

THE DATE OF 1 CHRONICLES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO THE CHRONICLER'S TREATMENT OF KING DAVID

The Date of 1 Chronicles With Special Reference
to the Chronicler's Treatment of King David

Mark Satterly

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

November 1985.

Master of Arts (1985)

(Religious Studies)

McMaster University

Hamilton, Ont.

TITLE: THE DATE OF 1 CHRONICLES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO THE CHRONICLER'S TREATMENT OF KING DAVID

AUTHOR: MARK PHILIP SATTERLY

SUPERVISOR: DR. A.M. COOPER

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 102.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to challenge the scholarly consensus regarding the historical circumstances which led to the writing of 1 Chronicles by a close examination of the nature and function of the Chronicler's treatment of David. There has to be a reason for the stress which is placed on David by the Chronicler, especially at a time when there was no monarchy ruling in Judah. Much of the study which has been carried out on Chronicles has concentrated to a large extent on linguistic evidence. Linguistic evidence alone, however, is insufficient for drawing any solid conclusions. Thus, the attempt is being made here to seek some answers on thematic evidence. This involves a close study of the Chronicler's treatment of David and the suggestion that David is to be equated with the post-exilic governor of Judah, Zerubbabel. The concentration on the Chronicler's interpretation of the figure of David is being used to demonstrate the possibility of reading 1 Chronicles as the historical expression of the movement inspired by the prophecies of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah.

During the course of the thesis, attention is drawn to the difficulties surrounding the dating of 1 Chronicles as a result of the work of many redactors, which is evident throughout the book. It becomes more difficult to assign the entire work, in its present form, to any one period in the post-exilic era. However, despite this difficulty, a comparison of the major themes in 1 Chronicles and those in Haggai and Proto-Zechariah shows that it is at least possible to date the original form of 1 Chronicles somewhere in the period of 520-515 BCE.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. A.M. Cooper, my thesis supervisor, for helping with the selection of this topic, and ^{for} his many comments and criticisms. My thanks are also extended to Drs. A.E. Combs and S.R. Westerholm, both of whom read the manuscript and made many constructive comments and criticisms.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABBREVIATIONS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 1	11
THE UNITY OF CHRONICLES-EZRA-NEHEMIAH	
Chapter 2	32
THE IMPORTANCE OF KING DAVID IN 1 CHRONICLES	
Chapter 3	56
AN EARLY HISTORICAL SETTING FOR 1 CHRONICLES	
Chapter 4	80
THE CHRONICLER'S ESCHATOLOGY	
CONCLUSION	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>AB</u>	Anchor Bible
<u>BASOR</u>	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
<u>CBQ</u>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
<u>CTM</u>	Concordia Theological Monthly
<u>EJ</u>	Encyclopaedia Judaica
<u>ET</u>	English Translation
<u>Exp</u>	The Expositor
<u>ExpT</u>	Expository Times
<u>HTR</u>	Harvard Theological Review
<u>IB</u>	The Interpreter's Bible
<u>ICC</u>	International Critical Commentary
<u>IDB</u>	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
<u>Interp</u>	Interpretation
<u>JBL</u>	Journal of Biblical Literature
<u>JBR</u>	Journal of Bible and Religion
<u>JSOT</u>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
<u>JSOTS</u>	<u>JSOT</u> Supplementary Series
<u>LTQ</u>	Lexington Theological Quarterly
<u>LXX</u>	Septuagint
<u>MT</u>	Masoretic Text
<u>Or</u>	Orientalia
<u>RB</u>	Révue Biblique
<u>SJT</u>	Scottish Journal of Theology
<u>SVT</u>	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
<u>TynB</u>	Tyndale Bulletin
<u>VT</u>	Vetus Testamentum
<u>ZAW</u>	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

INTRODUCTION

It used to be said that the facts speak for themselves. This is of course untrue. The facts speak only when the historian calls on them: it is he who decides to which facts to give the floor, and in what order and in what context.¹

For many years, scholarly study of the Chronicler's work has been conducted in the light of his relationship with the Deuteronomistic History. The historical accuracy, and therefore the trustworthiness, of the book has been called into question time and time again.² More recently, however, there has been a growing tendency to stress the historical reliability of Chronicles.³ Nevertheless, such a question concerning the Chronicler's historical reliability appears to be relevant only if a person starts out wanting to know Israel's history from an early point of view. When talking about the Chronicler's historicity, we need to take care so as not to limit the work by assuming, with Eissfeldt, that the Deuteronomistic History is the more accurate account of the two.⁴ Nor should we assume that the Chronicler was writing history

¹ E.H. Carr, What is History?, London (1961), p.5.

² O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, Oxford (1965), pp.539f. R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, New York (1943²), pp.732-312.

³ E.g. A.-L. Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses Sources", RB 60 (1955), pp.481-503 and RB 61 (1954), pp.349-86; J.I. Myers, 1 Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, New York (1965).

⁴ O. Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp.531f. Also see F. Halpern, "Sacred

in the twentieth century sense of the word. When we are presented with several accounts of the same event, we are often unable to reconcile them conclusively, or to arrive at some unequivocal decision as to the accuracy of the one at the expense of the other.⁵ Such a recognition holds true for the synoptic passages of the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles. We can never be in a position to maintain the historical reliability of the one against the other. Instead, we can only look upon them as being alternative interpretations of events.⁶ We also need to recognize that in most cases we cannot recover the events themselves.⁷

History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure - Indications of an Earlier Source", in R.E. Friedman (ed.), The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Sacred Text, Los Angeles (1981), pp.35-54, who argues that there is a common source underlying Kings and Chronicles which can be assigned to a period during the reign of Hezekiah, whom Halpern regards as being a second Solomon.

⁵ L.A. Cooper, "The Life and Times of King David According to the Book of Psalms" in R.E. Friedman (ed.), The Poet and the Historian, Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism, Scholars Press (1983), pp.123f.

⁶ Ibid., p.123 and J.W. Wenham, "Large Numbers in the Old Testament", TynB 18 (1967), p.19-53.

⁷ Ibid., p.125. Also see, W.F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, Garden City (1969⁵), p.121. See further the contributions of P.O. Long, 1 Kings: With an Introduction to

What has to be noted here is that the Chronicler (and in this respect he is no different from the Deuteronomistic Historian) is strongly conditioned by theological assumptions, and he is subject to errors in historical fact.⁸

The great problem with questioning the Chronicler's historical reliability is that such an understanding can misconstrue an ancient author's reasons for writing. To illustrate this, it is of interest to note the reasons given by Josephus to his readers as to why people write history. There are, in Josephus' view, four classes of historians. There are those who write to show skill in composition. There are those who write for apologetic purposes.

Historical Literature, Grand Rapids (1934), pp.3-7; J. I. Miller, The Old Testament and the Historian, Philadelphia (1976); and J. van Seters, "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Israelites", Or 50 (1951), pp.137-35. Not only has the Chronicler's work been identified as history, there have also been attempts to classify the material as Midrash on the rabbinic principle. See, for example, S. Chilton, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture, Philadelphia (1979), pp.644f; M. D. Goulder, Midrash Lection in Matthew, London (1974), pp.202-21. Also, R. Mosis, Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes, Freiberg (1973), pp.80, 124, 202, and the rejection by T. Willi, Die Chronik als Auslegung, FRLANT 106, Göttingen (1972), pp.55, 66, 193.

⁸ H. N. Richardson, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles", JBR 26 (1958), p.12.

Some write because they are concerned with what actually happened. Finally, others write simply because they wish to enlighten the public.⁹

Although Josephus was himself historically and culturally anachronistic, the warning is clear enough. Ancient historians were not necessarily concerned with questions of scientific historical study. They also had other reasons for writing as well as trying to establish historical fact. In the Hebrew Bible, questions of history were often intertwined with theological assumptions. In other words, Israelite historiography was theocentric. In the words of S.B. Frost, "Israel's religious understanding found its expression through history."¹⁰

In order to understand properly the Chronicler's reasons for writing, as he does, and to enable us to arrive at a correct interpretation of his work, it is necessary to try to isolate the original Sitz im Leben or the historical background addressed by the work.

Chronicles cannot be meaningfully studied when it is separated from its historical environment.¹¹ As an illustration, let us note T.S. Eliot's author in "Tradition and the Individual Talent"

⁹ Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Preface, Tregal Publications, Grand Rapids (1960), p.1.

¹⁰ S.B. Frost, "Apocalyptic and history" in W.L. Tollers and J.R. Maier, The Bible in its Literary Milieu, Grand Rapids (1979), pp. 137f; and E. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol. 1, Edinburgh (1962), p. 91f.

¹¹ W. Tollers and J. Maier, Literary Milieu, pp. 103-05.

who moves along in the perpetual stream of tradition: only he changes it by his own contributions and by his reinterpretation of the past.¹² What is being said here is that the author will reinterpret past traditions in the light of the contemporary situation in which he finds himself. Thus, the tradition might be changed to reflect another situation which could be quite different from the situation originally addressed.

Herein lies the fundamental purpose of searching for the Chronicler's original intention for writing as he does. According to Mosis, the Chronicler reflects his own historical situation sometimes intentionally, other times unintentionally. Mosis finds the key to the meaning of a given text in Chronicles in the author's portrayal of the contemporary post-exilic situation, which differs from the narrative context of the story itself.¹³ We can only understand what the Chronicler has done with the tradition that has been passed down to him if we can identify the historical background which gave rise to the work. Therefore, a close study of the Chronicler's David, for example, might contribute to the understanding of the Chronicler's historical setting.

The stress on the role of David in Chronicles differs from the portrayal of David as found in the Deuteronomistic History.¹⁴

¹² Cited ibid., p.103.

¹³ R. Mosis, chronistisch, pp.30f. T. Willi rejects the attempt to discover the influence of the writer's own historical circumstances as a misleading endeavour - Chronik, pp.55f.

¹⁴ It ought to be pointed out here that this thesis is not intended

This is what Wellhausen said about the Chronicler's interpretation of David:

See what Chronicles has made out of David! The founder of the kingdom has become the founder of the temple and the public worship, the king and hero at the head of his companions-in-arms has become the singer and master of ceremonies at the head of a swarm of priests and Levites; his clearly cut figure has become a feeble holy picture, seen through a cloud of incense. /15/

We can also take note of the words of Eissfeldt:

Not very much remains of the picture of David as he is presented to us in the books of Samuel - the bold man of war who can win the hearts of his companions in war... the skilled politician....a man worthy of love...and a worshipper of Yahweh filled with a deep fatalistically inclined piety....In place of this...there are Messianic overtones, and his figure is seen as a pledge of the Davidic covenant.... /16/

The points made by Wellhausen and Eissfeldt may be exaggerated in expression, but they do draw attention to the different stress placed on David in Chronicles to that of Samuel/Kings. In the Chronicler's presentation, David is not only the temple builder,¹⁷

to provide a straight comparison between the two accounts. However, reference will obviously have to be made to the Deuteronomistic History where such a reference is deemed useful.

¹⁵ J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, New York (1957), p.132.

¹⁶ O. Eissfeldt, Introduction, p.537.

¹⁷ As in the account of 2 Sam./1 Kgs., the Chronicler has the actual building of the temple assigned to Solomon. However, to all intents and purposes, David might just as well have built it as can be seen from the elaborate preparations described in 1 Chron. 22ff. See below, chapter 2.

he also organizes everything to do with the cult. "Without David, there would not even be the Levitical offices in which the writer has so great an interest."¹⁸ There is no mention of the private life of David which might impinge upon the author's portrayal of the faithful servant of Yahweh. The history actually contains very little apart from David. Even in 2 Chronicles, David remains the yardstick by which all his successors are judged. The prosperity of Israel/Judah is dependent upon the Davidides' fidelity towards the Jerusalem cult, given to the nation by David.

The question may be legitimately asked as to why the Chronicler has put this extra stress upon the role of David. Whether the work is dated early or late,¹⁹ the Davidic monarchy had ceased to exist with the fall of Jerusalem to the Babylonians. There seem to be two possible reasons for placing this stress upon the role of the historical David, both of which may be related. First, the leader of the Jewish community at the restoration was a descendant of David's called Zerubbabel. The actual position

¹⁸ G. von Rad, Theology, vol. 1, p.350.

¹⁹ The favoured view is that Chronicles was written c. 400 BCE, although an earlier date is now posited with increasing frequency. For an up to date survey of the question, see H.G.L. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, London (1962), pp.15-17. Also see the articles by D.N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose", CBQ 23 (1961), pp. 436-42; and J.D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and his Purposes", JBL 94 (1975), pp.201-17. Both articles have helped to renew interest in the political background which the Chronicler is addressing.

held by Zerubbabel is not clear. In Haggai 1:14, he is given the title "governor of Judah" whereas in Ezra, he is simply "the son of Shealtiel". In a recent article, S. Japhet questions the notion that Zerubbabel was the first governor of Judah after the exile. She concludes that Sheshbazzar was the first governor.²⁰ The difficulty arises from the reference to Zerubbabel in Ezra 3:8, which precedes a statement in 5:16 that says that Sheshbazzar laid the foundation stone of the temple. It has been suggested that Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel are two names for the same person, but this remains unlikely. It is also unlikely that Sheshbazzar is to be identified with Shenazzar, an uncle of Zerubbabel.²¹ The statement made in Ezra 5:16 is not confirmed elsewhere. It would seem best to adopt the conclusions of Japhet and P.R. Ackroyd that there was a first period of return from Babylon led by Sheshbazzar. This first return, however, met with failure. A second period of return was marked by the activities of Zerubbabel, Haggai and Zechariah.²² It is to this second period that Chronicles could be assigned. Zerubbabel, the descendant of David, is being championed by the Chronicler as the rightful heir and leader of the restored community.²³ One possible link between David and Zerubbabel is

²⁰ S. Japhet, "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel - Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah", ZAW 94 (1982), pp.66-93.

²¹ See P-R. Berger in ZAW 83 (1971), pp.98-100.

²² P.R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, Philadelphia (1963), pp.143f.

²³ So D.N. Freedman, "Purpose", pp.440-42.

the temple. Just as David was legitimated as the ruler of Israel by his relationship with the cult,²⁴ so is Zerubbabel legitimated by overseeing the rebuilding of that temple.

The second possible reason for the stress on David in Chronicles is that the work might mark the beginnings of messianism and eschatology. This interpretation has received support from scholars such as von Rad,²⁵ Plöger,²⁶ Stinespring²⁷ and others. To use Stinespring's phrase, the David of Chronicles could be the David of faith in the same manner that the historical Jesus has become the "Jesus of faith".²⁸ Such an interpretation is plausible because the Davidic dynasty was never re-established in Israel after the exile. This interpretation is also a useful way to date Chronicles after the failure of Zerubbabel. If Chronicles is eschatological, then it could conceivably be dated any time. The situation changes, however, if Zerubbabel is being referred to as some future Davidic ruler. At some level of redaction, it is possible that both interpretations are correct.

²⁴ The order is deliberate. Most scholars argue that the temple was made legitimate because it received its order from David, e.g. J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", pp.215f.

²⁵ G. von Rad, Theology, pp.349f.

²⁶ G. Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, Oxford (1965).

²⁷ W.F. Stinespring, "Eschatology in Chronicles", JBL 80 (1961), pp.209-19.

²⁸ Ibid., p.209.

In the ensuing chapters we shall be identifying the prominent themes used by the Chronicler in his interpretation of David and we shall attempt to define some of the characteristics of the historical situation which gave rise to this work. The conclusions drawn will be largely negative due to our limited knowledge of the historical background of the post-exilic era. However, using the Chronicler's interpretation of the figure of David and the prominent themes connected with that figure, we should at least discover some advantages in reading Chronicles as a document of the early second temple period as opposed to a date of 400 BCE, or later.

Before taking a close look at the Chronicler's interpretation of David, we have to survey the reasons why a date of 400 BCE is no longer tenable. Only then are we able to proceed and examine the themes of 1 Chronicles and suggest a date of about 520 BCE for the Chronicler's history. The final chapter of the thesis will then be devoted to the eschatological and messianic interpretations of Chronicles.

CHAPTER 1

THE UNITY OF CHRONICLES-EZRA-NEHEMIAH

In scholarship today, the prevailing view is that Chronicles was written by the author who was also responsible for the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.¹ However, this view has come under increasing attack, especially during the mid-1970s. The origin of this renewed quest for the Chronicler's Sitz im Leben is an article published by D.N. Freedman in 1961.² The purpose of this chapter is not only to open up discussion as to the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, but also to argue against a late date for 1 Chronicles which is maintained even by some scholars who do not

¹ E.g. E.J. Clines, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, London (1984), p.9; J.H. Myers, 1 Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, New York (1965), p.xviii; C.C. Torrey, Ezra Studies, reprinted New York (1970), pp.203-51. Also, W.F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler", JBL 40 (1921), pp.104-24.

