

Does Archeology Prove Chronicles Sources?

“Archaeological and historical studies have now rendered [Chronicles] more respectable and have shown it to be at times more accurate than some of its parallel sources,” wrote honored sexagenarian Professor Myers emphatically at the very outset of his three-volume masterpiece.¹ He here espouses a view which has been most trenchantly set forth and justified by Martin Noth.² We feel that a detailed evaluation of Noth’s two bedrock cases, plus mention of all minor items which scrutiny can discover, will be an appreciated service not only to Professor Myers but to the lamented German Lutheran master whose admirable methodology we strive to follow even where it may lead to conclusions not bolstering his own.³

Here are Noth’s words:

We have in the exposition of the post-Solomonic kings of Judah two individual details not derived from the Deuteronomist [Sam-Kings]. We are in a position to prove from other data that these are historically reliable: so much so that we are forced to suppose the use of a preexilic source by the Chronicler The question cannot be answered with generalized plausibilities, but only with meticulous demonstration in individual cases. We may assume older sources used by the Chronicler but unknown to us only where we are authorized by solid grounds, taking into account the work’s overall character. In less secure cases we will do well to leave open a decision until new evidence is available.⁴

THE TUNNEL: 2 CHRON 32: 3, 30 || 2 KINGS 20: 20 [Is 22: 9–11;
Sir 48: 17]

The first bedrock case of sources found by Noth in his magisterial Chronicles analysis is Hezekiah’s tunnel. The religious reform of 2 Kings 18: 4, greatly

amplified in 2 Chron 31 plus 29 f, must doubtless be seen as a veiled project to reassert the independence of United Israel vis-à-vis Assyria (2 Kings 18: 6). Idols like Nehushtan probably included statues of Assyrian divinities set up in sanctuaries, even of Jerusalem, as guarantors of treaty. Such a "protectorate" treaty was sought from Pul by Ahaz of Judah in 735 B.C. (2 Chron 28: 16 ||), and imposed on the northland by Sargon in 721 B.C. (2 Kings 17: 6). The idol purge at Jerusalem involved token representatives of all the northern tribes as part of an "Ecumenical Passover," narrated only by 2 Chron 30: 11; 31: 1.⁵ Manpower resources and economic benefits streaming toward Zion in the pilgrimage revival (2 Chron 31: 12) made possible an extensive building of fortifications (2 Chron 32:5; divergingly but more plainly prior to Sennacherib's invasion in 2 Kings 18: 8). Among these defense projects is explicitly included the tunnel from Gihon to Siloam:

2 Kings 20: 20. And the rest of the information about Hezekiah and all his [G *dynastela* +] *geste*, and his 'building of the pool and the conduit' [G 'spring and aqueduct'] so as to bring the waters toward [G into] the city, are not these written up in the book of annals of the kings of Judah?

Is 22: 9. "You [pl.: Hezekiah and ?] collected the waters of the lower pool; you made a sump within the two walls for the waters of the old pool."

Sir 48: 17. Hezekiah fortified his city and brought Gog into their midst [G^B; ^water (scanal) into its midst]; with iron he excavated the hewn rock, and built up springs for the waters.

2 Chron 32: 2. Hezekiah saw that Sennacherib was on his way to mount a siege of Jerusalem. 3 He took counsel with his princes [G elders] and his power-structure about shutting off the waters of the springs [pl. also G] which [G antecedent 'waters'] stood outside the city, and they promised their cooperation. 4 So they [G he] got together a big crowd and shut off all the water-[G of the] sources, including the wadi [G river] which 'floods over inside the land' [G 'serves as (or passes its) boundary through the city]. "Why," it was murmured, "should kings [G the king] of Assyria be able to invade and find water all ready?" [G + *kai kallschysen* 'and he succeeded' (*ischjō*) or 'shut it off' (*échō*)]. 30 Such was the Hezekiah who stopped up the upper fount of waters of Gihon [G Sion] and directed them to 'a lower point more westerly in relation to' [G pool of] the Davidic city.

Two empirical data of the case are known from modern exploration: the tunnel, and its inscription. The inscription near the Siloam issue at the south end of the tunnel was found by boys at play in 1880. It was on a side wall where the native rock had been smoothed off over an area of 29 by 67 cm, of which only the lower half was occupied by six lines of writing. This block was detached and removed to Istanbul, where it is now on the second

floor of the classical (not Near East) museum, and can be visited only with advance permit, difficult to secure, allegedly because of the frailty of the flooring.

Content of the inscription is vivid but tantalizingly laconic. If our re-reading or translation of the Hebrew strives neither to imply nor to exclude more than the text itself does regarding the idiomatic expression "man to his brother," we may find ourselves forced to corroborate the now universal assumption of two teams working toward each other from opposite ends of the tunnel. But we should ask ourselves whether the text itself contains any expression incompatible with an assumption that the hewers and callers were together and cutting in the same direction. "While 'it' was being cut, the voice of one man calling to another three cubits away was heard . . . the excavators hewed toward one another, axe against axe, and the water flowed from the spring toward the pool, 1200 cubits [1750 ft, 533 m], 100 cubits below the rock surface over the workers' heads."⁶

The inscription does not mention Hezekiah or any historical event even remotely datable. In fact we may generalize that apart from the (Kings) notice that Hezekiah made a canal for the (Gihon) spring, we would have no archeological ground for dating this tunnel any more accurately than we do for the extension of the southern wall to the southwest hill, controverted over a period of 1,300 years.⁷ Paleography of the letters fits between the Moabite Stone 830 B.C. and the Lachish Letters 589 B.C. This estimate—taking in stride the fact that the former is in a different dialect and the latter in a different medium—scarcely ties us down to the time of Hezekiah.

The canal itself was excavated and cleared by an expedition under Montagu Parker. His work was never published because it was suddenly and definitively interrupted under suspicion of misdemeanor, presumably the intention of penetrating forbidden areas under the Muslim sanctuary on the nearby Temple area. But Père Hugues Vincent was *au courant* as adviser of the work, and while defending the excavator's integrity he provides a relatively complete account. He narrates vividly how the hardships caused for Siloam villagers by the expedition's blocking up the tunnel flow from Gihon were ended by an acclaim for the renewed pouring forth of the waters, which must have been very like the excitement recorded in the inscription.⁸ Barrois considers evident from the present-day appearance of the tunnel itself that it was built by crews working independently from opposite directions.⁹ But the only real fact on which this judgment can be based is an unevenness near the midpoint, noticeable enough in itself but not enough to exclude some casual error or obstacle, and in any case trifling in comparison with the incredible accuracy of the supposed independent crews.

The tunnel has remained open to the public—that is, to occasional scholars—naturally with some inconvenience and repugnance for the users of the water. A group can walk in either direction in about twenty minutes; flashlights and sandals are desirable, as well as bathing trunks, though the water rarely reaches above the knees except near the two accesses. The canal floor is remarkably level, with a carefully calculated slight downward slope, and with occasional sharp pebbles strewn about. The ceiling is generally about six feet high, but with notable variations. The canal is S-shaped, and takes 533 m (1,750 ft = 1200 cubits) to cover the 335 m (1100 ft) in a straight line from Gihon to Siloam.¹⁰ In the supposition of two teams working from opposite directions, it was a well-nigh incredible feat of technology to meet head-on so accurately, even if the line had been straight. No hypothesis as to the reason for the S-shape has rallied consensus; there are both interest and difficulty in the claim that some tombs far above were to be avoided.

Infinitely more perplexing is the question of whether the Siloam egress of the tunnel was inside the city wall. This was indubitable, according to Barrois. But most experts find the relevant excavated data exasperatingly ambiguous. The two major recent researches maintain that only around the time of Hezekiah himself was the south wall of the Davidic city extended from the east to the west hill.¹¹ Some date this as early as David himself or even the Jebusites.¹² But a post-Nehemiah dating has gained wide support.¹³ The extreme dating was that of Albright—as late as the time of Herod.¹⁴ But the recent excavations of Miss Kenyon now claim certitude for a date nearly a hundred years later.¹⁵

Comparing now the facts with the Chronicles report, we find that the name Gihon is explicit only there, along with a less obvious clue that it is “upper” in relation not only to the unnamed egress but also to a second water source available a half mile farther south at Rogel.¹⁶ However, the unlikelihood that “the water source of Jerusalem” could be taken as anything other than Gihon is made clear already in the Chronicler’s vs 3. The Kings parallel in fact describes the enterprise more concretely than a proper name could have done, with technical terms like “tunnel” and “pool” not in Chronicles.¹⁷ As for “the wadi which floods over inside the land,” this is usually taken to refer to that open-air channel which had already been made earlier to carry Gihon’s waters farther southward.¹⁸ No fault can be found with that interpretation, but it adds no information either; if the spring itself was diverted, its waters would no longer flow where they had hitherto flowed. But *naḥal* usually means “wadi,” and may well refer to Kidron itself as the location of the spring.¹⁹ *Šāṭap* may indeed mean just “flow,” but its

nuance of overflow would better fit the rare wadi torrents than the slight variations in volume of water issuing from Gihon.

We will conclude that the essential fact is narrated in Kings concisely and on the whole more informatively. Differences in Chronicles consist in making explicit or rambling or ambiguous what was knowable from the Kings text. Thus, whatever archeological data support the Chronicles variants support a fortiori the Kings narrative from which the whole informational content was or could have been derived. But there is no evidence other than the biblical text itself (if we leave wishful thinking out of account) that the tunnel was built within 500 years on either side of Hezekiah, or that its inscription can be dated more narrowly than within 200 years on either side of him.

This attained, we may fully accept the terms in which Noth proposes three cognate cases to stand or fall with the validity of the tunnel-document supposition. The same or a similar transmitted source would have included also the data on other installations of defensive scope attributed to Judean kings in Chronicles but not in Kings: Rehoboam, 2 Chron 11: 5–10; Uzziah, 2 Chron 26: 9–15; Manasseh, 2 Chron 33: 14a.²⁰ Noth finds these three examples to be detailed by the Chronicler in a way which distinguishes them from similar observations of military preparedness which he could have glibly supplied from his inner awareness of what normally happens, or generalized from the above “documented” notices: 2 Chron 11: 11 f (with part of vs 10); 14: 5 ff; 17: 2, 12–19; 25: 5; 26: 11–14; 27: 3 f; 33: 14b.

JOSIAH’S DEATH: 2 CHRON 35: 20–24 || 2 KINGS 23: 29 f

2 Kings 23: 29. In the days of [Josiah], Pharaoh Neco king of Egypt went up on behalf of [*al* in sense implied by Gadd Chronicle, not ‘against’] the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates. So Josiah went to intercept him. But he [G Nechao] killed him at sight at Megiddo [G Magedō]. 30 His retainers drove him away dead from Megiddo [G^B Make-dōn]. They brought him to Jerusalem and buried him ‘with a funeral’ [or ‘in a tomb’, G *táphos* also ambivalent] of his own.

