INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

THE IDEAL RULER AS INTERTEXT
IN 1-2 CHRONICLES AND THE CYROPAEDIA

by

CHRISTINE MITCHELL, B.A., M.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Institute for Comparative Studies
in Literature, Art and Culture:
Comparative Literary Studies

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

September 7, 2001.

© copyright 2001,
Christine Mitchell

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-67052-X

Canada

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

"THE IDEAL RULER AS INTERTEXT
IN 1-2 CHRONICLES AND THE CYROPAEDIA"

submitted by Christine Mitchell, B.A., M.A.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Director
Institute for Comparative Studies
in Literature, Art and Culture

Thesis Supervisor

External Examiner

Carleton University

13 October, 2001

Date

ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I use the tool of intertextuality to discuss the genre of 1-2 Chronicles, producing a new interpretation of this work. Using a comparativist approach, I employ the figure of the "ideal ruler" in both Xenophon's Cyropaedia and 1-2 Chronicles as my example. In the first chapter, I discuss the concept of intertextuality, and its development by Kristeva, Riffaterre, Barthes, Culler, Bakhtin and Lotman. I then develop my own theoretical framework based on the Bakhtinian concept of dialogism. Next, I discuss the concept of genre and the genre of the Cyropaedia and 1-2 Chronicles. In the second chapter I look at the intertextual construction of Cyrus in the Cyropaedia, showing how Cyrus is constructed dialogically, and I link this reading with the concept of the genre of the Cyropaedia as political philosophy. In the third chapter, I turn to a reading of David in 1-2 Chronicles. First I read David in the context of Chronicles, and develop a theory about the Chronicler's literary construction of the ideal ruler, and then I read David dialogically. In the fourth and fifth chapters, I examine Solomon and the other kings of Judah in 1-2 Chronicles. First I read each king in the context of Chronicles, looking at how they fulfill the criteria of the ideal ruler as developed in my reading of David, and then I read each king dialogically. I conclude that the use of intertextuality by the Chronicler was a

hallmark of his genre, just as it was for Xenophon; both works fit into the genre of political philosophy. This reading of Chronicles presents a new way of looking at this biblical text, one that looks beyond the biblical tradition to the context of the ancient eastern Mediterranean world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada doctoral fellowship programme for its support during the research and writing of this dissertation. My thanks also go to my supervisor, Robert Polzin, whose perceptive comments on this dissertation helped me to see where I was being obscure. My other debts to his teaching are incalculable. John Wright was helpful in his encouragement of the aims of my project when it was in its early stage. Pat Graham's request to include an essay, based on this work, in his volume on the Chronicler as author gave me support at a crucial time. I would like to thank my husband, Kevin Kitchen, without whose support this project would not have been possible, and I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my daughter Marianne, who arrived during the final stages of the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	v
Table of Contents	vi
Abbreviations	ix
INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM AND THE TEXTS	1
Intertextuality and ancient literature	1
The "Ideal Ruler"	5
Introduction to the texts	9
<i>Chronicles</i>	9
<i>The Cyropaedia</i>	12
<i>Samuel-Kings</i>	13
<i>Herodotus' Histories</i>	17
<i>Ctesias' Persica</i>	18
Notes	20
CHAPTER ONE: INTERTEXTUALITY	23
Concepts of intertextuality	23
<i>Julia Kristeva</i>	26
<i>Michael Riffaterre</i>	28
<i>Roland Barthes</i>	32
<i>Jonathan Culler</i>	34
<i>Other concepts</i>	36
"Intertextuality" in ancient criticism	39
<i>Aristotle: The Poetics</i>	40
<i>"Demetrius": On Style</i>	42
<i>"Longinus": On the Sublime</i>	43
Intertextuality as dialogue	44
<i>Mikhail Bakhtin</i>	44
<i>Yuri Lotman</i>	52
Outline of the theoretical framework	57
Genre, and the genre of the texts	59
<i>Genre</i>	60
<i>The Cyropaedia</i>	64
<i>1-2 Chronicles</i>	70
Notes	86
CHAPTER TWO: XENOPHON'S CYRUS AS INTERTEXT	90
Previous discussions of Cyrus in the <i>Cyropaedia</i>	90
Reading Cyrus in the <i>Cyropaedia</i>	93
<i>Cyropaedia 1.1 - Introduction to the problem</i>	93
<i>Cyropaedia 1.2-1.6 - Cyrus' origins, nature and education</i>	95
<i>Cyropaedia 2.1-7.5.36 - Cyrus' conquests</i>	98

<u>Cyropaedia</u> 7.5.37-8.6 - The organization of the kingdom	105
<u>Cyropaedia</u> 8.7-8 - Cyrus' death and its aftermath	109
Reading Cyrus dialogically	113
<u>Cyropaedia</u> 1.1 - Introduction to the problem	113
<u>Cyropaedia</u> 1.2-1.6 - Cyrus' origins, nature and education	115
<u>Cyropaedia</u> 2.1-7.5.36 - Cyrus' conquests	120
<u>Cyropaedia</u> 7.5.37-8.6 - The organization of the kingdom	126
<u>Cyropaedia</u> 8.7-8: Cyrus' death and its aftermath	127
Cyrus	131
Notes	134
 CHAPTER THREE: THE CHRONICLER'S DAVID	140
Previous discussions of David in Chronicles	140
Reading David in Chronicles	144
1 Chronicles 9.35-12.40 - Saul's death and the consolidation of David's kingship	144
1 Chronicles 13.1-16.43 - The Ark	150
1 Chronicles 17.1-27 - The dynastic oracle	156
1 Chronicles 18.1-20.8 - David's wars	158
1 Chronicles 21.1-27.34 - The Temple site, builder, and organization of the Levites	161
1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - David plans Solomon's succession; David's death	166
Reading David dialogically	170
1 Chronicles 9.35-12.40 - Saul's death and the consolidation of David's kingship	170
1 Chronicles 13.1-16.43 - The Ark	173
1 Chronicles 17.1-27 - The dynastic oracle	175
1 Chronicles 18.1-20.8 - David's wars	177
1 Chronicles 21.1-27.34 - The Temple site, builder, and organization of the Levites	179
1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - David plans Solomon's succession; David's death	185
David and Cyrus	189
Notes	193
 CHAPTER FOUR: THE CHRONICLER'S SOLOMON	198
Previous discussions of Solomon in Chronicles	198
Reading Solomon in Chronicles	201
1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - Solomon's accession	201
2 Chronicles 1.1-17 - Solomon's greatness	205
2 Chronicles 2.1-7.22 - Building of the Temple	207
2 Chronicles 8.1-9.31: Solomon's greatness, continued	214
Reading Solomon dialogically	217
1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - Solomon's accession	217

2 Chronicles 1.1-17 - Solomon's greatness	221
2 Chronicles 2.1-7.22 - Building of the Temple	227
2 Chronicles 8.1-9.31: Solomon's greatness, continued	231
Solomon, David, and Cyrus	233
Notes	237
CHAPTER FIVE: THE CHRONICLER'S KINGS OF JUDAH	241
Previous discussions of the other kings in Chronicles	241
Reading the other kings in Chronicles	246
2 Chronicles 10.1-13.23a - Rehoboam and Abijah	246
2 Chronicles 13.23b-21.1 - Asa and Jehoshaphat	250
2 Chronicles 21.2-23.21 - Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah	256
2 Chronicles 24.1-27.9 - Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham	260
2 Chronicles 28.1-32.33 - Ahaz and Hezekiah	264
2 Chronicles 33.1-25 - Manasseh and Amon	272
2 Chronicles 34.1-36.23 - Josiah and the last four kings	274
Reading the other kings dialogically	278
2 Chronicles 10.1-13.23a - Rehoboam and Abijah	278
2 Chronicles 13.23b-21.1 - Asa and Jehoshaphat	284
2 Chronicles 21.2-23.21 - Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah	289
2 Chronicles 24.1-27.9 - Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham	292
2 Chronicles 28.1-32.33 - Ahaz and Hezekiah	293
2 Chronicles 33.1-25 - Manasseh and Amon	296
2 Chronicles 34.1-36.23 - Josiah and the last four kings	297
The kings, Solomon, David, and Cyrus	299
Notes	303
CONCLUSIONS	312
Notes	324
WORKS CITED	325

ABBREVIATIONS

4QSam ^a	Fragments of Samuel from Cave 4 at Qumran.
BD	Due, Bodil. <u>The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods</u> . Aarhus: Aarhus UP, 1989.
BDB	Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver & Charles A. Briggs. <u>The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon</u> . Oxford: Oxford UP, 1906.
Cyr.	Xenophon. <u>Cyropaedia</u> .
ELC	Curtis, E.L. & A.A. Madsen. <u>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles</u> . International Critical Commentary 11. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910.
FGrH	Jacoby, F. <u>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</u> . Leiden: Brill, 1923-1957.
Hdt.	Herodotus. <u>Histories</u> .
HGMW	Williamson, H.G.M. <u>1 and 2 Chronicles</u> . New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
LCL	Loeb Classical Library.
LXX	Septuagint.
JMM1	Myers, Jacob M. <u>I Chronicles</u> . Anchor Bible 12. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
JMM2	Myers, Jacob M. <u>II Chronicles</u> . Anchor Bible 13. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
JT	Tatum, James. <u>Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On The Education of Cyrus</u> . Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.
MT	Massoretic Text.
Pers.	Ctesias. <u>Persika</u> . FGrH 688.
PRA	Ackroyd, Peter R. <u>I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah</u> . Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM, 1973.
RB	Braun, Roddy. <u>1 Chronicles</u> . Word Biblical Commentary 14. Waco: Word, 1986.
RBD	Dillard, Raymond B. <u>2 Chronicles</u> . Word Biblical Commentary 15. Waco: Word, 1987.
SJ	Japhet, Sara. <u>I and II Chronicles: A Commentary</u> . Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
SJV	de Vries, Simon J. <u>1 and 2 Chronicles</u> . The Forms of Old Testament Literature 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
WJ	Johnstone, William. <u>1 and 2 Chronicles</u> . 2 vol. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1997.

All biblical chapter and verse numbers cited will follow the Hebrew numbering. Transliteration of both Hebrew and Greek follows the style found in the "Instructions for Contributors" Journal of Biblical Literature 107 (1988): 579-596.

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM AND THE TEXTS

Intertextuality and ancient literature

How do we understand the book of 1-2 Chronicles as literature? This book, which can seem so pedantic, so relentless in its emphasis on Temple, Israel, and Davidic king, can also seem to be nothing more than a stitched together crazy-quilt of mismatched textual pieces. When doing literary study of the Bible, most scholars are content to ignore 1-2 Chronicles in favour of the narratives of Genesis through 2 Kings. Yet this book is one of the earliest exemplars of a text that shows its awareness of other written texts. It makes reference to numerous other written texts, such as annals, law, commentary, and prophetic books, while Genesis through 2 Kings make reference very rarely to written texts other than annals or law.¹ 1-2 Chronicles seems to be aware of books in narrative form other than itself, while its parallel 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings is not (regardless if the books 1-2 Chronicles purports to know actually existed or not). If we assume that portions of the Hebrew Bible and the historical and philosophical texts of fifth-fourth century Athens were the first texts to be composed as written narrative texts rather than oral ones, then 1-2 Chronicles

becomes interesting simply because it can do what few other texts in the Hebrew Bible can do: namely, reflect other written texts.

What I would like to do in this dissertation is examine the relationship of texts to texts within the Hebrew Bible, specifically the relationship between 1 Samuel-2 Kings and 1-2 Chronicles, in comparison with the relationship between Xenophon's Cyropaedia and his predecessors Herodotus and Ctesias. I would like to examine this relationship through a different lens than those that have been trained on 1-2 Chronicles and the Cyropaedia up to this point. I am not going to examine 1-2 Chronicles and 1 Samuel-2 Kings with regard to the question of sources, since I think it is evident that they have much material in common; and for my purposes it does not matter which book came first or the origins of their common material.² Nor will I examine 1-2 Chronicles as a proto-midrash on 1 Samuel-2 Kings, since I think it has been shown that there are definite signs that midrash and other forms of post-biblical literature developed out of the trajectory for which 1-2 Chronicles was the beginning.³ Rather, I would like to examine 1-2 Chronicles in its very textuality, in its very existence as a written literary text in a tradition of written literary texts.

My hypothesis is, that the relationship between the Cyropaedia and its predecessors is very similar to the relationship between 1-2 Chronicles and 1 Samuel-2 Kings, and

that an examination of the Cyropaedia will lead to insights into the form, purpose, and function of 1-2 Chronicles. On what basis can I compare this text from the Hebrew Bible to a text from the classical Greek world? To many biblical scholars this would be a sensible question; indeed, there would be an outraged reaction in suggesting that such a comparison should be made. This was the reaction to John Van Seters' somewhat vague suggestion that perhaps Greek historiography should be compared with biblical literature (Search 246-248, 357-359).⁴ In recent years, a few studies have appeared which very explicitly compare the two bodies of literature (Mandell & Freedman, Nielsen, Wesselius), although the focus has been on the so-called "Primary History" or Genesis-2 Kings. Although most scholars would place 1-2 Chronicles in the Persian-Hellenistic period (see below), there has been very little work comparing 1-2 Chronicles to Greek literature; an exception would be Gary Knoppers' paper ("Classical").⁵ On the side of the classicists, Arnaldo Momigliano argued in his Sather lectures of 1961-1962, and in subsequent publications, that both Greek and Hebrew historical writing grew out of influence by and reaction to the Persian Empire: the Ionian Greeks and the emerging Jewish community in Yehud were on the margins of the vast Persian Empire. Similarities in form and attitude were due to this shared cultural milieu (Foundations 16-17; Alien 80-81).⁶

In order to make the comparisons between biblical and classical texts, and between one biblical text and another, I will draw on the theories of modern literary theorists such as Mikhail Bakhtin and Yuri Lotman. First I will describe the work of each theorist, before attempting to synthesize their work in order to develop a model to be applied first to the Cyropaedia, and then to 1-2 Chronicles. The use of the work of Bakhtin in literary circles has exploded in the last twenty years, although there has been comparatively very little work bringing the Bible and Bakhtin together.⁷ The model of intertextuality that I will develop in Chapter One is heavily based on the principle of the dialogic. Bakhtin developed his theories about dialogism based on Dostoevsky's novels. We might wonder about the validity of using theories based on 19th century novels on biblical literature. I will argue that Bakhtin anticipated that his theories about dialogism could have wider applications beyond the novels of this one particular author (a notion that not many would dispute), and that when his discussion of dialogism is tied together with his discussion of the rise of the novel, the concept of dialogism is indeed applicable to biblical literature.

Bakhtin's theories will be combined with the work of Lotman, who looked at the functions and purpose of texts: the transmission of the message, the generation of new messages, and cultural memory (giving the text new meanings through the history of interpretation); transmission could be through time as well as

space; texts shape readers who shape texts. By combining the work of Bakhtin with the work of Lotman, an understanding of intertextuality as a continuous, cyclical process will be developed.

The "Ideal Ruler"

Although a comparison between 1-2 Chronicles and the Cyropaedia is possible on many levels, for the purposes of this dissertation I have limited the analysis and discussion to the presentation of the "ideal ruler" in each text. Cyrus in the Cyropaedia, and David, Solomon, and the remaining kings of Judah in 1-2 Chronicles, will be the focus: the intertextual construction and function of these figures will serve as an example of how intertextuality might be used to examine each text as a whole. Before the discussion begins, therefore, I will define and describe the features of the ideal ruler as applied to these texts. It is important to note that I will not be dealing with the concept of the ideal leader/ruler in the sense that a political philosopher might do so, but rather as a literary construct.⁴

With respect to the ideal ruler, therefore, I am hypothesizing that ancient literature dealt with the concept of the ideal ruler in similar ways, not limited to one national literature. The ideal ruler was constructed in later pieces of literature from the depiction of that ruler in earlier pieces of literature, and this construction was done consciously. The

later construction of the ideal ruler was a contrast to the earlier construction of the same ruler in an un-idealized form. The later construction was an attempt to rewrite, correct, or present an alternative to the earlier depiction's construction. The result was that the earlier and later depictions ended up in dialogue with each other, providing corrections and alternatives to each other. My hypothesis is that this was not an isolated development, and that this development is but one example of the problem of intertextuality in ancient literature: the ideal ruler is only a test case.

Xenophon began the Cyropaedia by meditating on rulers and government in general (1.1). In his meditation, he pointed out a few of the good and bad features of various rulers, with the implication that the ideal ruler would have none of the flaws. Thus "many of those individuals who have aspired to absolute power have [...] been deposed once for all and that right quickly" (1.1.1), implying that a successful ruler would not be deposed quickly. Owners are masters of their herds of animals, who obey their owners and do not revolt against them, implying that a successful ruler would have obedient and loyal subjects. Xenophon then held up Cyrus as a paragon, noting that he "reduced a vast number of men and cities and nations" (1.1.3), and that he "ruled over these nations, even though they did not speak the same language as he [...] and he was able to awaken in all so lively a desire to please him, that they always wished to be

guided by his will" (1.1.5). From the outset, therefore, the ideal ruler is explicitly defined in the Cyropaedia as one who: 1) rules for a long period; 2) whose subjects are obedient and loyal; and 3) rules over a vast empire and holds it together, no matter what differences there may be between the various parts of it. However, this ideal ruler was understood by Xenophon to have been one of a kind, and that his form of government not even have been the best kind: Xenophon was trying to understand how Cyrus came to be so successful. In this way, we might understand the epilogue of the Cyropaedia as a comment on the impossibility of ever living up to this standard (Sage, "Dying" 164-165, 172-174). In fact, just where Cyrus fails to complete his task is where David seems to succeed: Cyrus fails to engender heirs who can rule as he has done ("[A]s soon as Cyrus was dead, his children at once fell into dissension, states and nations began to revolt, and everything began to deteriorate." [8.8.2]).

As is typical of biblical texts, there is no proem in 1-2 Chronicles that explicitly outlines the purpose of the book. However, it is likely that 1 Chron. 10 performs this function: this chapter portrays Saul as being an improper king, who dies alone, whose head is sacrificed to a foreign god, who had been unfaithful (*ma'al*) to Yhwh (see below, Chapter Three). David, then, is presented as a contrast, and as embodying the features of an ideal king. Perhaps it is not surprising that many of the features are the same as those in the Cyropaedia, and in fact

they are conveniently summarized in 1 Chron. 29.26-28, "Thus David son of Jesse reigned over all Israel. The period that he reigned over Israel was forty years [...] He died in a good old age, full of days, riches, and honor; and his son Solomon succeeded him." Thus, as in the Cyropaedia, the ideal ruler in should have a long reign, and his son should succeed him. In 1-2 Chronicles the ideal ruler should also be rich and honoured, especially by foreign rulers (e.g. 2 Chron. 8.17-18; 9.5-9). Finally, the ideal ruler should have a proper respect for God, and should further his worship (e.g. 1 Chron. 22).⁹

Each book, 1-2 Chronicles and the Cyropaedia, defines what an ideal ruler should be, at least partially, by defining what this ruler should not be. Although there are differences between the conceptions of the ideal ruler, both the Cyropaedia and 1-2 Chronicles agree that the ideal ruler should have a long reign, should be succeeded by able heirs, and should be honoured by many different peoples. In the second through fifth chapters of this dissertation, I will examine how the ideal ruler is constructed intertextually in both the Cyropaedia and 1-2 Chronicles: Chapter Two will deal with Cyrus in the Cyropaedia, Chapter Three with David in 1 Chronicles, Chapter Four with Solomon in 1-2 Chronicles, and Chapter Five with the remaining kings of Judah in 2 Chronicles. Chapter One will outline the theoretical framework, and will describe the hypotheses of this dissertation in detail.

Introduction to the texts

The two main texts, 1-2 Chronicles and the Cyropaedia, seem to me to be appropriate to compare. They are roughly contemporary. They have some similarities in content, as both describe how a kingdom was won, expanded and governed. In antiquity, both were recognized to have only dubious historical truth claims, although more recently scholars have tried to find nuggets of historicity within both works. As well, both works retell stories which had been told in earlier written texts: 1-2 Chronicles retelling Genesis-2 Kings (especially 1 Samuel-2 Kings), and the Cyropaedia retelling the life of Cyrus, found also in the works of Herodotus, Ctesias, and Antisthenes (of which almost nothing survives; cf. Gera 8-9). In this section, I will introduce the main texts that I will deal with in this dissertation. For each text I will discuss the title, content, authorship, date, textual problems and problems of transmission. The two main texts are 1-2 Chronicles (hereafter Chronicles) and Xenophon's Cyropaedia; the secondary texts include 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings (hereafter Samuel and Kings; together forming Samuel-Kings), Herodotus' Histories and Ctesias' Persica.

Chronicles

Chronicles is located at the end of the Hebrew Bible, closing out the Writings. In the Septuagint, it is placed after 1-4 Kingdoms and in English translations after Kings. The Hebrew title is *dibrê hayyāmîm*, "Accounts of the Days," or "Annals;" the

Greek title is *paraleipomena*, "Omissions." The book begins with nine chapters of genealogies and one chapter dealing with the death of Saul; the remainder outlines the Judahite monarchy, focusing on the reigns of David and Solomon, then continuing through to the deportation to Babylon, and concludes with a brief notice of the restoration to Jerusalem. Emphasis is on the role of the temple and temple personnel, the Davidic king, and the organization and ordering of life in Israel.

As with many biblical books, the author of Chronicles is not named, although later tradition named Ezra as the author. Biblical scholars call the anonymous author "the Chronicler," and I will continue this usage. However, many biblical scholars continue to refer to the Chronicler as the author of the biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah as well (cf. Noth, Chronicler's 29); although to my mind, it has been adequately shown that Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah have separate authorship (Japhet, "Common Authorship"; "Relationship"; Williamson, Israel 5-70). Thus I will use the term "the Chronicler" to refer to the author of Chronicles only.

As with almost all of the biblical books, it is difficult to determine a date for Chronicles. It is dated by various scholars anywhere between the sixth and second centuries BCE, although the earliest date demands that certain sections (such as the genealogies) be considered as having been added later. Most scholars, however, consider the fourth century BCE as the most

likely date. Sara Japhet outlines the reasoning as follows: 1) the book cannot be dated on the basis of reference to precise historical events; 2) the language is "Late Biblical Hebrew," i.e., later than the Hebrew of Torah and earlier than the Hebrew of Qumran and the Mishnah; 3) there is no evidence of Hellenistic influence, but there is also little evidence of Persian influence;¹⁰ 4) the genealogies which extend the farthest (1 Chron. 3.17-24) take the book to a period between 460-320 BCE; 5) an advanced stage of development of cultic organization;¹¹ and 6) the use by the Chronicler of other biblical books which are usually dated earlier than the fourth century BCE. Thus Japhet dates Chronicles to the end of the fourth century BCE (SJ 25-28). H.G.M. Williamson adds the evidence of the translation of Chronicles into Greek by the second century BCE (Israel 14-15). His statement that scholars cannot be too "dogmatic" about the dating is well put and well worth heeding (HGMW 16). Thus, while some of the arguments for a fourth century BCE date are perhaps tendentious, overall, the placement of the book within that period seems reasonable.

The text of Chronicles itself has come down to us in reasonably good condition, with the greatest number of corruptions to be found in the various lists. The various ancient translations are for the most part more important for the study of the history of exegesis than the study of the original Hebrew text (cf. SJ 29-31). In this dissertation, I have used

the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (based on the 10th century Leningrad codex) as my text, with due consideration for the variants presented in the apparatus; quotations in English will be from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible unless otherwise noted.

The Cyropaedia

The Cyropaedia (or The Education of Cyrus) is the latest of the works by Xenophon of Athens. The title appears in all the manuscripts and the work was known by this title in antiquity. Although the title may seem to refer to the first of the eight books, in which Cyrus' education is described, Xenophon himself used the term to refer to the Persian concept of education which went on throughout one's life (BD 15). The work begins with one book describing the childhood and education of the great Persian king Cyrus; the remaining books outline how Cyrus comes to be the master of a great empire, through his organization of his army, his conquests, and his organization of his empire. The epilogue points out that after Cyrus' death, his empire degenerates. The Cyropaedia has been described as "[c]onsidered by all too many to be one of the most tedious books to have survived classical antiquity" (Gera vii). Although it was considered in the ancient and renaissance periods to be an important work on statesmanship, modern scholarship has all but ignored this work, until recently. Three book-length works (BD, Gera, JT) and several articles have

appeared since 1975, indicating a small resurgence in the study of this work.

The author, Xenophon of Athens (c. 428-c. 354 BCE), is better known for his Anabasis and Hellenica, as well as his works on Socrates; the Cyropaedia was his last work. The precise dating for the Cyropaedia depends a great deal on whether the epilogue of 8.8, referring to events of 362/1 BCE, was original to the work or a later addition by Xenophon, or even an addition made by a later editor or copyist. The recent commentators agree that the epilogue is original, which would then place the Cyropaedia after 361 BCE.¹² The work is thus very much a work of the mid-fourth century BCE; it is thus roughly contemporary with Chronicles.

The earliest complete manuscript for the Cyropaedia dates to the twelfth century. In this dissertation I have used the Oxford edition by Marchant, with due consideration to the variants presented in the apparatus; unless otherwise noted, English translations will be from Miller's translation.

Samuel-Kings

Samuel and Kings are located in the middle of the Hebrew Bible, in the Prophets. They make up the last two books of the so-called "Primary History" which extends from Genesis through Kings. In Hebrew, they follow Judges, while in the Greek and English translations the book of Ruth is placed between Judges and Samuel. In Greek, they are called 1-4 Kingdoms, with 1-2

Kingdoms corresponding to Samuel and 3-4 Kingdoms corresponding to Kings. Samuel deals with the prophet Samuel, the kingdom of Saul, the rise of David, and David's rule of Israel. Kings deals with David's death, the rule of Solomon, the division of the kingdom, and the fate of both Israel and Judah. As with Chronicles, there is no explicitly named author. Biblical scholars often refer to the author of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings as "the Deuteronomist" or "the Deuteronomistic school," and I will continue this usage by referring to the author as the Deuteronomist.

Again, as with Chronicles, it is difficult to determine a date for Samuel-Kings. This difficulty is compounded by the propensity of biblical scholars to divide the text and give each section a different date. Thus the so-called "Court History" or "Succession Narrative" of 2 Samuel 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2 is often considered by scholars to be of separate provenance from the rest of Samuel-Kings; so too the "Ark Narrative" of 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 6. These sections are sometimes considered to be "eye-witness" accounts (cf. e.g., Rost 8-9, 84-85; von Rad 176-193; Campbell). Whatever the merits of these arguments, since I am concerned with the books as a whole, I am more interested in a date for the finished text. Here too there is something less than unanimity: the traditional view is that the bulk of the works were finished in the late seventh or sixth century BCE (Cross 274, 287-289; Noth, Deuteronomistic 79) while more recent

views place these works much later, and even as late as the fifth century BCE or later (e.g., N.P. Lemche, who places the entire Hebrew Bible within the Hellenistic period). Based on factors of linguistic and stylistic evidence, I believe that we can date Samuel-Kings and Chronicles in a relative fashion: Chronicles may be about one or two centuries later than Samuel-Kings. Thus, if we place Chronicles at the late fourth century BCE, an early fifth century BCE date is not unreasonable for Samuel-Kings. However, this is all highly tentative, and not crucial to the arguments of this dissertation.

The text of Kings has come down to us in reasonably good condition. The text of Samuel is more important: it is notoriously corrupt. This is especially important when we consider that Chronicles and Samuel-Kings share much text, and the way they use this material is the basis for discussion in Chapters Three, Four and Five of this dissertation. The problem is that in many cases a passage shared by Samuel and Chronicles contains differences, and that the version in Chronicles corresponds more closely to the Greek translation of Samuel than to the Massoretic text of the Hebrew, leading to the hypothesis that the Chronicler knew the Samuel passage in a different form than did the copyist of the Massoretic text of Samuel. This hypothesis is bolstered by the evidence from Qumran, where many fragments of Samuel have been found: these Hebrew fragments have many readings which agree with Chronicles and the Greek

translation of Samuel against the Massoretic text (cf. Lemke; Ulrich; McKenzie, Chronicler's). It thus seems safest to proceed with caution when comparing Chronicles and Samuel, and to take into consideration the evidence of the Greek versions. In this dissertation, I will proceed by comparing the reading from Chronicles to the readings from the Massoretic text of Samuel, the Greek text of Samuel, and Qumran fragments where they are extant. When the Massoretic text, the Greek text and the Qumran text all agree against Chronicles, then I will assume that the Chronicler changed his source text. When Chronicles, the Greek text of Samuel and the Qumran text of Samuel agree against the Massoretic text of Samuel, or when Chronicles and the Qumran text of Samuel agree against the Massoretic text of Samuel, then I will assume that the Chronicler followed his source text. Where the text from Qumran is not extant, I will assume that when Chronicles follows the Greek rather than the Massoretic text of Samuel, the Chronicler followed his source, and when Chronicles differs from both the Greek and the Massoretic text of Samuel, the Chronicler usually (but not always) changed his source.¹³ As with Chronicles, the texts from the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia and the New Revised Standard Version will be used throughout for the Hebrew and English texts, respectively. For the Greek translation of Samuel-Kings, I will use the text in Rahlfs's Septuaginta, again taking into consideration the textual apparatus.

Herodotus' Histories

This great work is the only one by Herodotus of Halicarnassus. The title is taken from the preface to the work, *Hērodotou Halikarnēsseos historiēs apodexis hēde*, "The researches of Herodotus of Halicarnassus are here set down" (1.1.0; my translation). It is from this work that all other such researches or histories have taken their name. The work describes the rise of enmity between Persia and Greece; the first book is dedicated to describing the rise of the Persian Empire, and it is here that the material about Cyrus may be found. The other books describe how Persia and Greece came to be at war, the various campaigns, and how Greece fought off the would-be Persian conquerors.

The author, Herodotus of Halicarnassus (c. 490-c. 425 BCE), was of a distinguished Ionian family, but he left Ionia and traveled (although how widely has become a subject of some debate). He visited Athens at some point in the 440s, mentioned events of about 430 in the Histories, and (it is presumed) died at some point shortly thereafter. His work is thought to have been composed over a long period, with portions composed and added at various points. However, the preface (1.1-5) was well enough known by 425 BCE for Aristophanes to parody it in The Acharnians, and part of Book 3 may be referred to in Sophocles' Antigone, produced in 441 BCE (Luce 19-20). Thus, we might posit

a date of the third quarter of the fifth century BCE for the work, but it was certainly complete by about 425 BCE.

The earliest manuscript for the Histories dates to the tenth century. In this dissertation, I have used the Oxford edition of Hude, with due consideration to the variants. All quotations in English will be from de Selincourt's translation, unless otherwise noted.

Ctesias' Persica

This work exists only in fragments, quoted in works by other ancient authors. The Persica was well known in antiquity, and was a work of twenty-three books: the first six dealt with the history of the Assyrian and Median empires to the mid-sixth century BCE, and the remainder with the Persian Empire from the mid-sixth century to about 398 BCE. The first six books were summarized in the epitome of Diodorus (late first century BCE), and the last seventeen in the epitome of the Bibliotheca of Photius (ninth century CE); there are also numerous other references in works by other ancient authors. So, although "[w]e have thus a very fair general idea of the substance of the Persika, [...] scarcely a sentence of Ktesias' text has come down to us verbatim" (Gilmore 2).¹⁴ However, the fragments that survive, along with the testimony of the ancient authors, indicate that the Persica was filled with fantastic and incredible tales, something for which Ctesias himself had derided Herodotus (Gera 200; Luce 112).

The author, Ctesias of Cnidos, was a Greek of Asia Minor, who was taken prisoner by the Persians about 417 BCE. By profession a physician, he became physician to the Persian court, and treated Artaxerxes II at the battle of Cunaxa in 401 BCE (at which Xenophon was on the opposing side!). He returned to Greece in about 398 BCE, and was put on trial in Sparta and acquitted. The Persica was published at about this time. The earliest reference to Ctesias' work is in Xenophon's Anabasis (1.8.26), from the early fourth century BCE.

Since the Persica only exists in fragments, we can only determine the general tone, themes, and content of the work. However, since Ctesias certainly knew Herodotus' work and Xenophon certainly knew Ctesias' and Herodotus' work, this work is important for an examination of the Cyropaedia. In this dissertation, I have used the fragments assembled by Jacoby (FGrH 688), supplemented by the analysis provided by Gilmore. All English translations are my own.

Notes

1. Samuel-Kings especially makes reference to written texts only in the cases of royal annals and the book of the law: a book of the annals of either the kings of Israel or Judah is referred to over 30 times (e.g., 1 Kings 14.19), a book of the law or covenant is referred to ten times (e.g., 2 Kings 22.8; 23.2). Other books are referred to three times (1 Sam. 10.25; 2 Sam. 1.18; 1 Kings 11.41). Chronicles includes the annals and law books (e.g., 2 Chron. 16.11; 17.9), as well as other accounts which are implied to be in narrative form: the commentary on the book of the kings (2 Chron. 24.27), and the records of various seers/prophets (1 Chron. 29.29; 2 Chron. 12.15; 33.19).
2. Although the consensus is that the Chronicler used a text of Samuel-Kings fairly close to the MT, a minority view holds that both Chronicles and Samuel-Kings used a common source (Auld 1-11).
3. For Chronicles as proto-midrash, embodying elements of haggadah, see Fishbane (290-291). For the later developments in late biblical and post-biblical literature, see Wills (223-225).
4. Mostly by ignoring the suggestion. For example, Japhet, in her discussion of ancient historiography, seems to limit the meaning of "ancient" to "biblical:" she omits entirely the Greek tradition (SJ 32-34).
5. However, Kent Richards has argued that the perspectives used in Chronicles interpretation should be widened; "Situating the study of [Chronicles] and [Ezra-Nehemiah] in the broader context of the Persian period demands knowledge of classical Greek sources, studies of the Persian Empire, geographical and archaeological data, and interdisciplinary socio-economic analysis" (219).
6. In Alien Wisdom, Momigliano points out that "[t]he technique by which in the fourth century B.C. the Chronicler rewrote and modernized the Books of Kings reminds us of the technique by which in the late fourth century Ephorus and Theopompus rewrote and modernized Herodotus and Thucydides" (81).
7. Exceptions include Craig, Garcia-Treto, Newsom, Polzin, Reed, and Sykes.

8. For a political view on Cyrus and the ideal ruler, see Newell and Ray.

9. Riley sees this aspect of the ideal ruler as the preeminent one: the king should be the "facilitator" of the proper observance of the cult (159).

10. However, Berquist has argued in an unpublished paper ("Contexts"), that the Persian and Hellenistic period are blurred in Palestine, so distinguishing between the two may not be very helpful.

11. Boer has argued that Chronicles may be considered a sort of utopian literature (Novel 136-168). If so, then so-called advanced cultic organization may be nothing more than wishful thinking that was later taken as a blueprint and adopted.

12. Gera (23-24); Delebecque (405-8); Due (BD 18-21); Tatum (JT 217-225); cf. Sage ("Dying"). Hirsch is the lone dissenting voice (Friendship 91-97).

13. My analysis of the texts is as follows (note the following abbreviations: Ch = Chronicles, MT = Massoretic text of Samuel, LXX = Greek text of Samuel, Q = Qumran text of Samuel, based on the fragments of 4Qsam^a, = referring to agreement, † referring to disagreement):

Where Q is extant:

- 1) Ch † Q = LXX = MT 43 times
- 2) Ch = Q † LXX = MT 19 times
- 3) Ch = Q = LXX † MT 11 times
- 4) Ch † Q = LXX † MT 5 times
- 5) Ch † Q † LXX = MT 4 times
- 6) Ch = Q † LXX † MT 3 times
- 7) Ch † Q † LXX † MT 2 times
- 8) Ch = LXX † Q = MT 1 time
- 9) Ch † LXX † Q = MT 1 time

Where Q is not extant:

- 10) Ch † LXX = MT 300 times
can represent cases 1), 2), 5).
- 11) Ch = LXX † MT 69 times
can represent cases 3), 8).
- 12) Ch † LXX † MT 19 times
can represent cases 4), 6), 7), 9).

In cases 1), 4), and 9), I hypothesize that the Chronicler changed his source text, which may or may not have resembled the MT; in cases 2), 3), 6), and 8), I hypothesize that the Chronicler followed his source text, which may or may not have resembled the MT; in cases 5), and 7), I hypothesize that there may have been some textual confusion. In case 11), I hypothesize that the Chronicler followed his source text, which differed from the MT; in cases 10), and 12), I hypothesize that about 70% of the time the Chronicler changed his source text, and about 30% of the time the Chronicler followed his source text, which differed from the MT, based on the proportions of change and follow that

the categories where Q is extant indicate. Changes do not include minor orthographic differences. Besides the works of Ulrich and McKenzie cited above, this analysis is also based on Tertel (237-244); unfortunately, the official version of the fragments that make up 4Qsam^a has not yet been published.

14. There is the problem of the fragments of the work of Nicolaus of Damascus. It is generally agreed that he based his account of Astyages and Cyrus on Ctesias' work. He may even have incorporated Ctesias' work directly into his own. If so, then we may have some of Ctesias' original text. However, even if we do, reconstructing Ctesias' work from the work of Nicolaus would not be unlike trying to reconstruct Samuel-Kings from Chronicles. Therefore, I will use the fragments of Nicolaus only to indicate the general tenor of Ctesias' work, and I will not use these fragments alone to frame my argument in the appropriate places. Cf. Toher (169-71).

CHAPTER ONE

INTERTEXTUALITY

Concepts of intertextuality

It is not my intention to provide a complete background and discussion of the concepts of intertextuality or intertextualities that have sprung up in the last twenty-five years: the models, theories, and discussions grow in number every year.¹ What I intend to do is broadly discuss the models and theories which seem most relevant to developing a model of my own for work with the ancient texts at hand. Thus I will discuss some of the work by Julia Kristeva, Michael Riffaterre, Roland Barthes, and Jonathan Culler pertaining to intertextuality; and I will point out some of the more interesting discussions of shorter length. I will also discuss how the ancients saw the relationships of texts to other texts. Then I will turn to the model of intertextuality as dialogism as discussed in the work of Bakhtin and Lotman, and finally I will outline the theoretical framework that will be used in this dissertation. I will conclude the chapter by looking at the nature and function (genre) of the Cyropaedia and Chronicles, which will become important because of the direction of the development of the theoretical framework.

Heinrich Plett characterizes two types of scholars whom he calls "intertextualists:" the progressives and the traditionalists, both confronted by the "anti-intertextualists." The progressives are those who "try to cultivate and develop the revolutionary heritage of the originators of the new concept;" they base their work on the work of Bakhtin, Barthes, and Kristeva, and work on intertextuality from a philosophical or semiotic perspective (3). Plett characterizes this work as "elitist" and "esoteric," and claims that,

This "school" has never developed a comprehensible and teachable method of textual analysis. Its publications are marked by a strangely abstract quality [...] [which] impede their understandability but also surround their critical enterprise with an aura of mystery and exclusiveness. (4)

The traditionalists, on the other hand, are conventional literary scholars who have tried to apply notions of intertextuality in their own work. Some, who are more concerned with theory, have used the term in order to "improve their methodological and terminological instruments" (4), and thus have made intertextuality more relevant and understandable. But, warns Plett, the downside to this applicability is that some scholars use the term without examining its background and meaning, thus turning it into a "vogue word" (4). Being neither a philosopher nor a semiotician myself (as are the progressives in Plett's

categorization), I suppose I must place myself here. However, I hope to develop a theoretical background to my interpretive method so that I can assert that I am not simply using intertextuality as a "vogue word."

The anti-intertextualists Plett characterizes as those scholars who: 1) deny that anything new is being done by the traditionalists; they claim that intertextual work has been done since antiquity, and that thus all we have is a change in terminology; and 2) simply brush off the work of the progressives. Thus intertextuality is "accused of being incomprehensible on the one hand and old wine in new bottles on the other" (5).

Plett also points out the importance of time (i.e., historical context of texts) in discussions of intertextuality. There are two different approaches: the synchronic and the diachronic. The synchronic approach posits that all texts are interrelated, regardless of context; Plett asserts that this is not helpful for true scholarship. The diachronic approach uses "meticulously researched intertextualities;" by adding in the axis of semantics, Plett argues, intertextuality can "resume its dialogue with reality" (25-26). He also points out that although intertextuality is not limited to certain periods, in certain periods there is more use of it than in others (his examples were modernism and postmodernism). He wonders if perhaps intertextuality is a signal of "cultural decadence" (26).

Julia Kristeva

As is well known, Kristeva coined the term "intertextuality" in her readings of the work of Bakhtin. It first appears in her essay "Le mot, le dialogue et le roman" (Semeiotikè 143-173).³ In this essay, she points out that Bakhtin was the first to introduce this notion into literary theory: all texts are constructed as a mosaic of citations. She then defines intertextuality as, "tout texte est absorption et transformation d'un autre texte" (146). She uses the notion of intertextuality in the place of the notion of intersubjectivity.

In this essay, Kristeva examines narration as a dialogic matrix. She systematizes Bakhtin by using monologic discourse to refer to epic, historical discourse and scientific discourse, and dialogic discourse to refer to carnival, satire and the polyphonic novel; these latter are all textual forms where writing reads another writing (158-159). Although she follows Bakhtin in seeing the novel as coming out of the end of the Middle Ages (133-37), she notes that the precursor to the satire (including the ancient Greek novel) was the Socratic dialogue; it was ultimately these forms that led to the novel (164-68).

For Kristeva in this essay, dialogism situates a philosophical problem in language, specifically in language as a correlation of texts (172). We can see the outside text brought into the text either as reminiscence or as citation (194). We

will see further attempts to deal with this problem in the work of Lotman, which I will discuss below.

Some of Kristeva's work on poetic texts in this essay is also instructive in examining her conception of intertextuality. She sees poetic utterances as a subset of the textual space: the poetic signified is defined as where many codes meet; these codes find themselves in a negative relationship to each other. Modern poetic texts absorb and destroy (at the same time) other texts of the intertextual space; the poetic text is produced in the simultaneous affirmation and negation of another text (255-57). This notion of the simultaneous absorption and destruction of texts will become important in the theoretical framework I will develop later in this chapter.

In Le texte du roman, Kristeva further develops the idea of intertextuality. First, she defines the text as,

[U]n appareil translinguistique que redistribue
l'ordre de la langue, en mettant en relation une
parole communicative visant l'information directe,
avec différents types d'énoncés antérieurs ou
synchroniques. (12)

The text is thus a "productivité;" that is, it can cross logical and mathematical categories beyond purely linguistic ones. It is a permutation of texts, an "inter-textualité:" in the space of one text many utterances from other texts meet and neutralize each other (an idea developed from her earlier work in

Semeiotikè). She then defines the ideologeme (*idéologème*) as the intertextual function that appears in different levels in the structure of each text: the means by which the utterances are transformed into the whole text (12, cf. Semeiotikè 114).

In Le texte du roman, Kristeva further elaborates on the work of Bakhtin. She points out that in dialogism, writing (*l'écriture*) is marked as both subjectivity and communicativity; writing is ambivalent (90). She also indicates that "le dialogisme est inhérent au langage même" (89). In her discussion of the novel, she indicates (furthering Bakhtin) that the novel works in the intertextual space; all novels are polyphonic (176). In order to study how the novel works as a transformation we have to look at the textual dialogue (dialogue of many texts), i.e., the intertextuality. Here she defines intertextuality as the meeting and mutual modification of the unities belonging to different texts in the new text (68). Further, she defines literature as all discourse that uses the mode of intertextuality (69). Therefore, although she discusses the novel as the primary genre through which intertextuality can operate, I think it is possible to see her work as having a wider application.

Michael Riffaterre

In Riffaterre's earlier work, he uses Peirce's semiotic theories in order to focus on the concept of the interpretant. The interpretant is a textual sign, "a fragment of that text actually quoted in the poem it serves to interpret," which may be

a quotation marked as such, or may be a quotation not differentiated from its new textual context (Semiotics 109). Riffaterre distinguishes between two types of interpretants: textual interpretants and lexematic interpretants. Textual interpretants he defines as texts which might be either quoted or alluded to; these texts can mediate between one semiotic code and another. Lexematic interpretants he defines as words which might generate two texts or two hypograms (systems of signs) simultaneously. The interpretant, therefore, is an intertextual sign, a sign "that translates the text's surface signs and explains what else the text suggests" (Semiotics 81). When we see that a text (intertext) is ungrammatical in its semiotic system, then we see that this intertext belongs to another semiotic system (Semiotics 164).

For Riffaterre, literature is an act of communication guided by three rules: 1) the act is a game guided by the text; 2) the game is played according to linguistic rules; and 3) reality and the author are the text's substitutes. The text is both a limiting and a prescriptive code (Production 10-11). In looking at the issue of literary history and formal analysis, he suggests that the two approaches to the study of the literary text are complementary. Formal analysis of the text when combined with literary history helps to show the effect of the text on the reader; for him, the original meaning of the text is the meaning it had for its first readers (Production 89, 104-5).

We will see below that Lotman also discusses the relationship of text and audience in more detail.

The importance of Riffaterre's work for the problem of intertextuality comes mainly from his insistence on the importance of the reader in text production. The reader is the only one who makes the connection between the text, interpretant and intertext (Semiotics 164). Thus literary production includes the reader and the reader's reactions as well as the text; and the literary phenomenon is not located in the relationship between the author and the text but between the text and the reader (Production 9, 89). Nevertheless, reading is restrictive. The reader is under the guidance and control of the various intertexts; when the text activates an intertext, it controls the reader's response, thus maintaining the text's identity ("Compulsory" 57). Even so, reading is also unstable, and "interpretation is never final" as the text cannot be "correct or amended" by the reader (Semiotics 165). Textuality and intertextuality cannot be separated, in Riffaterre's view, because what the text leaves unsaid, the intertext spells out ("Intertextuality" 781).

Riffaterre defines the intertext as "a text or series of texts selected as referents by the text we are reading." Although it is hidden, we can identify it from elements in the text, and in fact, we are invited to do so (Fictional 86). He calls the intertext the "unconscious of fiction" (Fictional 91).

He suggests that literariness can only be found where texts combine or refer to other texts on the level of intertextuality. However, he also points out that we must distinguish between knowledge of the intertext's form and content and an awareness that an intertext exists, although simply being aware may be enough to experience the literariness of the text. We must also distinguish between the intertext and intertextuality, which he defines as a "web of functions that constitutes and regulates the relationships between text and intertext" ("Compulsory" 56-57). Riffaterre suggests that there are "signposts," i.e., words or phrases that indicate an obscurity or difficulty in the text, and where the solution might be found: these signposts link the text and intertext. However, the reader can compensate for the loss of the intertexts since they are stabilities in the text ("Compulsory" 57-58, 74).

For Riffaterre, then, unlike in Kristeva's work, intertextuality is not something that operates as an interrelationship between all texts, but rather as something that operates as a relationship between specific texts, through the tool of the interpretant. Intertextuality is not a free-flowing concept, but rather a "structured network of text-generated constraints on the reader's perceptions" ("Intertextuality" 781). Intertextuality, according to Riffaterre, 1) excludes irrelevant data; 2) is generated by textuality; 3) connects existing texts with other texts; 4) decontextualizes the text and focuses on its

literariness; and 5) is a closed exchange between the text and intertext ("Intertextuality" 786). This is a way of looking at intertextuality not as a web, but rather as an infinite line of signification: a chain. According to his model, therefore, it is not appropriate to pick texts randomly to associate, but rather one must pick texts that seem already to be associated in some way.

Roland Barthes

I am primarily concerned with Barthes' work as expressed in S/Z and in the article "Texte (Théorie du)." In the article, he discusses the text and intertext, and defines intertextuality as follows,

L'intertextualité, condition de tout texte, quel qu'il soit, ne se réduit évidemment pas à un problème de sources ou d'influences; l'intertext est un champ général de formules anonymes, dont l'origine est rarement repérable, de citations inconscientes ou automatiques données sans guillemets. (1015)

The concept of intertextuality, for Barthes, makes the text not a "reproduction" but a "productivity." But what is the text? It is not a literary work *per se*, but rather the entire field of language, although the text is only visible in a literary work. The text is a tissue or weaving (1015-16). This way of looking at the text necessitates the introduction of reading and the reader ("[L]a théorie du texte élargit à l'infini les libertés

de la lecture.") so that all literary works may be read with each other. As well, Barthes argues that writing and reading are equivalent in their productivity (1016).

In S/Z, Barthes writes that in order to interpret a text, one must appreciate the plurality from which it is made. The ideal text is formed of various codes interacting without one being superior to the rest. Each code is a voice, and the text is woven or braided from the convergence of the codes. Barthes names five codes: the voices of Empirics, the Person, Science, Truth and Symbol (11-12, 28). For Barthes, there is nothing outside the text, and literature is a single text, what he called a text with a thousand entrances - when one enters the text, one aims for a perspective on other codes, or fragments (12, 19). This idea of the text as being self-contained is, I think, now passé; the context of literary production is now seen as also important. However, for a text like *Chronicles*, when the context of literary production is extremely hard to determine, looking at the self-contained text may be an important interpretive strategy.

One of Barthes' more interesting points is that the critic should read the text not only as a first reading but also as a rereading (22). This is important, I think, because it brings forward the idea that the reader of the text is formed by a plurality of texts, even when the texts are formed by codes whose origins are lost (16).

Jonathan Culler

In The Pursuit of Signs, Culler offers a critique of other work on intertextuality; he also offers suggestions of his own about the phenomenon. For him, intertextuality has a double focus: 1) it points out the importance of previous texts; it points out that the notion of the autonomy of texts is misleading, because texts have meaning only because other texts have been written; and 2) it leads us to consider the previous texts as contributing to a code which makes meaning possible. He looks at intertextuality as a name for a text's "participation in the discursive space of a culture" (103). Therefore, intertextuality is not the study of sources or influences, but is wider in scope, including codes that are now lost that make possible the meanings of later texts. He thus suggests that there are good reasons to exclude the study of allusion from intertextuality (103-4). However, he also cautions that restricting the scope of intertextuality for the practical reasons of textual analysis is not innocent, but rather questions the claims made for the concept of intertextuality as a whole. Intertextuality is meant to be a general theory, but when it is applied, it is often narrowed down to such a point that the generality of the theory is arguable (105). Thus he suggests that when we look at intertextuality, we should focus on "the conditions of meaning in literature" and "relate a literary work to a whole series of other works, treating them not as sources

but as constituents of a genre, for example, whose conventions we attempt to infer" (117). In this way, we can look at intertextuality as a tool for examining the place of various literary works in genres. By looking at how texts interrelate, we can see what they have in common that we might otherwise overlook. This concept will become very important as I attempt to look at the relationship between Chronicles and the Cyropaedia in this dissertation.

Culler makes some interesting observations about some of the other theorists that I have already discussed. He points out that Kristeva's procedure of looking at source texts for analysis of intertextual space shows how the concept of intertextuality leads to a concentration on cases that question the general theory of intertextuality. While she claimed that meaning is made possible through a general intertextuality, through her examples we see that intertextuality works best when we can identify the pretexts. When dealing with the work of Riffaterre, he asks whether the reader is obliged to perceive what Riffaterre did in the text, or does the reader have freedom. He points out that there is a tension in Riffaterre's work, between his desire both to outperform other scholars, and his desire to develop a semiotics that explains how readers interpret (93-94).

The work of Harold Bloom comes in for a good deal of criticism in Culler's work. Although Bloom indicates that texts are not a writing but a rewriting, and that we cannot write or

read without imitating what others have done, as it has been mediated by the tradition (Poetry 2-3; Map 32), he shifts the focus from the relationship of texts to texts or texts and readers to a focus on authors and texts. For him, poets attempt to overcome their predecessors, and the notion of influence means that texts are produced when one author misreads another (Poetry 2; Map 3; Anxiety 30). Bloom is only concerned with "strong" authors, who struggle with their "strong" predecessors; "Weaker talents idealize, figures of capable imagination appropriate for themselves" (Anxiety 5). Culler points out that all of this puts Bloom at odds with Kristeva, Barthes, Riffaterre and their like, and that what Bloom is doing is a search for origins in a single precursor author (108-9). This is another example of what happens when we make the focus narrower: we undermine the concept of intertextuality itself, and make it a vague search for origins. We need to use multiple strategies of intertextual investigation, even though they may not lead to a synthesis, according to Culler (111). I hope that my theoretical framework that I outline later in this chapter will use multiple strategies in order to investigate the relationship of *Chronicles* and the Cyropaedia.

Other concepts

One concept that is especially pertinent to the concerns here with the ideal ruler is Müller's concept of interfigurality. In his article, he discusses cases where characters or figures

become intertextual through a play on the name. However, the most intriguing part of his article deals with what he called "an extreme type," the re-use of a literary figure from one author's work into another's. He points out that when an author takes over another's figure, the figure is adapted into the structure of the new text, and is put to new uses (107). One use is parody, where the figure in the new text is a parody of the original, which undermines the original. He argues that it is important to realize that the new figure is not a "mere duplicate" of the original, and that there is a tension created between the original and the new figure (108-9). Other uses for interfigurality include sequels (either written by the same author or by a different one), texts which group together figures from a variety of pre-texts, texts in which a character so identifies with a literary figure that he/she loses grasp of reality, and texts within texts where figures are re-used. However, the most important use for our purposes here is parody: it will be possible to see some of the figures in *Chronicles* and the *Cyropaedia* as parodies undermining the original characters.

John Frow tries to take the concept of intertextuality beyond the study of literature into the cultural/societal sphere, and apply intertextuality to social structure. However, before he does so (which is the main point of his article), he defines ten theses with respect to literary intertextuality, which I think are helpful in summarizing the various concepts of

intertextuality. By using the concept of intertextuality we understand that: 1) the text is self-contained but differential and historical; 2) texts are traces of otherness - they are repetitions and transformations of other texts; 3) the absent texts constrain the text and are represented by/within it; 4) the representation may be implicit or explicit; 5) intertextual reference implies reference to the meanings stored in a genre; 6) the process of intertextuality in literature is governed by the structure of the literary system and the authority of the canon; 7) the text's relationship to discursive authority may not reflect authorial intention; 8) identifying an intertext is an interpretive act; 9) identifying the general genre or ideology of the source-text is more important than identifying the particular source; and 10) intertextuality is distinguished from source criticism by its stress on interpretation rather than mere influence or causality (45-46).

When looking at what intertextual theory has to do with biblical studies, Gary Phillips has pointed out that most biblical scholars are actively hostile to the use of theory, since they think that theory obscures the true task of the biblical exegete, which is to interpret the text. This leads to biblical scholars generally being shut out of the wider debates in literary studies (79). Phillips then develops a model of intertextuality based on Peirce's triadic sign, or unlimited

semiosis, where texts function as interpretants to other texts (83-85).

"Intertextuality" in ancient criticism

As I discussed above, intertextuality is a concept developed in the 20th century. However, in order to develop fully the historical context for a study of intertextuality in ancient literature, in this section I will discuss concepts akin to intertextuality in ancient literary criticism and theory. This discussion is limited to Greek texts, without the inclusion of material from the Hebrew-language tradition, for two reasons: 1) there is no theoretical material on literature which has survived from the pre-rabbinic Hebrew language tradition, either biblical or extrabiblical; 2) rabbinic material is far outside the time frame which I am using.

Judith Still and Michael Worton suggest that the concept of mimesis in Plato (along with other features of his thought) might be seen as a precursor to intertextuality. They also point out that the form of the Socratic dialogue is inherently intertextual (cf. Bakhtin, "Epic" 21-25). For them, Plato's philosophy is similar to Bakhtin's dialogism (which will be discussed below), in that both are "serious truth seeking via a plurality of voices in a specific narrative context and in an ironic mode" (3). Although we can see how Aristotle developed his notion of mimesis

from Plato (Halliwell 116-23), I would like to bypass the purely philosophical arguments in order to focus on literary criticism.³

Three Greek texts dealing with literary criticism have come down to us in some form from antiquity: Aristotle's Poetics, Longinus' On the Sublime, and Demetrius' On Style. Only Aristotle's work is considered to be correctly attributed: both On the Sublime and On Style are attributed conventionally, but improperly. The Poetics dates to the fourth century BCE, thus it is roughly contemporary with the Cyropaedia and Chronicles. On Style may be dated to the second century BCE (see the introduction by Innes). On the Sublime may be dated to the first century CE (see the introduction by Russell).

Aristotle: The Poetics

There are two concepts in the Poetics that may lend themselves to a discussion of intertextuality, although neither is given that sense exactly: mimesis (*mimēsis*) and plot (*mythos*). Mimesis, imitation, has two senses in the Poetics, the sense of image-making (as in a work of art) and enactment - this is the sense that Aristotle emphasized (cf. Halliwell 129-31); it is one of the core concepts in the Poetics.⁴ For Aristotle, literature, especially tragedy and epic, was mimetic.⁵ Whether we can expand this definition of mimesis from the imitation of forms to include the imitation of earlier works of literature is possible, but improbable in Aristotle's context, since there is no explicit

reference to such reuse other than in the matter of plot. There is no reference to reuse of figures, themes, motifs, language etc., which we might consider hallmarks of intertextuality.

Plot, on the other hand, is something that Aristotle dealt with more concretely. While dealing with plot, Aristotle made mention of plots which are created from the author's imagination, and plots which come from stories that are already known. With both types, Aristotle argued that the author should use an outline, which he then fills in with episodes that advance the plot (55a34-55b2). Aristotle saw no difference in effect between new and re-used plots, and in fact stated that the author need not stick with the traditional plots but can feel free to invent his own (51b19-25). Then, he stated that "even [*kai*] the familiar subjects are familiar only to a minority, yet nonetheless please everyone" (51b25-27), which suggests (along with the rest of this section of argument) that while the expected thing to do in his time was to re-use plots, not everyone would be familiar with the old plots, and would receive them as if they were new. Still and Worton have pointed out that Aristotle's thought is associated with monologism in Bakhtin's work (especially in "Epic" 5, 8). However, they have also suggested that the ancient author's drawing on a variety of sources implies polyphony (4); to me, this is reaching a bit further than Aristotle's work really allows.