² D.N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose", CBQ 23 (1961), pp. 436-42. Other notable studies include S. Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew", VT 18 (1968), pp.550-71; J.D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes", JBL 94 (1975), pp.201-17; H.G.M. Williamson, Israel in the Books of Chronicles, Cambridge (1977), pp.41-70.

accept the unity of the three works.³

Any discussion of the literary history of the Chronicler's work is compounded by uncertainties as to the extent that the work in its present form is representative of an earlier work.⁴ These difficulties are made more complex by doubts concerning the originality of the genealogies,⁵ amongst other passages of equally dubious origins, and the purpose of writing the history. F.M. Cross has isolated several redactions in 1 Chronicles, the earliest of which he dates to a time when the prophets Haggai and Zechariah were active. Cross assigns the latest edition to a period between 450 and 400 BCE.⁶ In addition to the problems of dating the editions, there is still confusion about the exact relationship between Chronicles and Samuel/Kings. There are some obvious parallels between the two histories,⁷ but there are also other passages which bear marked divergences.⁸ The matter is further convoluted by questions of how to interpret the Chronicler's approach to his Vorlage. This approach has been characterized

³ E.g. H.G.M. Williamson, ibid., pp.83-86.

⁴ P.R. Ackroyd, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, London (1973), p.23; F.M. Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration", JBL 94 (1975), pp.4-13.

⁵ M.D. Johnson, The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, Cambridge (1969), pp.44f.

⁶ F.M. Cross, "Reconstruction", pp.11f.

⁷ E.g. Nathan's prophecy in 1 Chron. 17//2 Sam. 7.

⁸ E.g. There is no mention of David's struggle for power after the

in several different ways, including Targum⁹ and Midrash.¹⁰

The Chronicler has left us with very few clues for the dating of his work.¹¹ The earliest possible limit has been customarily set by the reference in 2 Chronicles 36:20 to "the establishment of the Kingdom of Persia" which excludes a date earlier than 539 BCE.¹² At the other extreme, we do have textual evidence of the existence of Chronicles before the middle of the second century BCE when Eupolemus cites the IXX version of the work. Furthermore, according to Williamson, it is possible that the description of David contained in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach is dependent upon the Chronicler's portrayal of the Israelite King.¹³ If this is tenable, then the lower limit for the work may be raised to the exclusion of a Maccabean date which occasionally has been posited.¹⁴

Other data included in fixing the limits for the dating of Chronicles are the presence of a word translated as "darics" in

death of Saul, and Solomon's accession is not threatened by revolt.

⁹ W.E. Barnes, ExpT 8 (1896-7), pp.316-19.

¹⁰ J. Weingreen, From Bible to Mishnah: The Continuity of Tradition, Manchester (1976); and T. Willi, Die Chronik als Auslegung. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels, Göttingen (1972).

¹¹ H.G.M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, London (1982), pp.21-23.

¹² P.R. Ackroyd, Israel Under Babylon and Persia, Oxford (1970), pp.293-312.

¹³ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.15.

¹⁴ Loc.cit.

1 Chronicles 29:7. This coin was not minted until about 515 BCE, and scholars suggest that time has to be allowed to lapse between the minting of the coin and its reaching Palestine.¹⁵ However, with such difficulties surrounding the precise number of editions of Chronicles, the reference to darics could easily belong to a later edition. The evidence provided by the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9 is also cited as a witness to the dating of the work.¹⁶ However, despite the protestations of Johnson and Rudolph, the original nature of these genealogies is far from being a closed book.¹⁷

It has been traditionally maintained that Chronicles arose from the same literary milieu as the books of Ezra and Nehemiah,¹⁸ although, as has already been suggested, such a view is not so readily accepted today. This view is derived in part from the presence of 2 Chronicles 36:22-23 as the opening three verses of Ezra. This phenomenon has been adequately dealt with by Williamson who maintains that such an understanding arises from a mistaken comprehension of the process of canonization. He also regards the last two verses of 2 Chronicles as having been added subsequently from Ezra 1:1-3. This addition was probably made for liturgical

¹⁵ H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles", EynB 28 (1977).

¹⁶ J.M. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p.lxxxix; W. Rudolph, "Problems of the Books of Chronicles", VT 4 (1954), pp.401-09.

¹⁷ R.R. Wilson, "The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research", JBL 94 (1975), pp.169-89.

¹⁸ J.M. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p.xviii; C.C. Torrey, Ezra, pp.208-51.

reasons.¹⁹

The unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah is further maintained on the basis of Rabbinic evidence which identifies the author of Chronicles with both Ezra and Nehemiah. For example, Baba Bathra has this to say:

Ezra wrote his book and the genealogies of the Books of Chronicles up to his own time....Who then finished it?
Nehemiah the son of Hacaliah. /20/

Abravanel poses the question of why the Chronicler's work, which contains so many prophetic oracles and stories, should be placed in the Hebrew canon amongst the Hagiographa. He provides three answers. First, the authors were Ezra and Nehemiah, neither of whom were prophets. Secondly, the authors had not received any divine command to write. Thirdly, the books were not written by means of prophetic inspiration. Instead, they were excerpted from the stories of the prophets and the Hagiographa, but with the facts and proper names changed in order to improve the understanding of the stories. Abravanel continues by suggesting that Chronicles was written as

a monument to David and his house because only the tribes of Judah and Benjamin were left after the exile. Due to the primary aim of glorifying David, Ezra left out all that could be detrimental to his memory. /21/

In 1921, W.F. Albright revived the Rabbinic tradition and

¹⁹ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, pp.3-5, 6 and 419.

²⁰ BB 15a. Cited from S. Japhet, "Chronicles, Books of", EJ 5 (1971), col.555.

²¹ Cited from E.I.J. Rosenthal, Studia Semitica: Jewish Themes, vol.1, Cambridge (1971), p.38, n.1.

equated Ezra the Scribe with the Chronicler.²² Albright draws heavily from the studies carried out earlier by Torrey which attempted to illuminate the literary affinities between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.²³ More recently, Albright's conclusions have been tentatively adopted by Myers, while Bright regards them as being at least possible.²⁴ It is not germane to our purposes here to do an in depth study of all the arguments forwarded by Torrey and Albright. Our concern in this chapter will be limited to illustrating the fundamental weaknesses in the argument in favour of the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah.

The authorship of Chronicles by Ezra stands or falls on the unity of the books in question. In the words of Myers:

Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are so closely related in thought, language, and theology that not only must they have come from a single hand, with possibly a few exceptions, but, like the other great literature of Israel, their author must have had in view a purpose that the earlier histories of his people did not meet in the form in which they had been transmitted. /25/

Needless to say, the question is how closely these books are related in thought, language and theology. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of this question and will show that the pertinent books are not as closely united as was commonly thought. Myers, in his statement quoted above, fails to provide any evidence for the unity of the three books. We

²² W.F. Albright, "Personality", pp.104-24.

²³ W.C. Torrey, Ezra, pp.238f.

²⁴ J. Bright, A History of Israel, London (1972²), pp.398f.

²⁵ J.M. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p.xviii.

will proceed to take a closer look at the material available to us.

The most frequently adduced argument in favour of the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah is that of linguistic, or stylistic, similarity. In many commentaries, this unity is simply assumed rather than proved, or even cogently argued for.²⁶ Some of the older commentaries have assembled evidence to illustrate a few of the "peculiarities and mannerisms" of the style of the Chronicler in which "the occurrences in Ezra-Nehemiah are included."²⁷ However, a close study of these older commentaries, such as has been carried out by Williamson, reveals that too many modern scholars have tended to utilize this material for purposes different from those originally intended.²⁸ Although it would be fair to say that these earlier scholars did indeed maintain the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, the lists which they drew up were not primarily composed for this purpose. For example, it appears from the list of Curtis and Madsen that their intention was not so much to prove the unity of authorship, as to show that many

²⁶ Loc.cit. Also see R.J. Coggins, The First and Second Books of Chronicles, Cambridge (1976), p.3; and B.W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, Englewood Cliffs (1957), pp.434f.

²⁷ S.R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Edinburgh (1913), p.535. Also see E.L. Curtis and A.A. Madsen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, Edinburgh (1910), pp.27-36.

²⁸ H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, pp.37f.

of these words only appear in one of the books under discussion.²⁹

Whatever date we might assign to 1 Chronicles, it is going to fall into the post-exilic era. The amount of Hebrew which we are going to know about with any certainty from the same period is bound to be small.³⁰ Nevertheless, it is still possible to draw distinctions between the Hebrew of the post-exilic period and Mishnaic Hebrew.³¹ The existence of such a possibility should be enough to warn against designating something as being a "peculiarity of style" when it may only reflect the style of a particular literary period for which we might have little or no information. Thus, there has to exist a substantial number of common words or phrases before common authorship can be justified on these grounds alone.³² In fact, linguistic evidence alone is not sufficient to verify common authorship. At best, linguistic evidence will be shown to be inconclusive.

In 1963, S. Japhet published an important article for the

²⁹ Ibid., p.33.

³⁰ Ibid., p.39. Also see R. Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose, Missoula (1976).

³¹ Attention can be drawn here to two Hebrew works. A. Bendavid, Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew, Jerusalem (1967 and 1971); A. Hurvitz, The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew: A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Implications for the Dating of Psalms, Jerusalem (1972). Both works are cited from Williamson, Israel, p.39, n.2.

³² Ibid., p.39.

study of Chronicles in which she threw into ^udoubt the whole question of the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah on linguistic grounds.³³ Dividing her article into three parts under the headings of "linguistic opposition", "specific technical terms", and "peculiarities of style", Japhet has successfully shown that not only are there differences between the books, but that there are also points of opposition between the styles of the books.³⁴ She concludes her article by saying that linguistically Chronicles deviates in some important themes from the tendencies and phenomena of the late post-exilic era.³⁵ These tendencies are extant in Ezra-Nehemiah.

Further linguistic study has been carried out by Williamson in both of his major contributions already referred to in this chapter.³⁶ Polzin's work also bears significance for our studies. He too does a linguistic study of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, but he arrives at a conflicting conclusion to that reached by Japhet

³³ S. Japhet, "Authorship", pp.330-71.

³⁴ Ibid., pp.370f.

³⁵ Loc.cit. Clines criticizes Japhet for failing to discriminate adequately between the writing of the editor and that of his sources - Ezra, p.10. However, Japhet has done enough to warn against too ready an acceptance of the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah: Clines' criticism could also be levelled against scholars holding the opposite view.

³⁶ Especially Israel, pp.41-70. Also see the review written by S.J.L. Croft in JSOT 14 (1979), pp.68-72.

and Williamson: that linguistically, Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah are indeed linked.³⁷ Williamson, however, points out that Polzin's specific purpose was to see where the Priestly strand fits into the typology of late biblical Hebrew prose.³⁸ Williamson thus makes two points in applying Polzin's results to his own purpose. First, that the similarities between Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah are only to be expected because they reflect a living language. Secondly, it is not pertinent to Polzin's overall purpose to draw attention to the differences between the books in question. Williamson's conclusion is that Polzin's work does not affect either his own or Japhet's findings that Chronicles is not linguistically linked with Ezra-Nehemiah.³⁹ Nevertheless, despite the efforts made by Williamson to harmonize the conclusions of Japhet with those of Polzin, it appears that linguistic evidence alone does not suffice to prove or disprove the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah.⁴⁰

Before leaving the subject of linguistic evidence for the

³⁷ R. Polzin, Typology, pp.70f. - especially p.71.

³⁸ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.8.

³⁹ Loc.cit.

⁴⁰ According to Croft, the greatest difficulty with Williamson's work is that his contribution sets out to destroy an argument which has been built upon an accumulation of probabilities - p.69. The question which can be raised to this conjecture is how much weight can legitimately be attached to such an "accumulation of probabilities".

Chronicler's original setting in life, attention may be drawn to an article by W.G.E. Watson⁴¹ which attempted to find a parallel between the work of the Chronicler and Ugaritic literature.⁴¹ However, as we have already seen above in the works of Japhet, Polzin and Williamson, no sharp conclusions can be drawn. Watson does point out that there are archaic features in the Chronicler's work which need to be recognized as a rectification for too much stress upon Aramaic influence.⁴² Watson concludes his article by saying that it cannot be maintained with any certainty as to whether Chronicles exhibits linguistic phenomena common to texts written at a late stage in any language, or whether the conclusion must be that the bulk of the work was composed at a much earlier date than that commonly supposed.⁴³ All of this serves to illustrate further the paucity of our knowledge of language during the second temple period.

Of far greater importance in our quest for the Chronicler's Sitz im Leben is the study of his outlooks, themes and theology.⁴⁴ As a result of our lack of knowledge of post-exilic biblical Hebrew, such linguistic evidence as has been surveyed above proves to be largely negative. By concentrating on the themes of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, we are looking for a more positive

⁴¹ W.G.E. Watson, "Archaic Elements in the Language of Chronicles", Biblica 53 (1972), pp.191-207.

⁴² Ibid., p.205.

⁴³ Ibid., p.206.

⁴⁴ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.9.

approach to the unity of the books in question. The treatment of themes here is not meant to be exhaustive in any way, especially as our only concern with Ezra-Nehemiah is its supposed relationship with Chronicles. However, a comparison of some of the major themes of the books would prove useful in establishing whether or not Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah really are united.

The first point which we can make is that neither Chronicles nor Ezra-Nehemiah deals directly with the early history of Israel. H.G.M. Vogt has shown that the Israelite community which is addressed in Ezra-Nehemiah stands in direct succession to the Israelite community of the Exodus and the Conquest.⁴⁵ As an example, we can note Nehemiah 1:10 and chapter 9. In the first reference, the Exodus is the grounds for an appeal to God, while chapter 9 records the statement of faith which forms the basis of the covenant.⁴⁶ The election of Abram is represented as being the beginning of Yahweh's relationship with Israel. The remainder of the presentation is dominated by the Exodus and ensuing events.⁴⁷

In Chronicles, the portrayal of Israel's early history is quite different. The following chapter of this thesis will deal at greater length with the Chronicler's interpretation of David

⁴⁵ H.G.M. Vogt, Studie zur nachexilischen Gemeinde in Ezra-Nehemia, Verl. (1966), pp.55-59. This material receives fuller discussion in Williamson, Israel, pp.61-66 from where the majority of the following discussion is drawn.

⁴⁶ Especially 9:32ff.

⁴⁷ H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, p.62.

as the fulfiller of the old traditions.⁴⁸ In Chronicles, the history proper begins with David. Apart from the genealogies, and the brief note in 1 Chronicles 10 which documents the death of Saul, the early history of Israel and its characters receive no coverage. In addition, in the genealogies we can recognize the stress placed upon Jacob, the immediate father of the tribes, as opposed to Abram who merely received the promise. The emphasis upon Jacob is made at the expense of the Exodus tradition and the Chronicler's viewpoint is clearly brought out by his arrangement of the genealogy at 1 Chronicles 1:1-2:2.⁴⁹ By this rearranging of the genealogy, the Chronicler is able to emphasize that the line which he is following is one of election and not one of natural descent.⁵⁰ It is also of significance that the break in the Chronicler's scheme occurs, not with Abram, but with Jacob. After Jacob, the genealogies are arranged on a completely different principle.⁵¹ The stress on the role of Jacob in Chronicles is

⁴⁸ See below, chapter 2.

⁴⁹ For a discussion of the textual problems of this chapter and a defence of its originality, see T. Pochechard, "Le Première Chapitre des Paralipomènes", RB 13 (1916), pp.363-86.

⁵⁰ H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, p.63.

⁵¹ Loc.cit. This material is drawn from Gen. 5; 10; 11; 25; 36 and 35:23-26. The Chronicler rearranges material frequently in these genealogies. See further his ordering of the genealogy of Judah - H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, pp.48f. Also see Williamson's "Sources and Redaction in the Chronicler's Genealogy of Judah", JBL 98 (1979), pp.351-59.

totally lacking in Ezra-Nehemiah.

The contrast between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah in their handling of the early history of Israel can be further illustrated by the Chronicler's handling of the Exodus, which receives considerably less stress in his work. Explanations for this will be summarized in the following chapter, so there is no need to delve too deeply here.⁵² We will also see in chapter 2 that David has actually replaced the stress on the earlier traditions of Israel in the account of 1 Chronicles. Therefore, we will see that for the Chronicler it is unnecessary to reiterate these already well established and widely known stories. The purpose of Ezra-Nehemiah is somewhat different. These books are more concerned with establishing the continuity of the succession from Abram to the post-exilic community. For the Chronicler, this is not a necessity because David is the start of history. All that happened before David finds its fulfilment in the founder of Israel's first dynasty. There is no equivalent stress on the monarchy in Ezra-Nehemiah. This is probably the result of the historical situation in which there was no hope that the Davidic monarchy could be reinstituted as the rightful leader of the restored community.⁵³

The Chronicler's emphasis on the role played by David in the building of the temple is a further distinguishing feature between

⁵² See R. North, "Theology of the Chronicler", JBL 82 (1963), pp.369-81; F.R. Ackroyd, "History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler", OTM 33 (1967), pp.51-15.

