

1. Introduction

The Ahaz account in the book of Chronicles (2 Chronicles 28) is an intriguing pericope which serves as a striking example of the freedom with which the Chronicler (hereafter Ch)¹ reworked his putative *Vorlage*, 2 Kings 16.² Recognition of his reliance on the DH has aided enormously the interpretation of Chronicles and allowed interpreters to better understand Ch's unique message by focusing on how the book of Chronicles differs from his *Vorlage*. Deviations from his *Vorlage* often are understood as the result of the Ch's intentional editorial activity (possibly relying on other unknown sources) and/or creative writing skills. However, in the case of the Ahaz narrative explaining the exact purpose of all of his deviations from 2 Kings 16 is not easy.

When Ch's Ahaz account is compared with the account in 2 Kings 16, considerable differences are apparent. At first blush the two accounts seem more dissimilar than similar. However, a comparison of the structure/outline of the narrative, reveals that Ch was influenced heavily by his putative *Vorlage* even here.³ Both contain a very similar regnal resume, and describe: war between Judah, Ephraim and Aram; Edomite conquests of Judahite lands; Ahaz's appeal to (and monetary gift to) Assyria for aid; Ahaz's new altar patterned after the Damascus altar; Ahaz's other cultic offenses, and give evaluative conclusions regarding Ahaz's reign. Yet despite the structural

¹ By the Chronicler I mean the author(s) of the book of Chronicles.

² Of course Auld and Ho argue for a common source behind both Chronicles and the DH rather than a theory of dependence of the former on the latter. Cf. A.G. Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh 1994). *idem*, A. Graeme Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994) "What Was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles?" *The Chronicler as Author* ed. M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (JSOTSup, 263; Sheffield 1999) 91-135. C.Y.S. Ho, "Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXXI 1-13 Really the Source of 1 Chronicles X 1-12?" 45 (1995): 82-106

³ Both Japhet and Dillard point out that the structure is basically parallel, even if the details differ tremendously. Cf. Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 896 Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987), 220

parallels, each of these sections are augmented, supplemented or transformed in considerable ways in Chronicles.

Explaining the differences between Ch's Ahaz account and that of his *Vorlage* has been a subject of great scholarly endeavour. At times, in some explanations determining the purpose of Ch's pericope substitutes for a real explanation of the specific changes he appears to make from his *Vorlage*. For instance, H.G.M. Williamson has compared 2 Chronicles 13, when Jeroboam was king in Israel at the time of the schism, with Ch's Ahaz narrative and has argued compellingly that in the latter Ch purposed to reverse the situation between the Northern and Southern kingdoms as presented in the former, and leave both nations in a similar situation of military defeat and exile.⁴ Like Jeroboam, Ahaz makes molten images for worship (2 Chr 12:2), worships false gods (2 Chr 13:8-9; 28:10-16, 23) and closes the temple, making Abijah's claim of orthodoxy (2 Chr 13:11) for the South null and void.⁵ Also, at the time of the schism, the South was obedient to a prophet, whereas in this narrative the North is obedient to the prophet Oded. In other words Ch casts Ahaz in the same form as Jeroboam and makes way for the possibility of the unification of Israel by presenting both nations as in similar situations (defeated and partially exiled).

Williamson's argument depends in part upon the assumption that Ch assumed that his audience would understand the Northern kingdom to be exiled at the end of the Ahaz

⁴ H. G. M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 114-118 Cf. H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids, Mich. London: Eerdmans.

Marshall, Morgan & Scott Pub. Ltd., 1982), 343-350

⁵ Japhet notes that the sins of Jeroboam (which Williamson equates with the sin of Ahaz and his molten images to Baalim) is to be distinguished from Canaanite worship in both Dtr and Ch's views. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 898

narrative. As is well known, Ch does not narrate the fall of the North as does the Deuteronomist (hereafter Dtr)⁶ (2 Kings 17; 18:9-12). While Judah is clearly narrated as having suffered a partial exile, with captives exiled to Damascus (2 Chr 28:5), Samaria (2 Chr 28:8) and Edom (2 Chr 28:17), there is no explicit mention of an exile of the North. Acknowledging this reality, Williamson believes the exile of the North is inferred two chapters later in the invitation Hezekiah makes to the "remnants who escaped from the hands of the kings of Assyria" (2 Chr 30:6). Williamson argues that since Hezekiah's invitation occurs in the beginning of Hezekiah's reign, "the events described are attributed by the Chronicler to the period of the reign of Ahaz."⁷ Of course, in the DH, the fall of Samaria occurs during the reign of Hezekiah and not that of Ahaz. In fact the exile of Samaria occurs early on in Hezekiah's regency,⁸ making it unclear that Ch is dating the fall of the North to the time of Ahaz just because it is relatively early in Hezekiah's reign that the "remnants" of the exile are mentioned.⁹ Since most believe that Ch assumes that his readership had knowledge of the DH, this explanation seems tenuous. Nevertheless, many commentators have largely agreed with Williamson's analysis.¹⁰

However, while Williamson's observations regarding parallels between 2 Chronicles 13 and 2 Chronicles 28 are helpful in understanding the purpose of the overall

⁶ By Dtr I mean the author(s) of the books of Josh-Kings.

⁷ Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 117

⁸ as the siege begins the 4th year of Hezekiah's reign and Samaria is taken in his 6th year (2 Kgs 18:9-10).

⁹ In the DH this is relatively early in his reign as no other events are narrated until Hezekiah's 14th year (2 Kgs 18:13). If those who would emend 14th to 24th year are correct, the 4th year of his reign appears quite early indeed. Cf. Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1988), 228 Edwin R. Thiele, *Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings: A Reconstruction of the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 118-140

¹⁰ E.g., Steven L. McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2004), 334 Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 219 Simon John De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989), 366

presentation of Ahaz and North-South relations in 2 Chronicles 28, in other respects its explanatory power is lacking. Williamson fails to explain all the differences in Ch's account of the war between Judah and Israel and Aram, leaving him to posit "an alternative account of the Syro-Ephraimite war" to which Ch had access.¹¹ Due to the clear purpose in Ch's account, Williamson concedes that "the Chronicler's own hand is clearly to be seen in this chapter."¹² That is, divergences may be attributed to Ch's own creative contributions to the narrative. However, in some instances, such as the success of Israel and Aram against Judah in Chronicles, Williamson defends Ch's historicity by speculating that if the Syro-Ephraimite alliance was able to besiege Jerusalem, then they must have had widespread military success in other areas of Judah to allow them to carry out their siege plans.¹³ Thus the changes are partially explained because they reflect historical reality.