2 Chron 35: 20. After all these consolidations of the Temple on the part of Josiah, Neco king of Egypt came up to join the battle ‘at Carmish, *al*’ [*>G^{AB}*] Euphrates. Josiah went out to intercept him. 21 He however had sent to him this message: “What affair is this of yours, king of Judah? You are not minding [*al*] your own business [G, S, V: I am not moving against you] today, but ‘against the house of’ [G to make] my quarrel. Elohim has said [so] to my ‘dismay’ [or as G ‘hastening’]. Lay off of Elohim who is with me. Otherwise he will destroy you.” 22 But Josiah did not turn back from him. In order to do battle with him,

he 'disguised himself'²¹ [G withstood]. He refused to listen to Neco's observations coming from Elohim. On he came, to the battle in Megiddo plain. 23 The archers promptly shot down King Josiah. Then the king said to his retainers, "Bear me away; I am on my last legs". 24 His retainers transferred him from his chariot and drove him in the spare chariot he had brought along. They brought him to Jerusalem. There he died, and was buried amid the tombs of his fathers. All Judah along with Jerusalem bewailed Josiah.

Noth admits frankly that the Chronicler's genuine additions to the Kings report are here harder to detect amid much that is mere paraphrase. Everything about the mode of the king's wounding can be dismissed as a perhaps subconscious echo of the similar situation of Ahab's death in 2 Chron 18: 33 = 1 Kings 22: 34. Similarly, the Chronicler's own musings can be seen in the curious moralizing about Josiah's punishment for not obeying a message transmitted by paraoh from Elohim. We may admit that the factual details are "supplied by theological reasoning" from the Chronicler's own imagination.²² In that case, we need feel no concern about who this alleged "god" was: the Elohim of the Hebrews or some one of the many gods of the pharaohs. It may have been the divine symbols on standards of the Egyptian army.²³ Venerable authorities even suspect the Assyrian king (= *ilani*) involved here.²⁴

Strangely, Noth does not single out the Chronicler's detail that only after reaching Jerusalem did Josiah expire, which others hold to be historically factual.²⁵ Ultimately his only real talking point is the purpose of Neco's expedition, which is given by the Chronicler so vaguely that it escapes the positive inaccuracy which Noth attributes to Kings as disproved by the Gadd Chronicle.²⁶ Insofar as the Chronicler frequently garbles the concise Kings data by rotund rhetoric, we can hardly be surprised to see his vagueness occasionally diverging less palpably from some known minor detail than the Deuteronomist's exactness. But Noth can scarcely have overlooked that 'al may equally well mean "for" (as Gadd) or "against" (as G), exactly like our deplorably ambiguous English "fight with."²⁷ Presuming that Josephus *Antiquities* 10 (74 ff) 5, 1 has before him the Greek text of both Kings and Chronicles, we find even less reason for Noth's further supposition that Josephus was using a third source distinct from that of either biblical report.²⁸

Here again, supposing as proved the existence of a factual documentation underlying the Chronicler's report, Noth adds minor battle reports which gain likelihood from it for the reason that "they just don't look like the Chronicler's inventions": 2 Chron 13: 3-20 (omitting the adverse judgment of 1 Kings 15: 3-5); 14: 8-14; 26: 6-8; 27: 5; 28: 18. Noth reckons loyally with the fact that these instances, and especially the first two, may owe their lifelikeness to the Chronicler's recollections of a real battle which took place near his own time. He can project it back into a historic situation which he deems similar, just as the author of Jubilees attributes Maccabee battle traits to Jacob.²⁹ Gladly we agree with Noth that there is something realistic about these battle descriptions; this would not indeed be beyond the literary skill of a counterfeiter, but simply does not fit into this particular author's creativity. Yet the point at issue, highlighted by Noth himself, remains: whether the minor episodes gain historical reliability from the archeologically proved force of the test case freely chosen by him.³⁰ We here find the data for the test case less cogent than for the daughter cases.

TOPONYMY: 2 CHRON 20: 1-30 (NOT || 2 KINGS 3: 4-27)

This chapter is quite emphatically claimed by Noth to be a transformation of 2 Kings 3: 4-27, though that Jehoram-Jehoshaphat campaign is located elsewhere by Vannutelli and related back, rather, to 2 Chron 18: 1-34, which has its own parallel in 1 Kings 22: 1-40.³¹ Noth's book does not cite his own lengthy article spelling out details of the same conclusions, except perhaps for a more vague equating with 2 Kings 3.³² He formally excludes this passage from his test cases, and indeed from any relevance to the search for the Chronicler's written sources at all, because he thinks that the variants from Kings here are due to a tradition known indeed to the Chronicler but local and oral.³³ But we must take into account the extent to which the whole Bible was composed normatively in oral form (for which the early written equivalent served chiefly as a memory aid, like our systems of musical notation).³⁴ In any case, much of the detective work which would enable us to intuit in the variants empirical information not drawn from the Chronicler's own head would be just as relevant to oral as to written source determination.

The main factual empirical content is found to be in 2 Chron 20: 2, "Hazazon-Tamar which is En-Gedi." Though the Chronicler "had no more idea than we do where the *real* Hazazon-Tamar of Gen 14: 7 was located," he in fact rightly associated with En-Gedi this name preserved in wadi Haṣāṣa of Nabatean Ma'ōn, which constitutes the upper origins of the wadi Yassāra (176.108 Israel Survey grid), north of En-Gedi. In vs 27 of the same

chapter may be noted also the toponym Beracah, "blessing": representative sample of the "etiology" for which Noth's *Josua* has become normative.³⁵

Toponymic reasoning like the foregoing may serve as a model for the type of archeological topography that has characterized the century between Robinson and Abel.³⁶ To locate an unidentified toponym related in a biblical passage to a known metropolis, a noncommittal list is made of all discoverable Arab place-names in a wide circuit around that area. If one turns out to have the same consonants (taking into account normal ablaut between Hebrew and Arabic), then a check is made at the spot: not necessarily the exact spot, but within a radius to which toponyms are known to "migrate." If there are found features of terrain and artifacts compatible with the biblical episode and chronology, then a working hypothesis is laid down. Further inferences regarding either that episode or other occurrences of the name are then drawn, and gradually, as "it all hangs together" with no contradictions creeping in, the hypothesis is taken to be a fact. It then is no longer important how frail the original guess was, because the assurance now lies in a convergence of empirical compatibilities: a sound and normal procedure of the inductive sciences.

Here are similar geographical details divergently given in Chronicles from its parallels, and recently clarified by archeology. Moriah ("mountain;" Gen 22: 2 "land") is attested only by 2 Chron 3: 1 (relevant to Solomon; not David, 1 Chron 21: 15) as name or fortuitous homonym of the Jebusite crest acquired as temple area. Vincent upholds with rabbinic tradition that Abraham from near Beersheba could have gone with Isaac as far as Jerusalem.³⁷ Glueck denies it.³⁸ It may be noted that (*har*) *ha-nôriyyâ* (Aram *amoriyy-â*) could mean "mountain of the Amorite," which may well be what the Chronicler intended to write.³⁹ In payment of temple materials, Solomon gave Hiram some cities near the Tyre-Dan border (1 Kings 9: 10). But 2 Chron 8: 2 knows only cities given not by Solomon but to him by "Hiram." Maybe Hiram, either dissatisfied (1 Kings 9: 13: followed by Hiram's implausible compensation to Solomon) or otherwise indemnified, just gave back the cities. The border towns seem related to the other "Hiram son of a Tyrian father and Danite mother" sent by King Hiram as architect in 2 Chron 2: 14. The "Valley of Salt" where David defeated Edom (1 Chron 18: 12) and Amaziah massacred hordes of Seir and Sela (both = Petra; 2 Chron 25: 11) is too similar to the parallel (2 Sam 8: 13; 2 Kings 14: 7) to shed light on whether we are here dealing with "Salt-City" of Josh 15: 62 = Qumran.⁴⁰ This Seir is doubtless distinct from the one near Baalah [and] Kiriath-jearim.⁴¹ The Greek of 1 Chron 18: 17 omits the "Cherethites" or Cretans cognate to (?Philistine) Pelethites in David's bodyguard.⁴²

Other examples abound in the "genealogical vestibule" 1 Chron 1-9, recently treated (with Gen parallels) as an artificial production in support of David's claims.⁴³ Noth devotes many pages to this prologue under the heading "post-Chronicler insertions," which might blind us to the fact that he firmly makes the essential lines of an "Adam-to-David history by cue-names" in Chapter 1 an indispensable part of the Chronicler's overall plan. It gathers up incidentally much of the biblical ethnography.⁴⁴ The verses 2 on Kenan, 5 Javan, 7 Kittim, 8 Canaan, and 17 f Shem-Eber are prominent in recent researches beyond our present scope.⁴⁵ We have treated elsewhere relation of Ophir (1: 23) and the man Tarshish (7: 10) to the "Tarshish (i. e. far-)sailing ships" sent by Solomon to "Ophir" (2 Chron 8: 18 = Parvaim, 2 Chron 3: 6).⁴⁶ "Ophir gold for Beth-horon" is attested at excavations near Joppe, alleged to corroborate also the unparalleled 2 Chron 2: 16 as base for cedar transshipment though north of the Yarqon River.⁴⁷ Israel's northeast boundary *L'ôd'-Ĥamat* under David (1 Chron 13: 5; cf 18: 3) and Solomon (2 Chron 7: 8; 8: 3; cf 9: 26) is unduly stretched by the reading Tadmor (Palmyra, 8: 3): the vaguely parallel 1 Kings 9: 18 reads Tamar (near Baalah, probably that of Kiriath-jearim in 1 Chron 13: 6).⁴⁸

A link with the Essenes and Qumran may be provided by Rechab of 1 Chron 2: 55 (2: 44 Rekem; 4: 12 Recah) and Jer 35: 2.⁴⁹ This Rechab is related to Cain and the Kenites, thus also to Kenaz (Teman, Edom, 1: 51; ?Nebaiot 1: 29), Midian (1: 32, 46), Amalek (4: 43).⁵⁰ This Kenite background adds another link of David's Bethlehem to Calebite Hebron; the seven different genealogies given for "somebody named Caleb" in 1 Chron 2-4 may perhaps be homogenized by supposing Jephunneh to be a village rather than a patronym, as in 2: 50 ff.⁵¹ Caleb's congener Mareshah occurring in the second half of 1 Chron 2: 42 is replaced in the first half by Mesha (G variants: Mousa, Marousa), a name too momentous in 2 Kings 3: 5 to be dismissed as just a slip.⁵² The Ephraim towns in 1 Chron 7: 28 curiously include Gezer and even Gaza ('Azza for 'Ayya) in the Talmud variant adopted in the earliest printed Bibles. The Huppim of 1 Chron 7: 12 (with Šuppim) corroborates the reading of Gen 46: 21 (with Muppim) against Num 26: 39 Huppam [with Šup(p)am], if plausibly equated with the modern-sounding Akkadian *hipi* = "so-and-so." Gozan is a river in 1 Chron 5: 26, or a town on a river, but distinct from Habor, which in 2 Kings 17: 6; 18: 11 is the "river of Gozan" at Tell Ḥalaf, Oppenheim's epochal excavation.⁵³

MANASSEH'S SALVIFIC ARREST: 2 CHRON 33: 10-17 (2 KINGS 21: 10-16; 20: 18).

