60.

28. Compare the general spirit of *m. 'Abot* 3:15.

29. See esp. Japhet, *Ideology*, 184–90.

30. I discussed the main roles of these figures elsewhere, "'The Prophets': Generic Prophets and Their Role in the Construction of the Image of the 'Prophets of Old' within the Postmonarchic Readership of the Book of Kings," *ZAW* 16 (2004) 555–67.

say, 2 Chr 36:15–16.³¹ Prophets in the world of Chronicles explained to kings the significance of their actions for the future (e.g., 2 Chr 12:5; 25:15), and so did, for instance, Nathan in 2 Samuel 12. Prophets are aware of YHWH's will in both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles (e.g., 2 Kgs 22:16–17; 24:2; 2 Chr 25:16; 34:22–25, and cf. Amos 3:7).

Prophetic speeches are aimed at teaching the divine world view in Chronicles and in Kings, “all the (divine) teaching that I have commanded your ancestors and that I have sent you through my servants, the prophets” (2 Kgs 17:13). Because within the world of Chronicles, divine teaching is conceived as saliently textualized, it is only a logical (and perhaps even a necessary) step for the book to imagine prophets as interpreters of Scripture,³² whether the Scripture they are interpreting was associated in the repertoire of the literati with periods earlier or later than those in which the prophet was set in Chronicles.³³

The same tendency toward full textualization may explain why the Chronicler (i.e., the implied author of the book of Chronicles) refers to written works of prophets among his sources for regnal accounts (e.g., 1 Chr 29:29; 2 Chr 13:22; 20:34; 26:22; 32:32) and therefore implies that prophets were also “historians” who left records of their own times. If prophets understood the significance of past events (a point shared by both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles), then Chronicles

31. In 2 Kgs 17, the text deals with the fall of Samaria but from the perspective of the readers of the book clearly points to the fall of Judah and Jerusalem (and see explicit reference to Judah in v. 13). From the perspective of the present text, the “they” in vv. 13–14 can only refer to both Judah and Israel. See P. A. Viviano, “2 Kings 17: A Rhetorical and Form-Critical Analysis,” *CBQ* 49 (1987) 548–59 (esp. p. 551). The saliency of these verses is indicated by the shift toward YHWH as the subject (in comparison with previous verses) in v. 13 and then to the position of the speaker. See also R. D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield, 1981) 58.

32. See, for instance, W. M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 197; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); idem, “The Chronicler as Interpreter of Scripture,” 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) 158–80; Y. Amit, “The Role of Prophecy and Prophets in the Chronicler's World,” in *Prophets, Prophecy and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (ed. M. H. Floyd and R. L. Haak; Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006) 80–101; 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 and see the extensive bibliography in p. 46 n. 11.

33. I elaborated this point in my “Who Knew What?”

would have assumed that at least some of them would have written their explanations (see 2 Chr 26:22; cf. 2 Chr 20:34).³⁴

The point in this section, and in any other section of this paper for that matter, is *not* to show that there are no differences between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles. The point is to show that there are substantial lines of conceptual convergence between the two. Certainly, the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles did not construct the very same institution of prophets and prophecy. For instance, in Chronicles characters who are not prophets may temporarily fulfill the role of prophet.³⁵ In Chronicles, even a foreign king (Necho) may fulfill such a role. This is not the case in the Deuteronomistic History, even if it also “Israelitizes” good foreigners such as Hiram (compare with the figure of Jethro in the Primary History). Here, as on the matter of the prophet as an interpreter of Scripture or history, Chronicles develops existing notions further as it understands (and “translates”) them in a way that relates to its own world of knowledge and ideological prism.

Finally, it is worth noting that there are substantial and perhaps even larger differences in the conceptualization of the role of the prophet within the Deuteronomistic History itself than between the main voices in Kings and Chronicles. For instance, prophets play no role as such in Judges and Joshua (cf. Deut 17:18–20), and there was a substantial voice in the Deuteronomistic History according to which prophets—and by implication, prophecy—were of only secondary political and, perhaps, theological importance (see the basic structure of the regnal reports; and a text such as 2 Kgs 14:26).³⁶ This voice sharply differs with the other voices mentioned above, whether they appear in Kings or Chronicles.

David and the Davidides

The differences between the Davids of Chronicles and Samuel are all too obvious and do not require further elaboration.³⁷ But what

34. Cf. Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 42; T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels* (FRLANT 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 231–41. Chronicles is also influenced by the prophetic books and their superscriptions (Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 218).

35. Cf. Amit, “The Role of Prophecy.”

36. See my “Prophets and Prophecy in the Compositional and Redactional Notes in I–II Kings,” *ZAW* 105 (1993) 331–51.

37. However, there are also important points of convergence besides the obvious sharing of narrative elements that reflects (a) the dependence of Chronicles on the Deuteronomistic History and above all (b) its dependence on the corpus of “core facts” about

about the memory of David represented by 2 Kgs 14:3; 16:2; 18:3; 22:2 (see also 1 Kgs 15:11)? Even the one reservation about “Uriaah, the Hittite,” advanced in 1 Kgs 15:3–5 does not reappear in any of these verses. Are not the readers of these texts invited to imagine him as a paragon of virtue, who did not turn aside from YHWH’s path to the right or to the left? A David imagined within these parameters is likely to look much more like the David of Chronicles than the David of Samuel. Moreover, even the close association of the temple in Chronicles with both David and Solomon finds an earlier echo in 2 Kgs 21:7.³⁸