Although Aristotle's arguments on plot outlined above were originally meant to apply to tragedy and epic (he specifically separated out history from poetry as a genre in 51a36-51b8), it seems to me that they might be applied to other ancient literary forms. It is clear, at any rate, that the use and re-use of previous works (specifically the plots of previous works) was a known and accepted phenomenon in Aristotle's day, even though exact relationships perhaps had not been thought out.

"Demetrius": On Style

The work of "Demetrius" deals with: 1) sentence structure; and 2) the Four Styles of writing/oratory. Under the grand style (*megaloprepēs*), Demetrius introduced the concept of bringing poetic words into prose texts. He suggested that "[p]oetic vocabulary in prose adds grandeur [...]" but "some writers imitate (*mimēsei*) the poets quite crudely, or rather, they do not imitate them but plagiarise (*metathesei*) them [...]" (§112). He contrasted Herodotus (as a plagiarist) with Thucydides (as a writer of the grand style), suggesting that Thucydides did not plagiarize, but rather used the borrowed vocabulary in his own way and "makes it his own property" (§113). This, then, suggests that reuse of words in a new context was acceptable in Demetrius' time, as long as the words fit the new context and expressed the author's message appropriately.

"Longinus": On the Sublime

"Longinus" was concerned with the explication of the sublime (*hypsos*) in literature, where the sublime is seen as true greatness that elevates (7.1-4). According to Longinus, there are many paths to the sublime, one of which is the "[z]ealous imitation [*mimēsis*] of the great prose writers and poets of the past," since the writers of the past might provide inspiration for the contemporary author (13.2). He provided examples of "Homeric" authors, including Herodotus and especially Plato (13.3). This imitation of past writers he considered especially appropriate in matters of style, and "no theft; it is rather like the reproduction of good character by sculptures or other works of art" (13.4). An author or orator, then, should ask himself how previous great authors and orators would have expressed something; an author should ask himself how that previous great author would respond to his new work; and most importantly, an author should ask himself how posterity might receive his work (14.1-3). Dionysius of Halicarnassus seems also to have subscribed to this theory; he said in his Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius that Xenophon modeled his work upon Herodotus' both in terms of subject and style. Dionysius especially praised Xenophon for the arrangement of his material, the purity of his vocabulary and the charm of his writing. However, Longinus suggested that while Herodotus had sublimity (*hypsos*), Xenophon fell short in that respect (§4). Therefore, while Aristotle was

concerned with the reuse of plots, and Demetrius with the reuse of vocabulary, here we have a concern with the reuse of style; again, it was considered highly appropriate to do so.

Intertextuality as dialogue⁶

In this section, I will turn to a discussion of the theories of textuality put forward by Bakhtin and Lotman. It is primarily upon the work of these two scholars that I will be building my theoretical framework in the next section. In this section, I will also be arguing more directly for the application of these 20th century theories to ancient texts. I hope to show that it is not unreasonable, given what presented above in the section on ancient literary criticism, to develop from these modern scholars a theory for ancient texts.

Mikhail Bakhtin

Bakhtin's work is rich and varied, and for the purposes of this dissertation, I will limit myself to drawing on his work on dialogism and heteroglossia.⁷ Dialogism is defined primarily in one of Bakhtin's early works, Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. There he examines dialogism in terms of linguistics, or more precisely, in terms of metalinguistics, which he defines as "those aspects in the life of the word [...] that exceed - and completely legitimately - the boundaries of linguistics" (181). Dialogic relationships, for Bakhtin, are outside of purely linguistic study, that is, are a matter for metalinguistics

(183). For Bakhtin, the word and the idea are by nature dialogic; the word and the idea want "to be heard, understood and 'answered' by other voices from other positions" (Problems 88). The word and idea are also "inter-individual and inter-subjective - the realm of its existence is not individual consciousness, but dialogic communion between consciousnesses" (Problems 88). However, this rather abstract idea of dialogism can only be made concrete through linguistic formulae such as syntax and semantics - dialogic relationships are "impossible without logical relationships or relationships oriented toward a referential object" (Problems 184). Dialogic relationships thus cannot exist in the abstract; they must become concrete through the utterances of the author. The author uses his/her utterances to express a position, to which other utterances respond (Problems 184). Michael Holquist has pointed out that the reception of Bakhtin in the West has focused on a joyful, hopeful and open dialogism, but although those aspects exist in Bakhtin's work, there are also darker, more sinister, aspects to dialogism (181).

David Shepherd has suggested that Bakhtin had a strong notion of the author's authority over the text (95); this separates Bakhtin from the theorists (Kristeva, Barthes), who follow his work, but who posit the "death of the author." However, Shepherd also argues that in Bakhtin's work there is a strong focus on the historical and social situation of readers, so that "the dialogic act of reading is disruptive of the

seemingly fixed positions of text and reader" (99). This suggests that although Bakhtin had ideas about authorial authority, the very notion of dialogism breaks down this concept.⁶

Ken Hirschkop asks if the notion of dialogism is "for real." He suggests that we have been eager to embrace the concept of dialogism because the concept of dialogue is very important in a liberal democracy. The point of his essay is to show that there is a difference between dialogue and novel, and thus there is a difference between dialogue and dialogism: they are not the same things (183-84). By doing so, Hirschkop would seem to be contradicting those who see the origins of dialogism (and hence intertextuality) in such things as the Socratic dialogues, and those who see dialogism in midrashic exegesis. He points out that in a dialogic novel, all of the speech positions have to be represented by a single author, thus the openness of true dialogue is not present (189). What dialogism does do is bring in "everyday" speech-types into the novel, "endow[ing] so-called popular or everyday language with an historical or social significance it lacks in its everyday context" (190). He argues that although Bakhtin tried to extend dialogue with the concept of dialogism, in fact he showed the limitations of dialogue by showing all that novels can achieve without being dialogues. Dialogism is not the be-all and end-all, but rather one form of representation in discourse (192-93, 195). This is an important

corrective, I think, to an over-enthusiasm to make all things dialogic, while still showing that dialogism is a meaningful concept.

Bakhtin developed his theories about dialogism based on Dostoevsky's novels. As I noted above, we might wonder about the validity of using theories based on 19th century novels on classical and biblical literature. In this chapter, I will argue that Bakhtin anticipated that his theories about dialogism could have wider applications beyond the novels of this one particular author. Indeed, in his later works he expands dialogism to include all novels, in his essay "Discourse in the Novel." Towards the end of his life, he dealt with the even wider implications of dialogism in his essay "The Problem of the Text," where he describes dialogism as,

Confidence in another's word, reverential reception [...], apprenticeship, the search for and mandatory nature of deep meaning, agreement, its infinite gradations and shadings [...], the layering of meaning upon meaning, voice upon voice, strengthening through merging, the combination of many voices [...] that augments understanding, departure beyond the limits of the understood [...]. (121)

If we take Bakhtin's thoughts on the subject as they developed, we could argue that dialogism could be applied to almost any literary text. However, even in Problems of Dostoevsky's

Poetics, he begins to generalize his specialized theory in ways that can be specifically applied to the Bible; he notes in his discussion of the dialogic that,

[T]he forms of this real authorship can be very diverse. A given work can be the product of a collective effort, it can be created by the successive efforts of generations, and so forth - but in all cases we hear in it a unified creative will, a definite position to which it is possible to react dialogically. (184)

What work does this describe if not the Bible as a whole or its component books like Chronicles? For Bakhtin, then, the ins and outs of the composition of the utterance (the book) would not matter, since the result is one specific position. This way of examining a composite text like the Bible as a whole or Chronicles more specifically can be very liberating; no longer is the interpreter bound to examine each block of text as determined by historical-critical scholarship. As long as we agree that the basic intent and message pervades the entire work, we can examine the entire work as one literary position.⁹

Dialogic relationships can operate on the micro level of individual words or speeches within a work (which Bakhtin describes as heteroglossia, see below), or they can operate on the macro level of relationships between entire works, as long as we can hear two voices operating. According to Bakhtin, there

can even be dialogic relationships within one author's text, if the authorship is divided into two inner voices. Finally, Bakhtin points out that dialogic relationships are possible even between works in dissimilar media, as long as there is some kind of semiotic expression (Problems 184-185).

Heteroglossia in Bakhtin is defined as the variety of speech types that make up the novel. This is how dialogic relationships (i.e. different positions) can enter the novel itself, through the differences in authorial and narratorial speech, the speech of characters, inserted genres, and so on. The novel is inherently a dialogic form ("Discourse" 263).¹⁰ Again, what do we have in the Bible, and more specifically, in Chronicles, if not heteroglossia? Chronicles contains many kinds of speech, some of which overlap: the Chronicler's speech, the narrator's speech, the speeches of the various characters, and the inserted sections that parallel the autonomous work of Samuel-Kings. With such a variety of speech types, Chronicles must be inherently dialogic: there must be a variety of words and ideas wanting answers from other positions. However, we could argue that all of these speech types are adapted into the Chronicler's speech plan and that therefore there would be tight authorial control over the heteroglossia (cf. Bakhtin, "Speech Genres").

But are Chronicles and the Cyropaedia novels? If we take Bakhtin's description of the novel in his essay "Epic and Novel,"

then Chronicles and the Cyropaedia in some sense do appear to be novels. For Bakhtin, the novel is distinguished by three characteristics: 1) its stylistic three dimensionality (i.e., dialogism); 2) its ability to change the temporality of the "literary image" (i.e., talking about the past as the past and not as some continuous "now"); and 3) its ability to make the past contact the present (i.e., although the past is depicted, the starting point and concerns come from the present). The novel takes the form of dialogues framed by a story, which is also dialogized ("Epic" 11-30). Chronicles has heteroglossia and dialogic relationships by virtue of its variety of speech types. It describes the time of the kings as the definable past, not in terms of some "once upon a time" past; and its contemporary concerns for temple, Israel and Davidic king are depicted in terms of the past. Although in Chronicles the framing story seems to take precedence over the speeches of the characters, the basic form of Bakhtin's novel prevails. Chronicles can indeed be seen as an early novel or a proto-novel. The Cyropaedia also has a variety of speech types; it describes the time of Cyrus as the definable past; and its contemporary concerns for proper rulers and a philosophy of ruling are depicted in terms of the past. The Cyropaedia also has a good number of speeches, so that there is more of the novelistic form of dialogues framed by a story than in Chronicles. Now, Bakhtin implied that the Bible as a whole was part of the epic tradition rather than the novelistic,

a claim that I accept with some reservations. However, Chronicles is not like most of the rest of the Bible: it is not a prose epic (as we might describe Genesis through 2 Kings). In the same way, Esther, Ruth and Daniel are not prose epics but well-crafted stories expressing contemporary concerns.

Concerning the Cyropaedia, Bakhtin himself considered it an early form of the novel, saying, "Cyropaedia is a novel, in the most basic sense of the word" ("Epic" 29).¹¹ Therefore, if we can accept Chronicles as being some kind of early exemplar of the novel as well, then we have taken the first step towards accepting and understanding the dialogic and heteroglossic relationships of both Chronicles and the Cyropaedia.

However, there is a line of thought that suggests Bakhtin's understanding of the novelistic genre was flawed. R.B. Branham argues that the Greek romances/novels are not novelistic according to Bakhtin's own criteria; he suggests that the Greek novel was "a modernized version of the 'absolute past' of epic" (84). The Greek novel, then, according to this view, is a bridge between the epic and the true novel that developed in Latin literature (the works of Petronius are given as an example). Branham suggests that this refinement or reformulation of Bakhtin "would require us to historicize his theory of the novel's origins [...]" (87). If we accept Branham's view, then Chronicles and the Cyropaedia can still be seen as precursors to the novel, but at a much earlier stage in novelistic development, and

without all of the features of the true heteroglossic novel.

Holquist, however, pointed out that Bakhtin made a distinction between the novel and novelness: the former has its history in literary history, and the latter has its history in the history of human consciousness (72-73).

Yuri Lotman

Now I would like to turn away from Bakhtin towards the work of Lotman. Lotman certainly knew Bakhtin's work, and in many places built his own upon it. Both Allan Reid and David Bethea have discussed Lotman's relationship to Bakhtin's work. Reid points out that it appears that in the mid-1970s Lotman discovered and familiarized himself with the work of Bakhtin. At this point Lotman began to move away from a statistical-semiotic approach to texts and to move towards a development of Bakhtin's positions (Literature 36-37).¹² Bethea suggests that although Lotman learned from Bakhtin's work and developed his own later work using Bakhtin's arguments,¹³ he remained "very much his own thinker." He suggests that Lotman could be seen as a theorist of poetry while Bakhtin was a theorist of the novel. Lotman was interested in poetic thinking while Bakhtin was interested in prosaics; Lotman came to see "[t]he connection between life and art, text and code [...] [as] generative of meaning - the ultimate semiotic gesture" (2). Bethea discusses how Lotman was able to use the "openness" of Bakhtinian thought in order to open up his own closed semiotic systems, thus showing how Bakhtin could have

used Lotman's understanding of text and code to "tighten up" his thinking (4-5).¹⁴ Although much of Lotman's work has not been translated, some of it has, and I will be drawing upon some of this in order to refine and expand Bakhtin's concepts of dialogism and heteroglossia.

Among other things, Lotman was interested in textuality; that is, the form and function of texts. In one work, he defines the text's functions as transmission and generation: the transmission of the message and the generation of new messages. In order for the message to be transmitted perfectly, both the author and audience have to have wholly identical semiotic codes, which Lotman claims is almost impossible. That gap between the transmissible and the intransmissible is what allows the text to create or generate new meanings ("Text" 377-384). In his later work, he adds a third function, memory, which he describes as the text's ability to condense cultural memory and to be interpreted - the text acquires new meanings through the history of interpretation (Universe 18).

Lotman brings the audience of the text much more to the forefront: he claims that "as a generator of meaning [...] the text needs an interlocutor" ("Text" 378; cf. Bakhtin, "Speech Genres" 94). This interlocutor could be an audience or a consciousness or another text. When the addresser sends a message to the addressee¹⁵ in a subject-object transmission, what Lotman calls an "I-S/he" transmission, the message is transmitted in space

(Universe 20-21). However, when the addresser sends a message to the addressee in a subject-subject transmission, what Lotman calls an "I-I" transmission, the message is transmitted not in space but in time. Lotman calls this "autocommunication" (Universe 21).¹⁶ In I-S/he transmission, the message is static, but in I-I transmission, the message is dynamic: it acquires new meanings in the communication process. The original message is supplemented or has a new meaning imposed upon it, or the meaning of the message is transformed (Universe 22). However, even in autocommunication there is an audience, the new subject, for the message.

Not only does Lotman presuppose an audience for the text, he argues that the audience and text interact. For him, not only does the text have an idea of its own ideal readership, but also the readership has an idea of its own ideal text. The text and audience must share an interpretive code (Universe 63-64). The relationship between the text and audience is not a passive one (reception of the text by the audience), but rather is dialogic; "[d]ialogic speech is distinguished not only by the common code of two juxtaposed utterances, but also by the presence of a common memory shared by addresser and addressee" ("Text and the Structure" 81). Tradition is often one of the interpretive codes. Lotman defines tradition as a system of texts in the cultural memory; any text is filtered through the code of tradition, that is, through other texts that serve as

interpreters (Universe 70-71). However, often an audience will change, and this will force a change in the way the text constructs its ideal readership: text shapes reader shapes text. The relevance of the foregoing to the relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles is, I hope, clear. When Samuel-Kings and its audience or a portion of it no longer sufficiently shared an interpretive code, such as tradition, then the audience reshaped its text and in effect generated a new one, Chronicles. Chronicles was the result of autocommunication, a message sent through time to its addressee, the new writing subject. The Cyropaedia also can be seen as the result of autocommunication, where the new text had a different purpose than the texts of Herodotus and Ctesias, and hence a different audience.

Finally, Lotman also deals with one of the problems of Chronicles: the text within the text; his thought on this problem developed through time. In his earlier work, "Problems in the Typology of Texts," Lotman points out that the text within the text acquires an artistic function even though it may have originally belonged to another typological system (e.g., legal); it is reinterpreted (120). Even in this earlier (pre-Bakhtinian?) work, Lotman seems to have been looking at the problem from a dialogic perspective. Later, in The Structure of the Artistic Text, he discusses textual boundaries and remarks that transferring a textual feature to another text "is one of

the essential methods for forming new meanings" (52). In his later essay, "The Text Within the Text," he notes that,

The introduction of an external text into the immanent world has far-reaching consequences. The external text is transformed in the structural field of the other text's meaning, and a new message is created.

("Text" 378; cf. Bakhtin, "Speech Genres" 62)

This is self-evident; in the terms of the Samuel-Kings-Chronicles relationship, when a source text from Samuel-Kings is introduced into Chronicles, that source text is transformed by the text of Chronicles. What Lotman goes on to say is that "the transformation occurs not only within the entering text; the entire semiotic situation inside the other text is also changed" ("Text" 379). In terms of Samuel-Kings-Chronicles, not only is the source text from Samuel-Kings transformed, but the meaning of the text of Chronicles is also changed. This statement was anticipated by Vološinov/Bakhtin in Marxism and the Philosophy of Language where it is argued (in the language of Lotman) that the other text (Chronicles) tries to break down the external text (Samuel-Kings), to obliterate its boundaries, while the external text (Samuel-Kings) tries to overcome the other text (Chronicles) (120-121; cf. Bakhtin, "Speech Genres" 92).¹⁷ Therefore, both the synoptic portions of Samuel-Kings-Chronicles and the surrounding text of Chronicles are changed in meaning by their interaction. Chronicles creates new information by the interaction of its

synoptic and non-synoptic portions. Because the Cyropaedia does not have text-within-a-text, as does *Chronicles*, it is more difficult to use this portion of Lotman's work when dealing with it.

Outline of the theoretical framework

If we bring together the work by Bakhtin and Lotman that I have presented, it is all leading towards the term which so far I have deliberately avoided in my discussion of the work of Bakhtin and Lotman: intertextuality. Bakhtin never used this term. The closest he came to it was in the essay "The Problem of the Text," where he describes the text as "a unique monad that in itself reflects all texts ... of a given sphere. The interconnection of all ideas (since all are realized in utterances). The dialogic relationships among texts and within the text" ("Problem of the Text" 105). In this section, I will outline my model of a dialogic intertextuality, which I will use for the analysis of the texts of *Chronicles* and the Cyropaedia.

In the chapters that follow, I will be using a theoretical framework developed from the above section, i.e., intertextuality as dialogue, but I will also make use of the insights of the other authors I discussed while discussing the concepts of intertextuality. In this dissertation intertextuality will be defined as: the interrelationship of texts, including, but not limited to, the absorption, rewriting, reuse and dialogue of text

with text. The text is the work which absorbs, rewrites or reuses; the intertext is the work which is absorbed, rewritten or reused - in Lotman's terms, the text within the text, in Riffaterre's terms, the text(s) selected as referent(s) by the text. Kristeva's notion that the text absorbs and destroys the intertext is extremely important: it is the first step to seeing the text and intertext in a dialogic relationship. However, rather than seeing intertextuality as a free-flowing web (like Kristeva and Barthes), I see intertextuality as a structured network connecting texts and intertexts which are already associated (like Riffaterre). Barthes' idea of looking at the self-contained text allows us to put aside the text's context for a moment in order to focus on the text itself; Lotman's work reminds us that we need to keep the context always in mind. With Culler, I see the purpose of the study of intertextuality to be most acute in the study of genre: by looking at the textual interrelationships, we can see textual commonalties. Müller's concept of interfiguralität is helpful when we consider that in this dissertation I will be examining the figure of the ideal ruler that is reused from intertext to text. Especially helpful is the realization that there is a tension created between the original and the new figure, notably a parodic relationship.

When we bring in the work of Bakhtin and Lotman, we bring in the idea of dialogism and its refinements. Dialogism involves the relationships between utterances, whether inside or between

texts. The word or idea in an utterance is a position, which can be answered by other utterances. Speeches and inserted texts are in a dialogic relationship with the surrounding text, and mutually shape each other and change each other's meaning. The utterance as an entire text accepts speeches and inserted texts into the speech plan, which the text already has. As well, when the utterance is an entire text, that text transmits its message not only through space but also through time. The audience of the text receives the transmission and generates new meanings so that text and readers mutually shape each other, just as utterances or texts mutually shape each other. When we add this to the ideas from Kristeva, Riffaterre, Barthes, Culler and Müller, we have developed a concept of dialogic intertextuality that takes into consideration the movement of texts and figures through space, time, and discourse. When I analyze the texts, I will be putting aside the context during the analysis, but the context will then be brought back into the discussion when I discuss the implications of the analysis in my conclusions.

Genre, and the genre of the texts

Ultimately, a lot of what I am going to say about both the Cyropaedia and Chronicles has to do with genre. In this section, I will briefly outline my presuppositions about genre in general and the genres of fiction, historiography and (political) philosophy in particular, then I will look at the genre of

Chronicles and the Cyropaedia. Here I am interested in looking at how scholars have seen these texts: how have they seen the genre, the main theme(s), the ideology, the function, and the purpose of these texts. This is important because ultimately the intertextual construction of the ideal ruler has implications for how we understand the nature and purpose of these texts; as Culler states (above), an important use for intertextuality is the study of genre. I will begin with the Cyropaedia, as there is less contention over its purpose, and then I will turn to scholarship on Chronicles.

Genre

The issue of genre is complicated, because it is so nebulous a term. The idea of genre is as old as thinking about literature: Aristotle began the Poetics by stating that he wanted to consider poetry (*poiēsis*) in general and its genres (*eidos*) (47a1). Here, I will be briefly setting out the Bakhtinian understanding of genre that I will be assuming in my intertextual study. In The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, Bakhtin describes literary genre as containing "the most stable, 'eternal' tendencies in literature's development [...]," yet a genre is "reborn and renewed at every new stage in the development of literature and in every individual work of a given genre" (106). In "The Problem of Speech Genres," where he discusses the speech genres of utterances (ranging from the sentence to the full-length text), he notes that speech genres

are heterogeneous in the extreme, and that their diversity is linked to the diversity of the human experience (60-61). Thus, genre can be seen as an ever-shifting array of speech types. Bakhtin divides speech genres into primary (simple) and secondary (complex) speech genres; the complex speech genres such as novels absorb primary speech genres such as letters (61-62). However, most important for our project is Bakhtin's assertion that "style is inseparably related to the utterance and to typical forms of utterances [...]" (63): there is an "organic, inseparable link between style and genre [...] each sphere has and applies its own genres that correspond to its own specific conditions" (64). He also states,

Where there is style there is genre. The transfer of style from one genre to another not only alters the way a style sounds, under conditions of a genre unnatural to it, but also violates or renews the given genre. (66)

Finally, Bakhtin also suggests that an individual's speech is adapted for a specific genre, it takes the form of the genre; and if speech genres did not exist, communication would be almost impossible (78-79). We rely on stylistic markers in order to determine genre, which makes communication possible. Genre is thus linked to form, as well as theme. I will be using this point in order to come to conclusions about the genre of *Chronicles*.

Now I will briefly define the genres of historiography, fiction and (political) philosophy, as I will be using the terms in the next sections. As I mentioned above, Aristotle in the Poetics separated out history from poetry as a genre. He then defined history as the genre that "relates actual events," and poetry as the genre that relates "the kind of events that might occur." He went on to suggest that poetry is "more philosophical and more elevated than history [...]" (51a36-51b8). In the context of biblical literature, Marc Zvi Brettler has defined history as "a narrative that presents a past" (12) and has opposed it to ideology, which he defines as a type of sets of beliefs (14). He does not use the term literature; instead, he uses ideology, suggesting that just because a text has literary features that does not mean it is literature (17). Both Aristotle and Brettler, therefore, place history or historiography on one side, and the things that "might occur" on the other.

G. Bowersock does not explicitly define the terms "fiction" and "history" in his Fiction as History, but implies that history is what really happened and fiction is what did not. However, he does go on to show how, later in the classical period, Roman authors such as Lucian "trie[d] to pull down the distinction between fiction that we accept as fiction and fiction that is presented as a record of real events" (5-6). Although Herodotus had described his work as "researches," by the first century BCE, the term *historia* meant plot, "the received account of the past

that reached back into mythical times without a break" (7-8). Creating fiction through the rewriting of history (the reuse of plot as Aristotle described such reuse) was important in ancient times (12). Meir Sternberg describes the usual opposition between history and fiction, but then describes both history-writing and fiction-writing as discourses: one claims to be factual and the other claims the "freedom of invention" (25). He also claims that one cannot tell the difference between fiction and history by formal characteristics alone; they can be distinguished only by their purpose (30). This is contrary to Bakhtin's claim, which I discussed above, that every genre has its own style.

In this dissertation, I will be using the generic labels of "historiography," "fiction," and "philosophy." Bearing in mind the discussion above, I define "historiography" as a narrative about the past that makes a truth claim about the past it recounts; "fiction" as a narrative that makes no truth claim about its story; and "philosophy" as a prose rendering which makes a truth claim about its ideology. Philosophy, therefore, can be in narrative form recounting the past, like historiography, it can also make no truth claim about the past that it recounts, like fiction. However, it does make a truth claim about its underlying message. As we will see below, there is a good deal of debate as to the genre of both the Cyropaedia and Chronicles. I would suggest that although for us it is

unclear as to the genre of these works, for the ancients it may have been perfectly clear (cf. Bakhtin, "Speech Genres" 98).

Before I begin to amass my evidence in Chapters Three through Five, I will briefly outline the various ways scholars have placed these two texts into a generic category.

The Cyropaedia

The life of Xenophon and the context for his work is reasonably well known, as I pointed out in the Introduction to this dissertation. He lived during a time of considerable political confusion and war among the Greek city-states, and during a time of the flowering of philosophy.¹⁸ Xenophon's writings as a whole can be divided into two general categories: historiography and philosophy. Certainly he is better known as a historian today, but in antiquity he was more known for his philosophical works, and in antiquity and during the Renaissance his most influential work was the Cyropaedia (Luce 99). Whether we should view the Cyropaedia as historiography or philosophy is not much debated: scholars generally agree that it is not a work of historiography.¹⁹ In discussing what he terms "history's competitors," Charles Fornara includes the Cyropaedia under the genre of "philosophical history" or "utopian history." He describes the philosophical/utopian history as having "scrupulously maintained the fiction of historicity, however great its departure from it" (175).²⁰ He suggests that Xenophon was able to use a foreign setting in a historical past in order

to express his own theoretical views. The "historical characters served as the mouthpiece of the philosopher's opinions," opinions which were given the veneer of historicity or reality (176). Philip Stadter points out that Xenophon said that he had made "inquiries," just as an ancient historian would claim. It is only when the series of long dialogues begin near the end of Book 1 that the reader realizes that this is not a work of historiography, even though Xenophon did present some factual historical material (461-63). Momigliano points out that Xenophon was not trying to write the history of Cyrus, but rather present his portrait of the ideal ruler (Alien 134). Pierre Carlier suggests that Xenophon would have been able to choose from various versions of the Cyrus-legends that were in circulation in order to make his points (133). Generally today, then, there are three ways of viewing the Cyropaedia: as a novel (fiction), as a biography (a sub-genre of historiography), or as political philosophy.

Some scholars have tried to see the Cyropaedia as a novel, the first novel of its kind, as I discussed above when referring to Bakhtin. Besides Bakhtin, William Higgins also discusses the Cyropaedia as a novel, suggesting that in this work "the ideal and the historical could merge to create the first novel [...]" History turned to fiction could permit the elucidation of ideas concerning the typical and the timeless" (44). He later suggests that the Cyropaedia is more of a prose epic in which Cyrus is the

hero (53), and also asserts that there is little of philosophy and philosophers in the work (55). Alexandru Cizek also considers the Cyropaedia a novel, calling it "a wholly original fiction" and "the first Bildungsroman in world literature freely governed by the formative will of the author" (548). James Tatum has been the most eloquent author on the subject of the Cyropaedia as novel, characterizing it as "both idealistic and romantic," and a precursor to the Greek romance; but he also reminds us that it should be read as "political education" ("Education" 16). The novelistic features of the Cyropaedia are especially evident in the on-going story of Panthea and Abradatas, which does seem to anticipate some of the same concerns of the later Greek novels but is much more moralistic (19-20). As an ideological novel, the Cyropaedia presents its central message repeatedly so that its lesson is conveyed: it is authoritarian fiction, where Xenophon "intertwined the political and the fictional in a single text" (25-27). Tatum points out that Cicero praised the Cyropaedia precisely because it was fiction with a political purpose (JT 9).

Tatum's article leads us to a discussion of what many scholars consider the Cyropaedia to be, a work of political philosophy (*politeia*-literature) in the form of a biography. Momigliano suggests that the Cyropaedia is the first and most accomplished example of the Greek biography, but it was not (and never claimed to be) the true account of the life of a real

person. This biography which was no biography used a mixture of fact and fiction in order to communicate its philosophic message. Momigliano also points out that the border between fiction and reality was more blurred in the ancient biography than it was in ancient historiography (Development 55-56). J.R. Morgan points out that the ancient novelists often constructed their texts as if they were histories (we might call them historical novels) (206).

Bodil Due has indicated that the Cyropaedia is both in form (discussing the "education" of Cyrus) and in length (very long) very different from other examples of the genre of political philosophy, especially if we compare it to Xenophon's Constitution of the Lacedaemonians, which is much shorter (BD 14). She thus considers the work to be devoted to discussing the best way of governing, but put within the form of a biography or fictional biography of a historical figure. This figure is the subject of the book, making the book a political work with both novelistic and biographical tendencies (BD 25-26). In her later article, Due considers the work to be a novel, plain and simple: more specifically, a historical novel or an educational novel; she rejects its classification as either a biography or as a history ("Xenophon" 588). Jean Luccioni also considers the Cyropaedia as a historical novel, between history and novel (213; cf. Luce 99).

Deborah Gera considers the Cyropaedia to be a type of biography designed to be a vehicle for presenting Xenophon's own concerns. Thus Xenophon used the form of a biography, which had already developed into a genre, but presented the message of political philosophy. He wanted his work to be classified within the genre of *politeia*-literature; he had already written other works which clearly fit within that genre, including the Constitution of the Lacedaemonians and the Hiero. There are indications that Xenophon wanted the Cyropaedia to be seen as a work comparable to Plato's Republic, and in antiquity many authors saw Plato and Xenophon as having been in competition (though Gera argued that they probably were not). Gera's assessment of the Cyropaedia's genre is thus not much different from Due's; a biography that highlights the concerns of political philosophy (1-13).

Stadter calls the Cyropaedia a "didactic narrative," where Xenophon's use of time and space, character, and idealization combine to form a narrative about Cyrus much closer to Plato's depiction of Socrates than to a historical figure. He calls Cyrus a paradigm of the ideal ruler (490-91). Thus, although he does not use the terms philosophy or *politeia*-literature, by implication he suggests that political philosophy is the nature and function of the Cyropaedia. Steven Hirsch also sees the purpose of the Cyropaedia as being a didactic narrative on education, administration and military affairs ("1001" 71). John

Dillery sees the idea of the ideal community to be strong in both the Anabasis and the Hellenica, due perhaps to the breakdown of organized society in Greece in the fourth century (43-44). Perhaps he could have expanded his work to look at the Cyropaedia as well. I find it interesting that generally classicists have tended to classify the Cyropaedia as a novel or biography, and tended to resist the classification as philosophy, while political philosophers have tended to classify the Cyropaedia as a work of philosophy, as I will show below.²¹

When we turn to the political philosophers, John Ray suggests that Xenophon himself embodied the complete man as suggested by Xenophon's works: both political (as in the Anabasis), and philosophical (as in the Memorabilia) (241). He sees the Cyropaedia as being primarily about its stated main problem: how to rule (225), rather than being a novel or biography (these terms do not even come up during his discussion). Leslie Rubin discusses the Panthea episodes not as being novelistic (as so many classicists see them), but rather as episodes which help to illuminate Xenophon's political philosophy. The only philosophical dialogues in the Cyropaedia are the dialogues about love; Rubin suggests that these dialogues, although philosophical in nature, are pertinent for Xenophon's overall political philosophy (391). Luccioni points out that Xenophon only included information relevant to his theories about ruling (213-14). W.R. Newell suggests that the

Cyropaedia "can be regarded as the centerpiece of Xenophon's political writings" (891).

My own hypothesis about the genre of the Cyropaedia is that it is a work of political philosophy, which means that it can include the features of biography, historiography, and novel (as I defined the genres in the previous section). It is utopian, and presents a world that never existed. It is a handbook, which presents a summary of Xenophon's thought on everything from chariot tactics to the art of ruling. Because it is set in a time and place far removed from its author, it is perhaps easier to see its purpose. We will see in Chapter Two how the intertextual construction of Cyrus leads us to a description of the genre of the Cyropaedia.

Chronicles

First, I would like to undertake a brief excursus on the context of the production of *Chronicles*. Unlike the case of Xenophon, since the author of *Chronicles* is anonymous, it is difficult for us to pin down the literary history of the text's production. Here, I will give a brief discussion of the possible context for the production of *Chronicles* in order that my discussion of genre and purpose at the end of this section might have some context as well. We can place *Chronicles* roughly within the period of Persian rule of the Near East (539-333 BCE), probably towards the end of that period of rule. During this period, the Persian administrative district of Yehud was small,

poor, and primarily composed of Jerusalem and its surrounding hinterlands. There would have been an extremely small percentage of the population who had either the ability or leisure to create works of literature. The Chronicler may have been a Temple scribe (the usual view), or possibly may have been a teacher (not unlike the figure of the sage in biblical wisdom literature). Yehud during this period was relatively out-of-the-way and unimportant, resource-poor, people-poor.²² That any literature at all was created may seem miraculous; but the type of literature that I will argue that Chronicles is would be especially important for a people trying to form some kind of identity in this context (cf. Davies 108-115).

Above, I discussed the rationale for seeing Chronicles as a sort of novel, which allows us to use a dialogic method of reading the text. This is not the usual way that scholars see this text. M.P. Graham and Steven McKenzie have edited two books, and are in the process of collecting a third, entitled The Chronicler as Historian, The Chronicler as Author, and The Chronicler as Theologian.²³ These three titles seem to me to describe quite clearly the three categories into which scholarly understanding of the nature and purpose of Chronicles may be grouped. I will begin by discussing how Chronicles is understood as history, then I will turn to its understanding as theology, and finally I will turn to its understanding as literature, i.e., fiction.

It is common to understand Chronicles as being historiography: these books recount the past, use source citations, divide time into eras or reigns, and so on. The very title of the books in Hebrew, "Annals," implies a historical purpose, although we must remember that titles in ancient times were often attached not by the author but by later scribes or librarians. The placement of the books in the Christian canon, among the other "historical" books (rather than among the "Writings" as in the Jewish canon), also contributes to the notion of Chronicles as historiography. Perhaps the clearest expression of the idea of Chronicles as historiography has come from Japhet,

A consideration of the work's relevant features, such as aim, plan, form, and method, must lead to the conclusion that Chronicles is a history, an idiosyncratic expression of biblical historiography. It is a presentation of consequent events, focussed on the fortunes of a collective body, Israel, along a period of time within a defined chronological and territorial setting. The events do not constitute an incidental collection of episodes but are both selected and structured. They are represented in a rational sequence, governed by acknowledged and explicitly formulated principles of cause and effect,

and are judged by stringent criteria of historical probability.²⁴ (SJ 32)

She then goes on to distinguish between the aims and methods of ancient (by which she means biblical) and modern historians (SJ 32-34). For Japhet, the aim of the Chronicler's history was to rewrite Israel's history in order to explain the past in terms relevant to the present and to legitimate contemporary practices by connecting them to an authoritative past (SJ 49). She also points out the importance of the so-called "Levitical Sermons" in Chronicles - these speeches play the same role in Chronicles as orations in other ancient historiography ("Relationship" 307).

Kenneth Hoglund has written an excellent essay that continues Japhet's arguments about ancient historiography in a more nuanced way. He looks not only at biblical models for historiography, but at other ancient models as well. He points out that genealogies played an important role in the historiography of the Hellenistic world (22). He notes that the role of the prophet in Chronicles is paralleled in the "wise counselor" scenes in Herodotus (24). Likewise, the use of "stock numbers" for troops or people finds a parallel in Hellenistic historiography, as does the use of source citations (27-28). He concludes that since many of these features of Chronicles are absent from the Deuteronomic History, the Chronicler was working with a different conception of historiography, one closer to the concept of historiography found in the Hellenistic world, and

that the Chronicler was working well within the accepted practices of the ancient world (29).

Rodney Duke sees three functions behind biblical historical narratives: 1) to preserve the traditions and identity of Israel; 2) to respond to the needs of an audience; and 3) to present a world-view ("Model" 66). He is interested in a model of analysis that would elucidate this worldview, a model that he develops from the work of Hayden White. Thus, for Duke, the selection of subject matter by the historian reveals the historian's values: in the case of Chronicles, the primary events are those dealing with the establishment of the Davidic monarchy, the cult, proper worship, and Israel's success. The relationships between past events communicate the historian's reality: in Chronicles, Yhwh is the primary agent of history, and seeking or forsaking Yhwh results in divine blessing or curse (respectively). The events of the plot communicate the historian's teleology: in Chronicles, it is the promise of restoration in the land of Israel. These all combine to communicate an ideology about proper human action: in Chronicles, by representing the audience's past, the historian called for a proper relationship with Yhwh and hope of his blessing (67-76). Elsewhere, Duke uses Aristotelian rhetoric to analyze how the Chronicler achieved his purpose: the Chronicler used examples and maxims, bolstered by speeches of authoritative characters in order to drive home his point: that evil kings

receive retribution and ideal kings blessing (Persuasive 150-51).²⁵

Simon de Vries points out the differences between the Chronicler's history and the Deuteronomic history of which Samuel-Kings is the last half: the Deuteronomic history is the history of Israel, while the Chronicler's history is the history of God - it is the history of God's congregation (SJV 18). De Vries sees Chronicles as embodying a cyclical rather than a linear view of history: a series of "sabbaths" for the land, leading up to the longest "sabbath" of them all, the exile (SJV 18-19).

Brettler uses Chronicles as his model when describing the genre of biblical history, preferring Chronicles for this purpose to the Deuteronomic history used by other scholars, such as Van Seters in In Search of History. He argues that the Chronicler wrote his work as historiography, and that his manner of presenting the history of Israel (his worldview, his use of source citations) allowed his history to be accepted. He also argues that the Chronicler relied on this audience's knowledge of Samuel-Kings (Search 20-23). One of the Chronicler's main tools was typologies and patterns: thus David's removal of the Ark in 1 Chron. 15 is patterned after a similar event undertaken by Solomon in 1 Kings 8; Hezekiah is patterned after Solomon; David's purchase of the Temple site in 1 Chron. 21 is patterned after Abraham's purchase of the Cave of Machpelah in Gen. 23;

Solomon's accession is patterned after Joshua's succession to Moses (based on Williamson, "Accession"); and so on (34-37). For Brettler, the Chronicler "was so sure of certain political and religious ideologies that he rewrote the accepted version of history to conform to (and to confirm) what he truly believed happened" (47).²⁶

The issue of Chronicles' historical reliability is one that follows from seeing Chronicles as historiography. Isaac Kalimi makes a good point when he says that the issue of Chronicles' reliability as history should not overshadow how we evaluate its historiographic nature - he explicitly compares Chronicles to Herodotus on this point ("Historian" 85).²⁷ However, he does claim that Chronicles cannot be properly understood without knowing Samuel-Kings (87), a claim which I dispute, and which I will attempt to disprove in Chapters Three through Five. Contrary to biblical scholars earlier in the century, it is now commonly accepted that Chronicles can be used as a historical source in only a very limited way, once we factor in archaeological and extra-biblical textual material.²⁸

I will turn next to a discussion of Chronicles as a theological work. There are two basic approaches here, which often overlap: 1) Chronicles was written as a work of theology, with almost exclusively theological aims, not historical ones; 2) Chronicles was written as a midrash or proto-midrash on Samuel-Kings, i.e., as an exegetical exercise. Brettler has pointed out

the pervasiveness of the theological approaches to Chronicles in recent years (23). Of the recent commentaries, only Japhet's (SJ) really treats Chronicles as historiography; the rest generally look to the theology of Chronicles.

Although I identified Japhet as a scholar more concerned with Chronicles as historiography, her work on the ideology of Chronicles has definite theological overtones. Her ideas on the Chronicler's theology have been very influential, perhaps more so since The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought was translated into English. She doubts that there is one overriding theology of Chronicles,

Chronicles is not a manifesto devoted to a specific political movement but a more general and comprehensive theological stock-taking, striving to achieve a new religious balance in the face of a changing world. (SJ 43-44)

Rather, various theological themes are expressed through the working out of history. She points out that for the Chronicler, Israel's covenant with Yhwh did not have a basis in history, but was rather a universal constant. The primary attribute of God's rule was the concept of justice: God's absolute just rule was not a promise for the future but a historical fact. Although the Temple and proper worship were important, the individual Israelite also had to be righteous in conduct and attitude (SJ 44-45).

William Johnstone has produced a commentary and several articles devoted to delineating the theology of Chronicles. He has disputed that Chronicles is historiography,

The Chronicler is not now interested in the historian's discriminations of time and epoch; rather, his purpose is to gather together in a global manner the fulness of Israel past and present in timeless contemporaneity. He is concerned to portray an ideal Israel in all-inclusive terms, not to reconstruct the actual population at some point in time. ("Guilt" 115-116)

Overall, he sees Chronicles as a theological essay concerned with the relationship between God and humanity, and the purpose of Israel within that relationship. For him, 1 Chron. 1-2 Chron. 9 depicts Israel's attempt to accomplish the ideal form of life with God, and 2 Chron. 10-36 depicts the failure to do so (WJ 1: 10). For Johnstone, the problem of *ma'al* was the reason for the Exile; there was a break in *ma'al* only under David and Solomon - he defines *ma'al* as the failure to give God his due ("Guilt" 116-118). I will discuss *ma'al* further in Chapter Three. Johnstone also briefly touches on the possibility of Chronicles being a kind of midrash, i.e., the reinterpretation of a canonical text, and that the Chronicler saw himself as heir to a kind of prophetic tradition of presenting the life of Israel (WJ 1: 23).

Peter Ackroyd also dispenses with the notion of Chronicles as a work of historiography, instead dealing with the Chronicler as an interpreter (Chronicler 275-76). He suggests that we might see Chronicles as a kind of *summa* of the theology of the entire Hebrew Bible, attempting to unify the tradition in a comprehensive way (280). The Chronicler's theology was concerned with: 1) the Temple cult; 2) the Davidic ideal; 3) the link between David and the Temple; and 4) the centrality of Jerusalem to the community (282-288).

Williamson suggests that it is more useful to look at the themes that were important to the Chronicler, rather than trying to sketch out the Chronicler's theology (HGMW 24); however, his suggested themes seem to me to be theological in scope. The main themes for Williamson are: 1) the People Israel - a distinctive notion of the people of Israel as the people of God; 2) kingship - where the kingship of Israel is linked to the kingship of God; 3) the Temple - especially as the fulfillment of all the various worship traditions of Israel's past; and 4) retribution and repentance (discussed below) (HGMW 24-33). He also suggests that the Chronicler saw Samuel-Kings as a source rather than a text (it was not unalterable), and that we should look for the Chronicler's aims in his themes, not in his use of earlier material ("History" 33).

The idea of Chronicles as expressing a theology of immediate retribution is common, and is discussed in the works of

many authors. Williamson has pointed out that this has long been recognized, especially in the works of Julius Wellhausen and Gerhard von Rad (Israel 67). More recently, it has been discussed in the work of Raymond Dillard. Dillard suggests that in the non-synoptic passages of Chronicles there is strong evidence of this retribution theology: seeking God, or humbling oneself, or praying or turning to God at crucial moments is linked to good fortune; whereas not seeking, not humbling oneself or forsaking God is linked to evil fortune. However, this doctrine does not always hold, and is weaker in the sections of Chronicles that deal with David and Solomon ("Reward" 165-66, 169-70). Similarly, Roddy Braun, building on Dillard's work, points out that this is the framework into which all evaluations of kings in Chronicles are fitted - but there is also room for repentance in the Chronicler's theological framework (RB xxxviii-xxxix).

Ehud Ben Zvi has written a series of articles dealing with the Chronicler as a theologian. He points out that the Chronicles expounded the theology that individual actions lead to personal rewards or punishments (a "doctrine of retribution"), but that because this theology does not always hold true ("Sense" 38-39), Chronicles' theology is more nuanced. Thus, the Torah (God's law) is more important than either the Temple or the Davidic king: Israelites without a Davidic king or the Temple can still seek God's will ("Gateway" 239-244).

When we turn to a discussion of Chronicles as exegetical or interpretive in nature, the author that stands out most is Michael Fishbane. In his Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, although he views Chronicles as historiography, he sees its *modus operandi* as being exegetical, which I would argue is a theological approach to the text.²⁹ First, he contrasts midrashic features with the features of historiography: the historiographic features of Chronicles include its "expository, didactic, or edifying" nature (381). Midrashic exegesis, on the other hand, "is the specific reinterpretation or reworking of specific sources," and thus constitutes one of the techniques of historiography in general (381). Fishbane makes the point that the Chronicler would not have expected his work to be read synoptically with Samuel-Kings; rather, the Chronicler was creating a new work, which purported to be authoritative. However, we can uncover the "exegetical concerns of the Chronicler" by comparing Chronicles to Samuel-Kings as the text is transformed theologically (382-83). Thus, assessments of the various kings are based not so much on whether they did right or wrong (as in Kings), but rather on the promotion of Torah observance - the emphasis is increased on matters of theological importance (385-87). As well, the Chronicler reshaped his sources in order to reflect the theological concerns of his own day (387-88). The Chronicler also increased the importance of prophets and prophetic speeches, and by doing so was "able to

teach his contemporaries about the restorative power of repentance and the rewards for piety" (390-91).

According to Fishbane, not only did the Chronicler transform his sources theologically; he also came up with new theological explanations for well-known historical events. He explained events according to what was normative in his own day, i.e., according to the legislation of the Torah in books such as Leviticus and Numbers (392-94).³⁰ One of his strategies for doing so was to recontextualize the earlier traditions; he regrouped, added, or deleted material and combined texts in new contexts in order to make his theological point, a technique well-known by the later rabbis (399). Fishbane relies on rabbinic models for his description of exegetical methods in the Bible: he sees evidence for the development of these models in the Bible itself, before the later rabbis developed their own interpretive traditions. Although it may very well be true that the rabbinical methods of a few centuries later developed from methods of authors like the Chronicler, it does not explain how the Chronicler developed his exegetical technique (if that is what it is).

Finally, we turn to a discussion of Chronicles as a work of literature, concerned with stylistic issues and not historical or theological ones. Here, we might ask the question of the Chronicler's purpose in terms of genre: what literary genre was the Chronicler working within, if not within the genres of

historiography or theology? T. Sugimoto argues that contrary to the views of scholars who see Chronicles as historiography or theology, Chronicles is not exegetical or interpretive literature: the Chronicler's changes to Samuel-Kings are not meant to interpret or update Samuel-Kings, but rather are meant to enhance the Chronicler's own literary purpose (70-74).

Leslie Allen sees Chronicles as a series of homilies, i.e., "self-contained messages in literary form" (23). He discusses the various rhetorical markers of the units of Chronicles, especially with respect to recurring motifs, such as *prš* in 1 Chron. 13-15, and contrasted motifs, such as the contrast between the House of Ahab and the House of David in 2 Chron. 21-23. Like most of the essays in The Chronicler as Author (exceptions include the contributions by Boer, Wright, and Trotter), Allen performs a literary analysis in order to substantiate a view of Chronicles as historiography or theology.³¹ There has been very little work done on Chronicles that seeks to describe the meaning of Chronicles as a fictional work (e.g., as a novel).

In Novel Histories, Roland Boer discusses Chronicles as part of his larger work of metacommentary on the works of Georg Lukács and Martin Noth. He reads Chronicles in the light of utopian literature and science fiction, but does so in order to stress "the sheer artificiality of any biblical reading, particularly in a post modern context" (136). He shows how reading Chronicles as utopian literature should cause us to see

other readings of biblical texts (such as Noth's The Deuteronomistic History) as similarly artificial.³² He contrasts the utopian or ideal Israel of Chronicles with the dystopian Israel of the Deuteronomic History; he suggests that by presenting this ideal past, Chronicles also presents hope for a future where this ideal Israel will be realized (138). For Boer, Chronicles "neutralizes" Samuel-Kings in the themes of kingship, cult, Israel and the role of God in the world (151). By linking utopian literature with science fiction, he is able to suggest that Chronicles is able to present an alternative world and an alternative history for his community (156).³³ By making David and Solomon idealized, the Chronicler was able to enhance the Temple, a Temple that Boer sees as the centre of life in the post-exilic community (166). In his earlier work, Boer suggests that Chronicles marked a shift from a religious way of looking at the world to a political one (Jameson 279-284). This concept has been extremely beneficial to my own thinking on the nature and function of Chronicles, to which I will now turn.

What then is my own hypothesis about the genre of Chronicles? Through an examination in the next four chapters of the dialogic relationships between all the texts (Chronicles, Samuel-Kings, the Cyropaedia, Herodotus, Ctesias) specifically focused on the figure of the ideal ruler, I will attempt to show that Chronicles is a work of political philosophy. Because Chronicles is set in the same place and among the same people as

its author (unlike the Cyropaedia), it is tempting to describe it as historiography. However, Chronicles is utopian, presenting that utopia as a historical fact in order to justify its theories about leadership, the people, the cult, and God. It is theological, in that the role of God and proper behaviour towards God is very important, and is a factor in labeling the ideal. However, it is not primarily theology, nor is it primarily historiography: these are the tools, but not the finished work. The purpose of this dissertation is, then, two-fold: to examine the dialogic relationships between texts, and to use the dialogic construction of the ideal ruler to show that in genre, Chronicles is very similar to the Cyropaedia; it is political philosophy.

Notes

1. Still and Worton's introduction ("Introduction") to their edited volume on intertextuality provides an excellent overview of the development of the concept, as well as some of its more important incarnations.
2. Mai points out that Kristeva appropriated Bakhtin's ideas for her own purposes, and that Bakhtin's ideas may not be clearly reflected in concepts of intertextuality developed only from Kristeva's work (33).
3. For a discussion of the workings of allusion and intertextuality in Greek literature, especially in epic, lyric and drama, see Hubbard (33-40).
4. Still and Worton see Aristotelian mimesis as "the reduction and hence intensification of a mass of texts known to the poet" (4).
5. Gray points out that by the third century BCE, mimesis was being used to describe the desirable attributes of history as well as tragedy; it was a well-known technical term by the first century BCE (467-68).
6. This section is an expanded version of the discussion of dialogism in my article "The Dialogism of Chronicles" (Mitchell 312-19).
7. Holquist, however, sees dialogism as the unifying feature of Bakhtin's work, so that all of Bakhtin's various works can be reduced to the working out of this principle (15). Todorov makes the link between dialogism and intertextuality; while admitting that Bakhtin never used the term "intertextuality," he decides to reserve "dialogism" for specific purposes, while describing all of Bakhtin's work on dialogism under the rubric of "intertextuality."
8. A similar argument has been made by Holquist (68-69).
9. Newsom, however, has argued that since there is not one author of the Bible, we cannot approach the entire Bible as a polyphonic text (296-97).
10. This is the definition of heteroglossia I will be using, based on "Discourse in the Novel" (263). I realize that

heteroglossia more often has connotations of the different social speech types (also described in "Discourse" [263]). However, since it is very difficult to find such different social speech types in the Hebrew Bible, I will be using heteroglossia to refer to the different genres of speech, especially inserted speech, found in Chronicles and the Cyropaedia. Unlike authors of 19th century novels (which Bakhtin studied), biblical authors seem not to have been interested in representing different forms of speech in their works.

11. Thus, Tatum also looked at the Cyropaedia as the precursor to the Greek novel ("Education"; cf. Bowersock 124). Wills discussed the features of the Jewish novellas of the Hellenistic period in his article. I would suggest that Chronicles could be seen as a precursor to the Jewish novella in the same way that the Cyropaedia is seen as the precursor to the Greek novella.
12. For a discussion of Bakhtin's evaluation of Lotman, see Reid ("Who" 327-38, 331), where he suggests that in his published article Bakhtin evaluates Lotman fairly and approvingly ("Response" 2-3). This is in contrast to the private notes where he seems to have fundamentally misunderstood Lotman's work ("Notes" 135; "Methodology" 169).
13. Bethea suggests that Bakhtin's influence on Lotman can be found beginning in the 1980s, not the 1970s (1).
14. Even in his earlier work, Lotman showed an awareness of culture and cultural systems (cf. Lotman & Pyatigorsky). This was developed in his later work to the extent that in Universe of the Mind he discussed texts and culture as all part of the semiosphere, all generating meaning. Cf. Shukman (1).
15. Following Jakobson's communication model (353).
16. In his earlier work, Lotman calls this "internal speech" or "internal communication." Cf. "Two Models."
17. There is still considerable debate over the authorship of this work: some consider it the work of Bakhtin, others the work of Vološinov, while still others consider it more or less a collaborative effort. See Holquist (8), Reid (7-20), translators' preface to Vološinov (ix-xi).
18. See Gera for a discussion of the context of the Cyropaedia (1-13), cf. Due ("Xenophon").

19. Hirsch is one of the very few scholars who have considered the Cyropaedia to have historical usefulness (Friendship 66-70). Cf. especially his discussion about Xenophon's own experiences and his sources ("1001" 72-73).
20. Contra Luccioni, who considers that Xenophon was not writing a work of utopian fiction but rather preparing for the renewal of the Greek and "barbarian" worlds (254).
21. Exceptions among the classicists include the articles by Breebaart and Wood, who both examine the political philosophy of Xenophon. Both lament the lack of attention paid to Xenophon's philosophy.
22. Probably the best discussion of the Persian-period context for early Judaism is Berquist's Judaism in Persia's Shadow; the points I have made are drawn largely from this work.
23. See Graham, Hoglund & McKenzie for the first; Graham & McKenzie for the second; the title of the third (proposed book) was communicated to me by M.P. Graham.
24. Note Japhet's use of the word "idiosyncratic" to describe the Chronicler's history: it implies that there is a "correct" version of biblical history, which the Chronicler distorts. Myers seems to be in the minority when he states that the Chronicler "did not deliberately distort history to fit his purpose" (JMM1 xxx).
25. Cf. Japhet, "[The Chronicler's philosophy] is founded on a firm belief in the power of reasoning and persuasion, appealing to the understanding and goodwill of the other party. These elements of dialogue, reasoning and persuasion are manifest in Chronicles in every form and level of interrelationship [...]" (SJ 37-38).
26. The Chronicler's version of events was not universally accepted by other authors in the late Second Temple period. Ben Zvi's article ("Authority") on the use of the Deuteronomic History and Chronicles in late Second Temple writings concludes that most authors took their version of history from Samuel-Kings and not Chronicles; only Josephus consistently used Chronicles as a source (73-76).
27. "No one denies that Herodotus has unreliable stories in his Historia, but neither does one deny that his book is a history

nor that its author should be considered a historian" (Kalimi, "Historian" 85).

28. Cf. Ben Zvi ("Building"), Knoppers ("History"). Myers is an example of an earlier scholar who accepts many of the historical claims of the Chronicler.

29. Cf. Willi, who sees Chronicles not as a continuation of tradition but interpretation of traditions for current realities, a "prospective historiography" that retells the past while speaking about the present (148).

30. However, Shaver has disputed that it was the Torah (Genesis-Numbers) that was authoritative for the Chronicler. Instead, he argues that Deuteronomic law was more important (124-125).

31. So also de Vries ("Forms"), who performs an analysis of the prophetic speeches in Chronicles, showing that the speeches give theological comment on the narrative content. Cf. Kalimi, who sees many of the Chronicler's changes to the source text as motivated by a desire for harmonization, and reduces the literary features of the text to a search for textual history ("Contribution") or historiographic method ("Literary").

32. He suggests, "If it is strange to read Chronicles as utopian literature or as science fiction, then it is equally strange for Noth to read Deuteronomy-Kings as a 'Deuteronomistic History', as, in other words, a historical novel" (Boer, Novel 136-137).

33. One of the most seductive aspects of Boer's argument is that the lavishness of the description of the Temple cult is a complete fiction - it represents the complete lack of such a lavishness in the Chronicler's day, and a type of wish-fulfillment (Novel 160-61).

CHAPTER TWO

XENOPHON'S CYRUS AS INTERTEXT

Previous discussions of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*

It is generally agreed that Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* is an idealized figure.¹ Xenophon explicitly states that Cyrus was one of a kind (1.1.3-5). The figure of Cyrus is depicted by Xenophon in such a way as to make his didactic point about leadership and leaders (cf. Chapter One). According to Deborah Gera, this was according to Xenophon's usual technique: Xenophon used his works to teach by example with an "outstanding hero" (e.g., Socrates in the *Memorabilia*, Agesilaus in the *Agesilaus*, Xenophon himself in the *Anabasis*) (280). Due links the depiction of Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* to the depiction of Jason of Pherae in the *Hellenica*, Cyrus the Younger in the *Anabasis*, Agesilaus in the *Agesilaus*, Socrates in the *Memorabilia*, and Xenophon in the *Anabasis* (BD 185-206).² Due outlines the main features of Xenophon's ideal leader as epitomized by Cyrus: he was a man of action (but not aggressive), pious, kind and generous, temperate and moderate, eager to learn, ambitious, courageous and wise. Cyrus has all of these features and promotes them amongst his followers (BD 156-84). He is a model upon which a leader could pattern himself (BD 147).³ However, Paula Sage disagrees: she argues that Cyrus is not presented as a model to emulate (although Agesilaus in the

Agesilaus is), but rather as a marvel to wonder at. Cyrus is presented as one of a kind, and his government as not necessarily the best form of government, merely as the one which was successful while Cyrus was alive ("Dying" 164-65, 173). Cizek suggests that Xenophon's depiction of Cyrus follows a Socratic model, being both ethical and pedagogical (538).⁴

Tatum also suggests that by the end of his organization of his empire in 8.6.23, Cyrus is indeed the perfect ruler described in 1.1: his subjects follow him willingly. Cyrus is an ideal leader because he rules by persuasion, using the principles of household (*oikos*) management. His methods of persuasion are primarily expressed in his rhetoric - the ideal leader should also be an ideal rhetorician (JT 190-92). He also persuades by spectacle, taking on the customs of the Medes, which were more ostentatious than those of the Persians were. He persuades the Persians that he does not desire these new ways but that they have been forced on him because of necessity (JT 196-98). Cyrus also becomes the father figure in his empire (JT 201-203), and has wise counselors who seem to serve merely as extensions of himself (JT 204). Tatum implies that just as the subjects in the perfect empire have the imitation of Cyrus as their goal, thus too would-be rulers should have the imitation of Cyrus as their goal; his example of the first who tried to do so is Alexander the Great (JT 208, 193).