We add as the fourth test case one which Noth intentionally excludes (except for half of vs 14 allotted to the tunnel document above). The first half of

the chapter devoted to Manasseh in both Kings and Chronicles narrates the same sordid vices, syncretist idolatry, and "passing his sons through fire."⁵⁴ But the latter part differs radically in the two reports:

2 Kings 21: 10. ΥHWH by means of his servants the prophets spoke thus: 11 Because Manasseh king of Judah has committed these abominations, piling up evil beyond the measure of the Amorites before him, and seducing Judah into sin with his idols, 12 therefore thus has ΥHWH God of Israel said: "See, I am bringing evil upon Jerusalem and Judah, such evil as will make both ears ring for anyone who hears of it. 13 I will stretch over Jerusalem the line by which Samaria was measured, and the plumb-line which was hung over Ahab's house. I will wipe out Jerusalem the way a man wipes off a plate, wipes it and turns it upside down. 14 I will abandon the remnant of my inheritance; I will turn them over to their enemies; they shall be plunder and prey to all their foes: 15 because they have done evil to my face, and have spited me ever since the day their fathers fared forth from Egypt and right down to this day. 16 Manasseh has shed innocent blood, far too much; it has filled Jerusalem from one edge to the other, quite apart from the outrage which he had done to my face by leading Judah into sin."

20: 18. [Isaiah to Hezekiah] "Your sons will be seized and castrated in the royal palace of Babylon."

For many commentators, this passage is better than either of Noth's as touchstone of the Chronicler's use of factual documentation beyond his parallels. Myers and Randellini see no escape from postulating for the Babylonian repentance a free invention of the Chronicler. But, like Robert,

2 Chron 33: 10. ΥHWH spoke to Manasseh and his people, but they would not listen. 11 So ΥHWH brought upon them the generals of the Royal Assyrian Army. They seized Manasseh with halberds and flung him in irons. Thus they brought him all the way to Babylon. 12 He however in his crisis besought the face of ΥHWH his God. He was humbled indeed in the sight of the God of his fathers. 13 To him he prayed, and was heard. God hearkened to his plea. All the way back to Jerusalem he brought him, back to his royal throne. Thus Manasseh realized that ΥHWH is indeed God. 14 He thereupon rebuilt the outer wall of the Davidic city, on the slope west of Gihon along the access to the Fish Gate. It continued on around Ophel; he increased its height considerably. He furthermore installed armed guards in all the fortified cities of Judah. 15 Naturally he got rid of the gods of the foreigner. Their statues he flung out of the Temple. As for all the altars which he himself had built upon the very Temple crest and elsewhere in Jerusalem, he had their rubble dumped outside the city. 16 The altar of ΥHWH however he refurbished, to offer upon it sacrifices of communion and gratitude. Judah too he invited to the cultus of ΥHWH God of Israel. 17 Nevertheless the people went right on sacrificing on the high-places, only claiming it was in honor of ΥHWH their God.

they would call this a warranted theological syllogism rather than, as Pfeiffer and Torrey have, a blatant hoax. For the Chronicler, it is simply impossible that evil should be rewarded with longevity; hence, somewhere along the line the longest-reigning of all Judah's monarchs must have mended his ways, and ("as everybody knows") downfall is the likeliest occasion for tears of remorse. The invented repentance is commonly held to have prompted the equally fictitious "Psalm of Manasseh."⁵⁵ Only Cazelles has hazarded the intriguing observation that the psalm had already come into existence first, from the meditations of a theologian with views on retribution similar to the Chronicler's, who then could lift it from him ready-made.⁵⁶

The willingness of Myers and Randellini to admit some creativeness in the Chronicler's use of the data in this chapter is the more noteworthy since they, like Noth, feel that at least part of the later Judah rebuilding comes from a reliable document.⁵⁷ They both (like Galling and Rudolph) point to Assyrian sources which attest temporary arrest of vassal kings for briefing at the palace.⁵⁸ But be it noted that all these allegations reinforce rather than diminish the likelihood that the fact of Manasseh's own arrest is learned by the Chronicler by theological inference rather than from the materials in his sources or in historical reality.⁵⁹ Rudolph rather confidently rejects the possibility that the major premise of his syllogism was precisely Isaiah's threat to Manasseh's father cited in 2 Kings 20: 18.⁶⁰ Short shrift is made also of several Catholic attempts to vindicate the historicity of the repentance and Jerusalem purge by supposing it to have been quickly abandoned.⁶¹

Moreover, Manasseh is mentioned by name in an Ashurbanipal fragment, as Myers had noted. It is one of those reconstructed as "Cylinder A" supplementary to the Rassam Cylinder.⁶² Rassam 1, 25 gives the name and domain of each of the twenty-two kings mentioned anonymously in Rassam 1,65 as forced to accompany Ashurbanipal (668-633 B.C.) on a punitive expedition to Egypt; he then returned (? still taking them along) to Nineveh. Meanwhile Ehrlich pointed out that the unexpected naming of Babylon in 2 Chron 33: 11 corresponds to the fact that in the year 648 B.C. Ashurbanipal, after a two-year siege, had crushed his rival Šamaš-šum-ukin there and had sent to summon Manasseh from Jerusalem as one of the vassals supporting the uprising.⁶³ Only in the years 652-48 B.C. could Manasseh have had any chance to act otherwise than with that loyalty he is otherwise attested showing toward Assyria. Ehrlich does not mention the Cylinder A inscription, and bases himself rather on policies of Assyrian kings generalized from other examples, including even the Rassam Cylinder, concerning pardon granted to an arrested king (Neco) after he had been suitably enlightened

in Assyria. Ehrlich's historical intuition is interesting, but is based on no documented mention of Manasseh; the mention of Manasseh which is found in Esarhaddon-Ashurbanipal records says nothing of his being brought to Mesopotamia. So there is no real confirmation of the historicity of the deportation, much less of a written source from which the Chronicler drew it as a fact.

We thus conclude our exposition of the four passages which have best claim to be normative in proving a dependence of the Chronicler upon extracanonical written sources either already or foreseeably corroborated by excavation and exploration. Like Manasseh's repentance and Josiah's fatal flaw, the following details are often such that their relevance to archeology could only be secondary, via inference or inscriptions.

TEMPLE MATERIALS, ZADOK, AND WISE CHANT

The Temple is in general far more the achievement of David for the Chronicler than in Kings, and it is much more the focus of his life's interest. David is called the seventh son of Jesse in 1 Chron 2: 15, whereas in 1 Sam 17: 12 he is the eighth; it has been proposed that Elihu of 1 Chron 27: 18 is omitted because he had no descendants. Randellini concludes rather with Rudolph to an extrabiblical source, "since if he was just inventing the names he could easily have invented an eighth." Saul's suicide upon his squire's refusal to kill him is told in 1 Sam 31: 4 as in 1 Chron 10: 4, though, in hope of benefit, the squire reports the episode differently to David in 2 Sam 1: 10: only Saul's head is put on the Dagon temple in 1 Chron 10: 10; in 1 Sam 31: 9 it is his headless trunk. The whole "crime *does* pay" chapter of necromancy in 1 Sam 28 is summarized in the single verse 1 Chron 10: 13.⁶⁴ If a similar reference to the occult lurks in 1 Chron 12: 32 "skill in knowing the times" (astrology: Targum), it has been expressed vaguely enough to suggest rather political savvy (Rudolph).

David begins his reign over the northern kingdom, and moves from Hebron to Jerusalem, immediately after Saul's death in 1 Chron 11: 4, though 29: 27 does not ignore the seven-year lag at Hebron filled with fascinating episodes in 2 Sam 2-4. Then in the siege of Jerusalem, 1 Chron 11: 6 omits the *šinnôr*, which, despite well-grounded archeological acclaim for the "water-shaft" (RSV), is more objectively rendered "pipe" ("grappling-hook," *NEB*; G *paraxiphis*).⁶⁵ Details from real but separate episodes [1 Chron 11: 23, 26 (= 2 Sam 23: 21, 24); 20: 5 (2 Sam 21: 19)] involving an Elhanan son of Dodo or Jair, also David himself and his nephew, a (Beth-)Lehemite, and giants of Egypt and Gath: all seem to have been contaminated into the David-glorifying narrative of 1 Sam 17, omitted by the Chronicler because it shows David a killer. The list of 1 Chron 11 which furnishes

part of the above evidence is claimed to betray in vss 41-47, after Uriah, an East Jordan origin.⁶⁶

To a general prudishness of the Chronicler is traced his omission of David's nudity as the source of Michal's contempt (2 Sam 6: 20; not in 1 Chron 15: 27 ff).⁶⁷ Vital to the allegation of a "Third Source" used more faithfully by the Chronicler than by the Deuteronomist are the dynastic promise of 1 Chron 17, with its parallels in 2 Sam 7 and Ps 89: 19-37, and the suppression of 2 Sam 7: 14 conditions and threats in 2 Chron 6: 10.⁶⁸ David's census in 1 Chron 21: 1 is prompted by Satan; in 2 Sam 24: 1, by angry $\Upsilon\eta\omega\eta$ as a trap; its close relation to the plague of 1 Chron 21: 14 = 2 Sam 24: 15 is ingeniously and, with surprising naturalness, related by Myers to an epidemic caused by germ-laden census takers trudging from one town to another. In this same census, as is later noted in 1 Chron 27: 23 f without Kings parallel, David made no effort to count minors under the age of twenty; this may perhaps reflect the age of liturgical service in 1 Chron 23: 27 (Ezra 3: 8) and the curious variants this undergoes at Qumran.⁶⁹

David may have bought the Temple site from a Hittite.⁷⁰ The Temple stones were hewn: 1 Chron 22: 2 not in Kings and against Ex 20: 25. Height of the Temple pylon in 2 Chron 3: 4 (180 feet) is not mentioned in 1 Kings 6: 2, but the building itself is said only there to have been forty-five feet high; such a towering pylon does not seem disproportionate to Egyptian standards surviving at Karnak and Idfu from earlier styles generally held to have guided Solomon.⁷¹ Free standing sphinxes (*k'rubîm*, 2 Chron 3: 10 = 1 Kings 8: 7) with wings outspread over the Ark surely seem better than lid scratchings (1 Sam 4: 4; Ex 25: 17; perhaps by analogy with other cherubs carved on the *walls*, 2 Chron 3: 7); these and the seraphim of Is 6: 2 carry forward a long tradition of "God rushing into battle on cloud-wings of unemployed *elohim* drawing his ark-throne chariot."⁷² We are famished to know what was really inside the Ark; "the ten commandments and nothing else," says 2 Chron 5: 10 in agreement with 1 Kings 8: 9; Deut 10: 1; but Heb 9: 4 and plausible Arab *qubba* parallels lead us to suspect that the contents may have been either ephod-urim or sacral emptiness.⁷³