The Deuteronomistic History as a whole is clearly multivocal about hope (or lack thereof) for a future David. Some texts in the Deuteronomistic History allowed or even nurtured among the ancient readers of this collection of books a sense of hope for the coming of a future Davidide (e.g., 2 Sam 7:16), but others balanced such an approach and raised the possibility that the Davidides might not return to power (e.g., 1 Sam 2:30).³⁹

David that were agreed upon by the literati. Among these less obvious elements is the characterization of David as a speaker of psalms (cf. 2 Sam 22 with Ps 18 and 1 Chr 16:18–36 with Ps 105:1–15; 96:1–13; 106:1 (?) and 106:47–48).

38. It may be mentioned that the Solomon of Chronicles is consistent with a voice in 1 Kings that lionizes Solomon (and with the construction of Solomon in Proverbs, Pss 72:1, and 127:1, as well as with the references to Solomon in 2 Kings), while it rejects the strong critique of Solomon that is also present in 1 Kings. On the latter, see M. A. Sweeney, “The Critique of Solomon in the Josianic Edition of the Deuteronomistic History,” *JBL* 114 (1995) 607–22; D. A. Glatt-Gilad, “The Deuteronomistic Critique of Solomon: A Response to Marvin A. Sweeney,” *JBL* 116 (1997) 700–703; cf. M. Z. Brettler, “The Structure of 1 Kings 1–11,” *JOT* 49 (1991) 87–97.

39. Note the presence of the crucial temporal term *עַד-עוֹלָם* in both 1 Sam 2:30 and 2 Sam 7:16. 1 Samuel 2:30 may have served as *an* introduction and interpretive key to the book of Samuel as a whole. A full debate on these matters—which in any case must involve the issue of whether postmonarchic readers saw a reflection of themselves in the suffering David who was aware of having grievously sinned (a motif that characterizes the latter part of Samuel), and therefore the latter stood typologically for Israel—cannot be carried out here. It suffices to note that the Deuteronomistic History as a whole and as read within a postmonarchic setting is multivocal on these matters. The books in the Deuteronomistic History, Chronicles, and prophetic literature all exhibit some degree of multivocality on this issue, though not always the same cluster of balancing meanings. The same holds true for texts belonging to other genres that existed within Persian, Jerusalem-centered Yehud (e.g., Ps 132:11–12). In other words, it is clear that the discourse of the period as a whole did not prefer unequivocal, categorical answers. These matters deserve, of course, a separate discussion that goes beyond the scope of this paper. (On the reading of the David of Samuel that develops, among others, a portrayal in which David’s “consciousness of having sinned” plays an important role, see F. H. Polak, “David’s Kingship: A Precarious Equilibrium,” in *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature* [ed. H. G. Reventlow, Y. Hoffman, and B. Uffenheimer; JSOTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994] 119–47.)

To be sure, the readers of Judges are led to believe that there is a need for a monarchy, and readers of Samuel that it should be Davidic. But from the perspective of both the Deuteronomistic History and the Primary History, the failure of the divinely chosen Davidic Dynasty to shape a long-term stable society, guided by YHWH, is not only obvious but just the last—although the most catastrophic—of an extensive series of failures of leadership models for Israel's polity,⁴⁰ none of which succeeds in the long run and none of which is portrayed as being successfully (or even unsuccessfully) retried. The point of bringing back this series of failures for continuous remembrance was, of course, not to convey a sense of necessary and inevitable doom, but to highlight the message that the long-term welfare and stability of Israel, including its hold on the land, did not depend on any particular type of leadership or the actions of any individual but on “following” YHWH's teaching / “listening” to YHWH's word.⁴¹ Of course, the centrality of

40. Moses, Joshua, and the elders of his time, charismatic leaders such as the judges, a prophet-priest such as Samuel, and dynastic lines of kings such as Saul's and David's are all presented in this collection of works, one after the other. Each of them obtains a promising beginning for Israel. Yet the narratives are unequivocal: each of these beginnings eventually ends up with lack of success. The readers of the Primary History and the Deuteronomistic History are informed that Moses has already been told that, after his death, Israel will act in a corrupt manner (see Deut 4:25–28; 31:16), i.e., his leadership provided an excellent “beginning” but not a stable, sociopolitical foundation for the establishment of the Israel that should be. Joshua does not appoint a successor, nor does he create a stable community in which the people follow YHWH's teachings (see Judg 2:6–13; see also Josh 23:12–26; 24:15–20 in which the future actions of Israel are prefigured). The book of Judges does not express in equivocal language that the judges who followed Joshua did not provide the previously mentioned foundation (e.g., Judg 2:18–19; 3:12; 4:1; 6:1). The leadership of the house of Eli is presented as a dead end and so is that of the house of Samuel (e.g., 1 Sam 2:22–34; 4:10–18; 8:1–3). Significantly, the report about the sinful behavior of Samuel's sons immediately precedes and explains the people's request for a king. The text then deals with the Saulide “experiment” and its disastrous end, which sets the stage for the Davidic Dynasty, but the latter has an even more disastrous end. On these matters and on the Primary History and the Deuteronomistic History as a truncated creation story of the divinely-guided and divinely-rewarded Israel that will and should exist in the future, see my “Looking at the Primary (Hi)story and the Prophetic Books as Literary/Theological Units within the Frame of the Early Second Temple Period: Some Considerations,” *SJOT* 12 (1998) 26–43.

