Recent Research in Chronicles

Rodney K. Duke

Currents in Biblical Research 2009 8: 10
DOI: 10.1177/1476993X09338966

Recent Research in Chronicles

RODNEY K. DUKE
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina

ABSTRACT

This article surveys trends in Chronicles scholarship from 1994 to 2007. Most of the trends established by 1993 have continued with more depth and focus, although with a few challenges. These trends include: refining the distinctions between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemia as coming from separate authors/editors; recognizing the integral role of the genealogies; and examining the literary artistry of the Chronicler. Newer trends include: pursuing the interplay between orality, on the one hand, and textuality and literacy, on the other; and bringing insights from an increasing sociological understanding of the Persian and Hellenistic periods in general. Recent years have also seen a wealth of new commentaries.

Keywords: Chronicler, Chronicles, Deuteronomic History, Deuteronomistic History, Ezra-Nehemiah, genealogies, genre, orality, Persian period, Second Temple, Utopian literature.

Introduction

This article follows up on Kleinig's excellent survey, 'Recent Research in Chronicles', published earlier in *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* (1994). Kleinig surveys research from the period beginning with Williamson's commentary in 1982 and ending with Japhet's commentary in

Currents in Biblical Research

Vol. 8.1: 10-50
ISSN 1476-993X DOI: 10.1177/1476993X09338966

1993. My article, although beginning where Kleinig left off, and looking at research up to 2007, does not include all of the works that have come out on Chronicles since 1994, nor does it include the wealth of material being generated through the results of archaeological and sociological studies on the Persian and Second Temple periods. Rather, it surveys the main currents and some new trends in Chronicles studies. The reader may also wish to refer to Dirksen (1993), who surveyed the recent literature; Jones (1993), who, writing for the JSOT Old Testament Guides, provided a concise introduction to Chronicles, as well as a survey of the research on Chronicles, with a focus on the current scholarly consensus and open issues; Richards (1995), who also reviewed recent reshaping of Chronicles research; and the more recent survey by Willi (2002). To ensure inclusion of significant new trends in Chronicles research, I sought the advice of the following scholars, whose help I wish to acknowledge, while noting that the responsibility for omissions belongs to me: Isaac Kalimi, Ralph Klein, Gary Knoppers, Steven McKenzie, Mark Throntveit, and Hugh Williamson. Moreover, I have depended heavily on the extensively researched introductory material of Knoppers' commentary (2003a), which gives a voluminous bibliography (pp. 141-241).

In terms of major currents, the state of the field of Chronicles research is much the same as when Kleinig wrote. Kleinig demonstrated that during the period set off by the commentaries of Williamson (1982) and Japhet (1993), Chronicles research had revived and come into its own (1994: 68). Some new trends at the time were a merging consensus that the authorship of Chronicles was distinct from that of Ezra-Nehemiah; a growing application of literary approaches to Chronicles that recognizes the skill and artistry of the Chronicler; and recognition that the genealogies are an integral part of the book's structure and purpose. The years following 1993 do not show major new currents, but primarily advance and refine what had been initiated. As a result, this new period has produced a wealth of studies exploring various themes in Chronicles, as well as issues in Chronicles studies. It has also seen the production of many commentaries. What is new is that these ongoing issues are now being grounded in a growing knowledge of the sociological backgrounds of both the Persian and Hellenistic periods; and in a better understanding of the interplay of orality with textuality and literacy during these periods. Still, a few works have introduced some counter currents, but have yet to gain enough support to move the field of Chronicles studies significantly.

Major Currents on Introductory Matters

While no new major shifts have developed into a consensus position regarding the general extent, unity, and date of Chronicles, the discussion has moved more toward a refinement of arguments and toward moderation, with a few exceptions. In the following review, it is important to bear in mind that certain issues are inter-related, although distinct in definition: extent; unity; date, setting, and authorship; nature and use of sources; text criticism; and genre and historicity.

Extent of Chronicles

Kleinig (1994: 44) argued in his review that a new consensus had emerged which viewed Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah as having separate authorship, contrary both to the former scholarly consensus and to longstanding tradition, the latter going back at least as far as the Babylonian Talmud, which presents Ezra as the author of both works (*Baba Bathra* 15a). This new consensus has continued to be reinforced and has become the general working assumption, as demonstrated by recent commentaries. (For a fuller discussion, see Klein 2006: 6-10, and particularly Knoppers 2003a: 73-89.) For examples of those who recently still defend the idea of single authorship, see Knoppers (2003a: 73), who cites Koch (1996) and Bogaert (1999).

Although it is now widely held that Chronicles in its present form and Ezra-Nehemiah in its present form are not the work of a single individual, it is also recognized that those two works are closely related. Therefore, the current trend has been an advancement and refinement of arguments concerning the degree of both commonality and distinctiveness between these two works. However, the complex of similarities and differences are accounted for by different reconstructions of compositional and redactional activity. (See below, 'Unity of Chronicles'.) For instance, three contributors to the collection of essays on the authorship of Chronicles, edited by Graham and McKenzie (1999), advocate some kind of compositional continuity of Chronicles with Ezra-Nehemiah. Wright (1999) approaches the issue of extent not in terms of authorship, but from a narratological approach. By examining the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1–9, Wright notes that the chronology of the events/characters extends in one place to the genealogy connected to Zerubbabel (3.19-24)—however many generations that complex text is interpreted to address—and to the time of Nehemiah in a list of returnees (9.2-34). He also notes that the key characters of the genealogy parallel those of the main narrative body, with the exception of Zerubbabel, who is found in Ezra. Wright

concludes that such narrative structures suggest that Chronicles belonged to part of a larger unit of Ezra-Nehemiah. Kartveit (1999) conducts a redactional study of 2 Chron. 36.20-23, concluding that Chronicles initially continued with the full form of the edict of Cyrus and was immediately followed by the narratives in Ezra. In a following stage this unit was divided, and the edict was repeated and modified. So, too, Schniedewind affirms that he reluctantly came to agree with a similar thesis about Chronicles originally extending into Ezra (1999: 158; see references to work of Cross, below, under 'Unity of Chronicles'). One should note, though, that the arguments of these three scholars do not maintain that the whole of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah comes from one author; rather, apart from Wright, who does not indicate his thesis, the arguments tend to support stages of development in which the original work of Chronicles extended into Ezra-Nehemiah.

Given the general consensus regarding separate authorship of Chronicles from Ezra-Nehemiah, most recent commentators have worked with the canonical form, which ends at 2 Chron. 36.23 (e.g. Thompson 1994; Allen 1999; Knoppers 2003a). However, as was noted above, the ending of Chronicles continues to be debated, even if separate authorship on a general level is admitted. Therefore, as an exception to the trend in recent commentaries, Tuell (2001: 11-12) argues for an original edition of Chronicles that continues into Ezra. Along the same line as Tuell, Gelston (1996) has called for a renewed examination of the thesis that an original Chronicles extended into what has become the first six chapters of Ezra (going back to Pavlovský 1957; and independently, Freedman 1961, 1991). Cross, who also developed that thesis (1975), has again defended it in dialog with Japhet (1993) and Williamson (1982) (although apparently not Williamson 1996), and with the slight modification of accepting more of the genealogical material as original (Cross 1998: 151-72). Cross's argument re-examines the controversial debate about the date and compositional history of 1 Esdras and whether or not it serves as an early or late witness to an overlapping of Chronicles with Ezra (see more below, 'Unity of Chronicles'). Gelston, however, avoids the issue of 1 Esdras. His unique contribution lies in an examination of the editorial material in Ezra 1–6, with which he finds commonalities in Chronicles. He posits a three-stage process resulting in the canonical configuration: (1) What is now Ezra 7-Nehemiah 13 was loosely attached to the original work of Chronicles; (2) Since the material beginning with what is now Ezra 1 completed the historical material found in Samuel-Kings without duplication, that material (Ezra-Nehemiah) was later separated off and achieved canonical status; and, (3) Later the separated section of Chronicles, a repetitive history of Israel, finally became accepted as canonical (1996: 59).

Counter arguments to Gelston *et al*., however, explain the similarities between Chronicles and Ezra as due to later editorial shaping of Ezra for the specific purpose of joining it more closely to Chronicles (Knoppers 2003a: 96-100) and/or explain how the ending of Chronicles is appropriate to its literary and theological nature (Knoppers 2003a; Japhet 1999). Unfortunately, both the arguments and the counter arguments rest on some degree of circularity involving the scholar's understanding of Chronicles' purpose, date and setting.

Unity of Chronicles

As was true in Kleinig's report (1994: 44-46), there still is no consensus on the unity of Chronicles, that is, whether or not Chronicles was composed by one author. Moreover, the issue of unity (perhaps better, compositional history) stands in close relationship to the above issue of extent, and the following issues regarding date, setting and authorship (below). In relationship to theories on the extent of Chronicles, there tend to be two basic approaches. Some find a clear distinction between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, and explore the compositional history of Chronicles separately. Others find a close relationship between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, and explore the compositional history of that greater complex.

Redactions of Chronicles. Although Kleinig correctly reported that there was no consensus regarding an understanding of the history of the composition of Chronicles, one might say now that there is a growing skepticism toward theories about major redactional revisions (see Knoppers 2003a: 92). This trend is due largely to another trend, the growing interest in the literary artistry behind Chronicles. Certainly, most scholars who are interested in its literary techniques still recognize that Chronicles drew on earlier Priestly and Deuteronomic traditions; and they recognize different perspectives manifest within Chronicles. However, they tend to find the mark of one major compositional hand negotiating different traditions and perspectives into a greater whole. (See below, 'Closing Observation on Sources' and 'Literary Studies'.)

Still, there are a couple of scholars who have advanced some new redactional theories. Dörrfuss (1994) presents the thesis that there was a late 'Mosaic' redaction of Chronicles. According to him, the texts which mention Moses introduce a theocratic and eschatological perspective that ran in contrast to the Chronistic idealization of David and the Temple. Dating Chronicles to the third century, he then dates this Mosaic redactional layer to an early second-century community with eschatological expectations. (For a critique, see Knoppers [1996], who doubts that the Mosaic passages, whether

inserted or not, are either overtly critical of David *per se* or are eschatological.) Also, Steins (1995) has written a major new redactional study, which deserves attention not only for his thesis about compositional layers, but for his detailed analysis of issues of Chronicles' relationship to other canonical works and its place in the canon. Steins closely examines 2 Chronicles 29–32 (Hezekiah), 2 Chronicles 34 (Josiah), and 1 Chronicles 11–29 (David), as well as touching on 2 Chronicles 1–9 (Solomon) and 2 Chronicles 13, 20, and 26. He first posits a basic composition, dating from the Maccabean period, which was partly reliant on a basic form of Ezra-Nehemiah. The work, through a complex process of growth, underwent three major layers of redaction, which themselves reveal further editing. These major layers are: (1) a Levitical layer, which was concerned with cultic personnel and their duties; (2) a communal layer, which is interested in its leaders' involvement in public worship; and (3) another cultic layer, which addresses details in worship and affirmed the participation of northerners in worship at the Temple (as cited in Graham 2000; McKenzie 1999; and Smith-Christopher 1997). A critique of Steins's argument, much like that received by nineteenth-century source criticism, is that it rests its case over-confidently on the ability to observe minute differences in the text, and from these to reconstruct a complex compositional process (McKenzie 1999; Graham 2000).

