A few years ago, at a Waltham, Massachusetts, computer firm, a PDP-10 system began rather suddenly to read out error-messages at random points in its operation. A program would run through smoothly once, twice, or ten times, but on the next run an error-message would slash it to a halt. If the program was sent through again, no hitch occurred.

The operators were baffled; they checked the switches. The programmers were stymied; they examined the programs and, later, when that produced nothing, the compiler and the very grammar of the machine language. Digital Equipment Corporation eventually dispatched its field service representatives. They dismantled the machine piece by piece and put it back together. They found nothing. The error-messages continued in their random way—appearing and vanishing like a Circuit Pimpernel. The situation lasted for weeks.

One day, one of the company’s hardware specialists noticed that an electric cord behind a line printer was piled in a slightly tangled way. He kicked it. From that moment, the error-messages ceased. The hardware man had no inkling of any connection between the cord and the error-ticks. He was just kicking a wire. But it transpired subsequently that the minute impulses that penetrated the cord’s insulation had influenced the memory banks to affect the line printer in such a way as to create the apperition of a perverse independent intelligence in the machine. Probably, if artificial intelligence ever is created, it will be by some such accident as this.

Good art, curiously, is in the position of that computer. In its programmed imitation of the organic, it should take on an artificial life of its own. This constitutes a present danger to the scholar: a biblicist who seeks to retroject that artificial life into the mind of the author or editor is in peril of confounding project with product.¹

In essence, this problem is the one addressed in Richard Friedman’s essay above. In a very different sense, it is the subject also of the essay by John Russiano Miles below.

modern viewpoint. For the historian—of Israel's religion, culture, ideas, or just of Israel—these are less useful. The biblical scholar who subscribes to the former is potential prey to the intentional fallacy precisely where the fallacy is plainest—where the author is under compulsion to acknowledge or even to include materials either irrelevant or antithetic to his viewpoint.

In other words, the scholar is responsible to inquire, to what extent was the form of a work dictated by the use of sources, and to what extent the product of the redactor himself? How did the redactor use his sources, if any? How did he regard them? As canon? As true reports? Or as the fallible recollections of an imperfect journalist? Moreover, in what spirit did a redactor incorporate them? The models common today in scholarship—and to which I have myself on more than one occasion adhered—are far from being the only models on which to construe the redactorial enterprise. We are confronted with a phenomenon alien to us. It may be as complex as the Gordian knot—and it is not up to us to unravel it with a vorpal snickersnack. On the contrary, we are compelled to follow through each individual strand, until we recognize either a single, simple key, or the conglomerate, variegated nature of the problem.

The books of Chronicles and Kings, by virtue of being the only demonstrably synoptic and extensive historical works in the Bible, provide a unique testing-ground for source criticism. The only difficulty lies in the fact that the relationship between the two has not yet been fathomed. In the succeeding pages, therefore, I shall examine a specific but sprawling problem: does an extensive historical work underlie the present versions of Chronicles and Kings? In so doing, I mean to suggest that the model of redaction suggested by the evidence has relevance to "redaction" in all Israelite historiography (including the Pentateuch). Here, the only way to recover authorial intent is to judge, not just the final product, much less the material of which it was made, but the difference between the sculpture and the block.

The books of Chronicles first burst into full-blown narrative with a part of the story of Saul's death, taken from 1 Sam 31 (1 Chron 10). From this point to 1 Chron 21, Chronicles marches more or less through 2 Samuel, on which it seems to depend. However, in contrast to Samuel, where Saul's death represents the solution to a problem, the end of a certain narrative tension, Saul's death in Chronicles serves more the function of the primeval history in Genesis: it erects the problem to which David presents the solution:

"(Saul) did not seek Yhwh; so he killed him, and diverted the kingship to David ben-Yishai" (10:14). At the outset, David's monarchy is recognized by Israel. He takes Jerusalem. Yhwh is with him, and his career is on the wax (11:9). This leads to a review of his followers, and those "who came to . . . Hebron to divert the kingship of Saul to (David)" (12:23). Immediately thereafter, David gathers all the people of Israel, from all the lands of Israel, and says, "Let us divert the ark of our god to us, for we did not

3. See my *Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel* (Harvard Semitic Monograph, forthcoming), chap. 6, for a discussion of the bearings of the accounts of Saul's death. Chronicles seems to know of 1 Sam 28, and prps. of Sam 13:7-15a, but not of 1 Sam 15.
seek him/it in Saul's days” (13:3-4). The text alludes to 10:13-14; 12:24. David's diversion (sbb) of the ark complements Yhwh's diversion (sbb) of the kingship.

David's initial attempt to recover the ark (2 Sam 6:1-11; in 1 Chron 13) fails. It does lead, however, first to his recognition by Hiram (14:1-2/2 Sam 5:11-12), and then to his victory over Philistia. In the first instance, David's kingship is "exalted upward" (ns’ lmtlkh; 14:2). In the second, David receives what appears to be his first (and only) directly reported direct communication from god. These come in the form of war-oracles at David's request (14:10, 14; 2 Sam 5:19, 22-23). It seems that they imply some form of priestly intermediation. At any rate, the victory leads to the remark, "David's name went out among all the lands, and Yhwh instilled his fear in all the nations" (14:17).

The same sort of reciprocal Davidic behavior as that evinced in his first attempt to "divert the ark to us" marks the succeeding chapter. 1 Chron 14:1 reports that Hiram sent David workers to build him a house; 14:2 states that "David knew that Yhwh had established him firmly as king over Israel (hkynw lmlk), for his kingship was borne upward." 15:1 states, "He made himself a house/houses in the city of David, and established (wykn) a place for the ark of the deity, and pitched it a tent." The text continues with David's order that none but the Levites should "bear" (ns") the ark. As Yhwh establishes, David establishes. As Yhwh bears upward, David prepares to bear upward.

1 Chron 15 begins with David's organization of the priestly and Levitic orders. Most revealing is v 13, which notes that Yhwh had aborted the earlier attempt at recovering the ark because "we did not seek him/it in the proper way." On this occasion, however, the bugs are ironed out; the ark comes without incident to the city. On this follows the eternal dynastic promise of 1 Chron 17 (2 Sam 7). The victories of 1 Chron 18 (2 Sam 8) ensue; these are punctuated by the signal remark: "Yhwh gave salvation to David wherever he went” (18:6, 13; 2 Sam 8:6, 14).

These chapters of Chronicles follow a distinctive pattern. The king seeks Yhwh; some recognition of his sovereignty ensues. He wins a victory. And, he prepares or organizes his followers. In David's case, the process is one of incremental rapprochement with Yhwh—the gradual closing of the rift created by Saul. At the same time, Yhwh glorifies David by increments: he is recognized first by Israel, then by Tyre, and finally, dynastically, by Yhwh. He conquers first Jerusalem, then the Philistines (at this point remedying the problem attacked by Saul), and finally all of Cis-Euphratia (esp. 18:3). He begins in 11:9 on the wax (hal6k wog6d6l), with Yhwh with him; in 14:7, his reputation extends across "all the lands," while “Yhwh instills his fear in all the nations”; and in 18:6, 13 comes the remark that Yhwh gave him victory everywhere, wherever he went. The progression is one of constant growth, of continual expansion. It is correlated to the progressive narrowing of the gap between Israel and her god.

Nevertheless, Chronicles is careful to reserve the final act of rapprochement. 1 Chron 16:39-42 report that Zadoq, Heman, and Jeduthun were stationed not at the ark in Jerusalem but at the tabernacle, domiciled at Gibeon. This particular is retrieved in 1 Chron 21:29-30. Though David has seen the angel of Yhwh (21:16), though Yhwh answers David with a sign (21:26), though David has acquired the future site of the temple (22:1), nevertheless, "David could not approach (the tabernacle of Yhwh) to seek god, for he was terrified by the sword of Yhwh's angel" (21:30). Here, one recalls the
cherub stationed outside Eden. The tabernacle is the locus for communion with god. Chronicles recalls (21:29) that it is the tabernacle made by Moses—the model for Israel’s communication with the deity (as Deut 34:10).