⁵³ See below, chapter 3.

Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, as well as between Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History. The Chronicler stresses that the promises made to the Davidic dynasty in Nathan's prophecy find their initial fulfilment through the building of the temple. According to Williamson, this is the main purpose of the Davidic speeches found in 1 Chronicles 22:7-19; 28:2-10; 29:1-5 and his prayer of 29:10-19. All of this material is unique to Chronicles.⁵⁴ The Chronicler is here making a point of his own and it is a point which differs from the Deuteronomist as well as from Ezra-Nehemiah. We will see in chapter 2 that the new Davidic covenant of 1 Chronicles has superseded the old covenant of the Exodus and the Conquest. In total contrast, Ezra-Nehemiah do not reflect any development in the covenantal basis of God's relationship with Israel.⁵⁵ The point being made here is not that the Chronicler has no knowledge of the Exodus/Sinai tradition,⁵⁶ but rather that he is presenting a development of it. This development is absent from Ezra-Nehemiah.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, p.65.

⁵⁵ A.C. Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism, Edinburgh and London (1935) pp.219-35; L.N. Freedman, "Purpose", p.440.

⁵⁶ Contra McKroyd who has attempted to harmonize the emphasis upon the Davidic covenant in Chronicles with the stress upon the direct succession of the post-exilic community and the Exodus generation in Ezra-Nehemiah - "Writings", pp.501-15 and "The Theology of the Chronicler", LTQ 3 (1973), pp.101-16.

⁵⁷ C.f. H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, p.66. Also note R.L. Braun, "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude toward the North",

The stress placed upon the figure of David in Chronicles delineates another difference between the work of the Chronicler and that of the author(s) of Ezra-Nehemiah in their respective attitudes towards the Northern Kingdom. A number of scholars have suggested that there are traces of anti-Samaritan polemic in Chronicles such as can also be found in Ezra-Nehemiah.⁵⁸ However, it does not appear that there is any evidence of Samaritan polemic in Chronicles. For example, both David and Solomon are portrayed as rulers of a united Israel. With reference to the accession of David, the Chronicler ignores the schism between the Saulides of the North and the Davidides of the South. There is no mention made of David becoming ^{king} of Hebron first and only later becoming King of all Israel.⁵⁹ For the ceremonies surrounding the carrying of the Ark into Jerusalem, all the tribes

JBL 96 (1977), pp.59-62; "Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History", SVT 30(1979), pp.52-64; R. Nosis, Untersuchungen zur des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes, Freiburg (1973), pp.169-72.

⁵⁸ E.g. P.R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, Philadelphia (1968), p.236; O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, New York (1965), pp.551f.; R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament New York (1941), pp.608f.

⁵⁹ 1 Chron. 29:27 refers to David as being king in Hebron for 7 years and then King in Jerusalem for 33 years. Williamson suggests, plausibly, that this verse refers to David's reign over all Israel from Hebron until he had captured Jerusalem - Chronicles, p.103.

are invited to take part. After David's death, the united kingdom is handed over to Solomon without any recorded opposition. It is only during the reign of Rehoboam I that the division between the north and the south occurred. Even then, the north is not omitted entirely from the Chronicler's plan for the future. The only judgement passed is that the north must again submit to the rule of Yahweh which is exercised through the king of Judah.⁶⁰

The attitude towards the Northern Kingdom such as the one displayed by the Chronicler is diametrically opposed to the attitude found in Ezra-Nehemiah. Here Braun distinguishes two types of hostility exhibited towards the "people of the land", who are possibly made up from the remnants of the Northern Kingdom, although no formal identification is ever made. First, there is the general opposition of the "people of the land" to the rebuilding of the temple recorded in Ezra 4-6 and Nehemiah 2-6. Secondly, in Ezra 4:1-4, these "people of the land" are denied the right to assist in the rebuilding of the temple in spite of their profession to the worship of Yahweh. There is nothing similar to be found in 1 or 2 Chronicles.⁶¹

The centrality and importance accorded to the Davidic monarchy and its founder in Chronicles are also of significance for

⁶⁰ A fuller discussion may be found in H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, pp.87-140. Also see R.L. Braun, "Reconsideration" and note 2 Chron. 30:1, 5-11.

⁶¹ R.L. Braun, "Literary History", pp.57f. C.f. J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", pp.205-07 where the relevant passages are examined.

distinguishing between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. Although the Davidide Zerubbabel and the rebuilding of the temple do receive mention in Ezra, the attention given to them is only minimal.⁶² There is no great stress placed upon the role of Zerubbabel: he is merely referred to as "the governor of Judah". Zerubbabel's role in Ezra is limited to overseeing the rebuilding of the temple.

Another point which needs to be taken into account when comparing the themes of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah concerns the role played by the prophets and prophecy. Prophecy did not die out after the exile as is evidenced by the writings of Haggai and Zechariah. However, both of these prophets regarded themselves as the last in the line of the prophets. Prophecy is so inextricably linked with the history of the people in the work of the Chronicler that his history could be called, in the words of Williamson, "a prophetic history".⁶³ In Chronicles, history and prophecy go hand in hand.⁶⁴ In contrast to this emphasis in Chronicles, we find an almost total lack of prophetic influence in Ezra-Nehemiah. The work carried out by Haggai and Zechariah is referred to, but its influence always receives qualifications. The passages are always terse and lack elaboration.⁶⁵ It is of especial interest to note that Ezra 6:14 omits the reference to

⁶² Ezra 3-5 - D.N. Freedman, "Purpose", p.442.

⁶³ H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, p.68.

⁶⁴ See below chapter 2.

⁶⁵ I.g. Ezra 5:1-2; 6:14.

Zerubbabel as the chief temple-builder.⁶⁶ As in Ezra 5:5 and 5:9, it is "the elders of the Jews" who are responsible. Although there are references to the post-exilic prophets in Ezra-Nehemiah, these references cannot be used to argue persuasively for the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah on these grounds.⁶⁷ The role played by the prophets in Ezra-Nehemiah is more limited than the role played by the prophets in Chronicles. Von Rad too draws attention to the important role played by the prophets in Chronicles. He also suggests that the great speeches found in Chronicles are really sermons and cites as an example David's speech of 1 Chronicles 28:2-10.⁶⁸ In von Rad's view, the purpose of these speeches is to support the prophetic claims of the Levites as conceived by the Chronicler.⁶⁹

In summary then, the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah cannot be accepted uncritically. This conclusion can be reached on both linguistic and ideological grounds. However, the arguments for or against the unity of the three books cannot be considered to be conclusive. Put succinctly, it appears that there are four major

⁶⁶ See D.J. Clines, Ezra, p.95 and F.C. Fensham, The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, Grand Rapids (1962), p.92.

⁶⁷ D.N. Freedman, "Purpose", p.440; J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", p.212; H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, p.63.

⁶⁸ G. von Rad, "The Levitical sermon in I and II Chronicles" in The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, Edinburgh and London (1966), p.263.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p.277.

ideological differences between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah:

- i) The central role played by prophecy in Chronicles.
- ii) The role of the monarchy in Chronicles.
- iii) The internationalism of the Chronicler.
- iv) The role played by the Levitical sermon in Chronicles.

All four points are absent from Ezra-Nehemiah.⁷⁰ These differences have led Newsome to conclude that the three books cannot be united by common authorship. According to him, the end of the Chronicler's history is seen to be before the narrative recounting the building of the second temple, because it is here that many of the differences between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah are most pointed.⁷¹

Thus, the conclusions drawn from this chapter are largely negative. It is implausible to maintain the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, especially with reference to the important role assigned to David and the Davidic monarchy in Chronicles. Although the survey has of necessity been brief, it is the centrality of David in 1 Chronicles and the absence of any significant role being assigned to the Davidide in Ezra-Nehemiah which leads us to conclude that the three books are dealing with essentially different historical circumstances. It now remains to raise the question as to how we are going to interpret the role allocated to David by the Chronicler. This leads us into the next chapter, which will examine the role assigned to David by the Chronicler. When that has been done, chapter 3 will then explore the possibility of reading 1

⁷⁰ C.f. J.L. Newsome, "Understanding", pp.212-15.

⁷¹ Ibid., p.215.

Chronicles in conjunction with Haggai and Proto-Zechariah. The question needs to be asked as to what the Chronicler has done with the historical David. We will survey the major themes employed by the Chronicler when writing his history. Only after determining the themes of 1 Chronicles are we able to proceed in our search for the Sitz im Leben of 1 Chronicles.

CHAPTER 2

THE IMPORTANCE OF KING DAVID IN CHRONICLES

The purpose of this chapter is to survey what the Chronicler has done with the figure of David. The comparison will be made with the Deuteronomistic History. It cannot be said with certainty whether the Chronicler used the Samuel-Kings text as it has been passed down to us, but it is reasonable to suppose that the same, or at least similar, sources underlie the two works.¹ Therefore, when the discussion is about the Chronicler's interpretation of David, it means his interpretation as opposed to that of the Deuteronomist, or some other work, such as the Psalms.

The central theme of the Chronicler's theology is the Davidic

¹ For discussion of the Chronicler's sources see the works of A.-M. Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses Sources", RB 60 (1953), pp.481-508, and RB 61 (1954), pp.349-86; W.E. Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History", HTR 58 (1965), pp.349-63. Lemke's article consists largely of an attack against the work of Brunet and is an attempt to prove that the Chronicler's Vorlage was not the same as the MT of Samuel-Kings. Also see the article by B. Halpern, "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure - Indications of an Earlier Source" cited in the introduction of this thesis, pp.1f., n.4.

dynasty and its relation to the cult of Jerusalem.² This chapter will attempt to refute the suggestions made by Williamson and Braun in particular during recent years,³ that large parts of 1 Chronicles should be read as Solomonic apologetic. Instead of this, we are going to ask why there is this great stress on David at the expense of the other rulers of Judah, and of Israel. In the words of Porter, it is not enough to say simply that the author needed a convenient cult founder because he already had Solomon.⁴ Instead, the suggestion is going to be developed in

² See T. Michaeli, Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie, Neuchâtel (1967), pp.27f.; R. North, "Theology of the Chronicler", JBL 82 (1963), pp.369-81; J.R. Porter, "Old Testament Historiography" in G.W. Anderson (ed.), Tradition and Interpretation, Oxford (1979), pp.152-56; H.G.M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, London (1982), pp.24ff.

³ See the contributions of R.L. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles", JBL 92 (1973), pp.503-16; "Solomon the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28 and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles", JBL 95 (1976), pp.581-90; H.G.M. Williamson, "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles", VT 26 (1976), pp.351-61.

⁴ J.R. Porter, "Historiography", p.158. It seems that the two questions are possibly complementary. It reflects a change of emphasis rather than an irreconcilable alternative. At the same time, the stress here is going to be placed upon David to balance the greater stress which has been placed upon Solomon to the detriment of David.

this chapter that David is the fulfiller of the pre-exilic traditions. The Chronicler represents him as being a second Moses, a second Joshua, and possibly a second Abraham and Melchizedek. David in Chronicles is the embodiment of a number of pre-exilic traditions. He is the bridge between the pre-exilic and post-exilic ages.

We will start with an examination of the centrality of David as against Solomon. We will examine the reasons why David, and not Solomon, should be regarded as the most important figure in Chronicles. Although Braun and Williamson are correct to suggest that Solomon completed the work started by his father, they fail to stress adequately the important role played by David himself.⁵ David is the central figure of 1 Chronicles; no other character is developed at all. This stress on Solomon has also been forwarded to explain the function of the so-called "Succession Narrative" of 1 Samuel 9-20. This suggestion has been well dealt with by F.N. Gunn and his conclusions can be equally well applied to the Chronicler's work. Gunn says that the "Succession Narrative" is "above all else a story about David and not any successor....It

⁵ Williamson does however, point out that Braun overlooks the fact that the work of Solomon would have been impossible without that of David - ibid., p.353. Despite this, Williamson proceeds to state that Nathan's prophecy to David is fulfilled in Solomon. But, upon closer examination, the promise of Yahweh to David is made unconditionally: the promise to Solomon, and to his successors, is conditional. The point will be developed later in this chapter and in chapter 3.

is David...around whom every episode ultimately revolves."⁶

Solomon in 1 Chronicles is unimportant except as the successor of David.

Furthermore, there is no real need for an apology in the first place, despite the reasons posited by Braun and Williamson. For example, unlike the account of Solomon's accession in 2 Samuel-1 Kings, Chronicles presents no rival claimant to the throne. There is no mention of Amnon, nor of a rebellion led by Absalom. Neither is there a conspiracy to make Adonijah king instead of Solomon while David is on his death bed. In Chronicles, Solomon is presented as being the only possible successor to David. In 1 Kings, Solomon is portrayed as being only a likely successor. Even after his accession, his throne is still not stable.

That Solomon is merely the fulfiller of the work started by David is evidenced by the stress in 1 Chronicles upon the elaborate preparations made for the building of the temple. It is true that we have to wait until the death of David before the temple can be started; but without the meticulous planning of David, there would not have been a cult in the first place.⁷

⁶ L.A. Gunn, The Story of King David, Sheffield (1978), p.83.

⁷ See 1 Chron. 22-29 which are entirely devoted to the ordering of the cult. The only role which is assigned to Solomon in these chapters is to ensure that everything is completed according to the original designs of David. Chapters 23 and 28 are of especial importance in this respect.

Solomon had only to follow the instructions of his father. He was left to do nothing unaided.

In addition, at the beginning of 2 Chronicles, where the actual building of the temple is recounted, reference is continually made back to the actions and the role played by David in the organization of the cult. For example, in 2 Chronicles 2, Hiram of Tyre is exhorted to trade with Solomon in the same way that he traded with David. 3:1 emphasizes the fact that the temple is being built in the place designated for this purpose by David. In chapter 5, the vessels which are brought into the temple have already been dedicated by David. After the prayer of dedication in chapter 6, 7:6 states that the priests and Levites played music upon instruments made by David. Finally, in 1 Chronicles 22:7, we find that the Chronicler has put into David's mouth the self-same sentiments attributed to him by Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the temple.⁸ Thus, it is legitimate to ask whether Solomon could have built the temple without David's preparations. Solomon does nothing new, except he does put the bricks in place and install the various offices which have already been designated by David.

The imbalance created by an undue stress upon the importance of Solomon in 1 Chronicles can be illustrated with a reference to Braun. He suggests that the primary object of the Chronicler in 1 Chronicles 22 and 28 was to portray Solomon as the divinely chosen temple builder, which contradicts the statement made by Gunn

⁸ H.G.N. Williamson, Chronicles, p.154.

quoted earlier.⁹ However, McCarthy has offered what appears to be a more balanced, and therefore a more acceptable, interpretation. Referring to the influential work of M. Lohfink, who suggested that there is a parallel between the commissioning of Solomon by David and the commissioning of Joshua by Moses, McCarthy is able to illustrate the importance of David as against the importance of Solomon.¹⁰ He points out that a notable difference between 1 Chronicles 22 and 28, on the one hand, and Deuteronomy-Joshua, on the other, is that, in the latter, Yahweh does the commissioning, whereas in Chronicles, it is David who is the spokesman. Thus, although David himself has been barred from the building of the temple, the Chronicler is still able to emphasize his dignity by making him the mouthpiece of both the commission and the command.¹¹

⁹ R.L. Braun, "Solomon", p.590. Cf. H.G.M. Williamson, "Accession", pp.351-61.

¹⁰ M. Lohfink, "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue", Scholastik 37 (1962), pp.32-44. See especially p.33. The parallel between 1 Chronicles 22 and 28 and Deuteronomy is going to be developed later in this chapter. Here the reference is being made specifically to the contribution of McCarthy who argues persuasively against reading 1 Chronicles as Solomonic apologetic - D.J. McCarthy, "An Installation Genre?", JBL 90 (1971), pp.31-41.

¹¹ Contra Williamson who says that the two statements referring to Solomon's inability to meet the demands of building the temple unaided ultimately serve to heighten the inability of David to

"After all, his (the Chronicler's) main object in this whole section of his history is to show that to all intents and purposes the temple is due to David. Solomon only puts together what David has arranged, rather like the constructor of a pre-fabricated house."¹² The manner in which the account of the preparations for the building of the temple has been presented enables David to take as much credit as possible.¹³

There is a further reason for stressing the centrality of David in Chronicles. Freedman has drawn attention to the ambiguities in the Chronicler's statements concerning the status of the Davidic monarch.¹⁴ In the account of the divine promise made to David, the commitment from Yahweh is stated unconditionally:

He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son; I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you, but I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever, and his throne shall be established forever. /15/

do so because he is a man of war. See 1 Chron. 22:5 and 29:1f.