The "3000 baths contained in the priests' washing-tub called Bronze Sea" is inexorably confusing in the English of 2 Chron 4: 5. Bath is a liquid measure of some twenty-four quarts corresponding to the dry measure called ephah.⁷⁴ Only two thousand baths are given for the same vessel in 1 Kings 7: 26, which may be the result of calculating its three dimensions as a hemisphere ($V = \frac{1}{3} Cr^2$) while the Chronicler calculates them as a cylinder ($V = \frac{1}{2} Crh$).⁷⁵ Hiram agreed to float timbers (1 Kings 5: 6) of cedar and pine and algum (added in 2 Chron 2: 8 along with "via Joppe = ?Qasila" in vs 16).⁷⁶ The Temple area was to be 60 × 20 "old standard" cubits (2

Chron 3: 3). This was rather small if meant as 17.5 inches, in contrast to the "royal cubit" known from Herodotus 1,178: possibly understood also in Ezek 40: 5 as "a (normal) cubit plus a palm"—some twenty inches. Responsibility for the whole archeological crux of weights and measures is thrown on the Levites by 1 Chron 23: 29, not in Kings.

Metallurgy too, at this critical threshold of transit from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age, is prominent in relation to the "bath"-tub called "the sea". The bronze for the tub came from Zobah cities conquered by David (1 Chron 18: 8); vs 10 adds that fringe benefits from the conquest of Zobah were gifts of gold and silver and copper from relieved Hamath. The bronze for Hiram's art work was cast at Solomon's foundry between Succoth and Zeredah (2 Chron 4: 17; G: Anamesirdathai; 1 Kings 7: 46 Zarethan, G: Seira). All this time the Philistine monopoly of iron (1 Sam 13: 20; not in Chron), only recently noticed, has been taken as a key factor pushing the Israelites from judgeship-anarchy into kingship.⁷⁷ However, the Tyro-Danite Hiram sent by his homonymous king in 2 Chron 2: 14 is called an experienced worker in iron (as well as in bronze, 1 Kings 7: 2). David in fact had stored up tons of iron to make nails and hinges for the Temple doors, imagines 1 Chron 22: 3, 14 f without Kings parallel. This was in addition to the hundred thousand talents of iron gathered up from the families within Israel (1 Chron 29: 2, 7). Already in his previous military operations, David had set the defeated Ammonites to work with iron picks (1 Chron 20: 3; also in 2 Sam 12: 31). On that occasion he took a one-talent gold crown from the statue of Milcom in the Ammonite capital; this doubtless came in handy when he paid Ornan six hundred shekels of gold (1 Chron 21: 25; only fifty of silver in 2 Sam 24: 24).⁷⁸ The shekel weighed only half an ounce, or twelve grams; used as money in doubtless baser metal, it amounted to a half-dollar in current values. Solomon paid 150 shekels each (\$75) for his horses from Egypt (2 Chron 1: 17; only \$25 in 1 Kings 10: 33); the going rate in other lands is not noted. Among the free local contributions of gold, David got ten thousand anachronistic darics in 1 Chron 29: 6; that coin, worth five dollars in modern terms, was invented by Darius five hundred years later (Ezra 8: 27; ?2: 69). The Ophir from which David got gold in 1 Chron 29: 4 we above claimed to be identical with Parvaim 2 Chron 3: 6 (neither name is in the Kings parallel).

Seizure of Jerusalem as eventual Temple site is related to the mysterious eclipse of Abiathar's priesthood by Zadok. In 1 Chron 16: 39, Zadok is called priest "left" rather than "installed" by David at Gibeon, or rather at its High Place (? Nebi Samwil; = ? Nob of Ahimelech, 1 Sam 21: 1). This Gibeon, founded by Benjamite Jehiel (1 Chron 9: 35; cf 8: 29; no ||) served as semiofficial sanctuary (2 Chron 1: 3, expanding 1 Kings 3: 7)

between the flourits of Shiloh and Zion.⁷⁹ Hence there was good reason for maintaining that the Zadok "confirmed for Israelite cult" in place of high priest Abiathar of the Ithamar line was in fact a Canaanite through whom a politically influential sanctuary could be exploited for theocratic worship of YHWH.⁸⁰ In this Zadok's genealogy, only summarily hinted in 2 Sam 8: 17, Ahitub should be not his progenitor but Abiathar's along with Ahimelech, as in 1 Sam 22: 11 (Wellhausen).⁸¹ Ahimelech is Abiathar's son in 1 Chron 18: 16. The combination "Zadok ben-Ahitub" is indeed given twice elsewhere and traced back to Phinehas-Eleazar-Aaron-Levi in 1 Chron 6: 8-12; 24: 3, but at several removes both before and after the priest of Solomon's temple explicitly declared to be one Azariah (but Ahitub grandfather of Zadok in 9: 11). These genealogical quirks are rightly seen to show that Zadok is "without genealogy," which, according to Heb 7: 3, he has in common with Melchizedek.⁸² Indeed that name is identical or dynastically similar to "king Zadok, *melek Şadoq*"; and Melchizedek was worshiper of "God most high" (Ps 9: 3), acknowledged by Abraham at "(Jeru-)Salem," Gen 14: 18. Hence Rowley's further conclusion is warranted: Zadok was the pre-Israelite priest not at Gibeon but at Jebus = Zion.⁸³ To this we have added that the defense of Jebus crag only by "blind and lame" (2 Sam 5: 8) is best explained as Zadok's token resistance in exchange for a secret deal with David assuring to his descendants a dynastic dignity second only to the king's. Both the promise of eventual priesthood to Phinehas in Num 26: 11 and the specific names relating him to Zadok are thus a legitimate "legal adoption." Similarly, the genealogy of Moses (1 Chron 6: 22; 6: 3 = Num 26: 58 f) is a juridical straightening out of his enigmatic relation to Aaron and Miriam ("Aaron's sister," not his, in Ex 15: 20).⁸⁴ Moses' grandsons are called priests in Judg 18: 30; but few would follow the consistency of making Moses himself (Ex 18: 12) a priest.⁸⁵ Moses is further involved in the Davidic rise to power insofar as Caleb lost Hebron to "Aaron's grandfather Kohath" (1 Chron 6: 55; Ex 6: 18 ff).⁸⁶

Zadok in 1 Chron 16: 41 is closely associated with Heman and Jeduthun, whose genealogy links the Chronicler's own family to David's psalmody, Solomon's wisdom, and Job's topography. Music directors for the temple were already appointed by David himself (2 Chron 5: 12): Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman (1 Chron 25: 1, 6), and their sons, especially Heman's (whose names make up a little poem in 25: 4).⁸⁷ These are of Levite descent in 1 Chron 15: 17 ff. But in 2: 6 there is a Heman descendant of Judah, brother of Ethan, Calcol, Dara, all nephews of Hamul.⁸⁸ These (Darda for Dara) are the pre-Solomonic paragons of wisdom in 1 Kings 4: 31, but their father is (? by metathesis) Mahol.⁸⁹ Heman and Ethan are named authors of Ps 88 and 89; Asaph, of 73-83 and 50.⁹⁰ Ethan is commonly taken to be a variant

of Jeduthun, and is called *ezrahi*. This is equated with the local or proper name of 1 Chron 2: 6, but may mean just "the native." Albright maintains this to mean Canaanite.⁹¹ But there is an Edomite Zerah in Gen 36: 17, and the place-names of Job are linked in tenuous traditions to East Jordan; hence there has been launched a hypothesis of "Edomite Wisdom."⁹² Thus there seems to be more to link the Psalmody and Wisdom traditions together than the blood of David in Solomon. The psalm of Asaph in 1 Chron 16: 25 "YHWH is more to be feared than all gods" is echoed in Solomon's letter to Hiram (2 Chron 2: 5) "our god is greater than all gods" (6: 13: "O YHWH, there is no god like you"), whereas Hiram replies with a much more acceptable theology, "Blessed is YHWH the God of Israel, the maker of heaven and earth" (2 Chron 2: 12). Solomon's pious explanation of the palace he built for Pharaoh's daughter—"No woman of mine shall live in the house of David, because any place where the Ark has entered is holy"—suggested Myers' charming subtitle, "Moving Day for the Daughter of Pharaoh." *Whose* daughter she was continues to agitate the Bureau of Missing Persons.⁹³

THE SPLIT KINGDOMS AND THEIR ARITHMETIC PROBLEMS

Jeroboam's social-justice strivings against Solomon's corvée are ignored by the Chronicler. The Samaria whose independence gets reasserted in Jeroboam (2 Chron 10: 16) had been entrusted to David only to administer as a second fief, and the offer would have been continued if Rehoboam had shown some sense. To intercept politico-economic aspects of YHWH-pilgrimage flow southward to Zion, Jeroboam set up at Bethel and Dan the normal YHWH-throne bull sphinx (= "cherub"), whose implications were distorted by 1 Kings 12: 28 describing it in terms borrowed from the golden calf of Ex 32: 4.⁹⁴ 2 Chron notes only in passing these demonic calves (11: 13; 13: 8), along with the theologoumenon that not only all priests and Levites in Jeroboam's domain, abandoning their livelihood, but also all nonapostate laymen came to live in Judah and thus strengthened Rehoboam's reign.

Huge numbers are attributed to southern victories in skirmishes with the north; in 2 Chron 13: 17, Abijah felled 500,000 picked Israelites, "and the rest were reduced to submission" (inference from 16: 12?); in 17: 14, Jehoshaphat had a standing army of a million crack troops in Jerusalem alone plus others in the provinces. Refusal of burial with the other kings to Jehoram, Joash, Uzziah, Ahaz (21: 20; 24: 25; 26: 23; 28: 27) is coupled with clear insistence on burial of kings within the urban area (21: 20, Jehoram, as 1 Kings 15: 8, Abijah); popular convictions to the contrary are not con-

firmed by archeology.⁹⁵ Authenticity of the Uzziah gravestone has been claimed defensible only in the rather ad hoc supposition of a reburial monument.⁹⁶ The name of this king is given sometimes as Azariah, perhaps because of a transfer from his priest-regent.⁹⁷

The chronology of Asa in 16: 12 (along with his Christian Science sin of seeking medical assistance) is claimed superior to 1 Kings 20: 34.⁹⁸ (Variants of 2 Chron 17-24 concern only indirectly a new Jehoash chronology inscription.⁹⁹) But such claims can hardly stand except in an overall theory of the thorny monarchy dating norms.¹⁰⁰ Asa's reported destruction of dowager Maacah's Ashera idol (2 Chron 15: 16; as Josiah in 2 Kings 23: 6, 15) is the type of thing on which illuminating archeological finds might be hoped.¹⁰¹ Jehoram's Judah domination in Edom (21: 8), "in imitation of Ahab up North," we might say, sheds an interesting light on the Mesha inscription noted above, which makes Ahab the unsuccessful suzerain of nearby Moab.

