

1. “What historians do”: The Chronicler’s historiographic goal

1. Introduction and outline of the book

Prosigamos. Mucho me he detenido en contar cuentos viejos, como dice Bernal Díaz del Castillo en “La Conquista de Nueva España,” historia que escribió para contradecir a otro historiador; en suma, lo que hacen los historiadores.

Let us continue. I’ve detained us long enough in telling old stories, as Bernal Díaz del Castillo says in *The Conquest of New Spain*, a history that he wrote to contradict another historian; in sum, what historians do.

Miguel Ángel Asturias, *Leyendas de Guatemala*

A historian’s view of the past necessarily corresponds to his or her view of the present and future. The past constructed in historiographies cannot be otherwise but constrained by the bounds of a historian’s worldview, for there are a finite number of ways, ways determined by that worldview, in which a given writer can explain events. When Hayden White writes that “every historical narrative has as its latent or manifest purpose the desire to moralize the events of which it treats,”¹ he points to the fact that historians see history as functioning according to particular rules. If there is a story or moral for readers of a history writing, it is one that, explicitly or not, promotes the writer’s worldview: this is the way history works, and so the way the present and future must also work. If a historian believes that events are largely shaped by macroeconomic factors, then, for him or her, macroeconomic factors will always largely explain human events, whether in the past or present or future. If the historian believes that the gods intervene in human affairs for particular reasons, then he or she will explain events in the past by means of such intervention, and will expect to see such intervention in the future. Baruch

¹ Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 14.

Halpern makes the same point in rather more gnomic fashion when he writes that, “[h]ostage as history is to perspective, it is, like the prediction of the future, a form of wish fulfillment.”²

History writing cannot avoid being hostage to perspective—no interpretive activity could be—but if we want to be a bit more generous in our description of what historians do, we could say that, instead of fulfilling wishes, historians write with purposes in mind—perhaps to explain the present or future in the best ways they know, or perhaps to correct what they see as mistaken interpretations of the past, or perhaps to lead readers to expect a certain range of future outcomes of current macroeconomic policies, or perhaps for some other reason—purposes that are, nonetheless, guided by rules determined by their worldviews.

This is no more or less true for Chronicles than it is for any other historiography, and our goal in this work is to get a sense of the worldview and purposes that influenced the Chronicler to shape the narrative of the past that he or she presents. Since purpose and worldview shape all history writings, to make the point that they influence the production of the Chronicler is not to condemn Chronicles as a poor piece of historiography (although such condemnations are not difficult to locate in scholarship on the work),³ but it is to suggest that the work would be better

² Baruch Halpern, “Sybil, or the Two Nations? Archaism, Kinship, Alienation, and the Elite Definition of Traditional Culture in Judah in the 8th-7th Centuries B.C.E.” in *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Jerrold S. Cooper and Glenn M. Schwartz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 291-338 (291).

³ Many scholars, in fact, conclude that the Chronicler does such a bad job of presenting the past that they do not classify Chronicles as historiography at all. For brief discussions of negative evaluations in past scholarship of Chronicles as history writing, readers may consult Kenneth G. Hoglund, “The Chronicler as Historian: A Comparativist Perspective” in *The*

understood if we could determine what purposes and worldview went into its shaping. This is particularly true since the Chronicler appears to have been sending messages to his or her audience about what to expect in the future. For the Chronicler, as for all historians, history functions according to particular rules; as for all historians, the rules by which the Chronicler believes history functions are determined by his or her worldview: this is the way history works and so the way the present and future must also work. If we want to know what the Chronicler leads readers to expect in the future, we must know as much as we can about the Chronicler's worldview and the reasons why the work was composed.

Later in this chapter I will argue that Chronicles was written in the fourth century BCE,

Chronicler as Historian, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 19-29 (19-20) and Isaac Kalimi, "Was the Chronicler a Historian?" in *The Chronicler as Historian*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 73-89 (74-78). Indeed, the first volume of W.M.L. de Wette's *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, which was published in the early nineteenth century and which might be considered the first modern work on Chronicles, makes the historical unreliability of the book a key aspect of its larger argument; see his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Halle: Schimelpfennig, 1806-1807), 1:42-132. De Wette was not the first scholar to come to this conclusion, however, since the notion that Chronicles is historically unreliable can be dated as far back as the Renaissance; see Sara Japhet, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles: The History of the Problem and its Place in Biblical Research" in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Studies on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 117-36 (117-18).

and this will provide us with enough context to turn in chapter 2 to a discussion of the most important emphasis in and purpose of Chronicles: its promotion of a restoration of the Davidides as a client monarchy within the existing empire. That Chronicles looks to a future involving Davidic leadership is hardly a new argument, but I will show in chapter 2 that Chronicles represents the past in such a way as to make this seem not only a divinely-willed inevitability for its fourth century BCE readers—the Chronicler, as we shall see, says God made an eternal covenant with the Davidides that has not been annulled—but also a viable political reality and not simply an eschatological hope. Chronicles works to persuade its Persian-period (or, less likely, as I shall discuss later in this chapter, very early Hellenistic-period) readership that they stand to benefit from the rule of a local dynasty acting as client monarchs for the imperial government. There is no sense that the Chronicler promotes a violent rebellion against imperial rule, and (almost) no sense that readers should expect a massive divine alteration of the geopolitical order; the Chronicler aims instead for support for a kind of quiet revolution in local politics, one accomplished with the acquiescence of local political stakeholders and the empire. The Achaemenid (or, less likely, Macedonian or very early Ptolemaic) government permitted, as we shall see later in this chapter, kings and dynasts to remain in power as client rulers in the Persian and early Hellenistic empires, so a Davidic restoration in such a capacity would not necessarily have seemed an a priori impossibility to fourth century Judeans.

Judean resistance to this kind of quiet revolution, a resistance that the Chronicler aims to overcome, would be rooted in the fact that the Judean elite would have held power, even if of a limited nature and subject to Persian oversight, in Judah's local governance. Because the Chronicler is writing to persuade the elite in Judah to support Davidic leadership on the local level of governance there, in the first section of chapter 2 we will explore what that local

government was like—a temple assembly, resembling those in Babylon to some extent—and so which local political stakeholders needed to be convinced that a Davidic restoration would benefit, or at least not damage, their current positions. Local government was located in a temple assembly, and so the temple was of particular importance to this community's sense of identity and was the institution at the center of their local governance and intracommunal relationships of power. In the second section of chapter 2, an examination of Chronicles' general portrayal of the monarchy, we shall see that Chronicles insists that no future Davidide would dare to violate the temple's cultic norms, or refuse to support its claim to a monopoly on the Yahwistic cult. The assembly had built and maintained the temple, and the Chronicler's message that future Davidides would honor the assembly's most important institution sent an important message as to the Davidides' respect for the current local authority and their priorities. In this portrayal of the way things were under the Davidides, the Chronicler paints a picture of Davidic rule meant to appeal to fourth-century stakeholders in the local government, but an important part of Chronicles' pro-Davidic and pro-temple message was designed to demonstrate God's intention to return the Davidides to the throne, that the Davidides and the temple were intimately connected, and that future kings would be dedicated to the well-being of the cult. The Chronicler's portrayal of the past implies that readers can expect loyal Davidic support of the temple in the future.

Some of the best known aspects of Chronicles' shaping of history, aspects that alter Samuel-Kings' presentation of the monarchy, work to make just this point. To take merely one example of the issues we will discuss in chapter 2, the Chronistic doctrine of immediate retribution—the notion that one is punished or rewarded by God in one's lifetime for one's actions—really only applies in any absolute way to royal actions. Chronicles presents a history in

which kings who do damage to the Jerusalem cult are consistently punished by the divine for such actions; Chronicles thus assures readers whose identity and location in the local power structure is based in their relationship to the temple that any future king who would dare to damage the cult will be punished with assassination, disease, a short reign, and so on, as this is just what happened to the Davidides in the past who acted in this way. In this as in other aspects of the Chronicler's history, such alterations of and additions to source material reflect the writer's choice to adopt historiographic standards from Mesopotamia. That is, if such changes might seem convenient alterations of source material given the Chronicler's purposes, the Chronicler could at least claim a historiographic warrant for his or her changes. As we shall see in chapter 2, many other important changes the Chronicler makes to the narrative of Samuel-Kings, such as the elimination of the narrative of the origins of Israel's kingship, its presentation of David and Solomon as joint temple builders, the insistence that warfare disqualifies David from building the temple, and so on, result at least in part from an adoption of tropes of kingship from the royal ideology and historiography of the Neo-Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians, Judah's past imperial masters. If these alterations to source material serve the author's pro-Davidic purposes, they also make Chronicles' interpretation of history correspond more closely than Samuel-Kings' to that of other ancient Near Eastern history writings. If our author is indeed moralizing history, fulfilling a wish of what he or she wants the past to look like so as to make readers view the future in a particular way, this does not necessarily make Chronicles a bad piece of historiography. It is at least possible that, from the author's point of view, these alterations have the benefit of being better and more widely accepted interpretations of past events.

Having examined in chapter 2 how an overall portrayal of the monarchy in Chronicles works to garner support from the temple assembly for a Davidic restoration, we will turn in the

first section of chapter 3 to the Chronicler's portrayal of the Levites and, in the second section, to the portrayal of Israel/Judah. Chronicles advances the status and roles of the Levites, certainly in comparison with the place of the Levites in the Priestly Writing's cult; in its presentation of the Levites as a group who played important roles inside and outside of the cult under Davidic rule, the Chronicler suggests they will have a similar status under a restored monarchy. The Chronicler, in short, offers them an important incentive to support the restoration. The Chronicler has little politically to offer the priests, who, as we shall see, already held important local leadership positions in fourth-century Judah, and the work seeks merely not to alienate the priesthood while offering the Levites increased status under a restored client monarchy. Chronicle's presentation of the people of Israel/Judah claims that, under the pre-exilic monarchy, "all Israel" and the assembly played a role in important political and cultic decisions, emphasizing that the Davidides did not and will not function as autocrats. Given Chronicles' insistence that the Davidides will support the temple so as to avoid divine retribution, it signals to readers in the assembly that a Davidic restoration would relieve some of the assembly's financial burden in its care for the cult. Chronicles emphasizes as well that peace is the divinely-willed condition of the people, and assures assembly members that good Davidic kings do not force the people to join their armies, at least not without the assembly's consent, nor do good kings join foreign military alliances or deliberately begin debilitating foreign wars that put Judean lives and property at risk. The good Davidides of the past carefully tended the cult in Jerusalem and were rewarded by God with victories that seem to result in no casualties to their own forces. The Chronicler understands immediate retribution as applying to military issues under the monarch's oversight as well as cultic ones, insisting that God punishes not only those kings who do not wholly support the Jerusalem cult but also those who engage in foreign

military alliances and so who do not demonstrate complete trust in God to save in the case of a foreign invasion. Those two issues are, of course, related for the Chronicler, since God only saves those kings who are cultically loyal. As the Chronicler presents things, no future Davidide would dare risk his reign or life by failing to support the temple cult, and the readers in the assembly can rest assured that no Davidide would dare make a foreign alliance that might result in a military response by the empire, who could see it as a threat of rebellion.

In chapters 2 and 3, then, we will discuss Chronicles' positive message: it is pro-Davidic, pro-temple, pro-Levite, and pro-assembly. If the Chronicler works to promote a quiet revolution, a Davidic movement that hopes to see a king take power as a Persian (or, less likely, early Hellenistic) client, he or she is arguing that this will ultimately benefit the current political stakeholders who are addressed by the work. The Chronicler admits that some Davidides in the past refused to support the Jerusalem cult, and that some made foreign military alliances, but presents a past in which such kings are always punished. The divine cause and effect that rules history brings justice in these cases, disincentivizes future Davidides from following in the footsteps of their sinful ancestors, and so gives current local powerbrokers reasons to support a restoration. Chronicles' message is not entirely positive, however, and in chapter 4, where we investigate the difficulties in interpreting the Chronicler's version of the story of Josiah's death, we find a somewhat, although not entirely, negative presentation of prophecy. Prophets, who are in the position to challenge royal decisions with messages of divine disapproval, are a group whose power Chronicles limits. Chronicles cannot be said to be anti-prophetic, but the work ultimately limits true prophecy to directions and exhortations that correspond to Chronistic theology; from the author's standpoint, Chronicles' true interpretation of history articulates a theology that renders prophecy unnecessary. Readers should not trust prophets who speak

against royal actions unless such speech conforms to Chronistic norms, norms that provide the assembly and Levites and even priests with particular privileges within the context of royal rule. So in the context of a restored local monarchy, prophets could speak against kings when they violate temple norms or make dangerous foreign military alliances, but assembly members would have no reason to trust the validity of a prophetic word not clearly in line with Chronistic theology, especially not one that attempts to limit royal actions in manners of which the Chronicler would not approve.

Chapter 4 will also return to the presentation of peace in Chronicles, since the prophetess Huldah says that Josiah will die *מָוֶלְךָ בְּשָׁלוֹם* “in peace” (2 Chr 34:28), despite the fact that he dies in battle against Neco the Egyptian, who becomes Judah’s suzerain after Josiah’s death. This story extends Chronicles’ concept of peace, and suggests, if only subtly, that the true sense of peace is one in which the Davidides rule not as clients but independently; Josiah, that is, dies “in peace” because he is the last Davidide to rule without imperial supervision. Chronicles does not breathe a word of open rebellion against Persia, nor openly speculate about a future in which God acts to overthrow Persian power, but only hints at this as a possibility to readers, perhaps, as we shall suggest in chapter 6, to appeal to the sensibilities and support of those in the Judean assembly who await a great divine act in history. This then allows us to move in chapter 5 to another negative argument for Davidic rule, and there we will examine Achaemenid royal ideology and its claim that it is Persia who provides peace to the colonial subjects of the empire. The violence throughout the Persian empire in the fifth and fourth centuries must have mightily challenged this claim, and Chronicles argues instead that it is care for the cult, a care that good Davidides can be counted on to provide, that will guarantee peace for Judah.⁴ The Chronistic

⁴ As I will discuss below, even if Chronicles was written in the final decades of the fourth

concept of peace and the manner in which the book presents it as being achieved function as a subtle critique of Achaemenid rule, a negative argument for why the temple assembly should support the reinstatement of the Davidides as rulers, even if as clients to Persia, since proper Davidic governing of the cult can guarantee peace for Judah in a way that the Achaemenids simply cannot.

Once we understand that Chronicles comes from a pro-Davidic group hoping to gain the backing of interest groups within Judah's local government to support an approach to the Persians for the creation of a Davidic client monarchy, we can explain many aspects of the work. We need no longer argue as to whether Chronicles is either pro-Davidic or pro-Levitical; it is both. As we shall see in chapter 3, the appeal for Levitical support explains the alterations to the tabernacle cult that David makes in Chronicles as he prepares for temple construction, since his new temple cult results in an increase in the status and duties of the Levites. The Chronicler can therefore justify a new relationship between priests and Levites, one that supersedes that of the Priestly Writing, since the temple supersedes the tabernacle. Chronicles' insistence that "all Israel" plays a role in important cultic and even political decisions is a way to assure the fourth century assembly that their existing power will not be stripped from them when a Davidide is installed. Chronicles' well known doctrine of immediate retribution signals that no future Davidide would dare violate the cultic norms of the temple, the center of the assembly's identity

century, after Achaemenid rule, we could hardly expect a writing dealing with kingship not to interact with the dominant royal ideology of the previous two centuries, especially as the Macedonian rulers, the Ptolemies, and the Antigonids hardly had enough time to widely broadcast any kind of royal ideology by 300 BCE. As we shall see, however, from a Palestinian point of view they did contribute to an awareness of the world as full of violence.

and the basis of their political relationships in local government, for such violations always result in the punishment of the king who perpetrates them. We will see in the following chapters that these and many other aspects of Chronicles' narrative, such as the rationale Chronicles provides for God's refusal to allow David to build the temple, the presentation of a joint reign of David and Solomon, the omission of almost all of Samuel-Kings' stories of the North, the Chronicler's choice to begin his or her narrative with the death of Saul, and so on, can be explained by the Chronicler's desire to gain the support of the temple assembly, including that of the Levites, for an appeal to the Persian government for the establishment of the Davidides as a client dynasty. The Chronicler and, one imagines, the pro-Davidic party of which he or she was a part, simply did not feel that the Persians would change the existing polity on the local level in Judah unless a broad swath of the elite found it to be an acceptable alteration of the status quo; an unhappy populace, after all, is a potentially rebellious one. A future Davidide, moreover, would find it difficult to do much at the local level if working with a recalcitrant elite, and since we would expect that a local dynasty would take the place of the existing Persian governor and his bureaucratic apparatus, as I will explain in the next section of this chapter, the Davidide would be blamed by Persia if the Judean elite made it difficult for him to collect Judah's tax and otherwise act on the empire's behalf. A pro-Davidic party could hardly hope that a future client ruler could flourish in a newly reestablished kingly office if the elite were working to undermine him and conspiring to have him replaced by a governor appointed by the empire.

Chronicles, of course, was not the only biblical writing produced in the Persian period, yet it is the only one with an extensive reflection on the nature and role of the monarchy. In chapter 6 we will search for traces of the pro-Davidic worldview that we see in Chronicles in Judean works from the sixth through fourth centuries BCE, as well as worldviews of assembly

groups that might have been opposed to the Chronicler's quiet revolution. Zech 12:8, 10, 12 refer to "the house of David," pointing to a post-exilic group that understood itself to be descended from the royal family. This may be the group from which Chronicles originated, but there is evidence from other works from these centuries, works not produced by authors directly associated with the house of David, that there was support from other factions within the assembly for a Davidic restoration. In the sixth century, Haggai and First Zechariah aimed to unite a pro-Davidic assembly group with one that wished to maintain power in the assembly itself. Pro-Davidic sentiment existed outside of the group that claimed Davidic lineage; Haggai and First Zechariah give us evidence for an attempt to incorporate a pro-Davidic group or groups into the temple-building project, indicating that their support for the project was necessary and so that their influence in the early post-exilic assembly was not small. There were likely other groups who supported a Davidic restoration for a variety of reasons, and Chronicles may have come from one of these, or perhaps from a larger pro-Davidic coalition. Ezekiel 40-48 demonstrates that pro-Davidic sentiment could exist within a priestly group during the exile, although this group was not the Aaronides, the priests who eventually took control of the cultic administration in the Persian period, as we will discuss in chapter 3. Ezekiel 40-48 emerges from the Zadokites, and this priestly faction saw a place for Davidic rule even while the Aaronides did not. The Persian period works Malachi and Third Isaiah add to our knowledge of rifts between different assembly groups both inside and outside of the cultic personnel, rifts that the Chronicler largely works to elide in order to gain as much assembly support for Davidic rule as possible. The Chronicler failed in this goal, of course, and in the second part of chapter 6 we will compare Chronicles to Ezra-Nehemiah, a pro-Persian work written around 400 BCE that has no room at all for a Davidic monarchy, emphasizing instead the necessity for the assembly to remain loyal

subjects to the Achaemenids. In Ezra-Nehemiah, we see at least one kind of theological support for the political status quo of the Persian period, and so we see in it at least one set of beliefs the Chronicler was working to change.

Chronicles is the only work from these centuries that clearly and forcefully articulates powerful, important, extensive, and specific roles for the Davidides in its portrayal of a reformed Judean polity. Even a work like Second Zechariah, which, as we shall see, emerged from a group that could be described as pro-Davidic, portrays the Davidide merely as a figurehead with no real powers, and the group for which Second Zechariah speaks may well have been opposed to the authoritative and powerful roles for the Davidide the Chronicler promoted. Chronicles advances the political interests of one group or coalition in fourth-century Judah, interests that were in competition with those of other groups in the local Judean power structure who could look to a work like Ezra-Nehemiah for a historiographical and theological defense of the existing polity. Insofar as the Chronicler, like any other historian, moralizes history, he or she assumes a set of rules by which history functions and that derive from his or her understanding of the way the world is ordered: kings who do not look after the cult in Jerusalem are punished by God; Davidic care for the cult is rewarded by divinely-bestowed peace; and so on. This is how God guided events in the past according to the Chronicler, and so it stands to reason that God, who has made an eternal covenant with the Davidides and so will restore them to power, will apply the same guiding arm to events in the future. If the kinds of causative explanations of the past through which the Chronicler creates his or her historiographical narrative are “wish fulfillment” as Halpern puts it, if they work toward the purpose of convincing readers of the need for a quiet revolution in polity that will restore the Davidides as client rulers, this act of writing history with a purpose is not really different than what any historian does. The Chronicler follows rules of

historiography of his or her time in appropriating and interpreting source material, part of the process of trying to convince assembly groups with other political agendas that the work accurately represents the ways things were under Davidic rule and so the way things would be following a restoration. What matters to us is to grasp what kind of rules the Chronicler presents as guiding history and what kind of wish he or she is fulfilling. Only then will we be able to see why the Chronicler has produced the kind of history that he or she has.

2. The date of Chronicles and client monarchies in the fourth century BCE

Before I can launch into the series of arguments summarized above, I need to explain why we know that Chronicles was written in the fourth century BCE, and why it would not be outside of the realm of possibility for fourth-century Judeans to conceive of a local dynasty regaining power as client rulers to the imperial government. A scholarly consensus has formed around the dating of Chronicles to the fourth century, and for some good reasons. 1 Chr 9:22 and 2 Chr 36:22-23 refer to the post-exilic period, and the work contains Persian loanwords, including *Ndn* “sheath” (1 Chr 21:27), *rbrp* “colonnade, structure” (26:18), *Kzng* “treasury” (28:11), *Mynkrd* “darics” (29:7), and *lymrk* “crimson” (2 Chr 2:6, 13 [7, 14]; 3:14), which point to a date no earlier than the Persian period, and really no earlier than the fifth century, since darics were not minted until about 500 BCE, and it would have taken some time for Hebrew to have adopted words from Persian.⁵ 2 Chr 16:9 cites Zech 4:10, and 2 Chr 15:5 cites Zech 8:10,⁶

⁵ Hebrew *nādān* is assumedly a loanword from Old Persian **nidāna*, since we find Middle Persian *nidāman* and Farsi *niyām* “container.” Hebrew *ganzak* likely reached the language through Aramaic, the Persian Empire’s official language of correspondence; Biblical Aramaic has *yzng tyb* “treasury” (Ezra 5:17; 6:1; 7:20), and in Official Aramaic we find

gnz ‘“treasury” (e.g., TAD B8.5.2.3; C3.19.21), but this is itself a loanword from Old Persian, since we have Farsi *ganj* “treasury.” (Note also Aramaic *gnzbr* ‘“treasurer” [e.g., OIP 92:1.4; 12.3; 14.3; 15.3] from Old Persian **ganzabara-*, which would have the literal sense of “one who bears treasure.”) The final *-ak* of the Hebrew *ganzak* reflects an Iranian suffix; see Maximilian Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the Old Testament: Their Origin and Etymology* (London: Luzac & Company, 1962), 57. Hebrew *karmûl* reflects Farsi *kirmiz-i-tîrah* “purple,” from *kirm* “worm.” The Hebrew *parbâr* (and note also *parwârîm* in 2 Kgs 23:11) may derive from an Old Persian word from the same Iranian root as Pahlavi *parwâr* “forecourt”; see Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words*, 37-38. For others who use Persian loanwords to help date Chronicles, see, e.g., H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCBC (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), 15-16; Sara Japhet, *1 and II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1993), 25-26; Kai Peltonen, “A Jigsaw without a Model? The Date of Chronicles” in *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography in the Hellenistic Period*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe, JSOTSup 317, ESHM 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 225-71 (229-30); Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary* Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 15. Some scholars—e.g., Rudolf Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*, FTS 92 (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), 105-106—argue that 1 Chr 29:7, where the word “darics” appears, is a later addition, but this hardly changes the fact that we would not expect a series of Persian loanwords to appear in a Judean work produced in the first few decades of the Persian period.

⁶ Zech 4:10 states, in part, that Cr) h-1kb My++w# \$m hmh hwhy yny (“the eyes of Yhwh range through all the earth”; 2 Chr 16:9 says “Yhwh, his eyes range through all the earth.” Zech 8:10 says, in part, Mw1# \$ Ny)) b1w) cwyl “for the one going out and the one coming in there was no peace”; 2 Chr 15:5 says “there was no peace for the one going out or

placing Chronicles not just after this late-sixth century prophet, but late enough for a book to begin to form around Zechariah's prophecy and to become authoritative in some fashion.⁷

If Chronicles cannot be dated earlier than the fifth century, it also cannot really be dated much later than the fourth. There are no Greek loanwords in Chronicles or anything that clearly reflects exposure to Hellenistic culture.⁸ Chronicles is certainly known and considered

coming in.”

⁷ For studies of the dependence of these verses in Chronicles on Zechariah and other works, see, e.g., Rex Mason, *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 49-51; William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period*, JSOTSup 197 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 112-15; Peltonen, “A Jigsaw without a Model?” 229-30; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 15; Pancrattius C. Beentjes, “Historical Persons or Literary Characters: Prophets in the Book of Chronicles” in *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 129-39 (137); Ehud Ben Zvi, “Chronicles and its Reshaping of Memories of Monarchic Period Prophets: Some Observations” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Ancient Israelite Historiography*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Lissa M. Wray Beal (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 167-88 (185 n. 39).

⁸ Peter Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern*, WMANT 42 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), 105-11 argues that the division of the army in 2 Chr. 14.7 [8] into heavy and light infantry reflects familiarity with the warfare of the mainland Greeks, and that the term $\tau\omega\nu\beta\#\eta$ in 2 Chr 26:15 refers to catapults, unknown in Palestine until the time of Alexander. Greek mercenaries, however, served in the Egyptian and Persian armies as early as the sixth century—see, e.g., A. Fantalkin, “Mezad Ḥashavyahu: Its

authoritative by the early-second century BCE, however, since Sir 47:8-10 draws on the Chronic tradition that makes David the founder of the temple singers, and Dan 1:2 cites 2 Chr 36:6-7.⁹ For Chronicles to be considered authoritative by this point, it could really not have been

Material Culture and Historical Background” *TA* 28 (2001): 3-165 (128-47)—and Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in Light of Archaeological Discovery*, trans. M. Pearlman (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), 326-27 says תַּנְבֹּט simply refers to a platform used for shooting arrows and dropping stones.

⁹ Dan 1:2, like 2 Chr 36:6-7 but unlike 2 Kgs 24:6, says Nebuchadnezzar took Jehoiakim into exile. For these and other second century writings that appear to draw from Chronicles, see Isaac Kalimi, “The Date of the Book of Chronicles” in *God’s Word for Our World: Biblical Studies in Honor of Simon John De Vries*, ed. J. Harold Ellens et al., JSOTSup 388-389 (London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 1:347-371 (357-59). Yigael Yadin also argues that the Temple Scroll from Qumran proceeds from the assumption that David received a תַּנְבֹּט “blueprint” for the temple as narrated in 1 Chr 28:19; see his *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:82-83. Since the earliest texts of the Temple Scroll are from the second century BCE—see Lawrence H. Schiffman, James H. Charlesworth, and Andrew D. Gross, “Introduction” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation*, ed. James H. Charlesworth; (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994-), 7:1-11 (4-5)—that would mean, if Yadin is correct, that on the basis of this evidence Chronicles could not be dated later than the third century. A text at Qumran that obviously reflects Chronicles’ story of David as temple founder is 4Q522 9 II, 1-6 from the Prophecy of Joshua, which clearly draws on Chronicles’ depiction of David as collecting material to build the temple. This does little to help us date Chronicles, though, since Emile Puech puts 4Q522 in the late Hasmonean period; see his

written later than the mid-third century, and if there is anything in Chronicles itself that allows us to be more precise in our dating of the work than simply placing it between the early-fifth and mid-third centuries it is the Davidic genealogy of 1 Chr 3:1-24. Of all the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 2-8, only this one extends beyond the exile. The difficulty with 3:19-24, the part of the list that begins with Zerubbabel, who went from Babylon to Judah in the late-sixth century (Ezra 2:2; 3:2, 8; 4:3; 5:1), is that the MT counts six generations after Zerubbabel to the end of the list and the LXX counts eleven. The MT and LXX contain the same names; what differs is whether some of the names belong to the same generation or represent a series of them. If we assume twenty years to a generation, then MT 3:19-24 takes us to about 400 BCE, and LXX to about 300. As this is the only genealogy in 1 Chronicles 2-8 that extends beyond the exile, it makes some sense to believe the author was tracing the Davidic line to his or her own day, and so we can date Chronicles to the fourth century.¹⁰ As Isaac Kalimi and others note, the MT here is the more difficult text, and it is likely that the LXX translator was trying to clarify the original text, which would lead us to conclude that the MT of these verses more closely represents the original version, and thus that Chronicles was written closer to 400 than to 300.¹¹

Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579), DJD 25 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 40-41.

¹⁰ So also, e.g., Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 26; Peltonen, “A Jigsaw without a Model?” 229; Steven L. McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, AOTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004), 31; Klein, *I Chronicles*, 14-15.

¹¹ See particularly Kalimi, “The Date of the Book of Chronicles,” 363-65. The differences between the MT and LXX are most glaring in 3:21, where LXX adds five generations to the more difficult MT. The MT here has a string of personal names, each followed

Chronicles, then, is a fourth-century work, most likely written before Alexander's destruction of the Persian Empire. Since I am arguing that Chronicles promotes a Davidic restoration as a client monarchy under the Persians, we need to consider the question as to whether or not Judeans living at this time would even conceive of this as a viable possibility. The genealogy of 1 Chronicles 3 certainly tells us that there were figures who identified as Davidides and who could be returned to power if the political context permitted, and, as we have seen, Zechariah 12, either from the late Persian period or early Hellenistic period,¹² refers to the existence of "the house of David," claiming at one point that "the house of David will be like God" (12.8). Many scholars have argued that the Chronicler believed the Davidides would return to power, and some of them use the term "messianism" to refer to this belief.¹³ It is possible that

by *ynb*, except for the final one. The LXX, though, reads each occurrence of *ynb* as *wnb* "his son," which solves the difficulty of how to read *ynb* in this context by making each personal name the son of the previous one. The MT of 3:21, however, can be read as referring to a single generation, with emphasis placed on the fact that each of these brothers had descendants themselves. So a translation of the more original version of 3:21 should read: "and the son of Hananiah, Pelatiah, and Jeconiah, the sons of Rephiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah, the sons of Shecaniah." See Thomas Willi, *Chronik*, BKAT 24 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991-), 118-19; Klein, *I Chronicles*, 109-10. And, as Sara Japhet notes (*I and II Chronicles*, 101), if one follows the LXX, then a final *wnb* must be added to the end of the verse, making the MT the shorter as well as the more difficult reading.

¹² See chapter 6 for a discussion of the date of Second Zechariah.

¹³ Among just some of the many works that make this point, see Gerhard von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, BWANT 54 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 119-32;

the Chronicler believed God was about to drastically change the existing political order, a matter

G. Johannes Botterweck, "Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte," *ThQ* 136 (1956): 402-35; Adrien M. Brunet, "La theologie du Chroniste: Theocratie et messianisme," *SacPag* 1 (1959): 384-97; David Noel Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 436-42; Jacob M. Myers, "The Kerygma of the Chronicler: History and Theology in the Service of Religion," *Int* 20 (1966): 259-73 (266-67); James D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and his Purposes," *JBL* 94 (1975): 201-17 (208-15); Magne Saebø, "Messianism in Chronicles? Some Remarks to the Old Testament Background of the New Testament Christology," *HBT* 2 (1980): 85-109; Tae-Soo Im, *Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern: David als Idealbild des theokratischen Messianismus für den Chronisten*, EUS 23/263 (Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 1985), 120-24, 164-79; Martin Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, trans. H.G.M. Williamson, JSOTSup 50 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 105; Mark A. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, SBLDS 93 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 89-107; Manfred Oeming, *Das wahre Israel: Die "genealogische Vorhalle" 1 Chronik 1-9*, BWANT 128 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1990), 209; Ingeborg Gabriel, *Friede über Israel: Eine Untersuchung zur Friedenstheologie in Chronik I, 10-II*, 36, ÖBS 10 (Klosterneuburg: Verlag Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), 202-203; Frank Moore Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judaeen Restoration" in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 151-72 (169-70); Gary N. Knoppers, "Israel's First King and 'the kingdom of Yhwh in the hands of the sons of David': The Place of the Saulide Monarchy in the Chronicler's Historiography" in *Saul in Story and Tradition*, ed. Carl S. Ehrlich, FAT, 47 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 187-213 (192).

we will discuss in chapter 4; it is certainly clear in Chronicles that no force, no matter how great, can withstand God's will in history.¹⁴ Yet while Haggai and Zechariah in the late-sixth century allow for the possibility of a pro-Davidic divine intervention in history (Hag 2:20-23; Zech 3:1-10; 4:6-10a; 6:11-13),¹⁵ or, as we will discuss in chapter 6, witness to the existence of an

¹⁴ Chronicles constantly provides examples of God giving victory in war as a reward to those kings who are loyal and defeat as punishment to those who are not; see, e.g., 2 Chr 12:1-8; 14; 18; 24:23-24; and so on. Abijah makes the explicit Chronistic point in 2 Chr 13:3-12 that God will give victory to those who care for his cult and defeat to those who despise it, no matter the size of the competing armies.

¹⁵ This is certainly the way some scholars interpret these verses; see, e.g., Sigmund Mowinckel, *He that Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*, trans. G.W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 119-20; Karl-Martin Beyse, *Serubbabel und die Königserwartungen der Propheten Haggai und Sacharja: Eine historische und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung*, AzTh 1/48 (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), 40; Janet E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, JSOTSup 150 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 143-44; J.J.M. Roberts, "The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations" in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Collected Essays* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 376-88 (386-87); John Kessler, "Haggai, Zechariah, and the Political Status of Yehud: The Signet Ring in Haggai 2:23" in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak, LHBOTS 427 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2007), 102-19 (110-17); Paul L. Redditt, "The King in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8 and the Book of the Twelve" in *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd,

assembly group who believed this would happen, Chronicles is largely engaged in the much more prosaic task of convincing Judeans outside of the pro-Davidic group that the rule of a local dynasty would benefit them. And since the Persian Empire (and even the Hellenistic rulers of the late-fourth century, although it is unlikely that Chronicles was written that late) permitted the existence of client dynasties, it would hardly have been out of the question that Judeans of the fourth century, even ones not of a pro-Davidic group, could believe that the imperial power would allow a Davidic restoration under the right circumstances. They might even be willing to support a request to the imperial government to restore a local dynasty if they could be convinced that it would be to their benefit.

It would certainly have been no secret to the elite Judeans, the local political stakeholders whom the Chronicler hoped to convince to lend such support, that the Persians permitted client kings to exercise local power within the empire. While Xenophon says that the Great King of Persia imposed an administration led by satraps and military commanders throughout Persia's colonies (*Cyr.* 8.6.9-19;¹⁶ *Oec.* 4.9-11),¹⁷ and while Judah had a series of Persian-appointed

LHBOTS 475 (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2008), 56-82 (59-62).

¹⁶ It is now often asserted that Xenophon did not write the *Cyropaedia*—see, e.g., Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, “The Great Kings of the Fourth Century and the Greek Memory of the Persian Past” in *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, ed. John Marincola, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, and Calum Maciver, ELS 6 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 317-46 (319), although see also Christopher Tuplin, “Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*: Fictive History, Political Analysis and Thinking with Iranian Kings” in *Every Inch a King: Comparative Studies on Kings and Kingship in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*, ed. Lynette Mitchell and Charles Melville, RE 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 67-90 (67-69)—

governors responsible to the imperial administration,¹⁸ there was a wide variety in governance at the local level in the empire, including democracies, tyrannies, temple assemblies, and monarchies.¹⁹ To focus specifically on client monarchies operating on the local level in the

but I will continue to refer to him as its author for the sake of convenience.

¹⁷ For studies of this overarching administration imposed throughout the empire by the Persians, see Christopher Tuplin, “Persian Garrisons in Xenophon and Other Sources” in *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory*, ed. Amélie Kuhrt and Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1988), 67-70; Andrew R. Meadows, “The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire” in *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia*, ed. John Curtis and Nigel Tallis (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 181-209; Matt Waters, “Applied Royal Directive: Pissouthnes and Samos” in *Der Achämenidenhof/The Achaemenid Court*, ed. Bruno Jacobs and Robert Rollinger, CeO 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 817-28; Christopher Tuplin, “Xenophon and Achaemenid Courts” in *Der Achämenidenhof/The Achaemenid Court*, ed. Bruno Jacobs and Robert Rollinger, CeO 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 189-230.

¹⁸ For one reconstructed list of them, see James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 99-111.

¹⁹ On this point, see Pierre Briant, “Pouvoir central et polycentrisme culturel dans l’empire achéménide: Quelques réflexions et suggestions” in *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Synthesis*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1987), 1-31 (2) and Muhammad A. Dandamaev and Vladimir G. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran*, trans. Philip L. Kohl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 106.

Persian Empire, in Asia Minor the Cilicians likely came under Persian authority with the defeat of Croesus in 547/6, yet their kings continued to rule with client status to the Persians (Xenophon, *Cyr.* 7.4.2; 8.6.8).²⁰ Herodotus refers to Syennis ruling as a king in Cilicia in 499 (5.118.2), and a client monarchy was still in place there a century later (Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.2.12, 23). These royal houses acted to govern local affairs, but they also took the place of the local Persian administration; Aulus Gellius writes that Mausolus, a fourth century member of the Hecatomnid dynasty in Caria in Asia Minor, was “king of the land of Caria,” but also “prefect of the province, what the Greeks call a satrap” (*Noct. att.* 10.18.2).²¹ Members of these dynasties intermarried; for example, Herodotus says that Mausolus’s son Pixodarus, who was satrap of nearby Lycia (*GHI* 78.1-2), married a daughter of Syennis (5.118.2).²² In such cases client rulers rather than Persian satraps or governors were responsible for ensuring that the Great King received his tribute and military support. For example, the Cilician dynasts were required to pay tribute, part of which maintained the Persian garrison there, and to send soldiers to the Great King’s army (Herodotus 3.90; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 7.4.2; *Anab.* 8.6.8); the queen of Halicarnassus

²⁰ See A. Lemaire and H. Lozachmeur, “La Cilicie à l’époque perse, recherches sur les pouvoirs locaux et l’organisation du territoire,” *Transeu* 3 (1990):143-55 (145).

²¹ See Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 667-68, 767. Polyaeus also refers to Mausolus as “king of Caria” (7.23.1), and a Greek inscription describes him as satrap (*GHI* 54.2, 18, 33).

²² For a study of the dynasty of which Mausolus and Pixodarus were a part, see Stephen Ruzicka, *Politics of a Persian Dynasty: The Hecatomnids in the Fourth Century B.C.*, OSCC (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992).

had to supply five of the 70 ships that the Carians sent in Xerxes' invasion of Greece (Herodotus 7.99); Syennis supplied financial and military support to the Persians (Xenophon *Anab.* 1.2.27; Diodorus 14.23), and so on.²³ So long as local dynasts remained loyal, they would take the place of satraps and governors and execute the tasks of such officials. It is possible that the Persians bound their clients with suzerainty treaties as the Neo-Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians had before them;²⁴ Diodorus, for example, says that Persia's relationship with Sidon was characterized by *fili/a* 'love, friendship' (17.47.1), perhaps a reflection of the use of Akkadian *rāmu/ra'āmu* 'love' in ancient Near Eastern treaties, a term that refers to the loyalty owed by clients to their imperial rulers.²⁵

²³ For a discussion of these and other examples of client rulers in Asia Minor providing tribute and military aid to Persia, see Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 497-99.

²⁴ Neo-Assyrian treaties are collected in SAA 2. There are no extant Neo-Babylonian treaties, but Ezek 17:11-18 says that Judah was under treaty to Babylon, and it would make sense that the Neo-Babylonians, whose empire succeeded that of the Neo-Assyrians, would have adopted the same manner of dealing with client kings.

²⁵ Briant makes a connection between *fili/a* and the Neo-Assyrian *adê* treaties (*From Cyrus to Alexander*, 766-67). For an introduction to the antiquity of the use of *rāmu* in expressing ancient Near Eastern political relationships, see William L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy" in *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature*, ed. Ronald S. Hendel, CBQMS 35 (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2002), 170-81. For the Neo-Assyrian use of it in treaties with client rulers, see SAA 2:6.207-208, 266-268; 9.32-34. The Greek use of *fili/a*, however, does not always imply a formal treaty; for studies of its political usage, see Lynette G.

Local dynasties could, of course, prove to be problematic for the imperial government. Theopompus refers to a war between two client Lycian kings in Asia Minor (*FGH* 115 F103), and on Cyprus, where the nine major cities maintained their dynasties throughout the Persian period without the oversight of a satrap (Diodorus 16.42.4; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 7.4.2), King Evagoras of Salamis launched a war against the other Cypriot kings. By 390/89 Evagoras was receiving aid from the Athenians (Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.8.24), who were well aware that the Persians needed to secure Cyprus in order to recapture Egypt. Evagoras had, in fact, allied himself with Egypt (Diodorus 15.2.3), and Persia was forced to intervene in the Cypriot war (Diodorus 15.3-4). Xenophon writes that the king of Paphlagonia, a Persian client, rebelled against Persia in the early-fourth century and joined the Spartan forces fighting against Persia in Asia Minor (*Hell.* 4.1.2-3). And although we could multiply known instances of client rulers rebelling against Persia or acting against the empire's wishes, the Achaemenids exhibited no particular bias against local dynasties, and Herodotus writes that the Persians were willing to restore to power even the sons of client kings who had rebelled against them (3.15.2). Evagoras, for example, was allowed to remain in power after his defeat, and he agreed to once again become a faithful client, render tribute, and not expand his sphere of control beyond Salamis (Diodorus 15.8.1-3, 9.1-2). The two client kings of the Cadusians—a people from northwestern Iran—rebelled against Artaxerxes II, but were convinced to make peace with him before meeting

Mitchell, “*fili/a, eulnoia* and Greek Interstate Relations,” *Antichthon* 31 (1997): 28-44 and Matthew W. Waters, “Earth, Water, and Friendship with the King: Argos and Persia in the Mid-Fifth Century” in *Extraction and Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*, ed. Michael Kozuh et al., SAOS 68 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2014), 331-36.

his forces in battle, thereby gaining (or regaining) *filii/an...kai\ summaxi/an* “friendship...and alliance” (Plutarch, *Art.* 24.3-5).²⁶ When Gorgus, an earlier king of Salamis, was overthrown by his brother who joined the Ionian Revolt of 499-493 (Herodotus 5.104), Darius restored Gorgus and the royal house to power after crushing the revolt (5.115). And while King Tennes of Sidon was executed by Artaxerxes III for his role in leading a rebellion in Phoenicia in the fourth century (Diodorus 15.45.4), Arrian refers to a king of Sidon at the time of Alexander (*Anab.* 2.13.7-8), which tells us the monarchy had been reestablished there by the Persians after the rebellion.²⁷ In the case of the Egyptian revolt of 464-454, Thucydides writes that the Persians were never able to capture and defeat the rebels Amyrtaeus and Inarus (1.109.1; 1.110.2), and Herodotus says the Persians eventually recognized their sons as client rulers (3.15); in this case, it is likely that the Persians simply could not dislodge the rebels, and agreed to recognize their authority so long as they ceased their rebellion and agreed to become clients.²⁸

We know of client rulers to the Achaemenids as far to the east as the Zagros Mountains

²⁶ Xenophon says in *Cyr.* 8.7.11 that Cyrus appointed one of his sons as satrap over an area that included Cadusia, which suggests that these client rulers were responsible to a level of imperial administration below that of the Great King. *Cyr.* 5.3.22-24 tells us the Cadusians were clients at the time of Cyrus, for in this story he addresses them and others as *su&mmaxoi* “allies” (5.3.30, 4.19).

²⁷ The rule of Sidon may have been given to Evagoras of Salamis after the time of Tennes, but in 343 ‘Abd’astart, perhaps of the same dynasty as Tennes, took the throne. See J. Elayi, “An Updated Chronology of the Reigns of Phoenician Kings during the Persian Period (539-333 BCE)” *Transeu* 32 (2006): 11-43 (19-20).

²⁸ So Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 575-76.

in western Persia (Plutarch, *Art.* 24) and the Indus Valley (Quintus Curtius 10.1.1), but of course the client kings closest and, one imagines, best known to the Judeans were in Phoenicia, and the local monarchies remained in power there throughout the period.²⁹ It is possible that they coexisted with some sort of Persian oversight of their activities, since there may have been a building constructed in the apadana style at Sidon, suggesting a Persian administrative structure there.³⁰ After the Tennes Rebellion, Mazday ruled as satrap over Cilicia and Across-the-River, the satrapy of which Phoenicia (and Judah) was a part, from Sidon, as witnessed by the Sidonian mints that produced his coinage until 333;³¹ his coins, nonetheless, were minted concurrently in

²⁹ For a compilation and discussion of the inscriptional evidence that demonstrates the existence of Phoenician kings during the Persian period, see Vadim S. Jigoulov, *The Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia: Being a Phoenician, Negotiating Empires*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2010), 39-70.

³⁰ The apadana was a distinctive style of Persian columned building, and was found throughout the empire; see John Curtis and Shahrokh Razmjou, “The Palace” in *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia*, ed. John Curtis and Nigel Tallis (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 50-55 (50). A double-bull capital found at Sidon points to the existence of a prestigious apadana structure there, suggesting that a Persian official maintained a residence in Sidon; see John Curtis, “The Archaeology of the Achaemenid Period” in *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia*, ed. John Curtis and Nigel Tallis (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 30-49 (41-42).

³¹ For the coinage that reads *mzdy zy 'l 'brnhr' w'hlk* “Mazday, who is over Across-the-River and Cilicia,” see Leo Miltenberg, “Notes on the Coin Issues of Mazday,” *INJ* 11 (1990-1991): 9-23.

Sidon with those of the Sidonian kings who succeeded Tennes.³² Throughout the Persian period, the Phoenician kings maintained a kind of “managed autonomy” that allowed these clients a fair bit of independence.³³ In Arabia, a late-fifth century or early-fourth century Aramaic inscription refers to two figures from the same family as *[m]lk* “[k]ing” and *[ph]t tym* “[gover]nor of Tayma” (Cross, Tayma 1, 3), and Diodorus refers to a “king of the Arabs” who was allied with Evagoras in the early fourth century (15.2.4). More Aramaic inscriptional evidence from Arabia suggests that the Geshem/Gashmu who appears as Nehemiah’s opponent in Neh 2:19; 6:1, 2, 6 and whom Nehemiah calls “the Arab” also bore the title *mlk* “king”;³⁴ given Gashmu’s interest in influencing Judean affairs, the Judean elite were certainly aware that a client king ruled to the south. There is, in short, little reason to think that Judeans living toward the end of the Persian

³² So J. Elayi and A.G. Elayi, “Le monnayage sidonien de Mazday,” *Transeu* 27 (2004): 155-62.

³³ So Vadim Jigoulov, “Administration of Achaemenid Phoenicia: A Case for Managed Autonomy” in *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Lester L. Grabbe, LSTS 73 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2009), 138-51. On this point see also J. Elayi, “Studies in Phoenician Geography during the Persian Period,” *JNES* 41 (1982): 83-110 and Oded Lipschits, “Achaemenid Imperial Policy, Settlement Processes in Palestine, and the Status of Jerusalem in the Middle of the Fifth Century B.C.E.” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 19-52 (26-27).

³⁴ The late-fifth or early-fourth inscription in question refers to a “Qaynu, the son of Gashmu, the king of Qedar” (*TSSI* 2:25). This is certainly proof that Gashmu’s son bore the title “king,” but it stands to reason that Gashmu was king before his son.

period would believe that the Achaemenids were utterly opposed to the existence of client monarchies that could fulfill the functions of satraps or governors.³⁵

And even in the less likely event that Chronicles was written in the final decades of the fourth century, just after the fall of Persia, it still would not be unreasonable to assume that Judeans would believe that the new Hellenistic rulers would be willing to accommodate client kings, since they did just that. Alexander seemed more or less content to continue the administration of the Persian Empire as he encountered it. Arrian writes that he replaced Persian satraps and garrison commanders in Asia Minor with Macedonian ones, but otherwise maintained the Persian system of tribute, which the satraps were responsible for administering. The only local changes in governance for which Alexander was responsible was to replace oligarchies in Greek cities in Asia Minor with democracies, which earned him the support of the populations of those cities (Arrian, *Anab.* 1.17). The satrapies were still in existence at his death in 323, and Perdikkas, the immediate successor to Alexander's imperial leadership, seemed to have no plans to alter that political arrangement; he did appoint some new satraps after Alexander's death, but he confirmed the rule of others and of some existing client kings (Diodorus 18.3; Justin 13.4). The fact that Alexander married daughters of Darius III and Artaxerxes III, the last two Persian kings, and that he had his close companions marry into the

³⁵ So the conclusion that there was no kind of local rule at all in the Persian empire is simply not tenable—see, e.g., the arguments in Lisbeth S. Fried, *The Priest and the Great King: Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire*, BJSUCSD 10 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004) and Jeremiah W. Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud? Issues of Government in a Persian Period*, LHBOTS 498 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2009).

Persian nobility (Arrian, *Anab.* 7.4.4), suggests that he wanted to be seen as like a Persian king;³⁶ he saw himself as a new Cyrus, conquering a new empire, and showed great concern for Cyrus's tomb (Arrian, *Anab.* 6.29.4-11; Quintus Curtius 10.1.30-32),³⁷ and he largely seems to have left the parts of his empire under the local governance of client rulers remain under client rule.

We know, for example, that Alexander appointed client kings in his conquests as far as the Indus Valley (Quintus Curtius 8.13.3-4;³⁸ 10.1.1; Diodorus 18.3.2), but, much closer to Judah, the Phoenician and Cypriot cities maintained their monarchies after Alexander's conquest. Alexander replaced one king of Sidon with another (Quintus Curtius 4.1.16-26; Justin 11.10.8-9),³⁹ and even though he had to besiege Tyre for seven months, he allowed 'Ozmilk (Azemilcus) to remain in power (Arrian, *Anab.* 2.24.5); coins and inscriptional evidence suggest

³⁶ Whether or not he understood Achaemenid royal ideology, however, particularly in regard to the ways the Great Kings of Persia maintained their satraps' loyalty, is another matter entirely; see Maria Brosius, "Alexander and the Persians" in *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, ed. Joseph Roisman (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 169-93.

³⁷ Brosius, "Alexander and the Persians," 174.

³⁸ Quintus Curitus refers here to one Samaxus as king of a small part of India during the reign of Alexander, and this may be the same figure as Sambus, whom Arrian says Alexander made satrap (*Anab.* 6.16.3); this, at least, is the argument of Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 757. If this is so, then we would have here an example of Alexander continuing the Persian practice of allowing rulers to explicitly function in the place of imperial officials.

³⁹ Specifically, 'Abd'aštar was replaced by Abdalonymos. Diodorus 17.47 seems to mistakenly place this change in Tyre.

he remained a client ruler until perhaps as late as 309/8.⁴⁰ The other Phoenician kings and the kings of Cyprus abandoned their allegiance to Darius III during Alexander's siege of Tyre, and sent him the aid of their navies (Arrian, *Anab.* 2.20.13);⁴¹ Alexander granted these kings a *al-deia* "amnesty" (2.20.3), believing them to have been coerced by Darius to fight against him earlier. Numismatic evidence tells us that Alexander allowed the client dynasties in the Phoenician cities of Byblos and Arwad to remain in power as well,⁴² and Diodorus says that Nicocles was still reigning as king in the Cypriot city of Paphlos in 310/9 (20.21), an assertion that numismatic evidence seems to support.⁴³

⁴⁰ This is the conclusion of André Lemaire, "Le royaume de Tyr dans la seconde moitié du IV^e siècle av. J.-C." in *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di studi fenici e punici: Roma, 9-14 novembre 1987*, ed. Enrico Acquaro (Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, 1991), 1.131-50 (150). On the other hand, J. Elayi and A.G. Elayi, *The Coinage of the Phoenician City of Tyre in the Persian Period (5th-4th cent. BCE)*, StPh 20, OLA 188 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2009), 388-89 argue that, while this date is not an impossible one for the end of 'Ozmilk's reign, the coins and inscriptional evidence do not give firm evidence for his rule after 321 or 315.

⁴¹ Arrian, *Anab.* 2.20.1 names two Phoenician kings who fought with Alexander against Tyre, 2.22.2 names three kings of Cyprus who fought with him there, and Plutarch, *Alex.* 29 adds two other names.

⁴² See the evidence presented in Elayi, "An Updated Chronology," 27-30.

⁴³ There is a debate in regard to how late the numismatic evidence for Nicocles' reign extends; for a summary of the discussion, see Evangéline Markou, *L'or des rois de Chypre: Numismatique et histoire à l'époque classique*, Meletēmata 64 (Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 2011), 279-81.

For Alexander and the Diadochi, his “successors” who fought over the empire after his death, client kings in their colonies were not inherently problematic; what mattered was that they remain loyal. Alexander, as we have seen, was willing to allow local kings who previously opposed him to remain in power, likely because he understood this to be necessary for the stability of his new empire. This was also true, at least at first, during the time of the Diadochi. Ptolemy, for example, needed to hold the fortified cities of coastal Palestine and Cyprus in order to protect Egypt, and in 312 took a force to Cyprus to punish and remove those kings who had allied themselves with the rival Antigonids, giving rule of their cities to Nicocreon (Diodorus 19.79.4-5), whom Diodorus describes as *strathgogon* “governor” of Cyprus. Yet just as the Persians allowed local rulers to act both as royalty and in the place of the Persian administration, Nicocreon was also a king. He had previously been king of Salamis (Plutarch, *Alex.* 29; Diodorus 19.59), and the coinage he produced while subject to Ptolemy bore the legend *BA NK*, an abbreviation of *basileus Nikokreon* “King Nicocreon.”⁴⁴ And even after Ptolemy’s retributive invasion of Cyprus, the kingdom of Soloi continued to mint its own coinage until 310/9,⁴⁵ telling us that he did not put an immediate end to all of the old client monarchies there.

So even if *Chronicles* was written as late as the last three decades of the fourth century, the Davidic restoration would not necessarily have seemed like an a priori impossibility to Judean readers, and to someone who supported the Davidic cause it may have seemed distinctly plausible, so long as the new king was willing to be a loyal client. And although it is not likely that *Chronicles* was written soon after the fall of Persia, when the future political structure of

⁴⁴ See A.-M. Collombier, “La fin des royaumes chypriotes: Ruptures et continuités,” *Transeu* 6 (1993): 119-47 (137-38).

⁴⁵ Markou, *L’or des rois de Chypre*, 292-95.

Palestine was still unclear, if this was the case the author may have been convinced that the evolving political order might be amenable to the restoration of a dynasty in Judah. Unlike Haggai at the beginning of the Persian period, the Chronicler gives no explicit indication that God “is shaking the heavens and the earth / and I will overturn the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the nations” (Hag 2:21-22). The Chronicler works toward a quiet revolution in polity amenable to the imperial power, and abstains from overt references to an imminent noisy overthrow of it. When Chronicles explicitly refers to Judah’s past colonial suzerains, it does so in a positive way.⁴⁶ Yhwh rouses (רַי (h) Cyrus of Persia and, according to Cyrus, gives him “all the kingdoms of the earth” and entrusts him with the building of Yhwh’s house (2 Chr 36:22-23). Part of the Chronicler’s criticism of Zedekiah, the last Davidide to rule as king, is his rebellion against the Neo-Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar, “who made him [Zedekiah] swear by God” (36:13); here, rebellion against the imperial king is equated with rebellion against God, whom the suzerain appears to revere. Neco of Egypt, who is portrayed as Judah’s suzerain in 36:1-4, claims that God has sent him on a mission, and the narrative states that he speaks for God (35:22). God rouses (רַי (yw) the Neo-Assyrian Tiglath-pilneser (1 Chr 5:26) to exile the apostate Israelites in the Transjordan, and uses him to punish Ahaz (2 Chr 28:19-20). In such references, readers see that imperial kings merely carry out the divine will, and a good Davidic king whose actions lead to divine support will have nothing to fear from them.⁴⁷ As we shall see in chapter 4, however, Chronicles does offer the slightest of

⁴⁶ For the positive portrayal of foreign monarchs in general in Chronicles, see Ehud Ben Zvi, “When the Foreign Monarch Speaks” in *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2006), 270-88.

⁴⁷ Ehud Ben Zvi is incorrect to see Chronicles as “Israelitizing” Neco and Cyrus; their

hints that God can act to free Judah of imperial rule, although this is not an explicit part of its agenda in convincing readers to support a Davidic restoration.

3. *The Chronicler's use of Samuel-Kings*

In the following chapters I will frequently refer to the different ways in which the Chronicler adapted and borrowed from Samuel-Kings, references that assume Samuel-Kings is source material for the Chronicler, and that the Chronicler and the Deuteronomistic Historian were not independently drawing on a common third source, and here I provide some evidence for this assumption. As Kai Peltonen and Patrick Graham point out, after W.M.L. de Wette argued in the early nineteenth century that the Chronicler drew upon Samuel-Kings as source material and altered it (in the process creating, for de Wette, an inferior work of historiography),⁴⁸ conservative scholarship of the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries maintained that the differences between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings could be explained by the fact that their authors drew on different source material, or on a common source.⁴⁹ It took over half a century

foreignness—really, their imperial foreignness—is a key aspect of their identity in Chronicles.

See Ehud Ben Zvi, “Are there Any Bridges out There? How Wide was the Conceptual Gap between the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles?” in *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 59-86 (78-79).

⁴⁸ For de Wette, Samuel-Kings is earlier and therefore more historically reliable than Chronicles; see *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1:42-60.

⁴⁹ See the first volume of Kai Peltonen, *History Debated: The Historical Reliability of Chronicles in Pre-Critical and Critical Research*, PFES 64 (Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical

for de Wette's argument for the Chronicler's reliance on Samuel-Kings to become widely accepted in biblical scholarship,⁵⁰ although this consensus has been attacked more recently by Graeme Auld.⁵¹ The difficulty with the argument advanced by Auld and those who offer similar arguments in regard to the relation between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings is that, while they show that it is possible that these works could depend on a common third source, they do not show it to be a necessary conclusion. Given that, as we shall see, the Chronicler draws on material from Samuel well before Auld's hypothetical third source begins, it seems easiest and best to conclude that the Chronicler used the existing books of Samuel and Kings, and that Samuel-Kings and Chronicles do not derive from a third source.

We certainly cannot respond here to every argument Auld makes, but we will at least briefly survey the two parallels between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles to which he devotes the most space in making arguments for an original source from which both the authors of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles drew. The first of these is the story of Solomon's dialogue with God in 1

Society, 1996) and Matt Patrick Graham, *The Utilization of 1 and 2 Chronicles in the Reconstruction of Israelite History in the Nineteenth Century*, SBLDS 116 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990). In modern German biblical scholarship, the idea that Chronicles and Samuel-Kings draw upon a common independent source extends back to J.G. Eichhorn in the eighteenth century; see Peltonen, *History Debated*, 1:56-57.

⁵⁰ See John W. Rogerson, *W.M.L. de Wette Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography*, JSOTSup 126 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 56-57.

⁵¹ A. Graeme Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).

Kgs 3:4-15; 4:1 and 2 Chr 1:3-13.⁵² 1 Kgs 3:4-15, Auld notes, includes reflections of events from 1 Kings 1-2, chapters that have no parallel in Chronicles: 1 Kgs 3:6 uses the phrase “a son sitting on his throne,” echoing a common refrain we see in 1 Kings 1-2;⁵³ and 3:6, 14 reflect the advice David gives to Solomon in 1 Kgs 2:1-4.⁵⁴ Moreover, the references to Solomon’s understanding to judge the people in 3:9, 11 are borne out in the following story of 3:16-28, another passage with no parallel in Chronicles, where Solomon uses his understanding to judge the case of the two women and the dead child.⁵⁵ The references to 1 Kings 1-2 and 3:16-28 in 1 Kgs 3:4-15 do not appear in the parallel text of 2 Chr 1:3-13, and for Auld this demonstrates that the Chronicler is not drawing his or her story from 1 Kings 1-3, since, he argues, it is difficult to believe that the Chronicler borrowed from Kings and was able to eliminate every subtle reference to the material from 1 Kings 1-3 not found in Chronicles. For Auld, then, this shows that 1 Kgs 3:4-15; 4:1 and 2 Chr 1:3-13 derive from a shared source. The material from 1 Kgs 3:4-15 reflects ideas and vocabulary from 1 Kings 1-2 and 3:16-28 because it has been altered by the author who wrote 1

⁵² Auld, *Kings without Privilege*, 15-21.

⁵³ In 1 Kings 1-2 we see the phrases “he will sit on my throne” (1:13, 17, 24, 30, 35), “who will sit on the throne of my lord the king” (1:20, 27), “Solomon sits on the throne” (1:46), “one sitting on my throne” (1:48), and “Solomon sat on the throne of David his father” (2:12).

⁵⁴ In 1 Kgs 3:6, Solomon says that David went before God “in truth...and in uprightness of heart,” and in 3:14 God says that Solomon must “go in my ways, keeping my statutes and my commandments.” In 2:3-4, David tells Solomon that he and his descendants must “go in his [God’s] ways, keeping his statutes and his commandments,” and tells Solomon that God has ordered his descendants “to go before me in truth and with all their heart.”

⁵⁵ The roots *Nyḅ* and *+p#ṣ* both appear in 3:9, 11, 28.

Kings 1-2 and 3:16-28.

Auld's conclusion is necessarily true, however, only if we believe the Chronicler is not a good reader. The Chronicler omits the story of 1 Kings 1-2 because, as we shall discuss in the next chapter, it is important for his or her purposes that David and Solomon appear as holding a kind of joint rule, and the power struggle to succeed David in 1 Kings 1-2 is hardly conducive to such a presentation. It then makes sense, though, that the Chronicler might want to elide references to common phrases from that story, including the frequent references to a son sitting on David's throne—in 1 Kings 1-2, two of David's sons attempt to do this—as well as David's advice to Solomon in 1 Kgs 2:1-4 about how to eliminate his rival brother's important supporters. If modern readers like Auld are able to see references in 1 Kgs 3:4-15 to 1 Kings 1-2, why should we assume that the Chronicler was unable to do so?⁵⁶ And if we assume the Chronicler was a competent reader, it might make some sense to conclude that he or she was able

⁵⁶ And as Steven McKenzie points out in *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 106, the Chronicler follows Kings much less closely in the story of the Gibeon theophany than is normally the case in the parallel passages of Chronicles and Kings, and McKenzie actually suggests that the differences are so striking that the Chronicler may not even be relying on 1 Kings 3, even though McKenzie sees Samuel-Kings as the basic source of Chronicles. However, another way to explain the differences between the two narratives here is as the result of the Chronicler's awareness of the many allusions in 1 Kings 3 to material elsewhere in 1 Kings that the Chronicler is omitting; in other words, the Chronicler is making more alterations than normal to the source material because he or she is intent on eliminating aspects of 1 Kgs 3.4-15 that reflect the parts of Solomon's narrative that he or she is not including.

to identify and eliminate material from 1 Kings 1-3 he or she found unhelpful. So even though the Chronicler kept the story of 1 Kgs 3:4-15, he or she omitted all references in it to the story of Solomon's struggle for the throne in 1 Kings 1-2. Not only might such references remind readers of a story that was not amenable to the Chronicler's presentation of the reigns of David and Solomon, the references to the advice in 1 Kgs 3:6, 14 that David gives in 1 Kings 2 contain Deuteronomistic language concerning what kings must do to succeed,⁵⁷ and these are not the ideas that the Chronicler typically emphasizes as exemplary royal behavior. The Chronicler urges kings to seek (#\$rd/#\$qb) and rely on (N (#\$n) God, while humbling themselves ((nk) and avoiding rebellion (l (m) against God's will.⁵⁸ And whereas 1 Kgs 3:6 emphasizes that

⁵⁷ As we noted above, in 1 Kgs 2:1-4, David tells Solomon that he and his descendants must go (Klh) before God in truth (tm)) and in God's ways (wykrd), keeping God's statutes, commandments, and judgments (wy+p#\$mw wytwcm wyqx rm#\$l), language that is repeated in 1 Kgs 3:6, 14. For this as common Deuteronomistic language, see Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 333-34, 336, 338.

⁵⁸ For discussions of the importance of these ideas in Chronicles, see Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 13-122; Brian E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, JSOTSup 211 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 104; David Glatt-Gilad, "The Root *kn'* and Historiographic Periodization in Chronicles," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 248-57; Philippe Abadie, "Le livre des Chroniques comme œuvre littéraire," *RSR* 90 (2002): 525-53 (530); Louis Jonker, "Refocusing the Battle Accounts of the Kings: Identity Formation in the Books of Chronicles" in *Behutsames Lesen: Alttestamentliche Exegese im interdisziplinären Methodendiskurs*, ed. Sylke Lubs et al., ABG 28 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007), 245-74 (260); Pancratius C. Beentjes, "The Narrative on Uzziah's Leprosy (2 Chronicles 26)" in *Tradition and*

David earned God’s loyalty—“he walked in truth and righteousness and uprightness of heart”—1 Chr 2:9, which parallels 1 Kgs 3:6 but does not contain this phrase, focuses instead on the loyalty God is showing to the Davidides in extending a covenant to them, rather than what they might have done to earn it. Not only does this fit the Chronicler’s attempt to emphasize the inevitability of Davidic restoration, since God is loyal to them, it allows Chronicles to make the covenant ultimately dependent upon Solomon’s actions, not David’s, as we shall discuss in the next chapter. Finally, as we shall also see in the next chapter, in Chronicles Solomon’s wisdom is used primarily for building the temple, so the Chronicler eliminates Solomon’s judgment of the women from 1 Kgs 3:16-28 and the references to it earlier in the chapter.

So there are, in fact, perfectly good reasons for a Chronicler who borrows material from 1 Kings 3 to eliminate precisely the parts of it that he or she does. We have no particular reason to suppose the Chronicler was somehow a less astute reader than modern commentators, and if our author has reasons to exclude material from Samuel-Kings, it makes sense that he or she would want to exclude references to this material in the passages from Samuel-Kings that are included. This is especially so since some of the Chronicler’s readers may have known Samuel-Kings, and since the Chronicler disagrees with aspects of Dtr’s interpretation of history there, the Chronicler would hardly want to leave even a trace of those ideas with which he or she disagrees. The same

Transformation in the Book of Chronicles, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 79-90 (81-82);

Matthew Lynch, *Monotheism and Institutions in the Book of Chronicles: Temple, Priesthood, and Kingship in the Post-Exilic Perspective*, FAT 2/64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 75;

Pancratius C. Beentjes, “King Asa and Hanani the Seer: 2 Chronicles 16 as an Example of the Chronicler’s View of Prophets and Prophecy” in *Prophecy and Prophets in Stories*, ed. Bob Becking and Hans M. Barstad, OTS 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 141-51 (147-48).

principle helps us to explain the differences between the stories of Manasseh in 2 Kings 21 and 2 Chronicles 33, the second parallel where Auld lengthily defends a common source.⁵⁹ The Manasseh of 2 Kings 21 is the worst monarch of Dtr's narrative; he causes Judah to do more evil than the Canaanites (21:9, 11), outdoing the sins of even the Northern kings, who only cause their people's sin to equal that of the Canaanite nations (2 Kgs 17:8, 11, 15). This is what causes Judah's destruction according to Dtr (21:10-15; 23:26-27; 24:2-4), although Manasseh himself dies peacefully after a fifty five-year reign. Chronicles' well known doctrine of immediate retribution does not permit such an evil king to go unpunished, and this explains the differences that we see in Manasseh's narrative in 2 Chronicles 33. Manasseh is exiled to Babylon (33:11), where he prays (33:13), as Solomon instructs exiles to do in 2 Chr 6:36-39, and God receives his plea, as Solomon had asked God to do in such a situation. He can then return to Judah, where he enacts a partial reform, cleansing the temple and partially cleansing Jerusalem (although not Judah) from his earlier apostate constructions.⁶⁰ This explains the differences between the parallel texts; given the Chronicler's overall goal and his or her consistent application of immediate retribution in regard to royal cultic actions, hypothesizing the existence of a third source is of no more explanatory value here than in the case of Solomon's dialogue with God.

Craig Ho also examines parallels between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles with the goal of making an argument for a common source on which the two authors drew, but he too has difficulty proving this point. He argues, for example, that the story of Saul's death in 1

⁵⁹ Auld, *Kings without Privilege*, 73-86.

⁶⁰ 33:4-5, 7 says that Manasseh puts altars and an idol in the temple, and 33:15 says that he removes them upon return from exile. 33:3 says that he constructs high places, altars, and Asheroth; 33:15 says that he later removes the altars from Jerusalem.

Chronicles 10 does not derive from 1 Samuel 31 but from an independent source.⁶¹ He points out that the scope of Israel's defeat in 1 Chronicles 10 is less far-ranging than in 1 Samuel 31, where Philistine control at Saul's death extends even to the Transjordan.⁶² This, though, is not a very persuasive piece of evidence that 1 Chronicles 10 does not rely on 1 Samuel 31, since the Chronicler only needs the story of Saul's death to demonstrate divine punishment of a sinful king, punishment that ends with his death to clear the way for David's rule. For the Chronicler, it is not really necessary to comment on the extent of Israel's defeat, and the Chronicler may also not have found Dtr's claim that the Philistines took over the land even as far as the Transjordan historically credible. Ho also argues that the exploits of the men of Jabesh-gilead appear less impressive in 1 Chronicles 10 than in 1 Samuel 31: when they go to collect Saul's body after the battle (1 Sam 31:11-13; 1 Chr 10:11-12), they need only go to the battlefield where the Philistines abandoned it, since in 1 Chr 10:10-12 the Philistines only take Saul's head to Philistia, not his body, whereas in 1 Sam 31:10 his body is put up on the wall of Beth-shean, a Philistine city. Ho's point here is that it is unlikely that this story in Chronicles derives from 1 Samuel 31, since it would not make sense for an author borrowing the story from Dtr to make these warriors' deeds sound less impressive than in 1 Samuel 31.⁶³ There is certainly some danger the men must face in the Chronistic story, as 1 Chr 10:7-8 makes it clear that the Philistines controlled the field after the battle, and so the men of Jabesh-gilead still must venture into Philistine-held territory to reclaim the body of their fallen king. Moreover, as Sara Japhet has

⁶¹ Craig S. Ho, "Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel xxxi 1-13 the Source of 1 Chronicles x 1-12?," *VT* 45 (1995): 82-106.

⁶² Ho, "Conjectures and Refutations," 88-89.

⁶³ Ho, "Conjectures and Refutations," 90-93, 102.

pointed out, 1 Chr 7:29 has already listed Beth-shean as an Israelite and not a Philistine city, and so in this context it would make no sense for the Philistine warriors to take it there.⁶⁴ In fact, an Israelite raid on an Israelite city would seem much less impressive than the Chronicler's depiction of the men of Jabesh-gilead venturing on to a Philistine-held battlefield. And perhaps just as importantly, in 1 Chronicles 11-12 the pro-Davidic Chronicler makes it clear that battle is really something that should be fought by a Davidic king with a volunteer army from all of Israel, not by individual bands of men without royal leadership, or at least Davidic leadership; as we shall see in chapter 3, the organization and control of the army is an important issue in Chronicles. The Chronicler likely has no interest in making warriors before the time of David look braver and more glorious than David's men in 1 Chronicles 11, a chapter that suggests that heroism in warfare is something that has a place only in a Davidic army. There are, once more, perfectly good reasons to explain why the Chronicler has altered a source from Samuel-Kings, making it unnecessary to hypothesize the existence of a third source.

Being able to show that there might be a common source behind the parallel sections of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles is not the same as demonstrating that this is the most likely or better explanation for the parallels. A common source is not an impossibility, but since Chronicles draws from other biblical books such as Genesis, we are under no compulsion to accept it, especially when we can find good reasons why the Chronicler would have changed a source text that we have. And this is particularly true once we see that the author is drawing from material in Samuel-Kings that does not appear in Auld's hypothetical shared source; this makes

⁶⁴ Sara Japhet "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles" in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Studies on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 38-52 (49).

it almost certain that the Deuteronomistic Historian and the Chronicler are not drawing on a common source that we can reconstruct from their parallel texts, but that the Chronicler knows all of Samuel-Kings and is omitting some parts of its narrative and including but altering others. As John Van Seters points out, 1 Chr 10:13-14, which refers to Saul consulting a medium, is not part of Auld's hypothetical source, since these verses have no parallel in 1 Samuel 31, but the Chronicler is obviously drawing the information for these verses from the story of 1 Samuel 28, a point in Samuel-Kings before Auld's hypothetical source begins.⁶⁵ 1 Chr 11:2, also not from Auld's source, refers to David's military career under Saul, something narrated elsewhere only in 1 Samuel, and only before Auld's hypothetical shared source begins; 1 Chr 29:29 calls Samuel "seer," suggesting that the Chronicler knew the story of 1 Sam 9:1-10:16, the only other story in which Samuel receives such a title; and so on.⁶⁶ It simply makes the most sense to explain the relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles by concluding that the Chronicler used Samuel-Kings as a source.

And if our author is using Samuel-Kings as Chronicles' primary source, we should not expect that the Chronicler wanted readers to value that earlier work to the extent that they valued Chronicles. The Chronicler omitted parts of Samuel-Kings and altered other parts; from the Chronicler's standpoint, Samuel-Kings is not a complement to Chronicles, it is a source that

⁶⁵ John Van Seters, "The 'Shared Text' of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles Re-examined" in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, VTSup 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 503-15 (511-12).