It is Solomon, thus, who bridges the last gap between Israel and Yhwh. At the very outset of his reign, Solomon sacrifices with all Israel at what Chronicles calls 'ḥēl möʾēd ha-ḇēlohim (2 Chron 1:3)—implying, perhaps, participation there in god’s “meeting” or “appointed time.” Correspondingly, Solomon receives what is probably the first direct communication from Yhwh to a king in Chronicles, and what is certainly the first unsolicited direct communication. Even more, despite the insistence of Kings that the appearance was a dream (1 Kgs 3:5, 15; but cf. 11:9), Chronicles states that Solomon received an epiphany (2 Chron 1:7). Solomon (who has yet another epiphany in 2 Chron 7:12-22 after the reunification in the temple of the ark and tabernacle—2 Chron 5:4-9; 1 Kgs 8:3-9—foreshadowed in 2 Chron 1:4) is the only king to attain this height. He is the king who achieves Israel’s fullest reconciliation with Yhwh.

In connection with the Davido-Solomonic materials, it is the modality of reward employed by Chronicles that is of interest. The plainest is victory at war. This applies not only to David but also to Abijah (2 Chron 13:13-18—here ḥēsēb marks Jeroboam’s failure where David in 1 Chron 14:14ff. is a success), Asa (14:6, 10-14), Jehoshaphat (20; esp. vv 27, 29, where god’s fear falls on all the kingdoms of the lands, as in David’s case), Amaziah (25:7-10, 11-13), Uzziah (26:5-7), Jotham (27:5-6), and Hezekiah (32:1-23), all of whom are said to have sought Yhwh in one form or another in the immediate context of their victories.

Nevertheless, other, equally important types of reward are associated with this one. Territorial expansion—particularly under David—is of some importance. Japhet has argued that from the time of the division Chronicles reports progressive Judahite conquest of the north. While her case has been refuted by Williamson, her underlying perception remains valid: Chronicles evinces a strong interest in Israel’s and Judah’s territorial growth. Growth is one of the marks of divine favor.

In the same vein, Chronicles concerns itself with what it repeatedly calls “wealth and honor.” David reduces Moab to vassalage—to bearers of tribute (1 Chron 18:2). He captures hordes of men and equipment from Hadadezer (18:4), and exacts tribute of Damascus (18:6). He despoils Aramea and Edom of gold and silver in apparently unlimited quantity (18:7-11), dedicating it to Yhwh. His regnal account closes with the remark, “[David ben-Yishai] died at a ripe old age, full of days, wealth and honor . . .” (1 Chron 29:28). The same concerns appear in the account of David’s transferring the kingship to Solomon. 1 Chron 22 repeatedly stresses the infinity of wealth accumulated by David for the temple-building (vv 3-4, 5b, 14, 15, 16). The motifs surface yet again in 1 Chron 28-29, at the actual passing of the mantle (28:1, 14-18; 29:2-5, 6-8, 12, 21).

It is hardly necessary to dwell on the emphasis placed on Solomon’s wealth in 2 Chron 1-9. Already at 2 Chron 1:12 he is promised wisdom, honor, and wealth exceeding that of any king before or after. The succeeding materials hasten to bear out the point (1:14-17; 2:6-9; 3:4-7, 14; 4:7-8, 18, 19-22; 5:1; 8:17-18). They culminate in the

4. See Williamson, Israel, pp. 100-101. The text so belies Japhet’s scheme here that one suspects her of an understandable but unfortunate infatuation with the scheme.
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remarks of 9:9-28, which include such statements as “silver was not reckoned as anything in Solomon's days” (9:20c) and “All the kings of Arabia [? the west], and the governors of the earth used to bring gold and silver to Solomon” (9:14b).

Nor is Solomon the only king rewarded with wealth or territory. Abijah seizes cities from Jeroboam (2 Chron 13:19). Asa carries off “very much spoil indeed” (14:12) from his encounter with Zerah (note 14:13-14). His disbursal of funds to Aram, by contrast, leads to his condemnation to war for the rest of his reign: The spoil of Aram eludes him; he dies of a hideous disease (16:7-13). Jehoshaphat, conversely, seeks Yhwh throughout his reign. He is rewarded with tribute from all Judah: “he had wealth and honor in quantity” (17:5; 18:1). The Philistines and Arabs pay him tribute (17:11), and, as in David's time, Yhwh's fear goes forth upon all the lands about (17:9; 20:29). Jehoshaphat waxes ever greater again like David. His building activity burgeons (17:12b-19). His despoliation of Ammon, Moab, and Edom is so extensive as to require three full days (20:25).

By the same token, the early part of Joash's reign sees extensive royal capital accumulation (2 Chron 24:5-14). Only when Joash forsakes Yhwh is he, like his wicked predecessors Rehoboam (2 Chron 12:9) and Jehoram (21:16-17), plundered. Again, Amaziah despoils Edom while relying on Yhwh (25:9-10, 13). He in turn is despoiled (25:22-24) when and only when he rejects the divine counsel (25:14-16). Uzziah accumulates tremendous wealth and builds frantically, meanwhile extracting tribute from Philistia, Arabia, and Ammon (26:6-15), all because “He used to seek God in the days of Zechariah, who was understanding in fearing [or: seeing] God, and in the days of his seeking Yhwh, the deity gave him success” (26:5). Similarly, Jotham, who “established his ways before Yhwh his god” (27:6), built, conquered Ammon, and exacted tribute (27:3-5).

The unregenerate Ahaz is first pillaged (28:8), and then disappointed at the results of his disbursing funds (28:21), all because he did not seek Yhwh. He is deprived of his cities (28:17-19); he is generally despoiled (28:5ff.). But Hezekiah's reform reverses the situation. He reigns in opulence (30:24ff.; 31:4-12); he builds and creates (32:3-5). And, at his rescue, the text records, “Many brought tribute to Yhwh, to Jerusalem, and gifts to Hezekiah, king of Judah, and he was exalted in the sight of all the nations thereafter” (32:23). His regnal summary recalls David and Solomon in this regard (32:27-30).

Though these motifs disappear after the account of Hezekiah’s reign, Chronicles up to that point is permeated with the notion that more is better. Wealth is good. Expansion is good. Growth is good (hence Solomon's exaltation—1 Chron 29:25, 2 Chron 1:1; esp. 2 Chron 9:22—Solomon was “greater” than all the kings of the earth with regard to wealth and wisdom—after David's, and before Jehoshaphat's and Hezekiah’s—1 Chron 11:9; 17:6, 12; cf. 26:15-16; 2 Chron 32:23). Size is good—for example, the temple must be “big,” Solomon says, “because our god is bigger than any god. And who could be strong enough to build him a house when the heavens—even the highest heavens—cannot contain him?” (2 Chron 2:4-5). Such emphases recur throughout—in Solomon's magnification at accession (1 Chron 29:25) so that he, “a youth and weak” (1 Chron 22:5; 29:1), will be capable of building the temple; at the failure of the altar at

5. See my Constitution. I have argued there that this is a ritual actualized in narrative.
the temple dedication to contain all the sacrifices (2 Chron 7:7); at the inability of the priests to enter the new temple because it was so full of Yhwh’s glory (2 Chron 6:14; 7:2-3).

Simply, from David through Hezekiah, Chronicles regards and bestows abundance as a mark of divine favor. This is illustrated by the distribution of the root rbh, “much, many.” The vocable occurs 100 times in Chronicles, 96 times with positive or neutral force. Of the four occurrences with negative connotations, one—1 Chron 21:15—uses it in the sense “Enough!”, to stop the slaughter of Israel by Yhwh’s angel (and this is shared with 2 Sam 24:16). And two occur after Hezekiah’s regnal report (2 Chron 33:6; 36:14; the fourth is 2 Chron 28:13). These are the only two instances of the root after Hezekiah. By contrast, Kings uses the root only 30 times, of which fully two-thirds occur in the account of Solomon’s reign (as opposed to less than twenty percent in that account in Chronicles). Of the remaining 10 instances, at least 6, and possibly 8, carry negative connotations.

