

1 and 2 Chronicles as a discourse of power



Author:

Ananda Geysler-Fouche¹ 

Affiliation:

¹Department Old Testament and Hebrew Scriptures, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

Research Project Registration:

Project Leader: Ananda Geysler-Fouche 

Project Number: u01258230

Corresponding author:

Ananda Geysler-Fouche,
ananda.geysler-fouche@up.ac.za

Description: This research is part of the research project 'Second Temple Literature and Qumran' directed by Prof. Dr Ananda Geysler-Fouché, Department of Old Testament and Hebrew Scriptures, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria.

Dates:

Received: 08 Aug. 2022

Accepted: 11 Oct. 2022

Published: 17 Feb. 2023

How to cite this article:

Geysler-Fouche, A., 2023, '1 and 2 Chronicles as a discourse of power', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 79(1), a8011. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v79i1.8011>

Copyright:

© 2023. The Author.
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

Read online:



Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

This article reflected a comparison of 1 and 2 Chronicles with its source documents. It transpires that the history of Israel and Judah is selectively retold by the authors of Chronicles with deliberate omissions and additions reflecting a certain emphasis. While the northern kingdom is negatively portrayed, the southern kingdom is positively evaluated. David is idealised as the perfect king. He is credited with founding the religious cult, which is contradicting the view in Exodus. The Jerusalem temple cult is legitimised and asserted as representing the only accurate religion. Chronicles 1 and 2 secured the temple elite's position by legitimising their actions, functioning in this community as a discourse of power for as long as the (second) temple existed. Being a discourse of power, it set margins and excluded various groups usually considered part of the people of YHWH. The destruction of the (second) temple led to the disempowerment of this text, opening the way for it to be included in the Hebrew canon. The key insights of this article were that 1 and 2 Chronicles were used as a discourse of power, but the power block was lifted once the second temple was destroyed.

Contribution: This article fitted into the scope of the journal by using historical-critical methods but also concepts from poststructuralism, namely the concept of powers behind texts and in language.

Keywords: Chronicles; discourse; power; exclusive language; second temple; post-exilic texts; identity; poststructuralism.

Introduction

Over the past few decades, linguistic and textual studies have unlocked new ways of interpreting and understanding texts. Philosophical impulses mostly contributed to this rekindling of views. Notions such as 'intratextuality', 'intertextuality', 'extratextuality', 'master narrative', and 'contra narrative' started to play a key role in studies on literature and associated discourses. These studies disclosed that texts are always in a relationship with other texts or reactions to them – they never exist in isolation. As texts are socially determined, there are always different narratives about the same event. Counternarratives are set up against master narratives – not to replace the master narratives but to 'de-dogmatise' them. Counternarratives aim to counter the tendency of master narratives to totalise or marginalise; they contest the master narrative's claim to universal truth (cf. Breytenbach 1997:1166). Contexts and social environments control the content of texts.

Consequently, no narrative, record or historical account can be objective. The social context motivates the historiographer to retell history with his or her selection of material, nuance and emphasis. Concerning the purpose of historiography, Jeismann (1985) emphasises two matters in particular: history is told or written, whether deliberately or unwittingly, to justify one's identity in the present, as well as to legitimise present claims. He summarises it as follows:

- *Vorstellung von Vergangenheit prägt Gegenwartsbewusstsein in einer tiefen, sozialpsychischen, weit ins Unbewusste reichenden Schicht durch die Fundamentierung von Identitätsempfinden und -bewusstsein.*
- *Eine zweite, klar auszumachende Funktion des Rückgriffs auf Geschichte ist die der Legitimierung von Zuständen oder Ansprüchen.* (pp. 13ff)

Deist (1995) refers to the power plays behind authoritative works and asks the question of who the *interest group* is:

Tradition is not static, though. As time and living conditions change, the social fabric of the group changes and with it, the group's sense of *identity* – and therefore also tradition itself (*author's own emphasis*). (p. 67)

Deist (1995:70) says that the creation of canons is the work of elitist groups. He says that a canon can be used to legitimise the exclusion of outsiders, and once it has been established, the canon is

safeguarded by the chosen 'elite' to which the power has been granted (see also Van Rooy 1994:164).

Without going in-depth into literature terminology, the author would like to define the concept of 'discourse of power' as understood in this article. It is a discourse or text that a narrator creates in a specific context to empower a specific group and strengthen their identity, legitimising their claims, actions and conduct and simultaneously excluding another group or other groups.¹ A discourse of power always originates in specific circumstances and is written for specific circumstances. A discourse of power can therefore only operate as such for as long as the context for which it was written prevails. When circumstances change, the text can strictly no longer function as or be described as a discourse of power.²

This article aims to enquire about the power plays behind Chronicles 1 and 2, as it was written with nuances, omissions and additions. The Chronicler³ used the source documents (Genesis, Samuel, Kings and smaller selections from other sources – Auld 1999) extremely selectively while claiming that Chronicles constituted a historical record (Beentjes 2002; Japhet 1993; Jonker 2007c; Klein 2006; Knoppers 2003a, 2004). The questions of interest are the following: 'Who could gain from this retelling of history? Who were the powers behind 1 and 2 Chronicles?'

To answer these questions, it is necessary to consider the following aspects. Firstly, the context or circumstances in which these texts were written have to be determined. Secondly, a comparison should be made between Chronicles and its source documents, and the most obvious discrepancies within context have to be identified. Then, it will be possible to identify the Chronicler's ideology as a point of departure. Finally, with the ideology and the context (social text) in mind, it will be possible to see if and how Chronicles could function as a discourse of power.

The possible context of 1 and 2 Chronicles

Exact dating for this book is impossible. However, the language can be used to determine an approximate date (Japhet 1968). Certain words in Chronicles are foreign to the Old Testament but are found in postexilic literature, rabbinical

1.Philosophers from the poststructuralist paradigm explored the concept of power(s) behind texts. They were Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Julia Kristeva and Jean-François Lyotard (to name but a few). See also Beukes (1996, 2012), Bourdieu (1991, 1995), Degenaar (1995), Dews (1984), Goldstein (ed. 1994), Geysler-Fouché (2016), Keane (1992) and Kristeva (1980), Lernout (1987), Nel and Van Den Berg (1995), Poster (1984), Readings (1991), Van Gorp, Delabastita and Ghesquire (1990), Van Heerden (1994) and Viljoen (1993).

2.The history of communism in Russia is a good example. The texts that had to legitimise this regime effectively lost their power when Boris Yeltsin declared Russia independent and instituted democracy.

3.The term 'Chronicler' is used in this study to refer to the author(s) of the books 1 and 2 Chronicles. The usage of this term does not indicate that the author believes that the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles are a unit. It can be noted that for many years, scholars believed that Ezra and Nehemiah could also be included in the work composed by this author (cf. Blenkinsopp 1988:47–54; Fensham 1982:2–4). It is, however, now generally accepted that linguistic and theological research has shown this not to be the case (Duke 1999:11; Japhet 1968:331–332; Klein 2001:385; Smith 2010:4). The term 'Chronicler' might refer to one or more authors. 'Chronicles', unless specified, in this article refers to both books together.

literature, the Targum and manuscripts from Qumran. Some of these are typically part of the language used in the time of the second temple. Terminology associated with the cult and the temple is also more often found in this book than in others (Williamson 1977:45–47). Likewise, some expressions which originated relatively late, as well as standard expressions usually associated with the temple, are found in Chronicles. Language and terminology found in the rabbinical literature, the Targum and the Qumran documents are also common in this book (Williamson 1977:48–59). The vocabulary may sometimes be unusual compared with the rest of the Hebrew Bible but is quite unremarkable compared to rabbinical Hebrew or that of the Mishnah and the Targumim (Kalimi 2005:278).

Williamson (1977:83) lists the arguments most frequently used for dating Chronicles to the late Persian Era. Firstly, it is evident from the document's content that the author had no information postdating the Persian Era (cf. 2 Chr 36:21). Secondly, there are no linguistic or ideological indications of any Hellenistic influence. Thirdly, some aspects point to the late rather than early Persian Era (cf., *inter alia*, 1 Chr 3:17–24). Fourthly, the coins (darics) referred to in 1 Chronicles 29:7, are generally assumed to be the Persian darics minted by Darius I (see also Wilcock 1987 for a discussion of the dating). Kalimi (2005:1) states that it is generally assumed that the book was collated during the second temple period, based on the language used and references to characters and events from the Persian Era. The general viewpoint scholars subscribe to is that Levites wrote the book (cf., among others, Labahn 2003:115; Smith 1984:257).

It is difficult to give an entire picture of the sociopolitical circumstances prevailing at that time, because not many historical writings from this time are available (cf. Grabbe 1994; Riley 1993; Smith 1984:219–247 as well as Smith 1987:113, for a discussion of religious life [the cult] in Jerusalem during the Persian Era). Scholars have studied extrabiblical documents and sources to describe the social structure. According to Smith (1984:219), priestly families, which were part of the greater tribe of the Levites, fulfilled priestly functions in the Israelite sanctuaries. When foreign invasions and internal reformations destroyed the provincial sanctuaries, the priests from the Jerusalem temple prohibited the provincial Levites from performing any services in the temple. In the time of Nehemiah, they became the ruling group because Nehemiah had summoned them to Jerusalem. He used them as guards in the temple and offered them 10% of the duty raised on agricultural products from the province as remuneration. Once they were stationed in the temple, they started performing all kinds of functions in the temple. Carroll (1994) and Clines (1994) argue that the second temple was not very important to the writers of the Bible. They argue that holding on to the Jerusalem temple was a sectarian activity that represented the interests of only a minor group and that the rebuilding of the temple was not in the interest of the people. They point out that it was a prestige project encouraged by the elite and undertaken to serve their vanity.

