

Selective Transmission of the Past in Chronicles. Jehoiada's Rebellion in 2Kgs 11 and 2Chr 22:10–23:21

JUHA PAKKALA

A. Introduction

The editorial processes are central for understanding how the Hebrew Bible was created and transmitted. Scholarship has traditionally assumed that the older traditions were largely preserved in the *Fortschreibung* of the texts. For example, Christoph Levin has suggested that in this process “nothing was taken away. The given text remained unchanged; at least it was not abridged.”¹ Although this position is common in source, redaction and composition critical analyses of the Hebrew Bible, its methodological basis is rarely discussed or tested. The assumption, at least in such an unconditional form, may not stand on a solid ground. There is extensive “empirical” evidence² in the Hebrew Bible to assume that at least in some cases the use of sources was much more radical than what is generally assumed in Biblical scholarship. The Chronicler's relationship with its sources is an example of how parts of the older text may have been rewritten, relocated and omitted. Such methods of *Fortschreibung* are not assumed to have taken place in the transmission of Biblical texts. The evidence from Chronicles is one witness that is often ignored, despite the fact that it may provide scholarship with the most extensive amount of evidence about how sources were used during the time the Hebrew Bible was created and transmitted.

The Chronicler's position towards his textual sources is complicated and varies from passage to passage. In some passages he used

¹ Christoph Levin, *The Old Testament* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005), 27. Similarly many others, for example Jean Louis Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006, 169–170, notes: “If a tradition is ancient, it must be maintained even if it has been superseded. A law cannot be abolished, even if it is no longer applicable ... Indeed, nothing is eliminated; everything is preserved and interpreted ... the desire to collect everything that tradition had handed down became particularly strong during the time of the Second Temple.” Very typical is also the position of Georg Fohrer, *Exegese des Alten Testaments. Einführung in die Methodik* (Uni Taschenbücher 267. Heidelberg – Wiesbaden. Quelle u. Meyer, 1989), 42, according to whom there may have been “Auslassungen ... von Buchstaben, Partikeln, kleinen häufigen Wörtern” and “Beseitigung anstößiger Ausdrücke”. He does not mention any other possible omissions.

² The term “empirical” evidence to refer to parallel passages derives from Jeffrey Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

his sources rather freely to form the new composition. In these sections his method may not be much different from the authors of the Holiness Code, Deuteronomy or the history writer of 1–2Kings, who used older traditions as resource material that could be changed, rewritten or omitted as the author assumed to be suitable for the new composition. On the other hand, there are sections where 1–2Chronicles follows the source text so closely that the parallels could be passages from the same composition. In many passages where 1–2Kings³ was used as the source the Chronicler adopted the older text almost word-for-word (for example in 2Chr 21:5–10a and 23:7–18). Here his method does not differ much from the technique of a copyist.

That very many passages were adopted without major changes shows that the Chronicler had a very high view of his source. 1–2 Kings was assumed to provide an authoritative presentation of Israel's history in the monarchic period, for otherwise the extensive use and faithful rendering of the source would be incomprehensible. 1–2Kings was the basis and starting point.⁴ However, this does not mean that the Chronicler regarded 1–2Kings as infallible, divinely authoritative or unchangeable, because there are many examples where he could change events and issues where they contradicted with his own conceptions. The reason for writing a new version of Judah's history during the monarchy is that 1–2Kings had to be updated and corrected theologically. This necessitated many extensive and radical changes. In most cases, a theological reason can be seen as the main motive for the changes.

I will show examples of passages where the source text was rewritten and where parts of the source were omitted, mostly for theological reasons. They will show that the Chronicler was far from perceiving 1–2Kings as a holy text or a divine revelation that may not be changed substantially. Although the resulting text in Chronicles may be a reflection or reaction to 1–2Kings, the examples will show that the

³ In this paper I will mainly refer to the relationship between Chronicles and 1–2Kings. The relationship between Chronicles and its other sources may be slightly different in nature and should be discussed separately.

⁴ Some scholars, for example Peter R. Ackroyd, *I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah* (Torah Bible Paperbacks; London: SCM Press, 1973), 155, imply that many deviations were caused by the Chronicler's disuse of 1–2Kings, but this would be a misleading conception. Even in cases where the Chronicler's account differs completely from the parallel in 1–2Kings, the reasons are theological. The close parallels but also the differences imply that the Chronicler has read his source very carefully and spent considerable time to contemplate on its theological meaning. The changes are mainly theological corrections that were not made lightly.

Chronicler's own theological conceptions regularly preceded the text and conceptions of 1–2Kings.⁵

Many scholars since early research have downplayed the differences between Chronicles and its sources, and this has, in my view, resulted in theories which assume Chronicles to be merely an interpretation or supplementation of its sources. According to Keil, the Chronicler rendered his sources very carefully and the deviations are due to the Chronicler's attempt to explain the text in more detail and from a different perspective. Other differences would be purely formal or linguistic.⁶ Steuernagel noted that the Chronicler made only small changes to his sources.⁷ Similarly also Noth, who emphasized the faithfulness of the Chronicler towards his source, and maintained that the changes are primarily minor.⁸ According to Torrey, theological abridgements were not extensive, and where there are large abridgements the reason is that the Chronicler was in agreement with the older composition. Torrey is also "certain that he [the Chronicler] did not mean to supplant the books of Samuel and Kings; he intended rather to supplement them."⁹ In view of the parallel text and their differences that we will see, such positions are unconvincing or even hard to comprehend, especially when represented by scholars who have been very consistent and critical in other areas of Biblical scholarship. Although discussing specifically the Chronicler's relationship with his sources, many scholars have avoided the issue of

⁵ Thus also Kai Peltonen, "Function, Explanation and Literary phenomena," in *Chronicler as Author*; Eds. P. Graham and S. McKenzie; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 18–69 (66), and others.

