

SCHROER, Silvia—see KEEL, O.	
SCHULLER, Eileen M., <i>Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. A Pseudepigraphic Collection</i> .....	502
SELMS, A. VAN, <i>Job. A Practical Commentary</i> .....	503
SILVER, M., <i>Economic Structures of the Ancient Near East</i> .....	503
SMEND, R., <i>Die Mitte des Alten Testaments. Gesammelte Studien 1</i>	504
SODEN, W. VON—see MÜLLER, H.-P.	
SODERLUND, S., <i>The Greek Text of Jeremiah. A Revised Hypothesis</i>	505
SOGGIN, J. A., <i>Le Livre des Juges</i> .....	505
SOGGIN, J. A., <i>The Prophet Amos. A Translation and Commentary</i>	505
SPREAFICO, A., <i>Esodo: Memoria e Promessa. Interpretazioni profetiche</i> .....	506
STÄHLI, H. P., <i>Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments</i> .....	506
STULMAN, L., <i>The Other Text of Jeremiah. A Reconstruction of the Hebrew Text Underlying the Greek Version of the Prose Sections of Jeremiah With English Translation</i> .....	506
SYRÉN, R., <i>The Blessings in the Targums. A Study on the Targumic Interpretations of Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33</i> ...	507
TALMON, S., <i>King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel. Collected Studies</i> .....	507
TALSTRA, E.—see WAL, A. VAN DER	
<i>The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version III. 1: Isaiah, and III. 3: Ezekiel</i> .....	507-8
TIGAY, J. H., (ed.), <i>Empirical Modes of Biblical Criticism</i> ....	508
TIGAY, J. H., <i>You Shall Have No Other Gods. Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions</i> .....	509
TOORN, K. VAN DER, <i>Sin and Sanction in Israel and Mesopotamia</i> .....	510
TRAFTON, J. L., <i>The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon. A Critical Evaluation</i> .....	510
TUCKER, G. M.—see KNIGHT, D. A.	
TURGMAN, V., <i>De l'autorité de Moïse. Ex 15,22-27</i> .....	511
UELINGER, C.—see KEEL, O.	
VANONI, G., <i>Literarkritik und Grammatik. Untersuchung der Wiederholungen und Spannungen in 1 Kön. 11-12</i> .....	511
VERMEYLEN, J., <i>Job, ses amis et son Dieu. La légende de Job et ses relectures postexiliques</i> .....	512
VORSTER, W. S.—see LATEGAN, B. C.	
WAL, A. VAN DER, and TALSTRA, E., <i>Amos, Concordance and Lexical Survey</i> .....	512
YARDENI, A.—see PORTEN, B.	

## THE DEATH OF JOSIAH IN CHRONICLES: ANOTHER VIEW

by

CHRISTOPHER T. BEGG

Washington

In a recent note in this journal H. G. M. Williamson<sup>1</sup> argues that the account of Josiah's death in 2 Chr. xxxv 20-5(26-7) is not the Chronicler's own creative rewriting of the existing parallel text of the Deuteronomistic History (hereafter Dtr), 2 Kgs xxiii (28) 29-30a; nor is it drawn by him from some distinct source. Rather, the Chronicler took over this account from an expanded version of Dtr, of the sort attested by the Qumran Samuel manuscripts. My own study of the question has convinced me, however, that Williamson's supposition of such an "intermediate stage" is superfluous since 2 Chr. xxxv 20-5 (26-7) can satisfactorily be explained as the Chronicler's own reworking of 2 Kgs xxiii (28) 29-30a in its MT form. In what follows I shall first present the positive evidence for this claim, and then consider Williamson's own arguments in the light of that evidence.

I begin by calling attention to various features in which 2 Chr. xxxv 20-5 (26-7), precisely in its peculiarities *vis-à-vis* 2 Kgs xxiii (28) 29-30a, carries forward and "caps" a whole series of motifs or theological principles highlighted by the Chronicler throughout his presentation of the post-Solomonic period (2 Chr. x-xxxvi). Note the following items:

(1) A distinctive feature of the Chronicler's theology is his systematic inculcation of the principle that individual sin is punished in the lifetime and on the person of the culprit, with its corollary that where personal affliction is present there must also be a

<sup>1</sup> "The death of Josiah and the continuing development of the Deuteronomistic History", *VT* 32 (1982), pp. 242-7. See also his *1 and 2 Chronicles* (London and Grand Rapids, 1982), pp. 408-11.

preceding personal sin.<sup>2</sup> But then it is immediately apparent that the account of 2 Chr. xxxv 21-4 admirably exemplifies the above principle: here, Josiah's sad end results, not, as in Kings, from bad luck or mere lack of judgement, but from his culpable refusal to heed the divine warning mediated to him by Neco.