Clines's view of Judean history leaves much room for debate and is, in the author's view, too radical. Nevertheless, he correctly points out the enrichment of the temple personnel, the fact that they were an elitist group (a remnant of the 'true Israel') as well as the fact that, by implication, they wanted to force the temple cult upon the rest of Israel (cf. also Albertz 2003:2).⁴

Selective omissions and additions in the use of the source documents

It was mentioned earlier that historiography is characterised by selecting, nuancing and emphasising sources to adapt them to the author's situation (cf. Duke 1999; Kalimi 2005). The phenomenon of selective presentation in Chronicles has also been referred to. Some aspects are emphasised and nuanced through selective writing (cf. Riley 1993:28). Specific attention will be devoted below to the selections made from the available sources when Chronicles was written and to the over-emphasising and under-emphasising of facts.

Genealogies

The first nine chapters of Chronicles contain genealogical lists.⁵ From the outset, the Chronicler used genealogies to include certain groups and exclude others. In the first section (1 Chr 1:1–2:1), the ancestors are listed from Adam to the twelve sons of Israel. 1 Chronicles 1:1–4 lists the names of the persons between Adam and Noah. From verses 5 to 23, the genealogy is that of Noah's sons, and in verses 38 to 54, there is material concerning the Edomites. There are ten generations from Adam to Noah (1 Chr 1:1–4a). This ten-generation line splits from 1 Chronicles 1:4b, but a second line runs from Noah's son Shem to Abraham (1 Chr 1:17–28), Isaac (1 Chr 1:34) and Israel (i.e. Jacob, cf. 1 Chr 2:1–2 as well as 1 Chr 1:24–28, 34). The line continues through Judah, Hezron (1 Chr 2:3–9), Jesse, David (1 Chr 2:1, 3–5, 9–15) and the twenty successive kings up to Zedekiah (1 Chr 3:1, 5, 10–16). It ends after the Babylonian exile, with the youngest generation (1 Chr 3:17–24).

Although this genealogy as a whole is very important, the immediate family of each important person in the main line receives special attention. Families mentioned include, for example, the family of Noah (1 Chr 1:4), Israel (Jacob, 1 Chr 2:1–2), Jesse and David (1 Chr 2:13–16, 3:1–9) and Josiah and Jehoiakim (1 Chr 3:15–16). Where these additions are inserted, the first son mentioned may be the oldest, as in the case of Noah's son Shem (1 Chr 1:4) and Jacob's son Reuben (1 Chr 2:1), but it can also be a younger but more important descendant, as in the case of Abraham's son Isaac (1 Chr 1:28). The lists are evidently borrowed from

Genesis.⁶ There are points of correspondence with the material in Genesis, but the two versions are not identical. The genealogies in Chronicles do not represent a natural line but rather those of the 'chosen' group. Except for two sections (1 Chr 1:32–33, Abraham's descendants; and 1 Chr 2:1–2, Israel's (Jacob's) descendants), the same sequence is used as in Genesis. Putting Ishmael and his descendants first, the story of Keturah ends up in a different place than one would expect based on Genesis 25 (cf. 1 Chr 1:29–31 with Gn 25:13–16 and Gn 25:1–4). Where nominative constructions ('the son of') were regularly used earlier, a verb is used in the latter case to make it clear that Abraham *begat* Isaac. In 1 Chronicles 1:34, the verb *yalad* (יָלַד) is used to emphasise the bloodline. When reference is made to Abraham's line, it literally reads: 'and he, Abraham, *begat* Isaac and Israel'. According to the Pentateuch, Abraham is the father of all Hebrews; consequently, it was very important for the narrator in Chronicles to emphasise the bloodline, namely that Abraham is Israel's direct grandfather.

The second section of the genealogies runs from 1 Chronicles 2:2 to 4:23. It can be divided into the following three parts: 1 Chronicles 2:3–55 records the first part of the genealogy of the tribe of Judah; 1 Chronicles 3:1–24 records the dynasty of David; 1 Chronicles 4:1–23 records the second part of the genealogy of Judah. Immediately after the twelve sons of Jacob (Israel) are mentioned, the spotlight falls on Judah (1 Chr 2:3). In order of birth, he is fourth in line, but as he is (and will be) significant in Chronicles, he is mentioned first. Judah is also foregrounded in 1 Chronicles 5:1–2 (see a later discussion in this regard). The fact that David's monarchy is put at the centre of Judah's genealogy is quite conspicuous, as is the fact that there is no mention of the Bathsheba narrative (cf. 2 Sm 11); in 1 Chronicles 3:5, even her name is changed. There it is said that Solomon's mother was called Bath-shua. The place where Shelah's genealogy is recorded is also curious. Because he was Judah's only surviving son, one would expect him to be mentioned first (in 1 Chr 2:3). However, he is mentioned last (1 Chr 4:21–23). This is because the Chronicler needed a particular family tree to fit David into Tamar's line. Another conspicuous omission in this part of Chronicles is that no mention is made of Tamar and Judah's episode of fornication, related at length in Genesis 38. By omitting the Judah-Tamar episode, David's image remains untarnished. The Chronicler thus succeeds in putting Judah and Tamar in a more favourable light. From Tamar's descendants was born Jesse, the father of David. 1 Chronicles 2:3–4:23 uses mainly its own material. Only when it comes to David do some borrowings from other Old Testament texts occur. In 1 Chronicles 2:9–15, there are correspondences with Ruth 4:18–22. In 1 Chronicles 3:1–9, a

4. It is important to mention in this regard the later developments in the studies of Chronicles and in this regard to refer specifically to Knoppers (2003b), who was one of the first voices to introduce the idea that Chronicles was influenced by Greek historiography and classical Greek writers. See also the arguments of Jonker (2008) concerning the international influence on Chronicles.

The aspect of the Persian imperial context is thoroughly discussed by Wiesehöfer (2007a, 2007b, 2009) and is a very valuable information concerning the possible context of Chronicles.

5. See also the article of Gary Knoppers (2003b) which deals mainly with genealogies in Chronicles.

6. 1 Chronicles 1:1–4 – from Adam to Noah – Genesis 5:1–32; Chronicles 1:5–7 – descendants of Japheth – Genesis 10:2–4; 1 Chronicles 1:8–16 – descendants of Ham – Genesis 10:6–8, 13–18; 1 Chronicles 1:17–23 – descendants of Shem – Genesis 10:22–29; 1 Chronicles 1:24–27 – patriarchs from Shem to Abraham – Genesis 11:10–26; 1 Chronicles 1:28 – sons of Abraham – own material; 1 Chronicles 1:29–31 – sons of Ishmael – Genesis 25:13–16; 1 Chronicles 1:32–33 – sons of Abraham up to Keturah – Genesis 25:1–4; 1 Chronicles 1:34 – Abraham's grandchildren via Isaac: Esau and Israel – Genesis 25:19–26; 1 Chronicles 1:35–37 – descendants of Esau – Genesis 36:4–5, 9–14; 1 Chronicles 1:38–42 – descendants of Esau – Genesis 36:20–28; 1 Chronicles 1:43–50 – kings of Edom – Genesis 36:31–39; 1 Chronicles 1:51–54 – clans of Edom after the death of Hadad – Genesis 36:4–43; and 1 Chronicles 2:1–2 – sons of Israel – Exodus 1:2–4.

few verses from 2 Samuel 3 and 5 are used. The Chronicler uses numbers to indicate each of Jesse's sons. According to this numbering, David was the seventh (1 Chr 2:15). The fact that the numbers are specifically mentioned and that, according to Samuel, in 1 Samuel 16:10–11 and 17:12–14, he was the *eighth* son of Jesse once again shows the emphasis that David had to be given. Because seven indicates perfection, the Chronicler manipulates the narrative, making David the seventh child (Kalimi 2005:367 also refers to this). Compared with the rest of the genealogies, the space given to David's genealogy (1 Chr 2:13–17; 3:1–9) and the rest of his family in the tribe of Judah (1 Chr 2:18–55) is quite generous.

It is worth noting that Abraham and Moses, with whom YHWH had made covenants, are not mentioned as special in the genealogy lists; they are merely mentioned in passing. In Chronicles, Moses is only mentioned in connection with the cult or religion.⁷ The scant attention YHWH's covenants with Abraham and Moses received in Chronicles was apparently motivated by the emphasis on the image of David. Moreover, these two persons also represent theologies that conflict with the ideology of Chronicles. What they represent does not correlate with the ideal figure Chronicles creates in the person of David. Besides, both are associated too closely with the northern kingdom. Abraham sacrificed in Shechem and many other places, and Moses in the tabernacle throughout the wanderings in the desert, but he was never in Jerusalem.

Furthermore, Abraham's wanderings brought him into contact with numerous other peoples with whom he had dealings – a practice strongly discouraged in Chronicles. For example, he visited Ur of the Chaldeans (thus the Babylonians), Haran of the Western Semitic Amorites and the Arameans (cf. also Gn 12:6; 13:7b; 23; 12:10–20 and 20). Such conduct does not befit the ideal Judean described in Chronicles. In the Pentateuch, Abraham is described as the father of many nations, whereas in Chronicles, YHWH has only one chosen nation, namely the Judeans who worshipped in the temple in Jerusalem following the proper instructions. Likewise, the entire history of the entry into the Promised Land is ignored, as it conflicts with the perspective of Chronicles. Even in the enumeration of the descendants of Ephraim (1 Chr 7:20–29), where Joshua is mentioned by name, there is no reference to the fact that he led the people into the Promised Land. It is also said that Manasseh's descendants (1 Chr 7:29) had lived in the region from the beginning. This differs from the accounts given in Joshua and Judges.