41. There is, of course, a multiplicity of voices about the monarchy in the Deuteronomistic History. Although diachronic in perspective, see McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kingship*, and the contributions in *Israel Constructs Its History* (ed. A. de Pury, T. Römer, and J.-D. Macchi; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 286–314 with bibliography. Needless to say, whatever the process by which the Deuteronomistic History arrived at its present form, its ancient (Persian period) readers would not have understood the text in terms of multiple univocal redactions but as a multivocal text. For the claim that the promise to David is never compromised in the Deuteronomistic History, see J. Harvey, “The Structure of the Deuteronomistic History,” *SJOT* 20 (2006) 237–58.

the concept of following YHWH's teaching or "listening" to YHWH's word is a ubiquitous Deuteronomistic theme, but it is also a Chronicist theme, and in fact, stands at the ideological core of much of the Hebrew Bible, cutting across literary genres and linguistic choices.⁴²

Finally, the Deuteronomistic History and the Primary History do not conclude with any explicit statement about a future Davidic restoration. The reference to Jehoiachin's release and his new status as one who is maintained by and becomes a life-long courtier to "the king" is consonant with the hope for a future return of the Davidides to (limited) power—after all, it tells its readers that the Davidides have survived the turmoil of history—but also connotes a strong sense of Jehoiachin's and the Davidides' (and Judah's?) acceptance of "the king" (i.e., the king of Babylon) as such and provides an unmistakably positive characterization of a foreign human king who is "the king" of the Davidides.

Despite all its differences with the Deuteronomistic History (and the Primary History), the basic approach of Chronicles regarding these matters is quite similar. For instance, on the one hand, the readers are told that YHWH confirmed a Davidide in YHWH's house and in YHWH's kingdom forever, and his throne will be established forever (1 Chr 17:14; compare the careful choice of words in 2 Chr 9:8); but, on the other hand, they are told that the kingdom and the house were destroyed and that eventually YHWH will give all the kingdoms of the earth (including, of course, Judah) to Cyrus (certainly not a Davidide) and has commanded him to build the temple for YHWH in Jerusalem (2 Chr 36:23). Just as the Deuteronomistic History (and the Primary History), Chronicles concludes with a note that advances a positive characterization of the foreign king and implicitly calls for Israel's acceptance of his royal status over Judah, which is explicitly presented as reflecting YHWH's will.⁴³

The highly and uniquely developed genealogy of the Davidides in 1 Chr 3 draws the attention of the readers of the book not only to its past importance but also to the fact that this lineage survived "the ravages of history."⁴⁴ The report of the lineage in Chronicles may be consonant with dormant messianic or quasi-messianic aspirations such as those expressed in some prophetic books, which are focused on hopes for a distant, utopian future that will be brought about by YHWH at the

42. See further below.

43. This feature can be easily explained in terms of the Persian-period background within which all these works reached their present compositional form.

44. See Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 332–36 (citation from p. 335).

time of the deity's choosing. But, even if this is the case, the genealogy likely conveyed a number of additional messages. For instance, it was an unmistakably emphatic statement about the vast decline in the status of the Davidides, from David to the later members of the lineage. This statement of decline is consonant with and reflects a status quo in which Davidides need not play their "traditional" role in the present for the community to be pious and lead its life in accordance with YHWH's will.⁴⁵ Moreover, a community centered around a temple already built is a community for which "David" (and "Solomon") are alive and well, as it were, through the ordinances for the cult and the temple.⁴⁶ All in all, the genealogy in 1 Chr 3 allowed itself to be understood by its intended and primary (re)readers in different ways, depending on the ideological and pragmatic context/s in which it was read. All these seemingly separate meanings informed and balanced each other. Similar things may be said of the take of the Deuteronomistic History and the Primary History and of prophetic literature for that matter on David and his dynasty.

*The Exclusive Legitimacy of the Davidic Dynasty
in the Monarchic Period*

Both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles emphasize the legitimacy of the Davidic Dynasty. In Chronicles, northern dynasties are by definition illegitimate, but the (re)readers of 1 Kgs 11:29–38 are told that Jeroboam would have initiated an enduring dynasty that was legitimate in the sight of YHWH. Chronicles rejects a voice of this sort in the Deuteronomistic History, but its position seems to be not so far from the one reflected in 2 Kgs 17:21a, according to which the crowning of Jeroboam and Israel's rejection of the House of David are sins in themselves. Moreover, the LXX version of the division of the kingdom, which is itself as "Deuteronomistic" as the MT (and which may or may not precede the MT version) portrays Jeroboam as one who wanted to

45. This perspective may be compared with the issues raised in the previous discussion about the failure of all models of leadership to achieve these goals, by themselves, according to the Deuteronomistic History and the Primary History.