⁶⁶ Van Seters notes these examples in "The 'Shared Text,'" 512-13; see the full essay for others.

needed alteration and so needed to be replaced by Chronicles. Some scholars argue the Chronicler expected readers to be aware of Samuel-Kings and the other earlier traditions he or she drew on, and that he or she expected Chronicles to be read together with them,⁶⁷ a position that assumes Chronicles was written as a commentary or midrash on Samuel-Kings or was otherwise meant to supplement it. This, however, does not seem to be the case. If Chronicles was simply meant to be a commentary or midrash on Samuel-Kings, then the author would not have omitted parts of Samuel-Kings' story. It makes more sense to conclude the author found some stories or details in Samuel-Kings to be untrue or irrelevant, or perhaps even inconvenient in terms of his or her larger goals. If the author simply assumed that readers must fill in omitted stories and details from Samuel-Kings, then why would he or she repeat any of the work? It is

⁶⁷ E.g., Thomas Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels*, FRLANT 106 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 48-66; Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Theology of the Chronicler" in *The Chronicler and his Age*, JSOTSup 101 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 273-89 (276); Georg Steins, "1 Chr 1-10 als Set up der Chronikbücher" in *Textarbeit: Studien zu Texten und ihrer Rezeption aus dem Alten Testament und der Umwelt Israels*, ed. Klaus Kiesow and Thomas Meurer, AOAT 294 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003) 483-504 (484-88); Magnar Kartveit, "Names and Narratives: The Meaning of their Combination in 1 Chronicles 1-9" in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, its Exegesis and its Language*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher et al. (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2007), 59*-80* (66*-67*); Ingeborg Löwisch, "Cracks in the Male Mirror: References to Women as Challenges to Patrilinear Authority in the Genealogies of Judah" in *What was Authoritative for Chronicles?*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 105-32 (106-107).

the particular combination of inclusion of some of Samuel-Kings' text, omission of other parts, and alteration of yet others that suggests the Chronicler treated the work as a source for his or her history, a source that, from the Chronicler's point of view, includes some errors and unhelpful information. It makes little sense to assume that the Chronicler believed readers should add omitted stories or details from Samuel-Kings to inform their reading of Chronicles, since such work on readers' parts would, at times, run contrary to the Chronicler's purposes. To take one example, which we will discuss in the next chapter, Chronicles maintains that the Davidides' eternal covenant depends on Solomon's sinlessness. The Chronicler did not include the story of Solomon's sin of apostasy from 1 Kings 11; were this story in Chronicles, the author would be making the point that, because Solomon sinned, the covenant with the Davidides was not eternal. The story is omitted because the Chronicler did not believe it to be true (or at least did not want readers to believe it is). If the Chronicler truly believed Solomon sinned, then it would be of the utmost importance that readers know this since, in Chronicles' portrayal of the Davidides, this would mean that they do not have an eternal covenant to rule. Such information, in short, would be of such importance that we cannot reasonably assume the author would simply have hoped readers had read and could recall the specific story from Dtr.

We would expect that at least some of Chronicles' readers were aware of earlier traditions, and perhaps even of the Deuteronomistic History. But the fact that the author picked and chose from and altered these sources tells us that he or she did not find them to be infallible (and perhaps, at times, simply found some of their details to be inconvenient). A reader cannot accept Chronicles' claim that the Davidides have an eternal covenant based on Solomon's sinlessness and accept the validity of the story of Solomon's sin in 1 Kings 11; this is logically impossible. So it then makes little sense to conclude that because Chronicles included a reference

to the fulfillment of an oracle concerning the split of the kingdom in 2 Chr 10:15 that the Chronicler expected readers to know the story of the giving of the oracle in 1 Kings 11 and to read 2 Chronicles 10 with 1 Kings 11 in mind,⁶⁸ for the oracle in 1 Kings 11 presents the split of the kingdom as a punishment for a sin of Solomon to which Chronicles does not refer. If the Chronicler believed 1 Kings 11 was necessary to make sense of 2 Chr 10:15 then why was it not included? As we shall see in chapter 3, 2 Chr 10:15 makes perfect sense in its context. As we would expect from any historian, the Chronicler was not always in agreement with his or her sources, and this explains the alteration and omission of material from Samuel-Kings. (Chronicles has a different relationship to the Pentateuch, for while it draws upon Pentateuchal material, it can hardly be said to do so to nearly the same extent that it does in regard to Samuel-Kings.)⁶⁹ Chronicles is a replacement for Samuel-Kings rather in the same way that any modern

⁶⁸ This, nonetheless, is the argument of, e.g., Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, HAT 21 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955), 227 and Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 58; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 239; Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, WBC 15 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 87; Rodney K. Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis*, JSOTSup 88, BLS 25 (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1990), 37; Gabriel, *Friede über Israel*, 12 n. 44; Steven James Schweitzer, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*, LHBOTS 442 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2007), 46 n. 47; Ralph W. Klein, *2 Chronicles: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 161.

⁶⁹ For more on this point, see Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London: Routledge, 1995), 23-24 and Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler*, 114, who argue that Torah is “authoritative” for the Chronicler, who acted to alter Samuel-Kings so that it agrees with the Pentateuch. Ehud Ben Zvi argues in “One Size Does not Fit All: Observations on

historiography that focuses on a particular subject is a replacement for earlier writings on the same subject; it will not be in absolute disagreement, and so can draw material from those earlier works, but it will disagree on some aspects of fact and on interpretations and explanations of fact. If this were not the case, there would be no point in writing another historiography. So regardless of whether or not Chronicles' readers knew of Dtr and Samuel-Kings, the Chronicler did not intend the work to be read as some kind of supplement to them. In the mind of the author, Chronicles is a new and better history, and so replaces the earlier source.⁷⁰ It is to the purpose that motivated this replacement, the Chronicler's quiet revolution, that we now turn.

the Different Ways that Chronicles Dealt with the Authoritative Literature of its Time" in *What was Authoritative for the Chronicler?*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 13-35 that the Pentateuch was not authoritative for the Chronicler, pointing to the fact that apparent contradictions within the Pentateuch or between the Pentateuch and the cultic practices of the Chronicler's day are harmonized. The former set of alterations, however, is simply the way that the Chronicler tried to make sense of a text he or she regarded as authoritative—see Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 123-58—and the Chronicler could justify the latter, as we shall see in chapter 3, as warranted by a change in primary cultic institution from the tabernacle, to which the laws of the Pentateuch apply, to the temple.

⁷⁰ Among others who have also come to this conclusion see, e.g., Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 381-83; William Johnstone, "Reactivating the Chronicles Analogy in Pentateuchal Studies with Special Reference to the Sinai Pericope in Exodus," *ZAW* 99 (1987): 16-37 (18-19); Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal*, 36-37; Schweitzer, *Reading Utopia*, 76.

2. Judean local government and the Davidides in Chronicles

1. The temple and Judean leadership in the Persian period

Readers who have even a passing acquaintance with current scholarship on Chronicles will be aware that, while many commentators view it as a pro-Davidic work promoting a Davidic restoration, others, noting its emphasis on cult, argue that it promotes a theocracy as the proper form of post-exilic leadership in the province.⁷¹ At points the work seems so focused on the

⁷¹ For references to scholars who see Chronicles as promoting a Davidic restoration, see section 2 of the previous chapter. For some of the scholars who argue that Chronicles advances a post-exilic theocracy see, e.g., Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, HAT 21 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955), xxiii-xxiv; André Caquot, “Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l’oeuvre du Chroniste?,” *RTP* 16 (1966): 110-20; Ulrich Kellermann, *Nehemia: Quellen, Überlieferung und Geschichte*, BZAW 102 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967), 96-97; Rudolf Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*, FTS 92 (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), 93-94; Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, BEATAJ 9 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989), 499-504; Rodney K. Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis*, JSOTSup 88, BLS 25 (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1990), 49-51; Ernst Michael Dörrfuss, *Mose in den Chronikbüchern: Garant theokratischer Zukunftserwartung*, BZAW 219 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 115-18; Louis Jonker, “Reforming History: The Hermeneutical Significance of the Books of Chronicles,” *VT* 57 (2007): 21-44; Timothy D. Goltz, “The Chronicler as Elite: Establishing an Atmosphere of Perpetuity in Jerusalemite Yehud” in *The Function of Ancient Historiography in Biblical and Cognate Studies*, ed. Patricia G. Kirkpatrick and Timothy D. Goltz, LHBOTS 489 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2008), 91-110.

Levites—Louis Jonker rightly claims that Chronicles is more pro-Levitical than any other writing in the Hebrew Bible⁷²—that it seems obvious to some scholars that it was written, or at least redacted, by someone trying to enhance the Levites’ role in the cult.⁷³ Since there appears to be evidence to argue that Chronicles is pro-Davidic and pro-cultic, especially pro-Levitical, we can see why some scholars might want to appeal to redaction to explain its final form,

⁷² Louis Jonker, “The Disappearing Nehushtan: The Chronicler’s Reinterpretation of Hezekiah’s Reformation Measures” in *“From Ebla to Stellenbosch”: Syro Palestinian Religions and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Izak Cornelius and Louis Jonker, ADPV 37 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 116-40 (128-29).

⁷³ E.g., Gerhard von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, BWANT 54 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 88-115; W. Stinespring, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 209-19 (210); Simon J. De Vries, “Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 619-39 (636); Dörrfuss, *Mose in den Chronikbüchern*, 17, 282; Manfred Oeming, *Das wahre Israel: Die “genealogische Vorhalle” 1 Chronik 1-9*, BWANT 128 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1990), 46; Kim Strübind, *Tradition als Interpretation in der Chronik: König Josaphat als Paradigma chronistischer Hermeneutik und Theologie*, BZAW 201 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 23; Thomas Willi, “Leviten, Priester und Kult in vorhellenistischer Zeit: Die chronistische Optik in ihrem geschichtlichen Kontext” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, ed. Beate Ego et al., WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1999), 75-98 (90-95); Antje Labahn, “Antitheocratic Tendencies in Chronicles” in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era*, ed. Rainer Albertz and Bob Becking, STAR 5 (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003), 115-35.

concluding that the author fell into one of these camps and the redactor into another.⁷⁴ Inventing redactional layers when they are not necessary to explain the final form of the work, however, only serves to blind us to the author's intentions. As we shall see in this and the following chapter, we can make sense of Chronicles without appealing to redaction once we see it as a pro-Davidic work trying to convince the Levites and the temple assembly that they would in fact benefit from a Davidic restoration.

One could argue that Chronicles was written by a pro-Levitical author who had no interest in a Davidic restoration, but who wanted to emphasize the role of the Davidides, and David's role in particular, in establishing cultic personnel and providing the Levites with notable authority and important cultic roles in the pre-exilic age, with the purpose of promoting Levitical privilege in the post-exilic temple.⁷⁵ It is not clear, however, why a post-exilic writer interested

⁷⁴ E.g., Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 1-5; David Noel Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 436-42 (440-41); Mosis, *Untersuchungen*, 44-45; H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCBC (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982), 28-31; Mark A. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, SBLDS 93 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 6-7; Dörrfuss, *Mose in den Chronikbüchern*, 17, 282.

⁷⁵ E.g., P. Abadie, "Le fonctionnement symbolique de la figure de David dans l'œuvre du Chroniste," *Transeu* 7 (1994): 143-51; Jozef Tiño, *King and Temple in Chronicles: A Contextual Approach to their Relation*, FRLANT 234 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 107-19. And Gabriele Boccaccini argues in *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2002), 57-59 that Chronicles was produced by a pro-Zadokite/Aaronide group that wanted to establish Zadokite legitimacy based on the work of David in the founding of the cult. See also on this idea Paul D. Hanson, *The*

in the current authority and roles of the Levites, a writer with no current interest in the Davidides, would find it necessary to extend such a history much beyond the time of David, or perhaps Solomon, the royal figures in Chronicles responsible for establishing the Levites' place in the cult and inaugurating temple worship. The Priestly Writing, which promotes Aaronide cultic leadership, does not extend far beyond the time of Moses, the figure in P responsible for the establishment of the tabernacle cult, but Chronicles' narrative begins with the founding of the Davidic dynasty and ends with its removal from power centuries later. Nor is it clear why an author who wanted to promote only a theocracy and/or the expansion of the Levitical role within it, rather than a Davidic restoration, would choose to rework Samuel-Kings, a text centered on monarchy, rather than the parts of the Pentateuch where readers encounter a king-less Israel whose identity lies in a cult led by a theocracy. Chronicles "is a thoroughly royalist document," and its main actors are kings.⁷⁶ The Levites are certainly more important cultic players than in P's narrative, but they are not nearly as important in Chronicles' history as the kings are.

To make sense of Chronicles' focus on monarchy as well as the importance it places on the temple cult and on the Levitical roles inside and outside of it, we will begin here by examining the polity of Judah in the fourth century BCE. The very fact that the Chronicler reworks an earlier history about the monarchy suggests that it is pro-Davidic—although we will discuss evidence for this conclusion in section 2 of this chapter—and if our author is trying to convince others in Judah to support a Davidic restoration, then we need to be clear as to who the

Dawn of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 269-75.

⁷⁶ John W. Wright, "The Fabula of the Book of Chronicles" in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 136-58 (150).

political stakeholders in the local government of fourth-century Judah were, both inside and outside of the temple, and what kind of convincing would have been necessary to win them over to the pro-Davidic cause. Once this is clear, we can, in section 2, turn to a discussion of how the Chronicler presents the Davidides to make their restoration as a client monarchy seem appealing to the temple assembly and to the Levites. As we shall see in section 2, Chronicles promotes the monarchy as a divinely supported office and describes the Davidides as holding an eternal warrant from God to occupy it, but is also clear that future kings will support the temple and promote a cultic monopoly of Yahwism in Jerusalem. At a time when there were rival Yahwistic shrines at Gerizim and elsewhere in Samaria,⁷⁷ in Idumea,⁷⁸ and perhaps at Bethel,⁷⁹ and when

⁷⁷ For the existence of a Yahwistic shrine at Gerizim by at least the end of the fifth century, see Yitzhak Magen, Haggai Misgav, and Levana Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations I: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*, JSP 2 (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004), 1; Yitzhak Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations II: A Temple City*, JSP 8 (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2008), 167-69. Given the presence of Yahwists in Samaria, one imagines that there were other Yahwistic shrines there before the construction of the one at Gerizim, and that they may have continued in use; so, e.g., Magnar Kartveit, *The Origin of the Samaritans*, VTSup 128 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 357-58 and Gary N. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of their Early Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 120-23.

⁷⁸ One of the fourth century Aramaic ostraca from Idumea (TranseuSup 9:283.2) refers to “the house of YHW,” indicating the existence of a temple there; see A. Lemaire, *Nouvelles inscriptions araméennes d’Idumée II: Collections Moussaïef, Jeselsohn, Welch et divers*, TranseuSup 9 (Paris: Gabalda, 2002), 149-56, 223 and André Lemaire “New Aramaic Ostraca

some aspects of the Yahwistic cult such as incense burning may have been practiced outside of the temple,⁸⁰ a pro-temple narrative produced by a pro-monarchic movement may have made that movement seem appealing to the temple hierarchy, who made up part of Judah's local leadership. As we shall see in chapter 3, the Chronicler aimed to make a Davidic restoration seem particularly appealing to the Levites, whose duties, authority, and status are greatly expanded in comparison to those they are given in P, and who are even given roles in civil administration in the narrative. Chronicles does little to augment or to challenge the roles of the

from Idumea and their Historical Interpretation" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 413-56 (413).

⁷⁹ The argument for a temple functioning at Bethel after the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem has been advanced most forcefully by Joseph Blenkinsopp; see, e.g., his "Bethel in the Neo-Babylonian Period" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 93-107. He is not alone in this assessment; e.g., Jill Middlemas, *The Templeless Age: An Introduction to the History, Literature, and Theology of the "Exile"* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 29-32 arrives at the same conclusion. For a rebuttal of this position based on archaeological findings, see Klaus Koenen, *Bethel: Geschichte, Kult und Theologie*, OBO 192 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 59-64, and see the discussion in Melody Knowles, *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora in the Persian Period*, SBLABS 16 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 48-52.

⁸⁰ Mal 1:11 refers to incense offerings as taking place "among the nations." Persian period incense altars have been found at Judean sites—see Knowles, *Centrality Practiced*, 70-71, 126—and the letters of *TAD* A4.7-10 tell us that incense was offered at Elephantine.

priests, largely assuming the roles with which they are provided in P; since they were, as we shall see, important figures in the existing temple hierarchy of the fourth century, the pro-Davidic party likely had little to offer them in terms of augmenting the power they already had in the local governance, and so the Chronicler seems to aim simply to assuage any fears they may have had that they would face some kind of cultic or political demotion as a result of a Davidic restoration. Chronicles, however, suggests that the Davidic party saw the Levites as their main potential allies inside of the temple hierarchy itself.

As we shall see in section 2, part of the way Chronicles manages its pro-Davidic and pro-temple presentation of history is to rely more heavily than Kings on interpretations of history from Mesopotamia. As in works such as the Sin of Sargon and the Weidner Chronicle, kings in Chronicles who fail to support the temple cult are punished during their lifetimes, while those who support it are rewarded. What is often called the Chronicler's doctrine of immediate retribution is not absolutely applied to all human actions in the work, but it is certainly applied to royal actions that involve the cult. There is a clear lesson to be learned by future Davidides and by readers of Chronicles in general: the king must support the norms of temple cult or suffer divine punishment. If a pro-Davidic group were looking for allies in the temple assembly leadership so that they might back an appeal to the Achaemenids for a Davidic restoration, it could do far worse than to use a document like Chronicles to persuade them to lend their support to this request.

To turn now to a discussion of the local government in Judah in the Persian period, it is unlikely to have been one that ever involved the Davidides in the role of client monarch. Despite the fact that Ezra 1:8 refers to Sheshbazzar as *hdwhyl) y#&nh* "the prince/leader of Judah," and that the Davidide Zerubbabel was governor of Judah, it is unlikely that the Davidides were

briefly restored to power at the beginning of the Persian period, as some argue.⁸¹ Even Haggai who, as we shall see in chapter 6, hints at the possibility of an imminent restoration of the monarchy, only refers to Zerubbabel as *hdwhy tꝝp* “governor of Judah” (1:1, 14; 2:2, 21), not “king,” and Sheshbazzar, the earliest post-exilic leader of whom we know, is also “governor” (Ezra 5:14). Evidence from sixth- and early-fifth-century bullae provides us with the names of three Judean governors who were in office between Zerubbabel and 445, the year Nehemiah becomes governor,⁸² but there is nothing to lead us to believe that these figures were Davidides,

⁸¹ So, e.g., F. Bianchi, “Le rôle de Zorobabel et de le dynastie davidique en Judée du VI^e siècle au II^e siècle av. J.-C.,” *Transeu* 7 (1994): 153-65; André Lemaire, “Zorobabel et la Judée à la lumière de l’épigraphie (fin du VI^e s. av. J.-C.),” *RB* 103 (1996): 48-57 (55-56); Herbert Niehr, “Religio-Historical Aspects of the ‘Early Post-Exilic’ Period” in *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*, ed. Bob Becking and Marjo C.A. Korpel, OTS 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 228-40 (230-31); Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 49-56. This argument depends, in part, on equating the Sheshbazzar of Ezra 1 with the Sheshnazzar who appears in 1 Chr 3:18 as a descendant of David. Jason M. Silverman, “Sheshbazzar, a Judean or Babylonian? A Note on his Identity” in *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, ed. Jonathan Stökl and Caroline Waerzeggers, BZAW 478 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 308-21 argues he was the Neo-Babylonian governor of Judah.

⁸² For the bulla reading *l’lntn pꝝw* “belonging to Elnathan the governor,” see Nahman Avigad, *Bullae and Seals from a Post-Exilic Judean Archive*, Qedem 4 (Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, 1976), 5-7, 17; for the seals that refer to *yhw’zr* “Yehoezer” and *’hzy* “Ahzay” or *’hyb* “Ahiab,” see Oded Lipschits and David Stephen Vanderhooft, *The Yehud Stamp Impressions: A Corpus of Inscribed Impressions from the Persian and Hellenistic Periods in*

and none of these bullae uses the word “king.” But even if one or two Davidides had been briefly restored to the position of client monarch two centuries before Chronicles was written, that would not have greatly affected the challenge the Chronicler faced in promoting the restoration of a dynasty to a temple assembly that had been governing its own affairs on a local level for this amount of time.

While Lisbeth Fried and Jeremiah Cataldo argue that there was no local government in Judah, simply a Persian administration,⁸³ local government and Persian oversight are not mutually exclusive ideas,⁸⁴ especially since, as we saw in the previous chapter, the Persians allowed local dynasties to remain in power, some without any satrapal oversight at all. As Pierre Briant notes, the creation of a Persian administration did not lead to the disappearance of local

Judah (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 83-106 and 192-201. In the oracle of Zech 4:8-14, the prophet claims that Zerubbabel will complete the temple, and if that actually was the case, then 515 is the latest date for which we can be said to have evidence of Zerubbabel’s activity; otherwise, we have no specific evidence of his role as governor after 519, the second year of Darius’s reign, at the beginning of the reconstruction of the temple (Zech 1:7, and see Hag 1:1, 12; 2:1-2, 20-21; Ezra 4:2-3; 5:1-2). Nehemiah writes that he begins his work as governor in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes (Neh 2:1), or 445.

⁸³ Lisbeth S. Fried, *The Priest and the Great King: Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire*, BJSUCSD 10 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), esp. 129-37 and Jeremiah W. Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud? Issues of Government in a Persian Period*, LHBOTS 498 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2009), esp. 67-117.

⁸⁴ So also Wolfgang Oswald, “Foreign Marriages and Citizenship in Persian Period Judah,” *JHS* 12/6 (2012): 1-17 (7-8 n. 25).

forms of government, and “local political entities (peoples, cities, kings, dynasts) were integrated into the state.”⁸⁵ As we shall see later in this chapter, Babylonian temple assemblies continued to exert political power on a local level in the Persian period, and Herodotus even refers to the Persians permitting the reestablishment of democracies in Ionian cities in 492 following the Persian suppression of the Ionian Revolt (6.43.3).⁸⁶ Judah was ruled by a series of governors appointed by the Persians, and their job was to serve Persian interests, to move taxes to the imperial center and to maintain loyalty to Persia in the province. But there would have been a whole host of local issues that would not have concerned the imperial government: regulations concerning marriage and divorce; details of temple cult; small local lawsuits; intra-communal relationships; and so on.⁸⁷ Local rule in Judah, that which existed to deal with affairs outside—

⁸⁵ Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 77, and see also 64. See as well Elspeth R.M. Dusinberre, *Empire, Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), who describes Achaemenid rule in Anatolia as based on an “authority-autonomy” or “tempered sovereignty” model, in which regions operated with limited autonomy within the empire (pp. 3-8 present a summary).

⁸⁶ Herodotus attributes this decision to Mardonius, a Persian general appointed by Darius to deal with the region in the aftermath of the rebellion. Diodorus seems to refer to this reestablishment of democracy in some Ionian cities, although he says it was ordered by the satrap Artaphernes (10.25.4).

⁸⁷ This is true even if one wishes to argue that Torah received some kind of Persian authorization, although this is unlikely. But even if this had been the case, this does not mean that the Persian government enforced the laws of Torah; Torah is still a Judean construction

reflecting Judean norms, involving regulations and areas of life—like, say, the laws of kashrut—that the Persians would have had no interest in overseeing. For arguments concerning the question as to whether or not the Persians authorized Torah, see, e.g., Reinhard Gregor Kratz, *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld*, WMANT 63 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 233-41; Thomas Willi, *Juda—Jehud—Israel: Studien zum Selbstverständnis des Judentums in persischer Zeit*, FAT 12 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), 101-17; Peter Frei, “Zentralgewalt und Lokalautonomie im Achämenidenreich” in *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich* rev. ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 5-131; Rolf Rendtorff, “Esra und das ‘Gesetz,’” ZAW 96 (1984): 165-84; and the essays in James W. Watts, ed., *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*, SBLSS 17 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001). For some convincing arguments that the Persians had nothing to do with this, see Jean Louis Ska, “‘Persian Imperial Authorization’: Some Question Marks” in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*, ed. James W. Watts, SBLSS 17 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 161-82 and Kyong-Jin Lee, *The Authority and Authorization of Torah in the Persian Period*, CBET (Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

The letter of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7:11-26 claims the king commands that the law of Ezra’s God become the law of the entire satrapy of Across-the-River (7:25-26). It is not clear that any of this letter is authentic, and the notion that Torah would become lawful in its entirety throughout the many cultures of Across-the-River is difficult to believe. And, again, even if this had been the case, it would not follow that the Persian government rather than local political bodies would have been responsible for enforcing every last one of these laws. See Gary N. Knoppers, “An Achaemenid Imperial Authorization of Torah in Yehud?” in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of*

from an imperial perspective, one might say below—the bailiwick of the Persian-appointed governor, appears to have had some basis in the group made up of the $\text{twb) } \text{tyb}$ “house of the ancestors/fathers” or “ancestral house,” as I shall be translating the term. Before the exile, the $\text{b) } \text{tyb}$ “father’s house” or extended family was the smallest and most basic social unit in Judah.⁸⁸ In post-exilic literature, however, particularly in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, the

Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch, ed. James W. Watts, SBLSS 17 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 115-34. So some see the letter only as authorizing Ezra to appoint judges in Across-the-River to carry out Persian law; see, e.g., Lisbeth S. Fried, “‘You shall appoint judges’: Ezra’s Mission and the Rescript of Artaxerxes” in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*, ed. James W. Watts, SBLSS 17 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 63-89; Richard A. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 19. For arguments that the letter is not authentic, see Dirk Schwiderski, *Handbuch des nordwestsemitischen Briefformulars: Ein Beitrag zur Echtheitsfrage der aramäischen Briefe des Esrabuches*, BZAW 295 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000), 344-82; David Janzen, “The ‘Mission’ of Ezra and the Persian-Period Temple Community,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 619-43 (624-38); Sebastian Grätz, *Das Edikt des Artaxerxes: Eine Untersuchung zum religionspolitischen und historischen Umfeld von Esra 7,12-26*, BZAW 337 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 92-137; Anselm C. Hagedorn, “Local Law in an Imperial Context: The Role of Torah in the (Imagined) Persian Period” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding its Promulgation and Acceptance*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 57-76 (70-71)

⁸⁸ For the pre-exilic $\text{b) } \text{tyb}$ and other larger social groupings of that period, see

term “ancestral house” rather than “father’s house” dominates in references to the social structure of Judah, and it has become a consensus in scholarship that in the post-exilic period a somewhat different form of social organization had arisen to replace the *b) ַyב*.⁸⁹ The term *b) ַyב* appears thirty five times in Joshua-2 Kings, but only ten times in Chronicles and only

Lawrence E. Stager, “The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel,” *BASOR* 260 (1985): 1-35 (18-23); Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Family in First Temple Judaism” in *Families in Ancient Israel*, ed. Leo G. Perdue (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 48-103; Karel van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life*, SHCANE 7 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 194-97; Avraham Faust, “The Rural Community in Ancient Israel during Iron Age II,” *BASOR* 317 (2000): 17-39.

⁸⁹ So, e.g., Daniel L. Smith, *The Religion of the Landless: The Social Context of the Babylonian Exile* (Bloomington, IN: Meyer-Stone Books, 1989), 97-99; Joel Weinberg, *The Citizen-Temple Community*, trans. D.L. Smith-Christopher, JSOTSup 151 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 49-61; Jonathan E. Dyck, *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler*, BIS 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 188-96; H.G.M. Williamson, “The Family in Persian Period Judah: Some Textual Reflections” in *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*, ed. William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 469-85; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Judaism: The First Phase. The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 81; Rainer Albertz, “More and Less than a Myth: Reality and Significance of Exile for the Political, Social, and Religious History of Judah” in *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon: Approaches to the Study of Exile*, ed. John J. Ahn and Jill Middlemas, LHBOTS 526 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2012), 20-33 (31).

once in Ezra-Nehemiah; on the other hand, $\text{twb}) \text{ } \text{tyb}$ (or sometimes the shortened form $\text{twb})$) occurs only six times in Joshua-2 Kings but forty six times in Chronicles and nineteen times in Ezra-Nehemiah.⁹⁰ Pre-exilic physical constructions designed to support the extended family of the father's house—notably the four room house and the Judahite tomb—disappear in the Neo-Babylonian period and do not recur later.⁹¹

Post-exilic texts refer to $\text{twb}) \text{ } \text{y}\#\text{\$}) \text{ } \text{r}$ “the heads of the ancestors”—a way of referring to the heads of the ancestral house or $\text{twb}) \text{ } \text{tyb}$ —as the figures who represent these groups and who are involved in decision making on the local level. Even the Priestly Writer, who is consciously trying to re-create the pre-exilic social structures in his or her writing,⁹² refers far

⁹⁰ These statistics are compiled in Weinberg, *The Citizen-Temple Community*, 49. So, on average, the term $\text{b}) \text{ } \text{tyb}$ appears in about one out of every four chapters in Joshua through 2 Kings but in only one of every ten chapters in Chronicles, and only once in the twenty three chapters of Ezra-Nehemiah. On the other hand, the term $\text{twb}) \text{ } (\text{tyb})$ appears on average in fewer than one in every twenty chapters in Joshua through 2 Kings but almost once for every chapter of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.

⁹¹ This has been a particular focus of the work of Avraham Faust; see, e.g., Avraham Faust, *Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Period: The Archaeology of Destruction*, SBLABS 18 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 93-106; Avraham Faust, “Social, Cultural and Demographic Changes in Judah during the Transition from the Iron Age to the Persian Period and the Nature of the Society during the Persian Period” in *From Judah to Judaea: Socio-economic Structures and Processes in the Persian Period*, ed. Johannes Unsok Ro, HBM 43 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 106-32 (109-13).

⁹² On this point, see David S. Vanderhooft, “The Israelite *mišpāḥâ*, the Priestly Writings,

more frequently to the $\tau w b) \tau y b$ and to the “heads” of the ancestral houses than to the $\tau y b b)$.⁹³ In Ezra-Nehemiah we see these “heads” responsible for organizing the journey from Babylon to Judah (Ezra 1:1-5) and determining that the Babylonian immigrants alone will be responsible for building the temple (4:2-3). In Ezra 9-10, Ezra convinces the assembly to send away their foreign wives (see 10:12, 14), but does not appear to have the authority to force them to do so; he merely acts as a kind of administrator who has to work with the heads of the ancestral houses in order to accomplish this task (10:16). In Neh 8:13-18 it is the “heads” who study the law and agree that the people must observe Sukkoth. Ezra 8:1-14, a list of migrants to Judah in the time of Ezra, makes specific reference to the heads of the ancestral houses of this group (8:1) and Neh 12:12, 22-23 says that records were kept of past “heads of the ancestors” of the priests and Levites, signaling the importance of such figures. The list of Babylonian immigrants to Judah in Ezra 2:1-63 (= Neh 7:6-65) largely divides the people up according to the ancestral houses; most of these houses number in the hundreds, so these bodies obviously represent more than just extended families.⁹⁴ Each of these groups is named after an ancestor,

and Changing Valences in Israel’s Kinship Terminology” in *Exploring the Longue Durée: Essays in Honor of Lawrence E. Stager*, ed. J. David Schloen (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 485-96.

⁹³ For just some of the many appearances of $\tau w b) \tau y b$ in P, see Num 1:18-45 and 4:22-46. We find the expression $M \tau w b) \tau y b (\gamma) \# \$) r$ or its equivalent in P in Exod 6:14, 25; Num 1:4; 7:2; 17:18 [3]. As Leonhard Rost points out in *Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im Alten Testament: Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), 68-69, $\# \$) r$ appears 20 times in P, and only 19 times in all non-Priestly Pentateuchal material.

⁹⁴ See Blenkinsopp, *Judaism*, 81. See also the list of Babylonian immigrants in Ezra 8:1-

and when Chronicles lists groups of people, including temple personnel, it also typically only refers to the “heads of the ancestors,” and sometimes names those heads (e.g., 1 Chr 9:3-34; 23:9; 24:4, 6, 30; 26:32; 27:1; 2 Chr 17:14-19; 25:5; 31:17; 35:4), rather than referring to any other members of the house.

The ancestral houses also seem to have been categorized in the post-exilic period as to whether or not they were houses of cultic personnel. Ezra-Nehemiah distinguishes among the houses in terms of whether they belong to “the children of Israel” (Ezra 2:2-35 [= Neh 7:7-38]), the priests (Ezra 2:36-37 [= Neh 7:39-42]), the Levites (Ezra 2:40 [= Neh 7:43]), the musicians (Ezra 2:41 [= Neh 7:44]), the gatekeepers (Ezra 2:42 [= Neh 7:45]), the temple servants (Ezra 2:43-53 [= Neh 7:46-56]),⁹⁵ or Solomon’s servants (Ezra 2:55-57 [= Neh 7:57-59]).⁹⁶ We see a

14, where the numbers of members of each house who are said to go to Judah are generally much smaller. This can be explained by the fact that Ezra 8:1-14 lists only numbers of migrants from these houses rather than the total population of them. That the list of Ezra 2 (= Neh 7) also claims to be a list of immigrants from Babylon to Judah reflects the (historically inaccurate) trope that the bulk of the exilic community moved to Judah all at once, as soon as the exilic period ended. See Bob Becking, “‘We all returned as one!’ Critical Notes on the Myth of the Mass Return” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 3-18, who describes Ezra 2 as a “historical myth” (pp. 6-7).

⁹⁵ Ezra 8:20 suggests that, at least in Ezra-Nehemiah, the מְנַנְיָטִין are a class of temple personnel below the rank of Levites. See Baruch A. Levine, “The Netînîm,” *JBL* 82 (1963): 207-12; Risto Nurmela, *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood*, SFSHJ 193 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 171-72; Daniela Piatelli, “The Levites and Temple Singers within the Qahal of Israel on the Return from the Babylonian Exile” in *For Uriel: Studies in the*

similar subdivision among the ancestral houses, minus the categories of temple musicians and gatekeepers, in Neh 11:3, but Ezra-Nehemiah normally divides the people into three groups of ancestral houses: priests, Levites, and Israel (Ezra 3:8; 6:16; 9:1; 10:18-43; Neh 10:1-28 [9:38-10:27]). By the time Chronicles is written, the temple musicians and gatekeepers are understood to be Levites (1 Chr 23; 25-26), and 1 Chr 9:1-34 divides post-exilic society into ancestral houses led by heads, but distinguished as to whether these houses belong to Israel (9:3-9), the priests (9:10-13), or the Levites (9:14-34).⁹⁷

Given the shift in social organization between the pre- and post-exilic periods, the consensus view is, rightly, that the $\tau\omega\beta) \tau\gamma\beta$ formed in Babylon, perhaps as a social adaptation that allowed the Judeans to survive the exile and maintain some kind of social identity.⁹⁸ It seems undeniable that post-exilic Judean society was organized around these

History of Israel in Antiquity Presented to Professor Uriel Rappaport, ed. Menahem Mor et al., (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2005), 91*-104* (92*).

⁹⁶ Given that “Solomon’s servants” are consistently found in lists placed next to temple personnel (see also Neh 11:3), it would appear that they also held positions within the temple. See H.G.M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, WBC 16 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), 35 and Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), 91.

⁹⁷ And note 9:9, 13, and 34, which all state that these are lists of the “heads” of the ancestral houses.

⁹⁸ So, e.g., Smith, *The Religion of the Landless*, 118; Weinberg, *The Citizen-Temple Community*, 49-61; Jeremiah Cataldo, “Persian Policy and the Yehud Community during Nehemiah,” *JSOT* 28 (2003): 240-52 (247-48); Williamson, “The Family in Persian Period

groups; not only do their “heads” appear as important and powerful figures in post-exilic texts, but, according to Ezra-Nehemiah, in their totality the ancestral houses form, along with the people from the towns in Judah, “the people of the province,” “the people of Israel” (Ezra 2:1-2 [= Neh 7:6-7]), and the *ḥq* “assembly” (Ezra 2:64 [= Neh 7:6]).⁹⁹ And as in Ezra-Nehemiah, 1 Chr 13:1-5 equates “the assembly of Israel” with “all Israel,” and it is a group that David consults in this story to decide an important religious matter. Similarly, in 2 Chr 30:2-3, Hezekiah consults not only his officials but “all the assembly” about keeping Passover in the second month, rather than the first as the law prescribes. In 1 Chr 28:8 “all Israel” is also called “the assembly of Yhwh,” and the Chronicler sometimes alters his or her source material to

Judah,” 477-78; Faust, *Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, 106-107.

⁹⁹ The list of Ezra 2 (= Neh 7) also refers to numbers of people listed by geographical location rather than ancestral houses, and as commentators often point out, these may refer to people not descended from the Babylonian immigrants. See, e.g., John Kessler, “Persia’s Loyal Yahwists: Power Identity and Ethnicity in Achaemenid Yehud” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 91-121 (109); Ernst Axel Knauf, “Bethel: The Israelite Impact on Judean Language and Literature” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 291-349 (301-302); H.G.M. Williamson, “Welcome Home” in *The Historian and the Bible: Essays in Honour of Lester L. Grabbe*, ed. Philip R. Davies and Diana V. Edelman, LHBOTS 530 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2010), 113-23 (120-21). As Ezra-Nehemiah portrays the assembly, however, all of them are descended from Babylonian immigrants.

replace an original *hd* (“congregation” with *lhq*.¹⁰⁰ Even though the Chronicler writes a history of the time of the monarchy, he or she presents the assembly as involved even in political matters (1 Chr 29:1; 2 Chr 23:3), although they are more normally associated with the temple and its worship (2 Chr 1:5; 6:3; 7:8; 20:5; 29:23, 28, 31-32; 30:2, 13, 17, 23-25; 31:18) and are sometimes portrayed as being in the temple (2 Chr 6:12-13; 20:5; 23:3; 29:25-28). Ezra-Nehemiah also associates assembly and temple, as we have seen, since it portrays this group alone as responsible for its construction (Ezra 4:1-3). And in Chronicles, just as in Ezra-Nehemiah, the heads of the ancestral houses can represent the assembly, and they seem to hold particularly important leadership roles. It is the heads of priestly and Levitical houses who lead and organize cult and whom the Chronicler finds most important to mention in various contexts (e.g., 1 Chr 15:12-15; 23:24; 24:21, 31; 26:10, 12; 2 Chr 24:6); in 2 Chr 1:2 *twb) h y#š) r* make up “all of the leaders of Israel”; in 2 Chr 19:8 the king appoints heads of the ancestors as judges; in 2 Chr 23:2-3 the heads of the ancestors represent the assembly as they agree to overthrow Athaliah in a pro-Davidic coup; and so on. In Chronicles there are even heads in the Northern Kingdom whom the army and the people obey (2 Chr 28:12-15).

It is difficult to know precisely how far to trust Chronicles’ depiction of the assembly, since it may well be describing post-exilic society as the author wants it to be rather than as it

¹⁰⁰ Cf. 2 Chr 23:3 and 2 Kgs 11:17, as well as 2 Chr 24:6 and Exod 35:4, 20, and see Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 242-43 on the two words as synonyms. The Chronicler prefers to use *lhq* to create continuity between the political entity of the pre-exilic past and that of his or her present.

was,¹⁰¹ but if we include only the general portrayals of the assembly in Chronicles that correspond to ones that we also find in Ezra-Nehemiah, then we see a group divided by ancestral houses and classified as to whether or not they belong to Israel, the priests, or the Levites.¹⁰² They are led by heads who seem to represent the houses and to wield authority in Judean society. Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles associate the assembly particularly with the temple and its worship. Associated with “all Israel” (and, in Ezra-Nehemiah, with “the people of the province”), important political figures like Ezra (or, in Chronicles, the kings) consult with the assembly to accomplish particular goals. In Nehemiah 5, for example, the governor does not deal with the financial crisis by himself but convenes “a great assembly” (5:7). Both Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles refer to מַנְּקֵז “elders” and מַיְרָא “officials,” and these terms generally appear to refer to the heads of the ancestral houses; certainly Ezekiel refers to “the elders of Judah/Israel” (8:1; 14:1; 20:1, 3) as the Judean leadership in exile, the time when the *twb) tyb* is evolving.¹⁰³ And although the heads of the ancestral houses study the law with Ezra in

¹⁰¹ This is Schweitzer’s point in *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*.

¹⁰² These divisions of the assembly, again, are in place by the fourth century since, as we have seen above, Ezra 2 (= Neh 7) also includes divisions of the temple personnel that have been absorbed into the Levites by the time the Chronicler is writing in the fourth century.

¹⁰³ Williamson argues that the terms “heads,” “elders,” and “officials” were interchangeable; see his “The Family in the Persian Period,” 475. I. Eph‘al, “The Western Minorities in Babylonia in the 6th-5th Centuries B.C.: Maintenance and Cohesion,” *Or* 47 (1978): 74-90 (76-79) argues that the “heads” and “elders” were two different terms used for the assembly leadership. Rainer Albertz describes a local post-exilic leadership jointly based on a council of elders, a congregation of priests, and an assembly; see, e.g., Albertz, *A History of*

Nehemiah 8 and decide that the people must observe Sukkoth, in Neh 10:1-28 [9:38-10:27] it is the “officials,” Levites, and priests who sign the declaration on behalf of the people to keep the law. In the story of the divorce of the foreign women in Ezra 9-10, although, as we have seen, Ezra works with the assembly and its heads (see especially 10:1, 12, 16, which refer to the actions of the assembly and the heads of the houses), the “elders” and “officials” also exercise authority within the assembly (10:8, 14).

Ezra 1-6 portrays the post-exilic assembly as responsible for the reconstruction of the temple, and the assembly and its member ancestral houses are also responsible for supporting the temple through tithes (Neh 10:1-40 [9:38-10:39]).¹⁰⁴ So besides the fact that the ancestral houses

Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, trans. John Bowden, OTL (Louisville:

Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 2:446-47; Albertz, “More and Less than a Myth,” 30.

¹⁰⁴ Regardless of what one might think of the validity of Artaxerxes’ letter in Ezra 7:11-26, in which the Great King commands royal officials to provide the materials for the sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple (7:21-23), or of Darius’s letter of 6:2-12, which contains a similar command (6:8-10), the fact that the community must pledge to support the temple in Nehemiah 10, combined with Nehemiah’s claim in 13:10-14 that this support was not forthcoming, forcing the Levites to return to farming, suggests that local support for the temple was the basis, and likely the sole basis, of its financial resources. Darius’s order in Ezra 6 is reportedly based on his discovery of a command by Cyrus that the Persian administration bear the cost of temple reconstruction (6:2-5). Yet if Cyrus had truly commanded his administration to do this, why is it that, at the beginning of Darius’s reign, not one stone of the temple had been put in place (Hag 2:15-19)? Ezra 1-6 insists that the temple’s foundation was laid during the time of Cyrus (Ezra 3)—part of its project as presenting post-exilic temple and assembly as coeval, as we discussed

of the temple personnel are specifically distinguished from other houses in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles and that the assembly is often mentioned in the context of the temple and its worship, the assembly's self-imposed obligation to maintain the temple suggests that an important part of the assembly's identity has to do with this institution. Moreover, beyond the leadership role of the assembly's heads, the priests appear to have played a particularly important role in post-

in chapter 1—but then cannot explain why this work came to a halt. 4:17-22 provides a putative letter from Artaxerxes ordering a stop to the work on Jerusalem's wall, and 4:24, rather confusingly, goes on to say that “then the work on the house of the God of Jerusalem ceased.” See Peter Ross Bedford, *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*, JSJSup 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 132-80.

As we shall see below, the Achaemenids, following the lead of the Neo-Babylonian kings, worked to channel resources from temples to the state, not the other way around, and this seems to have been their policy throughout the empire; see Lester L. Grabbe, “The ‘Persian Documents’ in the Book of Ezra: Are They Authentic?” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 531-70 and Caroline Waerzeggers, “Babylonian Kingship in the Persian Period: Performance and Reception” in *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, ed. Jonathan Stökl and Caroline Waerzeggers, BZAW 478 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 181-222. As Wouter Henkelman shows in *The Other Gods Who Are: Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts*, AchHist 14 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2008), 334-51, part of his study of the Persepolis texts, the only cults for which the Persians provided funding were those dedicated to gods that had traditionally been worshiped in Elam and Iran.

exilic Judean leadership, certainly by the fourth century, again pointing to the centrality of the temple in the political life and identity of the assembly. In Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, as we have seen, the temple personnel are listed as distinct groups within the assembly, pointing to their social importance but also to the importance of the institution in which they serve. The high priest in particular was a significant figure in post-exilic society. Haggai, for example, portrays Joshua the high priest as a leader in post-exilic Judah whose importance is more or less equal to that of Zerubbabel's (1:1, 12, 14; 2:2), and in Zech 6:11 God orders that a crown be placed on Joshua's head.¹⁰⁵ In Ezra-Nehemiah's narrative of the temple-building, Joshua has a place of importance equal to that of Zerubbabel's (Ezra 3:1, 8-9; 4:3), and Neh 12:1-26, as we have seen, contains lists of priestly and Levitical heads of ancestral houses, suggesting these groups were of particular importance. Josephus presents the high priest as largely in charge of Judah by the time of the Macedonian invasion of the Levant; in his account, at least, it is the high priest who communicates with Alexander (*Ant.* 11.317-319).¹⁰⁶ But in the larger section of which this story is a part (11.302-339), Josephus also refers to the "elders of Jerusalem," who drive Manasseh, the brother of the high priest, from his priestly office in Jerusalem because of his marriage to a woman from the family of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria (11.302-309), and so the society he portrays here is not a theocracy where the priests alone have power, but one where "elders," likely the heads of the ancestral houses, exercised political influence, just as they do in Ezra-

¹⁰⁵ We will discuss the difficult passage of Zech 6:9-14 and the word $\tau\omega\rho\iota$ (that I am translating as "crown" in chapter 6.

¹⁰⁶ For a summary of the scholarly arguments of the sources that Josephus might have used to write *Ant.* 11.302-339, see James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 66-81.

Nehemiah and Chronicles.¹⁰⁷

Other evidence for priestly leadership in fourth century Judah includes a coin produced in that century that reads *ywhnn hkwhn* “Yohanan the priest.”¹⁰⁸ The iconography of this coin type is precisely like that of coins struck by a governor of Judah, some of which read *yhzqyh hphh* “Hezekiah the governor” and others of which simply say *yhzqyh*; it is possible that the Hezekiah coins minted without the title “governor” were produced after the Macedonian conquest of Palestine, indicating that the same figure continued to hold office after Alexander’s arrival, even if that office was no longer called “governor.”¹⁰⁹ The similarity between the coins of Yohanan

¹⁰⁷ Kyung-jin Min even argues in *The Levitical Authorship of Ezra-Nehemiah*, JSOTSup 409 (London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 116-37 that the Persians originally used the priests as agents of Persian rule in Judah, but that in the mid-fifth century became worried about the concentration of power in their hands.

¹⁰⁸ For discussions of the coin, including when in the fourth century it might have been minted, see John Betlyon, “The Provincial Government of Persian Period Judea and the Yehud Coins,” *JBL* 105 (1986): 633-42; Dan Barag, “Silver Coin of Yohanan the High Priest and the Coinage of Judea in the Fourth Century B.C.,” *INJ* 9 (1986-1987): 4-14; Ya’akov Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins: From the Persian Period to Bar Kokhba* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2001), 14; L.S. Fried, “A Silver Coin of Yoḥanan Hakkôhên,” *Transeu* 25 (2003): 47-67.

¹⁰⁹ For the coins and the argument concerning the significance of the omission of the term *hphh* on some of them, see Leo Mildenberg, “Yehud: A Preliminary Study of the Provincial Coinage of Judaea” in *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology: Essays in Honor of Margaret Thompson*, ed. Otto Mørkholm and Nancy Waggoner (Wettener: np, 1979), 183-96 (188-89); Peter Machinist, “The First Coins of Judah and Samaria: Numismatics and History in the

and Hezekiah suggests that the priest had a status like or equal to that of the governor's;¹¹⁰ it is not even out of the question that Yohanan the high priest functioned as a Persian governor, especially since the iconography on the coins tells us the same mint produced the coins for priest and governor,¹¹¹ just as it is not out of the question that a fourth-century coin bearing the name *ydw* "Jaddua" was struck by the last high priest mentioned in the lists of Neh 12:10-11, 22.¹¹²

Parts of the late-fourth-century work of Hecataeus of Abdera also point to the importance of priestly leadership in Judah. It is not entirely clear that the material Josephus claims is from Hecataeus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.183-204) truly is,¹¹³ but scholarship widely accepts that Diodorus drew

Achaemenid and Early Hellenistic Periods" in *Continuity and Change: Proceedings of the Last Achaemenid History Workshop*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, Amélie Kuhrt, and Margaret Cool Root, *AchHist* 8 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1994), 365-79 (369-71); Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins*, 15-18.

¹¹⁰ So Dan Barag, "Some Notes on a Silver Coin of Johanan the High Priest," *BA* 48 (1985): 166-68; cf. also James W. Watts, "Scripturalization and the Aaronide Dynasties," *JHS* 13/6 (2013): 1-15 (5).

¹¹¹ So Deborah W. Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*, OTM (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 230-31.

¹¹² So Arnold Spaer, "Jaddua the High Priest?," *INJ* 9 (1986-1987): 1-3. Ya'akov Meshorer, however, suggests that the coin may have been minted in Samaria, and may not refer to a Judean at all. See his *A Treasury of Jewish Coins*, 14 n. 45.

¹¹³ Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus, On the Jews: Legitimizing the Diaspora*, HCS 21 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996) concludes that Josephus is referring to the work of a Pseudo-Hecataeus who wrote c. 100 BCE. For some of the earlier

information from the work of this Gentile author, and the material from Hecataeus to which he refers in 40.3.1-8 certainly demonstrates that his source knows some basic facts about Judaism's traditions: Jews live in Jerusalem; their nation was founded by Moses; Moses gave them a law; they were divided into twelve tribes; they practice aniconic worship; they have a temple and a priesthood.¹¹⁴ Hecataeus claims that, after Moses established the people in the land and gave them their laws and temple, he appointed the wisest among them to be their priests, who oversaw cult and law. As a result, he writes, the Jews have never had a king and they docilely obey the high priest, whom they see as a divine intermediary. It stands to reason that Hecataeus received his information about Judaism from a priest—if Josephus's witness to Hecataeus is in fact accurate, then Hecataeus's informant was a Judean priest (*Ag. Ap.* 1.187)—since his informant

scholarly discussion as to whether or not Josephus truly was relying on the work of the fourth century Hecataeus, see Miriam Pucci Ben Zeev, "The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism. Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974-1990)," *JSJ* 24 (1993): 215-34.

¹¹⁴ Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, 246-50 and Russell E. Gmirkin, *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch*, LHBOTS 433 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2006), 34-71 do argue that Diodorus depends on an unreliable source here, but the very fact that Hecataeus is so familiar with Jewish tradition suggests otherwise. For fuller defenses of Hecataeus as relying on an Egyptian Jewish source, see Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 25-39 and Lester L. Grabbe, "Hecataeus of Abdera and the Jewish Law: The Question of Authenticity" in *Berührungspunkte: Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt*, ed. Ingo Kottsieper, Rüdiger Schmidt, and Jakob Wöhrle, AOAT 350 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008), 613-26.

has provided him with a description of Israel's past that is clearly biased to favor the priesthood.¹¹⁵ It indeed suggests that someone who had little exposure to Judean texts but access to information personally communicated by Jews in the fourth century could be persuaded that priests had always formed the leadership in Judah, and it is difficult to see how a reasonable person could have been persuaded by such an account if priests had not held some kind of important leadership role by the late fourth century.

Whether or not the high priest Yohanan truly was a governor, and whether or not there was a Judean priest Jaddua who minted coins as Yohanan did, the very fact that it was the high priest to whom the Judean garrison in Elephantine first wrote at the end of the fifth century to ask for support in rebuilding their Yahwistic temple (*TAD* A4.7.17-19) tells us that the Persians understood the priesthood and the high priest in Jerusalem as wielding some sort of authority at that time that the Persian government, even the Persian administration in Egypt, would recognize. It is only because the priesthood in Jerusalem provided Elephantine with no answer, no warrant or authority to show the Persian government in Egypt that the Judeans in Elephantine should be allowed to rebuild their temple (7.19), that the garrison there wrote to the governor of Judah (7.1, 22-29).¹¹⁶ The governor was, apparently, not their first choice of authority figure to

¹¹⁵ And cf. Doron Mendels, "Hecataeus of Abdera and a Jewish '*patrios politeia*' of the Persian Period (Diodorus Siculus XL,3)," *ZAW* 95 (1983): 96-110 and Bar Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 25-39.

¹¹⁶ *TAD* A4.7.18 suggests that Elephantine originally wrote to Bagohi the Persian governor of Judah also, but we have no sense that they had asked him to do anything in that earlier letter. A4.7 refers to the failure of the Jerusalem priesthood to act, but the priests of Elephantine never mention that they had requested in the earlier letter that Bagohi do something

appeal to in this matter; that is, they seem to have believed that the word of the high priest and priesthood in Jerusalem would carry more weight with the Persian authorities than that of the governor of Judah.

The high priest maintained an important political role in Judea in the Hellenistic period as well, further evidence that, in the Persian period, the political importance of the office was already in place. The Zenon Papyri give us no indication that the Ptolemies appointed an administrator over Syria-Palestine, and so it seems that they allowed local rule there; the most obvious way for them to have done so would have been to continue pre-existing forms of local government. The Tobiad Romance of *Ant.* 12.154-236 refers to the third-century high priest Onias as in charge of sending tribute to the Ptolemies (12.156-159);¹¹⁷ the story also says he exercises the office of *τὸν λαὸν προτάσι/αν* “the leadership of the people,” and seems to distinguish between this *prostasi/a* and his cultic leadership as high priest

for them; that is, A4.7 is not a renewal of an earlier request to Bagohi. The case would seem to be rather that they are making a request of him here for the first time, and only because of the failure of the Jerusalem priesthood to reply. But even if Elephantine had originally asked Bagohi to write on their behalf, that would not alter the fact that they believed the Persians would highly value the word of the temple hierarchy of Jerusalem. If they did appeal to Bagohi in an earlier letter, requesting that he ask the Persian authorities in Egypt to have the temple rebuilt, they did not make the request solely to him, but to the Jerusalem priesthood as well.

¹¹⁷ For a discussion of Josephus’s report of this tribute, see Lester L. Grabbe, “Hyparchs, *Oikonomoi* and Mafiosi: The Governance of Judah in the Ptolemaic Period” in *Judah between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400-200 BCE)*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits, LSTS 75 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2011), 70-90 (79-80).

(12.163).¹¹⁸ The letter of 2 Macc 11:27-33, which 2 Maccabees places in the reign of Antiochus V, refers to the high priest as an intermediary between the people and the Seleucid king. Antiochus VI appoints the Hasmonean Simon to be both high priest and *strathgo&j* “governor” from Tyre to Egypt (1 Macc 11:59); 1 Macc 14:27-49 refers to Simon as “high priest forever,” “governor,” *h (gou&menoj* “leader,” and ethnarch. *Ant.* 13.299 and *J.W.* 1.68 say that Simon’s son John Hyrcanus had both *th&n te a)rxh_n tou~ e)qnou~j* “the rule of the nation” and high priesthood, telling us he held leadership offices in civil and cultic government.¹¹⁹ Hyrcanus’s son Aristobulus may have been the first high priest who claimed to be king (*J.W.* 1.70), but his predecessors had held that office in everything but name.¹²⁰ It is no wonder, then, that Josephus portrays the priests as Judaism’s leadership (*Ag. Ap.* 2.185-187), or that Ben Sira refers to Aaron as wearing a golden crown (45:12) and the Aaronides rather than

¹¹⁸ See Klaus D. Schunck, “Hoherpriester und Politiker? Die Stellung der Hohenpriester von Jaddua bis Jonatan zur jüdischen Gemeinde und zum hellenistischen Staat,” *VT* 44 (1994): 498-512 and VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 169-71, 180-81. The argument that *prostasi/a* need not refer to an office, but simply to the fact that the Ptolemies recognized the Judean high priest as “the representative head of the Judeans”—so, e.g., Horsley, *Scribes*, 40—simply replaces the notion of “office” with that of “representative head,” which is, for all intents and purposes, an office. See Elias J. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 74; Maria Brutti, *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period: History, Ideology, Theology*, *JSJSup* 108 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 124-25.

¹¹⁹ Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs*, 310-11 and VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 304-305.

¹²⁰ See VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 313.

the Davidides as possessing an eternal covenant (45:15).¹²¹ It is unlikely that this apparently natural adoption of the high priesthood as a local political leadership in Judea in the Hellenistic period would have been possible if the high priests had not exercised a great deal of authority on the local level in the Persian period.

And in the Persian period, the Judeans writing from Elephantine to the governor of Judah claim in *TAD* A4.7 that they first wrote not only to the high priest but also to *ḥry yhwdy*' (7.19) to ask for support in their efforts to rebuild their temple. As Muhammad Dandamaev argues, the North West Semitic *ḥr* refers to freepersons.¹²² In inscriptional material, the word mainly appears in Arabian Aramaic material to individuals as belonging to households of freepersons;¹²³ in rabbinic Hebrew *ḥwr* is used to distinguish freepersons from slaves (e.g., m. *Git.* 4:4, 5; m. *B. Qam.* 1:3); and in *Qoh* 10:16-17, *rx* is the opposite of *r* (n “servant.” But the Nehemiah Memoir¹²⁴ refers to the *Myrx* as influential power brokers among the population, people whom

¹²¹ For Ben Sira as presenting the priesthood as the ideal governing body, see Martha Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*, JCC (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 35-37; Joseph L. Angel, *Otherworldly Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *STDJ* 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 259-63.

¹²² M.A. Dandamaev, “Babylonian Popular Assemblies in the First Millennium B.C.,” *BCSMS* 30 (1995): 23-29 (26-27).

¹²³ E.g., we see the expressions *br ḥry PN* “member of the freepersons of PN” (e.g., *CIS* 2.161.i.2; 2.990.2; 2.4000.3-4) and *bt ḥry PN* “house of the freepersons of PN” (*CIS* 2.3901; 2.4340.2-3).

¹²⁴ Scholarship largely accepts *Neh* 1:1-2:20; 4:1-7:5; 12:31-43; 13:6-31 as Nehemiah’s own account. See Mark J. Boda, “Redaction in the Book of Nehemiah: A Fresh Proposal” in

Nehemiah can address as leaders of and intermediaries for the Judean population as a whole.¹²⁵

He refers to the *Myrx* (and the *Myngs*, people who hold positions of some sort within the Persian administration of Judah, perhaps a formal Persian recognition of their local leadership positions within the assembly)¹²⁶ as part of “the people,” since in the Memoir we normally

Unity and Disunity in Ezra-Nehemiah: Redaction, Rhetoric, and Reader, ed. Mark J. Boda and Paul L. Redditt, HBM 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 25-54 (25 n. 2) for a brief bibliography of scholars who accept these verses as comprising the Nehemiah Memoir.

¹²⁵ The *Myrx* appear together with the priests and/or other officials as an important group within the people as a whole in Neh 2:16; 4:8, 13 [14, 19]; 5:7; 7:5. In passages like 6:17 and 13:17 Nehemiah depicts the *Myrx* as leaders among the people, and figures who appear to wield local power in the province; in 5:7 Nehemiah portrays them as wealthy figures, for he blames them for taking interest from the people as a whole, driving them into poverty.

¹²⁶ The term *NgS* is a loanword from Akkadian *šaknu*, a word that could be used for someone who oversaw professional groups dependent on the state, or even someone serving as governor; see Israel Eph'al, “Changes in Palestine during the Persian Period in Light of Epigraphic Sources,” *IEJ* 48 (1998): 106-19 (117); M.A. Dandamaev, “Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid State Administration in Mesopotamia” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 373-98 (375-76). For the use of *sgn* in reference to functionaries of the Persian administration in Elephantine, see Thierry Petit, “L'évolution sémantique des termes hébreux et araméens *pḥh* et *sgn* et accadiens *pāḥatu* et *šaknu*,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 53-67 (58-60) and Rainer Albertz, “The Thwarted Restoration” in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era*, ed. Rainer Albertz and Bob Becking, STAR 5 (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003),

encounter the word in the phrase “the Myrx, the Myngs, and the rest of the people” (Neh 2:16; 4:8, 13 [14, 19]; 7:5), and in 5:7 Nehemiah accuses both the Myrx and the Myngs of charging interest from and so impoverishing their “kin.” In 13:17, Nehemiah clearly writes of the Myrx as if they exercised authority in Judean society, for he blames them for allowing people to work on the Sabbath and for permitting foreign traders to operate in Judah on the Sabbath.¹²⁷ Nehemiah’s portrayal of the Myrx, in fact, makes them seem very much like the heads of the ancestral houses elsewhere in Ezra-Nehemiah—that is, part of the people but responsible for them—and it is likely that Myrx is simply the term Nehemiah uses for the heads.¹²⁸ So when the Judeans at

1-17 (12).

¹²⁷ So the case may be not that the Myrx represent a different power structure than the heads and the ancestral houses—contra Williamson, “The Family,” 475-76—but that Nehemiah simply uses a different word to describe the heads.

¹²⁸ The Nehemiah Memoir never uses the word #) r in reference to a group of people. twb) h y#) r/twb) l My#) r does appear in Neh 7:70; 8:13; 11:13; 12:12, 22, 23, and #) r is used in a synonymous sense in regard to houses of temple personnel in Neh 11:16; 12:7, 24, 46, but these are from lists and, in the case of Neh 8:13, material associated with Ezra, not from material composed by Nehemiah. *TAD* A4.7.18-19 suggests that there was some sort of figure who led the Myrx in Judah; as Bezael Porten points out, just as these lines portray Jehohanan the high priest as the head of the priests, they seem to portray a figure by the name of Ostanes as the head of *hry yhwdy*; see Bezael Porten, “The Aramaic Texts” in *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change*, 2nd ed., ed. Bezael Porten, DMOA 22 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 75-275 (144 n. 62). There is no other indication, though, of the Myrx or heads having an official leader.

Elephantine use the term, they may be referring to the leadership of the temple assembly, and likely to the heads of the ancestral houses, but they clearly expected that the voice of *hry yhwdy*, along with that of the high priest, would carry weight with the Persian authorities in Egypt in regard to the matter of the temple there. And given that Josephus portrays the “elders” as having enough power to force a member of the high priest’s family to leave Jerusalem, the information from Persian and Hellenistic period sources gives us a picture of a local Judean government where the priesthood, and certainly the high priest, exercised great influence, but where the heads of the ancestral houses were also powerbrokers.

What we see in fourth-century Judah is a situation rather like that of the temple assemblies in Babylonia, the place where the fundamental social shift from *b) tyb* to *tyb twb)* took place that would so shape post-exilic Judean society,¹²⁹ and a brief overview of the composition and function of these assemblies will shed some light on the local government of fourth-century Judah. In Babylonia, the *mār banê* (singular: *mār banī*) were free native persons

¹²⁹ For other works that make this connection between social structure in Persian period Judah and the Babylonian temple assemblies, see Eph‘al, “The Western Minorities,” 79; Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Temple and Society in Achaemenid Judah” in *Second Temple Studies I: Persian Period*, ed. P.R. Davies, JSOTSup 117 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 22-53 (30-32); Weinberg, *The Citizen-Temple Community*, 28, 61; Janzen, “The ‘Mission’ of Ezra”; Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 190-93; John W. Wright, ““Those doing the work for the service of the house of the Lord’: 1 Chronicles 23:6-24:31 and the Sociohistorical Context of the Temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem in the Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Period” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 361-84.

and citizens who belonged to the *puḫru* “assembly” associated with a temple or city and that formed the local government; in some cases, in fact, the local administrations of the temple and city seem to be so closely related that it is difficult to distinguish between them.¹³⁰ Non-native free persons, such as foreigners resettled in Babylonia by the imperial government, held no property in the cities and so had no access to the temples and were excluded from the native assemblies, although they could create assemblies of their own,¹³¹ as was the case, for example, with an Egyptian expatriate community who formed “the assembly of the elders of the

¹³⁰ See Gilbert J.P. McEwan, *Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia*, FAS 4 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1981), 189; Amélie Kuhrt, “Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood” in *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, ed. Mary Beard and John North (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 119-55 (153-54); Gojko Barjamovic, “Civic Institutions and Self-Government in Southern Mesopotamia in the Mid-First Millennium BC” in *Assyria and Beyond: Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*, ed. J.G. Dercksen; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2004), 55-72.

¹³¹ On the Babylonian *puḫru* and the formation of foreign assemblies in Babylonia, see M.A. Dandamaev, “The Neo-Babylonian Citizens,” *Klio* 63 (1981): 45-49; M.A. Dandamaev, “The Neo-Babylonian Elders” in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff*, ed. M.A. Dandamaev et al. (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1982), 38-41; M.A. Dandamaev, “The Neo-Babylonian Popular Assembly” in *Šulmu: Papers on the Ancient Near East Presented at the International Conference of Socialist Countries*, ed. Petr Vavroušek and Vladimír Souček (Prague: Charles University, 1988), 63-71; John P. Nielsen, *Sons and Descendants: A Social History of Kin Groups and Family Names in the Early Neo-Babylonian Period, 747-626 BC*, CHANE 43 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 253-55

Egyptians.”¹³² Since the Judeans were resettled in Babylonia in a place known as “the city of Judah,” we might expect that they did the same.¹³³

A temple assembly was responsible for affairs involving the temple itself: its personnel, sacrifice, the distribution of its land and its usufruct to assembly members, collecting the temple tithe, and so on. Anyone who owned land fell under the jurisdiction of the assembly. Freepersons had the right to be judged by their peers, and legal cases were held before the assemblies.¹³⁴ The assembly’s elders were its elite members, and seemed to function as a kind of executive

¹³² For the relevant texts concerning the *puḫur šibūtu ša mišrāya*, see Muhammad A. Dandamaev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, CLIS 6 (New York: Mazda Press, 1992), 176. See also the discussion concerning this assembly in Eph‘al, “The Western Minorities,” 76-79.

¹³³ For discussions of the texts that refer to *āl Yāhūdu* “the city of Judah” and *ālu ša Yāhūdaia* “the city of the Judeans,” see Laurie E. Pearce, “New Evidence for Judeans in Babylonia” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 399-410; Laurie E. Pearce, “‘Judean’: A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Babylonia?” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 267-77; Laurie E. Pearce, “Identifying Judeans and Judean Identity in the Babylonian Evidence” in *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, ed. Jonathan Stökl and Caroline Waerzeggers, BZAW 478 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 7-32.

¹³⁴ Dandamaev, “The Babylonian Elders”; Muhammad A. Dandamaev, *Slavery in Babylonia from Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626-331 BC)*, rev. ed., trans. Victoria A. Powell (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1984), 46-47.

committee within the assembly.¹³⁵ Advice to a Prince (*BWL* 4.4), a Neo-Assyrian text, warns that kings who mistreat the citizens of the cities (*mār Sippar* [4.4.9], *māri Nippuri* [4.4.11], *māri Bābili* [4.4.15]), who do not provide them with justice or proper trials (4.4.1-3, 9-14, 16, 45-49), who take their money or property (4.4.15, 31-34, 38-44), who alter their treaties (4.4.51-54), who impose fines on or imprison them (4.4.19-22), or who demand forced labor from them (4.4.23-30) will be punished by the gods with invasion and loss of rule. By the late Neo-Babylonian period, however, the monarchy began to limit the power of the assemblies, an understandable move given the vast economic wealth controlled by the temples. Beginning with Nabonidus and continuing through the Persian period, the monarchy began to siphon off the temples' wealth through taxation and appropriation of labor, taking responsibility for some temple land and controlling its usufruct.¹³⁶ From the time of Nabonidus we begin to see members of the royal administration placed within the temple administrations in order to ensure a flow of resources to the crown.¹³⁷ The Persians appear to have ended the earlier practice of royal tithing to temples,¹³⁸

¹³⁵ See Marc Van De Mieroop, *The Ancient Mesopotamian City* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 121-25.

¹³⁶ See Dandamaev, "Babylonian Popular Assemblies," 24-25; M.A. Dandamaev, "Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid State Administration," 376-77, 395; Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 36-41; Peter R. Bedford, "The Economic Role of the Jerusalem Temple in Achaemenid Judah: Comparative Perspectives" in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, its Exegesis and its Language*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher et al. (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2007), 3*-20* (18*-19*).

¹³⁷ McEwan, *Priest and Temple*, 26; Matthew W. Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašu Archive, the Murašu Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*, UNHAI 54 (Leiden :

and even began to limit the assemblies' judicial control over their own members,¹³⁹ the latter action perhaps an inevitable outcome of the presence of royal officials in the temple hierarchy.¹⁴⁰

The Judeans in Babylonia, of course, would have been exposed to these assemblies before the culmination of these erosions of their power, but even in the Persian period the Babylonian assemblies were still deciding legal cases, adjudicating such issues as theft of temple property, the matter of the parentage of a *mār banî*, the failure of individuals to fulfill contracts, the rental of temple property, and so on.¹⁴¹ The exiles lived in the midst of a society in which the

Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1985), 42-43; Dandamaev, *Slavery in Babylonia*, 56-57; Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 13-15; Bedford, "The Economic Role," 18*-19*.

The civic and temple assemblies had always functioned with at least nominal imperial oversight, but in Babylonia under Neo-Assyrian rule the governors had generally come from the local population and represented the city or temple to the king. See Barjamovic, "Civic Institutions," 51-55.

¹³⁸ Dandamaev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, 19; Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 42-43; Kristin Kleber, *Tempel und Palast: Die Beziehungen zwischen dem König und dem Eanna-Tempel im spätbabylonischen Uruk*, AOAT 358 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008), 342-43.

¹³⁹ Dandamaev, *Slavery in Babylonia*, 57; Dandamaev, "Babylonian Popular Assemblies," 25; Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 32-33.

¹⁴⁰ The fact that the Babylonian temples supported the revolts of 522 and 484 while the managers of the Persian estates in Babylonia remained loyal may reflect the erosion of temple wealth and autonomy under the Persians. See Waerzeggers, "Babylonian Kingship," 194-202.

¹⁴¹ Dandamaev, "Babylonian Popular Assemblies," 25-26.

mār banê were divided into *bīt abīm* “ancestral houses,”¹⁴² groupings that allowed the families that composed them to solidify control of temple prebends.¹⁴³ The Judeans saw temple assemblies in which the *šibūtu* “elders,” likely the heads of the prominent ancestral houses, decided local judicial cases, sometimes acting with royal judges or officials—although sometimes the whole *puhur mār banê* “assembly of freepersons” could make judicial decisions in regard to local issues¹⁴⁴—and otherwise representing the assembly in affairs involving state officials and even the king.¹⁴⁵ Such exposure would certainly explain why Ezekiel refers to “the elders of Judah/Israel” as the exilic leadership, as well as the fact that Judean communities even in late Persian period Babylonia still organized themselves into *bīt abīm*.¹⁴⁶ After having migrated from Babylonia to Judah, faced with the challenge of rebuilding the temple and maintaining the cult for which the Judean monarchy had been responsible in the pre-exilic period, we should not be surprised that they adopted aspects of the social institutions of the

¹⁴² For the development and widespread appearance of these social groupings in Babylonia by the seventh century, see Nielsen, *Sons and Descendants*, 269-70, 276-77, 289-90.

¹⁴³ Nielsen, *Sons and Descendants*, 291-92.

¹⁴⁴ These involved family disputes, theft of temple property, payments for the leasing of temple lands, and so on. Sometimes the assembly was only involved in the preliminary investigation while royal judges made the final decision in regard to the case. See Dandamaev, “The Neo-Babylonian Popular Assembly,” 67-68.

¹⁴⁵ Dandamaev, “The Neo-Babylonian Elders,” 38-41; Dandamaev, “Babylonian Popular Assemblies,” 28-29; Van De Mieroop, *The Ancient Mesopotamian City*, 124-28.

¹⁴⁶ Ran Zadok, *The Jews in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods according to the Babylonian Sources*, SHJPLI 3 (Haifa: The University of Haifa, 1979), 53-55.

Babylonian groups responsible for running the temples there. So even in the exilic period we see “elders” as their leaders, and in post-exilic Judah “ancestral houses” grouped into an “assembly” that is particularly associated with the temple in Jerusalem. The importance of the temple to the assembly’s self-identity explains the leadership role of the high priest and temple personnel in the Persian period, whose ancestral houses are categorized in distinction from those of the rest of the assembly, for they presided over the assembly’s most important and central institution.

And in regard to temple personnel, Chronicles, like the Priestly Writing and unlike the most of the lists of Ezra-Nehemiah, really seems to recognize only two groups: priests and Levites. There is no exact parallel here to the situation in the Babylonian temples, where a whole host of different temple offices existed and where there was no real distinction between priests and laypersons, since the *mār banê* held the temple offices and were rewarded for their services with the usufruct of temple land or rations;¹⁴⁷ perhaps the difference between priests and Levites could be said to correspond to the difference between the Neo-Babylonian clergy who held the rank of *ērib bīti* “temple enterer” and who had access to the divine image, and those who did not.¹⁴⁸ Top administrative figures who governed with the elders and assembly and who acted as

¹⁴⁷ See Kuhrt, “Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood,” 151-54; Wright, ““Those doing the work,”” 364; Caroline Waerzeggers, *The Ezida Temple of Borsippa: Priesthood, Cult, Archives*, AchHist 15 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2010), 38-40; M. Jursa, *Aspects of the Economic History of Babylonia in the First Millennium BC*, AOAT 377 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010), 155-68.