7. Compare, *inter alia*, 1 Chronicles 15:15, according to which the Levites carried the ark the way Moses had commanded; in 1 Chronicles 21:29, reference is made to the tabernacle built by Moses in the desert; 1 Chronicles 22:13 says that the people will prosper if they keep the commandments given by Moses; 1 Chronicles 23:13 points out that Moses' descendants were counted among the tribe of Levi; 1 Chronicles 26:24 mentions that Shebuel, from the descendants of Moses, was chief officer in charge of the treasuries; 2 Chronicles 1:3 mentions that all the people went to the tent of meeting erected by Moses; 2 Chronicles 5:10 mentions that there was nothing more in the ark than the tables Moses put into it at Horeb; in 2 Chronicles 8:13, it says that the people had to sacrifice as commanded by Moses; 2 Chronicles 24:6, 9 emphasise the taxes as instituted by Moses; 2 Chronicles 25:4 refers to the law as the book of Moses and says that the king acted accordingly; 2 Chronicles 30:16 points out that the priests and the Levites took their posts at the Passover as commanded in the law of Moses; 2 Chronicles 33:8 asserts that the future of the people would be assured as long as they kept the law of Moses; according to 2 Chronicles 34:14, the Book of Law that was found was that of Moses, and in 2 Chronicles 35:6,12 it is pointed out that the Passover and sacrifices were brought as commanded by Moses.

The narrative about Reuben draws immediate attention. Although Reuben was the firstborn, he committed incest, so Joseph took his place. Ultimately, Judah assumed the place of the firstborn, as one of his descendants became king (1 Chr 5:1–2). This is quite obviously an own amendment and interpretation of the author(s) of Chronicles to comment on the existing or traditional text.

1 Chronicles 5:27–6:66 lists the descendants of Levi and describes the services they rendered. The same amount of time and space is devoted to the discussion of this tribe as to all the other tribes put together. The author(s) of Chronicles wanted to set this tribe apart and accentuate it. Beentjes (2002:54) points out that in the first section (1 Chr 5:27–41), certain parts of the existing narrative (Gn 46:11; Ex 6:16–25; Nm 3:17–39, 26:57–61) are used but that they are arranged and presented differently. Levi's son Kohath is put in the spotlight. Each time, the person who rendered service is mentioned first (Kohath, Amram, Aaron, Eleazar, Phinehas, etc.). In this way, a direct line of descent is created from Aaron and Eleazar up to the exile. This selection practically excludes Moses, who is mentioned only as the brother of Aaron and Miriam. It is also striking that the construction of the temple is specifically referred to, as well as the priest in office at the time (1 Chr 5:36). It is clear that the author(s) of Chronicles regarded the temple officials, especially the priests and the Levites, and the services they performed, as extremely important.

The emphasis on the temple personnel can be seen in several places. One example is that this genealogy of the priests ends with the priests serving during the time of David. In the last section of this pericope (1 Chr 6:39–66), there are distinct correlations with Joshua 21. Again, the selection and placement of the material are important. Whereas in Joshua 21:2 and 8, it is specifically stated that YHWH gave the instructions to Moses, Chronicles does not mention this (1 Chr 6:49).

1 Chronicles 8:1–40 presents the genealogy of Benjamin. At first glance, this seems odd, as a genealogy was already presented in 1 Chronicles 7:6–11. However, Chronicles needed to make a clear distinction between a part of the tribe associated with the northern kingdom and another, larger part mentioned in 1 Chronicles 8, which was evidently more important. In this pericope, the name Benjamin is the first (8:1) and the last (8:40) word. The emphasis put on this tribe strongly resembles the emphasis on the other two important tribes in Chronicles, to wit the tribes of Judah (1 Chr 2:3–4:23) and Levi (1 Chr 5:27–6:66). Like these two tribes, Benjamin's tribe is presented with an extensive list of descendants. These three tribes, therefore, are also presented in Chronicles as the ones who had remained unconditionally faithful to David and the Jerusalem temple before the exile.

Beentjes (2002:73) considers 1 Chronicles 9:1 as a closure that is theologically heavily loaded ('[D]e omvang van alle stammen, van heel Israël is nu officieel vastgelegd'), as it indicates that 'all Israel' has now been officially registered and it is beyond

dispute who belongs to Israel. He points out that the phrase 'all Israel' is used here for the first time in Chronicles but again another 40 times after this instance. The term is, in fact, own material and does not occur in the sources. The statement that they 'were written in the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah' also gives it greater weight. The fact that this verse states that Judah is taken into exile and the reason for the exile (unfaithfulness) also adds weight to its content. Beentjes (2002) prefers to view 1 Chronicles 9:1–2 as a unit:

De Kronist heeft nu immers in een lang exposé (2:3–9:2) alles van de stammen, het land en zijn inwoners in kaart gebracht. Nu kan hij zich eindelijk gaan concentreren op Jeruzalem, in het bijzonder op de tempel. (After all, the Chronicler has now, after a long exposition [2:3–9:2], set out everything about the tribes, the country and its inhabitants. Now he can finally focus on Jerusalem, especially on the temple). (p. 75 [author's own translation])

The second part of 1 Chronicles 9 (vv. 3–34) is a narrative of who resided in Jerusalem after the exile. The same expression encloses the section: 'And in Jerusalem dwelt [...]' (1 Chr 9:3) and '[...] these dwelt at Jerusalem' (1 Chr 9:34, KJB). Within the section, two pericopes can be distinguished. The first is the one in which the nation is described (1 Chr 9:3–9) and in which Judah and Benjamin and their descendants are again mentioned more specifically. It is concluded with the names of the heads of families. The second is the one in which those who served in the temple are mentioned (1 Chr 9:10–34). The fact that the temple personnel are discussed in more detail can be ascribed to the emphasis placed on them and their services in Chronicles, together with the emphasis on the temple and its cult. In 1 Chronicles 9:5, there is even a mention of 'Shilonites', which may refer to Shiloh and the sanctuary located there. This is an attempt to shift the historical importance of the cult site in Shiloh to Jerusalem. The place where the tabernacle was kept (Jos 18:1), where the ark once stood (1 Sm 1–7), the city of the Levites (Jos 21:2) and the religious centre of the northern kingdom (Jdg 21:19) are 'replaced' in Chronicles by the temple in Jerusalem.

The kings of Judah

The genealogies in Chronicles are followed by narrative material. Most of this material (1 Chr 10:1 to 36:16) consists of the narrative of the kings of Judah. Their conduct and obedience to YHWH are appraised by their participation and contribution to the temple cult of Jerusalem.

Saul

It is striking that immediately after Saul has been brought onto the stage, his demise is recounted (cf. Kalimi 2005:166: '[A]n author-creator [...] can express his attitude toward characters in his work [...] [in] the frequency with which he has them appear in a given episode'). The whole story of YHWH electing him as king (1 Sm 9–10), his good qualities (1 Sm 9:2; 10:23) and his anointment by the prophet Samuel are completely omitted in Chronicles. Neither his victories in war nor his conflict with David is mentioned. It is not mentioned that David used to be Saul's servant, either.

Further examples of the unfavourable light in which the Chronicler depicts Saul are the mentioning of his undignified death (that he committed suicide, 1 Chr 10:3–5) and that his corpse was left lying in the field for a few days before he was buried (1 Chr 10:8–12; cf. the narration in 2 Sm 31:1–13, according to which his corpse was hung from the wall in Beth-Shan) and that he was subsequently buried under a tree in Jabez, not in a family grave (cf. Kalimi 2005:326 for a discussion of the report about Saul's death).

A contrast between Saul and David is created by stating that David asked for help from YHWH before joining battle with the Philistines, whereas according to the account in Samuel (1 Sm 28:15), Saul, in a similar situation, invoked YHWH, but YHWH did not answer him. As this statement conflicts with the theology of Chronicles,⁸ the text was amended to read that he consulted a deceased person for information instead of YHWH (Kalimi 2005:327–328). This is also suggested as the reason for his condemnation, the termination of his reign and the election of David in his place (1 Chr 10:13–14): He was *unfaithful* (מַעַל) to YHWH. Saul's cultic transgression is not only implied using מַעַל but also by the statement וְלֹא־דָרַשׁ בַּיהוָה ('and he did not consult YHWH'). As following YHWH includes an interest in and involvement in the cult, it is obvious that Saul failed the cult. The contrast between him and David (who was concerned about the ark) is made very distinct in 1 Chronicles 13:3. Another negative association between Saul and the ark is the reference to his daughter Michal's discontent with David's cultic dance in front of the ark. Saul and David are contrasted more than once (Kalimi 2005:330–331). Because of Saul's unfaithfulness to the cult, he does not fit into the ideology of Chronicles and is therefore denigrated.

David

According to Chronicles, David received his kingship and reign from YHWH (1 Chr 10:14; 2 Chr 6:6). He was also the first to receive instructions from YHWH. His inauguration at Hebron by all of Israel is narrated in the beginning and again at the end of 1 Chronicles 11–12. This causes chronological irregularity. One would expect the conquest of Jerusalem to follow 1 Chronicles 12:39–41; instead, it is put immediately after 1 Chronicles 11:4–9. Only after he was anointed as the king did he conquer – as the leader of 'all Israel' – the city of Jerusalem. The narrative in 2 Samuel 5:4–5 is omitted from Chronicles. According to Samuel, David was king of Judah for seven years and six months, and after that, he reigned over the whole of Israel and Judah for another thirty-three years. According to Chronicles, he was king over 'all Israel' from the beginning. The references to David in Chronicles are not just favourable; there is a distinct preoccupation with him. Japhet (2009:292) describes Chronicles' treatment of David as follows: 'Chronicles begins its historical narrative with David; whatever

8.1 Chronicles 28:9: '[...] if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever' (KJV). Refer also to the article of Jonker (2010) wherein he not only discusses the differences with the Samuel text but also the theology of Chronicles and the possibility of reading it as interaction with the Persian imperial context.