As a side note, this is probably the best section to call attention to a work by Johnstone (1998), which takes one back to the days when the study of Chronicles contributed to Pentateuchal criticism. His work, which is a collection of several of his articles, presents the thesis that a guide to understanding the redaction of the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic History should be based on the redactional pattern that is found in Chronicles. In general, one should look for the Chronicler's pattern of offering a Priestly (holiness) revision and supplementation to a Deuteronomistic (covenant) edition.

Redactions of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah. There are some theses which, instead of just contraposing separate authorship and unified authorship of Chronicler-Ezra-Nehemiah, seek to show how multiple authorship of this block of works can account for both their differences and similarities. One approach finds some overlapping authorship of this block. As noted above ('Extent of Chronicles'), Gelston (1996) and Cross (1998) have re-supported the thesis that an early version of Chronicles extended into what has become the first part of canonical Ezra. Cross supports three stages of growth:

1. A genealogical introduction, plus much of 1 Chron. 10.1–2 Chron. 36.21, plus what corresponds to Ezra 1.1–3.13 (= what is later found in 1 Esdras 2.1-15; 5.1-62), which ends with a climax celebrating the dedication of

the altar and foundation of the Second Temple, and was composed in support of Zerubbabel shortly after 520 BCE;

2. Additions to the genealogical introduction, creating a shorter version of what will become 1 Chronicles 1–9, plus 1 Chronicles 10–2 Chronicles 34, plus the Hebrew *Vorlage* of 1 Esdras, which was composed about 450 BCE, and did not know of Nehemiah's mission; and,
3. Additions that lead to the final form of 1 Chronicles 1–9, plus 1 Chronicles 10 through 2 Chronicles 36, plus Hebrew Ezra-Nehemiah, by an editor about 400 BCE who mistakenly thought Ezra and Nehemiah were contemporaries (Cross 1998: 158-69).

A critique of Cross's argument rests on incidental evidence, which reveals that behind 1 Esdras was a fuller tradition of Ezra-Nehemiah with the Nehemiah Memoirs, and that at some point the story of Nehemiah had been omitted (see Williamson 1996; Talshir 1999: 3-109; and McKenzie 1999: 72-78). At this point there seems to be a scholarly impasse in terms of the witness of 1 Esdras to the compositional history of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, partly due to the fact that the exact compositional history of 1 Esdras is also unknown. One intriguing element in the discussion, however, is that both sides now recognize that 1 Esdras appears to reflect a Hebrew textual tradition that is different and sometimes better than what is behind the Greek Ezra-Nehemiah and the Masoretic Text. Still, without the presence of 1 Esdras in the argument, there exists enough similarity between Chronicles and Ezra 1–6 to fuel the debate.

Addressing this similarity between Chronicles and Ezra differently is Knoppers (2003a: 96-97). He concludes that, although Ezra was authored separately from Chronicles, an editor deliberately linked it to the Chronicler's pre-exilic story in order to create a complete history of Israel, beginning with Adam and extending to the reforms of Nehemiah. Chronicles was chosen over Kings precisely because of the Chronicler's interest in the Jerusalem cult. This editor linked the two works with a series of ties. Still, even with these differing conclusions about the relationship of Chronicles to the first part of Ezra, the result is the continuing trend to separate Chronicles from Ezra-Nehemiah, and not to read one work's ideology into the other work.

Date and Setting of Chronicles

Although there is still a diversity of positions on dating Chronicles within the broadest possible range of dates, from Cyrus' decree in 538 BCE to Eupolemus' use of Chronicles about 150 BCE, there is a growing majority who place Chronicles around the fourth century BCE. It is noteworthy that,

in their recent commentaries, both McKenzie (2004: 32) and Knoppers (2003a: 116-17) have shifted away from holding to an early Persian-period date to a preference for dates in the range of 350–300 BCE and the mid-third century BCE respectively, although both admit the possible range to be much wider. Also dating Chronicles to the mid-fourth century is Allen (1999: 299-301) partly on the basis of tracking development in the cultic personnel from Ezra-Nehemiah to Chronicles, and Levin (2003: 242-43) on the basis of the genealogies and lists. Moreover, there is a growing trend to see Persian and Hellenistic periods as formative times for editing the Hebrew Scriptures. Still, an early date in the Persian period is argued by some; for example, see Schniedewind (1995: 249-52; 1999), who supports the argument that the royalist ideology, the validation of the Temple cultus, and the correspondence to the prophets Haggai and Zechariah fit better in the early Persian period than in the later period.

For a review of the recent discussion on dating, besides Knoppers' introduction to his commentary (2003a: 101-17) and Klein (2006: 13-16), see Peltonen, who has written an excellent summary of what have become the standard arguments (2001: 225-39), as has Kalimi (2004; revised in 2005a: 41-65). For a survey of the interpretation and dating of Chronicles up to Spinoza, see Kalimi (1998).

Also, Dyck (1997) has offered a critique on the direct connection between one's dating of Chronicles and one's understanding of the purpose and occasion of Chronicles. He argues that scholars have held an inadequate understanding of purpose and have confused three elements that need to be kept distinct: communicative intention, motive, and context of production (1997: 20). As a result, such scholars have come to a dead end regarding dating Chronicles. Therefore, Dyck gives a brief survey of some of the dating factors and offers a critique of some of the major dating arguments, which rely on an inadequate understanding of purpose: the royalist position of Freedman (1961, miscited as 1993) and Cross (1975), discussed in Dyck (1997: 21-22); the anti-Samaritan argument of Noth (1943) and Torrey (1910), discussed in Dyck (1997: 22-24); and the inclusivist position of Williamson (1977), discussed in Dyck (1997: 24-26). Dyck's conclusion is that the Chronicler optimistically asked his audience to imagine Jerusalem as the center of a nation, and that he must have been writing between the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, when the cultic community was small, and the late second to early first centuries, when it had become dominant in Palestine (1997: 26).

As most scholars caution, there simply is no unambiguous evidence for dating Chronicles more precisely than within a span of about 300 years. Debate has generally continued over the same evidence. On the one hand is

the internal evidence that suggests dates later than the late sixth century and early fifth (e.g. the extended Davidic lineage, the anachronistic mention of 'darics', and the advanced Levitical orders). The main problem with such internal details is that they may well be attributed to minor scribal updates and additions. As a result, such debate becomes closely tied to analyses of the extent and the compositional history of Chronicles. On the other hand is external evidence that takes various forms of argumentation. One pursuit involves how the complex of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah was formed and its relationship to the closing of the canon. This pursuit again overlaps with the matters of extent and compositional history. Another tack involves seeking to date Chronicles by its use of biblical sources. This pursuit itself is fraught with many difficulties (see below, 'Nature and Use of Sources'). A third, and growing approach is to seek evidence of cultural influence that would serve to place Chronicles in a Persian or Hellenic milieu. During this period of Chronicles research, there has been much debate over the existence or nonexistence of Greek influence, but no consensus (see below, 'Greek Influence'). Then, too, as Peltonen notes, arguments about the non-existence of Persian or Greek influence are of little weight, since the writers might have consciously avoided such language and views (2001: 238). Overall, based on the variety of arguments, there is a tendency to place Chronicles later in the post-exilic era rather than very early.

One trend, however, is to rely more on sociological reconstructions of the post-exilic period. Peltonen (2001) argues that Albertz (1997: II, 605-23) has advanced a coherent explanation of the compositional issues. Albertz revived the idea of the Samaritan conflict as the ideological setting behind Chronicles, but reconstructed it somewhat differently. In response to the legislation of Ezra-Nehemiah that excluded Samaritans from equal status in the Jerusalem community, the Samaritans established their own cultic center, while adopting the Pentateuch as their authoritative tradition as well. The writers of Chronicles wrote not so much to defeat this move through argumentation, as to draw back those people who might be tempted to take their cultic allegiance elsewhere. The difficulty they faced was that both communities had the same source of authority. Therefore, the rhetorical response of the writers of Chronicles was to establish the co-authority of the Deuteronomistic History by showing that the Jerusalem Temple and the House of David were established within the regulations of Torah. They also gave authority through Chronicles to the prophetic tradition that revealed how Yahweh kept his promises to those who remained faithful to him. In other words, the cultic reality of the Jerusalem community was grounded legally and historically. Based on this model, Albertz dates Chronicles to

scribal circles of the late Persian or early Hellenistic period (as cited in Peltonen 2001: 252-61). One critique, as noted by Peltonen (2001: 269), is that it makes more sense to see the works of Samuel-Kings as having some canonical status as a prerequisite to, rather than as a consequence of, the writing of Chronicles.

Also reviewed by Peltonen (2001: 242-51) is the important work by Weinberg (1996), who dates Chronicles on sociological grounds to soon after the mid-fifth century. This work represents a synthesis and culmination of a good twenty years of work on Chronicles by Weinberg, in which he maintains his thesis that certain socio-economic conditions had to exist for Hellenism to spread, one of which was local self-governing powers such as the citizen-temple community, in which there was a merger of temple personnel with property-owning citizens. He posits this to be the case in the Jerusalem Temple community after the return. According to Weinberg, during the formative period of about 539 to 458/457 BCE, there was a bipartite structure of returnees and the local people. Local Judeans who were not deported had formed territorial communities out of their destroyed kinship institutions, whereas the exiles formed new kinship communities. Weinberg sees the real *Sitz im Leben* of Chronicles as coming from one segment of the citizen-temple community, the scribal circles of non-exiled northern Judeans, even more precisely, those that dwelt at Jabez. The Chronicler wrote in part to defend the existence of the non-exiled collectives who lost their independence as they were merged with returnees into the larger citizen-temple community in 458/457 BCE, when the Persians granted this community their own self-jurisdiction. The Chronicler argued for a greater entity, which would include the non-exiled members as legitimate heirs (278-84). Therefore, Weinberg dates Chronicles to soon after this merger, in response to the favor shown to the repatriated exiles in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. A critique offered by Peltonen is that even if such citizen-temple communities existed as posited by Weinberg, he has not proposed how, by means of audience and publication, the Chronicler's defense was expected to make an impact (Peltonen 2001: 250).

As noted above ('Redactions of Chronicles'), Steins's redactional analyses pushes the date of Chronicles the latest, down to a second-century work of the Maccabean Period (1995, 1997). He speculates that the final layer of Chronicles was written as an effort to support a restorative movement against Hellenism, and marks the summary of the third part of the canon and closing of the whole (Peltonen 2001: 269-70). [Interestingly, both Freedman (1991) and now Koorevaar (1997, as cited in Peltonen 2001: 269-70) theorize that the final edition of Chronicles resulted in the finalization of the

Hebrew Bible as well, although they date this effort to the time of Nehemiah.] Against Steins's late date, however, stands the work of Knoppers (2003a: 106-11), who perhaps gives the most detailed evidence for knowledge of Chronicles in various works: biblical, apocryphal, pseudepigraphal, as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls. As a result, Knoppers clearly establishes a terminus *ante quem* to the mid-third century BCE.