⁶ C. F. Keil, *Chronik, Esra, Nehemia, Esther* (BK, Leipzig: Dörffling u. Franke, 1870), 26: "Die Sorgfalt, mit welcher der Chronist seine Quellen benutzt hat, ersieht man bei der Vergleichung der der Chronik mit den Büchern Samuels und der Könige gemeinsamen Erzählungen, und zwar nicht bloß daraus, daß in diesen parallelen Abschnitten die Relation der Chronik mit den Berichten jener Bücher in allen wesentlichen Punkten übereinstimmt, sondern auch aus den darin uns entgegentretenden Abweichungen, indem diese in sachlicher Beziehung vielfach genauere und vollständigere Nachrichten liefern und in jeder anderen Beziehung rein formeller Art sind, zum größeren Teile nur Sprache und Ausdrucksweise betreffen oder mit dem paränetisch-didactischen Zwecke der Geschichtserzählung zusammenhängen." According to Keil, the Chronicler omitted some parts because they were "Nebenumstände" (see p. 7).

⁷ Carl Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, J. C. B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1912, 408.

⁸ Martin Noth, *The Chronicler's History*. JSOT Supplement Series 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988, 89–95.

⁹ Charles C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*. New York: Ktav Publishing House (Reprinted 1970), 1910, 213–214. His view is somewhat ambiguous, because he also emphasizes the Chronicler's attempt to correct the erroneous conceptions of the sources (cf. p. 218–223).

omission or assumed that there are only minor and technical omissions.¹⁰ It is somewhat surprising that even Kalimi, who may be one of the most consistent scholars to investigate the Chronicler's relationship to his sources, discusses omissions only briefly.¹¹ It is therefore evident that the phenomenon of omissions in Chronicles and its implications for the wider study of the Hebrew Bible should be given much more attention in scholarship.

In many ways the Chronicler's method may be characterized as one of a redactor or editor, such as is usually assumed to have edited the Deuteronomistic history or other books of the Hebrew Bible.¹² If we would only possess Chronicles, there would probably be many scholarly investigations that would characterize the Chronicler as an editor of an earlier composition, which some scholars would try to reconstruct. In the passages discussed here, some of his methods are similar to the assumed methods of the nomists or the history writer. The main difference is that the Chronicler seems to be much more radical than what one *usually assumes* from the later editors of 1–2Kings. As noted by W. Rudolph, "While the author of the Deuteronomistic History normally transmitted his sources unchanged ... the Chronist intervenes more strongly in the text, when it was necessary ..."¹³ The omissions in Chronicles range from individual words to entire passages. Some of the omissions are such that an entire story or part of the story was left out, without any counterpart in Chronicles. On the other hand, there are omissions where the Chronicler did not agree with some detail, theme or course of events in the source text, and omitted it. His method in such cases may be what is often *implicitly* assumed of the history writer in relation to his sources, the royal annals.

It is rather surprising that the Chronicler's use of his source has not had wider methodological impact on the study of the editorial processes of other texts of the Hebrew Bible.¹⁴ The reason for this may be the common

¹⁰ Thus especially Thomas Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung. Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1972, 92–111.

¹¹ Isaac Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten* (BZAW 226, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 80–91.

¹² Many scholars since early research have called the Chronicler a redactor, see for example, Carl Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung*, 408.

¹³ Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1955, XIII.

¹⁴ That Chronicles has been neglected and continues to be neglected is also noted by Ehud Ben Zvi, *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles* (London and Oakville: Equinox, 2006), 20. 79: "the book is considered more often than not as, at best, of peripheral importance from historical, literary or theological perspectives. The book is often described as being boring, inferior to other biblical narrative works ..." (p. 20).

view that Chronicles is an interpretation or Midrash that is merely supplementing its sources. On the other hand, some scholars imply that the Chronicler's method must have been different from that of the editors of other books.¹⁵

It is necessary to acknowledge that Chronicles may be a prime source for editorial processes of the Hebrew Bible. Although it is only one example of these processes, it provides a wide variety of techniques in relating to the source to form a new composition. Not all editors used similar techniques, but in investigating any texts in the Hebrew Bible, one should take into consideration the possibility that *some* of the editors in the transmission of *any* Biblical text may have used similar techniques as the Chronicler. It provides a range of possibilities how the texts may have been changed in the course of their transmission. In view of the evidence from Chronicles, it would be difficult to assume that the texts of the Hebrew Bible were exclusively edited with conservative techniques where nothing was omitted and rewritten.

In this paper 2Chr 22:10–23:21 will be used as an example of the Chronicler's use of sources. This passage is especially fruitful for the investigation because it contains many different kinds of changes made in relation to the source text.¹⁶ Although the observations primarily relate to this passage, similar changes in relation to the sources can be found in many other parts of 1–2Chronicles as well.

¹⁵ This is also implied in the above-mentioned quotation from Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, XIII.

¹⁶ Although it is probable that the Chronicler used 2Kgs 11, or a text relatively close to the MT, it is not necessary to determine here in what stage of the transmission the omissions or other changes took place. One also cannot completely exclude the possibility that in some cases the original author of Chronicles followed the source closely but that a later editor of Chronicles omitted a section that was theologically problematical. See, for example, Wilhelm Martin Leberech De Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Halle, 1806–07, 61; Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung*, 408–409; Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, VIII, 4 and Kurt Galling, *Die Bücher der Chronik* (ATD 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954). It should be noted, however, that editing in the chapters investigated here is traditionally assumed to be very limited. For example, according to Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, VIII, 4, who assumes considerable number of later expansions to Chronicles, has suggested only one small addition in the chapters investigated here, namely in 2Chr 23:10. Georg Steins, *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Entstehung and. Theologie von 1/2 Chronik*. BBB 9, Weinheim, 1995, 415–439, has shown that the redaction history of Chronicles may be much more complicated than traditionally assumed.