2 Chronicles 15:2: '[...] The LORD is with you, while ye be with him; and if ye seek him, he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you' (KJV).

happened before David is not recounted as history'. Besides the references to him in the narration about his reign (1 Chr 11–29) and the genealogical material (1 Chr 2:9–17; 3:1–24), the name David, דָּוִד, appears in 76 other places. Kalimi (2005:167–170) points out the Chronicler's deliberate attempts to highlight the name דָּוִד. He does this by exchanging the term המֶלֶךְ [the king] with דָּוִד [David] (cf., *inter alia*, 2 Sm 24:2 with 1 Chr 21:2; 2 Sm 24:9 with 1 Chr 21:5; 2 Sm 24:20 with 1 Chr 21:21), by adding his name to the title 'king' (cf., *inter alia*, 2 Sm 24:24 with 1 Chr 21:24) and by exchanging direct speech with indirect speech, thereby using the personal name more often (cf., *inter alia*, 2 Sm 24:18, אל־דָּוִד בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ עֲלֵה הָקֵם לַיהוָה מִזְבֵּחַ וַיְבַאֲגֵד, with 1 Chr 21:18, וּמֵלֶאֱדָן יִהְיֶה אִמֶּר אֲלֵיגֵד לְאִמֶּר לְדָוִד כִּי יַעֲלֶה דָוִד לְהָקִים, (מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה).

Another example of source manipulation to enhance David's image is in 1 Chronicles 14:12 (Kalimi 2005:154–155). According to the account in Samuel (2 Sm 5:17–21), David and his men took the idols of the Philistines after vanquishing them. This act conflicts with the Torah's prescripts (Dt 7:25, cf. also Dt 7:5; 12:3) and depicts David as someone who either is ignorant of the commandment or disregards it. Of course, this does not sit well with how David is described in Chronicles. The Chronicler solves this dilemma by amending the text. It is stated that David not only destroyed these gods but also gave instructions that they had to be dealt with exactly as prescribed in the Torah (Kalimi 2005:156). David is portrayed as the chief patron and founder of the Jerusalem temple cult. This is evident in, among others, 1 Chronicles 6:38, where the list of priests ends with those who served during his reign. David is presented as one who watches over the cult. He selected and assigned the duties of the temple personnel himself (1 Chr 9:22). This assignment would be followed by subsequent generations (2 Chr 23:18; 29:25–30). David also fetched the ark from Kiriath-jearim to the place he had prepared for it by pitching a tent in Jerusalem (2 Chr 1:4). It was also he who had to build the altar for YHWH on the threshing floor of Ornan (1 Chr 21:18–22:5). David is depicted as a priest, or as performing priestly functions, among others in the narrative of the successful removal of the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem (1 Chr 15:1–16:43) and the fact that he blessed the people in the name of YHWH (1 Chr 16:2), an act that traditionally was a priestly privilege. David wanted to build YHWH a temple (2 Chr 2:6, 6:7) and supplied treasures for the future temple (2 Chr 5:1). Even the making of the musical instruments and songs of praise with which YHWH would be honoured are attributed to David (2 Chr 7:6); so are the shields that later found a place in the temple (2 Chr 23:9). The Chronicler holds up David's involvement in the temple and the cultic institutions as an example and a guideline for subsequent generations (2 Chr 33:7; 35:4, 15 and 2 Chr 8:14). Although he did not build the temple himself, he selected the site for it (1 Chr 21:18–22:1), provided the building materials (1 Chr 22:2–5, 14–16; 29:2–9, 17; cf. also 1 Chr 18:8–11) and organised the temple personnel for the cult (1 Chr 15:2–24; 16:4–7, 37–42; 23:2–26:32; 28:13, 21). David counted the Levites and decided on their tasks (1 Chr 23 and 26). He divided the priests into twenty-four groups (1 Chr 24

and counted and divided the holy singers (1 Chr 25) and the temple guards. He explicitly commanded his son, Solomon, to build the temple (1 Chr 22:6–19; 28:1–10, 20–21; 29:19), and, most importantly, he had received the plan (תְּבִינָה) for the temple directly from YHWH's hand (1 Chr 28:11–19). The fact that David is portrayed as receiving instructions directly from YHWH and establishing the temple and cult ceremonies, similar to the way Moses had received the Ten Commandments directly from YHWH and established the cult with the tabernacle and the ark, leaves an impression on the reader that David was a Moses *redivivus*. The statement that David had received the plan (תְּבִינָה) of the temple from the hand of YHWH is a direct contradiction of the remarks in Exodus that Moses saw the plan of the tabernacle and its contents on Sinai and built the sanctuary exactly like that (cf., e.g. Ex 25:40; 26:30; 27:8). Just as Moses only saw the Promised Land but never entered it, David organised and planned everything for the temple, yet he did not build it. Chronicles also mentions David's wealth, power and popularity (1 Chr 14:17). His power is evident from the number of representatives attending his inauguration as king in Hebron (1 Chr 12:23–40) and his redoubtable army (1 Chr 21:5–6), as well as the enormous budget for the building of the temple (1 Chr 22:14).

The adultery and murder committed by David (cf. 2 Sm 11) are not mentioned in Chronicles. All except one of the transgressions of David that are mentioned in the Books of Samuel and Kings are omitted in Chronicles. The only critical reference to David's conduct pertains to the census he undertook (1 Chr 21:1–22:1). The reason for its inclusion is the outcome, namely the selection of the site chosen for building the temple (2 Chr 3:1). David's last days and his death are portrayed positively by the Chronicler. In 1 Chronicles 28:2, David's speech is introduced with a specific mention of the fact that he stood 'on his feet' (וַיִּקָּם דָּוִד עַל־רַגְלָיו). In 1 Kings 1:1, he is described as 'old and stricken in years', without strength and a weakling. He was an old man, so cold that he had to be covered with blankets. A young girl had to lie in bed with him to keep him warm and look after him. But according to Chronicles, he remains the hero he was until his death. He stands upright and gives a prayer of praise while the whole assembly praises YHWH and bows before him and David (1 Chr 29:10–20). Explicit parts of the source texts were absent in Chronicles to put David in a more favourable light.

Solomon

The narrative of Solomon presented in Samuel does not convey a sense of general approval and unity among the king's sons. On the contrary, this is a story of revolt, of how Absalom, who wanted to destroy his father, killed his brother and spread the rumour that all the king's sons had been murdered (2 Sm 13:23–38, see also 2 Sm 14:28–32; 15:1–5; 15:7–17:29; 18; 19:41–43; 20:1–3, 4–13, 14–22 and 1 Ki 1:5–27). Chronicles omits all these references and merely mentions that all the people accepted Solomon and that all King David's sons took an oath of allegiance to King Solomon (cf., *inter alia*, 1 Chr 29:22–24). This part was inserted into

Chronicles to present David's line via Solomon as ideal, pure and in accordance with the will of YHWH. Furthermore, the Chronicler emphasises the general acceptance of Solomon's kingship by relating that he was inaugurated a second time (1 Chr 29:22): וימליכו שנית לשלמה בן-דוד:

The many similarities between the David and the Solomon narratives and the interwovenness of the two narratives are noticeable. Chronicles specifically states that Solomon's inauguration took place while David was still ruling Israel (1 Chr 23:1). It is also described how he ascended the throne while David was still alive (1 Chr 29:23). In the narrative about the kings after Solomon, there are three references to Solomon that link him to David (2 Chr 11:17, 33:7, 35:4). Chronicles specifically states that both kings were appointed by YHWH (cf. 1 Chr 10:13–14, 2 Chr 1:8–9; 2:11), as well as that both ruled for 40 years (1 Chr 29:27 and 2 Chr 9:30).

Solomon is therefore portrayed in the same positive light as David. As in the David narrative, Chronicles keeps quiet about the negative elements in the narrative about Solomon. Solomon's election as king is emphasised, which is also an election to build the temple. Chronicles portrays Solomon as one who is willing to give all for the temple and the cult, while other sources point out that he took foreign wives against YHWH's command (1 Ki 1:1–10) and built other shrines (1 Ki 11:6–8). Solomon's negotiations and alliances with other countries (1 Ki 9–10) are not mentioned in Chronicles either. Kalimi (2005:143–145) refers to 1 Kings 3:2, which tells how Solomon sacrificed at other shrines and argues that the Chronicler could not accept that Solomon would sacrifice at any place; even though the temple did not exist yet, it would have been contrary to the prescripts of the Torah (Lv 17:8–9). It would have been inconceivable to the Chronicler that Solomon would not have known the Torah or would not have obeyed it. The Chronicler attempts to explain this by amending the text (cf. 2 Chr 1:13a). Although there are parts of Chronicles in which more is told about Solomon himself, the greater part of the Solomon narrative deals with the building of the temple (1 Chr 3:1–7:11; 2 Chr 2:1–18). In 1 Chronicles 22:7–10 and 28:3, the difference between David and Solomon is explained: David could not build the temple because he had spilt blood in wars, whereas Solomon's capacity as a man of rest (איש מנוחה) allowed him to do it.⁹ In so doing, Chronicles not only provided a reason for the unalterable historical fact that Solomon and not David built the temple but also emphasised its holiness.

Kings of Judah after Solomon

The Chronicler evaluates all the kings after Solomon against the identity of David created in Chronicles. Their burial place was determined according to their cultic faithfulness or unfaithfulness. Because of the limited scope of this article, only some of the kings will be referred to, and only information relevant to the topic will be discussed.

⁹See in this regard the article of Jonker (2008), wherein he interprets the Books of Chronicles against the background of the international influence of the time and his reading of Solomon, the King of Peace, against this background.