Regarding Ch presenting the military campaigns of Israel and Aram against Judah as separate and independent campaigns (contrary to their being a coalition in 2 Kings 16), Dillard has suggested that since Ch is presenting the North in a positive light, he may have chosen to omit their alliance due to the biblical polemic against foreign alliances.¹⁴ In other words, if the North was in a foreign alliance at this time and was successful, it would undermine his position of being against such associations. However, the North is explicitly stated by the prophet and the people themselves as living in sin and rebellion against Yahweh (2 Chr 28:10, 13). Only at the point where they listen to the prophet and

¹¹ Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 344, 346

¹² *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 344, 346

¹³ *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 345

¹⁴ Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 221 E.g. . 2 Chr 16.2-9; 19.1-2; 22.3-6; 25.6-10. Other instances of biblical condemnation of foreign alliances can be seen in 2 Kgs 17:4; Hos 12:2; Isa 30:1-7; 31:1, 3; Jer 37:6-8; 46:25; Ezek 29:6-7.

confess their sin are they portrayed positively. Therefore, their being in an alliance with Aram previously would not be a problem for Ch's presentation, but would fit with their current circumstance of "continuing in sin and guilt."¹⁵ Another reason for Ch presenting Israel and Aram as independent threats must be sought after.

Japhet views the story of the North's military success against Judah and their subsequent return of Judahite prisoners as *not* serving Ch's "objectives in the history of Ahaz" since the military oppression of Ahaz's Judah (necessary in light of his wickedness) is contradicted in it.¹⁶ Therefore, she views the pericope as "taken from one of his sources" and as serving "different objectives from the portrayal of Ahaz."¹⁷ Japhet entertains the possibility that Ch is relating different events than those referred to in 2 Kings 16 since "one would assume that there were frequent incidents of conflict, only one of which, the attempt to conquer Jerusalem, is mentioned in Kings."¹⁸ However, be that as it may historically, neither Japhet nor Williamson explains why Ch *chose* to present Israel and Aram as independent military threats rather than as a coalition.¹⁹

While acknowledging the tremendous value of the contributions of these scholars, this study finds further explanation for Ch's divergences from his *Vorlage*. While Williamson is probably correct in seeing a connection between 2 Chronicles 13 and 2 Chronicles 28, and scholar's recognition that Ch is purposefully heightening the wickedness of Ahaz in his narrative *vis a vis* Dtr's presentation is undoubted, some more clues as to the specific changes he makes in order to achieve his goals are evident and it

¹⁵ להסיף על-חטאתינו ועל-אשמתינו

¹⁶ Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 900

¹⁷ *I & II Chronicles*, 900

¹⁸ *I & II Chronicles*, 899

¹⁹ Keeping in mind that all historiographic accounts are selective. After all, if these events were historical, Dtr chose *not* to recount them for his own purposes.

appears that Ch made these changes not out of whole cloth, but based on the tensions he saw within his source narratives

The present study will focus on two perspectives which illuminate likely reasons for many of the divergences between Ch's Ahaz narrative and that of his *Vorlage*. First, it appears that his changes often begin with textual clues in his *Vorlage*, which lend themselves to his purposes. Secondly, many of the more perplexing changes become explicable if we understand Ch to be in dialogue not only with 2 Kings 16 at this point, but also the book of Isaiah. Others²⁰ have acknowledged the possibility that Ch had access to Isaiah when rewriting his history of Israel, however, it is the position of this paper that this suggestion has not been examined sufficiently.²¹

There is good indication that Ch had access to the book of Isaiah, probably in its canonical form. In 2 Chr 32:32, Ch cites the "vision of Isaiah, son of Amoz" (בְּ-יִשְׁעֵי אִישׁוּן) (בְּחִזְוֹן יִשְׁעֵי אִישׁוּן) as a source for his information on Hezekiah, which Ch says is located in "the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel" (2 Chr 32,32). It is well known that Isaiah 36-39 is nearly identical to 2 Kgs 18-20 and it appears that Ch was aware of a relationship between the book of Isaiah and Kings.²² Ch refers to this source as "the

²⁰ Johnstone actually argues that Ch presupposes not only Dtr's history, but the account in the book of Isaiah as well William Johnstone, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (2vols.; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 2.180 Williamson has also mentioned in passing the possibility that the Chronicler was influenced by the book of Isaiah. He writes, "This latter point in particular is in line with, and may have been derived by the Chronicler directly from, the interpretation of the same event in Isa. 7." 348 Cf. Dillard? Japhet denies the likelihood of this. Cf. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 899

²¹ Regarding the divergences from his *Vorlage* in Ch's Ahaz narrative, Dillard suggested that "the writer appears to have been elaborating and interpreting the events reported in the parallel history in accord with some other sources at his disposal; one can only speculate regarding the nature of these additional materials." Cf. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 220 This is similar to the position of the present essay, except that Isaiah (rather than empty speculation) is considered to be another source/voice through which Ch is interpreting his *Vorlage*.

²² William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 216

vision (וַיִּזְוֶה) of Isaiah" which is the natural title of the canonical book of Isaiah since the editorial incipit reads, "The vision of Isaiah son of Amoz" (וַיִּזְוֶה יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן-אֲמוֹז). Since such editorial superscriptions are late accompaniments to prophetic books, if not some of the very last additions, Ch's awareness of this title indicates his knowledge of the canonical book already in its edited form. Ch also references Isaiah in 2 Chr 26:22 as being the author of the history of Uzziah, a king under whose reign the book of Isaiah claims the prophet ministered. Of course, many doubt whether Isaiah actually served during Uzziah's time, probably especially due to Isaiah 6 being understood as the prophet's call narrative, which occurred when Uzziah died (Isa 6:1).²³ In fact, were it not for the superscription of the book, no one would think that Isaiah served during Uzziah's regency, which strengthens the supposition that Ch had access to the book of Isaiah.