46. For a discussion on these matters as they pertain to Chronicles, see Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 332–36; and my contribution to "In Conversation and Appreciation of the Recent Commentaries by S. L. McKenzie and G. N. Knoppers," in Melody D. Knowles, ed., "New Studies in Chronicles: A Discussion of Two Recently-Published Commentaries," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 5/20 (2004–5) 39–43, and Knoppers's response in the same (pp. 88–93). Also see the excursus in my "Gateway to the Chronicler's Teaching: The Account of the Reign of Ahaz in 2 Chr 28,1–27," *SJOT* 7 (1993) 216–49 (republished in *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles* [London: Equinox, 2006] 230–31).

make a ruling dynasty by and for himself and, as such, in opposition to YHWH and doomed from the beginning.⁴⁷ Again, Chronicles is not so far from voices within the Deuteronomistic tradition.

Divine Teaching (Torah)

The Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles share a general world view according to which YHWH's teaching is central to Israel and to its identity. As mentioned above (pp. 72–73), both histories communicate to their readers that the fate of Israel depends, not on any model of leadership, but on whether Israel follows YHWH's teaching or rejects it.⁴⁸ Time and time again, both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles associated and asked their readers to associate this teaching/Torah with a written record (of teachings) to be read (e.g., Deut 17:18–19; Josh 1:8; 8:31–32; 23:6; 24:26; 2 Kgs 14:6; 22:8; 1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 17:9; 23:18; 25:4; 31:3; 34:14–15).⁴⁹ For the present purposes, there is no need to dwell on the social and ideological significance of the emphasis on the written character of divine teaching or on the implications of a so-called nomistic viewpoint. It suffices to notice that these positions are central to the Deuteronomistic History (at least in its present form) and Chronicles and that they were imprinted in the minds of their respective readerships. It is significant that the same general considerations about writtenness apply to the prophetic books, which present themselves to their readers as YHWH's word, and that the "nomistic" viewpoint is so prevalent in the larger discourse of postmonarchic Yehud that it is even retrojected into their constructed memories of the patriarchs (see Gen 26:5; cf. Deut 11:1).

It is worth stressing that both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles include the crucial episode of the finding of the book of the divine teaching during Josiah's period, and both emplot it such a way that it communicates to the readers the symbolic priority of the written authoritative text over the temple,⁵⁰ even if the temple is central in

47. See A. Schenker, "The Division of the Kingdom in the Ancient Septuagint: LXX 3 Kingdoms 12.24 a–z, MT 2 Kings 11–12; 14 and the Deuteronomistic History," in *Israel Constructs Its History* (ed. A. de Pury, T. Römer, and J.-D. Macchi; JSOTSUP 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 214–57.

48. The same holds true for the Primary History. The view of the constructed patriarchal period in Gen 26:5 is particularly worth noting.

49. Following YHWH's teaching/word requires knowledge of it. Once YHWH's teaching is construed as being present in written texts, the literati, at least in their own eyes, become absolutely necessary, because they serve as brokers of YHWH's knowledge and word to the general population.

50. See, for instance, T. Römer, "Du Temple au Livre: L'idéologie de la centralization dans l'historiographie deutéronomiste," in *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the*

both works. In either case, the text they carry is fully congruent with the text-centered nature of the Persian period in Israel and with the social and ideological processes that led to the production of prophetic, historical, and pentateuchal books at this time and in these communities. In either case, two crucial ideological points are conveyed: (a) the written teaching of YHWH legitimizes the temple, not the other way around; and (b) Israel may live without a temple, but Israel may not exist without YHWH's teaching.

To be sure, readings of the Deuteronomistic History as a stand-alone textual record suggested to its readers that the written teachings, and in particular Josiah's book resembled but did not equate with the book of Deuteronomy.⁵¹ In contrast, the readers of Chronicles, for whom the concept of Scripture was central, were asked to imagine an integrative Scripture that includes Deuteronomy as well as other pentateuchal texts. Yet one must keep in mind that the ancient readers of Chronicles likely read the Deuteronomistic History, not only as a stand-alone textual record, but also in a way that was informed by pentateuchal texts. In this respect, they would have read the Deuteronomistic History as part and parcel of the Primary History. This sort of reading would have provided them with an additional understanding of the identity of Josiah's book, this time in terms consonant with the world view of Chronicles.

"National" History and "All Israel":

Transtemporal, Ideologically Conceived Israel

Both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles belong to the genre of "national" history. Both tell the story of an ethnotheological, transtemporal entity, "Israel."⁵² The very existence of these histories points not only to a sense of group self-awareness among the composers and readers of the histories but also to (a) the readers' self-identification as Israel and (b) the centrality of people's corporate, transtemporal identity in their ideological discourses. In fact, the only other permanent and central character in the histories, besides Israel,

Ancient World and in the Bible: Essays in Honour of John Van Seters (ed. T. Römer and S. L. McKenzie; BZAW 294; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000) 207–25. I discussed these matters as they relate to the account in Kings in my "Imagining Josiah's Book and the Implications of Imagining It in Early Persian Yehud" (*Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt: Festschrift für Rainer Albertz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* [AOAT 250; Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2008] 193–212) and as they relate to Chronicles, in "Observations on Josiah's Account in Chronicles."