Much of the Cyropaedia is taken up with speeches and dialogue. Gera points out that the speeches which Xenophon placed in Cyrus' mouth reflect Xenophon's own philosophy, and whenever a plan of action is considered by Cyrus and his advisors, it is the opinion of Cyrus which is always correct; there is almost never any opposition to Cyrus' plans or speeches (280-83). However, Gera also points out that sometimes Cyrus behaves in less than an ideal fashion, or contradicts in his words his previous actions; this is almost always to press home another didactic point (280, 284). When it is not, Gera suggests that Xenophon was trying to take into consideration the depiction of Cyrus or other figures (Croesus, Astyages) in the work of previous authors (284-85). The only major flaw in the portrayal of Cyrus, according to Gera, is the depiction of Cyrus after the conquest of Babylon in Cyr. 7.5. In this section Xenophon attempted to show that Cyrus is not an ideal ruler figure: he uses trickery and stratagems against his friends (rather than his enemies), he uses eunuchs in his palace (a custom which would have offended Xenophon's Greek readers), and he does not follow the traditional Persian rule of law. All of this is explicitly contrasted with Cambyses' Persian government, and all of Cyrus' seemingly generous policies are seen to be purely practical if not selfish. However, Gera considers that Xenophon emphasized the benevolent despot aspects of Cyrus in order to show that only through these means could an empire be ruled; thus in order to

rule well, one cannot be an "ideal" ruler (286-297). This is a more complex view of Cyrus in the Cyropaedia.

In the analysis that follows, I will attempt to show what the features of the ideal king are in the Cyropaedia and how Cyrus fulfills them. In the second section of analysis, I will attempt to read Cyrus dialogically; that is, I will read the construction of Cyrus in the Cyropaedia as being in dialogue with the other figures of Cyrus in ancient texts, notably Herodotus and (what we know of) Ctesias. This will lead to some conclusions about how Cyrus is constructed intertextually, which I will compare with the intertextual constructions of David, Solomon, and the other kings of Judah in the next three chapters. Not only is Cyrus the model of the ideal king, but he will become the model of intertextual construction as well.

Reading Cyrus in the Cyropaedia

Cyropaedia 1.1 - Introduction to the problem

One thing that almost everyone agrees on about the Cyropaedia is that Xenophon provided a clear introduction to the work, as well as a clear conclusion (which I will discuss below). This is in contrast to his other major (long) works, such as the Hellenica and the Anabasis, which lack such an introduction (BD 14). It has often been noted that this introduction to the Cyropaedia is similar to the introduction to the Constitution of the Lacedaemonians.⁵ There is also much similarity between the

material of the Cyropaedia and the Anabasis and the Agesilaus. Higgins considers that there is much to be said for thinking that all of Xenophon's works were written around the same time, and in the same milieu (131). It is also generally agreed that the introduction provides a clear indication of Xenophon's intentions; what his intentions actually were is usually the matter of debate. The debate about Xenophon's intentions is usually tied up with the debate over the genre of the Cyropaedia, which I discussed in Chapter One. However, even those scholars who consider the work to be a biography or novel or historical novel usually describe Xenophon's intentions as being at least partially philosophical (cf. BD 14; Gera 59; JT 59). Tatum states, "If the importance of the prologue were self-evident, it would not be necessary to turn to a commentary on it" (JT 37). Hirsch's evaluation of Xenophon's intentions in the preface (1.1.3, 6) seems to me to be the correct one: although the Cyropaedia contains historical and biographical material, it is neither a history or a biography, but rather deals with the problem of how to govern, through an investigation of how Cyrus conquers and rules his empire (Friendship 66).

There are six points that Xenophon makes about the problem of the ideal ruler in the preface, which roughly correspond to the six paragraphs the preface is now divided into. The first point is made by means of contrast: there are many governments that fall and rulers that fail (1.1.1); thus, we might conclude

that the ideal ruler would not fall. The second is made by means of an analogy: animals are ruled by their keeper and bring him profits, whereas men rebel against their ruler (1.1.2); thus we might conclude that the ideal ruler would have subjects easily ruled and non-rebellious, as Xenophon himself concludes about Cyrus (1.1.3). The third is made by direct description: Cyrus is different from all other kings (*diēnegke tōn allōn basileōn*) (1.1.4); he has never been emulated; though we might infer that one could try. The fourth is also made by direct description: Cyrus ruled over a vast empire of diverse peoples whom he conquered (1.1.4). The fifth continues from the fourth: Cyrus ruled over this vast empire through fear (*phobō*) and by terrifying the people (*kataplēxai pantas*) (1.1.5); Newell takes this to be the primary statement of the preface (891-92). The sixth point completes the preface by stating the method that Xenophon will use in the rest of the work: he has examined (*eskepsametha*) Cyrus, and intends to show how his origins (*genea*), nature (*physis*) and education (*paideia*) led him to become such a ruler (1.1.6).

Cyropaedia 1.2-1.6 - Cyrus' origins, nature and education

In the Cyropaedia, Cyrus is the son of the king of Persia, Cambyses, and his wife Mandane, who is the daughter of Astyages, the king of Media. Thus Cyrus unites two royal families, the families of Persia and Media; such was his *genea* (1.2.1). As Due has indicated, this is an aristocratic view of heredity, with an

idealized family life (BD 149). Cyrus' origins also are marked by an absence of miraculous elements: he is not predestined to greatness, but rather his success comes from his exceptional talents (Carlier 140-41). Although his origins may be aristocratic, it is not only his origins that lead to his success. Xenophon next turns to Cyrus' nature, quoting the Persians of his own day as saying that,

Cyrus was most handsome (*kallistos*) in person, most generous (*philanthrōpotatos*) of heart, most devoted to learning (*philomathestatos*), and most ambitious (*philotimotatos*), so that he endured all sorts of labour and faced all sorts of danger for the sake of praise. (1.2.1)

Xenophon accepts that this was Cyrus' *physis*. He then turns to Cyrus' *paideia*, which seems to take up the next few chapters, but in fact takes up the rest of the work.

Due has pointed out that the qualities Cyrus gains through his formal course of education strengthen his inborn qualities; these qualities are *dikaiosynē* (justice), *charis* (gratitude/generosity), *sōphrosynē* (temperance), *peithesthai* (obedience), *philomathia* (love of learning), and *philotimia* (ambition). All of these qualities are on display in the episode of Cyrus' visit to Astyages (Cyr. 1.3-4) (BD 150-51, 181-82). It is important to point out that Cyrus does not complete the course of Persian education so carefully described in 1.2, but rather

interrupts it for a four-year visit to his grandfather in Media in 1.3-4 (cf. Higgins 46; contra Carlier 141). In Tatum's perceptive analysis of this visit, he notes that Cyrus' first words in the Cyropaedia, "Oh mother, how handsome my grandfather is!" (1.3.2), are also his last spontaneous words in the work; after this outburst he learns the consequences of intemperate outbursts (JT 99); thus his temperance is usually displayed more subtly than it is in his discussion with his grandfather in 1.3.10-11. Cyrus also learns during this visit how to adjust his performance to suit his audience, for example, acting as the host at his grandfather's banquet (1.3.6-7), while also displaying his generosity (JT 103-6). He also is obedient to his grandfather, while at the same time discovering how to act just as he pleases in the matter of the hunt in 1.3.12-14. His discussion with his mother about justice in 1.3.16-18 also displays what he considers his mastery of that subject; I will return to this below. Finally, his love of learning is shown especially in his desire to learn horsemanship in 1.4.4 (BD 181), and his ambition or love of honour is demonstrated throughout this section (cf. BD 182).

Cyrus' qualities as a child continue to be his qualities as an adult, and as an adult he adds one more quality, *eusebia* (piety), when in his first action upon being selected as leader of the Persian army, he sacrifices to the gods (1.5.6) (BD 151-52, 156). Gera suggests that the most explicit example of the education Cyrus receives can be found in his dialogue with his

father Cambyses in 1.6.2-1.6.46 (50), in which among the more practical concerns about leadership, there is a strong discussion about piety and proper respect for the gods. However, the kernel of this discussion in terms of leadership can be found in 1.6.7, where Cambyses tells Cyrus that the most important feature of the ruler is not only to be "a truly good and noble man [i.e. a gentleman, *kalos kagathos*]" but to "provide a good living both for himself and his household" and to "govern other people so that they might have all the necessities of life [...]." Thus the qualities that we have seen as forming Cyrus' personality, the qualities that might define a gentleman, are of no account if they are not turned to proper purposes.

Cyropaedia 2.1-7.5.36 - Cyrus' conquests

Cyrus' organization of his army and his various battles take up the bulk of the Cyropaedia. In this section, I will briefly discuss Books 2-6, before turning to a more detailed analysis of the events of Book 7. The events in these books are all part of one great event, the conquest of the Assyrian Empire; all of the other battles take place along the way. Stadter notes that these books do not describe the development of Cyrus' character or education (*paideia*), but rather reveal Cyrus, "unfold[ing] for the reader the mature Cyrus, who has learned to deal with all situations" (491, 474). Although time is carefully marked in the battles themselves, that is merely a structuring device for the narrative, and otherwise the passage of time is

vague and imprecise. It must have been a short period of time covered by Books 2-7, as Cyrus returns to Persia in Book 8 still a youth, as he had left it (474-77; cf. Tatum, "Education" 18; BD 132). Book 2 is a description of Cyrus' organization of the army that is assembled to fight the Assyrian prince, an army made up of Persians, Medes and other allied peoples, against the Assyrian army which contains Croesus as an ally. It is important to note that throughout the Cyropaedia, Cyrus does not seek out or initiate any wars, but once involved, his army is carefully organized while that of his enemies is unorganized (Higgins 47, 50-52). Book 3 describes the battles against first the Armenians, who have defected from the Median-Persian alliance, and then the Chaldeans, bringing both groups into the army against the Assyrians. The action then continues to Cyrus' invasion of Assyria and his first victory over the Assyrians. Book 4 then depicts Cyrus' capture of two Assyrian camps and his gain of the Assyrian nobleman Gobryas as an ally. Book 5 deals with the consolidation of Gobryas' support as well as with the support of another disaffected Assyrian, Gadatas. Cyrus then deals with the complaints of his uncle Cyaxares (since Cyrus is commanding the army, but is not yet the ruler of the Persian or Median kingdom). Book 6 describes the preparations for the final battle against Babylon. In all of these episodes, Cyrus' abilities as a military commander, tactician, diplomat and debater are displayed by Xenophon, as well as his qualities of

dikaiosynē (justice), *charis* (gratitude/generosity), *sōphrosynē* (temperance), and *peithesthai* (obedience) as well as his ability to innovate and his love of honour (cf. BD 163-183). Thus there are numerous examples of Cyrus' attitudes towards excessive eating and drinking (4.2.38-45; 4.5.1-4; 6.2.25-29), contrasted with Cyaxares' intemperance (4.5.8-9). Cyrus is shown as being obedient to his uncle the king Cyaxares the Mede (2.4.1-6; 3.3.56). His generosity to both his enemies and his friends is also depicted (4.4.9-13; 5.4.17-18), as is his sense of justice (5.4.21; 5.5.10-24).

Book 7 deals with the culmination of Cyrus' campaign: the final battle against the Assyrian forces under the command of Croesus, and the capture of Sardis and Babylon. All three of these events are interesting, and depict the culmination of the accumulation of Cyrus' empire, although, as I pointed out above, he is still subject to his father and uncle. In this section, I will analyze each episode, showing how all of Cyrus' qualities are depicted.

Before the battle began, Cyrus sacrifices and prays to the gods, thus displaying again his piety (7.1.1). His armour is described: it is similar to the armour of his men, differing only in its brightness, thus displaying his temperance and distaste for display (7.1.2). His ability to read omens is again shown (7.1.3), as it was in his discussion with Cambyses about leadership in 1.6. His generosity is shown in his exhortations

to his men, as is his sense of justice, when he describes the rewards for bravery and the penalties for cowardice during his exhortation (7.1.10-14). His generosity is also depicted in his exhortations of his officers, as is his courage, and his tactical abilities (7.1.15-22). His self-control during the battle is shown in contrast to the lack of self-control shown by Abradatas, who charges recklessly to his death (7.1.29-32), much as the young Cyrus had charged during the hunt in Media. Cyrus has learned from his experience: when he realizes that Abradatas and his men are dead and that the Persian troops are in difficulty, instead of himself charging against the enemy Egyptians, he circles around them and takes them from the rear (7.1.36). When he defeats the Egyptians, he shows again his generosity (or self-interest), and spares them, allowing them instead to become part of his army (7.1.41-45). The battle itself is quick and decisive (7.1.23-40); Cyrus' speeches and exhortations before the battle are longer than the battle itself, at least as it is told by Xenophon, and of course Cyrus' troops win the day. Croesus and his troops flee to Sardis, and the other Assyrian-allied troops flee to their own homes (7.2.1).

However, although the battle is decisive, the campaign is not yet won as long as the two major cities of Sardis and Babylon hold out. The capture of Sardis is again a relatively simple affair, with Cyrus making the preparations for a siege and then sending his troops to climb up the citadel, guided by a Persian

who has been living in the acropolis. The Lydian troops then flee, and Cyrus takes the city (7.2.2-3). The rest of 7.2 describes Cyrus and Croesus' meeting, where Croesus and Cyrus are set up as foils, thus stressing Cyrus' courage and military skill (BD 89; cf. Higgins 53). Here I will be following the elegant and insightful reading of James Tatum (JT 152-159); although Gera has disputed this reading (266-279), it seems to me to show Cyrus' status as an ideal leader very well.

After Cyrus takes the city, while his troops remain obedient, the Chaldean troops begin to loot the city, forcing him to deal with them; but as Tatum points out, this also forces a delay in Cyrus' meeting with Croesus. By delaying his meeting, he is able to see Croesus on his own terms and to show that Croesus is not that important to him (JT 153). The episode of the looting also gives Cyrus the opportunity to humble Croesus farther, by forcing the Lydians to loot themselves in order to pay Cyrus' army, and at the same time keeping the city intact (JT 155).⁶ While Croesus attempts to reduce all of the events to a matter of good luck for Cyrus and bad luck for himself,⁷ throughout the Cyropaedia we have seen that Cyrus' victories are the result of his character and skills, and Croesus' defeats are the result of his character (more specifically his cowardice; cf. 6.2.19). Croesus himself thinks that his ability to escape harm comes from divine aid, not through his own cowardice (cf. 7.2.22) (JT 155-57). Croesus, through flattery and praise of Cyrus (his

praise of Cyrus echoes Xenophon's prologue), reveals his own lack of self-knowledge, knowledge that Cyrus has - Croesus thinks that self-knowledge has to do with material means to happiness (JT 156-58). Cyrus then keeps Croesus near him out of self-interest: anyone this flattering and willing to switch sides should be kept close by at all times; compare Croesus' use of the term "master" (*despotēs*) in order to appeal to Cyrus' vanity (JT 158-59, 153).⁴ However, we should refrain from giving Croesus more importance than he has in the narrative, as Due points out, Cyrus' main enemy in the Cyropaedia is not Croesus, but his overlord the Assyrian king (BD 89).

The death of the Assyrian king takes place during the capture of Babylon. However, the capture of Babylon does not follow immediately after the capture of Sardis. Instead, there is an interlude, during which Cyrus engages in some "mopping up" activities from the conquest of Sardis and preparations for the march against Babylon. In these two expeditions, one to Caria and one to Phrygia, he sends trusted lieutenants, who of course get the job done (7.4.1-11). The contrast between these two lieutenants, Adusius and Hystapas, and Croesus could not be greater: Cyrus trusts them to act alone, as he does not trust Croesus, and they accomplish their tasks, as Croesus had not when he was the commander of the Assyrian army. Immediately after their success, another conversation takes place between Cyrus and

Croesus, just to emphasize the contrast; in it, Cyrus denigrates Croesus' advice (7.4.12-13).

The account of the capture of Babylon in the Cyropaedia is somewhat confusing, as Gera has shown (260). First, Cyrus inspects the walls, and decides to prepare a siege instead of making a direct assault (7.5.2, 7). What seems of more consequence to Xenophon, however, is the tactic for an orderly retreat, as this tactic is described in detail (7.5.3-6). The transition from siege preparations to preparations for diverting the Euphrates river is then made very awkwardly in the text: Cyrus asks for suggestions other than siege, and his aides Chrysantas and Gobryas answer by posing questions about the size and depth of the river (7.5.7-8).³ At once, they begin preparations to divert the river, but these preparations are described as if they are siege preparations (7.5.9-14). It is clear that Cyrus wishes the Babylonians to believe they are siege-works (cf. 7.5.13, *tēs poliorkias*), and it may be that Xenophon wanted to keep some suspense as to how the city would actually be taken. However, it seems more likely that the ditches were to serve double-duty as both siege-works and the method of attack, as implied by 7.5.12.¹⁰ The city itself is then taken during a festival, and Cyrus' army faces virtually no resistance until they arrive at the Assyrian king's palace, and the disaffected Assyrians Gadatas and Gobryas kill the king (7.5.30).

Cyropaedia 7.5.37-8.6 - The organization of the kingdom

Once Babylon is conquered, Cyrus turns his attention from matters of conquest to matters of organization. As A. Breebaart has put it, in this section Xenophon was interested in depicting the "administrative channeling of monarchical virtue to all subjects;" peace-time rule for Cyrus means the efficient spread of virtue (*aretē*), not the constitutional principles or rights associated with the old Persian education described in 1.2 (120). Christopher Nadon has argued against such an interpretation, suggesting that Cyrus aims "to bind his subjects to one another and himself through a shared self-understanding of themselves as instruments of a just and divinely sanctioned retribution against their foes" (373). We must also remember that although Cyrus is called "king" (*basileus*) starting in 7.5.37, he is as yet still subject to the rule of his father Cambyses and his uncle Cyaxares. He is now king of Babylon, having succeeded the dead Assyrian king in that title. He has won the right to the title by having conquered the Assyrian king (Carlier 149).

There are two schools of thought on Cyrus' organization of his kingdom with respect to his earlier character. Gera claims that there is a gap between Cyrus' original ideals about good conduct in the early part of the Cyropaedia and his ideas and actions during his rule in Babylon (286), although she does note that it is necessary for Cyrus to change his behaviour in order to rule a large empire (297). Tatum, Carlier, Breebaart and Due

see Cyrus' actions in this passage as reiterating earlier themes (BD 97), or as being wholly logical for ruling a large empire as opposed to the small Persian kingdom of Cambyses (Carlier 150; Breebaart), or as being wholly of a piece with his earlier character (JT 189-208). Nadon suggests that there would be no inconsistency if we see the Cyropaedia as a critique of all political systems, including Cyrus' empire (373). However, it seems to me important to make the distinction between Cyrus' beliefs about his personal character and behaviour, and how he believed it would be appropriate for him to behave in his role as king. After all, the very first thing that Cyrus does after his conquest of Babylon is to equip himself "as he thought became a king [*hōs basilei hēgeito prepein*]" (7.5.37). The rest of the passage describes a very conscious play-acting on the part of Cyrus, a play-acting that Tatum has described as having been present from Cyrus' first introduction in 1.3 (cf. above).

According to Tatum, Cyrus' aim is to create a monarchy that is not a tyranny: his subjects have to be taught how to serve Cyrus properly (JT 190). Cyrus begins his organization with himself in Babylon and moves outward (cf. Breebaart 121-130). Thus, his first concern is with himself: he decides how best to present himself, he organizes his personal bodyguard and he sets up a guard for the city of Babylon in order to protect himself. He then sets up an administrative hierarchy (7.5.37-8.1.15). His second concern is to educate his associates as to proper

behaviour at his court: this court aristocracy is a company of equals, subordinate to Cyrus, but superior to the rest of the subjects (8.1.16-43). His third concern is with the rest of his subjects, including his servants (8.1.45-8.2.26). Breebaart notes that the procession and state banquet of 8.3-4 shows how the preceding arrangements work now that they are all put into effect; good management depends on everybody knowing his place (128-29). Cyrus' final concern is to organize the rest of the kingdom through the satrapies, where the court of each satrap is to be a miniature of Cyrus' own court (8.6). Tatum notes that by 8.6.23, Cyrus is the perfect monarch "issuing orders to the willing subjects of an empire" (JT 189).

During the organization of the empire, we can continue to see Cyrus' characteristics as I outlined above. Thus, his sense of justice may be seen in his allotment of the spoils of war: he says to his companions about the property of the defeated Babylonians,

[F]or it is a law established [...] that when a city is taken in war, the persons and the property of the inhabitants thereof belong to the captor. It will, therefore, be no injustice [*oukoun adikia*] for you to keep what you have, but if you let them keep anything, it will be only out of generosity [*philanthrōpia*] that you do not take it away. (7.5.73)

Cyrus is of course generous in this organization of the kingdom, lavishing gifts upon his associates, his servants, and the people generally (e.g., 8.2.2-4, 7-9, 13). He continues to preach temperance (8.1.30). He both preaches obedience (8.1.29), and models it in his behaviour towards Cambyses and Cyaxares (8.5.27, 20; cf. JT 83). Finally, he continues both to preach piety (8.1.24-25) and to display his proper obedience to the cultic rituals as prescribed by the priestly caste of Magi (7.5.57; 8.3.11-12, 24) and according to the traditions of Persia (8.5.21, 27). It is clear from this entire passage that Cyrus is manipulating his friends and subjects in order to get the kind of obedient subjects he needs. If this is the case, then rather than seeing his ideals as having been laid aside, perhaps it would be better to read his past actions in light of these ones; thus, his precocious childhood behaviour becomes more sinister. It is also ironic that Cyrus' court in Babylon, in terms of the elaborate Median dress and the feasts enjoyed by the nobles, makes Cyrus resemble nothing so much as his grandfather Astyages: Cyrus combines the features from both his Persian and Median education in order to rule his large empire (cf. Gera 291-93; Carlier 149).

Finally, it is important to note, as does Tatum, that as this passage draws near its end, the voices of the narrator and the character of Cyrus "blend into a single voice" (JT 199). Whereas earlier in the work Cyrus makes many speeches outlining

his ideas and actions, here Cyrus' speeches are fewer: he lets others do the speaking for him (e.g., Chrysantas' speech of 8.1.1-5), or the narrator gives us Cyrus' thoughts rather than his words (e.g., 8.1.12-16). Only when it is necessary for a dialogue to take place, where Cyrus and his interlocutor debate one of Cyrus' policies, are we given Cyrus' direct speech in 8.1-6; most of these dialogues take place during the banquet of 8.4. The interlocutor's position is always shown to be incorrect.¹¹

Cyropaedia 8.7-8 - Cyrus' death and its aftermath

This section deals with Cyrus' death (8.7) and the degeneration in the Persian Empire after his death (8.8). Both chapters present an ending to the Cyropaedia, but only one of these is a true ending: there is, in effect, a false ending followed by the real ending. Without the real ending, the Cyropaedia would end with an idealized account of Cyrus' death, which could lead us to conclude that the Cyropaedia was Xenophon's model of ideal governance (Sage, "Dying" 163-64; cf. Nadon 373).

The false ending is introduced by a quick transition to the end of Cyrus' life. On a state visit to Persia, he receives a warning from the gods in a dream that his life was about to end. He promptly prays to the gods, and then summons his family and delivers his final speech, which takes up most of 8.7. Sage has noted that Cyrus is in fact delivering his own funeral speech; no one else is worthy of making this speech ("Tradition" 75). In

this speech, which Gera describes as a Cyropaedia within the Cyropaedia, a microcosm of the entire work, Cyrus sums up the accomplishments of his life, and he follows the speech with a "quiet, philosophical death [...]" (130). Tatum points out that Cyrus continues to instruct even as he is dying (JT 209). Gera also notes that it is significant that Cyrus' death is not on the battle-field but rather at home in peace; this emphasizes Cyrus' role not as merely a warrior-king but also as the ideal ruler of a peacetime empire (122). However, Cyrus' speech brings forward the major problem with his rule, the problem of succession. Tatum points out that in Cyrus' speech, authority has moved from the gods and Cambyses to Cyrus and from Cyrus to his sons, but that this speech is also "a presentiment of a failure which even the monarch of the Cyropaedia will not be able to avert" (JT 211). Cyrus' empire could not survive without him.

Although Cyrus' speech and death would seem to close out the Cyropaedia appropriately, the little question of the succession leads into the real ending of the work (8.8).¹² Due indicates how in 8.8.1, Xenophon summarized the previous books with clear reference to 1.1 (BD 17; cf. Luccioni 247):

Cyr. 8.8.1

That Cyrus's empire was the greatest and most glorious of all the kingdoms in Asia - of that it may be its own witness. For it was bounded on the east by the Indian Ocean, on the north by the

Cyr. 1.1.4-5

[H]e then conquered Syria, Assyria [...], he ruled also over Bactria, India, and Cilicia [...], and very many other nations, of which one could not even tell the names [...] and, descending to

Black Sea, on the west by Cyprus and Egypt, and on the south by Ethiopia. And although it was of such magnitude, it was governed by the single will of Cyrus; and he honoured his subjects and cared for them as if they were his own children; and they, on their part, revered Cyrus as a father.

the sea, he added both Cyprus and Egypt to his empire [...] He ruled over these nations [...] he was able to cover so vast a region with the fear [...] and he was able to awaken in all so lively a desire to please him, that they always wished to be guided by his will.

Tatum points out that 8.8.1 also repeats 8.6.21 in terms of the extent of Cyrus' empire, and thus encapsulates the entire narrative movement of the Cyropaedia (JT 217-18).

However, the success of Cyrus' empire has within it the roots of its downfall. The kind of fatherly rule practiced by Cyrus cannot survive his death, as it is based on him as a role model; since Cyrus institutes practices, not a rule of law. Cyrus is a unique ruler (Sage, "Dying" 165-66). Passing down this form of rule to successors is a problem. As Sage has pointed out, "Succession is too obvious a feature of continuing the stability of any government for Xenophon to have missed it," and she has suggested that the structure of the narrative deliberately suggests a lack of provision for effective succession by Cyrus ("Dying" 169). Xenophon passed over Cyrus' education of his sons, and Tatum suggests that Cyrus' neglect of his own sons' education undermines the theme of Cyrus as father to the empire (JT 230-31). In a similar vein, Sage notes that in the introduction, Xenophon stated that he wanted to look at the origins, nature and education of Cyrus in order to understand

him, but when he introduced Cyrus' sons, he gave an account only of their origins, suggesting that they did not have the benefits of nature and education ("Dying" 173).¹³

The conclusion of the Cyropaedia is a profoundly ironic one, and, I might add, an example of heteroglossia within the text. One voice in the text describes the ideal ruler in the ideal kingdom, the perfect example of the warrior and philosopher king united in one person. The other voice in the text describes the ruler as not having been so ideal: he cannot ensure a succession that will lead to the practices of his kingdom being continued, and suggests that perhaps there could be no ideal ruler at all (cf. Nadon). A concrete example of this phenomenon may be found in the use of the phrase "still today" (*eti kai nyn*). Throughout the Cyropaedia, this phrase would seem to indicate that some admirable practices instituted in Persia before or at the time of Cyrus continued in the time of Xenophon himself; this phrase gives the impression that institutions are durable. However, 8.8 points out that while the institutions had been maintained, their purpose was perverted or converted, so that the letter of the tradition continued while the spirit of it was lost (Carlier 160-61).¹⁴ Hirsch sees the *eti kai nyn* phrases as acting as an epilogue should, thus obviating the need for an epilogue (Friendship 93).¹⁵ He misses the point. All of the harmonies of the text have been disrupted with the conclusion of 8.8, which returns to the questions brought forward in the

prologue of 1.1 (cf. JT 216; BD 19). While the questioning voice of 1.1, suggesting the impossibility of ruling, was overwhelmed by the voice of 1.2-8.7 suggesting that it was possible to rule successfully, it reasserts itself in 8.8.

Reading Cyrus dialogically

Cyropaedia 1.1 - Introduction to the problem

Although Cyrus is certainly one of the major figures of Book 1 of Herodotus' Histories, his story is not told sequentially. Rather, his interactions with Croesus are told first (Hdt. 1.75-90), because they form part of Croesus' story. However, once he got to the point of introducing Cyrus, Herodotus introduced him by asking who was Cyrus, and how did the Persians achieve their dominance. He stated that he would "write according to what those Persians say, those who do not want to embellish the deeds of Cyrus, but who tell the real story," and suggested that "there are three other ways to tell the story about Cyrus" (1.95.1; my translation). The Cyropaedia's position then would be that it tells the story of Cyrus according to one of the other ways to tell the story that Herodotus mentioned.

When we turn to the analogies and the descriptions of the problem of leadership and rulers in the Cyropaedia, it is interesting to juxtapose what Xenophon had to say with what Herodotus said in the Histories. The first sentence of the Cyropaedia is telling in this respect (1.1.1),

The thought once occurred to us how many republics [dēmokratiai] have been overthrown by people who preferred to live under any form of government other than a republican, and again how many monarchies and how many oligarchies in times past have been abolished by the people [hypo dēmōn] [and] how many of those individuals who have aspired to absolute power [tyrannein] have either been deposed [...].

In Herodotus' introduction to Cyrus, he described how the Medes had revolted from the Assyrians, becoming free (eleutherōthēsan), yet after a while they once more became subjects of an absolute government (es tyrannidas) under the command of Deioces, an ancestor of Cyrus' (1.95-96). For Herodotus in this passage, the notion of freedom is very important, and an absolute government one to be avoided, and the case of Cyrus' ancestor and the entire Median line is brought forward as an example. The Cyropaedia replies that governments run by the people are often overthrown, and that it is autocratic rule that seems to offer a solution to the problem of government. Herodotus warned in the example of Deioces in 1.96-102 about the prerogatives the king takes to himself;¹⁶ the Cyropaedia hints in the opening passage that these prerogatives might not be inappropriate. However, the Cyropaedia also hints that the methods used by Cyrus might not be good for other rulers (Gera 298).

Cyropaedia 1.2-1.6 - Cyrus' origins, nature and education

It is a critical commonplace that Herodotus' Cyrus is a tragic figure, while Xenophon's is not; Tatum has referred to Xenophon's Cyrus as a political hero while Herodotus' Cyrus is a mythical one (JT 101; cf. Cizek 538). More importantly, in both the Histories and the Cyropaedia, the fate of Cyrus is foretold by his origins and character: the origins of Cyrus in Herodotus (the foundling, raised by peasants, but his noble birth prevailed) foretell his rise and tragic death, while the origins of Cyrus in Xenophon (the happy childhood) foretell his rise and happy end (JT 91).

The relationship between Cyrus and his grandfather Astyages in the Cyropaedia is an amiable and happy one. This is in complete contrast to their relationship in Herodotus' Histories and in what we know of Ctesias' Persica. In Herodotus, Astyages tries to have Cyrus killed as a child, and as an adult, Cyrus conquers him, although we are told that "Cyrus treated Astyages with great consideration and kept him at his court until he died" (Hdt. 1.130.3). In Ctesias, Cyrus is not related to Astyages, but becomes his son-in-law through marriage (Pers. 9.1). There is also the possibility, based on the evidence from the fragments of Nicolaus of Damascus, that Ctesias' work included a story about Cyrus' rise to power as first the gardener and then the cupbearer of Astyages (FGrH 90 F 66.4-8; cf. Gera 157, 201).¹⁷ The position of Ctesias, that Cyrus rose to power as Astyages'

cupbearer, is incorporated and changed by Xenophon in the scene in Cyr. 1.3.9, where Cyrus playfully acts as Astyages' cupbearer (cf. Gera 156-57); here we can see Xenophon fictionalizing the tradition. In the Cyropaedia, we have the positions of both Herodotus and Ctesias incorporated and refuted. Cyrus' familial relationship with Astyages is maintained, yet any hint that it is an unhappy relationship is transmuted into a mark of their close relationship: thus, when Astyages is ill, Cyrus weeps lest he die (Cyr. 1.4.2), and Astyages' death is in the end peaceful, and not in any way related to Cyrus' actions, as he is succeeded by his son Cyaxares (1.5.2).

The incorporation of and dialogue with Herodotus and Ctesias may be seen also with respect to Cyrus' origins. First, about Cyrus' father, Xenophon says that he "is said [*legetai*] to have been Cambyses, king of the Persians" (1.2.1). This takes care of Herodotus, for whom Cambyses is the father, but not a king (Hdt. 1.107). It also takes care of Ctesias, for whom Cambyses is not the father (FGrH 90 F 66.3; if we can trust the account of Nicolaus of Damascus): thus, it is not said by everyone. With regard to his mother, Xenophon says that "it is generally agreed [*homologeitai*]" that it was Mandane, daughter of Astyages (1.2.1): this statement thus agrees with Herodotus (Hdt. 1.108) and disputes the position of Ctesias (Pers. 9.1) - thus it is not generally agreed. Here we have Xenophon's ironic use of

phrases "it is said" and "it is generally agreed" in order to reverse the positions of Herodotus and Ctesias.

There are three more episodes in Cyrus' childhood in the Cyropaedia that are in a dialogic relationship with Herodotus. The first is Cyrus' description of his lessons in justice in 1.3.16-17. In Cyrus' telling of this story, when picked as a judge during his schooling, he erred in applying the principles of Persian justice when making his judgement. He learned at that time that the role of the judge is to "always render his verdict on the side of the law [*syn tō nomō*]" rather than on what seems right to him; in fact, what only what is lawful is right (*to men nomimon dikaion einai*). In Herodotus' Histories, it is Cyrus doing what seems right to him that leads to his true parentage being discovered; in Cyrus' speech to Astyages justifying his actions, he says, "Master, I did these things to him according to what was right [*syn dikē*]" (1.115.2; my translation). In the Cyropaedia, the position of Herodotus is absorbed and refined, and at the same time subtly refuted, as Cyrus in Herodotus is acting as a tyrannical king (Hdt. 1.114), something specifically banned under the Persian concept of justice in the Cyropaedia (1.3.18). Mandane tells Cyrus that he should be careful not to learn the principles of tyranny, lest he be flogged to death (*mē apolē mastigoumenos*) (1.3.18), an ironic reversal of what the tyrannical Cyrus in Herodotus has done to one of the boys who has

refused to obey one of his tyrannical commands - he flogs him (*mastigeōn*) (1.114).¹⁸

The second episode involves the hunt Cyrus is involved in with his uncle Cyaxares in Cyr. 1.4.5-10. Cyrus is eager to hunt in the wild, having exhausted the challenges of his grandfather's wildlife collection, but his grandfather is afraid of his being harmed. However, Astyages finally allows him to go with his uncle Cyaxares to hunt, along with attendants whose role it is "to keep him away from dangerous places and guard [*phylattoien*] him against wild beasts" (1.4.7). Cyrus of course, succeeds in the hunt, killing not only a deer, but also a boar (*kapros*) which rushed at him. However, his recklessness earns him a reproof from both the attendants and his uncle, who says of Astyages, "But if he finds out that you have been giving chase, he will chide not only you but me also for allowing you to do so" (1.4.9). All of this follows the pattern of the hunt in Herodotus 1.36-45, where Croesus entrusts his son Atys to Adrastus on a hunt (JT 110): Atys begs Croesus to allow him to go on the hunt despite Croesus' fears; Adrastus is his attendant, charged to guard him (there are six occurrences of words from the root *phylak* in the passage); and it was a boar (*hys*) that charged at the hunters. However, the outcome for the young man differs in Herodotus: Atys is killed by Adrastus, the man charged to guard him, and Adrastus kills himself on Atys' tomb. Cyrus, of course, avoids Atys' fate and kills the boar, yet the episode

does not bode well for Cyaxares. Cyaxares does not lose his life because of this hunt, but he does lose his throne to Cyrus in Cyr. 8.5.19, and is shown to be a coward in 4.1.13.

The third episode is related to the second, and pertains to Cyrus' ability to read auspices. Cambyses tells Cyrus at the beginning of their discussion about ruling in Cyr. 1.6 that he has had him taught about divination "on purpose [...] for I would not have you at the mercy of the soothsayers, in case they should wish to deceive you by saying other things than those revealed by the gods [...]" (Cyr. 1.6.2). Cyrus' ability to correctly divine the intention of the gods is in direct contrast both to Croesus in Herodotus as well as Astyages in Herodotus: in a sense, he replaces both Croesus and Astyages. Croesus' loss of both his son and his empire are prefaced by an incorrect understanding of oracles: his son is lost because of an incorrect understanding of his own dream (Hdt. 1.34), which leads him to spend a good deal of effort on learning the effectiveness of various professional oracles (Hdt. 1.46-49), but he misinterprets their pronouncements as well, leading to the fall of his empire (Hdt. 1.53-56, 91). Astyages' reliance on professional diviners also leads to the loss of his empire (Hdt. 1.107-8, 120). While it is possible to see Xenophon's emphasis on correct interpretation of omens as having arisen from his own experiences as related in the Anabasis (Gera 55), surely the lesson is more pointed when we consider

what happens to the rulers in Herodotus who cannot correctly interpret omens.

Cyropaedia 2.1-7.5.36 - *Cyrus' conquests*

The two most important events for understanding the intertextual construction of Cyrus may be found in Book 7: the capture of Sardis and Babylon. A good deal of scholarship has gone into proving that Xenophon knew Herodotus' versions of these events and shaped his own accounts either to include or to refute Herodotus. William Keller in 1911 could state that, "The question of Xenophon's acquaintance with the History of Herodotus is still unsettled" (252); he then goes on to show how Xenophon was acquainted with Herodotus' work especially with regard to the episodes at Sardis and Babylon. However, there is no scholar today who would dispute that Xenophon knew Herodotus' work as it pertained to Cyrus' capture of these two cities.¹⁹ Xenophon also knew Ctesias' work and referred to him by name in the Anabasis (1.8.26-27) - but not in the Cyropaedia. We are lucky in that three later Greek authors referred to Ctesias' version of the capture of Sardis (Pers. 9.4-5; 9b; 9c): we thus have a good idea of what Ctesias' version contained.

In Herodotus, the capture of Sardis gives Cyrus difficulties, in that he cannot determine how he is to capture such an impregnable city, defended by soldiers who are no cowards (ou [...] deiloi ēsan) (1.80.6). After fourteen days of siege, he makes one attempt, which fails, but then finally takes the city

by climbing the wall, after one of his soldiers has seen a Lydian climb down the wall (1.84). In Ctesias, at dawn Cyrus takes the city by placing Persian helmets on wooden posts and, raising them above the walls of the acropolis, convinces the Lydians that the city has already been taken; the Lydians then flee (Pers. 9b). Xenophon successfully absorbs and refutes both versions: Cyrus makes his attempt as soon as he arrives at Sardis, he raises up the scaling ladders and siege engines first, and then the conquest is made at night, up the steepest side of the acropolis, but led by a Persian slave who knows the way, and the Lydians flee (Cyr. 2.2-4). Thus Cyrus is not at a loss as to what to do, but rather fools the Lydians (refuting Herodotus); he does raise things against the wall, but they are scaling ladders, not helmets on poles (refuting Ctesias); he does take the city at night by going up the wall (combining Herodotus and Ctesias); and the Lydians flee, not because they were tricked but because they are cowardly (refuting both Herodotus and Ctesias). The overall effect is actually more like the battle of Thermopylae in Herodotus' work (7.213-28), but in a subtly reversed way: Cyrus sure what to do rather than Xerxes unsure how to take Thermopylae; one of the attackers' countrymen showing the way up the citadel rather than a traitor showing the way over the pass; the Lydians fleeing rather than the Spartans fighting to the death. Thus, although a similar tactic is used by Cyrus here, compared to Xerxes in the Histories, in the account of the

Cyropaedia the honour goes to the attacking Persians over the cowardly Lydians, rather than to the attacking Persians over the brave Spartans.

James Tatum's elegant reading of the capture of Sardis and the encounter between Cyrus and Croesus has more to say about the relationship of the Cyropaedia and Herodotus. He shows how the Cyrus of the Cyropaedia has completely absorbed all of the lessons of the Croesus of Herodotus; Cyrus in the Cyropaedia already knows about his own mortality and knows that his success had come not through good fortune but through his own skills (see above). This is all encapsulated in his use of the phrase "For we are both men [*epeiper anthrōpoi ge esmen amphoteroi*]" (Cyr. 7.2.10), bringing to mind Cyrus' thought in Herodotus, "that he himself was a mortal man [*hoti kai autos anthrōpos eōn*]" (Hdt. 1.86.6). Croesus teaches this lesson to Cyrus in Herodotus; in the Cyropaedia, it is Cyrus who teaches it to Croesus (JT 154). In a similar fashion, Cyrus immediately asks Croesus for advice in the Cyropaedia, which forces Croesus into becoming Cyrus' "tax-collector" (7.2.11); in Herodotus, it is Croesus who offers advice, and Cyrus who happily accepts it (1.88-89). Tatum points out that it seems that in the Cyropaedia Croesus wants to play the "child of misfortune," which he seems to be in Herodotus, but Cyrus prevents him through making him his tax-collector (JT 154-55).

Finally, there is the matter of Croesus and the oracle at Delphi. In the Cyropaedia, Cyrus introduces the subject, but once introduced, Croesus is very happy to continue the discussion. It is important to remember that all of Croesus' interactions with the Delphic oracle are given only through his own speech, and that in this speech we can see that he is deluding himself. Thus, when Croesus asks the oracle what he should do to live a happy life, he is told that in knowing himself he would be happy (*Sauton gignōskōn eudaimōn, Kroise, peraseis*) (7.2.20). As Tatum says, Croesus has paid a lot of money to find out what any traveler to Delphi could find out for free from the inscription on the temple, and he completely misunderstands the philosophy: it is not knowing what material things or desires would make one happy, but rather it is self-awareness that would. Cyrus does not correct Croesus' misapprehension, but rather restores to him the material things which Croesus thinks will make him happy - in the process, making him play a woman's role by providing for him (Cyr. 7.2.27-28; JT 156-57). The role reversal of Cyrus and Croesus between Herodotus and the Cyropaedia has the effect of making Croesus look foolish. As well, we should also recall that Xenophon was at some pains to show how Cyrus can read omens on his own, without recourse to oracles (see above); this makes Croesus look even more foolish.²⁶

However, while this discourse on happiness and self-awareness fits in perfectly with the purpose of the Cyropaedia, it also responds to the discussions between Croesus and Solon in Herodotus (1.30-33). Tatum has pointed out that all of the episodes dealing with Croesus, Solon and Cyrus in Herodotus are compressed in the Cyropaedia into the dialogue between Croesus and Cyrus (JT 149). Specifically, Croesus in the Cyropaedia does not fulfill any of the criteria for the happy man given by Solon's account of the happiest man (Tellus the Athenian) in Herodotus: he does not have (any longer) a prosperous city, nor fine sons, nor grandchildren, nor does he have wealth any longer, nor does he have a glorious death. When Cyrus restores Croesus to his wife, this also does not lead to the fulfillment of any of the criteria given in Herodotus. However, while Herodotus' position is that Croesus has learned the truth of Solon's claims and teaches them to Cyrus, Xenophon responds that Croesus never does understand Solon's points, and Cyrus already does (JT 148), and does not bother to enlighten him. The contrast between Croesus and Cyrus is clear when we read the Cyropaedia alone, but when we read it alongside Herodotus, the contrast is even greater.

On his march to Babylon from Sardis, Cyrus barely stops long enough to subdue Phrygia, Cappadocia and Arabia (Cyr. 7.4.16), and when he arrives, he finds the Babylonians secure behind their walls (7.5.1-2). This is in contrast to Cyrus'

march to Babylon in Herodotus: there he spends a whole summer subduing a river for washing away one of his horses, and then finds the Babylonian army waiting for him outside the city when he arrives (Hdt. 1.189-190). While Cyrus looks purposeful and direct in Xenophon's account, when we read the Cyropaedia with Herodotus in mind, we can see him as even more direct in his journey to achieve victory. His reputation must also be more imposing to the Babylonians of the Cyropaedia, as they are already hiding within their walls when he arrives, thus being much less courageous than the Babylonians of Herodotus.

As Gera has pointed out, there are many similarities between Xenophon's and Herodotus' versions of the capture of Babylon: the immense size of the city (Cyr. 7.5.2; Hdt. 1.178); the ability to take the city thwarted by the Babylonians' defenses (Cyr. 7.5.7; Hdt. 1.190-91);²¹ the diversion of the Euphrates (Cyr. 7.5.16; Hdt. 1.191); and the attack during a festival (Cyr. 7.5.15; Hdt. 1.191) (260-61; cf. Keller 257-58).²² However, what is key about the conquest of Babylon is that in the Cyropaedia it is Cyrus' climactic and final battle. After having traveled around the various parts of the Assyrian empire and its allies, he ends up in the centre, and conquers it. In Herodotus, however, although an important battle, it is not the end of Cyrus' campaigns, as Cyrus leaves Babylon to go to the fringes of his empire in order to battle the Massagetae (Hdt. 1.205). From what we can tell of Ctesias' account of Cyrus, he must be

depicted as leaving the heartland in order to campaign on the frontier (Pers. 9.7); although there is no mention of the conquest of Babylon itself in the surviving fragments,²³ it is clear that Cyrus' battles do end on the frontier (see below). Thus to Herodotus' and Ctesias' claims that Cyrus has a restless ambition that leads him to attempt further conquests, Xenophon replies that Cyrus' ambition is well-ordered, leading him around the world and back to the centre of it. With the conquest of Babylon, all is well (cf. JT 189).

Cyropaedia 7.5.37-8.6 - *The organization of the kingdom*

This section has no corresponding section in Herodotus or Ctesias in terms of providing a blueprint for Cyrus' administration. However, there are some interesting intertextual relationships nonetheless. The first serves to emphasize the contrast between Cyrus and Croesus, not only as it has been described earlier in the Cyropaedia, but also as it is described in Herodotus, especially with respect to the conversation between Croesus and Solon about happiness and wealth (cf. above). This is the conversation between Pheraulas and the Sacian in Cyr. 8.3.35-50, where Pheraulas complains of the burden his riches have placed upon him; he gives the management of them to the Sacian. Pheraulas, unlike Croesus, another one of Cyrus' creatures, realizes that wealth does not make him happy.

At the end of the section, in 8.6.19-20, we are told that Cyrus is said to have collected his army and gone off to campaign

against the other nations he has not already conquered, as well as Egypt. Due has suggested that these subsequent campaigns are compressed in the narrative because of the focus on the "just war" of Cyrus against the Assyrian aggressor (BD 161). Herodotus left the conquest of Egypt to Cyrus' son Cambyses (Hdt. 2.1), and Hirsch has speculated that there may have been the accretion of traditions about the deeds of Cyrus' successors to Cyrus himself (Friendship 79-80). It is important to note that rather than simply reporting these campaigns, Xenophon uses the word *legetai* ("it is said"), thus emphasizing the use of sources or traditions. By doing so, he incorporates the voices of the competing traditions into his work. It is as if he were saying that he knows his narrative opposes other texts, and he is thus both acknowledging that other positions exist and that his position opposes them.³⁴ If we consider that his use of *legetai* in 1.2.1 was ironic, then we must consider the possibility that his use of *legetai* here may also be ironic. It may point up Xenophon's change in the characterization of Cyrus, from restless to content.

Cyropaedia 8.7-8 - Cyrus' death and its aftermath

The final two chapters of the Cyropaedia offer extremely rich intertextual possibilities. In his funeral speech (8.7.6-28), Cyrus' summary of his achievements parallels the achievements of Tellus in Solon's account (Hdt. 1.30): Cyrus claims that 1) he has kept his health and strength into old age

(8.7.6); 2) he is at the peak of his power (8.7.6); 3) he has done good to his friends and harm to his enemies (8.7.7); 4) he leaves his country prosperous (8.7.7, 8); 5) he has retained all his wealth (8.7.7); 6) he has not boasted of his wealth or happiness (8.7.7);²⁵ 7) he has surviving sons (8.7.8); 8) his friends and country are happy (8.7.8); and 9) his funeral will be one for a person considered happy and of undying fame (8.7.27); he thus meets or exceeds Solon's requirements for a man to be considered happy and "preempts Solon's cautions" - he thus is a contrast to and correction of the Herodotean Croesus (Sage, "Tradition" 67-68).²⁶ Due suggests that Xenophon has completely changed the meaning of the Herodotean passage on happiness: Cyrus understands the happiness that Solon tried to tell Croesus about, and he has no hubris (BD 135) - Xenophon thus makes the point that Cyrus is no tragic hero. However, in one very important way is Cyrus deficient in meeting the criteria for happiness laid out in Herodotus: he does not see his sons happy nor does he have grandchildren living (Sage, "Tradition" 68). The problem of succession looms large over the last two chapters of the Cyropaedia; its importance is highlighted by this intertextual omission.

Cyrus' death is also interesting from an intertextual perspective. In the Cyropaedia, we have seen that Cyrus dies a peaceful death at home in Persia, surrounded by his family. This is very different from the death of Cyrus in both Herodotus and

Ctesias: in Herodotus, Cyrus dies a bloody death at the hands of the Massagetae (Hdt. 1.213-214), while in Ctesias, he dies because of a wound received in a battle against the Dyrbaeans (Pers. 9.7-8). However, Cyrus' death in the Cyropaedia is in a dialogic relationship with both of these versions.

It is important to note that after Herodotus gave his version of the death of Cyrus, he said, "There are many stories told of the end of Cyrus' life; I have told the one which is most persuasive [*pithanōtatos*] to me" (1.214.5; my translation). The opportunity for others to give the version which they thought would be most persuasive to them is there. Herodotus' version fits in nicely with the way he had presented Cyrus throughout Book 1: when Cyrus does things right he succeeds, and when he makes wrong decisions he fails. The story of Cyrus' final campaigns and his death fits in with this pattern: his earlier virtues are fading, and his ineptness as a ruler is becoming predominant (Avery 536-37, 542).²⁷ Xenophon's Cyrus, knowing all of the lessons that Herodotus' Cyrus, Croesus and Solon have to teach, knows also how to avoid the death of the Herodotean Cyrus; instead of boasting that the gods always warn him of impending dangers (as in Hdt. 1.209), he claims that he has never boasted of the gods' favour. He also knows how to interpret correctly the dream that foretells his own death, in contrast to the Herodotean Cyrus (Hdt. 1.210; BD 133; Gera 119). Ctesias' version of the death of Cyrus seems to have more in common with

Xenophon's: the deathbed scene, setting up Cambyses as king with Tanaoxares as satrap over large provinces, and the prayer for everyone to get along (Pers. 9.8). However, while Ctesias' Cyrus tells his sons to obey their mother, Xenophon's Cyrus gives a long discourse on the propriety of Tanaoxares' obedience to his brother (the rightful king) (Cyr. 8.7.16). Moreover, Ctesias' Cyrus dies because of a battle, a battle that is won even as he is dying;²⁸ Xenophon's Cyrus dies at home peacefully. It is also important to note which satrapies were given to Tanaoxares: in Ctesias (Pers. 9.8) it is Bactria, Choramnia, Parthia and Kerman, regions on the eastern fringes of the empire; in Xenophon (Cyr. 8.7.11) it is Media, Armenia and Cadusia, regions right in the heartland of the empire - in Xenophon's account, both sons are seen as central to the proper function of the empire. Thus Xenophon both incorporates and refutes the position of both Herodotus and Ctesias with respect to Cyrus' death: Xenophon's Cyrus does everything right where Herodotus' and Ctesias' Cyrus have erred.²⁹

Finally, I would like to turn to the Cyropaedia's epilogue of 8.8. Not only is it an example of dialogism within the Cyropaedia, it is also in a dialogic relationship with the end of Herodotus' Histories. Herodotus ended his work by referring to a story about Cyrus (9.122): once he had gained rule over an empire, Cyrus was asked by his people whether they should leave their country and take possession of a richer one; Cyrus replied

that they could if they wished to, but that soft lands bred soft men who would no longer be able to rule a great empire. In Herodotus' version, the Persians acknowledged that Cyrus was right, and they were content to live in their harsh land (cf. Avery 534-35). So the Cyropaedia also makes much of the softness of the Persians of Xenophon's own day, and suggests that the Persian Empire was in decline. But Xenophon put a twist on the Herodotean formulation: instead of the Persians asking to move to a softer land, but being content with their own once Cyrus pointed out the dangers of a move, they brought the customs of the softer lands to them while at the same time maintaining the letter of the customs of their harsher land. Xenophon refined the Herodotean position by saying that rulers can become soft without moving to a softer land, if they no longer hold on to the virtues which made them rulers in the first place.

Cyrus

In the Cyropaedia, Xenophon constructed his hero Cyrus as an ideal ruler; ideal in two senses: perfect in almost every way, and unique. He is a perfect warrior and a perfect philosopher, always with the perfect battle tactic at hand along with a perfect understanding of himself and the route to true happiness. He rules himself, and thus rules his empire. Xenophon tried to demonstrate how Cyrus came by his abilities, through his origins, nature and education. Throughout his life, Cyrus displays a

series of qualities which have come from his nature and are refined by his education: *dikaiosynē* (justice), *charis* (gratitude/ generosity), *sōphrosynē* (temperance), *peithesthai* (obedience), and *eusebia* (piety), along with *philomathia* (love of learning) and *philotimia* (ambition). However, it is also important to remember that the greatest portion of the work is given over to the description of Cyrus' journey of conquest: military tactics, diplomacy and other tools of empire building are given extreme importance.

Where necessary, Xenophon used material from Herodotus and Ctesias in his construction of Cyrus without credit - he reworked it in order to create a dialogic relationship between the Cyropaedia and those other texts. Xenophon used several techniques in order to create his intertextual Cyrus. He fictionalized previous traditions, where the tradition is kept but its meaning is changed (as in the cupbearer tradition). He used phrases such as "it is generally agreed" ironically. The use of *legetai* marks those passages where Xenophon was most ardently casting doubt on or opposing the position of Herodotus and Ctesias, most notably in Books 1 and 8; otherwise, his intertextual constructions are subtler. He replaced characters in episodes, such as the episode of Pheraulas and Sacian. He used role reversal; this is especially marked with respect to Croesus. The result is a change in characterization: Herodotus'

tragic king and Ctesias' failed warrior-king become Xenophon's perfect military leader and philosopher-king.

Generally, Xenophon's use of intertextuality emphasizes and reaffirms his position that he had already put forward. He did not need to use Herodotus or Ctesias, and in fact often did not, but his integration and refutation of their positions within his own text adds depth to his own work. It also adds irony, or enhances the pleasure of reading the text. At this point, we can begin to see what might be a generic form of (political) philosophy: the disputation between competing voices in the text. This is more easily seen in the Socratic dialogues of both Plato and Xenophon, where the competing voices are clearly marked in the dialogue. Here in the Cyropaedia we have the dialogue internalized into the narrative, with Xenophon-as-narrator taking the place of Socrates, and Herodotus and Ctesias taking the place of Socrates' interlocutors.

Notes

1. Cyrus seems to have been a figure with whom many ancient peoples were fascinated. Thus, he appears in the various historical texts of the Hellenistic world, such as Herodotus' Histories and Ctesias' Persica. Xenophon also appears not to have been the first to deal with the life of Cyrus: his predecessor Antisthenes wrote at least one and perhaps two works which dealt with the life of Cyrus, although neither is extant today (cf. Gera 8-9). Cyrus also appears in the works of the Greek orators, such as Isocrates, a contemporary of Xenophon's (5.66-67 To Philip; 9.37-38 Evagoras), and in Aeschylus' Persians (768-72), about a century before the Cyropaedia. In the Hebrew Bible, Cyrus appears several times, most notably in Isaiah, where he is considered to be God's anointed, carrying out the divine plan (Isa. 44.28-45.1); and in the first verses of Ezra (1.1-8=2 Chron. 36.22-23), where he allowed the Jews to return to their homeland (his warrant is then referred to in several more places in Ezra). The earliest "idealizing" tendencies in the depiction of Cyrus must date to his own lifetime, as the evidence of the "Cyrus Cylinder" and the "Verse Account of Nabonidus" shows (Pritchard 313-316). Cyrus was a figure who appealed to many different peoples of the ancient world.
2. Hirsch has pointed out that the correspondences between Cyrus the Great in the Cyropaedia and Cyrus the Younger in the Anabasis are numerous and well attested ("1001" 75).
3. Farber traces the relationship between the Cyropaedia and the kings of the Hellenistic period, showing how Xenophon's political thought anticipated Hellenistic political thought; he concludes that the Hellenistic writers knew the Cyropaedia (514).
4. Cizek has characterized Herodotus' Cyrus as being in the Aeschylean tragic model and Ctesias' Cyrus as being in the romance model of post-Euripidean drama (538).
5. Dillery (64); Due (BD 29-30); Gera (11); Tatum (JT 51); Higgins has stated that the Constitution cannot be dated with any certainty (131-32).
6. Gera suggests that Cyrus' asking for and acceptance of advice from Croesus marks Croesus as a wise advisor to Cyrus (268). I would suggest that Cyrus is merely using Croesus to get his desired results: an intact city and plenty of loot; this "advice" was merely the tool by which he could manipulate Croesus.