These allusions to the book of Isaiah invite the interpreter to view Ch in dialogue with Isaiah.²⁴ In fact, 2 Chr 32:32 connects "the scroll of the kings of Judah and Israel" to the book of Isaiah, and "the scroll of the kings of Judah and Israel" is explicitly referred to in the Ahaz account (2 Chr 28:26). Ch only refers to this source in this exact way three times²⁵ in the book of Chronicles, making the connection here quite significant.

Following this lead, this study will examine the relationship between 2 Kings 16, Isaiah 7 and 2 Chronicles 28, drawing on Bakhtin's ideas of dialogism. Christine Mitchell has made a good case for Chronicles being "some kind of early exemplar of the novel" and, therefore, understanding Chronicles as "inherently dialogic" as it responds to

²³ E.g., Ronald E. Clements, *Isaiah 1-39* (ed. Ronald E. Clements; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 8; Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 3

²⁴ I do not mean to suggest that Isaiah was the author of the entire book, or even the portions under discussion in this essay, but will refer to Isaiah periodically as either the implied author of these narratives and/or originator of the oracles.

²⁵ 2 Chr 25:26; 28:26; and 32:32.

the utterances of other works/voices.²⁶ Following her lead this study will examine Chronicles as a response to the voice ideas of both the DH and Isaiah. This study could examine the relationship of Chronicles with Samuel-Kings and the book of Isaiah, solely in terms of sources, however, for the purposes of this Bakhtinian approach, it does not really matter whether Ch's divergences draw on Isaiah in terms of an actual source relationship or whether Isaiah is better seen as an influence in his writing which answers the utterances of the book of Isaiah.²⁷

Supposing that Ch was familiar with both the DH and the book of Isaiah, it seems likely he would have seen the potential for these texts/ideas to quarrel. Bakhtin suggests that ideas are physically "embodied" by an author, and that the author "hears" the dialogical interaction through these idea-images.²⁸ That Ch heard the voice-ideas of both Dtr and Isaiah regarding Ahaz's reign, does not mean that he merely repeated the material in both (repeated the dialogues known to him), but that he played upon their potential for conflict and dialogue by creatively reworking them into his Ahaz narrative. Rather than viewing Ch as attempting to harmonize the data, we could envision him as placing these ideas at intersections of dialogical conversation, where he saw fit. Thus he is not privileging one over the other (that is prioritizing Isaiah over Dtr or vice versa), nor

²⁶ Christine Mitchell, "Dialogism in Chronicles," in *The Chronicler as Author* (ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 311-326

²⁷ As C. Mitchell has argued, "it does not matter which book came first or what the origins of their common material are." Mitchell, "Dialogism in Chronicles,"

²⁸ Bakhtin, *Problem of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 90. Bakhtin wrote of Dostoevsky that he heard "both the loud, recognized, reigning voices of the epoch, that is, the reigning dominant ideas (official and unofficial), as well as voices still weak, ideas not yet fully emerged, latent ideas heard as yet by no one but himself, and ideas that were just beginning to ripen, embryos of future worldviews." Ibid..

is he attempting to replace either text,²⁹ but instead he answers their dialogue, making room for us to hear the variety of voices in his narrative.

In order to explore the dialogue which Ch responds to, and perpetuates, this study will briefly examine the Ahaz narratives in both Dtr and Isaiah and then scrutinize Chronicles in order to understand Ch's presentation of Ahaz. The benefit in viewing Chronicles as in dialogue with both Kings and Isaiah will hopefully be evident in terms of insightful exegesis and may even suggest something in terms of actual sources employed.

2. Ahaz and the Deuteronomist

In the DH, the presentation of Ahaz begins with his regnal resume which emphasizes his cultic offenses, fronting their description with a reference to his "passing his son through fire" (2 Kgs 16:3) and sacrificing offerings on the high places (2 Kgs 16:4).³⁰ Following the delineation of his cultic offenses, the siege of Jerusalem by Pekah and Rezin is tersely narrated, followed by a statement that their attack was unsuccessful (2 Kgs 16:5).³¹ In this narrative Aram and Israel clearly act in concert as a coalition in their military campaign against Judah (2 Kgs 16:5). As well, in the context of this military crisis, Edom is said to have made gains at Judah's expense³²

²⁹ Contra Fishbane who suggests that Chronicles is attempting to replace the DH. Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 381-382

³⁰ Something which previous Judahite kings did not do (only the people were said to have done this) Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 186

³¹ The exact meaning of these statements is unclear as one (וַיִּצְרְוּ עַל-אֲחָז) normally indicates a siege, but the other (וְלֹא יָבִיאוּ לְהִלָּחֵם) seems to indicate that they were unable to mount an attack. Cf. *II Kings*, 186

³² Most scholars read אֲרָם for אֲרָם in this verse, arguing that the misreading (and introduction of Rezin's name) comes from 2 Kgs 16:6 into v. 5. Cf. *II Kings*, 186 Volkmar Fritz, *1 & 2 Kings: A*

In response to this military crisis, Ahaz then appeals to Tiglath-pileser of Assyria for aid and sends a gift/bribe (תָּבַשׁ) to encourage Assyrian action on his behalf (2 Kgs 16:8). However, there is no explicit negative comment regarding his appropriation of temple treasures.³³ If one examines other instances of Judean monarchs in the DH who act similarly, the lack of negative comment is consistent.³⁴ Asa draws on the temple riches to bribe the Arameans in 1 Kgs 15:16-22, yet is assessed positively in direct statements by the narrator.³⁵ In 2 Kgs 18:15-16 Hezekiah dips into the temple treasuries in order to secure salvation from the Assyrian threat, yet is not criticized for this and is held up as a model king.³⁶

Continental Commentary (1st English language ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 342 John Gray, *1 & 2 Kings* (2d, fully rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 632

³³ Tadmor and Cogan ("Ahaz and Tiglath-Pileser in the Book of Kings: Historiographic Considerations," *Bib* 60 [1979]: 491-508) have argued that the term "bribe" תָּבַשׁ "bears negative connotations" and is used in the Ahaz narrative to criticize the king (499). However, the same term is used of Asa, despite the fact he is characterized positively by Dtr.