51. See my "Imagining Josiah's Book."

52. This is, of course, the case of the Primary History, as well.

is YHWH, the God of Israel. Whereas “national” histories are rare in the ancient Near East prior to the Hellenistic era (they may represent a response of cultural “peripheries” in interaction with the Achaemenid or later Hellenistic empires),⁵³ “national histories” are the norm in ancient Israelite historiography. This historiography is strongly shaped by the powerful sense of “ethnocultural” centrality that characterized the postmonarchic and most likely Persian-period works that eventually became included in the HB. It is particularly significant that the ethnocultural group at the center of these works is never political Judah or Yehud but a religious ethnocultural and transtemporal group, a theologically conceived Israel at whose center stood Jerusalem and Judah since David’s times, by divine decision.

To be sure, there are differences. The Deuteronomistic History conveys the centrality of “all Israel” by means of books such as Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and by the “synchronistic” retelling of northern and southern histories that constructs a world in which the life of the two kingdoms is understood as deeply intertwined. This is not the main way in which the concept of “all Israel” is shaped and reflected in Chronicles, but a very similar basic concept may be found there.⁵⁴ Moreover, the relation and ideological subordination of the northern kingdom and its past to Judah is reflected and shaped in different forms. Thus, for one thing, the Jerusalem-centeredness of “all Israel” along with the ideological marginality of northern Israel are communicated in the Deuteronomistic History by the rhetorical use of the fall of the northern polity and the characterization of its sin in terms of a warning message to Judah/Jerusalem in the world portrayed in the book. The demise of the northern realm is also used as an interpretive key for the description of the events in Judah from the perspective of the ancient readers of the book of Kings (especially with respect to 2 Kgs 17:7–17).⁵⁵ Chronicles, instead, explicitly refers to the northern polity only in terms of its interaction with Judah, presents the latter as the real stage on which the fate of Israel is decided and as the

53. Cf. A. Momigliano, “Eastern Elements in Post-exilic, Jewish, and Greek Historiography,” *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1977) 25–35. Compare and contrast A. Kuhrt, “Israelite and Near Eastern Historiography,” in *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998* (ed. A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø; VTSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 257–79 (esp. pp. 268–76). For examples of historiographical works by and about “peripheries” in Hellenistic times, see the works of Berossus and Manetho.

54. See in the latter, for instance, the role of genealogies, and texts such as 2 Chr 28:9–15; 30:1–11; 31:1.

55. It is worth noting that many of the sins explicitly mentioned in 2 Kgs 17:7–17 reflect the Deuteronomistic portrayal of cultic (mis)behavior in Judah specifically.

main manifestation of Israel. In other words, Chronicles communicates a similar sense of Jerusalem-centeredness and of northern marginality but through other rhetorical means.⁵⁶

In sum, despite all their differences, the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles shared an understanding that “all Israel” was at the center and, for both, “all Israel” was Jerusalem-centered. Both shared an understanding of northern Israel as part and parcel of “Israel” while at the same time peripheral to an “Israel” whose center was in Jerusalem and Judah. Needless to say, the same holds true for the rest of the works that ended up in the Hebrew Bible with the exception of the pentateuchal books, which were co-opted into this view in Yehud as they were read in a way informed by the Deuteronomistic History or by Chronicles.⁵⁷

Constructions of “The Other”: The “Israelitization” of the “Pious” Other and Exclusionary Boundaries

Both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles construe similar boundaries around “all Israel.” As they do so, they construe “the other.” It is worth noting that both contain reports that serve to partially “Israelitize” the “pious other”—that is, to construe the “pious other” in terms of ideal Israelite norms of behavior, while at the same time maintaining its foreign character. The speech of the queen of Sheba in 2 Chr 9:5–8, which constitutes an excellent illustration of this tendency, has a very clear parallel that constructs the same meaning, insofar as it is relevant to the point discussed here, in 1 Kgs 10:6–9. Hiram’s letter in 2 Chr 2:10–15, which is another excellent illustration, is consonant with and perhaps may be seen as an expansion and development of a characterization already implied in 1 Kgs 5:21. To be sure, Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History are not the only texts that show converging lines in this regard. For instance, the Primary History and Jonah are similar to them in exhibiting this motif.⁵⁸ In other

56. I discussed the way in which northern Israel is presented as marginal in my *History, Literature and Theology*, 195–209.

57. Thus, for instance, the story of the golden calf becomes a diatribe against northern sanctuaries, and the tabernacle becomes a direct precursor of the temple in Jerusalem and the like. On Exod 32 and 1 Kgs 12:25–33, see M. Aberbach and L. Smolar, “Aaron, Jeroboam, and the Golden Calves,” *JBL* 86 (1967) 129–40. See also the excellent discussion of the interplay between pentateuchal traditions and Jerusalem-centered texts by A. G. Auld, “Leviticus: After Exodus and before Numbers,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; VTSup 93; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 41–54 (esp. pp. 43–48) and the examples provided there.

58. Concerning the Primary History, see, for instance, Gen 14:18–20; Exod 18:10–11. The sailors and the repentant Ninevites in Jonah provide another example.

words, both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles show elements of a larger discursive attitude.

As for patterns of explicit exclusion and oppression of the other, one clear example will suffice. It is well known that in the world of Chronicles non-Israelites were conscripted for forced labor by Solomon but not Israelites (see 2 Chr 2:16–17; 8:7–9). This is usually contrasted with the picture emerging from 1 Kgs 5:27–32 (cf. also 1 Kgs 11:28). But again, this was not really an innovation of Chronicles, because it actually reflects the approach and image of the past explicitly stated in 1 Kgs 9:20–22. The real difference between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles here is that the Deuteronomistic History is multi-vocal, while Chronicles takes up only one of the voices that existed in Deuteronomistic tradition.