7. Contra Higgins, who states that Croesus understands that he lost to Cyrus because he had overestimated himself (52).
8. Gera sees the use of the term *despotēs* by Croesus as a genuine meekness on his part. She suggests that Cyrus "seems unusually benevolent here [...]" and compares Cyrus' behaviour to Croesus to his behaviour to the rebellious Armenian king in *Cyr.* 3.1 (266). I would suggest that the two situations are different: the Armenian king rebels, and is defeated, and his "court-martial" is an opportunity for him to convict himself. Cyrus is harsh with him because he wants him to learn of Cyrus' superiority, as the Armenian king's son Tigranes says, "But if people are convinced that others are superior to themselves, they are often ready even without compulsion to submit to them" (3.1.20). Croesus is a different challenge, because he has already (through his exchange with Cyrus) shown no compunction about changing sides and flattering the one who had conquered him without really thinking him a superior; there can be no doubt that he will do so again if the opportunity presents itself.
9. Cyrus says, *ei mē tin' oun allon tropon echete legein, toutō poliorkēteous phēmi einai tous andras*, "Therefore, unless you have some other method to suggest, I propose that we use this method of laying siege [i.e., starvation] to these gentlemen." Chrysantas responds with a question, *ho de potamos [...] houtos ou dia mesēs tēs poleōs rhei platos echōn pleion ē epi duo stadia*, "But [...] does not this river flow through the midst of the city? And it is more than two stadia in width" (7.5.7-8). There had been no talk of the river previously.
10. The sentence *toutous d' hypetitheis toutou heneka hopōs hoti malista eoikoi poliorkēsein paraskeuazomenō, hōs ei kai diaphygoi ho potamos eis tēn taphron, mē aneloi tous pyrgous*, "He used these as a foundation, so that it was most like he was making preparations to lay siege, in order that, even if the river escaped into the trench, it would not carry off the towers" (7.5.12; my translation) has given commentators some difficulty, and the critical editions usually bracket *hopōs ... paraskeuazomenō*, "so that ... siege," as an interpolation. However, the entire sentence can be understood as expressing in the one sentence both Cyrus' actual intentions and the Babylonians' understanding of his actions, cf. Holden (107).
11. Dialogue between Cyrus and Croesus on wealth, 8.2.15-23; between Cyrus and his associates on personal adornment, 8.3.2-6; between Cyrus and the Sacian on the bravery of Cyrus' men,

8.3.26-30; between Cyrus and Gobryas on generosity, 8.4.7-8; between Cyrus and Hystaspas on obedience, 8.4.9-12; between Cyrus and his associates on marriage, 8.4.13-27; between Cyrus and his men on wealth, 8.4.32-36; between Cyrus and Cyaxares, 8.5.19-20. There is one long discourse on the practicality of setting up satrapies in 8.6.3-13, but this discourse merely summarizes the practices Cyrus has put into place earlier.

12. Of the modern commentators, only Hirsch has seen 8.8 as a later addition to the Cyropaedia. All of the others (Gera, Tatum, Due, Sage, Higgins) follow Delebecque (405-8) in seeing 8.8 as a Xenophontic composition, although possibly added to the work later by the author. See Tatum (JT 220-25) for a good discussion of the ideologies behind seeing 8.8 as a later editorial addition.

13. However, Carlier, who also notes this omission, asks whether the faults of Cyrus' successors should be attributed to their nature or education. He concludes that since nothing is known about their nature, on balance it must have been their education that was defective (161-62).

14. A close examination of the correspondence of the examples of Persian decay in 8.8 with the occurrence of the institutions said to be *eti kai nyn* is instructive. There are 26 occurrences of the phrase *eti kai nyn* in the Cyropaedia referring to institutions set up by Cyrus or existing before Cyrus: 1.2.16 (x2); 1.3.2; 1.4.27; 4.3.23; 6.1.30; 7.1.4, 46, 47; 7.5.70; 8.1.6, 7, 24, 36; 8.2.4, 7; 8.3.9, 10, 34; 8.4.5, 28; 8.5.21, 27; 8.6.5, 9, 14, 16. Of these 26 institutions, only six are specifically referred to in 8.8: the custom of not spitting or blowing the nose (1.2.16 // 8.8.8); the custom of moderate fare (1.2.16 // 8.8.9); the custom of the hunt (8.1.36 // 8.8.12); the custom of plain clothing and frugal habits (1.3.2 // 8.8.15); the custom of going on horseback (4.3.23 // 8.8.19); and the use of scythe-bearing chariots (7.1.47 // 8.8.24); and in all of these cases, Xenophon shows how the tradition was still followed but not in its original spirit. Concerning the other 19 institutions, their continuation is not discussed in 8.8, nor are the practices which Xenophon says in 8.8 came from antiquity discussed earlier in the Cyropaedia with the *eti kai nyn* phrase. There is the interesting case of 1.6.23, where in his speech Cambyses says that in his day boys were taught to speak the truth; Xenophon appears to be saying in 8.8.2-3 that the Persian word was not worth anything in his own day, but we should recall that it is only in Cambyses' speech that this tradition was

persisting. Xenophon himself did not say that this tradition was still found to his day.

15. Delebecque points out that Xenophon takes care to preview his epilogue with passages earlier in the work: 8.1.7-8 shows the conditionality of good rule upon the ruler; 8.7.9-20 warns the two sons to get along; and 8.1.48 suggests that the ruler needs to make the nobility his friends to preclude them allying amongst themselves (406-7).

16. This warning is not unlike Samuel's warning about the dangers of having a king in 1 Sam. 8 and 12.

17. If this fragment can be trusted to have transmitted Ctesias' work, Cyrus' rise in Ctesias is not unlike the rise of David in 1 Samuel. However, see my comments in the Introduction on the use of Nicolaus' work.

18. Wood points out that for Xenophon, law was the "rightful" command of the leader; Xenophon did not mention law in most of his works. The question of legitimacy for a ruler never comes up in Xenophon's works; rather political leadership is judged on performance (61-63).

19. Thus Tatum calls the Cyropaedia's account of Cyrus and Croesus "plainly a radical revision of Herodotus," where Xenophon "compressed, if not indeed suppressed, so much of Herodotus" (JT 149); Hirsch states that the capture of Sardis and its aftermath is a "conscious elaboration of the Herodotean material," as is the capture of Babylon (Friendship 77-78); Gera asserts that Croesus' story is clearly dependent on Herodotus (215); Due suggests that Xenophon "also supposed that at least some of his readers would have been familiar with it [Herodotus] and able to relish the omissions, changes and differences his version represents" ("Xenophon" 590).

20. Hirsch suggests that Xenophon was criticizing Herodotus for misunderstanding the meaning of Croesus' association with Delphi: Croesus offends the god through testing him and then pestering the oracle. The oracle does not treat Croesus "shabbily," it answers him not with enigmatic puzzles about empires falling, but with profound truth which Croesus does not recognize (Friendship 169).

21. Note that in the Cyropaedia it is the size of the walls which leads a direct attack to be unprofitable, and that Cyrus believes that the great mass of people inside will quickly eat

the provisions, thus making a siege the only option available (7.5.7), whereas in Herodotus it is the amount of provisions that makes a siege not worthwhile (1.190).

22. Keller notes that Xenophon stated five times that it was a night attack (7.5.15, 15, 16, 21, 25), thus making up for Herodotus' failure to note the time of day of the attack (257). Dan. 5.1, 30 also has the attack taking place during a festival at night.

23. If we follow the account of Nicolaus, there is no need for a conquest of Babylon, since it has long been part of the Median Empire (Drews 113).

24. Hirsch has suggested that the use (three times) of *legetai* in Cyr. 8.6.20-22 is contrary to Xenophon's normal practice and it indicates that Xenophon was only reporting something he had heard, a tradition (Friendship 79-80). I would note that of the 32 uses of *legetai* in the Cyropaedia, 25 are used by the narrator of a tradition about Cyrus, and these are found largely in Book 1 and Book 8 (1.2.1 [x2]; 1.3.4, 15; 1.4.25, 26 [x2], 27; 1.5.1; 8.2.9, 13, 15, 18, 19; 8.3.26; 8.6.19, 20 [x2]; the others are 2.1.11; 4.2.13, 15; 4.5.9; 5.2.20; 7.3.15). It is not a coincidence, I think, that Books 1 and 8 relate material either not paralleled in other authors, or described in very different ways - it is as if Xenophon here was emphasizing his relationship to his sources.

25. Due emphasizes that in Cyrus' final address he takes up the theme of good fortune (*eudaimonia*), and that until his final moment he is always afraid his luck would change (133-34). This takes Solon's lesson to its final extreme.

26. Cf. Keller (256) on Cyrus' country's prosperity, his surviving children, his wealth, and his peaceful death; Keller also notes the emphatic use of *egō* in 8.7.9 to refer to Cyrus and the fulfillment of Solon's happy man; cf. also Gera (121), Due (BD 133-37).

27. Avery also notes that the depiction of Cyrus in Book 1 of Herodotus does not match the mentions of Cyrus in the rest of the Histories, where he is held up as a model for later kings (530, 535).

28. Drews has pointed out that it was the only full-out battle in Ctesias' account that Cyrus actually wins, and only with the

help of his allies, otherwise trickery is used in his conquests (199).

29. Due suggests that the versions of Xenophon and Ctesias of Cyrus' death are similar only with respect to Cyrus' calm behaviour, and that the other similarities are minor (BD 136-37). Gera examines the death scene in light of what we can conjecture about the death scene of the hero in Persian traditional stories, and concludes that the similarities between Xenophon and Ctesias go beyond simply fitting into this pattern; Ctesias' account was one of the bases for Xenophon's account (117). The fragmentary condition of Ctesias' Persica leads to such speculations. However, it would be more in line with Xenophon's practice elsewhere in the Cyropaedia with respect to Herodotus and Ctesias to suggest that he both incorporates and refutes the positions of other authors.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CHRONICLER'S DAVID

Previous discussions of David in Chronicles

There is generally a broad consensus among scholars about the depiction of David in Chronicles. Especially when compared to David's depiction in Samuel-Kings, in Chronicles David is idealized: he is shown to have all good characteristics and no bad ones. This understanding of David is usually developed from comparisons of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles - very rarely is David read in Chronicles alone. The same can be said for all of the kings in Chronicles.

The consensus regarding the length of the David narrative in Chronicles has been summed up by Braun, "There is no denying that an unusually large proportion of the Chronicler's work seems to concern itself with David" (RB xxxiii; cf. PRA 48). He is the ruler to whom the greatest amount of text has been devoted. This does not mean, as Braun points out, that the other kings have been excluded, but rather that David is of greater importance than other kings (xxxiiii).

It is often pointed out that the David of 1 Chronicles is a public figure; A. Graeme Auld has said that this is "appropriat[e] enough for a king!" (35). All of David's actions take place in public, and are all relevant to a king's duties.

David's role in Chronicles, therefore, is exclusively that of a king, not a father or a husband, nor a young warrior, nor a guerrilla fighter.

David and Solomon are often seen as one unit; that is, Solomon's reign is really the completion of David's. Certainly they are depicted in complementary ways in Chronicles (I will discuss this further in Chapter Four). 1 Chron. 28-29 is really the bridge between the two reigns, and, as Braun points out, although these chapters are usually dealt with in the David portion of the narrative, they are of equal importance to the story of Solomon (RB xxxv). In the analysis that follows, therefore, I will deal with these chapters twice: once in this chapter while dealing with David, and a second time in Chapter Four while dealing with Solomon.

Scholars generally have seen the characterization of David in Chronicles as follows. Japhet has seen three things which guided the Chronicler's depiction of both David and Solomon: 1) "the glorification of the king's figure," which she points out is the feature most often discussed in the scholarly literature; 2) "a focus on the king's public figure rather than on his private life," which is more applicable to David than to Solomon when we take Samuel-Kings into consideration (cf. Auld, above); and 3) "a strong emphasis on the Temple, as the central interest of the two kings." She also points out that David is not completely idealized considering that he is disqualified from building the

Temple and he is twice described as having committed a sin (1 Chron. 15.13; 21.8) (SJ 48). De Vries also makes a brief mention of the ideal nature of David and Solomon's reign without clarifying how this is depicted (SJV 112-13). Ackroyd and Myers both see the Davidic ideal as representing the state of the kingdom which could be recreated in the Chronicler's own time (PRA 27-28; JMM1 xxxi-xxxii); Myers suggests that it was the idea of the Davidic king and not David himself that was important (lxxxii). Williamson, on the other hand, suggests that the Chronicler was not interested in portraying kingship and the kings in any particular light, beyond considering David and Solomon's reign to have been one unit (HGMW 27-28).

The issue of David's blamelessness and idealization is the one that most scholars have focused on (as Japhet states, above). Thus, Braun points out that the Chronicler's David is not blameless (for the same reasons as Japhet states). However, David does have idealized features: his role as mastermind of the cultic music (including instruments, lyrics, and Levitical musical groups); establisher of the Levitical divisions; and his role as eschatological hope for Israel (RB xxxiii). William Riley focuses on David's role as cult founder, and concludes that David is idealized so that the cult depicted by the Chronicler will have an appropriate pedigree (57-58). This is a view implied in most scholarship on Chronicles (cf. de Vries, "Moses" 636-37).

The episode that gives scholars the most trouble when looking at the depiction of David in Chronicles is the episode of the census in 1 Chron. 21, which seems to lead to David's disqualification as builder of the Temple, and thus to a lessening of David's idealization. It seems likely that it was too well known in antiquity that the "historical" David did not build the Temple for the Chronicler to have shown David as the Temple builder (as founder of the dynasty it would have been expected that he would build the dynastic sanctuary); thus an excuse had to be found (Dirksen 53-54). The taking of the census in 1 Chron. 21 becomes the excuse. However, both Knoppers and John Wright have seen this episode not as a negative depiction of David, but as a positive one: Knoppers concludes that the depiction of David may be more complex than is usually thought, and Wright concludes that David tries to take the blame for Joab's failure ("Images" 469-71, 454; "Innocence").¹ I will discuss this episode further below in my analysis.

Generally then, scholars see David as being idealized in Chronicles, and this idealization has strong links to his participation in the organization of Temple and cult. What I find interesting about the strong link between David and the cult made by most scholars is that there is no attempt made by most scholars to either 1) define what it is that makes David (or any of the kings of Judah) so "ideal" besides the cult, if anything - they often assume that it is only the cult; or 2) show how David

(or any of the kings) is depicted in the text as "ideal" or not. My analysis that follows will attempt to remedy this deficiency by showing what the features of the ideal king are in Chronicles, and how David fulfills the criteria. The second part of my analysis will examine how the ideal king is constructed dialogically; that is, how David can be read in Chronicles in relationship to other texts: this will show how David is constructed intertextually.

Reading David in Chronicles

1 Chronicles 9.35-12.40 - Saul's death and the consolidation of David's kingship²

The first few verses of this section, 1 Chron. 9.35-44, repeat the genealogical lineage of Saul given in 1 Chron. 8.29-38. Rather than an unnecessary doubling, we should see the first genealogy of 8.29-38 as fitting within the genealogy of the tribe of Benjamin as a whole (1 Chron. 8), while the genealogy of 9.35-44, coming as it does after the description of the lineage and function of the Levites in 9.1-34, should be seen as the prologue to the episode of Saul's death. The genealogy of 9.35-44, therefore, gives us the context for the appearance of Saul in 10.2: it tells us who Saul is, where he comes from, and what happens to his lineage after his death and the death of three of his sons.³

In terms of narrative time, 1 Chron. 10.1-12.40 operates in a disjointed sequence. The events are not recounted one after another. Instead, the narrative is punctuated by a series of flash-forwards and flashbacks. The first flash-forward, 10.7, has the Philistines settling in the abandoned Israelite cities at some point after the battle at Gilboa. The second flash-forward is found in 11.4-9, and describes the capture of Jerusalem, which does not take place until after the action of 12.38-40 (12.33-40 is the completion of the action of 11.1-3), but before the action of chapter 13, since 13.13 presupposes the capture of Jerusalem. Within this flash-forward is a flashback, 11.4-5, in which David sets and Joab wins the prize for the capture. As well, the action of 11.1-2 seems to be taking place at the same time as 10.8-12, while 11.3, David's anointing, might be taken as the first event which takes place after the action of chapter 10 is complete. The list of David's warriors in 11.10-12.37, inserted into the middle of the story of David's anointing, also gives accounts of the warriors' previous actions (11.11, 13-14, 15-19, 20, 22-23; 12.1-2, 8, 11, 16-18, 19-22), and looks forward to the positions given to the various men later in David's reign (11.20-21, 25). In fact, this disjointed narrative sequence continues through most of 1 Chronicles. The effect is curious. Although the Chronicler understood the concept of temporality (the expression *wayhî mimmoḥōrāt* 'on the next day' is used in 10.8) (SJV 118), this mixing of temporalities has the effect of making

all of the events of 10.1-12.40 appear to occur at once.⁴

They are, in effect, all part of one event: the consolidation of David's kingship.⁵

The language used in this passage also serves to tie 1 Chron. 10 to what follows. In 10.9, the Philistines raise up (wayyis'û) Saul's head, and in 10.12 the men of Jabesh raise up (wayyis'û) Saul's body. In Chronicles as a whole, outside of bearing arms, the verb *nāsā'* is used predominantly to describe the actions of lifting the ark or making offerings. These actions in 1 Chron. 10, then, are described using cultic vocabulary: Saul's head and body are sacrifices -- Saul himself could be seen as a sacrifice. However, since the Philistines carry away Saul's head and set it up in the temple of Dagon, Saul is sacrificed or made an offering to Dagon.

The word *rō'š* 'head' is also prominent in 1 Chron 10.1-12.40. First, in 10.9, Saul's head (*rō'šô*) is lifted up. Then in 11.6, in a multiple play on the word *rō'š*, Joab is made chief (*lērō'š*) and commander for taking Jerusalem first (*bari'sônâ*) (cf. SJ 241). Joab's headiness is contrasted to Saul's headlessness, both in the literal as well as in the metaphorical sense: Joab is now head of the people while Saul is not. The other chiefs of David's army are also described in this section using the word *rō'š* (11.10, 11, 15, 20, 42; 12.3, 10, 15, 19 (twice), 21, 24, 33); almost one-quarter of the occurrences of *rō'š* in 1 Chronicles occur between 10.9-12.33. In an aside in 12.20, we

are told that earlier the Philistine chiefs had expressed their fear that David would desert to Saul and cost them their heads (*běra'shênû*); in fact, the opposite happens, as Saul loses his head. Saul's role as military commander is removed from him here, as his role as worshipper of Yhwh is removed from him by his being sacrificed to Dagon. On a similar note, it is important to notice that only once is Saul called king (*melek*) in Chronicles, and it is here in 11.2. It is as if Saul was never really king at all, and the one mention in 11.2 is there simply to emphasize Saul's non-kingship.

There is another point to be made about the language of this passage. In 10.10, Saul's skull (*gulgoltô*) is nailed up in the temple of Dagon, and in 10.12 his bones (*'ašmôtêhem*) are buried in Jabesh-Gilead. In 11.1, the people tell David, "Behold, we are your bone [*'ašmēkâ*] and your flesh [*ûbēsārēkâ*]." In 1 Chron. 10, it is clear that the Philistines send Saul's head and armour on a tour around their land before laying them up in their temples. This would account for Saul's head being only a skull - some time has passed. After this period has passed, the men of Jabesh go to the battlefield and collect Saul's body, which likewise has been reduced to bone.⁶ The flesh is no longer united with the bone at this point. Thus when the people speak to David in 11.1, it is a contrast between the union of flesh and bone of David and the people on the one hand, and the fleshlessness of Saul on the other. Saul no longer has any power

at all; even his remains are immaterial. The long list of David's warriors and the numbers of his supporters in 11.10-12.37 also emphasizes the complete power and total support that David has.

Finally, there is the bridge of 10.13-14, which joins the account of Saul's death to the account David's anointing. In these verses, Saul is castigated for his unfaithfulness (*bēma'ālō 'ašer mā'al*), his not keeping the word of Yhwh, his consultation of a necromancer (*bā'ôb*), and for his not seeking (*wēlō'-dāraš*) Yhwh. Kalimi has suggested that there is a deliberate antithesis between the seeking of a necromancer and the not seeking of Yhwh ("Contribution" 195). It has been often pointed out that *ma'al* is a specific technical term for forsaking God (cf. SJ 229-230), frequently used in Chronicles.⁷ Similarly, *dāraš* in Chronicles emphasizes the seeking of Yhwh and his commandments. Saul is condemned in language common to the rest of Chronicles (HGMW 95). It is possible to conclude, therefore, that the ideal ruler of Israel would not be unfaithful (*ma'al*), and would seek (*dāraš*) Yhwh, not other gods or necromancers. The classic formulation in Chronicles of this tenet is found, for example, in 1 Chron. 28.9, "If you seek him [*'im-tidrēšennû*] he will be found by you, and if you forsake him [*wē'im-ta'azbennû*] he will reject you forever." A similar formulation is found in 2 Chron. 15.2, while 2 Chron. 15.13 states that those who do not seek (*lō'-yidrōš*) Yhwh should be put to death; this is Saul's fate.

It is interesting that the Chronicler chose to add 10.13-14 after the episode of 10.1-12, which does not show Saul having any of the characteristics for which he is condemned in 10.13-14. It is likely, therefore, that Saul is being condemned for his general attitude.⁶ Here is an example of a dialogic relationship within Chronicles, an example of its heteroglossia. 1 Chron. 10.1-12 presents a position: Saul, leader of his house (king, if we accept the declaration of 11.2), dies in a battle with the Philistines, and his house dies with him. He dies because of a military event: for some reason, the army is not able to fend off the Philistines. Saul is defeated, and wishing to save whatever is left of his personal dignity, he commits suicide. 1 Chron. 10.13-14, however, answers this position. These verses say, no, Saul does not die because of his military defeat, God kills him because of his *ma'al*. Although this latter position tends to overwhelm the first, the first remains, and by its very presence prevents the monologic vision of the second.

In all, this passage contrasts Saul with David and his associates. Saul is dead, mere bones, headless, sacrificed to Dagon, and no king at all; while David is alive, flesh and bone, with Joab as head of the people, and he himself very much the king. The rest of 1 Chronicles will show if David is a proper king: whether he seeks Yhwh and is faithful to him, or whether he deserves to die like Saul.

Once we have read this passage of 1 Chron. 9.35-12.40, it becomes clear that it fits perfectly within Chronicles. Its purpose is to demonstrate the unfitness of Saul and the fitness of David.⁹ It acts as the introduction to the work as a whole: it lays out the framework by which we may judge the fit and unfit king.

1 Chronicles 13.1-16.43 - The Ark

The first action that David takes upon being anointed king is to bring the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem. The key word that binds this entire section together is 'ārôn 'Ark': it appears 29 times, about 60% of the occurrences in Chronicles. The Ark is named in five different ways in this section: eleven times it is called "the Ark of God" ('ārôn-'ēlōhîm) (13.3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14; 15.1, 2, 15, 24; 16.1); seven times it is called simply "the Ark" (ha'ārôn) (13.9, 10, 13; 15.23, 24, 27; 16.37); five times it is called "the Ark of Yhwh" ('ārôn-yhwh) (15.2, 3, 12, 14; 16.4); five times it is called "the Ark of the Covenant of Yhwh" ('ārôn-bērît-yhwh) (15.25, 26, 28, 29; 16.37); and once it is called "the Ark of the Covenant of God" ('ārôn-bērît-'ēlōhîm) (16.6). Most commentators have seen this variety of names (when they have considered it at all) to be a result of a poor textual tradition on the part of the source text (i.e. the notoriously corrupt text of Samuel) and/or heavy redaction or editing (cf. Ulrich 197). I would suggest, however, that the names are important. The Ark is called "the Ark of God" while it

is outside Jerusalem, but once it begins to make its final journey into the city of Jerusalem in 15.2, it is called "the Ark of Yhwh," and once it is inside the city of Jerusalem in 15.25, it is called "the Ark of the covenant of Yhwh," or simply "the Ark." Throughout the rest of Chronicles, the Ark is usually called "the Ark" or "the Ark of the Covenant of Yhwh," and of course, it is inside Jerusalem. Although there are some exceptions to the above schema (which can easily be explained by scribal errors during transmission, and are minor), it seems to describe an increasing level of sacredness as the Ark was brought from its resting place outside Jerusalem, to a temporary resting place, and finally into the city itself.

That David's first act of bringing the Ark into the city is extremely important is emphasized by his own words in 1 Chron. 13.3, "Then let us bring again the ark of our God to us; for we did not turn to it in the days of Saul." Again, David is being held up against the negative model of Saul: while Saul had not brought the Ark to the people, David does (cf. HGMW 113-14; Riley 45, 59).¹⁰ The language of this phrase also points out the contrast: just as Yhwh in 10.14 turns over (*wayyassēb*) the kingdom to David because Saul did not seek him, at this point (13.3) David seeks to turn (*wēnāsēbbā*) the Ark back to its proper home (SJ 276).

Again, in this section there is a disjointed sequence of narrative time. The previous section concludes with David's

anointing in Hebron (12.38-40); now David intends to bring the Ark into Jerusalem as his first action; when has he captured Jerusalem? Of course, the capture and fortification is recounted in the flash-forward of 11.4-9. By placing the episode of the capture in chapter 11, it becomes part of David's consolidation of his kingship (in order to be king, one needs a capital city), and makes David's first act after his anointing the removal of the Ark. Or, it all happens at once.

The tribute of Hiram of Tyre and the military actions against the Philistines, and the description of David's children given in chapter 14 cannot all possibly occur within the three month time frame given in 13.14 for the Ark's temporary rest at the house of Obed-edom (SJ 284; WJ 1: 177; HGMW 117). It may be that the three months simply denotes an interval during which David can perform more deeds to justify bringing the Ark into Jerusalem. At the conclusion of chapter 13, it seems that the Ark cannot be brought into Jerusalem. The events of chapter 14 are told in order to justify the arrival of the Ark. Three things happen: tribute, specifically cedar logs, is given to David (14.1); David has many sons (14.3-5); David defeats the Philistines not once but twice (14.8-17). We are specifically told that the tribute allows David to see that he is established as king and that his kingdom is "highly exalted" (14.2). We are also told that the military victories spread David's fame and that "the LORD brought the fear of him on all nations" (14.17).

So although David's first act as king is to bring the Ark into Jerusalem, the act cannot be completed until he has 1) received the homage of other kings; 2) has many children; and 3) defeats other peoples who have made incursions into Israel (notably the Philistines) in battle - he makes the borders of Israel secure. Again, this is all in direct contrast to Saul in chapter 10, who did not receive the homage of other kings, whose sons died, and who was defeated by the Philistines (cf. HGMW 116-117).

The language of 14.8-17 has many similarities with the language of chapter 10, mostly giving rise to contrasts. In 10.7, the Israelites are in the valley (*bā'ēmeq*), and flee because they are defeated; in 14.9 and 14.13, the Philistines are defeated in valleys (*bā'ēmeq*). In 10.7, the Israelites abandon (*wayya'azbû*) their towns; in 14.12, the Philistines abandon (*wayya'azbû*) their gods: note that the gods of the Philistines are defeated, as a contrast to Saul's armour and skull being laid up in the Philistines' temples after his defeat. In 14.10 and 14.14, David inquires (*wayyiš'al*) of God, in order to seek out God's commands: although a nice contrast would have been for the word *dāraš* 'to seek' to be used in order to contrast with Saul's not seeking (*wēlō'-dāraš*) in 10.13-14, the use of *šā'al* 'to ask' makes an even more direct contrast, as it is the root from which Saul's name comes. Not only that, but it is the same word which is used to describe Saul's inquiring of a necromancer in 10.13 (HGMW 117-18). Both the themes and the specific language of

chapter 14, therefore, further emphasize the contrast between David and Saul, pointing up David's proper kingly actions. Although the verb *dāraš* is not used in chapter 14, it is used three times in the rest of the section, in 13.3, 15.13, and 16.11. In 13.3, David says, "Then let us bring again the ark of our God to us, for we did not turn [*lō' dērašnūhū* 'we did not seek'] to it in the days of Saul." Again, Saul's not seeking is emphasized (HGMW 115). When the removal of the Ark was resumed in chapter 15, David says, "Because you [Levites] were not there the first time, the LORD our God burst out against us, because we did not seek [*lō' dērašnūhū*] it out properly" (15.13, my translation). David at this point recognizes that seeking out Yhwh properly was very important. Finally, in the hymn at the dedication of the Ark, the people are instructed to "[s]eek [*diršū*] the LORD and his strength" (16.11); seek out Yhwh and no one else for guidance.

Most of chapter 15 and the non-hymn portion of chapter 16 are given over to describing how David arranges for the proper guardianship of the Ark: he prepares a place for the Ark (15.1); he commands that only Levites should carry the Ark (15.2) - he attributes the previous disaster with the Ark in 14.10 to the lack of proper levitical attention (15.13); he gathers the Levites and priests (who are properly numbered and accounted for) (15.4-11); he instructs the Levites to appoint musicians, singers and gatekeepers for the Ark (15.16-24); he appoints levitical

ministers for the Ark (16.4-6); and he appoints the regular daily ministers and priests for the tabernacle (which is remaining at Gibeon) and the Ark (16.37-42).¹¹ David also ensures that the Ark is properly brought into Jerusalem, that everyone is properly attired, that there is appropriate musical accompaniment to the procession, and that the proper offerings and food distributions are made (15.25-16.3). All of this points to an understanding on David's part of the importance of the ritual and observances which surround the Ark, and shows his concern for proper worship, again all in contrast with Saul. The contrast is especially well pointed out by two small details: in 15.29, Michal the daughter of Saul, upon watching the procession, despises David; and in 16.39 we are told that the most sacred tabernacle and altar remain at Gibeon, the hometown of Saul and his family. A representative of the family of Saul, despises David as he performs the proper cultic function for the Ark, as he performs proper worship; and David understands the importance of the tabernacle and altar which are located right in the home of Saul.

This entire passage, then, continues to contrast David with Saul, and begins to present David as Saul's antithesis, and therefore as the proper king. David's first concern is for proper worship of Yhwh, and so he brings the Ark of the Covenant into Jerusalem and appoints its attendants. He also seeks the counsel of Yhwh. He has many sons to follow him. He receives

tribute from other nations, and subdues other nations militarily. Saul could not or did not do any of these things. David, therefore, is the ideal king for Israel.

1 Chronicles 17.1-27 - The dynastic oracle

This section continues the theme of a successor to David, first outlined in 1 Chron. 14.3. There are several word plays on the words "son" (*bēn*), "build" (*bānāh*), and "house" (*bayit*). Once David is settled in his house (*bēbētô*) in 17.1, Yhwh tells David not to build (*tibneh*) a (literal) house (*habbayit*) for him (Yhwh) (17.4), but rather that he (Yhwh) will build (*yibneh*) a (metaphorical) house (*ûbayit*) for him (David) (17.10). This offspring is specified as being one of David's sons (*mibbāneykā*) (17.11). This son will build (*yibneh*) the house (*bāyit*) for Yhwh (17.12). Yhwh will be as his father and David's son as his son (*lēbēn*) (17.13). Strictly speaking, in this dynastic oracle, Yhwh promises not that David's throne will remain forever, but that the throne of his son will be established forever. Similarly, the son will be established in Yhwh's house and kingdom - the promise is made to the son, not to David (cf. SJ 335). In Yhwh's speech, therefore, son (i.e. offspring), house (both literal "house of Yhwh" and metaphorical "house of David"), and the act of building (both literal "building a temple" and metaphorical "establishing a dynasty") are all closely linked (cf. Throntveit, "Idealization" 412). We will see that these three words are also closely linked in 1 Chron. 22, 28, and 29.

This section is also linked to the previous section and to the next section in language. First, the dynastic oracle clearly refers to one of the sons (*bānîm*) born in Jerusalem in 14.3-7, though we are not at this point told which of those sons will be his successor. Second, Yhwh declares to David that he (Yhwh) will subdue (*wěhikna'tî*) all David's enemies in 17.10, and in the very first verse of the next section (18.1), David subdues (*wayyaknî'ēm*) the Philistines. Third, in this passage, the word servant/slave (*'ebed*) is used twelve times, referring to David as Yhwh's servant. This follows on the use of *'ebed* in 16.13 to refer to Israel as Yhwh's servant, and anticipates the use of *'ebed* (18.2, 6, 7, 13; 19.19) to refer to the various nations becoming subject to David after their defeat. Thus David is subject to Yhwh, and the nations around Israel are subject to David: as Yhwh is to David, so David is to the nations.

Finally, there is another contrast made with Saul: Yhwh says that he will not take his favour from David's son, as he did take it from David's predecessor, i.e., Saul. Rather, the son of David's throne will be established forever, not taken away from him as it was taken from the sons of Saul (17.13-14). This fulfills one of the criteria for being a successful king as outlined implicitly in 1 Chron. 10 and explicitly in 1 Chron. 14: the successful king has sons to succeed him.

1 Chronicles 18.1-20.8 - David's wars

One of the interesting features about this section is that suddenly there is a concern for chronology. We have seen that the action of the previous chapters is characterized by flashbacks and flash-forwards, and that narrative time is disjointed. Here in this section, there is a strict ordering of narrative time: first, several battles are fought, then David appoints his cabinet, then there are more battles. The progression through time is marked by repeated use of the phrase "after this" ('aḥārê-kēn) in 18.1, 19.1 and 20.4 (cf. SJ 344). If all of the action of 10.1-16.43 occurs roughly in the space of three or four months, as is implied by the chronology given,¹² this section now sees action over some unspecified time, probably years. In fact, these wars seem to be the main action of David's reign, or at least the action that takes the most time of his reign.¹³ We will see that this is certainly the implication of 1 Chron. 22.8 in the next section.

This section shows how David fulfills another of the criteria for being an ideal king: he defeats his enemies and rules over them. The identity and geographical location of the enemies is important here: while in 1 Chron. 14 David defeated the Philistines when they made incursions into the territory of Israel, in this section there are a variety of nations subjugated by David and/or his army in aggressive action outside of Israel's frontiers (cf. Wright, "Fight" 162-63). The section begins in 1

Chron. 18.1 with David attacking the Philistines and taking the city of Gath from them; the section ends with another defeat of the Philistines at Gath (20.6-8). After the Philistines (located to the west of Israel), in 18.2 David defeats the Moabites (located to the east), then in 18.3-8 he defeats the king of Zobah and conquers the Arameans (located to the north), then in 18.12-13 Abishai (one of David's commanders) subjugates the Edomites (located to the south-east). Chapter 19 details another battle against the Arameans, while 20.1-3 describes Joab's conquest of the Ammonites (located to the northeast), and 20.4-8 completes the section with more conquests of the Philistines. Although there is no account of David fighting against the Amalekites, 18.11 notes that the booty dedicated to Yhwh includes booty taken from the Amalekites (located to the southwest). Thus these three chapters show David or his commanders subjugating Israel's enemies to the north, north-east, east, south-east, south-west, and west (WJ 1: 212); i.e., expanding the kingdom in every direction. Twice we are told in this section that Yhwh "gave victory to David wherever he went" (18.6, 13).

Another criterion is fulfilled for the ideal king when David receives tribute from kings he has not conquered as well as from conquered nations. In 14.1, David receives tribute from Tyre (located to the northwest), while in this section (18.6-10) he receives tribute from Moab, Damascus (located to the north)

and Hamath (also in the north). Thus David becomes very wealthy, but he dedicates the tribute and booty to Yhwh (18.11) (cf. Wright, "Fight" 163).

Wealth, in terms of gold, silver, and bronze, is important in this section. David amasses vast amounts of precious metals from the various nations he has conquered or from whom he has received tribute. However, we get our first hint about the use that this wealth will be put to (a minor flash-forward).¹⁴ In 18.8, we are told about some bronze taken from the Arameans that "with it Solomon made the bronze sea and the pillars and the vessels of bronze." These are items which will make up part of the furnishings of the Temple (2 Chron. 4.11-16). It is made more explicit later in 1 Chronicles, but it seems from this section that the wealth of David is not only a signal of his fitness as king, but that this wealth will be reserved for the purposes of building the Temple.

In the same verse, 1 Chron. 18.8, we have the first mention of Solomon's role as successor to David in the narrative section of 1 Chronicles. Before 1 Chron. 22, when Solomon is formally introduced as David's successor, there are six occurrences of Solomon's name in 1 Chronicles (3.5, 10; 5.36; 6.17; 14.4; 18.8). An examination of the function of these occurrences is instructive: 3.5 lists Solomon among David's sons, while 3.10 gives the descendants of Solomon; 5.36 notes that Johanan son of Azariah "served as priest in the house that Solomon built in

Jerusalem," i.e., in the Temple; while 6.17 describes the Levites as "minister[ing] with song before the tabernacle of the tent of meeting, until Solomon had built the house of the LORD in Jerusalem [...];" 14.4 again lists Solomon as being one of David's sons; while here in 18.8, we have another mention of Solomon in connection with the Temple. Taken as a group, therefore, we can see that Solomon's function in Chronicles so far seems to be 1) successor to David, and 2) builder of the Temple. We will see in Chapter Four of this dissertation whether that is all there is to Solomon.

In chapters 11-12, we saw David appoint the various commanders of the army, while in chapters 15-16 we saw David appoint the various cultic officials. Here in chapter 18 we see David doing more organization: his "cabinet" or top officials are listed: Joab commander of the army, Jehoshaphat the recorder, Zadok and Ahimelek the priests, Shavsha the secretary, Benaiah the chief bodyguard, and David's sons as other chief officials (18.15-17). We are also told that David "administered justice and equity to all his people" (18.14), perhaps another feature of the ideal king.

1 Chronicles 21.1-27.34 - The Temple site, builder, and organization of the Levites

This section begins with an episode that seems to be very troubling: after the successful completion of his wars, David commits a sin that prevents him from building the Temple. He

takes a census (1 Chron. 21.1-6). Here there are two words used by the Chronicler to describe David's action: Satan incites David to count (*limnôt*) the people (21.1), and David orders Joab to number (*siprû*) the people (21.2). In Chronicles as a whole, *mānāh* 'to count' occurs four times in the qal or niphal (1 Chron. 21.1, 17; 27.24; 2 Chron. 5.6), while *sāpar* 'to number' occurs seven times in the qal or niphal (1 Chron. 21.2; 23.3; 2 Chron. 2.1, 16 (x3); 5.6). All of the other occurrences of *sāpar* in Chronicles pertain to the Temple: in 1 Chron. 23.3 David takes a census of the Levites, in 2 Chron. 2.1 and 2.16 the census refers to conscripted labour for building the Temple, and in 2 Chron. 5.6 Solomon makes numberless sacrifices in the Temple. Likewise, the one use of *mānāh* to refer to a counting other than this one is in 2 Chron. 5.6, referring to the numberless sacrifices made in the Temple. Since God is displeased with what has happened (1 Chron. 21.7), it would seem that numbering or counting is only acceptable when it concerns the Temple and its cult.¹⁵ In 1 Chron. 21, it is the number of able-bodied men which is being counted, that is, how many men could be raised to form an army (cf. Wright, "Innocence" 92). The fact that Joab is the one entrusted with carrying out the census lends credence to this interpretation. Since David's wars were completed with the conquest of Gath in 1 Chron. 20.6-8, there should be no need for him to raise an army, and since he has already been told that he will not be the builder of the Temple in 1 Chron. 17.4, there is

no need for him to conscript labour (cf. WJ 1: 227-8). In fact, conscripting labour could be seen as trying to circumvent God's plan.

Once David realizes that what he had done was displeasing to God, God offers him three choices for his punishment.¹⁶ However, there is only one choice that logically fits with David's crime: punishment by the sword of Yhwh for three days (21.12). Because David has already conquered the peoples round about, he cannot be conquered by them; because David has wealth, he cannot lose it through famine (agriculture being the mainstay of the society's economy); only a cultic punishment fits this crime against the cult of Yhwh. However, this punishment cannot include the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, where the Ark has been placed, and thus the city is spared.

Even though there is a punishment because of David's offense, even at this point something good comes of it (cf. Wright, "Innocence" 101). Through the near-destruction of the city of Jerusalem, the exact location of the future Temple is determined.¹⁷ Up until now, the Ark has been located at "a place" (*māqôm*) (15.1); now the specific place, the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, is located. This is the first step in David's preparations for the building of the Temple. Before this, there have been allusions to David's wealth being earmarked for the construction of the Temple, but this is the first step taken towards the actual construction.

1 Chron. 22 marks the introduction of Solomon as David's successor: David sets aside wealth and materials for the building of the Temple, which Solomon will undertake. Thus one of the criteria for the ideal king, having a successor, now begins to be fulfilled in a concrete way. The play on the words son (*bēn*), build (*bānāh*), and house (*bayit*) which we saw in 1 Chron. 17 continues here, with 25 occurrences of these words in this chapter, most of them linked with each other. Thus in 22.5 David says, "My son [*bēnī*] Solomon is young and inexperienced, and the house [*wēhabbayit*] that is to be built [*libnôt*] for the LORD must be exceedingly magnificent [...];" in 22.6 David calls for his son (*bēnô*) and commands him to build (*libnôt*) a house (*bayit*) for Yhwh; in 22.7 David says, "My son [*bēnī*]¹⁸, I had planned to build [*libnôt*] a house [*bayit*] to the name of the LORD my God;" in 22.10 David quotes Yhwh as saying that Solomon will build (*yibneh*) a house (*bayit*) and that he will be as a son (*lēbēn*) to Yhwh; and in 22.11 David says, "Now, my son [*bēnī*], the LORD be with you, so that you may succeed in building [*ûbānītā*] the house [*bēt*] of the LORD your God [...]." However, the play in 1 Chron. 17 on building a temple and establishing a dynasty is not continued here; the emphasis is solely on the building of the temple. Although in 1 Chron. 17 it is David's son's dynastic house which will be established, here the emphasis is on the house which David's son will build for Yhwh.

1 Chron. 22 also marks start of the end of David's story in Chronicles: the mixing of temporalities that we have seen throughout 1 Chronicles again becomes more prominent here. In 1 Chron. 22.6 David begins his charge to Solomon. In 1 Chron. 23.1 David makes Solomon king over Israel (while David is still alive). This passage of 1 Chron. 22.6-23.1 seems to be the private discussion between David and Solomon (with only the "leaders of Israel" present as seen by 22.17-19), and would seem to flow naturally into the next section of 1 Chron. 28-29, where the succession is publicly enacted. However, at this point there is an interruption (1 Chron. 23.2-27.34) in which David sets up: 1) Levitical divisions for Temple service (23.2-32; 24.20-31), 2) priests (24.1-19), 3) Temple musicians (25.1-31), 4) Temple gatekeepers (26.1-19), 5) Temple treasurers (26.20-28), 6) officers and judges (26.29-32), 7) military officers (27.1-15), 8) tribal leaders (27.16-24), 9) royal stewards (27.25-31), and 10) his advisors (27.32-34). This organization of officials complements David's organization of the military in 1 Chron. 11.10-12.40 and his organization of the ministers to the Ark in 1 Chron. 15.2-24, 16.4-6, and 16.37-42, as well as his cabinet listed in 1 Chron. 18.15-17. This is, in fact, a sort of census, but undertaken in a cultic context (WJ 1: 244). Some of the organization expands upon what he had done earlier (e.g. the organization of the musicians in 1 Chron. 25 merely builds upon his organization in 1 Chron. 16), while the rest fills gaps in

what we can assume is the organizational structure of the kingdom: priests (not needed until there is a Temple), military officers, tribal leaders, stewards and advisors. It is not until this organization is complete that David's kingdom has proper organizational support, for cult, palace and military. Perhaps all of these lists in 1 Chronicles have the role of showing how David has properly organized his kingdom: an unorganized kingdom is one that is sure to fail. Thus, this is David's chief legacy for the kingdom and Temple (Wright, "Legacy" 229). By blurring the temporal sequence, the Chronicler made it seem as if this organization had been in place all along rather than having been instituted just before David's death.¹⁹

*1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - David plans Solomon's succession;
David's death*

In this chapter, I will read this episode as it pertains to David; I will read this episode as it pertains to Solomon in the next chapter. This is a somewhat arbitrary separation, as this episode really acts as the bridge between David and Solomon's reigns, linking them together so that they function as one. However, there are a few features in this episode important to the reading of David alone.

Although the succession was introduced in 1 Chron. 23.1 with David making Solomon king over Israel, this episode has the characteristics of a final speech to his people. Whereas David speaks only to Solomon in 1 Chron. 22.6 and to the leaders of

Israel (a somewhat vague term, probably deliberately vague) in 1 Chron. 22.17, here in 1 Chron. 28.1, David makes a public assembly of what would seem to be the people enumerated in 1 Chron. 23-27 and delivers a series of speeches. In this, his final address to the people, he sets forth what we can presume he sees as the most important actions of his reign, and he introduces Solomon as his successor. The importance of the gathering is highlighted by the use of the verb *qāhal* to denote David's action in gathering the people, and its related noun *qāhāl* to denote the gathering. The root *qhl* is used over 35 times in Chronicles;²⁰ as Wright points out, most of the occurrences are in a cultic context, as the verb *'āsap* is used in its place in contexts of military or material gathering ("Legacy" 229-30). This is certainly the case in the occurrences of *qhl* in the story of David in 1 Chronicles: the verb is used in 1 Chron. 13.5 and 15.3; the noun is used in 1 Chron. 13.2 and 4: these passages are connected with the Ark; the verb *'āsap* is used in 1 Chron. 11.13; 15.4; 19.7, 17; 23.2: these passages are generally connected with military endeavours.²¹ Here in this passage the verb *qāhal* is used in 1 Chron. 28.1, and the noun *qāhāl* in 1 Chron. 28.8; 29.1, 10, 20, and the verb *'āsap* is not used at all. Thus, this gathering has a cultic or sacred nature.

In this final address, David covers several themes that seem to be important to the evaluation of his reign. First, he addresses the issue of the Temple, and how he has come not to

build it: he cites the reason he previously gave in 1 Chron. 22.8 - that he had shed blood in war (1 Chron. 28.2-3). Next, he emphasizes how he was selected by Yhwh to be king, and how Solomon is selected by Yhwh to be his successor (28.4-5). The verb *bāḥar* 'to choose' is used three times in these verses and six times in this episode, all with Yhwh/God as the subject: Yhwh chose Judah as the tribe of leadership, Yhwh chose David as king, Yhwh chose Solomon as successor (cf. SJ 488). Not only did Yhwh choose David, he also "took delight [*rāṣā*] in making me king over all Israel [...]" (28.4). Three of the five occurrences of *rāṣāh* 'to be pleased with' in Chronicles occur in this passage: besides 28.4, David gives his personal fortune to the Temple, "because of my devotion [*birṣôtî*] to the house of my God [...]" (29.3); David says of Yhwh, "that you search the heart, and take pleasure [*tirṣeh*] in uprightness [...]" (29.17). Yhwh's choosing and being pleased are thus linked, and David reciprocates by being pleased in his turn.

After introducing Solomon, David next instructs the assembly to keep God's commandments, and instructs Solomon to always seek out God and not to forsake him, and to be strong and act in building the Temple (1 Chron. 28.8-10). As I pointed out above, here we have the classic formulation of seeking out and not forsaking God, "If you seek him [*'im-tidrēšennû*], he will be found by you; but if you forsake him [*wē'im-ta'azbennû*], he will abandon you [*yaznîḥākā*] forever" (28.9). We have already seen

above the importance of the words *dāraš* 'to seek' and '*āzab* 'to forsake/abandon' in 1 Chronicles (cf. SJ 492-3). However, the word used of God's abandoning, *zānāḥ*, is very strong, with connotations of rejection beyond simple abandonment: it is often used to describe God's rejection of people (cf. Ps. 43.2; 60.3; 77.8). In David's instructions, then, we can assume that he has sought God and has not been abandoned by him.

In the next part of the address, David gives Solomon the plans for the Temple, with a heavy emphasis on the precious materials to be used in its ornamentation (1 Chron. 28.11-19). He then describes how he has provided the gold, silver, bronze and other precious materials for the Temple (29.2), adds his own personal fortune to the collection (29.3-5), and asks the people to donate their wealth as well (29.6-9). As I noted above, the tribute and booty taken from foreign nations had been all dedicated to the Temple construction (cf. 1 Chron. 18.8, 10-11). At this point David also indicates the organization he has put into effect (1 Chron. 28.21).

Finally, David blesses the assembly (1 Chron. 29.10-19) and directs them in a series of sacrifices to Yhwh (29.20-22). The people then anoint Solomon (29.22-25). We can see from this final address that David sees several themes as being important to his kingship and to kingship in general: proper cultic behaviour, seeking the counsel of Yhwh, having a successor, the receipt of tribute (and the military conquest that allows such

tribute to be received), and proper organization; he exhorts either Solomon and/or the people to do these things in his address.

The Chronicler's final evaluation of David comes in 1 Chron. 29.26-30. We are told that David dies "in a good old age, full of days, riches and honor; and his son Solomon succeeded him,"²² and "accounts of all his rule and his might and of the events that befell him [...]" are to be found in various books. This notice again points up the importance of a successor and of military conquest. As Japhet has pointed out, David's kingdom is given universal significance, which is unique in Chronicles (SJ 516); perhaps this indicates how David might be perceived as a model or ideal for rulers generally. Most importantly, for our purposes, it implies that David dies a peaceful death after a long reign. Again, this is set up as a contrast with the death of Saul in 1 Chron. 10: Saul died a violent death in battle, and the length of his rule is not given. We might add this to our list of important features of the ideal ruler.

Reading David dialogically

1 Chronicles 9.35-12.40 - Saul's death and the consolidation of David's kingship

All of the features of 1 Chron. 9.35-12.40 that I described above are unique to Chronicles. In Samuel, time does not shift back and forth to the same extent. In 1 Sam. 31, the verb *nāšā'*

is not used in relation to Saul's head and body, nor is the noun *gulgōlet* used to describe Saul's head. Joab's chieftainship is not emphasized using the word *rō'š* as in 1 Chron. 11, and all but four of the fourteen occurrences of *rō'š* in 1 Chron. 11.1-12.40 are absent from Samuel. Saul is not described as *ma'al* 'unfaithful,' and in fact is often described as *melek* 'king' in Samuel, which he is not in Chronicles. All of these features are absent from Samuel, and their presence in Chronicles have a definite purpose, as I have described.

In 1 Samuel, Saul loses his kingship to David because of his failure as a king. God changes his mind about Saul's being king in 1 Sam. 15.11 and 16.1, and David is anointed in 16.13. God no longer listens to Saul, although Saul continues to seek him (cf. 1 Sam. 28.6, SJ 229). Chronicles' answer is that God does not reject Saul, Saul rejects God. Saul does not seek God. God does not reject Saul because Saul is a failure as a king; Saul is doomed from the start because of his unfaithful attitude. The battle with the Philistines merely epitomizes and illustrates what happens to those who do not seek God. A reader who knows both Samuel and Chronicles can see the dialogue between the two: rejection by God because of failure, rejection of God because of *ma'al*. Within Chronicles, as I noted above, Saul seems to be condemned for his general attitude, for his *ma'al* in a general sense. However, when we read Chronicles with Samuel, it is extremely tempting to try to see the charges against Saul in a

more specific way: his failure to keep the word of Yhwh (1 Chron. 10.13) as a reference to his sparing of Agag in 1 Sam. 15.8-10 and his making of sacrifices in 1 Sam. 13.8-10; and his inquiring of a necromancer (1 Chron. 10.13) as a reference to 1 Sam. 28.7 (JMM1 82; ELC 182-83; Zalewski 456). We do not need to choose between a reference to Saul's general attitude or to his specific actions in 1 Chron. 10.13-14, since both meanings are contained within the one utterance.

In 1 Samuel, Saul is from Gibeah, while in the genealogies of Chronicles (1 Chron. 8.29-33; 9.35-39), Saul is from Gibeon. Gibeah is primarily associated with one thing in the Hebrew Bible besides Saul: the rape of the Levite's concubine and subsequent events in Judges 19-20.²³ Gibeah is a place of bad associations; one would think it would be perfect for the Chronicler. However, Gibeon is even more appropriate: the Gibeonites are not even real Israelites (cf. Judges 10; 2 Sam. 21.2; Walters 70-71). Not only that, but also in 2 Sam. 21 we learn that Saul had even tried to destroy them. To Samuel's claim that Saul's ancestors were perpetrators of a great crime, Chronicles answers that Saul is in fact no Israelite at all, and in a wonderful irony, is a member of a group he had tried to destroy. Here we have an example of a tradition being replaced by another story, where the new story recalls and makes the other tradition ironic.

Although it is implied in 1 Chron. 10 that the house of Saul is extinguished in the battle with the Philistines, there is

a dialogic relationship between the account in 1 Chron. 10 and the two genealogical accounts in 1 Chron. 8.33-40 and 1 Chron. 9.39-44. In the genealogies, Saul is given twelve generations of descendants, through Jonathan's son Meribbaal. 2 Samuel 9 makes a point of David's kindness to Meribbaal (Samuel calls him Mephibosheth) as the last son of Saul; later in 2 Samuel 16, Mephibosheth does not ally himself with David during Absalom's revolt, for which David forgives him (somewhat) in 2 Sam. 19. Therefore, although the Chronicler's position in 1 Chron. 10 is that Saul's entire line is extinguished, the heteroglossia of Chronicles preserves another position about the sons of Saul. In this way, two competing voices are incorporated into the text of Chronicles.

1 Chronicles 13.1-16.43 - The Ark

When we read this passage with the relevant passages from 2 Samuel, some interesting points present themselves. Again, in 2 Samuel, narrative time is linear, without the flash-forwards and flashbacks seen in 1 Chronicles. In 2 Samuel, David's first concern is not for the proper worship of Yhwh, but rather with fighting a civil war with the last heir of Saul, then with capturing Jerusalem, and finally with fighting against the Philistines. It is many years after the beginning of his kingship when he finally gets around to bringing the Ark into Jerusalem (at least seven years, if we consider 2 Sam. 5.5). So while Samuel says that David is a great military leader first

during his reign, Chronicles says that David is a great worshipper of Yhwh first during his reign. For the Chronicler, military accomplishment was important as a facet of the ideal king, but subordinate to the proper worship of God. Here we have an example of a change in David's characterization through the re-ordering of the narrative, from warrior first to worshipper first.

In 1 Chron. 13-16, the terminology for the Ark is more carefully refined than in 2 Sam. 6. The covenantal aspect of the Ark is never mentioned: the Ark is never called "the Ark of the covenant of Yhwh/God" once it is inside Jerusalem; similarly, it is often called "the Ark of Yhwh" before it makes its journey to Jerusalem, and it is clear that the Chronicler changed the language in these passages so that the Ark is called "the Ark of God" in the corresponding parts of 1 Chron. 13.³⁴

David's attitude towards the Ark is also different in 2 Sam. 6 and 1 Chron. 13. In 2 Sam. 6.12, David decides to bring the Ark into Jerusalem from the house of Obed-edom because he finds out that having the Ark in one's house is a blessing. Chronicles' reply is that David has always planned to bring the Ark into Jerusalem, but he needs to prepare a place for it first, and to demonstrate in other ways that he is the proper king. David is not grasping and acquisitive, rather, he is merely giving himself enough time to prepare himself to receive the Ark. Chronicles elaborates by showing how the meticulous preparations

made by David, both in terms of preparing a tent to receive the Ark and in terms of levitical ministers, are evidence of his regard for proper worship above all (cf. HGMW 119-120; SJ 282).

Finally, in Samuel, Michal is the wife of David. In the scene of 2 Sam. 6.16-23, she is represented as the daughter of Saul, as representative of Saul's house, but the reader already knows that she is the wife of David. She despises (sexual jealousy is implied) David for the scene he makes in front of the Ark as it is being brought into the city, and she confronts him for it. Chronicles' reply is that Michal is not the wife of David, she is merely the representative of Saul's house, and that she despises David for performing proper cultic worship. The irony is that in Samuel, Michal despises David for performing what in her eyes is improper cultic worship, while in Chronicles she despises him for performing proper cultic worship - a wonderful tension which does not need to be resolved. Michal's characterization is changed from a good but disloyal wife to a bad non-wife. Thus, the episode is kept from Samuel, but its meaning is changed in Chronicles, achieved using irony and a subsequent shift in characterization.

1 Chronicles 17.1-27 - The dynastic oracle

At first glance, this chapter seems to be taken verbatim from 2 Sam. 7. However, when we examine it closely, we see that there are subtle differences, which show two different positions responding to each other dialogically. In 2 Sam. 7.16, it is

David's house, David's kingdom, and David's throne which will be established forever, which gives rise to the phrase "Davidic king" used by scholars to refer to the successors of David. As well, 2 Sam. 7.12 describes the offspring as "com[ing] forth from your [David's] body." However, Chronicles responds that it is not David's house, kingdom, and throne, but rather Yhwh's house and kingdom and David's son's throne which will be established forever (1 Chron. 17.14) - the king is the custodian of Yhwh's property (Beentjes, "Transformations" 37).²⁵ The emphasis is shifted from David himself (the offspring actually coming forth from David's body) to the son who will actually benefit from the oracle (1 Chron. 17.11).²⁶ P.C. Beentjes points out that 1 Chron. 17 is missing any references to "rest," which is present in 2 Sam. 7.11 - "rest" is linked to the Temple in 1 Chron. 28.2 ("Transformations" 32-33; cf. McKenzie, "Why" 217).

Probably the most important difference between the two positions concerns the relationship between Yhwh and David's successor. Yhwh tells David in 2 Sam. 7.14 that he will punish David's successor when he commits any wrongs. Yhwh makes no such promise/threat in Chronicles (cf. HGMW 136). Note especially that in 2 Sam. 7.29, David chooses to understand Yhwh's promise as unconditional ("[A]nd with your blessing shall the house of your servant be blessed forever" - the MT and LXX of Samuel agree with 4Qsam^a). In 1 Chron. 17.27, David makes no such claim for his house, rather referring to the blessed state of Yhwh ("For

you, O LORD, have blessed and are blessed forever.").²⁷ To Samuel's position that Yhwh might punish his anointed king, Chronicles replies that Yhwh will always love and be committed to that anointed king. However, this is in a dialogic relationship with the very conditionality of the promise as outlined above: on the one hand, the promise to David's sons is not unconditional, on the other hand, Yhwh will always keep covenant with David's sons (cf. HGMW 133-34). We will see further the tension and the working-out of this relationship further in 2 Chronicles.