(2) Another characteristic and distinctive feature in the Chronicler's narration of the post-Solomonic era is the motif of the king who starts out good, but turns bad later in his reign: see Rehoboam (2 Chr. x-xii), Asa (2 Chr. xiv-xvi), Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvii-xx), Joash (2 Chr. xxiv), Amaziah (2 Chr. xxv), Uzziah (2 Chr. xxvi) and—more mutedly—Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxxii 25).<sup>3</sup> Here too, however, it is precisely the peculiarities of Chronicles' version of Josiah's death that assimilate his career to this typical pattern: the youthful zealot for Yahweh's words set out in the book of the law ends up disregarding a divine directive.

(3) Throughout 2 Chr. x-xxxvi the Chronicler develops the motif of the warning speech addressed to a king projecting a war about its destined negative outcome. In doing this he uses passages from Dtr,<sup>4</sup> i.e. 2 Chr. xi 1-4 (= 1 Kgs xii 21-4, Shemaiah to Rehoboam), 2 Chr. xviii 16-22 (= 1 Kgs xxii 17-23, Micaiah to Ahab), 2 Chr. xxv 17-24 (= 2 Kgs xiv 8-11, Jehoash to Amaziah), but also introduces compositions of his own exemplifying the motif, i.e. 2 Chr. xiii 4-12 (Abijah to Jeroboam).<sup>5</sup> In the above texts, the speaker of the warning varies: in the first two cases cited it is a prophet, in the latter two rather a king. These prophetic/royal

<sup>2</sup> In Dtr, the principle is developed much less systematically, especially at the level of the individual; see, e.g., the leprosy that strikes the personally blameless Amaziah (2 Kgs xiv 1-7) or the untroubled career of the wicked Manasseh (2 Kgs xxi).

<sup>3</sup> In Dtr the pattern, while not absent, is much less obvious and explicit than in Chronicles. Thus of the kings cited above as exemplifying the pattern in Chronicles the Deuteronomist makes no personal accusations against either J(eh)oshaphat or Azariah/Uzziah at any point during their reigns. Similarly, while he reports incidents in the course of the reigns of Asa, Jehoshaphat, Amaziah—and likewise Josiah himself—which might be construed as blameworthy (e.g., surrendering of Judean treasures to foreigners), he, in contrast to the Chronicler, does not explicitly evaluate them as such. Curiously, the one clear instance of this "Chronistic pattern" in Dtr, i.e. its account of Solomon, is not reproduced in the Solomonic narrative of Chronicles where Solomon appears as a perfect king.

<sup>4</sup> Here too then the pattern exists already in Dtr, once again, however, without the prominence and frequency it has in Chronicles.

<sup>5</sup> On this text, see R. W. Klein, "Abijah's Campaign against the North (II Chr 13)—What were the Chronicler's Sources?", *ZAW* 95 (1983), pp. 210-17.

warnings likewise evoke divergent responses from the hearers: in the first text the warning is heeded, in the last three it is ignored—each time with disastrous consequences for those doing so. Here again, however, the presentation of Josiah's death in 2 Chr. xxxv 21-4 clearly is in line with this continuing Chronistic motif: Josiah is warned in advance about the outcome of his intended war by a fellow king; ignoring that warning he brings disaster on himself. Note in addition that some of the specific terms used in 2 Chr. xxxv 21-2 recall those employed in one or other of the passages just cited. Thus, Neco's reference to "God who is with me (*'immī*)" in xxxv 21 is reminiscent of Abijah's claim to Jeroboam in xiii 12: "God is with us (*'immānū*) as our head". Again, the notice *w'lo' sāma' 'el-dibrē n'kō* in xxxv 22 serves to align Josiah's response—whether positively or negatively—with those of Rehoboam (*wayyis'mē'ū 'el-dibrē yhw'h*, xi 4) and Amaziah (*w'lo' sāma'*, xxv 20).

(4) A final characteristic of the Chronicler's presentation to be noted for its bearing of the question of the "source" of 2 Chr. xxxv 20-7 is his practice of immediately juxtaposing notices of meritorious, reform activity by Judah's kings with references to the appearance of a perceived threat, i.e. a powerful foreign ruler. This pattern can be observed particularly in the case of Asa,<sup>6</sup> Jehoshaphat,<sup>7</sup> and Hezekiah.<sup>8</sup> The presence of the same pattern in Chronicles' treatment of Josiah is obvious: directly attached to the lengthy description of the king's reform activities in xxxiv 3 - xxxv 19 is the notice "After all this, when Josiah had prepared the temple... Neco king of Egypt went up to fight at Carchemish..." (xxxv 20). Note further that the wording of this transitional notice recalls those used to juxtapose royal reform and foreign threat in the case of both Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xx 1: "After this [i.e. Jehoshaphat's judicial reform described in xix 4-11] the Moabites and Ammonites... came against Jehoshaphat ...") and Hezekiah; xxxii 1: "After these things and these acts of faithfulness [i.e. the reforms

<sup>6</sup> In his case the pattern actually occurs twice: directly following the description of Asa's early achievements, including his cultic purification in xiv 2-8, is the Ethiopian assault in xiv 9-15. Subsequently, to the account of Asa's second, more elaborate reform in xv 1-19 is appended the notice of Baasha's attack in xvi 1-6.