In the narrative of the reign of Jehoshaphat, it is stated that he walked in the earlier ways of his father David (cf. also 2 Chr 17) and did not seek the Baalim (כי הלך בדרכי דוד אביו הראשנים ולא דרש לבעלים). Following the Baalim is described as a practice associated with the northern kingdom (2 Chr 17:3–4). The more detailed description of Jehoshaphat's good deeds in Chronicles includes the removal of the high places and holy groves (2 Chr 17:6), as well as sending out princes, priests and Levites to instruct the people in the Torah (תורה) (2 Chr 17:7–9). The rewards for his faithfulness can be seen in his wealth, peace and military power (2 Chr 17:2, 5, 10–19). The rest of his narrative tells of Jehoshaphat's faithfulness and that he became involved in a war from which he barely escaped with his life because he collaborated with the northern kingdom. He was saved only because he turned to YHWH. The story creates the impression that YHWH saved Jehoshaphat but not Ahab. YHWH's displeasure at the alliance is expressed through a seer. In 2 Chronicles 19:1, Jehu asks Jehoshaphat whether one should assist the ungodly and love those who hate YHWH. Verse 4 explains who the people of YHWH are, namely the inhabitants of the region from Beer-Sheba up to the mountains of Ephraim. Jehoshaphat again concluded a treaty with Israel (King Ahaziah) which YHWH frowned upon so that his fleet was destroyed (2 Chr 20:35–37); nevertheless, he was buried with his ancestors in the city of David. The Book of Kings does not describe his successes or acts in detail (1 Ki 22:41–51).

The versions of the story of Joash in Kings as well as Chronicles recount that Athaliah, the mother of Ahaziah, killed the royal family and that Joash was hidden in the house of YHWH by Jehoshabeath, the daughter of the king (according to 2 Chr 22:11, she was also the wife of Jehoiada), and that Athaliah reigned over the country for six years. After seven years, Jehoiada, the priest, made Joash king in the sanctuary. Joash's rescue and the eventual restoration of the throne are described as cultic acts by the cultic personnel in Chronicles. The fact that he was hidden in the temple for six years contributes to his image as a king associated with the cult. The story of Joash is the same in both versions (2 Ki 11:4–12 and 2 Chr 23–24), with a difference in emphasis in 2 Chronicles 24:2 and 2 Kings 12:3. Chronicles states that Joash did everything right in the eyes of YHWH all the days of Jehoiada the priest (כל-ימי יהוידע הכהן), whereas in Kings it says he did right all the days Jehoiada the priest *instructed* him (כל-ימי אשר הורהו יהוידע). Both versions report that Joash abolished the idols – all under the supervision of Jehoiada, the priest. Chronicles tells of the death of Jehoiada and that he was buried like a king, with the kings, because he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH and to the temple (2 Chr 24:15–16). Chronicles does not report (as stated in 2 Ki 24:17–25) how Joash strayed after Jehoiada's death or murdered Zechariah, who admonished him, or how YHWH punished him for it by the victory that Aram gained. Chronicles merely reports a conspiracy against him (cf. 2 Chr 24:25–26), that he was killed and buried with his fathers in the city of David (2 Chr 12:20–21). It does mention that he was buried in the city of David but states that he was not buried with the kings (2 Chr 24:25).

Uzziah and his reign are barely mentioned in Kings. It is mentioned that he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH, only he did not abolish the high places and was punished with leprosy by YHWH. Chronicles reports that he did what was right (2 Chr 26:4) but also mentions his successes, wealth and consequent pride (2 Chr 26:5–16). In his arrogance, he entered the temple and sacrificed there. The priests took him to task, he became cross with them and YHWH smote him with leprosy (2 Chr 26:16–21). The fact that these events are described in such detail is once again a technique employed by the Chronicler to highlight the sanctity of the temple and the exclusivity of the duties of the priests.

The transgressions of the cult committed by Ahaz are described in Chronicles as if they were endless. He made images, made unauthorised sacrifices and even burnt his sons (ויעברו את-בניו באש). Chronicles emphasises the number of times other nations took the city, the number of people killed and abducted and the amount of booty taken because they had forsaken YHWH (2 Chr 28:5–8 and 17–18). According to Chronicles, the prophet Obed criticised the Israelites (the northern kingdom) because they had carried off the Judeans. He clarified that this only happened because YHWH wanted to punish the Judeans for disobedience. It is then described how the Judeans were released and assisted to return to Jericho (2 Chr 28:9–15). This addition is made because the Chronicler wants to point out that the northern kingdom had gained the upper hand over Judah, not because they were any better than the Judeans but because YHWH allowed it.

In Chronicles, Hezekiah is portrayed as a second David (2 Chr 29–32). He repaired the temple (2 Chr 29:1–11), applied the prescribed rules for cleansing it and employed the correct temple personnel, the Levites and the priests, to cleanse and sanctify it (2 Chr 29:12–19).¹⁰ A major part of the Hezekiah narrative in Chronicles deals with his cultic activities, whereas the narrative in Kings does not have much to say about that. It is evidently an addition by the author(s) of Chronicles to underline the importance of the cult and the offices of the priests and the Levites.

Manasseh's evil deeds are compared with those of the nations expelled from Palestine to make room for Israel (2 Chr 33:2). He undid all Hezekiah's reforms (2 Chr 33:3–5, 7). Like Saul, he occupied himself with enchantments, witchcraft, divining and the summoning of spirits. He provoked and blasphemed against YHWH (2 Chr 33:3–5, 7). His punishment was that he was personally carried off in exile to Babylon. He repented and humbled himself there, after which YHWH heard his prayers and allowed him to return to Jerusalem. After his return, Manasseh embarked on a programme of cultic reforms (2 Chr 33:15–16). Nevertheless, it is stated that he was buried in his house and not with the revered kings (2 Chr 33:20), which probably indicates that Manasseh is

10. See also 2 Chronicles 29–31 for the description of the feast; the assistance the Levites gave with the sacrifices; the Passover and the thousands of offerings; as well as the fact that the people had to give the Levites and the priests their share so that they could remain true to the law.

remembered more for his aberrations than his conversion (which is not mentioned in Kings).¹¹

Josiah is described as a reformer who did what was right in the sight of YHWH from a young age, walked in the ways of his father David (2 Chr 34:2) and sought YHWH (דרש). He restored the cult in honour of YHWH by destroying the symbols of idolatry (2 Chr 34:3–7). He sent money to the high priest in the temple (2 Chr 34:9) and had the temple cleaned and repaired. The priest Hilkiah came across the Book of the Law when he brought out the money (2 Chr 34:10–15). The reading of the Book of Law gave Josiah new zeal to restore the covenant between YHWH and the nation (2 Chr 34:16–33). According to Kings, the idols were only destroyed once the covenant (2 Ki 23:4–24) had been restored. The money sent to the high priest is mentioned (2 Ki 22:4), but it is not mentioned that the Book of the Law was discovered when the money was taken out. Chronicles (2 Chr 35:18) also describes the celebration of Passover. In Kings, not a word is mentioned about all the thousands of sacrifices or the participation of the priests and the Levites. In Chronicles, this is an addition to the source text to underline the importance of the cult and the offices of the priests and Levites.

The exile

The exile, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple and the capture of the treasures are described much more briefly in Chronicles (2 Chr 36:17) than in Kings (2 Ki 25:1–30).¹² It is all mentioned in passing, so to speak, after which it is stated that the exile lasted until the establishment of the Persian kingdom (2 Chr 36:20), so that the word of Jeremiah concerning the Sabbath would be fulfilled (2 Chr 36:21). Chronicles concludes with Cyrus giving the Jews permission to return to their country, stating that he was doing this at the command of YHWH so that they could build a house for YHWH again (2 Chr 36:22–23). With this addition, the Chronicler wanted to legitimise the building of the second temple and motivate it theologically: it was a command from YHWH to Cyrus.

The result of the selective additions, omissions and emphasis

The above discussion has made it clear that the source material was used selectively and that the Chronicler had a free hand regarding additions, omissions and emphasis. In this part, these selections' effect on the text's understanding is scrutinised. The omissions, additions and emphasis are referred to only through examples where they support the argument. Different groups and matters are evaluated in Chronicles. Three tribes are particularly singled out: Judah (1 Chr 2:3–4:23), which is associated with the southern

11. In the narrative about Manasseh's life and reign, his conversion is mentioned twice (2 Chr 33:112–113 and 23), with the aim of describing his life as an example of the life of the Judeans. According to the narratives, he was forgiven after his conversion. In this way, the Chronicles narrative wanted to emphasise that Judah, which had also been carried off but repented and returned to Jerusalem and the temple, could once again claim YHWH's forgiveness and acceptance, to the extent that they were the only ones who could make that claim.

12. See also Japhet (1999, 2009:284–292) and Jonker (2007b) for a discussion on the exile in Chronicles.

kingdom, is portrayed as being faithful to the house of David; Levi (1 Chr 5:27-6:66), associated with the temple cult, is portrayed as being faithful to the temple; and Benjamin (1 Chr 8:1-9:1), which is also associated with the southern kingdom, is also portrayed as being faithful to the house of David. In Chronicles, these tribes are held up as the real Israel. This is obvious from how they receive special mention in the book. While the three tribes are judged positively, the northern kingdom is portrayed negatively. It is obvious that the history of only one kingdom, the southern kingdom, is narrated. The northern kingdom is referred to only where it happens to form part of the Judah narrative (see also Kalimi 2005:88-89). The points of departure underlying this attitude can be discerned in Abijah's speech (2 Chr 13:4-12), as well as in the narrative of the reign of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17-20). The northern kingdom represented a revolt against YHWH. Only Judah was the true kingdom of YHWH (2 Chr 13:8). The righteous in the northern kingdom who wished to seek YHWH left their houses and went to Jerusalem to sacrifice there (2 Chr 11:16, 15:9, 30:11). Japhet (2009:242) refers to research about the attitude of the author(s) of Chronicles towards the northern kingdom in Chronicles: '[T]he Chronicler saw Judah alone as legitimate heir to the monarchy of David and Solomon and therefore described only Judah'.