1 Chronicles 18.1-20.8 - David's wars

In Chronicles, this section details the action of the bulk of David's reign, successful military endeavours. A reader who knows Samuel is immediately struck by the omission of the stories of David showing kindness to the descendants of Saul (2 Sam. 9), David and Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11-12), the rape of Tamar (2 Sam. 13), Absalom's revolt (2 Sam. 14-18), and its aftermath, which includes more mentions of the descendants of Saul (2 Sam. 19-21). When we add in the account of the war between David and Ishbaal in 2 Sam 2-6, all of these stories show division in Israel and division in the house of David. Chronicles on the other hand replies that there is no division in Israel, and David's sons do not cause him problems. Wright points out that in Chronicles, David never loses a battle, never fights against other Israelites, never engages in "cruel military conduct,"²⁸ and altogether does not appear to be so much a tribal chieftain but

rather a Hellenistic tyrant ("Fight" 164). Perhaps, I might suggest, David is here the model of ideal military behaviour: successful and "gentlemanly" - the comparison with Cyrus in the Cyropaedia might easily be made here. David also rules over a united kingdom: there is no dissent.

In Samuel, a completely different picture of David appears: he loses control over himself (as shown by the episode with Uriah and Bathsheba in 2 Sam. 11),⁹ he loses control of his sons (one rapes his daughter in 2 Sam. 13, one revolts against him in 2 Sam. 15), and he seems also to be losing control over Israel, or at least he seems to lose perspective on what is important as king. Joab has to come to David and tell him what to do in 2 Sam. 19.5-7. David's kingdom is beset by dissent and trouble after the events of 2 Sam. 12. Samuel-Kings says that David's kingdom is promised to be secure in the long run (cf. 2 Sam. 7), but in his reign there is nothing but trouble once David loses control of himself in 2 Sam. 11. Chronicles replies that not only is David's kingdom secure in the long run (1 Chron. 17), but that during his reign, the boundaries of Israel are made secure and nothing troubles the internal peace of Israel.

On a minor note, it is worth pointing out that the complete cycle of David's conquest in 1 Chron. 18.1-20.8, beginning and ending with the conquest of Gath is not told in such a way in Samuel. In Samuel, David's conquests are spread throughout the text, from 2 Sam. 8 through 2 Sam. 21. In Chronicles, David's

wars make a nice package, neatly tied with the battles in Gath, implying completion; in Samuel, it is implied that David's wars never end: there are always new enemies to fight.

1 Chronicles 21.1-27.34 - The Temple site, builder, and organization of the Levites

Although Joab has appeared in several of the episodes in Chronicles so far, at this point I would like to discuss Joab and his status as David's military commander. The differences in the characterization of Joab in Samuel and Chronicles are instructive. In Chronicles, Joab is described as the commander of the army (he is so named in 1 Chron. 11.6; 18.15; 27.34; and his tribute for the Temple is described in 1 Chron. 26.28), and his actions are those of a loyal supporter of David. Reports of his military achievements in David's name are given in 1 Chron. 19 and 20; in 1 Chron. 19 his battle tactic is shown to be sound, having combined sound strategy with faith in Yhwh (19.4-5), while in 1 Chron. 20 he is shown as acting in David's name, reserving the glory of capture for David himself. He is shown as having a greater understanding of God's purpose for the army in 1 Chron. 21 than David does - he does not number the entire military-eligible population (21.5-6). This is very different from the Joab shown in Samuel-Kings. Joab in Samuel-Kings is often only concerned with his own interests; at other times his loyalty to David take the form of ruthless actions, actions with which David only sometimes agrees. Joab's concerns with his own interests

may be seen in the episode of Abner's murder in 2 Sam. 3: this murder is coincidentally in David's interest, but he shows a great deal of public sorrow for Abner's death. Joab's ruthless loyalty to David may be seen in his killing of Absalom in 2 Sam. 18.14 against David's express orders. In Samuel-Kings, Joab is also able to convince David to do things that strengthen his rule: the most striking example is his reproof to David in 2 Sam. 19.5-7. In Samuel-Kings Joab is an independent actor; in Chronicles, he is almost entirely an extension of David's own military might. In Samuel-Kings, Joab sometimes works at cross-purposes to David and at other times indulges in overkill of David's commands; in Chronicles he operates solely in David's best interests.²⁹ The change in characterization of Joab, effected intertextually, has the effect of showing up the change in characterization of David.

An extremely interesting dialogic relationship between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings pertains to David's purchase of the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite for the site of the Temple, and definitely points to David's status as the ideal ruler. However, in this case it is not David being contrasted with Saul (as in many of the episodes dealt with so far), but rather David being contrasted with Ahab, the king of Israel of a later time.³⁰ Ahab is referred to fourteen times in Chronicles (2 Chron. 18.1, 2 (x2), 3, 19; 21.6 (x2), 13; 22.3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), often in conjunction with his wickedness and the wickedness of his house

(e.g. 2 Chron. 21.13; 22.3). However, it is in 1 Kings 16-22 that we see Ahab being set up as the anti-David, the archetypal evil king who leads his people away from Yhwh. What is most interesting about the episode of 1 Chron. 21.18-30 is how it compares with the episode of Naboth's vineyard in 1 Kings 21. In 1 Chron. 21, David, the king of all Israel, approaches Ornan the Jebusite (thus a non-Israelite) and offers to purchase his threshing floor from him as a place to build an altar to Yhwh. In 1 Kings 21, Ahab, the king of the divided kingdom of Israel, approaches Naboth the Jezreelite (thus an Israelite) and offers to purchase his vineyard from him as a place to grow a herb garden. A series of oppositions are thus set up: king over all Israel vs. king of truncated Israel, non-Israelite vs. Israelite owner, altar to Yhwh vs. herb garden. The opening words of the kings in making their offers are almost identical. David says,

Give me [tēnā-lî] the site of the threshing-floor, and I will build on it an altar to Yhwh (at its full price in silver [bēkesep mālē'] give it to me), so that the plague may be stayed from upon the people. (1 Chron. 21.22; my translation)

Ahab says,

Give me [tēnā-lî] your vineyard and it will be mine as a herb garden, for it is right beside my house, and I will give you a better vineyard instead of it, or if it seems good to you I will give you silver for its

purchase price [*kesep mēḥîr zeh*]. (1 Kings 21.2; my translation)

Although the wording is similar, it is not identical, merely suggesting the other episode rather than quoting it exactly. From this point on, almost everything else is in contrast: Naboth the Jezreelite refuses to sell his vineyard since it is his ancestral inheritance; Ornan the Jebusite immediately offers up his threshing-floor (even though we might assume that it is his ancestral inheritance as well), and offers not only the threshing-floor, but everything in it, including the oxen, sledges and grain. David refuses, emphasizing again that he will pay full price (*bēkesep mālē'*), and that he will not take "what is yours [*'āšer-lēkā*]" (1 Chron. 21.24). In 1 Kings 21, Naboth ends up losing everything, including his life, and Ahab gains not only the vineyard, but also all of Naboth's property, without paying for it.³¹ In this episode we have an illustration of David's status as ideal ruler through his treatment of Ornan the Jebusite, as opposed to Ahab the wicked ruler: the ideal ruler thinks of the good of the people and of Yhwh, and cares even for the non-Israelites living in his kingdom, while the wicked ruler thinks only of his own good. Here we have an example of role replacement, where Ahab takes on the role of the wicked king normally reserved for Saul in Chronicles. This illustration works if we do not know the story of Naboth's vineyard in 1 Kings 21, but is even more pointed when that story is brought in as

well. Braun has pointed out even more echoes in 1 Chron. 21: the angel recalls Josh. 5.13-15; the full price paid by David recalls Abraham's purchase of a burial plot in Gen. 23; Yhwh's speech to David in fire recalls 1 Kings. 18.38; and Ornan on his threshing floor recalls Gideon in Judg. 6 (RB 218; cf. Williamson, "Temple" 21). Williamson also has pointed out links between 1 Chron. 21 and Gen. 22-23, seeing the Temple site as a focus of continuity with Israel's early history ("Temple" 22-24). This is more evidence that David's "sin" in 1 Chron. 21 does not detract from his status as an ideal king.

Beginning with 1 Chron. 22, the rest of 1 Chronicles is almost entirely independent of Samuel-Kings. Here, therefore, we are not looking at the subtle dialogism between episodes in Chronicles and their parallels in Samuel-Kings; rather, we are looking at what these episodes contribute to the picture of David as an ideal king, and at the dialogic relationships between these sections and the rest of 1 Chronicles.

One of the most interesting features of 1 Chron. 22 is David's speech to Solomon in 22.7-15, in which he purports to quote Yhwh's words. The general tone of Yhwh's words is reminiscent of Yhwh's words in 1 Chron. 17.4-14, however, when we carefully examine them, we see that David is not really repeating Yhwh's words accurately. David's quotation of Yhwh's words can be divided into three parts: 1 Chron. 22.8 gives the reason why David has been precluded from being the Temple-builder; 1 Chron.

22.9 sets up Solomon as his successor; and 1 Chron. 22.10 deals with Solomon's status and activities. Only 1 Chron. 22.10 comes close to capturing Yhwh's words in 1 Chron. 17.12-14, and even here, David is condensing and slightly altering Yhwh's words:

1 Chron. 17.12-14

He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever.

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

1 Chron. 22.10

He shall build a house for my name.

He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him,

and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever.

Why does David so alter Yhwh's words to him? There are two parts to the solution. First, when we carefully examine Yhwh's speeches in 1 Chron. 17, we note that while David has been forbidden to build the Temple, and is given a promise of a dynasty instead, there is barely a mention that the successor will be the one to build the Temple. David's alteration of the speech in 1 Chron. 22 takes care of this problem: Solomon's building of the Temple instead of him is emphasized and given divine sanction. The second clue is in the first two parts of his quotation: the contrast between himself as a man of war and a shedder of blood (22.8) and Solomon as a man of peace (22.9). Only a man of peace could build the Temple (cf. Braun, "Solomon"

582-4).³² Throughout the rest of 1 Chronicles there is no hint that war-making on the part of the king is bad (Dirksen 51-2): in fact, as discussed above, military conquest seems to be one of the criteria for the ideal king. This is an example of a dialogic relationship within Chronicles: on the one hand, military conquest is important while at the same time military conquest precludes a king from completion of his cultic endeavours (cf. Dirksen 52).³³ The tension does not need to be resolved. Both of these contradictory traditions, each found in a voice in Chronicles, are sanctioned.³⁴

Finally, the organization that David undertakes in 1 Chron. 23-27 is also important in reading David dialogically. In 2 Samuel, the last part of David's reign is taken up with chaos and strife. Here, Chronicles answers that position by showing how David's reign is orderly and thorough.

*1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - David plans Solomon's succession;
David's death*

Again, this passage is not paralleled in Samuel-Kings. However, the event that it describes is; namely David's death and Solomon's succession. In 1 Kings 1-2, David is depicted as old and feeble, easily manipulated by Bathsheba and Nathan. The succession is not orderly; in fact, one of David's other sons, Adonijah, declares himself king. Chronicles answers this position by showing how David is in full control of his faculties and the succession of Solomon is directed by him in an orderly

fashion.¹⁵ The Chronicler dealt with the problem of David's other sons by having them swear allegiance to Solomon in 1 Chron. 29.24, and completely overrode any hint of dissent by noting that "all Israel obeyed him" in 1 Chron. 29.23 (cf. SJ 514-5). In 1 Kings 1 Abiathar the priest and Joab support Adonijah; in Chronicles the final mention of Abiathar and Joab comes in 27.34 (the final verse of the catalogue of officials in 1 Chron. 27), and they are depicted as being completely loyal to David. Their names never occur again in 1 Chronicles. Here an episode of disloyalty is removed, yet it is alluded to by the phrase "all Israel obeyed him."

One of the more interesting features of this episode is the dialogic relationship between David's final speeches in 1 Kings and 1 Chronicles. In 1 Kings 2.2-9, David makes his final speech to Solomon before his death (there is no public speech in 1 Kings). In the first three verses, he exhorts Solomon in this way,

[B]e strong [wěhāzaqtā], be courageous [wěhāyîṭā lē'îš], and keep the charge of the LORD your God, walking in his ways and keeping his statutes [ḥuqqōtāyw], his commandments [mišwōtāyw], his ordinances [ûmišpāṭāyw], and his testimonies [wě'ēdēwōtāyw] [...] so that you may prosper in all that you do [...]. (1 Kings 2.2-3).

The same kind of language is used in 1 Chron. 22.13; 28.7, 9-10, 20; 29.19;³⁶ thus David's speeches to Solomon in Chronicles are generally reminiscent of this final speech in 1 Kings 2. However, it is the second part of David's speech in 1 Kings 2 which is unparalleled in 1 Chron. 28-29: David instructs Solomon on how to deal with Joab and Shimei (to put them to death) and the sons of Barzillai (to honour them). These are David's final words in Samuel-Kings. Chronicles' response is that David does not seek vengeance on Joab; his final words are not about political enemies but rather about the Temple.

The most interesting dialogic relationship pertaining to these speeches of David's to Solomon in 1 Kings 2 and 1 Chron. 22 and 28, involves Moses' and God's speeches to Joshua in Deut. 31 and Josh. 1. This relationship revolves around the use of the verbs *ḥāzaq* 'to be strong' and *'āmēṣ* 'to be courageous' in the imperative. In 1 Kings 2.2, *ḥāzaq* is used in the perfect and *'āmēṣ* is not used, with the phrase *hāyîṭā lē'îš* (literally, "you will be(come) a man") used instead in order to describe how David thinks Solomon should be with respect to God's laws. However, in both 1 Chron. 22.13 and 28.20, David uses the imperative of both *ḥāzaq* and *'āmēṣ* ("be strong and be courageous") in order to exhort Solomon in his efforts to build the Temple. These two words are used in two other places in the Hebrew Bible: in Deut. 31.7, 23 and Josh. 1.6, 7, 9, 18: both chapters deal with the transfer of leadership from Moses to Joshua, with Joshua being

exhorted to be strong during the conquest of Canaan and in obedience to the law of Yhwh. Williamson has shown how the Chronicler modeled the transition from David to Solomon on that of Moses to Joshua ("Accession"; cf. Braun, "Solomon"; see Chapter Four);³⁷ thus we have an example here of an episode being kept from the earlier text, but the characters being changed. However, what is also important for our purposes is the use of language usually associated with military purposes (and so used elsewhere in Chronicles, cf. 1 Chron. 19.13; 2 Chron. 25.8) used here with respect to building the Temple. There is more military language associated with the Temple here: in 1 Chron. 29.1 and 19 the building is actually called a fortress (*bîrâ*; emended to "temple" in the NRSV) (cf. WJ 1: 283). This may all be a hint that David sees Solomon's task of building the Temple as equivalent to his own military victories. We will see in Chapter Four if this bears out.

Finally, there is the notice of David's death to deal with. We are told in 1 Chron. 29.27 that David "reigned seven years in Hebron and thirty-three years in Jerusalem." This statement parallels the statement given in David's genealogy in 1 Chron. 3.1-4; this notice lists the sons born to David in Hebron, where he ruled for "seven years and six months" (3.4). However, we have seen above that time in 1 Chron. 11-16 is compressed, making it seem that David's accession, the capture of Jerusalem, the defeat of the Philistines and the removal of the Ark all occur

within a few months. This dialogism within Chronicles has the effect of bringing into question the version of events given in 1 Chron. 11-16, while at the same time bringing to mind the events narrated in 2 Sam. 1-6, where the accession of David is not smooth.³⁸ One voice within Chronicles states the position that David is made king easily and smoothly, while the other answers that David's kingship is hard won and precarious.

David and Cyrus

The reading of David in this chapter has produced traits that we might consider central to the construction of the ideal king. They are: 1) proper regard for the cult of Yhwh; 2) seeking the counsel of Yhwh; 3) many sons including a successor; 4) receipt of tribute from foreign nations;³⁹ 5) military conquest; 6) proper organization of the cult and kingdom; and 7) peaceful death at an old age after a long reign. With the exception of the proper organization of cult and kingdom, all of these traits are first set up by a comparison (either implicit or explicit) between David and Saul. Thus 1 Chron. 9.35-10.14 acts as an introduction, showing what the ideal king would not be like; the rest of 1 Chronicles shows what the ideal king would be like. Even errors by the ideal king are acceptable if they lead to benefits (as 1 Chron. 21 shows).

Both Chronicles and the Cyropaedia begin with an introduction to the problem which then is then pursued throughout

the depiction of the ideal ruler: Xenophon began with an explicit description of the problem and its solution in Cyrus, while the Chronicler began with an implicit description of the problem through the story of the death of Saul. Cyrus' major characteristics are described in Book 1 of the Cyropaedia, while David's important characteristics are developed through a comparison with Saul. In both books, time is compressed in order to depict almost the entire reign as the consolidation of the kingdom in the hand of the ruler. In both works, there is a strong emphasis on piety on the part of the ideal ruler: in Chronicles, proper cultic observance is predominant, while in the Cyropaedia, there is an emphasis on Cyrus' piety and ability to correctly interpret omens at key moments. However, Chronicles is not interested in the nature of David, but only in his origins as expressed in the genealogical section of 1 Chron. 1-9, and in his actions, unlike in the Cyropaedia, where the nature of Cyrus is of interest, along with Cyrus' origins and education. The main difference, therefore, between the construction of the ideal ruler in these two books lies in the emphasis on character and character formation in the Cyropaedia and the emphasis on action in Chronicles.

When we set David in Chronicles and Cyrus in the Cyropaedia together with their counterparts in other texts, we can read them in terms of a dialogic relationship as well. In both books, there is a dialogic relationship between the work and other

texts, which enhances the pleasure and ironies within the work and serves to make the work's points even more forcefully. Both the Cyropaedia and Chronicles actively reply to the position taken about the ruler in other texts, and it is striking that both remove the tragic or flawed elements of the ruler found in the other texts, replacing them instead with elements which tend towards the philosophical. In Chronicles, the contrast between David and Saul is set up even more firmly when read in a dialogic relationship with Samuel; similarly, the contrast between Cyrus and Croesus is made even more pointed when read along with Herodotus' Histories. Both texts use the dialogic relationship with their predecessors in order to emphasize their own construction of the ideal ruler.

Both Xenophon and the Chronicler worked in similar ways. As we have seen, both changed the meaning of previous traditions or episodes while still keeping them in the text, both used phrases ironically, both used the replacement of characters while keeping episodes from other traditions. However, while Xenophon used the technique of role reversal, this technique is not found in 1 Chronicles: we do not have David taking the role of someone else from Samuel. The result of these techniques is similar: the change in characterization of the ideal ruler. David is changed from a flawed character to an ideal ruler.

At this point, we can make some preliminary conclusions about the genre of Chronicles, through the investigation of the

intertextual construction of the character of David. If we accept that the Cyropaedia is a work of political philosophy, then surely it is not too far of a stretch to suggest that Chronicles might also be a work of political philosophy. Chronicles constructs its ideal ruler, David, using many of the same techniques used by Xenophon to construct his ideal ruler, Cyrus. The heteroglossia and dialogism in 1 Chronicles, along with Chronicles' dialogic relationship with Samuel-Kings, suggest that there may be a dialogue going on about the ideal Israel and its ideal king. On the one hand, Yhwh's promise to David is unconditional, yet it is also conditional. War is good (victory in war), because it brings wealth and honour, yet it also precludes the ruler from building the Temple. The ideal ruler should show proper cultic obedience first, yet military success is also needed before cultic obligations can be fulfilled. We will see in the next two chapters how this dialogue works itself out.

Notes

1. See Bailey's response to Wright: he suggests that Wright has to find a reason to shift the blame away from David because he depends on the depiction of David being sanitized (83).
2. This section and the corresponding section beginning on page 170, are an expanded version of a section of my article "The Dialogism of Chronicles" (Mitchell 319-26).
3. I wish to thank John Wright for our brief discussion about this genealogy and its place in the overall scheme of Chronicles, which helped me clarify my own thoughts about these verses.
4. Cf. Johnstone, "The Chronicler is not now interested in the historian's discriminations of time and epoch; rather, his purpose is to gather together in a global manner the fulness of Israel past and present in timeless contemporaneity" ("Guilt" 115-116). See also Wright, who has discussed this in some detail ("Fabula").
5. However, Wright has argued that David's rule is not completely confirmed until 1 Chron. 14.2, after his first movement of the ark, and his perception of his kingship ("Founding" 51-52). Support for that argument also comes from Japhet, who points out that the boundaries of David's kingdom (rather expansive ones at that) are given in 1 Chron. 13.5 ("Conquest" 210).
6. Japhet suggests that the men of Jabesh simply go to the battlefield and collect the bodies; it is important to notice their delay, which makes their efforts even less heroic (SJ 228). This is opposite to Ho, who sees the Chronicler as portraying the men of Jabesh as very heroic (98-100).
7. See also Johnstone on *ma'al*: he links the use of the term in Chronicles with the use of the term in Leviticus; *ma'al* requires the eventual forfeiture of the land of Israel (WJ 1: 13-14).
8. A good deal of research has gone into trying to decide whether Saul is condemned for specific acts or his general attitude. For the former, see Myers (JMM1 81-82); for the latter, see Williamson (HGMW 95) and Braun (RB 151-52). Since Saul's specific acts are not mentioned elsewhere in Chronicles, it seems appropriate to regard these verses as an expression of Saul's general attitude.

9. Riley has also agreed that the story of Saul should be seen as a paradigm for the narrative of the Chronicler, but he lays stress on the cultic failures of Saul (41-45); I believe the paradigm can be extended farther.
10. Japhet points out that there is a great concern that the people of Israel should be involved in the transfer of the Ark, that it not be the function of David alone (SJ 274). However, David is the primary director in this event; the people merely consult with him on the best way to do it. This may be an indicator of the Chronicler's feelings on the proper role of a king: one who "consults with others before taking action," as Japhet says (SJ 274).
11. De Vries claims that the Chronicler's main purpose here was to claim for the Levites a place as supervisors of the worship (i.e., the priests' traditional role), and in order to do so the idealized and divinely inspired King David was created as the legitimator of this levitical function ("Moses" 637-39). I would argue that it is the other way around; he is the ideal king because he establishes levitical functions.
12. Note that in 17.1, the text says, "Once [wayhî ka'āšer] David settled in his house [...]" (my translation); it may indicate the end of the sequence of action piled upon action of the previous chapters.
13. Cf. Williamson (HGMW 137-38), and Japhet, who has said that by presenting all of David's wars together, he is presented as "the great warrior" of Israel (SJ 343-44). However, I would point out the battles of 1 Chron. 14 are separated from these accounts; see below on the reasons for the separation.
14. Japhet claims that such flash-forwards are rare in Chronicles (SJ 348). I would disagree, considering the many instances I have already cited.
15. Wright has argued that censuses are generally considered positively in Chronicles ("Innocence" 90); Bailey makes a similar point ("David" 340); I would argue that only cultic censuses are so considered.
16. Bailey points out that all of these choices actually punish the people of Israel rather than David ("Innocence" 345-6).
17. Knoppers points out that David's name is emphasized throughout this episode, not the Temple, and suggests that David is being put forward as a repentant sinner similar to some of the

kings in 2 Chronicles; David is able to turn his catastrophe into blessing ("Images" 451, 469-70).

18. The Qere and many of the versions read *bēnī* 'my son,' the Kethib reads *bēnō* 'his son;' the difference is minor and is not important for the argument: it is the word "son" which is important.

19. De Vries makes a fundamental error when he says, "We cannot, therefore, praise this pericope from a strictly literary point of view" (SJV 184); the "lacunae and inconcinnities" which he laments have a very definite literary purpose.

20. Almost all of the occurrences of *qāhal* are in passages not paralleled in Samuel-Kings. More on this below.

21. The one apparently non-military use of *'āsap*, in 1 Chron. 15.4, is used right after an account of David's military victories in 1 Chron. 14. It is possible that the use of this verb here implies that the Levites are gathered in a military procession in order to retrieve the Ark.

22. The extravagance of this eulogy is noted by Japhet; she points out that David is meant to be seen as superior to any other king (SJ 516).

23. Walters claims that Gibeah is meant to be associated with prophetic authority (75). However, prophets are associated with Gibeah only in 1 Sam. 10.10, and priests with Gibeah in Josh. 24.33; while there are dozens of biblical references to Gibeah as either the dwelling place of Saul or as the place of the rape of the Levite's concubine. Hos. 9.9 and 10.9 make the latter connection especially clear, "They have deeply corrupted themselves as in the days of Gibeah [...]. Since the days of Gibeah you have sinned, O Israel; there they have continued. Shall not war overtake them in Gibeah?"

24. Despite the textual difficulties in the Samuel tradition I pointed out above, I make this assertion with some confidence, since Chron. disagrees with the MT of Samuel, the LXX of Samuel, and 4Qsam^a (which is extant at this point).

25. Cf. Schniedewind, who sees a shift from an emphasis on David to an emphasis on God, which leads him to see "an ideology of shared leadership between king and priest." However, he does note that Chronicles does not include a dynastic promise for priests ("King" 73-77).

26. However, Japhet sees no difference in meaning between the two different wordings; she also sees David himself and not the offspring as the main recipient of God's grace here (SJ 333-34).
27. Beentjes suggests that the Davidic dynasty is only important with respect to the Temple, not in and of itself ("Transformations" 44).
28. Contra Johnstone (WJ 1: 221).
29. Contra Wright ("Innocence" 97-8), who sees Joab as the primary actor in 1 Chron. 22, and the one who actually sins by not completing the census. However, see the response by Bailey ("Innocence"). I agree that David does here commit an error, but this is not irreconcilable with his characterization as an ideal king: there is a good that comes of it in the selection of the Temple site (cf. Knoppers, "Images" 471).
30. Cf. Allen (31) on the contrast between the house of Ahab and the house of David in 2 Chron. 21-23, more on this in Chapter Five.
31. This may be inferred from the manner of Naboth's death, consistent with the legislation of Deut. 13.6-11 and 17.2-7; Ahab's ability to take the vineyard implies that he now has control of all of Naboth's property.
32. However, Kelly suggests that instead of reading "shedder of blood" as a necessary consequence of "man of war" in, we should read the "man of war" as referring to David's wars and the "shedder of blood" as referring to David's census in 1 Chron. 21: the census is the primary reason for the disqualification (59). McKenzie agrees that the shedding of blood is the key to David's disqualification, but he thinks that it refers to the shedding of blood in war ("Why" 220).
33. This is further suggested by another play on Solomon's name and the word "peace" (*šālôm*) in 1 Chron. 22.10: the root *šlm* not only means peace, but also completion or wholeness. Solomon is therefore the completion of David. Cf. Johnstone (WJ 1: 288).
34. McKenzie calls David's speeches of 1 Chron. 22 and 1 Chron. 28, where he summarizes and retells 1 Chron. 17 and 2 Sam. 7, "the Chronicler's interpretation of the Nathan oracle" ("Why" 219). This shows a lack of awareness of the different voices in the text of Chronicles: it is simplistic to equate David's voice with the Chronicler's voice.

35. Cf. Japhet on the many details in 1 Chron. 28-29 which seem explicitly to oppose the depiction of David in 1 Kings 1-2 (SJ 486).

36. The words *ḥōq/ḥuqqā* 'statute,' *mišwā* 'commandment,' *mišpāt* 'ordinance,' and *ʿēdūt* 'testimony,' occur in clusters of two or three of the above words throughout Kings and Chronicles. What is interesting is that they rarely occur in parallel passages: only in 1 Kings 9.4 = 2 Chron. 7.17, 1 Kings 9.6 = 2 Chron. 7.19, and 2 Kings 23.3 = 2 Chron. 34.31. They usually occur in material unique to either Chronicles or Kings: 1 Chron. 22.13; 28.7; 29.19; 2 Chron. 19.10; 1 Kings 2.3; 3.14; 6.12; 8.58, 61; 11.33, 34, 38; 2 Kings 17.13, 15, 19, 29, 37. They also once occur in a passage that is parallel but has been altered in some way: 2 Chron. 33.8 = 2 Kings 21.8 (where they have been added in Chron.). The conclusion might be that the Chronicler had a different conception of how these terms should be used, or in what context they should be used, than did the Deuteronomist.

37. Japhet points out other relationships between Chronicles and Joshua; she notes that the land that remains to be conquered in Josh. 13.1-6 is already included within Israel's boundaries in 1 Chron. 13.5, before David's wars in 1 Chron. 18-20 ("Conquest" 208-10). So to the position held in Joshua and Samuel that the land had to be conquered and the conquest was not completed until the time of David, the Chronicler answered that the land was already conquered before David conquers it. Japhet also points out elsewhere (SJ 499) that there are differences in the perspectives of Chronicles and Joshua: Chronicles sees the people as actively supporting the leader rather than passively following him as in Joshua.

38. Williamson points out that in Chronicles it seems as if David rules over all Israel from Hebron before the capture of Jerusalem, rather than just a part of it as in 2 Samuel (HGMW 188).

39. Cf. Halpern, who notes that wealth is a mark of divine favour all through Chronicles ("Sacred" 40).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CHRONICLER'S SOLOMON

Previous discussions of Solomon in Chronicles

As I stated in Chapter Three, it is common to view David and Solomon as one unit, or as a linked pair: what David leaves unfinished (the Temple), Solomon finishes.¹ There is much less text devoted to Solomon in Chronicles than to David, and most of it is concerned with the building of the Temple. Dillard has suggested that the Solomon narrative is chiastic and centered on the building of the Temple ("Literary"). It is interesting that Solomon is not explicitly judged in the text the way David is (cf. 1 Chron. 29.28), or the way that the later kings are (e.g. 2 Chron. 33.2). Auld states that the Chronicler assessed Solomon positively, but not explicitly: Solomon is part of the ideal pair (139).

Braun points out that in Samuel-Kings Solomon is often judged unfavourably, and that it is because of his sins that the kingdom is divided after his death. However, in Chronicles, Solomon is depicted as being completely obedient to Yhwh: his primary achievement is the building of the Temple (RB xxxiii-xxxv). Japhet notes that while David is shown as having sinned, Solomon is "indeed flawless," and shown as having many positive qualities, "such as his personal election, his special

relationship with God, and the achievement in his time of 'rest' and 'peace'." However, she states that Solomon's achievements are undermined by David having anticipated them (SJ 48). De Vries agrees, showing that David's reign was "the preparation for the fulfillment that was to come under the kingship of Solomon" (SJV 229). Riley examines Solomon's activities with respect to the Temple and cult, and shows that in every case, Solomon is completing what David had planned or started: he concludes that Solomon's function in Chronicles is to carry out David's plan, thus making David the main figure for the building of the Temple (83-87).

It is commonly accepted by now that the Chronicler patterned his succession of Solomon to David after the succession of Joshua to Moses in Deuteronomy-Joshua. Williamson outlines the five main elements of the transition: 1) David's disqualification as Temple builder linked to Solomon's succession parallels Moses' disqualification from entering the land of Israel linked to Joshua's succession; 2) the installation of Solomon parallels that of Joshua by including encouragement, the description of the task, and the assurance of divine aid; 3) both charges are first given in private and then in public; 4) the obedience of the people is emphasized in both accounts; and 5) Joshua is magnified with respect to Moses, so too Solomon is magnified ("Accession" 351-55). I will further discuss the transition from David to Solomon in my analysis below.

Dillard suggests that the Chronicler was only interested in Solomon with respect to the cult: he saw both David and Solomon as figures of messianic expectations. Solomon is even more idealized than David is, he is the second David ("Chronicler's" 291-92). Dillard also suggests that while Solomon is patterned on David, and the succession is patterned on the succession of Joshua to Moses, Solomon might also be seen as the new Bezalel, the builder of the Tabernacle in Exodus (RBD 4-5). However, Mark Throntveit considers that the Chronicler's emphasis is on the Temple and the glorification of God, rather than on the idealization of Solomon ("Idealization" 425-6).

Again, as with David, there is a lack of description (other than the Temple) about what the criteria are for the "ideal" king and how Solomon might fulfill those criteria. In Chapter Three, I established the characteristics of the ideal king through an intertextual reading of David; they are: 1) a concern for the proper worship of Yhwh, 2) seeking the counsel of Yhwh, 3) having many sons to follow after him, 4) receiving tribute from other nations (the ideal king is both wealthy and honoured), 5) military conquest of other nations, 6) the proper organization of the cult and the kingdom, and 7) having a long (forty-year) reign and a peaceful death at an old age. In the analysis, I will take the criteria established during the analysis of the Davidic material in 1 Chronicles and look at how Solomon may or may not fulfill the criteria for being the "ideal" king. In the second

section of analysis, I will look at how Solomon functions intertextually through the dialogic relationship between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings.

Reading Solomon in Chronicles

1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - Solomon's accession

In Chapter Three, I read this passage with my focus on the portrayal of David. Here, I will look at the features of the passage that have to do more specifically with Solomon. The first feature has to do with how and when Solomon is made king. We are first told in 1 Chron. 23.1 that David made Solomon king [wayyamlēk] over Israel. As I noted in Chapter Three, this would seem to be a private event. Then in 1 Chron. 29.22, the assembly "made David's son Solomon king [wayyamlîkû] a second time [šēnîṭ]."² This is clearly a public event (cf. HGMW 187). Nowhere else in Chronicles is someone made a king twice. What is also interesting is that in Chronicles usually the people who make someone king. The verb *mālak* in the hiphil is used 20 times in Chronicles: Israel, or a group of warriors, or one tribe or one city makes someone king (1 Chron. 11.10; 12.32, 39 (x2); 29.22; 2 Chron. 10.1; 21.8; 22.1; 23.11; 26.1; 33.25; 36.1); Yhwh makes someone king (1 Chron. 28.4; 2 Chron. 1.8, 9, 11); and a foreign king appoints a puppet king (2 Chron. 36.4, 10). Here in 1 Chron. 23.1, David makes Solomon king - he takes upon himself the powers of the people and/or Yhwh.³ It would seem that in

order for Solomon's kingship to be fully sanctioned, he has to be made king by the people, not merely by his father.

In 1 Chron. 28.5-6 David quotes Yhwh as having chosen Solomon as the king and Temple builder, and in 28.10 and 29.1 David reiterates how God has chosen Solomon. The use of the verb *bāḥar* 'to choose' is interesting, as only Solomon after David is described as having been chosen by Yhwh to be king (cf. RB 271, SJ 488-9). What is equally interesting is that it is only in David's words here that Solomon is described as "chosen;" the speech of Yhwh in 1 Chron. 17 which David quotes here does not use the word "chosen." David is emphasizing the "chosen-ness" of Solomon, and the fact that God has chosen Solomon, not him.⁴

The third point I would like to draw out in this episode is what Solomon is anointed as. In 1 Chron. 29.22, we are told that "[t]hey made David's son Solomon king a second time; they anointed him [*wayyimšəḥū*] as the LORD's prince [*lənāgīd*], and Zadok as priest." Here I want to examine the implications of the second half of the description, starting with the use of the verb *māšah* 'to anoint'. This verb is used only five times in Chronicles, and the occurrences are critical: twice referring to David (1 Chron. 11.3; 14.8), once to Solomon (1 Chron. 29.22), once to Jehu as the destroyer of the house of Ahab (2 Chron. 22.7), and once to Joash (2 Chron. 23.11). With the exception of 1 Chron. 14.8 (which merely reports what the Philistines had heard), this verb is strongly associated with Yhwh: David and

Solomon are anointed before Yhwh, Yhwh himself anoints Jehu, and Joash is anointed inside the Temple of Yhwh. The verb *mālak* in the hiphil 'to make king' seems to be the more usual word in Chronicles. Anointing is something much more special: it happens only to David, Solomon, and Joash (I will explore the implications for Joash in Chapter Five).

What is Solomon anointed as? We have in this verse (1 Chron. 29.22) the combination of both *mālak* in the hiphil and *māṣaḥ*: Solomon is both "made king" and "anointed." He is anointed as *nāgīd*, a very interesting term. It has often been pointed out that this term in late texts, such as Chronicles, reflects a usage beyond the "prince" or "ruler" attested in earlier texts (this usage is also attested in Chronicles, e.g., 1 Chron. 11.2; 28.4). In Chronicles, the term often has the connotations of "overseer" or "leader" of a group of officials or military officers (e.g., 1 Chron. 26.4; 13.1). However, both usages are found in Chronicles. So what is Solomon anointed as? The key is found in the other appointment made at the same time: Zadok as (high) priest. In 2 Chron. 19.11, as Jehoshaphat is appointing judges, he says, "Amariah the chief priest is over you in all matters of the LORD; and Zebadiah son of Ishmael, the governor [*nāgīd*] of the house of Judah, in all the king's matters [...]." This is the only other place in Chronicles where priest and *nāgīd* are juxtaposed, and it is clear that they are subordinate to the authority of the king.⁵ I would suggest that

in 1 Chron. 29.22, Solomon is made a sort of "crown prince:" a formal title for the successor to the king (with RB 288).⁶ Once David is dead, Solomon can become the king.

Finally, the verb *ḥāzaq* 'to be strong' is important in binding this passage together; it occurs four times: 1 Chron. 28.7, 10, 20; 29.12, as well as in 1 Chron. 22.13. In 1 Chron. 28.7, David quotes Yhwh as saying that he will "establish [Solomon's] kingdom forever if he continues resolute [*'im-yehēzaq*] in keeping my commandments and my ordinances [...];" David then twice exhorts Solomon to be strong (*ḥāzaq*) and act in building the Temple (28.10, 20; also 22.13); and David praises Yhwh in his prayer, saying to Yhwh that "it is in your hand to make great and to give strength [*ūlēḥazzēq*] to all" (29.12). David clearly considers the ability to be strong to be of extreme importance to his son; he himself is never described this way in 1 Chronicles.⁷

The entire episode of Solomon's accession sets the stage for the depiction of his reign, much as the episode of Saul's death in 1 Chron. 10 sets the stage for the depiction of the reign of David. Although Solomon himself is not shown here as having any of the characteristics of the ideal king, the language used of him, especially by David, would suggest that we should see these features once Solomon's own reign develops. However, even at this early stage, we can see that language pertaining to

Solomon's cultic role as Temple builder is more prominent than language describing other features of the ideal king.

2 Chronicles 1.1-17 - Solomon's greatness

The first thing we are told about Solomon's reign after David's death is that he "established himself [wayyithāzzēq] in his kingdom [...]" (2 Chron. 1.1). After being exhorted three times by David to be strong, the first thing Solomon does is to make himself strong. The verb *hāzaq* in the hithpael 'to establish' is used frequently in Chronicles (15 of the 27 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible); we will see in Chapter Five how it is used to describe some of the other kings of Judah (cf. HGMW 193). The second thing we are told about Solomon is that Yhwh "was with him and made him exceedingly great [waygaddēlēhū]" (2 Chron. 1.1). The verb *gādal* in the piel 'to magnify' is used only three times in Chronicles: in 1 Chron. 29.12, 25 and here in 2 Chron. 1.1. The first reference (1 Chron. 29.12) also has it paired with *hāzaq* and refers to God's ability to magnify and strengthen. Thus God's role in Solomon's establishment is emphasized, and David's prayer in 1 Chron. 29 is fulfilled. We begin to see that Solomon's role may primarily be as the fulfillment or continuation of David's reign; this has been foreshadowed by the occurrences of Solomon's name in 1 Chronicles, as I discussed in Chapter Three.

Solomon's first act is to show cultic obedience by visiting the tabernacle in Gibeon (SJ 525), just as David's first act was

to show cultic obedience by removing the Ark in 1 Chron. 13 (HGMW 193-4). His reward is wisdom given to him by Yhwh. As we will see throughout the analysis of Solomon in Chronicles, Solomon's cultic obedience is emphasized above all other aspects of the ideal king. However, the place the Solomon goes to is interesting: he goes to the high place at Gibeon in order to visit the tabernacle (2 Chron. 1.3); the Chronicler points out that the Ark has already been moved into Jerusalem (1.4). The high place at Gibeon has been mentioned twice before (1 Chron. 16.39, 21.29) as the abode of the tabernacle and altar of Yhwh. Solomon's visit to Gibeon, like David's removal of the Ark in 1 Chron. 13 (RBD 11), and the establishment of Levites in 1 Chron. 16.39, again points up the contrast between Solomon and Saul in terms of cultic obedience. It also points out the task that Solomon now has to complete, the bringing together in Jerusalem (cf. PRA 101) of the tabernacle and the Ark, which were separated by David. Cultic obedience is one of the characteristics of the ideal ruler as established by David; here Solomon is shown as having completed David's cultic tasks - the two primary features of Solomon (builder of the Temple and successor to David) continue to be emphasized.

After his return from Gibeon, Solomon amasses his military forces (2 Chron. 1.14), and gathers together wealth (1.15-17), two more features of the ideal ruler. However, Solomon does not here engage in military conquest, nor is his wealth due to the

gathering of booty or the receipt of tribute; his wealth comes through trade.⁸ It is as if the Chronicler has taken the play on Solomon's name ("peace" or "rest") and extended it to the features required of him to be an ideal ruler.⁹ These cursory mentions of these characteristics should be compared with the lengthy description of Solomon's cultic functions.

2 Chronicles 2.1-7.22 - Building of the Temple

Solomon's first act in building the Temple is to initiate a trading partnership with Hiram (Hiram) of Tyre. Hiram had sent wood to David as tribute (1 Chron. 14.1); here Solomon requests artisans to make the fittings for the Temple, and more wood, and he proposes to feed Hiram's woodcutters. Hiram makes a good deal: he sends one artisan, ensures that the food will be sent, and then tells Solomon that it will be Solomon's responsibility to get the wood from the coast to Jerusalem. This is hardly the unconditional tribute that he sent to Solomon's father David. Here we have a contrast with rather than a continuation of David with respect to the amassing of tribute.¹⁰

In the last few verses of the chapter (2.16-17), Solomon completes a census of the resident aliens (*haggêrîm*) living in Israel, and assigns them to work on the Temple. Clearly, there is no problem with this census, either because it involves conscription for working on the Temple (as I argued in Chapter Three), or because it counts not Israelites, but aliens, or because of a combination of both reasons. However, although

David set the aliens to cutting stone for the Temple in 1 Chron. 22.2 (a task reserved for subjugated people, cf. 1 Chron. 20.3), we should regard with caution any suggestion that these aliens deserve no better fate. In David's prayer to Yhwh in 1 Chron. 29.15, he compared the Israelites to aliens (*gērîm*) before God; it is implied in the prayer that the Israelites had benefited greatly from God's goodness. Solomon's treatment of the aliens, therefore, contrasts greatly with God's treatment of the aliens before him; it also contrasts greatly with David's description in his prayer.

Much has been written regarding the plan of Solomon's Temple in 2 Chron. 3.3-5.1; the details of the Temple plans are not of importance here.¹¹ What is important is that although we are told in 2 Chron. 3.3 that these are Solomon's measurements for the Temple, the double occurrence of David's name in 3.1 reminds us that David was the one who drew up the plans and provided them to Solomon in 1 Chron. 28.11-12. What is also important is that the materials for the ornamentation of the Temple came as a result of the tribute which David received or booty which he captured, and which he donated to the Temple in 1 Chron. 29.2-5 - this is only alluded to once in the description, in 2 Chron. 5.1. The whole description of the Temple plan and ornamentation is framed by the use of David's name, in 3.1 and 5.1; this emphasizes that all of this work was really the result

of David's actions. Solomon is thus shown as perfectly realizing David's plans (cf. Riley 83-87).

The episode of 2 Chron. 5, where the priests and Levites bring the Ark into the Temple can also be seen as Solomon completing David's work. David brought the Ark from Kiriath-jearim to the house of Obed-edom in 1 Chron. 13, and brought it into the city of Jerusalem in 1 Chron. 15. He commanded Solomon to bring the Ark into the completed Temple in 1 Chron. 22.19, emphasized in 28.2 how he had wanted himself to build the Temple for the Ark, and put forward instructions for the cherubim to cover the Ark in 28.18. Solomon's bringing the Ark in exactly fulfills all of David's instructions in 1 Chron. 22 and 28, and completes David's task begun in 1 Chron. 13 (cf. SJ 574). Johnstone points out a number of similarities between the action of David in removing the Ark to Jerusalem in 1 Chron. 15-16 and Solomon in bringing it into the Temple in 2 Chron. 5-6: the use of the verb *qāhal* 'to assemble' (1 Chron. 15.3; 2 Chron. 5.2, 3); the use of the verb *ālāh* in the hiphil 'to bring up' (1 Chron. 15.3, 12, 14, 25, 28; 2 Chron. 5.2, 5 [x2]); "all Israel" participating in the action (1 Chron. 15.3, 28; 16.3; 2 Chron. 5.3, 6); the Levites as the bearers of the Ark (1 Chron. 15.5; 2 Chron. 5.4); the offering of sacrifice during the procession (1 Chron. 15.26; 2 Chron. 5.6); the presence of musicians (1 Chron. 15.27-28; 2 Chron. 5.12-13); and the blessing of the people by the king (1 Chron. 16.7-36; 2 Chron. 6.3) (WJ 1: 332).

After Solomon completes the tasks set for him by David, namely building the Temple and bringing the Ark into it, he makes a speech to the assembly. This speech has three parts: in the first (2 Chron. 6.1-2), Solomon speaks to Yhwh, emphasizing that he has indeed built the Temple; in the second (6.3-11), Solomon speaks to the assembly, blessing Yhwh and quoting him with respect to his commission to build the Temple, and showing how he has completed the task; in the third (6.12-42), Solomon prays to Yhwh. This speech would seem to parallel David's speech to the assembly in 1 Chron. 28-29, the speech he made when he had finished all of his tasks (cf. SJ 573-4). In both speeches, Yhwh's choosing David as king over Israel and David's desire to build the Temple is emphasized (1 Chron. 28.2-4; 2 Chron. 6.4-7); Solomon's choice by Yhwh as Temple builder is mentioned (1 Chron. 28.5-7; 2 Chron. 6.8-10); and both speeches end with a long prayer and blessing (1 Chron. 29.10-20; 2 Chron. 6.14-42). Furthermore, the language used in the two speeches is very similar, and the one seems deliberately to recall the other; an example of a dialogic relationship within the text of Chronicles itself. Thus, just as the verb *bāḥar* 'to choose' ties together the speech of 1 Chron. 28-29, it also ties together this speech and Yhwh's response to it, occurring in 2 Chron. 6.5 (x2), 6 (x2), 34, 38; 7.12, 16. However, here the emphasis is a little different, as it is the chosen-ness of Jerusalem which is brought to the forefront (6.5, 6, 34, 38; 7.12, 16). The chosen-ness of

David and Solomon emphasized in 1 Chron. 28-29 is here complemented by the chosen-ness of Jerusalem as the city of Yhwh, the site of Yhwh's Temple. When Jerusalem was first captured by David in 1 Chron. 11, it was not designated by anyone as "chosen;" and when the site of the Temple within Jerusalem is selected, in 1 Chron. 22.1, it is not designated by anyone as "chosen." So far in Chronicles, *bāḥar* has been strongly linked with the dynastic line of David. It is not until this point that we see David, Solomon, the House of David, Jerusalem and the Temple all linked together as having been chosen by Yhwh.

Beyond the use of *bāḥar*, there are other similarities between the language of 2 Chron. 6 and other passages in Chronicles. In his speech, Solomon quotes Yhwh as telling David that "because it was in your heart to build a house for my name, you did well [*hēṭībôtā*]" (6.8; my translation). We can assume that Solomon is quoting either David's speech of 1 Chron. 28 or his private speech to Solomon of 1 Chron. 22, both of which quote Yhwh's speech to Nathan of 1 Chron. 17. In none of the three earlier speeches is Yhwh quoted as having told David that he "did well." In fact, in the earlier speeches, it is not a good thing for David to have considered building the Temple, and David is definitely excluded from Temple building. The conclusion of Solomon's quotation of Yhwh, that "your [David's] son who shall be born to you shall build the house for my name" (6.9), merely summarizes the intent of all of Yhwh's previous speeches (those

both from Yhwh and attributed to Yhwh) with respect to David's son (1 Chron. 17.12; 22.10; 28.6 - see Chapter Three for the discussion of these speeches). Solomon's assertion in response to Yhwh's promises is that he has succeeded his father David and built the Temple (2 Chron. 6.10). Even he seems to be viewing these two acts as being the most important ones of his rule. So far, there does not seem to be anything else to Solomon.

Yhwh's response to Solomon's dedication and prayer occur in another personal appearance in the night (2 Chron. 7.12).¹² During his response, he addresses Solomon specifically as follows,

As for you, if you walk before me, as your father David walked, doing according to all that I have commanded you and keeping my statutes [wəḥuqqay] and my ordinances [ûmišpāṭay], then I will establish your royal throne, as I made covenant with your father David saying, "You shall never lack a successor [lō'-yikkārēt lēkā 'îš] to rule over Israel." (2 Chron. 7.17-18)

This statement reminds us of David's quotation of Yhwh's words in 1 Chron. 28.7 and Yhwh's dynastic promise of 1 Chron. 17.11-12. It is in direct response to Solomon's quotation during his prayer in 2 Chron. 6.16 of a promise made by Yhwh to David,

There shall never fail you a successor [lō'-yikkārēt lēkā 'îš] before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if

only your children keep to their way, to walk in my
law [bētôrātî] as you have walked before me.

As I pointed out in Chapter Three, the terms "statute" (ḥōq/ḥuqqâ) and "ordinance" (mišpāt) appear in clusters throughout Chronicles; Yhwh's speech of 2 Chron. 7.17 almost directly quotes David's quotation of Yhwh in 1 Chron. 28.7 with respect to the keeping of Yhwh's statutes and ordinances. However, Solomon's quotation in 2 Chron. 6.16 of Yhwh's words to David with respect to a successor, and Yhwh's close repetition of these words in 2 Chron. 7.18, although seeming to allude to the dynastic promise of 1 Chron. 17.11-12, is unprecedented. In the prayer of 2 Chron. 6.16 and Yhwh's response of 2 Chron. 7.17-18, we have the bringing together of two concepts introduced separately in 1 Chronicles. In 1 Chron. 17.11-12, Yhwh promises unconditionally to establish David's offspring (here seemingly referring to his son) in his kingdom forever; in 1 Chron. 28.7, Yhwh promises conditionally to establish Solomon in his kingdom as long as he keeps Yhwh's statutes and ordinances. Now here we have the combination of the two opposing promises: Solomon's quotation of Yhwh has the promise being both unconditional (never lacking a successor) and conditional (keeping the law), as does Yhwh's response (never lacking a successor, keeping statutes and ordinances). Riley points out that commentators have seen 2 Chron. 7 as supporting either one of the two possibilities for the dynastic covenant (93-4). He concludes that 2 Chron. 7.17-18

"points to a condition which can never be finally fulfilled but which must be continually fulfilled; therefore the conditionality [...]" (95).¹³ Most importantly, Yhwh's purported quotation of himself in 2 Chron. 7.18 (lit. "There shall not fail you anyone having dominion over Israel.") is not a direct quotation of any speech of his in 1 Chronicles, but is merely a quotation of Solomon's quotation of Yhwh's words to David in 2 Chron. 6.16 (lit., "There shall not fail you anyone before me sitting upon the throne of Israel". It is almost as if Yhwh himself has been hoodwinked by the spiral of quotation within quotation - from the basic promise of a son to David in 1 Chron. 17 to the complicated dialogic relationship between conditional and unconditional promise of enduring successors in 2 Chron. 7. *2 Chronicles 8.1-9.31 - Solomon's greatness, continued*

2 Chron. 8 continues and expands the account of Solomon's might and power begun in 2 Chron. 1. In this chapter, Solomon undertakes the military conquest of Hamath-zobah and then builds Tadmor (8.3) - both cities were located to the north of Israel, on the extreme edge of the territory conquered by David (cf. JMM2 47-8). This is the only mention of a military conquest by Solomon (RBD 64), who has been earlier described as a man of peace (SJ 622) - this would suggest that the ideal ruler has to show at least some military might. He also settles Israelites in towns given to him by Hiram (8.2),¹⁴ and conscripts non-Israelites for labour (8.7-8). He also enters on a massive building

campaign (8.4-6), and undertakes the organization of the labour for this campaign (8.9-10). He increases his wealth through trade (8.17-18), takes a wife (8.11), and continues the cultic organization that had been started by David (8.12-15). 2 Chron. 9 also details Solomon's great wealth accumulated by trade (9.13-21, 28) and by the receipt of tribute (9.23-24),¹⁵ and briefly describes the empire which he rules over (9.26), which basically seems to be the empire captured by David during his conquests. The only sustained narrative of this section, the story of the arrival of the queen of Sheba (9.1-12), merely re-emphasizes Solomon's great wealth (and his wisdom) - in this case, the great wealth amassed through the tribute of the queen. Solomon's generosity is also highlighted, since he gives her everything she asks for, even "well beyond what she had brought to the king" (9.12). Taken together, it would seem that all of these actions are meant to fulfill some of the criteria of the ideal ruler, namely: receipt of tribute, military conquest, and proper organization of cult and kingdom. The notice of a wife would seem to be given in order that he might have a son or successor. However, where the fulfillment of the criteria of proper cultic observance and seeking the counsel of Yhwh are shown by the means of an elaborate intertextual web constructed by the Chronicler, the fulfillment of these criteria is simply listed.

The final summary of Solomon's reign at 2 Chron. 9.29-31 follows in general form the summary given at the death of David in 1 Chron. 29.26-30, but with some crucial differences.¹⁶ In 1 Chron. 29.27-30, the summary for David is given in the following order: length of reign (40 years) over all Israel, death in old age, succession by son, account of David's deeds given in records of the prophets. In 2 Chron. 9.29-31, the summary for Solomon is given in this order: account of Solomon's deeds given in records of the prophets, length of reign (40 years) over all Israel, death (there is no notice of his death "in a good old age, full of days, riches and honor [...]," as with David in 1 Chron. 29.28), succession by son. The notice that there is an account of the ruler's deeds to be found in other records is placed either at the beginning or at the end of the summary; it is the "rest of" the deeds of Solomon which are recounted in the prophetic works, which might explain why the notice is placed first. We might infer that while all of David's deeds are recorded in 1 Chronicles, only some of Solomon's deeds are recorded in 2 Chronicles - all of David's deeds are important, but only a few of Solomon's are - this would have to be the building of the Temple. Notably, it is only at this point in the text that the fulfillment of the final criteria for the ideal ruler are introduced: a son/successor, and a peaceful death after a long reign.

Reading Solomon dialogically

1 Chronicles 28.1-29.30 - Solomon's accession

As I pointed out above, Solomon is made king twice. Although this is unparalleled elsewhere in Chronicles, and does not occur in the same way in 1 Kings, there is a dialogic relationship between the accession of Solomon and the accession of Saul in 1 Sam. 10-11. In 1 Sam. 10.1, Samuel anoints Saul as king in private; then in 1 Sam. 10.20-26 Saul is chosen as king by lot and acclaimed by the people in public. After Saul proves himself in battle against the Ammonites, he is made king (wayyamlikû) in public (and "before the LORD") in 1 Sam. 11.14-15. When we put this accession together with the evaluation of Saul in 1 Chron. 10 and the evaluation of Solomon in 1 Chron. 29.25, we can see that the Chronicler's Solomon and the Deuteronomist's Saul are set in opposition. Saul is made king twice in 1 Samuel, suffers a horrible fate and is evaluated negatively; Solomon is made king twice in 1 Chronicles and is exalted and is given "such royal majesty as had not been on any king before him in Israel" (1 Chron. 29.25); the comparison with Saul is thus made explicit without even mentioning Saul's name (this is similar to 1 Chron. 17.13). Thus, we have here an example of role replacement: the traditions of Saul's selection and anointing as king are kept, but Solomon is substituted for Saul. The contrast between Solomon and Saul is thus made subtly but effectively.

The use of the verb *bāḥar* 'to choose' to describe Solomon's selection as king has many interesting intertextual possibilities. First, David's emphasis on God's having chosen Solomon brings up a contrast with Solomon's selection as king in 1 Kings 1-2. Nowhere in Samuel-Kings does it say that Solomon is chosen by anyone (let alone Yhwh) to be king over Israel, and as I pointed out in Chapter Three, Solomon's succession to David is no sure and easy thing in 1 Kings 1-2. Chronicles' response to the position of 1 Kings, then, is that Solomon's succession is no result of political intrigue, but rather that he has been chosen all along: putting the words in David's mouth absolves David of any part in the political intrigue of 1 Kings 1. Second, although Solomon is not chosen in Samuel-Kings (and neither is David), there is one king who is chosen by Yhwh in 1 Samuel, namely Saul: Saul is selected through the casting of lots, and when the process is finished, Samuel says to the people, "Do you see the one whom the LORD has chosen [*bāḥar*]?" (1 Sam. 10.24). Japhet has pointed out that even the system that David narrates in 1 Chron. 28.4-5 resembles the casting of lots (SJ 488), but she does not link this casting of lots with the other king who is chosen by lots, namely Saul. The similarities between Saul and Solomon are so close that it seems that Solomon's selection and investiture are inextricably linked with Saul's selection. David's emphasis that both he and Solomon are chosen by God to be king answers the position of 1 Samuel, that Saul is the one

chosen by God, not David or Solomon.¹⁷ This furthers the aspect of role reversal with respect to Solomon and Saul, and does so with great irony; the continued emphasis on the chosenness of Solomon makes us think that perhaps he was not so chosen after all.