¹⁴⁸ See Caroline Waerzeggers, “The Pious King: Patronage of Temples” in *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, ed. Karen Radner and Eleanor Robson (Oxford University Press, 2011), 725-51 (735-37). As Wright, ““Those doing the work,”” 376 points out, in

chief administrators are called variously *šangu* and *šatammu*,¹⁴⁹ and by the Persian period at least some of these officials were appointed by the king.¹⁵⁰ One important difference between the Babylonian temples and the one in Jerusalem, however, is that we have no evidence that the latter institution owned any land.¹⁵¹ There are two important consequences of this: first, the temple's lack of land and, therefore, its lack of wealth, means that the Persians would have demonstrated far less interest in interfering with its activity than those in Babylonia, since there was virtually no financial incentive for them to do so;¹⁵² and second, the temple's maintenance

Chronicles only the Aaronide priests are described as those who “enter the temple of Yhwh” (1 Chr 24:19).

¹⁴⁹ See McEwan, *Priest and Temple*, 25-26; John MacGinnis, “The Šatammu of Sippar,” *WO* 26 (1995): 21-26; A.C.V.M. Bongenaar, *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar: Its Administration and its Prosopography*, UNHAI 80 (Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1997), 22-23; Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 16-17; Waerzeggers, *The Ezida Temple*, 42-44.

¹⁵⁰ Fried, *The Priest and the Great King*, 13-15; Waerzeggers, *The Ezida Temple*, 42-43.

¹⁵¹ On this point, see, e.g., Bedford, “The Economic Role,” 11*-13*; Wright, ““Those doing the work,”” 379-81; I. Milevski, “Palestine's Economic Formation and the Crisis of Judah (Yehud) during the Persian Period” *Transeu* 40 (2011): 135-66 (148). Joseph Blenkinsopp's suggestion that the Jerusalem temple owned land depends on his reading of the word #šwkr in Ezra 10:8 as referring to temple land, even though the word normally does not have this sense. See his “Did the Second Jerusalemite Temple Possess Land?” *Transeu* 21 (2001): 61-68.

¹⁵² If Joachim Schaper's argument in “The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration,” *VT* 45 (1995): 528-39 is correct and the Persians used the

would have depended on the largesse of the assembly and its ancestral houses, since there was no longer a monarchy to provide financial support.¹⁵³ Nehemiah 10 relates an agreement on the part of the assembly to properly supply the cult, but Nehemiah writes that tithes were not being brought to the temple and that the Levites and other cultic personnel had returned to farming (13:4-14), and Mal 1:6-14 complains about the poor quality of sacrificial animals available to the cult, suggesting that the necessary assembly support for the temple was sometimes lacking.¹⁵⁴

temple treasury in Jerusalem to collect taxes, then they certainly would have had an official stationed there to make sure the money was sent to the Persian administration. The center of his argument, however, turns mainly on the appearance of the word רִצְיָ “fashioner,” a figure whom Zech 11:13 places in the temple, and whom Schaper hypothesizes acted for the Persians, following the Persian practice of melting down silver taken as tax into blocks of metal. This is a very slim piece of evidence for the hypothesis, however, especially as we now know the Persians ruled from Ramat Rahel, not Jerusalem. See Peter R. Bedford, “Temple Funding and Priestly Authority in Achaemenid Judah” in *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, ed. Jonathan Stökl and Caroline Waerzeggers, BZAW 478 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 336-51 (340-42).

¹⁵³ As we saw above, claims in Ezra-Nehemiah that the Achaemenids provided material support for the temple seem quite unlikely to be true.

¹⁵⁴ And, as we noted above, the Achaemenids continued the Neo-Babylonian practice of funneling temple resources to the crown, not the other way around, and so despite the fact that Ezra-Nehemiah claims to include royal orders to the Persian administration in the region that the crown would bear the cost of cultic maintenance in Jerusalem (Ezra 6:9-10; 7:21-24), this does not appear to have happened, as Nehemiah 10; 13; and Malachi 1 suggest. Also, as we have seen

It would seem, then, that the local government in Judah consisted of a temple assembly in which the elders or heads of the ancestral houses, along with the temple personnel or at least the high priest, exercised power over local, intracommunal issues concerning which the Persian administration would have evinced little interest, exercising the same sorts of oversight of assembly matters that Babylonian assemblies did before the crown began to take control of their land and administration. They would have been responsible for the temple itself and of adjudicating at least some civil and criminal matters for assembly members. So in Ezra-Nehemiah, the assembly does not only build and maintain the temple, they are responsible for enforcing the local religious law. For example, it is the “leaders” of the priests, Levites, and people who agree along with the whole assembly to enforce particular aspects of the law in Nehemiah 10 (see 10:1, 15 [9:38; 10:14]), just as the assembly, its leaders, elders, and heads work with Ezra to force assembly members to expel foreign wives in Ezra 10 (see 10:8, 14, 16). Ezra cannot unilaterally force the assembly to act here, and it is the assembly elders and leaders who decide on the penalty of property forfeiture and expulsion from the assembly for those who refuse to participate in the process (10:8). In the same way, Nehemiah must work with the assembly leadership—the *Myrx* and *Myngs* in his terminology—to enact economic reform in Judah. And the assembly’s influence, if not actual political power, was thought to extend even outside of Judah, since the high priest, priesthood, and assembly leaders were of enough importance in the imperial administration’s eyes that the Judean community at Elephantine asked them for support in an appeal to the Persian authorities for permission to rebuild the temple in Elephantine. Only once they failed to provide this support did Elephantine turn to the Persian governor of Judah for help, and this tells us that the Elephantine community believed that the

above, this was not Achaemenid policy outside of the cults of Elamite and Iranian gods.

Judean temple assembly and personnel would have had more influence in the Persians' decision on the matter than the Persian governor of Judah. Priests, moreover, were the only figures besides governors who minted coins in the province, and were clearly important political actors in Persian and Hellenistic period Judah. While the Neo-Babylonians and Persians did appoint administrators in the Babylonian temples, this is a reflection of the wealth inherent in those institutions, something of which the temple in Jerusalem could not boast, and we might expect that the temple in Jerusalem functioned with rather less imperial oversight than their much wealthier peer institutions elsewhere.

This, then, brings us to a key question from the standpoint of a pro-Davidic writer: how might he or she appeal to the existing local political stakeholders in Jerusalem in order to gain their support for a Davidic restoration? The assembly was associated with building and maintaining the temple, an indication of its importance to the group, and so such a writer could point to a golden past in which Davidic kings largely took on the financial burden of supporting the temple. Such a writer could also make it clear to readers who knew of traditions of past Davidides who had not supported the temple cult that all such kings were punished by the divine, and therefore that no future king would dream of repeating such sins. A pro-Davidic writer would want to assure assembly members that, beyond relieving them of part of their financial responsibility for the temple, a future Davidide would not draft them into *corvée* labor, or force them to fight in an army without the consent of the assembly and its ancestral houses, and would avoid waging dangerous offensive wars that would put their lives and property and even the temple at risk. Such a writer would want to assure the assembly as well that aspects of their current power would be retained, and so that the assembly and its heads or elders would continue

to play a role in the leadership of Judah.¹⁵⁵ So long as the heads of the ancestral houses maintained an acceptable amount of power under a monarchy, assembly members would not need to fear that the king would strip them of the civil and criminal legal system through which they adjudicated their affairs. A pro-Davidic writer might even want to single out a group within the temple personnel who felt particularly vulnerable to the vagaries of the assembly's financial contributions to the cult—the Levites, say—and suggest that, under a monarchy, the scope of their power and authority in temple and even in civil society as a whole would be widened. At a time when the leadership of the Aaronide priesthood was inscribed in the Priestly Writing—and so, of course, in the Pentateuch—the Aaronides had the least to gain from a political reorganization in Judah. It would make sense, then, that a pro-Davidic writer would look for a group within the temple cult to whom the Davidic party could offer more authority and power than that available to them in the Pentateuch, although such a writer would also have to be careful not to openly threaten the authority and power of the existing priestly class, lest they find the proposed political change threatening and actively work to oppose the approach to the imperial government for a client monarchy. Yet they would certainly be attracted to promises—or, in Chronicles, to implied promises—of royal support for the temple and royal reestablishment of Jerusalem's Yahwistic cultic monopoly.

In the rest of this chapter we will examine the ways in which the Chronicler presents the monarchy as the inevitable and divinely-willed form of government in Judah, and the Davidides

¹⁵⁵ And there was, in fact, an example of such a polity close at hand, since a non-royal assembly at Sidon exercised some power in conjunction with the Persian period client monarchy there. See J. Elayi, *Sidon, cité autonome de l'empire perse* (Paris: Editions Idéaphane, 1989), 120-23.

specifically as God's choice of royal house to construct and maintain the temple. We will focus particularly on how this presentation of the royal house would work to appeal to the temple assembly and Levites to support its restoration; in the following chapter we will turn to the Chronicler's presentation of the assembly and the Levites to make the same point. Part of the argument in the rest of this chapter is that the Chronicler draws upon Mesopotamian rules of historiography in order to alter Samuel-Kings, his or her main source for the history of Davidic rule, but we shall see that these alterations work to create a narrative that would assure readers that future Davidides would not dare to do otherwise than support the functioning and monopoly of Yahwistic worship in Jerusalem. Writing with the goal of convincing the current stakeholders in the local government to support a change to the existing local polity, the pro-Davidic Chronicler's hope is that a unanimous voice in this regard from the elite in Judah would convince the Persians that a Davidic restoration would meet with support from a happy populace. Assuming that the Davidides could also convince the Persians that this happy populace—or happy elite populace, at any rate—and its client monarchy would pose no threat to Persian rule in the region, then the Achaemenids could be led to believe that the province would be unlikely to rebel. Of course, a client monarchy like the Davidides could, like other client rulers in the empire, render the Persian governor in the region unnecessary, and one intangible benefit to the Judeans of a Davidic king, even a client, would be pride in this kind of home rule, limited as that rule might be.

2. The kingship of the Davidides in Chronicles

We turn now to examine how the Chronicler's presentation of the Davidides would function to gain assembly support for a Davidic restoration, the quiet revolution in local Judean polity our

author hoped to effect, especially in regard to the ways in which the Chronicler altered the Deuteronomistic History's portrayals of kingship and the Davidides. The most obvious influence on the Chronicler's understanding of the role and status of the monarchy is Samuel-Kings, since one-half of Chronicles has some kind of parallel with those books;¹⁵⁶ to a large extent, Chronicles follows Kings' narrative, or at least Kings' narrative of the Judean monarchy, even as he or she does add, omit, and alter some stories. Chronicles certainly does share important aspects of Samuel-King's presentation of the Davidic monarchy: kings are largely evaluated based on their cultic actions; temple construction is an important aspect of Solomon's narrative; there are references to an eternal covenant of kingship between God and the Davidides; and the Davidide—or at least Solomon—is God's son. But the Chronistic portrayal of the king is hardly identical to what we find in Samuel-Kings. The first of the most obvious differences between Chronicles' portrayal of the monarchy and that of Samuel-Kings is that, in Chronicles, there is no story of the origins of Israelite kingship. It is simply present as an established fact when the narrative of 1 Chronicles 10 begins.¹⁵⁷ Second, while Chronicles states that God has chosen (rxb) David to rule, as does Samuel-Kings (2 Sam 6:21; 1 Kgs 8:16; 11:34; 1 Chr 28:4; 2 Chr

¹⁵⁶ See Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 1-2 and Ehud Ben Zvi, "Shifting the Gaze: Historiographic Constraints in Chronicles and their Implications" in *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2006), 78-99 (86).

¹⁵⁷ If we mean by narrative a series of events placed in relationship to each other by explanation and causation, then there is some narrative in 1 Chronicles 1-9—2:3b, for example, or 4:9-10—but these chapters mainly consist of lists, and extended narrative does not begin until 1 Chronicles 10.

6:6), Chronicles specifically states that God has chosen Solomon to build the temple and sit on the throne (1 Chr 28:5, 6, 10; 29:1),¹⁵⁸ while Samuel-Kings never uses *רָב* in reference to Solomon. Third, Chronicles states that David has been disqualified from building the temple because he has fought many wars and spilled blood (*מִדְּקָרְבָּן*), a qualitatively different claim than 1 Kgs 5:17-18 [3-4], which simply says that David's wars kept him too busy to build. Fourth, the reigns of David and Solomon are essentially presented as a single unit in Chronicles. They are not separated by the struggle for the throne and assassinations that we see in 1 Kings 1-2, and, moreover, if the narrative of Solomon's reign is focused on building (*הִנְבֵּן*) the temple, a significant portion of David's reign is devoted to preparing (*נִכַּן*) for that building,¹⁵⁹ as if we have two parts of a single reign, both in their own ways devoted to the same goal of temple construction.¹⁶⁰ Fifth, unlike Samuel-Kings, good kings in Chronicles are universally rewarded

¹⁵⁸ On the use of *רָב* in reference to Solomon and the Davidides, see Roddy Braun, "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of the Chronicler," *JBL* 95 (1976): 581-90 (581-82); Raymond B. Dillard, "The Chronicler's Solomon," *WTJ* 43 (1981): 289-300 (292); Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 89; Gary N. Knoppers, "Changing History: Nathan's Oracle and the Structure of the Davidic Monarchy in Chronicles" in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, its Exegesis and its Language*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher et al. (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2007), 99*-123* (115*-16*).

¹⁵⁹ David prepares personnel and material for the temple construction in 1 Chronicles 22-26, and instructs Israel and his son about the act of temple building in 1 Chronicles 28-29; these seven chapters make up about a third of the narrative devoted to his reign.

¹⁶⁰ That David's and Solomon's reigns make, in essence, a single unit in Chronicles,

for their positive cultic actions and kings who negatively impact the cult are universally punished during their lifetimes. Sixth, Chronicles explains the Davidides' loss of rule over the North not as punishment for Solomon's apostasy as in 1 Kings 11—Solomon commits no sin in Chronicles—but as punishment for Rehoboam's attempt to put assembly members to forced labor. Finally, Chronicles' narrative says virtually nothing about the North; Chronicles, unlike 1 Kings 11, does not blame Solomon for the Davidides' loss of the North, and almost all of the narrative concerning the Northern kings has been omitted by the Chronicler, even the explanation of its destruction.

Our goal in this part of the chapter is to demonstrate how the Chronicler's portrayal of the Davidic monarchy would have functioned in an appeal to the assembly for their support in

where both kings act toward the goal of building the temple, is a point commonly made in scholarship; see, e.g., Otto Plöger, "Reden und Gebete im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk" in *Aus der Spätzeit des Alttestaments: Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 50-66 (56); Gary N. Knoppers, "David's Relation to Moses: The Contexts, Content and Conditions of the Davidic Promises" in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, JSOTSup 270 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 91-118 (102); H.G.M. Williamson, "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles" in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 141-49 (145-46); Mark J. Boda, "Legitimizing the Temple: The Chronicler's Temple Building Account" in *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible*, ed. Mark J. Boda and James Novotny, AOAT 366 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010), 303-18 (305); Tiño, *King and Temple in Chronicles*, 48.

having the Davidides restored as client rulers. Much of this, however, will involve a discussion of how and why the Chronicler altered Samuel-Kings' depiction of the Davidides and monarchy, and in this chapter we will examine, among other things, the first five of the major changes to Samuel-Kings' portrayal of the monarchy that we have just mentioned—the last two will be discussed in chapter 3—and see that they function to link the Davidides to the temple, presenting them as maintainers of the true Yahwistic cultic norms and as financial supporters of the temple. This presentation alone might help put assembly members' minds at ease in regard to the matter of a Davidic restoration, since the assembly would certainly be concerned about the effects of any political change on the institution that stands at the center of their identity and of the local power structure. What Chronicles suggests about the Davidides' future treatment of the temple assembly's most important institution is just good politics. This is why Cyrus and Alexander took immediate pro-temple steps when they entered Babylonia as conquerors:¹⁶¹ this was necessary to win over the temple assemblies to help ensure peaceful reigns. In chapter 3 we will discuss the specific political rights afforded to the assembly under a restored monarchy in Chronicles, but the signals the Chronicler sends about the Davidides and their respect and support for the temple were likely equally important in the attempt to gain assembly backing for the quiet revolution the Chronicler had in mind. The assembly, not a king, rebuilt the temple, and if that institution could be said to have belonged to anyone—besides God—it belonged to the

¹⁶¹ In the Cyrus Cylinder, Cyrus says he increased offerings at the temples (AOAT 256:K2.1.37-38). The Verse Account of Nabonidus makes the same claim (AOAT 256:P1.vi.1-6) and also says he undid all of Nabonidus's foolish cultic innovations (17-24). Arrian writes that Alexander commanded the rebuilding of the Babylonian temples Xerxes destroyed, and that he followed the cultic instructions of the Babylonian priests (*Anab.* 3.16.4-5).

assembly who built and maintained it and who assumedly had some say in its cultic norms. A monarchy that aimed to seize control of the temple, draw on its funds, alter its cult, or support other cult centers and deities would clearly be one that had the power to override the assembly's will and would not be afraid to use it. An assembly that believed future Davidides intended to do some or all of these things would expect them also to work against the assembly's political and economic interests whenever it suited them, so what Chronicles says about Davidic support for the temple cannot be isolated from what it says about the political power of the assembly under a monarchy.

Some of the Chronicler's alterations to source material are really about making the Davidides seem like the divinely-willed and natural leaders of Judah, as we shall see. But these and other changes to source material do, of course, leave the Chronicler open to charges of being willing to alter sources without historiographical warrant and only to further his or her own political agenda. The Chronicler's goal of persuading readers of the benefits of a Davidic restoration depends on persuading them of the veracity of the portrayal of the past they find in this history; that is, the Chronicler's project does not work if readers believe they are encountering a politically convenient historical fiction. But Judah was not the only culture in the ancient Near East that produced histories, and the Chronicler also draws on tropes of kingship found in the historiographies of the Neo-Assyrians and the Neo-Babylonians, Judah's old colonial masters. He or she appears to use aspects of Mesopotamian history writing as warrants to alter the source material of Samuel-Kings—to eliminate or change stories from Samuel-Kings and to add new material to this source, in other words—because the Chronicler sees such alterations as a better representation of and explanation for what actually happened; this, at least, can be our conclusion if we wish to be the sympathetic readers we can assume the author hoped

would encounter the work. Of course, these alterations do have the benefit to the pro-Davidic Chronicler of making a Davidic restoration sound politically enticing to the temple assembly as a whole, and particularly to the Levites, as we shall see.

So while the focus of this part of the chapter is on the Chronicler's alterations of Samuel-Kings' portrayal of the Davidic monarchy, alterations that would make a Davidic restoration appealing to an assembly audience, we will also see that there is more to such alterations than a naked desire for political gain, even if it seems difficult to deny that some changes to the source material benefit the Chronicler's promotion of a quiet revolution in local Judean polity. It is likely that the Chronicler honestly found some of the source material confusing and problematic, and sometimes turned to Mesopotamian historiographical traditions in order to resolve these problems, and we will spend part of this section of the chapter showing where and why the Chronicler did so. Chronicles was written about 200 years after the destruction of the Neo-Babylonian empire and about two and a half centuries after the destruction of the Neo-Assyrian empire. This gap in time, however, does not mean that the hegemonic footprints of these old colonial powers would have disappeared from Judah's cultural memory. I will discuss the concept of hegemony in the sense that I am using it here in more detail in chapter 5, but, briefly put, it refers to widely accepted cultural norms. Hegemony elevates particular ideas and groups over others, and is what is meant to be so obvious and self-evident that those who participate in the culture generally take it to be universally valid rather than as something that needs to be interrogated for truth claims. Neo-Assyrian stelae began to appear in Northern Syria and the Levant in the ninth century BCE as the Assyrians first campaigned there, and by this means they broadcasted their hegemony, their explanations as to why the Neo-Assyrian kings should rule

and their understandings of kingship and empire, to peoples on the edges of their empire.¹⁶² Fragments of their victory stelae have been found in Israel and Palestine.¹⁶³ This kind of imperial discourse was quickly absorbed by rulers in Syria and the Levant, who began to carve their own stelae a generation after the Neo-Assyrian ones first appeared in the region; these Western counterparts of the Assyrian kings also narrated their stelae in the first person, opened their inscriptions by naming themselves, and followed this with a description of wars and conquests, construction projects, and curses against those who might destroy their inscriptions.¹⁶⁴ And not only did Assyrian hegemony and its understanding of the past and the role of the monarch have centuries to become part of the ideological landscape of the Levant, but Judah was itself a vassal to the Neo-Assyrians for about a century.¹⁶⁵ Client status meant that there was a written copy of

¹⁶² See Steven W. Holloway, *Aššur is King! Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, CHANE 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 91.

¹⁶³ Specifically, in Ashdod, Samaria, and Qaqun, just to the northwest of Samaria. For these stelae, see Wayne Horowitz and Takayoshi Oshima, *Cuneiform in Canaan: Cuneiform Sources from the Land of Canaan in Ancient Times* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 19-22, 40-41, 111, 115.

¹⁶⁴ Seth L. Sanders, *The Invention of Hebrew*, Traditions (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 120; Nadav Na'aman, "Three Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan" in *Ancient Israel's History and Historiography: The First Temple Period. Collected Essays, III* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 173-86 (173-76).

¹⁶⁵ 2 Kgs 16:5-9 says that the Syro-Ephraimite War of 735-732 led to Ahaz's request for client status with Assyria, and 18:13-14 tells us that his son Hezekiah continued this relationship, although he tried to defect to Egypt (18:19-25). Inscriptions of Esarhaddon tell us that Ahaz's

the *adê* or loyalty oath in Jerusalem, something else that broadcast Assyrian hegemony and its understanding of the role of the imperial king, as well as a *qēpu* official stationed there to oversee Judean compliance with the treaty they had made with the empire.¹⁶⁶

If Judah's two centuries of exposure to Neo-Assyrian concepts of the role of kingship in history explains how Neo-Assyrian hegemony infiltrated the culture of the Judean elite, the source of their knowledge of Neo-Babylonian hegemony and its understanding of the place and role of the king is perhaps self-evident. The Judean exiles in Babylonia were largely settled in rural areas,¹⁶⁷ but some were situated by canals with access to Babylonian cities,¹⁶⁸ and some

grandson Manasseh remained in client status to Assyria (RINAP 4:1.v.55; 5.vi.7), and it does not really seem that Judah's client status to Assyria would have ended before the Assyrians withdrew from the region, something that occurred no later than 623, when a civil war in Assyria, following on the heels of a Babylonian revolt, forced the Assyrians to abandon the West. See Nadav Na'aman, "Josiah and the Kingdom of Judah" in *Good Kings and Bad Kings*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe, LHBOTS 393, ESHM 5 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 189-247 (212-16), who argues that Egypt replaced Assyrian power in the Levant so quickly that it seems the two empires might have negotiated the withdrawal.

¹⁶⁶ Karen Radner, "Assyrische *tuppi adê* als Vorbild für Deuteronomium 28,20-44?" in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur 'Deuteronomismus'-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*, ed. Markus Witte et al., BZAW 365 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 351-78 (374-75).

¹⁶⁷ David Vanderhooft, "New Evidence Pertaining to the Transition from Neo-Babylonian to Achaemenid Administration in Palestine" in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era*, ed. Rainer Albertz and Bob Becking,

lived in the cities of Nippur and Babylon and near Borsippa and Uruk,¹⁶⁹ and the Judean community there could hardly have been unaware of Babylonian culture;¹⁷⁰ Ezekiel, for example, clearly demonstrates an awareness of it.¹⁷¹ Neo-Babylonian understandings of the role and authority of the king in history were not radically different than Neo-Assyrian ones, since the Babylonians adopted Neo-Assyrian royal ideology¹⁷² and saw their empire as a continuation of

STAR 5 (Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 219-35 (219-23).

¹⁶⁸ Ran Zadok, *The Earliest Diaspora: Israelites and Judeans in pre-Hellenistic Mesopotamia*, PDRI 151 (Tel Aviv: Diaspora Research Institute, 2002), 52-53.

¹⁶⁹ Zadok, *The Earliest Diaspora*, 27-28.

¹⁷⁰ So also Peter Machinist, “Mesopotamian Imperialism and Israelite Religion: A Case Study from the Second Isaiah” in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through the Roman Palaestina*, ed. William G. Dever and Seymour Gittin (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 237-64 (255-56).

¹⁷¹ See, e.g., Isaac Gluska, “Akkadian Influence on the Book of Ezekiel” in “*An experienced scribe who neglects nothing*”: *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*, ed. Yitschak Sefati et al. (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2005), 718-37 and Jonathan Stökl, “‘A youth without blemish, handsome, proficient in all wisdom, knowledgeable and intelligent’: Ezekiel’s Access to Babylonian Culture” in *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, ed. Jonathan Stökl and Caroline Waerzeggers, BZAW 478 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 223-52.

¹⁷² Muhammad Dandamaev, “Assyrian Traditions during Achaemenid Times” in *Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project*, ed. S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting (Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997), 41-

the Assyrian one.¹⁷³ The diaspora community in Babylonia appears also to have exercised an important influence on Judah in the Persian period; if Ezra-Nehemiah and other Persian period biblical literature is to be believed, Babylonia was the source of Judah's leaders, leadership, and important writings,¹⁷⁴ and so Babylonian hegemony continued to have a path to Judean culture in

48; Simo Parpola, "Neo-Assyrian Concepts of Kingship and their Heritage in Mediterranean Antiquity" in *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity: Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop*, ed. Giovanni B. Lanfranchi and Robert Rollinger, HANEM 11 (Padua: S.A.R.G.O.N., 2010), 35-44 (39-40).

¹⁷³ Not only did the Neo-Babylonian kings adopt Neo-Assyrian royal titles, but they portrayed themselves as the legitimate continuation of the Assyrian dynasty. See Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.*, YNER 10 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 139-40 and Stephanie Dalley, "The Transition from Neo-Assyrians to Neo-Babylonians: Break or Continuity?," *EI* 27 (2003): 25*-28*. This is not to say that the Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions sound just like the Neo-Assyrian ones, but the differences between them are, to some degree, a function of the fact that the only Neo-Babylonian inscriptions of any length of which we are aware are building inscriptions.

¹⁷⁴ See Peter R. Bedford, "Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra-Nehemiah," *VT* 52 (2002): 147-65; Bustenay Oded, "Exile-Homeland Relations during the Exilic Period and Restoration" in *T^eshûrôt LaAvishur: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, in Hebrew and Semitic Languages*, ed. Yitzhak Avishur, Michael Heltzer, and Meir Malul (Tel Aviv-Jaffa: Archaeological Center Publications, 2004), 153*-60*; John Kessler, "Images of Exile: Representations of the 'Exile' and 'Empty Land' in the Sixth to Fourth Centuries BCE Yehudite Literature" in *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts*, ed. Ehud Ben

the post-exilic period. The Achaemenids portrayed themselves as heirs to the Assyrians and Babylonians, and so their royal ideology was influenced by those of these two great empires,¹⁷⁵ but we will discuss Chronicles' reaction to Persian hegemony in chapter 5. As one might imagine, the Chronicler had a different relationship to the hegemony of the empire that was governing Judah when he or she wrote as compared to those of the imperial powers that had collapsed long before.

It is not overly surprising, then, that Neo-Assyrian and -Babylonian concepts of history, particularly aspects of history that involve the king, should be echoed in Chronicles. The first important difference between Chronicles' and Samuel-Kings' portrayals of the monarchy that we identified above is Chronicles' omission of the story of the origins of the monarchy in 1 Samuel. We can perhaps see here a reflection of a trope found in a Babylonian continuation of the Sumerian King List, one known in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian copies, which presents

Zvi and Christoph Levin, BZAW 404 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 309-51 (335-37); Gary Knoppers, "Exile, Return and Diaspora: Expatriates and Repatriates in Late Biblical Literature" in *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature: Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts*, ed. Louis Jonker, FAT 2/53 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 29-61 (47-49); Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Israel in the Persian Period: The Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.E.*, trans. Siegfried S. Schatzmann, SBLBE 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 124-25.

¹⁷⁵ See, e.g., Kratz, *Translatio imperii*, 197-212; Dandamaev, "Assyrian Traditions"; Josef Wiesehöfer, "The Medes and the Idea of the Succession of Empires in Antiquity" in *Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia*, ed. Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, Michael Roaf, and Robert Rollinger, HANEM 5 (Padua: SARGON, 2003), 391-96 (391-92).

kingship as established by the gods at the beginning of time (WAW 19:3.i.1-10).¹⁷⁶ The same idea is found as well in a different Neo-Assyrian text, copied also in the Neo-Babylonian period, that refers to the king as a special creation of the gods made at the beginning of time, a *māliku amēlu* “counselor man,” a separate creation from the *lullû amēlu*, the rest of humanity, and endowed with divine wisdom and martial capabilities (Mayer 32-41).¹⁷⁷ Unlike these Mesopotamian writings, Chronicles does not actually claim that the institution of the monarchy was created at the beginning, but it shows very little interest in the history of Israel (or humanity,

¹⁷⁶ Other versions of the Sumerian King List open with the words, “When kingship had come down from heaven...” (WAW 19:1.i.1-2), without specifying when this happened, and then launch into a list of the kings as the monarchy is passed from one dynasty to another. The Babylonian version, however, begins, “[When An]u, Enlil, and [Ea had fixed the plans of heaven and earth, Anu,] Enlil, and Ea [ordained the destinies (?). They established (?)] kingship in the land. [They set up] a king to be shepherd of the land. They gave the people [to him] as a shepherd. They made all the black-headed people bow down at his feet. They made his sovereignty resplendent in the four quarters. After they lowered kingship from heaven, kingship (was) [at Eridu].” This version is clear that kingship begins with creation.

¹⁷⁷ See the discussions in Werner R. Mayer, “Ein Mythos von der Erschaffung des Menschen und des Königs,” *Or* 56 (1987): 55-68; John Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 61-62; Karen Radner, “Assyrian and Non-Assyrian Kingship in the First Millennium BC” in *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity: Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop*, ed. Giovanni B. Lanfranchi and Robert Rollinger, HANEM 11 (Padua: S.A.R.G.O.N., 2010), 25-34 (26-27).

for that matter), before the time of the Davidides; 1 Samuel's story of the development of the monarchy is entirely omitted, and even Saul's reign is abbreviated to a single chapter, really the introduction to Chronicles' story of David. Given that there is virtually no narrative in Chronicles before 1 Chronicles 10,¹⁷⁸ and that historiography demands narrative, a causative explanation of the past,¹⁷⁹ the Chronicler's narrative, and so his or her history, only truly begins with the story of Saul's death. There is no mention of how he became king in Chronicles.

Nonetheless, even in lists that make up 1 Chronicles 1-9, the prehistoric (so to speak) part of Chronicles, we find a list of kings of Edom in 1:43-51a, one that begins with the words, "These

¹⁷⁸ As I noted earlier in this chapter, if we mean by narrative a series of events placed in relationship to each other by explanation and causation, then there is some narrative in 1 Chronicles 1-9—2:3b, for example, or 4:9-10—but these chapters mainly consist of lists, and extended narrative does not begin until 1 Chronicles 10. 1 Chr 1:1-4, for example, offers a list of thirteen names with no reference to causation among them. 1:11-12 does present a causative connection between Egypt and the names that follow (...dly Myrcmw), but this is simply an expression of a personal relationship, not an explanation of events, no different than ynb hl) ...l) r#&y in 2:1.

¹⁷⁹ As some of those who have discussed the study of history in the field of Hebrew Bible have put it, a history is a story written by a historian. See, e.g., V. Philips Long, *The Art of Biblical History*, FCI 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994), 68-76; Philip R. Davies, *Memories of Ancient Israel: An Introduction to Biblical History—Ancient and Modern* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 9-10; Rachele Gilmour, *Representing the Past: A Literary Analysis of Narrative Historiography in the Book of Samuel*, VTSup 143 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 8-10.

are the kings who reigned in the land of Edom before a king reigned over the Israelites,” an indication for readers that the office can be traced earlier in human history than its appearance in Israel. The Chronicler does not deny that Israel existed at some point in its history without a king; that part of the source material is simply omitted because, apparently, the Chronicler sees the pre-monarchic period to be of little importance. Kingship may not have descended from heaven at creation according to Chronicles, but, as Israel’s history begins with the monarchy already in place, with no indication as to when or how the institution was established, it simply appears as the natural form of leadership for Judah.

So readers of Chronicles encounter a fully functioning monarchy as soon as the narrative/history begins in 1 Chronicles 10, where the story of Saul’s death functions as an introduction to Davidic rule.¹⁸⁰ Readers are told that Saul and his sons and house die in battle

¹⁸⁰ For discussions of how 1 Chronicles 10 functions as an introduction to the David narrative in Chronicles, see Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal*, 56-63; John W. Wright, “The Founding Father: The Structure of the Chronicler’s David Narrative,” *JBL* 117 (1998): 45-59 (49-50); Gary N. Knoppers, “Israel’s First King and ‘the kingdom of YHWH in the hands of the sons of David’: The Place of the Saulide Monarchy in the Chronicler’s Historiography” in *Saul in Story and Tradition*, ed. Carl S. Ehrlich, FAT 47 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 187-213 (206-10). If the Chronicler had meant to portray Saul as an evil paradigm or type for other royal failures in the book to be compared with—so, e.g., Mosis, *Untersuchungen*, 17-43—we might then expect to see references from the narrator that compare later kings to Saul, but this is not the case; see Knoppers, “Israel’s First King,” 190. And, as James M. Trotter, “Reading, Readers, and Reading Readers Reading the Account of Saul’s Death in 1 Chronicles 10” in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L.

with the Philistines (10:1-7). While the Saulide genealogy in 1 Chr 8:29-40 and 9:35-44 extends twelve generations beyond Saul, roughly to the exilic period in the Chronicler's understanding of history,¹⁸¹ Saul's sin has apparently disqualified his house from ruling, and unlike the narrative of 2 Samuel 2-4, no Saulide continues the house's rule.¹⁸² Readers are also told that Saul's death is not an historical accident: because of his $\text{ל}(\text{מ})$ "rebellion" and failure to $\text{\#}\text{\$}\text{\text{r}}\text{\text{d}}$ "seek" God,

McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 294-310 (309) points out, it is difficult to maintain a complete disjunction between the stories of Saul and David, given that 10:13-14 refers to David's reign and Saul's death.

¹⁸¹ 1 Chr 3:1-15 places Jehoiakim in the twelfth generation after David, so for the Chronicler about twelve generations separate David and Saul from the exile.

¹⁸² 1 Chr 10:6 follows 1 Sam 31:6 as it reports Saul's death, except that, unlike the passage from Dtr, Chronicles says that all of Saul's house died, rather than all of Saul's men. This minor change in wording implies that Saul has no male heirs to succeed him, although 1 Chronicles 10 does not explicitly claim that this is true, and the Saulide genealogy of 1 Chronicles 8 and 9, of course, extends long after Saul's time. The Chronicler does not need to claim that Saul's house is utterly destroyed here, since he or she uses Saul's sin as the explanation for God's action in giving the house to David, the king with whom he makes an eternal covenant, but the wording of 1 Chr 10:6 has the effect of making readers think that Saul's house has been destroyed without directly making that claim. The Chronicler does not explicitly deny that Eshbaal succeeds Saul on the throne as 2 Samuel 2-4 reports, but he or she also does not mention this. Since God turns the kingdom over to David directly upon Saul's death (1 Chr 10:14), a reference to Eshbaal's rule would simply have muddied the clear handover of power to David from Saul in Chronicles.

“Yhwh killed him and turned the royal rule over to David son of Jesse” (10:13-14). Opening the narrative in this fashion allows the Chronicler to present a monarchy in place when Israel’s history—or the significant part of Israel’s history—begins, while brushing away any claims of legitimacy for any pre-Davidic ruling house. It is the Davidides, not the Saulides, whom God has chosen to rule. The establishment of kingship is a real problem in Dtr, for Israel’s request for it seems like a rejection of Yhwh’s kingship (1 Sam 8:7-8) and it angers God (12:16-18), while the first king is rejected by God almost as soon as he is appointed (13:13-14; 15:10-11, 26). In Chronicles, though, kingship simply appears as the natural form of leadership within Israel/Judah, and the narrative section of Chronicles ends when Davidic kingship does. The last figure in the narrative to speak is the king of Persia, to whom God has given “all the kingdoms of the earth” (2 Chr 36:22-23). Monarchy is simply the natural and unquestioned kind of rule for humanity as it is in the Sumerian King List; countries are “kingdoms” (e.g., 1 Chr 29:30; 2 Chr 17:10; 20:29; 32:15; 36:23) and the leader of a country is a “king/queen” (1 Chr 5:6, 26; 18:3, 5, 9; 2 Chr 12:2, 9, etc.).¹⁸³ And even though Cyrus rules all kingdoms by the end of Chronicles, many of these kingdoms close to Judah maintained their kings, and from the Chronicler’s standpoint there was no reason why Judah could not regain its traditional dynasty. It is not that Dtr’s assertion that Israel was ruled by judges before a monarchy is entirely erased by the Chronicler (see 1 Chr 17:6), but Chronicles’ narrative shows no interest in pre-monarchic Israel. As in the Mesopotamian historiography seen in a document like the Babylonian version of the Sumerian King List, there is no history without a king. So while the Chronicler’s elimination of the story of the monarchy’s origins largely serves a pro-Davidic political goal by making a monarchy appear as the natural form of governance, this is also the promotion of a worldview

¹⁸³ So Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 395 n. 1.

that has much more in common with one from Mesopotamian historiography than with Dtr.

While readers are presented with only two royal houses that rule over Israel/Judah—if we omit references to Northern kings who rule after Solomon, figures who are only tangential players in Chronicles’ narrative of the Davidides—David’s house has a distinct advantage over Saul’s, since God declares that he will never take his steadfast love from David’s son as he took it from Saul, but will establish his throne forever (1 Chr 17:12, 14),¹⁸⁴ a claim the Chronicler adopts from Dtr. The case is not, as some have argued, that Chronicles presents a conditional covenant with David, or a covenant that is unconditional only up until the time Solomon completes the temple;¹⁸⁵ rather, we find a covenant that is made unconditional by Solomon’s

¹⁸⁴ As Tiño, *King and Temple*, 36, 55 points out, the use of the root *bbš* in reference to God turning the kingdom’s rule from Saul to David (1 Chr 10:14) emphasizes the disjunction between the two rules, just as *bbš* appears in 2 Chr 10:15 to refer to the Davidides’ loss of rule over the North. In the same way, writes Tiño, 1 Chr 17:10-13 makes David’s dynasty qualitatively different than Saul’s: it is eternal.

¹⁸⁵ For some examples of these arguments, see Caquot, “Peut-on parler de messianisme?”; Roddy Braun, “Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles,” *JBL* 92 (1973): 503-16 (515); Dennis J. McCarthy, “Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 25-44 (26-28); Japhet, *Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 457-65; Tomotoshi Sugimoto, “Chronicles as Independent Literature,” *JSOT* 55 (1992): 61-74 (68); William Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History*, JSOTSup 160 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 67-76, 93-96; Philippe Abadie, “La figure de David dans le livre des Chroniques” in *Figures de David à travers la Bible*, ed. Louis Desrousseaux and Jacques Vermeulen, *LecDiv* 177 (Paris: Les éditions de Cerf, 1999), 157-86 (176-82); Schweitzer,

sinless reign that culminates in temple, thereby linking dynasty and cult. In 1 Chronicles 17, in reference to an unnamed son of David, God says, “I will establish his royal rule; he will build a house for me and I will establish his throne forever. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me, and I will not turn aside my steadfast love from him as I turned it aside from the one who was before you; I will set him up in my house and my royal rule forever and his throne will be established forever” (17:11-14). In Chronicles it is clear that, even though God is building a house for David (17:10), God is also speaking of Solomon’s royal rule and establishing Solomon’s throne forever; unlike 2 Samuel 7, 1 Chronicles 17 does not have God speak to David about “your kingdom” and “your throne.” David speaks to Solomon in 1 Chronicles 22, and in 22.8-10, where he relates a “word of Yhwh” he has received, he either provides his interpretation of 1 Chronicles 17 or refers to an otherwise unmentioned divine communication. He repeats some of the language and ideas of God’s communication to him in 1 Chronicles 17 (“he will build a house for my name,” “he will be a son to me and I will be a father to him, and I will establish the throne of his royal rule forever”), and now goes on to tell Solomon that he will prosper (xylct) if he observes the law (22:11-13). This is not some kind of reference to a conditional covenant, for David refers to the eternal nature of God’s establishment of Solomon’s throne earlier in the same speech. David is simply informing Solomon of what is necessary to “prosper,” and readers are told in 1 Chr 29:23 that Solomon did indeed prosper (xlcyw), an unsurprising conclusion on the Chronicler’s part, since Chronicles nowhere claims that Solomon disobeys the law. In 1 Chr 28:6-7, David again either interprets 1 Chronicles 17 or refers to a

Reading Utopia in Chronicles, 125-27; Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Nathan’s Oracle and David’s Prayer in 1 Chronicles 17” in *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 31-44 (40-41); Tiño, *King and Temple*, 49-50.

different divine communication, claiming that God has told him that “Solomon your son will build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him to be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal rule forever if he is strong in doing my commandments and my judgments as he is today.” Unlike 1 Chr 22:11-13, this actually is a conditional presentation of the covenant, and Davidic rule here is dependent upon Solomon’s sinlessness. We cannot simply dismiss this condition David places on the eternality of the dynasty’s rule as his possibly flawed interpretation of a divine word, since God repeats this idea to Solomon in 2 Chr 7:17-18 using even clearer language: if Solomon does all that God commands and observes the law, only then will God establish “the throne of your royal rule” forever. Nonetheless, since Chronicles presents Solomon as sinless, his perfection guarantees the eternal establishment of the Davidic throne as far as the work is concerned.¹⁸⁶ For all that readers of Chronicles are exposed to lists and acts of the temple personnel, the priests and Levites do not have eternal covenants with God as the Davidides do, a different perspective than other post-exilic works that claim otherwise.¹⁸⁷ The

¹⁸⁶ For similar arguments, see, e.g., Brian E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, JSOTSup 211 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 160-61; H.G.M. Williamson, “Eschatology in Chronicles” in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 162-95 (184-85); Knoppers, “Changing History,” 107*-108*.

¹⁸⁷ The Priestly Writing presents the Aaronides as having an eternal covenant of priesthood in Num 25:12-13. Jer 33:21 and Mal 2:4-9 present the Levites as a whole as having some kind of covenant with God, and Nehemiah refers to “the covenant of the priests and the Levites” (Neh 13:29) without specifying what that is, although this would seem to be a reference to the pan-Levitical covenant of Jeremiah 33 and Malachi 2. See B. Gosse, “L’alliance avec Lévi

Davidides are the only group in Chronicles whom God guarantees will maintain their office forever, and in Chronicles this is thanks to Solomon's sinlessness.

The very fact that the Chronicler presents the Davidides as having an eternal covenant makes the point to readers that God wants them to continue to rule in the post-exilic period, and it makes their reinstatement in some fashion, even if as Achaemenid clients, seem divinely preordained. This is certainly an important point to make for a writer hoping to convince the assembly to support a Davidic restoration, but why does the Chronicler have the covenant depend on Solomon's sinlessness? On the one hand, 2 Chr 7:17-18, where God utters this condition, is simply Chronicles' version of 2 Kgs 9:4-5,¹⁸⁸ but on the other hand, the Chronicler

et l'opposition entre les lignées royale et sacerdotale à l'époque perse," *Transeu* 10 (1995): 29-33.

¹⁸⁸ In 1 Kgs 9:4-5, God promises Solomon not that his sinlessness will result in an eternal establishment of "the throne of your royal rule (Ktwwklm)," which is what God says in 2 Chr 7:17-18, but in an eternal establishment of "the throne of your kingdom (Ktklmm) sk) over Israel." In Dtr, Solomon does sin, and the Davidides lose their rule over the North/Israel; Solomon sits on "the throne of Israel" in 1 Kgs 1:46; 10:9, but when Jeroboam receives kingship of the ten northern tribes following Solomon's sin, he becomes "king over (all) Israel" (1 Kgs 11:37; 12:20), and after the time of Solomon, Dtr only uses the term "the throne of Israel" in reference to Northern kings (2 Kgs 10:30; 15:12). God tells Solomon in 1 Kgs 11.11 that he will take the kingdom (hklmmh) from him because of his sin, except for Judah (11:13), and God tells Jeroboam that he will receive the kingdom (11:31, 34; 14:8). See Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 18 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 99-105 and Baruch Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (University Park, PA:

likely has the political goal of restoration in mind here. By making the eternal Davidic covenant depend on the sinlessness of the Davidic temple-builder, then the temple's very existence in and of itself is a sign to readers and should constantly remind them of the necessity of Davidic rule, since the sinlessness of the king who constructed the institution that lies at the center of the assembly's identity provides the necessary basis of this covenant. In Chronicles' narrative, the coexistence of the Davidides and the temple is simply the way things should be. Moreover, Chronicles' inclusion of the end—but not the beginning—of Saul's story does not only make the monarchy appear as the natural form of rule in Judah, it allows the Chronicler to contrast the fate of the Saulides with that of the Davidides. Readers can see that, while God destroys Saul and his house for his failure as a king and gives the kingdom to David, the Davidides will not be treated that way, no matter what their failures are, since God has established the temple builder's throne forever: one way or another, God will return them to power, and the existence of the temple is a witness to this inevitability, since it was built by the king whose sinlessness guaranteed eternal Davidic rule.

Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988), 157-74.

In Chronicles, on the other hand, David receives $\tau w k l m$ “royal rule” from God (1 Chr 14:2), and this is what God promises to establish in an eternal sense for the Davidides (1 Chr 17:11, 14; 22:10; 28:7; 2 Chr 7:18). And in Chronicles, the Davidides are continuously said to exercise this royal rule, even after the time of Solomon (2 Chr 11:17; 12:1; 15:10, 19, etc.). The word $h k l m m$ does not feature in God's promise to the Davidides in Chronicles, but the Davidides are said to rule in a kingdom even after the time of Solomon (2 Chr 13:5, 8; 14:5; 17:5; 21:3; etc.), meaning that Chronicles understands Judah to be a “kingdom” while Dtr does not.

The Chronicler's linking of the Davidides' eternal covenant to Solomon's actions allows the Chronicler to discuss temple and eternal Davidic covenant together in 1 Chronicles 17; 22; and 28, consistently drawing readers' attention in the first part of the narrative to the temple and Davidides at the same time, suggesting that the existence of one implies the existence of the other. That these passages appear where God establishes the eternal covenant and where David speaks to his successor concerning his royal duty in regard to the temple brings us to another important difference between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings: the portrayal of David's and Solomon's rules as two parts of the same reign. There is no intra-Davidic struggle for the throne as in 1 Kings 1-2; there, Solomon assassinates his brother Adonijah, his rival for the throne, but 1 Chr 29:24 says that all of David's sons supported Solomon's succession. There is no intra-palace intrigue in regard to Solomon's succession of David in Chronicles, unlike 1 Kings 1-2 where Bathsheba and Nathan have to conspire to place Solomon on the throne; by 1 Chr 22:5-16, David reveals that God has told him Solomon will succeed him and build the temple. As we have already discussed, much of David's narrative in Chronicles is devoted to his preparations for Solomon's temple-building project, and in 1 Chr 17:3-10, although God is clear that David is not to build (hnb) the temple, this does not stop him from preparing (Nwk) for the coming work of the chosen temple-builder, which he does from 22:2-26:32. David consistently uses the verb Nwk to describe these activities (22:5, 14; 28:2; 29:2, 3, 16, 19), a repetitive explanation that makes it clear that he is not violating the divine prohibition on building while still participating in it. And while the eternal covenant with the Davidides is established in Chronicles because of Solomon's sinlessness, virtually all Solomon does in Chronicles is complete the temple for which his father has assembled the materials and personnel, which adds to the sense of the two kings as making up two parts of the same reign.

The Chronicler is clearly convinced (or believes readers will be convinced) that God thwarted David's desire to build the temple. The Chronicler constructs a history that acknowledges this as fact, but that also has David involved in the act of temple-building without violating the letter of the divine prohibition. Given that David's and Solomon's rules form virtually two parts of the same reign in Chronicles, the temple and dynasty are coeval, and so in Chronicles' presentation it hardly seems as if the temple should exist without Davidic rule. The Chronicler, moreover, felt a need to make sense of the problem of why God forbids David to build the temple when granting permission to David's son to do so; to an ancient Judean historian using Dtr as a source, this would seem like an important problem to resolve, for, given the high regard in which God holds David throughout Samuel-Kings—he is consistently the royal model against whom other Israelite and Judean monarchs are judged, the standard of perfection they are expected to meet¹⁸⁹—he might appear to be the perfect candidate to build the temple. In Dtr, after all, Solomon says that God approved of David's desire to build the temple (1 Kgs 8:17-19), so it might appear odd to a later Judean historian that God would refuse David permission (2 Sam 7:4-7), especially as God provides no rationale for this, except that he seems to prefer dwelling in a tent, a preference that he (apparently) alters for no explained reason by the time of Solomon.

As a result, the Chronicler makes a number of important changes to the source material to deal with this problem. First, the Chronicler says God has specifically chosen (רxb) Solomon to be king and build the temple (1 Chr 28:5, 6, 10; 29:1). Second, this divine choice for Solomon and against David as temple builder is clearly explained. According to David, at least, God has prohibited him from building the temple because “you have shed much blood (tkp# \$ brl

¹⁸⁹ See 1 Kgs 3:14; 9:4; 11:4, 6, 33, 38; 14:8; 15:3, 5, 11; 2 Kgs 14:3; 16:2; 18:3; 22:2.

Md) and fought great wars; you will not build a house for my name because you have shed much blood (תִּכְרֹם־שָׁ מַיְבֵר מַיְמֵד) on the earth before me” (1 Chr 22:8). In 28:3 David says again that God has told him that “you will not build a house for my name because you are a man of war and have shed blood (תִּכְרֹם־שָׁ מַיְמֵD).” This explanation, as we saw above, is different than that provided by Dtr, which says that David was too busy fighting to build (1 Kgs 5:17-18 [3-4]). In Chronicles, David is clearly “a man of war” as soon as he is introduced with his troops in 1 Chronicles 11-12, and this is also clearly an important part of his identity when he defends Israel from the Philistines in 1 Chronicles 14, and in his divinely supported wars of 1 Chronicles 18-20. All of the wars David fights as king in Dtr’s history, except for the intra-Israelite ones, appear in Chronicles’ narrative.¹⁹⁰ But because these wars are not condemned by the narrator or by God, and because God gives him victory (11:9; 12:18; 14:10-11, 14-16; 18:6, 13; 19:13-15), the Chronicler’s explanation for God’s rejection of David as temple builder is not one that is based in David’s sin. David may not be entirely sinless in Chronicles but he is almost so, and so the temple builders at the beginning of the dynasty are almost entirely ethically perfect. Outside of its use in sacrificial texts, Md כִּרְפֹם־שָׁ almost always refers to homicide, although it can also refer to killing in warfare,¹⁹¹ and the specific reference to warfare in both texts where David offers this

¹⁹⁰ See Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 469-71.

¹⁹¹ For a thorough study of this language, see Donald F. Murray, “Under YHWH’s Veto: David as Shedder of Blood in Chronicles,” *Bib* 82 (2001): 457-76. As he points out, Joel 4:19 [3:19] and Ps 79:3, 10 use the phrase in the context of warfare. See also Hieronymus Christ, *Blutvergiessen im Alten Testament: Der gewaltsame Tod des Menschen untersucht am hebräischen Wort dām*, ThDis 12 (Basel: Komm. Friedrich Reinhardt, 1977), 8 and Piet B. Dirksen, “Why was David Disqualified as Temple Builder? The Meaning of 1 Chronicles 22.8,”

as God's rationale for his disqualification as temple builder makes his killing in war appear to be the obvious referent to his spilling of blood. Brian Kelly suggests the blood in question is the death of the seventy thousand Israelites who die of the plague caused by David's census in 1 Chronicles 21,¹⁹² but 1 Chronicles 21 does not charge David with murder, use the phrase $\text{Kp}\#$ Md , or even use the word Md . David only uses the phrase when he speaks of his work as a warrior, work in which God has actually helped him succeed; had this not been the case, the Chronicler implies, then David rather than Solomon would have been the chosen temple builder. But Solomon ($\text{hml}\#\text{\$}$), unlike David, is the king under whose reign God will grant Israel "peace ($\text{Mwl}\#\text{\$}$) and quiet" (1 Chr 22:9). Since, as we shall see in chapter 3, peace is the state God desires for Judah, there is some sense in a Chronistic worldview that God would delay temple construction to the reign that is dominated by it, to the time of a king whose very name reflects it.

To a fourth-century Judean reader, at least one sympathetic to the Chronicler's cause, these changes might seem like straightforward explanations of difficult source material. Since God chose David to rule (1 Kgs 8:16; 11:34), and chose Jerusalem as the city for his temple (1 Kgs 8:44, 48; 11:32, 36; 14:21; 2 Kgs 21:7; 23:7), it might stand to reason for an ancient Judean that he would also have chosen the temple builder, even though the source material says nothing about that. Such a matter was surely too important to leave to historical chance; but if God chose Solomon as temple builder then the narrative of the struggle for the throne in 1 Kings 1-2 is suspect, for there political machinations rather than divine will are highlighted in Solomon's

JSOT 70 (1996): 51-56.

¹⁹² Brian E. Kelly, "David's Disqualification in 1 Chronicles 22.8: A Response to Piet B. Dirksen," *JSOT* 80 (1998): 53-61.

ascent to the throne. The Chronicler's assertion that all of David's sons supported Solomon's succession (1 Chr 29:24) does not necessarily imply that he or she believed (or at least wanted readers to believe) that the story of 1 Kings 1-2 is false,¹⁹³ but the Chronicler nonetheless wiped that story from Chronicles' historical record so that it is clear God chose David's successor specifically so that he could build the temple.

So while in Dtr the prohibition on David's construction of the temple might suggest some kind of divine disfavor, an attitude at odds with the positive portrayal of David in the work, the Chronicler privileges the perfection in which Dtr holds David when evaluating monarchs in Kings, and presents him as virtually sinless, although not entirely so, since God denounces and punishes his census of 1 Chronicles 21. But Solomon, God's chosen temple builder, is entirely without sin in Chronicles. For the Chronicler, it likely made little sense that God would choose as a temple builder a king who commits apostasy as Solomon does in 1 Kings 11, and so he or she may well have been skeptical of the truth of this story. In the same way, the story of David's adultery and murder in 2 Samuel 11-12 might have seemed difficult to believe when the rest of the same source consistently insists that David acted perfectly, and so the stories of the rebellions against David of 2 Samuel 14-20, which are the result of God's punishment for this sin (see 2 Sam 12:10-12), are also suspect. One can see how the Chronicler, faced with source material that seemed to be contradictory, felt the need to make choices among this material. If the Chronicler happened to make choices that cast the Davidides, and specifically the Davidides responsible for

¹⁹³ It is logically possible, given the Chronicler's narrative, that he or she might have believed that Adonijah, upon realizing that he was not God's choice as David's successor, supported Solomon's claim to the throne. This, though, is simply a guess as to how the Chronicler might have responded if asked about the issue.

the existence of the temple, in a more positive light than in Dtr, he or she does have historiographical principles to appeal to as a warrant for these choices, as we shall discuss at more length below.

Nonetheless, these changes happen to strikingly benefit the Chronicler's pro-Davidic argument, for the Davidic dynasty and its divine guarantee of an eternal rule is intimately linked to the temple itself, the center of identity and social organization and power of Chronicles' readers. The first king of the dynasty wants to build the temple, but technical reasons disqualify him from doing so. Nonetheless, he begins important preparations for it, and his son, the figure whom God has specifically chosen as builder, assembles the material his father has gathered, and builds. The Davidic temple builder is sinless and his father, who can almost be considered a temple builder himself, is virtually so, and the temple and Davidides here are coeval and seem intimately linked. By omitting the monarchy's origin story, Chronicles' narrative presents kingship as the natural form of rule for Israel/Judah, and the narrative begins with David, the king during whose reign the temple in some sense begins, and it concludes with the simultaneous ends of the dynasty's pre-exilic rule and the first temple. The narrative encompasses and does not really extend beyond the time of the Davidides,¹⁹⁴ and so in Chronicles' narrative, the two really do not exist without each other. And since God has given the Davidides an eternal covenant to rule, the current situation of a king-less temple will come to an end. In a similar manner, Ezra-Nehemiah—a document focused on the assembly, as we shall discuss in chapter 6—presents the assembly as beginning the rebuilding of the temple immediately upon the arrival of the first

¹⁹⁴ The only exceptions to this in the book are the report of exile and return in 1 Chr 9:1-2 and the appearance in the final verses of Chronicles of Cyrus, who claims Yhwh has chosen him to rebuild the temple. The latter is a story we will discuss in chapter 5.

Judean immigrants from Babylon, at the very beginning of the Persian period, even though temple construction does not actually appear to have begun until two decades after this.¹⁹⁵ Just as Chronicles does not present a temple without a Davidic monarchy, Ezra-Nehemiah does not present an assembly without a temple. The Chronicler, however, wants to convince readers that the current situation of a Davidide-less temple is not the religious and political order God had in mind.¹⁹⁶

If, as we have already seen, the Chronicler's alterations to parts of Samuel-Kings' portrait of the Davidides conveniently support the aims of a pro-Davidic movement, the Chronicler could at least have made the claim, had anyone questioned him or her as to the quality of the work, that

¹⁹⁵ See, e.g., Peter Ross Beford, "Discerning the Time: Haggai, Zechariah, and the 'Delay' in the Rebuilding of the Temple" in *The Pitcher is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström*, ed. Steven W. Holloway and Lowell K. Handy, JSOTSup 190 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 71-94; Hayim Tadmor, "'The appointed time has not yet arrived': The Historical Background of Haggai 1:2" in *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*, ed. Robert Chazan, William W. Hallo, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 401-408; James M. Trotter, "Was the Second Jerusalem Temple a Primarily Persian Project?," *SJOT* 15 (2001): 276-94 (287-94); Elie Assis, "To Build or Not to Build: A Dispute between Haggai and His People (Hag 1)," *ZAW* 119 (2007): 514-27.

¹⁹⁶ 2 Chr 36:22-23 might appear to contradict this conclusion, since Cyrus claims here that God has ordered him to build the temple in Jerusalem. As our discussion in chapter 5 of Chronicles' reaction to Persian hegemony will show, however, Chronicles simply does not see Persian royal rule as a replacement for Davidic rule.

some of the alterations to the source material that at times seems difficult or confusing were guided by common tropes or standards of Mesopotamian history writings, particularly ones that prominently feature kings, which is precisely the focus of Chronicles' narrative. Since, as we have seen, the Judean elite would have been aware of the thought and culture of their past imperial rulers, the alteration of source material to reflect Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian understandings of the ways in which history operated might have appeared to readers as commonsensical historiographic choices. So, for example, the notion that the gods have specifically chosen a particular king to build their temples is a common trope in Mesopotamian history writings. The eighth-century Neo-Assyrian monarch Esarhaddon, in recounting his battle for the throne, claims that the gods chose him as king specifically so that he would build the cultic centers and restore the divine images there (RINAP 4:1.ii.12-24). He writes in part here that he was "chosen by Nabû (and) Marduk, favorite of Ištar, the queen, desired by the great gods, capable, able, intelligent, learned, the one whom the great gods raised to be king in order to restore the great gods and complete the shrines of all of the cult centers of the great gods." This appears to be an idea common to both Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions.¹⁹⁷ From the Chronicler's standpoint, if it is common for the divine world to choose kings as temple

¹⁹⁷ To point to just a few other examples, the same claim is made by the Neo-Assyrians Šamši-Adad V (RIMA 3:103.1.i.26-33), Adad-nārāri III (RIMA 3:104.8.105), Tiglath-pileser III (RINAP 1:T-P III.37.12-13), Sargon (RIMB 2:6.22.3.26-29), and Šamaš-šuma-ukīn (RIMB 2:6.33.1.9-13). The Neo-Babylonians Neriglissar and Nabonidus make the same claim (SANER 3:4.2.3.i.15-20; AOAT 256:2.8.i.17-20), and Nebuchadnezzar even states that he was created by the gods for the very purpose of rebuilding their temples (e.g., VAB 4:Neb.1.i.11-13; 3.i.11-15; 7.i.15-ii.1; etc.).

builders, it only makes sense that Yhwh would do the same, even if Dtr did not report that fact.

Nor is this the only change that the Chronicler makes to source material from Samuel-Kings that we can trace to Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian historiography. The Chronicler's creation of a kind of joint reign between David and Solomon, in which the first king fights wars and prepares for the temple while the second builds it in peace, reflects another trope of Mesopotamian historiography, in which royal warfare precedes the work on the temples. When Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian inscriptions refer both to a king's victories and his attention to cult, normally temple repair, the narration of the battles regularly precedes that of the cultic work. Such a pattern makes practical sense, given that these inscriptions frequently refer to using spoil from the royal victories for the cult. As an example, we can return to the inscription of Esarhaddon cited above; there, after a lengthy description of his divinely-supported victories (RINAP 4:1.ii-iv), the king writes that "with the booty of the vast enemies which my hands had captured through the help of the great gods, my lords, I had the shrines of the cult centers built in Assyria and Akkad; I decorated (them) with silver (and) gold and made them shine like daylight" (1.v.36-39). This is hardly the only example of the pattern in Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁸ Again, for just a few examples in which temple-building and care for the cult follow warfare in Neo-Assyrian royal historiographies, we find the same pattern in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (RIMA 3:102.12.9-40); Sennacherib (RINAP 3:1.63-92)—and Sennacherib states that some of the tribute his vassals must pay is expressly for the maintenance of the Assyrian temples (e.g., RINAP 3:2.19; 4.17)—Ashurbanipal (RIMB 2:6.32.19.7-15), Ninurta-kudurri-ušur (RIMB 2:1002.3.i.7-iii.4), and Tiglath-pileser III (RINAP 1:T-P III.53.1-23). In a similar manner, an inscription of Tiglath-pileser III describes the construction of his palace as occurring after his conquests (RINAP 1:T-P III.47).

In comparison to their Neo-Assyrian counterparts, Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions tend to say almost nothing about foreign conquests, yet Nebuchadnezzar, for example, can still refer to the vast extent of the victories Marduk has won for him (VAB 4:Neb.15.ii.12-29) and the wealth this has enabled him to offer to Marduk and that he can use to build the temples (15.ii.30-50).¹⁹⁹ The Chronicler appears to follow the pattern in Mesopotamian hegemony in which royal warfare precedes temple building. This helps us to explain why the Chronicler interprets Solomon's claim in 1 Kgs 5:17 [3] that war prevented David from building the temple in the way he or she does, especially once we consider the importance of peace in Chronicles—which we will discuss in the following chapter—as the author assures the assembly that the king will not unadvisedly force them to fight wars. In the Chronicler's thinking, David's rule forms the first part of a royal reign dedicated to temple building, but since God desires peace and rest and quiet for the temple and Israel/Judah, its completion must be delayed until the second part of his joint reign with Solomon, the king whose very name the Chronicler associates with peace (1 Chr 22:9).

As part of the Chronicler's overwhelmingly positive picture of the founder of the Davidides, we can add that he or she portrays David as someone who would have done an excellent job of temple-building. Even as God tells David he will not build the temple, David acts to choose the temple's future location (1 Chr 22:1) and to prepare for the actual construction, as we have seen; God does not tell him to do these things, although in 2 Chr 6:8

¹⁹⁹ See also the broken text of VAB 4:Neb.19A.ii.1-iii.58, which seems to manifest the same pattern, although, if that is the case, then almost all of the references to the conquests that were originally part of the text are missing in what is extant. This pattern is more common in the inscriptions of Nabopolassar, who defeated the Assyrians and inaugurated the Neo-Babylonian Empire; see, e.g., SANER 3:2.1.3.6-12; 2.2.4.i.20-ii.10; 2.2.6.i.19-ii.8.

Solomon says God complimented David on his initiative in this regard. David, like other good kings in Chronicles, regularly seems to intuit what cultic actions God wishes to be performed. David separates the ark from the tabernacle on his own initiative in 1 Chronicles 13, and even when God kills Uzzah as David moves the ark (13:9-10), the king correctly understands that this does not reflect divine anger in reaction against his separation of ark and tabernacle, but God's disapproval of the failure of the Levites to carry the ark (15:11-28). David, of course, takes the initiative to organize and arrange the cultic personnel for the temple his son will build (1 Chr 6:16-17 [31-32]; 23:1-6; 24:3; 25:1), an organization that differs from that associated with the tabernacle in the Priestly Writing and the Pentateuch, and he arranges for the workers who will do the building (22:2, 15-16) and for the material for the construction (22:14; 29:2), and he establishes monetary resources for the construction so vast (22:14; 29:3-5) that they dwarf the annual income of the Great King of Persia.²⁰⁰ He does say that God has given him a written blueprint for the plan of the temple and the divisions of its personnel (1 Chr 28:11-19), and so while readers are assumedly supposed to conclude that he acts in accordance with divine commands in cultic preparations, the text puts much more emphasis on David's work and pro-

²⁰⁰ David claims in 1 Chr 22:14 that he has gathered 1,000,000 talents of silver and 100,000 talents of gold, and that he cannot even estimate how much bronze and iron he has collected. Herodotus 3.89-95 calculates the total annual tribute of the empire to Persia as the equivalent of 14,560 Babylonian talents of silver. In 3.95.1 he values gold at thirteen times the same weight in silver, meaning that David has gathered the equivalent of 2,300,000 talents of silver with which to build the temple, an amount equal to more than 150 years of tribute from the empire to the Persian king.

temple initiative.²⁰¹ David acts like a Mesopotamian king in the first part of his rule, fighting wars and bringing the spoil to the temple (1 Chr 18:8-11; 26:27);²⁰² by creating a joint reign with his successor, the Chronicler has David and Solomon follow the standard Mesopotamian royal pattern of action, and so Solomon finishes David's reign by using the resources David has gathered to build.

The Chronicler's portrayal of the importance of Solomon's wisdom is another way in which we can see an alteration of Samuel-Kings that reflects Mesopotamian historiographic norms. In Chronicles, as in Kings, Solomon receives divine wisdom (1 Kgs 3:3-15; 2 Chr 1:2-

²⁰¹ As another example of the notion that Chronicles emphasizes David's actions in the cult while also claiming divine direction for them, 2 Chr 29:25 states that Yhwh provided David with the organization of the Levitical musicians through the prophets Gad and Nathan. Yet the fact that his notice of divine direction is delayed until the final chapters of the work places the focus on David's direction. It is true that, for Chronicles, royal decision alone is not enough for the establishment of the new temple cult—see William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period*, JSOTSup 197 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 181-82—but Chronicles is emphasizing David's actions in establishing the cult and noticeably downplaying divine direction.

²⁰² In fact, the list of David's battles in 1 Chr 18:1-13, borrowed from 2 Sam 8:1-14, lists his conquests from west to east and then north to south, following the Neo-Assyrian pattern of relating conquests in royal inscriptions. See Cynthia Edenburg, "David, the Great King, King of the Four Quarters: Structure and Signification in the Catalog of David's Conquests (2 Samuel 8:1-14, 1 Chronicles 18:1-13)" in *Raising Up a Faithful Exegete: Essays in Honor of Richard D. Nelson*, ed. K.L. Noll and Brooks Schramm (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 159-75.

13), but the Chronicler omits the story of 1 Kgs 3:16-28 that shows Solomon immediately applying this wisdom to resolve the difficult case of the two prostitutes who both claim to be the mother of the same boy, as well as the story that has Solomon use his wisdom to carry out political assassinations (see 1 Kgs 2:6, 9). References to Solomon's wisdom in Chronicles are largely limited to its use in temple-building,²⁰³ and so his reception of divine wisdom in 2 Chronicles 1 is immediately followed by his decision to build the temple (1:18 [2:1]), not to resolve the disputed parentage of a child, and Hiram also makes the connection between Solomon's wisdom and his role as temple builder (2:11 [12]). Chronicles even limits the use of the word מְחָכִים "sage" to describe the craftsmen who build the temple (1 Chr 22:15; 2 Chr 2:6, 12 [7, 13]) and Solomon as he is preparing to build it (2 Chr 2:11 [12]).²⁰⁴ For the Chronicler, Solomon's wisdom and skill in regard to matters that have nothing to do with temple-building

²⁰³ See, e.g., Baruch Halpern, "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Theocratic Structure—Indications of an Earlier Source" in *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text*, ed. Richard Elliott Friedman, UCPNES 22 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981), 35-54 (44-45); Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 482-84; P. Abadie, "La symbolique du Temple dans l'œuvre du chroniqueur," *Transeu* 21 (2001): 13-27 (18); H.G.M. Williamson, "The Temple in the Books of Chronicles" in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 150-61 (150-51); Manfred Oeming, "Wisdom as a Central Category in the Book of Chronicles: The Significance of the *Talio* Principle in a Sapiential Construction of History" in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, its Exegesis and its Language*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher et al. (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2007), 125*-41* (125*-26*).

²⁰⁴ Oeming, "Wisdom as a Central Category," 125*-26* n. 4.

are not nearly as important as his use of it to construct the temple, and this emphasis also reflects Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian historiography that involves kings and temple construction.²⁰⁵ So when, for example, Esarhaddon states that Aššur chose him and that Ea, Aššur, and Marduk gave him wisdom to refurbish the temple cults (RINAP 4:48.61-65), he prays that the craftsmen who will be involved will receive wisdom from the gods as well (48.66-72).²⁰⁶

With these kinds of changes to source material, the Chronicler is trying to create important and positive links between the Davidides and the temple. For Chronicles, there really is no Israelite/Judean history without the Davidides, a dynasty that is coeval with the temple because the first king of the house initiated the process of its construction. While David would have been a good temple builder, his wars, wars that God supported, disqualified him from completing the task, and so God chose his son to finish the work he began. There would be no temple were it not for the dynasty, which, thanks to the sinlessness of the actual temple builder,

²⁰⁵ On the trope of wisdom in Mesopotamian temple-building texts, see Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, “Cosmos, Temple, House: Building and Wisdom in Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel” in *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Jamie Novotny, AOAT 366 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010), 399-421.

²⁰⁶ Here again, for just a few Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian examples of the kings who claim that they have received divine wisdom to build, see the inscriptions of Sargon (RIMB 2:6.22.3.i.26-ii.6), Sennacherib (RINAP 3:11.1-6), Marduk-apla-iddina II or Merodach-baladan (RIMB 2:6.21.1.19-22); Nebuchadnezzar (VAB 4:Neb.3.i.5-8); Nabopolassar (SANER 3:2.2.6.ii.9-20); and Neriglissar (SANER 3:4.2.2.i.22-31). In a similar way, Tiglath-pileser III says Ea provided him with wisdom to construct his palace (RINAP 1:T-P III.47.r17-18).

God chose to rule forever. And David and Solomon are not the only Davidic kings whose cultic work is important, for other Davidides in Chronicles use their own wealth to support the Jerusalem cult (2 Chr 9:10-11; 15:18; 31:3; 35:7) and they repair the temple (2 Chr 15:8; 24:4-14; 27:3; 33:16; 34:8-13). They use their power to enforce Jerusalem's cultic monopoly, eliminating idolatry and aspects of the Yahwistic cult practiced outside of the sanctuary (2 Chr 14:2-4 [3-5]; 15:8; 17:6; 29:1-19; 33:15; 34:3-5), even in the remnants of the Northern Kingdom (34:6-7), and reestablish the proper rituals and roles for cultic personnel when these have been neglected (2 Chr 29:20-30; 31:2; 35:2-6). There is much in Chronicles' presentation of the Davidides that would make their restoration as Persian clients seem attractive to a community whose identity and relationships of power are located in the Jerusalem temple. The fact of the matter, however, is that not all of the Davidides act in such positive ways in regard to the cult. The Chronicler obviously sees such Davidic failures as a reality so firmly engrained in the cultural memory of the Judean elite that references to at least some of them cannot be avoided. As a result, source material from Kings is altered in order to demonstrate that no future Davidide would dare to imitate such failures, for in Chronicles kings who act in such a fashion meet with punishment during their lifetimes. The Chronicler's doctrine of immediate retribution, which explains the last set of changes to Samuel-Kings that we will discuss in this chapter, sends a clear message to Judah's elite that the pro-Davidic party's understanding of history, an understanding articulated in Chronicles, means that future kings will only support the temple and its cultic monopoly, something for which they will receive divine rewards, for failure to do so will lead to God directly punishing the king.

This is not always the case in the Deuteronomistic History's narrative of the monarchy, however. One of the most important examples of royal evil that goes unpunished in the king's

lifetime in Dtr is Solomon's, a king who commits apostasy (1 Kgs 11:1-8), and yet is not punished while he is alive (11:9-13, 34-35). Jeroboam I, who establishes the apostate cultic apparatus that all of the following Northern kings maintain and that is responsible for the destruction of the North (1 Kgs 12:26-33; 14:15-16; 2 Kgs 17:21-23) is punished only to the extent that his house is wiped out after his death (1 Kgs 14:7-11); Manasseh, whose sins are so dreadful that Dtr blames them for the destruction of Judah (2 Kgs 21:10-16; 23:26-27; 24:3-4), reigns for fifty five years and dies in peace (21:1). And despite Dtr's contention that Yhwh directly repays those who do not keep his commandments (Deut 7:9-10), there are other kings in the history who are explicitly said to do evil—Baasha (1 Kgs 15:34), Omri (16:19), and Jeroboam II (2 Kgs 14:24)—whose narratives are utterly free of stories of disease, assassination, exile, or defeat suffered by the king. Jeroboam II actually wins divinely-sanctioned victories that extend the size of his kingdom (2 Kgs 14:25-27). Conversely, there are Davidides of whom Dtr expresses explicit approval—Asa (1 Kgs 15:11), Jehoshaphat (22:43), Joash (2 Kgs 12:2), and Amaziah (14:3)—who are not said to receive any kind of reward for their righteousness.