³⁴ Mullen ("Crime and Punishment," 231-248) has examined instances where kings seek to survive a military threat through the offering of temple and palace treasuries. He concludes that the account of the despoliation of the treasuries functioned to show the king was being punished for failing to remove the high places—though he notes Hezekiah as an exception (247). However, his view is difficult to accept since various kings who despoiled the treasuries are evaluated differently by the narrator, with some said to have done right in Yahweh's eyes (e.g., Asa). Also the exception of Hezekiah seems enough not to "prove the rule" but break it. Na'aman has examined these narratives and emphasizes the different circumstances of these kings with some being robbed of treasures (Rehoboam, Amaziah, Jehoiachin), some voluntarily handing over treasure (Asa and Ahaz), and others attempting to avert a threat to Jerusalem (Jehoash and Hezekiah). Na'aman ("The Deuteronomist and Voluntary Servitude to Foreign Powers," *JSOT* 65 [1995]: 37-53) criticizes Mullen's study, concluding that it is doubtful that "these notices consistently serve as a part of the 'punishment' for numerous rulers who failed to remove the high places" (44, n. 18).

³⁵ Still Cogan (*1 Kings*, 402) suggests that it "was likely viewed negatively by Dtr, though this is not specifically stated." In the later book of Chronicles, Asa is characterized negatively (2 Chr 16:1-12) but interestingly, no explicit connection is made with this negativity and the appropriation of temple treasures.

³⁶ who "trusted in Yahweh the God of Israel and after him or before him there was no one like him among all the kings of Judah" (2 Kgs 18:5). Interestingly, while appropriating temple treasuries is never explicitly judged negatively, when Hezekiah shows the Babylonians the non-temple treasuries of Judah, Isaiah levels an extremely negative oracle in response, implying that this action was very wrong. Christopher T. Begg ("2 Kings 20:12-19 as an Element of the Deuteronomistic History," *CBQ* 48 [1986]: 27-38) has drawn attention to the fact that Judean kings who despoil the temple are never explicitly evaluated for their actions nor "is anything directly said about their evoking retribution from Yahweh....[but] Hezekiah's action [of showing the treasures to the Babylonians] does call for a divine response...." (33).

While, unlike Hezekiah and Asa, Ahaz *is* characterized negatively by the narrator (2 Kgs 16:2-4), this criticism is not explicitly linked to his appropriation of temple monetary resources. In fact, the comparison of the accounts of these three kings in the DH would seem to suggest that appropriating the temple treasuries was not necessarily a deplorable action. In fact, Ahaz's actions could be understood as heroic, since he is defending Jerusalem and his people by such actions.³⁷

Ahaz had not done what was right in God's eyes (2 Kgs 16:2), yet, despite the Deuteronomistic tendency for good things to happen to good kings and bad things to bad kings, the result of Ahaz's plea to Assyria appears to break this law of retribution. The text notes that "the king of Assyria listened to him" (2 Kgs 16:9)³⁸ and quickly took care of Ahaz's enemies. One could hardly hope for a better result. From one perspective Ahaz's political move proved flawless.

The text then describes Ahaz going to Damascus (to meet with the Assyrian king) and his duplication of the Aramean altar in the Jerusalem temple (2 Kgs 16:10-11). The temple innovation is usually seen to be a negative mark on his reign. However, given

³⁷ Walter Brueggemann (*1 & 2 Kings* [Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2000], 494) sees Hezekiah's similar actions as positive since "Hezekiah, good king that he is, wants the occupying troops of the empire removed...." Na'aman ("Voluntary Servitude") has observed that in the DH "the payment of treasure under threat of siege may have been described in a non-critical tone" (44). Similarly, Long (*2 Kings*, 205) suggests that such payment of treasures was merely "a strategy to relieve military pressure on Jerusalem and to preserve Judah's independence" and not capitulation.

³⁸ A common meaning of this idiom אֵל שָׁמַע is "to obey" (with אֵל Gen 28:7; Ex 6:9; Jos 1:17; 1 Kings 12:15), which could be implied here, making the result of his plea even more shocking in light of his wickedness.

Dtr's lack of explicit comments³⁹ denouncing his temple reform, it is possible to read even this portion of the text as reflecting positively on Ahaz.⁴⁰

In conclusion, we could understand the "voice idea" of Dtr's Ahaz pericope in the following way. Ahaz cultic offenses (2 Kgs 16:3-4) result (in a good Deuteronomistic fashion) in his being attacked by Aram and Israel (2 Kgs 16:5-6).⁴¹ Bravely, he takes the extreme measure of sacrificing the riches of the temple (which the King had rights and access to) to appeal to the dangerous Assyrian King, Tiglath-pileser (2 Kgs 16:7-8). As a result of his heroism in that regard, the Assyrian king grants his request and delivers Ahaz from his enemies (2 Kgs 16:9). After his salvation experience, he celebrates by renovating the temple and installing a new and improved altar.⁴² The orthodox nature of the reform is implied.⁴³ First, the priest Uriah (a known supporter of Isaiah the prophet; cf. Isa. 8:2) concurs with the temple reform and carries it out, and secondly, Ahaz's son, Hezekiah, does *not* purge the temple of this new altar, though he even destroys an ancient Mosaic cultic appurtenance (2 Kgs 18:4).⁴⁴ Ahaz's officiating at the sacrifice⁴⁵ is in line

³⁹ Earlier criticisms of the king included Ahaz passing his son through the fire, and sacrificing on the high places, but nothing about his temple innovations.

⁴⁰ Some commentators view the innovations as (in reality) neutral, or motivated not by syncretistic motives but by attempting to update the 'fashion' of the Jerusalem temple. Cogan and Tadmor note that "Syrian art and architectural styles" were widespread at the time. Cf. Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 193

⁴¹ Note the clear Hebrew expression (יָסַח) which begins 2 Kgs 16:5 which explicitly connects the military crisis to his offering of sacrifices on the high places.