B. Jehoiada's Rebellion – 2Kgs 11 and 2Chr 22:10–23:21

Although the differences between the two accounts on Jehoiada's rebellion are extensive, it is generally accepted that 2Kgs 11 was the main source behind 2Chr 22:10–23:21.¹⁷ Because the Chronicler's version is already familiar with the later additions to 2Kgs 11,¹⁸ it is apparent that the Chronicler used a late version of 2Kgs 11. Despite the differences between the two versions, there is no reason to assume that the author of 2Chr 22:10–23:21 had another completely different source at disposal.¹⁹ Almost every verse of 2Kgs 11 is used in some form in 2Chr and they are used in exactly the same order. If other sources had been used for 2Chr 22:10–23:21, one would expect to find different themes and, at least in some parts, more variation in the order of events from those of 2Kgs 11. The differences between the two texts can best be understood as reactions of the Chronicler to the text of 2Kgs 11, because most of the changes are well in line with the Chronicler's theology.²⁰

There are some significant differences between the Hebrew and Greek versions of the passages, but they are limited in comparison with the much more substantial changes taking place between 2Kgs and 2Chr.²¹

¹⁷ Hugh G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*. NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 312–31; Jacob M. Myers, *II Chronicles*. Anchor Bible; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1965, 131.

¹⁸ For the redaction history of 2Kgs 11, see for example Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja: Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte Judas im 9. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (SBS 105; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk 1982). There is no evidence for significant expansions in 2Kgs 11 after the author of 2Chr 22:10–23:21 had used it as a source.

¹⁹ Many since early research, for example, Keil, *Chronik*, 305–307, have assumed other sources. Keil argues that the versions differ so much that there must have been another source. It is evident that Keil's position is circular reasoning, because his observations on the differences between 1–2Kings and 1–2Chr lead him to the conclusion that the Chronicler rendered his sources very faithfully (see p. 7–8, 26–27). Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch*, 404, assumes that many of the plusses were taken from the now lost Midrash of Kings. Also Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles. Old Testament Library*; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993, 828–837, suggests that other sources may have been used.

²⁰ As Edward L. Curtis, *Books of Chronicles*. ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910, 423, rightly notes about 2Chr 23–24, "Nowhere else does the Chronicler's method of interpreting history and introducing notions of his own time as controlling factors in the earlier history more clearly appear." Similarly also Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 271–272.

²¹ The most significant of the differences between the LXX and MT is the plus *καὶ ἀνέστησεν τὰς ἐφημερίας τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν Λευιτῶν* in the LXX of 2Chr 23:18. Other differences are a plus in the LXX in 2Chr 23:12 (*καὶ ἐξομολογουμένων*), a plus in the MT of 2Kgs 11:1 (מִקְרָן) and 11:6 (מִקְרָם). In 2Chr 23:3 the MT has *וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הֲנֵה בְּיַמְּךָ*, while the LXX contains *καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἴδοὺ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ βασιλέως*.

Although the focus here is on the omissions, also other changes will be investigated in order to gain a better view of the overall editorial processes and in order to understand when the Chronicler resorted to omissions.

The accounts on Joash being hidden from Athaliah are mostly very similar, but there are some important differences:²²

2Chr 22:11	2Kgs 11:2
וַתִּקַּח יְהוֹשֻׁבֶעַת בַּת־הַמֶּלֶךְ	וַתִּקַּח יְהוֹשֻׁבֶעַת בַּת־הַמֶּלֶךְ
אֶת־יְוָאָשׁ בֶּן־אֲחַזְיָהוּ וַתִּגְנֹב אֹתוֹ מִתּוֹךְ	אֶת־יְוָאָשׁ בֶּן־אֲחַזְיָה וַתִּגְנֹב אֹתוֹ מִתּוֹךְ
בְּנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמּוֹמְתִים	בְּנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמּוֹמְ(ו)ת(ת)ִים
וַתִּתֵּן אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־מִינְקָתוֹ בְּחֹדֶר הַמַּטּוֹת	אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־מִינְקָתוֹ בְּחֹדֶר הַמַּטּוֹת
וַתִּסְתִּירָהּ יְהוֹשֻׁבֶעַת בַּת־הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוֹרָם אִשְׁת׃	וַיִּסְתְּרוּ אֹתוֹ
יְהוֹדָע הַכֹּהֵן כִּי הִיא הָיְתָה אֲחֹת אֲחַזְיָהוּ	
מִפְּנֵי עֲתִלְיָהוּ וְלֹא הִמִּיתָהּ	מִפְּנֵי עֲתִלְיָהוּ וְלֹא הוֹמָת

The most important difference is the expansion in 2Chr 22:1, where the family relationships of Jehoshebat²³ are explained in more detail than in the source text. At the beginning of 2Kgs 11:2, Jehoshebat is defined as the daughter of king Jehoram and sister of Ahaziah. Chronicles preserves this information but it is relocated and incorporated into the larger expansion later in the verse. The author of 2Chr 22:11 added that Jehoshebat was the wife of Jehoiada the priest. This idea is probably an invention of the Chronicler increased the influence and involvement of Jehoiada throughout 2Chr 22–24. Since the expansion was made in a verse where the Chronicler otherwise followed 2Kgs 11:2 word-for-word and since it partly overlaps with the relocated information about her being the daughter of king Jehoram and sister of Ahaziah, it is not probable that the expansion derives from a different source, as some scholars have suggested.²⁴ The expansion is met exactly where the author of 2Chr 22:11 seems to have rearranged the text. If the author of 2Chr 22:11 had used another source, one would expect to have other traces of it as well, and, in any case, the assumption that there was an isolated piece of tradition reporting that Jehoshebat was the wife of Jehoiada the priest seems unlikely. Consequently, it is probable that the Chronicler invented the idea that Jehoshebat was the wife of Jehoiada the priest.

²² The expansions in the Chronicler's account are written in **bold**, slight changes are in *cursive* and the omissions are marked ~~through~~.

²³ Note that the name is written slightly differently in the two versions: יהושבע vs. יהושבעת.

²⁴ For example, Japhet, *1–2. Chronicles*, 1993, has suggested that here the Chronicler may have had authentic information not preserved by the author of 2Kgs 11.