Athaliah, with operatic villainy, instigated her husband Jehoram's murder of all his brothers (21: 4); she is "daughter of Ahab" and of Jezebel (21: 6) and (grand)daughter of Omri in 22: 2 = 2 Kings 8: 26, despite escape from some chronological tangles gained by supposing her Omri's own daughter.¹⁰² Jehoram has brothers whose Persian style names Jehiel and Michael also raise minor chronological suspicions. Athaliah herself also "destroyed all the family of the king" who succeeded Jehoram, his son Ahaziah (22: 10 = 2 Kings 11: 1). Despite the time lag, these two massacres may both refer to a single continuing murderousness, from which, however, as by a Dumas plot, Joash escaped. But he, despite his virtue, lived so short a time that idolatry and sacrilege had to be supplied for him (24: 18, 25; not in Kings).¹⁰³

Hezekiah's reign is a free field for archeological solutions in addition to the tunnel and southwest wall.

The invasion of Sennacherib connected with the tunnel in 32: 2 (but not 32: 30 or its probable source 2 Kings 20: 20) is generally held to have occurred only once, in 701 B.C. But the brief surrender of Hezekiah in 2 Kings 18: 14 ff, omitted in the Isaiah 36: 1 f parallel but corroborated by the chronology of Tirhakah (2 Kings 19: 9) and by Sennacherib's own account (*ANET*, p. 287), induces Bright to postulate a *second* campaign in 688, unmentioned in Assyrian records.¹⁰⁴ It is noteworthy that in 2 Chron 32: 12 (= 2 Kings 18: 22) the foreign agent Rabshakeh ascribes quite explicitly to Hezekiah the cult monopoly long claimed to have been the Deuteronomic (12: 13 f) innovation of Josiah (2 Chron 34: 7, 21; 2 Kings 23: 3 f). No real empirical information or error (van den Born) is involved in making Josiah's reform already well under way when the book was found; he was a child submissive to priests from the beginning of his rule. Excavated objects in

Egypt and Assyria show musicians setting the beat for masons at work; for Temple work it is plausible that such musicians should be Levites, and that this fact should be mentioned by a chronicler who is apparently a Levite musician.¹⁰⁵

Our principal conclusions may be summarized as follows. Extrabiblical sources of the Chronicler's factual variants may be admitted as a general rule if two or more cases can be empirically proved to correspond to his data better than to the parallels. Four test cases emerge.

The tunnel of Hezekiah is described at greater length in 2 Chron 32: 3, 30 but with no additional information not implicit in 2 Kings 20: 20. Thus neither the inscription nor the exploration of the tunnel corroborates Chronicles better than Kings, or affords a genuine proof that this tunnel was made by teams working from opposite ends or in Hezekiah's time.

The place of Josiah's expiring, given differently in 2 Chron 35: 24 and in 2 Kings 23: 30, and its theological justification, typical of the Chronicler, have received no archeological corroboration despite indecisive details about the "god" Josiah disobeyed; better conformity of 2 Chron 35: 20 to the Gadd Chronicle is due only to its greater vagueness along with misinterpretation of Hebrew 'al in 2 Kings 23: 29.

Geographical precisions like 2 Chron 20: 2; 1 Chron 2: 55; 18: 12, even if due to local traditions known orally to the Chronicler, might justly be attributed to an extrabiblical source; but the numerous interesting cases do not so far pass the bounds of working hypothesis.

A Babylon captivity of Manasseh in 2 Chron 33: 10 is proved neither by his forced accompaniment of Ashurbanipal in Palestine-Egypt nor by Esarhaddon's penchant for bringing refractory vassals to Nineveh; and whatever likelihood of a captivity these Assyrian documents do create is negated rather than supported by the Chronicler's assertion of divine liberation and consequent repentance.

In similar but minor Chronicles variants, we neither found nor expected to find any more cogent proof of source than the four test cases. Unless we have some of our facts wrong or have interpreted them more tendentiously than is done by current consensus, it would follow as a fact that no single use of extrabiblical sources by the Chronicler has ever been proved. From this further follows not the fact but the undeniable possibility that any information communicated to us only by the Chronicler may be due in every case to his own legitimate theological inference or paraphrase from the canonical Scripture.

NOTES

¹ Jacob M. Myers, *I Chronicles [II Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah]*, AB 12 [-14] (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965), p. xv; but see also pp. xlix, xxiv, xviii, xx: cited in our appreciation in *CBQ* 28 (1966), 520.

² How the dozen sources explicitly cited by the Chronicler can be reduced to a single "Midrash on Kings," whether or not identical with the canonical Sam-Kings [or known to the Chronicler only as already cited in Kings: A. van den Born, *Kronieken (De Boeken van het Oude Testament*, 5/3; Roermond: Romen, 1960) 9], must here be presumed from our *Jerome Biblical Commentary "Chronicles"* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 403, or Myers, or any other recent commentary; or the OT Introductions of O. Eissfeldt (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965) pp. 532 ff, and G. Fohrer (London: SPCK, 1970), p. 241; A. Burnet, "Le Chroniste et ses sources," *RB* 60 (1953), 481-508; 61 (1954), 349-86.

³ "On Right and Wrong Uses of Archaeology," see Roland de Vaux in the Nelson Glueck Festschrift, *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century* (ed. J. Sanders; Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), pp. 64-80; also pp. 268-76, "The Megiddo Stables: a Reassessment," by James B. Pritchard.

⁴ Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*⁸ (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967 = ¹1943) p. 139; p. 133 (our translation). In more specific justification of our limiting the source problem here to the books of Chronicles without the same author's Ezra-Nehemiah, see Frank Michaeli, *Les livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie (Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament*, 16; Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1967) [Footnotes p. 1], p. 24.

⁵ "Unity Passover": W. A. L. Elmslie, "Chronicles," *IB* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1954), 3, p. 537.

⁶ Guido Berardi, *Inscriptio Siloam* (facsimile, with explanations of Pietro Boccaccio; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1956); trans. of W. F. Albright in *ANET*³, p. 321; Sabatino Moscati, *L'epigrafi ebraica antica (Biblica et orientalia*, 15; Rome: PBI, 1951) pp. 40 ff; Raymond P. Dougherty, "Sennacherib and the Walled Cities of Judah," *JBL* 49 (1930), 160-71.

⁷ R. North, "Hômôt Y'rušalayim l'e-pl h'qirôt h'dašôt," in *Judah and Jerusalem* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1957), pp. 59-64; *Stratigraphia geobiblica*⁸ (Rome: PBI, 1970), p. 118; see notes 11-15, below.

⁸ L.-Hugues Vincent, *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament: Recherches d'archéologie et d'histoire I. Archéologie de la Ville* (Paris: Gabalda, 1954), pp. 269-79; *Underground Jerusalem* (London, 1911); "Les récentes fouilles d'Ophel," *RB* 20 (1911), 567-77; 21 (1912), 105-11, 424-41.

⁹ Georges Barrois, "Siloam," *IDB*, 4, p. 354; his map on p. 352 shows well the relation of the tunnel to earlier channels.

¹⁰ G. Ernest Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957), p. 169.

¹¹ Jan Simons, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories (Studia Scholten*, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1952), p. 238; on tunnel, pp. 157-94. To Hezekiah in 2 Chron 32: 5 is falsely ascribed the work of Manasseh (33: 14; note 57 below), according to Johann Fischer, "Die Mauern und Tore des biblischen Jerusalem," *TTQ* 113 (1932), 287; 221-88; 114 (1933), 73-85.

¹² Gustaf Dalman, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930), p. 83. David's occupation of the west hill, Urusalim of the Amarna letters, while Jebus was the east hill, is maintained by Pierce S. Hubbard, "The Topography of Ancient Jerusalem," *PEQ* 98 (1966), 130-54.

¹³ A. H. Sayce, "The Topography of Pre-Exilic Jerusalem," *PEQ* 15 (1883), 215-23; M. Avi-Yonah, "The Walls of Nehemiah: A Minimalist View," *IEJ* 4 (1954), 239-48 (1968), 98-125; Millar Burrows, "Nehemiah 3: 1-32 as a Source for the Topography of Ancient Jerusalem," *AASOR* 14 (1934), 115-40; "The Topography of Nehemiah 12: 31-43," *JBL* 54 (1935), 29-39; retracted in "Nehemiah's Tour of Inspection," *BASOR* 64 (1936), 12; and *IDB* 2, p. 854 [referring to 3, p. 533 map]. A Maccabean dating was favored by Kurt Galling, "Jerusalem," *Biblisches Reallexikon (HAT, 1; Tübingen: Mohr, 1937)*, p. 302; "Die Baugeschichte Jerusalems," *ZDPV* 54 (1931), 85-90; "Die Nekropole von Jerusalem," *PJ* 32 (1936), (73-) 95-101; following A. Alt, "Das Taltor von Jerusalem," *PJ* 24 (1928), 79-98.

¹⁴ W. F. Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine* (Pelican, 1951), p. 154, with J. Germer-Durand, *Topographie de l'ancienne Jérusalem* (Paris, 1925; *Guide N. D. de France* 1932, p. 82).

¹⁵ Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History* (New Aspects of Antiquity; London: Thames, 1967), p. 144; "Excavations in Jerusalem, 1966," *PEQ* 99 (1967), 65-71, and preceding campaigns [*BA* 27 (1964), 33-52]; Glueck Festschrift (note 3 above), pp. 232-53, "Israelite Jerusalem"; her excavations are incorporated into an overall reappraisal of Jerusalem's topography by Ernst Vogt, "Das Wachstum des alten Stadtgebietes von Jerusalem," *Bibl* 48 (1967), 337-58.

¹⁶ Since "Springs" is plainly plural [not also singular as in English, or as the Hebrew word for "water(s)"], not only Gihon but also Rogel and even "the dragon spring" of Neh 2: 13 are meant, according to Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher (HAT, 21; Tübingen: Mohr, 1955)*, p. 311. On p. 315, he suggests that vs 30 is taken from 2 Kings 20 "and amplified from the Chronicler's immediate personal experience of the local situation"; but its anticipation in vs 4 is anachronistic. The Rogel and (dubiously) dragon springs are admitted also by Lino Randellini, *Il libro delle Cronache* (S. Garofalo, *Sacra Bibbia*; Torino: Marietti, 1966), p. 462. But on p. 467 he feels surprisingly sure that the later allusion forms part of an addition "entirely due to the Chronicler" (32: 27-30, plus "a personal reflection" in vs 31) "possibly due to a special source listing Hezekiah's wealth"; p. 468 "his mode of describing the tunnel in divergence from the canonical source confirms the hypothesis that he was using a special document, yet does not exclude that an acquaintance with local conditions would have been adequate for him" (!?).