We do not see such divine failures to directly punish and reward royal cultic actions in Chronicles. There are times in Chronicles when kings must restore the cult because earlier Davidides have neglected it and turned to the worship of other gods; we can find such neglect, later corrected, in the stories of Jehoram (2 Chr 21:11-15), Ahaziah (22:1-4),²⁰⁷ Joash (24:17-18),

²⁰⁷ 2 Chr 22:4 says that Ahaziah “did evil in the eyes of Yhwh like the house of Ahab.” 21:11-13, part of the condemnation of Ahaziah's father, Jehoram, makes it clear what the house of Ahab has done: Jehoram “also made high places in the hill country of Judah, and he caused the inhabitants of Jerusalem to prostitute themselves and he led Judah astray.” When Elijah condemns Jehoram, he writes that “you caused Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to

Amaziah (25:14-16), Ahaz (28:1-4, 23-25), Manasseh (33:1-9), and Amon (33:22). We can make two observations about such Davidides in Chronicles: all of their cultic failures are corrected by other Davidides; and all of them are punished for these failures, as we shall demonstrate below. These are not the only Davidides whom Chronicles portrays negatively for at least part of their reigns: Rehoboam and the people abandon Torah (2 Chr 12:1); Asa makes a foreign military alliance with Aram (16:1-6); Jehoshaphat makes an alliance with Ahab, one of the “haters of Yhwh” (19:2); and the final three kings are said to do “evil in the eyes of Yhwh” (36:5, 9, 12), a statement that appears to refer to cultic sin.²⁰⁸ We can add to this the case of Uzziah, who tries to offer sacrifice in the temple (26:16). Unlike Dtr, every Davidic king who is said to commit a cultic sin is also said to be punished during his lifetime. (This is also true for the cases of kings who make foreign military alliances, but we will discuss this in the next chapter.) The sin of Rehoboam and the people results in foreign invasion, servitude, and plunder (2 Chr 12:2-10); Jehoram is punished with foreign invasion and plunder, an almost total annihilation of his royal house, and a painful disease of which he dies (21:16-19); Ahaziah is assassinated (22:9); Joash’s apostasy results in foreign invasion and plunder (24:23-24); Amaziah suffers defeat, plunder, and assassination (24:14-24, 27); Uzziah is struck by a disease that effectively ends his reign (26:19-

 prostitute themselves like the prostitution of the house of Ahab.” For the Chronicler, acting like the house of Ahab involves creating non-Yahwistic places of worship.

²⁰⁸ The Chronicler omits the language from 2 Kgs 23:37; 24:9, 19 that compares their evil to that of the earlier kings of Judah, but Chronicles uses the phrase “did evil in the eyes of Yhwh” to refer to the sin of Jehoram (2 Chr 21:6), Ahaziah (22:4), Ahaz (29:6), Manasseh (33:2, 6), and Amon (33:22), and all of them are responsible for cultic sins. And Chronicles says that Zedekiah refused to “repent to Yhwh” and allowed the people to pollute the temple (36:13-14).

21); Ahaz is punished with massive military defeats and the death of his son (28:5-7, 16-21); Manasseh is punished with exile (33:10-11); Amon is assassinated after only two years in power (33:21-24); Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin are taken into exile (36:6, 10); and Zedekiah is either killed during the Babylonian invasion or taken into exile (36:20).

And if there is not a single Davidic king responsible for cultic evil who escapes punishment, all of the Davidides who act in a positive manner toward the Jerusalem cult, correcting cultic missteps of past kings and enforcing the temple's cultic monopoly, are rewarded. Asa's cultic reforms include the removal of incense altars and non-Yahwistic cultic constructions from throughout Judah (2 Chr 14:1-4 [2-5]), and they result in a victory against a massively superior invader (14:8-12 [9-13]) and plunder from that foe (14:12-14 [13-15]). Jehoshaphat's adherence to Yahwistic cult and law (17:3-4, 6) causes God to establish the kingdom in his hand, something that results in wealth (17:5) and that is followed by tribute from the Philistines and Arabs (17:10-11). Amaziah does what is "right in the eyes of Yhwh," and God gives him victory and plunder (25:7-11), just as Yhwh does for Jehoshaphat (20:1-30). Uzziah, before committing his cultic sin, also does what is "right in the eyes of Yhwh" and seeks (#\$rd) God (26:4-5), and Yhwh defeats his enemies, who then render him tribute (26:6-8). Jotham's victories are also attributed to doing "what is right in the eyes of Yhwh" (27:2, 5-6). Hezekiah re-opens the temple Ahaz had closed, and dedicates himself to cultic restoration, including donations to the cult from his own wealth and removal of all cultic artifices not associated with the temple (2 Chr 29-31). The narrative of God's defeat of the Assyrian invasion during Hezekiah's reign (32:1-23) specifically refers back to those reforms (32:11-12), and particular mention is made later to Hezekiah's divinely-bestowed wealth (32:27-29). As soon as

Josiah reaches the age of twenty, a kind of age of majority for the Chronicler²⁰⁹—meaning that he cannot be blamed for continuing his father’s sin during the early years of his reign—he does what “is right in the eyes of Yhwh” and destroys all illegitimate cultic apparatuses. The very fact that he is able to do this even in the North (34:6-7, 33) tells readers that he can move freely throughout that region; it suggests, in fact, that this territory is his reward for his cultic faithfulness. As Chronicles makes clear to readers, no future Davidide would dare to violate cultic norms, since Chronicles reveals to them the truth of how God acts in response to such violations. After the Persians took control of Babylon, Cyrus’s pro-temple rhetoric was followed by the Achaemenids’ neglect of Mesopotamian temples and abuse of their financial resources.²¹⁰ The Chronicler assures assembly readers that they need not worry that the Davidides, like the Persians, would renege on any pro-temple promises they might make before their rise to power, since the Davidides, having the benefit of Chronicles’ history, would be too frightened of divine

²⁰⁹ Passages such as 1 Chr 23:24, 27; 27:23; and 2 Chr 31:17 certainly suggest this. See, e.g., H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCBC (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), 398; Sara Japhet, *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 1019; Steven L. McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, AOTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004), 360; Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Remembering Josiah” in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*, ed. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 236-56 (242-43).

²¹⁰ Persian temple building projects in Babylonia ceased after the time of Cyrus, as did Persian donations to Babylonian temples. Persian authorities appear to have even removed temple vessels from the Eanna temple in Uruk, and they ended the royal practice of tithing. See Kleber, *Tempel und Palast*, 342-43.

punishment to act in such a way.

The Chronicler's doctrine of immediate retribution appears so striking in comparison with his or her source material that some have concluded that he or she applies this principle absolutely to all human actions.²¹¹ This, however, is not entirely true. David's census results in the death of 70,000 innocent Israelites but spares him and his family, a matter to which he draws attention in 1 Chr 21:17; 2 Chr 24:17-18 says that "the officials of Judah" abandoned the temple and worshiped idols, but that "there was wrath upon Judah and Jerusalem because of this their guilt"; in 2 Chr 24:20-22 a prophet is executed because he speaks for Yhwh; in 2 Chr 32:24-25 the ambiguous sin attributed to Hezekiah results in the punishment of Judah and Jerusalem; more than one generation is affected by the seventy year exile of 2 Chr 36:21; and invasions occur without being linked to any evil of kings or people in 1 Chronicles 14; 2 Chronicles 14; 16; 20; and 32.²¹² Sometimes good people (although not good kings) suffer because of the sins of others.

²¹¹ E.g., von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild*, 10-15; Raymond B. Dillard, "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution," *WTJ* 46 (1984): 164-72 (165); Martin Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, trans. H.G.M. Williamson, JSOTSup 50 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 98; Sara Japhet, "Theodicy in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles" in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Studies on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 367-98.

²¹² See, e.g., Brian E. Kelly, "'Retribution' Revisited: Covenant, Grace and Restoration" in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie, and Gary N. Knoppers, JSOTSup 371 (London: T. & T. Clark International, 2003), 206-27; Ehud Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Chronicler" in *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, BibleWorld (London:

There may be a consistent relationship in Chronicles between royal actions in regard to the cult and rewards and punishments, but it is not clear that the Chronicler extends the concept of immediate retribution much beyond this (except to the cases of kings' foreign military alliances, which we shall discuss in the next chapter). Even its extension this far, however, sends a very clear message about how God interacts with Davidic kings, and makes it clear that no Davidide would dare to repeat the cultic errors of his predecessors, especially as the book of Chronicles is now available to them to make divine causation in history clear.

Chronicles, moreover, quietly insists that kings can learn from the past, so long as they can rightly interpret history or have someone rightly interpret it for them. In 2 Chr 12:5-7, for example, a prophet tells Rehoboam and the leaders of Judah that their sin is responsible for the Egyptian invasion, and they humble themselves ((nk). In 2 Chr 25:7-12, Amaziah learns from a prophet that he does not need to make foreign military alliances since God alone decides the outcome of battles, and so he sends his hired mercenaries home and wins the battle. 2 Chr 27:2 suggests that Jotham has learned from his father's punishment that a king has no place at the altar, space that is reserved for priests alone. Hezekiah rightly interprets the disaster of Ahaz's reign as the result of Ahaz's "rebellion" (1 (m) and rejection of the Yahwistic cult (2 Chr 29:3-11), and he applies the same lesson to the destruction of the North (30:6-9). And Manasseh, to take one more example, learns from his exile that he must humble himself before God (2 Chr 33:10-13). While the final three kings of Chronicles all do evil, suggesting that assembly readers should not believe that all kings will learn from past royal errors, future Davidides will have the book of Chronicles to teach them the truth of historical cause and effect. Insofar as Chronicles

Equinox, 2006), 160-73; G. Galil, "'The secret things belong to the Lord our God' (*Deut* 29:29): Retribution in the Persian Period," *Transeu* 39 (2010): 91-96.

comes from a pro-Davidic party, it is a message to others that the Davidides have learned the ironclad rules according to which God responds in history to royal actions.

With this presentation of immediate retribution for royal cultic sins, the Chronicler might be said to be developing an idea already present in some form in Kings, although he or she may also be relying on works known to the Neo-Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians that portray royal cultic failures as consistently subject to punishment in their lifetimes, an idea not present in Dtr. The Sin of Sargon (SAA 3:33), a text produced by the Neo-Assyrian Esarhaddon to justify his restoration of the Babylonian sanctuaries destroyed by Sennacherib, his father,²¹³ claims that Sargon, Sennacherib's father, died in battle because he did not properly reverence the gods of Babylon, and that Sennacherib's life was shortened because he did not restore Marduk's statue. The Weidner Chronicle (ABC 19), extant in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian copies, explicitly uses a history lesson to give advice to kings, explaining that past monarchs who properly supplied Marduk's cult were rewarded with sovereignty, while those who did not, or who altered the rituals of Esagil, were punished with loss of rule, rebellion, and sickness and death. The Persian period Cyrus Cylinder (AOAT 256:K2.1), the Verse Account of Nabonidus (AOAT 256:P1), and the Nabonidus Chronicle (ABC 7)²¹⁴ all blame Nabonidus's failure to attend to the

²¹³ See H. Tadmor, Benno Landsberger, and Simo Parpola, "The Sin of Sargon and Sennacherib's Last Will," *SAAB* 3 (1989): 3-51.

²¹⁴ The Nabonidus Chronicles is almost universally dated to the early Persian period, but see Caroline Waerzeggers, "Facts, Propaganda, or History? Shaping Political Memory in the Nabonidus Chronicle" in *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*, ed. Jason M. Silverman and Caroline Waerzeggers, ANEM 13 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 95-124, who reads it as a Hellenistic composition.

Babylonian cults as the explanation for his loss of kingship to Cyrus.²¹⁵ This list could go on, for texts dating back to the late-third-millennium Curse of Agadê blame the cultic missteps of kings for invasion and loss of rule, but this kind of understanding of kingship seems to have been especially popular in Persian-period Babylonia.²¹⁶ Part of the point of Chronicles is that it acts like these Mesopotamian works do—it provides explanations of history that inform future kings how not to act—and it signals to assembly readers that the Davidic party in Judah is well aware that sinful royal cultic actions are met with divine punishment of the king, and that, therefore, no future Davidide would imitate such sins. Conversely, it is a common claim on the part of Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian kings that they deserve victory, wealth, and health because of their dedication to the cults. So Šamaš-šuma-ukīn, for example, writes that he builds in Ezida, the temple of Nabû, “to ensure my good health, to prolong my life, to ensure the well-being of my descendants, to confirm my reign, to ensure that I might have no illness” (RIMB

²¹⁵ And just as kings in Chronicles like Rehoboam or Manasseh can learn from their own missteps, so can kings in Mesopotamian histories. In the Cuthean Legend, for example, known in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian copies, defeat causes Naram-Sin to conclude that he has been a bad king (MC 7:22.72-92).

²¹⁶ See the discussions in John P. Nielsen, “‘I overwhelmed the king of Elam’: Remembering Nebuchadnezzar I in Persian Babylonia” in *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*, ed. Jason M. Silverman and Caroline Waerzeggers, ANEM 13 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 53-73 and Geert De Breucker, “Heroes and Sinners: Babylonian Kings in Cuneiform Historiography of the Persian and Hellenistic Periods” in *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*, ed. Jason M. Silverman and Caroline Waerzeggers, ANEM 13 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 75-94.

2:6.33.4.26). Nebuchadnezzar asks Marad, the god whose temple he has just refurbished, that he give him “life to far away days, abundance of posterity, security of my throne, and a long reign. With your terrible weapons smite the rebellious, devastate all the territory of my enemies” (VAB 4:Neb.3.ii.23-29).²¹⁷

So in the Chronicler’s history, then, kingship is the natural form of rule in Judah, and as far as Chronicles presents matters, there really is no history of Israel/Judah without kings. The Davidides have an eternal covenant from God to exercise rule, a fact that readers should be reminded of every time they see the temple, since the Davidic temple builder was Solomon, whose sinlessness guaranteed the eternal covenant. In Chronicles’ narrative, temple and Davidides naturally belong together, and readers can expect God to return the house to power. God was deliberate in choosing not just the Davidides but Solomon in particular, who uses his divinely-bestowed wisdom to build the temple. David and Solomon really exercised a kind of joint reign, and David, who came up with the idea to build the temple, could only prepare for its construction because his divinely-supported wars disqualified him from actual construction, as

²¹⁷ For just some of the other like examples in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions, see the claims and requests of Shalmaneser III (RIMA 3 102.12.33-40), Marduk-apla-iddina II or Merodach-baladan (RIMB 2:6.21.1.30-35), Sargon (RIMB 2:6.22.1.21-23, 32-35), Esarhaddon (RINAP 4:104.vi.34-vii.3), Ashurbanipal (RIMB 2:6.32.6.20-23), and Nabopolassar (SANER 3:2.2.4.ii.21-22). The clay cylinder text AOAT 256:2.24 may have been composed by Nabonidus or Cyrus, but it reflects the same basic pattern in i.10-11 and ii.2-8. In the Cyrus Cylinder, which is far closer in style and content to the Mesopotamian inscriptions than the Achaemenid ones we will discuss in chapter 5, Cyrus also asks the gods to lengthen his life after discussing his care for the divine images (AOAT 256:K2.1.31-36).

the temple is associated with the peace that good Davidides will maintain for the assembly (as we shall see in the next chapter). The temple and Davidic rule are coeval, and in Chronicles' presentation of history the existence of one implies the existence of the other. Readers encounter many stories of Davidides who support the temple and maintain its cultic monopoly, and the Chronicler makes it clear that the pro-Davidic party is well aware of what happens to kings who do not offer the Jerusalem cult such support. After reading Chronicles, it would be clear to the assembly and prospective Davidic rulers alike that all past Davidides who neglected the cult have been dreadfully punished, and no sane future monarch would ever attempt such things again, especially as Chronicles decisively interprets history to make such cause and effect clear. They would instead maintain and repair the temple, enforce its cultic monopoly, and would alleviate some of the assembly's financial responsibility for it. In Chronicles there is no divine hesitation over the establishment of the monarchy or the temple, no lack of clarity over why David did not build it, and no royal cultic sin that goes unpunished. What assembly readers see here is a dynasty devoted to temple just as the assembly is, a dynasty that will act with rather than against the assembly in matters associated with the assembly's most important institution. There is nothing here that suggests the Davidides would exercise their power against the assembly's wishes in regard to the cult, especially as, thanks to Chronicles, they can now be aware of what God will do to all kings who violate cultic norms. The kings will not use their power to challenge the assembly in regard to the cult, and this positive signal about Davidic respect for the assembly's temple clearly bodes well for the relations between king and assembly after a restoration. We turn now to chapter 3 where, as part of our examination of how the Chronicler's portrayals of the Levites and assembly function to gain their support for a restoration, we shall see that Chronicles has other and more specific things to say about the ways in which the

assembly's political power would be safeguarded under the Davidides.

3. The Davidides, the Levites, and the assembly

1. The Davidides and the Levites

We have already noted that Chronicles seems so oriented toward the cult that some scholars argue that it was written to justify a post-exilic theocratic rule of Judah, and that it clearly seems to promote the Levites. We concluded in the previous chapter, however, that Chronicles presents an eternal covenant with the Davidides, making their restoration a certainty in Chronicist theology, and that the Chronicler has altered Samuel-Kings to make a Davidic restoration appear as a natural complement to the temple and as an appealing shift in the local power structure to a group that grounds its identity and relationships of power in the temple. By changing source material in particular ways, specifically by demonstrating that all anti-temple royal actions result in punishment of the king, Chronicles makes it appear that, armed with such knowledge of how history works, no future Davidide would dare to do anything but support the temple and its cultic monopoly; this is a necessary part of the Chronicler's attempt to gain the support of the local government for an appeal to the Achaemenids (or potentially to the early Hellenistic rulers) for a restoration of the Davidides as clients. The narrative of 1 Chronicles 10-2 Chronicles 36 makes the kings the focus of the history, and had the Chronicler truly wanted to advance a theocracy rather than a monarchy, the parts of the Pentateuch dominated by Priestly material would surely have made a better primary source than Samuel-Kings.

As we saw, the Chronicler's message that the Davidides would respect the place of the temple in Judean society sends a signal to the assembly that future kings will tread carefully when it comes to issues the assembly regards as important. This message in and of itself would likely not have been enough to convince all assembly members that the Davidides would safeguard assembly power and privileges after a restoration, and in section 2 of this chapter we

will examine other ways the Chronicler worked to reassure the assembly that their local authority and power would be preserved under Davidic rule. In this section, however, we examine the Chronicler's appeal to the Levites for support for its quiet revolution. As we saw in chapter 2, the temple personnel, and the high priest specifically, seems to have had an important leadership role in fourth century Judean local government, as did the rest of the temple assembly and its heads or elders. Chronicles presents priests as important cultic actors, as we shall see, but places particular emphasis on the authority and roles of the Levites. Chronicles and the Priestly Writing are the earliest works that refer to the Aaronide priesthood and Levites as holding distinct cultic offices,²¹⁸ but Chronicles, very unlike P, pays much more attention to the Levites and their duties. As we shall see, P clearly subordinates the Levites to the Aaronide priests,²¹⁹ although the

²¹⁸ On this see, e.g., Risto Nurmela, *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood*, SFSHJ 193 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 76; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Judaeen Priesthood during the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods: A Hypothetical Reconstruction," *CBQ* 60 (1998): 25-43 (37-39); Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Mystery of the Missing 'Sons of Aaron'" in *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter H. Ackroyd*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Lester L. Grabbe, LSTS 73 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2009), 65-77 (67-68). Of course, Neh 10:38 and 12:47 also refer to the priests as Aaronides, but this is hardly an idea that dominates the book's references to cultic personnel. Josh 21:13-19 assigns cities to Aaron's descendants, but for this list as a post-exilic insertion, see Joachim Schaper, *Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda: Studien zur Kult- und Sozialgeschichte Israels in persischer Zeit*, FAT 31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 172-73.

²¹⁹ See, e.g., Antonius H.J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester: Hauptlinien der*

same cannot be said for Chronicles.²²⁰ So much has already been written on the privileging of the Levites in Chronicles that it might seem as if little else needs to be said,²²¹ but we want to be

Traditionsbildung und Geschichte des israelitisch-jüdischen Kultpersonals, FRLANT 89 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 138-39, 146-55; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Sage Priest Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*, LAI (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 92-93; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2002), 68-71; Antje Labahn, “Antitheocratic Tendencies in Chronicles” in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Period*, ed. Rainer Albertz and Bob Becking, STAR 5 (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003), 115-35 (129); Kyung-jin Min, *The Levitical Authorship of Ezra-Nehemiah*, JSOTSup 409 (London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 63-65.

²²⁰ Contra, e.g., Nurmela, *The Levites*, 168; Min, *The Levitical Authorship*, 65-68; Louis C. Jonker, “David’s Officials According to the Chronicler (1 Chronicles 23-27): A Reflection of Second Temple Self-Categorization?” in *Historiography and Identity (Re)formulation in Second Temple Historiographical Literature*, ed. Louis Jonker, LHBOTS 534 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2010), 65-91 (89-90); Peter Altmann, “What Do the ‘Levites in your gates’ Have to Do with the ‘Levitical priests’? An Attempt at European-North American Dialogue on the Levites in the Deuteronomic Law Corpus” in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition*, ed. Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, SBLAIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 135-54 (136).

²²¹ Early and important discussions of the Levites in Chronicles include W.M.L. de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Halle: Schimelpfennig, 1806-1807), 1:80-102; Adolf Büchler, “Zur Geschichte der Tempelmusik und der Tempelsalmen,” ZAW 19

clear that Chronicles has far more to say about Levitical duties than priestly ones, that in Chronicles Levites are even incorporated into the royal administration, that Chronicles presents a pre-exilic history in which the Davidides appoint and support the Levites in their full range of cultic and civic roles and authority, and that, while Chronicles portrays the cult as under the leadership of the high priest, it does not portray Levitical duties as inferior to priestly ones, a different case than the Priestly tradition in the Pentateuch. If there is a group within the temple personnel whom Chronicles presents as having something to gain from a reestablishment of Davidic rule and a re-creation of the pre-exilic relationship between king and cult (as Chronicles portrays it, at least), it is the Levites.²²² Since we know that the priests, and the high priest in particular, held significant power in Persian-period local Judean polity, they could likely not hope for an increase in their status should a Davidic client monarchy be installed, and so the Chronicler reassures the priests of their importance under Davidic rule, likely hoping that they would not actively oppose an approach to the Achaemenids for a Davidic restoration. But the Chronicler did have more to offer the Levites in terms of increased authority and power under local royal rule, and so focuses his or her attention on them, aiming to gain the support of this bloc within the temple personnel.

Before we can really begin to investigate how far the Chronistic privileging of the Levites

(1899): 96-133 (124-30); and Gerhard von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, BWANT 54 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 80-119.

²²² Steven Schweitzer argues that the Levites, more than any other group in Chronicles, are a focus of utopianism; see his *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*, LHBOTS 442 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2007), 164-73. With the exception of the Davidides, who held no office when Chronicles was written, this is true.

extends, we should be clear that our knowledge of the fourth-century temple personnel and the relative statuses of priests and Levites is rather limited, and we will begin by exploring what little we do know about this. One thing we can conclude is that the Priestly Writing and Chronicles offer two competing versions of the relative status and authority of the Aaronide priests and Levites in the temple, and that it is likely, although not certain, that P more closely approximates the fourth-century cultic status quo in this regard. As we saw in chapter 2, the high priest and priesthood held positions of civil authority in the Persian and Hellenistic periods, but we have no such information for the Levites, and so it seems more likely that P's picture of cultic personnel, where Aaronide priests are clearly superior in authority and function to the Levites, more closely reflected fourth-century reality than Chronicles' portrayal of cultic personnel. Nonetheless, simply to know that P—and so the Pentateuch available to the Chronicler—and Chronicles present two different pictures in this regard, and that Chronicles provides the Levites with greater prestige than that available to them in P, tells us the Levites would likely find Chronicles' version of a cult overseen by Davidides a superior option to the Pentateuchal cult controlled by the Aaronides. While the priests could appeal to the Pentateuch as the theological basis of their authority, Chronicles presents the Levites and all of its readers with an alternative version of the relationship between priests and Levites that is meant to take precedence over the one in the Pentateuch.

Our search for information about the Levites and cultic personnel in the Persian period cult begins with the late pre-exilic priesthood, concerning which there is a consensus in scholarship that it was understood in Judah to be descended from Zadok,²²³ an important priestly

²²³ The scholarship on the issue of a pre-exilic Zadokite priesthood is surveyed in Alice Hunt, *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*, LHBOTS 452 (T. & T. Clark

figure in the Deuteronomistic History's story of David (see, e.g., 2 Sam 8:17; 20:25). In Dtr's story, Zadok supports David during Absalom's coup attempt (2 Sam 15:24-37; 17:15-16; 19:12 [11]) and is aligned with Solomon in the struggle to succeed David (1 Kgs 1:8, 26, 32-48). Dtr, however, provides us with very little information about Zadok. He appears to emerge out of nowhere,²²⁴ and his sons are mentioned only in the context of the family's support of David during the coup (2 Sam 15:36; 18:19, 22, 27) and, in one case, as one of Solomon's officials (1 Kgs 4:2). They are never presented as occupying any kind of priestly role, and Dtr says nothing about any other figure as a descendant of Zadok.²²⁵ There is, in short, really no evidence in Dtr of a Zadokite priestly dynasty. Dtr simply presents priests as Levites, and so we see the phrase *Mywlh Mynhkh* "the Levitical priests" or "the priests, the sons of Levi" in Deut 17:9; 18:18; 21:5; 24:8; 27:9; 31:9; Josh 3:3; 8:3 (and cf. 1 Kgs 12:31).²²⁶ So while Dtr does not offer good evidence for anything more than a pre-exilic priesthood in which all Levites participated, one often finds the argument in scholarship that Josiah created a two-tiered priesthood when he centralized Yahwism in Jerusalem (2 Kgs 23:8-9), marginalizing the Levitical priests who had served in local cults and elevating the Zadokites to a place of prominence in the Jerusalem temple.²²⁷

International, 2006), 13-47.

²²⁴ So Nurmela, *The Levites*, 19.

²²⁵ See Hunt, *Missing Priests*, 81-90 and Blenkinsopp, "The Mystery," 67.

²²⁶ See Blenkinsopp, *Sage Priest Prophet*, 84-85.

²²⁷ So, e.g., Stephen L. Cook, "Innerbiblical Interpretation in Ezekiel 44 and the History of Israel's Priesthood," *JBL* 114 (1995): 193-208 (193-94); Nurmela, *The Levites*, 70-72; Altmann, "What Do the 'Levites in your gates,'" 139-40. Some argue that Josiah was

Ezra-Nehemiah, as we saw in the last chapter, does distinguish between priestly and Levitical ancestral houses, but, like Dtr, makes no reference to a Zadokite priestly house or dynasty. Ezra 2:36-39 (= Neh 7:39-42) and Ezra 10:18-22 refer to four priestly ancestral houses, none of which is named after Zadok, and while we find a greater number of priestly houses in Neh 12:12-21, there is still no indication here that they are descended from him.²²⁸ The only indication of his importance in Ezra-Nehemiah is in Ezra's genealogy of Ezra 7:1-5, which traces his ancestry back sixteen generations and which includes Zadok. But this genealogy ends with "Aaron the chief priest," and Neh 10:38 and 12:47 refer to the priests as Aaronides, while Ezra 8:2 mentions priests who belong to the Aaronide ancestral houses of Phinehas and Ithamar. Ezra-Nehemiah, then, includes material that is based in the tradition of Aaron as the first high

deliberately trying to limit priestly power with these reforms—e.g., Marvin A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 157-63; Stephen L. Cook "Those Stubborn Levites: Overcoming Levitical Disenfranchisement" in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition*, ed. Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, SBLAIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 155-70 (157-61)—perhaps because the Levites were attempting to limit royal power, on which see Mark Leuchter, "'The Levite in your gates': The Deuteronomic Redefinition of Levitical Authority," *JBL* 126 (2007): 417-36; S. Dean McBride, "Jeremiah and the Levitical Priests of Anathoth" in *Thus Says the Lord: Essays on the Former and Latter Prophets in Honor of Robert R. Wilson*, ed. John J. Ahn and Stephen L. Cook, LHBOTS 502 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2009), 179-96; Cook, "Those Stubborn Levites," 157-58, 161-62.

²²⁸ See Blenkinsopp, *Sage Priest Prophet*, 91-92.

priest,²²⁹ and Ezra-Nehemiah really has only very little and even somewhat contradictory information about Zadok.²³⁰ And about the only clear information with which Ezra-Nehemiah provides readers in regard to the differences in duties and authority of priests and Levites is that the priests alone, as in P and Chronicles, appear to be responsible for sacrifice (Ezra 3:2-3), while the Levites are responsible for teaching the law (Neh 8:7, 9).²³¹ Otherwise, priests and Levites have joint oversight of temple reconstruction (Ezra 3:8-9), the cultic musicians praise God along with the priests (3:10-11),²³² both priests and Levites are permitted to manipulate temple vessels (8:29-30, 33), both priests and Levites are responsible for purifying the people (Neh 12:30), and both priests and Levites are in charge of distributing rations to the cultic personnel (10:39 [38]; 13:13). Ezra-Nehemiah, like Dtr, uses the phrase “Levitical priests” (Ezra 6:20; 8:29, 30; Neh 12:1, 30, 44; 13:30),²³³ and so it is no wonder that Nehemiah refers to a

²²⁹ See Blenkinsopp, “The Judaeen Priesthood,” 25-43 (39) and Hunt, *Missing Priests*, 99-102.

²³⁰ As Hunt, *Missing Priests*, 99-104 points out, Neh 11:11 lists Zadok as an ancestor of the high priest, although it gives his father’s name as Meraioth the son of Ahitub, whereas in Ezra 7:1-5 Zadok is the son of Ahitub, not his grandson.

²³¹ On the latter point see Mark Leuchter, “From Levite to Maškîl in the Persian and Hellenistic Eras” in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition*, ed. Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, SBLAIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 215-32.

²³² As we saw in chapter 1, however, Ezra-Nehemiah generally does not portray the temple musicians as Levites, with the exception of the lists of Neh 11:15-24 and 12:22-26.

²³³ See Min, *The Levitical Authorship*, 75-78, who points out that Levities are not presented as inferior to the priests in these passages.

covenant God has made with “the priesthood and the Levites” (13:29); neither the Nehemiah Memoir nor Ezra-Nehemiah as a whole acknowledges much of a difference between priests and Levites, and so we can hardly be surprised that Nehemiah believes the two groups are bound together in the same covenant with God.

Unlike Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, the Persian period work Malachi makes no distinction at all between priests and Levites; here, as in the Deuteronomistic History, priests simply are Levites. And if in Ezra-Nehemiah we are witnessing the development of a tradition of Aaron as the priestly ancestor, a tradition that otherwise among biblical works is explicit only in P and Chronicles, Malachi makes no hierarchical distinction at all among the Levitical priests. Mal 2:4-9, in fact, refers to a covenant with Levi, making him and not Aaron the priestly ancestor,²³⁴ a situation that sounds rather like the covenant that Nehemiah says exists with both priests and Levites. In Malachi the priests are *ywl ynb*,²³⁵ and so the book does not so much as

²³⁴ See James Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings,” *HTR* 86 (1993): 1-64 (30-32, 60-61); B. Gosse, “L’alliance avec Lévi et l’opposition entre les lignées royale et sacerdotale à l’époque pers,” *Transeu* 10 (1995): 29-33 (29-30); Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, SBLJL 9 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 18-21.

²³⁵ Julia O’Brien has performed the most thorough study of the uses of the terms “priests,” “Levi,” and “Levites” in Malachi, and concludes that there is no real difference between the terms there; see her *Priest and Levite in Malachi*, SBLDS 121 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 27-48, and see also Jeffrey Stackert, “The Cultic Status of the Levites in the *Temple Scroll*: Between History and Hermeneutics” in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition*, ed. Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, SBLAIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature,

maintain even the distinction between priestly and Levitical ancestral houses that appears in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, let alone any distinction between priestly and Levitical authority or duties. The evidence from Malachi tells us that such distinctions were not universally understood to be important in the Persian period, and based on the evidence from Malachi and Ezra-Nehemiah, two works that are actually quite interested in the Jerusalem cult, we could conclude that at least some people in Persian period Judah saw very little difference in the roles and authority of priests and Levites, and certainly did not always see a necessity to emphasize the differences that did exist. For at least some Persian-period Judeans, it was not inappropriate to talk about all Levites as priests, to refer to Levi as the priestly ancestor, and to talk about a divine covenant made jointly with all of the Levites, including the priests.

Passages in Ezekiel 40-48 offer a rationale as to why a priesthood originally consisting of all Levites should be restricted to simply a small part of them, and so these verses reflect an awareness of a tradition that the priesthood is—or at least was—made up of the Levites in their entirety. These verses claim that the Zadokites alone among the Levites have the right to work as altar priests (Ezek 40:46; 43:19; 44:10-16; 48:11), and were it not for these references to Zadok, there would be very little evidence on which to base an argument for a pre- or post-exilic Zadokite priesthood. The verses envision a radical change to the earlier pre-existing Levitical priesthood as having occurred. 44:10-16 and 48:11 specifically demote the Levites and limit their work to a general oversight of temple ministry that includes gatekeeping and the slaughtering of sacrifices “because they ministered to them before their idols and were a stumbling block of iniquity to the house of Israel” (44:12), unlike the Zadokites, who did not “go astray” (44:16; 48:11) as the rest of the Levites did. In Ezekiel 40-48 the Zadokites alone are now responsible

2011), 199-214 (202).

for sacrifice at the altar, and these chapters reserve the titles of “priests” and “Levitical priests” for them (43:19; 44:15; 48:11); from now on, says God, the other Levites “will not approach me to serve me as priest” (44:13). So like P and Chronicles but unlike Malachi, Ezekiel 40-48 presents a two-tiered system of cultic personnel, although with Zadokites rather than Aaronides as the altar priests. But unlike P and Chronicles, Ezekiel 40-48 demonstrates an awareness of the tradition that at one time the priesthood was understood to encompass all of the Levites, the same tradition that we see in Dtr and Malachi.

Nor does awareness of such a tradition entirely die away, even in the Hellenistic era. By the late third and early second centuries BCE works such as the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Levi, and Jub. 30:1-32:9 refer to Levi rather than Aaron as the ancestor of Israel’s priests. In ALD 10:1-2 Isaac says to Levi that “you are a holy priest of the Lord and all of your seed will be priests”; the only distinction here between different ranks of priests appears to be between the high priest and all others (11:2-6). However, neither Jubilees nor the Testament of Levi actually go so far as to claim that all Levites are priests, even though they seem to draw on the Aramaic Levi Document as a source.²³⁶ In T.Levi 8:11-19 Levi is told in a vision that his descendants will be divided into three offices: the greatest office; the priests; and a third group

²³⁶ See Michael E. Stone, “Enoch, Aramaic Levi, and Sectarian Origins,” *JSJ* 19 (1988): 159-70; Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 64; Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 4-7, 171-77; Cana Werman, “Levi and the Levites in the Second Temple Period,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 211-25 (220-21); Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*, SVTP 19 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 19-20; Richard A. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 53.

established by a king “whose presence is beloved.” While the text offers no more specificity than this in regard to these offices, it might imply that they are the high priest, the altar priests, and the Levites, whose duties David—whose name means “beloved”—sets out in 1 Chronicles 23; 25-26.²³⁷ It is not impossible that 8:12-15, where these distinctions are made, is a Christian interpolation, but even if this is part of the original text, and whether or not this interpretation of the three offices is correct, there is no evidence that the Testament of Levi presents the Levites as serving as altar priests.

The fact that these documents refer to Levi rather than Aaron (or Zadok, for that matter) as the priestly ancestor may constitute some kind of criticism of the Hellenistic era temple hierarchy (likely) controlled by the Aaronides,²³⁸ or may simply be a reflection of the feeling of the authors and their communities that they were as marginalized as the Levites at the temple were understood to be.²³⁹ Other writings from the Second Temple period, however, provide no

²³⁷ The LXX uses the adjective $\alpha) \text{gaphto}/\nu$ to translate words from the root dwd in Isa 5:1; Pss 45:1; 60:7 [5]; 84:2 [1]; 108:7 [6]; 127:2, so it makes some sense to see T. Levi 8:15 as referring to David as the one whose $\text{parousi}\alpha$ is $\alpha) \text{gapth}\&$, and thus as referring to Chronicles’ presentation of him as the king who established Levitical duties.

²³⁸ So, e.g., Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 135-37; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmann, 1998), 74.

²³⁹ So, e.g., Robert Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 465-79 (465-66, 477-79); Joseph L. Angel,

indication of any particular importance attached to Levi or the Levites. Ben Sira's Praise of the Ancestors (Sir. 44-50), for example, devotes more space to Aaron (45:6-22) and the late-third- to early-second-century high priest Simon (50:1-21) than to any other figure of Israel's past, and the book makes no reference at all to the Levites, one of the pieces of evidence that leads Cana Werman to conclude that the Levitical office simply disappeared in the Second Temple period.²⁴⁰ This conclusion is unlikely, however; the rabbis of the Tannaitic period retained memories of the Levites acting in the temple cult, particularly as musicians (e.g., m. Sukkah 5.4; m. Roš Haš. 4.4; m. 'Arak. 2.4, 6; m. Tamid 5.6; 7.3-4; m. Mid. 2.5-6) and gatekeepers (m. Mid. 2.5-6).²⁴¹ Josephus, who claims to be a member of the first of the 24 priestly courses (*Life* 1-2), places the Levites under priestly authority (*Ant.* 3.258), and downplays Levitical roles in some biblical stories,²⁴² which, combined with his pro-priestly alterations of some biblical texts,²⁴³ perhaps

Otherworldly Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls, STDJ 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 291-93.

²⁴⁰ Werman, "Levi and the Levites," 214-15. Saul Olyan, however, understands the absence of any reference to the Levites in Sirach as the result of an Aaronide rivalry with the Levites; see his "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood," *HTR* 80 (1987): 261-86 (275).

²⁴¹ At other places in early rabbinic literature, the Levites are mentioned as a special class of the population, often along with priests; see, e.g., m. Pe'ah 1:6; m. Yebam. 10:1; m. Ned. 11:3; m. Soṭah 11:5; m. Šebu. 4:7; m. Bek. 1:1; 2:1.

²⁴² For examples, see Christopher T. Begg, "The Levites in Josephus," *HUCA* 75 (2004): 1-22 (12-18).

²⁴³ Josephus claims, for example, that the king could do nothing without consulting the high priest (*Ant.* 4.224), and that Moses gave the holy books to the priests alone (4.304). For

reflects a priestly-Levitical rivalry that existed in the first century CE.²⁴⁴ But Josephus never denies that the Levites have a place in the temple cult, and in his summary of 1 Chronicles 23-29 in *Ant.* 7.363-382 he says that David established the Levites as temple gatekeepers and musicians (u(mnw|doi\; 7.363-364, and see 8.94), while in a story that takes place in the first century CE, he describes the Levites as the tribe of cultic musicians (20.216-217). In fact, Josephus can even refer to biblical texts that say nothing about the Levites' role as cultic musicians and add such references to the stories himself,²⁴⁵ assumedly because they played such a role in the first-century cult, and so he believed that they had done so in the past.

It is certainly true that a sectarian document like the Temple Scroll, which was read at Qumran,²⁴⁶ appears to afford important privileges to the Levites—they can receive sacrificial

other examples, see Seth Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeae Politics*, CSCT 18 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990), 88-90.

²⁴⁴ So Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998), 61-62.

²⁴⁵ For example, Josephus recounts stories from 1 Kings 10 // 2 Chronicles 9 that discuss Solomon's wealth and wisdom and in *Ant.* 8.176 refers to the Levites singing hymns to God (u(mnei=n oi(Lhoui=tai to_n qeo&n), even though there is no mention of this in those chapters. Or, in *Ant.* 11.62, as he discusses the story of 1 Esd 4:42-57, in which Darius acts to re-initiate the temple cult as a reward for Zerubbabel's wisdom, Josephus writes that Darius commanded that the instruments with which the Levites praise God (u(mnou~si to_n qeo&n) be returned to them, although 1 Esdras 4 says nothing about this.

²⁴⁶ The Temple Scroll, however, appears to pre-date the Qumran community; see the arguments for this in Baruch Levine, "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance

meat (11Q19 XXI, 1-5; XXII, 8-14; LX, 10-15)²⁴⁷ and tithes (LX, 6-9), for example, slaughter sacrificial animals (XXII, 4) as in Ezek 44:10-11 and 2 Chr 30:17; 35:6, 10-11, and serve equally with priests and Israelites in the council of the king's advisors (LVII, 11-14)—yet the author really does no more than attempt to reconcile a variety of Scriptural depictions of the Levites and their cultic roles.²⁴⁸ In Qumran's rules for the present and eschatological ages, the Levites are portrayed as subordinate to the priests (1QS II, 19-22; CD XIII, 2-4; XIV, 3-6; 1QM II, 1-3; XV, 4; XVIII, 5-6), and the Levites' roles and authority are generally as they appear in Scripture,²⁴⁹

and Literary Character,” *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5-23; George T. Brooke, “The Temple Scroll: A Law unto Itself?” in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity*, ed. Barnabas Lindars (Cambridge: J. Clarke, 1988), 33-43; Sidnie White Crawford, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*, CQS 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 24-29; Lawrence A. Schiffmann, James H. Charlesworth, and Andrew W. Gross, “Introduction” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994-), 7:1-11 (6-7).

²⁴⁷ T. Levi 8:16 and T. Jud. 21:5 also say the Levites will partake of food from God's table, although this may only indicate that priestly Levites will do so, not Levites outside of the priesthood.

²⁴⁸ So Jacob Milgrom, “The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles,” in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll*, ed. George J. Brooke, JSP 7 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 165-80 (173-77); Martha Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*, JCC (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 122-23; Stackert, “The Cultic Status.”

²⁴⁹ For examples, see Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 474.

and so even sectarian documents trying to portray an ideal cult and an ideal Israel according to their authors' interpretations of works they understand to be authoritative do not always place much emphasis on the Levites. The Damascus Document and the Rule of the Community, for example, divide the assembly into priests, Levites, and Israelites (CD XIV, 3-6; 1QS II, 19-22), just as Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah do, but the Levites disappear from the Rule of the Community's account of Israel, and in 1QS VI, 8-9 the seating plan of the assembly refers only to priests, elders, and people, while 1QS VIII, 1, 5-6 makes Aaron and Israel appear as the totality of the assembly. Martha Himmelfarb rightly concludes that such internal divisions must not have been overly important to the community's self-understanding,²⁵⁰ but we can note as well that the Rule of the Community does not omit mention of the Aaronide priests when referring to the assembly even as the Levites slip from view. As 1QS IX, 7-11 makes clear, it is the Aaronides who rule in the perfect community until the eschatological age, and they were clearly more important to the Qumran community than the Levites in the community's understanding of the ideal assembly and its cult, which is why the community's rule books provide the Levites with only limited cultic roles.²⁵¹

The limited information that we have suggests that the fourth-century cult had an Aaronide priesthood responsible for altar sacrifice, with Levites serving in other roles. To begin with the first point, what evidence we do have about the Persian-period priesthood makes it very likely that, at least toward the end of that period, it was understood to be descended from Aaron.

²⁵⁰ Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 120-22. Gary A. Anderson, "Aaron," *EDSS*, 1:1-2 (1) points out that the *Rule of the Community* really just divides the community into the Aaronides and the rest of the people.

²⁵¹ Angel, *Otherworldly Eschatological Priesthood*, 289-91.

This is so not simply because the Priestly Writing and Chronicles assume this to be the case; arguments for a post-exilic Zadokite priesthood mainly depend on the passages from Ezekiel 40-48 that we discussed above, but Ezekiel 40-48 as a whole presents a vision of a restoration that was not ultimately realized,²⁵² and between Ezekiel 40-48 and the texts from Qumran²⁵³ only the

²⁵² See Antti Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus: The Historical Josiah and the Messianic Expectations of Exilic and Postexilic Times*, ConBOT 33 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992), 189-96; Cook, “Innerbiblical Interpretation,” 195-96; Lester L. Grabbe, “Were the Pre-Maccabean High Priests ‘Zadokites?’” in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays in Honour of David J.A. Clines*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and H.G.M. Williamson, JSOTSup 373 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 205-15.

²⁵³ We can no longer be so certain of earlier scholarly arguments that claimed the Zadokites were pushed out of the temple hierarchy by the Hasmoneans—e.g., Jacob Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 501-23 (503-504); Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship,” 267 n. 23; Lawrence W. Schiffmann, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect” in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Jean Carmignac*, ed. Zdzisław J. Kapera, QumMog 3 (Cracow: The Engima Press, 1991-1993), 1:59-70. The earliest texts of the Rule of the Community from Cave 4 lack the references to the Zadokites in the later versions of the work—see Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 105-106—and so if there was a group of priests at Qumran understood to be descendants from Zadok, then they joined it relatively late. Documents like the Rule of the Community and the Rule of the Congregation in their latest forms can refer to Zadokites and Aaronides as priests without distinguishing between them in any way but name (see 1 QS I, 15-16; V, 2, 9; 1QSa I, 2, 16, 23, 24; II, 13), and so we

late Hebrew addition to Sir. 51:12²⁵⁴ refers to Zadokites as priests.²⁵⁵ Inscriptions from Gerizim suggest an Aaronide priesthood existed there,²⁵⁶ and since Josephus claims that it was founded

have little sense as to what such a distinction signified at Qumran. Since, when the Dead Sea Scrolls make reference to a Messiah in a priestly context the figure is uniquely associated with Aaron (CD XII, 23; XIV, 19; XIX, 10; 1QS IX, 11; 4Q226 10 I, 12), the anointing of priesthood seems most clearly associated with him.

²⁵⁴ For the hymn located after 51:12 as a late addition, see Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 569; Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship,” 275-76; Gabriele Boccaccini, “Where Does Ben Sira Belong? The Canon, Literary Genre, Intellectual Movement, and Social Group of a Zadokite Document” in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira*, ed. Géza G. Xeramits and József Zsengellér, JSJSup 127 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 21-41 (31); Maurice Gilbert, “Methodological and Hermeneutical Trends in Modern Exegesis on the Book of Ben Sira” in *Ben Sira: Recueil d’études—Collected Essays*, BETL 264 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2014), 3-21 (11-12).

²⁵⁵ See on this Grabbe, “Were the Pre-Maccabean High Priests?,” 213 and Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship,” 275-76.

²⁵⁶ Gary N. Knoppers, “Aspects of Samaria’s Religious Culture during the Early Hellenistic Period” in *The Historian and the Bible: Essays in Honour of Lester L. Grabbe*, ed. Philip R. Davies and Diana V. Edelman, LHBOTS 530 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2010), 159-74 (165-66) points out that common personal names at Gerizim include the Aaronide names Amram, Eleazar, and Phinehas. See Gerizim 1.1; 24.1; 25.2; 32; 61; 149.1; 384.1; 389.1; 390, and note as well that the only legible name with which the word “priest(s)” appears is

by priests from Jerusalem (*Ant.* 11.302-303, 321-324), an Aaronide priesthood was likely considered to be the norm for Yahwistic worship by the late Persian period, at least in Palestine. Josephus clearly understands the Aaronides to form the priesthood in Jerusalem, or at least the high priesthood (*Ant.* 3.188-192; 20.224-226),²⁵⁷ and while he refers to Zadok as the high priest of Solomon's temple in *Ant.* 10.152, this is the last time in the *Antiquities* he mentions Zadok. When he enumerates the high priests from Aaron to the destruction of the temple by the Romans (20.224-251), he does not so much as even name him. In this passage, Zadok is simply one of the unnamed 18 high priests between Solomon and Nebuchadnezzar (20.231-232); as in 1 Chr 5:34; 6:38 [53], Josephus's Zadok is an Aaronide.²⁵⁸ Zadok is entirely absent from Ben Sira's Praise of the Ancestors, even though, as we saw above, Aaron receives more attention in this section of Sirach than any other figure except for the high priest Simon.

But the verses in Ezekiel 40-48 that privilege the Zadokites as altar priests witness to a belief that the priesthood at one time extended to all Levites, a matter to which the Deuteronomistic History and Malachi also testify. It is not entirely clear, however, how a

Phinehas (24.1-2; 25.1-2; 389.1-2). See also James W. Watts, "Scripturalization and the Aaronide Dynasties," *JHS* 13/6 (2013): 1-15 (5).

²⁵⁷ And as H.G.M. Williamson points out in "The Historical Value of Josephus' Jewish Antiquities xi.297-301" in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 74-89 (79-80), the story casts the Aaronides in such a poor light that we have no reason to doubt it. See also Hans G. Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtl. Untersuchungen z. samaritan Religion d. aramäischen Periode*, RVV 30 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 58-59.

²⁵⁸ See Nurmela, *The Levites*, p. 169.

priesthood originally open to all Levites became one limited to the Aaronides. All that we can conclude with any kind of certainty is that, by at least the late Persian period, altar sacrifice seems to have been limited to the Aaronides, while the high priest, as we saw in the previous chapter, wielded significant local political influence. If Malachi and Ezra-Nehemiah attest to the fact that not everyone in Persian-period Judah believed that important differences existed between priests and Levites, or at least did not care to dwell on such differences, that is not the case for the Priestly Writing, and so for the Pentateuch that was available to the Chronicler. Even given the little we do know about the cultic personnel in Jerusalem in the fourth century, the clear subordination of Levites to priests in P better fits the information we have that portrays priests, but not Levites, in important positions of leadership in the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Chronicles, however, offers a competing version of the roles and authority of the Aaronides and Levites, and even if we cannot know with complete certainty whether or not either of these writings provided a blueprint for cultic activities and authority that was precisely followed in the fourth century, they each would have appealed to different constituencies within the temple hierarchy. If the relationship between priests and Levites as portrayed in P was actually in force when Chronicles was written, Chronicles offers the Levites a compelling reason to support a Davidic restoration, since Chronicles portrays the Levites as having a higher status and wielding more political power than P does. On the other hand, if the actual relationship between priests and Levites was closer to that portrayed in Chronicles, then the work presents a cult as overseen by the Davidides as one that maintains such Levitical authority in the face of the competing claims of the Aaronides, who could appeal to the Pentateuch to claim a wider reach of authority and control over the cult than they might actually have had since, they could argue, the Pentateuch presents Israel's original cult that God had ordered Moses to establish, the true cult to

which Israel should now return. Chronicles, as we shall see, explains why David's ordering of the temple personnel's roles and authority should take precedence over that of the Pentateuch's. Given that the rabbis of the Tannaitic period had inherited traditions of Levites acting in the Second Temple as musicians and gatekeepers, and that Josephus assumes such roles for them as well, it is most likely that the Levites held such positions in the fourth century, even though P says nothing about this, and that Chronicles is assuring them they would retain these cultic positions under Davidic rule, and be given wider political authority as well.

Chronicles assigns cultic roles to the Levites that P does not, and so in Chronicles the temple musicians and gatekeepers are Levites.²⁵⁹ In Ezra-Nehemiah, musicians and gatekeepers

²⁵⁹ Temple music is not assigned to any group in P, the Deuteronomistic History, or Ezekiel; see, e.g., von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild*, 99-100; Gary N. Knoppers, "Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood," *JBL* 118 (1999): 49-72 (65-68); Dierdre N. Fulton, "What Do Priests and Kings Have in Common? Priestly and Royal Succession Narratives in the Achaemenid Era" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 225-41 (234-35). One could argue that 1 Chr 23:32 reflects Num 18:5, and that the two passages assign the keeping of the sanctuary's gates to different groups. Num 18:5 states that the *ṭrm#šm* "charge, watch" of the sanctuary is the duty of the Aaronides, while 1 Chr 23:32 says this is the responsibility of the Levites. For the understanding of the term as "gatekeeping," see Knoppers, "Hierodules," 63-64. But while Chronicles uses the word *ṭ (' # \$ o* to mean "gatekeeper" (e.g., 1 Chr 9:17, 18, 21, etc.), the word does not appear in P, and so it is simply not clear that *ṭrm#šm* refers to gatekeeping.

are cultic personnel, but they are not classified as belonging to the Levites,²⁶⁰ except in the lists of Neh 11:15-24 and 12:22-26. The Chronicler is assuring Levites that, regardless of the claims of the Pentateuch, the temple musicians and gatekeepers will be considered as Levites under a restored Davidic rule. In comparison with P, the Levites are a larger group with greater cultic authority. They have more members, and so potentially more political leverage within the temple hierarchy than in P. And even if musicians and gatekeepers were already considered to be Levites at some point in the fourth century, the Chronicler is signaling that the Davidides would support this status quo in the face of priestly arguments that the Pentateuchal cultic regulations should be enforced. In 1 Chr 25:1, prophecy is an office delegated by David and the army to the temple musicians, providing the Levitical musicians in particular with more authority. The very first cultic role readers of Chronicles encounter in the work is, in fact, that of the temple musicians (1 Chr 6:16-17 [31-32]), and the text is clear there that they are Levites.²⁶¹ In 1 Chronicles 13 and 15, when David first begins to take cultic action, the necessity of the Levites to carry the ark becomes the narrative's emphasis, and once David moves the ark to Jerusalem and establishes a post-tabernacle cult around it in 1 Chronicles 16, the narrative emphasis shifts to the role of the Levitical musicians in the new cult. When David organizes the temple personnel in 1 Chronicles 23-26, he turns his attention first to the Levites in 1 Chronicles 23, and

²⁶⁰ This is most obvious in passages such as Ezra 2:70; 10:18-25; Neh 7:1; 10:29, 40 [28, 39].

²⁶¹ See Thomas Willi, "Israel's Holiness: Some Observations on the 'Clerical Nature' of 1 Chronicles 6" in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, its Exegesis and its Language*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher et al.; (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2007), 165*-76* (172*-73*).

references to Levitical duties and divisions occupy almost all of these chapters. It is, notably, the Levites who control the temple treasury and the distribution of rations to priests and Levites (1 Chr 26:20-28; 2 Chr 31:12-16), and in 2 Chr 24:8-14 the Levites are responsible for the collection of the temple tax under the joint oversight of the king and high priest. David also installs Levites as representatives of royal and temple authority throughout Israel (1 Chr 26:29-32).

The case is not that 1 Chronicles 6, where the Levitical musicians are mentioned in the first appearance of cultic personnel in Chronicles, does not also refer to the priestly duty of sacrifice (1 Chr 6:34 [49]); or that the story of 1 Chronicles 13 and 15-16, which focuses on the important cultic duties of the Levites, does not also refer to priestly sacrifice at the altar (16:39-40); or that 1 Chronicles 23-26, besides the overwhelming attention it pays to divisions of Levitical groups, does not also refer to the divisions of the priests (24:1-19). The point is simply that the Chronicler apparently wants to draw readers' attention to Levitical duties more than he or she wants to draw their attention to priestly roles. These Levitical responsibilities for temple music and gatekeeping are presented as David's innovations, and when the text narrates Solomon's establishment of the Levitical personnel when temple service begins it does so with an appeal to Davidic authority (2 Chr 8:14), just as, every time the Levitical divisions need to be reestablished after periods of cultic neglect, this occurs with an appeal to David's orders (2 Chr 23:18-19; 29:25; 35:4, 15);²⁶² in each of these cases, of course, it is a Davidide who acts in order

²⁶² See Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, BEATAJ 9 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989), 234-39 and John W. Wright "The Legacy of David in Chronicles: The Narrative Function of 1 Chronicles 23-27," *JBL* 110 (1991): 229-42 (233-37).

to restore the Levites to their proper positions and places of authority in the temple. At a time when Aaronide priests could argue that the cultic personnel should be shaped, or reshaped, in order to correspond to the hierarchy and duties reflected in the Pentateuch, Chronicles says that, under Davidic rule, Levites hold key cultic, civic, and financial roles.

The Chronicler is able to justify such cultic discrepancies in comparison with P and the Pentateuch by making the temple the successor to P's tabernacle, a divinely-approved cult that David thought of that calls for somewhat new cultic roles and duties. Moses and David are the two great cult founders of Chronicles,²⁶³ but Moses is responsible for the cultic institution of the tabernacle and David for that of the temple, the institution that evolves out of but replaces and supersedes the tabernacle. As soon as David moves the ark out of the tabernacle and places it in Jerusalem, Chronicles moves readers to a transitional period: the time of the tabernacle is over, the time of the temple is about to begin. The Levitical and priestly worship David establishes

²⁶³ So, e.g., Jacob M. Myers, "The Kerygma of the Chronicler: History and Theology in the Service of Religion," *Int* 20 (1966): 259-73 (268-69); Simon J. De Vries, "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles," *JBL* 107 (1988): 619-39; Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 234-39; John W. Kleinig, *The LORD's Song: The Basis, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles*, JSOTSup 156 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 28; Philippe Abadie, "La figure de David dans le livre des Chroniques" in *Figures de David à travers la Bible*, ed. Louis Desrousseaux and Jacques Vermeylen, LecDiv 177 (Paris: Les éditions de Cerf, 1999), 157-86 (169-76); Ehud Ben Zvi, "One Size Does not Fit All: Observations on the Different Ways that Chronicles Dealt with the Authoritative Literature of its Time" in *What was Authoritative for Chronicles?*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 13-35 (30-31).

before the ark in 1 Chronicles 16 is only the prelude to the temple that he wishes to build around it (17:1-2), although God delays this until Solomon's time (17:3-15). Chronicles' story of the founding of the temple certainly has parallels with P's story of the founding of the tabernacle, parallels not found in Chronicles' source text of Kings: both are built according to a divine *tynbt* "blueprint" (cf. 1 Chr 28:11-12, 18 and Exod 25:9, 40); the Chronicler draws parallels between Bezalel and Oholiab, the two figures who construct the tabernacle in P, and Solomon and Hiram-abi, the two temple builders in Chronicles;²⁶⁴ God's legitimation of the temple with heavenly fire that consumes the inaugural sacrifices as divine glory fills the house in 1 Chr 7:1-3 sounds very much like the installation of God's glory in the tabernacle in Exod 40:34-35 and the inauguration of the first sacrifices there in Lev 9:23-24;²⁶⁵ the people give freewill offerings

²⁶⁴ In P, only Bezalel and Oholiab are named among all of those who construct the tabernacle, and in Chronicles only Solomon and Hiram-abi are named among the temple builders. Both Bezalel and Solomon are specifically chosen by God for these tasks (Exod 31:1-11; 35:30-36.2; 38:22-23; 1 Chr 22:9-10; 28:6-29:2), both are Judeans (Exod 31:2; 35:30-35; 38:22), and both receive divine wisdom (Exod 31:1-3; 35:30-35; 2 Chr 1). In Chronicles, unlike 1 Kgs 7:14, Hiram-abi is involved in a wide array of construction duties (2 Chr 2:13 [14]), like those of Oholiab (Exod 31:1-6; 35:30-36.2; 38:22-23), and his mother is from Dan (2 Chr 2:13 [14]), not Naphtali as in 1 Kgs 7:14, and so he is from the same tribe as Oholiab (Exod 31:6; 35:34; 38:23). For more detailed investigations of these parallels, see Raymond B. Dillard, "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution," *WTJ* 46 (1984): 164-72 (296-98) and P. Abadie, "La symbolique du Temple dans l'œuvre du chroniqueur," *Transeu* 21 (2001): 13-27 (17-18).

²⁶⁵ In Exod 40:34-35, "the glory of Yhwh filled the tabernacle, and Moses was not able to

(wbdntyw) for the construction of the temple in 1 Chr 29:6 as they do for the tabernacle in Exod 35:4-29; there is a tkrp “veil” in the temple in 2 Chr 3:14 as there is in the tabernacle in Exod 26:31, 33, 35; 27:21, etc.,²⁶⁶ although 1 Kgs 6:31-32 refers to wooden doors instead;²⁶⁷ and in 2 Chr 3:8-4.10 there are twelve temple-building tasks, each beginning with # & (yw, reflecting the structure of the tabernacle construction story in Exodus 36-40.²⁶⁸

come into the tent of meeting because the cloud tabernacled upon it, and the glory of Yhwh filled the tabernacle”; in 2 Chr 7:1-2, “the glory of Yhwh filled the house, and the priests were not able to come into the house of Yhwh because the glory of Yhwh filled the house of Yhwh.” In Lev 9:23-24, “the glory of Yhwh appeared to all the people, and fire went out from before Yhwh and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat, and all of the people saw, and they cried out in praise and fell upon their faces”; in 2 Chr 7:1, 3, “fire descended from heaven and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices...and all the Israelites saw when the fire descended and the glory of Yhwh was upon the house and they bowed their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and they worshiped and gave thanks to Yhwh.”

²⁶⁶ See H.G.M. Williamson, “The Temple in the Books of Chronicles” in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 150-61 (157-58).

²⁶⁷ John Van Seters, “The Chronicler’s Account of Solomon’s Temple-Building: A Continuity Theme” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 283-300 (292-93).

²⁶⁸ Rudolf Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*, FTS 92 (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), 140 and Van Seters, “The Chronicler’s Account,” 291-92.

The Chronicler is going out of his or her way to portray the temple as a natural successor to the tabernacle, a new cult arising from David's initiative but meeting with divine approval as we saw in the previous chapter. As much like the tabernacle as the temple may be in Chronicles, the temple is still a new cultic institution, and so David has to take steps to provide materials and personnel appropriate to it; if, as we saw in the last chapter, Chronicles emphasizes the initiative that David takes in this regard, it also assures readers that there is divine support and direction for the changes David makes. This gives the Chronicler theological warrant to assert that the Levites have cultic duties assigned to them in the temple that they do not have in P's tabernacle, and they begin their cultic service in the Davidic temple at age twenty rather than age thirty as in the tabernacle (cf. Num 24 and 1 Chr 23:24-27). In Chronicles, David is responsible for adding music to the cultic activities before the ark (1 Chr 6:16-17 [31-32]; 16:4-6, 37), which is, again, something absent from P's description of tabernacle worship.²⁶⁹ In making the temple the new cultic institution that evolves out of the tabernacle, the Chronicler cleverly circumvents Aaronide appeals to the Pentateuch as referring to the original cult, since the point is that the temple supersedes the original cult, and that new rules apply to it. The tabernacle may have been established in the wilderness at God's command, but the temple has divine approval also, and it is coeval with the royal dynasty whose founder took the initiative to establish it. So again, even if the fourth-century cult was like that portrayed in Chronicles, the work assures the Levites that the Davidides will maintain their current status in the temple, as it provides a theological

²⁶⁹ Israel Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 148; Antti Laato, "The Levitical Genealogies in 1 Chronicles 5-6 and the Formation of Levitical Ideology in Post-Exilic Judah," *JSOT* 62 (1994): 77-99; Fulton, "What Do Priests?," 234-35.

rationale for why David's cultic organization supersedes that of Israel's original cult that the Pentateuch describes and to which the Aaronides would have appealed to augment their existing authority in relation to the Levites. And if the fourth-century cult was more like that depicted in P, Chronicles signals to the Levites that Davidic rule would restore them to their rightful place in the temple cult and in political life, since the Pentateuch only depicts a cultic organization that disappeared when David, with divine agreement, replaced it with the temple.

When Chronicles needs to legitimate cultic actions not prescribed in the Pentateuch, it uses the word $\text{+p}\#\text{\$m}$ or the word hwcm (e.g., 1 Chr 23:31; 2 Chr 8:14, 15; 29:25; 35:15), and David is the main source of these "orders" and "commandments,"²⁷⁰ although cultic personnel in Chronicles follow "commandments" given by other kings in regard to cultic issues (2 Chr 29:15; 30:6; 35:10, 16). Music in the temple was not the Chronicler's invention, nor was the idea that Levites should begin serving at age twenty, nor, likely, was the idea of the twenty four priestly courses,²⁷¹ but if these cultic ideas had been established earlier in the Second Temple period,

²⁷⁰ For an analysis of this, see William M. Schniedewind, "The Chronicler as an Interpreter of Scripture" in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 158-80 (172-78).

²⁷¹ Ezra 3:8 also refers to Levites of twenty years of age and older as cultic officials, suggesting that this was the existing Second Temple practice. Neh 11:15-24 and 12:22-26 refer to the temple musicians as Levites, and the cultic musicians' place as cultic actors is apparent elsewhere in Ezra-Nehemiah (e.g., Ezra 2:41; 7:7; 10:24; Neh 7:1, 44; 10:29 [28], 40 [39]). We see reference to the twenty four priestly courses in Josephus (*Life* 2; *Ant.* 7.363-367), calendrical scrolls from Qumran like 4Q320-330, and in Tannaitic works (e.g., m. Sukkah 5.8; m. Ta'an.

then we can see why the Chronicler might have attributed such changes to David: since, as the Deuteronomistic History reports, David had devised the notion of building a temple on his own initiative, then, the Chronicler concluded, he was responsible for shifting the cult from tabernacle to temple, and so, for the Chronicler, it stood to reason that he had been responsible for the changes in the personnel and their duties. This was not a necessary conclusion to come to, but attributing such changes to David also had the benefit for the Chronicler of making the Levites' enhanced status—at least in comparison to their status in the Pentateuch—due to the initiative and support of the Davidides. Zadok helps David organize the priests in 1 Chr 24:3-4, but David alone organizes the Levitical divisions of 1 Chronicles 23,²⁷² his son Solomon makes these Levitical organizations a reality as he establishes the temple (2 Chr 8:14), and, after Ahaz shuts the temple, Hezekiah reestablishes Levitical duties (2 Chr 30:3-11). Even if, for the Chronicler, David has been guided by God in organizing the temple personnel, as we saw in the last chapter, Chronicles keeps its focus on David as the one who has provided the Levites with their authority in the temple and says quite little in comparison in regard to God's role, and this is why Chronicles appeals to the *ḥwcm* and *ḥwcm* of David when later kings (re-)establish cultic duties. Readers are consistently directed to the king as responsible for the proper

4.2; t. Ta'an. 2.1). Given that Chronicles was of little importance at Qumran—see Ehud Ben Zvi, “The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period” in *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2006), 243-68 (251-54)—it is unlikely that the community's texts would have echoed any of Chronicles' prescriptions for cult had they not been long accepted as proper cultic practice.

²⁷² See Steven James Schweitzer, “The High Priest in Chronicles: An Anomaly in a Detailed Description of the Temple Cult,” *Bib* 84 (2003): 388-402 (394-95).

organization of the cultic personnel in the temple, the cult that supersedes the tabernacle and its organization of personnel. The only suggestion in 1 Chronicles 23-26 that God is helping David in the establishment of the Levitical and priestly orders is the casting of lots in 24:5-18; 25:8-31; and 26:13-18, which indicates divine involvement;²⁷³ as much as the Chronicler wants to underscore the royal impetus behind the Levitical duties and authority in the temple, he or she is also clear that God ultimately authorizes these royal decisions.

And so even if the Chronicler's portrayal of priestly and cultic duties is a representation of the fourth-century status quo in the Jerusalem temple, it informs Levites that they have the Davidides to thank for the roles which they currently hold. The priests of the time, or at least some of them, one imagines, appealed to the Pentateuch, wherein the Priestly tradition argued for a clear subordination of the Levites to the priests, insisting that the Aaronide priesthood is in charge of the cult and the Levites merely their assistants. Num 3:5-10 and 18:1-7 are absolutely clear on this matter; the Levites are "given" to the Aaronides to "serve" them. The priests in P are holy (Exod 28:42; 29:1, 33; Lev 8:12, 30; etc.), but the Levites are not, and so they cannot touch or even look at the most holy things or they will die (Num 4:15, 20; 18:3), which is why sacrifice is reserved for the Aaronides alone. Chronicles does not dispute that the Aaronides are in charge of sacrifice (1 Chr 6:34 [49]; 16:39-40; 23:13; 2 Chr 26:16-21), although by Hezekiah's Passover in 2 Chr 30:16 the Levites appear to be involved in handling sacrificial blood, a substance that, in P, is manipulated only by priests,²⁷⁴ and by the time of Josiah's Passover in 35:11 they are handling blood and slaughtering the sacrificial lambs.

²⁷³ See Kleinig, *The LORD's Song*, 41.

²⁷⁴ See Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 137-38.

And while in Chronicles it is the high priest who oversees the cult as a whole, including the Levites (2 Chr 19:11; 24:6), and Zadok is anointed at the same time as Solomon (1 Chr 29:22), suggesting that he holds an important social position, in Chronicles, unlike P, the Levites are holy (2 Chr 23:6; 29:33; 30:15; 35:3, 6) and so, like the priests, they may enter the temple (2 Chr 23:6). In Chronicles they do not serve the priests even if they, like the rest of the temple personnel, are subordinate to the high priest. In 1 Chr 23:28-32, David says the Levites are to work *Nrh) ynb dyl* “beside the Aaronides” in cultic service, but this does not suggest that they are subordinate to the Aaronides in general.²⁷⁵ They simply have different cultic tasks than the Aaronides do, and Chronicles is much more interested in the Levitical tasks than in the Aaronide ones. The Aaronides are not an upper priestly caste in Chronicles, for in the book God chooses (*rxb*) both the priests and Levites to act in the cult (1 Chr 15:2; 2 Chr 29:11), and so

²⁷⁵ The only thing about this passage that could be understood as Levitical subordination to the Aaronide priests is the claim that the Levites will keep the charge (*trm#sm*) of the tent of meeting, of the sanctuary, and of the *Nrh) ynb* (23:32). *trm#sm* in this context has the sense of duties inherent in something; when the Levites are told here to keep the *trm#sm* of the tent of meeting and sanctuary, it means that they must fulfill the duties that they have been assigned in regard to the tent of meeting and sanctuary, which David enumerates in 23:29-31. They have been assigned duties in regard to the Aaronides in 23:38 as well, but those duties involve being “beside” them, and so *trm#sm* does not refer to subordination to the priests. As Gary Knoppers puts it in *1 Chronicles 10-29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 12A (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 825-26, 1 Chronicles 23 emphasizes the complementarity of Levitical and priestly roles, not a hierarchy as in P, where the Levites *tr#s* “serve” the priests (Num 3:6; 8:26; 18:2).

there is no difference between them on this level.²⁷⁶ But by calling the Levites holy and having them sacrifice the Passover lambs and manipulate sacrificial blood in 2 Chronicles 35, Chronicles is clear that a temple run under Davidic auspices offers the Levites a higher status than P does. And kings after David add to Levitical duties and authority. Jehoshaphat sends Levites out along with royal officials and with priests to teach the book of the law (2 Chr 17:7-9) and sets up Levites along with priests to act as judges in cultic and civil matters (19:8-11); the priest Jehoiada, who marries into the royal family (22:11) and who is buried with the kings (24:16), appears to establish the Levites as a royal bodyguard (23:7);²⁷⁷ by the time of Hezekiah's reforms, the Levites are involved with sacrifice (29:34; 30:16-17); and by the time of Josiah they oversee the temple repairs (34:12-13). At this point, it seems that the Chronicler is doing more than signaling to the Levites that they will maintain their present cultic roles. While, as we saw in chapter 2, the priests and the high priest in particular played important roles in the local political leadership of Judea in the Hellenistic period, there is no evidence that the Levites did, or that they did so in the Persian period. Chronicles, though, tells the Levites that there are important civic roles for them in a Davidic polity.

And, in regard to the roles we have just discussed, it is not as if the priests are not also teachers of Torah and royal officials, and it is not as if they are not in charge of sacrifice, even if the Levites are encroaching on aspects of this prerogative by the end of the work. Yet Chronicles does not accept the subordination of Levites to Aaronides that we see in the Priestly Writing. In

²⁷⁶ See Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 89.