Solomon is made king and anointed "prince" (*nāgîd*) in 1 Chron. 29.22. While no one else in Chronicles is anointed (*māšāḥ*) as *nāgîd* (contra WJ 1: 291), there is one king in Samuel-Kings who is anointed as *nāgîd*, namely Saul; in 1 Sam. 9.16 Yhwh tells Samuel to anoint Saul, and in 10.1, he does it. No other ruler in Samuel-Kings is anointed as *nāgîd*. Again, we have a dialogic relationship between Solomon in 1 Chron. 29 and Saul in Samuel. To the claim of Samuel-Kings that Saul is anointed as the ruler over Israel, Chronicles replies that it is not Saul but Solomon who is so anointed. Solomon has a position as anointed ruler that not even David in Chronicles can claim, and his anointing forcefully establishes him as the rightful king in this text. The pattern which we saw with respect to the Chronicler's David in Chapter Three seems to be continuing here with respect to Solomon: Saul as the antithesis of the ideal king, Solomon as the paragon. All three of the features I pointed out in my reading of this passage in Chronicles alone as important to the reading of Solomon in Chronicles also are important in establishing this Saul-Solomon opposition, effected through the role reversal of the two characters. It is interesting that in

Samuel-Kings, David was preceded by a *nāgīd*, while in Chronicles he is succeeded by one; this may emphasize David as the pinnacle of kingship, while Solomon merely continues in his glory.

The use of the verb *ḥāzaq* 'to be strong' brings forward a contrast not between Solomon and Saul but between Solomon and David. As I pointed out above, the verb is never used of David himself in 1 Chronicles. However, it is used five times of David in Samuel: in 1 Sam. 17.35, David describes how he has prevailed over (*wēheḥēzaqtî*) predators; in 1 Sam. 17.50, David prevails over (*wayyeḥēzaq*) Goliath; in 1 Sam. 23.16 he is strengthened (*wayḥazzēq*) by Jonathan; in 1 Sam. 30.6 he strengthens himself (*wayyithazzēq*) in Yhwh; and in 2 Sam. 3.1 we are told that David grew stronger (*wēḥāzēq*) while the house of Saul grew weaker. The position of Samuel, that David is strong, is answered in Chronicles that Solomon should be strong, as David never was.¹⁶ We will explore further implications of the verb *ḥāzaq* in Chapter Five.

What is also interesting in the depiction of Solomon in 1 Chron. 29 is that Solomon has a true "coronation," as it were, while David in 1 Chron. 11-12 does not. This brings forward the relationship between David's accession in 1 Chronicles and his selection as king in 1 Samuel: in 1 Samuel 16.13, Samuel anoints David as king, while 1 Chronicles does not mention any such act by Samuel; in 1 Chron. 11.3 David is anointed as king by the

people. When we tie together all of the anointings in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, we find that they have a complex interrelationship, each anointing bringing to mind all of the others. The hinge is the anointing of Solomon in 1 Chron. 29.22: it recalls Samuel's anointing of Saul as *nāgîd*, Samuel's anointing of David as king, David's position as *nāgîd* of the people in Samuel (1 Sam. 25.30; 2 Sam. 5.2; 6.21; 7.8), and David's anointing in 1 Chron. 11. The combination of all of the elements found in these various scenes is found only in Solomon's accession here: Solomon's accession is more important and prestigious than any other before him, and is not repeated in such glory for any king after him. Perhaps it serves to accentuate his succession to David and David's glory, rather than to rebound onto his own glory.

2 Chronicles 1.1-17 - Solomon's greatness

From an intertextual perspective, this is a very interesting chapter. When read with the corresponding passage in Samuel-Kings (1 Kings 3-4), it becomes clear that there is an extremely subtle and sophisticated dialogic relationship between these two texts. In brief, the two texts seem on the surface to be saying the same thing, but when examined more closely, they actually contradict each other. The effect with respect to the concept of the ideal ruler is to downplay any characteristics of the ideal ruler that Solomon might have in favour of an emphasis on his role as Temple builder and promoter of the cult only.

First, Solomon's visit to the high place at Gibeon is emphasized in Chronicles in a way that it is not in 1 Kings 3; in 1 Kings 3, it is merely the backdrop to the far more important event of Solomon's dream. In 2 Chron. 1.5, Solomon and the assembly (*wēhaqqāhāl*) inquire (*wayyidrēšēhū*) at the altar at the high place. No such statement is made in 1 Kings 3 - and we have already seen the importance of seeking Yhwh to the Chronicler. Again, we have the contrast between Saul who did not seek Yhwh and Solomon who does. Solomon's reward is striking when we compare it to his reward in 1 Kings 3: here in 2 Chron. 1.7, Yhwh himself appears to Solomon (in person, as it were), whereas in 1 Kings 3 it is emphasized that Solomon has a dream in which Yhwh appears to him ("dream" occurs twice, in 3.5 and 3.15). The episode in 1 Kings recalls such dream-appearances as Yhwh appearing to Jacob in Gen. 28, whereas the episode in 2 Chronicles recalls such personal appearances as Yhwh appearing to Abraham in Gen. 17 and to Moses in Deut. 1-3 (as Moses recalls these appearances). It is extremely rare for Yhwh to appear in person to people after Moses in the Hebrew Bible, and this is the only such appearance in Chronicles. David himself receives Yhwh's word, but only through oracles as in 1 Chron. 14.10 and 14, or through prophets as in 1 Chron. 17.3 and 21.9. Other kings only receive Yhwh's word through prophets. Even the prophets themselves rarely see Yhwh, instead receiving his word. Solomon here is being described as a kind of super-prophet, with

the same kind of stature before Yhwh as the patriarchs. Thus while Samuel-Kings takes the position that Solomon receives Yhwh's word in the "normal" way, through a dream, Chronicles replies that Solomon does not dream, he actually sees Yhwh in the same way that special prophets (such as Samuel, cf. 1 Sam. 3) and the patriarchs had in earlier times.¹⁹

In 1 Kings 3, the account of Solomon's dream is detailed, and the example that immediately follows it demonstrates vividly the special gift of wisdom that Yhwh gives him. However, in 2 Chron. 1, the gift of wisdom is rather perfunctorily described, and is certainly not emphasized in the same way. Solomon's speech of request (1.8-10) for wisdom is much shorter than in 1 Kings 3, and so is Yhwh's reply (1.11-12). This reply is generally reminiscent of Yhwh's speech in 1 Kings 3.11-14, but there are several important differences as illustrated below:

1 Kings 3.11-14

Because you have asked this,
and have not asked for
yourself long life or riches
(*'ōšer*),

or for the life of your
enemies (*'ōyēbeykā*),

but have asked for yourself
understanding (*hābîn*) to
discern what is right,
I now do according to your
word. Indeed I give you a
wise (*hākām*) and discerning
(*wēnābôn*) mind; no one like
you has been before you and

2 Chron. 1.11-12

Because this was in your
heart, and you have not
asked for possessions
(*'ōšer*), wealth (*nēkāsîm*),
honor (*wēkābôd*),
or the life of those who
hate you (*sônē'eykā*),
and have not even asked for
long life,
but have asked for
wisdom (*hokmā*) and knowledge
(*ūmaddā'*) for yourself that
you may rule my people over
whom I have made you king,
wisdom (*hahokmā*) and
knowledge (*wēhammaddā'*) are
granted to you.

no one like you shall arise
after you.

I give you also what you have
not asked, both riches
(*'ōšer*) and honor (*kābôd*) all
your life;
no other king shall compare
with you.

I will also give you riches
(*wē'ōšer*), possessions
(*ûnēkāsîm*), and honor
(*wēkābôd*),
such as none of the kings
had who were before you,
and none after you shall
have the like.

If you walk in my ways,
keeping my statutes and my
commandments, as your father
David walked, then I will
lengthen your life.

The three things that Yhwh is pleased that Solomon has not asked for in 1 Kings 3 are long life, riches (*'ōšer*) and the lives of his enemies; the Chronicler adds possessions (*nēkāsîm*) and honour (*kābôd*) to the riches and changes "enemies" to "those who hate you." Clearly, for the Chronicler, Solomon cannot have any enemies because he is the king of peace (as I discussed above), and long life is demoted from the first to the last thing on the list (possibly showing how it would be the easiest thing for Yhwh to give, or perhaps the most difficult; it is the only thing on the list that Yhwh does not give to Solomon).²⁰ The most interesting change is the addition of possessions and honour to riches: this triad is then repeated later when Yhwh lists the things that he will give to Solomon. This phrase "riches, possessions, and honour" given by God may have been some kind of stock phrase by the time of the composition of Chronicles; it suggests the completeness of God's gift.²¹

While both accounts talk of the wisdom given to Solomon, in 1 Kings 3, Solomon also asks for and is given discernment (*bîn*), while in Chronicles it is knowledge (*maddā'*) that Solomon requests and is granted. The key to understanding this cluster of terms may be found in Dan. 1.4 and 1.17. The young men chosen by the king in that passage are to "have insight [*ûmaskîlîm*] in every wisdom [*ḥokmâ*] and have knowledge [*da'at*] and be skilled [*ûmēbînē*] in knowledge [*maddā'*] [...]" (1.4; my translation); to Daniel and his three friends, God gave "knowledge [*maddā'*] and insight [*wēḥaškēl*] in every literature and wisdom [*wēḥokmâ*], and Daniel was skilled [*hēbîn*] in every vision and dream" (1.17; my translation). The author of Daniel distinguished between two types of knowledge in 1.4: ordinary knowledge (the common term *da'at*) and some other kind of knowledge that one had to be able to discern or be skilled at (the rare term *maddā'*). He then saw this special knowledge as additional to the insight into wisdom in 1.17, and gave Daniel himself the additional skill of interpreting dreams. This special knowledge, therefore, may have been some kind of oracular or prophetic knowledge. That in Kings Solomon's wisdom is a skill of discernment is illustrated by the example of 1 Kings 3.16-27 that immediately follows his dream (similarly, that Daniel's wisdom is oracular is illustrated by the example of Dan. 2 that immediately follows the description of the young men's gifts). However, in Chronicles, "discernment" or "skill" (*bîn*) is something that Solomon does not have: it is not

needed. Instead, Solomon has knowledge and wisdom of a prophetic or visionary type - he has the same kind of wisdom as Daniel. These two positions exist simultaneously and in contradiction: practical wisdom against oracular wisdom.

It is interesting that Hiram gives Solomon the attributes of being "wise [*ḥākām*]," "insightful [*śēkel*]," and "understanding [*ûbînâ*]" (2.11; my translation), when Solomon's gift of wisdom in 2 Chron. 1 is understood by both Solomon and Yhwh as being something slightly different. Perhaps this is an example of a dialogic relationship within Chronicles, where two voices debate about the kind of wisdom with which Solomon has been endowed: the voice of the earthly ruler Hiram sees wisdom as being something practical, whereas the voice of Solomon sees wisdom as being something mystical and prophetic.²²

Finally, there is the matter of the condition for God to lengthen Solomon's life in 1 Kings 3.14, which is completely lacking in 2 Chron. 1. This is an interesting feature of God's gifts in 1 Kings, as all of the other gifts are unconditional: Yhwh gives Solomon wisdom and discernment, wealth and honour beyond what other kings have, all without condition; yet Yhwh attaches a condition to the length of Solomon's life. In 2 Chron. 1, Yhwh gives all of his gifts unconditionally, and does nothing about the length of Solomon's life. The condition in 1 Kings 3.14 is that Solomon must "walk in my [Yhwh's] ways, keeping my statutes [*ḥuqqay*] and my commandments [*ûmišwōtay*], as

your father David walked [...]." As we saw in Chapter Three, this kind of language was certainly familiar to the Chronicler. What reading this verse with the corresponding section from 2 Chron. 1 highlights is that Solomon is promised everything but a long life: he is not even conditionally promised a long life. This tension may lead us to consider that perhaps Solomon will not have a long life; this is contradicted by the statement at the end of 2 Chron. 9 (which I will discuss below).

If we only know the account of Solomon in Chronicles, his role as the Temple builder and prophet of Yhwh is clear in the text. When we read the Solomon of 2 Chron. 1 with the Solomon of 1 Kings 3-4, it is even clearer. We continue to see that in Chronicles Solomon may not be the ideal ruler inasmuch as he is the ideal Temple builder (and these are not necessarily the same things). The reading of Solomon later in 2 Chronicles will tend to confirm this characterization.

2 Chronicles 2.1-7.22 - Building of the Temple

One of the interesting features of this passage has to do with Hiram's letter to Solomon in which he strikes the trade deal: Hiram strikes a much better deal in 2 Chron. 2 than in 1 Kings 5: he specifies a non-Israelite town (Joppa) for the wood depot, and puts in writing the amount of foodstuffs Solomon is to provide. In 1 Kings 5, Hiram lets Solomon choose the depot and does not specify the amount of foodstuffs, and what Solomon does end up providing is less than what he provides in 2 Chron. 2. In

1 Kings 4.12, Hiram and Solomon make a treaty. If we read 2 Chron. 2 only within the context of Chronicles, we can see that Hiram makes Solomon give up a great deal, and that perhaps this deal might even be one not entirely advantageous to Solomon's kingdom. This impression is made even stronger when we read this passage in the light of 1 Kings 4. In Chronicles, Solomon is so focussed on the necessity of building the Temple that he neglects other aspects of his kingdom.

It is also noteworthy that Solomon decides to build not only a Temple for Yhwh (lit. a "house for Yhwh's name" [*bayit lěšēm yhwh*]), he also decides to build a "house for his royalty [*ûbayit lēmalkûtô*]" for himself (2 Chron. 1.18). He does not tell Hiram about his own house, but Hiram makes reference to it (2.11). David, of course, had built himself houses with the cedar Hiram had sent to him (cf. 1 Chron. 14.1; 15.1). Clearly, these houses are not good enough for Solomon. It is possible to read this verse as Solomon building a temple for his royal power, thus putting his power on a par with the name of Yhwh. This self-aggrandizement is very different from the characterization of David in Chronicles, leading to the possibility that Solomon is not acting in the best interests of the kingdom, but rather in his own best interests. In 1 Kings 6.38-7.1 that he spends seven years building the Temple and thirteen years building his own house, and his own house is elaborately described in 7.2-12; certainly the implication might be that Solomon's own house

(palace) is of greater importance to him. However, nowhere in 1 Kings does it say that Solomon decides to build a house for his royal power equal in importance to the Temple.²³

For all the Chronicler's purported interest in the Temple and all things cultic, it is noteworthy that the description of the building of the Temple is much shorter in Chronicles than in Kings. In fact, from 2 Chron. 1.1 through 4.10, although the general content of the text parallels that of the parallel passage of 1 Kings 3.1-7.39, only tiny snippets actually take over the wording of Kings. However, all that changes at 2 Chron. 4.11 (= 1 Kings 7.40); from this point through to 2 Chron. 9.28 the two texts parallel each other almost exactly. In this section of my analysis, what we are concerned with is 2 Chron. 5-7: Solomon's bringing in of the Ark, his prayer and blessing, and Yhwh's response.

The most important dialogic relationship here between Chronicles and Kings has to do with the dynastic promise. Above, I discussed how the dynastic promise evolves through the text of Chronicles; if we place this evolution next to the text of Kings, several features emerge. Both versions of Solomon's prayer to Yhwh contain a version of the dynastic promise (my translations, emphases added):

2 Chron. 6.16

And therefore, O Yhwh, God of Israel, keep for your servant David, my father, that which

1 Kings 8.25

And therefore, O Yhwh, God of Israel, keep for your servant David, my father, that which

you spoke to him saying,
 "There shall not fail you
 anyone before me sitting upon
 the throne of Israel, surely
 if your sons keep their path,
 walking in my law just as you
 have walked before me."

you spoke to him saying,
 "There shall not fail you
 anyone before me sitting upon
 the throne of Israel, surely
 if your sons keep their path,
 walking before me just as you
 have walked before me."

Both versions of Yhwh's response to Solomon also contain a
 version of the dynastic promise (my translations):

2 Chron. 7.17-18

And now if you walk before me
 as David your father walked,

and to do according to all
 which I commanded you, and my
 statutes [wěhuqqay] and my
 ordinances [ûmišpāṭay] you
 keep. Then I will establish
 the throne [kissē'] of your
 dominion,
 just as I covenanted [kāratî]
 with David your father,
 saying, "There shall not fail
 [lō'-yikkārēt] you anyone
 having dominion over Israel."

1 Kings 9.4-5

And now if you walk before me
 as David your father walked,
 with integrity of heart and
 uprightness, to do according
 to all which I commanded you,
 and my statutes [wěhuqqay]
 and my ordinances [ûmišpāṭay]
 you keep. Then I will
 establish the throne [kissē']
 of your dominion over Israel
 forever, just as I spoke
 [dibbartî] to David your
 father, saying, "There shall
 not fail [lō'-yikkārēt] you
 anyone upon the throne of
 Israel."

Solomon's prayer and Yhwh's response in 2 Chronicles focus on the
 aspects of Yhwh's law (the "law" of 2 Chron. 6.16 being echoed by
 the "statutes" and "ordinances" of 7.17). Yhwh's response
 especially picks up the notion of a covenant, with a play on
 kāratî 'I covenanted' and lō'-yikkārēt 'there shall not fail,'
 and the notion of rule/dominion. Dillard points out the
 similarities between the language of the Chronicler here and the
 language of Mic. 5.1, and suggests that in the Chronicler's time
 the throne of Israel was vacant, but there was "messianic or

royalist" hope that someone would have dominion over Israel from the Davidic line (RBD 59, cf. PRA 116, HGMW 226). Could Chronicles have been the handbook for that ruler in the mind of the Chronicler? Solomon's prayer and Yhwh's response in 1 Kings focus on the behaviour of the king and the succession to the throne of Israel ("throne" occurring twice in 1 Kings 9.5). To the position of Kings that Yhwh is concerned with the eternal rule of the House of David, Chronicles replies that Yhwh is concerned with the covenant, but a covenant of a peculiar kind: a covenant at once both conditional and unconditional: a covenant requiring strict adherence to Yhwh's law yet at the same time requiring merely the existence of David's heirs. Whatever complexities there might have been to the notion of dynastic oracle and covenant in the thought of the Deuteronomist, the Chronicler responded that these notions are even more complex.

2 Chronicles 8.1-9.31 - Solomon's greatness, continued

The Chronicler divides Solomon's reign into two parts. The first (2 Chron. 1.1-8.1) involves the first 20 years of his reign, in which Solomon is primarily concerned with building the Temple and his palace. The second (2 Chron. 8.2-9.31) involves the second 20 years of his reign, in which Solomon undertakes building projects, collects tribute, entertains foreign rulers, and so on (Johnstone calls this the period of "international recognition [WJ 1: 295]). However, in 1 Kings, in the second half of his reign, Solomon also turns to the worship of the gods

of his many foreign wives; because of this Yhwh raises up enemies against him. The most important of these is Jeroboam, to whom the prophet Ahijah promises (in the name of Yhwh) ten of the twelve tribes of Israel (1 Kings 11.31). The Chronicler does not have any such stories about Solomon. However, in 2 Chron. 9.29, the Chronicler informs us that the deeds of Solomon may be found in the "prophecy of [nēbū'at] Ahijah the Shilonite, and in the visions of [ūbaḥāzôt] the seer Iddo concerning Jeroboam son of Nebat [...]." Thus, we have the introduction into Chronicles of the story of Ahijah and Jeroboam of 1 Kings 11, without explicitly including it (PRA 123). The story of Solomon in Chronicles works without this dialogic relationship with Kings, but it is richer with it: Solomon's misdeeds are brought forward, and we see that perhaps the Chronicler's picture of his reign may not be so perfect.

In 1 Kings 11.33, Solomon is explicitly condemned by Yhwh in Ahijah's speech because he has "not walked in my ways, doing what is right in my sight and keeping my statutes [wēḥuqqōtay] and my ordinances [ūmišpāṭay], as his father David did." This is almost an exact quotation of 1 Kings 9.4, and is given as the reason why Solomon will lose ten of the tribes of Israel; yet it will not happen in his lifetime because of David, who "did keep my commandments [mišwōtay] and my statutes [wēḥuqqōtāy] [...]" (11.34). Chronicles' response is that Solomon does not lose the tribes of Israel; he does follow Yhwh's ways, and is the perfect

son of David in that respect. The Chronicler thus had to come up with a different reason for the loss of the tribes, but delayed it until his account of the reign of Rehoboam, as we will see in Chapter Five.

Dillard has pointed out the nice contrast between the two descriptions of the end of Solomon's reign: in Kings, Solomon's reign is tainted as a result of his foreign wives, while in Chronicles, Solomon's grandeur is enhanced as a result of the visit of a foreign queen (RBD 74-5). We might also point out that in 2 Chron. 8.11, Solomon is presented as having only one wife, as opposed to the many wives and concubines of 1 Kings 11.1-3.²⁴ Again we have a dialogic relationship between the two texts: Chronicles replies to Kings' position that Solomon loves many women and they lead to his downfall with the response that Solomon has only one wife, and she certainly does not lead to his downfall. The only other woman introduced to him also does not lead to his downfall but rather increases his prestige and his wealth.

Reading Solomon, David, and Cyrus

When we read Solomon in terms of the framework for the ideal ruler established in the reading of David, we see that although he technically fulfills all of the criteria, his status as the son of David and the builder of the Temple almost completely prevails over the other aspects of the ideal ruler.

In fact, in some places (such as the receipt of wood from Hiram) the dialogism within Chronicles and the dialogic relationship with Kings indicate criticisms of Solomon's practical abilities. His cultic or prophetic abilities are enhanced. I said in Chapter Three that the early mentions of Solomon's name serve merely to introduce him as David's son and builder of the Temple, and that we would see if that was all there would be to Solomon. It was.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the portrait of Solomon drawn by the Chronicler is Solomon's coronation and establishment, and how it is intertextually linked with the selection of Saul in 1 Samuel. It is almost as if the Chronicler wanted to give Solomon the coronation that was never given to David in 1 Chronicles; perhaps we should read this coronation not as Solomon's but as David's. That would also explain why the contrast with Saul is so elaborately set up in the coronation; throughout 1 Chronicles David is set up as the antithesis of Saul, but other than in his coronation, Solomon is never set up in that way. Thus, even in the episode of Solomon's coronation and establishment in the kingdom, which is meant to give Solomon stature and prestige, stature and prestige rebound back to David. This conclusion can be extended to all of Solomon's features: perhaps all of Solomon's idealized features, including his personal communion with Yhwh, his building of the Temple, his wealth, and his wisdom, are there only to rebound back to the

glory of David. Solomon stands in for David. This technique is similar to that used in the Cyropaedia, when Pheraulas and the Sacian stand in for Cyrus and Croesus respectively (8.3.35-50). Through the character of Solomon, we have a further elaboration of the characterization of David.

In the Cyropaedia, no one is allowed to compete with Cyrus for status as the perfect ruler: Xenophon said even in his introduction (1.1) that Cyrus was unique. We have seen that although Solomon may appear to embody the perfect ruler in his role as the builder of the Temple, ultimately he cannot compete with David for the status as the ideal ruler. His glory is really David's glory. Solomon is the Temple builder, but he is not the ideal ruler of Israel. This perception of Solomon, although visible reading Chronicles alone, is considerably strengthened by reading Chronicles' dialogic relationship with Kings; for example, the end of Solomon's rule would seem to be idealized, yet there are irruptions into the text of other voices showing the roots of the separation of the northern tribes from Israel.

The dialogue found in the dialogism of 1 Chronicles over the ideal Israel and the ideal king continues into 2 Chronicles, but now we begin to see the resolution of the argument. Solomon's glory rebounds onto David, but even within the story of Solomon, we see the stage being set for the disintegration of the kingdom. Although Solomon is the perfect Davidic son, completing

David's tasks and bringing him glory, perhaps it is not enough merely to be David's son. Perhaps the unconditional covenant between Yhwh and David is not enough. Similarly, perhaps mere cultic obedience is not enough to ensure the survival of the kingdom. Perhaps all of the features of the ideal king are necessary. If this is the case, then Chronicles would be making a truth claim about its ideology, thus making it a work of political philosophy, as I defined the genre in Chapter One.

Notes

1. Cf. Braun (RB xxxv), Japhet (SJ 48), Williamson ("Accession" 356-57).
2. Although *šēnīt* 'a second time' is missing in many of the versions of Chronicles, the use of *wayyamlīkū* 'they made king' already repeats the use of the verb *mālak* in 1 Chron. 23.1.
3. Only Rehoboam in 2 Chron. 11.22 attempts anything similar, and there we are told that Rehoboam appoints Abijah prince in order to make him king. The foreign king who appoints a puppet clearly does not have the support of the people.
4. Japhet points out that "the process of divine choice is finalized not in David but in his son [...]" (SJ 488).
5. That during the Persian period there was some kind of power sharing arrangement between the high priest and the Persian-appointed governor under the authority of the Persian king is well known (cf. Japhet [SJ 514] on the biblical evidence). Berquist outlines in detail how this power sharing would have worked (Judaism 131-59). Here in this passage the Chronicler may well have based his political organization on the accepted practice of his own day - the evidence of 2 Chron. 19.11 would be adduced to show that these functionaries were subordinate to the Persian ruler. It is interesting that only in these two places does this dual leadership come up, suggesting that while the Chronicler was not opposed to using the political structure of his own day within his model, it certainly was not the basis for his model, which saw a king supported by his cabinet as a whole as the ideal hierarchy. Cf. Schniedewind on the link between the relationship between the king and high priest in Chronicles as it was developed in the writings at Qumran ("King"); where he sees the Chronicler as supporting "bicephalic leadership administered by the temple and the palace" (72), I think the evidence is too thin to support this argument. Braun points out that this passage sees the *nāgīd* as subordinate to Yhwh, and concludes that the Chronicler was advocating a loyalty not only to the temporal ruler but also to God (RB 202).
6. In the same way, Zadok is appointed as the only (high) priest. Previously in 1 Chronicles, Zadok is always paired with another priest (Abiathar in 1 Chron. 15.11, Ahimelech in 1 Chron. 18.16; 24.3, 6, 31) in performing the duties of the high priest.
7. David's word (*ūdēbar*) prevails over (*hāzaq*) Joab in 1 Chron. 21.4, but the verb is never used of David himself.

8. De Vries sees this chapter and its counterpart at 2 Chron. 9 as an inclusio, which depicts Solomon as perfect in everything - wealth, wisdom and cultic obedience (SJV 238).
9. Johnstone sees this passage as suggesting that "a mere show of strength and the shrewd control of the international arms trade ... are all that is required to maintain peace among the nations" (WJ 1: 303); the peace implied by Solomon's name is extended out from Israel to the surrounding nations.
10. I differ from most other commentators on this passage, who see this trading partnership as of greater benefit to Solomon, especially when compared with the parallel passage in Kings. Cf. Myers (JMM2 11-12), Dillard (RBD 20), de Vries (SJV 242-3), Williamson (HGMW 198). Although Ackroyd considers the initiative to be with Solomon, implying his dominance in the relationship, he also notes that in 1 Kings 5 it is Hiram who initiates the relationship, and he is in the subordinate role there (PRA 103-4, cf. SJ 540).
11. Japhet (SJ 552-3) has given a good discussion of the textual difficulties of the passage describing the size of the Temple (2 Chron. 3.3-9); the measurement of the vestibule in 3.4 is surely a textual corruption.
12. Japhet points out that this appearance is tightly linked with the completion of the Temple; it also recalls Nathan's vision of Yhwh in the night in 1 Chron. 17 (SJ 614).
13. However, Riley also sees Solomon as becoming "sinless" because he completes the task of building the Temple - he is the "ideal Davidide" (96). Solomon's perfection is more limited, as I argue throughout this chapter.
14. Japhet points out that this description of the colonization of the towns is unique in the Bible; she hypothesizes that it would reflect the "historical experience" of the Chronicler (SJ 621-2). For a discussion of Persian-period Yehud as a colony, see Berquist (Judaism).
15. Williamson has pointed out that since the wealth acquired in 2 Chron. 1 must have gone to the building of the Temple, the wealth acquired in 2 Chron. 9 would have been needed to replenish Solomon's treasury and keep him in great wealth (HGMW 233).
16. As I noted above, Auld points out that Solomon is not explicitly judged in Chronicles; the implied assessment is positive (139). So is David's, although the implication is drawn

out a little more with the notice of his long life, wealth and honour of 1 Chron. 29.28. Auld suggests that both David and Solomon should be read in Chronicles as "founding fathers," the standard by which all succeeding kings should be judged (140). I would disagree, suggesting instead that only David should be read that way: Solomon is not nearly as important.

17. For a slightly different examination of the use of *bāḥar* in this passage, see Braun (RB 271); he suggests that the term here refers to some kind of notion of "charismatic" choice. If this is so, the link with Saul can still be made: the episode of Saul among the prophets (1 Sam. 10.10-13), which evidently became some kind of proverb, also links Saul with the charismatic prophetic tradition.

18. Although Williamson points out that all of these exhortations for Solomon to be strong are directly patterned on the transition from Moses to Joshua in Deut. 31 and Josh. 1 (HGMW 156), the contrast between David and Solomon is highlighted here just as much as the connection. Cf. Johnstone (WJ 1: 242) on David as the new Moses. Braun points out that the Chronicler's language in 22.13, 28.10, and 28.20 points up the important task at hand (building the Temple), and is not a mere dependence on Deuteronomy and Joshua (RB 273).

19. Contra de Vries, who suggests that dream appearances may have fallen into "disfavour" by the time of the Chronicler (SJV 237-8).

20. Japhet suggests that the lack of a promise of long life to Solomon in Chronicles might reflect the Chronicler's Vorlage rather than a deliberate omission (SJ 532).

21. This phrase is also found in Eccles. 6.2, and in Eccles. 5.18 as "riches and possessions" without the addition of "honour;" these four occurrences (2 Chron. 1.11, 12; Eccles. 5.18; 6.2) account for four of the five occurrences of *nekes* 'possession' in the Hebrew Bible, and all four times these attributes are seen as something given by God. Japhet suggests that Solomon's greatest gift from God is not his wisdom but his wealth (SJ 532).

22. De Vries also indicates that the Chronicler may have been moving away from a concept of practical wisdom (SJV 272); so too does Scott, who sees the wisdom of Solomon in Chronicles as moving towards an intellectual type of knowledge, beyond the wisdom of the successful ruler in Kings. For a different view, where Solomon is endowed with practical wisdom, see Myers (JMM2 57); Dillard sees Solomon's wisdom as a practical wisdom geared

towards the building of the Temple (RBD 2), as does Williamson (HGMW 195).

23. Van Seters suggests that the description of Solomon's palace in Kings shows that it was contained within the Temple precinct, and that it was omitted from Chronicles because it had nothing to do with the post-exilic construction of the Temple (there was no king in Israel at that point) ("Solomon's" 287).

24. There is a textual difficulty with the parallel text to 2 Chron. 9.7, 1 Kings 10.8, where the queen of Sheba describes Solomon's people as happy: while the MT has 'ānāšeykā 'your men/people,' the LXX has *hai gynaikeis sou* 'your wives,' as do many of the versions. The textual emendation of 1 Kings 10.8 ("men" to "wives") is then carried over to emend 2 Chron. 9.7 as well, where there is no such textual problem, and where it makes no sense to introduce other wives. Cf. Ackroyd (PRA 121).

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CHRONICLER'S KINGS OF JUDAH

Previous discussion of the other kings in Chronicles

After Solomon's death, Chronicles runs through the whole line of the kings of Judah. Some kings were reviewed positively by the Chronicler: Abijah (2 Chron. 13.21), Asa (14.1), Jehoshaphat (20.32), Joash (24.2), Amaziah (25.2 - but he later is reviewed negatively: 25.27), Uzziah (26.4-5), Jotham (27.2), Hezekiah (29.2; 31.20-21), and Josiah (34.2; 35.26); while others were reviewed negatively by the Chronicler: Rehoboam (2 Chron. 12.14), Jehoram (21.6), Ahaziah (22.3), Ahaz (28.1-2), Manasseh (33.2 - but he later reforms: 33.13), Amon (33.22), Jehoiakim (36.5), Jehoiachin (36.9) and Zedekiah (36.12). As I stated in Chapter Four, no such explicit comment is made about Solomon, and I might add, none is made about David either (although, as I noted in Chapter Four, the positive qualities of both kings are implied by the statements about them made at the time of their death: 1 Chron. 29.28; 2 Chron. 9.30). In this section, I will briefly review the scholarship about the Chronicler's depiction of the other kings of Judah; however, because of the sheer number of kings the comments here will be very general. I will discuss each king more specifically in the analysis that follows.

Generally, scholars consider that the other kings of Judah (with the possible exceptions of Hezekiah and Josiah) were not terribly important for the Chronicler. This is usually indicated in the scholarship by the lack of any discussion about the depiction of the kings of Judah other than David or Solomon (e.g. in commentaries).¹ When there is discussion of the various kings, it is usually in terms of cultic observance or following the law of Yhwh. Thus Johnstone, in line with his view that Chronicles is a heavily theological work, sees the description of the reigns of the kings of Judah as,

[A]n exhaustive exploration of the potentiality of the sacramental theology of the royal house of David, with its messianism and related Zion theology [...], to express and to realize Israel's destiny among the nations of the world. (WJ 1: 15)

He thus sees the material pertaining to the kings of Judah as expressing the importance of the Temple and the theology of the Temple; ultimately the royal theology of the Temple was destroyed when the Temple was destroyed (WJ 1: 15).² The theology of immediate retribution (which I discussed in Chapter One), where Yhwh immediately rewards or punishes the king for his actions is also seen by some scholars as being particularly prominent in 2 Chron. 10-36. The terms *dāraš* 'to seek,' *bāqaš* 'to search' and *kāna* 'to be humble' along with the action of prayer or turning towards Yhwh are linked to benefit, while the terms *āzab* 'to

abandon' and *mā'al* 'to be unfaithful' are linked to disaster; each king's reign may be described in such a pattern (Dillard, "Reward" 166-7; cf. HGMW 31-2, RB xxxviii-xxxix). Dillard sees this as something unique to Chronicles, in contrast to Samuel-Kings, where delayed judgement is the rule ("Reward" 171).

De Vries sees the entire section of 2 Chron. 10-36 as embodying several themes, all theological or having to do with the cult: punishment and forgiveness, revelation, victory over apostasy and festivals (SJV 277). Knoppers, on the other hand, points out that wealth management is closely linked with the Chronicler's judgement on the fitness of the various kings ("Treasures" 184); D.G. Deboys points out that the Chronicler portrayed war as a test by God to see the response of the monarch (50). Knoppers also shows how alliances, whether with foreign nations or with the northern kingdom of Israel, were also condemned by the Chronicler: this was a radical position in the Chronicler's time ("Yhwh" 622-24).

In contrast to the cursory treatment accorded the various kings of Judah by most commentators, Japhet discusses the Chronicler's kings in more detail. She sees "no desire to fashion faultless figures" of the kings of Judah on the part of the Chronicler, in contrast to David and Solomon. Thus the sins of the kings are included and even augmented; even the kings who are described as being righteous may have their sins augmented. Japhet suggests that the "addition of many details regarding the

military, economical, political and religious activities of the kings," as well as their "inconsistent religious conduct" and the "more subtle and varied standards for the appraisal of the kings" add up to a less simplistic picture of these kings than is found in Kings. She also suggests that this more complex picture of the kings "reflects the Chronicler's sober realism and understanding of human limitations" (SJ 48-49). Ackroyd makes a similar observation in that some of the bad rulers repent while some of the good rulers go wrong through pride or unfaith; the Chronicler had an understanding of the "realities of human experience" (PRA 124-25). This is the most interesting perspective on the Chronicler's kings of Judah: we shall see in the analysis if it holds true.

When we look at the individual kings, scholars have generally been concerned to show how and why the Chronicler's portrayal of a specific king differs from that in Kings. This usually brings out some of the nuances of the Chronicler's work. Thus Knoppers concludes his study of Jehoshaphat by saying that the Chronicler did not reconcile divergent portraits but rather left the tensions in order to show the contrasts between them ("Reform" 522).³ The depiction of the individual kings is sometimes linked with an earlier king (either in Chronicles or in the Deuteronomic History) or other event in the historical tradition. Thus Hezekiah can be seen as a second David or Solomon (Throntveit, "Hezekiah" 303), and Manasseh can be seen as

standing in for Israel in exile (Schniedewind, "Source" 451-52). However, there has been very little work done in the area of systematically examining the depictions of the various kings as individual rulers: I suspect that Knoppers' view on the complexity of the various presentations will turn out to be correct.

Again, in this chapter, I will analyze how the various kings of Judah fit the definition of the ideal king as laid out in my analysis of the material pertaining to David: the ideal king is concerned for the proper worship of Yhwh, he seeks the counsel of Yhwh, he has many sons to follow after him, he receives tribute from other nations (he is wealthy and honoured), he subdues other nations militarily, and he has a long (forty-year) reign and dies peacefully in old age. I will also determine if any of the kings of Judah fit better into the pattern delineated in my analysis of Solomon; are some of the kings rather better at cultic matters and being the successor to David than being the ideal king? In this chapter, it will be interesting to compare each king's fulfillment of the criteria for the ideal king with the explicit evaluation made by the Chronicler. In the second section of analysis, I will look at how the various kings are created intertextually, by looking at the dialogic relationship between Chronicles and Kings. Here I will especially look for any parts of the narrative that may link the various kings with Saul, or with other events narrated in

Samuel-Kings but not in Chronicles. In both sections, I will deal with certain kings at greater length than others: some of the kings of Judah I will deal with in only a brief fashion.

Reading the other kings in Chronicles

2 Chronicles 10.1-13.23a - Rehoboam and Abijah

Problems begin for Rehoboam as soon as Solomon dies.

First, we have the notice that "all Israel" go to Shechem to make him king (*lěhamlîk*) (10.1). Although, as I discussed in Chapter Four, it is proper for the people to make Rehoboam king - the same language is used of the people making David king in 1 Chron. 11-12 - it is in contrast to the language used by David to describe how Yhwh made him king (1 Chron. 28.4) and of Solomon's kingship in 2 Chron. 1.8, 9, 11, where both Solomon and Yhwh described Solomon as having been made king by Yhwh. It is as if the people are trying to revert to an earlier understanding of kingship, although both David and Solomon had understood their kingship as being bestowed by Yhwh.

The choice of Shechem is also strange: David was made king in Hebron, and Solomon in Jerusalem. Within Chronicles, outside this passage, Shechem is only mentioned twice, when cities were being allotted to the various tribes (1 Chron. 6.52; 7.28). Shechem is a city in Ephraim, which as we will see, is one of the tribes which rebels against Rehoboam. What is noteworthy is that it is the people who go to Shechem, and Rehoboam goes to meet

them there; they do not come to him, as they had to David and Solomon; they are issuing a challenge to him. Once he arrives, he finds Jeroboam⁴ and the people ready to issue their challenge: they want their labour lightened. Rehoboam's response is interesting: he consults first his father's counselors and then his own. The verb *yā'aš* in the niphal 'to consult' is used to describe his action; notably Rehoboam does not seek the counsel of Yhwh (the verbs *dāraš* or *bāqaš* are not used). I would argue that this is why he fails to hold on to Israel, not because he listens to the advice of his friends.⁵ Ultimately, he fails to meet the challenge, and flees Shechem for Jerusalem, leaving the northern tribes in rebellion against him.⁶

Rehoboam's first act upon returning to Jerusalem also does not fit into the pattern established by David and Solomon: instead of attending to cultic matters, he mounts a military expedition to quell the rebellion of the northern tribes (2 Chron. 11.1). This is ended by the word of Yhwh, which is obeyed (*wayyišmē'û 'et-dibrē yhwh*) by "all Israel in Judah and Benjamin" (11.3-4); the people end the expedition, not Rehoboam. So far, Rehoboam's reign is not promising.

After his initial missteps, which cost him most of his kingdom, Rehoboam then begins to act like a proper king. Although he does not engage in military conquest, he strengthens (the verb *ḥāzaq* 'to be strong' occurs in 11.11, 12) his kingdom militarily (2 Chron. 11.5-12; cf. Knoppers, "Rehoboam" 436).⁷ He

ensures the safety of priests and Levites from Jeroboam's kingdom (11.13-17). He has many sons and daughters, and appoints a successor (11.18-22), just as David appoints a successor before his death. He organizes the administration of the kingdom (11.23). During this time, people who seek (*lěbaqqēš*) Yhwh and walk in the ways of David (*hālkū bēderek dāwīd*) come to Jerusalem and strengthen (*wayhazzēqū*) Rehoboam's kingdom for three years (11.16-17). It is important to note that Rehoboam himself does not do these things:⁸ we might conclude that while Rehoboam has some of the characteristics of the ideal ruler, he does not have the important ones, and that it is the actions of the people which give him three good years of his reign.⁹

At the end of three years, Rehoboam's rule is established and strong (*ûkēhezqātō*), and then he abandons (*'āzab*) the law of Yhwh (2 Chron. 12.1). Although the language of his first two actions is reminiscent of the language used to describe the establishment of David in 1 Chron. 14.2 and Solomon's making himself strong in 2 Chron. 1.1, the language describing his action of abandoning the law of Yhwh is right out of the classic statement of 1 Chron. 28.9 as the opposite of seeking Yhwh (and recalls Saul in 1 Chron. 10.13-14; cf. HGMW 246). The second half of the verse is thus a complete reversal of what we might expect from the language of the first half. However, it has been foreshadowed by 2 Chron. 11, where we noted that Rehoboam himself never acts properly in cultic matters. Rehoboam's punishment for

abandoning Yhwh is only allayed when he humbles himself before Yhwh (12.6), language exactly fulfilling Yhwh's speech to Solomon in 2 Chron. 7.14, but more notably reminiscent of what David does to his enemies in 1 Chron. 18.1 and 20.4. The ideal ruler should not have to be humbled is the implication; being humbled is what happens to the ideal ruler's enemies. Rehoboam also loses the wealth gathered by David and Solomon; surely, this would be another indicator that he is not an ideal ruler.

Ultimately, Rehoboam is judged negatively by the Chronicler because "he did not set his heart to seek [lidrôš] the LORD" (12.14). However, as a ruler he is not effective either, ensuring only the succession of his son to the throne while losing most of his kingdom, his wealth, and the respect of foreign rulers. He does not fulfill the criteria for being either the ideal ruler (as David) or the ideal son (as Solomon).

The three-year reign of Abijah is dealt with quickly in 2 Chron. 13,¹⁰ most of which relates a speech by Abijah to the warriors of the northern kingdom of Israel led by Jeroboam (13.4-12). In the speech, Abijah describes how proper cultic observance is going on in the Temple (13.10-11). Abijah then defeats Israel in battle and takes territory from Jeroboam (13.17-19). He also has many wives and children (13.21). We are also told in 13.21 that he "grew strong" (wayyithazzēq), just as Solomon and Rehoboam had before him. Abijah also points out his status as a descendant of David in his speech (13.5, 8).

Although the Chronicler does not explicitly evaluate Abijah either for good or for bad (cf. Deboys 50),¹¹ it seems that Abijah fulfills enough of the criteria for the ideal ruler to be classified as one (cf. SJV 295); however, he does not completely fulfill the requirements. Perhaps this is our first hint that only David may be the ideal ruler.

2 Chronicles 13.23b-21.1 - Asa and Jehoshaphat

Asa's first actions upon becoming king follow the model of both David and Solomon: he enforces proper cultic practice, telling the people to seek (*lidrôš*) Yhwh and to keep the law (*hattôrâ*) and commandments (*wěhammišwâ*) (2 Chron. 14.3; cf. HGMW 259). He claims that he and the people had sought (*děrašānû*) Yhwh (14.6). Although there is no war immediately pressing, he builds fortifications (14.5-6) and maintains a large army (14.7). When there is a military threat, not only does he defeat his enemy (the Cushites, a group from far beyond the territory of Israel), but also takes booty from the enemy people (14.11-12). He also conquers a neighbouring group of cities and plunders them (14.13); and he subdues some kind of nomadic people (14.14). This follows the pattern laid down in David's rule, where he first attends to cultic affairs (1 Chron. 13), then takes military action (1 Chron. 14).

The pattern laid down by David is followed by Asa in his next action, which is to repair the altar in front of the Temple and then perform sacrifice (2 Chron. 15.8-11). Then he and the

people make a covenant with Yhwh (15.12-13), couched very much in the terms of 1 Chron. 28.9 and in response to the prophecy of Azariah in 2 Chron. 15.4.¹³ Asa then gives gifts of silver and gold to the Temple, just as David did in 1 Chron. 22. So far, Asa would seem to be completely in the mould of the ideal ruler.

Just as David, after his successful completion of his removal of the Ark and his wars, undertook an act which was displeasing to Yhwh, so too does Asa: he takes the silver and gold from the Temple and sends it to King Ben-hadad in Damascus in token of an alliance against King Baasha of Israel (2 Chron. 16.1-3);¹³ this is the turning point of his reign (Knoppers, "Yhwh" 605). His words to Ben-hadad are interesting: he calls for an alliance "like that between my father and your father [...]" (16.3), yet there was no alliance between Abijah and Ben-Hadad reported. The "father" referred to here would thus be David, who had not had an alliance with the Arameans, but rather had subjugated them (1 Chron. 19.19).¹⁴ Asa, therefore, is treating a king that should be subject to him as his superior. His punishment for allowing Ben-hadad to fight his war for him is a constant state of war (16.9), just as David's punishment in 1 Chron. 21 for numbering the people is for the people to die. The link between the two events is made even more clear by the use of the verb *sākal* 'to be foolish,' in both 1 Chron. 21.8 and 2 Chron. 16.9. However, instead of recognizing the foolishness of his action, Asa grows angry with the prophet Hanani who tells him

of Yhwh's punishment, and punishes both him and the people (2 Chron. 16.10). He also does not trust in Yhwh when he becomes ill, but consults physicians instead (16.12); perhaps an ironic comment is meant here based on his name, which may mean "healer" (SJ 739; RBD 129-30).

Asa has a long reign, and is succeeded by his son Jehoshaphat.¹⁵ Ultimately, Asa fulfills the criteria for being an ideal ruler, and in fact, his reign seems to follow the pattern laid down by the story of the rule of David. The only thing that would seem to tell against seeing Asa as an ideal ruler is his response to Hanani's pronouncement. As with Abijah, we can see that there seems to be a flaw introduced into the depiction of the Davidic ruler who is not David; only David can be ideal.

Jehoshaphat's reign also follows the pattern set by David and Solomon. De Vries sees Jehoshaphat's reign as the mirror of Asa's (SJV 308-9), and Dillard has outlined the parallels between Asa and Jehoshaphat, suggesting that Asa is used as the paradigm for Jehoshaphat's reign (RBD 129),¹⁶ but both mirror the reigns of David and Solomon. Like Solomon, Jehoshaphat's first act is to make himself strong (*wayyithazzēq*) (2 Chron. 17.1), i.e. to consolidate his power (RBD 133), he then fortifies his cities (17.2). He has also "sought [*dārāš*] the God of his father and walked in his commandments [*ûbēmišwōtāyw*]" (17.4). Judah brings tribute (*minḥâ*) to him (17.5), as do the Philistines (17.11), and he has great riches and honour (*'ôšer-wēkābôd*) (17.5). Tribute

(*minhâ*) is also brought to David (1 Chron. 18.2, 6) and Solomon (2 Chron. 9.24), while riches and honour are associated both with David at the time of his death (1 Chron. 29.28) and most especially with Solomon (2 Chron. 1.11, 12; 9.22), as I discussed in Chapter Four. Japhet points out that after David and Solomon, only Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah are described in such a way with respect to wealth and honour (SJ 747). Jehoshaphat undertakes great building projects (2 Chron. 17.12-13), like Solomon. He also has peace, as "all the kingdoms of the lands around Judah [...] did not make war against Jehoshaphat" (17.10), just like Solomon.

Problems begin for Jehoshaphat when he allies himself with Ahab, the king of Israel, through marriage (2 Chron. 18.1): literally, he becomes Ahab's son-in-law (*wayyithattēn lē'ah'āb*). We have already been told that Jehoshaphat has not followed the "ways of Israel" (17.4), the kingdom over which Ahab was king. By making this marriage alliance, will Jehoshaphat follow the ways of Israel? Myers points out that since Jehoshaphat already has riches and honour, he does not need the alliance (JMM2 105). The key is in 18.2, when Ahab "induce[s] him [*waysîtehû*] to go up against Ramoth-gilead." The language is almost identical to the language of 1 Chron. 21.1, when the Adversary incited (*wayyāset*) David to count Israel (WJ 2: 84). This episode of 2 Chron. 18, then, may be seen as parallel to the episode of 1 Chron. 21, but whereas in 1 Chron. 21, David was punished for doing something

contrary to Yhwh's intention, in 2 Chron. 18, Jehoshaphat is allowed to escape unscathed; in fact, Yhwh induces (*waysîtem*) the charioteers away from him (18.31). Jehoshaphat's original inducer, Ahab, then is killed in the battle (18.34), while he himself returns to Jerusalem safely (*běšālôm*) (19.1). However, Jehoshaphat will have to endure some kind of punishment, according to the prophet Jehu, who says, "Should you help the wicked and love those who hate the LORD? Because of this, wrath [*qeṣep*] has gone out against you from the LORD" (19.2; cf. Knoppers, "Yhwh" 616). In 1 Chron. 27.24, wrath (*qeṣep*) came upon Israel for the census undertaken by David - so here we have another link between the episodes of 2 Chron. 18 and 1 Chron. 21 - and in 2 Chron. 19.10, Jehoshaphat tries to head off this wrath by instructing the judges to uphold the law so that the people "may not incur guilt before the LORD and wrath [*qeṣep*] may not come on you and your kindred" (cf. Knoppers, "Reform" 516).

After returning to Jerusalem, Jehoshaphat resumes his course of cultic observance (19.4), and organizes judges for the proper administration of law (19.5-11).¹⁷ This parallels David's organization of the cult after the episode of 1 Chron. 21. Nonetheless, Jehoshaphat has to deal with the consequences of his alliance with Ahab, as more enemies rise up to challenge him. This time, instead of forming an alliance with Israel or with Aram as his father had done, he relies on prayer and seeking Yhwh (2 Chron. 20.3, 6-12). He is rewarded by victory without even

having to fight (20.23), and he collects a great deal of booty (20.25). After that, his kingdom has "quiet [wattišqōṭ], for his God gave him rest [wayyānaḥ] all around" (20.30). The term šāqat 'to be quiet' is the same one used to introduce Asa's reign in 2 Chron. 13.23, binding the two reigns together, whereas the term nūaḥ 'to rest' is the same one used by David in quoting Yhwh about Solomon in 1 Chron. 22.9 and by David in 22.18, and is also used of the reign of Asa in 2 Chron. 14.5, 6; 15.15.

The narrative of the end of Jehoshaphat's reign is a little strange. It begins with the typical summary of Jehoshaphat's reign (2 Chron. 20.31-33), continues with the usual statement "Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat [...]" (20.34), and concludes with "Jehoshaphat slept with his ancestors [...]" (21.1). However, in the middle is a strange little tale of building ships to go to Tarshish, introduced with the temporal phrase "after this [wē'ahārēkēn]" (20.35). Does this mean after the peace given to Jehoshaphat? or simply "at some later time?" What is clear from the story is that Jehoshaphat does not learn from the two earlier episodes of 2 Chron. 18 and 20, and again makes a joint effort with the king of Israel, an effort that fails. All of the alliances with the house of Ahab end up being detrimental to Judah (Knoppers, "Yhwh" 618, 621; Knoppers, "Reform" 501; cf. HGMW 302-3). Otherwise, Jehoshaphat would seem to fulfill all of the criteria for the ideal ruler: he observes the cult, consults Yhwh, has military success, gathers tribute and wealth, organizes

judicial officials and has a son to succeed him (many sons, to whom are given wealth and governing authority, cf. 2 Chron. 21.2-3). Both he and his father Asa's rule seem to be patterned on the rule of David and Solomon; perhaps the small imperfections introduced into the stories of Asa and Jehoshaphat are meant to ensure that they do not have the same ideal reigns as David and Solomon. Their reigns are definitely bound together as a father-son pair, just as David and Solomon are.

2 Chronicles 21.2-23.21 - Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah

The next three rulers, Jehoshaphat's son,¹⁸ grandson, and daughter-in-law, are all portrayed as doing evil. These rulers are the first of the Davidic line to have no redeeming features (Rehoboam's rule, as we saw above, is not clearly good or bad). Altogether, they reign fifteen years (2 Chron. 21.20; 22.2, 12). The additional complicating factor here is the reign of the woman, Athaliah, only the second woman in Chronicles to have performed an active role (the first being the queen of Sheba).

Jehoram clearly does not undertake any of the actions of the ideal ruler. His first action after establishing himself (*wayyithazzaq*) is not to see to the cult or to seek Yhwh, but rather to murder his brothers and other administrative officials (2 Chron. 21.4).¹⁹ His second action is to try to suppress a rebellion in Edom, which effort fails (this is told very elliptically), and he loses territory (21.8-10), territory which his predecessors had gained (RBD 164). We are told specifically

that he loses this territory "because he had forsaken ['āzab] the LORD [...]" (21.10). How has he forsaken Yhwh? Early in the reign, we are told that, "he walked in the way of the kings of Israel [...]. He did what was evil in the sight of the LORD" (21.6), but this is very general. More specifically, he has built high places in Judah, and "caused the inhabitants of Jerusalem to prostitute themselves [to other gods] [wayyezen], and banished Judah [from Yhwh] [wayyaddaḥ]" (21.11, my translation). The language of this description is extremely strong: the verb *zānāh* 'to be a prostitute' is used outside this chapter only in 1 Chron. 5.25, where the tribe of Manasseh is described as having "prostituted themselves [wayyiznū] to the gods of the peoples of the land;" and the verb *nādaḥ* 'to banish' is used outside this chapter only in 2 Chron. 13.9, where Jeroboam is described as having banished the priests and Levites. This is all the direct opposite of correct cultic behaviour.

The final action of Jehoram's reign is his loss of all of his possessions, his wives and his sons (except one) during a military raid (2 Chron. 21.17) - even the criterion of having many sons/successors is almost denied him. Notably, this raid is the work of the Philistines and the Arabs, two peoples from whom his father had received tribute (17.11). He then dies an excruciating death at the age of forty (21.19-20), a number of special significance because it is the length of the reigns of both David and Solomon: Jehoram is being depicted as the complete

opposite of those two kings, as well as the opposite of his father Jehoshaphat (cf. Begg, "Constructing" 43-7). What is interesting is that it is at this point when the Davidic house almost ends, that the account of Yhwh's covenant with the Davidic house is repeated (21.7) (RBD 169).

Things deteriorate with the accession of Ahaziah. The only action that we are told about during his reign is his joining with his cousin Joram, son of Ahab, to fight against the Arameans at Ramoth-Gilead (2 Chron. 22.5), an action explicitly called evil (Wright, "Fight" 171). This brings to mind the other ill-fated expedition to Ramoth-Gilead which cost Ahab his life (2 Chron. 18) (WJ 2: 117-18; cf. SJ 821-22), but from which Jehoshaphat returned safely. This time, however, since Ahaziah seems not to seek Yhwh's help, he does not return. He dies a coward's death, dragged out from his hiding place and killed during Jehu's revolt against Joram (22.8-9). Chronicles' only other comment about Ahaziah is that he "walked in the ways of the house of Ahab" and his mother and the house of Ahab had been his counselors in doing wickedly (22.3-4). Ahaziah fulfills none of the criteria of the ideal ruler (except in having children, cf. 22.11), and is contrasted with his father Jehoshaphat (both implicitly and explicitly, cf. 22.9), who did.

Although Ahaziah seems to have many children, he is almost denied the chance to fulfill any criteria of the ideal ruler (like his father Jehoram), since all his children but one are

killed by his mother Athaliah. She then reigns for six years. She is not given any evaluative comment by the Chronicler, thus signifying that she is not an appropriate ruler (cf. RBD 179, 183); she is the only ruler who is not given such a comment. Nor are any of her actions as ruler described, so we cannot tell if she fulfills any of the criteria for the ideal ruler (the implication would be that she does not). I would suggest, as does Japhet (SJ 828), that it is rather her being a woman than her being a member of the House of Ahab which disqualifies her from being an appropriate ruler: other members of the House of Ahab rule Judah, and are given the requisite evaluative comments by the Chronicler. Allen points out that the House of Ahab and House of David are contrasted throughout this passage (31). However, the priest Jehoida seems to be given the features of the appropriate (i.e., Davidic) ruler: in 2 Chron. 23.1, he takes courage, that is, he makes himself strong (*hitḥazzaq*) - he is the only non-ruler to be the subject of this verb in Chronicles; he commands the military troops (23.1-8), and musters them as for battle (23.9-10) - a battle which he wins; he has sons (23.11); he makes sure of proper cultic behaviour (23.18-19); he gets two wives for Joash (24.3), just as previous kings had provided wives for their sons (cf. 2 Chron 11.23; 18.1; SJ 841); and he dies at an old age, and is buried in the tomb of the kings (24.15-16) - this burial contrasts with the burial of Joash not being in the tomb of the kings (cf. WJ 2: 143).

Jehoaida's relationship with Joash, then, seems to be a kind of father-son relationship, reminiscent of David and Solomon. This is emphasized by the use of the verb *māšah* 'to anoint:' as I pointed out in Chapter Four, this verb is used primarily of David and Solomon, and especially in 1 Chron. 29.22 to describe the anointing of Solomon in David's presence. However, in 2 Chron. 22.7, Jehu is described as being anointed by Yhwh to destroy the House of Ahab. Since these are the only two occurrences of this verb in Chronicles that do not refer to David or Solomon, I would suggest that Joash is also anointed to destroy the House of Ahab, namely Ahab's daughter Athaliah.

The two kings Jehoram and Ahaziah seem to follow one on the other like David and Solomon or Asa and Jehoshaphat (cf. HGMW 310), but as a pair of flawed kings, having none of the characteristics of the ideal ruler. They are followed by someone who cannot even be a ruler at all, Athaliah, who has her place taken by the priest Jehoaida. The Davidic line of ideal rulers is almost completely ruptured, so that this line is almost at the point of the line of Saul (RBD 175; SJ 815; cf. Riley 105).