<sup>7</sup> His judicial reform narrated in xix 4-11 immediately precedes the account of the attack by assorted peoples in xx 1-30.

<sup>8</sup> The lengthy description of his reform activities in xxix-xxxi is directly followed by the notice on the Assyrian invasion in xxxii 1.

described in 2 Chr. xxix-xxxij Sennacherib... invaded Judah...'). As with several of the Chronicler's narrative patterns, also this one is present already in Dtr, see its presentations of Asa, J(eh)oash,<sup>9</sup> Hezekiah and Josiah. At the same time, however, it is clear that the Chronicler does not simply appropriate the pattern, but further develops it himself. He does this by introducing it several times where it is not to be found in Dtr, i.e. the first of its two occurrences in connection with Asa, 2 Chr. xiv 2-15, and its use in relation to Jehoshaphat, 2 Chr. xix 4-xx 30. In addition, he goes beyond Dtr in calling attention to the unexpectedness of this juxtaposition of royal good deed and emergence of foreign threat by noting in several instances (see above) that it was precisely "after" the former that the latter manifested itself.<sup>10</sup>

The above considerations indicate that the distinctive presentation of Josiah's death in 2 Chr. xxxv 20-7 corresponds to a whole series of features typical for the Chronicler's narrative in x-xxxvi. It is, of course, conceivable that, as Williamson would hold, this state of affairs is due to the Chronicler's having taken over a pre-existing text which he recognized as serviceable for his wider purposes. On the other hand, 2 Chr. xxxv 20-7 coheres to such an extent with motifs and principles developed over the course of the Chronicler's work that one can only wonder if it would not be simpler and less hypothetical to equate the author with the Chronicler himself. This question appears all the more in order if, as I shall now try to show, Williamson's own positive arguments for denying authorship to the Chronicler should not prove compelling. Williamson proffers four such arguments which I shall consider in turn.

(1) Williamson notes that 2 Chr. xxxv 26-7 (= 2 Kgs xxiii 28) is the only case where Chronicles places its "source citation for-

<sup>9</sup> In the case of this king, Chronicles too has a foreign assault follow on his reform activities (compare 2 Chr. xxiv 4-14 and 23-4). Here, however, the linkage is not a direct one—as it is in 2 Kgs xii—in that the account of J(eh)oash's apostasy (*vv.* 15-22) supervenes.

<sup>10</sup> Note that in the case of both Hezekiah and Josiah, where Dtr too has a foreign threat follow royal reform, the juxtaposition of the two is much less sharp and dramatic: in 2 Kgs xviii the notices on Hezekiah's good deeds/achievements (*vv.* 3-8) are separated from the mention of Sennacherib's advance (*v.* 14) by the segment on the fall of Samaria (*vv.* 9-12). In 2 Kgs xxiii the notices in *vv.* 25-8 stand between the conclusion of Josiah's reform (*v.* 24) and Neco's appearance (*v.* 29).

mula" at a point in its presentation of a given king other than where it stands in Dtr's account of that king.<sup>11</sup> He then goes on to affirm: "There is no apparent reason for this exceptional circumstance. It is thus tempting to suppose that the form of Kings which he [the Chronicler] was following already included the change of order" ("Josiah", p. 245). This reasoning evokes several comments. A first point to be noted is that, also elsewhere, the order of Kings and Chronicles diverges in their respective accounts of Josiah. As is well known, the former makes all reform activity by Josiah follow the discovery of the book in the Temple (2 Kgs xxii 3-xxiii 24), whereas the latter has the bulk of that activity take place prior to—and so independently of—the book's discovery (2 Chr. xxxiv 3-xxxv 19). In this instance, Williamson, in his commentary, ascribes the divergence to the editorial activity of the Chronicler himself working directly on a text virtually identical with the MT (*1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 397-8). But if the Chronicler could thus allow himself to make such a major re-ordering of the events of Josiah's reign, might one not likewise credit him with taking the liberty of relocating Kings' source citation, all the more so since the placing of that notice in Kings could appear premature and also since he himself still has a good deal more to tell concerning Josiah? In addition, however, our earlier considerations suggest a more positive, definite reason the Chronicler could, in fact, have had for not adhering to Kings' placing of the source reference in this particular case, i.e. here too he wished directly and sharply to juxtapose royal reform and emergence of foreign threat, just as he does elsewhere. In order to do this, however, he had to shift the placing given the source citation in Kings, where it supervenes between Josiah's reform and the confrontation with Neco.<sup>12</sup>