²⁷⁷ John Wright "Guarding the Gates: 1 Chronicles 26.1-19 and the Roles of Gatekeepers in Chronicles," *JSOT* 48 (1990): 69-81 uses this and other passages to argue that Chronicles presents the Levitical gatekeepers as a paramilitary force.

fact, in 2 Chr 5:5; 23:18; and 30:27, the Chronicler even uses the phrase “Levitical priests,” a phrase that, to some degree, elides the differences between priests and Levites,²⁷⁸ implying that Levi rather than Aaron is the important cultic ancestor. 2 Chr 11:14 even refers to Jeroboam preventing the Levites in the North from “acting as priests,” and while the context of 11:13-16 in general distinguishes between priests and Levites (and cf. 13:19), it is telling that the Chronicler does not always see a need to carefully distinguish between their cultic duties. Chronicles does not call Levi a priest, thereby implying that all of his descendants, and not just the Aaronides, hold that rank, for the Chronicler could only go so far in advancing Levitical prerogatives before risking full-throated opposition from the Aaronides against the pro-Davidic project. Still, if the fourth-century temple cult resembled the picture of it we see in the Priestly Writing, then Chronicles tells the Levites that Davidic rule would restore the proper place and status of the Levites in the temple; the Davidides would ensure they would resume the largely equal status with priests that the Levites should have in the temple—not to mention the equal status with the priests they would have in the Davidic administration that would rule Judah—regardless of what the Pentateuch might say about the tabernacle, since the temple, the cultic organization the Davidides established and maintained, has replaced it. Chronicles does not strip the priests of their control of altar sacrifice, and it does not strip the high priest of his leadership role in the

²⁷⁸ In each of these cases, LXX and Vulgate (or LXX^A, at least, in the case of 30:27) read “the priests and the Levites,” but MT 5:5 differs from its source in 1 Kgs 8:4, which reads “the priests and the Levites.” The fact that the phrase “Levitical priests” appears three times in the MT suggests that it is more than just scribal error; certainly at 5:5 the LXX and Vulgate provide the easier reading, since they eliminate the difference with 1 Kgs 8:4. See H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCBC (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982), 214.

cult, but the Levites, who are holy in Chronicles, encroach on that sphere of activity,²⁷⁹ and the high priest will act under royal authority.²⁸⁰ Levitical duties may be different than priestly ones in Chronicles, but they are not inferior. And if the fourth-century cult, particularly the relationship between priests and Levites, was more or less as represented in Chronicles, Chronicles argues against the view in P—the view of the Pentateuch, in other words—that the Levites should be subordinate to the priests. The Aaronides could appeal to this writing as establishing the rules of the cult from its beginnings in the wilderness, but the Chronicler portrays the temple as evolving out of the tabernacle, as a replacement for tabernacle worship, and so this new cultic establishment comes with new cultic rules. Since a king establishes it, a king takes charge of establishing its personnel and their roles. Chronicles also assures the Levites that they will have roles in the civil administration of a restored Davidic monarchy; it gives the same assurances to the priests, making it clear to them that they will maintain some power under a client monarchy, even if ultimate local authority would pass to the Davidide. It is certainly within the realm of possibility, however, that some within the priesthood would have been concerned that their place of political leadership in Judah would have been negatively affected

²⁷⁹ See also, e.g., Paul D. Hanson, “1 Chronicles 15-16 and the Chronicler’s Views on the Levites” in *“Sha‘arei Talmon”: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 69-77; Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 68-71; Schweitzer, “The High Priest in Chronicles”; Jonker, “David’s Officials,” 81.

²⁸⁰ See 1 Chr 15:11; 2 Chr 19:11; 31:11-13; 34:20-21, where we find kings giving commands to the high priests and, in the case of 2 Chr 19:11, creating a specific administrative role for the high priest.

by a restoration; one can see how this might be a particular concern of the high priest, given his important civic position in the fourth century. This explains why Chronicles focuses on Levitical privileges so much more than on priestly ones. They are the real audience within the temple personnel whose support for a Davidic restoration the Chronicler hopes to gain, but Chronicles assures the priesthood that their basic roles within the temple would not change and that the high priest would remain in charge of temple personnel. Moreover, if the Levites will have a role in a royal local administration of Judah, so will the priests. The Chronicler's political strategy seems to have been to keep priestly opposition to a restoration muted while winning clear support for it from the Levites, so that the Davidides could plausibly argue to the empire that the temple supported the quiet revolution.

2. The Davidides and the assembly

We saw in the previous chapter that the Chronicler worked to assure the assembly that restored Davidides would be sensitive to assembly sentiment in regard to the temple, surely a very positive sign to them that this would not be a monarchy that would ignore the assembly's wishes when formulating policy around issues of importance to this local governing group. But the temple would hardly have been the assembly's only concern when faced with the prospect of a restoration. Chronicles presents a picture of a monarchy in which the assembly wields political power, in which kings do not impose burdensome demands such as forced labor upon the people, and in which kings do not force their people to sacrifice their lives in futile wars. To begin with the issue of the ways in which the Chronicler assures the assembly that they would maintain power under a Davidic monarchy, Chronicles portrays the assembly as involved in numerous cases in the accession of a new king, or at the very least as publicly proclaiming its assent,

suggesting that it will not be left without a voice in the succession of power under a client monarchy. “All Israel” and the “assembly” is involved in the accessions of David, Solomon, and Rehoboam (1 Chr 11:1-3; 29:20-22; 2 Chr 10:1), and in the first case they acknowledge David to be God’s choice as king. “The inhabitants of Jerusalem” make Ahaziah king in 2 Chr 22:1, and “all the assembly” follows the priest Jehoiada in restoring the Davidide Joash to the throne after Athaliah’s coup (23:3). “All the people of Judah” make Uzziah king (26:1), and “the people of the land” place both Josiah and Jehoahaz on the throne (33:25; 36:1). In 1 Chr 22:17 David commands the officers of the people to help Solomon, suggesting that when a king is “young and inexperienced” (see 1 Chr 22:5),²⁸¹ at least, the heads of the assembly can act as royal advisors. Given the importance of the temple to the assembly, Chronicles also portrays a monarchic past in which the king consulted the assembly concerning important cultic decisions. David does not move the ark and so begin the transition away from tabernacle worship without first getting the assembly’s agreement in regard to this momentous cultic shift (1 Chr 13:1-4), and the assembly acts with David as he moves the ark (15:28), just as “all the assembly” goes with Solomon to the high place at Gibeon where the tabernacle is (2 Chr 1:3), and “all the Israelites” and “all the congregation of Israel” are present at the inauguration of the temple (2 Chr 5:2-6), sacrificing with Solomon (7:4).

It is, nonetheless, the king who leads in this history, and the Chronicler needs to convince

²⁸¹ David twice refers to Solomon as *krw r(n)* (1 Chr 22:5; 29:1), and Abijah, in his description of his father Rehoboam as a new king, describes him as *bb1-krw r(n)* (2 Chr 13:7). Rehoboam was not literally young when he ascended the throne, since 2 Chr 12:13 says he was forty one at that time, so the phrase would appear to refer to someone who has no experience in regard to his or her new responsibilities.

the assembly that, as a Davidic restoration would mean the re-creation of an office in local government superior in power to the assembly, acceding to the establishment of the office would be worthwhile. So Chronicles makes it clear that royal wealth supports the temple, not an insignificant matter in the Persian period when the temple had no land and the assembly seemed to struggle to provide the temple with adequate resources (Neh 13:10-12; Mal 1:6-14) and even needed to make a written agreement to force themselves to provide for it (Neh 10). David, as we have seen in the previous chapter, donates from his vast wealth to the temple (1 Chr 18:8-11; 22:14; 26:27; 29:25), as does Solomon (2 Chr 9:10-11), and later kings provide for huge quantities of sacrifices (2 Chr 31:2-4; 35:7-9). Chronicles leaves readers with no doubt that the Davidic kings were extraordinarily wealthy (e.g., 1 Chr 27:25-34; 2 Chr 8:17-18; 9:9-26; 26:10; 32:27-29), but this prosperity is divinely-willed, a reward from God for good kings (1 Chr 29:12; 2 Chr 1:11-12; 17:5, 10-11; 32:29). The assembly should expect future kings to be wealthy, but this is because God rewards royal righteousness in such a manner, and royal wealth also benefits the temple. Chronicles presents a temple tax as in effect under Davidic rule and paid by Judah to the temple (2 Chr 24:4-6, 9; cf. Exod 30:11-16; 38:25-26)—although it is collected by the Levites, not the priests as in 2 Kgs 12:9-10²⁸²—and the people are invited to give freewill offerings to support the temple (1 Chr 29:5-6; 2 Chr 31:14), but readers are led to expect that a monarchy would shoulder a significant part of the temple’s financial burden.

The assembly in Chronicles often acts under the king’s leadership rather than with him,

²⁸² See Ralph W. Klein, “The Ironic End of Joash in Chronicles” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 116-27 (120-21).

and readers see the king has the ability to call an assembly (לְהַאֲדֹפ), for example (1 Chr 13:5; 15:3; 28:1; 2 Chr 5:2-6; 11:1).²⁸³ Of course, Nehemiah as governor exercises the same power (Neh 5:7), so claiming that Davidic kings have the power to call an assembly is not necessarily pointing to a diminishment of the assembly's authority in the Persian period; under a Davidic client monarchy, they would still be subject to a higher authority, but one that replaces the governor, and, normally, kings call assemblies to gain its assent on or have it act with them in implementing some kind of cultic change (1 Chr 13:5; 15:3; 23:2; 28:1; 2 Chr 5:2-6; 15:9; 34:29). So Chronicles hardly presents a monarchy that wields absolute power in Judah and, moreover, Chronicles assures the assembly that a Davidic restoration would not impose undue burdens of taxation or labor on them; the king's vast wealth, in short, will not be based on the exploitation of the people. Chronicles is clear that Davidides never use Israelites/Judeans as forced labor, not even in the context of temple-building. David drafts resident aliens to prepare for the temple construction (1 Chr 22:2), and Solomon relies solely on resident aliens to build the temple (2 Chr 2:1, 16-17 [2, 17-18]). Unlike 1 Kgs 5:27 [13]; 11:28, Solomon uses only the descendants of Canaanites for his temple-building and other royal construction projects (8:3-9), and Chronicles says, in fact, that these people serve as corvée labor "to this day," and that

²⁸³ The king is exercising the same authority over the assembly even when other verbs are used, such as פָּסַד (1 Chr 19:17; 23:2; 2 Chr 34:29) and צָבַד (2 Chr 15:9; 25:5). On the importance of the verb לְהַאֲדֹפ, though, see Louis C. Jonker, "David's Officials According to the Chronicler (1 Chronicles 23-27): A Reflection of Second Temple Self-Categorization?" in *Historiography and Identity (Re)formulation in Second Temple Historiographical Literature*, ed. Louis Jonker, LHBOTS 534 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2010), 65-91 (75).

“Solomon did not make Israelites slaves to do his work” (8:8-9).²⁸⁴

So when, after Solomon’s death, Israel complains to Rehoboam of the heavy yoke Solomon laid on them (10:1-5), their interpretation of events does not match that of the narrative. Rehoboam follows bad advice from his younger counselors and says that he will add to the people’s burden, with the result that, under Jeroboam’s leadership, “Israel revolted against the house of David until this day” (10:6-19), and when Rehoboam sends Hadoram, the officer in charge of forced labor, to the North, Hadoram is stoned to death there (10:18). Because these

²⁸⁴ Following most commentators, we read 8:9 with the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate, which omit the MT’s ר#§). See Ralph W. Klein, *2 Chronicles: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 116. The Chronicler took 2 Chr 8:7-9 from 1 Kgs 9:20-22, part of a section that opens with 9:15, introducing the *sm* Solomon conscripted for his works in Jerusalem and other Israelite cities. 1 Kings 5 and 11 refer to Israelites drafted into *sm* and *lbs*, so those passages would appear to refer to royal projects other than those identified in 1 Kings 9. Words like *sm* and *lbs/hlbs* can refer to the kind of compulsory labor performed by slaves (e.g., Exod 1:11; 5:4; 6:6-7), and this would appear to be the sense of *sm* in the Deuteronomistic History in references to the defeated Canaanites (e.g., Josh 16:10; 17:13; Judg 1:28, 30, 33, 35; 1 Kgs 9:21). For Dtr, the phrase *db* (*sm* (Josh 16:10 and 1 Kgs 9:21), which applies to Canaanites alone, may suggest a somewhat different status than *sm* and *lbs* when applied to Israelites during Solomon’s reign (1 Kgs 4:6; 5:27-29 [13-15]; 11:28), but that is not clear, and the Chronicler may simply have seen the assertions in 1 Kings 4-11 that Solomon applied *sm* to Israelites but did not make them *Mydb* (as contradictory, and so chose the one that he or she believed (or wanted readers to believe) to be true. See Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 39-40, 67-68.

events are said to be the will of God in fulfillment of the oracle to Jeroboam through Ahijah (10:15; cf. 9:29; 11:4), some argue, as we mentioned in the first chapter, that the Chronicler meant readers to understand that the split of the kingdom as punishment for Solomon's apostasy, part of the narrative of 1 Kings 11 but an idea entirely absent in Chronicles' narrative.²⁸⁵ There are a number of difficulties with this argument. First, Solomon commits no sin in Chronicles,²⁸⁶

²⁸⁵ For scholars who argue the Chronicler expects his or her audience to read 2 Chronicles 10 synoptically with 1 Kings 11 in order to make sense of the reference to the oracle of Jeroboam, see, e.g., Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, HAT 21 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955), 227; Thomas Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels*, FRLANT 106 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 58; Peter R. Ackroyd, *I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*, TBC (London: SCM Press, 1973), 126; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 239; Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, WBC 15 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 85-87; Joachim Becker, *2 Chronik*, NEB (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1988), 40-41; Simon J. De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, FOTL 11 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1989), 279-80; Ingeborg Gabriel, *Friede über Israel: Eine Untersuchung zur Friedenstheologie in Chronik I, 10-II, 36*, ÖBS 10 (Klosterneuburg: Verlag Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), 12 n. 44; Rodney Duke, "A Rhetorical Approach to Appreciating the Books of Chronicles" in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 100-35 (108-109); Schweitzer, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*, 46 n. 47.

²⁸⁶ On Solomon's sinlessness and the very positive portrayal of him in Chronicles, see, e.g., Mosis, *Untersuchungen*, 125-63; Roddy L. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles,"

and as we saw in the previous chapter the Chronicler makes the Davidides' eternal covenant depend on Solomon's sinlessness. The question as to whether or not Solomon sinned is pivotal to Chronicles, and, if the author truly wanted readers to believe Solomon had sinned, we would have to conclude that he or she is fairly incompetent as an author. This is especially the case since David tells Solomon that he will prosper (xylct) if he keeps "the statutes and commandments Yhwh commanded Moses" (1 Chr 22:13), sounding very much like God when he informs Solomon that the Davidides will rule forever if Solomon keeps "my statutes and my commandments" (2 Chr 7:17-18). So when readers learn in a preliminary summary of Solomon's reign that he "prospered (xylcyw)" (1 Chr 29:23), they would not reasonably expect to find any account of Solomonic sin. The Chronicler appears to have gone out of his or her way to prove Solomon's sinlessness—if he "prospered," then he kept the commandments—and any assertion to the contrary would seem to need some kind of comment, which the Chronicler does not provide.

Moreover, if the Chronicler intended the audience to supply information from 1 Kings 11 to inform their reading of 2 Chronicles 10, then what is otherwise an ironclad rule of the doctrine of immediate retribution—all kings who commit cultic sin are punished during their lifetimes, as we saw in chapter 2—is violated here, and with no comment from the narrator. Again, to assume the Chronicler intended readers to believe Solomon committed the sin with which 1 Kings 11 charges him is to assume a fairly incompetent author. But since there is a general lack of scholarly claims in regard to the Chronicler's incompetence, we should assume that he or she does not intend the audience to read 1 Kings 11 and 2 Chronicles 10 synoptically. Instead, as the

JBL 92 (1973): 503-16; Raymond B. Dillard, "The Chronicler's Solomon," *WTJ* 43 (1981): 289-300; Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 478-89.

Chronicler has omitted the story of 1 Kings 11 but almost entirely retained the story of 1 Kings 12 in which a king attempts to impose forced labor upon Israel, it makes some sense to see this as the cause of the Davidides' loss of the North. As King Abijah puts it in 2 Chr 13:6-7, Jeroboam rose up in rebellion against Solomon and then took advantage of Rehoboam while he was "young and inexperienced"; that is, Chronicles' narrative makes it seem as if Jeroboam misled Israel to complain about a non-existent problem of forced labor that would incite the North and provide him with a pretext for rebellion. Chronicles' story is not one of punishment for Solomon's sin as in 1 Kings 11, it is a story that informs readers that God will not support the rule of a king who insists on making forced labor of the people. The Chronicler makes the point as well that the split of the kingdom results from God fulfilling "his word, which he spoke in the hand of Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam the son of Nebat" (10:15), although there is no explanation as to what that word actually was. In part, we can simply see the Chronicler as preparing readers here for the string of prophets who will begin to appear in the next and many of the following chapters to warn and to explain God's control of history to Judah in the face of the sins of the kings and people. But since the events of this chapter focus on the unwise attempt on the part of a king to demand forced labor from the people, the simplest assumption on the part of readers might well be that God had previously warned through Ahijah that the Davidic loss of the North would be the result of any royal attempt to institute corvée labor in Israel.²⁸⁷

If, as we saw in chapter 2, Chronicles' main emphasis when referring to Solomon's wisdom is his use of it in temple-building, his original request for it stems from a desire to

²⁸⁷ For a similar conclusion in regard to the Chronicler's blaming of Rehoboam for the secession of the North, see Troy D. Cudworth, "The Division of Israel's Kingdom in Chronicles: A Re-examination of the Usual Suspects," *Bib* 95 (2014): 498-523.

rightly rule God's people (2 Chr 1:10). Solomon's wisdom is also a focus of 2 Chronicles 9, the final chapter of the history dedicated to him, and it results not just in a vast increase in his personal wealth (9:9, 22-25) but in the wealth of Jerusalem (9:27). Part of the point of the story of Rehoboam's loss of the North is to have readers contrast Solomon's wisdom, a wisdom that helps him build the temple, causes him to forbear from drafting the people into forced labor, and provides wealth for Jerusalem, with a young and inexperienced Rehoboam who is manipulated into an extremely unwise decision. It is important that it is a Davidide who makes the point that Rehoboam was *bb1-Krw r (n* "young and inexperienced"; Abijah manifests a royal recognition that this failure of wisdom should not be repeated. In fact, in all of Chronicles' narrative only Rehoboam and Solomon are ever called "young and inexperienced."²⁸⁸ It is David who refers to Solomon as *Krw r (n* as he sets out to prepare for Solomon's later act of temple-building (1 Chr 22:5), and he commands "the officers of Israel" to help Solomon in this project (22:17-19). Poor advisors can lead to poor royal decisions (see also 2 Chr 22:4; 25:17),²⁸⁹ but with David's command Chronicles carves out room for the assembly to function in an advisory capacity to the king, especially when he first ascends to the throne.²⁹⁰ Given that Chronicles

²⁸⁸ Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Secession of the Northern Kingdom in Chronicles: Accepted 'Facts' and New Meanings" in *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2006), 117-43 (128-29).

²⁸⁹ As Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History*, 359-61 points out, the Chronicler adds the verb *C (y* "to advise, counsel" in 2 Chr 25:17 to the source material he or she receives from 2 Kgs 14:8, where the verb does not appear.

²⁹⁰ Ben Zvi, "The Secession of the Northern Kingdom," 128-29 argues that the use of (*bb1-)**Krw r (n* in regard to both Solomon and Rehoboam simply demonstrates that the

presents the assembly as having a voice in establishing new Davidides as king, this makes sense. Yet the story of 2 Chronicles 10 and Abijah's interpretation of it in 13:6-7 also makes it clear that there will be evil men like Jeroboam²⁹¹ who will try to take advantage of inexperienced kings and rebel against them. The assembly should not listen to such figures, but should advise the king to treat the assembly well and to forbear from creating the kind of disaffection of which potential rebels could take advantage, especially disaffection caused by demanding forced labor from the people, something God does not support; following the North's rebellion after Rehoboam's failed attempt to impose forced labor on them, God opposes the king's military attempt to retake the North, telling him and Judah that "this thing was from me" (11:1-4). The assembly should not follow non-Davidic leaders like Jeroboam, who will, in the end, have only rebellious political motivations in mind, for only one house has an eternal covenant to rule.²⁹²

As a client ruler, the Davidide would control an army (see Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.18),²⁹³ and

Chronicler's God can act very differently in the cases of two different kings. Assembly readers, however, might be struck instead by what a difference good advice from the people makes in regard to a king's ability to succeed and to gain the support of the people.

²⁹¹ 2 Chr 10:2 says that Jeroboam fled from Solomon; given Solomon's perfection in Chronicles, this reflects negatively on him. Abijah says that Jeroboam *drmyw* "rebelled" and was among the "worthless men, evil ones" who acted against Rehoboam.

²⁹² Of course, having omitted all of 1 Kings 11, including the content of the oracle to Jeroboam in 11:26-40 in which God tells Jeroboam that he will be king over Israel, the Chronicler strips Jeroboam of any divine sanction to rule as king.

²⁹³ See Vadim Jigoulov, "Administration of Achaemenid Phoenicia: A Case for Managed Autonomy" in *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods*

the assembly would want to know that a Davidic ruler would not launch unnecessary wars against neighboring clients or band together with other client rulers to fight the Persians, thereby putting assembly lives and property at needless risk. In Chronicles, David's single sin is to initiate a census, and 1 Chronicles 21 functions as a condemnation of his attempt to number Israel for military purposes. 21:1 says that David is "incited" to begin the census by N+#& "an adversary"; given that 1 Chronicles 18-20 is an account of David's wars and that David has Joab, his general, carry out the census of those "drawing the sword," it makes most sense to see this "adversary" as some unnamed human opponent.²⁹⁴ If David's attempt to deliberately gather an army meets with swift divine disapproval, Chronicles nonetheless portrays Israelite warriors

in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Lester L. Grabbe, LSTS 73 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2009), 138-51 (140) and *Anab.* 1.4.10; 7.8.25.

²⁹⁴ So also, e.g., Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 145-49; John W. Wright, "The Innocence of David in 1 Chronicles 21," *JSOT* 60 (1993): 87-105 (92-93); Gary N. Knoppers, "Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles," *Bib* 76 (1995): 449-70 (455-56); Pancratius C. Beentjes, "David's Census and Ornan's Threshing Floor: A Close Reading of 1 Chronicles 21," in *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 45-59 (46-47); Yairah Amit, "Araunah's Threshing Floor: A Lesson in Shaping Historical Memory" in *What was Authoritative for Chronicles?*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 133-44 (135). Chronicles simply does not manifest any kind of metaphysical dualism that would suggest that N+#& here is a supernatural figure; see Knoppers, "Images of David," 455-56 and Kenneth A. Ristau, "Breaking Down Unity: An Analysis of 1 Chronicles 21.1-22.1," *JSOT* 30 (2005): 201-21 (207 n. 11).

freely joining David of their own accord (1 Chr 12), and 1 Chr 11:10-25 presents readers with glorious martial deeds of David's warriors. The point of 1 Chronicles 21 is not that a royal army is illegitimate, but that formal royal attempts to number the people for the purposes of warfare are. What might particularly strike assembly readers of the fourth century is Chronicles' repeated claim that warriors from all over Israel "came to" or "were separated to" or "deserted to" David of their own free will, even while Saul was still king (1 Chr 12:1, 9 [8], 17 [16], 20 [19], 21 [20], 23 [22], 24 [23], 39 [38]), and that such military support from the tribes was an essential part of the divine plan to make David king in place of Saul (11:10; 12:24, 39 [23, 38]). There is a particular message here to the fourth-century assembly that allows them to see that Israel's/Judah's army is one provided by the tribes or the assembly to the king, not one that the king forcibly levies from the assembly. A future Davidic client would have need of an army if only because, as we saw in chapter 1, the Achaemenids would expect him to supply soldiers for the imperial forces from time to time, but Chronicles presents a situation in which the assembly has a voice in regard to the royal appropriation of those soldiers. In 1 Chronicles 12, as warriors from Benjamin and Judah "came" to David, David is concerned that their true purpose is to betray him to Saul, but a divine spirit speaks through their leader, who says, "We are yours, O David, and with you, O son of Jesse" (12:17-19 [16-18]). The assembly's forces are at once fighting with the king ("we are with you") and under the king's command ("we are yours"), pointing to a fine balance of royal and assembly control over the royal army that will provide for the defense of Judah.

As we saw in the previous chapter, one aspect of the Chronicler's interpretation of history is that God consistently rewards kings who care for the cult and punishes those who do not; among these rewards and punishments, as we saw, are victories and defeats in battle. This is why

the Chronicler insists that victory is dependent upon God's will alone, for in Chronicles, unlike the Deuteronomistic History, God never rewards an apostate king or people with victory in battle. A military census, then, is unnecessary for this theological reason, but it is also unnecessary because, as we have just seen, it impinges upon the assembly's jurisdiction in providing soldiers to the king. Censuses in and of themselves are not problematic in Chronicles—Israel is enrolled by genealogies (1 Chr 9:1); the Levites *wrpsyw* “were numbered” for cultic service (1 Chr 23:3), the same verb used in 21:2 for David's census; and Solomon “numbered” the resident aliens to begin temple construction (2 Chr 2:1 [2])²⁹⁵—so what sets David's census apart is its use in his determination to control the number of forces at his disposal. This should really be left up to the people, just as victory is left up to God. This, then, is David's sin in 1 Chronicles 21,²⁹⁶ and if his hope had been to win a battle of his own

²⁹⁵ See Wright, “The Innocence of David,” 90-92.

²⁹⁶ Explaining the sin of 1 Chronicles 21 as a failure to follow the law of the census of Exod 30:11-16 does not, in and of itself, seem like an incorrect explanation—see Paul S. Evans, “Let the Crime Fit the Punishment: The Chronicler's Explication of David's ‘Sin’ in 1 Chronicles 21” in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*, ed. Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 65-80 (68-74)—but that explanation is not incompatible with the Chronicler's view concerning the assembly's voice in supplying forces to the king. The suggestion that the Chronicler presents Joab rather than David as at fault, since Joab fails to complete the census (21:6)—so Wright, “The Innocence of David”—does not really fit the context. The Chronicler insists that God has been responsible for David's past victories (1 Chr 18:6, 13), but Joab is the only character in this part of the narrative to explicitly acknowledge that God alone is responsible for the outcome of

accord by relying on a large army, God responds by reducing the numbers available to him through a plague.²⁹⁷

2 Chr 25:5 and 26:11-13 might also appear to refer to censuses in the context of warfare, but the kings in these cases never actually “number” the warriors in their army; the narrative is simply reporting how many men were at their disposal. These two passages refer to the forces as being arranged by ancestral houses, and so if someone has numbered these armies before they joined together for battle, the larger context of Chronicles suggests that it was the ancestral houses themselves, the bodies, Chronicles is suggesting, that will maintain some kind of control over supplying soldiers for the Davidide’s post-exilic army. 26:11-13, after all, first records “the number of the heads of the ancestral houses,” and only then reports the size of the army that accompanies them. In fact, in 1 Chronicles 1-9 readers encounter not only isolated stories of individual tribes fighting foreigners during the monarchical period with no mention of royal involvement (4:41-43; 5:17-22), but also references to written records of large numbers of warriors recorded according to tribe and ancestral house (4:41-43; 5:18; 7:1-5, 6-12, 40). It is battle (19:12-13). It is precisely this that stands at the center of his opposition to David’s census and his reluctance to fulfill the royal order (21:3-6), and so he rather than David acts in accord with Chronistic theology.

²⁹⁷ Just as Joab cites the vast numbers of *brx Pl# \$ # \$y* “men drawing the sword” (21:5) as he carries out the census, the narrator records that *# \$y Pl) My (b# \$* “seventy thousand men” died from the plague (21:14). One could, of course, take *# \$y* in 21:14 as referring to people of both sexes—1 Chr 16:3 uses *# \$y* to refer to males and females, for example—but the repetition of the word in the context of a large number is striking, suggesting that God is standing in the way of what David hoped to accomplish.

difficult to construe Chronicles as a whole as advocating Judean warfare that has not been sanctioned by the king since it is always the king who leads in warfare beginning in 1 Chronicles 10, but the Chronicler has no difficulty in portraying the troops as primarily associated with ancestral houses. As in a case like 2 Chr 25:5, the king may use the soldiers in order to go out to war, but they are grouped by ancestral house.

2 Chr 25:5 is part of 25:5-10, the section of the narrative of Amaziah that is one of several Chronistic stories that condemn Davidides for making military alliances, the only other royal action besides cultic activity to which the Chronicler consistently applies the doctrine of immediate retribution; every such alliance in Chronicles is condemned and punished. Amaziah, for example, does not believe the Judean troops at his disposal are numerous enough for victory, and so he hires 100,000 mercenaries from the North, but when he listens to the prophetic condemnation of this act in 25:7-8, which tells him that God has the power to grant victory, he sends those troops home (25:10). Still, this does not help him entirely avoid punishment for the action, since the troops pillage Judah after they leave the army (25:3). Asa's alliance with Aram (2 Chr 16:1-6) appears to meet with initial success, but is condemned by a prophet who tells the king that victory depends on God who rewards faithfulness, not on the size of the army, and that Asa will now have wars (16:7-9). Jehoshaphat's alliance with the North (2 Chr 18) is censured by a prophet (19:1-2), and if he avoids punishment besides the defeat in battle he suffers because of that alliance,²⁹⁸ it is only because he previously destroyed idolatry throughout Judah (19:3). Ahaziah also makes a military alliance with the North (22:5), and is assassinated along with

²⁹⁸ Upon his return from the defeat of his and Ahab's joint forces, the prophet tells him that "there is wrath against you from Yhwh" (19:2), which is assumedly a reference to the defeat he has suffered.

Joram, the Northern king, as Jehu destroys Ahab's house (22:7-9). Ahaz's attempt to make an alliance with Assyria becomes a punishment in and of itself, since the Assyrians simply oppress rather than save Judah (28:16-21).²⁹⁹ If Chronicles is clear that kings are punished for their failure to promote the temple, it is equally clear that they are punished for making foreign military alliances; these are the two royal actions to which immediate retribution applies absolutely. The Chronicler, then, reassures assembly members that future Davidides would not dare to make a foreign military alliance since, as history has proven, such alliances inevitably lead to punishment, and the assembly, as a result, need not fear that a future king would make this kind of treaty. For the assembly, the danger in such an act is that it may well be the desire of a client who wishes to rebel against Persian power, a matter not altogether uncommon in the fourth century, as we shall see in chapter 5.

The fact that God provides cultically loyal kings with military victory is simply a reflection of Chronicles' message that kings in the future will support the cult, since they would not dare risk the divine punishment of defeat in battle; the larger point of this aspect of immediate retribution, as we saw in the previous chapter, is to convince assembly readers that the king will support the institution in which they ground their identity and relationships of power. So under the cultically-faithful Asa, for example, the land has quiet for ten years (2 Chr 13:23 [14:1]), a state that the king and the narrator attribute to his cultic faithfulness (14:4, 6 [5, 7]; 15:1-15). The periods of rest in Asa's reign are interrupted by a massive Ethiopian invasion,

²⁹⁹ For a thorough discussion of the ways in which the Chronicler alters stories from Samuel-Kings to emphasize an anti-foreign treaty ideology, see Tetsuo Yamaga, "Anti-Treaty Theology of the Chronicler and his View of History" in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, ed. Martti Nissinen, VTSup 148 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 277-306.

during which Asa asks God for help, and God defeats the invaders (14:8-14 [9-15]). In Chronicles even a faithful king and people can be struck by invasion, but because of their loyalty to the cult they can rely utterly on God to defeat the invaders, as Asa does.³⁰⁰ Regardless of the vast size of the invading army—800,000 in 2 Chr 13:3, for example, or 1,000,000 in 14:8 [9]—it is always clear that God alone determines victory, a point that Asa makes in 14:10 [11] and that other kings, a prophet, and the narrator make in 2 Chr 13:12; 16:8; 24:2; 28:19; and 32:8. 2 Chronicles 12-16 really serves as a kind of primer for the Chronicler’s view of invasion and warfare: God uses it to punish an unfaithful king and people (2 Chr 12); God defends Judah from invasion when king and people are cultically faithful (2 Chr 13 and 14); and so not only are foreign alliances unnecessary, they result in the punishment of king and people (2 Chr 16).³⁰¹ When the cult in Jerusalem is functioning rightly, in fact, to fight against Judah is to fight against God (13:12), and while cultically faithful kings can rely on God to win their battles (1 Chr 18-20; 2 Chr 6:34-35; 13:4-18; 14:8-14 [9-15]; 16:8-9; 20:1-30; 26:6-8; 27:1-5; 32:1-22), unfaithful ones, it goes without saying, can expect defeat in warfare (1 Chr 10:13-14; 2 Chr 12:1-8; 21:16-17; 24:17-24; 25:14-24; 28:1-7, 16-21). Yet even a cultically perfect king can sin in his failure to

³⁰⁰ Contra Ehud Ben Zvi, “When YHWH Tests People: General Considerations and Particular Observations Regarding the Books of Chronicles and Job” in *Far from Minimal: Celebrating the Work and Influence of Philip R. Davies*, ed. Duncan Burns and J.W. Rogerson, LHBOTS 484 (London: T. & T. Clark International, 2012), 11-20, such invasions are not tests. Chronicles does use the verb *hšn* with God as the subject, but only once, and only in regard to the “officers of Babylon” sent to test Hezekiah (2 Chr 32:31).

³⁰¹ For further discussion of these ideas, see Gary N. Knoppers, “‘Yhwh is not with Israel’: Alliances as a *Topos* in Chronicle,” *CBQ* 58 (1996): 601-26.

rely on God to win battles, as is the case with Asa, whose heart is מל # \$ “perfect” in the context of cult (2 Chr 15:17), but who fails to rely on God in battle and makes a military alliance with Aram, resulting in a promise of divine punishment (16:9). As a prophet condemns Asa for the alliance, he tells the king that God saves those whose heart is מל # \$ (16:9), but since Asa will not be saved from wars, kings must be “perfect” in regard to their rejection of such alliances as well as in their support of cult to avoid punishment.

The obvious lesson this sends to future kings, assembly readers would have been happy to learn, is that they must focus on promoting cultic norms, not on making foreign military alliances with an eye to engaging in rebellion and a war with Persia that could well have devastating consequences for Judah. As Chronicles presents Israel/Judah’s monarchic past, the ancestral houses can send soldiers to the king’s army, but the Davidide has no business in numbering the people for this purpose, since that would infringe on the role of the ancestral houses and assembly to supply the soldiers in the first place. The king must devote himself to temple, not warfare and military alliances, and the kings who fail in either or both regards are all punished by God—these are the two areas of royal activity to which the Chronicler absolutely applies the doctrine of immediate retribution. Warfare in and of itself is not an unmitigated evil in Chronicles; David fights wars of expansion with divine support in 1 Chronicles 18-20, and on two occasions after David’s time Chronicles appears to present other faithful Davidides as doing the same (2 Chr 8:3; 26:6-8), but otherwise the wars after the time of the temple-building are defensive in nature or inevitable defeats sent as divine punishments.³⁰² Since future Davidides have Chronicles to make plain the ways in which God acts in response to royal actions, they will

³⁰² 2 Chr 12:1-4; 13; 14:8-14 [9-15]; 20:1-30; 21:8-10, 16-17; 24:23-24; 25:5-13, 20-24; 28:1-7, 16-21; 32:1-22; 36:11-21.

not risk their reigns by failing to support temple cult or by making foreign military alliances that might make the imperial government suspicious of a revolt, a suspicion that could have grave consequences for the Judean assembly.

So it is hardly a surprise to see the Chronicler present peace as God's ultimate blessing for the people.³⁰³ Rest (xwn) and peace (Mwl#š) are things Chronicles associates with the temple; David, as we discussed in the previous chapter, believes that God has disqualified him from temple-building because of his involvement in divinely-sanctioned warfare, but says that Solomon can build because God has given him rest, peace, and +q#š "quiet" (1 Chr 22:9). The same verse, in fact, links Solomon's name (hml#š) to the concept of peace: "he will be a man of peace (Mwl#š #šy)." Because God has used David to defeat Israel's enemies, God has given rest to Israel (22:18) and to Solomon (22:9), a rest that is clearly the precondition for temple construction (22:18-19; 23.25). The temple, as a result, is the place of rest for Yhwh and his ark (1 Chr 6:16 [31]; 28:2; 2 Chr 6:41), and God continues to give Judah rest and quiet in the sense of sparing them from warfare (2 Chr 13:23 [14:1]; 14:4, 6 [5, 7]; 15:15; 20:30).³⁰⁴ This reflects

³⁰³ On this, see, e.g., Gabriel, *Friede über Israel*, 199-204; Andreas Ruffing, *Jahwekrieg als Weltmetapher: Studien zu Jahwekriegstexten des chronistischen Sondergutes*, SBB 24 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992), 359-60; Susan Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 146-49; John W. Wright, "The Fight for Peace: Narrative and History in the Battle Accounts" in *The Chronicler as Historian*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 155-77.

³⁰⁴ We might well add to this list 2 Chr 32:22, the LXX of which says that God
kate&pausen au) tou_j. katapau&w is the translation of xwn in LXX 14:6 [7]; 15:15;

an alteration that the Chronicler has made to the Deuteronomistic History, for Dtr associates rest with the victories of the conquest and the eternal promise to David as well as with the temple;³⁰⁵ Chronicles, however, limits the concept to the period of the temple alone, and, in its version of 2 Samuel 7, excises God's claim in Dtr to have given rest to David the warrior.³⁰⁶ The period of offensive warfare, which Chronicles almost entirely limits to the pre-temple period, does result in winning spoil (1 Chr 18:7, 11; 20:2) and tribute from other peoples (18:2, 6), some of which is used in temple construction (18:8, 11), but when kings support the cult, God can cause foreigners to send tribute without warfare (2 Chr 17:10-11; 26:8; 32:23), and kings who are loyal to the cult and who are forced to fight defensive wars are victorious, thanks to God, and they carry off spoil

and 20:30, and MT 32:22 may have read מלחניו for an original מלח זניו.

³⁰⁵ For Dtr's use of the concept of rest in association with the conquest, see Deut 3:20; 12:10; 25:19; Josh 1:13, 15; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1. For its use of it in association with the eternal covenant with David, see 2 Sam 7:1, 11, and in association with the temple, see 1 Kgs 5:18 [4]; 8:56. See Georg Braulik, "Zur deuteronomistischen Konzeption von Freiheit und Frieden" in *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums*, SBAB 2 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 219-30.

³⁰⁶ See Roddy Braun, "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of the Chronicler," *JBL* 95 (1976): 581-90 (582-86); Mark A. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, SBLDS 93 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 86-88; Schniedewind, "The Chronicler as an Interpreter of Scripture," 168-72; Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Nathan's Oracle and David's Prayer in 1 Chronicles 17" in *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 31-44 (35-37)

and land from their defeated enemies (2 Chr 13:18-19; 14:11-14 [12-15]; 20:25; 27:5).³⁰⁷

Solomon receives tribute as a result of his wisdom, not his military actions (2 Chr 9:1, 9, 24), and so Chronicles assures readers that God will find a way to provide future Davidides with tribute that will not necessitate launching potentially debilitating wars.

Two exceptions that seem to prove the rule that good Davidides in Chronicles' temple period do not launch offensive wars appear during the reigns of Uzziah and Solomon. Uzziah launches an offensive war against the Philistines and Arabs in 2 Chr 26:6-8 and even builds cities in Philistine territory, but we can construe this as a war of revenge. There are only two other places in Chronicles where the words "Philistines" and "Arabs" appear together: in 2 Chr 17:11, where they bring tribute to Jehoshaphat; and in 2 Chr 21:16-17, where they invade Judah and carry away spoil from the royal household as part of God's punishment for Jehoram's sin. Now, in 2 Chr 26:6-7, God rewards Uzziah's cultic loyalty by helping him (whrz (yw) defeat the Philistines and Arabs, and Uzziah now takes from them as they once took from the Davidides. So while the Chronicler does not emphasize the point, he or she reserves the right of kings to take military vengeance on their enemies, so long as the kings have been loyal to the temple as Uzziah was when "God made him prosper" (26:5). It is possible that the same point is being made in 2 Chr 8:3, the only other example of a successful temple-era offensive war in Chronicles. Here Solomon captures Hamath-zobah, and although we cannot be entirely certain

³⁰⁷ It is not entirely clear whether Jotham's war against the Ammonites in 2 Chr 27:5 is offensive or defensive. Given that the previous battle with the Ammonites involved an Ammonite invasion (2 Chr 20:10-11) and that they are portrayed as a treacherous people (1 Chr 19:1-9), it is easier to see this as a defensive battle that results from an Ammonite invasion.

where this city was located,³⁰⁸ references to Hamath and Zobah last appeared together in Chronicles in 1 Chronicles 18-19 where Hamath was a city often at war with Zobah, and Zobah was a land David defeats (18:3-11). Zobah was also allied with the Ammonites against David when the Ammonites unjustly provoked David and attacked him (19:1-9). It is possible, then, that the Chronicler means to portray Hamath as a city that Zobah, an untrustworthy and dangerous enemy, has unjustly occupied³⁰⁹—since the independent Hamath of 1 Chronicles 19 is now “Hamath of Zobah”—and the cultically perfect Solomon is being rewarded by God with a victory over Zobah, a rebellious client.

The Chronicler, then, tells the assembly that future Davidides will generally limit their wars to defending Judah and not unnecessarily put assembly lives and property at risk, most especially in making foreign military alliances that would serve little purpose outside of a rebellion that would likely provoke an enormous imperial response. It would seem, then, that part of the point of presenting David’s and Solomon’s reigns as two parts of the same whole is not only to mimic the pattern of Mesopotamian royal historiography in which victories precede temple-building, but also to be clear that David, the military victor, is actually excluded from temple-building, since the kings who rule during the time of temple should be men of peace, like Solomon. Since the Davidides will have Chronicles to help them see how God acts in history, they will also be men of peace in their rule, thereby avoiding the inevitable divine punishment for acting in any other manner.

But should future Davidic kings take military action against Samaria? After all, as is now

³⁰⁸ For a range of options, see Wayne T. Pitard, “Hamath-zobah” in *ABD*, 3:37.

³⁰⁹ See Sara Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 622.

generally recognized, the Chronicler portrays the people of the North as a legitimate part of Israel,³¹⁰ and we see Northerners faithful to the true cult of Jerusalem migrate to Judah (2 Chr 11:16-17; 15:9), or at least go there to celebrate Passover (30:10-11), and we see Davidides eliminating cultic apparatuses in the North (31:1; 34:7) and Northerners donating to the Jerusalem temple (34:9). The real difficulty Chronicles portrays in regard to the North is its leadership, which establishes idolatry and a false priesthood (2 Chr 11:13-15; 13:8-9; 30:7-8), rendering such rule illegitimate.³¹¹ The Chronicler is committed to gaining the support of the temple assembly and the Levites, who base their identity and power relationships in the Jerusalem temple, and so he or she is firmly in favor of Jerusalem exercising a cultic monopoly on Yahwism. Josephus claims the Yahwistic cult at Gerizim was established by the Samaritan

³¹⁰ E.g., H.G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Roddy L. Braun, "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude toward the North," *JBL* 96 (1977): 59-62; Throntveit, *When Kings Speak*, 84-88; Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 318-24; Yigal Levin, "Who was the Chronicler's Audience? A Hint from his Genealogies," *JBL* 122 (2003): 229-45 (238); Louis Jonker, "Who Constitutes Society? Yehud's Self-understanding in the Late Persian Era as Reflected in the Books of Chronicles," *JBL* 127 (2008): 703-24 (715); Gary N. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of their Early Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 75-99.

³¹¹ So, e.g., von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild*, 32-36; Gary N. Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion: A Study in the Early History of Samaritans and Jews," *SR* 34 (2005): 309-38 (314-18); Ehud Ben Zvi, "Shifting the Gaze: Historiographic Constraints in Chronicles and their Implications' in *History, Literature and Theology of the Book of Chronicles*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2006), 78-99 (84-85, 91).

leadership (*Ant.* 11.302-303, 321-324), and so we might see why Chronicles suggests that the apostate cult Jeroboam established was simply a theological prototype of Gerizim. The religions of fourth-century Samaria and Judah and the cults of Jerusalem and Gerizim might have seemed remarkably the same to outsiders:³¹² a significant part of the population of both areas appear to have been Yahwists,³¹³ and Josephus even writes that many Judeans lived in Shechem (*Ant.* 11.340, 346-347); the central temple in both regions was Yahwistic; the priestly leadership of both temples was Aaronide (*Ant.* 11.302, 321-324);³¹⁴ and both temples appear to have followed

³¹² See Bob Becking, “Do the Earliest Samaritan Inscriptions already Indicate a Parting of the Ways?” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 213-22 (220).

³¹³ The largest category of names from the Samaria Papyri is Yahwistic (twenty eight names in total), and the second largest category is that of names with no theophoric element (sixteen names), although those who bore the names were likely Yahwists since these names are common in the Bible. The papyri contain only ten names with non-Yahwistic theophoric elements. See Frank Moore Cross, “Personal Names in the Samaria Papyri,” *BASOR* 344 (2006): 75-90 (86). Yahwistic names also predominate on Samaritan bullae and coins; see Jan Dušek, *Les manuscrits araméens du Wadi Daliyeh et la Samarie vers 450-332 av. J.-C.*, CHANE 30 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 495-506. Many of the names from the Gerizim inscriptions also Yahwistic; see Knoppers, “Aspects of Samaria’s Religious Culture,” 162. For the similarity between the Samaritan and Judean onomastica in the late Persian period, see Ran Zadok, *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponymy and Prosopography*, OLA 28 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1988), 785.

³¹⁴ As Gary Knoppers, “The Samaritan Schism or the Judaization of Samaria? Reassessing Josephus’s Account of the Mt Gerizim Temple” in *Making a Difference: Essays on*

the same sacrificial practices.³¹⁵ The Chronicler, nonetheless, is clear that the cult in one of these regions is orthodox and the cult in the other is heterodox (2 Chr 11:13-16; 13:8-11; 19:2; 21:13; 28:1-4, 9-13; 30:7-9). The Northern leadership has erected and maintains an apostate and idolatrous cult without true priests and Levites (2 Chr 11:14-15; 13:8-9). For the Chronicler, any leadership, in fact, that is unfaithful to the true worship of God, a worship that can take place in Jerusalem alone, is illegitimate, and so the Chronicler has eliminated all of the stories of the North and Northern kings from the Deuteronomistic History that do not involve Judeans.³¹⁶

Demonstrating the pro-Davidic party's absolute support for the assembly's most important institution, the negative light Chronicles casts upon Northern leadership and cult points to fourth-century Gerizim and any other Yahwistic institutions in the North as illegitimate rivals to the true cult in Jerusalem. The animosity directed against Samaritan leadership for its role in supporting Gerizim and any other Yahwistic shrines there explains why the Chronicler

the Bible and Judaism in Honor of Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, ed. David J.A. Clines, Kent Harold Richards, and Jacob L. Wright, HBM 49 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 163-78 (174-75) puts it, Josephus's account of the construction of the Gerizim shrine makes it appear a largely Judean undertaking.

³¹⁵ See Yitzhak Magen, Haggai Misgav, and Levana Tefania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations I: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*, JSP 2 (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004), 6-10.

³¹⁶ Eleven of the nineteen Northern kings from Dtr are mentioned at least by name in Chronicles (Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 317 n. 187), but unless the stories of the Northern kings involve encounters with Judeans, the Chronicler omits them. See Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans*, 73.

has eliminated Dtr's stories about the North when Judeans are not involved, but he or she never suggests that any future Davidide should invade the North. Northerners certainly should be Yahwists and should acknowledge Jerusalem's right to a monopoly on the Yahwistic cult, which is why faithful Northerners are portrayed as journeying to Jerusalem to worship there.³¹⁷ There is no story in Chronicles like that of 2 Kgs 17:24-41, which says the Assyrians exiled the Israelites of the North and replaced them with foreigners. So animosity in Chronicles is reserved for the apostate and illegitimate leadership of the North—but not for the people who live under this leadership—and Chronicles is very suspicious of alliances with the North, especially ones solidified with intermarriage with Northern leaders. The Chronicler wishes to make it clear that future Davidides will promote Jerusalem's claim to a cultic monopoly insofar as that is possible, and certainly not lend any royal prestige to a rival cult by intermarrying with the leadership that supports it. All intermarriages with Northern leaders in Chronicles are portrayed negatively: Jehoshaphat's marriage with a woman of Ahab's house (2 Chr 18:1) results in military alliance and defeat, and a similar marriage made by his son Jehoram leads to an imitation of the sin of the Northern kings (21:6) and punishment (21:11-19). This alliance causes Jehoram's son Ahaziah to commit cultic sin and to listen to counselors from the North, including his mother, who advise

³¹⁷ So, e.g., Ehud Ben Zvi, "Ideological Constructions of Non-Yehudite/Peripheral Israel in Achaemenid Yehud: The Case of the Book of Chronicles" in *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2006), 195-209 (198-99); Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion," 315-16, 323-24; Louis Jonker, "Textual Identities in the Books of Chronicles: The Case of Jehoram's History" in *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 197-217.

him to make a military alliance with the North, which ends in his assassination (22:2-9) and the removal of the Davidides from the throne for six years (22:10-12). Clearly, the Chronicler assures assembly readers, no sane future Davidide would make an alliance with the North lest he wish to suffer dreadful divine punishment. Non-military alliances with foreigners pose no difficulty for Chronicles (2 Chr 2:2-15 [3-16]; 8:17-18), but Jehoshaphat is punished because he makes a commercial and trading agreement with a Northern king (2 Chr 20:35-37); although this may seem no different than Solomon's trading agreement of 2 Chr 8:17-18 that has a positive outcome—both involve a trading agreement with foreign leaders that center on maritime expeditions sent out from Ezion-geber—Jehoshaphat's agreement is made with a Northerner, while Solomon's is made with a Phoenician.

Condemning royal alliances with the North is, however, about as far as the Chronicler is willing to take royal sanctions against Samaria. In 1 Kings 11, Northern secession is divine punishment of the Davidides for the foreign high places erected by Solomon, so once Josiah removes them later in Dtr (2 Kgs 23:13), the road is open for a renewal of Davidic political control there.³¹⁸ We have seen in this chapter, however, that Chronicles does not explain secession in this way. 2 Chronicles 10 and 13:6-7, we discovered, lay the blame for the Northern rebellion at the feet of Jeroboam and the inexperienced and poorly-advised Rehoboam, who wrongly attempts to subject Israelites to forced labor. By altering the explanation for the split of the kingdom, Chronicles deprives any future Davidide from claiming some kind of divine

³¹⁸ So Baruch Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 154-55 and Gary N. Knoppers, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*, HSM 52-53 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993-1994), 2:68-69, 195.

mandate rooted in history for an invasion of Samaria that would put assembly lives at risk. The North may be part of “Israel” for Chronicles, but there is no sense in the work that God has authorized an invasion of it. The closest thing we see to an invasion of the North is 2 Chr 34:6-7, 33, where Josiah eliminates non-Yahwistic cultic apparatuses there, but he is not presented as doing so by military means. 2 Chr 30:6-9 suggests some kind destruction and a partial exile of the North by the Assyrians, and makes no reference to any kind of government there at all by the time of Hezekiah. So as far as fourth-century readers of Chronicles would be able to tell, Josiah seems to be able to act in the North because there was no governing authority there, not because he launched an invasion to force his cultic will upon the region.

Given our observations concerning 2 Chronicles 10, if the Davidides wish to control the North again they must undo the damage that Rehoboam did by demonstrating that they do not and will not put their subjects to forced labor, at least not the subjects whom the Chronicler understands to be “Israel.” This will reflect Solomon’s wisdom, not simply in terms of concern for the temple but in care for the people’s well-being. If the North could be misled by the wicked to believe the Davidides would put them to forced labor, wise Davidic rule that proves otherwise may cause God to restore the North to Judean rule. There is a parallel in the stories of Jehoram and Uzziah that points to this kind of hope for a peaceful restoration of Davidic rule outside of Judah. Jehoram’s failure in cultic loyalty results in loss of Judean control of Edom (2 Chr 21:6, 8-10), but by 26:2 the righteous Uzziah restores the Edomite city of Eloth to Judah. 2 Chronicles 26 makes no reference to a Judean invasion of Edom, suggesting that Uzziah’s righteousness simply caused God to restore the region—or at least the city—to Judean rule. The Chronicler suggests to assembly readers that kings will enlarge the borders of Judah not through warfare but through solicitousness to the temple and through their care of the people.

According to Chronicles, the temple exists because David wants it to exist and because God agrees with David's decision, even if he delays construction of the house until the reign of Solomon. If Chronicles is clear that there were Davidic failures in regard to cult, this historiography demonstrates that no sane Davidide would attempt to repeat them, or attempt to draft Judeans into forced labor, or draft them into their army without the approval of the assembly, or make foreign military alliances, or, at least when new to the throne, rule without sound counsel from the assembly. The Chronicler does not guarantee that no future Davidide will ever offend God, and does not deny that royal missteps in cult and warfare can cause great harm to the people, who can be killed through no fault of their own, as is obviously the case in 1 Chronicles 21.³¹⁹ This narrative of the plague caused by David's census concludes with his decision in 22:1 that the temple must be in Jerusalem so that a king can inquire of God at just such a time of crisis. Commentators often argue that the point of including the story of the census is to justify the placement of the temple,³²⁰ but the Chronicler could have told any story to make

³¹⁹ Sara Japhet, "Theodicy in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles" in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Studies on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 367-98 is correct to point out that Chronicles distinguishes between the sins of the people and the kings, but incorrect to argue that the people are never punished for royal actions since, as we have already seen, the Chronicler does not apply the doctrine of immediate retribution absolutely, but only to royal acts involving cult and foreign military alliances.

³²⁰ E.g., Mosis, *Untersuchungen*, 104-24; Dillard, "The Chronicler's Solomon," 290-91 n. 4; Tae-Soo Im, *Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern: David als Idealbild des theokratischen Messianismus für den Chronisten*, EH 23/263 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985), 145-53;

that point, or no story at all. Gary Knoppers points out that the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 barely mentions the temple, and that it focuses far more on David's repentance and intercession on Israel's behalf,³²¹ but the two ideas are linked in this narrative. The temple needs to be close to the king, and the king needs to properly maintain it, so that when a king sins—"for there is no mortal who does not sin," as Solomon says (2 Chr 6:36)—the temple is close by for inquiry and sacrifice; Gibeon, where the tabernacle was in David's day, is too far away, as David recognizes in 1 Chr 21:29-22:1, most especially if God is angry and attacking or threatening to attack Israel because of a royal sin. One of the points of the story of the census is that even very good kings can make mistakes that can hurt the assembly, but that God is also willing to accept the king's intercession to lessen the harm the people suffer. In the end, David calls upon God and sacrifices at the spot where he then decides the temple will stand, and God stops the plague (21:18-22:1). This is precisely the kind of mercy Solomon repetitively asks God to show in 2 Chronicles 6 when sinners call to God in the temple, a request to which God assents in 2 Chr 7:12-16. Hezekiah also demonstrates the king's ability to intercede for the people in 2 Chr 30:18-20, when he asks that God r̄pky all the people who were participating in Passover while unclean, "not as it is written," and God listens to his intercession.

These kinds of appeal for assembly support for the pro-Davidic movement may have won some readers to the Davidic cause, but the Davidides, of course, never were restored to power, while the assembly continued to exercise political influence into the Hellenistic age. Writings from the Hellenistic period and beyond refer to a *gerousi/a* in connection with Judea and

Rodney K. Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis*, JSOTSup 88, BLS 25 (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1990), 59-60; Knoppers, "Images of David," 451-52.

³²¹ Knoppers, "Images of David."

Jerusalem, the standard Greek term for a ruling body of a city. The root of the word is *ger-*, referring to old age (hence *ge/rwn* ‘old man’), and while *gerousi/a* is normally translated as “senate,” we could simply see it as a council of elders. Certainly by the Hasmonean period the *gerousi/a* appears to have exercised power with the high priest. As one example of this, 1 Macc 12:6 refers to a letter sent to Sparta from Jonathan the high priest “and from the *gerousi/a* of the nation and the priests and the rest of the Judean people,” and the letter sent in return from Sparta is addressed to the high priest, *gerousi/a*, the priests, and the rest of the people (14:20). And, to take another example, a letter from the Seleucid Demetrius II is addressed to the high priest and to the “elders” (*presbute/roij*) and the nation of the Judeans (1 Macc 13:36). It would seem that the “elders” made up the *gerousi/a*, and 1 Maccabees refers to the elders on a number of occasions as involved in ruling Judea: they are paired with the *a) /rxontej* “rulers” in 1:26 and with the priests in 7:33 and 11:23, where the two groups are clearly representing the people to the Seleucid Empire, and the high priest consults the elders when making important decisions in domestic and foreign affairs (11:23; 12:35). When the high priest is involved in an uprising in Jerusalem during the reign of Antiochus IV, it is the *gerousi/a* who brings charges against him to the king (2 Macc 4:43-44). In *Ant.* 12.138-144, which is a copy of a letter from Antiochus III, written after he took Coele-Syria from the Ptolemies, Antiochus writes that, upon entering Jerusalem, the Judeans met him “with their council of elders (*th~j gerousi/aj*)” in order to provision his army (12.138). The letter, however, says nothing about a high priest, and so suggests Antiochus interacted with the elders alone as a leadership group. Perhaps some of the fourth-century elders and assembly leadership were convinced by Chronicles to support the Davidic cause, but the case may be that the assembly as a whole saw no reason to alter the existing status quo in the

relationship between local and imperial governments; certainly they continued to exercise local power along with the high priest centuries after the composition of Chronicles. They perhaps did not trust that Chronicles' portrayal of the relationship between Davidides and assembly would actually come to fruition in the event of a restoration, and were concerned about their ability to place checks on Davidic power, particularly given Chronicles' restrictions on prophecy in criticizing royal actions and limiting royal power, an issue to which we now turn.

4. The good and bad deaths of Josiah: Prophecy and peace in Chronicles

1. *The problem of Josiah's death in Chronicles*

We turn now to examine one specific story from the book's narrative of Josiah, the story of his death. If this seems like some kind of excursus in our larger argument concerning Chronicles' pro-Davidic argument, it really is not. We have already examined a number of ways in which the Chronicler points to particular limitations of the power of future Davidides in order to appeal to his or her existing polity, limitations meant to appeal to the assembly, but the story of the death of Josiah is more concerned with defending royal power. Chronicles does this in a much less overt manner than that in which it provides the assembly with limitations of monarchical power, but in subtle ways it attempts to provide kings with political space to maneuver—as we saw in the previous chapter, for example, Chronicles quietly defends the right of good kings to take military revenge on their enemies—and this is the case with the story of Josiah's death. Two things in particular are at stake in this story: the role of prophecy and the concept of peace, at least insofar as the notion of peace touches on Judah's relationship with its imperial masters. As the story of Josiah's death shows, the Chronicler maintains a role for prophecy, but one limited to articulating Chronistic theology. Prophets may publicly chastise kings when they do not act in accordance with this theology—when they fail to support the cult or when they make a foreign military alliance—but when prophets are not speaking about these specific issues, and thus safeguarding the assembly privileges that Chronicles guarantees, then there is no political space for them as far as the Chronicler is concerned. They certainly do not have *carte blanche* to critique all royal actions, and the narrative of Josiah's death is one example of a story in which the Chronicler casts doubt on prophecy that is not specifically related to core ideas of Chronistic theology, and so through it readers learn to doubt prophets who do something other than

articulate the specific limits Chronicles places on Davidic power, limits the pro-Davidic party was assumedly willing to recognize in order to gain assembly support. The Chronicler, therefore, casts doubt on prophets who attempt to limit royal power in any other way, or who might otherwise censure royal activity. We shall deal with this issue in the first and second parts of the chapter, and in the third turn to what assembly readers might learn about the Chronicler's concept of peace, beyond the issues we have already discussed in that regard. As we shall see, if Chronicles nowhere urges any kind of anti-imperial revolution, it also hints in the story of Josiah's death at the hands of an imperial king that peace in its fullest sense involves freedom from empire.

But to turn first to the issue of prophecy, Chronicles' portrayal of this office is not precisely that which readers encounter in Samuel-Kings. Prophets are certainly not the thaumaturges they are in Samuel-Kings, classical prophetic behavior as seen in the Deuteronomistic History and the prophetic writings is absent in Chronicles,³²² and Chronicles exhibits no interest in prophetic groups or in relating biographical information about prophets.³²³

³²² See, e.g., Thomas Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels*, FRLANT 106 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 216-44; Jürgen Kegler, "**Prophetengestalten** im Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk und in den Chronikbüchern: Ein Beitrag zur Kompositions- und Redaktionsgeschichte der Chronikbücher," ZAW 105 (1993): 489-97; Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Historical Persons or Literary Characters: Prophets in the Book of Chronicles" in *Tradition in Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 129-39 (129-30).

³²³ So Gary N. Knoppers, "Democratizing Revelation? Prophets, Seers and Visionaries in

As is commonly noted, prophets in Chronicles function almost solely as characters of the past who can interpret events in accord with Chronistic theology.³²⁴ This is particularly true in regard to prophetic explanations of events that reflect the Chronicler's understanding of immediate retribution (e.g., 2 Chr 12:5, 7-9; 15:1-7; 21:12-15; 24:20; 25:16; 33:10-11; 34:24-25, 26-28; 36:15-21). To take simply one example, when Rehoboam and the people abandon the law, punishment follows in the form of Shishak's invasion, and God says through the prophet Shemaiah that "You abandoned me, and so I have abandoned you into the hand of Shishak" (2 Chr 12:5). Prophets also speak in order to condemn foreign alliances and to urge king and people

Chronicles" in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2010), 391-409 (399-401).

³²⁴ E.g., Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 216-44; Isaac Leo Seeligmann, "Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung (mit einem Exkurs über Jeremia)" in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977*, ed. Walther Zimmerli, VTSup 29 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), 254-84 (273); Rosemarie Micheel, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik*, BBET 18 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983), 67-71; Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, BEATAJ 9 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989), 176-79; William M. Schniedewind, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Books of Chronicles" in *The Chronicler as Historian*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 204-24 (212-13, 219-21); Yairah Amit, "The Role of Prophecy and Prophets in the Chronicler's World" in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, LHBOTS 427 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2006), 80-101 (87-88).

to trust in God to give them victory in battle, sometimes explaining that what has happened or will happen is punishment for these illegitimate alliances (2 Chr 16:7-9; 19:1-3; 20:14-17, 35-37; 25:7-9). Prophets often promote the importance of fidelity to the law and cult, sometimes in the context of explaining that failure in this leads to punishment (e.g., 2 Chr 12:1-5; 15:1-7; 21:11-15; 24:20), but sometimes simply in an attempt to urge repentance with no specific reference to punishment (e.g., 2 Chr 25:15-16; 28:9-11; 33:10; 36:15).

Yet prophecy in Chronicles does not always clearly articulate Chronistic theology or clearly explain historical events, and this is the case in the story of Josiah's death, a story that poses some notable difficulties in interpretation, as we shall see. The first part of Chronicles' narrative of Josiah, on the other hand, seems much more straightforward, and the Chronicler appears to have taken pains to simplify the story that he or she has received from Kings. In Chronicles, by the time Josiah is sixteen, in the eighth year of his reign, "and he was still a boy, he began to seek (#šwrdl) the God of David his ancestor," and by the time he is twenty, a kind of age of majority for the Chronicler,³²⁵ "he began to purify Judah and Jerusalem from the high places and the Asherim and the carved idols and the cast idols" (2 Chr 34:3), continuing at the

³²⁵ This is suggested in verses such as 1 Chr 23:24, 27; 27:23; 2 Chr 31:17; so, e.g., H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCBC (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), 398; Sara Japhet, *1 and II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1993), 1019; Steven L. McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, AOTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004), 360; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Remembering Josiah" in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*, ed. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 236-56 (242-43).

earliest practical age the reforms begun by Manasseh in 33:15-16.³²⁶ Unlike the story of Josiah in Kings, then, he begins his reforms as soon as he becomes an adult and does not spend more than half of his thirty one year reign blindly following the apostasy that he inherited from his father and grandfather (2 Kgs 22:1-3), and so the Chronicler makes it rather easier to see why Josiah deserves the high esteem in which God appears to hold him (34:26-28). Josiah even extends his cultic reform to the North (34:6-7) and, six years later, he makes Judah and Benjamin enter into a covenant with God (34:29-32), and he “turned aside all the abominations from all the lands that belong to the Israelites, and he made all who were found in Israel serve Yhwh their God; all his days they did not turn aside from following Yhwh the God of their ancestors” (34:33). The emphasis in 34:6-7, 33 on Josiah carrying out proper cultic reforms and enforcing cultic loyalty throughout the totality of Israel, and not simply in Judah and Benjamin, points to a claim that Josiah, thanks to his cultic reforms in the North, reigned there as well, the kind of reward for cultic behavior we might expect from the Chronicler and his or her doctrine of immediate retribution. In 2 Kings 22-23, Josiah enacts reforms in Judah and the North only after renovating

³²⁶ On this point, see Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 1019-20; Baruch Halpern, “Why Manasseh is Blamed for the Babylonian Exile: The Evolution of a Biblical Tradition,” *VT* 48 (1998): 473-514 (477-78); Gary Knoppers, “Saint or Sinner? Manasseh in Chronicles” in *Rewriting Biblical History: Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honor of Pancratius C. Beentjes*, ed. Jeremy Corley and Harm van Grol, DCLS 7 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 211-29 (220-24). All of the cultic apparatuses Manasseh erects in 33:3-5, 7 are removed by Josiah in 34:3-4, except for *lms*h of 33:7, which Manasseh himself removes in 33:15. Manasseh’s reform is limited to the temple and Jerusalem (33:15), and Josiah continues it elsewhere.

the temple, finding the law, and being told by Huldah that God was going to destroy Judah; by having Josiah enact his reforms before being told by a prophet that they would make no difference in regard to punishment, Chronicles avoids the unanswered question raised by the Kings passage as to why Josiah would enact reforms if they were to make no difference.³²⁷ The Chronicler's alteration of the story of Josiah's reforms from Dtr simplifies and clarifies Kings' narrative.

The same cannot be said, however, for the story of Josiah's death in Chronicles. Josiah dies at the hands of a foreign monarch in Kings, a bad death that, scholars generally argue, the Chronicler felt that he or she should explain by means of the doctrine of immediate retribution.³²⁸ As the Chronicler tells the story, Josiah advances into battle against Neco at Megiddo (2 Kgs

³²⁷ One could also argue that the Chronicler wants to portray Josiah carrying out the reforms because of his own piety, unprompted by the threats of punishment in the law; so, e.g., Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 1020; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 358-59; Blenkinsopp, "Remembering Josiah," 242-43.

³²⁸ This is certainly the consensus explanation within scholarship as to why the Chronicler composes or expands upon the story of Josiah's death at the hands of Neco. See, e.g., Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 408; Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, WBC 15 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 292; Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 1042; Zipora Talshir, "The Three Deaths of Josiah and the Strata of Biblical Historiography (2 Kings xxiii 29-30; 2 Chronicles xxxv 20-5; 1 Esdras i 23-31)," *VT* 46 (1996), 213-36 (230-31); David A. Glatt-Gilad, "The Role of Huldah's Prophecy in the Chronicler's Portrayal of Josiah's Reform," *Bib* 77 (1996), 16-31 (24); João Paulo Thomaz de Aquino, "Por que Josias Morreu?" *FidRef* 16 (2011): 91-105 (99-101).

23:29 refers only to a meeting between the two, not a battle),³²⁹ and refuses to withdraw his forces, despite Neco's claim, a claim not found in Dtr, that he is moving his own army at God's command and that Josiah's opposition will lead to divine punishment of the Judean (35:22). The narrative confirms that the Egyptian's words are "from the mouth of God" (35:22). The Chronicler, however, has created a story in which Josiah's failure to listen to Neco's prophecy is quite understandable, for how is Josiah to know that Neco, a foreigner, speaks for Yhwh rather than an Egyptian god? Neco simply refers to "the God who is with me," never claiming that his message comes from "Yhwh" or "the God of Israel."³³⁰ If the Chronicler merely wanted to provide a story that explained Josiah's death by means of the doctrine of immediate retribution—

³²⁹ 2 Kgs 23:29 says that Josiah *wt) rql...Klyw* "went to meet him [Neco]" at Megiddo; 2 Chr 35:20 says that Josiah *wt) rql) cyw*. The former wording merely suggests a meeting, but the latter implies a military action. See the analysis in Talshir, "The Three Deaths of Josiah," 215-17 and Blenkinsopp, "Remembering Josiah," 244 n. 28. It is possible that the Chronicler believed Dtr was describing a battle, but even in this case the alteration in wording makes the point clearer.

³³⁰ For others who see this as a problem with which Josiah is confronted, see Talshir, "The Three Deaths of Josiah," 232; Christine Mitchell, "The Ironic Death of Josiah in 2 Chronicles," *CBQ* 68 (2006): 421-35 (426); Kenneth A. Ristau, "Reading and Rereading Josiah: The Chronicler's Representation of Josiah for the Postexilic Community" in *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 219-47 (233-34); Ralph W. Klein, 2 *Chronicles: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 526; Blenkinsopp, "Remembering Josiah," 246.

he deliberately disobeyed a prophetic word and was punished with death as a result—why provide a story in which Josiah disobeys an oracle that is so vague that it would seem that any good Yahwist might doubt it? The story is certainly more complicated than it needs to be for such a purpose, and unlike the story of Josiah’s reforms it can hardly be said to simplify Dtr’s version of events. If the Chronicler only wished to create an explanation for Josiah’s bad death that would unambiguously portray it as a punishment that aligns with the doctrine of immediate retribution, why not have him disobey an unambiguously Yahwistic oracle from a Judean prophet, or at the very least have Neco be clear as to which God he is speaking for? Moreover, the prophetess Huldah had earlier prophesied that Josiah’s death would be a good death, a death “in peace” that is a reward for his humility (34:26-28). If Josiah’s death is supposed to be a good death, a reward, then why did the Chronicler not simply eliminate the narrative of Josiah’s death at the hands of Neco altogether? Or why not make Josiah unambiguously wicked, and eliminate the part of the oracle that Huldah addresses to Josiah?

Nor is this the end of the potential problems of interpretation that this story poses, for the story of Josiah’s death sounds very much like the Chronicler’s version of the death of Ahab in 2 Chronicles 18. Ahab and Josiah both receive prophetic warnings about participation in an upcoming battle (2 Chr 18:18-22; 35:21), and both warnings appear in a context that makes it very difficult for the kings to determine their validity, as we shall discuss below. In both cases the king goes into battle, but, because of the ambiguous prophetic message, hedges his bets by disguising (#&pxth) himself (18:29; 35:22), the only places in Chronicles where this verb is used.³³¹ In both cases, the king is wounded by an archer (18:33) or archers (35:23), and tells his

³³¹ Steve Delmarter, “The Death of Josiah in Scripture and Tradition: Wrestling with the Problem of Evil?,” *VT* 54 (2004): 29-60 (35 n. 10).

servants to remove him from the field “because I am (badly) wounded (yṭyḷxh)” (18:33; 35:23), the only places in Chronicles where ḥḷx appears in the hophal.³³² These stories appear so similar that the Chronicler appears to be urging readers to compare them. Yet why does the Chronicler have Josiah die just like Ahab when Josiah’s cultic actions are impeccable—even more so than in Dtr, where the author does not attempt to excuse the fact that Josiah spends one-half of his reign as an apostate—and Ahab is said to be “wicked” and among “the haters of Yhwh” (2 Chr 19:2), notable in Chronicles for founding a house that causes its subjects to commit apostasy (21:13; 22:4)? Moreover, despite the fact that Ahab’s and Josiah’s deaths are virtually identical, Ahab is specifically said not to return from battle “in peace” (18:26, 27), yet Huldah claims that Josiah’s death will take place “in peace” (34:28). Why are two such similar deaths described in such opposite fashions?³³³

The Chronicler’s alterations to the story of Josiah’s death from Kings do not appear to have the goal of simplifying Dtr’s account since, as we have seen, there were obvious narrative paths available that would arrive at such a goal, paths that the Chronicler did not choose. We should ask, then, what particular goals might have motivated the Chronicler to create this particular story. In regard to Josiah’s bad death, the most obvious thing to note is that it involves prophecy and a powerful foreign monarch. As we shall see, one of the ways Josiah’s death in Chronicles parallels Ahab’s is in the problem that both kings face in determining the true

³³² Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 1042-43.

³³³ Other commentators acknowledge that this aspect of the story is difficult to explain, and offer various solutions, which we will discuss below. See Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 1033; Halpern, “Why Manasseh is Blamed,” 502-504; Mitchell, “The Ironic Death,” 422-23; Ristau, “Reading and Rereading Josiah,” 236; Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 505.

prophetic word, and this reflects Chronicles' insistence that while past prophecy has been helpful for explaining how God controls history in response to human actions, especially royal ones, the contemporary prophecy of readers' time is of rather less value. The ambiguous role of prophecy in Josiah's death is one example of the Chronicler attempting to largely confine prophecy to the past. It is not an institution that readers should rely on for current guidance, unless it operates to enunciate Chronistic principles. The story of Josiah's death demonstrates that readers cannot trust prophecy they hear unless it is promoting precisely such principles, principles that are meant, as we have seen, to limit royal power only in very specific ways. Should assembly members hear prophets criticizing kings in any other way, however, they simply should not listen.

Huldah says that Josiah's death is supposed to be a good death, a death "in peace" as a reward for his humility. The parallel between Josiah's and Ahab's deaths is pertinent here, since the story of Ahab is the last place where the word *Mwl # \$* appears before Huldah's oracle (2 Chr 18:16, 26, 27; 19:1). In the story of 2 Chronicles 18, where Jehoshaphat makes a foreign military alliance with Ahab and the two kings fight as allies, the word obviously refers to escape from battle; Ahab does not return in peace, since God has determined to kill him (18:26, 27), but Jehoshaphat does (19:1), since God saves him as a reward for his care of the cult. As Huldah uses the word in the context of Josiah's narrative, it applies both to his personal situation—"you will die in peace"—and to the end of the collective peace of Judah and Jerusalem—"your eyes will not see all the evil I am bringing upon this place and upon its inhabitants" (34:28). Josiah's death, that is, marks the end of *Mwl # \$* in Chronicles' narrative: all the following kings experience exile or destruction, and the people soon do, as well. The story of Josiah's death, then, tells us that his death in peace is death at the end of the period in which Judah lives free

from imperial rule, which begins as soon as he dies. So if peace, the desired state for Judah, is something that exists outside of colonial rule, then Chronicles is subtly hinting that more may be in store for Judah's future than simply the restoration of a client monarchy. God truly desires Judah and Jerusalem to live in peace, but the Chronicler hints here that peace is more than just an absence of war and divine defense of Judah, but freedom from imperial control as well.