In the Chronicles narrative, it was very important to prove that Abraham was the direct grandfather of Israel. Israel (Jacob) is emphasised using a comprehensive genealogy of his twelve sons, starting in 1 Chronicles 2:1. Kalimi (2005:171) points out that David was emphasised using his name instead of his title; the same applies to Israel (cf. 2 Sm 24:2 with 1 Chr 21:2): the Chronicler uses the name Israel, not the name Jacob. The description by Gerleman (1984:784-786) of the development of the name Israel in the Old Testament may explain why the Chronicler substituted the name Israel for Jacob. He points out that the term 'Israel' had more than one meaning and that from an alternative for the name Jacob it developed into a reference to the Judeans in Jerusalem. In Chronicles, the name Israel is therefore used instead of Jacob, apparently because Jacob as a person is not associated with Jerusalem and the temple. The name Israel is used because it is associated with YHWH's people, Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The name Israel is already used early in the book to refer to the people of Judah, the southern kingdom. It is not used for the northern kingdom (cf., e.g. 2 Chr 10:17, 2 Chr 21:2, 2 Chr 28:27). In Chronicles, claims are legitimised. One such claim is the election of the returned Judah (Israel) to be YHWH's chosen people. In the narrative of Manasseh's reign and life, an insertion concerning his conversion occurs twice (2 Chr 33:11-13 and 23), allowing his life to be depicted as an example of the Judeans. According to the narratives, he was forgiven after his conversion. Here the Chronicler wanted to emphasise that Judah, which had also been exiled but then converted and returned to Jerusalem and the temple, could reclaim YHWH's forgiveness and acceptance – to the point that they were the only people who could make this claim. Kalimi (2005:58) points out that 'Abraham' in the source text (Ps 105:6) is replaced with 'Israel' in Chronicles

(1 Chr 16:13), thus referring to Israel's descendants rather than Abraham's. Kalimi says Israel replaces Abraham because 'the seed of Abraham also includes non-Israelites – Ishmael' (Gn 25:1ff).

Apart from certain groups and matters criticised in Chronicles, the cult and the temple in Jerusalem are also legitimised. Chronicles values the temple and the cult to such an extent that the deeds of the kings who were faithful to the temple are discussed in detail, while those who were not are only mentioned in passing. Another striking phenomenon is that most of the additions to the source texts concern the cult. The services rendered by the priests are heavily emphasised, partly because the cult and the temple feature prominently, but also because, for the Chronicler, they count among the most important figures (cf., 2 Chr 8:15). According to Chronicles, the priests were the representatives of YHWH. Their task was to guide the people by teaching and advising them (cf. 2 Chr 15:3). The Chronicler also allows only the priests to anoint kings (cf. 2 Chr 23:30 with 2 Chr 36:1). Besides the services of the priests, Chronicles also emphasises the duties of the Levites through additions and omissions. With Hezekiah's inauguration of the temple, there were too many sacrifices for the priests to handle, so the Levites had to help with the slaughtering of animals (אֲחִיהֶם הַלְוִיִּים וַיְחַזְקוּם, 2 Chr 29:34). It is even stated that they were more sincere and more conscientious about sanctifying themselves than the priests (כִּי הַלְוִיִּים יִשְׂרָי לִבָּב לְהִתְקַדֵּשׁ מִהַכֹּהֲנִים).

Labahn (2003) points out that the priests always had more power than the Levites and that the Levites only performed minor tasks in the temple, a situation that changed with the second temple:

By their links with the powerful in society they themselves in a way participated in the exercise of power. [...] In the positions they occupied they took on large responsibilities and could shape things the way they wanted. (p. 130)

Like the other temple functions, the sacrificial rites are also emphasised in Chronicles. Large numbers of animals that were sacrificed are mentioned – sometimes innumerable (cf. 2 Chr 5:6), sometimes thousands (cf., *inter alia*, 2 Chr 1:6; 15:11 and 7:5). The fact that seven days were set aside for a feast to consecrate the altar (2 Chr 7:9) is an indication of the importance of sacrifices in Chronicles. The temple is even called the house of sacrifice (2 Chr 7:12).

The Chronicler clearly states which place of worship was legitimate. The northern kingdom is portrayed negatively because other places than Jerusalem and the temple were erected in the north to worship. This may indicate idolatry, but in most cases, it was simply a different place in the north set up as a place for worshipping YHWH. Chronicles states the following about Jerusalem: it was the place that YHWH had selected for his name to dwell; the persons who had decided to serve YHWH did so in Jerusalem; the tribes which had decided to worship in Jerusalem were righteous; of all the settlements of the different tribes, YHWH had preferred to establish his name in Jerusalem. (See Kalimi

2005:390–391 for a full discussion of how the Chronicler replaced the tabernacle with the temple.) To legitimise Jerusalem as the only place of worship, the Chronicler needed to keep silent about the entry into Canaan. Therefore, the narratives about the covenant of YHWH with Abraham and Moses do not feature in Chronicles. The covenants with Abraham and Moses were not important to the Chronicler, only the covenant with David (see Japhet 2009:76–98, especially 97–98 in this regard). There is an indication of this in 2 Chronicles 36:21, according to which the entire exile is merely described as a compulsory sabbatical leave of 70 years. This, as well as the fact that the Chronicler does not emphasise the Promised Land, is how the Chronicler tells the reader that Jerusalem had always been the place where YHWH's people had to live and pray. Therefore, the book ends with YHWH commanding Cyrus to let Judah return to Jerusalem to rebuild the temple.

Chronicles as a discourse of power

In this section, the questions originally asked regarding Chronicles as a discourse of power will be answered: who stood to benefit, who could be empowered and who would be excluded?

According to Trotter (1999), literacy gave access to texts and empowerment:

This means that literary skills and the control of those with literary skills were sources of power. By effectively limiting the production and interpretation of texts to a small, literate elite, a substantial amount of power within the community is given to the literati and their patrons. (p. 305)

If, therefore, some members of the Levites composed Chronicles, as it seems, then that was what they achieved. Because they were literate and in the position to rewrite history, they could empower themselves and legitimise their conduct.

It was demonstrated that the writer(s) of Chronicles used selective writing to emphasise certain aspects. These are matters such as the cult in Jerusalem as the only true religion and the temple as the only place of worship; the importance of the service of the priests and the Levites; the hyperbolic sacrifices as well as the emphasis placed on the southern kingdom and the returned Judeans as the only people of YHWH. Chronicles was written against old narratives to legitimise certain groups and practices in a new situation. It contradicts the theological perspectives of Genesis, Samuel, Kings and the prophets. This new ideology¹³ is founded and legitimised theologically.¹⁴

13.The term 'ideology' is interpreted as defined by Van Wyk (1999:24). Ideology is a set of coherent ideas about the world and specifically about society. Every ideology is attuned to serving the interests of a particular societal group by acquiring, retaining and/or increasing power and is therefore linked to politics. Ideology is expressed in language and especially in narratives.

14.Although there are points of contact between 'theology' and 'ideology', there is nevertheless a fine distinction. Van Wyk (1999:25) points out that theology and ideology have different aims: theology aims to explain the way God acts in the world, whereas every specific ideology aims to promote the power interests of a particular group in society. Van Wyk (1999:26) draws the following distinction: theology is a set of coherent ideas about the person and work of God in relation to people, whereas ideology is a set of coherent ideas about the world, society or a particular matter.

According to the source documents, the king of Jerusalem was the patron of the Jerusalem temple cult. The earlier kings of Judah had the power to decide what should happen to temple treasures, which gods should be served, whether idols should be kept or destroyed and whether heathen practices were permissible. Chronicles, on the other hand, originated when the Judean monarchy no longer existed. Judah was nothing but a province of the Persian Empire at that stage, so the power the temple and the cult could exercise was very important. The status of the patron of the cult moved from the king to the high priest. In the new dispensation, he was the head of the group which had the power to decide about the temple, its treasures, the cult's rituals, the sacrifices and all the accompanying customs. This implies that the high priest and his 'officials' were empowered when David and the kings closely associated with the cult were portrayed as the ideal. It is striking that Chronicles evaluates all kings (e.g. David and Solomon) who restored the cult in a positive light (cf., *inter alia*, Hezekiah and Joash, guided by the priest Jehoiada). In the main, they are described as doing three things. Firstly, they deployed the priests and the Levites in the service of the temple, as YHWH had instructed David so that the temple could be restored. Secondly, they made enormous numbers of sacrifices. Thirdly, they destroyed the idols, high places and other places of worship so that the temple would be the only place of worship (or house of sacrifice). Worship or sacrificing at any other place was denounced as idolatry or improper service of YHWH. In essence, these three aspects of the cult concern the same matter. Firstly, the priests and Levites and their services were highlighted. Secondly, this could become and remain important only if the temple in Jerusalem were the only place of worship. Thirdly, they were the only ones who stood to gain from all the sacrifices. This aspect is evident from the instructions for the sacrifices in Leviticus and Numbers (cf. Lv 2:3, 6:26, 7:10, 22:7, 22:11, 24:7–9, 27:21; Nm 5:8–10, 8:21–24). These aspects of the temple cult could favour nobody but the priests and the Levites. The 'new history' presented in Chronicles is nothing more than a legitimisation of a new ideology serving to benefit and empower the priests and the Levites. By emphasising the temple and the importance of the priests, Levites and sacrifices, the economic welfare of the temple staff was guaranteed. The sacrifices enriched them. Not only animal sacrifices are mentioned in Chronicles; there are clear references to money as well. The numerous references to the temple's treasures and the treasuries indicate the potential economic welfare a 'temple only' philosophy (which amounts to an ideology) could generate for the temple personnel. Besides the economic benefit this ideology brought, it also gave the priests and the Levites political clout. As they were regarded as the leaders of the people, they were also, by implication, the elite who had decision-making powers over the daily lives of ordinary citizens.