This difference, in fact, symptomizes the differences between Chronicles and Kings. Except in shared passages, after Solomon’s reign, Kings virtually never speaks of Yhwh’s rewarding a pious monarch with wealth. The very lexeme “wealth” (םשֶׁר), which occurs eight times in Chronicles (1 Chron 29:12, 28: 2 Chron 1:11, 12; 9:22; 17:5; 18:1; 32:27), seven times in conjunction with “honor” (not in 2 Chron 9:22), occurs only three times in Kings (1 Kgs 3:11, 13; 10:23), all with regard to Solomon, and all with parallels in Chronicles (2 Chron 1:11, 12; 9:22). Kings is simply not oriented toward accumulation.

Within Chronicles, the motifs of nearness to god, of salvation, and of expansion, growth, and accumulation all merge into a single complex, characterized by the rest motif. The motif surfaces already in 1 Chron 22:9, where David recounts that Yhwh promised him a son:

He will be a man of rest, and I shall give him rest from all his enemies from about. For Solomon (יהוֹם֥וֹ) will be his name (יהוֹמָּה), and well-being (םֵלֶチーム) and quiet (שֶׁקֶט) I shall bestow on Israel in his days.

The motif resurfaces in 22:18, and especially in 28:3, in which David explains that he was prevented from building the temple because he was “a man of wars” (and 22:8). Moreover, 1 Chron 23:25 correlates Israel’s rest with Yhwh’s (23:26): because Yhwh has given rest to his people “from about,” Israel is obliged to give rest to Yhwh; Solomon must build him a permanent dwelling. This same notion emerges in 1 Chron 28:2, where David calls the temple a “house of rest,” a reference to Solomon, “a man of rest” (22:9). At the dedication of the temple, 2 Chron 6:41 retrieves the thought once again: Yhwh is called on to occupy his resting-place. The temple project is Solomon’s reciprocation for the rest bestowed on Israel by Yhwh.

After Solomon, the theme continues to unfold. Though Abijah inherits the unrest caused by Jeroboam, Asa’s reign represents a period of peace and quiet (2 Chron 13:23c; 14:4c, 5b, 6d; 15:15, 19), characterized by prosperity, expansion, and salvation at war, so long as his heart was “wholly with Yhwh.” It is precisely at the point at which he abandons Yhwh that he is condemned to war for the remainder of his reign (16:9). Similarly, Jehoshaphat’s reign is marked not just by union with Yhwh, or wealth, and so forth, but also by peace (17:10). As in Solomon’s and Asa’s cases, Jehoshaphat achieves
“rest from about” (20:30). His is an era of quiet (20:30). And at Joash’s accession, the text reads, “All the people of the land rejoiced and the city was quiet (wat-tišqot). Athaliah they killed by the sword” (23:31). This is the response to Jehoiada’s righteous acts.

This theme is consistently tied up with seeking Yhwh, with salvation, with prosperity, and so forth. Its final articulation comes in 2 Chron 32:22, toward the end of the Hezekiah account:

Yhwh saved (ως) Hezekiah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem from the hand of Sennacherib king of Assyria and from everyone’s hand, and he guided them from about (wa-yōnahālem mis-sabib).

Notices of tribute borne to Hezekiah, of Hezekiah’s exaltation and wealth, of his humiliation before Yhwh all follow. This is the last occurrence of the term mis-sabib, “from about,” in Chronicles, and of the root wāš, “save.” The verse appears to form an inclusio of Hezekiah with David, who also was saved wherever he went (1 Chron 18:6, 13). From Manasseh onward, the whole rest/prosperity/salvation complex disappears.

The rest motif in Chronicles resembles closely that in Joshua and Judges (esp. 2 Chron 13:23; 24:4, 5; 20:30, 23:31 with Josh 11:23; 14:15; Judg 3:11, 30; 5:31; 8:28). Kings, however, evinces no such interest. It is noteworthy, for example, that the term nāl, “rescue,” occurs twelve times with regard to Hezekiah in Kings (nine of these shared with the Isaiah tradition in Isa 36-39, and three more in the same pericope), and only once elsewhere, in close proximity (2 Kgs 17:39). The root yēš, “save,” occurs in Kings seven times with reference to Israel, not Judah, twice in the Isaiah tradition material (2 Kgs 19:19, 34 = Isa 37:20, 35), and once with reference to Ahaz’s importuning Tiglath Pileser (2 Kgs 16:7). The notion of Yhwh’s intervention on behalf of the pious monarch is not explicitly elaborated.

The situation with the rest motif proper is even starker. Numerous commentators have taken 2 Kgs 11:20—“the people of the land rejoiced and the city was quiet”—to imply that syncretistic Jerusalem went into mourning at Athaliah’s death. In the context of Kings, where the lexeme šqt does not again appear, this interpretation is almost plausible. But Chronicles provides a context against which this verse demands to be read: the statement is unequivocally positive. The city was quiet—it was at rest.

The case of 2 Kgs 11:20 is in and of itself somewhat suspicious. Only at one other locus does the rest motif crop up in Kings—that is, in 1 Kgs 5:4, 18, in the account of Solomon’s reign. The latter is of greatest interest here. In it, Solomon writes to Hiram:

6. For the vb., cf. Exod 15:13; note Ps 31:4; 23:2 for conjunction with nwh.
8. I discount 2 Kgs 22:20; 2 Chron 34:28, in which Josiah is promised death “in peace, well-being (ḇa-šalôm),” first, because the rest is not general; but second, even allowing that the context may imply that the phrase merely asserts that Josiah will not see Jerusalem’s destruction, an interpretation which seems to me to founder on other uses of šalôm and the Israelite distinction between violent and natural death, the character of the rest is sufficiently fleeting to distinguish it from other instances in the histories. Otherwise—and far more probably—Josiah’s Armageddon completely belies the promise, a fact with which Chronicles, at least, attempts to come to terms (2 Chron 35:21-22). 2 Kgs 20:19, from the Isaiah-tradition (Isa 39:8), is an intermediate instance.
You knew David my father, that he was not able to build a house to Yhwh's, his god's name, on account of the war that was about him, until Yhwh should give them over under the soles of his feet. So now, Yhwh my god has given rest to me from about; there is no opponent; there is none who does damage.

This sounds more like Chronicles than it does like Kings. David was prevented by his preoccupation with war from erecting a house to Yhwh. At least, like 1 Chron 22:9 with regard to 1 Chron 17, it stands in tension with the repudiation of the temple in 2 Sam 7. Certainly, it stands in tension with the remark of 2 Sam 7:1 that Yhwh had granted David “rest from about,” though this is probably a late insertion. It is a remark ungrounded elsewhere in the former prophets, but it falls into quite a natural context if read in conjunction with Chronicles.

In this respect, 1 Kgs 5:4; 18; 2 Kgs 11:20 seem peculiar. Like the emphasis on wealth in Kings' account of Solomon's reign—like the stress of plenty, growth, and building there—the vestigial presence of the rest motif in three verses in Kings ought to evoke suspicion. In Chronicles, the whole account of Solomon's reign, which is quite similar to 1 Kgs 3–10, integrates nicely with the rest of the narrative up to the account of Hezekiah. Chronicles focuses consistently on rest, on quantity, on divine intervention. Kings is perversely sporadic in these regards. Thus, the term la-rob (“in quantity”) occurs five times in Kings, all in the account of Solomon's reign, and two of them shared with Chronicles. Chronicles uses the same term fully thirty-five times, only seven times in reference to Solomon's reign, and last in 2 Chron 32:29—the end of the account of Hezekiah's reign. Again, Kings selects against the term qhl throughout. The root occurs nine times there, seven of them in 1 Kgs 8 (six shared with Chronicles) and two in 1 Kgs 12 (one shared with Chronicles). It is thus in relatively restricted usage. Conversely, Chronicles uses the root frequently in connection with the Israelite assembly. It occurs thirty-eight times from David to Hezekiah, referring usually to the assembly constituted in either its sacral or its deliberative capacity.