¹⁷ Hence we cannot admit Noth's too casual observation that the Chronicler adds to Kings three *genaue Angaben* (presumably empirical details, as distinct from verbal paraphrase): "occlusion of the upper issue," "deviation downwards," "toward west of Davidic city" (*ÜS*, 139, n. 3). He adds in the text that there can be no question here of a local Jerusalem tradition known orally to the Chronicler because (!) his vs 30 gives essentially the same fact as his vs 4, which is "all too plainly far removed from a local tradition."

¹⁸ Kurt Galling, *Die Bücher der Chronik (ATD, 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1954)* p. 165; he holds 2 Chron 32: 3 an interpolation not agreeing with 32: 30.

¹⁹ F. X. Rodríguez Moleró, "Los dos libros de las Crónicas," in *La Sagrada Escritura: Texto y comentario*, ed. J. Leal (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 281, 1968), pp. 2, 934.

²⁰ Noth, *ÜS*, 140; G. Beyer, "Das Festungssystem Rehabeams," *ZDPV* 54 (1931), 113-34; on Manasseh, see note 57 below. We may note here some titles whose apparent relevance to our theme is fallacious: Elias Auerbach, "Die grosse Überarbeitung der biblischen Bücher," *VT(S)*, 1 (Copenhagen volume, 1953), 1-10 relates to D and P sources; H. W. Hertzberg, "Die Nachgeschichte alttestamentlicher Texte innerhalb des ATs" (*BZAW* 66, *Werden und Wesen des ATs*, 1936), 110-21.

²¹ Godfrey R. Driver, "L'interprétation du texte masorétique à la lumière de la lexicographie hébraïque," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 26 (1950), 347, "applied himself."

²² André Robert, "Littéraires (Genres)," *DBS* 5, pp. 418; 405-21; (with A. Tricot), *Guide to the Bible*² (New York: Desclée, 1960), 508; cf. A. Robert, A. Feuillet, *Introduction to the OT* (New York: Desclée, 1969), "Chronicles" by H. Lusseau. Millar Burrows, "Ancient Israel," in R. Dentan, *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East* (New Haven, 1955), p. 126, the Chronicler "interprets the whole past in terms of individual retribution, even though this sometimes involves a radical reconstruction of what could be known from the more ancient sources." It must be recognized that in the search for sources there is no essential difference between such "theological reasoning" and what other authors call "pure fiction": Robert H. Pfeiffer, *IDB*, 1, p. 577; C. C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies* (University of Chicago Press, 1910) p. 231; *The Chronicler's History of Israel* (1954); though it is hard to see what is gained by considering the Chronicler "as fantastically unhistorical as possible" [Hugo Preller, *Geschichte der Historiographie unseres Kulturkreises: Materialien, Skizzen, Vorarbeiten; I, bis 330 a.D.* (Aalen: Scientia, 1967), p. 104].

²³ B. Couroyer, "Le litige entré Josias et Nechao," *RB* 55 (1948), 388-96.

²⁴ Bernard Alfrink, "Der Schlacht bei Megiddo und der Tod des Josias," *Bibl* 15 (1934), 180; 173-84.

²⁵ James A. Montgomery, *Kings*, in *ICC* (New York: Scribner, 1951), p. 537, notes grounds for a "detailed and probably true tradition preserved in Chron."

²⁶ Noth, *ÜS*, 140; *ANET* 305 [with insertions by A. Oppenheim]; C. J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh: The Newly Discovered Babylonian Chronicle* (London: Longmans, 1923), p. 35, "Ashur-uballit, king of Assyria, much E[gy]pt, crossed the river to conquer Harran"; Donald J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings* (London: British Museum, 1956); David N. Freedman, "The Babylonian Chronicle," *BA* 19 (1956), 50-60; Ernst Vogt, "Die neubabylonische Chronik über die Schlacht bei Karkemisch und die Einnahme von Jerusalem," *VT(S)*, 4 (Strasbourg volume, 1957), pp. 67-96; A. C. Welch, "The Death of Josiah," *ZAW* 43 (1925), 255-60.

²⁷ The combination 'ālā 'al can only be hostile, according to Arthur Hjelt, "Die Chronik Nabupolassars und der syrische Feldzug Nechos," *BZAW* 41 (Festschrift K. Marti, 1925), 145; 142-47.

²⁸ The Chronicler misunderstood as Megiddo that *Migdol* near Qadeš which Herodotus 2, 159 calls *Mágdolos*, according to T. H. Robinson, *History of Israel* (Oxford: 1932), 1, p. 424, n. 2, following an unpublished lead of R. H. Kennett.

²⁹ S. Klein, "Palästinisches im Jubiläenbuch," *ZDPV* 57 (1934), 16; 7-27.

³⁰ J. Mulcahy, "1 and 2 Chronicles," in Nelson's *New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (ed. R. Fuller; London, 1969), p. 356, seems to hold with A. Bea, *Bibl* 27 (1946), 145, that every report similar to the corroborated ones must be ascribed to factual sources until proved otherwise. [His citation of Bea's "Neuere Arbeiten zum Problem der biblischen Chronikbücher" in #297a should be *Bibl* 22 (1946), 46-58; while *Collationes Gandavenses* 33 (1950), 205-27, is H. van den Bussche, "Het Problem van Kronieken."] But on p. 355 he says "we are justified in making the general statement that [the Chronicler's] changes of Sm-Kgs are based on literary and theological grounds, rather than on historical information."

³¹ Primo Vannutelli, *Libri synoptici Veteris Testamenti, seu librorum Regum et Chronicorum loci paralleli hebraice graece et latine* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1931), pp. 428, 442 referring to 410.

³² Noth, *ÜS*, 142, n. 3; "Eine palästinische Lokalüberlieferung in 2 Chr. 20," *ZDPV* 67 (1945), 52, 45-71.

³³ Professor Myers in *II Chronicles*, p. 114, not rejecting the view of Benzinger that this chapter is "a beautiful example of an historical midrash," adds, "the essence of the story is not pure fabrication, although much of it is couched in terms drawn from the period in which the author was writing . . . certain features have been magnified somewhat out of proportion."

³⁴ Adolphe Lods, "Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la formation des récits de l'Ancien Testament," *RHR* 88 (1923), 51-64; W. H. Gispen, *Mondelinge overlevering in het Oude Testament* (Meppel, 1932); H. S. Nyberg, "Das textkritische Problem des ATs am Hoseabuch demonstriert," *ZAW* 52 (1934), 243; 241-54 and *Studien zum Hoseabuch* (Uppsala, 1935); Geo Widengren, "Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets," *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift* 1948/10, pp. 61 and 11-34. The objections of J. van der Ploeg, "Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la transmission du texte de l'AT," *RB* 54 (1947), 5-41, "must be reappraised," according to H. Stoebe, *BZAW* 77 (1958), 243.

³⁵ M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*² (*HAT*, 7; Tübingen: Mohr, 1953¹1937); Brevard S. Childs, "A Study of the Formula 'Unto This Day,'" *JBL* 82 (1963), 279-92; Johannes Fichtner, "Die etymologische Ätiologie in den Namengebungen der geschichtlichen Bücher des ATs," *VT* 6 (1956), 372-96; J. L. Seeligmann, "Aetiological Elements in Biblical Historiography," *Zion* 26 (1961), 141-69.

³⁶ Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine (1838)*² (Boston, 1856); F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine* (Paris: Gabalda, 1967 = 1933-38).

³⁷ L.-Hugues Vincent, "Abraham à Jérusalem," *RB* 58 (1951), 360-71.

³⁸ Nelson Glueck, *Rivers in the Desert: A History of the Negev* (New York: Farrar, 1959), p. 63.

³⁹ Noted with disfavor by Samuel Krauss, "Moriah-Ariel I," *PEQ* 79 (1947), 46.

⁴⁰ M. Noth, *Josua*², p. 100, abandons the view of *Josua*¹ on the basis of G. Harding *PEQ* 84 (1952), 104 (no pre-Roman sherds at Qumran), but reespouses it in "Der alttestamentliche Name der Siedlung auf chirbet kumrân," *ZDPV* 71 (1955), 111-23.

⁴¹ R. North, "Three Judean Hills in Josue 15, 9 f.," *Bibl* 37 (1956), 209-16. This Baalah is equated rather with that of Jos 19: 44 on a ridge south of Beersheba by Mordechai Gichon, "The Defences of the Salomonic Kingdom," *PEQ* 95 (1963), 113-26. On Petra-Seir as the stronghold of Ḥorim but not Ḥurrians, see R. de Vaux, "Les Ḥurrites de l'histoire et les Horites de la Bible," *RB* 74 (1967), 481-503; otherwise our "Some Links between the Ḥurrians and the Language of the Exodus," *Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung*² (H. Bossert volume, 1965), pp. 349; 343-57.

⁴² The Carians/Cretans in 2 Sam 8: 18 are called centurions and given Jewish names in 2 Chron 23: 1. Egyptian *Keftiu* was Caphtor=Crete until 1370, then applied to Cilicia, according to J. Prignaud, "Caftorim et Kerétim," *RB* 71 (1964), 215-29; somewhat similarly, G. A. Wainwright, "Caphtor-Cappadocia," "Some Early Philistine History," *VT* 6 (1956), 199-210; 9 (1959), 73-84. Hanniba'al the PLTY is linked with Phoenician Cirta of Algeria by Hermann Schult, "Ein inschriftlicher Beleg für 'Plethi'?", *ZDPV* 81 (1965), 74-79.

⁴³ Abraham Malamat, "King Lists of the Old Babylonian Period and Biblical Genealogies" [J. J. Finkelstein, "The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty," *JCS* 20 (1966), 95-118], *JAOS* 88 (Speiser issue, 1968 = *AO Series*, 53), 163-73.

⁴⁴ J. Simons, "The 'Table of Nations' (Gen. x): Its General Structure and Meaning," *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 10 (1954), 155-84; cf 5 (1948), 92.

⁴⁵ N. A. van Uchelen, *Abraham de Hebreëer: een literair- en historisch-kritische studie naar aanleiding van Genesis 14: 13* (*Studia Semitica Neerlandica*, 5; Assen: van Gorcum, 1964), reviewing theories of Albright (note 83 below) and others on Abraham as merchant,

concludes he was rather a warrior hero like the Ḥabiru. S. N. Kramer, "Sumerian Literature and the Bible," *Studia Biblica et Orientalia* (Analecta Biblica, 12; Rome: PBI, 1959), pp. 203; 185-204, holds with Poebel that Šem comes from Sumer like *šem* "name" from *šummu*.

