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 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 f.), 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 Assayria (2 Kings 18: 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 Y] 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 [GP: •water (canal) 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 + kal katalschysen 'and he succeeded' (schō) or 'shut it off' (dchō)].

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 fruit 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."

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 tunnel 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 Pére 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. 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. 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. Some date this as early as David himself or even the Jebusites. But a post-Nehemiah dating has gained wide support. The extreme dating was that of Albright—as late as the time of Herod. But the recent excavations of Miss Kenyon now claim certitude for a date nearly a hundred years later.

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. 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. 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. 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 nahal usually means "wadi," and may well refer to Kidron itself as the location of the spring. Sīqāp 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 fail 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. 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 Magedo]. His retainers drove him away dead from Megiddo [G B Make- don]. They brought him to Jerusalem and buried him 'with a funeral' [or 'in a tomb', G tāphos also bivalent] 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 Carchemish, 'al [>G49] Euphrates. Josiah went out to intercept him. 21 He however had sent to him this message: "Wh...t affair is this of yours, king of Judah? You are not minding [all] 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,
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he 'disguised himself' [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 the factual details are “supplied by theological reasoning” from the Chronicler’s own imagination. 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. Venerable authorities even suspect the Assyrian king (= ilani) involved here. 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. Ultimately his only real talking point is the purpose of Neco’s expedition, which is given by the Chronicler so factual, positive inaccuracy which Noth attributes to Kings as disproved by the Gadd Chronicle. 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 ‘at may equally well mean “for” (as Gadd) or “against” (as G), exactly like our deplorably ambiguous English “fight with.” Presuming that Josephus Antiquitates 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.

Does Archeology Prove Chronicles Sources?

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. 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. We here find the data for the test case less cogent than for the daughter cases.

Toponomy: 2 Chron 20: 1–30 (not II 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. 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. 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. 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). 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 Hassa of Nabatean Ma‘ôn, which constitutes the upper origins of the wadi Yassara (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.26

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.26 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 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.38s

It is to the “etiology” of the Amorite,” which may well be a convergence of empirical compatibilities: a sound and normal procedure of the inductive sciences.

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-Chronicer 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 Kitim, 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 Joppa, alleged to corroborate also the unparalleled 2 Chron 2: 16 as base for cedar transshipment though north of the Yarkon River.47 Israel’s northeast boundary L‘bō-Hamait 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 Kiriaht-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 Rechab) and Jer 35: 2.49 This Rechab is related to Cain and the Kenites, thus also to Kenaz (Teman, Edom, 1: 51; ?Nebaitot 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: 4–5 may perhaps be homogenized by supposing Jephunneh to be a village rather than a patronym, as in 2: 50 ff.51 Caleb’s eastern Marahash 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 Šupp(p)am], if plausibly equated with the modern-sounding Akkadian šipī = “so-and-so.” Gozan is a river in 1 Chron 5: 26, or a town on a river, but distinct from Ḥabor, 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, syncrétist idolatry, and "passing his sons through fire." But the latter part differs radically in the two reports:

2 Kings 21: 10. יְּהוָ֣ה 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 יְּהוָ֣ה 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 יְּהוָ֣ה God of Israel measured, and the plumb-line which was hung over Ahab's house. 14 I will wipe out Jerusalem the way a man wipes off a plate, wipes it and turns it upside down. 15 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 by leading Judah into sin."

2 Chron 33: 10. יְּהוָ֣ה spoke to Manasseh and his people, but they would not listen. 11 So יְּהוָ֣ה 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 יְּהוָ֣ה his God. He was humbled 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 יְּהוָ֣ה is indeed God. 14 He therefore rebuilt the outer wall of the Davidic city, on the slope west of Gilon 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 יְּהוָ֣ה however he refurbished, to offer upon it sacrifices of communion and gratitude. Judah too he invited to the cultus of יְּהוָ֣ה God of Israel. 17 Nevertheless the people went right on sacrificing on the high-places, only claiming it was in honor of יְּהוָ֣ה their God.

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,

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." 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 readily.

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. They both (like Galling and Rudolph) point to Assyrian sources which attest temporary arrest of vassal kings for briefing at the palace. 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. 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. 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.

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. 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-ukīn there and had sent to summon Manasseh from Jerusalem as one of the vassals supporting the uprising. 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 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. 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 śinnōr, which, despite well-grounded archeological acclaim for the “water-shaft” (RSV), is more objectively rendered “pipe” (“grappling-hook,” NEB; G paraziphis). 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 vs 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 Michael’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 vēhāh 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 if 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 (kręḥāḥm, 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 eḥōḥām 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 = ⅓ πR³) while the Chronicler calculates them as a cylinder (V = πCr²),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 Joppa = ṪQasila” in vs 16).76 The Temple area was to be 60 x 20 “old standard” cubits (2
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 Huram's art work was cast at Solomon's foundry between Succoth and Zeredah (2 Chron 4: 17; G: Anamesiradathai; 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 operations, David had set the defeated Ammonites to work producing iron (as well as in bronze, 1 Kings 7: 2).

The fact had stored up tons of iron to make nails and hinges for doors, images, and of the Temple. Solomon's bath was 20 feet 9 inches long, 20 feet wide, and 6 feet deep at its greatest depth (1 Kings 7: 23); and its capacity was 1,000 baths (2 Kings 25: 13). The Ark of the Covenant was 4' 6" long, 2' 9" wide, and 2' 6" high (Ex 25: 10). David paid 150 shekels 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; 72: 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 [J]) served as semiofficial sanctuary (2 Chron 1: 3, expanding 1 Kings 3: 7) between the floruits 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 WHWH.80 In this Zadok's genealogy, only recently noticed, has been taken as a key factor pushing the operations, David had set the defeated Ammonites to work producing iron (as well as in bronze, 1 Kings 7: 2).

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 Șadok"; 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 estrah. 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. 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.” 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 Huram (2 Chron 2:5) “our god is greater than all gods” (6:13: “O Yhwh, there is no god like you”), whereas Huram 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.

**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 reassessed 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. 2 Chron notes only in passing these demonic calves (11:13; 13:8), along with the theologumenon that not only all priests and Levites in Jeroboam’s domain, abandoning their livelihood, but also all non-postate 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, Abijam); popular convictions to the contrary are not con-

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

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. (Variants of 2 Chron 17:24 concern only indirectly a new Jehoshaph chronology inscription.) But such claims can hardly stand except in an overall theory of the thorny monarchy dating norms. 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. 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. 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).

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 ff 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. 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 best 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.  

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 either the Kings or the Chronicler 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 ‘at 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 Chronicler 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.
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