Chronicles were not only written to counter the negative evaluation of the kings and priests but also to counter all

northern traditions. This means that many events that occurred outside Jerusalem, before the entry into the Promised Land or north of Benjamin, were omitted and that the tribes of the northern kingdom that did not worship in Jerusalem were by implication not seen as part of YHWH's people (unlike the source writings, according to which YHWH led the people out of Egypt, brought them into the Promised Land and gave it to all of the twelve tribes). This also means that all characters associated with the northern kingdom (such as Abraham, Joseph, Moses, etc.) were excised through the genealogies, and by selective narration they were portrayed as unimportant compared with those of the southern kingdom.

Breytenbach (1997:1180) points out that, just as kings and priests were written out of the Books of Kings and Samuel and prophets were inserted, the opposite happened in Chronicles: priests and kings were inserted, with the difference that the high priest now took the place of the king.

When the Old Testament books written before Chronicles are studied, two different theological views come to the fore (cf. Breytenbach 1997:1172–1180). The first is the theology of Zion, according to which Jerusalem is the only place of worship, where kings and priests have a role to play, but the cult comes first, and Jerusalem cannot be conquered because YHWH is most closely associated with the temple. The second is the theological view represented by the prophets, in which the sovereignty of YHWH comes first, and the people would be safe if they upheld the covenant requirements. In Chronicles, an attempt is made to create a third view that contains some elements of each of these theological views but attempts to exclude their problematic aspects. The Chronicler retains an element of the Zion theology, namely that Jerusalem is the only place of worship and that if the cult of the temple and (David's) covenant are upheld, all will be well. After the exile, it was clear that Jerusalem could be conquered. So this view could not be maintained. But the idea that YHWH could only be served in Jerusalem was retained, and it formed the basis of the new 'theology', which was, in essence, a theologically legitimised ideology. The temple and the cult were highly important, but the mere presence of the temple alone could not guarantee the safety of the residents of the city. As in the prophetic writings, correct conduct was necessary, but in Chronicles, correct conduct is defined in new terms. Correct conduct meant especially obedience to the regulations of the temple personnel. The cult had to be maintained; in particular, sacrifices had to be brought to ensure salvation. These sacrifices could only be brought to the temple in Jerusalem; no other place of sacrifice would do. The catastrophe of the temple's destruction (as in the prophetic writings) resulted from cultic disobedience. But in this case, cultic disobedience was given new content. Prophets regarded 'cultic disobedience' as abandoning YHWH and worshipping the Baalim and other gods. The Chronicler, in turn, defined 'cultic disobedience' as worshipping and sacrificing at any place other than the temple. The new ideology had the same effect as the Zion theology; it constrained YHWH's sovereignty. The people's salvation was in the hands of the

temple personnel. The temple personnel mediated YHWH's salvation and mercy. In this way, they exercised control over people's lives and futures. This was a theology of exclusivity that was legitimised theologically. The exclusivity contrasted with the broader theological vision of the source documents, according to which YHWH had elected the entire nation, consisting of twelve tribes. The Chronicler succeeded very well in singling out the temple elite and highlighting their importance. The book starts with genealogies which (as described above) do not follow a natural line but serve the interests of a chosen group. In this way, boundaries were set around the chosen group, and their future exclusivity was ensured. No outsider would be able to become a member of this group. People not born into the right family could not easily partake in YHWH's salvation. Naturally, restricting YHWH's presence and salvation to the temple in Jerusalem would persuade the ordinary citizen of Judah to listen to the priests and Levites, bring the regulation sacrifices and make the required contributions. In this way, the temple elite gained power over the lives of simple citizens.

In a literary process where certain people are advantaged and 'written into the text', it inevitably follows that others are excluded and therefore disadvantaged. Exclusivism does not only benefit and empower; it also always excludes and disempowers. In Chronicles, this is also the case. The Chronicler created the 'ideal' identity around the figure of David and granted the privileges associated with the temple to the temple personnel and the Judeans. Everybody outside these boundaries, whose traditions and customs did not fit in, was denied access to this privileged group. One of the groups excluded in this way consisted of those whose ancestors remained in the country during the exile. From the book of Ezra, it is clear that they used 'impure descent' to discriminate against them. The genealogies in Chronicles had, therefore, already excluded them to a large extent. However, especially groups from the region north of Benjamin were disadvantaged by the text of Chronicles. By implication, their exclusion from the 'real Israel' robbed them of their centuries-old traditions that legitimised sanctuaries such as Shechem, Shiloh and Beth-El. It also deprived them of the traditions of their ancestors, their kings and their history as a people. Based on their genealogies, they were put into the same category as the Ishmaelites and the hated Edomites (cf. the book of Obadiah).

At the beginning of this article, a 'discourse of power' was defined as a text created by a historiographer in certain circumstances to strengthen the identity of a particular group and empower it, legitimise the acts and claims of this group and simultaneously exclude other groups.¹⁵ This investigation shows that Chronicles meets this criterion and can therefore be typified as a discourse of power for the Jerusalem temple elite.

Conclusion

The extent to which Chronicles succeeded as a discourse of power cannot be answered with absolute certainty because

¹⁵ See the contributions of Jonker (2003, 2009, 2010, 2011) concerning the identity-finding and/or negotiation of Israel after exile and in Chronicles.

(as shown above) the socioreligious circumstances in which the book was compiled cannot be reconstructed with certainty. What is clear is that the group that benefitted from the temple and oversaw the cult in Jerusalem became an important economic factor and gained substantial political power. Chronicles would undoubtedly have contributed to the legitimisation of the conduct of this power bloc. On the other hand, it is also clear that Chronicles could not remove the traditions against which it polemicalised, and it can therefore be assumed that it only served as a discourse of power in a circumscribed community.

At the beginning of this article, it was argued that a discourse of power is intimately related to the sociopolitical context in which it is written. If events (usually of a political nature) radically change this sociopolitical context, then discourses of power that served to uphold a particular master narrative lose their influence and can no longer act as a discourse of power. This must have been the fate of Chronicles when the Romans destroyed the temple in 70 CE. The symbolic universe Chronicles had helped create and maintain, collapsed dramatically. Without the temple, priests and Levites in Jerusalem, Chronicles lost its function as a discourse of power. It could no longer function as a theological legitimisation of a particular ideology. This disempowerment of the text allowed it to be read against different historical contexts as a theological document that testifies to God's actions towards people. The destruction of the power base Chronicles was supposed to legitimise theologically, became the main reason for the book to be accepted into the collection of Holy Scriptures. In this regard, the words of Joseph to his brothers in Genesis 50:20 spring to mind: 'As for you, you meant evil against me; but God meant it for good' (New Revised Edition).

Acknowledgements

This article is an English translation with minor revisions of the article: Geysers, A.B. & Breytenbach, A.P.B., 2006, '1 & 2 Kronieke as 'n magsteks', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 62(2), 473–500. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v62i2.370>.

Because this article is a translation of a previous article, mentioned above, the sources are a bit dated, but the findings still hold true. For the sake of not deviating too much from the original article but also to be more up to date, the author decided not to add unnecessary additional information to the text, but rather to refer where applicable to current sources that are relevant for the arguments. Readings that were published after the research for the original article and which are very relevant and important concerning Chronicles studies are, inter alia: Jonker (2003, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2016), Klein (2001, 2006, 2012), Knoppers (2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2004b, 2021) and Knoppers and MacConville (2000).

This article might also correlate marginally with some material from the following publications: Geysers-Fouché, A.,

2016, 'Exclusive language: The tool to empower and create identity', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 37(1), <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1495>; Geysers-Fouché, A., *in press*, 'Portraits of Moses in 1 and 2 Chronicles', in D.J. Human & G.J. Steyn (eds.), *Portraits of Moses*, Phoenix Press, Sheffield.

Competing interests

The author has declared that no competing interest exists.

Author's contributions

A.G.-F. is the sole author of this article.

Ethical considerations

This article followed all ethical standards for research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated agency of the author.

References

- Albertz, R., 2003, 'The thwarted restoration', in R. Albertz & B. Becking (eds.), *Yahwism after the exile, perspectives on Israelite religion in the Persian era*, pp. 1–17, Royal Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Auld, A.G., 1999, 'What was the main source of the Books of Chronicles?', in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *The chronicler as author: Studies in text and texture*, pp. 91–99, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Beentjes, P.C., 2002, *I Kronieken, Verklaring van de Hebreeuwse Bijbel*, Uitgeverij Kok, Kampen.
- Beukes, J., 2012, 'Analitiese konsepte in middel-Foucault' [Analytic concepts in middle Foucault], *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 68(1), Art. 1035, p. 17. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v68i1.1035>
- Beukes, J.C., 1996, 'Michel Foucault en die historisering van Anderswees' [Michel Foucault and the historization of otherness], *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 52(2&3), 233–251. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v52i2/3.1496>
- Blenkinsopp, J., 1988, *Nehemiah*, The Old Testament Library, Westminster, Philadelphia, PA.
- Bourdieu, P., 1991, *Language and symbolic power*, ed. L. Thompson, transl. G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P., 1995, *The rules of art genesis and structure of the literary field*, transl. S. Emmanuel, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Breytenbach, A.P.B., 1997, 'Meesternarratiewe, kontrannarratiewe en kanoniserings – 'n Perspektief op sommige profetiese geskrifte', *HTS* 53(4), 1161–1186. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v53i4.1774>
- Carroll, R.P., 1994, 'So what do we know about the temple? The temple in the prophets', in T.C. Eskenazi & K.H. Richards (eds.), *Second temple studies: 2. Temple community in the Persian period*, JSOT Supplement Series, 175, pp. 34–51, JSOT Press, Sheffield.
- Clines, D.J.A., 1994, 'Haggai's temple constructed, deconstructed and reconstructed', in T.C. Eskenazi & K.H. Richards (eds.), *Second temple studies: 2. Temple community in the Persian period*, JSOT Supplement Series, 175, pp. 60–87, JSOT Press, Sheffield.
- Degenaar, J., 1995, 'The text is an episode in an all-encompassing textuality', in P.J. Nel & D.J. Van Den Berg (eds.), *Concepts of textuality and religious texts*, pp. 3–21, UOVS, Bloemfontein. (Acta Academia, Supplementum I.)