"Accession", p.358.

¹² D.J. McCarthy, "Installation", p.36.

¹³ Ibid., p.37.

¹⁴ E.H. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose", CBQ 23 (1961), pp.436-42.

¹⁵ 1 Chron. 17:12-14. The parallel passage in 2 Sam. 7 contains these additional words in v.14: "When he commits iniquity, I will chasten him with the rods of men, with the stripes of the sons of men. In Chronicles, this condition is omitted in contrast to the promise made with the rest of the Israelite rulers. But see 1 Chron. 28:6f. where the conditional promise is given to David.

In contrast to this, the commitment made to David's successors is made conditional upon their faithfulness and obedience to the Jerusalem cult. Even to Solomon the promise is made conditional to his fidelity:

...if you walk before me...I will establish your royal throne....But if you turn aside and forsake my statutes and my commandments...then I will pluck you up from the land.... /16/

Thus it is David and not Solomon who is accorded the glorification by the Chronicler. The promises are made primarily to David and only secondarily to Solomon.

Although the arguments set out above are perhaps not definitive, they are enough to show that for the Chronicler David is the most important figure in his history. In comparison with the role assigned to David, the importance of Solomon must not be overemphasized. Now that the groundwork has been done, we are able to proceed and look more closely at the Chronicler's interpretation of David. The last word has not been uttered on the relationship between David and Solomon in 1 Chronicles, but it will be dealt with in an entirely new context later in the chapter. We will continue now by surveying the Chronicler's concept of kingship, of which there are several aspects.

The first characteristic of the Chronicler's concept of kingship is the direct equation of the Kingdom of Yahweh and the Kingdom of Israel. This equation is expressed both in passages where it appears that the Chronicler is composing independently of any sources known to us, as well as in those

¹⁶ 2 Chron. 7:17-20.

places where he differs from the Deuteronomistic text. In the first category, we can take as an example 1 Chronicles 28:5 - "he has chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh over Israel." To illustrate the second category, we can turn to 1 Chronicles 17:14 which speaks of "my house" and "my kingdom" as opposed to the "your house" and "your kingdom" of 2 Samuel 7:16.¹⁷ This kingship of Yahweh is expressed by the Chronicler as being exercised in Israel through Yahweh's chosen representative, the Davidic ruler.¹⁸ Thus, the throne of David, and the Davidic kingdom, are portrayed as belonging to Yahweh.¹⁹ Therefore, the Davidide of Chronicles is the chosen and legitimate ruler of Yahweh's "earthly kingdom".

The second characteristic of the Chronicler's concept of kingship is, according to Williamson, that the Davidic dynasty

¹⁷ E.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.26. Further examples of both of these categories may be found in 1 Chron. 29:23 and 2 Chron. 9:8 respectively.

¹⁸ Loc.cit. Williamson tends to read the emphasis upon kingship as being the beginnings of a movement which reached its fulfillment in later apocalyptic literature. He refers to 1 Chron. 29:11 and 2 Chron. 20:6 as examples of the severing of all links with the human realm. A fuller discussion of reading Chronicles apocalyptically and eschatologically will follow in the last chapter of this thesis.

¹⁹ J.M. Myers, 1 Chronicles: An Introduction, Translation, and Notes, New York (1965), p.125.

has been completely entrusted with the kingship of Israel.²⁰ By the time of Solomon's death, the hereditary nature of the monarchy had been established. However, its hereditary nature was also promised as early as 1 Chronicles 17:15. Here Yahweh says that no transfer such as that which happened from Saul to David shall happen again.²¹ The same idea is expressed in 1 Chronicles 29:11 and 2 Chronicles 9:8. This contrasts with the rejection of Saul in 1 Chronicles 10:14.²² Saul was defeated and killed by Yahweh who then handed the kingdom over to David. The later promises made to David show that this will not happen again: the Davidic kingdom has the blessing of Yahweh. Or, the the Kingdom of Israel/Yahweh will be ruled by a Davidide.

The third and the most important characteristic of the Chronicler's concept of kingship has been alluded to by a number of scholars: that for the Chronicler, the establishment of the Davidic dynasty has displaced in importance the earlier emphasis upon the Exodus and Sinai traditions.²³ If the Chronicler really did rely heavily upon the Deuteronomistic History, as many scholars have suggested, then it leaves unanswered the question as to why

²⁰ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.27.

²¹ See further, H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles", TynB 28 (1977), pp.115-54.

²² H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.136.

²³ Ibid., pp.27ff. Also see D.J. McCarthy, "Installation", pp.31-41; F. Michaeli, Chroniques, p.27; J.M. Myers, "The Kerygma of the Chronicler", Interp. 20 (1966), p.269.

such important and integral events of that earlier history are omitted in the later work. S. Japhet reads this omission as a polemic. She theorizes that the Chronicler wanted to present a view of an Israel with timeless origins marked by the continuous habitation of the promised land. Therefore, because the Exodus, Conquest and Exile necessarily imply absence from the land, they are themes which must be dispensed with.²⁴ However, as Williamson suggests, the Chronicler's replacement of the stress on Moses and Sinai should not be seen as a rejection on his part of a recognition of these other themes.²⁵

In a later article, Japhet suggests that the omission of any reference to the Exodus could be a reflection of the Chronicler's lack of interest in periods outside the time of the monarchy.²⁶ At the same time, however, Japhet does allow that there are allusions to the earlier history of Israel and those early traditions. Examples cited include the geographical scope of the Conquest and the question of the Levitical and Priestly cities, both of which are dealt with in 1 Chronicles 13:1-5; and the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9.²⁷ According to Japhet, the

²⁴ S. Japhet, The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought, (Hebrew), Jerusalem (1977), pp.14-19; 93-130; 367-38. Cited from H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, p.66, n.1.

²⁵ Loc.cit.

²⁶ S. Japhet, "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles", JBL 96 (1979), p.206.

²⁷ Ibid., pp.203 and 217f.

genealogies represent the Chronicler's presentation of "a concept of people and land which is autochthonic in its basic features."²⁸

If the omission of references to Moses and Sinai is not to be seen as a denial of the Chronicler's recognition of these themes, then another interpretation is required. Williamson suggests that we should see that the Chronicler is "attempting his own distinctive resolution of the often-observed tension between the Mosaic and Davidic covenants."²⁹ After the Davidic dynasty had been established, the covenantal basis for the people's existence is moved from Sinai to the new covenant made with David. Similarly, the Mosaic covenant, now defunct, replaced, or rather fulfilled, the original covenant made with Abram.³⁰ However, care must be taken and this feature should not be stressed to the detriment of the Chronicler's recognition of the earlier traditions. For example, the genealogical lists of the opening nine chapters of 1 Chronicles do deal with the early history, albeit in a somewhat cursory and uncusomary manner.³¹ Nevertheless, for the Chronicler, history proper begins with the accession of

²⁸ Ibid., p.218. See above.

²⁹ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.27.

³⁰ In the same way, the Christian Church has come to regard the Davidic covenant as reaching its fulfilment in the life and death of Jesus Christ. Thus, in the New Testament, this is the covenant which receives the emphasis over the "old" Davidic covenant.

³¹ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, pp.27f. Also see S. Japhet, "Conquest", pp.205-16.

David to the throne of Israel. The Exodus and Sinai traditions lie outside that history which treats Israel as the Kingdom of Yahweh; or rather, as we shall see, for the Chronicler, David is the fulfilment of these early traditions.

In articles and commentaries cited throughout this chapter, there have been numerous attempts to identify David as the second Moses. This identification has arisen largely because of the anointing of Solomon to be David's successor in 1 Chronicles 22 and 28. Successive scholars have isolated parallels between the commissioning of Solomon by David, and the commissioning of Joshua by Moses. The starting point for all these studies is the work carried out by N. Lohfink. Lohfink discovered the following three elements in the commissioning of Joshua which are found in Deuteronomy 31:23:

- i) The formula of encouragement.
- ii) The description of the task to be undertaken.
- iii) The formula of accompaniment.³²

These same elements can also be found in the relevant chapters of 1 Chronicles. 22:10 and 22:11 contain the assurance that Yahweh is with Solomon. Verse 11 then proceeds to delineate the task upon which Solomon is about to embark. Finally, verse 12 states that Yahweh will provide the necessary accompaniment. This same three-fold formula is also present in 1 Chronicles 28:10 which recounts Solomon's presentation to the people.

J.M. Myers has put forward the suggestion that 1 Chronicles

³² N. Lohfink, "deuteronomistische", pp.32-44 - especially p.30.

22:6-16 was not intended to imitate the commissioning of Joshua but the charge made to Solomon by David in 1 Kings 2:1-9. In addition to the counsel concerning Joab, the sons of Barzillai and Shimei, David encourages Solomon to remain faithful to the law of Moses.³³ However, the circumstances of the two accounts are completely different. In 1 Kings, Solomon's position was far from being secure and David's final speech is aimed largely towards the stabilizing of the political situation. In 1 Chronicles, Solomon has already been accepted as the heir to the throne, and in chapter 28 he is presented as such to the people. David's counsel in 1 Chronicles is primarily concerned with the completion of the temple. The political situation in 1 Chronicles is already stable and does ^{not} need the authoritative word of David to prevent any further rebellion.

The specific parallel between David and Moses can be developed further. David made all the plans and preparations for the building of the temple in the same way that Moses did for the tabernacle at Sinai.³⁴ W. Eichrodt, amongst others, regards the tabernacle as the prototype of the temple.³⁵ The parallels are striking. The tabernacle was prepared in accordance with a heavenly model seen by Moses;³⁶ the plan for the building

³³ J.M. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p.154.

³⁴ 1 Chron. 22-29, c f. Exod. 25.

³⁵ W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol.1, London (1961), p.423.

³⁶ Exod. 25:9, 40.

of the temple is attributed to a writing of Yahweh.³⁷ We also discover that David, like Moses, called on Israel to make a free-will offering to Yahweh.³⁸

The identification of David with Moses does not end there, however. Just as Moses was prevented from attaining his goal by being barred from entering Canaan, so David was prevented from fulfilling his dream of building the temple.³⁹ The forbidding of David from building the temple is seen, in 1 Chronicles, to be the result of the fact that David was involved in bloodshed, whereas Solomon could be accepted because he was a "man of rest".⁴⁰ Outside Deuteronomy, this concept of rest occurs in relation to three other events: the Conquest, the dynastic promise to David, and the building of the temple by Solomon. According to Braun, the Chronicler has adopted from the Deuteronomist the idea that a God-given rest in the promised land marked the fulfilment of the promise of Yahweh to Israel.⁴¹ It also provided the necessary

³⁷ See 1 Chron. 28:19. C f. Ezek. 40-48.

³⁸ 1 Chron. 29:3f. C f. Exod. 25:1ff and 35:4ff. See G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol.1, Edinburgh (1962), p.351.

³⁹ 1 Chron. 17, c f. Deut. 34:5.

⁴⁰ R.L. Braun, "Solomon", p.583. See H.G.H. Williamson, Chronicles, p.154 on the translation of the Hebrew wah^hnihôti/šîs menûhah.

It needs to be distinguished from the word for peace which provides the word play on the name Solomon.

⁴¹ For the importance of the rest concept in the Deuteronomistic History, see G. von Rad, "There Remains Still a Rest for the People

prerequisite for the construction of the temple. This rest was not enjoyed in the same sense by David as it was by Solomon. For the Chronicler, such rest only happened during Solomon's reign.⁴² Williamson once again reminds us that this motif is also a part of the Moses-Joshua typology. Moses was prevented from accomplishing the objective of his ministry, whereas Joshua, who was appointed solely for this task, was the one who gave rest to Israel.⁴³ In the same way, Solomon was appointed solely for the purpose of completing the life work of David. He too provided Israel with rest of which the temple could be seen as a symbol.

This idea that David was the fulfiller⁴⁴ of the early Israelite tradition is carried a step further by the account of his capture of Jerusalem in 1 Chronicles 11. This is, in Chronicles, David's first act upon acquiring the throne of Israel.⁴⁵ Here,

of God" in The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, New York (1966), pp.94-102; and R.A. Carlson, David the Chosen King: A Traditio-historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel, Stockholm (1964), pp.97-106.

⁴² R.L. Braun, "Solomon", pp.503f.

⁴³ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.150. C f. Josh. 1:13, 15; 21:24.

⁴⁴ Solomon and Joshua appear to be the actual fulfillers in that they officially complete the work begun by their predecessors. However, they remain secondary figures to David and Moses respectively, and their work could only be successful if the work carried out by David and Moses was also successful.

⁴⁵ The account in 1 Chronicles is almost word for word the same

David is not being presented as the second Moses; he is now the second Joshua. Israel had to wait until the time of David before the conquest of Canaan could be completed. Thus, Joshua, like Moses, also failed to achieve his ultimate objective. In a sense, therefore, it can be said that David is a fusion of both Moses and Joshua. For the first, and practically only, time, Israel was now poised to reach the limits of the promised land as described by Yahweh to Abraham in Genesis.⁴⁶

The identification of David with Abraham has been well documented. The important parallel to note here is found in 1 Chronicles 21, which clearly invokes parts of Genesis 22 and 23. According to Williamson, David's purchase of the threshing-floor from Ornan is patterned on Abraham's buying of the cave of Machpelah

as the account in 2 Sam. 5:6-10. However, in the Deuteronomistic version, David has first to defeat a rebellion led by the Saulide Abner before he is able to assume control of the entire country. For the Chronicler, it is important to emphasize that David was the monarch of a united Israel by unanimous approval. It is also worth noting the central role of Jerusalem in Chronicles - see P. Michaeli, Chroniques, pp.30f. and 75f.

⁴⁶ Gen. 15:18-21. By implication, then, David could also be regarded as the fulfiller of the promise made to the Patriarchs. Thus, David is linked to the earliest traditions of Israel, to that time before the people became a nation, although, as we saw in chapter 1, the Chronicler places a greater stress upon the role played by Jacob - see pp.22-24.

from Ephron in Genesis 23. The most noteworthy similarity is the Chronicler's addition of the phrase b^ekesep māle' in verses 22 and 24. This same phrase also occurs at Genesis 23:9. It occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible.⁴⁷ In response to David's offer, Ornan wishes to give the threshing-floor to David, just as Ephron's initial response was to give the field to Abraham.⁴⁸ It seems that this was a method of bargaining in the east at this time.

The parallel between 1 Chronicles 21 and Genesis 22 is also of interest. By a later identification, we find out that the threshing-floor of Ornan is on Mount Moriah, the very place where Abraham went to offer up his son as a sacrifice.⁴⁹ Abraham's "sacrifice" was seen as a test whereby he demonstrated his fidelity to Yahweh. In the same way, David's experience at Moriah could also be seen as the fulfilment of a test of his faithfulness.⁵⁰ Satan certainly acquires the role of tempter in Job 1 and 2, and in Zechariah 3. Finally, both Abraham and David offer sacrifices to Yahweh on Moriah as signs that their respective trials have been successfully terminated. It is on Moriah that the promise to Abraham that he would be the ancestor of a nation is reiterated. By the building of the temple, Yahweh's promise to Abraham reaches its fulfilment. The presence of the temple illustrates the permanent

⁴⁷ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.149.

⁴⁸ Loc.cit.

⁴⁹ 2 Chron. 3:1.

⁵⁰ P.R. Ackroyd, I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, London (1973), p.74.

presence of Yahweh. No longer will the Ark of the Covenant have to be carried around as a symbol of Yahweh's presence. The promise to Abraham has reached its climax. Under the rule and guidance of David, the people have a land and become a nation.

David is connected with the pre-exilic generations in another way. The Chronicler assigns a special place in his work to the role of the Levites.⁵¹ Originally, the Levites were meant for service to the Ark.⁵² According to the Chronicler, they were the religious class responsible for looking after it at Jerusalem until the temple had been completed.⁵³ After the building of the temple, the Levites were handed the duty of carrying the Ark to its new resting place.⁵⁴ According to de Vaux, the source of this tradition is drawn, not from any of the Priestly writings, but from Deuteronomy 10:3.⁵⁵ Therefore, support is being given to the tradition of Levitical claims; and this support is once more drawn from the early history of Israel. Because the Levites carried the Ark into the temple, their continued presence in the temple is in

⁵¹ So much so that some scholars have suggested that the author was himself a Levite. This view has, however, been largely discredited by the works of Noth and Rudolph.