There is little point in multiplying examples of this sort, except to indicate that they are both numerous and suggestive. The term šmh (“to rejoice”), for example, occurs only eight times in Kings. Of these, two are shared with Chronicles (1 Kgs 8:66; 2 Kgs 11:20 and 2 Chron 7:10; 23:21). A third derives from a shared passage (2 Kgs 11:14 from 11:20). And the remaining five (1 Kgs 1:40 bis, 45; 4:20; 5:21) are all concentrated in the first part of the account of Solomon's reign. In Chronicles, the root is distributed freely, occurring twenty-four times in all. Another example is that of the expression heyyôt ‘im lēb. This occurs in 1 Kgs 10:2 (2 Chron 9:1); it also occurs in 1 Kgs 8:17–18 (2 Chron 6:7–8). The latter instance is of particular interest. In it, Solomon states that

10. J. Milgrom has kindly called my attention to his attempt to trace out a linear typology for the use of qhl and ‘dh in the Bible UQR 1979, unavailable to me at the time of this writing). See also my treatment in my Constitution. I am a bit suspicious of the typological approach in vocabulary questions (less so in semantic, though I am still hesitant), since regional, personal, factional, and other preferences in selection necessarily intrude, and since the quantity of text on which we must base our typologies is so limited. In other words, the fact that P only of the Pentateuchal narrators uses the word ‘ēdā, “(sacred) community, (sacred) assembly” in no way suggests that the lexeme was unknown at the time when J wrote. The possibility is there; but the evidence is insufficient to prove it. At any rate, for the best attempt to impose chronological order on the biblical chaos, see R. Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose, HSM 12 (Missoula, 1976).
David “had it in mind” to build a house for Yhwh, but Yhwh responded negatively. Chronicles, in which the same expression occurs eight times, grounds the remark fully. David himself has said as much in 1 Chron 22:7; 28:2. 2 Chron 1:11 has Yhwh respond (not in 1 Kgs 3:11) to Solomon, as to David in 1 Kgs 8:18//2 Chron 6:8, “Because you ‘had it in mind,’ I shall reward you in such-and-such a way.” Indeed, after the account of Solomon’s reign, Chronicles twice more uses the expression in connection with establishing a relationship with the deity (2 Chron 24:4; 29:10). There are no other instances in Kings.

Data of this nature, plentiful throughout the histories, suggest two distinct possibilities. Either Chronicles seizes upon certain isolated, anomalous texts in Kings, and applies the values they reflect to reports concerning kings from David to Hezekiah, or Chronicles draws consistently from a source used by Kings perhaps relatively heavily for the account of Solomon’s reign, but thereafter only irregularly. Of these possibilities, the former seems inherently unlikely. The latter, that both histories draw on a common source, is naturally a possibility.

II

It is, fortunately, possible to shed some light on this subject by brief examination of the attitudes struck by Kings and Chronicles toward Davidic dynasty over Israel. On this point, the histories diverge widely.

Apart from the dynastic promise of 1 Chron 17, which duplicates that of 2 Sam 7 with minor variation, Chronicles, like Kings, articulates Solomon’s arrangement with Yhwh in conditional contractual terms. David prays that Yhwh will endow Solomon with the ʿīkāl ṣwbynh, “sense and insight,” that will enable him to “succeed” (1 Chron 22:11-13). He urges Solomon to “serve God” (28:9); he urges God to give Solomon a “whole mind, to observe” Yhwh’s will (29:19). The issue, especially in 1 Chron 22:1ff., is whether Solomon will prove himself worthy of the dynastic award by observing Yhwh’s statutes sufficiently to be allowed to complete the temple. In this regard, it appears that Chronicles does not take the remark in Samuel, “He will build me a house” (2 Sam 7:13; 1 Chron 17:12), as a lapidary prophecy. Rather, it serves for Chronicles as

11. I shall marshal a series of such cases in a volume, now in preparation, on the common source of Kings and Chronicles.
12. One might argue chronistic generalization of materials in Solomon’s reign. However, such passages as 2 Kgs 11:14 (and, indeed, 2 Kgs 11 as a whole) and the anomalous character of those materials in Kings contraindicate that hypothesis. One must also strain somewhat to explain the absence of such values in Chronicles after Hezekiah. See J. Liver, “The Book of the Acts of Solomon,” Bib 48 (1967) 75-101, on the source cited in 1 Kgs 11:41. Pace Liver, the source is probably closer to 1 Kgs 3-10//2 Chron 1-9 than to anything else.
14. Professor N. Sarna notes (in conversation) the absence of music from Solomon’s, but its prominence in Hezekiah’s, temple ceremonies. This suggests neither pro- nor retrojection, but plain recording. See below, and my forthcoming study.
15. Specifically, Solomon, rather than David, is the recipient of the dynastic award. This may be the more authentic tradition (!). See F. M. Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973), pp. 219-273. Cf. also the fine study of N. Sarna, “Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis” in Biblical and Other Studies, ed. A. Altmann, Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University. Studies and Texts, 1 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1963), pp. 29-46.
an implicit protasis to the establishment of Solomon's dynasty forever. If Solomon is pious, he will complete the temple. If, in David's words, he "succeeds" in building the temple, Yhwh's promise will have come true.

For the account of Solomon's reign, this interpretation has important ramifications. There, and thereafter, two types of rehearsal of David's and Solomon's contracts are in evidence. Kings features one refrain that has no counterpart in Chronicles. This is the expression "for the sake of my servant, David," etc. (1 Kgs 11:34; 11:12, 13, 32; cf. 2 Kgs 20:6). Its alloforms invoke "the sake of my servant, David" to whom Yhwh promised a fief forever (1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19; 2 Chron 21:7). This refrain accounts for ongoing Davidic ascendance in Judah and Jerusalem. It conveys the doctrine that under no circumstances will Yhwh revoke the Davidic charter there. What it amounts to, as Weinfeld and others have observed, is the justification for a land grant to the house of David.16

A second doctrine—that David's dynasty depends on his successors' behavior—is expressed with the clause, "There will not fail you/David a man sitting on the throne of Israel." This surfaces three times in Kings and twice in Chronicles (1 Kgs 2:2-4 [in the structural locus of 1 Chron 22:7-13 and with the shared term סכף]; 8:25 [2 Chron 6:16]; 9:4-5 [2 Chron 7:17]; and cf. 2 Kgs 10:32; 15:12). A third text in Chronicles, 1 Chron 28:6-7, shares with them the notion that Solomon's dynasty hinged on his behavior as king.17 However, as R. E. Friedman has observed, the texts that place the responsibility for the continuation of David's dynasty on Solomon's shoulders deal not with dynasty over a fief but with kingship over Israel.20 That is, none of the fief-refrains deals specifically with kingship or with any of its Hebrew metonyms: none mentions "Israel." None of the conditional ("there will not fail you . . . ") refrains addresses anything but kingship, and that always over Israel.

Unlike the fief-formulae, which are scattered throughout Kings, the refrain, "There will not fail you a man sitting on the throne of Israel—\(\text{if you obey Yhwh's ordinances,}\)" along with all articulations of a conditional dynastic agreement with Solomon, are confined in Kings and Chronicles to the account of Solomon's reign. This intimates to what extent that reign served historiographically as a testing-ground for the dynasty. Chronicles emerges with an undeniably positive portrait of Solomon; Kings arrives at a negative evaluation. It is in the dynamic of their relationship in this regard that a clearer understanding of the histories can emerge.