The change was probably sparked by 2Kgs 11 which implied that a lay person was able to move freely or even live in the temple area. This would have been inconceivable in the Chronicler's own context in the Second Temple period, and therefore an explanation and justification for her presence there was needed. Although the whole idea that non-priests were able to enter the temple area is bound to have disturbed the Chronicler,²⁵ it would have been difficult for him to omit altogether the idea that Joash was hidden in the temple, because many details in the ensuing story were dependent on his hiding place. The temple was the hub of the rebellion. Making Jehoshebat the wife of Jehoiada would have given the justification for her presence in the temple area. The change of אָתָּה in 2Kgs 11:3 to הָאָתָּה in 2Chr 22:12 developed the text in the same direction, reducing the tension of a non-priest being in the temple. In the older text Joash is reported to have hidden with Jehosheba alone, whereas in the Chronicler's account Joash stays with them, referring to both Jehoshebat and his husband Jehoiada the priest.

These changes are illustrative of the Chronicler's method in using the source. He found a detail in the source text that did not correspond to his own understanding of who was allowed to enter the temple. Because it was difficult to omit the problematic reference, an explanation was invented to reduce the disturbance. The reference to Joash having been instructed by Jehoiada the priest in 2Kgs 12:3 certainly influenced the expansion as well. It would have been logical that Joash had been close to the priest also in his childhood. The result was the priest's increased influence in the entire story. In other words, a theologically disturbing detail forced a reaction from the Chronicler. Although the source text was silent, it was evident for him that Jehoshebat must have had a closer connection with the temple.

The two accounts on the main participants and supporters of Jehoiada's rebellion in 2Kgs 11:4 and 2Chr 23:1–2 differ considerably:

2Chr 23:1–2	2Kgs 11:4
¹ וּבִשְׁנֵה הַשְּׁבִיעִית הַתְּחִיזָה יְהוֹיָדָע וַיִּקַּח אֶת־שָׂרֵי הַמְּאוֹת לְעֹזְרֵיהֶוּ בְּדִיּוֹחָם וּלְיִשְׁמַעֵאל בְּדִיּוֹחָנָן וּלְעֹזְרֵיהֶוּ בְּדִעֹבָד וְאֶת־מַעֲשֵׂיהֶוּ בְּדִעֲדֵיהֶוּ וְאֶת־אֱלִישָׁפָט בְּדִזְכָּרֵי עַמּוֹ בְּבָרִית ² וַיִּסְבּוּ בִּיהוּדָה וַיִּקְבְּצוּ אֶת־הַלְוִיִּם מִכָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה וְרָאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶל־יְרוּשָׁלַם	וּבִשְׁנֵה הַשְּׁבִיעִית שָׁלַח יְהוֹיָדָע וַיִּקַּח אֶת־שָׂרֵי הַמְּאוֹת(וֹ)ת לְכָרֵי וְלָרָצִים וַיָּבֹאוּ אִתָּם אֲלֵיוּ בֵּית יְהוָה

²⁵ 2Chr 23:6–7 in fact makes it explicit that this issue was important for the Chronicler.

According to 2Kgs 11:4 Jehoiada was supported by the leaders (captains of the hundreds) of the royal guards (רָצִים) and of the Carians (לְכָרִים), which was a group of foreign mercenaries.²⁶ Although they were the backbone of the rebellion in the original story, both groups were systematically omitted in 2Chr 23 (v. 12, 20, cf. 2Kgs 11:11, 19, see below).²⁷ Instead of the soldiers, 2Chr 23:1 provides a list of names, whose professions are not mentioned, but who, with the exception of Elishaphat, are otherwise found in other parts of Chronicles, where they are regarded as priestly or Levitical names.²⁸ Other changes in the Chronicler's account confirm that priests and Levites were meant (see below). The change is understandable because the rebellion began in the temple, and it would certainly have disturbed the Chronicler to have foreign mercenaries enter an area where not even lay Judeans were allowed (cf. Jehoshebat above and 2Chr 23:6–7). Some scholars have suggested that the list of priests may derive from a different source that contained a parallel version of the rebellion,²⁹ but this is unlikely. The change is logical and understandable in view of the Chronicler's theological conceptions.³⁰

The Chronicler's expansions and changes concerning the beginnings of the rebellion continue in 2Chr 23:2, which adds that before starting the rebellion, the rebels had to go to all Judean cities and gather

²⁶ On Carians as foreign mercenaries, see for example Carl S. Ehrlich, *Carites*, ABD I, 1992, 872.

²⁷ Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 118–119, has suggested that the Chronicler did not understand many of the old institutions and actors of the older text, for example כָּרִים and רָצִים, and he therefore replaced them with other actors. This is a very unlikely explanation, because the changes are systematically made towards certain theological conceptions. His view ignores the general development in the whole chapter and the tendency of changes that the Chronicler made in relation to his source. Willi (p. 119) similarly explains many of the changes in locations as a consequence of unfamiliarity with the old locations of the monarchical times.

²⁸ Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 271.

²⁹ For example, Steven L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33, Atlanta, 1984.

³⁰ The incomprehensible construction אֶת־שָׂרֵי הַמְּאוֹת לְעִזְרִיהוּ – which is often unsuccessfully translated – may suggest that 2Chr 23:1 was edited. 2Kgs 11:4 uses the preposition לְ to express a genitive, but this makes little sense in 2Chr 23:1, because then one would have to conclude that Jehoiada was supported by the leaders of Azariah the son of Jeroham, of Ishmael the son of Jehohanan and of Azariah the son of Oded. If one follows most modern and ancient translations (such as LXX) and assumes that לְ introduces the object, one would have to explain, why did the author first use אֶת to introduce the object then switch to לְ in the middle of the list of objects and then again return to the original אֶת. Consequently, the list of persons in 2Chr 23:1 may contain traces of further editing, or the Chronicler preserved the לְ preposition from the original text only partly, but having difficulties in incorporating it in the new text, switched to the אֶת preposition in the middle of the list.

the Levites and the chief fathers (ראשי האבות) of Israel to join the rebellion. The idea that the Levites as a group are part of the rebellion against the evil queen Athaliah is again an expected addition.³¹ It further changes the nature of the rebellion from a military *coup d'état* led by soldiers and mercenaries to a general religious uprising with the aim of re-establishing a nation that follows Yahweh's will. The role of the chief fathers is also typically added in Chronicles, although their role remains less significant than that of the priests and Levites.³²

The final change in these verses deals with the location where the rebels met. Yahweh's temple as the meeting place was changed to Jerusalem. As also other changes in the passage indicate, the temple had, in the Chronicler's Second Temple context, become a place meant to be mainly entered by priests, while 1–2Kings implies that the rules had not been so strict during the First Temple Period. A meeting of the rebels in the temple, especially if also non-priests were involved, would not have been possible for the Chronicler. Although many of the events in the following verses still do take place in the temple, the Chronicler found it necessary to stress that non-priests were not allowed to enter the temple itself and that the Levites would kill anyone who does (2Chr 23:6–7).