Constructing Other Dynasties: The House of Ahab

How does Chronicles construe Israelite royal dynasties other than David's that existed within the world of knowledge of the ancient readers of Chronicles? Of course, they are illegitimate and sinful (see above), but is there something else in their characterization that plays an important role in Chronicles' construction of the past and to which the readers of Chronicles are asked to pay attention by clear markers in the text? Certainly, there is not much reference to any of them in Chronicles, but given the lack of narrative about the northern kingdom, it is worth noting that Chronicles does refer to Ahabites. Moreover, the House of Ahab plays a particularly important ideological role that is saliently marked in Chronicles: Ahabites are implicitly, but saliently, construed as possessing a quasi-mythical power to entice Davidic kings, including some of the best of them. These kings approach the House of Ahab again and again, not only for no apparent reason, but also contrary to any reasonable expectation. For instance, in Chronicles Jehoshaphat is at the height of his power when he initiates an alliance with Ahab, for which he has no rational need within the world portrayed in the book (see 2 Chr 17:1–18:1). He is then induced by Ahab to wage war against Aram (ויסיתדורו); see 2 Chr 18:2) and almost loses his life as a result. The often noted difference between 2 Chr 20:35–37 and 1 Kgs 22:49–50 is also consistent with the tendency in Chronicles to stress the power of the Ahabites to lead Davidic kings astray.⁵⁹ Jehoshaphat's successor, Jehoram, is the addressee of a letter

59. On the account of Jehoshaphat in Chronicles, see G. N. Knoppers, "Reform and Regression: The Chronicler's Presentation of Jehoshaphat," *Bib* 72 (1991) 500–524. The difference between 2 Chr 20:35–37 and 1 Kgs 22:49–50 reflects a number of matters. For

that draws the attention of the readers of Chronicles to his irrational aping of the ways of the House of Ahab (2 Chr 21:12–15; cf. 2 Chr 21:6). Not only is no comparable letter sent to any other Davidic king in Chronicles, but the sender is identified as Elijah, a central figure in the discourse/s of postmonarchic Israel. Even more remarkable is that the readers of Chronicles were explicitly informed that Ahaziah, Jehoram's successor, was 42 years old when he became king (2 Chr 22:2). This is one of the cases in Chronicles in which its ancient readers were explicitly required to approach the text with a non-mimetic strategy of reading. After all, they were informed *twice*, including once in the immediate literary context of 2 Chr 22:2 that his father could not have been older than 40 when he died and was succeeded by Ahaziah (2 Chr 21:5, 20) and *twice* that Ahaziah/Jehoahaz was his youngest son (2 Chr 21:17; 22:1).⁶⁰ Surely, ancient readers knew that Jehoram could not have begotten his youngest son, never mind the older brothers, before he himself was born. As in similar cases in which a narrowly referential reading of Chronicles makes no sense, seeming incongruity serves to draw the attention of readers to the "true" message of the text.⁶¹ In this case, the point is to highlight an unequivocal image of Ahaziah as a mature person at the time of his ascension to the throne king. He was not a boy⁶² simply influenced by his Ahabite mother and members of her house (see 2 Chr 22:2–5) but an adult, 42 years of age, a mature Davidic king who should have been able to make his own decisions but in fact simply did what the Ahabites told him to do. The Davidic king, due to Ahabite influence, became like a boy—a simple Ahabite pawn with no will of his own. Significantly, the inability of the Davidic kings to stand up to the Ahabites in general and, in particular, the timidity of

the present purposes, it suffices that this difference is consistent with the tendency in Chronicles to stress the power of the Ahabites to lead Davidic kings astray.

60. It is worth stressing that Chronicles diverges from (MT) Kings on the reported age of Judahite kings at the point when they came to the throne. The only other case concerns Jehoiachin (2 Chr 36:9; cf. 2 Chr 24:8).

61. For a general discussion of the rhetorical value of this construction from the perspective of the readers of Chronicles, along with its implications for understanding the ancient modes of reading Chronicles and numerous other examples, see my *History, Literature, and Theology*, 44–77.

62. Numerous markers in the text might have suggested that he was young when his father died. See the double reference to his being the youngest of his brothers, the connotation of 21:17, the sense of temporal proximity conveyed by the literary proximity of 2 Chr 21:16–17 and 18–19, and the statements that he followed the advice of his mother and 2 Chr 22:3b. On the use of literary proximity to convey temporal proximity, see Kallim, *Reshaping*, 18–34.