Chronicles' view of Solomon is evinced in a variety of ways. For one thing, David states that only if Yhwh gives Solomon סכף ויבין, "sense and insight," will Solomon "succeed" (1 Chron 22:12). At Gibeon, Solomon requests and receives הַכְּרִית וֹמַדְך, 16. See Rashi on 1 Kgs 11:36; P. D. Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon and David's Mvr," HTR 61 (1968) 297-320.
17. The instance in 2 Chron 21:7 is drawn, with the surrounding vv, from 2 Kgs 8:17-22.
20. See his The Exile and Biblical Narrative (Harvard Semitic Monographs 22, Chico, California, 1981). I have developed his insight in its historical connections in my Constitution.
“wisdom and knowledge” (2 Chron 1:7-13), not the same thing at all. But a letter from Hiram settles the issue decisively. Hiram starts: “In Yhwh’s love for his people did he make you king over them” (2 Chron 2:10). This forms an inclusio with Sheba’s recognition of the same fact in 2 Chron 9:8. A second inclusio encompasses this first: the concluding notices of Solomon’s reign (2 Chron 9) report how extensively Yhwh fulfilled the promises he made, at the start of the reign, in the Gibeonite incubation.

Hiram’s continuation is more revealing. He states:

Blessed is Yhwh god of Israel, who made heaven and earth, and who gave David the king a son, wise, and knowing sense of understanding (ḥākām yōdēḇ’ ṣēḵel ʿā-bīnā), who will build a house for Yhwh, and a house for his kingship [or: a dynasty for his kingship (I)]. (2:11)

Apart from the paronomasia on bn, “son,” bnyh, “insight,” and bnh, “build,” in evidence here and often in this section of Chronicles, Hiram’s letter communicates subliminally to the reader. The gift bestowed by Yhwh at Gibeon, “wisdom and knowledge” (hkmh ḥmd), encompasses and surpasses the standard of wisdom necessary for Solomon to establish his dynasty (ḥl ḥmn). Producing a king who is “wise, having knowledge of sense and insight.” Solomon does not merely meet the standard for securing the dynasty. He surpasses it, just as he surpasses all kings in wealth and in wisdom.

Chronicles’ handling of Solomon’s reign in no way deviates from any of these intimations. The two epiphanies, the accumulation of wealth, the successful completion of the temple (esp. after 1 Chron 22:7-13) leave no doubt that Solomon has fulfilled all conditions laid upon him. Solomon has discharged his several obligations, earning perpetual dynastic sway over Israel. 2 Chron 7:11—“in everything that entered Solomon’s mind to do with regard to the temple of Yhwh or to his own house [or: dynasty], he succeeded”—confirms the point. And the statements of 2 Chron 9:22ff. should leave no doubt.

Kings, however, takes an alternate view. Although it adulterates some of the pro-Solomonic materials of chaps. 3-10, it does preserve much of the material contained in Chronicles. Where it diverges is primarily in 1 Kgs 11; there, it accuses Solomon of nothing less than outright apostasy (1 Kgs 11:1-8, 10).

It is likely that by the time Kings was written, Solomon had already attained the sanctified status accorded him by Chronicles and most of subsequent Jewish tradition. Thus, only “in Solomon’s old age” (1 Kgs 11:4a) did he deviate from the righteous paths. Nevertheless, Kings reports that Solomon’s wives “perverted him,” so that “his heart was not wholly with Yhwh his god, as David’s heart had been,” and so forth. He “built altars to Chemosh, . . . Molech,” etc. (v 7; see v 8), despite the fact that Yhwh had appeared to him twice (11:9; here the dreams are suddenly epiphanies). Solomon’s altars, of course, are destroyed by Josiah (2 Kgs 23:13-14), a hint that leads Weinfeld, along with Cross and Lohfink, to trace these reports, and Kings’ negative attitude toward Solomon generally, straight to the Josianic court. But these reports have heavier implications still.

In Kings, all the considerations above—Solomon’s supposed saintliness, David’s

fealty, Solomon’s senile apostasy—have combined to produce a peculiar historiographic view: though Solomon precipitated by his apostasy the division of the kingdom, Yhwh nevertheless preserved, first, the integrity of the kingdom during his lifetime, and, second, a fief forever in Jerusalem for the sake of his servant David. The result is that Yhwh is said to have harassed Solomon throughout his reign. In particular, he incited the Edomite Hadad and the Aramean Rezin to revolt (1 Kgs 11:14–25), though these notices do not easily square with Kings’ notion of Solomon’s early fidelity. This material, too, is at best incidental to the historian, amounting to minor proofs for his interpretation. The climax, so far as he is concerned, and the damning verification, is the division of the Davidic empire (11:9–13, 26–40; 12:1ff.).

It is at this juncture precisely that Kings begins to invoke the fief-formula. The fief in Jerusalem is a cup of consolation to the Davidides deprived of Israel. Yet Chronicles, though cognizant of the Solomonic schism, finds no room for the formula. The reason is, Chronicles does not recognize the legitimacy of the northern secession.

A number of texts confirm this view. The historian states it straight out in Abijah’s battle-taunt of Jeroboam (2 Chron 13:4–7):

Hear me, Jeroboam and all Israel! Oughtn’t you know that Yhwh the god of Israel gave the kingdom to David over Israel forever, to him and to his sons by a salt treaty? And Jeroboam ben-Nebat, Solomon ben-David’s servant, arose and rebelled against his liege? and there were gathered to him desperadoes, sons of bitches, and they took their stand against Rehoboam ben-Solomon? and Rehoboam was a youth and weak-hearted [or: weak-minded], and didn’t nerve himself in their presence?

The historian then vindicates Abijah by reporting Yhwh’s intervention on his behalf (2 Chron 13:14–20).

By the same token, Chronicles addresses Hezekiah’s efforts to return Israel to the Davidic fold with considerable sympathy (2 Chron 30:1–11). Hezekiah’s reconciliation of parts of the north to the Jerusalem cult and the Davidic line produces the greatest and happiest assembly since the time of Solomon (30:13, 18–20, 23, 25–26)—that is, since before the schism. Perhaps most important, while both Kings and Chronicles report alliances between Judah and Israel, Chronicles in each case enters a prophecy against the league (2 Chron 19:1–3; 20:35–37; 25:7–9; prps. 21:6, 12ff.). And certainly most obviously, Chronicles averts its narrative eye from materials that concern the northern kingdom. This practice extends so far that there is no report of Jeroboam’s making the golden calves, though Abijah alludes to them. There is no “sin of Jeroboam.” There is no report of the north’s fall. It is not that Chronicles is uninterested in the matter—as Abijah’s speech makes clear. Nor is it indifferent to the northern population—Hezekiah’s attempt at conciliation, among other texts (e.g., 2 Chron 28:5–15; 2 Chron 10:17; 31:1 on “all Israel in Judah” from Rehoboam to Hezekiah), is incompatible with

22. 'anāšîm réqīm. Dahood is in my view entirely correct in connecting the term with *ryq (Heb. “unsheathe” in C. Dahood’s “army, troops”). See his Psalms 1–3, AB 16, 17, 17a (Garden City, N.Y., 1965–1970), 1.7–8, 195, 210. However, like the English idiom “eat humble pie,” which derives from the medieval English practice of feeding umbles pies to feudal retainers, the Hebrew expression has undergone a congeneric (and paronomastic semantic) assimilation, in this case with réq, “empty,” and taken on the connotation “worthless, shiftless, good-for-nothing.” Cf. already EA 292:47; 297:14 for réq (EA ri-ki) as “worthless, nothing to lose” (cf. 2 Kgs 4:3).
that hypothesis. The point is, Chronicles does not recognize the legitimacy of the division. It will not therefore report the course of northern history. Kings, which does recognize the schism, reports that history throughout. Each history justifies itself by appeal to Solomon's reign.

There are substantial indications that underlying the negative appraisal of Solomon in Kings is an originally pro-Solomonic source. Thus, every articulation of the dynastic covenant in Kings has a parallel or mirror text in Chronicles. The structure of 1 Kgs 3-10 closely resembles that of 1 Chron 1-9. Much of the material is shared verbatim.