- Deist, F.E., 1995, 'Canonical literature: Some ideology-critical observations', in P.J. Nel & D.J. Van Den Berg (eds.), *Concepts of textuality and religious texts*, pp. 66–80, UOVS, Bloemfontein. (Acta Academia, Supplementum I.)
- Dews, P., 1984, 'The letter and the line: Discourse and its Other in Lyotard', *JSTOR* 14(3), 39–49.
- Duke, R.K., 1999, 'A rhetorical approach to appreciating the Books of Chronicles', in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *The chronicler as author. Studies in text and texture*, JSOT Supplement Series 263, pp. 100–135, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Fensham, F.C., 1982, *The books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Gerleman, G., 1984, 'לארשי – Israel', in E. Jenni & C. Westermann (eds.), *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, Band I, pp. 782–786, CHR Kaiser, München.
- Geyser-Fouché, A., in press, 'Portraits of Moses in 1 and 2 Chronicles', in D.J. Human & G.J. Steyn (eds.), *Portraits of Moses*, Phoenix Press, Sheffield.
- Geyser, A.B. & Breytjenbach, A.P.B., 2006, '1 & 2 Kronieke as 'n magsteks', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studie* 62(2), 473–500. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v62i2.370>
- Geyser-Fouché, A., 2016, 'Exclusive language: The tool to empower and create identity', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 37(1), a1495. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1495>
- Goldstein, J. (ed.), 1994, *Foucault and the writing of history*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Grabbe, L.L., 1994, 'What was Ezra's mission?', in T.C. Eskenazi & K.H. Richards (eds.), *Second temple studies: 2. Temple community in the Persian period*, JSOT Supplement Series 175, pp. 286–299, JSOT Press, Sheffield.
- Japhet, S., 1968, 'The supposed common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah', *Vetus Testamentum* 18(3), 330–371. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1516644>
- Japhet, S., 1993, *I & II Chronicles: A commentary*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.
- Japhet, S., 1999, 'Exile and restoration in the Book of Chronicles', in B. Becking & M.C.A. Korpel (eds.), *The crisis of Israelite religion*, pp. 33–44, Oud-Testamentische Studien 42, Brill, Leiden.
- Japhet, S., 2009, *The ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its place in biblical thought*, Eisenbrauns, Warsaw, IN. (First published as vol.9 of *Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums* in 1989. Transl. A. Barber, Completely retypeset and reprinted by Eisenbrauns, 2009.)
- Jeismann, K.E., 1985, *Geschichte als Horizont der Gegenwart*, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn.
- Jonker, L.C., 2003, 'The rhetoric of finding a new identity in a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society: The case of the Book of Chronicles', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 24(2), 396–416.
- Jonker, L.C., 2007a, 'Reading the Pentateuch with both eyes open: On reading biblical texts multidimensionally', in J.H. Le Roux & E. Otto (eds.), *South African perspectives on the Pentateuch between synchrony and diachrony*, pp. 90–107, T&T Clark, London. (Adapted from the previously published article in *Old Testament Essays* 19(1), 58–76, 2006.)
- Jonker, L.C., 2007b, 'The exile as Sabbath rest: The chronicler's interpretation of the exile', *Old Testament Essays* 20(3), 703–719.
- Jonker, L.C., 2007c, 'Reforming history: The hermeneutical significance of the Books of Chronicles', *Vetus Testamentum* 57(1), 21–44. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v24i2.350>
- Jonker, L.C., 2008, 'The chronicler's portrayal of Solomon as the King of Peace within the context of the international peace discourses of the Persian era', *Old Testament Essays* 21(3), 653–669.
- Jonker, L.C., 2009, 'Textual identities in the Books of Chronicles: The case of Jehoram's history', in G.N. Knoppers & K. Ristau (eds.), *Community identity in Judean historiography: Biblical and comparative perspectives*, pp. 197–217, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN.
- Jonker, L.C., 2010, 'Saul narrative in Chronicles, revisiting the Saul narrative in Chronicles: Interacting with the Persian imperial context?', *Old Testament Essays* 23(2), 283–305.
- Jonker, L.C., 2011, *Texts, contents and readings in postexilic literature: Explorations into historiography and identity negotiation in Hebrew Bible and related texts*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Jonker, L.C., 2012, 'Reading the Pentateuch's genealogies after the exile: The chronicler's usage of Genesis 1–11 in negotiating an all-Israelite identity', *Old Testament Essays* 25(2), 316–333.
- Jonker, L.C., 2013, *1 & 2 Chronicles, understanding the Bible commentary series*, Baker Books, Bellingham, WA.
- Jonker, L.C., 2016, *Defining all-Israel in Chronicles. Multi-levelled identity negotiation in Late Persian-period Yehud*, FAT 106, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Kalimi, I., 2005, *The reshaping of ancient Israelite history in Chronicles*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN.
- Keane, J., 1992, 'The modern democratic revolution: Reflections on Lyotard's "The Postmodern Condition"', in A. Benjamin (ed.), *Judging Lyotard*, pp. 81–98, The University of Warwick, London.
- Klein, R., 2001, 'Narrative texts: Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah', in L. Perdue (ed.), *The Blackwell companion to the Hebrew Bible*, pp. 385–401, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Klein, R., 2006, *1 Chronicles: A commentary*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Klein, R., 2012, *2 Chronicles: A commentary*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Knoppers, G.N., 2003a, *The anchor bible. 1 Chronicles, a new translation with introduction and commentary*, Doubleday, Broadway, NY.
- Knoppers, G.N., 2003b, 'Greek historiography and the chronicler's history: A reexamination', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122(4), 627–650. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3268069>
- Knoppers, G.N., 2004a, *1 Chronicles 1–9: A new translation with introduction and commentary*, Doubleday, Broadway, NY.
- Knoppers, G.N., 2004b, *1 Chronicles 10–29: A new translation with introduction and commentary*, Doubleday, Broadway, NY.
- Knoppers, G.N., 2021, *Prophets, priests, and promises: Essays on the Deuteronomistic history, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah*, Brill, Leiden.
- Knoppers, G.N. & MacConville, J., 2000, *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent studies on the Deuteronomistic history*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN.
- Kristeva, J., 1980, *Desire in language. A semiotic approach to literature and art*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Labahn, A., 2003, 'Antitheocratic tendencies in Chronicles', in R. Albertz & B. Becking (eds.), *Yahwism after the exile, perspectives on Israelite religion in the Persian Era*, pp. 115–135, Royal Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Lernout, G., 1987, 'Intertextualiteit als programma', *Spiegel der Letteren* 20(1–2), 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.2143/SDL.29.1.2014504>
- Nel, P.J. & Van Den Berg, D.J. (eds.), 1995, *Concepts of textuality and religious texts*, UOVS, Bloemfontein. (Acta Academia, Supplementum I.)
- Poster, M., 1984, *Foucault, Marxism & history*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Readings, B., 1991, *Introducing Lyotard. Art and politics*, Routledge, London.
- Riley, W., 1993, *King and Cultus in Chronicles. Worship and the reinterpretation of history*, JSOT Supplement Series 160, JSOT Press, Sheffield.
- Smith, G.V., 2010, *Ezra-Nehemiah and Esther*, Tyndale House Publishers, Illinois.
- Smith, M., 1984, 'Jewish religious life in the Persian period', in W.D. Davies & L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge history of Judaism. Vol 1: Introduction; The Persian period*, pp. 219–278, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Smith, M., 1987, *Palestinian parties and politics that shaped the Old Testament*, SCM Press, London.
- Trotter, J.M., 1999, 'Reading, readers and reading readers reading the account of Saul's death in 1 Chronicles 10', in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as author. Studies in text and texture*, JSOT Supplement Series 263, pp. 294–310, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Van Gorp, H., Delabastita, D. & Ghesquiere, R., 1990, *Lexicon van Literaire Termen*, Wolters-Noordhoff, Mechelen.
- Van Heerden, E., 1994, 'Vanuit eie werk: Die skrywer as historiograaf', *Tydskrif vir Letterkunde* 32(3), 1–15.
- Van Rooy, H.F., 1994, 'Prophet and society in the Persian period according to Chronicles', in T.C. Eskenazi & K.H. Richards (eds.), *Second temple studies: 2. Temple community in the Persian period*, JSOT Supplement Series 175, pp. 163–179, JSOT Press, Sheffield.
- Van Wyk, W.C., 1999, 'Teologie en Ideologie in Esra-Nehemia', *Ongepubleerde Proefskrif voorgelê ter vervulling van 'n deel van die vereistes vir die graad Doctor Divinitatis in die Fakulteit Teologie*, Universiteit van Pretoria.
- Viljoen, L., 1993, 'Die roman as polifonie: Diskursiewe verskeidenheid in Lettie Viljoen se "Belemmering"', *Tydskrif vir Literatuurwetenskap* 9, 313–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02564719308530051>
- Wiesehöfer, J., 2007a, 'From Achaemenid imperial order to Sasanian diplomacy: War, peace, and reconciliation in pre-Islamic Iran', in K.A. Raaflaub (ed.), *War and peace in the ancient world*, pp. 121–140, Blackwell, London.
- Wiesehöfer, J., 2007b, 'The Achaemenid Empire in the fourth century B.C.E.: A period of decline?', in O. Lipschits, G.N. Knoppers & R. Albertz (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the fourth century B.C.E.*, pp. 11–32, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN.
- Wiesehöfer, J., 2009, 'The Achaemenid Empire', in I. Morris & W. Scheidel (eds.), *The dynamics of ancient empires*, pp. 66–98, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Wilcock, M., 1987, *The message of Chronicles*, Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.
- Williamson, H.G.M., 1977, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.