⁵² Num. 3 and 4.

⁵³ 1 Chron. 16:4-6; 2 Chron. 5:5-14.

⁵⁴ Once again this mirrors an earlier Davidic tradition. The Ark was carried into Jerusalem by the Levites - 1 Chron. 15:2.

⁵⁵ R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: its Life and Institutions, London (1961), p. 291.

keeping with the law. For von Rad, "the unique significance of David in Chronicles is based upon his organization of the Levites."⁵⁶

After the temple had been built and the Ark had been moved into the temple, the Levites became redundant, according to the Chronicler's scheme.⁵⁷ Thus, David gave them a new role to perform in the cult by setting them apart as temple singers.⁵⁸ Therefore, these singers were traced by the Chronicler back to David, traditionally Israel's greatest singer.⁵⁹ Other Levitical functions included being door-keepers, clerks, judges and even teachers.⁶⁰

At this point, let us summarize what we have said about the Chronicler's presentation of David as the fulfiller of the pre-

⁵⁶ G. von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes, Stuttgart (1930), p.129. Cited from A.C. Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism, Edinburgh and London (1935), p.196.

⁵⁷ See 1 Chron. 23:25f.

⁵⁸ E.g. 1 Chron. 16:4.

⁵⁹ See A.M. Cooper, "The Life and Times of King David According to the Book of Psalms", Chico (1983), pp.124f., who also argues that this might be Levitical apologetic.

⁶⁰ R. de Vaux assigns many of these functions to a late date and he suggests that these passages describe the end process of a long development, Ancient Israel, p.393. The census list of 1 Chron. 23:4 includes mention of clerks and judges. With reference to the door-keepers, the six families who returned from exile were not Levites, although 1 Chron. 6:7 does give them a Levitical ancestry.

exilic traditions. We have seen how David's reign in 1 Chronicles is dominated by the account of the preparations for the building of the temple. There can be very little doubt that many of the customs and traditions referred to in Chronicles reflect post-exilic customs.⁶¹ At the same time, continuity with the past is expressed by the author's inclusion of references to all of the major cultic symbols of the pre-exilic era. For example, there are references to the Ark, the tabernacle and the holy vessels. In addition, the Chronicler also makes reference to important cultic sites, such as Mount Moriah and Gibeon.⁶² The building of the temple is, for the Chronicler, the fulfilment of all the pre-exilic traditions and is the final embodiment of the centres of worship where Israel worshipped Yahweh from the earliest days.⁶³ It is perhaps in the light of this that we should interpret the Chronicler's presentation of David. David has not so much replaced Moses⁶⁴ as fulfilled the tradition which was begun by Moses. For the Chronicler, David is the ultimate fulfilment of the covenant made between Yahweh and Israel.⁶⁵

⁶¹ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.28. See J.D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes", JBL 94 (1975), pp.201-17; R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp.390-94; A.C. Welch, Judaism, pp.197f.

⁶² H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.29.

⁶³ Loc.cit.

⁶⁴ Contra the suggestions of Williamson and North.

⁶⁵ See the commentaries listed in the bibliography.

David as the fulfiller of the Mosaic traditions can be further illustrated. Despite the already noted stress on the new Davidic covenant at the expense of the old covenant, it can be seen that, as far as possible, the temple worship was ordered in conformity with Pentateuchal stipulations. For example, the fundamental divisions of the sons of Aaron in 1 Chronicles 24 are based upon the common biblical tradition of Exodus 6:23 and Numbers 3:2-4, while 1 Chronicles 25:1 is based upon Numbers 8:25. However, it can also be noted that very little attention is given by the Chronicler to the role played by the High Priest; it appears that the Davidic king alone is necessary for the successful maintenance and function of the cult.⁶⁶ The importance of this point for establishing the Sitz im Leben of the Chronicler's work will be discussed at a later point. Suffice it to say here that the Chronicler may well be opposing those who regarded the post-exilic High Priests as the legitimate successors of the kings.

Not only is David presented as the fulfiller of the Mosaic tradition in 1 Chronicles, he is also presented as a prophet. For the Chronicler, prophecy and the monarchy go hand in hand, not just for David, but also for his descendants.⁶⁷ David receives advice and warnings from the prophets. The Chronicler presents the Davidic dynasty as having been commissioned as a result of

⁶⁶ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.29.

⁶⁷ D.N. Freedman, "Purpose", p.440; J.L. Newsome, "Understanding", pp.203, 212f.; D.L. Petersen, Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles, Missoula (1977), pp.55ff.

the prophetic word. For instance, David is anointed King of Israel "according to the word of Yahweh by Samuel".⁶⁸

Furthermore, the covenant made between Yahweh and David is mediated through Nathan the prophet, as is the designation of Solomon as the temple builder.⁶⁹ In addition to these points, we can note that the Davidic king in Chronicles receives the divine word and then passes it on to others, thus assuming the prophetic role himself.⁷⁰

David is so central to the theology of 1 Chronicles that he cannot be ignored. In the previous chapter, some reasons were outlined which suggest that it is impossible to maintain the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah. In the conclusion to that chapter, it was noted that the centrality of David had no place in Ezra-Nehemiah. Such a stress on David would, in fact, be incredible in the light of the fact that Ezra-Nehemiah was written at a time when there was no monarchy in Judah/Israel; nor was there any realistic hope that a Davidic monarchy would ever be re-established. In addition, 1 Chronicles is largely concerned with the building of the temple and the organization of the temple personnel. At the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, the temple had been rebuilt about 100 years earlier. The emphasis in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah is on the reading of the Law and other legal matters, and the rebuilding of

⁶⁸ 1 Chron. 11:3.

⁶⁹ 1 Chron. 17:1-27//2 Sam. 7:1-29.

⁷⁰ E.g. 1 Chron. 21:26; 22:3; 23:19 - see J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", p.203.

Jerusalem and its walls.⁷¹ Thus, the major themes of 1 Chronicles differ from the major themes of Ezra-Nehemiah.

There must be a reason for the great stress upon David and his descendants in Chronicles. The Chronicler is not simply writing an alternative historical account of the reign of David. Rather, his work has to be coloured by his own historical situation and contemporary events. Therefore, chapter 3 will be devoted to a search for that historical situation. The focus will be on reading 1 Chronicles as a document of the early post-exilic era.

⁷¹See D.J. Clines, Ezra, pp.15f. for a brief summary of the historical background to Ezra-Nehemiah.

CHAPTER 3

AN EARLY HISTORICAL SETTING FOR 1 CHRONICLES

Chapter 1 of this thesis surveyed some of the reasons which have been put forward by some scholars who maintain that Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah all belong to the same literary genre. The conclusion reached was that the unity of the three books can be questioned. Chapter 2 then concentrated on the major themes of 1 Chronicles in particular, drawing attention to the considerable stress on David and his involvement with the building of the temple. The conclusion reached in that chapter was that the Chronicler's interpretation of David might reflect the conditions of his own time and circumstances. The present chapter will be largely devoted to arguing for an early date for 1 Chronicles on the basis of what has already been discovered in chapter 2 about the role of David. The historical setting which is being sought will have to provide a plausible reason for the stress on David and the building of the temple in 1 Chronicles. As was concluded in chapter 2, Ezra-Nehemiah deal with a separate historical setting ~~from~~ the one being addressed in 1 Chronicles.

Before progressing, however, it needs to be noted that a late date for Chronicles does not depend solely on the links between that book and Ezra-Nehemiah. Williamson, for example, rejects the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, but he still accepts a late date for Chronicles:

It may...be concluded that a date for Chronicles within

the fourth century BC is most probable, but that in the circumstances dogmatism is out of the question. With this clearly understood, perhaps a speculation may be allowed. It is probable, to judge from 1 Chr. 23-27, that the priestly reviser worked no more than a generation after the Chronicler, and that he did so under the impact of the institution of the twenty-four priestly courses. It has been suggested that two incidents from very late in the Persian period may have caused this development. If so, Chronicles itself would come from about the middle of the fourth century BC. /1/

There are two major problems with such a conclusion. First, it fails to distinguish clearly enough between the various redactional layers of the work; the conclusion draws heavily from material which is not accepted as being part of the original work.² Secondly, as Williamson himself admits, we know very little about the historical situation of Judah during the late Persian period. D. Barag has argued that the effects of the Persian suppression of the Tennes revolt are reflected in Chronicles.³ However, our

¹ H.G.M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, London (1982), p.16. Attention can also be drawn to other articles by Williamson which suggest a late date for Chronicles: his excursus in Israel in the Books of Chronicles, Cambridge (1977), pp.83-86; and "The Origins of the Twenty-Four Priestly Courses", SVT 30 (1979), pp.251-68.

² Notably the genealogies and chapters 23-27 of 1 Chronicles which could have been added several centuries after the Chronicler.

³ D. Barag, "The Effects of the Tennes Revolt on Palestine", BASOR 183 (1966), pp.6-12. A summary of the evidence for a late date and the relevant bibliography is presented by J. Bright, A History of Israel, Philadelphia (1972), pp.393f.

understanding of the Chronicler's history is not dependent upon the conjecture that the author was encouraging a community whose hopes of independence had just been crushed.⁴

A date later than the Persian period has been proposed by P. Welten, amongst others, who wrote an excursus on the implications of the notes in Chronicles on building, the army and battles, for the dating of the book. Welten argues that these concerns reflect the conditions of the Chronicler's contemporary situation.⁵ His suggestion for a date for Chronicles within the Hellenistic period has been adequately dealt with by Williamson. Williamson argues against Welten's understanding of defensive constructions for cities and his presentation of the Judean army being based upon the Greek model. Welten's suggestions remain uncertain and too vague in detail to rest the case for a late date for Chronicles.⁶ In the course of the remainder of his commentary, Welten accepts that the Persian period provides the most satisfactory background for the data which he has adduced.⁷

There is, however, a major stumbling block to dating Chronicles to a period of 400 BCE or later. Most scholars tend to overlook this fact although it has been recognized by Newsome: it appears that by 400 BCE all hope for the re-establishment of the Davidic

⁴ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.16.

⁵ P. Welten, Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern, Neukirchen (1973), pp.199f.

⁶ H.G.M. Williamson, Israel, pp.35f.

⁷ P. Welten, Chronikbüchern, pp.35f, 40f, 153, 166 and 167.

dynasty had ended.⁸ At this late date, only the cult had survived. There has to be a reason for the great emphasis upon the Davidic dynasty, especially at a time when no Davidide was ruling in Israel. A logical conclusion for this emphasis would be that the Chronicler was working for the reinstitution of the Davidic monarchy. D.L. Petersen disagrees on this point and is content to say that the reinstitution of the monarchy was needless because the temple, given to Israel by David, had taken the place of the monarchy. In the post-exilic community, the prophet and the temple apparently served as the focal points of the returned people.⁹ There are, however, two problems with Petersen's interpretation. First, the question as to why there is this great stress on the role of David in 1 Chronicles is left unanswered. Secondly, prophecy had all but died out in late post-exilic Judaism.¹⁰ The role played by the prophets in Chronicles cannot be denied, but it cannot be said that their importance outstrips the emphasis placed upon the unconditional promise made to David in 1 Chronicles. In Ezra-Nehemiah, an example of late post-exilic literature, the prophets are not assigned any particularly

⁸ J.D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes", JBL 94 (1975), p.216.

⁹ D.L. Petersen, Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and Chronicles, Kistroula (1977), p.56.

¹⁰ J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", pp.210-12, 216. For a reply to this suggestion of Newsome, see H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles", TynB 28 (1977), pp. 120-35.

important role. The work of Haggai and Zechariah is referred to but not stressed or developed. Furthermore, the search for the Chronicler's original historical setting must account for the role played by the prophets in Chronicles, and this therefore seems to rule out the possibility of too late a date for Chronicles.

Up until this point, we have briefly surveyed objections to dating the Chronicler late in the Persian period. It remains, therefore, to suggest a plausible alternative to a late date. One has already been argued for by Freedman, Newsome and Cross, but it has received only mixed reactions. There is one brief period within the post-exilic era, that between 538 and 515 BCE, about which we do know something. In 538 BCE, Cyrus issued his decree which allowed the exiled Judeans to return to their homeland. In 515 BCE, the rebuilding of the temple had been completed. To this period we can also assign the prophecies of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah. These two post-exilic prophets worked for the completion of the second temple. It is also likely that they campaigned for the reinstitution of the Davidic monarchy which was represented by the person of Zerubbabel during this period.¹¹ The suggestion being made in this chapter is that the Chronicler is providing "the historical expression of the same movement whose prophetic aspects are articulated by Haggai and Zechariah".¹² The immediate

¹¹ See P.R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, Philadelphia (1968), pp.146f, 154, 165, 189f, 192f. R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, New York (1941), pp.602, 605-07.

¹² J.E. Newsome, "Understanding", p.216.

attraction of reading Chronicles as a work from the same period as the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah is that the centrality of the temple and the Davidic rule can be accounted for.¹³ How this works we shall see below.

In his article, D.N. Freedman emphasizes the principle that the Chronicler composed his history around the figure of David and his dynasty.¹⁴ He makes the following five points which will require further examination:

i) The purpose of Chronicles was to establish and defend the legitimate claims of the House of David to pre-eminence in Israel. In particular, the Chronicler is defending its authoritative relationship to the temple and the cult.

ii) The inspiration for the work was provided by the return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple under the auspices of Zerubbabel.

iii) The Chronicler was influenced by and collaborated with Haggai and Zechariah.

iv) The work was finished shortly after the completion of the temple.

v) The Memoirs of Ezra-Nehemiah were attached later along with the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9. These additions were made for the sole purpose of updating the work and adapting it for fifth century usage. There are clear differences in the attitudes of

¹³ H.G.I. Williamson, "Eschatology", p.120.

¹⁴ D.N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose", CBQ 23 (1961), p.440.

See further chapter 2.

the two works which reflect two different eras.¹⁵

Since much of Freedman's first point has already been discussed in the second chapter of this thesis, only a few points need to be made here. The most important issue which has to be noted in this section is the relationship between the Davidic monarchy and the Jerusalem-centred cult. It has been suggested elsewhere that the temple is necessary to legitimate the claims of the Davidic dynasty. Yahweh has shown his election of the House of David by commissioning David to build the first temple. The continuation of this election is illustrated by the fulfilment of that commission in the completion of the temple by Solomon and then by the relationship between the Davidides and the temple. By building the temple, the Davidic monarchy becomes the legitimate leader of pre-exilic Israel. The temple, when it has been built, replaces the Ark of the Covenant as the symbol of Yahweh's presence amongst his people. Therefore, the whole time that the temple remains intact, the people remain secure in the land. The Davidic monarchy, the builder of the Jerusalem temple, receives special blessings and favour. This can be illustrated in part by the fact that when Judah is overrun by the Babylonians, not only is the temple destroyed, but the monarchy also ceases to exist.

There are three points to make in respect to the outline of the preceding paragraph. First, Saul's reign is dismissed in one chapter by the Chronicler, and that chapter concentrates entirely on the defeat of the Saulides by the Philistines on

¹⁵ Ibid., pp.440-42.

Mount Gilboa. 1 Chronicles 10:13-14 states that Saul died because he was unfaithful to Yahweh. Saul had no temple with which he could concretize his relationship with the Israelite God. Even the Ark had been captured by the Philistines. Thus, with the exception of the "Tent of Meeting", mentioned in 2 Chronicles 1:3, there was no symbolic presence of Yahweh. The lack of a permanent temple may possibly explain why David is so eager to build a temple for Yahweh. A permanent dwelling place could well mean that Yahweh would dwell with the House of David forever. Secondly, there are two rulers after David and Solomon who receive unqualified praise and commendation from the Chronicler. They are Hezekiah and Josiah. We read that both rulers "did what was right in the eyes of the LORD, according to all that David...had done". These right actions consisted of the sanctification of the temple, the banishing of the high places, and, in Josiah's case, the reinforcement of the Torah.¹⁶ Thirdly, the deposing of King Jehoiachin by Nebuchadrezzar did not bring about the immediate end of the Davidic monarchy. The monarchy did not cease to rule Judah until the defeat and overthrow of Zedekiah, which also included the destruction of the Jerusalem temple.¹⁷

In the post-exilic community, almost the first action of the returned exiles was to begin the rebuilding of the temple. In Newsome's opinion, the rebuilding of the temple is closely identified with the reinstitution of the Davidic monarchy in the

¹⁶ See 2 Chron. 29-32 and 34-35.