Second, the Kings dynastic promises, like those of Chronicles, appear in an atmosphere of general optimism. It is up to the reader to determine in the succeeding chapters whether Solomon has performed in the way specified by David (1 Kgs 2:2-4).

However, it is plain from the ensuing verses that he managed to execute the blood-purge David enjoined on him at the same time (25-28, 30-34, 36-46). Nor do the succeeding chapters intimate at any time that he deviated from the righteous way.

By the same token, Solomon's plea that Yhwh fulfill his promise to David—at the temple dedication (8:25-26; 2 Chron 6:16-17)—should evoke very positive expectations. Cases are rare in HB of characters making positive requests of Yhwh to no avail. There is none of which I am aware in which a character as guiltless as Solomon is at this point in Kings (or throughout in Chronicles) is rebuffed or disappointed by God. It may be noted, too, that Solomon's request is couched in a phrase, ȳd̄mēn d̄bārkā (8:26; 2 Chron 6:17), which, used elsewhere by Chronicles (1 Chron 17:23-24; 2 Chron 1:9) but not by Dtr, appears to connote an abiding fulfillment (2 Chron 1:9). If so, the mitigation of the conditionality of the dynastic promise is implied.

1 Kgs 9:2-5, the last articulation of the dynastic agreement in Kings (2 Chron 7:17-18), presents yet another interesting point. The text affirms that the conditional agreement remains in force. It promises perpetual enfranchisement to Solomon's line over Israel. 9:6-9, probably but not certainly an Exilic insertion, confront Israel with the possibility of exile (2 Chron 7:20-22). That is, the text provides for the Israelites' destruction; it holds out nothing but promise for the Davidides.

To a limited extent, even the Gibeonite incubation seems to share this understanding (1 Kgs 3:5-15). The text states that Yhwh is fulfilling his dynastic obligations to David (v 6). The text erected by the text—the potential reward for Solomon's fidelity—is length of reign (3:14). This is the issue that Solomon's behavior will decide. First, the implication seems to be a tacit understanding concerning the ongoing nature of the dynasty. Second, the fact that Solomon reigned for forty years must imply at least a modicum of fidelity on his part.

Apart from such hints, and mutatis mutandis in conjunction with them, the presence of an occasional editorial apostil to the effect that Solomon fulfilled his obligations to

23. On the exception, 1 Kgs 6:11-13, see above, n. 19.
24. Jonah (Jon 4:3, 8-9) and Elijah (1 Kgs 19:4) ask to die, and receive lessons in meteorology instead. The case of Job is a bit more intricate and is arguable from either position.
25. David's prayer for his sick love-child is rebuffed (2 Sam 12:15-20). But this is a specific punishment for a (specific) sin (12:14). Generally, biblical narrators are not interested in the prayers of the kinds of characters whose prayers would be rebuffed. This is quite plainly the case in the Pentateuch, the Former Prophets, and Chronicles.
the deity is decisive. 1 Kgs 3:3, for example, states that “Solomon loved Yhwh, adhering to the statutes of David his father. . . .” The Gibeonite episode concludes, “Divine wisdom was in him to perform justice” (3:28). Subsequent texts insist on his wisdom and demeanor (5:9-14, 26; 10:3-4, 9, 23-24), on the peace and prosperity he enjoyed (4:20; 5:1, 4-26; 10:1-29, etc.), and so forth. The atmosphere implies a positive evaluation of his performance.

Given this information, and given especially the integration of the material on Solomon’s reign shared in 2 Chron 1-9 and 1 Kgs 3-10 with the rest of Chronicles, it is difficult to resist staking a conclusion: there was a source common to Chronicles and Kings, on which Chronicles relied more consistently than did Kings. This source seems to have been favorable to Solomon. It seems to have affirmed eternal Davidic dynasty over the northern tribes. It seems to have exuded the optimism of an expansive community.16

If one were to seek a source underlying Kings and Chronicles, the logical period to which to assign it would be that of Hezekiah. There are several hints in the opening genealogies that this is the case. One speaks of the enrollment of a genealogy in Hezekiah’s time (1 Chron 4:41). The Saulide lists have eleven and thirteen generations in them (1 Chron 8; 9). Curiously, there are thirteen generations from David to Hezekiah. Moreover, the last instance of the term “enroll,” (htyiḥ) in Chronicles, used with reference to the genealogies, is found precisely in the account of Hezekiah’s reign (2 Chron 31:16, 17, 19).

But sounder indications are to be sought in the formulaic variation after Hezekiah.27 Every accession formula in Kings (barring Asa’s, Jehoram’s, and Ahaz’s) for the kings of Judah reports the name of the queen mother. This continues down to the Exile. In Chronicles, however, the queen mother’s name disappears after Hezekiah, though it is consistently present to that point. This does not, on the surface of things, seem likely to be a literary device.

Similarly, the burial notices both of Kings and of Chronicles undergo a significant shift after Hezekiah’s. In Chronicles, most of the notices up to that point stipulate burial “in the city of David” (b’yr ḏwḏ). None of those after Hezekiah does (2 Chron 33:20, 24; 35:24). Here, a similar phenomenon is present in Kings: up to Hezekiah, all kings are buried “in the city of David.” Thereafter, none is (2 Kgs 21:18, 26; 23:30). There is a palpable break at Hezekiah’s time.

There are other indications in Kings that some Hezekian source was in use by the “Deuteronomist.” For example, 2 Kgs 18:5 states that Hezekiah was greater than any king who came after or before him. 2 Kgs 23:25 makes a remarkably similar statement about Josiah. Moreover, while Chronicles reports prophetic activity throughout Judah’s history, Hezekiah is the first king in Judah, according to Kings, to confront a prophet.

26. See above, n. 12. Since 1 Kgs 3-10 derive from a source in any case, and since that source is probably the one from which 2 Kgs 11 is drawn (and note the convergence with Chronicles there), its concern with the temple should probably be mooted.

Halpern: Chronicles' Thematic Structure

since the Solomonic schism. There is, in each account, something periodic about Hezekiah's reign. Hezekiah, for Kings, is the first king to remove the high places. In both histories, he is the last king of Israel or Judah of whom it is explicitly stated that God was with him (2 Kgs 18:7; 2 Chron 32:7-8). In Chronicles, God is last with Necho, and against Josiah (2 Chron 35:21). It is perhaps to be inferred that he is also later with Cyrus (2 Chron 36:22-23).

Within Chronicles, other schemes are in evidence. A relatively weak example is that of the notion of "strength, consolidation." The clearest usage here is that of 2 Chron 1:1: "Solomon ben-David, 'took hold' over his kingship" (way-yit' bazz qal malkutō). This stands where one would expect the accession formula to appear. It is associated with Yhwh's aid, and it leads immediately to the establishment of communication at the tabernacle. Similar statements are made about Rehoboam (2 Chron 12:13a; note esp. 13:7; contrast 11:7 and then 12:1), David (1 Chron 11:10), Abijah (2 Chron 13:21), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron 17:1), Jehoram (2 Chron 21:4), and Jehoiada (2 Chron 23:1), who was buried in the graves of the kings (2 Chron 24:16), though his protégé, Joash, was not (2 Chron 24:25). In these cases, the term relates either to taking hold of the kingship or to the accession formulae of the king.

In other cases, the reference, and even occasionally the binyan of the verb, is different. Thus, Asa "takes hold" immediately before his reform (2 Chron 15:8; 16:9 is more difficult). Amaziah "takes hold" (2 Chron 25:11) by obeying Yhwh's orders just before leading troops into battle. The notice, "when the kingdom was firmly in his grip" (25:11; kədēser hāz qā ham-mamlakā 'alayw; the same phrase has crept into 2 Kgs 14:5, one of two applications of the root to the kingship in all of Kings), forms the preface to his regnal record. The root occurs in similar bearings with regard to Uzziah (26:5, 8, 15, 16—cf. 12:1), Jotham (27:6 with v 7-9), and, finally, Hezekiah (32:5—in preparation for war with Assyria; Hezekiah, like Uzziah, is humbled in 32:25-26).