2Chr 23:1–2 shows that the Chronicler took large freedoms to rewrite his source text whenever it conflicted with his theological conceptions.³³ Several changes were made to show that the sanctity of the temple was preserved during the rebellion. The main idea of the passage was taken from the source, but many of the details were radically changed and the resulting text in 2Chr 23:1–2 is also notably expanded. Actors and locations were changed, without the author even seeking to justify the change or to explain the relationship of the new text to the source. For example, instead of trying to keep the older text and specify that the rebels met outside the temple but did not enter it, the Chronicler found it easier to omit the temple in this context and just refer to Jerusalem. He also did not regard it necessary to give the royal guard and the Carian soldiers even a small role in the rebellion, but instead dropped them altogether and replaced them with actors who could move freely inside the temple. He

³¹ One should not exclude the possibility that the reference to all Levites and the chief fathers is a later addition to the Chronicler's account, but in view of the constant involvement of the Levites in the ensuing verses may speak against this assumption.

³² The term is never met in 1–2 Kings, whereas it is fairly common in Chronicles and other late books, such as Numbers, Ezra and Nehemiah (68 times in all these books, and outside them only three times). Its additions seem to follow a general tendency in Chronicles.

³³ As noted by Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 218, "the story of the coronation of the boy-king ... is here rewritten in order to make it correspond to the recognized usage of the third century B.C."

may not have wanted to give the reader any impression that military power and foreign mercenaries were used to oust the evil queen. Although an interesting and possibly a historical vestige, the foreign soldiers were a disturbing factor for the Chronicler's view of the past. They would have defiled Yahweh's temple and therefore could not have been the backbone of a successful rebellion to reinstate the Davidic dynasty. For the Chronicler Israel's past was primarily dependent on Yahweh's will, which Israel could influence by keeping his commandments, and consequently, the sanctity of the temple as well as the role of the priests and Levites was more central. The source and the past were corrected accordingly, and in effect, the Chronicler reinvented this part of Israel's history on the basis of his theological conceptions.

The differences between the accounts continue after the rebels have met:

2Chr 23:3	2Kgs 11:4
וַיִּכְרַת כָּל־הַקְּהֵל בְּרִית	... וַיִּכְרַת לָהֶם בְּרִית
	וַיִּשָּׁבַע אֹתָם
בְּבֵית הָאֱלֹהִים עִם־הַמֶּלֶךְ	בְּבֵית יְהוָה
וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הִנֵּה בְּנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ	וַיֵּרָא אֹתָם אֶת־בְּנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ
יִמְלֹךְ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה עַל־בְּנֵי דָוִד	

In 2Kgs 11:4 Jehoiada makes a treaty with the soldiers and has them give an oath of loyalty to support him in the rebellion. Only after the oath Jehoiada shows them Joash the son of the dead king Ahaziah, and the rebellion can begin. All this happens in the temple, where Joash had been hiding.

Although the general development of the events is similar, the Chronistic account differs in many details. Instead of a treaty between the soldiers and Jehoiada (הם להם in 2Kgs 11:4 refers to the soldiers), in the Chronistic account the treaty (ברית) is a covenant between the entire community (כל־הקהל)³⁴ and the king.³⁵ It is a common feature in 1–2Chr to

³⁴ Note that the Chronicler's account contradicts his own conceptions about who was allowed in the temple. According to 2Chr 23:6–7 it was strictly prohibited for non-priests, whereas v. 3 could insinuate that the entire community came to the temple. The idea that the covenant was made in the temple was evidently adopted from 2Kgs 11:4, but the change the Chronicler made introduced an implied contradiction with his own conceptions and the text. The Chronicler evidently had difficulties in harmonizing the main plot of the older text where the temple was the center of the rebellion with his own theological conceptions.

³⁵ According to Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Publishing 1997, 101, "although the narrative describing the events is different, their significance remains the same." It is

emphasize the involvement of the entire community and the people in various events. The idea that the people make a covenant with the king is also met in 2Kgs 11:17, but this occurs only after the coup has been successful.³⁶ Although it is illogical that the whole community made a covenant with *king* Joash before he was made king and in the initial stages of the rebellion when everything still had to be kept secret – also shown by the secrecy concerning the hiding place and existence of an heir to the throne – the Chronicler regarded it more important to adhere to his ideals and include the whole community rather than to consider the rationale of the account.³⁷ The oath (וישבֵע) was also omitted in 2Chr 23:3, because it had become irrelevant after the treaty had been changed into a general covenant. In 2Kgs 11:4 the ברית functions as a promise of loyalty for the rebellion, further stressed by the oath, whereas in 2Chr 23:3 it defines the general relationship between the people and the Davidic king.³⁸

2Chr 23:3 is an example of radical changes in relation to the source. Preserving five words from 2Kgs, the Chronicler took the freedom to change the main actors (leaders of the soldiers to whole Israel and king),³⁹ omit the oath of loyalty, make a linguistic improvement without changing the message and adding a comment that he regarded theologically relevant (ימלך כאשר דבר יהוה על-בני דויד). In this verse the author took ideas and themes from the source, but was not bound by them to a great extent, and it is clear that we are not dealing with just an interpretation of the older text. The Chronicler consciously changed the meaning of the text, without him having any source to support the presented interpretation of the past events.

necessary to disagree with her view. She also assumes that in the Chronicler's account the first covenant (in 23:3) was "between Jehoiada and the commanders," but this must be a misunderstanding.

³⁶ Joash is called king in 2Chr 23:3, although he is made king only in v. 11. The motivation to change the treaty to a covenant between the people and the king introduced a clear inconsistency in the text.