¹⁷ 2 Chron. 36.

person of Zerubbabel.¹⁸ Bearing in mind the close relationship between the temple and the monarchy in pre-exilic Judah, it is at least plausible to suggest that the rebuilding of the temple was seen as an act which would lead to the reinstitution of the monarchy. The identification of temple and monarch in post-exilic literature comes out most clearly in Zechariah 6:12-13. There can be little doubt that this passage refers to Zerubbabel. Not only is he crowned, thus signifying his election, but he is also charged with the rebuilding of the temple.¹⁹ Therefore, if the monarchy has any chance of being re-instituted, it must be in relation to the temple. From the presentation in 1 Chronicles, the monarchy needs the temple in order to survive. That this is also the case in Haggai and Zechariah we shall see towards the end of this chapter.

Freedman's second point concerns the role played by Zerubbabel in the restored community. In many respects, Zerubbabel is an enigma. To start with, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah present him as the future hope of Israel; but he abruptly disappears from the scene soon after the completion of the temple, supposedly because the Persians heard about a possible rebellion in Judah, although the existence of such a rebellion has not been proved.²⁰ Zerubbabel's precise role in the post-exilic community

¹⁸ J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", pp.213-16, see Hag. 2:20-23.

¹⁹ See P.R. Ackroyd, Exile, p.174, n.12 and D.L. Petersen, Haggai and Zechariah 1-8, Philadelphia (1984), p.276. We shall return to this point later in the chapter.

²⁰ P.R. Ackroyd, Exile, p.147f; R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p.606.

is unclear. In the prologue of Haggai, Zerubbabel is "the governor of Judah"; but in Ezra-Nehemiah, no such title is given to him, although he is mentioned in relation to the rebuilding of the temple.²¹ If Zerubbabel is the projected leader of the restored community, it is strange that there is no direct stress placed upon his Davidic descent. In spite of the lack of any such stress, it is apparent from the use of various titles that Zerubbabel is indeed being designated for some special leadership purposes.

An important text to note in this respect is Haggai 2:23. Petersen regards the whole section consisting of verses 20-23 as a speech predicting that Zerubbabel will indeed attain royal status at some future time.²² The important terms are ʿebed, hōtām and bhr.²³ W.A.M. Beuken has argued that the term bhr is of a secondary nature because of its being limited, in his opinion,

²¹ However, even in the relevant chapters of Ezra, Zerubbabel is identified as the overseer of the rebuilding of the temple. That the building of the temple is of fundamental importance cannot be denied. Its importance in Ezra is different from Haggai-Zechariah in that by the later time the cult, separate from the monarchy, has become the dominant force in post-exilic Judaism. On the question of the governorship of Zerubbabel, see further the summary of Japhet's article in my introduction.

²² D.L. Petersen, Haggai, p.104.

²³ P.D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, Philadelphia (1975), p.248.

to Deuteronomistic or Chronistic sources.²⁴ Petersen, however, argues that it is a part of standard royal election traditions.²⁵ Whether the term is primary or secondary, the important point to note is that the verb bhr is used of David in 1 Chronicles 28:4, and of Solomon later in the same chapter. In Haggai, it is being used of Zerubbabel to imply his designation by Yahweh to rule the restored community.

A similar conclusion can be reached with regards to the word sebed. This title is also applied to the Davidic ruler, and to a future messianic ruler in Ezekiel 34:23f. and 37:24f.²⁶ That Zerubbabel is being set apart for "royal" duties can be further illustrated by the use of semah in Zechariah 6. Although Zerubbabel is not explicitly named here, the title is best understood as an appellation for a future Davidic ruler.²⁷ As such, the title is also used in Jeremiah 23:5 and 33:15.²⁸ Interestingly, it can be noted that the semah is closely identified with the building of the temple, and yet is different from the High Priest Joshua (6:12).²⁹

²⁴ W.A.M. Beuken, Haggai-Sacharaja 1-8, Assen (1967), p.81.

²⁵ D.L. Petersen, Haggai, p.105, n.24; P.R. Ackroyd, Exile, p.190.

²⁶ P.D. Hanson, Apocalyptic, p.248.

²⁷ D.L. Petersen, Haggai, pp.210f.

²⁸ Ibid., p.276. P.R. Ackroyd, Exile, p.190; A. Petitjean, Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie, Paris (1969), pp.283ff.

²⁹ D.L. Petersen, Haggai, p.276.

Our conclusions so far confirm that Zerubbabel was regarded by Haggai and Zechariah as a future ruler of Israel. However, we must turn our attention to the more specific question as to whether the identification of David with Zerubbabel in the Chronicler's work is tenable. There are obvious points of contact in the presentations of the two figures in 1 Chronicles and in Haggai-Proto-Zechariah. For example, both leaders are engaged in the task of establishing a temple in Jerusalem. Thus, the choosing of Zerubbabel is bound up with his relation to the cult in the same way that David is inextricably linked to the cult in 1 Chronicles. In addition, there is a parallel in that David represents the founder of a dynasty, while Zerubbabel marks the possible re-establishment of that dynasty after a 70-year break.

The reign of David in Chronicles is marked by a strong emphasis upon his religious achievements at the expense of his military exploits.³⁰ The Chronicler's history runs from the capture of Jerusalem to the conveyance of the Ark to the newly acquired centre of the Davidic kingdom. The account then culminates with David's organization of the cult and the commissioning of Solomon to fulfil the work already started. There is no mention of David's private life outside his prayers to Yahweh and his interviews with the

³⁰ R.J. Coggins, The First and Second Books of Chronicles, Cambridge (1976), p.11. In Coggins' words, the material about David has been rearranged so as to stress David's concern for a proper place of worship. Thus, his religious nature is stressed above his "secular" or military exploits.

prophets. According to R. North, the reason for this is that any blemish in the character of David must be whitewashed due to the concerns for legitimacy. David must be held responsible for the ordering of the cult and the foundation of the temple.³¹

North's point can be taken one step further. It may be stated that David, as the founder of the dynasty, must be removed from all blame for the exile. Ultimately, the monarchy led Judah into exile. This same monarchy was founded by David. Whether the leaders were right or wrong, they shoulder the responsibility for the community's actions. Only a brief glance at the prophetic literature is needed to see that a large part of the oracles is directed against the monarchy.³² A good king brought blessings, while a bad king brought chastisements.³³ David is tainted by the exile in that he was the founder of that dynasty which dragged Judah into exile. The Deuteronomistic History does not portray a flawless David, thus by implication, David could be seen to be as guilty for the exile as any other ruler.

By stressing the purity of David, the Chronicler is, therefore, saying that the monarchy was founded upon unimpeachable foundations:

³¹ R. North, "Theology of the Chronicler", JBL 82 (1963), p.374.

³² E.g. Amos and Jeremiah.

³³ I.e. in 2 Chron. 32:26, the wrath of Yahweh did not fall upon the people during the life-time of Hezekiah. But, the sins of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah led to the exile and the break up of the Davidic Kingdom. See further 2 Chron. 36:9-21 and compare with the Deuteronomist's account of the last days of Judah.

thus the monarchy is not inherently bad. The Deuteronomist, however, does not portray the monarchy in the most favourable light for the most part.³⁴ For example, Samuel is said to have opposed the anointing of Saul because a king would, in his view, distract Israel from her theocracy.³⁵ Thus Samuel regarded the monarchy as an outright challenge to Yahweh. If, as seems plausible, the Deuteronomistic History attained its final form during the exile,³⁶ then Chronicles could have been written to represent a contrasting position. One history could have been written from an anti-monarchic perspective, while the other is pro-monarchic. By writing as he does, the Chronicler is able to lay the greater stress on the more acceptable face of the Davidic dynasty. Zerubbabel, then, represents the new David, the person who re-establishes the Davidic dynasty. All blame for the exile must be removed so that a new start can be made. Zerubbabel represents that new start, a person free from the pre-exilic fiasco.

A further and very important reason for the identification of David with Zerubbabel concerns the interpretation of 1 Chronicles 17. The great difficulty presented by the Chronicler's version of Nathan's prophecy is the change made from a conditional promise to an unconditional promise. Such a change would be meaningless if 1 Chronicles were written late in the post-exilic era because

³⁴ Cf. Rehoboam I - 1 Kgs. 12-14; Manasseh - 2 Kgs. 21; and Jehoiakim - 2 Kgs. 23:36-24:6.

³⁵ 1 Sam. 8:6.

³⁶ D.M. Gunn, The Story of King David, Sheffield (1978), pp.19-34, 87.

by then all hope for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty seems to have abated. This has led scholars to adopt one of two solutions. Either the oracle refers to Solomon alone,³⁷ or it bears messianic overtones.³⁸ The first solution fails to account for the fact that the promise made to David's successors is conditional, without any exceptions. In 1 Chronicles 22:6-10 and 28:2-10, the establishment of the dynasty is made conditional upon the obedience of Solomon. Thus, the promise of chapter 17 seems to have greater significance than merely referring to the accession of Solomon. The second solution is also unsatisfactory because such messianic expectations seem to have played a very small part in the thought of the Chronicler.³⁹

Another interpretation for 1 Chronicles 17 would be that verses 11-15 refer to a contemporary figure in Jerusalem at the time that the Chronicler wrote his history. It would appear that for the Chronicler, "the promises were being fulfilled in the theocratic community of his own day."⁴⁰ We know that Zerubbabel was in the area soon after Cyrus' edict and that he was a descendant of David's, therefore it must be plausible to say that the Chronicler concretizes the continuing hope in the Davidic

³⁷ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.133.

³⁸ J.M. Myers, 1 Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, New York (1965), p.126. The messianic/eschatological interpretation of Chronicles will be discussed more fully in the next chapter.

³⁹ R.J. Coggins, Chronicles, p.95. See further, chapter 4.

⁴⁰ Loc.cit.

dynasty in the figure of Zerubbabel.

A further difficulty with 1 Chronicles 17 is the eternal nature of the promise. This difficulty can be overcome if the majority view that "the son" referred to in verses 11 and 13 is Solomon, is rejected. If the eternal nature of the promise is taken into account, then this oracle must have some significance for the Chronicler's own community. If that is the case, then it could apply to Zerubbabel directly. One of David's sons was to build a temple, and it must be a possibility that Zerubbabel is being referred to here. He, like Solomon, is linked to the building of the temple. Both men are also undoubtedly Davidides, as well as being leaders of their respective communities. Of interest in this respect is a comparison between 1 Chronicles 17:11 and its parallel in 2 Samuel 7:12. The Chronicles version is much less explicit. A "son" could refer to any descendant. In Samuel, the reference is considerably more explicit stating that the heir "shall come forth from your body". Whereas the Samuel reference must refer only to Solomon, 1 Chronicles seems to be ambiguous, and deliberately so.⁴¹

Freedman's third point, which suggests that Chronicles is the historical expression of the prophets Haggai and Proto-Zechariah, has already been touched upon. Probably the most important work to be done on this identification is by Beuken in a commentary on Haggai and Zechariah 1-8.⁴² Some of the themes which lead Beuken

⁴¹ H.G.M. Williamson, Chronicles, p.135 maintains that there is no reason, other than stylistic, for this usage.

⁴² Beuken's work is reviewed by R.A. Mason, "The Purpose of the

to make this identification include: the same concern for the temple and the temple ritual; concern for the continuation of the Davidic line; and the view of the prophets as messengers of Yahweh.⁴³ Beuken, however, does not make a simple identification between Haggai and the Chronicler, preferring instead to describe the framework of Haggai as having arisen out of the "Chronistic milieu".⁴⁴ For Newsome, the striking similarity between the Chronicler's outlook and that of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah cannot be overlooked.⁴⁵ Our purpose is to try and isolate some of these "striking similarities" which focus on David, and see in what way Chronicles can be considered to be the "historical expression" of Haggai-Zechariah.

The first point to look at is the role played by the prophets. In chapter 1 we noted the almost total absence of a prophetic role in Ezra-Nehemiah. In fact, in Nehemiah 6:6-8, Nehemiah actually denounces the rumour that he is a prophet or is in league with the prophets in order to become king.⁴⁶ The link between monarch and

'Editorial Framework' of the Book of Haggai", VT 27 (1977), pp.413-21.

⁴³ W.A.M. Beuken, Haggai, pp.216-29 and 230-330. See R.A. Mason, "Framework", p.414 for a summary and criticism.

⁴⁴ Mason has suggested that the editorial framework of Haggai is not especially Chronistic, but it is also characteristic of the Deuteronomist. The argument is centred on the opening phrase of Haggai and draws attention once more to the inconclusive evidence so often supplied by a linguistic survey - p.415.

⁴⁵ J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", p.210.

⁴⁶ D.N. Freedman, "Purpose", p.440.

prophet is therefore demonstrated. In Haggai and Proto-Zechariah, the word of Yahweh to Zerubbabel is mediated through the prophets. Similarly in 1 Chronicles, where for example, the prophets Nathan and Gad mediate Yahweh's will to David. It appears that the monarchy cannot survive without the temple. More specifically, Haggai and Proto-Zechariah address themselves to a community which has lost interest in the rebuilding of the temple, possibly as the result of opposition from the "people of the land". R.L. Braun has suggested that the concentration upon the temple and the cultic matters in 1 Chronicles also reflect a period of apathy similar to that found in Haggai-Zechariah.⁴⁷

The concern for the spoken prophetic word to the leaders of the post-exilic community is also a characteristic of the "Haggai framework". Beuken compares the opening verses of Haggai to the pattern found in 1 Chronicles 22:11-16 and 28:10-20.⁴⁸ According to him, it is a feature of the Chronicler's work that the prophecies are always addressed to the monarch. The response of the king then becomes normative for the entire community. He quotes Westermann in support:

The astonishing thing now is that all of these speeches (i.e. the prophetic speeches in Chronicles), with one exception (2 Chronicles 24:20), are actually prophetic speeches directed to the king. /49/

⁴⁷ R.L. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles", JBL 92 (1973), p.51.

⁴⁸ W.A.M. Beuken, Haggai, pp.24, 27f. and 222-28.

⁴⁹ C. Westermann, Basic Forms of Prophetic Speeches, London (1967), p.166. Although Westermann's excursus revolves around the prophetic

Mason argues quite correctly on the above point, that rather than being specifically Chronistic, this function of the prophetic speech can also be found in the Deuteronomistic History. In the earlier work too, the divine will is announced through the mediation of the prophets.⁵⁰ Despite this observation, the parallel between Chronicles and Haggai can be seen. For example, we read that the word of Yahweh was delivered by Haggai to Zerubbabel. Then, in Haggai 1:12, Zerubbabel and all the people of Judah obeyed Yahweh and worked on the rebuilding of the temple. Prophecy works in a similar way in 1 Chronicles 17 and 21: the response of David directly affects the whole community in the same way that the response of Zerubbabel affects his community.

The identification of the monarchy with the cult is also important to the discussion of the relationship between Chronicles and Haggai-Proto-Zechariah. When discussing the historical setting of Chronicles, most scholars omit reference to the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9 and the cultic details of chapters 23-27, because they are regarded as later additions and only serve to confuse further an already confusing issue.⁵¹ In the remainder

speeches of 2 Chron., the same principle holds true for those speeches found in 1 Chron.

⁵⁰ R.A. Mason, "Framework", p.417. However, Mason draws attention to one exception: Elijah's word concerning the cruse of oil.

⁵¹ In addition to the articles already cited in this chapter, reference can also be made to F.M. Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration", JBL 94(1975), pp.4-18 and W. Rudolph,

of 1 Chronicles, it can be argued that the kingdom and the cult are inextricably linked. In chapter 1, we saw that the Kingdom of Israel was the Kingdom of Yahweh. What we are left with, in Newsome's opinion, is not a history, but a portrait of the theocentric and theocratic kingdom, centred in Jerusalem, the home of the Davidide, regent of Yahweh.⁵² We noted earlier in this chapter the connecting links between Zerubbabel and the rebuilt temple. In Haggai-Zechariah, Jerusalem again becomes the religious centre of Judaism.

The last two points raised by Freedman require only a brief comment here. According to Freedman, Chronicles had to be completed shortly after 515 BCE because the work fails to deal with the further fortunes of Zerubbabel. The only direct reference to Zerubbabel which can be found in Chronicles occurs at 1 Chronicles 3:19, which appears in a section enumerating the descendants of the royal line after the exile. With the exception of this genealogy in 1 Chronicles 3, this is the last word which we have on the House of David. After the completion of the temple, Zerubbabel abruptly disappears from the scene, the supposed victim of Persian

"Problems of the Books of Chronicles", VT 4 (1954), pp.401-09.

Also see chapter 1.