Another consideration, which has an impact on dating and redactional theories, is that not all scholars assume that there was a 'Chronicler'. Many use the title 'Chronicler' to indicate that the work has a rather unified perspective behind it that could come from one person or from several scribes working closely together. In his work on 1 Chronicles, Jarick specifically makes the point that Chronicles was produced by a collective effort of gathering and assembling various Jerusalemite traditions by a guild of 'Annalists' (2002: 2). Similarly, Albertz (1997, as cited in Peltonen 2001: 252-61) refers to scribal circles as creating the work.

Person (2007) develops a thesis of a competing scribal school behind Chronicles. Person contends that the Deuteronomic History and the Chronistic History are competing histories written by two scribal groups, which were, in part, contemporaneous. He builds on his work of 2002, in which he supported the thesis that Deuteronomy through Kings came together in a series of editions from a scribal school that operated from the exilic period through the early Persian period. In his 2007 article, Person posits that the Deuteronomic scribal school, which had initially developed in the Babylonian exile, returned to Jerusalem, probably under Zerubbalel, and continued its work in support of the rebuilding of the temple. However, that school was replaced by another scribal school that came to Jerusalem with the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah, the scribal school that produced the Chronistic History (2007: 326-36). He addresses an anticipated criticism that the two schools wrote in two diachronically different types of Hebrew, Standard Biblical Hebrew and Late Biblical Hebrew, respectively, by citing the work of Rezetko (2003; see, too, Rezetko's complementary work of 2007). Rezetko set forth various arguments, questioning the diachronic model and supporting the possibility that the differences between the two works could be a matter of dialect. (See further use of Rezetko's work below under 'Use of Earlier Biblical Works'.) As a result of Person's conclusions about the compositional nature of Chronicles, Person dates Chronicles to the late Persian period, predating Ezra-Nehemiah.

Greek Influence. In conjunction with the issue of dating Chronicles, there has been a growing trend to debate the possibility of Greek influence on Chronicles, a debate that corresponds with a movement among some

scholars to date much of the composition and compilation of the Hebrew Bible to a Greek date or later. One should note, though, that many scholars fail to make a distinction between 'Hellenic' influence (prior to the conquest of Alexander the Great, c. 332 BCE) and 'Hellenistic' influence (the spread of Greek culture after the conquest). This distinction is significant, particularly since Hellenic influences are found in the Persian period and probably earlier.

Hoglund (1997) argues that the Chronicler used various historiographic practices that are found in the Hellenic world: genealogies as 'carriers of the organization of society' (1997: 22); prophets portrayed typologically as wise counselors; authentification by using numbers and source citations; and the use and adaptation of earlier works without attribution (1997: 22-29). So, too, Knoppers finds various features in Chronicles' genealogies which compare better to Greek practice than to lists from the ancient Near East: 'their heavily segmented organization, their fixation upon certain earlier periods, the paucity of explicit references to the Chronicler's own time, and their concentration on kinship relations within the larger nation' as well as 'the very existence of an elaborate system of generational relationships' (2003b: 647). However, Knoppers rightly notes that if there was direct Greek influence, it did not have to occur after the conquest of Alexander the Great, since avenues of interchange with Greek culture existed well before that event (2003b: 647-50).

Grabbe (2001) has edited an important work, although not specifically on Chronicles, which evaluates the thesis of Hellenistic influence on the creation of the Hebrew Bible. This collection of seminar papers and discussion is devoted to the Hellenistic period, but it was particularly prompted by Lemche's thesis (2001) that the Hebrew Bible is a Hellenistic product. While there was, among the contributors, general agreement with Lemche that the Hebrew Bible was completed no later than the Hellenistic period, there was considerable opposition to the thesis that this period was the primary period of composition. The majority of contributors presented arguments for dating most of the composition of the Hebrew Bible no later than the late Persian period.

Moreover, a cautionary note should be added. With the rush to find analogies in Greek literature indicating Greek influence on Hebrew literature, the unspoken presupposition is that the borrowing went in one direction, from west to east. Ironically, premiere classicist M.L. West traces Greek epic compositional techniques, conventions of style and even specific formulae and themes back to the influence of Sumero-Akkadian, Hurrian-Hittite, and Ugaritic narrative poetry of the second millennium (1988). West

further supports that claim with a 630-page compendium of evidence that shows parallels of Greek literature to that of the east Mediterranean world (1997). This observation of course does not preclude a popular thesis that the Greek culture may have developed the art of historiography in new ways that subsequently had an impact on the literature of the east Mediterranean world. It does, however, indicate that one must first carefully identify that which was unique to Greek tradition, and then show how it moved from west to east.

Future in Chronicles. Discussion on the Chronicler's setting and purpose has generally been held in conjunction with some understanding of his perspective toward the future. Positions have varied on whether he was a hopeful royalist or a realist in light of Persian rule, and on whether or not he held messianic or eschatological expectations. At present there is no consensus, but a considerable variety of positions. Dörrfuss (1994) analyzes the role of Moses in Chronicles and argues that Moses is the focus of theocratic expectation. He has also advanced the discussion on theocracy by surveying earlier works which refer to the Chronicler's theocracy or eschatology, and has called for a sharper definition and distinction between these terms. Kelly (1996) has written a major monograph, which does not present a new thesis, but does argue with other positions, and defends the perspective that the role of Davidic Kingship in Chronicles served as grounds for eschatological hope for the restoration of Israel. Dirksen (1999) surveys a few major views and recent discussion about Chronicles' view toward the future. He concludes that the Chronicler did not intend to convey any specific hope for the future, but that does not mean that he was content with the present. The Chronicler encouraged a faith that left the future open in God's hands as the community seeks God in the Temple service, the locus of God's saving action. (So, too, Dirksen 2005: 12-14.) Japhet (1999) argues that, while the Chronicler looked forward to a continuation of the monarchy, he envisioned a realistic transformation rather than a dramatic eschatological event. Murray (2000), who seeks to create a balanced presentation of retribution and non-retribution in Chronicles, sees the Chronicler as creating an idealized, utopian portrayal of the community, a portrayal that is not an eschatological prediction, but one that serves as a critique of the status quo and calls the community to revival. In much the same way, Schweitzer (2007) understands Chronicles not as laying out a blueprint for the future, but rather as creating revolutionary literature that implicitly critiques and challenges the status quo (see Schweitzer under "Genre. A New Challenge" below).

Nature and Use of Sources

The discussion of Chronicle's use of sources is best discussed in two categories, the use of earlier biblical texts, and the issue of other possible extra-biblical sources.

Use of Earlier Biblical Works. A long-standing consensus has been that the Chronicler had at his disposal some form of Samuel-Kings, which he used as his major source. Indeed, much of Chronicles interpretation since de Wette (1806–1807) has been based on this understanding (see 'Literary Studies' below). Auld (1994, 1999), however, has revived a pre-de Wette theory, but without the theological agenda of seeking to support the historicity of Chronicles. He has argued not that Chronicles followed Samuel-Kings, but that both works used a common source, a non-Deuteronomistic source. His work particularly explores their different use of traditions regarding David and Moses.

Auld's thesis is much like the Priority of Mark theory in the New Testament study of the synoptic gospels. The common material between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, he claims, goes back to a common source, which he calls 'The Book of Two Houses', in reference to the House of Yahweh (the Temple) and the House of David. Starting from this common material, Auld argues that each work expanded on it to support its own story. One significant point of Auld's 1994 work, *Kings without Privilege*, creating a play on its title, is to note how scholars have privileged Samuel-Kings over Chronicles, and have not given enough attention to Samuel-Kings' shaping of material according to its own biases.

Auld's thesis has also been followed and supported by a couple of other scholars. Ho (1995) seeks not so much to prove a common source as to show the inadequacy of supposing that 1 Sam. 31.1-13, in any form that we have it, was the source of 1 Chron. 10.1-12. Brooke (2007) believes that he has partially supported Auld's thesis by making two points. First, in general, he shows how the different textual traditions, as evidenced by the Qumran library, could lead to viewing such works as Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles as a loosely defined genre of 'rewritten Bible' (2007: 40-42; see discussion of 'rewritten Bible' below, under 'Genre: General Trend'). More specifically, he shows how the evidence of 4QSam^{a} seems to indicate that Chronicles knew a different Hebrew textual tradition than what is in MT Samuel (2007: 35-37). However, one cannot logically conclude, based on this evidence, whether such an earlier tradition was Auld's independent 'common source' or an earlier edition of Samuel-Kings.

Rezetko (2003, 2007) has indirectly supported Auld's thesis on linguistic grounds. He notes that a counter argument to Auld's thesis has been

made on the grounds that the diachronic differences in the language of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles are too considerable to accommodate a common source. His work, however, questions the linguistic criteria on which a diachronic distinction has been made between Early/Standard Biblical Hebrew and Late Biblical Hebrew. Indeed, all of the articles in the work edited by Ian Young (2003) debate the grounds for making linguistic diachronic distinctions among biblical books, and therefore have implications for the relationship of Samuel-Kings to Chronicles.

McKenzie presents a critique of Auld's thesis, in which he defends Samuel-Kings as the Chronicler's *Vorlage* (1999). McKenzie not only raises several questions for clarification, but presents eight test cases in which Chronicles does not directly share material in common with Samuel-Kings, but yet appears to have knowledge of material found therein. So, too, Glatt-Gilad (2001), while exploring the regnal formulae in Kings and Chronicles, finds incidental evidence for Chronicles' reliance on Kings. Van Seters (2007) also presents a similar kind of case against Auld's thesis. Agreeing with Auld (1983) that the so-called 'Court History' (2 Sam. 9-20; 1 Kgs 1–2) was a distinct work added to the original narrative, Van Seters argues that the Chronicler knew the 'Court History', and, therefore, must have used a form of Samuel-Kings after such additions had been made. The logic of this argument falters, however, if one postulates that the Chronicler also knew the 'Court History' as a separate source. Still, Van Seters shows that for the Chronicler's account to make sense, it must presuppose a greater portion of Samuel-Kings than Auld's 'common source' allows.

Auld responds to McKenzie's challenge in the same 1999 volume with a point-by-point rebuttal, answering some of McKenzie's questions and defining his thesis further. A significant refinement is that he would no longer call 'The Book of Two Houses' a history of the monarchy of Judah, but a history of the House of David (and Yahweh) which begins with the failed pre-Davidic leadership of Saul.