2 Chronicles 24.1-27.9 - Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham

Joash's reign is explicitly divided into two parts: the first part during the life of the priest Jehoaida, and the second part after Jehoaida's death.²⁰ We are told that he has sons and daughters (2 Chron. 24.3), thus fulfilling one of the criteria for the ideal ruler (cf. PRA 158), as well as securing the

Davidic line that had almost been exterminated (RBD 188). His only action, however, is to restore the Temple which had been desecrated during the reign of Athaliah (24.4, 7) - he does not seek Yhwh at any time. After Jehoaida's death, Joash no longer enforces cultic obedience, after listening to bad advice (24.17-19; SJV 348).²¹ He suffers defeat in war, and has his kingdom looted (24.23). His death is not peaceful (although he has a forty-year reign [24.1]), but rather results from a conspiracy by his officials (*hitqaššērû*) (24.25). This conspiracy is ironic, since Athaliah had also accused Jehoaida and his confederates of taking part in a conspiracy (*qešer*) (23.13), and by Joash's command people conspire (*wayyiqšērû*) against the priest Zechariah son of Jehoaida who had condemned Joash for abandoning (the verb *'āzab* is used) Yhwh (24.20-21).²² He does not learn from his setbacks, as David, Asa and Jehoshaphat had done, and ultimately does not fit the model of the ideal ruler.²³

Joash's son Amaziah is also the victim of a conspiracy, "they conspired against him a conspiracy [*wayyiqšērû 'ālāyw qešer*] in Jerusalem" (2 Chron. 25.27; my translation); his death is the opposite of a proper king's death (Graham, "Aspects" 89). Thus, these two kings are also bound together in a father-son pair. Amaziah's reign seems to begin well, as had Joash's: his first action upon his kingship being established (*ḥāzēqā*) is to follow Yhwh's command (*šiwwā*) in the manner of executing his father's murderers (25.3-4). However, it is important to note

that his execution of them is described by the verb *hārag* 'to murder,' the same verb used to describe Jehoram's murder of his brothers in 21.4 (SJV 351), and Jehu's execution of Ahaziah's officials in 23.17. This execution, therefore, while it might be appropriate as Jehu's executions were appropriate, also might be inappropriate, as Jehoram's murders were. However, Amaziah does not seek Yhwh's counsel, nor does he turn to cultic matters. His second action is to raise an army to fight the Edomites (cf. RBD 199), whom he defeats (25.11-12).²⁴ Yet, his own territory is ransacked at the same time (25.13). He then, like his father Joash, does not adhere to cultic obedience to Yhwh, instead worshipping the gods of the Edomites, and in fact is accused of seeking (*dāraštā*) after those gods (25.14-15; cf. Riley 106; SJ 866). He then tries to make an alliance with the king of Israel, which leads to war between them, a war in which he is defeated,²⁵ and which loses him a great deal of wealth; he himself is captured (25.17-24). Although the narrator says that he does "what was right in the sight of the LORD" (25.2), and he is buried with his ancestors (25.28), ultimately, he fulfills none of the criteria for the ideal ruler except in having a successor.

Uzziah and Jotham form the next father-son pair; both are effective rulers. Uzziah's first action is to seek (*lidrōš*) Yhwh (2 Chron. 26.5). His second action is to make war and defeat his enemies, enemies to the west, south and east of him (26.6-7); he receives tribute from foreign nations (26.8). He

also undertakes building projects (26.6, 9-10). He organizes the military (26.11).²⁶ He has a long reign, and dies at an old age (26.3, 23). However, the account of his reign does not follow the pattern laid down by the reign of David and followed by the reigns of Asa and Jehoshaphat, in that his first action is not concerned with the Temple cult. Later in his reign, after he has strengthened himself (*ûkêhezqâtô*), he grows proud (*gābah libbô*) which brings down Yhwh's wrath upon him (26.16) - this is similar to the other good kings who also did something wrong.²⁷ In his case, instead of making an alliance with a foreign king (like Asa or Jehoshaphat), he makes an error in performing cultic obedience. This error is described as having been unfaithful to Yhwh (*wayyim'al*), in the same language used to describe Saul in 1 Chron. 10.13 (SJV 356). He takes the role of the priest upon himself, and attempts to offer incense to Yhwh in the Temple (26.16), for which he is punished with some kind of skin affliction (26.19). He himself accepts this punishment, much as David accepted the punishment of 1 Chron. 21, yet no good comes of it, as it did in the case of David. Again, as with Asa and Jehoshaphat, perhaps this imperfection is introduced into his reign to ensure that he does not upstage David; unlike Jehoshaphat, Uzziah does not learn from his error and go on to other successes.

Jotham, Uzziah's son, also acts as a proper ruler: his first action is an addition to the Temple (27.3), and he shows

cultic obedience by not trying to repeat the actions of his father in the Temple (27.2).²⁸ He also builds elsewhere, expanding on the building projects of his father (27.3-4; cf. Knoppers, "History" 189). He conquers the Ammonites, thus completing the conquests of his father, and receives tribute from them (27.5).²⁹ He seems to die a peaceful death, and is succeeded by his son (27.9). His role (narrated only briefly) seems to be as a completion of his father's actions (RBD 214-15), and as a model to follow (SJV 361).³⁰

2 Chronicles 28.1-32.33 - Ahaz and Hezekiah

The next father-son pair is a radical departure from the previous pairings: previous pairs had the son following his father's work, or completing tasks only begun by his father. Instead, Ahaz and Hezekiah's reigns are depicted as contrasts (cf. PRA 179). Ahaz's first action is to perform the cultic actions of the peoples around Judah, not the proper Temple cultic actions for Yhwh (2 Chron. 28.3-4). There is also no notice about how he establishes himself (no use of *ḥāzaq*) on the throne (WJ 2: 174).³¹ He then is defeated in battle by the Arameans, who take captives (*šibyā*) away to Damascus (28.5). Then he is defeated by the king of Israel (28.6-7). This defeat is noteworthy in many ways: 1) Pekah the king of Israel is described as having killed (*wayyahārōg*) a huge number of Judahites - but the word used is the one that also connotes "murder" - this is not ordinary battle loss, but carnage on an obscene scale; 2) the

men killed are "valiant warriors [*bēnē-ḥāyil*]," further emphasizing the defeat; 3) one Ephraimite warrior defeats three important officials: the king's son, his steward, and the prime minister;³² 4) all of this takes place because they had abandoned (*bē'āzēbām*) Yhwh; and 5) the Israelites take a large number of captives, including women and children, and a large amount of booty (28.8) - captives and captivity are themes of this section (SJV 363). This defeat is reminiscent of Saul's defeat by the Philistines in 1 Chron. 10: the massive defeat, the three named sons killed, the abandonment of the cities by the Israelites, the warriors who come to remove Saul's body, and the capture of Saul's head by the Philistines. Finally, an ironic contrast is then drawn between the Israelites and the Judahites when the Israelites decide to return the captives, clothed, fed and cared for, to Jericho (28.9-15). The Israelites are depicted as having more concern for Yhwh's commandments than the Judahites, further reflecting on Ahaz's status as ruler.

Next, Judah is defeated by the Edomites, who also carry away captives, and by the Philistines (28.17-18). This defeat by the Philistines is described in language that recalls the language of 1 Chron. 10: 1) the Philistines raid (*pāšēṭû* 'they stripped') the cities of Judah, just as they stripped the dead (the verb *pāšaṭ*) in 1 Chron. 10.8-9; 2) they settle (*wayyēšēbû šām*) in the towns taken from Judah, just as they settle (*wayyēšēbû bāhem*) in the towns taken in 1 Chron. 10.7; 3) this is

described as having been the result of Ahaz's *ma'al* against Yhwh (2 Chron. 28.19), just as Saul's loss is the result of *ma'al* against Yhwh (1 Chron. 10.13); and 4) Yhwh humbles (*hiknîa'*) Judah (2 Chron. 28.19), which is a direct contrast to David's humbling of the Philistines in 1 Chron. 18.1; in total, there would seem to be a reference back to 1 Chron. 10 and the death of Saul here (cf. HGMW 348). Ahaz's next action is to call for help from the Assyrian king (2 Chron. 28.16), in contrast to the previous kings who had called for help from Yhwh (like Abijah) (cf. Ben Zvi, "Gateway" 227). This appeal is one more indication of the failure of Ahaz as a ruler (Knoppers, "Yhwh" 610-11). This appeal leads not to help, but rather to further oppression, and Ahaz has to loot the Temple and the palace and the homes of his officials in order to pay off the Assyrians (28.21), who do not conquer him only because of this tribute (cf. SJ 907). The verb *hālaq* is used, which literally means "to distribute" or "to divide," and elsewhere in Chronicles pertains to cultic distribution or assignment. Here it is used ironically, to show how completely outrageous Ahaz's action was; he distributes wealth to the Assyrians rather than to the Temple.

Ahaz's final action is also an act of unfaithfulness (*ma'al*) against Yhwh (28.22), including the sacrifice to the gods of Damascus and a looting of the Temple and its closure. This is the counterpoint of Ahaz's first actions of cultic disobedience. Ahaz fulfills none of the criteria for the ideal ruler, except in

having a son to follow him - but even this is put in doubt with the death of one of his sons in 28.7. Ahaz's reign is a counterpart to Saul's (contra RBD 220; Williamson, Israel 118-9).

Hezekiah's status as a cult founder and as the high point of the post-Solomonic kingdom is a well-known fact in Chronicles studies.¹³ However, it is important to uncover how the account of Hezekiah's reign is constructed with respect to the reign of Ahaz (cf. Ben Zvi, "Gateway" 229). Hezekiah's first action is undertaken in the first month of his reign, as the Chronicler points out, thus emphasizing how early this action was (cf. PRA 180-1) - no other king's cultic actions are placed so specifically). This action is to open (*pātaḥ*) the gates (*daltôt*) of the Temple and repair them (*wayḥazzēqēm*) (2 Chron. 29.3) - de Vries notes the lovely pun on Hezekiah's name and his actions of "hazaking" the Temple (SJV 373). This reverses the action of Ahaz's, which had been to close (*wayyisgôr*) the gates (*daltôt*) of the Temple (28.24). Hezekiah makes specific reference to this closing (*sāgērû daltôt*) in his speech to the Levites (29.7). The verb used to describe Hezekiah's gathering (*wayya'aspēm*) of the priests and Levites in 29.4 is the same verb used to describe Ahaz's gathering (*wayye'ēsōp*) of the sacred vessels to destroy them (28.24). The verb used in 29.19 by the Levites to describe Ahaz's repudiation (*hiznīaḥ*) of the sacred vessels while he had been unfaithful is the same one used in 1 Chron. 28.9 to describe Yhwh's action (*yaznîḥākā*) if Israel should forsake him. In his

speech, Hezekiah also condemns the unfaithfulness (*mā'ālû*) and the forsaking (*wayya'azbūhû*) of Yhwh by the ancestors (lit. "fathers") (29.6), and states that the incense offerings (*hiqtîrû*) were not made (29.7). All this is in contrast to Ahaz's unfaithfulness and forsaking, and his making incense offerings (*lāqatṭēr*) to other gods (28.25) (cf. WJ 2: 194; cf. 1 Chron. 10.13 as well; HGMW 353, 355). Furthermore, in 29.9 Hezekiah describes how their fathers had fallen by the sword (*nāpēlû 'ābôtēnû beḥāreb*), recalling Saul's falling (*wayyippōl*) on his sword (*haḥereb*) in 1 Chron. 10.5, and how their sons, daughters and wives are in exile, reproducing the language describing the captives taken by Israel in 2 Chron. 28.8.³⁴ Finally, Hezekiah decides to make a covenant with Yhwh (29.10), the only time such a covenant is explicitly made in Chronicles; other covenants are made between the king and the people (1 Chron. 11.3) or between Yhwh and the people (2 Chron. 6.11) or between Yhwh and David (2 Chron. 21.7), but never elsewhere between the king and Yhwh, with the king taking the initiative.³⁵ Hezekiah completes his first action by making copious sacrifices, accompanied by music (2 Chron. 29.21-36); this recalls David's sacrifices in 1 Chron. 16 and 29, and Solomon's sacrifice in 2 Chron. 7 (cf. Graham, "Setting" 131).

Hezekiah's second action takes place in the second month of his reign, the celebration of Passover (2 Chron. 30.2). In his letter of proclamation, Hezekiah suggests that those still in the

captivity begun under Ahaz should return to Yhwh, and then will be returned to the land (30.9), recalling the language of Solomon's prayer in 2 Chron. 6.36-38.³⁶ Again, there is a contrast between Hezekiah's actions and the actions of Ahaz: in 30.14 the altars are taken from Jerusalem, the altars that Ahaz had placed there in 28.24. We are also told something about Hezekiah in 30.20 that is unique in Chronicles: Yhwh listens (*wayyišma'*) to him. This is a unique usage of *šāma'* 'to hear' in Chronicles; it is rare in the Hebrew Bible as a whole.³⁷

Hezekiah's third action is to oversee the destruction of the high places and their paraphernalia in Judah (31.1); these are the high places erected by Ahaz in 28.25. There is a nice paralleling of these cultic actions by Hezekiah to the cultic desecrations by Ahaz: first the Temple, then Jerusalem, then Judah:

[Ahaz] shut up the doors
of the house of the LORD
and made himself altars
in every corner of Jerusalem.

In every city of Judah he
made high places to make
offerings to other gods
[...]. (28.24-25)

[Hezekiah] opened the doors
of the house of the LORD
and repaired them. (29.3)
[They] removed the altars
that were in Jerusalem [...].
(30.14)
[They] went out to the cities
of Judah [...] and pulled down
the high places and the
altars [...]. (31.1)

Hezekiah also organizes cultic officials (31.2, 12-19) and contributes to the financial upkeep of the cult (31.3).³⁸ His actions in the first few months of his reign are then summarized by the Chronicler as being done according to the law (*ûbattôrâ*)

and the commandments (*ûbammīṣwā*), and as seeking (*līdrōš*) Yhwh, and that he then prospers (*wēhiṣlīāḥ*) (31.21), all language used to describe the actions of the proper king and his reward in 1 Chron. 22.13. Ackroyd pointed out that in this section Hezekiah should be seen as both as a second David and as a second Solomon (PRA 187).

However, although Hezekiah has by this point in his reign been seeking Yhwh and showing proper concern for the cult, he has not had any military successes or received tribute and wealth. The next thing that happens to Hezekiah is that Judah is invaded by the Assyrians (2 Chron. 32.1). The Assyrians are defeated after Hezekiah and the prophet Isaiah pray to Yhwh; Yhwh sends an angel to kill all the Assyrian soldiers and commanders, and the Assyrian king Sennacherib is killed upon his return home (32.20-21). However, Hezekiah also makes other preparations to defend against the invasion by building fortifications, equipping his army and stopping up the water supplies (32.3-6).³⁹ After this victory, Hezekiah has "rest on every side" (32.22), like Solomon (cf. 1 Chron. 22.18) and Asa (cf. 2 Chron. 14.7).⁴⁰ He also receives tribute from his enemies (32.23).

Like David, Hezekiah then suffers a setback: he becomes ill, and although he prays to Yhwh and receives relief, he does not respond properly to this help (32.24-25). Yhwh's wrath (*qeṣep*) then comes upon first him, Judah, and Jerusalem (32.25), paralleling Yhwh's punishment of David in 1 Chron. 21. The

punishment is abated when Hezekiah humbles himself (wayyikkāna') before Yhwh (32.26), comparable to David's action of dressing in sackcloth and falling on his face before Yhwh's angel in 1 Chron. 21.16. After this incident, we are then told that Hezekiah has riches ('ōšer) and honour (wēkābôd): his wealth is described in detail, and he builds cities and prospers (wayyašlah) (32.27-30), all language used of Solomon. His death then comes peacefully, and his son succeeds him (32.33).

Ahaz and Hezekiah are a father-son pair unlike any of the others preceding them. Ahaz is a ruler in the image of Saul, depicted as a bad ruler, while Hezekiah is explicitly and implicitly contrasted with him, much as David was contrasted with Saul (cf. Graham, "Setting" 131). Hezekiah's reign points to a unified Israel and Judah, reversing the division under Rehoboam (Graham, "Setting" 133-34). Hezekiah would seem to be an ideal ruler in the Davidic mould.⁴¹ Throntveit points out that Hezekiah is constructed as both the new David and the new Solomon (When 124-5); he is constructed as both because David and Solomon's reigns are seen by the Chronicler to be one reign ("Hezekiah" 310-11). However, Hezekiah is more like Solomon than David: his interest in the cult, his wealth and honour, his building projects, his lack of clear military success, all would seem to align him with Solomon rather than David.⁴² Therefore, while he is cast as an ideal successor to David, he still does not reach the ideal ruler status of David himself.

2 Chronicles 33.1-25 - Manasseh and Amon

Manasseh is a very interesting figure in Chronicles. He is the only king who is depicted as starting out evil and ending up as a good ruler (SJ 1001); while some kings begin well and end up badly (e.g. Joash), and others are evil throughout their reigns (e.g. Joram, Ahaz), Manasseh does change from evil to good. De Vries sees his reign as being part of an *inclusio* with the reign of Ahaz around the reign of the good king Hezekiah (SJV 397). Manasseh's son Amon, on the other hand, is depicted as having no redeeming features. Amon's story is the shortest one so far to be depicted in Chronicles.

Manasseh's first action is cultic, but not proper cultic behaviour with regards to Yhwh or the Temple; instead, he rebuilds the high places, and even builds altars to other gods inside the Temple (2 Chron. 33.3-5), something that even Ahaz did not do. His other actions with regard to him having "practiced soothsaying [wě'ônēn] and divination [wěnihēš] and sorcery [wěkiššēp], and dealt with necromancers ['ôb] and with wizards [wěyiddē'ônî]" (33.6) are even more telling: they bring to mind the accusations made against Saul (wěgam-liš'ôl bā'ôb) in 1 Chron. 10.13 (SJV 397), but these ones are even more heinous.

Manasseh next suffers military defeat, and is himself captured by the Assyrians and taken into exile (2 Chron. 33.11), much as Amaziah before him had been captured by the king of Israel (25.23). However, unlike Amaziah, Manasseh then humbles

himself (wayyikkāna') before Yhwh, prays (wayyitpallēl) to him, and is returned (waysībēhū) to Jerusalem and to his kingdom (33.12-13). This is all told in the language of 2 Chron. 6-7: for example, Yhwh told Solomon that,

[I]f my people who are called by my name humble themselves [wēyikkānē'ū], pray [wēyitpallū], seek my face, and turn [wēyāšūbū] from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land. (7.14; cf. HGMW 393-4)⁴³

Williamson notes that the theme of exile and restoration is also prominent during the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah, and that the reign of Manasseh combines the themes into one reign (HGMW 389-90).

After his return, Manasseh then acts as a proper king: he builds fortifications and strengthens the military; he removes the foreign objects from the Temple and removes the altars, restoring Yhwh's altar; he observes proper cultic rituals (33.14-16); and he has a long reign (33.1). However, he does not have military successes, nor does he receive tribute or actually seek the counsel of Yhwh; nor does he "hazak" anything (no correlation with Hezekiah is made) (cf. WJ 2: 227). Therefore, while before his repentance he is a prototype evil king, after his repentance he does not become an ideal king.

Manasseh's son Amon does evil things as Manasseh had done (thus binding the two reigns together), and does not "humble

himself before the LORD, as his father Manasseh had humbled himself" (2 Chron. 33.23). The conspiracy against him led to his death (the verb used is *mût* 'to die,' not *hārag* 'to murder'), and his assassins are themselves killed (the verb used is *nākāh* 'to smite,' not *hārag* 'to murder,' as in 2 Chron. 25.3). Tellingly, Amon is not even buried,⁴⁴ although what happens to his body is not specified - this is similar to what happens to Saul in 1 Chron. 10 before the men of Jabesh-Gilead rescue his body.

2 Chronicles 34.1-36.23 - Josiah and the last four kings

At this point, the father-son pairings we have seen throughout Chronicles seem to break down. Josiah's reign, described in some length, is followed by the four last kings of Judah, described in quick succession. However, as Japhet has pointed out (SJ 1061-2), this last chapter is carefully structured as a unity (cf. HGMW 412), and may be seen as encompassing one reign, thus providing a kind of structural father-son pair with Josiah. However, it is might also be appropriate that the father-son pairings should break down at this point, since it is at this point that things start to go very wrong for Judah.

Josiah's reign is ordered along a strict chronology (cf. RBD 276-7), not unlike the strict chronology given for Hezekiah's reign. Thus his first action, taken while still a youth at age 16, is to seek (*lidrôš*) Yhwh (2 Chron. 34.3), while his second action (taken once he is in his majority) is to show proper

cultic obedience by purging (*lěṭahēr*) Judah and Jerusalem of foreign cultic objects (34.3-5), and then by moving on to purge the territories of the northern tribes (34.6-7). This action seems to take six years, and not until it is complete does he turn his attention to the Temple. This recalls the series of activities that David engaged in before he brought the Ark into Jerusalem in 1 Chron. 15. The language of Josiah's purging of the lands of Judah and Israel is the same as the language used to describe Hezekiah's purging of the Temple during his reforms.⁴⁵ However, whereas Hezekiah began with the Temple and worked outwards, Josiah begins with the countryside and culminates with the repair of the Temple (WJ 2: 234).

Josiah's third action is to begin a repair programme for the Temple, notably, to strengthen it (*lěḥazzēq*), i.e. to "hazak/Hezekiah" it (34.8), as part of his overall reforms (HGMW 399-400). In order to do so, his arrangements for the proper cultic organization are described (34.8-13). It is during this repair programme that a "book of the law" is found (34.14), and causes Josiah to ask his servants to seek (*diršû*) the word of Yhwh from the prophet Huldah (34.21). Her pronouncement touches on how the people have forsaken (*'āzābûnî*) Yhwh and worshipped (*wayaqtîrû Qere*) other gods, causing Yhwh to decide to punish Judah (34.24-25). But Josiah has humbled (*wattikkāna'*) himself before Yhwh, according to the pronouncement (34.27), and therefore Yhwh says to him, "I will gather you to your ancestors

and you shall be gathered to your grave in peace [*bēšālôm*]; your eyes shall not see all the disaster that I will bring on this place and its inhabitants" (34.28). This prophecy will prove to be Josiah's undoing.⁴⁶

Yhwh's pronouncement leads to Josiah leading the people in making a covenant to keep the commandments (*mišwōtāyw*), testimonies (*wē'ēdēwōtāyw*) and statutes (*wēḥuqqāyw*) which he has commanded (34.31-32). He then removes from the land whatever "abominations" had escaped him the first time (34.33). Finally, he organizes a Passover festival, leading to cultic organization (35.2-6); then he contributes to the festival, encouraging others to do so as well (35.7-9), just as Hezekiah and David had done before him. We are then explicitly told that there had been no such festival since the days of Samuel (35.18), implying that even Hezekiah's Passover, which has been compared to the days of David and Solomon (30.26), has been eclipsed (cf. Riley 135-8).

Josiah's final action is to go out against King Neco of Egypt. Neco warns him not to fight against him, saying that it is God's will that he go north, but Josiah disguises himself, fights against him, is wounded by archers, retreats from the battle, and dies in Jerusalem (35.20-24). It would seem that Yhwh's earlier prophecy that he would die in peace misleads him into thinking that he cannot die in battle, thus allowing the prophecy to be fulfilled ironically; Josiah also ignores the word of God because it comes not from a Judahite prophet but from an

Egyptian king (Halpern, "Manasseh" 513, 502-4). The battle scene itself is eerily reminiscent of the death of Ahab in 2 Chron. 18: the disguised king, the being shot by archers, the cry to his retainers to take him from the battle because he is wounded; Japhet points out that both kings receive warnings not to go into battle (SJ 1043). It is also reminiscent of the death of Saul in 1 Chron. 10: the being shot by archers, the request from the retainer (cf. Riley 139).⁴⁷ However, unlike both Ahab and Saul, Josiah does not die on the field of battle, but rather back in Jerusalem (*yěrûšālam*), thus punning on Huldah's prophecy that he would die "in shalom" (Talshir 220).⁴⁸ Surely, however, the king should stay on the battle-field through the battle - the other king to leave the battle-field and go to his city was King Joram of Israel in 2 Chron. 22, who ended up with a nasty death at the hands of Jehu. All of this would seem to place Josiah firmly in the category of a not-ideal ruler, no matter what his cultic accomplishments have been.⁴⁹ Neco's arrival is a test of Josiah's military acumen, and he fails it.

Once Josiah sets himself against the prophecy of God with respect to Neco, it is all over for Judah. The last four kings, two sets of two brothers, preside over the piece-by-piece looting of the Temple (36.3, 7, 9), cultic disobedience (36.5, 9, 12), and military defeats (36.3, 6, 10, 17), culminating in the destruction of Judah, Jerusalem, and the Temple, and the exile of the inhabitants (36.17-20). Under Zedekiah, there is an increase

of unfaithfulness (36.14) (cf. Riley 140-1, who points out the similarities to Saul); he himself does not humble himself (*nikna'*) before Yhwh (36.12), nor does he turn (*miššûb*) to Yhwh (36.13), instead he rebels (*mārād*) against Nebuchadnezzar (36.13), just as Jeroboam had rebelled against the House of David (13.6). Each one of the four rulers is exiled, and his death is not described, binding the four together into what is effectively one reign. The concluding comment of the book (36.22-23), that Cyrus is charged (*pāqad*) to build (*libnôt*) Yhwh a temple (*bayit*) in Jerusalem (all language laden with cultic implications, cf. WJ 2: 237, 275), only adds to the contrast between the four inept kings and the ideal foreign king, Cyrus.⁵⁰ The tension between the conditional-unconditional dynastic promise to David would seem to be resolved on the side of the conditionality of the promise.

Reading the other kings dialogically

2 Chronicles 10.1-13.23a - Rehoboam and Abijah

Certainly, the reader of Chronicles who also knows Samuel-Kings knows right away that the account of Rehoboam is much longer in 2 Chronicles than in 1 Kings. The extra material in 2 Chron. 11.5-12.8 details Rehoboam's activities in the first three years of his reign and the prelude to Shishak's conquest of him. This material is the only material that would lead the reader to think at all positively about Rehoboam's abilities to rule.

However, a more complex way of reading this passage would look at the various dialogic relationships within the passage itself. Ultimately, this is a confusing and contradictory passage; this might be why some commentators have seen Rehoboam as a victim, like Knoppers ("Rehoboam" 425), while others see him as a villain, like Williamson (HGMW 249); Riley does note that "[t]he Chronicler seems to pass a mixed verdict on Rehoboam [...]" (100).

The interpretive key to the reign of Rehoboam is found not in the description of his reign I outlined in the previous section, but rather in the speech of his son Abijah in 2 Chron. 13.4-12. In that speech, Abijah condemns Jeroboam for taking advantage of Rehoboam when he was "a young man [*na'ar*] and weak of heart [*wērak-lēbāb*]" (13.7). The term *rak* 'weak' is used only three times in Chronicles, here and in 1 Chron. 22.5 and 29.1; in the other two cases, the term is used by David to describe Solomon. In all three cases, the term is paired with the term *na'ar* 'young man,' a term which itself is only used five times in Chronicles. This phrase "a young man and weak of heart" picks up on the description of Rehoboam's friends whom he consults in 2 Chron. 10.8 and 1 Kings 12.8 (these men are described as "young men" [*haylādīm*]), but makes it more explicit. What we have in Abijah's speech, therefore, is a strong identification of Rehoboam with Solomon as a young man and inexperienced at the time of his accession. However, in 2 Chron. 12.13 Rehoboam is 41 years old when he begins to reign. I do not think that this

would be considered young.⁵¹ Rehoboam may also be identified with Solomon in terms of the great quantity of wives and concubines he has (2 Chron. 11.18-21), even though this number does not approach the vastness of Solomon's harem (1 Kings 11.3). He may also be identified with Solomon in his role as builder (2 Chron. 11.5-10; cf. 2 Chron. 8.2-6; 1 Kings 9.15-19). Here we have an example of the heteroglossia within Chronicles: one voice says that Rehoboam is young and inexperienced and for that reason loses the kingdom, but he also does good work in Judah (cf. Knoppers, "Rehoboam" 438-9), while the other voice says that Rehoboam is not young but incompetent and for that reason loses the kingdom. The text does not force us to choose (unlike 1 Kings, which does make the choice that Rehoboam is incompetent).

Furthermore, when we compare the role of Jeroboam in 1 Kings and in 2 Chronicles, we see that in 1 Kings, Jeroboam is much more active during the reign of Solomon than he is in the Chronicler's depiction of that reign. His rebellion, therefore, is displaced into the reign of Rehoboam in Chronicles (the position of Kings, that Jeroboam rebels during the reign of Solomon is answered by Chronicles that it is during the reign of Rehoboam).⁵² Jeroboam is set up as a foil for Rehoboam both explicitly as an adversary in 2 Chron. 10-12, and dialogically through the contrast of their building activities: Ben Zvi points out the contrast between "Jeroboam," "Shechem," and "in the hill country of Ephraim" (1 Kings 12.25) with "Rehoboam," "Jerusalem,"

and "in Judah" (2 Chron. 11.5) ("Building" 142); Goldingay sees Rehoboam's rule in 2 Chron. 11-12 as patterned specifically on the account of Jeroboam's rule in 1 Kings 12-14 (102-3).⁵³ However, 2 Chron. 10-12 is full of references that pull Jeroboam back into the reign of Solomon: 10.2 describes how Jeroboam fled to Egypt while Solomon was alive; 10.15 makes reference to the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite already alluded to in 9.29; and 12.15 juxtaposes the notice of the records of Iddo (who also records Solomon's reign, cf. 9.29) with the notice of the continual wars between Rehoboam and Jeroboam. When we put this together with the depiction of the later part of Solomon's reign in 1 Kings 11, we can read Rehoboam's reign in Chronicles as the collection-point for all of the negative stories about Solomon in 1 Kings: rebellion by Jeroboam, loss of the kingdom, cultic aberrations, many wives.

When we read the story of Rehoboam in Chronicles alone, it tells of an incompetent king who makes up for his major losses by some minor organizational tinkering. However, when we read the story of Rehoboam in Chronicles alongside the story in Kings, he emerges not only as an incompetent king and unworthy successor to David and Solomon,⁵⁴ but also in effect as the negative face of Solomon. In that way, he is both the villain in the text for having lost Israel and the Temple wealth, and victim of the text's requirement that all explicitly negative features of Solomon be removed (cf. Knoppers, "Rehoboam"). However, because

he has been given the negative attributes of Solomon in 1 Kings, he is identified too closely with Solomon in Chronicles to be all bad; thus, he is given positive attributes as well. The dialogic construction of Rehoboam as Solomon explains some of the confusion commentators have while reading this passage. Rehoboam takes on the role of Solomon in 1 Kings, who also had both good and bad characteristics, and who definitely lost the northern tribes (cf. 1 Kings 11.11): the Chronicler kept the traditions but changed the character.

Jeroboam looms large over the reading of both Rehoboam and Abijah as the description of his reign in Israel acts as a bookend for both reigns (2 Chron. 10.2 and 12.15; 13.1 and 13.20).⁵⁵ This is especially pointed when we consider that in 1 Kings 15.9 Jeroboam is still alive when Abijah dies, while in 2 Chron. 13.20 it is the other way around (contra Dillard [RBD 109]). Considering that the main speech and narrative of 2 Chron. 13 is concerned with the battle against Jeroboam, it would seem that the main role of Abijah's reign is to subdue Jeroboam (as he indeed does, cf. *wayyikkānē'û bēnē-yisrā'ēl*, "and they subdued the Israelites" in 13.18). Abijah's speech of 2 Chron. 13.4-12 refers to Jeroboam's making of golden calves (1 Kings 12.28, cf. 2 Chron. 11.15), and repeats that the priests and Levites have been driven out by Jeroboam (2 Chron. 11.14). However, Abijah also declares that Jeroboam has rebelled (*wayyimrōd*) against the kingship of the sons of David, a kingship

held by a covenant (*bērit*) with Yhwh (13.5-6); this would seem to be a contradiction to the reason already given for the revolt, that the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite would be fulfilled (9.29; 10.15). This prophecy is fully explained in 1 Kings 11.31-39: because Solomon had not walked in the ways (*bidrākay*) of Yhwh, nor kept the statutes (*wēḥuqqōtay*) and ordinances (*ûmišpāṭay*), his son would lose his kingdom to Jeroboam; moreover, if Jeroboam walks in the ways (*bidrākay*) of Yhwh and keeps his statutes (*ḥuqqōtay*) and commandments (*ûmišwōtay*), Yhwh will build him a house (*bayit*) as he has done for David. In Kings, Jeroboam is set up as an alternative to the Davidic house, sanctioned by Yhwh. The voice of Abijah in 2 Chron. 13 repudiates that version of the story, but it still exists in Chronicles through the allusions to the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite.

In 1 Kings 15.3, Abijah is evaluated negatively, and we are told in 15.6 that the wars begun between Jeroboam and Rehoboam continue throughout his reign. Chronicles' position is that Abijah is able to do what his father could not do, and defeat Jeroboam decisively.⁵⁶ In fact, Jeroboam had been a rebellious servant of Solomon, and Abijah is able to remedy the situation. Yet, traces of the position of 1 Kings remain in the text, creating a dialogic relationship between the two texts (cf. Deboys 60).

2 Chronicles 13.23b-21.1 - Asa and Jehoshaphat

The first thing we are told about Asa is that, "In his days the land had rest for ten years" (2 Chron. 13.23); Myers points out that this formula is very similar to the formula used of the judges (JMM2 81; cf. HGMW 259; SJ 719), for example, in Judg. 5.31. The speech of the prophet Azariah in 2 Chron. 15.3-6 also seems to recall the period of the judges, "For a long time Israel was [...] without law [...] In those times it was not safe for anyone to go or come [...] They were broken in pieces, nation against nation and city against city [...];" this describes quite accurately the situation in Judg. 17-21.⁵⁷ This language of the period of the judges might well be intended to deal with the problem of the unprecedented appearance of the altars, high places and so on in 2 Chron. 14.2, and which are removed by Asa (15.8) following Azariah's speech. Japhet suggests that the sudden appearance of the altars, idols and so on were the result of "a lack of full integration between history and theology" on the part of the Chronicler, so that Asa's reforms contradict the story given so far in Chronicles but make sense in the context of the story in Kings (SJ 707). I would suggest that this is an example of a heteroglossic relationship between the texts, where the text of Kings appears within the text of Chronicles. Azariah also reminds Asa and the people in his speech that when the people of old "turned to the LORD, the God of Israel, and sought

him, he was found by them" (15.4); this is language reminiscent of David's charge to Solomon in 1 Chron. 28.9.

Unlike Rehoboam and Abijah, the evaluations of Asa by the Chronicler and by the Deuteronomist generally coincide. However, there is an interesting difference between the two accounts of Asa's funeral. 1 Kings 15.24 uses the typical formula of death and burial, "Then Asa slept with his ancestors, and was buried with his ancestors in the city of his father David; his son Jehoshaphat succeeded him." Chronicles, on the other hand, makes Asa's funeral rather elaborate. Asa's preparation of his own grave in 2 Chron. 16.14 (*bēqibrōtāyw 'āšer kārâ-lô*), recalls the grave the patriarch Jacob prepares for himself in Gen. 50.5 (*bēqibrî 'āšer kārîî lî*).⁵⁶ The use of an embalmed bier (16.14) is unique in the Hebrew Bible. However, what is intriguing is that they "made an exceedingly great fire for him" (16.14; my translation). Only in 2 Chron. 21.19 do we have a fire being used in a similar way, but in that case the people "did not make a fire for him [Jehoram] like the fire for his ancestors" (my translation); Jehoram was elsewhere evaluated negatively by the Chronicler. Elsewhere in Chronicles, burning is depicted as something disgraceful: in 1 Chron. 14.12; 2 Chron. 15.16; 34.5, relics pertaining to non-Yahwistic practices are burned, and in 2 Chron. 36.19, the Temple and palaces are burned. Burning, therefore, is an ambiguous act, one of honour and of shame. The burning of a great fire for Asa (and it is ambiguous just what

was burned: is it the bier, the spices, the body, or all of the above?⁵⁹), however, does link him back to Saul. In 1 Sam. 31.12, the men of Jabesh burned the bodies of Saul and his sons, an act repudiated by the Chronicler in 1 Chron. 10. As well, Ackroyd points out that the word for the physicians consulted by Asa in 2 Chron. 16.12, *rōp'îm*, is very similar to the word for ghosts or spirits, *rēpā'îm* (PRA 141; cf. SJV 304; Riley 102). Saul was condemned in 1 Chron. 10.13 for consulting a necromancer, one who communes with ghosts. The act, therefore, that would seem to honour Asa, is extremely ambiguous, just as the depiction of the last few years of Asa's reign is also ambiguous. The ambiguities in Chronicles about Asa would seem to be the result of contradictory materials taken over from Kings, and these ambiguities are made productive.⁶⁰

Jehoshaphat's reign takes place during the reign of Ahab of Israel. It is interesting to examine the narrative of 2 Chron. 18 and its parallel 1 Kings 22: in Chronicles, the story is placed in the middle of the narrative about Jehoshaphat, while in Kings, the story is placed at the end of the narrative about Ahab (cf. SJ 756). Thus even though the differences between the episodes are small, their very context gives them different meanings: the Deuteronomist's position was that the story of Ahab was the important one, while the Chronicler replied that the story of Jehoshaphat was the important one, not Ahab. Once we see this relationship, then the dual purpose of most of the minor

differences between the two versions becomes clear: the Chronicler was trying to show that Jehoshaphat was not subordinate to Ahab, and also that in allying himself with Ahab, Jehoshaphat was not acting as the ideal ruler should (cf. PRA 143-4). Thus in 2 Chron. 18.2, Ahab sacrifices in honour of Jehoshaphat, and the reference in 1 Kings 22.4 to Jehoshaphat's horses belonging to Ahab is missing, as is Ahab's inciting of Jehoshaphat, that I discussed above; it also is unique to Chronicles, as is the reference to Yhwh's protection of Jehoshaphat in 2 Chron. 18.31.

Nevertheless, the figure of Ahab looms large over the reign of Jehoshaphat, just as Jeroboam loomed over the reigns of Rehoboam and Abijah, and the figure of Ahab continues to resonate through the reigns of Jehoshaphat's son and grandson (SJ 758). The first mention of Ahab is in 2 Chron. 18.1, near the beginning of Jehoshaphat's reign, and the last is in 2 Chron. 22.8, at the end of the reign of Ahaziah, Jehoshaphat's grandson. The only extended narrative about Ahab is 2 Chron. 18, which details his death in battle. A lovely irony in this passage involves a play on the roles of the "inducer" and "enticer:" Ahab induces Jehoshaphat to join him in his battle (18.2), but it is Yhwh who entices Ahab into the battle to his death (18.19-21) and who induces the enemy away from Jehoshaphat (18.31) (cf. PRA 144). Therefore, although Ahab thinks he is doing the enticing to ensure his victory, it is really Yhwh doing the enticing to

ensure his death. This play is not found in the parallel passage in 1 Kings 22. The death of Ahab is also similar to the death of Saul, the archetype of the flawed king, in several ways: futile battle, wounded by archers, the scattering of the Israelite army (2 Chron. 18.16), lonely death; they are also similar in that Saul had earlier sought the advice of a necromancer, according to 1 Chron. 10.13, and Ahab has sought the advice of prophets. In 1 Kings, Ahab is portrayed in successive events as a king who alternates between obedience to Yhwh and obedience to other gods, and the episode of 1 Kings 22 shows the difference between true and false prophets (PRA 143-4). However, in Chronicles, Ahab is portrayed as consistently unfaithful to Yhwh, both in the explicit description and in the dialogic characterization with Saul; here we have another example of a dialogic relationship between these two texts.⁶¹

There is one episode in Kings which involves Jehoshaphat which does not appear in Chronicles, the battle against the Moabites in 2 Kings 3, which may have been substituted with 2 Chron. 20 (cf. RBD 154). The beginning of the episode parallels the beginning of the episode of 1 Kings 22 (= 2 Chron. 18), with Jehoshaphat joining the Israelite king Jehoram, and the inquiring of the prophet of Yhwh. However, in this case, because of an act of Yhwh, the Moabites think that the allied kings of Judah, Israel and Edom have fought amongst themselves and destroyed each other (2 Kings 3.23), and when they go to take the booty, they

are destroyed by the allied kings (3.24-26). This is reminiscent of the trick pulled by Yhwh on the Ammonites, Moabites, and their allies in 2 Chron. 20.22-23, leading to the victory of Jehoshaphat. The use of the term *qesep* 'wrath' in 2 Kings 3.27 also links 2 Kings 3 to the reign of Jehoshaphat, who is concerned to avoid wrath (*qesep*) in 2 Chron. 19.10 (RBD 150; HGMW 279). Therefore, while the Deuteronomist claimed that Jehoshaphat was constantly involved as a partner of the king of Israel, the Chronicler replied that he was victorious alone.⁶²

2 Chronicles 21.2-23.21 - Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah

In the last section, I pointed out that the figure of Ahab looms large over the reigns of Jehoshaphat and his successors. Although he was killed during the reign of Jehoshaphat, his name appears nine times more: 2 Chron. 21.6 (x2), 13; 22.3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. It would seem that the House of David is contaminated by its association with the House of Ahab; Jehoshaphat survived because he sought Yhwh, but his successors do not: Jehoram's wife is a daughter of Ahab, his son's mother is a daughter of Ahab, and Athaliah is the daughter of Ahab. The contaminant is all through the one person of Athaliah. It is worthwhile to point out that the name of Jehoram's mother is not given in Chronicles (the first king not to have such a notice), but that his wife is a daughter of Ahab is noted, and that the name of Joash's mother is given as Zibiah of Beer-sheba (2 Chron. 24.1); Beer-sheba is solidly within the bounds of Judah. Ahab's house is so offensive

that Yhwh anoints Jehu to destroy it (22.7). Jehu's destruction of the House of Ahab brings about the destruction of Ahab's representative in Judah, Ahaziah, narrated in 2 Chron. 22.7-9. C.T. Begg has argued that the material about Jehoram in Chronicles that is not found in Kings has been reworked from the Ahab material in Kings: thus Jehoram's fratricide is based on Athaliah's murders in 2 Kings 11 or on Jehu's slaughter of Ahaziah's family in 2 Kings 10, his cultic offenses are based on those of Ahab, Jezebel and Athaliah, the letter from Elijah in 2 Chron. 21.12-15 is based on the role letters play in the story of the House of Ahab in Kings (1 Kings 21.8, 9, 11; 2 Kings 5.5, 6, 7; 10.1, 6, 7), and Ahaziah of Israel's death in 2 Kings 1 is transposed to Jehoram ("Constructing" 37-41).

The short passage of 2 Chron. 22.7-9 is extremely significant intertextually. The language is replete with the vocabulary of prophetic works: *tēbûsâ* 'downfall,'⁶³ *šāpaṭ* in the niphal 'to enter into judgment,' and *kārat* in the hiphil 'to cut off/destroy.' *kārat* in the hiphil is also used in the prophecies about Jeroboam and Ahab in Kings (1 Kings 14.10, 14; 21.21; 2 Kings 9.8), and it is the word used to describe Ahab's wife Jezebel's destruction of the prophets of Yhwh in 1 Kings 18.4. The reference to Elijah in 2 Chron. 21.12 just makes this a little more obvious, and it reinforces the link between Jehoram and Ahab, since Elijah was a prophet opposed to Ahab (SJV 333). The language of this passage also is full of expressions common

to the Chronicler's favourite language: Jehu seeks (*waybaqqēš*) Ahaziah, he finds (*wayyimṣā'*) the captains of Judah, Jehoshaphat seeks (*dāraš*) Yhwh, and there is a repetition of the House of Ahab and the House of Ahaziah (*bēt-*). The verb *hārag* 'to murder,' used here and also used fairly often in this entire section (2 Chron. 21.4, 13; 22.1, 8; 23.17; 24.22, 25; 25.3), is also common to the language of the reign of Ahab and its aftermath in Kings (1 Kings 18.12, 13, 14; 19.1, 10, 14; 2 Kings 8.12; 9.31; 10.9; 11.18). Besides the language, this short passage manages to compress all of the events of 2 Kings 9-10, and shape the events so Ahaziah and his attendants receive rightful retribution at the hands of Yhwh's anointed (HGMW 311-12). As well, Ahaziah becomes the focus of this passage, as his death is the culmination of the revolt (SJ 823). This version is in almost complete contrast to Jehu's depiction in 2 Kings 9-10, where his zeal to eradicate Joram and Jezebel and the temple of Baal lead him to perform outrageously bloody acts. This version also contrasts with Ahaziah's depiction in Kings as a noble if hapless victim on Jehu's road to the extermination of Baalism in Israel. The two positions are equally present in the text of Chronicles: the text of 2 Kings 9-10 has been inserted, evoked, changed in these few verses, and a variety of speech genres inserted into the Chronicler's text.

2 Chronicles 24.1-27.9 - Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham

In 2 Kings 12, Joash is portrayed as a good king who repairs the Temple. However, he is assassinated by his retainers. In 2 Chron. 24, Joash is portrayed as a weak king, who can only do right while his father figure Jehoaida is alive, and as soon as Jehoaida dies, he is prey to bad advisors. His conspiracy against Jehoaida's son leads to the conspiracy that kills him. This conspiracy also recalls the conspiracy that led to the death of Naboth in 1 Kings 21; the shadow of the House of Ahab continues to loom over the Davidic line, and here the Davidic king acts like the Omride rulers (SJ 850; HGMW 324). Joash's death also recalls the death of Ahab's son Jehoram, who also was wounded in battle and was killed during his recovery in 2 Chron 21.6. The position of Kings, that Joash is a good king who meets an unfortunate end, is answered by the position of Chronicles, that Joash gets the fate he deserves because he has not acted as the appropriate ruler should, and perhaps because he has begun to act like the rulers of the House of Ahab.

The key to understanding Amaziah may be found in the verb *hārag* 'to murder' used to describe his action of killing his father's murderers (2 Chron. 25.3). In the parallel passage of 2 Kings 15.5, the verb used is *nākāh* 'to smite,' a much more broad term for smiting or striking; but in Chronicles, the much more specific term for murdering is used.⁶⁴ To the position of Kings, that Amaziah's actions are justified, Chronicles replies that

this action is murder, just as much as the conspirators' killing of Joash is murder. Once we see this distinction, the tone for the rest of Amaziah's reign is set: we can expect that all of his actions will be tainted.

The reigns of both Uzziah (Azariah in Kings) and Jotham are both related only briefly in Kings, and while Jotham's reign is only expanded a little in 2 Chron. 27, the reign of Uzziah in 2 Chron. 26 is given much greater attention. The expansions give Uzziah's reign the pattern of the reigns of Asa and Jehoshaphat, complete with the action which tests the ruler; in this case, Uzziah's attempt to usurp priestly prerogatives (Shaver 88). The expansion of the account of Jotham's reign provides those features of the ideal ruler not found in the account in Kings: military success, building projects and receipt of tribute. The position of Kings, in this case, has been elaborated on rather than answered.

2 Chronicles 28.1-32.33 - Ahaz and Hezekiah

These two rulers are very interesting in their intertextual construction. In Kings, Ahaz (while a bad king), is not as bad as in Chronicles, and Hezekiah (although pious), is not as good. In 2 Kings 16, the Arameans and Israelites attack Ahaz, but cannot conquer him (16.5), and when Ahaz tries to buy Assyria's help, the king of Assyria comes and captures the neighbouring city Damascus, taking its people captive (*wayyaglehā*), and Ahaz goes to meet him there (16.8-10). Ahaz's cultic misbehaviour

seems to have been because of this meeting, according to 2 Kings 16 (cf. especially 16.18). The position of Kings, that Ahaz's misdeeds are largely due to the influence of the Assyrians, is answered by Chronicles that Ahaz's misdeeds are due to Ahaz alone: it is his attempt to gain the favour of the Assyrians that leads to even more misfortune for Judah, and it is his defeat by the Arameans that leads to his worship of the gods of Damascus. In order for Ahaz to fit the model of the evil king, he has to be defeated in battle, and it is because of his defeat that he becomes even more evil in the construction of him in Chronicles.

Hezekiah's actions concerning the cult, so detailed in the account of the Chronicler, are only briefly mentioned in 2 Kings 18.4-6, and are formulaic. It is in the accounts of Sennacherib's invasion that the most interesting differences lie. In 2 Kings 18.16, Hezekiah strips the wealth of the Temple in order to buy off Sennacherib, and after Hezekiah's prayer and Isaiah's prophetic response in 19.15-34, Yhwh's angel kills the entire army of Sennacherib (19.35-37). The position of Kings, that Hezekiah's faith in Yhwh and his cash averts the destruction that has just befallen Samaria, is answered by the position of Chronicles, that it is Hezekiah's faith in Yhwh as well as his good sense in preparing the country for invasion that averts Judah's destruction (Knoppers, "History" 190-1). An ideal ruler does not try to buy off his enemy (as does Ahaz in both Kings and

Chronicles), but rather defeats his enemy through sound planning.⁶⁵ His great wealth will then come to him because of his ideal actions.

The progression of Hezekiah's cultic actions that I outlined above, from Temple to Jerusalem to Judah, while reversing Ahaz's actions which are taken in the same order, also can be read in the context of Josiah's reforms in 2 Kings 23 (RBD 249), as illustrated below:

Hezekiah in 2 Chron.	Josiah in 2 Kings
Repair of Temple (29.3-19)	Repair of Temple (22.3-7)
Removal of altars from Jerusalem (30.14)	Removal of altars etc. from Temple and Jerusalem (23.4-14)
Removal of high places etc. from Judah (31.1)	Destruction of high places in Israel and Judah (23.15-20)

It is clear that in Chronicles, Hezekiah is the great reforming king, while in Kings it is Josiah. By appropriating Josiah's reforms in Kings for Hezekiah, the Chronicler downplayed Josiah while exalting Hezekiah, a truism in Chronicles studies, but important in showing the continuation of the Chronicler's pattern of keeping episodes from other texts but replacing the characters involved.

Hezekiah's illness, recovery, and the final actions of his reign, related in 2 Chron. 32.24-31, make good sense within the context of Chronicles itself.⁶⁶ However, several features of this passage also allude to the narration of his reign in 2 Kings 20. According to 2 Chron. 32.25, Hezekiah does not respond

appropriately to Yhwh's sign, and so wrath comes upon him; while in 2 Kings 20 there is no indication that Hezekiah does not respond to Yhwh's sign, but there is also no indication that he does. The description of Hezekiah's wealth in 2 Chron. 32.27-29 is not linked with the "matter of the envoys of the officials of Babylon" (32.31), and in fact Hezekiah seems to be blessed as a result of this test (Riley 109), yet in 2 Kings 20.12-18, Hezekiah is punished by Yhwh for showing off his wealth to the Babylonians. These fragments are the traces of the position of Kings in Chronicles, part of the dialogism of Chronicles: although Hezekiah is portrayed positively, and according to the model of David and Solomon in Chronicles, these other texts within the text respond by indicating that Hezekiah could also be constructed as a not-so-positive figure.

2 Chronicles 33.1-25 - Manasseh and Amon

In 2 Kings 21, Manasseh is depicted as relentlessly evil: he is not captured by the Assyrians, nor does he turn to Yhwh while imprisoned. Instead of the episode of his capture, there is a long prophecy against him (2 Kings 21.10-15); this prophecy is then alluded to in 2 Chron. 33.18, and summarized in 33.19.⁶⁷ This prophecy in 2 Kings 21 makes Manasseh the cause of the Babylonian Exile; it is unrelenting in its doom for Judah. The Chronicler's position was that there would be hope for Judah: if Manasseh could become a proper king (although not ideal like David or Solomon), then Judah could be saved (cf. Schniedewind

"Source" 451-2; HGMW 388-9).⁶⁸ However, by referring to this prophecy, the Chronicler introduced a text within the text, which radically undercut the message of Manasseh's repentance (cf. SJ 1012). The trace of the Deuteronomist's position in 2 Chron. 33.10 erupts into the text in 33.18-19, suggesting that while the overt message of the passage is that repentance will avert disaster, the implicit message is that it will not.

2 Chronicles 34.1-36.23 - Josiah and the last four kings

It is a truism in Chronicles studies that the Chronicler's post-Solomonic hero was Hezekiah, while the Deuteronomist's was Josiah, and each author played up his favourite at the expense of the other. For example, Japhet notes that Josiah's reforms are diminished in Chronicles because of Manasseh's reforming actions: Josiah does not need to purify the Temple because Manasseh had already done it (SJ 1002); whereas in Kings, Josiah's reforms are much broader because of Manasseh's more complete cultic disobedience. However, from an intertextual perspective, it is more pertinent to point out that Hezekiah is constructed in Chronicles completely according to the model of David and Solomon. Josiah, on the other hand, is based on Hezekiah on the matter of his reforms, and on non-ideal models with respect to his death.

Josiah's death is told very differently in Kings and Chronicles: in 2 Kings 23.29-30, we are told simply that Neco kills Josiah when he meets him at Megiddo, and that Josiah's

servants bring him back dead from Megiddo to Jerusalem. Z. Talshir makes a good point by questioning whether we would even understand the account in Kings as a battle account without the account in Chronicles (215). The Chronicler's account is much more involved, as I discussed above. The one crucial difference between the accounts is that in 2 Kings 23.29-30, Josiah dies at Megiddo, while in 2 Chron. 35.24 he dies in Jerusalem; in Kings, the part of Huldah's prophecy about Josiah not living to see the exile is fulfilled, whereas in Chronicles the whole prophecy is fulfilled, but ironically.⁶⁹ The point, therefore, is that while the position of Kings has Josiah die a meaningless, almost accidental death, the position of Chronicles has Josiah die an ironic death, and a foolish one. The irony of his death is only emphasized by the knowledge of the Kings account.⁷⁰

In her discussion of the ending of Chronicles, Japhet suggests that the different ending of Chronicles from that of Kings functions in three ways: 1) it ends on a positive note; 2) it allows the experience of exile to be downplayed; and 3) it allows the restoration to be downplayed. These three factors suggest that for the Chronicler, "all Israel" had never been exiled: Judah had been relocated temporarily until the land's Sabbath had been fulfilled (2 Chron. 36.21), but Israel itself continued in the land. By ending before the return of the exiles, therefore, the Chronicler placed himself in the time of Cyrus, with the restoration about to begin. The restoration,

therefore, means the continuation of the Davidic monarchy ("Exile").

The other kings, Solomon, David, and Cyrus

It has become obvious that the father-son pairing is one of the major structuring elements of Chronicles as a whole, leading to the pairing of David and Solomon, Rehoboam and Abijah, Asa and Jehoshaphat, Jehoram and Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah, Uzziah and Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, Manasseh and Amon, Josiah and the last four kings (the last four kings being two sets of two brothers). However, the questions which could be posed is how does the text of Chronicles make such pairings possible? The easiest way to account for the father-son pairings in Chronicles is to note that in Chronicles as opposed to Kings, the narratives of the rulers of Judah follow one on another, uninterrupted by narratives about the rulers of Israel, as in Kings. The pattern of father-son pairs simply is not as apparent in Kings. In Kings, it is typical for the date of the beginning of each king's reign to be given with respect to the reign of the king of the other kingdom, for example, in 2 Kings 13.1 and 14.1. Thus, in Kings, the kings of Israel and Judah are paired with each other. As I pointed out above, only Abijah is given such a relational notice in 2 Chron. 13.1. Not only does the elimination of such notices focus the attention upon Judah rather than Israel, it also focuses the attention upon the father-son relationship.

However, even though the regnal notices of Kings are not duplicated in Chronicles, it is the relationship with the kings of Israel which binds together each father-son pair, at least until the destruction of the House of Ahab with Athaliah's death in 2 Chron. 23. These relationships are not so pronounced in Kings, and in fact, much of the material unique to Chronicles is devoted to describing these relationships. Thus Rehoboam and Abijah are linked by their struggle with Jeroboam - Abijah is given no such relationship with Jeroboam in 1 Kings. Asa and Jehoshaphat are linked by their alliances with kings of Israel, alliances for which they are repeatedly punished - not so in 1 Kings. Jehoram and Ahaziah are linked by their relationship to the House of Ahab, a relationship which also exists in 2 Kings 8.18, 26, but which is heightened by the material of 2 Chron. 21.10-20 and 22.7-9. After the death of Athaliah, the culmination of the relationship between the House of David and the House of Ahab, this structuring device of relationship with Israel can no longer be seen. From the death of Athaliah until the Exile, the father-son pairings continue to be used as a structuring device. However, what we see replacing the relationship with the northern kingdom is a foreshadowing of the Exile: this may be seen in the reigns of Ahaz, Hezekiah (who refers to the exile under Ahaz), and Manasseh, before culminating in the constant removals into exile during the reigns of the last four kings. What we see here is a dialogue about relationships

with foreign rulers: Judah/Israel should not be subordinate to foreign rulers, yet if Judah's rulers are incompetent, it is better that they should fall.

When we look at the accounts of the kings of Judah in conjunction with the Cyropaedia, there are several striking features. First, as I noted in Chapter Three, the Chronicler was not interested in the nature of David, but only in his origins and actions; but in 2 Chronicles, the nature of the various kings becomes very important: for example, in 2 Chron. 25.2, we are told that Amaziah does right, but "not with a true heart [*lō' bēlēbāb šālēm*]." Thus not even correct actions are enough for success, but an appropriate character is needed as well, as in the Cyropaedia: the presence or absence of such a nature could explain the successes and failures of the various kings along with their actions. Thus what we have is a dialogic relationship between the origins (descendants of David) and nature of the various kings. It was not enough to be a descendant of David; the nature and actions of the king also had a bearing on the fate of the king. This resolves the problem of the unconditional yet conditional dynastic oracle: it is necessary for all factors to be positive, not just the origins of the king. The unconditional dynastic oracle of 1 Chron. 17 is thus shown to be overwhelmed by the conditional dynastic promises of 1 Chron. 28 and 2 Chron. 7.

Finally, there is another point of similarity between the Cyropaedia and Chronicles: the inability of the successors of the

ideal ruler to live up to his legacy. After Cyrus' death, his successors were not able to rule their empire the way he had, because Xenophon saw them lacking his nature and education; this underscores Cyrus' uniqueness. After David's death, his successors were not able to unite cultic obedience, military success, wealth and honour the way he had; it seems likely that the Chronicler saw this inability as coming from their lack of character and effort. When a Davidic king tries to emulate David, he can almost achieve David's status, but not quite - there is always something lacking. As well, the Chronicler's techniques of dialogism, such as having Rehoboam stand in for Solomon, keeping traditions about cultic reform but having Hezekiah take them (although he does not equal David in his cultic perfection), Josiah's ironic death, all say more about the characterization of David than about the kings themselves. David's uniqueness is underscored. As does the Cyropaedia, Chronicles may also have something to say about the impossibility of ruling.