⁵² J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", p.215, contra D.N. Freedman, "Purpose", pp.436f. who asks whether the Chronicler is writing a history of the Davidic dynasty. The answer must be "no." Rather he is reinterpreting that history in the light of his contemporary situation. Cf. the introduction.

suspicions of a revolt.⁵³ Freedman points out that we have no evidence that Zerubbabel was ever crowned King of Israel/Judah.⁵⁴ Finally, Freedman conjectures that the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah were added later, to update the work of the Chronicler so as to reflect the changed circumstances faced by the fifth century community. By this time, all hope for the restoration of the Davidic monarchy had faded.⁵⁵

E. Bickerman has put forward two arguments against the dating of Chronicles in the late sixth or early fifth century. First, he maintains that the Chronicler's historiography shares the method of Herodotus, the fifth century Greek historian.⁵⁶ However,

⁵³ See R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp.605-07. The comment has already been made that there is no evidence for any rebellion, although the writings of Haggai and Proto-Zechariah could be interpreted as suggesting such.

⁵⁴ D.N. Freedman, "Purpose", p.442.

⁵⁵ A.T. Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, Chicago (1948), p.138 has stated that Ezra-Nehemiah actually shared the same royalist hopes of Haggai and Zechariah, but that they were afraid to express this hope for fear of political consequences. However, as Newsome points out, only Ezra 3:12 refers to the first temple and it would be more plausible to say that thematically Ezra and Nehemiah did not share the same political hopes of Haggai and Zechariah - "Understanding", p.214.

⁵⁶ E. Bickerman, From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism, New York (1962), pp.23f.

as Petersen asserts, Bickerman's contention depends upon too broad a characterization of Chronicles. The characteristics which he isolates could also be applied to Samuel/Kings, which do not rely upon Herodotus' methods.⁵⁷ Secondly, Bickerman attempts to distinguish the Deuteronomist's historiography from that of the Chronicler.⁵⁸ For instance, Bickerman argues that the Chronicler differs from the Deuteronomist in his assessment of personal responsibility. This is illustrated by Bickerman from a reference to Manasseh. 2 Kings 24:3 reads that Jerusalem is destroyed and Jehoiachin is taken into exile "for the sins of Manasseh". This is changed in 2 Chronicles 33 where it is assumed that Manasseh has already received due punishment for his sins.⁵⁹ Petersen deals with this point at some length, suggesting that Bickerman's attempts are somewhat forced. Petersen concludes that it is improper to argue that Chronicles is late because "it presents an historiography significantly different from that of the deuteronomistic history".⁶⁰ In summary, according to Petersen, there is no essential difference between these two perspectives.⁶¹

In addition to the criticisms of Bickerman, Newsome himself can foresee two objections which might be raised against an early date for Chronicles:

⁵⁷ D.L. Petersen, Prophecy, p.58.

⁵⁸ E. Bickerman, Foundations, pp.23f.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p.25.

⁶⁰ D.L. Petersen, Prophecy, pp.58f.

⁶¹ Loc.cit.

- i) The Deuteronomistic History would not have had time to become entrenched in Jewish tradition.
- ii) The emphasis upon the Levitical hierarchy apparently reflects a time later than 515 BCE.⁶²

The first objection really raises the question of the date of Samuel/Kings and the relationship of the books to Chronicles.⁶³ However, the objection can be met. If the Deuteronomistic History received its present form, or something akin to its present form, during the exile, then it would have been available to the Chronicler writing immediately after the exile had been ended. "Also, the liberties which the Chronicler takes with this material reflect an attitude toward it which is consistent with a less entrenched place in the tradition."⁶⁴ In other words, Newsome is saying that the Deuteronomistic History was widely enough known to be used by the Chronicler, but that there is no need to argue that it had become that firmly entrenched in Jewish tradition by 515 BCE.⁶⁵ In addition, even if the Deuteronomistic History only attained its final form during the exile, the traditions and sources behind it would have been considerably older; therefore, the traditions underlying 1 Chronicles probably also date to a time well before

⁶² J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", p.216f. n.42.

⁶³ W.E. Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History", HTR 58 (1965), pp.349-63.

⁶⁴ J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", p.217, n.42.

⁶⁵ F.M. Cross reaches a similar conclusion to that of Newsome, "Reconstruction", pp.4-18.

the exile.

The second objection can be answered by a simple recognition of the fact that it is so difficult to isolate the various redactions of Chronicles. As we have already seen, it is generally maintained that there are several redactions of Chronicles; to argue from the evidence of two or three chapters that Chronicles must be dated late ignores other thematic arguments which collectively point to the opposite conclusion. For example, if 1 Chronicles 23-27 is deleted from the Chronicler's original work, then so is most of the detail concerning the place of the Levites in the life of the cult. We are left only with a reflection of the fact that the Levites were prominent in the return from exile and in the inauguration of worship in the second temple.⁶⁶

All that can be concluded in this chapter is that there is an alternative historical setting for the Chronicler's work. We have attempted to argue on thematic grounds for the unity of Chronicles-Haggai-Proto-Zechariah. One great convenience in dating Chronicles to a period shortly after the return from exile is that we are then dealing with a period of which we do know something, certainly more so than that period which gave rise to Ezra-Nehemiah. An early date also provides an explanation for the stress being placed on the Davidic monarchy and its relationship to the Jerusalem cult. In other words, there was the possibility that the Davidic monarchy would be reinstituted.

⁶⁶ J.D. Newsome, "Understanding", p.217, n.42.

CHAPTER 4

THE CHRONICLER'S ESCHATOLOGY

The possibility of reading 1 Chronicles as the historical expression of the same convictions held by the prophets Haggai and Proto-Zechariah arose as a result of the remarkable words in 1 Chronicles 17, which concern the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty. Such a view gives a specific reason for the Chronicler writing as he does. However, there is another way to interpret the dynastic oracle of 1 Chronicles, along with chapters 22 and 28. Since the Davidic dynasty was never re-established after the return from exile, the Chronicler's work might be read as eschatological¹ or messianic. If the conclusion proposed in chapter 3 can be maintained, then there is no need to posit an eschatological

¹ The problems of the meaning of "eschatology" are well known. In this chapter, I am taking the word to refer to some future messianic hope; i.e., Zerubbabel cannot be the eschatological fulfiller of the promises as presented by the Chronicler because in the previous chapter it has been maintained that Zerubbabel is in fact a contemporary of our author. Thus, eschatology here points to some event or person of the future removed from the contemporary community being addressed by the Chronicler. See further the various Bible Dictionaries and H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles", TynB 28 (1977), pp.115f.

interpretation of Chronicles, although such a reinterpretation is both logical and inevitable. At the same time, if such an interpretation could be established, it would obviate an early date for 1 Chronicles. Once more, we are concerned primarily with the intention of the original author, as far as we are able to decipher it.

An important article on the eschatology of Chronicles is by W.F. Stinespring.² In his article, Stinespring draws on an earlier publication by H. Anderson which is concerned with the question of the historical Jesus. Anderson argues for the existence for two Jesuses: the Jesus of history and the Jesus of faith.³ Working from this position, Stinespring argues that in the Chronicler's presentation there are two Davids: the David of history and the David of faith. According to Stinespring, if we are to understand Chronicles, we must first understand the duality of his presentation of King David. In other words, Stinespring is saying that these two Davids cannot be separated and that "we must be prepared to deal with history and theology entangled together."⁴ Stinespring argues that in David were gathered the first messianic hopes of the post-exilic period. For example, towards the end of the genealogy of Judah in 1 Chronicles

² W.F. Stinespring, "Eschatology in Chronicles", JBL 80 (1961), pp.209-19.

³ H. Anderson, "The Historical Jesus and the Origins of Christianity", SJT 13 (1960), pp.113-36.

⁴ G. von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes, Stuttgart (1930). Cited from Stinespring, "Eschatology", p.209.

3, there is a list giving a large number of Zerubbabel's descendants, thus stressing the eternal nature of the House of David.⁵ In addition, Stinespring also draws attention to 1 Chronicles 5:2, which says that a prince came from Judah, and to 6:31, which contains the first reference to the Davidic organization of Levitical temple music in the form which we presume it had in the Chronicler's own day. Stinespring's suggestion can be summed up in one phrase: the historical David is being projected into the future.⁶

Stinespring's arguments can be extended. The leading themes of 1 Chronicles are, according to Stinespring, the historical David, the eschatological David, and the temple. The first theme is concerned with the past, the second with the future, and the third with the Chronicler's contemporary situation, but with futuristic hopes. Stinespring concludes his article with a quotation from an English translation of the work of the New Testament scholar, R. Bultmann:

To believe in the Kingdom of God means to live on the eschatological level, that is to say, in the dimension of the eternal that swoops down to enter into time. /7/

For Stinespring, the Chronicler lived on this level and his work should be regarded as being "Preparation for the Gospel".⁸

Stinespring is not the only scholar to seek a messianic

⁵ Mention of this theme also occurs in 1 Chron. 17, 22 and 28.

⁶ W.F. Stinespring, "Eschatology", p.210.

⁷ G. Miegge, Gospel and Myth in the Thought of Rudolf Bultmann, translated by S. Neill, p.137.

⁸ W.F. Stinespring, "Eschatology", p.219.

expectation in the Book of Chronicles. Other scholars to note include A.C. Welch and F.M. Cross. Welch draws heavily from work already carried out by von Rad in his work which has been cited earlier in the chapter. In Welch's view, the Davidic king in Chronicles is endowed with a dignity which raises him above "ordinary humanity".⁹ However, after stating this, Welch is then quick to recognize the limits which are set to this dignity. He correctly points out that no passage in Chronicles actually goes so far as to designate any one of the royal house as "Messiah". In addition, there is always the condition attached to Yahweh's promise to the successors of David: that they will only continue to rule in Israel/Judah if they are obedient to Yahweh, which normally involves fidelity to the Jerusalem cult.¹⁰

According to Cross, the Chronicler wrote his history in support of the messianic movement.¹¹ However, Cross presupposes the existence of three editions of Chronicles, enabling him to cover all possibilities. For example, he suggests that the original work was contemporary with Haggai and Proto-Zechariah. The other two editions of Chronicles are assigned by Cross to a period after Zerubbabel had failed to secure the throne of Judah after the return from exile. Therefore, these two editions were written

⁹ A.C. Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism, Edinburgh and London (1935), p.192.

¹⁰ Ibid., p.193.

¹¹ F.M. Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration", JBL 94 (1975), p.15.

to update the work.¹² Nevertheless, this interpretation by Cross is only to be regarded as a secondary interpretation of Chronicles: for Cross, the original work urged the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, the rebuilding of the temple and the establishment of the divinely appointed cult. Thus, it appears that Cross is saying that the future orientation of the messianic movement first received its motivation, or impetus, from the failure of Zerubbabel to re-establish the Davidic dynasty in the post-exilic community.

W. Eichrodt and T. Vriezen both regard the messianic element of 1 Chronicles as the backbone of the Chronicler's concept of history. According to Eichrodt, it is the great emphasis on the everlasting covenant with David, which is peculiar to the Chronicler, which needs to be interpreted messianically. Eichrodt's reason for saying this is that it involves the restoration of the Davidic kingdom which, as we mentioned in chapter 2, is to be identified with the Kingdom of Yahweh. In support of his view, Eichrodt cites 1 Chronicles 28:4, 7 and 29:23.¹³ Here, though, the "day of salvation" is presented as a working out of divine decrees: it does not represent the dissolving of the present order.¹⁴

Vriezen reaches his conclusion on the messianic background of Chronicles by arguing that Chronicles defends the legitimacy of the Jewish community at Jerusalem, where the temple and cult

¹² Cross is reviewed by Williamson, "Eschatology", pp.120ff.

¹³ W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol. 1, London (1961), p.430, n.4.

¹⁴ Loc.cit. C f. G. von Rad, Chronistischen, p.128.

are situated. This defence was needed to refute the claims of the Samaritan community.¹⁵ It is stressed that the Davidic dynasty is the one true dynasty of Israel/Judah: it is the Davidic dynasty which rightfully rules all Israel, because it possesses the throne of Yahweh. David became the central figure in this dynasty as a result of the promise of salvation which rests with him. It is from the centrality of David that Vriezen is able to conclude that the messianic element is of fundamental importance for the Chronicler.¹⁶

At this point, it would be useful to remind ourselves of T.S. Eliot's author in "Tradition and the Individual Talent" which was referred to in the introduction of this thesis (pp.4f). This author changed the tradition which was handed down to him by his own contributions and interpretations of the past.¹⁷ Thus, it is feasible that the tradition which has been handed down to us in 1 Chronicles, reflects the contemporary situation of, not only the original author, but also of the various reactors who have had a hand in shaping the final form of the work which has come down to us. Therefore, it can be said that, at some level of

¹⁵ On the supposed anti-Samaritan polemic in Chronicles, see above, chapter 1.

¹⁶ T.C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, Oxford (1958), p.74. The material concerning the centrality of David and his institutions can be found in chapter 2.

¹⁷ J. Maier and V. Tollers, The Bible in its Literary Milieu, Grand Rapids (1979), pp.103f.

redaction, an eschatological interpretation of 1 Chronicles is perfectly legitimate. This can be further illustrated. The original author of Chronicles has taken the Israelite tradition of David and applied it to his own contemporary situation in the post-exilic community.¹⁸ This original application of the history of Israel/Judah may not necessarily be eschatological, although it could be. ^{While} it cannot be certain whether, for the Chronicler, there really is a David of faith, there clearly is for his interpreter. Nor can it be certain whether the Chronicler's contemporary audience would have interpreted the Davidic presentation in that way. Such a messianic interpretation must, at best, be regarded as a secondary interpretation in the light of the failure of the House of David to regain the throne of Judah. Thus, the question is best left open. Given the nature of the evidence, it seems that there are at least two levels of meaning, whether the redactional argument is accepted or not.

A more acceptable interpretation of Chronicles might be to read it as "realized" eschatology. P.D. Hanson draws from earlier work published by W. Rudolph and M. Noth and argues that there is a total absence of an "eschatological dimension" to the Chronicler's history.¹⁹ The affirmation of the existing social

¹⁸ C f. R. Mosis, Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes, Freiburg (1973), pp.30, etc.

¹⁹ P.D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, Philadelphia (1975), p.276. C.f. W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, Tübingen (1955), p.xxiii, and M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I, Tübingen (1957²), p.204. Cited from Hanson.

structures implies, according to Hanson, a negation of the eschatological element of classical prophecy:

Thus...the Chronicler dwells at length...on the glories of the Davidic era...[but] the eschatological element implicit in the Davidic covenant is neglected. Whatever his hopes for the future were, he does not express them. For the fulfilment of history...is recognized in the present order. /20/

The prophets Haggai and Proto-Zechariah had declared that the eschaton would arrive with the successful completion of the temple building. Thus we find that the Chronicler,

living at a time when the temple was erected and standing at the very centre of the life of the community, sees in the present order the fulfilment of history; past history is used not to point beyond the present to a future fulfilment, but to prove that the present represents the culmination toward which past history has been moving. /21/

All that needs to be noted here is that Chronicles lacks an eschatological element expressed as hope for the future. The Chronicler was writing about a contemporary situation. His immediate concern was for the post-exilic community in which he lived, and in this respect he is no different from any other biblical author.

Rudolph has suggested that there are hints of eschatology in

²⁰ P.D. Hanson, Apocalyptic, pp.276f.

²¹ Ibid., p.277. Cited from K. Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia, New York (1936), p.233. Hanson's general ^b observations can be accepted. However, it needs to be pointed out that Hanson accepts a late date for Chronicles which has been rejected in chapters 1 and 3. He does fail to explain satisfactorily the stress upon the Davidic institutions.

the references made in Chronicles to the continuity of the Davidic dynasty, but that such undertones are few and far between. In fact, Rudolph acknowledges that Chronicles is distinguished by the almost complete lack of any eschatological expectation.²² This stance is also adopted by O. Plöger, who argues that messianism in Chronicles is limited and that the Davidic dynasty has reached its goal through the establishment of theocracy on Israelite soil.²³ According to Plöger, the undeveloped dynastic emphasis leads to the suggestion that the promise to David has been fulfilled by the building of the temple.²⁴ The heart of Plöger's work is his claim that this theocracy is "influenced not only by an outward looking anti-Samaritan aim, but also by an inward looking anti-eschatological point of view".²⁵

The majority of the recent attempts to find eschatology in Chronicles are derived from the work carried out by earlier scholars such as von Rad, Noth and Gallinger. The important study of Mosis, for example, has attempted to refine the approach of von

²² W. Rudolph, "Problems of the Books of Chronicles", VT 4 (1954), p.408.

²³ O. Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, Oxford (1968). This work has been reviewed by R.A. Mason, "The Purpose of the 'Editorial Framework' of the Book of Haggai", VT 27 (1977), pp.413-21. Also see, H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology", pp.115f.

²⁴ O. Plöger, Theocracy - see, R.A. Mason, "Framework", pp.419-21.

²⁵ O. Plöger, Theocracy, p. 40.