(2) Williamson sees in the fact that 2 Chr. xxxv 21 makes Neco the speaker of the divine warning an indication that the Chronicler must be dependent on a source here since "...In comparable cir-

<sup>11</sup> The point is of significance in that in several instances the formula in Kings appears, not in its normal, expected position, i.e. after everything about the given monarch has been related, but at some point prior to this; in all such cases—2 Kgs xxiii 28 excepted—Chronicles follows Kings' placing; see 2 Chr. xvi 11 (= 1 Kgs xv 23b), xx 34 (= 1 Kgs xxii 45), xxv 26 (= 2 Kgs xiv 18).

<sup>12</sup> Note in this connection that Chronicles does not reproduce the whole sequence of 2 Kgs xxiii 25-7 which in Dtr separates Josiah's reform (xxiii 24) and Neco's advance (xxiii 29).

cumstances, the Chronicler will, if given a free hand, readily introduce warnings on the lips of inspired prophets or Levites" ("Josiah", p. 245). Also this remark calls forth various rejoinders. First, it has to be questioned whether one should speak of the Chronicler's having a "free hand" in this instance in that 2 Kgs xxiii 29 in its confronting Josiah and Neco naturally suggests that if Josiah is to be addressed Neco would be the one to address him. In addition, my earlier discussion of the Chronicler's practice of having a warning precede a projected war that is destined to turn out badly needs to be recalled here. These warnings are, I noted, issued, not only by prophets, but also by kings. Especially instructive here is the warning made to Jeroboam as he advances against Judah, 2 Chr. xiii 4-12. Here, where, to all appearances, the Chronicles did have a "free hand"—Dtr has nothing parallel—to attribute the warning to whatever figure he chose, he placed it on the lips, not of a prophet or Levite, but of the Judean king Abijah. But then, why could not the Chronicler himself have been the one responsible for making the speaker a king also in 2 Chr. xxxv 21—all the more so since a king already appears as Josiah's *Neben-einander* in 2 Kgs xxiii 29?<sup>13</sup>

(3) Williamson's third argument concerns the purported absence of typical Chronistic phraseology in 2 Chr. xxxv 20-7, and conversely its use rather of expressions found elsewhere in Dtr. This point calls for a more extended treatment. First of all, one does, in fact, find elements of the Chronicler's characteristic vocabulary in the framework verses of the pericope, i.e. v. 20<sup>14</sup> and vv. 26-7.<sup>15</sup> Also in the case of the core of the unit, vv. 21-5, Williamson's claim needs to be qualified. First, it should be kept in mind that a pagan

<sup>13</sup> That the Chronicler would have no problem in making a foreign king the speaker of a divine word is clear from his presentation of Cyrus in 2 Chr. xxxv 22-3.

<sup>14</sup> E.g., the hipil *hēkīn* used here is a characteristic Chronistic term, employed forty-three times in 1 and 2 Chronicles as opposed to only eight times in Samuel-Kings.

<sup>15</sup> With v. 26a *w'yeter dibrē yō'hiyyāhū wah'asādāw* compare *w'yeter dibrē y'hiyyāhū wah'asādāw* in xxxii 32; for v. 26b *kakkātūb b'w'rat yhw'w* see the same expression used of Hezekiah in xxxi 3 (note that the expression "law of Yahweh" is used only once in Samuel-Kings, i.e. 2 Kgs x 31, whereas it occurs seven times in 1-2 Chronicles). With v. 27 compare especially 2 Chr. xvi 11, xxv 26, xxviii 26; cf. also 1 Chr. xxix 29; 2 Chr. ix 29, xii 15, xx 34, xxvi 22, xxxii 32. Note further that the expression *hāri'šōnīm w'hā'ah'arōnīm* of this verse occurs eight times in the source citations of Chronicles, but never in those of Dtr.

king speaks in xxxv 21. But then, ought one not expect that state of affairs to have had a constraining effect on what the Chronicler gives him to say, i.e. can one legitimately look for—as Williamson seems to demand—a full-blown "Chronistic" theological discourse of the sort ascribed by the Chronicler to his prophets, Levites and Judean kings on the lips of Neco—note his use of "God" rather than "Yahweh" throughout? Even if we bear in mind what has just been said, however, the terminology both in v. 21 and vv. 21-5 as a whole cannot be called "non-Chronistic" without more ado. In fact, these verses contain a whole series of expressions which could readily be attributed to the Chronicler himself.<sup>16</sup>