⁴² The problem of the original altar's small size is even mentioned in the text. First Kings 8:64 notes that it was "too small" (קָטַן) for the offerings. Ahaz's altar solved this problem with its larger (הַגְּדוֹל) proportions (2 Kgs 16:15). Cf. J. Glen Taylor, *Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1993), 129

⁴³ As Gray points out, Yahwistic practice is implied and the sacrifice described on the altar is "a *locus classicus* for sacrifice in the Temple." Gray, *I & 2 Kings*, 636

⁴⁴ J.G. Taylor draws attention to the fact that Hezekiah did not tear down Ahaz's altar and suggests it is because Hezekiah was sympathetic to Ahaz's solar Yahwism implied by the altar and Ahaz's sun dial. Taylor, *Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel*, 164-172

⁴⁵ As Cogan and Tadmor have pointed out, "these were inaugural, not everyday, sacrifices" Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 189

with the precedent of David (2 Sam 6:17-18) and Solomon (1 Kgs 8:63), accordingly, in light of this precedent, these actions should not be viewed as negative. While most commentators⁴⁶ view the story of Ahaz's temple renovations as presenting the king in a negative light, it is possible to view them otherwise.

3. Ahaz and the Prophet Isaiah

The Ahaz narrative in the book of Isaiah begins with a summary statement that Israel and Aram had allied themselves against Ahaz of Judah (Isa 7:1). In combination with 2 Kings 16, most biblical historians argue from this text that Aram and Israel formed a "Syro-Ephramite" alliance against Assyria, which opposed Judah because Ahaz would not join in their cause.⁴⁷ This military crisis sets the context for the following story which narrates a confrontation between the prophet Isaiah and the Davidic king, Ahaz. Isaiah brings unsolicited oracles of encouragement (Isa 7:4-9) to Ahaz, presumably before his appeal to Assyria.⁴⁸ Isaiah predicts that the Syro-Ephraimite Coalition will actually come to nothing (Isa 7:7) and that Ahaz has nothing to fear (Isa 7:4). Isaiah belittles the kings (Rezin and Pekah) of these enemy nations, suggesting that they, and their capital cities, do not have the legitimacy of Ahaz and Jerusalem.⁴⁹ Isaiah cautions that Ahaz must believe (יִשְׁמַע) if he is to be established (יִבָּנֶה), perhaps alluding to the

⁴⁶ *II Kings*, 193 argue that Dtr "recorded this narration in full to bolster his indictment of King Ahaz, whose apostasy he set out in the introduction to the king's reign, vv. 1-4. Ahaz's innovations, by no means idolatrous or syncretistic, are criticized, it would seem, because they upset the order of the Temple as established by Solomon." Even in this observation, it is interesting to note that it is by no means clear that the innovations are wrong because they "upset" Solomon's order, as nothing to this effect is mentioned in the text.

⁴⁷ Joachim Begrich, "Der syrisch-efraimitische Krieg und seine weltpolitischen Zusammenhänge," 83 (1929): 213-237

⁴⁸ Clements, *Isaiah 1-39*, 79

⁴⁹ Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 300

Davidic promise in 2 Sam 7:16 of the Davidic line's perpetuity (that it be 'established [יָבִיחַ] forever').⁵⁰

The narrative continues with Isaiah offering a sign to Ahaz to encourage his trust in the oracle.⁵¹ Ahaz is pictured as refusing to listen to the prophet, and refusing the generous offer of a sign of his choice. Therefore, Ahaz is famously given the sign of Immanuel. Whether the sign is a promise of salvation or of judgment has been fiercely debated.⁵² Without entering deeply into the debate here, we hold that since the sign is given in response to Ahaz's unbelief, it seems logical that it would be a threatening sign of judgment.⁵³ Though the sign includes the assurance that the two kings now plaguing Ahaz will be destroyed (Isa 7:16), the following verse (Isa 7:17) make clear that days of trouble are ahead for the Davidic monarchy at the hands of the king of Assyria. Whether it was originally a salvation sign with vv. 17ff being a late addition or not, is irrelevant here. The final form of the text clearly portrays difficult times for Ahaz's Judah at the hand of Assyria.

What is also interesting about the judgment oracles following the sign of Immanuel is the insect imagery used in Isa 7:18. A close look at this text is necessary.

On that day Yahweh will whistle for the fly that is at the ends of the streams of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria.

It is curious that both Egypt and Assyria are mentioned together, since historically they never allied together against Judah and, in Ahaz's day, Egypt was not a threat at all.

⁵⁰ *Isaiah 1-12*, 302

⁵¹ Though some have suggested that there should be a break between Isa 7:9 and Isa 7:10 indicating a different time and locale for this pericope (e.g., Kaiser), however, with Wildberger we hold that "the sign is clearly connected with the message delivered to Ahaz in vv. 4-9: Signs never have meaning in and of themselves, but only as they are connected with a message from Yahweh...." Cf. *Isaiah 1-12*, 287

⁵² Coppens, "La prophétie de la 'Almahk, ETL 28 (1952): 648-678 (salvation);

⁵³ Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 313

Seeing this difficulty, some have emended the text to make sense of it, suggesting that Egypt and/or the fly imagery was added secondarily.⁵⁴ However, as the text stands both are mentioned and seem to anticipate trouble for Ahaz from both North (Assyria) and South (the ends of the streams of Egypt). Finally, the oracles conclude with a picture of a time of devastation for Judah, where the countryside is impoverished ("silver" to "thorns" Isa 7:23), invaded by enemies ("bows and arrows" Isa 7:24), unfertile (Isa 7:25) and uncontrolled (Isa 7:25).