³⁷ As noted by Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 830 on 2Kgs 11: "a sense of authenticity pervades the entire course of the narrative." This can hardly be said of 2Chr 23, although the authenticity of 2Kgs 11 should also not be taken for granted.

³⁸ The addition of Yahweh's promise to preserve David's dynastic line by the Chronicler is understandable, because it emphasizes what is at stake here and who the people are declaring allegiance to. There is no reason to see any other source for this comment than Yahweh's promise of eternal dynasty to David in 2Sam 7. The Chronicler wanted to remind the reader about the broader theological meaning of the whole event, which he did not find appropriately represented in the older text. Williamson, *I and II Chronicles*, 315–317, has also suggested that the Chronicler probably attempted to show that the rise of power by Joash had similarities with David's rise to power.

³⁹ 2Kgs 11:3 implies that the leaders of the soldiers are the subject. They are not repeated, but this is evident after v. 2.

Rewriting continues in the following verses, where Jehoiada gives orders to the rebels on how to execute the rebellion:

2Chr 23	2Kgs 11
<p style="text-align: right;">4</p> <p>זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּ הַשְּׁלִישִׁית מִכֶּם בְּאֵי הַשַּׁבָּת לְכַהֲנִים וְלִלְוִיִּם לְשַׁעְרֵי הַסְּפִיִּם 5 וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁית בְּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁית בְּשַׁעַר הַיְסוּד וְכִלְהָעָם בְּחֻצוֹת בֵּית יְהוָה 6 וְאַל יָבוֹא בֵּית יְהוָה כִּי אִסִּי-הַכַּהֲנִים וְהַמְשָׁרְתִים לְלוֹיִם הֵמָּה יָבֹאוּ כִּי-קִדַּשׁ הֵמָּה וְכִלְהָעָם יִשְׁמְרוּ מִשְׁמֶרֶת יְהוָה 7 וְהַקִּיפוּ הַלְוִיִּם אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ סָבִיב אִישׁ וְכִלְיוּ בִידּוֹ וְהָבֵאוּ אֶל-הַבַּיִת יוֹמָת וְהָיוּ אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ בָּבֹאוּ וּבְצֵאתוֹ</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּן הַשְּׁלִישִׁית מִכֶּם בְּאֵי הַשַּׁבָּת וְשֹׁמְרֵי מִשְׁמֶרֶת בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ 6 וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁית בְּשַׁעַר סוּר וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁית בְּשַׁעַר אַחֲרֵי הָרְצִיִּים וּשְׁמֶרְתֶּם אֶת-מִשְׁמֶרֶת הַבַּיִת מִסָּחַ 7 וְשָׂתִי הַיְדוּת בְּכֶם כֹּל יֵצְאֵי הַשַּׁבָּת וְשָׁמְרוּ אֶת-מִשְׁמֶרֶת בֵּית יְהוָה אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ 8 וְהַקְּפֹתֶם עַל-הַמֶּלֶךְ סָבִיב אִישׁ וְכִלְיוּ בִידּוֹ וְהָבֵאוּ אֶל-הַשְּׁדָרוֹת יוֹמָת וְהָיוּ אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּצֵאתוֹ וּבָבֹאוּ</p>

In 2Kgs 11:5–6 the Carian soldiers and guards are divided into three groups of duty, guarding three locations, where they should be when the rebellion begins: king's palace, the Sur gate and the gate behind where the guards were located (בשער אחר הרצים). They are also ordered to guard the temple, each in turn, although the meaning of this part of the verse (ושמרתם את-משמרת הבית מסח) is debated and possibly corrupted.⁴⁰ Moreover, two smaller divisions are ordered to guard the part of the temple where the king is (בית-יהוה אל-המלך). They should surround the king and kill anyone who tries to break their ranks.

In accordance with the other changes, the author of 2Chr 23 made an addition that specifies the three different groups as Levites and priests. The locations were also changed: the gates, king's palace and the Jesod (Foundation)-gate. Moreover, the whole people is now asked to go to the courts of Yahweh's temple, as 2Chr 23:6 explicitly emphasizes that non-priests and non-Levites may not enter the temple building itself.⁴¹ Although some scholars have suggested that this verse may be an addition, at least v. 6b is clearly influenced by 2Kgs 11:7b, which could indicate that instead of being an addition at least this part of the verse is a poorly written vestige from the original text of 2Chr. Moreover, v. 6 is well in line with the other changes that the Chronicler made in relation to his source text.

⁴⁰ For example Williamson, *1 and 2Chronicles*, 316, suggests that both 2Kgs 11 as well as 2Chr may be partly corrupted in these verses.

⁴¹ Thus also, for example, Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 831.

Several details in these verses are informative of the Chronicler's tendencies and methods of using the source. Again the holiness of the temple and the primacy of the priestly class were more important than the preservation of the integrity and rationale of the original account. He omitted the soldiers and guards and replaced them with priests, although it would have been much more logical for soldiers to guard the king. He also added that the whole nation took part in the rebellion and went to the courts of the temple (v. 6), although the whole event is originally described as a secret and sensitive operation that should surprise queen Athaliah and her entourage. It is illogical that the whole nation would have taken part in the rebellion and still the queen did not even hear about it before v. 11. Nevertheless, the addition is well in accordance with 2Chr 23:3 where the entire community is told to have taken part in the treaty.

The idea that the guards should kill anyone who tries to break their rank when they surround the king was replaced with the idea that the Levites, in addition to protecting the king, should kill anyone who tries to enter the temple (2Chr 23:7). This change again illustrates how priestly interests overruled realism in the Chronicler's account of the rebellion. Protection of the king's life in the sensitive phase of the rebellion was clearly a relevant feature of the older text, but the Chronicler regarded it even more important for the success of the rebellion to preserve the temple's sanctity. Practical and military considerations were replaced by theological considerations.