This leaves us with Williamson's observation about 2 Chr. xxxv 21-4's terminological affinities with Dtr. In particular, he cites the following items: Josiah's "not hearing" in v. 22 contrasts with the "hearing" spoken of in Huldah's oracle in 2 Kgs xxii 18-19; the terms used of Josiah's wounding and death in vv. 22-4 recall those describing Ahab's end in 1 Kgs xxii 30, 34-7, while v. 24's making Josiah die in his own capital rather than in Megiddo (so 2 Kgs xxiii 29) seems an attempt at harmonization with Huldah's announcement in 2 Kgs xxii 20 about Josiah's being "gathered to his grave in peace". The question here, however, is: what prevents us from identifying the hand at work in each of the above instances with the Chronicler himself? Thus, the Chronicler, in view of his characteristic principle or motif of affliction presupposing sin and good kings turning bad with age, might readily have himself constructed the contrast between Josiah's earlier "hearing" and final

<sup>16</sup> Note the following concerning the individual verses: v. 21: with the piel of *bāhal* ("to hasten") here compare the hipil ("to cause to hurry") used in 2 Chr. xxvi 20; *bāhal* in this sense is absent in Dtr. With the imperative *h'adal l'kā* compare the same construction in 2 Chr. xxv 16 (no *Vorlage*). The hipil of *šāhat* occurs 12 times in Chronicles; only three of these uses have a *Vorlage* in Dtr. Especially comparable with the use of the term here are 2 Chr. xii 7 where Yahweh states of the Judeans of Rehoboam's time "I will not destroy them (*ʔašhīlēm*)", and xxv 16 where a prophet tells Amaziah "I know that God has determined to destroy you (*l'hašhītekā*)". V. 22: the construction *hēšīb pānīm* occurs twice elsewhere in Chronicles, i.e. 2 Chr. vi 3 (= 1 Kgs viii 14) and xxix 6 (no *Vorlage*). With the expression *w'elō' šāma' dibrē n'kō* compare particularly the word of the prophet to Amaziah in 2 Chr. xxv 16, *w'elō' šāma'tū la'asātī* (no *Vorlage*)—note how here the expression stands together with *šāhat* hipil used in our passage in the preceding v. 21. The formula *mippī ʔelōhīm* has a close parallel in the *mippī yhw'w* in 2 Chr. xxxvi 12 (no *Vorlage*). V. 24: with the construction *wayyōlikūhū y'rūšālayim*, compare 2 Chr. xxxiii 11 *wayyōlikūhū bābelāh*. For *ʔabal* hitpael, see 1 Chr. vii 22.

“not hearing” in *v.* 22. Similarly, the transferal—apparent in the application of an “Ahab topology” to Josiah in *vv.* 22-4—of terminology or motifs used of one king in Dtr to another king or kings in Chronicles is a recurrent and remarkable feature of the Chronicler’s presentation overall.<sup>17</sup> But if elsewhere this “transferal process” can be attributed (also by Williamson) to the Chronicler himself, why not here too? Finally, since so many of the divergencies between Chronicles and Dtr can be viewed as the Chronicler’s attempt to resolve “problems” he perceived in the latter,<sup>18</sup> the “harmonization” Williamson identifies in *v.* 24 might readily be attributed to him too.

(4) Williamson’s final argument is—self-admittedly—a minor one: the “improbability” that laments were still being made for Josiah in the Chronicler’s own time suggests that his notice on this point in *v.* 25 comes from a source. Given our lack of source material on the history of the practice, however, the force of this argument is minimal.<sup>19</sup>

In conclusion, I suggest that Williamson’s hypothesis of an intermediate stage between 2 Kgs xxiii (28) 29-30a and 2 Chr. xxxv 20-5 (26-7) is one that can and should be dispensed with as unnecessary to account for the facts of the case. To say this is not, of course, to claim that the peculiarities of the Chronicler’s version of Josiah’s demise were all simply invented by him. It may well be that the Chronicler has worked one or other historical reminiscence into his presentation. But whatever his traditions may have been, he has thoroughly reworked them in the light of his own characteristic literary patterns, theological principles and terminology so as to give us an account that is clearly his personal creation.

---

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., how the Chronicler expands, in 2 Chr. xv 16, 1 Kgs xv 13’s account of Asa’s destruction of his mother’s image with a term he draws from Dtr’s account of Josiah’s reform measures in 2 Kgs xxiii 6, 15, i.e. *āqāq* hiphil. Note too how in 2 Chr. xxxiii 15 he transfers to Manasseh the purification of the Temple of pagan emblems attributed to Josiah by Dtr, cf. 2 Kgs xxiii 4, 6.

<sup>18</sup> For a survey of the different sorts of “problems” posed by Dtr which the Chronicler attempts to resolve in various ways, see especially T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung* (Göttingen, 1972).