4. *Ahaz and the Chronicler*

Keeping in mind the distinctives of both the Ahaz narrative in the DH and that in the book of Isaiah, this study will now examine Ch's Ahaz narrative and search for the reasons behind the distinctiveness in his narrative. As Sarah Japhet has commented Ch's reworking of the narrative is "drastic" and "comprehensive."⁵⁵ Even in Ch's regnal resume of the king there are significant changes. First, unlike Dtr which simply stated that Ahaz "walked in the ways of the kings of Israel" (2 Kgs 16:3) it is said that he also made molten images for the Baalim. Secondly, Ch changes Dtr's note (2 Kgs 16:3) that Ahaz made his son pass through the fire to an assertion that Ahaz "burnt" his "sons" (plural) with fire and made sacrifices in the valley of the son of Hinnom (2 Chr 28:3). While scholars debate what was meant by Dtr's note, Ch removes the ambiguity and interprets the act as being nothing less than child sacrifice, and notes that Ahaz subjected

⁵⁴ Wildberger suggests that the original text did not mention Egypt or the fly imagery, asserting that the reference to Egypt was not in the original text, but only added later in the time of Seleucid and Ptolemaic times. Cf. *Isaiah 1-12*, 322. Clements suggests that the fly and bee imagery were original, but both referred to Assyria. Clements, *Isaiah 1-39*, 90

⁵⁵ Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (1st American ed.; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 895

more than one son to the pagan act. Regarding Ahaz's idol worship, it appears that Ch interpreted Dtr's criticism of Ahaz sacrificing on the high places (2 Kgs 16:4).⁵⁶ While perhaps historically incorrect, it is obvious that Ch used the text as a springboard for his expanded description of Ahaz's wickedness in the regnal resume.

A. The Condemnation of Appropriating Temple Treasuries

Contrary to 2 King 16, the appropriation of Temple funds in Ahaz's appeal to Assyria is explicitly condemned in Ch's version, perhaps out of concern for cultic purity and the sanctity of the temple, (which Ch emphasizes more than Dtr).⁵⁷ It is quite possible that Ch's change in despoliation notices evince an attempt to impose limitations on royal privileges regarding temple.⁵⁸ This concern may be in dialogue with the voice idea of the day that the ruler had authority over the temple and its treasuries, as evidenced in the Persian practice of the "king's chest" which was a tax-collection device where part

⁵⁶ In line with the later Deuteronomistic view of high places. Cf. Iain W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: a Contribution to the Debate About the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988)

⁵⁷ This has been highlighted by many studies. Cf. Gary N. Knoppers, "'The City Yhwh Has Chosen': The Chronicler's Promotion of Jerusalem in Light of Recent Archaeology," in *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology* (ed. Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 307-326; Norbert Dennerlein, *Die Bedeutung Jerusalems in den Chronikbüchern* (Frankfurt am Main; New York: P. Lang, 1999); Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Jerusalem in the Book of Chronicles," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 15-28; Martin Selmen, "Jerusalem in Chronicles," in *Zion, City of our God* (ed. Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 43-56; and Isaac Kalimi, *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, his Time, Place and Writing* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005), 125-139.

⁵⁸ In another paper I have suggested that this possibility, arguing that Ch's explicit statements condemning such temple despoliation, his negative characterization of the offending monarch (contrary to the king's characterization in the DH), and his omissions of temple despoliation notices all reveal the negative disposition of the book of Chronicles in this regard and his desire to limit royal control over temple treasuries. Cf. Paul S. Evans, "Riches, Religion and Politics: The Role of the Temple in Kings and Chronicles," paper presented at the Annual Congress of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies which met in Vancouver, Canada in June, 2008.

of the temple income was diverted from the sanctuary and handed on to the ruler.⁵⁹ In order to counter this idea, Ch quarrels with it by limiting even a Davidic king's privileges in regard to the temple treasuries (this concern can be seen in the deletion of Hezekiah's analogous actions in 2 Chronicles 32 in order to present that monarch in a positive light).

B. Ahaz's Temple Innovations as Worship of Aramean Gods

Another intriguing distinctive of Ch's Ahaz narrative is the king's reproduction of the Damascus altar in Jerusalem, which is presented in Chronicles as his worshipping the gods of Aram. This is contrary to the apparently Yahwistic nature of the worship performed on this altar in 2 Kings 16.⁶⁰ However, even at this point Ch may have been following the lead of his *Vorlage*. Second Kings 16:10 states that Ahaz spent time in Damascus, where he saw the Aramean altar and sent plans back to Jerusalem for the priest to have built a similar/identical altar there. Interestingly, Dtr asserts that the construction of the altar was completed *before* Ahaz returned to Jerusalem (2 Kgs 16:11). This appears to suggest that Ahaz was absent from Judah for an extended period of time. No other king of Israel or Judah is presented in the DH as abdicating his capital for any length of time, making this a unique episode.

In an ancient Near Eastern mindset, to dwell in a new land meant there was no opportunity to worship the god of the old land. Even in 2 Sam 26:19, when David is on

⁵⁹ Joachim Schaper, "The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration," 45 (1995): 528-539. Cf. André Lemaire, "New Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea and Their Historical Interpretation," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. Oded Lipschits et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 413-456] who discusses some Aramaic ostraca which he argues are important for understanding Achaemenid administration and the collection of taxes.

⁶⁰ As Gray points out, Yahwistic practice is implied and the sacrifice described on the altar is "a *locus classicus* for sacrifice in the Temple." Gray, *1 & 2 Kings*, 636

the run from Saul, this understanding is reflected in David's speech when he complains "they have driven me out today, so that I cannot have a share in Yahweh's possession, saying 'go serve other gods.'" To dwell in another land is to worship the god of that land. Ch may have understood Ahaz' absence from Judah and his sojourn in Damascus as indicating that he worshipped the gods of Aram.

Ahaz's sojourn in a foreign land and his concern with the religious practice of that foreign land during his absence, find an interesting echo in the story of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon.⁶¹ As is well known, Nabonidus left Babylon for an extended period of time and resided in Haran, where he undertook the building of temples for a foreign god.⁶² These actions led to his character defamation and an infamous reputation (utilized by Cyrus in his propaganda campaign against the Babylonian monarchy) that alienated him from the powerful Marduk priesthood. While it is unlikely/impossible that Dtr knew of Nabonidus' story, since he probably wrote before Nabonidus' reign,⁶³ the parallel is striking. Ch, on the other hand, would doubtless have known about Nabonidus⁶⁴ and this may have influenced him to understand Ahaz as being analogous to the infamous Babylonian king in this way.

C. The Philistine Campaign Against Judah

⁶¹ For Nabonidus, see Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556-539 B.C.* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989)

⁶² See "The Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus," translated by Paul-Alain Beaulieu (*COS* 2.123A: 310-313).

⁶³ Assuming a pre-exilic (Cross et al.) or exilic Dtr (Noth etc.).