Further critique of Auld's thesis has been raised by Klein and by Knoppers. Klein presents in his commentary on 1 Chronicles numerous cases in which Chronicles presupposes knowledge of material in Samuel that is not included, and gives a table of comparison (2006: 31-37). Knoppers notes a critique that applies to all close analyses of the biblical texts that may have served as the Chronicler's sources. This is the point that the discovery of different text types at Qumran makes conclusions regarding such close comparisons tenuous. It appears quite likely that Chronicles relied on a older and sometimes shorter and less corrupt version of the books of Joshua, Samuel, and Kings (Knoppers 2003a: 68; see, too, Trebolle 2007:

497, who finds the 'main text' of the LXX to be the oldest form of 1 Kings 3–10//2 Chronicles 1–9). One should note that the Chronicler's use of different textual traditions for the books of Joshua, Samuel, and Kings might support the part of Auld's thesis that sees the Deuteronomistic History as a late creation. Apparently the Chronicler did not have a Primary History, at least from a unified and fixed textual tradition. In any case, the issue of different textual traditions witnessed by MT, LXX, and Qumran complicates the matter of distinguishing sources behind Chronicles.

In summary, at this point, one cannot say that Auld's thesis has gained much popularity. The consensus assumption is clearly that Chronicles is based on something quite similar to canonical Samuel-Kings. Still, while not a main 'current', this 'eddy' of Auld's raises questions about the Deuteronomistic History, the relative value of the portrayal of the monarchy in Samuel-Kings versus Chronicles, and the former's value for historical reconstruction.

Issue of Extra-Biblical Sources

In regard to Chronicles' use of extra-biblical sources, Kleinig's evaluation still holds true (1994). He noted that over the origin of non-synoptic material there is no consensus, but there is still an emphasis more on the Chronicler's purpose and method in using such sources than over the issue of their historicity. Furthermore, there appears to be a majority consensus on some issues: (1) the Chronicler did have a range of extra-biblical sources, both written and oral; (2) the citations that vary from Samuel-Kings referring to royal and prophetic sources really go back to Samuel-Kings and not to an extra source; (3) the Chronicler uses extra sources more freely than his biblical ones; (4) there is no guarantee that the Chronicler's sources are historically accurate; and (5) the origin and nature of a source needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis (1994: 48-49). There have been, however, some significant contributions in the recent discussion. Involved in this discussion is a distinction, not always made, that there are two different but overlapping issues: the Chronicler's use of sources, and the Chronicler's use of source citations.

On the general level of source criticism, Peltonen (1999), drawing some on his major work of 1996, has written an extensive survey of source-critical work on Chronicles as it has progressed in theory and methodology. He makes the point that the initial main discussion up to the twentieth century was motivated by ideological concerns: those wanting for theological reasons to support the historicity of Chronicles, versus those who opposed such arguments and argued for the non-historicity of Chronicles

(1999: 41). Peltonen makes nine points in his conclusion, among which are: source-critical theory is an inseparable element of Chronicles research that has an interest in historicity; the basic questions over sources are still open after a couple of hundred years of research; the acceptance of extra-biblical sources is more widely supported than the thesis that there were no such sources; and, less is known about Chronicles' extra-biblical sources than ever (1999: 66-69).

Rainey (1997) presents a source theory that involves source citations, and also runs against the current trend. His theory is related to Auld's thesis about a common source being used by both Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic History; however, Rainey maintains that the Chronicler supplemented the Deuteronomistic History with a source that they shared. He notes that references to sources in the Deuteronomistic History mention military exploits and building projects that were not included in the narrative. Rainey surveys sections in Chronicles that do record such exploits and building projects and that reflect an accurate understanding of geopolitical and geographical features. He concludes that much of this material in Chronicles was probably taken from a common source, Chronicles' main supplementary source, the 'Chronicles of the Kings of Judah' (1997: 43-72).

In terms of source citations in general, Klein (2006) helpfully summarizes five positions that have been taken on the Chronicler's source reference 'the book of kings', which he sees as one source referred to by five names, and on the Chronicler's prophetic citations. Klein leans toward two positions as more plausible than the rest: the Chronicler repeated and reworded source citations from the Deuteronomistic History while understanding them as references to the Deuteronomistic History itself; or, the Chronicler believed that the 'book of the kings' was a collection of works of prophets who had recorded contemporary events, and which in turn had been summarized by the Deuteronomistic History (2006: 40-42). Glatt-Gilad (2001) adds a helpful observation on the prophetic source citations. He surveyed and compared the usage in Kings and Chronicles of the standard formulae that introduce, evaluate and conclude the reigns of the kings. Included in the formulae were source citations. Although Glatt-Gilad accepts the thesis that the Chronicler did have extra-biblical sources, he also observed that the Chronicler's prophetically-attributed sources supported a literary scheme. Such prophetic source citations appear in relationship with kings who obeyed the voices of prophets, but not with those kings who are portrayed as having rejected prophetic authority (2001: 199-201). Following this literary observation, Knoppers (2004) concludes that source citations

help one to see the Chronicler's method of historiography and interpretation, but not what real sources he had (2004: 126).

Closing Observation on Sources and Use of Sources. In conclusion, in regard to both topics, the use of biblical and extra-biblical works, one can see a trend that follows Peltonen's observations (1999; see above). This trend is that source-critical pursuits are less focused on proving or disproving the historicity of Chronicles, and more focused on understanding its literary or rhetorical qualities. For instance, it has long been noted that the Chronicler does not for the most part cite his biblical or non-biblical sources. Knoppers suggests this is due to the ancient literary technique of mimesis, in which one reuses admired older works without citing them (2004: 122-23).

Such theses need further development. In Hebrew Bible studies in general, it appears that there is a movement away from a Western-minded and simplistic model of composition that previously characterized biblical source-critical studies, toward a growing study of ancient Near Eastern compositional techniques. For instance, Niditch (1996) has presented a synthesis of some studies on the interplay of orality and literacy. Along the same line as Knoppers' remark about the use of mimesis, Niditch notes how writers from an oral culture tended to abbreviate rather than expand. They could draw on a registry of phrases and patterns that were meant to evoke a greater whole of earlier tradition. The purpose of moving from orality to a written record was not necessarily to supply the audience with a full account, but to evoke the weight of ancient traditions (1996: 68-69). As a result of these observations, she strongly cautions source critics from too quickly assuming literary dependence (1996: 19-20).

Another call for caution comes from the work of Tertel (1994), who carefully seeks to develop an empirical model for understanding redactional developments in the transmission of biblical narrative by first identifying such general tendencies in other ancient Near Eastern texts. From his cautious methodological viewpoint, he rejects the conclusion that redactional tendencies can be isolated with control by comparing Samuel-Kings to Chronicles, since: we have only two developmental stages; it is unknown whether Chronicles was meant to supersede or supplement Samuel-Kings; the exact nature of the literary relationship between the two works is obscure; and the works were further transmitted after the Chronicler used parallel material (1994: 57-59). The closest analogy for which he believes he can establish sufficient control is found in the Akkadian royal annals, which display repeated revision with direct dependence. Contrary to source-critical methods that presuppose progressive

expansion and the resulting literary-critical and redactional hypothesis of biblical scholars, he finds a tendency to abbreviate and simplify, so that later versions have less dramatic complexity; that is, assimilation occurs, rather than dissimilation. This tendency, he notes, is found in the Chronicler's account of Sennacherib's invasion as compared to that of Kings. He also observed that, although the trend toward progressive abbreviation may lead to inconsistencies and anachronisms, these do not render the basic narrative untrustworthy. Tertel also examines the Chronicler's references to non-extant sources, and concludes on several grounds that the authenticity of the sources should not be denied. He speculates that the Chronicler had two modes of reference: he referred to Samuel-Kings mainly by almost quoting it verbatim, possibly assuming that his readers knew the text; and he used other sources in his own style while referring to them by title. Although Tertel's last thesis may not hold up under scrutiny by Chronicles scholars, one hopes that Chronicles scholars will increasingly evaluate and incorporate the findings of such studies on ancient Near Eastern compositions.

Text Criticism

In the study of Chronicles, the discipline of text criticism intersects with source-critical and redactional analyses. Beginning with the work of Lemke (1963, 1965) and refined by others such as McKenzie (1984), text critics have identified that the Chronicler used biblical sources from different textual traditions (e.g. LXX *Vorlage* for Genesis, LXX *Vorlage* for Samuel, and proto-Masoretic Text for Kings), an observation that raised a caution flag against too detailed redactional analyses. As a result, it is possible that where the Chronicler appears to deviate from his source may reveal less about his redactional techniques and more about the textual history of that source. One implication is that it is safer to draw conclusions about the Chronicler's creative use of his Deuteronomistic sources, when comparing passages to Kings than to Samuel. Again, Knoppers' commentary (2003a: 52-71) is most useful for a summary of the current status of text-critical research and for an evaluation of the textual witnesses. He also discusses the relative usefulness of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1 Esdras, the Septuagint, the Ethiopic version, the Peshitta, and the Masoretic Text. Also helpful is Klein (2006: 26-30). Significant publications include: the one Dead Sea Scroll fragment of Chronicles (Trebolle Barrera 2000), a comparison of 1 Esdras and the Septuagint (Talshir 1999), a recensional history of Greek Chronicles (Spottorno Díaz-Caro 1997, 2001), a new edition of Septuagint Chronicles (Fernández Marcos and Saiz 1996), a study of the Old Latin of

Chronicles (Fernández Marcos 1997), a new Ethiopic translation (Knibb 1999), and a new work on the Peshitta (Weitzman 1999).

Historicity

The issue of the historical credibility of Chronicles has long been a matter of scholarly concern. In short, within a spectrum from those who see little historical value to those that find a good deal, the current consensus is still that one needs to work with caution on a case-by-case basis in assessing statements made in Chronicles.

Providing a major resource for the study of Chronicles, Peltonen's exhaustive, two-volume work (1996) presents a survey of the history of the scholarly assessment of the historical reliability of Chronicles, beginning with pre-critical times and ending with recent positions. He not only gives a rather full and fair presentation of all major scholars and includes many that are barely known, but he also provides clear summaries of trends. Although Peltonen's focus is on the assessment of Chronicles' historical value, the depth of discussion that he provides makes this work a near-comprehensive study of the history of Chronicles research in general.

A collection of articles edited by Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (1997), *The Chronicler as Historian, c*omplements Peltonen's survey. This collection sets forth positions by several scholars who represent the front-line of research on Chronicles, and, therefore, is representative of the current state of scholarship. Here one finds that the scholarly opinion continues to be variegated. The authors differ on the typical issues of the genre of Chronicles, the Chronicler's use of sources, whether or not one finds reliable historical data for the pre-exilic period or even for the Chronicler's period, and on general methodology. For instance, Rainey (1997) posits that the Chronicler drew on a supplementary source to Samuel-Kings, one that provided accurate geopolitical and geographical information regarding ancient Judah. However, Ben Zvi cautiously notes that the Chronicler's reports on such building projects of kings fit well as literary constructs to support a message about divine blessing (1997). Barnes (1997) looks at the thirty-odd non-synoptic chronological references in Chronicles and concludes that the majority of them—all but three—have no historicity, and that Chronicles yields little for reconstructing the pre-exilic monarchy. Knoppers (1997) represents perhaps a more centrist position. He examines the Chronicler' presentation of activities of royal reforms in light of epigraphic and archaeological evidence and concludes that, while the Chronicler's work reflects his post-exilic context, it does have a different range

of interest than the Deuteronomist, and occasionally provides valuable pre-exilic information. His working approach, as summarized in his commentary, is not to rely on source-critical evaluations of the Chronicler's unique material, but rather to ask how his account coheres with information gained from material remains (2003a: 126-28). In support of Knopper's position is a monograph by Vaughn (1999), who explores the Chronicler's presentation of Hezekiah in light of recent artifactual evidence. He concludes that, although the Chronicler does write according to his ideological purposes, he nonetheless provides historically valid information in regard to Hezekiah's reign (1999: 169-79).