The tendency to increase the role of the Levites continues in 2Chr 23:8:

2Chr 23:8	2Kgs 11:9
וַיַּעֲשׂוּ הַלְוִיִּם וְכָל־יְהוּדָה כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה	וַיַּעֲשׂוּ שָׂרֵי הַמֵּאֹת כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה
יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן וַיִּקְחוּ אִישׁ אֶת־אֲנָשָׁיו בְּאֵי	יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן וַיִּקְחוּ אִישׁ אֶת־אֲנָשָׁיו בְּאֵי
הַשִּׁבְתַּת עִם יוֹצְאֵי הַשִּׁבְתַּת	הַשִּׁבְתַּת עִם יוֹצְאֵי הַשִּׁבְתַּת
כִּי לֹא פָטַר יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַמַּחְלָקוֹת	וַיִּבְאֵרוּ אֶל־יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן

Whereas 2Kgs 11:9 refers to the leaders of the hundreds – evidently of the Carian soldiers and guards of 2Kgs 11:4 – as the main pillars of the rebellion, the Chronicler replaced them with the Levites, followed by the whole Judah. Using some words of the source, the Chronicler further formed a short comment about the priestly divisions. The verse is yet another example of how the Chronicler could change the original actors with new ones, without even trying to explain or leave a trace of the original text.

Similar motives to change the text are also found in 2Chr 23:11:

2Chr 23:11

2Kgs 11:12

וּיֹצֵא (ו) אֶת־בְּנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּתֵּן (ו) עָלָיו
 אֶת־הַנְּזָר וְאֶת־הָעֵדוּת וַיְמַלְכוּ אֹתוֹ
 וַיִּמְשְׁחֵהוּ יְהוֹיָדָע וּבָנָיו
 וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ

וּיֹצֵא אֶת־בְּנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּתֵּן עָלָיו
 אֶת־הַנְּזָר וְאֶת־הָעֵדוּת וַיְמַלְכוּ אֹתוֹ
 וַיִּמְשְׁחֵהוּ וַיְכַוְּרֵהוּ
 וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ

Following his general tendency, it was clear for the Chronicler that Jehoiada was the main actor in the scene, but the original text contained a problem. Some of the verbs were in the singular and some in the plural, although the subject is not specified. The reason for the inconsistency is probably an earlier expansion in 2Kgs 11:12a.⁴² The singular evidently refers to Jehoiada, while the more original plural implies that the guards of v. 11 are the subject. Instead of harmonizing the verb forms, the Chronicler specified the subject of the plural verbs as Jehoiada *and* his sons. Jehoiada was already implied by the older text whereas the sons are an interpretation and attempt to correct the incongruence caused by the addition.

The omission of *וַיְכַוְּרֵהוּ* in the Chronistic account is probably a consequence of changed subjects. In 2Kgs 11 the soldiers of v. 11 (*הַרְצִים*) clap hands, but as they were removed in the Chronicler's account, Jehoiada and his sons would have been clapping hands. For the Chronicler, it may have been inappropriate or degrading for priests to clap hands for the king, although the meaning of the gesture in ancient Israel is not well known.⁴³

The short reference to Jehoiada appointing people to oversee the temple 2Kgs 11:18 was substantially expanded in 2Chr 23:18.⁴⁴

⁴² The numbers in verbs (pl. vs. sg.) of 2Kgs 11:12 and 2Chr 23:11 contain considerable differences. The LXX and MT versions also differ in this respect: The LXX of 2Chr follows 2Kgs 11, whereas the LXX of 2Kgs 11:12 uses singulars where the MT has plural verbs. The problems were probably caused by earlier editorial activity in 2Kgs 11:12. The plural of v. 11 continues in v. 12aβ, whereas v. 12aα is a later addition to 2Kgs 11 that disturbed the original plural subjects of the verse. For the editorial history of 2Kgs 11, see Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja*, 18–19, 45–46. In v. 12aα, which is an addition, the verbs (*וּיֹצֵא* and *וַיִּתֵּן*) are in the singular, and it is implied that Jehoiada is the subject, whereas it is probable that the guards (*הַרְצִים*) are the original subject of v. 12aβ. The MT of 2Kgs 11:12 probably preserves the oldest text, whereas 2Chr 23:11 as well as the LXX of 2Kgs 11:12 have secondarily attempted to correct the disturbance between the subjects, both in their own way. The verbs were changed to singular and thus Jehoiada was made the only subject of the LXX of 2Kgs 11:12aα. Only in v. 12b does the LXX preserve the plural (clapping of the hands and the hailing of the new king), and it is implied that the soldiers are the subjects.

⁴³ The gesture is otherwise met only in Ezek 6:11; 21:19, 21; 22:13.

⁴⁴ The longer reading in the LXX of 2Chr 23:18 should be preferred as original. The MT is missing an equivalent of *καὶ ἀνέστησεν τὰς ἐφημερίας τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν Λευιτῶν*, probably caused by a homoioteleuton, as assumed by many, for example, Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 1955, 272.

2Chr 23:18

וַיִּשֶׂם יְהוֹיָדָע פְּקֻדֹת בַּיִת יְהוָה
בְּיַד הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם אֲשֶׁר חָלַק דָּוִד עַל-בַּיִת
יְהוָה לְהַעֲלוֹת עֹלוֹת יְהוָה בְּכַתוּב בְּתוֹרַת
מֹשֶׁה בְּשִׁמְחָה וּבְשִׂיר עַל יְדֵי דָוִד

2Kgs 11:18

... וַיִּשֶׂם הַכֹּהֵן פְּקֻדֹת עַל-בַּיִת יְהוָה

It is not surprising that the Chronicler reacted to this reference by expanding it to a more detailed instruction on tasks relating to the temple, with the priests and Levites playing a major role. Similar expansions are common in many other parts of 1–2Chr as well, and in fact, this is a typical expansion of the older text that one commonly assumes to have taken place in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. Nevertheless, the comparison of the parallel accounts has shown that such classical expansions are only one of the many techniques used by the Chronicler to edit and reuse the source in his composition.