⁶⁴ Note his knowledge of the Cyrus decree (2 Chr 36:23. The Cyrus cylinder explicitly references Nabonidus and his infamous abandonment of Babylon for cultic observances at Haran. Cf. See "Cyrus Cylinder," translated by Mordechai Cogan (*COS* 2.124: 314-316).

Another interesting divergence between 2 Chronicles 28 and 2 Kings 16 is Ch attributing the Philistines as having a successful invasion and conquest against Judah (2 Chr 28:18). This Philistine campaign has no parallel in 2 Kings 16. Some have surmised that the alliance against Assyria at this time was broader than just Aram and Israel and that Philistia was part of the coalition.⁶⁵ If this is so, it is interesting that Dtr chose to omit reference to it.

While it may be that Ch relied on an unknown source for this information,⁶⁶ and that it is historically accurate, his *choosing* to include it in the Ahaz pericope may be due to his dialogue with the book of Isaiah. Isaiah predicted that along with Assyrian trouble will come a threat from the "ends of the springs of Egypt" (Isa 7:18). While Egypt was not a threat to Ahaz during this time, the phrase is sufficiently ambiguous as to signify Philistia to Ch. The word "ends" (קצה) may indicate the "edge," "extremity" or "border" of Egypt, not Egypt itself.⁶⁷ In 2 Chr 9:26 "the land of the Philistines" is paralleled with the "border (גבול) of Egypt," and geographically they are basically adjacent.

Whether the Isaian oracle originally intended Philistia to be understood or not, there is a distinct possibility that Ch could have interpreted it that way.⁶⁸ In fact, in his

⁶⁵ D. J. Wiseman, "A Fragmentary Inscription of Tiglath-pileser. III from Nimrud," 18 (1956): 117-129 Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 191

⁶⁶ Williamson suggests that "Since these matters are not demanded by the Chronicler's message nor suggested by any other passage (beyond a possible hint in 2 Kgs 16:6), it may be confidently concluded that he had access to a separate and valuable alternative source." Williamson, *I and 2 Chronicles*, 345 While this possibility cannot be disproved, if Ch includes this story due to the influence of Isaiah, perhaps some of the need for a separate source to explain this evaporates. Of course others also posit such sources. Cf. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 220 Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 900

⁶⁷ HALOT defines it as "edge, end, extremity."

⁶⁸ It is even possible that Ch augmented Edom's role against Judah during this time due to this ambiguous phrase. Perhaps Ch saw the prophecy as indicating trouble from the south—including Philistia and Edom. Note that Edom and Egypt are lumped together in Jer 9:26 as "those with shaven temples who live in the desert." An interesting translation issue with Jer 9:26 is found in where "פצוצי פאה" (shaven

narrative the chronological progression of campaigns follows that of their mention in the prophecy of Isa 7:18: first, "the fly at the ends of the water channels of Egypt," i.e., Philistia (2 Chr 28:18), then, secondly, "the bee which is in the land of Assyria," i.e., Tiglath-Pileser (2 Chr 28:20). This probability is strengthened by the fact that this threat is called the "fly" from the ends of the water channels of Egypt" and one of the most famous gods of Philistia is Baal-zebub "Master of the flies," known as the god of Ekron (2 Kgs 1:2, 3, 6, 16). In fact, in the entire HB/OT the word זבוב only occurs in reference to the god of Ekron, Isa 7:18 and Qoh 10:1. Ch may have made the connection between 'fly' and Philistia due to the god of Ekron. Interestingly, the villages the Philistines are said to have taken at this time (2 Chr 28:18) are within the vicinity of Ekron (from Ekron Beth-shemesh is less than 7 miles, Soco less than 9 miles and Gimzo less than 12 miles). Baal-zebub rules the 'flies' in Ekron, who invade Ahaz's Judah, as prophesied by Isaiah.

D. The Syro-Ephraimite Threat

Ch's distinctives are seen in a significant way in the description of the war between Judah and its northern neighbours, Israel and Aram. While Dtr and Isaiah present these nations as acting as a unified coalition, Ch presents them as working independently as separate enemies of Ahaz. Also, Dtr notes that the coalition was not successful, concluding that they but could not defeat Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:5), while Ch presents these same nations as defeating him (2 Chr 28:5). This defeat of Ahaz is even elaborated on through the addition of non-synoptic story (2 Chr 28:8-15) of Israel's

temples) was translated by Rashi and Kimchi as "fringe of the desert" (קצה = קצה) using קצה to indicate Edom. (Also in Joel 3:19 Egypt and Edom are listed together condemned together.)

successful campaign against Judah (and the prisoners they took), and the prophetic response it generates. Understanding Ch as being in dialogue with Isaiah may explicate some of the glaring differences between Ch's and Dtr's presentation of these events.

i. *Separating the Syro-Ephraimite Coalition*

In Isa 7:7-9 the prophet predicts that the Syro-Ephraimite coalition will come to nothing (which agrees with 2 Kgs 16:5 which states that Aram and Israel could not prevail against Ahaz). However, due to Ahaz's wickedness, Ch saw it necessary to present Ahaz as defeated by his enemies and suffering immediate retribution. Therefore, in order to acknowledge the voice idea in Isaiah's prophecy Ch could only present separate *and* independent attacks from these nations as successful. This allowed Isaiah's prediction to be sustained as the *coalition* came to nothing.

Ch's dialogue with Isaiah can also be heard in that Pekah ben Remaliah is never referred to as the king of Israel/Ephraim in 2 Chronicles 28. In fact, in the pericope about the return of prisoners from the North, the king of Israel is conspicuously absent from the narrative. When consulting about what to do after the prophetic message, the king is not consulted, but only the chiefs of the Ephraimites (2 Chr 28:12). Ch may be recognizing Isaiah's belittling the king of Israel in Isaiah 7, where Pekah is referred to as a "smouldering stump of firebrand" (Isa 7:4) and the prophet links the failure of the coalition to the fact that "the head of Samaria is the son of Remailiah" (Isa 7:9).⁶⁹ Due to these *ad hominine* arguments in Isaiah 7, Ch's narration of the positive actions of

⁶⁹ Of course Rezin is referred in analogously negative ways in Isaiah 7, which may explain why his name is not mentioned by Ch, who instead calls him "the king of Aram." Due to Isaiah's negative presentation of these kings, Israel's king is denied kingship and Rezin is denied his name.