One apparent trend that can be noted in the volume by Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie is that some of the participants no longer work from a positivistic view of historiography. Although Van Seters (1997) contrasts Israelite historiography ('more akin to myth-making', p. 300) to classical and modern historiography, others, such as Kalimi (1997) recognize the subjective nature of all historiography, as well as the inherently theological orientation of an ancient Israelite perspective. Knoppers even states, 'Writing about the past is never done in a vacuum but is always influenced by the witness's own circumstances' (1997: 202). Although this collection of articles is valuable for the variety of positions it represents, its contribution would have been strengthened by a critical dialogue among the participants about presuppositions and methodology.

Genre

Closely tied to the issue of historicity is the identification of the genre of Chronicles. Scholars have sometimes put the 'cart before the horse': convinced that they have proven/disproven the historicity of events in Chronicles, they believe that they can infer the genre and intent of Chronicles. However, actual historicity does not necessarily indicate an author's historiographical intent. The process of successful communication works in the other direction: the prior recognition of genre leads the audience to the correct expectations about authorial intent and how one should go about further interpretation. Still, regarding this primary step, scholars have not come up with a genre classification for Chronicles over which there is general agreement.

General Trend. In general, past discussion has sought to identify Chronicles as midrash, exegesis, rewritten Bible, or theology. For example, in Selman's two-volume commentary that appeared at the end of the period surveyed by Kleinig, Selman sees the Chronicler as providing an interpretation of the

Bible as the Chronicler knew it (1994a: 26). A related thesis has been presented in a series of works by Schniedewind (1994; 1995: 80-129; 1999). He identifies Chronicles as an extended historical sermon, which takes its role as part of a new stage in the development of Israelite prophecy. In part, his thesis is that the Chronicler thought of the monarchial, 'classical' prophets as writers of history who had a role of interpreting the past, as well as projecting the future, to Israelite kings. The Chronicler, however, reflects a new stage in prophecy. He presents modified prophetic functionaries, 'inspired messengers' to the community, who often use scripture and the history of Israel homiletically to teach the people to act correctly. The Chronicler, according to Schniedewind, sees himself functioning in the role of an inspired messenger as he authoritatively interprets and applies tradition in his written historical sermon.

Some new trends may be noted, particularly in the summaries and evaluations of recent discussion in Kalimi (1997; 2005a: 19-39), Klein (2006: 17-19), Knoppers (2004: 129-34), and McKenzie (2004). The first main trend is a movement away from seeing Chronicles as merely midrash, exegesis, rewritten Bible, or theology. The problem with classifying Chronicles as rewritten Bible, midrash, or exegesis is that Chronicles has so much unique, non-parallel material. A second trend is to move away from viewing Chronicles as a work meant to supplement the Deuteronomistic History, since Chronicles has important differences from the Deuteronomistic History, which involve its perspective (post-exilic), subject matter (Judah), and themes (Davidic king, temple and priesthood), particularly in its unique material. A third trend is to recognize Chronicles as a theologically oriented work of history writing in its own right, conforming to the historiographical standards of its day (so the authors above, with Kalimi as the most forthright in calling the Chronicler a 'historian'). See, too, Duke (2005a), who in his discussion of genre argues for the interpretive nature of all forms of history telling, not just ancient ones.

A New Challenge. A recent work by Schweitzer (2007) presents a new thesis regarding the genre of Chronicles. To some extent it may be compared with works which considered Chronicles as merely theology, because it too dismisses any historicity; however, Schweitzer comes from a different literary-critical perspective. [Since his work has not received reviews at the time of this writing, and since it does present new challenges, I have treated it in more depth.] Schweitzer presents a new perspective through which to view Chronicles, that of utopian literature. It is true that some past works have referred to Chronicles as presenting a utopian picture of

history in general (Wahl 1988: 197, as cited in Schweitzer 2007: 26-27, n. 78), of the Davidic-Solomonic period in particular (Murray 2000), or of the priestly system (Nelson 1993: 111-40). Also, Collins (2000) has examined biblical and Jewish literature along this line of thought, although not Chronicles. However, in terms of a serious literary-critical theory regarding utopian literature, Schweitzer regards Boer (1996, 1997) as the first to suggest such a possibility for analyzing Chronicles. Schweitzer took up his suggestion. Although Schweitzer recognizes that utopian literary theory is based on contemporary literary theories, going back to Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), he nonetheless makes a strong case for recognizing utopian characteristics in examples of ancient literature (2007: 26-28). His understanding of the role of utopian sociological thinking will particularly challenge interpretations of biblical texts that have been labeled apocalyptic and/or eschatological, as well as other texts such as Chronicles.

Basically, utopian literature creates 'places' as they should be and not as they are. A utopian place, which is generally highly structured, can be projected into the past, present or future. What is distinct about such literature is that it serves a revolutionary function, not really presenting a blueprint for the future, but offering an implicit social critique challenging the status quo (2007: 14-30). Examples that one might point to in the Hebrew Bible, besides the prophetic literature in general, are the Garden of Eden, Deuteronomy, the Priestly source of the Pentateuch, and the Temple cultus as described in Ezekiel 40–48.

In one part of his work, Schweitzer examines the genealogies of Chronicles, its presentation of the Davidic kings, and its portrayal of the Temple cultus. He concludes that Chronicles provides neither a legitimation of currently held social structures (contra Levin 2003, for example), nor an eschatological vision for such structures to be enacted. Rather, he argues that in critique of the status quo, Chronicles presents a utopian picture of 'Israel', of the founding kingdom of David and Solomon, and of the Temple cultus.

The concept that Chronicles presents an idealization of Israel's past is nothing new, particularly regarding its story of the monarchy. Murray, too, sees the Chronicler's utopian portrayal as a critique of the status quo, but also as a call to revival (2000: 88, n. 27). However, Schweitzer has reframed the purpose of Chronicles' utopian creations.

Of particular significance is Schweitzer's challenge to interpreting the genealogies and those sections of Chronicles that describe the Temple cultus. On both counts, he argues that these texts do not capture a current reality, but create 'a better alternative of reality'. For instance, in regard to cultic matters in Chronicles, it has been variously argued that Chronicles

does not preserve practices of the First Temple, but has sought to legitimize the current practices of the Second Temple. Schweitzer charges that it is a presumption that such cultic structures were in practice from the date of the Chronicler down to Josephus's description of some of them, and asks for the historical evidence (Schweitzer 2007: 28-30). (So, too, Nelson noted that the various priestly utopian pictures of the Priestly Writing, Ezekiel 40–48, Zechariah 1–8, and Chronicles, never were completely actualized [1993: 111]). Schweitzer, therefore, presents the thesis that the Chronicler addressed current social problems by presenting a better reality, some of the practices of which actually were put into place some time later.

In the Chronicler's utopian picture, the monarchy is an institution of the past that has served its purpose. The priests, necessary for Temple service, are also shown to be a group with a history of failure. As such, they, and the high-priest in particular, receive a limited description of their duties. In turn, however, the Chronicler grants expanded roles to Levites as prophets, Temple treasurers, scribes, judges, teachers of Torah, and ones who pray in cultic and non-cultic contexts (2007: 164-73). While the Chronicler's utopian picture does not exclusively grant these new roles to the Levites (contra Schniedewind [1995], for example, who sees a cessation of classical prophecy and a new form of Levitical musicians), it does grant them those roles as a necessary part of the operation of the cultus for the purpose of enabling the community to seek God better (2007: 173-75). Here Schweitzer makes the Chronicler sound more programmatic than just an advocate of change, although he points out that no clear blueprint is given, just a 'better alternative reality'.

In summary, Schweitzer not only presents a new literary-theoretical perspective from which to view Chronicles, but also challenges assumptions about the historicity of the Chronicler's genealogies and his cultic system, as well as weighing in on the Chronicler's genre, purpose and ideology.

Literary Studies

Overview: To some degree all studies of Chronicles are literary studies; but, both as part of the changing milieu of biblical studies in general, and of the focus of Chronicles studies in particular, scholars have become much more sensitive to the literary devices and character of Chronicles. As a result, virtually all recent commentators examine, to some degree, the significance of various literary structures and devices. Certainly the work by Schweitzer (above) presents not just a thesis about the genre and purpose of Chronicles, but approaches it through a contemporary literary perspective. Another example would be the work of Dyck (1998), who

employs ideological criticism. Dyck adopts Ricoeur's (1986) three-stage analysis of ideology: distortion, legitimation, and integration/identity, and he applies it in reverse order to three readings of Chronicles. His ideological approach sets the Chronicler's communicative act in a specific context, and focuses on the power roles at work among the different strata of his social setting. As a result, Dyck's reconstruction of the social structures and forces of the Second Temple community and their dynamic interplay will be of service to students of Chronicles and this era of Judaism. Duke (1999) approaches Chronicles from the perspective of classical rhetoric. He also expands on the Chronicler's method of developing an 'argument' both inductively and deductively (2002), and in another work (2005b) demonstrates how the Chronicler validated his argument through various 'ethical/character' appeals through speech material.

Brettler (1995) works along more traditional literary-critical lines, looking for specific redactional techniques. When Brettler set about writing a book on the nature of Israelite historiography, unlike others who usually start with the Deuteronomistic History, he started with Chronicles as the work concerning which we have the most controlling data (Chapter 2, 'Chronicles as a Model for Biblical History', pp. 20-47; notes, pp. 162-74). In this chapter and the following four chapters, he identifies four major literary techniques, which work together in the production of biblical historical texts: typology, creative reinterpretations of sources, rhetorical devices and ideological shaping. Likewise, Schniedewind (1999), while arguing that the Chronicler saw himself as an authoritative interpreter of tradition, gives specific methodological examples of how the Chronicler drew both on written citations of Torah as well as on a body of tradition in order to justify interpretive decisions that sometimes revised or reconciled diverse traditions to make them applicable. Dorsey, in a broad-ranging work (1999: 145-57) on Genesis through Malachi, identifies various chiastic structures within both the parts and the whole of Chronicles.

However, in terms of literary-critical studies, the most attention and credit must go to Kalimi for compiling a monumental work illustrating numerous literary devices found in Chronicles (2005b, a translated and expanded version of 2000, which is a translated and expanded version of 1995). His goal is to reveal and define the Chronicler's compositional techniques through a study comparing Chronicles to, primarily, Samuel-Kings.