⁴⁶ M. Noth (also ed.), *Könige (Biblischer Kommentar)*; Neukirchen: Verein, 1964), p. 232, rejects as "forced" the interpretation "foundry-ships" by W. F. Albright, "New Light on the Early History of Phoenician Colonization," *BASOR* 83 (1941), 17 [and J. M. Solá Solé, "Tarshish y los comienzos de la colonización fenicea en Occidente," *Seferad* 17 (1957), 23-35]; R. North, "Ophir/Parvaim and Petra/Joktheel," *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1967), 1, pp. 197-202; other interpretations of Parvaim in *VT* 11 (1961), 30-38 and 14 (1964), 155-63 (Hyperborea: P. Grelot); 13 (1963), 158-86 (Hesperides: H. E. del Médico).

⁴⁷ Benjamin Mazar (=Maisler), "The Excavation of Tel Qasileh," *IEJ* 1 (1950), 209.

⁴⁸ Eugene Maly, *The World of David and Solomon* (Backgrounds to the Bible, 2; Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 151; R. North, "Phoenicia-Canaan Boundary *L'bb'-Hamat*," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph de Beyrouth* 46 (M. Dunand volume, 1971), 71-103.

⁴⁹ S. Abramsky, "The Qenites," "The House of Rechab: Genealogy and Social Character"; S. Talmon, "*Hemmá ha-qēnim ha-bā'im mē-ḥammāt* [= "relatives"] *ābl bēl Reḳab*": *Eretz-Israel* 3 (1954), 124; 8 (1967), 255-64; 5 (Mazar volume, 1958), 111-13.

⁵⁰ R. North, "The Cain Music," *JBL* 83 (1964), 373-89 [p. 377, correct to "Breadville" the third "Forestville," of 1 Chron 2: 54 (not 53)].

⁵¹ R. North, "Caleb," *Bibbia e Oriente* 8 (G. Rinaldi issue, 1966), 167; W. Beltz, *Die Kaleb-Tradition* (Budapest, 1966; *ZAW* [1967], 117).

⁵² G. Berardi, P. Boccaccio: facsimile, *Inscriptio Meša Regis* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1956); Albright translation and bibliography in *ANET*, p. 320.

⁵³ Barthel Hrouda, *Tell Halaf IV: Die Kleinjunde aus historischer Zeit* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962); our review in *Orientalia* 39 (1970), 579.

⁵⁴ On this practice attributed to Israelites only here and 2 Chron 28: 3 = 2 Kings 16: 3 Ahaz, see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (tr. J. McHugh; London: McGraw, 1961), pp. 445 f and bibliography, p. 548.

⁵⁵ Text and concise critical exposition in Randellini, *Cronache*, p. 475 ff; Herbert E. Ryle in R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford University Press, 1968 = 1913), 1, pp. 612-24; L. Gry, "Manassé dans les légendes midrashiques," *Mélanges L. Potechard* (Lyons, 1945), pp. 147-57.

⁵⁶ Henri Cazelles, *Les livres des Chroniques* (Bible de Jérusalem; Paris: Cerf, 1954), p. 56; Eissfeldt's *OT Introduction*, p. 588, finds a similar implication in 2 Chron 33: 12; but it is rejected in the English Jerusalem Bible (ed. A. Jones; Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), p. 565 n.

⁵⁷ J. Simons, "The Wall of Manasseh and the 'Mišneh' of Jerusalem," *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 7 (1950), 191, 179-200; *Jerusalem in OT*, p. 328.

⁵⁸ D. J. Wiseman, "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon," *Iraq* 20 (1958), 1-99; R. Borger, "Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, König von Assyrien," *AJO*, Beiheft 9 (1956), 60; *ANET*, p. 291.

⁵⁹ Eissfeldt's *OT Introduction*, p. 536, in admitting Manasseh's captivity "no doubt historical but clearly improperly interpreted," does not take issue on whether the Chronicler got this from a documented source.

⁶⁰ Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, p. 316. He here rejects even more bluntly the view that the Chronicler erroneously applies to Manasseh what was true of Jehoiachin (36: 10; 2 Kings

24: 15) as hinted in the "halberds" of Ezek 19: 9; Cazelles, *Chroniques*, p. 227 [also rejected in the English Jerusalem Bible, p. 565 n]; R. Fruin, "De gevangenschap van Koning Manasse te Babel," *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* 19 (1930), 3-9.

⁶¹ Johann Goettsberger, *Die Bücher der Chronik* (Bonner Bibel 4/1; Bonn: Hanstein, 1931), p. 369; following Carl F. Keil, *Chronik* (Biblicher Commentar; Leipzig: Dörffling, 1870), p. 365; Franz X. Kugler, "Zur Glaubwürdigkeit der Chronik," *Von Moses bis Paulus; Forschungen zur Geschichte Israels* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1922), pp. 224-300; 282 [and *Stimmen der Zeit* 109 (1925), 367-82].

⁶² Maximilian Streck, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Ninivehs* (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1916), 2, p. 139; 1, p. xvii.

⁶³ Ernst E. Ehrlich, "Der Aufenthalt des Königs Manasse in Babylon," *TZ* 21 (1965), 281-86. He declares that Noth's first edition of *ÜS*, on p. 183, holds the deportation un-historical. But the only allusion on p. 282 of the later edition is less clear. The Esarhaddon prism A 5,57 is in *ANET*, p. 291; F. Michaëli refers to it also on p. 69 of his *Textes de la Bible et de l'Ancien Orient*. Esarhaddon's date is 680-669 B.C.; and Manasse's 696 [Jepsen; 687 Bright]-642 B.C.

⁶⁴ Francesco Vattioni, "La necromanzia nell'Antico Testamento 1 Sam 28, 3-25," *Augustinianum* 3 (1963), 474; 461-81.

⁶⁵ Hans-J. Stoebe, "Die Einnahme Jerusalems und der Šinnor," *ZDPV* 73 (1957), 73-99; Vincent and Simons as notes 8 and 11 above.

⁶⁶ Charles C. Torrey, "The Chronicler as Editor and as Independent Narrator," *Ezra Studies* (Chicago, 1910), ch. 10 = *AJSL* 25 (1909) 157-73; 188-217; otherwise Benjamin Mazar, "The Military Elite of King David," *VT* 13 (1963), 319; 310-20.

⁶⁷ A. van Selms, "Preutseid in Kronieke," *Hervormde Theologiese Studies* 4 (1948), 136, 133-44; Hans-J. Stoebe, "David und Mikal: Überlegungen zur Jugendgeschichte Davids," *BZAW* 77 (Festschrift for O. Eissfeldt, *Von Ugarit nach Qumran*, 1958), 224-43; R. A. Carlson, *David, the Chosen King* (Uppsala: Almqvist, 1964), p. 93.

⁶⁸ H. van den Bussche, "Le texte de la prophétie de Nathan sur la dynastie davidique, II. Sam., VII—I. Chron. XVII," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 24 (1948), 393; 354-94; a common source, not necessarily better preserved in Chronicles, is also maintained by [J. Wilhelm Rothstein] Johannes Hänel, *Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik* (*KAT*; Leipzig: Deichert, 1927), p. 385; denied by Noth, *ÜS*, 132-37; G. Johannes Botterweck, "Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte," *TTQ* 136 (1956), 402-35. Van den Bussche bases his view largely on Arno Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen* (*BZAW*, 16; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1909); but a third source behind Kings and Chron can not be determined by textual criticism, according to Martin Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, 13/3; Münster: Aschendorff, 1937), 128; see now Gillis Gerleman, "The Chronicles and Their Sources," *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament* (Lund: Gleerup, 1948), pp. 8-23; and *Studies in the Septuagint II: Chronicles* (Lund, 1946). On the 2 Sam 7 parallel, further: Marcel Simon, "La prophétie de Nathan et le Temple," *RHPR* 32 (1952), 41-58; on van den Bussche and Sigmund Mowinkel, "Natanforjettelsen, II. Sam. kap. 7," *Svensk Exegelik Årsbok* 12 (1947), 220-29; now Artur Weiser, "Die Tempelbaukrise unter David," *ZAW* 77 (1965), 153-68; Hans Gottlieb, "Die Tradition von David als Hirten," *VT* 17 (1967), 190-200; John L. McKenzie, "The Dynastic Oracle: II Samuel 7," *Theological Studies* 8 (1947), 190; 187-218.

⁶⁹ Myers, *I Chronicles*, p. 146; R. North, "'Kittim' War or 'Sectaries' Liturgy?," *Bibl* 39 (1958), 90 [84-93] on Qumran *Milḥamā* scroll 2, 4; 7, 1, ed. Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1957), p. 72.

⁷⁰ M. D. Goldman, "From Whom Did David Buy the Temple Area?" *Australian Biblical Review* 1 (1951), 138 f; H. B. Rosen, "Arawna—nom hittite?" *VT* 5 (1955), 319 [arawanni = "free"]; Arawna was the last Jebusite king, according to Shemuel Yeivin, "Social, Religious, and Cultural Trends in Jerusalem under the Davidic Dynasty," *VT* 3 (1953), 149 (-166), citing his "Beginnings of the Davidids," *Zion* 9 (1944), 63 f, and Mazar, "The Scribe of King David and the Problem of the High Officials in the Ancient Kingdom of Israel," *Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society* 13 (1947), 105. But see notes 80-83 below.

⁷¹ Shemuel Yeivin, "Was There a High Portal in the First Temple?," *VT* 14 (1964), 331-43, holds that Chronicles gives only the height of the porch after repairs (implied in 2 Chron 24: 6 ff; 34: 8 = 2 Kings 12: 5; 22: 3), while Kings gives only the height of the building before repairs; at both times, building and porch would have had similar height.

⁷² 1 Sam 4: 4; 2 Chron 7: 41 = Ps 132: 8; Ps 138: 1 (angels = *elohim*); 99: 1; 104: 3 f; 18: 10; Ex 13: 21; 23: 23; R. de Vaux, "Les Chérubins et l'arche d'alliance; les Sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'ancien Orient," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph de Beyrouth* 37 (R. Mouterde issue, 1961), pp. 94; 93-124.