Notes

1. So, for example, Williamson might discuss kingship (HGMW 26-28) and Braun might discuss David and Solomon (RB xxxiii-xxxv) without dealing with how the other kings are portrayed. Myers simply summarizes the contents of 2 Chron. 10-36 without trying to deal with how the kings are generally portrayed (JMM2 xxv-xxxi).
2. Riley also considers the cult to be the primary criterion for determining the success of a king (155-56).
3. He makes a similar conclusion with respect to the Chronicler's David (cf. Chapter Three above).
4. Jeroboam's appearance in the narrative is tantalizingly brief when we read Chronicles alone: who is this mysterious figure who had fled from Solomon (2 Chron. 10.2), of whom there were certain prophecies made (9.29; 10.15), and who now appears to be leading the northern tribes (10.3; 11.4). Later, he is described as oppressing the Levites and appointing his own priests for bizarre cultic practices (11.14). At the end of the Chronicler's description of Rehoboam's reign, there are "continual wars" between Rehoboam and Jeroboam (12.15). Jeroboam's end does not come until the reign of Abijah, which I will discuss next. Knoppers sees Jeroboam as a foil for Rehoboam ("Rehoboam" 434-5).
5. Cf. Johnstone (WJ 2: 24-5), who sees the actions of the people as "presumptuousness" and Rehoboam's response as "inadequate" and "inept."
6. The verb *pāša'* is used to describe this rebellion (2 Chron. 10.19). It is used only three other times in Chronicles, all referring to Edom rebelling against Judah (2 Chron. 21.8, 10 [x2]), but elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible it is characteristic of prophetic language discussing transgression against Yhwh. We might conclude, therefore, that Israel's rebellion has implications of religious transgression. Cf. Knoppers, who argues that the Chronicler played down the secession of Israel from Judah as an aberration ("Rehoboam" 430, 440).
7. Ben Zvi points out that this kind of specific list of building activities is unique in the Chronicler's description of the Judahite kings, and that building activity by other kings is usually described in a more general way ("Building" 141). Only Solomon undertakes anything similar (2 Chron. 8.4-5).

8. Although the MT says "they" walk in the way of David, the LXX has "he," referring to Rehoboam; thus the possibility exists that only a textual corruption has shut Rehoboam out of this good action. However, it is not Rehoboam who initiates the action of the northern cultic officials.
9. Contra Knoppers, who sees Rehoboam's early reign as being depicted in a positive way ("Rehoboam" 433), but who takes his building activities and his wives/sons as indices of this positive depiction (435).
10. Japhet points out that this short reign would seem to be inconsistent with the Chronicler's view that a long reign is a necessary feature of a successful king (SJ 688); I would point out that the mention of Abijah's many wives and children after he grows strong (2 Chron. 13.21) would indicate that Abijah does rule a long time - another instance of the chronological compression common in Chronicles. Japhet suggests that these two events of children and strength are unconnected and general (SJ 699), whereas Williamson sees the wives and children as an expression of Abijah's growing strong (HGMW 255).
11. Deboys suggests that the Chronicler was ambivalent to Abijah because of the idolatry mentioned in 1 Kings 15 (52). Japhet points out that only Abijah and Jehoahaz are not evaluated explicitly by the Chronicler (SJ 686).
12. Japhet points out with respect to Azariah's speech that it is "one of the best of several examples in Chronicles of an 'anthological style' - a mosaic of longer or shorter citations from existing prophetic texts, slightly altered and sophisticatedly interwoven [...]" (SJ 716). The dialogism used by the Chronicler in order to create his ideal ruler was also used to create other features of his work.
13. The use of the Temple wealth (gained through booty capture) for something other than Temple projects would also be a deviation from the model of David and Solomon (cf. WJ 2: 71).
14. In fact, in 1 Chron. 19, the Arameans were bought by the Ammonites to oppose David; they were unsuccessful, of course.
15. Johnstone suggests a chronological framework for the reign of Asa where there are ten years of peace, followed by an invasion of five years, then 20 years of peace, then an invasion and the illness of Asa in the last five years (WJ 2: 59); Japhet also comments on the "extensive chronological framework, the most elaborate provided for any monarch [...]" (SJ 703). Since elsewhere in Chronicles chronology seems to have been compressed,

it might be suggestive that there is such a strict chronological framework here.

16. These parallels are: 1) similar scheme for the reign: reform, building, army; battle; reform; battle; transgression and death; 2) the two reform attempts may have been one; 3) suppression of high places and later report of non-suppression; 4) rewards for piety; 5) indictment by prophets for foreign alliances; 6) paranomasia on the name of the king (RBD 129-30).
17. Klein suggests that the differentiation between civil and cultic law evident in this passage could only have taken place in the historical situation after the end of the monarchy (649-51).
18. Japhet points out that the transition from Jehoshaphat to Jehoram is reminiscent of the transition from David to Solomon in that the king names his successor while still alive, and disperses his other sons to positions of authority (SJ 806-7).
19. Contra Dillard, who saw nothing inconsistent about the use of the verb *ḥāzaq* 'to be strong' in this passage, using the material from 1 Kings 1-2 to suggest that Solomon does the same thing (RBD 165); of course, this material is not found in Chronicles.
20. De Vries perceptively notes that as long as Jehoaida is alive, Joash is called "the king" by the narrator, rather than by name: this namelessness "underscores his subordination" (SJV 345).
21. Johnstone points out that the term for the idols (*ḥā'āšabbîm*) worshipped by the people in 2 Chron. 24.18 only appears one other time in Chronicles: in 1 Chron. 10.9, when it refers to the gods of the Philistines who hear the good news about the defeat of Saul (WJ 2: 144).
22. The death of Zechariah in the Temple contrasts with his father Jehoaida's concern that Athaliah not be killed in the Temple (SJ 850; HGMW 324).
23. Note the contrast between the burials of Jehoaida and Joash: the priest buried in the royal tomb, the king not (PRA 159).
24. Although his own army is very large (2 Chron. 25.5), he hires mercenaries from Israel (25.6); this leads to the ransacking of his own territory. The ideal ruler should not have to rely on outside troops (PRA 163; RBD 199). Knoppers shows that even the use of mercenaries rather than an alliance with Israel is unacceptable to the Chronicler ("Yhwh" 621).

25. Amaziah's defeat in 2 Chron. 25.22-23 also recalls Saul's defeat at the hands of the Philistines: Judah flees (*wayyānūsū*), just as the Israelites fled the Philistines in 1 Chron. 10.1; Amaziah is captured, just as Saul's body was captured by the Philistines.
26. Knoppers pointed out that Uzziah's army is large like the armies of David, Abijah, Asa, and Jehoshaphat, kings evaluated positively ("History" 188).
27. Uzziah's growing proud (*gābah libbô*) is described in the same language as Jehoshaphat acting properly in 2 Chron. 17.6, but Jehoshaphat had acted "in the ways of the LORD" (cf. WJ 2: 167).
28. Williamson (HGMW 341); contra Johnstone (WJ 2: 171) and Myers (JMM2 156).
29. It seems that for every loss of wealth, there is a gain of wealth in the text: it all balances out (Knoppers, "Treasures" 204).
30. Williamson suggests that because Jotham is the first king after Solomon who is presented as wholly positive, that his reign is meant to contrast with the reign of Ahaz, which immediately follows (HGMW 341).
31. When we consider, below, that Hezekiah's name is punned upon in his strengthening of the Temple, it is clear that the Chronicler does not want Ahaz to be "hazaking" or "Hezekiah-ing" anything.
32. Japhet sees the details about these officials as not contributing to the story (SJ 901), but as I point out below, they correspond to the three sons of Saul killed in 1 Chron. 10.
33. Thus Hezekiah is seen as a "new David, re-establishing the music of the shrine" (PRA 182); he acts as Solomon had done before him, emphasizing the Temple and the cult (SJV 369-70). Cf. also Dillard (RBD 228).
34. The language describing the exile in 2 Chron. 28.8 and 29.10 is also reminiscent of the language of Solomon's prayer to Yhwh in 2 Chron. 6.36-38, but there the captives could only return to Jerusalem if they repented; there is no indication in 2 Chron. 28-29 that the captives themselves repent, although first the Israelites and then Hezekiah certainly do.

35. Japhet claims that no such covenant-ceremony is described by the Chronicler between Hezekiah and Yhwh, and it would be a logical impossibility for Hezekiah (the inferior) to make a covenant with Yhwh (the superior) (SJ 919).
36. Contra Ackroyd, who sees these themes only in the Kings version of Solomon's prayer, not in 2 Chron. 6 (PRA 184).
37. After the stories of Genesis, in which Yhwh is depicted as having a very close relationship with various people, Yhwh is described as hearing only Moses (e.g. Deut. 10.10) and Elijah (1 Kings 17.22), and doing what they asked of him.
38. Hezekiah's command that the people should contribute to the support of the cultic personnel, and the obedience to this command (2 Chron. 31.4-7), compares nicely to David's command that the people contribute to the materials needed to build the Temple, and the obedience to that command (1 Chron. 29.5-9).
39. The note about building up the Millo (2 Chron. 32.5) recalls David's construction of the Millo (1 Chron. 11.8) (PRA 191).
40. Hezekiah's call to all of the Israelites who live from Dan to Beer-sheba to come to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover in Jerusalem (2 Chron. 30.5) also implies that he has control over all of this territory, the territory of the monarchy under David and Solomon (HGMW 367); the Assyrian invasion and exile of the Israelites is only obliquely referred to 30.6 (cf. RBD 219, 228). With Hezekiah's reign, the monarchy is once again united (HGMW 343-44).
41. Contra Murray, who sees Hezekiah as an ideal religious leader, not as an ideal Davidide (90). Also contra Japhet, who sees Hezekiah not as a "type" of either David or Solomon, but as his own character (SJ 998).
42. So Dillard (RBD 237); cf. de Vries on the Solomonic typology of Hezekiah (SJV 376, 381, 383, 386). Williamson also sees Hezekiah as a second Solomon (HGMW 351).
43. So also the verb *šārar* 'to be in distress' (2 Chron. 33.12) is used in 2 Chron. 6.28; the verb *pālal* in the hithpael 'to pray' is used in 2 Chron. 6.19, 20, 21, 24, 26, 32, 34, 38; the noun *tēhinnā* 'supplication' (2 Chron. 33.13) is used in 2 Chron. 6.19, 29, 35, 39; and the verb *šûb* 'to turn, return' is used in 2 Chron. 6.23, 24, 25, 26, 37 (x2), 38, 42. Johnstone noted that a similar phrase to "while he was in distress [*ûkēhāšēr*]" is used of Ahaz in 2 Chron. 28.22, who does not turn to Yhwh (WJ 2: 227; cf. HGMW 393).

44. I follow Japhet here in her judgement that a statement about Amon's burial is not missing through a textual corruption but rather due to intention on the part of the Chronicler; see her argument (SJ 1014).
45. Thus *ṭāher* 'to purge,' used in 2 Chron. 34.3, 5, 8, is also used in 29.15, 16, 18; 30.18; *nātaṣ* 'to pull down,' used in 34.4, 7, is also used in 31.1, 3; and *gāda'* 'to hew down,' used in 34.4, 7, is also used in 31.1. Notably, Manasseh's reforms of 33.15-16 do not use this language. Josiah's reforms include destroying the same sorts of things as Hezekiah: sacred poles (*hā'āšērîm*), high places (*bāmôt*) and altars (*mizbēhôt*); as well as the things erected by Manasseh in 33.3 and 19, and worshipped by Amon in 33.22: images (*hammassēkôt*) and idols (*happēsîlîm*) (34.3-4).
46. Glatt-Gilad suggests that after Huldah's prophecy, Josiah shifts his actions from his private devotions to public matters of reform of the cult (29-30); whether we can call a Temple repair programme non-public is debatable.
47. Riley suggests that after Josiah's completion of the cultic arrangements seen in his Passover, the role of the Davidic House is played out, and it is for this reason that Josiah is killed (138-9).
48. Williamson's comment (HGMW 409), that this death in Jerusalem rather than on the battlefield is meant to deal with the problem of the non-fulfillment of Huldah's prophecy, misses the point completely.
49. Many commentators, such as Talshir (219) and Williamson ("Death" 246) see Josiah's death as simply having been copied from Ahab's death in 1 Kings 22/2 Chron. 18. It is more important, however, to recognize that this pattern deliberately says something about Josiah, placing him firmly in the shadow of Ahab and Saul. The account also acts as a frame: the death of the first king and the death of the last king occur in the same way.
50. Snyder suggests that the arrival of Cyrus was a result of the Judahite kings' failures; written under Persian overlordship, Chronicles had to find a way to rationalize Persian rule (109).
51. Japhet deals with this problem differently: she sees the terms as being applied literally to Solomon and figuratively to Rehoboam (SJ 692); I think this overlooks the mention of the "young men" who were Rehoboam's advisors (cf. HGMW 253).

52. However, Ackroyd points out that the LXX of 1 Kings 12 tells the story of Rehoboam at Shechem with no reference to Jeroboam being there, and that Jeroboam's revolt is treated differently in the LXX. He suggests it is possible that the Chronicler knew the story of Jeroboam as it exists in the LXX, and that the MT of 1 Kings 12 was influenced by 2 Chron. 10 (PRA 125). Japhet outlines a plausible version of the textual history of the two passages (SJ 648-50).
53. However, see Dillard's comments that this entire pattern is not that obvious (RBD 93): the pattern is more general than specific.
54. I realize that this is contrary to the way most commentators have read Rehoboam: overwhelmed by the voice of the text which suggests that Rehoboam does indeed do as Yhwh commands, they ignore the voice which says that he does not and never did. Japhet does point out that if we view Rehoboam's reign as an "unsuccessful digression," Abijah would be the true successor to David and Solomon (SJ 687).
55. Johnstone points out that only in 2 Chron. 13.1 is the start of the reign of a Judahite king given in terms of the reign of an Israelite king (WJ 2: 50, cf. RBD 106).
56. Knoppers argues that the battle in 2 Chron. 13 is patterned after the battle of Jericho in Josh. 6: it is a stylized battle ("Battling" 522).
57. However, Ackroyd argues that the language might be referring to events contemporary to the Chronicler (PRA 138).
58. Riley suggests that this grave of Asa's "may indicate a certain distancing from the burial with the fathers/kings" (103).
59. Jer. 34.5 also alludes to the burning done in honour of the kings, but also is unclear as to what is burnt. Dillard asserts that this rite is definitely not cremation but "a memorial and honorific rite" (RBD 127). Japhet suggests that the "spice-fire" might be an interpretation of Asa's name, which in Aramaic means "myrtle" as well as "healer," thus the two stories about Asa's death have their origins in his name (SJ 739-40).
60. Snyman's account of the relationship of Asa and Saul runs roughly parallel to this analysis (103-6).
61. Beentjes, in an article discussing 2 Chron. 20 ("Tradition"), points out that the entire episode seems to have

been patterned on Exod. 14 as well as being an interpretation of certain verses in Isaiah.

62. Myers argues that although older commentators saw 2 Kings 3 as a pattern for 2 Chron. 20, there is no use of Kings by the Chronicler in this passage (JMM2 114); however, the subtle use of dialogism in these passages would again reinforce the Chronicler's depiction of Jehoshaphat.

63. Ackroyd suggests that this word is a transposition of a hypothetical word from the root *sbb* rather than from the root *bws*, giving the meaning of "a turn of events" (PRA 156); Williamson also supports such an emendation, suggesting the theological significance of similar terms from the root *sbb* in Chronicles (HGMW 312); Japhet points out that the root *bws* never elsewhere appears in prose in the Hebrew Bible, and supports the emendation (SJ 822); the prophetic language, however, fits well here.

64. The corresponding verb in 2 Chron. 24.25 has also been changed from the *nākāh* of 2 Kings 12.21 to *hārag*, which also picks up the use of *hārag* in 2 Chron. 24.22: the implication is that none of these actions are justified (cf. HGMW 325-6).

65. When dealing with the Assyrian invasion in 2 Chron. 32 and Hezekiah's illness, we have the additional complicating factor that there is a second parallel to this passage, in Isa. 36-39. Auld's argument, that the authors of Chronicles, Kings and Isaiah all drew from a common source, may hold more weight here than with respect to other passages (98-102). Williamson points out that Hezekiah's preparations in the face of the invasion also have a similarity to Isa. 22.8-11 (HGMW 381).

66. Contra Ackroyd, who claims that this passage "would be very difficult to understand if we did not possess the Kings text" (PRA 190). The passage can be understood in Chronicles alone, but it makes a different sense when understood in the context of Kings as well.

67. Contra de Vries, who sees the references to "seers" in these verses of 2 Chron. 33 as trying to assure the readers that "Manasseh was not, after all, so wicked that Yahweh's 'seers' [...] would no longer speak to him" (SJV 399).

68. Schniedewind also points out that Manasseh is taken to Babylon, not Nineveh as we might expect with the Assyrians: this is another indication of Manasseh's position as a "type" for post-exilic Israel ("Source" 451-2).

69. Contra both Dillard (RBD 282) and Williamson (HGMW 401-2), who see the Chronicler as emphasizing only the part of the prophecy that is fulfilled (Josiah not living to see the exile), because, as Williamson says, the Chronicler "must have realized that part of the promise was not fulfilled."

70. Debate has surrounded the differences in the two accounts in recent scholarship, with emphasis on the possibility that the Chronicler had access to a historical account to fill in the gaps in the Kings account, or perhaps even an expanded version of Kings (so Williamson, "Death"). For the recent debate on this issue, see Williamson ("Death"), Begg ("Death"), and Williamson's reply ("Reliving"), as well as Talshir. I think that the evidence is fairly convincing that even if the Chronicler had a source giving an expanded account of Josiah's death, Chronicles is still in a dialogic relationship with the Kings account as we have it.

CONCLUSIONS

Finally, we can draw all of the strands of this dissertation together, and end its argument. I began this dissertation by choosing to look at how the ideal ruler is constructed intertextually; I hoped that this would shed some light on the intertextual construction of *Chronicles*. In order to illuminate *Chronicles*, I chose Xenophon's Cyropaedia for comparison, a text from the same general timeframe and geographical position with respect to the superpower of the day (Persia). By using the Cyropaedia as a starting point, I hoped to be able to say something about *Chronicles*.

In the first chapter, I looked at some of the prominent theories and theorists of intertextuality, beginning with Kristeva, Riffaterre, Barthes, and Culler, in order to get some ideas about how intertextuality might be conceived. Then I turned to a discussion of "intertextuality" in ancient writers on composition, and concluded that although it was not a concept rigorously theorized, ancient authors did have an understanding of the use of other texts. This led into my summary and discussion of the theories about intertextuality as dialogue, based on the work of Bakhtin and Lotman, and the construction of my own theoretical framework for the analysis of the texts. I concluded the chapter with a discussion of genre in general and a

long discussion of how scholars have seen the genre of both the Cyropaedia and Chronicles, which led to my hypothesis about the purpose of Chronicles as a kind of political philosophy.

The next four chapters provided my readings of the Cyropaedia and Chronicles. I read Cyrus, then David, Solomon, and the remaining kings of Judah, first within the context of the Cyropaedia and Chronicles in order to determine some of the characteristics of the ideal ruler within the text; and then I read the rulers within the context of an intertextual relationship in order to show how the intertextual construction of the ruler works in conjunction with the characteristics of the ideal ruler developed within the text.

The second chapter detailed my understanding of the Cyropaedia and its construction of the ideal ruler in the person of Cyrus, as well as its intertextual construction. Here I relied almost entirely on the work of previous scholars in my readings, but recast it in light of my theoretical framework of intertextuality. I concluded that the ideal ruler in the Cyropaedia, Cyrus, is constructed as a unique individual, whose abilities were not equaled by his successors. Xenophon investigated Cyrus' origins, nature and education in order to determine where Cyrus' ability to rule came from. Cyrus is described as having certain characteristics: justice, generosity, temperance, obedience, piety, love of learning and ambition. These characteristics are part of his nature, but are

demonstrated or enhanced by his education, an education that lasts through to his death.

This depiction of Cyrus is further supported by its intertextual construction, where the positions of Herodotus and Ctesias are absorbed and refuted within the Cyropaedia. This is seen primarily in the contrast of Cyrus with the Croesus of both the Cyropaedia and Herodotus' Histories. Xenophon used several intertextual techniques in order to construct Cyrus: role reversal, re-use of episodes with new characters, irony, and re-use of episodes with a shift in the meaning of the episode. His use of phrases such as "it is said" and "it is generally agreed" allowed him to incorporate episodes while at the same time casting doubt on the original meaning of the episodes; so too did his use of the phrase *eti kai nyn* allow him to question the world he had created in his work. Through these techniques, Xenophon created his hero intertextually, taking the tragic hero of Herodotus and the failed warrior of Ctesias and shifting the characterization to the philosopher-king of the Cyropaedia.

If we agree that Cyrus in the Cyropaedia is a philosopher-king, then surely it is not much of a stretch to suggest that the Cyropaedia is a work of political philosophy. However, taking that approach merely looks at the theme of the work. In Chapter One, I agreed with Bakhtin's premise that every genre has its own generic form. The works of political philosophy from the Greek world that most easily come to mind are the Socratic dialogues of

Plato, especially the Republic. I suggested in Chapter Two that in the Cyropaedia, in the dialogic and heteroglossic form of the text, we have a dialogue in narrative form. This dialogue is not between named characters in the text,¹ but rather between the voices or texts within the text. Xenophon himself had used the form of the Socratic dialogue for some of his other works (the Memorabilia, Oeconomicus and Symposium featured Socrates, while the Hiero did not). The Cyropaedia internalizes this form, maintaining it within the genre of philosophy. However, in the Cyropaedia Xenophon (or the implied author "Xenophon") took on the role of Socrates, controlling the voices and texts within the text, leading the dialogue in the direction he wanted it go, just as Socrates did.

From Cyrus, in Chapter Three I turned to the depiction of David in 1 Chronicles. Beginning with an examination of the narrative about the death of Saul, I showed how David is constructed in 1 Chronicles as the antithesis to Saul. All of David's characteristics as an ideal ruler are derived from this opposition of David to Saul. I determined that the ideal ruler in Chronicles: is obedient to cultic demands, seeks the counsel of Yhwh, is successful militarily, receives tribute and honour from foreign kings, has wealth, has sons to succeed him, organizes the kingdom, and dies a peaceful death at old age. When we place David next to Cyrus, there are many similarities between the two rulers, including the importance of piety and

military success; as well, both rulers undertake organization of the kingdom, and both plan the succession of one of the sons just before their own deaths. However, the Chronicler was not interested in David's nature in the same way that Xenophon was in Cyrus', but rather was interested in his actions. With respect of the theme of the idealized ruler, therefore, Chronicles seems very similar to the Cyropaedia, and could be called political philosophy.

When the David of Chronicles is placed alongside the David of Samuel-Kings, I showed how the different positions of the Chronicler and the Deuteronomist respond to each other. The intertextual construction of David in Chronicles emphasizes the features of the ideal ruler. The features we saw used by Xenophon in the intertextual construction of his ideal ruler in the Cyropaedia are also found in Chronicles' Davidic material: replacement of characters, change in the meaning of episodes, ironic use of phrases; although one of Xenophon's favourites, role reversal, is not used. In the Cyropaedia, these techniques lead to a shift in characterization of Cyrus from a tragic hero to a philosopher-king. In Samuel-Kings, David could very easily be described as a kind of tragic hero, whose involvement with Bathsheba and Uriah in 2 Sam. 11 leads to his downfall (although not his destruction, the destruction of almost everything else he holds dear follows). The intertextual techniques of Chronicles lead to a shift in characterization of David as a flawed ruler to

David the ideal king. The dialogue between the voices and texts within Chronicles on the unconditional and conditional dynastic promise, war and peace, war and the cult, the primacy of cultic obedience or military endeavour all point to the form of the genre of political philosophy. Indeed, when we consider that both the Deuteronomic History and Herodotus' Histories can be considered as tragic works,² then this gives us another starting point for seeing the similarities in the techniques used by both the Chronicler and Xenophon to create their texts.

In Chapter Four I examined Solomon from the perspective of the ideal ruler as established through my reading of David. I concluded that Solomon does not fulfill the requirements established in the text for the ideal ruler, but is instead the ideal successor to David for completing his project of the Temple. This allowed me to develop another category for assessing the kings of Judah, beyond the category of ideal ruler: the category of ideal successor, maintaining David's kingdom while adhering to the cult of Yhwh.

Intertextually, Solomon's depiction in 2 Chronicles is also interesting, as I showed that although it would seem that Solomon is idealized by the Chronicler in comparison to his depiction in Samuel-Kings, there are irruptions by a more condemnatory voice in the heteroglossia and competing voices within the text of Chronicles. Here, the techniques used by the Chronicler, most notably his replacement of Saul by Solomon with respect to being

chosen, anointed, and selected as *nāgīd* can be seen as intending to rebound onto the glory of David. Solomon is given by the Chronicler all of the things that David did not have in the Chronicler's story: selection by Yhwh, anointing, personal relationship with Yhwh, building of the Temple. Although it is common enough in the study of Chronicles to see Solomon as David's completion, what we have is actually Solomon standing in for David, or Solomon replacing David. Where we see this in the Cyropaedia, as for example, in the episode of Pheraulas and the Sacian, where Pheraulas stands in for Cyrus, it is Cyrus' depiction that is enhanced. Thus in Chronicles, it is David's characterization that is enhanced by Solomon standing in for him.

However, this raises the problem of what the Chronicler needed Solomon for, if he is not the idealized ruler but rather David's stand-in. The easy solution would be to suggest that Solomon's building of the Temple was too well known to remove it to David altogether, and this may certainly explain the Temple episode. However, this does not explain the depiction of Solomon's accession or personal relationship with Yhwh. Why not simply give these things to David, especially since he had an anointing and a more personal relationship with Yhwh in Samuel? I would suggest that the Chronicler was subtler than that. Just as in the Cyropaedia, where sometimes speeches and actions are taken by Cyrus' subordinates that represent what he would himself do, Solomon is given features that represent what David himself

should have. In the Cyropaedia these features do not make Cyrus' men more important or more virtuous than him, and neither do they in Chronicles. My reading of the Cyropaedia placed next to my reading of Solomon in Chronicles also shows that it would be completely expected for the ideal ruler (David) to be unique, and not equaled by any of his successors. Although this pattern is obvious in the depictions of the remaining kings of Judah, it actually begins with the depiction of Solomon. Solomon, then, has a two-fold function in the text: he stands in for David, giving features to David; and he shows the uniqueness of David.

In the final chapter, I discussed the depiction of the remaining kings of Judah in 2 Chronicles. Here I showed that within the context of Chronicles itself, none of these kings live up to the model established by David. Even Hezekiah, the king depicted as closest to the Davidic ideal, does not fulfill the ideal. Hezekiah is an interesting case, since he is preceded by Ahaz, who is established in my reading as almost a second Saul; it seems reasonable to assume that through this construction, Hezekiah is meant to be read as a second David. However, even this construction of Hezekiah in Chronicles underlines David's unique status as the ideal ruler, as Hezekiah does not entirely live up to the Davidic ideal. When I compared the Cyropaedia to 2 Chron. 10-36, I showed that this portion of Chronicles functions in almost the same way as the epilogue to the

Cyropaedia. The impossibility of proper rule is thus emphasized, again highlighting the uniqueness of David.

In Chapter One, I defined (political) philosophy as a narrative that makes a truth claim about its ideology, differing from historiography, which makes a truth claim about its story. How, then, can we make the distinction between an ideological truth claim and a historical truth claim? This is what trips up commentators on both the Cyropaedia and Chronicles: they implicitly accept the formulation (as exemplified by Sternberg) that there is no stylistic difference between the two genres. Using a Bakhtinian notion of genre, I suggested that there would be a distinct style for the genre of (political) philosophy. Perhaps we can only distinguish this style in Chronicles and the Cyropaedia because they come from a tradition of written texts, not oral ones (as I pointed out in the Introduction). This style is a style of dialogism and heteroglossia: the Cyropaedia and Chronicles are both in a dialogic relationship with other texts in the same tradition, and they both contain heteroglossia themselves; in both, the heteroglossia are overpowered by the monologic message (in the Cyropaedia, the voice of the introduction and the conclusion, in Chronicles, the voice of the conditional promise). The theme of both books is also similar: the theme of the ideal ruler in the Cyropaedia, and the theme of the ideal ruler and ideal Israel in Chronicles. I began this dissertation by examining the Cyropaedia as a model for

comparison. When we combine style and theme, and compare Chronicles to the Cyropaedia, then we can say with some confidence that we have placed Chronicles correctly in a genre, the genre of political philosophy.³

I would like to conclude by briefly discussing a question I have scrupulously avoided throughout this dissertation, the question of the relationship between Chronicles and the Cyropaedia. In the Introduction, I suggested that these two texts, the Cyropaedia and Chronicles would be appropriate to compare, as they both come from the same general geographic and temporal area. However, nowhere have I suggested that either author knew the work of the other - a question that is unanswerable, due to the state of our evidence.⁴ In Chapter Two (note 1), I pointed out that Cyrus was a well-known figure in the ancient world, thus perhaps it is not surprising that both the Greek and Hebrew tradition chose to include him in their lists of heroes. In Chapter Five, I briefly pointed out that in Chronicles Cyrus is contrasted with the incompetent four final kings of Judah. Throughout 2 Chronicles, we have been gradually prepared for everything to go terribly wrong in Israel, since none of its rulers lived up to the example of David, and the travesty of the last four kings would seem to indicate no relief in sight (this is certainly the route that the Deuteronomist took at the end of 2 Kings). Right at the end, however, Cyrus appears, and makes everything all right again.

Does Cyrus in 2 Chron. 36.22-23 fit the Chronicler's definition of the ideal ruler? His first action (or so we might infer from the fact that it takes place in his first year) is to perform cultic obedience by starting to rebuild the Temple. If he does not seek Yhwh, he certainly obeys him. He has had all the kingdoms of the earth given to him. There is nothing negative here about him at all, but there is also not enough information given to consider him as an ideal ruler.

However, now I would like to look at the final two verses of Chronicles, and read them intertextually with the Cyropaedia. In the Cyropaedia, Cyrus is concerned with proper worship - he makes that clear at the beginning of his military career. He has military success. He has wealth and honour. He seeks the advice of the gods. He has sons to succeed him. He has a peaceful death at an old age. Cyrus might very well be the second David. Most importantly, it is almost impossible to read the final two verses of 2 Chronicles without them bringing to mind other traditions about Cyrus; the two verses make no sense otherwise, with Cyrus appearing much as a deus ex machina.

The final word of Chronicles is *wēyā'al* 'and let him go up.' It is a hopeful word, suggesting that the fortunes of Israel are on the rise (cf. SJ 1077). It begs the conclusion that it has in Ezra 1.3, *lîrûšālaïm* 'to Jerusalem.'⁵ However, it is also a word from a root ('lh) of many connotations: to go up, to ascend, to meet, to visit, to go up (to God), to go against (in war), to go

after, to rise up, to spring up, to grow, to be offered (in sacrifice), to come up (before God), to raise up (an emotion), to extend, to be superior (cf. BDB, q.v.). Ending Chronicles this way leaves it open-ended. It leaves open the possibility that Israel will again be in Jerusalem, successful militarily, offering sacrifice in the Temple, meeting God, fertile and wealthy. Thus Israel will be under Cyrus, the non-Davidic Davidic king.

Notes

1. Although there is a good deal of dialogue between characters in the Cyropaedia: the examples I dealt with included the dialogue between Cyrus and Croesus in Book 7 and between Pheraulas and the Sacian in Book 8, but there are many, many more. Cf. Gera (26-49) for a discussion of the Socratic influence in the Cyropaedia.
2. For a brief description of Herodotus' Histories as tragedy, see Romm (68-72) and Luce (55-57); Fornara sees some remnants of tragedy in the form of Herodotus' Histories, but describes them as "vestigial" and accounts for them by saying that the early Greek historians "visualized episodes as if they formed the scenes of a play" (171). For an analysis of the Deuteronomic History as a tragedy, see Mandell & Freedman (152-53). In bringing the two works together, Nielsen argues that, "The tragedy in Herodotus is the tragedy of 'the others' [i.e., the Persians], whereas in DtrH it is 'our tragedy' [i.e., Israel]" (162).
3. Contra Coggins (268), who suggests that the Chronicler was not interested in politics as God had taken care of that. Although by "politics," Coggins seems to mean events contemporary with the Chronicler, in light of the analyses of this dissertation, this would seem to be an absurd claim. Smelik argues that the Chronicler's "polemic against his source suggests that the Chronicler intended to replace Samuel-Kings with his own work," a work of history more theologically convincing (184). This too is an absurd claim: there is no suggestion in the case of the Cyropaedia that Xenophon's disputation with Herodotus and Ctesias meant that he intended his own work to replace theirs - it was in a different genre, with different aims. So too Chronicles with respect to Samuel-Kings.
4. Mandell and Freedman do try to answer a similar question about the relationship of Genesis-2 Kings and Herodotus; they suggest that Herodotus was familiar with the biblical work (176).
5. Johnstone argues that this was to make the ending of 2 Chronicles eschatological, looking forward to a divine restoration (WJ 2: 275-76).

WORKS CITED

Primary texts and translations

The Bible. New Revised Standard Version. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Ed. K. Elliger & W. Rudolph.
Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77.

Herodotus. Historiae. Ed. Carolus Hude. 2 vols. Oxford:
Clarendon, 1908.

---. The Histories. Trans. Aubrey de Selincourt. Rev. A.R. Burns.
London: Penguin, 1972.

Jacoby, F. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Leiden:
Brill, 1923-1957.

Septuaginta. Ed. Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche
Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Xenophon. Cyropaedia, in two volumes. Trans. Walter Miller. LCL
51-52. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1914.

---. Opera Omnia, vol. 4: Institutio Cyri. Ed. E.C. Marchant.
Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.

Secondary texts

Ackroyd, Peter R. I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah. Torch Bible
Commentaries. London: SCM, 1973.

---. The Chronicler in His Age. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

Aeschylus. Persians. Aeschylus, vol. 1. Ed. & trans. Herbert Weir
Smyth. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1922. 108-207.

Allen, L.C. "Kerygmatic Units in 1&2 Chronicles." Journal for the
Study of the Old Testament 41 (1988): 21-36.

Aristotle. Poetics. Ed. & trans. Stephen Halliwell.
Poetics/Aristotle; On the Sublime/Longinus; On
Style/Demetrius. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995. 1-
141.

- Auld, A. Graeme. Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Avery, Harry C. "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus." American Journal of Philology 93 (1972): 529-46.
- Bailey, Noel C. "David and God in 1 Chronicles 21: Edged with Mist." The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture. Ed. M. Patrick Graham & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 337-59.
- . "David's Innocence: A Response to J. Wright." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 64 (1994): 83-90.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1975. "Discourse in the Novel." The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Trans. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. 259-422.
- . 1975. "Epic and Novel." The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Trans. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. 3-40.
- . 1979. "From Notes Made in 1970-71." Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986. 132-58.
- . 1979. "The Problem of Speech Genres." Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986. 60-102.
- . 1979. "The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis." Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986. 103-31.
- . 1963. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Trans. & ed. Caryl Emerson. Intro. Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984.
- . 1979. "Response to a Question from the Novy Mir Editorial Staff." Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986. 1-9.
- . 1979. "Toward a Methodology for the Human Sciences." Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed.

Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986. 159-72.

Barthes, Roland. S/Z. Paris: Seuil, 1970.

---. "Texte (Théorie du)." Encyclopaedia Universalis. 20 vols. Paris: Encyclopaedia Universalis France, 1973.

Beentjes, P.C. "Tradition and Transformation: Aspects of Innerbiblical Interpretation in 2 Chronicles 20." Biblica 74 (1993): 258-68.

---. "Transformations of Space and Time: Nathan's Oracle to David's Prayer in 1 Chronicles 17." Sanctity of Time and Space in Tradition and Modernity. Ed. A. Houtman, M. Poorthuis & J. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 1998. 27-44.

Begg, C.T. "Constructing a Monster: The Chronicler's Sondergut in 2 Chronicles 21." Australian Biblical Review 37 (1989): 35-51.

---. "The Death of Josiah in Chronicles: Another View." Vetus Testamentum 37 (1987): 1-8.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period." Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 3 (1988): 59-88.

---. "The Chronicler as a Historian: Building Texts." The Chronicler as Historian. Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997. 132-49.

---. "A Gateway to the Chronicler's Teaching: The Account of the Reign of Ahaz in 2 Chr 28,1-27." Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 7 (1993): 216-49.

---. "A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler." Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 9 (1995): 37-51.

Berquist, Jon L. "The Contexts of Persian Yehud: Colony, Empire, and World-System." Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah Section. Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting. Orlando. Nov. 21-24, 1998.

---. Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

- Bethea, David M. "Bakhtinian Prosaics Versus Lotmanian 'Poetic Thinking': The Code and Its Relation to Literary Biography." Slavic and East European Journal 41 (1997): 1-15.
- Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1997.
- . A Map of Misreading. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.
- . Poetry and Repression: Revisionism from Blake to Stevens. New Haven: Yale UP, 1976.
- Boer, Roland. Jameson and Jeroboam. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.
- . Novel Histories: The Fiction of Biblical Criticism. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1997.
- . "Utopian Politics in 2 Chronicles 10-13." The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture. Ed. M. Patrick Graham & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 360-94.
- Bowersock, G.W. Fiction as History: Nero to Julian. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.
- Branham, R. Bracht. "Inventing the Novel." Bakhtin in Contexts: Across the Disciplines. Ed. Amy Mandelker. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1995. 79-87.
- Braun, Roddy. 1 Chronicles. Word Biblical Commentary 14. Waco: Word, 1986.
- . "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles." Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (1976): 581-90.
- Breebaart, A.B. "From Victory to Peace: Some Aspects of Cyrus' State in Xenophon's Cyrupaedia." Mnemosyne 36 (1983): 117-34.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. The Creation of History in Ancient Israel. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver & Charles A. Briggs. The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1906.

- Campbell, Antony F. "Yahweh and the Ark: A Case Study in Narrative." Journal of Biblical Literature 98 (1979): 31-43.
- Carlier, Pierre. "L'idée de monarchie impériale dans la Cyropédie de Xénophon." Ktema 3 (1978): 133-63.
- Cizek, Alexandru. "From the Historical Truth to Literary Convention: The Life of Cyrus the Great Viewed by Herodotus, Ctesias, and Xenophon." Antiquité Classique 44 (1975): 531-52.
- Coggins, R.J. "Theology and Hermeneutics in the Books of Chronicles." In Search of True Wisdom. Ed. Edward Ball. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 263-278.
- Craig, Kenneth. Reading Esther: A Case for the Literary Carnavalesque. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995.
- Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973.
- Culler, Jonathan. The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, and Deconstruction. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.
- Curtis, E.L. & A.A. Madsen. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. International Critical Commentary 11. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910.
- Davies, Philip R. In Search of "Ancient Israel", 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1995.
- Deboys, D.G. "History and Theology in the Chronicler's Portrayal of Abijah." Biblica 71 (1990) 48-62.
- Delebecque, Edouard. Essai sur la vie de Xénophon. Paris: Klincksieck, 1957.
- Demetrius. On Style. Ed. & trans. Doreen C. Innes, based on trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Poetics/Aristotle; On the Sublime/Longinus; On Style/Demetrius. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995. 309-526.
- de Vries, Simon J. 1 and 2 Chronicles. The Forms of Old Testament Literature 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

- . "The Forms of Prophetic Address in Chronicles." Hebrew Annual Review 10 (1986): 15-36.
- . "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles." Journal of Biblical Literature 107 (1988): 619-39.
- Dillard, Raymond B. 2 Chronicles. Word Biblical Commentary 15. Waco: Word, 1987.
- . "The Chronicler's Solomon." Westminster Theological Journal 43 (1981): 289-300.
- . "The Literary Structure of the Chronicler's Solomon Narrative." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 30 (1984): 85-93.
- . "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution." Westminster Theological Journal 46 (1985): 164-72.
- Dillery, John. Xenophon and the History of His Times. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius. Dionysius of Halicarnassus: The Critical Essays, vol. 2. Trans. & intro. Stephen Usher. LCL 466. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985. 347-99.
- Dirksen, Piet B. "Why Was David Disqualified as Temple Builder? The Meaning of 1 Chronicles 22.8." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 70 (1996): 51-56.
- Drews, Robert. The Greek Accounts of Eastern History. Washington: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1973.
- Due, Bodil. The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods. Aarhus: Aarhus UP, 1989.
- . "Xenophon of Athens: The Cyropaedia." The Novel in the Ancient World. Ed. Gareth Schmeling. Leiden: Brill, 1996. 581-99.
- Duke, Rodney K. "A Model for a Theory of Biblical Historical Narratives, Proposed and Demonstrated with the Books of Chronicles." History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes. Ed. M.P. Graham, W.P. Brown & Jeffery K. Kuan. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993. 65-77.

- . The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis. Sheffield: Almond, 1990.
- Farber, J. Joel. "The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship." American Journal of Philology 100 (1979): 497-514.
- Fishbane, Michael. Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Fornara, Charles. The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome. Berkeley: U of California P, 1983.
- Frow, John. "Intertextuality and Ontology." Intertextuality: Theories and Practices. Ed. Michael Worton & Judith Still. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990. 45-55.
- Garcia-Treto, Francisco O. "The Fall of the House: A Carnavalesque Reading of 2 Kings 9 and 10." Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible. Ed. Danna Nolan Fewell. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992. 153-71.
- Gera, Deborah Levine. Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Gilmore, John, ed. The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias. By Ctesias. London: Macmillan, 1888.
- Glatt-Gilad, David A. "The Role of Huldah's Prophecy in the Chronicler's Portrayal of Josiah's Reform." Biblica 77 (1996): 16-31.
- Graham, M. Patrick, "Aspects of the Structure and Rhetoric of 2 Chronicles 25." History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes. Ed. M.P. Graham, W.P. Brown & J.K. Kuan. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993. 78-89.
- . "Setting the Heart to Seek God: Worship in 2 Chronicles 30:1-31:1." Worship and the Hebrew Bible. Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Rick R. Marrs & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 124-41.
- Graham, M. Patrick, Kenneth G. Hoglund & Steven L. McKenzie, eds. The Chronicler as Historian. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997.
- Graham, M. Patrick, & Steven L. McKenzie, eds. The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999.

- Gray, Vivienne. "Mimesis in Greek Historical Theory." American Journal of Philology 108 (1987): 467-86.
- Halliwel, Stephen. Aristotle's Poetics. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.
- Halpern, Baruch. "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure - Indications of an Earlier Source." The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text. Ed. R.E. Friedman. Berkeley: U of California P, 1981. 35-54.
- . "Why Manasseh is Blamed for the Babylonian Exile: The Evolution of a Biblical Tradition." Vetus Testamentum 48 (1998): 473-514.
- Higgins, William E. Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis. Albany: SUNY P, 1977.
- Hirsch, Stephen W. "1001 Iranian Nights: History and Fiction in Xenophon's Cyropaedia." The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Ed. Michael Jameson. Saratoga: AMNA Libri, 1985. 65-85.
- . The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire. Hanover: UP of New England, 1985.
- Hirschkop, Ken. 1992. "Is Dialogism for Real?" The Contexts of Bakhtin: Philosophy, Authorship, Aesthetics. Ed. David Shepherd. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 1998. 183-95.
- Ho, C.Y.S. "Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXXI 1-13 Really the Source of 1 Chronicles X 1-12?" Vetus Testamentum 45 (1995): 82-106.
- Hoglund, Kenneth G. "The Chronicler as Historian: A Comparativist Perspective." The Chronicler as Historian. Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997. 19-29.
- Holden, Hubert A. The Cyropaedeia of Xenophon, Books VI VII VIII, With Notes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1890.
- Holquist, Michael. Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World. London: Routledge, 1990.

- Hubbard, Thomas K. The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.
- Isocrates. To Philip. Isocrates, vol. 1. Ed. & trans. George Nolin. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1928. 244-339.
- . Evagoras. Isocrates, vol. 3. Ed. & trans. Larue Van Hook. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1945. 2-51.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." Style in Language. Ed. T. Sebeok. Cambridge: MIT P, 1960. 350-77.
- Japhet, Sara. I and II Chronicles: A Commentary. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- . "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles." Journal of Biblical Literature 98 (1979): 205-28.
- . "Exile and Restoration in the Book of Chronicles." The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-exilic Times. Ed. Bob Becking & Marjo C.A. Korpel. Leiden: Brill, 1999. 33-44.
- . 1977. The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought. Trans. Anna Barber. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989.
- . "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew." Vetus Testamentum 18 (1968): 332-72.
- . "The Relationship Between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah." Congress Volume: Leuven 1989. Ed. J.A. Emerton. Leiden: Brill, 1991. 298-313.
- Johnstone, William. 1 and 2 Chronicles. 2 vol. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1997.
- . "Guilt and Atonement: the Theme of 1 and 2 Chronicles." A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane. Ed. J.D. Martin & P.R. Davies. Sheffield: JSOT, 1986. 113-38.
- Kalimi, Isaac. "The Contribution of the Literary Study of Chronicles to the Solution of its Textual Problems." Biblical Interpretation 2 (1995): 190-212.
- . "Literary-Chronological Proximity in the Chronicler's Historiography." Vetus Testamentum 43 (1993): 318-38.

- . "Was the Chronicler a Historian?" The Chronicler as Historian. Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997. 73-89.
- Keller, W.J. "Xenophon's Acquaintance with the History of Herodotus." The Classical Journal 6 (1911): 252-59.
- Kelly, Brian E. "David's Disqualification on 1 Chronicles 22.8: A Response to Piet B. Dirksen." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 80 (1998): 53-61.
- Klein, R.W. "Reflections on Historiography in the Account of Jehoshaphat." Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom. Ed. D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman & A. Hurvitz. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995. 643-57.
- Knoppers, Gary N. "'Battling Against Yahweh': Israel's War Against Judah in 2 Chr 13:2-20." Revue Biblique 100 (1993): 511-32.
- . "Classical Historiography and Chronicles: A Reexamination of an Alleged Non-Relationship." Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah Section. Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting. Orlando. Nov. 21-24, 1998.
- . "History and Historiography: The Royal Reforms." The Chronicler as Historian. Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997. 178-203.
- . "Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles." Biblica 76 (1995): 449-70.
- . "Reform and Regression: The Chronicler's Presentation of Jehoshaphat." Biblica 72 (1991) 500-24.
- . "Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?" Journal of Biblical Literature 109 (1990): 423-40.
- . "Treasures Won and Lost: Royal (Mis)appropriations in Kings and Chronicles." The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture. Ed. M. Patrick Graham & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 181-208.
- . "'Yhwh is Not With Israel': Alliances as a Topos in Chronicles." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 58 (1996): 601-26.

- Kristeva, Julia. Semeiotikè: Recherche pour une sémanalyse. Paris: Seuil, 1969.
- . Le texte du roman: Approche sémiologique d'une structure discursive transformationnelle. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Lemche, Niels Peter. "The Old Testament - A Hellenistic Book?" Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 7 (1993): 163-93.
- Lemke, Werner E. "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History." Harvard Theological Review 58 (1965): 349-63.
- Longinus. On the Sublime. Ed. & trans. W.H. Fyfe. Rev. Donald Russell. Poetics/Aristotle; On the Sublime/Longinus; On Style/Demetrius. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995. 143-308.
- Lotman, Yuri. 1966. "Problems in the Typology of Texts." Soviet Semiotics: An Anthology. Ed., trans., intro. Daniel P. Lucid. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977. 119-24.
- . 1971. The Structure of the Artistic Text. Trans. R. Vroon. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1977.
- . 1977. "The Text and the Structure of Its Audience." Trans. Ann Shukman. New Literary History 14 (1982): 81-87.
- . "The Text Within the Text." Trans. Jerry Leo & Amy Mandelker. PMLA 109 (1993): 377-84.
- . 1970. "Two Models of Communication." Soviet Semiotics: An Anthology. Ed., trans., intro. Daniel P. Lucid. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977. 99-101.
- . Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture. Trans. Ann Shukman. Intro. Umberto Eco. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.
- Lotman, Yuri, & A.M. Pyatigorsky. 1968. "Text and Function." Soviet Semiotics: An Anthology. Ed., trans., intro. Daniel P. Lucid. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977. 125-35.
- Luccioni, Jean. Les idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon. Paris: Orphys, 1947.
- Luce, T.J. The Greek Historians. London: Routledge, 1997.

- Mai, Hans-Peter. "Bypassing Intertextuality." Intertextuality. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991. 30-59.
- Mandell, Sara, and David Noel Freedman. The Relationship between Herodotus' History and Primary History. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- McKenzie, Steven L. The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History. Atlanta: Scholars, 1984.
- . "Why Didn't David Build the Temple? The History of a Biblical Tradition." Worship and the Hebrew Bible. Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Rick R. Marrs & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 204-24.
- Mitchell, Christine. "The Dialogism of Chronicles." The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture. Ed. M. Patrick Graham & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 311-26.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971.
- . The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.
- . The Development of Greek Biography. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971.
- Morgan, J.R. "Make-believe and Make Believe: the Fictionality of the Greek Novels." Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World. Ed. Christopher Gill & T.P. Wiseman. Austin: U of Texas P, 1993. 175-229.
- Müller, Wolfgang G. "Interfiguralität: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures." Intertextuality. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991. 101-21.
- Murray, D.F. "Dynasty, People, and the Future: The Message of Chronicles." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 58 (1993): 71-92.
- Myers, Jacob M. I Chronicles. Anchor Bible 12. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- . II Chronicles. Anchor Bible 13. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

- Nadon, Christopher. "From Republic to Empire: Political Revolution and the Common Good in Xenophon's Education of Cyrus." The American Political Science Review 90 (1996): 361-374.
- Newell, W.R. "Tyranny and the Science of Ruling in Xenophon's 'Education of Cyrus.'" Journal of Politics 45 (1983): 889-906.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth." Journal of Religion 76 (1996): 290-306.
- Nielsen, Flemming A.J. The Tragedy in History: Herodotus and the Deuteronomistic History. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1997.
- Noth, Martin. 1957. The Chronicler's History. Trans. & intro. H.G.M. Williamson. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.
- . 1957. The Deuteronomistic History. Trans. Jane Doull, John Barton, Michael D. Rutter & D.R. Ap-Thomas. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.
- Phillips, Gary A. "Sign/Text/Différance: The Contribution of Intertextual Theory to Biblical Criticism." Intertextuality. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991. 78-97.
- Plett, Heinrich F. "Intertextualities." Intertextuality. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991. 3-29.
- Polzin, Robert. 1980. Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History: Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1993.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. "Herodotus, Political Thought, and the Meaning of History." Arethusa 20 (1987): 221-48.
- Rad, Gerhard von. 1958. "The Beginnings of Historical Writing in Ancient Israel." The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Trans. E.W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. 166-204.
- Ray, John. "The Education of Cyrus as Xenophon's 'Statesman'." Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy 19 (1992): 225-42.

- Reed, Walter R. Dialogues of the Word: The Bible as Literature According to Bakhtin. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.
- Reid, Allan. Literature as Communication in Bakhtin and Lotman. New York: Garland, 1990.
- . "Who is Lotman and Why is Bakhtin Saying Those Nasty Things About Him?" Discours Social/Social Discourse 3.1-2 (1990): 324-38.
- Richards, Kent H. "Reshaping Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Interpretation." Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, and Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker. Ed. James L. Mays, David L. Petersen & Kent H. Richards. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995. 211-24.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive." Intertextuality: Theories and Practices. Ed. Michael Worton and Judith Still. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990. 56-78.
- . Fictional Truth. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990.
- . "Intertextuality vs. Hypertextuality." New Literary History 25 (1994): 779-88.
- . La production du texte. Paris: Seuil, 1979.
- . Semiotics of Poetry. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1978.
- Riley, William. King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Romm, James. Herodotus. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Rost, Leonhard. 1926. The Succession to the Throne of David. Trans. Michael D. Rutter & David M. Gunn. Sheffield: Almond, 1982.
- Rubin, Leslie G. "Love and Politics in Xenophon's Cyropaedia." Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy 16 (1989): 391-413.
- Sage, Paula Windsor. "Dying in Style: Xenophon's Ideal Leader and the End of the Cyropaedia." The Classical Journal 90 (1995): 161-74.

- . "Tradition, Genre, and Character Portrayal: Cyropaedia 8.7 and Anabasis 1.9." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 32 (1991): 61-79.
- Schniedewind, W.M. "King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism." Journal of Jewish Studies 45 (1994): 71-78.
- . "The Source Citations of Manasseh: King Manasseh in History and Homily." Vetus Testamentum 41 (1991): 450-61.
- Scott, R.B.Y. "Solomon and the Beginnings of Wisdom in Israel." Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Ed. M. Noth & D. Winton Thomas. Leiden: Brill, 1960. 262-79.
- Shaver, Judson R. Torah and The Chronicler's History Work: An Inquiry into the Chronicler's References to Laws, Festivals, and Cultic Institutions in Relationship to Pentateuchal Legislation. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- Shepherd, David. "Bakhtin and the Reader." Bakhtin and Cultural Theory. Ed. Ken Hirschkop & David Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989. 91-108.
- Shukman, Ann. Literature and Semiotics: A Study of the Writings of Yu.M.Lotman. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1977.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D. "The Representation of King Ahaz in 2 Kings 16 and 2 Chronicles 28." Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel. Ed. Johannes C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 1998. 143-85.
- Snyman, Gerrie. "'Tis a Vice to Know Him.' Readers' Response-Ability and Responsibility in 2 Chronicles 14-16." Semeia 77 (1997): 91-113.
- Stadter, Philip A. "Fictional Narrative in the Cyropaedia." American Journal of Philology 112 (1991): 461-91.
- Sternberg, Meir. The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985.
- Still, Judith, and Michael Worton. "Introduction." Intertextuality: Theories and Practices. Ed. Michael Worton and Judith Still. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990. 1-44.
- Sugimoto, T. "Chronicles as Independent Literature." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 55 (1992): 61-74.

- Sykes, Seth. "Time and Space in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8: A Bakhtinian Analysis of a Prophetic Chronicle." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 76 (1997): 125-28.
- Talshir, Z. "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)." Vetus Testamentum 46 (1996): 213-36.
- Tatum, James. "The Education of Cyrus." Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context. Ed. J.R. Morgan & Richard Stoneman. London: Routledge, 1994. 15-28.
- . Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On The Education of Cyrus. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.
- Tertel, H.J. Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.
- Throntveit, Mark A. "Hezekiah in the books of Chronicles." Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1988: 302-11.
- . "The Idealization of Solomon as the Glorification of God in the Chronicler's Royal Speeches and Royal Prayers." The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium. Ed. Lowell K. Handy. Leiden: Brill, 1997. 411-27.
- . When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. Mikhaïl Bakhtine: Le principe dialogique. Paris: Seuil, 1981.
- Toher, Mark. "On the Use of Nicolaus' Historical Fragments." Classical Antiquity 8 (1989): 159-72.
- Trotter, James M. "Reading, Readers and Reading Readers Reading the Account of Saul's Death in 1 Chronicles 10." The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture. Ed. M. Patrick Graham & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 294-310.
- Ulrich, Eugene Charles, Jr. The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus. Missoula: Scholars, 1978.
- Van Seters, John. "The Chronicler's Account of Solomon's Temple-Building: A Continuity Theme." The Chronicler as Historian.

- Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1997. 283-300.
- . In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.
- Vološinov, V.N. 1929. Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Trans. Ladislav Matejka & I.R. Titunik. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973/1986.
- Walters, S.D. "Saul of Gibeon." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 52 (1991): 61-76.
- Wesselius, Jan Wim. "Analysis, imitation and emulation of classical texts in the Hebrew Bible." Dutch Studies - Near Eastern Languages and Literature 2 (1996): 43-68.
- Willi, T. "Late Persian Judaism and its Conception of an Integral Israel According to Chronicles: Some Observations on Form and Function of the Genealogy of Judah in Chronicles 2.3-4.23." Second Temple Studies, vol. 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period. Ed. Tamara Cohn Eskenazi & Kent H. Richards. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994. 146-62.
- Williamson, H.G.M. 1 and 2 Chronicles. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles." Vetus Testamentum 26 (1976): 351-61.
- . "The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History." Vetus Testamentum 32 (1982): 242-48.
- . "History." It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF. Ed. D.A. Carson & H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988. 25-38.
- . Israel in the Books of Chronicles. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977.
- . "Reliving the Death of Josiah: A Reply to C.T. Begg." Vetus Testamentum 37 (1987): 9-15.
- . "The Temple in the Books of Chronicles." Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Rammelm. Ed. W. Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991. 15-31.

- Wills, L.M. "The Jewish Novellas." Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context. Ed. J.R. Morgan & R. Stoneman. London: Routledge, 1994. 223-38.
- Wood, Neal. "Xenophon's Theory of Leadership." Classica et Mediaevalia 25 (1964): 33-66.
- Wright, John W. "The Fabula of the Book of Chronicles." The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture. Ed. M. Patrick Graham & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 1999. 136-55.
- . "The Fight for Peace: Narrative and History in the Battle Accounts in Chronicles." The Chronicler as Historian. Ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund & Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997. 150-77.
- . "The Founding Father: The Structure of the Chronicler's David Narrative." Journal of Biblical Literature 117 (1998): 45-59.
- . "The Innocence of David in 1 Chronicles 21." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 60 (1993): 87-105.
- . "The Legacy of David in Chronicles: The Narrative Function of 1 Chronicles 23-27." Journal of Biblical Literature 110 (1991): 229-42.
- Xenophon. Anabasis. Ed. & trans. Carleton L. Brownson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1922.
- Zalewski, S. "The Purpose of the Story of the Death of Saul in 1 Chronicles X." Vetus Testamentum 39 (1989): 449-67.