2. Josiah's bad death and prophecy in Chronicles

As we have already seen, the fact that the Chronicler creates similar death narratives for Ahab and Josiah appears to create interpretive difficulties. The Chronicler has, of course, taken the story of Ahab's death from 1 Kings 22, and reproduced it with few alterations. In both 2 Chronicles 18 and 1 Kings 22, Ahab inquires of Yhwh as to whether or not to go into battle, and his 400 prophets tell him he will be victorious. When Jehoshaphat urges further prophetic inquiry, Ahab summons Micaiah, even though, he says, Micaiah only prophesies evil for him. The king's servant who fetches the prophet tells him to speak in agreement with the other prophets; Micaiah tells him that he will only repeat God's word, and upon arrival parrots the message of the 400 prophets. When Ahab then commands him to speak "only the truth in the name of Yhwh," Micaiah provides him with a message of his coming defeat in battle, explaining that God has lied to the other prophets in order to lure him to his death. Some scholars see the minor changes in Chronicles as enough to significantly alter its meaning in comparison with the story of 1 Kings 22. Particularly because Chronicles' story concludes in 19:1-3, after Jehoshaphat returns home "in peace" from the battle and is met with a prophetic condemnation of alliances with "haters of Yhwh," they argue that the story of Ahab's death is really not about the problem of false prophecy or the failure of a prophetic word but about the folly of Davidic

kings making military alliances.³³⁴ While 2 Chr 19:1-3 does indeed condemn Jehoshaphat's alliance with someone who is "wicked" and one of "the haters of Yhwh," the Chronicler would hardly need to retell all of the story of 1 Kings 22 in order to make this point. We have already seen that the Chronicler uses narratives of prophets to condemn military alliances in many other stories. The full Deuteronomistic story of Ahab—the longest story by far in Chronicles in which a Northern king is a central figure—and his 400 prophets and Micaiah is obviously important for the Chronicler.

There are a number of aspects of this story that undermine trust in prophecy. God can apparently lie to prophets, prophets can be urged to lie by royal officials, prophets can lie to conceal God's lie, and listeners can be left with two conflicting prophetic messages and no clear way to decide between them. Ahab's command to Micaiah to speak only the truth suggests that he believes the prophet is in the habit of lying.³³⁵ These were not problems unique to Israelite

³³⁴ So, e.g., William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period*, JSOTSup 197 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 96-97, 138-43; Mark A. Throntveit, "The Chronicler's Speeches and Historical Reconstruction" in *The Chronicler as Historian*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 225-45 (236). The claim is made that the story in Chronicles is really not concerned with the problem of false prophecy at all—so, e.g., Amit, "The Role of Prophecy," 86—and as Knoppers, "Democratizing Revelation?," 399 puts it, there is virtually no criticism of prophecy at all in Chronicles.

³³⁵ So J.J.M. Roberts, "Does God Lie? Divine Deceit as a Theological Problem in Israelite Prophetic Literature" in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Collected Essays*

prophecy in the ancient Near East, where it was understood that the gods can lie to prophets and diviners,³³⁶ that pressure could be exerted on such figures to produce a message to the liking of the king,³³⁷ and that prophets or diviners might lie of their own accords. For example, in one case a diviner writes to Esarhaddon to tell the king he was forced to perform divination in regard to the question of whether someone else would become king, and says he deliberately gave a false answer (SAA 10:179).³³⁸ In another case, a Neo-Assyrian diviner responds to a royal letter, and the diviner quotes from the king's earlier correspondence: "[Why] have you never told me [the truth? When] will you tell me [all] that there is to it?" (SAA 10:8.5-8). The diviner's response to the king's concern that he has lied or concealed part of the truth is really much like Micaiah's when he is confronted by a royal suspicion he is lying: he cites his sources.³³⁹ He says his

(Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 123-31 (126-28).

³³⁶ Roberts, "Does God Lie?" discusses this in the context of his reading of the story of Ahab's death. As he points out, Ezek 14:7-10 also refers to God lying to prophets (130-31), and Jer 4:10 makes the same claim.

³³⁷ Roberts, "Does God Lie?," 127-28 refers to a letter from Shibtu, the wife of Zimri-Lim, the king of Mari, concerning two prophets who have prophesied victory in battle. In this letter (Roberts 11), note particularly ll. 35-39, where Shibtu assures Zimri-Lim that she has not coerced the prophets to give a favorable message, an assurance that points to a belief that this could happen.

³³⁸ See the discussion of the text in Martti Nissinen, *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources*, SAAS 7 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1998), 133-35.

³³⁹ For a discussion of the letter, see Cynthia Jean, "Divination and Oracles at the Neo-Assyrian Palace: The Importance of Signs in Royal Ideology" in *Divination and Interpretation of*

interpretation of astrological signs is based on a series of authoritative sources;³⁴⁰ Micaiah, who is a prophet rather than a diviner,³⁴¹ can only appeal to his vision of the divine assembly (2 Chr 18:18-22). If Micaiah is supposed to lie in order to keep God's lie through the 400 prophets, then at this point either he (or God) seems incompetent for revealing the lie (or allowing it to be revealed),³⁴² adding to the problematic presentation of prophecy in 2 Chronicles 18, but perhaps

Signs in the Ancient World, ed. Amar Annus, OIS 6 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2010), 267-75 (268-69).

³⁴⁰ His interpretations come "from the oral traditions of the masters" (SAA 10:8.rev2), "the series" (rev14-15), a reference to the authoritative divination series *Enūma Anu Enlil*, and a "non-canonical" (*ahiu*) source (rev8-9).

³⁴¹ Martti Nissinen, "Prophecy and Omen Divination: Two Sides of the Same Coin" in *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*, ed. Amar Annus, OIS 6 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2010), 341-51 (343) explains that diviners followed a system involving the organization of phenomena, empirical methods, and a collection of writings that contain this information, a "science," rather different than the divine communication that takes place through prophets.

³⁴² K.L. Noll, "Presumptuous Prophets Participating in a Deuteronomic Debate" in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Ancient Israelite Historiography*, ed. Mark. J. Boda and Lissa M. Wray Beal (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 125-42 (139-40) says Ahab would have to believe God was incompetent in order to believe the content of Micaiah's vision, since he has allowed Micaiah to eavesdrop on his decision to kill the king and then reveal the divine subterfuge. On the other hand, Ahab might simply decide Micaiah is incompetent because he has failed to keep God's deception a secret.

the case was that a challenge to a prophet's truthfulness demanded a discussion of the revelation, just as was the case when the legitimacy of a message brought by a diviner was called into question.

A story that so obviously undermines trust in prophecy does not, at first glance, fit easily into what seems like Chronicles' positive presentation of the office. Some have attempted to identify a hierarchy or distinction of roles based on different prophetic titles in Chronicles—*h'lyh*, *h'lyh*, *h'lyh*, *h'lyh*, *h'lyh*, and even prophetic figures given no classical title by the narrative³⁴³—but the generally positive portrayal of prophets who explain historical events according to principles of Chronistic theology does not appear to be affected by these distinctions.³⁴⁴ 2 Chronicles 18, however, obviously complicates this generally positive view, and it is not the sole exception that proves the rule. In the case of the oracle that leads to his Ahab-like death, Josiah is presented with an Ahab-like prophetic dilemma: could a foreign king truly function as Yhwh's mouthpiece, especially as that king gives no indication that he speaks

³⁴³ See, e.g., Micheel, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen*, 71-82; Kegler, "Prophetengestalten"; Schniedewind, "Prophets and Prophecy," 219-21; Raymond Kuntzmann, "La fonction prophétique en 1-2 Chroniques: Du ministère de la Parole au service de l'institution communautaire" in *Ich bewirke das Heil und erschaffe das Unheil (Jesaja 45,7): Studien zur Botschaft der Propheten*, ed. Friedrich Diedrich and Bernd Willmes, FB 88 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1998), 245-58; Amit, "The Role of Prophecy," 85-86.

³⁴⁴ See Gary N. Knoppers, "'To him you must listen': The Prophetic Legislation in Deuteronomy and the Reformation of the Classical Tradition in Chronicles" in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*, ed. Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 161-94 (173-74).

for the God of Israel, and especially as there is no precedent for this in history (as, at least, Chronicles presents it)? It is no wonder that Sara Japhet believes that Neco is understood to be speaking for an Egyptian god,³⁴⁵ and so we see that Josiah is ultimately in the same position as Ahab is, uncertain if a given prophet truly speaks for Yhwh or not. As a result, he acts precisely as Ahab does, and suffers the same fate. One could argue that Ahab is described as one who hates God and who causes his people to commit apostasy, and so that the divine lie to his prophets is justified for the Chronicler by the punishment God wishes to accomplish, but the same argument could not be made for Josiah, who has enforced positive cultic reforms throughout Judah and the North, and been rewarded with rule over all of Israel. The fact that the Chronicler composes a story of his death that sounds just like Ahab's tells readers that even the very righteous can be confronted with the dilemma of ambiguous prophecy that can have life or death outcomes.³⁴⁶

So the fact that Josiah faces the same problem Ahab does in regard to prophecy leads us to a larger point that Chronicles makes about the institution: prophecy clearly works and is

³⁴⁵ Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 51-52.

³⁴⁶ Perhaps careful fourth-century assembly readers of Chronicles might conclude that, when a king is facing an ambiguous prophetic message or multiple messages about going into battle, he should simply not go, since that would have saved both Ahab and Josiah. This interpretation certainly corresponds nicely to the Chronicler's limitations on royal warfare, limitations that would protect the assembly, as we discussed in the previous chapter. Such an interpretation of these two stories, however, does not exclude the conclusion that prophetic messages, outside of ones dealing with important Chronic principles, can be ambiguous and incorrect.

fulfilled in history when it broadcasts messages in accord with Chronistic theology—that is, when it deals with immediate retribution, criticizes foreign military alliances, and urges fidelity to the cult—and so safeguards the rights of the assembly and the Levites that the Chronicler is trying to safeguard. But this means in turn that readers really do not need prophets in order to make sense of events or to determine how God will respond to the actions of the people and any future king, since the Book of Chronicles interprets history as the prophets did. Chronicles obviates prophecy, and for the Chronicler any prophet who might interpret events in a manner that contradicts the important theological principles of the book would simply be a false prophet. What the Chronicler points to in the stories of the deaths of Ahab and Josiah is that, when prophets address some matter that does not clearly support or contradict Chronistic theology, readers have no way to tell whether or not such prophecy will come true. The Chronicler hardly argues that prophecy should not exist, but simply limits what sort of trust readers—who are ideally future subjects of a Davidide—should place in the prophetic messages they encounter. The stories of Ahab and Josiah certainly suggest that there really is no point for a future king to seek prophetic oracles before going out to battle, no matter how widespread such a practice might have been in the past in Judah and the ancient Near East.³⁴⁷ In Chronicles' presentation of

³⁴⁷ See William L. Kelly, "Prophets, Kings and Honour in the Narrative of 1 Kings 22" in *Prophecy and Prophets in Stories*, ed. Bob Becking and Hans M. Barstad, OTS 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 64-75 (68-69). In one prophetic text from Mari, for example, Adad tells Zimri-Lim that he is not to go out on campaign without an oracle (Roberts 1.12'-17'), and the king appears to have received many prophecies in regard to his military ventures (e.g., Roberts 5.8-10, 32-40; 11; 14.8-18; 25.8-14). The collections of oracles for Esarhaddon contain many examples of oracles of victory the king received (e.g., SAA 9:1.i.18-23, 30-35; 2.i.10-12, 22-23; 2.ii.1-10; 5.3-rev5),

history, prophets would be superfluous in this regard, since history has proven God will win battles for kings who properly support the cult, fight defensively, and do not make foreign alliances. Prophets can critique royal actions should kings attempt to make foreign alliances or violate cultic norms, and in this way prophecy can continue to exist in order to protect the assembly's rights under future Davidic rule. It is important, then, that the Chronicler has David and the army arrange the prophetic office among the Levitical musicians (1 Chr 25:1), for the Levites themselves can speak for God from the temple when the king oversteps Chronistically imposed limits. But Chronicles also insulates future Davidides from prophetic critiques that have nothing to do with the rights of the assembly and the cult that the work safeguards. Readers would simply not know whether or not to trust such a prophetic word.³⁴⁸

and the same is true of the oracles directed to Ashurbanipal (SAA 9:7.14-rev5; 8.8-rev2). Sennacherib, to take another Neo-Assyrian example, frequently refers to having received encouragement from the gods as he launched various campaigns (e.g., RINAP 3:15.iv.15-16; 16.iii.6-7, iv.38-39; 17.i.78, iii.82), which suggests that he received divine communication through prophets or diviners in regard to them. The Zakkur Inscription (*KAI 202*), a late-ninth- or early-eighth-century Aramaic inscription, tells us that this also occurred in the West (see particularly 202.11-17).

³⁴⁸ William Schniedewind, "History or Homily: Toward Understanding the Chronicler's Purpose" in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Congress of Jewish Studies: Division A*, ed. David Assaf (Jerusalem: The World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994), 91-97 (95-97) makes a good point when he writes that the Chronicler understood him or herself to be speaking like an inspired prophet, but perhaps a better way to express the idea is that the Chronicler understood this writing to be replacing the prophets as interpreters of history.

And if prophecy exists in Chronicles simply to articulate Chronistic theology by providing specific kinds of explanatory links between historical events, then it is no wonder that we find non-prophetic figures doing just that and so speaking like prophets. The Judean king Abijah addresses Jeroboam and the North in 2 Chr 13:4-12 as they are invading Judah, telling them that God fights for Judah because of their cultic loyalty, and that those who follow a heterodox cult such as that imposed by the Northern leadership cannot hope to prevail against Judah no matter the size of their army, and this speech functions to explain Judah's victory in 13:13-19. It is a message that could have come directly from the mouth of a Chronistic prophet, as could Hezekiah's statement in 2 Chr 29:9-11 that Ahaz's cultic disloyalty has resulted in divine punishment, or his letter to the Northerners in 30:6-9 that says God had Assyria destroy the North because of their cultic unfaithfulness, or his words to Judah in 32:7-8 that proclaim that God is utterly responsible for victory. In cases like these, royal and prophetic addresses are similar in both form and content,³⁴⁹ and these good kings do not need prophets to make such claims about events, since as good kings they are aware of what actions lead to divine reward and punishment. Good Davidides of the future, the kind the Chronicler tries to assure assembly readers that they will have, will not need prophets either, although the Chronicler retains the office in order to safeguard the assembly's interests. David is even described with the prophetic title "man of God" (2 Chr 8:14), just as Moses is (1 Chr 23:14),³⁵⁰ and he receives a written

³⁴⁹ See the discussion in Christopher T. Begg, "The Classical Prophets in the Chronistic History," *BZ* 32 (1988): 100-107 (102); Rex Mason, *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 137-44; Amit, "The Role of Prophecy," 89.

³⁵⁰ See, e.g., P. Abadie, "Le fonctionnement symbolique de la figure de David dans

blueprint of the temple directly from God. Solomon communicates directly with God (2 Chr 1:7-13; 7:1, 11-12), not in dreams as in the parallel Deuteronomistic passages (1 Kgs 3:5, 15; 9:2), and Isaiah is almost entirely removed from Chronicles' narrative of Hezekiah, allowing the king to take the lead in communicating with God and providing reassurance that God would protect Jerusalem (2 Chr 32:7-8, and cf. 2 Kgs 19:20-34).³⁵¹ So in his analysis of speech in Chronicles, Mark Throntveit points out that, among the Judean kings, only good ones are given speeches, and only during the good parts of their reigns.³⁵² It is just at such points when they can take the roles of prophets, for good kings are aware of the things that they, the people, and the temple personnel should and should not do.

l'œuvre du Chroniste," *Transeu* 7 (1994): 143-51 (147-48) and Ehud Ben Zvi, "Chronicles and its Reshaping of Memories of Monarchic Period Prophets: Some Observations" in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Ancient Israelite Historiography*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Lissa M. Wray Beal (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 167-88 (182-83 n. 34).

³⁵¹ For further analysis of these ideas, see, e.g., James D. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler's Purposes," *JBL* 94 (1975): 201-17 (203-204); Baruch Halpern, "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure—Indications of an Earlier Source" in *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text*, ed. Richard Elliott Friedman, UCPNES 22 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981), 35-54 (38); Amit, "The Role of Prophecy," 97-99.

³⁵² Throntveit, *The Chronicler's Speeches*, 229 and Mark A. Throntveit, "The Idealization of Solomon as the Glorification of God in the Chronicler's Speeches and Royal Prayers" in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. Lowell K. Handy, SHCANE 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 411-27 (418).

Chronicles' limiting of prophecy to that in accord with its theology is complemented by its attribution of source material to prophetic writings such as those of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad, which apparently contain records of all of David's works (1 Chr 29:29-30), or those of Ahijah and Iddo that, along with the writing the Chronicler attributes to Nathan, contain records of all of Solomon's works (2 Chr 9:29). In referring to these and other prophetic writings of which we have no other record (see also 2 Chr 12:15; 13:22; 20:34; 26:22; 32:32; 33:19), the Chronicler suggests that prophecy is helpful for an interpretation of the past, but for little else. It may be that Chronicles was written at a time when classical prophecy was in decline or disappearing,³⁵³ and certainly at the time when the Chronicler was writing the prophetic corpus was in the process of formation, an act that preserved the authority of that past prophetic word but also potentially limited its relevance to the past.³⁵⁴ Chronicles does draw material from the writings of the Latter

³⁵³ For discussions of the issue, see Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 137-44; Schniedewind, "Prophets and Prophecy," 205-10; Knoppers, "Democratizing Revelation?," 404-405; Louis Jonker, "The Chronicler and the Prophets: Who were his Authoritative Sources?," *SJOT* 22 (2008): 275-95 (289-90).

³⁵⁴ See, e.g., Joseph Blenkinsopp, "'We pay no heed to heavenly voices': The 'End of Prophecy' and the Formation of the Canon" in *Biblical and Humane: A Festschrift for John F. Priest*, ed. Linda Bennett Elder, David L. Barr, and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 19-31 (24-30); Erhard S. Gerstenberger, "Prophetie in den Chronikbüchern: Jahwes Wort in zweierlei Gestalt?" in *Schriftprophetie: Festschrift für Jörg Jeremias zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Friedhelm Hartenstein, Jutta Krispenz and Aaron Scharf (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 351-67 (366-67); Diana Edelman, "From Prophets to Prophetic Books: The Fixing of the Divine Word" in *The Production of Prophecy:*

Prophets—to choose just one example, the prophet Amaziah’s speech in 2 Chr 15:2-7 contains an amalgam of material from Hos 3:4; Amos 3:9; Zeph 3:16; and Zech 8:9-10³⁵⁵—but, except for Isaiah (2 Chr 32:20) and Jeremiah (35:25; 36:12, 21), they are absent as characters from the narrative. Just as the use of prophetic figures to articulate the Chronicler’s theology obviates such figures in his or her readers’ present, the general failure to introduce the latter prophets as characters into the narrative, and the failure to quote references from their works except as unattributed snippets such as those in 2 Chr 15:2-7, point to a writer who was very concerned that these writings only be understood and used on the Chronicler’s very limited terms. The case could be made that by referring to existing prophetic writings in a passage like 2 Chr 15:2-7 the Chronicler is presenting past prophecies as applicable to readers’ present,³⁵⁶ but that is true only insofar as such writings are exegetically controlled by the Chronicler. While the Chronicler mentions Isaiah and Jeremiah, he or she gives no indication that they were responsible for any

Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud, ed. Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2009), 29-54 (29); Nissinen, “Prophecy and Omen Divination,” 344-45.

³⁵⁵ See Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 49-51; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 49-51; Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition*, 112-15; Beentjes, “Historical Persons,” 137-39; Ehud Ben Zvi, “One Size Does Not Fit All: Observations on the Different Ways that Chronicles Dealt with the Authoritative Literature of its Time’ in *What was Authoritative for the Chronicler?*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 13-35 (32-33).

³⁵⁶ So Ben Zvi, “Chronicles and its Reshaping,” 185.

writings,³⁵⁷ and the only prophetic writings that the Chronicler actually names—the ones by Samuel, Nathan, Gad, and so on—are not ones that, so far as we know, actually existed. Tangential references to such works as containing deeds of kings paradoxically render these writings unimportant, since, had they contained any other information of note, surely, the Chronicler suggests, he or she would have included such information in Chronicles, and so readers have no need to actually read any prophetic works. Certainly the Chronicler does not advise readers to consult any prophetic book, existing or otherwise; allusions to prophetic writings, whether or not they truly existed, simply suggest to readers that they are not terribly important. Everything readers need to know about the Davidic kings and how history functions has already been recorded in Chronicles.

Chronicles limits prophecy in such a way that prophecy can still continue as an institution that safeguards the rights of the assembly, rights that Chronicles itself establishes, and this portrayal of the institution minimizes future prophetic attacks on royalty. Readers do not see prophets anoint kings, for example, suggesting they have no voice in royal succession, unlike the assembly. The Chronicler also protects the temple personnel from prophetic attacks, for readers never see prophets criticize priests or Levites, even though the narrator sometimes does (e.g., 2 Chr 24:5; 30:3, 15).³⁵⁸ As Louis Jonker points out, it is mainly temple personnel rather than

³⁵⁷ There are, however, unattributed references in Chronicles to the books associated with these prophets; see Amber K. Warhurst, “The Chronicler’s Use of the Prophets” in *What was Authoritative for the Chronicler?*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 165-81.

³⁵⁸ See Knoppers, “To him you must listen,” 189-90.

prophets who speak in the narrative about cultic reforms and transgressions,³⁵⁹ and if Chronicles limits the criticism prophets can direct toward kings, it does the same for the priests and Levites. And, in fact, since Chronicles presents David and the army as lodging the office of prophecy within the Levitical musicians (1 Chr 25:1), prophecy of this sort resides in the cult overseen by the Davidide and the assembly.³⁶⁰ So, in the amount of power Chronicles does give prophecy in terms of critiquing a monarchy, the Chronicler is not only protecting the political interests of the assembly under a monarchy, but even giving a Levitical group the right to exercise that power. And it is worthwhile keeping in mind that prophets often have positive things to say about kings in the narrative; in fact, the first three prophetic utterances of the book are pro-Davidic (1 Chr 11:3; 12:19 [18]; 17:3-15), establishing David as king and announcing an eternal covenant with his house, and providing readers with one other acceptable kind of prophetic message, since Davidic rule is the central aspect of Chronistic theology.

³⁵⁹ Louis Jonker, “Who Constitutes Society? Yehud’s Self-understanding in the Late Persian Era as Reflected in the Books of Chronicles,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 703-24 (712).

³⁶⁰ As we saw in the previous chapter, the assembly and the king are jointly responsible for the army. Chronicles really provides no information as to how the Levitical musicians would actually function as prophets. See von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild*, 114-15; Kurt Galling, *Die Bücher Chronik, Esra, Nehemia*, ATD 12 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), 73; John W. Kleinig, *The LORD’s Song: The Basics, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles*, JSOTSup 156 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 148-57; Knoppers, ““To him you must listen,”” 188-89; Jonathan Stökl, *Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: A Philological and Sociological Comparison*, CHANE 56 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 211-15.

3. Josiah's good death and peace in Chronicles

If Josiah's death is bad, the result of a failure to heed an ambiguous prophetic word, it is also good, since Huldah says that Josiah's humility and mourning in reaction to hearing the law has won him the reward of being "gathered to your grave in peace," and so avoiding "all the evil that I am bringing upon this place and its inhabitants" (2 Chr 34:28). Yet given how similar Josiah's end is to Ahab's, who is said not to return from battle "in peace" (18:26, 27), how can Huldah prophesy that Josiah will die מַלְכָּא בְּשָׁלוֹם? Perhaps her prophecy is simply wrong,³⁶¹ or perhaps Josiah's failure to listen to Neco means that her prophecy goes unfulfilled.³⁶² Perhaps her prophecy is fulfilled ironically, since Josiah, unlike Ahab, dies in מַלְכָּא בְּשָׁלוֹם, "the foundation of מַלְכָּא בְּשָׁלוֹם."³⁶³

On the other hand, perhaps the real difficulty in solving this problem lies in determining just what different things the Chronicler might mean when referring to peace. As we discussed in the previous chapter, peace, rest, and quiet are the intended state of Israel and Judah in Chronicles, and are associated with the temple since, when the Davidides properly care for the cult, God gives rest to Judah, defeating any invaders who appear. The time of peace only truly begins with Solomon; it is David's offensive wars that disqualify him from temple-building, and the establishment of the temple is only possible once God has given rest (שָׁלוֹם) to Israel (1 Chr 23:25), the peace and quiet of Solomon's days (22:9). When God gives rest, the time of David's

³⁶¹ So Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 1033.

³⁶² So Glatt-Gilad, "The Role of Huldah's Prophecy," 23-25 and Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 505.

³⁶³ So Mitchell, "The Ironic Death of Josiah," 422-23 and Ristau, "Reading and Rereading Josiah," 236.

warfare is over and enemies do not threaten the people (1 Chr 22:18). Peace and rest continue when king and people attend the cult and rely on God rather than foreign alliances to save them (2 Chr 14:5-6 [6-7]; 15:15; 20:30), something also described as $\text{+q}\#\text{\$}$ “quiet” (2 Chr 13:23 [14:1]; 20:30). The concepts of rest and quiet largely appear to be synonymous with peace in Chronicles, and so we see the nouns $\text{h}\times\text{w}\text{n}\text{m}$ and $\text{+q}\#\text{\$}$ appear as synonyms for $\text{M}\text{w}\text{l}\#\text{\$}$ in 1 Chr 22:9. After David’s repeated insistence that God wants the temple built in a time of $\text{M}\text{w}\text{l}\#\text{\$}$, we do not encounter the word again until Azariah, referring to some vague period in Israel’s past, says there was a lack of peace when there was neither priest nor law in Israel (2 Chr 15:3-5), and 15:6 makes it clear that this was a time of debilitating warfare. The word next appears in the story of Ahab’s death where it is used four times, all in the sense of victory, or at least escape from death, in battle (2 Chr 18:16, 26, 27; 19:1). Ahab believes he will achieve this (18:26), but Micaiah does not (18:27), and God only permits Jehoshaphat to escape “in peace” because of his earlier cultic reforms (19:1-3).

The readers of Chronicles who notice the obvious parallels between the stories of the deaths of Ahab and Jehoshaphat might also recognize that, despite the fact that Josiah dies of arrow wounds after the battle just as Ahab does, he is, according to Huldah’s oracle, still said to end up in a state of peace like Jehoshaphat. So if we are to believe that Huldah’s prophecy is fulfilled, then the parallel between the death stories of Ahab and Josiah breaks down in the evaluation of their deaths. What makes Josiah’s death one “in peace,” a reward for his humility and mourning upon hearing of God’s future punishment of Jerusalem and its inhabitants, is the fact that he will die without witnessing that punishment (2 Chr 34:28). Dying “in peace” in Josiah’s case clearly has nothing to do with victory in or escape from battle, it has to do with

dying before God brings “evil” upon Jerusalem.³⁶⁴ Readers will not be entirely clear how his death fulfills Huldah’s prophecy until they read the stories of the final four kings of Judah, the first three of whom are taken into exile by their imperial overlords and the last of whom is a victim of the Babylonian destruction of the city. One could say that the exile begins immediately following Josiah’s reign,³⁶⁵ but since no one but Judean royalty is said to be exiled until 36:20, it is perhaps more precise to say that Judah’s independence ends with Josiah’s death. The stories of the final four kings in 2 Chr 35:20-36:21 reveal another sense of the meaning of “peace” in Chronicles: a divinely granted period of self-rule in the land, free from imperial control.³⁶⁶ Foreign control of Judah begins immediately after Josiah’s death, as an imperial suzerain appears

³⁶⁴ God tells Josiah through Huldah that he will not witness “the evil that I am bringing upon this place.” Since the Chronicler goes out of his or her way in 34:22 to mention that Huldah lives in Jerusalem and that the king’s officials go to her house to receive the oracle, the city would be appear to be the obvious referent of “this place.”

³⁶⁵ So William Johnstone, “The Use of Leviticus in Chronicles” in *Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas*, ed. John F.A. Sawyer, JSOTSup 227 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 243-55 (252-54). Christopher T. Begg, “The Fate of Judah’s Last Four Kings in the Book of Chronicles,” *OLP* 18 (1987): 79-85 (81-82) argues, though, that since the ultimate fates of these kings are not revealed—we are not told whether or not they are killed—the Davidides’ future is left open.

³⁶⁶ Baruch Halpern, “Why Manasseh is Blamed,” 502-504 writes that Josiah can be said to die in peace because he is in a state of peace with Neco. This is really not the case in 2 Chr 35:20-23, however, where Josiah goes into battle against the Egyptian king, although it is an explanation that fits Josiah’s death in 2 Kgs 23:29, where there is no battle.

in each of the short narratives of the four kings who follow Josiah. Neco removes Josiah's successor Jehoahaz after only three months in power (2 Chr 36:3), takes him to Egypt, and replaces him as client monarch with his brother Jehoiakim (36:4). Jehoiakim is exiled by Nebuchadnezzar (36:6), as is his successor Jehoiachin (36:10), and Zedekiah rebels against Nebuchadnezzar (36:13), who destroys Jerusalem. Josiah dies "in peace" because he dies immediately before the imperial rule of Judah begins.

In order to reinforce the point that Josiah does die in peace, and that peace involves Judean self-rule under the Davidides without colonial control, Josiah's immediate successor, Jehoahaz, is the only Davidide in Chronicles who receives no evaluation from the narrator.³⁶⁷ No actions, outside of becoming king, are even attributed to him, and yet "the king of Egypt turned

³⁶⁷ The LXX actually does supply him with an evaluation, and some see this as the original text; see, e.g., Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 1063; Halpern, "Why Manasseh is Blamed," 475 n. 4; David Glatt-Gilad, "Regnal Formulae as a Historiographic Device in the Book of Chronicles," *RB* 108 (2001): 184-209 (192). Like other parts of LXX 2 Chr 36:1-4, however, this material has been added to the original text from 2 Kgs 23:31-35. The addition of an evaluation for Jehoahaz in particular provides an explanation for his exile and brings Jehoahaz's narrative in Chronicles into conformity with that of the final three kings and with the text of 2 Kings. In the same way, LXX 2 Chr 35:19 adds material from 2 Kgs 23:24-27 in order to blame the exile on Manasseh, and so bring Chronicles into conformity with Kings, and LXX 2 Chr 35:20 adds that Neco is moving "against the king of the Assyrians," thereby making Neco's intentions correspond to those of 2 Kgs 23:29. So MT 2 Chr 36:1-4 has the shorter and more difficult reading, since it does not correspond as closely to the narrative of Jehoahaz in 2 Kings as the LXX does.

him aside in Jerusalem...and Neco took and brought him to Egypt” (36:3-4). One can hardly see his removal from power as punishment, since he does virtually nothing in the narrative and no evil actions are attributed to him; the point here is simply that the time of “peace” in the sense of Judean self-rule is now over, so all future pre-exilic kings, no matter how good or bad, will live under colonial rule. Peace may involve God’s defense of Judah in time of war when the cult is being properly observed, and in its most basic sense can simply refer to an escape from battle, but in its fullest Chronistic sense it also involves Davidic reign that is unmolested by imperial monarchs. Chronicles does not so much as breathe a word of rebellion against Achaemenid rule, but in the story of Josiah’s death “in peace” it suggests that peace in its most complete sense is something that will involve more than just freedom from warfare, but freedom from colonial rule as well, even if it does not explain how such freedom might be restored.

It may seem that the idea of peace in Chronicles as complete freedom from imperial control contradicts much of the discussion of the previous chapter, where we saw that the Chronicler is at pains to show that a Davidide would not risk the lives of assembly members in needless warfare or by provoking an imperial response by entering into some kind of foreign military alliance. The story of Josiah’s death actually suggests that the imperial suzerain can speak for God, but merely because a speaker is a powerful foreign monarch does not mean his words are to be trusted. The Chronicler clearly does not intend readers to accept as true Sennacherib’s slander of Yhwh and of Hezekiah’s reforms (2 Chr 32:9-19), and he or she hardly believes that every utterance of the Achaemenid king is divinely inspired, as we shall see in the following chapter. Josiah’s story does suggest that Judean kings should not fight powerful empires, but that general point does not necessarily contradict the notion that the Davidides could be more than client rulers. We have already seen that there is no lack of examples in

Chronicles that point to the idea that God can defeat the most powerful armies; Josiah's story points faintly to a future hope of independence, but it is hardly an open call to anti-imperial revolution. As we shall see in chapter 6, the Chronicler may have hoped to use this story to appeal to assembly groups who foresaw a divine intervention in history, and without directly claiming that this is what would happen, and without making divine overthrow of empire the focus of his or her narrative, the Chronicler may have hoped that this story was enough to signal to such groups that the pro-Davidic party quietly shared their views. Of course, as we shall discuss in the next chapter, the fourth century was one of violence and rebellion throughout the Persian empire, and the Chronicler may have been looking to a future without imperial rule. Certainly, as we shall see in chapter 5, Chronicles does attack Achaemenid ideology and the claims of Achaemenid leadership, even if it does so very subtly.

5. The Davidides and the Achaemenids

1. Achaemenid hegemony

For a work that insists that peace is the desired state for Judah/Israel and something that future Davidides can guarantee through their care for Yhwh's cult, Chronicles seems oddly fixated on warfare. Twenty percent of the occurrences of the word $\text{hmx}^{\text{l}}\text{m}$ "battle" in the Hebrew Bible are in Chronicles, and more than one-half of the times this word and the verb Mx^{l} in the niphal appear in Chronicles are in its unique material.³⁶⁸ Part of this obsession may reflect the Chronistic message to the assembly that the Davidides will not risk assembly lives in needless offensive wars, but part of it may also reflect the fact that the fifth and fourth centuries were a time of widespread warfare throughout the Persian Empire. It is at least possible that Chronicles was written in the late-fourth century, after the fall of the Achaemenids, but the period of the Macedonian destruction of the empire and the struggle among the Diadochi, Alexander's "successors," was hardly one of widespread peace in the Levant, as we shall see. To pick up on the final point of the previous chapter, if the Chronicler's fullest concept of peace is one that involves Judah's freedom from imperial rule, then we might expect Chronicles to argue that the peace and quiet with which God rewards a righteous king and people is something that the Achaemenids cannot provide. This is, as we said in the first chapter, part of Chronicles' negative argument for a Davidic restoration, for, based on our discussion of Chronicles' presentation of

³⁶⁸ Pancratius C. Beentjes, "'We have YHWH to fight our battles': War Narratives in the Book of Chronicles" in *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 177-85 (179-81) provides a list of the occurrences of these words in Chronicles, and notes which passages derive from Samuel-Kings and which from Chronicles' unique material.

the monarchy and of peace, there is no room in the Chronicler's theology for the imperial government to guarantee any kind of peace and quiet; this is up to God, who responds to Davidic actions in the cult. As we shall see, the aspects of Chronistic theology that we have already examined react directly against Achaemenid claims that it is the Great King who provides peace. The empire, as we shall discuss below, was hardly at peace when Chronicles was written, and so Chronicles' emphasis on rest, peace, and quiet as associated with the temple and good Davidic rule is also a message that the assembly cannot rely on Achaemenid rule to keep Judah safe, despite the claims of the Great Kings of Persia. Chronicles quietly reacts against the Persians' claims that they provide their colonized peoples with peace, a claim that functions as a justification for their rule, and so Chronicles signals to assembly members who want to preserve the political status quo that the Davidides and not the Achaemenids are the only royal house who can guarantee peace for Judah.

The Achaemenids' claim to provide peace for their colonized subjects was an important part of what we could call their imperial hegemony, using "hegemony" in the sense in which it is understood in postcolonial criticism. Edward Said, one of the founders of postcolonial literary studies, follows Antonio Gramsci's understanding of hegemony as a widely accepted culture, and in Said's postcolonial analysis hegemony is imperial culture, a culture that distinguishes between the civilized colonial center and the uncivilized and inferior cultural margins of the empire.³⁶⁹ This imperial culture, this way of viewing things, is one in which it is widely accepted, even among the colonized, that the culture of the empire's center is better and normative. The hegemony of the colonizers thus creates certain canons of tastes and values, and it distinguishes between the good and civilized things that the imperial colonizers can do, which

³⁶⁹ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 6-8.

are things that the uncivilized colonized cannot.³⁷⁰ As hegemony elevates certain groups of peoples and languages and ideas and religions above others, it “shares with magic and with mythology the self-containing, self-reinforcing character of a closed system, in which objects are what they are *because* they are what they are, for once, for all time, for ontological reasons that no empirical material can dislodge or alter.”³⁷¹ There are many types of relationships between empire and colonized that are distinguished by unequal distributions of power, including military, economic, and political power, and hegemony in this sense is the exertion of imperial cultural and moral power. It explains to both colonizers and colonized why the subject peoples need to be ruled by the empire, why this is necessary and good,³⁷² and becomes a form of power exercised throughout a whole range of cultural institutions and practices.³⁷³ It denies that it is the production of any particular social group, and presents certain structures of power and order as universally valid, obvious, and natural. Hegemonic discourse is culture on the empire’s terms, although it does not represent itself this way, and it portrays the empire “as the possessor of culture—or, better, Culture—the one which owns and defines...the central means of communication and the traditions they communicate.”³⁷⁴

³⁷⁰ Said, *Orientalism*, 12.

³⁷¹ Said, *Orientalism*, 70. Italics in the original.

³⁷² Mariano Liverani, “The Ideology of the Assyrian Empire” in *Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires*, ed. Mognes Trolle Larsen, Meso 7 (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979), 297-317 (299).

³⁷³ Timothy Mitchell, “Everyday Metaphors of Power,” *ThSoc* 19 (1990): 545-77 (553).

³⁷⁴ Peter Machinist, “Final Response: On the Study of the Ancients, Language, Writing, and the State” in *Margins of Writing: Origins of Cultures*, ed. Seth L. Sanders, OIS 2 (Chicago:

Our most immediate source of access to Persian hegemony are the Achaemenid inscriptions. The ones of which we are aware were located mainly in Persia, but Darius also erected inscriptions at Suez (DZa; DZb; DZc), and the statue of Darius from Susa in the Egyptian style, with inscriptions in Egyptian, Elamite, Akkadian, and Old Persian (DSab) was constructed in Egypt³⁷⁵ and likely stood originally in the temple of Atum in Heliopolis.³⁷⁶ Herodotus describes Darius as erecting a number of inscriptions on his campaign to Greece (4.87-88, 91), suggesting that Achaemenid kings erected inscriptions broadcasting their hegemony throughout the empire. In the Bisitun Inscription, Darius writes that he had the inscription translated and distributed throughout the empire on clay and parchment (DB 4.88-92), a claim that appears to be true since an Aramaic copy of it exists (*TAD* C2.1) and Akkadian copies were placed in Babylon (CII 1/2/1). The Aramaic copy of the Bisitun Inscription also contains material copied from the inscription at Darius's tomb,³⁷⁷ which tells us that copies of other royal inscriptions besides the one from Bisitun circulated throughout the empire.³⁷⁸

The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2006), 291-300 (294).

³⁷⁵ Jean Trichet and Pierre Poupet, “Étude pétrographique de la roche constituant la statue de Darius découverte à Suse en décembre 1972,” *CDAFI* 4 (1974): 57-59.

³⁷⁶ For this as the scholarly consensus as to the statue's original location, see Shahrokh Razmjou, “Assessing the Damage: Notes on the Life and Demise of the Statue of Darius from Susa,” *ArsOr* 32 (2002): 81-104 (86-87).

³⁷⁷ Specifically, *TAD* C2.1.66-70 parallels DNb 50-60.

³⁷⁸ See Jonas C. Greenfield and Bezalel Porten, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Aramaic Version*, CII 1/5/1 (London: Lund Humphries, 1982), 3-4 and Amélie Kuhrt, “Achaemenid Images of Royalty and Empire” in *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity: Proceedings*

Herodotus, writing at a century's remove from the carving of the Bisitun Inscription, is able to relate the story of Bardiya/Gautama's revolt described in DB 1.11-15, and knows the names of the Persian nobles Darius claims as his allies in 4.80-88,³⁷⁹ and so we know that the basic message of Bisitun was still widely known a century after Darius had it engraved. Before the time of the Achaemenids, bilingual inscriptions in the ancient Near East were rare, but multilingual inscriptions become the norm for Persian rulers:³⁸⁰ they wanted their hegemony broadcast in the languages of empires, and the inscriptions themselves state that writing is an important way to convey the truth that the king wants to communicate (DB 4.41-43, 45-50, 54-59; DNb 50-57). It is even possible that the Bisitun Inscription existed first as a document that circulated widely throughout the regions Persia controlled and only later as a text carved into a mountain.³⁸¹

Persian hegemony circulated in other ways in the areas the empire had conquered. The Achaemenids revived the use of the cylinder seal, an effective way to distribute iconography,³⁸²

of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop, ed. Giovanni B. Lanfranchi and Robert Rollings, HANEM 11 (Padua: S.A.R.G.O.N., 2010), 87-105 (98-99).

³⁷⁹ See Maria Brosius, "Greek Sources on Achaemenid Iran" in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*, ed. D.T. Potts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 658-68 (662).

³⁸⁰ Hannes D. Galter, "Cuneiform Bilingual Royal Inscriptions," *IOS* 15 (1995): 25-50 (41).

³⁸¹ So, e.g., Josef Wiesehöfer, *Ancient Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD*, trans. Azizeh Azodi (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), 18-19.

³⁸² See Dominique Collon, *First Impressions: Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 90.

as was the daric, the coinage developed by Darius and circulated throughout the empire, potentially as gifts specifically meant to communicate Persian hegemony.³⁸³ By the time local Persian officials and client rulers began to mint their own coinage, they reproduced this iconography.³⁸⁴ Achaemenid royal motifs also appeared on luxury items produced throughout the empire in imitations of Persian prototypes.³⁸⁵ The reliefs from the Persian palaces conveyed

³⁸³ So Peter Vargyas, “Darius I and the Daric Reconsidered,” *IrAnt* 35 (2000): 33-46 and Cindy L. Nimchuk, “The ‘Archers’ of Darius: Coinage or Tokens of Royal Esteem?,” *ArsOr* 32 (2002): 55-79.

³⁸⁴ This was the case, for example, in Sidon and Samaria. See Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 607-608, 714-16.

³⁸⁵ For discussions of different aspects of this so-called court style, see A.S. Melikian-Chirvani, “The International Achaemenid Style,” *BAI* 7 (1993): 111-30; Florian Knauss, “Persian Rule in the North: Achaemenid Palaces on the Periphery of the Empire” in *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange between East and West*, ed. Inge Nielsen, MDIA 4 (Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 2001), 125-43; Elspeth R.M. Dusinberre, *Aspects of Empire in Achaemenid Sardis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); John Curtis, “The Archaeology of the Achaemenid Period” in *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia*, ed. John Curtis and Nigel Tallis (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 30-49; Elspeth R.M. Dusinberre, “Anatolian Crossroads: Achaemenid Seals from Sardis and Gordion” in *The World of Achaemenid Persia: History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John Curtis and St John Simpson; (London: I.B. Taurus, 2010), 323-35. Deniz Kaptan prefers the term “Persianizing styles” for glyptic art

royal ideology too—DNa 38-47, for example, directs readers to look at the relief beside the inscriptions³⁸⁶—and given that remnants of the apadana style of Persian palace have been found outside of Persia at Babylon and Sidon and in Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia,³⁸⁷ we might expect that the iconography of these palaces broadcasted Persian hegemony as well, as did that of other imperial administrative buildings, such as the one that may have existed in Samaria.³⁸⁸ Persian officials who would have promoted such hegemony were certainly found throughout the empire; Xenophon writes that a military force was stationed in each region of the empire (*Oec.* 4.5) and that there was one official in each region to collect tribute and another to oversee military operations (4.9-11), and the imperial correspondence and bullae from locations as disparate as Elephantine in Egypt, Daskyleion in Asia Minor, and Bactria in Afghanistan suggest

produced outside Persia but drawing on a kind of Achaemenid *koine*; see his *The Daskyleion Bullae: Seal Images from the Western Achaemenid Empire*, *AchHist* 12 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2002), 1:2-5

³⁸⁶ See Margaret Cool Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire*, *Acta Iranica* 19 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), 154-55.

³⁸⁷ John Curtis and Shahrokh Razmjou, “The Palace” in *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia*, ed. John Curtis and Nigel Tallis (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 50-55 (50).

³⁸⁸ For the possible existence of such a building, see M. Tadmor, “Fragments of an Achaemenid Throne from Samaria,” *IEJ* 24 (1974): 37-43 and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, *King and Court in Ancient Persia 559 to 331 BCE*, *DDAH* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), 70.

a unified Achaemenid approach to governing.³⁸⁹ Given that the Persians constructed fortresses in Judah³⁹⁰ and appear to have had a palace at Ramat Rahel, just outside of Jerusalem,³⁹¹ it is

³⁸⁹ On this point, see Christopher Tuplin, “Persian Garrisons in Xenophon and Other Sources” in *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory*, ed. Amélie Kuhrt and Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1988), 67-70; Andrew R. Meadows, “The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire” in *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia*, ed. John Curtis and Nigel Tallis (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005), 181-209; Matt Waters, “Applied Royal Directive: Pissouthnes and Samos” in *Der Achämenidenhof/The Achaemenid Court*, ed. Bruno Jacobs and Robert Rollinger, CeO 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 817-28 (819). Even the style of official correspondence in Aramaic remained relatively constant from one extremity of the empire to the other; see Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria (Fourth Century BCE)* (London: The Khalili Family Trust, 2012), 15, 37-39, 50-51.

³⁹⁰ See, e.g., Kenneth G. Hoglund, *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah*, SBLDS 125 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); J. Sapin, “La ‘frontière’ judéo-iduméenne au IV^e s. avant J.-C.,” *Transeu* 27 (2004): 109-54 (115-24); C. Balandier, “La défense de la Transeuphratène occidentale par les Achéménides: Etude des fortifications de Chypre et de Palestine cisjordanienne,” *Transeu* 40 (2011): 9-32 (17-19).

³⁹¹ Oded Lipschits, “Shedding New Light on the Dark Years of the ‘Exilic Period’: New Studies, Further Elucidation, and Some Questions Regarding the Archaeology of Judah as an ‘Empty Land’” in *Interpreting Exile: Displacement and Deportation in Biblical and Modern Contexts*, ed. Brad E. Kelle, Frank Rithel Ames, and Jacob L. Wright, SBLAIL 10 (Atlanta:

reasonable to believe that the assembly elite would have been aware of Persian hegemony.³⁹²

An important aspect of the Achaemenid hegemony that begins with Darius³⁹³ is the

Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 57-90 (57-61); Oded Lipschits et al., “Palace and Village, Paradise and Oblivion: Unraveling the Riddles of Ramat Rahel,” *NEA* 74 (2011): 2-49 (31-37); O. Lipschits, Y. Gadot, and D. Langgut, “The Riddle of Ramat Raḥel: The Archaeology of a Royal Persian Period Edifice,” *Transeu* 41 (2012): 57-79.

³⁹² It is true that very little Persian-influenced iconography has been discovered in Judah; see Christoph Uehlinger, “‘Powerful Persianisms’ in Glyptic Iconography of Persian Period Palestine” in *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*, ed. Bob Becking and Marjo C.A. Korpel, OTS 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 134-82. But some of the Judean coinage from the fourth century bore the image of the Persian king—see Haim Gittler, “Identities of the Indigenous Coinages of Palestine under Achaemenid Rule: The Dissemination of the Image of the Great King” in *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on the Royal Cult and Imperial Worship*, ed. Panagiotis P. Iossif, Andrzej S. Chankowski, and Catherine C. Lorber, StHel 11 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 105-19 (108-10)—and this is imagery that must have sent some kind of understandable message to the Judean elite, a message understandable through the context of Achaemenid hegemony. The presence of a Persian palace at Ramat Rahel means there were Persian officials and iconography to communicate Achaemenid hegemony to the local leadership.

³⁹³ Cyrus and his son Cambyses do not appear to have been Achaemenids; they may have been members of an earlier Elamite or Persian dynasty that Darius overthrew. On the Cyrus Cylinder, Cyrus refers to himself as a descendant of *Šišpiš* “Teispes” and as king of Anšan (AOAT 256:K2.1.21) rather than as an Achaemenid, whereas each of the Persian kings

insistence that Auramazda created the world and human well-being (*šiyāti-*) and made the Achaemenid king; the inscriptions, and particularly those of Darius, emphasize that it is

beginning with Darius I for whom we have extant royal inscriptions refers to himself as a *Haxāmanišiya* “Achaemenid” (see, e.g., DB 1.3; XPb 20-21; A¹Pa 16; D²Sb 2; A²Sc1; A³Pa 20-21), for Darius insists that *Haxāmaniš*, not Teispes, was the founder of the line (DB 1.6). See, e.g., Matthew Waters, “Darius and the Achaemenid Line,” *AHB* 10 (1996): 11-18; Richard Nelson Frye, “Cyrus the Mede and Darius the Achaemenid?” in *The World of Achaemenid Persia: History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John Curtis and St John Simpson (London: I.B. Taurus, 2010), 17-19; D.T. Potts, “A Note on the Limits of Anšan” in *Elam and Persia*, ed. Javier Álvarez-Mon and Mark B. Garrison (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 35-43 (41); Enrique Quintana, “Elamitas frente a Persas: El Reino Independiente de Anšan” in *Elam and Persia*, ed. Javier Álvarez-Mon and Mark B. Garrison (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 167-86; Thomas Harrison, *Writing Ancient Persia*, ClaE (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2011), 13; Robert Rollinger, “Thinking and Writing about History in Teispid and Achaemenid Persia” in *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, ed. Kurt A. Raaflaub (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2014), 187-212 (187). There is, then, a cultural and ideological break between Darius and the earlier Persian rulers; see David Stronach, “Anshan and Parsa: Early Achaemenid History, Art and Architecture on the Iranian Plateau” in *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Persian Period: Conquest and Imperialism 539-331 BC*, ed. John Curtis (London: British Museum Press, 1997), 35-53 and Bruno Jacobs, “From Gabled Hut to Rock-Cut Tomb: A Religious and Cultural Break between Cyrus and Darius?” in *The World of Achaemenid Persia: History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John Curtis and St John Simpson (London: I.B. Taurus, 2010), 91-101 (93-94).

Auramazda's will (*vašna-*) that the Achaemenid is king.³⁹⁴ The first lines of Darius's burial inscription became a standard opening for Achaemenid inscriptions: "A great god is Auramazda, who created (*adā*) this earth, who created that sky, who created humanity, who created *šiyātim* for humanity, who made (*akunauš*) Darius king, one king of many, one lord of many" (DNa 1-8).³⁹⁵ Other inscriptions use this opening, adding only that Auramazda is "greatest of the gods,"³⁹⁶ a phrase that is also common in Darius's inscriptions.³⁹⁷ If it is obvious that the Achaemenids wanted to broadcast Auramazda's role as creator of the world that the Persians and their subjects live in, it is equally obvious that they wanted to emphasize that the Creator had

³⁹⁴ See Gregor Ahn, *Religiöse Herrscherlegitimation im achämenidischen Iran: Die Voraussetzungen und die Struktur ihrer Argumentation*, Acta Iranica 31 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 196-99; Bruce Lincoln, "The Wise Lord's Will and the Making of Wonders" in "*Happiness for mankind*": *Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, Acta Iranica 53 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 357-74 (357-58).

³⁹⁵ We find the same opening in DPg 1-5; DSe 1-7; DSf 1-8; DSab 1-8; DZc 1-4; DE 1-11; XPa 1-6; XPb 1-11; XPc 1-5; XPd 1-8; XPf 1-8; XPh 1-6; A¹Pa 1-8; A³Pa 1-8; Xerxes, Artaxerxes I, and Artaxerxes III only alter the wording in order to replace Darius's name with their own. For the last inscription and its attribution to Artaxerxes III, see Rüdiger Schmitt, *The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis*, CII 1/1/2 (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 2000), 119.

³⁹⁶ We see this in XE 1-11; XV 1-9; and A²Hc 1-7

³⁹⁷ *maqišta bagānām* appears also in DPd 1-2; DPh 9; DSf 9; DSp 1; and DH 7. DPg 1-5 makes the claim (in Babylonian) that Auramazda is the greatest of the gods within the standard opening phrase that refers to creation, just as XE 1-11; XV 1-9; and A²Hc 1-7 do.

established the Achaemenid as king over this world. Some of the inscriptions are quite clear that Achaemenid rule extends throughout the earth; one of Darius's inscriptions from Persepolis, for example, says that the king's rule extends "from this side of the sea to that side of the sea, from this side of the desert to that side of the desert" (DPg 9-12),³⁹⁸ and others state that Auramazada has given the world to the Achaemenid to rule (DNa 30-34; DSf 15-18; DSm 3-5; DSs). As a result, the Achaemenid is "the great king, king of kings, king of (many) peoples/countries (*dahyūnām*),"³⁹⁹ and some of the inscriptions contain long lists of subject peoples.⁴⁰⁰ Xenophon was clearly aware of this aspect of Achaemenid hegemony, for he writes that the empire was so large the lands beyond its borders were uninhabitable (*Cyr.* 8.6.21), and in his story of the rebellion of Cyrus the Younger, Cyrus claims that the Persians rule as far to the south as the heat makes it possible for humans to live and as far to the north as the cold makes human habitation possible (*Anab.* 1.7.6). It is no wonder, then, that some of Darius's inscriptions use the word *būmi*- "earth" to refer to the empire.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁸ For other ways in which the same idea is communicated in DPh and DH, see Kuhrt, "Achaemenid Images of Royalty," 91.

³⁹⁹ So, e.g., DPa 1-5; DPe 1-5; DSm 1-2; DZb 1-3; XPa 6-8; XPb 6-8; XPe 6-7; XPd 8-11; D²Sb 1; A²Sa 1; A²Sc 4; A³Pa 8-11. DSj 1 refers to Darius as "great king, king of kings, king in this earth," and DZb 3-4; XPj 2; D²Sb 1-2; A²Sa 1; A²Hc 7-8 and other inscriptions also add that the Achaemenid is "king in this earth." See also XPe 1-2 and XPj 1-3. *dahyu*- refers both to a land and the people who live in that land; see Wiesehöfer, *Ancient Persia*, 60.

⁴⁰⁰ So DB 1.12-17; DPe 5-18; DNa 15-30; DSe 14-30; DSm 5-11; XPh 13-28; and A³Pb.

⁴⁰¹ See the explanation in Cl. Herrenschildt, "Désignation de l'empire et concepts politiques de Darius I^{er} d'après ses inscriptions en vieux-perse," *SIr* 5 (1976): 33-65 (42-45).

Persian hegemony creates a necessity for Achaemenid rule, for while Auramazda created *šiyāti*- for humanity, Darius explains at the beginning of his burial inscription, “Auramazda saw this earth in turmoil (*yaudantim*)” (DNa 31-32). As a result, says the king, “he bore (this earth) to me, he wanted me king—I am king. By the will of Auramazda, I put (this earth) down in its place; that which I said, they did, as was my desire (*kāma*)” (33-38). Darius then goes on to boast that “a Persian has fought battle far from Persia” (46-47). These battles ultimately benefit the peoples he rules, however; in an inscription from Susa, after listing these peoples (DSe 14-30), he explains that “the lands were in turmoil (*ayaudan*), one fought another” (32-34). By the will of Auramazda, Darius acted so this fighting ceased (34-41). Achaemenid violence is necessary because it is good violence, it restores the *šiyāti*- Auramazda intended at creation and the Achaemenid unites the whole world he rules in this *šiyāti*-.⁴⁰² The word is cognate with Latin *quiēs* and English “quiet,”⁴⁰³ and it is the peace and quiet in which Auramazda intended humans to live. As Clarisse Herrenschildt points out, it is the opposite of the disaster of warfare and famine from which Darius asks Auramazda to save Persia (DPd 12-24), and so *šiyāti*- is more

⁴⁰² Christine Mitchell, “The Testament of Darius (DN_A/DN_B) and Constructions of King and Kingship in 1-2 Chronicles” in *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*, ed. Jason M. Silverman and Caroline Waerzeggers, ANEM 13 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 363-80 (365-66) notes that Darius’s references to being “one” king and lord point to a restoration of Auramazda’s creation.

⁴⁰³ Thomas V. Gamkrelidze and Vjačeslav V. Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*, trans. Johanna Nichols, TLSM 80 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 1:205.

than just peace and quiet.⁴⁰⁴ The Indo-European root **kweyǵ-*, from which *šiyāti-* derives, has the general sense of “to rest comfortably,” and so in Avestan—like Old Persian, an Iranian language—we find the cognates *šaiti-š* “joy” and *šyāta-* “pleased.”⁴⁰⁵ *šiyāti-* is not simply rest and quiet in the sense of an absence of warfare, it is general well-being, and so it is to the benefit of the empire’s subjects to live under Achaemenid rule and act according to the king’s desire since he has the perfect characteristics to rule and ensure such well-being for his subjects, characteristics that some inscriptions list (DNb 5-49; XPI 5-50) and that were obviously broadcast as an important part of Achaemenid hegemony, since they appear to have been well-known to the Greeks.⁴⁰⁶ In a markedly different manner than their Neo-Assyrian predecessors, the Achaemenids did not emphasize imperial violence in their hegemony.⁴⁰⁷ Of the inscriptions, only Bisitun refers to specific battles fought by the king against named enemies, and of the art, the Bisitun relief is practically the only example of a portrayal of the king as triumphant over

⁴⁰⁴ Clarisse Herrens Schmidt, “Vieux-perse *šiyāti-*” in *La religion iranienne à l’époque achéménide*, ed. Jean Kellens, IrAntSup 5 (Leuven: Iranica Antiqua, 1990), 13-18.

⁴⁰⁵ Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1959-1969), 1:638.

⁴⁰⁶ Herodotus 1.36; Xenophon *Cyr.* 1.2.6-8; *Anab.* 1.9.2-31; and Strabo 15.3.8 all describe Persian education as involving the development of the skills that Darius and Xerxes list as their virtues on their inscriptions; see Bruce Lincoln, “On Persian Pedagogy and Greek Machismo” in *“Happiness for mankind”: Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, Acta Iranica 53 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 335-54.

⁴⁰⁷ For a helpful discussion of this issue, see Margaret Cool Root, “Imperial Ideology in Achaemenid Persian Art: Transforming the Mesopotamian Legacy,” *BCSMS* 35 (2000): 19-27.

human enemies. As Bruce Lincoln points out, there are fifty three known Achaemenid inscriptions that postdate Bisitun, and not one of them refers to any specific armed struggle.⁴⁰⁸ On reliefs and other Persian art, the Royal Hero, the dominant motif in Achaemenid glyptic art, appearing in two-thirds of the known Achaemenid seal types and prominently featured in Achaemenid reliefs, is sometimes depicted in the act of stabbing a rampant lion, bull, or monster, or, very rarely, a human foe, but more frequently is merely grasping his antagonists in a way that suggests his complete control over them;⁴⁰⁹ in Achaemenid sculpture, only the Bisitun relief

⁴⁰⁸ Bruce Lincoln, *Religion, Empire, and Torture: The Case of Achaemenian Persia with a Postscript on Abu Ghraib* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 12. XPh 28-35 refers to Xerxes' crushing of a rebellion, but, unlike Bisitun, the country and rebel leader are not named. Like XPh 35-41, it seems to be a general warning of the futility of resisting Achaemenid rule. For this interpretation of XPh 35-41, see, e.g., Wouter F.M. Henkelman, *The Other Gods Who Are: Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts*, AchHist 14 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2008), 10; Harrison, *Writing Ancient Persia*, 80-81; Josef Wiesehöfer, "Achaemenid Rule and its Impact on Yehud" in *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature: Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts*, ed. Louis Jonker, FAT 2/53 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 171-85 (180).

⁴⁰⁹ For helpful discussions of the Royal Hero motif, see Root, *The King and Kingship*, 303-306; Mark B. Garrison and Margaret Cool Root, *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets I: Images of Heroic Encounter*, OIP 117 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 54-59; Kaptan, *The Daskyleion Bullae*, 1:57-71; Mark B. Garrison, "Royal Achaemenid Iconography" in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*, ed. D.T. Potts (Oxford: Oxford

portrays the king as triumphant over enemies.⁴¹⁰ In the Hero images that involve killing, the act of violence is really already accomplished, for the Hero's weapon is entering his opponent's body, and so his enemy's death is assured, and order is in the process of being restored.⁴¹¹

The Bisitun Inscription is unique among the Achaemenid inscriptions for its lengthy depiction of specific—and, of course, failed—rebellions against the Achaemenid's power, and much more frequently Persian hegemony urges the colonized to work with their imperial masters. Those who build the empire with the king are rewarded by him, as Darius emphasizes at the end of the original Old Persian version of the Bisitun Inscription.⁴¹² Here, Darius discusses his *aršta*- “righteous rule,” and states that “I bore good things to the one who cooperated (*hamataxšatā*) with my house” and punished the one who did injury (4.65-67). In his burial inscription he states again that he rewards the one who cooperates (*hamtaxšataiy*) and punishes

University Press, 2013), 566-95 (582). For the very small number of cases in which the Hero is portrayed in the act of killing a human antagonist, see Lâtife Summerer, “Picturing Persian Victory: The Painted Battle Scene on the Munich Wood” in *Achaemenid Culture and Local Traditions in Anatolia, Southern Caucasus and Iran*, ed. Askold Ivantchik and Vakhtang Licheli, ACSS 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 3-30 (8-9).

⁴¹⁰ Kaptan, *The Daskyleion Bullae*, 1:87-89.

⁴¹¹ Outside of the Royal Hero combat theme, Achaemenid imperial art generally avoids scenes of violence. See Harrison, *Writing Ancient Persia*, 86-88.

⁴¹² The original version of the Old Persian in the Bisitun Inscription ended with column 4; column 5 was added later. For the order in which the various parts of the inscription were engraved, see Rykle Borger, *Die Chronologie des Darius-Denkmal am Behistun-Felsen*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 103-32.

the one who causes injury (DNb 16-21); it is not his desire (*kāma-*), Darius says here, that any one of his subjects should have injury done to them (5-15), and so Persian hegemony makes the act of one subject harming another the opposite of cooperating with the king. The root of the Old Persian verb *hamtaxš-* is *taxš-* “to work” (cognate with Greek *τε&ktwn* “builder” and *τε&xnh* “craft, art”),⁴¹³ and the root is combined with the prefix *hama-* “same” (cognate with Greek *ο (μο&j)*),⁴¹⁴ and so the one who cooperates acts according to the king’s desire and does the same work as the king. The king’s desire is clearly beneficial, since it is a desire to re-create the peace and well-being Auramazda established at the beginning, and if the king must re-establish this *šiyāti-* by means of violence, as Darius says he does in the Bisitun Inscription, this is a just war that prevents unjust violence. As Darius writes, Auramazda allows him to set the earth down in its place, so that the people act according to his beneficent desire (DNa 33-38).

To work with the king is not, in Persian hegemony, an onerous task. Since the Achaemenid provides for the peace of his colonized subjects, they are to bring him *bāji-*

⁴¹³ The Indo-European root **t^hek^hs-* generally refers to craft production; see Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*, 1:611, 734. But while a word such as the Latin *texō* “to weave” also derives from this root, the Achaemenid inscriptions are not only referring to craft production, since the Old Persian stem *taxš-* is not used specifically for crafts or arts. The Old Persian *taxš-* (and so the Old Persian *hamtaxš-*) refers to work in a much broader sense, like the cognate Hittite *takš-* “to undertake, attempt.” See Roland Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, AOS 33 (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1953), 185-86 and Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1:1058-59.

⁴¹⁴ Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*, 1:741.

“tribute,” a word that conveys the sense of something owed to the king.⁴¹⁵ Persian iconography consistently portrays the king’s subjects with dignity, bearing tribute to him or lifting him up in praise, but doing so with little exertion.⁴¹⁶ Greek and other Achaemenid era accounts are full of stories of the Great Kings rewarding those among the colonized elite and the Persian nobility who “worked with” them and punishing those who did injury, at least injury to Achaemenid rule.⁴¹⁷ Persian iconography does maintain that power is available to the king—the archers depicted on coins and palace reliefs are the most obvious examples of this⁴¹⁸—but the colonized

⁴¹⁵ See especially Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, “Bāji” in *Studies in Persian History: Essays in Memory of David M. Lewis*, ed. Maria Brosius and Amélie Kuhrt, AchHist 11 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1998), 23-34. On the place of *bāji*- in Achaemenid hegemony, see also Kuhrt, “Achaemenid Images of Royalty,” 91-92; Pierre Carlier, “The Idea of Imperial Monarchy in Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*” in *Xenophon*, ed. Vivienne Gray, ORCS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 327-66 (349-50); Wiesehöfer, “Achaemenid Rule,” 178-79.

⁴¹⁶ See Root, *The King and Kingship*, 131-61; Root, “Imperial Ideology,” 22-24; Razmjou, “Assessing the Damage,” 85.

⁴¹⁷ For just some of these texts, see Herodotus 3.110; 6.19.3; 8.53.2, 85.3, 90.4; Xenophon, *Oec.* 4.6-10; *Cyr.* 8.2.10-12; *Anab.* 1.9.13; Plutarch, *Art.* 14.5; 16.2-4; DB 4.80-86; *KAI* 14.10-12.

⁴¹⁸ The crowned archer is a “central motif” in Achaemenid royal ideology; see Mark B. Garrison, “Archers at Persepolis: The Emergence of Royal Ideology at the Heart of the Empire” in *The World of Achaemenid Persia: History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John Curtis and St John Simpson (London: I.B. Taurus, 2010), 337-59 (quote on 337). In the

who fulfill the easy task of working with the king to fulfill his desire will experience only peace and quiet. Indeed, many of the representations of the archer in Achaemenid iconography portray him as shooting at a predator attacking another animal;⁴¹⁹ the real reason the king uses his military power is to defend the colonized and Persia from violent, uncivilized forces.

The Persian royal parks or paradises established throughout the empire broadcast the same hegemony. The Old Persian word **parideisa-*, like the Greek *peritei&xisisij*, refers to an area that is surrounded by a wall,⁴²⁰ but the fact that Greek, like Hebrew and Akkadian,

type II archer on Persian coins, the archer is in Persian dress and about to fire his arrow, likely a representation of the king and the military power available to him. On this, see Margaret Cool Root, “From the Heart: Powerful Persianisms in the Art of the Western Empire” in *Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Amélie Kuhrt, *AchHist* 6 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1991), 1-29 (16-17); David Stronach, “From Cyrus to Darius: Notes on Art and Architecture in Early Achaemenid Palaces” in *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange between East and West*, ed. Inge Nielsen, *MDIA* 4 (Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 2001), 95-111 (102-103); Nimchuk, “The ‘Archers’ of Darius,” 64-66.

⁴¹⁹ Garrison, “Archers at Persepolis,” 351-55.

⁴²⁰ The Indo-European root **dheiǵh-* can have the senses of “wall” and “pottery”; see Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1:244. Note Avestan *pairidaēza* “fence, enclosure.” The Indo-European diphthong *ei* normally remains *ei* in Old Persian, but becomes *aē* in Avestan (Kent, *Old Persian*, 27-28), hence the reconstruction of the diphthong in Old Persian **parideisa-*. Indo-European *ǵh* can go to *ç* or *d* in Old Persian—the Old Persian *didā-* “fortress,” for example, derives from Indo-European **dhiǵha-*—but also to *s* and *z* in words borrowed from

adopted the Old Persian as a loanword⁴²¹ suggests that the royal paradise was thought of as being uniquely Persian. The Classical sources consistently state that the paradises contained plants and animals from throughout the world;⁴²² inside the wall is the world as Auramazda created it, the world given to the Achaemenid to rule. David Stronach, describing the paradise at Pasargadae, says it was laid out with rectilinear gardens, with the trees and shrubs planted in straight lines. The garden's central axis was aligned with the throne inside the palace, thereby directing viewers toward authority. The landscaping depicts an empire that is well-ordered and free from disruption.⁴²³ The paradises were often located just outside of cities and seem also to have been

Median (Kent, *Old Persian*, 33). The witness of the languages that adopted the Old Persian as a loanword (see below) suggests that it was in fact borrowed from Median, and that the *-gh-* in Indo-European **dheiǵh-* became *s* or *z* in Old Persian. For other suggestions of reconstructions of the word, see Christopher Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies*, *Historia* 99 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996), 93-96.

⁴²¹ So we see Greek *paradeíisos*, Hebrew *pardēs*, and Akkadian *pardēsu*. See Bruce Lincoln, “À la recherche du paradis perdu” in “*Happiness for mankind*”: *Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, *Acta Iranica* 53 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 3-19 (5).

⁴²² E.g., Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.4.10; 2.4.14; *Oec.* 4.13-14; *Cyr.* 1.3.14 ; Diodorus 5.19.2; Longus 4.2-3. See Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies*, 102 ; Lincoln, “À la recherche,” 5-6.

⁴²³ David Stronach, “Parterres and Stone Watercourses at Pasargadae: Notes on the Achaemenid Contribution to Garden Design,” *JGS* 14 (1994): 3-12. Xenophon describes another paradise with trees planted at right angles in *Oec.* 4.20-21, but sometimes the trees in the paradises are simply described as being thickly planted (Strabo 15.3.7; Longus 4.2). See Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies*, 105-106.

found near satrapal residences,⁴²⁴ and the park that accompanied the Persian-period palace at Ramat Rahel, close to Jerusalem, contained imported flora, including, for example, the citron, which came to the region from India via Persia. This well-watered paradise, write its excavators, “must have left a lasting impression on the viewers in this relatively arid environment. Its imported trees from far-off lands, aromatic plants and impressive fruit trees, together with its aesthetic architectural features, symbolized the power and affluence of the Persian-period rulers.”⁴²⁵ At the seat of Persian authority in the region was a microcosm of a well-tended empire, demonstrating the *šiyāti-* that Auramazda designed for all of humanity and that only the Achaemenids could truly implement.⁴²⁶

2. *Peace and Chronicles’ mockery of Achaemenid hegemony*

As we have seen in chapters 2 and 3, Chronicles gives readers a history lesson that explains that peace for the colonized in Judah has nothing to do with the Achaemenids but depends instead on loyalty to God’s cult in Jerusalem as enforced by a Davidic king. Chronicles nowhere advocates

⁴²⁴ For paradises near cities, see Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.2.7; 2.4.14-16; Arrian, *Anab.* 7.25; Diodorus 16.41.5, and see also Josephus, *Ant.* 7.347. For their association with satrapal residences, see Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.15-16; *Anab.* 1.2.7-8; 1.4.10; Diodorus 14.80.2; Plutarch, *Alc.* 24.5. See also Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies*, 109-10.

⁴²⁵ Lipschits, Gadot, and Langgut, “The Riddle of Ramat Rahel,” 71-72.

⁴²⁶ See Lincoln, “À la recherche,” 18-19 and Bruce Lincoln, “Implications of Grammatical Number in the Mythology of Vegetation” in “*Happiness for mankind*”: *Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, *Acta Iranica* 53 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 89-104 (104).

rebellion against Persia, but it does engage in what postcolonial analysis refers to as mockery of imperial hegemony. The postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha argues that imperial hegemony, which claims that the empire alone is fit to rule and that the colonized are better off under imperial power precisely because they are inferior, creates a sense of self for imperial rulers. But this Self needs the binary opposite of the colonized Other in order to exist, for the imperial Self is what the colonized Other is not, and so the Self cannot be understood in isolation from the Other as constructed by imperial hegemony. And for hegemony to truly work as a set of widely-accepted cultural norms, it must be something the colonized accept and mimic. The colonized Other may seem trapped by this worldview, doomed to mimic the inferiority that imperial hegemony has created for it,⁴²⁷ yet, writes Bhabha, mimicry provides a place of “civil disobedience” in which the colonized can mock imperial hegemony by seeming to accept and mimic it while actually subtly altering it and turning mimicry into mockery.⁴²⁸ A forthright rejection of hegemony would be rebellion rather than mockery, but in mockery we see something more subtle and less dangerous than rebellion—Bhabha calls it a “sly civility”⁴²⁹—as imperial hegemony is carefully combined with aspects of the culture of the colonized, who can demonstrate, at least to themselves, the inadequacy of the empire’s message of their inferiority.

⁴²⁷ Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), 47, 51-52, 59.

Gayatri Spivak, in fact, specifically argues that the colonized subject is trapped by imperial hegemony and has no way to articulate an identity besides that of the Other; see her “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 271-313.

⁴²⁸ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 120-21.

⁴²⁹ See Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 99-100.

This mockery creates a hybridity, the fusion of different cultures in a colonial or postcolonial setting,⁴³⁰ the result of “mixed cultural legacies and fruitful cross-pollination of cultures.”⁴³¹ Chronicles’ pro-Davidic argument engages in this kind of anti-Achaemenid mockery and hybridity.