In all, Chronicles applies the verb הָצָּק, often in the hitpa'el (Dt), to every Judahite king from David to Hezekiah, with the exceptions of Ahaziah and Ahaz. The last occurrence of the hitpa'el refers to Hezekiah. In each case, there is some more or less general connotation to the usage. Contrariwise, after Hezekiah, the root is nowhere applied in the same connection. It would be too much to suggest a deliberate connection between the use of הָצָּק in Chronicles and the name Hezekiah (הָצָּק). At the same time, the disturbance in this case after Hezekiah is nearly as stark as the disappearance of the queen mothers' names at that point. Perhaps it is even more significant.

In this context of the breakdown of formulae, the breakdown of various Chronistic motifs at Hezekiah elicits no surprise. Hezekiah is the last king of whom it is reported that Yhwh was with him, saved him, rescued him, gave him any sort of rest, brought foreigners to pay tribute to him, and so forth. This is peculiar: an author who reports as frequently as does Chronicles that Yhwh entreated will not rebuke, that Yhwh, once

28. Jehoiada is a royal figure for Chronicles. His 130-year life span is plain testimony to his righteousness; his burial among kings is proof.

29. It pops up in 2 Chron 34:8, 10; 35:2, in the first two occurrences with regard to reinforcing the temple, and in the third with regard to reinforcing the priestly orders. These are pedestrian usage, and far from the more formuliac usage of Chronicles up to Hezekiah.

30. In conversation, however, Professor S. Talmon has drawn my attention to Isa 39:1, which, especially in the context of the preceding verses (esp. 38:16-17, 19-21) with their plethora of הֶצֶר, looks very much like intentional paronomasia.
sought, will not repudiate (1 Chron 28:9; 2 Chron 15:2; 28:11; 30:6, 8, 9; 14:6, etc.), is not the author to produce the story of Josiah’s death. Chronicles will produce Amaziah’s or Rehoboam’s or Uzziah’s or Asa’s or Joash’s backsliding, Manasseh’s or Hezekiah’s or David’s regeneration. But it will not kill an innocent king, as it does Josiah. It will not—as it does in the case of Josiah—report Yhwh’s championing an alien army. Josiah is the only Judahite king in Chronicles to die untimely, yet innocent of active trespass. He is the only king against whom Yhwh takes an active stance. He is the only king unre- servedly endorsed by Chronicles whose accumulation of “wealth” is not reported. Even the simple formula “wealth and honor” disappears after Hezekiah.

Generally, there is no enumerating the thematic shifts at Hezekiah in Chronicles. The examples above can serve to create only an impressionistic effect. The text jettisons thereafter the entire rest-motif complex. The break is substantial. The break is clean.

At the same time, there is another path by which the break at Hezekiah in Chronicles can be established: there is an inclusio formed there between Hezekiah and the “United Monarchy.” This has been recognized by various authors.31 Williamson, for example, notes the emphases on Hezekiah’s and Solomon’s wealth (2 Chron 32:27–29; 9:13ff.), on the bringing of tribute to both (9:23–24; 32:23), on the two-week length of the festival of temple dedication (7:8–9; 30:23, 26), and so forth.32 It would be difficult, additionally, to miss other bracketing devices—for example, Hezekiah’s Passover is described as the height of joy since the time of Solomon (2 Chron 30:26). And the duties ascribed to the priests in Hezekiah’s time (2 Chron 31:3) are precisely those described in the time of Solomon (1 Chron 16:39–40; 23:31; 2 Chron 2:3; 8:13; cf. Isa 1:13–14). The notion of the priests’ self-sanctification occurs only in the accounts of Solomon’s and Hezekiah’s reigns (2 Chron 5:11; 29:15, 34). And other items of a lexical and a thematic nature fall into the same scheme.

There is very little point in multiplying examples here. It may be worth observing that with regard to Hezekiah and Solomon only (2 Chron 31:21; 7:11), Chronicles affirms that the king succeeded in all he sought to do with regard to the temple. It may be worth noting that Hezekiah (2 Chron 32:22), like David (1 Chron 18:6, 13), and, by implication, like Solomon, was successful in whatever he did. It may be worth observing that, like Solomon (2 Chron 1:1ff.), Hezekiah recovers access to the tabernacle (2 Chron 29:6—way-yassēb pōnēhem!), which Ahaz had shut off (2 Chron 28:24). It is important that unlike Rehoboam (2 Chron 12:14), but like the people under Solomon (1 Chron 22:19; 29:18), Hezekiah “fixed all his heart to seek Yhwh” (2 Chron 30:19, and cf. 28:8–9; cf. 19:3; 20:33). It is revealing that Yhwh listens to Hezekiah and cures the people of their impurity (2 Chron 30:20), the sort of tailored miracle that stands out in any biblical book.33 And it seems impressive that of the first six Hezekian Levitic leaders enumerated (2 Chron 29:12), five have names identical with those in the genealogies of David’s appointees to the temple service (1 Chron 6:20, 21, 29, 5–6, 6).

32. See Williamson, Israel, pp. 120–125.
33. It may be that the historian understood the “miracle” in a less-than-miraculous sense. So, for example, Yhwh cleansing the people may mean nothing more than that priestly (prps. divinatory) dispensation was obtained. In very much the same way, Chronicles summarizes the civil war after Saul’s death by the phrase “Yhwh diverted the kingdom to David ben-Jesse” (1 Chron 10:14). Scholars will need to pay more attention to the modes of Israelite discourse in future attempts to understand the text and reconstruct the history.
Nevertheless, the strongest evidence is the repetition in Hezekiah’s account of themes first set out with regard to the United Monarchy. These have been reviewed above. The culmination of the rest-motif, with its associated notions of salvation, of prosperity, of abundance, of honor abroad, of foreigners bringing tribute—all in Hezekiah’s reign—the fact that Hezekiah’s Passover is specifically compared to Solomon’s temple dedication (2 Chron 30:26), the fact that Hezekiah is the first king since Solomon to address all Israel “from Beersheba unto Dan” (2 Chron 30:26, 1 Chron 21:2 and 2 Chron 2:16) all contribute to the general impression. That Hezekiah is said to have stationed the Levites at the house of Yhwh with timbrels, with lyres and with flutes, according to the command of David and Gad the royal seer and Nathan the prophet, because the command was from Yhwh’s hand, from the hand of his prophets (29:25), recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.

Vestiges of the correspondence between Solomon and Hezekiah have even crept in Kings. Thus, David enjoins Solomon to piety, recalling thereby Solomon’s receipt of the temple plans written by Yhwh’s hand, from David, and his stationing of the Levites in the Davidically ordained order (2 Chron 5:12–13 with 1 Chron 28:11, 19), indicates a conscious correspondence.
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not see the coming destruction of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 22:15ff.; 23:30). The first lies partially outside the book (von Rad cites the promise in 2 Sam 7:13) and derives from older materials (probably the common source) that had become traditional (cf. Pss 89; 132, inter alia). The second is merely dilatory of the eradication of Jehu's house (note 2 Kgs 10:31). And the third is similarly dilatory, but of an even greater disaster. Kings, that is to say, does not portray a world rife with milk and honey.

The narrative tensions in Chronicles stand in a marked contrast. There, the first question (after "Will these genealogies and lists ever end?") is, will David seek and find Yhwh? Will David recover communication with God? Will Solomon complete the approachment? Will Solomon earn perpetual dynasty? Will Hezekiah return Israel from limbo to the Davidic fold? Most of the tensions in Chronicles are quite positive in their narrative bearings. Chronicles asks, how will a problem be solved? How will Israel's lot ameliorate? Kings asks, conversely, when is the axe going to fall?