Ahaziah led directly to a Judah in which no Davidic king reigned for about a sabbath of years and caused the dynasty itself to totter at the brink of extinction. From the perspectives of the readers of Chronicles, all these considerations evoked and reinforced a mental association between the House of Ahab and the eventual destruction of monarchic Judah and the fall of the Davidic line.⁶³

Any reader of Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History would easily notice vast and obvious differences between the narratives about the Ahabites in Kings and the references to them in Chronicles (see, for instance, the presence of extensive Elijah and Elisha narratives in Kings). This said, some common conceptual elements do appear. First, it is really the House of Ahab, not of Omri. Second, it is not a “regular” Israelite dynasty in Kings either. The narrative space given to the Ahabite period in northern Israel far surpasses the narrative space given to any other northern dynasty. Moreover, the coverage given to the reign of Ahab surpasses the space allocated to most kings of either Judah or Israel. Thirdly, although on the whole very negative, the image of the Ahabites (and particularly Ahab) is multifaceted also in both Kings and Chronicles. Fourthly, and even more important, Ahabites are construed in Kings as influencing and even partially shaping the conduct and future of Davidic kings.⁶⁴ In fact, there is a clear voice in Kings that construes the fall of the Davidic House as a result of the actions of kings of Judah who followed the model of the Ahabites, even centuries after their death. The account of Manasseh is partially evocative of the image of Ahab both directly (cf. 1 Kgs 16:33 with 2 Kgs 21:3) and indirectly, since the readers of Kings were supposed to construe Ahab (and the Ahabites, by extension) as a paradigmatic embodiment

63. It is worth noting that, despite all these central ideological features, the portrayal of the House of Ahab in Chronicles is not flat at all or one sided, but multifaceted. I discussed some of these matters mentioned above, the general portrayal of the House of Ahab in Chronicles, and its value for any historical reconstruction of the historical Omrides in my “The House of Omri/Ahab in Chronicles,” in *Ahab Agonistes: The Rise and Fall of the Omri Dynasty* (ed. L. L. Grabbe; Library of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 421 / European Seminar on Methodology in Israel’s History 6; London: T. & T. Clark, 2007) 41–53.

It is likely that the association of the House of Ahab with the fall of the House of David has to do with the image of Athaliah (an Ahabite) as the only non-Davidic ruler of Judah and the associated image of the near fall of the Davidic Dynasty at the time. In Chronicles, however, the House of David could not be replaced by an Ahabite or, for that matter, by any other Israelite.

64. Aside from well-known narratives, such as 1 Kgs 22 and 2 Kgs 3, see the statements in 2 Kgs 8:18, 27, and esp. 21:3.

of the sinful behavior of the kings of (northern) Israel and their people (see 2 Kgs 17:11*, 16–17* and 23:8*, 4a*; see also 21:3).⁶⁵ In other words, the Deuteronomistic History led its readers to create a mental association between the House of Ahab and the eventual destruction of monarchic Judah and the fall of the Davidic line. To be sure, Chronicles develops further some aspects of the construction of the Ahabites, but in some central matters the Deuteronomistic History showed Chronicles the way. Despite all the differences between them, when it comes to the main ideological attributes associated with the House of Ahab among postmonarchic literati (cf. Mic 6:16), Chronicles develops in a particular way what already existed at least in an incipient way in the Deuteronomistic History.

Historiographical Commonalities

A large number of additional observations or sets of observations in the category of converging lines of historiography may be advanced. A few examples suffice. There are numerous cases in which Chronicles implicitly interacted with claims advanced in the Deuteronomistic History—even if the latter are omitted in Chronicles—as it advanced a different, counter or complementary image of the past evoked in the Deuteronomistic History. For instance, one of the reasons for the presence of the list of fortified cities in Chronicles' account of Rehoboam's reign is the reference in 1 Kgs 12:25 to Jeroboam's building projects.⁶⁶ Whereas the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles differ a great deal in the details, the two can interact, because they both share a "set of rules for the rhetorical game."

This observation, in turn, leads us to the numerous converging lines between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles (and the Primary History, for that matter) that are related to matters of historical writing. For instance, it was neither expected nor demanded of the readerships of Chronicles, the Deuteronomistic History, or the Primary History that one must approach these works only from the perspective of

65. Much has been written on the account of Manasseh in Kings. Among recent monographs, see Percy S. F. van Keulen, *Manasseh through the Eyes of the Deuteronomists: The Manasseh Account (2 Kings 21:1–18) and the Final Chapters of the Deuteronomistic History* (OtSt 38; Leiden: Brill, 1996); Francesca Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh and Child Sacrifice: Biblical Distortions of Historical Realities* (BZAW 338; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004). For my own contribution, see "The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in 2 Kgs 21:1–18 and the Redactional History of the Book of Kings," *ZAW* 103 (1991) 355–74 and the bibliography there.

66. See my *History, Literature, and Theology*, 103–6.

full and complete mimesis between past events and historical narrative.⁶⁷ From the perspective of the (implied) authorship and readership of these three histories, the point was not what exactly happened but what can be learned from or taught by a story about what happened.⁶⁸

One may note also that both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles understood successful royal building activities and multiplication of progeny as blessings,⁶⁹ and both used the rhetorical tool of referring to existing written sources to convey authority, while at the same time claiming implicitly to supersede and supplant them as the main sources of knowledge for the community. This is because they purported to convey to the community all the information that was really important for it, while the remainder is construed as “the rest [i.e., the least important] of the deeds of. . .”⁷⁰

It is worth noting that, at times, the implied narrator of Chronicles seems to be filling gaps and fleshing out matters that were hinted at but not developed in the memory of the past that the readers of the Deuteronomistic History were supposed to create. As the latter virtually visited and revisited these sites of memory through their reading of the books in the Deuteronomistic History, the presence of “gaps” called for acts of imagination to fill them. For instance, the Deuteronomistic History hints at reform by Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:47) and reports a few details of reforms carried out by Asa and Hezekiah (1 Kgs 15:12–13; 2 Kgs 18:4). Chronicles develops these matters. As it does so, it places itself as independent from but complementary to and in continuity with the Deuteronomistic History and the Primary History, which were considered “authoritative” (Pentateuch) or at least “classical” (Joshua–2 Kings) by the literati who actually wrote, read, and reread Chronicles. To some extent, one may compare this process that bridged and separated Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History with the process

67. I discussed the matter at length in *ibid.*, 44–77. See also p. 80 above.

68. The same holds true for Josephus; see S. Mason, “Contradiction or Counterpoint? Josephus and Historical Method,” *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 6 (2003) 145–88.