<sup>19</sup> Note how in his *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 410, Williamson’s formulation on the point has become still more hesitant: “Though not impossible from the Chronicler’s own day, the references to the continued singing of laments for Josiah would fit an earlier date more easily.”

## RELIVING THE DEATH OF JOSIAH: A REPLY TO C. T. BEGG

by

H. G. M. WILLIAMSON

Cambridge

I am grateful to the editor of *Vetus Testamentum* for inviting me to respond to C. T. Begg’s discussion of my article (above, pp. 1-8) concerning the Chronicler’s account of the death of Josiah (*VT* 32 [1982], pp. 242-8). Likewise I welcome Begg’s fair and courteous presentation, consideration of which has helped me to clarify my understanding of the principal issues involved. Whilst as a result I still believe that the evidence is best explained along the lines of the suggestion which I originally advanced, I should emphasize that I do of course recognize that it is no more than a hypothesis and that at the end of the day readers will have to decide for themselves where they think the weight of probability lies.

Begg’s article falls into two main parts. In the first part he outlines some well-known general features of the Chronicler’s narrative regarding such matters as retribution, prophetic warning, and the juxtaposing of good and bad phases within the reigns of a number of the kings of Judah. With most of this I am in full agreement and indeed I have tried to draw attention to these same points throughout the relevant sections of my commentary, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids and London, 1982). Begg, however, introduces his discussion of these matters by suggesting that at the points where it differs from 2 Kgs xxiii (28)29-30a, 2 Chr. xxxv 20-5(26-7) “carries forward and ‘caps’ a whole series of motifs and/or theological principles highlighted by the Chronicler throughout his presentation of the post-Solomonic period (2 Chr. x-xxxvi)”. This is an unfortunate choice of wording in that it implies that the passage in question supplies a necessary step in the development of the Chronicler’s thought on these matters and that without 2 Chr. xxxv 20-7 our understanding of them would be deficient. This is not the case, however, and Begg does not develop his subsequent argument as though it were. It is important to establish

at the outset, therefore, that a decision as to how the Chronicler arrived at the material in 2 Chr. xxxv 20-7 does not have any major bearing on these important wider issues. We are free to examine the passage without fearing any loss to the gains which recent years have seen in our appreciation of the Chronicler's theology.

In the second half of his article Begg considers in detail the arguments which I advanced in favour of the view that the Chronicler neither invented his account of the death of Josiah nor derived it from some completely independent source but rather that the substance of it already stood in the form of the Deuteronomic History which he used as his *Vorlage*. The striking feature of the Chronicler's account which first led me to formulate this theory is the fact that, contrary to his wholly consistent practice elsewhere, the Chronicler here abandons the order of the books of Kings in his positioning of the concluding source citation formula (2 Chr. xxxv 26-7). Because it follows the account of the death of Josiah (whereas in Kings it precedes it), it looks as though this account already stood in the text which the Chronicler was following. The strength of this argument will be appreciated when it is realized, as Begg agrees, that elsewhere the Chronicler follows the order of Kings even in those cases where the formula does not occur at the end of the account of the reign.

Begg responds to this argument in two ways. First, he observes that the order of other parts of the Chronicler's account of Josiah's reign differs from the order in Kings. He deduces from this that the Chronicler could have been responsible for moving the source citation formula as well. Whilst admittedly such a possibility cannot be disproved absolutely, it does not seem to me to be at all probable. Not only in Josiah's reign but also frequently elsewhere the Chronicler rearranges the order of his *Vorlage* for a variety of reasons (1 Chr. xi, xiv and 2 Chr. i 14-17 are well-known—though by no means the only—clear examples). This all serves only to highlight, however, the peculiarity of his slavish adherence to his *Vorlage*'s positioning of the source citation formulae. It seems that he did not regard himself as having the same freedom here as on other matters, so that the exceptional case of Josiah demands some more specific explanation.

Secondly, Begg supposes that such an explanation is to hand: we know from elsewhere that the Chronicler was fond of sharply juxtaposing accounts of a king's reform measures and of a foreign

threat which is seen as a test of his loyalty. Indeed, such a juxtaposing is often introduced by the redactional stitching "After these things ..." or equivalents. This is exactly so at 2 Chr. xxxv 20, but this would have been marred if the Chronicler had left the source citation formula in its original position before v. 20. Begg concludes that this is a sufficient explanation for the Chronicler's exceptional procedure.