⁷³ Henri Lammens, "Le culte des bétyles et les processions religieuses chez les Arabes préislamites," *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 17 (1919), 39-101 = his *L'Arabie occidentale avant l'Hégire* (1928), 101-79; Julian Morgenstern, "The Ark, the Ephod, and the 'Tent of Meeting,'" *HUCA* 17 (1943), 185 (beautiful girl inside); 205 (copies of Qor'an inside); 153-265; 18 (1944), 39; 1-52; Frank Cross, "The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological and Historical Approach," *BA* 10 (1947), 60; 45-68; Eduard Nielsen, "Some Reflections on the History of the Ark," *VT(S)*, 7 (Oxford volume, 1960), 61-74; Edward Robertson, "The 'Urîm and Tummîm: What Were They?," *VT* 14 (1964), 67-74; 73, contained in Ark; denied by Leonard A. Bushinski (N. Greitmann) in L. Hartman (A. van den Born), *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: McGraw, 1963) 134 f following L. Dürr, "Ursprung und Bedeutung der Bundeslade," *Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge* 1 (1924), 17-32; further H.-J. Kraus, "Archäologische und topographische Probleme Jerusalems im Lichte der Psalmenexegese," *ZDPV* 75 (1959), (125-40); Gerhard von Rad, "Zelt und Lade," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 42 (1931), 476-98 = *Gesammelte Schriften* (München: Kaiser, 1965) pp. 109-29; *OT Theology*, 1, 237 f.; G. Henton Davies, *IDB*, 1, pp. 222-26.

⁷⁴ R. North, "Measures" (chart), *New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London: Nelson, 1969) p. 106 f (#86g). G. Barrois in *IB*, 1, pp. 152-57, calculates the bath at double this amount; excavated samples bear marks ranging from 20 to 50 quarts.

⁷⁵ C. Wylie, "On King Solomon's Molten Sea," *BA* 12 (1949), 86-90.

⁷⁶ See note 47 above; and Hannes Mayer, "Das Bauholz des Tempels Salomos," *BZ* 11 (1967), 53-66.

⁷⁷ Harry C. Richardson, "Iron, Prehistoric and Ancient," *AJA* 38 (1934), 555-83; 41 (1937), 441-47; G. Ernest Wright, "Iron: The Date of its Introduction into Common Use in Palestine," *AJA* 43 (1939), 458-63; R. J. Forbes, "The Early Story of Iron," *Studies in Ancient Technology*, 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1964), pp. 175-290; 7 (1963), 67-191; *Metallurgy in Antiquity: A Notebook for Archaeologists and Technologists* (Leiden: 1950); M. Noth, *The History of Israel*² (tr. P. Ackroyd; London: Black, 1960), p. 171; John Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), p. 164.

⁷⁸ William F. Stinespring, "Eschatology in Chronicles," *JBL* 80 (1961), 213, 209-19.

⁷⁹ Shemuel Yeivin, "The High Place at Gibeon," *Revue de l'Histoire Juive en Égypte*, 1 (the only volume, 1947), pp. 143-47.

⁸⁰ Elias Auerbach, "Die Herkunft der Šadoķiden," *ZAW* 49 (1931), 327 f; Henri Cazell-

les, "David's Monarchy and the Gibeonite Claim," *PEQ* 87 (1955), (162-)-172; J. M. Grintz, "Aspects of the History of the High-Priesthood," *Zion* 24 (1959), 124-40; J. Dus, "Gibeon, eine Kultstätte des šmš und die Stadt des benjaminitischen Schicksals," *VT* 10 (1960), 353-74; James B. Pritchard, *Gibeon Where the Sun Stood Still* (Princeton, 1962).

⁸¹ W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, p. 53, citing the unsuccessful refutation of Wellhausen by Kurt Möhlenbrink, "Die levitischen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments," *ZAW* 52 (1934), 204; L. Waterman, "Some Repercussions of Late Levitical Genealogical Accretions in P and the Chronicler," *AJSL* 58 (1941), 49-56.

⁸² Harold H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok," in *Festschrift für A. Bertholet* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1950), pp. 461-72; "Zadok and Nehushtan," *JBL* 58 (1939), 113-41; Karl Budde, "Der Herkunft Šadoqs," *ZAW* 52 (1934), 42-50; H. G. Judge, "Aaron, Zadok and Abiathar," *JTS* 7 (1956), 70-74.

⁸³ Christian E. Hauer, "Who Was Zadok?" *JBL* 82 (1963), 89-94; not king but deserting soldier-priest of Jebus; see his "Jerusalem, the Stronghold and Rephaim," *CBQ* 32 (1970), 571-78; J. R. Bartlett, "Zadok and His Successors at Jerusalem," *JTS* 19 (1968), 1-18; on Salem = Jerusalem, M. Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, 8 (1951), pp. 29; 28-46; Joseph (Ignatius) Hunt, "Recent Melchizedek Study," Memorial for M. Gruenthaner, *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought* (ed. J. McKenzie; New York: Herder, 1962) pp. 25; 21-33; denied by W. F. Albright, "Abram the Hebrew: a New Archaeological Interpretation," *BASOR* 163 (Oct., 1961), 52; 36-54.

⁸⁴ Leroy Waterman, "Moses the Pseudo Levite," *JBL* 59 (1940), 397-404; denied by T. J. Meek, "Moses and the Levites," *AJSL* 56 (1939), 113-20.

⁸⁵ C. Hauret, "Moïse était-il prêtre?," *Bibl* 40 (1959), 509-21.

⁸⁶ André Lefèvre, "Note d'exégèse sur la généalogie des Qéhatites," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 37 (1950), 287-92.

⁸⁷ Harry Țur-Sinai (Torczyner), "A Psalm by the Sons of Heman," *JBL* 68 (1949), 247-49; Edward L. Curtis and Albert A. Madsen, *Chronicles*, in ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1910), p. 281.

⁸⁸ Hartmut Gese, "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am zweiten Tempel," *Festschrift für O. Michel, Abraham unser Vater* (ed. O. Betz; Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1963), pp. 225, 226-34.

⁸⁹ Albrecht Alt, "Die Weisheit Salomos," *TLZ* 76 (1951), 139-44; M. Noth, "Die Bewahrung von Salomos 'Göttlicher Weisheit,'" *VT(S)*, 3 (Rowley volume, 1960), 225-37.

⁹⁰ M. J. Buss, "The Psalms of Asaph and Korah," *JBL* 82 (1963), 382-92.

⁹¹ W. F. Albright, *ARI*² (Baltimore 1953), pp. 197, 210; holding *māḥōl* = "dancer"; see also his "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom" *VT(S)*, 3 (Rowley volume, 1960), 1-15.

⁹² Robert H. Pfeiffer, "Edomitic Wisdom," *ZAW* 44 (1926), 19; 13-25; *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper, 1941), p. 676, rejecting the apocryphal addition to Septuagint Job which makes him the Edomite Jobab of Gen 36: 33.

⁹³ Abraham Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon," *JNES* 22 (1963), 11, 1-17; favoring Siamun. Shishak is a more intriguing but less likely candidate: B. Mazar, "The Campaign of the Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine," *VT(S)*, 4 (Strasbourg volume, 1957), 57-66, finds 2 Chron 12 an amalgam of a prophetic and a Kings source.

⁹⁴ Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (New York: McGraw, 1961), p. 333, and "Le schisme religieux de Jéroboam I^{er}," *Angelicum*, 20 (Vosté volume, 1943), 77-91.

⁹⁵ Shemuel Yeivin, "The Sepulchers of the Kings of the House of David," *JNES* 6 (1948), (30-) 45; Samuel Krauss, "Moriah-Ariel II: The Sepulchres of the Davidic Dynasty," *PEQ* 79 (1947), 102-11; J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the OT*, pp. 274, 309; both *IDB*,

1, p. 475; and *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 2452, preserve the no-city-burial view.

⁹⁶ Eleazar L. Sukenik, "An Epitaph of Uzziahu King of Judah," *Tarbiš* 2 (1931), 288-92; W. F. Albright, "The Discovery of an Aramaic Inscription Relating to King Uzziyah," *BASOR* 44 (1931), 8-10, suggesting that the reburied bones were not those of Uzziyah.

⁹⁷ R. North, "The Qumran Reservoirs," in M. Gruenthaner Memorial, *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought* (New York: Herder, 1962), pp. 112 n; 100-32.

⁹⁸ H. Neil Richardson, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles," *JBR* 26 (1958), 10, 9-12, citing W. F. Albright, "A Votive Stele Erected by Ben-Hadad I of Damascus to the God Melcarth," *BASOR* 87 (1942), 27.

⁹⁹ Stephanie Page, "A Stela of Adad-nirari III [810-783] and Nergal-ereš from [David Oates excavation] Tell al Rimah," *Iraq* 30 (1968), 139-53; best explained as a co-regency of Jehoash with his father dating from 806 B.C., according to Aelred Cody, "A New Inscription from Tell al-Rimah and King Jehoash of Israel," *CBQ* 32 (1970), 333; 325-40.

¹⁰⁰ A. Jepsen [R. Hanhart, *Makkabäer*], *Untersuchungen zur israelitisch-jüdischen Chronologie* (BZAW, 88; Berlin: Topelmann, 1964), updating of J. Begrich, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda und die Quellen des Rahmens der Königbücher* (*Beiträge zur historischen Theologie*, 3; Tübingen: Mohr, 1929); V. Pavlovský, E. Vogt, "Die Jahre der Könige von Juda und Israel," *Bibl* 45 (1964), 321-47, and Vogt "Zeittafel," in *Wort und Botschaft* (ed. J. Schreiner; Würzburg: Echter, 1967), pp. 389-402; Edwin R. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*² (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), our review in *CBQ* 29 (1967), 181-83; W. F. Albright, "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel," *BASOR* 100 (1946), 16-22; see also the 1961 Albright *Festschrift* articles on chronology by D. Freedman and E. Campbell, pp. 203-88.

¹⁰¹ Gerhard von Rad, "Die levitische Predigt in den Büchern der Chronik, in *Festschrift für O. Procksch* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1934), pp. 113-24; A. S. Herbert, "Chronicles," in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (London: Nelson, 1962), p. 358, distinguishes deuteronomic from priestly influences in the Chronicler; W. Rudolph, "Der Aufbau der Asa-Geschichte," *VT* 2 (1952), 367-71.

¹⁰² Myers, *II Chronicles*, p. 120, lends tacit support to J. Begrich, "Atalja, die Tochter Omris," *ZAW* 53 (1935), 78 f and H. J. Katzenstein, "Who Were the Parents of Athaliah?" *IEJ* 5 (1955), 194-97.

¹⁰³ Similarly 1 Chron 15: 13 augments the punishment of Uzzah, 2 Sam 6: 7, according to A. George, "Fautes contre Yahwé dans les livres de Samuël," *RB* 53 (1946), 161-84.

¹⁰⁴ John Bright, *History of Israel*, pp. 282-87; denied by H. H. Rowley, "Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion," *BJRL* 44 (1961), 417, 395-431; Herbert Haag, "La campagne de Sennachérib contre Jérusalem en 701," *RB* 58 (1951), 356; 348-59.

¹⁰⁵ 2 Chron 34: 13; Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, p. 323, against G. von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (BWANT, 54; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), p. 104.