Samaria in 2 Chronicles 28 are done without consultation (or mention) of the king, and Pekah is denied the title of king, even in his introduction in the narrative (2 Chr 28:6).

ii. *The Exile of the North*

Regarding Williamson's contention that Ch understood both the North and the South as being in partial exile at the end of 2 Chronicles 28, realization of Ch's dialogue with Isaiah 7 supports this conclusion. If Ch was in dialogue with Isaiah, Ch's understanding of the exile of the North as being eminent (or having occurred) in the time of Ahaz may have been influenced by Isa 7:8, which, in the context of the prophet's oracles to Ahaz, mentions that "Ephraim will be shattered from being a people."⁷⁰

iii. *Ahaz's Appeal to Assyria*

Interestingly, the efficacy of Ahaz's appeal to Assyria in this historical context is reversed in Chronicles *vis a vis* 2 Kings 16.⁷¹ Instead of resulting in Ahaz's deliverance from Aram and Israel as in 2 Kings 16, the appeal in 2 Chronicles 28 results in Assyrian oppression. Perhaps the greatest benefit exegetically in recognizing Ch's dialogue with Kings *and* Isaiah, is its ability to explain this difference. Ch doubtless sensed the tension between Isaiah's predictions in this regard and Dtr's presentation of historical events.

⁷⁰ This prediction, of course, states that within 65 years Ephraim would be exiled. While in reality it occurred much sooner than this, leading some scholars to suggest this is a genuine, but inaccurate prophecy. Cf. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 301 however, 65 years is 5 years shorter than the lifespan given to man (Ps 90:10), so Ch may have interpreted it as meaning within one man's lifespan—i.e, Ahaz's lifespan. This may have led him to infer the exile of the North in Ahaz's day.

⁷¹ The occasion of Ahaz's appeal to Assyria appears to be the same in Chronicles as the temporal marker "at that time" בַּעַתְּ הַהִיא appears to refer back to Syro-Ephraimite defeats in 2 Chr 28:5-7 (Aram) and 2 Chr 28:8 (Israel). So Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*, 905 Contra Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 223 Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 345 and the NRSV rendering which views Philistia and Edom as the cause for the appeal through translating וְעַד as "for."

Isaiah emphasized the need for Ahaz to trust in Yahweh or he would not stand at all (Isa 7:9). The prophet also clearly predicts that Assyria will trouble Ahaz severely (Isa 7:17), yet Dtr presented the appeal as essentially successful (2 Kgs 16:9), ending the Syro-Ephraimite threat as Assyria came to his aid. Sensing that the antagonism between these voice-ideas, Ch makes these texts quarrel by making Isaiah's ideas dialogue with Dtr's ideas in 2 Chronicles 28. Ch answers the positions of both texts through his presentation of Ahaz's lack of faith (=appeal to Assyria) which resulted in Assyrian oppression, in accordance with Isaiah's oracles. The book of Isaiah presents Ahaz as rejecting Isaiah's advice, while Dtr does not recount the episode, or present Ahaz as spurning prophetic revelation. Therefore, Ch inserted a story about prophetic obedience, with the apostate north playing the role of obedient to the prophet, in order to make a contrast with Ahaz's prophetic rejection. Furthermore, acknowledging Dtr's voice-idea that Ahaz *did* escape some military threat, Ch includes the story of Israel's returning prisoners to Judah, which, in line with Isaiah's voice-idea, only occurs due to an act of faith (Northern obedience of the prophet Oded). Thus Isaiah's caution that faith is needed in order to survive is affirmed as true, though in this case it is the North who show such faith.⁷²

It is quite clear that Ch would equate obedience to a prophet with "trusting/remaining steadfast" (אמץ). This can be seen in the story of Jehoshaphat in 2 Chronicles 20 and how it parallels Isaiah 7. In Chronicles and Isaiah, a coalition of foreign nations is threatening the Judahite king (Isa7:1; 2 Chr 20:1), the king is afraid (Isa 7:2; 2 Chr 20:3), and a prophet encourages the king (Isa 7:3-9; 2 Chr 20:14-17). In a very

⁷² The notion that the faith of one can aid another is not foreign to biblical texts as the suffering servant suffers vicariously for others (Isaiah 53), the presence of 10 good men would save Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 18), and in the DH, God allows Abijam's son to succeed him, not for his own sake, but for "David's sake" (1 Kgs 15:4).

similar situation, Jehoshaphat chooses to trust in Yahweh, contrary to Ahaz. That Ch saw them as analogous may be perceived by the twofold use of the verb הִשְׁמַיִן in 2 Chr 20:20. In the entire OT/HB, only here and Isa 7:9 employ the verb twice in one sentence, and both employ the words in exactly the same sense. Isaiah cautions Ahaz that "if you do not remain steadfast (הִשְׁמַיִן), you will not stand firm (הִשְׁמַיִן)" (Isa 7:9). Analogously, in Chronicles, after the prophetic message, Jehoshaphat urges the people to "Remain steadfast (הִשְׁמַיִן) in Yahweh your God, and you will stand firm (הִשְׁמַיִן); remain steadfast (הִשְׁמַיִן) in His prophets, and prosper!" The wording clearly seems influenced by Isaiah, only Jehoshaphat is the king heeding such advice. Remaining steadfast is equated with obeying Yahweh's prophets. In Ch's Ahaz narrative, though Ahaz fails to listen to the prophet and remain steadfast, the Northerners do just that.

As Mitchell has asserted, "the reader of Chronicles does not have to know Samuel-Kings [and I would add, Isaiah] in order to get the message of Chronicles. But the reader of Chronicles who also knows Samuel-Kings [+ Isaiah] can appreciate the dialogue between the [three]...."⁷³ In this essay, I suggested that viewing Chronicles as dialogic is fruitful for understanding his specific divergences with his *Vorlage* and perhaps for better understanding his method. As well, this study would suggest that explaining differences between Chronicles and Sam-Kgs could be immensely benefited by realizing the influence of texts other than his primary *Vorlage* as well as ideas current in his day, to which he answers.

⁷³ Mitchell, "Dialogism in Chronicles,"