This conclusion must be challenged, however, by comparing the three other places where the Chronicler follows Kings in placing the source citation formula before the end of the king's reign.<sup>1</sup> (i) 2 Chr. xvi 11 = 1 Kgs xv 23. Following the formula, the Chronicler expands the brief note in Kings about Asa's foot-disease. It is generally believed that it was this note about Asa's illness which prompted the Chronicler to insert—if not to compose—the account in the earlier verses (2 Chr. xvi 7-10) about how Asa rejected the warning of Hanani the seer: for the Chronicler, every effect requires a necessary cause. If so, then the source citation formula intrudes awkwardly between the two related parts. Despite this, the Chronicler did not choose to abandon the order of his *Vorlage*. (ii) 2 Chr. xx 34 = 1 Kgs xxii 46. Here we may observe that in spite of leaving the source citation formula in the awkward position which it holds in Kings, the Chronicler has introduced the following story by himself inserting the words *wəʿaḥarê-kēn*, "And after this" (2 Chr. xx 35). This is closely comparable with 2 Chr. xxxv 20 but has not necessitated rearranging the order of material in Kings. In addition, the Chronicler has rewritten 1 Kgs xxii 47-51 to a considerable extent, omitting vv. 47-8 altogether and conforming the remainder more closely to his theology, including the addition of a brief prophetic sermon. The result is to balance the very positive account of 2 Chr. xx 1-30 with a negative conclusion to Jehoshaphat's reign, and thus to achieve a "good/bad" variation which recurs throughout the Chronicler's treatment of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvii-xx). Furthermore, I have suggested in my commentary

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Mr D. G. Deboys for pointing out to me that there is a fourth brief example of this same phenomenon at 2 Chr. xv 15b and that here again the Chronicler follows his *Vorlage* in this respect (1 Kgs xiv 29-30). I shall not discuss the passage further here because neither Begg nor I reckoned with it previously and because on this occasion the Chronicler makes no change which is significant for our present purposes. Nevertheless, the passage serves further to underline the peculiar nature of 2 Chr. xxxv 20 ff. within Chronicles.

(pp. 279-80) that this concluding paragraph is further integrated into the account of the reign as a whole by its allusion (cf. *pāraš* in xx 37 in the light of 1 Chr. xiii 10-11) to the recurring theme of God's wrath. All these factors, it may be suggested, would have given the Chronicler good reason sharply to juxtapose 2 Chr. xx 35 ff. with 1-30, certainly as much reason as Begg finds at 2 Chr. xxxv 20 ff. Yet in spite of this, he has chosen not to alter the setting of the source citation formula. (iii) 2 Chr. xxv 26 = 2 Kgs xiv 18. In the case of Amaziah too, the Chronicler adds a temporal phrase (*ūmē'et 'āšer-sār 'amasyāhū mē'aharē yhw*, "Now from the time that Amaziah turned away from following the Lord ...") in order to associate the account of the king's untimely death (*vv.* 27-8) with his apostasy and its consequences (*vv.* 14 and 20-4). However, although this is clearly his intention, he still leaves the source citation formula untouched in its apparently intrusive position in *vv.* 25-6.

From this discussion we may certainly conclude that the Chronicler was responsible for the redactional introduction to 2 Chr. xxxv 20 (as I already suggested in my commentary), that he may have been responsible for other touches in the following verses (though it is difficult to isolate them for certain), and that he intended the whole to serve the kind of purposes which Begg outlines. Along with these conclusions, however, it has also been confirmed that even under such circumstances it was not the Chronicler's practice to move the source citation formulae from the position which they held in his *Vorlage*.

I regard this first argument as the decisive one, the others being supportive only. They still seem to me to carry some weight, but they were never intended to carry the burden of the case. I shall therefore treat them more briefly. To my observation that we should not expect the Chronicler to have put a prophetic warning into the mouth of Neco, Begg replies that such warnings were sometimes spoken by kings; he notes especially Abijah's speech to Jeroboam at 2 Chr. xiii 4-12. This does not answer the point, however, for Abijah is presented as a devout Judaeon whereas Neco is a foreign "pagan". Interestingly, the only other case of a non-Judaeon king issuing such a warning (Joash king of Israel in 2 Chr. xxv 18-19) is drawn straight from the Deuteronomistic History (2 Kgs xiv 9-10), precisely what I am postulating for Neco's speech. In a footnote, Begg attempts to adduce the words of Cyrus in 2 Chr. xxxvi 22-3 as evidence that "the Chronicler would have no problem

in making a foreign king the speaker of a divine word", but I have argued on more than one occasion that the verses in question are not part of the Chronicler's original composition; and even if they were they too would have been drawn from what I believe to have been the separate work of Ezra and Nehemiah. The argument, therefore, from the unlikelihood of the Chronicler himself putting such a warning into Neco's mouth retains some weight. Indeed, it will be reinforced if T. C. Eskenazi is right ("The Chronicler and the Composition of 1 Esdras", *CBQ* 48 [1986], pp. 39-61) that 1 Esdras is an independent composition of the Chronicler himself, for, as I previously pointed out, 1 Esd. i 28 substitutes Jeremiah the prophet for Neco at 2 Chr. xxxv 22. This substitution at least shows that Neco was not so necessarily the obvious choice for divine spokesman as Begg supposes. (By contrast, S. L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* [Atlanta, 1984], p. 188, argues for the priority of the reading in 1 Esdras and consequently rejects my understanding of 2 Chr. xxxv 20 ff. The fact that McKenzie does not seem to consider it necessary to discuss the more significant points at issue suggests that he is perhaps overconfident of his text-critical judgements.)