Kalimi works with two main assumptions, that Chronicles is basically a unity composed by the Chronicler, and that the Chronicler had Samuel-Kings, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Psalms, and Ezra-Nehemiah as source material. He also bases his comparative study mainly on the Masoretic Text,

although he recognizes the problem of distinguishing deliberate modifications of the Chronicler from differences between the Chronicler's *Vorlage* and the Masoretic Text, and 'exercised great caution' (2005b: 12).

Kalimi's thesis is that the Chronicler, as an artist and historian (2005b: 7, 407-409), created a new telling of Israel's history through his sophisticated literary and historiographical reshaping of his sources. In twenty chapters, Kalimi catalogues texts under the following categories/chapter titles: Literary-Chronological Proximity; Historiographical Revision; Completions and Additions; Omissions; Given Name –Equivalent Name Interchanges; Treatment of Problematic Texts; Harmonizations; Character Creation; 'Measure for Measure'; Allusion; Chiasmus; Chiasmus between Parallel Texts; Repetitions; Inclusio; Antithesis; Simile; Key Words; Numerical Patterns; Generalization and Specification; and Inconsistency, Disharmony, and Historical Mistakes. In each chapter, he not only gives a definition of the literary feature and its distribution in the Hebrew Bible and in Chronicles, but he also gives examples from extra-biblical literature. An additional work of Kalimi's, *An Ancient Israelite Historian*, came out at the same time. This work, which is a collection of articles, not only explores another literary feature, that of pun/paronomasia (2005a: 67-82), but also more clearly argues for and summarizes his positions on genre and date.

One weakness of Kalimi's work is that to some extent he concludes what he assumes. For instance, he concludes that scholarly assumptions about corruptions, omissions, and emendations are mainly false, and that most comparative differences are due to the Chronicler's literary creativity (2005b: 405). Also, he sometimes pushes his argument for creativity to a point of some methodological confusion about ancient historiography. For example, although Kalimi notes well how the Chronicler's theology influenced his writing, he still says that many changes were made not because of the Chronicler's beliefs, but because of the literary devices that he employed (2005b: 406). But, does not a creative author employ literary devices for the purpose of effectively communicating the author's message, which in this case is the Chronicler's theology? Still, due to the mass of examples Kalimi produces to demonstrate stylistic patterns in Chronicles, the weight of the argument tends to fall on the one who wants to object to his findings. Kalimi's massive work should become the starting point for ever more precise and fruitful discussions of biblical literary techniques and historiography.

Genealogies. Genealogies have increasingly become a focus of study, not only in regard to dating the book, but also for understanding the literary structure and the purpose of Chronicles. In their recent commentaries,

both Klein (2006) and especially Knoppers (2003a) have devoted much attention to them. Studies on genealogies, however, have taken a variety of approaches and drawn differing conclusions about their historicity, tradition of origin, and purposes. Generally, the genealogies have been understood as supporting the Chronicler's social structures, with some debate on whether or not they also reflected biological/historical reality. However, as noted above ('A New Challenge'), Schweitzer (2007) examines the genealogies and concludes that they do not provide a legitimation of currently held social structures, but instead a utopian picture of 'Israel', of the founding kingdom of David and Solomon, and of the Temple cultus. Levin (2003), who presented a survey on genealogies for *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* (2001), also argues that they define the Chronicler's concept of Israel, but are historiographic. He claims in particular that the genealogies of the central tribes are so complex, segmented, deep, and fluid, that they could not come from an archival source as many of the other genealogies, but were actual 'living' tribal traditions at the time they were written down by the Chronicler in the late Persian period.

Both Hoglund (1997) and Knoppers (2003b) have argued that the historiographical use of genealogies in Chronicles parallels Greek usage, in which genealogies were used to give an individual prestige by tying them into famous people and thus providing a sense of identity or a source of authority. Wright (1999), in a narratological approach, examines the genealogies in order to compare and contrast the key characters there with those in the main narrative body. Williams (2002) examines 1 Chronicles 5, in which most of the material is unique, and argues that the Chronicler had plausibly obtained independent information from the early United Monarchy that accurately reflected the date, geography and tribes treated.

In conclusion, one can note that the study of the genealogies is often inseparable from the scholar's integrated view of matters such as date, purpose and historicity. As a result, the nature and purpose of the genealogies are still open to debate.

Resources for the Study of Chronicles

Several valuable resources have been produced during the period under review. First, Graham and McKenzie, along with Hoglund and Knoppers, have been responsible for turning out a set of three collections of articles (Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie 1997; Graham and McKenzie 1999; Graham, McKenzie and Knoppers 2003) on the Chronicler as historian, author, and theologian, respectively. These works for the most part present

the measure of the current state of Chronicles research. Several individual articles on the issues of authorship (Graham and McKenzie 1999) and on genre and historicity (Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie 1997) are cited above. Not to slight the third work on theology (2003), it should be noted that it too contains fine exegetical and thematic studies, which have not received specific mention.

This period has also seen a wealth of commentaries produced on Chronicles, several in 'mainline' series. In the Anchor Bible series, Knoppers, who has been cited frequently in this article, is in the process of producing a multi-volume work that will most likely be the new benchmark of Chronicles studies for some time to come. His first volume covers introductory matters, as well as new translation and commentary on the genealogical section of 1 Chronicles 1–9 (2003a). The second volume covers 1 Chronicles 10–29 (2004). Klein, also cited frequently, is writing a multi-volume work for the Hermeneia series, having turned out the first volume on 1 Chronicles (2006). Both of these scholars have done extensive work on the genealogies in 1 Chronicles 1–9, a growing field of study, and both employ their expertise in text criticism.

Other major scholars in Chronicles studies have produced significant works for a less specialized audience. Allen (1999) has again produced a fine commentary, this time for the New Interpreter's Bible. Johnstone (1997) wrote a two-volume work for the JSOT Supplement series. Rather distinct to his work is the thesis that in the mind of the Chronicler, the exile played a major role and was a spiritual condition under which post-exilic Judah still existed as they employed the Temple cultus and waited for full restoration. Johnstone's work is strongly theological. Tuell (2001), who wrote for the commentary series Interpretation, interacts with a wide range of biblical scholarship on Chronicles, presenting relevant discussions on textual criticism, source criticism, form and structure, historical assessment, and sociological background. At the same time, he provides comments on the level of contemporary theological application. Tuell's work is strong in explaining the cultic material of Chronicles and the Chronicler's use of Israelite hymnic material.

Jarick (2002) has a written a non-traditional 'commentary' on 1 Chronicles for Sheffield Academic Press. It is more of a literary close reading of the text, which posits that 1 Chronicles is an assembled collection of Jerusalemite traditions by a guild of annalists whose goal was to uphold the Davidic traditions as part of a sacred cosmic plan. McKenzie's commentary in the Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries series (2004) was written as a textbook for theological students. After an excellent introduc-

tory survey of key issues, the commentary explores the text by literary units, each in terms of literary, exegetical and theological analysis. Though not designed as a homiletical tool, the theological reflections still may be of use to pastors. In his methodology, McKenzie leans on his former research and critical skill of comparing the text of Chronicles to that of Samuel-Kings, in order to understand the purposes of the Chronicler through the ways in which he modified his *Vorlage*. McKenzie presents Chronicles as a (mainly) unified work of the Chronicler, a skilled editor, exegete and theologian (2004: 29).

Dirksen (2005) has published an English translation of his Dutch work from 2003 for the Historical Commentary on the Old Testament series. This work tends to focus on text-critical and grammatical issues. Dirksen sees the Chronicler as pastorally motivated to persuade his audience to follow the Temple cultus for their spiritual well-being.

With apologies for the lack of annotation, I mention some other recent commentaries that have come out: Thompson (1994) for the New American Commentary; Selman's two volumes (1994a, 1994b) for the Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries; Laubach (2000) on 1 Chronicles for the popular German language series, Wuppertaler Studienbibel, with the second volume by Bräumer (2002); Hooker (2001) for the Westminster Bible Companion; Rabinovits, Starret and Kaplan (2002) for the Da'ath Sofrim series, which gives the Hebrew text with translation and a collection of comments from medieval rabbinic exegesis; Beentjes (2002, 2006) for the Dutch series Verklaring van de Hebreeuwse Bijbel; and of important note, Berger (Kimhi and Berger 2007) has published his dissertation work of 2003, which is an English version of the mediaeval commentary of David Kimhi for Brown Judaic Studies.

Finally, one should not overlook the work of Endres, Millar and Burns (1998). They have created, using their own translations, a new English version, with synoptic parallels of Chronicles to Samuel-Kings, and other biblical works that Chronicles uses.

Orality, Textuality, and Literacy

A recent trend in Old Testament studies in general, which is also beginning to have a greater impact on Chronicles studies, is the increasing exploration of the issue of literacy and textuality. The work by Niditch (1996, noted above under 'Closing Observation on Sources and Use of Sources') explores the interplay between orality and literacy, and, although she perhaps overemphasizes the oral end, she still draws conclusions that should have an impact on source and redactional methodological approaches to

understanding the biblical texts. A major comparative compendium of what is known about scribes, schools, education, the interplay of orality with textual transmission, and how these factors might have influenced the canonical process has been produced by Carr (2005). He, too, demonstrates how oral and textual transmission work together, and he notes how memorization and performance of texts played an important role of enculturation through scribal circles. Carr tends to emphasize a generally held thesis about fluidity in transmission as scribes would reproduce texts by memory, an emphasis that perhaps deserves a caveat. Carr was apparently not aware of the work by West (1997; particularly Chapter 12 'The Question of Transmission', pp. 586-630). Whereas Carr surveys secondary literature to draw analogies for biblical studies, West works with the primary literature as a classicist. He has compiled a major collection of parallels between ancient Near Eastern poetic narratives and Greek literature, and then explored how such West Asiatic influence might have come into Greek tradition starting in the second millennium BCE. His results, therefore, are 'incidental' for biblical scholars. West demonstrates from the primary Mesopotamian sources that even the most 'oral' literature, namely songs, interacted closely with written texts. Musicians, if they were not scribes, had their works recorded by scribes, who sometimes retrieved archived songs and read them for musicians to learn. He shows cases of Near Eastern poems spreading not just by oral means, but by written transmission. Although he recognizes the fluidity that often existed in the transmission of songs, he also notes how written documents could exercise a normative influence on a text. For instance, whereas poems originating during the Old Babylonian period frequently were revised in transmission, after the fourteenth century BCE one can see the development of the concept of a standard text. In some cases, scribes certified the accuracy of their copies and, if their exemplar was damaged, did not conjecture restorations. Such observations should lead biblical scholars to explore further the nature of fluidity and fixity in relationship to different genres and different functions and settings of literary usage, particularly those associated with enculturation, before drawing generalizations too quickly.