69. See, for instance, Judg 10:3–4; 1 Kgs 4:20. Pentateuchal texts (and therefore, the Primary History) emphasized time and again the blessing of progeny. Of course, this is also true for other ancient historiographical traditions. Building activities play an important role in Mesopotamian texts that are meant to create an image of the past, among other things.

70. On general rhetorical matters associated with explicit references to written sources in ancient historiographic works, see K. Stott, *Why Did They Write This Way? Reflections on References to Written Documents in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Literature* (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 492; London: T. & T. Clark, 2008).

that bridged biblical texts and their “retelling” in the *Antiquities* of Josephus, even though the gap between Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History as understood by their primary readerships was certainly much narrower than the gap between the readerships of the Primary History and Josephus’s *Antiquities*.

Some Conclusions

The point of this study is certainly not to “harmonize” the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles. Harmonization only blunts their messages and is detrimental to the study of the ideological world of the literati who produced and first read these histories, as well as detrimental to any understanding of these works in their primary, historical setting. Similarly, any attempt to gloss over the differences between Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History would be, at best, counterproductive. There are clear differences in style and structure between the two, which, of course, reflect and communicate a substantive divergence with regard to meaning. Above all, each work creates its own story of the past, presents its own characterization of the main figures of the past, and shapes its sites of memory to be imagined, visited, and revisited by its ancient readers.

This said, intellectual historians of ancient Israel and particularly of the Jerusalem-centered Yehud in which I locate the production of the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles in their present forms (the former in the earlier Persian period; the latter in the late Persian period) cannot but notice that neither work is univocal. Multiple voices appear in both of them. This is, by itself, an important point of similarity. Moreover, some of the voices heard in one overlap, to some extent, with the voices heard in the other. From the perspective of the study of the social setting of the creation of knowledge (and literature) in Jerusalem-centered Yehud, there is nothing “strange” about these observations. In fact, they should have been anticipated, given that there was a substantial level of continuity between the literati of the early and the late Persian period and their worlds of images, ideas, and memories.⁷¹

71. Scholars who work with diachronic approaches to the Deuteronomistic History are likely to conclude that the postmonarchic literati responsible for Dtr-N or Dtr-2 or the Persian-period edition of DtrH or a post-Deuteronomistic redaction of the books of Joshua–2 Kings or any combination of the above shared some central ideological motifs with the individuals responsible for Chronicles. The bibliography on proposals for the redaction history of the DtrH is immense. For a recent diachronic study of the DtrH and its different (and hypothetical) redactional layers, see T. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005).

The converging lines mentioned here draw attention to the fact that, particularly at the level of ground ideas, core ideological concepts, and basic communicative (rhetorical) grammar as well as general historiographical tendencies, the gap between Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History (in its present form) was not as large as often claimed. The works' underlying ideological systems shared much more and at a much deeper level than usually assumed, and so did the Persian-period literati responsible for each of them, even if they lived in different sub-periods and even if, consequently, their "world of knowledge" was far from identical (that is, the individuals who were responsible for Chronicles knew the Deuteronomistic History [and the Primary History], but the reverse is not true; those responsible for Chronicles knew of integrative, authoritative Scripture, but this was probably not the case for the individuals responsible for the Deuteronomistic History). Moreover, it is not by chance that Chronicles often shares these converging lines not only with the Deuteronomistic History but also with pentateuchal and even prophetic books, because the triad of pentateuchal, prophetic, and historical books evolved together, and together reflected the authoritative repertoire and shaped the general intellectual (and ideological) horizon of the few literati of Jerusalem-centered (early) Yehud who produced, read, and reread these books.⁷²

The preceding discussion leads to a clear affirmative response to the question in the title of this paper: there were bridges. Of course, even the best bridges and, particularly, the best among them cannot but draw attention to the existence of a gap that needs bridging. In this case, even the most converging lines mentioned here point at differences on the surface of the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic narratives and even more importantly to differences at the level of the multiple didactic meanings created through the literati's continuous rereading of these narratives (both the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles) in a way informed by their different sets of co-texts, each of which led to complementary sets of meaning that are, by necessity, different.⁷³

All in all, this study demonstrates that the analysis of continuity and discontinuity between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles can profit much from taking into account that which goes beyond

72. On these matters, see also my "Reconstructing the Intellectual Discourse of Ancient Yehud," forthcoming in *Studies in Religion*.

73. These sets of co-texts included passages in literary proximity to the relevant pericopes within a particular book, the particular book as a whole, the entire literary collection with which the book was associated in its primary setting, the whole repertoire of authoritative texts available to the literati, and the like.

the surface differences between the two works. The categorical claims about their differences must not be rejected but set in proportion to their similarities.