Rad,²⁶ Brunet²⁷ and Michaeli,²⁸ who all thought that the Chronicler sought to glorify the past in order to stimulate the hope, within his readers, for a return to that former condition in either an eschatological or quasi-eschatological dimension.²⁹ In Mosis' view, the reigns of Saul, David and Solomon serve as paradigms for three situations which later generations could face. Saul represents apostasy and evil; David represents restoration; Solomon represents the ultimate fulfilment.³⁰ According to Williamson, this study by Mosis fails because it necessitates that David and Solomon are idealized, which they are not in Williamson's opinion.³¹ At the same time, Williamson does admit that although these two kings are not idealized, they are presented in a positive manner.³²

²⁶ G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol. 1, London (1962), pp.350f.

²⁷ A-M. Brunet, "La Théologie du Chroniste: Théocratie et Messianisme", in Sacra Pagina (1959), pp.384-97.

²⁸ F. Michaeli, Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et Nehemie, Neuchatel (1967), pp.31f.

²⁹ This material is largely drawn from H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology", pp.131-33.

³⁰ R. Mosis, Untersuchungen, pp.164-69 and Williamson, "Eschatology", p.131.

³¹ S. Japhet, The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought, (Hebrew), Jerusalem (1977), pp.463-72. Cited from Williamson, "Eschatology", pp.132f.

³² H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology", p.132. Further criticisms of

At the end of his article, Williamson reaches four conclusions which may be summarized here:

i) Despite the influence of Plöger, some scholars have persisted in attempting to find a more positive attitude towards the north in Chronicles. However, the main arguments upon which these studies have been based are not especially satisfactory.

ii) By his interpretation of the united monarchy of David and Solomon, and by his handling of the dynastic oracle, the Chronicler has shown that with the death of Solomon that promise had been established as unconditional.³³

iii) This position can be confirmed by other texts.

iv) The presence of the doctrine of retribution suggests that the people should look to the future and that it is not absurd to say that the Chronicler was hanging onto a tradition of hope

Mosis' study have been made by P.R. Ackroyd, "The Chronicler as Exegete", JSOT 2 (1977), pp.2-32. Ackroyd still manages to come to a conclusion similar to that of Mosis.

³³ In the light of our studies in chapters 2 and 3, Williamson's point here is difficult to accept. It is not clear in what way the promise has become unconditional by the time of Solomon's death. It seems that the only unconditional promise was made directly to David. The dynastic oracles of 1 Chron. 12:39f; 17:13; 22:9f; 28:6f. and 2 Chron. 13 are either idealistic or they speak of the dynasty in direct relationship to the construction of the temple. Cf. R.L. Braun, "Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History", SVT 30 (1979), p.61, n.31.

centred upon the Davidic dynasty. In the strict sense of the word, this is not messianic.³⁴

In the light of our findings in chapter 3, it would seem to be best to adopt the broad outlines and conclusions of Hanson and Williamson: there is not really any eschatology in Chronicles. However, as has already been suggested, there is the problem caused by the various redactions which all go to make up 1 Chronicles in its present form. The eschatological interpretation is plausible when the failure of the Davidic dynasty to regain the leadership of Judah after the exile becomes apparent. As it stands, it can be concluded that the eschatological interpretation of 1 Chronicles does not seriously damage, or annul, the conclusions reached in chapter 3. Even allowing for the possibility of a later eschatological interpretation, the original intention of the Chronicler could still have been to secure the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty. Thus, the recognition of an eschatological element serves only to point more strongly to the importance of differentiating between the original work and the work of the redactor(s).

³⁴ H.G.M. Williamson, "Eschatology", pp.153f.

CONCLUSION

Due to the nature of the evidence available, the conclusions drawn from this thesis are perhaps inconclusive. However, attention has drawn to the fact that the unity of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, which has been criticized on linguistic grounds, cannot be adequately defended thematically. The role assigned to King David in 1 Chronicles has been stressed as an important aspect of the Chronicler's theology. It has been noted that this enormous stress, not just on David, but also on the dynastic promise of 1 Chronicles 17, fails to fit a time late in the post-exilic period,

when the Davidic monarchy did not reign in Judah. The material which has been surveyed seems to fit a time early in the post-exilic era better than a date of about 400 BCE, which remains popular amongst most scholars of today. By positing a date of 520-515 BCE, the referent of the dynastic oracle could be Zerubbabel who was either the first or the second governor of Judah after the exile. Zerubbabel, the descendant of David, could have provided the hope in "royalist" circles that the Davidic monarchy would be reinstituted along with the rebuilding of the temple. The same combination of temple and monarchy had led to the establishment of the Davidic dynasty in the first place.

It has become more and more apparent in the course of this study that 1 Chronicles is not an historical work about the Davidic line. To clarify, it is not a simple re-telling of the story of the Davidic monarchy. It seems that 1 Chronicles is a fabricated literary work on kingship, and that the Davidic monarchy is being

used as a model. It was suggested towards the end of chapter 3 of this thesis that Chronicles was possibly a work written to defend the legitimacy of the monarchy after the disaster of the exile. It was also suggested in chapter 3 that Chronicles was written to provide a counter-argument to the viewpoint adopted by the Deuteronomistic Historian. The Deuteronomist's work contains few favourable comments on the monarchy and seems to be attempting to explain the exile as being a result of bad rulers. Even David is presented as a ruler with too many human failings. The Chronicler, on the other hand, by concentrating on the positive aspect of David's reign, is able to portray a favourable picture of the early monarchical period. He is able to show that the monarchy was founded on unimpeachable foundations. Thus, the wrong lay in the refusal of some of the later Kings of Judah to obey the command of Yahweh. The monarchy itself is shown as being essentially good; it is not a thing to be despised. The Chronicler portrays a David who is responsible for providing Judah with the temple and the personnel to maintain that special relationship between God and the people. Therefore, the Davidic monarchy is portrayed in Chronicles as being divinely appointed to maintain the relationship of God and Israel in the Jerusalem cult. It is when the monarchy strays from this ideal that the relationship and promise are broken. In the post-exilic community, Zerubbabel appears as a second David, fulfilling the promise made to David in 1 Chronicles 17. Just as Solomon rules and is legitimated by implementing the life-work of his father, so Zerubbabel also receives legitimation in the post-exilic community through his relationship with the second temple. At this level, it could

be argued that Zerubbabel is the fulfilment of both David and Solomon. He becomes the referent of the promise made in 1 Chronicles 17, and he is also actively engaged in the building of the temple at Jerusalem.

As is evidenced by the final chapter, if 1 Chronicles is interpreted as being just an eschatological work, then it could conceivably be dated to any time. In concluding, the suggestion is going to be made that maybe the Chronicler deliberately confused the issue by omitting all, or most, of the more explicit datable references. Other books of the Old Testament can be dated because of evidence left by the author. For example, Proto-Isaiah begins with the words:

The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, Kings of Judah.

Other prophets, such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Amos, have also left clues as to when they were written; or at least to what community the prophecies were being addressed. There is nothing this explicit in 1 Chronicles. Even thematically, not all the evidence points conclusively to one period. Attention has been drawn to the secondary nature of such material as the genealogies and the lists of the duties of the Levites. A number of scholars think that this material must be included when searching for the Chronicler's historical setting. If this material is included, then it points to a date for the writing of 1 Chronicles late in the post-exilic period: probably to a time close to 350 BCE. However, then the problem of interpreting Chronicles remains unsolved. For example, there is no apparent explanation for the stress on the Davidic dynasty late in the Persian period. On the other hand, to date

1 Chronicles to a time early in the post-exilic period does mean that large blocks of material have to be regarded as being secondary. It is possible that the problems encountered when searching for the historical setting of 1 Chronicles arise because of the failure to recognize that we are dealing with a highly complex work which has had material added to it during the course of a number of decades, or even centuries. It seems that the best method to adopt when approaching 1 Chronicles is to accept that we are going to be dealing with a number of redactions and that ^{to} ~~to look~~ for one date for the whole book is bound to end in failure.

To conclude, then, it seems that the best approach to Chronicles is along the lines suggested by Cross. There are several editions from distinct periods in the post-exilic era which have made up Chronicles in its present form. No one period adequately fits the evidence provided by the entire book. At the same time, the most likely setting for the original work of the Chronicler appears to be sometime in the period of 520-515 BCE. This conclusion can be maintained by comparing the themes of much of 1 Chronicles with the themes found in Haggai and Proto-Zechariah.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, P.R., I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Torch Bible Commentaries (SCM), London (1973).
- Exile and Restoration, The Westminster Press (SCM), Philadelphia (1968).
- "Haggai and Zechariah" in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, Nelson and Sons, London (1962), pp.643-55.
- Israel Under Babylon and Persia, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1970).
- Albright, W.F., "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler", JBL 40 (1921), pp.104-24.
- Anderson, B.W., Understanding the Old Testament, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. (1957).
- Anderson, G.W., (ed.), Tradition and Interpretation, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1979).
- Beuken, W.A.M., Haggai-Sacharaja 1-6, Van Gorcum and Comp. N.V., Assen (1967).
- Bickerman, E., From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism, Schocken Books, New York (1962).
- Braun, R.L., "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude Toward the North", JBL 96 (1977), pp.59-62.
- "Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History", SVT 30 (1979), pp.52-64.
- "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles", JBL 92 (1973), pp.503-16.

----- "Solomon the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of
1 Chronicles 22, 28 and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles",
JBL 95 (1976), pp.581-90.

Bright, J., A History of Israel, SCM Press, London (1972²).

Brunet, A-M., "Le Chroniste et ses Sources", RB 60 (1953),
pp.481-508.

----- "Le Chroniste et ses Sources", RB 61 (1954), pp.349-86.

Butler, T.C., "A Forgotten Passage from a Forgotten Era (1 Chr.
16:8-36)", VT 28 (1978), pp.142-50.

Childs, B.S., Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture,
Fortress Press, Philadelphia (1979).

Clines, D.J., Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Eerdsman/Marshall, Morgan
and Scott, London (1984).

Coggins, R.J., The First and Second Books of the Chronicles,
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1976).

Cooper, A.M., "The Life and Times of King David According to the
Book of Psalms", in R.E. Friedman (ed.), The Poet and the
Historian, Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism,
Scholars Press, California (1983), pp.117-31.

Croft, S.J.L., "Review of Williamson's Israel in the Books of
Chronicles", JSOT 14 (1979), pp.68-72.

Cross, F.M., "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration", JBL 94
(1975), pp.4-18.

Curtis, E.L., and Madsen, A.A., A Critical and Exegetical
Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, ICC, T. and T. Clark,
Edinburgh (1910).

Driver, S.R., An Introduction to the Literature of the Old
Testament, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh (1913).

- Richrodt, W., Theology of the Old Testament, volumes I and II, translated by J. Baker, SCM Press, London (1961).
- Elissfeldt, O., The Old Testament: An Introduction, translated by P.R. Ackroyd, Harper and Row, New York (1965).
- Elmslie, W.A.L., "The First and Second Books of Chronicles" in IB volume III, Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville (1954), pp.341-548.
- Fensham, F.C., The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids (1982).
- Freedman, D.N., "The Chronicler's Purpose", CBQ 23 (1961), pp.436-42.
- Friedman, R.E., (ed.), The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Sacred Text, UCAL, Los Angeles (1981).
- Goldingay, J.E., "Chronicles, Books of" in The Illustrated Bible Dictionary, Part I, IVP, Hodder and Stoughton, Sydney and Auckland (1980), pp.267-68.
- Goulder, M.D., Midrash and Lektion in Matthew, SPCK, London (1974).
- Gunn, D.M., The Story of King David, JSOTS 6, Sheffield (1978).
- Halpern, B., and Levenson, J.D., Traditions in Transformation, Turning Points in Biblical Faith, Eisenbrauns (1981).
- Hanson, P.D., The Dawn of Apocalyptic, Fortress Press, Philadelphia (1975).
- Harrison, R.K., Introduction to the Old Testament, The Tyndale Press, London (1970).
- Herbert, A.S., "I and II Chronicles" in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, Nelson and Sons, London (1962), pp.357-69.
- Japhet, S., "Chronicles, Book of" in Encyclopaedia Judaica 5, columns 517-34, MacMillan Company, Jerusalem (1971).

- "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles", JBL 98 (1979), pp.205-18.
- "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew", VT 18 (1968), pp.330-71.
- "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel - Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah", ZAW 94 (1982), pp.66-98.
- Johnson, M.D., The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1969).
- Josephus, The Antiquities of the Jews, translated by W. Whiston, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids (1960).
- Lemke, W.E., "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History", HTR 58 (1965), pp.349-63.
- Long, E.O., 1 Kings: With an Introduction to the Historical Literature, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids (1984).
- Maier, J., and Tollers, V., (eds.), The Bible in its Literary Milieu, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids (1979).
- Mason, R.A., "The Purpose of the 'Editorial Framework' of the Book of Haggai", VT 27 (1977), pp.413-21.
- McCarthy, D.J., "An Installation Genre?", JBL 90 (1971), pp.31-41.
- Michaeli, F., Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie, Delachoux and Nestlé, Neuchâtel (1967).
- Miller, J.M., The Old Testament and the Historian, Fortress Press, Philadelphia (1976).
- Mosis, R., Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes, Herder, Freiburg, Basel, Wien (1973).
- Myers, J.M., 1 Chronicles: Introduction, Translation and Notes, AB, Doubleday and Company Inc., New York (1965).

----- "The Kerygma of the Chronicler", Interpretation 20 (1966), pp.259-73.

Newsome, J.D., "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes", JBL 94 (1975), pp.201-17.

North, R., "Theology of the Chronicler", JBL 82 (1963), pp.369-81.

Petersen, D.L., Haggai and Zechariah 1-8, OTL, Westminster Press, Philadelphia (1984).

----- Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles, Scholars Press, Missoula (1977).

Petitjean, A., Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie, Libraire Lecoffre, Paris (1969).

Pfeiffer, R.H., "Chronicles, I and II" in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, volume I, Abingdon Press, Nashville and New York (1962), pp.572-80.

----- Introduction to the Old Testament, Harper and Brothers, New York (1948²).

Polzin, R., Late Biblical Hebrew Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose, Scholars Press, Missoula (1976).

Rad, G. von, Old Testament Theology, volume I, translated by D.M.G. Stalker, Harper and Row, London (1962).

----- The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, translated by E.W. Trueman Dicken, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London (1966).

Richardson, H.N., "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles", JBR 26 (1958), pp.9-12.

Rosenthal, E.I.J., "Jewish Themes", Studia Semitica, volume I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1971).

- Rowley, P.H., (ed.), The Old Testament and Modern Study, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1951).
- Rudolph, W., "Problems of the Books of Chronicles", VT 4 (1954), pp.401-09.
- Seters, J. van, "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Israelites", Orientalia 50 (1981), pp.137-85.
- Slotki, I.W., Chronicles: Hebrew Text and English Translation, With an Introduction and Commentary, Soncino Press, London and Bournemouth (1952).
- Stinespring, W.F., "Eschatology in Chronicles", JBL 80 (1961), pp.209-19.
- Soggin, J.A., Introduction to the Old Testament, translated by J. Bowden, SCM, London (1980²).
- Strack, H.L., Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, Atheneum, New York (1980).
- Torrey, C.C., Ezra Studies, KTAV Publishing House Inc., New York (1910 and 1970).
- Vaux, R. de, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, translated by J. McHugh, Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., London (1961).
- Vriezen, Th. C., An Outline of Old Testament Theology, Blackwell, Oxford (1958).
- Watson, W.G.E., "Archaic Elements in the Language of Chronicles", Biblica 53 (1972), pp.191-207.
- Weingreen, J., From Bible to Mishna, The Continuity of Tradition, Manchester University Press, Manchester (1976).
- Welch, A.C., Post-Exilic Judaism, William Blackwood and Sons Ltd., Edinburgh and London (1935).

- Wellhausen, J., Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, translated by Black and Menzies, Meridian Books, New York (1957).
- Welten, P., Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern, Neukirchen (1973).
- Wenham, J.W., "Large Numbers in the Old Testament", TynB 18 (1967), pp.19-53.
- Westermann, C., Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech, translated by H.C. White, Westminster Press, Philadelphia (1967).
- Willi, T., Die Chronik als Auslegung. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen (1972).
- Williamson, H.G.M., 1 and 2 Chronicles, Marshall, Morgan and Scott Ltd., London (1982).
- "Eschatology in Chronicles", TynB 28 (1977), pp.115-54.
- Israel in the Books of Chronicles, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1977).
- "Sources and Redaction in the Chronicler's Genealogy of Judah", JBL 98 (1979), pp.351-59.
- "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles", VT 26 (1976), pp.351-61.
- "The Origins of the Twenty-Four Priestly Courses", SVT 30 (1979), pp.251-63.
- Wilson, R.R., "The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research", JBL 94 (1975), pp.169-89.