There is also important ongoing discussion about just what degree of literacy existed at various periods. One extreme is represented by Davies (1998), who argues that literacy was confined to a small scribal class during the monarchic period of Judah. He does not, however, explore the current archaeological evidence, but rather rests his case on his thesis that most of the biblical literature was created in the post-exilic period. To the contrary, Hess (2002) surveys the epigraphic evidence and cautiously concludes that although there is not enough evidence to know how widespread literacy

was, writing appears to be in continuous use in all periods of the Iron Age in Palestine, and it cannot be limited to specific classes and places. So, too, Millard (2005) concludes that even if most writing was confined to administrative texts, the widespread distribution of Hebrew seals and ostraca certainly shows that reading and writing were not confined to temples and royal usage, and are a good indication that virtually all people would be aware of writing, documents, and books (2005: 1009-10).

Even more positive about the scope and role of literacy in the monarchical period is Schniedewind, who has developed the discussion of literacy and textuality based in part on evidence from Chronicles. Schniedewind (1995, particularly chapters 2–3) traces the rise of growing textuality in the Second Temple period. He argues that prophetic authority shifts from the oral prophetic word, as found in the Deuteronomistic History, to the interpretation of written texts and oral tradition by inspired messengers, as both found in Chronicles and exemplified by the Chronicler. In a later work (2004), Schniedewind cites epigraphical evidence demonstrating an increase in literacy and textuality in Judah from the eighth through the sixth century. His work, therefore, challenges those who date most, if not all, of the biblical literary activity to the Persian period, and, as a result, his book has generated a formal response of scholarly discussion (Knoppers 2005). Schniedewind's work also provides a new measure for comparing and contrasting Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah in terms of their appeals to textual authority, and what such appeals reveal about shifting power sociologically. These implications are tentatively sketched out by Eskenazi (2005).

One area which lacks study—perhaps the greatest lack in studies on the transmission of biblical traditions—are the related issues of intended audience and 'publication'; that is, to whom and how were oral and written texts made known. Whereas the scribal educational system appears rather elitist, the interplay of orality with literacy and indications of growing literacy, outside of the court and temple, raise important questions about the intended audiences of biblical texts. Evidence from Egyptian studies indicates that there were some public readings of legal texts (Redford 2001), just as we see in the story of Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. 8.2-3, 18; 9.3; 13.1). For some time, scholars have argued, on rhetorical grounds, that Chronicles bears the marks of homiletical composition (for example, Schniedewind 1994). Duke (2005a) picks up on the amount of speech material in Chronicles and the previous studies that have noted Chronicles' homiletical style and short structural units (e.g. von Rad 1966; Allen 1988; Mason 1990). He suggests (2005a: 169-70) that Chronicles could have been composed for oral performance to a public audience gathered at the Temple. Certainly, much more work needs to be done in this area.

Conclusion

As Kleinig noted in his 1994 survey of Chronicles research in *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*, Chronicles had 'finally come into its own' after a century of comparative neglect (1994: 68). He listed three major reasons. First, there had been a shift from historical to literary analysis. Along with this trend was a tendency not to pose the Deuteronomistic History as more reliable than Chronicles. As a result, rather than just taking a historical-reconstructive approach, scholars focused more on understanding the setting and purpose of the book. Second, there had been a shift from diachronic source and redactional analyses to more synchronic, canonical analyses. The former approaches assumed disunity and looked for discontinuity, while seeking to find meaning in a supposed 'original' form. Third, there was a newly forming trend to move from thematic analyses to theological synthesis (1994: 68-69).

All of these trends have continued in the following years with increasing focus and breadth. As a result, numerous articles and monographs have been produced and major commentary series have been adding to, or even replacing, volumes on Chronicles. The significant newer tendencies have been to date Chronicles later, even down to Hellenistic times, and to try to place Chronicles better into its sociological and literary context as scholars gain a fuller understanding of the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Chronicles indeed has come into its own as a biblical book worthy of study.

Bibliography

Albertz, R.

1994 *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. II. *From the Exile to the Maccabees* (2 vols.; trans. J. Bowden; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox [1992]).

1996–1997 *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*. II. *Vom Exil bis zu den Makkabäern* (2 vols.; Grundrisse zum Alten Testament, 8.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd rev. edn [1992]).

Allen, L.C.

1988 'Kerygmatic Units in 1 & 2 Chronicles', *JSOT* 41: 21-36.

1999 'The First and Second Books of Chronicles', in L.E. Keck (ed.), *The New Interpreter's Bible* (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon): III, 299-659.

Arnold, W.T., and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.)

2005 *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).

Auld, A.G.

1983 'Prophets through the Looking Glass: Between Writings and Moses', *JSOT* 27: 3-23.

1994 *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

1998 *Joshua Retold: Synoptic Perspectives* (Old Testament Studies; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

1999 'What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles?', in Graham and McKenzie (eds.) 1999: 91-99.

Barnes, W.H.

1997 'Non-Synoptic Chronological References in the Books of Chronicles', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997: 106-31.

Beentjes, P.C.

2002 *1 Kronieken* (Verklaring van de Hebreeuwse Bijbel; Kampen: Kok).

2006 *2 Kronieken* (Verklaring van de Hebreeuwse Bijbel; Kampen: Kok).

Ben Zvi, E.

1997 'The Chronicler as a Historian: Building Texts', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997: 132-49.

Boer, R.T.

1996 'Decentered and Utopian Politics: 3 Reigns 11–14 and 2 Chronicles 10–13', in idem, *Jameson and Jeroboam* (Semeia Studies, 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press): 198-285.

1997 *Novel Histories: The Fiction of Biblical Criticism* (Playing the Texts, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Bogaert, P.M.

1999 'La Porte Orientale, place de rassemblement du peuple, et l'extension de l'oeuvre du Chroniste', *Transeu* 17: 9-16.

Bräumer, H.

2002 *Das zweite Buch der Chronik* (Wuppertaler Studienbibel; Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag); for 1 Chronicles, see Laubach.

Brettler, M.Z.

1995 *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London and New York: Routledge).

Brooke, G.J.

2007 'The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran', in Rezetko, Lim and Aucker (eds.) 2007: 35-48.

Carr, D.M.

2005 *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).

Collins, J.J.

2000 'Models of Utopia in the Biblical Tradition', in S.M. Olyan and R.C. Culley (eds.), *'A Wise and Discerning Mind': Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long* (Brown Judaic Studies, 325; Providence, RI: Brown University Press): 51-67.

Cross, F.M.

1975 'A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration', *JBL* 94: 4-18.

1998 *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Davies, P.R.

1998 *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox).

Dirksen, P.B.

1993 'Kronieken in de recente literatuur: Een overzicht van recente publicaties betreffende Kronieken', *NedTTs* 47: 6-20.

1999 'The Future in the Book of Chronicles', in P.J. Harland and C.T.R. Hayward (eds.), *New Heaven and New Earth—Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (VTSup, 77; Leiden and Boston: Brill): 37-51.

2005 *1 Chronicles* (trans. A.P. Runia; Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters [2003]).

Dörrfuss, E.M.
1994 *Mose in den Chronikbüchern: Garant theokratisher Zukunftserwartung* (BZAW, 219; Berlin: de Gruyter).

Dorsey, D.A.
1999 *The Literary Structure of the Old Testament: A Commentary on Genesis-Malachi* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books).

Duke, R.K.
1996 'Chronicles, Theology of', in W.A. Elwell (ed.), *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books): 92-95.

1999 'A Rhetorical Approach to Appreciating the Books of Chronicles', in Graham and McKenzie (eds.) 1999: 100-35.

2002 'The Strategic Use of the Enthymeme and Example in the Argumentation of the Books of Chronicles', in A. Eriksson, T.H. Olbricht and W. Übelacker (eds.), *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference* (Emory Studies for Early Christianity; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International): 127-40.

2005a 'Chronicles, 1 & 2', in Arnold and Williamson (eds.) 2005: 161-81.

2005b 'The Ethical Appeal of the Chronicler', in A. Eriksson, T.H. Olbricht and W. Übelacker (eds.), *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion in Biblical Discourse: Essays from the 2002 Heidelberg Conference* (Emory Studies for Early Christianity; London: T&T Clark International): 33-51.

Dyck, J.E.
1997 'Dating Chronicles and the Purpose of Chronicles', *Didaskalia* 8: 16-29.

1998 *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler* (Biblical Interpretation Series, 33; Leiden: Brill).

Endres, J.C., W.R. Millar and J.B. Burns (eds.)
1998 *Chronicles and its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press).

Eskenazi, T.C.
2005 'Implications for and from Ezra-Nehemiah', in G.N. Knoppers (ed.), *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 5: Art. 18.

Fernández Marcos, N.
1997 'The Old Latin of Chronicles between the Greek and the Hebrew', in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge, 1995* (SBLSCS, 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press): 123-36.

Fernández Marcos, N., and J.R.B. Saiz (eds.)
1996 *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega: Crónicas* (Textos y Estudios C. Cisneros. Biblia Políngl. Matrit, 60; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).

Freedman, D.N.
1961 'The Chronicler's Purpose', *CBQ* 23: 436-42.

1991 *The Unity of the Hebrew Bible* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Gelston, A.
1996 'The End of Chronicles', *SJOT* 10: 53-60.

Glatt-Gilad, D.A.
2001 'Regnal Formulae as a Historiographic Device in the Book of Chronicles', *RB* 108: 184-209.

Grabbe, L.L. (ed.)
1998 *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology* (JSOTSup, 278; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

2001 *Did Moses Speak Attic?: Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (JSOTSup, 317; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Graham, M.P.
2000 Review of *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Enstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik*, by G. Steins. *JBL* 119: 552-53.

Graham, M.P., K.G. Hoglund and S.L. McKenzie (eds.)
1997 *The Chronicler as Historian* (JSOTSup, 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Graham, M.P., and S.L. McKenzie (eds.)
1999 *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (JSOTSup, 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Graham, M.P., S.L. McKenzie and G.N. Knoppers (eds.)
2003 *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* (JSOTSup, 371; London and New York: T&T Clark International).

Hess, R.S.
2002 'Literacy in Iron Age Israel', in Long, Baker and Wenham (eds.) 2002: 82-102.

Ho, C.Y.S.
1995 'Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXXI 1-13 Really the Source of 1 Chronicles X 1-12?', *VT* 45: 82-106.

1999 'The Stories of the Family Troubles of Judah and David: A Study of their Literary Links', *VT* 49: 514-31.

Hoglund, K.G.
1997 'The Chronicler as Historian: A Comparativist Perspective', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997: 19-29.

Hooker, P.K.
2001 *First and Second Chronicles* (Westminster Bible Companion; London: Westminster John Knox).

Japhet, S.
1993 *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (The Old Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox).

1997 *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ, 9; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2nd rev. edn [1989]).

1999 'Exile and Restoration in the Book of Chronicles', in B. Becking and M.C.A. Korpel (eds.), *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times* (Oudtestamentische Studiën, 42; Leiden: Brill): 33-44.

Jarick, J.
2002 *1 Chronicles* (London: Sheffield Academic Press).