Yet, after the account of Hezekiah's reign, Chronicles ceases to ask the same sort of question. In fact, it seems to erect no narrative tensions at all. Events follow in sequence; but no expectations are evoked in the reader. The suggestion is, the work was geared to climax and to culminate in the account of Hezekiah's reign.

The foregoing argumentation has by necessity been impressionistic. It nevertheless opens up the possibility that a common source underlies Kings and Chronicles. This is not to say that Chronicles does not depend also on Kings—the statements that Asa and Jehoshaphat removed the bāmōt, for example, are juxtaposed with remarks taken from Kings that the bāmōt remained (2 Chron 14:2; 15:17; 17:6; 20:33). The fief-formula even occurs once in Chronicles (2 Chron 21:7), though it is wholly irrelevant to that work as it stands. But the vestigial presence in Kings of language and motifs full-blown in Chronicles strongly suggests common reliance on a prior source. The strong articulation of Hezekiah's correspondence to Solomon and the stark shift of interest after Hezekiah point directly to a source from Hezekiah's era.

That is, in much the same measure as Josiah's court produced a "Deuteronomistic" history, it seems that Hezekiah's court produced an extensive historical work of its own. This work, used sparingly in Kings, formed the broader base for Chronicles. Possibly, given the distribution of the rest motif in Joshua and Judges, it actually embraced what later became the "Deuteronomistic history." At all events, it exalted Solomon, rejected northern independence, and looked forward to a period of expansion, of wealth, or of reconstitution. It viewed the destruction of the north with equanimity—as a chance

10:30 is open to the interpretation that the message came secondhand, or, rather, that the historian or his source understood that to be the case. 1 Sam 30:8 reports that Yhwh spoke to David; a glance at the preceding verse establishes that priestly mediation of the message is in point. It is perfectly plausible, thus, that 2 Kgs 10:30 represents a similar instance, but without the contextual control. Similarly, 2 Sam 5:19, 23-24; 1 Chron 14:10, 14-15 look very much like mediated war-oracles, though no notice of the mediation appears in the context.

37. Note further Prov 25:1. Hezekiah's dabbling with wisdom suggests further preoccupation with Solomon at his court. Thus, the intuition of R. B. Y. Scott that Hezekiah's court was the fount of Solomon's reputation, though ineptly argued, evidences a certain prescience. See his "Solomon and the Beginnings of Wisdom in Israel" in Wisdom in Israel, ed. M. Noth and D. W. Thomas, VTSup 3 (Leiden, 1955), pp. 262-279. More recently, see Weinfeld, Deuteronomy, pp. 161-162. Unfortunately, the notion that "wisdom"—the reification and restriction of which in the last quarter-century seem somewhat to have abated, yet without producing the rush to find "ignorance literature" and a "stupidity tradition" that one would expect in response—originated at Hezekiah's court seems to me to stem from the character and origins of the sources more than
for reunification of Israel with the Davidic line. It left its mark on all subsequent Israelite historiography.

IV

The present context does not afford space for extensive ramification on the basis of what precedes. These materials do suggest, however, a few points of general interest. First, the biblical historian—the redactor, arranger, traitant, whatever—was prepared to live with logical contradictions. This is true of Kings, of Chronicles, of Samuel, of Joshua, and of the Pentateuchal historians as well. The Israelite historian seems to have respect for his sources. Moreover, the apparent emphases of biblical compositions—of Chronicles on Davidic kingship, the unity of Israel, and on royal "consolidation, taking hold," of Kings on Solomon’s positive achievements and on Hezekiah’s piety—may be dictated in some measure by the use of sources. Chronicles ends with Yahweh championing two foreign kings, with Cyrus urging Judah to return and rebuild the temple under his authority. This is hardly a defense of Davido-Solomonic rule.

Second, it may be that the historiographic enterprise was one undertaken in monarchic Judah on a basis more extensive, and to a degree more sophisticated, than most of biblical scholarship is prepared to countenance. If Kings includes texts affirming (1 Kgs 4:27-28, 29-32) and denying (1 Kgs 9:22) Solomon’s conscription of Israelites, if Chronicles includes texts affirming and denying Asa’s and Jehoshaphat’s removal of the bêt-hamōt, one must reckon with the possibility not just that one or more historical traditions preceded but that historiography was sufficiently developed to deal with the problem, albeit in its own terms. Key, therefore, is the issue of selection. Thus, Kings selects less freely from the putatively Hezekian source than does Chronicles; Chronicles selects from Samuel only the materials pertinent to its enterprise.39 But selection and criteria must be examined in some serious manner. On the flip side, there is nothing to say that Isaiah’s account of Uzziah’s reign (2 Chron 26:22) or, perhaps, of Hezekiah’s (32:32) was not the equal of any other work in sophistication or breadth. Israel’s historiographic tradition is as hoary as J, perhaps hoarier. To neglect that fact is, I think, a signal miscalculation.

Third, and finally, it seems likely that we are dealing here with a written document, a thematically integrated account. The evidence suggests to me that it encompasses all that we now call “Deuteronomistic history,” from Joshua to Kings. I have no doubt that this suggestion, if noted, will be called into question, that the thesis of this presentation will be subject to attack. Still, whether it is right or wrong, it strikes me that accretional, redactional, and other models—the question cui bono? asked a posteriori will from any semblance of historical reality. See below, p. 53. The fact that much of our documentation comes from the last century and a half of Judah’s early independence hardly precludes the possibility of an extensive written literature from earlier times. Quite the reverse: the consolidation of literature, its assembly, its collection, in the seventh century suggests a literary legacy of considerable size.

38. See Gray, Kings, pp. 155-156, for the most reasonable of the many attempts to explain the contradiction away. It seems to me, however, that the tension remains strong.
39. Chronicles may not have had Samuel in its present form, of course. Or, if the Samuel materials were included already in the source used by Chronicles, the source may not have had the current text. Especially 2 Sam 11:2-12:25 looks very much like an insertion. Possibly it seems so because the historian is integrating two different sorts of records about David’s reign.
not suffice to explain either the thematic generalization in Chronicles of materials anomalous in Kings—from the term *hsqrwt* in 2 Kgs 11:14, a “technical term” shared here with Chronicles, which uses it more than once, in a shared context, to broader themes, such as the rest motif—or the manifest ideological stratigraphy of both Chronicles and Kings. I therefore incline toward placing the supposed source in the reign of Hezekiah, the only king for whose reign literary activity is documented (Prov 25:1), and the king whose era produced the first prophetic books (that remain extant, of course).

At the same time, what with J and Judges and the so-called Court History, it behooves us to recognize the existence of a complex of literature antedating Hezekiah, and largely unknown to us. Chronicles, citing its sources, makes known the existence of a fair body of documents. This is no deception. We may find, underlying Kings, an extensive historical account. We are almost certain to find, underlying Kings, an extensive historiographic tradition. Before we ask, “cui bono?” we may profitably inquire, is this an isolated phenomenon? Is this a constant of pre-Exilic Israel? If so, the criteria for the inclusion of materials and the methods employed—if any—to rework, as well as to supplement, materials assume a prime interest.

Israel’s was an historically oriented culture, as even commonplace biblical scholarship will concede. In such a culture, historiography is no alien being. On the contrary, we may expect the records to be as extensive as they are for any ancient culture. Only, we must be open both to the possibility of their existence and to the subtlety of their influence. In David’s “court history,” Israel presents us with the most sophisticated historiography until Suetonius. She wines us on politics; she dines us on personality. That from the tenth century to the seventh she should impose an historiographic moratorium on herself is sufficiently improbable to command disbelief. In all likelihood, Israel had a flourishing historiographic tradition. Scholars may or may not be able to effect its recovery. But it is the duty of the historian to bear the possibility into account—in his reconstructions, in his researches, and in his deliberations. Treatments delinquent in this regard impoverish themselves, impoverishing the society that is their subject.

40. Unfortunately, this consideration calls for a reevaluation of the “common authorship” of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. Depending upon the use of sources, common authorship remains a possibility. Here, principles of selection, exclusion, and reworking have prime importance.