We see such mockery in 2 Chr 36:22-23, where we find the very little that Chronicles says overtly about the Persians. Yhwh “roused” Cyrus, according to the Chronicler, and Cyrus proclaims that Yhwh has given him all the kingdoms of the earth and told him to rebuild the temple. Chronicles is apparently acknowledging the Achaemenid hegemonic claim to rule the whole earth, but we see mockery in the claim that Yhwh and not Auramazda is the causative agent of this rule. As one might expect in the writing of a Persian subject whose local monarchy was deposed, the previous native dynasty is portrayed negatively, at least in regard to the conclusion of its rule; Chronicles, that is, might appear to accept the claim of Achaemenid hegemony that a Judean monarchy is not fit to rule, that native self-rule brings wars and horrific

⁴³⁰ R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Asian Biblical Hermeneutics and Postcolonialism: Contesting the Interpretations*, BibLibS (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998), 16-17; Musa Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000), 122; Jon L. Berquist, “Psalms, Postcolonialism, and the Construction of the Self” in *Approaching Yehud: New Approaches to the Study of the Persian Period*, ed. Jon L. Berquist, SBLSemS 50 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 195-202 (197); Uriah Kim, *Identity and Loyalty in the David Story: A Postcolonial Reading*, HBM 22 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 15-16.

⁴³¹ R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Postcolonial Reconfigurations: An Alternative Way of Reading the Bible and Doing Theology* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2003), 109.

defeat rather than peace and well-being, and that Judah is better off as a colonized people under Persian control. Chronicles has no positive comments in regard to the rule of the final four kings (2 Chr 36:1-13), and eight of the eleven kings who precede them are responsible for some kind of cultic fault.⁴³² But in the Chronicler's claim that it is Yhwh who controls history and who punishes royal sin, and not Auramazda or the Achaemenids whom (the Persians claim) Auramazda has appointed, we see mockery rather than mimicry of imperial hegemony. The Chronicler's doctrine of immediate retribution that we examined in chapters 2 and 3 is absolutely applied only to royal actions involving cult and foreign military alliances, and these punishments and rewards have nothing to do with cooperating or working with the Achaemenid or fulfilling his desire.⁴³³ As we saw, God sends defeat through foreign invasion as a frequent punishment for royal sins, and most particularly for a king's failure to be cultically loyal (2 Chr 12:1-8; 16:7-9; 21:16-17; 24:17-25; 25:14-24; 28:5-7, 16-21; 33:11; 36:11-21). As the inspired Azariah says, when Israel had no teaching priest or law and did not seek God, "there was no peace for the one

⁴³² These eight include Jehoram, Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, Ahaz, Manasseh, and Amon. I do not include Josiah in this list since, as we discussed in the previous chapter, the apostasy over which he presided in the early part of his reign was inherited from his father and, in Chronicles' telling, something that he dismantles as soon as he reaches the age of majority.

⁴³³ In Chronicles, Yhwh can use imperial monarchs to carry out his punishments, as we discussed in chapter 1. If 2 Chr 36:13 seems to censure Zedekiah because "he rebelled against King Nebuchadnezzar," the real sin there is that Nebuchadnezzar "caused him to swear by God," and Zedekiah refused to repent "to Yhwh the God of Israel." That is, his rebellion against Nebuchadnezzar signals his refusal to accept the punishment he has earned because "he did evil in the eyes of Yhwh" (36:12).

going out or coming in, for there were great disturbances upon the dwellers of the lands, and they were broken in pieces, nation against nation and city against city, for God disturbed them with every kind of distress” (2 Chr 15:5-6). And, as we have seen, kings loyal to the cult who utterly trust in God to defend Judah are spared defeat, even when massive armies invade (2 Chr 13:2-19; 14:9-15; 20:1-30; 32:1-23). If peace, rest, and quiet are the ultimate blessings for Judah, they are mainly the result of what the king and the people do in regard to the cult and reflect the king’s military reliance on God, but these blessings have absolutely nothing to do with the Achaemenids.

If the Chronicler’s doctrine of immediate retribution is meant to persuade readers that future Davidides—now knowing, thanks to Chronicles, how God will deal with royal failures in regard to cult and military alliances—will not dare violate cultic norms or risk assembly lives with ill-conceived military ventures, it also signals to them that the Persians, despite their hegemonic claims to the contrary, have nothing to do with Judah’s peace. Combined with the Chronicler’s statements concerning rest and peace, immediate retribution functions to mock Persian hegemony. Despite what the Achaemenids might say, Auramazda did not establish them to rule the earth, Yhwh did. Nor was the point of Yhwh’s commission to have them restore peace and well-being to the earth, but simply to build his temple. Persian rule hardly appears as the timeless institution that it does in the Achaemenid inscriptions;⁴³⁴ Davidic rule and Israelite

⁴³⁴ Achaemenid inscriptions give no sense as to when Persian rule began; it simply appears as a necessity in order to restore the cosmic order Auramazda created at the beginning. Darius, who, as we mentioned above, may have overthrown the earlier Persian or Elamite dynasty of Cyrus and Cambyses, does not explain how long the Achaemenids have been in power. In DB 1.3-8, he traces his lineage back five generations before himself until he reaches a

kingship in general appears to be of much greater antiquity in Chronicles for, as we saw in chapter 2, Chronicles gives no indication as to when kings first ruled in Israel.

In this kind of mockery of imperial hegemony, the hegemonic claims themselves about the goodness of the imperial king and his importance for maintaining world peace are never explicitly contradicted, although Auramazda's role in this cosmovision is elided. The final pre-exilic Davidides are hardly presented in a uniformly positive way, and if this and the destruction of Judah at the end of the Chronicler's narrative might appear to validate one aspect of Persian hegemony—that is, the Achaemenids and not the colonized can provide for proper rule and peace throughout the world—we see mockery here too, since it is Yhwh rather than Auramazda or the Achaemenid who deals with the failure of the Davidides, and Chronicles as a whole suggests that a Davidic restoration would have a positive outcome. Again, Chronicles does not explicitly make this statement, for it is portraying a past rather than explicitly advocating for a future, even if it might implicitly do the latter. What the Persian government and pro-Persian elements of the assembly would find to be important is that Chronicles nowhere advocates revolt against Persia; the most obvious understanding of its implicit pro-Davidic message, then, is a restoration as a client monarchy. Yet once Judean readers carefully consider what Chronicles has to say about Yhwh's eternal covenant with the Davidides, the link it draws between dynasty and temple, its doctrine of immediate retribution, and its understanding of peace, they might perceive the subtle mockery of Persian hegemony here. The Davidides are the dynasty God wants to rule Judah; future Davidides will not dare to do otherwise than care for temple cult so that they avoid the inevitable dreadful divine punishment that would befall them personally for failure in this

common ancestor with Cyrus, and then simply states that the family had been kings “from long ago” (1.8).

regard; this, and not Achaemenid rule, will provide for Judah's peace; and so Davidic rule, even with client status, is necessary. The Chronicler, as we saw in the previous chapter, also hopes to gain the support of assembly members who hope for a great divine action in history—we will discuss such hopes within the Persian-period assembly in the next chapter—and such readers might be led by the story of Josiah's death to see a confirmation of this belief. Yet even as the Chronicler mocks Persian hegemony, he or she does not advocate rebellion against Persia. The Chronicler emphasizes, as we have seen, that God has the ability to win any battle, regardless of the size of the opposing army, and so if Chronicles assures assembly readers that a future Davidide would not dare to make an anti-imperial foreign military alliance, it also signals, ever so subtly, that no Davidide would need to do so to be free from Achaemenid power if that were God's will.

The Chronicler, one might say, wanted to have his or her cake and eat it too. The Chronicler wanted to assure assembly readers that a Davidic client would not risk assembly lives in needless wars and alliances, but also, and more subtly, the Chronicler holds the door open for a bid for Judean independence on the part of a future Davidide. Such a king would of necessity promote cultic norms in Jerusalem and would, in theory, rely on God to defeat the empire; if readers take Chronistic theology seriously, there is no impediment to God's control over history, and no empire or army can prevent the fulfillment of God's will. This is a remarkably intelligent writing strategy given the Chronicler's goals, for he or she can appeal to assembly members who have no interest in challenging imperial power by pointing out that good Davidides, the kind they can expect from now on, will ensure Judean peace in a way that the Achaemenids cannot. On the other hand, the Chronicler very carefully uses the story of Josiah's death and his or her theology of immediate retribution according to which God defends Judah when it is ruled by culturally

loyal Davidic monarchs in order to point out to assembly members who might be willing to hope for Judean independence that such a thing is possible.

Certainly events in the fifth and fourth centuries, the periods just before and around the time when Chronicles was written, would have helped make the Chronicler's case that the Achaemenids, despite their hegemony, were having difficulty providing peace for any of their colonized peoples. Egypt rebelled when Xerxes died in 465 and made an alliance with Athens (Thucydides 1.104; Diodorus 11.71); according to Diodorus, Artaxerxes I responded by gathering an army of 300,000 soldiers drawn from all of his satrapies, which he sent to Egypt some years later, but which failed to defeat Egyptian and Greek forces (11.71.6, 74.1-4). Another Persian army eventually arrived and subdued most of Egypt after besieging the Greeks on an island in the Nile Delta for a year and a half (Thucydides 1.110; Diodorus 11.77). The Athenians returned to attack Egypt and Cyprus after concluding peace with Sparta in the 450s, and defeated Phoenician, Cypriot, and Cilician forces on both land and sea (Thucydides 1.115; Diodorus 12.3-4; Plutarch, *Cim.* 18.4-6). The Judeans, like all other subject peoples in the empire, would have been required to send soldiers to the Great King's army, and could hardly have been unaware of the great Persian forces massing in the region to deal with these rebellions and attacks. One imagines that the Judean elite, at least, would have been cognizant of the Achaemenids' struggles elsewhere, such as the war between Persia and Athens over Samos in 440-439 (Thucydides 1.115-117; Diodorus 12.27-28; Plutarch, *Per.* 25-28), or the revolts by satraps in Asia Minor (Thucydides 8.5.5, 19.2, 54.3), or the assassinations and revolts that followed in the wake of Artaxerxes' death in 424 (Ctesias 47-53), or the revolts in Media (Xenophon, *Hell.* 1.2.19) or Cadusia (2.1.3) toward the end of the fifth century. Diodorus reports that an alliance between Egyptian and Arabian kings was threatening enough to cause Pharnabazus, a Persian satrap, to

send 300 triremes to Phoenicia (13.46.6). Upon the death of Darius II in 404, Egypt successfully rebelled against Persia and regained its independence under Amyrtaeus, who had been leading a fight for independence since 411, and the fifth century closed with a struggle between Artaxerxes II and Cyrus the Younger for control of the empire, a war that reached throughout the empire and into Across-the-River and Phoenicia (*Anab.* 1.4.4-11; cf. Diodorus 14.35.2).

The fourth century would hardly have seemed any more peaceful to the Judeans, particularly to those aware of events outside of Palestine. After Cyrus's death at Cunaxa in 401, Tissaphernes, the satrap of Sardis, demanded that the Ionian cities recognize his authority, but they refused and appealed for help to Sparta (Xenophon, *Hell.* 3.1.3; Diodorus 14.35.6). The Spartan forces who arrived in Asia Minor in 399 allied themselves with Greek mercenaries who had fought for Cyrus (*Hell.* 3.1.4-6), and Tamos, Cyrus's lieutenant, delivered his 50 triremes to the Egyptians (Diodorus 14.19.5, 35.4). Another Spartan expeditionary force arrived in Asia Minor in 396 (*Hell.* 4.1.1) and campaigned throughout the region (*Hell. Oxy.* 21.1-22.3) in alliance with the king of Paphlagonia, a rebellious Persian client (Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.1.2-3). Not until the Persian navy defeated Sparta in 394 were the Spartans driven from Asia Minor (*Hell.* 4.8.1; Diodorus 14.83.4-7). Closer to Judah, Persia entered a war in Cyprus in the 380s, which the client king Evagoras of Salamis had launched against other Persian clients on the island. Evagoras was allied with Egypt, Tyre, an Arabian king (Diodorus 15.2.1-4), and Athens (Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.8.24), and the Persians needed to act to limit Evagoras's power. Isocrates said that, even in 380, Phoenicia remained devastated from that war (*Paneg.* 161), and refers as well to a failed three-year Persian campaign to retake Egypt in the 380s (*Paneg.* 140).

Archaeological evidence demonstrates that there was a wave of destruction in the Shephelah and

the Negev between 400 and 380, the result of Egyptian advances into Persian-held territory.⁴³⁵ The Persians launched yet another invasion of Egypt in the mid-370s, which Diodorus says involved 200,000 Persian troops and 20,000 Greek mercenaries, an army that took several years to assemble (15.41.2-3) and then failed in its objective to re-secure Egypt for Persia (15.41-43). It would have been obvious in the hill country of Palestine, even to those who were not compelled to fight in the Persian army, that the Achaemenids seemed to be failing to keep the earth down in its place. The Persians began to fortify Southern Palestine and even reorganize the region administratively in response to the threat posed by Egypt's independence from 402 to 343.⁴³⁶ Rather obviously, nation would have appeared to have been fighting against nation and city against city, with the peace and quiet of the Achaemenid *šiyāti*- perhaps appearing to some as an imperial fantasy rather than accepted hegemony.

⁴³⁵ Ephraim Stern, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible II: The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods 732-332 BCE*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 577-78.

⁴³⁶ See Oded Lipschits, "Achaemenid Imperial Policy, Settlement Processes in Palestine, and the Status of Jerusalem in the Middle of the Fifth Century B.C.E." in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 19-52 (38); Alexander Fantalkin and Oren Tal, "Redating Lachish Level I: Identifying Achaemenid Imperial Policy at the Southern Frontier of the Fifth Satrapy" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 167-97; Alexander Fantalkin and Oren Tal, "Judah and its Neighbors in the Fourth Century BCE: A Time of Major Transformations" in *From Judah to Judaea: Socio-economic Structures and Processes in the Persian Period*, ed. Johannes Unsok Ro, HBM 43 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 133-96.

In 366, Athens sent aid to the rebellious satrap of Phrygia (Demosthenes, *Rhod. lib.* 9), and Diodorus writes that, by 361, Phrygia and other satrapies of Asia Minor were in alliance with Egypt and Sparta (15.90).⁴³⁷ By 359, an army of 80,000 Egyptians and 10,000 Greek mercenaries was marching through Palestine toward Syria before a revolt in Egypt cut the advance in short (Diodorus 15.92.2-5). And if it were not difficult to live in fourth-century Palestine without awareness of the massive struggle between Persia and Egypt, the Tennes Rebellion, an alliance between Phoenician cities, Egypt, and the nine kings of Cyprus⁴³⁸ against Artaxerxes III (Diodorus 16.41) that ended with the Persian recapture of the Phoenician and Cypriot cities (16.42-46), would have brought this fight to Judah's doorstep. Some scholars have even suggested that Judah participated in this revolt and suffered from Persian reprisals⁴³⁹—

⁴³⁷ As Michael Weiskopf notes in *The So-Called "Great Satraps' Revolt", 366-360 B.C.: Concerning Local Instability in the Achaemenid Far West*, *Historia* 63 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1989), 9-13, Diodorus 15.90-92 is really the only clear reference to a widespread Anatolian revolt in the 360s supported by Egypt. Weiskopf argues that what is sometimes seen as a widespread and united Satraps' Revolt was really a series of rebellions in Asia Minor rather than a single organized revolt that threatened the empire.

⁴³⁸ Isocrates, *Phil.* 102 writes that Cilicia was also an ally of the anti-Persian coalition, but Diodorus 16.42.1 says that Cilicia fought for Persia.

⁴³⁹ E.g., D. Barag, "The Effects of the Tennes Rebellion on Palestine," *BASOR* 183 (1966): 6-12; Peter Machinist, "The First Coins of Judah and Samaria: Numismatics and History in the Achaemenid and Early Hellenistic Periods" in *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, Amélie Kuhrt, and Margaret Cool Root (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1994), 365-80 (375-76); Joachim Schaper,

Solinus writes that Jericho was destroyed in the “war of Artaxerxes” (*Coll.* 35.4)—and although there is not very strong evidence for this,⁴⁴⁰ the very occurrence of a nearby rebellion that elicited a Persian military response could not have failed to increase the impression in Judah that Persia was an empire full of internal strife rather than peace, quiet, and well-being. The same impression could only have been heightened when the Persians, following their defeat of this rebellion, massed troops in Phoenicia for their successful invasion of Egypt in 343/2 (Diodorus 16.46-51). The more violence in the wider world of which Judeans were aware, the harder it would have been to believe the claims of Achaemenid hegemony that the Great King provided peace and quiet and well-being to his colonized subjects. Chronistic mockery of this hegemony pointed to a path of security and peace for a tiny province that, without divine protection, was subject to vast and destructive forces outside of the assembly’s control. It gave assembly members another reason to consider a change in the political status quo, and Chronicles as a whole points to a Davidic restoration as the change God has in mind.

And even though it is possible, although not as likely, that Chronicles was written in the final decades of the fourth century, soon after the fall of Persia, we would still expect the

Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda: Studien zur Kult- und Sozialgeschichte Israels in persischer Zeit, FAT 31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 155-56.

⁴⁴⁰ See, e.g., Stern, *Archaeology of the Land*, 359-60; H.G.M. Williamson, *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 22-23 and Lester L. Grabbe, “Archaeology and *Archaiologos*: Relating Excavations to History in Fourth-Century B.C.E. Palestine” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 125-35.

Chronicler to reflect and subtly mock Persian hegemony. This had been the imperial ideology for the past two centuries, and Alexander showed little sign of repudiating it, even if he did not fully understand it.⁴⁴¹ Alexander saw himself, to some degree, as a new Cyrus conquering a new empire,⁴⁴² and Arrian writes that Alexander retained the Persian bureaucracy (*Anab.* 1.17). Although he replaced Persian satraps with Macedonian ones, he kept the old administrative structure with its satrapies and traditional amounts of tribute, and so the Persian style of government remained until his death, with his immediate successors giving no indication that they planned to do away with it (Diodorus 18.3.1-3). Alexander married daughters of Darius III and Artaxerxes III in ceremonies that followed Persian custom, and had his companions marry Persian noblewomen as well (Arrian, *Anab.* 7.4). Insofar as the *yhwd* stamps from Judah witness to some form of imperial tax collection, there does not appear to be any interruption of the tax regime established by Persia through the end of the fourth century.⁴⁴³ Real administrative

⁴⁴¹ See Maria Brosius, “Alexander and the Persians” in *Brill’s Companion to Alexander the Great*, ed. Joseph Roisman (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 169-93.

⁴⁴² As suggested by the fact that he showed concern for Cyrus’s tomb, on which see Arrian, *Anab.* 6.29.4-11; Quintus Curtius 10.1.30-32; and Brosius, “Alexander and the Persians,” 174.

⁴⁴³ While important changes in style, palaeography, and orthography of the stamps take place in the late fifth/early fourth centuries, the new impressions that appear from that time maintain a stable style through the second century. See Oded Lipschits and David S. Vanderhooft, *The Yehud Stamp Impressions: A Corpus of Inscribed Impressions from the Persian and Hellenistic Periods in Judah* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 11-22, 63-73, 761-62.

changes in Judah do not appear to take place until the Hasmonean period,⁴⁴⁴ and Greek language and art do not appear to reach the interior of Palestine until the early-third century.⁴⁴⁵ There would hardly have been any sense in the colonies that a centuries-old ruling ideology was about to change. And after Alexander's death in 323 until the end of the fourth century it would not have been clear to residents of Palestine which power would rule the region. The Ptolemies and Antigonids fought over the area until the end of the century, and the time did not exist for either of these houses to clearly propagate their hegemony that would validate and justify their control over Palestine, a situation that would not change until Palestine was firmly in Ptolemaic hands. In short, from the Macedonian conquest of the region until the end of the fourth century, imperial ideology meant Achaemenid ideology, and so even in the unlikely event that Chronicles was written after the fall of Persia we should not be surprised to find an author engaged in mockery of Persian hegemony, since Judeans would not have received any firm indication that imperial ideology was changing

And even if Chronicles was written toward the end of the fourth century, the violence of that period would likely have appeared to Judeans as even greater than that of the earlier part of

⁴⁴⁴ See James K. Aitken, "Judaic National Identity" in *Judah between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400-200 BCE)*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits, LSTS 75 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2011), 31-48 (35-36).

⁴⁴⁵ This at least is the conclusion of Amos Kloner in regard to his study of Maresha, the main city of Ptolemaic Idumaea; see his "The Introduction of the Greek Language and Culture in the Third Century BCE, According to the Archaeological Evidence in Idumaea" in *Judah between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400-200 BCE)*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits, LSTS 75 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2011), 158-62.

the century. Alexander's forces arrived in Palestine in 332, and although they did not enter Judah, it is hard to believe that the Judeans were not aware of the Macedonians' six-month long siege of Tyre (Diodorus 17.40-46), which culminated in Alexander's crucifixion of the surviving men of the city and his selling of the women and children into slavery (17.46.4), or of his two-month long siege of Gaza, which concluded with the death of all of the soldiers in the city and the selling of the women and children there into slavery (Arrian, *Anab.* 2.27.7). After Alexander's death, Ptolemy sent an army to southern Syria in 319, removing the satrap there and establishing garrisons in the Phoenician cities (Diodorus 18.43), but in 315 Antigonus invaded the region and had the Phoenician kings build him ships (19.58). In 312, Ptolemy's counterattack resulted in a massive battle and Egyptian victory at Gaza (19.80-84), yet in 306 Antigonus won a decisive naval victory over Ptolemy at Salamis (Diodorus 20.50-52; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 16; Justin 15.2.6) and had 80,000 troops in Gaza preparing for an invasion of Egypt (Diodorus 20.73). Josephus refers to the violence of the period of the Diadochi's struggle for succession as *sunexei=j kai_ makrou_j* "unremitting and long" (*Ant.* 12.3); besides the battles and slaughters mentioned above, Palestine also witnessed Antigonus's year-long siege of Tyre that ended in the city's starvation and surrender (Diodorus 19.61.5) and Ptolemy's razing of important coastal cities in 312 as he retreated to Egypt (19.93.4-7). Such unremitting violence in the region might have served as evidence for some Judeans that the Chronicler's understanding of peace as the result of action in the cult overseen by God's chosen dynasty, rather than as the result of imperial power, was the right one.

6. The development of and challenge to the pro-Davidic vision

1. Judean political factions and pro-Davidic visions in the sixth through fourth centuries

Having reached the end of our study of the political motivations and tactics that lie behind Chronicles, we conclude now by searching for the roots of the pro-Davidic ideology of the group from which Chronicles emerged. To be more specific, we are searching the Judean literature of the sixth through fourth centuries for evidence of pro-Davidic sentiment and of the groups that might have promoted it. Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 provide us with some evidence of the existence of a pro-Davidic group in the early post-exilic assembly, and Ezekiel 40-48 suggests that pro-Davidic sentiment existed even with the exilic priesthood, and that at least one group of exilic priests looked forward to some kind of Davidic leadership in the post-exilic period. We will also see, however, that the Chronicler's promotion of a quiet revolution, his or her main vision of a peaceful reordering of the local polity with a Davidide at its head and with room for assembly and temple personnel to exercise power, is not one that relies on Haggai, First Zechariah, or Ezekiel. Yet Chronicles would never have been written without the existence of the pro-Davidic group or groups in the sixth century to which these writings bear witness. Other Persian-period biblical literature, as we shall see, points to a real complexity of groups and interests within the Judean assembly, a situation of overlapping political and theological agreements and conflicts. Given what we know of the Chronicler, it would appear that he or she largely tries to elide these differences in order to gain as much support as possible from the assembly for the pro-Davidic cause.

Yet the Chronicler's quest for a quiet revolution failed; as we saw in chapters 2 and 3, the Judean local government of the Hellenistic period continued to consist of the leadership of high priest, priesthood, and assembly. We can likely never be sure as to why the Chronicler's vision

was never realized, but the very fact that he or she felt it necessary to try to persuade assembly members, including those within the temple personnel, to support it suggests that many of the local elite were not in favor of it. Part of the work in this first section of the chapter will involve examining Malachi, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Third Isaiah, works that say nothing about a Davidic restoration but that give us a sense of the complexity of interest groups in the Persian period assembly that the Chronicler needed to negotiate; even Second Zechariah, as we shall see, appears to be in favor of a Davidic restoration, but not the kind the Chronicler promotes. We will conclude this chapter with an examination of Ezra-Nehemiah, a late-fifth- or early-fourth-century work that offers a political vision and ruling ideology that stands in stark contrast to that of Chronicles. Ezra-Nehemiah has no place for a local client monarchy; the assembly's success in this work depends on their loyalty to Persia, which Ezra-Nehemiah equates with loyalty to God. The assembly of Ezra-Nehemiah is presented as a group of colonists sent by the Persian king from the center of the empire to colonize its margins. Ezra-Nehemiah does not polemicize against the establishment of a local client monarchy, but it also allows no political space for one. The political bonds that matter are the ones that bind the community to the Persian king and the figures whom he sends from the imperial center to Judah to lead the assembly and bring it the law, a law that he has sealed with the stamp of Achaemenid approval. Ezra-Nehemiah has no room for a leadership to emerge from within the Judean group itself, and certainly has no room for the restoration of a local royal house, something the work never refers to. It is the assembly from Babylon, not the Davidides, who are coeval with the temple of Ezra-Nehemiah, and neither the assembly nor temple has any need of a Davidic middleman between them and the Persians, for the problems they face will be solved by the king and his representatives that he sends from the center of the empire. In Ezra-Nehemiah, in short, we see one kind of defense of the existing

political status quo, one of the defenses against which the Chronicler fought and lost.

Second Zechariah refers to “the house of David” in 12:8, 10, 12. We will examine the portrayal of kingship and the Davidides in Second Zechariah below, but these references to the house of David point to the existence in Judah of some group that understood itself to consist of Davidides,⁴⁴⁶ just as the genealogy of 1 Chronicles 3 does; this, or a group closely allied with it, is likely the one from which Chronicles emerged. While we would expect self-identified Davidides to promote pro-Davidic ideology, there are signs in works from the exilic and Persian periods that assembly groups beyond the Davidides manifested such sentiment; Second Zechariah itself, as we shall see, does not appear to originate from “the house of David.” Nonetheless, Chronicles’ forthright promotion of Davidic authority and power has no parallel elsewhere in sixth to fourth century literature. Even Haggai and First Zechariah, the writings where we begin our search for the political roots of Chronicles’ pro-Davidic message, are hardly unreservedly pro-Davidic, despite their positive references to Zerubbabel, the sixth-century governor through whom 1 Chr 3:1-24 traces the Davidic lineage. Ezra 5:1 and 6:14 say that both the prophets Haggai and Zechariah promoted temple construction,⁴⁴⁷ and it has been argued that

⁴⁴⁶ So also, e.g., Kenneth E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism*, SBLEJL 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 117-23; James D. Nogalski, *The Book of the Twelve*, SHBC (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2011), 2:949.

⁴⁴⁷ As Bob Becking points out in “Haggai and Zechariah in the Stories of Ezra and *I Esdras*” in *Prophecy and Prophets in Stories*, ed. Bob Becking and Hans M. Barstad, OTS 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 152-65 (155-56), Ezra 5:1-2 uses the Aramaic verb *s’d* “to help” in reference to Haggai’s and Zechariah’s work in regard to temple construction, the same verb the

Haggai 1-2 and Zechariah 1-8 originally formed a composite work assembled in preparation for the completion of the temple, as the similar dating formulae found throughout the editorial sections of these chapters might attest.⁴⁴⁸ The dates appear to have been attached to these oracles at an early stage, and so in these chapters we have at least some sense of the message of these prophets who were working in Judah between 520 and 518, near the beginning of Darius's reign and at the start of the construction of the temple.⁴⁴⁹ While Ezra 3:6-10 and 4:1-3 present a Judean

Aramaic version of the Bisitun Inscription uses in reference to the help Auramazda gave to Darius to defeat those who rebelled against his power; that is, in the Achaemenid context the verb suggests some kind of connection with the divine, and so points to the prophets' help in temple construction as consisting of bringing oracles of divine support for the work. For the appearance of *s'd* in such a context in the Aramaic version of DB, see, e.g., *TAD C2.1.10*, 12, 15, 42, etc.

⁴⁴⁸ For the dates, see Hag 1:1, 15; 2:1, 10, 20; Zech 1:1, 7; 7:1. For arguments that Haggai and Zechariah were originally assembled as a composite work before the completion of the temple, see, e.g., Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 25B (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1987), xlv-xlviii and Byron G. Curtis, *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*, SBLAB 25 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 111-13.

⁴⁴⁹ For the early combination of editorial framework and dates with Haggai's oracles, see John Kessler, *The Book of Haggai: Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud*, VTSup 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 41-51. Diana Edelman argues that the dates provided by the editors of the works are not accurate—see her *The Origins of the 'Second' Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem*, BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2005), 80-150—and that these

group from Babylon beginning the rebuilding of the temple during the reign of Cyrus, Haggai, near the beginning of Darius's reign, says that the temple is בָּרָא "ruined, desolate" (1:4, 9), and that "this people" has claimed that the time has not yet come to build it (1:2).⁴⁵⁰ Hag 1:14 says that Zerubbabel, Joshua the high priest, and "all the remnant of the people" worked on the temple beginning in the year 520, and Hag 2:15 says that not one stone of the temple was laid upon the other at that time, despite the fact that Ezra 3:8-10 puts the laying of the temple foundation in the second year of the Babylonian immigrants' arrival in Judah. Ezra-Nehemiah, which wants to present the post-exilic temple and assembly as coeval—just as Chronicles presents the Davidides and first temple as coeval—presents two phases of temple-building, one during Cyrus's reign and another during Darius's.⁴⁵¹

two prophets actually worked much later, promoting a temple construction that did not begin until Nehemiah's governorship in the mid-fifth century (1-9). For a refutation of her argument and support for the consensus that Haggai and Zechariah promoted a temple construction project that began in 520, see Ralph Klein, "Were Joshua, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah Contemporaries? A Response to Diana Edelman," *JBL* 127 (2008): 697-701.

⁴⁵⁰ For the dating of the temple construction to the early years of Darius's reign, see Hayim Tadmor, "'The appointed time has not yet arrived': The Historical Background of Haggai 1:2" in *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*, ed. Robert Chazan, William W. Hallo, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 401-408; James M. Trotter, "Was the Second Jerusalem Temple a Primarily Persian Project?," *SJOT* 15 (2001): 276-94 (278-85); Peter Ross Bedford, *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*, *JSJSup* 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 152-57.

⁴⁵¹ See Bedford, *Temple Restoration*, 87-94. In Ezra-Nehemiah, the foundations are laid

Haggai's oracles promise divinely-bestowed prosperity should the people build the temple, and God even promises to shake the heavens and the earth so that the nations will bring precious things to fill the temple and make it even more glorious than the first building (2:6-9). Two of the oracles are formally addressed to Zerubbabel, called "the governor of Judah," and Joshua, "the high priest" (1:1; 2:2), but God speaks to "this people" (1:2), and the content of the messages about the temple are really directed to them as well, even if they are not formally addressed in all of the oracles, while the prophecy of 1:13 is specifically directed to them. It is thus rather surprising to find that the final oracle of the book is addressed both formally and in content to Zerubbabel alone (2:20-23), who is still called "governor of Judah" (2:21). Haggai repeats the message of 2:6-9 that God will shake heavens and earth, but adds now that God will overthrow "the kingdoms of the nations" and their armies. "On that day—the oracle of Yhwh of armies—I will take you, Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel, my servant—the oracle of Yhwh—and I will set you as a signet ring, because I have chosen you—the oracle of Yhwh of armies" (2:23). The very fact that this oracle alone is addressed to and involves only Zerubbabel might suggest that he will have a special role in this imminent change in the geopolitical order. Despite the fact that Haggai never refers to Zerubbabel's Davidic lineage, some read the language of 2:23 as indicating the prophet's belief that Zerubbabel the Davidide would take the throne following

in the second year after the end of the exile, during Cyrus's reign, but Ezra 4:1-5 introduces opposition to the temple construction from "the people of the land." We will discuss the Aramaic section of Ezra 4-6 and its correspondence in the next section of this chapter, but part of its point is to create a history in which there are two starts to temple construction, one that begins in 537 that was halted by the assembly's opposition (4:24), and one that began in the time of the prophecy of Haggai and Zechariah (5:1-2).

God's overthrow of Persia. Like Zerubbabel, David is "my servant" in passages like 2 Sam 7:5; 1 Kgs 11:32, 36; God "chose his servant David" in Ps 78:70 as God chooses Zerubbabel; and the use of מַטְוֶן "signet ring" might be intended as a reversal of the prophecy of Jer 22:24-30 where it is used as a symbol of God's rejection of the Davidides.⁴⁵²

⁴⁵² See, e.g., Sigmund Mowinckel, *He that Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*, trans. G.W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 119-20; Georg Sauer, "Serubbabel in der Sicht Haggais und Sacharjas" in *Das ferne und nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 30. November 1966*, ed. Fritz Maass, BZAW 105 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967), 199-207 (202-204); Karl-Martin Beyse, *Serubbabel und die Königserwartungen der Propheten Haggai und Sacharja: Eine historische und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), 56-59; Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 248; Robert P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed: Cognitive Dissonance in the Prophetic Traditions of the Old Testament* (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), 159-64; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 29-30; Antti Laato, *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of Jewish Messianic Expectations*, ISFCJ 5 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 196-97; Sara Japhet, "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah: Part 1" in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Studies on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 51-84 (62-64); Paul L. Redditt, "The King in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8 and the Book of the Twelve" in *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, LHBOTS 475 (New York: T. & T.

As many commentators have pointed out, however, this is not clearly royal language. Many figures in the Hebrew Bible are said to be God’s servants, the verb רָב is not normally used in reference to kings, nor, indeed, is the word מֶלֶךְ . Given that Zerubbabel is still explicitly “governor” here, that the word “king” is never used in reference to him, and that Zerubbabel’s Davidic lineage is also never mentioned, this is hardly an ambiguous declaration that Haggai expects Zerubbabel to be king.⁴⁵³ The fact that Haggai repeats and elaborates on the

Clark, 2008), 56-82 (59); James Boswick, “Characters in Stone: Royal Ideology and Yehudite Identity in the Behistun Inscription and the Book of Haggai” in *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 87-117 (111-16); Antonius Finitis, *Visions and Eschatology: A Socio-Historical Analysis of Zechariah 1-6*, LSTS 79 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2011), 119-20; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2013), 79-81.

⁴⁵³ So, e.g., Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 68-70; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 47-49; Janet E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, JSOTSup 150 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 137-44; Rex Mason, “The Messiah in the Postexilic Old Testament Literature” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, JSOTSup 270 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 338-64 (341-42); Wolter H. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period*, JSOTSup 304 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 208-43; John Kessler, “Haggai, Zechariah, and the Political Status of Yehud: The Signet Ring in Haggai 2:23” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak, LHBOTS 427 (New York:

coming cosmic shaking and change in the geopolitical order in this oracle to Zerubbabel the governor may simply suggest that the prophet believes God will protect Zerubbabel, even though he holds a Persian office, when God overthrows the empire.⁴⁵⁴ Given that Haggai speaks so openly of this divine overthrow, one can hardly argue that he uses obscure royal language for Zerubbabel so as not to antagonize the Persians.⁴⁵⁵ Haggai suggests, although does not clearly claim, that there is a role for Zerubbabel following the coming cosmic upheaval that will allow the temple to be splendidly completed. The language hints that this will be a royal role, but this is not clear, and likely deliberately so, as we shall discuss later. Zerubbabel and Joshua the high priest are the most important members of the community here, since they can be directly addressed in oracles directed to all of the people, but Haggai gives no clear indication that Zerubbabel will reign as king, even though the language the prophet uses leaves this open as a possibility.

Outside of exhorting the people to temple construction, Haggai urges no action, certainly not rebellion against Persia,⁴⁵⁶ and not even the quiet revolution of a local change in polity to

T. & T. Clark International, 2007), 102-19 (110-17); Greg Goswell, "The Fate and Future of Zerubbabel in the Prophecy of Haggai," *Bib* 91 (2010): 77-90 (80-83).

⁴⁵⁴ So also Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*, 242-43 and Goswell, "The Fate and Future," 89-90. As Carol and Eric Meyers suggest, in referring to him as "signet ring," Haggai may simply be prophesying that Zerubbabel would be the sign of God's coming reign (*Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 82-83).

⁴⁵⁵ So also Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 49-50.

⁴⁵⁶ See also on this Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 119-20; J. Kessler, "The Second Year of Darius and the Prophet Haggai," *Transeu* 5 (1992): 63-84 (82-83); Tollington, *Tradition and*

which Chronicles points, for geopolitical change is in divine hands for the prophet. First Zechariah also emphasizes God's coming overthrow of the nations (2:1-4 [1:18-21], 10-17 [2:6-13]), but in the context of vengeance for Babylon's treatment of Judah rather than to have the nations supply precious objects for the temple, as is the case in Haggai. Unlike the general overthrow of the nations of which Hag 2:6-7, 21-22 speaks, God in Zechariah is about to strike the nation that scattered Judah (2:3-4 [1:20-21]). The Judeans who remain in Babylon must flee since God is about to punish the nations that plundered them; these nations are about to become plunder, which will allow Zion to rejoice (2:11-14 [6-10]).⁴⁵⁷ This has nothing to do with causing the peoples to bring supplies for the temple or protecting—let alone exalting—Zerubbabel during such a geopolitical change.

Nonetheless, Zerubbabel is mentioned by name in First Zechariah. He is the one who has founded and will complete the temple (4:8-10), and so he would appear to be the $\chi\mu\varsigma$ "Branch"

Innovation, 135-37; Finitsis, *Visions and Eschatology*, 123-24.

⁴⁵⁷ The Babylonian Empire was, of course, destroyed by the time of this oracle, delivered in 519 (see 1:7), but Zechariah may simply use the concept of Babylon to refer to any enemy of Judah—so, e.g., David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1985), 154-55; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 121; Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 219-20. That is, the case may be that the colonial population of Judah was used to seeing Mesopotamia as the imperial center, and so simply associated imperial power with Babylon. The case may also be that Zechariah prophesies the destruction of the actual city of Babylon in fulfillment of prophecies like those of Isa 43:14; 47:1-5; Jer 25:11-12; 50-51. See Mark J. Boda, "Terrifying the Horns: Persia and Babylon in Zechariah 1:7-6:15," *CBQ* 67 (2005): 22-41 (33-41).

of 3:8 and 6:12, since this figure “will build the temple of Yhwh” according to 6:12.⁴⁵⁸ For some scholars, however, it is not clear that Zerubbabel is the Branch, for while 4:9 says that Zerubbabel has laid the foundation of the temple, 3:8 and 6:12 refer to the Branch as a future figure who will build the temple. While Zechariah refers neither to Zerubbabel nor the Branch as a Davidide, there is some reason to believe that Zechariah sees the Branch as a future royal ruler; if we understand Zerubbabel to be the Branch, then it is possible to see Zechariah as indicating that Zerubbabel will rule as king. The oracle of 6:9-15 says that the Branch “will bear majesty (dwh) and will sit and rule upon his throne (w) sk-l (l # \$m),” while “there will be a priest upon his throne (w) sk-l (), and peaceful counsel will be between the two of them.” In Zech 6:9-15 we have, as in Hag 2:23, language used for Zerubbabel (or at least the Branch) that could be read to imply that he will rule as a king. For some commentators, the use of dwh,) sk, and l # \$m imply this, as does the very appearance of the word xmc, which could be understood as reflecting Jer 23:5 and 33:15, where the word appears in the context of a Davidic restoration.⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁸ For this conclusion, see, e.g., Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 276-77; Paul L. Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, NCBC (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 78-79; Deborah W. Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*, OTM (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 141-42; Mark J. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004), 335-41; Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*, LHBOTS 506 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2009), 145-49.

⁴⁵⁹ E.g., Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 120-21; Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed*, 163; Antti Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus: The Historical Josiah and the Messianic Expectations of Exilic and Postexilic Times*, ConBOT 33 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992),

If the Branch is to be understood as a later figure than Zerubbabel, then it might make more sense to see him as a post-Zerubbabel royal figure who will extend the temple-building project begun by Zerubbabel.⁴⁶⁰

Others, however, point out that the allegedly royal language of 6:9-15 is ambiguous as that of Hag 2:23: *dwh* refers to splendor or majesty, but is not always used of kings; *sk* is used of important seats in general and not only of royal thrones; Zechariah chooses the verb *l#šm* “rule” rather than the unambiguous *klm* “rule as king”; Jer 23:5 and 33:15 use the phrase *xmc qydc* “legitimate heir” (see the same phrase in *KAI* 43.11), which is not the wording Zech 3:8 or 6:12 use in reference to the Branch; and Zechariah, like Haggai, never refers to Zerubbabel’s Davidic descent.⁴⁶¹ If Zechariah had wanted to clearly portray Zerubbabel (or the Branch, if the

234-301; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 30; Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 210-11, 276-78; Redditt, “The King in Haggai,” 60-62.

⁴⁶⁰ For arguments that the Branch is a post-Zerubbabel figure who will build an expansion of Zerubbabel’s temple or a more impressive one, see, e.g., Wilhelm Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1-8, Sacharja 9-14, Maleachi*, KAT 13/4 (Gütersloh : Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1976), 130-31; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 371; Laato, *Josiah and David*, 236-38; Henning Graf Reventlow, *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi*, ATD 25/2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 55; Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*, 140-41; Curtis, *Up the Steep and Stony Road*, 135-36; Anthony R. Petterson, *Behold your King: The Hope for the House of David in the Book of Zechariah*, LHBOTS 513 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2009), 114-20.

⁴⁶¹ See, e.g., Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 361-62; Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 173-75; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 53-55; Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*,

prophet understood these to be two different figures) as a king, then he could have done so, and the simple use of $\kappa\lambda\mu$ in place of $\lambda\#\varsigma\mu$ would have accomplished that. It certainly would be possible for some sixth-century readers to see Zechariah's Zerubbabel/Branch as a royal figure (or figures) if they were predisposed to read those references in that way, but the text's language is hardly unambiguously royal.

Whether or not Zechariah understands the Branch to be Zerubbabel, Zerubbabel's/the Branch's most obvious responsibility and most important role is the completion of the temple, as this is the only specific role with which the text connects the figure or figures.⁴⁶² The very fact that the two times we encounter references to the Branch are in the context of oracles to Joshua the high priest (3:8; 6:11-14) links Zerubbabel—or at least the Branch, if the Branch is supposed to be a later royal figure—to the temple hierarchy. The fact that, following an oracle addressed to Joshua in 3:6-10 and one to Zerubbabel in 4:6-7, we read about the two “sons of oil” in 4:11-14 suggests a kind of joint rule between the high priest and Zerubbabel,⁴⁶³ rather the same

63-64, 91-120, 129-30. For the lack of scholarly consensus concerning the royal portrayal of Zerubbabel in Zechariah, see Petterson, *Behold your King*, 13-45.

⁴⁶² So also Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 144-54; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 56-57; Thomas Pola, *Das Priestertum bei Sacharja: Historische und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen zur früh-nachexilischen Herrschererwartung*, FAT 35 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 276-78; Jeremiah W. Cataldo, *Breaking Monotheism: Yehud and the Material Formation of Monotheistic Identity*, LHBOTS 565 (New York: Bloomsbury, 2012), 67-70.

⁴⁶³ See, e.g., Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, xlii-xliii, 349-54; Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 175-78; Iain M. Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel*, VTSup 56

impression we receive from reading Haggai, where oracles are addressed jointly to Zerubbabel and Joshua. Zech 6:9-15 adds to the impression of the high priest's importance in civil rule, for it says that Zechariah is to set a crown (טַרְסָנִים)⁴⁶⁴ on Joshua's head as the prophet announces to him that the Branch will build the temple. The noun חַטָּן (or טַרְסָנִים) need not imply a royal crown, so the case is not that Zechariah is clearly signaling that the high priest is to have royal stature.⁴⁶⁵ Yet it is the high priest and not the Branch who receives the crown in this oracle, and so 6:9-15 could be read as suggesting the high priest will have greater stature than the Branch will. Some have argued that an earlier reference here to the crowning of Zerubbabel was removed from the text after Zerubbabel died or was removed from power,⁴⁶⁶ or that Joshua

(Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 140-41; Mason, "The Messiah," 348-49; Marko Jauhiainen, "Turban and Crown Lost and Regained: Ezekiel 21:29-32 and Zechariah's Zema," *JBL* 127 (2008): 501-11 (501-502).

⁴⁶⁴ טַרְסָנִים in 6:11, 14 can be read as a feminine plural noun, but the verb in 6:14 (חַטָּן) suggests that we are to see it as a singular, which is how the same nominal form of the word should be read in Job 31:36. For some of the attempts to explain the Hebrew here, see Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus*, 246; Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*, 46-48; Åke Viberg, "An Elusive Crown: An Analysis of the Performance of a Prophetic Symbolic Act (Zech 6:9-15)," *SEÅ* 65 (2000): 161-69 (164-65).

⁴⁶⁵ So, e.g., Paul L. Redditt, "Zerubbabel, Joshua, and the Night Visions of Zechariah," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 249-59 (252); Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 167; Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel*, 48-56; Mark J. Boda, "Oil, Crowns and Thrones: Prophet, Priest and King in Zechariah 1:7-6:15," *JHS* 3/10 (2001): 1-35 (18).

⁴⁶⁶ E.g., Beyse, *Serubbabel*, 77-78; Paul D. Hanson, *The People Called: The Growth of*

received the crown on behalf of Zerubbabel, who had not yet arrived from Babylon, which would explain why 3:8 and 6:11-12 refer to the Branch as a future figure.⁴⁶⁷ To work with the text we have, however, only one figure is being crowned, and that is the high priest. Of course, while Zechariah says both Joshua and the Branch “will sit upon his throne,” the prophet uses the verb לָּשָׁב only for the Branch, so perhaps we should see him as the true political leader in the prophet’s vision of the future. On the other hand, since both sit on thrones and since “peaceful counsel will be between the two of them,” perhaps we are supposed to see them as co-rulers, the picture that 4:11-14 provides.

So given that it is possible to read the oracle of 6:9-15 as referring to either the high priest or Zerubbabel/the Branch as the superior figure or to the two of them as partners in rule, we can hardly conclude that Zechariah clearly and unambiguously points to Zerubbabel/the Branch as a royal figure or figures, future or otherwise. It is the high priest who wears the crown and who, like the Branch, sits on a throne,⁴⁶⁸ and who is also told in 3:6-7 that he will judge in the temple

Community in the Bible (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), 265; André Lemaire, “Zorobabel et la Judée à lumière de l’épigraphie (fin du VI^e s. av. J.-C.),” *RB* 103 (1996): 48-57 (55); Mason, “The Messiah,” 346; Marvin A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, BerO (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 2:629; Finitis, *Visions and Eschatology*, 134-35.

⁴⁶⁷ E.g., Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation*, 167-68; Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 335-41.

⁴⁶⁸ Since 6:9-15 says that Joshua will sit בְּיָדָיו (and that the Branch will sit בְּיָדָיו (, it would appear that both the high priest and the Branch are performing precisely the same action on precisely the same kind of seat. It does not really make sense, then, to see the high priest merely as “beside his throne,” contra, e.g., Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*, 277-78; Finitis, *Visions and Eschatology*, 134-35; Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered*, 100. Had

and have charge over it. There is clearly room for Zerubbabel/the Branch to rule in some fashion in First Zechariah, yet his rule is not clearly superior to Joshua's. The high priest is a more important and impressive figure than in Haggai, although there too he is more important than any other Judean figure except for Zerubbabel the governor. And besides the importance of the high priest in these two writings, we should note as well the regard in which the community is held. Except for the fact that, by 520, they have not yet begun to build the temple, the assembly is not addressed negatively in Haggai; they are not accused of violations of Torah⁴⁶⁹ or of idolatry, for example. They simply seem to be convinced that the time has not yet come to build the temple, while Haggai claims that the time has indeed come for this project. The assembly is also portrayed positively in First Zechariah. God has punished the community's ancestors (Zech 1:4-6; 7:8-14; 8:10), and the people are told that they must act rightly (6:5; 7:15; 8:8-10, 16-17), as God will punish wrongdoers (5:1-4). Yet God will also remove evil from the land (5:5-11) and the people can expect to receive divine prosperity and protection, not punishment (1:16-17; 2:5-9 [1-4], 14-16 [10-12]; 8:1-8, 11-13). In Haggai, God's great imminent geopolitical action will benefit the temple the people are beginning to build (2:6-10), and in Zechariah God's great action functions to enact vengeance on the people's enemies (1:14-15; 2:3-4 [1:20-21], 10-17 [2:6-13]). The messages of Zechariah all appear to be addressed directly to the people as a whole, and even to the Judeans in Babylon (2:10-13 [6-9]), except for the messages directed to Joshua (3:6-10; 6:11-15), the single oracle addressed to Zerubbabel (4:6-7), and one addressed

Zechariah wished to portray the high priest merely as standing beside the Branch's throne rather than sitting upon his own, he surely would not have used identical language for the two figures.

⁴⁶⁹ Hag 2:14 is actually the single exception to this, because it accuses the people of bringing unclean offerings.

jointly to “all the people of the land and the priests” (7:4-7).

Considered together as works from the early post-exilic period, Haggai and First Zechariah reflect a local subject population in which the high priest wields some kind of power. The fact that people themselves are not directly attacked by these works suggests some kind of local power group that the prophets do not want to alienate, likely some form of the assembly. Haggai has an obvious reason for not wanting to alienate “this people,” since his main goal appears to be temple construction. He comes as close as either prophet does to criticizing the assembly, stating that “this people says the time has not yet come to build Yhwh’s house” (1:2), and if it seems odd that the group that would become the temple assembly had not begun temple construction by 520, we should note that Haggai’s claim is not that the people are refusing to build the temple but waiting to do so. Perhaps this was a theological issue, a desire to wait several more years so that Jeremiah’s prophecy of a seventy-year destruction would be fulfilled,⁴⁷⁰ or perhaps it was a financial matter, as Haggai’s oracles focus on the community’s current poverty (1:5-6, 9-11; 2:3, 15-19). In either event, Haggai, like First Zechariah, largely avoids direct criticism of the assembly, and these pro-assembly and pro-priestly works maintain a political space for Zerubbabel the governor even after the coming divinely-caused geopolitical change. They are remarkably vague as to what this role will be, however, leaving room for sixth-century readers in the assembly to interpret their portrayals of such leadership according to their political and theological proclivities.

⁴⁷⁰ So, e.g., Peter Ross Beford, “Discerning the Time: Haggai, Zechariah, and the ‘Delay’ in the Rebuilding of the Temple” in *The Pitcher is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström*, ed. Steven W. Holloway and Lowell K. Handy, JSOTSup 190 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 71-94; Tadmor, “The appointed time.”

Our survey of Haggai's and First Zechariah's language in regard to Zerubbabel, the Branch, and (potentially) royal language suggests an ambiguity created by design, open to interpretation. If Haggai and Zechariah truly were promoting the temple construction as Ezra 5:1 and 6:14 claim and as their oracles, particularly Haggai's, certainly bear out, then it makes some sense that they would be at pains to foster unity within the community so that this task could be completed. If there is a point to oracles concerning Zerubbabel (and even some future royal figure, if the Branch is supposed to be a figure who is to follow Zerubbabel) that can be interpreted, depending on a sixth-century reader's political biases, as signaling either that Zerubbabel/the Branch will rule as king or that he will not, we might ask why the prophets have chosen such ambiguous language when they did not need to do so. One obvious answer to this question is that the assembly included groups that favored a Davidic restoration and groups that did not. Given how easily this ambiguity could have been avoided, it appears to have been deliberate and so points to the existence of at least two different groups within the assembly with two different political visions. For the prophets, what matters is unity among these groups to complete the larger task of temple construction. A pro-Davidic faction in the assembly was free to listen to the prophets and be encouraged by the oracle of Hag 2:20-23, which they could interpret as pointing to an imminent Davidic restoration, a prophetic reversal of Jer 22:24-30, and to understand Zerubbabel as Zechariah's "Branch" who would rule upon a royal throne. Such assembly members, however, would also be confronted with Zechariah's oracle that the high priest, not the Davidide, would wear a crown and function as judge. These pro-Davidic members, faced with oracles from both prophets, could conclude that God planned on making Zerubbabel king, although Zechariah's prophecy would make it difficult to conclude that the high priest would have no governing role.

Other factions within the assembly, however, may have hoped to strengthen the local political position of the community, and they would be free to read Haggai's prophecy merely as God's promise to protect Zerubbabel the Persian-appointed governor from the coming divine destruction of the empire. They could see the oracle of 2:20-23 simply as Zerubbabel's reward for supporting temple construction; by their lights, there would be no need for governors or kings following God's destruction of Persia, for the assembly would then be completely free to govern its own affairs. Whatever interpretation others might bring to Zechariah's prophecies concerning Zerubbabel/the Branch, these assembly members could understand his oracles to mean that God would place the high priest in a position that is at least equal to Zerubbabel's, and could focus on the fact that Zerubbabel's real importance is his role in bringing the temple to completion. They would, nonetheless, be faced in Zech 6:9-15 with an oracle that places the Branch on a *sk*, the same kind of seat on which the high priest was to sit, and Haggai's and Zechariah's ambiguous language in regard to this figure and Zerubbabel would make it impossible for them to rule out entirely the possibility that God was about to reestablish Davidic rule.

Haggai and First Zechariah, in short, provide the assembly with careful prophecy of political compromise that presents each group with at least part of the message that they want to hear while signaling that each must create some room in the assembly for the ideology of the other, allowing these groups to unite in the common enterprise of temple construction. Each group would be able to see its preferred future political order in these prophecies, yet the pro-Davidic group would be faced with Zerubbabel's claim that the high priest will have political power, while a group opposed to Davidic rule could not absolutely deny that the prophets' oracles could be construed in a pro-Davidic sense. The prophecies, while permitting each group to largely arrive at their preferred view of the future, do not allow these groups to dismiss the

legitimacy of the other's beliefs out of hand. What is important about Zerubbabel now is his role in temple construction, and assumedly God would clarify the future role of Zerubbabel/the Branch after the great coming divine intervention in history. It is unlikely that either one of these prophets came from the group that identified itself with the house of David; they could not be called unambiguously pro-Davidic, and the name "David" does not appear in either writing. They do bear witness to some kind of support within the assembly for a Davidic restoration, and it is certainly possible that such support existed beyond the group that saw itself as descended from the royal house. Others in the assembly may have awaited a great divine action in history to destroy Judah's imperial masters and restore the pre-exilic political status quo, or at least an imagined utopian version of it. Some may have simply hoped to realize some kind of political or economic advantage in a Davidic restoration, perhaps of the kinds Chronicles says the assembly and Levites will realize. Second Zechariah, as we shall discuss below, suggests that some within the later temple assembly were extremely dissatisfied with the current leadership and saw the reinstatement of the Davidides as the obvious solution to the current failures of local government. The very fact that Haggai and First Zechariah appeal to a pro-Davidic group or groups for support suggest that such a group wielded influence in the assembly and could not easily be marginalized when the assembly needed to marshal all of its resources to complete an important task. Either the so-called house of David had important political influence in the early assembly or else they had a base of support that extended far beyond their own group.

Much would have changed in Judah between the late-sixth century and the composition of Chronicles more than a century later (and perhaps almost two), but Chronicles' pro-Davidic standpoint tells us that a pro-Davidic group was still in existence (as, of course, do the references to "the house of David" in Second Zechariah), and the Chronicler's creation of a work meant to

create support for a Davidic restoration tells us that, as in the sixth century, the assembly was not uniformly pro-Davidic and that some assembly groups would not automatically support a restoration. Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 offer readers no vision of a quiet revolution, but a great divine action in history, after which there will be some political space, although perhaps only a very limited space, for the Davidide. Chronicles is heir to this tradition in the sense that it hints in the narrative of Josiah's death that God will enact a great change in history that will result in an independent Judah, but a hint is all readers encounter there. The elite of the assembly and the temple personnel, as well established as they were by the fourth century, appear to have been more accepting of the political status quo, and so the Chronicler appealed to them by promoting a politically plausible quiet revolution that would allow them to maintain important roles and power under a client monarchy. Chronicles could, like Haggai and First Zechariah, also be described as literature of compromise, since it is promoting a pro-Davidic cause while maintaining political space for assembly and temple personnel, and like Haggai and First Zechariah it is generally trying to unite the elite rather than mark out divisions within them. But it is far more forthright and clear about the necessity of a Davidic restoration than those sixth-century works are. We really could not conclude that the Chronicler was influenced by the writings in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 either in terms of Chronicles' presentation of a vision of a quiet revolution in polity or in its unambiguous support for a Davidic restoration, and the reason for this is that Chronicles emerges from a group advancing a pro-Davidic agenda, and unlike Haggai and Zechariah is not trying to elide intracommunal differences in regard to a political future for the Davidides for the purpose of achieving a larger goal. The Davidides are the goal for Chronicles. So while we cannot establish Chronicles' ideological reliance on Haggai and First Zechariah, these two prophetic works point to the existence of some pro-Davidic group or

groups in the early post-exilic assembly, and the faction from which Chronicles emerged was one of these groups or some descendant of one.

The exilic prophet Ezekiel clearly has room for a Davidide in his vision of a post-exilic society in Ezekiel 40-48. These are chapters sometimes dated in whole or in part to the post-exilic period, albeit the very early post-exilic period since the vision of the temple here is so radically different from the project completed in 515 that it would not make sense for these chapters to have been composed later than this.⁴⁷¹ But it is not necessary to separate these chapters from the rest of the work; the entire book forms a unified whole, and Ezekiel 40-48 portrays the restoration of the temple and the return of Yhwh's glory that will occur after the exile, reversing the departure of the glory in Ezekiel 8-11.⁴⁷² Ezekiel 40-48 refers to a) y#&n

⁴⁷¹ For post-exilic datings of Ezekiel 40-48, see, e.g., Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*, AnBib 35 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 20; Susan Niditch, "Ezekiel 40-48 in a Visionary Context," *CBQ* 48 (1986): 208-24 (216-19); Steven Shawn Tuell, *The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48*, HSM 49 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 13-14; Laato, *A Star is Rising*, 168-69; Andrew Mein, *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile*, OTM (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 142-43; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Bethel in the Neo-Babylonian Period" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschitz and Joseph Blenkinsopp (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 93-107 (104).

⁴⁷² For discussions of the place of these chapters in the exilic visions of Ezekiel, see, e.g., Menahem Haran, "The Law-Code of Ezekiel xl-xlvi and its Relation to the Priestly School," *HUCA* 50 (1979): 45-71; Moshe Greenberg, "The Design and Themes of Ezekiel's Program of Restoration," *Int* 38 (1984): 181-208; Hanson, *The People Called*, 220-21; Ronald M. Hals, *Ezekiel*, FOTL 19 (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1989), 3-4; Duguid, *Ezekiel and the*

“prince” who is responsible for providing for some of the temple sacrifices (45:13-25; 46:4-7, 12-15) and who is mainly presented as a kind of patron of the rebuilt temple.⁴⁷³ He is the leader of the worshipping congregation whom the people join in making offerings (45:13-17), and he supplies much more of the sacrificial material than the people as a whole do (45:22-25; 46:4-7, 13-15).⁴⁷⁴ He has the resources to do this because he is to control two massive pieces of land (45:7-8a). It is notable, in fact, that the priestly group of which Ezekiel was a part did not simply assign that land to the temple; despite the fact that exposure to massive Neo-Babylonian temple estates⁴⁷⁵ leads Ezekiel to assign a great deal of land to the temple and its personnel (45:1-5), this group still saw a place for a king whose land contributed to temple maintenance. The king also has privileged access to the sanctuary, and although he is not a priest or permitted access to the altar, he alone may eat in the east gate (44:2-3), the same gate through which the glory of Yhwh enters the rebuilt temple (43:1-4), and a position that would allow him to view the immolation of

Leaders, 142-43; Sunwoo Hwang, “() y# & n in Ezekiel 40-48,” *SJOT* 23 (2009): 183-99 (190-91); Jacob Milgrom and Daniel I. Block, *Ezekiel’s Hope: A Commentary on Ezekiel 38-48* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012), 43.

⁴⁷³ Tuell, *The Law of the Temple*, 108-10.

⁴⁷⁴ See the discussions of these issues in Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998), 659 and Brian Boyle, “The Figure of the *nāšī’* in Ezekiel’s Vision of the New Temple (*Ezekiel 40-48*)” *ABR* 58 (2010): 1-16 (7-9).

⁴⁷⁵ Both Ebabbar and Eanna, for example, had more land than the temple administration could actually farm, and so much of it was rented out to private tenants. See M. Jursa, *Aspects of the Economic History of Babylonia in the First Millennium BC*, AOAT 377 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010), 768.

the sacrifices (cf. 46:1-2).⁴⁷⁶

Ezekiel 40-48 says very little else about the prince, and it is easy to see why some conclude that these chapters portray him as a mere figurehead with no political power, whose activities are restricted to supporting the cult.⁴⁷⁷ The fact that Ezekiel 40-48 always refers to this figure as “prince” and never as “king”⁴⁷⁸ might also suggest a limited status for him, but the use of *šr* needs to be considered within the context of Ezekiel as a whole. Ezekiel tends to use *šr* for imperial rulers and *šr* for client kings,⁴⁷⁹ so the latter term in and of itself refers to

⁴⁷⁶ See Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 51-53; Boyle, “The Figure of the *nāšî’*,” 10; Milgrom and Block, *Ezekiel’s Hope*, 173.

⁴⁷⁷ See, e.g., Jon Douglas Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48*, HSM 10 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), 75-101; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 30-31; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2002), 44-45; Boyle, “The Figure of the *nāšî’*,” 15.

⁴⁷⁸ The noun *šr* appears in Ezekiel 40-48 only in 43:7-9, where it is used in reference to Israel’s evil past kings. See Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 25-27.

⁴⁷⁹ See Beyse, *Serubbabel*, 61; Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, trans. Ronald E. Clements, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979-1983), 1:209; Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 18-25, 31-33; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 27-29; Paul M. Joyce, “King and Messiah in Ezekiel” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, JSOTSup 270 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 323-37 (330).

a king rather than someone of lower status like, for example, the Persian governor of Judah.⁴⁸⁰ Madhavi Nevader points out, in fact, that Ezekiel 40-48's portrayal of a king dedicated to cult reflects the presentation of the monarch in Neo-Babylonian royal ideology.⁴⁸¹ Despite the fact that Ezek 17:1-21 condemns the Davidide Zedekiah for violating God's covenant by rebelling against Nebuchadnezzar, 17:22-23 promises that God will restore a new king to Judah.⁴⁸² Ezek 34:23-24 and 37:24-25 make the same promise in more concrete language, referring to "my servant David" as "prince" and "king" over a restored and united Israel and Judah.⁴⁸³ The use of the term "prince" in Ezekiel 40-48, then, may simply be a reference to a Davidic monarchy that will have client status within a larger empire, or perhaps points to some kind of diminished sense of post-exilic kingship.⁴⁸⁴

⁴⁸⁰ Nonetheless, for claims that Ezekiel 40-48 uses *šar malk* to refer to the governor of Judah, see, e.g., Hartmut Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40-48): Traditionsgeschichtlich Untersucht*, BHT 25 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1957), 116-23; Tuell, *The Law of the Temple*, 115-20.

⁴⁸¹ Madhavi Nevader, "Picking up the Pieces of the Little Prince: Refractions of Neo-Babylonian Kingship Ideology in Ezekiel 40-48?" in *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, ed. Jonathan Stökl and Caroline Waerzeggers, BZAW 478 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 268-91.

⁴⁸² For explanations of this oracle, see Laato, *Josiah and David*, 163; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 25-26; Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 44-45.

⁴⁸³ See Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 27-30; Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, 110-11.

⁴⁸⁴ So Duguid argues that the choice of the term is based on 1 Kgs 11:34, which refers to a Davidic king as *šar malk* once the Davidides are punished for Solomon's sin by losing their

The title, like so much else in Ezekiel, sounds like the Priestly Writing but does not precisely match P's vision of temple, cult, and community.⁴⁸⁵ In P there are מְלָכִים "princes," but these figures are associated with the heads of the tribes (e.g., Num 2; 7; 13:1-6) and the heads of the ancestral houses (e.g., Num 1:4; 7:2).⁴⁸⁶ Like the single prince of Ezekiel 40-48, the tribal rule of the North, with their reign then confined to Judah alone (*Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 56-57). The term, Paul Joyce suggests, points to "a downgrading of royal language" ("King and Messiah," 331).

⁴⁸⁵ For arguments that Ezekiel relies on but alters P, perhaps in order to reconcile it with Deuteronomic legislation, see Risa Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*, JSOTSup 358 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) and Michael A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*, LHBOTS 507 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2009). Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart*, 34-75 provides a comparison of the language between P and Ezekiel, noting that the two works share over one hundred terms in common, of which fifty four are not found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, as well as a list of vocabulary common to Ezekiel and Deuteronomy/the Deuteronomic History (86-93). Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, 162-86 provides a list of the parallel passages in Ezekiel and Leviticus 17-26.

⁴⁸⁶ The twelve individuals named as מְלָכִים in Numbers 2 are associated with the troops of their respective tribes—Num 1:16 calls them מְלָכֵי אֶלְפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "the princes of the thousands (i.e., military divisions) of Israel." These are precisely the same individuals named as the tribal princes in Numbers 7, where they are in charge of supplying the new tabernacle with offerings. But when Moses sends out twelve princes, one from each tribe, to spy out the land in Num 13:1-6, the text refers to twelve different individuals, which may suggest that in P's

princes of P are expected to provide for the maintenance of the cult (Exod 35:20-29; Num 7), yet Ezekiel, quite unlike the Priestly Writing, has room for a Davidic king in its polity.⁴⁸⁷ It might be fair to refer to the vision of the post-exilic future in Ezekiel 40-48 as utopian, for it is a vision of a restored cult in which the priests function with no apparent leadership from a high priest,⁴⁸⁸ but it would not really be accurate to say that the Davidic prince has no role in the vision except as cultic patron.⁴⁸⁹ The prince, for example, is responsible for administering justice in society (45:9-12),⁴⁹⁰ and while it is true that these chapters have very little to say about his extra-temple duties, that is because they are a vision of a future cult rather than a future polity. Ezekiel 40-48 has virtually nothing to say about any non-cultic role of any Judean, and so the very fact that 45:9 is

presentation of the Tabernacle Age tribes had different princes for different purposes. Since the ancestral houses in P are also headed by princes, there are apparently many individuals to whom the title can apply at the same time, and so P can refer to 250 *hd (y) y#&n* “princes of the congregation” rebelling with Korah against Moses (Num 16:2).

⁴⁸⁷ See Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 60; Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 50.

⁴⁸⁸ Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 59-64 argues that “the priest” of 44:30 and 45:19 is the high priest, but the actual title “high priest” never appears in Ezekiel 40-48.

⁴⁸⁹ Although this is a common conclusion in regard to the *y#&n* in Ezekiel 40-48; see, e.g., Levenson, *Theology of the Program*, 75-101; Werner E. Lemke, “Life in the Present and Hope for the Future,” *Int* 38 (1984): 165-80 (174); Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 30.

⁴⁹⁰ See Hanson, *The People Called*, 221; Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 53; Stephen L. Cook, “Ezekiel’s God Incarnate! The God that the Temple Blueprint Creates” in *The God Ezekiel Creates*, ed. Paul M. Joyce and Dalit Rom-Shiloni, LHBOTS 607 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 132-49 (148).

addressed to the future princes, calling upon them not to oppress the people (while 45:8 appears to guarantee that they will not) and thereby pointing to some kind of role in civil leadership for the Davidides, is remarkable in and of itself, since no other figure or office is given any extra-temple duty in these chapters.

The message concerning post-exilic cult in Ezekiel 40-48 is for “the house of Israel” (40:4; 43:10; 44:6), yet the single-minded focus on cult in these chapters, as well as the close similarities to the Priestly Writing’s vision of the cult and the broad use of language and terminology also found in P, rather obviously suggests that this vision emerges from a priestly group. It is not the same priestly group that produced P, however, for its vision of cult does not precisely coincide with P’s, and it is a group that, unlike the one that produced the Priestly Writing, had room for Davidic leadership in civil society, even if the work is not terribly interested in clarifying what the specifics of that leadership should be, at least when it does not involve the Davidide’s contributions to temple maintenance. It tells us that, at least in the sixth century, there was one priestly group that wished to maintain some political room for the Davidides. The claims of Ezek 40:46; 43:19; 44:10-16; and 48:11 that the Zadokites alone among the Levites are now worthy to serve as altar priests suggests that the work emerges from a priestly group that claimed David’s priest Zadok as their ancestor, while P, of course, says that the Aaronides alone among the Levites are holy and thus able to serve as altar priests. As we saw in chapter 3, the Aaronides appear to have controlled the priestly office by the fourth century when Chronicles was written; indeed, Ezekiel’s vision of the post-exilic cult was not realized in regard to its view of the layout of the temple, the distribution of land around the temple, the specifics of its instructions in regard to the festivals, or the rule of the Zadokites within it,⁴⁹¹

⁴⁹¹ See, e.g., Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus*, 189-96; Stephen L. Cook, “Innerbiblical

although it presents a sacrificial program that has much in common with P's. Some argue that Ezekiel's Zadokites were renamed or merged with the Aaronides after the exile,⁴⁹² but the very fact that we are dealing with two competing visions of cult suggests that they derive from two priestly groups. It is possible that there was some kind of struggle for leadership between them; some argue, for example, that the Persians commissioned the Zadokites to take up leadership roles in post-exilic Judah,⁴⁹³ and that, upon emigration, they entered into conflict with the Aaronides, a priestly group that had not gone into exile.⁴⁹⁴ One could argue that the references to

Interpretation in Ezekiel 44 and the History of Israel's Priesthood," *JBL* 114 (1995): 193-208 (195-96); Lester L. Grabbe, "Were the Pre-Maccabean High Priests 'Zadokites'?" in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and H.G.M. Williamson, JSOTSup 373 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 205-15 (207).

⁴⁹² For this kind of explanation, see Hanson, *The People Called*, 226; Risto Nurmela, *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood*, SFSHJ 193 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 107-39; Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 61-65.

⁴⁹³ See the arguments advanced in this regard in Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 225-26; Joachim Schaper, *Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda: Studien zur Kultur und Sozialgeschichte Israels in persischer Zeit*, FAT 31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 303-308; Kyung-jin Min, *The Levitical Authorship of Ezra-Nehemiah*, JSOTSup 409 (London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 116-27.

⁴⁹⁴ For various reconstructions of such a struggle, see Richard D. Nelson, *Raising up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 5; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Sage Priest Prophet: Religious and Intellectual*

the Zadokites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Hebrew addition to Sir 51:12 to which we referred in chapter 3 suggest that there was a post-exilic group that continued to see Zadok rather than Aaron as their most important ancestor, even while the Aaronides controlled the temple, but the specifics of this need not concern us here. The more important point is that not all sixth-century priests agreed as to whether or not the Davidides should have some kind of role in post-exilic society. A pro-Davidic group existed even within the priesthood, although, given the triumph of P's Aaronides, this does not appear to have been the dominant group. Ezekiel was not a work to which the Chronicler turned to ground his or her presentation of the Davidides, but it tells us that pro-Davidic sentiment could exist among the priests.

The priestly groups from which both Ezekiel and the Priestly Writing emerged did agree that the Levites were disqualified from serving as altar priests. This, however, was not the only opinion on the matter in the post-exilic assembly, since, in the fifth century,⁴⁹⁵ Malachi attacks

Leadership in Ancient Israel, LAI (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 89-93; Nurmela, *The Levites*, 119-24; Schaper, *Priester und Leviten*, 174-94; Reinhard Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*, BZABR 3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 93-110.

⁴⁹⁵ The fact that Malachi is concerned with the issues of community intermarriage and with the failure to properly supply the sacrificial cult (see below) suggests it derives from the mid-fifth century, since the Nehemiah Memoir and Ezra-Nehemiah as a whole point to an assembly struggling with these issues at that time. For arguments dating Malachi to the fifth century, see, e.g., Reventlow, *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja*, 130; Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 25D (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 80-84; Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets*, FOTL 22 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans,

the temple priests (1:6-2:9) by arguing they have robbed God through bringing imperfect animals to sacrifice, and that they have failed to properly instruct in Torah. If this current group of priests continues to refuse to listen to God, they will be punished, and even removed from their current priestly status (2:1-3).⁴⁹⁶ The very fact that, as we discussed in chapter 3, Malachi sees Levi and not Aaron as the priestly ancestor suggests that not everyone in the assembly believed that the priesthood should be limited to Aaronides or Zadokites. Malachi may well have emerged from the Levites, or at least from a Levitical faction that saw God’s covenant as having been made

2000), 2:575; Nogalski, *The Book of the Twelve*, 2:993; S.D. Snyman, *Malachi*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 2.

⁴⁹⁶ Depending on whether one reads 2.3 with the MT or LXX, God promises that he is about to rebuke (so MT’s ר (g) the priests’ progeny or remove them from the priesthood (so LXX’s α) fori/zw, reading Hebrew (dg); see, e.g., David L. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 176 and Hill, *Malachi*, 200. In both the MT and LXX, God says he will, in the case of continued disobedience, smear the priests’ faces with excrement (#\$ rṣ), a word normally used in ritual contexts to refer to animal excrement and entrails that must be removed from the ritual compound (Exod 29:14; Lev 4:11; 8:17; 16:27; Num 19:5), and as a result, writes Petersen, the priests will have to be removed from their cultic service (*Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 189). While Hill reads with the MT at the end of 2:3 (wyl) Mkt)) #&nw) and understands this to point to the removal of the priests from temple service (*Malachi*, 202-203), Petersen sees incorrect word division here, and reconstructs an original yl) m Mt) #&nw “you will be carried away from before me,” which in sense if not in wording approximates the LXX here.

with Levi (Mal 2:4-5, 8) rather than with Aaron, as in P (Exod 29:9; 40:15),⁴⁹⁷ for despite the fact that Malachi can refer to a covenant with the Levites as a whole, it is specifically the priests rather than all of the Levites who are singled out as having failed in sacrifice and in the teaching of Torah (2:1, 7). The very fact that Malachi can refer to a covenant with Levi, warn of a complete removal of the priests, and claim that the Levites will be purified so that they can present proper offerings (3:2-3) points to an author who can envision non-Aaronide Levitical priests working at the altar, since the very fact that the author can refer to the priests as Levites denies the Aaronides the legitimacy of the place they claimed at the top of the cultic hierarchy.⁴⁹⁸ On the other hand, the work criticizes Judah in general for marrying foreign women in 2:10-16,⁴⁹⁹ as well as for other sins (2:17; 3:5-10, 13-15),⁵⁰⁰ and promises judgment on both Levitical

⁴⁹⁷ Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 189 argues, in fact, that 2:3 reflects the belief that the covenant with Aaron has come to an end.