Johnstone, W.
1997 *1 and 2 Chronicles* (2 vols.; JSOTSup, 253-54; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

1998 *Chronicles and Exodus: An Analogy and its Application* (JSOTSup, 275; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Jones, G.H.
1993 *1 & 2 Chronicles* (Old Testament Guides; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Kalimi, I.
1995 *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten: Literarisch-historiographische Abweichungen der Chronik von ihren Paralleltexten in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern* (BZAW, 226; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
1997 'Was the Chronicler a Historian?', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997: 73-89.
1998 'History of Interpretation: The Book of Chronicles in Jewish Tradition form Daniel to Spinoza', *RB* 105: 5-41.
2000 *The Book of Chronicles: Historical Writing and Literary Devices* (Hebrew) (Biblical Encyclopaedia Library, 18; Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik).
2004 'The Date of the Book of Chronicles', in J.H. Ellens, *et al*. (eds.), *Biblical Studies in Honour of Simon John De Vries* (2 vols.; JSOTSup, 388; London: T&T Clark): I, 347-71.
2005a *An Ancient Israelite Historian* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica; Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum).
2005b *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Kartveit, M.
1999 '2 Chronicles 36.20-23 as Literary and Theological "Interface"', in Graham and McKenzie (eds.) 1999: 395-403.

Kelly, B.E.
1996 *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (JSOTSup, 211; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
2002 'Manasseh in the Books of Kings and Chronicles (2 Kings 21:1-18; 2 Chron 33: 1-20)', in Long, Baker and Wenham (eds.) 2002: 131-46.

Kimhi, D., and Y. Berger
2007 *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi to Chronicles: A Translation with Introduction and Supercommentary* (trans. Y. Berger; Brown Judaic Studies, 345; Providence, RI: Brown University Press).

Klein, R.W.
1997 'How Many in a Thousand?', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997:270-82.
1999 'The Books of Ezra & Nehemiah', in L.E. Keck (ed.), *The New Interpreter's Bible* (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press): III, 661-851.
2006 *1 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press).

Kleinig, J.W.
1994 'Recent Research in Chronicles', *CRBS* 2: 43-76.

Knibb, M.A.
1999 *Translating the Bible: The Ethiopic Version of the Old Testament* (The Schweich lectures of the British Academy, 1995; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Knoppers, G.N.
1996 Review of *Mose in den Chronikbüchern: Garant theokratisher Zukunftserwartung*, by E.M. Dörrfuss. *CBQ* 58: 705-707.
1997 'History and Historiography: The Royal Reforms', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997: 178-203.
2003a *I Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible, 12; New York: Doubleday).

2003b 'Greek Historiography and the Chronicler's History: A Reexamination', *JBL* 122: 627-50.

2004 *I Chronicles, 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible, 12A; New York: Doubleday).

Knoppers, G.N. (ed.)
2005 'In Conversation with W. M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge, 2003)', *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 5: Art. 18. http://www.jhsonline.org.

Koch, K.
1996 'Weltordnung und Reichsidee im alten Iran', in P. Frei and K. Koch (eds.), *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 55; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2nd edn): 133-337.

Koorevaar, H.J.
1997 'Die Chronik als intendierter Abschluss des alttestamentlichen Kanons', *JETh* 11: 42-76.

Laubach, F.
2000 *Das erste Buch der Chronik* (Wuppertaler Studienbibel; Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag; for 2 Chronicles, see Bräumer).

Lemche, N.P.
2001 'The Old Testament: A Hellenistic Book?', in Grabbe (ed.) 2001: 287-318.

Lemke, W.
1963 'Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History' (unpublished ThD thesis, Divinity School, Harvard University Press).

1965 'The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History', *HTR* 58: 349-63.

Levin, Y.
2001 'Understanding Biblical Genealogies', *CRBS* 9: 11-46.

2003 'Who Was the Chronicler's Audience? A Hint from His Genealogies', *JBL* 122: 229-45.

Long, V.P., D.W. Baker and G.J. Wenham (eds.)
2002 *Windows into Old Testament History: Evidence, Argument, and the Crisis of 'Biblical Israel'* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Mason, R.
1990 *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

McKenzie, S.L.
1984 *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM, 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

1999 'The Chronicler as Redactor', in Graham and McKenzie (eds.) 1999: 70-90.

2004 *1–2 Chronicles* (Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon Press).

Millard, A.R.
2005 'Writing, Writing Materials and Literacy in the Ancient Near East', in Arnold and Williamson (eds.) 2005: 1003-11.

More, T.
2001 *Utopia* (trans. C.H. Miller [orig. 1516]; repr. New Haven: Yale University Press).

Murray, D.F.
2000 'Retribution and Revival: Theological Theory, Religious Praxis, and the Future in Chronicles', *JSOT* 88: 77-99.

Nelson, R.D.
1993 *Raising Up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox).

Niditch, S.
1996 *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville: Westminster John Knox).

Noth, M.
1987 *The Chronicler's History* (trans. H.G.M. Williamson; JSOTSup, 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press [1943]).

Pavlovský, V.
1957 'Die Chronologie der Tätigkeit Esdras. Versuch einer neuen Lösung (I)', *Biblica* (new series) 38: 275-305.

Peltonen, K.
1996 *History Debated: The Historical Reliability of Chronicles in Pre-Critical and Critical Research* (2 vols.; Finnish Exegetical Society, 64; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society).

1999 'Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena: Aspects of Source Criticism as Theory and Method in the History of Chronicles Research', in Graham and McKenzie (eds.) 1999: 18-69.

2001 'A Jigsaw without a Model? The Date of Chronicles', in Grabbe (ed.) 2001: 225-71.

Person, Jr., R.F.
2002 *The Deuteronomic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature* (Studies in Biblical Literature, 2: Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

2007 'The Deuteronomic History and the Books of Chronicles: Contemporary Competing Historiographies', in Rezetko, Lim and Aucker (eds.) 2007: 315-36.

Rabinovits, H., Y. Starret and S. Kaplan
2002 *Commentary to the Book of Divrey ha-yamim* (trans. Y. Starret; Da'ath Sofrim; New York and Jerusalem: H. Vagshal Publishing).

Rainey, A.F.
1997 'The Chronicler and his Sources—Historical and Geographical', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997: 30-72.

Redford, D.B.
2001 'The So-Called "Codification" of Egyptian Law under Darius I', in J.W. Watts (ed.), *Persia and Torah* (SBL Symposium Series, 17; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 135-59.

Rezetko, R.
2003 'Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles', in Young (ed.) 2003: 215-50.

2007 '"Late" Common Nouns in the Book of Chronicles', in Rezetko, Lim and Aucker (eds.) 2007: 379-417.

Rezetko, R., Lim, T.H., and W.B. Aucker (eds.)
2007 *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (Leiden and Boston: Brill).

Richards, K.H.
1995 'Reshaping Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Interpretation', in J.L. Mays, D.L. Petersen and K.H. Richards (eds.), *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, and Future* (Nashville: Abingdon Press): 211-24.

Ricoeur, P.
1986 *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (ed. G.H. Taylor; New York: Columbia University Press).

Rudolph, W.
1955 *Chronikbücher* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]).

Schniedewind, W.M.
1994 'History or Homily: Toward Understanding the Chronicler's Purpose', in *The Bible and the World* (Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies) Div. A.: 91-97.

1995 *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup, 197; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

1999 'The Chronicler as an Interpreter of Scripture', in Graham and McKenzie (eds.) 1999: 158-80.

2000 'Orality and Literacy in Ancient Israel', *RelSRev* 26: 327-32.

2004 *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Schweitzer, S.J.
2005 'Response to Recent Chronicles Commentaries by G.N. Knoppers and S.L. McKenzie', in M.D. Knowles (ed.), *'New Studies in Chronicles: A Discussion of Two Recently-Published Commentaries', Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 5: Art. 20. http://www.jhsonline.org.

2007 *Reading Utopia in Chronicles* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, 442; New York: T&T Clark).

Selman, M.J.
1994a *1 Chronicles: An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, 10a; Leicester, UK and Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).

1994b *2 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, 10b; Leicester, UK and Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).

Smith-Christopher, D.L.
1997 Review of *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Enstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik*, by G. Steins. *CBQ* 59: 754-55.

Spottorno Díaz-Caro, M.V.
1997 'The Book of Chronicles in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*', in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge, 1995* (SBLSCS, 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press): 381-90.

2001 'Lexical Variants in the Greek Text of Reigns and Chronicles', in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS, 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 63-80.

Steins, G.
1995 *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Enstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik* (Bonner biblische Beiträge, 93; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum).

1997 'Zur Datierung der Chronik: Ein neuer methodischer Ansatz', *ZAW* 109: 84-92.

Talshir, Z.
1999 *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (SBLSCS, 47; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Tertel, H.J.
1994 *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives* (BZAW, 221; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter).

Thompson, J.A.
1994 *1,2 Chronicles* (The New American Commentary, 9; Nashville: Broadman & Holman).

Torrey, C.C.
1910 *Ezra Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Trebolle, J. [same as Trebolle Barrera, J.C.]
2000 '4QChr (Pl. XXXVIII)', in E. Ulrich (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, 16; Oxford: Clarendon): 295-97.
2007 'Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Text Tradition', in Rezetko, Lim and Aucker (eds.) 2007: 483-501.

Tuell, S.S.
2001 *First and Second Chronicles* (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching; Louisville: John Knox).

Van Seters, J.
1997 'The Chronicler's Account of Solomon's Temple-Building: A Continuity Theme', in Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie (eds.) 1997: 283-300.
2007 'The "Shared Text" of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles Re-examined', in Rezetko, Lim and Aucker (eds.) 2007: 503-15.

Vaughn, A.G.
1999 *Theology, History, and Archaeology in the Chronicler's Account* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies, 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Von Rad, G.
1966 'The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles', in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (trans. E.W.T. Dicken; New York: McGraw-Hill): 267-80.

Wahl, T.P.
1988 'Chronicles: The Rewriting of History', *TBT* 26: 197-202.

Weinberg, J.
1996 *Der Chronist in seiner Mitwelt* (BZAW, 239; New York and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Weitzman, M.
1999 *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

West, M.L.
1988 'The Rise of the Greek Epic', *JHS* 108: 151-72.
1997 *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Wette, W.M.L. de
1806–1807 *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (2 vols.; Halle: Schimmelpfennig).

Willi, T.
2002 'Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an Chronik und Esra-Nehemia', *TRu* 67: 61-104.

Williams, P.J.
2002 'Israel outside the Land: The Transjordanian Tribes in 1 Chronicles 5', in Long, Baker and Wenham (eds.) 2002: 147-160.

Williamson, H.G.M.
1977 *Israel in the Book of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

1982 *1 and 2 Chronicles* (New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

1996 'The Problem with 1 Esdras', in J. Barton and D. Reimer (eds.), *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Mason* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press): 201-16.

1998 Review of *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Enstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik*, by G. Steins. *VT* 48: 285-86.

Wright, J.W.

1999 'The Fabula of the Book of Chronicles', in Graham and McKenzie (eds.) 1999: 136-55.

Young, I. (ed.)

2003 *Biblical Hebrew: Chronology and Typology* (JSOTSup, 369; London and New York: T&T Clark International).