On the matter of the absence of typical Chronistic phraseology in 2 Chr. xxxv 20-7 I welcome this opportunity to make my point more clear, even though it remains an argument from silence. Generally speaking, in cases where there is reason to suppose that the Chronicler has himself composed a prophetic warning or the like, he draws on a limited selection of vocabulary based on such programmatic verses as 1 Chr. x 13-14, xxviii 9, and 2 Chr. vii 14. Such vocabulary is absent from 2 Chr. xxxv 20-5. By contrast, there is nothing in the vocabulary of the passage which would cause surprise if it had been composed in Deuteronomistic circles. Begg seeks to avoid the force of this argument by pointing to (i) *hēkin* in *v.* 20 as characteristic of the Chronicler—but it has already been shown that this is part of the Chronicler's redactional introduction, comparable with his insertions in similar situations elsewhere; and (ii) *wēyeter dibrē* etc. in *v.* 26—but the Chronicler regularly rewords the source citation formula in the way that he does here and in *v.* 27, so that this observation has no bearing on the matter in hand. It was never my intention to deny that the Chronicler handled his postulated *Vorlage* in the same way as he handled it elsewhere.

Moving from the framework to the "core" of the narrative in vv. 21-5, Begg lists in footnote 19 "a whole series of expressions which could readily be attributed to the Chronicler himself". Space precludes a detailed examination of each of the items listed, but it can be seen from Begg's clear summary of the salient facts that many of these could equally readily be attributed to some other writer within the Deuteronomistic tradition (e.g. for *w<sup>el</sup>lō<sup>?</sup> šāma<sup>c</sup> ʿel-dibrē nēkō* compare not only 2 Chr. xxv 16 but also the equally close, or once even closer, expressions at 2 Chr. x 15, 16, and xxv 20, all of which, however, the Chronicler adopts straight from his *Vorlage* in Kings). In other cases, the data are too limited to permit of any conclusions (e.g. the comparison of the *pi<sup>c</sup>el* of *bāhal* with its *hiph<sup>c</sup>il* at 2 Chr. xxvi 20; not only is the verbal theme different, but the whole narrative context is so divergent that the comparison is insignificant). Begg's best evidence is the cluster of words which occur both in our passage and in 2 Chr. xxv 16, something not previously noted, so far as I am aware. However, since in themselves the words and phrases in question are common enough outside Chronicles as well (the imperative singular *h<sup>a</sup>dal* followed by the so-called "ethic dative" *l<sup>e</sup>kā* is not attested elsewhere, but cf. the plural at Isa. ii 22), this would be a precariously narrow basis on which to construct a case. (For a suggestion that the Chronicler may have been reworking inherited material at 2 Chr. xxv 16 as well, cf. P. R. Ackroyd, "A Judgment Narrative between Kings and Chronicles? An Approach to Amos 7:9-17", in G. W. Coats and B. O. Long [ed.], *Canon and Authority. Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology* [Philadelphia, 1977], pp. 71-87.)

To conclude on the matter of language and style, the characteristic marks of the Chronicler's hand when describing a prophetic warning and its consequences are absent from 2 Chr. xxxv 20 ff. Whilst there are, not unnaturally, a number of elements which occur elsewhere in the Chronicler's work, there is sufficient evidence to allow that they could have been equally at home in a reworked form of the Deuteronomistic History. Thus whilst Begg's discussion is compatible with his overall view, it is insufficient, in my opinion, to establish it. We are in agreement, however, that the framework of the paragraph shows clear evidence of the Chronicler's procedures in rewriting antecedent material.

Finally, there is the minor point of the unlikelihood of laments for Josiah still being made as late as the Chronicler's day. Suffice

to say here that this can only make Begg's position less probable, and that what force the argument has tells in favour of an earlier date for this material.

In sum, 2 Chr. xxxv 20 ff. presents us with a version of the death of Josiah which many scholars believe includes authentic historical reminiscence, and Begg appears to accept this in his concluding paragraph. We are then left with the question how such material may have reached the Chronicler. In my original article I offered a hypothesis to answer this question, basing myself on some unusual literary features in the Chronicler's version. Begg has not, it seems to me, grasped the nettle of this particular conjunction of problems and it is for that reason that some such solution as that which I have proposed remains necessary.