C. Summary

2Chr 23 contains various positions towards the source text, which was a version of 2Kgs 11 relatively close to the MT. The comparison of these two passages bears evidence to the editorial processes of the Hebrew Bible and shows how a source text was used to create a new version that describes the same events. The differences also show how the Chronicler related to the source text. Although Biblical scholarship has invested considerable attention to reconstruct the earlier sources of various compositions, there has been notably little discussion on the consequences of the differences between 1–2Kings and 1–2Chr for understanding the editorial processes during the when much or most of the Hebrew Bible was written. Although only a short sample, this passage challenges some assumptions made in the investigation of the editorial history of the Hebrew Bible.

Most of the differences with the source are consistent with the theological conceptions and ideals of the Chronicler, known from other parts of Chronicles. Like in many other passages, the Chronicler increased the role of the priests, Levites and the Temple. Many of the additions or plusses in relation to 2Kgs 11 are not large in number of words but they still had substantial impact on the text and fundamentally changed the message of the passage. It is noteworthy that many of the additions did not have any notable kernel in the source text. They were added because of the Chronicler's conviction. For example, the priests and Levites were added because the Chronicler assumed that they should have had a role. In view

of the source text these additions can be characterized as inventions that do not have a textual basis in the older text, although one may see logic in the way they were created on the basis of the older text.

In addition to the expansions, 2Chr 22:10–23:21 bears witness to much more radical interventions to the text: Parts of 2Kgs 11 were omitted and/or rewritten. The rewritings range from small changes of individual words (e.g., בית יהוה to בית האלהים) to larger rewritings of details, actors and events (e.g., the main actors of the rebellion). The Chronicler replaced some of the omitted parts with an entirely new version of the events, but there are also examples of omissions without any substitute in the Chronicler's text. The Chronicler apparently did not feel obliged to render everything in the source, and since the omissions mainly occur where the source is in disagreement with the Chronicler's theological conceptions, it is evident that he did not omit parts of the text because he agreed with the source.⁴⁵

Although the Chronicler had a high regard of 1–2Kings, he could apparently rewrite or omit any of its part, if it did not correspond to his own views of the past or if it conflicted with his theological conceptions. The Chronicler did not have to explain or interpret any part of the older text, and instead, contradictions and perceived errors were simply omitted and, if necessary, replaced with a new text. There are several cases where correcting or revising would much better describe his attitude towards the older text than interpreting. The replacement of the soldiers and mercenaries with the priests and Levites is the most illustrative example of this.

Despite considerable freedoms to omit, add and rewrite, the Chronicler did not invent the past freely. He was evidently convinced that the text in 2Kgs 11 preserved important and even authoritative

⁴⁵ Nevertheless, it is clear that not all omissions are caused by theological problems or the Chronicler's disagreement with something in the source. As noted by Ben Zvi, *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*, 92, "It has been shown again and again that these supposed 'lacks' should not be construed as evidence for a denial or for an implied request to dismiss or devalue the periods that are not mentioned, not their main figures." This certainly applies to many passages (or figures like Moses, as pointed out by Ben Zvi). One should not make it a general rule that if something is missing in Chronicles in relation to his sources, it must have been against the Chronicler's convictions. However, when we can establish a parallel where the source text evidently contradicts the Chronicler's conceptions that can be reconstructed on the basis of his work and when the Chronicler is clearly using the text but leaves out details or replaces them with something that explicitly contradicts the source, it is fair to assume that the Chronicler was not in agreement with the source and that the omission was caused by a theological or other reason. The passages investigated here have provided many such examples. In the end, each passage has to be investigated separately to understand what the Chronicler's position to his source was in that case.

information about Jehoiada's rebellion. He copied much of 2Kgs 11 word-for-word, which shows that he regarded this account as a generally reliable text which could function as the starting point for Jehoiada's rebellion. However, this was done only to a point where the source text did not contradict his theological conceptions. Most of the changes are theological corrections. The Chronicler's text is the result of an interrelationship between the source and his own theological conceptions. The fact that much of the source was preserved in Chronicles should not distract from seeing that his theological conceptions had the overhand if they conflicted with the source.⁴⁶ Although the source was assumed to have considerable historical authority, it had to be corrected theologically. Where the source text was changed, there is no question that the Chronicler regarded his own version more relevant and correct than 2Kings 11.

Bibliography:

- Ackroyd, Peter R. *I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*. Torah Bible Paperbacks; London: SCM Press, 1973.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*. London and Oakville: Equinox, 2006.
- Curtis, Edward L. *Books of Chronicles*. ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.
- De Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Halle, 1806–07.
- Ehrlich, Carl S. "Carites," *ABD* I (1992): 872.
- Galling, Kurt. *Die Bücher der Chronik*. ATD 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.
- Fohrer, Georg. *Exegese des Alten Testaments. Einführung in die Methodik*. Uni Taschenbücher 267; Heidelberg and Wiesbaden: Quelle u. Meyer, 1989.
- Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles*. Old Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- . *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums, Bd. 9; revised edition, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Publishing, 1997.
- Keil, C. F. *Chronik, Esra, Nehemia, Esther*. BK, Leipzig: Dörffling u. Franke, 1870.
- Kalimi, Isaac. *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten*. BZAW 226, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Levin, Christoph. *The Old Testament*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- . *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja: Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte Judas im 9. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* SBS 105; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk 1982.
- McKenzie, Steven L. *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33, Atlanta, 1984.
- Myers, Jacob M. *II Chronicles*. Anchor Bible; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1965.

⁴⁶ This does not mean that 1–2Kgs would not have had considerable theological influence on the Chronicler. See Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 55.

- Noth, Martin. *The Chronicler's History*. JSOT Supplement Series 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Peltonen, Kai. "Function, Explanation and literary phenomena: aspects of Source Criticism as theory and method in the history of Chronicles Research." Pages 18–69 in *Chronicler as Author*; Eds. P. Graham and S. McKenzie; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Chronikbücher*. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1955.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Steins, Georg. *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik*. BBB 9, Weinheim, 1995.
- Steuernagel, Carl. *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1912.
- Tigay, Jeffrey. *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- Torrey, Charles C. *Ezra Studies*. New York: Ktav Publishing House (Reprinted 1970), 1910.
- Willi, Thomas. *Die Chronik als Auslegung. Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1972.
- Williamson, Hugh G. M. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.