⁴⁹⁸ So Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 151-52.

⁴⁹⁹ For the arguments that demonstrate that these verses condemn (or at least primarily so) foreign marriage rather than apostasy, see Beth Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*, SBLDS 98 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 119-20; Herbert Donner, "Ein Vorschlag zum Verständnis von Maleachi 2,10-16" in *Von Gott reden: Beiträge zur Theologie und Exegese des Alten Testaments*, ed. Dieter Vieweger und Ernst-Joachim Waschke (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995), 97-103 (98); Markus Zehnder, "A Fresh Look at Malachi ii 13-16," *VT* 53 (2003): 224-59; Joachim Schaper, "The Priests of the Book of Malachi and their Opponents" in *The Priests in the Prophets: The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis, JSOTSup 408 (London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 177-88 (178-79); Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites and*

priests (3:1-4) and the assembly (3:5, 19 [4:1]). Perhaps Malachi emerged from an assembly group outside of the temple personnel, a group that, like Ezra-Nehemiah, condemned assembly marriages with foreigners, perhaps the one that referred to itself as the מַדְרֵשׁ “tremblers”;⁵⁰¹ such a group might have hoped that the Levites would support their position, and so spoke out through Malachi in support of the Levites, implicitly blaming the Aaronides for current cultic failures (since they would have been the only Levitical group recognized as altar priests), while claiming that God’s covenant is with the Levites and that God would purify the whole tribe and allow it as a whole to sacrifice.

Regardless of which of these groups Malachi emerged from, the work has nothing to say about the Davidides or royal leadership, but the work is important to us because it exposes rifts

Prophetic Rage: Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood, FAT 2/19 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 193-95.

⁵⁰⁰ Although Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites*, 19-27 sees Malachi’s critique as directed against the priesthood alone.

⁵⁰¹ Ezra 9:4 and 10:3 refer to those who tremble at God’s words as particular supporters of Ezra’s desire to force foreign women out of Judah. Joseph Blenkinsopp argues that we can see the same group in Isa 66:2, 5, where the “tremblers” are a minority, a group once part of the community elite that have been excluded from the temple assembly; see, e.g., his “Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of Second Temple History” in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, ed. E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten, and Alan Mendelson (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 1:1-26 (7-9); his “A Jewish Sect of the Persian Period,” *CBQ* 52 (1990): 5-20; and his *Judaism: The First Phase. The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 196-204.

within the temple personnel and within the assembly, and the Chronicler exploited the rift between Levites and priests in order to advance his or her pro-Davidic agenda. We really have no idea if the Levites or some group of them would have been willing to support a Davidic restoration, but the Chronicler hoped to convince them that it would be worth their while to do so. Stemming from a pro-Davidic group in the assembly, the Chronicler is really trying to do what Malachi is trying to do: establish unity between a group within the assembly (or, in the Chronicler's case, perhaps several of them) and one within the temple personnel. It is unlikely that we could ever know all of the groups or factions within the assembly to whom the Chronicler hoped to convince of his or her message. Third Isaiah, for example, like Malachi, comes from a group that attacks the priestly hierarchy (Isa 66:3),⁵⁰² but very unlike Malachi, who condemns foreign marriages, has room for foreigners in the assembly and even in the temple (Isa 56:1-8; 66:18-24).⁵⁰³ The Priestly Writing, like Third Isaiah, looks at resident aliens and at

⁵⁰² On this verse in particular and the antagonistic view toward the temple establishment (or at the very least part of it) in Third Isaiah in general, see Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 88-113; Alexander Rofé, "Isaiah 66:1-4: Judean Sects in the Persian Period as Viewed by Trito-Isaiah" in *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, ed. Ann Kort and Scott Morschauer (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 205-17; Brooks Schramm, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration*, JSOTSup 193 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 166-69; Christophe Nihan, "Ethnicity and Identity in Isaiah 56-66" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 67-104 (85-92).

⁵⁰³ See Jon L. Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach*

foreigners—for P, foreigners understood to be descended from Abraham, at any rate—favorably⁵⁰⁴ (although in P they cannot become part of the priesthood since they are not

(Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 78; Schramm, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah*, 122; Kyung-Chul Park, *Die Gerechtigkeit Israels und das Heil der Völker: Kultus, Tempel, Eschatologie und Gerechtigkeit in der Endgestalt des Jesajabuches (Jes 56,1-8; 58,1-14; 65,17-66,24)*, BEATAJ 52 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), 100-101; Philipp A. Enger, *Die Adoptivkinder Abrahams: Eine exegetische Spurensuche zur Vorgeschichte des Proselytentums*, BEATAJ 53 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006), 388; Lisbeth S. Fried, “From Xeno-Philia to -Phobia—Jewish Encounters with the Other” in *A Time of Change: Judah and its Neighbours in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods*, ed. Yigal Levin, LSTS 65 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007), 179-204 (187-88); Jill Middlemas, “Trito-Isaiah’s Intra- and Internationalization: Identity Markers in the Second Temple Period” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 105-25 (112-15).

⁵⁰⁴ See, e.g., Fried, “From Xeno-Philia,” 183; Hannah K. Harrington, “Holiness and Purity in Ezra-Nehemiah” in *Unity and Disunity in Ezra-Nehemiah: Redaction, Rhetoric, and Reader*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Paul L. Redditt, HBM 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 98-116 (99-104); Konrad Schmidt, “Judean Identity and Ecumenicity: The Political Theology of the Priestly Document” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 3-26 (4-9); Ralf Rothenbusch, “The Question of Mixed Marriages between the Poles of Diaspora and Homeland: Observations in Ezra-Nehemiah” in *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Christian

descended from Aaron), but P does not, of course, attack the temple establishment as Third Isaiah does. And while P and Ezra-Nehemiah support the cultic and political status quo—the versions each describes, at least—Ezra-Nehemiah, quite unlike P and Third Isaiah but like Malachi, evinces a distinctively negative attitude toward foreigners, as Ezra 9-10; Nehemiah 10 and 13 make clear. Haggai and Zechariah are visionaries who support the temple hierarchy and who claim a coming divine intervention in history in the assembly’s favor, while Malachi is a visionary who attacks the temple hierarchy and sees a coming act of God that will punish the assembly and the temple leadership, and Third Isaiah contains oracles that affirm both kinds of divine works (e.g., Isa 60; 65:1-7). Different groups within the assembly could agree with other groups on some but not all issues, and it is not difficult to imagine the existence of yet other assembly factions of whose views on issues such as cult, foreigners, and the ideal polity we have no knowledge.

So simply because an assembly group might have considered itself pro-Davidic does not necessarily mean that it would have agreed with the Chronicler’s specific pro-Davidic program, as a discussion of Second Zechariah will show. Zechariah 9-14, as we have already noted, provides us with evidence that a group called “the house of David” existed in the post-exilic assembly (12:8, 10, 12). It is not clear whether Second Zechariah is a Persian or Hellenistic

Frevel, LHBOTS 547 (New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2011), 60-77 (73-77); Thomas Römer, “Conflicting Models of Identity and the Publication of the Torah in the Persian Period” in *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers*, ed. Rainer Albertz and Jakob Wöhrle, JAJSup 11 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 33-51 (44-45).

period work,⁵⁰⁵ but even if it was written or compiled after the composition of Chronicles, it points to the existence of a group that identified with the Davidides centuries after they had been removed from power, and it makes sense to conclude that such a group existed earlier in post-exilic Judah rather than simply emerging as if by magic in the Hellenistic period. Second Zechariah itself, however, is unlikely to have originated from that group, since it subjects the house of David to criticism in 12:1-13:1; along with “the inhabitants of Jerusalem,” they are indicted in the case of “the one whom they stabbed,” an act that 13:1 says will demand divinely-granted purification. Nonetheless, 9:9-10, which follows a description of a great divine victory over Aram, Phoenicia, and Philistia in 9:1-8, refers to the coming of a king to Jerusalem. He himself is not responsible for victory in warfare, but is instead “humble and riding on a donkey,”

⁵⁰⁵ For some scholars, the reference to Nwy “Ionia, Greece” in 9:13 puts Second Zechariah in the time of Alexander or later; see, e.g., Karl Elliger, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, ATD 25 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), 2:143; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Haggai—Sacharja*, 162-64; James Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*, BZAW 219 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), 216; Ina Willi-Plein, *Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi*, ZBKAT 24.4 (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2007), 152; Floyd, *Minor Prophets*, 2:315-16. Others note that the Greeks were present in Palestine in the Persian period, that Persia’s wars with Greek cities in Ionia and the mainland were well known, and that it makes more sense to date these chapters to this period. See, e.g., Reventlow, *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja*, 88; Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, WBC 32 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), 169-70; Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 25C (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 26-29; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 31-32; Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 62-63.

and will rule over a peaceful earth. It is God who is the agent of this great victory, and he says that he “will cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem.” God, that is, gives victory and then removes Judah’s/Israel’s ability to make war, since warfare will not be necessary in the peaceful world with which God leaves this king. And although 9:9-10 does not refer to the king as Davidic, Second Zechariah’s generally pro-Davidic sentiment in 12:1-13:1—where, after another description of a divine victory over the nations, God says “the house of David will be like God, like the angel of Yhwh” as it leads Judah and Jerusalem (12:8)—suggests that we should understand the king of 9:9-10 as a Davidide.⁵⁰⁶

Given 9:9-10 and the positive view of the house of David in 12:8, it is easy to exaggerate the extent of Second Zechariah’s pro-Davidic enthusiasm, and conclude that 12:1-13:1 itself promotes a Davidic restoration, or that 10:3-12 does, even though this passage does not use the words “king” or “David,” or to conclude that “the one whom they stabbed” is a Davidide.⁵⁰⁷ The

⁵⁰⁶ Curtis points out that 9:10 says the king’s rule will be “from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth,” and that this is exactly the same language used for the king in Ps 72:8 (*Up the Steep and Stony Road*, 172). While Psalm 72 does not actually refer to the king as Davidic, the superscription of its canonical form reads *hml #šl*, and its postscript—it closes Book 2 of the Psalms—refers to the conclusion of “the prayers of David.” For others who see the king of 9:9-10 as Davidic, see, e.g., Floyd, *Minor Prophets*, 2:465-66; Nogalski, *The Book of the Twelve*, 2:907-909; Paul L. Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, IECOT (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2012), 50-51, 108-109.

⁵⁰⁷ For 12:1-13:1 as promoting a Davidic restoration, see, e.g., Smith, *Micah to Malachi*, 275. For 10:3-12 as promoting a restoration, see, e.g., Paul L. Redditt, “The True Shepherds in Zechariah 11:4-17,” *CBQ* 55 (1993): 676-86 (675). For the argument that “the one whom they

fact of the matter is, however, that 9:9-10 alone in Second Zechariah clearly refers to the actual rule of a king.⁵⁰⁸ Insofar as Zechariah 9 portrays the Davidic restoration in the context of a great divine action in history, it is reminiscent of the pro-Davidic readings of Haggai and First Zechariah, although Zechariah 9 is very clear as to the certainty of future royal rule, while those other two writings are not. And more clearly than any other work we have discussed in this chapter, Second Zechariah provides some indication as to why a group not directly associated with the house of David might promote Davidic rule: unhappiness with the current leadership. God says he is angry with the “shepherds,” the Judean leadership (10:3), a group who has no pity on the people and who devour them (11:4-17). 11:8 even claims that three shepherds have already been removed “in one month,” although it is now impossible to achieve any clarity as to who these deposed shepherds were, even though those who first heard this oracle likely understood to which leaders the text refers.⁵⁰⁹ To take Zechariah 11 at its word—as difficult as

stabbed’ is a Davidide see, e.g., Petterson, *Behold your King*, pp. 224-39.

⁵⁰⁸ See the discussion in Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 100-101, 108-10.

⁵⁰⁹ As just a partial list of suggestions, scholars have argued that these three figures are hierocratic rulers (Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 345-46; Redditt, *Zechariah 9-14*, 83-84), Persian officials in Judah (Robert L. Foster, “Shepherds, Sticks, and Social Destabilization: A Fresh Look at Zechariah 11:4-17,” *JBL* 126 [2007]: 735-53 [740-43]), leaders in the local civil leadership (Stephen L. Cook, “The Metamorphosis of a Shepherd: The Tradition History of Zechariah 11:17 + 13:7-9,” *CBQ* 55 [1993]: 453-66 [456-60]; Curtis, *Up the Steep and Stony Road*, 200-201), or even three Persian kings (Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, 2:677-78) or the three offices of king, priest, and prophet (Michael R. Stead, “The Three Shepherds: Reading Zechariah 11 in the Light of Jeremiah” in *A God of Faithfulness: Essays in Honour of J. Gordon*

that word now is to understand⁵¹⁰—the people’s leaders are worthless, and so we can see why a group with such a sentiment would advocate for a wholesale change in the political status quo.

The Chronicler steered clear of such claims in regard to the local Judean leadership of the fourth century, as his or her goal is to create as much support as possible for a Davidic restoration, and that meant avoiding the alienation of any potential allies, most especially those in positions of power in local government. By composing a narrative about what life was like under a Davidic monarchy, the Chronicler can allude to what life should be like (since God will restore the Davidides to power) without having to directly criticize the way things actually are. Yet even in this allusiveness Chronicles is much more strongly pro-Davidic than Second Zechariah is. This latter writing may critique Judah’s leaders and so justify a Davidic restoration as God’s preferred form of rule, yet Second Zechariah’s king is given virtually nothing to do. God will have accomplished victory and provided universal peace by the time of the restoration, and so the king can be “humble and riding on a donkey.” If he has “rule” (לְשֹׁמֵר), he is given no actual responsibilities, not even that of maintaining a just society that the Davidic prince of Ezekiel 40-48 has. The group or groups who supported the prophecies of Second Zechariah may have hoped for a change of leadership, but their understanding of a Davidic restoration is one in which the Davidide functions as a figurehead. 9:9-10 is clear that he would not serve in any kind of military capacity as Chronicles’ Davidides do, for example, or have any say at all in cultic matters, or provide for a system of justice. If we want to call Second Zechariah’s social

McConville on his 60th Birthday, ed. Jamie A. Grant, Alison Lo, and Gordon J. Wenham, LHBOTS 538 [New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2011], 149-65).

⁵¹⁰ Carol Meyers and Eric Meyers call Zechariah 11 “one of the most difficult passages in all of Hebrew Scripture” (*Zechariah 9-14*, 293).

background pro-Davidic, it is pro-Davidic in a very different way than the Chronicler's is, for Chronicles presents a political program in which the Davidide has specific and powerful authority and duties. Our discussion of Second Zechariah, then, should warn us that simply because an assembly group could be described as pro-Davidic does not mean that it would necessarily have sympathy for the Chronicler's program, and might actually be opposed to a Davidide who was more than a figurehead. The Chronicler's whole concept of a quiet revolution that involves political negotiation with the Persians might run contrary to the beliefs of an assembly group who expects God to initiate any changes in polity.

So although the Chronicler likely emerged from the group that called itself "the house of David," or perhaps from a group closely allied with it, not everyone in the post-exilic assembly who hoped for a Davidic restoration would have agreed with the politically powerful office Chronicles describes. Groups like the one(s) for which Second Zechariah speaks would also need to be persuaded and enticed to join the specific kind of pro-Davidic movement of which the Chronicler was a part. So while he or she takes a specific kind of pro-Davidic stance, it is one that aims for wide support without obviously taking positions that would be likely to draw the ire of assembly groups inside and outside of the temple. This would certainly explain the Chronicler's choice of genre—historiography—since, on the one hand, the Chronicler could claim that he or she was simply describing the way things were without having to offer any direct critique of existing institutions. Like Haggai and Zechariah, the Chronicler tries to elide rather than exacerbate differences within the assembly, although he or she does seem willing to exploit the disparity in power between Aaronides and Levites (or at least the disparity that P says should exist), extending to the Levites' authority in temple and in civil society under the Davidides. Nonetheless, while the priests, as we have seen, might have the most to lose in terms

of authority and prestige with the establishment of a Davidic client monarchy, Chronicles maintains their ultimate place of authority in the temple, and even presents priestly civil leadership within a Davidic monarchy. In the narrative of Josiah's death, the Chronicler hints at the possibility of a great divine action in history, perhaps in order to appeal to any in the community who might believe in such an action—those who promoted the kinds of views propagated by Haggai, First and Second Zechariah, and Third Isaiah—while largely obscuring such a vision behind ideas that point to a more practical view of a pro-Davidic future. The Chronicler remains studiously neutral when it comes to the question of the incorporation of foreigners into the community; while the Chronicler includes stories of alliances between Davidides and other monarchs, as we saw in chapter 3, this has nothing to do with the question as to whether foreigners should have any political power in a post-exilic Judean assembly under the leadership of a Davidide. Foreigners should be told of God's great deeds and absolute authority (1 Chr 16:8, 25-26), and can even be called upon to praise Yhwh (16:23, 28-33), but Yhwh is still "our God" who has a covenant with Israel (16:13, 14-18). Foreigners can pray toward God's temple, but the point of this is for God's response to result in the foreigners' fear of him (2 Chr 6:32-33). Northerners, as we have seen, are Israelites according to Chronicles, and owe their devotion to the Jerusalem temple. While this may seem an obvious contradiction of the view espoused by Ezra 4:1-3, where Northerners are explicitly excluded from the assembly, the Chronicler offers them no political role in Jerusalem or Judah; it does not, in short, contradict Ezra-Nehemiah's claim to limit the assembly to descendants of the exiles alone.⁵¹¹ Readers in the

⁵¹¹ That Ezra-Nehemiah limits the Judean assembly in this way seems most obvious from passages like Ezra 2 (= Neh 7), where "the people of the province" are "the ones going up from the captivity of the exile" (Ezra 2:1 [= Neh 7:6]), a group identified as "all of the assembly"

(Ezra 2:64 [= Neh 7:66]), or Ezra 4:1-3, where *hlwgh ynb* “the exiles” identify themselves as the only Yahwists authorized by Cyrus to build the temple, or Ezra 10, where “the exiles” (10:6, 7, 8, 16) are equated with “all of the assembly” (10:12, 14) and agree to remove foreign women from the assembly’s midst (10:10-15), or Nehemiah 1, where “the Judeans” are “the survivors who remained from the captivity” (1:2-3) and “the Israelites” (1:6). Some scholars maintain that a passage like Ezra 6:21, which refers to the consumption of the Passover meal by *l) r#&y- ynb Mhl) Cr)h-ywg t)m+m ldbnh lkw hlwghm Myb#&h*, suggests that people who could not trace their ancestry to the exiles (i.e., *Cr)h-ywg t)m+m ldbnh lkw*, and see a similar phrase in Neh 10:29 [28]) were granted entry into the group; see, e.g., H.G.M.

Williamson, “Judah and the Jews” in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 25-45 (32); Peter H.W. Lau, “Gentile Incorporation into Israel in Ezra-Nehemiah,” *Bib* 90 (2009): 356-73 (356, 364-65); John Kessler, “Images of Exile: Representations of the ‘Exile’ and ‘Empty Land’ in the Sixth to Fourth Century BCE Yehudite Literature” in *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Christopher Levin, BZAW 404 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 309-51 (333-34).

The difficulty with this view is, first, that it flies in the face of the clear portrayal of the assembly throughout Ezra-Nehemiah as a group descended from the exiles, and, second, that the *-w* in *ldbnh lkw* can be read as an explanatory *wāw*, which would mean that “all of those who separated themselves from the impurity of the nations of the land to them” is the same group described as “the Israelites, the captives from the exile.” See *GKC* 484 n. 1 and Matthew Thiessen, “The Function of a Conjunction: Inclusivist or Exclusivist Strategies in Ezra 6.19-21 and Nehemiah 10.29-30?,” *JSOT* 34 (2009): 63-79.

assembly who supported the exclusivist vision of Ezra-Nehemiah and Malachi could read Chronicles as in line with their position, but groups more open to foreigners would not find anything in Chronicles that explicitly contradicted their view. Just as Haggai and First Zechariah carefully maneuver between different positions on the future political role of the Davidide, Chronicles does so in regard to the place of foreigners in Judah.

Even if some of these works, like Ezra-Nehemiah, the Priestly Writing, Malachi, and Third Isaiah, have nothing to say about Davidic leadership,⁵¹² they do give us at least some sense of the variety of political interests that appear to have existed within the small Judean elite of the Persian period. Groups who might agree on one issue could be opposed in regard to another, and so simply dividing the post-exilic community up into opposing camps—Yhwh-aloneists versus syncretists, or the temple establishment versus visionaries, or wealthy exclusivists versus impoverished inclusivists⁵¹³—will miss the social complexity with which the Chronicler was

⁵¹² Some commentators, however, understand the narrator of Isaiah 61, the one anointed to bring deliverance, to be a Davidic king; see, e.g., Marvin A. Sweeney, “The Reconceptualization of the Davidic Covenant in Isaiah” in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A.M. Beuken*, ed. J. Van Ruiten and M. Vervenne, BETL 132 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997), 41-61 (50-57); Jan L. Koole, *Isaiah: Part III*, trans. Anthony P. Runia (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1997), 270; John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998), 563.

⁵¹³ See, e.g., Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*, LHR 9 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 82-115 (who describes a conflict between Yhwh-aloneists and syncretists); Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (temple establishment versus eschatological visionaries); Harold Washington, “The Strange Woman of

faced and with which he or she had to struggle to advance a pro-Davidic agenda. Visionaries like Haggai and Zechariah could promote the temple and its leadership; assembly and priestly groups could hope for and even promote a Davidic restoration; two groups that might agree with each other in regard to their positive view of foreigners might be drastically at odds with each other in regard to the temple cult; and a different pro-Davidic group might hope for a future Davidide who would act merely as a figurehead, not one who would exercise real control over the assembly as a client ruler. We can likely only begin to guess at the complexity of the interactions among the groups whom the Chronicler tried to convince to support his or her quiet revolution.

2. *Ezra-Nehemiah, the assembly, and Chronicles' quiet revolution*

The Chronicler's pro-Davidic vision, however, was not realized; as we saw in chapters 2 and 3, the high priest, priests, and assembly continued to exercise local power through the Hellenistic period. It is unlikely that we can ever be entirely clear as to precisely what factors we should attribute this failure; perhaps an approach was made to the Achaemenids, who rejected it, or perhaps the assembly was, in general, happy with the local status quo and unwilling to risk the authority they did wield in a change of polities. We conclude now by examining Ezra-Nehemiah, a document written about the same time as Chronicles,⁵¹⁴ which presents the assembly as a group

Proverbs 1-9 and Post-Exilic Judaeon Society" in *Second Temple Studies. 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period*, ed. Tamara C. Eskanazi and Kent H. Richards, JSOTSup 175 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 217-42 (wealthy exclusivists versus poor inclusivists).

⁵¹⁴ The last event in Ezra-Nehemiah that we can date specifically is Nehemiah's return from Babylon in 433 (Neh 13:6), unless one believes that Ezra journeyed to Judah in 398 under Artaxerxes II, thereby following rather than preceding Nehemiah's arrival, contrary to the

narrative of Ezra-Nehemiah. There is no good reason, however, not to accept the work's chronology of Ezra's arrival in Judah before that of Nehemiah; for persuasive refutations of the opposing view, see H.G.M. Williamson, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, OTG 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 55-69. The list of high priests in Neh 12:10-11 may help us arrive at some general sense as to when Ezra-Nehemiah reached its final form, since it would make sense that this list would conclude with the high priest who was in office when this happened. The list begins with Jeshua, the first post-exilic high priest, and ends with Jaddua, five generations later. Josephus places a high priest named Jaddua at the end of the Persian period (*Ant.* 11.302-316), and it is possible that the Jaddua who lived five generations after Jeshua was high priest 200 years later. James VanderKam, for example, argues that this is the case; see his *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 85-99. However, Josephus's story that involves Jaddua concerns the construction of Gerizim, which we now know took place in the fifth century, and so Josephus was incorrect to date this story to the time of Alexander—see Yitzhak Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations Volume II: A Temple City*, JSP 8 (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2008), 174-75. Neh 12:22 provides us with the last four names of the list of high priests of 12:10-11, and 12:22 refers also to the reign of Darius. In 12:22 Jaddua's father is named Johanan, whereas in 12:11 he is called Jonathan. We know from *TAD* A4.7.18 that Johanan was high priest in Jerusalem in 411, during the reign of Darius II (423-405)—*TAD* A4.7.4 says the destruction of the Elephantine temple took place in the fourteenth year of Darius, or 411, and 7.17-19 says that the community there wrote to Johanan and Judah “when this evil was done to us”—so this evidence suggests that Jaddua became high priest in the very late-fifth or early-fourth century. This puts us about a century after Jeshua, giving each high priest an average of two decades or one generation in office.

of Persian colonizers whose success depends on their loyalty to Persia, something that Ezra-Nehemiah equates with loyalty to God. There is not the slightest need for local Davidic rule in the work, there is only the need for the assembly to become more loyal subjects of Persia and Yhwh. When lack of leadership is a problem in the narrative of Ezra-Nehemiah, Judeans sent by the Persian king from the imperial center, not Davidides, appear as the solution. It is assembly and empire and not the Davidides who are coeval with Ezra-Nehemiah's temple, and it is the assembly, under orders and with support from the Persians, who must build it and maintain the cult. Ezra-Nehemiah is not explicitly anti-Davidide, but when it critiques the local Judean leadership it does not even bother to suggest a Davidic restoration as a possible solution. Ezra-Nehemiah provides us with evidence that thinking about the possibility of future Davidic leadership did not come naturally to the fourth-century assembly, or at least not to all parts of it. For Ezra-Nehemiah, stricter Persian oversight of the existing political status quo is the solution to dealing with the problems the assembly faces; loyalty to the Achaemenid, devotion to God,

So if Ezra-Nehemiah was compiled during the high priesthood of Jaddua, then it is basically contemporaneous with Chronicles, which was likely written in the early-fourth century. Williamson has argued that the author of Ezra 1-6 knew of the existence of Ezra 7-Nehemiah 13, and that Ezra 1-6 is a late fourth century composition ("The Composition of Ezra 1-6" in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 244-70), but this view has been challenged; see Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1988), 43-44. Williamson argues that Ezra 1-6 reacts against the construction of Gerizim, but even if that is the case, we now know that Gerizim was built in the fifth century. It simply makes the most sense to put Ezra-Nehemiah in the late-fifth or early-fourth century.

God's temple, and God's law, which (in Ezra-Nehemiah) is also Persia's law, will solve the assembly's problems, as will the figures whom the Persian king sends to Judah to lead. In the end, it seems, the Chronicler's claims in regard to the benefits the Davidides could provide the temple assembly were not enough to overcome defenses of the status quo such as this one.

Others in the fourth-century assembly may have offered somewhat different rationales to support the current polity, but Ezra-Nehemiah's argument is the one that has survived. An assembly reader in agreement with Ezra-Nehemiah's overall political vision would not have seen the current situation as perfect, but would also not have agreed that the political overhaul suggested by Chronicles was appropriate or necessary.

Chronicles, as we discussed in chapter 1, generally portrays imperial suzerains positively. God uses them to carry out the divine will (1 Chr 5:26; 2 Chr 28:19-20; 35:22), and Chronicles concludes with precisely this view of Cyrus and Persia (2 Chr 36:22-23), concludes, in fact, with the same words that open Ezra-Nehemiah (Ezra 1:1-3a), suggesting that the Chronicler has borrowed these verses from Ezra-Nehemiah or that the author of Ezra 1-6 has borrowed them from Chronicles. So neither work takes objection to the Persian claim that the Great King has been given rule of "all the kingdoms of the earth" by a divine power, part of the Persian imperial hegemony we discussed in chapter 5. The two Judean writings claim, of course, that legitimacy for this rule comes from Yhwh rather than Auramazda, but they also allow Cyrus to speak in language that, in Judean literature, is more usually associated with Yhwh: "Thus says Cyrus the king of Persia" (Ezra 1:2; 2 Chr 36:23). In both works Yhwh has commanded Cyrus to act to build his temple, and Cyrus is acknowledging this, and so Cyrus is not portrayed as usurping God's place but as God's tool and intermediary with Israel, and as a result his speech is introduced as Yhwh's often is. In Ezra-Nehemiah, however, the imperial king now begins to take

on a kind of prominence that he simply does not have in Chronicles. He is the one through whom God acts and he is the one who sends representatives of the empire to Judah so that God's will can be performed there. If Cyrus's speech is introduced the way God's speech often is in the Bible, that is because the Persian king in Ezra-Nehemiah normally represents the divine will. It is also language that is perfectly at home in Achaemenid imperial discourse, which frequently uses the expression *qāti PN xšāya qiya* "Proclaims PN the king." The Old Persian verb *qanh-* is used to express the authority of someone in a sovereign position; in the Achaemenid inscriptions, writes Bruce Lincoln, the king uses it to shape the world to the words he is speaking.⁵¹⁵ In both Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, the Persian king's explanation of the past is also authoritative, as the introduction to his words and the words themselves present him as speaking for Yhwh.

For Chronicles, however, this is the end of the narrative. Chronicles has no interest in portraying a history or Judean temple without the Davidides, but Ezra-Nehemiah associates the temple with the assembly and with the Persians whom God uses to accomplish its construction. The narrative of Ezra 1-6 presents readers with a story of a newly restored assembly who, under orders from the Persian king (who is himself under orders from Yhwh) goes to Jerusalem to build a temple. As we noted earlier in this chapter, despite the fact that temple construction did not really begin until the reign of Darius, Ezra-Nehemiah wants to present the assembly, Persian

⁵¹⁵ Bruce Lincoln, "The King's Truth" in *"Happiness for mankind": Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, Acta Iranica 53 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 20-40 (34-35). The Aramaic version of the Bisitun Inscription simply uses *dryhwš mlk' kn 'mr* as the parallel to *qāti Dārayavauš xšāya qiya* (see *TAD* C2.1.8, 19, 25, 30, 36, 51), a common way of introducing direct speech in the Aramaic correspondence of the Achaemenid administration. See, e.g., *TAD* A6.2.22; 6.3.6; 6.6.2-3; 6.8.1, 2; 6.11.1; 6.13.1, 4; 6.15.1, 3.

empire, and temple as coeval. These institutions, and the city in which the temple is found, are the axes of Ezra-Nehemiah's concern. A reader of Ezra 1:2-4 might conclude that the whole point of the existence of the Persian empire is to build the temple, and passages where the Persian kings provide the Jerusalem cult with vast resources (Ezra 1:7-11; 6:8-10; 7:14-24) might lead readers to the conclusion that it continues to exist to benefit the Yahwistic cult there. The very presentation of a community moving *en masse* from Babylonia to Judah at the very beginning of the post-exilic period—an “historical fiction,” as we noted in chapter 2⁵¹⁶—under orders from the Great King presents the assembly as a group of Persian colonists sent from the center of empire to colonize the margins. (For Ezra-Nehemiah, Mesopotamia is as much the imperial center as Persia is; the Persian king is also “king of Babylon” [Neh 13:6] and king of Assyria [Ezra 6:22]). While Ezra 1:5 says that Yhwh “roused” the spirits of the emigrants, 1:2-4 presents the very idea of sending them as Cyrus's. Yhwh has ordered him to build the temple; he commissions the people to go and build; and Yhwh confirms that choice by rousing them to go.⁵¹⁷ We saw in chapter 5 the centrality of the claim in Achaemenid hegemony that the

⁵¹⁶ See Bob Becking, “‘We all returned as one!’ Critical Notes on the Myth of the Mass Return” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 3-18 (6-7).

⁵¹⁷ John Kessler has argued that the Judean immigrants from Babylon formed a “charter group” sent by the Persians to establish control of Judah on Persia's behalf—see, e.g., his “Persia's Loyal Yahwists: Power, Identity and Ethnicity in Achaemenid Yehud” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 91-121. This is not an impossible conclusion, but one wonders if it is also not the creation of Ezra-Nehemiah's pro-Persian ideology.

colonized must work with (*hamtaxš-*) the Great King, and do his desire, and this is precisely what happens as the community builds the temple under royal orders in Ezra 1-6. When Yahwists from outside the community wish to join in the building project, Zerubbabel, Joshua the high priest, and the heads of the ancestral houses refuse, because “Cyrus the king of Persia”—rather than “Yhwh the God of Israel”—has commanded them alone to build (4:1-3).

The only political relationship that really matters in Ezra-Nehemiah is the one between the assembly and the Persian king. He communicates the divine will to the assembly and provides them with the resources that they need to complete God’s temple. The assembly acts under his orders and authority; they are, really, the colonists he sends, and so loyalty to him is paramount. There is simply no room here for a local dynasty. Out on the margins of the empire, however, Persia’s loyal colonists in Judah are confronted with implacable opposition as they work with the king to carry out his desire. The Aramaic section of Ezra 4:8-6:18 contains a series of letters to and from Persian officials and the Great Kings concerning Judean construction projects. Confusingly, the first of these concerns not the temple but the wall of Jerusalem, which is not constructed until the time of Nehemiah, almost a century after Cyrus’s reign. If the letters about the wall in Ezra 4:11-23 seem out of place in a narrative that has been focusing and will continue to focus until Ezra 6 on the construction of the temple, they allow the narrative to present the opponents of the assembly as the opponents of the empire. That is, these opponents have the officials who write the letter of 4:11-16 lie to Artaxerxes as they claim that the assembly will prove disloyal to the king and will not pay tax once the walls are rebuilt (4:13), and that Jerusalem was destroyed in the first place because it is “a rebellious city, causing injury to kings and provinces, and they have been making revolt in it for a long time” (4:15). Yet, readers of Ezra-Nehemiah discover, no such description of the assembly and Jerusalem could be

further from the truth. Jerusalem was not destroyed because it was disloyal to empire; it was destroyed because the people there offended their God (Ezra 5:11-12; 9:7-9; Neh 9:26-37). And, once the walls are rebuilt under Nehemiah's leadership later in the narrative, tax continues to flow to Persia. As the city wall nears completion, the people complain to Nehemiah that "the king's tax" is causing them to sell family members into slavery (Neh 5:1-5), but Nehemiah simply redirects blame to the leaders of the assembly⁵¹⁸ for charging too much interest on the poor (5:6-13). He ends local payment of "the food of the governor" (5:18), but there is no mention at all of any attenuation of the tax sent to Persia.

It would appear that an important point of putting correspondence that has nothing to do with the construction of the temple at this early point in Ezra-Nehemiah's narrative is to contrast the assembly with others who live around them. The assembly is loyal to the king, but those around them are liars, and in Achaemenid hegemony the liar is a rebel, controlled by the Lie. As we have seen, the only Achaemenid inscription that refers to specific rebellions against the king is the Bisitun Inscription, and at the root of each rebellion against his kingship that Darius discusses in it is the Lie. What unites Darius's description of every rebel he defeats is that *adurujiya* "he lied,"⁵¹⁹ and in his summary of his victories over these rebels (DB 4.2-31) he

⁵¹⁸ Nehemiah 5 uses kinship language to describe the relationship of the poor affected by the tax and the wealthy who are charging them interest (5:1, 5, 7-8, 10), thereby blaming the leaders of the assembly itself and not Persia for their financial woes. For an analysis of this language, see Richard J. Bautch, "The Function of Covenant across Ezra-Nehemiah" in *Unity and Disunity in Ezra-Nehemiah*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Paul L. Redditt, HBM 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 8-24 (14-18).

⁵¹⁹ So DB 1.39, 78; 3.80; 4.8, 10-11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 24, 26-27, 29; DBb 2-3; DBc 2-3;

refers to “the peoples (*dahyāva*)⁵²⁰ who became rebellious; the Lie (*drauga*) made them rebellious, because these (rebels) lied to (*adurujiyašan*) the people” (4.33-35). The foreigners Darius rules are clearly vulnerable to the Lie, to being misled into rebellion.⁵²¹ Darius, though, does not lie (4.41-43); he is not a Lie-follower, but acts out of *arštā-* (from the Indo-European root **rēg-* “straight, just, rule justly”), which appears to refer to his righteous or correct rule,⁵²² and to mean that he rewards those who “work with” him and punishes those who “did injury”

DBd 2; DBe 2-3; DBf 1-2; DBg 2-3; DBh 2-3; DBi 2-3; DBj 2-3.

⁵²⁰ As we discussed in chapter 5, *dahyu-* refers both to a land and the people who live in that land. In this particular context, the emphasis is on the rebellious colonized peoples, and so the word here suggests the various subject peoples deceived by the rebels.

⁵²¹ Bruce Lincoln, *Religion, Empire, and Torture: The Case of Achaemenian Persia with a Postscript on Abu Ghraib* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 9-10.

⁵²² Indo-European contained such words related to the root as **rēg-s* “king” and **regyom* “leadership,” but it is not simply words involving kingship (like Latin *rēx* and Sanskrit *rāj-*) that derive from **rēg-*, so do words that refer to justice and order, such as Latin *rēctum* “uprightness, virtue” and Avestan *razišta-* “the upright, just.” See Roland Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, AOS 33 (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1953), 171 and Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1959-1969), 1:854-57. It is understandable, then, that, when translating the Old Persian *upari arštām upariyāyam* “according to righteous rule I conducted myself” (DB 4.64-65), the Babylonian version of the Bisitun Inscription uses the word *dīnātu* “laws” for *arštām* (CII 1/2/1:104), since the translator sees action according to the laws as manifestation of just rule on the part of the king.

(4.61-67).⁵²³ In this hegemonic context, *arštā-* functions as the opposite of *drauga-*, and so refers to the righteous exercise of rule on the part of the king; as a result, the “injury” to which Darius refers to here is injury to his rule, a rule that, as we saw in chapter 5, is said in Persian hegemony to benefit the colonized.⁵²⁴ It is no wonder, then, that Herodotus received a tradition that claimed the Persians understood lying as the most shameful act anyone could commit (1.136, 138). Ultimately, in Achaemenid imperial discourse, the king must rule since his *arštā-*, his righteous rule, is the antithesis of *drauga-*, the Lie by which the colonized are easily misled.⁵²⁵

⁵²³ “Proclaims Darius the king: For this reason Auramazda bore me aid, and the other gods who are: I was not evil, I was not a Lie-follower (*draujana*), I was not a wrongdoer, neither I nor my family; according to uprightness (*arštām*) I conducted myself; I did not do wrong to the weak or to the strong; I rewarded well the person who worked with (*hamataxšatā*) my house; I punished well the person who did injury.”

⁵²⁴ *vinaç-* “to cause injury” is an action that Darius says he does not desire or leave unpunished (DNb 17-21). That at least DB 4.61-67 sees it as injury done to his rule is suggested by the larger context of the inscription, which concerns his defeat of rebellions, as is the fact that it is contrasted with *arštā-*, which derives from a root referring to his just rule of empire. In fact, the word *drauga-* derives from the Indo-European **dhreugh-*, which means “to deceive,” and also has the sense of “to deceitfully harm.” *drauga-*, then, is cognate not only with a word like German *Trug* “deception” but also with Sanskrit *drúhyati* “to seek harm”; see Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1:276. It is the Lie that causes injury to the king and to his subjects, and the king, seeking to bring peace and well-being to the colonized, responds with *aršta-*, his righteous rule.

⁵²⁵ See Gregor Ahn, *Religiöse Herrscherlegitimation im achämenidischen Iran: Die*

There is a clear distinction in Ezra-Nehemiah, then, between those who lie and so who effect rebellion against the king, who oppose the building project of the temple that he has authorized, and between the assembly who works with the king and carries out his order. The Aramaic letters of Ezra 4:11-23 draw this contrast as soon as the assembly begins to work with the Great King to accomplish the building project he has ordered. And in Ezra 1-6 this group of colonizers from the imperial center who works with the king overcomes the rebellious opposition to the imperial building projects through the imperial bureaucracy. Although 4:11-23 concerns opposition to the construction of Jerusalem's walls during the reign of Artaxerxes, readers will learn in Nehemiah 2 that it is in fact a project Artaxerxes eventually authorizes. Ezra 4:24, which says construction of the temple was halted until the reign of Darius, suggests, given its proximity to 4:11-23, that some kind of foreign Lie, like that of 4:11-23, was responsible for this delay. There is, as Hugh Williamson points out, really no narrative of temple construction, but simply a series of Aramaic letters about it.⁵²⁶ Ezra 4:8-6:18, largely an exchange of letters between royal functionaries in the region and the king, is in Aramaic because this is the language of the imperial administration, and the imperial administration—ultimately its head, the king—solves the problem created by the liars who make up the loyal Judean assembly's opponents. He ultimately acts, as Achaemenid hegemony claims he does, to benefit those who work with him and uphold his righteous rule. In Ezra 4-6, contrary to the hegemony of the Achaemenid

Voraussetzungen und die Struktur ihrer Argumentation, Acta Iranica 31 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 278-81, 293-97.

⁵²⁶ H.G.M. Williamson, "The Aramaic Documents in Ezra Revisited," *JTS* 59 (2008): 41-62 (47).

inscriptions, the Persian king can be fooled by liars,⁵²⁷ since Artaxerxes is taken in by the assembly's opponents who bribe the empire's officials to lie about the assembly (4:17-22), but the wall, like the temple, is eventually completed with material support from the Persian king (Neh 2:1-8). By presenting readers with Aramaic correspondence, the language of empire, the narrative shows that the king and his imperial apparatus will act on behalf of his loyal subjects.⁵²⁸

There is an obvious lesson here for Ezra-Nehemiah's assembly readers: maintain loyalty to Persia and the Great King, who acts on Yhwh's behalf, will support the assembly. As far as Ezra 1-6 is concerned, the assembly is a group of colonizers sent by the king to do his imperial will at the margins of the empire. Again, the importance of this political alliance works to the exclusion of all others, for there is no role for a local dynasty here. The very fact that the assembly is presented as colonists ordered by the king to colonize an area on the empire's margins obviates the very existence of a local dynasty. There is an assembly because Persia has

⁵²⁷ In DB 4.61-67, as we have seen, Darius claims that he "was not a Lie-follower" nor "a wrongdoer" and that he "did not do wrong to the weak or to the strong."

⁵²⁸ See on this Don Polaski, "Nehemiah: Subject of the Empire, Subject of Writing" in *New Perspectives on Ezra-Nehemiah: History and Historiography, Text, Literature, and Interpretation*, ed. Isaac Kalimi (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 37-59 (38). The point of the use of Aramaic in Ezra 4:8-6:18 is not to provide the Samaritan point of view, contra Joshua Berman, "The Narratorial Voice of the Scribes of Samaria: Ezra iv 8-vi 18 Reconsidered," *VT* 56 (2006): 313-26. As Andrew E. Steinman points out in "Letters of Kings about Votive Offerings, the God of Israel and the Aramaic Document in Ezra 4:8-6:18," *JHS* 8/23 (2008): 1-14 (2-3), that argument ignores the blatantly pro-Judean features of this section.

created one, a choice God has recognized, and the assembly completes the temple construction “at the order of the God of Israel and at the order of Cyrus and Darius and Artaxerxes, the king of Persia” (Ezra 6:14). The Aramaic correspondence, and Ezra 1-6 as a whole, demonstrates that a loyal assembly will ultimately be supported by the Persian king, who not only ordered the construction of the temple but paid for its construction and the sacrifices offered in it (6:1-12). But readers of Ezra-Nehemiah are also told the continued existence of the assembly will be put at risk if it fails in loyalty to its God and his law (Ezra 5:11-12; 9:6-15; Neh 9:6-37). In these chapters, however, loyalty to God is not unconnected to loyalty to the Persian king. Ezra 7 introduces Ezra as “a scribe skilled in the law of (ṭrwṭ) Moses, which Yhwh, the God of Israel, had given” (7:6). At the beginning of the letter Artaxerxes gives to Ezra to commission him as a royal representative whom he is sending from the imperial center of Babylon to the colonial margin that is Judah, the king acknowledges him as “the scribe of the law () ṭd) of the God of heaven” (7:12), and tells him to establish a justice system in the satrapy of Across-the-River (and not merely in the province of Judah) based on) klm yd) ṭdw Khl) –yd) ṭd “the law of your God and the law of the king” (7:26). By acknowledging hrwt as ṭd and setting it beside) klm yd) ṭd, Ezra-Nehemiah presents the Achaemenids as recognizing the authority of hrwt, at least in the satrapy of Across-the-River, and placing it on par with the law of the king.⁵²⁹ The very fact that hrwt/ṭd is law throughout Across-the-River and not simply in Judah suggests that this law is part of the king’s law, something applicable beyond the community of

⁵²⁹ See Rolf Rendtorff, “Ezra und das ‘Gesetz,’” *ZAW* 94 (1986): 65-84; Thomas Willi, *Juda—Jehud—Israel: Studien zum Selbstverständnis des Judentums in persischer Zeit*, FAT 12 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), 91-117; Thomas B. Dozeman, “Geography and History in Herodotus and in Ezra-Nehemiah,” *JBL* 122 (2003): 449-66 (457-64); Anselm C. Hagedorn, “Local Law in an Imperial Context: The Role of Torah in the (Imagined) Persian Period” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding its Promulgation and Acceptance*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 57-76 (72-73).

Yahwists, and the king is clear that he will enforce it (7:26), and so in Ezra 7, as in Ezra 1-6, to serve the king is to serve Yhwh, and that idea has now been extended to the very concept of Torah.⁵³⁰

⁵³⁰ The very fact that the Hebrew $h\#\$m \text{ } \tau r w t$ in 7:6 is also the Aramaic $h l) - y d) \tau d$ $) y m \# \$$ in 7:12 tells us that τd was simply seen as the Aramaic synonym of $h r w t$. Lisbeth Fried argues that the Old Persian *dāta-* refers to royal command, not to specific law codes (see Lisbeth S. Fried, “‘You shall appoint judges’: Ezra’s Mission and the Rescript of Artaxerxes” in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*, ed. James W. Watts, SBLSS 17 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001], 63-89 and Lisbeth S. Fried, *Ezra and the Law in History and Tradition*, SPOT [Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2014], 14-17), but given that Xerxes claims that Auramazda established *dāta-* (XPh 49-53), not to mention the fact that Ezra 7 clearly presents $h r w t$ and τd as synonymous, this seems unlikely. Late Babylonian translations of Darius’s inscriptions render Old Persian *dāta-* with *dīnātu* “laws,” but by the time of Xerxes (485-465) the Old Persian *dāta-* has been adopted as a loanword, and is now Akkadian *dātu*. So whereas the Akkadian translation of the phrase “my law (*dātam*) held them” in DNa 21-22 and DSe 20-21 uses *dīnātu*, the Akkadian translation of precisely the same phrase in XPh 18-19 uses the loanword *dātu*. The Babylonian “laws,” in short, have become *dāta-/dātu*, just as Judean $h r w t$ in Ezra-Nehemiah has become τd . For the use of *dātu* in Late Babylonian as reference to royal Persian law in regard to tax regulation, repayment of debts, and criminal and civil law, see M. Jursa, J. Paszkowiak, and C. Waerzeggers, “Three Court Records,” *AfO* 50 (2003/2004): 255-68 (259) and *CAD* 3:122-23. See also Kristin Kleber, “*Dātu ša šarri*: Gesetzgebung in Babylonien unter den Achämeniden,” *ZABR* 16 (2011): 49-75.

In chapter 5 we saw that Achaemenid hegemony claims that Auramazda put the Great King in power because he found his creation to be “in turmoil” and wanted the Achaemenid to put the world “down in its place” by having his colonial subjects do his desire (see DNa 30-38 as well as DB 1.23-24 and DZc 7-12). In an inscription from Susa, Darius writes that this divine order that he has reestablished has come about because he has promulgated *dātam tya manā* “my law” (DSe 30-41).⁵³¹ The obedient subalterns “showed respect to my law” (DB 1.23),⁵³² and it is the royal law that holds the lands Darius rules (DNa 21-22; DSe 20-21). For Ezra-Nehemiah, turmoil will end for the Judean assembly so long as they are loyal to God’s Torah and commandments, something that the work equates with the Persian law, but something that the narrative claims that Judah has failed to do in the past and fails to do now. The first thing Ezra must do after arrival in Judah is to proclaim the community’s “guilt” and “iniquities” (9:6, 7, 13, 15) because of their intermarriage with the peoples of the lands, which violates Yhwh’s commandments and *hrwt* (9:10, 11, 14; 10:3, 4). When Ezra and the Levites teach the law to the community in Nehemiah 8, the people weep (8:9) and are grieved (8:11), they fast, wear sackcloth, put dust on their heads, and confess their sins and those of their ancestors (9:1-2), and this reaction tells us they realize the danger of their sin, something that becomes explicit in the prayer of 9:6-37, which recounts God’s violent reactions to the people’s disloyalty. Because of

⁵³¹ For a full discussion of these ideas, see P.O. Skjævrø, “Ahura Mazdā and Ārmaiti, Heaven and Earth, in the Old Avesta,” *JAOS* 122 (2002): 399-410; P.O. Skjævrø, “The Achaemenids and the *Avesta*” in *Birth of the Persian Empire, Volume I*, ed. Vesta Sarkhosh Curtis and Sarah Stewart (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), 52-84.

⁵³² The only thing the Achaemenid inscriptions ever call upon the colonized *pariya-* “to respect” is *dāta-* (DB 1.23; XPh 49, 52).

their own sin, “we are slaves to this day, and as for the land that you gave to our ancestors to eat of its fruit and good things, we are slaves upon it; its great yield goes to kings whom you have given over us because of our sins, and over our bodies and our livestock they rule at their pleasure, and we are in great distress” (9:36-37).

Ezra makes the same point in Ezra 9:6-9, part of his response to the mixed marriage crisis, and he claims in these verses that Israel’s past guilt resulted in the community’s current status as a group of slaves, even though God has extended steadfast love to them “before the kings of Persia” in this state of slavery. In Ezra 9, Ezra points to no exit from this slavery, but only warns that further violations of God’s commandments will lead to complete destruction. Some see the conclusion of Neh 9:6-37 as reflecting negatively on the Persian kings, for the Persians are the ones taking the produce of the land, the land on which the people are now slaves.⁵³³ But if the assembly is “in great distress,” that is the just result of their sin and those of

⁵³³ So, e.g., Waldemar Chrostowski, “An Examination of Conscience by God’s People as Exemplified in Neh 9,6-37,” *BZ* 34 (1990): 253-61 (261); Michael W. Duggan, *The Covenant Renewal in Ezra-Nehemiah (Neh 7:72B-10:40): An Exegetical, Literary, and Theological Study*, SBLDS 164 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 231-32; Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, *A Biblical Theology of Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 44-45; H.G.M. Williamson, “The Belief System of the Book of Nehemiah,” in *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, *FAT* 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 271-91 (289-90); Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, “Abraham—A Judahite Prerogative,” *ZAW* 120 (2008): 49-66 (61); Armin Siedlecki, “Contextualizations of Ezra-Nehemiah” in *Unity and Disunity in Ezra-Nehemiah: Redaction, Rhetoric, and Reader*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Paul L. Redditt, *HBM* 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 263-76 (271-72); Klaas A.D. Smelik, “Nehemiah as a ‘Court Jew’” in *New*

their ancestors, as 9:32-37 states. Nehemiah 9, like Ezra 9, points to no way out of this slavery; one might argue that the assembly's decision in Nehemiah 10 to agree to keep Torah suggests a path to freedom, but this is not a point the text actually makes. In fact, the specific aspects of the law the community agrees to observe in Nehemiah 10—they will not intermarry with “the peoples of the land” or trade with them on the Sabbath (10:31-32 [30-31]) and they will financially support the temple and its personnel (10:33-40 [32-39])—are ones they violate three chapters later (13:10, 16, 23). As Nehemiah 9-13 presents matters, the assembly is unable to keep the law. Given Ezra-Nehemiah's positive portrayal of the Persian kings, not to mention Ezra 9's acceptance of slavery as a best-case scenario for the assembly—there, the only alternative Ezra mentions is complete destruction—it makes the most sense to understand Ezra 9 and Nehemiah 9 as reflecting the language of Persian hegemony in regard to the subjects of the Achaemenid. Slavery in the context of the Persian empire was simply the accepted status of the colonized, who are *bandaka*- “subject, servant,” a word related to the Old Persian verb *band*- “to bind,” and used for both high-ranking Persians (DB 3.56 uses it in reference to a satrap) as well as everyone else within the empire (DB 1.19 uses it to refer to all the peoples Darius rules).⁵³⁴ If the term can suggest a close relationship between king and subaltern,⁵³⁵ it also

Perspectives on Ezra-Nehemiah: History and Historiography, Text, Literature, and

Interpretation, ed. Isaac Kalimi (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 61-72 (71-72).

⁵³⁴ See Christopher Tuplin, “All the King's Men” in *The World of Achaemenid Persia: History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John Curtis and St John Simpson (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010), 51-61 (54-55). See DB 1.19, as well as 2.20, 30, 49-50, 82; 3.13, 31, 56, 85; 5.8. The words derive from Indo-European **bhendh-*, and so are cognate with English “bond” and “bind” and Greek *pei~sma* “rope, cable.” See Pokorny, *Indogermanisches*

suggests slaves who are bound in fetters. The Akkadian version of the Bisitun Inscription uses *qallu* “slave” as the translation for *bandaka-* (CII 1/2/1:44, 48, 53, 62, 69, 73, 79, 86), and it is possible that the Greek view that all of the great king’s subjects were *dou~loi* “slaves” derives from a similar understanding of the Old Persian word.⁵³⁶

So when Ezra 9 and Nehemiah 9 say that the members of the assembly are “slaves” to the Achaemenids, they only repeat the claim of Persian hegemony in regard to everyone below the rank of the Great King; Ezra 9 and Nehemiah 9 simply attribute the assembly’s status as “slaves” or subjects to the Achaemenids to the will of Yhwh rather than Auramazda.⁵³⁷ What Ezra 9 warns of is complete destruction should the assembly fail to keep the law that Artaxerxes has just proclaimed to be the Law of the King, valid throughout the whole satrapy of Across-the-River. Ezra 9 reflects the choices Persian hegemony offers Persian subjects, a choice between being bound as slaves to the Great King—something that, we saw in chapter 5, Persian hegemony does not represent as onerous—or bound in preparation for torture and execution. The Bisitun

etymologisches Wörterbuch, 1:127.

⁵³⁵ So Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 65 and Josef Wiesehöfer, *Ancient Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD*, trans. Azizeh Azodi (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), 31.

⁵³⁶ Anna Missiou, “*Dou~loj tou basile/wj*: The Politics of Translation,” *ClatQ* 43 (1993): 377-91.

⁵³⁷ Manfred Oeming makes this point in regard to the use of *Mydb* (in Nehemiah 9; see his “‘See, we are serving today’ (Nehemiah 9:36): Nehemiah 9 as a Theological Interpretation of the Persian Period” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 571-88.

Inscription uses a participial form of the verb *band-* to refer to the rebels: once defeated and captured, they are bound (*basta*), mutilated,⁵³⁸ and killed (DB 1.81-83; 2.70-78, 86-91; 5.25-27).

The kinds of torture to which the Great King subjected criminals were well known within the empire,⁵³⁹ and Xenophon writes that it was common in Persian-held territory to come across lawbreakers left without feet, hands, or eyes (*Anab.* 1.9.13).⁵⁴⁰ Darius is unlikely to have been exaggerating when he writes that the colonized are afraid of his law (DSe 37-39); when he says that his law “held” the conquered peoples (DNa 21-22; DSe 20-21), one imagines that it is the

⁵³⁸ Darius describes cutting off rebels’ noses, ears, tongues, and putting out their eyes while putting them on public display before their executions. Bruce Lincoln suggests that these mutilations are meant to correspond to the ways in which the Lie can enter and leave a person; see his “Representing the Lie in Achaemenian Persia” in *“Happiness for mankind”*: *Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, Acta Iranica 53 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 213-24 (222-24).

⁵³⁹ This, at least, seems to be a reasonable conclusion given how well such things appear to be known to the Greek writers. See, e.g., the various kinds of mutilations and punishments described in Plutarch, *Art.* 14.5; 16.2-4; Herodotus 3.119, 130.1-2; 5.25; Diodorus 17.30.4; Strabo 15.3.17, and see also Thomas Harrison, *The Emptiness of Persia: Aeschylus’ Persians and the History of the Fifth Century* (London: Duckworth, 2000), 78.

⁵⁴⁰ As a result, writes Bruce Lincoln, the Achaemenid kings did not need to make such punishments an explicit part of their hegemony, since it was on vivid display in the bodies of those who had been punished for their violations of the king’s law; see his “Happiness, Law, and Fear” in *“Happiness for mankind”*: *Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, Acta Iranica 53 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 406-24 (420-23).

fear of the consequences of violating his law that was responsible for this. Ezra 9 and Nehemiah 9 use Yahwistic language to convey this idea that violations of God’s law—which Ezra 7 equates with Persian law—lead to destruction. In the end, this is simply a hybrid product of Persian hegemony and Yahwistic theology of the assembly group from which Ezra-Nehemiah has emerged: the people must be loyal to Yhwh’s Torah/the Achaemenid’s *dāta*-. It is no wonder the Judeans weep and mourn in Nehemiah 8-9 upon hearing the law, for they have learned that, given their sin, their situation might be much worse. Given the context of Ezra-Nehemiah as a whole, especially given its very positive portrayal of the Persian monarchy, Neh 9:36-37 should be read like Ezra 9, a plea that God not worsen the current situation of bondage to the Achaemenids.

Ezra 9 and Nehemiah 9 reinforce the view of imperial discourse that the colonized are “in turmoil” by nature, and so need the Achaemenid king to reestablish the divine order that existed at the beginning. Ezra-Nehemiah gives absolutely no sign that the assembly needs a Davidide; in fact, it is Ezra and Nehemiah, figures sent by the Persian king from the imperial center, just as the assembly itself was sent by the Persian king from the imperial center, who lead the people in law. The assembly’s native Judean leadership in the decades after the initial migration is not portrayed positively in Ezra-Nehemiah. In Ezra 1-6, the Judeans responsible for building the temple come from Babylon, but when Ezra goes to Judah during the reign of Artaxerxes and encounters the problem of the mixed marriages in Ezra 9:1-2, he is told that “the hand of the leaders and officials (*Myngshw Myr#&h*) was first in this rebellion.” In Nehemiah 5, Nehemiah discovers it is the assembly leadership (the *Myrx* and the *Myngs*) who have been impoverishing their poorer kin within the assembly by lending money to them at interest. Upon returning to Judah after visiting Artaxerxes in Babylon, he finds the high priest has permitted one

of his sons to marry a foreigner (Neh 13:28) and that the Myr~~x~~ have permitted trading with foreigners on the Sabbath (13:17), despite the fact that the assembly and its leadership publicly agreed not to do these things as they violate God's law (Neh 10:31-32 [30-31]).

As far as Ezra-Nehemiah is concerned, the assembly consistently needs the Achaemenid to send them new leadership from the center of the empire so that will remain loyal to their God and avoid complete destruction. Ezra, as we have seen, is commissioned by Artaxerxes in the narrative of Ezra-Nehemiah to convey Judean law as a kind of Persian law that is to be enforced throughout Across-the-River. Nehemiah comes from Susa, at the heart of the empire, and is sent by Artaxerxes to construct the wall around Jerusalem (Neh 2:1-8). Nehemiah's claim to be ḥq#šm "cup-bearer" to Artaxerxes (1:11) signals to readers that he is equal in rank to the Persian nobles at court, since only they could hold positions such as cup-bearer, quiver-bearer, clothes-bearer, and chariot-driver to the king.⁵⁴¹ Nehemiah is as central a figure as one could possibly

⁵⁴¹ For example, Darius himself was the quiver-bearer to Cyrus (Aelian, *Var. hist.* 12.43); Herodotus 3.34.1 refers to a Persian aristocrat as the king's οἰονοχο/οἰ "cup-bearer," exactly the position Nehemiah says that he holds (LXX^A uses the word οἰονοχο/οἰ to translate ḥq#šm in Neh 1:11), and, Herodotus says, "this is no small honor"; DNC and DND refer to Persians as spear- and clothes-bearers to the king (see Rüdiger Schmitt, *The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis*, CII 1/1/2 [London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 2000], 45-46 for short discussions of the inscriptions); Herodotus 7.40.4 refers to a Persian as the king's chariot-driver; Darius III once functioned as the king's letter-bearer (Plutarch, *Alex.* 18.7); and so on. It is not historically likely that Nehemiah held the position of cup-bearer since he was not a member of the Persian nobility, but in his memoir he presents this claim as fact; see, however, Lester Grabbe, "The Terminology of Government in the

imagine in the Persian Empire, outside of the king himself, and the construction of the wall, which Artaxerxes forbids in Ezra 4:11-22 because of the lies of the officials bribed by the people of the land, is possible only because Nehemiah can speak to him personally. According to Nehemiah, Artaxerxes even permits trees from one of the royal paradises to be cut down and used for the construction of Jerusalem's walls (Neh 2:8), and readers would likely see in this claim on the part of Nehemiah a manifestation of a very close relationship between him and the Great King, since the trees from these royal parks were rarely cut down.⁵⁴² Both Ezra and Nehemiah work in Judah under written orders from the king (Ezra 7:11-26; cf. Neh 2:7-8), and so both are "working with" Artaxerxes, bringing the divine/royal law to Judah and enforcing it, rebuilding Jerusalem and its walls.

Ezra 1-6 is a narrative that provides readers with more focus on the assembly than on its

Septuagint—in Comparison with Hebrew, Aramaic, and Other Languages" in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak et al., HCS 50 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007), 225-37 (231). For nobility among the Persians as based in descent and wealth, see Herodotus 3.68.1 and Quintus Curtius 10.1.22-23, and for distinctions within the nobility, see Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 331-32.

⁵⁴² Plutarch writes in *Art.* 25.1-2 that Artaxerxes II, while campaigning, stopped at a royal park and told his soldiers to cut down trees for firewood since it was so cold. The soldiers would not do this, though, until the king himself began to cut one down, suggesting that it was a rarity for trees in the paradises to be felled for mundane activities. Strabo 16.1.11 says Alexander had timber taken from paradises in Babylon for military purposes, but he may not have understood the significance of the paradises to the Achaemenids or, if he did understand, he may not have cared.

leaders;⁵⁴³ when things go wrong there, it is ultimately the king of Persia who fixes the assembly's problems. The king has sent this community, and, in Ezra 7-Nehemiah 13, he commissions leaders whom he sends to guide them and solve their problems. If the point is often made that Ezra-Nehemiah presents a community that depends on the diaspora for its leadership and texts,⁵⁴⁴ perhaps the point for Ezra-Nehemiah is more that the assembly's well-being

⁵⁴³ See Japhet, "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel," 66-75.

⁵⁴⁴ E.g., Peter R. Belford, "Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra-Nehemiah," *VT* 52 (2002): 147-65; Bustenay Oded, "Exile-Homeland Relations during the Exilic Period and Restoration" in *T'shûrôt LaAvishur: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East in Hebrew and Semitic Languages*, ed. Michael Heltzer and Meir Maul (Tel Aviv-Jaffa: Archaeological Center Publications, 2004), 153*-60*; Sara Japhet, "'History' and 'Literature' in the Persian Period: The Restoration of the Temple" in *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah: Collected Studies on the Restoration Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 152-68 (166-67); John Kessler, "The Diaspora in Zechariah 1-8 and Ezra-Nehemiah: The Role of History, Social Location, and Tradition in the Formulation of Identity" in *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Kenneth A. Ristau (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 119-45 (128-34); Gary Knoppers, "Exile, Return and Diaspora: Expatriates and Repatriates in Late Biblical Literature" in *Texts, Contexts and Reading in Postexilic Literature: Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts*, ed. Louis Jonker, FAT 2/53 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 29-61 (47-49); Dalit Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity: Identity Conflicts between the Exiles and the People Who Remained (6th-5th Centuries BCE)*, LHBOTS 543 (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 83-92.

depends on the Persian king and the officials he commissions. There is simply no room here for a local client monarchy, since local leadership in Ezra-Nehemiah that does not originate in Babylon under direct orders from the Achaemenid is suspect. It is not difficult to see, in fact, how the local assembly leadership might have been offended by Ezra-Nehemiah, a work that insists they cannot be trusted to lead without direct supervision installed by the Persians. The work appears to have been composed for a pro-Achaemenid group in the assembly, and it insists that the assembly needs continual oversight of the existing leadership by figures sent by the king himself, such as Nehemiah the governor. In regard to local government, however, one could call it anti-establishment. As in Second Zechariah, suspicion is cast on the quality of local leadership, but Ezra-Nehemiah is not arguing for a replacement of the local Judean government, it is arguing for strict oversight and guidance by the leaders sent by the Persians. It portrays the assembly as a group of colonists sent from the colonial center, a group who needs to maintain their loyalty to their God, something the work has conflated with loyalty to the Achaemenid. The leadership that matters most here is Persian leadership; this is the political key to the assembly's continuing survival. If the assembly is made up of "slaves" to the Persians, that is not necessarily to say anything else than that they are subjects of the Great King, a state to which Ezra-Nehemiah offers them no alternative. The case is not that Ezra-Nehemiah argues against the restoration of the Davidides as a client monarchy; the case is that such a restoration seems so far from the reality that the author or compiler of Ezra-Nehemiah is willing to contemplate, even as the work criticizes the existing local leadership, that it is difficult to imagine his or her ideal reader ever considering the idea.

The Chronicler's goal was to inspire such consideration, and in a positive manner, but in this he or she does not appear to have been successful. Perhaps members of the assembly did not

believe that Chronicles and the pro-Davidic group that produced it offered enough of an enticement; perhaps they did not believe a restored Davidide would really do the things Chronicles says that good Davidides did; perhaps they simply preferred the status quo rather than risking their political standing on a change in polity that might have consequences they could not foresee; perhaps different groups within the assembly had one or several of these reservations, or even different ones entirely. Perhaps Chronicles' pro-Davidic argument was widely and positively received by the assembly, but a consequent petition to the imperial government for restoration was flatly rejected. Certainly the sixth-century assembly had room for pro-Davidic sentiment, but, of the Persian period works, only Chronicles clearly supports a local monarchy with extensive and clearly defined powers, and the very lack of political space for the Davidides in a work like Ezra-Nehemiah that witnesses to some unhappiness with the existing local leadership suggests that a Davidic restoration was not an idea that came naturally to the Persian period assembly. Even if Ezra-Nehemiah condemns the local leadership, the work does not bother to consider that a Davidic restoration might be an acceptable alternative. As far as Ezra-Nehemiah is concerned, assembly problems will be dealt with by the representatives the Achaemenid sends to Judah.

7. Conclusion

We have seen that a variety of groups existed within the post-exilic Judean assembly; given the political interests manifested by Chronicles, the Chronicler likely emerged from the group that identified itself as “the house of David.” There were parties that hoped for a Davidic restoration through divine action and not necessarily through the quiet revolution of political compromises and deals struck with the assembly and the Persian Empire that the Chronicler advanced, and it is certainly possible that some of these were really sub-groups within the house of David. Of course, thanks to Ezekiel 40-48 we know that even within the priesthood—although perhaps not the Aaronides of the fourth century—there were some who saw a role for Davidic rule. We cannot simply divide the fourth-century assembly into pro- and anti-Davidic parties, as we saw in the previous chapter. In the promotion of a quiet revolution, the Chronicler had to navigate among the interests of a variety of groups. Some may have been pro-Davidic, other pro-Davidic in a way the Chronicler was not, hoping for or foreseeing future Davidic rule that was merely ornamental rather than politically effective, the sort of vision we encounter in Second Zechariah, a work that emerged from outside of the house of David. Others may not have strongly supported or opposed any kind of restoration, while Ezra-Nehemiah shows us that some assembly members believed that Persian-appointed leadership and not a client monarchy was the key to the assembly’s survival. The Chronicler worked to convince assembly members who held this last sort of belief that they would be better off with Davidides as the local leadership, just as he or she worked to show all assembly members the benefits of de facto and not just de jure Davidic rule in Judah. The Chronicler’s choice of historiography as the medium to accomplish this goal allows a presentation of Judah/Israel as a nation whose history begins and ends with the Davidides, a nation in which kingship appears not just as the natural form of leadership but as its

inevitable form, since the Davidides have a divine guarantee of eternal rule.

As inevitable as this restoration may have been in the Chronicler's telling, it was not necessarily one that all within the Judean temple assembly were willing to accept. The assembly had maintained control over local matters for about two centuries before the time of Chronicles, and assurances were needed if they were not to work against an approach to the empire from a pro-Davidic group. In regard to the temple, the institution of greatest importance to the assembly that built and maintained it, the Chronicler assures readers that it is something that all future Davidides would respect and support. The Chronicler does not elide past Davidic failures in regard to the cult, but creates a history that demonstrates how God punishes kings who do fail in this regard, sending a message of warning to eligible Davidides and a message of reassurance to the assembly that future client rulers would honor temple norms. The Chronicler's history sends this dual message of warning and reassurance in regard to military matters as well; an imperial client would have to maintain an army, but no future Davidide, now informed by Chronicles as to how history functions, would dare to misuse an army made up of assembly members. As the Chronicler presents things, the assembly itself would have some control over providing soldiers for the army, and the Davidides would not risk assembly lives by making foreign military alliances that would draw the empire's ire, for dreadful punishment awaits the king who does so. In Chronicles, the assembly also has a say in choosing a king's successor and in making important cultic decisions, and there is even a suggestion that they should serve to counsel kings when they first ascend to the throne. The Chronicler also portrays the Levites under a monarchy with higher status than they have in the Priestly Writing and with important roles in civil administration. The Chronicler does not wish to alienate the Aaronide priesthood, and so does not attempt to diminish their authority, but he or she is also aware that the Aaronides stand the

most to lose from a restoration, and so aims merely not to arouse their opposition while gaining strong Levitical support. The Chronicler knows that prophets could impinge upon the power of any future monarchy, and so works to limit valid prophetic messages to those in accord with Chronistic theology. Prophets can criticize kings when kings encroach upon the rights Chronicles reserves for the assembly and the temple personnel, but a prophetic voice that speaks in some other way cannot be trusted.

Chronicles is not really an anti-Persian work, even if it does dispute important aspects of Achaemenid hegemony. But in challenging the Persian claim that the Achaemenids are the guarantors of Judah's peace, the Chronicler provides an argument that challenges the belief in the necessity of Persian rule, the sort of belief broadcast by Ezra-Nehemiah. The Davidides, on the other hand, can guarantee Judah's well-being through their support and maintenance of the temple and its cultic norms, something they will certainly do, since Chronicles makes clear what will happen to them if they do not. The Chronicler hints in the story of Josiah's death that complete peace and well-being is a Judah free of imperial rule, although the work avoids making this point explicitly, thereby avoiding alienating readers with some sympathy for Ezra-Nehemiah's kind of pro-Persian sentiment. That the Chronicler hints at it at all suggests he or she hopes to attract the support of those who await a great divine overthrow of the existing political order, the kind of worldview we see in Haggai and First and Second Zechariah. But, of course, this is not the focus of Chronicles, which spends the bulk of its space devoted to the more mundane political calculus of assuring assembly members that they will gain rather than lose from a restoration.

Of course, the Chronicler's quiet revolution failed, perhaps because he or she was unable to convince the assembly of the Davidic cause, or perhaps because the empire refused to create a

client monarchy in Judah. Hopes for a Davidic restoration do not disappear but, as far as we can tell, they become limited to the result of divine action, the kind we see in passages like Hag 2:20-23, where God's overthrow of the political order appears imminent, or Zech 9:1-10, where God establishes the Davidide as a figurehead over a world God has pacified. By the early-second century, Ben Sira refers to an eternal covenant with the Aaronides (45:7, 24), but says nothing about such a covenant with David,⁵⁴⁵ reflecting the importance of Aaronide leadership in the Hellenistic period. At Qumran, the belief in future Davidic rule becomes an eschatological phenomenon, the result of divine action "in the latter days" (4QFlor 1 I, 10-13; see also 4QDibHam 2 IV, 6-8; 4QCommGen 6 V, 1-4; 4Q161 8-10 15-29; 4Q285 7 2-6). Even Ps. Sol. 17:21-45, which provides a non-eschatological picture of Davidic rule, does not see it as accomplished without God's intervention. In the Hellenistic period it is the priesthood and assembly that exercise power in Judah, and whatever entity that might have been known in the late Persian period as "the house of David" seems to disappear, and so any realistic hope of its restoration through political channels obviously disappears along with it. The Chronicler's promotion of a quiet revolution came to nothing, and the beliefs concerning future Davidic rule that survived were ones tied to a very noisy overthrow of the established order.

⁵⁴⁵ Sir 45:25 refers to a covenant with David, although not an eternal one, but reference to this covenant appears only as part of a larger discussion of the eternal priestly covenant. In fact, Pancratius Beentjes, "'The countries marveled at you': King Solomon in Ben Sira 47:12-22" in *"Happy the one who meditates on wisdom" (Sir. 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira*, CBET 42 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 135-44 (141-42) argues that the preferred Hebrew text of this passage portrays God's covenant with David as continued by the Aaronides.